UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 15

JULY 15, 1969, TO JULY 25, 1969
(PAGES 19497 TO 20846)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1969

XUM

T
wa
der
T
L.
pr

A
blo
get
beg
of
sov
cor
thi
wh
tho
per
the
ish
to
of
tog
the
fill

T
bec
pre
hat
hed
tive
the
acc
1, 2
A

I
un
the
day
T
po

LI
I
I

I
un
sio
Ser
if
Do
tim
for
bus
to
T
por

I
ask

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE—*Tuesday, July 15, 1969*

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast made of one blood all races and nations to dwell together upon the earth, and who at the beginning breathed into man the breath of life and set him free under Thy divine sovereignty, look, we pray Thee, with compassion upon the captive peoples of this world, whose freedom is denied and whose spirits suffocate under regimes of thought control, property control and person control. Keep us ever faithful in the freedom in which we have been nourished, and by Thy grace give us wisdom to foster freedom among all the peoples of the world, until all mankind is drawn together in a firm spiritual alliance and the word of the ancient prophet is fulfilled:

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; He hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord—Isaiah 61: 1, 2.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 14, 1969, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), if the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) is not ready to proceed at that time for his 20 minutes, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with "New Reports."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated, beginning with "New Reports."

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Bethel B. Larey, of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Arkansas for the term of 4 years.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

U.S. ASSAY OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N.Y.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Nicholas Costanzo, of New York, to be Superintendent of the U.S. assay office at New York, N.Y.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MURPHY

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, without the time coming out of his time?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

U.S. DIPLOMATIC COURIER SERVICE COMMEMORATIVE MEDAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 310, H.R. 7215.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7215) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Diplomatic Courier Service.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

(At this point Mr. ALLEN assumed the chair.)

S. 2625—INTRODUCTION OF THE URBAN AND RURAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1969

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill, the Urban and Rural Education Act of 1969. The measure would amend title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to alleviate and help with some of the critical problems that are besetting the field of education.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2625) to amend title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide for a program of urban and rural education grants to local educational agencies, introduced by Mr. MURPHY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, today I address the Senate and introduce a bill on a most important and vital subject. I am speaking of the educational crisis that exists today in the Nation's big cities and depressed rural areas, where so very many disadvantaged youngsters are concentrated.

Almost daily, from these troubled schools, we pick up educational distress signals—bond issues defeated, cutbacks in educational programs, teacher shortages, classroom violence, dropouts, lack of discipline, drug problems, and an endless number of concerns that beset our educational system. While there is general agreement that these signals are both real and serious, little response has been made to them. The measure I introduce today, Mr. President, is a sorely needed reply to these insistent educational "S O S" signals. It would amend title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to provide additional assistance to these schools in an effort to rescue them from the fiscal straits they are in and to enable them to compensate for the educational deficiencies of the disadvantaged youngsters found in disproportionate numbers and percentages in these areas.

My bill, the Urban and Rural Education Act of 1969, would authorize a 30-percent addition or "add-on" to regular title I funds for the first year and a 40-percent addition or "add-on" for the second and succeeding years to local education agencies with approval by the State education departments in which:

First, the number of disadvantaged, title I children, is double the national rate of low-income children; or

Second, the number of title I children is 5,000 or more.

Because we are in the midst of an educational crisis, first-year funds will go to local educational agencies without any preconditions. For second and succeeding years, however, my bill requires that the local educational agency develop and secure approval of a plan before receiving funds.

I have written into the amendment some requirements, which I am convinced are necessary. These requirements were framed after discussions with both classroom teachers and educational leaders. I believe they are essential to get maximum use out of limited resources and attain maximum results. First, my amendment requires that these add-on funds be used only at the elementary level. Classroom teachers, who daily struggle with this crisis, tell me that it is difficult at best to rescue youngsters who reach the secondary grades trailing their contemporaries by a number of grades. I do provide, however, for an escape clause which would allow funds to be used at the secondary level, with the approval of the local and State educational agencies, if the problems are equally urgent at the secondary level and if it can be shown that such expenditures are effective at the higher level.

Another important reason for emphasizing the elementary school years is the growing realization of their importance to a child's early development. A recent State of California evaluation of the Headstart program demonstrated that this program in California is producing "Dramatic and positive results." This study found that the children participating in the Headstart program made twice the normal gains in language tests. The report also indicated that IQ scores were raised an average of 17 points over a 17-month period. With this program providing youngsters an equal start, it is important that the elementary grades continue this progress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a June 13 article from the Los Angeles Times on the Headstart program be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, a second requirement is that preference must be given to schools having the greatest need within a qualifying district. Scattering of funds too thinly within a district has been a criticism voiced frequently to the use of the title I funds. It is my hope and intent that the elementary level requirement not only will help prevent the necessity for difficult remedial work at the secondary level, but also, when coupled with the preference provision, will result in the concentration of resources so as to achieve a substantial and a maximum impact.

My bill also would provide an additional 3 percent for the first year and 4 percent for subsequent years, to be used at the discretion of the Commissioner of Education. This is to avoid any inequities in the operation of the formula. While I am convinced that my formula is a fair one and will reach the most troubled schools in the country, I have added this amendment so that the Commissioner will have the needed flexibility to respond to schools in districts, not qualifying under my amendment, but nevertheless having similar needs. Mr. President, this bill will provide substantial new resources to school districts. Had my amendment been on the books in the last fiscal year, for example, it would have meant, based on the appropriations for title I, approximately $200 million, and for this fiscal year, based on the administration's title I request, it would mean an additional $220 million, which is badly needed.

In 1961, Dr. James Conant, the noted educator, warned:

> We are allowing social dynamite to accumulate in our large cities.

The accuracy of his warning, the explosiveness of the "social dynamite" has been brought home to all Americans. Much of this "social dynamite" results from those who have dropped out of school. The Commission on Civil Disorders reported that the "typical riot participant was a high school dropout." The fact that 1 million youngsters drop out of school yearly, ill-prepared to find employment and a useful place in our competitive society which demands highly trained and educated citizens has greatly alarmed me and I know this is true of all Senators. As a result, I authored in 1967 a dropout prevention program to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This program, which was adopted by the Congress and is now part of our education laws, seeks to concentrate resources in an effort to find approaches that will prevent dropouts. Strongly supported by both the Johnson and the Nixon administrations, this program has great promise and potential in finding long-term solutions to the dropout problem. However, it is just getting underway and only $5 million of the $30 million authorized was appropriated. The administration has requested $23 million for the program for this new fiscal year, and I certainly hope the Congress will fully fund it, because I can think of no area where an expenditure could do a better job in connection with the future of our country.

I am convinced, however, that existing problems of our cities and depressed rural areas are too urgent to await these results. Our 50 large cities alone enroll one out of every four disadvantaged youngsters in the United States. What we have, Mr. President, is an intolerable situation where large numbers of students with significant education handicaps are found in school districts with resources unequal to the challenge of educating them. These youngsters are harder to educate and we simply must provide additional resources if we are to give them an equal educational opportunity. The following facts clearly reveal not only the enormity, but the severity of the educational problems in both our troubled urban and rural schools.

In our urban areas, Mr. President, youngsters from low-income families begin school with a handicap. Standardized test scores given to first graders indicate that minority children, many of whom are in the low-income group, on the average, rank 15 percent lower than other children. Quite obviously they have a much harder job to get started.

Starting behind, these children fall even further behind. The average minority group student is roughly two grades behind other students at grade 6, three grades behind at grade 9 and four grades behind at grade 12.

In our Nation's 15 largest cities, the school dropout rate varies from a high of 46.6 percent to a low of 21.4 percent. As bad as these statistics are, focusing on poverty area schools within our large cities, it is shocking that 70 percent of the youngsters drop out before completing high school. In Californiia the McCone Commission, established in the wake of the 1965 Watts rioting, found that in three schools in a predominately Negro area of Los Angeles, two-thirds of the students drop out before completing high school.

And in our rural areas:

Youngsters receive less education than their counterparts in other sections of the country. Children in urban centers average 11 years of school whereas rural regions average about 9 years.

Appoximately half of the 415,000 children of migrant parents have been estimated not to attend school on a regular basis.

In 1960 nearly twice as many urban as rural youngsters were enrolled in college.

Rural isolation and inadequate salaries make it difficult to secure trained teachers. As a result, twice as many rural teachers as urban teachers lack proper certification.

XUM

A September 1967, Presidential Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty reported:

> There are still about 10,000 one-room schools in this country—mostly in rural America.

Mr. President, nearly two decades ago, the late, esteemed Senator Robert Taft, saw inequities in educational opportunities throughout the country, and reversed his earlier opposition to Federal aid to education and became its strong advocate. Senator Taft then eloquently explained this shift:

> Two years ago I opposed very strongly the proposal which then was made for a general passing out of Federal funds in aid for education; but, in the course of that investigation and that debate, one fact became apparent, namely, that in many States the children were not receiving a basic education; and that some of the states although spending on education as much of a proportion of their income as the larger wealthier States, were not able to provide such basic education . . . It has always seemed to me that education is primarily a state function. I have not changed my views on that subject; but I believe that in the field of education the Federal Government, as in the fields of health, relief, and medical care, has a secondary interest or obligation to see that there is a basic floor under those essential services for all adults and children in the United States. I have particularly felt that the entire basis of American life is opportunity, and that no child can have an equal opportunity unless he has a basic minimum education.

Mr. President, as a nation, we have made substantial educational advances in the past two decades, both qualitatively and quantitatively. Sputnik jolted the Nation into enacting the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This was followed by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the vocational education amendments, as well as other Federal legislation which, along with a tremendous effort on the part of State governments and local communities, has resulted in more and more people receiving increased and better education.

Yet, education inequities, which so concerned and moved Senator Taft in the late forties, exist today and should, I believe, move Congress to adopt my proposal. Today, the inequities in education are both similar and drastically different than those of Taft's time. They reflect those very changes that have taken place across our country.

These changes have developed from perhaps one of the greatest internal migrations of people in history. Since World War II, a great exodus of Americans from rural to urban America has occurred. Over 20 million Americans have made that march until now, 70 percent of our citizens live in urban areas containing less than 2 percent of our land.

To produce such a dramatic population shift, obviously many factors were at work. Poor conditions and limited opportunities in rural America sent people to the cities, seeking greater opportunities and better conditions. This push-pull phenomenon often resulted in bringing both the best and the worst of rural America to the city. And, rural America, by this process, was stripped of needed educated and trained manpower and the arrival of the worst into the cities substantially magnified the serious situation that cities find themselves in today. The poorest of the migrants, in terms of training, education, and financial resources, and because of discrimination, have tended to stay in the cities while the best trained and educated, making up a rising middle class, joined in another significant internal migration—the movement of 33 percent of these cities' inhabitants to the suburbs. Today, more than half of our metropolitan population lives outside the central city. During the period of 1966–68, an average of 486,000 white Americans left cities. This was almost four times as many as the 141,000 whites who left the cities during the previous 6-year period. Sylvia Porter, the widely syndicated financial columnist commented recently on the consequences to the big cities of this outward migration. She wrote:

> For a high proportion of those moving out of the cities are those in their young to middle financially able and independent years. A high proportion remaining in the cities are the poorer households—households headed by women or older citizens, households with a lot of children, broken families. These are the people most dependent on welfare, the people who can least afford to pay the taxes to finance the cost of essential public services. No sign of reversal in these new population trends is in sight. The financial outlook for our cities has never been bleaker.

In addition to the migration from cities of such citizens, industry, with its tax base and jobs, both of which are desperately needed by core city citizens, has also been moving out. Mr. Alan K. Campbell, in the January 11, 1969, edition of Saturday Review traced this industry decentralization trend, saying:

> An examination of the central cities of twelve large metropolitan areas demonstrates that the proportion of manufacturing compared to that of suburban areas has clearly declined over the past three decades, especially in the post-World War II period. In 1929, these twelve cities accounted, on the average, for 66 per cent of manufacturing employment. This percentage decreased to 61 per cent by 1947, dropped to 49 per cent by 1958, and has since declined even further.

New jobs being created in the suburban areas, because of transportation problems, are often out of reach of the poor people from the central city.

Mr. President, it is not that our troubled cities and impoverished rural areas have not been trying. Although running as fast as they can, they slip farther and farther behind. With its financially better-off individuals and industry moving to the suburban areas, the tax base of the cities has seriously eroded. Mr. Alan K. Campbell described the meaning of this tax base loss to city education programs, and I quote:

> Translated into educational terms, the tax base in large cities has not kept pace with the most recent growth and changing nature of the school population in the cities. Indeed, an examination of the per pupil taxable assessed evaluation over a five-year period shows that ten large cities out of fourteen experienced a decrease in this source of revenue. Since local property taxes are the major source of local educational revenues, large cities can barely meet ordinary education needs, let alone resolve problems resulting from shifting their population patterns.

The tax base of impoverished rural areas is equally distressing.

Mr. President, the population pattern shifts which we have been discussing have produced great changes in our society, changes we must appreciate, changes we must understand, if we are to deal with the crisis confronting us.

It is useful to recall that there was not always such a dilemma in our cities. On the contrary, from almost the beginning of the free public school education, cities with their concentration of wealth and talents were in the forefront of the Nation in education. The large cities had higher per pupil expenditures than outlying school districts. Their better education programs were an additional attraction to the cities. Around 1949, which is about the period Senator Taft was urging financial assistance to remove educational inequities, many large cities began to show a decline in the educational expenditures relative to their previous levels and with few exceptions relative to the national norm.

By 1965–66, only New York City of the top 36 cities in the Nation could boast of a per pupil expenditure significantly higher than the national norm. Economist Seymour Sacks, professor of economics at Syracuse University, traces the deterioration of the central city's favored financial position as follows:

> It would not be amiss, however, to state that the period from about 1957 to the present witnessed the most fundamental shift in the fiscal position of large city educational systems in U.S. history. For as late as 1957 central cities were still able to spend slightly more than their own outside central city areas. Based on a representative cross-sectional study of 36 Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas in the year 1957, the comparable current expenditures per pupil for the two areas were $312 in the central cities and $303 in the outside central city areas. In a short five-year period, that is by 1962, a gap of $64 had opened up between the current expenditures per pupil in the outside central city area and the central city areas, $438 compared to $376. In this short period the historic preeminence of central city education had vanished. And within three more years the gap had widened to $124 per pupil, $573 per pupil as compared to $449 per pupil. With only two exceptions, whatever per pupil expenditures in a given central city area were, those of its outlying areas were higher. In only two areas, Denver and Providence, R.I., were central city expenditures higher than those of their outlying areas, and they were nominal amounts. In two areas the same school districts provided public school education to both the central city and outside central city areas. In the remaining 32 areas the outside areas had higher levels than those of their central city areas. A clear pattern of dominance had been established.

Thus, from 1957, when the central city enjoyed a slight edge in per pupil expenditures, its educational system, compared to the school system outside the city, steadily deteriorated. By 1965, in the 37 largest metropolitan areas, the average per pupil expenditure was $449 for the central city but $573 for the suburbs—a gap of $124. All indications are that this expenditure gap, already wide, is growing dramatically.

Mr. President, also entering the picture and compounding the fiscal crisis of our cities are the noneducation services and demands which confront them. Our

XUM

cities have monumental problems beside education. Air and water pollution, rising crime rates, transportation snarls, and housing are just a few. That noneducation costs are a greater burden to the city is demonstrated by the fact that noneducational expenditures make up 68 percent of the total public expenditures in the Nation's 37 largest central cities, as compared to only 47 percent in the suburban districts. This excessive demand for services, or what one author has called municipal overburden, on education in our cities has been described by the Fels Institute as follows:

> The high cost of municipal services which produce much higher total tax burden on the urban districts significantly reduces the ability of the urban districts to provide fiscal support for education services.

In addition, Mr. President, State equalization formulas have not kept pace with the population movements and financial needs of the various districts within the States. Earlier in our history, the city's wealth was tapped to equalize educational opportunities in less affluent areas. Now that the situation is reversed and the cities are in desperate need of financial help, States must reexamine their allocation formulas in light of these changing circumstances. Mr. Alan Campbell describes the State equalization formulas, saying:

> The shocker, however, is that state aid to schools, which one might think would be designed to redress the imbalance somewhat, discriminates against the cities. On the average, the suburbs receive $40 more in state aid than the cities.

Governor Reagan, of California, is well aware of the failure to properly match resources and need. In a May 11, 1969, report to the people of the State, he said:

> There is widespread agreement that we must overhaul the tax structure used to finance our public schools system. The existing financing program for elementary and scondary schools in California does not provide equal education opportunities for all children in the state. Elementary school district expenditures, for example, range from as little as $289 per ADA—this means per average daily attendance, or $289 per student—all the way up to $2,662 per student per ADA in some school districts. Some low-wealth districts struggle under intolerable property tax burden, while some high-wealth districts are not so heavily burdened.

There is definitely an imbalance there that needs attention.

My good friend, Governor Reagan also made an innovative proposal to correct these traditions. Certainly he is to be commended for his efforts to right this mismatch of need and resources.

The picture that has emerged from the discussion so far is not a pleasant nor a pretty one. We have traced the great migrations that have taken place in our country. We saw that both the best and the worst of the rural areas poured into the cities. We examined a subsequent exodus from the city to the surburban community by a growing middle class with its higher income and by industry with its important tax base. This has left a high concentration of disadvantaged children with pressing educational needs in our core cities and rural areas which simply do not have adequate resources to cope with the situation.

Mr. President, inadequate fiscal resources are a chronic complaint and concern at all levels of government. But in the case of our central cities their fiscal condition is acute. It is a tribute to our cities, given so many priorities, that they have been able to keep fiscally afloat. But tribute is not enough. We must provide help.

Mr. President, the urgency of responding to the education crisis can be shown by the fact that during an April meeting of the National School Board Associations, as many as 30 of the largest cities indicated they may not have enough money to begin school this coming fall year. I understand, however, that this is unlikely and that they will all open, but what will happen is what is happening in my city of Los Angeles, where needed programs will have to be curtailed or reduced. In a June 19 letter, Dr. Jack Crowther, superintendent of schools, Los Angeles, described the Los Angeles situation to me.

May I say I have had the privilege of knowing Dr. Crowther for a long time. I do not think there is a finer educator or superintendent of schools in this great land of ours. He said:

> The financial crisis of education in large cities has received national attention this past year. The situation in Los Angeles is particularly acute as we find ourselves $27 million short for the fiscal year 1969–70. The resulting cuts have seriously affected the quality of our educational program.

Secretary Finch, in testimony before the Senate Education Subcommittee, discussed this problem as follows:

> One of our greatest concerns is to find better ways to meet the educational crisis in the cities. School people and board members across the country are frightened by what they are calling the "Youngstown's phenomenon"—the complete shutdown of their schools for lack of funds. Cities like Philadelphia, Chicago, Baltimore, Los Angeles, and Detroit, to name a few, are facing severe financial crises. Some, like Baltimore, have made the most strenuous efforts to attain additional resources, and still finding their needs to be far beyond their capabilities.

The Secretary went on to discuss the educational crisis in the cities, saying:

> The core cities contain the highest concentration of the poor and educationally deprived, and are experiencing mounting difficulties in finding adequate resources to support their school system. Providing quality education for the disadvantaged children in our cities, and in rural areas is apparent not only for the sake of poverty's children, but also for the sake of all children of increasingly urbanized America. This problem is among the most important priorities in our search for improved ways to respond to the need of America's schools and school children.

Thus, Mr. President, one of the greatest concerns and priorities of our most capable Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is a search for programs to meet the rural-urban educational crisis.

Commissioner of Education, James Allen, in discussing this school crisis said:

> The urban crises in education . . . has shaken society at its very roots. The situation is one which emphasizes a need for bold action at the federal and there is no problem of higher priority or greater urgency and importance in determining what direction and form this action shall take.

Commissioner Allen has therefore echoed the deep concern of Secretary Finch for help to our troubled cities.

Dr. George Fisher of the National Education Association, in testimony before the Education Committee, emphasized the urban crisis and suggested an approach similar to that which I am making today. He said:

> The major problem facing America's public schools today lies in our inner-city areas . . . We suggest a 30 per cent override on the appropriation proposed by the Administration with such funds to go to those cities with large centers. . . .

A similar plea was sounded by Boardman Moore, a Californian and president of the National School Board Association, who told the committee:

> Core cities contain the highest concentration of the poor and educationally deprived. There is a dire necessity for providing compensatory education for the children from these backgrounds. Programs aimed at upgrading these educational opportunities are both expensive and are in addition to the regular educational system. At the same time, the tax base of these cities has been eroded. Medium and high-income families have moved from the cities, more and more industry is decentralizing its operation. On top of this, the cost of providing necessary city services, often called municipal overburden, is rising.

So, Mr. President, over and over again in testimony before the Senate Education Subcommittee, and in our communications media, the crisis in the cities and rural areas has been retold. Time is running out, however, and I agree with Secretary Finch, Commissioner Allen, the NEA, the National School Board, Governor Reagan, and so many others that we must indeed take "bold action." It is for that reason that I am proposing this bill today.

Mr. President, I am convinced that a new effort is needed to deal with the massive, critical educational problems. Why did I elect a two-prong attack targeted where the need is the greatest—in our core cities and our depressed rural areas? It is no secret that much of the educational problems in our cities today had their roots in rural America. With the mobility of our present population, which sees one-fifth of our citizens change their homes and approximately one million youngsters cross State lines annually, educational deficiencies in one area of the country produce problems in another area. We truly are a mobile people—a nation on the move. My State of California is aware of this mobility as much as any State, for enough people enter California each month to create a town of 30,000 citizens. Mr. President, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in a study entitled, "Rural Poverty and Regional Progress in Urban Society," urged a twin approach to eradicate "gross educational inequities between regions and between impoverished rural and urban areas and affluent suburban communities," emphasizing:

> It is unrealistic to expect the eroding tax base of many of our core cities and rural areas to supply the additional money.

Continuing, the chamber's report reasoned:

> Better education for potential or incoming migrants both at the place of origin—the rural south—and the place of destination—the central city—is necessary to maximize human resources and reduce poverty nationally. An inferior education for impoverished children in rural and urban areas is economically costly to the nation. Education expands life's opportunities. In today's economy, education, jobs and material well-being are inextricably related. The better a man's education the better his pay and the better his standard of living. To maximize productive human resources, this nation must offer full and fair educational opportunities to all its residents.

Mr. President, in 7 short years, this Nation will commemorate its 200th birthday. I know of no greater way of honoring this anniversary of the signing of our Declaration of Independence than by an effort to equal what Dr. Wilson Riles of the California State Department of Education, called "American education's most challenging problem in the latter half of the 20th century."

He said:

> The top priority issue facing the city schools and in fact facing all education is how to improve the school achievement of the children of the poor, disadvantaged, groups that have in the past failed to receive the full benefits of American education.

Let us recognize that this has not always been the case. In the fifties, we were concerned over how many made it to college, and following sputnik, over the quality and quantity of our engineering and scientific talent. Our school systems served the country well during this period.

It was not until the sixties that we began to really concern ourselves with the challenge of adequately educating youngsters coming from disadvantaged backgrounds. Many forces converged to bring their education problems to the forefront. Education, always important because of the technical nature of our society which needed skilled and educated manpower, became a necessity. A high school diploma became a passport to employment. In addition, the country set out to reduce poverty and the country was determined to move more minority citizens into society's mainstream.

Providing equal education opportunities to all children, regardless of their background and place of birth, is a necessary challenge to a nation whose very history is one challenging chapter after another. Those who doubt we will be equal to this challenge might reread the history of the signers of the Declaration of Independence and those who followed them through the pages of history. For those who doubt we can do it, they had better reexamine the fact that our national response to sputnik will place a man—two men, really—on the moon ahead of our competitor. My amendment is in response to the city and rural school crisis—a challenge more difficult and as exciting as the moon race, and there are some who think it may be even more productive. My amendment will help us meet the challenge of providing truly equal educational opportunities to all disadvantaged citizens. As a member of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate, I will do everything I can to see that this program, which I consider to be most worthy and most vital, is enacted this year.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The text of the bill follows:

S. 2625

A bill to amend title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide for a program of urban and rural education grants to local educational agencies

Be it enacted in the Senate and House of Representatives in the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Urban and Rural Education Act of 1969".

SEC. 2. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended (1) by redesignating part C, and all references thereto, as part D, (2) by redesignating sections 131 through 136, and all references thereto, as sections 141 through 146, and (3) by inserting before such part a new part as follows:

"PART C—URBAN AND RURAL EDUCATION GRANTS

"SEC. 131. (a) (1) For each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1969, for which payments are made pursuant to part A, a payment shall be made to each State educational agency for a grant to each local educational agency in such State in which—

"(A) the per centum which the total number of children described in clause (A), (B), or (C), of section 103(a) (2) of this title in the school district of such agency for such year bears to the total enrollment in the schools of such agency for such year is greater than two times the average such per centum for all local educational agencies in all the States; or

"(B) the total number of such children in the school district of such agency in such year is five thousand or more.

"For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such grant shall be in the amount of 30 per centum of the amount which such local educational agency is eligible to receive for such year pursuant to part A of this title, and for each succeeding fiscal year such grant shall be in the amount of 40 per centum of the amount which such agency is eligible to receive pursuant to part A.

"(2) For each such fiscal year the Commissioner may also make payments to State educational agencies for grants to local educational agencies which do not qualify pursuant to paragraph (1) but notwithstanding have an urgent need for grants pursuant to this part. The total such payments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, may be in an amount not in excess of 3 per centum of the total authorized payments for such year under paragraph (1), and for each succeeding fiscal year, the total such payments may be in an amount not in excess of 4 per centum of the total authorized payments for such year under paragraph (1).

"(b) Grants pursuant to this section shall be used for the same purposes as grants pursuant to part A, but for elementary education only, unless the local educational agency and its State educational agency determine—

"(1) that the need for financial assistance for such purposes is as urgent in the secondary schools of the area; and

"(2) that the use of financial assistance pursuant to this part for secondary education will be as effective for the purposes of this title as the use of such assistance for elementary education;

and in such event such grants may also be used for secondary education. Preference in the use of such grants shall be given to schools with the greatest number of children described in clause (A), (B), or (C) of section 103(a) (2) of this title and to schools with the greatest percentage of such children in the enrollment.

"(c) (1) The provisions of sections 105, 106, and 107 (except subsection (b)) with respect to applications, assurances from States, and payments for the purposes of part A shall apply to applications, assurances from States, and payments for the purposes of this part, and the Commissioner may establish such additional requirements as may be necessary for the purposes of this part.

"(2) In addition to the requirements of paragraph (1), for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and each succeeding fiscal year, each local educational agency applying for a grant pursuant to this part shall submit with the application for such grant a plan, approved by its State educational agency, for the use of such grant.

"(d) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

SEC. 3. Section 107(b) of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "under this part" and inserting in lieu thereof "under this title."

SEC. 4. Sections 132 and 133(a) of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 are each amended by striking out "or 121(b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "121(b) or 131(c)".

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Los Angeles, (Calif.) Times, June 13, 1969]

STATE'S VERSION OF PROGRAM: CHILDREN MAKE STRONG GAINS IN HEADSTART, STUDY CLAIMS

(By Jack McCurdy)

SACRAMENTO.—Children in California's version of the Head Start program made twice the normal gains on language tests after almost a year in the classes, the first evaluation of the project showed Thursday.

They averaged a growth of 14 months in reading ability over a seven-month period, the study indicated.

The evaluation, presented to the State Board of Education, reflects the most dramatic improvement in pupils' achievement of any state program in the nation, state officials said.

The findings are in sharp contrast with conclusions from a widely publicized study of the National Head Start program reported several months ago by Westinghouse Learning Corp.

It indicated that children involved in Head Start summer classes in 1966 had received little benefit from the instruction.

However, California's program is producing "dramatic and positive results," Mrs. Jeanada Nolan, head of the state's preschool program, told the board.

The study of California's preschool classes, she said, is the first since the program began in 1965. It was recommended by the Legislature two years ago and launched last fall.

About 1,550 children, representing approximately 10% of the youngsters enrolled in the state program, were tested last October and last May in an attempt to measure any changes in their achievement level over the seven-month span.

The pupils were located in Los Angeles, the San Francisco Bay Area, other parts of Northern California and the San Joaquin Valley. All major racial and ethnic groups were included, she added.

The Peabody Picture Vocabulary test, a widely used test to assess the intellectual status of very young children, was used.

The test is reliable, and the children involved were carefully drawn to fairly repre-

XUM

sent a cross section of the preschool pupils, the report said.

As a result, it added, "it can be safely concluded that the increase (in achievement) can be attributed to the effects of the preschool educational program."

The report also indicated that the children who were tested raised their IQs (intelligence quotients) an average of 17 points over the seven-month period.

On the first test, their average IQ was 88. By the May test, it had risen to 105.

In another analysis of the test scores, the study showed that the average growth in "mental age" of the pupils totaled 16 months over the seven-month period.

This was arrived at by averaging the tested mental age of the pupils in October and May and then comparing them.

They averaged three years, nine months in October when their actual age averaged 4 years, three months.

In May, they averaged 5 years, 1 month in mental age, and in actual age they had remained an average of 4 years, 10 months.

This analysis showed that after seven months in the classes, their mental age as reflected on the test had exceeded their actual age by three months—making them above-average age in language ability.

Max Rafferty, state superintendent of public instruction, told the board that despite what the Westinghouse study showed, "Head Start did make a difference in California."

Mrs. Nolan challenged the validity of the Westinghouse study, pointing out that the children who were tested only were involved in about eight weeks of Head Start classes.

She said no pretests were used and that when the children were tested, about two years had elapsed since they had been in Head Start classes.

The study was based on a comparison of their test scores with those of children who had not been in the program, showing little difference.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) is to be recognized for 1 hour at this point. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, notwithstanding the previous order, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a brief quorum call, without the time being charged against the Senator who is next in order of appearance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, notwithstanding the previous order under which the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin would be now recognized, I ask unanimous consent that the able Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) be recognized for not to exceed 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I thank my good friend the Senator from West Virginia for his courtesy.

S. 2626—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL DESIGNATING THE POST CEMETERY AT FORT RICHARDSON, ALASKA, AS A NATIONAL CEMETERY

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the citizens of Alaska have never hesitated to step forward when their country has called. The service record of Alaska's veterans is long and distinguished, ranking proudly with any State in the Nation.

However, the veterans of my State are being denied one of the basic privileges that all veterans in this Nation receive. This is the privilege to be buried in a national cemetery.

Currently, there is a national cemetery in Alaska, located in Sitka. However, it is far removed from many population centers of the State, and it works an extreme hardship and expense upon the families of many veterans who wish to bury their deceased veterans there. Transportation costs are high, and the final resting place of the veteran is far away from his loved ones in other parts of Alaska. Alaska is a huge State, being over one-fifth the size of the entire continental United States together. Our transportation system is very inadequate, and travel between different areas is difficult and expensive. Often, the only method of travel is by sea or air. For an area as large as Alaska, having only one national cemetery is a hardship. The Sitka Cemetery is adequately located for citizens of southeastern Alaska but very much removed from the citizens of the central and southcentral areas. The situation is the same as if the people of Los Angeles had to bury their loved ones in Sacramento and then were only able to visit the cemetery by air or boat. I think the inadequacy of the present situation is evident.

For several years there has been discussion of establishing a new national cemetery in central or south-central Alaska to better serve the large population of the rail-belt area. However, the entire national cemetery program is currently under review, and it is presently impossible to establish an entirely new national cemetery until the administrative problems of that review are settled.

Nonetheless, I feel that, in the interim, the veterans of Alaska should have access to a proper national cemetery, convenient to their homes and loved ones.

Consequently, I am today introducing S. 2626 which would designate the existing post cemetery at Fort Richardson, Alaska, as a national cemetery. The cemetery facilities already exist there, and it is a matter of little or no money and a minor administrative change to provide the veterans of this area with a national cemetery within reach of their homes. This is a step which would not conflict with the current policy of not establishing entirely new national cemeteries and yet provide a basic service to many deserving veterans.

The people of Alaska are extremely interested in seeing that a centrally located national cemetery is established in Alaska. The State legislature has passed a resolution calling for the establishment of a national cemetery in the Cook Inlet-Tanana Basin area of Alaska and all of the veterans organizations in the State have expressed their wholehearted approval and support for such a measure.

Despite the fact that there is a moratorium on establishing new national cemeteries, I feel that it is both desirable and feasible to designate the existing facility at Fort Richardson as a national cemetery without upsetting the national review now underway. This is a simple thing to do, but it would have the greatest benefit for thousands of veterans in my State. I hope that the Congress will see fit to accord these veterans the same rights and privileges that veterans in all the rest of the Nation receive.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent that the text of S. 2626 be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2626) to provide for the establishment of the post cemetery at Fort Richardson, Alaska, as a national cemetery, introduced by the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2626

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to establish a national cemetery at Fort Richardson, Alaska. The Secretary shall include within the boundaries of such national cemetery the grounds presently set aside for use as a post cemetery at Fort Richardson and shall include within the boundaries of such national cemetery such other lands under his jurisdiction at Fort Richardson as he deems necessary or appropriate.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Army shall provide for the care and maintenance of the national cemetery established under authority of this Act.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

CONTINUANCE OF INCOME TAX SURCHARGE AND CERTAIN EXCISE TAXES—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 74 AND 75

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for referral to the Committee on Finance, a series of amendments to be proposed to H.R. 12290, the income tax surcharge and the repeal of the investment credit.

I ask unanimous consent that the economic reasons for retention of the investment credit for the mining industry be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without

XUM

objection, the material will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

The amendments were referred to the Committee on Finance.

The material, presented by Mr. STEVENS, is as follows:

Economic Reasons for Retention of the Investment Credit for the Mining Industry

Repeal of the seven percent investment credit will probably have its greatest impact on the mining industry, which has the *highest ratio of investment in facilities and equipment per employee*. New and bigger mining equipment and minerals processing facilities are the key to profitable utilization of *lower grade deposits* on which this nation is becoming increasingly reliant in many areas. Because of the long lead-times involved such projects must be undertaken now and on a continuing basis if this nation is not going to become less self-sufficient in its raw material supply in the face of a *fourfold increase* in the projected *demand* for minerals by the turn of the century.

The credit has had, and continues to have, a valuable role in encouraging investment in the minerals industry to increase productivity, which is a constructive way to combat *inflation;* with mineral demands constantly increasing, it is imperative that this country have available an adequate supply of the raw material industrial input at reasonable prices. Inflation would be fed by either a reduction in supply of raw materials or an increase in the minerals industry's costs, which in effect the repeal of the credit would amount to.

Retention of the seven percent investment credit is one essential step toward providing feasible and economic *financing* of vitally needed expansion of mining facilities; the favorable effect of its cash flow helps prevent undue strains on the capital market. The need for borrowing is reduced particularly for small companies who, even if they could get the money, would find today's high interest rates prohibitive in many projects.

During 1962 Congress adopted the seven percent investment credit and the Administration promulgated new depreciation guidelines for the purpose of placing U.S. industry on a *competitive* basis with industries of *other* major industrialized *nations* of the free world that used their tax systems to encourage investment in machinery and equipment. One of the main goals of this two-pronged attack on the obsolete character of our nation's industrial machine was to make our industry competitive both at home and abroad and thus help correct our adverse balance of payments.

Finally, the mining industry in particular is faced with rising costs for air and water pollution, for land reclamation, and for mine safety, which seldom, if ever, produce an economic return. It would be unwise to put an additional burden on this industry by repealing the investment credit, and it should be retained as a permanent feature of our tax laws.

Mr. STEVENS. I should like to point out that the second amendment I propose would exempt from the repeal of the investment credit small business properties as defined by Small Business Administration, intrastate pipeline properties, and investments made in depressed areas. These are these areas which are vital to my State; and I urge that the chairman of the Committee on Finance, our good friend, the Senator from Louisiana, give consideration to these, as he indicated to me on the floor yesterday he would do.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the previous order, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT) be recognized for a unanimous-consent request at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR MEANINGFUL EFFORTS TO ESTABLISH PERMANENT PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST—ADDITION OF NAME OF SENATOR FONG TO LIST OF SIGNERS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on April 25, 1969, I had the pleasure to join in a statement expressing strong support for meaningful efforts to establish permanent peace in the Middle East. This statement was made on the occasion of Israel's 21st anniversary. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG) be added to the list of Senators who signed this statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Proposed Legislation Authorizing the Secretary Concerned To Apply the Pay and Allowances of a Missing Member of an Armed Force to the Purchase of U.S. Savings Bonds and Saving Notes

A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary concerned to apply the pay and allowances of a missing member of an armed force to the purchase of U.S. savings bonds and savings notes under certain circumstances (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Corporation for the calendar year 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Proposed Wholesome Fish and Fishery Products Act of 1969

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to regulate interstate commerce by strengthening and improving consumer protection under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to fish and fishery products, including provision for assistance to and cooperation with the States in the administration of their related programs and assistance by them in the carrying out of the Federal Program, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Proposed Amendment of Internal Revenue Code

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make qualification under State law a prerequisite to registration under the drug and marihuana law; to eliminate the provision permitting payment of tax to acquire marihuana by unregistered persons, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

Reports of the Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a review of status of development toward establishment of a unified national communications system, dated July 14, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on administration and effectiveness of work experience and training project under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, St. Louis and St. Louis County, Mo., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on administration and effectiveness of work experience and training project under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Jackson County, Mo., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated July 15, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the reasonableness of prices questioned for bomb and hand grenade fuses under three negotiated contracts, Department of the Army, dated July 15, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the effectiveness and administration of the community action program administered by the White Earth Reservation Business Committee under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, White Earth, Minn., Office of Economic Opportunity, dated July 15, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Public Laws Enacted by the Ninth Guam Legislature

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, one copy each of the public laws enacted by the Ninth Guam Legislature in its 1968 sessions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Proposed Amendment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolution of the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Resolution of the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts

"Resolution requesting the Department of Transportation to purchase ships built in the United States

"*Whereas,* The Department of Transportation has expressed interest in purchasing ships built in foreign countries to break ice for the Alaskan oil fields; and

"*Whereas,* Said Department has the responsibility of enhancing shipbuilding in the United States and its trade and labor forces; and

XUM

"*Whereas,* The purchase of foreign ships would create a definite hardship on United States shipbuilding, manufacturing and jobs; therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully requests the Department of Transportation to purchase ships built in the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, John A. Volpe, Secretary of the Department of Transportation, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"House of Representatives, adopted, July 7, 1969.

"Wallace C. Mills,
"*Clerk.*

"A true copy. Attest:

"John F. X. Davoren,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

H.R. 10946. An act to promote health and safety in the building trades and construction industry in all Federal and federally financed or federally assisted construction projects (Rept. No. 91–320).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session, the following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works:

Orville H. Lerch, of Pennsylvania, to be alternate Federal cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission; and

Brig. Gen. Willard Roper, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 2625. A bill to amend title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide for a program of urban and rural education grants to local educational agencies; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(The remarks of Mr. Murphy when he introduced the bill appear earlier in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. STEVENS:

S. 2626. A bill to provide for the establishment of the post cemetery at Fort Richardson, Alaska, as a national cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(The remarks of Mr. Stevens when he introduced the bill appear earlier in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2627. A bill to establish the Amistad National Recreation Area in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(The remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. STEVENS:

S. 2628. A bill to provide for the disposition of certain funds awarded to the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska by a judgment entered by the Court of Claims against the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(The remarks of Mr. Stevens when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. HATFIELD:

S. 2629. A bill designating the third Monday in July of each year a legal public holiday to be known as "National Achievement Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. Hatfield when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. Bayh):

S. 2630. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Wabash River National Parkway in the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(The remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. LONG:

S. 2631. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of treble damage payments under the antitrust laws and certain other payments; to the Committee on Finance.

(The remarks of Mr. Long when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. FONG:

S. 2632. A bill to authorize and request the President to call in 1970 a White House Conference on Population Growth and Family Planning; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(The remarks of Mr. Fong when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

S. 2633. A bill for the relief of Nina Raas; and

S. 2634. A bill for the relief of Vilaketi Bloomfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLINGS:

S. 2635. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Hartwell Dam project, South Carolina and Georgia, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2627—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO CREATE AMISTAD NATIONAL RECREATIONAL AREA

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which will create the Amistad National Recreation Area. This recreation facility, to be developed at the Amistad Dam site on the Mexican-American boundary, will provide opportunities for healthy activity for 2⅓ million people who reside within 250 miles of the Dam and the more than 2 million annual visitors who are anticipated by 1972.

Since 1965 when the proposal for the Amistad Recreation Area was first presented, I have watched with considerable pleasure the growth of public and administrative support. It was my privilege to introduce the Amistad National Recreation legislation, S. 2168 of the 89th Congress, on June 21, 1965. In August 1966, the Interior Department's formal report endorsing the project was received. On December 3, 1966, while speaking at the Amistad Dam construction site, President Johnson himself underscored the value of this project when he said that the dam would, "enable development of a great inland water recreational facility for the benefit of this region in two countries." So I think the time is ripe, and I hope that this session of Congress will see the enactment of this bill.

At a time when envy, fear, and misunderstanding are fanning the flames of hate on international boundaries around the world, we and our Mexican neighbors can be justly proud of creative and socially significant efforts like the Amistad Dam. On December 3, 1966, President Johnson at the dam construction site, said:

> And looking into the future—we will see millions of farmers and townspeople on both sides of this great river enjoying the protection which this great dam will afford and the resources and recreation which this great lake will provide.

However, important as the Amistad Dam is to the economic life of several million Mexicans and Americans, its human and social value would be incomplete without the recreation area provided in the bill which I am introducing today. A dam is a design and construction achievement which uses nature for limited economic and scientific purposes. A park, on the other hand, is an expression of a man's search for opportunities to serve himself spiritually and physically within scenic areas which nature has provided.

Mr. President, the Amistad Dam, a dam of friendship, will be a joint achievement of American and Mexican technology and labor. The Amistad Recreation Area, which I am introducing today, will be a useful monument to the happy relationship which now exists along the 2,000-mile Mexican-American boundary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2627) to establish the Amistad National Recreation Area in the State of Texas, introduced by Mr. Yarborough, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2628—INTRODUCTION OF BILL RELATING TO TLINGIT AND HAIDA INDIANS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill pertaining to the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska.

In 1968 the Tlingit and Haida Indians recovered a judgment against the United States in the gross amount of $7,546,053.80. The case was prosecuted in the Court of Claims under the act of June 19, 1935 (49 Stat. 388), as amended, and funds to pay the judgment were appropriated by the act of July 9, 1968 (82 Stat. 307). After payment of attorney fees and after reserve for expert witness fees and other expenses of the litigation, the net amount available to the Tlingit and Haida was approximately $6.7 million.

At the present time, the Tlingit and Haida have funds, in an amount in excess of $6,500,000, invested in various U.S. Government securities and other obligations unconditionally guaranteed by the United States. There are also bal-

XUM

ances of Tlingit and Haida funds on deposit in accounts in the U.S. Treasury. We estimate that, taking account of accrued interest earnings, the Tlingit and Haida funds currently exceed $7 million.

The funds are presently subject to section 8 of the act of June 19, 1935, supra, as amended by the act of August 19, 1965 (79 Stat. 543). In part, section 8 provides:

> The amount of the appropriation made to pay any judgment in favor of said Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska, and such funds shall bear interest at the rate of 4 per centum per annum. Such funds, including the interest thereon, shall not be available for advances, except for such amounts as may be necessary to pay attorney fees, expenses of litigation, organizational, operating and administrative expenses of program planning, until after legislation has been enacted that sets forth the purposes for which such funds shall be used. The Council is authorized to prepare plans for the use of said funds, and to exercise such further powers with respect to the advance, expenditure, and distribution of said funds as may be authorized by Congress.

The program planning committee of the central council of the Tlingit and Haida Indians proposed plans for the use of the judgment funds in November 1968, which plans were approved by the executive committee. The program committee reviewed and supplemented the plans during the meeting of the central council held at Sitka in April of this year. As revised the plans were approved by the central council. The central council has requested this important legislation be introduced. The needs of the Tlingit and Haida people are critical. It is their judgment that these funds should be made available to promote their economic and social advancement. I request that early consideration be given to this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Tlingit and Haida Council and the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2628) to provide for the disposition of certain funds awarded to the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska by a judgment entered by the Court of Claims against the United States, introduced by Mr. STEVENS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2628

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the unexpended funds and interest thereon on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of and otherwise invested by the Secretary of the Interior for the account of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska which were appropriated by the Act of July 9, 1968 (82 Stat. 307), to pay the judgment of the Court of Claims in the case entitled *The Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska, et al.* v. *The United States,* No. 47900, after payment of attorney fees and expenses, may be advanced, expended, invested or used for any purpose and in any manner authorized by the Central Council of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Any of such funds that may be distributed under the provisions of this Act shall not be subject to Federal or State income taxes.

The resolution presented by Mr. STEVENS is as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE CENTRAL COUNCIL OF THE TLINGIT AND HAIDA INDIANS OF ALASKA

Whereas, the Program Planning Committee of the Central Council of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska, in meeting at Juneau, Alaska on November 8, 9 and 10, 1968, did give careful consideration to the formulation of plans for the use of the Tlingit and Haida Judgment Funds in order to promote and advance the economic and social progress of each of the Communities of the Tlingit and Haida Indians and the members thereof; and

Whereas, the Program Planning Committee formulated and reviewed a statement entitled, "Statement of Plans for the Use of Tlingit and Haida Funds," dated November, 1968; and

Whereas, the Program Planning Committee presented the statement to the Executive Committee; and

Whereas, the Executive Committee by Resolution (Resolution No. 68–69, Ex. 8) adopted on November 10, 1968, did approve said Statement of Plans and did direct that the statement shall be made the basis of a presentation and report to Congress of plans for the use of the Tlingit and Haida Judgment Funds subject to consideration of modifications of the plans in the event that during the interim period before the plans are presented to Congress changes in circumstances should make such modifications appropriate and desirable; and

Whereas, the Program Planning Committee in meeting assembled at Sitka, Alaska, has formulated a Supplement to the Statement of Plans and has presented to the Central Council said Statement of Plans and the Supplement to the Statement of Plans:

Now therefore, be it resolved by the Central Council in meeting assembled in Sitka, Alaska, on April 26, 1969, that:

(1) The statement dated November, 1968, entitled "Statement of Plans for the Use of Tlingit and Haida Funds," as modified by the supplement dated April, 1969, entitled "Supplement to Statement of Plans for the Use of Tlingit and Haida Funds," which has been presented and recommended by the Program Planning Committee to the Central Council is hereby approved; and

(2) The President of the Central Council is hereby authorized to make said Statement of Plans dated November 1963 as supplemented by the Supplement to Statement of Plans dated April 1969 the basis of the presentation and report to Congress pursuant to Section 8 of the Act of June 19, 1935, as amended by the Act of August 19, 1965; and

(3) The President is authorized to take all appropriate steps in order to obtain, as promptly as possible, the enactment by Congress of a law permitting the advance, expenditure and use of the Tlingit and Haida Judgment Funds for the purposes of, and in accordance with, the said Statement of Plans and the said Supplement to the Statement of Plans.

S. 2629—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL DESIGNATING THE THIRD MONDAY IN JULY AS NATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT DAY

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, on the eve of man's most ambitious undertaking, I think we need to reflect on what it represents. The media has told the story well in terms of the scientific and technological milestones represented by this and prior space missions.

To me, the day an American first leaves his footprint on the moon should represent more than paeans to our scientific prowess. It really represents a day of national achievement in many allied fields as well.

My colleagues, I am sure, are aware of the uplift that this moonshot has given the entire country. From liftoff to splashdown, all Americans have a common interest in the safety of the men and the success of the mission. Strangers will strike up conversations about the mission, knowing that the moonshot represents a topic in which everyone has a great interest. This uplift, this pride, this sense of accomplishment is all too rare in a time when much news reflects the painful side of our life.

The space shot focuses our attention on this particular facet of our achievement as a nation. A personal sense of achievement, however, is just as important to every American, in his mental and moral well-being. It is true that today the scientific and technology phase of our achievement is well publicized, but this highlights the need to focus on man's personal achievement.

I propose that we as a nation recognize achievement: on a national scale, on a local scale, and, most important, on the personal level. I am introducing a bill which designates the third Monday in July of each year as a legal public holiday to be known as "National Achievement Day."

As I indicated, this would reflect achievement in three areas—the national, the local, and the personal. Just as the word "achievement" indicates success at past endeavors, the word "commitment" indicates a pledge for future goals. "Achievement" and "commitment"—one looking back and one looking forward—would provide the core of this day of reflection. The particular day itself is chosen to be near the date of our landing on the moon.

First, the impending manned lunar landing makes it appropriate for each individual to reflect on his personal goals and achievements. Each American should use National Achievement Day to examine what he has accomplished to better himself as a person.

He also should ask what he has done to ease the many tensions and problems of our cities and rural areas. He also should ask how he has bettered his nation. As the coordinate of this, he should pledge himself to a commitment to work in these areas of personal concern so he can be a part of this sense of achievement.

Second, just as individuals need this self-examination, so should State and local governments use this day to focus on their problems. Government on the local level always must remain accessible to the people they serve and not withdraw behind bureaucratic curtains. Many frustrations of people today can be traced to this feeling of helplessness as they attempt to thread through the governmental maze. We at the Federal level also are guilty of this removal from

XUM

close contact with the people. At the local level, however, this accessibility must be present, so that people have more contact with their State and local governments than merely in tax and school budget elections.

State and local governments should use the time surrounding this day of achievement to initiate action on their part to cope with the many problems plaguing their governments. Local achievement is the best way to prevent Federal action in any area.

Work at the State and local level should replace the increasing cries of "Let Washington solve it," or "Let the Federal Government pay for it."

The third aspect of National Achievement Day should reflect concern at the national level for solving national problems. These problems are well known: hunger, racial tensions, pollution, military manpower, alienation of youth, and problems of the aged all are well known. In addition, we as a nation and we in the Senate must pledge ourselves to bring about world peace and harmony. We must not let success on the moon mock failure in the cities and abroad.

It was a pleasant coincidence that a newspaper article echoing my thoughts appeared in the Washington Post last Sunday, July 13. The article was written by the distinguished Arnold Toynbee. Because this article capsules the thoughts of so many of us, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. HATFIELD. In conclusion, I can see no better way to commemorate our lunar success than by designating a National Achievement Day, at which time every American can reflect on his achievements and can commit and involve himself in working to solve mankind's many problems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2629) designating the third Monday in July of each year a legal public holiday to be known as National Achievement Day, introduced by Mr. HATFIELD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The article presented by Mr. HATFIELD, is as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 13, 1969]

THE MOON AND WORLD SOLIDARITY

(By Arnold Toynbee)

The most obvious aspect of a landing on the moon is that it is a sensational new triumph for technology—a triumph in the same field as the conquest of the ocean in the 15th century and, within living memory, the reaching of the North and South Poles and the conquest of the air. Like these previous achievements, a landing on the moon increases man's range of action but does not enlarge his habitat. Human beings cannot live on the water or in the air or on the solid surface of a starlet that has no atmosphere.

In this important point, all these extensions of the range of action of the human race must be distinguished from the effect, for Europeans, of the discovery of the Americas. This discovery brought with it an immense extension of the habitat of the European peoples. For them it signified the acquisition of a New World in which they could breathe, stand, sit, sleep, sow, reap, spin, weave and mine. (For the pre-Columbian inhabitants of the Americas, the Europeans' arrival there was, of course, a supreme disaster, but the sequel is seldom looked at from the pre-Columbian Americans' point of view.)

However, the technological aspect of a landing on the moon is not the most important feature of this historic event. Man's technological prowess and progress can be taken for granted. Our ancestors may have been making, as well as using tools already even before they became fully human, and though technological progress in the Lower Paleolithic Age is hardly perceptible when we look at the Lower Paleolithic tools displayed in chronological order in a museum, technology has been accelerating recently at an ever increasing rate. After the virtual stagnation of technology during Man's first million years, it began to get up speed at the beginning of the Upper Paleolithic Age, perhaps about 30,000 years ago.

Since then, the acceleration of technological progress has been increasing; in our own day it is being keyed up to an unprecedented degree; and no end of this progress is in sight—unless, of course, mankind misuses its technology to liquidate itself by polluting its habitat by the poisonous atomic waste of "atoms for peace" or by deliberately devasting this planet in a world war fought with atomic weapons.

This choice that is open to us for using our technological achievements for either good or evil is a reminder that technological virtuosity is not Man's only distinctive gift. Besides being makers and users of tools, we are social, moral and spiritual creatures—or, alternatively, antisocial, immoral and diabolic creatures, if we choose death and evil instead of life and good. This aspect of human nature is more important than its technological aspect. At a pinch, we could survive without apparatus, but we could not survive without at least a minimum of good behavior. What, then, is the significance of a moon landing from the spiritual point of view?

The good spiritual aspects of this enterprise are impressive. The adventurousness and the courage of the astronauts are wholly admirable. But we must also remind ourselves that these human stars could never have got off the ground—and certainly could never have reached the moon and then come safely back to earth again—if they had not been supported by the skill, toil, devotion, loyalty and cooperativeness of the hundreds and thousands of scientists and technicians who have made the astronauts' feat possible. The huge ground staff's feat is morally still more impressive—and more encouraging—than the feat of the astronauts; for loyal cooperation is evidently very difficult for human nature. The tragedies in human history—private and public—all stem from failures in the field of moral endeavor.

The political aspect of the international competition for the conquest of outer space is also impressive and encouraging. In applauding each others' achievements in spacemanship, the Russians and Americans have shown a chivalry and a generosity that have been lacking all too often, in their dealings with each other over terrestrial affairs. Each of the two parties is eager to outstrip its rivel, yet this thirst for victory has not made the competitors petty-minded or rancorous or unfair in their attitude toward each other. The pleasure taken by each of them in the other's successes is not a diplomatic pretense; it is genuine; it is a pleasure in a victory that is felt—and rightly felt—to be, not just a triumph for one fraction of the human race, but a triumph for mankind, one and indivisible. The spirit is that of sportsmanship at its best; it is not the spirit in which human beings play politics and wage wars.

Will a landing on the moon create a feeling of human solidarity that will be strong enough to overcome the divisive effects of nationalism? This is the crucial question, and we cannot foretell the answer. When the European peoples discovered the Americas and made their way by sea to India, they did not treat this enlargement of their domain as a common patrimony to be administered by them jointly for the good of all. They fought each other for land and trade overseas as furiously as they had fought each other in Europe for these prizes. From the close of the 15th century onward, every fresh war in Europe was accompanied by a war, between the same belligerents, in India and in the Americas, and the last two great wars have been worldwide. When the European and American peoples discovered the South Polar Continent, they carved it up into slices, coming to a point at the South Pole itself, and they quarreled with each other acrimoniously over the size of their respective portions of this iced cake.

On these precedents, it is conceivable that, after landing on the moon, the Americans and Russians will convey to the moon from the earth barbed-wire netting for setting up an "Iron Curtain" around the moon, to match the one that the Russians have already set up round the frontiers of the Soviet Union. This would be ludicrous, but it is not inconceivable, considering mankind's deplorable past practice.

Fortunately, human beings have a sense of humor, and there is perhaps some hope in this. The successive extensions of mankind's range of action from our planet's dry-land surface to the seas, from the seas to the planet's air envelope, and from the stratosphere to the moon have surely made it ludicrous for us to continue to partition this planet's land surface politically into about 125 sovereign independent states. The incongruity between our technological progress and our political backwardness has now become glaring. It is enough to make us both laugh and weep, and our laughter may be more profitable than our tears, for there is perhaps a chance that we may laugh ourselves out of our present anachronistic obsession with nationalism.

Today, nationalism is about 90 per cent of the religion of about 90 per cent of mankind. It is a fanatical religion, and our technology has now armed our local sovereign national states with annihilation weapons. If, when we have reached the moon, we do not either weep ourselves or laugh ourselves out of this deadly political folly, the prospects for our survival will be dark indeed.

The significance of a landing on the moon lies in its forcing us to face—and, we may, hope to deal effectively with—the ludicrous, but also perilous, discrepancy between our attainments in technology and in morals. This gap is now very great, and it is growing greater day by day. Our generation's task is to try to raise our morals to a level at which they will be spiritually adequate for wielding the enormous power, for either good or evil, that our technological progress has already thrust into our hands.

Will mankind's common feat of landing on the moon move us to put our terrestrial habitat in better order, morally and politically? Will it move us to subordinate our 125 local states to some form of world government that will be effective enough to be able to put a stop to our cherished practice of waging wars with each other? If landing on the moon is going to serve as a substitute for waging a Third World War, the courage and skill and wealth that have been spent on this enterprise will have been spent to good purpose.

But if we are going to go on behaving on earth as we have behaved here so far, then a landing on the moon will have to be written off as just one more shocking misuse of mankind's slender surplus product. It will be remembered (if we survive to remember anything) as an extravagance on a par with the building of the Pyramids and Angkor Wat and Louis XIV's palace at Versailles. In themselves, these extravagant expenditures on superfluities are shocking when a majority of mankind is still desperately short of food and clothes and housing.

S. 2630—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO ESTABLISHMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE WABASH RIVER NATIONAL PARKWAY, INDIANA

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, on behalf of myself and Senator BAYH, a bill which would establish a scenic highway in Indiana to be known as the Wabash River National Parkway. This bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, to survey and select a right-of-way for a broad meandering roadway which would originate near Fort Wayne, Ind. The parkway would then follow the scenic and historically significant Wabash River to the "toe" of Indiana where the Wabash meets the Ohio and Tradewater Rivers in Kentucky.

The Wabash River National Parkway would provide easy access for the first time to areas of scenic wonder which are also rich in Indian lore and historical significance. A traveler along this proposed parkway would be able to stop and see such sights as a prehistoric Indian village located near Evansville; the first capital of the Northwest Territory located at Vincennes; Indiana battlefields such as those found at Mississinewa; remnants of the old Wabash and Erie Canals; and New Harmony, the site of the utopian colony founded by Robert Owens. As well, the Wabash River area abounds with natural rock bridges, old grist mills, covered bridges, reservoirs, lakes, and heavily wooded sections.

It is my opinion that national scenic parkways and roads are desperately needed if we are to effectively display the historically significant sites within the various States. Moreover, a national system of scenic parkways would help us to save many of our areas of natural beauty while at the same time providing safe access roads across this great land.

The Wabash River route more than fulfills the preliminary criteria for a national system of scenic parkways and roads which were first outlined in a study published in 1967 entitled "A Proposed Program for Scenic Roads and Parkways." These criteria are, as follows: First, a quantity of existing or potential scenic features having recreational, historical, educational, scientific or cultural values and potential access to them; second, a variety of experiences for persons using the highway and complementary facilities; third, proximity to urban areas; fourth, economic feasibility; fifth, location as related to general geographic distribution of similar features and facilities; sixth, adaptability to development and public use; and seventh, compatibility with recreational, esthetic and conservation needs of the area and consideration of competing transportation needs. This study was prepared for the President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty which President Nixon has replaced with the Council on Environmental Quality.

Certainly the concept of a national system of scenic parkways and roads is one which merits continued discussion. It is my hope that this bill which I introduce today will mark but the beginning of renewed interest in the national scenic parkway idea.

The time for action is now, Mr. President, for there is no remaining time to spare. Land values increase daily while our expanding urban and industrial society continues to infringe on these relatively unspoiled areas which are adjacent to the proposed parkways. If we are to succeed in saving what is unique historically and scenically in this country, while still making it accessible to our population, we must continue to seriously consider the implementation of the scenic highway concept.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2630) to provide for the establishment and administration of the Wabash River National Parkway in the State of Indiana, introduced by Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. BAYH), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2630

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to enhance the public enjoyment and accessibility of certain areas in the State of Indiana having a scenic and historical value, including the Wabash River, vast and dense forests, historical sites, and spectacular scenery, the Wabash River National Parkway is authorized to be established and administered in the manner hereinafter provided.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation and the Governor of the State of Indiana, to survey and select a right-of-way for the Wabash River National Parkway beginning at a point at, or in close proximity to, Aboite, Indiana, and extending generally along the eastern banks of the Wabash River to a point ending at, or in close proximity to, the Wabash River levee numbered 2 in Posey County, Indiana. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire, in such manner as he finds to be in the public interest, lands and interests in lands for such right-of-way of sufficient width to include the road and all bridges, ditches, cuts, and fills appurtenant thereto, together with sites of recreational and historical areas in connection with the parkway.

SEC. 3. The Wabash River National Parkway shall be administered and maintained by the Secretary of the Interior subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), the provisions of which Act, as amended and supplemented, are hereby extended over and made applicable to such parkway.

SEC. 4. In the administration of the Wabash River National Parkway, the Secretary of the Interior may issue revocable licenses or permits for rights-of-way over, across, and upon parkway lands, or for the use of parkway lands by the owners or lessees of adjacent lands, for such purposes and under such terms, regulations, and conditions as he may determine to be not inconsistent with the use of such lands for parkway purposes.

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

S. 2632—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO A WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON POPULATION GROWTH AND FAMILY PLANNING

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, as we all know, one of the most pressing problems that face mankind is the frightening growth of the world's population. Unless more is done to improve family planning and population control programs, this problem will explode into one of the most critical crises of the 20th century.

The rampant increase in the number of human beings threatens to smother the economic growth of many nations and endangers our struggle for peace and security.

Because of these and other pressing reasons, I introduce today a bill to authorize and request the President of the United States to call in 1970 a White House Conference on Population Growth and Family Planning.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will be responsible for planning and conducting the Conference which will be composed of professional people working in the area of population growth and family planning and individuals who are representative of the general public.

In addition, a sum to be determined by the Secretary which is not less than $5,000 nor more than $25,000 will be authorized to be paid to each State for the purpose of planning and conducting a State conference on population planning prior to the White House Conference and for other related purposes.

At a later date, I will have further remarks on this critical issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2632) to authorize and request the President to call in 1970 a White House Conference on Population Growth and Family Planning, introduced by Mr. FONG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION

S. 203

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA) be added as a cosponsor of S. 203, to amend the act of June 13, 1962, with respect to the Navajo Indian irrigation project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

XUM

S. 740

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA) I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) be added as a cosponsor of S. 740, to permanently establish the Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2499

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE) I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE) be added as cosponsors of S. 2499 to provide for the regulation of the maximum rates of interest which may be charged by federally supervised banks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 108

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG) be added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 108, to provide for a study and evaluation of the relationship between underground nuclear detonations and seismic disturbances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUANCE OF INCOME TAX SURCHARGE AND CERTAIN EXCISE TAXES—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 74 AND 75

Mr. STEVENS submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 12290) to continue the income tax surcharge and the excise taxes on automobiles and communication services for temporary periods, to terminate the investment credit, to provide for a low-income allowance for individuals, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

(The remarks of Mr. STEVENS when he submitted the amendments appear earlier in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

COLLECTION OF FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX IN QUARTERLY INSTALLMENTS—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 76

Mr. MILLER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 9951) to provide for the collection of the Federal unemployment tax in quarterly installments during each taxable year; to make status of employer depend on employment during preceding as well as current taxable year; to exclude from the computation of the excess the balance in the employment security administration account as of the close of fiscal years 1970 through 1972; to raise the limitation on the amount authorized to be made available for expenditure out of the employment security administration account by the amounts so excluded; and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT OF 1947—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 77

Mr. FANNIN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2068) to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to permit employer contributions to trust funds to provide employees, their families, and dependents with scholarships for study at educational institutions or the establishment of child-care centers for preschool and school-age dependents of employees, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Floyd Eugene Carrier, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years, vice Rex B. Hawks.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Tuesday, July 22, 1969, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

RECESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess awaiting the call of the Chair, but with the understanding that the recess not extend beyond 12:30 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 12:30 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ALLEN in the chair).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 257. An act to prohibit the intimidation, coercion, or annoyance of a person officiating at or attending a religious service or ceremony in a church in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 4181. An act to amend title 12, District of Columbia Code, to provide a limitation of actions for actions arising out of death or injury caused by a defective or unsafe improvement to real property;

H.R. 4183. An act to provide that the widow of a retired officer or member of the Metropolitan Police Department or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who married such officer or member after his retirement may qualify for survivor benefits;

H.R. 4184. An act to equalize the retirement benefits for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are retired for permanent total disability;

H.R. 9548. An act to amend section 15–503 of the District of Columbia Code with respect to exemptions from attachment and certain other process in the case of persons not residing in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 9549. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia," approved May 23, 1918, as amended;

H.R. 12677. An act to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to lease to the Jewish Historical Society of Greater Washington the former synagogue of the Adas Israel Congregation and real property of the District of Columbia for the purpose of establishing a Jewish Historical Museum; and

H.R. 12720. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the District of Columbia to the Washington International School, Inc.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 1828. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon James F. Wegener;

H.R. 1948. An act to confer U. S. citizenship posthumously upon PFC Joseph Anthony Snitko;

H.R. 2224. An act for the relief of Franklin Jacinto Antonio;

H.R. 2536. An act for the relief of Francesca Adriana Millonzi;

H.R. 2890. An act for the relief of Rueben Rosen;

H.R. 3167. An act for the relief of Ryszard Stanislaw Obacz; and

H.R. 10060. An act for the relief of LCpl. Peter M. Nee (2465662).

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H.R. 257. An act to prohibit the intimidation, coercion, or annoyance of a person officiating at or attending a religious service or ceremony in a church in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 4181. An act to amend title 12, District of Columbia Code, to provide a limitation of actions for actions arising out of death or injury caused by a defective or unsafe improvement to real property;

H.R. 4183. An act to provide that the widow of a retired officer or member of the Metropolitan Police Department or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who married such officer or member after his retirement may qualify for survivor benefits;

H.R. 4184. An act to equalize the retirement benefits for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are retired for permanent total disability;

H.R. 9548. An act to amend section 15–503 of the District of Columbia Code with respect to exemptions from attachment and certain other process in the case of persons not residing in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 9549. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia", approved May 23, 1918, as amended;

H.R. 12677. An act to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to lease to the Jewish Historical Society of Greater Washington the former synagogue of the Adas Israel Congregation and real property of the District of Columbia for the purpose of establishing a Jewish Historical Museum; and

H.R. 12720. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the District of Columbia to the Washington International School, Inc.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Proxmire).

RUSSIAN MILITARY POWER LIMITED BY ECONOMIC WEAKNESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the speech I am about to deliver is, in part, a reply to the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. Jackson). As we all know, he is an able member of the Committee on Armed Services and is an outstanding expert in the military area. Indeed, I understand that he was offered the post of Secretary of Defense in the Nixon administration. I notified Senator Jackson that I was going to give this speech. I told him personally on the floor of the Senate yesterday. I understand that my staff has called him and has told him that I am in the Chamber now and am about to speak.

Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Washington (Mr. Jackson) for the speech he delivered on July 9, last Wednesday. I disagree with some of his conclusions. But I think he was right when he said that we have not been debating the central issue. He said:

> The central issue which you have to decide first, before you can decide what kind of military budget you should have or what kind of foreign policy you should have, is, What kind of adversary do you face, and what is he up to?

Senator Jackson also said:

> I can think of nothing more essential for the Congress than clear thinking about the Soviet Union.

He asked:

> How can we reach sound judgments on the national defense budget if we do not understand the nature of the Soviet adversary?

Of course, Senator Jackson is right. But unfortunately, Mr. President, there is no record in the hearings on this bill of any testimony of any kind—expert or amateur, responsible or irresponsible—on the Soviet Union's capability, its economic capacity to challenge this Nation militarily. There is not a witness who has appeared before the Armed Services Committee during these hearings on what the Soviet Union is economically capable of doing.

Senator Jackson has helpfully come to the floor to give the Senate the benefit of his own opinion of what we face in the Soviet Union.

Now, Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington is a remarkable man. He is competent in many fields. His advice to the Senate on the Soviet Union deserves the most careful and respected attention, because he is competent, and even more so because he is the only Senator who has until today chosen to address himself in a thoughtful, prepared speech to what I would agree with him is the central issue.

NO EXPERT RECORD ON U.S.S.R. IN HEARINGS

But, Mr. President, if Senator Jackson's speech is based on any record—on the up-to-date advice of any experts on the Soviet Union to his committee in formal session—where there could be consideration and cross-examination—if this speech by Senator Jackson is the result of such a record, the Senator from Washington has not revealed it. I have scrutinized the more than 2,000 pages of the hearing record of this committee and if any expert on the basic economic capability of the Soviet Union of any kind or description appeared at these hearings, he must have been wearing quite a disguise.

There is nothing from anyone with any qualifications to speak on the Soviet Union's economic resources. The committee has given us no record—none—on what Senator Jackson calls the central issue.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE PROVIDES RECORD

Now, Mr. President, the Economy in Government Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee completed hearings only a relatively few days ago on the very central issue to which the Senator from Washington refers.

This subcommittee had just previously completed 3 weeks of intensive review of the U.S. military budget in the context of overall national priorities. In the course of those hearings, it was repeatedly emphasized that the actual and potential threat of the Soviet Union to the United States and, indeed, to the world is the central fact which dominates our military planning.

It is obvious that the military potentiality of a Soviet economy that is half the size of America's has a central bearing on the size and shape of our own military budget. Our military thinking, and indeed the concern of all Americans, with respect to military preparedness is shaped by the threat—actual and potential—which the Soviet Union represents to this Nation.

Thus, the relevance of those hearings by the Joint Economic Subcommittee is beyond question. Just as the subcommittee had been examining the ordering of our national priorities at home, we then asked our experts to help us understand the political, social and economic processes at work within the Soviet Union. Our witnesses were specialists who gave us a firmer grasp of the source and political forces shaping the vital decisions which the Russian authorities must make in allocating the resources available to that country.

It is exactly because the military capability of the Soviet Union is indeed the central issue in determining our military budget in relation to our other priorities that we held these hearings.

And, Mr. President, I submit that the record of these hearings provides a thoughtful, balanced, reasonably objective basis for evaluating the Soviet challenge. This evaluation comes not on the basis of the views of one Senator, but on a record made by professionals.

Here are the witnesses who testified and their qualifications to speak on the nature of the Russian challenge:

EXPERT WITNESSES

First. Prof. Merle Fainsod is professor of government and former director, Russian Research Center, Harvard. Incidentally, I had the privilege of sitting at Professor Fainsod's feet for 3 years when I was at graduate school at Harvard. He is as fine a teacher as I have known. He is a superb teacher. He is the author of the classic book on Soviet government, "How Russia is Ruled."

Second. Prof. Alex Inkeles is professor of sociology at Harvard. He has been a long-time student of Soviet social system, for Russian Research Center and U.S. Air Force. He also specializes in public opinion in the U.S.S.R.

Third. Dr. Thomas Wolfe—senior specialist on Soviet military in RAND—is a former Assistant Air Attaché in Moscow, and author of "Soviet Strategy at the Crossroads."

Fourth. Prof. Abram Bergson is professor of economics and former director, Russian Research Center, Harvard. He is the architect of a reconstructed series of Soviet national income and product for RAND and USAF. He has supervised more doctorates in the field of Soviet economics than any other professor in the West.

Fifth. Prof. Joseph Berliner is professor of economics and chairman of economics department, Brandeis; he was the economic member of Russian emigre interview project in early 1950's; and has special interests in Soviet management, foreign trade, and technology.

Sixth. Prof. Holland Hunter is professor of economics, Haverford—one of the finer small higher education institutions in the country.

His special interests are Soviet transportation, including passenger cars, Soviet planning and the economic effects of arms control.

Seventh. Prof. William Kintner is deputy director of the Institute of Foreign Relations at the University of Pennsylvania. A former army colonel, Dr. Kintner recently released publications on strategic Soviet development which stressed the growing danger of Soviet strategic superiority.

Eighth. David E. Mark is currently serving as Deputy Director for Research, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Department of State. He has had long record of service to his government: political adviser to U.S. Armed Forces in Korea; member of U.S. mission in Berlin; first secretary to our embassy in Moscow; director of Office of West European Research and Analysis, State Department. He is the author of "Cessation of Nuclear Weapons Test Problems and Results of Negotiations to Date—1965."

Mr. President, I submit these eight wit-

XUM

nesses are certainly among the best informed experts in America on the Soviet Union. They have in most cases devoted much of their professional lives to studying the Soviet Union.

Their views on the Soviet Union have been challenged and tested.

Their perception and understanding has been widely acknowledged.

And they represent a reasonably balanced diversity of opinion on U.S.S.R. economic and military strength.

Mr. President, because of the central importance of these hearings to this debate, I ask unanimous consent that some substantial excerpts from the testimony of a number of these expert witnesses be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

LEADERSHIP ATTITUDE UNSTABLE, UNPREDICTABLE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it may be helpful to some Senators to consider the ups and downs of the men who are running the show in the Soviet Union. It is interesting to know who among the leaders stresses a military buildup as the dominant priority at all times and under all circumstances, and to know who stresses greater agricultural investment on greater long-range investment in basic capital facilities, or who is the champion of providing more consumer goods.

But it is hard to come to any useful conclusion on the basis of this kind of analysis, for many reasons. First, most of these leaders are unpredictable. Second, effective leadership shifts swiftly and drastically and at times with little or no warning in the Soviet Union.

Furthermore, even if these were stable and secure men with an established system of authority, technological or foreign policy changes, death, or disability could change their posture suddenly and dramatically.

So I suggest that juggling the names and histories of the men in the Kremlin will tell us very little about what we have to do to be prepared to defend this Nation against our principal potential adversary.

What we need is not speculation about personalities and attitudes, but an understanding of the capability of Russia. What can the leaders do? What is potential military capacity, given the problems that confront them and the resources they have available to meet those problems?

What do the Soviet leaders have to work with? What are they up against?

SOVIET ECONOMIC WEAKNESS

The first big fact to recognize is that the Soviet Union has perhaps 10 percent more people than the United States, but it has only one-half the economic production. I repeat, it has only one-half—think of it, one-half—the production of this country.

Russians are not 10 feet tall. From an economic standpoint, if Americans are 6 feet, Russians are literally 3-foot pygmies compared to Americans.

Russia is constrained, for example, to devote seven times as large a proportion of its population to agriculture—to farming—than this counrty, and yet it produces about 20 percent less food. This single factor—agricultural inefficiency—chews up so much Soviet manpower that it greatly retards Soviet economic effort elsewhere.

MILITARY BUDGET COMPARISON

The total amount that Russia devotes to defense is estimated in rubles at around 20 billion which converts in dollars to about $22 billion.

But I hasten to add, this is not a fair comparison because prices and wages are not comparable in the Soviet Union and in this country. The amount actually devoted to the military is estimated to vary on a full equivalent basis—making allowance for price and wage differences—from about $40 billion to $50 billion.

The most reliable estimate from the London Institute of Strategic Studies places the U.S.S.R. military budget at less than $40 billion, or about half of that of the United States.

At any rate, it is substantially less than the United States expends militarily.

With its difficulties on its long China border and its practice of intervention with its satellites, Russia obviously needs manpower in its military force. Even still, that Russian military manpower is estimated at 3 million—about half a million less than the United States has.

Unquestionably, the Soviet Union, if directly attacked or invaded, could mobilize and sustain for some time an immense military capability.

MILITARY CAPABILITY UNDER PRESENT CIRCUMSTANCES

But is this the question? Or is the question what kind of capability can the Soviet Union put together in the context of a cold war over a period of years—or decades?

This context is quite different. The Soviet Union has discovered that industrial efficiency and motivation over the years depends importantly on economic reward. The Soviet worker whose efforts are not rewarded with improved consumer goods—food, housing, and so forth—like any other human being loses his drive, his willingness to work hard, to contribute.

The partial shift of resources to consumer goods in some recent years in the Soviet Union was motivated not because feeding and housing people better was the prime national goal, but because a better fed, better housed people were more productive. Industrial efficiency benefited. The country increased its economic growth and therefore its military potential more swiftly—not less swiftly by putting more into consumer goods—even if that meant less temporarily into the military. If the production of consumer goods is now reduced so that more resources can be poured into military hardware, productive efficiency will again decline—and I think surely and certainly.

Let me quote Professor Fainsod in this regard. He says:

> Even at the base of the Soviet social pyramid rank and file, peasants and workers are now in a position to exert greater influence on the course of elite decision-making. When collective or state farm workers respond to inadequate incentives by listless performance in the public sector, by transferring their energies to private plots, or by abandoning their jobs to seek better paid work in the industrial centers, they in effect bargain to improve their position. They vote with their feet, in the absence of large-scale terror, there is a point beyond which they cannot be driven. If more production is to be extracted from them, improved incentives have to be provided. The state and party functionaries responsible for increasing agricultural output find themselves forced to plead the case of their peasant clients. In a perhaps perverted form, what takes place is a form of indirect representation.

During the hearings, I asked Professor Fainsod the following question:

> Do you see any signs that this pressure for domestic commitment is growing, or can the leadership continue indefinitely to be subjected to military demands?

Professor Fainsod's answer was thus:

> I think there are limits. If the leadership is prepared to turn to the kind of patterns that Stalin used, I am sure that it can put a much greater squeeze on the people in terms of standards of living sacrifices. But I think in the present state of development of the Soviet economy this kind of pressure has become counterproductive, that essentially the case for using economic incentives rather than mass terror is a kind of productive case. If of course the leadership feels itself in very great danger, I have no doubt that it would not hesitate to use very repressive means. But if it sees its future in terms of increases in productive or increases in production against, whether it be on the military or non-military side, it seems to me it must and has turned increasingly toward the use of incentives as a way of evoking contributions to productivity.
>
> So that in this sense the groups of which I spoke, and even just ordinary workers, ordinary farmers, are in a position to affect priorities to a degree which they weren't able to effect them before.

The appeal of industrial investment is even clearer. Our witnesses unanimously agreed that the continued economic growth of Russia at past rates will require an increasing allocation of Soviet resources into investment.

If resources are taken from industrial investment for the military, the Soviet economy will suffer and quickly. It will slow its growth and within a very few years its capacity to provide military hardware and support will suffer.

I should like to quote just briefly from Professor Abram Bergson, of Harvard University, who is probably the outstanding economic expert in this country on the Soviet Union.

He says:

> Soviet growth for long has been notably expensive in terms of the additional capital that it has required. Even in the 'fifties, rapid growth of output could be achieved only through decidedly more rapid growth of capital, and more recently the disproportion between the two trends has become still more marked. Over the ten-year period 1950–60, the stock of Soviet capital per unit of output grew 22 percent. By 1965, or in the interval half as long, it had grown another 14 percent. A corollary is that in order to assure continued expansion of output, the government must plow back an ever larger share of that output in new investment. This is necessary merely to maintain the tempo of growth of output, never mind to raise it.

AGRICULTURE NEEDS SERIOUS

Most conspicuously of all, the Soviets must pour more of their resources into agriculture. Here is the real economic Achilles heel of Russia compared to America. The only way the immense manpower commitment to farming in the Soviet Union can be eased is to push more resources into fertilizer, irrigation, and agricultural implements.

Failure to make this allocation of resources means a continuing, dragging handicap with tens of millions of productive workers toiling in the fields who could be building a stronger Soviet economy and an improved Soviet military force.

So whether the Soviet masters are or are not becoming more Stalinist, whether they engage in more or less repression, whether they lock up or murder more or less of their dissident intellectuals does not really determine the Soviet military potential.

Whether a Stalin on the one hand or a Khrushchev on the other is leading the Soviet Union, the leader still has the terrible predicament of challenging a military force in the United States that is supported by an economy twice as productive as the Soviet Union and that therefore has twice the military potential.

Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I regret that more Senators are not present in the Chamber this afternoon to hear what in my opinion could be at least as important as any address delivered in the Senate during this session.

As the able Senator from Wisconsin has pointed out, the central issue is, before we can decide what kind of military budget we should have or what kind of foreign policy we should have, is what kind of adversary do we face and what he is up to.

Mr. President, I commend with respect the magnificent job done by the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee during this session of the Congress with respect to certain aspects of the military budget he has brought to the attention of the Congress and the American people.

Mr. President, we had information in the early fifties as to the thousands and thousands of bombers being built by the Soviet Union. That information turned out to be wrong. But it resulted in a great many billions of our dollars being spent, as it turned out, unnecessarily.

Later, we had what was called the missile gap. I have written one article on that subject. It was created by the Central Intelligence Agency and destroyed by the Central Intelligence Agency within a period of 21 months.

The number of ICBM's on launching pads estimated by top intelligence was reduced, in four separate reductions, 96.5 percent.

Now, Mr. President, we have before the Senate a new discussion as to various weapons systems.. The military budget is being analyzed this year as all other budgets are being analyzed; and a great deal of credit for this goes to the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin.

When we had the witnesses before the Committee on Armed Services, we picked four proponents and four opponents. The four proponents, as the record will show, spent much, if not most, of their time emphasizing the grave danger this country faces because of the determination of the Soviet Union to destroy the United States. The four opponents spent nearly all of their time explaining, first, why they did not think the system would work; and, second, even if it did work, it would be relatively easy to knock out the radar; and, third, even if the radar worked, a relatively small additional production of Soviet missiles would totally nullify billions of dollars the American people are now being asked to put up on the same basis—fear—fear of the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, this is why I believe this talk is so important. The distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin—and I say this without fear of refutation, as is evidenced by this talk—has spent more time and effort to analyze what is going on in the Soviet Union than any other Member of this body. For that he deserves our gratitude; because if these weapons systems, costing tens of billions of dollars, must continue, we know they will be voted for only through fear of the Soviet Union—that has been made clear. Second, if they are voted for, there will not be enough money to consider other matters which many of us believe are also important to our national security and well-being; the condition on the rural farms of America today, the family farms; the conditions in the cities; the question of water and air pollution, and, perhaps above all, the whole question of education.

How many Americans realize that just $44 is being requested by the Federal Government for every child and youth of primary and secondary school age, up to college: whereas $21,600 is being requested for every enemy in South Vietnam in ammunition alone? How many Missourians realize that the Vietnam war is costing every Missourian $18 a day, whereas, although floods have created hundreds of millions of dollars of loss in my State, the amount per day being spent on flood control is 4 cents per Missourian; $18 a day versus 4 cents a day.

Mr. President, either these statements made this afternoon by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin on this floor are true or they are not true. If they are not true, somebody should take the floor of the Senate and explain why. If they are true, we should, indeed, take an even more serious look at billions and billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money now being expended on the basis of a danger which, if Senator Proxmire is right, is not nearly as great as some would believe. I say this as one totally dedicated to a completely adequate national defense posture on the part of the United States.

Mr. President, I am already late for a delegation meeting, but cannot leave without congratulating the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin for what we in the Senate have really become used to from him—another job well done.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri from the bottom of my heart. There is no Member of the Senate I would rather have support me on any issue, and I think we all know that on this issue he is an expert. He has a remarkable background in defense.

The Senator from Missouri certainly recognizes the overwhelming importance of having a secure nation and that it depends on a strong Army, Navy, and Air Force. At the same time, he is well aware that a strong nation militarily also depends on a strong and sound economy and that we must make the hard, tough, sometimes unpopular political decisions if we are going to keep the kind of strong military force we believe in. I think that what the Senator from Missouri has been stressing will give us a stronger military force in the long run and, as a matter of fact, in the short run, too.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does not the Senator agree that what we in the Senate and the country must face up to today is the question of what is a definition of true security?

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is exactly right. We have neglected this. We have just assumed that if we pour money into hardware, we are going to get more security. The fact is, as I indicate at the close of my speech, whether it is Russia or the United States, this can be the most serious kind of military blunder.

The skill, the training, and the ability of our people is the greatest resource. If we neglect education in order to build weapons systems that are of marginal, if any, use, we are weakening our country, not strengthening it. We are enfeebling our true security.

I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I have had the privilege of reading the prepared statement now being delivered by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, and I commend him for his very gifted insights into the key question of the Soviet intention vis-a-vis the imagined or real U.S. military efforts. I think it is a point that is exceedingly well taken. It is not just, as the Senator from Wisconsin points out, what the Soviet leaders say they are going to do; it is far more important, as the Senator puts it, to ask, "What can they do?" Just as it is true in our country or any other country, it is true in the Soviet Union that the range of possibilities is limited by the economic capacity to achieve them. The searching hearings conducted by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin have helped to bring forth the facts that bear directly on this issue.

As I understand the Senator, one of the key facts is that the gross national product of the Soviet Union is only one-half of our own.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Minnesota is exactly correct.

Mr. MONDALE. To put it differently, every dollar of its currency that the Soviet Union spends on its military effort costs it twice as much, relatively, as the dollar the United States spends.

XUM

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. MONDALE. I also note some other distortions in the Soviet economy that are particularly serious, notably the agriculture problem. I see in the Chamber the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) who has just returned from a searching, thorough, on-the-scene view of the Soviet economy. As I understand, the statistics indicate that seven times as many people are devoted to producing agricultural products in the Soviet Union as are engaged in this activity in the United States.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Our agricultural economy is so much more efficient that although the Soviets have to use seven times as many people in their farming and agriculture, they produce 20 percent less food than we produce. This has obvious overall economic and military implications. What happens is that agriculture chews up such a large proportion of the total work force of the Soviet Union to produce the essential food that it cannot be producing the weapons of war and cannot be in the armed services.

The reason I make the point is that Russia recognizes this and recognizes that while she may achieve superiority in some military areas between now and 1975, she will cripple her agriculture investment and enfeeble her incentives. It is very doubtful if Russia can do that, even if she tries. If she does, I cannot believe that our intelligence is so feeble that we will not know what she is doing. We can match Russia weapon for weapon and beat her. We can if necessary surpass her, for that matter, with our economy.

Mr. MONDALE. Did the hearings held by the joint committee, of which the Senator from Wisconsin is chairman, disclose the nature of the average Soviet citizen's desires for an expanded and improved availability of consumer goods? Is not that factor becoming serious and imperative?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The answer most people give is: "What difference does it make? After all, Stalin, Brezhnev, or whoever happens to be in charge can cut down the consumer demand ruthlessly." However, as Professor Fainsod points out to the contrary, there really are significant limitations, because as dictators in the Kremlin do this they reduce the incentive, the productivity, and they sharply reduce their workers' willingness to work and their ability to work. This is the reason the Soviet Union increased consumer consumption. Everything we know about the Soviet Union indicates that they may be motivated by many forces but the dominant force is power. The leaders want power in the Soviet Union. I do not assume they are idealistic humanists. If one makes the assumption they want to increase productivity, to do that they must increase consumer goods. This is a fairly harsh judgment on them and it may or may not be correct. If one takes the harsh line they cannot starve the human sector without reducing effectiveness.

Mr. MONDALE. When I visited Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union over a year ago, I was struck by the fact that in each of the Eastern European countries the state-controlled economies were all hardpressed by the growing demand of consumers for a greater share of the gross national product. They had been denied consumer goods for over one generation in the name of increased military buildups and investment in industrial goods; and increasingly they were demanding a greater share for themselves, such as housing, clothing, and a greater number of automobiles.

It is interesting to note that throughout Eastern Europe and possibly in the Soviet Union there is a tremendous investment in Fiat automobiles and other automobiles because the consumers are demanding them. This is going to take a larger share of their capacity, is it not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Absolutely.

(At this point Mr. CRANSTON assumed the chair.)

Mr. MONDALE. The other day Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko, in a speech before the Supreme Soviet, expressed a desire for improved friendship with the United States. There may be totally selfish reasons for that interest. We know about their problems on the Chinese border and we know of their economic problems. Would it not seem wise to the Senator from Wisconsin for us to take up this offer, not that we would do it foolishly or romantically, but that we find out how serious they are about arms limitations and what kind of an enforceable agreement we might reach to prevent the latest escalation? We could test it out. Does that not make sense?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It does make sense because it would be in the interest of the Soviet Union for the reasons the Senator has stated, and we all know what the benefits would be to us. We could get inflation under control, ease the tax burden and get to work on our poverty and education problems. All these things depend on some kind of a working agreement with the Soviet Union; but the pressure is on them because they have a smaller economy. At the same time I stress, as I am sure the Senator from Minnesota would, that we cannot rely on any kind of negotiations of agreements in good faith. We have to rely on something that can be enforced by unilateral inspection so we know the agreement is being kept.

Mr. MONDALE. At this point in history most of the items we would seek to agree upon could be observed by air surveillance. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONDALE. I think the Senator has made a remarkable contribution today and one that was very much needed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I would like to close by quoting from Professor Abram Bergson, who is probably the outstanding expert on the economy of the Soviet Union. He said:

> Now, Senator, I want to repeat, I do feel that the alternative claims are becoming more onerous rather than less onerous, the claims that are competing with the military claim. The Soviet government cannot ignore them. Under Stalin it did ignore consumption to an extraordinary degree, probably unparalleled in the history of industrialization of major economies. I sometimes feel that in this area the present government is suffering partly from Stalin's success. It happens that he was so successful in limiting consumption that he left very little opportunity for his followers to limit it more, and on the contrary they have found, for reasons of maintaining morale and incentives, and for reasons of political expediency generally, they have found that they have to do more for consumers rather than less.
>
> Well this is limiting what is available for other uses. And I repeat, investment possesses a growing claim. In my judgment the Soviet government cannot ignore these claims. And this tends to limit what they can do, the kind of defense budget they can project to support one or another foreign policy. I think of this as a quite significant constraint. You can't rule out extremes, but nevertheless realistically I do feel that any talk of a larger effort which would enable the Russians to go much beyond the United States effort overall is not very realistic.

ALL-OUT RUSSIAN MILITARY EFFORT WOULD CRIPPLE ECONOMY

Mr. President, if Russia chooses to go all out in the next 10 years in building the biggest and most threatening navy, air force, missile force of which it is capable by 1975, giving short shrift to consumer goods or industrial investment or agriculture in the process—if it does this—this Nation can easily match that Soviet military concentration and the Soviet leaders know that. They may be incompetent. They may be super hawks. They may have bad judgment. But they do know a lot about this open society of ours even if they just read our newspapers.

And they know that whatever they do, we can double and we can do it without even breathing hard.

So what do they have by 1975 if they throw all of their resources into the military? They will then have a far weaker economy: a Russian worker poorly motivated and maybe dangerously alienated, an industry that has fallen even farther behind the West in capital equipment, and an agriculture that continues to absorb nearly a quarter of their entire productive manpower.

And meanwhile we can, as they know, double whatever they do—plane for plane, missile for missile, rifle for rifle.

CONCLUSIONS

This adds up to several things:

First. Regardless of who is in charge in the Kremlin, the prospect of a Russian breakneck race to beat us by developing superior military hardware in the next 5 or 10 years is very unlikely. If it develops, we can meet it and beat it.

Second. The Russians have every reason to want to enter into an arms agreement with the United States, as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota brought out so well. While such an agreement based on unilateral inspection would not give the Soviet Union any advantage over the United States, it would provide a chance to build its consumer goods, its industrial plants, its agriculture in a balanced way that would give it far greater overall strength—including potential military strength than it now has—within the next 5 or 10 years.

Third. Such an agreement would help the Soviet Union in every area where they have serious problems. It would permit them to continue their superiority

XUM

over the Chinese. That superiority could deteriorate if the nonmilitary sectors were to be starved for a number of years.

Russia could strengthen its position with satellite countries whether this meant the so-called Brezhnev doctrine of interference to keep Soviet stooges in power, as applied in Czechoslovakia, or whether it simply meant potential military superiority that would be feared and followed. Obviously, an economic deterioration could enfeeble that domination and probably force more Czechoslovakias on Russia.

Russian leaders could strengthen their domestic position as consumer goods, industries, and agriculture improved.

I should like to quote again from Dr. Bergson's testimony:

> In sum, the Soviet government has been seeking to support a military establishment of the first-class with an economy that by U.S. standards has been of the second class. This is a difficult feat, and it is apt to become more difficult in the future, as the competing claims of capital investment and consumption become more demanding. Still the government has found the necessary means so far, and it should be able to continue to do so, but it may well be led to scrutinize marginal requirements for additional military outlays more closely than hitherto. It also goes without saying that for the USSR there has always been an economic case to join in arms control and disarmament measures. That should certainly still be so in the future.

Then, as Prof. Joseph Berliner of Brandeis University stated:

> Military and space expenditures in the USSR, as in the United States, employ resources that are deflected from other highly pressing national needs. One class of such needs is the long-postponed rise in the living levels of the population, particularly in the areas of agriculture and housing. The other high-priority goal is the need to advance the long-term objective of gaining economic parity with the major capitalist countries, which requires heavy expenditures on investment. The urgency of these needs is not such that the Soviet leaders would neglect the nation's defense requirements in order to meet them. Nor is it such as to overcome the pressures to expand their strategic, military and naval forces in support of their longer-run foreign policy objectives. These pressures are likely to be dominating as long as the USSR maintains military inferiority to the United States, both in general and in areas of particular strategic interest like the Mediterranean. But it does mean that the Soviet leaders—perhaps one should say some Soviet civilian leaders—may be expected to view with great alarm the prospect of future large increases of military and space expenditures for such reasons as the defense of the Chinese border, or war in the Middle East, or a major new escalation in nuclear weaponry.
>
> This is not to say that the Soviet leaders are desperate for any form of arms control agreement. One can say, however, that because of their pressing national needs the Soviet leaders may be expected to be seriously interested in the prospect of a satisfactory arms control agreement.

NEED U.S. MILITARY STRENGTH

Now Mr. President, none of this is to argue that the United States should not maintain sufficient military strength. We can do so and, of course, we must do so. But if we take a calm and clear look at what we are up against in the Soviet Union, it is clear that we can maintain that sufficiency without insisting that whatever the Soviet Union does militarily we must do more in that particular respect.

We have three times as many long-range bombers as the Soviet Union. We have 15 attack aircraft carriers, each carrying scores of attack aircraft, and surrounded by an armada of support vessels. We invest in any new sea-fortress complexes of this kind more than $1.7 billion each, and, as I say, we have 15 of them. How many does the Soviet Union have? None. Not one.

They have some things we do not have. They have anti-ballistic-missile systems. We do not. It is my understanding that we can get through their ABM's without difficulty.

We have far more missiles but they have greater megatonnage in their missiles. This simply means we can destroy them. They can destroy us.

U.S. SECURITY, TOO, CAN BE HURT BY MILITARY OVEREMPHASIS

Mr. President, all of this should provide a lesson for us. Our economic options are far broader for the United States than those facing the Soviet Union.

The United States does have some economic leeway. It can, if necessary, continue to invest $80 billion a year in the military—even after Vietnam—without a sudden or sharp deterioration in our marvelous economic system.

But let there be no mistake—there would be some definite and serious economic attrition for such a decision on our part.

I intend to address this subject before the Senate at a later date. But the witnesses before our Joint Economic Committee in testifying on the military budget and the Nation's priorities did convince this Senator that the United States, too—in the long run—will have a stronger country—militarily as well as socially—if we not only reduce the present high level of waste in our military spending, but also eliminate our investment in some of the marginal but enormously expensive weapons systems that contribute little to our national security. Such a decision would free resources to slow inflation and provide a stronger society as well as a sounder economy.

Just as the Russians could enfeeble themselves militarily by denying resources to investment in industry and agriculture in order to secure a temporary military hardware buildup, so we could reduce our military—I repeat, our military—potential by neglecting education in order to build highly questionable weapons systems.

EXHIBIT 1

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

EXCERPT, TESTIMONY OF MERLE FAINSOD

Even at the base of the Soviet social pyramid rank and file, peasants and workers are now in a position to exert greater influence on the course of elite decision-making. When collective or state farm workers respond to inadequate incentives by listless performance in the public sector, by transferring their energies to private plots, or by abandoning their jobs to seek better paid work in the industrial centers, they in effect bargain to improve their position. They vote with their feet, in the absence of large-scale terror, there is a point beyond which they cannot be driven. If more production is to be extracted from them, improved incentives have to be provided. The state and party functionaries responsible for increasing agricultural output find themselves forced to plead the case of their peasant clients. In a perhaps perverted form, what takes place is a form of indirect representation.

The Soviet Union is under heavy pressure to devote its energy and resources to domestic problems, to invest more heavily in agriculture, housing, and consumer goods, sectors of the economy which it has historically stinted. But it is doubtful that it will yield to such pressure as long as it feels, to use Kosygin's words, that "to economize on defense would be acting against the interests of the Soviet state and the Soviet people." Both the Soviet Union and the United States have a mutual interest in adopting a moratorium in the construction of antimissile systems and in limiting the arms race in offensive weapons. But it is one thing to proclaim a mutual interest and quite another to embody it in arrangements and agreements in which both sides can have confidence and trust. That arduous task is still before us, and it will not be made easier—indeed it may become infinitely more difficult—if we now launch a new round in the arms race which can only increase insecurity on both sides.

EXCERPT FROM PROF. ABRAM BERGSON'S TESTIMONY

How Soviet defense expenditures will vary in the future, to come to this question, will depend on the evolving international environment in which the USSR finds itself; the foreign policy which the USSR wishes to pursue within this environment and the economic potential available to support one or another such foreign policy, including the defense budget that it requires. Among these different factors, the latter must be accorded priority here. Turning to it, any serious appraisal must, I think, consider a number of aspects:

(i) The total output from which the Soviet government must draw its defense outlays is still relatively limited by U.S. standards. Thus, the USSR produced in 1966 a gross national product equal to but one-half of ours, or to but two-fifths of ours when calculated per capita.

(ii) The Soviet GNP continues to grow at a respectable rate, though not as fast as formerly. Whereas total output grew at over 7 percent during 1950–58, the tempo has now declined and during the years 1962–67 averaged but 5.5 percent.

(iii) Soviet growth for long has been notably expensive in terms of the additional capital that it has required. Even in the fifties, rapid growth of output could be achieved only through decidedly more rapid growth of capital, and more recently the disproportion between the two trends has become still more marked. Over the ten-year period 1950–60, the stock of Soviet capital per unit of output grew 22 percent. By 1965, or in the interval half as long, it had grown another 14 percent. A corollary is that in order to assure continued expansion of output, the government must plow back an ever larger share of that output in new investment. This is necessary merely to maintain the tempo of growth of output, never mind to raise it.

(iv) The Soviet government through the years promised consumers much. At long last it has concluded that it is expedient to redeem these promises in a greater degree than it did formerly. To a greater extent than in the past, therefore, consumers too must share in the fruits of progress, and consumption is no longer simply the residual segment of total output that it once was.

(v) Under the reforms in planning initiated by Brezhnev and Kosygin in September 1965, the Soviet government hopes to limit

XUM

further increases in the capital cost of growth, and perhaps even to reduce such costs. Resources allotted to consumption are also to be used more effectively in meeting consumers' demands, particularly in respect of quality and assortment. These reforms are still in process of implementation, and what they will achieve remains to be seen.

In sum, the Soviet government has been seeking to support a military establishment of the first-class with an economy that by U.S. standards has been of the second class. This is a difficult feat, and it is apt to become more difficult in the future, as the competing claims of capital investment and consumption become more demanding. Still the government has found the necessary means so far, and it should be able to continue to do so, but it may well be led to scrutinize marginal requirements for additional military outlays more closely than hitherto. It also goes without saying that for the USSR there has always been an economic case to join in arms control and disarmament measures. That should certainly still be so in the future.

EXCERPT FROM TESTIMONY OF PROF. JOSEPH S. BERLINER

Military and space expenditures in the USSR, as in the United States, employ resources that are deflected from other highly pressing national needs. One class of such needs is the long-postponed rise in the living levels of the population, particularly in the areas of agriculture and housing. The other high-priority goal is the need to advance the long-term objective of gaining economic parity with the major capitalist countries, which requires heavy expenditures on investment. The urgency of these needs is not such that the Soviet leaders would neglect the nation's defense requirements in order to meet them. Nor is it such as to overcome the pressures to expand their strategic, military and naval forces in support of their longer-run foreign policy objectives. These pressures are likely to be dominating as long as the USSR maintains military inferiority to the United States, both in general and in areas of particular strategic interest like the Mediterranean. But it does mean that the Soviet leaders—perhaps one should say some Soviet civilian leaders—may be expected to view with great alarm the prospect of future large increases of military and space expenditures for such reasons as the defense of the Chinese border, or war in the Middle East, or a major new escalation in nuclear weaponry.

This is not to say that the Soviet leaders are desperate for any form of arms control agreement. One can say, however, that because of their pressing national needs the Soviet leaders may be expected to be seriously interested in the prospect of a satisfactory arms control agreement.

EXCERPT FROM TESTIMONY OF PROF. HOLLAND HUNTER

The high rate of Soviet output growth reflects a high share of capital investment in each year's GNP. Rapid future growth will require continuation of a high investment/output ratio. This means that national security outlays compete, among major Soviet priorities, not only with consumption but also with investment. It's not just "guns versus butter," but "guns versus butter versus a larger pie in the future." During the 1960s, in fact, the "larger pie" took about three times as much output as defense did. In the short run, as a result, a marked slowdown in Soviet output growth would free resources either for larger defense outlays or for immediate consumption increases.

United States defense outlays produce no net gain in national security when they are offset by equivalent Soviet defense outlays. The principle also applies in reverse: reduced United States arms spending would not reduce national security if it were matched by verified Soviet reductions. Reduced outlays would, however, release resources for other high priority uses, which suggests that arms reduction negotiations should have the highest priority of all.

These crude projections (of Soviet output growth) illustrate the major trade-offs that confront policy makers in Moscow, much as similar trade-offs are confronted in Washington. It is clear that Soviet opportunities are very sensitive to the rate of output growth. If the Soviet GNP continues to grow rapidly, there will be room for both more guns and more butter. Even with reduced growth, somewhat more butter and a lot more guns can be had, if the system's directors are willing to imperil future growth.

If we assume that Soviet authorities will not abandon their high-growth objectives, and assume further that the Soviet public's morale would suffer from a sharp check to the rise in their living standards, several conclusions follow. First, it is evident that an arms freeze would benefit the Soviet economy, and that a reduced level of defense outlays would be even more attractive.

Secondly, it seems obvious that since an arms freeze or reduced defense outlays by the United States would be similarly useful for United States purposes, the USSR and the United States have a joint interest in halting and reversing the arms race. Arms outlays have a remarkable feature which distinguishes them from most other forms of expenditure. When the Congress appropriates funds for national security, the resources utilized have value only in relation to the simultaneous outlays being made by other countries. The value of American expenditures can be offset by the expenditures of other countries. The security that the United States tries to purchase with another ten billion dollars of defense appropriations can be completely nullified by equivalent Soviet outlays, so that neither nation is any more secure than before.

EXCERPTS FROM THE TESTIMONY AND QUESTIONING OF MR. BERGSON

Mr. Bergson. The Institute of Strategic Studies estimates that their current expenditures are running about $50 billion overall. I would not rule out figures larger than this. I am a little uneasy at the deduction of all of our expenditures on Vietnam in order to obtain a comparable figure for the U.S., and clearly we have forces in being. They are committed at the moment. But it does seem somewhat dubious to deduct those expenditures from our budget as if they did not contribute any strength. I would say that the balance is comparable to the Russian level.

I do feel, though, that in the existing state of our knowledge this committee would not be well advised to try to pinpoint precisely the level of expenditures for Russia compared with the United States. I think this can quickly become a game.

Senator Proxmire. We understand that. But you see, Professor Bergson, we are in a difficult position. We have to bite the bullet next month. We have to decide on the military budget. We have to vote it up or down. And we have far less knowledge by and large of the Russian economy and the Russian potential militarily than any of you four gentlemen has. I am speaking of most of us in the Senate and in the House. We have to make that decision. And we have to make some assumptions about our military strength. And the assumption that I am asking is, would it be sound in your view for us to feel that our present level of military strength is adequate, is sufficient.

Mr. Bergson. Senator, let me be clear, I feel that this is a matter which requires a most careful examination of extraordinarily complex questions. It is not a matter to be determined simply by looking at a defense budget translated in one way or another, from one currency to another. I repeat, I feel the Russians have, from all the information I have seen--and some of it is from such restricted sources as the New York Times—from all the information that I have seen, the Russians have established a very impressive military power, on the basis of an inferior economy. This has required a greater effort on their part. And in effect you have asked whether they could exert an additional effort and much surpass us in the future. I cannot speak in absolutes. I am rather skeptical that this is among the realistic possibilities we have to reckon with. I do feel that the Russians will exert an effort to assure that they have a defense potential appropriate to the kind of foreign policy they want to conduct in the future. And I can see them continuing to spend vast sums of money, and trying to match us where this seems appropriate, and perhaps in one area or another where it seems appropriate surpassing us.

I don't think it is any great secret that they probably have already surpassed the West in some areas, especially that of conventional power in Europe. There seems to be a good deal of evidence that this is so.

But over all I think it would be a most difficult thing for them to much surpass us in military strength in the future with the kind of economy they have. They have to consider that the pressures of other needs are rising rather than declining. There are other matters of importance to them.

* * * * *

Senator Proxmire. All the testimony we got this morning from all of you experts indicated that in spite of the fact that you indicated that the Russians may be growing percentagewise more rapidly, in absolute terms they are growing less than we are, isn't that correct? Because they have one-half the size economy, and obviously if they grow at 7 percent and we grow at 4 percent, the 4 percent growth translates into a larger real growth than theirs.

Mr. Bergson. This is quite true.

Senator Proxmire. So they are not gaining on us.

Mr. Bergson. It happens—I too feel that if you take a number of recent years, they are growing less rapidly than 7 percent. According to the estimate submitted to your committee, perhaps 5 to 6 is their mark. And we have been growing, it is true, above our trend level, but nevertheless at around 5 percent, 4 and ½ to 5 percent for a recent period. That is not a rate which we can quite maintain. But you are quite right, in terms of absolute increments, the Russians are actually falling behind rather than gaining.

Now, Senator, I want to repeat, I do feel that the alternative claims are becoming more onerous rather than less onerous, the claims that are competing with the military claim. The Soviet government cannot ignore them. Under Stalin it did ignore consumption to an extraordinary degree, probably unparalleled in the history of industrialization of major economies. I sometimes feel that in this area the present government is suffering partly from Stalin's success. It happens that he was so successful in limiting consumption that he left very little opportunity for his followers to limit it more, and on the contrary they have found, for reasons of maintaining morale and incentives, and for reasons of political expediency generally, they have found that they have to do more for consumers rather than less.

Well this is limiting what is available for other uses. And I repeat, investment possesses a growing claim. In my judgment the Soviet government cannot ignore these claims. And this tends to limit what they can do, the kind of defense budget they can project to support one or another foreign policy. I think of this as a quite significant constraint. You can't rule out extremes, but nevertheless realistically I do feel that any talk of a larger effort which would enable the Russians to go much beyond the United States effort over all is not very realistic.

XUM

Mr. Berliner. With respect to the capacity to support it?

Chairman Proxmire. Correct.

Mr. Berliner. I would guess that any reasonable expansion in military capacity is not outside the capability of the Soviet Union, just as it isn't outside our own capability. The question we have to ask is, what would it do to the Russians to continue to increase or to accelerate their military capacity? That is the question with which I will conclude.

But first I would like to say that as a sort of semi-layman in this business, one way in which I would answer your question would be to ask, if I were a general, which military establishment would I like to be running? Suppose I were a de-nationalized, international sort of amorphous war maker, and had my choice of military machines. I dare say, my hunch is that I would much rather be sitting across our strategic military force than I would across the Russians. Anybody who says that the Russians have a greater military capability than we must be saying in effect if he were this kind of general he would rather be riding on the Russian military strength.

I think few would hold that view. If that is the case, then in this semi-layman way my answer to your question is that we could reduce our military appropriations.

Secondly, the Russians are generally behind us militarily. They are behind us in nuclear submarines. And the Institute of Strategic Studies calculates that they are producing them at only the rate of one or two a year, which I found a rather astonishing figure.

I think we have to expect that as long as the Russians maintain military inferiority to us, are going to continue to feel that they have got to pull abreast of us. I think we would do the same thing if we were in their position, whether we were Marxists, or Chinese Nationalists, or American imperialists. I can't imagine how the Russians would permanently accept a state of military inferiority that no sensible nation that had the capacity to overcome such inferiority would ever maintain. From this point of view I would agree with those who have pointed out that the Soviet military buildup, particularly in their ICBMs over the last two years, may have created the possibility for the first time of some kind of nuclear agreements, even with all the problems of China—and I agree that these are going to be different ones—with all the problems of China and related ones, we may now for the first time be in the position of being able to deal with the Russians, they dealing as equals in a sense that they never were before.

My last point is directed to the question that was asked by Mr. Conable, how do the Russians feel about the need to allocate the increasing resources—consumer goods and services—for incentive purposes, resources which compete with military and investment resources? It is a good question, and the substance of the answer has been given here. But I hope the same question is asked about the United States, when you make your decision on how to vote on the defense budget. The United States equivalent of Russian consumer goods is the poverty problem, and the problem of urban blight. And I do hope that when the decision is taken on military expenditures that we think of the strength of the Nation not solely in military terms, but in general social and economic strength.

For there is in the Federal budget this year, I understand, the first appropriation for interplanetary travel, which is a very grim business. When we get into the business of interplanetary travel I imagine the present space program is going to look like peanuts. And it is going to be defended in the same terms as were used by Colonel Bordenko, the Soviet colonel who talked like any colonel in any country in the world, I presume, about the appropriate approach to military planning.

If we get involved in this interplanetary travel, which would be defended on the basis of our national military posture and our national honor, we have no guarantee today that the housing program, the urban program, and the poverty program will not be made to wait.

EXCERPT FROM DR. WOLFE'S TESTIMONY

I think this steady upward trend in Soviet military outlays represents a diversion of resources hardly calculated to help the regime meet its domestic economic goals. Naturally, the question arises: What has prompted Khrushchev's successors to increase the scale of Soviet military preparations? At the risk of violating my earlier caveats against relying on overly facile explanations of Soviet behavior, let's, in concluding, venture a few comments on this question.

In the first instance, the Brezhnev-Kosygin regime was probably moved to break through the ceiling Khrushchev has sought to maintain on Soviet military expenditures by the conviction that the USSR must provide itself with a wider range of military options and divest itself of a markedly inferior strategic posture in any future Soviet-U.S. confrontations that might occur—a liability that was dramatically driven home by the Cuban missile crisis in the later days of the Khrushchev decade. Secondly, the war in Vietnam and an apparent Soviet belief that U.S. military power was being increasingly committed to the suppression of so-called "national liberation" movements in the Third World probably served also to persuade the Brezhnev-Kosygin regime that further measures were needed to improve the Soviet Union's ability to project its military presence into areas like the Middle East, Africa and the Indian Ocean in support of Soviet policy.

But an explanation couched solely in terms of Soviet response to the perceived posture and policy of the United States falls short of the mark. The tendency of the Soviet leadership to seek resolution of its political dilemma in Czechoslovakia through military pressure—first in the form of threatened intervention and then by actual invasion—serves to remind us that problems like arresting the erosion of Moscow's authority in East Europe count high also in the pattern of Soviet priorities. Similarly, new difficulties with China in the Asian borderlands point to another source of motivation for the strengthening of Soviet arms.

In addition to such external grounds for a steady rise in military allocations, the internal play of Soviet elite politics and especially the appetite of the military bureaucracy for a larger slice of resources are factors which deserve close attention. In this connection, the likelihood that the Soviet military hierachy under the Brezhnev-Kosygin regime has sought and obtained a more influential voice in decisions affecting the country's security should not be overlooked, although the outward evidence available does not—at least in my opinion indicate that the traditional hold of the Soviet political leadership on the machinery of decisionmaking has been usurped by the military.

Finally, whatever the explanations advanced for the present scale of Soviet military outlays, I think it is also well to view the situation in broad historical perspective. Seen thus, the evolution of the Soviet military posture up to this point in time can perhaps best be understood as part of a larger historical process, still under way, marking the Soviet Union's emergence as one of the world's two super powers and reflecting the aspirations of its leaders to share the global stage with the United States.

EXCERPT FROM QUESTIONING

Senator Proxmire. I would like to ask Professor Fainsod this. Professor, you referred to Soviet politics as "bureaucratic politics," and that one of the primary concerns of the party leadership is that of mediating and balancing the claims of the various groups making up the bureaucracy. Under the present leadership the military appear to have the upper hand, or at least more dominance than they have had in some recent periods. You know they are under heavy pressure to devote more resources to domestic problems. Do you see any signs that this pressure for domestic commitment is growing, or can the leadership continue indefinitely to be subjected to military demands?

Mr. Fainsod. I think there are limits. If the leadership is prepared to turn to the kind of patterns that Stalin used, I am sure that it can put a much greater squeeze on the people in terms of standards of living sacrifices. But I think in the present state of development of the Soviet economy this kind of pressure has become counterproductive, that essentially the case for using economic incentives rather than mass terror is a kind of productive case. If of course the leadership feels itself in very great danger, I have no doubt that it would not hesitate to use very repressive means. But if it sees its future in terms of increases in productive or increases in production against, whether it be on the military or non-military side, it seems to me it must and has turned increasingly toward the use of incentives as a way of evoking contributions to productivity.

So that in this sense the groups of which I spoke, and even just ordinary workers, ordinary farmers, are in a position to affect priorities to a degree which they weren't able to affect them before.

Now, this doesn't mean that the leadership is at the mercy of this environment group activity. It can make calculated concessions of a rather modest sort. And I think on the whole its concessions can be so described. And when it feels under pressure to increase its military budget as it has in these last few years, something has to give. And if you study what has been happening you will notice that what has been giving has been investments in agriculture. And this has been openly acknowledged by Brezhnev in a recent statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am sorry I did not hear all the Senator had to say, but the information furnished to him by the various professors he named is most interesting.

During my last visit to Russia, believe it or not, I found in their very large cities, particularly in Siberia, a shortage of labor—something I never found before.

As the Senator states, the number of people engaging in farming is quite large compared to ours. As I recall, it requires about 40 percent of the people in Russia who live on the farm to produce food for themselves and the rest of the population. Is that about the figure that was testified to?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. They said seven times as many people as we have in this country in agriculture. So perhaps it would. I am not sure whether the percentage would be exactly 40 percent but perhaps it is in that area.

Mr. ELLENDER. Around 40 to 42 percent. Efforts are being made to reduce the number of people on the farms, but they find that cannot be done because Russian agriculture is not sufficiently mechanized.

I visited a huge plant in Rostov-on-the-Don which manufactures harvesters.

XUM

They are being made in fairly large quantities but in the old style—very heavy, and inefficient. I asked them, "Why don't you improve the quality of your harvesters?" The answer was that it would take them too long to retool, that they do not have sufficient personnel they could put to work to do that retooling so that a more modern harvester could be manufactured. Meanwhile, much iron and steel used in the machines was being needlessly wasted. The same thing holds true in the oil fields around Baku.

Mr. President, I discovered, on my last trip, that there are only two sources of manpower in Russia from which they can draw for industry. One is on the farm, and unless they can mechanize their farms so that it will take fewer people to produce food, I do not see that they can get many from the farms.

Another source of labor, believe it or not, is the colleges. As the Senator knows, every student in Russia is allowed a free education in the elementary schools, high schools, or colleges. Many of the boys and girls who go to college are now learning that, even though they spend from 3 to as many as 5 years more in school than those who graduated only from high school, they do not get more opportunity than the high school graduate obtains. It is a peculiar situation. I learned that there was much dissatisfaction among the students. They often wonder why it is that they should spend as many as 4 or 5 years in college and not get a better opportunity in industry than they have now. This goes back a long way into Communist ideology, when it was considered an article of faith that intellectuals and workers would be placed on the same footing.

I asked the question why they continued at college. The students said: "Well, that is one way to make a living, because we can go to college, and as long as we stay there, the Government pays us to go to school."

That was their answer. But I believe the leadership will, sooner or later, as I said in my most recent report, change that system and make a better selection of those who are eligible to go to college.

As it is now, it is optional with the student. I was told that not much effort is made by the Government to discourage a high school graduate from going to college. As I said, all are offered a monthly stipend. It may be that this adds to the labor shortage.

Another deficiency from which the Soviet Government is suffering is in transportation. Russia's railroad system is very deficient. There seems to be no effort made to change it or increase its efficiency. I would not be at all surprised if, because of the distances in Russia, which are so great, the Russians developed an air transportation system rather than trying to depend on railroads.

For example, most of the fruits and vegetables and other products of that kind are produced in Asiatic Russia, around Tashkent in Uzbek and Alma Ata in Kazakh, the largest republics in Asiatic Russia. The distance from those producing areas to Moscow or Leningrad, or other places where fruits and vegetables in large quantities could be consumed, is so great that those products could not be shipped by train.

I am sure efforts will be made to organize some method by which those products can be carried by air. I may be in error about that, but that is my belief.

I wish to compliment the Senator from Wisconsin for his presentation. I have not read all he has said, but, from what I have heard, I think he is on sound ground.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator. What he has said is most pertinent and relevant to the point I make. He believes there is a manpower or labor shortage in Russia. That is exactly why agriculture is so burdened. It absorbs so much manpower. If Russia could mechanize, if it could invest more of its resources in agriculture, and perhaps not so much in military, or at least decrease the rate at which it is making military expenditures, Russia could benefit in the long run by freeing her manpower.

The second point the Senator made, about the college students in Russia, is very interesting. The principal reason for Russian student resentment, I suppose, is that in a society in which there is a great emphasis on working with one's hands on the farm, for example, or which has a great number of what we call blue collar workers, there is not the opportunity for college graduates which obtains in a country like ours or West Europe, where there is more efficient agriculture and industry.

Finally, the Senator makes a very valid point which, frankly, we missed in our hearings and which should be stressed, namely, the great importance to Russia now of a transportation system, whether it be air, highways, or rail. It will require an immense amount of investment, whatever system is used. We have a great advantage in this country with our superb highway system, as well as our rail and air transportation systems. The Russians must know of this U.S. advantage. That fact greatly reduces the strength and force of her economy. If Russia is to have a great improvement in her economy, she must develop a transportation system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time allowed the Senator under the unanimous-consent agreement has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have another 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator stressed one point, which I overlooked until now. It is the production of fertilizers. Even in that field, there is much neglect because, I presume, the Russians have devoted so much of their resources in the development of military hardware, missiles, and so forth, and the creation of a heavy-industry base. I can foresee that, unless Russia produces more fertilizer for the farm, and unless she mechanizes her farms, things will get worse instead of better, in my opinion.

As I stated in my last report, there is no doubt in my own mind that, as time goes on, fewer and fewer boys and girls will be desirous of going on the farm. I am very hopeful that things will change there, for their own good. I am very hopeful we can start talking peace meaningfully. We cannot approach the Russians, speak of desiring peace with them, and, in the next breath, talk about war, such as revitalizing the alliance in Western Europe and the program we are now discussing.

It strikes me that we ought to be very frank and honest with them. Mr. Llewellyn Thompson, when he came back, stressed that one of the important things we should do in regard to Russia is to be at least honest with her. If we want to talk peace, let us do it, and not be building up for a war, which, in my opinion, will never come.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator. He not only is chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but he is a great expert in this area. He is probably the most fully informed and aware Senator with regard to the Soviet Union, in terms of having traveled there, five times, as he says, not for merely overnight visits, but spending many weeks in many parts of that great country. I think his opinions should carry particular weight. His reports have been most useful to us in getting an understanding of Russia.

Mr. ELLENDER. Last week I had six moving picture showing at the auditorium of my recent visit to Russia. I wish to say to Senators and others who were not able to see those moving picture shows—I have been asked to have others—that tomorrow at 5 o'clock, at the auditorium, there will again be a showing of those pictures. Probably next week I will again show those pictures. So those who are desirous of seeing them, and have not had the opportunity to do so yet, will have that opportunity.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HUGHES. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin, in line with the transportation problems that have been suggested here, the Russians seem outwardly to be dedicated to developing their transportation by sea. They certainly have made an economic decision to engage in building sea transport and in building submarines, probably to catch up with or surpass our submarine fleet. In world trade, they are certainly starting out on more than a competitive economic basis, in an attempt to compete with and surpass our great country in this area. Does the Senator believe, on the basis of his research and studies, that this is true?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, I do, indeed, in certain fields. We had testimony before our committee that, especially in the merchant marine area, the Soviet Union is making a substantial increase in investment. It would not be hard to surpass this country, because we just do not have very much in the area of merchant marine, in comparison with our great resources and the capacity we could have if we wished to invest in that area.

But once again, if they are going to

build up their capacity for foreign trade, they have to make a choice: They cannot do that and also these other things they so urgently would like to do, and engage in an arms race with the United States at the same time.

Mr. **HUGHES**. To get to the latter part of the Senator's speech, when he was talking about the excellent weapons system this country has in comparison with what the Russians have, does he believe that we are at a level of sufficiency in this regard at the present time?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator's additional time has expired.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. I ask unanimous consent for 3 additional minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. I would say, on the basis of what I have heard and read, that we are. I do agree with those who say we must work to maintain our military sufficiency. We cannot take it for granted.

I do think there are many weapons systems of those which have been proposed which are not required for us to maintain our military sufficiency.

For instance, I feel that an additional aircraft carrier, when they do not have any, when we have 15, and when no other country is building any, is redundant. There is also a serious question in my mind whether we ought to have a supersonic manned bomber 8 years from now, when 8 years ago it was stated that it was becoming obsolete, and Russia is a long way from having as many manned bombers as we have.

So I think there are areas where, even with the most skeptical view of the Soviet capacity and intention—skeptical in the sense of avoiding underrating them or their capacity—I think there are many areas where we can reduce the efforts proposed to us, and still maintain our sufficiency.

Mr. **HUGHES**. In view of that fact, and in view of the fact that we are hopefully about to begin some negotiations, it seems to me quite obvious that if we upset the balance of military power now either way, obviously the nation that feels it has lost the level of equality that it feels ought to be maintained is going to have to stall in whatever negotiations are begun until its sufficiency is again at a level of equality. Would that seem to make sense to the Senator?

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. That seems very logical to me. The notion that because we might be approaching negotiations, therefore we should rush in with everything we can think of to strengthen our so-called bargaining position, does not seem logical. I would agree with the implication of the Senator's remarks that these negotiations are vital to the United States and to the Soviet Union, and that it could well be that by a military overcommitment, we could upset them, or make them very difficult to work out or to develop; and we should keep that constantly in mind in voting on the military budget.

Mr. **HUGHES**. I express my appreciation to the Senator from Wisconsin for his enlightening presentation today, which I believe is especially valuable because of his particular background, the committees of which he has been chairman, and the research he has done. I appreciate the fact that this matter has been brought before the Senate.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. I thank the Senator from Iowa very much.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. **LONG**. Mr. President, I will have printed in the RECORD the invitation I received to appear at the Democratic policy committee luncheon and the statement I made before the Democratic policy committee luncheon with regard to tax reform.

I believe that statement will make it clear that it has always been my point that to act responsibly on tax reform measures would require a wait until at least December or maybe until sometime next year.

That is the reason why I felt that any comprehensive type of tax reform should not be added to the extension of the surtax measure. That measure is viewed by us as being a measure of great urgency.

I will also have printed in the RECORD a statement I made before the Senate Committee on Finance today explaining the procedural problem as it appears to me.

At the conclusion of that statement, the Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS) suggested that we should have an executive meeting on Thursday to discuss the problem.

I requested the right to invite the Democratic policy committee to meet with the Senate Committee on Finance so that there could be no misunderstanding or breakdown of communications between the two, hoping that we could agree on procedure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the material to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., May 22, 1969.

Hon. RUSSELL LONG,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, Washington, D.C.

DEAR RUSSELL: Following up our conversation of a few days ago, at which time I requested that you attend the next meeting of the Policy Committee, I am taking this means to put that oral request in written form.

As I told you, the Policy Committee requested Mr. Stanley Surrey to meet with it to discuss the question of taxes in general. It was the unanimous opinion of the Policy Committee that in line with its procedure not to overstep the bounds of any legislative committee, that you, as Chairman of the Finance Committee, should be there to give us the benefit of your views, your wisdom, and your counsel on this most important matter. This will be, in effect, a round robin discussion which we hope will be of educational value to the Policy Committee, and we would be most happy and honored if you could see your way clear to sit in with us on Tuesday, May 27th in Room S–221, U. S. Capitol.

Must close now, Russell, but with best personal wishes and looking forward to seeing you, I am

Most sincerely,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR LONG TO THE DEMOCRATIC POLICY COMMITTEE TAX REFORM LUNCHEON, MAY 27, 1969

I want to applaud the Democratic Policy Committee for taking time from its important work to discuss the matter of tax reform and I want to report on the role of the Committee on Finance in this area.

Before giving that report, however, let me state that—except in general terms—I do not know what will be in the tax reform bill now being drafted in the House Ways and Means Committee. Certainly, the rules governing the tax-exempt foundations are going to be tightened and I am optomistic that a minimum income tax will be enacted to do something about the fellow who is financially able to juggle his income and deductions in such a way as to avoid paying any Federal income tax—or perhaps only a token tax. That sort of exploitation of the tax law is a direct consequence of wealth. It creates an unfair preference in favor of the man who is fortunate enough to make his money from the ownership of property as contrasted to people who earn their living with their hands.

Thanks to hard work by people like Stanley Surrey a minimum tax, which I have long advocated, is close to enactment in this 91st Congress. It will do much to bolster taxpayer morale and confidence in our voluntary self-assessment tax system.

Now, in exploring the role of the Finance Committee in tax matters I want to point out that the Senate must operate under a constitutional infirmity which reserves to the House of Representatives the power to originate tax measures. We can't act in the tax area until we have received a bill from the House and then we can only amend the House bill.

Thus, if an idea develops in the Senate for a major tax change the chances are the House is going to get first crack at that suggestion and if its a good one they are going to get credit for it. If it's a bad one the Senate is going to get the blame for not taking it out of the House bill.

The suspension of the investment tax credit in 1966 is a good example of the first point. I offered an amendment to suspend it in August. In September, the President submitted a recommendation to Congress that it be suspended. In October, the House passed a bill to do it, and was widely hailed for easing the pressures on the money markets and slowing inflation. But the fact remains that the impetus for that legislation came from the Senate.

Now, the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Revenue Acts of 1962 and 1964 all represent great tax reform efforts.

But in talking about tax reform, we have to understand what we mean. To some people, tax reform is a process of simplification—getting the law to a state where common ordinary people and businessmen can read the statutes and determine how much tax they owe. Unfortunately, our tax law is too complicated, and we are always in need of this type of tax reform.

To other people, tax reform is a means of achieving equity between tax payers with similar income. Generally, what we mean here is that tax payers in similar lines of business or with similar types of income should pay similar amounts of tax. Equity can also mean bringing persons with different incomes into a better tax paying balance with each other—relating the tax schedules to ability to pay. To yet another group, tax reform means additional revenues to the Federal Government—revenues that can be put to work to better the lives of all our citizens. But, before anyone gets the impression that tax reform invariably means higher taxes, let me stress that some of the more significant reforms have actually brought tax reductions, and tax increases. The investment tax credit in 1962 is one. The dividend credit in 1954 is another. It was

XUM

subsequently repealed and the repeal, too, was viewed as a tax reform. The tax reductions in the Revenue Act of 1964 totaling more than $13 billion was a major tax reform. And so was the repeal of most excise taxes in 1965.

Let me make this simple observation about tax reform. Nearly every provision of the tax law that is the target of today's tax reform was looked on as a tax reform itself when it was written into the law. The "reasonable allowance" for depletion first granted in 1916 reformed the 1913 law which *prevented* a recovery of costs. "Discovery value" depletion was a reform when it came along in 1918. "Percentage depletion" in 1926 was a tax reform in the nature of simplification of discovery depletiton. Now, tax reform of percentage depletion is being discussed by those who do not understand the minerals industry.

Now the significant point about this is that the first tax reform was in the name of equity. So was the 1918 reform. It recognized that what was being depleted was the mineral in the ground. The third tax reform—percentage depletion—involved tax simplification. The tax reform now being discussed is raised in the name of revenue.

Capital gains was a major reform when this liberal tax rule was first enacted in 1921. It recognized that some income accrues over a period longer than the taxable year, and it should not be taxed at the high graduated rates generally applicable to income earned in a single year. Since 1921 a great many features have been added to the capital gains provision broadening its scope and reducing the tax on a host of different types of income where some lower rate seemed appropriate. The income averaging rules constituted a tax reform when they came into law———but they were not very comprehensive. Congress reformed the averaging rules again in 1964 with an overall rule which applies all sorts of situations, except where gambling gains are involved. Our efforts since 1964 have been to discourage further enlargement of the capital gain rule, and I might say we have been quite successful.

The divident credit enacted the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 was looked on as a tax reform responding to the argument that corporation income was subject to double taxation. Its repeal in 1964 was a tax reform move also.

Accelerated depreciation dating from 1954 was a tax reform and the special rules for recapturing excess accelerated depreciation deductions at ordinary income rates—with respect to personal property in 1962 and with respect to real property in 1964—were also tax reforms. They stopped the conversion of ordinary income into tax-favored capital gains.

The investment tax credit was considered a major tax reform by President Kennedy in 1962 when it was enacted. It was the backbone of the Revenue Act of that year. Today, in a different climate and with a new set of priorities tax reform dictates that the investment credit be repealed. I might point out that once again the impetus for its repeal came from the Senate.

In another area it was tax reform motivations which prompted amendments to foster the development of private charitable foundations. Witness the unlimited charitable contribution deduction and the tax exemption for these institutions. Today, tax reform demands that foundations be severely restricted in their operations and that the unlimited charitable contribution deduction—a favorite device for avoiding Federal income tax—be repealed.

The system of private pension plans we have in this country developed under favorable tax amendments specifically designed to encourage employers to look after the retirement needs of their employees. Indeed social security itself rests on a tax base. Here tax reform has been adapted to mold and shape a socially desirable system of pension and retirement benefits, easing the financial burden on those whose working days are past. Today, the tax purist looks at the tax benefits associated with pension plans, concludes they are too generous and calls for reform.

These illustrations demonstrate, I believe, that tax reform is not a phenomenon of 1968 and 1969. It is a part of the never-ending process of legislating in the light of changing situations.

While a great deal of attention is presently focused on the closing of "loopholes" I can point to countless provisions of the tax law which prior Congresses put there to close the loopholes of their time. The personal holding company tax is one. The wash sale provision which prevents the creation of artificial losses in securities transactions is another. So are the provisions which deny capital gains treatment—or prevent the deduction of losses—in the case of sales between spouses or between a man and his controlled corporation. The tax on improperly accelerated surplus of corporations and the provision ignoring the corporate entity when tax gimmickry is involved are still others.

As a matter of fact one of the principal reasons the tax law is so complicated is because we have gone to great lengths to prevent loopholes in the new tax concessions Congress enacts. A look at the investment credit provisions with special recapture rules for early disposition of the property, reduced credits for short-lived property and for property acquired by tax favored organizations, and denial of credits for property used outside the United States—all these restraints attest to our efforts to close loopholes before they really develop.

Examine the election in Subchapter S for small corporations to have their income taxed directly to their shareholders, thus avoiding the corporate income tax, and you will see the same pattern of concern.

As a matter of fact, we have done such a good job of closing possible loopholes in new legislation that few of the suggestions for tax reform are aimed at recent amendments. Most of them are directed at provisions which came into the law prior to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. And many of them go back to the period before the depression.

These are the tough ones. As I have already observed most of them were looked on as desirable tax objectives when they came into the law. For many of them a strong case can be made that they are still desirable objectives. For instance the cash method accounting that farmers use dates from an Internal Revenue Ruling of 1916 designed to simplify tax reporting since most farmers could not understand accrued method accounting. Although we have fewer farmers now than we had then, and our farmers today are more sophisticated, simplicity of tax reporting is still a desirable objective. I'd like to offer every taxpayer a simplified method of reporting his income and paying his tax.

Unfortunately, the extension of capital gains treatment to livestock in 1951, combined with the favorable accounting rules of 1916, have created a very generous tax preference that has attracted non-farmers into the farm economy for tax reasons rather than good business reasons. At the present time there are at least four separate and different solutions before Congress to modify this situation in varying degrees and each one of them is heralded as a tax reform.

Now we'll take this farm loss issue and all the suggested solutions in the Finance Committee and we will study them and come to a decision as to what we think we should recommend to the Senate. We'll do the same thing with every other issue involved in tax reform. If we find loopholes in the law I am confident we will close them, and in the process we will probably also tighten up on a lot of tax concessions that are not loopholes.

At this point let me offer some comments on the question of timing of a tax reform bill and then I want to demonstrate why I believe the Finance Committee is becoming a more dynamic and significant force in the legislative process of enacting a tax bill.

It is a matter of fact that the Senate acts on major tax legislation in about one-half the time it takes for the House to prepare a bill and send it to us. And we are able to do this despite the fact that they act on tax bills under a closed rule which generally prohibits floor amendments and which usually limits debate to only four hours. Contrast that with the rule of unlimited debate under which we operate in the Senate and note that printed amendments to major tax bills now run over 100—and I mean the substantive amendments that Senators want to offer from the Floor. It becomes truly amazing that we are able to act as expeditiously as we do.

Let me relate the time span for consideration of the last three major income tax bills—the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Revenue Acts of 1962 and 1964.

We received the Internal Revenue Code of 1965 nine and one-half months after the House Ways and Means Committee started to work on it. Five months later the Senate passed the bill and sent it to Conference.

Turning now to the Revenue Act of 1962, we find that the President submitted his recommendations to Congress in April of 1961. One year later, in April 1962, the bill passed the House and came before the Finance Committee. We began public hearings the same day we got the bill. The hearings lasted 29 days, covering 5000 pages of testimony in 12 printed volumes. Despite this lengthy hearing and the consideration of more than 200 amendments the Senate passed the 1962 Act and sent it to conference in just four and one-half months—only slightly more than one-third of the time the bill was under consideration in the House.

The legislative history of the Revenue Act of 1964 reflects the same pattern. The House worked on it for 10 months before they sent it to the Senate in September of 1963. Thirty-two days of hearings were held on the bill in the Finance Committee. Nevertheless, only four months elapsed before the Senate passed the bill and sent it to conference.

Two significant facts emerge from this examination of the past. First, it takes longer than a single year to complete the legislative enactment of a major tax bill. Work on the 1954 Code began in June, 1953; the law was enacted in August 1954. The Revenue Act of 1962 was initiated in April, 1961, but enactment did not come until October, 1962. The Revenue Act of 1964 began with President Kennedy's message of January 24, 1963. It was completed in February, 1964 and I might say that the assassination of President Kennedy in the fall of 1963 with the resultant surge of sentiment to enact the measure for which he labored the last year of his life probably spurred Congress to pass the bill several months sooner than would otherwise be the case. There was a lot of reluctance to cutting individual income taxes—and revenues—in the face of the budget deficits we were experiencing.

The second fact is that the Senate invariably acts more swiftly on major tax legislation than the House of Representatives.

Applying this history to the present situation we observe that the House Ways and Means Committee has already devoted four months to tax reform.

The most optimistic predictions are that they will send us a bill in August—three months away. Assuming they meet that schedule and that we begin hearings in the

XUM

Finance Committee right after Labor Day (Congress will be in recess from August 13 until after Labor Day) it would probably be December before the Senate passes the bill. Even so it would be a tremendous accomplishment to pass a major tax bill in less than one year.

Now, as I have mentioned, the Committee on Finance and the Senate are becoming more innovative and effective in the tax legislative processes. For instance, when other approaches had failed, a tax amendment assured the legality of the merger of the two major professional football leagues and fostered the single player draft, thereby reducing a tremendous financial strain on that industry. The tax check-off amendment, by which a taxpayer could direct the use of $1 of his tax payment for presidential campaign purposes, is another illustration of Senate innovation in the tax area. Although the tax check-off was suspended a few months after it was enacted—and the suspension itself was Senate motivated—it has focused the attention of the nation on a problem we are going to have to deal with, probably before the next presidential election in 1972.

Indeed the 10 percent tax surcharge and the restraint on Federal spending in this fiscal year—which has made possible the first budget surplus in a good many years—was enacted as a Senate amendment. I would have preferred a change in the tax rates to the surcharge and my own amendment to provide an increase in the tax rates was at the desk when the surcharge amendment was agreed to. The many, many complaints we have had about the surcharge suggest to me that we would have done better from the standpoint of the public relations if we had taken the rate increase route.

In the Revenue Act of 1962 a Senate amendment (which I offered) assured enactment of the investment tax credit. It required that the depreciable basis for the property involved be decreased by the amount of the investment credit so that there would be no pyramiding of tax benefits. A Senate amendment calling for reporting to the tax collector of interest and dividend payments made to depositors and shareholders closed off a massive "leakage" in the tax system. This amendment was offered after it became clear that withholding of tax on this sort of income would not be passed.

The tie-breaking vote I cast in the Committee on the question of taxing foreign income of United States corporations and their subsidiaries probably saved those provisions. I cast that vote by telephone from Louisiana after the case for and against the amendment had been explained to me by Senators calling from the executive session of the Committee.

In the Revenue Act of 1964 a move in the Finance Committee to substitute an increase in the personal exemption for the rate reductions provided by the House bill was successfully resisted, guaranteeing that American taxpayers would realize their first tax rate reduction since the Korean War.

In another area, one of the important Senate amendments to the 1964 Act deleted a series of House provisions which would have substantially liberalized the capital gains treatment for property held longer than three years. This liberalization had been linked to a proposal to tax unrealized appreciation in value of property held at death, but in a last-minute maneuver the House Ways and Means Committee decided not to change the law with respect to property held at death. However, it left the provision lowering the capital gains tax in the bill.

We deleted those provisions in the Finance Committee and during the debates on the bill we demonstrated for the Senate how capital gains have permitted many high income individuals to pay inordinately low taxes. I have observed that in terms of sheer size capital gains is the "granddaddy" of all the tax preferences, and we just could not justify making capital gains still more rewarding and we made this attitude stick in conference.

More currently, the present move for tax reform really got its start as a Senate amendment which we prevailed upon the House to accept, calling on the President to submit recommendations for tax reform to Congress by December 31, 1968. Those recommendations, actually submitted by Treasury technicians in February of this year are now the backbone of the tax reform effort underway in the House Ways and Means Committee.

So in a large measure the present tax reform move owes its momentum to two significant developments, both of which occurred in the Senate. First, the enactment of the surtax, which has created a great unrest among taxpayers across the land, causing a public demand for tax reform. Secondly, was the advance work on tax reform done by the Treasury Department in response to the Senate amendment calling for tax reform suggestions. When the call came much of the work was already done.

CONSIDERATION OF THE SURTAX BY THE SENATE

(Press release of Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate)

Before ending this phase of hearings on the surtax bill, the Chairman would like to make his position on this bill clear, if that is possible. To begin with, I am thoroughly confused about whatever it is that the Democratic Policy Committee wants this Committee to do. I have been a member of the Senate for more than 20 years and a member of the Committee on Finance for more than 16, During those years I have managed major revenue bills recommended by former President, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson.

But unfortunately, I had no such experience with the present policy of the Democratic Policy Committee, because at that time the Democratic Policy Committee did not seek to provide guidance to Committees and Committee Chairman about House revenue bills much less provide such guidance even before the bills reached the Senate. The procedure is completely new to me and therefore, I find myself groping for an answer just as the Policy Committee itself is groping for an answer to its own policy.

Before this bill came to the Senate, the Democratic Policy Committee requested me to meet with that Committee and discuss tax reform suggestions. The Democratic Policy Committee had one expert with them, a fair, distinguished and able man who is a former high government official. I was invited back again two weeks later without any prior knowledge of the subject to be discussed. At that meeting the Democratic Policy Committee agreed to a resoluiton as follows:

"Whereas, the Senate Majority Policy Committee, having met and considered the matter of the extension of the income tax surcharge, hereby resolves:

"That meaningful tax reforms should be adopted as a means of achieving an equitable national income tax policy, and further resolves,

"That any proposal to extend the income tax surcharge be considered simultaneously with recommendations on meaningful tax reform and further resolves,

"That the present income tax withholding rates be continued after June 30, 1969 for a period of one quarter to permit full consideration and disposition of the reform and extension of the surtax."

The original text of this resolution used the words "full and comprehensive tax reform" instead of "meaningful" as was in the published resolution. It is because I pointed out to the Policy Committee that it could take many months or even years to draft a full and comprehensive tax reform measure that the word "meaningful" was substituted for "full and comprehensive" in its resolution.

I explained to the Policy Committee that tax reform meant different things to different people. It was my suggestion that the Committee on Finance should report whatever bill the Committee could agree upon, and Senators could offer any amendment they chose when the bill reached the floor.

It was my thought that the Senate would approve those amendments that a majority of the Senators favored and vote down those amendments which a majority of the Senate did not favor. We have proceeded that way with revenue bills for the twenty years that I have served here.

This important measure has been of major concern to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of the Treasury. Both of them have expressed fear of the utter chaos that could discend upon this nation, if this bill—which is the only Administration measure at this point seeking to maintain a stable economic and fiscal condition in our land—should fail to be enacted.

Their concern has been shared by public expression of every living ex-Secretary of the Treasury, including such men as Joe Barr, Henry Fowler, Douglas Dillon, Bob Anderson, George Humphrey and John Snyder. All of these financial leaders have deplored the present situation which jeopardizes the ability of the Federal government to pay its debts currently. They deplore the plight of the President and they deplore the plight of the nation if this bill should fail. It would be of the utmost concern to all of them and to the President if the present surtax should not be expeditiously extended. Therefore, as Chairman of this Committee, I undertook to set up a schedule which would bring this bill before the Senate prior to the expiration date set by law—July 31. That is the basis upon which this Committee is proceeding.

Now, it has been suggested that two bills should be reported by the Committee on Finance before the first bill is considered. That came as a surprise to me when it was first suggested, just as it surprised Senator Muskie who was a member of the Policy Committee. His remarks on the Floor yesterday suggested that he felt the two bills approach was contrary to the resolution of the Democratic Policy Committee.

Fortunately for us, the task today is simple—we will now conclude the hearings of the public witnesses testifying on the suspension of the investment tax credit. I would hope that we can hear Senators next week who desire to testify on the tax reform proposals they plan to offer to this bill. Then I will seek to obtain for the Committee the benefit of further guidance, after which the Committee can then decide if it wishes to hear further testimony or commence voting.

As Chairman of this Committee I regret that there has been a misunderstanding of how I intend to proceed with this bill. It was my intention to satisfy the views of the President, Secretary of the Treasury as well as the Democratic Policy Committee by promptly reporting to the Senate a bill which would improve upon the House-passed measure and add some meaningful tax reform in addition to that which is already in the House bill.

I might say that I have often been advised by a President or a Secretary of the Treasury or even by my Majority Leader that a bill was important or that it had something in it that should not be there or that it lacked a feature which should be in it. That is nothing new to me. If I had not received the guidance of the Democratic Policy Committee I would not have known what to do with this bill. Major revenue measures are no novelty to the Committee on Finance.

I do not presume to speak for the Demo-

XUM

crats on this Committee nor do I presume to speak for the Republicans except as they authorize me to speak for them. But in proceeding with the consideration of the surtax bill I am not unmindful of the major tax reform measure being readied for House action by the Committee on Ways and Means. That Committee has dedicated itself to tax reform and the President and the Secretary of the Treasury has committed the Administration to tax reform. The Senate itself is gripped with tax reform fever.

But the pressing business now is to maintain the fiscal integrity of the Federal government and give the President the tools he says are needed to contain inflation.

As Chairman of the Committee on Finance it is my purpose to try and bring men of good will together so that the dual goals of fiscal policy and tax reform can be achieved in the best interest of the nation. I thought that was also the purpose of the resolution of the Democratic Policy Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement the Senator from Louisiana has made. I appreciate his willingness to call the committee into executive session on Thursday in order that we can consider the possibility of taking action on reporting the surtax bill from the committee.

I think it is very important that we do consider in our committee major tax reform proposals, and I agree completely with the chairman that to do so properly will take rather extended hearings.

I do not think it is good for the country or for the economy of the country to postpone action on the surtax or the question of repeal of investment credit until after the hearings have been completed on major tax reforms and the committee can act. That could take until October.

I was hoping that we could proceed in an orderly manner. I was hoping that we could act on the surtax bill, which came from the House, and then, as the chairman has already announced, proceed next week to the hearing of any reform proposal of any Senator. By holding these hearings now we would be ready to mark up the bill soon after it is received from the House. Perhaps the House would have included their amendments as a part of the House bill; if not we could consider their suggestions.

I think we need major tax reform. The country is desirous of it. I have a strong interest in it; however, if we try to combine the two the delay will do a great disservice to the country.

I appreciate the fact that the chairman is willing to call the committee into executive session later this week and give us a chance to decide on reporting the surtax bill.

I would welcome the presence of the Democratic policy committee if they want to appear before the Finance Committee and express their views.

However, in all due respect to the Democratic policy committee, as I have pointed out, this is a measure that affects the country as a whole. It is a measure on which the Senate as a whole, both Republican and Democratic Senators, have a vital decision to make. I do not think the decision as to what we should not do is one that we can delegate to either the Republican policy committee or the Democratic policy committee. I think that this is something we should sit down together and work out.

I most respectfully point out to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that when the tax bill was passed last year it was enacted in a bipartisan manner. It was cosponsored by Senator Smathers of Florida and me, and while President Johnson was in the White House.

I think the question of an extension of this topic now merits that same bipartisan approach at this time. And I hope that we can get it.

Again I want to express my appreciation to the chairman of our committee for his courtesy in extending to the minority members an opportunity to express their views by calling this executive session for later this week.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, who is always fair and always considerate to members of his committee and Members of the Senate.

The Senator keeps in mind the interest of our total economy. We are faced with very definite problems. We need more revenue. The financial situation is acute.

It is easy to have a lot of talk about tax reform, and there should be tax reform.

Many of the provisions about which there is discussion of having reform have been in the Internal Revenue Code for 30, 40, or 50 years. We cannot strike them out either in the committee or on the floor without giving people a hearing.

I will give an illustration. One of the proposals relates to gifts that have an appreciated value to churches, hospitals, and colleges.

It would be unthinkable to change the status of that until we had heard from all parties involved. And to insist on combining the proposals for reform in the revenue bill may result in having neither reform nor a revenue bill.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MISSILE TEST FACILITIES AT KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE, AND RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTH

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 2546) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Curtis) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, one of the major responsibilities of our Government is to maintain the peace and avoid the involvement in war. It is when the United States is strong—spiritually, economically, and militarily—that we will have the greatest success in preventing both large wars and small wars. Strength and firmness on the part of the United States are instruments of peace. Vacillation and appeasement are invitations to war. Such is the verdict of history.

I shall support the anti-ballistic-missile proposal because I am convinced that to do so enhances the cause of peace. I am convinced that to fail to provide for this defensive weapon will lessen our chances for peace. At a time like this, we should give to the President of the United States our unified support and every instrument that strengthens his position in dealing with the Communist world.

An awesome responsibility rests on the President of the United States. He is committed to the task of carrying on discussions with the Soviet leaders. I appeal to my colleagues to do all that is within their power to strengthen the position of the United States in these momentous times.

We should all realize the gravity of the situation. This is one issue where the outcome may rest upon one Senator. Theoretically, at least, it is possible for one Senator to bring into being an anti-ballistic-missile system to add to the strength of our Nation, or for that same Senator, by his vote, to tip the scales so that the measure is defeated. We should approach this not as a popularity contest. Fifty-one votes will authorize the ABM, which will bring protection to our country, add to its strength, and give us something that will deter aggression. A mere 49 votes for the ABM, assuming all Members of the Senate are present and voting, will deny this protection, not to the President personally but rather to our country.

Today there is a movement afoot to downgrade those who are charged with the defense of our country. There are those who preach disarmament and stress rapproachment with a potential enemy that understands only strength. There are some who view our relations with the Communist world by a double standard. When the Communists develop a new nuclear weapon system it is not destabilizing. When the United States proposes a defensive nuclear system it is an escalation.

The international graveyards of history are full of the corpses of those who believed that appeasement and weakness would not be challenged by an aggressor.

Today, America stands at a crossroads. While we debate whether or not a defensive system is needed to protect our retaliatory capability, the Soviet Union is expanding its offensive on all fronts.

Ad hoc committees against the ABM are being formed. Anti-ABM books are being written and leaflets are being distributed. The propaganda mills of the unilateral disarmers are going full tilt.

It is interesting to note that those

XUM

groups who stress that the Safeguard ABM system will not work because it has not been tested in the environment in which it must be used are some of the same groups who pleaded so eloquently for the limited test ban treaty. This treaty prevents the United States from testing in the atmosphere or outer space. I voted against the limited test ban treaty, and I well remember during the debate that we were all assured that we could accomplish whatever nuclear tests were needed for our defense underground. Would those opponents of the ABM now suggest that we abrogate the limited test ban treaty in order to test the ABM? I think not.

I believe those who told us then and tell us now that the ABM can be successfully tested without the resumption of atmospheric testing. I am concerned when I hear those who do not have the awesome responsibility of decision criticize and carp. I wonder about those who, when they were in government, raised no objection to ABM concepts, but now without the responsibility of command speak so eloquently in opposition from their ivory towers.

I believe Dr. John Foster, Director of Research and Engineering for the Defense Department, when he stated before the Armed Services Committee that the ABM will perform the task assigned to it.

Let me point out some of the reasons the United States needs an ABM system.

The Soviet Union has one and possibly two ABM systems—the first around Moscow, and the second, the so-called Tallinn system, spread throughout the Soviet Union. These systems are already deployed. We, on the other hand, have none.

The Soviets have greatly increased their offensive capability. Former Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford in his prepared statement of January 16, 1969, said:

> We estimate that as of September 1, 1968, the Soviets had approximately 900 ICBM launchers operational, compared with 570 in mid-1967, and 250 in mid-1966, an increase of well over threefold in a period of little more than two years.

According to Adm. H. G. Rickover, the Soviet Union has greatly increased its offensive ballistic missile submarines. In a letter to the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), vice chairman of the joint committee, Admiral Rickover said:

> In the single year 1968, the Soviets put to sea a new type ballistic missile submarine as well as several new types of nuclear attack submarines—a feat far exceeding anything we have ever done. . . .

In November 1967, former Secretary of Defense McNamara revealed that the Soviet Union had developed a fractional orbital bombardment system—FOBS. This FOBS target cannot be determined until 3 minutes and 500 miles from the target.

Secretary of Defense Laird revealed in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee that the Soviet arsenal contains over 200 SS–9 missiles, each one capable of delivering up to 25 megatons on our Minuteman missiles.

Despite overwhelming evidence of a recent increase in the Soviet offensive as well as defensive capability, we still hesitate to defend ourselves.

The anti-ballistic-missile system proposed by President Nixon on March 14, 1969, is a defensive system to protect U.S. retaliatory capability. It has been suggested by some that this defensive move on our part constitutes an escalation of the East-West arms race. Nothing could be further from the truth. Rather than escalation, a defensive ABM system is a stabilizing factor. Even opponents of the ABM system concede that it is not another round in the arms race.

In an exchange with the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) during hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee, Dr. Wolfgang Panofsky discussed this point:

> Senator SYMINGTON. Dr. Panofsky, I would ask this question: If we are successful in defending Minuteman bases in this way, and if they desire to maintain parity, would they not increase their ICBMs?
>
> Dr. PANOFSKY. Only if they were genuinely interested in a first strike posture. If they were satisfied by a second strike posture, then, if we increased the defense of our Minuteman bases by ABMs, they would not have to increase their ICBM force. (Page 341, March 28, 1969)

Dr. Hans Bethe, professor of physics, Cornell University, then opposing the Sentinel ABM system, stated:

> A completely different concept of ABM is to deploy it around Minuteman silos and command and control centers. This application has gone in and out of Defense Department planning. I am in favor of such a scheme at the appropriate time. My main reason for being in favor is that such a deployment would stabilize the strategic situation rather than the opposite. (Page 39)

Dr. Bethe's statement was made on March 6, 8 days before President Nixon announced the Safeguard system which would accomplish precisely what Dr. Bethe advocated.

I have been discussing Soviet strength and capability to wage war. Let me review Soviet past behavior.

Less than a year ago, in August 1968, the Soviet Union ruthlessly invaded the territory of an ally—Czechoslovakia. If the Soviet Union would do this to an ally, what would it do to a potential foe?

In 1962 the Soviet Union placed offensive nuclear missiles in Cuba, 90 miles from our shores.

In 1956 the Soviets brutally stamped out the freedom fighters of Hungary.

And for those who prefer long-range history, who can forget that in 1940 the Soviet Union joined with Nazi Germany in a nonaggression pact?

In America today, our problem is to alert the people to the threat of the international Communist conspiracy. We have to reach the heartland of America. We have to avoid the siren calls of the disgruntled intellectuals. We must alert the people to the problems around us as President Eisenhower did in his farewell speech given on January 17, 1961. It is interesting that one sentence—no, really three words, "military-industrial complex"—is almost solely quoted from that speech. How many have read the speech in its entirety? President Eisenhower referred to the Communists in that speech when he said:

> We face a hostile ideology—global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose, and insidious in method. Unhappily the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration.

In another part of his excellent address, President Eisenhower said:

> In holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite.

I have rarely seen these portions quoted in our news media and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the entire speech by President Eisenhower to follow my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the choice today is ours. Communist nations are on the march. Our leaders, both Democrats and Republicans, urge us to defend ourselves. The last three Secretaries of Defense urged the development of an anti-ballistic-missile system. There is no partisanship in this cry for defense. I regret that some members of my own party may not see the dangers of taking first one step, then another, and still another toward peace at any price.

What is past is prologue. I only hope we will remember it was the Soviet Union that broke the informal atmospheric testing moratorium in 1961. During that test series, the Soviets detonated a 60-megaton terror weapon. They broke that informal moratorium while their representatives sat with ours in peaceful discussions in Geneva. If we do not learn from the past, we are doomed in the future.

I strongly urge that every Member of the Senate vote for the defensive Safeguard system. To do otherwise is an invitation to disaster.

EXHIBIT 1

FAREWELL RADIO AND TELEVISION ADDRESS TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, JANUARY 17, 1961

[Delivered from the President's Office at 8:30 p.m.]

My fellow Americans:

Three days from now, after half a century in the service of our country, I shall lay down the responsibilities of office as, in traditional and solemn ceremony, the authority of the Presidency is vested in my successor.

This evening I come to you with a message of leave-taking and farewell, and to share a few final thoughts with you, my countrymen.

Like every other citizen, I wish the new President, and all who will labor with him, Godspeed. I pray that the coming years will be blessed with peace and prosperity for all.

Our people expect their President and the Congress to find essential agreement on issues of great moment, the wise resolution of which will better shape the future of the Nation.

My own relations with the Congress, which began on a remote and tenuous basis when, long ago, a member of the Senate appointed me to West Point, have since ranged to the intimate during the war and immediate post-war period, and, finally, to the mutually interdependent during these past eight years.

In this final relationship, the Congress and the Administration have, on most vital issues, cooperated well, to serve the national good

XUM

rather than mere partisanship, and so have assured that the business of the Nation should go forward. So, my official relationship with the Congress ends in a feeling, on my part, of gratitude that we have been able to do so much together.

II

We now stand ten years past the midpoint of a century that has witnessed four major wars among great nations. Three of these involved our own country. Despite these holocausts America is today the strongest, the most influential and most productive nation in the world. Understandably proud of this pre-eminence, we yet realize that America's leadership and prestige depend, not merely upon our unmatched material progress, riches and military strength, but on how we use our power in the interests of world peace and human betterment.

III

Throughout America's adventure in free government, our basic purposes have been to keep the peace; to foster progress in human achievement, and to enhance liberty, dignity and integrity among people and among nations. To strive for less would be unworthy of a free and religious people. Any failure traceable to arrogance, or our lack of comprehension or readiness to sacrifice would inflict upon us grievous hurt both at home and abroad.

Progress toward these noble goals is persistently threatened by the conflict now engulfing the world. It commands our whole attention, absorbs our very beings. We face a hostile ideology—global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose, and insidious in method. Unhappily the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration. To meet it successfully, there is called for, not so much the emotional and transitory sacrifices of crisis, but rather those which enable us to carry forward steadily, surely, and without complaint the burdens of a prolonged and complex struggle—with liberty the stake. Only thus shall we remain, despite every provocation, on our charted course toward permanent peace and human betterment.

Crises there will continue to be. In meeting them, whether foreign or domestic, great or small, there is a recurring temptation to feel that some spectacular and costly action could become the miraculous solution to all current difficulties. A huge increase in newer elements of our defense; development of unrealistic programs to cure every ill in agriculture; a dramatic expansion in basic and applied research—these and many other possibilities, each possibly promising in itself, may be suggested as the only way to the road we wish to travel.

But each proposal must be weighed in the light of a broader consideration: the need to maintain balance in and among national programs—balance between the private and the public economy, balance between cost and hoped for advantage—balance between the clearly necessary and the comfortably desirable; balance between our essential requirements as a nation and the duties imposed by the nation upon the individual; balance between actions of the moment and the national welfare of the future. Good judgment seeks balance and progress; lack of it eventually finds imbalance and frustration.

The record of many decades stands as proof that our people and their government have, in the main, understood these truths and have responded to them well, in the face of stress and threat. But threats, new in kind or degree, constantly arise. I mention two only.

IV

A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction.

Our military organization today bears little relation to that known by any of my predecessors in peacetime, or indeed by the fighting men of World War II or Korea.

Until the latest of our world conflicts, the United States had no armaments industry. American makers of plowshares could, with time and as required, make swords as well. But now we can no longer risk emergency improvisation of national defense; we have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions. Added to this, three and a half million men and women are directly engaged in the defense establishment. We annually spend on military security more than the net income of all United States corporations.

This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence—economic, political, even spiritual—is felt in every city, every State house, every office of the Federal government. We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society.

In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together.

Akin to, and largely responsible for the sweeping changes in our industrial-military posture, has been the technological revolution during recent decades.

In this revolution, research has become central; it also becomes more formalized, complex, and costly. A steadily increasing share is conducted for, by, or at the direction of, the Federal government.

Today, the solitary inventor, tinkering in his shop, has been overshadowed by task forces of scientists in laboratories and testing fields. In the same fashion, the free university, historically the fountainhead of free ideas and scientific discovery, has experienced a revolution in the conduct of research. Partly because of the huge cost involved, a government contract becomes virtually a substitute for intellectual curiosity. For every old blackboard there are now hundreds of new electronic computers.

The prospect of domination of the nation's scholars by Federal employment, project allocations, and the power of money is ever present—and is gravely to be regarded.

Yet, in holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite.

It is the task of statesmanship to mold, to balance, and to integrate these and other forces, new and old, within the principles of our democratic system—ever aiming toward the supreme goals of our free society.

V

Another factor in maintaining balance involves the element of time. As we peer into society's future, we—you and I, and our government—must avoid the impulse to live only for today, plundering, for own ease and convenience, the precious resources of tomorrow. We cannot mortgage the material assets of our grandchildren without risking the loss also of their political and spiritual heritage. We want democracy to survive for all generations to come, not to become the insolvent phantom of tomorrow.

VI

Down the long lane of the history yet to be written America knows that this world of ours, ever growing smaller, must avoid becoming a community of dreadful fear and hate, and be, instead, a proud confederation of mutual trust and respect.

Such a confederation must be one of equals. The weakest must come to the conference table with the same confidence as do we, protected as we are by our moral, economic, and military strength. That table, though scarred by many past frustrations, cannot be abandoned for the certain agony of the battlefield.

Disarmament, with mutual honor and confidence, is a continuing imperative. Together we must learn how to compose differences, not with arms, but with intellect and decent purpose. Because this need is so sharp and apparent I confess that I lay down my official responsibilities in this field with a definite sense of disappointment. As one who has witnessed the horror and the lingering sadness of war—as one who knows that another war could utterly destroy this civilization which has been so slowly and painfully built over thousands of years—I wish I could say tonight that a lasting peace is in sight.

Happily, I can say that war has been avoided. Steady progress toward our ultimate goal has been made. But, so much remains to be done. As a private citizen, I shall never cease to do what little I can to help the world advance along that road.

VII

So—in this my last good night to you as your President—I thank you for the many opportunities you have given me for public service in war and peace. I trust that in that service you find some things worthy; as for the rest of it, I know you will find ways to improve performance in the future.

You and I—my fellow citizens—need to be strong in our faith that all nations, under God, will reach the goal of peace with justice. May we be ever unswerving in devotion to principle, confident but humble with power, diligent in pursuit of the Nation's great goals.

To all the peoples of the world, I once more give expression to America's prayerful and continuing aspiration:

We pray that peoples of all faiths, all races, all nations, may have their great human needs satisfied; that those now denied opportunity shall come to enjoy it to the full; that all who yearn for freedom may experience its spiritual blessings; that those who have freedom will understand, also, its heavy responsibilities; that all who are insensitive to the needs of others will learn charity; that the scourges of poverty, disease and ignorance will be made to disappear from the earth, and that, in the goodness of time, all peoples will come to live together in a peace guaranteed by the binding force of mutual respect and love.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

XUM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, briefly?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am happy to yield.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM WEDNESDAY, JULY 16, UNTIL THURSDAY, JULY 17, 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tomorrow, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, after the prayer and possibly the reading of the Journal on Thursday next, it is the intention of the distinguished Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) to move that the Senate go into closed session. There will be no morning hour that day. There will be a live quorum call as soon as the request is made and granted, which is automatic; and all Senators should be on notice that this will take place on that day, and they should be prepared accordingly.

One more thing: It is my understanding that no attachés of the Senate will be permitted in the Chamber except those designated under rule XXXVI and those who the Presiding Officer thinks are necessary. In other words, it is my understanding that there will be no officials or staff members attached to Senators or to the committee itself.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one comment on the situation?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. At a conference with the Senator from Kentucky, who is in opposition to the ABM, we were in agreement that we should try—and we thought we could—to finish that session in 1 day, and that we should go into it in that spirit.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. STENNIS. I expect to be fairly brief, and I think others will, and I hope we can conclude within that time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am wholeheartedly in accord with the statement just made by the Senator from Mississippi, the manager of the bill under consideration. Frankly, I see no reason why the closed session should not be completed in 1 day, and I devoutly hope it would be so that we could go on with the business and perhaps begin voting on amendments.

Mr. STENNIS. May I commend and also thank the majority leader for agreeing to cooperate to have this all done in 1 day, if possible, and to have no other business on that day, so that the session can move along.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

I hope that Senators who are not present in the Chamber at this time will read the RECORD and will be aware of the fact that there will be no morning business on Thursday next; that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) will move for a closed session; that the motion will be seconded—its acceptance is automatic—and that there will be no staff members in the Chamber, either for individual Senators or for the Committee on Armed Services itself.

That is all I have to say, unless there are further questions.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I understand that the Senator from Missouri will ask for a closed session. How long will that last, or is there a limit, or what do the rules provide?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is no limit that I know of, but I hope we would get through within 4, 5, or 6 hours at the most, and complete the closed session that day. I would say offhand that the chances are fairly good that such could be done.

Mr. MURPHY. Does the majority leader control the limitation on that, or does the Senator from Missouri control the limitation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Any control, I would imagine, would have to be under unanimous agreement, in closed session, and that would be a matter for the Senators most interested—the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER)—and others to discuss. Whatever they would desire to do, the leadership would be glad to comply with their request.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, as has already been said, we talked about the possibility of completing the closed session in this one meeting. I have consulted with the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), who will move for a closed session, and I have spoken with other Senators who oppose the deployment of the anti-ballistic-missile system, and all have agreed to make a determined effort to conclude all the business of the closed session on Thursday. However, of course, we cannot bind anyone who may later desire to move for a closed session from so doing. At least, it is our intention to move as quickly as we can on Thursday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it should be made clear that any Senator can move for a closed session, and if we get one second, it becomes automatic.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct. If later on any Senator felt he needed more information or anything that was from classified information that we should have access to, it is not only his right but his duty to request a closed session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as long as the Senator from Missouri is now present in the Chamber, I wish to say that the Senator from Missouri has informed me that it is his intention, after reading of the Journal on Thursday next, to move that the Senate go into executive session. I have informed the Senate that there will be no attachés on the floor of the Senate, either for individual Senators or for the Committee on Armed Services; and the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Mississippi, and a number of other Senators, along with the joint leadership, have expressed the hope that it may be possible to complete that closed session that day so that it will not go over to the next day, but we cannot guarantee it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It would not be my intention to take extended time when presenting matters in closed session on this particular issue. However, from what I understand, there may be other closed sessions on other weapons systems later. I do not know what the distinguished chairman, the Senator from Mississippi has in mind, but I do not intend to take much time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado for his graciousness and courtesy in allowing us to proceed.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 11, 1969, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1010. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alli Kallio; and

S. 1011. An act to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program for fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 648) for the relief of Ernesto Alunday.

XUM

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 3166. An act for the relief of Aleksandar Zambeli;

H.R. 3172. An act for the relief of Yolanda Fulgencio Hunter; and

H.R. 3376. An act for the relief of Maria da Conceicao Evaristo.

SAFEGUARD IN PERSPECTIVE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on March 14, 1969, President Nixon announced that he had decided to proceed with the development, construction, and positioning of the Safeguard ballistic missile defense system in a carefully phased program. He stated his belief that we must act now to buy options to help counter the growing capability of potential adversaries of this country. A delay would mean a significant lag before such a defense could become operational. This delay could in turn expose the country to dangerous risks in the mid-1970's.

In the debate which has ensued over this system, four key questions appear to have been raised.

First. Why do we need such a system?

Second. What exactly is the system?

Third. What does it do to prospects for arms control?

Fourth. Will Safeguard work?

I would like to explore these four principal points in some depth.

WHY DO WE NEED SUCH A SYSTEM?

The President stated that the objectives of this program are:

First, protection of our land-based retaliatory forces against a direct attack by the Soviet Union.

Second, defense of the American people against any kind of primitive nuclear attack or nuclear blackmail which countries such as Communist China may threaten in the 1970's.

Third, protection against accidental ballistic launches from any source in the mid- to late-1970's.

The following facts underscore the committee's decision to proceed with a program to meet these objectives.

First, the Soviet Union is engaged in a buildup of its strategic forces significantly larger than was envisaged in 1967 when the previous administration decided to go ahead with the Sentinel. For example:

The Soviet Union is continuing the deployment of very large missiles. Whether these missiles are armed with 25-megaton nuclear warheads or with multiple, independently targetable warheads, continued production and deployment of these missiles will give the Soviets the capability to destroy our own land-based missile force.

The Soviet Union has been substantially increasing the size of its submarine force. As noted on page 7 of the committee report, the Soviets now have a new submarine force of about 375, whereas we have 143—of which 61 are diesel submarines of World War II vintage. Thus the Soviets have a numerical advantage of about 230 submarines. Parenthetically, I might say this is extremely interesting when one considers that in World War II, when the Nazis almost cut off all commerce with European countries, they started that fight with 97 submarines. The Soviet Union now has about 230 submarines over our forces.

At least 65 of the Soviet subs are nuclear powered, and many are equipped with ballistic launched missiles. They are continuing to produce these and have the capability of striking with virtually no warnng against our bomber bases or elsewhere.

The Soviets have been developing a semiorbital nuclear weapon system, known as FOBS, which poses a new and different threat to our people and to our bomber bases.

The Soviet Union has already deployed an ABM system designed to afford protection to its western industrialized area and is continuing its research and development in this field.

Second, the Red Chinese capability to launch a weak nuclear attack against the U.S. population in the middle 1970's formed the announced basis for President Johnson's decision to proceed with the Sentinel system, a far more costly and controversial system than the Safeguard. Red China's capability still remains a real threat.

Third, an accidental or unauthorized launch targeted on our country would leave any President in a horrible dilemma if we had no ABM with which to intercept it. In such a case would the President—any President—assume that it was accidental and watch the death of millions of Americans without retaliating, or should he push the command button to unleash our own nuclear forces? Should we not for that reason alone commence work to give us another alternative?

By going ahead with the Safeguard system, it is believed possible to: provide for local defense of selected Minuteman missile sites, provide an area defense to protect our bomber bases and our command and control authorities, defend the continental United States against an accidental or unauthorized attack, and reduce U.S. fatalities to a minimal level in the event of a Chinese nuclear attack in the 1970's.

We do not now know who will be President of the United States in 1970's. Regardless of whom he may be or to which party he may belong, it seems apparent that the administration then in power will be responsible for the lives and security of the American people. It seems equally apparent that steps must be taken now to start the system which may be needed for this protection.

WHAT IS THE SAFEGUARD SYSTEM?

The second issue which has arisen is, what is the Safeguard system? A great number of people in this country are still unaware or misguided about it. I think it is worthwhile to point out that the components of the system consist of first, radars for long-range detection of any kind of nuclear attack and for accurate guidance of the defense missiles to the incoming weapons; second, Spartan missiles, for high-altitude interception of attacking weapons; and third, Sprint missiles, for lower altitude interception in the atmosphere to provide local protection. It will not be necessary to place missiles and radar sites close to our major cities. Total investment costs for initial deployment will be $2.1 billion for phase I, and between $6 and $7 billion through phase II exclusive of R.D.T. & E. and AEC costs. However, budgetary requests for next year involve $400.9 million for R.D.T. & E.; $12.7 million for test facilities at Kwajalein; and $345.5 million for procurement. These amounts are significantly less than the amounts granted by Congress and the previous administration for the Sentinel system. The only amount in controversy in this debate under the bill appears to be the $345.5 million, as everyone on the other side appear to support continued research and testing in the ABM field.

The initial phase, as authorized in this bill, will involve the following steps:

First. Continuation of research and development.

Second. Beginning of construction for defense of two of our Minuteman fields: Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont., and Grand Forks Air Force Base, N. Dak. At the present time, construction of radars and deployment of missiles at these sites is scheduled to be completed in 4 years.

Third. Acquisition of the remaining sites needed for subsequent phases of Safeguard, but no construction.

The exact expenditures authorized are shown on page 25 of the committee report, and it should be noted that no funds are presently authorized for production model missiles.

Each subsequent phase of the deployment will be reviewed to insure that we are doing as much as necessary but no more than is required at that time. The President announced his intention to review the program annually from the point of view of technical developments; the potential threat; the diplomatic context, including any talks on arms limitation with the Soviet Union. I think this is a point which has not been brought out. He has also asked his Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board—a nonpartisan group of distinguished private citizens—to make a yearly assessment of the threat to supplement regular intelligence assessments. Moreover, maximum advantage will be taken of the information gathered from the initial deployment in designing the later phases of the program.

The President noted:

> Since our deployment is to be closely related to the threat, it is subject to modification as the threat changes, either through negotiations or through unilateral actions by the Soviet Union or Communist China.

It would seem to me, therefore, that the system itself is explained, the amount we are dealing with is explained; yet the position of some opponents of this system is that it will cost hundreds of billions of dollars and go on forever. That is simply not factual in the light of debate in the Senate, in the light of the President's statement, and in the light of the purpose of the particular system.

WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE SAFEGUARD PROGRAM TO PROSPECTS FOR ARMS CONTROL?

The Safeguard program is the least provocative way to assist survival of a significant portion of our retaliatory forces. As an alternative, we could buy

XUM

more Polaris type submarines and land-based missiles and bombers, or we could begin construction of new missile silos in hard rock. But, aside from providing only marginal improvements in our deterrent—if we should do any one of those things—such programs could be misinterpreted by the Soviets as an attempt to threaten their deterrent. This would be true because they are offensive weapons, or in the case of nuclear missile silos in hard rock, it would be an effort to show that we are going to prevent any kind of attack by them from doing us any damage at all.

Thus, they would stimulate further the costly competition in strategic armaments that we seek to restrain.

At the present time, as some opponents of the ABM have said—and I agree with them—we have enough deliverable nuclear weapons to decimate any country which attacks us. Neither I nor anyone else wants to increase this offensive capability unless absolutely necessary. We must, however, insure that the weapons which we do have can be delivered if we are to prevent a nuclear holocaust in the first place.

That is the purpose and design of the Safeguard system.

If the Soviet force buildup is designed to strengthen further their own deterrent, our Safeguard program is clearly not a threat to them. If, on the other hand, the Soviets have more aggressive purposes, the Safeguard program demonstrates our determination to maintain our powerful deterrent to nuclear attacks on the United States or its allies.

The careful phasing of the Safeguard deployment insures maximum flexibility to adjust the program if arms limitation talks or unilateral actions by the Soviet Union or China result in a reduced threat to our deterrent. If the Soviet Union slows down or stops its deployment of the large payload SS–9 missile, or if the likelihood that these missiles will be armed with accurate MIRV warheads is materially reduced, we can readily limit that part of the Safeguard program which is designed to defend our land-based missiles. Even more favorable reductions in the Soviet offensive and defensive threat could be matched by further restraints in our ABM deployment. However, those parts of the Safeguard program designed for defense against Communist China, small countries with a strategic delivery capability, or accidental or unauthorized attacks from any source, would not be affected by arms control agreements with the Soviet Union, nor do we expect the Soviet Union to forgo deployment of offensive or defensive weapons designed for similar purposes.

WILL THE SAFEGUARD SYSTEM WORK?

The last question which has arisen is, Will the Safeguard system work? Reputable scientists are in disagreement on this, as they were on the A-bomb, the H-bomb, the Polaris submarine, the moonshot and many other phases of our scientific breakthroughs. However, almost all components of the Safeguard System have been tested individually, and the computer, which is the only nontested component, is within current technological knowledge. Moreover, because of the measured pace of the deployment, later phases of the program can benefit from technical progress during the early phases.

Furthermore, as Senator TOWER aptly pointed out, the deployment will complicate greatly any plan for an aggressive nuclear attack on this country.

It will do that because the opponents must assume that it will work, at least in part. Therefore, if they are going to plan an attack, they would have to concentrate on that area to try to get a knockout blow if they are really going to cripple our deterrent forces.

The President has summarized his position as follows:

> The question of ABM involves a complex combination of many factors: numerous, highly technical, often conflicting judgments; the costs; the relationship to prospects for reaching an agreement on limiting nuclear arms; the moral implications which the deployment of a ballistic missile defense system has for many Americans; the impact of the decision on the security of the United States in this perilous age of nuclear arms.
>
> I have weighed all these factors. I am deeply sympathetic to the concerns of private citizens and Members of Congress that we do only that which is necessary for national security. This is why I am recommending a minimum program essential for our security. It is my duty as President to make certain that we do no less.

I just want to ask the membership: Can we in Congress afford to do less? Can we in Congress afford to take the chance of putting the President—any President—in a position where he has to make a horrendous decision of letting an unauthorized or accidental launch, or even a deliberate one, hit our country without retaliation, murdering millions of American people, or push the button which would almost guarantee a worldwide nuclear holocaust? I do not think we in Congress should make a decision which would put any President under that kind of handicap.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator has just referred, very adequately, to the words of the President. Is it not a fact that the duty of individual Members of the Senate with respect to our security is no less than that of the President himself?

Mr. DOMINICK. I would certainly agree with my distinguished colleague.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish to compliment my colleague on his very plain and simple evaluation of the facts. They are put forward in such a way that I think any reasonable person reading them can comprehend them and understand the very excellent reasons by which the Senator has arrived at his decision, reasons with which I must say I agree 100 percent.

I do not have a copy of the Senator's statement, but as I came on the floor he was speaking, in the forepart of it, about the development of Soviet capability. He mentioned, for example, the increase in submarines and naval capability. The report talks also in relation to our F–14 and Russia's great increases and advancements in fighters and bombers. I want to ask the distinguished Senator if, in his studies, as a distinguished member and a very understanding and knowledgeable member of the Armed Services Committee, he has seen any signs of diminishment of Soviet land-based ordinary forces in Western Europe and western Russia during this period.

Mr. DOMINICK. No; I would say to my distinguished colleague from Colorado that it is quite to the contrary. Although we have limited further production of our land-based missiles, the Soviets, quite to the contrary, have not followed our example. They have continued to produce, at a much higher level, both their intermediate range missiles and their SS–9 missiles.

If that production continues, it poses a threat not only to our country but also a very major one to our allies in the European theater. Of course, for their air force, the Russians have developed 13 new fighter aircraft in the last 8 years. We have not developed any. We are well behind.

Mr. ALLOTT. As a matter of fact, our most modern fighter really is 15 years old in its concept, is it not? I refer to the F–4.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is approximately correct. I think our first design of the F–4 was in 1956. I think it was first put into semiproduction in about 1959.

Mr. ALLOTT. Since we are talking about the Soviet Union going ahead with her ICBM's, ABM's, fighters, and submarines, I want to speak to the subject of conventional land forces. Within the realm of security, can the Senator tell me—and I know he can, because the newspapers are full of it—whether he has seen any diminishment in the conventional ground forces of the Russians and/or the satellite countries of Europe in the last year or 2 years?

Mr. DOMINICK. There has been no diminution to any considerable extent, but there has been, in part, some redeployment of her forces from the western portion of Russia to the eastern portion, because of the Chinese problem. But in terms of overall manpower, in terms of her conventional potential in Western Europe, she is just as strong in fighters, bombers, and medium-range missiles, and probably even more threatening in her capability than she was before because of her increased production in those categories.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator.

One other question. There seems to be an assumption on the part of those who are opposed to the Safeguard system that we can wait another year or 2 or 3 years. It has been repeatedly stated on the floor of that there is a possibility of a Chinese delivery capability in the middle 1970's. No one, of course, can tell exactly what date that will be, which would be about the time the Safeguard system would be implemented. My question to my distinguished colleague is this: We do not have much knowledge of the inscrutable Chinese mind, nor of China's intention under the present situation.

What else could protect this country against an accidental—let us be kind and call it accidental—pushing of the button in Red China in the mid-1970's

XUM

except to let loose a significant portion of our ICBM system to destroy that portion of China which we thought to be of significance? What other choice would we have than the ABM in such a situation?

Mr. DOMINICK. I totally agree with the question the Senator poses. It is a problem. As a matter of fact, in order to give us any protection, we would have to strike first, because we would have to wipe out their potential of sending a missile in, unless we had an ABM. I do not think any President would ever do that. I would hope that he would not. Our country is not built that way. Our people do not want to do that. I know I do not want to see us do it.

That is another graphic example of the danger, it seems to me, of not deploying our system now. As the Senator so well points out, if we do not start now, we will not have a first phase deployed system in from 18 months to 3 years after the time for which it has been scheduled, which would be about 1974 for the first phase.

So in 1975—let us just pick a year at random—if the Chinese launched a missile against us, and if we did not have an ABM, the President would have to decide whether to let that missile, assuming it was accidentally launched, kill millions of people in this country, and do nothing, or he would have to retaliate, which still would not alter the fact that that missile would hit and kill us.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the President retaliated, it would result in the wholesale destruction of at least hundreds of thousands of lives. That would be inconsistent with our own philosophy of government and our humanistic motives.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is absolutely correct.

I said yesterday, and I think it is worthwhile repeating, that those who read the book "On the Beach," written by Nevil Shute, will recall that the plot of the novel was based on a Middle Eastern country having one nuclear weapon which was launched against the United States under false colors. The United States, in turn, attacked the country we thought had created the problem. That country, in turn, thought some other country had attacked. Before we knew it, the world was in a total holocaust.

An ABM system, if it had been in effect and had worked properly, would have been able to intercept that missile and knock it down. Then the whole plot of the story would have fallen apart. We did not have an ABM technology then—at least in any kind of perfected form—and it is not perfected now. But it is certainly far better than it was in the days when that book was written. If that technology had been available in those days, I doubt very much whether Mr. Shute would have written a book based on that premise.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank my distinguished colleague again. He has performed an outstanding service. His statement is a model of clarity, and I know it will have a great deal of influence and be listened to by a great many people.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank my distinguished friend.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I ask the Senator from Colorado what, in his opinion, is the alternative open to Congress and the American people, through Congress and the President, if the ABM is denied the Commander in Chief? Would I be right in assuming that the only alternative we would have would be the immediate building of many more ICBM's than we now have?

Mr. DOMINICK. The only alternative that has been proposed by the opponents of the Senator's position and mine is continuation with research and testing, but no deployment.

As I say, this would substantially delay eventual deployment. If we decided against and voted against any continuation of this system at all, which I do not think is the type of question that we will be presented with, but we might, then we would have no alternative except to start increasing our own offensive capacity, in the event the Russians continued theirs, and we would have an ever-escalating arms race.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senate, by its vote, turns down the request of the Commander in Chief, is an escalation of the arms race, for certain?

Mr. DOMINICK. Well, it would seem to me that it is, because if we once turn down deployment, are we ever going to be able to get the missile? We are going to have some votes on it, I am sure, any time the question comes up, until we are finally convinced that there is no other way to handle it. I do not see any other alternative, I am frank to admit.

I would think that a large amount of money would be put into the development of larger missiles. I think we would have to have bigger nuclear warheads. I would think we would have to start developing an enormously expensive system on movable-type missile sites, whether on trucks or rails, underwater, or whatever it might be. All this would be enormously expensive.

I think this Safeguard system is the least provocative and least expensive way to proceed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I was very glad that I have heard the Senator's speech. I do not intend to go over again questions we have already discussed several times on this floor. I was glad to hear the Senator say that he had no doubt about our retaliatory capacity at present.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. And it is correct, is it not, that Secretary Laird and the administration now concede that our retaliatory capacity will be effective until the mid-1970's?

Mr. DOMINICK. I did not understand them to say that. I think what they said was that our retaliatory capability would be steadily declining in relation to that of the Soviets and our other potential adversaries.

Mr. COOPER. That is somewhat different from saying whether we would have a retaliatory capacity.

Mr. DOMINICK. Well, the retaliatory capacity, if I may say so, must be based on two things if it is to be an effective deterrent. Perhaps we are playing on words.

Mr. COOPER. I think not.

Mr. DOMINICK. "Retaliatory" means that you have weapons that you can strike them with. "Deterrent" means that they know you have the weapons, and they believe they can be fired.

Now, if they do not know this, or do not believe it, whether we have them or not, it is not a deterrent; and that is a major part of the psychological problem involved here.

If one looks at the situation from a potential enemy's point of view, let us say that potentially the Soviets are our enemies—but let us say potentially, because we have had a lot of discussion on that—let us say that they are increasing their missile production substantially; they have a very big submarine fleet; they have the FOBS system, which we do not have at all; they watch the Congress of the United States refuse to deploy an ABM system, while they have one for their industrialized area; and they are going ahead with research and deployment on new systems—when you put all this together, the question of whether or not we have a reliable deterrent is going to determine the credibility of this to the planners in the other country.

That, it seems to me, is a tremendous risk as far as our country is concerned.

Mr. COOPER. I raise the issue of retaliatory capability because of the differing positions which it seems to me the Secretary of Defense has taken during this debate; and I shall enumerate.

I was present in the committee, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), when Secretary Laird first was a witness. While he did not say so explicity, it was implied that the Soviets intended a first strike, and would have the capability of a first strike.

Mr. DOMINICK. Those are two different things.

Mr. COOPER. Let me proceed; I understand the difference.

Mr. DOMINICK. All right.

Mr. COOPER. They retreated from that position. He assures us that the United States has the capability of inflicting a retaliatory strike, defined as the ability to inflict upon the Soviet Union assured destruction, even though the United States were first the subject of a strike.

The Senator will agree, will he not?

Mr. DOMINICK. "Unacceptable damage," I think, is the word I remember, but that is all right.

Mr. COOPER. All right; some say "assured destruction," others "unacceptable damage."

Later, if I may call it to the Senator's attention, that he believes the Secretary has said we can maintain that capability until the mid-1970's.

To suggest that we cannot maintain the capability—the deterrent—is based upon the assumption that during the critical period from today until the mid-

1970's the United States would do nothing to protect itself, if the threat should develop.

During the debate it has been said that those of us who oppose the ABM system offer, as an alternative, the development of more offensive weapons now. Of course, that is not correct, as I said a few days ago in an exchange with my friend. We have only said that is what we should do if the threat does develop as the Secretary of Defense projected. Our country would not leave itself defenseless. If the projected threat develops we would take every means we could to protect this country.

Mr. DOMINICK. Let me be the first to assure my friend from Kentucky that I know he has no intentions of advocating unilateral disarmament.

Mr. COOPER. Of course not.

Mr. DOMINICK. I know he has no intentions of pooh-poohing any possible threat there may be to us, and the Senator will note that I very carefully said that I know that the Senator from Kentucky, at least, and others who have opposed deployment, I am sure, have indicated that they want to go ahead with research and testing on the ABM system.

Mr. COOPER. I am talking about offensive capacity.

Mr. DOMINICK. The point I want to make, if I may make this last comment, is that I do not think that any of those things are contradictions.

What the Secretary of Defense has said is that the growing potential of the Soviet Union, if they are an adversary of ours, will be a threat to our country by the 1970's.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. DOMINICK. They have the potential of being a first-strike force by that time and could annihilate our land-based missiles. They are at the same time developing the attack submarine which has the capability again of shadowing and following the limited number of submarines that we have, anywhere at any time.

It is not an easy task to do. But by the potential of their antisubmarine warfare, it is perfectly possible within their technology to get increasing ability to accomplish this.

So, if we are going to have a continued mixed force which will act as a credible deterrent—and I think those two words are all important—then it seems to me we must take steps to make this more reliable within that time frame by putting in a defensive system around our ICBM.

Mr. COOPER. There is another point I want to raise. I do not think it has been brought out as yet in the debate.

Very little advice is given to the Senate in the report on the debate about the measures we are now taking to increase our offensive strength.

I would like to point to the report and the hearings for the facts.

There is an impression in some quarters that nothing is being done or should be done, in the field of offensive weapons to meet the projected threat.

Very little emphasis, if any, has been given to the measure, now being taken by the administration to meet the projected threat by the development of offensive weapons.

A few moments ago, my good friend from Arizona, Senator GOLDWATER, measured the ICBM in terms of numbers alone.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, is the Senator referring to me? I did not try to number the ICBM's.

Mr. COOPER. In the exchange between the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Arizona, the number of ICBM's was argued upon the question of relative strength.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. It cannot be measured only upon numbers—1,054 as against 1,000 or 1,100. We have to measure also ICBM's in terms of warheads.

It is correct, is it not, that the Department of Defense is now proceeding with its Minuteman III program which would be armed with several warheads—probably three MIRV warheads?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct.

Mr. DOMINICK. We are proceeding with the research and development on it.

Mr. COOPER. On page 1783 of the hearings, Mr. Foster stated, when reporting on the program:

> August 16, 1968, was a doubly significant day in the development of strategic missiles. The first flight tests of both the Poseidon and Minuteman III were held on that day, and both tests [deleted] were successful. Since then we have had [deleted] additional successful flight tests of each of these missiles. [Deleted.]
>
> Our overall evaluation is that both Minuteman III and Poseidon have demonstrated feasibility adequately and we expect to meet our development goals. We have [deleted] more Minuteman III tests this fiscal year and [deleted] in fiscal year 1970. Poseidon has [deleted] more tests this fiscal year and [deleted], in fiscal year 1970. Both programs will deploy on schedule: [deleted] for Minuteman III and [deleted], for Poseidon.
>
> The first submarine equipped with the modified Polaris A3T missile was deployed on schedule [deleted]. Approximately [deleted] percent of the Atlantic Fleet will have been modified by the end of this calendar year.

Is it not correct that the Defense Department and our administration is proceeding to improve offensive weapons—the Poseidon for the Polaris as well as the Minuteman III?

Mr. DOMINICK. Yes. It is correct to the point the Senator takes it. However, I think where the Senator and I agree in disagreement can be put this plainly. We still have a limited number of ICBM's.

Mr. COOPER. My question is about the Polaris.

Mr. DOMINICK. Second, we have a limited number of Polaris and Poseidon, because the Poseidon goes on the same ship as the Polaris. It is not a new ship. So, if we have that limited number of positions and a first-strike capability of an adversary which will threaten any number, it does not make any difference what they are armed with. If they are knocked out, they are no longer credible.

Mr. COOPER. It is a gloomy picture presented of the Soviet threat. It surprises me that the Secretary will predict such great capabilities for the Soviet Union and derogate our own.

Is it not correct that a program has been authorized to refit 31 of our 41 Polaris submarines with the Poseidon?

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not correct that money is contained in the bill to proceed with the refitting?

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. We are on the program and have begun to deploy.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct. However, we still have a limited number of submarines.

Mr. COOPER. How many warheads will the 31 bear when the refitting is completed?

Mr. DOMINICK. I do not know whether that information is classified. However, it is a fairly large number.

Mr. COOPER. Much larger than the 656 they now carry.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct. However, they only have a limited number of those on station at any one time.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct. Would it not be safe to say without declassifying that when the Polaris is refitted and becomes armed with the Poseidon missiles, the warheads, which are now 656 on the Polaris, would be at least tripled and could be increased by a factor of 5 to 10?

Mr. DOMINICK. I would not think that the strength of the Polaris fleet would be tripled in terms of warheads. However, it would be just under that, I would think.

Let me say, if I may once again, that these arguments are all fine. We are trying to improve the capability of what we have. That is correct. However, if we have a finite number of submarines and those submarines get sunk, we do not have anything to shoot off. And in the same way, if we have a finite number of missiles and they can be hit with a pattern, they will be knocked out. It does not then make any difference what we have on them.

In the third place, even assuming that we have all of the offensive power—and I do not want to increase it much more than we have now—it does not do us a bit of good against an accidental or an unauthorized launch—not a bit.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator has affirmed my position that our country has now embarked upon programs which will increase greatly our offensive strength and the number of warheads that we could deliver upon the Soviet Union, by means of our Polaris fleet and our land-based ICBM fleet. I know that it has been argued that the Polaris fleet could be rendered useless because the attack submarines of the Soviet Union might be able to hunt them down.

Mr. DOMINICK. I hope this will not be true.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not correct that in this bill the Senator's committee has authorized the construction of attack submarines?

Mr. DOMINICK. That is totally correct. Those are attack submarines. Those are not Polaris submarines.

Mr. COOPER. I am simply making the point that while the supporters of ABM give the grim picture, that in the next 4 or 5 years we will become increasingly subject to a first strike, we are in fact increasing our offensive capabilities through these programs to meet such a threat.

Mr. DOMINICK. I think this is a matter of the glasses one looks through to see what the picture is. One can look through pink glasses and everything seems rosy, but, if he does not look through pink glasses, it does not look so rosy.

Let me say once again what I was trying to point out before: We are trying to stay abreast of new technology so that our weaponry will not deteriorate. If you once lock on to a position and do not move from it at all, sooner or later you find yourself behind, both in terms of scientists and ability, to be able to defend the country with modern, up-to-date equipment. I do not think any of us wants that, including the Senator from Kentucky. So we are continuing these things.

But in terms of finite numbers, we are now spending on offensive and defensive strategic weapons, on a constant dollar basis, 50 percent of what we spent in 1952. This seems to me to be an example of the degree to which we have tried to cut back on strategic and offensive systems for this country. This particular one is one in which two Presidents, three Secretaries of Defense, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have said we wanted an ABM system of one sort or another. The one they have is, to me, as recommended by President Nixon, far sounder than the Sentinel system. To me, it makes a lot more sense, because it preserves the credibility of our deterrent so that there will not be a nuclear attack, to begin with.

Mr. COOPER. One more point. The first strike, of course, implies a capability to strike and destroy all our retaliatory forces—synchronized and simultaneously to strike our ICBM's, to strike our bombers, to destroy our Polaris. This is an assumption, that from most of the expert testimony I have read, seems impossible to do.

Mr. DOMINICK. Let me just reply, and I will be brief in replying to that. This, again, is the question of how one looks at it. If they knock out our ICBM's, we have a limited number of Polaris or Poseidon around with refitted equipment. They are subject to attack by the attack submarines. About all we have left is our bomber attack, and Secretary McNamara pretty well ruined that. We do not have much left of our bomber capability, or will not have by the 1970's, anyhow.

Mr. COOPER. I have found the following deficiencies in the presentation in support of the ABM. First the implication that we are in grave danger now, and that the danger could develop by the mid-1970's. There has been a failure to make clear to the country and to Congress that we are now making great efforts to meet such a threat with increased offensive capability. I have noted to the Senator from Colorado, and he has agreed, they include the arming of Minuteman III and Polaris with Poseidon, and attack submarines. If these programs go forward, in the next 3 or 4 years, instead of 4,200 warheads in our arsenal at present, we will have double that amount, and perhaps triple that number.

We are proceeding with the deployment of MIRV. I do not think anyone believes that we are behind the Soviets with MIRV.

Mr. DOMINICK. I do not want to interrupt the Senator, but I do want to comment on this.

Let us suppose that everything the Senator has said is correct, which I do not agree with, as he knows. Let us just suppose it. There is not a single thing in this country's hardware, now or proposed, which would defend this country against a ballistic missile coming in—not a single thing. Until we get something that can do it, we are wide open for any kind of attack, and the only alternative we have is to push a button and send some of our ICBM's, which neither the Senator from Kentucky nor I want to do.

Mr. COOPER. May I say, in response, this argument, made again and again in the last few days, illustrates the changes in position, supporting ABM.

Last year we were considering the Sentinel system, designed to protect the population as an area defense. The very arguments are being made today for the Safeguard system which were made last year for the Sentinel system.

Mr. DOMINICK. And the same argument is still valid.

Mr. COOPER. I do not agree.

Since that time, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who last year were saying categorically we should build the Sentinel system, now support the Safeguard system.

Mr. DOMINICK. Let me correct that. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, for 3 years, and the heads of all the services have been recommending an ABM system. The method of deployment of it has been determined by either the Secretary of Defense or the President, depending upon who it might be at the particular time. Even some of the funds that Congress authorized in the earlier days—I am talking about 3 or 4 years ago—the then Secretary of Defense would not use.

Mr. COOPER. I do not think the Senator can say there is no distinction between the two systems. The Sentinel area system, is a population protector. The Safeguard, as the Senator has said, is for protection of the Minuteman missiles.

Then we have heard the argument that the decision to deploy the Safeguard is to strengthen the President's hand in negotiations. That has been a constant theme in the debate.

Then, I note in the last 2 days a chief argument has been made that we must have this system to protect against an accidental launch or a deliberate small attack. If this is correct—if this is the position—then I believe that the administration should come out strongly for an area defense, one which would cover the country and blanket it against an accidental launch.

Because Safeguard is not an effective enough system, the cities could not be protected by the area defense provided by Safeguard. But if this is the purpose, or one of the chief purposes, then the administration should ask for an adequate area defense, one that would give greater protection against accidental launching.

Mr. DOMINICK. Let me comment on that. I brought up the subject of an accidental launch or an unauthorized launch as long as 3 years ago. I made speeches last year on the floor about it, so it is not anything new, and it is not necessarily an administration argument. It is one that I think has deep validity, which is why I have been repeating it over and over again.

I certainly would not want the Senator from Kentucky or the Senator from Arizona or myself to be President of the United States and be faced with that kind of alternative in the middle 1970's. I think it is a totally untenable position to put any President in, regardless of who he may be.

Second, I think we have to say that if we go forward with the Safeguard system, in its 12-site selection, that system, when we have the long-range Spartans and Sprints installed, will give us pretty good protection on over-the-pole threats.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I think in the colloquy that has just transpired we have seen some doubts raised, or some reasons raised to have doubts, particularly if we get into the numbers game.

Five years ago I said that the missile force was not reliable. I am not sure today how reliable it is. The manned bomber is much more reliable and it is a much more dependable system than a missile system. We have never tested one of our missiles with a warhead on it. The potential enemy of whom we are speaking has done this.

Therefore, when my good friend from Kentucky talks about the fact that this administration is increasing the number of warheads, is increasing the capability of the Minuteman, through Minuteman III, and talks about numbers, I do not think any one of us can say these numbers are adequate because we do not know with any degree of certainty the percentage of these missiles that will fly when the button has to be pushed or that can live through a nuclear environment. But the Russians, I must say, back in 1961 thoroughly tested all their weapons through. We are not sure, even with navigation and guidance systems if these missiles can survive a nuclear environment. So I do not think anybody can say with any degree of certainty that 1,000 warheads are enough, that 2,000 warheads are enough or that 500 warheads are enough. This weapon is not a lot different in that respect than any other weapon we have used throughout history. Until we have actual combat experience we cannot say it will require x number of weapons, x number of tons, or x number of pounds to diminish a target.

I wanted to make that statement because as we consider the basic fact that this request for an ABM or Safeguard system has come from the one man in this country charged with the responsibility of making recommendations, I think we must also recognize—and I find no quarrel up to now with the opposition to the ABM—that the President was not wrong in going along with the improvement of Minuteman, in going along with MIRV, in going along with new advanced manned aircraft, or any of the other weapons in the bill. I think we must get back to the fact that while those who oppose the ABM will probably approve other parts of this bill, that this entire package is from the Commander in Chief, backed up by his military advisers.

I cannot conceive of any country, and particularly the United States, saying that we are not going to provide a defense against any weapon.

With respect to retaliatory capability, yes, there is truth to that and we have been able to maintain—not stability, but we have not had a world war III since we had the worldwide retaliatory concept of Foster Dulles, a theory which proved right. But what is going to happen if potential enemies see that the United States has no protection except a retaliatory strike? I shudder to think of the blackmail that will be heaped upon the United States if that day ever comes.

I am happy that the Senator from Kentucky, in his brilliant way, has gotten into this matter, because out of it we will have a better understanding.

I will say that there have been changes, but not from the standpoint of the administration. I observed the other day when this matter first came up that the opposition was totally against the ABM. Then, sensing that there might not be success in that area, they changed to opposition to MIRV.

Let us say the ABM section of the bill passes, and let us say that MIRV is denied, the very thing the Senator from Kentucky sees as hopeful, the growth of warheads, will be denied this country so we will be saying we have an ABM but we have no way to equal the strength of the other, or say we have no ABM and no MIRV, there is no possible way in the world of showing strength to a potential enemy.

Now, we see the struggle of the opposition in several amendments. One would do what this bill proposes to do, namely, not deploy. We could not deploy any of these until 1974, even if the Lord were down here running the show.

The change has been made in the opposition to the ABM. We see it fluctuating day after day as it totals the vote which now seems to favor those who are for the ABM. Frankly, I watch this debate with great interest to see what the next development on the part of the opponents will be because I think so far they are running around loosely—I will not say like sheep because they are not sheep—but there has been no pattern established that the proponents of this measure have not been able to stamp out.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator for his counseling. I want to make it clear to the Senator that there has been no change in our position. It was in April a year ago that I introduced an amendment to delay the deployment for two purposes: one purpose was to first determine whether it would be effective. A year has passed and we still do not know if it is effective. Integrated testing will not be done until 1973 or later.

But that was not the only reason. We have urged again and again and there is no change—that we use this year in an effort to stop the arms race or at least control it.

We know that additional nuclear weapons systems have not brought us security, and they may eventually lessen our security. We are trying to see, while there is an opportunity through talks, to determine if the arms race can be brought under control rather than to continue it, by new weapons systems.

Mr. DOMINICK. I hope we can control the arms race by putting in the ABM and not with more offensive weapons.

I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I asked the Senator to yield to me only briefly. I know there are other Senators who wish to speak. The Senator from Virginia asked for time yesterday afternoon.

I wish to commend the Senator highly for what I think is a solid and constructive analysis of this problem. I know personally how much dedication, time, and work he has given to this matter, particularly since January 1.

One point the Senator makes on the last page of the copy of his address which I have deals with the reputable scientists in disagreement. We found that all the way through, as the Senator pointed out. One thing they are not in disagreement about, as I understand it, is that this is the most advanced and best anti-ballistic-missile system by far that we have. When we assembled here in January there was talk about other systems that were involved and the rumor was that the Air Force had something to propose. But when we come right down to the testimony, the ABM was the one. As to the four scientists we had before the committee, as the Senator will recall, in open session, two opposed it and two were in favor of it. All four said that it was the most advanced and the best system.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator remember that clearly?

Mr. DOMINICK. Very well.

Mr. STENNIS. So the question now is, if we are going to have an ABM, this is the one within present knowledge. The Senator thinks, too, does he not, that of all the research and development we have had, bringing this along slowly over the years, that we have now reached the point, as a practical matter, that if we are going to go on to the next stage, now is the time to do it?

Mr. DOMINICK. I certainly do. I completely agree. As a matter of fact, as the Senator may recall, I think it was in 1963 when the distinguished Senator from South Carolina called a closed session to discuss this question.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. DOMINICK. After that session, most of us, I might say, gained some knowledge. Many Senators had it already, but many did not. Thus, it was a constructive session. I voted against deployment at that time. I think the Senator from Mississippi did also.

Mr. STENNIS. I did, too. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMINICK. That was because it was not ready, so far as we could see. Now I think it is, and I think we should go ahead with it.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Colorado very much for his fine contribution.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KENNEDY obtained the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Mississippi, provided that I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon, the Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD) saw me about, if possible, getting some time this afternoon to speak.

Today, the Senate was not in session when I had in mind asking for this request. Now we are back in session, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that after the Senator from Massachusetts has completed his remarks, the special order of business be that the Senator from Virginia——

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President——

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I have the floor. I yielded to the Senator from Mississippi with the understanding that I would not lose my right to the floor. I think the Senator from Mississippi has propounded a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understood that I was scheduled to follow the Senator from Massachusetts. In fact, there was some question as to who would come first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. I do not wish to relinquish any more of my time because I have another commitment to meet and I have already been waiting a long time to gain the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President. I knew nothing about the time that the Senator from South Carolina would have to speak. I did not know that. I know the Senator mentoned yesterday afternoon that he might wish to speak today or the next day. However, I hope that something can be done to meet the situation so that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD) may speak, especially in view of the fact that I promised to see that he would be placed on the schedule. When I got in today, the Senate had recessed and I did not get back to it.

Mr. President, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request, since the Senator from South Carolina objects.

XUM

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor.

THE SURCHARGE AND THE NEED FOR TAX REFORM

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the extraordinary discussions that took place yesterday on the Senate floor, particularly the discussion between the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, have set the stage for what will almost certainly become one of the most significant debates of the current session of the 91st Congress—the debate over the income tax surcharge and tax reform.

In part, of course, the debate will be important because the surcharge is a major tool of Federal fiscal policy for combating the strong inflationary pressures now gripping the economy. In addition, however, the debate will be important for another reason, a reason that has vast significance for all taxpayers in the Nation. For the first time in many years, Congress now has the opportunity to enact comprehensive tax reform. These two areas—the tax surcharge and tax reform—are closely tied to one another, and it is entirely appropriate that Congress should consider them together, as the resolution of the Senate majority policy committee has so clearly stated.

There can be no question that our first duty is to carry out a responsible fiscal policy that brings maximum feasible pressure to bear in our increasingly difficult battle against inflation. At the same time, however, I believe we must keep the strongest possible pressure on the administration and Congress to take the responsibility for seeking comprehensive tax reform.

At the present time, there is strong and rising pressure for tax reform in all parts of the country. Each of our Senate offices is being deluged with communications from outraged citizens demanding reform. One of the most important aspects of the national sentiment for tax reform is the realization by millions of taxpayers that the income tax surcharge itself is unfair. It aggravates the serious inequities in our existing tax laws. It applies only to those who already pay taxes on their income, and it requires no contribution whatever from those who escape their fair share of taxes. At a time, therefore, when the administration is asking that the surcharge be extended, it is fair—indeed essential—to insist that the administration also demonstrate its commitment to prompt and meaningful tax reform.

At the present stage of the legislative debate on the surcharge and tax reform, I believe that the resolution of the policy committee fully achieves our twin goals of controlling inflation and accelerating the enactment of comprehensive tax reform. By extending the current withholding tax rates, we have taken the only step we need take at the present time to maintain a completely responsible fiscal policy in the fight against inflation. It is not necessary to extend the surcharge provisions themselves. All that is essential at this time is to continue the surcharge withholding rates, which by themselves are sufficient to preserve Government receipts for the summer months at the same level that would have existed had the surcharge itself been extended.

The length of the period of extension of the withholding rates will depend on our progress toward meaningful tax reform. Congress has already acted to extend the rates through July 31 of this year. I agree with the resolution of the policy committee that the rates should be extended through the end of the present quarter—that is until September 30. In light of the announcement last week by Chairman WILBUR MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee, it is becoming increasingly likely that a significant tax reform bill may be passed by the House before Congress adjourns for the August recess. In light of the announcement last week by Chairman RUSSELL LONG, of the Finance Committee, it now seems likely that the Finance Committee will have completed a major portion of its own hearings on tax reform before the recess. As a result, the September 30 date for extension of the withholding rates would seem to offer both the Senate and the House a reasonable opportunity to enact a comprehensive tax reform bill in this session of the Congress. Of course, if action on tax reform is not completed by that time, the withholding rates could be extended for another appropriate period.

Thus, I believe that any action on the surcharge itself and the other provisions of the House-passed bill, as opposed to the mere extension of the withholding rates, should await the action by Congress on tax reform. If, as seems possible in light of recent developments, a downturn in the economy has begun, or major revenue-raising tax reforms are adopted, it would be wise to reconsider both the amount and the duration of the surcharge. Any excess amount withheld from taxpayers under the higher withholding rates during the extension period could be returned to the taxpayers through the usual yearend refund procedure.

In sum, the policy committee resolution offers us the very real opportunity to carry out a thoroughly adequate fiscal policy. I do not accept the proposition that extension of the withholding rates contributes in some vague psychological way to the pressures of inflation. It is widely accepted among economists that take-home pay is the major determinant of consumer expenditures, and take-home pay is the same today as it would be if the surcharge had been extended. Those who argue otherwise are themselves contributing to the inflationary psychology.

The vital link between the surcharge and tax reform was recognized by Congress more than a year ago. On the floor of the Senate in June 1968, the surcharge legislation was amended to require President Johnson to submit proposals for comprehensive tax reform to Congress. The floor amendment was adopted in clear recognition of the feeling abroad in the Nation that when taxes increase, strong efforts should be made to eliminate the existing inequities and discriminations in our tax laws.

The case for tax reform has a dual basis. First, the genius and guiding principle of our Federal income tax system is that the tax a person bears is determined by his ability to pay. As Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once said:

> Taxes are the price we pay for civilization.

Those with the greatest ability to pay should contribute the most to meet the costs of Government. Those who are situated in similar economic circumstances should bear similar tax burdens. For the tax system to function properly, each citizen must have confidence that he is paying a fair portion of the price of our society.

Second, and equally important, the fair and effective operation of our tax system is vital to our entire competitive free enterprise system, and therefore to our democratic society itself. Under the proper working of the system, resources must be guided to their most efficient use by the free working of the marketplace. What the market rewards with high returns will and should attract an optimum level of financial and real resources. This is the hallmark of our competitive market system. If we permit unreasonable tax privileges to divert resources away from their best uses, away from the point of greatest natural profit to the point of greatest tax advantage, we distort our profit system and lose many of the benefits of the free market. As President Kennedy stated, the full benefits of the market system can only be felt when all of our people and all of our resources are used as wisely and effectively as possible.

Our present tax laws fall far short of these goals. Unfairness and discrimination abound. Privileges designed for another era linger on to distort the economy, long after the logic for their use has disappeared.

The most glaring defect of our tax laws is their inequity. Although our procedures for administering the tax laws are the most advanced of any nation in the world, the laws themselves are unfair. We know that some taxpayers pay a bargain basement price while others, especially the poor, are required to bear far more than their fair share. Millions of Americans below the poverty level pay taxes they cannot afford on their meager yearly incomes. Many of our wealthiest citizens, with million of dollars in income each year, pay little tax or no tax at all. Often taxpayers with the same real economic income are taxed at widely different rates, depending on the source of their income.

In 1967, for example, in what has now become the most famous statistic in American tax lore, 155 Americans filed tax returns with adjusted gross incomes in excess of $200,000, but paid no taxes whatever. Twenty-one of these citizens had incomes in excess of $1 million. Although the maximum tax rate is 70 percent, the effective tax rates are far lower. Indeed, the average effective tax rate rises to only about 30 percent for persons with annual incomes in the

XUM

range of $50,000 to $200,000, then gradually declines for those earning over $1 million a year.

Even these dramatic figures, however, do not adequately measure the breakdown in fairness of our current tax structure. Clearly, in our tax laws, some types of income are more equal than others. Thus, salaries and many kinds of business income are taxed at ordinary income rates, but other income is not taxed at all—such as interest on municipal bonds—or is taxed at lower capital gain rates. And taxable income from any source can be offset by artificially large deductions for oil and gas properties, such as intangible drilling costs, the recurring percentage depletion allowance, and the foreign tax credit.

Even beyond the grave, the inequities in our tax laws continue. The estates of some people are subject to substantial Federal taxes when they pass to the next generation. Others—usually the wealthy—are able to avoid a large portion of such taxes. At death, vast accumulations of capital gains pass untouched by the income tax laws.

These disparities in tax treatment are not isolated. The loopholes and escapes in the laws are widespread, and are known to be widespread. They seriously erode our progressive rate structure. With good reason, it has said, our tax system delves with a sieve.

Compounding the unfairness, privileged classes of income can be reached most easily only by the wealthiest citizens. To paraphrase a famous aphorism, our tax laws in their majestic equality allow the poor as well as the rich to invest in State and local bonds, to reap long-term capital gains, to search for oil, and to charter their own foundations. But, middle and lower income taxpayers cannot afford the substantial investments required to generate tax-free income, capital gains, and large deductions. The more income an individual has, the easier it becomes to reduce his taxes or escape them altogether. According to one estimate, the threshold level of income required for profligate use of tax preferences is $5,000 a year.

Meanwhile, millions of law-abiding American citizens faithfully pay the Federal tax collector billions of dollars each year from their hard-earned salaries. More than half of the $80 billion collected annually from our individual citizens come from taxpayers with adjusted gross income in the range of $7,000 to $20,000. These are the citizens who must carry the burden of our unfair Federal tax structure. These are the citizens on whom the tax demands of the Federal Government—and State and local governments as well—fall most heavily. These are the citizens for whom we must provide basic tax relief.

We cannot tolerate the inequities of our Federal tax laws. We must make our progressive tax structure a reality, not a fiction. When the highest officials of the administration begin to speak of the danger of a "taxpayers' revolt," it is time for Congress to listen.

The unsheltered taxpayer is losing his patience. Our entire tax system is based upon voluntary compliance, and we can boast a record of such compliance unequaled by any other nation in the world. Yet, if we continue to permit the few to maintain the lucrative escapes they now enjoy, we can hardly expect willing compliance by the many who are unable to take advantage of such special benefits.

I believe, therefore, that the time has come to enact meaningful tax reforms, and that, as the policy committee has recommended, basic tax reform should be considered simultaneously with any bill extending the surcharge. By taking such action, we gain a double benefit. We lay the groundwork for comprehensive tax reform by eliminating some of the most flagrant inequities in the existing system. And we insure that the surcharge falls more evenly on all our citizens.

In addition, to the extent we generate new revenues from tax reform, funds will become available for other important programs. Indeed, by adopting immediate reforms to close tax loopholes in particularly flagrant areas, it may be possible to produce a substantial tax reform dividend in fiscal year 1970.

If the proper timing can be worked out, the revenue gained from tax reform can be used to provide an even greater reduction in the surcharge rate beyond that already proposed by the administration. By closing loopholes for the few, we could provide lower taxes for the many, without sacrificing any of the anti-inflationary impact the surcharge is intended to exert on the economy.

This is not the occasion for a technical discussion of the various proposals for tax reform that have been put forward by Members of the Senate and others in recent weeks and months. The examination I have made of many of these proposals leads me to believe, however, that a number of them have already been widely discussed and are now ripe for enactment.

First, as one of the most immediate and basic reforms, we should adopt the minimum income tax. The minimum tax is an idea whose time has come. Several years ago, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), chairman of the Finance Committee, helped launch the concept of such a tax. In recent months, the concept of the minimum tax has received increasing support from tax experts as a reform that can and should be enacted immediately, independent of other reforms in specific provisions of the tax code. It was endorsed in the Treasury study prepared under the Johnson administration, and it has been recommended—albeit in diluted form—by the present administration.

The minimum tax would require many citizens with substantial income, even those whose income is derived from sources that are currently tax exempt, to pay at least a modest tax. I believe that the base upon which the minimum tax is calculated should be as comprehensive as possible. At the present time, five sources of tax-exempt income contribute substantially to the present inequity of our tax laws:

The portion of long-term capital gains that is now excluded from income;

Interest on State and local government bonds;

The excess of percentage depletion over capital investment in oil and minerals, and the current expensing of intangible drilling and development costs;

Excess depreciation on real property and certain leasing arrangements on personal property produced by accelerated depreciation deductions available even for highly leveraged property; and

The appreciation in value of property donated to charity.

In the version of the minimum tax I favor, each of these categories of exempt income would be included in a new and expanded tax base. The indiivdual would be required to pay tax in an amount equal at least to the amount he would pay if the full tax rates were applied to half his total income. In other words, the minimum tax would be applicable only if the individual's tax-exempt income exceeds his taxable income. In effect, it would place a limit of 50 percent on the amount of a person's total income that can be excluded from tax.

It is clear, of course, that in enacting the minimum tax, we will not be dealing with the merits of the various tax preferences that are used to produce tax-exempt income under present law. All we must decide is that a citizen should not be entitled to use these preferences so extensively and in such combination that more than half his total income goes untaxed. I believe there is already widespread acceptance of this underlying principle.

Success in enacting the minimum tax must not, however, become the excuse for abandoning the struggle for comprehensive tax reform. In particular adoption of the minimum tax must not reduce the momentum of our drive for other reforms. We must recognize that enactment of the minimum tax is a partial reform at best. It does not mean that real reform has taken place, or that the loopholes are closed, or that the tax dodgers have become taxpayers. Rather, by demonstrating how large a gap there is between the total income and the taxable income of some individuals, the minimum tax is a reform we can use as an incentive for further efforts toward overall reform.

Second, we should build on the comprehensive income philosophy of the minimum tax by requiring taxpayers to allocate their personal deductions between nontaxable and taxable sources. For example, an individual who is taxable on only two-thirds of his total income should be allowed to subtract only two-thirds of his total personal deductions in calculating his taxable income. This principle is a matter of simple equity, since an individual's personal deductions are paid out of his total income, and not solely out of his taxable income as currently defined by the revenue code.

Third, we must adopt tax reform to help our poor and middle income citizens. For too long, we have imposed an onerous tax burden on tens of millions of these citizens. To alleviate the burden on the poor, the Treasury study under the Johnson administration recommended a substantial increase in the

XUM

minimum standard deduction. This proposal would eliminate Federal income taxes on half of the 2 million families now living below the poverty level. It would provide major tax reductions for the others. This proposal was a start in the right direction. The recent low income allowance offered by the present administration and adopted by the House as part of the surcharge legislation would go even farther in some respects, and would remove virtually all of the poor from the income tax rolls.

I believe we can do even better. Our goal must be to insure not only that individuals living in poverty are not required to pay tax on their income, but also that the tax relief made available is not phased out so rapidly that serious tax burdens continue to be placed on those who live above the poverty level. The National Committee on Tax Justice has urged that all taxpayers be given a minimum standard deduction of $1,100, thereby expanding the benefits of the administration's "low income allowance" to include over 20 million additional low- and middle-income taxpayers. Alternatively, the Treasury proposals under the Johnson administration would have provided similar relief for such taxpayers by substantially increasing both the percentage and the maximum amount of the standard deduction. I support these proposals. I am confident that the Senate will give close attention to each of these proposals, in order to provide the most effective possible relief to large numbers of our taxpayers.

Fourth, we must reform the tax treatment of the petroleum industry. In recent months, increasing numbers of Senators have become aware of the tax inequities that exist because of the percentage depletion allowance and other special income tax preferences available to that industry.

In many respects, the 27½-percent depletion allowance for oil is the most flagrant single loophole in our entire tax system. Although other special benefits for the industry are less well known, they are almost of equal significance. These include, for example, the current deduction allowed for the so-called intangible costs of exploration and development; the credit allowed for foreign taxes, even though such taxes are frequently in the nature of royalty payments to foreign governments; and, the favorable capital gains treatment allowed for mineral production payments.

Largely as a result of the immense benefits available from the depletion allowance and other tax preferences, the petroleum industry is consistently taxed at effective rates much lower than those paid by most other industries. According to recent Treasury estimates, the overwhelming proportion of the depletion allowance and the deduction for intangible costs is far in excess of what would be allowed if strict financial accounting principles were followed. Indeed, the annual revenue loss alone from excess depletion over cost is almost $1¼ billion.

For too long, we have failed to recognize that the Nation's economy is paying an enormous public subsidy to the petroleum industry. The mere fact that the subsidy is through the tax system makes it no different in principle from a subsidy provided through direct appropriations. For too long, we have failed to give tax expenditures the same intense examination we have regularly given to our domestic social programs, and more recently, to our defense programs.

In these circumstances, it is ironic that the percentage depletion allowance is today so widely regarded as an immutable benefit to which the petroleum industry is entitled as of right. The administration's recent tax reform proposals are notoriously silent on the issue of the depletion allowance and almost all the other tax advantages available to the oil industry.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, would the Senator prefer to yield to me now, or would he rather complete his statement?

Mr. KENNEDY. I would rather complete the statement. I have a copy of my statement, which I hope will be made available to the Senator from Louisiana.

Reduction of the depletion allowance will be accomplished only after lengthy debates in Congress. Nevertheless, I believe that we will be shirking our responsibility if we fail to act now to bring the depletion allowance and the other special benefits available to the oil industry into line with the economic and tax realities of other industries. The present value of 27½ percent for the depletion allowance originated more than 40 years ago in a relatively arbitrary compromise, in which a Senate-House conference split the difference between the 25-percent figure proposed by one House and the 30-percent figure proposed by the other. The year was 1927, a time when tax rates were far lower than they are today and the tax benefits were correspondingly smaller.

Extensive studies by economists in both Government and private industry suggest that the impact of reducing the foreign and domestic depletion allowances may be far smaller than has previously been thought. According to a major recent study sponsored by the Treasury, the depletion allowance contributes only a small amount to the Nation's petroleum reserves. Instead, it encourages excessive drilling and inefficient production methods and discourages research into other potential fuel sources.

The studies that have been conducted have carried us as far as we can reasonably go by economic and statistical analysis. The time is ripe to begin the fight for reform. Once the issues are clearly raised, I am confident that a majority of Congress will agree that the depletion allowance under present law is excessive, and that the cause of reform will prevail.

Moreover, the American people will not believe that genuine tax reform has been achieved until there is a thorough investigation of the tax advantages available to the petroleum industry. Indeed, in many parts of the country the percentage depletion allowance has become the symbol of the need for tax reform, and other oil tax shelters are being increasingly challenged. I believe that a reasonable reform package in this area should include the following:

For the largest producers, reduction of the percentage depletion allowance for domestic production from 27½ percent to 15 percent and elimination of the allowance for foreign production, while still maintaining appropriate incentives for small producers.

Adoption of a requirement that the intangible costs of exploration, drilling and development be capitalized, rather than deducted as current expenses.

Elimination of the present loophole which allows a tax credit for payments to foreign governments, even though such payments are in the nature of royalties, not taxes.

Elimination of the favorable capital gains treatment available for certain types of mineral production payments.

Fifth, we must reform the tax treatment of capital gains. Most important we should increase the holding period for long-term capital gains from its present level of 6 months to 1 year. We should also abolish the current 25 percent maximum alternative tax rate on such gains. In addition, unrealized capital gains transferred by gift or at death should be taxed at the prevailing capital gains rates.

Sixth, we must reform the tax treatment of interest on State and local government bonds. A number of major proposals have recently been offered in this area, ranging from a Federal interest subsidy to the establishment of an urban development bank. I believe that a positive Federal incentive is necessary to encourage State and local governments to seek new and more efficient methods of financing. I commend the House Ways and Means Committee for the imaginative approach it suggested in its tentative proposals announced last week, and I urge the Senate to consider similar alternatives.

Seventh, we must reform the tax treatment of real estate transactions. At the present time, there are a variety of tax shelters widely used for profiteering in this area. Our goal should be the elimination of the accelerated depreciation deduction for buildings, and the recapture of the profits on the sale of depreciated property as ordinary income, without impairing the construction of housing that is desperately needed for low- and middle-income groups throughout the Nation.

Eighth, we must reform the tax treatment of the farm loss deduction. There is already broad popular support for this reform. Surely it is time to eliminate the bizarre abuses that exist for city dwellers who engage in tax farming. The escapes available under present law are the product of simplified accounting procedures intended for small farmers. Over the years, however, these procedures have spawned a generation of wealthy absentee cowboys—hobby farmers more interested in farming the Internal Revenue Code for tax benefits than in legitimate farm operations.

The absurdity of the situation is indicated by the coincidence that the taxpayers with the highest farm losses also happen to be the taxpayers with the highest nonfarm incomes. No one believes that taxpayers who are extremely successful in their other enterprises suddenly become incompetent when they turn to farming. Obviously, they are using their farm losses to obtain substantial tax windfalls through reductions in their income from other sources.

The Senator from Montana (Mr. Metcalf) has introduced a bill to limit the amount of farm losses that can be deducted from nonfarm income. A companion bill is being sponsored in the House by Representative JOHN CULVER, and a somewhat similar proposal has been made by the administration. I have strongly endorsed Senator METCALF's bill. Each of the bills has wide bipartisan support in Congress. They also have the support of a growing number of farm organizations and others concerned about the destructive competition of tax farmers, whose most pressing interest is to preside over a losing farm operation. As a result, the price of farmland is bid abnormally high, and legitimate farmers find themselves unable to compete.

The eight reforms that I have proposed do not in any sense exhaust the demand for tax reform that is widespread throughout the country. I believe, however, that they are representatives of the areas of our revenue laws where basic reforms are most needed. I support and endorse many of the reforms that have been proposed in other areas, such as the tax treatment of foundations and charitable contributions, the multiple corporate exemption, the liberalization of the deduction for moving expenses, withholding of income on dividends and interest at the source, repeal of the 7-percent investment credit, and so on.

In addition, we must also make every possible effort to lighten the tax burden on all our citizens. A number of significant reforms have been proposed, but their unfortunate hallmark is that they produce substantial Federal revenue losses at the very time when demands on the Treasury are enormous. This applies especially to proposals to increase the $600 personal exemption, and to allow a deduction for the expenses of education. Nevertheless, in the weeks to come, I believe we must make every effort to explore whether meaningful reforms can be enacted in these and other areas, such as more favorable tax treatment for single persons, expanding the income averaging system, a more generous allowance for child care expenses of working mothers, and revising the overall tax structure to provide lower rates for all.

In the course of the coming debate on the surcharge and tax reform, it is quite likely that new areas will be identified in which tax reforms should be carried out, and that more imaginative solutions will be proposed for the areas of present controversy. I therefore welcome the current discussion as a fertile opportunity to achieve the goal for which we have waited so long—the enactment of comprehensive tax reform.

Perhaps the most valuable result of our effort for tax reform is that it promotes a greater sense of national purpose for all Americans. If we are to succeed in the effort to rebuild our cities, to develop and preserve our rural areas, and to maintain our national security at home and abroad, the funds to finance these programs must be raised fairly from all. Only when each citizen knows that all citizens share equitably in the tax burden will we achieve the sense of national commitment that is essential if we are to reach our goals.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, permit me to compliment the Senator on his speech. It is a courageous statement, whether one agrees with it or not. I am sure that the Senator will find he has alienated a number of people in various business endeavors by the suggestions he has made, but he is not the only one to make those suggestions. I think he will find that a considerable number of people in the revenue field, certainly a number of academicians, and many people who serve the Government would agree with his suggestions.

As far as I am concerned, I find a number of things in the Senator's speech that I think could be agreed to by the Senate. I think if we had a major revenue bill before us, we could agree to a number of them. Offhand, I heard the Senator tick off about four or five items for which I would enthusiastically vote if we were voting on the Senate floor, and I expect I would also vote for them as a member of the committee.

What confuses me is how we are to proceed. I have been accused of bringing out a Christmas-tree bill, an Easter-basket bill, and bills with other names, with a number of new amendments. The reason we do that is that we do not have the power to initiate revenue measures. Under the Constitution, the House of Representatives must initiate them, but the Senate may amend.

With all due respect to a very consistent statesman, some people, like former Representative Tom Curtis, on the House side, have contended down through the years that we had no right to amend their bills except in ways relevant to something they included in the bill. I do not agree with that, and I know the Senator from Massachusetts does not. Nor, fortunately for us, do the chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, the ranking members on the Republican side, nor the House of Representatives itself, based upon its votes.

One thing that I have learned about revenue bills is that if you are going to put a rider on a bill, it is something like putting a rider on a horse; if the rider is too heavy, the horse goes nowhere. You have to pick a strong enough horse to carry the rider you seek to put on it.

I believe the Senator realizes that if we put the amendments he suggests on the surtax bill as passed by the House of Representatives, the bill might fail of passage. We are voting on a bill that passed the House by five votes. If we vote for the reforms the Senator has in mind, would it not seem likely that that five-vote margin in the House of Representatives would be even lower and smaller, if first one group and then another were to say to their Representative or their Senator, as the case may be, "That is not tax reform; that is unfair; you are crucifying me with that amendment"?

Does the Senator from Massachusetts recognize that possibility?

Mr. KENNEDY. I think it is very difficult to try to predict exactly what the House of Representatives would do with particular items of tax reform, including some of my suggestions, and perhaps a number of others. As I stated, my suggestions are an all-inclusive group. Many of the suggestions are merely for the purpose of identifying broad areas for consideration.

I do know, both from reading through the RECORD of the House debates and from conversations with a number of the Members who voted on the House bill, that when the matter of extension of the surcharge came up, many of them voted in opposition to the bill, because they did not feel there was meaningful tax reform in the legislation.

It would be extremely difficult for me to predict how the House vote would have changed, if there had been some riders on that horse representing what reasonable men of good will felt was suitable tax reform. I am sure that some Members would have had reservations, and might have voted in opposition. But I think that other Members would have supported an extension of the surcharge if they felt it included some meaningful tax reform.

I doubt that we can say, from the closeness of the vote in the House of Representatives, that we will have less opportunity to pass the surcharge if we have a more extensive tax reform provision than was included in the House bill.

Mr. LONG. The House of Representatives passed a bill which was opposed by the American Federation of Labor and the National Association of Manufacturers. I congratulate Chairman MILLS, Representative HALE BOGGS, and Representative JOHN BYRNES, as well as the leadership on both sides of the aisle in the House of Representatives, for passing a bill opposed by that combination of powers—manufacturers and labor alike. That is a very difficult thing to do, and the fact that they could pass it at all is a monument to their fiscal responsibility, in the eyes of this Senator.

That took a lot of courage. Every one of those men have to run for office next year. A fellow can be a real statesman about a matter of that sort if he has 5 or 6 years before the public passes on his qualifications. However, if a fellow has to submit himself for reelection next year, it takes a lot of courage when both labor and management are against it.

When the House passes a bill and sends it to us, how should we proceed? Ordinarily my approach is that the Finance Committee should consider the bill. It is roughly a $10 billion tax increase. That is not popular to begin with.

I thought we would include in the bill some of the same suggestions that the Senator has made here, perhaps three or four which are important recommendations.

Having done that, we would bring to the Senate floor a bill, and I would cheerfully propose to vote on every suggestion the Senator has made in his speech. Having voted on the suggestions, any one of them that could muster a majority vote would be taken to a conference

XUM

with the House. We would ask them to accept it.

The Senator knows that when one does that, he cannot expect them to accept all of them. However, if one has good fortune, they will accept some of them. We will have made a substantial and worthwhile contribution by having improved on what the House has sent us. And the House bill has some reform to it.

I was pleased to advocate the tax investment credit. It was a recommendation of the Senator's brother, the late President Kennedy.

I became convinced then that with the country in the doldrums, this would provide employment. It would help to reverse a recession and give us prosperity. The entire record under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson indicated that we had a constant increase in prosperity throughout the entire period. There was never a slump at any time. So one cannot say that this provision failed to do what it was proposed to do, because the facts would indicate otherwise.

Mr. KENNEDY. In fact, there was a period of inflation.

Mr. LONG. With a war on and with pressure on the money market and things of that sort, one would think that, with business absorbing most of the credit and money available for business expansion and things of that sort and with a very great shortage of money for housing and with very high interest rates, if one wants to take the pressure off the money supply, he should now vote to repeal or take off the tax investment credit.

The Senator may or may not know it, but I strongly advocated that.

The Senator from Delaware was against it to begin with. He said recently that the time had come to repeal it.

I commended him and said I agreed. I had voted to put it on. I voted to suspend it. I voted to put it back on again. He said that should not be done. Yet, when it was time to take it off the second time I was happy to recommend it.

Under the present circumstances I would think that inasmuch as it was serving more of a negative purpose than a positive purpose at that point, it would be well to suspend or repeal it. That is in the bill.

I commend the House for approving the proposal for low-income people. I think that is correct. I doubt that it goes far enough. Perhaps we should do more for taxpayers in that category and for those who are only a little better off.

All I say is that it would seem to me as a matter of procedure that when there is a $10 billion revenue bill, people are entitled to know the answers. Business is entitled to know whether they get the investment credit or not. Labor is entitled to know with respect to the withholding of the money by the employer—whether it belong to the workingman or to the Government.

If the workingman is to get the money and if the bill is delayed until September, we will have $3 billion sitting there assuming we extend the withholding rates. Who does the money belong to? Does it belong to the Government or to the workingman?

Furthermore, the whole world is looking at us. Are we going to have a sound fiscal policy with a balanced budget or a badly unbalanced budget with runaway inflation?Are we going to be responsible to our economic and fiscal needs and try to stabilize the economy, or are we going to postpone the matter indefinitely?

That is why it seemed to me that we should bring the big revenue bill before the Senate and let the Senate begin voting.

The committee is willing to vote on every suggestion the Senator has made right now. To be fair, it would seem that those who favor the amendments should have the opportunity to address themselves to them. However, when we report the bill, it would seem to me that we ought to move to it as the next item of business, so that everyone around the world, as well as those inside our country, would know where they stand.

The House is working on a tax reform bill that is going to be a shocker when business sees it. My impression is that they will go far beyond what the Senator has in his speech.

If they can pass it, it will be one more monument in the courageous and forceful leadership of the committee chairman, Representative MILLS and the other members of that committee, Representative BOGGS and Representative BYRNES and the rest of them.

If they can pass it, we will consider the matter and those suggestions. Some of those which were dropped by the wayside for further study will be up again and will be considered.

It would seem to me that the best procedure would be to take up the first bill with such suggestions as the committee might make and then proceed to move on to the next bill when we get it. To do otherwise I think would delay this bill quite a while.

The Democratic Policy Committee invited me to attend its meeting and express my views. I had a prepared text which I read and which I had printed in the RECORD today.

I was under the impression that to have comprehensive tax reform, we would be waiting for the House-passed bill.

I have always been prepared on a major revenue bill—and certainly one involving $10 billion in taxes—to expect 100 amendments to a bill. It is the feeling that it is a very big horse and can carry riders.

Senators make their greatest efforts on a revenue bill of that sort. If they failed, I would not be surprised to see them try again on another big revenue bill.

I feel that this bill is of such importance that it should move ahead without regard for the House reform bill, regardless of what is done with that bill.

There will be a great number of people who want to be heard on the House bill. And they have every right to be heard.

The House did not hear witnesses in opposition to repealing the tax credit. They did not do so for a good reason. After they closed their hearing on tax reform, they wrote their bill.

The industry has been before our hearings for 2 weeks now on the investment tax credit. They have pointed out beyond any peradventure of a doubt that the House bill contains inequities.

Many Senators want to vote on the matter.

We will hold hearings, if we proceed as I have it scheduled, in which Senators will explain the amendments they would like to offer. And the Senator is welcome to appear before the committee and testify for every one of his amendments.

We ask only that he present his amendments. They do not have to be letter perfect. If we agree, we will proceed with them.

I heard a chuckle somewhere.

However, if the thing is troublesome, but the committee agrees with the point of view expressed, it will correct the language. It is a very, very technical thing. It requires some expert drafting. We have a good staff to help us, but it is a difficult thing to do. Put the amendment in, testify for it, and if the Senator is not satisfied with what the committee does, then let us vote again on the floor. That is how I feel we should proceed.

But there is some misunderstanding about the matter. I thought I had made it clear to the Policy Committee that it seemed to me that to proceed in an orderly fashion, in a comprehensive tax bill—I mean voting on 50 amendments or a hundred—to proceed in a fair way in that respect, would require that business be accorded an opportunity to be heard.

For example, the Senator thinks we should increase taxes on the oil industry. That is a subject of debate. That is the biggest industry in Louisiana.

I make the Senator a fair proposition right now. What is the biggest industry in Massachusetts?

Mr. KENNEDY. Electrical machinery and electronics.

Mr. LONG. I make the Senator this proposition: If the Senator will modify his statement to reduce or remove the depletion allowance and accept an amendment that would require that the electronics industry carry as heavy a tax burden as does the oil industry, I will support his amendment.

When I say that, the Senator should understand that I am talking about all taxes. I am not just talking about the Federal income tax. I am talking about State taxes, about the production taxes, and I am talking about the burden on the product in terms of excise taxes. In other words, one thing the Senator would have to put in his amendment would be that when it comes to selling those things, we put a 50-percent excise tax on them; because one may think that, with respect to the petroleum industry a gallon costs 39 cents, but the oil company is getting only 20 cents for that. The other 19 cents goes to the retailer and into production taxes, excise taxes, and things of that sort.

So if the Senator will modify his amendment in that fashion, I will support it, just on this theory: If he could incur that much wrath from the electronics industry, and impose that big a burden on them, I would be willing to impose that burden on the oil industry. It is a matter of debate. It depends on how one looks at it.

In any event, when the Senator testifies to reduce the depletion allowance, I think he would be the first one to admit that the oil industry is entitled to respond to his argument. We do not have the time to hear them now. If we heard them for 2 weeks defend themselves on depletion allowances, as we have heard other industries defend themselves on the investment tax credit, or even 2 or 3 days, this bill would not be ready for action any time soon.

Therefore, I am today inviting the Democratic Policy Committee to meet with the Committee on Finance. We will meet, if it is convenient to the Democratic Policy Committee, on Thursday, at 10 o'clock, and we will discuss procedure—how we shall proceed with these bills. This is not on the merits. So far as I am concerned, it is the procedure. How do we handle this? Do we move the bill, which the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, and every Secretary of the Treasury who served in the administrations of John F. Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, Harry Truman, and Dwight Eisenhower think must be passed, and passed soon, to protect the stability of this country? Do we proceed forthwith with this bill, as expeditiously as possible, or do we permit the taxes to expire and permit this country to fall into economic chaos?

That is the kind of problem with which we are confronted, as responsible members of that committee. We would hope that when we meet together and discuss it, all men of good will—to use the Senator's term, which appeals to me, also—we can agree on procedure. If we can agree on what we are going to try to do, then it seems to me that we have a fair chance of achieving that objective.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation for the comments of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. On many occasions, when the Policy Committee has met, he has attended and expressed the views he is stating on the floor today.

I cannot speak for the majority leader with respect to meeting with the Committee on Finance. I believe, however, that such an invitation would be welcomed by the members of the Policy Committee. I think the meeting might be of significant value. I think the inquiry should be made to the majority leader, and I believe he would be extremely receptive, as he has been in the past.

The chairman of the Finance Committee has been extremely fair in outlining the procedure for those who have recommendations and suggestions for tax reform. He has outlined the procedure in detail on the floor and has given clear notice as to how the amendments of Senators would be considered by the committee. He obviously respects the right of a Senator to submit such amendments on the floor, and he has outlined an appropriate procedure, which I think is eminently fair.

As the Senator from Louisiana has pointed out, the Committee on Finance has a time-consuming responsibility to perform in its efforts to obtain comprehensive tax reform. As the Senator has pointed out the House of Representatives has had several months to work out a tax-reform package. I understand the Ways and Means Committee will report a reform bill in early August. I agree that it puts a serious strain on the Finance Committee to expect it to respond expeditiously by coming up with meaningful tax reform.

At the same time, however, I think the American people have become increasingly aware of the kinds of tax loopholes that exist. There are a large number of such preferences, many of which were mentioned in my brief remarks today. But we are beginning to recognize that they exist. I think the pressure for tax reform should be taken very seriously by those of us who represent the people, and I know that the Senator from Louisiana believes this.

At a time when we are asked to extend the tax surcharge in a system which has a number of inequities, it is not improper to ask that before the surcharge is extended, we should modify the tax system to provide a more equitable distribution of the tax burden.

I have heard the arguments by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, that if we delay action on the surcharge, the workingman will not know the terms of the withholding tax, and that he will not know whether he is going to receive the funds which have been withheld from his paycheck. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the leadership, the majority leader, and many others have expressed strong sentiments about their interest in supporting a tax surcharge, because of the fiscal exigencies of the Nation. These expressions are a clear mandate that an extension of the surcharge will be forthcoming, and overwhelmingly so. But I think the sentiment for the surcharge will be more overwhelming when we have assurances that the basic structure of the tax code will be improved to the extent that reform is possible. At least, the Members of the Senate should have an opportunity to express themselves with respect to providing meaningful tax reform.

Let me also say on this point that the statements made by the administration with respect to wage-price guidelines and doubts as to the extension of the surcharge are the kind of talk which I fear may be adding to the insecurity of many of our businessmen in the current condition of the economy, and may actually be contributing to inflation.

Mr. LONG. I wish to make one further point. In my judgment the greatest fiscal tribute to the Senator's brother, the late John Kennedy, was the Revenue Act of 1964. John Kennedy made a speech at the Economic Club of New York the year before that bill was introduced. I believe I spoke to the Economic Club of New York after that bill became law. That was almost 3 years after the day John Kennedy made his speech saying that was what we should do and laying out the general pattern for his bill. He introduced that bill and fought for it for 1 long, hard year without seeing it enacted.

I recall that when we went to conference on that bill the first amendment between the Senate and the House of Representatives which the House agreed to was to change the title from the Revenue Act of 1963 to the Revenue Act of 1964.

The Senator will recall when President Johnson made his first speech before Congress he recommended that one of the first things we should do was to pass that revenue bill for which John Kennedy had labored the last year of his life trying to pass into law, with all the frustrations involved in something that comprehensive.

That measure involved the entire Internal Revenue Code, as well as literally hundreds of suggested amendments with which we were confronted. It was a good bill and it contained much tax reform and many tax reductions. the statement which I placed in the RECORD today, which I delivered before the policy committee, describes how long it took from a Treasury study to final enactment. I think it was almost 2 years. It must be borne in mind that they had all the technical help down at the Treasury to put those recommendations together and to hear all the pros and cons in the Treasury before they brought the bill here. Then, we took more than a year working on that bill.

Therefore, comprehensive tax reform, such as the Senator has in mind, is difficult to do without the help of the Treasury. The Senator can have available retired Treasury employees who will go before committees and testify what they think about matters. But the men who have the responsibility to recommend, to suggest, and to help get support on both sides of the aisle are now with the Nixon administration and those people would like to look at some of the proposed tax reforms and suggestions before they draft their own tax reforms, as I understand it.

It takes most administrations about a year to recommend a comprehensive package. That is about par for the course under all Presidents. It would seem to me that we must recognize we have one big revenue bill, a $10 billion bill, on which bold immediate action is needed.

In connection with tax reform there are a number of things mentioned in the Senator's speech that we would be ready to vote on; and there are a number of things we would not be ready to vote on. I am ready to take to conference any amendment that can muster 51 votes on the floor, with both sides being heard. As to those about which Senators agree that it requires further study, those which should have more mature consideration, those about which Senators say we must wait for the House bill, I am prepared to vote up or down, or to table, as the case may be. It would certainly be best to proceed with the bill which the House sends us, and when they send a reform package we can proceed on that measure.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in conclusion I would like to mention to the distinguished Senator that I think the members of the Committee on Finance have a very broad background and understanding of the items which I discussed today, and the broad areas of each of the major recommendations on tax reform.

The situation is somewhat different this year compared with previous years, since we now have the results of the very comprehensive tax reform work of the last administration. Although I recognize that different administrations look at things in different ways, it seems to me that the recommendations of the Johnson administration can serve as a very important starting point for consideration.

A great deal of that work was done, and it has not been done in a partisan way. The past administration made a broad attempt to reach many of the excesses that are found in the tax structure.

S. 2631—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF TREBLE DAMAGE PAYMENTS UNDER THE ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I would like to introduce my own tax reform proposal which would say that corporations which are convicted of antitrust violations cannot deduct treble damages as ordinary business expenses. As I understand the matter, such damages are in the nature of fines for committing crimes and are not business expenses. Such a proposal would not be popular with business but it should be part of any tax reform measure we pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2631) relating to the income tax treatment of treble damage payments under the antitrust laws and certain other payments, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am concerned, as are all Senators with the need for achieving greater equity and balance in our tax laws.

Toward that end the bill I introduce today prohibits a business from deducting the punitive portion of a treble damages award arising out of a suit following a conviction or a plea of nolo contendere to a criminal action for violation of the antitrust laws.

This bill is identical with S. 2963 which I offered in the 90th Congress.

So that Senators may review again the basis for this legislation, I ask unanimous consent that pertinent portions of my remarks at the introduction of S. 2963 appear at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

In the 89th Congress, I introduced legislation designed to prohibit the deduction as a normal business expense of the punitive portion, two-thirds of the damages awarded following a criminal conviction for the violation of the antitrust laws.

It is inconceivable to me that illegal business conduct of this nature should be recognized as "ordinary and necessary expense." Public policy simply cannot be twisted into that crippled a posture. How can we ask the millions of taxpayers of this country to pick up half the tab for the penalty imposed upon someone else?

The legislation I now proposed basically says that the purpose of treble damages is to deter illegal conduct and that a party guilty of such conduct must suffer an economic loss. This bill is essentially the same as S. 3650 of the 89th Congress. I think it is time we acted to take the tax favoritism out of this sort of price fixing.

Mr. Hart. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. Long of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield, but first may I point out that the distinguished Senator from Michigan introduced a bill which, although not quite identical with mine, seeks to correct the same loophole in the law under which innocent taxpayers are required to pick up 50 percent of the tab for the unlawful conduct of those who have victimized and exploited the American people.

Mr. Hart. Mr. President, I am delighted that the Senator from Louisiana introduced the bill. It is very kind of the Senator to make the comment that he has made on the bill which I introduced.

As a matter of fact, several years ago a bill looking to this end—namely, to prevent the deduction of such sums by corporations convicted of violating the antitrust laws by virtue of allowing them to claim the deduction as a business expense was introduced by me. A companion bill was introduced in the House by Representative Celler, chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

The Senate Antitrust Subcommittee held hearings for several days on the bill I introduced. Following that, we reexamined the matter and introduced a second, refined bill on the subject matter.

The staff of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee was then instructed to see if, together with the staff of the majority whip in his role as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, we could not develop an approach that would respond effectively to the problem and prevent the Government in effect, from paying for the cost of the illegal conduct.

I would hope that, with the introduction of this bill by the Senator from Louisiana, and the pendency of my bill and the hearings record made in the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, that Congress in this session will be able to do what is right and certainly—whatever the proper composition of the statutory language is—correct an obvious and gross inequity in the tax structure—namely, the provision of taxpayers' money to reimburse for criminal fines. It does not happen when one runs a traffic light, and it should not happen when one runs the antitrust light.

Mr. Long of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

I had indicated that I was going to seek to move a measure along this line after the big electrical contractors were convicted of conspiracy and were given a favorable ruling by the executive branch of Government.

It seems to me that there is no basis and no excuse whatever for the Treasury Department or those who were consulted about it, to give these people a ruling that they could deduct as a necessary and ordinary business expense, the treble damages they paid for violating the criminal law of the country. To me, it was utterly fantastic that there would be such a ruling. It would almost be the same as saying that a criminal who had stolen from the public could be required to give back what he stole but could then deduct the cost of his fine.

But once the horse was out of the barn, it was generally agreed by Senators and Representatives, especially those who were the senior members of the committees, not to make an effort to attempt to collect retroactively what the Government lost because of letting these people get away with this deduction. It was felt that this was done and that was the end of it. We would just let it go at that. It was wrong, but it was too late to correct it. I regret that we did not push immediaely at that time to correct that improper ruling.

Now the drug companies will undoubtedly contend that they should have the benefit of the same ruling after their conviction. In my judgment, the fact that you have to pay treble damages and cannot deduct it as a business expense should be part of the deterrent that would cause one not to commit a crime such as this.

Mr. President, I have indicated how high some of those drug costs are. I made reference to tetracycline, which sells under the name of Achromycin and other names. It is interesting to note that patients at one time were paying 50 cents a pill for tetracycline, as a result of the conspiracy to which I have made reference, when it was estimated that the maximum cost to the manufacturers was 1.5 cents per pill. So now, when citizens guess that they are paying approximately three times the manufacturer's cost, it is interesting to note that with regard to the wonder drug tetracycline, they were badly in error—if they had that pill in mind—because they were paying approximately 30 times the cost of the company to manufacture it.

Mr. President, I do not blame the pharmacists in this matter. I am happy to say that representatives of the 45,000 pharmacists who are members of the American Pharmaceutical Association have come before our committee and urged us to pass effective legislation to help them protect the public by helping them to do business in a way that would permit them to make a decent profit, and at the same time protect the public against the exhorbitant prices they have been charged as a result of conspiracies and as a result of other much criticized practices in the drug industry designed to extort from the public a much greater price than is justifiable.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I did not get an opportunity to hear all of the Senator's statement, but I do recognize that he is recommending certain revisions or amendments to the Internal Revenue Code.

I notice the Senator refers to interest on State and local government bonds. Do I understand the Senator is recommending that this tax exemption be repealed or partially repealed?

Mr. KENNEDY. The matters I hoped the Finance Committee would consider were the possibility of providing a Federal interest-rate subsidy for municipal bonds, the possibility of creating an urban development bank. I believe that additional Federal incentives may be useful in encouraging State and local governments to seek more efficient methods of financing their operations.

I hope that this is an area to which the Senate will give consideration. I appreciate the fact that many localities now depend on the issuance of tax-free municipal bonds and that we must proceed carefully with any changes we make. But I think there are important questions here that we must explore.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree that it is a problem. That was dealt with in the Ways and Means Committee, and it is on the agenda to be considered by our own committee.

Nevertheless, being realistic, when one speaks of minimum income tax, regardless of the source of income, we are in effect speaking about repealing, to a certain extent, the tax-exempt status of State and municipal bonds.

Mr. KENNEDY. The minimum tax proposal would apply only if an individual's tax-exempt income exceeds 50 percent of his total income.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That still has the mathematical effect to a certain extent of repealing the tax-exempt status of State and municipal bonds. I am not saying that that should not be done, but that is the result of the suggested minimum tax.

Mr. KENNEDY. It is my understanding, in the preliminary work I have done on this, that this would tend to affect only the highest brackets of taxpayers because they are the taxpayers who have the largest proportion of tax-exempt income.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. To a large extent, but it would affect low-income taxpayers as well. I am not debating the merits of this proposal. I am speaking of the mathematics of it——

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If it hits only one taxpayer regardless of size, under this proposal we would be repealing a portion of the tax-exempt status of State bonds. Would the Senator propose that we make that retroactive on the bonds that the taxpayer owns at this time and bought heretofore or only on the ones purchased hereafter?

Mr. KENNEDY. At the present time, I lean toward the view that the tax should be retroactive. However, I would be very strongly guided by what the committee feels is the fairest way to proceed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I notice one other proposal, one in which I, too, have had a great interest. I have introduced bills dealing with this subject, and I was wondering how close we were together on that. I refer to the Senator's discussion as to adequate controls on the deductions allowed for farm losses. One approach would be to repeal the capital gains status on livestock, and I was wondering whether the Senator would go along with that or just what he had in mind.

Mr. KENNEDY. The proposal I mentioned in my statement is really an incorporation of the approach suggested by Senator METCALF. I am a cosponsor of his bill, which is quite comprehensive.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I should be familiar with that bill, but could the Senator outline it for me?

Mr. KENNEDY. The essence of the proposal, as I understand it, is a limitation on the amount of farm losses that can be deducted from income. As I understand it, there are accounting procedures peculiar to farming, which provide special advantages to the hobbyhorse farmers.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The greatest tax advantage called to the attention of our committee, in terms of criticism, is the present capital gains treatment for livestock, including race horses. I was wondering how the Senator would treat that? Would he repeal the capital gains provision? Personally, I have advocated that myself, and I am wondering whether the Senator would go that far.

Mr. KENNEDY. I believe that is not included as part of the Metcalf proposal.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Does not the Senator from Massachusetts recognize this as the real loophole? Now I did not see here what suggestions the Senator has made regarding taxing of foundations. Has the Senator made any suggestions in that connection?

Mr. KENNEDY. I think the opportunity for foundations to operate tax-free businesses and industries outside the scope of their charter should not be permitted. This is one of the major sources of abuse, and I think the present loopholes should be closed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That suggestion was made to our committee, and it is under close study; however, suppose we tax or limit the activities outside of their charters, they could merely amend the charter in order to qualify and still get the same tax exemption. To be frank, it pretty well boils down to the fact that we need to approach the problem with the idea foundations should pay some form of tax. I was wondering how the Senator feels about that.

Mr. KENNEDY. I would have serious reservations about taxing foundations in this way. I do not think we should start down the road of a general tax on foundations. It would place a serious burden on many foundations that are doing extremely important and essential work in a variety of areas.

I would rather draw up stronger guidelines with respect to the kinds of activities in which foundations are involved. I would not deter them from engaging in educational or other kinds of charitable work. But I do think there are some holdings and investments which are outside the scope of legitimate foundation activities, and I think they should not be exempt from taxation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We all realize that many foundations are doing a commendable job in making contributions to charity. However, we are confronted with the fact that an individual taxpayer could do a greater job in making contributions to charity if he did not have to pay such heavy taxes. To the extent that foundations are tax exempt they are distributing public funds that would otherwise go in the Federal Treasury.

The House Ways and Means Committee has tentatively agreed on a proposal which would, to some extent, tax these foundations. Is the Senator familiar with that proposal? I wondered how the Senator feels about that. I am just seeking his advice.

Mr. KENNEDY. As I understand it, the House provision goes far beyond what the Senator has mentioned in placing limitations on the activities of foundations.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It does. It taxes them also.

Mr. KENNEDY. I certainly hope that the Finance Committee will have a chance to review that provision, because I personally feel that we need to adopt an extremely cautious approach here.

I hope that the Finance Committee can identify the abuses that exist in foundation activities. As I understand it, the House committee has proposed serious restrictions on the opportunity for foundations to engage in a variety of educational and other charitable functions. I hope that this proposal will be examined in detail by the Finance Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am sure it will. The Senator would agree that there have been some abuses in that area, and it needs examining.

I noticed that the Senator speaks of the deductions for contributions made to charity. This proposal has been called to the attention of the committee, and it too, relates to foundations. Under the present law a man who has stock or property of very low cost value can donate it to a foundation which he controls and take a charitable deduction for his contribution based on market value of the gift. Ofttimes, the cash value of the charitable tax deduction exceeds what he could get for the property in the market.

One suggestion is that such increase in the value of this gift above actual cost be taxed as a capital gain, or under another proposal that the donor would only receive the charitable deduction for the actual cost of the gift. Does the Senator have any opinions about that?

Mr. KENNEDY. As the Senator mentioned, I included a reference to that reform in my remarks. I think this loophole should be closed. I think the charitable deduction has been subject to extraordinary abuse. The House committee heard some very graphic testimony on the activities of wealthy individuals. I think that loophole should definitely be closed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I know the committee of the House was very concerned over it.

Mr. KENNEDY. As a matter of fact, I think a number of witnesses appeared before the committee and spoke about that provision in some detail.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the House does not deal with it, I have legislation prepared for Senate consideration.

Another abuse is getting tax credit for private papers far in excess of the cost. The loopholes to which I refer was described in an article in the Wall Street Journal. For example, when a Member of Congress leaves the Congress he can donate his papers or files to a university, a charitable institution or a library, get a large appraisal as to the value, and take tax credit for this as charitable contribution. This is wrong. I wondered if the Senator considered that as one of the areas which should be dealt with.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am not familiar with the specific details of those abuses, but I think it should be an area for consideration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall cite a hypothetical case. I shall be leaving the Senate after my present term expires. Certainly, any files and papers I

XUM

have accumulated were accumulated at Government expense. I did not pay for them. Under present law if they are turned over to a university of a family established library one could get a charitable deduction for their appraised value. Yet they were files created at Government expense. Personally I think that is wrong. I have a bill prepared which would close this glaring loophole. It relates to the executive branch, too.

I was wondering if the Senator did not agree with me that it is wrong to get a charitable tax credit for something that he or I may have created as a Government official. These files were created at Government expense. Why should there be any tax credit when they are turned over to a public institution?

Mr. KENNEDY. I would say we are getting into a difficult area. What do we do about the astronauts who are put on the moon at taxpayer's expense? Billions of dollars from American taxpayers have been used to put the astronauts into space. Then they come down to earth and sell the rights to their stories for large sums.

What would the Senator do with respect to a former President who appeared on television and obtained several hundred thousand dollars, when the basis for his appearance was his experience in public office, gained at the taxpayers' expense?

I agree with the Senator that this is a matter of great concern. I can understand the point the Senator from Delaware is making. Once we get into this matter, we must establish broad guidelines, so that people may have an idea as to where they are. We are trying to close tax loopholes. Many of the problems in this area are fuzzy.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree with the Senator that it needs study, but really it is not so fuzzy. With reference to the examples the Senator gave about astronauts getting paid for an article and a former President appearing on television, those are already taxable incomes. Those are already taken care of under the present law.

I am speaking about papers and files that have been accumulated at Government expense and then perhaps turned over to a library and the ex-official getting a high valuation put on them for the sole purpose of claiming a large charitable deduction. If they are valued at $100,000 and the man is in the 50-percent tax bracket he gets the equivalent of $50,000 in tax credit. Those papers were accumulated while we were on the Government payroll. To the extent that the official has a value put on those papers and then donates them to X university or X charitable organization should not that value be taxable income to the official? Why should the ex-official not pay tax for the increased valuation over his actual cost, which in most instances is zero?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am sure the papers of the distinguished Senator from Delaware will be of significant value. I do not know how a value can be set on them. What happens to a Member of the Congress who, after he becomes a Member, decides to write a book? He will acquire additional compensation. Perhaps he will make speeches. That will be taxable income, but I suppose it could be spread over a period of time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is taxable income under present law.

Mr. KENNEDY. As I understand it, there are ways of escaping the immediate imposition of taxes.

I know the Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD) has been extremely patient, and I should like to conclude these remarks.

Perhaps there have been abuses in the area to which the Senator has referred. I am sure the committee will look into them. I am sure they should be investigated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I congratulate the Senator for his interest in these major reforms. As one who has been working to bring reforms about for many years I welcome recruits. Perhaps by working together we can get something done toward closing these loopholes which are not available to the private citizens.

Mr. KENNEDY. Realizing the important contribution that the Senator from Delaware can make, I hope, if reforms are to be made, they will be made this year, because we need the presence of the Senator from Delaware in this important field.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will be here next year.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. We will need his assistance in these discussions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I assure the Senator he will get it.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MISSILE TEST FACILITIES AT KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE, AND RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTH

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2546) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, for a few minutes today, I wish to discuss the urgent importance of the ABM in light of information contained in "Military Strategy," by V. D. Sokolovsky, Marshal of the Soviet Union, third edition, 1968.

A critical question in the ABM debate is whether or not the Soviets are planning a first strike.

Secretary of Defense Laird has pointed out that the weapons systems now in production by the Soviets will have the capability of a first strike within a few years. Secretary Laird said:

> I do not believe that the Soviet Union would be foolish enough in this year 1969 or 1970 to go with the first strike, and I want to make that very clear. But as Secretary of Defense I must consider why they are going forward with the deployment of an SS-9 with such a large massive warhead. If they are developing a retaliatory strike, they don't need that kind of warhead to hit our cities. They don't need that kind of missile system.
>
> It only leads me to believe that they are developing a capability to go after our missile bases and to knock out our deterrent forces.

The emphasis in Secretary Laird's statement is on the word "capability." He is not basing his decision upon an analysis of intent. However, it would be a mistake not to seek out such evidence of Soviet intentions as we may have. One of the problems in this whole debate is that we tend to look upon the other side's preparations with our own assumptions and outlook upon life. We assume that arguments persuasive for us will be persuasive for them. It is clear that we have no intentions of delivering a first strike. In fact, we have tailored our nuclear arsenal to exclude all weapons designed to initiate such an attack or with which we could even threaten such an attack. We are not planning any such weapon as the SS–9.

From our point of view, any attempt to initiate a first strike would go contrary to our moral principles. On March 28, 1961, President John F. Kennedy gave this pledge to the world:

> Our arms will never be used to strike the first blow in any attack. This is not a confession of weakness but a statement of strength. It is our national tradition. We must offset whatever advantage this may appear to hand an aggressor by so increasing the capability of our forces to respond swiftly and effectively to any aggressive move as to convince any would-be aggressor that such a movement would be too futile and costly to undertake. In the area of general war, this doctrine means that such capability must rest with that portion of our forces which would survive the initial attack. We are not creating forces for a first strike against any other nation. We shall never threaten, provoke or initiate aggression—but if aggression should come, our response will be swift and effective.

Because of our faith in this doctrine, we have tended to believe that the Soviets also would never consider a first strike and we have built our past policy upon the assumption that the Soviets and the United States share the same preconception. For example, Defense Secretary McNamara on September 19, 1967, said:

> It would not be sensible for either side to launch a maximum effort to achieve a first strike capability. It would not be sensible because the intelligence-gathering capability of each side, being what it is, and the realities of lead time from technological breakthrough to operational readiness being what they are, neither of us would be able to acquire a first strike capability in secret.

Such reasoning does not seem to have been followed by the chief Soviet strategists in their published writings. The most important of all such writings is the book entitled "Military Strategy," by the late Marshal V. D. Sokolovsky. This volume has gone through three editions in the Soviet Union, the most recent in 1968, each time with significant changes to reflect changing advances in technology. The work reflects not only the ideas of the author, but of a broad committee of Soviet strategists which he headed until his death. The book was published and distributed for the use of the officers of the Soviet forces, and is in fact the most authoritative statement of Soviet strategic policy.

It is clear from this book that the author anticipates the elimination of military strategic targets by the use of ICBM's. For example, he says:

> Nuclear rocket attacks by strategic weapons will have decisive primary significance on the outcome of a modern war. Mass nuclear attacks on the strategic nuclear weapons of the enemy, on the economy and governmental control system, with the simultaneous defeat of the armed forces in theatres of military operations will make it possible to attain the political aims of a war in a considerably shorter period of time than in past wars.

He further says:

> Such strikes can destroy the basic regions of the territory of enemy countries where the economic foundations for war by the imperialist aggressors are situated; where the strategic means for nuclear offense—strategic aviation, ICBM's, IRBM's, tactical bomber aviation, naval forces—are based; where the basic stockpiles of nuclear ammunition and materiel for conducting a war are located . . .
>
> The basic aim of this type of military operation is to undermine the military power of the enemy by eliminating the nuclear weapons and formations of armed forces, and eliminating the military economic potential by destroying the economic foundation; and by disrupting the governmental and military controls. The basic means for attacking these ends are the Strategic Rocket Troops equipped with ICBM's and IRBM's with powerful thermo-nuclear and atomic warheads, and also long-range aviation and rocket-carrying submarines armed with rockets with nuclear warheads, hydrogen and atomic bombs.

It is clear that Soviet strategic thinking is aimed at destroying our ICBM's, as Secretary Laird has indicated. The question then arises as to the timing of the Soviet strategic strike. Would such a strike be a preemptive first strike, or would the Soviets wait until we fired first? Now there is no doubt that the Soviets assume in all their writings that we intend to fire first, despite all our statements to the contrary and the actual plans we have prepared. They cannot believe that anyone would not be preparing a first strike. Their whole thinking is based upon a first-strike psychology. Now judging from the passages I have just read, does it make any sense that the Soviets would be planning to wait until the U.S. had fired before they fired their own ICBM's? Such a plan does not logically follow from their assumptions. There is no point in preparing to destroy an enemy's ICBM bases after the missiles have left their pads. Such a strategy makes sense only if the Soviets are planning to destroy the ICBM's before they leave the pad.

Such reasoning is exactly the reasoning which Sokolovsky uses at another point. He says:

> It is difficult for the strikes by the Rocket Troops to qualify as offensive or defensive operations. Their operations will always be decisive, in no way defensive in nature, regardless of whether troops are on the offensive or the defensive in the land theatres.

This passage shows that the Soviets do not consider ICBM's as being either offensive or defensive. The point is that they must be decisive. In the same way, the question of whether a strike is a preemptive strike or a retaliatory strike has no meaning in Soviet strategy. The important thing is that the strike be decisive; that is, it must be timed perfectly so that it is launched in time to prevent ICBM's from being fired against them. The Soviets do not expect to receive a devastating first blow. Our strategy is based upon the theory that we will be able to respond with a retaliatory strike after great damage has been inflicted upon us; the Soviet strategy is to destroy our ICBM's before they are fired. Notice that the Soviets are not speaking here of intercepting ICBM's by their ABM system after the ICBM's have been fired; they are speaking of destroying the ICBM's before launching.

The question of timing is the key question. In Soviet thinking the correct time is when ground preparations are being made for the presumed first strike, but before the ICBM's are actually fired. In Soviet terminology, a retaliatory strike is one that retaliates against preparations, not against an actual firing. Despite the conclusions of former Secretary McNamara, the Soviets are very confident that they can detect such preparations.

The 1968 edition of "Military Strategy" has some new material which precisely defines such a "retaliatory strike."

> However, possibilities of averting a surprise attack are constantly growing. Present means of reconnaissance, detection and surveillance can expertly disclose a significant portion of the measures of direct preparation of a nuclear attack by the enemy and in the very first minutes locate the mass launch of missiles and the take-off of aircraft belonging to the aggressor and, at the right time, warn the political leadership of the country about the impending danger. Thus, possibilities exist not to allow a surprise attack by an aggressor; to deliver nuclear strikes on him at the right time.

Thus, it will be seen that the Soviets reject all the premises of our policy:

First, they assume that the United States is planning a first strike.

Second, their strategy proposes to knock out our nuclear bases.

Third, they are convinced that they have the technology to detect the preparations for a first strike.

Fourth, their strategy is to launch a so-called retaliatory strike before U.S. ICBM's would leave their launching sites.

The so-called Soviet retaliatory strike, in terms of priority, amounts to a first strike against our ICBM's. It might be called the strategy of the "retaliatory first strike."

Now, if we leave the published Soviet strategic plans on this point and go back to Secretary Laird's testimony that the Soviets are building a capability for a first strike against our missiles, we see that the Soviets have the plan now and will soon have the capability for a first strike. We cannot answer the question of whether they intend to implement this plan, but we would certainly be derelict in our duties if we did not prepare the proper defense against such planning and production; and that defense means immediately going forward with the development and deployment of the Safeguard antiballistic missile.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, if the Senator from South Carolina has concluded his remarks, that the Chair recognize the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Byrd).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I support the pending legislation providing for the procurement of major weapons and for research and development.

I commend the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee for his comprehensive presentation. Senator Stennis has ably stated the actions of the committee which considered for so many weeks the details of this important legislation.

As originally presented by the outgoing administration of President Johnson, the Department of Defense sought a $23 billion authorization. The new administration of President Nixon reduced this figure to $22 billion.

After long deliberation the Senate Committee on Armed Services recommends a further reduction of $2 billion, making the total authorization for military procurement—missiles, aircraft, naval vessels, tanks, and research—$20 billion.

I supported in committee the $2 billion reduction. I support such reduction today.

Of the $2 billion reduction, a little more than half applies to research and development and the remainder to the procurement of hardware.

I favor a comprehensive research and development program. I am convinced, however, that the proposed $1 billion reduction in research and development funds will not in any way jeopardize our national security. Funds for these activities still will total more than $7 billion.

In this imperfect world, it is important that the United States remain militarily strong.

In this age of nuclear weapons, our Nation cannot afford to be caught with its defenses down.

In this period of time in world history, the United States of America is the one major nation with both a strong military capability and a system of representative democratic government.

To protect the latter, we must keep the former. We must not gamble with the security of a nation which has the best form of government ever devised by man—and one with the highest standard of living.

I, more than most Senators, have been critical of certain procurement procedures. I question the open-ended, ambiguous, flexible procedures used for the procurement of the C–5A aircraft. I am not happy about the F–111 program. I feel that the Department of Defense in general, and the Department of the Air Force in particular, must give better protection to the tax funds of the American people.

For that reason, I have frequently called attention to the laxity which appears to me to have existed in the Department of Defense in the handling of tax moneys.

XUM

But these are matters which can be corrected if the Congress stays vigilant.

In urging approval of the pending legislation, I caution those who would curtail our strategic offensive capability.

The strategic advantage long held by the United States begins to disappear during this year of 1969. By deliberate design, the United States has permitted the Soviet Union to achieve parity in the number of land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles. The Soviet submarine force is three times that of the United States, although the United States does have superiority in the field of submarine-borne missiles and in strategic long-range bombers.

All of us would like an end to the arms race.

All of us would like to devote to more constructive purposes the money being sought for weaponry.

But the day that those objectives can be accomplished is not yet here—nor does it appear imminent.

For the foreseeable future a strong military posture remains essential to our national survival.

We cannot take a chance on just what might be the intentions of other nations.

Hours of discussion have been consumed on the floor of the Senate as to the intentions of the Soviet Union, as to whether it intends to seek a first-strike capability against the United States.

Frankly, I do not know just what the intentions of the Soviet Union are, nor, I submit, does any other member of the Senate; nor does the President, nor the Secretary of Defense, nor the Central Intelligence Agency.

But we do know—I repeat, for emphasis, we do know—that in recent years the Soviet Union has greatly increased its offensive capability; and we do know that it is continuing to increase its offensive capability.

We do know that the Soviet SS–9 missile has the capability of knocking out a U.S. missile site. It is our strong offensive missiles, upon which we must rely to deter any nuclear aggressor.

Mr. President, one of the scientists who has been the most quoted during the Senate debate, and one who is strongly opposed to the deployment of the anti-ballistic missile, is Dr. W. K. H. Panofsky, professor and director, Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford University. If the Members of the Senate will turn to page 1175 of the printed hearings of the Committee on Armed Services, they will note that in committee I called attention to a statement made by Dr. Panofsky on page 5 of his testimony before the committee. I read just one sentence:

> It is consistent with known technical intelligence information on the high yields and accuracy on targets that SS–9 missiles could destroy the Minuteman launch control centers and our silos.

The entire strategic concept upon which the United States has been relying to avert a nuclear war is that the United States be so strong that any foreign power deploying missiles against us would know that we could retaliate by destroying him who struck the first blow.

Today, we are in such a position.

But we must constantly be on the alert. These major weapons systems have a long leadtime. We must legislate today for 4 and 5 and 6 years hence. We cannot let down our guard—not until the day, not yet discernible, when effective arms control agreements can be reached.

Now, Mr. President, a word about the anti-ballistic-missile defense system.

For the past 3 months, I have been giving a great deal of thought to President Nixon's proposal for the development of an anti-ballistic-missile defense system.

I have listened to a great deal of testimony by outstanding scientists, both those who favor deployment of ABM and those who oppose it.

The amount of money involved in the 1970 budget for President Nixon's Safeguard system is $891.5 million. The total system over a period of 6 years is estimated by the Defense Department to cost approximately $7 billion. The total cost, in my judgment, will be substantially greater than the Defense Department estimate.

The program represents 13 years of intense research and development effort at a cost of more than $3 billion. The question now is whether this 13 years of research and development shall be put to use?

First, we must consider what the proposed system will and will not do.

The missile defense system is not an offensive weapon; it is purely a defensive one.

It is not a warmaking weapon—its only use is to protect the United States in the event of an attack.

It does not add to our Nation's offensive potential—but it does add to our Nation's protection.

President Nixon believes that the Safeguard system will strengthen the hand of the United States in any arms control talks with the Soviet Union—and I believe that history teaches us that the Russians respect strength and despise weakness.

Before it is completed, this system will be a costly one. Balanced against the cost is this: In this imperfect world of international violence and instability, can we afford not to develop some defense against nuclear attack?

So while I have doubts concerning the effectiveness of the ABM proposal, I have decided to resolve the doubts in favor of defense.

In the light of world developments, I have concluded it would be wise to support the Commander in Chief in his firm belief that our missile bases must be protected against foreign attack.

In recent years, the world has made great strides in almost every line of endeavor—in medicine, in scientific achievements, in space.

But in learning to live in peace with one another, the nations have made little progress. During the past quarter of a century, the United States has been involved in three major wars.

Until a more peaceful world is at hand, it seems to me we have little choice but to spend the necessary funds in an effort to deter an attack on the two hundred million people in the United States.

In such complex and technical matters as the ABM deployment question, it is not possible to be certain, but it is possible to be prudent. I support prudence.

In closing, I want to say a few words in defense of the professional military personnel of our Nation.

All of us are weary and frustrated with the Vietnam war. But the conduct of this war needs to be put into perspective.

The uniformed military leaders of this Nation did not make the decision to intervene in Vietnam. Those decisions were made by civilian leaders.

The professional military officers did not make the decisions to observe sanctuaries from which the enemy could regroup and resupply and attack again and again. Civilian leaders made those decisions.

It was not the military who made the decision to permit Haiphong to continue to be a free port through which the Soviet Union could daily bring military cargo to the North Vietnamese.

It was not the military who decreed there could be no bombing of vital military targets in North Vietnam.

All these decisions were made by civilian leaders of the Government.

From the beginning, I have felt it was a great error of judgment to become involved in a ground war in Asia. But having become involved, our civilian leaders compounded the error by dispatching more and more ground troops and simultaneously putting on more and more restrictions as to how those troops should be protected.

As a result, the war has been prolonged and the casualties have been increased.

Total U.S. casualties in Vietnam are now double the casualties the American people suffered in the Korean war.

Yes, mistakes have been made in regard to Vietnam. The military have made mistakes, but the basic errors of judgment have been on the part of the civilian leaders.

The basic decisions in regard to Vietnam were not made by the military and, indeed, their advice was repeatedly rejected.

When the Senate votes on the pending legislation, I hope its judgment will not be influenced by the frustrations of Vietnam.

Our Nation has mutual defense agreements with 44 countries.

We have guaranteed the security, insofar as foreign aggression is concerned, of 19 Latin American nations; we have guaranteed the security of 13 European nations; we have mutual defense agreements with Vietnam, Thailand, and Pakistan, and with Australia and New Zealand; we have guaranteed the security of free China, the Philippines, Japan, and Canada.

So I say the United States is in a difficult and awkward position. We have overextended ourselves militarily and financially.

But until major reappraisals are made in our foreign policies—and until effective arrangements for arms controls can be worked out with the Soviet

Union—the United States has no recourse except to appropriate large sums of money for the national defense.

We have an obligation to see that the money is used efficiently and effectively. But appropriate the essential funds we must.

I support the $20 billion authorization, I support the $2 billion reduction made by the committee, and I again commend the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Mississippi, for his able handling of this legislation on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Missippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this afternoon I was privileged to read the Senator's speech. I am very impressed with his speech and I was glad to be able to hear him deliver it.

I believe the Senator has set forth some landmark principles around which we can build in the future that will have effect for years.

I especially thank the Senator for his very fine help during the long hearings on the bill and at every session of the markup of the bill. The markup lasted over a week, and the Senator from Virginia attended every one of those sessions and made contributions. He has an amendment which is very timely and it will be offered later.

Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator for his summary. We talk about what we are going to do and what is needed and not needed in this military program. We overlook the fact that we have these commitments with 44 nations. I voted against some of those commitments. It occurs to me that some of the persons who led us into those commitments are the first ones to holler now about the burden they entail.

We guaranteed the security of Japan. We guaranteed the security of the Philippines. What are we going to do now? Are we just going to turn and run out on those commitments? That never has been our policy. I think we would be borrowing more trouble if we were to do that.

I know the Senator's point of view is the result of the thorough investigation of the facts he made and the application of the rule of prudence.

I am looking forward to further valuable services from the Senator from Virginia in our committee. Again I commend the Senator and I thank him.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I am grateful for the comments of the able and thoughtful chairman of the committee.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the Senator from Mississippi in recognizing that there is no better student on the Committee on Armed Services, and no one who seeks to get deeper into the facts and values of these measures that come before the committee than the Senator from Virginia. I was proud to serve with him for 2 years.

The Senator made one point and he made it very strongly and with great persuasion. It is a point that has been made on the floor a number of times. I wonder if the Senator would explore the point with me for just a moment. I refer to the classification of weapons systems in terms of offensive and defensive systems. It appears to me that in relation to strategic forces it is extremely difficult to make that kind of distinction.

I ask the Senator to imagine himself to be one of the Soviet war planners and to look at any nation, or our Nation's development. If we have an ABM which is effective, or which they think is effective, and if we have a strategic force level of 1,000 ICBM's, and if we have 666 Polaris submarines, and 650 intercontinental bombers, and if they see us with an ABM, and the offensive force I have outlined, is not the totality of that enormous increase in our offensive capabilities; for would it not be reasonable for them to assume we might strike considering that we have an ABM which would deter their retaliatory strike to us or at least give us a damaging factor which would make it intolerable under certain circumstances?

We would never do that. They understand our intentions better than we understand their intentions.

However, I am unable to make the distinction between an offensive system and a defensive system. Assistant Secretary of Defense Packard conceded this in the conversation I had with him.

I ask the Senator to comment on that because there is confusion in the terms and almost everyone who speaks in support of the ABM has gone into great detail of the defensive nature of it. I fail to see the distinction.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I think the splendid Senator from Kansas raises a most interesting point. Of course, we cannot say categorically what view the Soviet Union will take. We know what the facts are.

We know the Soviet Union has developed and deployed an ABM system.

We do know, and I think the Senator from Kansas will not disagree, that the ABM can be used only to defend the United States. It cannot be used to attack or hurt in any way the Soviet Union, Communist China, or any other potential enemy.

Mr. PEARSON. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. As to whether this is an offensive weapon or a defensive weapon, I think it is well documented in this very large book, the printed hearings, beginning on page 1326 through page 1333. I asked a series of questions along this line because I was concerned just as the Senator from Kansas is concerned.

I wanted fully to understand whether this is a defensive or an offensive weapon. So, to each of the scientists—and I am not a scientist or an expert on this question and do not pretend to be—but to each of these scientists and the so-called experts I put the same question: Is this an offensive weapon or is it purely a defensive weapon?

Those who opposed deployment of ABM took a longer time and more coaxing and quite a few more questions on my part, but in the end every one of them said—it is right here in the record—that the ABM is a defensive weapon, that it is not an offensive weapon.

The Senator from Kansas has concurred in that view.

As to how the Soviets would view any activity on the part of the United States, of course we can regret if they misjudge our intentions, but we cannot prevent them from misjudging our intentions.

I think that the Soviet Union knows that only a few years ago we had all the ICBM's and they had virtually none. We had them all. We deliberately let them catch up with us. That shows, or certainly should have shown to them our good intentions.

The Senator from Kansas is properly concerned about the so-called arms race and, I might say, I am likewise concerned about that. But the way I reason this thing is, living in an imperfect world such as we are, can we afford not to attempt to develop some defense against foreign nuclear weapons?

More and more countries are getting them. One day, some very foolish individual is going to start letting nuclear weapons fly around a bit. I cannot conceive of any sane person doing that, but World War II was not started by a sane person.

Thus, whether we can develop an effective system of protection, I do not know that any one of us can categorically say. I do not know that any scientist can categorically say that, either. Some say that we cannot develop an effective system. Others, like Dr. Teller, say that we can.

I am not a scientist and I cannot categorically say that we can or we cannot. But, it occurs to me that there is evidence of more and more nuclear capability and we would therefore be wise to attempt to develop a defense against foreign nuclear warheads.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the Senator. I understand his reasoning. I might say that there are three conditions which I think would upset the relative stability that we have had in the world in the late 1960's.

First, would be the construction and deployment of ICBM's by the Soviet Union, which is a dangerous condition.

Second, would be the proliferation of nuclear weapons and delivery systems by third powers, which is of concern to us.

Third, would be the combination of the ABM and MIRV system which I view as hardness.

It is my understanding that it was a misinterpretation of the Tallinn line on the part of our intelligence community, believing it to be an ABM system, that pushed us ahead with the development of the MIRV system.

I would assume that, of course, the Soviets are developing our MIRV system and are doing so in relation to our ABM system.

I continue to fail to make the distinction between offensive and defensive weapons. The Senator, with great persuasion has set forth his view, and I respect it, as I respect the very adequate and very, very competent service of the

XUM

Senator on the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I am very grateful for the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Kansas and for his contribution to this discussion today. I recognize that he speaks from a feeling of deep conviction.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. PERCY. I am sorry that I did not hear all of the distinguished Senator's comments. I have great respect for his judgment. I have enjoyed joining him in common causes in the past.

What concerns me about going ahead and building a system is the possibility that there may be some accidental launch, or some madman may launch one; so that apparently the administration has thought about this very carefully. The possibility of a launch by the Chinese has been fully discussed. It was given as the principal reason for building Sentinel.

But, apparently, the administration, after thinking about it, has decided that that is not a valid reason for going ahead with the Safeguard system because Secretary Rogers has clearly stated that if the Soviet Union wants to go out of the ABM business, we will go out of the ABM business.

How can we go out of the business and still build a system designed for some madman or some Chinese or someone else?

We either have to go into it or not go into it.

Now the administration has come to a policy decision and has pressed forward to have negotiations with the Soviet Union, established a date and said that we would be ready to go by July 31. Certainly, there is every evidence that the ABM will be a high item of priority for discussion in those talks.

I have done it the other way. I have stated that if in the course of those talks, when the two countries sit down, possessing the power that the two countries have, we decide in our joint intelligence that a shield of some sort is needed, we can build it in cooperation with each other, or with each other's full knowledge, and this would not constitute an escalation but a shield. This would cause me to think differently on this subject.

But I take the word of the administration that they are serious about talking about negotiating our way out of it, that if the Soviets want to get out of it, we will get out of it, and, therefore, I take it that they do not think the argument too valid that we should build a multibillion-dollar system and go into a substantial escalation on the chance that some madman may press a button and set the world on fire.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. As I mentioned in my prepared talk earlier in the day, all of us are hopeful that something can be worked out in the way of arms control and arms limitation.

Whether it can be done in the foreseeable future, I think is debatable. But it is worth trying. President Nixon and Secretary Rogers are both determined to have a go at it.

In determining to try to work something out, I do not know exactly how, attempting to defend one's country could be provocative to another country, if it has no intention of attacking this country.

Thus, again I say that the enactment of the Safeguard program recommended by the President should have a desirable effect on the arms talks.

At least, the President thinks so. I think the Senator from Illinois will agree that the President gives that as one of his important reasons for developing the ABM system. It will give him additional leverage in arms control talks with the Soviet Union.

We have to rely upon the President and his official representatives to represent us when they go to Geneva or Moscow, or wherever they may go for the arms control talks. That was another point which helped persuade me to support this proposal.

I may say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that 3 or 4 years ago I was opposed to deployment of the ABM. Last year I reluctantly supported the Sentinel system. This year, as I indicated in my earlier remarks, I support this proposal with reluctance.

I do not think any of us want to expand or continue the arms race; but, as I look at it, this is not a part of that race in the sense of being an offensive weapon. It is not an offensive weapon. It is a defensive weapon.

Its only purpose is to defend this Nation if it comes under attack. If we do not come under attack, then it is not used. The American people will have lost some tax dollars, but otherwise the world will not have been disturbed.

Mr. PERCY. The distinguished Senator's comments bring to mind that there is not as big a difference between the two sides in this debate as I think would appear on the surface. Those of us who are are opposed are characterized as opposed to the ABM and everything about it, and those who are for it are for everything about it.

The opposition is almost unanimous in saying we should continue research, development, evaluation, and testing.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. That has been done for 13 years.

Mr. PERCY. Yes; and, wisely, as the Senator has said, he was opposed to previous deployment. Thank heavens for that. The Senator from Mississippi should be commended for his foresight in having opposed deployment of it. Had it been deployed, it would have cost billions of dollars, and we would be in a much worse economic posture. But we waited.

Our only point is that we can well afford to continue research and development. In fact, the military has said, in its suggestions with regard to this bill, that it needs $400 million for research. If we are going to get ready for production, would they need that amount? When we get ready for production, we need the tooling and everything else that goes into production. How can they then say they are ready for it if they say they need $400 million for research and development?

As far as supporting the President is concerned, I want to support the President in every possible way; but I do not imagine that any President thinks he is infallible or his administration is infallible.

We were told to support the President in his request for a Sentinel system. I did not choose to do so. I opposed it because it needed more work on it. It was not fully evaluated. I do not think we had the vaguest idea how much the full system would have cost us. That view turned out to be sound. It is now admitted by the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff and everybody else that it would have been a mistake to go into the Sentinel.

We are simply saying now that we would be making a mistake to rush into production of the ABM. Let us go further into research. Let us go into the MSR.

This is why I feel it is the better part of prudence to support the Cooper-Hart amendment. I intend to fight fully for it. But I appreciate the viewpoint of the Senator from Virginia. We are all men of good will trying to resolve this issue. We are usually billions of dollars apart. On this issue we are apart only a little. Those in opposition are not against the money. We are saying, keep the money in there; just do not rush into production and deployment, because we will lose more time at the end. We are all hoping we can reach an agreement so production and deployment will not be necessary.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, as to whether the time has come to continue research and development, I think the Senator will find that Dr. Foster and those in charge of the program say that all the research that can be effectively done has been done, and now is the time, if the Nation feels it should go into such a program, to be effective 5 or 6 years from now, to put the research and development to work.

So I say again that while, as a Democrat, when a Democratic President felt it was essential to develop a system of defense against foreign weapons, I supported him. As a Democrat, when a Republican President, the Commander in Chief, says it is essential in his judgment to develop a defense against foreign nuclear warheads, I feel it is prudent to follow that recommendation. Both Presidents—one a Democrat and one a Republican—feel it important to develop a defense against nuclear weapons.

My record as a Member of the Senate is not one to follow blindly either a Democratic President or a Republican President.

I have voted rather independently since I have been here.

But on great questions of the defense of our Nation, on great questions involving nuclear power, involving nuclear warheads, nuclear missiles, I say it is not possible to be certain we are right, but I think it is possible to be prudent.

I expect to be prudent and will vote accordingly in regard to the pending legislation.

I yield the floor.

ABM ANALYSIS

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, one of the outstanding journals in the field of aviation, missiles, and space is Aviation Week. Its editor, Mr. Robert Hotz, has written a most perceptive editorial concerning the ABM question. I am aware that Mr. Hotz's magazine will be characterized by the opposition forces of the ABM as a part of the military-industrial complex. However, I think it also fair to note that this journal can also speak from the vantage of close scrutiny of the issues involved and with the authority of an informed and accurate news gathering organization that has familiarity with the field.

In the light of the foregoing, Mr. President, I think it is especially interesting that the editors of Aviation Week have addressed themselves to the "question of time" in relation to our defense needs. This is an editorial which can contribute a great deal to our understanding and solution of the ABM issue.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A QUESTION OF TIME

(By Robert Hotz)

The fate of this nation over the next decade will hinge on whether Congress votes to proceed with the development of an anti-ballistic missile system (ABM). This is the crux of the issue now before the country. It transcends all of the comparatively trivial issues that have generated most of the public debate on this subject.

The guts of the ABM problem now is whether Congress will buy, at a cost of from $200–300 million, the time that will enable the U.S. to maintain its capability to meet the spearhead of the Soviet threat if it materializes in the 1974–75 period. Congress' alternative is to foreclose this country's option and create a development lag that will leave the U.S. unable to respond to this crisis until three or four years after it occurs. Those potential three or four years of nuclear nakedness between 1974 and 1978 are what are at stake in the current ABM debate on Capitol Hill.

The $200–300 million cost is not, of course, the price of the fully deployed ABM system. It is the difference between proceeding with the next stage of operational development with the two Minuteman sites in the west which will maintain the capability to meet the growth rate of the Soviet threat and the cost of proceeding at a strictly research and development level with the Kwajalein facility. The latter will inevitably produce a four-year lag in the possibilities of operational deployment in sufficient strength to blunt the Soviet spearhead.

It is a matter of incontrovertible fact that the Soviet Union is well along on a program of weapons development aimed, by its own admission, at achieving nuclear superiority over the United States or any other potential enemy or combination thereof. This weapons development has proceeded at a steady and inexorable pace despite what the U.S. and other countries have done.

GOAL OF SUPERIORITY

The Soviet Union's goal is nuclear superiority, not parity. The Soviet leaders apparently understand the potential value of nuclear superiority better than many U.S. policy makers. This despite the fact that the U.S. was the first to use its nuclear superiority effectively as a major policy instrument against the USSR in the 1962 Cuban missile crisis.

In 1962 the U.S. had an unquestionable superiority in nuclear weapons and delivery systems with Atlas and Titan ICBMs, plus the large fleet of B–52 intercontinental bombers. It was a desperate move to reduce this margin of superiority that apparently motivated the Soviets to deploy medium-range Sandals to Cuba within range of key U.S. targets. It was a move similar to that in a chess game when a pawn reaches the last row and is instantly transformed into a powerful queen. The Soviet MRBMs in Cuba suddenly became the strategic equivalent of the SS–6 first-generation Vostok-booster ICBMs with their 20 clustered liquid-fuel engines deployed with flatcar launchers on spurs along the trans-Siberian railroad.

Contrary to popular belief at the time, the MRBMs in Cuba were not targeted against U.S. cities but against key communications, command and control centers and soft SAC air bases. Offering much less warning time than Siberian launched ICBMs, the Cuban MRBMs had the task of crippling the U.S. ability to launch its retaliatory forces.

When the U.S. made it clear that this continued deployment in Cuba was unacceptable and demanded the missiles' removal, the Soviet policy makers had to decide whether the U.S. had both the forces and the will to use them in nuclear retaliation against the USSR. When the U.S. put its nuclear forces into a strike configuration, the Soviets had no stomach to bluff further. They withdrew their missiles from Cuba.

DIPLOMATIC LEVERAGE

They felt that the U.S. was not bluffing because all of their intelligence sensors—human, electronic and photographic—told them that the U.S. was in a condition to exercise its tremendous nuclear superiority. The Strategic Air Command's bomb-loaded B–52s were blips on Soviet radars. ELINT told them that SAC ICBMs were counted down to final launch configuration.

No country on this tiny planet would care to proceed further in that kind of situation. The Soviets backed down and so would any other government in a similar situation.

Ever since that humiliating defeat, the Soviet Union has made a mighty effort to wipe out the margin of U.S. nuclear superiority. Its goal was to reverse the situation by achieving its own significant margin of nuclear superiority that could provide it with the same force of diplomatic leverage that the U.S. was able to exert over Cuba. The Soviets have developed, produced and deployed a whole new arsenal of nuclear weapons during the past six years in an armament program that has no parallel in history.

These weapons included mobile battlefield medium-range missiles for the European and Chinese theaters, hardened silo-based third and fourth-generation, ICMBs, nuclear-powered submarines with SLBMs, and FOBS (Fractional Orbital Bombardment System) or depressed trajectory ultra long-ranged ICBMs.

In addition, the Soviets have developed, produced and deployed a whole new generation of weapons for tactical nuclear war, stressing vertical envelopment, air transportability and independence of fixed, permanent bases.

None of these developments comes as any surprise to U.S. military planners and top level civilian policy makers. The reconnaissance satellite systems plus various other types of ELINT have produced pictures and progress reports on production and deployment of all these weapons.

Thus, it is possible for President Richard Nixon to know that there are approximately 900 Russian SS–11 Savage missiles operationally deployed in hardened, camouflaged silos and that they are being replaced by the SS–13 solid-fueled version of the storable, liquid-fueled Savage. These weapons are of the same class in range, accuracy and warhead capacity as the earlier versions of the U.S. Minuteman. They appear to be targeted primarily toward soft-type objectives such as cities and major industrial concentrations.

But the real concern that is now rippling through the Pentagon and the White House is caused by the SS–9 Scarp. The Scarp began initial operational deployment in 1965 and was first publicly displayed by the Soviets in their 50th anniversary of the revolution parade in November, 1967. The version displayed in the Moscow parade was an earlier model with a single 20–25 megaton warhead that led to an early interpretation that it was primarily a city-buster.

But later versions of the SS–9 have utilized three warheads that make separate re-entries with an impact footprint that roughly matches the deployment of a Minuteman wing. Tests in the Pacific have not yet revealed the characteristics of a fully developed multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicle (MIRV) system. But the developmental progress of the tests indicated that their only purpose could be to achieve such a capability.

DISTURBING CAPABILITY

During the 1967–68 period, SS–9 deployment in operational silos reached a total of about 200 and then stopped temporarily. Early in 1969 deployment was resumed at a rate that could give the USSR from 400 to 500 ready to go by 1974–75. This is a force sufficient—with the triple dispersed warhead—to knock out a high percentage of the hardened Minuteman silo sites.

It is this capability that has both the Pentagon and the White House deeply disturbed about its possible effect on the U.S. strategic deterrent section-strike strength and the position of this nation in international policy.

This is why the Nixon Administration is fighting so hard to proceed with a complete operational test installation of its ABM system at the two Minuteman sites in Montana and North Dakota. The Administration desperately wants to buy the additional development time for an ABM system that will eventually give it the capability to counter the Soviet threat in the 1975–80 period.

The ABM system that the Pentagon is now pushing into operational test phase is a far cry from the old Nike concept of the Army. It is far from perfected. But the system utilizes a new generation of technology in warheads, computers, missiles and radar. It is similar in concept and potential to the advanced ABM system the Soviets are deploying around Moscow.

Now there is no way in the world that U.S. policy makers can divine Soviet intentions. They must base their planning for this nation's defense on the capabilities of the foe, not his intentions.

CRITICAL CHESS GAME

In the nuclear age, the weapons development and deployment cycle is more like a chess game than a battle. Both sides have developed and scrapped several generations of nuclear weapons without using them. But they always press on to exploit new technology to develop superior capabilities in the hope that when the big international crunches come, as they inevitably do, one side will have outmaneuvered the other technically and strategically so that "check" can be called and the other will concede without the holocaust of a nuclear "mate." This is what happened in Cuba in 1962.

This is what the Soviet Union can do in reverse if it has a credible threat to the U.S. Minuteman force in 1975 and the U.S. has no credible counter to it. Because of the complexities of development of some phases of the ABM system and the long lead time required for production of certain key components, one fiscal year's delay in proceeding now will translate into a four-year lag in eventual deployment.

XUM

Congress is not really voting now on the issue of full ABM deployment. That decision should come in subsequent years commensurate with development progress and the scale of the Soviet threat.

What Congress is voting for now is simply whether it will give the U.S. time to prepare an effective counter to the Soviet SS–9 threat or whether it will allow the Soviets an opportunity to achieve significant nuclear superiority between 1974 and 1980 and exercise its resultant leverage.

Every senator and congressman should search the depths of his conscience before he votes on this momentous issue. The decision will determine the fate of his country and his children for many years to come.

ABM—THE LARGER QUESTIONS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, today's New York Times carries a perceptive column by Tom Wicker on the significance of the vote on the ABM upon the issue of priorities to be given to "military attitudes and military devices in the never-ending quest for national security."

He points out:

> At this stage of history and technology, what one great power can build and deploy, another can build and deploy—and probably will believe itself forced to.

This statement, it seems to me, goes right to the heart of the debate in the Congress and the country this year over arms budgets, of which the ABM is the symbol.

A similar point was made in an editorial appearing in yesterday's Washington Post, which pointed out that whichever way the vote goes on ABM, "the struggle over the size, course, and control of this country's gigantic military enterprise" has led to some notable achievements.

I was struck by Mr. Wicker's conclusion:

> There can be little further security in devices; what mankind needs instead is sensible political arrangments to help manage those he has.

One such arrangement would be an arms control agreement, and those of us who think as Mr. Wicker does cannot be proud of our record over these last 12 months in moving toward such an agreement. We know full well that the Soviets, after an initial reluctance, have stood ready for a year now to open talks on an arms control agreement. We have not matched their willingness and ultimately it is the cause of world peace which suffers.

We are a people justifiably confident of our technological abilities. The Apollo flight this week caps a stunning series of achievements in our manned space flight program, and it gives us a great sense of accomplishment. Much the same feeling of pride derives from our strategic weapons programs, particularly the Minutemen and Polaris. But we must take care that the comfort we draw from the technological miracles in our military devices does not divert us from the larger question of pursuing a stable world order.

Our current and most advanced ICBM, the Minuteman ICBM, can carry a 2,000 pound payload 5,300 miles with a quarter-mile accuracy. The next generation ICBM's—the WS120A, the ICM, and the ICBM–X—will carry 7,000-pound payloads up to 6,500 miles with a 1,200-foot accuracy. These refinements are well within our capabilities, and we can be reasonably certain that in due time the Pentagon will seek the funds to procure and deploy them.

But can we in conscience ignore the implications of this escalator? Which puts our national security in more jeopardy—building an ever-larger, more redundant stockpile of nuclear weapons and deploying them all over the world, or pausing for 12 months or so and seeking arms reductions? Which course will bring a more stable, more healthy, more prosperous world?

The old canard that the Soviets will gain on us should we choose to pause is just that, an old canard. We started out on our manned space flight program well behind the Soviets, but are today ahead. We are today well ahead of the Soviets in strategic nuclear power. In fact, it was a significant and little-appreciated surprise that the Soviets should agree to begin arms control talks when we are so much stronger than they. One can easily imagine the reaction in this country should the positions be reversed—that we agreed to arms control talks when the Soviets were ahead of us.

These are among the larger questions which we should keep before us during the ABM debate. Because Mr. Wicker's column and the Post editorial are so relevant, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 15, 1969]

THE FUTILITY OF DEVICES

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, July 14.—One of the Senate's leading Republicans is said to have observed privately that the controversy over an anti-ballistic-missile system was "a confrontation between the taxpayers and the munitions makers." That may be at the root of the question, but as it has developed to the point where the Senate is almost ready to vote, a great deal more is at stake.

Everyone concedes that the issue is close, but since the influential George Aiken of Vermont joined the opposition last week the edge appears to be against President Nixon's Safeguard plan. At the least, it now appears unlikely that the Administration can get outright approval for the proposal.

A CONTINUING DEBATE

But the history of issues as complicated as this one is that one debate and one roll-call seldom settle them; in Congressional procedures and the American political process there is so much room for maneuver that defeat or victory are only occasionally final. The Safeguard battle itself is only a continuation of the debate that began with Lyndon Johnson's Sentinel plan for an ABM.

So whatever happens in the coming week, it is altogether likely that the last will not yet have been said and done in the ABM debate. Even so, what the Senate does obviously will be of crucial importance in the final determination of this issue that may well be the most important of its kind during Mr. Nixon's term in office.

QUESTION OF MILITARY PRIORITY

It may well be that important, not only because of the money involved—which is not great, unless Safeguard leads on to a full-scale ABM system around our principal cities—and not even because of its potential effect on Soviet-American nuclear disarmament talks, whatever that effect might be. What is even more crucially involved in the Safeguard issue is the question of what priorities are going to be given to military attitudes and military devices in the never-ending quest for national security.

Considering how much public and Congressional opposition there is to Safeguard, some limited authority to proceed would be a considerable—though perhaps Pyrrhic—victory for the Pentagon and its Congressional and industrial constituencies. On the other hand, if this formidable complex of forces can be defeated on this issue—with Presidential prestige and power entirely on its side, with Secretary Laird playing every note on the anti-Communist, anti-Moscow scale, with the mystique of superior military knowledge, as well as secret intelligence, fully invoked—if the Pentagon loses in such circumstances, a turning point may well have been reached.

In the Pentagon itself, defeat on the ABM issue might lead military and civilian officials to recognize that Congress is at last ready to make a stand against unlimited military expenditure in the quest for security. So long as security was regarded largely as a military matter, and so long as any outlay of funds could be authorized if it was touted as increasing security, the Pentagon could go on demanding more and more weapons, more and more autonomy in determining what is and what is not necessary for security, and more and more money to support both.

THE REAL NEED

Even the debate on Safeguard, with all the ambiguities, contradictions, weaknesses and questions it has disclosed, should have helped persuade the public that at this stage of history and technology, what one great power can build and deploy, another can overcome—and probably will believe itself forced to. In such circumstances there can be little further security in devices; what mankind needs instead is sensible political arrangements to help manage those he has. It can at least be hoped that defeat for Safeguard might turn the world at last in that direction.

[From the Washington Post, July 14, 1969]

THE PRESIDENT, THE SENATE, AND THE ABM

It is hard to judge the degree to which the current round of tough talk coming out of both camps in the ABM debate is merely tactical. From the critics' insistence that they have the President licked, to Senator Dirksen's insistence that they do not and his mindless analogy of a possible one-vote majority with a one-point football win, much of the "no compromise" posture being adopted by both sides has the aspect of being just that: posturing.

This, in any event, is the best construction one can put on the solemn declaration of intent all around to go for a hard, close, mean "victory." For at the end of several months of controversy, there are also profoundly bitter feelings in the air, which have little to do with cool parliamentary tactics, and which, if indulged, could propel the Senate and the Administration into a mutually maiming conflict from which there would emerge only technical winners and losers. Neither reality nor necessity, however, argues for this result. For the facts are that the two sides have fought each other to a standoff, that there is room for accommodation between the positions they have taken, and that the kind of "victory" now being demanded could do considerable damage to whichever side was simultaneously strong enough and foolish enough to achieve it.

What seems to have occurred is that two related but separate debates have become confused. One, in which Safeguard functions in some measure as a symbol, is the struggle

XUM

over the size, course, and control of this country's gigantic military enterprise. The critics have done well in this encounter already. They have wrested crucial procedural concessions from an Armed Services Committee accustomed to paying its opposition little mind; they have forced the pro-ABM spokesmen to make their case with a degree of seriousness and care rarely required of those putting forth the need for any weapons system; from the MOL program to chemical warfare they have stopped some things from happening, and they have also made it plain to the Pentagon that the palmy days of ask-and-it-shall-be-given are over. Still, among the legislators who have managed so much, you may find a tendency to disregard these achievements or not even to perceive them and a consequent insistence on the need for a symbolic victory of their own over the President on the ABM. It's not the ABM—this thinking goes—it's the principle of the thing, or what it has come to seem to mean.

All this has managed to distort the second argument, namely that over Safeguard itself—its cost, purpose, efficacy, and diplomatic-strategic ramifications. At the center of that argument is a semantic perplexity: the meaning of the term "deployment" as it is used in three measures destined for the Senate's scrutiny. These are the President's program providing freedom to begin minimal deployment mainly of radars, computers and other software (not actual missiles or warheads) at two ABM sites; a Hart-Cooper amendment that would grant research, development, testing and evaluation rights to the Administration (along with related procurement authorization), but would forbid deployment of any kind at actual ABM sites under this or previously passed legislation; and a proposed "compromise" amendment that would circumscribe what could be deployed by the Administration at the two sites and make certain other moves—acquisition of land, construction of silos, and so on—contingent on congressionl approval.

The opponents of the ABM, who are backing the Hart-Cooper amendment and who contend that they are not killing the ABM but simply delaying deployment until its need and usefulness have been established, claim that the Administration does not actually intend to begin much of its "software" deployment in Fiscal 1970 anyway—much less its weapons deployment. From this they argue that their amendment would deny the Administration nothing other than the commitment to proceed with this system that is implicit in any decision to deploy. The Administration counters that certain critical testing and evaluation can only be achieved at the two forbidden deployment sites, which it characterizes as a limbo between actual deployment and mere development with the use of the term "prototype-like." Finally, both the opponents and the proponents of the Safeguard are, for the most part, also expressing dissatisfaction with the proposed compromise, since one side believes it circumscribes nothing the Administration meant to do in the coming year, while the Administration believes that in its present form it circumscribes much too much. When you probe these matters with the participants in the debate you quickly come back to the question of definitions, of what the other side is thought to mean or have in mind by its terms—especially by the term "deployment." Clearly, this semantic confusion can have its uses. In the ambiguity lies the ground for resolution of some difference and for a compromise measure that does not defeat the legitimate interests of the White House or roll over the more reasonable qualms of the critics for no purpose other than trouncing them.

If Mr. Nixon loses in the Senate, he could conceivably retrieve his defeat in a House-Senate conference. Moreover, the senators who had denied him outright his request on the eve of the arms talks could come to rue the day they had done so. From the point of view of political vulnerability alone, this is worth considering. On the other side, as Senator Aiken has so aptly pointed out, Mr. Nixon stands to win very little with a narrow, hard-fought, pressured victory. Even with House approval, it will hardly be convincing baggage to take to the arms talks. Leaving half the Senate in the state of a wounded animal cannot be said to bode well for gaining some degree of cooperation on future questions of this kind—and it is cooperation, consent, common purpose rather than a numercial majority that the President so sorely needs to be strong enough to make his moves in the field of arms control as well as in the field of defense. In short, as a test case, the ABM vote is one that neither side can win closely with any lasting profit to its cause. Thus it is in the interest of both to make an accommodation. The narrower question of the ABM authorization, stripped of its symbolism, provides plenty of room for this, and men such as Hugh Scott and George Aiken appear ready—if they will be heeded—to help bring it about.

BACK CONTAMINATION PROCEEDINGS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, 2 months ago, NASA announced that it was implementing a change in the procedures of returning the Apollo 11 astronauts from their spacecraft to the waiting carrier after their return from the moon. Since the previous plan had been devised in an effort to minimize any possible back contamination from microorganisms which might have been brought back from the moon, I immediately wrote a letter to Dr. Thomas O. Paine, Administrator of NASA, asking for a fuller explanation of the proposed change. I ask unanimous consent that NASA's reply, and a detailed description of NASA's contamination control program, appear in the Record at the end of my remarks.

The essence of his reply was that, because of experience in recovering previous Apollo spacecraft, the Apollo 11 sequence was being revised in order to minimize possible injury to the astronauts while not measurably increasing the risk of back contamination from the moon.

NASA has long been concerned with the possibility of back contamination and, in an effort to obtain the broadest possible scientific advice, created in 1964 the Interagency Committee on Back Contamination—ICBC—composed of representatives of the Public Health Service, Department of Agriculture, Department of the Interior, NASA, and the National Academy of Sciences. Without going into the history of the ICBC, let me just say that it has not been a paper committee, that it has met at frequent intervals, and that NASA has not implemented one single procedure in this area that was contrary to the recommendations of this committee. It is extremely important to note, then, that the ICBC studied the proposed changes in Apollo 11 procedure with great care, and that NASA did not proceed with this plan until it had received the unanimous approval of the ICBC.

Of course, in this area, as in virtually all scientific disciplines, it is difficult if not impossible to get 100-percent agreement from everybody. There are even those who still believe that the earth is flat. But some biologists, who apparently were not completely informed regarding the details, have raised a raucous voice against the new procedure. And certain of the press has seen fit to print the position of the dissenters while ignoring the preponderance of qualified opinion.

Well, difference of scientific opinion is one thing, and I have come to accept that, just as I accept difference of opinion among my political colleagues. But in the last few days, allegations have been raised that certain members of the ICBC had resigned under protest and that other members were coerced into giving their approval to the new procedure.

Since this is a very serious charge, I raised the question with members of the ICBC and I have received several telegrams and letters which I should like to put in the Record for inspection by Senators.

The conclusions to be drawn are as follows: First, the ICBC has a well established operating procedure which allows for dissent and for the filing of minority reports. No such dissent nor minority report was filed. Second, no member of the ICBC has resigned. Third, no member of the ICBC has been coerced. Fourth, no member has changed his view since the original approval was given.

Now these are the facts; they are not very glamorous and, therefore, probably not too interesting from the viewpoint of the news. I hope, however, that Senators when studying the matter will give it the mature judgment that it deserves.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

National Aeronautics
and Space Administration,
Washington, D.C., June 4, 1969.

Hon. Clinton P. Anderson,
Chairman, Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: This is further in response to your letter of May 15 regarding the recovery procedures for the Apollo 11 mission.

The subject of possible back-contamination of the earth's biosphere through Apollo operations has, of course, received our very serious attention for some time. NASA and other agencies of Government have spent considerable effort to insure that everything possible is done to preclude such contamination consistent with safe accomplishment of the mission. To this end, in 1964 an Interagency Committee on Back Contamination (ICBC) was established to provide expert guidance to us on all matters concerning possible back-contamination. This Committee, composed of members from the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, Health, Education and Welfare (U.S. Public Health Service), National Academy of Sciences and NASA, has the responsibility of insuring that our Apollo mission plans do not violate the integrity of the Earth's biosphere. Hence the preventive procedures we plan to employ must have the ICBC's approval before implementation.

A very difficult problem and decision we

XUM

and the ICBC have had to resolve is the one you mention, that is, all constraints considered, determining the optimum recovery procedure which would protect the lives of the returned astronauts while at the same time providing the lowest practicable possibility of back-contamination. Our efforts have been directed toward both recovery procedures and methods to prevent uncontained lunar material from entering and leaving the Lunar Module and the Command Module.

The current astronaut-recovery procedure, which has been approved by the ICBC for the Apollo 11 mission, involves egressing them from the spacecraft into a raft and transferring them by helicopter to the recovery ship where they will enter the Mobile Quarantine Facility. The astronauts will don Biological Isolation Garments prior to departing the spacecraft if sea conditions permit; otherwise the garments will be donned in the life raft.

We had considered having the astronauts remain inside the Command Module while it was hoisted onto the recovery ship. Since this represented a departure from the present recovery procedures which have been developed over a period of several years and which are based on the cumulative experience of Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo, a thorough review was made of the difficulties involved in transferring the Command Module to the carrier deck, particularly in a heavy sea. The hazards demonstrated in actual practice led to our decision to transfer the astronauts to the carrier deck by helicopter. The current astronaut recovery procedures received ICBC approval for the Apollo 11 mission only after the ICBC became convinced that (1) there was a real hazard involved in sea retrieval of a manned spacecraft and (2) any increased risk of biosphere contamination was not significant. The former concern has been validated in both tests and previous end-of-mission recoveries. Test data has dictated the installation by a swimmer of a recovery loop or sling onto the spacecraft prior to lifting it from the water because the integral loop on the Command Module will not accommodate all possible recovery loads. Such a procedure is acceptable to us for use only on an unoccupied spacecraft. At the conclusion of the Apollo 9 mission, for example, the spacecraft was dropped back into the water due to a mechanical failure of the crane.

The increase in the contamination potential from extracting the astronauts has been minimized by programing improved housekeeping procedures by the astronauts and by recognition of the scrubbing action of the Lunar Module and Command Module lithium hydroxide (LiOH) cannisters on the cabin atmosphere. The astronauts will now bag all items exposed to the lunar surface prior to transfer to the Command Module. They plan to vacuum the cabin at frequent intervals during the return trip from lunar orbit. Of additional significance, however, is recently developed date which indicates that the LiOH cannisters will remove essentially all of the particulate matter from the cabin atmosphere. Thus the complementary effects of of minimizing cabin interior contamination and understanding LiOH filtering capabilities have led us to conclude, and the ICBC to concur, that the recovery procedure described does not materially increase the probability of earth contamination.

In these few brief paragraphs I have not described all the detailed procedural steps we plan to take to reduce the possibility of Earth back-contamination. For instance, the maximum number of items possible which have contacted the lunar surface will either be left on the lunar surface or in the LM. This and the many other steps we are taking represent a heavy concentration of effort to tighten our procedures to minimize the possibility of back-contamination of the earth's biosphere.

If we can provide any additional information, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

HOMER E. NEWELL,
Acting Administrator.

Contamination Control Program

In 1964 an Interagency Committee on Back Contamination (ICBC) was established. The function of this Committee was to assist NASA in developing a program to prevent the contamination of the Earth from lunar materials following manned lunar exploration. The committee charter included specific authority to review and approve the plans and procedures to prevent back contamination. The committee membership includes representatives from the Public Health Service, Department of Agriculture, Department of the Interior, NASA, and the National Academy of Sciences.

Over the last several years NASA has developed facilities, equipment and operational procedures to provide an adequate back contamination program for the Apollo missions. This program of facilities and procedures, which is well beyond the current state-of-the-art, and the overall effort have resulted in a laboratory with capabilities which have never previously existed. The scheme of isolation of the Apollo crewmen and lunar samples, and the exhaustive test programs to be conducted are extensive in scope and complexity.

The Apollo Back Contamination Program can be divided into three phases. The first phase covers the procedures which are followed by the crew while in flight to reduce and, if possible, eliminate the return of lunar surface contaminants in the command module.

The second phase includes spacecraft and crew recovery and the provisions for isolation and transport of the crew, spacecraft, and lunar samples to the Manned Spacecraft Center. The third phase encompasses the quarantine operations and preliminary sample analysis in the Lunar Receiving Laboratory.

A primary step in preventing back contamination is careful attention to spacecraft cleanliness following lunar surface operations. This includes use of special cleaning equipment, stowage provisions for lunar-exposed equipment, and crew procedures for proper "housekeeping."

LUNAR MODULE OPERATIONS

The lunar module has been designed with a bacterial filter system to prevent contamination of the lunar surface when the cabin atmosphere is released at the start of the lunar exploration.

Prior to reentering the LM after lunar surface exploration, the crewmen will brush any lunar surface dust or dirt from the space suit using the suit gloves. They will scrape their overboots on the LM footpad and while ascending the LM ladder dislodge any clinging particles by a kicking action.

After entering the LM and pressurizing the cabin, the crew will doff their portable life support system, oxygen purge system, lunar boots, EVA gloves, etc.

The equipment shown in Table I as jettisoned equipment will be assembled and bagged to be subsequently left on the lunar surface. The lunar boots, likely the most contaminated items, will be placed in a bag as early as possible to minimize the spread of lunar particles.

Following LM rendezvous and docking with the CM, the CM tunnel will be pressurized and checks made to insure that an adequate pressurized seal has been made. During this period, the LM, space suits, and lunar surface equipment will be vacuumed. To accomplish this, one additional lunar orbit has been added to the mission.

The lunar module cabin atmosphere will be circulated through the environmental control system suit circuit lithium hydroxide (Li-OH) cannister to filter particles from the atmosphere. A minimum of five hours weightless operation and filtering will reduce the original airborne contamination to about 10–15 per cent.

To prevent dust particles from being transferred from the LM atmosphere to the CM, a constant flow of 0.8 lbs/hr oxygen will be initiated in the CM at the start of combined LM/CM operation. Oxygen will flow from the CM into the LM then overboard through the LM cabin relief valve or through spacecraft leakage. Since the flow of gas is always from the CM to the LM, diffusion and flow of dust contamination into the CM will be minimized. After this positive gas flow has been established from the CM, the tunnel hatch will be removed.

The CM pilot will transfer the lunar surface equipment stowage bags into the LM one at a time. The equipment listed in Table 1 as equipment transferred will then be bagged using the "Buddy System" and transferred back into the CM where the equipment will be stowed. The only equipment which will not be bagged at this time are the crewmen's space suits and flight logs.

Following the transfer of the LM crew and equipment, the spacecraft will be separated and the three crewmen will start the return to Earth. The separated LM contains the remainder of the lunar exposed equipment listed in Table 1.

COMMAND MODULE OPERATIONS

Through the use of operational and housekeeping procedures the command module cabin will be purged of lunar surface and/or other particulate contamination prior to Earth reentry. These procedures start while the LM is docked with the CM and continue through reentry into the Earth's atmosphere.

The LM crewmen will doff their space suits immediately upon separation of the LM and CM. The space suits will be stowed and will not be used again during the trans-Earth phase unless an emergency occurs.

Specific periods for cleaning the spacecraft using the vacuum brush have been established. Visible liquids will be removed by the liquid dump system. Towels will be used by the crew to wipe surfaces clean of liquids and dirt particles. The three ECS suit hoses will be located at random positions around the spacecraft to insure positive ventilation, cabin atmosphere filtration, and avoid partitioning.

During the trans-Earth phase, the command module atmosphere will be continually filtered through the environmental control system lithium hydroxide canister. This will remove essentially all airborne dust particles. After about 63 hours operation essentially none (10–90 per cent) of the original contaminates will remain.

LUNAR MISSION RECOVERY OPERATIONS

Following landing and the attachment of the flotation collar to the command module, the swimmer in a biological isolation garment (BIG) will open the spacecraft hatch, pass three BIGs into the spacecraft, and close the hatch.

The crew will don the BIGs and then egress into a life raft containing a decontaminant solution. The hatch will be closed immediately after egress. Tests have shown that the crew can don their BIGs in less than 5 minutes under ideal sea conditions. The spacecraft hatch will only be open for a matter of a few minutes. The spacecraft and crew will be decontaminated by the swimmer using a liquid agent.

Crew retrieval will be accomplished by helicopter to the carrier and subsequent crew transfer to the Mobile Quarantine Facility. The spacecraft will be retrieved by the aircraft carrier.

BIOLOGICAL ISOLATION GARMENT

Biological isolation garment (BIGs), will be donned in the CM just prior to egress and helicopter pickup and will be worn until the crew enters the Mobile Quarantine Facility aboard the primary recovery ship.

The suit is fabricated of a light weight

XUM

cloth fabric which completely covers the wearer and serves as a biological barrier. Built into the hood area is a face mask with a plastic visor, air inlet flapper valve, and an air outlet biological filter.

Two types of BIGs are used in the recovery operation. One is worn by the recovery swimmer. In this type garment, the inflow air (inspired) is filtered by a biological filter to preclude possible contamination of support personnel. The second type is worn by the astronauts. The inflow gas is not filtered, but the outflow gas (respired) is passed through a biological filter to preclude contamination of the air.

MOBILE QUARANTINE FACILITY

The Mobile Quarantine Facility, is equipped to house six people for a period up to 10 days. The interior is divided into three sections—lounge area, galley, and sleep/bath area. The facility is powered through several systems to interface with various ships, aircraft, and transportation vehicles. The shell is air and water tight. The principal method of assuring quarantine is to filter effluent air and provide a negative pressure differential for biological containment in the event of leaks.

Non-fecal liquids from the trailer are chemically treated and stored in special containers. Fecal wastes will be contained until after the quarantine period. Items are passed in or out of the MQF through a submersible transfer lock. A complete communications system is provided for intercom and external communications to land bases from ship or aircraft. Emergency alarms are provided for oxygen alerts while in transport by aircraft for fire, loss of power and loss of negative pressure.

Specially packaged and controlled meals will be passed into the facility where they will be prepared in a micro-wave oven. Medical equipment to complete immediate postlanding crew examination and tests are provided.

LUNAR RECEIVING LABORATORY

The final phase of the back contamination program is completed in the MSC Lunar Receiving Laboratory. The crew and spacecraft are quarantined for a minimum of 21 days after lunar liftoff and are released based upon the completion of prescribed test requirements and results. The lunar sample will be quarantined for a period of 50 to 80 days depending upon the result of extensive biological tests.

The LRL serves four basic purposes:

The quarantine of the lunar mission crew and spacecraft, the containment of lunar and lunar-exposed materials and quarantine testing to search for adverse effects of lunar material upon terrestrial life.

The preservation and protection of the lunar samples.

The performance of time critical investigations.

The preliminary examination of returned samples to assist in an intelligent distribution of samples to principal investigators.

The LRL has the only vacuum system in the world with space gloves operated by a man leading directly into a vacuum chamber at pressures of 10^{-7} torr. (mm Hg). It has a low level counting facility, whose background count is an order of magnitude better than other known counters. Additionally, it is a facility that can handle a large variety of biological specimens inside Class III biological cabinets designed to contain extremely hazardous pathogenic material.

The LRL covers 83,000 square feet of floor space and includes several distinct areas. These are the Crew Reception Area (CRA), Vacuum Laboratory, Sample Laboratories (Physical and Bio-Science) and an administrative and support area. Special building systems are employed to maintain air flow into sample handling areas and the CRA to sterilize liquid waste and to incinerate contaminated air from the primary containment systems.

The biomedical laboratories provide for the required quarantine tests to determine the effect of lunar samples on terrestrial life. These tests are designed to provide data upon which to base the decision to release lunar material from quarantine.

Among the tests:

a. Germ-free mice will be exposed to lunar material and observed continuously for 21 days for any abnormal changes. Periodically, groups will be sacrificed for pathologic observation.

b. Lunar material will be applied to 12 different culture media and maintained under several environmental conditions. The media will then be observed for bacterial or fungal growth. Detailed inventories of the microbial flora of the spacecraft and crew have been maintained so that any living material found in the sample testing can be compared against this list of potential contaminants taken to the Moon by the crew or spacecraft.

c. Six types of human and animal tissue culture cell lines will be maintained in the laboratory and together with embryonated eggs are exposed to the lunar material. Based on cellular and/or other changes, the presence of viral material can be established so that special tests can be conducted to identify and isolate the type of virus present.

d. Thirty-three species of plants and seedlings will be exposed to lunar material. Seed germination, growth of plant cells or the health of seedlings then observed, and histological, microbiological and biochemical techniques used to determine the cause of any suspected abnormality.

e. A number of lower animals will be exposed to lunar material. These specimens include fish, birds, oysters, shrimp, cockroaches, houseflies, planaria, paramecia and euglena. If abnormalities are noted, further tests will be conducted to determine if the condition is transmissible from one group to another.

The crew reception area provides biological containment for the flight crew and 12 support personnel. The nominal occupancy is about 14 days but the facility is designed and equipped to operate for considerably longer if necessary.

STERILIZATION AND RELEASE OF THE SPACECRAFT

Postflight testing and inspection of the spacecraft is presently limited to investigation of anomalies which happened during the flight. Generally, this entails some specific testing of the spacecraft and removal of certain components of systems for further analysis. The timing of postflight testing is important so that corrective action may be taken for subsequent flights.

The schedule calls for the spacecraft to be returned to port where a team will deactivate pyrotechnics, flush and drain fluid systems (except water). This operation will be confined to the exterior of the spacecraft. The spacecraft will then be flown to the LRL and placed in a special room for storage, sterilization, and postflight checkout.

Brooks Air Force Base, Tex.,
July 11, 1969.

Hon. Clinton P. Anderson,
Chairman, Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

As a member of and the executive secretary to the Interagency Committee on Back Contamination, I wish to express concurrence in the egress recovery procedures to be used on Apollo 11. This was a unanimous committee opinion at the March 1969 meeting for the first lunar landing. Additionally, Dr. Klein has not resigned from the committee and was present at the March meeting. To my knowledge there has never been a suggestion of coercion by any of the committee membership nor by NASA on the agreed upon recovery mode for Apollo 11. Furthermore, the interagency agreement signed by the secretaries of Agriculture, HEW and Interior, the president of the National Academy of Sciences and the Administrator of NASA, clearly establishes a procedure for presenting a minority report by a person or persons on the Interagency Committee. No minority report has been received from any member. To my knowledge, no member has privately refuted the public position agreed to in March and May meeting nor has anyone changed his opinion in writing (see minutes of March, May, and June meetings). The entire membership, over the past 3 years has carefully considered the probability of back contamination from the Moon against other aspects of the Apollo 11 mission, and based upon our considered judgment believe that all necessary precautions are being taken to preclude any undue risk.

Col. John E. Pickering.

Rochester, N.Y.,
July 11, 1969.

Senator Clinton Anderson,
Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

As the Representative of the National Academy of Sciences on the Interagency committee on back contamination I wish to reject emphatically the allegations that my recorded opinions have been uttered under coercion or that my publicly voiced attitude differs from my privately expressed opinion. I am intimately acquainted with the recovery and quarantine procedures plan for Apollo Eleven and I concur with the committee view that they are adequate. Whatever improvements may or should be contemplated for future and more elaborate missions, there must be no change in the present schedule for the Apollo Eleven launch. I have not only recorded my opinion to this effect in the minutes of the Interagency Committee but I have publicly stated them on a nationwide TV broadcast on June 13.

Wolf Vishnicac,
Chairman, Department of Biology, University of Rochester.

Morehead City, N.C.,
July 11, 1969.

Chairman Clinton P. Anderson,
Aeronautics and Space Science Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Honorable Anderson: I am a member of the Inter Agency Committee on Back Contamination (ICBC) and want to let you know that I concurred with the back contamination protocol plans for Apollo eleven. In arriving at our decision concerning the procedures to be used the members were not coerced. Actually we always had the opportunity of filing a minority opinion and no member has resigned under protest. Dr. Sencer and our efforts throughout have been directed toward providing the best possible procedures for preventing possible back contamination under the conditions of the space flight as we understand them.

Respectfully,

Dr. T. R. Rice,
Director of the Center for the Estuarine and Menhaden Research, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Interior Department.

Palo Alto, Calif.,
July 11, 1969.

Hon. Clinton P. Anderson,
Chairman, Aeronautics and Space Science Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

It has come to my attention that allegations have been made concerning my activities as a member of the Inter Agency Committee for Back Contamination. For the record let me state that I have not resigned from the ICBC. In considering the Apollo 11 mission I was not coerced by anyone in reaching decisions regarding recovery operations or quarantine procedures. My views on these matters were fully discussed by the ICBC and I have not changed them. As a result of our deliberations the ICBC recommended that the mission proceed as currently planned on schedule. I supported this position then as I do now.

HAROLD P. KLINE,
Ames Research Center, NASA, Moffett Field, Calif.

RALEIGH, N.C.,
July 10, 1969.

Chairman CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Aeronautics and Space Science Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SENATOR ANDERSON. Permit me to voice to you a note of reassurance concerning the prevention of back contamination during Apollo 11. I have been intimately associated with this program for six years and have been involved in all of the discussions and decisions of back contamination, as a consultant to the Interagency Committee on Back Contamination and as a professional in the contamination control field I find the Apollo 11 recovery and quarantine protocol to be entirely in keeping with our responsibilities and adequate for this flight. In addition may I state that no committee member has been discharged or has resigned and that the business of the committee was always conducted with the right of filing a minority report. Furthermore there has been no coercion of the members during our months of meetings preparing for the Apollo 11 mission. Finally please be assured that there has been no change in Dr. Senser's policies as chairman and of the deep conviction on my part that the planned procedures for Apollo 11 are entirely reasonable in relation to the predicted risk and under the conditions of this manned space flight. Respectfully,

F. BRIGGS PHILLIPS, Ph. D.,
Director, Becton-Dickinson Research Center.

KENNEDY SPACE CENTER, FLA.,
July 11, 1969.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Senate Space Committee,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

I am greatly distressed to hear of the statements made at this time about the ICBC as a member of the interagency committee on back contamination (ICBC), I have participated in every discussion and decision by the committee. These sessions have always been lively and every member or presenter of data has had ample opportunity to discuss, question or argue. In addition the ICBC charter allows the filing of a minority report by any member.

I have never been coerced in regards to any decision of the committee. I have never felt the need to file a minority opinion. Further, as one of the principal persons responsible for implementing the quarantine and back contamination program, I fully agree with our current plans and feel they will adequately protect the earth's biosphere.

My alternate on the committee, Dr. W. W. Kemmerer, Jr., agrees with the above statements.

CHARLES A. BERRY, M.D.,
Director of Medical Research and Operations, NASA Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Tex.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., July 12, 1969.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As an alternate member of the Interagency Committee on Back Contamination for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, I have served on the committee since its inception. Although our regulatory function is carried out by the Agricultural Research Service where I am assigned, the member for USDA has always been from the Office of the Secretary and in a position to determine and interpret policy.

I do not have a written copy of the allegations made, but as I understand it they involve (1) Dr. Kline's membership and his position on back contamination prevention techniques, (2) the private vs. public position of ICBC members, (3) attempted or implied coercion, and (4) lack of consideration of all possible modes of recovery.

To my certain knowledge, Dr. Kline is still a member of ICBC. He participated in decisions concerning recovery as a brief review of the minutes will show. So far as his personal convictions, as well as those of other ICBC members, are concerned, I have never heard anyone express one opinion to me in private and then proceed to sign for their agencies in a contrary manner. As would and should be expected, scrupulous attention was paid to every facet of the flight from the point of view of containment. The committee recommended both equipment and procedural changes and these have been made. Differences of opinion were vigorously debated, but never was coercion attempted or implied.

Finally, the recovery procedures were considered exhaustively. The minutes will show these discussions go back many months. NASA's position was certainly a reasonable one. They were willing to adopt any procedure that did not jeopardize crew safety. Anyone who views egress in biological isolation garments as a frank breach of quarantine has failed to consider procedures and equipment which start to function on the lunar surface and continue all the way home. Except for navigation and the ordinary human functions of eating, sleeping, etc., most of the transit time to Earth will be occupied in preparing the spacecraft so that the open hatch does not represent a frank break of containment. What risk there is, is unknown, but in the considered opinion of the committee it is acceptable. The committee is on record that certain equipment and procedural changes are desirable for future missions when deeper probes of the lunar surface will be conducted, but it agreed that these changes need not delay Apollo 11.

Sincerely,

A. B. PARKS,
Assistant to the Administrator.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1969.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Aeronautical and Space Science
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As a member of the Interagency Committee on Back Contamination representing the Apollo Program Office, I am familiar with all of the deliberations of this group since January 1968. The Committee has been provided with all pertinent program information and has participated in many open and frank discussions with program officials. There has been vigorous debate over the various problems and considerations related to containment and quarantine as the final procedures evolved. I emphatically deny any attempted or implied coercion of any Committee members. I am not aware of any differences between public and private opinions expressed by any members. There certainly have been none expressed by me.

It is difficult to decide what steps are really adequate when one is taking precautions against unknown risks. Just as there are critics who feel we are not taking adequate precautions, there are those who feel our precautions are extreme and a waste of the taxpayers' money.

I am in full agreement with the ICBC formal position that the procedures for containment and quarantine planned for Apollo 11 are reasonable.

Sincerely yours,

LEE R. SCHEER,
Director, Apollo Lunar Exporation Office.

ATLANTA, GA.,
July 14, 1969.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

As a member and co-chairman of the NASA Interagency Committee on back contamination I submit the following:

1. I consider the landing and recovery operation for Apollo 11 as adopted unanimously by ICBC, adequate to fulfill requirements for containment of astronauts, equipment, and materials.

2. No member of the committee, to my knowledge, has privately stated views contrary to those publicly adopted by the committee.

3. The interagency agreement establishing the ICBC provides adequate safeguards for minority reporting. To my knowledge no minority reports have been received to this date.

JOHN R. BAGBY, Jr.,
Deputy Director, National Communicable Disease Center.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF MARINE RESOURCES,
Washington, D.C., July 14, 1969.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: In my capacity as Department of the Interior representative on the Interagency Committee on Back Contamination, I wish to state that I support the Committee's position on post-landing recovery procedures for Apollo 11 astronauts. The decision to approve egress from the command module was made after assurance from NASA that measures specified by the Committee would be followed to prevent release of lunar particles to the earth environment and that the astronauts would be kept in effective isolation during recovery and transfer to the Lunar Receiving Laboratory.

The Interagency Committee on Back Contamination has been working with NASA officials on containment and quarantine requirements in the landing and recovery operations since the Committee was first organized and this subject has been under intensive examination during the past year. Members of the Committee have expressed themselves freely and NASA has responded to recommendations in order to reach agreement on procedures which would satisfy quarantine and containment as well as safety of the astronauts.

The Committee has under consideration recommendations for changes in recovery and transfer procedures for later Apollo flights. Subsequent decisions on this will be based upon the results of Apollo 11 and the fact that future missions will sample the lunar surface at deeper levels thus increasing the possibility of returning viable organisms.

If there is life on the moon, which is very unlikely, there could be some risk of contamination from Apollo 11 and possibly later missions. However, I am satisfied that the recovery procedures to be followed by NASA on Apollo 11 will keep this risk to a minimum.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD H. ECKLES,
Program Manager, Marine Resources Development.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I should like to respond briefly to the statement made yesterday by the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Young), regarding the Federal judicial system as administered in the district of Massachusetts, and to correct some inaccuracies which it contained. Senator Young has suggested that the jury in the Spock trial which was held in the district of Massachusetts was "hand-picked." The fact is, Mr. President, that the defense counsel, as prescribed by Congress in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedures, plays a significant role with the prosecution in the jury selection process. The fact that the defense counsel in criminal cases of this nature has no limit on challenges for cause and 10 peremptory challenges of jurors drawn by lot in open court from a representative districtwide juror pool should speak for itself.

Senator Young has said that he suspects that the assignment of the trial judge to this case "was arranged by the assignment commissioner at the behest of the district attorney." Mr. President, I know of no such office as assignment commissioner in the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts. It is my understanding that after an indictment has been returned, assignments of judges to trial are made by lot.

The U.S. attorney has no voice in the assignment proceedings. Further, the U.S. attorney for the district of Massachusetts in that trial was an attorney whose professional ethics are beyond reproach and who carried out his duties as prosecuting attorney in the finest traditions of the Federal bar during his entire tenure in that office.

Finally, Senator Young refers personally to the Honorable Francis J. W. Ford, as a "tyrannical" trial judge who showed "merciless severity" through the trial. The Senator from Ohio describes Judge Ford as having been "nominated by President Herbert Hoover to be U.S. district judge." The facts are these, Mr. President: Judge Ford was appointed to the U.S. district court by his good friend, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, after having served with distinction as the district's U.S. attorney. From the date of his appointment, Judge Ford has brought the highest credit to himself and to our Federal judicial system. He is respected in Massachusetts and beyond as a jurist who has been assigned to and has treated with unimpeachable fairness some of the most difficult cases to be heard in the district's judicial history. The well-deserved esteem in which Judge Ford is held by members of the judiciary and the bar is a tribute to the integrity, the keen legal mind, and the highest standards of judicial conduct which have marked his career. His distinguished record needs no defense in this body. but in a day when the judiciary as a whole has been the constant target for abuse and criticism, we of Massachusetts can take pride in the respect which Judge Ford has brought to our Federal bench and cannot leave uncorrected the errors of fact and characterization which reflect upon it.

RADIO STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA ON THE ABUSE OF LIBERTY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on July 9, 1969, I made a statement for radio regarding the abuse of liberty by extremists and militants.

I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of that statement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Perversion of Liberty

The Pledge of Allegiance to our flag has, as its ending, the words . . . "with liberty and justice for all."

In America today we are witnessing a perversion of liberty in many areas of our national life. It is not too much to say, I believe, that the future of freedom in our Nation is threatened by the gross distortion of freedom by extremists and militants.

The near-treasonable denunciation of our Government, the radical plans to infiltrate industrial plants, the unholy invasion of our churches, the destructive disorder on our college and university campuses are examples of the perversion of liberty to which I refer.

All of these things have been committed under the guise of free speech and assembly and the rights enjoyed by a free people under our Constitution. They have been possible, and they have been tolerated, because of the guarantees of liberty in our fundamental law. Unless checked, they will become the greatest threat to the continuation of our liberty.

Many years ago when our republic was young, James Madison, the fourth President of the United States, recognized the kind of danger the Nation faces today when he said:

"Liberty may be endangered by the abuse of liberty as well as by the abuse of power."

The recent elections in which law and order and domestic tranquility were once again revealed as predominant national issues should tell us a great deal. They made it very clear that the average citizen is deeply concerned about the abuse of liberty that has become so prevalent in America and the lack of action by government or other proper authority to counteract it.

The vast majority of our people, I believe, are dismayed at the widespread effort of militants to undermine and overthrow our form of government. They are angered by the moves of the so-called Students for a Democratic Society to disrupt industrial plants. They are outraged by the interruption and desecration of worship services by radicals who demand money from the churches. And they are thoroughly and completely fed up with civil disorder of all kinds, whether in the inner city, the suburbs, in the streets, or on the college campus.

So-called "work-in" plans that aim at subversion and disruption of business and industry are an abuse of liberty. Disruption of religious worship is an abuse of liberty. Seizure of college buildings and the willful disruption of education activities is an abuse of liberty.

Abraham Lincoln said:

"It is safe to assert that no government proper ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination."

Our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution are not charters for self-destruction. Permissiveness will not preserve freedom. Indecisiveness by legally constituted authority is the enemy of independence.

This should be a time for the American people, and for all in positions of authority, to rededicate themselves to the concepts and practices of a lawful and orderly society.

Our Nation has the right and the duty to protect itself, by whatever lawful means are necessary, against those who would destroy it. And a first duty of government is to enforce the law and maintain order.

Continued appeasement of those who abuse liberty can only lead to the destruction of liberty for all.

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, a highly informative and enlightening article on chemical and biological warfare, written by Seymour Hersh, was published in the Washington Post June 29.

The article raises a number of important questions which deserve the attention and the scrutiny of Congress and the American public. For example, what really is the policy of the U.S. Government in regard to the use of CBW weapons? How did the present estimates of the Soviet capability in CBW come into being?

In addition, the fact is brought forth that the CBW testing program has extended beyond the bounds of the continental United States to the Eniwetok Atoll in Micronesia. This is certainly a disturbing revelation, especially after finding that three sites within this country are at present being used to field test toxic CBW munitions. I commend this article to the Senate in the hope that it will stimulate a more vigorous discussion of an issue that has been too long neglected.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Pentagon's Gas Plans Spring a Leak," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Pentagon's Gas Plans Spring a Leak

(By Seymour M. Hersh)

(Notes—*A free-lance writer, Hersh is author of "Chemical and Biological Warfare: America's Hidden Arsenal."*)

These are bad times for the chemical and biological warfare (CBW) advocates in the Pentagon. Morale is low among the men who have visions of "War Without Death," as one propaganda slogan put it ten years ago.

Brig. Gen. James A. Hebbeler, head of the Army's CBW efforts, is retiring early to take a job in industry (not in chemicals). He's made it clear in private comments to a number of friends that the recent congressional criticism over CBW had much to do with his decision.

Early in July, a special 14-nation United Nations study team on CBW will deliver its report to Secretary-General U Thant, advising him that the world would be better off if all nations immediately outlawed preparations for biological warfare.

The U.S. Army bitterly fought the recommendation, at one point attempting to redefine certain biological agents—such as deadly bacterial toxins and incapacitating (nonlethal) biological agents—to exclude them from the U.N. recommendation. But the American delegation, headed by Dr. Ivan L. Bennett of New York University's medical center (and a member of the President's Science Advisory Council), held firm—encouraged no doubt by the other nations' unwillingness to leave a loophole for the American military.

The Army initially blanketed the early plenary sessions of the study committee, held both in Geneva and at U.N. headquarters in

XUM

New York, but by the closing meeting two weeks ago, the Army men were nowhere to be seen. "They just stopped showing up," one delegate said.

The U.N. recommendations will be heavily relied upon by the 18-nation disarmament conference in Geneva, which is soon scheduled to take up an English proposal to outlaw biological weapons.

Another jolt to the CBW advocates in the Pentagon came recently from the White House. The President recently ordered a full-scale high-level review of this country's CBW policies and programs. The decisions, which had the blessing of Henry Kissinger, the President's adviser on national security affairs, reflects a political reality: it's becoming increasingly difficult to justify spending more than $600 million a year, including salaries, on a weapons system whose potential is, to say the least, unproven.

Another supporter of the review, sources report, is Secretary of Defense Melvin A. Laird, who knows a political problem when he sees one. Laird's endorsement, taken in the last few weeks, amounts to a significant about face. For shortly after moving into the top defense post, Laird called off a similar policy review that had been in sometimes tenuous existence since 1963. That decision is believed to have been pushed on the then-new Defense Secretary by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

A NATIONAL POLICY

The history of the earlier review shows how difficult it is to get the Pentagon to give up any weapon.

Although initiated in the State Department in 1963, the study went nowhere until 1966, when the Pentagon sent over its version of national policy on CBW weapons. The State Department quickly produced its own version, as did the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA). The inevitable series of meetings and discussions took place over the next two years (at one point a pro-Pentagon Navy captain was removed from the State Department's study team), but progress was made.

By midsummer 1968, just as some criticism over CBW was beginning to flare, the differences were narrowed to a few points, all negotiable.

Shortly after Jan. 1 this year, a major meeting was convened at which high officials of all agencies involved agreed to a flat ban on the first use of CBW agents with the exception of herbicides and tear gases (now in use in South Vietnam). It was also agreed that the combat use of all weapons, including the tear gases and herbicides, had to be authorized by the President.

The agreement was considered a milestone (it was the first time that any national CBW policy had been spelled out), and copies were quickly passed around to key agencies for approval. Everybody signed but the Pentagon.

Once a national CBW policy was set, the Pentagon then decided to press for the review of CBW policy it had long avoided.

As one military source explains, it was at this point that someone got to Laird and said, in effect, "We ought to have a study before agreeing to this." Laird then passed on the study recommendation to Kissinger, who agreed.

The Pentagon's ability to sustain studies and delay action isn't always harmful, but this time it may be. The State Department recently attempted to get Laird to issue a directive ordering that during the new study (expected to take six months or less), no significant action regarding CBW could be taken without presidential or at least White House approval. Laird refused to do so.

GAS FOR THE GERMANS

At issue is a West German request for the United States to ship it 40 kilos (88 pounds) of nerve gas. Shipments of two, four and six-kilo packages of nerve gas have been going from the Pentagon to West Germany for years, allegedly because that nation needed the material for such uses as testing gas masks.

The German, sources say, accompanied the new request with a note explaining that it would be more economical to ship the larger quantities rather than rely on year-to-year shipments. "What are they going to do with this stuff?" one critical official asked explaining that 40 kilos would be enough agent to accommodate the West German test needs for years. "At some point, this stuff becomes a stockpile."

If the larger quantity of gas is shipped (and the decision is now being worked out in the Pentagon), it could put the West Germans in violation of the 1954 West European Union Protocol, which prohibits either the manufacturing or stockpiling of CBW weapons.

A more important question is whether the United States itself has been violating the protocol by shipping even small quantities of nerve agent to West Germany. The 1954 agreement stipulates that West Germany can only receive NATO-approved quantities of CBW materials; that is, the shipments must be publicized and made available to other NATO allies. This has not been done by the United States in the past, largely because the Chemical Corps has described the shipments as not militarily significant.

(The question was raised last year when West Germany, responding to a defector's charge that CBW efforts are being organized by the Bonn government, said in a press statement that the only CBW agents in the country were shipped there by its allies. The statement prompted some NATO allies, notably France and England, to ask the Pentagon what it was doing.)

Sources also report that Canada has recently requested increased shipments of CBW agents from the Pentagon, for unspecified reasons.

Another possible legal question centers around the U.S. practice of shipping VX nerve gas to allied nations.

The gas was invented by the British at their CBW facility at Porton Downs and is manufactured in America under special license. Can we then ship VX to West Germany and other nations without telling Britain? The question has occurred to the British.

Another complication for the military is the growing dispute among U.S. intelligence agencies over Russia's biological warfare capabilities.

For years, the Pentagon has been defending its efforts in biological warfare by arguing that the weapons are needed to serve as a deterrent. As late as June 4, Dr. John S. Foster Jr., head of the Pentagon research programs, privately wrote a complaining housewife that the American CBW effort is being maintained "for our own protection. Unfriendly nations are known to have large stockpiles, a vigorous testing program and an active military operational capability."

Yet it is on precisely this score that the intelligence apparatus is badly divided in this country, a division that has never been made known either to Congress or to the people.

The fact is that the State Department's intelligence agencies have reported for a number of years that there is no evidence whatsoever of any significant Russian activity in biological warfare. The Russians are believed to have conducted biological experiments on animals during World War II on an island off the coast of the Ural Sea, but the prevailing winds from the island blow inland, a factor that most experts indicate would clearly rule it out as a test center for biological weapons.

"We've been asking them [the Army] for years" to find the Russian biological test facility, one source told me, "and they can't."

Even in their classified briefings to members of Congress, Army intelligence officials, while attributing a great CBW capability to Russia, are careful not to list specifically a biological test facility. "I never really was told anything solid," one source acknowledged after a classified Army briefing.

Yet Rep. Bob Wilson (R-Calif.) took to the floor of the House a few hours after the White House CBW review was announced to warn: "The Soviet Union today is better equipped militarily—offensively and defensively—for CB warfare than any other nation in the world." And Rep. Robert L. F. Sikes (D-Fla.), a former major general in the Army Chemical Corps reserves, told his colleagues a day later that "it is estimated by those who are experts and who have possession of the facts—and I stress fact rather than rumor—that Russia has ten times the capability in this field that we have."

COUNTING SHED ROOFS

Russia is known to have a strong program in chemical warfare, yet even this aspect of Russia's capabilities may be overrated. The Pentagon has never revealed any unclassified information about Russian CBW capability and tells questioners that to do so would compromise its intelligence sources, presumably spies. The only testimony on record came during congressional hearings into CBW in 1960 when Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, then chief of Army Research, said:

"We know that the Soviets are putting a high priority on development of lethal and nonlethal weapons and that their weapons stockpile consists of about one-sixth chemical munitions."

A responsible Government official who has provided reliable information in the past told me how the Trudeau statistic, which is cited by the Army even today, came to be.

In 1963 or 1964, the source said, the Army issued a request to send a large shipment of nerve gas to West Germany under U.S. control. "Their argument was that the Russians have it in Russia; therefore we need it in Germany," the source recalled. The request was turned down.

To back up its plea, the Army presented evidence supporting Trudeau's statement. This consisted of analysis made from aerial photos of Russia that showed large storage sheds similar to those used for storing warfare gases at the Army's depot in Tooele, Utah. "The Army computed the roof size of the Russian sheds, figured out how many gallons of nerve gas could be stored in a comparably sized shed in Utah, added a 20 per cent 'fudge' factor and came up with the estimate," the source said.

There is no mystery about the U.S. Army's facilities for testing biological and chemical warfare agents.

Besides the now-famous Dugway Proving Grounds in Utah (site of the March, 1968, sheep kill), the Army has conducted secret tests with nerve gases on the island of Hawaii, 120 miles southeast of the heavily populated island of Oahu (Honolulu). In addition, the Army has tested bacterial toxins and other CBW agents on the Eniwetok Atoll in Micronesia. Some tests were conducted on islands known simply as Fred and Henry.

Despite the mounting evidence of the extensive U.S. programs in testing and developing chemical and biological agents, Dr. Foster was still capable of writing to the housewife: "We are not developing resistant strains of plague or any other disease. We are concerned with developing vaccines and treatment for this and other diseases . . . These vaccines and the therapy for the diseases are made available to the medical profession for the benefit of all people everywhere."

Yet, in 1962, a Chemical Corps general told Congress that 40 scientists were then assigned full time to work in genetics and added: "It is not unlikely that the major

XUM

contribution to biological weaponry will result from research and a better understanding of the science of genetics."

A BLIGHT FOR CUBA

Dr. Foster did not mention this, nor did he tell the writer about the time America came closest to actual use of biological warfare against an enemy. This was, according to at least three sources, during the 1962 Cuban crisis, when the Kennedy Administration was frantically seeking ways of punishing Cuba without resorting to bombing.

The Chemical Corps was assigned the job of finding a biological agent that would be capable of destroying the Cuban sugar cane crop. At the time, the United States had vast stores of dried antifood biological rusts and blights (one source said as much as 10,000 pounds of the antifood biologicals were stockpiled then), but none would work against sugar cane.

The Chemical Corps was given a month to come up with an effective agent, but could not. The program was dropped, much to the disappointment of the Chemical Corps, which had prepared elaborate logistical plans for spraying the agent over Cuba.

There is no evidence that President Kennedy would have authorized the use of biological weapons during the Cuban crisis even if an acceptable weapon had been developed, but the incident serves to raise once again the frightening prospect that if a weapon is available, it will be used.

PUBLIC OPINION SHOULD EXERT PRESSURE ON HANOI TO END WAR

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, on July 4, it was my privilege to address hundreds of patriotic citizens attending the Waialua 22d Independence Day Festival sponsored by the Kinney-Nozaki Post No. 5 of the American Legion, the North Shore Jaycees, the Waialua Athletic Association, and the Waialua Juvenile Delinquency Committee of the Waialua Community Association.

In my speech, I said:

I am convinced that, if the same pressure of world opinion were brought to bear on Hanoi that is now concentrated solely on America and South Vietnam, peace would be much, much closer!

I asked:

Where is the daily barrage of demands that the North Vietnamese and the NLF make some move—even one move—to deescalate the war!

I pointed out:

An international commission long ago documented Hanoi's responsibility for fomenting war in South Vietnam. Therefore, Hanoi should not escape responsibility for stopping the war!

Surely, those loudest in their calls for peace should insist, with equal fervor, that Hanoi must do its part toward peace.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of my address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Master of Ceremonies Leong, Chairman Takenaka, Reverend Thompson, Ladies and Gentlemen, Friends: I am truly honored to share with you your 22d Independence Day celebration. What a wonderful tradition this community has established with your patriotic observances for more than two decades!

I especially want to commend the sponsors of your festivities today: The Kinney-Nozaki Post #5 of the American Legion, the North Shore Jaycees, the Waialua Athletic Association, and the Waialua Juvenile Delinquency Committee of the Waialua Community Association.

To all who have worked so hard to make this day a successful and memorable one, my warmest congratulations! Let's give them a big hand.

I also want to commend each and every person here. By your very presence, you are reaffirming your gratitude for the priceless heritage handed down by generation after generation of Americans; and you are demonstrating your devotion to our beloved Nation and all it stands for: liberty, justice, human dignity, government of, by, and for the people!

For each of us, the Fourth of July is more than a day of festivities and fun. It is a day to be thankful, thankful that the flag we live under is the United States flag and that our Nation's banner has 50 stars, the last one representing Hawaii.

Had history been different, today we might be living under the British Union Jack, the French tricolor, the Russian hammer and sickle, the Spanish flag, or even the German.

Twice Hawaii was ceded to Britain—once in 1794 and again in 1843, after a show of British naval power. For five months a British commission actually ruled Hawaii. But England's monarchs never ratified these cessations, and Queen Victoria recognized King Kamehameha III as an independent sovereign.

A second world power, France, also used force to intimidate Hawaii. In 1839, the captain of a 60-gun frigate threatened war on Hawaii if his demands were not met. In 1849, French armed forces under Admiral de Tromelin took the city of Honolulu. Later, the Paris Government disapproved of his action, but did not drop their demands of Hawaii until after Kamehameha gave the United States Commissioner a deed of provisional cession, to be used if hostilities began with France.

Not to be outdone by the British and French, Russia sent out several round-the-world expeditions in the 1800s to seek likely sites for new colonies. In 1840, the Russian ship *Kadiak* put in at Honolulu, where the crew built a blockhouse and ran up the Russian flag. From there, the Russians sailed to Kauai, where they erected several forts, including one at Hanalei and one at the mouth of the Waimea River. Whenever foreign ships approached Kauai, the Czar's flag would be raised. After about a year, the people, led by Americans in Hawaii, rebelled and ousted the Russians, first from Kauai and then from Honolulu. Never again did Russian sovereignty prevail anywhere in Hawaii!

Other nations cast covetous eyes upon our strategically located mid-Pacific Islands. Spain considered a settlement here, and a German community was actually established on Maui.

So, on this day commemorating American independence, we in Hawaii realize anew that, instead of being one of the 50 United States, our Islands could today by cession be a part of the British Commonwealth; by conquest, a colony of France; or by occupation, a part of the U.S.S.R., Spain, or Germany!

Some kind fate or merciful destiny apparently intended Hawaii to be united with mainland U.S.A., now the oldest republic on earth and leader of the non-Communist world.

In these days when rebellious and anarchistic minorities are bent on destroying America and its fundamental institutions of government, schools, churches, and industry, it is heartening to have ceremonies such as these where loyal Americans can express their steadfast devotion to our Nation.

And while the instigators of violence who agitate and destroy are small in numbers compared with our total population, we dare not underestimate their capacity to wreak havoc.

Termites are tiny, but they can cause incredible damage.

In America today, we have too many "termites" undermining the structure of the very institutions that protect and defend liberty and freedom for every American. By constantly gnawing at law enforcement offices, administrative agencies, legislative bodies, schools, courts, churches and synagogues, this destructive species aims at a complete breakdown of legal authority and discipline in America.

There are extremists who justify terror and violence on the ground the end justifies the means. From time immemorial, tyrants and dictators have used "the end justifies the means" as their battle cry. The atrocities committed thereunder shame the human race.

There are those impatient rebels who want to rebuild America overnight. It has taken America nearly two centuries to conquer the ancient scourges of mankind—hunger, disease, and ignorance—and we have progressed very far. But the rebels think they can do better "right now." I say, especially to young people here this morning, beware of those peddling instant solutions to complex problems. You may well lose the blessings you already have.

There are dissenters who magnify what's wrong with America and ignore what's right with America. They would have us believe the only way to correct what's wrong is to destroy all that exists—to overturn "the Establishment."

But they do not tell us what we would get in its place: anarchy; rule by force instead of rule by law; stifling of individual freedom; and curtailment, if not complete denial, of the right to dissent.

There are those self-righteous moralists who espouse a strange brand of morality in international affairs—one standard for America, but an entirely different standard for other countries.

What kind of morality is it that condemns America for helping a tiny nation defend its people from outside aggression, yet remained silent when Russia took over Czechoslovakia by armed force and subjugated its people to a puppet regime directed from Moscow!

What strange morality utters not a peep whenever Red China tests nuclear bombs and pollutes the atmosphere with radioactive fall-out!

What strange morality preaches that freedom does not exist in America but abounds in Castro's Cuba!

Where are the horrified protesters when Ho Chi Minh's troops shell innocent people in towns and hamlets all over Vietnam, blow up schools and school buses filled with children, kidnap thousands of villagers as part of a calculated campaign of terror!

Where were the outraged demonstrators when Mao Tse-tung unleashed his Red Guards against the Chinese people, causing widespread death and destruction among his own countrymen!

Where were the indignant marchers when North Korea committed piracy against America on the high seas and grossly mistreated our Pueblo captain and crewmen!

Where are the impassioned pleas and petitions to Ho Chi Minh to accord U.S. prisoners civilized and humane treatment! Some 1300 Americans are missing, yet Hanoi will not even let their families know whether they are dead or alive!

Where are the shocked outcries against North Korea for the murder of 31 Americans in an unarmed plane over international waters!

Where is the daily barrage of demands

XUM

that the North Vietnamese and the NLF make some move—even one move—to de-escalate the war!

We hear no such demands. All we hear are insistent calls that the U.S. and South Vietnam take the steps toward peace.

Why, I ask you, is there no pressure of public opinion on Hanoi and the Viet Cong to end the war?

An international commission long ago documented Hanoi's responsibility for fomenting war in South Vietnam. Therefore, Hanoi should not escape responsibility for stopping the war!

Surely, those loudest in their calls for peace should insist, with equal fervor, that Hanoi must do its part toward peace!

Instead, a rising crescendo of criticism is aimed at us—only a strange silence in regard to Hanoi.

I am convinced that, if the same pressure of world opinion were brought to bear on Hanoi that is now concentrated solely on America and South Vietnam, peace would be much, much closer!

If we are to have justice and equity and peace in this world, a single moral standard must apply—not just to America—but to ALL nations!

If we are to have justice and equity and peace in America, we must repudiate those inciting revolution and insurrection!

They seek the destruction of capitalism—the economic system that has produced the greatest good for the greatest number in all of human history!

They seek the destruction of the American system of government—the system that provides the greatest freedom and the greatest participation of its people in their own self-governance!

They seek the destruction of America's system of education—which provides better training for more students of all economic levels than ever before anywhere . . . and which has been instrumental in keeping America ahead of all nations, though we have but one-fifteenth of the world's population!

They seek destruction of law and order with a systematic campaign of killing and harassment of policemen and firemen, with arson, bombing, sniping, a reign of terror out of which they hope to land on top of the heap!

They seek to destroy the incredible industrial might of America through infiltration, sabotage, and subversion of America's working men and women!

They seek to destroy religious institutions, demanding reparations for grievances of ages past, disrupting holy ritual, and desecrating houses of worship!

They seek to destroy what you and I hold dear and precious and vital in our way of life, even the values that we seek to instill in our children.

My friends, one hundred and ninety-three years ago today, a band of brave men pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor so that the people of thirteen American colonies might obtain the right of self-government and independence from all outside powers.

Today, against any threat to America—whether from outside or here at home—let us pledge ourselves with the same courage and the same dedication so that the rights we cherish will be preserved in our land.

Let the silent majority of Americans—the bulwark and backbone of our Nation—no longer be silent. But let us expose, ridicule, and resist those who would annihilate America, the last best hope of Earth.

They would redress wrongs, alleged or real, with greater wrongs. Let *us* redress wrong with right.

They would institute reforms that would deny the many freedoms and rights we enjoy. Let *us* institute reforms that make our Constitutional guarantees a reality for all Americans.

They would abolish our system of private ownership and enterprise and replace it with government ownership, a system that has proven vastly inferior wherever it has been tried. Let *us* improve our private enterprise system, which provides most of the jobs and most of the income for the American people, so that all Americans will have a fair share in prosperity.

As *we* take the initiative for solving today's problems we will deprive the extremists of the opportunity to wreck America!

May we have the wisdom and the courage to succeed in this task!

May the Almighty bless this land and all its people and may this great Nation endure in freedom, independence, righteousness, and dignity forevermore!

Mahalo and Aloha.

THE VIETCONG AND THE NORTH VIETNAMESE COMMUNISTS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, amazingly, there are still those who argue that the Vietcong is not really Communist and not really directed by the North Vietnamese Communist Party, or the Dang Lao Dong, as it is called.

The efforts of knowledgeable analysts have been cast aside as "propaganda." The texts of reams of captured documents have been rejected as fabrications," and the testimony of hundreds of defectors assailed as "forced lies."

For the benefit of those who still have doubts on this matter, I wish to draw the attention of Senators to a broadcast of the Vietcong's so-called Liberation Radio made on February 3 of this year, in commemoration of the Dang Lao Dong's 39th anniversary.

The broadcast was entitled "The Vietnamese Workers Party—Dang Lao Dong—the Great Banner of the Heroic Vietnamese People."

At the outset, this broadcast lets us know that the Dang Lao Dong's original name—Indochinese Communist Party—has been changed to "Vietnam Workers Party." This statement, like many others before it, should lay to rest the claim of those friends of Hanoi who tell us that, to prove his nationalism, Ho Chi Minh in 1946 disbanded the Indochinese Communist Party. The fact is, as an official party history published by Hanoi on the occasion of the 35th anniversary informs us, that the Indochinese Communist Party "only went underground."

The once secretive control of the so-called liberation effort in South Vietnam has of late become more public through broadcasts such as this one. Little wonder, then, that all Vietnamese who listen to the Vietcong radio shake their heads in disbelief when an American asks them if they think the Vietcong is controlled by Hanoi.

This Vietcong broadcast lets it be known that—

> Since its emergence, the Party has led the Vietnamese revolution, assuming an extremely heavy responsibility before history, motivating our people to carry out the national democratic people's revolution, and building socialism and Communism in our country.

In case any still have doubts, objecting that this statement could well be limited to North Vietnam, let me quote further:

> For scores of years, our Southern people have been led by the Indochinese Communist Party and the Vietnam Workers Party.

The broadcast goes on to declare:

> Party members form the vanguard in thoughts and action and fully deserve to be our entire people's clear-sighted and brave staff . . . the Party is worthy of our entire people's love and confidence.

Speaking of the republican government in Saigon, the broadcast boasts of the Dang Lao Dong's power in the South:

> In the southern part of our country, the reactionary Vietnamese traitors are as afraid of the Party's power and reputation as owls are of sunlight . . . But how can they eliminate the Party's influence from the hearts of southern patriots?

Now totally identified as nothing but the Dang Lao Dong by their own declaration, the Viet Cong further boast:

> It is these Viet Cong who, for the Vietnamese fatherland and for world revolution, are determined to fight to the end to drive out the Americans and overthrow the puppets.

It is my hope that Senators will find the time to study this revealing document carefully. It is a major indicator of what is to come if we are foolish enough to believe that the Vietcong are anything but what they are.

There is not a single reference in this text to the "People's Revolutionary Party," which purports to be the South Vietnamese Communist Party and which was created to serve as the vanguard of the southern revolution. Because the so-called People's Revolutionary Party is none other than the Dang Lao Dong by another name, the Vietcong broadcast could declare the Dang Lao Dong to be the "vanguard" of "the entire people."

I also challenge the disbelievers to find in this broadcast the slightest reference to neutrality for the future of South Vietnam. Though calling for "neutrality" in all foreign broadcasts, in this domestic broadcast, as in other domestic broadcasts, the Vietcong left out all reference to neutrality and instead pledged to "achieve the revolutionary objectives set forth by the Vietnam Workers Party 39 years ago."

So here we are. In their own words, the Vietcong movement is identified as the same thing as the South Vietnamese Communist Party—PRP—which, in turn, is identified as a branch of North Vietnamese Communist Party, or Dang Lao Dong; which, in turn, is identified as the synonym for the Indochinese Communist Party. And the goal of the Indochinese Communist Party, it should be pointed out, was the establishment of a unified Communist government covering the territory of old Indochina, that is, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the broadcast be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

XUM

Vietnam Workers Party Anniversary Greeted—The Vietnam Workers Party, the Greater Banner of the Heroic Vietnamese People

In our people's history of liberation struggles, 3 February 1930 is one of the most glorious dates. It is the birthday of the Indochinese Communist Party, now the Vietnam Workers Party.

This day, 39 years ago, while our entire people were still staggering in the terrible long night under French colonialism, the Indochinese Communist Party emerged as the brilliant morning star, clearing away the dark clouds and heralding a shining dawn, and showing the direction and lighting the way for the revolution to move forward. Since its emergence, the party has led the Vietnamese revolution, assuming an extremely heavy responsibility before history, motivating our people to carry out the national, democratic people's revolution, and building socialism and communism in our country.

Thirty-nine years of the party have been 39 years of strenuous persevering, and fierce struggles. Living through extremely hard but very glorious periods, from soviet Nghe-Tinh to Bac Son, Nam Ky, and Ba To uprisings, the party always stood firmly against strong winds and waves. Although tens of thousands of its members were imprisoned, tortured, or executed, it constantly arose, dashing directly at the enemy. In stormy periods, it clung more firmly to the masses in which it was firmly rooted and became experienced, mature, and invulnerable to any reactionary force.

In 1945, only 15 years of age, the party led our entire people in successfully carrying out the August revolution. This was the youngest Marxist party in the world to win administrative power at the time. During the anti-French resistance, it led our entire people from victory to victory and finally defeated the French colonialists, completely liberating half of our country.

Since 1954, under its leadership, our 17 million kith-and-kin northern compatriots have achieved their national, democratic people's revolution and are devoting all their efforts to building socialism.

After 4 years of extremely brave fighting, the northern part of our country has completely defeated the U.S. aggressors' war of destruction, preserved the fruit of the revolution, and wholeheartedly aided the southern revolution, thus fulfilling the duty of a great rear to a great frontline.

Meanwhile, our 14 million southern compatriots, under the NFLSV's leadership, have successively defeated every scheme and plan of the U.S. aggressors and their country-selling lackeys, and are vigorously advancing their general offensive and simultaneous uprisings toward complete victory.

After 39 years of tirelessly fighting for the fatherland, the people, and the class, the Vietnam Workers Party has developed the workers class' fine nature and has built an extremely brilliant tradition of revolutionary struggle for a genuine Marxist party. So far, its lines have been the shining manifestations of Marxism-Leninism applied in a most correct and creative manner to the circumstances of Vietnam.

These lines constitute the basic cause of our people's great and consecutive successes and are valuable contributions of the Vietnamese revolution to the treasure of world revolution.

The party has made revolutionary ethics and thoughts penetrate more and more deeply into Vietnamese society, eliminating evil vestiges of nonproletarian classes. Revolutionary ethics and thoughts have played an essential role in our entire people's life, production, and combat. These are a bright patriotism, a deep hatred for the enemy, a wonderfully pure Vietnamese heroism, and a noble international spirit. The party has formed a powerful rank of members consisting of the most outstanding persons in the [words indistinct] among the people.

They form the vanguard in thoughts and action and fully deserve to be our entire people's clear-sighted and brave staff in the fight against the enemy and in the struggle for making our country rich and strong. It has many glorious sons whose names have been closely associated with the nation's heroic struggle. They are Tran Phu, Le Hong Phong, Nguyen (?Duy) Cu, Ha Huy Trach, Nguyen Thi Minh Khai, Vo Van Tan, and tens of thousands of other members who have offered their whole lives to the communist ideal and the vital undertaking of the nation.

The party's ranks have constantly developed, increasingly strengthening the vanguard force of the class and the nation. The party is worthy of our entire people's love and confidence.

How glorious it is for it to have so talented and virtuous a leader as President Ho who first brought Marxism-Leninism into our country and who is respected and loved by our entire people as the old father of the nation and is considered by the revolutionary world as a brave and loyal comrade in arms. The party's history is one of constant struggle for the fatherland's independence and freedom and for the people's peace and decency.

Now, every patriotic Vietnamese, when holding a full bowl of rice, wearing a beautiful dress, going to school, enjoying every democratic freedom, taking a gun to shoot at the enemy, or enjoying the honor of standing at the anti-U.S. forefront, cannot help thinking of the good deeds achieved by the party, the saviour of our country and the guide who has helped our people to regain their life. For scores of years, our southern people have been led by the Indochinese Communist Party and the Vietnam Workers Party which have shared with them good and bad. When drinking water everyone thinks of the spring, our southern people will remember forever the party's good deeds.

Although the north and the south remain separated, no partition line can separate the hearts of our 31 million compatriots. As far as the southern PLAF is concerned, it has grown up and matured and is worthy of carrying on the traditions of "boundless loyalty, unexcelled courage, and glorious victories."

This is attributable to the fact that over the past 8 years, the NFLSV, with its extremely correct, creative military and political lines, has constantly helped us in improving our correct revolutionary viewpoint and stand, training us in the thoroughly revolutionary spirit and in revolutionary heroism, equipping us with an unshakable determination to fight the Americans, and helping us to acquire genuine enthusiasm. We have fulfilled our tasks because of the clear-sighted, skillful leadership of the NFLSV.

The Vietnam Workers Party is the organizer and leader of the heroic Vietnam People's Army, an older, fraternal army which has fought to protect every inch of Vietnamese land and has handed down to us extensive, rich experience in defeating the U.S. aggressors. Our PLAF has deeply engraved in its heart gratitude toward the Vietnam Workers Party for its meritorious deeds.

The prestige of the Vietnam Workers Party has spread widely at home and abroad. In the southern part of our country, the reactionary Vietnamese traitors are as afraid of the party's power and reputation as owls are of sunlight. They have sought by every means to slander the party and distort facts about it. But how can they eliminate the party's influence from the hearts of southern patriots? Frightened by communism and nursing hatred for it, the traitors, with the most evil intentions, have labelled southern patriots as "Viet Cong," in the hope of distorting the significance of the noble actions taken by our armed forces and people for the interests of the people and the country.

Today, everyone in our country, in the world, in the United States, and in Paris has clearly understood that the Viet Cong are the most lovable, most respectable Vietnamese who are sinking the most dishonest, most cruel enemy of progressive mankind in the quagmire of defeat. It is these Viet Cong who, for the Vietnamese fatherland and for the world revolution, are determined to fight to the end to drive out the Americans and overthrow the puppets and to insure that no single aggressor remains in Vietnam.

The solemnly commemorating the anniversary of the founding of the Vietnam Workers Party, all our PLAF pledge, together with the people, to resolutely struggle to liberate the south, protect the north, reunify the country, and, together with the entire Vietnamese people, build a peaceful, independent, democratic, unified, prosperous, and powerful Vietnam and, thereby, achieve the revolutionary objectives set forth by the Vietnam Workers Party 39 years ago.

SOUTHWESTERN ASSOCIATION OF NATURALISTS OF TEMPE, ARIZ., SUPPORTS 100,000-ACRE BIG THICKET NATIONAL PARK

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, support for the establishment of a Big Thicket National Park is not limited by the legal boundaries of the State of Texas. The Southwestern Association of Naturalists of Tempe, Ariz., adopted a resolution on April 18, 1969, to support my bill, S. 4, to establish a Big Thicket National Park of at least 100,000 acres in southeast Texas.

The Southwestern Association of Naturalists describes the Big Thicket as a natural area of unusual ecological and conservational interest, possessing vegetational and wildlife characterists found nowhere else in the United States. They recognize the importance of retaining this area in a more or less natural condition indefinitely for the enlightenment and enjoyment of the people of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and policy statement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution From the Southwestern Association of Naturalists, Concerning a Big Thicket National Area, in Texas

Whereas an ecotonal forest area in eastern Texas, comprising parts of Hardin, Liberty, San Jacinto, Polk, and Tyler Counties, and popularly known as the Big Thicket, is a natural area of unusual ecological and conservational interest, possessing vegetational and wildlife characteristics found nowhere else in the United States, and

Whereas much of this area is still relatively unmodified and possesses no known assets of high economic value, and

Whereas this area is relatively close to large and rapidly growing population centers of the United States where natural recreational areas are increasingly in demand, and

Whereas many members of the Southwestern Association of Naturalists (SWAN) are acquainted with this area and regard it as an area, parts of which should be retained in a more or less natural condition indefinitely for the enlightenment and enjoyment of the people of the United States; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the membership of SWAN in

XUM

meeting assembled, That this organization adopt the appended Policy Statement on the Big Thicket National Area, and

That it also endorse in principle a bill introduced by Mr. Yarborough into the Senate of the United States to establish the Big Thicket National Park (S. 4) as may be modified in detail by normal legislative procedures, to comprise a "block and corridor" area of approximately 100,000 acres (out of some three million acres originally contained by the Big Thicket area), and be it further

Resolved, That the president and secretary of SWAN submit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and to his concerned administrators in the Department of the Interior; to concerned Members of the Congress of the United States; to the Governor of Texas and to his administrators of such state lands as may be involved; and to such other organizations and individuals as may express concern with this project.

Theodore M. Sperry,
Chairman, SWAN Conservation Committee.

POLICY STATEMENT ON BIG THICKET NATIONAL AREA

We favor a Big Thicket National Park or area which would include not only the minimum of 35,500 acres proposed in the Preliminary Report by the National Park Service study team, but also the following modifications and additions:

1. Extend the Pine Island Bayou section southward and eastward down both sides of Pine Island Bayou to its confluence with the Neches River.

2. Extend the Neches Bottom Unit to cover a strip, a maximum of three miles, but not less than four hundred feet, wide on both sides of the Neches River from Highway 1746, just below Dam B, down to the confluence of Pine Island Bayou.

3. Extend the Beaumont Unit northward to include all the area between the LNVA Canal and the Neches.

4. Incorporate a Village Creek Unit, comprising a strip up to one mile wide where feasible, and no less than 400 feet wide on each side of Big Sandy-Village Creek from the proposed Profile Unit down to the Neches confluence. Where ever residences have already been constructed, an effort should be made to reach agreement with the owners for scenic easements, limiting further development on such tracts and preserving the natural environment. Pioneer architecture within these areas should also be preserved.

5. Incorporate a squarish area of at least 20,000 acres so that larger species such as black bear, puma and red wolf may survive there. An ideal area for this purpose would be the area southeast of Saratoga, surrounded by Highways 770, 326 and 105. Although there are pipeline crossings in this area, they do not destroy the ecosystem; therefore the National Park Service should revise its standards pertaining to such incumbrances, in this case, leaving them under scenic easement rules instead of acquiring them.

6. Connect the major units with corridors at least one-half mile wide, with a hiking trail along each corridor but without new public roads cutting any forest. A portion of Menard Creek would be good for one such corridor. The entire watershed of Rush Creek would be excellent for another.

Such additions would form a connected two-looped green belt of about 100,000 acres (there are more than 3 million acres in the overall Big Thicket area) through which wildlife and people could move along a continuous circle of more than 100 miles.

We recommend that the headquarters be in or near the line of the Profile Unit.

We are absolutely opposed to any trading or cession of any National Forest areas in the formation of the Big Thicket National Park or Monument.

In addition, but not as a part of the Big Thicket National Monument, we recommend: (a) the establishment of a National Wildlife Refuge comprising the lands of the U.S. Corps of Engineers around Dam B, (b) a state historical area encompassing communities of typical pioneer dwellings, farms, etc., such as that between Beech and Theuvenins Creeks off Road 1943 in Tyler County, and (c) other state parks to supplement the national reserve.

TRIBUTE TO DR. FRANK P. GRAHAM

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I hope I may be allowed this opportunity to pay tribute to a truly outstanding North Carolinian and a great American—Dr. Frank Porter Graham.

I speak now in recognition of his retirement after a 60-year career as an educator, statesman, and international diplomat who gained world recognition at the crest of his career as a United Nations mediator.

Some Senators in the Chamber today will remember him from his Senate days. All Senators, I am confident, know him at least by reputation because of the important service he performed in a wide variety of Government assignments from the thirties through the period of World War II.

He dealt with many issues during those years, ranging from education and science to economics and national security, and he enjoyed the confidence and respect of Presidents in every administration from the Roosevelt years through the Kennedy era.

I think it appropriate, however, that he climaxed his career with the services he performed through and with the United Nations.

This is so because Dr. Graham is, above all, a man of peace and a humanitarian dedicated to the causes of the oppressed and downtrodden.

It was that concern for others and the depth of his personal philosophy that made him a loved and respected educator in his years as president of the University of North Carolina and which earn for him a special place in the hearts of North Carolinians now even though his public career has ended. It is significant that his most recent award was tendered him by the National Child Labor Committee and the National Sharecroppers Fund.

It is as such a man that I salute Dr. Graham now, not just for his service to his country and the world, but for his courage, integrity, and dedication to the causes of justice and equality.

THE TRANSPACIFIC ROUTE CASE

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, twice I have spoken in this body about the transpacific route case. Shortly after the President's decision to intervene in the case and overturn the Civil Aeronautics Board's decision, I pointed out the need for new competitive air service to Hawaii and urged the President to arrive at a decision quickly. After his review the President on April 24 instructed the Board to restrict competitive service on many of the routes originally authorized by the CAB and to reopen the case for further proceedings to select a carrier to serve the South Pacific route decreed by the President. The President's April decision had the unfortunate side effect of postponing further new domestic air service to Hawaii. The international and domestic phases of the case are so intertwined that a final result cannot be reached in the domestic case until all issues have been resolved in the international phase.

On July 1, I told the Senate that the delay was creating havoc with the Hawaiian economy, geared as it is to tourism. I said that the vacation plans of thousands of Americans had been frustrated because of the failure to implement new air service. I urged the President to make his final decision quickly in order to "minimize the inconvenience and economic damage that is occurring daily."

On July 2, the President's latest decision was announced. Once again it spelled confusion and increased economic catastrophe for the State of Hawaii. For the second time, the President rejected the CAB's recommendation that Continental Air Lines be selected to serve the South Pacific air route. He sent the case back to the CAB for additional consideration within even tighter Presidential guidelines that have been interpreted to compel the CAB to select a large trunk airline to serve the route.

In the meantime, new domestic air service has been postponed—this time indefinitely until the President approves a carrier for the South Pacific routes. Although the President said he did not mean for domestic service to be delayed further, he remanded the case to the CAB with full knowledge that any change would require reconsideration of the domestic authority authorized by the CAB in January. The CAB must now engage in careful deliberations to arrive at a domestic service pattern that will fit the international route structured by the President.

Mr. President, whatever the final outcome of the transpacific case and as a citizen of Hawaii, I would be pleased and delighted to welcome to my island State any of the major competitive airlines, be it Continental, Braniff, Alaskan, Western, Eastern, American, Trans-World, or another. I am convinced that the present statutory procedure for the granting of international air routes must be changed. In the first place, there is serious question that the President acted properly and within the statutory authority delegated to him by Congress in the Federal Aviation Act. His actions appear to have invaded areas of responsibility which Congress delegated solely to the CAB—areas completely outside the limited responsibility of the President in these cases, confined as it is to considerations of foreign policy and national defense and security. His actions have also jeopardized the integrity and continued independence of the CAB as a regulatory agency.

The allegations of impropriety on the part of the President standing alone are grave enough to justify congressional investigation of the transpacific case. But I suggest that such an investigation is required, whether or not the President acted within his power. The simple fact is that a procedure which permits route cases to degenerate into a debacle like the transpacfic case does not serve the public interest. Such a procedure must be reviewed, and changed if necessary, to prevent the reoccurrence of a flasco like the transpacific case.

My State has suffered economic damage, the traveling public has been hurt, the CAB has been mauled, and the only airlines to benefit thus far are the large incumbent carriers who make more money with each day of delay. I believe the Senate Subcommittee on Aviation must look into this matter. It is the constitutional power of Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations that is at stake, as well as the provision of adequate airline service and the maintenance of competition in the airline industry.

Mr. President, I urge the chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation, the distinguished senior Senator from Washington (Mr. Magnuson), and the vice chairman, the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada (Mr. Cannon), to schedule hearings at the earliest possible date to investigate the manner in which the transpacific case has been handled and to consider legislative changes in the Federal Aviation Act which may be required to protect the public and the CAB in the exercise of its delegated powers.

TV STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA ON PENTAGON SPENDING PRACTICES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on July 7, 1969, I made a statement for television regarding Pentagon management and spending practices.

I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of that statement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Byrd Favors Pentagon Study

Criticism of the so-called military-industrial complex is increasingly heard. A comprehensive study of the nation's defense management and spending practices is needed. I am glad that the President has created an outstanding panel of civilians to make such a study. I believe that a strong national defense is necessary. But I also believe that the taxpayer should get a dollar's worth of defense for each dollar spent. We should not gloss over military waste, or condone vast overruns in the cost of procurement of weapons and supplies. Congress must provide whatever defenses our country needs. But it must also exercise tight control over the defense budget. I hope that the review to be made will contribute significantly toward that end.

McGEE SENATE INTERNSHIP CONTEST

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, each year it is my pleasure to conduct for high school students in my State of Wyoming the McGee Senate internship contest, which brings to Washington one boy and one girl for a week of observing democracy in action here in the Senate and in Washington. The contest is designed to stir up interest among high school students in national and international questions.

As a part of the contest each student was required to complete an essay on "Our President: How Should We Choose Him?" Frankly, it was a study of our electoral college system. This year, as I am each year, I was impressed with the depth of understanding and the dedication to our democratic principles displayed by these young people in their essays. This topic is one of vital interest today, and the essays reflect sound reasoning which should be of interest to us all.

Of course, it would be impossible for everyone to read all these essays, but I think some of the most outstanding ones selected by an impartial panel of three judges should receive wider circulation, and I ask unanimous consent that two of these essays, written by Miss Peggy Knittel, of Casper, Wyo., and Mr. Kim Viner, of Laramie, Wyo., which received honorable mention in the McGee Senate internship contest, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Democratic Reform

(By Peggy Knittel, Natrona County High School, Casper, Wyo.)

Today, Americans are faced with the difficult task of assessing the present system of electing a president, and if necessary, finding a better means of choosing their nation's leader. The most controversial issue that has come up in the new assessment is that of the electoral college. Many Americans contend that the electoral college is obsolete and unnecessary. Others are of the opinion that it violates the ideals of democracy upon which the United States was established. Still others believe that since the electoral college has operated for nearly 200 years with few mishaps, it should be preserved. Americans are, and rightly so, hesitant to alter the Constitution. They feel that they must hold to the basic ideals set forth by their Founding Fathers. For this reason, the evolution of a new system may be a lengthy, tedious process, a process disastrous to a democracy. But the time for hesitation is over. Citizens of the United States must evaluate the present system and formulate a plan for improving the method of electing a president.

In the beginning, the electoral college was founded as an important safeguard of democratic government. But even as it was being drawn up, there was controversy as to the merit of the plan. How to choose a chief executive was the most bitterly debated provision of the Constitution. The Founding Fathers discussed innumerable proposals—election by the national legislature, by the Senate alone, by the state governors, and even by the state legislatures. As for the proposition that the people elect the president by direct voting, the consensus was that the populace simply would not have the necessary "information and discernment" to do the job properly. By way of compromise, a plan was adopted which provided that each state choose well-informed electors, equal in number to its U.S. Senators and Representatives, who would then get together and elect a president by majority vote. Few changes have been made in the electoral college since 1787.

In today's presidential elections, each party is represented by a different slate of electors equal to the number of congressmen in each respective state. When a U.S. citizen votes, he does not vote for the candidate directly, but actually casts his ballot for the slate of electors chosen by his candidate's party. In the December following a presidential election, the winning electors meet in their state capitals and cast their votes. The candidate receiving the majority of the electoral college votes is then named president. Unfortunately, the plan of the electoral college has never worked quite as it was intended. From the beginning, voters wanted no independent body of "wise" men electing a president for them. However, the plan was adopted and accepted by the American public. The plan soon showed major drawbacks, many of which have grown more evident in recent years.

Critics of the electoral college contend that in *any* form the electoral college is undemocratic. The very foundations of democracy rest on the principle of majority rule. The president and vice-president should be elected by a majority of the people. However, three times in American history, presidents who received fewer popular votes than their opponents have been elected. Because of the "winner take all" tradition, which awards all of a state's electoral votes to the winning candidate in that state, millions of citizens who vote on the losing side in each state are, in effect, deprived of their votes. For this reason, the system discourages people from voting in traditionally "one-party" states. As things are now, the electoral system violates the democratic principle of "one man, one vote" because millions of Americans' votes play no part in the final tally. Also in violation of the "one man, one vote" idea is the fact that some votes carry more influence than others. For example, a single voter in New York has the potential of swinging 43 electoral votes, while a Wyoming voter can swing no more than three. The popular vote and electoral vote are often wildly disproportionate.

Under the "winner take all" system, a candidate can carry just twelve states by a thin margin and win the presidency, with less than 25% of the nation's popular vote. However, since only 17 of the 50 states have laws requiring their electors to vote for the candidate with the highest number of votes in that state, electors may vote against the will of the people who voted them into their one-day ceremonial office. Here again single votes carry more influence than large numbers. Another major fault of the electoral system is the procedure for breaking a deadlock. If no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes, the House of Representatives choose the president. The Senate meanwhile picks the vice-president, thus making possible the mismatch of a president of one party with a vice-president from another. It is evident that the electoral college has not functioned as the safeguard of democratic government it was intended to be.

Over the years, many plans for removing the faults of the electoral college have been brought before Congress. Today there are four major proposals being considered by Congress for electoral reform. The first, the Automatic Plan, would retain the present system, but abolish the electors. This plan would automatically award the electoral votes to each state's popular vote winner, thus eliminating "faithless electors" who might break their party pledges. The chief drawbacks of the Automatic plan are that it would not abolish the "winner take all" system, nor the unequal weights given to voters in different states. The second, the District Plan, would retain the electoral college but provide that each state's votes be divided as to districts. The electoral vote for each district would then be cast for the candidate who carried that district, with the two "bonus" statewide electoral votes going to the candidate who received the largest popular vote in each state. This plan's major drawback is that it might lead the local politicians to gerrymander the electoral districts to favor one party.

XUM

The third, called the Proportionate Plan, would do away with the "winner take all" system by dividing the electoral vote in each state according to the percentage of popular votes cast for each candidate in the state. A total of 40% or more of the electoral vote would be required to elect a president. Critics of this plan feel that it would undermine the two-party system, since minority parties would be able to win electoral votes and prevent a candidate from receiving a much-needed majority. The last plan, the popular vote plan, would do away entirely with the electoral college. It would base the election of the president and vice-president on a nationwide popular vote. In order to win, a candidate would have to receive a minimum of 40% of the popular vote. If no candidate received as much as 40%, there would be a run off election between the two candidates who received the highest number of popular votes. The drawback of the direct vote plan, as in the proportionate plan, is that it could make it possible for minority parties to alter the outcome of the election by using their votes as political blocks, and selling their support for political favor. Of the four proposed plans, possibly the most democratic is the system of direct election by popular vote. This plan does away with the undemocratic principles of "winner take all" systems, "faithless" electors, presidents who are not popular favorites, political deadlocks, and certain votes carrying more weight than others. The direct election plan would insure the "one man, one vote" basic concept of democracy. Of all the plans presented in the past years, the direct election system appears to be the plan that most effectively removes the faults of the electoral college system.

As evidenced by recent legislation, the long-term trend of the American political system is toward direct democratic participation of the voter in every level of government. Since the president is the only official who represents all the people of the country, the next logical step in the plan for more democratic participation of the voter is direct popular election of the president. At this time of nationwide unrest, Americans can not afford political stumbling-blocks in the process of choosing their nation's leaders. The future of the American nation rests with the people. Likewise, the power to elect the nation's president should lie in the hands of all citizens.

OUR PRESIDENT: HOW SHOULD WE CHOOSE HIM?

(By Kim Viner, Laramie Senor High School, Laramie, Wyo.)

There are two main steps in the selection of a President for the United States: the convention and the general election. Due to the present structure of each, I feel that both need to be revised.

The first step in selection is the National Convention which was devised in 1908 by the Federalist party. The system for balloting in the convention has been revamped many times, yet, many of the original problems still exist. The first problem is the selection of the various delegates who vote in the National Convention. The method of selection varies from state to state. For example: in Maryland there is a presidential preference primary in which the voters give their preference for president but the voting delegates are chosen by state convention. In Nebraska delegates are chosen by direct election but no presidential preference is stated. In Wisconsin the primary voter expresses his choice for a presidential candidate and a slate of convention delegates is pledged to him. The second problem still existing involves the voting of delegates at the convention. Delegates come to the convention pledged rather than being pledged after the first ballot. Through this method the voters voice goes entirely unheeded in many cases. Also, because of this method, some of the rumors about shady deals made to obtain the nomination appear more true.

The following list of attitudes was given to John Kennedy (relating to governors who were delegates): Governor C.—enjoys being wooed and is looking for support to be keynoter (at convention) or nominator (of Kennedy); Governor D.—reportedly has been reached by Johnson people though still far from being committed; Governor G.—reportedly made a deal with Symington, can be wooed. I feel the National Convention should be abolished. In its place should be a nation-wide presidential primary system which could be regulated by Federal law and be put in affect by a constitutional amendment. This system would do away with much of the confusion and inefficiencies of the system. However, it must be noted here, that no matter what type of election is held, without the wide participation of voters, any of the systems could fall under the party bosses of certain areas.

The second step involved in choosing our President is the general election and the electoral college vote. Certain parts of the general election were questioned in the last presidential election. For example: in Cooke County, Illinois there was a question whether the votes were correctly counted and television commentators noted in some states the popular vote may be off as much as three percent. The second and most important step in the election is the casting of the electoral college vote. The electoral college is the most out-of-date segment of American politics. The electoral college, as a method of electing a president, was written into the Constitution, Article II, section 1, and was revised by the 12th amendment, adopted in 1804, declaring a vote for the president is also a vote for the vice-president. Most historians agree the founding fathers included the electoral college in the election of the president because they had reservations about the people's ability to choose the correct candidate. To overcome this incapability they left the final decision in the hands of the carefully chosen electors. However, the electoral college has elected a president three different times who received a minority of the total popular votes cast. The problem in this area is the fact that in the first incident the two candidates had an equal number of electoral votes and the election went into the House of Representatives due to a peculiarity which was corrected by the 12th amendment. In the second incident the problem occurred when two sets of electoral votes were returned by some states. This problem was also corrected later. The third case, however, was simply a case in which the winner was the loser, and, this could happen again if a change is not instituted. The second problem lies in the electors themselves.

Almost everyone agrees it is dangerous to have a system which allows individual electors to vote for whomever they wish despite the results of the popular vote in their state. In a close election a small group of persons could frustrate the wishes of the majority of the electorate. This is possible because there is no law which states electors must vote for the candidate who wins the majority in their state. This happened in 1960 and again in 1968 when, in each case, an elector voted for a separate candidate. I feel the best way to resolve the problems of the electoral college is to abolish it and replace it with a better system. My own proposal for a new system is as follows: the presidential candidate with the largest number of popular votes would win the election. To eliminate questioning over the counting of ballots, a federally appointed official would be on hand at each polling and counting site. The vote would first be counted in each congressional district, then in each state, then sent to Washington, D.C., and totalled by a board of election commissioners. In the case of a tie, the result of the election would be decided in the House of Representatives with each representative having one vote and the candidate having the most votes would be declared the winner. I feel the proposals I have submitted are, not only more feasible, but also, another step toward complete democracy in these United States of America.

THE ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am extremely pleased to see that another major California newspaper has editorially endorsed President Nixon's ABM proposals. An editorial published in the Los Angeles Times, which I asked to have printed in the RECORD yesterday, pointed out that a majority of those Americans who have made up their minds on the ABM are in favor of it, according to the polls.

Today I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the San Diego Union of July 7, 1969, also be printed in the RECORD. This editorial underscores some of the facts of the debate on this issue and concludes that these facts, indeed, emphasize the need for the authorization of an anti-ballistic-missile system.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOMENT OF TRUTH NEAR: FACTS EMPHASIZE NEED FOR ABM

A moment of truth for the defense of the United States of America will come in the next few days when the Senate considers an authorization for a modest anti-ballistic missile system (ABM).

The issue of whether the United States should begin to construct a pilot defense system against enemy intercontinental weapons has unfortunately been clouded with emotion, politics, misrepresentation, guesswork and good intentions.

But the facts are clear.

It is a fact that neither proponents nor opponents of the ABM have said that the United States of America does not have a moral right and obligation to defend herself against attack. We do.

It is a fact that the United States is not engaged in an arms race with anyone. We have not established a major new offensive weapons system in this decade.

It is a fact that under the world conditions existing today the nation that does not have strength behind its voice in world councils might as well be speaking into the wind.

It is a fact that both the enemies of the United States and the non-Communist world in which we are a leader are obviously seeking to surpass our military strength by the end of the next decade, on land, on sea and in space.

And it is a fact that the ABM question simply cannot be made conditional on any other national problem in the economic sense—not the poor, not cities, not the war in Vietnam, nor the balance of payments or education. Each national problem must bear individual scrutiny; each solution must be on merit.

From the facts it is clear there is a potential threat to the security of the United States. From the national debate the major alternatives are evident:

We can do nothing—just give up. No responsible person advocates this.

We can try to make our intercontinental missiles impregnable to enemy attack. This is impractical.

We can build more intercontinental missiles, seeking by sheer power to deter pos-

XUM

sible attack. This is expensive, and is a definite invitation to an arms race.

We can tinker with our defense planning—perhaps serve notice that we will launch our missiles the very second we detect a rocket coming in our direction. Even the concept is frightening. It could literally mean the end of the world.

We can put total trust in the good faith and good intentions of our enemies. This is obvious folly.

Or we can, as President Nixon proposes, make a start by building defenses for our missiles in Montana and North Dakota to assure the enemy he could not escape destruction if he attacks.

This is the only approach that makes sense. A modest ABM system will protect a portion of our deterrent strength. It will be a defensive, not provocative act. It will preserve defensive and diplomatic flexibility. It will be the least expensive and least agonizing of all the alternatives. And the persons charged by us with the responsibility to protect our country against enemy attack assure us that it will work.

It would, in short, keep our powder dry and our options open.

THE PESTICIDE PERIL—XXVI

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Stevens Point, Wis., Daily Journal reported last week that the directors of the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture have set up a special committee to improve Federal and State control over the use of pesticides. Don Wickham, president of NASDA, said the association "must recognize the need for more stringent controls on pesticides."

Farmers are the biggest users of pesticides in the United States; they depend on the pesticides to kill insects which would harm their crops. However, in recent years scientists have become alarmed by the persistence of certain toxic pesticides and the effects they are having on our environment—effects which also pose a potential threat to man. Farm crops revealing too high levels of pesticide concentrations by the Food and Drug Administration standards are kept off the market, and the farmer is the one to suffer the loss.

The action taken by the NASDA is significant and timely. It represents a growing awareness among the agricultural community to the pesticide threat. There are now known substitutes for persistent, toxic pesticides, but considerable research is still needed in this area. Just yesterday the Department of Agriculture issued a release reporting two grants awarded to three State universities to study biological approaches to the control of cotton insects. In addition, the Department of the Interior has announced a new program to develop a catalyst which would cause DDT to degrade more rapidly after application.

I ask unanimous consent that the Stevens Point Daily Journal article, the U.S. Department of Agriculture release, and the U.S. Department of the Interior release be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Stevens Point (Wis.) Daily Journal, July 11, 1969]

TIGHTER PESTICIDE CONTROL URGED

OCEAN SHORES, WASH.—Action to tighten federal and state control over the use of pesticides was taken by the directors of the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture Thursday.

Don Wickham, New York State commissioner of agriculture and NASDA president, said the association "must recognize the need for more stringent controls on pesticides."

The board directed Wickham to develop recommendations for state and federal action. Wickham asked Charles Ellington, Maryland director of agriculture, to head a subcommittee to recommend both amendments to federal laws and a model state law.

"Many states already have the necessary legislation and have instituted tighter controls on pesticides," Wickham said.

The U.S. Agriculture Department announced Wednesday a 30-day ban on the use of nine long-lasting pesticides—including DDT—in government pest control programs. A NASDA spokesman said its action was undertaken before that announcement.

BIOLOGICAL CONTROL OF COTTON PESTS TO BE STUDIED

WASHINGTON, July 14, 1969.—Biological approaches to control of cotton insects will be studied at three State universities under terms of two grants and a cooperative agreement recently signed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

USDA's Agricultural Research Service will provide financial support for the studies, which will be led by the universities' agricultural experiment stations.

At the University of California, Berkeley, Dr. Robert van den Bosch will lead research on biological control of a cotton pest, *Lygus hesperus*, by interplanting cotton with strips of alfalfa, which supports several natural insect enemies of the lygus bug. In related tests, alfalfa will also be interplanted with safflower to support natural insect enemies on this crop. The interrelationships of lygus and its natural enemies in solid and strip harvested alfalfa and in nearby cotton fields will be determined. Earlier studies indicate these approaches to pest control may reduce the need for conventional insecticides.

ARS will support the 3-year studies with a $30,000 research grant. Dr. Sloan E. Jones, stationed at Beltsville, Md., will represent ARS in this project.

At the Texas A&M University, Dr. Perry L. Adkisson and Dr. Winfield Sterling will lead studies on the nutritional requirements and mating and egg-laying habits of selected parasites of the bollworm and tobacco budworm. Using this information, they will then develop methods for mass-rearing the parasites for field releases in control programs.

ARS will support the 2-year study with $40,000; the University will provide an additional $28,000. Dr. Erma Vanderzant and Dr. Richard L. Ridgway, stationed at the College Station, Tex., ARS entomology laboratory, will represent USDA in this project.

At the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Dr. Jacob R. Phillips will lead studies of genetic differences in insecticide resistance of various strains of bollworms and tobacco budworms. These studies may show what role insect migration plays in spreading of insecticide resistance among various strains of insects.

Related studies of genetic traits associated with various strains' adaptation to different climates may suggest ways to control the pests biologically by disrupting these genetic traits—a possibility that might be exploited by interbreeding strains adapted to different climates. The reproductive capacity of their progeny may be adversely affected.

ARS will support these studies with a $39,930 research grant. Dr. Waldemar Klassen, stationed at the ARS Metabolism and Radiation Research Laboratory, Fargo, N.D., will represent USDA in this 3-year project.

FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR DDT CONTROL

Award of a contract to evaluate the feasibility of developing a process which could control the environmental pollution caused by DDT was announced today by Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel.

The contract is regarded as a first step in the search for a catalyst which would cause DDT to self-destruct.

The Secretary said it is hoped that a catalyst can be developed which would prevent not only future deposits of DDT from endangering the environment but degrade pesticides already in the soil so they would no longer be toxic.

The $96,520 contract was awarded through the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to the Aerojet-General Corp. of El Monte, California.

"Success in this effort will make a significant contribution toward ending the environmental pollution caused by DDT," Secretary Hickel said. "Existing evidence indicates a possible relationship between DDT and the reproductive cycle in birds, damage to commercial fishing, and the aquatic food chain."

Carl L. Klein, Assistant Secretary for Water Quality and Research, who has jurisdiction over the FWPCA, said that only after an appropriate catalyst was developed could a practical method be found to combine it with a pesticide in such a way that the strength of the pesticide could be weakened over a certain period of time. He noted that DDT, in its present form, takes from 10 to 12 years to decompose.

Under the terms of the contract, three different approaches are to be studied. One calls for placing DDT and a catalyst in a capsule in such a way that possible destruct action is delayed until two to four weeks after the application date. Another would have DDT and a catalyst placed in the same divided pressurized can so that they mix at the time of spraying, with possible destruct action by the catalyst coming in the same two- to four-week period after application.

Tests are also to be made using DDT containers with partitions that dissolve after six months or a year, thereby automatically allowing the catalyst to begin the process of attacking the DDT. The idea in all cases is to secure positive scientific controls over DDT and especially its persistence.

After the laboratory tests are completed, spray tests are to be made in pilot areas in which different catalysts are to be used in a variety of applications. Evaluation of the pest control and the destructing catalysts would be made weekly or even bi-weekly to determine the effectiveness of the catalysts and the time they take to decompose DDT.

Work under the contract will be performed at the Aerojet-General Corp. laboratories in El Monte, Calif. The scheduled completion date is April 1, 1970.

ADDITIONAL SUPPORT FOR COMPENSATION OF VICTIMS OF CRIME

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on January 15, 1969, I reintroduced my bill to compensate innocent victims of crime in the District of Columbia and certain other federally administered areas. The bill is S. 9 of the 91st Congress. I had previously introduced a similar bill in the 89th and 90th Congresses.

Recently I received a letter from Mr. Leo A. Huard, of the University of Santa Clara Law School, in California, informing me of a private effort by a group of students at the University of Santa Clara to provide relief for crime victims in the local area. This is a very encouraging development; first, because of the initiative it shows; second, because it demonstrates

XUM

once again the public support for the concept of helping crime victims.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Huard's letters, a news release from the University of Santa Clara, and an article, entitled "SHOP Aids Victims of Crime," published in the Santa Clara Views of March 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF
SANTA CLARA, CALIF.,
June 24, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: In view of your introduction of a bill to create a Federal Violent Crimes Compensation Commission, I think you will find the enclosures interesting.

It is refreshing also to see a substantial group of college age men and women engaged in such worthwhile endeavors. There are many young people like these.

Good luck with your bill.

Sincerely,

LEO A. HUARD.

THE UNIVERSITY OF
SANTA CLARA, CALIF.,
June 23, 1969.

Mr. OSBORN ELLIOTT,
Editor, Newsweek,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. ELLIOTT: I was very much interested in the Newsweek story "Help for the Victim" (Newsweek, June 23, 1969, p. 59), because I can furnish evidence that someone is trying to help the victims of crime. I am enclosing copies of a press release and a story from our alumni news letter concerning the efforts of some college students to alleviate the misery of the Sam Wassertein's and Park Huey's of this world.

The campaign referred to in the release and the story raised $7,000, most of which is being invested under the supervision of the Community Bank of San Jose to enlarge the SHOP fund. The student directors of SHOP propose to continue their efforts next year in order to raise enough money to give meaningful help to Susan Bartolomei and others in the same predicament.

The enthusiasm with which so many college students have worked for SHOP is a real tribute to their social awareness and their sense of social responsibility.

Sincerely,

LEO A. HUARD,
Dean.

SHOP AIDS VICTIMS OF CRIME

Victims of crime, like young Susan Bartolomei of Ukiah who was left paralyzed from the neck down after being shot five times, will be the benefactors of a new multicampus organization, Students Helping Other People (SHOP), begun this month at the University.

Developed by Santa Clara students, SHOP already has branch units on the nearby campuses of Foothill, San Mateo and San Jose State.

SHOP's first goal is to raise $100,000, which its members plan to do by staging raffles, concerts and drawings during the next two months on all four campuses.

Incorporated by the State as a non-profit, charitable organization, SHOP is governed by a nine-man board of directors, all Santa Clara students. Its purposes are to provide relief for 1) those who have suffered injury or damage to person or property through crimes and criminal assaults; 2) those who have suffered injury or damage to person or property while rescuing another or another's property from criminal assaults or natural calamities, such as fires, floods and earthquakes; and 3) other similar charitable purposes.

The idea originated in a philosophy class of Dr. Patrick Hughes. Guest lecturer for the day was Law School Dean Leo A. Huard who was explaining the difference between law and justice. As an illustration, he said that if Susan Bartolomei had been hit by a car, she probably could have collected $400,000 from the driver's insurance company, but because she was a victim of a crime, there was no recourse open to her.

After her tragedy, a bill was passed by the State Legislature that provides a maximum of $5,000 for victims, but Susan's hospital bills alone exceed $35,000 at the present time.

Huard said that when the class was over, the students and Prof. Hughes became very interested in doing something about the situation. After investigating the problem legally they formed SHOP and applied for incorporation.

Students involved in the organization and administration of SHOP include Patrick Tondreau of Mt. View, Lee Greeley of Redwood City, Marcia Fort of Mt. Vernon, Wash., David Arata of Saratoga, Robert Watson of Los Angeles, Philip Mastrocola of San Jose, Larry Bolton of Arcadia, Jeanne Huard of Saratoga, Martha Paine of Hollister and Frank Sapena of Santa Clara.

THE TEXTILE-APPAREL INDUSTRY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, an economic development program is going on in this country backed by Federal legislation and Federal funds and frustrated by our foreign economic policy.

The Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 states "that regionwide development is feasible, desirable, and urgently needed." The act provides for Federal and State joint action to help the economic development of the region and of substantial areas nearby in eight Appalachian region States and in the State of Mississippi.

Appalachia is one of two regions undergoing economic development in this country. The other is the core city, in almost every city in our land.

Both of these underdeveloped areas have several things in common. They have high unemployment rates; large portions of their workers have low skill levels; family incomes are below national averages; living conditions are often substandard. There is one more thing these two areas have in common; they have large portions of their employed workers employed in the textile-apparel industry, that is, in textiles, apparel, and manmade fiber production.

Throughout our Nation as a whole, one in every eight workers in manufacturing industries is a textile-apparel industry worker. In the Appalachian region, one in every four manufacturing workers is in the textile-apparel industry. In all, the textile-apparel industrial complex provides 2.4 million jobs in the United States today. In Appalachia and within 50 miles of it—many of which areas have similar conditions—are about 1.1 million textile-apparel industry jobs.

Some counties in Appalachia have 90 percent or more of their manufacturing workers employed in the textile-apparel industry. Somewhat over 20 percent of the jobs in the textile-apparel industry in the entire United States are in the Appalachian region. The manmade fibers sector of this industrial complex provides half of its jobs in the Appalachian region.

In many of our largest cities the textile-apparel complex also plays a significant part in providing employment. In the five boroughs of New York City, 30 percent of all manufacturing jobs are directly related to the production of textile and apparel products. In Manhattan alone, 39 percent of all manufacturing jobs are in the textile-apparel industry.

Naturally, an industry of the size and importance to our economy as the textile-apparel industry is also providing many jobs for others. Cotton farmers, sheep ranchers, machinery manufacturers, paper manufacturers, utility companies, and many other industries supply the textile-apparel complex with billions of dollars in goods and services each year. The purhcasing power provided the employees of this industrial complex provides many more jobs in consumer goods and services industries.

This is an industry which can provide jobs to unskilled or semiskilled workers. Training can be done on the job after the person has been hired. High educational levels are not needed for the majority of jobs in this industry. This means that it is a very large source of employment for those groups in our economy who traditionally have the highest unemployment rates: Negroes, women, unskilled workers. These are the people who live in the areas of underdevelopment in this country.

If the textile-apparel industry is to be a moving force behind the development of Appalachia and the core city, it must be able to function as a growing industry, an industry whose markets are fairly reliable in size and growth. As things now stand, the textile-apparel industry cannot make plans for growth, plans to hire more people, start up new plants, enter new areas where reserves of unemployed people are waiting to work.

At the same time that our textile-apparel complex is providing jobs for our harder-to-employ citizens, it is being frustrated by the tremendous rush of imported textile and apparel products entering this country every day of the year. This industry is not interested in shutting off all imports of apparel and textiles, it recognizes the need to help economic development in all parts of the world as well as in our own country. But it does need to have an orderly market at home if it is to continue as the important and viable industry that it should be.

When the importation of cotton textile and apparel products began to be a threat to the stability of our domestic markets for these products, our Government undertook to help establish an international understanding concerning the world trade in cotton products. That was at the very beginning of this decade. The Long-Term Cotton Textile Arrangement has, in large measure, provided orderly markets within the United States as well as in every other participating country in the world.

We have seen a marked change in the type of clothing and textiles used over

XUM

this decade. Now the dominant type of fiber for many textile and apparel products is man made rather than cotton. In response to this change, foreign textile and apparel producers have shipped us ever-increasing amounts of manmade fiber textiles and apparel. They have shipped us so much that in many important areas imports are already providing disorderly domestic markets.

As the textile-apparel complex views the situation, the best solution to the problem is the establishment of an international arrangement covering all major fibers. To be most effective, this arrangement should be modeled after the cotton arrangement. This would permit foreign producers to increase their exports to the United States in proportion to the growth in our domestic markets. At the same time, this type of arrangement would enable American textile and apparel producers to manufacture for orderly markets with a demand more easily determined than under current conditions.

Before I close, I would like to give you an idea of the importance to the economy of my State of Pennsylvania of the textile-apparel complex.

In Pennsylvania, this industrial complex employs 250,000 people, about 16 percent of all manufacturing employment in the State. It pays $1 billion in wages and salaries to these employees. The industry has 3,000 plants located throughout the State.

The textile-apparel complex in my State is a big employer of core city workers in such places as Philadelphia and in many cities in our area of Appalachia. In Philadelphia alone, 83,000 people work in the textile-apparel complex. The contribution is even greater in some areas of Appalachia. For example, over 40 percent of the manufacturing employment of the Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton and Scranton areas are in the textile and apparel industry, some 36,000 of 88,000 workers.

Almost all of the textile and apparel companies in my State are being hurt by imports. With normal growth this industrial complex could continue to supply increasing job opportunities to people who need low skill threshold entry opportunities. Continued, unchecked growth of textile and apparel imports, particularly in wool and manmade fibers, will do irreparable harm to this important industry in my State and many others.

We need an orderly access arrangement whereby we can share the growth or decline in our textile and apparel markets with the developing nations of the world. To do less than this would be an admission that this complex is not important to our national economy. I do not believe this. I think that the textile apparel complex is an extremely important segment of our industrial complex and we cannot afford the luxury of allowing it to decline.

DR. O. C. ADERHOLD

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, Dr. O. C. Aderhold, president emeritus of the University of Georgia, passed away July 4 after a long illness. During his tenure as president, from 1950 to 1967, he provided forceful, dynamic leadership that assured the university of a ranking position in the forefront of higher education, not only in the South, but throughout the Nation. He established himself as one of Georgia's greatest and most beloved educators.

The year Dr. Aderhold assumed leadership of the University of Georgia, enrollment totaled 4,517. The university's physical plant was valued at $12 million. Seventeen years later, at the time of his retirement, 14,500 students were enrolled, studying at modern, well-equipped facilities worth more than $100 million.

These statistics are impressive. But even more important was Dr. Aderhold's concern with the aims of education. Under his tutelage, the university is producing graduates able and eager to provide Georgia with the concerned, intelligent leadership so vital to the progress of any society. This was his great accomplishment, for which all the State is indebted.

Mr. President, I join all Georgians in mourning Dr. Aderhold's death. Mrs. Talmadge joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to the family.

I ask unanimous consent that selected editorial eulogies from Georgia newspapers be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal, July 11, 1969]

DR. ADERHOLD

When Dr. O. C. Aderhold became president of the University of Georgia in 1950 it was a small institution made up of a number of schools and colleges, frequently on diverse courses. Some of these schools were good, some were bad and a few were deplorable.

When he retired 17 years later, the institution had expanded enormously in size. What matters, though, was the increase in quality and prestige.

Dr. Aderhold provided the force which brought the several units together and kept them there. He knew how to build for quality and he did this. He knew how to get money for new buildings and new buildings sprung up as a result of this talent. He knew salaries had to be brought up to standards and they were. When he left his office in 1967 he left a university which could contribute enormously to a state which badly needed quality from the top in order to improve its economic standing, its literacy level and its social scheme. The improvements in Georgia are notable. It is easy to show that they came from the greatly improved university and University System of Georgia. Dr. Aderhold's imagination and work will live on for a long time. The Journal joins his many other friends in extending sympathy to his family.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, July 9, 1969]

DR. O. C. ADERHOLD

Dr. O. C. Aderhold presided in an era of great change at the University of Georgia. When he became president in 1950, the university had slightly more than 4,000 students, and it granted one doctoral degree in 1951. The great college rush of the late Fifties and Sixties so transformed the school that in 1967 when Dr. Aderhold retired, Athens had more than 14,000 students and granted that year 151 doctorates.

Dr. Aderhold, who died during the past weekend, served, then, during 17 years of tremendous educational and physical changes at the university. "No man has ever done more for education in Georgia," said Dr. George L. Simpson Jr., chancellor of the University System.

His family and friends may be proud of Dr. Aderhold's enduring contributions to this state.

[From the Savannah (Ga.) Evening Press, July 8, 1969]

DR. O. C. ADERHOLD

Dr. O. C. Aderhold, who died Friday night after a long illness, was a leader in the development of the University of Georgia and was at its head during the period of its greatest growth.

While he was president of Georgia, the state university expanded from 4,517 students to 14,500. The worth of its physical plant grew from $12 million to more than $100 million. Its research budget rose to $14 million representing about 800 studies by 650 faculty members.

During the Aderhold years from 1950 to 1967, the university's number of graduate students increased from 361 to 1,725, and when he became president emeritus, he left it with a still more prominent future in education assured.

Dr. Aderhold was a native of Georgia, a Lavonia farm boy who made his way up through the ranks in education and who made friends all along the way. The many Georgia graduates who knew him, and the many who profited from the growth of the university during his presidency, mourn his passing.

[From the Waycross (Ga.) Journal-Herald, July 9, 1969]

DR. ADERHOLD WAS BUILDER

Dr. O. C. Aderhold was at the helm of the University of Georgia when it experienced its greatest growth.

While his 17 years were during a post-war boom period for education, the wise planning and practical leadership of this career educator helped put the University in the forefront of the nation's institutions of higher education.

During his tenure as president, the University grew from 4,517 students to more than 14,500 in 1967. The physical plant increased from $12 million to more than $100 million.

The research budget grew to more than $14 million representing about 800 studies by 650 faculty members.

During the Aderhold years the number of graduate students increased from 361 to 1,725.

These great accomplishments would not have been possible without dynamic leadership.

These excerpts from speeches by Dr. Aderhold mirror an outlook that helped make the University the great force it has become in our time:

"Education is an investment in people. Business is good when people have the ability to produce and the desire to buy. Where schools are best, average incomes are greatest and retail sales are highest . . .

". . . . education, to be worthy of its name, must be concerned with the worth, the dignity and the value of the individual"

Dr. Aderhold has had a life-long interest in education not only at the campus level but at every stage. He once served as president of the Georgia Education Association and he was executive secretary of the General Assembly committee which founded the Minimum Foundation Program for public education, the "constitution" of the state's current school program.

All Georgians are indebted to this distinguished man. His passing saddens us but

XUM

the campus of the University at Athens, expanding and dynamic, stands as a monument to his service.

RALPH NADER EXPOSES NEED FOR PUBLIC INFORMATION ON HEALTH EFFECTS OF FOOD ADDITIVES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this morning Ralph Nader testified before the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, so ably presided over by the junior Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGovern), about the food supply of the United States. In my view, his statements regarding the lack of public information concerning the contents of food products and the effects of food additives which are regularly placed in the food we all consume should be of great concern to everyone.

During the hearing it was disclosed that Mr. Nader as a citizen and, I might add, the committee itself have been unable to obtain complete information as to what various commonly consumed foods such as frankfurters and baby foods contain.

Mr. President, in view of the importance of Mr. Nader's statement, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

Mr. McGOVERN. I join the distinguished Senator from Texas in asking unanimous consent that Mr. Nader's statement before the select committee this morning be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Ralph Nader

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Members of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, I am grateful for the opportunity to comment on the matters of greatest moment before you. The Select Committee's mandate, as set forth in Senate Resolution 281, is "to study the food, medical, and other related basic needs among the people of the United States and to report back to the appropriate committees of the Senate . . ." From this mandate, there clearly flows the Committee's inquiry into the quantity, quality and distribution of the nation's food supply. This inquiry, past hearings show, involves industry, government, the marketplace and the ultimate receivers of food products. I would like to concentrate on the food industry and its relations with government in this statement.

The food industry is one of the few commercial activities that has 201 million customers in this country. Its consumer body is universal. The industry also offers the product that has the most intimate consumption pattern. These two obvious facts have important and less obvious corollaries. One is that the industry has a vertical and horizontal structure that amasses to itself the most comprehensive matrices of political and economic power. It has the concentrated power of mighty corporations and the decentralized power of growers and distributors right down to Main Street, USA. It has felt the lobbying might of political votes and differentiated economic interest groups, each organized around a special focus in their trade groups, but all ready to rally around the totem pole of their aggregate self-interest. A mighty $100 billion industry—affecting the public in endless ways, overt and covert—with little critical oversight by external institutions—public or private. A crucial touchstone of the relentlessly successful acquisition of its objectives is its transformation of government agencies into a manner of corporate socialism with such fallouts as annual subsidies to Standard Oil in its role as "farmer,"—the greatest semantic defense of concentrated agri-business ever developed.

The structure of the food industry has pointed consequences adverse to consumer welfare and citizen knowledge. These consequences were pointed out in great detail in the report of the National Commission on Food Marketing (1966) and its voluminous technical studies. The Commission warned against the growing concentration in national food processing and distribution, declaring that it worked to reduce competition, raised high barriers to entry by new firms and was not at all counterbalanced by economics of scale. It is significant that almost all the recommendations of the Commission have gone unheeded, including its caveats against conglomerates and the necessity for action in this area. The conglomerates continue their takeover of the food industry. Greyhound Corp., which cannot even equip many of its buses with safe tires, now wants to produce hot dogs et al by taking over Armour—the nation's second largest meatpacker. ITT is taking over Continental Bakery. Competition requires competitors competing over better quality and service. The corporate radicalism, which pitches food companies headlong into concentrated collectivism, should alarm all those who value the traditional precepts of competitive enterprise.

One of the telltale signs of a deteriorating competitive performance in any industry—despite huzzas from the Chamber of Commerce table to the contrary—is the enhanced ability of firms to promote product distinctions without a genuine difference. This is known as competing more and more about less and less that is relevant to the purported purpose or use of the product. This trivial product differentiation, often shading into effective monopolistic competition, is significantly a function of high concentrations in the relevant product markets. The National Commission described the phenomenon quite succinctly:

"High concentration in the food industry is undesirable because it weakens competition as a self-regulating device by which the activities of business firms are directed toward the welfare of the public at large. When a few large firms dominate a field, they frequently forbear from competing actively by price; competition by advertising, sales promotion, and other selling efforts almost always increases; and the market power inescapably at the disposal of such firms may be used to impose onerous terms upon suppliers or customers. The breakfast cereal field provides one of the clearest examples in the food industry: Four firms have 85 percent of the business; advertising and sales promotion amount to 19 percent of manufacturers' sales; retail prices of cereals rose more than other retail food prices between 1954 and 1964; profits are nearly double the average for all food manufacturing; and entry of a new competitior would be extremely difficult.

"The substantial costs built into the price of food as a result of various forms of selling effort—advertising, sales promotion, expensive packaging, salesmen—are an important form of inefficiency in the food industry."

It is important not to misunderstand, as segments of the food and advertising industries are wont to do, the Commission's point. The thrust of the Commission's conclusions is that these costs are mostly directed toward non-price, non-quality competition, not to promotional costs *per se*. A tour of a cereal plant offers a glimpse of the tremendous effort that has gone into the packaging, style, shape, copy activities, the shape, color and texture of the cereal and how little attention is devoted to the nutritional level of the cereal. In a spectacularly maligned passage, the Commission majority asserted its view of the consumer's position:

"The principal criticism of the efficiency of the industry, in the broad sense of the term, is the cost devoted to selling efforts that yield little value to consumers. This point is closely related to the other principal criticism of the food industry from the standpoint of consumers; the difficulty they encounter in trying to buy so as to get the most for their money.

"The difficulty takes numerous forms. Some advertising is misleading or downright deceptive; some package sizes and designs exaggerate the contents; essential information that should be contained in labels if often hard to find, illegible, or even missing; package contents may be in odd or nonstandard amounts for no technical reason, making price comparisons difficult; per-pound prices of the 'large economy size' occasionally are higher than per-pound prices of smaller sizes; "cents-off" labels proclaim price reductions that may not be genuine; special prices create confusion as to what the going price is; not all products advertised as weekend features are sold at special prices; consumer grades are confined to a few products and are by no means uniformly used even for those; and standards of identity are lacking for many products."

When one company controls over 95% of the canned soup market (Campbell Soups); when by 1958, according to the Commission's studies, 80% of all food industries were classified as oligopolies (a condition of few sellers); when four companies—Kellogg, General Foods, General Mills, and Quaker Oats have over 85% of breakfast cereal sales; when the 22 largest food manufacturers spend about 18% of sales on advertising (compared with less than 3% for automobile companies), it is imperative to evaluate continually the effect on the consumer of such market structure and these built-in costs. If all these promotional costs reflected consumer-benefiting technological innovations and enhanced nutrition, for example, it would be one thing. As a coverup for quality deficiencies and inefficiencies, such promotional costs simply drain the consumer's real income without his achieving value comparable with the increased costs. Food manufacturers spend on promotion a percentage of sales only exceeded by the soap and cosmetic industries. The difference is that one industry is selling food (a necessity) and the other (cosmetic industry) is selling hope.

The connection between industry structure and conduct and the consumer's pocketbook is clear but rarely communicated in understandable terms. The chief Federal Trade Commission economist—Willard Mueller—who manages to escape the arcane terminology of his profession, recently described what price fixing by the leading bread bakers of the State of Washington meant to consumers. Prior to the commencement of the conspiracy in 1954, Seattle bread prices were very near the national average. During the tenure (1955–1964) of the price-fixing, Seattle bread prices rose sharply and averaged between 15 percent and 20 percent above the national average. After the FTC's decision against the bakeries, Seattle bread prices began to tumble and for the past four years have been at or below the national average. Mr. Mueller concluded about this not untypical situation: "The people of the State of Washington paid about $3.5 million more for bread each year during 1955–1964 than they would have paid had prices continued at the national average, or about $35 million over the 10-year period. Since 1964, when the conspiracy was declared illegal, Washington consumers have paid about $15 million less for their bread than they would have paid had the conspiracy continued in effect."

Such market conduct cheapens the consumer dollar, much as government-inspired inflation does and in effect not only reduces real income, but probably impairs the food budget of poorer households.

A standard food industry argument about higher costs is to cite figures showing that there has been a decline in the percentage of consumer income spent on food since 1935. This argument merely reflects Engel's law of diminishing percentage expenditures for foods as real incomes increase.

In their operating practices, however, food manufacturers and processors do everything they can to overcome Engel's law. The trade press is filled with pages stressing the same themes—maximize sales and reduce costs. There are many ways to achieve these goals—some of them quite laudable. What is of concern here is the achievement of the goals at the expense of quality, nutrition, quantity and truth in the marketplace.

Before moving to a number of specific cases illustrating central themes of deplorable industry behavior, it is useful to describe briefly both the burden on the industry and the manipulative strategies *vis-a-vis* the consumer which are harmful and bilking.

Food products are consumed with such profound need and deep trust by people that the common law long ago reserved hazardous food products for strict liability treatment. Harmful ingredients or deteriorations in food represent a classic "latent defect" of tort law. Harm done to persons by such food products constitutes a silent violence which is usually not perceivable by the senses until it is too late. The defense of *caveat emptor*—now heading for oblivion—generally went out long ago in food product liability cases. The silent violence of harmful food products ranges from minor discomforts to erosion of bodily processes, shortening of life or sudden death. With the growing chemical and other technologies of food growing, processing and packaging, the magnitude of potential harmful genetic impacts is alarming scientists at recent symposia. Silent violence is rarely confronted by high level calls for law and order, mass demands for empirical and statistical studies as for street crimes and disorders. The nature of the assault—quiet, most often harmful over time, and attacking cell or tissue structure—simply does not generate the kinds of moral indignation and concern reserved for the more primitive types of domestic violence.

Under such an insulation, and absent government data gathering, regulatory and enforcement activity worthy of the challenge, the food industry has institutionalized an indifference to the adverse consumer consequences of its manufacturing, processing and merchandising responsibilities. Much of the industry's activity goes beyond indifference, moreover, and is calculated to maximize sales and minimize costs no matter what the nutritional toxic, carcinogenic or mutagenic impact may be on humans and their progeny.

What the food industry does to reduce critical consumer feedback and divert consumer attention to highly controllable demand patterns is really quite simple. Long ago, anthropologists documented in their study of diverse societies that food preferences are culturally determined. Some societies eat insects which would repel Americans; other societies think semi-digested fish regurgitated from a mammal to be a prime delicacy. The pertinent point is that a far more complex society with mass, instantaneous communications offers many opportunities for skilled salesmen to shape consumer preferences. There is nothing esoteric about this practice. It is applied social science. Generating cultural determinants of food tastes and preferences has become an industry all by itself. Heredity does not explain why Americans eat Bond Bread and why Frenchmen would not even call it bread, much less eat the spongy conglomerate. Culture—commercial culture particularly—explains the difference.

For the domestic food industry there are several important consumer preferences to meet if a particular product is to be commercially successful. These are: *taste, texture, tenderness, aesthetics* and *convenience*. The ingenious misuse of modern chemistry—especially coloring agents, seasonings and preservatives—can meet these preferences. The tragic factor is that these preferences can be met by non-nutritious, contaminated, deteriorating and other adulterated food products. Further, the same chemical tactics that meet these preferences also mask the true condition of the product and dull what sensory detection facilities the consumer has to alert him to wholesome products. The soothing pictures and messages on the packages and in the media further lull the consumer into blind trust.

Now, for some specific cases out of many to show how some of the afore-mentioned principles are applied and how supremely indifferent or calculating the industry is to the consumer's welfare:

1. A combination of facilitative technology, creeping greed and a somnolent U.S. Department of Agriculture has resulted in a very significant increase of fat content in frankfurters. Between 1937 and 1967, fat content increased from 18.6% to 31.2% and the protein content decreased from 19.6% to 11.8%. The upswing in fat content continues with the latest figures in the 33% range and the American Meat Institute claiming that the maximum fat content normal in this product is in the 33–35% range. New techniques—some developed by the USDA and some developed in Germany promise even more emphatic production of "fatfurters." Recent Department of Agriculture tests show brands exceeding 40% fat with one brand reaching 51%. As is its industry-indentured practice, USDA refuses to divulge fat content by brand name. Rather it proposes to limit fat content to 33% which together with water, spices and miscellaneous debris very nearly exceeds the substandard meat that makes up the rest of this sausage type product. Fifteen billion hot dogs are consumed annually by Americans. If we accept reputable and repeated medical studies and judgment linking high fat diet to higher blood cholesterol levels which are connected with the rising incidence of heart and coronary disease (the nation's leading cause of death) then these 15 billion hot dogs are among America's deadliest missiles. As an economic fraud—looting would be a better word—the "fatfurter" is costing consumers tens of millions of dollars. The looting is done with slide rule efficiency—each manufacturer knows how many pennies per pound he saves with every increment of fat. The consumer, of course, has no idea how much fat is in frankfurters—there has been no labeling required—and little awareness of the serious health hazard involved in his later years. Hot dogs as a device to defraud people under the guise of meat, and as a food form to sell the substandard meat palatably, has matched the dreams of any meat companies avarice.

Given the fore-going on hot dogs, it should not come as any surprise that hamburgers are subjected to similar adulterations with ingredients that are cheaper than meat. All over the country, hamburgers are exceeding state ingredient requirements. In New York City, hamburgers were exposed recently by the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs, Bess Myerson Grant, as highly adulterated with such discernible matter as starchy flour, cereal and chemical additives. (A 1963 New York State study came to similar conclusions.) Although advertised as "all beef" hamburgers, they were really "shamburgers." Earlier this year in Columbus, Ohio, city officials tested hamburgers and found that 70% of them (from 40 stores) exceeded fat content limits of 20% for ground beef and 30% for ground meat advertised as hamburger. The 1967 Wholesome Meat Act hearings in the Congress contained further documentation of this problem.

An additional and little mentioned problem from excessive fat content in these products is that a far greater percentage of calories come from the fat than the fat-meat percentages in the hot dog or hamburger would indicate. (Fat has 9 calories per gram while protein has 4 calories per gram).

2. One of the enduring characteristics of the food industry is its penchant to sell now and have someone else test later. In case after case, the sequence of doubt to risk to reasonable certainty of harm has been the burden of researchers outside the food industry. It comes as a highly disturbing disclosure that this sequence is emerging for the one area of food product in which most people hold greatest trust. I am speaking of baby food.

Competent nutritionists are showing growing concern over the amounts of salt, sugar, starch and monosodium glutamate in many baby foods. Salt is of particular concern because of its link to increase hypertension. According to a prominent expert on infant nutrition, Dr. Samuel Fomon, University of Iowa, a child with a hereditary exposure to hypertension would be especially affected now and in later years by the salt in baby food. Sodium intake is increased further to the degree that baby foods with abundantly salted meats, vegetables and even some fruit displace milk. Why is salt put in baby food? Not for the baby, but to please the taste of the mother. The same appeal accounts for the addition of sugar to strained vegetables. Sugar also provides the baby food with a cheaper substance than vegetables and loads the baby with empty calories (i.e. a nutritionally poor, cariogenic and possibly atherogenic substance). A research official at the H. J. Heinz Company admitted that the inclusion of salt and sugar by his company was in response to another company's initiation of the practice and claiming that their food tasted better in their advertisements. As a minimum, since salt and sugar do nothing for the baby, yet raise risks against the baby, the burden of proof should be on the companies who use them. They have not met nor attempted to meet this burden of proof at all, as far as any of their disclosures indicate.

Price and profit considerations also determine the use of increasing amounts of modified starches in strained fruits and dinners. The use of starch has no nutritional justification but it does have nutritional adversities. According to Harvard nutritionists, this starch replaces meat, and decreases the concentration of iron, copper and other nutrients not found in milk (which is a principal nutritional justification for the introduction of baby food). Why is modified food starch added to baby food? One reason is to preserve the texture of the food against baby's saliva liquifying unmodified starch. The modified starch is no longer normally digested. (A pertinent study by Thomas A. Anderson, National Research Laboratory, H. J. Heinz Company (1969) suggests that modified starches are not digested "in a manner identical to their unmodified counterpart." He also suggests that modified starches actually raises the blood cholesterol level.)

The attraction of monosodium glutamate (85% of which is produced by Accent International) to the baby food producers is enhancing the flavor of these starchy foods for the benefit of the mother. There is no evidence that baby craves MSG. It was not until the late 1940's that large scale MSG production began in this country. Yet not until last year did the first report of the "Chinese restaurant syndrome"—a cluster of pathological reactions affecting some people who ate Chinese food—emerge. Typically, the report was not done by industry researchers, but by an independent physician. There still is no data on the tolerance of babies to MSG. It is known that MSG increases the sodium content of the food, that it has reacted in large doses, most seriously on mice and chicks, that the FDA has conducted tests on how much MSG is going into baby foods and that Campbell Soups is contracted for tests at Alvany Medical College, N.Y. The question repeats itself—when the benefit is nil nutritionally and is commercially geared to the mother, why take the risk without studying the effects first?

Another ingredient on which alarms are being raised is the nitrate content of vegetable baby food. Nitrates come from the residuals of nitrogen fertilizer (which is expected to increase massively in the next few decades). Once inside the baby, nitrates can lead to nitrite poisoning—to which babies are most vulnerable. Professor Barry Commoner of Washington University, St. Louis, has written a paper on such poisoning discovered by European public health officials among infants that was traced to the consumption of unrefrigerated American-processed baby food. Professor Commoner claims that in recent tests he ran on strained beets in baby food, the amount of nitrate was consistently above what is considered acceptable levels. He plans to publish this data officially in the fall. The more precise extent of this toxic hazard to infants is not fully known in this country because no one is trying to find out in any systematic way. The food industry does not appear interested in incorporating detection techniques or doing research on this problem.

Other activity toward safer baby food is worthy of note. The Nutrition Committee of the Pediatrics Academy is urging the industry to reduce the salt content of baby foods. There is little hope that the baby food companies, especially the hard-liner of the industry—Gerbers—will listen to the pediatricians. Heinz is experimenting with unsalted food and perhaps the company will inform the Committee of its findings.

3. The food companies are averse to labeling their products for nutritional content so as to permit the consumer greater choice and judgment. Baby food displays a listing of ingedients (sugar, salt, starch, MSG) but there is obviously a need to list protein, fat and important vitamins and minerals. West Germany requires specific nutrient labeling and there is no evidence of pending bankruptcy of German food companies. An FDA toxicological adviser, Dr. O. G. Fitzhugh, declares that the individuals who are particularly susceptible to MSG should learn to stay away from food with large amounts of MSG. However, many foods, such as mayonnaise, french dressings and salad dressings may also contain MSG and are not required to list it on the label. Previously it was noted that the USDA does not require the label of hot dogs and sausages to carry the percentage content of their major components such as fat, spices, water and meat. But pet food manufacturers eagerly put detailed ingredient statements on their labels (e.g. dog food produced by Armour & Company and by General Foods Corporation) to let owners know what their pets are eating.* Similarly, detailed labeling obtained for cattle feed because cattle owners want fast growing, large cattle for market.

4. The case of artificial sweeteners illustrate the unwillingness of the industry in anticipating and resolving a health problem. The significant marketing of artificial sweeteners began a decade ago. The FDA, without engaging in precautionary testing, had promptly included these sweeteners (cyclamates) on its GRAS (Generally Recognized As Safe) list. These artificial sweeteners were promoted as an antidote to obesity, without any evidence that this was the case. Sales rocketed, increasing seven-fold between 1962 and 1967. One aspect of General Foods handling of these sweeteners can be illustrated in the following way. A customer can go into a market and buy a packet of Kool-Aid. On the back, there is the following FDA required statement: "Contains 31.5% calcium cyclamate and 3.2% sodium saccharin, nonnutritive artificial sweeteners which should be used only by persons who must restrict their intake of ordinary sweets." Now compare this advice with the content of TV advertisements for exactly the same product, but which omit entirely this advice. (Exhibit)

Late last year, due entirely to government research at FDA, scientific doubt was cast on the safety of cyclamates, which millions of Americans were consuming daily in food and drink. It was discovered that a breakdown chemical of cyclamates called Cyclohexylimine appeared to caues genetic damage. On the basis of this and other damaging British information, private label foods containing the cyclamate were banned by three British retail chains from the shelves of 27 department stores and 270 supermarkets. No similar action has been taken by any American business. The FDA put out recommended intake levels in a manner conducive to noncomprehension by anyone but a physician. In addition, it is very difficult for a consumer to find out how much cyclamate by grams is in the artificially sweetened products. The FDA has not widely distributed cyclamate content by brands and sizes. And cyclamates still remain on the FDA GRAS list as a product for which no testing and no tolerance levels are required.

5. If we accept the rhetoric of modern business in the area of the social responsibility of the large corporation, it is not incumbent for the large food companies, at least, to study and act on the dietary patterns of different groups that make up their consumer market. Should not General Mills, General Foods, Quaker Oats, Green Giant, Ralston-Purina, Kellogg, Lipton, Coca-Cola and other companies be actively concerned about the USDA reporting last year as follows: In 1955, 40% of families consumed poor diets, by 1965 the figure reached 50%. Of the families living on poor diets, *63% had income above $3000/year*. Other trends between 1955 and 1965 showed "an increase in the proportion going to grain products because of more purchases of bakery products; and an increase in the proportion going for beverages such as soft drinks, punches, ades and beverage powders." (USDA—Household Food Consumption Survey, 1965–1966 report No. 1) The same report indicated that "From 1955 to 1965 (percentage) consumption increased for soft drinks, punches and ades, potato chips, crackers, cookies, doughnuts, ice cream, candy and peanut butter." Do the food companies have an overall responsibility for what they sell, for the dietary shifts downward in nutrition that their campaigns promote, for the deep ignorance of nutrition in the population that breeds food quackery at its extreme?

Other questions come to mind: Is private industry generating an economy of deficient abundance with middle-class consumers being persuaded in faulty food diets? Why has private industry neglected to apply to domestic consumer markets the highly nutritious foods developed for people overseas under government sponsorship or encouragement? While the food corporations of the U.S. supply "Vitasay" to Hong Kong, "Pronutro" to South America and "Incapurina" to the same area, U.S. consumers are being fed on potato chips, pretzels, snacks that come in various sculptures and colors. While the Coca-Cola company is distributing a high protein chocolate drink "Saci" to developing countries, it supplies the U.S. with cola—a massive affliction that contains absolutely no vitamins or proteins. It does add caffeine, however, and is not required to announce that fact on its label, contrary to nearly unanimous FDA staff recommendations in 1966. The views of companies testifying before this Committee will be interested to read on these subjects. (By way of comparison, the following food selections for good nutrition by the Agricultural Research Service, USDA, October, 1968, are appended. You may wish to note how many heavily merchandised so-called food products are absent from this list and would never make any such a list.)

Telling evidence as to the inadequate concern for consumer welfare by food manufacturers and processors is the amount of funds committed to research and nutritional testing. The National Commission on Food Marketing reported in 1966 that in 1964 the food manufacturing companies spent $1,389,000,000 on advertising, while the same companies in the same year only spent $135,000,000—less than one-tenth as much on research and development. Of this $135,000,000 spent on corporate R&D, fully 90 percent was devoted to research and development of such promotional items as package design, consumer motivation and the like. Only a bare $12,000,000 was spent on basic food research. Food and kindred products rank lowest, except for primary metals, in the number of research and development employees per 1000 employees. The industry's attitude toward its own responsibilities in testing the various effects, short and longer range, of their additives is reflected in the tragically low research and testing budget, most of which goes to developing new convenience foods using more additives and not on the effects of these additives on the human organism. The level of technical competence in the food laboratories is now, as judged by the producers of food additives who sell to these companies (Chemical and Engineering News Record, October 10, 1968).

One of this century's greatest geneticists, Dr. Herman J. Muller, put this kind of problem in proper focus:

"What we are concerned with . . . is the possibility of (food additives, drugs, narcotics, antibiotics, pesticides, air pollutants and water pollutants) being mutagenetic, that is, producing mutations in the genetic material, and being thereby damaging not only to the directly exposed individuals but even to their descendants.

"It is now important to know what substances have such effects, how they may be recognized and dealt with, and in what ways the effects will be expressed in the exposed and subsequent generations."

Over the past several years, leading geneticists and biologists meeting at scientific meetings have expressed alarm at the lack of national policy and commitment to understanding the somatic and genetic impacts on people by the thousands of chemicals, including food additives, that are confronting us. When scientists such as Dr. Rene Dubos, Dr. Richard A. Kimball (Oak Ridge National Laboratory), Dr. Marvin Legator (FDA) and Dr. Matthew Meselson of Harvard show deep worry, it is time we all became concerned about the need for safety guidelines and monitoring procedures within an overall strategy of prevention.

The specific and mounting pressure for action is well stated in an FDA five-year program 1970–1974:

---

*The Senate hearings on the 1967 meat act contained information about a substantial number of poor people eating dog food as a normal diet. I have heard of this consumption pattern from various sources around the country including the large northern cities. The pet food companies, I am told, have some surveys which point more concretely to this being the case. Certainly the television commercials display an exuberance on dog food which may persuade some people that what is so good for the dog is good for the master.

"The use of direct food additives in food manufacture will have approximately doubled by 1974 from the level of use prior to the passage of the Food Additives Amendment (1958) to the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act. Over 1,000,000,000 pounds of some 2,500 food additive chemicals will be consumed. Both the methodology for their detection and their long-term toxicological significance require an expansion of research activities by the FDA. Unknown alteration products further complicate the attaining of the necessary security in the safety of the food supply. The primary need at present is for the development of multi-additive detection methods to facilitate surveillance and measurement of actual additive intake levels. The needs are similar in the area of natural poisons such as the mycotoxins."

In the time available, a few words should be directed toward the performance of the FDA and USDA in safeguarding and promoting the quality and nutritional value of the food supply. Federal government performance can be divided into five functions—*research, regulatory, support, statistical and studies* and *educational.*

1. *Research*—USDA research on the food supply has been heavily dictated by the Department's promotional responsibilities and the state of surplus commodities or the health of particular agricultural sub-industries. These activities have clearly taken precedence over activities to insure product quality and nutrition which affect the greatest number of citizens. The Department's proud sense of priorities was displayed on March 10, 1969 before the House Appropriations Subcommittee. Dr. F. R. Senti noted the Department's achievements in improving cotton products and cotton markets, developing treatments for apple ciders for longer storage periods, the reduction of cucumber spoilage and similar advances which may indirectly help the consumer but directly assist the sellers. In dollar terms, the USDA's budget request for fiscal 1970 was $33,448,000 for industry oriented research and only $5,527,000 for what is termed "nutrition and consumer use research." In addition the Department requested another $8,558,000 for "marketing research."

When dealing with its regulatory duties, FDA in most cases does not do its own research nor does it, in most cases, reveal the raw data of industry or other outside scientists. It just reviews the summaries of these data. The tragic results of this practice have been well documented in the field of drugs. What is not as well known is the way the FDA allowed itself to err in the food irradiation project of the U.S. Army. In 1962, the FDA approved the preservation of bacon by treating it with radiation. They granted this approval after reviewing the summaries of scientific data done outside the agencies. It was not until five years later that FDA discovered a series of danger signals in the old data that required them to remove permission to treat any food with radiation. In the intervening period, more than 30,000 Army and Air Force recruits were fed food similar to that which had caused eye lesions and nutritional deficiencies in laboratory rats. (Article from FDA Papers appended).

It is apparent that FDA needs more funds and manpower for research which presently is only a small percentage of FDA's overall annual budgetary level of some $23,000,000 for fiscal year 1970. In no area is the distributive injustice of federal funds more clearly etched than in this pathetic allocation for insuring the purity and safety of the nation's food supply. FDA has failed, however, in vigorously pushing for its rightful share of public funds and in taking the lead for bringing public attention on the woeful absence of minimal research facilities and manpower. An authoritative assessment of how little is being done in genetic monitoring, including the impact of food additives and pesticides, by Dr. S. S. Epstein, Director of Research, Children's Cancer Research Foundation, Inc. is submitted for the record. Dr. Epstein provided this material in response to questions put to him last August by Senator Edmund Muskie.

2. *Regulatory*—The regulatory deficiencies of the USDA in meat and poultry inspection are now well known. Successful pressuring of Departmental personnel to refuse public disclosure of inspection reports, widespread complicity, incompetence and demoralization among the inspector corp., and the ad hoc overruling of honest inspectors by politically attuned supervisors are samples of this breakdown in inspection and enforcement. The massive violations of the Department's own standards make a mockery of law and order in poultry and meat plants and the state inspected plants are operated within a worse system of anarchy.

Unlike most regulatory agencies, the FDA does not have subpoena authority either to summon witnesses or to require firms to divulge pertinent records. The agency has requested Congress for such authority but a battery of trade groups defeated this elementary power to protect the consumer at the earliest stage of any potential risk situation. A lengthy list of plants which refused FDA inspection requests in 1962 is appended for the record. Anemia pervades the legal authority of the agency. Abuses and deficiencies pervade the industry that this authority purports to control. The monthly seizure and recall lists that appear in *FDA Papers* provide some illustrative cases. Samples are provided for the record. FDA is trying to stop the illegal diversion of incubator reject eggs into human food channels. Contaminated carmine red color finding its way onto candy, food seasonings, meat extenders and barbecue sauce over a wide area was a recent FDA case.

Present compliance levels with microbiological contamination eliminating procedures are estimated by FDA to be approximately 65% of the industry. This means that 35% of the industry is engaging in practices that could lead to widespread food contamination and disease. For example, there are presently an estimated 2 million human cases of salmonella a year. The National Research Council report (November, 1968) on salmonella stated: "In addition to the pain and suffering it causes, this disease is responsible for substantial costs in the form of medical care, hospitalization and lost income through absence from work . . . we consider the total cost to be at least $300 million annually and probably more." Last year, Congressman Benjamin Rosenthal of the House Government Operations released details on the commercial resale of dozens of foods after they were rejected by the government as unfit for government procurement.

An instance showing how helpful FDA subpoena power would be came from a voluntary act of cooperation earlier in the decade. A canned product for infant feeding was recalled from the market when it produced convulsions in over 130 infants. In this case the manufacturer furnished complete information about manufacturing processes, formulas, and other pertinent data, and one FDA scientist was able to pinpoint the difficulty. A change in the formula and processing operation gave a baby food too low in vitamin B_6. When this vitamin was added to the formula, FDA reports, there was no more trouble.

In 1967, the Report on the National Commission on Community Health Services, chaired by former HEW Secretary Marion Folsome, described the current level of support being given to food protection at all levels of government as "grossly inadequate." "It does not even permit the responsible agencies to apply available knowledge to prevent such illnesses, much less to cope with the multitude of new and emerging problems . . . Changes in the production and processing of foods, increasing exposure of foods to chemicals, and changes in food preparation and nationwide distribution methods and techniques, together with inadequate public health controls, have created the potential for massive nationwide outbreaks of food-borne illnesses."

It is important to recognize that those companies who wish to strive for excellence in nutrition and food quality are at a marked disadvantage when there is inadequate policing of the industry, when abuses are rewarded with greater sales and when the less reputable capitalize on the irregular or nonexistent enforcement of the law.

3. *Support Function*—Both the USDA and the FDA have neglected their support function for state and local government particularly in the dissemination of information, techniques and evidence of violations. The Wholesome Meat Act of 1967 requires a stronger role by USDA toward the state's inspection services, as does the Poultry Inspection Act of 1968. The FDA in its 5 year program plans wants to turn what little inforcement and surveillance activity it has to the states and to develop voluntary compliance by industry. The entire posture is one of passivity in the midst of a need to deploy legal regulation far more comprehensively.

4. *Statistical and Studies*—The prototype system has been worked out in the health area on a nationwide basis. The computers are available for use. But the national and Congressional will to establish a first rate system of data gathering on food-borne diseases, their etiology, nutritional content of various food products and the like, apparently will have to await a disaster, judging by past responses in the consumer protection area. Studies for preventive impact are likewise lagging. More creative work has been done on the food needs and problems of the astronauts in recent years than on the nutritional needs of 200 million other Americans.

5. *Education*—The FDA apparently views its educational role in food as one principal of rebutting nutrition quacks. Thus, to any one who writes FDA expressing concern over the quality of the food supply, the FDA sends him a four page specially prepared question and answer sheet filled with complaceny and assuaging remarks rebutted repeatedly by FDA officials through out the years in speeches and statements. Many other answers are to questions that are more like strawmen and hardly representative of the real problems confronting a federal food safety regulator.

In marked contrast to statements by Dr. Herbert Ley, Jr., Commissioner of Food and Drug Administration and others, the fact sheet replies to one question on additives this way: "Today's scientific knowledge, working through good laws to protect consumers, assures the safety and the wholesomeness of every component of our food supply." On December 3, 1968, Dr. Ley told the 12th FDLI–FDA Educational Conference: "I am not going to tell you that FDA has devised the perfect system for keeping hazardous chemicals out of our foods, and you'll simply have to live with it. But I must also point out that our scientific knowledge in this particular field is still extremely superficial. We know too little of potential secondary and long-range effects of man's chemical diet."

Another illustration of educational lag is the failure of USDA to inform consumers that food processors and retailers have developed coding systems that indicate the date the package was packaged and inspected or an expiration date for perishables. But consumers cannot utilize these cryptic codes. Yet shouldn't USDA attempt to provide the same protection for consumers that exist for retailers? Otherwise, the integrity of USDA

XUM

grades is impaired because they were applied before the product degraded over time.

CONCLUSION

A nation which took until 1967–1968 to "discover" hunger in its midst is a nation which has been complacent far too long about its food supply. Year after year, the Agricultural Yearbook painted a glorious picture of America's food supply with a marked ability to ignore the nutritional deprivations and dietary deficiences of millions of Americans and as well the deteriorating impact on food quality by the food industry. Quantity is not necessarily quality and it certainly is not necessarily just distribution. We have little about which to be complacent. Heart disease, cancer and stroke—the three leading causes of death in this country—are increasingly being tied to diet. Infant mortality which is in part a function of malnutrition is not being eliminated as rapidly as possible. Presently, the U.S. ranks 12th in the world in infant mortality. The U.S. has a high background of genetic defects which is currently being cited as one explanation for the 20% of pregnancies that do not end in birth.

Life expectancy of an American male who reaches the age of 40 has increased less than 4 years since 1900. Life expectancy for a white American male from age 1 to 65 is slightly lower than it was in 1959–1961. The U.S. in life expectancy at birth presently ranks 18th for men and 11th for women, according to the Public Health Service. The enormity of our neglect of these problems, as against our enormous unused resources with which to respond, makes it more morally imperative to appraise thoroughly this silent violence and overcome it.

OIL IMPORTS

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the highly controversial issue of oil imports and the present mandatory oil import program is now under study by an oil import task force established by the President. Statements have been solicited from all parties interested in the oil import question. Because of the vital importance of oil exploration and production to the State of Wyoming, I have submitted such a statement to the task force.

One important aspect of the overall effects increased imports could have on the domestic petroleum industry is in an adequate domestic natural gas supply.

Earlier this year, in testimony before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Mineral Resources, Hollis M. Dole, and Director of the Bureau of Mines, John F. O'Leary, warned that a shortage of natural gas is imminent without the development of new productive capacity. In fact, during 1968, for the first time in history, we utilized more gas than we added to proved reserves. The same is true of gas liquids. For the fifth time in the past 9 years, we suffered a net decline in crude oil reserves.

The discovery, development, and production of oil and natural gas go hand in hand, and although we could, at the expense of further development of our domestic petroleum-producing capacity, make up the difference in our oil needs, gas is another question.

With 140,000,000 domestic gas users in the Nation dependent on a reliable supply of natural gas for all or part of their household needs—heating, cooking, laundry, and the like—we simply cannot afford to run short.

It is not a problem of running out of gas. Secretary Dole told committee members we are not running out of mineral resources, but there is every indication we are short changing the science and mineral technology industries, needed for their discovery capabilities, profitable production and processing, at a time of widening world competition and increasing demands.

The increased shift to foreign sources of supply raises an important question, Dole said. How long can the United States rely on investment abroad to substitute for the development of new technology in expanding the U.S. mineral supply? There is evidence that time is running out.

I will point out to my good friends and colleagues, who believe that removal of oil import quotas would lower product prices, that the impact on the domestic natural gas industry could be disastrous. Gas is something we cannot import like oil. Optimistically, according to Director of the Bureau of Mines O'Leary, we are between 5 and 7 years away from establishing a viable gas synthesis technology, capable of supplementing our natural gas supplies of this clean and flexible fuel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my July 15 statement to the Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Controls be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLIFFORD P. HANSEN

The Nation's security as to essential fuels, long-range supplies of petroleum, the stability of the U.S. dollar, and the economics and government operations of more than half of our states including my State of Wyoming, are vitally affected by our Government's oil import policies. Therefore, the review and the conclusions of the Cabinet Task Force on Oil Imports Controls will be of far-reaching consequence to all Americans. As a member of the Senate from one of our important oil-producing states, I welcome the opportunity to present, for the task force's consideration, the following views.

World events are such that it would seem the question as to whether the United States should pursue policies which will assure access to adequate petroleum supplies within our own control is not even debatable. Fortunately, and due in great part to the Mandatory Oil Import Program initiated by President Eisenhower, the Nation has been able thus far to maintain its self-sufficiency in essential supplies of both oil and natural gas.

However, our self-sufficiency in both oil and gas, both of which are developed and made available in the exploratory programs of the domestic petroleum industry, already has been lost. While the United States has excess oil producing capacity, it does not have sufficient idle capacity to fill domestic requirements should all present imports be disrupted or discontinued. Last year for the first time, U.S. productive capacity fell below domestic demand. Shortages of natural gas are said by the Bureau of Mines to be in prospect as early as this winter, and this is confirmed by natural gas utilities which have informed the Federal Power Commission that they are presently unable to contract for new gas supplies needed to meet expanding consumer requirements.

This Nation, therefore, already is confronted with a fuel crisis which our best authorities believe to be imminent. Such a prospect illustrates that security as to essential energy supplies cannot be confined to the narrow concept of developing fuels to "fight the last war". A family having investments in natural gas equipment for heating, for air-conditioning, and for laundry, certainly would face insecurity as to both their health and their economic status if gas stortages suddenly rendered their expensive gas appliances useless.

There are 40 million gas meters in the U.S. and a $30 billion investment in gas appliances, and a family having such investments in natural gas equipment for heating, cooking, air conditioning, laundry and the like certainly would face insecurity and health hazards if a gas shortage suddenly made such appliances useless. And gas is something we can't import like oil.

It should, therefore, be kept in mind that imported oil which discourages exploration for and development of domestic *crude oil*, likewise is discouraging the search for, discovery and availability of additional supplies of *natural gas* which already is in insufficient supply to meet existing demands. Viewed in terms of such realities, it is clear that "security" as to U.S. petroleum fuels, both oil and gas, is important in terms far broader than for waging war. In fact, the most serious shortages of petroleum liquids since World War II have occurred in situations which did not involve general or extended warfare—the Iranian oil shutdown of 1951, the Suez crisis of 1956–57, and the Arab-Israeli war of June 1967.

It is assumed that the Department of Defense, responding to the Task Force's appeal for interdepartmental commentary, as well as other witnesses, will document the strategic defense necessity of maintaining adequate petroleum fuels, and the need for effective import controls to serve that purpose. Therefore, I will limit the remainder of my comments to other aspects of the problem which I consider almost equally important.

First, it is my conviction that the United States, as the consumer of about a third of the world's liquid petroleum fuels, and the great bulk of the natural gas burned for both household and industrial purposes, simply *could not afford* to become substantially dependent upon foreign sources for these fuels. It is estimated that, by 1980, the domestic consumption of petroleum liquids will average 18 million barrels daily. In hearings recently before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, witness after witness estimated that—with no import controls—the United States would increase imports to about 50 percent of consumption in the relatively short range of about five years. Many believe that with no restraint on imports, the overabundance of low-cost foreign oil would, within this period, rise to 75 percent or more of the domestic market.

For illustrative purposes, however, assuming a 50 percent import level, it becomes apparent that imports in 1980 would approximate 9 million barrels a day. At $2 per barrel, which is minimal, imports of this order of magnitude would represent a dollar outflow of $18 million daily and would approach $8 billion a year. Should we go the route of such increased dependence, it is clear that we would be importing natural gas from Canada and from other world areas in liquefied form, at perhaps additional costs of $2.5 billion to $4 billion a year.

Because this Nation is the most massive user of petroleum fuels in the world, it is clear that the balance of payments impact of a rapidly accelerated and unlimited dependence on foreign supplies would be intolerable. It would create a cost and a dollar drain that without question could not be offset, and the ultimate result, I am convinced, would be a devaluation of the dollar.

It is all too clear that, aside from the security problem and even if we had unquestioned assurance of access to world supplies at current prices for the foreseeable future, the United States—as a matter of economic policy and its own national interest—could not afford to be a customer of foreign countries for the bulk of its petroleum supplies. It is equally clear that an end, or a substantial loosening of import limitations now existing, would point the Nation in the direction of this intolerable economic predicament. I submit that such a course would be economic folly.

My own State of Wyoming is the 5th ranking petroleum producing State and also one of the most active in exploration and new discoveries. Last year oil and gas production increased by $31 million to a total value of $406 million in Wyoming. In a state of only 300,000 population, the industry employs 7,000 people and pays more than 40 percent of total state taxes including a one percent minerals severance tax enacted this year.

Over 70 percent of the mineral estate in Wyoming is in government ownership and it is interesting to note that at the present time, about 70 percent of Wyoming's oil production is from the public domain. Further, it ought not to go unnoticed that 39 percent of *all* the funds in the Bureau of Reclamation's resolving fund, which is the royalty from production on public lands, comes from oil and gas development in Wyoming.

Minerals are Wyoming's number one industry and oil and gas account for 75 percent of total minerals production value. Obviously any diminution in petroleum exploration and production from whatever cause would have dire effects on the overall economy of not only Wyoming but all major oil producing states.

One other point upon which I wish to comment involves the integrity of the oil import program. It is essential that any regulatory program apply equally to those citizens and those companies being regulated. Any regulatory process which accommodates one citizen, or one company, or one geographic area, at the expense of another, cannot survive. It becomes morally bankrupt. It becomes, from a practical standpoint, unworkable—because one special deal or exception begets demands for more special deals and exceptions.

The present Mandatory Oil Import Program, during the Johnson Administration, was so used and abused. It took on the character of a cookie jar or goodie bank from which only certain and select boys, on the basis of promises that they would share the benefits, were allowed the choice morsels.

This is a known fact that the chief executive officer of at least one company receiving a special deal to move large amounts of gasoline from a refinery in the Virgin Islands to the U.S. mainland was listed as a $100,000 contributor to the Humphrey-Muskie campaign. This certainly leaves considerable doubt in my mind about the objectivity of the oil import program as it was then administered.

This is no way to run a government program. It is the certain road to a loss of confidence in government. It is the eventual road to charges of rank favoritism and scandal. Former Interior Secretary Stewart Udall, who riddled the present program with exceptions and exemptions during the three years, 1965–68, made the understatement of the year on page 106 of the June 1969 issue of *Fortune* magazine, where he states, with respect to his administration of the oil import program, "It was a minor miracle that I got by without any major scandal."

I commend Mr. Udall for his candidness, and I say that this comment embodies a valuable lesson for the present Administration. The Task Force will be bombarded with appeals for special exemptions, special treatments and special deals. It should make certain that whatever restructuring it recommends in the present program deal first and foremost with assuring that the *special deal* is out and will not be tolerated in the Nixon Administration. Unless that is made clear, the program, in my opinion, is foredoomed and its purpose, however important, will be automatically thwarted.

Now, I turn to one specific case of special pleading. This involves pressures precipitated by the Occidental Petroleum Company to carve out a special deal under which a large portion of the New England petroleum market would be carved out and set aside for that company, to be supplied from its prolific wells in Libya. Under the Occidental plan, this company would misuse the Foreign Trade Zones Act as a means of circumventing the oil import program. In a Foreign Trade Zone which the State of Maine seeks at Machiasport, Maine, Occidental would construct a 300,000 barrel refinery. From this refinery, 200,000 barrels daily of petroleum products would move into U.S. markets.

This bizarre plot to gain special exemption from the import program is particularly attractive, because it now has two rivals. No less than three companies now have offered to build refineries at Machiasport, if permitted to operate on foreign oil. To gain such special privilege, they have promised price cuts to New England consumers and they have pledged to put up to 20 cents per barrel of imported product into a special kitty for a New England Conservation Fund. In the case of Occidental's plan, this would amount to $7 million a year.

Much support has been garnered for the Occidental project on claim that New England faces (1) shortages, and (2) unreasonable prices for home heating fuel. There have been no shortages, and the facts show that wholesale prices of home heating fuel in New England have been as low or lower than prices in any other geographic area of the United States. New England simply does not have a case for special favor under the oil import program on the basis of either short supply or unreasonable prices. Certainly, it does not have a case justifying special treatment giving a multimillion dollar economic advantage to one company or even a group of companies.

In this connection, the charges which have been made with respect to New England fuel prices have implied that certain large supplying companies have engaged in practices which amount to a restraint of trade. It has been charged that some large suppliers have been unwilling or unable to meet the requirements of small, independent fuel oil dealers and jobbers. It has been charged that these large suppliers have followed a pattern of buying out and eliminating the competitive smaller jobbers and dealers. Such practices, if they exist, would seem to involve questionable and perhaps illegal tactics. If there are, in fact, practices which amount to trade restraint due to the economic power of any company or group of companies, then there clearly would be a case for prosecution under Federal antitrust laws, and the proper place for such complaints is before the Department of Justice. The Oil Import Administration is neither the intended nor the proper agency to handle charges of unfair competition or price discrimination if either, indeed, exists.

Neither can practices of price discrimination, or anti-competitive practices, be corrected by handling special competitive advantages to one refiner. Two wrongs do not make a right. Therefore, I appeal to the Task Force to recommend to the President rigid standards or guidelines which would apply with equal force to all parties affected by the oil import program. It is the special deal and the special exception which brought the present program into disrepute and resulted in the present study. Unless ironclad guarantees are assured against such special deals favoring particular persons, particular companies, or particular geographic areas, the basic weakness of the present program will have been left intact for correction by some future Task Force, or perhaps by the Congress.

In conclusion, I make and stress these particular points:

1. Loss of reasonable sufficiency in petroleum fuels from domestic sources in the United States would leave the Soviet Union as the single major world power with adequate petroleum to meet its economic requirements and to wage war. Therefore, the necessity for import controls on petroleum to serve the vital end of maintaining reasonable self-sufficiency is more important than ever.

2. Because the consumption of petroleum in the United States is so large and growing so rapidly, the Nation—aside from the defense question—could not afford dependence on foreign sources for a major portion of our energy requirements; the pressure on our balance of payments position would be intolerable and the strain on the dollar unbearable.

3. Any diminution in present rates of petroleum exploration and production resulting from increased imports would have dire effects on the economies of major oil producing states such as Wyoming where petroleum exploration and production is the number one revenue, employing and tax paying industry.

4. The first goal of the Task Force should be to firmly establish guidelines and standards which will apply equally to all affected parties, so as to restore the integrity and stability of the program which was all but dismantled by special deals and exemptions during the Johnson Administration.

5. There has been no demonstrated need for increased imports of foreign oil, and, the record before the Task Force will show, in fact, that U.S. exploration for and development of both oil and natural gas has been declining for over a decade. It is self-evident that any substantial increase in imports would further aggravate the downtrend in exploration-drilling, and jeopardize our ability to meet future demands for these fuels. Therefore, total imports should be held within their present relationship to domestic demand, and serious thought should be given to reducing this ratio if present unhealthy conditions in the domestic industry persist.

MOON LANDING DAY—HOLIDAY FOR MANY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Sunday, next, a very brave young American will set foot on the moon. He and his two companions will thus join the ranks of the great explorers and adventurers of our time. Furthermore, as in the days of Columbus, it can truly be claimed that man has entered into a new world.

Recently, I received a petition from 26 of my fellow Texans urging that this date be made a national holiday. The statement is indicative of the intense interest my fellow Texans, particularly those from the Space Capital of Houston, show in this project.

I ask unanimous consent that the petition and the names and addresses of the 26 signers be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the petition and signatures were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hon. Ralph Yarborough and Hon. John Tower: We the undersigned desire that you advocate and support the declaration of a

XUM

National Holiday to recognize and celebrate man's first landing on the Moon. Surely no other exploratory effort in the history of mankind will have been as meaningful.

Ward J. Idol, Houston, Tex.
E. F. Newenschwander, Houston, Tex.
F. Rodd, Houston, Tex.
Gaither E. Simmons, Houston, Tex.
Noble H. Solvison, Houston, Tex.
James M. Curtis, Houston, Tex.
Raymond Kulraik, Houston, Tex.
Mrs. J. A. Parks, Houston, Tex.
Syd Joplin, Houston, Tex.
James A. Beshirs, Houston, Tex.
Jack E. Whitley, Houston, Tex.
Erwin W. Schulz, Houston, Tex.
W. P. Springer, Houston, Tex.
R. C. Rumble, Houston, Tex.
Joseph A. Ayres, Houston, Tex.
W. H. Day, Houston, Tex.
John Richto, Houston, Tex.
Earnest A. Siger, Houston, Tex.
Charles W. Lord, Houston, Tex.
Willie Eckles, Houston, Tex.
Bill J. Coye, Houston, Tex.
J. L. McIntyre, Houston, Tex.
Charles J. Morngence, Houston, Tex.
J. O. Soam, Houston, Tex.
M. B. Landers, Houston, Tex.
Mrs. Jesse Thompson, Houston, Tex.

THE DO SOMETHING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, in recent days, scattered journalistic statements have created the impression there is a deep current of discontent throughout the Nation over what the authors of these statements refer to as the inaction of the Nixon administration.

It is true that the new administration has declined to use the tired techniques of previous Democratic administrations to ballyhoo its programs.

It is quite obvious that the public welcomes the respite from the continual sales pitch it has received during the past 8 years to sell these programs. This does not mean, however, that the Nixon administration has the Nation in the doldrums. On the contrary, we now have a hardworking, no-nonsense administration of which our citizens are proud. This fact is effectively outlined by David Lawrence in his recent column entitled "Administration Critics Answered," published in the Washington Evening Star of July 10. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Administration Critics Answered

(By David Lawrence)

A lot of criticism has been uttered by Democrats in Congress that the country is witnessessing a "do-nothing" administration. President Nixon and his Cabinet have been charged with failing to furnish Congress with important legislative proposals that could have been acted on in the last six months.

But a countercomment is made by the Republicans—namely, that the country is witnessing a "do-nothing" Congress. This, of course, is a generalization, as there are many committees in both the Senate and House which have been working assiduously on certain problems.

Yet it is true that hardly any major legislation has been enacted. If the subject is examined more closely, it will be found, however, that constructive activity has also been going on during the last six months in the Executive Branch of the government. For when an administration changes, the incoming president and his cabinet must familiarize themselves with each problem and get a picture from the inside before they can concentrate on how to make improvements in established practices.

The Executive Branch of the government under President Nixon is in fact a "work-hard" administration. It is reluctant to act impulsively or come to conclusious without a thorough analysis of the merits of the pro-and-con of controversial subjects. This takes time.

Congress itself has an obligation to enact laws dealing with vital problems, and there is nothing in the Constitution which says that either the House or the Senate or both must wait for recommendations from a president before starting to legislate. It is significant, therefore, that neither the House nor the Senate has initiated and passed important legislation in recent months.

Not long ago, a group of 23 Republicans from the House went around the country to find out firsthand something about the campus riots. They brought back a lot of interesting information which was presented in a report to the President. This is the kind of contact that could be made on other kinds of governmental problems, too.

While each house has committees which specialize in particular subjects, not many members of either house can find the time to read thoroughly all the printed reports. There are journalists who do more reading on the various subjects before Congress than is done by some senators or representatives. This is due not to a lack of interest on the part of congressmen, but to a preoccupation with problems from their home states or districts or with a specialized subject or two dealt with by the committees on which they serve.

If each house could send around the country a group of 20 members and if each group could spend a few weeks studying a particular topic, the information gathered would be invaluable to Congress. Members who go back to their own districts or states too often find themselves importuned for jobs or favors.

Special groups really could learn what the American people are thinking about—their reactions to the crime wave, their feelings about busing children from one school district to another, and their views on ways and means of getting better quality education for people of all races. The anti-poverty program, for instance, and the impact of the Medicare program are but two of the many important issues that are before the government and on which the thoughts of citizens should be obtained.

Government is a far more difficult operation than it has ever been at any time heretofore in American history. For the growth of population to more than 200 million has created problems. States and cities as well as the federal government have never had to deal with one of the biggest challenges today—How to redistribute the population. Virtually 70 percent of all the people are concentrated in urban areas occupying less than 3 percent of the land in the United States. More factories could be built in country districts, and other devices could help to redistribute population.

With all these problems facing the country, members of Congress who are crying out that the administration of President Nixon is "doing nothing" are not being realistic. The truth is Congress itself could be of greater help if it really got in direct touch with the thinking of the American people as a whole and then constructively legislate.

SURPLUS FEDERAL LAND FOR HOUSING

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on July 8, I introduced a bill (S. 2563) which would amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act to permit the disposal of surplus real property for public housing purposes.

My attention has now been called to the fact that the U.S. Conference of Mayors, at its annual meeting in Pittsburgh, Pa., on June 18, 1969, passed resolution 15, specifically urging that the Federal Government make surplus Federal land available for housing.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the conference be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution 15. Surplus Federal Land

Whereas one of the factors inhibiting construction of necessary housing units across the country is the lack of available land in suitable locations; and

Whereas local governments are searching for land not only for housing but for many other public purposes, such as parks and recreation; and

Whereas the federal government from time to time makes surplus federal land available to local governments for a variety of purposes; and

Whereas under present regulations and laws governing the disposition of surplus federal land the acquiring local government must pay fair market value for the property,

Now therefore be it resolved that the U.S. Conference of Mayors calls on the Administration and Congress to recognize the needs of local governments with respect to surplus federal land and enact legislation which will make such land available to local governments at less than fair market value.

Be it further resolved that Congress immediately provide funds for construction of military public quarters on lands now held as reserve for military housing, or that such lands be reclassified as surplus and made immediately available for housing.

Be it further resolved that the Conference urges that if surplus federal land is appropriate for housing or park and recreation use, a local government should be given a preference to acquire it for those purposes.

Be it further resolved that the following should be used as guidelines for disposition of surplus federal property: (1) If the local government originally donated the property to the federal government, the property should be reacquired at no cost. (2) If the federal government originally paid for the property, the local government should be permitted to reacquire it at the original cost. (3) In no instance should local governments be required to pay more than 50% of the fair market value.

TAX REVISION PROPOSALS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial published in yesterday's Washington Daily News. The editorial indicates the need for the prompt enactment of the Nixon administration's tax revision proposals.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 14, 1969]

Senator Long's New Signal

Senator Russell Long, who is in a key position of power as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, apparently has done a switcheroo on the question of hustling along the surtax extension bill. About $9 billion in government revenue is at stake in this bill—the difference between a probable inflation-spurring deficit and a modest surplus.

The Senator earlier had indicated he and the other Senate Democrats would not act on the tax bill until it had been loaded with tax "reforms" to their satisfaction. But now he volunteers to get the bill moving before July 31, or mid-August at the latest.

There already is some tax reform in the bill as passed by the House, and the Senate could add more if it chooses. But, as the senator now agrees, the important need is to get the tax bill passed "to balance the budget and stabilize the economy."

Tax revision long has been urgent and both President Nixon and Congress now are committed to a sweeping overhaul. But, as Sen. Long and everybody else knows, some revisions are bound to arouse dispute. The delay would jeopardize the government's revenue and stir up more inflation.

Whatever the reason for Sen. Long's shift in attitude, he is on the right track—and we hope the other Senate Democrats will join him. The sooner the tax bill is passed, the sooner Congress can get to work on tax reforms.

THE NEED FOR FEDERAL RAIL SAFETY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in railroad safety, the illness is evident, the remedy is given.

The illness is the increasing number of railroad accidents. The very week of the publication of the Federal task force report, two railroad accidents occurred validating the report's conclusion. A passenger train derailed outside Washington, D.C., killing one person and injuring a hundred more. In Nevada, a freight train carrying 750-pound bombs exploded, throwing bombs more than 300 yards. Both accidents were caused by equipment not now regulated by either State or Federal Governments.

The remedy is a recently released Federal task force report on railroad safety, recommending that "legislation authorizing broad Federal regulating power over railroad safety should be enacted." That recommendation only serves to endorse the bill (S. 1933) I had the honor to introduce in this body on April 22, 1969.

So far we have been luckier than we deserve. Potentially tragic accidents have occurred in relatively isolated areas; miraculously few have been injured. Continued neglect will not be rewarded by continued luck. Let us enact meaningful railroad safety standards before there is a major railroad tragedy. The July 7, 1969, issue of the National Observer brought some much needed national publicity to this urgent problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the National Observer article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TASK FORCE REPORT ON RAIL SAFETY IS OVERSHADOWED BY TWO ACCIDENTS

The report of a Federal task force on railroad safety did not receive much publicity last week; it was overshadowed by two spectacular train wrecks.

A passenger-train derailment outside Washington, D.C., on June 28 killed one person and injured 100. The apparent cause: a buckled rail.

A freight train carrying 750-pound bombs caught fire in the Nevada desert, blowing 15-foot holes in the roadbed and hurling bombs more than 300 yards. The apparent cause: a faulty axle bearing.

The task force, which was composed of labor, management, and Government representatives, recommended that "legislation authorizing broad Federal regulatory power [over railroad safety] should be enacted. . . ." Its conclusion was illustrated by those accidents; both wrecks were caused by equipment not now regulated by either state or Federal governments.

RISING NUMBER OF ACCIDENTS

The task force, detailing the rising number and severity of railroad accidents, suggested railroad safety has become a national problem and now requires national cures. Some examples:

Grade-crossing accidents account for two-thirds of all railroad fatalities, approximately 1,600 a year. Yet only one-fifth of the nation's grade crossings are protected by automatic safety devices.

More than 8,000 train accidents were recorded last year with two-thirds of them caused by derailments.

The cause of accidents is almost evenly divided among human error, equipment failure, and track and roadbed defects. The severity of the accidents is multiplied by the cargoes now carried in greater quantity—hazardous materials such as chemicals, acids, explosives, and gases.

But, if the dimensions of railroad accidents are clear, the possibility of much immediate improvement in railroad safety is not. The report stressed the need for "a co-ordinated approach by industry, labor, state, and Federal Government" and recognized "long-standing differences among the three groups" as one barrier to prompt improvement.

RESEARCH IS NEEDED

In its recommendations, the task force called for: rules and regulations establishing safety standards in all areas of railroad safety; the creation of a panel to assist in lawmaking and to study present industry influence on existing regulations; the initiation by Government and industry of research on safety technology; a concerted grade-crossing safety program; and better methods of reporting railroad accidents.

On Capitol Hill, Sen. Vance Hartke, Indiana Democrat and chairman of a Commerce subcommittee on surface transportation, praised the task force's participants for their unusual co-operation but stressed that "with rail accidents increasing at an alarming rate, it's imperative for Congress to take decisive action soon."

But such action is sure to rankle those now concerned with railroad safety, and will be strongly contested. At present no Federal standards govern the design, construction, or maintenance of railroad car trucks, frames, wheels and axles, track, switches, or roadbed.

The task force sketched the "areas of agreement rather than disagreement" between the parties who must co-operate before any new railroad-safety provisions can go into effect. But until these differences are explored and resolved, train wrecks will continue to overshadow task forces.

STATE TRAFFIC SAFETY COUNCIL AND NEW YORK POLICE LAUNCH CAMPAIGN AGAINST DRINKING DRIVERS

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, the State Traffic Safety Council of New York has done pioneering work in the field of drinking, driving, and drugs. An outstanding example of this is the fact that more than 900 public officials attended 2-day workshops on this subject conducted by the council in Watertown, Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, Albany, Binghamton, Valhalla, and Farmingdale. Some 300 agencies and political units of government participated in these seminars.

The council has also conducted valuable training programs in other areas such as police administration, accident control and prevention, and the use and maintenance of accident records.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the council and its leadership for the vital contribution they are making to insure that New York State highways are safer for motorists and their families. Gov. Nelson Rockefeller has served as an active, hard-working honorary chairman of this organization since its inception, and I heartily applaud his efforts in the field of traffic safety and police work. To my knowledge no other Governor in the United States has worked so hard to improve the police profession and to upgrade its standards and personnel. A word of thanks is owed to C. W. Owens, president of the New York Telephone Co., who is serving so vigorously and ably as the president of the council. He succeeded Baldwin Maull, vice chairman of the board of the Marine Midland Banks, Inc., as the council's finance chairman and more recently as president. Both of these outstanding leaders are serving the council and providing it with dedicated leadership at the specific request of Governor Rockefeller. Another man who has provided outstanding leadership to the council in recent years is N. H. Wentworth, vice chairman of the boards, the Continental Insurance Cos. After serving the council as president and finance chairman, he is now the chairman of the council's executive committee.

It is only appropriate to mention the names of the business and industrial leadership which has been promoting traffic safety through the council's programs. These men give of themselves to promote the health and welfare of all New York State residents. Their effort deserves the attention not only of the Congress but also the attention of business and industrial leaders in every State of the Union. Here is a list of the names of the men serving on the council's finance and advisory committee, to whom I gladly pay tribute for their inspiring work:

William R. Adams, president, St. Regis Paper Company, New York.

Melvin W. Alldredge, chairman of the board, the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Company, Inc., New York.

Frank A. Augsbury, Jr., president, George Hall Corporation, Ogdensburg.

G. Wallace Bates, vice president and general counsel, New York Telephone Company, New York.

George S. Beinetti, President, Rochester Telephone Corporation, Rochester.

Joseph M. Bell, Jr., Chairman of the Board, New York State Electric and Gas Corporation, Binghamton.

Lee S. Bickmore, Chairman of the Board, National Biscuit Company, New York.

R. Burdell Bixby, Chairman & Secretary, New York State Thruway Authority, Elsmere.

Kenneth E. Black, President, The Home Insurance Company, New York.

Lew L. Callaway, Jr., Publisher, Newsweek, Inc., New York.

George Champion, Chairman of the Board, The Chase Manhattan Bank, New York.

Donald C. Cook, President, American Electric Power Company, Inc., New York.

Kempton Dunn, Chairman of the Board, Abex Corporation, New York.

XUM

Gordon Edwards, Chairman of the Board, Kraftco, New York.

Victor T. Ehre, President, Utica Mutual Insurance Company, Utica.

Edmund H. Fallon, Executive Vice Presiwent, Agway, Inc., Syracuse.

Gilbert W. Fitzhugh, Chairman of the Board, Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, New York.

J. Frank Forster, President, Sperry Rand Corporation, New York.

Curtiss E. Frank, Vice Chairman of the Board, Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., New York.

Paul A. Gorman, President, Western Electric Company, Inc., New York.

Henry H. Henley, Jr., President, Cluett, Peabody & Company, Inc., New York.

Henry B. Henshel, President, Bulova Watch Company, New York.

J. Victor Herd, Chairman of the Boards, The Continental Insurance Companies, New York.

Andrew Jones, Senior Editor, Reader's Digest, Pleasantville.

Robert C. Kirkwood, Chairman of the Board, F. W. Woolworth Company, New York.

Samuel J. Lefrak, President, Lefrak Organization, Inc., Forest Hills.

George J. Leness, Former Chairman of the Board, Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc., New York.

Charles F. Luce, Chairman of the Board, Consolidated Edison Company of New York.

L. W. Lundell, Chairman of the Board and President, C. I. T. Financial Corporation, New York.

John O. Zimmerman, President, General Motors Acceptance Corporation, New York.

Earle J. Machold, Chairman of the Board, Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, Syracuse.

Malcolm A. MacIntyre, President, Chemical Division, Martin Marietta Corporation, New York.

Mercer C. Macpherson, Vice President, Chemical Bank New York Trust Company, New York.

David J. Mahoney, Chairman of the Board, Canada Dry Corporation, New York.

Joseph A. Martino, Honorary Chairman of the Board, National Lead Company, New York.

R. C. McCurdy, Former President, Shell Oil Company, New York.

William G. Miller, Former Vice President Chairman of the Board, Worthington Corporation, Harrison, New Jersey.

William H. Moore, Chairman of the Board, Bankers Trust Company, New York.

William H. Newcomb, Chairman of the Board, Great American Insurance Company, New York.

William S. Renchard, Chairman of the Board, Chemical Bank, New York Trust Company, New York.

Ralph Saul, President, American Stock Exchange, New York.

John M. Schiff, General Partner, Kuhn, Loeb and Company, New York.

J. Fred Schoellkopf IV, President, Marine Midland Banks, Inc., Buffalo.

Lewis P. Seiler, Chairman of the Board, Associated Dry Goods Corporation, New York.

A. C. Seymour, Executive Vice President, Royal-Globe Insurance Companies, New York.

John A. Spencer, Regional Vice President, General Electric Company, New York.

Jack I. Straus, Chairman, Executive Committee, R. H. Macy & Company, New York.

William J. Taylor, Chairman of the Board, Railway Express Agency, Inc., New York.

John J. Tuohy, Chairman of the Board, Long Island Lighting Company, Mineola.

Huntington M. Turner, Executive Vice President, H. S. Koster & Company, Inc., New York.

George R. Vila, Chairman of the Board & President, Uniroyal, Inc., New York.

Thomas F. Willers, president, Hooker Chemical Corp., New York.

The June issue of Law & Order magazine has featured an article describing the New York council's activities. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article, "Police Launch Campaign Against Drinking Drivers," be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Police Launch Campaign Against Drinking Drivers

The drunk behind the wheel is not a new problem nor was he invented along with the auto. In ancient Rome, Caesar warned his chariot drivers not to drive after drinking. Lord Nelson warned his sailors about overimbibing, then rationed rum or grog as a daily fuel for men whose lives at sea were filled with hardship. After his victories, however, the whole crew got extra rations and also got gloriously drunk. Thus it comes as no surprise that the problem is still with us and growing to alarming proportions. There is ample evidence today that alcohol is a factor in 50% or more of our highway fatalities. More alarming than the actual fatalities, however, is the fact there is reason to believe that alcohol is a factor in 50% of all accidents.

A recent report to Congress stated that "every witness who testified at a recent hearing on this problem expressed deep and growing concern regarding the incidence of impairment by alcohol in relation to highway accidents. Though it is, on the basis of present information, impossible to state how many accidents were in fact the result, or even in part the result of the driver's or the pedestrian's consumption of alcohol, the statistics do indicate clearly that alcohol is a factor present to some degree in about 50% of all accidents. This is a serious problem and a perplexing one. Its alleviation and control will be extremely difficult but its magnitude precludes its evasion."

Law and Order Magazine has periodically called attention to the serious nature of this problem on a national scale. This effort was made to highlight the fact that this is more than just a police headache. The problem transcends police work and has invaded all levels of society. The poor get drunk as well as the rich, and the middle class has no monopoly on drinking. The skilled and the unskilled drink. And drinking, once thought to be an exclusive prerogative of the male, has shown a disturbing increase among women.

ALCOHOL AND DRUGS

Equally alarming in today''s society is the use of drugs. Dr. Bernard Newman, President of the National Association of Police Laboratories, estimates there are as many, if not more, individuals driving cars under the influence of one form of drug or another than there are under the influence of liquor. Where the drinking and driving problem has been thoroughly researched, the fact about the use of drugs and driving have hardly been gathered, let alone touched.

Dr. Newman, who is a widely acclaimed lecturer and Director of the Suffolk County (N.Y.) Police Laboratory, is recognized as one of the pioneering experts in this field. Investigations conducted by Dr. Newman frequently show drivers who appear under the influence of alcohol, when tested, show no signs of it.

We know the use of drugs is causing a rising number of traffic accidents and deaths, but we can't do anything more about it because we need more knowledge, facts, studies and research. In many cases today it is difficult to determine by blood, breath or urine tests if a person is under the influence of drugs, Dr. Newman says.

He further states that "The law handles the 'drugged driver' the same way it handles the drinking driver. Yet it doesn't really define the term 'drug' or the term 'under the influence of drugs.'"

Dr. Newman points out the law is meaningless if there is no way to prove guilt or no means available at present to prove guilt. "We simply don't have the guidelines," he says. "Laws are not the answer. The time has come for a major university or federal agency to step in and fund some much needed research in this vital area."

When Dr. Newman talks of drugs he is referring to all forms of drugs from the common aspirin to pain killers to transquilizers to heroin, the worst. It is obvious that marijuana or heroin have a definite and immediate effect on the reflexes of the driver—and these are indeed dangerous drugs. But relatively little is known of the impact of many of the so-called minor drugs such as the little aspirin or medicines prescribed by doctors for the common cold. The body of knowledge on what these drugs do as they relate to the average driver is so skeletal that it is more than obvious that much serious research needs to be done.

NEW YORK'S STATEWIDE CAMPAIGN

Law and order recently discovered that a statewide campaign was being conducted in the State of New York to combat the rising incidence of drinking, drugs and driving. This campaign was launched by the State Traffic Safety Council—New York—under the presidency of Baldwin Maull, Vice Chairman of the Board of the Marine Midland Banks, Inc., and President of the New York Telephone Company, Cornelius W. Owens, who is the Council's Finance Chairman. Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller is the Honorary Chairman of this organization. The Council is a private, non-profit agency wholly dedicated to traffic safety and supported by contributions from business and industry. It has been in existence for nearly ten years.

Governor Rockefeller recognized the urgency of the drinking driving problem facing the state when he recently called on the legislature to enact a tougher law zeroed in against the drinking driver. The Council, thus alerted by its Honorary Chairman, quietly began preparations for a massive attack on the problem. The planning and organization in New York established a pattern for other states to follow. To our knowledge no other state has ever attempted anything on a comparable basis.

Before detailing the campaign, one might well ask what is the nature of the drinking-drug-driving problem in New York State? The problem falls into several categories:

1. Tougher laws are needed.
2. Stricter enforcement is needed.
3. Prosecutors should enforce the law and judges should hand out meaningful sentences.
4. The public must support enforcement of the laws and also their enforcement agencies.

The situation is not peculiar to New York. It exists in every state in the nation. The courts are sympathetic to offenders. Prosecutors are reluctant to prosecute. Juries are inclined to be more understanding than they should be. Thus with the cards already stacked against them, the police naturally are reluctant to enforce existing laws. A recent survey conducted by the State Traffic Safety Council—New York—among police agencies showed that arrests and convictions in drunken driving cases was at best negligible and almost nonexistent.

WHEN ARE YOU LEGALLY DRUNK?

Stripped of its legal verbiage, the New York drunk-driving law states that if the alcohol content of a man's blood is 0.15%, he's legally intoxicated and shouldn't be driving, and if he is, his alcoholic content is prima facie evidence of his guilt. A 0.10% alcoholic content in his blood indicates to the arresting officer that the driver has had it and should be removed from the road. It is also evidence of sufficient strength to prosecute. This is true in most states though a few consider an alcoholic content of 0.08% as prima facie evidence. Most European countries also consider the smaller 0.08% figure as damaging evidence or proof that the motorist is unfit to drive and should be hauled into court. Europe is stricter than we are.

Here's how New York organized a statewide assault on the problem: Following a staff conference of the State Traffic Safety Council and conferences with state and local officials, the program virtually dictated itself. Eight regional two-day seminars would be held at key population centers in New York.

Julian D. Rivo, the Council's Director of Research and Planning, was placed in charge of the attack. Mr. Rivo has an interesting background. A graduate of the University of Buffalo, he served for six years as Training Director in the Sheriff's Department, Erie County, New York. While there, he developed the curriculum leading to an Associate Degree in Police Science at Erie County Technical Institute and later served with the Municipal Police Training Council in the Office of Local Government at Albany, New York. As a dedicated police official and training director, he has maintained a twenty year interest in the problems of enforcement as they relate not only to general training and upgrading of performance standards for police, but a special interest in enforcement as it relates to the drinking driver.

The Council issued a press release strongly endorsing Governor Rockefeller's proposals for stiffer laws against the drinking driver. Hundreds of newspapers in the state picked up the story and featured it prominently. The press went one step further: It interviewed local police officials to find out what they thought of the need for such legislation and enforcement. Their follow-up stories established the need for further action.

RELUCTANT LAWMAKERS STALL BILL

Most officials interviewed agreed with the Governor's position and also endorsed the Council's call for support of this legislation. But lawmakers are reluctant to pass such laws, and as we closed the June issue, no concrete action has been taken on the bill. In the meantime, the State Traffic Safety Council felt it could not wait for the solons to make their move. The problem was urgent and action was called for, while the merits of the bill were being debated in Albany.

The Council initially sent out letters of invitation to all enforcement agencies in New York—nearly six hundred. It invited the chiefs and sheriffs to these seminars and also to send their men to the seminars at Watertown, Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, Albany, Binghamton, Valhalla and Farmingdale.

The Council obtained the cooperation and approval of the New York State Association of Chiefs of Police, New York State Sheriff's Association, New York State Police, International Association of Chiefs of Police, and New York State Municipal Police Training Council.

Sponsoring agencies at the eight sites included the Watertown Police Department, Albany Police Department, Broome County Sheriff's Department, Westchester County Sheriff's Department, Nassau County Police Department, Suffolk County Police Department, Erie County Sheriff's Department, Rochester Police Department, Monroe County Sheriff's Department, and the Syracuse Police Department.

THE TWO-DAY SEMINARS

The two-day course would seek to answer the following questions: How does the manner in which alcohol is consumed affect the driver? What laboratory tests are available to detect the drugged driver? Why do police reports of accidents frequently note the presence of alcohol or drugs in only a fraction of the cases? Why is conviction of the drinking driver helped by scientific evidence showing the motorist's blood alcohol content at 0.15% or more at the time of arrest? Does a referee have discretion to suspend or revoke drivers' licenses in chemical test refusal cases? Were the new drinking and driving regulations largely responsible for the substantial reduction in road accidents in the first year following the passage of Great Britain's Road Safety Act? What legislation is needed in New York State to implement the federal standard on "Alcohol in Relation to Highway Safety"? What steps or programs must be taken at the local level to reduce accidents and fatalities arising from the drinking driving or drug problem?

While the Council sought to answer these questions specifically, it was felt that the police and other public officials should be given a thorough indoctrination on the full scope of the problem. Accordingly, speakers—experts in their areas—were provided by the state or local agencies for each workshop.

Dr. Newman, whose services were loaned to the Council for the entire series of seminars by Commissioner John L. Barry of the Suffolk County Police Department, was the keynote speaker at each session. Max I. Basner, Senior Referee, New York State Department of Motor Vehicles, was an especially powerful speaker on the subject "Revocations/Suspension of Drivers' Licenses in DWI/DWAI." Sgt. Frank D. Smith, Division Headquarters, New York State Police, spoke on "Breath Testing Equipment" at seven locations. His services were provided through the courtesy of Superintendent William E. Kirwan under whose direction the State Police have cracked down on drinking drivers wherever they are found in jurisdictions under their control. It is significant that drunken driving arrests by the State Police rose 41% to nearly 5000 in 1968. Other speakers who spoke at all eight sites were John O. Moore, Motor Vehicles Program Coordinator, New York State Department of Motor Vehicles; Emerson H. Westwick, Traffic Safety Specialist, Institute for Highway Safety, Washington, D.C.; and Edward T. Ayres, Assistant Director, Bureau of Alcohol, New York State Department of Mental Hygiene. The District Attorney or one of his top assistants, in each county where the seminar was held, spoke on prosecution of drunken driving cases, and a local magistrate covered the subject of the role of the court.

Commissioner Francis B. Looney of the Nassau County Police Department welcomed the nearly 300 police and other public officials who attended the workshop held in Long Island by indicating that his department would continue to maintain pressures on motorists who imbibe too much and then drive their motor vehicles. Nassau County has obtained several breath-testing machines and in recent years has virtually doubled its arrests of drinking drivers.

When the final session was held in Syracuse nearly 900 police and other officials had attended the eight workshops. The Council received many letters of commendation from law enforcement agencies whose personnel had participated in the two-day course. It is too early to predict the impact of these seminars on enforcement practices in New York. Suffice it to say these hard-nosed officials and chiefs who sent hundreds of their men to these sessions on full pay did not do it as a courtesy. Scattered evidence, however, indicates that the drinking driver had better watch out in New York State. Conversations with police who attended these workshops reveal they have returned to their departments inspired and convinced that if our highways are to be rid of this menace, the police must jack up their efforts and the courts and prosecutors must cooperate with the police.

Fifty thousand deaths a year on our highways are too many. The public is demanding better protection. They will get it if they support their enforcement agencies. For the police can only do as good a job in traffic control and safety, in strict enforcement against the drinking driver, as the public is willing to support. It may very well turn out that what is happening in New York State may have a judicious impact on the forty-nine other states. Time will tell.

FISH INSPECTION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Consumer Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee has been holding public hearings on S. 1092, my bill to authorize mandatory Federal fish inspection.

It is with great pleasure and satisfaction that I present to my colleagues a resolution—No. 43—on this subject adopted at the Sixth Biennial Michigan AFL–CIO Convention held in Grand Rapids, June 9–11, 1969.

In contrast to the testimony presented yesterday by the administration, the Michigan AFL–CIO urges legislation that will provide consumer protection "at least as strong and effective as that of the meat and poultry inspection statutes."

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 43—SEAFOOD PROCESSING LEGISLATION

Whereas, The Labor Movement, led by the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL–CIO, played a major and decisive role in the enactment of strong and effective legislation for the inspection of meat and poultry, and as a result no filthy, diseased, or adulterated red or poultry meats can be legally sold in the United States by mid-1970, and

Whereas, A major food problem exists concerning fish and no mandatory federal inspection of seafoods exists in one of the most highly perishable foods, and

Whereas, The mishandling of this food caused serious illness and death for eleven persons in the past five years due to botulism, and

Whereas, Most of all of these deaths could have been prevented by proper inspection of the product or facilities processing these foods, and

Whereas, There is general agreement on the need for fish inspection legislation and many companies are still protesting and are seeking a cut-rate program that would eliminate an inspector in the plant during processing which would make such legislation a sham and a farce, and

Whereas, Strong and effective fish legislation based on the meat and poultry programs is before Congress (S. 1092) championed by our own Senator Philip A. Hart (D. Michigan) and

Whereas, A major effort will be made this year to provide this additional protection to the consumer, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Michigan State AFL–CIO strongly supports the legislative campaign for fish inspection and that it supports legislation that will provide consumer protection at least as strong and effective as that of the meat and poultry inspection statutes, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Maritime Trades Department, AFL–CIO, and to all Senators of the United States.

WHAT IS RIGHT WITH AMERICA

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, a leading daily newspaper in my home State of Utah recently sponsored a contest and invited teenagers to submit essays on "What's Right With America." The

XUM

quality of thinking and dedication to our Nation's highest ideals that is evident in the winning essays provide the answer to the essay subject, in my opinion: What's right with America are young citizens such as these.

First-place winner Jolynn Anderson, who, incidentally, was 13 years old on Independence Day, based her essay on President Nixon's memorable inaugural suggestion that we in America learn to talk rather than shout, so we can hear words and thoughts rather than the cacophony of voices.

Miss Anderson wrote:

> I hear an overwhelming chorus of another side of America, the real America. The America that will lead all citizens to a great, prosperous and happy future.
>
> What's right with America? It's you. You're right about America. And as long as each one of us can feel this way and keep working in the right direction—That's what's right with America!

Mr. President, I believe each of us can benefit from reading this excellent essay. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed following these remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that the runners-up in the contest also be printed. They were written by John B. Quinn, 18, of Bountiful, Utah, and Kevin C. Cromar, 16, of Salt Lake City. All of the essays appeared in the July 4 edition of the Deseret News.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH AMERICA

(By Jolynn Anderson)

(Jolynn Anderson, 13, is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Belmont F. Anderson, 2746 Apple Blossom Ln., and will be in the eighth grade at Churchill Junior High School this fall. Jolynn is active in sports such as skiing, baseball, swimming and gymnastics, along with studying history, social science and similar subjects. As first prize winner, Jolynn receives a $500 U.S. Savings Bond.)

In his Inaugural address President Nixon said he didn't like the shouting in America. He said we should talk instead of shout so we could hear each other's words instead of voices. I hear shouting. The headlines blast out the news of riots, demonstrations, war. The television blares of discontent, black power and civil disobedience. The neighbors talk of rising costs, governmental problems and poverty. Youth talk of drugs, cars and end of the world.

Oh, yes, I hear all this. But overpowering it are the words of Americans, not the loud voices. I hear an overwhelming chorus of another side of America, the real America. The America that will lead all citizens to a great, prosperous and happy future.

And what do I hear? I hear a group of Community citizens planning an outing for Senior Citizens. I hear a young man of 17 say in a talk, "I may or may not be a leader of this country in the next few years, but I know for sure that I will be a leader in my community, my church, and a leader in a home. I want to be the kind of leader that will advance my community, that will support and develop my church, and I want to be the kind of father and husband that leads a happy and secure family."

I see a group of Boy Scouts, young and energetic, half of them already advanced to the Eagle Scout rank, performing a good deed task of cleaning a ball park.

I see a community, my community, and schools planning a D for Decency Week, when they show what they like about good movies, proper music, wholesome entertainment and books that improve the mind.

I read of a group of young people in Florida who demonstrated for the obliteration of obscenity. I watched a group of school students collect money, clothes and toys for a school for the mentally retarded.

I see a large majority of college students, well dressed, clean looking, building themselves, and a credit to their university. I know minority groups who respect law and order and who expect to work for what they get.

I watched our Legislature in action. They were honest, hardworking men, anxious to make the right vote to improve their state.

What's right with America is everywhere. It isn't hidden, it isn't disguised, it isn't so subtle you can't see it. It's in your home, in your school, in your church, on the street, in your government, on the battle front in Vietnam. You're looking at it, hearing it, feeling it, breathing it. It's you, it's your sister, it's your teacher, your bishop or reverend, your congressman, your soldier brother, your mom and dad, your President of the United States.

What's right with America? It's you. You're right about America. And as long as each one of us can feel this way and keep working in the right direction—That's what's right with America!

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH AMERICA

(By John B. Quinn)

(NOTE.—John B. Quinn, 18, is a recipient of a $250 U.S. Savings Bond as second place winner. A son of Mr. and Mrs. Horace A. Quinn, 1130 N. 718 East, Bountiful, he was graduated from Viewmont High School this spring. John was active in debate, Model United Nations, football, swimming and track. He also was a Sterling Scholar nominee in social science and was a member of the National Honor Society. He is holder of the Eagle Scout and Duty to God awards. John plans to attend Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif., this fall.)

In recent years, America's ineffectual search for peace in Vietnam and her seemingly insurmountable domestic crises have forced America to experience spasms of self-questioning. Thus the seething domestic situation has led critics to label American society a contemporary wasteland, a "sick" society. As guidelines become scarcer, emotionalism becomes more common. Hence the radical demands vast transformations while the reactionary of the right, the superpatriot, insists that America lost its way somewhere in the past and only an about face will cure her ills. Fortunately, an examination of these extremists will not reveal the true conditions of America. It is upon the goals, principles, and values of the average citizen that America will survive or fall. Collectively, this may be termed the American Conscience.

The American Conscience is based upon a code of principles originally formulated in 1787 upon the writing of the United States Constitution. Among these principles are equality under law, self determination, and the dignity of the individual. It is because the Constitution has ingrained these principles in our national character that America has a conscience. The absence of this standard would be an invitation to political anarchy and moral apathy.

As a result of the American Conscience, America has a capacity to be shocked—a capacity to recognize wrong. Thus, though the extremists may propagate violence and hate, the American Conscience rejects the extremists. If violence is a reaction to injustices, it is the American Conscience which will stimulate reform. Hence, it was the American Conscience in 1800 which resulted in the repeal of the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798, it was the American Conscience which freed the slaves, and it was the American Conscience which keynoted numerous reforms during the Progressive Era.

In contemporary American Society it is the stable American Conscience which denies the accusations of sickness. Much of the agitation prevelant in our society is actually a sign of health. The minority groups clamor for reform because they have faith that by appealing to the American Conscience reform is possible.

It cannot be denied that conflicts are rife. But America is not sick, because the American Conscience is healthy. We see this conscience in the way that the majority reacts to the crimes of the minority—though Sirhan Sirhan may assassinate Robert Kennedy, the public will be shocked and still grant him a fair trial; though there may be disturbances in Selma, Alabama, Congress will react with the Voting Rights Act of 1965; that though campus revolutionaries may seize campuses the public will react with indignation, and that though Russia may rape Czechoslovakia the United States will lead the free countries of the world in opposition to the act.

The American Way—political, economically, socially—is not on trial today. Its worth is proven. It is the American citizen who is on trial. Minorities will always perpetuate crimes, but will the majority recognize the crimes and take steps to redress? Thus far, the majority has. This is what's right with America.

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH AMERICA

(By Kevin Cromar)

(NOTE.—Kevin C. Cromar, 16, is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Douglas W. Cromar, 4813 Viewmont St. (2085 East), and will be a junior at Olympus High School this fall. He receives a $100 U.S. Savings Bond as third place winner. Interested in American history and politics, Kevin follows news events and worked with the state headquarters for the Nixon campaign. He is holder of the Eagle Scout and Duty to God awards. Following high school, he plans to attend law school after a mission for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.)

We constantly hear the wrong in America—the shouting voice of the minority of Americans.

They are the Students for a Democratic Society on the college campuses, euphemizing communism as a "New Left."

Americans who sing Ho Chi Minh chants and scream "police brutality."

Americans who have distorted and blown up our mistakes, shouting that America is 200 years mistaken.

Americans who believe the only way to correct our mistakes is through mob violence, insurrections and riots.

Americans who encourage the enemy with their "better Red than Dead" attitude, guising their treason as the "peace movement."

Americans guilty of the crime and delinquency that plagues the land.

Americans who believe "God is dead;" that religion, an institution America was founded on, is "not with it."

Americans who rationalize immorality as the "new morality."

There is another voice in America. It is a quiet voice that goes little-noticed in the tumult and the shouting. It is the voice of the majority of Americans, the forgotten Americans—the non-shouters; the non-demonstrators.

They work in America's factories.

They mine America's minerals.

They farm America's fertile soil.

They run America's businesses.

They serve the people in government.

They are students of America's schools.

They worship God according to their belief, allowing others the same privilege of religous freedom. Their individual faith and the nation's trust in God has sustained America through hardship and crisis.

They have the American dream to build and to dream, to fail and to succeed, to dream again.

They give life to the spirit of America and steel to its backbone.

XUM

They love America.

They respect its flag.

They obey its laws and will not tolerate their violation by others. If they don't like something they change it; not through rebellion but through the ballot box.

Americans who have given their lives out of love for their country. Their voice echoes across the battlefield cemeteries, through the rows of white crosses, and over the tombs of the unknown soldiers.

What's right with America is her people.

THE ABA'S ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS ARE OF DOUBTFUL VALIDITY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the ratification of the international conventions on human rights now before the Senate is prevented by no overwhelming force. But one of the principal opponents to their ratification—the American Bar Association—speaks with a strong voice.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee saw fit in 1967 to recommend approval of the Supplementary Slavery Convention, but tabled those on forced labor and the political rights of women. The committee's recommendations for these last two conventions run directly parallel to those of the American Bar Association.

This organization reasoned—and so reported to the Foreign Relations Committee—that these conventions would impinge on fields that are of purely domestic concern and therefore, usurp the sovereignty of the National Government. The association also stated that these treaties would increase the power of the Federal Government, thus upsetting the delicate balance between State and Federal jurisdiction.

There are several excellent reasons, Mr. President, to doubt the validity of these arguments.

The state of the world is increasingly such that matters once of solely domestic concern are now irrevocably international in character. President Kennedy said that—

> The day-to-day unfolding of events makes it ever clearer that our own welfare is interrelated with the rights and freedoms assured the peoples of other nations.

Indeed the very purpose of conventions such as these is to establish the understanding among nations that human rights are not simply a matter of domestic concern, but the proper business of all people acting together. We cannot afford, then, to view the ratification of these agreements as a sacrifice of authority. Rather, we must see them as an opportunity to demonstrate our commitment to principles already in our Constitution and to translate those principles to the international community.

The very fact, moreover, that these conventions contain nothing that is not already in our Constitution and thus would not require any new laws to be enacted, insures that their ratification will do nothing to alter the balance between State and Federal jurisdictions.

Thus the arguments of the American Bar Association, Mr. President, upon which the Foreign Relations Committee has seen fit to place so much weight, are of questionable value. I urge the committee to reexamine its findings, to concur with the overwhelming weight of opinion on these vital matters and recommend ratification of these conventions.

PROGRESS AFTER WATTS RIOTS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, following the Watts riots of 1965, there was formed in Los Angeles, Calif., the Management Council for Merit Employment, Training, and Research. Under the able, dedicated and energetic leadership of H. C. "Chad" McClellan, business in the Los Angeles area was told of the problems facing the community, was urged to respond, and the manner in which they did is a source of pride to me and, I am sure, to all Californians.

The management council has been able to open up communications between the minority community and the business world, develop a close working relationship with employers in the Los Angeles area and established good working relationships with the California Employment Service and the Los Angeles city school system.

As the ranking Republican on the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, I have frequently praised the contributions of the management council, because I believe that their work could very well serve as a model for the entire Nation. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a progress report which appeared in the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce magazine be printed in full in the RECORD.

Incidentally, Mr. President, in California at the request of Governor Reagan and Secretary Finch, who at that time was the Lieutenant Governor of the State, the management council has formed a statewide effort. Management councils have been formed in San Diego, San Francisco, Monterey Peninsula, Pasadena, Monrovia, Orange County, and Fresno, as well as by efforts by industries in the San Fernando Valley, in Santa Monica, in Sacramento, and in Riverside, Coulton, and San Bernardino communities.

In short, Mr. President, the business community in California is mobilized and is making a tremendous effort and we are very confident that although the problems are tough, we will be equal to the task.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MANAGEMENT COUNCIL FOR MERIT EMPLOYMENT, TRAINING, AND RESEARCH

SUMMARY

The Management Council has officially been in operation since March 1966. It is a non-profit corporation, privately funded. If the actions taken by the Committee which preceded the organization of the Management Council were to be included, as perhaps they should be, the Council has served the community for more than three years following the riots of August, 1965.

The purpose of this report is to outline the techniques employed in the Los Angeles area for the benefit of businessmen here and in other Management Councils.

BACKGROUND

Immediately following the riots which occurred in Los Angeles beginning on August 11, 1965, the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce appointed a Rehabilitation Committee of seven members.

The committee was charged with the responsibility of doing what it could toward rehabilitation of the stricken area. No specifics were given.

The committee met immediately and reached several conclusions. When the riots ended, great controversy was taking place in Los Angeles over probable causes and possible remedies for the situation. Complaints were registered against the Police Department, the schools were criticized, the Welfare Departments were maligned, charges of every kind were voiced, including some against the Negroes themselves for their conduct. The committee decided that it should stay out of the controversies to avoid bias or partisanship. The committee recognized that Governor Pat Brown had just appointed the McCone Commission and assigned to it the specific task of determining the underlying causes of the riots and offering some recommendations for remedy.

The committee decided that before determining a course of action it should assemble the essential facts. Some were chilling:

1. Approximately 650,000 Negroes reside in Los Angeles County, 450,000 of this number living in the curfew area.

2. The riots which lasted six days cost 34 lives. There were 3,438 adults arrested . . . The number of juveniles arrested was 514. . . Of the adults arrested 1,232 had never been arrested before; 1,164 had a minor criminal record (arrest only or convictions with sentences of 90 days or less) . . . Of the juveniles arrested 257 had never been arrested before; 212 had a minor criminal record.

3. The riots covered an area of slightly more than 46 square miles and resulted in the destruction of 200 buildings with an economic loss of approximately $40,000,000.

4. In 1964 the Negro communities in seven Eastern cities were stricken by riots and in each case the fundamental causes were the same: not enough jobs to go around, inadequate schools, and resentment of police authority.

5. In 1964 the Urban League made a national study concerning Negro conditions in 68 major cities in this country. Included were ten economic factors such as housing, job opportunity, etc. Of the 68 cities studied, Los Angeles emerged as the one offering the best score.

6. It was clear that unemployment in the Negro community was two to three times that in the white community; from all indications, there were some 25,000 unemployed Negroes in the central section of Los Angeles County and probably an equal number of unemployed Mexican-Americans.

There was an actual shortage of semi-skilled and skilled workers in Los Angeles County.

8. Welfare costs in Los Angeles County were running in excess of $400,000,000 annually (perhaps one-fourth of this being expended in the curfew area).

9. Transportation to and from the Watts area was poor. Los Angeles covers an area of approximately 450 square miles. Industry is not concentrated in any one area. It is dispersed. A worker residing in Watts may be called upon to travel a considerable number of miles from his home to his place of employment. This circumstance, however, while especially difficult for the disadvantaged did not apply to him alone. There was no fully adequate rapid transit system in Los Angeles. Most citizens tended to rely upon private means of transportation rather than upon any public transit system.

PHILOSOPHY OF THE JOB PROGRAM

The war on poverty has many facets. The problem is immense. This fact is clearly recognized by the Management Council For Merit Employment, Training and Research. Fundamentally, there are two parts to the poverty program, each of which is impor-

XUM

tant, although each is different from the other. Part I has to do with welfare.

The Council believes that any nation should see to it that the poverty-stricken should be cared for by society to the extent that none go hungry, unclothed or without shelter. Charity should be participated in by all who can afford it and welfare should be the concern of all of the people. Provision for the needy should be generous. In the ordinary sense, however, welfare programs, like simple charity, tend merely to accommodate the poor, making their unfortunate circumstances more bearable by making the recipients of charity more comfortable.

Desirable as welfare programs are, however, and generous as they must be, more than mere charity is needed if poverty is to be significantly reduced. Thus the second part of the poverty program should concern itself with the *means of escape; the means by which those in need can permanently remove themselves from the disadvantaged category.*

It is to the "escape" part of the poverty program that the Management Council addresses itself. *While it certainly is a part of the war on poverty, it is not a welfare plan nor is it charity.*

The Management Council was organized to help the disadvantaged help themselves. They welcome this approach. Almost without exception, the disadvantaged, in this area, principally Negroes and Mexican-Americans, *would far rather hold a respectable job and earn a living than subsist on welfare payments of any kind.* With opportunity, incentive and a reasonable amount of encouragement, the disadvantaged will respond and perform productively and with good results. For the many who need pre-job training, it is now available in numerous areas of our community. There are five Skill Centers and eight adult vocational schools in the disadvantaged areas of Los Angeles.

Once the disadvantaged unemployed learn that a reasonable amount of pre-job training results in their getting a job opportunity, training is readily accepted. Three years ago, some people were reluctant to accept training in the Skill Centers; there is now a long waiting list, simply because most of those graduating have been and are being placed in meaningful jobs.

The Management Council in Los Angeles is now working in direct relationship with 1200 employer firms, with "affiliates," and with Management Councils in other parts of California and the nation.

An affiliate is simply an employer organization operating under a different name. Most of our affiliates—they now number 15—are Chambers of Commerce. A Chamber of Commerce, having established a relationship with our Management Council, conducts its own independent program, utilizing its own membership and its own staff organization.

The other Management Councils which have been organized with our cooperation extend up and down the State. They are located in San Diego, Orange County, Pasadena, Monrovia, Fresno, Monterey, San Francisco and Long Beach. Others are in the stages of development.

The objectives of the Management Council are limited. This is because the over-all problem is immense; the Management Council has taken a rifle-shot, rather than a shot-gun approach.

The means employed by the Council in this effort are to place qualified job applicants from the disadvantaged areas of our community into appropriate contact with willing employers who need workers.

In addition, and toward this single-purpose objective, the Management Council endeavors to arrange, to the extent possible, such pre-job training as may be necessary to enable the job applicants from the disadvantaged areas to meet job entry requirements.

The Management Council serves as a catalyst in bringing together employers and the disadvantaged unemployed. It also serves as a coordinator to insure that many agencies and organizations which are earnestly trying to be helpful work in full cooperation rather than at cross purposes with each other. *Thus, the major function of the Management Council is to encourage employers to reach into the disadvantaged areas for the purpose of discovering, recruiting and hiring qualified, disadvantaged unemployed to fill open jobs.*

FINANCING

Financing of the Management Council has been achieved as follows: Initially, the aerospace industry at the request of H. C. McClellan, subscribed $23,000 as the foundation for broader based underwriting. Thereafter, funding of the operating budget has been obtained entirely from private foundations.

In 1966, a grant was made by the Ford Foundation in the amount of $50,000 as partial underwriting for 1966 and 1967.

Also in 1966, the Haynes Foundation of Los Angeles contributed a total of $65,000 as partial underwriting for the years 1966–1967. Subsequently, the Haynes Foundation granted the Management Council an additional $35,000 for the year 1968 and has committed $25,000 for the year 1969.

Another foundation, which does not wish to be identified, provided $200,000 for the years 1967 and 1968 and has committed an additional $100,000 for the year 1969.

The total of these grants has made it possible for the Management Council to operate without deficit and to be financed through the year 1969.

In addition to the above-mentioned operating grants, additional sums have been provided for specific projects sponsored by the Council. Among these are the following:

$5,000 has been subscribed by private industry to underwrite the cost of planting 1,000 trees in the Watts area.

A $10,000 special project fund has been made available by the Los Angeles Clearing House Association for a variety of projects such as support for the Watts Summer Festival.

$7,000 has been subscribed by the Henry Salvatori Foundation for a number of smaller projects.

The paint industry has subscribed $10,000 worth of paint and paint products for a house painting project.

Norris Industries of Los Angeles has subscribed $4,000 for an additional house painting project and has also contributed $2,000 support of a Negro recreational school in Compton. These are but a few of the special projects underwritten by industry outside of the regular activities of the Management Council.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Briefly stated, the achievements to date are these:

Extensive dialogue has been established with leaders of the Negro community of Los Angeles. This includes good relations with numerous Negro organizations, including the Opportunities Industrialization Center, the Westminster Neighborhood Association, Operation Bootstrap, the Watts Chamber of Commerce, the Sons of Watts Improvement Association and the Black Congress. This communication with the residents of the South Central City continues to increase.

A working relationship has been established with 1200 employer organizations in metropolitan Los Angeles, most of the contacts having been made first with the president of the company or the chief executive officer. Through constant cooperation with these firms, it has been possible to arrange positive recruitment from the disadvantaged areas of our city to fill open jobs. Included in the working plan has been the organization of a Merit Employment Committee, made up of personnel officers from major manufacturing firms.

A close working relationship has been established with the California Employment Service as well as with other government agencies to insure good coordination and full cooperation to the maximum extent possible.

A strong liaison has been worked out with the Los Angeles City School System for the purpose of developing adequate and favorable contact between the adult vocational schools in the disadvantaged areas and employers who can hire graduates when their studies have been completed.

This work has included extensive surveys to determine which skills are in short supply for the benefit of those schools where training takes place. It has also included evaluation of training courses by professional industry representatives as an aid to the schools in determining the level of competence industry will require.

EMPLOYMENT SURVEYS

As the work of the Council has proceeded, three surveys have been made of cooperating employers to find out how many each had hired up to a given time following the riots of August 1965. The first survey was made of 100 employers in December 1965. This survey indicated 2,150 had been hired since August of that year.

On March 11, 1966 the second survey was made, this time by letter. The letter was directed to the president of each of the same 100 companies previously contacted. Enclosed with the letter was a report form upon which the company was asked to indicate how many had been hired from the South Central City (curfew area) since the August 1965 period. This time the total reported was 4,751—in writing.

The third survey was made in November 1966. On this occasion the same letter was mailed which went out on March 11, but it was sent to 250 corporation presidents. The same reporting enclosure was included; 201 responded. The total placements thus recorded were 17,903.

No hiring surveys have been made by the Management Council since November 1966 nor are any contemplated at the present time. Sufficient evidence has been accumulated, however, to indicate that substantial progress continues to be made month by month. No longer is it possible to easily find qualified candidates for the curfew area; most of those who remain unemployed need pre-job training. The qualified have found good jobs.

An unemployment survey covering 20 major cities was reported by the Department of Labor in February, 1968. The combined Los Angeles-Long Beach areas reveal substantial improvement in the unemployment level of the Negroes in this area. The report also shows a very favorable comparison between the Los Angeles metropolitan area and the other 19 cities surveyed by the Department of Labor. This change has come about in spite of the fact that more than 1,000 Negro citizens arrive in Los Angeles County from other states each month.

THE PRECIPITATING INCIDENT

A drunk-driver arrest sparked the riots. Obviously, the circumstances which made the disturbance possible were complex, varied and diverse. It is not easy even now either to identify or fully understand all of the factors responsible for this trouble. It appears logical that the inner frustrations which had smoldered and burned for many years in the minds of Negroes across the country and the strong sense of denial, both real and imagined, finally exploded into rage and violence unprecedented for this community.

CONFERENCES WITH GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

The Chairman of the Rehabilitation Committee met with the Mayor of Los Angeles, with the Chief of Police, with a representative of the Los Angeles County Human Relations Commission and with the Governor's coordinating officer on many occasions for purposes of communication and coordination.

In addition, conferences took place between the Chairman of the Chamber's Rehabilitation Committee and President Johnson's Fact-Finding Mission, headed by Ramsey Clark, Deputy Attorney General, which spent several days in Los Angeles immediately following the riots. The principal purpose of these conferences was to assure, to the extent possible, good coordination and communication between each of the agencies endeavoring to serve whether they be privately operated or governmental.

The Rehabilitation Committee adopted these objectives:

"The objectives of the Rehabilitation Committee are relatively limited when considering the problem as a whole. In order to be effective to the maximum in our work we believe that it is essential that our function be limited to one simple purpose—providing job opportunities for the disadvantaged."

"The fundamental objective of the Rehabilitation Committee is, therefore, to place qualified job applicants from the disadvantaged areas of our community into appropriate contact with willing employers needing workers.

"Toward this end it is our purpose to arrange, if possible, such pre-job training as may be necessary to enable the job applicants from these areas to meet minimum job entry requirements.

"The Rehabilitation Committee will serve as the catalyst in bringing together employers and the disadvantaged unemployed. We will also serve as a coordinator to insure that the many agencies and organizations which are earnestly trying to be helpful work in full cooperation rather than at cross purposes with each other.

"A major function of the Rehabilitation Committee will be to encourage employers to reach into the disadvantaged areas for the purpose of recruiting qualified disadvantaged unemployed to fill open jobs."

The Plan was businesslike and practical.

First, the Council persuaded a group of prominent Negro businessmen from the curfew area to form a "counterpart" committee of fifty and provide dialogue with the Negro community. (The Rehabilitation Committee was expanded to a membership of thirty-five.) The "counterpart" committee itself selected an executive committee. Over a period of several weeks, nine meetings were held which were attended by members of the executive committee from each side. Some of these meetings lasted into late night hours. Beyond a doubt the benefits which resulted from the forthright discussions which took place were substantial. But the going was not easy.

Those closely associated with this effort have learned a great deal about involvement with the residents of the Negro community. McClellan, for example, now board chairman, has said on numerous occasions that what he has learned in these past three years about the problem has changed his mind on many of the ideas he formerly held. He has stated time and again that, as a resident of the Los Angeles area for more than half a century, he thought he understood the people in the community. Furthermore, he has said that he considered himself a professional in the general field of human relations. Throughout his industrial experience his was largely a role of personnel administration; executive management, dealing with people.

He has served on assignments in the general field of human relations overseas. His travels have included Asia, many countries of South America, many countries in Western Europe as well as six visits to Russia where he spent most of a year. In all of these travels he has been called upon to meet with his industrial counterparts in the development of improved understanding. Frequently countries visited were, to say the least, unfriendly. Even so, McClellan has felt that he was moderately successful. He has been invited back to every country ever visited. He has twice been called upon to serve as Ambassador to a foreign nation, in one case upon nomination by the host country.

But McClellan has declared that never before in his experience had he met a problem quite as difficult in communication.

"Our Committee wanted to talk about job opportunities for the minority unemployed. We wanted to limit our efforts to this part of the problem. The Negroes wanted to talk about every subject related to discrimination and they wanted immediate assurances of action. Each wanted to voice a lifetime of complaints.

"Time and again we explained our conclusion that to be effective we must limit our activities to something in which we could be productive. Interested though we were in the problems of housing and all forms of discrimination which had plagued them in the past, we simply wanted to deal with the problem of jobs. At first we found it impossible to limit the discussion to this subject.

"It took several weeks of lengthy, drawn out, of times bitter discussion, before we finally convinced the Negro panel that we were limiting our function as the means of accomplishing the maximum within our capacities. It seemed to us that the breakthrough came late one night following a rather high tension meeting at one of the hotels. The discussions had been lengthy, vigorous and at times bitter."

Finally, after a somewhat forthright statement from Chairman McClellan in which he made an appeal for objective understanding, one of the Negroes stood up and said: "Mr. McClellan, we are beginning to trust you." McClellan rose somewhat indignantly and said: "Well, gentlemen, I have news for you—it is justified." From that icebreaking point forward, the Rehabilitation Committee addressed itself to the problem of job opportunity and how to achieve it.

"It puzzled us at first that we could not seem to establish friendly, objective, down-to-earth discussions with the Negro Executive Committee. We believe now, after our experience of the past three years, that our problem is the same one that plagues many well-wishing organizations trying to work with minority groups. We believe, incidentally, that what we discovered here is something that the American people to this day do not fully understand. It is the degree of resentment, frustration and bitterness and even hatred that permeates the Negro society.

"From our viewpoint, few among us are fully aware of what all Negroes suffer as a consequence of the prejudice which still persists in our society as a whole. Little by little we learned, as we spent hour after hour with our Negro counterparts, what was in their minds and the depth of feeling which resided there.

"They did not talk about it much and they never fully stated the degree of their resentment, but it was there—always there—and we sensed it in time.

"Every Negro in the nation, regardless of what his name is, awakens in the morning conscious of the fact that he is black. He knows that he must face it all day, every day in little ways and sometimes in big ones. He feels degraded, insulted, denied or humiliated. It is on his mind until he falls asleep at night."

BUSINESSMEN'S COMMITTEE

The Negro businessmen's committee adopted a resolution rejecting the concept of rioting as a means of achieving goals. This proposal was born in long discussion and some resistance; when it was explained that such a resolution would be helpful in persuading employers to cooperate, a resolution was adopted.

"Actions contrary to the concepts of law and order such as took place here recently can never be justified in a civilized society.

"There were, nevertheless, underlying causes for these incidents which must be identified and understood as a first step toward permanent cure. Governor Brown has appointed a commission made up of leading citizens for precisely this purpose. In addition, many other investigating bodies are at work.

"We earnestly hope that these investigations will be thorough, penetrating and unbiased. We sincerely believe they will be.

"When all the facts are in hand and the full truth is known, appropriate and adequate steps must be taken to immediately correct whatever is wrong in this community. Our city of Los Angeles, particularly the Negro community, deserves no less than this.

"In the meantime, we join wholeheartedly in the coordinated effort by business, industry and government to rebuild, repair, restore and create new jobs and improve conditions in our city."

The above resolution was adopted unanimously by the entire 50-member committee. The Rehabilitation Committee made it clear to the Negro leaders that the program would be strictly private enterprise, without government financing, yet conducted in full cooperation with all agencies, public or private, designed to provide job opportunities for the qualified minorities. It was clearly understood that we would recommend only that employers hire *qualified* applicants, and that employers would not be asked to lower their standards to accommodate the deficient. This would only create "second-class" employees who would be the first laid off in an economic slump.

The committee of Negro businessmen agreed that the two groups would not participate in marches, boycotts, picketing or the like to achieve these ends. All declared that persuasive efforts would work far faster and deserved the first chance.

If the Rehabilitation Committee failed to produce it would be dissolved. But if the Negroes insisted on militant action, the committee would abandon the program and address itself to other matters. The Negro committee unanimously agreed to work with the Chamber in developing persuasive, non-militant means of attaining common objectives. *To the date of this report they have kept their commitment fully.*

COORDINATION WITH THE CALIFORNIA EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

At this point, as a result of discussions which had already taken place between top local officers of the Department and members of our Committee, it was agreed that there should be close coordination between the California Employment Office and the Committee. Up to this time there had not been as effective employment service delivered to industry from the disadvantaged areas as had been needed. There was no employment office in the Watts area and, for whatever reason, the Negroes had developed an unfriendly attitude toward the California Employment Service generally and were reluctant to use it. Thus employers themselves, failing to achieve solid recruitment through that means, made only limited use of such offices as were open and operating at that time.

Mr. Arthur Morgan, Los Angeles Area Manager for the Service, joined with the Committee enthusiastically in the development of a workable, compatible plan in the hope of attracting not only Negro job candidates but willing employers as well. New procedures were developed. Attention was given to employers' specific needs and an attitude was created in the Department's Service Office which would tend to encourage increasing employer participation. A State Employment Office was opened on 103rd Street in Watts.

STEP TWO—EMPLOYERS INITIAL CONTACTS

Having developed a seemingly workable arrangement with the California Employment Service to recruit, screen and refer Negro job candidates, the Committee turned to the employers themselves.

On August 24, 1965, the Committee sent this telegram to the President or chief executive officer of one hundred of the largest employers in the Los Angeles area. The telegram follows:

You are urgently requested to attend a brief but important conference concerning recent riots.

The time: 4:00 p.m., Thursday, August 26.

The place: Board Room, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

R.S.V.P.: 482-4010, Miss Angela Nolan.

Marion Banks, Robert L. Gordon, Ernest J. Loebbecke, Robert W. Maney, Harold Quinton, Charles S. Thomas, and H. C. McClellan.

The attendance was outstanding. Most of those invited came to find out what was going on and to help. This initial employers' meeting proved to be highly successful, and set a pattern which has been followed throughout the many, many similar employers' meetings which have taken place since that day. The meeting lasted one hour and fifteen minutes. The situation in the crisis areas of our city was depicted with clarity and purpose. The facts were revealed, including the penalties which had been suffered by the community as a consequence of the riot and the possibility that another riot could occur unless appropriate steps were taken by the community as a whole.

It was not suggested that industry or the employers could or should by themselves solve the problem. It was not recommended that industry engage in a welfare or charity program. It was suggested only that the fundamental issues involved here did indicate that industry itself should bear some responsibility out of pure selfish interest, if nothing more.

It was pointed out that unemployment in the distressed area was perhaps three times that of the County area; those assembled were reminded that welfare costs out of taxpayer funds exceeded $400,000,000 annually in Los Angeles County *alone. It was declared that a shortage existed even then of both skilled and semi-skilled workers throughout industry in the metropolitan Los Angeles area.* It was declared that investigation had revealed that half of the unemployed in the curfew area were well equipped to meet minimum job entry standards for jobs then open.

(*1*) *One of the companies represented had recently announced a plan to import 1500 workers from Chicago and East of there at a cost of $1,000 per man—just to operate idle machines.*

Those assembled were urged not to lower employment standards nor to hire the unqualified candidates. They were, however, urged to look objectively at the large number of candidates then available who were actively seeking jobs and whose applications were on file at the new California Employment Service in the heart of Watts in their search for qualified workers.

The Committee explained the new relationship with the California Employment Service which had been developed. A representative of that agency was present to make his own statement of purpose and plan and to demonstrate willingness to cooperate to the maximum by seeking out qualified candidates and screening them carefully in order to serve the employers as best they could. The response was unanimous, enthusiastic and affirmative. We requested that the "word" be passed on to the personnel departments.

A few days later the personnel officers of the same one hundred companies whose presidents had been in attendance at the first meeting convened in the Chamber of Commerce Board Room. During this meeting the facts were reviewed (the personnel men had already received favorable recommendations from the front office) and details for action were worked out. Toward the close of the discussion the personnel officers approved the formation of an action Committee from their own membership. This would be called the Merit Employment Committee (a subcommittee of the Rehabilitation Committee). *In the months which followed, this Committee was to become an exceedingly effective part of the whole job development program.*

INITIAL RESULTS

Largely through the initiative of the Merit Employment Committee, more than fifty companies promptly sent their personnel representatives to the new Watts employment office to interview candidates and hire on the spot. *Seventy-four companies placed jobs orders there.*

Up to this time the Committee had no paid staff. H. C. McClellan, the Chairman, was devoting full time to the effort and he had enlisted the services of Murray A. Lewis whose employer had released him on a full-time basis with pay for a brief period. Even so, progress was good from the beginning.

Follow-up letters had been sent to each of the employers contacted. Close relationship had been maintained with the California Employment Office in Watts. It was obvious that hiring was taking place, but in order to actually determine how much action had resulted from the efforts made would require both staff and plan.

To make certain that we were correct in our evaluation of progress made, each of the initial one hundred employers was requested by telephone to report how many had been hired from the South Central City area since the riots. The total thus reported was 2,153 as of December 15, 1965.

ORGANIZATION OF THE MANAGEMENT COUNCIL FOR MERIT EMPLOYMENT, TRAINING AND RESEARCH

On December 2, 1965, the McCone Commission, appointed by California Governor Pat Brown, submitted its report to the Governor. Contained in this report was the following statement:

"We commend the work of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce through its Rehabilitation Committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. H. C. McClellan. This committee organized one hundred employers and, through their efforts, over 1,200 Negroes have been employed by private industry in recent months. It is the hope of our Commission that all of the one thousand or more major employers in the metropolitan area will join this cooperative effort. We urge that a permanent organization, properly staffed and financed by the Chamber of Commerce be established for this purpose. The Committee, as well as several major employers, should continue to operate, in conjunction with the State Employment Service in the South Central area and the committee of Negro businessmen, and should establish joint counseling and employment functions, so that those who seek jobs can make application with a minimum of inconvenience and expense.

"The great majority of the unemployed in the South Central Los Angeles area are unemployable because they lack skill and training. To meet that pressing need, a major job training and placement program should be initiated in the area. This program should be large and should be concentrated in an area which is predominantly Negro."

With this in mind several steps were taken by the Chamber's Rehabilitation Committee to broaden its base beyond the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

"Mindful of the recommendation made in the McCone Commission Report and having learned from our own experience that there was potential success in dealing with the problems of the disadvantaged unemployed, we organized promptly."

Ten business organizations were asked to cooperate in the formation of a non-profit public service corporation called The Management Council for Merit Employment, Training & Research. Each of the organizations was requested to formally approve the undertaking and to designate a principal officer to serve on the Council's Board of Directors. Annual dues of $100 were stipulated. Each of the organizations accepted the Council's invitation and designated an offer to serve. Funding by industry followed. The Management Council corporation was formed and offices were opened in the Chamber of Commerce building. The first Officers and Directors of the corporation were:

President: H. C. McCellan, Chairman of the Board (on leave) Old Colony Paint & Chemical Co.

Vice Presidents: Daniel P. Bryant, President, Bekins Van & Storage Co., President, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce. Hugo Riemer, President, U.S. Borax & Chemical Corp., and President, Merchants & Manufacturers Assn.

Secretary-Treasurer: David G. Soash, Executive Vice President, Merchants & Manufacturers Assn.

Directors: Robert L. Gordon, Executive Vice President, Bank of America N.T. & S.A., President, Downtown Businessmen's Assn.

William H. Fellows, President, Old Colony Paint & Chemical Co., President, California Manufacturers Assn.

Rollin Eckis, President, Richfield Oil Corporation, President, Western Oil & Gas Assn.

Neil Papiano, Attorney, Trippet, Yoakum & Ballantyne, President, Los Angeles Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Sterling Peck, General Manager, Bel Air Sands Hotel, President, Southern California Hotel & Motel Assn.

Floyd O. Gwinn, Proprietor, Gwinn's Restaurants, President, Southern California Restaurant Association.

H. M. O'Haver, Metropolitan Division Sales Manager, Southern California Gas Co., President, The Industrial Council of the City of Commerce.

F. Marion Banks, President, Southern California Gas Co.

Dr. Arthur G. Coons, President Emeritus, Occidental College, President, The Coordinating Council, State of California (Education).

Louis B. Lundborg, Chairman of the Board, Bank of America N.T. & S.A.

John Robert Fluor, Former Chairman of the Board, National Assn. of Manufacturers, President, The Fluor Corp.

Harold Quinton, Chairman of the Board, Southern California Edison Co.

James P. Lydon, Vice President—Industrial Relations, Lockheed Aircraft Corp.

J. Curtis Counts, Vice President—Industrial Relations, Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc.

Eugene D. Starkweather, Vice President—Personnel, North American Aviation, Inc.

William Larrabee, Vice President—Industrial Relations, Northrop Corp.

Executive Director: Murray A. Lewis.

Administrative Associate: J. M. Wright.

MORE COMPANIES JOIN

While continuing to work with the initial one hundred employers who had been enlisted by the committee, the Management Council now reached out for more employers.

Invitations were sent to the presidents of each of 167 firms to meet in the Board Room of the Chamber of Commerce on February 3, 1966, just as had been done with the first groups.

The same procedures were followed and the results were identical with those achieved with the first one hundred companies in December of 1965. The response was enthusiastic and affirmative from the Presidents. This meeting was followed by a group meeting with the personnel directors of the same corporations and again, full cooperation was assured.

AFFILIATES

At this point it was decided by the Council to further expand its efforts by decentralizing some of its activity through cooperation with enlisted affiliates. It was concluded that in outlying communities, such as the City of Commerce, Pasadena, Santa Monica and Long Beach, greater progress could be achieved if the strongest local employer organization would join in the employment program with its own staff, "motivating" its own membership, substantially in accordance with the means we had developed in the Management Council.

It was contemplated that the Management Council would serve as a resource for each outlying affiliate enlisted, providing employment information, establishing employment service contracts, coordinating public service agencies supporting the hiring plan and offering samples of letters which have proven effective, techniques which have been successful and even providing staff support for conferences, meetings or counsel.

Each affiliate would be expected to pay annual dues in the amount of $100. Thus an "operating affiliate" in an outlying area would be substantially in the same position as a central city affiliate excepting that the outlying affiliate would, in addition to cooperating with the Council in its effort, operate its own independent membership motivating program, using the Management Council as a resource.

The first outlying affiliate to engage in this special independent effort was the Industrial Council of the City of Commerce, an organization with more than 300 industrial employer members. (Its President had already become a member of of the Board.) Other affiliates soon undertook similar action, by unanimous action of the Board of Directors of the Southern California Restaurant Association with 800 members; the Southern California Hotel and Motel Association, 100 members; and the Independent Garage Owners' Association, with 400 members; later, other affiliates were enlisted.

FIRST SURVEY

Now—March 11, 1966—was a good time to take stock of employment progress. *Thus, on March 11, 1966, a letter was sent to the Presidents of the one hundred companies who had met in the Chamber of Comemrce Board Room right after the riots occurred. This letter requested that each company forward to the office of the Management Council specific information as to the number hired from the area of the South Central City. A report was enclosed for this purpose.*

Eighty-nine companies responded. The total reported as having been hired from the South Central City area since the riots of August 1965 was 4,751. *This information was provided by eighty-nine companies only, and additional employers were cooperating.*

THE SITUATION CHANGES

Progress continued. On March 1966 it was evident that while the unemployment problem remained severe, considerable success had been achieved. Based on the reports filed by the Watts Employment Office and elsewhere, and judging from the reports industry, it was clear that qualified Negroes, *those able to meet minimum job entry level* standards, had become increasingly scarce. For example, the Yellow Cab Company was short more than 100 drivers and would willingly accept Negroes if they could be found. There were applicants, but practically none who could qualify as cab drivers even though the requirements were minimal. A cab driver earns as high as $140.00 per week. There were then more than 100 Negro drivers working for the Yellow Cab Company.

Similarly, it was discovered that the City Transit Lines were short of help and were seeking bus drivers. A bus was equipped with desks, chairs and staff and sent to the Watts area. Recruitment was undertaken for a period of two weeks only to find that practically no candidates appeared who could meet the minimum tests, including the ability to make change for a dollar.

An effort was made through the Recruiting Office—the California Employment Service—in Watts, but even here we were unable to locate enough candidates for jobs who could meet either the needs of the Cab Company or the Transit Lines to fill open positions.

This did not suggest that the problem had been lessened; quite the contrary. It simply meant that there were fewer unemployed Negroes qualified to fill open jobs than formerly. The best had been hired. *There were, however, literally thousands still without work within the area who would require prejob training before they would be acceptable by business and industry.* This was serious. Furthermore, the whole problem of placing the disadvantaged unemployed was greatly complicated by the fact that nearly 150,000 new citizens come to the County each year from other parts of the country. Many are without adequate education or work experience.

MULTIOCCUPATIONAL SKILL CENTERS

Fortunately, a program had been conceived which was admirably suited to the need for prejob training. This program, made possible by the Federal Manpower Development and Training Act, provided for the establishment of four Skill Centers in the Los Angeles area.

The purpose of the Skill Centers was to enable the disadvantaged unemployed to receive first-rate training under modern methods which would, within a relatively short period of time, qualify the trainees for job entry. Included in the training programs would be fundamental education, attitudinal development, and specific skills within the categories then needed by industry.

Furthermore, and most important, *training programs in the Skill Centers* would also underwrite living costs of the trainees while courses were conducted. Women would be included.

There were, in addition, such pre-job training organizations as the Opportunities Industrialization Center, which were in most instances separately financed and some of them privately funded. These would address themselves to motivation of the disadvantaged, fundamental education, and a minimum of skill development. Included in this group, in addition to the O.I.C., were the Westminister Neighborhood Association, Operation Bootstrap and others.

It was unfortunate that the Skill Center program, as well as the others named, were slow in getting underway. Progress could and should have been much faster. The benefit from training of the kind offered by these institutions was immediately evident because of the fact that as quickly as graduates were produced jobs were made available to them. To some this was a surprise. Initially, some Negro advisors said Negroes would be unwilling to attend such training centers, especially those Federally funded, because of suspicion and doubt. They claimed experiences of the past, here and elsewhere, had shown few jobs available when training had been completed. The first Skill Center was picketed.

It is true that at first enrollment in the Skill Centers was slow and considerable criticism was offered. As training got underway, however, each of the Skill Centers achieved surprising results. *The Community Skill Center, for example, at 150th Street & Figueroa in Los Angeles, moved most quickly into training programs, achieving instant success.* The Management Council, working closely with the California Employment Service, *saw to it that all of the first graduates were hired immediately*—even though most had police records. A Skill Center on East 111th Place in Los Angeles had moderate but growing success and the Skill Center in Pacoima, while getting off to a slow start, began to show promise as the months passed by.

TRAINING IN THE ADULT VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS

While the adult vocational schools were earnestly trying to develop employability in those who took their courses, there were serious problems which stood in the way .

In the disadvantaged areas alone there were fourteen adult vocational schools (twenty-eight altogether). These schools had very limited contact with business and industry. The teachers were not always fully aware of what the demand occupations were, nor did they know the level of competency required to make a trainee employable upon graduation.

It was immediately evident that there was need for the development of a closer relationship between industry and these schools. Dr. William Johnston, Assistant Superintendent of Schools for Adult Education, welcomed a liaison between the Management Council and his office as a means of establishing a close working relationship.

The Management Council appointed Mr. Eldridge W. Reese, a former corporation president interested in education, to serve as our representative. Similarly, Dr. Johnston appointed Mr. George H. Winder, Administrative Coordinator for Especially Funded Programs, as Mr. Reese's counterpart in education. The Merit Employment Committee of the Management Council, made up of top personnel officers in industry, selected a subcommittee to work with Mr. Reese and Mr. Winder. They were: Walter King, Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co.; Robert Tyler, Western Electric; and Robert Coe of Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Joint meetings were held immediately with representatives from the California Department of Employment and coordination began. Subsequently, when this progress was brought to the attention of the Los Angeles Board of Education a resolution was adopted making the Employment Service and the Management Council "partners" with the school system in developing improved teaching.

As a part of the procedure which followed, the Management Council made a comprehensive survey of industry's actual needs by contacting 160 companies and surveying twenty-six specific occupational skills for the schools to teach. This survey, when submitted to the school system, resulted in substantial changes and improvement in job placements. In the many months that have followed this initial effort the relationship between industry and the adult school system has continued to improve. Representatives from the Management Council as well as representatives from industry have, in addition, participated in dozens of graduations, school ceremonies, teachers' meetings, staff meetings and other events over the past three years.

The adult school system is now prepared to set up special classes for any company or for any group of twenty or more pupils either on their premises or on those most convenient for those in attendance. This has opened up many localized training possibilities.

The Council has also cooperated closely with the Mexican-American Opportunity Foundation and with other training facilities operated separately from the regular school system.

HIRING SURVEY—NOVEMBER 1966

In November 1966, the Council began one final progress check on employment achieved in the South Central City, the 46-square mile riot area. There was a very special reason why the information would be needed. Governor Reagan, being impressed by the results achieved by the Management Council, had asked its President to accept the responsibil-

XUM

ity for developing similar programs in other cities throughout the State where minority unemployment problems existed. The President of the Management Council had accepted the assignment with the clear understanding that the effort would continue to be wholly a private enterprise undertaking, not financed by Government. This meant that a substantial sum of additional money would be needed and needed promptly.

It was recognized that to obtain such underwriting from private resources would require current information on hiring achieved.

On November 11, 1966 a letter was again sent to the Presidents of major employer organizations in the Los Angeles area. The letter requested a specific report on the number hired from the South Central City area and a report form was enclosed for that purpose. The letter this time was sent to 250 corporation presidents or chief executive officers.

Two-hundred-one companies responded. The tabulated result of hirings reported totaled 17,903.

From the very beginning, the members of the Board of Directors of the Management Council were well aware that the placement of the unemployed is complicated; that employment only *begins* with hiring. What happens then? How long does the new worker stay? How much does he earn? Is he promoted, fired, discriminated against or merely tolerated until the "persuasion pressure" is off?

The Council was not so naive as to believe that all job placements represented a net decrease in unemployment. If a man quit and was re-hired by another firm, he could be counted twice. Furthermore, some who quit or were fired were not rehired, and *many of the employers would have hired some of the disadvantaged from the area without any urging by the Management Council*. Also, those few companies reporting did not represent total hirings because we were working with many, many more companies which had not been asked to report, even though many were cooperating fully and had hired many of the disadvantaged.

Nevertheless, it was essential to evaluate what was being accomplished. Therefore, early in 1966, shortly after the Management Council was organized, a contract was entered into with the University of Southern California to survey the newly employed from the South Central City area to find the answers. $13,500 was paid to the University to make this study possible and was paid out of the funds of the Management Council.

The study was conducted by the Research Department of the School of Business Administration. A random selection of one hundred names from those first hired, men and women was made from the records of the California Employment Service Office in the heart of Watts. Those chosen represented employees of fifty-nine different companies. All were Negroes.

Beginning ten months after hiring took place and ending after fourteen months' employment, interviews were conducted with those whose names had been selected. These interviews were conducted at night in the homes of the employees by professional Negro personnel, people hired on a part-time basis from the California Employment Service by the University. In addition, employers were interviewed as well as personnel officers. Some of these interviews were conducted by University students; some by faculty members. A review of the study is encouraging. In summary, it revealed the following:

1. Two-thirds of those first hired and traced were still employed by the same company.

2. Of the one-third who left the initial job, half had found another job at higher pay and were working. (Most of these were in the $2.00 per hour or less initial starting rate).

3. Average rate of pay, including women, was $2.75 per hour.

4. Most workers said it was the best job they ever had. (90% said the job was different from any they had ever had before.)

5. 30% had moved into better homes during the period covered by the University of Southern California Survey. (Most of these had actually moved out of the area.)

7. All companies contacted reported satisfaction with the programs—planned to hire more minorities in the future.

6. Not one of the Negroes interviewed who had terminated reported he left the job because of discrimination.

8. Most had received pay increases—half had been promoted.

PUBLIC RELATIONS

As noted earlier in this document, it never was the plan of the Management Council to seek publicity. To this day, no press release has ever been issued by the Council. It had been the Council's intention to let results speak for themselves and *it had also been their hope that industry, not the Management Council, would receive credit for whatever progress was made in hiring the disadvantaged*.

Nevertheless, considerable publicity resulted from the Council's actions, starting with the newspaper coverage given a speech made by the Management Council president early in 1966 before the Los Angeles Rotary Club during which a progress report on hiring was given. The news media have since frequently sought information on progress.

When numbers hired were first reported, the Council was challenged by a resident of the South Central City area and by two local politicians, who discounted the achievements of industry. In every case *the challenges took place without any effort being made to contact the Management Council office to learn what the basis was for the report given*. Both were invited and both declined.

Because of this difficulty in communication and because the disadvantaged unemployed generally are suspicious and hard to convince (with considerable justification, based upon past promises made and not kept), the Management Council elected not to release the results of the November 11 hiring survey. *While it was essential that the informaton be obtained in order that Foundations being approached for funds would have some solid indication progress, it would be a mistake to announce the number hired publicly*.

It so happened, however, that almost on the same day that the results of the November 1966 employers' hiring survey were obtained, the report from the University of Southern California on what happened to the Negroes first hired was completed.

When the news media learned, through their own sources, of the two reports, the Council was pressed for full information. It had planned no announcements; the surveys were conducted only for the Council's own guidance.

But it became obvious that to keep the reports secret would give rise to unhealthy speculation. The decision was made to make results available, with full warnings about how the results were to be interpreted. In this, the press and broadcast media was most cooperative and thorough.

Some elements of the community, however, chose to interpret only the surface of the surveys, and publicly questioned the validity of the surveys and the effectiveness of the Council without even having read the news reports thoroughly. This action created a small but frustrating "credibility gap" within that section of the minority community most thoroughly conditioned to doubt and suspicion.

Thanks in a part to a thorough and objective full page story which appeared later in a prominent Negro newspaper, at least a part of that suspicion has now been dispelled, but certainly, early reports caused some damage which can never be undone.

THE STATEWIDE EFFORT

Almost immediately following the election of Governor Ronald Reagan he joined with Lieutenant Governor Robert Finch in requesting that the President of the Management Council undertake statewide responsibilities in the development of job and training opportunities for the disadvantaged. After considerable discussion, the invitation was accepted by McClellan. The terms were: no salary, no expense account from the State, and a pattern of effort calling for the establishment of Management Councils similar to the one in Los Angeles in other major cities throughout the State. All efforts were to be privately financed.

This invitation was not immediately accepted by McClellan, however, Lieutenant Governor Robert Finch and McClellan met for breakfast on four different occasions to discuss the possibilities of such an arrangement and to explore means by which real progress might be achieved by such a plan. The Lieutenant Governor was very persuasive and succeeded in enlisting McClellan into the program because it seemed both to him and to McClellan that the Governor was right in seeking statewide participation by industry on some sound plan.

The effort made to develop industry programs in key cities of the State has resulted in the formation of a Management Council in San Diego, a Bay Area Management Council in San Francisco, Management Councils for the Monterey Peninsula, Pasadena, Monrovia, Orange County and Fresno, as well as some efforts by industry in the San Fernando Valley, in Santa Monica, in Sacramento and in the Riverside, Colton and San Bernardino communities.

The Bay Area Management Council was formed under the chairmanship of Reed Hunt, Chairman of the Board, Crown Zellerbach Co. of San Francisco. Structured similarly to the Los Angeles Council, the program contemplated is almost identical. Meetings have been held with attendance of in excess of one hundred principal officers of major corporations each time. These meetings were held for the purpose of motivating employers into positive action in cooperation with the California Employment Service. All have been highly successful.

In addition, the Lockheed Missiles and Space Corporation of Sunnyvale has conducted a management meeting (dinner) which was attended by approximately 650 company managers. This meeting was addressed by the president of the company and by the President of the Management Council of Los Angeles, this time appearing in the role of Statewide Coordinator for the development of training and job opportunity for the disadvantaged.

ACTIVITIES OF THE MERIT EMPLOYMENT COMMITTEE

The Merit Employment Committee of the Management Council, mentioned earlier in this document, is made up of professional personnel officers among major employers. Organized under the leadership of Merl Felker, Director of Employment for Douglas Aircraft Company, the Committee established a 15-member Steering Committee and developed direct contact with approximately 200 of the personnel officers among major employers. Regular meetings are conducted and approximately once each month the Steering Committee of this group meets with officers of the Management Council. This permits good communication.

The achievements of the Merit Employment Committee are outstanding. They have been, in sense, *the* action committee of the Management Council. The Committee has functioned in a variety of ways, some of which follow.

XUM

The Committee produced a document entitled "You too can be a winner." This document, produced in cooperation with "Plans For Progress," a nationally-sponsored effort in which many major corporations across the United States have joined, is a pictorial brochure depicting the success of numerous minority group workers in industry at various levels of employment. It is a true success story publication and is very persuasive. More than 75,000 copies of this document have been circulated among the disadvantaged for purposes of motivation and encouragement. It has proven an excellent tool.

The Merit Employment Committee steering group has visited many of the Skill Centers, vocational schools, and employment offices for purposes of counseling, evaluating and coaching those engaged in the effort, to enable them to serve with maximum success. Such contacts, made by these experienced personnel officers, have proven invaluable to all concerned.

As an example of the outstanding service performed, in early 1967 the Merit Employment Committee arranged for nearly 300 successful Mexican-American and Negro workers to be excused from their jobs for half a day with pay. They were transported by company buses to two high schools, one (Garfield) in the Mexican-American community, the other (Jordan) in the South Central City Negro Community. The workers appeared in pairs in the class rooms to talk with the students. During that day 6,000 minority students were told by successful minority workers in industry why education pays.

EMPLOYER COOPERATION GROWS

In mid-1967 the Management Council again sought to expand the number of employer organizations working directly with the Management Council in recruitment from the disadvantaged areas of the community. By this time the effort had been broadened to include not only the South Central City but East Los Angeles (the primary Mexican-American area), Pacoima and elsewhere. One thousand corporation presidents and chief executive officers were invited to attend meetings (similar to the first held in August 1965) in the auditorium of the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce. Several hundred attended. They were given precisely the same information and encouragement to participate in the job opportunity program as those first addressed.

Their responses, too, were the same, Cooperation was assured. Personnel men were contacted and communication has continued. Through this method contact has now been established with 1200 companies directly from the Management Council office in Los Angeles. In addition, there are no less than 2,000 employers who have been "motivated" independently through affiliated employer organizations listed in this element.

LABOR DEPARTMENT HELPS

In the spring of 1967, during a visit to Washington, D.C., on other business, Vice President Humphrey invited McClellan to a conference in his office. The sole subject discussed was the Management Council program and problems in Los Angeles. McClellan described in positive terms the need for more training in programs like the Skill Centers in order to enable those seeking work to qualify for jobs then open. Vice President Humphrey suggested that Stanley Ruttenberg, Assistant Secretary of Labor, come to California to discuss the problems with McClellan and work out such improvements as seemed practical. The Vice President explained that Ruttenberg was the captain of the manpower team in the Government in Washington and would be the appropriate man to undertake this.

In the middle of May 1967, Ruttenberg and Frank Borda, his Deputy, came to Los Angeles to review and discuss manpower problems with the local Department of Labor staff here in Los Angeles. Meetings were also held in the office of the Management Council.

McClellan pointed out that the Skill Centers could accommodate twice the number then enrolled, if a moderate sum of additional underwriting could be provided. It was explained that the facilities were there, the management was there, the machinery and equipment were there. All that would be needed would be additional underwriting to cover the cost of the teachers involved as well as the cost of the subsistence allowances provided for the trainees. Both Ruttenberg and Borda seemed favorably impressed.

Following the meetings, Ruttenberg and Borda were invited to attend a meeting of employers. This was a typical meeting of 100 employers to see and hear a presentation by the Management Council urging their participation in the Council program of recruitment, training and employment of the disadvantaged from the minority areas.

It was not until the meeting was about to be adjourned that meeting chairman McClellan announced that Ruttenberg and his associate, Frank Borda, were in the room. He then called upon Ruttenberg to speak. Ruttenberg expressed his pleasure with the work and aims of the Council, and later arranged for an additional $1,500,000 to be provided for Skill Center underwriting in this area, thus enabling many more trainees to prepare themselves for jobs in industry.

EXTRA ACTIVITIES

While it has been the policy of the Management Council from the very beginning to concentrate on providing job opportunities for the disadvantaged, there have been developments which seem to justify participation in projects not directly related to employment.

There are several reasons for this. The deeper it got into the problem, the more obvious it became that business could not wholly escape some involvement with community problems even though the relationship to job opportunity was limited. In the first place, there was no other agency qualified to recruit industry support. Secondly, by such participation, the Council greatly strengthened relations with the Negro community and earned the confidence of many people who would otherwise be unreachable.

Credibility is an important element in working with the disadvantaged. It is necessary to be trusted. There must be an awareness of sincerity and some demonstration of ability to perform if credibility is to be achieved. For these reasons and other, the Council has become somewhat involved in efforts beyond job opportunity, hoping that others might soon become interested enough and be able to assume this role separately.

Here are a few examples of "non-job" efforts:

BANKING

By early 1967, financial institutions in the Watts area had begun to suffer a drying-up of major deposit sources, perhaps as people feared further rioting. This came at a time when loan demand for repairs and rehabilitation was greatest.

On the Council's recommendation, a meeting was arranged between heads of the six Negro-owned financial institutions and financial officers of 17 major industrial firms. The bankers and savings and loan men told industry that they needed industrial deposits, and within a matter of hours, over $1,000,000 was deposited in new accounts at those institutions.

WATTS SUMMER FESTIVALS, 1966, 1967 AND 1968

Under Billie Joe Tidwell of the Sons of Watts Improvement Association, people in the South Central and Watts area organized and staged festivals each August to symbolically replace the riots of August, 1965. Baltimore Scott, a young Negro attorney and Management Council staffer, worked with Tidwell and others in 1966, and in 1967 was recruited as a Director of the Festival. The Council helped with, among other things, a contribution of $2600 for jackets to be worn by the Sons of Watts who had been commissioned by Festival organizers to "keep the cool." They helped H. Rap Brown decide not to start trouble in 1967, and did their best to keep the peace in 1968, when minor trouble erupted five days before the festival. In both festivals, the Council helped with money and with financial counsel.

The Watts Summer Festival that took root in Los Angeles sprang up in San Francisco's Hunter's Point area. There, with the advice of the Council, the Hunter's Point Festival took place in October of 1967. Public officials and private citizens praised the event as a significant breakthrough toward constructive rehabilitation and employment in the area.

HELPING COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS

Other efforts for improvement included programs to combat unemployment in several potentially explosive areas such as Monterey and Seaside.

Local communities were visited and informal dinner meetings were held. Goals, programs and activities in the community were examined. In turn, Council representatives described their working relationship between industry and the Council in coordinating job opportunities for the minority community.

A similar meeting was conducted among leading Los Angeles Negro editors and publishers. At the end of the evening, both the Council and the news representatives obtained a greater understanding of each other's problems. Several editors commented that they could better understand what the Council's program meant in terms of the community's people.

The Council helped the Willowbrook Job Corporation, which was devoted to improving conditions in areas with conditions more severe than those in Watts. The Council helped the group with equipment for a free medical clinic for the poor, for fix-up materials for a rehabilitation home and an eight-week summer camp for a number of needy boys and girls.

NEIGHBORHOOD FIX-UP

Many organizations in South Central Los Angeles have helped stimulate neighborhood pride and redevelopment. Men may find jobs, but they should be able to have nice neighborhoods to return to each day.

Project H.O.P.E. and the 28th and 32nd Street Neighborhood Improvement Associations undertook the fix-up of several hundred homes in the Watts-Compton area. Hundreds of gallons of paint, painting materials, and several hundred trees were donated or obtained at cost. Organizations like the Los Angeles Paint, Varnish & Lacquer Association, and Norris Industries contributed their time and support to the projects which were co-sponsored by the Council and various neighborhood groups.

The result: 487 houses brightly painted and numerous yards cleaned up. In one major area more than half the homes painted were spread out—two houses painted on each block. This served as a "seed" or incentive for many neighborhoods.

With the help of the Council, another South Central City area group enhanced the beauty of their streets and yards. The Watts Labor Community Action Committee lacked the funds to plant 1,000 trees on the main crossroads of Watts. But, with the help of the Council, $5,000 was raised and the first increment of 750 trees was planted and the rest are on the way.

XUM

These are but a few of the projects undertaken by the Management Council outside its regular role of finding jobs for the disadvantaged.

COMMUNITY DIALOGUE

The Council continues to be interested in developing more effective means of achieving the needed dialogue between the Black Community and key forces in the white community interested in solving the basic problems confronting the entire populace.

An organization that has made great strides toward meaningful understanding is the Los Angeles Black Congress. This organization works on the important concept of "operational unity," maintaining that all black people and organizations can and should work together, regardless of individual differences in philosophy and program.

The Council has made no small efforts to bring the Black Congress, the Urban Coalition and other organizations together to achieve a unified purpose and program long talked about in the Negro Community.

BUSINESSES' RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE FUTURE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, our country is going to face many challenges in the future, internally and externally. If we are to respond effectively to these challenges, the business community is going to have to change and develop faster than ever before in our history.

Arnold A. Saltzman, one of the new type of business leaders, has eloquently stated the function that business will have to play in the future growth of our country. I would like to commend his statement to other leaders of the business community. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

America's New Frontier

(By Arnold A. Saltzman, president, the Seagrave Corp.)

The corporate entity which survives and prospers through the 1970's and beyond will be the one that leans with, and not against, the winds of change which continue to blow across the world. Our world has changed more dramatically in the sixty-eight years of the twentieth century than in all the preceding nineteen centuries since the birth of Christ. Change has always been a part of the human condition, but never has its pace been so fast as now. Never have ideas both scientific and social proliferated at such a bewildering rate of speed. Nor has the prospect ever been so clear that the pace will be steadily accelerated. No business organization which fails to take these facts into consideration can plan soundly for the future. No business organization which fails to welcome change can expect to have a future.

Alfred North Whitehead, one of the influential thinkers of this century, said: "A race preserves its vigor so long as it harbors a real contrast between what has been and what may be; and so long as it is nerved by vigor to adventures beyond the safeties of the past." Without the ability and the courage to depart from the snug harbor of status quo, nations and companies tend to decay.

Symbolic of this spirit and of our time are the widely published photographs of the earth as viewed from the moon. The moon-orbiting astronauts saw the planet on which we live as whole and beautiful, an oasis spinning slowly in a cold and silent universe, a tiny portion of a system about to be explored. But on this earth the continents by now are fully bounded and chartered, so the challenge of exploration of new frontiers must be turned inward by man to develop ways to improve the quality of human life. The most urgent need in the world today is to make certain that the era ahead will be the Age of Man.

No corporation which fails to understand and come to grips with the great changes occurring day by day will be able to capitalize on the exciting challenge of the Seventies. The world is in the process of searching for answers to some of the most compelling questions it has ever faced in improving our cities, in working to restore the purity of our atmosphere and our water resources, in devising new concepts for fruitful use of increased leisure time, in bettering the opportunities of people everywhere to achieve a full measure of economic well-being and political democracy.

The leader in the business community today can exercise that function best by helping to provide leadership for his country and the world in the development of the new environments that peoples all over the world desire and impatiently expect. This is one of the signals that young people are sending us. Their continuing interest in business as a career and their support of the capitalist system as the most satisfactory depends on how well our system functions in solving the world's needs—and how interested we are in dedicating much of our attention to these solutions and not merely to short range profit objectives.

We who believe in a democratic capitalist society cannot point with pride to its advantages but shirk the responsibility of its flaws and errors. Business has no choice but to help find the answers, indeed to take the lead in seeking them. The world's problems will not be solved without the active participation of business in the quest. This participation must be vigorous, informed, continuous. And it should originate from inside the business community, not be imposed from without.

While it is true that virtually every business decision is affected by government in one way or another, government is not the agency responsible for applying to people's daily lives the technology that has transformed the world. In the United States business has that responsibility. And social changes sought by government can be best brought about through the effective utilization by business of this technology. If the world's social problems are to be met effectively, business must apply its technical knowledge and management skill to their solution. It must provide economic opportunity and the benefits of mass production and distribution to peoples all over the world. People who are not afraid and not hungry are less likely to seek solutions linked to force inside the United States or elsewhere.

This will require of the modern executive and his corporation a high degree of flexibility in filling this role successfully. This means flexibility of thought as well as of operation—a flexibility that will enable management to meet the imperative necessity of extending corporate philosophy into new and frequently changing areas, as well as changing social attitudes. This challenge is not one that may be expected to arise at some future date. It is now.

Entrepreneurial America is linked both in opportunity and responsibility to our country's present and continuing greatest challenge. The remaking of the cities of the United States will, over the next decade, tax to the fullest our capabilities, our imagination and our dedication to our country as well as to our corporate objectives.

The great revolution in America which has been going on virtually unheeded has been the transformation from a largely agricultural society to an almost totally industrial one. Our methods of growing food and fibers are so mechanized that today only a small fraction of our people live on the land. The ever-increasing trek to the cities without corresponding planning has made our cities, in large measure, a burden not a blessing to those who reside there. We cannot expect a tranquil society when almost every living moment is an irritant and every day brings hazards to health or even life. Our citizens are entitled to a radical change and improvement, and Seagrave has both the intention and capability to be deeply involved in such improvement.

With rising standards of living and more leisure time, people all over the world will reach for upgraded, quality products that they can use, as well as increased quantities of the basic necessities of modern life. Producers and consumers can both benefit by the industrial race to achieve mass production of high quality goods which previously might be the function of artisans producing small amounts. Business must understand the need to improve the standard of living of all the people of America, as well as to bring increased purchasing power to the people of the underdeveloped nations. Bringing into the economy hordes of additional consumers, both in quantity and quality of demand, could produce a long range business boom of a magnitude previously unknown.

The role of the American corporation which is planning for growth and expansion in keeping with the times is enhanced by the fact that, even as we begin to shrink the universe, our own planet already has been turned into a single neighborhood by diminished space, as well as global communication and scientific revolution. Today the affairs of the United States are intermingled with those of every other nation on earth. Since ours is a business-based society, it places a heavy responsibility on business and, of course, opens up wide opportunities.

Words like "tomorrow" and "the future" necessarily guide the business planning of today. Only the future can be managed; not much can be done about the present. The problems of today represent the turbulence from yesterday's future. That turbulence must not be allowed to distract American business from its primary concern of preparing for the new Age of Man.

RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Los Angeles Times syndicate, for which on two previous occasions I have worked as a columnist, once again is publishing a weekly column which I write. It is not my intention to clutter the Record with these, but because the attack on the military, including the ROTC, is growing so strong in this country, I intend to place in the Record a column I have prepared on ROTC. The times we are going through today remind me exactly of the period during the late 1920's and 1930's, when there were the same accusations against ROTC, the citizens military training corps, and the military in general. We are likewise going through a period of unilateral disarmament when the country felt safe in its isolated position. Once again the words of fear against the uniform are being spread across this country, particularly against ROTC. I received my commission in the ROTC in 1930 and served 37 years, filling every rank up to and including major general. The ROTC training I received put me in better stead than any other training I have ever received outside of my family, and I deplore the activities on some of our campuses which tend to deny young men the military training and background they desire. I ask unanimous consent that my column, on this subject and tables showing the number of ROTC graduates and their service, the percent of officer strength commissioned through ROTC, the number of institutions that host Army senior ROTC, the officer procurement by source, and a letter outlining the Navy ROTC experience be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times Syndicate]

A COLUMN BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER

It is long past the time when somebody should speak up for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

Contrary to popular left-wing opinion, the ROTC is not a campus-spawned instrument of the devil. Nor is it an indication that the United States of America has turned to a policy of gross militarism with aggressive international designs.

Rather, the ROTC is an honorable, longstanding and extremely important facet of this nation's defense system.

In point of fact, the United States Army draws more than two-thirds of its general-service commissioned officers from the ROTC.

The organization is the prime source of supply for junior officers trained in advanced techniques of military operations.

In 1969 alone, the Army is counting on the ROTC to turn out 16,800 new second lieutenants. This compares with 8,500 which will come from officer candidate schools operated within the Army and a mere 750 from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

For those who have a working knowledge of the defense requirements of this nation, this is perhaps one of the worse times that could be chosen for an all-out attack on the Reserve Officers' Training Corps. While there is nothing new in making the ROTC a sort of "resident scapegoat" on campuses where it operates, the current leftist attack coincides with a growing demand for officers of the caliber which the ROTC turns out.

The art of military defense has become unbelievably sophisticated and complex in this nuclear age. Consequently, the demand for college trained officers is heavier than at any time in our history. And the demand is undoubtedly going to grow in the future.

It's entirely understandable, of course, that the ROTC supplies campus protest groups against wars and rumors of wars with their nearest uniformed target. The widespread attack on ROTC programs which are going on today are part and parcel of the entire broad-gauged attack on the defense establishment. President Nixon has described this as "an open season on the Armed Services" and, of course, on many campuses that season includes ROTC.

Because of the wide publicity given to campus demonstrations and protests by the news media, it is important to get the situation affecting the ROTC in proper perspective.

Our defense officials are concerned, just as were the Armed Services back in the pre-World War II days when ROTC programs were the target of pacifists and demonstrations in the 1920's and 1930's. However, they do not expect that the current effort to destroy ROTC will come anywhere near its mark.

It is pointed out that demonstrations of varying degrees of severity have hit 30 of the 350 schools which offer reserve officers' training. Nine cases of arson have been recorded and it is possible that some schools may be forced to drop their programs. But this should have little effect since there is a long list of other schools which have applied for a ROTC unit of one or the other of the services. Included are some 90 applications for Army programs, 116 for Air Force programs and 129 for the Navy. At the present time the Army has 150,000 students enrolled in ROTC; the Air Force has 51,200 and the Navy 10,100.

Recently Brigadier General Clifford P. Hannum, the Army's Deputy Director for ROTC, had some pertinent comments on the program:

"We are not looking for an abolition of ROTC because it is too deep in our history and too deep in the civilian-military tradition of the Army.

"I think some of the professors who attack the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in the name of academic freedom should stop to think that they are attacking an institution which is helping to preserve a general freedom within which academic freedom exists.

"If we were to lose our civilian-military character, we might become the kind of inbred Army that takes over countries."

Conflict and number of ROTC graduates serving

World War II (Dec. 7, 1941 to Sept. 2, 1945)	81, 580
Korea (June 25, 1950 to July 27, 1953) (estimate)	54, 079
Vietnam (Jan. 1, 1965 to March 31, 1969) (estimate)	43, 050

Percentage of the officer strength commissioned through the ROTC program

Colonel	20. 1
Lieutenant colonel	27. 6
Major	51. 8
Captain	40. 8
First lieutenant	32. 1
Second lieutenant	28. 1
Total	35. 2

Number of institutions that host Army senior ROTC detachments

Four-year institutions	246
Branches thereof	13
Military junior colleges	9
Fiscal year 1969	268
Fiscal year 1970 (increase)	15
Fiscal year 1971 (increase)	3
Total by fiscal year 1971	286

OFFICER PROCUREMENT BY SOURCE

	Service academies	ROTC	OCS
Fiscal year:			
1958	428	6, 858	566
1959	451	5, 013	647
1960	503	6, 252	729
1961	487	6, 899	565
1962	537	[1] 11, 992	608
1963	465	10, 578	781
1964	494	10, 837	1, 688
1965	524	9, 886	2, 277
1966	562	9, 690	3, 351
1967	561	10, 629	19, 240
1968	675	10, 846	18, 355
Subtotal	5, 687	99, 480	48, 807
Total		153, 974	
Percent	3. 7	64. 5	31. 8

[1] 91.2 percent.

Note: Extracted from DCSPER 46 Report. Does not include all sources.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., June 26, 1969.
Hon. BARRY GOLDWATER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in further reply to your recent request for statistical information relative to the Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps Program.

The Chief of Naval Personnel has informed me that the actual numbers of Navy and Marine Corps officers from Naval ROTC source who served in World War II, Korea and Vietnam are not available. However, during fiscal years 1947 through 1968, 23,083 Regular and 17,331 Reserve officers were commissioned from this program. Almost all of these served immediately on active duty for varying periods of time. Most of those who did not serve on active duty immediately were so ordered at a later date. Of all the Naval officers first reporting to active duty during fiscal year 1968, other than doctors, dentists, chaplains, nurses, Medical Service Corps officers and Waves, 13.2% came from NROTC and of those ordered to active duty in the Marine Corps during the same year, NROTC furnished 7%.

Additionally, eight of the thirty-one astronauts presently on active duty are Naval ROTC graduates. There are nine Rear Admirals, USN, commissioned initially from this source, currently on active duty and three in a retired status. Eight Rear Admirals, U.S. Naval Reserve, of the forty-eight in the Ready Reserve category on inactive duty at this time, are NROTC products.

I have been advised that the Naval ROTC began at six schools in 1926, and grew to twenty-seven by World War II when it served as the foundation for the WWII V–12 college training program. It was expanded to fifty-two schools in 1946, fifty-three in 1956 and to our present total of fifty-four in 1968 when Prairie View A&M College, Prairie View, Texas, a predominantly Negro school, was added.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated, and I trust that the foregoing information will be useful to you.

Sincerely yours,

MEANS JOHNSTON, Jr.,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy,
Chief of Legislative Affairs.

THE SURTAX

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Brighter Surtax Outlook," published in the Washington Evening Star of July 14, 1969.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIGHTER SURTAX OUTLOOK

In the early part of last week Russell B. Long, chairman of the powerful Senate Finance Committee, was talking as though extension of the surtax might be blocked in this session of Congress by partisan political considerations. The senator from Louisiana seemed determined to tie the surtax bill to major tax reform, and he was quoted as saying that "tax reform hearings are going to be just as broad and comprehensive as the senators want them to be."

Given the eager-beaver insistence of many senators that extension of the surtax could come only as a companion piece to free-wheeling tax reform, it seemed quite likely the bill to extend the surtax might be disastrously delayed or even doomed in this session. But Senator Long now says there was "some misunderstanding" of his position. He

XUM

wants to remove any inequities in the bill that squeaked through the House by a 210 to 205 vote, but he does not believe the Senate version of the bill should seek to achieve tax reform "so sweeping or comprehensive as to obscure the need to balance the budget and stabilize the economy." He added: "The bill should not be so mired down in endless controversy that it fails to pass before the August recess."

This surely is a sensible and a responsible position for the chairman of the Finance Committee to take. No one questions the need for tax reform. It is urgent, and reform should be forthcoming before this Congress adjourns. But the price for tax reform should not be an unconscionable delay in extending the surtax, with all that this would mean in terms of more inflation, higher prices and erosion of the value of the dollar.

Tax reform and surtax extension need not be wrapped up in one package. Congress should deal with them separately and Senator Long seemed to concede as much when he said that full and comprehensive overhaul of the tax laws could take several months. As a matter of fact, tax reform should be dealt with first by the House Ways and Means Committee, which is moving ahead rapidly on a tax-reform bill. Furthermore, the Democratic chairman of that committee, Wilbur Mills, has pledged that the reform bill will be reported out in time for action by this Congress.

Given all this, what excuse or justification remains for congressional stalling on extension of the surtax? The answer is that there is none—unless the Democratic majority in Congress really wants to embarrass a Republican administration, weaken the dollar at home and abroad, and compel the American housewife to pay more for less food to put on the family table. We do not believe this is in the Democratic political cards this year.

TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, it has been stated by the majority party that it intends to delay action on the surtax legislation and to associate this legislation with proposals for tax reform. This means that a final decision on the surtax will not be made until later in the year. Mr. President, it is my view that this delay is undesirable and that the reasons given for it are invalid.

The surtax is an integral part of the administration's program for stopping inflation, and this program should be acted upon as soon as possible. The program includes, first, a policy of monetary restraint which has reduced from 13 percent to less than 3 percent the rate of growth of our money supply. The second part of the program is a budget surplus representing a decrease in planned expenditures, and the third element is the maintenance of current tax levels, so as to prevent increases in demand for goods that would offset the effect of the other two elements.

Thus, the surtax proposal itself has considerable economic impact, but this impact is capable of arresting inflation only in concert with other measures of fiscal and monetary policy. These measures have been taken and they have been strong, as the proposed budget cuts of the Nixon administration and the very tight money policy of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board indicate. Now it is necessary that the third element of anti-inflation policy be adopted as a commitment on the part of the Federal Government to surely and rapidly bring under control the inflationary trends in the economy.

There is no valid reason for the majority party, which controls the Congress, its committees, and the flow of legislation, to delay action on grounds that the Senate should await tax reform. It is within the power of the majority party itself to decide when tax reform legislation or any other legislation, will come before this body. The tax surplus need not be held as a hostage. While I fully agree that tax reform proposals should be carefully considered by the Senate, there is no justification for the majority party to use this very important issue as an excuse for delaying final action on the surtax.

Mr. President, the distinction between tax reform and control of inflation should be kept very clear. The former deals with the tax structure of our economy and questions of equity in methods by which the Government obtains its resources, whereas the latter deals with the role of Government in controlling the value of the dollar. There are many areas in which tax reform should be undertaken, but it is important to keep in mind that serious tax reform has serious effects on the relative position of many groups in the economy and that reforms should not be constructed hastily and legislated as a side issue or even a substitute issue for the proposal at hand which is, in fact, a measure to control the inflation.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I should like first to commend the distinguished Senator from Kansas. He is, in my judgment, a great progressive Republican and a humanitarian, and certainly has always been in the forefront of progressive principles.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PERCY. But I would say, in addition, that in the area of economics he is sound. He is a conservative, if I may use that word; and I think being a fiscal conservative is the greatest way to make progress for this country. He is a progressive statesman, in my opinion.

I wish also to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Delaware. Since I have come to the Senate, I have been impressed with his judgment in fiscal matters. He is a man who has fought hard for economy in Government, for cutting wasteful Federal expenditures, and also a man who has had a great foresight as to what a sound fiscal policy for this country should be.

I should like, at this point, to comment on this very important matter of the extension of the surtax. There is no economic subject which will come before Congress this year that will directly affect as many Americans as does this issue.

I wish to commend once again, as I did yesterday, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), for his announcement that it is his intention to press for early consideration of this legislation. He understands that it is important that "Members on both sides of the aisle be responsible in providing the President with the revenue he needs to sustain the Government and the support he needs to defend the Nation." He asks the help of all Members of Congress for "the struggle to control inflation and rising interest costs is not something that the President can do by himself." Senator LONG is acting in the best traditions of the Senate for, as a responsible legislator, he sees the need of the Nation for a stable economy and he is assuming the leadership to see that his committee acts with this goal in mind.

It was not too long ago that a Democratic President asked for support and help on this side of the aisle to impose what was then a new tax, not an extension of an existing tax, the surtax. We worked very closely with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Under Secretary, many of us on this side, who felt that though it was not the popular thing to do, it was absolutely crucial and essential that we start the process of matching our income with our expenditures, and that only then could we get a grip on this problem of inflation, which is a psychological as much as a financial problem. The responsibility rests squarely with the Government, and when the Government pours more money into the economy than the economy legitimately requires, it must take the first steps toward restoring economic health.

In my judgment, on the other side of the Capitol, on Monday, June 30, 1969, the House of Representatives took a courageous and vital step toward restoring health to this Nation's economy.

It may seem strange to talk of restoring health to an economy that has seen unprecedented production, employment at an all-time high, and more Americans enjoying a higher standard of living than ever before. But the description could not be more accurate. Our economy is seriously ill with the infection of excessive inflation.

The Senate Finance Committee now has before it a House-passed bill which would, among other things, extend the 10-percent income tax surcharge for 6 months—until January 1, and then reduce it to 5 percent for the first half of 1970.

The House vote on this legislation was very close. The final verdict, in fact, was in doubt for several weeks, and that doubt centered around one critical issue. I refer, of course, to the widely recognized need for early action on far-reaching and meaningful tax reform.

I doubt that anyone in the Senate more earnestly supports sweeping reforms in our tax structure than I do. Our revenue collection system must be made more fair and equitable. Loopholes must be closed. The system must be made to live up to the principle that Americans support their Government in accordance with their ability to provide that support. Existing inequities have resulted in lower and middle-income Americans shouldering an extra-heavy burden while some wealthy citizens have shouldered no burden at all.

No mail that I receive is more indignant than that which comments on this fact that poor people have to pay taxes and the very wealthy somehow seem to escape this heavy burden.

The bill before the Finance Committee is not essentially a tax reform measure and was not meant to be, although even this bill takes the significant step of removing several million low-income wage earners from the tax rolls.

The chief purpose of this bill—the extension of the tax surcharge—is to strengthen the fight against inflation. It is an emergency measure which is vital to the restoration of our economy's health. We can talk forever about improving the equity of our tax system, but it operates as part of Government's overall plan to restore the economy to an even keel. When it is high, it is burdensome, but it remains, nevertheless, a real tax.

The alternative is a phony tax. It costs more than the real tax. It is completely useless, serves no purposes, and worse, is a cruel delusion. It attacks those who can least defend themselves. The poor. Those on fixed incomes.

The phony tax of inflation has gripped our economy so firmly that a single dollar earned just 6 months ago is now worth only 96 cents, and will be worth only 92 cents by Christmas if nothing is done with it. While most workers have received substantial pay raises in recent years, the average family remains right where it was in 1964 in terms of purchasing power.

Despite these facts, and despite the obvious logical preference for an end to inflation, ours is not an easy choice. It is not an easy choice because it is always difficult to vote for taxes—and the phony tax which now holds sway has the extra advantage of invisibility. It works behind the scenes, deceptively eroding real income and wealth.

No one argues about the need to stop inflation. No one, any longer, questions the need of wide-ranging tax reforms. The President has made it clear that passage of this bill and truly meaningful tax reforms are both vitally important. He pledged in a recent letter to Representative FORD that progress on tax reform would become a reality as quickly as Congress can act, and that means this summer.

Within the first few months of the new administration, the Congress received extension proposals for tax reform from the Treasury Department. Sixteen separate proposals were advanced, including measures that will:

Limit preferred—tax exempt—income to 50 percent of total income, and require allocating itemized deductions between taxable and preferred income;

Exempt those who fall below the Federal "poverty line";

Restrict the tax exemption privileges currently available to foundations, as well as the taxation of certain kinds of unrelated income of charitable organizations;

Restrict charitable contribution deductions;

Restrict the use of small corporations by large parent corporations for tax avoidance; and

Alter the rules affecting stock dividends and long-term capital losses.

These administration proposals are just the first installment. Many of these tax measures are complex, requiring careful, patient examination before comprehensive legislation can be drafted. The administration has set a deadline for the submission by the Treasury of the second installment of tax reform proposals, which will include even more far-reaching proposals.

Chairman MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee has given his word that his committee will present substantial legislation this summer before the recess. He is supported by House Members on both sides of the aisle, including the Republican leadership.

In short, far-ranging and meaningful tax reform will become a reality this year.

But to confuse the issue by delaying extension of the tax surcharge because of our sincere desire for tax reform would be extremely dangerous.

Each day we delay passage of this legislation, the inflationary psychology which grips our economy is growing stronger. Further delay would signal to our own business and financial community and the world markets that we are not serious about controlling inflation. Higher interest rates and a speedup in the wage price spiral would surely follow, with grave consequences for confidence in our dollar, which is the foundation of the free world's monetary system. Ultimately, uncontrolled inflation will lead to a severe economic correction accompanied by a painful level of unemployment.

No one seriously argues that taxes should be cut now, at a time when prices are rising by 7 percent per year, yet failure to enact this bill would do precisely that.

Let us not allow our zeal for sweeping tax reforms—and I intend to do everything possible to advance this goal—blind us to the need for early action to demonstrate this Government's total commitment to bringing inflation under control.

Tax reform can and will be enacted by Congress this year. The people want it. The administration wants it. Congress wants it. I am convinced that the only way to achieve both sound reforms, and a sound economy is to pass this stabilization measure now, and then get down to serious business on thorough tax reform.

To attempt to join both measures at this time would be unfair to the surtax issue as well as the reform issue. To my mind it would be wrong to delay the surtax extension and it would be equally wrong to rush reforms through the Congress without proper consideration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PERCY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I wish to compliment both the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Kansas on their remarks today wherein they expressed the urgency of the Senate's taking prompt action on the question of extending the surcharge as well as on the question of whether or not we should repeal the investment tax credit.

I agree with both of them that major tax reforms are needed and that this Congress should and, I am confident, will act on this matter before the year is out.

To try to delay action on the surcharge until after we have had time to explore adequately these various reform proposals would, in my opinion, be a disaster. And the uncertainty that would arise in the financial community would create chaos.

I certainly hope the Senate leadership will proceed. I join the Senator in paying respects to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, who recognizes that we do have a responsibility in this direction and that we should act promptly.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I compliment the Senior from Illinois and associate myself with the very excellent statement made by him. I recognize his leadership in this endeavor.

It was a private conversation with the Senator from Illinois that greatly persuaded me, not knowing of his statement today, to make some expression on this very serious problem.

I commend the Senator for his foresight and for his statesmanship. We use that term very loosely here, but it applies in this case.

I do thank the Senator from Delaware for his kind remarks.

Mr. PERCY. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) citing the need for prompt passage of the bill providing for a limited extension of the surtax. As we all know, this measure has been passed by the House of Representatives and is now pending before the Finance Committee.

Yesterday several Senators, including the distinguished majority leader (Mr. MANSFIELD) and the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee (Mr. LONG) engaged in an extensive discussion as to when this measure might be called up on the Senate floor for consideration. During the course of this discussion it was not altogether clear as to the policy of the leadership, and certainly there was no unanimity among the viewpoints expressed. However, the majority leader did finally state that the bill extending the surtax would not be considered until a House-passed tax reform package is also reported from the Finance Committee and placed on the Senate calendar.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the majority leader will not pursue this course of action. There can be little doubt that the House Ways and Means Committee will report a tax reform proposal, that some measure of this nature will be sent to the Senate, and that each Senator will have every opportunity to introduce any tax reform amendment that he would like to see enacted. For this reason, I can see no reason to delay consideration of the bill extending the surtax.

At the present time the surtax is being extended for a limited period of 1 month until such time as the Senate has

XUM

the opportunity to vote the measure up or down. While it is correct that surtax revenues are being collected, there are many who believe that this measure will not be extended and, for this reason, the inflation psychology persists. In my judgment, it is most important that Congress take prompt and incisive action to combat the inflationary spiral and the psychology on which it fuels. This can only be done by a final determination on the merits of the question. To fail to take this course of action will create additional uncertainty as to whether Congress will or will not extend the surtax and as to whether Congress will or will not repeal the investment tax credit. This continuing uncertainty can only have the inevitable result of creating additional problems within our economy.

If there were little or no likelihood that the House of Representatives would pass some tax reform measure, then I could see some justification in the course of action outlined by the majority leader. But since that is not the case and since both the President and the Secretary of the Treasury have stated on numerous occasions their deep conviction that tax reform should be pursued, I do not believe the call for tax reform to be a legitimate device to delay or defeat passage of this measure.

Again, I commend the Senator from Illinois on his remarks, and, for the reasons I have stated, I hope that the Senate will move promptly and that the majority leader will not persue the course of action I understood him to outline yesterday.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I think it is of significance that once again we have a Senator who is both progressive and moderate in ideology and thought, who is consistently sound and conservative in economic matters and who in the end supports a progressive policy with respect to this important pending issue before the country.

I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MISSILE TEST FACILITIES AT KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE, AND RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTH

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2546) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, for the past 2 weeks the Senate has been debating the issue of ABM.

Today I want to discuss the question of polls and how important a part they have either in influencing legislation or in molding public opinion and to point out why I think this practice if carried too far can be dangerous.

According to one poll conducted by the press the final vote on the Safeguard ABM system will be 50 Senators for and 49 against, with only 1 Senator—myself—listed as uncommitted. If it were true that 99 Senators have already taken a position then why do we not proceed to an immediate vote? .

First let me point out that I respect and admire the press for trying to anticipate the results even before the votes are cast. This makes an interesting numbers game, but frankly ever since the 1948 election I have been somewhat dubious about the reliability of polls, and in this instance they may again be in error.

However, if these polls are to be accepted as accurate the question may well be asked why I have not taken a position.

Surely 99 Senators are not making speeches and conducting this debate just to influence the vote of one lone Senator. If that is the case I am ready to vote today.

On the other hand, why do I not answer the poll and then let the guessing game start all over as to who has changed his mind?

For 23 years I have made it a practice not to answer polls—public or private—because in my opinion while polls are interesting they are ofttimes dangerous.

For example, I am a member of the Senate Finance Committee which handles tax legislation. Advance knowledge obtained by a poll of the members of that committee as to a rate of tax or its effective date can be worth millions to someone who is in a position to make use of such information.

For this reason when the Finance Committee is ready to mark up a bill we try to act fast on the major decisions and then release to the press immediately the results of our vote. For instance, the day after the House voted on the surtax bill, June 30, our committee went into executive session and took a tentative vote on the effective date for the repeal of the 7-percent investment credit. Millions were involved on this question of the effective date, and an immediate announcement was made to the press as to the results of that vote.

Here today we have before us a bill, a decision on which is of major importance to our country, and while the money factor alone is not the determining point, nevertheless, Senators are aware that this question involves expenditures of several billion.

How many defense contractors and how many speculators are trying to outguess this vote and make plans as to how it will affect their interests?

This question is not asked to cast any reflection on industry, nor is it intended as a reflection on any Senator who has taken a position on the bill or who is taking part in this debate.

It is not only proper but it is a necessary part of our legislative process that Senators who have made a study of any important bill before the Senate should take part in the debate, and certainly their positions are made known.

For weeks I have been urging prompt action on the surtax bill, and as far back as last January I advocated the repeal of the 7-percent investment credit. My position is established on these points, and I have spoken out trying to sell my viewpoint to other Members of Congress. But I did not recommend, nor do I now recommend, a private poll of all other Senators as to how they will vote on that bill.

Besides, how can Senators make a decision on a bill before disposition has been made of various amendments either on a tax bill or on the bill now before us?

Who knows what effect the acceptance or rejection of some of the pending amendments will have on the final vote on the bill before us?

If the Senate ever approves a procedure wherein the press will be able to announce an accurate count of the vote weeks before the actual rollcall on a major bill, we will have ceased to function as a legislative body.

Certainly Senators have an idea as to how they intend to vote, but national or world developments at the last moment must be taken into consideration. For example, the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia last year prompted a last-minute change in the plans of the Senate for consideration of the Nonproliferation Treaty.

How will I vote on this most important question now pending before the Senate? If at any time I think I can contribute anything toward the debate on any pending amendment or on the bill itself I shall speak out; otherwise I shall just wait until the debate ends, and then on each amendment and on the final passage of the bill I will cast my votes in what I consider to be in the best interests of our country.

Meanwhile, for the remainder of my term in office I will continue the practice of the past 23 years of not answering polls and of not trying to be an authority in every important bill that comes before the Senate.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator. I noted with considerable interest the account in the newspapers of a poll that had been taken of 100 Senators. To my knowledge, no question has been asked of my office, and no poll has been taken concerning my vote, and I certainly have not responded to any poll. I can not recall any contact by any newspaper of my office as to how I would vote on this issue.

I think the Senator has rendered a service today in making the statement he has made.

I was just a little nonplussed when I read the account of 100 Senators having been polled. I asked my staff if I had been polled, and I was told that I had not. I am sure that I have not made any statement to any newspaper during the past several months as to where I stand on this issue. I assumed that the press media—those who were doing the polling—probably went back to some previous vote and perhaps took a chance on my voting this way or that way based on some vote in the past, and they may be right or they may not be. I do not know whether they counted me as a supporter of the ABM or whether they counted me as being opposed to the ABM.

But I am going to follow the same procedure that the Senator states he has been following for 23 years. I am not going to answer any polls as to how I shall vote on such a controversial issue as the ABM. I think the time to cast one's vote is when the roll is called; and if I wish to indicate prior to that time what my position is by way of a speech on the floor of the Senate, by way of some announcement on the radio, or via television, or by issuance of a news release that is for me to determine. But I do not intend to answer any polls. Perhaps at some time in past years I may have responded to some polls on other issues, I do not recall; but, if so, I do not intend to do it again; and it has been my policy for quite some time not to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator.

I think this can be a dangerous practice. Again, I do not question the good intentions or the propriety of the members of the press in conducting these polls. If I were a reporter, I suppose I would do the same as they are doing, but it is our fault if we answer them. If we answer one poll, then why do we not answer this poll or the next poll? In the Finance Committee we act on proposed legislation which involves major changes in tax rates that can affect financial markets. I think it would be very dangerous to adopt a practice in which the members of that committee could be polled in advance of the votes.

I have served on this committee with the Senator from Virginia, Mr. Harry F. Byrd, Sr., and before that I served with the Senator from Georgia, Mr. George, and with the Senator from Colorado, Mr. Millikin, as chairmen. They emphasized to all the new members of that committee the importance of not letting the committee be used by those who would turn the information to their own advantage. I have tried to live up to that standard.

One person called our office this week in a private poll—not a member of the press—and told the gentleman in my office that it was very important. They were checking the poll on the votes for the ABM as it had been related in the press to see whether or not it was accurate. They were trying to get the position I would take on the ABM as well as the position of other Senators because he said their clients wanted more factual information as to what was going to happen on this bill.

This illustrates the danger we could get into if we, as Members of the Senate, adopted a procedure whereby we could be polled a week or two in advance as to how we were going to vote. If 99 or 100 percent of the Members of the Senate have actually made up their minds then let us vote.

That illustrates the ridiculousness of this polling process, and I thought I would make clear my reasons as to why I think the problem of polling should be checked.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator.

So far as I am concerned, I think it is my responsibility to take a position on the issues that come before us for decision, but I do not think that I have a duty to respond to polls as to how I intend to vote on any issue. I think it is demeaning to the Senate to do so. Naturally, if I take a position and make that position known in a speech, that vote can be counted as I so state. But as to answering polls per se, I am not going to do it; and I think it is wrong for the impression to be given out that 100 Senators have been polled on this issue or any other issue when, as a matter of fact, they have not been so polled. I, too, do not question the good intentions of any pollster. But 100 Senators have not been polled on the ABM. As far as I am aware, even the leadership on this side of the aisle has made no attempt to conduct a poll on this issue.

I can only speak for one Senator, but mine is one of the votes out of 100. Perhaps 99 other Senators were polled, and perhaps it was not considered necessary to poll the junior Senator from West Virginia. Nevertheless, I think it is wrong to state that all Senators have been polled when such is not the case. It might conceivably cause some Senator to change his position some day just for the heck of it, to show that the polls are not always right.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 16, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 15, 1969:

Department of Justice

Bethel B. Larey, of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Arkansas for the term of 4 years.

U.S. Assay Office at New York, N.Y.

Nicholas Costanzo, of New York, to be Superintendent of the U.S. assay office at New York, N.Y.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 15, 1969:

U.S. Air Force Academy

Col. William R. Jarrell, Jr., FR16821, for appointment as Registrar, U.S. Air Force Academy, under the provisions of section 9333(c), title 10, United States Code.

Richard H. White, cadet of the U.S. Air Force Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon his graduation, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code. Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, July 15, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. James L. Powell, Jr., First Baptist Church, Mount Airy, N.C., offered the following prayer:

Lord, we pray for the Members of this great body today, and all those who share in its labors.

Teach them courageous leadership, based on faith and not on fear.

Forgive them when they talk too much and think too little; when they worry so often and pray so seldom.

Take away the stubborn pride that keeps them from apology and makes them unwilling to open their hearts honestly to their colleagues.

Deliver them from the blasphemy of optimism that is mere wishful thinking, but give them a courage to want to stand for something, lest they fall for anything.

For conscience sake, for God's sake; help us to give a good account of ourselves in these days.

In our Lord's name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1828. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon James F. Wegener;

H.R. 1948. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Pfc. Joseph Anthony Snitko;

H.R. 2224. An act for the relief of Franklin Jacinto Antonio;

H.R. 2536. An act for the relief of Francesca Adriana Millonzi;

H.R. 2890. An act for the relief of Rueben Rosen;

H.R. 3166. An act for the relief of Aleksandar Zambeli;

H.R. 3167. An act for the relief of Ryszard Stanislaw Obacz;

H.R. 3172. An act for the relief of Yolanda Fulgencio Hunter;

H.R. 3376. An act for the relief of Maria da Conceicao Evaristo;

H.R. 7215. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Diplomatic Courier Service; and

H.R. 10060. An act for the relief of L. Cpl. Peter M. Nee (2465662).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

XUM

S. 267. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Samuel J. Cole, U.S. Army (retired);

S. 571. An act for the relief of Dr. Diego Aguilar Aranda;

S. 1110. An act for the relief of Nickolas George Polizos;

S. 1526. An act for the relief of Dr. Zeliha Bilsel;

S. 1527. An act for the relief of Dr. Yilmaz Bilsel;

S. 1645. An act for the relief of Andrew Chu Yang;

S. 1798. An act for the relief of Dr. Yovuz Aykent;

S. 1963. An act for the relief of Wu Hip;

S. 2019. An act for the relief of Dug Foo Wong;

S. 2462. An act to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission; and

S.J. Res. 85. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the period from August 26, 1969, through September 1, 1969, as "National Archery Week."

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on the Investigation of the *Pueblo* of the Committee on Armed Services be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, if this request has been cleared with the ranking minority member of that committee?

Mr. PIKE. It has been cleared with Mr. BRAY, the ranking minority member.

Mr. HALL. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask if there is some compelling reason why this committee should sit at this particular time while we have important legislation under debate on the floor of the House, for which some of the members of that committee must be in attendance this afternoon at a time certain?

Mr. PIKE. The most compelling reason that I can find is the fact that because the full committee is meeting every morning on a daily basis the subcommittee does not have much other chance to meet, and we would like to get the report out.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to get the report out, also, and I think I understand the other reasons, but I am constrained to object to that committee meeting this afternoon during debate on the extension of Appalachia.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

TAX REFORM

(Mr. HUNGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, as we proceed to consider tax reform we may undoubtedly expect considerable correspondence on the subject. Some companies are already seeking to be helpful and to stimulate congressional mail.

The following statement is on a slip enclosed with credit cards and credit billings:

> YOU SHOULD KNOW ABOUT THIS NOW
>
> As part of its effort to draft a revised tax program, Congress is considering reducing the percentage depletion allowed producers of oil. Any change in this provision will affect the oil industry and its customers. The provision basically is an incentive to motivate people to invest money in the high-risk business of trying to find oil.
>
> We need oil—because you need gasoline. If Congress so changes the depletion provision—prices for oil and gasoline will, we're convinced, go up significantly. We want you to realize this before Congress acts. If you agree, please take a minute to write your Congressman and tell him that changing this provision will not close a "tax loophole" but will result in higher prices to the customer.
>
> SUN OIL CO.—DX DIVISION.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS—WITH EMPHASIS ON FACTUAL DATA

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the President of these United States, Richard M. Nixon, serves his country well with this sensitive and farsighted program which he announced yesterday. It is a credit to his entire administration that they have offered a coordinated response to the needs which this expanding social and moral problem presents.

I am particularly impressed with certain points within the President's program. Research in every field from genetics and neurosurgery to social psychology needs be conducted or compiled and conclusions reached upon the entire narcotics field. It will only be after effective and thorough research of, at least, the more popular items such as marihuana and the amphetamines and barbiturates that professionals within and without government will know fully and accurately the extent of the problem we face. Equipped with conclusions from valid research, the legislature will know best how to cope with this situation which threatens to spiral beyond our control. Second, the curious and experimenting youth is more likely to be convinced by the logic and data, demonstrating the damage he risks, than he is by an edict which tells him "no" but fails to convince him why he should not "turn on" or "trip out."

The second feature of the program which impresses me is that it proposes a firm stand by all government, Federal, State, and municipal, that there is no promise of relaxation of the laws regulating abuse of dangerous drugs. As an author of the legislation passed in the last session to control LSD, I feel strongly that any doubt as to the destructive power of any drug must be resolved in favor of the welfare of the people. As long as the possibility exists that a drug may be addictive, may be corrosive to one's physical health and of one's psychological balance, there should and must be effective, strict, and complete regulation of its transmission in commerce and of its use.

ELECTIONS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

(Mr. TAFT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR) regarding the recent offer of elections by President Thieu, as endorsed by President Nixon.

The steps that have been taken and the offer that has been made are of great significance. Just today, Mr. Max Frankel, writing in the New York Times, commented on evidence of "restlessness, weariness, and dissent in North Vietnam." In part, that article reads as follows:

> A distinct but still minority share of power is what the Nixon Administration has so far offered the Viet Cong.

As President Thieu has again pointed out yesterday, this represents a maximum offer on the subject. Those who deprecate the offer seem to want to commit the administration indirectly to the unconditional withdrawal which none are willing to espouse directly.

Fairness and firmness represented by the current approach seem far more likely of bringing a meaningful response.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, TO SIT TODAY DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Daniels Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate in order to hear one witness.

Mr. Speaker, the Daniels subcommittee, if my information is correct, would like to sit this afternoon to hear a witness that they were unable to hear this morning in connection with the so-called pneumoconiosis hearings—the black lung hearings—and want to accommodate the witness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky if this has been cleared with the ranking minority member of the subcommittee?

Mr. PERKINS. No, it has not, but I am sure that there would be no objection on the part of the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. GROSS. Well, will the gentleman withhold his request until the ranking member can be contacted?

Mr. PERKINS. I shall do so.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky withdraws his unanimous-consent request.

LAUNCH OF APOLLO 11 ONE OF THE GREAT EVENTS OF RECORDED HISTORY

(Mr. FREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, the launch of Apollo 11 tomorrow to the moon is one of the great events of recorded history. Mankind has talked about this not for tens of years but for centuries. It is hard to believe, but even more difficult when one realizes that we did not take our first step into space until 1958. This is a dangerous venture, even with the many safeguards employed. There is no guarantee of success.

The entire space team, ranging from the technicians to the astronauts, are putting their intelligence, dedication, and courage on the line in order to prove man's ability to travel in space. Never before has the American spirit been so prominently on display for the whole world to observe and admire. As with all Americans, our prayers are with the astronauts. Good luck, God speed.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

(Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency will begin hearings on Thursday, July 17, to consider pending legislation including the administration's proposals which I understand will be introduced today. The bills before us do not include major innovative programs of the magnitude of our bills in 1965, 1966, and 1968, but they do include many important provisions such as the extension of FHA mortgage insuring authority and Farmers Home Administration programs, which in existing law have expiration dates of October 1. It is regrettable that we have been delayed this long in starting our hearings but, of course, we could not move until the administration had time to prepare its own proposals. It is our hope that we can proceed quickly and enact legislation well before October 1.

EXTENDING THE CONGRATULATIONS OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ORGANIZED BASEBALL UPON THE OCCASION OF ITS CENTENNIAL YEAR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 300.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 300

Concurrent resolution extending the congratulations of the Congress of the United States to organized baseball upon the occasion of its centennial year

Whereas, baseball is among the oldest outstanding national games of the United States, combining the zest of the amateur with the skills of the professional and providing excitement, drama, interest, and entertainment both for participants and for spectators; and

Whereas, although baseball was already being widely played, watched, and attended in various forms on a largely amateur or recreational basis, the development of the game to its present status as a national institution truly began with the organization of America's first professional baseball team in 1869; and

Whereas, the year 1969 marks the one-hundredth anniversary of organized professional baseball in the United States and is baseball's centennial year; and

Whereas, the playing of the Fortieth All-Star Baseball Game, on July 22, 1969, in Washington, District of Columbia, together with related activities and observances in Washington and throughout the country, is the occasion for the special celebration of baseball's centennial year; and

Whereas, it is fitting that appropriate recognition be given to the many contributions which baseball has made to the American way of life both as a sport and as an expression of the American spirit: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, to commemorate the one-hundredth anniversary in 1969 of the birth of organized baseball, the Congress of the United States officially recognizes the year 1969 as baseball's centennial year and extends its congratulations and best wishes to the Commissioner of Baseball, the President of the National League, the President of the American League, the twelve teams of the National League, and the twelve teams of the American League, and the several minor leagues and all other organizations and individuals participating in or connected with organized baseball.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, again I renew my unanimous-consent request that the Daniels Subcommittee on Labor be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

JOHN VINCENT AMIRAULT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2552) for the relief of John Vincent Amirault.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

REFERENCE OF CLAIM OF JESUS J. RODRIGUEZ

The Clerk called the House Resolution 86, referring the bill (H.R. 1691) to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

MRS. BEATRICE JAFFE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1865) for the relief of Mrs. Beatrice Jaffe.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is ther objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

AMALIA P. MONTERO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6375) for the relief of Amalia P. Montero.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

MARTIN H. LOEFFLER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3165) for the relief of Martin H. Loeffler.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

VISITACION ENRIQUEZ MAYPA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6389) for the relief of Visitacion Enriquez Maypa.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ERNESTO ALUNDAY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 648) for the relief of Ernesto Alunday.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 648

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 203(a) (1) and 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ernesto Alunday shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien son of Teodoro A. Alunday, a citizen of the United States: *Provided*, That no natural parent or brothers or sisters of the beneficiary, by virtue of such relationship, shall be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YAU MING CHINN (GON MING LOO)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1438) for the relief of Yau Ming Chinn (Gon Ming Loo).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CAPT. MELVIN A. KAYE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1453) for the relief of Capt. Melvin A. Kaye.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

ROBERT G. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3723) for the relief of Robert G. Smith.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

DR. EMIL BRUNO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4105) for the relief of Dr. Emil Bruno.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

MRS. RUTH BRUNNER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9488) for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Brunner.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 105]

Abbitt
Addabbo
Ashley
Aspinall
Berry
Betts
Boggs
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Cahill
Camp
Carey
Chappell
Clay
Conyers
Cunningham
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Downing
Esch
Fisher
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Hogan
Jarman
Karth
Kirwan
Kleppe
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClure
Macdonald, Mass.
May
Mize
Morgan
Obey
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patten
Pollock
Powell
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Pryor, Ark.
Reifel
Ronan
Sandman
Scheuer
Shipley
Stanton
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Teague, Tex.
Tunney
Watson
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 359 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE THURSDAY, JULY 17, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate on Thursday, July 17.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

APPALACHIAN AND REGIONAL ACTION PLANNING COMMISSIONS

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 473 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 473

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4018) to provide for the renewal and extension of certain sections of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Public Works now printed in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 473 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 4018 to provide for the renewal and extension of certain sections of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 and of title V of the Economic Development Act of 1965. The resolution also provides that it shall be in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

Title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 authorized five regional development commissions. These commissions, which were designated in 1966, are the Ozarks, New England, Upper Great Lakes, Four Corners, and Coastal Plains Regional Commissions—shown on page 21 of the report.

Title I of H.R. 4018 amends title V of that act.

To permit broader use of funds for studies, technical assistance and demonstration projects, and training programs, and to confirm that the Federal Government will provide 50 percent of the administrative expenses of the commissions, the bill expands the authorization for technical and planning assistance to and through the commissions. To permit flexibility in administration, the authorization presently in section 505(c) of title V is repealed in favor of a single authorization in section 509 of the act, which currently authorizes supplemental grant assistance.

The bill amends section 509 to authorize funds to be used to make all or any portion of the basic Federal grant for a program authorized by existing Federal law. Currently, supplemental grants assist financially inadequate local governments to meet matching requirements for Federal grants-in-aid. The Commission's authority would be expanded to permit it to make the basic Federal grant in the case of an otherwise authorized program where funds are not available within the regions from the national programs for that purpose.

Title V is amended to authorize for the 2-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971, not to exceed $225 million. Not less than 10 percent nor more than 30 percent of the sums appropriated for any one fiscal year shall be made available to any one regional commission.

A new section is added to title V which requires the Secretary to coordinate his activities in making grants and loans under titles I and II with those of the Federal cochairmen of the regional commissions. The Federal cochairmen are also required to coordinate their activities in making such grants with those of the Secretary of Commerce.

Title II of H.R. 4018 amends the Appalachian Regional Development Act.

The act is amended to authorize to the Commission to be available until expended not to exceed $1,900,000 for the 2-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971. Not to exceed $475,000 of the authorization shall be available for the expenses of the Federal cochairman, his alternate, and his staff.

The bill does not increase the amount authorized by the 1967 amendments to the act.

The act is amended to make clear the intention of the Congress that contract authority, as used in the Federal-aid highway program, should apply to the Appalachian development highway system and local access roads.

Not to exceed $85 million is authorized for demonstration health projects for the 2-fiscal-year period.

Not to exceed $15 million is authorized for the 2-fiscal-year period for contracts of up to 10 years for assistance to landowners, operators, or occupiers of land in the Appalachian region. Such contracts provide for land stabilization and erosion and sediment control, and so forth.

Not to exceed $15 million is authorized to assist in the sealing and filling of voids in abandoned coal mines, and related purposes. Funds are authorized for mine fire control programs to be made available on a grant-in-aid basis.

Not to exceed $2 million is authorized for the 2-fiscal-year period for housing projects.

Not to exceed $50 million is authorized for vocational programs.

Not to exceed $75 million is authorized for grant-in-aid programs.

Not to exceed $8 million is authorized to make grants to the Commission for administrative expenses including technical services of local development districts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 473 in order that H.R. 4018 may be considered.

Mr. Speaker, I failed to mention that the resolution also provides that it shall be in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Has any way been found to move the Appalachian Mountains around so that the good things of life could be spread to a wider area of the country?

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. As the gentleman knows, the program has been extended somewhat. In addition to the Appalachian region, this bill covers four additional commissions, some of which are in the East and some in the West.

Mr. GROSS. I notice that for the purpose of building so-called access roads, the Appalachian region has been extended to Alabama, Mississippi, and South Carolina. They are listed in what is termed in the report "Appalachian Highway Program Financing Needs, State-by-State Summary." Does the gentleman have any suggestions as to how more people could share in these good things of life that are distributed so freely from the Federal Government under this Appalachian program that now embraces an area from New York down to Mississippi, Alabama, and South Carolina?

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. I appreciate the gentleman's question. Perhaps we see more use of what some people term "creeping federalism," and perhaps the Appalachian region can creep out a little further.

Mr. GROSS. It has not been contemplated to extend the Appalachian region down into Florida or perhaps out to California.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. I do not believe that there is any contemplation to make any further substantial increase in the area. I think it will remain essentially as it is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 4018, upon the adoption of House Resolution 473, will be presented under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate with the committee substitute made in order.

As the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ANDERSON) has said, the purpose of the bill is to authorize for 2 fiscal years—1970 and 1971—funds for the continuation of the programs operated by the Appalachian Regional Development Act and the companion Public Works and Economic Development Act.

The Appalachian program was first enacted in 1965. It created a regional commission made up of Governors of the affected States and a Federal cochairman. The Commission developed programs and administered them after implementation in a number of areas, all aimed at improving the educational, health, and industrial facilities in the Appalachian area.

Later that same year, regional commissions were authorized under the Public Works and Economic Development Act. These commissions are now in operation in the Ozarks, New England, Upper Great Lakes, Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, and the Carolinas, and Georgia.

Title I of the bill deals with the regional planning commissions which have as their chief purpose the development of programs to stimulate economic growth in their respective areas and of making recommendations to the Congress supporting programs they believe will stimulate growth.

In the first several years of the Commission's existence, the technique was developed to supply supplemental grants and technical assistance to provide additional Federal funds in support of comprehensive area development programs.

This concept is expanded by this bill, H.R. 4018, to permit broader use of such funds and detailed studies, technical assistance, and demonstration projects, including construction where necessary for such demonstration projects.

The existing act is amended to grant each regional commission expanded authority to permit it to utilize its own funds to make the basic Federal grant in cases where a federally authorized program is not available to the region served by the commission because of lack of funds within that regional program.

This amendment will permit the use of such programs as the Water Pollution Control Act, Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, and so forth, by the use of the supplemental funds authorized to the regional commissions.

Any regional commission using expanded authority to make a basic Federal grant must work with the Federal official administering the grant program. Such official must certify that the project for which the grant is proposed meets all requirements of the Federal grant-in-aid program and would be approved if funds were available.

The bill authorizes, for fiscal 1970 and 1971, $225 million for the use of the regional commissions. Not less than 10 percent nor more than 30 percent of the sums appropriated in any one fiscal year may be made available to one regional commission.

Title II of the bill deals with Appalachian regional development. The program is extended for 2 years, fiscal 1970 and 1971. Funds authorized total $250 million for this period and are broken down as follows:

For health demonstration projects, $85 million.

For land conservation and erosion control, $15 million;

For mining lands restoration, $15 million;

For housing programs, $2 million;

For vocational education facilities and programs, $50 million;

For supplemental grants, $75 million; and

For administrative expenses of regional development districts, $8 million.

The highway program which provides for the construction of 2,700 miles of development highways and 1,000 miles of access roads is presently authorized at $1 billion, $15 million through fiscal 1971.

The bill (H.R. 4018) amends this to extend this authorization through fiscal 1972. It does not increase the authorization amount. It is now estimated that construction cannot be completed by the earlier date. In order to insure construction as rapidly as feasible on a basis of overall and comprehensive planning, the committee believed the time period required a 1-year extension.

Finally, the bill authorizes $1,900,000 for administrative expenses of the Appalachian Regional Commission for 2 fiscal years, 1970 and 1972, and limits the expenses of the Federal Cochairman and his staff to $475,000 of that amount.

Mr. Speaker, the Appalachian regional program has proved itself in the time it has been in effect and I am anxious to see it continue. In a relatively short time, enormous progress has been made to construct a development highway system in the region, to develop health and education facilities, to deal with erosion, water resources, and other improvements to unlock the enormous potential of this proud area of our country. The progress is substantial, but more time is needed to complete the work that has been so well begun.

What has been thus far accomplished is a tribute to the close cooperation of all levels of government and all types of people in taking the limited assistance authorized by the act and making it work for the betterment of the people and the Appalachian area.

The Appalachian Regional Commission is in itself a good example of the work that can be accomplished when State and Federal representatives can meet and work out policies together about what kind of aid is needed, where and how much. Final decisions on expenditures are made jointly, and I am inclined to believe this means they are more applicable to the particular problems of the States involved.

I can best speak for the Appalachian program by pointing out some of the projects which have so greatly benefited the First District of Tennessee, which I represent. Every county in the district has reaped benefits from the program.

The program's funds have been used for construction on hospitals in Cocke County and Greene County, for nursing homes in Rogersville, Jefferson City, Sevierville, Johnson City, and Kingsport. With the help of the program's funds, access roads have been built in Hancock, Hawkins, Johnson, and Unicoi Counties. Vocational schools in Carter, and Sullivan, and Washington Counties have benefited. A supplemental grant went to Elizabethton's Blue Springs Utility District in Carter County, as well as to sewer and water projects in Greene, Hawkins, Sevier, Sullivan, and Washington Counties. Lastly, grants for educational equipment and facilities have gone to schools and colleges throughout the First District.

It is important, however, to point out that the benefits of this program go not just to the immediately affected areas of the Appalachian region, but to the country as a whole.

If we are to effectively deal with the problems of the cities, problems we hear more and more about through newspaper reports of troubled areas, we must find opportunities, jobs, adequate living and working areas, outside the great metropolitan areas.

If we would judge the effectiveness and need of the Appalachian program, we have only to compare the continuing cost to our Government of welfare, support and subsistence, and similar Federal expenditures in the area to the immediate cost of a remedial effort to do away with much of the need for such payments.

The focus of the Appalachian program is not on welfare or relief but opportunity. It attacks the fundamental obstacles to economic growth in the Appalachian area, the need for access, the need for better education, for health facilities, for erosion control, for exploitation of its water resources and for dealing with the peculiar legacy of coal mining.

Beyond these forms of assistance, the focus is on organizing all levels of government to do a better job with other Federal, State, and local programs and funds.

The ultimate objective is to attract private capital, productive enterprise and jobs, which in the final analysis is the solution to the Appalachian problem.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time but I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4018) to provide for the renewal and extension of certain sections of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 4018, with Mr. SLACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRAMER) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland, the chairman of the Committee on Public Works (Mr. FALLON).

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4018, legislation which will renew and extend title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

I am especially grateful to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES), who so ably chaired the subcommittee during the long and intensive deliberations on this bill, also the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRAMER).

I am proud of the work the committee has done, because we feel that we have a vested interest in this legislation. The committee was and is now very much a proud parent of the legislation and the program which has translated so much of its very great promise into reality.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation has the full support of the members of the Committee on Public Works and the record of the hearings held on the bill indicates complete support from all areas of the country which are affected by the legislation.

This is a gratifying program because it deals with the substance of people's lives. It is designed to make life better and easier for people who have had it so hard for so long and the fact that it is achieving its purpose is a very great reward for us on the Committee on Public Works. The committee has worked hard on the bill before you. It heard from 25 witnesses during 8 days of hearings. Almost without exception, the testimony praised what the program has done and urged its continuation. The Governors of 13 States, Members of this body, local officials, and interested people were unanimous in their affection for the whole idea. To me there is no greater monument to any program.

The Appalachian legislation is older and more advanced than the regions set up under title V of the Economic Development Act of 1965. Its record of achievement more than commands our commitment. It demands that we finish the job that has been well begun.

In the case of other regional commissions, we are just now coming to the threshold of achievement. It would be unfair and improper to close the door on them.

This legislation, if allowed to realize its full potential, may set the pattern for future encouragement and cultivation of economic growth. This may be the key to the successful solution of the Nation's nagging economic problems with the federal system working at its best.

No small element in the success of this enterprise is the way in which the States and Federal Government have been able to work in concert toward a common goal. We have the States' testimony on how well that has worked. It is not that commonplace to hear so much praise for a Federal program from the State governments.

This program initiated in 1965 in a few short years has already given a much needed boost to the economy and the development of those regions of our Nation which are covered by the Appalachian Range and which are known as the Appalachia area.

XUM

The success of the Appalachian program has provided the impetus for development of regional commissions similar to the Appalachian Commission in other sections of our Nation. This includes the New England Commission, composed of the six New England States; the Coastal Plains Commission, composed of parts of North and South Carolina, and Georgia; the Great Lakes Commission, composed of segments of Wisconsin, Michigan, and Minnesota; the Ozarks Commission, composed of Oklahoma, Arkansas, Kansas, and Missouri; and the Four Corners, composed of Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah. These commissions have just come into being. In 1967 we passed legislation which gave them funds for technical assistance and program development. The legislation provides funds for these commissions for the next 2 fiscal years ending June 30, 1971, to allow them to begin actual construction on demonstration projects and training programs that will further the economy of the regions.

Both title I and title II of the reported bill are a further development of the regional concept wherein an effort is made to move forward an entire section of the Nation by a carefully planned economic development program worked out in conjunction with responsible State and Federal officials.

I believe the regional commission concept will continue to be one of our major instruments in the full scale economic development of these sections of our country where the economy has not developed along with the vast majority of the Nation.

Before I conclude these brief remarks I wish to pay tribute to all members of the committee on both sides of the aisle who worked so diligently on the legislation, and, in particular, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON), chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Economic Development Programs; the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRAMER); and a strong supporter of the Appalachian program, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA).

There are details upon which the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRAMER) will touch. And there are issues that will be refined and focused upon in the coming discussion. But this is sound, well-conceived legislation. The committee is proud of it. I commend it to you.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to call up the bill H.R. 4018 amending the Appalachian Regional Development Act and title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act.

This bill has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Public Works. It provides the basis for continued progress in the development of the Appalachian region of the country and amends title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act to expand the programs being carried out by the Regional Planning Commissions for the New England, Ozarks, Upper Great Lakes, Coastal Plains, and Four Corners regions. The Committee on Public Works held extensive hearings on the Appalachian bill and the other regional programs I have mentioned. The committee received testimony from a number of witnesses among who were Governors and the Federal officials entrusted with the administration of the programs. In the course of these hearings, the committee heard from the Governors of West Virginia and Kentucky with respect to the Appalachian program and received statements from eleven of the other Governors participating in the program uniformly supporting this effort. The Governors of Oklahoma, South Carolina, Maine, and New Mexico testified on behalf of the Governors of the regions with respect to the programs and the accomplishments of the regional commissions formed to foster development in the regions designated by the Secretary of Commerce under authority of the Public Works and Economic Development Act.

The Regional Action Planning Commission Amendments of 1969 revise and extend title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

The amendments to the Public Works and Economic Development Act which are carried in title I of this bill provides the basis for the implementation of many of the plans and programs developed by these commissions to foster economic growth and development within the areas for which they are responsible. These commissions were formed in 1966 to develop programs geared specifically to the needs, problems, and potentials of the five development regions. They have, with full participation of the Governors of the affected States, proceeded to fulfill this charge and have presented to the committee detailed and well-conceived programs to improve the capacities of these regions to attract and hold private investments through alleviating critical problems in the fields of transportation, health, education, pollution control, and the like. These commissions, patterned after the Appalachian Regional Commission, are designed to combine efforts of Federal, State, and local governments. The Governors of the affected States are members of these commissions along with a Federal cochairman for each of them appointed by the President. This form of organization permits the full participation of the State governments in the deliberations and decisions of these commissions and has been a major factor in the development of their programs.

The committee bill does not alter the basic structure of the five regional commissions. It does expand their program authority through the implementation of a broader range of programs and projects as provided in the bill. The committee anticipates that the commissions will become a forum for enlisting the aid and involvement of all related agencies at the State and Federal levels in the accomplishment of their mission.

In title II of the Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1967, funds were authorized to initiate development programs in the areas covered by the commissions. Funds had been authorized in 1965 for staff support. The 1967 amendments authorized funds for supplemental grants and technical assistance. This action was premised largely on the success of the supplemental grant program in the Appalachian region and the need for technical assistance funds to support the planning and comprehensive development programs. The sum of $75 million was authorized for fiscal year 1968 and fiscal year 1969—$5 million per commission for fiscal year 1968 and $10 million per commission for fiscal year 1969—for supplemental grants. A total of $8,915,000 for fiscal year 1968 and $12,500,000 for fiscal year 1969 has been appropriated for supplemental grants.

Testimony received by the committee on the state and progress of these programs indicates that, while the supplemental grant program has been useful, real progress in the implementation of the plans which they have developed requires expanded authority. Uniformly, witnesses before the committee indicated deficits in basic Federal programs pertinent to the commission plans in critical areas such as vocational education, transportation, manpower development, hospitals, airports, and similar facilities. The supplemental grant program now authorized does not meet these needs. It serves the very useful purpose of assisting financially inadequate local governments in meeting the requirements for these basic programs. However, when the basic programs are inadequate to achieve the accelerated development which these commissions are designed to produce, the supplemental grant program does not fill this gap.

The committee bill makes the following changes in existing law:

Section 505 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act authorizes technical and planning assistance to and through the regional action planning commissions. This section is expanded to permit broader use of these funds for studies, technical assistance and demonstration projects, and training programs, and to confirm that the Federal Government will provide 50 percent of the expenses of the Commissions. To permit flexibility in administration, the expanded authorization which is now carried in section 505(c) is eliminated in favor of a single authorization in the title V program which is carried in section 509. The expansion of the authority for commission support for demonstrations and technical assistance is added to the law to permit implementation of several of the innovative proposals submitted to the committee, particularly by the New England Regional Commission.

Section 509, which currently authorizes supplemental grant assistance, is amended to authorize funds to accelerate existing Federal grant-in-aid programs within the development regions. Currently, supplemental grants assist financially inadequate local governments to meet matching requirements for Federal

XUM

grants-in-aid. The committee bill would expand authority to permit acceleration of the basic Federal programs where funds available within the regions from the national programs are inadequate. In other words, the new program will permit supplementation of programs, as opposed to supplementation of grants on individual projects, by restricting the use of these funds for purposes presently authorized by other Federal statutes such as the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, title VI of the Public Health Service Act, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Library Services Act, the Federal Airport Act, part IV of title III of the Communications Act of 1934, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

The committee bill would permit the initiation of programs recommended by the regional commissions without prejudice to the administration's desire to evaluate major innovations in the field of economic development. Language is included in the bill to safeguard against the diversion of regular Federal grant-in-aid funds from the development regions because of the availability of this program.

To insure that projects funded under section 509 of the act as it would be amended by this bill, receives full evaluation by Federal agencies responsible for administering the funds prior to Commission approval, the bill provides that no grant shall be made until the responsible Federal officials administering the Federal grant-in-aid which is being supplemented by the Commission program have certified that the program or project meets all of the applicable requirements of the basic grant-in-aid statute. The committee anticipates that such response should be obtained by the Federal cochairmen of the Commissions prior to Commission action.

Title II of the bill amends and extends the Appalachian Regional Development Act, one of the most innovative and successful of the many programs enacted by the Congress in the 1960's. The Appalachian Act, which was passed in 1965, grew out of an intensive effort of the State governments, Federal agencies, and interested citizens operating under the guidance of a White House task force. In the 4 years since the enactment of the program a tremendous amount has been accomplished with fairly modest amounts of money. The testimony received by the committee from a variety of witnesses was uniformly laudatory of the remarkable cooperation between Federal and State authorities in planning and carrying out the expenditures of funds for a regional highway system, a vocational education system, a regional health program, mine area restoration program, housing, and a variety of other activities. This has been done with a minimum of friction and a maximum of effectiveness.

The Appalachian regional development program was a national response to the severe hardship that had existed in much of Appalachia for several decades, but had grown most acute during the 1950's.

Mining, agricultural, and railroad employment—the mainstays of much of the old Appalachian economy—had plummeted as advancing technology wiped out job after job. With a heavily specialized economy concentrated in primary manufacturing and mining, Appalachia was unable to replace the jobs in other sectors of employment, the jobs it lost to advancing technology and changing markets.

In 1964, the President's Appalachian Regional Commission reported that between 1950 and 1960 Appalachia lost over half of its jobs in agriculture and 58.6 percent of its jobs in mining while the rest of the United States lost one-third of its agricultural jobs and only 1 percent of its jobs in mining. Yet, its proportionate gains in services and contract construction were only one-half the rate of increase in the rest of the country in manufacturing.

For a region already deficient in employment and growth, these losses were disastrous. Unemployment in some industrial counties in southwestern Pennsylvania approached 25 percent by the end of the 1950's, and in some rural counties in eastern Kentucky actual unemployment was about 80 percent of the male labor force.

By almost any yardstick, large parts of Appalachia lagged so far behind the rest of the country in employment, income, health, education, and housing, that conditions were equivalent to those in some underdeveloped countries. Wolfe County, Ky., for example, had a per capita income of $435—about the same as Jamaica. As a result of these conditions, in the 1950's alone, 2.2 million people left Appalachia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Many of these Appalachian migrants moved into such large cities as Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Detroit ill-equipped for the jobs that were available.

It was recognized when the Appalachian program was first enacted that Federal spending only would not solve these problems. There had to be an effort to concentrate funds where they would do the most good and this would only be done by calling on local and State leadership to help make the decisions on which projects and programs were most beneficial.

As it was conceived originally, the program was designed to create in Appalachia a climate to which private investment would be attracted and in which it would flourish as the ultimate solution to the long-range problem. This was to be done by the construction of a highway network that would link Appalachia to the mainstream of commerce and industry and the building of public facilities that would outfit the region with the chance to compete equally in the technological world of today. So far, there are nearly 300 miles of highways completed with another 400 miles under construction; and in an innovative program to provide health facilities and services more than 50 programs and 20 facilities are either completed or underway; more than 7,000 land stabilization and conservation contracts have been signed with farmers in Appalachia; there are more than 50 projects to restore and reclaim land ravaged by mining either underway or completed; nearly 100 vocational education facilities have been built with another 50 being constructed; and the construction of some 600 airports, hospitals, colleges, sewage treatment plants, libraries, vocational schools, recreation areas, and educational television facilities have been assisted with Appalachian funds.

What has been the result? The great expanse of distance between Appalachia and the rest of the world has been closed or narrowed, so that people now have access to jobs and to opportunity; migration out of the region has tapered off dramatically; unemployment has been cut in half; wage rates have risen gradually.

After 4 years in the Appalachian regional development effort, there have been some improvements in the region. The average annual increase in employment in Appalachia between 1962 and 1965, for example, was 2.2 percent, the same as the U.S. rate. Thus, the gap between the region and the Nation remained the same during those years.

In 1966, however, the gap began to close: Appalachian employment increased by 3.7 percent compared to 2.5 percent for the Nation.

The gap began to narrow even more dramatically in comparable rates of unemployment. In 1962, the U.S. unemployment rate was 5.5 percent while Appalachia's was 8.6 percent. By 1966, the rates were 3.8 percent and 4.3 percent respectively.

Nevertheless these general statistics mask the continued problems of the region. While the unemployment rates in West Virginia and Kentucky, for example, have been reduced, the 1967 rate for Appalachian Kentucky was still 9.1 percent which is not far from being triple of that for the Nation, and for West Virginia it was 6.5 percent, almost double that of the Nation.

Wages tended to lag substantially behind the Nation. For example, in 1963 wages in manufacturing were only 86 percent of the U.S. average and in services 77.1 percent.

But despite the fact that progress is visible, there is still much to do. There is still a long way to go. Outmigration has slowed down, but has not been reversed; unemployment is down but still exceeds the national figure; wage rates are up, but still lag behind the national average. The job is not finished. H.R. 4018 is designed to do that.

The committee bill authorizes funds to carry out Appalachian Act programs in fiscal 1970 and fiscal 1971. The sum of $250 million is authorized for this period of which $85 million is for demonstration health projects; $15 million for land stabilization and erosion control; $15 million for mine area restoration; $2 million to stimulate low cost housing projects; $50 million for vocational education facilities; $75 million for supplemental grants to facilitate the use of all Federal grant-in-aid programs in the region; and $8 million for the support of local development districts and for research and demonstration projects. These amounts are in line with the Nixon administration's budget request for fiscal 1970.

In addition, the bill provides for a 1-year stretchout of the regional highway program which due to fiscal restraints has not been funded at the pace contemplated by the 1965 act. A 1-year stretchout is provided in the bill with no increase in the authorization.

As I conclude my remarks, I wish to pay deserved tribute to the chairman of the full committee, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, the Honorable GEORGE H. FALLON, for his chairmanship in connection therewith. I would like to commend all Members of both sides of aisle for their attendance during the hearings and the interest they showed in this worthwhile legislation. Finally, I commend an outstanding piece of staff work done by all members of the staff on the majority and minority sides.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. I wonder if the gentleman would address himself briefly to the concept of phasing out this program? Is this something that will go on from year to year, or will these regions in time become self-sufficient so that there will not be a need for the continuation of the program?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would state in reply to the gentleman from Virginia that I would like to phase out these programs, but as of now and in the immediate future I see a need for them——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, replying further to the gentleman from Virginia, I might add that we still have problems of employment and outmigration of these regions. These must be faced up to and solved. Then we can talk of "phaseout."

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I first want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES) for his untiring work on a very necessary and needed piece of legislation for a section of the country that has failed in economic development for a century and a half. But if I undertood the statement made by the gentleman correctly, I would like to know if the committee made any changes in the amount of Federal funds that the States are permitted to pay on the advanced engineering and right-of-way acquisition, with the provision for the four-lane highways?

Do I understand the gentleman to state that still under the bill you authorize 70 percent there for those two items: advanced engineering and right-of-way acquisition?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman does raise an important question. The Federal share can still be up to 70 percent.

Mr. PERKINS. In other words, it has not been lowered; the amount the Federal Government puts up in this act has not been changed in any way?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman is correct. The answer is "No."

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would state to the gentleman from Alabama that I am curious about this four-lane highway business, because in my State the bulk of the money has gone to rebuild a U.S. highway which the State would have had to put up its own money on a 50–50 basis to build, and they got out of it.

As far as helping Appalachia, and as far as building highways to get up into these inaccessible areas, and as far as going into those areas to help the people, they have not done anything, and they are not about to do anything.

Mr. Chairman, I was one of the original supporters of this bill. I went down to Athens, Ohio, and met with the Governor and the mayors, and the county commissioners, the Governor who was then Governor, and the now-Governor, was saying let us not have anything to do with this program——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HAYS. I made a pitch to them about the program, and they came in in executive session, and every official there but one voted to go into it. The Governor voted to go into it, and he found out there was this bonanza to highways.

Is there anything to prevent this in the future? Because unless there is, I do not intend to vote for the measure.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Ohio has brought out a very solid point. We believe the language in the bill to prevent overlapping of programs or duplication thereof or using funds under this bill as a substitute for an existing Federal program in a State answers the gentleman's problem.

Mr. HAYS. If there is a recurrence, is there anything in the act to prevent it or can this just go on anyway?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I think if that were to occur again, if you will bring it to the attention of the committee, we would address ourselves immediately to that problem.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Did you know that it was occurring before?

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. DENNEY), a member of the committee.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman for his fair statement.

During the committee hearings, as the gentleman recognizes, I brought up one question and if the gentleman will turn to page 21 of the report which shows the different economic development regions, you will remember I suggested to different witnesses that possibly if we were to divide the entire United States into economic development regions that could act as a vehicle whereby when we came to the problem of revenue sharing and block grants possibly they could be funneled down through the economic development region.

I believe the chairman said at that time that that would be a subject matter that this committee could consider in future hearings; is that correct?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes, it is. I would refer the gentleman to the report on page 4.

Mr. DENNEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to compliment the distinguished gentleman on his statement here. It is quite clear. Certainly, I regret that anyone from any State may have had difficulty with this very worthwhile bill.

So far as the highway part of it is concerned, it has been a great help to Kentucky. For instance, Harlan County which was almost without roads now has a wonderful road cutting right through the mountains into Harlan County and it will provide transportation where transportation is most needed. Certainly it has been a great help to our area and I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished gentleman in the well knows so well, and as was pointed out by our colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. DENNEY), I know you are aware that there are other areas of the country that have persistent underemployment and unemployment problems and they may wish to organize themselves into regional commissions as was suggested here.

One other thing—I have one particular area in mind, as I look at this proposal, the Delta Regional Commission, which is not an entity in fact yet, but my distinguished colleague on the Senate side testified in favor of this commission over in the area along the Mississippi Delta that includes the eastern side of Arkansas as well as portions of economically depressed parts of these States: Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, Missouri, and perhaps others. I am not sure of all the counties or States that it will be comprised of.

I want to ask if such a region were to be designated within the United States this fiscal year, would this new commission be eligible for funding under the terms of this present bill?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. As the bill now stands, it might be subject to certain conditions.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may further answer the gentleman?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. It is my understanding that additional regions established can qualify under the present law and also can qualify these additional regional commissions properly established.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Under title V of the act of 1965 that is true, other regions can be added.

Mr. CRAMER. I would suggest to the gentleman that if he would take the position that the amount of money was established solely on the basis of having a certain number of existing regions, I might agree with the gentleman. But it is my understanding that was not the intention. That was not the case. But if additional regions are approved under title V, and they want to try to get title I money, they have to convince the Appropriations Committee and the administration that it is justified and that they can qualify. Is that correct?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is my understanding. These are the conditions I mentioned earlier.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Might I inquire further of the distinguished gentleman along this line: Should a region be designated under the necessary criteria and approved by the Secretary, it is your opinion it could receive some proportional share of the amount of money appropriated to help get it started; is that correct?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I think the gentleman from Florida has stated the situation correctly.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. One further point to help me clarify my thinking on the subject. Hypothetically, say a new regional commission was established in the fiscal year 1971, toward the latter part of the fiscal year. Under this bill it is provided that no regional commission shall receive less than 10 percent of the money appropriated in any 1 fiscal year. But would it be logical for the gentleman to say that that regional commission might come in for their share of funding on a proportional basis?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I cannot conceive of a situation such as the gentleman describes without the Commission coming to the Congress. I would hope that the administration would never entertain that without informing the Congress and telling them of their plans, as we have done in the case of these five commissions. We do not intend this bill to give authority for every Tom, Dick, and Harry who comes down the road. There has to be legitimacy of purpose. There has to be a proper cause. There must be an identity of need. There must be a system of priority established by the Congress itself as to how we want to deal with it.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee, representing the State of West Virginia, which is the only State that is included in the Appalachian area in its entirety, I take this opportunity to highly commend the distinguished gentleman in the well, the floor manager of the bill, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES), and author of the bill, and for the long hours he has spent in holding hearings and for the extremely objective and fair manner in which he conducted the hearings, we owe him a debt of gratitude and congratulate him. It is my hope that the Members of the House unanimously will vote to support this measure without a single amendment as presented by the distinguished gentleman in the well.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I just want to ask a point of information. I read the report and the bill in toto. Are there any administration reports? Does the administration favor the measure? What about the departmental report on title I?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. We have no registered objections to any of the titles of the bill. Originally the administration asked for an extension of 1 year. Subsequent to that the committee indicated that they wanted a 3-year program, and the administration acquiesced in our proposal for a 2-year program.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the distinguished chairman's forthright explanation. As I understand it, then, neither the new nor the former Secretary of Commerce has commented on the various Commissions under title I, nor has the administration set forth its new position or its acquiescence. I believe the gentleman did say the administration acquiesced, but has not approved or come forth with a new program for title II, the Appalachian program.

Let me just ask this question for information. I appreciate the Government's need for planning and I understand it is cochairman on the various Commissions, but is this increase or continuation budgeted in the administration budget?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I do not know what the figures are in the budget.

Mr. HALL. Certainly the increase recommended in here is not included in the new budget?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I am not sure on that point.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I do not intend to duplicate the information the gentleman from Alabama has already discussed. However, I do have a few observations.

The question was asked as to whether or not the administration has evidenced a position on this legislation. I will say to those who asked the question that the administration was consulted in the draftsmanship constantly and that some of the proposals made by the administration in order to make it a better bill were accepted. In particular there is the amendment the gentleman from Alabama referred to, which I believe to be one of the significant new contributions to this legislation itself. This amendment, which will bring order out of what could otherwise be chaos, is the section contained on page 5, "coordination," which states as it relates to these regions and EDA the following:

> The Secretary shall coordinate his activities in making grants and loans under titles I and II of this Act with those of each of the Federal cochairmen in making grants under this title, and each Federal cochairman shall coordinate his activities in making grants under this title with those of the Secretary in making grants and loans under titles I and II of this Act.

So the objective is to make certain there is not unnecessary duplication and to make certain the program has a maximum thrust in the area of economic development and that these regions, along with the EDA program, generally accomplish the objective that should be accomplished in helping economic development. The answer, very simply, is "Yes," the administration was consulted and, so far as I know, they have raised no objection to this House version.

I will say further with regard to the cost, this bill is subtsantially below the bill passed by the other body. It is substantially below that. There were considerable pressures to increase it, even to the Senate version, and even higher. In attempting to exercise some spending responsibility, the House refused to go along with the version of the other body and, in fact, reduced the program of the other body by $254 million. So there is a very substantial difference and less spending in this bill.

Third, I initially voted against Appalachia. I voted against EDA. I voted against Appalachia when it was first authorized in 1965. When it was first authorized, I offered a Republican or minority substitute which would make available relief as needed to any area of the United States that could qualify under the same formula of underemployment or unemployment and need of economic development. As far as I am concerned, what is good for Appalachia, if it is needed, should be equally good for the rest of the Nation within our budgetary capabilities.

That is how simple it was.

The substitute was defeated, but now we see we are moving exactly in the same direction. We now have a bill moving that way.

I do not say that on a partisan basis. I say it because I believe there is a need for the development of this country.

There are all kinds of millions of dollars thrown into OEO, and all kinds of money thrown into the Job Corps, at $8,000 or $9,000 per trainee per year, with few, if any, results. But here we have a program, I am convinced, which is working and is workable.

Admittedly, there are some areas outside the regions involved in this legislation, the five regions plus Appalachia. What is the answer for those areas? If in fact there is an economic need and if in fact there are a minimum of two redevelopment counties or areas, they can qualify as a district for proper districtwide development. We hope to do something with regard to that when we get to the EDA legislation, too.

We see ourselves moving more and more in this direction.

The gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) and the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND), whom I see on the floor, myself and others have been pushing for the idea that we are never going to solve the problems of the big cities alone. We have an urban council in the administration, and that is fine, but where is the rural council? I have asked this question at the White House: Where is the rural council? There is an urban council, and that is fine, because goodness knows we have enough urban problems; but likewise we have rural problems.

What is one of the basic problems? One of the basic problems is that the economic base of the rural areas is not sound enough. We have not had enough concern about development of those areas to keep the people in the rural areas or in the smaller towns. They are migrating to the big cities.

So the gentlemen from California and New Hampshire, myself and others have been attempting to interest this administration and others in the concept of not having all the migration percentages going to the major communities or the large communities, but instead encouraging these people to remain in rural areas, and even to provide outmigration, to help solve some of the big city problems. So long as the people are stacked on top of other people in the apartment buildings and what have you in the big cities, obviously they will have endless problems. There is an obvious need for a reverse migration, and this should be expressed in this country, and legislatively so, and this is a part of that package. I hope more will be done.

In addition to that, we have attempted to make this a regional bill in the process. The regions want to have everything Appalachia has, basically. One cannot blame them.

Eighty percent of the money for Appalachia, approximatley, is for highway construction. I personally did not feel, and still do not feel, that we should go into a major arterial development highway program in these regions, which we did in Appalachia because of an emergency situation, in addition to and duplicating the present Federal-aid highway program, which also takes care of these regions, and rightly should. So we were able to avoid that.

There were other areas of duplication we were able to avoid.

Basically, we have a bill which deserves the support of the Members of the House. I, for one, intend to support it.

Frankly, I think the more we analyze it the more we will favor it. I am willing to say here that in my opinion Appalachia is one of the best administered Federal-State partnerships that I have had experience with. I hope the regions, in developing their plans and programs, will equally be so.

Now, these regions have just tooled themselves up administratively in the past 2 years. They were only authorized a few years ago to come into existence. Now the regions are in a position to want to go forward with those plans they have spent millions of dollars on.

We in the House are faced with the proposition: Do we go ahead with this program, or do we terminate it at the very time the regions are capable and ready to go ahead administratively and programwise to do the job in these regions?

I would say "Yes," that we have no alternative. Appalachia is 4 years old and it has 2 years to go. We authorized 2 years and no more. What happens after that is up to the Congress to determine.

I did not support the Appalachian Act in 1965 because it represented favoritism for a particular area. Rather, I supported a bill and offered it as a substitute to provide a nationwide regional approach where justified.

In 1967, I did not support the extension of the act because I felt that Appalachia and EDA were dual efforts which should be combined in one overall economic development program.

Today, I believe the Appalachian program has been well administered, and there remains but 2 years of the original 6-year program. The funding of these 2 years is in the amount of $250,000,000 for nonhighway programs and $1.9 million for administrative expenses, a total authorization for Appalachia of $251.9 million for fiscal years 1970 and 1971.

The present five title V regional commissions were designated in 1966 under authority granted in the 1965 EDA Act. Initially they were permitted only planning and technical assistance moneys to aid in their formation. For fiscal years 1966 and 1967, there was authorized $30 million and appropriated $12.2 million, including administrative expenses, for this purpose.

The 1967 amendments gave these commissions supplementary grant money to increase the Federal share of programs and projects within their regions up to a maximum of 80 percent. These amendments authorized $25 million for fiscal year 1968 and $50 million for fiscal year 1969 for this purpose, and a total of $21,415,000 was allocated to the commissions for these 2 fiscal years. The 1968–69 authorization for the commissions for planning, technical assistance, and administrative expenses resulted in an allocation of $14,492,000.

Now these title V commissions appear ready to implement the plans they have formulated and H.R. 4018 adds the basic grant tool to those of technical assistance and supplementary grants. H.R. 4018 would authorize $225 million for the commissions for fiscal years 1970 and 1971 for all of these purposes; $15 million of this amount represents a reauthorization for technical assistance for fiscal year 1970, leaving an additional authorization total for the commissions of $210 million. This $210 million plus the $251.9 million for Appalachia adds up to a total additional authorization for the bill of $461.9 million for 2 fiscal years.

The Senate bill contains new authorizations for Appalachia and the title V commissions of $715.9 million for the same period or an excess of $254 million over the House bill. I intend to support the lower House figures in conference.

Certain safeguards for the regional commissions are contained in H.R. 4018, and I would like to bring some of these to the attention of my colleagues. First, the structure of the organization has not changed, and the Secretary of Commerce remains in a supervisory position in order to further assist the commissions as they grow in experience and test their new authority. Second, in the case of basic grant expenditures, H.R. 4018 would require of the responsible Federal official administering the Federal grant-in-aid Act authorizing such contribution, a certification that such program or projects meets all of the requirements of such Federal Grant-in-Aid Act and would be approved if funds were available. Third, before funds may be provided for programs or projects, each Commission must determine that the level of State and Federal assistance, under other laws and other titles of the Economic Development Act, for the same type of programs and projects, will not be diminished in the portion of the State within the region. Fourth, a new section would be added which would require the Secretary to coordinate with the Federal cochairmen and the Federal cochairmen to coordinate with the Secretary their activities in making grants and loans under the act. This section was added to prevent duplication of the efforts of EDA and the commissions in the same geographical areas.

The administration has given its approval of H.R. 4018 as reported. I support this legislation to extend for 2 years the Appalachian and EDA Regional Commissions.

XUM

H.R. 4018.—A COMPARISON OF AUTHORIZED AMOUNTS IN H.R. 4018 WITH PREVIOUS AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS, WITH THE 1970 BUDGET REQUEST, AND WITH COMPARABLE PARTS OF S. 1072

[Amounts in millions of dollars]

	1965-67		1968-69		1970-71 authorizations		
	Authorization	Appropriation	Authorization	Appropriation	Comparable parts of S. 1072	H.R. 4018	1970 budget
Title I, EDA regions:							
Technical Assistants and Planning (reauthorized amounts)	30.0	12.2	30.0	13.9	(15.0)	(15.0)	6.8
Supplemental grants			75.0	[1] 18.9			16.5
Both plus basic grants					270.0	210.0	
Total title I	30.0	12.2	105.0	32.8	285.0	225.0	23.3
Title II, Appalachia:							
Commission expenses	2.4	2.4	1.7	1.6	1.9	1.9	.9
Additional highway authorizations [2]					150.0		
Nonhighway programs	250.0	164.9	170.0	130.3	294.0	250.0	112.5
Total, title II	252.4	167.3	171.7	131.9	445.9	251.9	113.4
Totals, titles I and II	282.4	179.5	276.7	164.7	730.9	476.9	136.7
Less reauthorized amounts					(15.0)	(15.0)	
Additional authorization					715.9	461.9	
Excess of S. 1072 over H.R. 4018					254.0		

[1] In absence of specific fiscal year 1968 appropriations for this program, EDA used $8,900,000 of own grant and supplementary grant appropriation.

[2] $1,015 authorized by existing law for 6-plus year period ending June 30, 1971.

A COMPARISON OF AUTHORIZED AMOUNTS IN H.R. 4018 AND S. 1072 WITH PREVIOUS AUTHORIZATIONS FOR APPALACHIA AND TITLE V REGIONAL COMMISSIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1970, 1971, H.R. 4018	Fiscal year 1970, 1971, S. 1072	Fiscal year 1968, 1969, Public Law 90-103	Fiscal year 1966, 1967, Public Law 89-4
APPALACHIA:				
Sec. of act:				
202 Health demonstration	85	95	50	69
203 Land stabilization	15	15	19	17
205 Mine restoration	15	15	30	36.5
207 Housing	2	3	5	0
211 Vocational education	50	50	26	16
214 Supplementary grant	75	90	97	90
302 Local development districts	8	15	11	5.5
208 Manpower development		10		
215 Culture		1		
204 Timber development			2	5
206 Water research			2	5
212 Sewage treatment			6	6
Total, nonhighway program	250	294	248	250
Less			[1] −78	
Subtotal			170	
201 Highway program		150	[2] 1,015	[3] 840
105 Administrative expenses	1.9	1.9	1.7	2.4
Total authorized	251.9	445.9	1,186.7	1,092.4
Title V, regions:				
505 Planning and technical assistance	[4] 225	[5] 285	[6] 30	30
509 Supplementary grant			[8] 75	
Total authorization	476.9	730.9	1,291.7	1,122.4
Less reauthorization	15	15		
Total additional authorization	461.9	[9] 715.9		

[1] General authorization of $170,000,000 was $78,000,000 less than total ceilings placed on section-by-section basis.

[2] For 6-plus year period ending June 30, 1971 (increased $175 in 1967).

[3] For 6-plus year period ending June 30, 1971.

[4] Not less than 10 percent nor more than 30 percent of funds appropriated can go to any one region.

[5] Ozarks 50, New England 75, Upper Great Lakes 45, Four Corners 45, Coastal Plains 60, Alaska 10.

[6] Not to exceed 2.5 per region, per year to be allocated by the Secretary.

[7] Public Law 89-136.

[8] 5 per region in 1968 and 10 per region in 1969.

[9] Does not include title III which provides 500 for EDA grant program and 50 for technical assistance; bill total 1,265.9.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Florida's statement and particularly I appreciate his comments on the need to avoid duplication in these programs. I believe the gentleman referred to page 4 of the report, which I have read in its entirety. I will call his attention to the middle paragraph on page 7 of the report wherein again it says:

> Section 104 of the reported bill adds a new section 511 to title V which requires the Secretary to coordinate his activities in making grants and loans under titles I and II with those of the Federal cochairmen of the Regional Commissions in making grants under title V and the Federal cochairmen are also required to coordinate their activities in making such title V grants with those of the Secretary in making grants and loans under titles I and II. This is to insure there will be no duplication of programs and projects in carrying out the authorities contained in this Act.

Mr. Chairman, I have had absolutely no experience other than observation with the Appalachia program. I was one of the beginners on the Ozarks Commission program. Of course, the main difference is that the latter reports to the Secretary of Commerce and is not an independent commission under the President of the United States, as Appalachia is.

Be that as it may, on the prior page, page 6 of the committee's report, near the bottom of the page it says:

> The new program will permit supplementation of programs, as compared with supplementation of grants and individual projects.

And it lists many of them which are already laws of the land, such as the Water Pollution Control Act, the Soil Conservation Act, the Public Health Service Act, the Vocational Education and Technical Training Act, the National Defense Education Act, and many others.

The problem bothering me and which I think is bothering the people back home is the increased amount of taxes and the increased number of duplicating or add-on or supplemental programs—or whatever you wish to call them—which requires a veritable maze to be unraveled before one knows how to participate in them or how to get the maximum benefit out of them. Granted that many of these programs supplement programs such as the Vocational Education Act, for example. States that have been slow or backward in this particular program find the add-on worthwhile and maybe they would not resort to the basic education act if they did have these. My question is, Are there really any programs under the commissions in title I that are not duplicative or additive or, if you want to use that kind of language, supplemental? If so, why would it not be better legislative procedure to put the emphasis under the original act rather than a supplemental commission? As the gentleman says, if it is good for some, why not make it equally applicable to all within the limits of the taxpayers' ability?

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman at the outset with this coordinative requirement the basic grant agency would first have to approve any grant program. It would have to be approved by the administering agency as well as the region and as well as the Secretary. So I frankly think that what we are accomplishing here as compared to what we have had in the past is true coordination and direction. It is true that under the regions you do not have new programing outside of the EDA and the existing basic grant programing. I do not think you really should. What you need to do is coordinate what you have now in a package to do the total job rather than a piecemeal operation here and something else there, but not a package to make a usable, effective community program in a given area to get results.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, do I understand his statement in response to mine, to mean that these Ozark Regional Commission grants that I hold in my hand, such as the one for the airport at McAllister, Okla., or the one for a highway in Oklahoma, or the one for the Arkansas State Park in Arkansas or the one for Piedmont, Mo., for the enhancement of tourism; would have to be coordinated with those respective Federal agencies handling the basic programs before the grants are authorized? In other words, the FAA, the Bureau of Transportation, and the Department of Transportation, as well as for the enhancement of tourism and the development of tourism in the United States of America?

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. I think this has been a weakness of the whole program. I think this is necessary coordination, and the language is actually written into the supplement to the basic grant itself—not a supplement to it, but a supplement of it, where it says on page 3, line 18 of the bill as follows—"there are insufficient funds available for the Federal Grant-in-Aid Act authorizing such programs to meet pressing needs of the region."

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his clarification.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I have this question to pose to the gentleman from Florida: Do we have this problem? Is there any likelihood that the level of authorization as contained in this bill is so much higher than the level of the appropriation of funds that it is likely that we are misleading the beneficiaries into some hopes which will not be justified and that all their problems will be cured overnight as a result of the enactment of this bill?

Mr. CRAMER. Well, I will say to the gentleman that I offered an amendment some time ago, a few years ago, to EDA, reducing the authorization by $75 million in order to prevent the administration or the Government from doing exactly that, misleading these people.

What we are trying to do here is to trim the authorization without the necessary infallible crystal ball as to the war in Vietnam and when it will be over—and we hope it will soon be—which might put us in a position where this money might be spent domestically and channeled into these programs. We have been trying to put the authorization at a figure that we thought was realistic. I am going to put the figures in the RECORD so that there will be no misunderstanding about them, with the full realization that appropriations have been substantially less than even the existing authorizations. I do not think anyone should be misled. As long as the war in Vietnam is going on and as long as we have our present budget squeeze, the appropriations will not be increased. I think the people in the various regions know this, most of them, but should we have this opportunity, I think we could take advantage of it.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I thank the gentleman. However, I do believe it is important that we do not mislead the people.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to state with reference to the questions which the gentleman from Missouri raised that the Appalachian program provided for supplemental grants which are very valuable to the poorer towns and to the poorer rural counties. Many of them are just not able to raise the matching money. This helps to bridge the gap. It would mesh with the Hill-Burton program, the community facilities program, the sewage treatment program in the poorer counties, the ones that need it the most but which are not able to raise the matching money.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his contribution.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding, and I want to compliment the gentleman and also the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES), for the yeoman work which they have done on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I am personally convinced that the philosophy behind the program is very sound. All during the hearings it was quite evident that there is participation in the program and that there are highways in place and that it has been a successful program.

I further believe that the gentleman from Florida has clearly enunciated what I believe to be the fact, that the basic direction that future programs should take—that is, if it is good for one section of the country it certainly could apply or be available to other sections of the country and I was so pleased that the gentleman at least alluded to this in his remarks.

To add to this, I might refer the Members who are on the floor, or those who might read the RECORD, to the testimony of the Governor of the State of Kentucky, Governor Nunn, wherein he very clearly and succinctly pointed out that what was needed in this area was to concentrate on water resources development, highway construction, airport construction, and vocational and technical educational facilities, and once this was accomplished that he felt that this would provide the opportunity for economic progress in their section of the country, and this could minimize, frankly, some of the other programs that have been advanced into these areas. I believe this will eliminate duplication, which the gentleman has already indicated, that there would be coordination, and this is worthy of consideration. But, again, I would hope that as we authorize this legislation here today it will serve notice to the Bureau of the Budget and to other agencies who have funding programs, that this is the kind of program that has paid off many times over in providing job opportunities and broadening the economic and tax base in the areas where the programs have been in effect. So I, like the gentleman in the well, join in support of this legislation which heretofore I have not supported, and I believe that we have an improvement here today.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I know he does join me in the hope that this will become the implement through which the first implementation of the reverse migration concept can be brought into being.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to a member of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON).

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4018. I want to congratulate both the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRAMER) for the very fine explanations which they have made in pointing out the provisions of this bill. I believe they have covered the high points very well so there is very little need for additional forensics on the part of the committee members with regard to this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself in the pleasant position of being able to quote a couple of distinguished witnesses on the subject of the regional commission provisions in this bill, and desirability of the bill. One is a Republican Governor and the other is a distinguished scholar whose testimony was called to my attention by a Republican colleague. I am grateful that we have a very strong level of bipartisan support for this legislation.

I am obligated to my good friend the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL), for calling to my attention the testimony which was given recently by one of his distinguished constituents, Dr. Carlton, of Springfield, Mo., who appeared before the Committee on Public Works of the other body on May 5, 1969, and summed up basically the problem that confronts the Ozarks region. That is the problem of having taken the initial three steps that are necessary, the steps of being sold the idea, of having obtained legislation, and of having engaged in study, at some expense. Dr. Carlton then concludes with the statement that we are now at the point where we need to have funding and action to really carry this thing forward. In fact, the quotation from Dr. Carlton's statement which completes his testimony before the Senate committee is that:

> The Ozark program is a great idea. Men should carry it out. The legislation should become action or be repealed.

Basically, what we are endeavoring to do with this legislation, I say to my colleagues, is to make action out of what has been primarily a study program in five regions up to this point.

I want to turn to another Republican witness, one for whom I have very high respect, the present Governor of the State of Oklahoma, who made one of the strong presentations before the Committee on Public Works on the subject of title I of this bill.

Gov. Dewey F. Bartlett appeared before our committee and urged very

XUM

strongly that we provide additional funding for this program, and that we endorse some improvements in it that have been referred to briefly by the gentleman from Florida, to improve coordination and to give more direct authority to these commissions in the grant field, subject of course to this coordination feature that assures that there will be an approval by the Federal department in the field of the specific project for which grants are going to be made.

I think Governor Bartlett's testimony which was given to the committee on April 15, 1969, is about as persuasive for going ahead with this program, and particularly for title I, as anything I have read.

The Governor calls attention to the fact that the Appalachian region, which had a 1960 population of about 5 million below the level of population in these regional commission areas, title V commissions, has nonetheless enjoyed funding from the Congress at a ratio of 15 to 1, over Ozarks and the other title V commissions.

These regional commissions have been lagging behind in funding and notwithstanding this lag in funding, they have accomplished some very substantial things.

If you would like to see some of the data on their accomplishments, I refer you to the testimony of Governor Bartlett in the hearings; the Governor details some of the employment increases and some of the capital investment increases that have occurred in the State of Oklahoma since the Ozark Regional Commission program began.

Now let me add just one further point, and that is that I agree thoroughly with my good friend, the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama, that we will expect the Secretary in the creation of any new regional commissions to come to the Congress and confer with us and consult with us and make quite certain that there is an understanding in the Congress of what is intended to be done with regard to additional regional commissions.

Of course, you are going to have to get appropriations by the Appropriations Committee to get the job done for any additional regions. At the same time, I think the law is rather clear that under the basic section 502 of the 1965 act, the authority is present in the basic act for the creation of additional regional commissions. I think that that authority is not diminished in any way by the provisions of the bill, H.R. 4108.

The bill that has been passed in the other body, by specifically detailing the commissions that are covered by their authorizations, takes a different posture in this regard as compared to the House bill. Our House bill—and I see my good friend, the chairman, nodding his head on this point—it does not specify these commissions and in that sense does not limit in any way the basic law with regard to the creation of additional commissions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the bill and hope it will be adopted by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND).

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I will address my remarks almost entirely to the subject matter of the supplemental views which are included in House Report No. 91-36 on this legislation.

Before doing so, however, I would like to add a word of commendation concerning the remarks of the gentleman from Flordia (Mr. CRAMER). He pointed out that several years ago when economic development legislation was first introduced into the Congress, the Republican members of the Committee on Public Works did suggest at that time that a national legislative program to cope with the problems of rural decline and rural disadvantage was clearly called for. We introduced legislation to accomplish that result.

I think as we contemplate this legislation today, the need for national legislation is obvious. I call your attention to the report and the map on page 21 showing the Appalachian region, and the five additional regions we have provided for.

You will see that there are many other areas of the country which are affected by this very important problem of rural disadvantage and rural decline, sometimes called outmigration.

This problem, of course, is back to back with the urban problem that faces the country where people are piling up in urban areas and creating problems which apparently our natural resources and capabilities cannot solve. So I think the words of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRAMER) and the efforts that some of us have made in the Public Works Committee several years ago to enact national legislation in this area were not only wise but foresighted.

Now for the supplemental views, very briefly. The problem I address myself to is this: When Appalachia and the boundaries for Appalachia were drawn, it was my opinion that an important part of the region was left out. Later under the 5-minute rule I shall offer an amendment that would include in the Appalachian region what those of us in northern New England and New York at least, consider the crowning glory of Appalachia—the White Mountains, the Green Mountains, the Katahdin Range, the Berkshires, the Adirondacks, and the Catskills of New York. At that time I will offer my reasons why this is so. At the present time just let me point out that many of the problems of rural decline—outmigration and the decline of industry and agriculture—that have characterized much of the Appalachian region, are also prevalent in important parts of northern New York and northern New England.

What happens is this: As the local economy and agriculture decline, there is nothing there to keep the young people, to keep future leadership in place, so you have an outmigration. As a result of the outmigration, you lose people and you lose leadership and a downward spiral sets in as fewer and fewer people are left to lead the communities and pay for the community facilities. It is ironic that this last year, on July 15, this House passed legislation to establish the Appalachian Mountain Trail, and included in this, of course, were northern New England States and New York.

If you turn to the dictionary, you will find that Appalachia is described as:

> Appalachian, * * * a. 1 Of or pertaining to the mountain system of the eastern United States extending from eastern Quebec to northern Alabama and including the White and Green Mountains of New England, the Adirondacks and Catskills of New York, the Alleghanies, Blue Ridge, Black and Smoky ranges, etc.

I will point out under the 5-minute rule that at the same time, 2 years ago, that my request to include New England in a part of the Appalachia program was declined, this House in its infinite wisdom saw fit to include relatively flat portions of the State of Mississippi, some of which are actually west of Chicago.

So I think in fairness northern New England and northern New York should be included in the Appalachia system.

Concluding my remarks, I would like again to point out briefly that what we are working toward or should be in this area is not merely an Appalachia region, a New England region, or an Ozark region, but national legislation that will permit the States, with help from the Federal Government, to address themselves to the problems of rural decline where and as they find it in their own States. I think this approach would be the key to truly solve the problem of rural decline.

The supplemental views to which I have referred follow:

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

We concur generally with the committee report. However, it is our firm belief that the bill reported by the committee is lacking in what we consider to be a most important provision. We refer to H.R. 10491, which would amend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 to include all of the Appalachian mountain system in the Appalachian region. Unfortunately, efforts to include this bill as an amendment in the committee-reported legislation were unsuccessful.

The bill was introduced by Mr. Cleveland and cosponsored by 15 colleagues in the House who recognize the need for its adoption and its essential fairness. Three of the cosponsors are members of the Committee on Public Works, and two of these three would not realize any direct benefits for their districts by the adoption of the proposal. Cosponsors of the bill are Congressmen McEwen, Button, Conable, Conte, Fish, Grover, Hathaway, King, Kyros, McCarthy, McKneally, Pirnie, Stafford, Stratton and Wyman.

To put this matter in its proper perspective, we wish to point out that northern New England and northern New York are Appalachia. If you read the definition in Funk & Wagnalls' Dictionary of the English language, you find, "Appalachian, * * * a. 1. Of or pertaining to the mountain system of the eastern United States extending from eastern Quebec to northern Alabama and including the White and Green Mountains of New England, the Adirondacks and Catskills of New York, the Alleghanies, Blue Ridge and Smoky ranges, etc."

We might also remind the House that on July 15 last year, we passed the national scenic trails bill which formally designated as part of the scenic trails system, the Appalachia Trail running about 2,000 miles from Georgia to Maine. This formal recognition

XUM

of the Appalachia mountain area is now Public Law 90–543.

Since we are part of the Appalachian Mountain system and are suffering many of the same problems, we fail to see why all of the Appalachian Mountain system has not been included in the Appalachian Act, especially its crowning glory in northern New York and New England. This exclusion of the upper portion of Appalachia was especially difficult for us to understand when, in 1967, we added 20 counties of the Mississippi flatlands—20 counties which are, each and every one, located west of the great industrial midwest city of Chicago. This was done in spite of the fact that the report of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission, published in early 1964, defines Appalachia as "a mountain land boldly upthrust between the prosperous eastern seaboard and the industrial Middle West."

If we are to have an Appalachian region, let us have all of Appalachia in it. If we are to have an end to the economic decline of rural areas and outmigration in Appalachia, let us have an end to these problems throughout the entire Appalachian region.

Time and again, we have sat in committee hearings in 1965, 1967, and again this year, and have heard described in precise detail the economic plight of the hill country of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, and other Appalachian States. We have heard of the problems resulting from the decline in farming and other industries in these areas. We have listened to the statistics on outmigration to the cities, and we have sympathized fully with the difficulties of combating economic problems on a reduced tax base caused by declining population and low incomes. We know how discouraging the efforts to attract new industry under these conditions can be.

We know these matters well, because all that we have heard over the years is an accurate reflection of existing conditions in large parts of northern New England and northern New York. These areas also, at one time, had a healthy farming industry, well-based lumbering industry, and textile mills and shoe factories. But, just as in the other parts of Appalachia, the northern tier of Appalachia has also suffered from the effects of declining farming and declining industry. And, just as the population has left lower Appalachian rural areas, it has also left the rural areas of upper Appalachia. It leaves fewer taxpayers to support community facilities. There is a loss in these priceless human ingredients of leadership and youth. A downward spiral toward disadvantage sets in.

Northern New England and northern New York have similar problems, and these are the same problems which the Appalachian Regional Commission is working on to alleviate. But northern New England and New York more than most regions of the country are in a somewhat unique position. As an integral part of the whole New England region, they share a common bond and common problems with the rest of New England. At the same time, being more directly a part of Appalachia than southern New England, they are also suffering the same economic disadvantage as much of Appalachia.

Northern New England's needs are therefore twofold. This area needs to participate in the benefits provided through the New England Regional Commission, but it also, along with northern New York, very much needs to participate in the Appalachian region's approach to problem solving. For those who would object to northern New England's participating in two programs, let us point out that certain areas which benefit from the Appalachia program are also receiving assistance from the Economic Development Administration and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

During his testimony before our committee on this legislation, Gov. Kenneth M. Curtis, of the State of Maine, related that one could hardly tell the difference between northern Maine and Appalachia. Later in his testimony, he also stated that while he would not wish to detract from the New England Regional Commission, he would have no objection to the adoption of our proposal contained in H.R. 10491.

There is no question that there is a glaring need to reverse the economic decline and outmigration of the rural area of northern New England and upstate New York, as well as the other parts of the Appalachian Mountain chain. To have a regional development program and not include all of the region is most unfair. We earnestly hope that our colleagues in the House will, after considering this unfair exclusion of parts of Appalachia, vote to include our porposal, H.R. 10491, in the committee-reported legislation.

JAMES R. GROVER, JR.
JAMES C. CLEVELAND.
ROBERT C. MCEWEN.
RICHARD D. MCCARTHY.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4018. This legislation, to my way of thinking, has had a significant impact since its enactment in 1965; it certainly deserves to be extended.

As I recall, when this debate was going on originally, and when 80 percent of the funds for roads had already been allocated under the Appalachian program, it was contemplated at that time that the main artery highways be four lane, and the highway commissions of the respective States commenced to plan for four lanes on these highways. At that time, up until July 1, 1967, the Federal Government was paying not only 70 percent for advance engineering, design, and highway acquisition, but also 70 percent of the construction.

Because of underestimates of costs by the States upon which the authorizations were based, the Appalachian Regional Commission then made an announcement that after July 1, 1967, they would pay only 50 percent of construction costs and 70 percent of the advanced engineering and design and right-of-way acquisition costs on four-lane highways. But many of the highway departments, after this announcement was made, commenced to renege on what the Congress actually intended—which is to four-lane these main artery highways after July 1, 1967.

I think we should have it clearly understood that it was the intention of Congress that the Appalachian Regional Commission urge main artery highways be four lanes.

I know in the congressional district I am privileged to represent, if we fail to four-lane U.S. 23, through my congressional district, it will be the only gap in a north-south highway between Mackinaw, Mich., and Jacksonville, Fla., that will not be four lanes. Presently the highway department appears to not contemplate a four-lane facility.

I say again that is a tragic mistake, and the Appalachian Regional Commission certainly should urge the highway departments of these respective States to carry out the original intent of this Congress. The original intent of this Congress was to eliminate inadequate transportation facilities which isolated Appalachia.

I want to commend the chairman and the members of the committee for bringing to the floor H.R. 4018 to provide for the renewal and extension of certain sections of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

Upon the enactment of the Appalachian Regional Development Act in 1965 we initiated a national effort to overcome a century and a half of neglect. I refer to the neglect of the vast Appalachian region and its people. Although rich in natural resources, it has been bypassed in developmental efforts ever since the initial western migration settled its beautiful valleys and hills. The region has been neglected in the construction of modern means of transportation and access—neglected in the provision of educational facilities—neglected in the construction of flood control and water resources development.

It has a lack of water pollution treatment facilities, water and sewer works, health facilities, airports, college facilities, vocational schools, public parks, and other recreational facilities. Public libraries have been inadequate and, too often, nonexistent. Lacking these major public works activities, industrial expansion and commercial enterprise bypassed the area, leaving it isolated from the mainstream of the Nation's expanding economy. As the act approaches its second 2-year extension tangible results from the program are being evidenced.

Progress, albeit slow, is being made on the construction of the major Appalachia corridors in eastern Kentucky. I am disappointed, however, not only because we are not constructing these facilities as quickly as we should but also because I fear that in the design concepts for the system the engineers may have been too persuaded by current traffic volumes and not imaginative enough in terms of developmental needs. All portions of the Appalachia corridors should be to a minimum four-lane design which is essential in making the region assessible to tourists and to industrial development. I think, also, we need to give attention to gaps in the system which are not covered by the present authorized mileage. We are now at the point in the design of the system where it becomes obvious that many communities require new corridor designation as links to the existing system so as to fit in with economic development and community planning. Especially where present corridor locations result in the isolation of subregions which should be effectively served.

In this connection I would hope that at some point each State's allocation mileage could be increased to permit appropriate corridor connections and essential access roads to be constructed.

Appalachia, at least in the public eye, is often represented by eastern Kentucky. And it is true that nowhere else is the need for this program as great as it is in our part of the country. This is hard-core Appalachia, which was too long left behind. This is Appalachia almost without hope until passage of the act in 1965. This is the Appalachia to which attention must be paid by the Nation and the Congress. The program in the bill before us is so far the most realistic and effective salvation yet proposed for this heart of Appalachia.

We cannot sit down and rest on what we have done already. We have got to get up and go and keep on going until this job is done.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, the Appalachian Act has been extremely helpful to southeastern Kentucky.

Fourteen new vocational schools have been built, four more have been approved. These schools permit training of high school youngsters for worthwhile trades. They constitute one of the better ways of fighting poverty. Trades and skills can be taken from no one, they constitute worthwhile methods for earning a living.

The graduates of these institutions in Kentucky are employed in approximately 85 percent of the cases. The Somerset Area Vocational School in my district has a 92.4-percent rate of employment among its graduates. And in some trades, 100 percent of those who graduate are immediately employed. The training is not confined to high school graduates, but to those who need retraining for different trades or professions.

One vocational school dedicated to the training of personnel for the aviation trades is being constructed at Somerset, Ky., it is one of the few in our country. I feel that construction of this school and that its subsequent use will provide skilled employees for the rapidly expanding aviation industry.

I should compliment the Appalachian Commission and the Department of Vocational Education for their vision in construction of the many other schools in the Fifth District, in Kentucky, and also in the entire Appalachian area.

Assistance has been given to the construction of many hospitals in my area. Regardless of information which has been presented to this House, our hospitals in the rural area which I represent are overcrowded. Assistance by the Appalachian Commission in constructing additional hospital beds has been greatly helpful.

Many of the counties of Appalachia have had very poor roads. The Appalachian Regional Commission has, on the 70–30 basis, provided for the construction of roads throughout the Appalachian area, and in parts of my district.

In Harlan County, where the roads were of the very poorest quality—almost impassable—now we find well-constructed and beautiful roads are being built to provide much-needed means of transportation.

Funds from the Appalachian Commission also have been used in land conservation practices among the poor farmers of this area. And through this work, many eroded hillsides have been leveled over, planted in fescue and have become good, green pasture lands.

I can frankly state that the Appalachian regional program has been a superior program and that very little criticism has attended its execution.

EDA also has added greatly to the development of the area which I represent by assisting in development of water systems and sewage disposal systems in almost every county I represent.

I strongly urge passage of this bill.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to record my support of this very fine program and urge passage of this bill.

As a member of the committee and as an Appalachian, I have been witness to the birth and growth of this program.

I have sat in on committee sessions during which legislation was debated and written and shaped. I know the care and the concern and the sound thinking that went into it. And what is more, the same care and concern and desire to build a working program has been shown on both sides of the committee aisle.

Down home, I have been able to watch this program take root and grow into something really worth while, whose effect is just now about to be measured. The full impact is yet to come, but from the beginnings that have been made, I can say that that impact will be a substantial one.

Right now, we are just at the stage where libraries and sewage treatment plants and colleges and vocational schools are beginning to take form. There are more than $30 million worth of such facilities going into the Second District of Tennessee.

And there are highway corridors reaching through the back areas of a country that has been isolated from the main stream and imprisoned by a lack of opportunity.

As I say, all of this is just beginning to become visible and measurable. But I in particular know that it is on a sound foundation, located in the right place in the right way and it therefore cannot help but be of long-range benefit.

I know that facilities financed by this program were chosen by the local people themselves and were agreed to by the State with care and strategy. They are designed to do the area the most good by meeting its most pressing needs. And this is an excellent return on Federal investments.

Planned in this way, the program cannot help but succeed. It cannot help but raise my part of the country to equality with the rest of the country in terms of economic well-being. And if that is true in the Second District of Tennessee, it must be true in other parts of Appalachia. That is what makes this a good program and that is why it ought to be continued.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD).

Mr. FLOOD. The Chairman is very kind in yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, of necessity, as you older Members know, I must say these few words on this bill.

I was the author, with my great friend, the distinguished Senator from the great State of Illinois, Mr. Douglas, of the ARA. I come from the hard coal fields of Pennsylvania. I was a coal miner. Do not let this mustache fool you. My father was a coal miner and my grandfather was a coal miner and my uncles on both sides of my family were coal miners. So I know whereof I speak.

I came here 25 years ago. When I came here there were 35,000 men in my district working in the anthracite mines. Today, according to my count, there are only 3,500. I see to my left the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COUGHLIN). I knew him when he wore diapers. His father was a great lawyer, and he knows whereof we speak.

When the ARA bill expired something had to take its place. At that time this House in its sound judgment gave birth to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. This is the best bill which we could produce.

I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a former Senator from our great State, a minority leader there for 20 years when I was attorney general there so long ago. He is from the soft coal area, the bituminous area.

You know, we have a saying in hard coal—and I see my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER), here also—we have a saying in hard coal that we have collie dogs with their hind legs, Mr. COUGHLIN, who can scratch bigger holes than they have in the entire bituminous State.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for giving me this opportunity to join him in his praise of this legislation.

I want to go forward and say that I remember when this legislation or this type of legislation was but a gleam in the eye of the gentlemen from up in the hard coal region. The area in the United States, Mr. Chairman, that has had the longest history of depreciation of its values and of unemployment as such was the five-county area of the anthracite region. As the gentleman said, when the ARA died out something had to be done, and to the everlasting credit of this committee and its worthy counsels and its full membership, they realized that something had to be done for this great area.

Mr. Chairman, a suggestion was made once by Cleve Bailey, I think, as the gentleman will remember, wherein Cleve Bailey suggested that one way by which we could cure the problems of the 11-State Appalachian region would be to create a new country known as "Appalachian Independent," put it under foreign aid, take it from under the Fair Labor Standards Act, and give it a free trade protocol with the United States and let them work their will.

Mr. Chairman, without this type of legislation there would be many areas in my particular district that would not have been able to overcome the handicaps which they inherited from the earliest days.

Mr. FLOOD. May I interrupt the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, to say when I first came here, as I say in 1944, the

XUM

unemployment caseload in my district was 17.9 percent. Can you imagine that? Today, with the help of the country and you, Mr. Chairman, and this Congress, it is now 2.7 percent.

Mr. DENT. I thank the gentleman for his addition. And, let me again compliment the committee and the Congress for having had the foresight in the beginning to enact this legislation and for having had the foresight in continuing this legislation on the books. I am sure the people of Appalachia are very happy to know that the Congress is aware of their problems and is trying to do something about them.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT).

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4018. I have great admiration for the great ability of our distinguished subcommittee chairman, Mr. JONES of Alabama, as well as our own ranking member, Mr. CRAMER. Their teamwork and bipartisan cooperation has furnished excellent leadership for our committee. I would also like to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma. We have a great common interest in how well the Ozark Regional Commission functions. With its assistance, we feel that it will help us evaluate our area's potentialities for growth and discover better means of utilizing human and natural resources. We are just really beginning, but I feel that under this working Federal-State partnership, we will find a much fuller use of invaluable human resources and natural resources to make a good return on the investment authorized by this bill.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LANDRUM).

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, I listened a moment ago to the very eloquent description of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) about the genesis of this law which we propose to amend here today. I believe that there is no single piece of legislation which has been passed by this Congress since I have been a Member which has accomplished more good for the people in the areas it serves than has the Appalachian program. It helps to build schools, hospitals, roads, and all of the things that go to make up a prosperous area, a prosperous people, and a healthy society.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment which is brought to the floor in my judgment continues the life of a program which in my opinion has been very beneficial to the people. I think we would be remiss in praising the qualities of this act if we do not also at the same time say something about those who have administered it. I can say that in my opinion no single agency of this Government has done a better job of administering fairly and effectively the provisions of any act than this agency and I commend those responsible for it.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, I commend the distinguished gentleman from Alabama for his forceful leadership in developing this in his subcommittee, and presenting it to the full Committee on Public Works, chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Maryland. I believe that the members of this committee on both sides of the aisle have rendered a tremendous service to our area in particular, and to the Nation as well in providing this legislation. And in saying that, I want also to endorse all that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER), have had to say about this four-laning of highways. It is a shortsighted policy for the Bureau of Public Roads and for the State highway departments of the various States of Appalachia, and for this Commission assisting in the construction of these development highways in the area to proceed in this last one-third of the 20th century with two-lane highways. Take, for example, the highway proposed under this act, part of which is already constructed and much of which is soon to be under construction, and the corridor for which has already been named, between Atlanta, Ga., and Asheville, N.C., linking two metropolitan centers in adjoining States, soon will provide more traffic than two lanes can carry. I hope that they will go, as the chairman of the committee suggested, to a four-lane program immediately.

Mr. Chairman, again I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation enthusiastically as I did when the Appalachian program was being created in 1964 and again in 1965, and when the amendments were being acted upon in 1967 because this measure is vital and important to the area that I represent in Congress, and to the entire Appalachian section, and to the Nation.

The strength of this program in part lies in its adaptability from State to State, each State using it to solve its own problems and to meet its own needs. It has permitted national goals to be translated into workable programs to meet local needs. In my opinion, this is the best administered program in Washington. It is making possible construction of vitally needed highways, health and vocational facilities, sewage treatment plants, and other community facilities.

I am convinced that the Appalachian program has made more progress per dollar spent in the district which I represent in Congress than has any other program.

This is a program to rebuild and revitalize the economy of the entire Appalachian area. The highway building proposal in the Appalachian bill, coupled with its other features, promise relief to an area which has suffered economically because of an inadequate highway system.

The rugged geography of the Appalachian region creates tremendous transportation problems and much higher construction cost.

In most sections of the Appalachian Mountains, as in my area, the people have been active in trying to solve their own problems. They have been resourceful, self-reliant, and courageous. They have worked hard and accomplished much. And they appreciate this program.

I am proud to report that practically all of the Appalachian corridor highways approved for western North Carolina are in some stage of development—either in engineering, right-of-way acquisition, contract letting or construction stage.

The new roads and prospects of new roads are already causing new industry to locate in the region and present industries to expand. The new roads planned are already becoming an important factor in the expansion of the area's tourist business.

H.R. 4018 would stretch out the period for which roadbuilding funds are authorized from June 30, 1971, to June 30, 1972. This is necessary in order to permit States to proceed now with the orderly engineering and right-of-way acquisition work necessary for construction projects to be carried out between June 30, 1971, and June 30, 1972.

The vocational training and manpower training features of the program have done much to promote development of technical and vocational training facilities in western North Carolina. As the doors open to vocational training we do much to reduce unemployment, create job opportunities, and to make workers employable by providing new skills. This vocational training development benefits every businessman and every service establishment by increasing the earning ability and per capita income of our citizens. Such training is a safeguard against the effects of automation in this age of science and technology. It provides that our most valuable natural resource, the brains and muscles and ingenuity of our people, can be most effectively utilized. The bill before us authorizes not to exceed $50 million to continue this vocational education program during the 2-year period ending June 30, 1971.

The Appalachian program is promoting local, State, and Federal cooperation in meeting the economic needs of an important section of our Nation. It is encouraging people to help themselves. It deserves the continued support of Congress.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, the Appalachian program had its genesis in the spring of 1960 in two unrelated but simultaneous events—the West Virginia Democratic presidential primary and a meeting of eight Appalachian Governors in Annapolis. The primary gave John Kennedy a firsthand look at Appalachia and extracted from him the pledge to enlist the Government in its cause. At the Governors' meeting, called by Governor Tawes of Maryland, Alabama, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia were represented—Georgia, Mississippi, New York, Ohio, and South Carolina became involved in the program later at various stages of its evolution.

Soon after he took office in early 1961, President Kennedy named a task force on area development.

The conference of Appalachian Gov-

XUM

ernors, which had been formed at the 1960 Annapolis meeting, met in the spring of 1961 with Kennedy and he directed the newly created Area Redevelopment Administration—that had been a product of his task force—to work with the Governors on a State-Federal Appalachian program. Not much progress was made, and a year later an ad hoc Federal agency task force was formed to spur the effort toward developing an Appalachian program.

Another year passed and in March 1963, the recommendation was made to the President that he create an Appalachian commission. Kennedy's response was the President's Appalachian Regional Commission, which was the forerunner of the present Commission. It worked for another year on a legislative program for Appalachia. The bill came before the Committee on Public Works, and in 1964 during the consideration held after the committee refused to go to the area—I went with staff at my own expense to do some on-the-scene studies—we heard testimony from competent people in West Virginia. This revealed clearly that there were serious problems, but many of those were not very well understood. That is the reason that first version of the legislation was not as effective as it could be.

President Johnson recommended to the Congress such a program in early 1964. He signed the Appalachian program into law on April 9, 1965.

The bill had passed both Houses by substantial margins and created a commission to administer Federal funding of a program that was designed to close the gap between the Nation's prosperity and the economic deprivation of Appalachia. The program was given a life of 6 years until June 30, 1971. The highway section of the act was authorized for the full 6 years—all other sections were authorized for 2 years. The other sections were revised and extended in 1967 and are now before the Congress again for revision and extension.

Throughout the early planning and legislative infancy of the program, Gov. William Scranton of Pennsylvania was a leading and outspoken advocate. He made a number of contributions both to the planning and to the legislation.

Beyond that, the program was Republican both in spirit and in letter. First of all, it came ultimately to Washington from the local and State level, rather than vice versa. It also embodied very emphatically the basic premise of the federal system, in that the sovereign States retained their prerogatives and equality with the central government. This program places the initiative with the States and is inoperative without their full concurrence and cooperation

During the 1967 deliberations by the House Committee on Public Works, 15 of the amendments included in the committee-reported bill were Republican sponsored, and I personally was privileged to have offered eight of these. An excess of $38 million was saved by these Republican-sponsored amendments, and later, during debate on the floor, by a vote of 199 to 161, a Republican-sponsored amendment to save an additional $50 million was adopted.

During the congressional consideration of the bill, it had supporters and contributors on both sides of the aisle in both bodies. It still enjoys this unique bipartisan support and has never been the subject of partisanship in either direction.

At present, of 62 Members of the House from the Appalachian region, 37 are Democrats and 25 are Republicans. The program does not have an enemy among them. And they can speak from firsthand knowledge of the way it was conceived and the way in which it operates.

Of the 13 Appalachian Governors, five are Republicans, and a sixth was not too long ago raised to the office of Vice President. There are no more enthusiastic Appalachian program champions than Governors Rockefeller of New York, Rhodes of Ohio, Nunn of Kentucky, Moore of West Virginia, and Shafer of Pennsylvania, or Mr. AGNEW, the Vice President of the United States.

Very early in his administration, President Nixon let it be known that he favored the Appalachian program in substance and in form. He backed this up in his budget revision by leaving untouched the amount that had been requested by the Appalachian program in 1970. And the administration supports this bill today.

The list of Republicans in this body who favor this program is impressive—the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BEALL), the gentlemen from North Carolina (Mr. MIZELL, Mr. JONAS, and Mr. BROYHILL), the gentlemen from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA and Mr. MILLER), the gentlemen from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN and Mr. DUNCAN), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WAMPLER) and many more. There are even those from outside Appalachia in both parties who like this program because of the thing it is trying to do, the way it is trying to do it and the success it is having.

If any on this side of the aisle have opposed this program, it is because it has not been as good as it could have been. Which is to say that any Republican opposition has been constructive, an attempt to make a basically good idea even better. We feel we have been able to accomplish something this way and the program now, far from perfect, is better.

The minority members of the committee have been just as interested, just as concerned in the legislation and worked just as hard on it as the other side. I do not think that reveals obstructionism or negativism.

The program is truly bipartisan in every sense. Perhaps that is why it works so well and will achieve certain success.

Much the same may be said for title V of the Economic Development Act. Largely patterned after the Appalachian program, this legislation, also enacted in 1965 authorized the creation of other economic development regions.

These programs have likewise enjoyed bipartisan inspiration and support. Many of the Governors involved in the Ozarks, New England, Great Lakes, Coastal Plains, and Four Corners regions are Republicans and are just as enthusiastic about these programs as their Democratic counterparts. A number of Governors of both parties appeared before the committee during its consideration of this bill and were absolutely unanimous in their praise and support.

These other economic regions of the country have made less progress than Appalachia, mostly because they are given less money by the Congress but the same promise and hope is there slowly coming into bloom.

An overall program with so much support, so much help, so much interest must be given every chance to succeed. That is all we are doing today.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4018 is, of course, a vital piece of legislation to all of us, who live and work in the Appalachian area of this Nation. The concept at the time of the original Appalachian Act was that these areas of the country were in desperate need of massive public investment if they were to regain the prosperity to which the rest of the Nation had become accustomed.

In the 1950's, we lost more than 2½ million people from the Appalachian area. Coal, once king, cut 200,000 jobs in an effort to survive in the 1950's. My State of West Virginia once had six Members of the House of Representatives; after the next census, that will drop to four. The reasons for this situation are apparent enough. First, there was reliance upon extractive industry and agriculture rather than the diversification which other areas had undertaken. Then, too, the hill country of Appalachia was bypassed by the great highways crossing the Nation and linking its markets.

The consequences of these events too were predictable. When coal was no longer king and depression continued in Appalachia, the most vital of investments, the public investment in schools, hospitals, streets, and recreation almost ceased. Like Ireland, Appalachia exported her educated men and women to the other America, one which promised a better hope of rewarding careers.

But, with the advent of the sixties, Appalachia started on the long road back to prosperity. Coal has become mechanized. While it no longer employs the large organization of men which it once did, those it does employ are well paid. And coal has become the core of a huge growth of electric power, particularly in West Virginia.

The interstate and Appalachian highways, along with the enlarged lock and dam system on the Ohio River, are opening up markets for the State of West Virginia. Public investment in medical care and education and transportation and housing are now more in keeping with the large metropolitan centers of our Nation.

The Appalachian Regional Development Act is in no small way responsible for the resurgence. For, it has helped these States to look at themselves in a different manner. Its pragmatic approach to the development of investment and public services has helped not only to finance the public investment in Appalachia, but to redirect the attitudes from a fatalistic pessimism to a "can-do" approach. This has been particularly apparent, I think, in West Virginia.

We still have far to go before Appalachia begins to win the prosperity that is possible for that region. Key to those efforts, however, is the continuation of the Appalachian Regional Development Act. I would urge my colleagues' support for this measure.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad we are voting on this bill which would extend the Appalachian program and the title V commissions for 2 years.

I want to commend our distinguished Chairman GEORGE FALLON, BOB JONES, JOHN BLATNIK, ED EDMONDSON, and other colleagues on the committee for their interest in tomorrow and our future. This bill will mean jobs for the people who reside in the counties of the coastal plains region of my State, where income is low and opportunity is scarce. I agree with my good friend BOB JONES, that the Appalachia program has been a tremendous success. It has provided better roads, educational materials and facilities, better health facilities, and better recreation for the people of Appalachia.

This bill would broaden the present authority for technical assistance and research to authorize demonstration projects and training programs. This means the Coastal Plains Commission and the other title V commissions may now undertake specific innovative activities not covered under existing Federal programs. For the first time, funds are authorized for the construction of new projects where Federal grant-in-aid programs are not now authorized. This was the main thrust of the bill which I introduced earlier this year and I am highly pleased the committee has incorporated the main portions of my bill in H.R. 4018 which we are considering today.

Earlier this year, our distinguished and able Governor, the Honorable Robert E. McNair advocated the establishment of a Regional Marine Development Institute and indicated it was a first and vital step in developing the Carolinas and Georgia Coastal Plains areas. I agree with our Governor. Our region's land is rich, there is an abundance of good water and untapped natural resources. This bill will allow the development and construction of this regional marine facility. It could cost several million dollars. It offers tremendous potential.

The authorization for title V commissions calls for $225 million for 2 fiscal years ending June 30, 1971. One hundred and fifty-nine counties in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia will be eligible for benefits under this legislation. In South Carolina, it will include all the 28 counties from the fall line to the sea.

Mr. Chairman, my area of the country has the advantage of having a large human resource base. In 1965, the population of the Carolina-Georgia coastal region was estimated at 5,395,000. The projected population for 1975 is 6,125,000. Of the 4,987,115 persons in the region in 1960, over 50 percent of the households received incomes below $3,000 annually. The passage of this legislation is the first step in adding to this family income. It is going to provide more jobs and additional income.

Mr. Chairman, I predict this bill will pass by an overwhelming vote of the Members of this body. This authorization offers a unique opportunity for the States, local government and Federal Government to join their talents and resources with industry and agriculture to stimulate economic development.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on the provisions of H.R. 4018 as they apply to a large area of the State of Minnesota. The northern portions of Minnesota lie within the boundaries of the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission established by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. As we all know, the thrust and purpose of that act was to provide for the strengthening and improvement of the economies of areas of this Nation not able in themselves to generate the economic growth generally experienced throughout the Nation.

To date, these regional commissions have been formulating comprehensive economic development plans, which I understand, are now reaching final form. They have also, through the technical assistance provisions and the supplemental grant authority in section 509 of the act, been able to provide valuable funding assistance to local subdivisions of Government as they have sought to carry out projects financed by various agencies of the Federal Government. In the Upper Great Lakes region, for example, supplemental grants made available by the Commission during the last fiscal year amount to $2,760,000. These grants were the key to an aggregate funding in the amount of $23,300,000 for projects throughout the region. This means that the Commission was able to provide a funding leverage of $8.45 for each single dollar it was able to spend. In my own State of Minnesota some 20 different projects were funded at a cost of $943,000 to the Commission. These projects were a part of nearly $10 million worth of assistance for the Minnesota portion of the Upper Great Lakes region, obviously an effective use of Federal funds.

For these reasons I am pleased to see that the amendments before us provide for increased funding authorization and increased and broadened authority for the Upper Great Lakes and other title V commissions. The first dollar authority in the bill will strengthen the commissions, make them more viable and also bring Government closer to the people. With greater authority and effective leadership and State-Federal partnership as provided in the act, these commissions can carry out a fundamental and vitally important role in bringing these regions into the broad mainstream of economic life in this Nation.

My confidence in the future performance of the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission stems in no small part from my personal knowledge of the outstanding ability of its new Federal chief.

Alfred E. France of Duluth, Minn., a veteran State legislator and public relations executive, is Federal cochairman of this commission. The Upper Great Lakes region includes 119 counties in Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

France is the top Federal representative on the commission, which includes the Governor of each participating State. The Governors elect one of their group to serve as State cochairman.

France was appointed by President Nixon on April 18, 1969. He was confirmed by the Senate on May 20 and took office on June 24 following the 1969 session of the Minnesota State Legislature.

France served four consecutive terms in the Minnesota State Legislature. He served as chairman of the house cities of the first class committee. He also was involved with problems of taxation, education, Government reorganization, workmen's compensation, and State economic development. In 1963 France was on the committee which drafted, Minnesota's taconite statute and amendment, which brought about major expansion of Minnesota's taconite industry.

France is a 1949 graduate of the University of Minnesota and a veteran of 2 years' service in the Army. He headed his own public relations office in St. Paul from 1949 to 1951. From 1951 to 1954, he was executive secretary and administrative assistant to Minnesota Governors Luther Youngdahl and C. Elmer Anderson.

France was assistant to the director of public relations of the Reserve Mining Co., in Duluth from 1954 to 1957, and director of public relations for H. E. Westmoreland, Inc., a Duluth advertising agency, from 1958 until being named Federal cochairman.

France was born in Harrisburg, Pa., on June 5, 1927. He is married to the former Phyllis Page Brown, of St. Paul, and they have three children.

A resident of Duluth since 1955, France is active in civic affairs. He is a member of the Duluth Area Chamber of Commerce, the Public Relations Society of America, the American Institute of Mining Engineers, the Duluth Long-Range Planning Committee, and a board member of the Minnesota State Safety Council.

Al France has a record of commitment to the economic development of northern Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan. He is fully competent to direct the planning and coordination needed to insure the success of long-range programs increasing both job and incomes in the Upper Great Lakes region.

THE UNFAIRNESS OF H.R. 4018

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that the element of fairness is conspicuously missing from H.R. 4018 which authorizes the renewal and extension of certain sections of the Appalachian Renewal Development Act of 1965.

There are sections of New York City—notably in the Bronx—that require a regional development program, but we have not advanced any proposals for such badly needed assistance.

In addition, both northern New York State and northern New England—which are Appalachia—are not among the beneficiaries of this bill. The decline of farming and industry in northern New York has created economic problems there that are no less serious than the problems confronting the rest of the Appalachian region.

There is no question that there is a

XUM

glaring need to reverse the economic decline of the entire Appalachian region, along with some areas of New York City as well.

But this bill, in its present form, is not fair and equitable. Therefore, it is unworthy of support.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4018, and in particular title I of the bill, which contains important amendments and new opportunities for continued progress by the regional commissions chartered under the authority of title V of the 1965 Economic Development Act.

The Public Works Committee has reported that the commissions have made major efforts in developing comprehensive economic plans for their respective regions, but that they need expanded authority in order to allow real progress in fulfilling the programs developed over the past 3 years. It has, therefore, recommended expanding the regional commissions' technical and planning assistance authority to permit broader use of these funds for demonstration projects and training programs, confirming the 50-percent Federal share of administrative expenses, and authorizing basic grant authority for Federal programs, in order to "permit implementation of several of the innovative proposals submitted to the committee, particularly by the New England Regional Commission."

The New England Regional Commission has presented a legislative package which covers a broad range of regional problems. One of its most significant efforts is in the area of water pollution—an urgent situation affecting not only the economic development but the health and welfare of all of New England.

As one who has long urged a comprehensive and coordinated approach to the problem of pollution and recommended in legislation the utilization of modern management techniques in the solution of public problems such as pollution control, I am extremely gratified that the New England Regional Commission has recognized the need for such a comprehensive pollution abatement program. It has proposed a pollution-control project which would demonstrate a river basin approach and the feasibility of the use of comprehensive planning and management techniques in attacking the problem of pollution and impementing water quality standards.

The public problems we face today are no longer simple, easily manageable issues. They are vastly complex, made up of intricate interrelationships. And rivers—which do not know the limits of State or city boundaries and are affected by uncontrollable elements such as climate or geographical conditions—are even more complex. Pollution will be effectively eliminated only if we apply means which are commensurate with the magnitude and complexity of the problem, and the New England Regional Commission has envisaged a type of plan which goes beyond the traditional community-by-community "piecemeal" attack on pollution to meet this challenge.

The Commission has selected for the project the Nashua River, a small but badly polluted river that crosses State lines. Several years ago I proposed that the Merrimack River Basin, which includes the Nashua River, be made such a demonstration project. The basin is sufficiently compact and with a severe enough degree of pollution to make it particularly suitable for a demonstration program. Its pollution problems incorporate a wide enough range of situations to provide a particularly good example of methods from which the entire Nation could learn.

The White House has responded encouragingly to this concept. The General Accounting Office, in accordance with the President's directive to review existing pollution control programs as to efficiency and effectiveness, has contracted for the development of a mathematical "systems" model of the Merrimack to determine additional water uses at minimum cost. An outline for a systems analysis study of the Merrimack is available as a guide to developing a proposal, which can appropriately follow up the GAO study.

In view of these timely and new opportunities for progress, in view of the Merrimack Basin's unique suitability to start with this new approach to public problems, and in view of the potential that this approach holds for the entire Nation in the attack against pollution, the New England Regional Commission should be given the authority to undertake the innovative activities it has proposed and the encouragement to expand its view to the entire river basin.

It is a vast challenge and will involve the cooperation of local, State and Federal governments, the coordination of the many Federal, regional, and State agencies involved in pollution control, and the interaction of public and private resources and initiative. A successful experience will, to say the least, be a most compelling case for the wisdom and foresight of the provisions of the legislation before us today. I urge that the New England Regional Commission be afforded this opportunity, and am hopeful for the progress it portends.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, the 1960 census revealed vast pockets of poverty in this country. Most striking of all was the poverty in Appalachia—a region that has been described as poor, backward, with resources that have been either overworked or hardly worked at all, with people who have been devastated by lack of opportunity, by changing technology, by lack of even hope itself. Appalachia is an area of which it has been said; those who are young and ambitious leave, because they know the price of staying is an empty life. And so we enacted the Appalachian Regional Development Act in 1965. We hoped by this act to stop the outward migration from Appalachia, to build schools, hospitals, roads, industry, and human hope and dignity. We have achieved much in Appalachia, and there is hope that more still can be done.

But the fact is that Appalachia is not the only pocket of its kind. The existence of other areas is recognized in the various commissions established to develop plans for action and progress—the Four Corners Commission in the Southwest, and others in the Ozarks, the Great Lakes, New England, and Coastal Plains. But even these commissions do not encompass those pockets wherein all the most bitter poverty lies. The fact is that none of these commissions covers the southern parts of Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and California. It is a fact that while one out of six people in the United States reside in those States, one out of every four poor people live in those same States, and many of them in the southern border areas of those States. In the southern part of Texas alone there is a region of sufficient size and poverty to merit its being designated a little Appalachia. I believe that Congress ought to enact a statute recognizing the region for what it is, and propose that we establish whatever kind of planning commission may be necessary to find the key to the riddle of poverty along our southern border, and to undertake such public works and other actions as may be necessary to end poverty and despair once and for all along that thousand mile stretch of poverty. Our southern border region cries out for recognition, and for action to resolve its desperate wants.

There are 28 counties in south Texas, and in 1960 the census showed that those counties contained 616,000 poor people. No less than 37 percent of the population of south Texas is poor. And in fact, there are probably 400,000 people in that region who live in families having less than $2,000 annual income. It would be hard to find any place in the United States that holds poverty as wide and as deep as south Texas.

By and large south Texas has always been poor, and the people have never known much else but a hard life, hot sun and the dry wind.

Gigantic as the problems are, and as old as they are, there is much reason for hope in south Texas. I am convinced that if the region is treated as a development area, and its whole resources are taken into account, it would be possible to initiate programs that will completely change the economic nature of the area. Thus far there have been only the most tentative steps toward comprehensive planning in the area. But even these tentative steps show that there is a good reason for holding forth hope for south Texas and the southern border. A study of tourism in the south Texas triangle, so-called, reveals that here is an industry natural to the area, just waiting to be developed. Yet this study ironically is also a cause of frustration, for there is precious little available to actually carry out the recommenations of the study. What is needed then is a program that can study possibilities and find potentials, and a complementary program that can carry out those recommendations and capitalize on potentials.

The people of south Texas are anxious for a better day to come. They are willing to help themselves, but this Congress recognizes today as it did in 1965 that desire alone cannot solve economic problems. Resources, planning, and action are required to put reality into being. Only a regional development commission empowered to study and act can serve as the catalyst to end frustration and bring that long-awaited better day to south Texas.

Even in the desert the cactus flowers and bushes grow. Desert life is lean and tenacious, accustomed to hardship, and deep rooted.

The people of south Texas and the southern border know well their arid country, and they have good reason to love it. Their roots go deep, and they are anxious to stay. These people need help, have waited too long for it, and have great need of it. We would be derelict if we failed to recognize today their needs, and act to meet those needs.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill we have before us today, because I think it to be one of the outstanding programs developed by our Government in this decade.

It represents, first of all, a partnership between the Federal Government and many State governments, which is a model for what such a cooperative effort should be. There are no decisions handed down by the Federal Government to the States to tell the State what it must do. Each project is worked out in careful consultation and no project is pursued unless both State and Federal Governments wish to pursue it.

In my own congressional district, the Appalachian regional development program has operated with marvelous success.

We have had three major mine fires in one county in my district over the past several years. One mine fire posed an immediate threat to the south part of the city; and if left unchecked, could have made the entire city of Scranton unlivable. A joint State and Federal effort to seal this mine fire off from the city was entered upon. And I am pleased to report that this effort has met with complete success. For this, we can give a major share of our thanks to the Appalachian program.

There was a second mine fire which threatened our new industrial park on the border of Dunmore. Again a joint Federal-State effort was mounted, and again—thanks largely to the Appalachian program—that industrial park has been saved from destruction.

There is a third mine fire on the border of the city of Carbondale. This fire threatens not only Carbondale, but also the other communities just south of the city. Again a joint Federal-State project is even now progressing. And I know that the competent men from the State and Federal Governments—helped by the Appalachian program—will bring that mine fire to a halt also.

In these three efforts the Appalachian program has meant the literal salvation of these large communities of people. Were they the only Appalachian projects in my district, I would be here today to give this bill my vigorous support. In fact, of course, there are many others.

We have also faced the problem of mine subsidence in my congressional district. Over the past several years, some $2½ million in Appalachian money has been invested in this fight against subsidence which threatened many of the homes located over coal veins which had been mined. Again this program has meant salvation for the fine people who own these homes.

We have turned to the Appalachian program for help in the health facilities in our area; $63,000 of Appalachian money went to the Allied Services Community Center for the Mentally Retarded. Here the money would be invested to help those people who are most urgently in need of help and who are least capable of helping themselves.

Through the Appalachian program, we are constructing new access roads.

Through the Appalachian program, we are moving ahead in the construction of sewage treatment plants.

In 1965, when the Appalachian Regional Development Act was passed by the Congress, all of us who lived in the Appalachian area looked to this act with enormous hope. I assure you, my colleagues, that our hope has not been in vain. We have seen that hope justified many, many times over the past several years. I urge my colleagues to give this legislation their enthusiastic support. It is a model of excellent legislation. I know it will be passed overwhelmingly.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute committee amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I see no reason why we should not proceed with the reading of this bill for at least a short time, until some of us, who have not had the opportunity to speak up to this point, may have a minute or two.

Therefore, I object at this time to dispensing with the reading of the bill.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. This does not interpose any objection to the gentleman from Iowa offering any amendments or making use of whatever time is necessary.

Mr. GROSS. I want to say to the gentleman from Alabama, that what occurs when a bill is considered to be read and open for amendment, is that the committee members then get priority on the time to introduce their amendments. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, for the time being I object.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the gentleman from Iowa objects, and I am sorry that the gentleman took that point of view, that somebody was trying to keep him from making an objection or an exception to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT of 1965

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Regional Action Planning Commission Amendments of 1969".

SEC. 102. (a) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 505 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3185) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and planning, investigations, studies, demonstration projects, and training programs which will further the purposes of this Act."

(b) The second sentence of subsection (b) of section 505 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "Thereafter, such expenses shall be paid 50 per centum by the Federal Government and 50 per centum by the States in the region, except that the administrative expenses of the Federal cochairman, his alternate, and his staff shall be paid solely by the Federal Government. The share to be paid by each State shall be determined by the Commission. The Federal cochairman shall not participate or vote in such determination."

(c) Subsection (c) of section 505 of such Act is repealed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee that brought this bill to the floor says that this is a popular program. If you can assemble a gravy train long enough, with the capacity to haul enough money, then you have a popular bill as I have found in the few years that I have been here. Of course, it is popular because it is a gravy train. Incidentally, the "gravy planes" will be leaving Washington tomorrow for Florida and you will probably see the biggest exodus from this city since the first Battle of Bull Run.

It is strange indeed that there are no reports from any department of the Government as to the merit or demerit of the bill or the program for which it seeks to provide millions of dollars.

This report contains not one single word or syllable as to what the Nixon administration thinks about this program. I am unable to account for it. Perhaps there are those in this Chamber who can account for the fact that there is not one word representing the position of the new administration of this Government regarding this expenditure.

I am also disturbed by what appears to be a 25 percent allowance in the bill for administrative expenses. Is this normal in the Federal Government that 25 percent be expended for administration? I thought it was normally somewhere near 10 percent to 15 percent.

Again, I am disturbed to hear here today, reference to cost sharing on projects in the various local communities. We have been told that if the local community cannot come up with its share of the money, then the Federal Government just steps in and takes care of it.

I am disturbed by what I have heard about the construction of super highways. I do not find anything delineated here and I would like to ask a question of someone as to how much of the money in this Appalachian program has gone

XUM

for the construction of interstate or other superhighways?

In the matter of road building, I thought those entrusted with this Appalachian program were to build farm to market roads and access roads to serve the communities that were supposed to be built up.

Now, what has been spent for interstate or four-lane super highways in this alleged poverty region?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. The Appalachian regional development area has about 2,700 miles authorized of development highways. We already approved a system of 2,700 miles and of that 2,600 miles are presently under construction.

This is not an additional or new authorization. This merely carries out the balance of the previously agreed to total of $1,015,000,000 authorization for that number of miles in development highways within the Appalachian region. This merely finishes the authorization within that already-established maximum figure.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to my friend from Florida, that I do not care whether the money was authorized and appropriated 4 years ago or 14 years ago. What I am interested in is the sort of situation that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) called to our attention a little while ago, and for which I did not think he got a good answer—the use of money in Ohio for certain road-building purposes. Can the gentleman enlighten us as to what happened there and how many miles of superhighway have been built with this alleged poverty bill?

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman that if it is not part of the economic highway system previously referred to, the 2,700 miles, 2,600 of which is already determined, then it does not qualify. This does not mean putting the missing link into the Interstate System obviously. That is a separate program. It does not mean putting the missing link into U.S. 1 or 21, which was mentioned by another gentleman. It is not part of the development highway system. That is the basic existing highway system in America. This is the specifically designated 2,700-mile development highway system within Appalachia, which, in effect, is a supplement to the basic program in the rest of the country.

Mr. GROSS. Why should a single dime of money in this bill—a single dime authorized by this legislation or any other previous legislation—be used to construct superhighways of any kind in the 13 States covered by this program?

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman, in my opinion, the development highways are not limited-access highways. They are not superhighways. They are not interstate highways. They are to open the development of these areas. In some instances they are four-lane and in other instances two-lane existing highways. They are intended to further open up the areas and to provide access roads in another program to open up new areas that have no roads. That is not superhighways, in my opinion, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. To those of us who still cannot get four-lane highways, although we have a city or cities that meet every criteria, the use of a so-called poverty program to construct them elsewhere is incredible and totally unacceptable.

Implicit in this Appalachian program, which stretches from New York down into Mississippi, Alabama, and South Carolina, is the worst kind of discrimination in the use of Federal funds. Moreover, there is all kinds of duplication with other programs.

This legislation is in the nature of special privilege and I am opposed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 103. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 509 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3188a) is amended (1) by inserting after "share," the following: "or for which there are insufficient funds available under the Federal grant-in-aid Act authorizing such programs to meet pressing needs of the region,", and (2) by striking out "for the sole" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "for all or any portion of the basic Federal contribution to projects under such Federal grant-in-aid programs authorized by Federal grant-in-aid Acts, and for the".

(b) The next to the last sentence of subsection (a) of section 509 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "In the case of any program or project for which all or any portion of the basic Federal contribution to the project under a Federal grant-in-aid program is proposed to be made under this subsection, no such Federal contribution shall be made until the responsible Federal official administering the Federal grant-in-aid Act authorizing such contribution certifies that such program or project meets all of the requirements of such Federal grant-in-aid Act and would be approved for Federal contribution under such Act if funds were available under such Act for such program or project. Funds may be provided for programs and projects in a State under this subsection only if the Commission determines that the level of Federal and State financial assistance under titles of this Act other than this title, and under Acts other than this Act, for the same type of programs or projects in that portion of the State within the region will not be diminished in order to substitute funds authorized by this subsection."

(c) Subsection (c) of section 509 of such Act is amended by striking out in the first sentence thereof "December 31, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1970".

(d) Subsection (d) of section 509 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this title, for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971, to be available until expended, not to exceed $225,000,000. Not less than 10 per centum nor more than 30 per centum of the amounts appropriated under this authorization for any fiscal year shall be made available for any one regional commission."

SEC. 104. Title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3181 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"COORDINATION

"SEC. 511. The Secretary shall coordinate his activities in making grants and loans under title I and II of this Act with those of each of the Federal cochairmen in making grants under this title, and each Federal cochairman shall coordinate his activities in making grants under this title wtih those of the Secretary in making grants and loans under titles I and II of this Act."

TITLE II—APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1969

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1969".

SEC. 202. Subsection (b) of section 105 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 105) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) To carry out this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission to be available until expended, not to excess $1,900,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971. Not to exceed $475,000 of such authorization shall be available for the expenses of the Federal cochairman, his alternate, and his staff."

SEC. 203. (a) The second sentence of section 201(a) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 201) is amended to read as follows: "The provisions of sections 106(a) and 118 of title 23, United States Code, relating to the obligation, period of availability, and expenditure of Federal-aid highway funds, shall apply to the development highway system and the local access roads, and all other provisions of such title 23 that are applicable to the construction and maintenance of Federal-aid primary and secondary highways and which the Secretary determines are not inconsistent with this Act shall apply, respectively, to such system and roads."

(b) Subsection (g) of section 201 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 201) is amended by striking out "four-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971." and inserting in lieu thereof "five-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1972. except that not to exceed $195,000,000 of such amount may be obligated for any one such fiscal year."

SEC. 204. (a) The first sentence of clause (2) of subsection (a) of section 205 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 205) is amended by striking out "in accordance with the" and inserting in lieu thereof "or to make grants to the States for carrying out such projects, in accordance with the applicable".

(b) Subsection (b) of such section 205 is amended by striking out "and 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "1969, 1970, and 1971".

SEC. 205. Subsection (c) of section 214 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 214) is amended by striking out "December 31, 1967" in the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1970".

SEC. 206. Section 302(a)(1)(B) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 302) is amended by inserting before "a local" the following: "a State agency certified as".

SEC. 207. Section 401 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 401) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and not to exceed $250,000,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971, to carry out this Act, of which amounts not to exceed $85,000,000 is authorized for section 202, $15,000,000 for section 203, $15,000,000 for section 205, $2,000,000 for section 207, $50,000,000 for section 211, $75,000,000 for section 214, and $8,000,000 for section 302.".

SEC. 208. Section 405 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 405) is amended by inserting immediately after "Act" the following: ", other than section 201,".

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I renew my request. I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read, printed in the Record, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLEVELAND

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Cleveland: On page 8, after line 5, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 208. Section 403 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 403) is amended as follows:

"(1) By inserting after the clause relating to the counties in Kentucky the following:

"'In Maine, the counties of Aroostook, Franklin, Oxford, Penobscot, Piscataquis, and Somerset;';

"(2) by inserting after the clause relating to the counties in Maryland the following:

"'In Massachusetts, the counties of Berkshire and Franklin;';

"(3) by striking out the clause relating to the counties in New York and by inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'In New Hampshire, the counties of Belknap, Carroll, Cheshire, Coos, Grafton, Merrimack, and Sullivan;

"'In New York, the counties of Albany, Allegany, Broome, Cattaraugus, Cayuga, Chautauqua, Chemung, Chenango, Clinton, Columbia, Cortland, Delaware, Dutchess, Essex, Franklin, Fulton, Greene, Hamilton, Herkimer, Jefferson, Lewis, Livingston, Madison, Montgomery, Oneida, Onondaga, Ontario, Oswego, Otsego, Rensselaer, Saint Lawrence, Saratoga, Schenectady, Schoharie, Schuyler, Seneca, Steuben, Sullivan, Tioga, Tompkins, Ulster, Warren, Washington, Wyoming, and Yates;';

"(4) By inserting after the clause relating to the counties in Tennessee the following:

"'All the counties of Vermont;'."

Renumber succeeding section accordingly.

Mr. CLEVELAND (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, during general debate I described the amendment that I have just offered at some length. I briefly stated that the amendment would include in the Appalachian Regional Commission System parts of northern New England and northern New York. Specifically, it would include the Katahdin Mountain Range in Maine, the White Mountains in New Hampshire, the Green Mountains of Vermont, part of the Berkshires in western Massachusetts, the Catskills, and the Adirondack Mountains, of New York.

As I pointed out earlier, Mr. Chairman, during general debate, the dictionary definition of Appalachian includes those mountain ranges.

As I pointed out in the supplemental views, which are printed, and which I know you all read with great care and interest, many of the problems that have plagued Appalachia, many of the problems which we hope to solve in Appalachia, are problems of a similar nature that are faced in many areas of northern New England and northern New York.

Let me say in fairness to the committee, which has turned down this amendment, that the Governors of all the States involved have not requested to be included. And let me say further, in fairness to the committee, because the committee has been quite fair with me in this regard, northern New England, of course, is also included in the New England Regional Commission.

Under the provisions of the New England Regional Commission, it is quite possible that some of the Appalachian-type relief we seek might be granted to parts of northern New England. I point out, however, that northern New York is not included in any region, and parts of northern New York have problems very similar to those found in Appalachia. In addition, northern New York and New England must work together on mutual problems such as east-west highways.

I might just point out in this connection this map, and the Appalachian Mountain chain is shown here. If Members examine that map closely, they will find that parts of northern Mississippi, that have been so well represented by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. Montgomery), who I see on the floor, are in the Appalachian system.

So my suggestion is simply that if we can go a little bit west and a little bit south to take care of Mississippi, is it not also fair to go just a little bit north and a little bit east to take care of parts of New England and New York? I know the gentleman agrees with me because he is for good legislation, and good legislation is fair legislation.

I would like to point out one other aspect of this. The committee debate on this amendment pointed out there are parts of New England which would, if this amendment were adopted, then include two systems, the New England regional system as well as the Appalachian system. However, this is true of many other parts of the country. I have another map here which shows that many EDA areas are also part of the Appalachian area.

Again I have another map, and the purpose of this third map is simply to show that the areas we wish to add, as compared to the second map, would only give the same treatment to parts of New England. In addition, the maps show that parts of Appalachia also encompass not only EDA, but TVA, thus enjoying the benefits of three economic development programs.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I wish the gentleman would turn back to the first map, the bottom map, which is the relief map, which I am sure the gentleman is familiar with. I wish the gentleman would explain the distance between the contours on his map. Also, I could not find the true north nor the grid north, nor the magnetic north, so I could determine whether this map is accurate or not.

I say to the gentleman it depends on which map we read when we decide what is and what is not in Appalachia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Cleveland was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. If I understood the question of the gentleman from Mississippi—and I am not sure I did understand it.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I am not sure I understand it either.

Mr. CLEVELAND. The gentleman from Mississippi would like a basic lesson in map reading?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I understand map reading.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I understood the gentleman was a distinguished member of the National Guard, and I supposed he could read a map like the palm of his hand.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I can, but I do not understand his map. Can the gentleman give me the title of the map?

I thought the gentleman was familiar with his map.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I would like to tell the gentleman from Mississippi this is a map of the United States.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I thank the gentleman for answering my question.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the Speaker yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I should quit while I am ahead, but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman accept an amendment to put the State of Iowa in, or are we are blocked off the gravy train?

Mr. CLEVELAND. As I told the gentleman 4 years ago, I would be willing to put Iowa in there if the gentleman would offer an amendment.

Mr. GROSS. They will not even let us close to this gravy train. Will the gentleman accept that amendment?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I will accept the amendment if the gentleman has it prepared.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. M'EWEN FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLEVELAND

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McEwen as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Cleveland: On page 8, after line 5, in lieu of the matter proposed to be added by the amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 208. Section 403 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (48 App. U.S.C. 403) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'The President is authorized and directed to make a study of the extent to which portions of upper New York State, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine which are geographically part of the Appalachian region and share the social and economic characteristics thereof should be included in the region in order to carry out the purposes of this Act. He shall submit the results of such study together with his recommendations to Congress no later than June 30, 1970.'"

Renumber the succeeding section accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his substitute amendment.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McEWEN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. We are willing to accept the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. Certainly it is a request which will require consideration and study. There might be a need to vacate the Northeast Commission and to substitute, in lieu of the Appalachian Commission. Therefore, it is an appropriate study; therefore, we are ready to accept the substitute amendment.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of my subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama, for his consideration of this proposed amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McEWEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I, too, want to express my support for the gentleman's amendment, subject to the understanding that the amendment is not mandatory in nature so far as inclusion of additional territory is concerned and, secondly, it does not preclude within the study consideration of upstate New York or any portion as spelled out from being a part of the presently existing northeast region or any future development region. Is that the gentleman's intention?

Mr. McEWEN. I would say to the gentleman, that is absolutely correct. That is the gentleman's intention.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that a mere glance at the map which appears on page 21 of the committee report, showing the Appalachian region as it now exists and the New England Region, makes quite clear that there is one area of Appalachia in northern New York that is neither of these regions, an area which has an unemployment rate higher than almost all the rest of Appalachia.

Whether it is under Appalachia, or an EDA region, I hope both may be considered.

Again I thank the gentleman from Florida as well as the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield,

Mr. McEWEN. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding, and I reiterate what he said as to the indices in this part of New York State.

I compliment the gentleman and the gentleman from New Hampshire for their effort in this regard. Certainly I want to express my thanks and my compliments to the gentleman from Alabama for recognizing the importance of this and accepting this substitute amendment.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McEWEN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I want to join in support of the amendment. Having served on the Public Works Committee and having visited the area, I believe the gentleman has developed a realistic approach through the contents of his amendment, and I certainly urge its passage.

Mr. McEWEN. I thank the gentleman from California and my colleague from New York, who have supported me.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McEWEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I believe the substitute makes eminent good sense at this time, and I should be glad to accept it.

Mr. McEWEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask only the question of what do you have to do to qualify for an Appalachian handout? Do you have to have a mountain and poverty, or will just a mountain do?

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will be happy to respond to the gentleman from Iowa.

I would say if you have mountains and if you have an outmigration and if you have an unemployment rate higher than the national average—and the area which this substitute amendment is directed to has all three—it would be eligible. If Iowa meets those standards, I think it should be considered.

Mr. GROSS. But you do have to have a mountain or a hill or a mound of some kind. Is that right? I am at a loss to understand just what it takes to qualify and get on the payroll so easily as is being demonstrated with this amendment.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I do not think it is absolutely necessary to have a mountain or a hill. As I mentioned earlier in this discussion, parts of Mississippi apparently have been included in the Appalachia region. They are relatively level. However, I think that the concept of Appalachia is built up around the following basic fact: In the hill countries modern agriculture is not entirely feasible or fully competitive. Due to improvements in transportation and the fact that the broad, flat fields of the West can be more easily farmed by modern equipment, this results in the fact that in these Appalachia regions and in the hill regions small family farms have declined and with them the communities in which they are located have declined.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that the farmers of Iowa have been farming hills for a long, long time.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I believe the best way to answer the gentleman from Iowa is to say that you need high hills and distress to get Appalachia, just as we need tall corn and Appalachia to get in the $7 billion farm program.

Mr. GROSS. You mean they subsidized your cost of living for a long, long time and that accounted for a substantial part of the $7 billion the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. DENT. I do not think you have to subsidize us. We have 93,000 family farms in Pennsylvania and they all sustain themselves.

Mr. GROSS. And they have to have this legislation to help sustain them, this gravy train operation that the gentleman is putting forward so avidly.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama with respect to section 401 which appears on page 29 of the report, the italicized language, "not to exceed $250 million in the 2 fiscal year period ending June 30, 1971." Is that one $250 million or $250 million for each fiscal year?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNGATE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It is one $250 million.

Mr. HUNGATE. For the 2-year period. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire.

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute amendment, as amended.

The committee substitute amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SLACK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4018) to provide for the renewal and extension of certain sections of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, pursuant to House Resolution 473, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 273, nays 103, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]

YEAS—273

Abernethy
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashley
Ayres
Barrett
Beall, Md.
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Burke, Mass.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Calif.
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Caffery
Carter
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chisholm
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clay
Cleveland
Cohelan
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Coughlin
Cramer
Culver
Daddario
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Ga.
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fish
Flood
Flowers
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Foreman
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Galifianakis
Gaydos
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gubser
Gude
Hagan
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey
Hastings
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Hicks
Hogan
Holifield
Hosmer
Howard
Ichord
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
King
Kluczynski
Koch
Kyros
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
Lujan
McCarthy
McCloskey
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McKneally
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Madden
Mann
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Melcher
Meskill
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Mizell
Mollohan
Monagan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Patman
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pirnie
Podell
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Watkins
Watts
Weicker
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wright
Yates
Yatron
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—103

Adair
Andrews, Ala.
Arends
Ashbrook
Baring
Belcher
Bell, Calif.
Bennett
Blackburn
Bray
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burleson, Tex.
Bush
Casey
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Collier
Collins
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Cowger
Daniel, Va.
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Denney
Dennis
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dowdy
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Findley
Flynt
Frey
Fuqua
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Haley
Hall
Heckler, Mass.
Horton
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Jarman
Kyl
Landgrebe
Long, La.
Lukens
McClory
McClure
McDonald, Mich.
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Michel
Minshall
Myers
Passman
Pelly
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Poff
Price, Tex.
Purcell
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes
Rogers, Fla.
Roth
Roudebush
Satterfield
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scott
Sebelius
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Teague, Calif.
Utt
Vander Jagt
Wiggins
Winn
Wold
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman

NOT VOTING—56

Abbitt
Anderson, Tenn.
Aspinall
Berry
Betts
Biaggi
Boggs
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Cabell
Cahill
Camp
Carey
Chappell
Cunningham
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dwyer
Esch
Fisher
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Garmatz
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanna
Harsha
Henderson
Karth
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kuykendall
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Mize
Morgan
O'Neill, Mass.
Patten
Pollock
Powell
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Pryor, Ark.
Railsback
Ronan
Scheuer
Teague, Tex.
Tunney
Watson
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Berry against.

Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.

Mr. Hamilton for, with Mr. Railsback against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Lipscomb against.

Mr. Harsha for, with Mr. Burton of Utah against.

Mr. Kuykendall for, with Mr. Camp against.

Mr. Halpern for, with Mr. Cunningham against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Fraser with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Scheuer with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Mize.
Mr. Patten with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Kleppe.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Lloyd.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Cabell.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Preyer of North Carolina.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Abbitt.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.
Mr. Price of Illinois with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. de la Garza.

Mr. SCHADEBERG changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. MONAGAN and LANGEN changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the renewal and extension of title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

APPALACHIAN AND REGIONAL ACTION PLANNING COMMISSIONS

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a similar Senate bill (S. 1072) to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, and titles I, II, IV, and V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1072

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1969

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1969".

SEC. 102. Subsection (b) of section 105 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act") is amended to read as follows:

"(b) To carry out this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission, to be available until expended, not to exceed $1,900,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971. Not to exceed $475,000 of such authorization shall be available for the expenses of the Federal cochairman, his alternate, and his staff."

SEC. 103. Subsection (g) of section 201 of the Act as amended is amended to read as follows:

"(g)(1) To carry out this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, to be available until expended, $175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; $175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; and $170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (c), not to exceed $150,000,000 of such funds may be used for engineering work and advance right-of-way acquisition on sections of the development highway system whose actual construction is not expected to be accomplished under the authorization herein.

"(2) Funds authorized in this section shall be available for obligation on the first day of the fiscal year for which authorized, and shall remain available until expended. Funds appropriated under this section shall be available for payment of such obligations."

SEC. 104. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 202 of the Act is amended to read as follows: "(a) In order to demonstrate the value of adequate health facilities and services to the economic development of the region, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants for the planning, construction, equipment, and operation of multicounty demonstration health, nutrition, and child care projects, including hospitals, regional health diagnostic and treatment centers and other facilities and services necessary for the purposes of this section."

(b) The second sentence of subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking out "50 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "75 per centum".

(c) Subsection (e) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(e) In order to provide for the further development of the Appalachian region's human resources, grants under this section shall give special emphasis to:

"(1) Project components demonstrating the value of coordinated investments in early childhood health, nutrition, and education in the region. From funds appropriated pursuant to this Act and under such conditions as the Commission may establish, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay to a State which has a plan approved under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (in addition to amounts prescribed to be paid to such State under section 403(a)(3)(A) of the Social Security Act) not more than 60 per centum of the non-Federal share (as determined under section 403(a)(3)(A) of the Social Security Act of expenditures for the furnishing of the services described in clauses (14) and (15) of section 402(a) of the Social Security Act which the Commission determines will assist in carrying out the demonstration projects authorized by this section and with respect to which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, pursuant to section 1115 of the Social Security Act, has waived compliance with section 402(a)(1) of the Social Security Act; and

"(2) Programs and research for the early detection, diagnosis, and treatment of occupational diseases arising from coal mining, such as black lung."

SEC. 105. (a) Clause (2) of section 205(a) of this Act is amended by striking out the phrase "in accordance with the" and inserting in lieu thereof "or to make grants to the States for carrying out such projects, in accordance with the applicable".

(b) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out "and 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "1969, 1970, and 1971".

SEC. 106. Subsection (e) of section 207 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The Secretary is further authorized to provide, or contract with public or private organizations to provide, information, advice, and technical assistance with respect to the construction, rehabilitation, and operation by nonprofit organizations of housing for low or moderate income families in such areas of the region."

SEC. 107. Part A of title II of the Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

"SEC. 208. In order to facilitate the effective use of the region's manpower and to contribute to full employment of its labor force, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to make grants not to exceed 80 per centum of the costs of manpower survey, recruitment, basic education, training, counseling, and mobility demonstration projects, including projects for training, rehabilitation, and retraining of coal miners. Grants shall be made in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act (42 U.S.C. 2571 et seq.) and other laws authorizing grants for manpower development projects without regard to any provision therein relating to appropriation authorization ceilings or to allotments among the States. Grants under this section shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act and shall not be taken into account in the computation of the allotments among the States pursuant to any other provision of law."

SEC. 108. Subsection (c) of section 214 of the Act is amended as follows:

(a) By striking "December 31, 1967" from the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1970";

(b) By adding at the end "For the purpose of this section, any sewage treatment works constructed pursuant to section 8(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act without Federal grant-in-aid assistance under such section shall be regarded as if constructed with such assistance."

SEC. 109. Part B of title II of the Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"CULTURAL PROGRAMS

"SEC. 215. (a) In order to encourage the development of the cultural resources of the region, the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts and the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities are authorized to make grants to assist the member States of the Commission (1) in supporting existing programs and projects (including productions) in the region which meet the standards enumerated in sections 5 and 7 of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 846; 20 U.S.C. 954); and (2) in developing programs and projects in the arts and humanities in such a manner as will serve all the people of the region. Such grants shall be made in accordance with the applicable provisions of sections 5 and 7 of that Act, for programs and projects which are compatible with State plans approved pursuant to subsection (h) thereof, without regard to any provisions therein relating to appropriation authorization ceilings or to allotments among the States. Grants under this section shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act, and shall not be taken into account in the computation of the allotments among the States made pursuant to any other provision of law.

"(b) No grant shall be made to a State for a workshop production (other than a workshop conducted by a school, college, or university) for which a direct or indirect admission charge is asked if the proceeds, after deducting reasonable costs, are used for purposes other than assisting the grantee to develop high standards of artistic excellence or encourage greater appreciation of the arts and humanities by the people of the region.

SEC. 110. Section 302(a)(1)(B) of the Act is amended by inserting before "a local" the following: "a State agency certified as".

SEC. 111. Section 401 of the Act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and not to exceed $294,000,000 for the two fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971, to carry out this Act as follows:

"Section 202. Demonstration Health Projects	$95,000,000
"Section 203. Land Stabilization, Conservation, and Erosion Control	15,000,000
"Section 205. Mining Area Restoration	15,000,000
"Section 207. Housing Assistance	3,000,000
"Section 208. Manpower Development	10,000,000
"Section 211. Vocational Education	50,000,000
"Section 214. Supplemental Grants	90,000,000
"Section 215. Cultural Programs	1,000,000
"Section 302. Administrative Expenses of Local Development Districts and Research	15,000,000"

SEC. 112. Section 405 of the Act is amended by inserting after "Act" the following: ", excepting section 201,".

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE V OF THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Regional Action Planning Commission Amendments of 1969".

SEC. 202. Section 501 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3181) is amended by redesignating section 501 as section 501(a) and adding the following new subsection (b):

"(b) Upon resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the Senate or the House of Representatives, the Secretary is directed to study the advisability of altering the geographical area of any region designated under this section, in order to further the purpose of this Act."

SEC. 203. (a) Subsection (a) of section 505 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3185(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"REGIONAL ECONOMIC PLANNING, DEMONSTRATION, AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

"SEC. 505. (a) From the amounts appropriated to the Secretary for each of the regional commissions pursuant to the provisions of section 511 of this title, the Secretary shall provide funds to each commission to enable it to carry out its functions under this Act and to develop recommendations and programs. Such funds shall be available for studies and plans evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth of such region, and research on improving the conservation and utilization of the human and natural resources of the region, and planning, investigations, studies, demonstration projects and training programs which will further the purposes of this Act. Such activities may be carried out by the commission, through the payment of funds to departments or agencies of the Federal Government, or through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations or suitable institutions, under contracts entered into for such purposes, or through grants-in-aid to agencies of State or local government. With respect to demonstration projects and training programs, to the maximum extent possible, such activities shall be carried out through departments or agencies of the Federal Government or agencies of State or local government."

(b) The second sentence of subsection (b) of section 505 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "Thereafter, such expenses shall be paid 50 per centum by the Federal Government and 50 per centum by the States in the region, except that the expenses of the

Federal Co-Chairman, his alternate, and his staff, shall be paid solely by the Federal Government. The share to be paid by each State shall be determined by the Commission. The Federal Co-Chairman shall not participate or vote in such determination.".

(c) Subsection (c) of section 505 of such Act is repealed.

Sec. 204. Section 506 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3186) is amended by designating it as section 506(a) and by adding the following new subsection (b):

"(b) The Federal Co-Chairman shall establish and at all times maintain his headquarters office in the District of Columbia. He may establish a field office or field offices at such other places within the region as the Commission and the Secretary deem essential to carrying out the functions of the Federal Co-Chairman under this Act."

Sec. 205. (a) Subsection (a) of section 509 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3188a) is amended to read as follows:

"SUPPLEMENTAL TO FEDERAL GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAMS

"Sec. 509. (a) (1) In order to enable the States and other entities within economic development regions established under this Act to take maximum advantage of Federal grant-in-aid programs (as hereinafter defined) for which they are eligible but for which, because of their economic situation, they cannot supply the required matching share or for which they are insufficient funds available under the Acts authorizing such programs to meet pressing needs of the region, the Secretary shall, once a comprehensive long-range economic plan established pursuant to clause (2) of section 503(a) is in effect, provide funds to each of the Federal Cochairmen of the regional commissions heretofore or hereafter established under this title, to be used for all or any portion of the basic Federal contribution to projects under such programs authorized by the applicable Federal grant-in-aid law, or for the purpose of increasing the Federal contribution (subject to the limitations of subsection (b) of this section) to projects under such programs above the fixed maximum portion of the cost of such projects otherwise authorized by the applicable law. No program or project authorized under this section shall be implemented until (1) applications and plans relating to the program or project have been determined by the responsible Federal official to be compatible with the provisions and objectives of Federal laws which he administers that are not inconsistent with this Act, and (2) the Regional Commission involved has approved such program or project and has determined that it meets the applicable criteria under section 504 and will contribute to the development of the region, which determination shall be controlling.

"(2) In the case of any program or project for which all or any portion of the basic Federal contribution to the project under a Federal grant-in-aid program is proposed to be made under this section, no such Federal contribution shall be made until the responsible Federal official administering the Federal grant-in-aid Act authorizing such contribution certifies that such program or project meets the applicable requirements of such Federal grant-in-aid Act and could be approved for Federal contribution under such Act if funds were available under such Act for such program or project. Funds may be provided for programs and projects in a State under this subsection only if the Commission determines that the level of Federal and State financial assistance for the same type of programs or projects in that State will not be diminished in order to substitute funds authorized by this subsection. Funds provided pursuant to this Act shall be available without regard to any limitations on authorizations for appropriation in any other Act."

(b) Subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking out in the first sentence thereof "December 31, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1970".

(c) Subsection (d) of such section is repealed, and subsection (e) thereof is renumbered (d) accordingly.

Sec. 206. Title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by redesignating section 510 as 513, and inserting immediately after section 509 the following new sections:

"ALASKA

"Sec. 510. Funds appropriated under this title shall be available to assist programs and projects in Alaska in the manner provided for programs and projects in economic development regions established under this title. For the purposes of this title, the Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska, or any organization hereafter established by the President as a successor thereto, shall be treated as if established as a regional commission, except that the administrative expense of such Committee or successor organization shall be paid solely by the Federal Government. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as precluding the establishment of a regional commission for Alaska. At such time as Alaska is designated as a regional commission under this title, it shall be eligible for funds under the provisions of section 512 of this Act.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 511. To carry out this title, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971, to be available until expended, to the Secretary, not to exceed $50,000,000 for the Ozarks Regional Commission; $75,000,000 for the New England Regional Commission; $45,000,000 for the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission; $45,000,000 for the Four Corners Regional Commission; $60,000,000 for the Coastal Plains Regional Commission; and $10,000,000 for the Federal Field Committee for Alaska.

"REGIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

"Sec. 512. (a) The Secretary of Transportation (hereafter in this section referred to as 'the Secretary') is authorized to assist in the planning and development of regional transportation systems including the construction of development highways, and local access roads, airports, and urban mass transit facilities serving economic development regions established under this title which will further the purposes of this Act. Provisions of Federal law relating to highway and airport construction and mass transportation programs shall apply to such regional development transportation systems to the extent the Secretary determines that such provisions are not inconsistent with this Act. No part of the funds provided to carry out the purposes of this section shall be used for the costs of operation or maintenance of any regional transportation system including development highways, local access roads, airports, railroad commuter service, and other mass transit facilities, except for demonstration projects.

"(b) The Commissions shall transmit to the Secretary designations of (1) the general corridor location and termini of the development highways; (2) local access roads to be constructed; (3) airports to be constructed; and (4) railroad and mass transportation programs to be funded, and shall establish priorities for the development of such transportation systems and other criteria for the program authorized by this section. Before any State member participates in or votes on any highway designations, he shall have obtained the recommendations of the State highway department of the State which he represents.

"(c) No project authorized under this section shall be implemented until (1) applications and plans relating to the project have been determined by the Secretary to be compatible with the provisions and objectives of the applicable Federal law, that are not inconsistent with this Act; and (2) the regional commission involved has approved such project and has determined that it will contribute to the development of the region, which determination shall be controlling.

"(d) On its completion, each development highway not already on the Federal-aid primary system shall be added to such system and each development highway and local access road shall be required to be maintained by the State as provided for Federal-aid highways in title 23, United States Code. Any airports constructed under this section shall be maintained in accordance with the provisions of section 11 of the Federal Airport Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1110(2)).

"(e) Federal assistance to any construction project under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost of such project, unless the Commission determines that assistance in excess of such percentage is required in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, but in no event shall such Federal assistance exceed 70 per centum of such costs.

"(f) Not more than $20,000,000 from the funds authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for each Commission under section 511 of this Act may be used by such Commission for the purposes of this section."

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Sec. 301. Title I of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(a) The first sentence of section 101(c) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3131(c)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "except that in the case of a grant to an Indian tribe, the Secretary may reduce the non-Federal share below such per centum or may waive the non-Federal share".

(b) Section 105 is amended by striking "June 30, 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1970".

Sec. 302. Section 301 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3151) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The Secretary is authorized to make grants, enter into contracts or otherwise provide funds for any demonstration project which he determines is designed to foster regional productivity and growth, prevent out-migration, and otherwise carry out the purposes of this Act."

Sec. 303. Section 302 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3152) is amended by striking out "1970." and inserting in lieu thereof "1969, and $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970."

Sec. 304. (a) Subsection (a) of section 401 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3161) is amended by striking out the period at the end of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following:

"(6) those areas selected for assistance under part D of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964."

(b) Subsection (b)(3) of such section 401 is amended by inserting after "(a)(3)" the following: "or (a)(6)".

(c) Subsection (b)(4) of such section 401 is amended by striking out "and (a)(4)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(a) (4) and (a)(6)".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF ALABAMA

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Alabama: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1072 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 4018, as passed, as follows:

“TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

“SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the ‘Regional Action Planning Commission Amendments of 1969’.

“SEC. 102. (a) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 505 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3185) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: ‘and planning, investigations, studies, demonstration projects, and training programs which will further the purposes of this Act.’

“(b) The second sentence of subsection (b) of section 505 of such Act is amended to read as follows: ‘Thereafter, such expenses shall be paid 50 per centum by the Federal Government and 50 per centum by the States in the region, except that the administrative expenses of the Federal cochairman, his alternate, and his staff shall be paid solely by the Federal Government. The share to be paid by each State shall be determined by the Commission. The Federal cochairman shall not participate or vote in such determination.’

“(c) Subsection (c) of section 505 of such Act is repealed.

“SEC. 103. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) of setcion 509 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3188a) is amended (1) by inserting after ‘share,’ the following: ‘or for which there are insufficient funds available under the Federal grant-in-aid Act authorizing such programs to meet pressing needs of the region,’, and (2) by striking out ‘for the sole’ and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ‘for all or any portion of the basic Federal contribution to projects under such Federal grant-in-aid programs authorized by Federal grant-in-aid Acts, and for the’.

“(b) The next to the last sentence of subsection (a) of section 509 of such Act is amended to read as follows: ‘In the case, of any program or project for which all or any portion of the basic Federal contribution to the project under a Federal grant-in-aid program is proposed to be made under this subsection, no such Federal contribution shall be made until the responsible Federal official administering the Federal grant-in-aid Act authorizing such contribution certifies that such program or project meets all of the requirements of such Federal grant-in-aid Act and would be approved for Federal contribution under such Act if funds were available under such Act for such program or project. Funds may be provided for programs and projects in a State under this subsection only if the Commission determines that the level of Federal and State financial assistance under titles of this Act other than this title, and under Acts other than this Act, for the same type of programs or projects in that portion of the State within the region will not be diminished in order to substitute funds authorized by this subsection.’

“(c) Subsection (c) of section 509 of such Act is amended by striking out in the first sentence thereof ‘December 31, 1967’ and inserting in lieu thereof ‘December 31, 1970.’

“(d) Subsection (d) of section 509 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

“ ‘(d) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this title, for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971, to be available until expended, not to exceed $225,000,000. Not less than 10 per centum nor more than 30 per centum of the amounts appropriated under this authorization for any fiscal year shall be made available for any one regional commission.’

“SEC. 104. Title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3181 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

“ ‘COORDINATION

“ ‘SEC. 511. The Secretary shall coordinate his activities in making grants and loans under titles I and II of this Act with those of each of the Federal cochairmen in making grants under this title, and each Federal cochairman shall coordinate his activities in making grants under this title with those of the Secretary in making grants and loans under titles I and II of thjs Act.’

“TITLE II—APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1969

“SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the ‘Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1969’.

“SEC. 202. Subsection (b) of section 105 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 105) is amended to read as follows:

“ ‘(b) To carry out this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission to be available until expended, not to exceed $1,900,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971. Not to exceed $475,000 of such authorization shall be available for the expenses of the Federal cochairman, his alternate, and his staff.’

“SEC. 203. (a) The second sentence of section 201(a) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 201) is amended to read as follows: ‘The provisions of sections 106(a) and 118 of title 23, United States Code, relating to the obligation, period of availability, and expenditure of Federal-aid highway funds shall apply to the development highway system and the local access roads, and all other provisions of such title 23 that are applicable to the construction and maintenance of Federal-aid primary and secondary highways and which the Secretary determines are not inconsistent with this Act shall apply, respectively, to such system and roads.’

“(b) Subsection (g) of section 201 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 201) is amended by striking out ‘four-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971.’ and inserting in lieu thereof ‘five-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1972, except that not to exceed $195,000,000 of such amount may be obligated for any one such fiscal year.’

“SEC. 204. (a) The first sentence of clause (2) of subsection (a) of section 205 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 205) is amended by striking out ‘in accordance with the’ and inserting in lieu thereof ‘or to make grants to the States for carrying out such projects, in accordance with the applicable’.

“(b) Subsection (b) of such section 205 is amended by striking out ‘and 1969’ and inserting in lieu thereof ‘1969, 1970, and 1971’.

“SEC. 205. Subsection (c) of section 214 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 214) is amended by striking out ‘December 31, 1967’ in the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof ‘December 31, 1970’.

“SEC. 206. Section 302(a)(1)(B) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 302) is amended by inserting before ‘a local’ the following: ‘a State agency certified as’.

“SEC. 207. Section 401 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 401) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: ‘and not to exceed $250,000,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971, to carry out this Act, of which amount not to exceed $85,000,000 is authorized for section 202, $15,000,000 for section 203, $15,000,000 for section 205, $2,000,000 for section 207, $50,000,000 for section 211, $75,000,000 for section 214, and $8,000,000 for section 302.’.

“SEC. 208. Section 403 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (48 App. U.S.C. 403) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

“ ‘The President is authorized and directed to make a study of the extent to which portions of upper New York State, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine which are geographically part of the Appalachian region and share the social and economic characteristics thereof should be included in the region in order to carry out the purposes of this Act. He shall submit the results of such study together with his recommendations to Congress no later than June 30, 1970.’

“SEC. 209. Section 405 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 405) is amended by inserting immediately after ‘Act’ the following: ‘, other than section 201,’.

“Amend the title so as to read ‘An act to provide for the renewal and extension of title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.’ ”

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: “A bill to provide for the renewal and extension of title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 4018) was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 1072, APPALACHIAN AND REGIONAL ACTION PLANNING COMMISSIONS

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1072) to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, and titles I, III, IV, and V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, with a House amendment thereto, insist upon the House amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. JONES of Alabama, BLATNIK, WRIGHT, EDMONDSON, CRAMER, HARSHA, and CLEVELAND.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 6508, CALIFORNIA DISASTER RELIEF ACT OF 1969

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6508) to provide assistance to the State of California for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent storms, floods, and high waters, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. JOHNSON of California, WRIGHT, EDMONDSON, CRAMER, DON H. CLAUSEN, and DENNEY.

ADAIR CALLS FOR POSITIVE RESPONSE FROM HANOI

(Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as one who wants to see President Nixon succeed in his valiant effort to bring the Vietnam war to an honorable conclusion, so that we may have a lasting peace in Southeast Asia.

Prior to the inauguration of President Nixon on January 20, our Government had taken the initiative in the pursuit of peace by halting the bombing of North Vietnam. Also, it agreed to sit down at the conference table with the NLF, as well as the governments of Hanoi and Saigon.

Under President Nixon, we have remained at the table and refrained from resumption of the bombing, although Hanoi has shelled major cities in South Vietnam, violated the demilitarized zone, and refused to deal with the Saigon government.

President Thieu has cooperated with us in the search for peace. On March 25 he made a significant offer to meet with the NLF for private talks without preconditions on a political settlement.

On May 14, with Thieu's support, President Nixon issued an eight-point plan for peace. It renounced reliance on a military solution, offered to withdraw U.S. and allied forces within 12 months under international guarantees, and emphasized our desire to secure the right of the South Vietnam people to determine their future without outside interference.

On June 8, the President announced plans for the withdrawal of 25,000 U.S. combat troops, and indicated that further withdrawals would be announced later.

At Midway, both Presidents declared their readiness to accept any political outcome arrived at through free elections.

And in recent days, President Thieu has offered a concrete program by which free elections can be held and the will of the South Vietnamese people can be determined. He has walked the last mile.

As President Nixon said in his statement praising President Thieu's proposals:

> If the other side genuinely wants peace, it now has a comprehensive set of offers which permit a fair and reasonable settlement. If it approaches us in this spirit, it will find us reasonable. Hanoi has nothing to gain by waiting.

These steps toward peace have been taken by President Nixon in the short period of less than 6 months since he was inaugurated. We should applaud his positive efforts, which deserve an affirmative response from the other side. However, instead of meeting our offers with counter offers and beginning serious negotiations, the Communists have responded negatively or not at all.

Despite the lack of response by the other side, some Americans have responded to each initiative of our President with a call for more and more concessions to Hanoi. Why not support the President's peace initiative by calling upon the other side for reciprocal action? Why pressure our own people for more and more concessions? We know that propaganda is at least half the battle in a war such as that in Southeast Asia. We know that our every quote may be used or misused by the Communists to demonstrate to those they seek to dominate that they—the Communists—will prevail.

I believe that all of us want this war to end—honorably. We want it to end on a basis that will not encourage future Vietnams in Southeast Asia or elsewhere. I am sure that it will end on that basis if all of us will—as I said in a speech to this House on June 5—"demonstrate a national unity, so that Hanoi will negotiate seriously in Paris, instead of prolonging the war and the killing in the hope that its propaganda battle in the front lines of America will bring them the victory they could not win against American and South Vietnamese boys in Vietnam."

My colleagues, it is time for Hanoi to respond—positively—to our proposals. If it will so respond, this war can be brought to a close on honorable terms. Each of us who cherishes that goal should support our President and call upon Hanoi and the Vietcong to demonstrate their desire for peace. Such national unity, I am convinced, will bring this war to a speedy and honorable conclusion.

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, in pointing out that Hanoi is responsible for the continuation of the Vietnam war. They could end it in 1 hour by agreeing to a cease-fire. This they have not done.

Mr. Speaker, may I repeat by way of emphasis the points mentioned by my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana. Here is the record of efforts to end the war with no response whatever from Hanoi.

First. Prior to January 20, we halted the bombing of North Vietnam and agreed to sit down at the conference table with the NLF, as well as the governments of Hanoi and Saigon.

Second. We remained at the table and refrained from resumption of the bombing despite Hanoi's shelling of South Vietnamese major cities, its violation of the Demilitarized Zone and its refusal to deal with the Saigon government.

Third. On March 25, Thieu offered to meet with the NLF for private talks without preconditions on a political settlement.

Fourth. On May 14, with Thieu's support, the President put forward an eight-point plan for peace. It included the renouncement of reliance on a military solution, the offer of withdrawal of U.S. and allied forces within 12 months under international guarantees, and emphasis on our desire only to secure the right of the people of South Vietnam to determine their own future without outside interference.

Fifth. On June 8, the President announced the withdrawal of 25,000 U.S. combat troops.

Sixth. At Midway, both Thieu and the President declared their readiness to accept any political outcome arrived at through free elections.

Seventh. Thieu has now offered a concrete program by which free elections can be held and the will of the South Vietnamese people can be determined.

ATTACK ON THE CRIME PROBLEM IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Mr. NELSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with our distinguished minority leader, and Mr. MCCLORY, together with all the minority members of our House District of Columbia Committee, in introducing today three bills which have been sent to the Congress by the Justice Department representing part of President Nixon's program for a broad attack on the crime problem in the District of Columbia. We have not yet had the opportunity to carefully study these proposals in detail, but since they would make significant changes in the law enforcement and court procedures in the District of Columbia, they are being introduced at this point so that they may be referred to committee and subjected to study and hearings at the earliest possible date.

The first of these bills would provide for a reorganization of the courts of the District of Columbia. The second would establish a public defender service for the District of Columbia and the third would amend the District of Columbia Bail Agency Act. I include at this point in my remarks summary statements prepared by the Justice Department explaining the provisions of these proposals:

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1969

The proposed District of Columbia Court Reorganization Act of 1969 is a comprehensive bill restructuring the District of Columbia Courts, transferring jurisdiction from the Federal courts in the District to the District of Columbia Courts, revising the District's code of criminal procedure, and making conforming changes throughout the District of Columbia Code. It consists of six titles, described in detail below.

TITLE I

The first title of the bill is comprised of a revision and reenactment of title 11 of the D.C. Code and certain transitional sections relating to the personnel and property of the present D.C. courts.

Section 101, the revision of title 11 of the D.C. Code, would substantially reorganize the court systems in the District of Columbia. It is designed to establish, in gradual stages, federal and local court systems which would be analogous to the systems existing in the States. Thus, the federal courts would ultimately have only federal jurisdiction, with all local jurisdiction vested in the District of Columbia courts. However, the U.S. Attorney and U.S. Marshal would continue to serve both federal and local courts.

The present Court of General Sessions, Juvenile Court and D.C. Tax Court would be consolidated and upgraded into a single Superior Court of expanded jurisdiction which would be the trial court for the District. The present Court of Appeals would continue to hear appeals from the local trial court and would become the highest appellate court for local matters in the District, equivalent to the highest court of a State.

Chapter 1 describes the federal and local

XUM

courts in the District and equates the D.C. Court of Appeals with the highest court of a State.

Chapter 3 preserves the jurisdiction of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit over appeals from the D.C. Court of Appeals which are pending or may still be filed on the effective date of the Act or which involve federal misdemeanors tried in the D.C. court. It provides for the continued publication of the U.S. App. D.C. reports for so long as the court retains substantial local appellate jurisdiction.

Chapter 5 preserves the federal jurisdiction of the District Court. It gradually diminishes local civil jurisdiction, some being transferred to the Superior Court on the effective date of the Act, and the remainder in two subsequent stages. Local criminal jurisdiction is also transferred gradually, in two stages.

Provisions relating to employees of the District Court, except the auditor, have been omitted since they are covered by provisions applicable generally to federal courts.

Chapter 7 provides a nine-member D.C. Court of Appeals and continues the provisions for three-judge divisions and in banc hearings. The Court would hear all appeals from the Superior Court, appeals from administrative decisions as provided in the 1968 D.C. Administrative Procedure Act and all appeals from orders and decisions of the D.C. Public Service Commission. The Court would be authorized to hear interlocutory appeals from the Superior Court including orders to suppress evidence. Appeals would also be permitted from rulings on controlling issues of law, made during trial, in both civil and criminal cases.

Judges of the Court of Appeals could be assigned to Superior Court and Superior Court judges could be assigned to the Court of Appeals when necessary. The Chief Judge would be authorized to designate the judge who would act in his stead. Judicial salaries would be equated with level III of the Federal Executive scale—$2500 below judges of federal appellate courts.

The Court of Appeals could make its own rules of procedure, and would approve the general civil and criminal rules of the trial court.

Chapter 9 consolidates the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, Juvenile Court and Tax Court into a single Superior Court. The Court would consist initially of 37 judges—an increase of 10 over the total number of judges of the three courts. The number of judges would subsequently be increased in stages to a total number tentatively proposed as fifty judges. The Superior Court would ultimately be divided into four divisions—civil, criminal, family and probate. Judicial salaries would be equated with level IV of the Federal Executive scale—equal to the U.S. Attorney and $2000 below federal trial judges.

The Chief Judge would be empowered to rotate judges among the divisions and would be authorized to designate the judge who acts in his stead.

The civil jurisdiction of the court would be increased on the effective date (six months after enactment) to cover all personal injury actions of a purely local nature and all other local civil and equity cases where the amount in controversy is $50,000 or less. Other transfers on the effective date include D.C. land condemnation, real property actions, quo warranto actions against D.C. officials and corporations, habeas corpus against all but federal officials, and commensurate equity jurisdiction. Additional jurisdiction would be transferred in two further stages. The second stage (eighteen months after the first, *i.e.* two years after enactment) includes probate jurisdiction, hospitalization of the mentally ill, and various actions relating to the property and estates of individuals. The third stage (two and one-half years after the first, *i.e.* three years after enactment) would vest all other non-federal jurisdiction.

Criminal jurisdiction would be transferred in two stages. The first stage (six months after enactment) includes all D.C. felonies except certain enumerated crimes punishable by 15 years or more imprisonment. The second stage (two years after enactment) includes all remaining D.C. felonies. The federal court would retain jurisdiction to try any D.C. felonies joined in the same indictment with federal felonies. The Superior Court would continue to hold preliminary hearings in federal criminal cases until the second stage of the jurisdictional transfer. When all local jurisdiction is transferred to Superior Court, all federal jurisdiction would revert to the District Court.

Chapter 11 delineates the jurisdiction of the new Family Division. It would retain all the jurisdiction now vested in the Juvenile Court and the Domestic Relations Division of General Sessions. In addition it would have jurisdiction of civil proceedings involving intra-family offenses pursuant to a new chapter to be added to title 16, and of mental commitments (when jurisdiction over those proceedings is transferred to Superior Court).

The Division could be divided into separate branches or could sit as a unified "Family Court". The decision as to which is preferable would be left to the Superior Court.

This chapter contains certain basic provisions on juvenile procedure including new criteria for waiver of a juvenile for criminal trial. It provides that once a waiver decision has been made, the Family Division would lose jurisdiction over the particular child and any delinquent act he has committed or may commit would be tried in adult court. It utilizes terminology which will be defined and used throughout a proposed revision of chapter 23 of title 16, which will be submitted later.

New and detailed provisions for record confidentiality and the vacating of adjudications and sealing of records are included. Specific provisions on confidentiality of law enforcement records relating to juveniles have also been included.

Chapter 13 retains, with necessary modification, the existing provisions relating to the Small Claims and Conciliation Branch.

Chapter 15 contains the provisions for appointment, tenure and removal of judges and some amendments to the judicial retirement provisions.

Judges of the District of Columbia courts would be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to serve during good behavior, subject to mandatory retirement at the age of 70 and to the removal provisions of chapter 15. Upon completion of the terms of the present incumbents, the Chief Judges of the two courts would be designated by the President to serve for four year terms.

Judges of the courts would be subject to removal, involuntary retirement, or suspension upon action of a seven member District of Columbia Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure. The Commission, to be appointed by the President, would consist of two local federal judges, two members of the private bar, and three residents, at least two of whom would not be members of the bar. No officer or employee of the District of Columbia government, Member or employee of Congress, or officer or employee of any of the twelve Executive Departments of the federal government would be eligible to serve on the Commission.

Removal of a judge would be automatic upon final conviction of a felony. Removal, after hearing by the Commission, could be ordered upon a determination of wilful misconduct in office, wilful and persistent failure to perform judicial duties, or other conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice or bringing the judicial office into disrepute. Involuntary retirement, after hearing, could be ordered for permanent mental or physical disability. Suspension would be automatic pending finality of a felony conviction or order of removal or retirement. Discretionary suspension, with pay, would be permitted during pendency of a hearing. Removal or retirement could be appealed to a special three-judge court consisting of local federal judges designated by the Chief Justice of the United States.

The revision of the retirement law involves a basic change in form and several changes in substance. For example, it would permit a widow under the survivor annuity plan. It would permit a college student to qualify as a dependent child. It would permit a judge to count other federal service in his retirement computation.

Chapter 17 is an entirely new chapter relating to court administration and non-judicial personnel. It would establish a Joint Committee on Judicial Administration composed of two appellate and three trial judges which would have supervision of matters relating to the court system as a whole. The Chief Judges would retain supervisory authority in their respective courts.

There would be a single Executive Officer of the court system with responsibility for facilities, procurement, management of court operations and personnel. He would be appointed by the Joint Committee from nominees proposed by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. The Executive Officer would also administer each of the courts, subject to the respective Chief Judges.

The Clerks of the Courts, the new Director of Social Services, and the new Fiscal Officer would be appointed by the Executive Officer with the approval of the Joint Committee. Except for the Register of Wills, all other non-judicial personnel would be appointed by the Executive Officer in accordance with general rules approved by the Joint Committee.

The Director of Social Services would absorb the probation offices of the Juvenile and General Sessions Courts and would be authorized to perform additional services at the direction of the Superior Court.

The Fiscal Officer would handle budget and accounting for the court system. The budget would become independent of the D.C. budget in the same manner that the budget of the Federal judiciary is independent of the executive budget.

Chapter 19 would retain the present single jury system in the District. Statutory changes reflect the new federal law and new selection practices in the District.

Chapter 21 would continue the office of Register of Wills. He would serve the District Court with respect to its jurisdiction. When the Superior Court assumes probate jurisdiction, he would serve that court and be appointed by it. His duties would remain the same as they are under existing law.

Chapter 23 would substitute a Medical Examiner for the old coroner system. The provisions are patterned after the Maryland and Virginia laws and specify purely medical functions in lieu of the quasi-judicial functions of the coroner.

Section 102 of the bill provides for the transfer of property, records and funds to the new Superior Court. Section 103 provides for the transfer of personnel, retaining the classified civil service status of the Juvenile Court personnel who have acquired that status prior to enactment of the bill. Section 104 grants the incumbent D.C. Tax Court judge the right to retain his present retirement benefits or to elect to come under the general retirement system for Superior Court judges.

TITLE II

The second title of the bill consists of amendments to the remaining titles of Part II of the District of Columbia Code—*i.e.* titles 12 through 17. These titles relate to judicial procedure and most of the amendments made by the bill are purely technical. Since

XUM

these titles of the D.C. Code are positive law, references to the "Board of Commissioners" have been changed to "Commissioner" to reflect the reorganization plan. Some changes in substantive law have also been made and are discussed below where appropriate.

For ease in reference, the title and chapter of the D.C. Code which would be amended, rather than the section number of the bill, are highlighted below.

Title 12 amendments are purely technical.

Title 13 would be amended by repealing the requirement that the Federal Rules apply to D.C. Courts (chapter 1). The local courts would be free to adopt either the Federal Rules or their own rules of procedure. The provisions on jury trial (chapter 7) would be repealed as inconsistent with the new federal law and unnecessary in light of proposed chapter 19 of title 11 relating to juries. Other amendments are technical.

Title 14 would be amended by authorizing the Superior Court to take depositions for use in the various States. Presently only the federal court does this. Section 14-104 would be amended to give the local court more flexibility in ordering depositions for its own use.

Section 14-305 would be amended to reverse existing law by guaranteeing that prior convictions reflecting on either honesty or veracity will be admissible to impeach witnesses without ad hoc judicial determination in each case, (see *Luck* v. *United States*, 348 F. 2d 763 (CADC (1965)) but limiting the impeachment to convictions reflecting on honesty or veracity.

The physician-patient privilege (sec. 14-307) would be amended by permitting psychiatric testimony in criminal cases regardless of who raises the insanity defense, and by expressly permitting such testimony in juvenile cases.

The remaining amendments are technical.

Title 15 amendments are purely technical except the express ban on payment of travel allowances to local witnesses (sec. 15-714).

Chapters 3, 5, 6, 15, 19, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 37, and 39 of Title 16 would be amended in technical respects only.

Chapter 7 of title 16 would be amended to reflect the felony jurisdiction of the new Superior Court. Provisions on indictment and waiver of jury trial parallel the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. The right to jury trial as now stated in the D.C. Code would be preserved. However, since the penalty limit on contempt punishment by the D.C. Courts is eliminated in proposed title 11, a specific guarantee of jury trial for contempt punishable by more than six months imprisonment has been included. The U.S. Marshal would be authorized to execute arrest process for misdemeanors as well as felonies.

Chapter 9 of title 16 would be amended to permit the court to appoint independent counsel for a child in custody proceedings. This has been done by judicial decision in Wisconsin and has been recommended here by the D.C. Committee on the Administration of Justice.

A new chapter 10 would be added to title 16 to provide non-criminal disposition of intra-family offenses. The U.S. Attorney would be authorized to refer such matters to the Family Division. On referral, or on request of an individual, the Corporation Counsel would be authorized to petition the Division for a civil protection order—an equitable mandate designed to prevent further offenses and resolve, insofar as possible, family problems relating to the offense. The Division could, ex parte, issue a temporary order pending disposition of the petition. Other family matters before the Division could be consolidated with the petition and other family members brought before the Division.

Chapter 13 of title 16 would be amended in form to differentiate U.S. and D.C. land condemnation but there is no real substantive change other than the jurisdictional transfer, effected in proposed title 11.

Chapter 23 of title 16 amendments are only partially completed. Not even technical changes have been included with respect to subchapter I (juvenile procedures) since a substantial revision of those procedures is underway and will subsequently be recommended to the Congress. The amendments to subchapter II (paternity proceedings) are merely technical. Subchapter III (miscellaneous provisions) would be repealed as unnecessary in light of the consolidation of the Juvenile Court into the Superior Court.

Chapter 25 of title 16 has been rewritten to differentiate federal and local quo warranto proceedings. There is no change in substance beyond the jurisdictional transfer.

No change has been made in other portions of title 16.

Title 17 would be amended to simplify the provisions for appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit and to bring the provisions on the D.C. Court of Appeals into conformity with the 1968 D.C. Administrative Procedure Act. Other amendments are purely technical.

TITLE III

The third title of the bill consists of amendments to Part III of the District of Columbia Code—Decedents' Estates and Fiduciary Relations. Part III is comprised of three titles of the Code, all of which have been enacted into positive law. The amendments to these titles are primarily technical, although some substantive changes have been included. References below are to the title and chapter of the D.C. Code which would be amended.

Title 18 amendments reflect the Superior Court's authority to adopt its own rules of procedure and the transfer of probate jurisdiction.

Title 19 amendments are purely technical.

Title 20 amendments are purely technical.

Chapters 1, 3, 7, 9, 13 and 15 of title 21 would be amended in technical respects only.

Chapter 5 of title 21 (hospitalization of the mentally ill) amendments would provide for the transfer of the Mental Health Commission to the Superior Court at the second stage of jurisdictional transfer. Section 21-512 would be amended to provide for the retention in the hospital of a voluntary patient who requests release, if a proceeding for involuntary commitment is initiated within 48 hours of the request. Section 21-521 would be amended to permit a physician who is not the "family physician" to initiate emergency hospitalization.

Section 21-541 would provide that commitment petitions be filed in the court and referred by the court to the Mental Health Commission. The court would be authorized to issue an attachment for the person subject to the petition if he is not already in custody for examination. Section 21-542 would be amended to establish a seven day limit on examination and hearing of a person in custody.

The sequence of the sections relating to release of committed persons has been changed. Former section 21-548 becomes section 21-546, without change in substance. Former section 21-546 becomes section 21-547. The only change in substance is the deletion of special hearing procedures if one of the doctors examining the patient dissents from the conclusion he should not be released. Section 21-548 is essentially new and provides for motion for release to the committing court after the "administrative remedies" within the hospital have failed to secure release. Habeas corpus would be barred unless other administrative and judicial remedies are inadequate.

The thrust of these amendments is to make the statutory procedure, rather than habeas corpus, the standard avenue for seeking release. Release is seen as the culmination of a single proceeding, which begins with the petition for commitment, and all of which takes place in the same court. Since the release procedures are intended to be as broad as habeas corpus, habeas would be eliminated as a practical matter and the possibility of one trial court upsetting the decision of another would be eliminated for practical purposes. This has not been a problem under present law only because the committing and habeas corpus courts were always the same.

A new section 21-592 has been added providing for the return of escaped patients. The remaining amendments are purely technical.

Chapter 11 of title 21 would be amended in technical respects. The use of the term "mentally retarded" is substituted throughout for the somewhat archaic "feebleminded." Section 21-1114 provides that if a child before the Family Division (juvenile court) is alleged to be retarded, the proceedings shall be adjourned for civil commitment. Consistent with chapter 11 of title 11, waiver proceedings in criminal cases would be excepted from this adjournment requirement. Other amendments to chapter 11 are purely technical.

TITLE IV

The fourth title of the bill amends the criminal law provisions of the District of Columbia code, particularly criminal procedure, to take into account the court reorganization. Some new provisions were required to replace the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure presently governing local felony cases tried in the U.S. District Court and old provisions were revised to bring them up to date. Since this resulted in changes throughout the present title 23 of the Code, the title as a whole would be enacted into positive law.

Section 401 of the bill makes three changes in substantive criminal law.

Item (1) clarifies D.C. Code § 22-104, a 1901 provision for added punishment of persons who repeat the same offense. It defines "same offense" to include any previous crime, wherever committed, which could be prosecuted as the same offense in the District. It ends the "multiplication table" effect of present law (multiplying the maximum penalty one and one-half times each time a person commits the same offense), by making a third or subsequent conviction punishable by three times the maximum for a first offense.

Item (2) is new. It provides for lifetime supervision of repeating felony offenders. The sanction would apply only to persons who have engaged in a third separate course of felonious conduct, undeterred by two terms of probation or imprisonment, and only in the discretion of the sentencing judge.

Item (3) is new. It makes a conspiracy to commit a non-federal offense in the District an offense under the D.C. Code, and not merely a violation of 18 U.S.C. 371. This provision is necessary to permit prosecution of such conspiracies in the Superior Court. It is modeled on the New York provision, rather than federal law, because of the necessity of greater specificity in a statute applicable to a geographically limited area.

Section 402 is the codification of title 23 of the D.C. Code "Criminal Procedure". Most of the present uncodified title is merely repeated without substantial change, and many of the amendments would merely apply provisions of the Federal Rules to cases in the Superior Court.

In Chapter 1, the following provisions would alter prior statutory law:

Section 23-101(d) and (e) provides for joining offenses prosecuted by the United States and the District of Columbia in a single indictment or information, or for trial.

Section 23-103, modeled on Federal Rule 32(a)(1), provides that both defendant and prosecutor shall be allowed to address the court on sentence before it is imposed.

Section 23-104 clarifies the present statute on appeals by the Government. Subsection

XUM

(a) is prior law except for a provision, taken from Federal Rule 41(e), requiring motions to suppress evidence to be made before trial. Subsection (b) implements this requirement by allowing interlocutory Government appeal from the suppression of evidence during trial. Subsection (c) clarifies prior law on the Government's right to appeal from orders dismissing criminal charges. Subsection (d) allows the Government to appeal any other ruling made during a trial which involves a substantial and recurring question of law. The trial court may allow an interlocutory appeal, or the appeal may be taken after trial. This provision also seeks to clarify and to mandate the intent of Congress in present law, D.C. Code § 23–105, to allow Government appeals after acquittal of the defendant.

Section 23–105 adds provisions from the Federal Rules to present §§ 23–107 and 108 on challenges to jurors. It expressly provides for equal numbers of challenges for prosecution and defense, a principle implied in present law.

Section 23–106 substitutes Federal Rule 17(b) for present D.C. Code § 23–109, on defense witnesses, a change only in language.

Section 23–107 clarifies present D.C. Code § 23–110 on procedures for obtaining the testimony of jointly charged defendants either for each other or for the Government.

Section 23–108 changes present D.C. Code §§ 23–111 and 112 on depositions of defense witnesses by allowing the prosecutor to object to a deposition and by eliminating an archaic preference for depositions on written interrogatories.

Section 23–110 is new. Rather than relying on the inherent power of the Superior Court to review convictions, it applies statutory procedures for post-conviction challenges. It follows 28 U.S.C. 2255 with only the necessary technical changes.

Section 23–111 which is new, establishes uniform procedures for determining whether a person convicted of crime is subject to an increased penalty because of his prior convictions (*e.g.*, sections 401 (1) and (2), discussed above; D.C. Code §§ 22–3202, 3214, 33–423). The procedure is similar to that for repeated felony offenders in New York, with a hearing before the court, without jury, on any issue raised by the defendant's written response to an information filed by the prosecutor after conviction and before sentence. Like the New York statute, it specifies that a defendant who does not challenge a prior conviction as invalid before increased penalty is imposed in reliance on that conviction, waives the right to challenge it later. The prosecutor is also given a limited right to appeal from a determination which bars increased punishment, before sentence is imposed.

Chapter 3 makes no significant changes in prior law. All provisions are either present statutes or taken from the Federal Rules, with some minor clarifying changes of language.

Chapter 5 is almost entirely new, but much of it is based on present law.

Subchapter I sets forth definitions.

Subchapter II amends the present D.C. Code provisions on search warrants, §§ 23–301 through 305. Those provisions are excessively detailed in some respects and insufficiently comprehensive in others. Notable features of the new provisions are:

1. Sections 23–521(f) (5) and (6), and 23–522(c), and 524(a) (1), which provide for authorization, in a search warrant, for entry into premises to be searched without notice ("no knock"), and for nighttime searches, on a showing to the issuing magistrate that such authority is needed;

2. Section 23–524(a) (2) and (3), which allows entry without notice either when entry is freely granted or when circumstances unknown when the warrant was obtained render such entry necessary to protect persons or to avoid destruction of the property sought;

3. Section 23–524(e) specifically authorizing an officer to seize items not named in the warrant but found during the search and subject to seizure, without the needless formality of getting a new warrant;

4. Section 23–524(g) authorizing officers searching houses or vehicles to search persons therein to the extent necessary to protect themselves or to find the property identified in the warrant. This provision is a corollary of the power to search incident to an arrest, and does not limit that power where the persons are also subject to arrest.

Subchapter II generally, but particularly in § 23–525, provides for searching officers to retain seized property in safekeeping rather than take it to court, a requirement of present law which is seldom followed.

Subchapter III would afford, for District of Columbia Code offenses, the wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping powers granted to state authorities under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, 18 U.S.C. 2510–2520. The language is taken substantially verbatim from that Act, so that D.C. procedures would conform to the Federal as closely as possible, for both maximum authority and maximum safeguards against unwarranted electronic surveillance.

Subchapter IV codifies the law of arrest warrants, previously governed either by the Federal Rules or by dispersed sections of the D.C. Code.

Sections 23–561 and 23–562 essentially follow Federal Rules 4 and 5 on the form, issuance, contents and execution of arrest warrants and on the use of summonses in lieu of warrants. There are some minor changes reflecting specific practices in the District, for example, the requirement in section 23–561(d) that the prosecutor approve the application for a warrant, except for good cause shown.

Section 23–562(c) (2) is new. It requires that police procedures be performed before bringing an accused to court. This provision, dealing with routine procedures, does not affect the special provisions on interrogation in D.C. Code § 4–140a or 18 U.S.C. 3501, although, like those provisions, it also relates to police functions which do not constitute "unnecessary delay" in the initial appearance of the accused.

Section 23–563 establishes territorial limits for executing a warrant or summons issued by the Superior Court: anywhere in the United States in felony cases (unchanged from the federal-court standard now applicable), and anywhere within 25 miles in misdemeanor cases. It also places a one-year limit on the validity of misdemeanor warrants, and continues the use of federal interdistrict removal, rather than interstate extradition, for persons arrested outside the District of Columbia for crimes committed here. Subsection (d), which is new, provides for the issuance of "adult" warrants for juvenile offenders who flee from the District.

Subchapter V deals with arrests without warrants. Section 23–581 provides for arrest without warrant by a law enforcement officer. Basically it codifies prior law, but it also includes the power of the officer to arrest for misdemeanors committed in his presence, and additional power of fresh pursuit beyond the District for misdemeanors. Section 23–582 provides for arrest without warrant by a licensed special policeman and specific provisions on citizen arrest.

Chapter 7 reorganizes the provisions on extradition and fugitives. Certain substantive changes have been made as noted below.

Sections 23–701 and 23–702(a) reenact D.C. Code § 23–403, relating to warrants for and arrests of fugitives, without substantial change. Section 23–702(b) amends D.C. Code §§ 23–404 and 23–405, relating to bail for fugitives, by including a cross-reference to the Bail Reform Act and by adding a rebuttable presumption that a fugitive, once arrested, will flee again. Subsections (c) through (e) reenact the proceedings now set forth in D.C. Code §§ 23–406 through 23–408. Subsections (f) and (g), which are new, codify existing practice with respect to fugitives who waive extradition and add new filing procedures for extradition papers.

Section 23–703 is also new. It establishes a separate criminal penalty of up to five years' imprisonment and a $5000 fine for fugitives who "jump bond".

Section 23–704 amends present D.C. Code §§ 23–401 and 402. The principal changes are transfer of extradition authority from the Chief Judge of the United States District Court to the Chief Judge of the Superior Court, a provision for an expedited direct appeal of the Chief Judge's order of extradition in place of the present collateral proceeding by writ of habeas corpus, and an express prohibition on the release of an extradited person except on order of court of the State seeking his extradition.

Sections 23–705 and 706 are changed in technical respects only from D.C. Code §§ 23–410 and 411.

Chapter 9, "Fresh Pursuit," is changed from former chapter 5 only in allowing arrests on fresh pursuit into the District for offenses other than felonies, and in technical respects.

Chapter 11, "Professional Bondsmen," is the same as former chapter 6 with only technical changes.

Chapter 13, "D.C. Bail Agency" incorporates in former chapter 9, the amendments previously submitted to the Congress, adding the necessary technical changes.

Chapter 15, "Out-of-State Witnesses" is the same as former chapter 8 except that witness fees and allowances would be equated to those authorized in Federal Courts throughout the country. Other changes are merely technical.

Chapter 17, "Death Penalty" repeats former chapter 7 with necessary technical changes and the addition of the provision formerly classified as D.C. Code § 23–114.

Subsection (b) of section 402 repeals those provisions superseded by the new title 23.

Section 403 of the bill amends D.C. Code § 24–301 relating to insanity. It provides mental examination prior to hearing for juveniles subject to a waiver motion and commitment of juveniles incapable to participating in waiver proceedings. It adds a new subsection (k) to establish a statutory remedy for persons confined to mental hospitals in criminal cases. The statutory release procedure would substitute for habeas corpus except where the statutory remedy is inadequate or ineffective.

Section 404 amends the penalty provision of the D.C. Narcotic Drug Law, D.C. Code § 33–423. The penalties would remain the same, but the provision would specify that prior conviction under Federal or State law could be counted a "first offense" for purposes of invoking the second offense penalty after conviction in the District.

TITLE V

This title of the bill consists of the miscellaneous conforming amendments to the provisions of law found in titles 1 through 10, 22, and 24 through 49 of the District of Columbia Code.

Sections 501 through 531 reflect the changes in court names, the consolidation of courts and the transfers of jurisdiction.

Sections 532 through 536 reflect the jurisdictional transfer of condemnation proceedings, the revision of chapter 13 of title 16 of the Code, and the conforming changes in jury selection.

Sections 537 through 556 reflect the transfer of administrative review of all orders of the Public Service Commission and bring various provisions relating to administrative agencies into conformity with the 1968 D.C. Administrative Procedure Act. That Act superseded in many respects the provisions amended here but conforming amendments were not made at the time. Changes are also included to provide subpoena enforcement by the Superior Court rather than the federal court.

XUM

Sections 557 through 580 contain other conforming amendments such as the deletion or substitution of cross-references to revised title 11 or revisions in titles 12 through 21, and revisions of references to the "coroner" so as to reflect the change to a medical examiner. Certain obsolete provisions, such as references to the old Board of Tax Appeals and its conversion to a Tax Court are repealed.

Of particular note are sections 753 and 574. Present law (D.C. Code § 47–204) requires that the District of Columbia pay 60% of certain expenses of the U.S. District Court. This would be amended to reflect declining percentages as jurisdiction transfers, retaining, however, continuing provision for payment of the local share of jury selection and grand jury expenses. Remaining obligation of the D.C. Government to pay part of the cost of the construction and maintenance of the U.S. Courthouse are cancelled but provision is made for sharing the cost of space used by the United States Attorney and United States Marshal.

TITLE VI

This title contains the effective date provision and separability clause. Section 603 provides for the appointment of three additional judges to the D.C. Court of Appeals and ten additional judges to the Court of General Sessions upon enactment of the bill so that these judges can be serving at the time new jurisdiction is transferred to the local courts. Provision is also made for advance appointment of the Executive Officer of the court system so that he will be in a position to assist in the transition.

Explanation Statement: District of Columbia Public Defender Act of 1969

In his January 31, 1969 message on crime in the District of Columbia, the President called for an expanded office of the public defender to help improve the administration of criminal justice. The President said:

The Legal Aid Agency in the District is a pilot project which has given every indication of great success if properly supported. I believe the time has come to convert this project into a full fledged Public Defender Program. To make this project possible, I will support the Legal Aid Agency's 1970 budget request for $700,000 to allow an increase in its successful project in offender rehabilitation. This would allow it to become a full fledged Public Defender Office with the capacity to represent almost half of the indigent adult and juvenile defendants in the District.

The attached "District of Columbia Public Defender Act of 1969" accomplishes this aspect of the President's program. It expands the Legal Aid Agency and permits it to represent up to 60% of the eligible persons who are before the courts of the District of Columbia. In addition the legislation provides that the public defender shall cooperate in the system for assigning counsel to represent those persons who are not served by the public defender.

SECTION-TO-SECTION ANALYSIS AND COMMENT

Sec. 1—Enactment clauses.

Sec. 2—Name change. The name "District of Columbia Public Defender Service" would be substituted for the present "Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia," because the former more clearly describes the functions of the organization.

Sec. 3—Functions. This section defines the jurisdiction of the Public Defender Service and authorizes it to assist the courts in the District of Columbia in coordinating the assignment of cases to members of the private bar. The section also ensures continuation of a "mixed" defender system, by limiting the public defender to representation of a maximum of 60 per cent of the eligible persons.

Subsection (a) specifies that the Public Defender Service may represent persons in five classes of cases, if these persons are "financially unable to obtain adequate representation." This test of eligibility conforms to the one currently required for appointment of counsel under the Criminal Justice Act. The five classes of cases in which the Agency may furnish representation are as follows:

(1) Criminal cases punishable by at least six months imprisonment. Presently the Legal Aid Agency represents persons if the maximum penalty is imprisonment for at least a year. Moving the threshold back to six months would add relatively few cases but would guarantee public defender services on the same basis as they are now available under the Criminal Justice Act. At the same time, the Service would not be charged with the enormous burden of representing persons charged with such minor infractions as disorderly conduct, since these carry less than 6 months maxima.

(2) Cases in which a violation of probation is charged. Since the *Mempa* v. *Rhay* decision extended the right to counsel to probation revocation proceedings, this proposed expansion of jurisdiction merely keeps pace with recent developments in the criminal law.

(3) Cases in which civil commitment is sought pursuant to Title 21 of the D.C. Code. This provision would allow the Service to represent persons subject to commitment on mental health grounds as well as those already committed who seek release.

(4) Cases in which civil commitment of a narcotic addict is sought. Title III of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act statutorily entitled suspected addicts to the assistance of counsel when civil commitment is sought. Authorizing the Service to provide counsel in such cases would implement the policy of that provision. By the same token, counsel ought to be available to suspected addicts facing civil commitment under the analogous provision of the D.C. Code.

(5) Cases in which juvenile delinquency or "being a juvenile in need of supervision" is alleged. This will allow the Service to represent juveniles charged with law violations as well as those who, though not charged with a criminal act, face the possibility of a penal-type disposition.

The last sentence of subsection (a) defines the Service's role with respect to the private bar: at least 40 per cent of the cases would be handled by the private bar, and the Service would be authorized to provide technical and other assistance (such as investigators) to all appointed private attorneys.

Subsection (b) would establish machinery to coordinate the appointment of private attorneys from the Public Defender Service. This section operates on the premise that the ultimate responsibility for appointment of counsel rests with the courts. At the same time, since the Service is concerned with providing up to 60% of the defense representation, its expertise should be solicited in the design and implementation of the appointment system. The actual plan for appointment of counsel could take a wide variety of forms depending on the availability of resources to administer the system and the desires of the courts and other concerned parties.

Sec. 4—Board of Trustees. The Service would be governed by a seven-member board of trustees, as is the Legal Aid Agency at present. However, the trustees of the Service would elect their successors in lieu of the machinery incorporated in the Legal Aid Agency statute requiring the selection of trustees by the chief judges of the District's several courts and the Commissioner. The system of self-perpetuating trustees is more consistent with the A.B.A. recommendation that public defenders be entirely independent of the judiciary.

Sec. 5—Director and Deputy Director. Two executives would be provided for the Service, in keeping with the present operations of the Legal Aid Agency. The Board of Trustees would select both and each would serve at the pleasure of the board. The trustees would fix the salaries of both executives, up to the GS–18 level. This flexibility will allow the Service to attract and retain the first rate lawyers-administrators who are needed to run an organization which can be expected to employ more than 50 attorneys and additional supporting personnel.

Sec. 6—Staff. This section carries forward the present statutory scheme applicable to the Legal Aid Agency for the employment and compensation of staff. The only significant change is that the Director would be authorized to hire staff personnel without the approval of the Board of Trustees.

Sec. 7—Dual Employment Prohibition. The present prohibition against dual employment is carried forward in this section.

Sec. 8—Annual Reports. The only significant change compared with the Legal Aid Agency Act is that annual reports would be due at the end of the fiscal year instead of at June 1st. The benefit of this change is that statistics and budget figures would reflect the entire fiscal year's work and would conform to statistics prepared by other governmental agencies.

Sec. 9—Appropriations. There are no significant changes from the present provision governing the Legal Aid Agency.

Sec. 10—Continuity of Staff. This section simply provides for the transition from Legal Aid Agency to Public Defender Service.

Sec. 11—Repealer. The provisions of the original Legal Aid Agency Act would be repealed.

District of Columbia Bail Agency Act Amendments

The amendments to the District of Columbia Bail Agency Act are designed to expand, improve and increase the responsibilities of the District of Columbia Bail Agency. These amendments are not complex and probably enjoy unanimous endorsement of all concerned parties. Most of them respond to the findings of the District of Columbia Judicial Council Committee on Bail and the requests of the Agency itself.

The proposed legislation does the following:

1. Authorizes the Agency to recommend whether the defendant should be released.*
2. Directs the Agency to:
   - a. Supervise all persons on non-surety release
   - b. Notify all persons of each required Court appearance
   - c. Serve as coordinator of third party custodians
   - d. Aid in securing employment and other services for defendants
   - e. Inform judicial officers of defendant's failure to comply with conditions
   - f. Prepare Rule 46(h) lists.
3. Removes the $130,000 limitation on appropriations and increases the salary levels for Agency employees to levels commensurate with their new duties.

MRS. D. F. BAIN, NASHVILLE, IS PRESIDENT-ELECT OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

(Mr. FULTON of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure and personal pride that I bring to the attention of my colleagues the news that

---

*The Agency previously was limited to recommending non-financial conditions of release.

XUM

Mrs. D. F. Bain, of Nashville, Tenn., has just been elected president of the National Education Association.

It has been my privilege to know Helen Bain for a number of years and, without doubt, the delegates to last week's NEA Convention at Philadelphia chose wisely and well when they passed the gavel of leadership and responsibility to this dedicated schoolteacher, civic worker, community leader, wife, and mother.

In seeking this very important post, Mrs. Bain campaigned on a platform which stressed increased political activity by teachers at the State and local level and the need for additional Federal assistance to education.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Bain is a woman who considers wisely and then acts. It was my pleasure to watch and assist over recent years as Helen Bain worked to make the long dream of retired teacher apartment complex in Nashville a reality. Beset by a great adversity and at times almost inextricably entangled in bureaucratic redtape she never gave up even when I feared her cause was all but hopeless. Today that apartment complex is completed and occupied. It is a tribute to Mrs. Bain and those who worked so hard with her.

Mrs. Bain has also been long active in Nashville's civic affairs even though her job teaching English at Nashville's Cohn High School and her duties as a mother and wife occupy the majority of her time.

She has been able to undertake and successfuly carryout these demanding tasks because she is an active hard worker. Some wise man once noted that a lazy person has time for nothing but a worker has time for everything. The latter aptly describes Helen Bain.

Mr. Speaker, you will note that earlier I mentioned Mrs. Bain campaigned, in part, on a platform stressing greater political activity on the part of America's teachers. Let this be a warning and a promise to all of my colleagues. Remember the name of Helen Bain. I warn you will hear it often in the coming months. Meanwhile, I promise if you have the good fortune to meet Mrs. Bain, and I hope that each of you will, you will find yourself in the company of one of the loveliest, most charming and ablest of southern ladies.

Mr. Speaker, the Nashville Banner in an editorial entitled "Congratulations, Mrs. Bain," and the Nashville Tennessean in an editorial entitled "Teachers Made a Wise Choice" have commented favorably of Mrs. Bain's election and I insert these two editorials in the RECORD at this point:

CONGRATULATIONS, MRS. BAIN

Nashville notes with interest the honor bestowed on Mrs. Helen Bain in election as president of the National Education Association—her term in that capacity to begin next June.

It is an important assignment, recognizing stature both as a teacher and in professional leadership.

A Nashville native, with degrees from Peabody College and the University of Michigan, her classroom career has centered here where she is an English speech and drama teacher at Cohn High School. Respected by associates locally, her esteem by colleagues nationally speaks for itself.

No phase of the public service is closer to the home constituency, community by community everywhere, than the public school system—the proprietorship of which resides in taxpayer and patron hands; the faculties thereof its servants. When these components work together, in mutual effort and shared responsibility, there is progress. These are cordial ties of a relationship best cultivated by acceptable standards of guidance making for mutual trust.

The Banner congratulates Mrs. Bain on a distinguished achievement. It is an honor to her city, and to the school she has served so long as a faculty member.

TEACHERS MADE A WISE CHOICE

Mrs. Helen Bain, a teacher at Nashville's Cohn High School, has been chosen as president-elect of the National Education Association during the organization's annual convention in Philadelphia.

For the next year, Mrs. Bain will work from a Nashville office, but will travel widely as a representative of the NEA.

When she assumes the NEA presidency next June, she will move temporarily to Washington to act as one of the principal spokesmen for the nation's teachers.

Mrs. Bain has a record of 22 years as a classroom teacher. Although she will take a leave of absence from her English, speech and drama classes at Cohn, Mrs. Bain has made it clear that she will return to teaching when her term is finished.

The NEA made a wise decision in selecting a dedicated teacher, as well as an articulate advocate of quality education, for its highest office. The selection is an honor not only to Mrs. Bain, but also to the school system and community she represents.

VIETNAM AND PEACE

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the United States and South Vietnam have taken initiative after initiative for peace in Vietnam without any matching response from Hanoi. In fact, one of the phenomena of the Vietnam war in recent weeks has been the tendency of some Americans to discount United States and South Vietnamese peace initiatives and to demand additional concessions to North Vietnam and the Liberation Front.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, for Americans to rise in vocal and ardent support of President Nixon's strategy for peace in Vietnam.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, for Members of Congress and all other Americans to ask as with one voice: What is Hanoi doing to bring about peace in Vietnam? Where are Hanoi's initiatives for peace?

President Nixon has worked diligently and carefully toward the goal of peace in Vietnam since assuming office not quite 6 months ago. He has opened the door to a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam war. He has been joined by the Saigon government in stepping through that door. Only Hanoi and the NLF remain outside the door of peace, encouraged—I believe—by those critics in America and elsewhere who support the Communist demand for immediate massive unilateral withdrawal of U.S. forces from South Vietnam.

Let us review what President Nixon has done to advance the cause of peace in Vietnam and then ask ourselves whether these critics are helping to end the war by supporting the enemy's unbending demands.

Prior to January 20, the United States halted the bombing of North Vietnam and agreed to sit down at the conference table with the National Liberation Front as well as the Government of North Vietnam.

We stayed at the peace table and refrained from a resumption of the bombing despite Hanoi's shelling of major South Vietnamese cities and inhumane slaughter of defenseless civilians, its repeated violations of the demilitarized zone, and its refusal to deal with the South Vietnamese Government.

On March 25, President Thieu offered to meet with the NLF for private talks without preconditions on a political settlement.

On May 14, with Thieu's support, President Nixon put forward an eight-point plan for peace in South Vietnam. The President ruled out a military solution, offered withdrawal of U.S. and allied forces within 12 months under international guarantees, and emphasized that our only objective was to secure the right of the South Vietnamese people to determine their own future without outside interference.

On June 8, President Nixon announced the withdrawal of 25,000 U.S. combat troops and said decisions would be made later on additional troop withdrawals.

At Midway, both Thieu and President Nixon declared their willingness to accept any political result arrived at through free elections in South Vietnam.

Thieu has now outlined plans for the holding of free elections under terms which offer the NLF representation on a national election planning committee and places on the ballot. The only condition is that the NLF end its war against the Saigon government and renounce the use of violence.

Mr. Speaker, every American who believes that aggression should not be rewarded and that peaceful solution should be pursued in international disputes should support attempts to arrange for fair and impartial elections in South Vietnam.

I believe President Thieu is to be commended for advancing his elections plan and that the American people should rally behind the strategy for peace being followed by President Nixon.

It is time the American people and free peoples throughout the world demand to know when Hanoi is going to act to further a peaceful settlement in Vietnam.

Both President Nixon and President Thieu have made meaningful moves on behalf of peace in Vietnam. The burden now is on Hanoi, and we should let the world know it.

AMENDING SECTION 235 OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

(Mr. ASHLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend section 235 of the National Housing Act to provide more flexible mortgage limits in order to encourage the development of homeownership in high-cost areas for lower-income families.

All Federal housing assistance programs impose maximum limits on total dwelling development costs to insure that only modestly priced housing is built under these programs. These maximum limits vary according to program—public housing, 221(d) (3), 236, and 235—and from area to area. Each program recognizes that higher development cost limits must be allowed in high-cost areas where land and labor costs are higher.

Generally speaking, the allowances for high-cost areas provided by statute for public housing and FHA multifamily programs, such as 221(d) (3) and 236, are realistic and adequate. This is not the case for the new 235 homeownership program. As a result there are strong indications that the 235 program will not prove to be economically feasible in many high-cost metropolitan areas—such as New York City, Chicago, or Washington, D.C.—which have some of the most severe housing problems in the Nation.

Secretary Romney of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, in testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee's Subcommittee on Housing on June 12, 1969, acknowledged that the limitations in section 235 have, in fact, hampered efforts at construction of low-cost housing in high-cost metropolitan areas:

> The statutory mortage limits (expressed in terms of maximum dollars per unit) for the Section 235 homeownership program have made it difficult to achieve new construction in many of the larger metropolitan areas . . . especially in the Northeast. It is entirely possible that the high-cost area adjustments for this program may prove to be inadequate in practice.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The Department is concerned that . . . *fixed dollar limits both fail to recognize geographic cost variations and lag behind rising construction* (emphasis added).

The basic statutory development cost limit—technically it is the limit on the amount of the mortage—under the section 235 program is $15,000. The limit can be increased to $17,500 for high-cost areas.

The inadequacy of this statutory scheme to meet the requirements of rapidly escalating construction costs in major high-cost areas is well documented. In Claremont, Calif., where the National Association of Home Builders has been conducting an experimental cost study, the cost of constructing a low-cost, single-family structure has increased 31.5 percent from January 1968 to April 1969. The major items which contributed to the cost increase were lumber, up 200 percent; cement driveway, up 67 percent; roof wood, up 53 percent; doors, up 43 percent; frames and jambs, up 40 percent; and electrical, up 39 percent. In absolute dollar figures the cost of constructing a low-cost, single-family structure rose from $13,586 to $17,859 during this period. Thus a builder would lose $359 if he constructed a section 235 house in Claremont today—assuming that there were no cost increases in the interim.

Nationally, rising costs have caused a sharp decrease in the number of low-cost housing starts in recent years. In 1965, 54 percent of all new starts were for houses costing less than $20,000. By 1968, this figure had dropped to 26 percent and the estimate for 1969 is 27 percent. Further, the decline in housing starts for housing costing less than $15,000 is even more dramatic. In 1965, such housing represented 16 percent of all starts, but the estimate for 1969 is only 5.2 percent.

At the end of 1968, census data revealed that only 11 percent of new houses sold in the West and the Northeast were priced at under $17,500—the cost limit under section 235—and in north-central United States only 8 percent. The problem is particularly acute near the center of major metropolitan areas where high land and labor costs make building under the statutory maximum cost limits in section 235 unfeasible. A FHA survey early this year in the Washington, D.C., area uncovered no new single-family houses on the market with sales prices under $17,500. Thus in the very areas in which this program is most needed, the housing industry is least able to meet the challenge.

The above facts document the need for prompt action to maintain the integrity of the section 235 program in high cost metropolitan areas. The section 221(d) (3) and 236 programs permit development costs of up to 45 percent higher than their basic cost limits in high cost areas. The proposed amendment, which adopts the language of sections 221(d)(3) and 236, would apply the 45-percent formula for high cost areas that is used under these two sections to the 235 program.

Such an amendment to section 235 at this time is crucial, for there is every reason to believe that costs will continue to rise. Lumber products have undergone an unprecedented price rise in the last 2 years, prompting congressional hearings and administrative action. Land and labor costs have been consistently going up and, of course, we are all aware of the unprecedented increases in financing charges.

Recent statistics from the Department of Housing and Urban Development indicate that the statutory maximums have limited activity under the section 235 program in New York and in other comparable high cost areas throughout the United States. William B. Ross, Acting Assistant Secretary-Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration, noted:

> In New York City there has been absolutely no activity under the Section 235 program. . . . Our experience in other major cities is very similar. Assistance has been requested for only 181 units in Chicago; 250 units in Detroit; 73 units in Los Angeles and there have been no requests for assistance in the cities of San Francisco and Boston.
>
> When we consider the activity this program has engendered throughout the nation and the backlog of requests for assistance amounting to over 60,000 units which we have not been able to fund, we can better judge the impact of the cost limits in the high cost areas.

Mr. Speaker, this increase in the statutory cost limitations in high cost areas in the section 235 homeownership program has been endorsed by several major groups. These include the National Housing Conference, the National Association of Home Builders, and the Council of Housing Producers. Also before the Banking and Currency Committee's Subcommittee on Housing on June 12, 1969, Mr. Richard M. Wasserman, testifying on behalf of the Urban Coalition Action Council, stated:

> The construction cost limits for both FHA moderate-income and public housing programs should be amended to keep abreast of rising construction costs. . . . For example, the maximum mortgage limit (which is in effect the cost limit) for the 235 program is $17,500, for most units in high-cost areas. Given the rapid inflation in land prices, interest discounts, and construction costs, this limit is already obsolete in high rent building areas throughout the nation. . . .
>
> *Because of the continual rise in constructions costs, Congress should legislate a statutory construction cost ceiling sufficient to allow wide administrative flexibility under it to cover a variety of cost conditions in different areas of the country. And Congress should provide a regular statutory procedure for updating the construction cost ceiling.* (Emphasis in the original.)

Mr. Speaker, I cannot stress too strongly the importance of enactment of this measure if we are to continue our commitment to building low-cost housing in the high-cost areas. If this amendment is passed, builders concerned about meeting cost limits will be just as likely to build sales units as they would rental units in most of our metropolitan areas. The end result will be to fully effectuate the purpose of the 235 program, which is now in serious trouble in those metropolitan areas of the country.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS SHOULD MAKE THEIR FEDERAL INCOME TAX RETURNS PUBLIC

(Mr. WALDIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation requiring candidates for and Members of Congress to file their Federal income tax returns yearly for public examination.

There has been an increasing erosion of public confidence in the ethics of the elected officials of this Nation.

Disclosure of all income sources will do much, in my opinion, to restore that confidence.

I have voluntarily filed my Federal income tax return heretofore with the House Ethics Committee, and it is available for public inspection.

APOLLO 11

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I read today in the Washington Post for the first time that my name will appear among the names of those imprinted on a silicone disc to be left upon the moon by our Apollo 11 astronauts. As a freshman member of the Science and Astronautics Committee having jurisdiction over the space program, it should be readily apparent that I had nothing to do with the development of Apollo 11 or in any

XUM

way contributed to the historic moonshot. While I am deeply honored, had I been asked I would have declined the honor as being undeserved.

The sands of the moon, if sands they be, will ultimately cover that silicon disc. What will be remembered for ages to come are the extraordinary feats of the astronauts who are making this flight and those who preceded them. With all of my fellow citizens I look forward to the launching of Apollo 11 and pray for the safe return of our astronauts.

AMERICANS SHOULD FLY OLD GLORY DURING APOLLO 11 MISSION

(Mr. CLARK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution in the House this week asking the American people to pay tribute to the Apollo 11 mission by displaying the flag of the United States from Wednesday, July 16, 1969, until the close of the day on which the mission returns to earth.

What is occurring is clearly a landmark event in human history. But more than that, it is an unparalleled tribute to the ability of this free society to get things done. Francis Scott Key saw the waving Stars and Stripes through the smoke and flying cannonballs of the War of 1812, and I just think it might be a source of inspiration and pride to our three Astronauts to know, as they hurtle through space and look back through clouds and other flying satellites, that their flag is still there.

If each American would raise his flag in tribute to these courageous men, and then say a quiet prayer for their successful return, then their final splashdown can be a moment of new glory for Old Glory.

CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT SPEAKS OUT ON TAX REFORM

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, last Friday morning, it was my privilege to appear before the Senate Finance Committee in consideration of H.R. 12290 and related tax reform proposals.

Immediately after my presentation and interrogation by several members of the committee I was followed by the Honorable BOB ECKHARDT, Representative from the Eighth District of Texas, who very carefully outlined the case against the special treatment of oil and gas pipelines which was initiated before the House Ways and Means Committee in the closing hours of its deliberations by the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the Honorable GEORGE BUSH.

Mr. ECKHARDT in his analysis of the evils of this section discussed in careful and documented detail the precise way in which this industry was given special tax treatment to the detriment of the taxpayers of America.

I commend careful reading of this statement before further action is taken on this legislation in conference. The splendid statement by Mr. ECKHARDT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN BOB ECKHARDT

SUMMARY

A. Outline of statement

I. Opposition to the surtax on general grounds:

(a) Review of past opposition: offsetting of the effects of the surtax by rising war expenditures—fear of more of the same

(b) In full agreement with the Senate as to need for tax reform

II. Opposition to the surtax respecting exemption:

(a) Explanation of the loophole in the House-passed bill that allows the gas pipeline industry an unnecessary and unjust exemption from the April 18 deadline for repeal of the 7% investment tax credit

(b) Because the government allows this industry a guaranteed rate of profit, investment tax credit not warranted in the first place

III. Need for responsible, effective alternatives:

(a) Extension of the withholding rates without an extension of the actual tax

(b) Tax reform

(c) Excess profits tax

(d) Taxation of "excess interest"

B. Specific recommendations

I. Continue the higher withholding rates. The economic restraining effects not lessened and the pressure for tax reform continues unabated. Should the economy turn downward, Congress could lower withholding rates to their normal level and permit refunds; otherwise, institute the surtax retroactively.

II. Reinstate an excess profits tax. This would shift the burden from the poor and middle income groups to those benefiting most from the conflict in Southeast Asia.

III. Institute "excess interest" tax analogous to excess profits tax. Revenues generated by this tax could be used to subsidize home mortgages and municipal bond markets.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I appreciate this opportunity to come before you on perhaps the most pressing and urgent problem facing our Nation today. No one can argue with the fact that we are in the midst of rampant inflation and that we are experiencing some of the tightest money conditions in United States' history. The appropriate question that we should be considering is not whether economic restraint is needed—no responsible legislator or competent economist could doubt that fact—but rather, what form this economic restraint should take.

I voted against the 10% surtax extension, just as I voted against its original adoption last year. I shall state briefly why I oppose this particular form of economic restraint, the defects that appear in the House-passed bill, and my recommendations for responsible and effective alternatives to the surtax.

I

I opposed the imposition of this tax in 1968 because I did not feel that it would succeed in halting inflation. This is not to say that I have no faith in what is popularly referred to as the "new" economics; on the contrary I believe very strongly in the efficacy of fiscal and monetary policy. But these policies can only succeed if they are not subjected to other government operations whose economic effects are in the direct opposite direction. I am referring, of course, to the expansionary and inflationary effects of the continued high spending on the war in Vietnam. This is how I made my case against the surtax last year and I see little reason to expect the situation to be any different this year. If our people are taxed—in the guise of fiscal constraint—when any meaningful disinflationary effects are negated by war expenditures, the effect is only to add the tax burden to the burdens of high interest and high prices.

Also, I wish to add my voice to the many urging that we not continue the surtax without adding meaningful tax reform. The surcharge is a tax on a tax, and, if one manages to avoid paying *any* taxes, he automatically escapes the surcharge. How can we, with a straight face, tell income earners and honest sharers of the tax burden that they must bear the burdens of fiscal restraint when many people with largely exempt incomes, capable of making many extravagant purchases, are not forced to curb their spending or fairly share the burden? I am heartened by the sentiment in the Senate for closing the many nefarious tax loopholes before final approval is given for extension of the surtax.

II

Now, I would like to point out to the members of the Committee a very serious inequity in the House bill that passed on June 30.

As you know, one very important provision of the bill was the repeal of the 7% investment tax credit. Let me first say that I am very much in favor of this action for it has been effectively demonstrated that the investment credit is the primary contributor to the inflationary expansion of investment demand.

The bill sets the repeal date as of April 18, 1969 but quite correctly makes provision for construction begun, and binding contracts in effect, on or before that date. The general rule is that pre-termination property, i.e., property eligible to receive the investment tax credit, includes "any property . . . (that) is constructed, reconstructed, erected, or acquired pursuant to a contract which was, on April 18, 1969, and at all times thereafter, binding on the taxpayer." If such facts do not prevail, action taken after April 18 does not accrue an investment credit.

But among the exceptions is this one:

"Where, in order to perform a binding contract . . . in effect on April 18, 1969, (i) the taxpayer is required to . . . acquire property specified in any order of a federal regulatory agency for which application was filed before April 19, 1969, (ii) the property is to be used to transport one or more products under such contract . . . and (iii) one or more parties to the contract . . . are required to take or to provide more than 50% of the products to be transported over a substantial portion of the expected useful life of the property, then such property shall be pre-termination property."

This is the section (Section 4a) of the bill that I have strong objection to.

The report accompanying H.R. 12290 explains this seemingly harmless exception to the general rule defining pre-termination property.

"An example of the type of case covered by this provision would be a situation where a company has entered into a binding contract to transport fuel through a pipeline for another party who will provide more than 50 percent of the fuel to be transported over a substantial portion of the estimated useful life of the pipeline. The provision would be applicable in this case, however, only if the company had filed prior to April 19, 1969, its application with the Federal regulatory agency for an order permitting it to contruct the pipeline."

In sum, this provision is presented as one justly extending the deadline for those companies entering into contracts for which necessary Federal agency certification is not received by April 18. The major beneficiary of this exemption would be the gas pipeline industry. One of their chief supporters in the House, a Texas colleague, stated: ". . . they should not be denied the benefit of the credit because some Federal agency is sitting aside and refusing to act."

This is a dangerous, unnecessary and in-

XUM

equitable provision, and explanation of it on the floor of the House was misleading.

The implication in floor debate was that a contract for purchase of capital goods which is binding as between seller and purchaser contingent only upon FPC approval constituted the exception that would qualify.

Thus, Mr. Bush, with whom the amendment originated in the committee, in answer to my question, said:

"The contract spells out the equipment required and if these people have a bona fide contract, they should not be denied the benefit of the credit."

Mr. Boggs, who carried the bill on the floor, equated the provision to the ordinary contract for purchase of capital goods in the following language:

"The contract has been entered into and qualifies as a binding contract. If you were to build a plant . . . and no equipment has been installed, but they have simply entered into a contract, a binding contract, prior to April 19, that equipment is eligible for the full 7 percent."

I had previously been told by an Under Secretary of the Treasury that such was all that the amendment did. In candor, Mr. Boggs did at another point explain the amendment accurately. I do not attribute to anyone an intention to mislead, but the matter is technical and complex and needs clarification, both as to its provisions and its justification.

In fact, the contracts in question are not contracts to acquire property but are rather contracts *to supply gas*. These contracts are not binding without a certificate of approval from the Federal Power Commission, and it is in these certificates that the only requirement of designation of the capital goods to be acquired is made. In order for a gas pipeline company to obtain approval for an extension of service it must file an application with the Federal Power Commission within which it must include, among other things, an analysis of the equipment needed to fulfill the contract. This includes a detailed estimate of total capital cost of the proposed facilities for which application is made.

But, unlike the case of other pre-termination contracts, the contracts here are *not* binding without the certificate of approval; and hence the companies involved are not likely to be injured by the withdrawal of the investment tax credit. The FPC will allow a gas pipeline company to withdraw its application for an extension of service if the company can show just cause. Just cause might well include a reduction in the profitability of the contract. Presumably a loss of the investment tax credit would indicate lower profits.

This is a means of escape from a contract which would not be as profitable as anticipated. But there is another even surer safeguard against an improvident contract (in anticipation of investment credit) which might actually result in a loss.

As a public utility, the gas pipeline industry has its rates regulated by the government, and these rates are set so as to give the company a reasonable rate of profit on its investment. If the rate of profit is set, the company cannot possibly be stuck with an unprofitable venture. True, it may not generate an investment credit, which is "cream" on top of profit, but it may be presumed that the utility would have expanded its market for the sake of profit alone. It did not act to its detriment envisioning, improvidently, an investment credit.

Obviously there is, and was, plenty of inducement to improve an increase plant for gas pipelines *without* any investment tax credit. Even before the 7% investment tax credit provision was enacted, net gas utility plant for the entire Nation had grown from about $6 billion to about $8 billion from 1957 through 1961. After the enactment of the investment tax credit, through the next six years, net gas utility plant grew at about the same amount, from about $8 billion to about $10 billion. It is apparent from these figures that the investment tax credit was not needed to encourage investment in plant and it apparently did not affect such investment.

Actually, the gas pipeline industry has grown at a rate at least comparable to the other utilities which received only 3% investment tax credit. There is no apparent reason why the pipelines were favored, but in the Revenue Act of 1964 Congress favored them again by eliminating any authority on the part of the Federal Power Commission to use the investment tax credit without the consent of the company involved in determining its cost of service. The tax savings from the investment tax credit could thus be used by the companies for reinvestment or dividends without regard to their rate of return.

From 1962 through 1967 the interstate natural gas pipeline companies generated $296,124,000 in investment tax credits. Of this amount, they utilized and retained $247,106,000. (*Statistics of Interstate Natural Gas Pipeline Companies, 1967*, Federal Power Commission, p. ix.)

Now the gas transmission companies are again asking for special treatment, as if they needed special relief. Are they weak? Are they an industry with a declining growth pattern? Quite on the contrary, the industry has grown by one third in the last five years. In 1962, natural gas utility sales were 100.81 billion therms and in 1967 they were 133.42 billion therms. (See 1968 "Gas Facts" of American Gas Association.)

It is just not possible to put an exact dollar value on this special provision in the surtax and investment credit bill as to how much it benefits gas pipelines. But it clearly would defer the cutoff date for withdrawing the investment tax credit. As I have pointed out, they never needed it or deserved it in the first place; and, at more than twice the figure granted other utilities, it was nothing but a windfall for the stockholders—not the consumers.

The windfall was at an average of about $50 million a year. Typically, in past years, the highest number of rate applications by the gas pipelines have been in the winter months. In the winter of 1967 and 1968 approximately as many permits were filed as during the entire remainder of the year. This was not exactly the situation in the FPC fiscal year 1968–69. In that year over 70% of the applications had been filed by January 1.

I am frank to say, I cannot tell the significance of the timing of the applications other than to say an adroit timing of applications well in advance of actual equipment purchases could keep the 7% investment credit going for a considerable time. If this extended time be 6 months, the special treatment in this law is worth $25 million in investment credits generated to the gas pipelines.

I served for a good number of years in a legislative body which was very sympathetic with gas pipeline companies, and I have had the experience of their long arm reaching right into a conference committee of the Texas Legislature to render a tax unconstitutional. I thought I had escaped this tampering when I came to Congress, but I underestimated their reach.

III

Because I do not believe the surtax to be a fair way to halt inflation, or even a feasible way if present spending patterns continue, and also because the bill contains several questionable clauses, I voted against it in the House on June 30. But it would be quite irresponsible to oppose the surtax and leave it at that. As I said at the opening of this statement, we are facing an inflationary spiral affecting prices, wages, and interest rates. Some viable alternative to the 10% surcharge must be suggested.

The Senate and House have voted to continue the withholding rates, as if the surtax were still in effect, as a temporary fiscal measure. This in itself is a logical and practical alternative to the President's fiscal package. It would preserve and continue the economic restraining effects of the surcharge while allowing time for further consideration of its need.

We should simply continue such withholding while we hammer out tax reform.

The benefits of following this course are several:

1. We would be able to avoid legislating on such an important matter under the pressure of a deadline.

2. Many economists are convinced that we will be in the throes of a dangerous economic slowdown in the first quarter of 1970. If the Congress took no action other than to extend the withholding rate, the economy would be rejuvenated by a great influx of spending money to the public at the time of its greatest need, i.e., at tax refund time. If inflation is controlled or reversed, Congress would simply pass legislation lowering the withholding rate to its normal level.

3. The Congress, without engaging in a blind guess, would then be able to decide if the surtax was or was not needed. Congress is pretty good at "hindsight," and it could apply it then. If the inflation continued unabated the surtax could be enacted retroactively while none of the necessary economic effects would be lost in the interim. Retroactivity would not hurt the normal taxpayer because he would have paid his taxes by the previous withholding.

4. Tax reform minded Representatives would have the leverage that they have so long sought in this area. We would be able to put the heat on the President to push for tax reforms without risking the dangers of too early relaxation of fiscal restraint.

5. Also, Congress would retain a real budget control. We could be satisfied that the cuts that are made by the administration forces are not made in the programs most vital to cities and to the poor. Likewise, that some reductions are made in areas of extravagance like some military boondoggles. With the surtax question impending *after* the budget cuts, Congress would have potent bargaining strength.

As another alternative, either independent of or in combination with the extension of the withholding rates, I would propose the institution of an excess profits tax. This worked successfully during the second World War and during the Korean War. It is unfair for most to suffer increased war-time burdens while others enjoy increased wartime profits. I fully concur with the efforts of Senator McGovern in this area.

One of the more serious manifestations of the inflation we are experiencing are the extremely high interest rates. I fully comprehend the meaning of the market and how unwise it is to tamper with the market mechanism. There can be no doubt that the high money rates are a manifestation of market pressures and cannot be condemned sweepingly as an explicit effort by the banking industry to raise its profits. I would not support legislating a ceiling on interest rates—I feel that that would only serve to disrupt what is an orderly, but very tight market.

What I would propose is that the Congress pass a tax on excess interest rates, as on excess profits. Such would drain off the excess income engendered by the tight money market, just as excess profits from the inflationary war stimulus is drained off by an excess profits tax.

I am not criticizing the banks for the recent increases in the prime interest rates. They are simply reacting to the huge loan pressure and the constricted supply of

XUM

money. I am willing to accept the fact that the huge growth in bank earnings—largely due to the higher rates charged on loans—is incidental. But, just as I feel that it is unfair for corporations to earn extraordinary profits from the war, I feel that it is unfair for the banks to retain a fortuitous, incidental benefit from inflation. Unlike other industries, the costs of doing banking business during inflation does not rise as rapidly, or more rapidly, than revenues. As the price they charge for money goes up, so must their profits. Recent bank statements of earnings confirm this. Note the following table showing net operating earnings of seven great New York banks in the second quarter of 1969 as compared to the second quarter of 1968. The increases are largely due to an advance in prime interest rate from 6–6½% in 1968 to 7–7½% in 1969, and, of course, accompanying increases in all interest rates. On June 9, 1969, the prime rate has further increased to 8½% which will undoubtedly be reflected in even greater earnings in the third quarter.

Bank	Net earnings		Percent increase in earnings
	1968 (6–6½ percent)[1]	1969 (7–7½ percent)[1]	
Manufacturers Hanover Corp.	17.5	21.0	20.3
Charter New York	13.0	14.5	11.6
J. P. Morgan & Co.	18.4	20.5	11.4
Chemical New York	32.8	36.5	11.2
Chase Manhattan	58.1	63.8	11.2
First National City	62.4	66.1	5.9
Bankers Trust	27.0	27.5	1.8

[1] Prime interest rate.

Source: New York Times, July 7 and 9, 1969.

If, as the banks say, they must raise their interest rates in order to ration their loanable funds, there would be no hindrance. An additional benefit could be gained by using the revenues generated by this excess interest tax to subsidize home mortgages and interest on municipal and state bonds.

Perhaps an example of how this tax would work would help to clarify my proposal. In order to allow for normal growth in the demand for money and to make sure that this tax would only be effective in times of very high interest rates, let us take as our base the 8% prime interest rate. Then any loan for more than $10,000 at a rate of over 8% would be subject to the tax.

Using this as the base for our interest tax, a possible levy could be 1.0% for every 0.1% increase in the rate of interest over 8%. Thus, a 10,000 loan at the current 8½% prime interest rate would bring in $850.00 per annum in interest which would be taxed $42.50 (5% of $850.00). The bank would earn $807.50, just a little more than it would have earned at the lower 8% rate. The following table demonstrates how this tax would work over a range of interest rates (assuming a loan of $10,000):

Interest rate (percent)	Total interest payment	Rate of tax (percent)	Bank earnings	Tax
8	$800	0	$800.00	0
8½	850	5.0	807.50	$42.50
9	900	10.0	810.00	90.00
9½	950	15.0	807.50	142.50
10	1,000	20.0	800.00	200.00
10½	1,050	25.0	787.50	262.50

As you see, the interest earnings cease to grow after a certain point while government revenues from the tax rise rapidly. There would be no profit incentive for the banks to raise their rates although there would be nothing to prevent them from doing so if the pressures of the market made such raises expedient. Meanwhile, the revenues raised by the tax could be reserved for home mortgage subsidies and interest subsidies for states and municipalities on their bond issues.

We cannot in good conscience abandon the fight against inflation. This does not mean, however, that the Congress must passively accept whatever proposals the administration brings forth in the battle. I strongly believe that a combination of extended withholding rates, an excess profits tax, and an excess interest tax could most effectively curb inflation and high interest rates and, at the same time, pass the burden over from the least able to pay to the most able.

IF HANOI DOES NOT COOPERATE IN THE PEACE NEGOTIATIONS WE SHOULD SERIOUSLY CONSIDER RESUMING THE BOMBING

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished minority leader (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), has quite properly given us the record of many efforts being made by President Nixon to bring the war in Vietnam to a quick and honorable end and to bring our boys back. Certainly the President has been most generous in his offers for peace, and so has President Thieu, as well as the people of South Vietnam. I believe the recitation of facts as presented by the distinguished minority leader ought to be presented to this House, but I believe the House ought to also see the answer of the North Vietnamese.

In Paris today Mrs. Binh, the principal spokesman for the Communist negotiators, reached the height of arrogance in rejecting the proposal by President Thieu, when she said:

> Nixon has no other choice. He is choking and has to give way. We are capable of continuing the struggle as long as necessary—5, 10, or 20 years if need be.

Ho Chi Minh not too long ago said that Americans do not like a long war, and he is going to make this a long war, and win it.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is great merit in the proposal being circulated in Saigon today that if indeed the Communists do not start negotiating in good faith pretty soon, we ought to seriously consider terminating those negotiations. We have lost 16,000 American boys since the peace talks began, and if the present casualty rate continues it will not be long before more American boys will be killed on the field of battle since the peace talks began than our total casualties from 1961 until the bombing halt.

I believe there is merit to the proposal being circulated in some military quarters that we could withdraw 200,000 American troops from combat in Vietnam and not have to replace them if indeed we resumed the bombing in North Vietnam.

I believe such a move would placate American discontent with the war and still serve notice on Hanoi that the American withdrawal of troops does not mean a victory for the Communists. It would mean that if the Communists refuse to cooperate in the peace talks, they are in for a long bombing seige from American bombers even after American combat troops have been withdrawn from Vietnam.

May I remind this House that South Vietnam's President Thieu stated recently his South Vietnamese army can continue the battle against the Communists if we leave them our Air Force for support. South Vietnam has an excellent army of 1 million soldiers to protect their homeland. By resuming the bombing, we would force Hanoi to withdraw some 400,000 Communist troops back to North Vietnam. These troops were released for duty in South Vietnam when we ended the bombing.

One has a right to ask: "Why should the Communists negotiate when there is no pressure on them to do so?"

Ho Chi Minh can say he will make this a long war because there is no pressure on him. He has nothing to lose. There is no bombing of North Vietnam. It is our American boys who are being slaughtered. We are the ones who are going to have to send 545,000 replacements to Vietnam this year.

We talk about troop withdrawal and we give a big hoorah about the fact that 25,000 American boys are returned, but we totally obscure the fact that we have sent into battle in South Vietnam this year 545,000 replacements. It is no consolation to the mothers and to the parents and to the boys themselves who are leaving for Vietnam.

So it seems to me the right thing for this administration and this President to do is to serve notice on the Communists that there must be a cease-fire in Vietnam by August 1.

If there is no meaningful cease-fire and if the slaughter does not end by August 1, we should seriously consider resuming the bombing.

President Nixon said in his message that if this needless suffering continues, he will have to reappraise America's position.

I think Mr. Nixon has been most generous in his efforts to find some way of resolving this conflict. Yet, every single one of his efforts has been met with the height of arrogance on the part of the Communists.

The **SPEAKER.** The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

PITY THE PASSENGER

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the uncertain prospects for the future of Connecticut's rail passenger service have created apprehension among many citizens in the State.

On February 5, 1969, approximately 1 month after the Penn Central Railroad assumed control of the New Haven Railroad's operations, I wrote the vice president in charge of Penn Central's New England operations and requested detailed information about the corporation's plans for future service in the State of Connecticut. A major factor motivating my concern and hence my query was the despair, bitterness, and anxiety expressed by my constituents regarding the future of passenger rail service in Connecticut. Underlying this mood was the fear that the railroad, in the interest of high profits, would inexorably reduce to the barest minimum its rail passenger obligations. Under the label or guise of "restructuring," it was alleged, the Penn Central would raise fares, cut back passenger runs, and scrimp on maintenance of passenger facilities. In the end, the Penn Central would free itself of the burden of shouldering the New Haven's passenger service.

I am sorry to say that at this point in time, protestations by corporate management to the contrary, the scenario envisioned by the intimidated railroad commuter is being fulfilled. Discontinuances have been carried out for a substantial percentage of the passenger service which formerly operated between Boston and New York. The purported panacea of turbotrain service—put forward as partial justification for the discontinuances—has offered no real improvement in the service into New York City. One turbotrain per day—and especially one that operates with fitful regularity and at unimpressive speeds—is scarcely an adequate vehicle to measure potential consumer demand for modernized rail passenger service in the northeast corridor.

As for rates, the Penn Central has filed fare revision proposals now with the Interstate Commerce Commission, the New York Public Service Commission, and the Connecticut Public Utilities Commission. This package of fare revisions will affect all Connecticut and New York patrons utilizing the facilities of the former New Haven Railroad to reach New York City. Under the railroad's proposal, 30-day commutation tickets would be only slightly reduced, while the price of 10-trip tickets would be nearly doubled and the single round-trip ticket to New York City would be hiked by approximately 10 percent. These proposals come only a short period after the elimination of the popular 2-day return trip ticket between Connecticut stations and New York City.

The Trumbull Times of Trumbull, Conn., notes that these most recent fare revision proposals offer an insignificant sop to the "well-organized and highly vocal" daily railroad commuter group. However, this very marginal reduction in the 30-day commutation fares is to be accompanied or paid for by stiff increases in the fares which the less well organized and, as the Trumbull Times puts it, "hard working, lower income citizens" must pay to use the railroad for anything less than daily commutation trips into New York City.

This aspect of the latest fare revision, so ably presented by the Times editorial, is but another unhappy development in the declining fortunes of rail passenger service under the auspices of the Penn Central Railroad. The article from the Trumbull Times follows:

Soaking the Poor

> The Penn Central, the richly endowed successor to the much maligned New Haven Railroad, is demonstrating its mastery in the field of public relations. It has proposed to the regulatory commissions a reduction in monthly commutation tickets in exchange for permission to raise the price of single ride fares. This will have the overall effect of increasing railroad revenue by at least three per cent.
>
> By this strategy, Penn Central hopes to eliminate opposition to its proposal from the well organized and highly vocal commuters. The railroad is hoping that the single ride patrons lack the political muscle to make their opposition felt.
>
> Penn Central has fared magnificentally, no pun intended, at the expense of their single fare patrons. One of its first steps on Feb. 1, shortly after taking over the railroad, was the elimination of the two-day excursion ticket that offered a round trip from Bridgeport to New York for $3.51. These gave the occasional rider no alternative but two single fare tickets at $2.96 each, totaling $5.92 or a 69 per cent increase.
>
> Now, less than six months later, the Penn Central is asking for an additional 10 per cent increase so that a round trip ticket to New York would cost $6.50, more than two and a half times the commuter price.
>
> It is essential that the Connecticut Public Utilities Commission and the Interstate Commerce Commission understand exactly what sector of the public is affected by the Penn Central proposal. Visit the railroad station over the weekend and see some of our hard working, lower income citizens paying the increased fares because they still want to visit relatives in the Bronx or Harlem or see some of our financially-pinched college students home for the weekend or see the budget minded father paying the higher tariff because he promised his children an outing in New York.
>
> To add insult to injury, the Penn Central with all its affluence has done absolutely nothing to improve washroom facilities. They have the colossal gall to charge 10 cents just to enter washrooms which are deplorable, unsanitary and unsightly.
>
> It is high time the regulating agencies, with pressure from our elected representatives, took concrete steps to protect the public. For a starter, we suggest they reject this latest Penn Central proposal to "soak the poor" and insist upon real physical improvements before entertaining any new proposals.

LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE QUALITY OF JUSTICE IN LITIGATION OF ANTITRUST CASES

(Mr. McCULLOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I introduced legislation yesterday to improve the quality of justice in litigation of antitrust cases. Joining me in cosponsoring this most important legislation were: the distinguished minority leader, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, the chairman of the House Republican conference, Mr. ANDERSON, 11 of my fellow Republican members of the Judiciary Committee, and two of my Republican colleagues from Ohio.

The legislation would amend the Expediting Act which was passed in 1903. The 66-year-old laws governing the trial and appeal of antitrust cases are no longer suited to modern practice. They must be updated.

Under present law—15 U.S.C., section 29, 32 Stat. 823—every civil antitrust case in which the United States is complainant, whether important or not, may be appealed only to the Supreme Court of the United States. When this act was passed, such direct review was justified. The Sherman Act was new and many fundamental questions regarding its implications needed immediate clarification by the Supreme Court.

The reasons for enacting the Expediting Act of 1903 have long since vanished. At that time, antitrust law was an uncharted sea. The courts of appeals were then newly created and unproven. Since guidelines had to be established, it was reasonable to direct all appeals to the ultimate and proven tribunal, the Supreme Court.

However, 66 years later, the guidelines have been written. The courts of appeals are well recognized as competent tribunals and can provide a thorough review which will focus the issues to be decided by the Supreme Court. Thus, in all but the most important antitrust cases, direct appeal to the Supreme Court is not only unnecessary but burdensome.

Indeed, the Supreme Court has urged modernization of the present law. See, for example, *United States* v. *Singer Mfg. Co.*, 374 U.S. 174, 175, n. 1; *Brown Shoe Co.* v. *United States*, 370 U.S. 294, 355, 363–64 (opinions of Clark and Harlan, J.J.); *United States* v. *duPont & Co.*, 366 U.S. 316, 324; *cf. Kennecott Copper Co.* v. *United States*, 381 U.S. 414 (Harlan and Goldberg, J.J. dissenting); but see *United States* v. *Singer Mfg. Co.*, *supra*, at 197 (opinion of White, J.). Thus, this proposed legislation acknowledges the progress of the last 66 years by now treating civil antitrust cases in which the United States is complainant like other cases.

Of course, there may occur cases of such importance that an expedited appeal to the Supreme Court would be desirable. Hence, the bill allows for such expedition upon certification by the Federal district court who adjudicated the case or by the Attorney General "that immediate consideration of the appeal by the Supreme Court is of great public importance in the administration of justice."

Thus, the bill would unburden the Supreme Court, provide the litigants with a more thorough review of their antitrust cases, and assure the Department of Justice that it could still obtain an expedited decision when necessary.

Moreover, the legislation further eases the burden on the Federal courts by requiring that such antitrust actions be originally heard by a single Federal district judge. Under the present law, 15 U.S.C. sec. 28, 32 Stat. 823, the Attorney General can order that three Federal judges be empaneled to try the case. Resort to a three-judge court may have been advisable when the Expediting Act was enacted because of the novelty and complexity of the legal and economic issues involved in the antitrust laws.

However, such a consideration now is without foundation. Furthermore, with trial backlogs growing longer, the Federal judicial system cannot countenance disrupting already crowded dockets by requiring three judges to hear these cases. Recognizing this fact, the Attorney General has resorted to the three-judge court in antitrust cases only seven times in the last 30 years and only once in the last decade. Thus, there can be no adequate justification for this provision's continued existence in the law.

In addition, this legislation would re-

XUM

solve the uncertainty presently existing with respect to the interlocutory appeals in cases involving the Expediting Act. Compare *United States* v. *Ingersoll Rand*, 320 F. 2d, 509 (3rd Cir. 1963), with *United States* v. *F.M.C. Corp.*, 321 F. 2d 534 (9th Cir.), application for temporary injunction denied, 84 S. Ct. 4 (1963) (Goldberg, J., in chambers). Under the bill, interlocutory appeals of orders of district courts granting, modifying, or refusing injunctions in cases involving the Expediting Act would be permitted pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1292(a) (1), 62 Stat. 929, but not otherwise. In this way, consummation of potentially unlawful mergers under section 7 of the Clayton Act could be forestalled until their legality is finally determined without unnecessary disruption of the orderly procedure of the cases and without prejudice to the final resolution of the litigation.

Mr. Speaker, during the 90th Congress I introduced legislation to modernize our antitrust laws similar to the bill sponsored by the Nixon administration which I introduce today. I am happy to join with the Nixon administration to urge immediate action on this proposal so that this Nation's antitrust laws may better serve the interests of a free and competitive society.

THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION'S INACTION ON INTEREST RATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUCINSKI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration is rapidly earning the title of a "do nothing" administration on high interest rates.

Since the election of President Nixon, the commercial banking industry has had a free run at the American public. This industry, which has always had difficulty doing anything for the public, has now been turned loose to gouge the American public and, eventually, to wreck the economy.

Since the election of President Nixon and the announcement of the appointment of bankers at the Treasury Department, the commercial banking industry has gone to the well five times and raised the interest rate charged to its prime customers. Five times since December 1968. In 6 short months, the commercial banks have managed to impose increases amounting to 36 percent in the cost of money.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD the list of the prime rate increases as they have occurred beginning on December 2, 1968, and continuing until June 9:

December 2, 1968, Chase Manhattan Bank announced that it was raising its prime lending rate from 6¼ percent to 6½ percent. The other major banks followed within hours with identical increases.

December 18, 1968, the First National City Bank of New York City announced that it was raising its prime lending rate from 6½ percent to 6¾ percent. The other major banks immediately followed with identical increases.

January 7, 1969, First National City Bank of New York City announced that it was raising the prime rate from 6¾ percent to 7 percent. The other major banks immediately followed with identical increases.

March 17, 1969, Morgan Guaranty Bank of New York City announced that it was raising its prime lending rate from 7 percent to 7½ percent. The other major banks followed within hours with identical increases.

June 9, 1969, Bankers Trust Co. of New York City announced that it was raising the prime lending rate from 7½ percent to 8½ percent. The other major banks followed within minutes and hours with identical increases.

Mr. Speaker, these are the most flagrant and the largest increases in interest rates which this Nation has every experienced under any administration and under any economic conditions. Mr. Speaker, the commercial banking industry is running wild and it knows that no one in this banker-oriented administration has the courage to stop it.

Secretary of the Treasury, David M. Kennedy, who helped institute prime rate increases while he served as the chief executive officer of the Continental-Illinois National Bank, is sitting on the sidelines giving secret signals to his banker buddies. These signals are well understood in the banking industry—they say, "Go ahead and raise interest rates and we will not do a thing about it." The Secretary manages little taps on the wrist with a velvet hammer and nothing more.

Mr. Speaker, this Secretary of the Treasury is an absurdity. Last week, he called in the big banking chiefs—the big boys of the industry—to discuss prime rates. With great ballyhoo, the Treasury Department spokesmen—who always seem to remain anonymous—talked about this as a move to hold back interest rates.

One of these spokesmen was quoted in the Washington Post in this manner:

> A Treasury Spokesman said the meeting was called in response to several developments, including Chase Manhattan Bank Chairman David Rockefeller's remarks in a Washington Post interview that another increase in the prime lending rate may be put into effect.

Yet, when Secretary Kennedy emerged from his secret session with the bankers, he told a press briefing that he had not even discussed the prime rate. And he was quick and emphatic in his announcement that the meeting had not been for the purpose of rolling back interest rates and he wanted to make it clear that he had not asked his banker buddies for any commitment against further increases in the prime rate.

The big question remains, Why did Secretary Kennedy call the meeting in the first place if he was not going to discuss interest rates? Was it some kind of afternoon social? A bankers tea party at the expense of the Government? Or was it some back-door attempt by Secretary Kennedy to show how much strength he had in the banking community? Was it supposed to be a show of strength so that President Nixon would be frightened away from any move to seek the Secretary's resignation?

These were the 24 largest banks in the Nation with lots of political muscle and billions of dollars in resources behind them. This was the greatest assemblage of economic and political power ever gathered in a room at the Treasury Department.

These bankers represented $148 billion in deposits and $131 billion in bank trust assets. The 24 bankers had almost 36 percent of the total deposits in all 13,000 of the commercial banks in the United States and about half of the trust assets of the industry.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a list of the banks that were invited by Secretary Kennedy and their deposits and trust assets:

	Market value of trust assets (1968)	Deposits Dec. 31, 1968
Rudolph A. Peterson, Bank of America NT&SA, San Francisco, Calif	$4,988,265,148	$21,502,892,000
David Rockfeller, Chase Manhattan Bank NA, New York, N.Y	14,579,093,000	16,709,925,657
Walter B. Wriston, First National City Bank, New York, N.Y	11,930,777,493	16,643,247,000
Eugene S. Northrop, Manufacturers-Hanover Trust Co., New York, N.Y	7,959,479,000	9,202,391,539
John Meyer, Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., New York, N.Y	18,575,119,000	8,211,715,952
William S. Renchard, Chemical Bank New York Trust Co., New York, N.Y	5,658,125,000	7,640,535,069
William H. Moore, Bankers Trust Co., New York, N.Y	13,319,707,504	6,827,713,405
Tilden Cummings, Continental Illinois NB&T Co., Chicago, Ill	6,192,052,485	6,301,503,000
Gaylord S. Freeman, Jr., First National Bank Chicago, Ill	6,499,551,217	5,746,162,000
Carl E. Hartnack, Security Pacific National Bank, Los Angeles, Calif	2,718,018,000	5,711,376,229
Richard P. Cooley, Wells Fargo Bank NA, San Francisco, Calif	2,165,627,000	4,734,097,623
George A. Murphy, Irving Trust Co., New York, N.Y	1,976,864,572	4,412,980,656
Emmett G. Solomon, Crocker, Citizens National Bank, San Francisco, Calif	2,210,234,458	4,207,243,461
H. V. Grice, United California Bank, Los Angeles, Calif	2,784,728,000	3,765,607,866
John A. Mayer, Mellon National Bank & Trust Co., Pittsburgh, Pa	8,281,705,778	3,748,752,646
Roger C. Damon, First National Bank, Boston, Mass	[1] 5,323,411,245	3,260,839,600
Harold V. Gleason, Franklin National Bank, Mineola, N.Y	[2] 177,121,000	2,301,163,116
Chief Executive Officer, did not attend, Marine Midland Grace Trust Co., New York, N.Y	1,493,662,406	2,280,847,318
John R. Bunting, First Pennsylvania Banking & Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa	3,157,213,000	2,173,968,000
George F. Karch, Cleveland Trust Co., Cleveland, Ohio	3,690,492,000	2,129,999,331
Raymond T. Perring, Detroit Bank & Trust Co., Detroit, Mich	1,972,334,206	1,899,344,777
G. Morris Darrance, Philadelphia National Bank, Philadelphia, Pa	703,477,986	1,723,053,059
R. C. MacDonald, Seattle-First National Bank, Seattle, Wash	862,364,676	1,692,349,092
Ellis B. Merry, National Bank of Detroit, Detroit, Mich	[2] 3,427,431,000	3,443,048,504
Roland A. Mewhort, Manufacturers National Bank, Detroit, Mich	[2] 1,282,614,000	1,772,165,266
Total	[3] 131,929,469,174	[4] 148,042,922,166

[1] Includes Old Colony Trust Co.

[2] As of December 1967.

[3] This figure represents approximately ½ of all trust assets in the 13,000 commercial banks in the United States.

[4] This figure represents 36 percent of all bank deposits in the 13,000 commercial banks in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Treasury had a great opportunity to speak up and tell these giants of the banking industry that he wanted lower interest rates. He had an opportunity to ask for a roll back of the prime rate. But he did not—or could not—bring himself to speak up for the public.

Secretary Kennedy once again did exactly what the bankers wanted and once again they are free to gouge the American public. The bankers were well-satisfied with their session.

The American Banker for July 9, 1969, quotes one of the bankers as saying of the meeting with Kennedy:

> I told him afterward it was a damn good show.

And another banker is quoted as saying:

> We all know Dave and like him and are in entire sympathy with his views.

A cozy buddy-buddy session between the bankers and Secretary Kennedy.

Mr. Speaker, it has been this cozy arrangement—and understanding—that brought us the 8½ percent prime interest rate on June 9. At that time, Secretary Kennedy issued a tepid little statement which was an open invitation to the banks to raise the interest rate.

The Secretary refused to go along with my suggestion that he speak out for the administration against the prime rate increase which was being talked about in the banking community weeks before the actual action on June 9. Mr. Speaker, I place in the Record a copy of a telegram which I sent Secretary Kennedy on May 29 and a copy of his letter in reply:

May 29, 1969.

Hon. David M. Kennedy,
Secretary of the Treasury,
U.S. Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C.:

Reports persist that the large commercial banks are planning still another assault on the American people through an increase in the prime lending rate. As you know an increase in the already usurious 7½ per cent prime rate will send a shock wave through the entire economy, raising interest rates on every item.

As Secretary of the Treasury you have the power to stop this latest effort to increase interest rates. I urge you to announce today that you and the Nixon administration are flatly opposed to any increase in the prime rate.

I urge that you demand that the commercial banks refrain from any conspiracy to jack up the rate. Such a statement, coming from the Secretary of the Treasury, would stop the increase.

Another increase in the prime rate will all but halt an already badly depressed housing market and will raise the price of goods to millions of American families. Another increase is totally unnecessary and it is nothing more than an attempt by the banks to gouge the American public during a critical economic period.

The big commercial banks believe that this administration is more concerned about their welfare than the welfare of the American people. They are convinced that they can raise the prime rate without criticism from you or the administration. You now have the power to prove them wrong in this instance by coming down hard in a public statement opposed to a higher prime rate.

Mr. Secretary, I hope you will use the great powers of your high office to protect the American people. I hope sincerely that you will choose the public interest over the bank interest.

Wright Patman.

The Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C., June 2, 1969.
Hon. Wright Patman,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I share the concern over the high level of interest rates expressed in your telegram.

At the same time, we must recognize that the principal cause of the current level of interest rates is serious inflation and the expectation of rising prices in the future. Our economic policies, including monetary policy, must be aimed at curbing the pressures that have kept the economy overheated.

While monetary policy has a role to play, it must not be called upon to carry too heavy a share of the burden of fighting inflation. It was for that reason that the Administration proposed reductions in 1970 government expenditures and asked for repeal of the investment credit and for extension of the tax surcharge and certain excises.

I hope and expect that banks will act responsibly within the context of the present situation in the credit markets. As I have said before, I question whether a further increase in the prime rate at this time would in itself effectively restrain the demand for credit. Each bank has available other methods to allocate the limited supplies of funds.

Indeed, as the Administration's efforts to fight inflation increasingly take hold, it is logical to expect that bank interest rates will go down. Accordingly, I hope you will give your wholehearted support to the Administration's budget and tax policies as the surest route to relieving unnecessary pressures on interest rates.

Sincerely yours,
David M. Kennedy.

Secretary Kennedy revealed just how serious he was about opposing high interest rates when he appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee in its investigation of the prime interest rate. His performance before the committee was one of the weakest and one of the saddest by a public official that I have seen in my 40 years in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the Record an excerpt from the transcript which shows Mr. Kennedy's inability to handle his office in the public interest:

Excerpt From Transcript of Hearings on Increase in Prime Interest Rates, House Banking and Currency Committee, June 19, 1969

Chairman Patman. I asked you if you did anything yourself to stop this increase or to discourage it?

Secretary Kennedy. And I answered your question; if you mean did I call the banks and ask them as you did or make a bold statement, no.

Chairman Patman. Not necessarily call them, but did you do anything? If so, tell me what it was.

Secretary Kennedy. There was really nothing I could do.

Chairman Patman. You did not do anything then because you said there is nothing you could do?

Secretary Kennedy. There is no legal possibility of me rolling that back.

Chairman Patman. Did you discuss that with the banks about rolling that back.

Secretary Kennedy. No, I did not.

Chairman Patman. Did you discuss it with anybody?

Secretary Kennedy. No.

Chairman Patman. Why didn't you?

Secretary Kennedy. Why should I?

The Secretary, of course, dodges any suggestion that his friends in the banking community have entered into a conspiracy to fix prices through the prime rate.

Bankers Trust Co. of New York announced the prime rate increase first on June 9 and within minutes, First National City Bank and Chase Manhattan National Bank of New York had followed. All across the country, the major banks were in with identical announcements—all in an hour or two of the original move by Bankers Trust Co.

Despite Secretary Kennedy's opinion, the Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust, Richard McLaren, has launched a full-scale investigation into this conspiracy and I commend him for his action.

The bankers, of course, have consistently used the prime rate to fix interest generally across the Nation. Invariably it has been the large New York banks—the Wall Street complex—that leads the action with other banks falling in line like so many sheep.

Since the prime rate was first established in 1934, the New York banks have led the increases—with two exceptions. These exceptions were Continental-Illinois National Bank—Secretary Kennedy's bank—and the First National Bank of Boston.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the Record a full list of the banks which have been the leaders in setting each of the prime rates through the years:

Effective date	Rate (percent)	Bank initiating change
1934 to December 1947.	1½	Bankers Trust Co.
Dec. 15, 1947	1¾	Do.
Aug. 10, 1948	2	Irving Trust Co.
Sept. 22, 1950	2¼	First National City Bank.
Jan. 5, 1951	2½	Bankers Trust Co.
Oct. 17, 1951	2¾	First National City Bank.
Dec. 18, 1951	3	Chase Manhattan Bank.
Apr. 27, 1953	3¼	Bankers Trust Co.
Mar. 17, 1954	3	Morgan Guaranty Trust Co.
Aug. 4, 1955	3¼	Chase Manhattan Bank.
Oct. 14, 1955	3½	First National City Bank.
Apr. 13, 1956	3¾	Chase Manhattan Bank.
Aug. 20, 1956	4	First National Bank of Boston
Aug. 7, 1957	4½	Bankers Trust Co.
Jan. 21, 1958	4	Chase Manhattan Bank.
Apr. 21, 1958	3½	Morgan Guaranty Trust Co.
Sept. 11, 1958	4	Chase Manhattan Bank.
May 18, 1959	4½	First National City Bank.
Sept. 1, 1959	5	Do.
Aug. 23, 1960	4½	Manufacturers Trust Co.
Dec. 6, 1965	5	First National of Chicago.
------------		Morgan Guaranty Trust.
March 1966	5½	Do.
June 29, 1966	5¾	Chemical Bank New York Trust.
------------		First National of Chicago.
Aug. 16, 1966	6	First National City Bank, New York.
Jan. 26–27, 1967	5. 5	Chase Manhattan.
	5¾	First National City.
Mar. 27, 1967	5. 5	Morgan Guaranty.
	5. 5	Bank of America.
Nov. 20, 1967	6	Continental Illinois Bank & Trust.
Apr. 19, 1968	6½	Bankers Trust.
Sept. 26, 1968	6	Chase Manhattan.
Nov. 13, 1968	6¼	Do.
Dec. 2, 1968	6½	Do.
Dec. 18, 1968	6¾	First National City Bank.
Jan. 7, 1969	7	Do.
Mar. 17, 1969	7¼	Morgan Guaranty.
June 9, 1969	8½	Bankers Trust Co.

Mr. Speaker, the banks have approached this latest round of interest rate increases as if they were on the verge of taking welfare to survive. To hear the David Rockefellers and the other big bankers, it would appear they are not going to survive the winter unless they get these higher and higher interest rates. When David Rockefeller appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee in its investigation of the prime rate, he sounded like a poor boy about to apply for a poverty grant.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that the big banks are enjoying their greatest profit binge in history. They have been unable to hide the enormous profits which have been recorded over the first 6 months of 1969. The figures are coming out and they reveal profits ranging 20 percent to 30 percent above the profit levels recorded during the first half of 1968.

None of these banks appear to be poverty candidates.

For instance, the huge Bank of America, the world's largest bank, had profits of $74,179,000, up 13.3 percent from the first half of 1968.

Chase Manhattan, the second largest, had a profit of $63,832,467, up 9.9 percent from the first half of 1968.

First National City Bank of New York had a profit of $66,457,000, up 5.9 percent from the first half of 1968.

Manufacturers Hanover of New York, the Nation's fourth largest bank, had a profit of $41,115,652, up 20.3 percent from the first half of 1968.

The Nation's fifth largest bank, Morgan Guaranty of New York, had a profit of $20,500,000, up 11.4 percent from the first half of 1968.

Chemical Bank New York Trust, the Nation's sixth largest bank, had a profit of $36,500,000, up 11.2 percent from the first half of 1968.

The Bankers Trust Co. of New York, the Nation's seventh largest bank, had a profit of only $27,510,000, up 1.79 percent, but this low figure was due to the startup costs of their BankAmericard operations and expenses connected with the bank's new midtown headquarters.

And then we come to Mr. Kennedy's bank, the Continental-Illinois National Bank of Chicago—the Nation's eighth largest—which had a profit of $28,173,315, up 10.7 percent from the first half of 1968.

Mr. Speaker, I also place in the RECORD a list of other banks showing the percentage increase in profits from the first half of 1969 over the first half of 1968:

Increase in net operating earnings by banks in first half of 1969 as compared with first half of 1968

[Increase in percent]

American Security & Trust (Washington, D.C.)	12.0
Bank of Commerce (New York)	31.0
Central Penn National Bank (Philadelphia)	19.0
City National Bank (Detroit)	35.8
City National Bank & Trust (Kansas City, Mo.)	36.0
Citizens & Southern of Atlanta	20.0
Continental Bank & Trust (Norristown, Pa.)	27.0
Crocker National Bank (California)	12.9
Cleveland Trust Co.	16.5
Central National Bank (Cleveland)	20.0
Connecticut Bank & Trust (Hartford)	19.9
Central Trust (Rochester, N.Y.)	24.1
Exchange National Bank (Chicago)	40.0
First National Bank of Birmingham	50.0
1st National Bank of Atlanta	22.0
1st National State Bank of New Jersey	21.3
1st National Bank of Maryland	16.0
1st National Bank of St. Louis	15.1
Fidelity Union Trust (Newark)	21.1
1st National Bank (Cincinnati)	14.4
1st National Bank of Akron	27.0
1st National Bank of Boston	12.0
Franklin National Bank (New York)	17.7
1st Pennsylvania Banking & Trust Company	37.0
Fidelity Bank of Pennsylvania	25.0
1st Western Bank (Los Angeles)	18.0
Hartford National Bank (Connecticut)	18.0
Harris Trust & Savings (Chicago)	13.1
Irving Trust Co.	12.1
Industrial Valley Bank (Philadelphia)	23.0
Marine Midland Grace Trust	30.0
Mercantile Trust (St. Louis)	14.0
Mellon National Bank & Trust (Pittsburgh)	10.0
Northern Trust (Chicago)	19.0
National Newark & Exxes (New Jersey)	33.0
National City Bank of Cleveland	13.7
North Carolina National Bank	25.3
Pittsburgh National Bank	20.0
Philadelphia National Bank	28.0
Provident National Bank	21.0
Riggs National Bank (Washington, D.C.)	22.9
Suburban Trust Co. (Maryland)	14.5
Security Pacific National Bank (California)	15.0
Security National (Huntington, N.Y.)	42.0
State National Bank (Bridgeport, Conn.)	23.3
State Street Bank & Trust Co. (Boston)	6.2
Union Commerce Bank (Cleveland)	16.4
United California Bank (Los Angeles)	17.0
U.S. National Bank (Portland)	28.0
Virginia National Bank (Norfolk)	15.0
Western Pennsylvania National Bank	29.0
Wachovia Bank & Trust	15.2

Mr. Speaker, it would seem that the administration would move to curb this kind of excess profit taking by the banking industry. Clearly they do not need higher interest rates for the purpose of increasing their earnings.

Mr. Speaker, the 8½-percent prime rate that is quoted in the newspapers is highly misleading. It is the rate that is paid by only a selected few—institutions like A.T. & T. and General Motors, the giants of industry. The little guy—the average consumer—pays much more, usually more than double whatever the prime rate might be at any given moment. So when we talk about 8½-percent prime rates, we are talking about general interest rates of 14, 15 percent, and even 20 or 25 percent.

The increase in the prime rate affects every interest rate in the economy. It pushes them all up.

Interest costs are in the prices of everything we buy. Food, appliances, homes, automobiles—every item on the shelves or yet to be manufactured is affected by these price increases.

Interest rates are increasing prices all down the line and they are fueling the fires of inflation.

Just as important is the fact that thousands of needed projects are being stopped because of these high rates. State, county, and municipal governments put off their building of hospitals, schools, roads, and public buildings. These are public needs that will be postponed for years—needs the country can ill afford to postpone.

The homebuilding industry, of course, is the hardest hit by these interest rate increases. Housing starts are on their way down once again. Millions of low- and moderate-income families have already been priced out of the housing market and decent housing is beginning to be put out of the reach of even relatively well-off middle-income families.

Just this week a leading housing expert, Sanford Goodkin, said the housing market "will be crippled drastically" if the prime interest rate is allowed to go up again.

In fact, he predicted that housing starts would drop to an annual rate of 800,000 units if there were any further increases in the rate.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of an article in the July 11, 1969, Washington Evening Star on the interview with Mr. Goodkin:

HOME INDUSTRY IS THREATENED

The nation's troubled housing industry will be crippled drastically if the prime lending rate is raised again, according to Sanford R. Goodkin, a leading real estate research consultant.

Housing starts will plunge to an annual rate of about 800,000 in 1969, he predicted, if the prime rate charged by banks is increased from its current 8½ percent level.

Goodkin's observation came in the wake of recent comments in banking circles that still another rise in the historically high prime rate—possibly to as much as 10 percent—may be necessary to curb inflation.

"It is clear that if the prime rate hits 10 percent, followed shortly by new hikes in FHA and VA rates, then an 800,000 starts rate is sure to follow," said Goodkin. "What started out to be a good year in terms of housing starts has already turned into a reprise of 1966."

He noted that in 1966 a disastrous credit crunch saw a severe drying up of mortgage credit and a reduction of housing starts to 1.2 million from 1.6 million in the preceding year.

The prime rate now has gone through four recent increases, culminating with the June 9 jump to a record 8½ percent. Housing starts have correspondingly declined in every month in 1969 and are sure to fall more steeply following the most recent rate increase. Prior to the last increase, they already had declined by 17 percent from January.

Barring another rise in the prime rate, housing starts could still come close to the 1968 rate of 1.55 million, said Goodkin. This is down from earlier, rosier predictions of a 3 percent increase over the 1968 production.

But with inflation still unabated, he said, some bankers have indicated that another prime rate rise is in the offing. Goodkin predicted that if this happens, it probably will be done before September.

"The Nixon Administration will be reluctant to go into the 1970 elections with an unsettled and soft economy," he said. "So it is going to push hard on its anti-inflation fight through this September, then let up in an effort to demonstrate economic recovery by the fall of 1970."

September is a cut-off period to give the economy enough lead time to recover by 1970, he said, because economic patterns indicate that monetary policies don't have their maximum impact until some eight months after they are implemented.

In the 1966 credit crunch, for example, industrial production didn't hit bottom until May 1967, eight months after the greatest panic.

Goodkin said tougher times are ahead for housing, even with the current prime rate prevailing. But another prime rate hike, if put into effect, would have to be withdrawn before September is over in order for the economy to be in decent condition for the 1970 elections.

"It seems to us that high interest rates turn off only those who are too poor to buy at any interest rate—with the possible exception of home buyers, who are more aware of interest rates than any other consumers," said Goodkin. "It also seems that someone somewhere has decided that the prime lending rate will have to rise to some magic margin like 10 percent before all the sophisticates are turned off."

But, he said, "the fact is that inflation is being fed by thoughtless finger-pointing of unions to management, management to labor, private to public, consumer to anyone. The entire economy may be doomed to repeat some very unfortunate moments in its history because we insist on ignoring history."

Mr. Speaker, I also place in the Record an article from the Wall Street Journal entitled: "House Hunting Blues: Rising Interest Rates, Home Prices Discourage Many Would-Be Buyers":

House-Hunting Blues—Rising Interest Rates, Home Prices Discourage Many Would-Be Buyers—Housing Start Forecast Dips Below Year-Ago Figure—Down Payments Raised—Settling for an Apartment

A Philadelphia accountant who has combed the Main Line suburbs for the past six months in search of a home tells a tale of woe.

"The prices are simply outlandish," he moans. "We started out looking at the $35,000 level, but when you mention that price to a broker he just laughs. We looked at one house for $43,000 that had ceilings so low that you couldn't maneuver—you'd have to walk around like a hunchback. Another place for $42,000 had a tiny kitchen. It also was dark, dingy and dirty."

The accountant has slowed his search lately, but not because he wants a home any less. "With interest rates like they are, we probably couldn't get a mortgage even if we found a decent place," he says gloomily.

The Philadelphian's plight illustrates the extreme difficulties home hunters all around the country are having these days. Bankers, real estate brokers and people in the market for houses agree that the current housing squeeze is the worst in recent years. Few predict it will get better in the months ahead.

Behind this situation is a demand for money from all sectors of the economy that has sent interest rates soaring to all-time highs. On June 9, bankers raised their prime rate—the interest they charge their most credit-worthy corporate customers—to a record 8½% from 7½%. It was the fifth prime rate boost since December and the first full percentage-point increase since 1945.

Mortgage interest rates also have been rising sharply. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board reports that the effective interest on conventional new home loans averaged 7.64% in May, up from 7.3% in January and 6.84% in May 1968. Savings and loan associations are the nation's biggest mortgage lenders, and in recent months their supply of new funds has slackened as depositors have sought higher returns elsewhere. The trend may reduce their lending activity.

The maximum interest rate that lenders can charge on mortgage loans guaranteed by Federal agencies still stands at 7½%, but it's expected to rise to 8% shortly to reflect money market realities.

High-priced money is threatening to dry up the already meager supply of homes on the market. Builders complain that money for construction loans is scarce at precisely the time they need more of it to cope with rising labor and construction materials costs. the result is a cutback in their home-building plans.

The National Association of Home Builders, a Washington-based trade group, earlier this year predicted that about 1.7 million new homes would be started in 1969, about 13% more than in 1968. Six weeks ago it revised that estimate to forecast a 3% drop for the year. Now "we are going to have to revise that figure down again" as a result of the effects of the most recent prime-rate increase, says Michael Sumichrast, chief NAHB economist.

A shortage of new homes means that prices of existing homes are going up rapidly—more than 1% a month in some metropolitan areas. But homeowners are reluctant to cash in on this bonanza because it would entail braving the bruising housing and mortgage markets again for another home.

SCARED OFF

"A guy will hear about the big prices people are paying for homes and come in to see about selling his," says Frank La Rosa, a real estate broker in Westbury, Long Island, N.Y., "When he sees the current interest figures, he says, 'My God, I can't give up my 5% mortgage for those rates,' He decides to add a room to his present house."

Mr. La Rosa says he currently has about 25% fewer home listings than at this time a year ago.

The situation is much the same elsewhere. "I could get you $3,500 more for your home today than last year," Cleveland real estate man Lloyd A. Lehman tells one former customer. "But I can't guarantee you that I'd be able to find you another home."

The mortgage money-housing pinch is especially severe in states where usury laws have pegged the maximum interest rates that banks can charge on conventional home loans well below the returns available from other types of lending. In Illinois, Michigan and Pennsylvania, for instance, the maximum mortgage interest rate is 7% (though banks can get 7½% on loans guaranteed by the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans Administration). In New York and New Jersey, it's 7½%.

Lenders in some areas can circumvent those limits by tacking service fees known as "points" on home loans they make; a "point" is equal to 1% of the amount of the loan, and it must be paid in cash when the loan agreement is completed.

In Michigan, where the law doesn't permit lenders to add "points" to conventional home loans, many have simply stopped making such loans. They are adding up to seven points on FHA-backed mortgages.

In the Chicago area, some financial institutions responded to the latest prime-rate increase by boosting their points on 7½% FHA loans to 8½ from five. At that rate, the service charge on a $20,000 mortgage comes to a whopping $1,700.

DOWN PAYMENT REQUIREMENTS RISE

Lenders also have moved to make it tougher on potential borrowers by raising down-payment requirements. In the Chicago area, down payments on conventional mortgages range from 30% to 40% of the home price, up from 20% to 25% just two months ago. Savings and loan concerns in Chicago insist they still are investing most of their funds in local home mortgages, but real estate men dispute this.

"The lenders have let us down completely," asserts one real estate salesman in a suburb north of Chicago. "They're either sitting on their money waiting for the usury rate to go up (such a bill currently is pending in the Illinois legislature), or buying out-of-state mortgages at higher rates. I've had four deals collapse in the last two weeks because my people couldn't get mortgages."

Home lending hasn't stopped in New York and New Jersey, but many lenders have cut back their activity by accepting mortgage applications only from their own depositors or from customers of real estate men with whom they do a lot of business. And a few of them have begun casting a warier eye on loan applications from savings account holders.

"The other day we gave a $32,000 mortgage at 7½% with a 25% down payment to a man who had a $2,500 savings account with us," says Cadman H. Frederick, vice president of Suffolk County Federal Savings & Loan on New York's Long Island, "It turned out he deposited the $2,500 the day he asked for the loan and withdrew $2,400 of it the day after he got his mortgage. From now on we're going to check on how long people have had savings accounts with us."

Low and middle-income house hunters are feeling the housing squeeze most. Rising building costs have pushed many new homes out of their reach, and they are having an increasingly tough time making the monthly payments required by today's high interest rates.

In Philadelphia, for instance, A. P. Orleans & Co., a large building concern, offered row houses for $17,000 a year ago; the same house sells for $18,500 today. "We are rapidly losing the bottom of the market," says Edward Borowsky, the firm's sales manager.

In San Francisco, "there's slim pickings in the $20,000 to $25,000 range," says Lee Barrett, president of Leland Barrett Realty Co. Real estate men there say few houses are being built to sell at those prices, and price increases have taken existing homes out of that bracket.

According to some real estate men, the housing pinch also is affecting the well-to-do. Says Joe George, manager of William E. Doud Real Estate in the prosperous Los Feliz section of Los Angeles: "The $100,000 homes aren't selling as well as they used to. People just don't want to borrow that kind of money at today's interest rates." (Mortgage interest runs as high as 9% in Los Angeles.)

At best, the housing pinch is causing home buyers to lower their standards and stretch their budgets. Mr. and Mrs. Charles Williams started out last March looking for a three-bedroom home near New York; they wanted to pay about $25,000 and to put $5,000 down. The Williamses found a $25,000 home in Fanwood, N.J., but they had to put down $5,900 and settled for two bedrooms and an attic they will have to convert into a third bedroom. "After three months of looking, we felt lucky to get what we did," says Mrs. Williams.

A Philadelphia machine shop superintendent and his family fared worse. They sold their 23-year-old row house for $12,000 two months ago because "the way the neighborhood was changing, we figured it was no longer safe for our daughters," says the wife. After looking at some 30 homes in suburbs north of the city, they settled for an apartment. "We found just one house in our price range—at $24,900," she says. "The roof leaked and the floors needed refinishing. It would have cost us another $5,000 to make it livable."

Mr. Speaker, these high interest rates are ripping the American economy apart. We are fast taking on the economic character of the banana republics to the south where 20, 30, and 40 percent interest rates are commonplace.

Like many of these South American countries, the U.S. economy will collapse under the weight of these excessive and usurious interest rates. Unless something is done and done quickly, we will have a first-class recession that could quickly move into a full-scale depression.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I interrogated the Federal Reserve Board Chairman, William McChesney Martin, when he appeared before the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am chair-

XUM

man. At that time, I described the Federal Reserve Board Chairman as the most expensive Government official in the history of the world.

At the time, I felt that Mr. Martin would be able to keep his claim on this title for years to come. But I calculated this without realizing just how expensive the new Secretary of the Treasury, David M. Kennedy, would be to this Nation.

Secretary Kennedy's weak-kneed response to the banks brought about the increase from 7½ percent to 8½ percent in the prime rate on June 9. This one increase will cost the American people $15 billion in excess interest on the public and private debt which now amounts to a trillion, five hundred billion dollars

If the Secretary continues to make these kinds of mistakes, he will cost the American people well over $100 billion if he stays throughout President Nixon's first term. So, the Secretary may well be on his way to surpassing that infamous record of William McChesney Martin.

Today, Mr. Martin stands charged with costing the American people nearly $300 billion in excess interest charges since he became Federal Reserve Board Chairman in 1951. That is the excess cost on the public and private debt resulting from unnecessary interest rate increases during Mr. Martin's tenure.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a table showing these steady increases in interest costs under Mr. Martin:

NET PUBLIC AND PRIVATE DEBT, TOTAL INTEREST PAID, AND AVERAGE RATE OF INTEREST IN THE UNITED STATES, 1951–68

[Dollar amounts in billions]

Year (I)	Total debt [1] (II)	Interest paid [2] (III)	Computed average interest paid (percent) (3–2) (IV)	Interest costs figured at 1951 computed rate (V)
1951	$518.9	$17.7	3.41	$17.7
1952	549.7	19.5	3.55	18.7
1953	581.1	21.7	3.73	19.8
1954	605.2	23.5	3.88	20.6
1955	664.3	25.8	3.88	22.7
1956	697.6	29.5	4.22	23.8
1957	727.4	33.6	4.61	24.8
1958	768.2	35.5	4.62	26.2
1959	830.7	40.3	4.85	28.3
1960	872.0	44.2	5.07	29.7
1961	929.4	46.8	5.04	31.7
1962	997.0	52.5	5.27	34.0
1963	1,071.2	58.7	5.48	36.5
1964	1,154.0	65.2	5.65	39.4
1965	1,243.8	72.4	5.82	42.4
1966	1,335.7	81.9	6.13	45.5
1967	1,424.8	89.9	6.31	48.6
1968	[3]1,547.4	[3]100.8	6.52	52.8
Total		859.5		563.2
Less total col. V		563.2		
Excess cost		296.3		

[1] Economic Report of the President, 1969.

[2] Office of Business Economics, Department of Commerce.

[3] Estimated.

Mr. Speaker, Chairman Martin is fond of claiming that these excessive interest rate charges are the result of natural market forces and that they just happened to occur while he was in office. This is so much hogwash.

Mr. Speaker, we have in the past had good Federal Reserve Boards that would protect the public interest and keep interest rates down. Nothing illustrates this better than an analysis of the yields on long-term Government securities from 1939 to 1952. During this 14-year period, the rates were kept under 2½ percent on this type of Government borrowing. The Federal Reserve pegged the interest rate at this level and kept it there during a period that included severe depression, war, and inflation—good times and bad times.

As soon as the Republicans and William McChesney Martin gained firm control of our monetary policies in 1953, the rate started skyrocketing on long-term Government securities.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a chart which compares the 14-year period, 1939–52, with the 14-year period, 1953–66:

Yields on long-term Government bonds 1939 to present

[Percent per annum]

Years:	*Yield*
1939	2.36
1940	2.21
1941	1.95
1942	2.46
1943	2.47
1944	2.48
1945	2.37
1946	2.19
1947	2.25
1948	2.44
1949	2.31
1950	2.32
1951	2.57
1952	2.68
1953	2.94
1954	2.56
1955	2.84
1956	3.08
1957	3.47
1958	3.43
1959	4.08
1960	4.02
1961	3.90
1962	3.95
1963	4.00
1964	4.15
1965	4.12
1966	4.65
Average for 14-year period 1939–52)	2.36
Average for 14-year period 1953–66)	3.65

Of course, the rates have continued to go up and in 1967, they climbed to 4.85 on long-term Government securities and to 5.26 in 1968.

Mr. Speaker, these rates and yields on long-term Government securities do not really tell the full story. These are the rates to the Federal Government and, of course, the rates charged the American public were much higher.

A chart of the prime lending rates gives an even more graphic illustration of what has happened:

Prime rate (1939 to 1969) percent per annum

Year:	*Rate*
1939	1.50
1940	1.50
1941	1.50
1942	1.50
1943	1.50
1944	1.50
1945	1.50
1946	1.50
1947	1.75
1948	1.75
1949	2.00
1950	2.00
1951	2.50
1952	3.00
1953	3.25
1954	3.25
1955	3.50
1956	4.00
1957	4.50
1958	4.00
1959	5.00
1960	5.00
1961	4.50
1962	4.50
1963	4.50
1964	4.50
1965	5.00
1966	6.00
1967	6.00
1968	6.75
1969	8.50

Source: Federal Reserve Board.

I also place in the RECORD a chart which describes the increase in the FHA interest rate to its present level of 8 percent, including the insurance fee:

FHA interest rate [1]

(1939–69)

[In percent]

Year:	*Rate* [2]
1939	5.00
1940	4.50
1941	4.50
1942	4.50
1943	4.50
1944	4.50
1945	4.50
1946	4.50
1947	4.50
1948	4.50
1949	4.50
1950	4.50
1951	4.25
1952	4.25
1953	4.50
1954	4.50
1955	4.50
1956	5.00
1957	5.25
1958	5.25
1959	5.75
1960	5.75
1961	5.75
1962	5.25
1963	5.25
1964	5.25
1965	5.25
1966	6.00
1967	6.00
1968	6.75
1969	7.50

[1] Figure shown is maximum legal rate for that year.

[2] To this figure should be added ½% for insurance.

Source: Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. Speaker, these figures make it obvious that something must be done at the highest levels of the Federal Government to bring about a reversal in this trend toward higher and higher interest rates.

Yet, we have an administration which moves in the opposite direction. An example of this came last week when the Treasury Department announced plans to eliminate the 51-year-old limit of 4¼ percent on long-term Government securities.

The removal of the 4¼-percent ceiling is tantamount to a surrender to a permanent state of high interest rates in the U.S. economy. I do not accept this and I am convinced that the majority of the Members of the Congress are unwilling to write high interest into law on a permanent basis.

The Federal Government should finance its operations at short terms—under 7 years—while interest rates remain at their historic highs.

It is foolhardy and irresponsible to lock in long-term Government borrowings for 30, 40, and 50 years at these high rates. It is accepted and common practice for business corporations to borrow short term when rates are high and long term when rates decline. The Government should follow the same sound business practice and not recommend removal of the 4¼-percent ceiling.

I recognize that the 4¼-percent ceiling is well below existing market rates, but this is all the more reason to hold the line against long-term borrowings at high interest rates.

The 4¼-percent ceiling has always been a warning to remind the Federal Government that the American people expect their representatives to follow a policy of low and reasonable interest rates.

This is true despite the fact that this administration has violated this policy on all fronts.

The recommendation for removal of the 4¼-percent ceiling is an obvious signal that the Nixon administration plans to keep interest rates high for an indefinite period.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are in desperate need of help—in desperate need of officials who will live up to their responsibility on monetary policy.

Instead, we have twin mynah birds at the Treasury Department and at the Federal Reserve—one croaking out, "Fight inflation, fight inflation," and the other, "There is nothing I can do, there is nothing I can do."

It is now obvious—painfully so—that the people cannot turn to the Secretary of the Treasury for help on interest rates. He has turned a deaf ear to the demands from the people.

The Secretary continues to hold "window dressing" meetings with the bankers at the Treasury Department—get-togethers for his old friends. There is another of these sessions scheduled for tomorrow at the Department.

As I mentioned earlier, these meetings were originally billed as discussions of the prime rate—hopefully discussions to bring that rate down. But they have turned into nothing but political gatherings designed to shore up the strength of a weak Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Kennedy hopes to demonstrate his strength among the bankers and the big business community. He has given up any hopes of reaching the people. He is now appealing to the special interests to keep him in office.

Mr. Speaker, it has become more and more obvious that the Congress must seize the initiative if anything is to be done to bring interest rates down and to prevent them from going even higher. The administration, thanks to a reactionary Federal Reserve Board Chairman and an unbelievably weak sister in the top job at the Treasury Department, has abandoned its role on monetary policy.

Therefore, today, I am announcing the formation of a broadly based low interest steering committee among the Democrats in the House of Representatives. In the next few days, I will be asking my colleagues to join me in this effort.

Mr. Speaker, this steering committee will be designed to fill the enormous vacuum that has been left by the Nixon administration. It will be designed to provide direction and national policy on monetary affairs with particular emphasis on discovering ways to bring down interest rates.

In recent weeks, Members of the House from all sections of the Nation have contacted me about the high-interest-rate situation and expressed deep concern that the administration was doing nothing. The formation of this committee is an answer to these requests.

Initially, Mr. Speaker, the steering committee will work to mobilize strength in the House to oppose the administration's ill-conceived attempt to lift the 4¼-percent ceiling on long-term Government bonds. The steering committee, however, will move into broader areas of the interest rate question and will attempt to mobilize congressional and public sentiment behind efforts to roll back the prime rate and other key interest rates that are forcing up the cost of money in the economy.

Mr. Speaker, we formed a steering committee in the late 1950's and it did much to hold down interest rates in the Eisenhower administration. This committee was directly responsible for blocking the attempt to raise the 4¼-percent ceiling on long-term securities which President Eisenhower had proposed.

Today, there is even greater sentiment for action on interest rates. I know for a fact that mail is pouring into many Members' offices, and I have received over a thousand letters and telegrams from virtually every State in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we must have action to bring down interest rates and it is incumbent on the 91st Congress to fill the leadership vacuum that has been created by the administration and its monetary officials.

COMMENDING THE ATTORNEY GENERAL ON HIS VOTING RIGHTS POSITION

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. **WAGGONNER**. Mr. Speaker, you will remember that I spoke on a number of occasions during House consideration of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 in opposition to the measure. I am sure you will recall as well that I centered my opposition around the undisputed fact that it was sectional legislation, punitive in nature, carefully proscribed so that it applied only to a few States in the South. At that time, the baying of the hounds was loud and clear. Those of us who tried unsuccessfully to make this or any other legislation equally applicable to all States were hooted down.

The Attorney General has now presented to the House Judiciary Committee and the Senate Committee on the Judiciary a new proposal recognizing the unfairness and the inequity of the present law. This new proposal provides that whatever is enacted is to apply to all States and, further, it places the burden of proving discrimination on the Federal Government rather than requiring, as is now the case, the States or other geographical or political subdivisions to prove their innocence.

Nothing could be more democratic, more in keeping with the American tradition of equity and justice.

I am not surprised, however, that the same array of men who voted for the present discriminatory legislation 4 years ago is now uniformly horrified over the prospect of this law applying to their States as well. I have questions about certain aspects of the proposal myself, but, in regard to the equity of its being applicable to all States, I have none. As a matter of fact, if this were not such a serious subject, their display of demagoguery would be outlandishly funny.

But, as I say, this is a serious subject. In truth, there can be no intelligent argument advanced to deny that the Constitution of the United States gives to the several States the right to set their own voting requirements as long as the standards are uniformly applied to all people. Yet, the existing law forbids that right to the States.

I have had bitter personal experience with the present law and how its discriminatory provisions have been used. It is a matter of record that the former Attorney General, Ramsey Clark, sent hordes of Federal registrars into my district and others, there to round up men and women like so many cattle and herd them to the voter registration offices, providing only that they were Negro.

I asked Attorney General Clark face to face if any person in any parish of my congressional district had been guilty of discrimination against any person who had attempted to register and he said there had not been a single instance that he knew of.

I then asked him if he intended to make the same registration drive among whites because I am in favor of everyone being registered to vote who wants to be. In response, Attorney General Clark said he was not interested in registering whites, only Negroes.

Thus this act was abusively used to register tens of thousands of illiterates all over the South who had never expressed any interest in registering or voting before.

The present Attorney General is right of course, in taking the position that whatever is law in one State must also be law in all others. He is right when he says there should be no sectionalism, but equal justice under law. It is the distilled essence of demagoguery for anyone to attack him or this position as some are doing. Those who are doing so are the ones who voted in favor of this discrimination back in 1965. They are the ones who have been discriminating in the intervening years. The chickens have come home to roost

In all sincerity, I salute the Attorney General for his effort to provide equity under the law rather than discrimination as his predecessors did. Both he and the administration are to be commended for their forthright approach.

NONSILVER $1 COIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to a bill that was introduced last week by my colleague, the gentleman from Idaho, and 145 cosponsors. The bill, H.R. 12744, authorizes the minting of clad silver dollars bearing the likeness of the late Dwight David Eisenhower.

At the outset, I want to make it clear that my opposition is not to the commemoration of our beloved President. The fact of the matter is that I was the first to introduce such legislation. I did it almost 2 months ago, on May 19. My bill, H.R. 11404, specifically provided for the minting of a nonsilver $1 coin bearing the likeness of President Eisenhower.

My opposition, Mr. Speaker, is to the use of silver in this coin. And I want to take this opportunity to explain my position to you and the rest of my colleagues, especially those who joined in the bill to authorize the minting of a silver dollar coin.

On May 12 of this year, the Joint Commission on the Coinage held a very important meeting that was chaired, incidentally, by Secretary of the Treasury David Kennedy. As many of you know, this bipartisan commission has the responsibility of giving advice on silver and coinage problems to the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Congress.

I am currently a member of it, and have been since its inception several years ago. As a result of this position, I have studied the problems of silver and coinage very closely.

At this meeting, the Joint Commission on the Coinage recommended, among other things, that silver be taken out of the half dollar and that it be replaced by a nonsilver half dollar, and a nonsilver $1 coin. As a result of this recommendation, the Treasury Department urged prompt enactment of legislation to that effect, and I introduced my bill.

I might add at this point, Mr. Speaker, that these recommendations were not arrived at overnight. They were the result of more than 2 years' work, during which time the silver situation was studied with a fine-tooth comb. Every aspect of the problem was looked into, and I can assure you that no table was left unturned.

I think that Secretary Kennedy's statement to the Commission explains the problem very well. He said, and I quote:

> The first recommendation, for the minting of a non-silver clad half dollar, is consistent with the conclusions reached by the commission at its meeting last December. I think the convincing argument here is that despite the minting of some 760 million 40 percent silver half dollars over the past three years, very few of these coins are actually circulating. Even if we were to continue pouring all of our remaining 150 million ounces of surplus silver into the silver half dollar, it is extremely doubtful whether the coin would circulate in any quantity. Moreover, this use of our remaining silver would require a halting of surplus silver sales which would very probably drive the price up excessively and further stimulate the hoarding of these coins. *In short, the 40 percent half dollar in our past experience is simply a losing proposition.* (Emphasis added.)

That statement, I repeat, was made by the Secretary of the Treasury and you can readily see that it applies to the use of silver in any coin.

Mr. Speaker, to call the 40-percent half dollar a losing proposition is to state the case mildly.

The point is that we are wasting our precious supplies of silver on a coin that does not even circulate, while our domestic industry desperately needs the metal. And the legislation my collegues have introduced would not only continue this wasteful practice, but also would aggravate it. In addition, it would be inconsistent with the Joint Coinage Commission recommendations.

A few figures should put what I am saying in the proper perspective.

For example, since 1964, 267 million ounces of silver have been used in the minting of more than 1 billion half dollars. This amount of silver alone would have been enough to fill the gap between domestic production and consumption for a period of 2½ years.

Or to put it another way, the United States used 60 percent more silver in minting the half dollar than the rest of the entire world consumed during 1968 for this purpose.

The fact that the coin would not circulate even at the annual production rate of 300 million coins should be proof that, so long as silver is used, it will not serve as a medium of exchange.

And the mint reduced the production of the 40-percent half dollar to 100 million a year last July. Even at this reduced rate—15 million ounces of silver per year—more silver is consumed in 1 year than is consumed by the domestic photographic industry in 4 months or the electronics industry in 5 months.

In addition, U.S. industry uses about four times the amount of silver produced in this country. Thus, foreign silver must be purchased to fill the gap. At 1968 prices, this could mean a $175 to $256 million per year balance-of-payments deficit.

Mr. Speaker, simply stated, a new silver coin would not serve the purpose for which it was intended. It just would not circulate. But there are other reasons as well for not using silver in our currency.

For example, the Government could make more money on seigniorage by minting nonsilver coins. Seigniorage, as some of you know, is the difference between the face value and the intrinsic value of a coin.

The Treasury Department only has about 150 million ounces of silver left in its reserves.

Legislation authorizing silver coins could start an inflationary upward move for silver like the one that occurred last year.

And finally, I would remind all my colleagues that it was Congress that originally authorized taking silver out of our currency. Under Public Law 89-81, which pased on July 23, 1965, silver was taken out of the dime and the quarter. Unfortunately, it was not completely taken out of the half dollar, which retained 40 percent silver. The reason for this action was clear, and I should know. I fought hard for it, including removal of all silver from the half dollar which we lost on. Congress recognized that silver was much too precious and its supplies much too limited to waste on currency.

And yet, in spite of all this, Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues are asking for a silver coin. I just hope that they will take a good hard look at the silver situation, and in so doing, I would ask them to balance the crying need that domestic industry has for silver against the need for its use in a coin that would not even circulate.

I know it is a rare day that finds me quoting the Chicago Tribune, but today is indeed one of those rare days. In an editorial on June 7, the Tribune commented on the Treasury recommendations I have already mentioned. I quote:

> Mr. Kennedy's plan is sensible and timely. . . . (It) would give us half-dollars we can use, and the vending machines are starved for them. It might give us back the old cartwheel . . . even minus its silver. It would increase the profit . . . which the mint makes on its coinage. And nobody can complain that he will be seriously hurt by the proposal.

I repeat, that was the Chicago Tribune.

Even more interesting and somewhat ironical, are the comments of the Denver Post. On May 15, the Post ran an editorial entitled, "Wrong Time for Silver Oratory." Therein, they came out against the specific coin in question because they felt it would not circulate so long as it contained silver. And I would remind you that Colorado is a great silver-mining State.

Before concluding, I think there is something else we should all keep in mind. All the coins in question would bear the likeness of our late President, Dwight David Eisenhower. I am sure that my colleagues would agree with me that this is a fitting tribute to one of our greatest leaders. It would indeed be unfortunate if we failed or even delayed to commemorate him in this manner.

I regret to say, however, that this may well be the case if the silver dollar coin is pushed. I say this because I am confident that when my colleagues study the silver situation, they will have serious second thoughts about the wisdom of their action.

There would follow a period of substantial delay, during which time our silver supplies would be further depleted. In the end, we would either end up with no coin, or the nonsilver coin which I have advocated, and for which I have introduced legislation.

I might note that my nonsilver coin would not look like the brown-edged clad coins currently in circulation. It would be esthetically appealing, and far

XUM

superior in appearance than the dime and quarter. In addition, I am informed that the new Philadelphia Mint can develop such a coin. Thus, there will be no need to spend money for a private contract to develop it.

I am anxious to see our beloved President commemorated—and now I know that my colleagues feel the same way. I also know that they would want to do this in a way that will have no detrimental effect upon anyone.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that I have made my position clear, and at the same time, given my colleagues some food for thought. Thank you for the opportunity to make these remarks.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to learn my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, has recently found it in order and not at all painful to quote from the Chicago Tribune.

I would hope that in the future my distinguished friend from Massachusetts might read the Chicago Tribune and its editorial policy, with the hope that perhaps he might find further areas of agreement with it.

Mr. CONTE. I found it to be very enlightening on this subject. I intend to pursue and read it as often as I can.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I am delighted to hear that.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman.

NO TAXATION WITHOUT REFORMATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUCINSKI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I again stressed the need for substantive tax reform in testimony before the Senate Finance Committee. The text of that testimony follows:

Mr. Chairman, I applaud your intention that any proposal to extend the income tax surcharge be considered simultaneously with recommendations on meaningful tax reform.

My testimony this morning makes two points:

(1) how very necessary such a marriage between the surcharge and tax reform is if we are ever to get tax reform; and (2) a warning about some new loopholes which, strangely enough, appear in the surcharge—investment tax credit repealer bill before you.

The position you have taken on the surcharge and tax reform is supported by a very large number of House members. Unfortunately, it seems not to have found favor with the Administration. The Administration's position is: "Disaster impends if the surcharge extension is delayed. If you will but pass the surcharge now, tax reform in abundance will be forthcoming by the end of the summer."

I have my doubts about both of these Administration claims. I am not convinced that doom will be upon us if we merely continue to extend withholding rates without extending the surtax. Nor am I convinced that the Administration's professed ardor for meaningful tax reform will survive passage of the surtax.

If we extend the withholding rates each month to give Congress time to complete work on tax reform, there will be no great administrative burden on businessmen or on the Treasury. Taxes will continue to be withheld at the same rate as they have been in the past.

If we grant the Administration its argument that this tax revenue must be taken out of the economy in order to lessen inflationary pressures, extending the withholding rate will do this as well as an extension of the surcharge.

If we are concerned about the inflationary effect of delaying repeal of the 7 percent investment tax credit, we should recall that repeal, when passed, will be retroactive to April 18, 1969. Since businessmen know they can no longer count on the investment tax credit, a few months delay in enactment will not affect their investment plans.

As for the Administration's commitment to tax reform, there are signs that it is less than total. In such critical areas as the oil depletion allowance, tax-exempt state and local bonds, capital gains, stock options, accelerated depreciation on speculative real estate, and payment of estate taxes by the redemption of government bonds at par, one looks in vain for Administration loophole-plugging proposals. The reason, I suspect, is that there are strong anti-reform voices within the Administration blocking action in these areas.

Take the 27.5 percent oil depletion allowance. In a November 1, 1968, campaign speech in Lubbock, Texas, Mr. Nixon solemnly promised that he would never tamper with that sacrosanct loophole.

Or tax-exempt bonds. Attorney General John Mitchell was a leading tax counsel for the issuers of tax-exempt bonds for many years. Since becoming Attorney General, he has said that taxing income from such bonds would be unconstitutional, even though the great weight of legal authority is to the contrary. Vice President Spiro Agnew is another Nixon Administration figure who opposes taxing the interest from these bonds. Agnew, a former Governor and county executive, has reportedly been urging state and county officials to lobby against any proposals for tax reform in this area.

In the capital gains area, it has been reported that Dr. Arthur Burns, President Nixon's top economic advisor, does not believe that capital gains should be taxed at all. It was the influence of Dr. Burns, it is said, that kept any changes in capital gains taxation out of the April Nixon tax package.

Moving on to stock options, we find that Secretary of the Treasury Kennedy, earlier this year, negotiated successfully with the Senate to take advantage of the stock option loophole with regard to stock in his Chicago bank. Because he disposed of this stock before six months had passed, however, the bargained-for tax benefits turned out to be unavailable.

With regard to the loophole allowing accelerated depreciation on speculative real estate, we find Housing and Urban Development Secretary George Romney arguing that no changes can be made in this provision without doing irreparable harm to programs for low and middle income housing—despite the fact that only 6 percent of the tax benefits from this provision go to those investing in low and moderate income housing.

It should be clear from this that the Administration's commitment to "prompt and meaningful tax reform" would be strengthened by strong pressure from the outside. The only way to keep this outside pressure strong is to say to the Administration: No surtax without tax reform! No taxation without reformation!

Tax reform cannot pass without Republican votes. The amassing of 154 Republican votes for the tax surcharge in the House on June 30 demonstrates the wonders that can be worked when President Nixon and his Congressional leaders apply their persuasive skills.

Turning briefly to the investment tax credit repealer, the transition rules adopted by the House in connection with the repeal in at least three instances grant special privileges to individual companies which are very difficult to justify by any objective standard.

The transition rules generally allow the credit for expenditures after April 18, 1969, if the expenditures are made under a binding contract in effect on that date. In addition, the credit is allowed for an entire facility in certain cases in which, prior to the cut-off date, there is an economic commitment evidenced by expenditures constituting more than half the cost of the facility.

But there are three sections, tightly drawn to cover only a few companies, which allow the credit in situations not covered by the general transition rules.

The first, designed to save thirteen gas pipeline companies some $14.2 million in taxes, would enable these companies to take the investment credit on pipeline which they have not yet bought but for which approval was sought from the Federal Power Commission before April 19 (Sec. 4(a) of the bill and Sec. 49(b)(6)(B) of the code). The theory is that the companies should not be penalized for delay by a Federal agency. But there are a great many other analagous situations in which a company must hold off entering into a binding contract while waiting for a Federal agency to act that are not covered by this provision. How about the thousands of legitimate businessmen who didn't have a firm contract because they were waiting for commitments from the Interstate Commerce Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, or the Small Business Administration? The provision is very carefully drawn, however, so that only the thirteen pipeline companies can benefit. If there is so much merit in the pipeline companies' argument, why isn't similar largesse extended to everyone in the same position?

Another point—if it is the possible tardiness by a Federal agency which justifies this exemption from the general rule, why is it made available, as it is, to companies that sought Federal Power Commission approval only a day or two before the April 19 cut-off date? Surely these companies could not have expected action on their application within the space of a few days.

Finally, many economists have argued that the investment credit should never have been extended to utilities such as these pipeline companies in the first place, since they already recover all their investment costs plus a reasonable rate of return under the rates set for them by regulatory commissions.

The second special interest exception to the regular transition rules is designed to aid three shipping companies and would save them an estimated $3.5 million (sec. 4(a) of the bill and sec. 49(b)(9) of the code). The provision extends the investment credit to unordered and unbuilt barges which are to be carried on a new type of sea-going cargo vessel. The barges are made eligible for the credit if the ships which are to carry them are eligible, even if the barges have not been ordered before April 19. A general transition rule would make these barges eligible if they represented less than half the total cost of the ships plus the barges, but the special rule makes them eligible irrespective of this general provision. Again, the special exception is carefully drawn so that only the favored companies can benefit from it, leaving others in analogous situations to complain about the unfairness of the legislative process in Washington.

The third special provision is designed to aid the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation (sec.

XUM

4(a) of the bill and sec. 49(b)(10) of the code). The provision is tightly written to cover a contract Lockheed made last December with several companies for a new commercial plane. The planes will not all be delivered until 1973, and Lookheed has not yet bought all the tools needed to produce them. The provision would extend the credit not only to these tools, but to "all tangible personal property placed in service by [Lockheed] before January 1, 1972" which is required to carry out the contract, irrespective of the normal 50 percent rule. Once again we have a provision drafted in general terms which in fact applies to only one firm and which cynically excludes all others in similar situations.

My point, Mr. Chairman, is not that the Committee should seek out all others in similar circumstances so that the benefits unjustifiably extended to some are extended to all. Rather, I would urge the Committee to strike out these special interest provisions and leave these companies to be dealt with under the general rules that apply to everyone else. The Treasury Department has made a conscientious effort to draft transition rules that are as fair to everyone as possible. There will of course always be companies who are denied the credit under these rules who can plausibly claim to be entitled to it, but Congress is not well equipped to deal with these individual cases. The Congress should draw up rules which are generally applicable, leaving to the courts the task of applying them in individual cases. Once we get into the business of drafting special laws for special people, we simply compound the inequity of the laws we pass, while fostering cynicism and disillusionment among those who are excluded from the special benefits.

PANAMA SEA LEVEL PROPOSAL: VIEWS OF DISTINGUISHED GEOLOGIST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a most timely book by Teller, Talley, Higgins, & Johnson on "The Constructive Uses of Nuclear Explosives," published in 1968 by McGraw-Hill, the factual details and results of the Plowshare program were presented in honest scientific form and are thus available for objective appraisal of the nuclear excavation proposal by independent and experienced engineers and geologists.

As I stated on October 11, 1968, when commenting on the fourth annual report of the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Study Commission before this body, such evaluations should not be made by those who may benefit from their own recommendations, but by independent persons not employed in current canal studies that are rooted in the executive branch of our Government.

Prior to this date, on August 6, 1968, a distinguished physicist wrote me commending the Teller, et al. book, describing the "idealistic" proposed sea level project in Panama as "probably at this time actually impossible, dangerous, and unproven" as a realistic proposition.

The latest communication concerning the indicated book and the construction of a proposed sea-level canal in Panama is from Dr. Howard A. Meyerhoff, recently the chairman of the department of geology of the University of Pennsylvania. Because Dr. Meyerhoff's letter is illuminating and reflects the disciplined judgment that comes only from a background of study, experience, and observation, I quote it as part of my remarks and commend it for reading by all concerned with the canal question:

TULSA, OKLA.,
June 18, 1969.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Some months ago, you sent me a copy of a letter referring to the book by Teller, et al., on The Constructive Uses of Nuclear Energy. You asked for my opinion on its contents, specifically with reference to the feasibility of blasting a sea-level canal across some point in the isthmus or elsewhere in the "narrows" between the American continents.

I am sorry to have been so long responding, but I have had trouble fitting the assignment into an over-committed schedule. I cannot pretend to understand the physics involved, but I can comment on the engineering and geological impracticalities of the scheme. As you know, I have worked in Panama and am familiar with its topography and geology; and up to the time of my retirement two years ago, I taught engineering geology at the University of Pennsylvania.

First, without writing an essay on the subject, there is no other site than the Zone where a sea-level canal could (or should) even be considered, although there are 4 where a lock canal of greater length could conceivably be built.

Second, the use of nuclear explosives for major excavations has not even emerged from the incipient experimental stage; to employ the method for a major engineering project would, at this point in time, be folly. You are, I am sure familiar with the fact that the method was given prolonged consideration for the much simpler project of harbor excavation in Australia, and was recently abandoned because of dubious feasibility.

Third, a substantial—and formidable—part of the Zone, as well as of alternative interoceanic routes, consists of geologically young, poorly consolidated and unstable sedimentary rocks. At present canal elevations, slope instability resulting in slides has caused no end of trouble. An increase in the depth of certain of the cuts (Culebra, for example) by the difference between present elevation and sea level will increase the frequency and the volume of the slides during Panama's rainy season, roughly, by the square of the increase in depth. California's troubles during the torrential rains of last winter (and ante) illustrate the inability of sophisticated engineering to cope with the problem. Downward compaction of unstable material by nuclear blasts would actually aggravate the problem, as can readily be shown.

All these points can be elaborated, but I trust this summary will be helpful, even though very tardy.

Sincerely,

HOWARD A. MEYERHOFF.

RETIREMENT OF LT. GEN. WILLIAM F. CASSIDY, CHIEF OF ARMY ENGINEERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FALLON) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Gen. William F. Cassidy, the Chief of Army Engineers and one of the finest gentlemen in the Federal service, will retire August 1 of this year. General Cassidy, a distinguished soldier-engineer, has been responsible for many solid achievements as the director of the nationwide water resource development program of the Corps of Engineers since his appointment as Chief of Engineers in July 1965.

During General Cassidy's tenure as Chief of Engineers, our Nation has grown in strength, nurtured by a water and related land-development program that has exceeded a billion dollars annually. Even though our rivers and harbors work has been slowed due to pressing demands for tax dollars on our military front, the Corps under General Cassidy has brought nearer to completion many projects in our big river basins.

The Missouri River stands on the threshold of being flood-free thanks to the chain of dams which today is storing a record 66 million acre-feet of water. Work in the lower basin is transforming Kansas and Missouri into lake-dotted regions of flood control and other multiple-water uses.

The Southwest, long a staging ground for dust and crop failures, is rapidly being developed with corps built reservoirs on the increase. And the Arkansas River, where red water once was the only thing moving, today hears the whistle of towboats as commercial navigation pushes upstream bringing new industries and opening up a new economic frontier.

The Ohio River Basin, a bastion of industrial might, but also the scene of aging locks and dams, is now taking on a new look through a modernization program being pushed as rapidly as appropriations will permit by General Cassidy and his Corps of Engineers.

The Pacific coast locked in a race with a booming population is being boosted in the North by a growing list of dams on the Columbia River and its tributaries. California points with pride to its model water resources program which is receiving major benefits from flood control and storage projects built by the Corps of Engineers. The disastrous storms in the winter of 1968–69 and the spring of 1969 in California caused considerable damage. But Corps flood-control projects, which cost the Federal Government $872,000,000 to build, prevented damages in the amount of $1,600,065,000. The Atlantic Seaboard also reflects General Cassidy's philosophy of "Let's get on with the job." The excellent Chesapeake and Delaware Canal project in Delaware and the State of Maryland is testimony to this fine attitude. Floodwalls and flood control dams have been built in New England to protect that area from the drenching rains that follow in the wake of hurricanes. Great strides are also being made in building protective works along coastal areas to ward off destructive tidal flooding.

Since General Cassidy has been at the helm, the corps has participated and continues to be involved in a new series of studies and comprehensive planning undertakings which eventually will encompass every major region and river basin in the country. The innovative Chesapeake Bay basin model study is illustrative of this fine work being performed by the corps.

Like many others who work in the service of their country, General Cassidy has felt the sting of criticism, much of it in the controversial and sensitive areas of conservation and preservation. But the general quietly and with dignity is winning over many critics by demonstrating that the corps is devoting much effort to the preservation and enhancement of the esthetic and ecological values of natural environments in the planning and building of all corps projects.

General Cassidy leaves behind a booming new recreation industry that has sprung up almost overnight. During 1968 attendance at corps-built lakes reached 227 million visits—more than 23 million over the 1967 total, the previous all-time high.

The Chief also leaves a solid portfolio in other water resources dividends. Today the corps has 53 reservoirs which provide a dependable yield of nearly 3½ billion gallons of water per day to cities, towns, and rural areas with more than 3½ million people. Hydroelectric power generated at corps dams produce about a fifth of the Nation's total hydropower.

One of the great accomplishments of General Cassidy and his corps was recorded this spring in answer to the President's call for a coordinated national emergency effort to meet the immediate threat of severe flooding in 25 States across the northern half of the Nation and down the west coast to California. Working under the auspices of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, the corps quickly launched Operation Foresight—an emergency construction program deploying men and large stores of flood-fighting equipment and supplies throughout the threatened areas. Although final returns have not yet been recorded, the corps spent $15 million, thus far, damages prevented total $250 million.

General Cassidy leaves a glowing record of accomplishments, a topflight engineering and construction agency, and a well-stocked inventory of water resource projects. In his major responsibility as the supervisor of all military engineering functions in the Army—you might call him the Army's systems manager—he has counseled, advised, and assisted in the tremendous volume of construction and combat support contributed by Engineer troops to our forces and our allies in Southeast Asia. He also carried the added responsibility for the expanded military construction program at home and in other parts of the world.

General Cassidy's retirement will mark the end of a distinguished military career that started in 1931 when he was commissioned in the Army Corps of Engineers upon graduation from the U.S. Military Academy, West Point. Prior to his appointment as Chief of Engineers, General Cassidy was Commanding General, U.S. Army Engineer Center at Fort Belvoir, and Commandant of the Engineer School, Fort Belvoir, Va., from 1963 to 1965. He was Deputy Chief of Engineers from 1962 to 1963 and for the 3 preceding years, Director of Civil Works, Office of the Chief of Engineers.

The general's tremendous background of experience includes prior assignments as Division Engineer, South Pacific Division, and Senior Logistics Adviser to the Republic of Korea.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Public Works—the committee which has jurisdiction over the civil works activities of the Corps of Engineers—I speak for his many friends in saluting him for his achievements and wishing him continued health, happiness, and success in the years to come.

VIETNAM

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, during the Fourth of July recess, I went to Vietnam. Because we are all intensely interested in our Nation's commitment there, I would like to share with my colleagues a rather hastily written and sketchy report on my trip; prepared for my Biweekly Washington Report. We all thirst for knowledge and information about Vietnam, so I think it is appropriate to share some of my impressions.

The report follows:

Washington Report No. 8

In my last Report, I indicated I would vote for the surtax extension and gave my reasons. Also that I delayed a trip to Vietnam to be present for the vote. At the time, I did not realize just how important each vote would be. The final vote was 210–205, following a bruising debate, which probably influenced nobody, and some arm-twisting that probably did.

TRIP TO VIETNAM

My trip to Vietnam was most successful, interesting and informative. Last year, following my trip to the Far East, I reported that "generally speaking, the motivation and morale of our troops appear good. They are troubled, however, by an apparent lack of support on the home front. . . ." This observation still obtains. Also in my Report last year, while commenting on the fact that my trip was worthwhile, I commented that one tends to become a bit ingrown, and that person-to-person contact and sharing of experiences with persons involved in one of the best potentials for a better world. This observation, too, still obtains.

Space does not permit a full account of my trip, but here are some of the highlights:

I flew to Vietnam (at my own expense) by private carrier under contract to the military via Travis Air Force Base, Honolulu, Guam, to Bien Hoa. On the return trip, via Okinawa, Honolulu, Travis, and from San Francisco back to Washington. On the plane, I had the opportunity to meet and talk with many military personnel. During layovers, there were informative tours of the bases.

THE DELTA

In the Delta area, from which the 9th American Infantry troops are now withdrawing, I visited 4th Corps Headquarters for orientation. From there I went to Sa Dec, a province capital (provinces in Vietnam are the rough equivalent of our states), for a first-hand look at our pacification and economic development activities. These are usually conducted by AID officials. There is a wide diversity of opinion as to how successful these efforts have been. On balance, I received the distinct impression we are making some real progress. A good deal depends on the area, of course, and whom you talk to. Among the more encouraging statistics is the fact that in 1954 only 5% of eligible students were in primary school; the figure is now approximately 80%. Approximately 75% of the Vietnamese are doing as well or better than before the war in regard to such matters as wages, living conditions, food, and material possessions. A land-reform bill, which will vest title in a large number of tenant farmers, has been introduced in the National Assembly and passage is expected this summer.

While in the Delta, I visited the 9th ARVN (Vietnamese) Division at Regimental, Battalion and outpost levels. The key to continued withdrawal of American troops rests with the skill with which we help train South Vietnamese troops. Here again, there is a broad spectrum of opinion as to how successfully we are accomplishing this. Veterans of Korea, and I spoke to many, repeatedly assured me that the South Vietnamese have as good or better potential than South Koreans. But it will take time. There is a haunting fear frequently expressed, and at all levels, that impatient and uninformed public opinion may trigger a precipitous withdrawal, undoing what has been done. All agree the first step has been wise, a first step towards shoving the bird out of the nest, so to speak—the de-Americanization of the war that I urged following my visit last year. While in the Delta, I was privileged and proud to join with a Province Chief in the presenting of military medals to members of a River Patrol, who also took me for a trip on one of their patrol boats. Otherwise, my travels were almost entirely by helicopter.

SAIGON AND THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

During the time I spent in Saigon, I visited a Fourth of July reception hosted by Ambassador Bunker. Later I met with him privately for more than an hour—a most informative and encouraging conference. Of particular interest was my visit to the South Vietnamese National Assembly and meeting several of their Senators and Deputies. Deputies are elected from areas, usually provinces. Senators on a country-wide basis. One constructive suggestion that I intend to act on is to work out a method by which the United States Congress can establish a liaison with the South Vietnamese Assembly. By the sharing of experiences, I believe we can help them along the trail toward developing an effective legislative branch of government. Not that our own Congress, so badly in need of reorganization and reform itself, is any shining example, but I do feel that some of our experience and staff know-how would be helpful to the South Vietnamese Assembly during its infancy.

THE 3D BATTALION, 197TH FIELD ARTILLERY

Perhaps the highlight of my visit was the day I spent with all elements of New Hampshire's National Guard F. A. Battalion in the 3d Corps area. For tactical reasons, the firing batteries have been spread out to form widely-dispersed fire support bases. One of them, in northern Phuoc Long Province, is within range of the Cambodian border. It is referred to as Fire Base Ann. Three guns of "B" Battery are located there in support of Special Forces on constant search missions. The search is not only for North Vietnamese and Viet Cong troops, but just as important, for their caches of supplies. Those caches are built up painstakingly over long periods of time and then used as a base for troops quickly infiltrated from Cambodia to mount battalion and regimental (main force) attacks. Troop morale was good and our commanders had nothing but praise for the excellent performance of the New Hampshire men. When they return in September, I hope they do so as a group and with their colors. The Granite State should extend a proud welcome. While visiting the 25th Infantry and the 1st Cavalry Divisions, I met many New Hampshire men and was greatly impressed by the morale, technical proficiency

XUM

and uncanny new techniques and tactics we have adapted to the situations encountered.

NATIONAL CHILD ABUSE ACT

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly obvious that child abuse in the United States is growing into a major problem. Strictures of modern society are often too much for a good many marginal people. When they happen to be parents of small children, they too often turn upon such helpless youngsters, venting their feelings upon them. In case after case, the evidence is massive and damning. Our country is allowing a situation to come into being almost unnoticed, which, if unchecked, will continue to warp and perhaps ruin or end the lives of thousands of youngsters.

It is imperative for our National Government to act swiftly before this situation is completely out of hand. A set of national standards can be set up through passage of the National Child Abuse Act of 1969, H.R. 11585, which my distinguished colleague (Mr. BIAGGI) has pioneered in this body. I am most gratified to join him in sponsorship of this measure.

More often than not, Mr. Speaker, there is intent to aid neglected and abused children. Almost every jurisdiction and program contains such an element. Funds, however, are sadly lacking. Programs reflect this shortcoming. Without financing, we shall possess only good intentions, and the problem will continue to grow.

This measure would provide necessary funds with which to mount a national effort in the area of child abuse.

In cases where parents are on welfare, the bill calls for immediate cutoff of welfare funds if child abuse is proven. These funds, in turn, would be turned over to an agency or person charged with responsibility for the child.

If either parent of an abused child is found to be a drug addict, the bill provides for immediate mandatory removal of the child. I feel these provisions are fair and necessary. Facts increasingly coming to light are shocking, particularly to a society which gives such blaring lipservice to morality. Shall we not act as we speak? It has been stated by the medical director of one of New York's major hospitals that one or two children are killed daily by their parents in this Nation. Child abuse, therefore, is reaching epidemic proportions. More than 9,000 cases were reported nationally last year alone. The trend is constantly up. Think of how many cases which were completely hushed up.

This bill would also provide immunity from civil or criminal liability to any person reporting a case of suspected child abuse. Often, this is the only manner in which such cases can be brought to attention of appropriate authorities. A child, young, frightened, and in a state of shock, is hardly likely to go to authorities. In fact, that is probably the last thought to enter the mind of such a person. Some State laws still designate the medical profession as the reporting group rendering such a clause essential.

The final noteworthy section in the measure would establish a child identification system requiring the Federal Government to issue social security numbers to all newborn babies. It would then become mandatory for all hospitals and doctors to file the numbers of children who have been treated for abuse or neglect.

Mr. Speaker, I see precious little reason for debating this measure in great depth. Our problem is obvious and worsening. Our responsibility is clear. Our solution is immediately available. Its cost would be minimal. All we have to do is act accordingly on this excellent piece of legislation.

WHY DO AMERICA'S CONSUMERS PAY DOUBLE THE WORLD PRICE FOR OIL?

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, our oil industry is the coddled darling of the American tax structure. No single segment of their tax privileges is more essential to their continuing grip on the American consumer's jugular than our present system of mandatory oil import controls.

Established in 1959, their original purpose was to guard a lush American market against a flood of cheap foreign oil. Such a danger then seemed imminent because of proliferation of major oil finds and their swift commercial exploitation. Today these controls are used to reap a rich harvest of extra dollars from America's consumers. It is blatant exploitation, to say the least. These controls are now as necessary as Carrie Nation at a distillers convention.

Why should our consumers be forced to pay nearly double the world price for oil? This is a proven figure. A barrel of light Iranian crude can be delivered to our east coast for about $2 per barrel. It costs $3.78 for a barrel of east Texas sweet crude to be brought in by tanker to the Philadelphia-New Jersey area.

We are told that national security is the reason, a phrase which covers more than one scoundrel's activities. Our country produces more than a quarter of the world's oil, consuming more than a third of world production. We are told we dare not become dependent upon foreign oil sources. Yet evidence accumulates that, despite massive subsidies, our industry cannot keep pace with domestic demand. It is increasingly obvious that such subsidies are costing the public between $4 and $7 billion annually. Testimony to this effect has been given and proven out before the Congress.

Obviously, since their inception, these quotas over the past 10 years have cost the American buying public in the area of $40 to $50 billion. These massive subsidies come straight from the pockets of every American consumer. Bringing in cheap foreign oil would lower prices swiftly on every oil product sold the public.

Today we are allowed to obtain only about 20 percent of our oil from foreign sources. We now consume 12 million barrels daily, and our needs by 1980 will exceed 18 million barrels daily. Our support of artificially high domestic prices is costing us vast sums—all going as pure profit to oil companies.

The artificial wall against cheap foreign oil was supposed to provide incentives to domestic explorers and producers to expand domestic reserves. Proof has been brought forth in testimony before Senator HART's Subcommittee on Monopoly and Antitrust showing that exploration and drilling in our country have actually declined in the 10 years since mandatory curbs were imposed.

We have encouraged wasteful domestic production while subsidizing exploration and exploitation abroad. Couple these facts with foreign tax credits, domestic and foreign depletion allowances of 27½ percent, the highest allowed, and the rest of the range of oil tax privilege. The American consumer is a cow standing quietly as it is consistently milked by the oil industry. Half the oil moving in world trade is foreign oil American companies produce and sell, all subsidized by the taxpayer.

Dropping import barriers substantially is eminently sensible. Oil is available, controlled by American companies. It can easily be shipped to the United States in quantity, lowering prices here in short order. Millions of Americans would benefit, for a change, at the expense of our leech-like oil industry. Our domestic oil would be saved and available for any emergencies, such as in the case of national defense.

Otherwise, we see a total picture emerging which borders on the fantastic. Taxpayers are subsidizing foreign investment by our oil companies, which in turn are deliberately keeping their oil out of our domestic market to maintain high prices. Simultaneously, they are taking a systematic series of tax breaks. It boils down to a simple equation. What is theirs is theirs. What is ours is negotiable.

Mr. Speaker, today is the last day for filing opinions on possible revision of our oil import quota system with the Cabinet Task Force Committee headed by Secretary of Labor Schultz. All interested parties have filed, including the petrochemical industry—except the oil industry. It is worth noting further that not a single oil company has filed. But, of course, there is no conspiracy—is there?

THE POT DEBATE

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we had read to us President Nixon's message setting forth his plan to deal with the problem of narcotic usage in this country. That problem is so overwhelming and has caused so much personal heartache to so many families that we must all welcome any attention paid to this problem.

While I applaud much of what is in the message, I do want to suggest to the President and his advisors that they have committed the same error so often made in the area of drug abuse. Their error is in failing to make a distinction between the use of hard narcotics such as heroin and the use of marihuana. It is estimated by the President that those using hard narcotics such as heroin are estimated to be in the hundreds of thousands. The estimate of those using marihuana is in the millions. The difference in usage and the problems involved do require that different approaches be tried. The use of hard narcotics has been demonstrated scientifically to be adverse to the individual and to society. Few, if any, have any doubts respecting its destructive qualities. On the other hand, there is no overwhelming point of view which has been accepted by the public as controlling in the area of marihuana usage.

It is because the public is confused and desires some definitive report on this subject that on April 14 of this year I introduced a bill to establish a Presidential Commission on marihuana—a Commission which would take a new look at marihuana use and educate itself and the American people. That Commission would conduct a study of marihuana including but not limited to the following areas:

First, the extent of use of marihuana in the United States to include number of users, number of arrests, number of convictions, amount of marihuana seized, type of user, nature of use;

Second, an evaluation of the efficacy of existing marihuana laws;

Third, a study of the pharmacology of marihuana and its immediate and long-term effects both physiological and psychological;

Fourth, the relationship of marihuana use to aggressive behavior and crime; and

Fifth, the relationship between marihuana and the use of other drugs.

It appears that without an authoritative study concerning these questions, there is little hope that the criminal penalties for the use of marihuana will be significantly changed. The present Federal penalties for first-offense possession include a minimum of 2 years in prison to a maximum of 10 and for second-offense possession 5 years minimum to a maximum of 20. Can anyone seriously suggest at this point that the millions of young people who have violated the law and used marihuana be subjected to such harsh criminal penalties?

There are those who, without the benefit of scientific inquiry, advocate the legalization of marihuana use. I think such precipitous action taken without being certain of the medical, social, and legal consequences is just as wrong as the other extreme which mandates harsh criminal penalties to the user, ruining the lives of tens of thousands of our youth of today and leaders of tomorrow. Because there is no definitive report to support either of these positions, it is incumbent to ascertain what the facts are according to the best medical and scientific evidence now available to us.

And it is for that reason primarily that I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 10019 in order to establish the facts becaues it is only when we have the facts that we can rationally deal with any subject. Tens of thousands of young people in this country have been arrested and convicted for using marihuana and they have done so in my judgment because they refused to accept the point of view buttressed by our harsh criminal laws that the use of marihuana and its consequences is no different than that of heroin. I think it is high time that the best scientific minds in this country decide what the facts really are and give those facts to the American public.

This subject has been commented upon by the noted writer, William F. Buckley, Jr., as recently as July 12 and, because I believe his comments to be very relevant, I am including a copy of his article which appeared in the New York Post of that date:

THE POT DEBATE

Unfortunately, the dispute over marijuana has become highly idealogized, and this is true of both sides, i.e., true of many of those who favor the retention of stiff penalties against marijuana smoking, and true of many of those who believe in legalization. Unfortunately, because there is obviously a pressing need to know more about a drug which, according to the latest college poll, has been tested by approximately 50 per cent of the undergraduate population.

Newsweek has said of the great marijuana war, "It's the clincial version of should we stay in or get our of Vietnam." One doctor wrote recently, "Marijuana is much more a symbol than it is a drug, and this accounts for most of the extremism, polarization, and confusion. Along with the international Communist conspiracy, the marijuana mythology is a primary religious belief, the primary source of action and attitude of many Americans. The stepping-stone theory has as much validity as the domino theory in our foreign policy, both being deliberate creations of those who want to perpetuate policies that are otherwise untenable by adding to fear and hysteria."

Such analysis is of course left-Birchism, but it is significant that it is being made, and discouraging to any attempt to figure out just what it is that's going on, which we need sorely to know. Because it appears to be true, as Dr. David Smith of the Haight-Ashbury Medical Clinic reports, that "Marijuana has become one of the major vehicles in America's generation gap. Alcohol is the social drug of this generation and pot is the social drug of the next generation."

The so-called "stepping-stone" theory holds that those who begin with marijuana finish in hell. That they graduate from marijuana into narcotics. Dr. Robert Baird, director of the Haven Clinic in Harlem, is most emphatic on the point. "There's not the slightest doubt in my mind that 95 per cent of heroin addicts start with marijuana. . . . Searching for bigger kicks, they go on until they're on heroin."

Dr. Smith believes this to be utter nonsense. He contends, and the figures as they appear to a layman would seem to support him, that the percentage of marijuana smokers who graduate to heroin is small; about 20, roughly speaking, and (altogether coincidentally?) the same percentage as drink whiskey and then go on to alcoholism.

Recently the Supreme Court sprang Dr. Timothy Leary, the drug guru who was caught bringing grass into the country from Mexico. The court ruled that the law under which Leary was convicted was unconstitutional, because it required that someone importing marijuana pay a drug duty. But anyone paying that drug duty revealed himself to local authorities as having imported the stuff to begin with, exposing himself to the dire penalties of the individual states.

Meanwhile, prosecutions are likely to be tougher rather than less so. Because federal prosecutors had the discretion of putting importers of the drug on probation (they are over-whelmingly students coming in from abroad) for failure to pay the customs tax. Now they must turn them over for prosecution by the local states, many of which forbid probation.

Again, grass may prove to be a way station to hell, but it would appear plain that the marijuana laws are not much more effective than Prohibition. Indeed they may prove to be no more effective. Those who desire pot probably find and smoke it in about the same proportion as those who desired booze found and drank it. We need a crash program of testing and investigation, and above all, the de-ideologization of the arguments.

COAL MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my always colorful friend, George J. Titler, vice president of the United Mine Workers of America, is a well-beloved man who has fought many a good fight for the coal miners of this Nation from the days of bloody Harlan down to the present. All the good intentions of vice president Titler, however, are submerged by the fact that his superior, W. A. "Tony" Boyle is the actual president of the United Mine Workers of America and has the final say-so. Recently, I wrote a letter to Mr. Boyle, dated July 8, concerning the pending coal mine health and safety legislation, as follows:

JULY 8, 1969.

Mr. W. A. BOYLE,
President, United Mine Workers of America,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOYLE: You are as aware as anybody that the coal miners of West Virginia and the nation are in a restless mood. They know that in past years many promises of protection have been freely bandied about, yet when legislation was finally written it has been weakened and riddled with loopholes by the coal operator lobbies.

This year the miners are determined that their health and safety be fully protected through effective legislation. To succeed in their efforts, the muscle of the miners must be shown on Capitol Hill to counter and overcome the extremely effective lobbying which is going on by the coal operators.

Today (Tuesday), the Dent Subcommittee is meeting in executive session. Tomorrow (Wednesday) the full Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is meeting in executive session. Both groups will be making crucial decisions this week on the form and substance of the bill—decisions which will determine whether the bills will be strong or weak when they reach the House and Senate floor later this month for debate.

At this critical juncture, all those devoted to effective protection of the coal miners must join forces to press for a strong law without weakening loopholes. The United Mine Workers of America can make the

XUM

difference if you would direct every available man to come up to Capitol Hill and personally contact every member of the House Subcommittee and the Senate full committee on behalf of a strong bill. Furthermore, nothing would be more effective than to charter several busses to bring miners on vacation to the Capitol to work on behalf of effective legislation for their own protection.

I shall not attempt to affix blame for the dismally small turnout of miners at the Jefferson Memorial on Independence Day. It seems to me that if you could send observers to that rally you could have also sent some participants to join in the effort to help all coal miners. But this week you can summon, mobilize and start rolling toward Washington the men who could really make the difference between a strong bill and the same kind of dishwater compromise which has been slopped in the face of the miners in the past.

I have personally paid the way of several miners to come to Washington this week. Can your vast organization afford to do less? Senate and House members tell me they are under heavy pressure by coal operator interests. Why aren't they under the same pressure here and now on behalf of the rank and file of coal miners whose lungs, limbs and lives are on the line? What are you doing about getting effective legislation? Are you going to pass up this opportunity, and confirm the charges which some are making that you are really in league with the operators? I assure you that if you do not act, the miners and their new leaders will act for you and history will pass you by.

It is evident that any effective legislation must include some of the following principles, which I hope that with your help and the muscle of the miners brought to Washington we can persuade Congress to enact into law:

1. Mandatory Penalties To Assure Compliance.

This means that violations of the law must be punished, and not simply leave discretion as to whether they be punished. Penalties should be stiff enough to deter negligence, and should stick instead of being brushed aside. Firm authority to close mines which violate safety and health standards must be written clearly into the law.

2. Coal Dust Standard.

Coal dust produces black lung, enhances the danger of explosions, and limits visibility. We must start with the premise of what injures a coal miner's health and safety—and not take the position that the industry has some kind of vested right in economics or technology to destroy a man's lungs. The Surgeon General has testified that 4.5 milligrams per cubic meter of coal dust produces potentially 50% more cases of black lung than 3.0 milligrams. Some mines can reach 3.0 milligrams right now and must be directed and encouraged to do so. If industry undertakes an all-out effort, a level of 2.0 milligrams should be attainable within three years; even beyond that, a dust level of 1.0 milligrams should be the goal within five or six years.* Any waivers should be accompanied by a rigid requirement to submit engineering plans and specific timetables for progressive reduction of dust levels over the shortest possible time span. The cost to industry can never exceed the cost in human debris stricken by pneumoconiosis. Any miner who shows evidence of early development of pneumoconiosis should be allowed to work in areas where the dust level is no more than 1.0 milligrams per cubic meter of air. Respirators are no substitute for strict coal dust standards.

3. Board of Review.

Coal operators have testified strongly in support of an independent Board of Review which could nullify efforts of inspectors and health and safety officials to protect the coal miners. Judicial review already provides sufficient protection against arbitrary administrative action, and a Board of Review would be a serious loophole to overturn efforts to move effectively to protect health and safety.

4. Elimination of distinction between gassy and non-gassy mines.

A string of accidents in so-called non-gassy mines has proven that coal miners can be killed just as dead in these mines using dangerous, non-permissible electrical equipment. Here again the argument is economic vs. human, and we have had enough tragedy in the coal fields to dictate that for once Congress must declare that coal miners working in all types of underground mines deserve to be protected as human beings. The cost of new equipment should not outweigh the cost in human lives. Every time mine safety bills are debated, tears are shed over the poor little mine-owner who can't afford safe equipment and might be driven out of business. It's about time some tears are shed for the coal miners who are killed and crippled in such mines.

5. Administration by Secretary of Labor, and by Public Health Service.

It is natural that the Bureau of Mines and Secretary of the Interior should wish to maintain jurisdiction over enforcement of the health and safety features. No law, however strong, can be effective if it is administered on behalf of production rather than protection, as has been the case in the past. There should be a clean sweep of tired old inspectors, production-oriented methods of safety enforcement, and an entirely new approach is demanded if the coal miners are to be protected adequately. The Surgeon General should be given responsibility for x-ray and other physical examinations, including application of the results of updated research on pneumoconiosis. The Secretary of Labor should be given clear responsibility for enforcing safety standards.

6. Right to sue should be given to coal miners in case of owner or operator negligence.

One of the greatest incentives for the owner and operator to enforce health and safety requirements would be to empower the coal miner to file suit, with trial by jury, for accidents or impairment of health due to owner or operator negligence.

Sincerely,

KEN HECHLER.

Mr. Speaker, on June 20, Vice President Titler wrote me a rather interesting letter, in the course of which he stated:

> I demand you have this letter inserted in the Congressional Record.

It is a great pleasure for me to honor Mr. Titler's subtle suggestion and print the entire text of his June 20 letter, along with my reply dated July 11, Although Mr. Titler's letter was widely circulated in the newspapers 3 days prior to my receipt of the original text, I have made certain that he received my response several days in advance of its publication:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *June 20, 1969.*

Congressman KEN HECHLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I am getting tired of reading your lies in the newspapers. You are apparently some kin to Herr Goebbels who believed that if a lie was told often enough people would eventually believe it.

You and your two cronies, Drew Pearson and the instant expert "The Pied Piper of Lebanon" are what Harry Truman said about Drew Pearson, except you are also a prismatic liar.

You keep harping about my drawing $40,000 per year retirement pay. Nothing could be further from the truth under our present plan.

For your information I find you can retire from your position as Congressman (if you accept the government plan) at a minimum of $12,500 per year tax free, after only twelve years of service. You object to my drawing less than $10,000 after taxes after forty years service. If you do subscribe to the government plan I would be pleased to trade pensions with you. Many labor unions have much more liberal retirement plans than our union.

The resident officers of the United Mine Workers of America have not had a raise in wages in the last twenty-one years, and refused a raise at the 1968 convention. I see no place in the record where you refused your $12,500 raise making your salary $42,500 per year. It is now time for you to "fish" or "cut bait."

You and your cronies have been telling lies and half-truths continuously about the Welfare and Retirement Fund, about safety and about "black lung", in hopes of destroying the confidence of the coal miners in their officers.

You laud John L. Lewis in one breath as a great leader and call for an investigation of his welfare fund in the next. Make up your mind; was he good or evil? "Consistency thou art a jewel".

You criticize the union for owning a bank with its profits redounding to the benefit of the miners; you criticize the Welfare Fund for having too much inactive money in its checking account; you aver that the union does nothing about safety and Pneumoconiosis, which is entirely contrary to the record. In fact you are a "monkey searching for a flea". You are trying to prove to the coal miners of West Virginia that you are a "Do-Gooder", and the officials of the United Mine Workers of America are "No-Gooders".

You insult the intelligence of the miners with your distortions. You are a square peg in a round hole. I resent your trying to scab me out of my job.

Your "hot air" statements, you inserted in the Congressional Record, is only organic mulch which has cost the taxpayers of America thousands of dollars for printing with no tangible benefits.

What sinsister motives do you have in mind? Who is paying you; and/or for what are you running?

I am very much interested in helping you out—*way out!*

I expect you and your two buddies to get your facts straight, and immediately issue a public apology so the public will know what kind of prevaricators you are. Inasmuch as you have inserted in the Congressional Record at taxpayers expense many articles, statements and letters regarding the candidacy of many seeking office in the UMWA, I demand you have this letter inserted in the Congressional Record.

I will put my record for integrity and veracity against the instant experts or any other muckracker any day of the week.

Your reply is expected.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. TITLER.

JULY 11, 1969.

GEORGE J. TITLER,
Vice President, United Mine Workers of America, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: Your letter of June 20 puzzled me both by what it said and what it did not say.

How do you figure that a Congressman with 12 years of service can retire "at a minimum of $12,500 per year tax free"? You surely should check to find out the facts, which are that all Congressmen must pay in 7½ percent of their salary in order to draw any retirement, that it will be at least five years before I will be eligible to draw retirement, and that only the actual amount paid in is received back tax free. This means that after two years of drawing back what I have put into the retirement fund, I will be paying full taxes on all my retirement pay. So why do you make such outrageous statements without checking the true facts?

---

*Ultimately, we should press for 0.2 milligrams within eight years.

Second, you object to my stating that you will be able to draw $40,000 per year retirement pay. You deny this, despite the fact that the official records at the Department of Labor clearly stipulate that if you serve ten years as an international officer "who has served as International President, International Vice President, and/or International Secretary-Treasurer", then your pension shall be at the rate of your annual constitutional salary. Perhaps your outraged denial that you can draw your full $40,000 salary "under our present plan" simply reflects your fear that you will not be re-elected as Vice President, and thereby not serve out the full ten years necessary to qualify for that plush 100-percent-of-full-salary, non-contributory pension. The pennies, nickels and dimes of UMW dues-paying members have apparently been taken out of the UMW Treasury and set up in your National Bank of Washington as a special kitty just to pay the top plush retirement pensions of the fat cats in your headquarters—meaning you and Mr. Boyle and Mr. Owens.

Since you didn't, haven't and won't contribute one red cent of your salary toward your retirement, of course every penny of your plush retirement fund when paid you will be taxed. All Congressmen, including myself, pay 7½ percent of our salaries into our retirement fund. Therefore, we will be getting back that 7½ percent if and when we retire in the future, and then we will pay taxes on all the rest. So your comparisons are not very accurate, my good friend.

You wrote me: "I see no place in the record where you refused your $12,500 raise making your salary $42,500 per year." Let me tell you some of the ways I have spent that $12,500 (about half of which goes for taxes):

1. Starting off the year, I contributed $1,000 of my own money to the Black Lung Association to help them get the law through the West Virginia Legislature to protect and compensate miners afflicted by pneumoconiosis.

How much have you contributed of your salary to aid the cause of black lung at the state level in West Virginia?

2. At my personal expense, I financed a trip to Washington, D.C. by five of the widows of the Farmington disaster on February 24, who came here to urge Secretary of the Interior Hickel to retain John F. O'Leary as Director of the Bureau of Mines and urge him to support strong mine health and safety legislation?

How much of your $40,000-a-year salary have you personally contributed in the fight to retain John O'Leary and support strong mine health and safety legislation?

3. I personally paid the expenses out of my salary to fly Mrs. Willis Jessie and her foster mother to San Antonio, Texas, and Miami, Florida, and return to West Virginia with her three-year-old child who had been hi-jacked on a plane to Cuba. I did this because Mrs. Jessie is a resident of Holden, West Virginia, and her whole family are coal miners, active and disabled.

How much of your $40,000-a-year salary have you personally donated to help active and disabled coal miners who are in trouble?

4. On March 19 and March 20, I personally paid the expenses of three of the Farmington widows, Mrs. Kaznoski, Mrs. Snyder and Mrs. Rogers to fly from Clarksburg to Washington to testify before the Senate Subcommittee considering the mine health and safety bill. Their testimony was very effective.

How much of your $40,000-a-year salary have you personally contributed to bringing witnesses to Washington to testify?

5. On March 19, and March 20, 1969, I personally paid the expenses of three Logan County disabled coal miners afflicted with black lung to fly to Washington and testify before the Senate Subcommittee. Their names are Otis Ratliff of Davin, W. Va.; Huda Bailey of Mount Gay, W. Va.; and Henry Mann of Amherstdale, W. Va. I paid their plane fare round-trip, made arrangements for them to be picked up and driven to their homes, and paid their meals and hotel accommodations while in Washington presenting very effective testimony.

How much of your $40,000-a-year salary have you spent personally to bring home to the Members of the Congress the real facts concerning those who actually suffer from black lung?

6. At my own personal expense, I have travelled the length and breadth of West Virginia to talk with coal miners about the need for stronger mine health and safety legislation. Among the places to which I have traveiled, always at my own personal expense and not reimbursed by the government, are Logan, Beckley, Clifftop, Gilbert, Morgantown, Farmington, Princeton, Vivian, Oak Hill, Madison—and many other communities large and small. When I fly from Washington to make these trips, I fly tourist class; I sometimes see you flying on the same planes and you are always flying first-class. Congressmen can be reimbursed for one trip per month while Congress is in session, so long as it is on official business; none of the trips I have taken to the coal fields have been made at government expense, and I wonder just how many of your own trips were made at UMW expense.

How much of your $40,000-a-year salary have you spent personally to travel to the coal fields and acquaint the people with the facts on the need for coal mine health and safety legislation?

7. At my personal expense, in April, I flew to San Antonio, Texas, rented a car and drove to the Mexican border at Eagle Pass, Texas, and proceeded to the site of the major coal mine disaster which killed over 160 coal miners in Mexico. While on the scene, I also visited and inspected a comparable mine in the vicinity and spent considerable time underground.

How much of your $40,000-a-year salary have you spent personally to travel to other countries to get the facts on what is needed to make our mines safer?

I have not hitherto made public the extent of my personal expenditures out of my salary on behalf of the coal miners I represent and on behalf of strong and effective coal mine health and safety legislation. I can now assure you that during 1969 the amount of my salary increase has already been more than expended personally on the above and other related projects designed to help coal miners. I consider this my personal as well as official duty.

Speaking of what you term "lies", what truth is there in the statement made by UMW President W. A. Boyle, quoted in the Washington Evening Star of June 25, 1969, that the expenses of the World Premiere of "The Bridge at Remagen" (based on my book) were paid by the American Petroleum Institute? I wonder if you would care to repeat and endorse this libelous statement made by your immediate superior.

Finally, it has become apparent from remarks made to me by a number of UMW officials who had a half-hour conference in the Capitol on July 10 that your organization is now afraid my efforts might produce a bill which is "too strong". Are you personally afraid that a bill which genuinely protects the health and safety of the coal miners might be dangerous? I'd be interested in your views.

Sincerely,

KEN HECHLER.

Mr. Speaker, the Huntington, W. Va., Herald-Advertiser carried an account of a further statement which was made on coal mine health and safety, which follows:

Rep. Ken Hechler charged today that United Mine Workers President W. A. Boyle is "dragging his feet" on coal mine health and safety legislation pending in Congress.

"Last Tuesday, I personally called at Mr. Boyle's office to confer with him on the urgent items which must go into any effective bill to protect coal miners. Not only did he refuse to see me, but he informed me he would telephone when he was ready. That was four days ago. If the coal miners have to wait for Mr. Boyle, they will have to endure the same kind of misery which has killed, crippled and given black lung to thousands of miners and then thrown the miners or their widows and families out on the streets with only pennies for compensation and retirement," Hechler said.

Noting that President Boyle, Vice President Titler and Treasurer John Owens are scheduled to address a miner's rally in Welch this afternoon, Rep. Hechler said:

"Let Mr. Boyle explain at Welch where he stands on giving coal miners or their families the right to sue owners or operators whose negligence causes death or mine injuries. Let President Boyle explain where he stands on the infamous Board of Review which the coal operators want in the law to overrule and nullify the recommendations of safety and health inspectors. Let President Boyle tell the miners whether he really wants to bring the coal dust standard down to the level where human beings can live, work and breathe freely without being endangered by black lung. Let President Boyle tell where he stands on giving real authority to the Public Health Service to protect the health of the coal miner."

Congressman Hechler, a long-time critic of the top leadership of the United Mine Workers also stated that "various officials of the UMW have told me that it would be wrong to support a strong, effective mine health and safety law because such a law might cost the operators too much and result in closing down mines and loss of jobs." Rep. Hechler labelled this point of view "dangerous propaganda, designed to weaken the pending legislation."

He added: "Down through the years, the United Mine Workers have always given in to the coal operators when it comes to writing laws which really provide genuine protection for the coal miners. Now that we have the best chance in years to replace this skim milk legislation, the UMW comes up with the novel theory that cream is too rich for the miner's blood.

"It's high time that Mr. Boyle and his henchmen say exactly where they stand on mine health and safety, and either work to protect the miners or get replaced by leaders who will get out and fight for their people," Rep. Hechler concluded.

DICTATORIAL AND ANTILEGAL ACTS

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in efforts to hold on to the reins of power, the top officials now holding

XUM

office in the United Mine Workers of America have engaged in a number of acts which would seem to violate provisions of the law. Pursuant to section 601 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, the Secretary of Labor has been asked to investigate the activities of the present officers of the United Mine Workers of America. I have also urged the Secretary of Labor to pursue this investigation to ascertain if the law has been violated. There follows the text of a letter to the Secretary of Labor detailing in full the possible violations of the law by the present officials of the United Mine Workers of America:

RAUH AND SILARD,
Washington, D.C., July 9, 1969.

Hon. GEORGE P. SHULTZ,
Secretary of Labor, Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Joseph A. Yablonski, candidate for President of the United Mine Workers of America, and H. Elmer Brown, candidate for Vice President thereof, hereby request an immediate and continuing investigation, pursuant to Section 601 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, of the illegal activities of the offiers of the Union seeking to prevent the nomination of Mr. Yablonski and Mr. Brown for those offices. If the investigation is to be effective, it must commence immediately and encompass substantially all of the districts and local unions, and especially must include monitoring of local union nomination meetings through Government observers.

The Constitution of the United Mine Workers was amended in 1964 to require nominations by 50 local unions (previously it had been 5) in order for a candidate to have his name placed on the official United Mine Workers ballot. Pursuant to the Mine Workers Constitution, nominations are to be made during the period from July 9 to August 9, 1969, and there is a requirement that all local union members be given one week's notice of the nominating meeting. Since the nominating process starts today, Mr. Yablonski and Mr. Brown urgently request immediate investigatory action by the Department of Labor.

We set forth below the massive efforts being made by the incumbents, W. A. ("Tony") Boyle, President, George J. Titler, Vice President, and John Owens, Secretary-Treasurer, all of whom are candidates for reelection, to prevent Mr. Yablonski and Mr. Brown from meeting the new requirement of 50 local union nominations. Before describing the specific illegal acts of the incumbent officers and those working with them, we refer, as background, to some of the methods used by the incumbents to maintain absolute control of the union.

The Labor Department brought suit in 1964 (Civil Action No. 3071–64) in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia against the widespread and now almost universal practice of placing United Mine Worker districts into trusteeship and directing the affairs of local unions through appointed district officers. The Labor Department suit against the United Mine Workers and the appointed district officials seeks to outlaw certain trusteeships and return the districts to democratic control. This suit has been delayed for 5 years by the incumbents (i.e. Boyle, Titler, Owens), but the facts of their overwhelming power through trusteeships are well known to the Department. The presidents and secretary-treasurers of 19 of the 23 Mine Worker districts in the United States are appointed by Mr. Boyle; the International Executive Board members from 15 of these 23 districts are chosen by Mr. Boyle and ratified without discussion or opposition by the Mine Workers Convention. In addition to the power exercised through this trusteeship process, the records of the Labor Department are replete with nonrepayable loans made by the International Union to the districts, thus making the control through the power of appointment absolute through the power of the purse. It is against this background of the increase from 5 to 50 locals for nomination, widespread trusteeships, and loans to districts, that the Department must consider the facts set forth below of the incumbents' illegal activities to prevent the nomination of Mr. Yablonski and Mr. Brown.

1. Immediately following Mr. Yablonski's public announcement of his candidacy for President (May 29, 1969), he addressed a letter to Mr. Boyle asking that the Union mail campaign literature at his own expense to the members of the Union in compliance with Section 401(c) of LMRDA. Despite the express terms of Section 401(c) requiring unions to make such mailings, Mr. Boyle in flagrant violation of law rejected even this modest request. On June 23, 1969, District Judge Corcoran ordered the incumbents to mail Mr. Yablonski's literature in compliance with Section 401(c) (Civil Action No. 1662–69). Despite Judge Corcoran's order, an attorney for the United Mine Workers deliberately sought to sabotage the mailing.

2. One week after Mr. Yablonski's announcement of his candidacy (i.e., on June 6, 1969), Mr. Boyle removed him from his office as acting director of Labor's Non-Partisan League and threatened him with further reprisals. These reprisals are now the subject of Mr. Yablonski's second suit in the District Court here (Civil Action No. 1799–69).

3. On June 28, 1969, Mr. Yablonski appeared before a group of local union leaders in Springfield, Illinois seeking support for his nomination. While the meeting was breaking up, an as yet unknown assailant knocked Mr. Yablonski unconscious. According to Mr. Yablonski and his doctor, the blow was from the rear and of a professional nature. This matter is under Department of Justice investigation.

4. On the following day, June 29, 1969, a rally of Mr. Yablonski's supporters at Shenandoah, Pa., attended by Mr. Brown because of Mr. Yablonski's injury, was broken up by paid officials of the United Mine Workers. These officials imported into the area more than 50 hired goons who intimidated persons seeking entrance to the meeting, prevented speakers from being heard, forced others to leave, and caused cancellation of the meeting. The full story is reported in the Shenandoah Evening Herald of June 30, 1969. This matter is also under Department of Justice investigation.

5. Supporters of Mr. Yablonski have been systematically approached and directed to support Mr. Boyle. When they refused to do so, they have been threatened with later reprisal. Among those so approached are Victor Pezzoni, Pete Sabo and Eli Matovich.

6. A variation of the threats in the last paragraph was made to Jack Peters, Secretary-Treasurer of Local Union 1787, of which Mr. Yablonski is President. One week after Peters refused to succumb to pressure to support Mr. Boyle, Al Lamo, International Auditor, went to Peters' home and demanded the books of his local union under threat of charges against him.

7. Local union officials who were supporting Mr. Yablonski were offered jobs on the United Mine Workers payroll to persuade them to disavow Mr. Yablonski's candidacy and to go for Mr. Boyle. Among the men so approached are Andrew F. Surma, Joe Sitos, Victor Pezzoni, and Nick Devince.

8. In District 5 where Yablonski will obviously get many local union nominations because he is the democratically elected International Executive Board member and former President of the District, all local unions having 20 members or less were disbanded by letter dated June 27, 1969. This effort to deny him nominations is a clear violation of the Constitution of the United Mine Workers. Even worse, this discriminatory dechartering of small locals was done *only* in the area where Yablonski is strong and not in other districts. This action is in strange contrast to the recognition at recent Mine Workers Conventions of local unions of far less than 20 which were regularly seated. In one case at least, a local with only one member was seated.

9. On June 23, 1969, the charter of Local Union 247, Minonk, Illinois, was revoked at the direction of the International Union. This local, in which there was strong support for Mr. Yablonski, had been in continuous operation even though the mine was closed down in March, 1951. Now, 18 years later, for no reason except that there is an election coming up and opponents of the incumbents are seeking nominations, the charter has been revoked.

10. On Sunday, July 6, 1969, Local 7113 was having its regular meeting. Despite the fact that this was prior to the time for nominations and despite the fact that no notice had been given that nominations would be made at the meeting, financial secretary John Aiello assumed the chairmanship of the meeting, nominated Mr. Boyle, ruled out of order a nomination of Mr. Yablonski, closed the nominations and declared Mr. Boyle nominated. Aiello is a paid employee in District 17, a trusteed district.

11. The same illegal conduct was scheduled for Local Union 2339 the previous day. Five District and International representatives attended the meeting for the purpose of obtaining a similar surprise nomination for Mr. Boyle and blocking off one for Mr. Yablonski. Luckily, Mr. Yablonski himself attended this meeting and the surprise nomination did not occur.

12. On July 2, 1969, in an obvious attempt to repeat the action at Local 7113 and the intended action at Local 2339, Mr. Budzanoski, President of District 5 and one of those who has threatened Mr. Yablonski's supporters, addressed a letter to all recording secretaries in District 5 asking for the date, time and place of the local union meetings at which nominations are to be held. He demanded an immediate response in a self-addressed return envelope and said he had "certain responsibilities" in connection with the nominations. Like Springfield (par. 3), Shenandoah (par. 4), Local 7113 (par. 10), and Local 2339 (par. 11), Mr. Budzanoski's letter portends continuous unlawful activities at nomination meetings.

13. United Mine Workers funds are being illegally used in connection with the nominating process. We have already referred to job offers, but that is only the beginning. To break up the Shenandoah rally (par. 4), $20.00 a person was paid to goons. On June 25, 1969, $10.00 a car load was paid for persons to attend a rally at which Boyle, Titler and Owens were present.

14. An anonymous and libelous sheet about Mr. Yablonski, which has been circulated throughout the Union, was prepared by Mr. Justin McCarthy, editor of the United Mine Workers Journal, and other employees of the Union, all at Union expense.

15. For years the Mine Workers Journal has been a public joke for its efforts to keep the incumbents before the Union membership. Some editions have had more pictures of Mr. Boyle than pages. Recognizing this, Mr. Yablonski, immediately upon the announcement of his candidacy, asked for equal space. Not only was this rejected by Mr. Boyle, but in both of the issues since Mr. Yablonski's announcement, there has been no single reference to Mr. Yablonski and Mr. Boyle has been prominently and

favorably displayed. In the June 15th edition, a very prominent picture of him with John L. Lewis was captioned with Mr. Boyle as Lewis's "protege". In the July 1st issue, Mr. Boyle is shown in 5 pictures and repeatedly given credit for alleged achievements of the Union.

16. At an International Executive Board meeting in February 1969, Mr. Boyle told the presidents of various districts to request a loan from the Washington office in order to finance his reelection campaign. The district presidents at this meeting were Budzanoski, Younker, Philpott, Pass and Kelly. We have made a complaint to the Department of Justice about specific conversions of these loans into Mr. Boyle's election funds.

17. The incumbents have access to and have utilized the list of officers of the local unions of the United Mine Workers. Despite this fact, when counsel for Mr. Yablonski asked for a copy of the list, counsel for the United Mine Workers refused to turn same over to him.

What we have set out above is only the part of the iceberg above the water line. The terror inside a union where a candidate for President is knocked unconscious and where a rally for that candidate is broken up by goons is even greater when it comes to the individual members. The reign of terror makes it hard to get the facts. Many have told Mr. Yablonski and others the same stories as those listed above, but they also talk about their pensions, and their jobs, and their families, and they say that they cannot speak out. What we have presented here is only a small part of the total illegal activities of the incumbents. But it is enough to know that every local union is threatened with unlawful activities up to, during, and after their nomination meetings.

There can be no question from what has been set out above that the incumbents are engaged in massive violations of the Landrum-Griffin Act in order to save their posts in the Union. It is thus clear that the Labor Department will have to take action under Tilte IV of the Act. The time to get the evidence is while the action is on, during the nominating period starting today. We ask the Department to move now.

Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH L. RAUH, Jr.,
Attorney for Joseph A. Yablonski and H. Elmer Brown.

PERSONAL EXEMPTION INCREASE—PROGRESS REPORT

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with my promise to inform the House of the progress in the drive to increase the personal exemption amount, I am happy to report that another 12 Members have joined me today on a bill that would raise the amount to $1,000 from its present level of $600.

With these 12 cosponsors, the net, hard-core support for this measure now stands at 190 Members. In my report of June 25, I did not make allowance for Members who had introduced or cosponsored more than one bill. I think you will be interested to know that 21 of the 27 Members of the Pennsylvania delegation are sponsors or cosponsors of similar bills, and that there is support for Members representing all but nine of the States. The goal is 218 Members; however, considering the closeness of the vote on the surtax extension, perhaps we may not need quite that number to convince the Ways and Means Committee that the country is demanding this legislation.

I noticed that the Ways and Means Committee has just issued a list of "tentative decisions" concerning tax reform. Although the decisions taken do not touch on the subject of the personal exemption amount, I am heartened by the report because it indicates that the subject of tax reform is not a "dead issue" as I was beginning to fear. I feel certain that by now the committee understands that "tax reform" means "tax relief" for the middle-income taxpayer and that the taxpayer is not going to be satisfied with the work of this session of Congress unless his expectations on tax relief are met.

I have cited statistics in the past pointing out how much of the Federal tax burden the middle-income taxpayer bears. The Tax Foundation recently produced a chart showing just how much taxation is costing the wage earner as a portion of his daily income. It takes exactly 2 hours and 34 minutes a day for the average wage earner to pay for his share of Federal and State taxes. That is 8 minutes more than it required last year and 15 minutes more than it did in 1966. But an even more dramatic fact is that the "tax share" is the largest single item in a wage earner's budget based on an 8-hour day. Of the 2 hours and 34 minutes work time required to meet taxes, 1 hour and 47 minutes would be worked to pay the Federal tax share. If you are interested in how much working time is spent each year in earning money for taxes, the foundation says it takes 117 working days out of the year, on average, to meet tax obligations. Is it little wonder that the hard-pressed American middle-income taxpayer is in the mood for revolt against Government spending excesses.

I have heard the cry, Mr. Speaker, about the cost of tax reform and I appreciate the concern that such reform could mean in the loss of considerable Federal revenue. However, I want to point out that if the income tax system was going to be truly revised, that is, a have introduced. With an expanded tax base and doing away with all the special privileges, preferences, and exemptions, there would be no need for legislation I have introduced. With an expanded tax base, flat but progressive rates of tax on all income, there would probably be sufficient revenue to run the Government at its current level. In fact, pending the release of the results of the study underway by the Treasury Department, I would make a guess that the Treasury could expect more, rather than less revenue under such a system. But we all know that such a total reform of the tax system is not in the offing for this year, so one must find alternatives.

There appears to be at least two alternatives. The first and best alternative is to cut the Federal budget by at least the amount of expected revenue decrease. However, we have seen in the first 6 months of this session that Congress is not in the mood to economize to any great degree. The second alternative is to close the tax loopholes that currently exist. Some of these loopholes are in the process of being closed—repeal of the 7-percent investment tax credit is a step in the right direction. But that was a tiny step compared to the giant strides that are needed to make the present tax system more equitable.

The newly formed National Committee on Tax Justice, under the chairmanship of our distinguished former colleague, Paul Douglas, has recently informed the membership of both bodies of the tremendous size of the revenue loss the Government suffers because of the multitude of tax loopholes. The committee reports that in 1968, an estimated $12.5 billion was lost because of these loopholes. Now I cannot personally verify every single one of the dollar figures the committee used to arrive at that figure, but I think it is important to note that the figures were gathered from estimates by the U.S. Treasury Department so we should be able to rely on their authenticity.

The point is simply this: the potential revenue is there to offset the loss from giving the middle-income taxpayer a break if only we in Congress have the courage to go and get it. Congress has the responsibility to begin the process of a redistribution of the tax load and we should start the process by recognizing that the middle-income taxpayer has shouldered more than his share long enough. Raising the personal exemption amount this year to at least $1,000 would be a direct notice to the American middle-income taxpayer that we have heard his cry for tax reform and are fulfilling our obligation. We have all made a promise to the middle-income taxpayer, that "this is the year for tax reform"—it is time we acted to keep that promise.

THE FIVE-SIDED RIDDLE: OR, THE PENTAGON, WHO IS IN CHARGE HERE?—PART III

(Mr. FULTON of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's Washington Post Mr. Bernard D. Nossiter reports:

> A proposal affecting contractors' profits that could lead to a sharp cut in military costs has been stalled in the Pentagon for 18 months. No action is in sight.

Mr. Nossiter's article is another shocking chapter in this disturbing volume of evidence clearly indicating that our defense contracting and procurement is in a scandalous state of affairs, costing the American taxpayers billions of wasted dollars each year and seemingly impregnable to economizing efforts or ideas.

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Nossiter's article, "Pentagon Sits on Plan To Cut Military Costs," in the RECORD at this point:

XUM

PENTAGON SITS ON PLAN TO CUT MILITARY COSTS

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

A proposal affecting contractors' profits that could lead to a sharp cut in military costs has been stalled in the Pentagon for 18 months. No action is in sight.

The proposal, a new guideline for Defense Department negotiators, would link profits to suppliers' investment instead of the present system that relates earnings almost entirely to suppliers' costs.

For economists and nondefense businesses, this is a standard procedure. But many aerospace companies rely on Government plants, Government machinery and Government working capital. They don't want a system that ties their profits to their relatively small investment.

Supporters of the proposed guideline argue that it would achieve at least three useful things: Remove the present incentive for defense suppliers to inflate their costs in order to realize larger profits; encourage contractors to use cost-saving machinery, a goal that present contracting procedures hardly touch and discourage companies from leasing a Government property while stimulating them to risk more of their own money.

PROPOSED IN 1968

The proposal was advanced on February 3, 1968 by Lt. Col. Bruce Benefield, a special assistant to the Pentagon's Deputy Assistant Secretary for Procurement. Benefield described it at a private meeting of top procurement officials and a verbatim transcript of that gathering has now become available to The Washington Post.

Benefield was vigorously supported by the Pentagon's former Comptroller, Robert Anthony, who now teaches at the Harvard Business School.

Anthony warned, in effect, that continuing the present system of basing profits almost exclusively on costs could be embarrassing. "There are quite likely coming to light at some times some fantastically high returns on capital that certain companies are making," he said, "that are going to, I think, cause us trouble."

BACKED BY GENERAL

The late Gen. Thomas Gerrity, head of the Air Force Logistics Command, also argued for Benefield's approach.

But Benefield's immediate boss, John M. Malloy, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for procurement and a long time Penatgon official, was unenthusiastic. He said: "I really don't see this as maybe as clear cut as I believe Gen. Gerrity does. I'm afraid to fly with this so fast—too many unknowns, I think, yet."

Ever since then the scheme has been languishing. Benefield says that it is not dead, that it is being actively considered and constantly refined.

It is known that the plan has been studied by a panel of aerospace contractors brought together by the Pentagon's Industry Advisory Council. But defense officials are close-mouthed about their response.

FIRMS OPPOSED

However, one source said that large companies with little investment of their own are firmly against the new guideline. Big companies with substantial investment are reported to be only lukewarm because of their uncertainty over a new procedure.

Benefield's proposal would tie only 30 per cent of profits to investment and leave the remaining 70 per cent linked to costs. He suggested a 25 per cent rate of return for the investment-linked components.

The following example illustrates how a negotiated profit based exclusively on investment contracts with one based entirely on costs:

Assume that the Pentagon is buying $500 million of avionics widgets. General Military Inc. has $100 million of its own assets but relies largely on federal plants. If the Pentagon allows a 10 per cent profit on costs, GMI would net $50 million, a rate of return of 50 per cent on its capital.

However, if GMI were limited to a 25 per cent return on its assets, or investment, it would net only $25 million. This might encourage the company to put up more of its own money and invest in cost-cutting machinery, and diminish any incentive it had to expand costs.

COMPANIES DIFFER

Among the large defense contractors, those engaged in civilian business generally have large investments. Thus, the assets of General Motors and General Electric typically amount to two-thirds of annual sales. But companies whose business is almost entirely military—General Dynamics, Lockheed and the old North American Aviation, for example—typically have assets that are only one-third of their yearly sales. It is this latter group that could be expected to take the coolest view of any change.

Barry Shillito, the Pentagon's current procurement chief, took part in the February, 1968, meeting as the Navy's purchasing boss. He said yesterday that the delay in establishing the new guideline is due to its "complexity."

In principle, he said, he was for it. "We are going to do this. It's going to happen. We've got to give some consideration to (invested) capital," he said.

However, he said, negotiating officers in the field would have trouble determining precisely how much capital to allocate to each company's contract, a necessary step in determining the amount of profit. This he said, accounts for the delay in adopting the proposal.

Mr. Speaker, the very abuses of which Mr. Nossiter writes are precisely those which were exposed in Report of the Economy in Government Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, "The Economics of Military Procurement."

Over the past 2 weeks I have been placing portions of this report in the RECORD. I intend to place another portion today and would like to bring it to the particular attention of my colleagues because in a section of it the problem of cost analysis of which Mr. Nossiter writes is discussed.

Mr. Speaker, I place the third installment of the report "The Economics of Military Procurement" in the RECORD at this point and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

THE ECONOMICS OF MILITARY PROCUREMENT—PART III

10. THE CONCEPTUAL PROBLEMS IN USING HISTORICAL COST ANALYSIS AND THE FAILURE TO USE "SHOULD COSTING"

The analysis of cost and pricing data is a crucial factor in determining the amount the Government spends on weapons programs. Without good cost analysis and cost estimation, the Government is unable to control the costs of procurement, much of which is based on original estimates. That is, the price of a contract is negotiated on the basis of cost estimates submitted by the contractor. An inflated estimate can result in an inflated price unless DOD can properly evaluate estimated cost data. Yet, as indicated above, the Defense Department's ability to adequately analyze cost data is severely limited by the lack of information on profitability, the absence of data on subcontracting, the shortcomings of the Truth-in-Negotiations Act, and the nonexistence of uniform accounting standards.

Another obstacle to adequate analysis is the fact that cost estimation presently relies extensively on past experience; that is, historical costs are used to provide estimates of the future costs of proposed weapons systems. Historical costs refer to the actual costs of performing earlier contracts. They are often insufficient and misleading guides to estimating the costs of new contracts for several reasons. For example, it is possible for the cost of performing a contract to be inflated intentionally or through contractor inefficiency, and for the costs of that contract to influence the estimation of costs on subsequent contracts.

As the testimony showed, historical costs are no better than the underlying data on which they are based. If the costs of previous procurements were obtained without competition, estimates based on them probably would not be comparable to costs determined competitively. As we know, most procurements in the DOD data bank were not awarded competitively. In fact, many of the earlier contracts were the CPFF type in which some of the most extreme cases of cost overruns occurred.

The use of historical costs may give the contractor a premium to inflate his cost base. The inflated costs of previous contracts may then become the new cost base figure for subsequent production runs and subsequent contracts. If profit is calculated by DOD as a percentage of costs, the contractor may be given a profit motive to increase costs. The only party hurt in this scheme is the American taxpayer.

Implicit in the criticism of historical cost is the point that the cost of a particular contract may have been excessive because of contractor inefficiency. The possibility that contractor inefficiency may be a significant problem was brought out in the testimony of Colonel Buesking (U.S. Air Force, retired) and A. E. Fitzgerald, Deputy for Management Systems, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force. Both witnesses compared the probable cost approach, which employs historical costs, and the should-cost approach to Government estimates.

The should-cost approach attempts to determine the amount that weapons systems or products *ought* to cost given attainable efficiency and economy of operation. The method of determining the should-cost figure is based on a combination of industrial engineering and financial management principles. Briefly, a study is made at a contractor's plant of each of the cost elements of the contractor's operation to ascertain what the product should cost the Government, assuming reasonable efficiency and economy on the part of the contractor. Obviously, this approach differs sharply from the traditional one in which costs are estimated in advance on the basis of earlier costs, and in which the Government thereafter reimburses the contractor for incurred and allocable costs without finding out whether the costs were reasonable.

According to the testimony, when the should cost approach was employed by the Navy in connection with the TF-30 engine contract for the F-111 program, substantial inefficiencies were detected in the contractor's plant. As a result of the study, the contract price was later reduced by more than $100 million.

It is difficult to see how the Government can be assured that incurred costs will be reasonable on negotiated contracts without the benefit of a should-cost type in-depth study and evaluation. Col. A. W. Buesking (U.S. Air Force, retired) testified that selected evaluations of resource planning and control systems conducted to assess contractor's capability to meet standards of efficiency revealed that control systems essential to prevent excessive costs were absent. He estimated that costs in such plants are 30 to 50 percent in excess of what they might be under competitive conditions. When Admiral Rickover was asked to comment on Colonel Buesking's statement, he said, "His estimate is a conservative one." Establishing objective cost performance standards would be an important step toward cost control.

11. ABSENCE OF ONGOING COST REPORTS TO CONGRESS

Equally important is the need for devising a method to periodically report actual costs to Congress as they are incurred on large negotiated contracts. Presently, it is difficult for the Members of Congress and the public to know whether a program is staying within or exceeding original cost estimates and the negotiated price, during the period of contract performance. Reports of actual costs should be correlated with planned cost of work segments satisfactorily completed. In this way, cost estimates could be compared with incurred costs.

It may also be desirable to relate progress payments to real progress, in the sense of work segments satisfactorily completed, rather than simply incurred costs, and to report the volume and cost of contract change notices. Finally, a full cost report system would include the profit rate negotiated and realized, and estimated and realized profits as a return on investment. If this were done, Congress would at least have available to it indicators of contract objectives and contract costs which would make it possible to detect serious overruns and delays, and to determine on an ongoing basis the cost status of the contract.

C. The manifestation of these practices are:

1. High Defense Profits

Perhaps the most glaring fact about defense profits is that not enough is known about them. The DOD cannot accurately state what profits are in defense procurement. First, it defines profits as a percentage of costs, and does not report profits as a return on investment. Second, DOD does not obtain complete information about profits on firm fixed-price contracts. During fiscal year 1968, firm fixed-price contracts made up about 53 percent of total expenditures for defense procurement. Third, without uniform accounting standards, it is difficult, if not impossible, to discover the costs and profits in defense production unless months are spent to reconstruct contractors' books. The reason for this is that contractors are not required to maintain books and records on most defense contracts. Thus, while the profit *rate* is designated at the time a contract is negotiated, the profit actually realized in the performance of the contract cannot be known and verified without an expensive, time-consuming audit.

The DOD collects data on less than half of annual contract awards, and the data it collects is inadequate. Studies conducted independently of the Pentagon are admittedly sketchy. Among other problems, (1) the trend toward conglomerate mergers among large defense suppliers obscures the opportunity for determining defense profits as their data is published in the aggregate without separating sales and profits by division, and (2) neither the DOD nor their contractors will readily furnish profit data to congressional or academic investigators.

No complete and comprehensive study of this subject has ever been made by any agency of the executive branch or by the GAO. Contractors are not required to report their profits on most Government contracts. The DOD does not keep adequate records of contractors' profits. In view of the tens of billions of dollars of taxpayers' money spent on defense contracts each year, the Government's lack of knowledge about defense profits is inexcusable."

One difficulty is in defining what is meant by profits. GAO and DOD surveys deal with profits as a percentage of costs. On this basis a 10-percent profit rate on a contract for a weapon that cost $1 million to produce would result in a profit of $100,000. But profits as a percentage of costs or sales is often an inaccurate indicator of true profits. For example, if a contractor is able to use Government-owned equipment or operate in a Government-owned plant, he may have a relatively small investment in a given contract. In such a case, his profit may be more accurately measured as a percentage or return on investment. Thus, on a $1 million contract, performed in a given year, where the contractor had an investment of $500,000 worth of plant and equipment, a $100,000 profit would be equal to a 20-percent return on investment.

An example of how a low profit as a percentage of costs can be misleading is found in a case decided by the Tax Court involving Air Force contracts (*North American Aviation Inc.* v. *Renegotiation Board, 1962*). In that case, while the contract provided for 8 percent profits as a percentage of costs, the Tax Court found the contracts returned 612 percent and 802 percent profit on the contractor's investment in 2 succeeding years, according to Admiral Rickover. In that case 99 percent of the contractor's sales was to the Government. Indeed, profits as a return on investment is the preferred method of measuring profitability. Stockholders are concerned with the return on their investment, not with profits as a percentage of costs or sales. Return on investment is also a better indicator of the profit in relation to the contractor's input.

It is interesting to note that defense companies operate on smaller profit margins, based on percentage of costs, than do typical industrial corporations. Basically, this is because they often operate with large amounts of Government-supplied capital. Professor Murray Weidenbaum studied a sample of large defense contractors doing three-fourths or more of their business with the Government compared with similar sized industrial companies doing most of their business in the commercial market. Net profits as a percentage of stockholders' investment was 17.5 percent for the defense contractors and 10.6 percent for the industrial firms, for the period 1962–65.

The first question asked in this investigation was whether defense contractors' profits are too high. Much criticism of defense profits has been made in recent years. Critics maintain there is a serious problem of excessive profits. Others assert the opposite, that defense profits may be too low.

Although our present knowledge is incomplete, there is evidence that profits on defense contracts are higher than in related nondefense activities, and higher for the defense industry than for the manufacturing industry as a whole. There is also evidence that this differential has been increasing. The arguments of the Department of Defense to the contrary are unconvincing. The Pentagon's own figures show a 22-percent increase in profit rates on negotiated contracts under the weighted guidelines method of profit computation. GAO found a 26-percent increase in a study comparing the 5-year period from 1959 through 1963 with the average profit rate negotiated during the last 6 months of 1966. DOD claims the increases relate only to "going in" profits negotiated, and that actual "coming out" or realized profits are less. But the DOD in-house profit review survey shows that contractors are coming out with profits that are substantially the same as the going in rates. In addition, when Admiral Rickover made a comparison of profits reported and actual profits as determined by Government audit for five contractors, actual profits were found to be much higher than profits reported. Admiral Rickover also testified that suppliers of propulsion turbines are insisting on 20- to 25-percent profit on costs as compared with 10 percent a few years ago, that several nuclear equipment suppliers are requesting 15- to 20-percent profit, that profit percentages on shipbuilding contracts doubled in the past 2 years, and that a large company recently priced equipment to a Navy shipbuilder at a 33-percent profit.

Col. A. W. Buesking testified that profits based on return on investment in the Minuteman program, from 1958 to 1966, were 43 percent. Profits for the large companies seem to be relatively higher than the smaller and medium-sized ones, according to the studies already completed.

Officials of the Department of Defense have attempted to answer the criticism of high profits in defense contracting by citing Renegotiation Board figures. Yet, in the annual reports, the Renegotiation Board warns against using its figures for generalizing about defense profits. One of the reasons for not using these figures is the fact that a large amount of contract awards are exempt from renegotiation and therefore do not show up in the totals for renegotiable sales. In addition, the Board does not publish figures for profits as a return on investment, nor does it disclose the names of contractors who have been ordered to return excessive profits to the Government and the amounts involved. Unless such disclosures are made so that profits on renegotiable sales can be fully analyzed, we agree that Renegotiation Board figures should not be used to generalize about profitability in defense contracting.

Officials of the Department of Defense have also attempted to answer its critics with the results of a study performed by the Logistics Management Institute (LMI). LMI was created by the DOD and in the past has worked almost exclusively for DOD. The LMI profits study was financed by DOD.

The LMI study used unverified, unaudited data which was obtained through the voluntary cooperation of a sample of defense contractors. Those who did not wish to do so did not participate in the study. Forty-two percent of those contacted provided us data. As Admiral Rickover pointed out, one of the faults with such a study is that the contractors making high profits would naturally be reluctant to supply information and could simply choose not to participate. In addition, the study fails to distinguish between profits of the larger contractors and the medium sized and smaller ones.

These facts are cited to underline the continued need by Congress for an objective, independent, and comprehensive study of defense profits. This need cannot be satisfied by a DOD in-house study, or by an organization dependent upon the DOD for its funds.

2. Cost Overruns: The C–5A Cargo Plane

The Air Force selected the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. as the airframe prime contractor for the C–5A, a large, long-range, heavy logistic aircraft, on September 30, 1965, after proposals had been received in response to Requests for Proposals (RFP) from 5 firms, and preliminary contracts had been entered into with 3 of them in 1964. It is not clear, from the evidence, how much *price* competition had to do with the selection. Secretary Charles testified that there was competition among the firms. But when asked how low Lockheed's bid was compared to the others, he refused to disclose the figures on the grounds that "this is company proprietary information." A similar procedure resulted in the selection of General Electric as the engine manufacturer.

The contract with Lockheed is a negotiated fixed price incentive fee contract. It is also the first contract utilizing the total package procurement concept (TPPC). Two major objectives of the concept, according to the Defense Department, are to discourage contractors from buying in on a design and development contract with the intention of recovering on a subsequent production contract, and to motivate contractors to design for economical production and support of operational hardware. Thus, TPPC is supposed to act as a deterrent against cost overruns and less-than-promised performance. To accomplish this, all development, production, and as much support as is feasible of a system throughout its anticipated life, is to be procured in a single contract, as one total package. The contract includes price and performance commitments to motivate the contractor to control costs, perform to specifications, and produce on time. As the C–5A is an incentive contract (TPPC does not necessarily result in incentive contracting) it contains the usual financial rewards and penalties associated with incentive contracting.

The C–5A contract for the airframe provides for five research, development, test and evaluation (R.D.T. & E.) aircraft plus an initial production run of 53 airplanes (the total of 58 planes is called run A), and a Government option for additional airplanes. The present approved program for the C–5A is 120 airplanes comprised of run A (58 airplanes) plus run B (57 airplanes) plus five airplanes from run C.

The testimony received during the November 1968 hearings indicated a cost overrun in the C–5A program totaling as much as $2 billion. A "cost overrun" is the amount in excess of the original target cost. According to the testimony, the program originally called for 120 C–5A airplanes to cost the Government $3.4 billion, but because of cost overruns mainly being experienced in the performance of the Lockheed contract actual costs would total $5.3 billion.

Following the November hearings, Senator Proxmire asked GAO to investigate into the causes and amount of the C–5A overruns and other matters relating to the contract.

On November 19, 1968, the Air Force announced, in a press release, that the original estimate for 120 C–5A aircraft was $3.1 billion, compared to the current estimate of $4.3 billion. Subsequently, in response to a request by the subcommittee, Mr. Fitzgerald, who was responsible for the development of the management controls used on the C–5A and who was on a steering committee directing a financial review of the C–5A, supplied a breakdown of the estimates of C–5A program cost to completion. This data showed Air Force estimates for 120 airplanes was $3.4 billion in 1965, and $5.3 billion in 1968, indicating an overrun of about $2 billion. The difference between the Air Force press release and the data supplied by Mr. Fitzgerald seems to be accounted for in the figures for spare parts. The data supplied by Mr. Fitzgerald shows $0.3 billion for spares estimated in 1965, and $0.9 billion in 1968. If the figures for spares are added to the estimates in the Air Force press release, the two set of figures are close to one another.

In the January 16 followup hearing, GAO reported on its investigation, the nature of which is discussed below on page 40. Briefly, GAO transmitted to the subcommittee figures supplied by the Air Force 2 days prior to the hearing. These figures indicated a substantial overrun but a smaller total cost for the overall C–5A program than the $5.3 billion figure shown in the November hearings. The reason for the lower total was the omission by the Air Force of the costs of the spares.

Nevertheless, testimony and other evidence received in the course of the hearings confirmed the existence of the approximately $2 billion overrun in the C–5A program, the reverse incentives contained in the repricing formula, and large overruns in other Air Force programs. The latest estimate of the total cost of 120 C–5A's, including spares, provided by Secretary Charles, is $5.1 billion. This is close to the estimate previously supplied by Mr. Fitzgerald, and about $2 billion more than was estimated in 1965. The following table shows the estimates supplied by Mr. Fitzgerald, the Air Force press release of November 19, 1968, and Assistant Secretary Charles:

COMPARISON OF ESTIMATES OF C–5A PROGRAM

[In billions of dollars]

	Fitzgerald		Air Force press release[1]		Charles	
	1965	1968	1965	1968	1965	1968
120 aircraft:						
R.D.T. & E. plus production	3.1	4.4	3.1	4.3	......	4.3
AFLC[2] investment	.3	.9				.8
Total	3.4	5.3	3.1	4.3	......	5.1

[1] The Air Force press release of Nov. 19, 1968, did not provide cost breakdowns between R.D.T. & E. (research development, testing, and engineering), production runs, and AFLC investment. The figures given seem to omit AFLC investment.

[2] AFLC (Air Force Logistics Command) investment submitted by Fitzgerald includes spare parts; that submitted by Charles includes initial spares, replenishment spares, and support. Table submitted by Secretary Charles (hearings, pt. 1, p. 311) does not include estimates for 1965.

The cost growth of the C–5A program can be seen in the table. The figure supplied by Fitzgerald show an increase from $3.4 billion in 1965 to $5.3 billion in 1968. The Air Force press release can be reconciled with the Fitzgerald figures if the AFLC investment (spares) is added to each of the estimates. Thus, the $3.1 billion estimate for 1965 would total $3.4 billion, and the $4.3 billion estimate for 1968 would total $5.2 billion. Secretary Charles' own figures for 1968 total $5.1 billion. The subcommittee rejects the attempts of Air Force spokesmen to minimize the size of the program or the size of the overrun by removing spares as an item of cost. Spares are an integral part of the C–5A program and should be included in any consideration of costs.

According to the Air Force, the cost growth in the C–5A program has resulted from normal development problems associated with complex weapons and inflation. However, the subcommittee notes that the C–5A was chosen for the first application of the total package procurement concept partly for the reason that it was not considered a highly complex weapon system requiring technological advances beyond the state of the art. The inflation argument, which is supposed to account for $500 million of the cost growth, appears questionable. The contract contains an inflation provision to protect the contractor from unforeseeable price changes in the economy, to go into effect 3 years after the issuance of the initial contract, that is, October 1, 1968. The initial 3-year period was supposed to be considered a normal business risk. The Air Force official explanation of this provision states: "The contract thus included in the price an amount which reflected a projection of the mounting cost trend in the economy of labor, materials, equipment, and subcontract prices." If future inflation for at least 3 years was included *in the price*, it is hard to see why inflation should be a major factor in later increasing the price. Without a more thorough investigation of the C–5A program, the technical problems encountered, the failure to anticipate them at the time of the negotiations, and operations of the inflation provision, the subcommittee cannot form any firm conclusions about the reasons for the enormous overrun.

A repricing formula built into the contract was also revealed in the November testimony. The repricing formula is one of the most blatant reverse incentives ever encountered by this subcommittee. It should be recalled that the C–5A contract is supposed to represent an important step toward cost control. An Air Force manual on the total package procurement concept dated May 10, 1966, states that "It should produce not only lower costs on the first production units, but, in turn, a lower take-off point on the production learning curve, thus benefiting every unit in the production run." The facts about the C–5A are just the reverse. Costs for the first production units are greatly exceeding original estimates, resulting in a higher take-off point on the production learning curve, thus inflating every unit in the production run. In addition, the contract is supposed to provide the Government with binding commitments on price and performance. Obviously, there is in fact no binding commitment on price if the price can be modified upwards, as is being done in the C–5A, because actual costs are exceeding estimates. Whether the actual performance of the C–5A lives up to its promise remains to be seen. On the matter of delivery, it is interesting to note that the Air Force announced on February 25, 1969, a 6-month delay in the first operational C–5A aircraft, from June 1969 to December 1969.

Not only were the price increases made possible by the repricing formula, but the cost overruns which are resulting in the higher prices may very well have been encouraged by the existence of the formula and by the nature of the formula. For the mere fact that a repricing provision existed in the contract constituted a built-in get-well remedy for almost any kind of cost growth. According to this provision, the price of the second increment (run B) could be increased on the basis of excessive actual costs on the first increment (run A). The motivation, if any, of the incentive feature of the contract is thereby largely nullified, provided the contractor is confident that the Government will exercise the option. Why bother to keep costs down if their increase forms the basis for a higher price? Additionally, because of the nature of the formula, the higher the percentage of overrun over the original contract ceiling price on the first increment, the higher the percentage by which the second increment is repriced.

The subcommittee learned, on the morning of the January 16, 1969, hearing, that the Air Force had exercised the run B option for 57 additional C–5A aircraft, apparently committing the Government to spend at least $5.1 billion on aircraft originally estimated to cost $3.3 billion. The subcommittee was dismayed to learn that this decision was made before the completion of the GAO investigation and without a full disclosure of the reasons for the cost overruns. The public interest in economy in Government was not served by this precipitous decision, announced a few hours before the start of a congressional hearing and a few days before the inauguration of the new President.

PLAN FOR RACIAL BALANCE IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF MOBILE COUNTY, ALA.

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on July 10 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare filed in U.S. District Court in Mobile, Ala., a plan for the imposition of racial balance in the public schools of Mobile County, Ala.

The plan would call for the busing of some 2,105 pupils over substantial distances within the city and the county of

Mobile. Beyond that it calls for the closing of some schools and the construction of new ones.

Aside from the cost of implementation of this proposal which would be very substantial, it seems to fly in the face of section 407(a) of title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which states:

> . . . nothing herein shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another or one school district to another in order to achieve such racial balance, or otherwise enlarge the existing power of the court to insure compliance with constitutional standards.

What certainly appears to be a HEW plan in direct contradiction to the law must be of genuine concern to this Congress and to the people of the United States. Mr. Speaker, the law on busing is clear and I call on the Secretary of HEW to abide by that law and withdraw his plan.

On July 11, I directed a telegram to the Secretary, asking prompt action and I include the text of that telegram at this point in my remarks:

JULY 11, 1969.

Hon. ROBERT H. FINCH,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.:

In the last several weeks I have heard you say in my presence on two differenct occasions that HEW recognizes that the law prohibits forced busing of students for purposes of obtaining racial balance and that you intended to comply with the law. And yet busing is being forced on the Mobile County (Alabama) School Board by HEW in a plan filed in the U.S. District Court in the Southern District of Alabama on Thursday, July 10, 1969. I have seen the map concerning elementary school busing and I cannot believe that you could condone such a flagrant violation of the law. And yet the Mobile Press Register of Friday, July 11, 1969, reports that "the HEW plan hinges heavily upon cross-town busing of pupils from predominantly Negro areas to accomplish a greater measure of school integration." The paper quotes the HEW proposal as follows:

"Our recommendations undoubtedly raise the question whether, under the circumstances here, assignments legally are required to be in the desegregation plan if they require substantial additional transportation. This is a legal question which we can only leave to the parties and to the court."

If this is the position of HEW then it means your attorneys either cannot read the law or that HEW is embarking on a court challenge of the clear intention of Congress. In any case the actions of HEW are contrary to my understanding of your position and I insist upon an immediate clarification.

In addition to the question of busing the HEW plan is designed to promote integration only and completely disregards normal requirements of a properly run educational system. It ignores natural boundaries, proximity of students to existing schools and hazards.

It calls for mass conversion of schools for purposes other than those for which they were constructed. Elementary schools would become junior and senior high schools and high schools would become elementary schools. Schools would be closed and others required to be constructed. The resulting expense would be overwhelming. You and I have also discussed this problem and you made it clear there were no federal funds to help a school district in such a case. Where do you suppose the local school board will get the money?

In short, Mr. Secretary, the HEW plan is in many respects contrary to law, is unrealistic in the extreme, and is obviously the wild notion of your stable of dreamers.

Because of the urgency of his matter and the great concern of the people of Mobile County, I will appreciate a reply by wire or by messenger. In the meantime, I believe it is entirely in order for you to instruct HEW officials to withdraw the plan now in view of the busing proposals.

I am sending a copy of this wire to the Attorney General of the United States because of the fact that the plan of HEW was filed in a suit in Federal Court. Wire copy also to Bryce Harlow.

JACK EDWARDS,
Member of Congress, First District, Alabama.

FOREIGN INFORMATION ACT

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, at no time in America's history has it been more important that the story of our Nation is understood in other countries throughout the world.

The Congress has established a program for the purpose of pursuing this objective, with all its complexities and problems.

We have also established a special body, the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information, for the purpose of conducting a continuing and independent overview of this program.

Current chairman of the Commission is Mr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

In May of this year the Commission issued its 24th report to Congress in which it repeated its earlier recommendation that a searching reexamination be made of our Government overseas information programs.

On July 10 I introduced legislation designed to carry through this recommendation. Several of our colleagues joined in cosponsorship of that bill, H.R. 12726. My remarks of that day appear in the RECORD on pages 19124 and 19125.

Today I am pleased to say that the bill is being reintroduced with two new cosponsors, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TAFT). I invite others to join in this effort.

The report of the Commission is brief and to the point. It raises questions which ought to be the concern of every one of us in this Congress. The object of the legislation is to help find answers to these questions and many others related to them.

I call attention to the text of the report, as follows:

THE 24TH REPORT: U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION, MAY 1969

FOREWORD

The United States Advisory Commission on Information—created in 1948 to watch over a communications dialogue with the rest of the world—has arrived simultaneously at its majority and an inescapable conclusion:

Our national commitment is incomplete.

We are quick to advocate "mutual understanding," but slow to establish the conditions for its accomplishment.

We lament communications gaps, or credibility gaps, or information gaps, but throw few lines across them.

We claim to be motivated by "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind," yet keep those charged with that concern at arm's length from the national policy process.

We profess to seek the solution to men's problems with words, not weapons. But:

In fiscal 1968, we spend $80.5 billion for "national defense" and $4.6 billion for "international affairs and finance"—a ratio of 94.6 to 5.4. United States Information Agency: $194,255,000.

In fiscal 1969, we anticipate spending $80.9 billion for "national defense" and $3.9 billion for "international affairs and finance"—a ratio of 95.4 to 4.6 USIA: $173,168,000.

For fiscal 1970, we have budgeted $81.5 billion for "national defense" and $3.8 billion for "international affairs and finance"—a ratio of 95.5 to 4.5. *USIA: $177,650,000.*

Our concern is a matter of record. "There are four channels through which a nation may conduct its foreign affairs. The first is diplomacy. The second is trade. The third is communication. The fourth is force. Three are complementary, the last is alternative. Indeed, the last alternative. It is indicative of the disordered priorities of our time that 95 percent of our foreign affairs moneys are devoted to the channel that the other 5 percent is dedicated to avoid."

But the essential problem is not in dollars. It is in direction.

Which way best leads from where we are to where we want the world to be?

How are the two hundred million of us to convince the thirty-three hundred million of them that we are on the right path, and that it is wide enough for all to travel.

Eventually, if not now, it must be through knowing each other, then trusting each other.

And if eventually, why not now?

That is the petition of the 24th Report.

THE 24TH REPORT

The world's curiosity about the United States—about its policies and intentions, its actions and capabilities—has increased in proportion to the growth of America's power and influence. The world's *opinion* about the United States has fluctuated measurably. In recent years, the trend has been down.

To discover why, we must first look to actions, not words. Yet we may reasonably consider how much of the fault may lie in our prevailing approach to foreign and national security policy formulations, which gives but cursory due to public opinion abroad. This aloofness may well have been valid in a time when secret diplomacy was the principal if not the exclusive approach to relations between nations. It is not today. It can never be again. The time has passed when governments could control information dissemination—and, thereby, what their peoples think. After two decades of experience with the overseas information, educational and cultural programs initiated by Public Law 402 (the Smith-Mundt Act of 1948) and now administered by the United States Information Agency, the foreign affairs establishment has still to learn this lesson. The continued avoidance of this truth—and, in the Commission's view, of this opportunity—can lead only to further erosion of and disenchantment with U.S. leadership.

Effective, accurate, open communication can make the difference between peace and war. Moreover, it can make the difference in the eventual outcome of the contest now being waged between reform and revolution. Between 1948 and 1968, and now under its fifth Administration, USIA has constructed a worldwide apparatus capable of transmitting the message and the idea of America.

XUM

Yet a number of opportunities remain unexploited, and some past gains must be consolidated:

1. The Agency's research is inadequate. It does not deliver to the foreign policy planning process incisive inputs on trends in worldwide public opinion about the United States, or to USIA management meaningful data on the success, or lack of it, of the Agency's own efforts. As we have said before, "The plain fact is that in too many cases the Agency does not know why it is doing what it is doing." USIA's research effort—primitive, timid and stumbling in past—must be subjected to fundamental overhaul and strengthening.

2. Over the years, the Voice of America has established a capability for instant access to virtually all corners of the world—essentially via the shortwave bands. But the world has changed. The transistorized radio, available in abundance and at low cost, has brought standard medium-wave radio—that is, local radio—into a dominant position among communications media in many countries where the Voice hopes to be heard. (Two notable exceptions: The U.S.S.R. and Red China, where shortwave remains the principal courier for VOA.) This development has created both technical and programming demands which must be addressed at an accelerated pace if VOA is to retain its position of influence. It must maintain its capacity for service in "stress" situations and in "slack" periods, must hold its audience with an attractive program service.

3. The 150 libraries and information centers, the 45 reading rooms and the 130 binational centers can bring basic information about the U.S. to 101 countries—in English as well as the host language. These peaceful symbols of America abroad attract thousands of visitors daily. They need to be redesigned, refurbished and restocked with the dynamic new materials emerging from the American university presses and from the rest of the American communications industry.

4. It is overwhelmingly evident that there is no substitute for a foreign citizen's visit to this country. Invariably, he takes back with him profound and lasting impressions of our energy and purpose. His ability to witness first-hand the openness of our society—from space adventures to face-to-face confrontations of Presidents and press—demonstrates beyond dispute that ours is a free society. Similarly, the exposure of Americans to foreign cultures and viewpoints helps assure the mutuality of cultural and educational exchange—administered jointly by USIA and the Department of State—deserves an infusion of Congressional encouragement.

5. New techniques in audio-visual presentations, ranging from television to film exhibits, electronics and graphics—all especially cast for foreign audiences—can help dramatize and enhance America's efforts to communicate its story to the people of the world. They must be made part of USIA's skills inventory.

6. The massive private resources of this country must be brought into tandem with the U.S. communications program abroad. The vein has hardly been tapped. Creative, constructive talents in radio, press, television, film, design, graphics, publishing, education, the arts, the social sciences and related professions need to be marshalled more effectively.

7. Similarly, a special effort should be made to capitalize upon those resources in foreign countries which may be used to USIA's advantage. The two most conspicuous are those organizations indigenous to a host country which identify with the United States and have common cause with its policies and objectives, as well as organizations of the American private sector which have operating arms abroad and which by the mere fact of being there already serve as unofficial representatives, for good or ill. Or equal importance are those foreign journalists and news organizations stationed in this country and thus positioned to perform a key role in informing their audiences about us.

8. The level of representation allowances for USIA activities remains scandalously low; roughly half the level of current expenditures, forcing USIA personnel in the field to make up the difference from their own pockets. The Commission again urges the Congress to make adequate provision for this essential element of the Agency's overseas operations, and to lift the financial burden that is now being shouldered by a dedicated career staff.

9. The creation of a solid corps of professional officers in foreign communications, whose ability to communicate with the peoples of the world in their own languages and with a sensitivity, understanding and respect for the psychology, customs and traditions of their cultures, has helped gain acceptance and understanding of U.S. policy and action. (In this connection, the Commission is pleased to commend the 90th Congress—and particularly the leadership of Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island and Representative Wayne Hays of Ohio—for establishing a career corps for Foreign Service Information Officers, and thereby providing a long overdue legislative personnel base for USIA operations.) The importance of encouraging these American "ambassadors" to bridge the gaps between national cultures—and of strengthening their ability to do so—cannot be overemphasized.

One basic theme is common to this and the 23 earlier reports prepared by this Commission for the Congress and the President: that America's foreign policy must be strengthened by the infusion of psychological or communications factors. This can occur only if USIA is permitted to play a role where the action is—in the National Security Council, with the Secretary of State, with Ambassadors abroad, and whenever feasible in the Cabinet. The past 20 years have seen tortured, though discernible, progress toward that end. It is our hope that the reluctance of the past will be overcome by the enthusiastic endorsement of the future.

AFTERWORD

We of the United States Advisory Commission on Information find ourselves one year older, but of no different mind, than we were at the conclusion of the 23d Report. It was then that we called for a major review of (1) the USIA and (2) the governmental context in which it operates. We said it was time to examine assumptions, and posed eleven questions that might be among those covered in such a study.[1] They are still worth asking:

Is the United States Information Agency to be but an agent of American "propaganda"?

Should it be more than an arm of foreign policy?

Are information, educational and cultural objectives compatible within one agency?

Were they consolidated outside of the Department of State, should that body have Cabinet rank?

Or should the reins be drawn together within a restructured Department of State?

Does the responsibility of those who create the foreign policy of the United States go beyond its declaration?

Should they have charge of its promulgation as well?

Should USIA have a hand in information dispersal for Government agencies beyond the Department of State?

Should it play a role in the influence of policy as well as in its execution?

Should it help support those private organizations whose overseas activities had been subsidized covertly in the past by the federal government and whose future funding is under study by a committee chaired by the Secretary of State?

Do we really intend that USIA work toward "mutual understanding"; is it to help us understand them as well as to help them understand us?

As we repeat the questions, so also do we repeat the hope that they will be answered.

HIGHWAY SAFETY: COMMENTARY NO. 7

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, when considering highway safety, no one factor can be considered alone as the only cause of traffic accidents. As I noted in my "Highway Safety Commentary No. 6," the driver, the vehicle, and the road play major and interrelated parts in fully considering traffic accident statistics. The interdependent nature of these three factors should not be overlooked. However, discussion concerning each is relevant, as we consider the roles each play in the drive for highway safety.

Today, I wish to comment on an aspect of safety standards for vehicles. Congress passed in 1966 the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act. The act states that Congress "is determined that it is necessary to establish motor vehicle safety standards for motor vehicles and equipment in interstate commerce." The result of this act has been the issuance of 28 motor vehicle safety performance standards by the Department of Transportation. The latest of these standards will go into effect this year.

These safety standards are a necessary and important step toward the elimination of traffic deaths caused by improper manufacturing and or design. Unfortunately, as a practical matter these standards cannot be made retroactive. The average lifetime of vehicles is such that some cars manufactured in 1967, without the features required by Federal standards, will be on the roads until 1983. Even in 1975, almost 60 percent of the pre-1968 automobile population will still be in use.

The Department of Transportation submitted a report to the Congress in

---

[1] A number of courses might be taken in pursuing the examination. One which commends itself to the Advisory Commission takes this form:

The President would appoint a Committee of Nine—one member each from the Senate, the House of Representatives, the National Security Council, the Department of State, the United States Information Agency and the United States Advisory Commission on Information, and, from the private sector, a chairman and two additional members knowledgeable in the fields of information, education and cultural affairs. This committee would select the study organization, review and approve the direction and plan for the study, and critique its findings.

The study itself would be conducted by professional researchers and experts in foreign polcy, members either of an existing research and development organization or, perhaps, drawn together on an *ad hoc* basis under the auspices of a school of international studies.

1968 entitled "Safety for Motor Vehicles in Use," which illustrated another significant statistic. It estimated that about half of the 94 million motor vehicles in use today are deficient in one or more aspects of safety performance due to deterioration with use, improper maintenance, or inadequate initial design.

These facts are significant. Methods should be found to cope with this aspect of the problem.

THE DRUG PROBLEM

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the message which President Nixon sent to Congress yesterday afternoon is of such consequence that I feel justified to take this time to urge every Member to read it, even reread it, with more than ordinary care. The message deals with one of our gravest national problems: the growing traffic in narcotics and dangerous drugs.

There is no way of ascertaining the exact number of drug addicts. The number has been estimated to be in the hundreds of thousands. And we know from the crime statistics that the use of drugs, from the experimental to the addiction stage, has alarmingly increased among our youth. Even in our high schools and our junior high schools, particularly in our cities, the availability and use of dangerous drugs has been increasing.

We know that narcotics is a primary cause of crime. The addict is driven to a life of crime in a relentless search for the money to buy drugs. He finds himself enslaved. He finds himself a slave to the needle to feed an insatiable appetite but also a slave to the gun. He becomes a menace to himself and to society.

Obviously, our present laws are inadequate in dealing with this problem. For all too long our approach to it has been on a piecemeal basis. It is not simply a local, State or national problem. It is international in scope. At long last, as President Nixon proposes, we are to enter upon a broad program, dealing with every facet of this problem.

In every way—by law enforcement, by education, by training, by State-Federal cooperation, by international cooperation—President Nixon has begun an attack on what may be said to be the American plague—the plague of drug abuse. I applaud President Nixon's message and I intend to give my support to every phase of his proposed program. It is a program to protect American youth and America itself.

COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACT OF 1969

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the gap between this Nation's universal system of secondary education and our comparatively limited system of higher education is a key factor in keeping our desire to provide equal education opportunity for every citizen to the limit of his interest and capacity from being fully realized. This gap promises to grow even wider as society's demands for college-educated people and the capability and desire of our young people for higher education continue to grow at a faster rate than the capacity of our colleges and universities. In such a situation, cost and competition for available college and university slots will continue to increase, putting more and more individuals and groups in the Nation at disadvantage in obtaining an opportunity for advanced education, thereby taking us still further from our national goal of equal educational opportunity for interested and capable individuals at all levels.

One possible means of closing this gap and bringing us closer to our national educational goals is the development of junior and community colleges. Nearly a thousand such colleges are currently in operation, accommodating about 2 million students and accounting for almost half of all institutions of higher education in the United States. Seventy new community junior colleges opened their doors last year alone.

These institutions offer a number of distinct educational advantages. They provide post-secondary educational opportunities at low cost to students. They are located close to the students they serve. They can offer flexible admissions arrangements, strong counseling and advisory services, and a wide variety of educational programs—academic, vocational and professional. In short, the educational opportunities afforded by community junior colleges are the kinds of opportunities that are relevant to the most immediate needs and demands of the particular community in which they operate.

An additional advantage—or potential advantage—of community junior colleges is their unique ability to meet the intensifying educational demands of racial and economic groups that have long been at a particular disadvantage in the struggle for higher education. Many 2-year colleges are showing remarkable progress in this area. A recent survey by the highly respected Southern Education Reporting Service indicates that, excluding traditionally black institutions, only one public college among all the State universities and land-grant colleges has a black enrollment that exceeds 5 percent. There are, however, at least 20 larger urban community colleges whose non-white enrollments now exceed 10 percent. The New York Times noted recently, for example, that the New York City Community College has "6,000 non-white students, nearly half the total—a higher ethnic concentration than any other school in the City University, and almost in the entire State." Chicago City College has a black enrollment almost four times that of the much larger Illinois State University. A single 2-year campus in Oakland's Peralta District has more than twice as many black students as the entire University of California system whose total undergraduate enrollment exceeds 65,000.

These figures, of course, indicate a need for greater access for racial minorities to our major institutions of higher learning. They also indicate, however, that community junior colleges are already serving a very significant function in providing advanced education and training for members of minority groups. It might be fair to say, in fact, that to the extent that American higher education is coming to grips with the challenge of providing greater educational opportunities for minority and traditionally disadvantaged groups, the community colleges are very much the leading edge.

It is little wonder, then, that the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, commonly known as the Kerr Commission after its chairman, the distinguished educator, Clark Kerr, recommended the construction of 500 new community colleges to meet the basic educational needs of communities across the country by 1976.

Despite the excellent job that existing community junior colleges are doing and the intense need for expansion of such facilities, community colleges have long taken the last place in line when Federal funds for education are distributed. Local and State governments have so far borne the main burden of funding these institutions. Out of 24 institutional-support programs administered by the Office of Education, junior colleges are eligible to take part in only six. Although they serve nearly one-third of the total student population engaged in higher education, community colleges get only 4 percent of national defense loan funds, 6 percent of educational opportunity loans, and 15 percent of college work-study assistance. Despite a commitment in the Higher Education Facilities Act of a major Federal assistance effort for community colleges, construction grant funds requested in the 1970 budget amount to only $43 million. Divided among the 50 States, each with new community colleges in need of assistance, this amount will hardly put a dent in the construction needs of community and junior colleges.

In other regards, too, Federal machinery and policy for assisting community and junior colleges is haphazard and disjointed. Statements of Federal policy to community and junior colleges are uninspiring. No procedures or mechanisms are provided to insure that adequate planning and coordination are effected in the development of community and junior colleges within individual States and across the Nation. Authority and responsibility for providing Federal assistance to community and junior colleges is fragmented and divided among many sections of the Office of Education, with no bureau, division, office, or program devoted to overseeing and coordinating Federal efforts and plans in this area.

With these needs and current shortcomings in mind, I am today introducing legislation entitled the "Comprehensive Community College Act of 1969." This

XUM

legislation was formulated with the help of the American Association of Junior Colleges, and is identical to that already introduced by Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey on the Senate side. The bill would establish as official policy of the Federal Government the intention to provide "postsecondary education to all persons in all areas of each State through a program of Federal grants to each State for the purpose of strengthening, improving, and developing comprehensive community college." Under this proposal, States would be given a year to produce or update a master plan for postsecondary education within the State, during which time the U.S. Office of Education would organize a Bureau of Community Education and a National Advisory Council appointed by the U.S. Commissioner of Education to administer all Federal programs related to community colleges.

Master plans developed under the act would include plans for the development and implementation of comprehensive curricula, training and development of faculty and staff, formulation of admissions and financial aid policy, development of procedures to assure that Federal funds will not supplant existing State and local efforts, and—where feasible—arrangement for interstate planning and cooperation.

To help the States carry out their respective plans, the legislation provides for the authorization of funds to be appropriated for construction and initial equipment in the following amounts: $1.5 billion for fiscal year 1971, $2 billion for fiscal year 1972, and $2.5 billion in fiscal year 1973. All institutions included in each State plan which will provide a 2-year comprehensive program of postsecondary education to all high school graduates or anyone 18 years of age or older would be eligible for such Federal assistance.

Passage of this legislation by the Congress promises to stimulate and greatly improve our national effort to provide high-quality, postsecondary education short of a 4-year degree at a major institution of higher learning, not at the expense of the 4-year institutions but as a supplement to them. This legislation would allow us to serve more of those in our society who want to learn beyond high school, without regard to degrees, grade averages, age, or socioeconomic status. By so doing, we will take a great step toward the goal of equal educational opportunity for all by narrowing the existing chasm between secondary and 4-year college education—a chasm that stops so many of our citizens who are capable of educational achievement beyond secondary school from exploiting that capability.

CONGRESSMAN VANIK SPEAKS OUT ON THE NEED FOR TAX REFORM

(Mr. ECKHARDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, in the U.S. Congress there is no man more devoted to the interests of the public at large and more concerned about incursions upon the public interest in the field of taxation than the Honorable CHARLES VANIK of Ohio. His insistence upon tax reform as a necessary concomitant to any extension of the surtax, in his presentation to the Senate Finance Committee, is a further testimonial to his faithful attention to the interests of the middle-income taxpayer, who is most jeopardized by H.R. 12290. I commend consideration of his statement to Members, particularly his views with respect to capital gains with which I wholeheartedly concur. This is the single biggest loophole area. His full statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES A. VANIK, OHIO, BEFORE THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE, JULY 11, 1969

Mr. Chairman: First of all, I want to express my appreciation for the declared intention of your Committee to fit meaningful revenue-raising tax reform into the surtax deliberations. Your action reflects the hopes of most of the 205 members of the House who have declared that tax reform can be achieved within the practicable timetable of this session. The 91st Congress will overshadow most of its forebears—if it could indeed become known as The Tax Reform Congress.

In our House efforts for reform we were out-manuevered—but not defeated—if our best hopes are brought to fruition by your efforts.

INVESTMENT CREDIT

In connection with the investment credit, I urge that your deliberations sanitize the repeal to insure that the exceptions are limited, explainable and justified. In the Ways and Means Committee, I urged that the repeal date of the investment credit be set back to April 1, 1969, to coordinate the change in the law with the quarterly tax period. Congress has no obligation to extend the tax privilege of the investment credit to those who exploited the failure of government to exercise more drastic efforts to slow down over-indulgence in the expansion of our industrial plant.

When it was learned by our Ways and Means Committee on the day the surtax bill was reported out that one contractor boasted the execution of $900,000,000 in contracts on the Sunday before the scheduled termination, we moved the tax termination date to Friday, Midnight, April 18th. In addition to the one group of $900,000,000 in contracts, there is reason to believe that an additional $3 billion in contracts were executed on that Sunday, and perhaps $5 billion in contracts executed on Saturday, April 19th. Two extra days of investment credit repeal affected an estimated $9 billion in contracts for a potential Treasury gain of $630 million. Setting the investment credit repeal back to April 1st, 1969, would reach a potential contract total of $35 billion for a Treasury saving of $2.45 billion. Should we provide a tax bonanza for the bad guys who flaunted the government appeals for restraint and moderation? Should we penalize the responsible portions of our business sector which deferred expansion and borrowing to help cool down the inflationary spiral?

Secondly, I urge that within the framework of the repeal of the investment credit, language be inserted to eliminate the extension of the credit on items produced in foreign countries during the transition period.

I was shocked to discover that the investment credit would apply to items of foreign manufacture. It was my belief that the investment credit was designed to stimulate domestic industry. The extension of the credit to items of foreign manufacture—even during the period of transition—is indefensible and adds unwisely to the outflow of dollars. This provision extends a seven percent incentive to items of foreign manufacture which is not reciprocated by any other country.

Almost simultaneous with the announcement of the repeal of the investment credit, the Administration announced that depreciation guidelines would be modified and liberalized to substantially make up the loss of the investment credit tax advantage. It would be tragic if the Administration would give away in increased depreciation whatever is gained by Treasury in the repeal of the investment credit. For this reason, I urge that your legislation provide at least a temporary mandate or moratorium against further liberalization of the depreciation schedules.

In our tax reform work in the House, we have agreed upon a substantial amount of reform items. We have brushed the kittens but the fat cats are still roaming the neighborhood. We have not increased taxable revenues. As a matter of fact, we have generated Treasury losses. However, in the last several days we have moved into critical areas of reform which could substantially increase revenues.

CAPITAL GAINS

Our best hopes for revenue-raising reform rest in constructive changes in capital gains preferences, by extending the minimum holding period, decreasing the tax benefit, and eliminating the alternative tax.

The minimum holding period on capital gains was two years between 1922 through 1933. In 1934 it was reduced to one year and in 1938 was increased to 18 months. In 1942 the holding period was reduced to six months where it remains today.

The Revenue Act of 1932 provided for graduated taxation of capital gains. An asset held over one year and less than two was taxable at 80% gain. An asset held over two years and not over five years was taxable at 60% of gain. An asset held over five years and not over ten years was taxable at 40% of gain, while an asset held over ten years was taxable at 30% of gain.

The Revenue Act of 1938 provided for graduated taxation of capital gains as follows: An asset held more than 18 months but not more than 24 months was taxable at 66⅔% of gain while an asset held more than 24 months was taxable at 50% of gain.

Our present schedule of capital gains taxation was adopted in 1942 under war conditions when it was believed that a sudden reduction in capital gains taxation would result in an accelerated capital movement and increased tax yields. That decision provided a slight (two-year) short-term gain in capital gains taxation and a 25 year loss of potential capital gain revenue. The decision was no bargain for the government.

I do not have a documented recommendation as to the details of a graduated schedule of capital gains taxation. It seems to me, however, that the minimum holding period for capital assets should be extended to one year—resulting in an annual Treasury gain of almost $.5 billion. An increase in capital gains taxes based on the principles of the 1932 law would be more equitable and produce about $3⅓ billion in annual revenues from capital gains and still preserve essential inducements for the investment of risk capital. Under the present law and the ease with which losses may be artificially created under the 31-day rule, too much of the risk in capital adventure is carried out by the United States Treasury.

CAPITAL GAINS AT DEATH

Under present laws, we suffer a $3 to $4 billion annual loss in tax revenues by permitting capital gains to escape taxation at death. This is totally irrational and against the public interest. This type of non-taxation encourages the prolonged holding and immobilization of assets. Rigor mortis sets in on the blocked capital long before it overcomes its owner. Philanthropy, family and the Treasury will all benefit from a clean tax slate—with capital gains taxes paid.

INTEREST DEDUCTION

Section 265 of the Internal Revenue Code, Section 2, denies the interest deduction to financial institutions on indebtedness incurred to purchase or carry obligations on which interest income is tax exempt.

In fiscal 1965, approximately $15 billion in interest payments by individuals were deducted from the taxes due for a Treasury loss of $4 billion to $5 billion annually. For the same year, corporations utilized deductions totalling $26 billion for a Treasury loss of $9 billion. In view of the intensified borrowing in recent years, the annual Treasury loss in the interest deduction must total $6½ billion for individuals and $13 billion for corporations. High interest rates have served to multiply the interest deduction and the loss to Treasury in recent years.

There is unutilized power in the Congress to attack interest rates and to simultaneously increase tax yields. For example, a temporary suspension of the interest deduction on all debt contracted after a given date would eliminate the public subsidy for borrowing which results from the tax deductibility of interest paid. Such a provision suspending the tax deduction on all but housing debt contracted from this date could produce increased Treasury revenues. At the current rate of non-housing debt increase, a suspension of the interest deduction would increase tax revenues by almost $4 billion and guarantee an almost instant reduction in interest rates to acceptable and tolerable levels.

This is strong medicine—but the patient is very sick with high-interest fever. It takes this kind of legislative remedy to precipitate a return to normalcy from the high-interest fever which threatens to destroy our economy. This is tax reform which attacks high interest.

DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

I certainly hope that your Committee will provide for a reduction of depletion allowances to levels which meet the criteria of justification. The 27½ allowance was made arbitrarily and without any relevance to need. The depletion should be reduced to a percentage level that can be justified. The reform should endeavor to reach intangible drilling and deplorable bookkeeping procedures which avoid fair taxation.

In any event, there is no justification I can think of for extending the mineral depletion allowance extra-territorially to American investors in foreign countries. Some of these investors have multiple depletion allowances from America and the host country. When depletion allowances for foreign extraction is combined with the benefits of the foreign tax credit—there is little left for the United States Treasury. In the meanwhile, billions of dollars of our foreign commitments in aid and military assistance are spent to protect these investors from other foreign invaders and from the people of the host country who are coming to resent our extraction of their mineral wealth.

The elimination of the foreign mineral depletion privileges coupled with a sizable reduction in the privilege of domestic mineral and oil extraction, should raise $2 billion annually without adversely impairing the national security or the multiplicity of incentives for search and development.

CONCLUSION

What is going on right now in the House Ways and Means Committee and the fervor with which your work has begun here—bears the hallmark of The Great Race for Reform. Both of our Committees are making reality from what was considered the impossible. The anguish of the taxpayer has gotten through to the Congress.

In this contest for achieving a higher degree of tax justice, there are 70 million winners, the overwhelming majority of American taxpayers who pay the full tax assessment through withholding—the taxpayers who have no haven, no tax shelter—no special line of defense from the tax collector.

We are engaged in one of the most vital tasks of the legislator. We know what needs doing—and we must do it. We have been preparing for this day for a long time. We must not fail the taxpayer who has patiently waited an even longer time.

PROPOSED BAIL REFORM LEGISLATION

(Mr. McCULLOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced legislation proposed by the President which would amend the Bail Reform Act of 1966 in order to reduce crime committed by persons released on bail. The distinguished minority leader (Mr. Ford) the distinguished chairman of the House Republican conference (Mr. Anderson) 12 Republican members of the Judiciary Committee and 10 other Republican Members of this body joined with me in cosponsoring this most important legislation.

On January 9, 1969, together with 21 cosponsors, I introduced H.R. 2781, a bill which would amend the Bail Reform Act to authorize pretrial detention of certain classes of defendants deemed to constitute a danger to the community. The administration bill which I introduced yesterday, H.R. 12806, embodies the same concepts contained in my original bill with certain changes, such as provision for a detention hearing, designed to more fully insure that due process rights of the accused are fully protected.

Under the Bail Reform Act of 1966, no defendant in a noncapital case may be detained prior to trial. The sole criterion which the judicial officer may apply in setting conditions of release or the posting of monetary bond is the need to assure the defendant's appearance at trial. The court is not permitted to consider the possible danger to the community posed by the defendant—that is, the possibility that he will commit further crimes—in prescribing conditions of release.

The problem of crime committed by persons released on bail in the District of Columbia has become ever more acute since 1966. About 10 percent of all persons indicted in the U.S. District Court of the District of Columbia commit these crimes while out on bail in connection with another felony case. The rearrest rate among persons charged with robbery and released on bail, for example, has ranged between 60 and 70 percent.

The bill which I introduced yesterday, like the Bail Reform Act itself, would be applicable in the District of Columbia and in Federal courts throughout the country as well. The bill would give the courts authority to consider danger to the community in setting nonfinancial conditions of release on bail. It would also provide for pretrial detention for up to 60 days for certain defendants who are found to be dangerous to the community.

Pretrial detention is already authorized for persons charged in capital cases. The bill would authorize pretrial detention, after hearing, of:

First. Persons charged with a "dangerous crime." This would include certain offenses with high risk of additional repeated public danger; for example, robbery, rape, and sale of narcotics.

Second. Persons charged with a "crime of violence" who are out on bail in connection with another crime of violence or who have been convicted of a crime of violence in the preceding 10 years. "Crime of violence" is defined more broadly and covers the whole range of violent crimes.

Third. Persons charged with crimes of violence who the court determines, after hearing, to be narcotic addicts.

Fourth. Persons who threaten witnesses or jurors, regardless of the offense with which they are charged.

I understand that only about 10 percent of the persons arrested in the District of Columbia, for example, would fall within one of these four categories. It should be emphasized that all other arrested persons would not be subject to the provisions of the proposed act.

All of the following findings must be made by the court before pretrial detention is permitted:

First. There is clear and convincing evidence that the defendant falls within one of the four categories of persons subject to the provisions of the act.

Second. No condition of release can reasonably assure the safety of the community.

Third. There is a substantial probability that the defendant committed the offense with which he is charged.

Only those few persons who meet all these tests may be temporarily detained prior to trial. These findings must be made after a detention hearing at which the defendant is entitled to present information, testify, and present and cross examine witnesses. The judicial officer must then enter a written order with his findings and reasons, and, of course, the defendant retains the right to appeal from such findings. Confinement, where possible, must be in facilities separate from those used for convicted persons. The defendant must be granted an opportunity to prepare his defense, including release in the custody of appropriate persons where necessary. And most important, if the defendant is not tried within 60 days, unless delay is due to the defendant, he must be released.

The Bail Reform Act contains no specific sanctions for violating conditions of release. The bill provides two types of sanctions. First, release may be revoked and the defendant detained if upon hearing the U.S. attorney establishes "clear and convincing evidence" of violations and the court finds that no additional conditions of release will protect the community or prevent flight. Alternatively, the defendant may be tried for criminal contempt and sentenced up to 6 months.

The bill also creates added penalties for persons who jump bail and persons who commit crimes while on bail.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make clear that I am in accord with the basic objectives of the Bail Reform Act, particularly in-

XUM

sofar as it provides a means for the quick and equitable release pending trial of the majority of persons who are not chronic criminals or virtual professionals in the art of violent crime. I also realize, of course, that the Bail Reform Act is certainly not the major reason for the sharply rising crime rate.

However, when under the Bail Reform Act—regardless of the gravity and circumstances of the crime, the weight of the evidence, or the past history and dangerous character of the accused—the arraigning magistrate is forced to regularly release back to the streets, on nominal or relatively low bail or on personal recognizance or other seemingly ineffective conditions, perpetrators of the most vicious crimes, to continue preying on the public until trial—often at some far future date—then I believe it is time to amend the law.

There has now been sufficient experience under the 1966 law to demonstrate that it is proving a windfall to the chronic violent criminal. I feel that the law, as it now stands, may be of more benefit to the habitual criminal then it is to those for whom it was designed, and that it is turning into something of a catastrophe for the law-abiding public, which is the victim.

PROPOSED BAIL REFORM LEGISLATION

(Mr. McCLORY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I joined yesterday in cosponsoring the administration's proposed bail reform legislation, introduced by Mr. McCulloch, because of my deeply felt conviction that we in the Congress must make a start in dealing with the unacceptable rise in the national rate of crime. As Attorney General Mitchell stated at a conference on "Crime and the Urban Crisis" in early February:

> The simple fact is that crime is intimidating us, and our inability to control crime is a courtship with national disaster.

It is my hope that by focusing congressional attention on the problems dealt with by this legislation, we can devise new initiatives in the battle against criminal activity. We understand, of course, that by strengthening our pretrial release procedures we treat only the sickness; we do nothing to reduce the chances that others too will become sick. However, we are aware also that as important as dealing with the root-causes of crime are, the law-abiding citizens of our Nation deserve and demand immediate consideration and protection.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I support President Nixon's proposal to add the concern for community safety to the concern for equal justice when making pretrial release decisions.

I do, however, have some reservations about the legislation as it is introduced today. First, although my research has not been exhaustive, the constitutionality of any preventive detention plan is somewhat suspect. Two possible constitutional attacks can and, no doubt, will be made. Opponents will raise the eighth amendment provision that "excessive bail shall not be required" to argue that an absolute right to bail exists in all noncapital cases. They will argue that to forbid judges from setting excessively high bail but to permit them to deny bail entirely would be to invalidate altogether the constitutional protection. Furthermore, the U.S. Supreme Court in *Stack* v. *Boyle,* 342 U.S. 1 (1951) emphasized the traditional importance of bail in criminal cases stating:

> Unless the right to bail before trial is preserved, the presumption of innocence . . . would lose its meaning.

On the other hand, the Supreme Court—by a slim 5 to 4 majority—held in *Carlson* v. *Landon,* 342 U.S. 524 (1952) that at least as to an alien Communist awaiting deportation, no absolute right to bail exists. Some have interpreted this as a rejection of the theory that the eighth amendment guarantees a right to bail, but it is questionable whether this decision would be extended to the criminal situation.

A second constitutional problem concerns the fifth amendment right of due process since preventive detention would deprive a defendant of his liberty prior to conviction. Traditionally, however, in any analysis of due process the interests of society are balanced against the liberties of the individual and therefore, if sufficient safeguards are provided in the preventive detention plan to insure that fundamental fairness is not violated, it would appear that this argument can be successfully met.

The plan introduced has, as Tom Wicker admitted in the New York Times of Sunday, July 13, 1969, "about as many safeguards for the accused as possible." Perhaps it can be improved upon. The committee process will, in addition to focusing attention on the problems, educate many of us to the strengths and weaknesses of preventive detention. Perhaps we will also learn of alternative plans which would improve upon the current situation without taking the risk of wrongfully denying liberty to innocent persons.

Some alternatives to outright preventive detention that have been suggested and that should receive study are first, a system of restrictions on the activities and life-style of the released defendant; second, a method of expediting trials for those defendants who present, while free, the greatest threat to the community; third, a reexamination of sentencing and parole procedures to provide for increased punishment for offenses committed while free on bail awaiting trial. Although the President's proposal utilizes these alternatives, it does so concurrently with effectuating a plan for preventive detention. Perhaps some combination of these alternatives might be more desirable than the plan introduced, especially given our present inability to predict with any great accuracy which defendants will be recidivists. We will all no doubt follow the committee hearings on this subject with intense interest and it is my hope that legislation will emerge that will strengthen society's hand in dealing with the problems of crime.

ATTACKING THE EVILS OF HARD-CORE UNDEREMPLOYMENT

(Mr. McCLORY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, on July 7, 1969, H.R. 12598 was introduced by my colleague from Georgia, (Mr. Blackburn) and nine Members including myself to provide a broad attack on the evils of hard-core underemployment.

The Nation is becoming aware that the slum dweller, no matter whether he be black or white, is often caught in a vicious cycle of poverty. Because of a lack of adequate training he is frequently unable to find worthwhile employment. As a result, he and his family are economically obligated to live in a ghetto where his children are likely to go to poorly equipped schools, play on garbage strewn streets and develop the "turnon, drop-out" philosophy that can only result in future unemployment, crime and perhaps riot. Unquestionably, we must begin to break this cycle of poverty, if only to prevent the disintegration of the American society.

H.R. 12598 attacks the evils of unemployment by providing new financial incentives to the private sector to hire and train the undereducated and the unskilled. This approach is consistent with President Nixon's pledge to send to Congress a program of tax credits, designed to provide new incentives for the enlistment of additional private resources in meeting our urgent social needs.

H.R. 12598 would, under title I, provide American industry an income tax credit of 15 percent for most employee training expenses. Further, under title II, smaller employers would receive a direct refund of up to 50 percent of the wages paid to qualified trainees during the training period. Significantly, title II would require that the employer provide the trainee an opportunity for continued employment after completing the training period.

Mr. Speaker, the American businessman has indicated over the years that he sincerely wants to contribute to solving the important social problems with which our Nation is faced. This bill, if enacted, would make such contributions profitable. Is there a motivation more likely to obtain positive results? I think not.

I urge my colleagues to give this proposal their most serious consideration.

MEDICARE IN MEXICO AND CANADA?

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to travel is a well deserved aspect of a retirement that many senior citizens look forward to. Some also choose, as should be their privilege, to live in a foreign country for reasons of climate, cost, or other considerations.

It would seem logical that if a senior citizen for his own good reasons elects to travel or live outside of the United

XUM

States, this decision should not cost him medicare benefits to which he would otherwise be entitled. But this is not the case.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 8926, to insure that eligible persons who are taken ill while in Canada or Mexico and require immediate hospitalization outside the United States, would be covered by medicare. This proposal is an important step toward rectifying what I consider to be an unfair situation.

My bill would allow senior citizens to spend a vacation in Mexico, visit relatives in Canada, or retirc to one of these neighboring countries, secure in the knowledge that their medicare protection will travel with them beyond the borders of this country.

For the benefit of my colleagues and the many readers of the RECORD, I include an editorial on this subject published on July 7 in the Times, a Mexico City newspaper:

MEDICARE FOR MEXICO

Not only the vote is lacking. Medicare is too. As with the vote, a flood of mail to US lawmakers could help this cause. There is still time. Rep. James C. Cleveland reintroduced Bill H.R. 8926 last March to get Medicare for retired Americans extended to Canada and Mexico. This would actually represent a saving to US taxpayers. Medical costs in the US are soaring, hospitals are overcrowded. Mexico has well-equipped ones, very competent physicians, and could administer US patients the same treatment they get at home for about one-fourth the cost.

Yet to get Medicare, a retired US citizen must be physically in the US at the time illness, a heart atack or an accident hits him. Rush for the border when bedridden? It makes little sense. It works a hardship on the tourist or resident. It hurts tourism by the elderly to Mexico—who would otherwise be free the year around to travel—but often won't because they feel unprotected when abroad. By writing one's own congressmen, urging friends in the US to do the same, or directly to Rep. Cleveland, this situation could be changed. There are hundreds of retired Americans here, in Guadalajara, scattered throughout resort areas of the Republic. Being disenfranchised with the vote is bad enough. This other disenfranchisement is worse. It could be lethal in a moment of need.

"SCHOOL DESEGREGATION, NORTH AND SOUTH," A "FACTS & ISSUES" REPORT OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, surely one of the most significant and difficult problems facing our country is that of desegregation of the Nation's schools, in keeping with the rulings of the Supreme Court of the United States and other Federal courts.

One of the most useful compilations of information concerning the present status of school desegregation in the United States is found in the June 1969 issue of Facts & Issues, published by the highly respected League of Women Voters of the United States.

I insert the text of this issue, entitled "School Desegregation, North and South," at this point in the RECORD:

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION, NORTH AND SOUTH

"Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. . . . Segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race . . . generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone."—U.S. Supreme Court, May 17, 1954.

"The dominant fact that emerges from the recent research endeavors . . . is that educational opportunity is greater in racially balanced than in racially isolated schools . . . beyond any reasonable doubt . . . the academic attainments of both white and Negro pupils are significantly higher in majority-white classrooms than in majority-Negro classrooms."—Irwin Katz, University of Michigan, *Desegregation or Integration in Public Schools? The Policy Implications of Research.*

In the years since the Supreme Court rejected "separate but equal" schools and ordered desegregation with "all deliberate speed," the focus of concern has shifted from the problem of *de jure* segregated southern schools to the more intractable—perhaps even more politically charged—issue of racial imbalance or *de facto* segregation resulting from racially separated housing patterns in schools across the country.

Under pressure of judicial decrees and administrative enforcement actions based on recent civil rights legislation, most school districts in the 17 southern and border states which formerly operated dual school systems are now accepting some school desegregation—feared by some observers to be token integration at best. Racial imbalance growing out of segregated housing patterns is most severe in the cities of the north and west, but experts note a trend toward such *de facto* segregation in the south as well.

There is growing recognition that compensatory education programs aimed primarily at inner-city schools often tend to reinforce patterns of racial isolation. Moreover, the increasingly vigorous drive for local community control of schools, often linked with demands for black (or white) separatism, will doubtless impede progress toward greater racial balance in many areas.

It is important to note that issues of racial balance affect various minority groups, e.g., Mexican-Americans, American Indians and Puerto Ricans. But because the Negro minority's problem is greatest in terms of total numbers and national scope, this paper treats the issue solely in terms of black-white balance.

DESEGREGATION: STATISTICAL YARDSTICK

America's metropolitan areas

The U.S. Civil Rights Commission's March 1967 report, *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools*, documents extensive and increasing racial isolation in public schools of more than 100 city school systems sampled. Although the problem is most severe in the great metropolitan areas where two-thirds of the nation's population now live, the commission found that extent of student segregation was not necessarily related to the size of the school system, the proportion of Negroes enrolled or location in north or south. In 75 representative cities, the commission found (1965–66 school year):

75% of the 1.6 million Negro elementary school children attended schools in which student bodies were more than 90% Negro.

83% of the 2.4 million white elementary school children attended schools whose student populations were more than 90% white.

Nearly 90% of all Negro children in these 75 cities attended elementary schools in which student bodies ranged from 50.5% to 100% Negro.

More significant, the commission found rapid growth of segregation in the 13 years following the Supreme Court ruling in the *Brown* case:

A survey of 15 northern school systems showed an increase in Negro enrollment of 154,000 pupils since 1950—130,000 of these Negro students in schools where student bodies were more than 90% Negro.

In southern and border cities, the *proportion* of Negroes attending all-Negro elementary schools decreased, yet the *number* of children attending racially isolated schools *increased*—a result of rising Negro school enrollments combined with only slight desegregation.

Major factors in growing racial isolation have been the massive rural-to-urban, south-to-north-and-west Negro population migration of the past 30 years and the explosion of suburban development since 1950. Both have produced concentrations of low-income Negroes in central cities surrounded by white middle- and upper-income suburbs. While latest census data show a significant slowdown in Negro migration into central cities, marked changes in racial residence patterns seem unlikely in view of population patterns of the past decade plus the recent significant speedup in the rate of white migration to the suburbs.

Eleven Southern States

After a slow start during a decade marked by political obstructionism, harassment and open violence in some areas, the pace of desegregation has speeded up in the south—20.3% of an estimated 2.5 million Negro students in 11 southern states attended desegregated schools in the 1967–68 school years, compared with 13.9% the previous year and 2% in 1964–65, according to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW). Defining a desegregated school as one attended by Negroes, in which at least 50% of the students are white, HEW surveys show that desegregation has progressed more rapidly in districts complying with federal administrative guidelines issued under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 than in districts desegregating under court order. States in the deep south have the lowest percentages of Negro students attending desegregated schools.

The pace of southern desegregation has therefore been accelerated by greater emphasis on Title VI compliance, rather than court action, as a tool to promote desegregation; more demanding qualifications ("guidelines"), including a requirement for complete desegregation by the 1969–70 school year; and more effective monitoring of progress under Title VI proceedings than is possible in court-ordered desegregation plans. But this progress should not obscure serious problems remaining in the south:

Some 2 million Negro children, or 80% of the total Negro school population, still attend segregated schools, according to HEW—and some experts criticize HEW data as overly optimistic.

So-called "freedom-of-choice" open-enrollment plans adopted by most southern districts have for many reasons failed to bring about actual school desegregation. In May 1968, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled unanimously (*Green v. County School Board of Kent County, Virginia*) that a freedom-of-choice plan could not be "an end in itself." A school board "must establish that its proposed plan promises meaningful and immediate progress toward disestablishing state-imposed segregation." Freedom-of-choice districts now must prepare new plans to assure desegregation by the 1969–70 school year.

More than 120 school districts have chosen to operate without federal aid funds rather than prepare acceptable desegregation plans.

"Significant" numbers of white students attend segregated private schools in many southern states. According to the U.S. Civil

Rights Commission, establishment of the "vast majority" of these schools "undoubtedly was influenced by" the 1954 Supreme Court decision. Their organization was "encouraged and facilitated" by availability of state-financed tuition grants; *in some cases, public school desegregation was made a criterion of eligibility for tuition aid.* Some of these segregated private schools have been granted tax-exempt status by the Internal Revenue Service, and the commission found "tax-deductible contributions from private citizens . . . constitute an important source of financing." On December 9, 1968, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed lower court decisions barring South Carolina and Louisiana state tuition grants found to be designed to circumvent anti-discrimination requirements. In February 1969, a three-judge Federal Court of Appeals voided the Virginia tuition grant plan, ruling that "any assistance whatever by the state towards provision of a racially segregated education exceeds the pale of tolerance demarked by the Constitution."

The press reports mounting public and congressional pressure for a slowdown in desegregation, just as Title VI enforcement staffs come to grips with the most difficult southern districts. Harassment and threats of violence still deter desegregation in some areas.

Northern and Western States

HEW is currently gathering the first detailed statistics on racial enrollment patterns in the north and west. Until these figures are released later this year, the best data available are the Civil Rights Commission's 1967 estimates on enrollment in 75 cities.

THE GUIDELINES DESIGNED FOR SCHOOL BOARDS

HEW's Policies on Elementary and Secondary School Compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (the "guidelines") are often criticized as arbitrary or overly demanding. HEW's former director of civil rights compliance maintains that these guidelines are "no more than documents saying what the courts have said, a convenient method for telling [school boards] what is expected of them." The guidelines are continually subject to review in light of new court decisions.

Guidelines published in March 1968 for the first time imposed a time limit (start of the 1969–70 school year) for achieving complete desegregation. A few districts have been allowed a one-year extension, to September 1970, to complete desegregation.

These policies do not require the correction of racial imbalance arising from private housing patterns; neither do they bar local school systems from reducing or eliminating such imbalance.

To qualify for federal aid-to-education funds, all local school boards must:

Eliminate and prevent discrimination in all services, facilities, activities and programs, including transportation, athletic and extra-curricular activities, remedial and guidance services.

Eliminate student assignment or transfer policies, school attendance zones and school feeder patterns which segregate students on basis of race, color or national origin.

Locate new schools or other educational facilities in a nondiscriminatory manner.

Assure nondiscriminatory policies in hiring and firing, assignment and promotion of professional staff. School faculties must be integrated so that a school is not identifiable by the racial makeup of either faculty or students.

Assure that minority students are not denied equal educational opportunity by such practices as overcrowded classes, fewer qualified teachers, less-adequate curricula, textbooks, equipment, facilities or services or lower per-pupil expenditures. "Providing equal educational opportunity does not, however, require school systems to offer an identical educational program for each student. . . ."

Title VI—Noncompliance proceedings

If HEW enforcement officials are unable to obtain voluntary compliance with these requirements, they may initiate compliance proceedings with a formal notice to the school district. Determination of noncompliance by a HEW hearing examiner is subject to review by a three-member board within HEW before final decision by the Secretary. The Secretary must notify appropriate House and Senate committees 30 days before a proposed fund cutoff, with a full written report of circumstances and grounds for such action. If funds are cut off, they can be restored if the district adopts policies in compliance with guidelines.

Title VI enforcement in Southern and border States

From 1965 to 1968, HEW concentrated enforcement efforts in those states which had formerly operated dual school systems.

As of May 22, 1969, 515 enforcement cases had been initiated since the program's start; 228 of these districts were involved in current enforcement proceedings—including 123 districts whose federal aid funds had been cut off. Some 217 districts against which enforcement proceedings had been initiated had complied with desegregation requirements at some stage before cutoff; and 70 districts whose federal aid funds had been terminated had moved to comply and were again receiving federal funds.

Because aid to disadvantaged children comprises a large portion of federal aid monies, fund cutoffs often most hurt the neediest children. Nevertheless, Title VI enforcement is regarded as an effective tool for promoting desegregation, particularly in the rural south.

SEGREGATION IN THE NORTH

De facto segregation has been widely understood to arise as an inevitable result of a neighborhood school policy simply reflecting racially segregated housing patterns developed over the past 30 years or more. But *de facto* as well as *de jure* segregation often flows from conscious political or economic decisions of public or semi-public bodies. School boards, as agents of the state with power to levy taxes and enact regulations having the force of law, in effect enact *de jure* segregation when they deliberately draw boundary lines or locate school facilities in a manner to preserve racially segregated "neighborhood schools." Moreover, some authorities assert, residential segregation did not arise naturally but from preconsidered acts of powerful real estate interests supported by influential community groups and public agencies.

State legal or administrative actions

In 1963, the New York State Commissioner of Education initiated directives requiring local school officials to develop plans for eliminating racial imbalance (defined as a school having 50% or more Negro pupils enrolled). The same year, New Jersey's chief state school officer, responding to citizen petitions, directed school desegregation in three communities. Since that time, a dozen states have set up official bodies to further desegregation. Several state courts have upheld such state-sponsored efforts.

Massachusetts and California have enacted state laws to correct racial imbalance. Massachusetts law requires local school districts to correct imbalance in schools more than 50% nonwhite and gives the State Department of Education authority to withhold state education funds from noncomplying boards. California law lacks such sanctions; state policy grants prevention and elimination of racial imbalance "high priority" in school planning and provides that a district shall consider an integration plan when any of its schools have minority enrollments varying more than 15% from district-wide averages.

In 1968, the U.S. Supreme Court in effect upheld the Massachusetts law by refusing to review lower court decisions backing the law against a challenge by the Boston School Committee, ruling that the suit at issue failed to raise "a substantial federal question."

Racial imbalance challenged in courts

Decisions by federal courts in a series of cases indicate that *deliberate* segregation is unconstitutional even when less than complete and accomplished by inaction rather than by action. The key decision (1963) states:

"The neighborhood school policy certainly is not sacrosanct. It is valid only insofar as it is operated within the confines established by the Constitution. It cannot be used as an instrument to confine Negroes within an area artificially delineated in the first instance by official acts. If it is so used, the Constitution has been violated and the courts must intervene." (*Taylor v. Board of Education, New Rochelle, N.Y.*)

Responsibility of public school authorities to eliminate segregation *not* shown to result from deliberate official discrimination is not yet clear. The Supreme Court has not ruled on the issue, and lower federal courts and state courts are divided. Most courts have held that school boards in such situations are not obligated to remedy imbalance. In 1965, the Supreme Court let stand an Appeals Court decision which held that the Constitution prohibits segregation but does not require integration. The Supreme Court ruling in the *Green* case (May 1968), holding "freedom-of-choice" enrollment plans inadequate if they fail to bring about racial balance, applies only to states which previously maintained dual *de jure* systems.

In upholding state and local desegregation plans, the courts have held it is not unconstitutional to take race into account in assigning students to schools.

Administrative enforcement under title VI, 1964 Civil Rights Act

Racial imbalance *per se* is not illegal. Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act bars *federal* government action to correct racial imbalance arising solely from housing patterns. Congressional anti-busing directives forbid any federal *requirement* for school busing to remedy racial imbalance; *local* school districts which choose to use busing, however, may get federal funds to aid in planning or operations.

Prior to 1968, the only effort to implement Title VI in the north was the unsuccessful attempt to withhold funds from Chicago schools in 1965. In 1968, HEW launched an enforcement program aimed at northern districts in which racial isolation could be shown to result from deliberate acts of local school boards or governing bodies, e.g., gerrymandering of boundaries, inequitable assignment procedures or school construction decisions that increased racial concentration. (Expansion of the northern desegregation effort stems in part from a FY 1968 appropriations rider sponsored by Sen. Richard Russell (D., Ga.) requiring HEW to enforce civil rights standards as vigorously in the north as in the south.)

To date, HEW has investigated 40 school districts in small to medium size cities in 13 northern and western states. (HEW officials acknowledge they have not touched the problem in the larger cities.) Six districts (one each in New Jersey, Missouri, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan and Kansas) have been warned to produce acceptable desegregation plans or risk loss of federal funds; two districts have complied. In April 1969, HEW

XUM

began formal action toward cutting off funds for Ferndale, Michigan, the first northern district subject to such action. Cases in two additional districts (Pasadena, California, and Waterbury, Connecticut) have been referred to the Justice Department for possible legal action.

Desegregation enforcement in the north will be slow and piecemeal—documenting discriminatory practices is difficult and time consuming; enforcement staff is small, and political pressures pose special problems.

"The law is on the books, and we're going to enforce it nationally, not just in the south," HEW Secretary Robert H. Finch has promised. At the same time, he suggested past enforcement efforts were overzealous, that federal standards should be more "realistic." As pressures intensify from both sides, the Administration's future actions on desegregation enforcement will be viewed with keen interest in both north and south.

TECHNIQUES ADOPTED TO ACHIEVE BETTER RACIAL BALANCE

Local districts have adopted various techniques to meet situations where simple boundary changes or strategic location of new school facilities cannot produce racial balance. These include:

Pairing. Merge two or more nearby school areas so that each school serves different grade levels for a new and larger attendance zone.

School closing or conversion. Close a segregated school, assign its pupils to other schools and, if possible, convert the formerly segregated school to special-purpose use.

Single-grade or central schools. Convert one or more schools into central facilities for a single grade serving all or a large part of the city.

Magnet schools, supplementary centers. Offer special curricula to draw children from a wide geographic area for full-time or supplementary part-time attendance.

Education complex or cluster. Group several schools administratively and geographically to pool teachers and services and regroup staff and students.

Educational park. A large, consolidated campus arrangement grouping schools for varied age levels for children from many neighborhoods.

Busing within school district. Transport children from majority-black school to majority-white school within district, or vice versa.

Inter-district busing. Usually moves inner-city Negro students to suburban predominantly white schools.

FEW RACIAL BALANCE PROGRAMS OPERATE

Many communities have studied plans for racial balance, but few programs are actually in operation. While no one of the above techniques can resolve big-city segregation, authorities believe each is of educational value if well planned and executed. Limited plans can be expanded, serve as models and help to crack entrenched customs.

In the long run, many authorities believe, the only real solution to racial imbalance will be through a metropolitan approach that frees student assignment policies from limits imposed by district boundaries and fiscal requirements. It is important to counter certain widely held misconceptions:

Re school district boundaries. District lines are not sacrosanct; they are a matter of political will. In the 1950s, there was a strong nationwide trend of district consolidation, primarily for economic reasons associated with declining population in rural areas.

Re neighborhood schools. Special-purpose schools drawing from a wide geographic area have operated successfully for many years in certain areas.

Re school busing. Much opposition to efforts to improve racial balance has focused on busing as a technique for countering efforts of residential patterns. Opponents suggest that busing is uncommon and/or unwise. In fact, a recent HEW study notes: "90% of all districts bus students for one reason or another . . . to desegregate schools . . . [or] to improve the quality of education for their children."

Moreover, recent case studies have shown that school boards have not been averse to busing which is designed to *separate* white and Negro children.

Commitment is needed

Based on its studies of several local desegregation programs, the Civil Rights Commission identifies five key elements needed for successful desegregation: committed leadership by local and state officials; participation by all affected elements in the community; efforts to improve quality of education for *all* children, not just for minority-group children; careful staff selection and training, advance preparation of students for new experiences; desegregation of individual classrooms within schools and availability of supportive services for children needing remedial help.

ACTION PROPOSED TO SPEED DESEGREGATION

Prospects for congressional approval of new legislation to speed desegregation do not appear very promising for the near future, and the Nixon Administration's attitude toward expanded administrative efforts remains unclear. Current proposals for new or expanded federal or state government action include the following:

Congressional action

1. Enactment of uniform national standards for elimination of racial isolation.

2. Expansion of federal assistance aimed at increasing supply of low- and moderate-income housing throughout metropolitan areas, to reduce concentration of such projects in inner-city areas.

3. Expanded budget support for technical aid in desegration planning, including more funds for busing schemes where local districts wish to use this method.

4. More funds for Title VI enforcement efforts. As of March 1, 1969, HEW employed 51 staff members to enforce desegregation in some 4,500 southern and border-state districts. This year, the northern-western enforcement staff is to be expanded from 53 to 61 for nearly 20,000 districts—a tiny staff for the task.

Federal administrative action

5. Requirement by Department of Housing and Urban Development that approval of applications for low- and moderate-income housing projects or urban renewal plans be contigent on site selection and project planning that will help reduce racial concentration in housing, thus reducing racial isolation in schools.

6. Justice Department action to encourage courts supervising desegregation in certain southern school districts to revise early decrees to conform to more rigorous standards in administrative guidelines.

7. Internal Revenue Service denial of tax exemptions held by certain segregated private schools established in the south to avoid public school integration.

Proposals for State government actions

8. Adoption of statewide, long-term integration plans with support for metropolitan planning and urban-suburban cooperation.

9. Adoption of statewide standards, with both financial incentives and penalties to encourage racial balance.

10. Revision of state education aid formulae which often provide more financial support for rural and suburban schools than for city school systems, thus reinforcing existing inequities in per-pupil spending based on school district tax resources.

ADDRESS BY CLAUDE S. PHILLIPS, JR., PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, a most thoughtful discussion of the relationships among students, faculty and administration in international higher education is contained in an address delivered on April 18, 1969, by Prof. Claude S. Phillips, Jr.

Dr. Phillips is professor of political science and director of the Institute of International and Area Studies, at Western Michigan University at Kalamazoo, Mich.

His remarks were delivered at the annual spring conference of the Michigan Association for Higher Education and Wayne State University.

I insert Professor Phillips' address at this point in the RECORD:

STUDENT-FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION RELATIONSHIPS IN INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

(By Claude S. Phillips, Jr.)

Probably the first thing we note in the title is that we are concerned with a relationship, in this case of student, faculty and administration. One approach would be to emphasize the student end of the relationship in response to student-initiated movements related to sex, drugs, discipline and grading. Another approach would be to emphasize the generation gap and argue, as Margaret Mead does so persuasively, that "as long as any adult thinks that he, like the parents and teachers of old, can invoke his own youth to understand the youth before him, he is lost."[1]

However, I cannot deal with sex and liquor, exciting as they are, or with the generation gap, deplorable as it is to anyone over thirty. The relationship with which this paper is concerned is qualified by the phrase "in international higher education". That qualification, of course, is not self-explanatory. For example, some of you might think that I am going to describe student-faculty-administration relationships in various universities around the world. Valuable as that might be, I doubt that I am qualified to do it. My own personal experience involves only two foreign universities, one in India and one in Nigeria. In India, in the summer of 1961, I witnessed a student strike to oppose an increase in fees and to protest the introduction of a general education requirement in the curriculum. The argument used against general education was that most of it was not "relevant" to the student's main subject of study. "I want to be a chemist," one of the students told me, "so why should I study world history, economics and political science?"

In Nigeria in the fall of 1961, I listened as members of the student union condemned the Peace Corps as a nest of CIA spies and demanded of their government that the spies be sent home. In this case, the students were interested in foreign policy and not curriculum matters, and told their government in no uncertain terms what the foreign policy should be. In both the Indian and Nigerian cases, university administrators counseled students not to be rash, and faculty members were conspicuously absent. In both cases, politicians and news media were especially verbose. In both cases, the students lost.

Footnotes at end of article.

XUM

I give you these two cases, not to pile up other illustrations from around the world, but to point out the parallels we see in student protest movements in our own universities and colleges. Yet when the cases I mentioned occurred in 1961, our own students were still referred to as the silent generation. What a difference eight years have made! Our students, as well as students in many different countries, are striking, rioting, seizing university buildings, and presenting demands on many subjects. The range of their grievances is broad indeed. Students, abetted by some professors, have torn universities apart to protest government policies, domestic and foreign. With equal vigor they have protested disciplinary rules, the investment of endowments, the hiring and firing of professors, the curriculum (both what *is* offered and what is *not* offered), and the whole decision-making process of the university. "Relevancy" has become the catchword of the day. Not only must the course of study be relevant to each student, but the university must be relevant! These demands have put serious strains on the university, created doubts in many quarters about the purposes of higher education, and revealed that many of us have indeed become middle-raged.

Let us be clear of our context. Most students probably have only one goal, to get a degree as quickly and easily as possible. On the other hand, two to three percent of the students are thorough-going activists. Some of these want to destroy the university and apparently have no educational goals related to the present system. Others merely want changes peculiar to their group or conforming to their political and sociological interests. In between the dormant and activist groups is a large group of uneasy students. As Professor Joseph J. Schwab of the University of Chicago has concluded from a recent study, "the current of dissatisfaction and uneasiness about college curriculum runs deep and well beyond the borders of the highly audible protest groups."[2]

The target of discontent and criticism has been the college of arts and sciences and the graduate school, not the professional schools of education, business, engineering, etc. The attacks, therefore, have been on the very heart of the college and university. More precisely, the attacks have been aimed mainly at, and dissenters have come mainly from, the social sciences and humanities. To be even more precise, the social sciences have received the greatest challenge concerning relevancy.

RELEVANCY

Relevancy, therefore, becomes a key term, and we ought to deal with it. It is generally agreed (though not by Robert M. Hutchins and his followers) that the American university has three functions:

1. Teaching, i.e., the transmission from one generation to the next of the accumulated knowledge and wisdom of human culture in its broadest sense;
2. Research, i.e., the acquisition of new knowledge and wisdom; and
3. Service, i.e., providing to the community at large certain training, information and expertise which is peculiar to a community of scholars. The relevancy of the university, consequently, must be related to these functions. But here I would suggest that there is a long-range relevancy and a short-range relevancy. Teaching and research, I submit, must be organized primarily for long-range relevancy. They are ultimately, and continuously, concerned with the storehouse of knowledge of mankind. When they get ensnared in short-range relevancy, they invariably become nationalistic, parochial and anti-intellectual. Teaching for short-range relevancy becomes propaganda, utilizing carefully selected facts to produce desired and not intellectual ends. Research for short-range goals becomes channeled to political ends and not to new understanding which is universal and humane.

On the other hand, the service function of the university is often short-range in relevancy, training businessmen, teachers, technicians, etc., on the academic side, and providing extension services, consulting services, surveys, and various recruiting activities on the non-academic side. In regards to academic services, we have simply asserted that even people learning a skill will be better trained if their training is gained in the university setting.

The non-academic services, however, have caused some real difficulties. Students have especially protested the use of campus facilities for recruitment purposes related to the Viet Nam war. Yet only 25 years ago, and even during the Korean war, administrators, professors and students all cooperated in defense of government policy. Without arguing the merits of either case, I am simply suggesting that universities probably cannot be separated from the culture which nourishes them. All we can hope for, nay must demand, is that the university strive constantly to perform functions of long-range relevancy, recognizing that every crisis which forces it to bow to short-range relevancy weakens it seriously.

The question we must now raise is whether the university is now in the midst of a crisis which must force it to provide short-range relevancy. There is no doubt that we face problems never before faced by man, especially in methods of annihilation and in population growth. Only slightly less pressing are the threats to human survival in such areas as racism, urbanization, economic and social inequality, abject poverty and hunger, propaganda, rampant nationalism, intolerance, hatred, general violence, political corruption, public deceit, unemployment, waste of resources, air and water pollution, and scores of similar problems. Many students, and some faculty, marshal these deplorable conditions in defense of their claim that the crisis is so severe that the university must respond on principles of short-range relevancy. I agree that we live in a crisis era and that the university has a responsibility to recognize it. I disagree, however, with the assumption that the university has any short-range principles for handling the crisis. The deplorable conditions with which we must deal are not peculiar to the United States or even to Western culture. They are universal, human conditions of all mankind ensnared in the great vortex of the twentieth century. We are today caught in the culmination of great cultural forces which have finally brought all men into contact with all other men. Isolation is all but gone, nationalism is a threat not a security to human survival, science and technology are spreading through the world, communications connect us all together, change is rampant everywhere, and we are multiplying so fast that population is a greater threat to our survival than atomic war. If the university has anything to say about the human condition it can only be in terms of long-range relevancy and not in short-range palliatives. And long-range relevancy in higher education requires a perspective that is global, grounded in historical experience and explanatory. In other words, a relevant education is international, or more accurately, intercultural and universal. This places the greatest challenge of relevancy on the college of arts and sciences, because that college is the only one ostensibly committed to the liberal or general education of students.

What I have said is simple enough and sounds like a cliché with which most of us probably agree. But I now want to submit that few, if any, universities in the United States or any country that I know, have yet established truly international, universal, intercultural educational systems. I submit further that this weakness, especially in the social sciences and humanities, creates part of the frustration of students who seek relevancy. Admittedly, I know of no attacks on the curriculum which have demanded that it be made universal or cross-cultural. This, I believe, stems from the fact that we have so protected students from a universal perspective that they are not even aware of what frustrates them. Consequently, their demands for relevancy include simplistic action-oriented solutions to problems of social existence which have challenged man since his beginning. A narrow disciplinary education which is also nationalistic and parochial leaves students bereft of any grasp of their own limited problems. And it provides them with no understanding of world problems which the daily media force into their peripheral vision.

A REVIEW OF WHERE WE STAND

I will not recount here all of the efforts of the last twenty years to universalize the universities and colleges. Massive efforts from governments and foundations have been felt on almost every campus, resulting in area studies programs, new international curricula, overseas projects and seminars, AID and Peace Corps programs, and increased foreign research. The impact of these efforts to date are unbelievably small. As late as 1964, 90% of the graduates of liberal arts colleges had not had one single course which dealt with Non-Western cultures.[3] A study which I conducted showed that the high school social studies teachers in a Michigan county were overwhelmingly untrained to deal with issues outside Western Civilization,[4] a pattern which Harold Taylor found is common in the United States.[5] It is, in fact, no exaggeration to say that international studies have had little impact in higher education, less in secondary and elementary education, and practically none on the general public.

There have been modest successes, of course, as international and area studies were created on many campuses. But the original expectations have not been realized. We expected that a world perspective would gradually permeate the academic community: that faculties would see their disciplines in the context of universal manifestations and that the educated man—surely still the objective of higher education—would reflect an intellectual awareness of the human condition. Where did we go wrong? What we did was to make international studies an addendum to what already existed. We did not demand that the curriculum, the faculty and the departments be universalized but only that universalistic patches be added. This has resulted in the grand anomaly: most professors in the social sciences and humanities teach the majority of courses which deal with the United States and Europe, and a minority of professors teach a minority of courses which deal with the other two-thirds of mankind.

What we ran into, of course, was the increasing autonomy of departments. Departments now largely control the higher education process. They determine their own curriculum, select their own colleagues and establish standards for admitting students, all largely independent of any concern for a definition of the university.[6] In most social science and humanities courses one-third of the students are future teachers, but few departments even concern themselves with this fact.[7] Few departments coordinate their activities with others in the same division, much less with other divisions. Programs for majors and minors are designed for the minority who will go to graduate school. The role of the department in the liberal education of students is almost totally ignored. The trend of departmentalism, as Charles Frankel has noted, will "produce a breed of intellectual leaders who cannot speak to

---

Footnotes at end of article.

one another, or to other men, across the walls of their specialties," men who will be "learned experts who are barbarians." [8] One historian has attributed the present student unrest directly to departmentalism: "the undergraduate, hemmed in everywhere by narrow compartments, feels fragmented and frustrated," because scholars "prefer to provide definitive answers to small questions rather than tentative answers to important ones." [9]

Students, therefore, enter the university with a right to be frustrated. The world human condition impinges on them in an unprecedented fashion. We live in an era in which exponential curves are shooting almost straight up, in population, in knowledge, in technology, in communications, in urbanization, in powers of destruction, in conflict, in nationalism, and in social change. But the curve in understanding, in tolerance, in accommodation, in learning to live together, is almost a straight horizontal line from the time of Buddha to the present. Here I refer to world-wide trends which challenge the social sciences and humanities in ways which they have hardly begun to consider. Our nationalistic and parochially Western European focus has even led us to neglect our own changing culture and practically to ignore the significance of change on the world scale. And I have not even touched on other world-wide trends which we will face in the 1970's, such as overcrowding, unprecedented starvation, civil wars, revolutions, air and water pollution, transportation congestion, wasted resources, increased exploitation of resources, political and economic frustration, and undreamed-of conditions resulting from a world in which every culture seeks to accommodate itself to every other one.

Students, consequently, enter college with a great deal of apprehension. On the other hand, they enter college with almost no knowledge of the cultural world in which they live. Knowledge of their own culture is admittedly weak, so we repeat in college the courses they had in high school. This constitutes their so-called general education and we then send them on to their majors, which in history, political science, economics and sociology means more United States and some European culture. Anthropology does deviate from the pattern but neglects the great cultures of Asia and the contemporary complex cultures of the world. Students graduate from college with almost no increased knowledge of their cultural world. The largest single block of them become school teachers who repeat the cycle of ignorance. Most of the remainder go to work or enter professional schools, their formal cultural education ended. A few go on to graduate studies but even in the social sciences only a fraction will be involved in intercultural studies. Armed with Ph.D.'s, and a narrow specialization, they become the new college instructors.

Steven Muller, Vice President for Public Affairs at Cornell University, has pungently described the results. The undergraduate curriculum, he points out, is increasingly pre-professional, the courses are as narrow as the graduate seminars which the instructor had a few years before, and "the relevance of undergraduate courses to the world's and society's problems is not usually a major consideration in the determination of curricula." [10] He then exclaims that it is no mystery why students are beginning to revolt, and laments (rightly, I believe) that they attack the administration when in reality it is the faculty which is chiefly to blame for this state of affairs.

The attacks on the administration are not restricted to the most militant elements, such as S.D.S. or the Black Action Movement. Consider, for example, the testimony on campus disruption given last month before the House Subcommittee on Education. Robert S. Powell, Jr., President of the National Student Association, charged that the university alone is responsible for student unrest. "I blame our universities," he said, "for teaching powerlessness to the young people of this country, and I blame that institution and the people now responsible for its governance for creating one of the most undemocratic and authoritarian institutions through which young people must pass in order to achieve an educated adulthood." [11]

In a similar vein, David Hinshaw, president of the Association of Student Governments, charged that many administrators "have paid little attention to the intellectual and emotional arguments for student participation in university communication and policy." [12]

I submit that the students do not understand that the education with which they are displeased is largely created by the faculty. Their frustration, therefore, will surely increase. The administration, having relinquished curriculum leadership to the faculty, is unable to respond meaningfully. If it tells the students that it has little control over the curriculum, the students recoil in disbelief and anger. On the other hand, if it begs the faculty to reassess its curriculum in terms of long-range relevancy without adding new staff, the faculty recoils in disbelief and anger.

The administration is caught in a three-way vice. The board of control and public opinion harasses from above. The students and some faculty members harass from below with only whatever responsibility they impose on themselves. And the major portion of the faculty can simply demand from the sidelines that the administration take care of things as quickly as possible as long as it does not impinge on faculty autonomy. It is therefore understandable why one faculty wag has coined a new definition of the term "meaningful dialogue," to wit: "an affirmative one-word response (usually 'yes'), frequently used by college presidents after a confrontation with militant students." While this definition is understandable, I doubt that it is responsible.

Here we come face to face with an important social principle, namely that any ethical system must allocate responsibility. In the university, the main responsibility of the administration has been budgeting, student affairs, public relations, and general guidance of curriculum; of the faculty, teaching, research and specific development of curriculum; and of the student, learning. Collectively, the ethical purpose of the university has been the creation of new generations of educated people and the acquisition of new knowledge and understanding. Student demands to be involved in the determination of curriculum now challenge that ethical system.

It appears to be a matter of simple logic to say that in any teacher-student relationship, the responsibility of the student is to learn. We are now faced with the situation where the learner wants to tell the teacher what he wants to learn. Such demands are basically anti-intellectual. They presume that ignorance, when accompanied by intense emotional commitment, can organize and direct the intellectual community. On the other hand, we have admitted that students have considerable justification for condemning at least the social science education they are getting, They have reason to suspect that what they are being taught provides them with little of the knowledge they need to cope with survival in today's world.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

It must be clear now that the student-faculty-administration relationship with which I am concerned rests in the international or universal *content* of higher education. We are indeed concerned with that dismal subject called curriculum. Students sense that whatever higher education should deal with, a minimum requirement is that it deal with the world in which man lives and with man himself. It must not only be concerned with explaining how the present got to be what it is, but in marshaling the alternatives for future understanding which current knowledge and research can provide. It is no criticism of students, however, to observe that they do not know what kind of a curriculum must be established. If they knew that, there would be little need for them to be in college.

On the other hand, when we charge that the curriculum has become nationalistic, parochial and self-serving of narrow faculty interests, it is meant to be a criticism of faculty and administration. In other words, faculty and administration must re-examine their criteria for curriculum development before students can be brought into a new, more meaningful relationship with them. Criteria of curriculum development which have long-range relevancy would, I submit, require (1) the universalization of the social and behavioral sciences, and (2) administrative leadership in defining the social and behavioral sciences. (Although I will henceforth restrict my remarks to the social and behavioral sciences, much of what I say would apply also to the humanities.) Let me, therefore, expand on the two criteria.

1. *The universalization of the social and behavioral sciences.* The main characteristic of the social sciences since World War II is that they have become more and more scientific. This has greatly enhanced our knowledge of social processes and social behavior. However, the increasing emphasis on technique has had two unfortunate results: it has led to rigid departmentalism, and it often fails to convey a sense of relevancy at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. In view of the impact of science on all our lives, it is difficult for me to imagine that a scientific approach could be taught in such a way as to be irrelevant and I suspect the irrelevancy stems from the departmentalism rather than science.

A call for universalism is not as revolutionary as it sounds. It is based on trends already present in the social sciences, trends which will modify but not destroy departmentalism, trends which have a built-in relevancy. The trends I refer to are those which intercultural studies have imposed on the social sciences. Although I noted earlier that our impact has been small, I must now suggest that we have succeeded in challenging and destroying the theoretical base of the traditional social sciences. Our constant concern with Non-Western and developing areas forced social scientists to look, but when they looked their ethnocentrically-based theory began to crumble. Social scientists found that social systems could not simply be classified as democratic or dictatorial, capitalistic or communistic, traditional or modern, stable or unstable, literate or pre-literate, advanced or backward. Social scientists began to be aware of the fact that Non-Western peoples—with different histories, different technologies, different ideologies, different social systems, different natural and social environments—simply could not be understood by the terminology and tools used in the study of Western man.

The social sciences still have a long way to go to replace their nationalistic past with their universalistic future. But a beginning has already been made, as leading scholars are becoming more and more concerned with total living systems and with scientific explanations of how they function.[13] Seminal works are now providing us with a new and somewhat frightening language with such strange terms as ecology, eco-system, systems analysis, cultural evolution, input-output analysis, simulation, game theory, cultural adaptation and cybernetics. The new lan-

---

Footnotes at end of article.

guage is reflective of new perspectives on history, creativity, stability and change. New understandings are coming on questions of social determinants, in-group out-group relationships, and problems of identification, deprivation, hope and despair. The new arena of concern embraces social interactions from city blocks to nation-states, from varieties of small-group behavior to world relations.

What this means is that, finally, the social sciences are becoming scientific—and relevant! Oddly enough, some people regard this as a contradiction. The scientific aspect of physics, or chemistry, or medicine, they say, is obviously relevant, but it is the scientific aspect of the social sciences which makes them irrelevant. While the charge is partially understandable, especially where departmentalism has succeeded in building almost impermeable walls between and among the disciplines, nevertheless, I submit that a new relevancy is resulting from the universalism which is coming.

Part of the evidence for the new relevancy sounds cold and statistical, and therefore irrelevant to some people. Fallout, insecticides, air and water pollution, population growth, crowding, social unrest, technological innovation, transformation of values, urban pathology, mass education, rural mentality, the heavy hand of the past, leadership roles—how can such terms be relevant? Because they deal with the human condition, not the Western, not the Non-Western, but the human condition! Drop-outs in New York, school-leavers in Lagos, humanities college graduates in Calcutta are humans caught up in cultural conditions. Farm mechanization in Iowa, Tanzania and Japan is a technological condition rooted not only in a local cultural situation but in a universal storehouse of knowledge which knows no imaginary boundaries. Social mobility, economic opportunity, group loyalty, vested interests, ethnocentrism, receptivity to new ideas—these are terms by which cultures are analysed whether we are dealing with the United States, Romania, Syria or Thailand. What I am saying is that the nationalistic social sciences are dead and we ought to insist that they be buried. As Simon Kuznets has observed: "There is no national physics, chemistry, or biology, and there should be no national economics or sociology."[14] And if a universalistic concern for the human condition cannot be made relevant, on any campus on any continent, then we clearly are not teachers.

At the risk of boring you, let me indicate just a few of the exciting findings which a universalistic, scientific, systems-analytical approach is exposing. It is becoming more and more apparent that cultures possess people rather than the reverse. The Black Action Movement, riots in Watts and Chicago, student discontent throughout the world, nationalism rural conservatism and many other group behaviors are better understood as reflections of common characteristics which possess such groups than as simultaneous erratic behavior of a group of unrelated individual wills. It also appears that technology operates on laws on its own and as it changes it even affects the value system and social structure. What a valuable concept for studying any culture, whether Western or Non-Western! It now appears clear that democracy requires a set of historical and social pre-conditions. If this is so, then what profit is there in condemning nations, regions or even universities for being non-democratic if they do not possess the pre-conditions? It now appears clear that the nation-state can no longer fulfill one of its prime purposes, namely, the protection and security of its people. As one scholar has noted, if out-group hate was essential for uniting nations before the atomic age, some other kind of social conditioning is necessary for the future. (Perhaps our students have sensed what scholarship is beginning to expose.) It is clear that exponential curves in technological growth and population expansion cannot continue. A finite sphere is not infinitely exploitable and it cannot hold an infinite number of anything, much less people who must have some breathing and living room. Finally, to use Boulding's useful phrase, it seems clear now that man is entering an era of post-civilization, with an impact far more swift, and results far more constructive or far more destructive, than the era of civilization. (Again, perhaps our students sense the real world better than our statesmen or even our colleagues.) I could also point out the overwhelming evidence that all cultures are biological living systems bound to the natural world and that, to cite Amos Hawley, "human ecology might well be regarded as the basic social science."[15]

A universalized curriculum need not destroy departments. They will continue to analyze the particular constellation of functions which separated them historically, but these functions will be characteristics of human living systems. An intercultural perspective will not divide social systems into neat geographical boxes. Intercultural studies will be functional not national. Explanations will be sought in ecological contexts in which a Russian or Japanese example will be just as appropriate as the American or Swedish.

Area studies need not disappear, for specialists in depth—with command of the neccessary language and the minutia of data—will be necessary. But specialization will be built on the intercultural base and not in isolated pockets which neglect all other variations. We will know we have succeeded in universalizing the social sciences when institutes for Black American studies, Urban studies or European studies join the area studies programs as adjuncts to the main curriculum. The main curriculum will then treat a universal man, of an understanding of how human social systems function anywhere, of an awareness of the cultural determinants of the varieties of social systems in the world. Area studies—including American studies—will permit some specialization for the educated man, a specialization built on the base of a universal perspective.

We who are in intercultural studies have boldly, if not wisely, contriubted our share to the attack on departmentalism. But now the picture becomes rather frightening: we have pointed the way, but who among us is qualified to lead? This brings me to my second criterion of curricular development.

2. *Administrative leadership in defining the social and behavioral sciences.* Having defended the thesis that the social and behavioral sciences must be universalized, I am now forced to face a new fact: namely, that professors and departments have neither the will nor the ability to reform. Departmentalism is so entrenched that a professor fights it only at his peril. Social science departments are designed to be narrow and parochial. One history department I know has 37 members, 31 of whom teach various limited eras of Euro-American and Michigan history. Of the remaining six, one teaches Latin America, one teaches Africa, two teach the Slavic area and two teach East Asia. The Middle East, South Asia, Southeast Asia and Oceania are totally ignored. Unfortunately, the example is typical of social science departments.

The point is that a department which is overwhelmingly staffed by Euro-American specialists suffers from parochial incest. Its narrowly-trained staff can no more think in universal terms collectively than it can individually. With pretensions of the deepest professional concern, the majority members of such departments set about replicating themselves in all hiring policies, and in breaking the curriculum down into ever-more narrow specialization. Thus, a typical department of political science will have 20 to 30 courses on various aspects of American governments, perhaps an equal number on European governments and, if it is bold, it may hire one professor to teach the governments and politics of all Asia, one for all Africa and one for all Latin America, often on a part-time basis. Even in this scheme, the universal characteristics of politics may be ignored.

The only force in a university which can counter departmental incest is the administration. The heaviest burden falls on the deans and the vice president for academic affairs. Such administrators are treated by the faculty as bureaucrats, and sometimes as necessary bureaucrats. Rarely are they treated by faculty members as important members of the intellectual community. What is worse, administrators often behave as if they were indeed outside of, or "above," the intellectual community. They thus regard their main role as budgetary, allowing each department to define itself and its purposes in the university. Thus, the relationship of faculty and administration at their most basic point of contact is one of bargaining over money and staffing and not in defining the university. In the social sciences, therefore, faculty-administration relationships turn out to be almost a hiatus. Policies for long-range relevancy are almost totally ignored and short-range relevancy is invoked only to meet crises such as student confrontations.

Faculty members on a number of campuses have shown only contempt for my suggestion that administrators have a role to play in at least the general definition of divisions and departments. Administrators have told me that I do not really understand the pressures they face. Both responses, however, confirm my belief that something is wrong. In social science terms, the situation is dysfunctional: solutions to an intolerable situation are blocked on one hand by faculty intransigence and on the other by administration reluctance to challenge the myth of faculty supremacy. In philosophical terms, the situation is simply immoral!

One opportunity for administrators to affect the curriculum rests in the hiring policy. Vice presidents and deans can start demanding that new professors in the social sciences be trained to think in the universal perspectives I have outlined. Such people admittedly are hard to find because the Ph.D.-granting universities simply are not training them. The narrowness of graduate training is the prime cause of departmentalism and the explanation for the plethora of highly specialized and disconnected departmental offerings. Furthermore, the problem is not simply that young Ph.D.'s do not know anything about the other disciplines in their division, but usually they known little about fields other than their own in their own discipline. The exceptions are quite rare.

The more narrow the training, the more insistent is the young professor's demands that he teach only graduate courses. The undergraduate courses, specialized as most of them are, are still too broad for him. The problem is even more complex where, as on my campus for example, general social science courses are taught. Many an applicant for a teaching position rejects our offer of a position when he discovers he may have to teach a general social science course. The usual explanation is that he simply is unqualified to think or teach in such general terms.

Only when we get professors who are universalists can we hope to modify the undergraduate curriculum to serve its former and proper objective: namely, the liberally educated man. Historically, the educated man was "liberated" as he became

---

Footnotes at end of article.

aware of his environment, including the physical world, the social world and the world of philosophy, art, literature and religion. Historically, also, that world was limited to European cultures. Today the demands for liberation are just as valid but involve, in Whitehead's phrase, "the whole round world of human affairs." Only when social science professors view the whole round world as their proper province will the curriculum be modified so as to impart it to students. When this occurs then will we have the intellectual base for responding to student demands. Faculty and administration will then be able to point out that the curriculum is designed in the social sciences for the educated man—a man informed and knowledgeable about social institutions. Thus armed, the allocation of responsibility should be more easily re-established than it appears to be at the moment.

CONCLUSION

I hope it is clear now that my long discourse on criteria of curriculum development was not a digression. Student demands for a more relevant curriculum in the social sciences strike at a vulnerable point in the university. In their effort to upset the allocation of responsibility, they force us to examine first the relationship of faculty and administration. In examining that relationship, we discover great weaknesses in the machinery for defining the curriculum and perforce the university. The major effect of student discontent is that it has forced us to consider nothing less than the allocation of responsibility in the ethical system which we call the university. We are now forced, in the words of Professor Walter P. Metzger of Columbia University, to seek to "restore student confidence in authority."[16]

In summation, my thesis is that the future of student-faculty-administration relationships in intercultural higher education rests primarily on the faculty. If the faculty of the social sciences recognize the universal characteristics of their disciplines then they will expect, even demand, that administrative leadership help them reorganize their parochial departments. Faculty-administration relationships will then be functioning on a basis of defining the university for educational relevancy. Simultaneously, student-faculty relationships should improve since professors can demonstrate that their concern is with the varieties of social systems in which humans live and not merely with a defense of a particular system. The solution, as I see it, rests in long-range relevancy since the university in its primary educational role has no short-range relevancy in the social sciences. While this may offer no comfort for the immediate future, the university is still a dynamic, viable, adaptive institution. If it survives the present challenge, as I think it will, it should be a stronger institution, even closer to its ideal of being universal in its quest for truth.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Reported in The *New York Times*, March 16, 1969, p. 62.

[2] As reported in *Higher Education and National Affairs*, Vol. XVIII, No. 7 (March 7, 1969), p. 9.

[3] *Non-Western Studies in the Liberal Arts College* (Washington: Association of American Colleges, 1964).

[4] Claude S. Phillips, Jr., "World Affairs in Secondary Education: A Sample Survey," *Michigan Journal of Secondary Education*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (Fall 1968), pp. 32–42.

[5] Harold Taylor, *The World and the American Teacher* (Washington: American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, 1968).

[6] See James H. Billington, "Is Liberal Education Dead?," *Current*, July 28, 1968, pp. 51–57.

[7] See *The Professional School and World Affairs: Report of the Task Force on Education* (New York: Education and World Affairs, 1967), p. 22.

[8] Charles Frankel, "Conclusion: Critical Issues in American Higher Education," in *Issues in University Education*, edited by Charles Frankel (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959), p. 160.

[9] Billington, *loc. cit.*, p. 52.

[10] Steven Muller, "The Administration-Faculty Impasse," *Current*, August 1968, p. 18.

[11] Reported in *Higher Education and National Affairs*, Vol. XVIII, No. 10 (March 28, 1969), p. 10.

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] For example, see the following seminal works from scholars in various disciplines: Leslie A. White, *The Science of Culture* (New York: Grove Press, 1949); Julian H. Steward, *Theory of Culture Change* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1955); Marshall Sahlines and Elman Service, eds., *Evolution and Culture* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1960); Gabriel Almond and James S. Coleman, eds., *The Politics of the Developing Areas* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960); David Easton, *A Systems Analysis of Political Life* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1965); C. E. Ayres, *The Theory of Economic Progress* (New York: Schoken Books, Inc., 1962); Kenneth Boulding, *The Meaning of the Twentieth Century* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964); Robert L. Heilbroner, *The Great Ascent* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963); Daniel Lerner, *The Passing of Traditional Society* (New York: The Free Press, 1958); Talcott Parsons, *Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966); L. S. Stavrianos, *The World Since 1500: A Global History* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966); William H. McNeill, *The Rise of the West: A History of the Human Community* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963); Donald T. Campbell, "Variation and Selective Retention in Socio-Cultural Evolution," in *Social Change in Developing Areas*, edited by Herbert R. Barringer, George I. Blanksten and Raymond W. Mack (Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1965); Alfred E. Emerson, "Human Cultural Evolution and its Relation to Organic Evolution of Insect Societies," in Barringer, *et al.;* Anatol Rapoport, "Mathematical, Evolutionary and Psychological Approaches to the Study of Total Societies," in *The Study of Total Societies*, edited by Samuel Z. Klausner (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday 1967); and Norbert Wiener, *The Human Use of Human Beings* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1954).

[14] Simon Kuznets, *Economic Growth and Structure* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1965), p. 91.

[15] Amos Hawley, "Ecology and Human Ecology," *Social Forces*, Vol. 22, May 1944, p. 405.

[16] Reported in *Higher Education and National Affairs*, Vol. XVIII, No. 10 (March 28, 1969), p. 9.

THE FIGHT AGAINST HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION: THE STATE ROLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have written letters to the 36 northern Governors charging that they have been lax in their States in support of the food stamp and surplus commodity programs. I urged them to take the initiative to eliminate hunger and malnutrition by securing better cooperation from the counties in their respective States. See exhibits Nos. 1 and 2 for list of Governors and text of letter.

The Southern States, with a few notable exceptions, I have discovered, are generally doing much more to combat hunger and malnutrition than the Northeast, Midwest, and Far West. I sent the letters to every Governor outside the South on Monday pointing this out. It appears incomprehensible that the Midwest, which enjoys the benefit of huge farm subsidies, has the worst level of food programs for the poor, and that my own Northeast is no better.

I arrived at these conclusions after examining Department of Agriculture data on the numbers of commodities carried by counties participating in the free food program. Counties have formal responsibility for requesting and administering food programs, but generally receive State support and are required to follow State directives.

In calling upon the Governors to take up the challenge, I have reluctantly been forced to dismiss the role of the Department of Agriculture because it lacks direction and motivation, for it is caught in the crossfire of divided loyalties between the farmer and the hungry. Inevitably it is the hungry who suffer. Just last month, the Department returned $140 million in hunger money unspent to the Treasury because the 1969 fiscal year had ended and it had not committed the funds. The sum of $30 million of this was money appropriated for the food stamp program and $110 million for the free food program.

This is something about which I have previously complained. The Department knew in early January that it might have unspent food stamp money unless it increased its activity, but did nothing.

Indeed, it actively discouraged counties from applying for the program, claiming lack of money. I was informed by the Department that during this time, they had knowledge of 150 counties that were interested in participating in the program. At the beginning of May, in spite of this discouragement, 62 of these had formally applied for programs.

And, only after pressure from me, 42 of these were funded. But during the same period, another 63 applied and were ignored. As of today, 102 counties have formally applied, and no action has been taken to provide these counties with food stamp programs.

An appeal by a northern Democratic liberal Congressman to State Governors, most of whom are Republican, to take the initiative in the hunger area is unusual, but I do not care who gets the credit. I just want to see that the hungry are fed. With the Federal executive branch abdicating responsibility, the State is the logical vehicle to take the initiative, and the State can get counties participating in the free food program to take at least the 22 basic foods offered by the Department of Agriculture so that its residents can be a little less malnourished. It can get counties in both hunger programs to seek out those eligible. And it can provide financial and administrative assistance to the counties to pay the local share of increasing the level of bonus food stamps and the number of distribution centers for free food and food stamps.

There are 22 commodities made available to counties by the Department of Agriculture. By its own estimates, if an individual gets all 22 foods, he would still

XUM

suffer from malnutrition. If he eats fewer than the 22, he would be receiving nowhere near an adequate diet. See exhibits 3A and 3B for Department of Agriculture figures. This nutritional deficit is magnified by the fact that many of the items most frequently not carried are those which are nutritionally fortified. See exhibit 4. But in only one of the 10 Northeastern States does the median county provide its hungry with as many as 20 of the 22 available foods; and in the Midwest there are only two out of 11. By contrast, in the South the median county in five out of 12 States provides at least 20 out of the 22 foods to its poor. See exhibit 5. This contrast between North and South generally also emerges for participation rates among eligible individuals in both the free food and surplus commodities programs. See statement by Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 24, 1969, page 16906. Under present law a county is entitled to either a food stamp or surplus commodities—free food—program, but not both.

The contrast in quality of food programs between New York and Mississippi is particularly striking. This throws into doubt the sincerity of the New York State commitment to eliminate hunger. This doubt is reinforced by the recent cuts in State welfare payments for food and in school lunch program funds. While in Mississippi, 36 counties carried more than 19 of the available commodities, and the remaining three from 17 to 19 commodities; no county in New York State provides more than 19, and only three are in the 17 to 19 range. Of the remainder, 34 provide between 14 and 16, and 11 less than 14. New York City carried the most commodities of any jurisdiction in the State. See exhibits 6 and 7.

I noted a similar contrast in participation rates among eligibles for the free food and food stamp programs. The average participation rate of eligible individuals in counties in Mississippi on the free food program is 43 percent. For New York, it is 27 percent. For counties on the food stamp program, Mississippi's average participation is 25 percent, New York's is 13 percent. The fact that a county formally participates in a hunger program is not enough if the poor are not made aware of the existence of the program. I believe the failure of local and State officials to adequately inform the poor of these programs explains much of the low participation in the North, generally in New York State in particular.

The exhibits follow:

EXHIBIT 1

List of Governors to which the letter was sent:

Keith Miller, Alaska.
Jack Williams, Arizona.
Ronald Reagan, California.
John A. Love, Colorado.
John N. Dempsey, Connecticut.
Russell W. Peterson, Delaware.
John A. Burns, Hawaii.
Don Samuelson, Idaho.
Richard B. Ogilvie, Illinois.
Edgar D. Whitcomb, Indiana.
Robert D. Ray, Iowa.
Robert Docking, Kansas.
Marvin Mandel, Maryland.
Kenneth M. Curtis, Maine.
Francis W. Sargent, Massachusetts.
William G. Milliken, Michigan.
Harold E. LeVander, Minnesota.
Warren E. Hearnes, Missouri.
Forrest H. Anderson, Montana.
Norbert T. Tiemann, Nebraska.
Paul Laxalt, Nevada.
Walter R. Peterson, Jr., N.H.
Richard J. Hughes, New Jersey.
David F. Cargo, New Mexico.
Nelson A. Rockefeller, New York.
William L. Guy, North Dakota.
James A. Rhodes, Ohio.
Tom McCall, Oregon.
Raymond P. Shafer, Pennsylvania.
Frank Licht, Rhode Island.
Frank L. Farrar, South Dakota.
Calvin L. Rampton, Utah.
Deane C. Davis, Vermont.
Daniels J. Evans, Washington.
Warren P. Knowles, Wisconsin.
Stanley K. Hathaway, Wyoming.

EXHIBIT 2

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 14, 1969.

DEAR GOVERNOR: During the last several weeks, I have been investigating the administration of the Federal anti-hunger program, and I thought you might be interested in my findings, for they are shocking and at the same time offer a challenge to our State governments.

I have discovered that the Northern states have been lax in their support of the Food Stamp and Surplus Commodities programs. The Midwest, which enjoys the benefit of huge farm subsidies, has the worst level of food programs for the poor, and the Northeast is no better. The Southern states by contrast, with a few notable exceptions like Texas, are generally doing a great deal to combat hunger and malnutrition and have relatively the best programs in the country.

I have arrived at these conclusions after examining Department of Agriculture data on the numbers of commodities carried by each county participating in the free food program, as well as the participation rates for the free food and food stamp programs.

There are 22 commodities made available to counties by the Department of Agriculture. By its own estimates, if an individual gets all 22 foods, he would still suffer from malnutrition. If he eats fewer than the 22, he would be receiving nowhere near an adequate diet. But in only one of the ten Northeastern states does the median county provide its hungry with as many as 20 of the 22 available foods, and in the Midwest there are only two out of 11. By contrast, in the South the median county in five out of 12 states provides at least 20 out of the 22 foods to its poor. (The figures for states with counties participating in the free food program are listed in the attached table.) This contrast between North and South generally also emerges for participation rates among eligible individuals in both the free food and surplus commodities program.

The average participation rate of eligible individuals in counties in Louisiana for the free food program is 46%, for Mississippi, the figure is 43%. By contrast, only two states outside the South have rates over one-third, and many, like Kansas and Illinois, have rates under 10%. For counties on the Food Stamp Program, few states can come close to Mississippi's 25% participation rate.

To me this situation is shocking. Yet I see it as a challenge to our Northern State governments as well—to take the initiative to eliminate hunger and malnutrition by securing fuller involvement by the counties in your state in the two anti-hunger programs.

The state is the logical vehicle to take the initiative for it can get counties participating in the free food program to take at least the 22 basic foods offered by the Department of Agriculture so that its residents can be a little less malnourished. It can get counties in both hunger programs to seek out those eligible through outreach efforts. And it can provide financial and administrative assistance to the counties to pay the local share of increasing the level of bonus food stamps and the number of distribution centers for free food and food stamps.

I have called upon you as a State Governor to take the initiative because I believe the Department of Agriculture has abdicated its responsibility. It lacks direction and motivation for it is caught in the cross fire of divided loyalties between the farmer and the hungry. Inevitably it is the hungry who suffer. At the beginning of this month the Department returned $140 million in unspent money available to fight hunger for fiscal 1969 to the U.S. Treasury. Thirty million dollars of this was money appropriated for the food stamp program and $110 million for the free food program.

This is something about which I have previously complained. The Department knew in early January that it might have unspent food stamp money unless it increased its activity, but did nothing. Indeed it actively discouraged counties from applying for the program, claiming lack of money. I was informed by the Department that during this time, they had knowledge of 150 counties that were interested in participating in the program. At the beginning of May, in spite of this discouragement, 62 of these had formally applied for programs. And, only after pressure from me, 42 of these were funded. But during the same period, another 63 applied and were ignored. As of today, 102 counties have formally applied, and no action has been taken to provide these counties with food stamp programs.

I would be interested in your views on the hunger question and the appropriate role of the State government.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
Member of Congress.

EXHIBIT 3-A

PART OF RECOMMENDED DIETARY ALLOWANCES (1968) [1] SUPPLIED BY FOODS USDA OFFERS TO STATES FOR FAMILIES IN COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM COMPARED WITH PART SUPPLIED BY FOODS ACTUALLY DISTRIBUTED

[In percent]

Comparison	Food energy	Protein	Calcium	Iron	Vitamin A [2]	Thiamine	Riboflavin	Vitamin C
22 foods offered by USDA [3]	77	143	135	117	136	130	148	91
22 foods in amounts actually distributed [4]	61	103	82	94	92	100	94	78

[1] National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, Pub. 1694, 1968. Recommended dietary allowances based on average allowance for 1 person in family of 4 (man and woman in midthirties, boy 11 years, girl 8); that is 2,320 calories of food energy, 51 grams of protein, 960 milligrams of calcium, 12 milligrams of iron, 2,600 international units of vitamin A, 1.2 milligrams of thiamine, 1.4 milligrams of riboflavin, and 49 milligrams of vitamin C (ascorbic acid).

[2] Assumes 70 percent is preformed vitamin A for foods offered by USDA and 65 percent is preformed vitamin A for foods actually distributed.

[3] 22 foods in average amounts suggested by USDA for 1 person in 4-person household: Dry beans, bulgur, butter/margarine, cheese, corn grits, cornmeal, corn sirup, evaporated milk, flour, canned green beans, canned chopped meat, nonfat dry milk, peanut butter, canned pork, potato flakes, prunes, raisins, rice, rolled oats, scrambled egg mix, shortening/lard, and tomato juice.

[4] Based on distribution records except canned pork, scrambled egg mix, vegetable, juice, evaporated milk and corn sirup are estimated.

EXHIBIT 3-B

NUTRITIVE VALUE OF FOODS USDA OFFERS TO STATES FOR FAMILIES IN COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM, APR. 15, 1969

Commodity	Amount per person per month [1] (pounds)	Food energy (calories)	Protein (grams)	Calcium (milligrams)	Iron (milligrams)	Vitamin A (I.U.)	Thiamine (milligrams)	Riboflavin (milligrams)	Ascorbic acid (milligrams)
Beans, dry	2.00	3,084	202.4	1,306	70.8		5.92	2.04	
Bulgur	.50	803	25.4	66	8.4		.64	.32	
Butter/margarine	1.25	4,083	3.4	114	0	18,750	0	0	
Cheese	1.56	2,816	176.9	5,307	7.0	9,266	.19	3.23	
Corn grits [2]	.50	821	19.8	9	10.5	1,000	1.00	.60	
Cornmeal [2]	2.50	4,128	89.5	68	52.5	5,000	5.00	3.00	
Corn sirup blend	1.49	1,959	0	311	27.7		0	0	
Evaporated milk [3]	1.81	1,125	57.6	2,071	.9	2,664	.33	2.75	9
Flour [2]	5.00	8,255	238.0	365	65.0		10.00	6.00	
Green beans, canned [4]	.99	81	4.5	152	5.3	1,305	.15	.19	18
Meat, canned, chopped	1.88	2,501	127.5	77	18.8		2.64	1.78	
Milk, nonfat dry, regular, enriched [5]	4.50	7,412	732.6	26,699	12.2	41,580	7.16	36.72	144
Peanut butter	1.00	2,640	115.7	277	9.1		.57	.56	
Pork, in natural juices [6]	1.81	1,922	137.8	82	20.5		3.63	1.40	
Potato flakes [7]	1.00	1,651	32.7	159	7.7	16,000	1.05	.27	944
Prunes, dried	.50	492	4.1	99	7.5	3,085	.17	.32	6
Raisins	1.00	1,311	11.3	281	15.9	100	.51	.37	5
Rice [8]	1.50	2,471	45.6	164	31.5		3.00	0	
Rolled oats	1.50	2,654	96.6	360	30.6		4.08	.96	
Scrambled egg mix [9]	.56	1,392	89.0	1,246	11.8	5,638	.70	2.95	
Shortening/lard	1.00	4,010	0		0		0	0	
Tomato juice [10]	3.10	267	12.7	99	12.7	11,253	.74	.40	226
Total	36.95	55,874	2,223.0	39,311	426.4	115,642	47.47	63.86	1,352
Per person per day		1,838	73.1	1,293	14.0	3,804	1.56	2.10	44
Apricot nectar [11]	3.10	803	4.3	127	2.8	13,361	.16	.09	670
Beef in natural juices [6]	1.81	1,991	152.3	91	23.0		.36	1.16	
Boned turkey	1.81	1,661	171.9	82	11.6	1,070	.18	1.14	
Corn, whole kernel, canned	.99	296	8.5	18	1.8	1,207	.12	.22	23
Grapejuice [11]	3.10	927	2.8	155	4.3		.56	.31	632
Grapefruit juice, sweetened	3.10	744	7.1	112	5.6	155	.40	.22	437
Grapefruit juice, unsweetened	3.10	577	7.1	112	5.6	155	.40	.22	477
Green peas, canned	.99	256	15.2	85	6.7	2,018	.51	.26	40
Tomatoes, canned	.99	94	.45	27	2.3	4,035	.24	.13	75
Peas, dry split	.50	790	54.9	75	11.6	270	1.69	.66	
Prune juice	3.10	1,082	5.6	198	57.7		.09	.16	654
Farina	1.75	2,874	90.5	3,968	350.0		3.50	2.10	
Rolled wheat	1.50	2,313	67.4	244	21.8		2.48	.82	

---

[1] Based on USDA family distribution for a 4-person family, Jan. 28, 1969.

[2] Corn grits and cornmeal enriched with iron (21 mg. per pound, USDA minimum) riboflavin, thiamine, and niacin at minimum levels; flour enriched at minimum levels.

[3] Fortified with vitamin D (360 I.U. per pound.)

[4] May be replaced by canned tomatoes, green peas, or whole kernel corn.

[5] Same as regular nonfat dry milk except fortified with 9,100 I.U. vitamin A and 1,820 I.U. vitamin D per pound. Shipments started Apr. 7, 1969.

[6] Nutritive value obtained from ARS; calculations based on product with 18 percent chemical fat, and not more than 1.3 percent or less than 0.5 percent salt. May be replaced by beef in natural juices, or boned turkey.

[7] Instant potato flakes fortified with vitamin A (16,000 I.U. per pound) and vitamin C (800 mg. per pound).

[8] Rice enriched with iron (21 mg. per pound, USDA requirement), thiamine, and niacin at minimum levels.

[9] Nutritive value developed for Poultry Division by ARS.

[10] May be replaced by apricot nectar, grapejuice, or grapefruit juice.

[11] Fortified with vitamin C (204 mg. per pound).

EXHIBIT 4

ITEMS GENERALLY OMITTED

BY STATE

Alabama: Bulgur, dried peas, butter, canned peas.

Arizona: Bulgur, butter, cheese, eggs, corn/grits, dried peas, fowl.

Arkansas: Bulgur, grits, dried peas.

California: Peas dried, bulgur.

Connecticut: Bulgur, grits.

Delaware: Bulgur, eggs, grits, lard, oats/wheat, peas split, corn syrup.

Florida: Bulgur.

Georgia: Bulgur, cheese, butter, eggs, peanut butter.

Idaho: Bulgur, fowl, grits, dried peas.

Iowa: Bulgur, split peas, corn/grits.

Kansas: Grits, split peas.

Kentucky: Bulgur, grits, split peas canned.

Louisiana: Bulgur, grits, dried peas, evaporated milk, oats/wheat, corn syrup.

Maine: Bulgur, eggs, grits, split peas.

Maryland: Bulgur, eggs, grits, meat chopped, dried peas.

Massachusetts: Dry beans.

Michigan: Bulgur, grits, dried peas.

Minnesota: Grits, prunes/raisins.

Mississippi: Split peas.

Missouri: Dried peas, bulgur, eggs, grits, tomato juice.

Nebraska: Bulgur, grits.

Nevada: Bulgur, grits, dried peas.

New Hampshire: Beans, bulgur, grits, peas dried, prunes/raisins.

New Mexico: Bulgur, eggs, grits, dried peas.

New York: Dried beans, bulgur, canned meat, eggs, grits, dried peas.

North Carolina: Bulgur, split peas.

North Dakota: Bulgur.

Ohio: Bulgur, cornmeal, eggs, grits, split peas, evaporated milk.

Oklahoma: Bulgur, grits, eggs.

Oregon: Grits.

Pennsylvania: Bulgur, dry beans, grits, potatoes, peas split, turkey/fowl.

Rhode Island: Bulgur, dry beans, eggs, grits, dried milk.

South Dakota: Dried peas.

Tennessee: Bulgur, grits, dried peas.

Texas: Bulgur, dried peas, eggs.

Virginia: Bulgur, grits, fowl.

Wisconsin: Grits, eggs, prunes/raisins, fowl.

Wyoming: Beans dry, bulgur, grits, meat chopped, dry beans, peas dried, prunes/raisins, juice.

BY REGION

Northeast: Bulgur, dry beans, grits, corn meal, split peas, dried eggs.

South: Bulgur, split peas, butter, grits, cheese, eggs dried.

Midwest: Bulgur, grits, split peas, dried eggs.

Far West: Bulgur, grits, split peas.

EXHIBIT 5

NUMBER OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES RECEIVED BY COUNTIES PARTICIPATING IN SURPLUS COMMODITY PROGRAMS

State	Number of commodities				
	20-22	17-19	14-16	11-13	8-10
NORTHEAST					
Connecticut	4				
Delaware			3		
Maine		11	4		
Maryland			1		
Massachusetts	9	7	4	1	
New Hampshire		6	3	1	
New Jersey		7	3	1	
New York		3	34	10	1
Pennsylvania		2	7	7	
Rhode Island		15	1		
SOUTH					
Alabama	23	23			
Arkansas		17			
Florida	41	11	1		
Georgia	9	45	23	1	
Kentucky	15	46			
Louisiana	2	1	11		
Mississippi	36	3			
North Carolina	51	8			
Oklahoma	50	22	1		
Tennessee		13	1		
Texas	35	92	3		
Virginia	17	22	1		
MIDWEST					
Indiana	11	27	17	8	3
Iowa		9			
Kansas	5	8	1		
Michigan		40			
Minnesota	8	9	1	2	
Missouri	12	33	18	1	
Nebraska	1		1		
North Dakota	1	5	4		1
Ohio		4	10	2	
South Dakota	27	4	1		
Wisconsin	34	12	1		
FAR WEST					
Arizona		1	10	4	
California	23	5	1		
Idaho	2	7	3		
Montana			6	3	
Nevada		10	1	1	
New Mexico		10			
Oregon	32	2			
Wyoming			2		
TERRITORIES					
Guam		19			
Puerto Rico			18	53	9
Trust territories					2
Virgin Islands	4	5			

States not listed did not have surplus commodity programs. A community group was counted if any one item in the group was distributed; e.g. any one of these items—canned apricot, prune, tomato, grape, or grapefruit juice—satisfies the requirement of a fruit juice.

The 22 categories used were Dry beans, Bulgur, Butter/Margarine, Cheese, Corn Grits, Cornmeal, Corn sirup, Evaporated Milk, Flour, Canned Green Beans, Canned Chopped Meat, Nonfat Dry Milk, Peanut Butter, Dry Split Peas, Canned Pork, Potato Flakes, Prunes, Rice, Rolled Oats, Scrambled Egg Mix, Shortening/Lard, and Tomato Juice. They were the available categories as of March 31, 1969.

Alternatives to some of these commodities are available to the participating counties. They include for tomato juice: Apricot Nectar, grapefruit juice (sweetened and unsweetened), prune juice, and grape juice; for canned pork; canned beef and canned boneless turkey; for canned green beans; canned tomatoes, green peas, or whole kernel corn; and for prunes: raisins.

EXHIBIT 6.—BREAKDOWN OF COMMODITIES CARRIED BY MISSISSIPPI COUNTIES[1]

County/city or Indian reservation	Total number of eligibles	Number of recipients			Name of commodity (6)																																			
		Total	Public assistance	Other	Apricot nectar	Beans, dry	Beans, canned green	Bulgur	Butter	Cheese	Cornmeal	Egg mix, scrambled	Flour	Farina	Fowl, canned whole	Grape juice	Grits, corn	Lard/shortening	Margarine	Meat, chopped, canned	Milk, evaporated	Milk, instant	Milk mix (chocolate beverage)	Milk, nonfat dry	Oats, rolled	Peanut butter	Peas, canned	Peas, dried, split	Potatoes, dehydrated, white	Prunes, dried	Prune juice	Raisins	Rice	Syrup, corn	Tomatoes, canned	Tomatoe juice	Wheat, rolled	Beef 'n juices	Grapefruit juice	Number of commodities carried
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)																																				
Adams	4,764	4,698	3,023	1,675	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	20
Amite	4,454	4,445	568	3,877	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	21
Benton	3,116	3,076	932	2,144	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	21
Calhoun	3,492	3,152	1,210	1,942	X	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	20
Carroll	3,795	3,756	1,814	1,942	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	20
Choctaw	2,604	2,535	1,247	1,288	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	21
Clarke	5,098	4,988	1,228	3,760	X	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	X	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	19
Copiah	6,401	6,313	1,396	4,917	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	21
Franklin	1,625	1,587	675	912	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	21
George	2,558	2,474	768	1,706	X	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	21
Greene	2,642	2,625	765	1,860	X	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	20
Hancock	1,568	1,239	336	903	X	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	20
Issaquena	1,404	1,367	440	927	X	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	21
Jefferson	4,668	4,463	1,507	2,956	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	21
Kemper	3,264	3,263	643	2,620	X	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	21
Lafayette	3,052	2,987	874	2,113	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	21
Lauderdale	8,724	8,489	3,081	5,408	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	21
Lawrence	2,849	2,797	623	2,174	X	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	20
Leake	7,358	7,255	3,177	4,078	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	21
Marshall	9,656	9,404	1,515	7,889	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	21
Neshoba	3,077	2,824	1,392	1,432	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	21
Newton	2,940	2,729	1,132	1,597	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	21
Noxubee	7,661	7,455	1,345	6,110	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	21
Pearl River	2,193	2,150	824	1,326	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	21
Perry	1,567	1,559	615	944	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	X		X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	20
Pontotoc	2,821	2,774	1,214	1,560	X	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	20
Rankin	6,205	6,159	996	5,163	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	20
Sharkey	5,477	5,417	2,108	3,309	X	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	20
Smith	2,811	2,736	1,113	1,623	X	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	20
Stone	1,155	1,113	377	736	X	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	20
Tate	5,450	5,185	851	4,334	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	21
Tippah	2,771	2,694	1,215	1,479	X	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	19
Tishomingo	1,632	1,602	932	670	X	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	20
Walthall	4,587	4,478	637	3,841	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	20
Wayne	3,608	3,530	1,912	1,618	X	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	19
Webster	2,050	1,972	1,063	909	X	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	20
Wilkinson	5,037	4,982	855	4,127	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	21
Winston	4,426	4,304	1,498	2,806	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	21
Choctaw Indians	1,098	943	--------	943	X	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	21
Total	--------	--------	--------	--------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

[1] All counties receive all commodities except where an X appears in the box.

EXHIBIT 7—BREAKDOWN OF COMMODITIES CARRIED BY NEW YORK STATE COUNTIES[1]

County/city or Indian reservation	Total number of eligibles	Number of recipients			Name of commodity (6)																																			
		Total	Public assistance	Other	Apricot nectar	Beans, dry	Beans, canned green	Bulgur	Butter	Cheese	Cornmeal	Egg mix, scrambled	Flour	Farina	Fowl, canned whole	Grape juice	Grits, corn	Lard/shortening	Margarine	Meat, chopped, canned	Milk, evaporated	Milk, instant	Milk mix (choc. bev.)	Milk, nonfat dry	Oats, rolled	Peanut butter	Peas, canned, split	Peas, dried	Potatoes, dehy., white	Prunes, dried	Prune juice	Raisins	Rice	Syrup, corn	Tomatoes, canned	Tomato juice	Wheat, rolled	Canned pork	Canned beef	Number of commodities carried
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)																																				
Albany	6,440	5,380	4,018	1,362	X	X		X			X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X				X		X		X	13
Allegany	2,551	2,384	732	1,652	X			X			X	X		X	X	X	X		X			X	X				X	X		X	X				X		X	X		17
Broome	2,772	2,513	457	2,056	X	X		X			X	X		X	X	X	X		X			X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X				X		X			14
Cayuga	2,485	2,323	805	1,518	X	X		X			X	X		X	X	X	X		X			X	X				X	X		X	X			X	X		X		X	15
Chautauqua	5,265	4,950	2,282	2,668	X	X		X		X	X	X		X		X	X		X			X	X				X	X		X	X				X		X	X	X	15
Chemung	4,984	4,552	1,943	2,609	X	X		X			X	X		X	X	X	X		X			X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X				X		X	X		14
Columbia	1,826	1,706	642	1,064	X	X		X			X	X		X	X	X	X		X			X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X				X		X		X	14
Cortland	2,081	1,931	1,274	657	X	X		X			X	X		X	X	X	X		X			X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X		12

See footnotes at end of table.

EXHIBIT 7—BREAKDOWN OF COMMODITIES CARRIED BY NEW YORK STATE COUNTIES—Continued

County/city or Indian reservation	Total number of eligibles	Number of Recipients			Name of commodity (6)																																			
		Total	Public assistance	Other	Apricot nectar	Beans, dry	Beans, canned green	Bulgur	Butter	Cheese	Cornmeal	Egg mix, scrambled	Flour	Farina	Fowl, canned whole	Grape juice	Grits, Corn	Lard/shortening	Margarine	Meat, chopped, canned	Milk, evaporated	Milk, instant	Milk mix (choc. bev.)	Milk, nonfat dry	Oats, rolled	Peanut butter	Peas, canned split	Peas, dried	Potatoes, dehy., white	Prunes, dried	Prune juice	Raisins	Rice	Syrup, corn	Tomatoes, canned	Tomato juice	Wheat, rolled	Canned pork	Canned beef	Number of commodities carried
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)																																				
Delaware	2,823	2,779	384	2,395	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	X	X	X	X	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	--	14
Essex	2,579	2,458	606	1,852	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	X	--	--	X	X	X	X	X	--	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	11
Franklin	5,140	4,996	1,027	3,969	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	--	X	X	X	X	X	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	X	14
Fulton	3,584	3,465	1,499	1,957	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	X	X	X	X	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	X	15
Genesee	2,466	2,394	1,366	1,026	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	--	X	X	X	17
Greene	1,016	962	488	474	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	--	X	X	X	X	X	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	X	14
Hamilton	290	285	15	270	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	X	16
Herkimer	2,066	1,899	812	1,087	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	X	X	X	--	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	--	X	--	X	--	X	--	X	14
Jefferson	5,677	5,368	2,195	3,173	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	X	X	X	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	--	X	15
Lewis	3,002	2,908	602	2,306	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	X	X	X	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	--	X	15
Livingston	1,637	1,472	437	1,035	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	X	X	X	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	--	--	15
Madison	3,372	3,168	1,181	1,987	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	X	X	X	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	--	X	16
Monroe	19,398	16,784	14,500	2,284	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	--	X	16
Montgomery	2,579	2,479	1,201	1,278	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	X	--	X	X	--	X	--	X	X	X	X	X	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	--	13
Nassau	18,765	15,553	15,125	428	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	X	X	--	X	X	--	X	X	--	X	--	X	11
Oneida	15,548	10,142	6,391	3,751	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	X	X	X	X	--	--	--	X	--	X	X	X	16
Onondaga	23,422	18,868	17,043	1,825	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	--	X	X	X	X	X	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	X	14
Orleans	1,938	1,856	1,252	684	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	X	16
Oswego	5,553	5,375	1,921	3,454	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	--	X	X	X	X	X	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	X	14
Rensselaer	7,850	6,923	4,523	2,400	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	15
St. Lawrence	9,399	8,983	3,864	5,119	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	13
Saratoga	2,305	2,266	475	1,791	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	15
Schenectady	3,059	2,768	2,343	417	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	13
Schoharie	1,770	1,725	250	1,475	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	--	X	X	X	X	X	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	X	14
Schuyler	865	834	244	590	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	X	X	--	X	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	--	15
Seneca	1,276	1,092	452	640	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	--	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	--	X	X	X	16
Steuben	6,134	5,989	660	5,329	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	X	--	X	X	--	X	--	X	X	X	X	X	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	--	13
Suffolk	32,170	20,965	19,780	1,185	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	X	X	--	X	X	--	X	X	--	X	--	X	10
Tioga	2,486	2,319	837	1,482	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	--	16
Tompkins	1,845	1,754	1,231	523	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	--	X	X	X	X	X	--	--	--	X	--	X	X	--	14
Ulster	3,058	2,642	1,664	978	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	X	X	X	--	X	--	X	X	X	X	X	X	--	X	X	--	X	--	X	11
Warren	2,532	2,413	1,000	1,413	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	X	X	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	X	15
Washington	3,860	3,607	787	2,820	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	--	X	X	X	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	X	14
Westchester	17,924	13,627	13,036	591	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	X	X	--	X	X	--	X	--	X	12
Yates	1,296	1,199	322	877	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	--	X	X	X	X	X	--	--	--	X	--	X	X	--	14
City of Auburn	1,860	1,805	557	1,248	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	X	16
City of Binghamton	5,134	4,281	2,542	1,739	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	X	16
City of Oswego	1,175	1,005	321	684	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	X	16
Town of Union	764	674	351	323	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	X	X	X	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	15
New York City	557,926	356,985	340,942	16,043	X	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	X	--	X	19
Total	811,947	572,789	476,379	96,410	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--

* All counties received all commodities except where an "X" appears.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. Carey (at the request of Mr. Podell), for the balance of the week, on account of business in the district.

Mr. Preyer of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. Galifianakis), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Harsha (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today and the balance of the week, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson (at the request of Mr. Sisk) on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Gross, for 60 minutes, on Wednesday, July 16, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Waggonner, for 10 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Findley, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, July 22, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Conte (at the request of Mr. Coughlin), for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Flowers), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Reuss, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. Flood, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Farbstein, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Fallon, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Gonzalez, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Sikes, for 30 minutes, on July 16.

Mr. Diggs, for 60 minutes, on July 23.

Mr. Lowenstein, for 60 minutes, on July 17.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Hechler of West Virginia in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Coughlin) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Bush in two instances.

Mr. Schadeberg.

Mr. Wyatt.

Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. Brock.

Mr. Hosmer in five instances.

Mr. Wydler.

Mr. Pelly in two instances.

Mr. Wylie.

Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. McClure in two instances.

Mr. Wold.

Mr. Utt.

Mr. Duncan.

Mr. Morse.

Mr. Robison.

Mr. Hutchinson.

Mr. Bray in three instances.

Mr. Keith.

Mr. Gubser in two instances.

Mr. Wyman in two instances.

Mr. Poff.

Mr. Schneebeli in two instances.

Mr. Derwinski in two instances.

Mr. Bob Wilson in two instances.

Mr. Horton in two instances.

Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Davis of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Devine.

Mr. Roth in five instances.

Mr. Martin.

Mr. Steiger of Arizona.

Mr. Burton of Utah in 10 instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Flowers) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Charles H. Wilson in three instances.

Mr. Pepper in two instances.

Mr. Rosenthal in five instances.

Mr. Montgomery in two instances.

Mr. Matsunaga in two instances.

Mr. Dingell in two instances.

Mr. Eilberg.

Mr. Murphy of New York in three instances.

Mr. Culver in three instances.

Mr. Rodino in two instances.

Mr. Ashley.

Mr. Hébert.

Mr. McCarthy in four instances.

Mr. William D. Ford in two instances.

Mr. Wolff in two instances.

Mr. Podell in three instances.

Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Stuckey in two instances.

Mr. Boland in two instances.

Mr. Anderson of California in three instances.

Mr. Biaggi.

Mr. Bingham in two instances.

Mr. Baring.

Mrs. Sullivan in three instances.

Mr. Gonzalez in two instances.

Mr. Ryan in four instances.

Mrs. Mink in two instances.

Mr. Rarick in three instances.

Mr. Pickle in two instances.

Mr. Fraser.

Mr. O'Hara in two instances.

Mr. Hamilton in three instances.

Mr. Moorhead in two instances.

Mr. Feighan in five instances.

Mr. Galifianakis.

Mr. Nichols.

Mr. Dulski in four instances.

Mr. Cohelan in four instances.

Mr. Hagan in four instances.

Mr. Gettys in two instances.

Mr. Flowers in three instances.

Mr. Hechler of West Virginia in four instances.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 267. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Samuel J. Cole, U.S. Army (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 571. An act for the relief of Dr. Diego Aguilar Aranda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1110. An act for the relief of Nickolas George Polizos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1526. An act for the relief of Dr. Zeliha Bilsel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1527. An act for the relief of Dr. Yilmaz Bilsel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1645. An act for the relief of Andrew Chu Yang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1798. An act for the relief of Dr. Yavuz Aykent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1963. An act for the relief of Wu Hip; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2019. An act for the relief of Dug Foo Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2462. An act to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 85. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the period from August 26, 1969, through September 1, 1969, as "National Archery Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1828. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumosuly upon James F. Wegener;

H.R. 1948. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Private First Class Joseph Anthony Snitko;

H.R. 2224. An act for the relief of Franklin Jacinto Antonio;

H.R. 2536. An act for the relief of Francesca Adriana Millonzi;

H.R. 2890. An act for the relief of Rueben Rosen;

H.R. 3166. An act for the relief of Aleksandar Zambeli;

H.R. 3167. An act for the relief of Ryszard Stanislaw Obacz;

H.R. 3172. An act for the relief of Yolanda Fulgencio Hunter;

H.R. 3376. An act for the relief of Maria da Conceicao Evaristo; and

H.R. 10060. An act for the relief of Lance Cpl. Peter M. Nee (2465662).

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on July 14, 1969, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title

H.R. 11400. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was ageed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow Wednesday, July 16, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

959. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary concerned to apply the pay and allowances of a missing member of an armed force to the purchase of U.S. savings bond and savings notes under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

960. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

961. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the 1968 annual report of the operations of the Corporation, pursuant to the provisions of section 17(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

962. A letter from the Director, District of Columbia Bail Agency, transmitting the views of the Agency with regard to proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Bail Agency Act (80 Stat. 327), previously submitted; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

963. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of a review of the status of development toward establishment of a unified national communications system; to the Committee on Government Operations.

964. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the reasonableness of prices questioned for bomb and hand grenade fuses under three negotiated contracts, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

965. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of the public laws enacted by the Ninth Guam Legislature in its 1968 sessions, pursuant to the provisions of section 19 of the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

966. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to regulate interstate commerce by strengthening and improving consumer protection under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to fish and fishery products, including provision for assistance to, and cooperation with, the States in the administration of their related programs and assistance by them in the carrying out of the Federal program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

967. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

968. A letter from the Attorney General transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to protect the public health and safety by amending the narcotic, depressant, stimulant, and hallucinogenic drug laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

969. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make qualification under State law a prerequisite to registration under the narcotic drug and marihuana laws, to eliminate the provision permitting payment of tax to acquire marihuana by unregistered persons, and for other related purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 7517. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code to provide cost-of-living adjustments in cash relief payments to certain former employees of the Canal Zone Government, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–380). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 483. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 2. A bill to amend the Federal

Credit Union Act so as to provide for an independent Federal agency for the supervision of federally chartered credit unions, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 91–381). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS (for himself and Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin):

H.R. 12829. A bill to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 12830. A bill to amend the act of September 5, 1962 (76 Stat. 435), providing for the establishment of the Frederick Douglass home as a part of the park system in the National Capital; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ADAMS (for himself, Mr. Friedel, Mr. Moss, Mr. Ottinger, and Mr. Tiernan):

H.R. 12831. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the certification of airfreight forwarders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 12832. A bill to increase the authorization for the appropriation of funds to complete the International Peace Garden, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 12833. A bill to amend section 235 of the National Housing Act to provide more flexible mortgage limits in order to encourage the development of homeownership in high-cost areas for lower income families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 12834. A bill to improve and increase postsecondary educational opportunities throughout the Nation by providing assistance to the States for the development and construction of comprehensive community colleges; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12835. A bill to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950 (title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950); to the Committee on Internal Security.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 12836. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 12837. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to provide for a fair and random system of selecting persons for induction into military service, to provide for the uniform application of selective service policies, to raise the incidence of volunteers in military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12838. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to make crime protection insurance available to small business concerns; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12839. A bill to promote public health and welfare by expanding, improving, and a study of essential railroad passenger services and population research activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12840. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to add to such act a new title dealing especially with kidney disease and kidney-related diseases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 12841. A bill to amend section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, to authorize a study of essential railroad passenger service by the Secretary of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself and Mr. Burke of Massachusetts):

H.R. 12842. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat certain foster children of an individual as his natural children for purposes of the dependency exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H.R. 12843. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. Anderson of Illinois, and Mr. Taft):

H.R. 12844. A bill to provide for an examination of U.S. Government public information activities in foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 12845. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GUBSER (for himself, Mr. Johnson of California, Mr. Leggett, and Mr. Pirnie):

H.R. 12846. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide for additional nominations by Members of Congress of persons for appointment to the service academies by the Secretaries of the military departments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 12847. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to add to such act a new title dealing especially with kidney disease and kidney-related diseases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 12848. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction from gross income for certain funeral expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.R. 12849. A bill to amend section 203, Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to provide for the distribution of surplus personal property to State and local police organizations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 12850. A bill to prohibit the mailing of certain obscene matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 12851. A bill to provide relief for certain claimants against the vested assets of Japanese banks; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12852. A bill to provide relief for certain prewar Japanese bank claimants; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 12853. A bill to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN (for himself, Mr. Gerald R. Ford, Mr. Springer, Mr. O'Konski, Mr. Harsha, Mr. Horton, Mr. Broyhill of Virginia, Mr. Winn, Mr. Gude, Mr. Steiger of Arizona, Mrs. May, Mr. Hogan, Mr. McClory, and Mr. Poff):

H.R. 12854. A bill to reorganize the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 12855. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Bail Agency Act to increase the effectiveness of the Bail Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 12856. A bill to expand and improve public defender services in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 12857. A bill to improve the judicial machinery in customs courts by amending the statutory provisions relating to judicial actions and administrative proceedings in customs matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 12858. A bill to provide for the disposition of certain funds awarded to the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska by a judgment entered by the Court of Claims against the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 12859. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to make the program of aid to families with dependent children a wholly Federal program, to be administered by local agencies under federally prescribed terms and conditions (embodying the eligibility formulas currently in effect in the several States but designed to encourage such States to apply nationally uniform standards), with the cost being fully borne by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself and Mr. Skubitz):

H.R. 12860. A bill to establish the Ford's Theatre National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. Abbitt, Mr. Dent, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Henderson, Mr. Hull, Mr. Johnson of California, Mr. Jones of North Carolina, Mr. McKneally, Mr. Nix, Mr. Pucinski, Mr. Scheuer, and Mr. Tunney):

H.R. 12861. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER (for himself and Mr. Gerald R. Ford):

H.R. 12862. A bill to provide for the expansion and improvement of the Nation's airport and airway system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STOKES:

H.R. 12863. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to terminate the quota for South Africa; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12864. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the assignment of surplus real property to executive agencies for disposal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 12865. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize reduced-rate transportation for certain additional persons on a space-available basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12866. A bill to amend title IV of the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Lung Institute; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.R. 12867. A bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to define the equitable standards governing relationships between investment companies and their investment advisers and principal underwriters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

XUM

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 12868. A bill to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system, to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 12869. A bill to amend section 4005 of title 39, United States Code, to restore to such section the provisions requiring proof of intent to deceive in connection with the use of the mails to obtain money or property by false pretenses, representations, or promises; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 12870. A bill to provide for the establishment of the King Range National Conservation Area in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 12871. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to exclude from the U.S. mails as a special category of nonmailable matter certain obscene material sold or offered for sale to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 12872. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Frederick Douglass home as a part of the park system in the National Capital, and for other purposes," approved September 5, 1962; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 12873. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs, and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 12874. A bill to afford protection to the public from offensive intrustion into their homes through the postal service of sexually oriented mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 12875. A bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial forest land, to establish a high-timber-yield fund, and for other purposes; tc the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H.R. 12876. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to retain the effectiveness of materialmen's and mechanic's liens; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RUPPE (for himself, Mr. McDonald of Michigan, Mr. Vander Jagt, and Mr. Esch):

H.R. 12877. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 12878. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands at the Yavapai-Prescott Community Reservation in Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 12879. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 12880. A bill to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress by providing for public disclosure of Federal income tax returns by Members of Congress and candidates for that office; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 12881. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness) over a 4-year period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 12882. A bill to provide for a comprehensive and coordinated attack on the narcotic addiction and drug abuse problem, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (for himself, Mr. Purcell, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Waldie, Mr. White, Mr. Derwinski, Mr. Meskill, and Mr. Scott):

H.R. 12883. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a middecade census of population in the year 1975 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12884. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to assure confidentiality of information furnished in response to questionnaires, inquiries, and other requests of the Bureau of the Census, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATHIAS (for himself, Mr. Aspinall, Mr. Brotzman, Mr. Don H. Clausen, Mr. Del Clawson, Mr. Cohelan, Mr. Corman, Mr. Evans of Colorado, Mr. Hanna, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. Pettis, Mr. Rees, Mr. Rogers of Colorado, Mr. Talcott, Mr. Wiggins, Mr. Bob Wilson, and Mr. Charles H. Wilson):

H.J. Res. 815. Joint resolution to welcome to the United States all Olympic athletes and authorized Olympic delegations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MIZELL:

H.J. Res. 816. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.J. Res. 817. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that no person shall serve as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court or as Chief Justice of the United States, nor as a Member of Congress, after having attained the age of 70 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H. Con. Res. 301. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress relating to the establishment of the National Gerontology Center; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H. Con. Res. 302. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the recent elimination of the 2-percent allowance in lieu of certain provider costs under the medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 12885. A bill for the relief of Antoni de Januszkowski and Maurice Lemee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 12886. A bill for the relief of Floyd L. Gosnell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON of Texas:

H.R. 12887. A bill for the relief of John A. Avdeef; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12888. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rustico C. Polutan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 12889. A bill for the relief of Mr. Michele Trotta and Mrs. Reparata Trotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 12890. A bill for the relief of Mario and Anna Maria Barone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

178. The SPEAKER presented a petition of United Steel Workers of America, Local 2063, New York, N.Y., relative to tax reform, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1969

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Dwight David Eisenhower, soldier and statesman, general, and President, who dedicated his life to serving our country. His death brought great sadness to all Americans, especially to those who served in Congress during the 8 years of his Presidency.

His warm smile, his dedication, his honesty, and courage endeared him to to the world and kindled in Americans patriotism and statesmanship, in the finest sense of the words.

Ike lived a full and rewarding life, inspiring faith in the democratic process in his fellow Americans. His heroic and courageous struggle to continue living under adverse and often painful conditions was itself a memorial to his great personal integrity and unyielding spirit. Distinguished men require no tributes; their actions, decisions, and character cannot possibly be heightened by any additional adornments. Simply because of their existence the world is changed, and continues to improve.

All men of the world will continue to express their affection and admiration for Dwight David Eisenhower, a true citizen of the world. His unselfish and dedicated leadership in times of war and peace will never be forgotten. Ike will be remembered as an outstanding example of leadership in a world which could certainly use many such examples.

OUTSTANDING YOUNG SCIENTISTS—TWO FROM EACH STATE—HONORED AT NATIONAL YOUTH SCIENCE CAMP LUNCHEON, HOSTED BY SENATOR RANDOLPH—DR. JAMES E. ALLEN, JR., COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, ISSUES MEANINGFUL CHALLENGE

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the National Youth Science Camp is sponsored by the State of West Virginia and was begun in 1963 during our centennial year. Two young men, who have just graduated from high school, are chosen by their State superintendent of schools on the basis of academic achievement to attend the 3-week camp in the beautiful mountains of West Virginia.

On July 9, I had the privilege of hosting a luncheon for the delegates on their visit to the Nation's Capital, as I have done since the camp's beginning.

Each year they spend a short time in Washington. This year the boys toured the Capitol, the White House, Goddard Space Flight Center, and the Naval Research Laboratory.

The Senate luncheon was attended by 47 Senators—some of whom were able to be with us briefly and others who dined with and greeted the delegates from their States. West Virginia Members of the U.S. House of Representatives were present—Hon. Harley O. Staggers, Hon. John M. Slack, Hon. Ken Hechler, Hon. Jim Kee, and Hon. Robert H. Mollohan.

Special guests of honor included Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., Commissioner of Education; Hon. John H. Shaffer, Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration; Drew Pearson, noted columnist and commentator, who is a leader in the Big Brothers youth program; Dr. Randal Robertson, Associate Director, National Science Foundation; Lee A. DuBridge, science adviser to the President; Dr. Richard Strombotne, special assistant, Office of Research and Technology; Prof. Charles N. Cochran, camp director since its inception, and Rev. Dr. Edward L. Elson, Senate Chaplain.

Mr. President, when I am with such young people, I am not dismayed. I am encouraged by their eagerness to participate in solving problems, by their attentiveness and by the knowledge they possess.

These students did not represent the hippies, yippies, rabble rousers, or offbeat militants. Instead, they represented the youth in America who will lead. They were young men with a vision—a vision of a better America. They were young scientists eager to quest for answers in a complex society. And, Mr. President, I was heartened and impressed by my talks with these youth.

Dr. Allen's address was meaningful and challenging. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, Dr. Allen's address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SCIENCE: TO WHAT END?

(Address by James E. Allen, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Education and U.S. Commissioner of Education)

It is an honor and privilege for me to be with you today. I am pleased to be here both as United States Commissioner of Education, commending you young people who represent the best of our educational effort, and as a native West Virginian, sharing a long friendship with Senator Randolph and proud, as he is, that the State of West Virginia is the host of such a distinguished group of students.

It would be much more valuable to me if I could listen to you for I believe that the younger generation of today has a keen and penetrating insight concerning the needs and problems of our time that can be truly enlightening.

If you spoke of science, I'm not at all sure I could understand you, for we have advanced so rapidly into the age of laser beams, computers, nuclear power, walking on the moon, etc. that the oft-cited generation gap is probably wider in the field of science than most anywhere else.

One of the most interesting things about you as a group, however, is the breadth of your interests—music, poetry, social service—which indicates your awareness that science does not stand apart as a remote, laboratory-centered occupation but is rather a part of the whole substance of man's endeavor, needing to be so understood by both scientists and non-scientists alike. Thus, I am sure that your ideas would be valuable on a wide range of subjects.

You are fortunate indeed, however, to be so talented in the field of science in an age such as this. Emerson said that "Men love to wonder, and that is the seed of our science." Certainly man's sense of wonder has never had a wider scope of opportunity than today—nor have we ever witnessed such spurts of growth from those seeds of wonder in the minds of men.

Achievement in the whole range of scientific endeavor—medicine, electronics, space exploration—has been so brilliant and so boundless as to give the feeling that nothing is impossible. Next week a man will walk on the moon—the sense of wonder that made the moon a goddess to primitive man, caused Gallileo to persevere with his determined probing, now flowers into a part of man's direct experience.

But the most exciting and hopeful aspect of this achievement, as of all other scientific advance, is that it only serves to recreate and strengthen the wonder that is the seed of scientific progress.

If, however, science is not to stand apart from the whole substance of man's endeavor, it must serve. Albert Einstein once asked "Why does the magnificent applied science which saves work and makes life easier bring us so little happiness?" His answer was "Because we have not yet learned to make sensible use of it."

Sensible here implies, I believe, much more than practicality or material application—it goes beyond the questions of "how" to those of "why" and "to what end." Science to serve mankind must be in the context of the great philosophical question of the nature of life, of man's reason for being.

Since the first Cartesian doubt prompted man to think empirically, rather than abstractly, there has been a widening chasm between science and philosophy. Too often men relegate philosophy to a world of fiction—a world that has little or no relationship to the "real" world of the computer, industrial technology, the ABM, etc. But the relationship exists, recognized or not, and the happiness of mankind that Professor Einstein spoke of—the resolution of conflict, the achievement of justice and equality—will be more hopefully within our grasp if we will seek human advancement in a union of the scientific and the ethical.

I again congratulate you on your achievements and hope that the sense of wonder which has already prompted you to learn so much will lead to the full realization of your great talents.

The world you face is hard—its problems and evils many. Each must share in trying to eliminate them for all—and so may you bring to your future work not only your scientific ability but a warm and compassionate heart that will recognize the broad needs and hopes of mankind and accept a responsibility for helping to fulfill them.

TRIBUTE TO DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1969

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, after I was elected to Congress, a group of my colleagues and I traveled to Gettysburg to speak with Dwight David Eisenhower. I had met the former President previously, but in that summer of 1967 I was so impressed with his clarity of mind and perception of world politics, I felt the United States would be remiss if we did not put Ike's knowledge to use. After consultation with the general's aides, and after being assured that he looked favorably on the idea, I drafted the following resolution:

H. CON. RES. 476

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas General of the Army Dwight David Eisenhower has served the United States of America with distinction for more than fifty years as soldier, President, and statesman; and

Whereas as President of the United States he has gained great knowledge and understanding of this Nation's relations with other nations; and

Whereas he has rendered this Nation and the free world invaluable service as Supreme Commander of the Allied Expeditionary Force in Europe during World War II, and, later as Supreme Commander Allied Powers Europe, and, because of this service he knows well the aspirations, potential, and problems of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and

Whereas during his eight years as President of the United States this Nation cemented its ties of friendship and understanding with free world nations through a policy of mutual defense binding these nations together against the common threat to their security; and

Whereas developments in recent years have seen a disturbing deterioration in the close ties among members of the Western alliance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that General of the Army Dwight David Eisenhower should be requested to undertake a factfinding mission

XUM

to investigate and report to the Congress and the President on the state of the relations of the United States with other nations of the world, with particular attention to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and to the politicomilitary effort in defense of the Republic of Vietnam.

Unfortunately, the general took ill 2 days before 80 other Members of the House of Representatives were planning to introduce the resolution with me; out of respect for this great leader, we delayed our plan. After that first weekend in August 1967, Mr. Eisenhower never regained the good health and robust constitution with which he was blessed for most of his life; the resolution was never formally set forward. I wanted to record it here, Mr. Speaker, because I think it articulates most clearly how I felt about Dwight David Eisenhower. I mourn his passing, as do millions of people around the world; I particularly regret that in times such as these Dwight David Eisenhower is not here to offer us wisdom, counsel, and a firm, guiding hand.

INDEPENDENCE DAY ON STATEN ISLAND

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the 59th annual Independence Day parade in Travis was a stunning success. This community once again demonstrated its pride in itself, the city, the State, and the Nation. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the excellent newspaper narrative in the Staten Island Advance and the order of march as follows:

> The Travis festivities began with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Spanish-American War veteran William Gaylor. It was followed by speeches by Congressman John M. Murphy and Borough President Connor, who also spoke at the Elm Park parade.
>
> Murphy commended the community on the great pride it was showing in itself, in the city, in the state and in the nation. He said the parade was an example of the way to have a "safe and sane" Fourth of July.
>
> Connor said the spirit shown by the people in Travis was "typical of Staten Island," a place where "the Flag is flown proudly, law and order is respected and the police are not called 'pigs'."
>
> He concluded with a quote he felt befit the day: "My country right or wrong; but always my country."
>
> #### QUEEN CROWNED
>
> In a ceremony following their speeches, Murphy and Connor looked on as Miss Lois Okraszewski was crowned queen of the parade. She and her court, the Misses Rosealie Marchese, Jean Roberge, Theresa Sablowski, and Katherine Morris, were then presented with trophies and flowers and, after the Star Spangled Banner was played by the Staten Island Musician Society Band, led to their float and the parade began.
>
> As the crowd lining Victory Blvd. cheered, a Police escort and Auxiliary Police, followed by the Staten Island Musicians Society Band, the U.S. Naval Reserve, and James Smith, Grand Marshal, led the colorful marchers and musicians in a circular route back to Schmul Park.
>
> Beside the bands already mentioned, the Travis parade featured music by the Royal Eagles Drum Corps. Marchers included the VFW, American Legion, Fire Buffs, Improved Order of Red Men and the Boy Scouts.
>
> There were several special features, beside the 40 and 8 locomotive and the candy-dispensing clowns, including the Spirit of 76 Banner and 13-star Flag, antique cars, fire trucks, a military order of Cooties wagon with a firing mortar, and the Sheriff's Mounted Posse.
>
> The marchers stepped smartly, the bands played with precision, the fire sirens wailed, the Cooties' cannon boomed, the clowns danced, the Red Men whooped, and the crowd applauded as the sun beat down. A few of the bystanders cooled it a little in a local tavern but, in general, the people of Travis seemed oblivious to the heat.
>
> #### DANCING FOLLOWS
>
> The parade ended in Schmul Park, where the children received refreshments and where, in the evening, residents of Travis danced from 6 until 10 o'clock.
>
> Driving back from a full day of parades through the streets echoing the report of firecrackers and bearing the stench of gunpowder, the parades did seem a "safer" and certainly a "saner" way to enjoy Independence Day to an observer.

TRAVIS FOURTH OF JULY PARADE, 1969—ORDER OF THE MARCH

Chairman: Joseph Chociemski.
Perennial Standard Bearer: Porky Torotra.

1ST DIVISION (M. LARNEY, J. DECKER)—VICTORY BOUELEVARD IN FRONT OF THE SCHOOL

Police Escort and Auxiliary Police.
S.I. Musician Society Band.
U.S. Naval Reserve.
Grand Marshall: James Smith.
Committee and Officials.
William Gaylor Car.
Spirit of 1776 Banner: Frank Peters and Alan Blanchard.
Spirit of 1776 and 13 Star Flag: Robert Scully, Richie Brennen, Eddie Minto, and John Scully.
Miss Liberty: Janel Modzelewski.
Uncle Sam: Kevin Blanchard.
Colonial Girls: Jackie Straub, Janice Atlak, Helen Decker, and Susan Reid.
Betsy Ross Car: Victoria Peters, Sheri Ann Smidhum, Judy Saladis, and Teddy Mutschler.

2D DIVISION (JOHN KIRBY, RAY GOFFIN)—VICTORY BOULEVARD

Sea Cadets.
P.S. 26 Girls Flag Bearers: Jeffrey Stanley, Paula Thomson, and Mary Scully.
P.S. 26 Boys Flag Bearers: Robert Percoco, Linda Saladis, and Sandra Petersen.

3D DIVISION (MR. NEYLON)—MELVIN, OPPOSITE THE SCHOOL

Royal Eagles Drum Corps.
V.F.W.
Cooties.
W.W. I Barracks.
Knights of Columbus Alhambra.

4TH DIVISION (VINCENT KASPROVITZ, RICHARD RAJEWSKI)—MELVIN SCHOOL SIDE

S.I. Community Band.
American Legion.
40 & 8.
Antique cars.

5TH DIVISION (JOHN GLEN)—ROSWELL AVENUE

Our Lady of Perpetual Help Ridgeman.
Volunteer Firemen.
Fire Buffs.
Fire Trucks.
Order of Redmen.

6TH DIVISION (JIM BRAHN)—SCHOOL SIDE WILD AVENUE AND VICTORY BOULEVARD

S.I. Pipe Band.
St. Anthony's Cheer Leaders.
Queen's Float: Lois Okraszewski—Queen. Attendants: Rosealie Marchese, Jean Roberge, Theresa Sablowski, and Katherine Morris.
Sing Along Group: Up With People.

7TH DIVISION (AL HUGHES)—BAKERY SIDE WILD AVENUE AND VICTORY BOULEVARD

Our Lady of Perpetual Help Corps.
De Molay Boys.
Boy Scouts.
Sheriffs Posse.

SALUTE TO APOLLO 11

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out to all my colleagues and the people of this Nation that the advances the United States has made in both manned and unmanned space exploration is a great gift to not only this country, but to all mankind. I remind all parties that all of this development work has been accomplished here on earth with the people reaping the benefits whether it be in prestige or economics.

There is an unlimited future evolving out of our space program today with unknown achievements and further economic conquests just ahead for the United States.

However, Mr. Speaker, I, too, will stay in Washington, D.C., and watch the flight of Apollo 11 on television, listen on radio, and read about it in the newspapers and magazines, and I assure you that my hopes and prayers are with the astronauts on this flight when man makes his first step onto a celestial body.

On behalf of my State of Nevada, myself, my family, and staff, I wish astronauts Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin, Jr., Michael Collins, and the entire technological staff and all the other members and contributors to the NASA program, the very best in this historic voyage.

CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS INITIATES PROJECT "GET WITH IT"

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the city of Indianapolis has taken a major stride in developing and mobilizing the resources of voluntary community action by its new Project "Get With It." The following describes the project:

> #### GET WITH IT
>
> "Get With It" is the slogan adopted for a new project of the Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee designed to stimulate citizens' awareness and participation in the problems of metropolitan Indianapolis. The program is directed toward the final goal of eliciting citizen volunteer action in the operations of both public and private service organizations.
>
> The first step in "Get With It" is a continuing and comprehensive publicity cam-

paign enlisting the help of the local communications media. Five advertising agencies, including McQuade, Wilkens, & Bloomhorst, Garrison, Jasper, & Rose, P. J. Finneran & Co., Ruben-Montgomery & Co., and Caldwell-Van Riper & Co., are voluntarily contributing TV, radio, and newspaper material.

Topics to be covered are summer employment, housing, health and sanitation, education and black pride, and the Mayor's Upswing program. Each topic will enjoy two weeks of special concentration during the summer, with additional announcements of Upswing events distributed as they occur. A phone number and address for "Get With It" central control have been established for those citizens who wish to donate time or money toward the solution of problems depicted in the advertising.

Time and space for the "Get With It" advertising have been donated by various radio and television stations, and the city's daily newspapers. Additional exposure is being sought through the media of weekly newspapers, billboards, community bulletins, public signs, etc. The estimated value of the material, time and space contributed by the agencies and media is in excess of one million dollars.

The second phase of the "Get With It" effort involves the channeling of citizen volunteers into service organizations which are interesting to the individual worker and useful to the city. Working closely with the Progress Committee in this regard is the Volunteer Bureau of the Community Service Council. This agency serves as a clearing house for some eighty service groups in the Marion County area. The "Get With It" central office in the City-County building is open daily to receive inquiries and volunteers. Staffed primarily by CSC workers, this office attempts to suggest satisfactory areas of service to prospective volunteers, and schedules appointments for placement with the appropriate private agency, city department, Progress Committee Task Force, etc. It is hoped that a rapid and efficient process of referral will preserve initial volunteer enthusiasm and provide the best distribution of manpower to the participating groups.

The philosophy underlying the "Get With It" idea assumes that the problems of a modern city cannot be solved by government alone; on the contrary, truly lasting solutions require an aware, concerned, and active citizenry. The success of the Progress Committee in getting people "with it" can take Indianapolis a long way in the area of citizen action, and can produce the sort of community involvement that makes public programs vital and effective.

[From the Indianapolis News, June 24, 1969]

VOLUNTEER DRIVE ON CITY PROBLEMS STARTS—LUGAR ANNOUNCES "GET WITH IT" PROGRAM

(By Hugh Rutledge)

A campaign to obtain widespread citizen volunteer action to help solve problems of greater Indianapolis was announced today by Mayor Richard G. Lugar.

Using the slogan, "Get With It," Lugar said the aim of the new program is to stimulate citizens' awareness and participation in the operation of public and private service organizations.

The first step in "Get With It" project, according to the mayor, will be an extensive publicity campaign developed by the communications task force of the Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee and five advertising agencies here.

Lugar estimated the value of material, time and space being contributed by the agencies and newspapers, radio and television at about $1 million.

Topics to be considered in the campaign include employment, housing, health and sanitation, education, recreation and black pride.

Lugar said citizens wishing to donate time or money toward the solution of some of these problems should either write to "Get With It" Central Control, Postoffice Box 800, Indianapolis 46206 or call 633-2888.

WILL GUIDE VOLUNTEERS

The second phase of the project will involve channeling volunteers into 80 service organizations under the direction of the volunteer bureau of the Community Service Council and the progress committee, Lugar said.

The "Get With It" headquarters in the City-County Building will be staffed mainly by council workers directed by Kenneth I. Chapman.

Lugar said the philosophy underlying the "Get With It" idea "assumes that the problems of a modern city cannot be solved by government alone. On the contrary, truly lasting solutions require an aware, concerned and active citizenry."

The mayor also announced at the press conference that C. LeRoy Eldridge, retired director of public relations at Stokely-Van Camp Inc., will serve without pay as executive director of the communications task force.

As task force executive director, Lugar said Eldridge will give community relations assistance to all GIPC task forces and establish liaison with neighborhood organizations in an effort to improve communications.

The agencies which have donated time and people for the campaign are:

McQuade, Wilkins & Bloomhorst.
Garrison, Jasper & Rose.
P. J. Finneran & Co.
Ruben-Montgomer & Co.
Caldwell-Van Riper & Co.

MANY VOLUNTEER, MORE SOUGHT BY "GET WITH IT"

More than 75 persons answered Mayor Richard G. Lugar's call for citizen volunteers to help make Indianapolis a better place to live.

Fifty responded by telephone and another 25 called in person to say they were eager to join the city-wide "Get With It" campaign, Mitch Daniels, an intern in the mayor's office, reported.

Lugar and C. LeRoy Elderidge, executive director of the Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee (GIPC) communications task force, said they were highly pleased with the opening response.

Volunteers of all ages and from every social and economic level are being sought to help solve the city's problems of health, housing, unemployment, education and recreation.

"The more volunteers we get, the more we can accomplish," Eldridge said. "For that reason, we are asking everyone to respond. If every resident of Indianapolis volunteered, we'd be overjoyed."

Eldridge said the persons who have volunteered already indicated a desire to do everything they could to help solve the city's many problems.

"The more people with ideas we can get, the more people who are anxious to work, to make personal contributions, the more certain we'll be of achieving success," he said.

"All we want is their enthusiastic determination and ideas," he declared.

Activities of the campaign are being coordinated by the GIPC's task force and the Community Service Council. These two groups will interview the volunteers and decide where among the 80 affiliated groups their talents would best fit.

Most of the first volunteers appeared to be college students or high school pupils anxious to find ways of spending a constructive vacation season.

Citizens wishing to volunteer may either write the Get With It Office, Post Office Box 800, Indianapolis 46206, or telephone 633-2888.

Five advertising agencies are volunteering their services to help plan the program. They are Caldwell-VanRiper Inc.; Garrison, Jasper and Rose; McQuade, Wilkins and Bloomhorst Inc.; P. J. Fineran and Company and Ruben-Montgomery and Associates Inc.

The city's newspapers and television and radio stations will aid the drive with time and space.

Eldridge, retired director of public and industrial relations for Stokely-Van Camp Inc., is serving as executive director without pay.

FIREMEN AND COLLEGE TO "GET WITH IT"

Bridgeport-area volunteer firemen and an Indianapolis business college yesterday revealed plans to aid the "Get With It" community improvement drive.

The firemen, members of the Wayne Township Volunteer Fire Department, will invite about 300 inner-city children to attend without charge a fish fry and carnival to be held July 23-26 in Bridgeport.

The firemen's young guests will be able to enjoy free fire truck and carnival rides during the festival which will be held at the fire station at 8800 West Washington Street.

The children also will be able to watch pulling contests featuring mules and work horses.

Meanwhile Mrs. Mary H. VanBuren, manager of Consolidated Business College, 445 North Pennsylvania Street, offered to let 30 persons take courses at the school without charge.

Courses available include typing, accounting, business English and shorthand.

"Get With It" officials received calls from about 50 prospective volunteers yesterday, bringing the four-day total of calls to more than 200.

---

100 READY TO JOIN "GET WITH IT" PLAN

Mayor Richard G. Lugar said about 100 offers were received to assist with the "Get With It" program yesterday.

Lugar appealed for donations from individuals and companies to assist with promotional and operational aspects of the program. He said the money would be used to purchase more "Get With It" buttons and posters to advertise the program, among other things.

Volunteers or persons wishing to donate money may call 633-2888, or write Get With It, Box 800, Indianapolis, 46206.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, June 30, 1969]

WANTED: PEOPLE AND IDEAS

The problems of Indianapolis and practically all modern cities are big and many, and there is much complaining about them. But complaining will not solve these problems. Good ideas and hard work can.

No element in the population of our city has a monopoly on good ideas or the capability for the kind of hard work that can make solid progress toward solving the city's problems of health, housing, unemployment, education, recreation and positive racial relations.

The ideas must be presented if they are to be weighed and put to the test.

The people who have the time and energy and enthusiasm to make personal contributions to the city's progress must offer their services.

The city-wide "Get With It" campaign is aimed at galvanizing people who have ideas and people who are ready, willing and able to tackle urban problems firsthand.

"The more people with ideas we can get, the more people who are anxious to work, to make personal contributions, the more certain we'll be of achieving success," said C. LeRoy Eldridge, executive director of the Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee communications task force, which is co-

XUM

ordinating the opening phases of the campaign.

Mayor Richard G. Lugar's call for citizen volunteers has brought a promising response so far.

But many more volunteers and ideas are needed.

There can be no denying that the potential of this program is tremendous.

Citizens wishing to volunteer may write to the Get With It Office, Post Office Box 800, Indianapolis 46206, or telephone 633–2888.

Those who have something to offer will be opening a door to adventure as well as valuable service to their fellow citizens.

Fifty Willing To "Get With It"

Calls continue to come into Mayor Richard G. Lugar's "Get With It" office at the rate of about 50 a day as citizens respond to the challenge to take part in solving metropolitan problems.

Mitch Daniels, an intern in the mayor's office, said about 50 volunteers will meet with Community Service Council personnel to determine where the volunteers could be most valuable.

Lugar issued the challenge Tuesday, calling for volunteers to help seek solutions to growing dilemmas in health, housing, employment, education and recreation.

Volunteers may call 633–2888, or write Get With It, Box 800, Indianapolis, 46206.

Getting With It

Mayor Richard Lugar's newly announced campaign to enlist volunteers for social service work is a promising venture.

The new "Get With It" program is proceeding on a sound basis. It recognizes a fact which is frequently ignored but essential to progress: Motivated citizens working together of their own free will can go where the compulsions of government cannot.

Genuine community improvement comes not from government but from the good works of dedicated individuals working in concert.

Many citizens interested in community betterment wonder what they can do and how their efforts would be related to those of others. The "Get With It" program seeks to provide a comprehensive answer.

It will suggest where a person's talents can be put to best use, and it will give the co-ordination which is necessary for the volunteers to feel they are working as part of a city-wide team.

Anyone who wishes "to get with it" can write to Postoffice Box 800, Indianapolis 46206 or call 633–2888.

He will be making a meaningful contribution to the city's progress.

Volunteer Aid Sought for City

Formation of a city-wide campaign to enlist volunteers to help the city solve the problem of health, housing, unemployment, education and recreation was announced yesterday by Mayor Richard G. Lugar.

Lugar said every citizen will be asked to volunteer his services through work in various service organizations in the city.

The mayor, at a press conference, said the slogan, "Get With It," used by the Teen Guide Council in its fight for good citizenship earlier this year, will be the guiding theme of the campaign.

The mayor said the Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee's Communications Task Force and the Community Service Council will coordinate activities of the campaign.

Five advertising agencies here have volunteered to work on the "Get With It" campaign and newspapers, radio and television also will devote time and space to the drive.

The agencies are Caldwell-VanRiper, Inc.; Garrison, Jasper and Rose; McQuade, Wilkins and Bloomhorst Inc.; P. J. Finneran and Company and Ruben-Montgomery and Associates Inc.

Lugar said more than $1 million in time and space will be used in asking citizens to help solve the city's problems.

The Volunteer Bureau of the Community Service Council will work closely with the Progress Committee in channeling citizen volunteers into various service organizations, he said.

Citizens wishing to volunteer their services may either write the Get With It Office, Postoffice Box 800, Indianapolis 46206 or call 633–2888.

Lugar also announced the appointment of C. LeRoy Eldridge, retired director of public and industrial relations for Stokely-Van Camp Inc., as executive director of the Progress Committee's Communication Task Force.

Eldridge, who was with Stokely-Van Camp from 1946 through 1968, will serve in the post without pay.

Eldridge will assist the task force and will establish liaison with neighborhood organizations in an effort to improve communications.

Placement in 80 Groups—Citizens Offer Their Services To "Get With It"

(By Barry Henderson)

Volunteers to "Get With It" in the Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee's appeal for citizen participation in solving metropolitan problems began offering their services today.

Mitch Daniels, an intern in the office of Mayor Richard Lugar, said at least 50 phone calls were answered or monitored in the first 18 hours after the program was announced.

Callers are being assigned interviews with either the GIPC's communications task force or the Community Service Council's volunteer bureau to determine where, among the 80 organizations and groups affiliated with the CSC, summer assistance might best be utilized.

Most of the initial volunteers are college or high school students off for the summer, grouped with a smattering of business and professional men and housewives, according to Daniels.

Among those offering to participate were a sales correspondent on his vacation, a chef who said he was free to help during the evening hours and a DePauw University student who said he'd like to do anything he could. There were only a couple of negative calls.

The offers are channeled into four basic areas where volunteer services are needed. They are:

Neighborhood centers: including religious and recreational centers, social service associations, Parks Department, Model Cities and Project Renewal project offices and the Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A.

Health agencies: including associations and societies sponsoring disease control research and rehabilitative activities, the hospitals, neighborhood health centers and Indiana University Medical Center.

Education and cultural groups: including public schools, the zoo, the Children's Museum, Camp Fire Girls, Girl Scouts, preschool centers and nurseries and the Urban League.

Welfare groups: including Goodwill Industries, The Red Cross, The Salvation Army, nursing homes and correctional and juvenile aid institutions.

"It was boredom. I decided I was wasting myself, so I called," said Kit Mayberry, 19, of 7470 N. Central, a Smith College student home for the summer. She said she worked with Flanner House, taking children to parks, one summer while a student at Tudor Hall. She was one of the first to respond.

Dr. Alvin Schutzbank, a Northside podiatrist, said professional groups were urging participation in community affairs, and thought, "It's a good idea to meet people and exchange concepts . . . with the changes coming on.

"Indianapolis has people with latent ideas that could develop into an effective work force," Dr. Schutzbank said.

Cathy Writt, 14, of 1728 Wishmyer Road, a Warrent Central High School junior, said she thought it would provide something useful to be doing and might lead to a paying summer job. "I want to be a nurse," she said, adding she probably would enjoy working in health services.

"There are a lot of people in Indianapolis whose resources are untapped," said Mrs. Michael Stevens, 7835 E. 56th, a teacher for three years at St. Luke's grade school. "I'd decided to take a rest, but I'm restless already," she said. "This sounded good."

BUCHWALD TAKES ON THE BANKERS

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1969

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the bankers' Alice-in-Wonderland logic about interest rates is providing much fodder for the humor columnists.

Art Buchwald, in his syndicated column which appears in the Washington Post and other major newspapers across the country, points out the absurdities of the banks' position on their current lending practices. Mr. Buchwald's column is about the only funny thing that is happening over these high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the Record Mr. Buchwald's column of Tuesday, July 8:

Truth-in-Lending Is Taking Fun Out of Loan Business

(By Art Buchwald)

You can read all you want to about high interest rates and the problem the banks are having with "truth in lending," but it's only when you try to make a loan these days that you realize how tough things really are.

My friend Kalshiner went into a bank a few weeks ago to make a $1000 loan. The assistant vice president said, "Yes, I'm sure we can do something."

"That's fine."

"Now the prime rate for loans is 8½ per cent."

"That sounds a little high," said Kalshiner, "but I'll take it."

"I said that was the prime rate. That isn't the rate you get. The prime rate is for our large clients who borrow over $1-million. Our rate to you would be 10 per cent."

"Wow, they should call that the prime rate," Kalshiner said. "It's higher."

"No jokes, Mr. Kalshiner, "we're not in a laughing mood these days."

"Things are tough?"

"You don't know the half of it. Everyone wants money, and we don't have any money. Our safes are practically empty. We just don't know what we're going to do."

"I know what you're going to do."

"What?"

"You're going to raise the prime rate."

"You've been talking to David Rockefeller."

"As a matter of fact, I haven't," Kalshiner said. "But can we get on with my problem?"

"Of course. Now I must warn you that

although we tell you the rate on your loan in 10 per cent, it's really 18.65 per cent."

"Why did you have to tell me that?"

"Because," the vice president said as he put his hand on a Bible, "of the truth-in-lending bill, which requires us to tell you the actual amount of interest as opposed to the interest we advertise."

"Well, why don't you tell the people the actual interest rate in the first place?"

"Because, under the truth-in-lending bill we're not required to do so. Wouldn't you rather think you were paying 10 per cent than 19 per cent?"

"I guess so."

"Now under the Truth-In-Lending Act, I am also required to tell you that we will deduct the first payment and the interest out of your $1000 loan, which will add another 1.94 per cent to your interest charges."

"I knew you'd get over 20 per cent before I got out of here."

"Mr. Kalshiner, if you don't want this loan we can give it to somebody else."

"I'm sorry. I see you still have your hand on the Bible. Is there anything else you want to tell me?"

"There are certain bank handling charges for putting through the loan which will add another 2 per cent."

"Bonnie and Clyde were amateurs compared to you guys," Kalshiner said.

"Mr. Kalshiner, that wasn't a nice thing to say. Do you think we like telling people the truth about our loans? Do you think it's fun to have to keep my hand on this Bible every time someone wants to borrow money? We didn't want the truth-in-lending bill. We fought it, because we knew how unhappy it would make everyone. But it's the law of the land and all the fun has gone out of the loan business."

"I'm sorry," Kalshiner said. "Heck, if I have to pay 23 per cent for a loan it's fine with me."

The vice president put his hand back on the Bible. "Now let me tell you about the postage charges."

LAW AND ORDER

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, recently we have been hearing that the results of the mayorality campaigns in Los Angeles, Minneapolis, and New York could be the prelude to an orgy of "law and order" campaigning in cities across the land this coming election year.

I think the words which were expressed by AFL–CIO President George Meany during last year's presidential campaign on the "law and order" issue are especially timely today in view of recent mayoral elections.

Mr. Meany said:

> No believer in democracy can condone crimes of violence, no matter what the provocation. Riots, assault, arson, looting, and murder are not avenues of protest, they are attacks on society.
>
> But law and order alone, without regard for justice, can be corrupted into a pretext for tyranny. True law and order is not served by equipping police with tanks and machine guns as though the ghetto were the enemy and not the handful of criminals inside it. Yet, better police work is needed, but the way to get it, is through better-trained and better paid policemen operating in a center of justice, not through the indiscriminate use of force against innocent and guilty alike. Nor, is true law and order served, by ill-advised legislative attempts to dilute the constitutional rights of all Americans in the name of police power.
>
> By all means, let there be law and order. Let there be law and order in the cities, but not by the creation of a garrison state.
>
> Let there be law and order in the enforcement of civil rights, in statues and the application of other social welfare legislation.
>
> Let those who cry for more police in the slums cry also for more jobs, more housing and more schools for the prisoners of the slums. Those, too, are the tools of law and order.

As we reflect on the huge problems confronting our cities today, I feel it will bear well for us to keep Mr. Meany's thoughts in mind.

STAN COVELESKIE ELECTED TO BASEBALL HALL OF FAME

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, on July 3 many friends of Stanley Coveleskie, the great major league baseball player of the 1920's, honored him at a parade and dinner in recognition of his induction into the Baseball Hall of Fame later in July.

It was my privilege to attend this testimonial to a man born in 1888, but who has the vigor and appearance of someone in his early sixties. Mr. Coveleskie is a remarkable figure, with his amazing energy, and abounding optimism for the future. Here is a man who started to work as a lad of 12, 6 days a week from 7 a.m. to 6 p.m., at a wage of $3.75 a week. He stated he was concerned about signing his first baseball contract for $250 for the entire season since he felt it was such a vast sum of money. From these meager beginnings, Stan Coveleskie blossomed into one of baseball's real giants, having served in the major league for 14 years. He pitched for the Cleveland Indians and in the 1920 World Series against Brooklyn; Stan allowed 2 runs in 27 innings; thus allowing his team to win all three games. During his years in the American League, 214 games were won over 141 losses. The earned run average was 2.88.

I know Cleveland could not be more proud of their former star hurler than the people of his hometown, Shamokin, Pa. They gave him an enthusiastic ovation during the testimonial and I felt privileged in joining in the salute to Stan Coveleskie. The Shamokin News Item gave the event excellent coverage and I should like to include a portion of the column from their July 5 edition:

STANLEY COVELESKIE FETED DURING PARADE AND PROGRAM IN SHAMOKIN

Residents of the twin communities of Shamokin and Coal Township turned out in force Thursday night to pay tribute to a native son, Stanley Coveleskie, who recently was named to Baseball's Hall of Fame.

Over 400 persons, including young and old, attended the program in Pleasant Hill Lodge, Ranshaw and proudly honored their "distinguished son," a former pitcher for the Cleveland Indians, with gifts and words of praise.

Among the highlights was an informative talk by Coveleskie who fascinated the audience with his vivid memory of the many events that led to his stardom.

He amused the crowd when he said "I did not have enough nerve to sign a contract to play baseball for $250."

Area residents honored Coveleskie with a day of appreciation that will probably linger with the "Hall of Famer" for many years. The day of festivities began with a parade through the business district in his honor.

Coveleskie displayed his warm feelings toward the community when he hinted his desire to return to Shamokin. "I'll come home again sometime," he promised.

The dinner and testimonial program climaxed many weeks of planning by members of the Stanley Coveleskie Day Committee, headed by Alderman B. Lee Morgan, general chairman and long-time friend of Coveleskie.

The native of Shamokin brought wide recognition to the community when he was "finally" given the highest recognition a baseball player can achieve, being named to the Hall of Fame. Coveleskie is one of only 114 major league players in the United States to earn that distinction.

The gala affair took on a carnival atmosphere as the entire group joined in the singing of "For He's A Jolly Good Fellow" and "Take Me Out To The Ballgame." Coveleskie received several lengthy standing ovations from the spirited crowd.

Many gifts were presented to the guest of honor, including a plaque of coal containing pictures of the Coveleskie brothers, who also participated in the national sport. The presentation was made by Edward F. Cove on behalf of the entire Covelskie family. A large number of the family was in attendance.

REPRESENTATIVE CHET HOLIFIELD SPEAKS AT COMMISSIONING OF U.S.S. "NARWHAL"

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on July 12, the U.S.S. *Narwhal*—SSN 671—was commissioned during impressive ceremonies at the U.S. Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn. Highlight of the event was a major seapower speech delivered by our colleague and the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Representative CHET HOLIFIELD of California. The vision and determination of Chairman HOLIFIELD and other members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have done much to insure that we do have the beginnings of a modern nuclear Navy. And the existence of that Navy has done more to convince the Soviet Union to be civilized than any number of conferences, treaties, agreements, and ambassadors. Chairman HOLIFIELD's speech follows:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN CHET HOLIFIELD, CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, AT THE COMMISSIONING OF U.S.S. "NARWHAL" (SSN671), GROTON, CONN., JULY 12, 1969

It is with particular personal pleasure that I speak today at the commissioning of the NARWHAL, for I feel a special attachment to

XUM

this ship. Three and a half years ago I helped to weld my initials into the keel of the *Narwhal*, and I have followed her progress with interest since. Nearly two years ago, on September 9, 1967, my colleague Senator Pastore, then Chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee, gave the principal address at the launching of the *Narwhal*. You will recall that he called for full speed ahead on building an antiballistic system. He also, on behalf of all of us on the Atomic Energy Committee, made some important statements on our nuclear submarine program which I plan to go into later.

You who have given your skills and energies to the development and construction of the NARWHAL can feel justifiable pride in the completion of this outstanding ship. I am sure her performance at sea for our Navy will be a continuing source of pride to us all.

Just 15 years ago, the world's first nuclear submarine, the *Nautilus*, was commissioned at Electric Boat. Today, we have 43 nuclear attack, and 41 Polaris submarines in operation, a total of 84 nuclear submarines. Also, our naval surface fleet has four nuclear powered surface ships in operation. These ships have steamed over 13 million miles. An additional 22 nuclear powered attack submarines and three nuclear powered surface warships have been authorized by Congress, including the turbine-electric submarine being developed by Electric Boat.

The NR–1, the first nuclear powered oceanographic research submarine, is nearing completion at Electric Boat. Because of the vastly increased endurance made possible by nuclear power, the capability of NR–1 will be an order of magnitude greater than that of any other oceanographic vehicle built or planned.

At the same time, development continues on advanced nuclear propulsion plants and longer-life nuclear cores for both submarines and surface warships. The Joint Committee had to give another boost to the AEC's authorization bill this year by adding $4 million for development work on greatly improved nuclear propulsion plants for submarines. This progress in naval nuclear propulsion in the United States in the fifteen years since the *Nautilus* went to sea is remarkable.

This is an accomplishment we are all justly proud of—it was a Herculean task. The difficulty and importance of designing, building, and operating the propulsion plants of our nuclear submarines cannot be overestimated. The very safety of our country may depend on them. For this reason it is essential that centralized responsibility is continued and that doctrinaire administrative practices are not permitted to interfere with the effort.

But as remarkable as our progress has been, the growth of Soviet naval strength in the last few years has been even more remarkable. It is now ominously clear that the Soviet Union is far down the road on a massive naval and maritime program designed to make it the predominant sea power of the world. Since World War II, the Soviet Navy has undergone a far-reaching modernization program, including construction of missile-armed cruisers, helicopter carriers, and many new classes of conventional and nuclear powered submarines. The hard fact is that in less than 25 years Russia has become a major naval power and is determined to be second to none on and under the oceans of the world. At this moment, for the first time in its history, the Soviet Union is using a deployed naval force in support of its foreign policy in areas distant from its own borders. The Soviet force in the Mediterranean includes warships armed with surface-to-surface and surface-to-air missiles, amphibious ships with naval infantry, as well as torpedo attack and missile-armed submarines.

Speaking specifically about submarines, the present Soviet submarine force is a significant threat to our use of the seas and to our country itself. In comparative terms, the Soviet Union now has about 375 submarines, all built since World War II. We have 143, including diesel submarines, most of which are of World War II vintage. In *nuclear* submarines, the United States presently has an advantage of 84 to the Soviets' "65–70" which is all we can say publicly about the Soviets' nuclear submarine fleet; however, it is estimated that by 1974 the Soviets will add about 70 new nuclear submarines to their fleet, while the United States will add but 24. In the last year alone, the Soviets put to sea several new types of nuclear attack submarines and a new type ballistic missile submarine. In contrast to this, we will have completed only one new design submarine in a ten-year period.

In the case of ballistic missile submarines, the Soviets have undertaken a vigorous building program to surpass our *Polaris* fleet of 41 ships. Eight or nine of their new *Polaris*-type submarines have already been launched and a number of these are thought to be operational. It is estimated that today the Soviets have the capability to turn out *Polaris* submarines at the rate of one a month. Since we have no new *Polaris* submarines under construction or planned, we must assume that by the 1973–74 period they will be on a par with us in nuclear propelled *Polaris* type submarines.

At this point let me recall Senator Pastore's remarks at the launching of the *Narwhal*. At that time, he called for a serious consideration of an expanded *Polaris* program and more effort on advanced nuclear attack submarines. In light of Soviet developments in the field of *Polaris* type submarine construction and evidence we now have that the Soviets are actively engaged in a determined effort to acquire the capability to neutralize or destroy our *Polaris* force, the need for getting on with the development and construction of improved attack submarines to protect our *Polaris* fleet against this threat is more urgent than ever.

Though the numerical superiority the Soviets have in submarines is important, the capability of their new submarines is even more significant. We are impressed with the operating characteristics and performances of these new design submarines—in some cases equal to or better than ours.

Although I have singled out the advancements made by the Soviets in the field of submarines, the story in certain other areas of their navy is the same. These facts must lead us to the obvious conclusion that the Soviet leadership has made the decision to build a powerful navy and use it as a means of spreading their influence throughout the world.

I call for a vigorous program to develop and construct improved nuclear submarines, both attack and *Polaris* type. The construction program should be limited only by the capacity of our submarine building facilities. Every one of our obsolete diesel powered U.S. submarines built before and during World War II should be replaced by modern high speed nuclear propelled attack, or *Polaris* type submarines. We can do no less for the sake of National security, in the face of the startling Soviet nuclear submarine building program.

In contrast, let us look to our own shores and see what we are actually doing. It is indeed a sad commentary that the Congress and, in particular, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has had to struggle with the Defense Department over the years in order to get a nuclear navy. This was true with the *Nautilus;* it was true with nuclear powered aircraft carriers and frigates; it has been true with just about every new development in the nuclear navy. For example, approval to proceed with two new and critically needed submarine designs—the quiet turbine-electric drive and the high-speed submarines—was bogged down for several years in Pentagon studies and academic analyses. While we "studied," the Soviets steadily improved their nuclear submarine force. As late as last year, despite the evidence I have just cited on the Soviet naval buildup, the Defense Department recommended to the Congress that the United States not build any additional submarines after those authorized in fiscal year 1970. Congress turned that decision around. In addition, Congress authorized and appropriated funds to begin work on the high-speed submarine after Secretary McNamara turned it down. Had it not been for the initiative of Congress in providing such funds, the Defense Department would probably still be studying the pros and cons instead of proceeding with the high-speed submarine design as it now is.

Getting back to our legislative action on the nuclear warship program, again this year the Defense Department's budget request for fiscal year 1970 did not include the full nuclear warship building funds requested by the Navy. However, the Joint Committee has again taken a strong position in support of a vigorous nuclear warship building program. In our report, we summarized our position as follows:

"The committee, in addition to urging the support of a vigorous research and development effort, wishes to commend to the Congress a strong nuclear warship construction program. In the committee's view, such a program should include as a minimum authorization of the funds necessary to build three high-speed nuclear attack submarines and advance funding for five more; funds to complete the second *Nimitz* class nuclear aircraft carrier, advance funding for the third carrier of this class, and funds for space nuclear propulsion plant components for the entire class; funds for two nuclear frigates, and advance funding for three more.

"Historically, the development of nuclear propulsion has been accomplished largely through the efforts and insistence of the Congress. As recently as last year, while the Department of Defense debated and vacillated over whether to initiate development of a high-speed submarine and to proceed with the quiet electric-drive submarine program, the Congress acted—affirmatively. The Defense Department belatedly but finally recognized the vital importance of these programs and is now supporting them. However, had it not been for the initiative of the Congress in authorizing and appropriating funds for the high-speed submarine program, the Defense Department would not be in a position to proceed with it now. Similar affirmative congressional action is called for now to insure against any slowdown in the development of advanced nuclear propulsion plants—a slowdown that could have a significant adverse impact on our future submarine program."

Today, our military expenditures are being subjected to an unprecedented degree of critical public scrutiny and debate. This is proper and useful, provided the arguments are based on fact. But we must not base our national security policies on wishful thinking or look to academicians for military advice. I can tell you that if the Joint Committee and the President of the United States had taken the advice of the intellectuals and academicians in 1950 we would have been behind the Soviets in developing the hydrogen bomb.

The Soviets did not merely *wish* their submarine force into being, and we cannot wish it away. We must treat it as the hard reality it is. And I wish I could recommend to you a cheap, easy way to insure the continued security of our Nation in the face of this threat. However, the only way I know is to provide the best submarines and surface ships and other military weapons this Nation can develop—and that path is neither cheap nor easy. The Nation and the Navy are at a turning point in their history. The Congress of the United States must take the initiative to insure that the new warships we build for our first line naval striking forces will have nuclear propulsion and to insure that the program for improving and building nuclear submarines is aggressively pursued.

I have been privileged to be a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy since its establishment over 23 years ago. I am particularly proud that the Joint Committee, since its inception, has vigorously supported research and development in the field of naval nuclear propulsion and the construction of new and better nuclear powered ships.

ADMIRAL RICKOVER'S TENURE

In this connection there is another subject which has had the continued vigorous and determined support of the Joint Committee. This is the continuation of Vice Admiral H. G. Rickover as head of the naval nuclear propulsion program.

Earlier this week I was delighted to hear that the Secretary of the Navy with the strong urging of Admiral Moorer, Chief of Naval Operations, had decided to continue Admiral Rickover on active duty for a period of two additional years. I made mention of this on the floor of the House of Representatives, and I commended my former colleague, now the Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Melvin Laird. I am confident that his advice and counsel, based on his experience on the House Appropriations Committee where he had an opportunity to review Admiral Rickover's contribution to the security of the Nation, were effective in the decision announced by the Secretary of the Navy.

ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN NATIONS IN THE FIELD OF NUCLEAR PROPULSION

There is another subject I would like to mention. Over the past decade, the United States has received numerous requests from friendly governments that we sell them nuclear powered submarines or provide them with our technology to enable them to build their own. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as well as other Congressional groups, is firmly opposed to disseminating this sensitive information abroad.

First, we believe this invaluable and hard-earned technology must be given the greatest possible degree of protection against compromise to hostile powers—this would not be the case if it were made available to other countries. Second, we do not believe it would be prudent to increase the number of countries possessing this vital element of the *Polaris* delivery capability. Finally, since few, if any, of our allies have the resources to build more than one or two nuclear ships, even with our help, the military advantage to the allied mutual defense would be extremely slight.

The Joint Committee does not consider this small advantage justifies the considerable risk of our nuclear propulsion technology being compromised. This is particularly true during this critical period of an ever increasing Soviet threat. I can assure you there is no change in the Joint Committee's position on this important question.

I am hopeful that this Administration will provide the leadership and initiative necessary to build and maintain an adequate nuclear submarine force and surface fleet for the critical period that lies ahead. I am confident that such a program will meet with the approval of the Congress. I assure you that it will have the vigorous and determined support of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

To the officers and men of the *Narwhal*—smooth sailing and Godspeed. Each of us shares the hope that you will sail in peaceful waters and will never be called upon to fight. But if you are, we also share an absolute confidence in your capabilities. This ship is the finest product ever constructed by our shipbuilding industry. Her officers and men along with those who man our nuclear navy are the most carefully selected, the best trained and educated, and the most dedicated naval seamen the world has ever known. We will continue to provide you with the best ships and weapons possible. But it is in your patriotism, courage, and dedication that we truly place our confidence. It is these ingredients which are the true strength of the Navy and our Nation.

A LETTER OF INTEREST

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from a constituent of mine, Mr. Tim Hostiuck, which I feel is worthy of note by all Members of this body. I include his letter in the RECORD:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *June 27, 1969.*

DEAR SIR: I would like to comment on President Nixon's recent commencement addresses at Beadle State College and the Air Force Academy. With respect to the former speech on student unrest, I feel well qualified to comment, since I am a student myself and am just now ending my seventh year of college life. If we were to resort to traditional political dichotomism, I would probably be classified by others as a conservative, though I personally object to the term in its current connotation. To compound this, I live in a conservative city (Columbus) in a conservative state (Ohio) and attend a conservative university (Ohio State University). Indeed, I am probably a perfect representative of the silent and so-called apathetic majority of college students. To live in such an environment, however, is not to distort my perceptions to the point of ignorance as some might want to claim. Rather, my environment tends only to color my opinions; and in this regard I am no less human than any other student, for none is exempt from this external influence.

Having so characterized myself, let us now get back to the President's comments. You see, Mr. Nixon suffers from a socially imposed affliction similar to my own. He is a traditionalist or a conservative of what have you—or at least this is what he is commonly held to be among laymen. But to label him as such does not get at the true value of what he says. The question is not whether he is a conservative or a liberal; the question is whether he is right or wrong or more accurately whether he is heading in the right direction or the wrong direction.

From his personal value system, the President must judge the nation's youth, and no one would question his belief in the vitality and promise of the majority of our youth. Many do question, however, the beliefs he holds regarding a minority of our youth. This country has unquestionably become youth oriented—perhaps too much so. Leaders everywhere are bending to their will, gaining short-run relief to the sacrifice of the long-run good.

To be sure there is legitimate complaint in the campus movement—too long have students been on the short end of communications while professors struggle for professional survival in a system which tangibly rewards research while recognizing excellent pedagogy with but a pat on the back. There is, however, illegitimate complaint on the campus which is aimed at nothing less than the demise of our educational institutions. It is aimed not at responsible and internally generated reform but unresponsible and externally imposed destruction.

Administrators steeped in shortsightedness are reluctant to stamp out the bad for fear of obliterating that intermingled bit of legitimacy, despite the fact that both can be dealt with separately. In addition, they act in accordance with the aforementioned youth phobia and fail to recognize that there is nothing inherent in the youth movement that makes it right. True it is for change, but often only change for the sake of change or for the sake of destruction and not change for constructive purposes. The President is right in recognizing this movement for what it is and in calling for college administrators to consider the long-run consequences of their acts.

Now to move on to the closely related question of recent attitudes toward defense—closely related in that it concerns the opinion of the nation's youth. The reaction on the part of much of the news media to the President's Air Force Academy address was appalling. For the first time in his presidency, Mr. Nixon attacked major political figures. Immediately the news media (notably NBC) reacted irresponsibly. Unlike the era of the Johnson Administration when they were content to report only what was said, the news media judged Mr. Nixon's speech from their own political frameworks. They attacked what he did not say, contorted what he did say, accused him of reverting to his "pre-election" ways and of interjecting his own value system into the defense question.

To this press reaction let me first say that some of the news media have failed in their responsibility in that they have unduly distorted and misinterpreted what the President said. They have also demonstrated a lack of restraint in attacking the President's first really scorching words—it's as if they were lying in wait. To this end they have done this country a disservice, for the President desperately desires to, is trying to, and must communicate with the citizenry in his terms—instead his communications are distorted by the news media.

Some reporters say that the President showed his colors in his defense address. Is not this why the people elected him—to exercise his beliefs which supposedly reflect their own. Must a President become a meaningless mold of all public opinion and try to accommodate everyone and thereby accommodate no one. Did we not have enough of this leaderless leadership in the Johnson era. The President is supposed to take a stance—that's why he in particular was elected. Responsible dissent may object to the stance taken but not to the act of taking a stance.

Some reporters also say that the President created a straw man, that no responsible leader is calling for unilateral disarmament and that there is no field day on the defense establishment. Of course, the President knows that no responsible leader is explicitly saying these things. But this is not the point and it demonstrates the extent to which Mr. Nixon feels the pulse of the nation while others blindly condemn him. Of concern to the President is the image held by the public of the attack on the defense establishment; i.e., their perception of what is happening, particularly the perceptions of college students.

Despite the actual words being said, the grandiose fashion in which such weighty figures as Senator Fulbright are criticizing military spending gives the impression of an impending military state. The President, as he explicitly remarked in his speech, is for constructive criticism but he is against the fear and distrust of the military being built into the citizenry, especially young radicals who are anxiously waiting to branch out

XUM

from the Fulbright-type base to more extreme positions. There is no straw man then; there is a very real negative image of the military's purpose which fortunately the President is perceptive enough to see.

Mr. Nixon, despite how one feels about his opinions and values, should be applauded by *all* for attempting to exercise an *active* leadership and for having the courage to come face to face with reality and not some self-centered microcosm of it.

Respectfully yours,

TIM HOSTIUCK.

WISCONSIN GUIDANCE SYSTEM TO CONTROL FIRST MOON LANDING

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Dr. B. Paul Blasingame, general manager of the AC Electronics Division of the General Motoors Corp. of Milwaukee, has provided me with information on the Wisconsin-produced guidance system which will be used by the astronauts in their first history-making moon landing.

I believe this information will be of interest to the millions of Americans and others throughout the world who will be "in the gallery" for this epochal event. I include Dr. Blasingame's information in the RECORD:

GM GUIDANCE PROGRAMED TO CONTROL FIRST MOON LANDING

The first manned landing on the moon and liftoff from it are programmed to be controlled by the space-proven Guidance and Navigation (G&N) system in the Apollo Lunar Module (LM).

To begin the dramatic landing sequence, the General Motors–AC Electronics system controls the Descent Orbit Insertion (DOI) firing of the LM descent engine behind the moon, out of touch with Mission Control in Houston. DOI lowers the orbit of the LM, so that its eight mile low point comes some 15 degrees and about 260 nautical miles before landing site two.

As the low point approaches, Apollo 11 Commander Neil A. Armstrong and LM pilot Edwin E. Aldrin will enter Program 63 (P–63) into the G&N computer, calling for the Power Descent Initiation (PDI) firing of the throttleable descent engine, to start the LM down toward the landing site.

Seconds before planned PDI ignition, the computer's display and keyboard (DSKY) will flash its "proceed" button, asking the astronauts if they agree the engine should be fired as planned.

The push of that button will permit a completely automatic descent and landing under G&N control, which incorporates landing radar readouts. Meanwhile the astronauts monitor G&N and double check to be sure they are headed for a reasonably smooth, flat area. Thrusting in program 63 reduces relative ground speed to some 350 mph before the program switches automatically to P–64 and at 150 feet altitude to P–65 for the gentle, two-mile-per-hour final approach and touchdown.

Though it is planned that Armstrong and Aldrin will leave the G&N in its automatic mode until the final portion of the descent, they still can use hand controllers to make minor corrections of spacecraft attitude, basing their corrections on instruments driven by the G&N system. Rate of descent and total attitude are regulated automatically.

During the final portion of the descent, the crew can exert more direct control over the final touchdown point and velocities by selecting from two other programs: P–66 (semiautomatic) or P–67 (manual), though once they choose either of these programs—via DSKY entry—they cannot return to the automatic sequence. In P–66, total attitude is handled manually. The G&N system controls the rate of descent, though a flip of an instrument panel switch provides a one-foot-per-second variation in the descent rate. Complete manual control is provided by P–67.

The AC Electronics G&N systems in both the Command and Lunar Modules will be put to the test throughout the Apollo 11 lunar landing mission—from launch to splashdown.

During launch the AC Electronics Command Module (CM) system backstops the launch vehicle guidance package, and is able to turn over manual control of the rocket to the astronauts if the primary unit should fail.

In addition to the ascent and descent burns, AC Electronics systems control all other major firings of main engines in both spacecraft—the big service propulsion system (SPS) of the Command and Service Modules (CSM) combination, and the descent and ascent propulsion systems (DPS and APS) in the LM.

Four of the most critical of these firings—two lunar orbit insertion burns (LOI–1 and 2), DOI and transearth injection (TEI)—are controlled by G&N behind the moon—out of "sight" of NASA radar tracking and radio communication.

The astronauts will use the Command Module G&N System to determine their position in space and in lunar orbit, as a correlation with NASA's radar tracking. Should communications fail, the G&N would become the only position reference for the trip home.

While Armstrong and Aldrin are performing separate maneuvers with the LM, Command Module pilot Michael Collins uses the G&N optics to track the landing vehicle, during descent and ascent should a rescue rendezvous of the landing vehicle be necessary.

Each G&N system also maintains the attitude of its spacecraft when the two vehicles are separated. When they are docked, one of the systems (usually in the Command Module) will control attitude. Thus, the systems will be in control of both spacecraft virtually at all times during the mission.

Finally, the AC Electronics G&N system guides the spacecraft through the critical entry corridor at the edge of the earth's atmosphere, to a point just before drogue parachute deployment.

Heart of the G&N system is the inertial measurement unit (IMU), which consists of a gyroscopically stabilized platform mounted within gimbals which allow the spacecraft to move in any direction while the platform remains fixed in inertial space. Accelerometers, which measure changes in velocity, also are mounted on this platform. From the stable platform, all changes in the spacecraft's attitude, speed, and direction are measured and accumulated by the system's guidance computer. The computer controls the overall G&N operation, and issues guidance commands based in part on information from the IMU.

The optical subsystem, consisting of a one-power telescope and 28-power sextant in the CSM, is a very precise refinement of seafaring navigational instruments. In the LM, only a one-power alignment optical telescope (AOT) is provided. The CSM optical subsystem permits the astronauts to find their position in space relative to the moon and the planets, and to realign their stabilized inertial platform to star references. In addition, spacecraft attitude is verified periodically by sextant star sightings.

During the mission the astronauts will use the optics in both spacecraft to realign the stable platform several times, because:

Even the most precise gyroscopes accumulate minor errors or "drift" over a period of time, but alignment can correct for this drift.

For the most precise measurement of velocity change during a major thrusting maneuver, it is best to have the accelerometers properly aligned for the burn. Usually alignment is performed before every engine firing to accomplish this.

Normally the platform is aligned to its most convenient reference. For example, at launch, alignment is to a launch pad reference; in mid-course, to the stars; at the moon, to the landing site; and near entry, to certain entry coordinates.

Accelerometers also can develop some minor errors, or inherent bias. But as is the case with gyros, the bias usually is a known quantity, a definite signature developed through exhaustive testing of the instrument from the day it was built right up to mission time. The bias factors are programmed into the computer, which compensates for them when computing velocity change.

On their way to and from the moon, the astronauts correlate their position with the ground's radar tracking estimate by using the G&N system's sextant to make star-horizon or star-landmark fixes. The sightings are used to update their onboard state vector—position and velocity estimate—which would become critical if communications failed.

When the LM guidance and navigation system is powered up, the LM's IMU will be aligned initially using coordinates voiced from the CSM. After the two spacecraft separate the astronauts in the LM will take star sightings to perform IMU alignments. One of their first duties after landing on the moon is to perform optical alignment.

LAUNCH AND ORBITAL INSERTION

The CSM guidance and navigation system will be turned on and aligned to a launch pad reference at T–48 hours, and will not be powered down during the mission—until just before splashdown some 240 hours later. Here is a G&N mission sketch:

During launch and earth parking orbit insertion by the Saturn V rocket, guidance and control normally are the responsibility of the system in the instrument unit (IU) of the S–IVB third stage, while the AC Electronics system monitors IU guidance performance and displays for the astronauts the spacecraft's attitude and velocity.

If the launch vehicle inertial platform should fail, the AC system can provide the astronauts with a means to assume steering control and either continue or abort the mission as required.

TRANSLUNAR INJECTION (TLI)

During the second revolution of the 100 nautical mile high circular parking orbit the instrument unit will control a restart of the S–IVB to place the combined vehicles in a free return trajectory to the moon (so that if no lunar orbit were attempted, the spacecraft would merely circle the moon and return to earth). The AC system monitors this maneuver, and again provides takeover capability should trouble develop in the launch vehicle inertial platform.

TRANSPOSITION, DOCKING AND LM EXTRACTION

Soon after TLI, the astronauts will control separation, transposition and docking with the LM, then ease the moon vehicle from its S–IVB adapter. After the docked spacecraft makes a short evasive burn using the Service Propulsion System (SPS), the S–IVB's remaining fuel will be vented, accelerating it into a solar orbit.

TRANSLUNAR COAST (TLC)

On the 73-hour coasting flight to the moon, the AC G&N system will control up to four mid-course corrections, though on past missions most of these adjustments have not been required.

LUNAR ORBIT INSERTION (LOI-1 AND LOI-2)

At the moon the G&N system will control insertion of the two Apollo spacecraft into a 60 by 170 nautical mile lunar orbit. Two revolutions later, it will direct the SPS engine to fire again to circularize the orbit at approximately 60 nautical miles. Both burns will be behind the moon with no coverage by NASA's Manned Space Flight Network (MSFN). LM pilot Aldrin will enter the LM for the first time toward the end of the third lunar orbit for a two hour check of communications systems and general housekeeping chores, while CM pilot Collins performs orbital navigation, tracking landmarks with the G&N optical subsystem.

DESCENT ORBIT INSERTION (DOI)

In the eleventh orbit, after a rest period in the Command Module, spacecraft commander Armstrong and LM pilot Aldrin will occupy the LM. This time they will power up and check all LM systems and align its IMU for the first time. Collins will perform more landmark tracking from the CSM. In the 13th lunar revolution the two spacecraft will separate and the LM descent will begin, under G&N control and without MSFN coverage. The DOI-descent propulsion system (DPS) burn will lower the LM altitude to 8 nautical miles as its closest point. During the LM coasting descent, Collins will track it from the CSM with the G&N optics.

POWERED DESCENT AND LANDING

With the astronauts again in contact with earth, the G&N system initiates the key PDI burn which begins the vehicle's powered descent toward a gentle landing on the surface. If the astronauts wish, the guidance system can control the entire landing sequence automatically, while they monitor the progress of the descent. The G&N system processes and displays range and range rate information from the landing radar and attitude data from the IMU. In the latter phase of descent the astronauts can take over manual control and fly the LM to touchdown.

Soon after landing, the G&N's IMU is realigned using AOT star sightings, so that a G&N-controlled liftoff can be performed right away if necessary. Alignment is repeated again before the actual liftoff.

ASCENT AND RENDEZVOUS

When the lunar stay is concluded, the G&N system will automatically control the firing of the LM's ascent engine. The descent stage will be used as a launch pad for liftoff, to start Armstrong and Aldrin toward a rendezous in orbit with the Command Module.

After the LM is safely in orbit, the G&N system controls the three firings of the small LM reaction control system rockets to enable the spacecraft to rendezvous and dock with the CSM. Further braking burns are under manual control as the LM G&N system displays rendezvous radar data during the rendezvous sequence. Between rendezvous burns, the Command Module pilot again will use the G&N system's sextant to track it. Rendezvous manuevers are calculated by the G&N computers aboard the CSM and LM.

After the two LM astronauts finish their tasks in that spacecraft and crawl back into the CM with their lunar samples, the LM will be jettisoned and left in orbit around the moon.

TRANSEARTH INJECTION (TEI)

In the 30th revolution, the G&N system will control the SPS burn behind the moon which propels the CSM out of lunar orbit and back toward earth.

TRANSEARTH COAST (TEC)

During the two-and-a-half day trip home, the astronauts may make up to three midcourse corrections, though on Apollo 8 and again on Apollo 10, the transearth injection was so accurate that only one minor correction was needed.

ENTRY

The AC Electronics guidance and navigation system will control the 25,000 mile per hour entry into the earth's atmosphere automatically. The system will continue spacecraft guidance until just before drogue parachute deployment, as it did with such great accuracy on previous Apollo missions. On Apollo 9 and 10, the world watched as the spacecraft drifted down within range of television cameras aboard the recovery aircraft carrier.

The system controls speed and attitude during entry by rotating the spacecraft about its offset center of gravity, thus changing the direction of the aerodynamic lift. The system calculates how much and in which direction the spacecraft should be rolled to achieve the desired parachute deployment point. The system also calculates and shows the astronauts their anticipated splashdown point, the only variable being surface winds in the landing area.

AC is prime contractor to NASA for manufacture, assembly, subsystem integration and testing of the Apollo G&N systems. Major subcontractors are the Equipment Division of Raytheon Co., Sudbury, Mass., for the digital computer and associated displays and keyboards; and Kollsman Instrument Corp., Syosset, N.Y., a division of Standard Kollsman Industries, for the optical subsystem.

CUSTOMS COURT REFORM

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a bill to improve the judicial machinery in the customs courts by amending the statutory provisions relating to judicial actions and administrative proceedings in customs matters.

Over $3 billion in customs duties were collected last year. This is a very sharp increase over previous years. It reflects, of course, the great increase in imports into the United States. But one clear consequence of this situation is an upward trend in challenges by importers to duties assessed against them by the Bureau of the Customs.

The caseload of customs cases is very impressive. In fiscal 1963, the Customs Court received about 35,000 new cases; in fiscal 1968, this figure had increased to 108,000.

At the end of fiscal 1963, 186,000 cases were pending in the Customs Court; at the end of March 1969, there were over 439,000 cases pending.

The Bureau of Customs and the Customs Court are presently operating under outmoded procedural arrangements that hamper them in dealing with this great volume of work. The bill I am introducing will, I believe, provide new procedures that will reduce the volume of new cases and will permit the court to act more effectively and expenditiously on the cases that are filed.

Many hands have contributed to the present draft. Former Supreme Court Justice Tom C. Clark, Chief Judge Rao of the Customs Court, Treasury, and Justice officials, and representatives of interested groups, such as the importers and members of the bar have all worked together to produce these much needed reforms.

PRESS FAILURE AT THE PENTAGON

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Clark Mollenhoff has again done a fine piece of reporting. He has pointed the finger where it should be pointed.

Mr. Mollenhoff is no stranger to this body. He has been with the Washington Bureau of Cowles Publications since 1950, and is a Pulitzer Prize winner.

I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD the story he wrote for the Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors entitled "Press Faillure at the Pentagon."

I know my colleagues will be much enlightened by what he has to say:

PRESS FAILURE AT THE PENTAGON

(By Clark R. Mollenhoff)

In the spring of 1969, it was fashionable to assign a reporter or a group of reporters to do what was considered "an in-depth series" on the military-industrial complex, and the multibillion-dollar Pentagon bungles of the last few years. Newspapers, magazines, radio and television suddenly were busy trying to catch up with the important task of reporting, interpreting and policing a department that had been spending between $40 billion and $80 billion a year for a decade.

In the light of the handicap imposed in being suddenly tossed into this impossible job, many of the reporters did a useful but somewhat tardy job in calling public attention to a decade of corruption, mismanagement and waste in the operations of the Defense Department.

The research was not too difficult on the major problems, for a few of us have written books and extensive articles spelling out the details of the blundering on the TFX, the X-22, the decision to make the U.S.S. John F. Kennedy a conventional carrier and a wide range of cases of minor blundering, "conflicts of interest" and misrepresentations to the public and Congress on military problems. The hearings and reports of Congressional committees, and the debates on military budget provided considerable information that many of us had been writing about for years.

The public and many editors were suddenly hit with a shocking picture of the misuse of the tremendous power of the Pentagon's multibillion-dollar budget. There appears to be a sudden realization that regional political favoritism, "conflicts of interest" and cozy dealings with big and little defense contractors can be a drain on the taxpayers and detrimental to the goal of producing the best weapons systems for the best price. There could have been an understanding years earlier if the press had done its job.

There was a sudden realization that there are certain inherent problems in any easy flow of personnel, military or civilian, between the major defense industries and the highest policy positions in the Pentagon. And, there was new understanding of the evil influence across the entire Defense Department when the highest officials—some civilian and some military—give false testimony under oath, force subordinate officials to give false or slanted testimony and use the full power of the bureaucracy to demote, discipline or fire the dissenters who insist upon telling the truth.

Also, a part of the power picture that is now appearing in many publications is the interplay of forces in the Congress and the Defense Department, with cooperative senators and congressmen receiving favored treatment, while uncooperative senators and congressmen are punished and maligned.

While the picture of corruption and mismanagement at the Pentagon is shocking, it is equally shocking to examine the record of the American press during the last decade. Why has it just dawned upon the press—newspapers, magazines, radio and television—that the spending of half of the national budget and the status of our national defense is worth covering week by week? Why did the press permit itself to be dominated and overwhelmed in many cases by the propaganda of a centralized Pentagon press office that claimed a new scientific "cost-effective" system was saving billions of dollars every year?

It would be rather easy to do a devastating series of articles on the superficiality and the laxity of the American press in dealing with the corruption and the mismanagement in the Pentagon. Congressional investigations of Pentagon corruption and mismanagement were virtually ignored by the wire services, Washington specials and radio and and television. Where there was coverage it was usually short, superficial and more confusing than enlightening.

The editorial comment by most major newspapers was influenced by the lack of coverage in the news columns, or the superficiality of the coverage by commentators on radio and television, the columnists or the barrage of propaganda flowing from the new centralized Pentagon press office. The self-serving declarations of the Defense Secretary were accepted and printed as truths, even when they were clearly contradicted by a body of testimony and documentation. The evidence of the clearest "conflicts of interest" was ignored or excused by reporters and by the editorial writers who found it easier to accept the unsupported statements or conclusions of a President, a Defense Secretary or other political figure with an obvious stake in the story than to be concerned with the other evidence.

Editors cannot come to grips with the Pentagon from a point several hundred or several thousand miles from Washington unless they have reliable and tough-minded channels of information. Many influences have cluttered and contaminated those channels in recent years. Not the least of these has been the radio and television coverage.

While radio and television can do a great job on some subjects, there has been a glaring weakness in the manner in which the broadcast industry has dealt with the hard problems of covering corruption, mismanagement and waste at the Defense Department as well as in other government agencies.

Television is show business, and the show business aspect influences news coverage and public affairs programs. A big news story may get two or three minutes, which is for the most part confined to the most colorful or provocative statements on one or on both sides of an issue. Corruption or mismanagement is charged and denied with no real effort to explore the depth of proof beyond the self-serving statements of the spokesmen for the two sides. Viewers are influenced by the looks, the brief comment or by the facial expression of the commentator as much as they are by facts and depth of proof. It is not unusual for such programs to be devoid of facts or documentation on even the most important Defense Department issue.

While most editors are aware of these weaknesses in broadcast journalism, they are (like most of us) influenced to some degree by this most powerful medium in their assessment of the wire services and their own Washington correspondent.

While television seldom leads the way in challenging the press office of a government agency, particularly the Defense Department, it can be a tremendous influence in the way it takes up the fight on some issue or treats the issue as inconsequential and unworthy of air time.

Seldom do editors give any thought to the influences that have tended to keep the network newsmen and commentators from challenging the Defense Department's bosses or the White House. Broadcast journalism requires special access to the Defense Secretary, other high Defense officials and White House personnel. Certainly everyone can cover the regular press conferences, but it is a coup to arrange one of those "special" interviews on an exclusive basis. Such "specials" go to a favorite network or even a favorite newsman, usually the apologists. Specials seldom are arranged for men who question the honesty, integrity or judgment of high officials of the Defense Department.

Since there is really no effective way to change this system, editors should in most instances disregard the television news shows in making their judgments about either the wire service coverage or the coverage by their own Washington correspondent.

Wire service reporters assigned to the Pentagon, are usually overworked with routine and faced with ground rules that make it difficult to dig beyond the self-serving statements of the Defense press office.

The penalties for being a few minutes behind on a routine newsstory are such that they force bright, able and energetic reporters to accept Pentagon discipline and avoid rocking the boat. Aggressive independence can represent a serious handicap with too few compensations.

The Washington special correspondence operating out of a one- or two-man bureau, can lead an even more harried life than the wire service reporter who is permanently assigned to the Pentagon. Editors who would never expect one local reporter to be expert on city, county and state affairs, think nothing of expecting "instant expertise" from the one or two men they assign to Washington. Most correspondents understand their inability to be instant experts on all they are asked to do, but do develop a fine facility for quick research and fast, smooth writing that often passes for expertise.

But this kind of an operation is superficial and relies too much upon quick information from government press offices or Washington lobbyists. It is easier to go along with the viewpoint of the White House or a big agency in most cases, and it can take tremendous time and energy to carry the burden of an assault on the opinions or decisions of a government agency. The task can seem overwhelming when it involves a challenge to the biggest and most complicated Washington establishment, the Pentagon. A few make periodic challenges to the Pentagon propaganda position, but most give up in frustration after concluding that few in the press really see or care about the implications of mismanagement, corruption and waste that have been unearthed.

Although I am sympathetic with the problems faced in covering Defense spending, I do not want the sympathy to be interpreted as a justification for a continuation of the incompetence and superficiality of the past press performance. While the problems of covering an $80-billion-a-year agency are too numerous to mention here, we cannot afford to let the size of the problems be used to excuse future press failure. The press has a great responsibility that cannot be brushed aside.

The Pentagon spends half of our federal budget and has the responsibility for providing a modern defense system to protect this nation from all its enemies. Every bit of corruption, political favoritism, mismanagement or waste steals money from the taxpayers. More important, it cuts into the muscle of real defenses, saps the strength of the nation and could leave us as a second-rate power even as we spend our way into bankruptcy.

In the face of a host of international problems, and the turmoil at home over real and imagined wrongs in our society, it is essential that we take stringent measures to eliminate corruption. Honest government is not only practical, it is vital to our future. It is time for the press to eliminate some of the smart cynicism that tolerates corruption and mismanagement. It is time to exhibit some outrage at dishonest or political administration or the Defense Department, or any other agency of government including the courts.

Every story of Defense Department corruption is worth total pursuit by the press until the corrupter pays a penalty, or the mismanager is exposed and labeled for what he is.

Those who lie or misrepresent to hide the corruption and mismanagement should be exposed and criticized for precisely what they have done as accomplices after the fact. The point must be made that liars and falsifiers cannot be tolerated in high government office, and that the higher the office the man holds the higher the price he must pay for his falsification. This has not been the case.

The political defenders of those engaged in either crime or the cover-up of crime should be held accountable for either lack of judgment or for knowingly condoning dishonesty in government. Nothing less than such a massive assault on corruption and mismanagement will have any more than minor impact upon the problem facing the United States today.

The present press emphasis on coverage of the Pentagon might lead one to believe that newspapers, magazines, radio and television have finally learned the vital lessons after a decade of swallowing big chunks of Pentagon propaganda. Certainly no one can now say that the press is "soft on the Pentagon," but even that coverage is superficial. Week after week the stories pour out on the evil "military-industrial complex" with statistics on the number of generals and admirals who work for major defense contractors, and statistics on the increased concentration of defense contracts in the hands of fewer and fewer contractors. Always there is mention of the billions wasted through cancellation of major defense contracts that failed to meet standards, and there are the stories of the $2 billion overruns on the C–5A cargo plane contract, the mismanagement on the Cheyenne helicopter contract, and of course, the multibillion-dollar bungle on the infamous TFX contract. But there is little effort to report details of specific crimes and trace the responsibility.

Reporters who should know better have painted with a broad brush of truth, half-truth and distortion. There is a lack of precision in placing the responsibility for the Pentagon decisions on the civilian boss or the military officer who sold out the public trust. Usually there are only the broadest hints that something is wrong without specifying the crime.

With the broad sweep and lack of precision of a cartoonist, reporters have placed the blame for waste, corruption and mismanagement at the feet of "the military-industrial complex." Without using names, admirals and generals are pictured as corrupt or stupid. Senators and congressmen are often characterized as incompetent or corrupt parties to the waste of millions or billions, though no details are spelled out.

The facts are usually accurate, but a close reading of many of these series shows continuation of much of the same superficiality

XUM

that permeated the Pentagon coverage in the period prior to 1969. Some of the writers seemed bent upon proving a preconceived notion that the generals and admirals, the senior men on the Armed Services committees of the House and the Senate and the bosses of defense industries, have conspired to push the United States into the Vietnam war and other confrontations for the sake of business profits, promotions and political deals.

Certainly there has been waste and mismanagement, but the evidence hardly sustains the general conspiracy theory. There are instances of corruption and mismanagement involving generals, admirals, members of the Senate and House, officials of defense industries and the politically-appointed civilian bosses of the Pentagon. But, somehow many of the stories either ignore the dominant role of the political bosses at the Pentagon or tend to absolve them from blame for what has gone wrong.

Often the reporting of scandals is handled in such a loose manner that blame is placed on "the Pentagon" or "the Air Force" or "the Navy." The impression is given that the Nixon Administration or Defense Secretary Melvin Laird has the responsibility for what has taken place in 1963 or 1968. Seldom, if ever, is the name of former Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara mentioned in a critical manner, even when he was personally involved in the questionable decision or when the decision was dictated out of his office under some much-heralded new system that was to save billions of tax dollars.

Frequently, the whole mess of scandals originating under the Kennedy or Johnson administrations are lumped together and presented as evidence of a general Pentagon laxity. Then this Pentagon laxity is projected into certain waste of money if President Nixon's Safeguard antiballistic missile program is permitted to move forward. Certainly past scandals should serve as a warning about what could happen to the ABM in the future, but unless there is direct connection these should not serve as arguments for rejecting a program that the President and the Defense Secretary believe is essential.

The merits of constructing the Safeguard ABM should be considered by the press and the public without regard for scandals of an earlier administration, unless there is some evidence of misjudgments or misrepresentations of the Safeguard decision that are clearly linked to the past scandals.

The press cannot be permitted to plead that secrecy hid the scandals that originated in the McNamara years. Certainly the Defense Secretary and his press office tried to hide the record, issued orders to bar honest disclosure of the record and even misrepresented the facts to the committees of Congress.

However, over a period of months the facts did become available on such major scandals as the award of the TFX contract, and a dozen lesser scandals. The implications were obvious. The facts were available in the hearings of the McClellan Permanent Investigating Subcommittee, and in the testimony of Secretary McNamara and other high Defense Department officials who reluctantly testified under oath. I wrote detailed accounts on the TFX, the X–22 and the nuclear carrier dispute in a book called "Despoilers of Democracy" that was published in 1965, and covered a host of other scandals in depth in "The Pentagon" published in 1967. Millions of words were written for The Des Moines Register on these and other Pentagon problems.

This reporter was not alone in writing of detailed evidence of scandals and mismanagement. Hanson Baldwin, the distinguished Pulitzer Prize-winning military analyst of The New York Times, reported periodically on a host of serious Pentagon problems under the "McNamara Monarchy." George Wilson, of Aviation Week, and later with The Washington Post, did a consistent, tough-minded job on the TFX and other Air Force projects despite the propaganda flow from the Pentagon press office. Sanford Watzman of the Washington Bureau of the Cleveland Plain Dealer did a brilliant and thorough job of exposing the manner in which the McNamara Pentagon was failing to enforce the so-called Truth-in-Negotiations law of 1962. Charles Nicodemus of the Chicago Daily News was persistent as well as imaginative as he unearthed the entire series of scandals that poisoned the M–16 rifle program. Richard Elliott of Barron's Weekly did a great job of following up on the TFX contract and exposing the troubles that plagued the Navy version, the F–111B, until it was killed by Congress in 1968.

If there had been a dozen more reporters digging into the Pentagon to pull out the facts on scandals and reporting on the top level responsibility, for those scandals it could have forced some early assessment of many of those programs and would have resulted in better decisions on later programs. As it was, the critics of the McNamara Pentagon were drowned out by the noncritical and fawning coverage of McNamara by many magazine writers, columnists, and Pentagon specialists who apparently believed they needed a continuing pleasant personal relationship with the Defense Secretary.

It is the job of the American editors to create the conditions in which reporters covering government can exhibit aggressive independence without having their heads chopped off because they do not have rapport with the Defense Secretary for the intimate backgrounders. Wire service executives and the editors who deal with them must make certain the Pentagon reporter is motivated more by the necessity for doing a tough job than with the necessity for being fed routine stories at the same time a competing service receives it.

If the reporter believes he works for an organization that believes in aggressive independence, then the reporter will probably be aggressive and independent. If editors want the routine bunk that is fed out through the press office, then that is what they will get from the wire services and from their own specials.

The record of past press blunders has been available for years:

1. Control of the Pentagon was centralized in the Office of Defense Secretary. Instead of examining this action with a critical eye the press applauded it and viewed it as some move that would put the professional military men in their place.

2. The press office was centralized under the Office of Defense Secretary, and a broad range of practices instituted that tended to crush dissent. There were a few whimpers by the press, but many were unconcerned.

3. The TFX was awarded arbitrarily to the high bidder with the second best plane and over the unanimous recommendations of the Pentagon source selection board. Many editors bought the McNamara explanation without close examination and even managed to applaud an arbitrary award to General Dynamics (the embodiment of the military-industrial complex) as a blow against the complex.

4. The "conflicts of interest" in the TFX contract were documented fully as early as 1963, but most newspapers ignored it. Some even defended it editorially and followed a line that was right out of the mouth of the top Pentagon press spokesman.

5. Defense Secretary McNamara's claim of billions in savings were accepted and praised without careful examination, yet there was little or no coverage by most newspapers of the details of House hearings that proved most of the claimed "savings" were hogwash.

6. There was wide coverage of McNamara's establishment of the Defense Contract Audit Agency, and acceptance of the fact that this was to be a big money saver. There was little attention to the huge costs this added to the Pentagon budget, and no concern over the fact that the existence of the Defense Contract Audit Agency was used to justify cutting the scope of the outside audit by the GAO.

These are only a few of the blunders of the Defense Department and of the press in the last decade. Although I have hit them briefly here, I have covered them in detail in books, speeches and in news stories over the last eight years.

I believe it should be sufficient here to make the point that the press let itself be caught up in depth coverage of a lot of glamour projects, but failed to do a thorough job of going behind the Pentagon press line on the vital issues of honesty and integrity.

GOVERNOR REAGAN'S AEROSPACE-AVIATION EDUCATION TASK FORCE

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, on June 16, it was my privilege, as chairman of Gov. Ronald Reagan's aerospace-aviation education task force, to join him in launching this vital and dynamic education program in California. In view of tomorrow's launch of Apollo 11, I would like to take this opportunity to place in the RECORD the remarks made by both Governor Reagan and myself, since the subject matter of aviation and aerospace technology is of such timely interest.

This task force established by Governor Reagan is a first in the Nation. Once again, he has demonstrated that he is a man of vision—one who strongly believes in constructive, creative, and innovative programs that are designed to motivate our young people to broaden their perspective and enhance their ability to help themselves toward a better understanding and way of life.

The members of the task force and I are proud to be associated with him in this program. I suggest that my colleagues read the content of these remarks made by Governor Reagan and myself because it will be my intent to advance this concept nationally sometime in the near future. The remarks and address follow:

TEXT OF GOVERNOR REAGAN'S REMARKS TO THE AEROSPACE-AVIATION EDUCATION TASK FORCE

Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen of our Task Force for Aerospace-Aviation Education. I want to personally thank each of you for taking time out from your busy schedules to meet with me here today, and to participate willingly as members of the Task Force. The press of other duties has prevented our meeting together earlier, but I understand that the organizational meeting at San Jose went well. I am deeply interested in education, in all of its aspects, and it is my earnest conviction that aerospace-aviation has a place of prominence in our educational system. Your presence here today attests to a similar conviction on your part. I commend you for your public spirit and your progressive outlook on life.

This administration is wholly in accord with the aims and objectives of the Task Force. The complexities of this air age demand that our educators bend their efforts

XUM

toward adapting space and aviation concepts to the task of furnishing our young people a sound basis of understanding of the world around them. As I see it, the function of an educational institution—or educational system—is to produce citizens who are totally aware of life, and who are capable of assuming productive and meaningful roles in the modern community. In the full realization that aerospace-aviation is the largest non-agrarian user of manpower, it becomes abundantly clear that adequate preparation is required if our young people are to take on their responsibilities when they leave our schools. We need competent citizens in the fields of management, administration, operations and maintenance. We need the engineers, the designers, the transportation specialists, and above all, we need the generalists—that is—those who have a degree of familiarity with many aspects of aerospace-aviation, and who can blend aviation into an integrated system to accommodate movement. For movement is the essence of modern communication and the exchange of ideas. While a number of our schools and colleges now offer aviation courses—more than 61 colleges, and 79 high schools—we are still not reaching the majority of our students. We are seeking ways of broadening the opportunities for aerospace-aviation education to reach increasing numbers of our young people. Not just any course, however, will satisfy the need. What is required is quality in education, delivered by those competent to impart the knowledge—and that is one of the areas in which we are seeking help from this Task Force. Curriculum content, source materials, and instructor qualifications are vital considerations if our aerospace-aviation education efforts are to bear fruit.

Working carefully with Congressman Clausen, a most persuasive and astute gentleman, you members of the Task Force were chosen for your expertise and background in aviation. I am going to rely heavily on the advice and assistance you ladies and gentlemen come up with during the course of your work on this Task Force. I understand some committees are already organized and working on the various aspects of the situation, and I want to assure you that you can count on my support. Aerospace-aviation education will occupy a prominent position in the creative society so necessary in this modern air age, and I am deeply gratified by your efforts in this endeavor.

The school administrators, faculty members and advisors to our schools and colleges have achieved varying degrees of success in the educational programs they have fostered. We have noted with interest that some of our smaller communities have been able to generate greater interest in aviation education than our larger cities. This applies to school boards, school officials, students, and their parents. Some of the schools have full-blown programs of many years duration, and others are just getting started. It would not be possible to publicly recognize every one of these programs, and so we have singled out just a few to be honored on the basis of the excellence of their aviation education programs. From the more than 140 high schools and colleges, we have selected eleven. These eleven are typical and their honor should reflect on the others who were not selected this time. On behalf of the Task Force, I wish to publicly commend the eleven institutions for their continuing efforts in this vital field of education, and to cite them as proper examples for others to follow in establishing similar aerospace-aviation education programs. It was difficult to do so, but we narrowed the field of 140 down to 6 colleges and 5 high schools. I would now like to present to representatives of the chosen eleven a certificate attesting to their honor in the field of educational endeavor.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN DON H. CLAUSEN TO THE AEROSPACE-EDUCATION TASK FORCE, SACRAMENTO, CALIF., JUNE 16, 1969

It is, indeed, a very real pleasure for me to be here today to have this opportunity to address such a distinguished aviation-oriented group—and to have the distinct privilege of helping to officially launch Governor Reagan's Aerospace-Aviation Education Task Force.

At the outset, Governor Reagan—I want to preface my remarks here today by thanking you personally and commending you highly for your forward-looking attitude regarding aviation in general, for your vigorous support of aviation education, and for your bold initiative in authorizing and creating this Aerospace-Aviation Education Task Force.

I wish, also, to express my sincere and profound appreciation to you ladies and gentlemen, the members of the task force, who have so generously given of your time and rich talents to be with us here today, to lend the many benefits of your vast knowledge and expertise to this project which, I believe, presents untold challenges and opportunities for each of us.

As many of you know, I have devoted more than 20 years of my life to, and feel very strongly about, aviation education and the massive potential it holds, not only for aviation itself—but for the young people of California and for America as a whole. This, I believe, blends well with the concepts embodied in the Governor's "Creative Society" and, as Chairman of this Task Force, I am proud to be part of this effort and proud to be associated with such distinguished people as are assembled here today.

California has long held a commanding and leading role in America's economic growth, and as Californians, we should take both note and pride in the fact that our State is:

First, in total number of civil aircraft registered (23,000);

Second, in total number of airports (more than 684);

First, in total number of registered pilots (more than 80,000);

First, in total number of operational helicopters;

First, in aerospace-aviation technology; and

The home of America's aerospace-aviation industry.

Leading in so many categories as we do, the point is that we now have a golden opportunity to also take the lead in aerospace-aviation education. This, I'm convinced, is the primary challenge of the goal of this Task Force, and this—we must do!

At this point, it might be well to briefly review the goals and objectives of the Governor's Advisory Task-Force on Aerospace-Aviation Education, which are:

1. To develop within the California public system of education, a planned and coordinated aerospace-aviation education program, which embodies all phases and all aspects of aviation, aeronautical, and space education.

2. To serve all levels—elementary, secondary, higher and adult education on a continuing basis in the State of California.

3. To serve the curriculum areas of general education, vocational education, adult, and in-service education.

4. To study, evaluate, and implement the findings of the California Aviation Education Advisory Commission established by the California State Department of Education in 1967.

5. To encourage and stimulate the formation of County Aerospace-Aviation Advisory Committees to better coordinate the implementation of programs through established and contemplated educational facilities and their administration.

6. To afford particular recognition and consideration to the recommendations of the Vocational Education Director and the aviation consultants to the Department of Education on how best to coordinate the integration of aerospace-aviation educational materials into the general and vocational education curricula—consistent with the demands and requirements of the jet and space ages.

7. To draw particular attention to the extraordinary advantages of including aircraft control manipulation as an integral part of the vocational and general education programs through the use of stationary classroom flight simulators in elementary and secondary schools, and through actual flight training programs in high schools and junior colleges where easy access to airports is available.

Aviation and air transportation now play, and will continue to play, a dominant role in the movement of goods, services, and people throughout the State of California, the United States, and indeed, throughout the entire Western Hemisphere. As the jumbo jets, the SST, and other fixed and rotary-wing aircraft go into commercial use, world-wide air marketing programs will expand tremendously. In addition, there is growing interest in the future uses of STOL (short take-off & landing) and VTOL (vertical take-off & landing) aircraft to supplement the present air-carrier fleet. And business aviation and general aviation aircraft usage is expanding at fantastic rates of growth.

This, basically, is the direction in which we are moving when aerospace-aviation programs and objectives are viewed collectively.

But what are the more immediate benefits and advantages to be gained from a dynamic and future-oriented aerospace-aviation education program in the public schools of California?

What, specifically, is in it for the young people—the students of our State?

Over the years, successful aviation education programs have repeatedly demonstrated that they are, in fact, significant motivating factors in stimulating poor students to become honor students and inducing potential "drop-outs" to remain in school and complete their educations.

Therefore, and based on years of personal experience, I am convinced that aerospace-aviation education is not only an effective and viable "anti-drop-out tool"—but a highly motivating force that will provide the kind of a challenge that many young people desperately need early in life, especially during their school years.

I have proven to myself, during my 23 years of "experimenting" with this program of aerospace-aviation education that I can "capture the imagination" of *any* student from *any* home environment—by exposing him or her to the challenges of flight—be it in the classroom, the stationary Flight Simulator, or actual flight in an aircraft.

The cost? This is something that we must all be concerned about!

Let me state categorically, however, that the implementation and insertion of this type of program into or associated with the established curriculum of our schools, will actually save money, when considered in conjunction with our total public sector budgets.

Some sceptics might say, "How can you, Congressman Clausen, make this kind of statement?"

Here again, permit me to relate some of my personal experiences.

During my service as a Member of the Board of Supervisors of Del Norte County for seven years, I reviewed, perused, and carefully scrutinized the annual budget of the various department heads. Among them, of course, were the budgets of the Judge of the Superior Court, the District Attorney's office, the Probation Office, the Juvenile Hall, the Sheriff, a Bar-"O"-Boys' Rehabilitation Camp, the Welfare Office, etc.

After observing the large percentage of dollars of overall budget requested and required to finance the function of these offices, I decided to conduct research in the specific area of costs to our taxpayers for juvenile delinquency and probation problems, as well as minor and major criminal problems.

The cost factors revealed were, to say the least, shocking, and they prompted me to relate them to the high school principal, the Judge, the Superintendent of Schools, and Committee members of investigating Grand Juries.

I found that each boy or girl committed to the Youth Authority or Department of Correction cost the taxpayers approximately $13,000, and those individuals committed to penal institutions, as convicted criminals, cost an average of $35,000.

My candid comment to local officials at that time was, "Save *one* boy from the Youth Authority—you've bought one airplane or simulator—save *one* boy or girl from a life of crime, and you've paid for the entire program."

Once exposed to these economic facts of life, these key community leaders and many previously sceptical parents could readily see the reasonableness and the rationale of my suggestion to "continue and broaden the exposure to the challenging program of aviation education in Del Norte High School."

Therefore, I submit, we can better invest our tax dollars in the kind of innovative programs that I like to refer to as "preventive maintenance."

Believe me, I can refer you to many parents who are willing to testify to the success of our efforts. Once our program was underway, an Assembly Committee on Education held hearings in Crescent City, California, for the purpose of evaluating our results. The testimony of some of these parents and students is available in the public hearing record.

Mine, of course, is but one experience. There are thousands of other examples, and one that bears repeating took place in the Richmond Unified School District.

Here, a "flight experience program" was tested for students from the ghetto areas, and this experiment dramatically demonstrated and proved the motivational potential of the kind of program that will broaden their perspective through exposure to something new and challenging.

From this experience it was determined that learning performance was significantly improved for those students in the program who had been previously classified as "disciplinary problems." Thus, the value of this particular program was recognized not only by the students, and the school authorities, but more noteworthy, by the students' parents.

Thus, we see that the heart of the problem lies not so much in not having adequate or suitable aviation education programs—but rather, in the fact that we just don't have enough of these logical and constructive programs in existence.

We know, for instance, that 46 colleges and 77 high schools in California have some type of aviation education program, but from these figures, it is obvious that there are far too many areas where such programs just don't exist at all.

This, then is the challenge and the opportunity.

The time has come for all Californians, all Americans, and in particular, our educational institutions to broaden their perspective to eliminate "tunnel vision"—to seek broader horizons in this, our jet and space age.

For economic, social and security reasons, California must move forward dramatically and creatively through the updating and implementation of aerospace-aviation education programs in the schools of California—especially if we are to maintain the leadership in aviation and aerospace technology which has contributed so much to California's and our Nation's overall economy.

I believe that continuing social change and the challenge such change presents to our people, young and old alike, demands this undated, innovative, and provocative type of program so that education is tied to the real experiences of everyday life.

It has been repeatedly demonstrated that the energies of our youth, which we have witnessed in other and less constructive ways recently, can be directed toward this challenging concept of aerospace-aviation education. An experience, I might add, that results in the stimulation of a new sense of pride, purpose, and direction toward participation in a creative and constructive environment—and away from the demoralizing and destructive elements of our society.

Coupled with the expanded use of audio-visual techniques, these programs can focus new interest on the applied science fields by clearly demonstrating to the student why the basic fundamentals of education are essential and vital in furthering his learning process.

As we all know, our young people have a wisdom all their own. They know where "the action is"—they have jet-age ideas and ideals—and they recognize the potential offered by aerospace-aviation education for future job and business opportunities for their generation.

I've seen these programs in action, and now the Aviation Section of the Federal Aviation Administration has recognized the 50,000-member Experimental Aircraft Association's program for suggested airplane construction courses, such as that of Bay View High School in Milwaukee, Wisconsin and the famed "Flying Grandfather," Max Conrad's "Winona, Minnesota Experiment" of yesteryear, as the type of program that should be considered for recommendation by our Task Force.

The varied experiences gained would serve as excellent orientation for advanced study in science or engineering, or could be the basis for additional vocational training for business or industry.

In the construction of the plane, the students would feel the need for information and the desire to develop skills in the machining and fabricating of wood, layout and drawing, welding and machining of metal, and the mathematics and science affecting both the design and materials of the plane.

Situations are provided demanding ingenuity and resourcefulness that utilize the best creative efforts of the entire group involved. The project demonstrates the need and provides opportunity for careful and individual and group planning.

The facilities of our existing educational institutions can and must be utilized more effectively and advantageously for young people *AND* their parents in helping to close both the so-called "Generation Gap" *and* the "Communications Gap."

Too often, I feel, we tend to overlook the true objectives of the education process. One primary objective, in my judgment, is to produce enlightened and motivated graduates capable of assuming a productive and useful role in modern society—and I want to stress the word "modern." We must produce graduates who are not only aware of what is going on around them, but capable of balancing their high sense of idealism with a proportionate share of balanced realism.

The younger generation must know and keep pace with the technological changes taking place around them—beginning at the elementary school level.

Such innovations as:

1. Operational supersonic jets of many types.
2. The capability of revolutionized long-range air movement of goods, services, and people.
3. Electronic computers able to perform mathematical tasks and control complex operations far beyond the capacity of men and mechanical systems.
4. Miniaturized electronics that allow computers and the most sophisticated controls to be carried aboard aircraft.
5. New types of electronically-steered radar and a variety of sensors that have extended man's senses to a degree totally unpredictable in 1950.
6. Worldwide communications on almost an "anytime, realtime" basis, including the use of satellites, allowing Washington to participate in planning and evaluating daily operations in any part of the world.
7. And, the use of reconnaissance satellites to foster the involuntary termination of other nation's total secrecy; thereby giving the United States planners a reasonable amount of intelligence information, no matter how hotly it may be disputed at times.

Seemingly, this inventory would indicate that many organizations and many persons, especially those in the aerospace industry, have done an excellent job of staging a technical and technological revolution of vast proportions.

Thus, we see the need for a virtual army of administrators, managers, pilots, mechanics, crews, service personnel, aeronautical engineers, designers, air transportation specialists, and controllers. But, where will we find the personnel required to fill these upcoming vacancies if we don't "get off the dime now", and get your people moving in the right direction?

I say—the time is now!

This, then, brings us "full around" to the point of why we are all here today. We recognize the need for action and for expertise in establishing a vigorous, progressive, and far-reaching program of aerospace-aviation education.

By the same token, we know that each of you is busy—but over the years, we have come to know that, if you want something done, your best bet is to go to the "involved" individual—the busy man and woman—and enlist their help. Governor Reagan has selected each of you for your role in this task force, based on your skills, your knowledge, your proven and demonstrated ability—with the full knowledge and deepest faith that you can organize the effort required to produce a viable, dynamic, and creative program of aerospace-aviation education here in California.

As Chairman, I have appointed Gene Little, Vice-President for Education and Training for World Airways, as Vice-Chairman; and named as our Northern California Chairman Dr. Myrl Rupel, Superintendent, Tehachapi Unified School District; and Southern California Chairman, Miss Harriett Porch of the Rand Corporation.

Each of you on the Task Force, however, can and will fill a vital role.

We need a number of active committees to fill specific roles. We need committees to work with curricula, textbooks, classroom facilities, equipment, teaching aids, finance, and public information. We need an environmental committee to devote effort to educating the public on noise levels, compatible land uses, air pollution, and similar problems, and on what is being done in each of these areas, and we need a committee to decide on the appropriate qualifications for instructors.

The exploits of the astronauts in the Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo flights have gripped the interest of our people, and fired the imagination of our youth. What we have to do is to see that interest and imagination are channeled in the right direction. We can do no less. It is our obligation, and with your very capable assistance, I am sure that we can take up the task.

As President Nixon said, "When an American is the first to place his foot on the moon this next month, every one of us, as proud Americans, will stand a little taller."

Today, we are taking that first step toward building a better educational system through aviation—we are, in my judgment, taking a major step toward character building and indeed, nation building, through aviation.

I'm proud to be associated with our great Governor Reagan in this effort.

The challenge of change, in our everyday living, demands that we commit ourselves to this worthy task.

We can, as dedicated and creative people, recapture the American dream—through aviation.

We can rekindle the spark of hope and faith in America—through aviation.

We can stimulate, motivate, and accelerate the learning process—through aviation.

We can broaden the horizons—we can broaden the perspective of individuals—through aviation.

We can open up "opportunities unlimited" for this generation and future generations—through aviation.

We can "Revitalize Rural America," and "Build Countryside, USA"—through aviation.

We can provide relief from the overcrowded "pressure cookers"—the "high rise ghettos"—the "concrete jungles" of urban metropolitan areas—through aviation.

We can better coordinate the movement of people, goods, and services—through aviation.

We can improve the "environment for future living"—through aviation.

Governor Reagan, we, the members of your Aerospace-Aviation Education Task Force, are deeply grateful to you for "launching" this timely space-age education proposal, just one day before the arrival of the Apollo 10 astronauts—Stafford, Young, and Cernan—here in California.

In six months, we hope to have before you the best recommendation California's aviation "brain power" can formulate. Like you, "we want to make the best—better."

LEGION OF MERIT TO MISSISSIPPIAN

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in today's RECORD a copy of a citation accompanying the award of the Legion of Merit to Lt. Col. John H. Napier III. Colonel Napier is a native of my home State of Mississippi and has been assigned to the Secretary of the Air Force in the Pentagon for a little over 2 years. A career military personnel, Colonel Napier was presented the Legion of Merit upon being transferred to a new assignment. The citation accompanying his award reads as follows:

CITATION TO ACCOMPANY THE AWARD OF THE LEGION OF MERIT TO LT. COL. JOHN H. NAPIER III

Lt. Col. John H. Napier, III has distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious service as Chief, Policy Analysis Branch, Research and Analysis Division, Office of The Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Air Force from 20 February 1967 to 6 June 1969. In this important assignment Col. Napier played a major role in preparing the annual Military Posture Statement and other public statements for the Secretary of the Air Force and the Under Secretary. He has consistently demonstrated a unique understanding of national and international affairs and their impact upon United States military policies and strategies. In particular, his depth of knowledge and penetrating insights in the field of counterinsurgency operations have contributed substantially to coherent policy statements in this critical area. By virtue of his outstanding performance and professional competence, Col. Napier has materially contributed to the security of his country. His exemplary conduct and total dedication reflect the highest credit upon himself and the United States Air Force.

RECENT MOVES TO SECURE PEACE IN VIETNAM

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I am distressed and disgusted with the efforts of a few prominent politicians erroneously labeled "doves," who apparently will seize any opportunity to carp against this administration's efforts to achieve peace in Vietnam. Now they have chosen to assault the magnanimous and courageous offer of President Thieu to allow free elections—in his dramatic bid for settlement of this tragic conflict.

Such rantings on the part of a few pompous politicrats can only serve to endanger more American lives. I am sick and tired of this kind of partisanship; for one American's life is worth more than the political career of any politician, and it always will be.

Let me cite the record of recent moves made to secure peace and halt the killing:

First. Prior to January 20, we halted the bombing of North Vietnam and agreed to sit down at the conference table with the NLF, as well as the governments of Hanoi and Saigon.

Second. We remained at the table and refrained from resumption of the bombing despite Hanoi's shelling of South Vietnamese major cities, its violation of the demilitarized zone and its refusal to deal with the Saigon government.

Third. On March 25, President Thieu offered to meet with the NLF for private talks without preconditions on a political settlement.

Fourth. On May 14, with President Thieu's support, President Nixon put forward an eight-point plan for peace. It included the renouncement of reliance on a military solution, the offer of withdrawal of U.S. and allied forces within 12 months under international guarantees, and emphasis on our desire only to secure the right of the people of South Vietnam to determine their own future without outside interference.

Fifth. On June 8, President Nixon announced the withdrawal of 25,000 U.S. combat troops.

Sixth. At Midway, both President Thieu and President Nixon declared their readiness to accept any political outcome arrived at through free elections.

Seventh. President Thieu has now offered a concrete program by which free elections can be held and the will of the South Vietnamese people can be determined.

Such efforts on the part of this Nation's leadership are responsible. Their acceptance and support by President Thieu is courageous as well. These men are the real peacemakers of today, and they deserve our support.

THE APOLLO DREAM

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, all the world will be watching and focusing its attention on Cape Kennedy, tomorrow, Wednesday, July 16, 1969, as man prepares to take his first step on the moon.

The courage and skill of our brave astronauts who are about to realize one of man's oldest dreams is unquestioned. There are many heroes in this exciting space drama. I rise to pay tribute today to the many laborers, workers, engineers, and technicians across the land who have worked so hard on our space program. I am proud to say that many of the workers employed by the North American Rockwell Co., a major Apollo contractor, reside in my district, the 17th Congressional District of California.

On Thursday, July 10, 1969, North American Rockwell placed a full-page message in the Washington Evening Star which accurately reflects the sense of pride and accomplishment all Americans feel about the Apollo dream.

I now submit in the RECORD this article, as follows, so that my colleagues and others who may have missed this message can refer to it as the entire world prepares to observe the culmination of a goal that President Kennedy outlined for America almost a decade ago:

AMERICA IS ABOUT TO PUT MEN ON THE MOON—PLEASE READ THIS BEFORE THEY GO

Perhaps the best way for anyone to try to understand the size of such an undertaking is not for us to list the thousands of problems that had to be overcome, but for you to simply go out in your backyard some night, look up, and try to imagine how you'd begin, if it were up to you.

But our reason here is not to talk about the technicalities of the Apollo project. Rather, it is simply to ask you to think, for at least one brief moment, about the men and women who have applied their heads and their hearts and their hands—and a good many years of their lives—to putting a man on the moon.

Many of these people have worked for less money than they could have made in other places, and it is safe to say they have worked through more night and weekends and lunch and dinner hours than they would have anywhere else.

And the astronauts, the brave men who will fly again down that long, dark and dustless corridor of space, this time to set foot—to walk upon the surface of the moon—they know the price that's often paid in setting out for lands uncharted. They know the price their fathers' grandfathers paid just to walk across the wilderness of America for the first fifty years.

For a long time now, we have been involved with the people who are the thinkers and the designers and the builders and the pilots of America's man-to-the-moon dream, of America's man-to-the-moon determination. We have worked with them, eaten with them, lived with them.

Yet our appreciation and admiration for them, continues to grow each day—for their energy, for their imagination, their confidence, for their patience, their resourcefulness, for their courage.

We ask you, in the days ahead as we wait for the big one to begin, to understand this fantastic feat for what it is and to put it in proper perspective, a triumph of man, of individuals, of truly great human beings. For our touchdown on the moon will not be the product of magic, but the gift of men.

In James A. Michener's novel, "The Bridges at Toko-Ri," an American admiral stands on the deck of his carrier early one morning and ponders the subject of his brave men. And thinking to himself, he asks a question of the wind which we believe all of us should ask as we think of the men who will finally make it to the moon and of the men who got them there: "Why is America lucky enough to have such men? . . . Where did we get such men?"

North American Rockwell.

A COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to applaud the action of the President of the United States in reorganizing our national drug problem and proposing constructive action to combat it. In today's message to the Congress, President Nixon said:

> The habit of the narcotics addict is not only a danger to himself, but a threat to the community where he lives.

I can but agree and pledge my support to the 10-point program transmitted by the White House.

Who among us has not heard from a constituent whose child has run away from home because of drug addiction? Who among us has not seen the effects of narcotics in our district's schools and courthouses? Who among us has not been asked for assistance in stopping drug traffic?

Every Member of this body owes it to his constituents to work for and vote for enactment of the two legislative proposals submitted by the President. First is a comprehensive revision of the Federal drug statutes to tighten regulation, assure greater accountability, and strengthen the hand of law-enforcement officials. Second is an interim measure to insure that the Marihuana Tax Act is constitutional. Both of these laws are essential; both have been carefully drawn by the Attorney General.

The remainder of the President's message discusses the entire field of narcotics control including State and international efforts to control drug abuse, Federal efforts to educate our citizens on the dangers of drugs, research programs, new rehabilitation ideas, and training programs and conferences for local law-enforcement officials.

A comprehensive Federal attack on this growing menace—active from coast to coast, in urban ghettos and rural farms—is desperately needed. Today the President has outlined his plan for mounting that attack. It is a well thought out, workable program. I am certain it is not the total answer, but it is a tremendous stride in the right direction. I urge support of the legislative proposals; I urge support of the request for appropriations which will be needed to carry the program forward.

MASSIVE DOLLAR FLOW TO SWITZERLAND TO NUMBERED BANK ACCOUNTS

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1969

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, along with a number of my colleagues on the House Banking and Currency Committee, I have been very much concerned with the flight of U.S. hot money to Switzerland. The extent to which American dollars abroad went into gold speculation and currency raids last year is a scandal. While that situation has stabilized, thanks, in part, to action of the U.S. Government and the Congress, there is still serious cause for concern in the massive dollar flow to Switzerland.

Naturally, a lot of this flow is under the table so that there is no record of it. But, there is some startling factual data that cannot be ignored. A recent issue of Green's Commodity Market Comments, which is published biweekly by Economic News Agency, Inc., reports that the total assets of the three biggest Swiss banks increased by $3 billion in 1968. As they describe it, this is just the "top of the iceberg" because the figures do not reflect securities, gold, or other values purchased. It is startling to note further that the combined total assets of the big three Swiss banks has risen by 34 percent at the end of 1968 as compared with the end of 1967. One bank showed an increase in assets of 47 percent.

When we consider that the gross national product of Switzerland is $16 billion, we begin to get some idea of the massive nature of these flows into Switzerland. The three banks showed a combined total of $5.3 billion in assets in 1946. By 1958, this had risen to $11.6 billion. By the end of 1968, it had increased by more than four times to a figure of $50.9 billion. Obviously, this has to be outside hot money and unquestionably a good portion of it is American money.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that the Banking and Currency Committee of this House will make further inquiry into this matter of American dollar flows to Swiss banks. To leave the situation as it is, is to encourage serious instability in world monetary markets, as well as great difficulties in our own domestic monetary management. I submit for the Record an excerpt from the aforementioned market letter, Green's Commodity Market Comments:

Green's Commodity Market Comments

> The extraordinary dimensions of the dollar flow to Switzerland can be easily discerned when one analyzes the annual reports of the big three Swiss banks. During 1968, the total assets of the big three Swiss banks increased by approximately $3 billion. Switzerland's total dollar intake, however, must have been incomparably greater because the figures disclosed in the three annual reports shows just the top of an iceberg. The most prominent private banks in Switzerland do not publicize their balance sheets. Furthermore, the $3 billion increase in the total assets the big three Swiss banks do not reflect securities and/or gold and /or other values purchased by their clients in 1968. The combined total assets of the big three Swiss banks approximated $12 billion as of the end of 1968—a 34% increase over their total assets at the end of 1967. In the case of Union Bank of Switzerland, this increase amounted to 47%. No one can argue with a straight face that this increase in the total assets of the three Swiss banks could have been caused by other than U.S. citizens. The Swiss Gross National Product is less than $16 billion and this country has a chronic Balance of Trade deficit. The real Swiss GNP rose by 3½% in 1968 as compared to an increase of 1.9% in 1967. The 1968 Swiss trade deficit amounted to $483 million, about $100 million less than 1967. Comparative total asset figures of the three Swiss banks are shown below:

TOTAL ASSETS IN SWISS FRANCS ($1=FR. 4.31)

	1946	1958	1968
Swiss Bank Corporation	2,139,391,000	4,129,805,000	16,879,990,702
Union Bank of Switzerland	1,318,972,000	3,524,550,003	18,467,358,146
Credit Suisse	1,893,758,000	3,982,867,252	15,560,833,523
Combined total	5,352,121,000	11,637,222,255	50,908,182,371

USE POLLUTION TO BENEFIT MANKIND

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, we are learning all too fast that a price must be paid for an industrial society—contamination, pollution, and the other effluents of a mass industrial society.

Indeed, we have been rudely awakened by cries of "We are fouling our own nest," and prophecies of doom. I do not quarrel with those who warn us because the warnings are necessary if man is to take the active measures that will permit the maintenance of an ecological balance between the works of man and nature.

What I do not agree with is the Cassandra nature of their warnings; the negative attitudes that foreordain our fate.

I believe that we as men with free wills have the means of saving ourselves. In fact I think it possible to develop processes whereby the pollutants that threaten to destroy us may be put to use for the benefit of mankind.

Up to this point very little has been done with such an approach. There have, however, been beginnings at both the theoretical and practical levels.

Especially exciting about the idea of salvaging the wastes of the human species is putting them to work to solve another crisis that faces mankind—the population explosion.

Mr. J. Leon Potter is one who has explored the possibilities that lay in this area. Therefore, I ask that at this point an article of his, "Use Pollution to Benefit Mankind," which appeared in the May 1969 issue of Ocean Industry be inserted into the RECORD.

The article follows:

USE POLLUTION TO BENEFIT MANKIND

(By J. Leon Potter)

Among the problems facing mankind are maintenance of a nutritious food supply and prevention of environmental pollution. Only with proper planning is it possible to feed the people and clean up after them while allowing the essential biological life cycle to continue unbroken.

The population of the world is about 3.5 billion people. Conservative estimates say the world will have from 5.3 to 7.4 billion persons by 2000 A.D—with 80 to 85% of this population being in the underdeveloped countries.

In part, this means we need (1) more efficient food production; (2) more efficient utilization of the now-wasted organic compounds as byproducts; (3) new sources of food and food supplements, such as algae, yeast and fish protein concentrates, and (4) development of the efficient techniques of protein production by maximum utilization of our resources.

Approximately half the world's population lives on diets dominated by cereal crops which fail to provide protein of either the quantity or quality needed for adequate human nutrition. Chronic protein deficiencies will become one of man's most threatening problems because it can cause irreversible mental damage and premature death due to a low resistance to infectious diseases.

The alternative is to provide a nutritional supplement of 10 to 20 grams of animal protein per day to the diet. The world-wide problem of increasing need for protein and the great changes expected in the world food economy in the next 20 years emphasize the need for future development of the sea's food resources.

Instead of considering organic waste, thermal effluents, oil spills, sewage nutrients and garbage only as pollution, we must demonstrate that these currently wasted organic compounds—if properly managed—can be treated as enrichments to estuarine areas. With controlled symbiotic systems, it will be possible to solve our protein deficiencies while improving our environment.

PROTEIN FROM PETROLEUM WASTES

Waste oil and other petroleum materials constitute a constant pollution threat to the estuarine system. In 1968, the California State Department of Fish and Game reported 181 oil spills in the Los Angeles and Long Beach areas.

The clean-up of oil wastes depends on the capability of containment, collection, onshore treatment and eventual disposal or utilization. To this end, each major port or oil producing area should have an oil waste task force to abate oil pollution by routinely inspecting and making recommendations for prevention of accidents, cleaning up minor leaks and spills and taking immediate action in case of emergencies. This task force also can be responsible for the storage, treatment and eventual utilization of the oil as a private enterprise. Such activity should lead to the next step—conversion of waste oil into protein compounds for marketing as animal feed supplement.

HOW A FRENCH PLANT HANDLES PETROLEUM WASTE

A plant at Lauera, France, is selling protein produced from waste, low-grade petroleum. Micro-organisms, growing on a diet consisting primarily of oil hydrocarbons, are producing an excellent high-grade protein. This concept has proven so successful that there is good reason to believe petroleum will become an important food resource for the earth's growing population.[1]

A pound of bacteria, feeding on crude so worthless that it is burned as waste, can grow fast enough to produce 10 lbs. of protein in a day. If a yearling calf were able to manufacture protein at the same rate, it would end the day roughly the size of a three-car garage and it would have consumed several tons of expensive grain in the process.[2]

The proteins produced by fermentation of waste petroleum are no different in quality than protein made by any other natural resource. Petroleum proteins are rich in B vitamins and include a well-balanced variety of amino acids. In particular, they have a high content of lycine which makes them a useful complement to the cereal grains.

YEAST FROM INDUSTRIAL WASTES

Another major source of estuarine pollution are the industries such as pulp and paper, food processing, etc., which produce organic compounds as a waste effluent containing primarily carbohydrates, sugars and organic and inorganic nutrients.

Plant-treatment systems should be used to collect the solids, concentrate them and convert them into compost fertilizers and animal feed additives. The soluble nutrients and sugar compounds can be collected and converted by selective fermentation by Torula yeast into marketable protein for use as food additives and animal feed supplements.

Protein production from carbon-containing compounds is not a new idea. For many years the growing of yeast for animal supplements and human foods has been an appreciable, though small, industry.

Yeast cells grown on carbohydrates have a high nutritive value, not only because of their protein content, but also because of the presence of vitamins and amino acids. Yeast cells grow rapidly. Torula yeast under optimum conditions will double in size and volume every 30 minutes. These cells can be grown in tanks or lagoons using only waste organic compounds for food.

USING DOMESTIC SEWAGE

Modern sewage plants are designed to destroy or render harmless the solid waste and oxide of the nutrients in solution.

Because most plants are over-loaded and, therefore, inefficient, the effluents are befouling our environment and high volumes are moving to our oceans. The waste effluents discharged from those plants are in both solid and liquid form. Sludge solids, if properly treated, can be used for compost soil additives and fertilizers. This sludge, blended with garbage wastes, can be developed into an excellent and marketable compost while the millions of gallons of nutrient-rich effluent can be utilized as food for the more efficient protein-producing plant life, such as algae and plankton.

Soluble nutrients contained in the millions of gallons of wasted fresh water need to be utilized, or at least managed, to gain an economic re-use. In areas such as water-short southern California, re-cycling or multiple use of water is becoming a necessity.

Work at the University of California and other institutions around the world has demonstrated the economic potential of recovery of nutrients and pollution abatement while producing a marketable protein for cattle, poultry feeds and fish food with unicellular algae and plankton in processes using controlled photosynthesis.

The cost of protein produced from waste effluents is approaching 3 cents/lb., compared with agriculture and animal protein at 10 cents/lb. Algae produces protein at a rate of 30 to 50 tons/acre/year, compared with the conventional agriculture of 3 to 5 tons/acre/year.

Algae is used for many purposes. Marine algae is processed to obtain iodine. Agar is produced from numerous genera and species of algae. Alginates (polymers of manuronic acid) obtained from marine algae are used as thickeners or stabilizers in the production of plastics, ice cream and candy. Marine algae also has long been used as fertilizer, livestock feed and human food—particularly in the Asian countries.

More recently it has been suggested that unicellular forms of algae, such as Chlorella, be used to alleviate protein deficiencies or for space travel food. It has been used to purify sewage and reclaim waste waters. The nutritive value of algae grown on sewage has been studied with rats and chicks.[3]

HABITATS NEED TO BE IMPROVED

Habitat improvement likely will play a major role in improving the productivity of estuarine systems. All future land fills, bay realignment and dredging projects should be designed around the principle of such improvement. The most productive zones for fish ecology are our rapidly disappearing estuaries. Irregularities in bottom topography—such as reefs, rock outcrops, vegetated cover, piers or artificial habitats—attract fish and the vertebrates in greater abundance than nearby flat, barren bottoms. Recognition of this fact makes it important to create artificial irregularities in the barren bay bottoms which have been dredged and worked. With a planned dredging program it is possible to make the changes needed and still improve the habitat of the lower aquatic benthos.

Abandoned cars and other refuse cluttering our cities and countryside have proven to be good material for building fishing reefs in the sea. Fish are attracted to the artificial reefs to feed off mussels and other organisms which attach themselves to the reef materials to seek protection in the crevices or simply to have a "home."

A major use of industrial water is as a coolant. For each kilowatt generated in a modern coal-fired power plant, approximately 6,000 Btu's of heat must be dissipated via cooling water through heat exchangers. Nuclear reactors are less efficient, requiring the dissipation of 1,000 Btu's per kilowatt hour generated. By 1980, the electrical power industry will require 200 billion gallons of water per day for cooling purposes.[4]

This water has great potential in the production of food through development of aquiculture and enhancement of biological life. Thermal energy can increase the growth rate of the lower forms of marine life to provide additional food for the higher forms.

AQUICULTURE COMES OF AGE

Th cultivation of marine organisms has been practiced for hundreds of years, but intensified farming using supplemental

---

Footnotes at end of article.

XUM

feeds and warm water discharges has just begun.

The Inter-Chem Corp. has an oyster hatching facility at Oyster Bay, Long Island, where oyster spat are raised to a shell diameter of 2 to 3 millimeters and then moved to the thermal effluent discharge channel of the Long Island Light and Power Co. plant for accelerated growth. The process has been so successful that Inter-Chem is expanding the hatchery and growth areas.

Scotland's White Fish Authority has found that to fully utilize the increased growth potential of fish via thermal enhancement, it is necessary to supplement their diet with additional food. Special thermally heated algae ponds are producing an adequate feed supply for the thermally produced fish by using the nutrient from sewage of a nearby town. The results are so successful that each new nuclear-fueled electric power station in the British Isles will be established with aquiculture areas being an important part of the plant design and siting.

To apply the full potential of thermal effluents for fish protein production, provisions must be made for feeding these aquafarms. The use of waste organisms from industry and domestic sewers to produce marine organisms is the answer.

SYMBIOTIC INDUSTRIES

In conclusion, I would like to suggest a utilization concept demonstrating one feasible recycling approach for converting waste materials into food.

By utilizing the nutrients available from now wasted organic compounds, enhanced by thermal energy from the power industry and combined with planned marine habitats, highly efficient symbiotic food production systems, as shown in Fig. 1, could be produced. Such systems, designed to utilize the waste of man for the production of the necessary protein for man, will be one of man's greatest scientific advances.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Adapted from the paper "Beneficial Utilization of Off-shore Pollution" presented at OECON IV held in March 1969 in San Diego, Calif.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Champagant, Alfred, *Scientific American*, Vol. 213, No. 4, October 1965.

[2] *Life Magazine*, February 1968.

[3] Hintz, H. F. et al, "Nutritive Value of Algae Grown on Sewage," *Journal of Animal Science*, Vol. 25, No. 3, August 1966.

[4] Davidson, J. Banton and Bradshaw, Robert W., *Environmental Science and Technology*, February 1968. Page 618.

CONFUSION FELT BY THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record, I would like to include an editorial prepared by Ray McHugh, bureau chief of the Copley News Service. I think Mr. McHugh expresses the deep confusion felt by the American taxpayer. The editorial follows:

> The anatomy of a mess became evident as American governments went through a series of financial contortions that have come to mark the end of each fiscal year.
>
> The patient is obviously sick.
>
> In Washington the Federal Government still is operating although the Congress has not approved a firm budget nor the revenue measures to support it.
>
> In Sacramento the State of California has begun its fiscal year inauspiciously without a formally approved budget: with the executive branch obliged to sustain operations through fiscal manipulation.
>
> And the uncomfortable fact is that this is just the surface chaos. If the evidence is to be believed, everyone from the Federal Government to the taxpayer is either broke or acting as if he were.
>
> At their recent meeting, for example, the Nation's mayors insisted the cities could not survive without large infusions of cash from higher governmental authority.
>
> Governors of the Nation, in turn, said the continued operation of States and the welfare of citizens depended upon greater unfettered assistance from the Federal Government in Washington.
>
> And in Washington, it is likely the Federal operating budget—exclusive of the trust funds—will be in deficit this fiscal year regardless of what Congress does. It is not in much of a position to help anybody else.
>
> And the low man on the totem pole is the taxpayer, who cannot understand what is happening. He is being told that the Federal Government must tax him more, which leaves him less money to pay higher prices for the things he needs. It is possible the Government will spend his money instead—which could drive prices still higher.
>
> He is also discovering that he still has to pay the 10 per cent Federal Income Surtax although the measure has not been enacted into law.
>
> From Sacramento, the taxpayer learns that in spite of the high taxes he is paying, the state government cannot spend the money because it has not approved a budget. He also is told that a 1-cent sales tax increase may be needed to "reform" revenue laws—while legislators are bitterly arguing about what to do with an estimated $395 million in state surplus funds.
>
> And last year the California taxpayer was given "relief" by the state in the form of reduced property valuations—only to learn that his local government raised valuations sharply, and in many cases negated the "relief."
>
> Is it any wonder the average taxpayer is confused, irritated, suspicious and resentful—a fertile field for severe reaction.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE MASTON O'NEAL SPEAKS ON PROBLEMS FACING AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, on July 12, 1969, the Fourth Annual Peanut Progress Day was celebrated in Tifton, Ga. My esteemed colleague and good friend, Congressman Maston O'Neal of the Second District of Georgia, delivered the main address.

Congressman O'Neal is known for his efforts to improve the conditions of the American farmer, and particularly those engaged in the peanut industry. In his position on the House Agriculture Committee he has worked hard to alleviate the problems of rural America.

Also on this occasion, the Georgia Agricultural Commodity Commission for Peanuts paid special tribute to Georgia's senior Senator, Richard B. Russell, for his long and faithful service to the cause of agricultural advancement and for his interest in the development of the southeastern peanut agricultural economy. He was presented with a trophy which signified appreciation for his services. Unfortunately Senator Russell could not attend because of duties in Washington. The trophy was accepted in his behalf by his brother, Dr. Fielding Russell.

I think this speech will be of interest to all of the Members of Congress. I submit it, therefore, for insertion in the Record:

> Mr. Chairman, Dr. Pete Donaldson, other Officials and Directors of the Georgia Agricultural Commodity Commission for Peanuts, Ladies and Gentlemen attending this Fourth Annual Peanut Progress Day in Tifton:
>
> Every person here today is greatly disappointed that recent developments in Washington have prevented Senator Russell from being with us. I know that he is no less chagrined himself that he could not personally receive the honor you are paying him and that he could not respond to the great tribute.
>
> He scheduled his appearance from a grateful heart and a long standing desire to thank you face to face.
>
> He also looked forward to what all of us who are at posts of duty in Washington look forward to, and that is the chance to just visit and exchange thoughts on our problems.
>
> The Senator asked me to express his profound regrets over the circumstances which prevented him from being here today. I am highly honored to do so.
>
> As all of you know, the matter of providing for our national security has somehow become a controversial subject in the United States Senate this year and it would have been impossible to predict as early as three weeks ago that much of the heat of this controversy would converge during this week and next.
>
> The military procurement bill containing the authorization of funds for the important Safeguard anti-ballistic missile system is now the pending business before the Senate, and the hearings of the Defense Appropritions Bill over which Senator Russell presides are still incomplete as a result of two unforeseen delays.
>
> These circumstances made this a most difficult time for Senator Russell to leave Washington without undue physical strain, which he is prudently trying to avoid. As a result, Dr. Pete and our other good friends on the Commission assured him that all of you would understand the necessity of avoiding making his schedule more strenuous than it already is.
>
> Your tribute to the Senator speaks for itself. It is more eloquent than any words I might call forth. Its message—simply stated—is that Senator Russell is one of the great men of our age.
>
> All too often we take for granted the benefits that result from the Senator's leadership and influence in Washington. We often fail to fully appreciate the Senator's ability, integrity and dedication—the qualities which make him a key member of the Senate and an outstanding national figure.
>
> Public servants of Senator Russell's quality don't come along often. Therefore, it is a source of great pride to all of us that this giant of American government is a fellow Georgian.
>
> Our Senior Senator began his political career at the age of 22 when he was elected to the Georgia House of Representatives in 1920.
>
> He has set and broken many records since that first election. He was the youngest Governor ever elected in Georgia. He is the only Senator in the history of our country to

XUM

serve more than half of his life in the United State Senate.

As President Pro Tempore of the Senate, he is third in the line of succession to the Office of President of the United States. In terms of national prestige, he has achieved equal status with many of our Presidents. In terms of character, integrity and ability, he has—in my judgment—eclipsed them all.

It is not necessary to enumerate the Senator's contributions to the progress of agriculture in Georgia. You are the recipients of his efforts, and you know better than anyone else that our distinguished Senior Senator has openly fought many battles and quietly used his influence on other occasions in your behalf.

As for his contributions to peanut farmers, I need only mention that our new National Peanut Marketing Research Laboratory in Dawson is now completed and ready for occupancy. Without Senator Russell's persistence and untiring efforts along with those of Tic Forrester, the site of our modern laboratory would still be a vacant plot of ground in Terrell County.

Let it suffice to say that Dick Russell is a true and loyal friend of the Georgia farmer. He is Georgia's greatest human resource. I know of no other person more deserving of the honor you have bestowed upon Senator Russell today.

Several years ago I had the honor and pleasure of introducing him to an audience on this very campus.

I told a joke in doing so but I thought it a peculiarly appropriate one.

A circus owner was displeased because one of his Star Acrobats was thinking of retirement. He was the one they shot out of a cannon. "I hope you won't quit," the circus owner said, "because I don't know where I can get another man of your caliber."

Senator Richard Brevard Russell is not a 22 rifle. He is more like the 16 inch guns of mighty battleships.

I am particularly pleased that in addition to honoring the Senator, your program today has placed special emphasis on the problems facing American agriculture.

Problems with the consumer and the Congress were discussed earlier in the program. However, I would be remiss in my duties as a Congressional Representative of Southwest Georgia farmers if I did not add emphasis to such critical areas of concern to rural America.

In this year that will close out the 1960's and launch the 1970's, there is much justifiable concern over the future of American agriculture and the related industries that constitute the agri-business community.

Basically, the problems of the farmer are three-fold, First, he receives about the same prices or less than he received in the past quarter of a century; yet he must pay production costs that generally have doubled over the past 20 years.

Secondly, the farmer, like the businessman, has been severely cramped by inflation and ever-increasing interest rates on the money he must borrow to achieve the efficiency to offset rising production costs. The Federal Government must take the lion's share of blame for this deplorable situation. It has spent money and thrown it away like the prodigal son until it has become far and away the biggest borrower in history with a public debt that a few weeks ago was over $364 billion. The private borrower must then compete in the money market with the seemingly insatiable demand of the government for the lendable dollar. We are moving ever so slightly in the proper direction to solve this problem—by cutting federal expenditures and attempting to balance the budget. But we have not moved nearly fast enough nor far enough in my opinion; especially not soon enough.

Last, but certainly not least in importance, is the fact that the farmer does indeed have an image problem. His story is not being sufficiently told to the American public. The steel people, the airlines, the giant corporations who produce synthetic fibers, and other groups are certainly telling their story about the wonders of their products and services. Agriculture is making small and inadequate efforts in this direction. That's where businessmen who have a vested interest in agriculture come into the picture. The farmers and their friends must tell the American consumer that food and fiber are the greatest bargains on earth, not only because government is subsidizing the consumer through the farmer, but because of the farmer's efficiency and willingness to work at great risk of loss and without punching a clock.

Our farmers have been able to produce with such efficiency and abundance that the American consumer now uses only 17-point-2 percent of his disposable net income for food, as compared with 25 percent by consumers in Western Europe and 40 to 50 percent by Russians.

Therefore, it is clear that the farmer must continue to receive fair prices and stay in business or he will be forced out and the consumer will pay more when the big corporations take over the foreclosure wreckage and it gets in a very few hands.

However, millions of our urban people and hundreds of their Representatives in Congress don't understand these simple economic facts. They, at least appear to believe that they can have their cake and eat it too.

Urban district Congressmen so dominate the Congress these days that they determine what becomes law. Of the 435 Members of the House of Representatives, only 31 are from districts where as much as 25 percent of the constituency is made up of people residing on farms.

It is true that only six percent of nation's population is engaged in farming. But Department of Agriculture statistics show that 40 percent of the American people are either engaged in farming or dependent upon it through agri-business or by providing other goods and services to agriculture. That's including the man in Ohio who makes tractor tires and the railroadman in Jacksonville who makes his living on a freight train hauling agricultural commodities.

The farmer urgently needs the support of all his associates in industry and commerce if his interests are to be properly considered, as they deserve to be, in the Legislative and Executive Branches of Government. Only when the voice of agriculture is heard as clearly as the voices of labor, big business and other strong interests, will farm programs and other agricultural legislation receive proper consideration in Washington.

If Senator Russell were here he could testify to the inexorable changes that have occurred in the several decades of his services in the Senate. He would not say "Thank you" for what you have done for him but "Thank you" for what you are doing for America.

FABRIDAM, CENTRAL SUSQUEHANNA VALLEY, PA.

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, on July 4 it was my privilege to participate in the ceremonies marking the dedication of the world's largest fabridam at Sunbury, Pa. The key address was given by Pennsylvania's secretary of forests and waters, the Honorable Maurice Goddard, who emphasized the practical aspects and potentials of this new project.

This manmade structure, composed of seven large inflated neoprene synthetic rubber-coated tubes stretches across the Susquehanna River. The 8-foot-high tubes provide a water barrier, thus creating a new 3,000-acre pool of water to a depth of 8 to 9 feet above normal. The tubes are anchored by concrete piers and seven of them total more than 2,000 feet across the river. The structure is a unique answer in the field of water control and it is a forerunner of other fish, wildlife, and recreation projects now planned elsewhere in the Nation.

Structures such as this are capable of being deflated, fully or partially, during storms or rainy seasons to pass flood crests and prevent upstream flooding. The fabridam can be used to impound water for a variety of purposes: conservation, recreation, irrigation, navigation locks, and hydrolecetric power head maximization.

The Federal Government did not contribute any financial assistance to the project at Sunbury—most of the money amounting to approximately $2½ million was supplied by the State of Pennsylvania and local sources. We in the 17th Congressional District are proud to have this innovation in water control and conservation. I should like to commend the Central Susquehanna Valley Chamber of Commerce and all civic officials for their foresight and willingness to undertake a project of this magnitude to benefit the local citizens.

AMENDMENT OF INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 26 the Senate passed S. 2224, a bill proposing to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 in many significant ways. As I indicated in remarks when I introduced H.R. 8980 on March 13, 1969, many of the features of this bill will update the mutual fund laws and will provide more investor protection without interfering with the right of shareholders and directors to manage their mutual funds. However, some of the provisions of that bill are so far reaching in their consequences, that I thought it important to introduce my own bill in the House as a basis for discussion when this legislation comes before the committee of which I am a member.

The legislative process invites compromise and accommodation and we seek to resolve conflicting views in order to promote a broader public purpose and serve the common good. Now that I have studied S. 2224 in comparison to my own bill, I believe it will further advance the legislative process to revise my bill to include as much as possible of the bill passed by the Senate and introduced in the House by our committee chairman, JOHN MOSS, as H.R. 11995. The revised bill I am introducing today differs from the Senate bill in these important areas.

First, mutual funds which have at least 50 percent of the board of directors made up of unaffiliated and disinterested persons and which obtain approval of their management or distribution contracts by a two-thirds vote of outstanding shares and all of the unaffiliated directors within 1 year will be exempt from having the SEC and the NASD review management compensation and sales commissions if such approval is not obtained, these agreements will be subject to SEC review. Second, former SEC personnel along with lawyers and accountants will be included among a new category of "interested persons" barred from affiliation with mutual funds for a reasonable period of time. Third, incentive management fees based on performance and which increase and decrease proportionately will be encouraged, but will not be required to decrease below the level of no compensation or actual operating costs, if the parties agree. Fourth, the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 will not be applicable to advisers' agreements between non-U.S. entities and U.S. investment advisers registered under the act. Fifth, U.S. investment advisers will not be prohibited from having incentive contracts including performance fees with unregistered companies. Sixth, penalties will be imposed on those who bring lawsuits against mutual funds without justifiable cause. Seventh, former SEC personnel will be prohibited for 2 years from suing mutual funds. Eighth, the existing exemption from the 1940 act—but not the 1933 and 1934 acts—for oil exploration funds will be continued. These funds are completely regulated under Federal securities laws, and I see no reason to try and treat them as mutual funds when they are not. Ninth, I have tried to treat front-end-load contractual plans a little more equitably. They must compete with insurance policies where salesmen get from 65 to 120 percent front-end load and sell with no prospectus.

There are other minor differences in my bill, most of which involve a requirement that the SEC conform to the Administrative Procedure Act in its administrative activities, and that its actions be reasonable. The SEC now is permitted to exercise its discretion without the checks and balances required by due process under the Federal Constitution. I am hopeful that Members of Congress will review my revised bill with care, as I believe it is important we bring the controversy surrounding this legislation to a close. High interest rates, uncertainties in our fiscal and monetary policy, and unsettled conditions in Vietnam are rapidly eroding investor confidence as reflected in the sharp decline in securities prices in recent weeks. Far-reaching policy changes in antitrust law enforcement have added to investor unrest, and have caused share declines in the prices of securities of conglomerates. Actions of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the New York Stock Exchange respecting minimum rates, customer-directed commission sharing, access of nonmembers to the exchange markets, and reciprocal business arrangements, are all taking their toll of investor confidence. I urge my colleagues to be thoughtful and to be reasonable and above all to remember that securities salesmen are entitled to earn a fair living in these times of inflation along with everyone else. My bill will preserve their income at approximately the present level with an added opportunity for increased earnings. The Senate bill in its present form will, in my opinion, cut the income of mutual fund salesmen by approximately 50 percent. I think any such action by Congress at this time would be highly discriminatory and inconsistent with our ideas of equal protection under the law. I do not believe it is the function of the SEC or minority shareholders to second-guess majority shareholders or directors of companies as to the value of management compensation or the level of sales commissions. Competition in the mutual fund industry fixes the price of these services at a level considered reasonable by the buyers and sellers involved. My bill will protect this principle of corporate democracy and at the same time protect the right of investors to make their own decision as to the value of the services for which they pay.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ROTC IN AN ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, last month at a ROTC commissioning ceremony, the very able president of the University of North Dakota, Dr. George Starcher, outlined his thoughts on the significance of the ROTC in an academic community.

Because of many recent distortions of the mission of the ROTC, I felt my colleagues would be interested in having the viewpoint of Dr. Starcher on this matter.

At this time I include his remarks in the RECORD:

REMARKS AT THE ROTC COMMISSIONING CEREMONY, JUNE 8, 1969

(By Dr. George W. Starcher)

Colonel Whye, Colonel Woodard, members of the faculty, candidates for commissions, parents, relatives, and friends; Today I want to say something about ROTC and the University because we hear again that ROTC must go, or that it should be moved off to the periphery of the campus and stripped of academic credit. As with any other course or activity we should ask from time to time, "What is the significance of the ROTC in an academic community?" First, a quick review of this University's involvement in military training.

The Act creating this University in 1883 provided that military instruction must be made available. Up to 1888 military instruction was by a retired colonel, W. H. Topping, who operated the Boarding Department, chaperoned the students, drilled the boys in calisthenics and directed the school of the soldier. One of the reasons given for not making Acting President Montgomery the President of the University in 1887, was his total neglect of both military and physical training. Colonel Topping was so poor as an instructor that he was discharged. The students organized themselves for a half-hour drill at noon—out of doors in good weather and up and down the halls of Old Main when it was bad. They talked the Governor out of 38 State Militia muskets for drill. In 1890 the War Department sent in Lt. Leon Roudiez from Fort Pembina to be PMST. He also taught French. A uniform of "Baldwin grey" was adopted. Springfield cadet rifles and other accoutrements were obtained. Lt. Roudiez made military science very popular. Students liked the uniforms so well that they talked of making it the official daily dress at the University. Even the girls organized their own military company in 1889 and, at their own request, Lt. Roudiez directed their drill.

In the spring of 1897 the military and physical education departments joined in staging a program of bugle calls, band music, saber drills, bayonet exercises, club swinging and tumbling. Hailed as a "brilliant and daring achievement," it became so popular that it was performed at the Metropolitan Theatre downtown, and the following year it went on the road to Grafton and Larimore. The military coronet band achieved rank along with the choral club, the mandolin and guitar club and the glee club.

The Spanish War of 1898 took all of the instructors and military science was suspended. In 1904 the military department was closed since there was no war threat, Indian or foreign, student instructors become indifferent, and the faculty were willing to see military science forgotten in favor of "physical culture."

The National Defense Act of 1916 revived the idea of military training. With the war in Europe, trouble on the Mexican border and increasing student enlistments in the National Guard, the faculty, after heated discussion, voted in 1917 to revive compulsory military training. With the declaration of war on April 6, 1917, military training was reinstated at once and made compulsory in September. Many students enlisted. By November there was only one officer left—Captain Charles McVey, brother of President McVey. Students provided their own uniforms and when Captain McVey left in May, the students conducted their own drill, with nothing but wooden muskets.

The Student Army Training Corps (SATC) opened in 1918 with 400 student soldiers. In fact the opening ceremonies for the University that fall were entirely military in nature. During the sumemr the University conducted a vocational program for 360 men learning how to advance the war effort. That year construction was begun on the new $30,000 armory which now, just 50 years later, houses ROTC. The *Dakota Student* was replaced by an army paper called *The Camp Barrage*. We changed to the quarter system and only courses having some bearing on the training of military personnel were offered.

The end of the war in November, and the great influenza epidemic, paralyzed the campus.

The issue of compulsory military training created a fairly even split in the faculty and among the students. The SATC was over. The *Dakota Student*, the *Education Record*, and the *Grand Forks Herald* reported the debate while another paper, the *Grand Forks American*, opposed what it called "the blight of militarism" and "the menace of Prussianism" posed by military training.

The faculty council finally voted to establish the ROTC in 1919. That year the ROTC department introduced the military ball.

Seven years later, in 1926, the *Dakota Student* furiously opposed compulsory ROTC but it survived. In the 1930's anti-militarism appeared in the form of occasional agitation (we would call it demonstration) against the military ball and two organizations re-

XUM

ferred to as "Scabby Blade" and the "Sons of Future Wars."

In 1937 the state legislature abolished compulsory ROTC at the University and enrollment fell off by half or more. Beginning with Pearl Harbor and World War II so many students left for service that by 1943 enrollment dropped to 775 students, mostly women. The University began to look like a military camp with all sorts of defense and war training programs organized to train engineers, glider pilots, civilian pilots, radio operators and the 304th college training detachment trained more than 2500 men here. In addition, there were many specialized pre-professional, medical and nurse corps trainees on campus. Almost every faculty member was involved in one way or another in carrying out a truly phenomenal war training effort.

Following the war the campus experienced what observers described as an atmosphere of good feeling and deep pride in the great achievement made by the University for the country. There was a revival of optimism that had been missing for a generation.

And so the 1950's saw compulsory ROTC with both Army and Air Force ROTC units established again. Students and faculty alike protested the compulsory feature and, since engineers were excused, the faculty council had no logical alternative but to make ROTC voluntary, which they did in 1965. Since that time officer production has actually increased and morale and quality also improved.

The history of ROTC at this University makes clear that the faculty does carefully evaluate the program from time to time. Orderly expression of views, and protest that does not interfere with the on-going University have always been protected—even encouraged.

Today some 350 colleges and universities have approved ROTC units, 97% of them give academic credit for ROTC. Some 100 other colleges and universities have requested ROTC units. Fifteen new Army ROTC units were established last year. Eight schools were notified that their ROTC units would be withdrawn because of low production of officers, but the students and faculty protested so vigorously in four of them and provided such convincing guarantees of increased enrollment, that the cancellation orders were withdrawn.

We support ROTC because you young men about to receive your commissions, and hundreds like you, want an opportunity to complete officer training along with getting a college education—some to prepare for careers in the military and others for more limited service.

We should all bear in mind that the national objective of ROTC is to provide for the simultaneous blending of military training with civilian academic pursuit. This provides a high type officer who is, by and large, more successful in performance than typical graduates of an officers candidate school, where training for a commission covers a much shorter time. Last year more than 21,000 young men were commissioned through the ROTC while some 50,000 officers commissioned through other programs.

The Army commissioned 35% of its officers through ROTC last year. The Air Force secured 28% of its officers from graduates of the ROTC Aerospace Studies. The service academies furnish only 3% of the commissions in the total military system each year.

Approximately ⅓ of the generals in the army today are products of ROTC. Half of the officers from the level just below flag to lieutenant are ROTC products. Indeed, the Defense Department could not get along without ROTC unless new and far more expensive schools and academies were built.

One of the principles by which this nation has operated from its founding is that there be civilian control over the military. That principle applies not only to having the President be Commander in Chief and a civilian at the head of the Defense Department, but it produces the leavening effect of having men enter the services through ROTC, and through the selective service, rather than hiring professional paid soldiers. If the services are denied their source of officers through ROTC, they would be compelled to hire professionally trained military personnel. Then instead of an orientation toward peace, humanitarianism and individual liberty we could well create a Prussian type military elite, infinitely more objectionable than anything critics find in the ROTC.

The ultimate aim of the ROTC officer is the protection of this nation and its citizens. As long as protection is a necessity we must recognize the obligation of everyone to share in that burden. Anyone who believes that wars are made by military officers and not by statesmen simply have not read their history books. When we hear of criticism, violence and disruption of colleges and universities over the ROTC issues, we might pause and be thankful that ROTC graduates are helping to keep this a country where people are free to criticize. However, there can be no tolerance of those who would destroy that very freedom itself by violence or otherwise.

Every one of you young men who is about to receive a commission knows that our own history, especially our participation in two world wars, shows how security may be threatened when we tolerate aggression; and that saving lives and helping people, then having to defend them, may be of importance to us for many reasons, not the least of which is that there are those who wish we would lose our morale and determination.

There are those who oppose anything military. ROTC is the most visible identification with the military on campus, therefore it is the thing they would first destroy.

One objection to ROTC is that it discriminates on the basis of sex. So does physical education for men, and there is high selectivity in engineering, nursing, and home economics.

There are those who insist that the ROTC poses a contradiction to the concept of academic freedom. On the other hand, the military is recognized as a profession of vital importance to peace and to the nation. Then, is it not entirely consistent with the purposes of a university to provide opportunities for young men to prepare for such careers? As long as ROTC is voluntary those who protest stand with those who would prohibit the reading of Karl Marx or listening to Gus Hall.

All of those involved in ROTC, and that includes those of you completing your training today, would do anything in their power to build an ideal world where no military is needed. You know full well that military science and activity diverts men's attention and action away from humanitarian goals into a regrettable, but nevertheless a most necessary, responsibility of protecting all of us against aggression from outside. At worse there may come a time when it is necessary to abandon all else for the law of the jungle—kill or be killed. I suspect that those most acquainted with weapons and the skills and arts of war would do anything possible to bring about a world where there are no military people around because that would be a world without hatred, greed, fear ignorance, misery, or want—the basic causes of war.

Unfortunately the world is not that way yet and even wishing it were so neither gives us that kind of world nor the kind of people who will dependably act that way. We still have an Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, and all the rest because we have to have them if human freedom and dignity are to survive.

I do not know how many of you would be here had it not been for the pressures of the draft. But I believe you would all say that the ROTC has taught you a great deal about courage, unselfishness, and leadership—I would add also courtesy. To the seemingly growing number of young people who decry all war, those who have completed ROTC can probably confess a deeper abhorrence of war, and with better reasons, than any of those others engage in demonstrations of their belief, including a few who express themselves in more militant ways.

Every officer in the ROTC fervently strives to save lives and build a safer and more just world for all. It is precisely for this reason that they would also say that there must still be preparation for war if we are to avoid oppression, injustice, dishonor, and loss of freedom for all time to come. They know that military service is not something men live for and look forward to with pleasure. Rather they know it is a solemn duty.

We should remember that the academic quality of the ROTC program is reviewed every year by the military all the way up to the Pentagon, by civilian advisory groups of educators, and by curriculum committees and faculties in the universities themselves. Credit is determined by the curriculum committee as for any other course. The acceptability of military credit in each particular curriculum is determined by the dean and faculty of the college in which the student is enrolled. Some curricula permit including military credit in the minimum hours required, while some cannot do this and therefore, for them, ROTC credits are in excess of the degree requirements for other students. Students understand this and it is not a serious matter. The granting of academic credit is part of our contract with the Department of Defense, as is the provision of classroom and office space on the same basis as for other programs giving courses for credit. The Defense Department provides instruction, equipment, clothing, and pay for students.

The criticism that the University has nothing to say about the selection of instructors in ROTC is hardly valid. By agreement with the Department of Defense all instructors are nominated to the institution and we decide whether to accept or reject the individual so nominated. We have rejected several nominees and we have specified the type of officer and the background training we would accept. Our wishes in this regard have been honored. This arrangement is not different from that which we have followed in the appointment of faculty to the Department of Religious Studies, and in other areas here and at other universities. From year to year the ROTC program has been modified to include more regular university courses in lieu of some of the courses formerly taught by ROTC instructors.

ROTC gives one a greater consciousness of history, and of revolution, going back to our own American revolution, to secure freedom to do whatever we want except destroy that freedom itself. Through ROTC a man also achieves a little deeper consciousness of the moral revolution going on. The ROTC officer has no less compassion than the demonstrator. He only knows more about himself, about other people and about the world. He is perfectly capable of participating in those activities that a morally aroused youth demands. But with the training and leadership that ROTC affords, with the vision of man as master and the role of ideals in building a new world, you who receive your commissions today, more than any others, are prepared to build a new world in the tradition of freedom, justice, and peace that has been a basic motivation of Americans from the very beginning of that revolution that was intended to make such a world possible.

I congratulate you. We are proud of you. You are our single best reason why the ROTC is good.

AMENDMENT TO THE TRUTH IN LENDING LAW

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing an amendment to the truth-in-lending law to correct an inequity which exists because of the ruling of the Federal Reserve Board in regard to the right of rescission. The difficulty has arisen primarily from the Board's interpretation of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. CAHILL) on the floor of the House. The gentleman's amendment was aimed primarily at the fly-by-night door-to-door salesman, but has been interpreted by the Board to apply to the legitimate businessman who has a stake in his community.

GENERAL EXPLANATION

Title I of the Consumer Credit Protection Act, better known as the truth-in-lending law, went into effect July 1. Most sections of the act deal with the new Federal requirement that all businesses which charge consumers for the right to defer payment must disclose both the amount and the annual percentage rate of the credit charge. However, in addition to this requirement, Congress also enacted, in section 125 of the act, a highly innovative provision which grants consumers the unilateral right to rescind any credit transaction, including a retail sale, "in which a security interest is retained or acquired in any real property which is used or is expected to be used as the residence of the person to whom credit is extended." Under this provision, the consumer need give no reason for his decision to cancel a transaction. He need only notify the creditor of his intention to cancel within 3 business days following either the day the transaction was consummated or the day all credit disclosures were given him, whichever is later. If the consumer has purchased property in a credit sale and has taken it home with him or has had it delivered to his home, and then he decides to rescind, the creditor must go after the property within 10 days after it is tendered or the title to the property automatically vests in the consumer without any obligation on his part to pay for it. Clearly, this is a very rigorous provision. As will be seen below, however, it was not intended by Congress to apply to most businesses. Its purpose was to end a very serious, but specific, wrong which had been brought to the attention of the Congress, and indeed to the entire country. However, by the time the effective date of the act rolled around this very rigorous, but narrow, provision had, by administrative interpretation, been made applicable to literally millions of American businesses. This interpretation is contained in the truth-in-lending regulation—regulation Z—which was drafted by the Federal Reserve Board. The interpretation—section 226.2(z)—provides that the term "security interest," which was not specifically defined by Congress in the act, includes: "mechanic's, materialmen's, artisan's, and other similar liens, and any lien on property arisng by operation of law."

As the following will show, this interpretation, as applied to section 125 of the act, was promulgated in disregard of: First, the express language of section 125, second, the clearly indicated purpose for which section 125 was enacted, and third, the admittedly severe burden which it places on millions of businessmen who were never intended to be covered by section 125.

TECHNICAL EXPLANATION

(1) THE EXPRESS LANGUAGE OF SECTION 125

As indicated above, section 125 of the act (subsection (a)) provides that a consumer shall have the right to rescind any credit transaction "in which 'a security interest is retained or acquired' in any real property which is used or is expected to be used as the residence of the person to whom credit is extended."

It is this general language which the FRB relied on in defining the term "security interest," to include mechanic's, materialmen's, artisan's, or other liens, arising by operation of law—hereinafter referred to as "liens arising by operation of law." Admittedly, it is possible to interpret the language "security interest retained or acquired" to include liens arising by operation of law. However, in choosing this general language to justitfy its extension of section 125, the Board disregarded the more specific language of section 125(b). That subsection, which deals with the effects of a consumer's rescission, states that upon a consumer's giving notice of his intention to rescind "any security interest given by the obligor becomes void."

Liens arising by operation of law are not, of course, given by an obligor. They are, and have been for many years, provided by State law as a means of security performance of obligations arising from the purchase of services or goods which improve real property. Thus, when stating in section 125(b) that any security interest given by the obligor becomes void, Congress could not have had in mind liens arising by operation of law. Since one of the basic rules of statutory construction provides that specific language shall take procedence over more general language, the definition of the term "security interest" contained in regulation Z constitutes an erroneous interpretation of the act.

(2) THE PURPOSE FOR WHICH SECTION 125 WAS ENACTED

The error contained in regulation Z is made even more clear when the purpose of section 125 is considered.

What is now section 125 originated in a floor amendment. The discussion surrounding the introduction of the amendment clearly indicates that the purpose of section 125 was to end the fraudulent schemes of second mortgage racketeers and other fly-by-night operators who victimize homeowners with their fast-sell and quick-exit schemes. The methods used in these schemes are no secret. In the words of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. CAHILL), who introduced the amendment which later became section 125:

> A central feature of these schemes *is the assignment of the note and mortgage by the fraudulent mortgage lender* to the finance companies which, by callous disregard of the fraudulent underlying transactions, can claim the privileged status of holder in due course under State law. [Italics added.]

Liens which arise by operation of law are not generally assignable under State law. Thus, for the second mortgage racketeer to operate effectively, he must acquire a lien by contract, in other words a security interest given by the consumer. This is clearly what the Congress intended to protect against when it enacted section 125, and unlike the interpretation in regulation Z, the language of section 125(b) is both consistent with and a clear indicator of that intention.

3. BURDEN ON LEGITIMATE BUSINESSMEN

At least one member of the Federal Reserve Board readily admits that the consumer's right to rescind provided by section 125 is expected to cause the most problems in the application of the truth-in-lending law; and he has also indicated that an amendment to the statute might be necessary.*

Most of these problems, however, would not arise if section 125 were made to apply, as it was clearly intended to apply, only to liens acquired by contract.

The problems created by the right to rescind (as interpreted in regulation Z) result primarily from the fact that virtually every State has a law granting mechanic's, materialmen's, artisan's or other liens where services or property is purchased to improve real property. Because these laws are in effect, the FRB's interpretation has made section 125 applicable to sales by literally millions of legitimate businessmen. In some businesses, for example in lumber and building material retail establishments, virtually every product sold can be used to improve real property, including residences of consumers. Hence, the vast majority of the sales made by these businesses could conceivably be rescindable. The burden on these businesses is clear. Most of their customers will want them to begin performance of the transaction immediately, for example, they will want to take the property or have it delivered to their home. Yet, if the property is taken or delivered before the rescission period is ended, the creditor faces the risk of losing that property without compensation. Many of these businesses would be willing to waive their liens in some cases, for example, for small purchases, but this in itself is a burden, as a waiver may well require the signing and/or filing or a formal document. Moreover, even a waiver of a lien does not protect a business from a rescission if some other party to the transaction, such as a contractor or workman, retains a right to acquire a lien. The FRB has ruled that in such a case the transaction would be rescindable by the consumer regardless of the fact that the creditor's lien was waived. Again, the burden on these businesses is clear. Yet, as indicated

---

*See testimony of Hon. J. L. Robertson, Vice Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in hearings before the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, Part 2, March 6, 1969, p. 391.

XUM

above, the legislative history of the act shows that they were not even intended to be covered by the section. These businesses are not fast-sell, quick-exit operations. Very few make door-to-door sales, and even those that do maintain permanent establishments which stand behind their sales.

CONCLUSION

The language of section 125(b) clearly shows that the consumer's right to rescind was intended to apply only where a security interest in a consumer's home is given by him to a creditor. This is made even more clear when the legislative history of the act is considered, for it shows that the practices for which section 125 was enacted to end are effective only where security interests are acquired by contract, that is, given by the consumer. In view of these considerations, it is advocated that section 125 of the Consumer Credit Protection Act be amended to provide in definite terms that it does not apply to transactions where the only lien involved is a mechanic's, materialmen's or other lien arising solely by operation of law.

OBSCENE MAIL

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, although we have protested, we have investigated, and we have introduced corrective legislation—the flood of obscene mail has not been abated. Our mails are still open sewers filled with filth that makes a circus of sex.

Yesterday, my colleague from Texas Jack Brooks, brought new revelations into the matter of unsolicited obscene mail. Mr. Brooks has grown weary of excuses and inaction by the Post Office. To counter complaints that Congress was doing nothing, Mr. Brooks called his Government Activities Subcommittee into a special meeting July 8 and responded with a specific recommendation that I urge the Post Office to enact.

Mr. Brooks contends, and I agree, that the Post Office has sufficient authority, and certainly the responsibility, to implement regulations stopping this sick material from reaching home delivery. To augment his position, Mr. Brooks proposed expanding section 4001 of title 39, United States Code, to restrict obscene illustrations from being sent unsolicited through the U.S. mails. This regulation is limited in purpose and does not violate the tenets of our Constitution.

The simple-minded deliberations on what is or is not "obscene" have reached the point of the absurd, while the raw mail goes on. Mr. Brooks' regulation would not involve itself in semantics; it does not require any subjective tests which have weakened convictions under present obscenity laws. The regulation does not even include any written material or matter that is solicited by the person receiving it.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Post Office to respond to the complaints of its patrons and to the criticism of Congress. There is no excuse for apathy; there is no excuse for inaction by the Post Office. I would strongly recommend some of the funds to be derived from the increase in postal rates be channeled into concerted efforts to bar pornographic materials from the mail. This is not a simple matter to control, and we all know it, but that is no reason why no action is taken.

I would call your attention to the two bills I have introduced which would put muscle into existing obscenity laws. This proposal of Mr. Brooks, would certainly supplement this overall objective. The main thing is that positive action must be taken on all fronts.

A RESPONSIBLE CENSUS

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, today the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, which I have the honor to chair, of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee unanimously reported out H.R. 12825. This bill, which was introduced on behalf of myself and Mr. Purcell, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Waldie, Mr. White, Mr. Derwinski, and Mr. Meskill, and subsequently supported by Mr. Scott, amends title 13 of the United States Code to strengthen and improve the census law.

This legislation is the result of many weeks of investigation into the controversy surrounding the 1970 census.

The Subcommittee on Census and Statistics initiated this investigation, which was aimed at determining what changes, if any, were necessary in the census, more than 4 months ago. As chairman of the subcommittee, I scheduled the testimony of the various interested groups to provide a comprehensive and a balanced presentation of all points of view.

During the hearings I continually emphasized that our subcommittee was not out to harm the census—was not out on a witch hunt—but was concerned only with dealing intelligently and fairly with the controversy that developed. I pointed out that "at least in part, much of the outcry appeared to have been deliberately fomented through the issuance of news releases designed to distort and exaggerate the census programs in order to play upon our natural fears of 'Big Brother' and inflame our righteous indigation over governmental snooping into our private lives."

It was a tribute to the members of our subcommittee that during the course of our investigation they did not permit themselves to be swayed by the emotionalism of a public outcry. However, their refusal not to be swayed did not equate with a refusal to be concerned and, in the opinion of the subcommittee the allowable scope of the 1970 census questions and the extent to which mandatory replies to the census questionnaire are required were vital areas of concern.

It is, of course, true that any question asked under penalty of law—even if all that is being asked is the person's name—is an invasion of the individual's privacy. So, too, are the laws requiring that most people file an income tax return. The real question is whether the value of the action being taken justifies the restrictions upon the individual's privacy; whether the value of the statistical information provided by the census is of sufficient importance to warrant the question—all the questions—being asked.

The hearings which the subcommittee has held have been most comprehensive and have covered a wide cross-section of opinion and interest throughout the country. Beginning with Mr. A. Ross Eckler, Director of the Bureau of the Census, each witness, whether representing State or local government, a scientific or professional organization, the business community, or just himself as a concerned citizen, has added to the subcommittee's knowledge of the Census Bureau and the 1970 census program.

Our hearings produced both supporters and critics of the census. Yet, most all of the witnesses testified to the vital need of the census.

It was, therefore, clear that our subcommittee's assignment was to draw up legislation that would, on one hand, strengthen the census and, on the other hand, guarantee the rights of our citizens.

I sincerely believe that the legislation we have introduced indicates that we have succeeded.

As reported out of the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, H.R. 12825 would modify the census law to: First, eliminate the requirement that the census must include questions on unemployment and housing, directing the enumeration of a census of population only—though authorization is provided for the inclusion of unemployment and housing and other census information as deemed necessary; second, encourage the use of more sampling; third, provide the Secretary of Commerce with specific authority for conducting special census for States and local communities; fourth, direct the Secretary to prevent duplication of effort by using existing data; fifth, incorporate into title 13 present administrative procedures for guaranteeing confidentiality of census information as well as strengthening these procedures; sixth, increase the fine from $1,000 to $5,000 and the jail sentence from 2 to 5 years for any employee of the Census Bureau who divulges confidential information; seventh, eliminate the jail sentence penalty for citizens who refuse to answer the census questionnaire; eighth, eliminate the jail sentence penalty for citizens giving false answers to a census question; and ninth, direct the Secretary to submit the proposed census questions to the appropriate committees of Congress for review and approval 3 years before the census date.

I wish to emphasize that our bill not only tightens the confidentiality provision of title 13, but removes a never used and unneeded jail sentence penalty which has served only to irritate our citizens. We have also assured a review and approval of the proposed census questions by the appropriate congressional committees—the people's representatives. This provision was based on a similar proposal made by the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee has worked long and hard to develop legislation which would maintain the rights and privacy of our citizens and yet not deny to Government and society the information needed to make the intelligent and responsible decisions required in these difficult times. That we believe that we have done so is evidenced by the unanimous support of the subcommittee—many of whose members had previously supported strongly restrictive census legislation. I believe also that when those of my colleagues who do not serve on the Census and Statistics Subcommittee have had the opportunity to study our legislation and read the printed testimony they too will want to support our position.

TELEVISION NEWS, GOVERNMENT CHECKED?—NO

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the Arizona Republic, one of Arizona's distinguished newspapers, on July 7, 1969, published the following editorial, "Hogtying TV." I fully agree that the guidelines for news fairness and accuracy being administered by a Federal agency would be a major blow to press freedom. Certainly, I have frequently questioned the accuracy of some television news presentations. A vigilance on the part of the viewer and a diligent attempt by television officials for honesty is what is needed, though—not some governmental or quasi-governmental regulation.

The editorial follows:

HOGTYING TV

We have seldom hesitated to criticize television shows which we felt presented an unbalanced picture in the guise of news. Indeed, we have criticized more shows than we would have liked to criticize.

But we have never joined the wolfpack sniping at the heels of network television, agitating to have TV editorial content approved by some sort of ill-disguised government commission.

We say ill-disguised because those who hope to subject TV to government control seldom admit to favoring such a radical policy. Instead, they propose guidelines, or restrictions, or codes—but all to be administered through a federal agency.

In a recent candid and illuminating speech in Ottawa, before the International Press Institute, CBC President Frank Stanton said his network categorically rejects this idea: "If the agency were related to the government, no matter how distantly related, honest journalism simply could not long survive."

We are not opposed to guidelines, restrictions, or codes—for television, the movies, or the press. But they must be voluntary guidelines, restrictions, and codes, established by the industries themselves—not by government advisors (e.g., censors).

The most fundamental fact of democratic life, said Stanton, "is that the press cannot share its responsibility for news judgment and still fulfill its basic role." The proposal to invest editorial responsibilities in bureaucrats, even enlightened bureaucrats, is a proposal for press suppression and censorship. They, in turn, are open invitations to political oppression.

From the dawn of recorded history, there have always been those who were sure they knew exactly what people should be told, how they should be told, and when. By and large, those attitudes prevail in most of the countries of the world today, imposed by government fiat.

The U.S. press—and by press we of course include broadcast journalism—springs from a tradition of freedom . . . the freedom of editors to decide what constitutes news. Like Frank Stanton, we pledge to resist any effort to alter that indispensable tradition.

OCEANOGRAPHIC EXPERIMENTATION ON THE EVE OF OUR TRIP TO THE MOON

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning American scientists and astronauts will make Jules Verne the science prophet of all time. It is most significant that on the eve of mankind's most notable scientific achievement, the flight of Apollo 11, that our scientists are also exploring another environment about which Verne wrote so prophetically.

The Navy Sealab program, although not as extensive nor as imagination-capturing as the space program, is nonetheless exploring a scientific frontier about which almost as little is known: the undersea "inner space."

Today, the Navy's Experimental Diving Unit and Duke University's Medical Center began an experiment in the university's hyperbaric chamber. The experiment in which five aquanauts will simulate an undersea dive to a depth of 600 feet, will last for 14 days. The main purpose of the "dive" is to test new diving and breathing equipment which, if successful, will overcome the major barriers to man's penetration of the ocean depths. Another mission will be to simulate the conditions existing at the time of the death of Aquanaut Berry Cannon last February 17. Cannon died of a seizure shortly after leaving a diving capsule 600 feet beneath the surface of the Pacific. The exact cause of his death has never been determined; the dive will aid in revealing the cause.

The hyperbaric chamber, originally developed as part of the treatment for heart diseases and other ailments, is playing a significant role in undersea exploration and experimentation. The chamber, the medical center, and the entire university are integral aspects of North Carolina's rapidly emerging role in the vast field of oceanography. This role is made possible by the unprecedented cooperation of the State of North Carolina, the State's major educational institutions, and the Research Triangle, itself a unique cooperative venture by State government, three major universities, and private industry. All of the facilities and resources of the State of North Carolina are poised to assist this mighty Nation in making a giant step toward undersea exploration comparable to the reach into space which we shall witness tomorrow.

THE PASSING OF J. HANLY MORGAN

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the spirit of J. Hanly Morgan of Huntington, W. Va., will be around to cheer us in many different ways despite his recent passing. A tall man, straight as an arrow, you could always spot him with that wonderful old-fashioned string tie, and the cheery greeting accorded to one and all: "Hi, old Buddy-bud!" Hanly Morgan was a gentleman of the old school. His chuckle and soft answers turned away many pointed political assaults.

Renowned as a host, he annually or even more frequently than that opened his vast farm on the Mason County banks of the Kanawha River to the party faithful of the Democratic persuasion. There he presided over providing enjoyment and relaxation for a motley collection of Governors and ex-Governors, Senators, committeemen, working Democrats, and shaky Republicans. The festive board groaned with goodies. Children and grandchildren romped through the fields and barns. Grandfather Hanly proudly showed his visitors through the solid mansion, pointing with pride to the crib where he slept, the chamber pots, the oaken beams, the great relics of a bygone era, displaying the pride in his ancestry, and the hope for his progeny—all done with a rollicking humor and love for all mankind.

Many early churchgoers marveled that the ribald story-spinner Hanly escalated his Fifth Avenue Baptist Church Sunday School class into prodigious size. In later years, he came a couple of doors down Fifth Avenue and was a pillar of the church at Trinity Episcopal. There I was privileged to share with him membership in the same congregation.

County chairmen traditionally do not survive long in Cabell County, but Hanly Morgan outlived the reigns of two Presidents, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson. He served from 1961 until his death, always genial, always ready with his soothing sirup to pour on fiery arguments, and ever ready to spin a steady stream of stories and jokes when frequently called upon to repeat his many performances as master of ceremonies at dinner. Under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser of recent date:

SOLID CITIZEN OF GOOD HUMOR

Those who had talked with J. Hanly Morgan and shared his hearty good humor and robust enjoyment of life during the last few days were especially shocked to learn of his unexpected death.

Mr. Morgan was a solid citizen, a highly successful businessman, a churchman, an influential leader in various organizations and enterprises, a vice mayor for four terms and chairman of the Democratic Executive Committee since 1961, but he was perhaps best known as a raconteur of bubbling humor and enthusiastic geniality.

He was a favorite toastmaster of many organizations because he could always offer a series of funny yarns and anecdotes while threading his way even through a serious program.

XUM

His genial disposition was particularly notable during the occasional differences that arose among factions of the Democratic Party while he was serving as committee chairman.

No matter how heated the arguments, he remained calm and good-humored in his efforts to sooth ruffiled dispositions and restore harmony to the party.

As president of Morgan's, Inc., a Huntington office supply firm, Mr. Morgan conducted a thriving business. During the years he accumulated extensive realty holdings and became interested in a number of other enterprises.

As a churchman he taught for many years one of the largest Sunday school classes in the city at the Fifth Avenue Baptist Church.

His varied activities, his genial good humor and his efforts for community improvement gave him a wide acquaintance and an extensive circle of warm friends who realize that his death will leave a void that will not soon be filled.

He will be greatly missed in the downtown business community, in the religious activities of the city and area and in county and state councils of the Democratic party. But most of all he will be missed and long remembered for the cheerful good will that he spread along the way of life at a time when so many people were depressed by the bewildering array of complex problems confronting the nation and the world.

EDITOR WANTS MOON WITH A CAPITAL M

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, David T. Hayhow, publisher of the Dowagiac, Mich., Daily News, writes in an editorial July 12, 1969, that earth's satellite has no proper name; and he calls for an immediate declaration that the moon be named Moon—with a Capital M. He wrote the President pointing out the urgency of giving that celestial body a proper name forthwith, before Neil Armstrong sets foot on its surface.

In the English language, our satellite has been called the moon for many centuries. It has different names in different tongues. The first definition of the word moon in our dictionary is the earth's only known natural satellite. When satellites were discovered circling around some of the other planets of the sun, it was convenient to describe them as moons. It is possible that our satellite, the moon, may be losing or have already lost its age-old proper name through a process of synonymy. Following is the editorial:

STOP THE APOLLO 11 COUNTDOWN

Attention Cape Kennedy: Halt the countdown. Stop the blastoff. All systems are definitely not "go."

It hasn't occurred to anyone yet, but in a sense we're sending our astronauts almost a quarter of a million miles to a nameless orb which shines in our starry skies, makes love bloom and rhymes with June.

That hunk of rock is earth's moon. That's right, little m—moon. Our boys aren't going to Venus or Mars or Jupiter or Saturn. They're going to a moon. Earth's moon to be sure, but still one of many moons.

The only solution is to give it a name—quickly. We can't have Neil Armstrong stepping from his spacecraft July 21 in one of mankind's most dramatic moments and planting an American flag on a moon with no name.

Perhaps, in the tradition of most exploration, it should be christened Orbarmstrong or Vonbraunsphere on that historic day.

Would you care to hum a few bars of "By the Light of the Silvery Orbarmstrong" or "Vonbraunsphere Over Miami?"

A mod label might be more in keeping, with the times. How about Alphamoon or Apollolune. Kicky but not very romantic.

'Tis a quandary. It's been called the moon so long, no one could really make a transition. So the least we can do is give it legitimate status.

We're asking President Nixon, the United Nations and the heads of all governments in the world to decree, on the moment man steps foot onto the moon's surface, that its name become Moon. Moon—as in silvery, love in bloom and June.

Then in your newspaper on July 21, you'll read:

HOUSTON.—U.S. astronaut Neil Armstrong stepped onto the surface of Moon at 2:17 a.m. (EDT) today, realizing a pipedream of man almost as old as the species homo-sapien.

Armstrong's exhilarated voice was heard and his blurry image was seen around the world as millions shared the historic moment which turned centuries of fantasy into fact.

"Thank God" were Armstrong's first words as he was momentarily overcome by emotion and excitement. Then, more matter of factly reporting to mission control in Houston, he described his first footsteps on Moon, dispelling all notions of green cheese, or marshmallow or quicksand.

"It's like walking in a hayfield," Armstrong said of Moon's surface, "I feel like x x x."

As at that moment, earth's unique shiny orbiter will become Moon. Future dictionaries will have to be changed to indicate this stature. And future generations will have to call other moons something else. There is only one Moon.

U.S.S. "HEPBURN" (DE-1055) COMMISSIONED

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, named for Adm. Arthur J. Hepburn, U.S. Navy, the DE-1055 was commissioned at Long Beach Naval Shipyard at impressive ceremonies on July 3. She is the second of the *Knox*-class destroyer escorts to join the fleet.

This new class of escort ship is especially designed to locate and destroy submarines and therefore, is capable of assuming the various missions and tasks assigned to the modern naval destroyer. *Hepburn* can operate as a unit of a hunter-killer—HUK—group, screen amphibious or underway replenishment forces, patrol coastal waters for missile firing submarines—continental defense—conduct naval gunfire support missions, or escort military convoys. Like the destroyer, the escort ship is more than capable of successfully completing missions of search, patrol, rescue, evacuation, blockade, visit-and-search, or surveillance.

The keel layup of *Hepburn* took place on June 1, 1966. She was launched on March 25, 1967, and delivered on June 27, 1969. *Hepburn* is cosponsored by Mrs. Arthur J. Hepburn, widow of the late Admiral Hepburn, and Mrs. Joseph R. Barse, granddaughter of the ship's namesake.

Hepburn has an overall length of 438 feet, a beam of 47 feet and a full load displacement of about 4,000 tons. She is equipped with an integral, bow-mounted long range sonar, surface and air search radar, an antisubmarine rocket—ASROC—launcher, antisubmarine torpedo launchers, and a 5-inch, 54-caliber gun mount. She also has space and weight reservations for a self-defense missile system, a manned helicopter capability, and variable depth sonar.

Hepburn will carry a normal complement of 15 officers and 212 enlisted personnel. She also has accommodations available to carry a unit commander. When she joins the Cruiser-Destroyer Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet, *Hepburn* will be assigned to Destroyer Division 132, homeported on Long Beach, Calif., as one of the "Black Cats" of Destroyer Squadron 13.

The *Hepburn*'s commanding officer is Cmdr. Stuart D. Landersman, U.S. Navy, an able and experienced naval officer who received his first commission in 1953. The ship's executive officer is Lt. Cmdr. Victor P. Peri, U.S. Navy, who enlisted in the U.S. Navy in 1946 and was commissioned an ensign in 1958.

It was my pleasure to be the speaker at the *Hepburn*'s commissioning and the remarks I made at that time follow:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN CRAIG HOSMER, OF CALIFORNIA, AT COMMISSIONING OF U.S.S. "HEPBURN" (DE 1055), LONG BEACH NAVAL SHIPYARD, JULY 3, 1969

Admiral Arthur J. Hepburn was a Naval officer of superb brilliance. In the late 1930s he and a very small number of associates became architects of the United States Navy of World War II, the most powerful naval force the world has ever known.

So it is appropriate that this ship bear his proud name, especially because she and her *Knox*-class sisters are a new generation of the finest products of the naval shipbuilding art.

But I need not remind you that up to just moments ago the *Hepburn* was, after all, nothing more than a splendid tribute to her designers and builders.

Then, as she was commissioned and her first watch was set, she became something quite different—she was transformed into a Man-of-War of the United States Navy.

From that moment forth the *Hepburn* became the product of her Commanding Officer and the some 225 officers and men who man her—officers and men who are the most carefully selected, the best trained and the most highly motivated seamen the world has ever known.

Crew and ship together represent a new advance in Naval power—each is a fitting match for the other.

But in matching them we must appreciate and understand that for all her splendid design and engineering and for all the painstaking labor which went into her—the vessel itself is, after all, an inanimate weapon. She lacks what her men have—courage, resourcefulness, pride, faith and patriotism.

And it is these ingredients which are the power and the heart of the Navy—indeed, even of our country.

These men and this ship—together—have just become one of the basic elements of

United States national power. And that power, to my way of thinking, is one of the few hopes for peace and freedom left to mankind anywhere on this small planet.

Hepburn joins the fleet at a time when the challenge to our nation's power is great—and at a time when threats to peace and to freedom abound. For example:

Even now a fierce war rages across this ocean, and in other parts of the world situations are tense and explosive.

For some time it has been apparent the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has engaged itself upon a massive naval and merchant fleet expansion—a program designed to wrest control of the world's seas.

And, if there be doubts of this, I quote to you these recent boastful and provocative words of the Commander-in-Chief of the Soviet Navy, Admiral Sergei Gorshkov:

"The flag of the Soviet Navy now flies proudly over the oceans of the world. Sooner or later, the United States will have to understand that it no longer has mastery of the seas."

And, in the face of these circumstances, and despite additions such as the *Hepburn*, today nine-of-ten ships of the United States Navy are over ten years old, while nine-of-ten ships of the Soviet Navy are less than ten years old.

The *Hepburn* constitutes a portion of our alternative to submission to the challenge on the seas. But only a portion. Those of us who have reckoned this matter carefully see our full alternative to submission as no less than a 10-year 4-billion-dollar a year Naval shipbuilding and modernization program. Total, 40 billion dollars.

Though these sums may be large, to me they seem small when compared to the possible alternative cost to ourselves and the free world in terms of independence and freedom that is implied by Admiral Gorshkov's challenge.

In relations with such expansionist adversaries, our country needs to follow two consonant courses of action:

First, we must encourage peaceful change by working with them where interests converge;

And second and simultaneously, we must create and maintain a relationship of forces favorable to the deterrence of adventurism and aggression.

As the *Hepburn* soon leaves her artificial home near land to live where she belongs—in the bosom of the sea—let her be a symbol that a sovereign America will do what she must to preserve the peace—and that America can be relied upon—and that America will, indeed, stay the course.

If wishing could determine the manner of our lives, then I would wish for those who sail the *Hepburn* only missions of mercy, fair winds and following seas. And these I do wish.

But realistically, this ship joins our service at a time of national peril. She well may sail in harm's way.

So we must place our trust in the firm hands of her officers and men and hope for their safety, pray for their victory in battle if ever they are called upon to fight, and wish them Godspeed.

APOLLO 11 FLAGS

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news releases from NASA:

[News Release, NASA, July 3, 1969]

Apollo 11 Flags

When Astronauts Neil A. Armstrong and Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr., lift off from the Moon after their lunar exploration July 21 they will leave behind three items in commemoration of the historic event.

Armstrong will unveil a plaque attached to the descent stage of the Apollo lunar module. The plaque is signed by President Nixon and the three Apollo 11 astronauts—Armstrong, Michael Collins and Aldrin.

The plaque bears images of the two hemispheres of the Earth and this inscription: Here men from the planet earth, first set foot upon the moon, July 1969, A.D., we came in peace for all mankind.

Another memorial to be left on the Moon will be a 1½-inch silicon disc bearing messages of goodwill from heads of state of many nations. The messages will be placed on the wafer using the technique of making microcircuits for electronic equipment. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration invited the heads of nations to submit messages for this purpose.

The third item is the flag of the United States of America which will be erected on the Moon.

The flag is three by five feet and is made of nylon. It will be erected on an eight-foot aluminum staff and tubing along its top edge will unfurl it in the airless environment of the Moon. Plans are for the event to be recorded on television and transmitted live to Earth.

The planting of the flag is symbolic of the first time man has landed on another celestial body and does not constitute a territorial claim by the United States.

In addition, the Apollo 11 crew will carry four-by-six-inch flags of other nations of the world, the 50 states, District of Columbia and territories of the United States and the United Nations. These flags will be carried in the lunar module and brought back to Earth. They will not be deployed on the Moon.

Two other United States flags will be carried in the Apollo 11 command module. These measure five by eight feet and are to be presented to the two Houses of the Congress of the United States upon return to Earth. They were flown over the U.S. Capitol before the mission and will be flown again over the Capitol after their return.

The plaque is made of stainless steel measuring nine by seven and five-eighths inches and one-sixteenth inch thick. The finish has the appearance of brushed chrome and the world map, message and signatures are in black epoxy which fills the etched inscription.

It will be attached to the ladder on the lunar module descent stage of the landing gear strut between the third and fourth ladder rungs from the bottom.

To fit properly around but not touching the strut and to allow room for the insulation material which covers much of the lunar module, the plaque will be bent around a four-inch radius.

Covering the plaque during flight will be a thin sheet of stainless steel which will be removed by Armstrong during his activities on the surface of the Moon.

The plaque was made at NASA's Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston.

The disc upon which the messages of good will from heads of state will be carried is being made by the Sprague Electric Co., Semiconductor Division, Worcester, Mass., under the direction of NASA's Electronics Research Center, Cambridge, Mass.

The process used to make this wafer is the same as used to manufacture integrated circuits for electronic equipment. It involves making tiny photographic images and depositing metal on the images.

The Stars and Stripes to be deployed on the Moon was purchased along with several others made by different manufacturers at stores in the area around the Manned Spacecraft Center near Houston.

In order to attach the flag properly to its aluminum staff it was necessary to remove the binding and labels. For this reason the name of the manufacturer cannot be determined.

For its journey to the Moon, the flag will be wrapped in plastic and carried in a thin aluminum container attached to the left side ladder down which Astronauts Armstrong and Aldrin will descend to the surface of the Moon.

It will be erected after both astronauts step on the Moon and several feet away from the landing spacecraft sufficiently distant to minimize possible damage from the spacecraft's rocket engine as it leaves the Moon on its return trip to Earth.

Armstrong will erect the flag as Aldrin photographs the event. First Armstrong will place the lower four-foot section of the aluminum staff in the ground. He will then swing out a telescoping tube which runs along the top of the flag to keep it unfurled. The flag is riveted at its top two corners to this tube and is attached at its lower corner to the top portion of the staff. When the flag is properly unfurled, Armstrong then will slide the top portion of the staff into the bottom portion in the ground.

The aluminum staff and tube which holds the flag unfurled is gold in color.

The flag during its journey to the Moon will be wrapped in several layers of insulating blanket and attached by two brackets to the left handrail of the ladder. The packaged flag extends from the first step of the ladder upward to where the ladder bends inward toward the lunar module.

The flag and staff are removed from the stowage position by pulling retaining pins as the astronaut stands on the Moon's surface.

Weight of the flag and its wrapping is nine pounds, seven ounces. The flag and its staff and deploying tube weigh three pounds. The upper four-foot section of the staff slips into the bottom section for four inches making the length of the assembled staff seven feet eight inches. The staff will be stuck into the lunar surface from six to nine inches.

The small flags are to be carried in a plastic vacuum pack and stowed in a Beta cloth pouch with a Teflon outer wrap. Total weight is 10 ounces.

[News release, NASA, July 10, 1969]

United States and Foreign Flags on Apollo 11

The flags of 136 nations, the 50 United States, the District of Columbia and four U.S. possessions will be carried by the crew of Apollo 11 to the Moon and back.

These banners will be in addition to three U.S. flags—one to be planted on the Moon's surface, one each to be returned to Earth for presentation to the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives—and the United Nations Organization flag.

Foreign nations whose flags will be aboard Apollo 11 are:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium and Bhutan.

Also, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada and Central African Republic.

Also, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Kinshasa), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland and France.

Also, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy and Ivory Coast.

XUM

Also, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Korea, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldive Islands, Mali, Malta and Mauritania.

Also, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Muscat and Oman, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines and Poland.

Also, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somali, South Africa, Southern Yemen, Soviet Union, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Tanzania and Thailand.

Also, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vatican City, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Western Samoa, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

The U.S. possessions whose flags will be carried are Guam, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands and American Samoa.

The Apollo 11 mission is scheduled for launch from Kennedy Space Center, Fla., July 16.

SCHADEBERG ON CAPTIVE NATIONS DAY

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, our able and respected colleague from Wisconsin, Hon. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG, recently made an address in Kenosha, Wis., on Captive Nations Day.

In order that all Members of Congress and other interested parties may have the benefit of Reverend SCHADEBERG's outstanding remarks, I am submitting them for the RECORD, as follows:

Reverend clergy, Fellow Americans, and, most personally, my friends: I am sure that those of you present here today who have followed my activities not only as a Member of Congress but before that as a clergyman know of my intense interest in the cause of freedom not only for those of us blessed with the privilege of living in this great and beloved America but in the cause of freedom of men everywhere with a special emphasis in finding means to recapture the precious freedoms lost to those who are members of the so-called Captive Nations. I view with deep concern the loss of freedom and present threats to freedom both here and abroad because I believe, as is so clearly stated in this nation's treasured historic documents, that Almighty God is the Author of liberty and that He has endowed all of us with unalienable rights among which, but not limited to, are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Briefly, (1) let me say that life, as here referred to, does not mean only the right to be alive, but the right to make a life, to live as free men; and, (2) liberty means not merely to do as we please but to have freedom within the framework of law, that reserves for everyone the right to his freedom and that not at the expense of the freedom of others; (3) the unalienable right of the pursuit of happiness is not the right to be happy nor is happiness a gift anyone can give us but the right to pursue happiness and to attain it, if living according to the laws of God and man, it should be ours to grasp.

There are many and varied reasons men lose their God-given freedoms to tyrants who themselves play at the game of being God. While I mention a few, I do not intend to dwell upon what cannot be changed. I do hope that in mentioning these we who are recipients of the heritage of freedom might reassess the direction in which we are facing and might pause to review our present status as a nation standing as the impregnable bulkhead between those who would be tyrants and those who might be the victims of tyrants if this barrier is penetrated.

How does a nation lose its freedom? Some, but not all, perhaps, of those I will mention apply to those nations we refer to as Captive Nations. In a very real sense they apply in varying degrees for all nations.

First. Nations may lose their freedoms as a result of unwise political decisions made by leaders of larger nations who, while their primary interest is in peace, accept a status of Peace for themselves while the freedoms of countries outside of their own special areas of responsibilities take a less critical role. Some of the leaders of our own nation of the past have made such unwise decisions. Certainly, I do not stand in criticism of them since I do not know, nor do any of us know, the special circumstances that existed at the time these unfortunate decisions were made. I suggest that, for myself, I stand firmly on the conviction that no man's freedom, regardless of his color or race or creed or nationality or ethnic background or what-have-you, is a legitimate object for bargaining. No man's freedom is a pawn to be moved at will by those who play the game of political chess. I stand on this conviction and have made my decisions in Congress on this conviction, not only (which, incidentally, would be reason enough of itself) because freedom is a God-given right which no man has a right to deny but because history is replete with the memories of great men, known and unknown, great even if they occupied but common status in society, who have laid their lives on the line, who have been beaten and tortured and tested and tried, who have given their lives on the battlefield and in the prison cell and on the street because they believed that there was no substitute for liberty; that this God-given right was not a fit object for negotiation for any reason.

No one can find fault with the desire to keep the peace of the world. Surely in a time in which man holds in his hand the awesome power with which to literally wipe civilization off the face of this earth, we cannot be indifferent towards our search for peace. But peace without honor is no peace and peace without freedom is worse than hell itself. Surely, we must find a means to bring this world to an era of lasting peace but we cannot do it and we must not do it by being satisfied to see half the world living in chains. For freedom cannot survive in a world half slave, and half free. If freedom is lacking anywhere, it is in grave danger of being lost everywhere!

Second. Nations lose their freedoms when they abandon the moral principles of self-discipline, obedience of the law and respect for self and family; when they permit the home to be a mere convenience instead of a place of love and honor and harmony.

The moral laws laid down in the Ten Commandments, later interpreted in terms of the spirit by Jesus Christ are clear and unmistakable. They cannot be abandoned without paying a penalty for our disobedience. God's moral laws abide—they stay in force whether we insist they do not exist and choose to ignore them, or knowing they exist we choose to disobey them. God's laws apply no matter what attitude men have toward them.

As we look out upon our great land, we see around us a growing disregard for moral principles in high and low places. We see those who throw the concept of self-discipline to the winds and interpret freedom to be license (to do what we please regardless of its ill-effect on others). We see an utter disregard for law and order on the part of a minority who choose to make demands but who repudiate any sense of responsibility; we see politicians and educators and office-holders, and responsible men in business and industry—yes, even churches giving in to these demands for fear a confrontation would upset their little kingdom of affluence or their place in the sun.

As we look about us we see respect for self and others deteriorate to the point at which dirtiness of body and clothes and dirtiness of mind and speech become a status symbol of what is mis-named the new morality—which, in effect, is no morality at all. We see the home being reduced to what, for some, lacks even the decency of the animal den. And we see all this happen, not only with the permission of the courts of our land, but actually encouraged by some of their tortured decisions.

All the laws on our books are meaningless unless they are respected by the citizens, properly interpreted by the courts, and fairly and firmly administered. All the laws on the books are meaningless unless they are accepted and supported by a sense of morality (on the part of the people) that gives the power and standing in an orderly society.

True freedom is lost to the degree that morality is repudiated by the individuals who make up our society.

Third, Nations lose their freedom when they abandon their faith in God. While those of us who are capable of reasoning only in the finite sense, question the justice of the loss of freedom of God-fearing people along with those of a nation who have turned their backs on God, nevertheless in a very real sense this is a fact of life and in God's wisdom it is permitted. Jesus said, "Render unto Caesar that which belongs to Caesar and unto God that which belongs unto God." God does have an interest in human affairs and if God can weep [and I am sure He does], He must weep in His heaven as He looks down upon those whose faith has been so tempered by material things that the cause of freedom is lost in the rush for that which brings pleasure to the flesh. In one of his hymns of praise to the Creator, King David writes: "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord and the people whom He hath chosen is His own inheritance. Behold the eye of the Lord is open upon them that fear him; upon them that hope in His mercy to deliver their soul from death and to keep them alive in famine."

Bryant once said, "That nation that is not ruled by God will be ruled by tyrants." When it comes to our faith in God, there is and can be no compromise if we are to survive as free men. Those who are suggesting that we should look the other way while other humans suffer under the yoke of tyranny; that we should learn to co-exist with evil without serious effort to overcome it, need to read again the words of the Apostle Paul written to the Christians at Corinth: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, 'I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord.'"

We here in the United States are witnessing a determined effort to shut God out of the life of the individual, the nation, our schools. Some of this effort is made by those who would destroy America but a large part of it is a result of indifference towards the things of God. Unless we as men of faith prevail, freedom could well be lost here and should the light of freedom, being dimmed now, go out completely, freedom's cause throughout the world will fail and we may well experience in coming generations a dark age that will make the Dark Ages of the 12th and 13th centuries seem bright in comparison to the depth of darkness we could experience. It is not my intention to preach, but I make no apology when I say that faith in God must be strengthened, if freedom is to survive. Those in the Captive Nations who have become martyrs to the cause of freedom are the lights that keep alive the cause of freedom in the midst of darkness.

Fourth. Finally, freedom is lost by indifference to our responsibilities as citizens. Many of you who cherish freedom have lost it yourselves for a time or you know personally those who suffer under the yoke of tyranny. You who have the experience of the loss of freedom either yourselves or in your families have not only a responsibility but an opportunity and a challenge to lead the way toward the extension of freedom here where you live. Those who have known nothing but freedom in their lives cannot appreciate what the loss of it may mean. (1) We do not appreciate the value of a thumb until it is cut off. (2) We do not appreciate our health until we lose it. (3) We do not appreciate the value of love until it is denied us. (4) We do not appreciate our affluence until we have experienced poverty. (5) We do not appreciate freedom until it is no longer ours to enjoy. And so, to you, who know firsthand what the loss of freedom really means, is the responsibility to help others who have not had this experience to appreciate the values they possess. This is the greatest service you can perform as citizens of this nation and as friends and relatives of those to whom freedom has been denied. Do not be weary of welldoing. Repetition is necessary because we forget so easily. Only when the people of this nation truly appreciate the great gift of freedom they enjoy will they be inspired and challenged and moved to help extend this freedom throughout the world, not by reckless abandon to force but by every means available to them—diplomatic, social, political, economic, religious to create the environment in which tyranny cannot survive.

In a very real sense there can be no peace on earth until first there is peace in the hearts of men, the peace the Apostle Paul says is a "peace that passeth all understanding" (because we have faith in God and His purposes). And there is no peace within our hearts until the purpose of God is fulfilled—which is the freedom of His children.

While much of what needs to be done must come from you as individual citizens, yet it is not without reason that we look to Washington for guidance and support in our causes. I would be less than honest if I did not say to you that some of our problems have been caused by poor judgment regarding foreign aid. You and I know we cannot buy friendship. What is needed is for America to support our friends, tried and proven, not by offering dollars but by providing opportunities for them to help themselves. (1) Our goal is not to relieve them of the necessity for sacrifice but to relieve them of the causes for loss of hope. (2) Our purpose is not to keep them alive but to give them something for which to live. (3) Our purpose is not to remove difficulties from their paths but to help them make these difficulties stepping stones in the dangerous currents of Marxism that would sweep them into a sea of impersonal collectivism.

I am very happy to report to you that the Administration in Washington is making a serious reappraisal of our foreign policy as it relates to diplomatic decisions and economic aid. Our President is urging a greater emphasis on private enterprise and individual initiative in struggling and developing countries which, in their birth, might be added to the list of captive nations before they have learned to walk. He is doing this by trying to stimulate and channel additional investment by American businesses into the key growth sectors of these nations. A greater emphasis is being placed on technical assistance programs, the aim of which is to raise the quality of our advisory training experience in the fields of agriculture and education. As for me I shall continue to oppose the giving of aid through your tax dollars to any nation that gives aid and comfort to the Communist effort to rule the world.

I am happy to report to you that while the present Administration has made peace its primary goal, the President has assured us that it will not be a peace without honor and that it will not be a peace that might necessitate the sending of troops all over the world in a few years hence to settle difficulties arising from a hasty retreat or repudiation of our responsibilities to the freedom of others.

I close with this thought: this is a great nation in spite of what we may feel is wrong with it. What is right far outweighs what is wrong. America is the hope of freedom for people all over the world; especially in these days when Congress is debating the matter of the ABM System we need to be reminded that as the world's best hope for freedom we have a moral responsibility to remain strong and to defend these shores. We cannot be a second-class nation defense-wise in view of the expressed intent of another nation's leaders who boast they are out to bury us. Certainly I believe we must not overextend ourselves in the capacity to make war against another but common sense dictates that we cannot underextend ourselves in terms of our defense. To do so would be to invite disaster and all of our efforts to solve the social and economic problems would go down the drain because we, as a people, would no longer have a voice in them.

We as a nation must remain strong. We must remain a world leader. We must carry our heavy burden.

If for no other reason. we must remain a torch—not unlike Lady Liberty's torch in New York harbor which is a symbol of hope for freedom-loving people who are oppressed throughout the world.

America must remain strong and free as a deterrent to those forces in the world today who would move to enslave, to chain and to capture the minds and spirit of free men everywhere. We cannot afford to be less the world leader, less the champion of freedom.

Our country is beset by problems, unrest, suspicion. There is strong talk in the land today that we are through, that we are licked, that we are dead.

I shrug this off. I turn a deaf ear to it. I ignore it when I can. I have found it untrue, a falsehood. I share with you the enthusiasm you have shown on this great day, for this fine and glorious country which we all, together, call our own.

A LETTER TO SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE HARDIN

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, because of hearings in which I was deeply involved this morning in the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on legislation I have instigated dealing with navigation safety on our inland waterways, I was unable to listen in on the opening hearing of the House Committee on Agriculture on the many bills pending before that committee dealing with a general farm program and with the food stamp program. I was particularly anxious to hear the testimony of Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin on the food stamp program. I have now had an opportunity to read his testimony, and I am glad to see his general endorsement of the purposes of the food stamp program and read his ideas for improving it. I do not agree with all of his proposals, but I certainly agree on the need for a substantial increase in funds to bring about greater participation and provide greater benefits, as both the present and the previous administrations have recommended.

On June 23, 1969, after the administration had announced its plans for changes in the food stamp program if sufficient funds are made available, I addressed a long letter to Secretary Hardin on this issue, and also on the fat-in-hot-dogs issue. Because of the relevance of portions of this letter to the Secretary's statement yesterday on the food stamp program before the Agriculture Committee, I have decided to make public the text of that letter, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., June 23, 1969.

HON. CLIFFORD M. HARDIN,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Ever since meeting your charming wife at a recent reception where the crush of guests made it impossible for me to find you and express my willingness to work with you on issues of mutual interest, I have been hoping to have an opportunity to meet with you to discuss the future of the food stamp program. I believe you were advised of the several speeches I have made in the House during the period you and your associates in the new Administration were weighing your course of action. Now that your decisions have been made and the Administration bill forwarded to Congress, I will, of course, do my best to help you obtain those provisions which conform to my own long-held views on the important potential of this program, but there are some features of the Administration bill which I am not convinced are good policy, including the proposal for free stamps. At the same time, I recognize that this would mean very little in actual dollar cost. I am just afraid of the possible psychological consequences to public support for the expansion of the program and for the necessary increases in appropriations if moderate-income families, paying admittedly high taxes, see very low-income families using the stamps extravagantly (as some undoubtedly do out of lack of experience in food buying) and not having to pay even as little as 50 cents a person or $3 a family for the equivalent of $25 worth of food purchasing power per person per month.

One woman wrote me recently incensed at the idea of welfare families in the District of Columbia being allowed $132 a month for food for a family of six when she feeds her family of six on substantially less. (She was referring to Senator Hart's wife's experiment in staying within the D.C. Welfare food budget for a month—and the amount was $132 for a family of eight, not six.) The woman who wrote to me, and whose husband earns in the neighborhood of $10,000 a year, said she was feeding her family on $30 a week. When she learns that under the Administration Food Stamp bill, a family of her size could obtain about $150 a month in food stamps, and pay absolutely nothing, I am sure she will be indignant all over again. I use her only as an example of the kind of public outcry to be expected in making more food available free to very poor people than moderate income families feel they can afford to buy. While I can defend the food stamp program in terms of allowing people

XUM

to eat properly for the same amount of money they would normally be expected to spend for food, I fear the reaction to the idea that it is to become just a handout program, like the much-abused and discredited direct distribution program where the only needs test has often been one's willingness to stand in line for the commodities each month.

However, I assume these factors were fully taken into consideration in reaching your decision on the free stamp issue, and there is not much value in attempting retroactively to dissuade you from a firm position. I cite my feeling on it only so that you will understand why I oppose this feature of your bill. On most of the other features—not all, but most—I believe that the basic need is not so much for language changes in the 1964 Act Preamble or in details of Administration to be written into the law, but in assurance that sufficient funds can be and will be appropriated. Thus, I am pleased to see your decision to seek open-ended authorizations for the three fiscal years after 1970. This is what I fought for in the House last year, and won—only to lose the battle in the Senate-House Conference.

Now I would like to mention another matter, on which the official Administration position has not been solidified. It is the "hotdog" issue. I have received numerous complaints about the difficulty of patients on doctor-imposed low-cholesterol diets being able to know what foods are suitable—or safe—for them to eat. My own feeling is that the "juiciness" defense for the high fat content of frankfurters is like the old "artificial ham" problem confronted some years ago by your predecessor. The argument then for wanting permission to include added water at ham prices was that hams sold only in intrastate commerce could get away with this practice while inspected hams could not, and the public was expressing preference for the "juicier" product. My proposed solution then was to prepare a bill to extend meat inspection to intrastate commerce. That eventually came about, but Secretary Freeman solved the added water labeling problem in hams more directly, and with wisdom, by dropping the misleading requirement that they be labeled as "artificial," and requiring instead the label words, "water added."

It seems to me that in economic fairness to the public, and out of consideration for people required by their doctors to eschew fat in their diet, a similar solution could be found in the frankfurter issue by requiring the labeling words "fat added," and *preferably with a percentage figure*. Many consumers complain to me about the tastelessness of frankfurters, and the speed with which they spoil or become slimy. Undoubtedly, the added fat contributes to that. If the telltale words, "30% (or any specific percent) fat added" were required on the label, I am sure some processors would then decide to market all-meat no-fat-added frankfurters, and the public could then make a conscious choice. At present, this choice is not available.

While it might appear to be a minor issue, I remind you, from a foreign trade standpoint, that the justification for the high imports of Australian beef has rested in the need for this product for processed meats such as frankfurters. It makes sense for the State Department to enlist our support against beef import quotas on the argument that Australian beef is needed for processed meat because of its low quality grade, compared to the concentration by American cattle raisers on choice steers, when the low-fat Australian beef in frankfurters is then larded with 30 or 35 percent, or any other high percentage, of fat. The question might well be asked, why not just use more American beef, which is already fat enough for juiciness in frankfurters? And, of course, the answer to that question would appear to be that Australian beef is cheaper than American beef, and the added fat is cheap, and you thus reduce processing costs compared to using American beef. From the standpoint of your Department, undoubtedly a higher fat content in frankfurters would increase the usability of American beef for this product. But I am sure you are also obligated as an Administration official to look at it from its foreign trade aspects. Australia is a major U.S. customer. What are we to buy from them if we cut off their beef? This could well happen through quota legislation if we now officially designate a fat content in our processed meats which eliminates the major technical argument for continued large supplies of Australian beef. I would appreciate having your thinking on this aspect of it. I am also going to write to the Secretary of State along the same lines, because I *did* help in previous years in staving off highly restrictive quotas on imported meats, but I feel I need some assurance that in doing so, we were being told the whole truth.

Sincerely yours,
LEONOR K. (MRS. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, 3rd District, Missouri.

(P.S.—In authorizing use of chicken in frankfurters, without requiring they be labeled as "Chicken Dogs", what restrictions does your Department impose on the types of chicken parts used in the frankfurters? My information is that the "chicken" is merely waste skin scrapings.)

McCLELLAN DENIES NERVE GAS TESTS

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good bit of publicity given to a report released by the Army Friday outlining nerve gas testing it has been carrying on. One of the installations where the Army indicated it was testing this gas was at Fort McClellan, Ala., which is located in my district.

I made it a point over the weekend to discuss this matter with Col. William McKean, commander of Fort McClellan. Colonel McKean told me emphatically that no nerve gas is being tested in the open air at that installation. I am convinced that there is no danger whatsoever in the academic-type tests that are being conducted at Fort McClellan.

Reports such as those made by the Army Friday can be dangerous, especially when the public is given only the basic facts by the news media. I would hope that any Government agency which makes reports such as this public, as rightly they should, will be more careful in the future. It should be made clear what the facts are, and not allow conjecture by the reporters covering such releases.

I am pleased that reporters for the Birmingham Post-Herald and the Birmingham News took the extra time to check out this report before printing it. I would like to include these stories from the Post-Herald and News respectively in the RECORD at this point.

The stories follow:

McCLELLAN DENIES GAS TESTS

FT. McCLELLAN.—A spokesman at Ft. McClellan denied late Friday that open air testing of lethal nerve gas is being conducted here.

A statement released by the Department of the Army through the Ft. McClellan Information Office, refuted an earlier disclosure by the Pentagon Friday that the tests were being carried out at Ft. McClellan, at Dugway Proving Ground in Utah and Edgewood Arsenal in Maryland.

The spokesman for McClellan said small amounts of lethal chemical agents only—no biologicals—are used here in defensive training exercises to train personnel in decontamination, detection, and explosive ordnance demolition procedures.

"As an example, a toxic chemical agent such as mustard gas, would be poured on an empty artillery shell and EOD (Explosive Ordnance Detection) Teams undergoing training would be directed to decontaminate the shell."

"There has never been open air biological testing at Ft. McClellan," he added.

The Pentagon said the gases being tested include Tabun, Sarin, Soman, VX and mustard. VX was responsible for accidentally killing 5,000 sheep last year when deadly gases were tested at Dugway Proving Ground in Utah.

The military also unveiled Friday the extent and nature of its program in documents supplied to a House government operations subcommittee.

The documents are the first admission that open air gas testings have been conducted at locations outside Dugway, committee sources said.

The Army said it tested 67 different gas weapons at Dugway and 47 at Ft. McClellan between April and June of this year.

ARMY SAYS NO OPEN AIR NERVE GAS TESTS HELD AT McCLELLAN

FT. McCLELLAN.—The Army has emphatically denied that any testing of nerve gas is being conducted at Ft. McClellan.

"Any such statement is completely in error," a Department of the Army announcement said Friday night following reports that open air tests were being conducted.

The reports originated in Washington at a House operations subcommittee hearing, in which Army officials were questioned.

Col. William McKean, commander of Ft. McClellan, said the only testing being conducted at the post is the academic type, by scientists.

"It's all on paper, however," he said, "not for real."

The post uses small amounts of mustard gas in training operations. Mustard is not a nerve gas.

Nerve gas is odorless, colorless, and would be fatal unless a victim received medical attention quickly.

According to the subcommittee report Friday, open air tests were also being conducted at Dugway, Utah, and Edgewood Arsenal, Md.

It was near Dugway that 6,000 sheep were killed by nerve gas last year.

The Department of the Army announcement said that no biological testing has been conducted anywhere since 1967, and has never been conducted at Ft. McClellan.

A supply of nerve gas and other gases are stored at the nearby Anniston Ordnance Depot. It is contained in shells and mines which are stored in sealed concrete vaults.

Col. Sam Burney, commander of the depot, said the gas presents no threat.

The depot is one of several storage areas in the United States. Methods are now under study to find a safe way to remove the gas and either bury it at sea or chemically deactivate it.

The Army said mustard gas is potentially lethal. It is being used in small amounts at Ft. McClellan for decontamination training.

"As an example," a spokesman said, "a small amount—and we emphasize the term 'small amount'—will be poured onto an empty artillery shell. Then the explosive ordnance demolition team would be told to decontaminate it."

There are no tests, the spokesman said, where mustard gas is released into the air.

Rep. Bill Nicholas, D-Sylacauga, said today that, "I am convinced there is no impending danger from any work being done at the Chemical Warfare School at Ft. McClellan."

Nichols, a member of the House Armed Services Committee, said he had consulted with Col. W. A. McKean, of Ft. McClellan. McKean said no nerve gas is tested in the open air.

Nichols said that only academic studies are conducted such as theory and lectures.

In Washington, congressmen already concerned about chemical and biological warfare research expressed more alarm upon being told the Army has an open-air, nerve gas testing program.

Rep. Henry S. Reuss, D-Wis., chairman of the House Government Operations subcommittee investigating such programs, said, "I am concerned about this and not convinced of the necessity of all this environmental testing."

Sen. Charles McC. Mathias, R-Md., said he would ask for immediate suspension of the nerve gas testing. He also called for full reports on the testing from the Army, including details of safety precautions taken to protect surrounding areas.

Rep. Clarence D. Long, D-Md., whose district includes Edgewood, said he wants the testing stopped until Congress is fully informed.

"Frankly, I'm getting awfully tired of the military plunging ahead on so many fronts without consulting Congress," Long said.

Secret testing at the Dugway installation in Utah drew nationwide attention last year when some 6,000 sheep were killed in the area. The commander of the test center which administers Dugway said last Dec. 6 he didn't believe the Army nerve gas caused the death of the sheep, but he said aerial testing had been stopped.

WAYNE GUTHRIE ASKS NEW DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Wayne Guthrie, of the Indianapolis News, wrote a thoughtful and incisive commentary on the Declaration of Independence in the News of July 4, 1969. In his masterful style he shows the emptiness and hypocrisy of so-called new thought that has permeated so much of American society. And he shows how it might very well destroy all that the Founding Fathers sought, and all that we hold dear.

Mr. Guthrie's article follows:

New Declaration Could Reinforce Old

(By Wayne Guthrie)

On July 4, 1776, our forefathers issued the Declaration of Independence which made possible this great nation and its countless blessings.

Isn't it about time Americans issued another declaration of independence—declared their independence from many of the current ideas, philosophies and practices that not only contravene the dreams, hopes, aspirations and intentions of those forebears but also threaten and imperil the very existence of the nation they founded?

Shouldn't they discard, banish and eliminate them entirely before, leech-like, they strangle and squeeze out the last drop of freedom and liberty Americans enjoy?

What are some of those fuzzy notions that are alien to the factors that made America great? You can recognize them. Here are some of them.

That freedom is free. It is not. It is a jealous mistress. Its price is eternal vigilance.

That liberty is a carte blanche license to do whatever one wishes without regard for its consequences or for the rights of others. It is not. It cannot be divorced from the responsibility for one's acts.

That people have a right to disobey laws they do not like and spurn and defy courts in constituted authority by taking into their hands the law or what they think the law should be. They do not. That would invite chaos and anarchy.

That people have a right to preach defiance of law. They do not. That would tear down our legal structure, the only instrument that assures people of their rights of due process, equal protection and freedom from abuse.

That people seeking relief from grievances—either real or imagined—have a perfect right to hurl firebrands, bombs, stones or other missiles at passing cars or persons or into buildings or to commit arson, assault, mayhem, other bodily injury or other acts of violence. They do not. If condoned or not checked or stopped, such acts can lead only to anarchy which is the doorstep to dictatorship.

That the prohibition of indecent, libelous or blasphemous public utterances injurious to public morals or private reputations abridges the right of free speech. It does not. Otherwise the result would be unbridled defamation and undermining of character and respect for persons, institutions, officials and governments.

That the right of peaceful assembly sanctions mob rule. It does not. Otherwise, nothing but chaos would result and there would be no security for life, limb or property.

That the rights of free assembly and speech give anyone a license to break into, disturb or disrupt and break up the peaceful assembly of and by others. They do not. Those rights are two-edged swords that apply to all and cannot be denied to anybody by anybody.

That patriotism is completely passe. It is not. The brave men, living and dead, have proven that, as Abraham Lincoln said, "beyond our poor power to add or detract."

That society can and should look after one's children. That is not so. One of the greatest contributors to juvenile delinquency is that children are alone at home so much of the time while mothers are away at gainful employment, extra-curricular activities or social functions.

That America owes every one of its citizens a living. The opposite is true—each person owes every loyalty to it because he just happened to be lucky enough to be born in it.

That inflation is a bugaboo and not anything real that should cause any worry or concern. That is not true. It can break down the nation's currency and solvency, can lead to utter financial confusion and collapse and can result in repudiation of all debt. It is very real.

That maybe, after all, Communists are not as bad as pictured but are, perhaps, simply humanitarians who, in their own way, are planning reforms. Nothing could be farther from the truth. If they are humanitarian reformers, why do they resort to mass murders and unmentionable tortures? That is their barbaric way of removing all liberty and reducing mankind to endless slavery.

That we can trust Communism and its pledges. We cannot. History has proven that. The purpose of the present dream of that evil force is to disrupt, ruin and destroy the free world and reduce all men to helplessness, leaving a dictatorial band in control.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM DORN

HON. TOM S. GETTYS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and South Carolina colleague, the Honorable William Jennings Bryan Dorn, delivered a splendid address recently before the South Carolina General Assembly.

Mr. Dorn speaks eloquently of the cooperation of Federal and State Government with private enterprise and the academic community in making and keeping America No. 1 in space, economics, and promoting world peace.

Congressman Dorn's speech is worthy of the attention of all Americans, and I am proud to submit it for the Record:

Address of Congressman Wm. Jennings Bryan Dorn

Thank you, Governor West, for your very gracious and warm introduction. Speaker Pro-Tem Carter, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Joint Assembly, and my friends, it is a great honor to be extended this opportunity. I am flattered and honored beyond measure by your gracious invitation to be with you today. The training and the inspiration which I received in the House of Representatives and in the Senate of South Carolina have been my best education and have proved most beneficial to me in our service in the National Congress. I am very proud of the fact that I served here in both bodies and am proud to be one of your Representatives in Washington. I feel that as one of your Congressmen, I represent the people of South Carolina and this great General Assembly in Washington. Our State Capitol Building here in Columbia is one of the most beautiful Capitol Buildings in the entire world. I commend you for keeping this great symbol of liberty, justice, and progress in our State in such splendid condition.

It has always been a great pleasure to know your distinguished Lt. Governor West and to be associated with him. I feel a very deep affection and love for Senator Edgar Brown, who seconded the motion to seat me in the Senate here when I was a little bit younger than my friend Mike Laughlin. I know of no one in the history of South Carolina who has contributed more to progress in our State and the cause of good government than Senator Brown. Mr. Carter, I regret that our beloved Speaker, Sol Blatt, could not be with us here today. Speaker Blatt has served as Speaker longer than any other Speaker in the United States, national or state. Your Congressmen in Washington are proud of the South Carolina General Assembly. You have provided for South Carolina a good image, and you have maintained a good and respected State government. Our South Carolina government compares favorably in integrity, devotion, and dedicated public service to any other government in the world. I know that you have the honor and respect of your fellow citizens. We want to move forward with you, forward with our great State and our Nation.

The house where I live in Greenwood County was built in 1852, and it was then

XUM

in Abbeville County. The man who built that house, Dr. John Perkins Barratt, was a scientist and a doctor. He predicted in 1850 in a speech at Erskine College that someday man would go to the moon. In Italy, early in the 17th century, Galileo thought along similar lines and was ostracized by some of his contemporaries for his interest in space, in the moon and the planets. Just a few weeks ago Colonel Borman and his splendid crew went into orbit around the moon ten times and return to earth. People ask: Why put a man on the moon as we will do this year? Why spend these billions of dollars? Why spend this money when there is so much disease and poverty in the world and in our own country? Why spend this money on the moon? Why not look at the American ghetto in the great cities of the Country and to the many things that need to be done? Why?

Columbus discovered a new world despite the fact that people in his day and time thought the world was flat. He refuted the theory of his contemporaries, went into the great unknown of the Western Sea, and discovered a new world. Out of Columbus' discovery has grown the great arsenal of democracy that we know today as the United States of America, which is not only the heart and core of freedom, but also a Nation with emphasis on the dignity and the worth of the individual. Our Nation gave birth to a great capitalistic system, which has meant so much not only to the people of our great country, but to the peoples of the entire world. Columbus took that great step and gave us new horizons. John F. Kennedy, in a message in 1963 to the first Presidential Prayer Breakfast in San Jose, Costa Rica, said that Columbus was the forerunner of our American freedom of worship, of Christian ethics and Christian morality, lending emphasis to the worth and dignity of every single individual. Columbus was the forerunner; he was the man who took the risks, who believed in tomorrow, who did not look back but sailed straight into the Western Sea.

Charles A. Lindbergh in 1927, as some of you remember, flew the Atlantic in a single-engine aircraft nonstop to Paris, a distance of more than 3,000 miles. He held the key that opened the door to a new generation of thought and progress. He opened that door to tomorrow, a door to science and technology undreamed-of before, and thrilled and challenged the people of the world. Unfortunately, the Nation soon slipped into the greatest depression in history. Men who were dedicated to science and technology in the research labs and in our great academic communities had to dig ditches with pick and shovel. The United States was stagnated, floundering socially and materially. Scientific and educational progress in America was strangled in the grip of that great depression with 14 million unemployed. We didn't know which way to turn; we could not see over the horizon. Then out of the mist of the North Pacific the Imperial War Lords of Japan struck Pearl Harbor and exploded forever the theory that we, as a nation, could stand still. The American people were threatened with disaster and slavery. Our Government called on business leaders, the academic community, the military, and government agencies to all work together.

When Franklin Roosevelt said that we had to have 50,000 planes in one year, we produced almost 100,000 in one year. We had underestimated our technology, our science, and our capabilities. When the freedom of the American people was challenged, we rose to the occasion. Out of the necessities engendered by this attack, synthetic rubber, antibiotics, a whole world of industrial development, new jobs, new opportunities, medicine, nuclear science, and jet propulsion came into practical use. We entered an entirely new era. Many of the products developed during World War II were the direct results of that challenge to our freedom and national security.

In the '50s and '60s these industrial developments thrust our Nation into prosperity unprecedented in the history of the world. I remember after the war we again began to slip into complacency, patting ourselves contentedly on the back. I recall being at the White House in 1947 with a group of your Representatives, and the question was asked of the President of the United States, "What about Soviet Russia?" The President laughed and said, "Soviet Russia will never be a threat to America in your lifetime." "What about atomic science, Mr. President?" "In my opinion the Russians will never master atomic science, but if they do, it will be in the late '50s or '60s," he answered. I want to say to that President's credit that when Russia exploded an atomic bomb, just a few months after that meeting, he immediately, against the advice of many so-called experts, ordered the construction of the hydrogen bomb. We beat Russia by barely six months with the hydrogen bomb. This jolted our Nation and jolted the free people of the world. Again, we had to tighten our belts and with our great team of industry, government, and the academic community, we met that challenge and pulled ahead of Russia in sophisticated armament.

We then began to get complacent again, and I remember so well the day in Washington when Russia launched Sputnik in 1957, and then, only a few months later, Gagarin, the Russian astronaut, circled the globe in space. Shocked again, just as we had been by Pearl Harbor, we had to go to work again, and we inaugurated our space program. Since that day it has cost in excess of twenty billion dollars and is costing approximately five billion dollars a year. Again, why? American prestige, for one reason; military security, for another—and let's look for a moment at industrial development. I am informed that on Apollo 8, there were five million parts and that American ingenuity, American know-how, American science and technology reached a perfection ratio of 99.9999 on the Apollo 8 flight. This expresses more eloquently than words could the stimulus that our space program is giving to industrial development.

When people tell you that "everybody makes mistakes," I want to tell you today that in the space world there are very few mistakes made. Apollo 8, a flight that orbited the moon ten times, is a tribute to American science and technology. Credit goes to the team that I want to keep emphasizing: government, industry, the academic community, and most important, the American people who pay the bill and support such efforts. We have unlocked that door that Galileo dreamed of hundreds of years ago. We hold in our hands today the key to exploration and utilization of space. We are indeed a nation and world with unlimited horizons.

What are some of the by-products of our endeavors in space? Nonflammable materials are significant products affecting our textile industry. Computers and all types of electronic equipment have come into prominence and a battery which is superior to anything that we know today will soon be on the market. Yes, in fact, 80% of the computers in the world today are manufactured in the United States of America. When one surveys our overall balance of payments, we are losing billions of dollars a year. Yet a look only at the space-related areas of electronics and computers shows that the United States regularly achieves a trade surplus of well over a billion dollars a year; stated simply, the United States exports much more electronic goods than we import.

We are producing and manufacturing as a result of scientific and technological programs during World War II and in the 1950's 70% of the world's civilian jet aircraft. This is an eight billion dollar business in this country. Two hundred universities here worked in our space program; at the peak of our efforts, 400,000 people in every State in the American union and twenty thousand different industries were making parts for our space program.

Why the space program? We hear the question about poverty and disease. What is the real answer to poverty and disease? What has been the answer the last few years? Salk vaccine and other medicines have demonstrated what can be done. We have made more progress in medicine in the last ten years than in the previous thousand years of the history of the world, and we must not turn that clock back. We have heard that song about "One More Tomorrow." Members of this great Assembly, you can look forward to millions of tomorrows. This is the most fantastic age and the greatest era in all the history of the world. Yes, virtually every university in this country contributes to this program. Thousands of doctors and Ph. D.'s are working on research in order to put America first in space and to put our men on the moon. What about South Carolina? What about our great Aiken plant, an investment of over three billion dollars by the American people in the Savannah River plant? Some of the men who helped make this possible are here. It is related to our space programs. Yes, we had to have material that wouldn't burn. They are doing reseach there on cancer and heart disease. If you haven't been to this great plant I hope you will do so at your first opportunity.

Consider our nuclear generation of power, another billion-dollar project in the Western part of our State. South Carolina is a part of this program, is a part of the future. We are just beginning to unlock that door, and it is a source of energy which will benefit man more than any other development in our history.

A young man, a South Carolinian, came into my office not long ago and said, "I want to thank you, Mr. Congressman, for sending me to the United States Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs." He said, "I am proud of these silver wings—I can fly anything in the world." He added, "I have already been selected for the team to land on Mars in 1981." He was happy. He wasn't like these extreme right-wingers and left-wingers that I run into around this country. He smiled, threw his shoulders back, and said, "Yes, I am going to Mars, and so I am studying medicine, the same courses you have at the Medical College in South Carolina. After all the other courses that I have taken, I am studying medicine in order to know the effects of space on the human body so that I can medically treat men on Mars." He said, "I am going, and I want to thank you for giving me the opportunity."

I wish time would permit my reporting to you about the accomplishments of South Carolina students in national and world affairs. We had one from our District, a student at the United States Air Force Academy who ranked fourth in the graduating class, first in thermo-dynamics, and you know I don't think I could make 5% on that course of study. This student from South Carolina is flying today in the Pacific. Yes, we are looking to tomorrow. We are confident of the future. We are not afraid of the future.

What is the best way to fight poverty and disease? The best way is to create more wealth, more opportunity. This can only be done by such great endeavors as our space programs and our nuclear programs. These programs demand a team that reach the point of perfection mentioned a moment ago. They can and will eliminate poverty, as completely as it can be done, by the creation of new wealth, just as Columbus led the world out of the darkest of times.

We have as a nation created a high standard of living, developed an unprecedented philanthropy, and most importantly, have a genuine concern for our fellow man. When Colonel Borman circled the moon for the last time, he saw out in space the most beautiful sight he had ever witnessed. The Colonel saw the earth, and he told me in Washington, as he had told some of you over the air, that when he saw this world at that moment he realized more than ever before that the world is one community, and one brotherhood of men. He realized that what goes on in one part of the world will affect the future of all the world.

One day not long ago, an American missionary called the President of the Pharmaceutical Society in Washington on a Sunday—you know we do get calls sometimes on Sundays and in the middle of the night, just like you do. He wanted millions of dollars worth of medicine for children with leprosy and smallpox in Africa, and Monday morning the one million dollars of medicine was pledged and soon on the way. America does care—America is concerned. We are a compassionate people, and this is why we have to press forward with our programs regardless of the cost. We know that the balance of world power is about 50-50, and we could lose our associations and friendship with the people of Africa or South America or Asia. Our freedom and independence is at stake. We know that you are aware of it, and we know that Americans are concerned. We are concerned about the millions of people in places such as Calcutta, India, who do not have sewerage and who do not have running water. We are concerned about those who are born on the sidewalks of Calcutta, and who die on the sidewalks of Calcutta without ever knowing a home. America is concerned. We do care, and we are developing our programs to preserve the freedom of the American people and of all people throughout the world.

If the Soviet Union should reach the moon first—if the Soviet Union should reach Mars first—it would be difficult for you and me to sleep nights in this world. We must go there in the name of freedom, to secure peace in this world, for the dignity of man and the worth of the individual, and in order to preserve our inalienable rights. I am one of those who remember those depression years of the 1930's, when a troop of cavalry passed the high school and the principal of Greenwood High turned us all out to see those gallant men riding from Georgia to Fort Jackson. I wondered then how those men would stand up to armored tanks and bombs from the sky. The gallant Polish Cavalry taught the world a lesson when they charged the German Panzer divisions. They were mowed down like wheat in the harvest.

We must advance with science and technology to preserve our Nation and to preserve the freedom that we enjoy. The Berlin Wall, the Iron Curtain, these artificial barriers cannot, in this age of communications with television and radar and all of the electronic marvels, hide the progress of a free people. Someday the people behind the Iron Curtain are going to find out about individual freedom and private enterprise. You can't keep ideas out. Truth will make them free. They are going to find out about America and our standard of living, and they are going to change the governments of those nations because men inherently want to be free.

In the lifetime of our young people, I believe there will be no nuclear war. Freedom will advance on earth and seep through the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. The world will be free. In the meantime, we must move forward with our space program and continue as the "arsenal of democracy", and as the heart and hope of mankind. We must preserve the freedom and opportunity that we enjoy in this great Country today and export it to the ends of the earth.

Yes, you live in a great State. You represent a great State, a great Southland, the nuclear center of the world. With Cape Kennedy in Florida, Marshall Space Center in Alabama, and Houston Space Center in Houston, Texas, our capabilities are ever expanding. And I might mention the great men whom you sent to Congress during and before World War II. It was these great men, Committee Chairmen, most of them, like Dick Russell and Carl Vinson who sat in on every major decision during and since World War II, and Congressmen from the Southland whom the President of the United States called in during World War II and said that he had to have two or three billion dollars for a project, but he could not tell anyone the details. These men, without a moment's hesitation, gave the go-ahead signal for experimentation with nuclear energy. We split the atom, and we are free and secure today because they made that effort and took that step.

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, I believe in tomorrow, and I believe in our great State. I believe in the future of our Country. I think we are just on the dawn of the greatest era in the history of the Southland and the history of South Carolina. We stand to benefit by these great programs of government, science, industry, and the academic world working together and cooperating for freedom, for security, for wealth, for job opportunity, and for the capitalistic system. We now know the way to eliminate the problems of our society.

On the walls of the United States House of Representatives in Washington, we have placed over the Speaker's chair in gold letters "In God We Trust". Then above these words are placed the immortal words of Daniel Webster, "Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

THE INCREDIBLE DREAM: A WALK ON THE MOON—PART VII

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this week, human life will have reached out into the universe to touch a future as fathomless as infinity. In this soaring moment of history, Apollo 11 astronauts Neil Armstrong and Edwin Aldrin will become earth's first emissaries to another planet. In his excellent series on the history and events leading to the moon voyage of Apollo 11, Mr. Bloom records the sum of centuries of learning and experimentation. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Bloom's revealing article:

SHADOW AND SUBSTANCE: A LITTLE BUG CONCLUDES A SCIENTIFIC JOURNEY THAT BEGAN 2,500 YEARS AGO

(By Mark Bloom)

"When man has conquered all the depths of space, and all the mysteries of time, then will he be but still beginning."—H. G. Wells

It will be early morning on the long, hot lunar day when human life first reaches the moon.

The first sign will be hardly noticeable, just a tiny, black shadow flattening itself against some hilly, brown and gray lunar landscape.

But as it skims rapidly toward the west, the shadow will grow ever larger until it begins to resemble an elongated, four-legged insect.

Finally, just above a smooth patch of the moon in the Sea of Tranquillity, the shadow will halt its westward course.

And moments later, as the shadow reaches its full size, it will be touched by four, bowl-shaped pieces of shining aluminum.

At this instant, Apollo 11's lunar module will be on the moon. Aboard: Neil Armstrong and Edwin (Buzz) Aldrin, earth's first emissaries to its satellite

At this instant, the human spirit, as indefinable as faith or love but as real as the moon, will have swept man to another victory in his never-ending quest for accomplishing what has not been accomplished, for learning what has not been learned, for traveling to where he has never been.

In this soaring moment of history, human life will have reached out into the universe to touch a future as fathomless as infinity.

Like all explorers from the dawn of time, the banner of discovery will be carried by men who live by the subtle thrill of danger. Armstrong and Aldrin, highly trained and supremely confident of their skill, will trust their lives on the airless wastes of the moon to countless others. Despite the smooth, almost mechanical efficiency of their mission, the dangers are very real. In this most hazardous of all voyages, they risk a horror no other men have ever known—that of being marooned on another world.

Yet the promise of victory outweighs all, for man will at last be touching another planet, spearheading the conquest of the solar system and beyond to search for life in other worlds.

Though it will be two Americans who land, Armstrong and Aldrin will not simply represent the United States, but all men down through the centuries whose dreams have reached beyond their grasp.

"The question of the meaning of the lunar landing is a serious point," said Thomas O. Paine, administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

"We in America think it is based on science of all mankind over the centuries. We in the United States are proud and pleased that it is given to us to be the first to land on the moon. But . . . it is being done in the name of all mankind."

In a sense, the Russians deserve much of the credit. It was the first dramatic Soviet accomplishments in space, and the blow they gave to our national pride, which spurred President Kennedy to urge that we land a man on the moon before the end of the decade.

But man's desire to walk upon the stars did not begin in 1957 with Sputnik 1, or with the flight of Yuri Gagarin four years later. It is thousands of years old, possibly as old as mankind itself.

The voyage of Apollo 11 is a crowning achievement of the human imagination, the sum of centuries of learning and experimentation, as man slowly and painfully pieced together the secrets of his world.

Slowly but surely, almost 2,000 years before Columbus and Copernicus, the Greeks began to unravel the basic structure of the solar system.

Aristarchus of Samos (310–230 B.C.) concluded that the earth revolved round the sun in a circular orbit, an observation which was received with about as much enthusiasm as it was when Copernicus brought it up again 18 centuries later. Man was far from ready to accept the idea that the earth—at least physically—was not the center of the universe.

The next great step was made by Johannes Kepler, who published in 1609 the laws of orbital motion—showing that planets do not move in circles around the sun, but in ovals.

At last, the apparent wandering movement

XUM

of the planets across the sky could be calculated by a mathematical formula—a formula that holds as true for the earth or Jupiter or the moon as it does for Apollo 11.

Early in 1610 there was an event which had more significance for man's understanding of his universe than any other—until Apollo 11. Galileo pointed a telescope into the sky.

In rapid fashion, he saw wonders which man had never seen before. He saw four moons circling Jupiter, ending forever the concept that everything in the universe circled earth. He saw the rings of Saturn. He saw the vast cratered stretches of the moon, and realized it was another world—a terrestrial body like the earth. The great astronomer spied the valleys, mountains and craters of the moon.

He saw enormous dark areas which he thought might be seas. One of these, along the moon's equator, is now called the Sea of Tranquility. It is there Apollo 11 will land.

After Galileo, man's awareness of his place in the universe was never the same. Man could no longer be sure he was king, even of his own solar system. If the moon looked like the earth, did it follow that it was populated by human beings? If not the moon, were the planets populated? The stars?

Some day, man had to find out the answer to the basic question: Is there life somewhere else?

In 1687, Newton published his theories on gravity and motion which, among other things, explained why the moon orbits the earth and why the earth orbits the sun.

With his knowledge, the countdown began for man's first trip to the moon less than 300 years later.

But one major detail was still to be worked out. What in the world was powerful enough to hurl man past the earth's tenacious forces of gravity?

In 1899, a popular book called "Half Hours in Air and Sky" offered the hope that some discovery would be made to allow "a visit to our neighbor, the moon."

"The only machine independent of the atmosphere we can conceive of," said the book by an unidentified author, "would be one on the principle of the rocket. The rocket rises in the air, not from the resistance offered by the atmosphere on its fiery stream, but from internal reaction."

It was a remarkably accurate assessment of how men would travel into space, especially since it appeared four years before Russian scientist Konstantin Tsiolkovsky published his paper showing, for the first time, that a rocket would work in the vacuum of space.

American physicist Robert H. Goddard, (1882–1945), considered to be the father of modern rocketry, was still in high school, in Worcester, Mass., when he wrote an article called "Navigation in Space." It suggested that heat from radioactive materials could furnish sufficient power for a rocket to navigate a spacecraft across interplanetary space: In effect, a nuclear rocket, more than a half-century ahead of its time.

Current NASA studies show that a Saturn 5 nuclear upper stage, currently in an early phase of development, would be the only practical way to send men to Mars in the relatively near future.

Goddard's paper was rejected by Popular Science News, Scientific American and Popular Astronomy.

By 1909, two years before he received a doctorate in physics from Worcester's Clark University, Goddard had concluded that multi-stage rockets would be required for space flight, and that the most efficient rocket fuel would be a combination of oxygen and hydrogen.

Sixty years later, a three-stage Saturn 5, with the upper two stages powered by liquid hydrogen and liquid oxygen, was poised to hurl Apollo 11 toward the moon.

On March 16, 1926, on a farm owned by Goddard's aunt near Auburn, Mass., he staged the world's first flight of a liquid-fueled rocket. Goddard's rocket climbed to a maximum altitude of 41 feet as it sped 184 feet across a field at an average speed of 60 miles an hour. Total flight time for the 10-foot-tall rocket was 2.5 seconds. It was an historic step on the road to the moon.

While Goddard's contributions to rocketry were enormous, and he occasionally received front-page notice of his experiments, the full worth of his contributions were unrecognized until after he died.

German rocket scientists who surrendered to American troops in 1945 were amazed at the questions from U.S. intelligence officers. "Why are they asking us this?" they asked. "You have Goddard."

As it turned out, Goddard's work was so advanced that fifteen years after his death the Air Force, the Army, the Navy and NASA were forced to turn over a total of $1 million for infringing on his patents in the development of Atlas, Thor, Jupiter, Redstone and Vanguard rockets. The money went to the Daniel and Florence Guggenheim Foundation of New York which, at the urging of Charles Lindbergh, had financed Goddard's rocketry experiments in the 1930's.

While Goddard's work aroused mostly derision in the United States, a Rumanian-born German scientist named Hermann Oberth was highly interested.

In 1922, he wrote Goddard for a copy of a paper called "A Method of Reaching Extreme Altitudes," commenting: "I think that only by the common work of scholars of all nations can we solve this great problem . . . to pass over the atmosphere of our earth by means of a rocket."

In 1923 Oberth, recognized along with Tsiolkovsky and Goddard as one of the three great rocket pioneers, published "The Rocket into Planetary Space," which advanced many of the ideas of Goddard and Tsiolkovsky, and discussed the problems of space flight more exhaustively than had been done before.

In 1927, the famed German Rocket Society was founded, and Oberth became president two years later. A founding member was another rocket pioneer, Willy Ley, who came to the United States in 1935. In 1928, a young student named Wernher von Braun joined the society.

By 1932, however, a small nucleus of the society's members, most prominent among them von Braun, had been absorbed by the German army for rocket work. As it turned out, it was aimed more at the heart of London than at the stars.

While Oberth went back to teaching, von Braun, though still a student working toward his doctorate, became chief rocket development engineer for the German army ordnance department. The military man in charge was Capt. Walter Dornberger, who rose to general by 1945.

In 1937, the von Braun-Dornberger team moved to Peenemunde on the Baltic Sea where the V–2 was developed to bombard England.

When the war ended, in what was known as "Operation Paperclip," the cream of the German rocket team was whisked to the United States—von Braun, Dornberger, Kurt Debus, Arthur Rudolph and many others.

Von Braun is now director of NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala., where the Saturn 5 moonrocket was developed; Dornberger recently retired as vice president for research of Bell Aerosystems, Buffalo, N.Y.; Debus is director of NASA's Kennedy Space Center at Cape Kennedy; Rudolph recently retired as project manager of Saturn 5 development at Huntsville.

On July 28, 1960, NASA announced—all on the same day—the start of projects called Apollo, Surveyor and Ranger. Later would come Lunar Orbiter. These four projects, plus Mercury and Gemini, made up America's drive for the moon.

Rangers 7, 8 and 9 sent back to earth the first close-up photos of the moon, scouting potential manned landing sites. Five Surveyers soft-landed on the moon, sending back to earth thousands of ground-level views of potential manned landing sites. Five Lunar Orbiters, circling the moon as low as 30 miles, sent back hundreds of photos, mapping the surface for manned landings.

Six one-man Mercury flights showed man could function in space near the earth. Ten two-man Geminis showed man could live in space for up to two weeks, maneuver a vehicle to a rendezvous, and return to earth with pinpoint accuracy.

And then Apollo, a project of such stupendous magnitude and complexity that it virtually bars comparison. Comparing Apollo to Gemini, for instance, would be equivalent to matching a supersonic transport against a DC–3.

Apollo required a Saturn 5 rocket, a booster four times mightier than any previous one, so powerful that even Goddard would have gasped at its strength.

It required a three-man command cabin and a two-man lunar landing vehicle, both outstripping the imagination in complexity.

It required a world-wide tracking and communications system so efficient that astronauts and ground controllers would be able to chat easily from 240,000 miles away; so efficient that men on the earth would know virtually to the inch where Apollo was flying in the void of space every instant; so efficient that the ground would know at all times how every component on the spacecraft was working.

It required a management system that could trace every wire or switch or solder back to the ore where it was mined; a system that would keep track of a project which involved 20,000 companies and more than 300,000 persons.

It required $24 billion.

It faltered once, badly. On Jan. 27, 1967, a fire in the Apollo 1 capsule killed astronauts Gus Grissom, Ed White and Roger Chaffee during a pre-launch test. But the lure of the moon grew no less strong because of this tragedy.

"If we die," said Grissom a few weeks before the fire, "we want people to accept it. We are in a risky business, and we hope that if anything happens to us it will not delay the program.

"The conquest of space is worth the risk of life."

WILL DURANT: A LAST TESTAMENT TO YOUTH

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, there are few men with the gift of intellect and perception of Will Durant. There are few men, too, who can match his experience, his literary flair, and his judicious optimism.

In a recent girls school commencement oration, Mr. Durant addressed himself to our moment in history. He came away noting that we are making progress. We have not achieved Nirvana, but we are making progress:

In Mr. Durant's own words:

> Do not let the pessimism of contemporary thought darken your spirits; this is the passing mood of a transitional age, when we have

waged a shamefully barbarous war, when the blackest sins of our history demand atonement and when some of our fairest myths have faded and left a somber emptiness where once they chastened our conduct and warmed our hearts.

Above all, Mr. Durant is a man who appreciates civilization, and one who fears that its fruits may be lost. His caution should be heeded.

I include an excerpt from Mr. Durant's speech at this point in the RECORD:

WILL DURANT: A LAST TESTAMENT TO YOUTH

(By Will Durant)

(NOTE.—At 83, Will Durant, an elder statesman of American letters, has seen vast changes occur in the United States. In a recent commencement address to the graduating class of the Buckley School for Girls in Los Angeles—of which his granddaughter was a member—the noted philosopher-historian gave his views on the current turbulent American scene. Following is a partial text of the address, entitled "A Last Testament to Youth.")

It is good that the young should rebel and the old should resist; it is essential that minorities shall be heard; and one of the admirable aspects of the contemporary scene is the patient maintenance of free speech and minority rights by democracies tempted to answer force with super-force, joining in the martial march of authoritarian governments.

But the time has come for old and young to realize that civilization is endangered in its very foundations, that the social order that tamed us from savages into citizens is weakened in all its supports, and that the fruits of democratic progress may in a generation be lost in a contest between permissive anarchy and a police state.

What can we oldsters do about it? We can listen to the cries of the disadvantaged and dispossessed, and open the ways to controlled experiment with new ideas. We can check our racial antipathies by realizing that whichever side wins in a violent clash of races of classes, democracy, humanity, and security will disappear.

We can try to cleanse the avenues and halls of politics so that one need not be a millionaire to be eligible to the presidency. We can join the young in restraining our government from undertaking to police the world instead of bringing hope and health to the poor.

If we can check our rush into imperialism we have the resources to educate every American for profitable employment even in our ever more automated and computerized society. We have been clever and generous enough to spread the benefits of our inventiveness, enterprise, and skill to 80 per cent of our people—the greatest achievement in economic history; we are learning to let consumption keep up with production.

Two more generations, given enlightened leadership in government and industry, may reduce the impoverished 20 per cent to 15 per cent, to 10 per cent to 5 per cent to zero. That would be the fulfillment of Amos and Isaiah; it would be the resurrection of Christ.

And what can you privileged youngsters do? First, continue to study. It is not true that education will merely plunge you into a coarsening race for material rewards; it will enlarge your understanding and make you more patient with complex problems and the shortcomings of men.

Study the roots of our crime and corruption, our economic inequities, and our political failures; see how strong these roots are in the processes of biology, in the nature of man, and in the centuries of history.

Reconcile yourselves to modest and gradual improvements after your proposals have faced the necessary test of conservative resistance. Continue to express your dissent and your needs, but remember to remain civilized, for you will sorely miss civilization if it is sacrificed in turbulence of change.

Beware of those who take their vocabularies and privies; they are trying to cover up their lack of confidence in their own manhood by leveling you with themselves. Wear your hair and your feet as you like, but keep them clean, and do not add to the pollution of the air. Watch your sexual freedom that it bring no hurt to others or yourself. Lasting affection—the most precious gift of life—is rarely won by hasty accommodation to irresponsible desire.

Do not let the pessimism of contemporary thought darken your spirits; this is the passing mood of a transitional age, when we have waged a shamefully barbarous war, when the blackest sins of our history demand atonement and when some of our fairest myths have faded and left a somber emptiness where once they chastened our conduct and warmed our hearts. Do not yield to the mechanistic philosophy that grew from a physics long since rejected by physicists; man can make marvelous machines, but he is not a machine; let not the work of your hands conceal the miracle of your minds. Every one of you is a mystery of rational consciousness; every girl among you is a temple and glory of creative life.

Do not believe those dispirited spirits who call progress a delusion; progress is intermittent but it is real. A hundred advances that I pleaded for in my youth—like higher wages, more humane employment, governmental checks on private industry, the partial redistribution of wealth through the welfare state, the spread of comfort and leisure, the extension of education, the multiplication of colleges and universities, the freedom of speech, assemblage, and the press, the access of every American to the ballot, to public office, to the professions, to the Supreme Court—all these have become accepted parts of the American system since my wife Ariel and I agitated for them in our political puberty. If the founders of our republic could return from their graves they would marvel at our advances, and would brand our pessimists as ingrates whinning because perfection has not been laid at their feet.

I believe that we shall solve, or dissolve, within the limits of our nature, one after another of the problems that harass us today. Already our government, through a maze of difficulties, is seeking to end a disastrous war. Our ethnic minorities will enter in ever greater number into our high schools, colleges, and universities, they will get the courses that their pride may claim, and those that their adjustment to technology requires; they will rise in industry, in the professions, in the arts and sciences, and in public office; they will become established parts of the American scene as did our German-Americans, our Irish-Americans, our Italian-Americans, our Polish-Americans, our Jewish-Americans, even a French-Canadian-American like me. And, like their predecessors, they will lower their birth rate as they raise their income; and the urban ghettoes will relieve their pressure and their poverty by following a hundred outlets into American life. It will take more time and patience than before, but it will come, or America will lose its meaning in the history and aspirations of humanity.

HALT TO TESTING OF MIRV'S

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, is presently holding hearings on legislation calling for a halt to U.S. testing of multiple, independently targetable reentry vehicles—MIRV's.

Those hearings were stimulated by House Concurrent Resolution 259, introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM). I share Congressman BINGHAM's concern that testing and deployment of a MIRV system at this time would not only seriously escalate the costly and increasingly dangerous arms race, but may jeopardize the possibilities of reaching a meaningful strategic arms limitation agreement with the Soviet Union. It is for that reason that I have joined with more than 30 Members of the House in cosponsoring his resolution.

Under unanimous consent, I include at this point in the RECORD, Mr. BINGHAM's testimony before the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on National Security and Scientific Developments, on the opening day of the hearings, and commend it to the Members of this body as a most convincing and impressive argument for a sane initiative to halt this new spiral of armament:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

As the sponsor of the first Resolution introduced in the Congress (H. Con. Res. 259) calling for a halt to U.S. testing of multiple, independently targetable reentry vehicles (MIRVs), I wish to express my appreciation to this Subcommittee, and particularly to you, Mr. Chairman, for scheduling these hearings. I'm certain that the 31 other members of the House from both parties who have co-sponsored my Resolution, or who have introduced identical Resolutions, join me in that regard. The Committee's response to this situation, which many of us view as critical, is most gratifying. I share what I'm certain is the hope of this Subcommittee—that these hearings will spur a conscious and carefully considered decision on our further national action in the short-term future with regard to the development of MIRV weaponry. Some officials have argued that we have already made our decision on the MIRV. I personally disagree with that view. But whether or not it is accurate, I feel that we have nothing to lose and everything to gain from continuing to appraise and even reappraise, in the face of changing national and world conditions, our commitments to develop weapons systems of such great significance, and involving such great resources, as the MIRV system.

The expense and sophistication of the American and Soviet weapons arsenals have increased almost without interruption over the past several decades. The Congress and a great many capable and well-intentioned officials of the Executive branch, from the White House on down, have proved essentially powerless to divert this trend—so powerless as to lead to the regrettable conclusion that as soon as new and more expensive weapons become technically feasible, their development and deployment become practically inevitable. Not even the unprecedented determination with which the current Congress is examining and evaluating defense expenditures and procedures promises to produce more than a partial and perhaps momentary flutter in the rising costs and efficiency of the super-powers' capability to destroy.

Not only has our national preoccupation with death-dealing forces diverted valuable resources in ever-increasing amounts from efforts to improve the quality of our lives, it has failed significantly to improve our arms advantage relative to the Soviet Union—if such an improved advantage is necessary. Each increase in the total capability of either nation sets off a counter-reaction, allowing

XUM

no more than a fleeting gain by either side and leaving relative capabilities essentially static.

The only ray of hope in the rather dismal picture of the future this situation portends is the possibility that agreement can be reached between the Soviet Union and the United States to limit armaments.

Several times in the past two decades the United States has attempted to reach strategic agreements with the Soviet Union.

Since 1958 we have had five instances of significant mutual restraint. They are: the nuclear test moratorium of 1958–1961; the Antarctic Treaty of 1959; the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of 1963; the treaty for Peaceful Use of Outer Space, in 1967; and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968.

The record of successful arms limitation efforts is clear. In each of these five cases, acts of restraint preceded formal negotiation. The United States and the Soviet Union suspended objectionable activities before initiating talks. To a degree, discussions and treaty-writing only formalized existing moratoria. The real restraint, the suspension of actual or potential arms-race activities, came about through independent self-restraint by one or both of the great powers.

Unsuccessful arms limitation efforts have followed a contrasting pattern. In the cases, for example, of possible foreign base cut backs and the reduction of bomber forces, negotiations began before either side began practicing voluntary restraint. When negotiating partners feverishly conduct an activity which they say they are interested in negotiating to suspend, the talks predictably flounder, or fail even to begin. Neither side can afford to risk being left at a lasting disadvantage by the other's latest advance.

This record, I think, clearly disproves the contention that it is useless to try to reach agreements with the Soviets—that such agreements cannot be reached, and if reached will not be honored. The record shows, however, that negotiations are difficult to convene, and agreements—once negotiations are underway—are particularly difficult to achieve in the absence of prior restraint by one or both sides. Therefore, if we are to achieve further arms control agreements, we must improve our ability as a nation to tailor our national policies and operations to achieve and maintain an optimum environment for negotiation and accord.

The courage to take reasonable risks by refraining from acts which may be regarded as provocative or "destabilizing" is certainly essential in assuring an international environment conducive to fruitful negotiations.

Continued testing of multiple, independently targetable reentry vehicles is both provocative and "destabilizing". The very psychology of the arms race requires that each major new weapons system or concept developed by one side be duplicated with all haste by the other. Furthermore, Soviet military leaders, like their counterparts in this country, must be assumed to plan and act on the basis of the worst possible implications of each new development in the weapons field.

MIRV was first introduced by Defense Secretary McNamara as a counter to the now obsolete Soviet Galosh system of ABMs around Moscow. By increasing the number of warhead reentry vehicles, it was thought we could outnumber and overwhelm any Soviet ABM city defense, and thus maintain the credibility of our deterrent.

But the purpose of the MIRV, and the Defense Department's arguments for it, have shifted. As Secretary Laird clearly indicated in recent testimony (Defense Posture Statement, March 27, p. 36), MIRV guidance is now being perfected so that it will be accurate enough to destroy enemy missile sites. The Defense Department has announced its intention to improve the accuracy of the Poseidon missile, for example, "enhancing its effectiveness against hard targets." As early as 1968 it announced that MIRVs would be "far better suited for destruction of hardened enemy missile sites than any existing missile warheads." If it is not a first-strike capability, therefore, it is the closest thing we have to such a capability.

As counterforce weapons, MIRVs would be far more deadly than single-warhead missiles, even though the single warhead has greater explosive power. Some physicists have calculated that a MIRVed missile would do 70% more damage to an enemy's hardened missiles than a single-warhead missile. With further refinement of the guidance system, MIRV missiles could be many times as effective against an adversary's hardened weapons as our current Polaris-Minuteman force.

To the Soviets, therefore, the purpose of our MIRV program may well seem to have shifted from maintaining the credibility of our deterrent to providing a first-strike capability. Thus, from the worst-contingency view that must be assumed by Soviet leaders, MIRV development can only be regarded as provocative and threatening. Each step we take toward making this system operational, the greater the pressure we exert upon the Soviets to step up and carry through to completion their own efforts in this area.

There is disagreement as to whether the development of MIRV weapons systems to the operational stage will make an effective arms control agreement impossible. But there is little disagreement that the development of MIRV weapons to the operational stage will make an arms control agreement much more difficult. As I'm sure the Subcommittee is already aware, when there is only one warhead to a missile, the deployment of land-based warheads can be observed by satellite surveillance. Once the factor of multiple warheads is introduced, such verification becomes impossible without intense and extensive on-site inspection.

That being the case, one would think that there would be agreement among all those who want to achieve arms control agreement that the development of operational MIRVs should be deferred pending the SALT talks. One can only suspect that those who argue otherwise do not really want to see the SALT talks succeed. I am making no charges here, but it has been commonly accepted in Washington for a long time that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are basically hostile to arms limitations.

If we can agree on the proposition that deferment of the development of operational MIRVs would be useful, then surely it follows that flight testing to that end should be suspended. The question then becomes: how can we achieve such a suspension of testing?

I submit the simplest, quickest, and easiest way is for the U.S. to announce its suspension of such tests together with a statement that the suspension will continue as long as the Soviets also suspend their testing program. Obviously, the Soviets would be advised in advance that we were to make such a statement so that they would not be taken by surprise, but there would be no need for them to make an explicit agreement to suspend their tests also.

While I have the greatest respect for Senator Brooke and for our colleagues who have sponsored the Brooke resolution in the House, I believe that it would be a mistake for us to continue our testing program until we can achieve some kind of explicit agreement with the Russians that they will do likewise. Even if we were to attempt to reach such an agreement privately and informally, the effort is almost certain to mean delay, when time is of the essence. Moreover, to talk in terms of an informal agreement is bound to arouse the opposition and fears of those among us, who, with some justification, are skeptical of the trustworthiness of the Soviets.

Whether we have an explicit agreement to suspend testing, or whether we take the first step, inviting the Soviets to follow suit, our own suspension of testing would presumably not continue if the Soviets did not suspend testing, or having suspended, then resumed. Thus, a mutual moratorium following our initial suspension gives us just as much protection as an informal agreement. The advantage of the initial suspension, of course, is that it involves no delay whatever. And the sooner the testing can be suspended the better. We may not be in as good a position to succeed in the SALT talks as we were a year ago, but we are undoubtedly in a better position than we will be three or six months from now. The further the MIRV tests have been carried, the more likely it is that the talks will founder over the issue of verification.

Under H. Con. Res. 259, of course, if in his judgment the President felt that the best way to proceed would be to try to reach an informal agreement with the Soviets to halt MIRV testing prior to the convening of formal talks, he would be in a position to do so. It seems a mistake to me, however, to seem to suggest, as the Brooke resolution does, that no suspension can be achieved unless the Soviets are willing to make an explicit agreement for a mutual suspension.

What would my friends, Messrs. Anderson and Cohelan, recommend we do if the Soviets indicate a willingness to follow our lead in suspending tests, but not to make any explicit agreement until all the SALT talks issues can be resolved at once?

While H. Con. Res. 259 did not so state, it was my interpretation of it that the U.S. would have to resume testing if the Soviets went right ahead with their testing. It has been suggested that the second operative paragraph of the resolution should so specify. I am prepared and intend to introduce a revised version of my Resolution adding this stipulation.

To fail to show maximum restraint now, or to complicate the procedures for achieving restraint by imposing an unnecessary and possibly troublesome condition of U.S. action may well put us on the same road that has proved in the past to lead to failure at the negotiating table. I therefore respectfully urge the Committee to report favorably a Resolution which will provide the clearest, most unconditional directive to the President to halt MIRV testing by the United States and to continue to refrain from such testing so long as the Soviets do the same until a mutual halt has been fully considered in projected formal negotiations with the Soviet Union.

PATTERN OF CONCESSION FAMILIAR TO COMMUNISM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we encounter further disappointments in the quest for peace in Vietnam, realistic appraisals of foreign policy contacts with the Communists are essential to the understanding of the problem.

A renown expert on communism is Dumitru Danielopol, the distinguished foreign correspondent of the Copley Press writing in the South Bay Daily Breeze, Wednesday, June 25, drives home a point of special significance:

PATTERN OF CONCESSION FAMILIAR TO COMMUNISM

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

BRUSSELS.—The creation of a "provisional government" in South Vietnam to replace the Communist National Liberation Front has an ominous ring to anyone who has studied Communist tactics over the years.

Although the United States officially dismissed its importance, the Reds' announcement proves again their intention to take over the whole of Vietnam.

They seem convinced that what they haven't been able to win on the battle front will be handed them by a Washington that is hopelessly entangled in dissent.

Precedents give the Reds good reason to be optimistic.

The Lublin Committee set up by Stalin in Poland in 1944—in opposition to the legitimate Polish Government in exile operating from London—became a "provisional government" of Poland and finally took over, though it was non-representative.

In Yugoslavia Tito formed a provisional regime that took over from the legitimate government in exile.

It happened in Romania, in Hungary, in China and it can happen in Vietnam.

In their confrontation with the Communists the West has shown a lack of staying power. It has always been goaded to alternative solutions.

When President Nixon made his Vietnam speech in May and talked of "free election," South Vietnam diplomats and government officials were shocked. The President, they said, had put doubt on the legitimacy of the Saigon regime and had seriously weakened it.

Secretary of State William Rogers' statement that the United States was not "wedded" to any regime in South Vietnam sent another shudder through the Saigon men. The announcement that 25,000 U.S. troops would be withdrawn immediately contributes to the belief in Europe that the Americans are on the way out.

Many political observers I have talked to during a month in Europe predict that the Reds will now use every means to increase pressures on the Nixon administration for a quick solution in Vietnam.

A new wave of anti-war activity may erupt in the United States.

Although U.S. and Western diplomats pooh-pooh the creation of the "provisional government" as "a not terribly new wine in old bottles," and a propaganda trick, let no one minimize its importance.

It was immediately recognized by Algeria and the Communist countries. It will get recognition not only from the Communist bloc, but even perhaps from countries like Sweden.

It is sure to get endorsement from left-wing, liberal and pacifist groups in the United States who will clamor for recognition of its legitimacy, and for merger with the Saigon regime.

It is the seed of confusion and demoralization.

If the Communists are right, it will mean that we have learned nothing from the history of the last 30 years and the war will have been fought in vain.

Coalition with the Communists has never worked. Why should we think Vietnam is different?

A WAY TO ATTACK THE DRUG PROBLEM

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the President's message yesterday is a welcome bright spot on an otherwise dim horizon.

Daily, our news media recount alarming narcotics and drug abuse problems throughout the country, and the increasing incidence of crime to which the narcotics and drug abuse trend contribute greatly.

To my mind, the President's initial move to checkmate this scourge on the American scene attacks the problems on many fronts—all of which must be considered if the increasing drug abuse problem is to be dealt with effectively. Federal and State legislation are essential; international cooperation is a must; increased manpower and money and a commitment to effective enforcement are required; education, training, and research are basic; and the interchange of ideas and information among knowledgeable Federal and State officials must necessarily be productive. Anything less than the combination of all of these elements would be inadequate.

I look forward to receipt by the Congress of the legislation which the Attorney General is to submit and to the sympathetic, full consideration by the Congress of this legislation and the requests of the administration for the wherewithal to carry out the President's imaginative 10-point program.

With the cooperation of the public, our educators, our researchers and scientists, our lawmakers at all levels of government, our law-enforcement personnel and courts, and our corrections personnel, the drug abuse problem can be licked.

ALLIED PEACE PROPOSAL REJECTED

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, this morning's news carried the unhappy report that the North Vietnamese have rejected out of hand the latest allied peace proposals. This is particularly disturbing to those of us who had hoped that if the United States and South Vietnam went halfway toward accommodation, the other side would respond with at least some movement toward a compromise solution to the Vietnam war. The continued inflexibility of the North Vietnamese raises the question of how much further the critics of the President would have him go without expecting at least some reciprocation from the other side.

A few months ago, many of us in this House rose to commend the President for the reasonableness of his Vietnam bargaining position as outlined in his May 14 address to the Nation. Last week the allied position was set out more clearly and reasonably by President Thieu. It is obvious then that in the past few months the President and our allies have bent over backward in preparing a bargaining position which is both flexible and cognizant of the continued suffering of the Vietnamese people.

This country has halted all bombing of the North and has refrained from reinstituting this action despite provocations by the enemy, and despite the inflexibility of the other side at the Paris talks. In a further effort to bring peace to Southeast Asia, the President announced on May 14 an imaginative eight-point peace plan. Under the arrangements outlined in this position statement, the United States pledges to withdraw all troops from Vietnam shortly after a settlement is reached. Nevertheless, the other side continues its inflexible insistence upon a U.S. withdrawal prior to a settlement, without reference to the presence of North Vietnamese troops in the South.

In subsequent actions the President has further underlined the sincerity of his peace program. Our withdrawal of 25,000 troops is clearly a signal to the other side that we desire no American hegemony in the area. Additionally the administration has announced its willingness to accept any political arrangement which might be forged for South Vietnam through free elections. And just last week President Thieu was even more specific, proposing that an internationally supervised election be held in South Vietnam with the opportunity for participation by all political factions.

By the allied offer of free elections we confirm the altruistic nature of our commitment to South Vietnam. By the North's rejection of this offer, they confirm the weakness of their hold on the loyalty of the people of South Vietnam. By our offer we are consistent in espousing the rights of all individuals in South Vietnam to participate in the political process and determine their own destiny. By the North's denial of interest in this opportunity and responsibility, they are admitting the undemocratic nature of their cause.

Clearly then, the United States and our allies have been generous and flexible in approaching a peace settlement. Now it remains for the other side to respond with the same flexibility and with the same sense of compassion for the ordeal of Vietnam's people.

MINTING OF 100 MILLION SILVER DOLLARS TO COMMEMORATE DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER, PROPOSED

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday 145 Members of the House joined me in the introduction of legislation which would authorize the minting of a 40-percent silver dollar bearing the likeness of Dwight David Eisenhower. Over on the other side of the Capitol, Senator DOMINICK and 26 of his colleagues sponsored an identical bill.

The proposal is a simple one—requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a minimum of 100 million Eisenhower dollars annually for a period of 3 years. Most coin authorizations cover a minimum period of 25 years, but my proposal is deliberately pegged at three in order that Congress might review the silver

XUM

situation at that time. The Treasury has a sufficient amount of silver to fulfill a 3-year commitment. We can then decide whether or not to continue issuing a coin of prestige quality or whether we should switch to metals of lesser value. In any event, it is assumed that Mr. Eisenhower's likeness will remain on the coin for at least the traditional 25-year period.

The metallic content of the proposed coin is proportionately the same as in the Kennedy half-dollar. There is a growing commercial need for a coin dollar. The vending industry, in particular, is interested. It is true that coin collectors will undoubtedly grab up the initial minting. But just as the Kennedy 50-cent piece began to circulate after a time, the Eisenhower silver dollar will also circulate.

A couple of years ago, the Treasury Department decided it was no longer interested in silver as a reserve metal. So, 165 million ounces were transferred to the strategic stockpile and holders of silver certificates were given an opportunity to redeem their holdings. Now, the remaining stocks are sold to foreign and domestic users at a rate of 1.5 million ounces a week. These sales are always made at prices below the prevailing market and have gone as low as $1.51 an ounce recently.

On the other hand, the Eisenhower coin monetizes at $3.16 an ounce and would give the taxpayer more than twice the profit on the silver than is now being realized.

Finally, a word must be said about using this method as a vehicle for honoring President Eisenhower. Few men in our Nation's history had the opportunity or the capacity to serve their country in so many ways. Fewer still were held in such high esteem by their fellow man. The Eisenhower coin should be of the same quality as the one it seeks to honor—as solid, as genuine, as prestigious as the man himself.

I will be happy to submit additional bills should any more of my colleagues decide that they would like to join me in paying tribute to our late President in this fashion. If you care to cosponsor, please call my office—extension 6611—and notify any member of my staff.

RAILROAD DISCOURAGEMENT OF PUBLIC LAMENTED BY AMERICANS

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, many times I have taken the floor of the House to lament the increasing disappearance of passenger trains from American life, and I have authored legislation which is directed at correcting some of the problems in this matter.

However, passenger train service, in many cases, continues to decline except for the new Metroliner between Washington, D.C., and New York City which is carrying, I am told, capacity passenger loads.

The success of the Metroliner is reportedly having a positive effect on other rail service to New York. Recent figures have indicated an increase in passenger service on the older trains on this run since the Metroliner service began earlier this year.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, that a great number of Americans want good train service, yet it is difficult to find.

I call particularly to the attention of my colleagues five letters to the editor in the Christian Science Monitor from persons also concerned about passenger train service. These letters appear at this point in the Record:

Railroad Discouragement of Public Lamented by Americans

To the Travel Editor:

Your recent article concerning a trip on the California Zephyr and particularly your experience making reservations for it prompt me to write this letter. First, it is irresistible to reminisce. In 1949 I returned from San Francisco to Boston by rail, having driven an automobile to San Francisco.

Never will I forget that Zephyr trip (coach, too): the three spectacular canyons, the Nevada desert by moonlight, and even the prairies in broad daylight—all seen from the Vista Dome—were an unforgettable American epic.

And I distinctly recall a train employee traversing the coach aisles dusting and polishing the metal trimming on those comfortable seats with leg rests; the pleasant surprise of finding a luncheon coach where one could purchase sandwiches, salads, soups, and beverages instead of the usual diner serving the multicourse meal at outrageous expenditure of time as well as money. Such memories refuse to die.

I still am unconvinced that "passenger railroading is hopeless," as a railroad official recently stated. (As an amusing contrast, we limped into Boston on one of the Boston & Albany's wooden coaches with green plush seats—remember those reversible backs?)

But it was your experience with the reservations that provides the real impetus for this letter. About four years ago I attended a convention in Cleveland, a distance of only 250 miles from my native Cincinnati. Complications at both ends of this short trip led me to take the train as the most convenient solution. I secured a roomette with no difficulty; there was one other roomette occupied in our entire coach. A gentle porter of the old school felt talkative, and I found his information interesting.

He asked me if I knew what railroad people were doing to discourage passenger traffic. Beyond the discourteous attitudes of some railroad personnel, I replied that I did not.

He said that when prospective passengers went to ticket offices to buy tickets, they were told that no space was available on the train they wished to take. Having turned people away by this method, railroaders then showed government officials their blank reservation records as "proof" that a certain train was unpatronized, therefore unneeded, requesting permission to discontinue service.

The porter cited another tactic used to dishearten passengers. He said that a crack train from the South, well patronized for years, made an excellent connection in Cincinnati with a northbound train. The schedule was changed so that a several-hour layover in Cincinnati was necessary. The desired effect was brought about—a great falling off of passenger volume on that route. When I mentioned the Western trains, he said wistfully, "Oh, yes, they still give good service."

What a wonderful way it would be for Americans both young and old, as well as European tourists, to see the U.S.A. by train—even as Americans are discovering how desirable it is to see Europe by rail! Why don't we plan for the future? If we can believe what we hear and read, more leisure is certainly on the way for all of us. It seems to me that railroads could have a place in this picture. Why all the hurry? Need passenger railroading be financially hopeless?

Miss Grace E. Sherwood.

Cincinnati, Ohio.

To the Travel Editor:

I have noted with considerable approval the positive attitude of your newspaper toward attempting to stimulate the passenger service offered by American railroads today. The number of articles written about good train service and the true joy of traveling by rail attest to this positive approach.

In today's Monitor (June 24, 1969) the several letters written by readers from throughout the nation reinforce a belief I have that many people prefer train travel and would still be on trains if service were provided. The railroads, at least a good many of them, seem determined to "dump" the passenger and frankly I think the passenger has a right to protest through proper channels to the national government.

May I suggest that readers write to their congressmen about the situation. The Honorable Harley O. Staggers of West Virginia is the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and letters to him would be helpful in bringing to the attention of the national government the fact that many people in this country want, and feel our nation needs, good passenger train service. In addition, the National Association of Railroad Passengers is waging a campaign to save our trains but needs support, financial and moral. Their address is: 41 Ivy Street, S.E., Washington, D.C., 20003.

I have written to both Senators from Illinois as well as my Representative from this district, the Honorable Charlotte T. Reid. Their response has ranged from polite to mild interest. If more interested citizens of this country who prefer relaxed rail travel to hectic, nerve-shattering air travel, would write to their appropriate members of Congress perhaps we can collectively still save a seemingly dying mode of travel.

Any comments your paper or readers have on this subject, would, I think, be of considerable interest. Thank you for your attention to this letter.

James E. Diestler.

Aurora, Ill.

To the Travel Editor:

May I take just a moment of your precious time to tell you how much my sister Katherine and I enjoyed your article on railroads in the June 10 issue of the Monitor. This one seems particularly beautiful—all the "pleasant" aspects of train travel—every detail of it given to us in such a fascinating way, showing your appreciation of all those little niceties we all love to hear about.

But best of all that lovely paragraph of the "wail" of the locomotive and of the engineer "who was guiding his train with the utmost concern for his passengers' comfort." When we read that, we couldn't help but capitalize that "Engineer" for the moment, remembering our "take off" for Lisbon and two months abroad on June 29. It was a very comforting thought to us and we just had to tell you about it.

We haven't words to express our appreciation for those lovely articles you give us every Tuesday. They are always so fresh and full of delightful enthusiasm such as your description of Luxor—that sleepy little town and the clop-clop of the horses. We loved it!

Miss Harriett Hundley.

Oakland, Calif.

XUM

To the TRAVEL EDITOR:

The question you pose in the June 10 issue of the Monitor—"Are U.S. railroads trying to discourage passengers?"—certainly should be answered in the affirmative. The difficulty you describe in obtaining a roomette proves this point conclusively, since in reality several were available.

My own experience in this regard has been somewhat similar. For 10 or more years I have been spending summers in Vermont and the winter months in Texas or California, traveling via the New York Central and Southern Pacific Railroads.

A few years ago I thought I would change my itinerary and go by way of the Canadian Railways. The Montreal Ticket Agent's reply to my request was a genuine "classic" and was phrased in this exact wording: "I don't know what you want to travel by train for. Why don't you go by plane?" Now the Southern Pacific is no longer running between Chicago and El Paso, and no longer carries roomettes between El Paso and Los Angeles. In addition, the commuter train (Santa Fe line) runs no train between El Paso and Belen, New Mexico, from where I traveled to San Francisco.

There's something about this situation which almost defies analysis, since many persons prefer to travel by train, and also the fact that the airports are reportedly overcrowded. I wish to thank you for your excellent articles, and hope that you may help to uncover and correct this problem.

MRS. W. B. KING.

EL PASO, TEX.

To the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR:

I read your interesting article "Are U.S. railroads trying to discourage passengers?" My answer is a big "yes." Last year we went up to Alaska—so before we left by car we phoned the Southern Pacific Railroad and asked them if we could get a train from Los Angeles to Vancouver, B.C. They told us not to bother with the railroad, but to fly up there. At first they said the train we wanted was already filled—then we called their bluff and said we were going higher up—then they made the above statement about taking the plane. It's really a shame that the railroads have to sink so low.

I believe that your paper should go further into this subject and find out just who is in back of this. I would even go further—I would deny any more freight rate increases until something was done about the passenger train. It could be vastly improved. When someone takes the train from here to the East Coast they must get off at Chicago and go across town in Chicago—it's a mess.

In the near future we will need the railroads more than ever when our roads get overloaded.

RUSSELL MAHAFFEY.

LOS ANGELES.

ROCHESTER, N.Y., INDUSTRY HAVE VITAL ROLE IN SPACE PROGRAMS WHICH LEAD TO THE HISTORIC LAUNCH OF APOLLO 11

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body must take some measure of pride in the accomplishments which are leading up to the historic launch tomorrow of Apollo 11 and its gallant crew—Neil Armstrong, Mike Collins, and Buzz Aldrin.

Apollo 11 is the culmination of a national commitment never before equaled in our planet's history. Success of our efforts will prove that this Nation's ability to accomplish tremendous feats is only limited by imagination and determination.

Anytime this Nation makes a commitment, gives it the proper leadership, and follows through with the necessary resources, it can meet that challenge.

In his inaugural address, President Nixon stated the problem clearly as he said we are "reaching with magnificent precision for the moon but falling in raucous discord on earth."

This magnificent precision, so well proven by Apollo, must also be used to spur our efforts in other endeavors on earth. The message of Apollo is clear—total national commitment is the only course to rebuild our towns and cities, eliminate poverty and crime, and improve the lives of our people.

The people of my district in the Greater Rochester area of New York State can take special pride in our space program. More than a dozen firms are directly involved in providing services or equipment for the Apollo program.

I would like to share with my colleagues my praise for the Gannett newspapers, with its headquarters in Rochester, a part of my district. Under the leadership of Paul Miller, Gannett president, and Allen R. Neuharth, executive vice president, the Gannett Co. has made a deep commitment to the space program and the people of the Cape Kennedy area.

In an era when newspapers are dying at an alarming rate, Gannett moved to build a space-age daily newspaper to serve our country's space center. This vital commitment is also shared with the people of my own district.

I would also like to share with my colleagues two articles in the Rochester, N.Y., Democrat & Chronicle of July 13 detailing the efforts of the Greater Rochester industry in the Apollo program. The articles follow:

ROCHESTER GOES TO THE MOON—"O" RINGS AND RADIOS

(By Greg Conderacci)

About three minutes before closing time July 3, the telephone rang at Garlock Inc., Palmyra.

The voice at the other end spoke from a little peninsula on the Florida coast from which they fly rockets to the moon.

Apollo 11 would like five sheets of glass-filled fluorocarbon gasketing material designed for cryogenic application, please. Make them up in 48-inch squares three thirty-seconds of an inch thick—and make them fast.

The sheets, similar in composition to the slippery coating that keeps scrambled eggs from sticking to the bottom of frying pans, left Garlock July 10, only six days before scheduled liftoff at Cape Kennedy.

Garlock wasn't the only local business to contribute to the Apollo effort, nor was it the only one that had to hurry production to keep a date with the moon.

NASA paid Eastman Kodak $1,250,000 for a camera to take 100 pictures of the dirt on the moon—and gave the company six months to design, build, and deliver it.

Kodak came up with a device that looks like a jet propelled pogo stick. It will take one roll of pictures, in color and stereo, and will be left on the moon.

The nine-and-a-half pound camera is about as big as a cigar box and is attached to the end of telescoping cane so the astronauts won't have to bend to take close-ups of the ground. (It's even harder to do that in a space suit than it is in a mini-skirt).

NASA actually ordered 16 of the special cameras for which Web Seal Inc., 15 Oregon St., made 16 "O" rings. An "O" ring is a little bigger than, but not unlike, the rubber washer that stops the drip in the kitchen faucet. Cost: about $10.

When the pictures from that camera return they'll be viewed through a Bausch & Lomb Zoom 240 Stereoscope. The stereoscope is used to view them in 3–D.

Apollo 11 will land quietly on a pre-selected spot in the Sea of Tranquility, thanks to a "sophisticated TV set" designed by RF Communications Inc., 1680 University Ave., a Kodak subcontractor.

The "TV set" translated the transmissions from the Lunar Orbiter satellites into pictures from which the landing site was chosen.

Before, after and while Apollo 11 lands on that spot, three rebuilt World War II tankers, crammed with instruments designed in Rochester, will cruise the three oceans as the floating eyes, ears and voice of the Apollo tracking, communication and command network.

General Dynamics was the prime contractor for the Apollo Instrumentation Ships, sleek seagoing electronic platforms, bristling bow to stern with huge antennas. To the Electronics Division of General Dynamics fell the task of planning eight of the 12 major instrument systems on board.

Communications within the ships are over intercoms and telephones built by Stromberg Carlson, a Rochester subsidiary of General Dynamics.

While General Dynamics equipment will keep track of Apollo after it leaves earth, a switching matrix created by J. Cunningham & Son Company Inc. of Honeoye Falls (a subsidiary of Gleason Works) will help watch it on the ground.

The matrix coordinates 60 television cameras on the gantry and arming tower with 100 television sets in the launch control center. NASA engineers can visually inspect their operating functions from the start of countdown to liftoff.

Much has been made of the elaborate sterilization and quarantine procedures the astronauts and their ship will undergo when they return. The idea is to prevent "moon bugs" (which nobody is sure really exist) from spreading a dread lunar plague across the globe.

But scientists were equally concerned that micro-organisms from earth (which everybody knows exist) might contaminate the moon.

The techniques for sterilization and decontamination of the space craft while it was being prepared were outlined by Castle Co., a Henrietta division of Sybron Corp.

On its way to the moon, Apollo will spend a lot of time in the sun. Electro-Optical Systems, a division of Xerox in Pasadena, Calif., helped develop NASA's solar simulator that made it hot for Apollo in order to study the sun's effect on the craft.

Bendix Corp. Vacuum Division, 1775 Mount Read Blvd., designed chambers that would reproduce the environment of the moon so that Apollo instruments could be tested under lunar conditions.

The Vacuum Division also manufactures cryogenic (for use in extreme cold) fuel lines with vacuum jackets that work like thermos bottles to transport the liquid oxygen that powers the Saturn.

On some of the earlier unmanned moon probes part of the payload was a magnetic electron multiplier which measured space radiation. The Vacuum Division also made the multiplier.

"O" rings, TV sets, sterilization techniques and electron multipliers: That's how Rochester is helping send man to the moon and bring him back—with pictures.

"MOONFILM" READY FOR BLASTOFF

The film the astronauts will use to take pictures of the moon will be identical to the film you can buy in the corner drug store—with a few modifications.

Apollo 11 will carry 23 rolls of Eastman Kodak film on a special Estar base that makes the film thinner and lighter. Also, a thinner base means more film can fit in the camera.

The astronauts will expose three rolls of 70mm, one roll of 35 mm and 10 rolls of 16mm Ektachrome MS; two rolls of 70mm and two rolls of 16 mm Ektachrome EF; five rolls of 70 mm Kodak Panatomic X recording film.

The Ectachrome is color film, the Panatomic is black-and-white.

Each roll of 70 mm film is long enough for about 160 exposures and will be used in a Hasselblad camera. The 35mm roll is good for 100 stereo exposures in the special lunar camera Kodak developed for the flight. Each roll of 16 mm film is 140 feet long and will be exposed in a Maurer picture-sequence camera.

HISTORIC APOLLO 11

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning—if all continues to go well—three outstanding Americans, Neil A. Armstrong, Michael Collins, and Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr., will set foot on the moon in what I believe will rank as one of the greatest journeys of mankind. As these fine young men ascend into the sky on their long journey to the moon the hopes and aspirations of the American people and the people of the world will be riding with them. Every member of the large NASA-industrial-university team who has contributed to this effort since 1961 will be working intently on the accomplishment of this goal of a lunar landing which seemed remote and impossible only a few years ago. The Apollo program has been built much as we build a good home with a solid foundation and painstaking and careful construction, piece by piece, until its completion. Eight years of effort have gone into the development of the engines, the flight vehicle stages, the instrument unit, the service module, the command module, and the lunar module which will make the actual descent and return from the lunar surface. Months and years of effort have gone into the training and development of the operations capability to make this mission possible. Thousands of man-hours have been devoted to the development of the techniques, to the research and development, and to the actual facilities that are needed to assure a successful operation. The United States has built a tremendous technological base which can serve well in the future.

At this moment in time it is important to reflect on what is the future of this major investment in human and material resources that this country has made in our national space program. The Apollo program reached a peak in 1966 when over 400,000 people throughout the United States and over 20,000 contractors and subcontractors were devoting their effort to the successful accomplishment of the Apollo program. Today this effort has declined to approximately 190,000 people involved in the effort. A further decline in this technological capability can ill be afforded. Our Nation and its progress is firmly based on our technological preeminence. The history of the growth of our industry and our total economy has been geared to scientific and technological achievement which brings new knowledge into fruitful use at an early time. Our national space program is making substantial contributions to this growth. We are all aware of the contributions to weather predictions and communications that have been made and the past flights of Mercury and Gemini have begun to open the door not only to the exploration of space but to its utilization.

In every respect the flight of Apollo 11 should be the beginning and not the end of our commitment to a vital and aggressive national space program. There can be no better statement than that which has been placed on a plaque attached to the leg of the lunar landing vehicle which says:

> Here men from the planet Earth first set foot upon the Moon, July 1969, A.D. We came in peace for all mankind.

Indeed they do go in peace in the name of all mankind and may this be the beginning of further quests in the name of improvement of the lot of all people here on earth.

THE INCREDIBLE DREAM: A WALK ON THE MOON—PART VIII

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, America's space program played catchup. This week, Astronauts Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin will take that historic step to the surface of the moon. In his excellent series on the history and events leading up to the moon voyage of Apollo 11, New York Daily News Science Editor Mark Bloom tells us what it will be like during the crucial 690 seconds to touchdown. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Bloom's revealing article:

APOLLO 11: 690 SECONDS TO HISTORY

(By Mark Bloom)

CAPE KENNEDY, July 12.—Six hundred and ninety seconds pass virtually unnoticed in a person's life. But in this span of less than a quarter of an hour, barely enough time for a coffee break, Apollo 11 astronauts Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin will either make history or become footnotes to it.

In this 690-second period, Armstrong and Aldrin will either forge the final 50,000 feet to the surface of the moon, the historic step which was left to them by Apollo 10, or be forced to abandon the effort shy of their goal. During these 690 seconds, they will sweep 310 miles across the face of the moon toward the west, descending on a long graceful curve from 50,000 feet to touchdown.

They will be flying the four-legged lunar module called Eagle on the wings of batteries of computers and mathematical calculations and upon the back of a mighty braking rocket, slowing their descent from 3,800 miles an hour.

Unable to see where they are going for the first 480 seconds, they will be trusting the judgment of an on-board computer as it digests and reacts to streams of information from gyroscopes, accelerometers and a radar.

For this 480 seconds, all they will be able to do is react to warnings from the computer, react to alerts from a maze of dials and lights on their dashboard.

They will be riding on their backs because the legs of the lunar module must be pointed forward in the direction they are traveling, allowing the rocket to have full forward braking.

Not until the astronauts descend to an altitude of 7,600 feet—a point known as high gate—will the computer tip the spacecraft close to upright so that Armstrong and Aldrin can look out of their forward window to see what lies ahead and beneath them.

At this stage in the ride, the lunar module will have slowed its westward speed to about 370 miles an hour, and its descent to about 95 miles an hour.

If all is still going well, man will be 4.83 miles from a landing on a smooth patch of the moon, a spot on the moon which is safe.

In the next 75 to 100 seconds, Armstrong and Aldrin must decide if the lunar module is heading for that hospitable target. If it isn't, they have two choices.

They have about 20 seconds to fly Eagle to a safer landing site (away from a deep crater, for instance) either manually or by directing the computer to do it.

Or they may decide there is not enough fuel left in the braking rocket to handle the job, and choose to leave the honor of the first landing to Apollo 12.

In this case, they would push a button on their panel marked "abort stage." It would automatically separate the two stages of the lunar module, and fire the ascent rocket of the spacecraft, sending Armstrong and Aldrin back into lunar orbit.

There they would rendezvous and link with the command module called Columbia, manned by Michael Collins, for the trip back to earth.

But if everything still looks good during the 164 seconds between reaching high gate and the next critical stage of the descent, known as low gate, a landing is almost assured.

When Armstrong and Aldrin reach low gate, they should be 46 seconds from touchdown.

The lunar module will be 150 feet above and 53 feet west of the landing site. It will be descending at about two miles an hour and gliding west at four miles an hour.

The spacecraft will be tipped to a fully upright position, legs down. Once again the astronauts will lose sight of where they will land.

With the braking rocket still firing beneath them, the astronauts will be coming in to land like a hovering helicopter.

About 20 seconds before touchdown, the westward movement of the spacecraft will have finally stopped, and the astronauts will be descending straight down.

This is critical because forward movement of the spacecraft at landing could break one of its four spindly legs, tipping the vehicle over. If this happened, Armstrong and Aldrin would die on the moon.

During this entire descent from 50,000 feet, Armstrong and Aldrin may simply leave the whole problem up to the computer, which is designed to control a fully automatic landing.

It is more likely, however, that Armstrong, the commander, will take over part of the job during the last 150 feet, making sure the spacecraft has its legs pointed downward with his directional hand controller, but leaving the descent control to the computer.

He could fly the entire descent manually, but this is considered much less likely. It is up to him.

Finally, about two seconds before touchdown, one of the five-foot-long landing probes, dangling from three of the lunar module's four footpads, will make contact with the surface. It will trigger a light in the cabin.

A second later, Armstrong will press a button to shut down the braking rocket. A second after that, the lunar module will plunk onto the surface, falling with the impact of a hop off a three-foot-high wall.

It will be 4:19 in the afternoon on this part of the earth on Sunday, July 20, 1969, a date which will rank with Oct. 12, 1492 in the history of mankind's explorations.

Unless, of course, Armstrong and Aldrin are stopped even before they reach the critical 50,000-foot point above the moon.

"We will not hesitate to postpone the Apollo 11 mission if we feel we are not ready in all respects," said Thomas O. Paine, administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, after the Apollo 10 success in May.

"Once the voyage has begun," he added, "we have no commitment that would make us hesitate to bring home the crew immediately if we encounter problems."

The epic of Apollo 11 is scheduled to get underway at 9:32 a.m. on Wednesday with the roar of the gargantuan Saturn I booster. If there are countdown delays, the mission could slip to Friday or next Monday.

But if everything is not ready by then, the next chance to launch would be Aug. 14.

The most important factor in choosing these launch dates is the angle of the sun on the pre-selected landing sites. It must cast long shadows so that hazardous craters will be visible. In addition, the sun must be behind the astronauts as they head eastward toward a lunar landing site so they won't be blinded as they look out the window.

There are five pre-selected landing sites along the moon's equator, running from east to west. If Apollo 11 is launched July 16, it will attempt to land at site two, about half way between the center and the eastern rim of the moon as seen from earth.

If it is delayed to July 18, the sun angles would be right for site three. Site five would be the landing site for a July 21 launch. If the mission is delayed to August, site two would again be the first choice.

Assuming, however, that Apollo 11 gets off on time, the Saturn 5 will hurl the astronauts into a 115-mile-high parking orbit, allowing a trip and a half around the earth to make sure everything is go for the moon.

If it is, the third stage of the Saturn will reignite at 12:16 p.m. and power Apollo 11 toward the moon at 24,600 miles an hour, starting an almost replica of the mission of Apollo 10, which saw astronauts Tom Stafford and Gene Cernan swoop to within 50,000 feet of the surface.

After a cruise of 73 hours and 10 minutes, the Apollo 11 crew will fire their steering rocket to slip the spacecraft into lunar orbit at 1:26 p.m., July 19. The initial orbit of 70 by 195 miles will be lowered to a 62 by 76-mile high path about four hours later.

Here too, there is a point where Apollo 11 could become an also-ran. If everything is not functioning just the way it should, the astronauts will forget about the steering rocket and let the moon's gravity pull the spacecraft around, whipping it back toward earth.

Assuming again that things go well, the big day for Apollo 11—July 20—moves into high gear at 1:47 p.m. when Armstrong and Aldrin, having moved through the tunnel connecting the command module and lunar module, undock from the mother craft.

Just as in Apollo 10, the command module then makes the first move, performing a maneuver which in effect, flies a two-mile-diameter circle around the lunar module as the two spacecraft fly half-way around the moon.

This maneuver, called a mini-football, allows Armstrong and Aldrin to check out Eagle on their own, trying out communications equipment, guidance and navigation gear, and generally making sure all is ship shape.

At the same time, Collins in Columbia returns to the lunar module's vicinity at the end of the mini-football, ready to make rescue if Armstrong and Aldrin are in any trouble.

And if everything is still as advertised, Armstrong and Aldrin will keep on the trail of Apollo 10 by firing a burst from their descent rocket at 3:14 p.m.

This puts the lunar module into an orbit ranging between 50,000 feet and 70 miles, just like Apollo 10. At 4:07 p.m., they reach the 50,000-foot point.

When Apollo 10 reached this point, it continued in its lunar orbit. Armstrong and Aldrin, however, fire the descent engine again, starting the 690 seconds toward history.

Even if Armstrong and Aldrin land, however, they won't necessarily walk on the moon. The first two hours after touchdown are devoted to getting ready to fly off the moon, in case anything goes wrong. The first optimum chance is two minutes after touchdown; then nine minutes later; then two hours after landing.

And even if this period is passed, Armstrong and Aldrin won't be ready to take their historic steps. First they eat. Then they rest for four hours, possibly even catching a few winks. Then they eat again. Then, and only then, they get ready to emerge.

At 2:12 a.m. July 21—after 10 hours on the moon—Armstrong pops open the hatch, slides out of the cabin feet first, and climbs down a nine-rung ladder toward the surface, pulling a lanyard to turn on a black-and-white TV camera as he descends and giving the world its first view of men on the moon.

His first activities on the surface will be to test his footing and gait against the strange effects of one-sixth gravity, and then to gather about two pounds of rocks in the "grab bag" container.

This container, which he carries in his pocket, will be used to make sure Apollo 11 has some of the moon to show for its trip in case the walk has to be cut short.

About 30 minutes after Armstrong first emerges from the hatch, Aldrin follows down the ladder, and the pair proceed to lay out three scientific experiments—a seismometer and laser reflector to be left on the moon and a rare gas collector to be returned to earth.

They also collect up to 130 pounds of rocks and soil for return to several hundred scientists on earth, who hope to decipher from them clues to the origin and age of the earth, moon, solar system and universe.

For more than two hours, Armstrong and Aldrin will work on the moon, moving 100 feet or so away from the lunar module in temperatures of 215 degrees above zero in the sun, 250 degrees below zero in the shade of the spacecraft. Their specially designed suits will keep them comfortable in either extreme.

Finally Aldrin, then Armstrong, return to the lunar module cabin, and call man's first excursion on the moon's surface a day. The hatch is to be closed at 4:48 a.m.

A meal, a few hours of rest, another meal, and the astronauts begin the countdown for liftoff from the moon—a launch which must work if Armstrong and Aldrin are to return to earth.

At 1:55 p.m., the ascent engine of the lunar module blasts off, leaving the descent stage on the surface, and the astronauts head into lunar orbit for a rendezvous and linkup with the command module. Their stay on the moon: 21 hours and 26 minutes.

At all times during this intricate rendezvous, Collins in the command module will keep his computer crammed with guidance information should a rescue become necessary.

Space agency officials say that even if Armstrong and Aldrin are only able to reach the first stage of the rendezvous—a 12-by-51-mile orbit—Collins should be able to fly Columbia down to rescue his crew mates.

The only way back to earth is aboard the command module because, among other things, it is the only one of the two vehicles with a heat shield to protect against the searing friction temperatures of entry into the earth's atmosphere.

If all goes well, rendezvous and linkup will be completed by 5:32 p.m., July 21.

Seven hours later, the ascent stage undocked and discarded, the three astronauts fire the command module steering rocket and head back toward earth. It will be 12:56 a.m., July 22.

Splashdown in the Pacific southwest of Hawaii is scheduled for 12:51 p.m., July 24—ending a voyage of eight days, three hours and 9 minutes.

From the Pacific, the astronauts, their spacecraft and the treasure horde of moon rocks are placed in immediate strict quarantine to make sure some vicious lunar germ, the existance of which is highly unlikely, has not returned to earth with Apollo 11.

The concern is that our natural defensive systems and our drugs might prove no match against a germ from another world.

So anyone who comes into contact with the astronauts and all the equipment from the moon will travel by germ-proof van from the recovery ship to the lunar receiving laboratory at the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston to sit out three weeks of quarantine.

There, too, the world of science will have its first look at rocks from another world—the end product of America's $24 billion project called Apollo.

COMPREHENSIVE NARCOTIC ADDICTION AND DRUG ABUSE AND CONTROL ACT OF 1969

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, today it is my pleasure to introduce a bill that for the first time provides for a comprehensive and coordinated attack on the narcotic addiction and drug abuse problem. My bill is identical to that introduced by the distinguished Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) on the floor of the Senate yesterday. Significantly, introduction in the Senate and House precedes the administration's proposals which are currently being prepared by the Attorney General.

Narcotic addiction and drug abuses are reaching epidemic proportions. No segment of the population is secure from the intrusion of these means to self-destruction and moral decay. The problem which was once fairly limited to slum ghettos can now be found as easily in suburban high schools and on the college campus. Perhaps the inability of middle-class Americans to identify the problem as being of relevance to their lives has brought about the situation with which we are now faced. In any event, the problem has been brought home for all to see and the consensus of public opinion has finally coalesced, demanding solutions now.

The proposed legislation that I have introduced today calls for the construction, staffing, and operation of treatment facilities, professional training and evaluations, drug abuse education, authorization for research and studies relating to drug use, abuse, and addiction and the control of dangerous substances.

In the facilities construction area, the Community Mental Health Centers Act would be amended to allow eligibility for Federal funding of operation and maintenance costs as well as construction and staffing expenses. It shall increase the allowable Federal participation in funding the costs of construction of treatment and rehabilitation facilities from 66⅔ percent to 90 percent, and in the costs of operation, staffing, and maintenance of these facilities to 90 percent for the first 2 years and 75 percent for the next 6 years. In addition, authorization for future funding appropriations would be granted by the promulgation of this proffered legislation through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, as well as providing discretionary continuation grants covering fiscal year 1971 and each of the next 11 fiscal years.

In the area of professional training and education, provision has been made for development of specialized training programs and materials for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and for the training of personnel to administer such programs and services. Research and study relating to current and projected personnel needs in the field of drug abuse as well as planning and conduct of surveys and field trials to evaluate the adequacy of State drug programs will be undertaken. Fellowships and grants for individual studies will be made available under the supervision of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with the approval of the National Advisory Mental Health Council. Grants will also be made available to the States and political subdivision, as well as public and nonprofit private agencies for the collection, preparation, and dissemination of educational materials and "for the development and evaluation of programs of drug abuse education directed to the general public, school-age children and other high-risk groups." Dissemination of information shall be channeled through the Secretary acting in coordination with the National Institutes of Health.

The legislative presentment devised by Senator YARBOROUGH would amend the Public Health Service Act by "authorizing studies of depressant or stimulant drugs as well as studies of narcotics."

This provision of the bill that I introduce today would obviate the need for the creation of a Commission on Marihuana and Other Hallocinogenic Drugs which I proposed in another bill, H.R. 11166. In addition, the provisions contained in this legislation are consonant with another piece of drug legislation that I have cosponsored this session of the Congress. That bill, H.R. 9313, the purpose of which was to authorize the U.S. Commission on Education to make grants to elementary and secondary and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs, is complemented by the proposals put forward by me today and by Senator YARBOROUGH yesterday. A broad program of research into all phases of drug use, needed investigations, and surveys, shall be conducted. A National Addiction and Drug Abuse Research Center to be made part of the National Institute of Mental Health shall also be constructed.

Knowledge in this area will increase in geometric leaps and bounds and the root causes of the problem will be fully revealed for elimination by a now aroused citizenry. Drug abuse and narcotic addiction are national problems of such magnitude and seriousness as to call for the marshaling of Federal resources to meet the challenges that the use of these substances poses to our society. This challenge shall and will be met. The stakes are too high and the inability to surmount the difficulties in this area would portend serious consequences for our society, consequences that are more horrible since they first would be manifested by the deterioration and destruction of the physical and mental well-being of this Nation's youth. Rapid enactment of the "Comprehensive Narcotic Addiction and Drug Abuse Care and Control Act of 1969" is a vitally needed step in the right direction.

BRITISH GERM WARFARE BAN AT GENEVA

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the British Government tabled, on July 10, 1969, at the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva, a convention calling on all nations to ban research on, production, storage, and use of biological warfare.

This convention, essentially the same as that proposed by the British last summer, is aimed at the control of a form of warfare that is repugnant to all the civilized people of the world. Biological warfare, sometimes referred to as public health in reverse, is the deliberate use of disease to kill or cripple an enemy. More than 100 diseases are considered potential weapons in this arsenal. Some of their names, such as the plague, anthrax, and yellow fever, have killed thousands of people in the past.

The proposed ban on biological warfare goes beyond the Geneva protocol in the following ways:

Bans research on biological agents;

Bans production and storage of biological agents;

Bans the use of biological warfare agents under any circumstances; and

Calls for the destruction of biological warfare agent stockpiles.

The Geneva protocol bans the first use of chemical and biological warfare. It does not, however, place a restriction on all use, stockpiling, production, and research. The major change that would take place under the British proposal would be the abandonment by agreeing nations of both the intention and the capacity to use disease as a method of warfare.

The proposed ban on biological warfare puts in concrete form a conclusion that an increasing number of knowledgeable people have reached. Many of those familiar with the nature and implications of this form of warfare believe that the dangers involved in testing and production and the uncertainty involved in its use make it an unacceptable armament. The hazards involved in the use of biological warfare were pointed up in Secretary General U Thant's recent report on this subject. The report states:

> The risk of residual effects with some bacteriological—biological—agents is potentially greater, mainly because they could lead to disease, which might become epidemic if man-to-man transmission occurred readily. Bacteriological—biological—agents might also find unintended hosts in the animals and plants of an area, or be transported by infected individuals over great distances to new environments.

Dr. Joshua Lederberg, Nobel laureate geneticist, has said that there is a danger that if one of the deadly diseases were loosed on a country, it might spread to other countries, mutate-change form. On sufficiently widespread a scale it would be a pandemic, a world epidemic. And when the disease finally came back to the country that had used it in the first place, it might be in an entirely different form and vaccines designed to protect one from the disease would be of no use. Clearly, this is a double-edged sword at best.

Testing of biological agents also endangers the country that maintains a biological warfare capability. Accidental transmission of a deadly disease to humans or animals remains a constant possibility when these agents are tested in the open atmosphere. Who knows when a disease such as tularemia or anthrax might be spread by rodents or birds coming from a test area.

The proposed ban does not cover a major problem involving biological warfare. Toxins, poisons produced by disease bacteria, are not specifically mentioned in the Convention that has been tabled. Toxins are technically not bacteria—that is—they are not alive. Toxins are produced, however, by bacteria, and can be even more deadly than the most lethal nerve gas. One ounce of botulinus toxin, effectively spread, could kill every person in the United States and Canada.

In my opinion, toxins should be included in the ban on biological warfare because much of the biological warfare testing and production machinery and facilities would have to be kept if toxins are allowed. The deadly bacteria will have to be produced in order to further produce toxins. This would greatly complicate effective control of a ban on biological warfare weapons.

I believe that the complaint mechanism under which nations can protest to the United Nations if they believe that this convention was being violated is weak. Perhaps a standing U.N. committee of respected medical authorities could be called on to investigate any protest lodged to the Secretary General. The area of violations and methods of verification as to compliance deserves the most careful consideration.

I believe that adoption of the proposed convention, subject to the suggestions that I have made, is in the interest of all nations. Biological warfare deserves to be stricken from the list of arms that man employs. I strongly urge the United States to support the British resolution and to work for its adoption.

I have written to President Nixon urging that the U.S. Government pursue this course of action. I am including in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues the convention that has been tabled. I am also including the replies on chemical and biological warfare public policy that I received earlier in the year for the information of my colleagues:

BIOLOGICAL WARFARE CONVENTION

The States concluding this Convention, hereinafter referred to as "Parties to the Convention,"

Recalling that many states have become Parties to the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva on 17 June 1925,

Recognizing the contribution that said Protocol has already made, and continues to make, to mitigating the horrors of war,

Recalling further U.N. General Assembly Resolutions 2162 B(XXI) of 5 December 1966 and 2454 A(XXIII) of 20 December 1968, which called for strict observance by all States of the principles and objectives of the Geneva Protocal and invited all States to accede to it,

Believing that chemical and biological discoveries should be used only for the betterment of human life,

Recognizing nevertheless that the development of scientific knowledge throughout world will increase the risk of the eventual use of biological methods of warfare and being convinced that such use would be repugnant to the conscience of mankind and that no effort should be spared to minimize this risk,

Desiring therefore to reinforce the Geneva Protocol by the conclusion of a Convention making special provision in this field,

Declaring their belief that, in particular, provision should be made for the prohibition of the recourse to biological methods of warfare in any circumstances, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

Each of the Parties to this Convention undertakes never in any circumstances, by making use for hostile purpose of microbial or other biological agents causing death or disease by infection or infestation in man, other animals, or crops, to engage in biological methods of warfare.

ARTICLE II

Each of the Parties to this Convention undertakes—

(A) Not to produce or otherwise acquire, or assist in or permit the production or acquisition of (1) microbial or other biological agents of types and in quantities that have no independent peaceful justification for prophylactic or other purposes; (2) ancillary equipment or vectors the purpose of which is to facilitate the use of such agents for hostile purposes;

(B) Not to conduct, assist or permit research aimed at production of the kind prohibited in sub-paragraph (A) of this Article; and

(C) To destroy, or divert to peaceful purposes, within three months after this Convention comes into force for that Party, any stocks in its possession of such agents or ancillary equipment or vectors as have been produced or otherwise acquired for hostile purposes.

ARTICLE III

1. Any Party to this Convention which believes that biological methods of warfare have been used against it may lodge a complaint with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, submitting all evidence at its disposal in support of the complaint, and request that the complaint be investigated and that a report on the result of the investigation be submitted to the Security Council.

2. Any Party to this Convention which believes that another Party has acted in breach of its undertakings under Articles I and II of this Convention, but which is not entitled to lodge a complaint under paragraph 1 of this Article, may similarly lodge a complaint with the Security Council and request that the complaint be investigated.

3. Each of the Parties to this Convention undertakes to cooperate fully with the Secretary-General and his authorized representatives in any investigation he may carry out, as a result of a complaint, in accordance with Security Council Resolution No. ——.

ARTICLE IV

Each of the Parties to this Convention affirms its intention to provide or support appropriate assistance, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, to any other Party to this Convention, if the Security Council concludes that biological methods of warfare have been used against that Party.

ARTICLE V

Each of the Parties to this Convention undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures to strengthen the existing constraints on the use of chemical methods of warfare.

ARTICLE VI

Nothing contained in the present Convention shall be construed as in any way limiting or derogating from the obligations assumed by any State under the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva on 17 June 1925.

ARTICLE VII

(Provisions for Amendments)

ARTICLE VIII

(Provisions for signature, ratification, entry into force, etc.)

ARTICLE IX

1. This Convention shall be of unlimited duration.

2. Each Party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from this Convention, if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this Convention, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other Parties to this Convention and to the United Nations Security Council three months in advance. Such notice shall include a statement of the extraordinary events it regards as having jeopardized its supreme interests.

ARTICLE X

(Provisions on languages of texts, etc.)

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE POLICIES AND PRACTICES

(Statement of Congressman RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, April 21, 1969)

Early in February of this year the activities of the United States in chemical and biological warfare were brought to my attention by a disturbing documentary shown on NBC television. I recognized that I knew almost nothing about this aspect of our military capability and decided to inform myself. My main interest was in the public policy questions relating to chemical and biological warfare; why do we need a capability?; what sort of capability do we have?; what are our policies governing the use of these weapons?; what do these activities cost us each year?; what are the safety precautions taken to protect the public against accident?; and are our academic and private institutions being improperly involved in chemical and biological research?

In order to inform myself about our CBW program I asked the U.S. Army to brief those Members of Congress who were interested in this field. On March 4, 1969, the Army presented a briefing, most of which they insisted on classifying. I did not find that briefing satisfactory; it did not answer the public policy questions. So I then prepared a comprehensive set of policy questions which I sent to Secretary of Defense Laird, Secretary of State Rogers, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Smith, Ambassador to the United Nations Yost, and Dr. Henry Kissinger of the White House staff. While waiting for replies I have made a rather extensive study of the information that is available in public; I have received assistance from several organizations that are involved in a study of chemical and biological warfare, and I have consulted a number of individuals who are very knowledgeable in the field.

I have now received replies from all of the departments and agencies that I contacted with the exception of Dr. Kissinger. His office said that they had hoped to prepare a reply to my March 20, 1969 letter by last Friday but had not had time to do so, which is perhaps as much a comment on the priority placed on CBW policy in relation to other matters as it is on the pressures of the Executive Office. I would like to comment at this time on the nature of the information that I have received.

Chemical and biological warfare activities are shrouded in secrecy, unnecessarily so in my view. The Army's unclassified briefing was perfunctory at best; the classified presentation was not much better. I get the impression that the security curtain is parted only when it serves the interests of the advocates of the program. I found the replies from the departments heartening in some respects, but more deeply disturbing in most others. By far, the most revealing information appears in sources available to the public such as occasional statements by public officials, open publications, and press reports, both domestic and foreign.

Perhaps the most immediately disturbing aspect of the replies that I have received from the departments is the contradiction between some of the replies and the information that is available to the public. These contradictions should be resolved; both the Congress and the American public deserve a full explanation if the credibility of our public officials is to be maintained. Some of these contradictions are:

1. Defense states that we maintain a limited offensive capability in chemical weapons; that the carefully controlled inventories are adequate for tactical response.

Yet we have in storage about 100 million lethal doses of nerve gas at Rocky Mountain Arsenal and Tooele Army Depot. Col. S. J. Efnor stated that the gas from a single bomb the size of a quart fruit jar could kill every living thing in a cubic mile. The inventory of nerve gas seems to be more than that required for an adequate tactical response.

2. General Hebbeler in the unclassified briefing stated that biological warfare is generally considered to have strategic implications rather than tactical.

Yet Defense says "although the employment of biological weapons against U.S. population centers cannot be ruled out en-

XUM

tirely . . .". There appears to be a contradiction between the Army's estimate of the threat and that of Defense.

3. Defense states that the U.S. Armed Forces have the equipment to protect themselves against CB attack with the exception of a biological warning and detection device.

Yet I am informed that the Navy only purchases 1/10 of the quantity of atropine, the nerve gas antidote, needed for their total number of personnel.

4. State and Defense say that review has shown that there is no evidence of substantial permanent or irreparable damage, no significant permanent damage, to the ecology of Vietnam due to defoliation. Both Departments cite the work of Dr. Fred H. Tschirley as an authority; Defense cites a report prepared by Midwest Research Institute.

Yet Dr. Tschirley's report itself says that the mangrove tree, a source of food in Vietnam, is particularly susceptible to damage from herbicides and that he had seen quite a few dead mangroves, a tree taking about 20 years to grow. He goes on to say that a single treatment with the defoliants Orange or White would not be expected to have a lasting effect but that a second application durin the period of recovery would have a wholly different effect. Press reports state we spray more than once in the same growing system.

Even more damaging, Dr. Tschirley, their authority, reviewed the Midwest Research Institute Report for Ecology, a professional magazine, and said, "Reading the MRI Report before visiting Vietnam left me with the feeling of having read a literature review that resulted in accurate general conclusions, but told me nothing about the ecological consquences of using herbicides in Vietnam." In summary, the MRI Report is a literature review of a subject for which there is a great deal of literature relating to temperate zones, but little relating to tropical vegetation. "The MRI Report is disappointing because its direct applicability to Vietnam is so tenuous."

Similarly, Professors Egbert W. Pfeiffer and Gordon H. Orians, professor of zoology at the University of Montana and professor of zoology at the University of Washington respectively, made the following report on April 3, 1969 after a two week visit to Vietnam.

They described in grim terms the effects of leaf-killing chemicals on Vietnamese plant and animal life. They made a 65-mile trip by armed boat down the waterway linking Saigon with the sea. They scarcely saw a living plant. Bird life, apart from fish-eating birds, has virtually disappeared. The justification for the program, one reminiscent of the Colonel's remark at the time of the Tet offensive last year that "we had to destroy the village in order to save the village", was also given by Professors Pfeiffer and Orians. They said that it was completely unrealistic to expect military commanders to forgo such measures. There is no question about it; they save American lives.

5. Defense states that each use of herbicides or defoliants is approved by the U.S. Embassy and the government of the Republic of Vietnam.

Yet this must be a recent policy change if it is true because in February, 1967, Secretary McNamara told Congressional Committees that the decision on when and where to use chemicals had been turned over to commanders in the fields. Commanders in the area of South Vietnam can defoliate any time they think it will open up avenues of fire that are otherwise unavailable to them. Unless there has been a change in policy, this is a direct contradiction.

6. Defense and State say that the only gas used in Vietnam by U.S. forces is CS, a milder tear gas; Defense says that CN, a milder tear gas was also authorized some years ago. Both Departments justify its use by pointing out that it is often used as a riot control agent, State saying "the fact that tear gas is used for the control of riots by governments responsible to their people provides an objective standard for differentiating it from other chemical weapons."

Yet in 1965 Deputy Secretary of Defense Vance and Secretary McNamara said that South Vietnamese forces had been equipped with three gases which they had used, CN, CS, and DM. DM, otherwise known as Adamsite gas, was not classified as an incapacitating gas but rather as an irritant gas until relatively recently by the Army. Both Defense and State point out this gas often allows the Army to accomplish its aims with the minimum violence required, citing the case of civilians mixed with Vietcong that are subdued with gas rather than with explosives. Secretary Rusk spoke of the use of this gas as the attempt to use the minimum level of violence required.

Most disturbing, the New York Times reports that in 1966 helicopters dropped hundreds of tear gas grenades on a fortified Vietcong area in preparation for a B–52 bombing raid. Defense spokesmen are then quoted as saying that the purpose of the gas was to drive the Vietcong out of their fortifications so that they could be killed with bomb fragments. Gas has also been dropped prior to artillery attacks according to press reports. This clear use of gas in conjunction with lethal conventional weapons is chemical warfare. The extent of the use of this technique can be speculated upon when we find Defense procuring $81 million worth of riot control munitions—tear gas—in 1969.

7. Defense states that strict safety practices are enforced at laboratories which work with CBW agents.

Yet Defense's overall safety record during the past two decades is poor. Fort Detrick, the Army's biological warfare research center has one of the poorest records among major biological institutions for infections. There were 3,300 accidents at Detrick between 1954 and 1962 according to the Phillips report. Half of these occurred in the laboratory, involving broken test tubes, accidental scratches from needles, etc. About 400 men were infected as a result of these accidents. And infections among its workers pose some danger to neighboring communities. In 1959 one worker caught pneumonic plague, a highly infectious disease. He also happened to be a lifeguard at a swimming pool and had been in contact with many people. Local residents that might have come in contact with Detrick personnel who could have been infected were not warned of the danger. Nor did the Public Health Service promptly report this to the World Health Organization as required by agreement. In 1951 an Army bacteriologist working at Detrick became ill at his home in Frederick, Maryland. He was placed in the local hospital where his disease went unrecognized. He was taken to the base hospital shortly thereafter and died of deadly anthrax. The dangers of failing to warn local populations so that the most careful observation can be made is clear to any health authority.

At another installation, the Rocky Mountain Arsenal where chemical agents are stored and produced, the Army has failed to prevent accidents. In the early 1950's leakage of toxic material from the Arsenal began to kill crops and animals on surrounding farms. Vigorous complaints led the Army to drill a deep disposal well to store waste products from their activities. This resulted in the first series of earthquakes that Denver had experienced in 80 years. In the immediate period after the well was drilled and used for storage, there were over 1500 earth tremors in the Denver area, some reaching up to 6 on the Richter scale. Some tremors destroyed property. As a result the Army discontinued using the deep well and began pumping material out.

At the Dugway Proving Grounds, used for chemical and biological warfare testing, despite a recent order emphasizing the importance of safety, more than 6,000 sheep in nearby Skull Valley were killed when nerve gas was carried from the testing grounds onto their pastures. I am informed that tests of sheep in a number of areas around Dugway showed low-level exposure to nerve gas. In another disturbing report, I learned that the local sheriff is occasionally asked by Dugway authorities to patrol the roads that pass the Proving Ground to insure that motorists don't slow down or stop beside the road. Candor is not the mark of the Army's treatment of these problems; they have refused to confirm that the sheep died of nerve gas although they paid over $300,000 to the farmer for his loss and only last Thursday, awarded him an additional $198,309 in damages.

At the Pine Bluff Arsenal in Arkansas, production center for biological weapons, contamination of a local stream leading into a nearby river with toxic material led the Army to buy up the land along the stream. Presumably the toxic material is diluted when it feeds into the river.

I do not find this safety record very reassuring.

8. Defense states that gases are transported according to rules established by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the U.S. Public Health Service—that an underlying layer of sand is used to reduce vibration and absorb any leakage—that all shipments are accompanied by a trained escort—that routes are planned to avoid populated areas and to minimize time in populated areas—and that transported agents are not volatile.

Yet in the incident reported in the Denver rail yards, these statements appear to be contradicted. I rechecked the facts with Dick Kruse, the reporter for KBT–TV/KBTR in Denver and found that the gondola cars carrying large tanks of nerve gas that he filmed in the Denver rail yards on a siding had no sand under them; they were on a siding in the center of Denver for most of the night; that he had spent about 1½ hours filming the tanks both from the ground and up on the gondola cars and had seen no guards. General Hebbeler also stated that GB, presumed to be the agent in the tanks, is relatively volatile.

The movement of these agents by rail is fraught with danger; the Transportation Safety Board of the Department of Transportation has reported on the alarming increase in derailment and other forms of railroad accidents, up 85% between 1961 and 1967. As the Dunreith accident illustrated, the accident need not occur to the train carrying the gas; it might be caused by a passing train. If the accident were similar to that which occurred in Laurel, Mississippi, the explosion of the adjoining train might scatter nerve gas over a ten-block area of a city. Furthermore, the Transportation Safety Board will shortly announce some major revisions in transportation safety regulations because of their inadequacies, I am led to understand.

I also do not find Defense's reply that the statistical probability of a gas transportation accident is very difficult to determine because we have never had one. Certainly the art of safety and reliability analysis, as practiced by NASA and the AEC for example, has proceeded far enough to give some fairly good indications of the dangers involved.

I have come across information available to the public on the transportation of biological agents that causes me grave concern. In a December 1967 publication issued by Fort Detrick, procedures for the careful packaging of biological agents were described, including a crash of an aircraft with biological agent containers aboard. The packages are designed to protect the biological agents that are being shipped; the report concludes that "Any number of such packages is now acceptable in one aircraft for shipment by commercial airlines under the Official Air Transport Restricted Articles Tariff No. 6–D. Technical escort is not required. However, current regulations of the Armed Services require technical escort for any shipment in which the total volume of etiologic agent in all packages in one conveyance exceeds 3 gallons."

Although the containers survived a crash of an aircraft going 120 knots from about 40 feet up onto desert soil, it is highly questionable whether they would have survived a mid-air explosion with metal fragments being blown about or a crash at greater speeds into a mountain cliff. The biological agent might well have been vaporized, wind conditions might carry the vapor to a nearby community with disastrous results. As one expert has said, a fraction of a gram of purified bacteria or virus in aerosol form could be sufficient to infect anyone in a square kilometer.

The publication goes on to indicate that agents may be shipped to Fort Detrick, Maryland; Pine Bluff, Arkansas; Edgewood Arsenal, Maryland; Dover, New Jersey; Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland; Dugway, Utah; Desert Test Center, Utah; Eglin Air Force Base, Florida; Oakland, California; China Lake, California; U.S. Naval Base, Brooklyn, New York; Crane, Indiana; Fort McClellan, Alabama; and possible to Canada, Britain, and Australia.

8. Defense states that we have a CBW budget of $350 million for 1969. That budget includes $139 million for napalm, incendiary weapons, and the like, weapons that I will accept as not normally falling in the definition of CBW. It contains $81 million for tear gas or riot munitions. It contains $5 million for herbicides.

Yet I find it difficult to accept this budget figure. It is generally admitted that the U.S. spent about $100 million for defoliants and herbicides last year—I cannot believe that we will buy only $5 million this year. A McGraw-Hill investment newsletter states that Edgewood Arsenal would spend about $420 million in 1969 for CBW materials. And this is only one center.

9. Defense states that the Army does use discretion in placing CBW research contracts with academic and private institutions.

Yet it is reported to me that a number of biologists have been approached by an individual asking them to undertake certain specified research projects without identifying the source of the funds that would pay for the work—presumably the Army. Academic biologists have also indicated that they would not undertake research for the Army on CBW projects if it weren't for the great shortage of support funds in this field of science.

I also find use of the Smithsonian, even if not on CBW itself but rather in determining what areas might be suitable for CBW tests, of questionable discretion in view of the Institution's international reputation and need to keep clear of any doubt as to the nature of its work.

Going beyond the immediate contradictions which I have listed, some general comments should be made. First, the unnecessary secrecy surrounding our CBW activities from both Members of Congress and the public should be stripped away. A policy of evasiveness in responding to public inquiry only arouses more suspicion than already exists. I found Mr. Foster's reply an improvement over the information provided by the Army but even his reply has contradictions that require clarification. I believe that an inquiry calling on informed and expert opinion is required to resolve these contradictions. I am exploring with my colleagues in the House and Senate the possibility of an ad hoc committee of inquiry or a possible investigation by one of the standing subcommittees of the Senate. I expect to make a recommendation on this shortly.

Second, in comparing the replies of the departments I found a more thorough and comprehensive definition of policy in the reply received from Defense than I did from State. Defense at least says that we have a "no-first use" policy for biological warfare and implies that we have the same policy for lethal gas. The State Department says that it is up to the President to decide national policy and does not mention "no-first use" in reply to these questions. In contrast with Secretary Rusk's rather careful exposition of a no-first use policy in 1965, and a justification of the use of tear gases on humanitarian grounds, State now just says that it is the President's decision, almost an abdication of their responsibility in this aspect of foreign policy.

Third, although General Hebbeler defended use of incapacitating agents such as tear gas by saying they weren't invented at the time of the Geneva Protocol in 1925, it is well documented that tear gas and adamsite were extensively used in World War I. The records of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference meeting in 1931 which I placed in the Record on April 1st, also clearly show that the British, the French, the Spanish, the Yugoslavs, and others stated that they consider tear gas and other noxious gases, even if non-lethal, to be included in the wording of the Geneva Protocol. Significantly, neither the Defense nor the State reply justified the use of tear gas by saying that it is not included in the Geneva Protocol—a change in policy from General Hebbeler's statement and Defense and State's earlier justification for use of tear gas.

Fourth, I find the use of incapacitating gas in conjunction with B–52 raids and artillery attacks, and the use of defoliants as an anti-food weapon not "the minimum use of force required" or a herbicide or defoliant used for agricultural or industrial purposes in the United States and Russia, but rather chemical warfare. This is a change from our policy in World War II when President Roosevelt said, "Use of such weapons has been outlawed by the general opinion of civilized mankind. This country has not used them, and I hope that we will never be compelled to use them. I state categorically that we shall under no circumstances resort to the use of such weapons unless they are first used by our enemies."

Following World War II Admiral Chester Nimitz was asked about the toughest decisions he had to make. He replied, "there were a lot of tough ones. I think when the War Department suggested the use of poison gas during the invasion of Iwo Jima that was a trying decision. I decided the United States should not be the first to violate the Geneva Convention. It cost many fine Marines."

Similarly, in the Korean War we went to extraordinary lengths to refute Communist charges that we were using germ warfare. We recognized the grave impact that belief of this charge would have on world opinion.

Yet today, although we state that we adhere to the principles of the Geneva Protocol, we are using tear gas to aid in the killing of the enemy and we are using chemicals as an anti-food weapon and in a way that may well have long-term destructive effect on the Vietnamese countryside. This latter policy seems unlikely to win the battle for the minds of the uncommitted in Vietnam.

I ask who is responsible for this change in our chemical and biological warfare policy? Did the President decide? Has Congress agreed to this change? Do the American people accept this new policy as one in keeping with the principles and moral precepts of our Republic? This question demands the most thorough review and debate. I therefore ask President Nixon to resubmit the Geneva Protocol of 1925 to the United States Senate for ratification so that this review can be made. I, for one, would like to know where the United States stands on this issue today.

Fifth, I find it inconceivable that the United States would knowingly use biological warfare even as a matter of retaliation. Defense admits that we have no warning system to tell when and if such an attack were used against us. Biologists tell us that the purpose of biological warfare research is to develop vaccine-resistant strains of disease. Defense tells us there is no specific therapy available for most BW agents and that vaccination against the more than 100 agents is not practical and would probably harm the health of the individual.

Dr. Joshua Lederberg, Nobel Laureate biologist, warns that loosing a biological agent on a nation might well result in a world-wide epidemic raging out of control with new mutant strains of the disease developing that might not respond to a vaccine even if one were initially available.

Dr. James D. Watson, Nobel laureate biologist at Harvard who served on a Presidential chemical and biological warfare advisory panel from 1961 until 1964 said in an interview that he thinks CBW programs should be discontinued because they are not a good way of winning wars—militarily they're a waste of time. He went on to say that the top people in the Department of Defense never gave a damn about it—it becomes dangerous with a suspicious, hostile military who are losing a war, so will try it to win.

With these comments in mind, I urge the United States to give full support to the proposal of the British to the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference that biological warfare research and use be fully banned. Research on vaccines against diseases can be conducted—openly—with the results available to everyone. An open inspection system has been suggested, one in which all biologists would report by word of mouth any suspected violation of the ban on biological weapons research or manufacture. We would have little to lose and much to gain.

Sixth, I urge that a top-level panel of Department of Transportation, U.S. Public Health Service, Department of Defense, and independent academic experts be convened to review transportation policies for chemical and biological agents and to establish the strictest transportation standards for their transportation, if indeed such transportation is needed.

Finally, I intend to comment further on our chemical and biological warfare policies and practices for I regard them as one of the benchmarks of our moral and ethical principles. There are those who say that it makes no difference how a man dies. I disagree. Let me draw from General Hebbeler's briefing; there is a principle of proportionality, which is not only a general principle of international law, but is also fundamental to moral law. It applies even though the target, the weapon and the method of attack may be legitimate. It requires that belligerents refrain from employing any kind of violence which is not necessary for military purposes. I believe that chemical and biological warfare are not necessary for military purposes. Let the United States take the lead in seeing that they are banned from use. And let the United States refrain from using those chemicals which begin to break down the thin dividing line between the long standing principle of no-first use and chemical warfare.

The text of the answer from the Department of Defense follows:

XUM

"APRIL 15, 1969.

"Hon. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

"DEAR MR. MCCARTHY: The Secretary of Defense has asked me to reply to your letter of March 7, 1969, concerning chemical and biological warfare.

"Answers to each of your questions are attached. Copies of reports and other materials which are relevant to the questions are included. It is believed this information responds to your inquiries on an unclassified basis. There are areas which could be extended and amplified by classified discussion.

"Sincerely,

"JOHN S. FOSTER, Jr.,
"Director of Defense,
"Research and Engineering."

Question 1. Is it our national policy to respond in kind to a gas attack against the nation? Do we state that we will use lethal gas against a nation that launches a gas attack against us, rather than a nuclear attack? Wouldn't it be cheaper and just as effective to retaliate with another weapon with which we have had operational experience?

Answer. It is the policy of the U.S. to develop and maintain a defensive chemical-biological (CB) capability so that our military forces could operate for some period of time in a toxic environment if necessary; to develop and maintain a limited offensive capability in order to deter all use of CB weapons by the threat of retaliation in kind; and to continue a program of research and development in this area to minimize the possibility of technological surprise. This policy on CB weapons is part of a broader strategy designed to provide the U.S. with several options for response against various forms of attack. Should their employment ever be necessary, the President would have to authorize their use. The U.S. does not have a policy that requires a single and invariable response. Deterrence is our primary objective.

Chemical weapons, in many tactical situations, are more effective than conventional (high explosive and projectile) weapons. Accordingly, it is believed wise to deter their use. If two approximately equally effective military forces were engaged in combat, and one side initiated a CB operation, it could gain a significant advantage even if the opposing side has protective equipment. Neutralization of this advantage could not be achieved with conventional arms.

Question 2. Is it our national policy to respond in kind to a massive biological weapon attack? Wouldn't it be cheaper and infinitely safer for all of mankind to respond to a biological weapon attack with other weapons with which we have had operational experience?

Answer. The U.S. policy and its rationale with regard to biological warfare is generally the same as that for chemical. As a matter of policy the U.S. will not be the first to use biological weapons, but we are aware of the capabilities these weapons place in the hands of potential adversaries. For this reason it is important to carry on our R&D program in BW, not only to provide necessary equipment, such as detection and warning devices, but to define and quantify more fully the potential threat to the U.S. from these weapons, and the hazards involved if they are ever used against us.

Question 3. If our gas biological warfare efforts are purely defensive in nature, what steps have been taken to defend our public from these threats? Why hasn't the public been instructed as to what to do in the case of a nerve gas attack, a hallucinatory gas attack, or an incapacitating gas attack? Do we stockpile antidotes, serums, and vaccines for gas and biological attacks, at medical centers and instruct people where they are? We do, after all, instruct people what to do in the case of nuclear attack. We stockpile supplies in fall-out shelters that are marked so that the public will know where they are. Why don't we do the same for the threat from gas and biological weapons?

Answer. The threat to the U.S. civil population from CB attack has been studied by the Department of Defense and these analyses are periodically up-dated. It is clear that the threat of CB attack is less significant than that of nuclear attack. For this reason, more emphasis has been placed in civil defense on the nuclear threat.

For logistic reasons chemical agents do not appear to pose a major strategic threat against the U.S. For example, it would require many tons of nerve agent munitions to carry out an effective attack against a city of a few million people. This may appear inconsistent with the high toxicity of the nerve agents, but for many technical reasons such as the difficulty in disseminating the agents in vapor or aerosol form, the dilution of the agent in the atmosphere, and their impingement on ground and vegetation, it is correct. For this reason, the U.S. does not maintain stockpiles of therapeutic materials for nerve agents. Although the possibility of the employment of biological weapons against U.S. population centers cannot be ruled out entirely, it does not presently warrant the priority given to defense against the effects of nuclear weapons. Research on methods of detecting and warning, identifying, and defending against biological attack are continuing, as is the review of the magnitude and nature of the threat.

The Office of Civil Defense has developed an inexpensive but effective protective mask for civilian use, and a limited production run was made to test production quality. No large scale production was undertaken because of the low estimate of the threat as described above. Should the threat to the U.S. population increase, this mask could be produced quite rapidly and, together with other necessary defensive measures, would afford protection against both chemical and biological attack. Filtration systems have been designed and tested, and these could be added to fall-out shelters to afford collective protection for groups of people. In addition, many of the emergency plans developed by the Department of HEW for post-nuclear attack medical support would be applicable. The emergency packaged hospitals, for example, provide for expansion of hospital facilities by the equivalent of 2500 hospitals of 200 bed size.

The U.S. does not maintain large stockpiles of medical supplies such as antibiotics and vaccines against the possibility of biological attack. There is no specific antibiotic therapy available for most BW agents. As for vaccines, there are more than 100 possible BW agents, and production and administration of 100 vaccines to the U.S. population is not practical. There is medical reason to believe that such a program would be generally injurious to health in addition to requiring prohibitive expenditures.

Question 4. We have been told by former Under Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance, that the "why" of chemical and biological warfare is defense. Are our soldiers in the field, Vietnam, Korea, Germany, and sailors at sea able to defend themselves against all forms of chemical and biological weapons attack? Since we are using marginal forms of a chemical warfare in Vietnam, are our forces prepared for an escalation in the use of chemical weapons? Are our troops prepared for the possibility of the enemy responding with a stronger weapon than the incapacitating gases we use?

Answer. The U.S. Armed Forces have the equipment to protect themselves against CB attack with the exception of a biological warning and detection device which is under development. U.S. soldiers and sailors generally have masks and protective clothing; and collective protection equipment for vans and communication centers is being developed and supplied. U.S. troops in Vietnam are prepared for possible enemy uses of chemical weapons.

Question 5. Why do we choose to call defoliants herbicides of the type we use in our own agriculture rather than chemical warfare? What defoliants or chemicals, if any, are being used in Vietnam to destroy plant life which are not customarily used in the United States? To what extent are they used? What is the distinction between a chemical that is used to destroy crops and a plant disease from the field of biological warfare that could be used against rice or wheat?

Answer. There are *no* herbicidal chemicals used in Vietnam to destroy vegetation which have not been widely used in the United States in connection with clearing areas for agricultural or industrial purposes.

The term "defoliants" is used because it properly describes the purpose of its use; that is, to remove leaves from jungle foliage to reduce the threat of ambush and to increase visibility for U.S. Forces. This use of defoliants has saved many American and South Vietnam lives.

There are several distinctions between a chemical herbicide and a biological plant disease. The biological agents are living plant pathogens, and may be spread beyond the area of attack by winds, insects or animals. Chemical herbicides do not spread in this manner beyond the area of attack. Further, more is known about the effects of chemical herbicides because of their widespread use throughout the world. Each use of herbicides or defoliants in Vietnam is approved by the U.S. Embassy and the government of the Republic of Vietnam.

Question 6. Do we have in practice or in policy an anti-food policy through the use of defoliants in Vietnam? What are our plans to restore the environment of Vietnam which has significantly altered as a result of our defoliant policy? Will we establish a commission similar to the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission that operated in Nagasaki and Hiroshima after the war to study and correct some of the damage that we caused?

Answer. The U.S. has a carefully limited operation in South Vietnam to disrupt the enemy's food supply. It is limited to the attack of small and usually remote jungle plots which we know the VC or NVA are using. Usually these plots are along trails or near their base camp areas. Each such operation is approved by the U.S. Embassy and the government of the Republic of Vietnam. Enemy caches of food, principally rice, are also destroyed when it cannot be used by the South Vietnamese. These limited Allied activities have never, in any single year, affected as much as one percent of the annual food output of South Vietnam.

The date surveys have shown that there is no evidence of substantial permanent or irreparable damage from the viewpoint of the future development of South Vietnam, attributable to the defoliation effort. The Department of Defense has supported the Department of Agriculture in studies of herbicides in analagous areas, and I am attaching a copy of their report "Response of Tropical and Sub-Tropical Woody Plants to Chemical Treatments." The Department of Defense also had a base line study of the forests of Vietnam prepared entitled "Forests of Southeast Asia, Puerto Rico and Texas," a copy of which is attached. More recently a study "Assessment of Ecological Effects of Extensive or Repeated Use of Herbicides" was done by Midwest Research Institute, a copy of which is attached. This study was reviewed by a special committee of the National Academy of Sciences, and judged by them to be an accurate and competent report. Last fall, the Department of State, with Department of Defense participation, made a survey of the ecology of defoliated areas. One of the scientists who made this survey, Dr. Fred Tschirley from the Department of Agriculture, published his report in *Science*. A copy of his report is attached.

At the end of active combat, it appears probable that there will be agricultural and forestry activities and other programs which will aid the South Vietnamese people. The Department of Defense would cooperate with the Department of States and the U.S. Agency for International Development as necessary in accomplishing these. The Department of Defense supports the concept of a comprehensive study of the long-term efforts of the limited defoliation program, and has endorsed, in principle, proposals by the American Association for the Advancement of Science for such a scientific study.

Question 7. Why do we exclude incapacitating gases such as those used in combat operations in Vietnam, from the chemical warfare category? Why are vomiting gases, incapacitating gases, and other irritants regarded as being different from other forms of gas? Apparently, we have a policy of using non-lethal, or at least non-lethal by intent, gas in combat. Are there occasions under which the gases in use are or have been lethal? Under Secretary Vance has said that these gases are not chemical warfare because they are used by police for riot control and the like. Even if they are, this still appears to be a policy of using incapacitating agents as an offensive weapon. Any distinction made by Secretary Vance is semantic and once again opens the credibility gap.

Answer. The only "incapacitating gas" in use by U.S. Forces in Vietnam is the riot control agent called CS, although CN was also authorized some years ago. Both are tear gases. There is no known verified instance of lethality by CS, either in Vietnam or anywhere else in the world where it has been used to control disturbances by many governments.

Efforts to find the statement you attribute to the former Deputy Secretary Vance have been unsuccessful. A copy of an excerpt from his testimony two years ago before the Disarmament Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (February 1967) is attached. The distinction he made is that the U.S. has never used biological weapons, nor have we used lethal chemical weapons since World War I, and that it is against U.S. policy to initiate their use, but that the U.S. has used riot control agents and herbicides. It is believed these distinctions are still valid.

Question 8. What precautions are taken to insure that chemical and biological warfare experiments are of no danger to the public? What precautions did not work at the sheep kill at Skull Valley in Utah? What precautions are taken when the Army moves chemical agents from a plant to a storage depot or to a port of embarkation or an airfield? What are the risks if there is a train wreck? Are the agents being transported volatile? Is the statistical probability of an accidental discharge of poisonous chemicals greater than of the probability of a nuclear explosion from, say, an ABM warhead? What can be done to counter the damage that would be done if there were an accidental discharge of a chemical agent while in transit through a city or town?

Answer. Strict safety practices are enforced at laboratories which do research on CB agents. Elaborate systems of airtight hoods, air filtration and waste decontamination are employed. These precautions and procedures are reviewed by the U.S. Public Health Service as well as by Department of Defense safety experts. The equipment and building designs developed at the U.S. Army Biological Laboratories, for example, have been generally accepted throughout the world as the ultimate in safety for the investigation of infectious diseases.

With regard to the extremely unfortunate Skull Valley incident, the exact chain of events is still not completely understood. A freak meteorological situation was probably a major contributing factor. This matter has been carefully reviewed by a special advisory committee appointed by the Secretary of the Army and chaired by the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service. A copy of this report is included for your information. This committee has made a number of recommendations concerning test limitations, toxicological and environmental investigations, added meteorological facilities, and a permanent safety committee. All of these recommendations are being followed.

Movement of chemical agents is governed by rules and procedures established by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the U.S. Public Health Service. The material is shipped in special containers; these containers are put on pallets if necessary and fully restrained, and an underlying layer of sand is used to reduce vibration and to absorb agent in the highly unlikely event of leakage. All shipments are accompanied by a trained escort detachment equipped with decontaminating and first aid equipment. Routes are carefully planned to avoid populated areas to the greatest extent possible; and, where they cannot be avoided, to move through them carefully and with as little delay as possible.

The precautions taken—the use of special trains, careful routing, controlled speeds, and other measures—make a train wreck extremely unlikely. However, even further steps are taken to minimize any hazard that might result from an accident. Buffer cars are included in the train, the escort detachment is distributed in different cars to provide prompt full-train coverage in emergencies, and transit time through populated areas is minimized. Although the agents are not inert, it is important to note that transported agents are neither volatile nor in the gaseous state. They are liquid, and the most volatile is about eight times less volatile than water. The containers are not under pressure, and nerve agents are rapidly rendered harmless by fire.

The comparison of statistical probabilities of a railroad accident and subsequent discharge of chemicals or accidental explosion of a nuclear device is very difficult because of the differences between them. Extensive precautions are taken to provide safety in both. There has never been either an accidental nuclear explosion or an accidental discharge of chemical agent during shipment. This absence of data makes it impossible to calculate the respective probabilities of accident.

In the unlikely event of accidental discharge in a city or town, the first steps would be to secure the area; to decontaminate the liquid material, and to provide first-aid to any individuals who came in contact with the liquid. Supplies are carried in the train to accomplish this. Any alkaline material, such as bleach or quicklime, will rapidly decompose nerve agents. Because the agents have low volatility, there is little vapor hazard, however, people should not be allowed in the downwind vicinity as a matter of precaution.

Question 9. What is the annual cost of our activities in the fields of chemical and biological warfare? What is the cost of munitions and weapons in these fields? Since comparable figures are available for our procurement and reseach programs in ICBM's, the ABM, Polaris, and similar forces, I assume they can be made available for our CBW program. If they can't, why can't they?

Answer. Total U.S. expenditures in the CB field, including smoke, flame, and incendiary weapons, is $350 million for Fiscal Year 1969. There is no procurement of lethal chemical agents or of biological agents. Details of expenditures are given in the table below.

CB expenditures, fiscal year 1969

	Million
Procurement:	
Smoke, flame, and incendiary	$139
Riot control munitions	81
Herbicides	5
Defensive equipment	15
Total	240
R.D.T. & E.:	
General and basic R. & D	9
Offensive R. & D	31
Defensive R. & D	30
Test and evaluation	20
Total	90
Operation and maintenance	20

Question 10. Do we have the capability to respond to a massive nation-wide gas or biological warfare attack? That is, could we launch a similar and immediate attack against the aggressor? The deterrent effect of our ICBM's is based on the enemy's knowledge that we can and will respond. This has been a policy publicly stated by the Secretary of Defense. Is the same true in the field of chemical or biological warfare?

Answer. The answer to the question, as stated, is no: the U.S. could not launch an immediate, massive, chemical and biological attack. The U.S. has the technical capability to do this, but it has not been judged necessary or desirable to procure and install the weapon systems for "immediate massive" attack. The carefully controlled inventories are adequate for tactical response against enemy military forces; not for strategic or "nationwide" attack.

Question 11. Do we have a rapid warning system that will alert the public to a chemical or biological attack?

Answer. The U.S. has developed chemical detection and warning instruments which could provide the components for a national alarm system. They have not been deployed to build such a system. However, as noted above, it is believed that the threat of strategic chemical attack is not great. Warning against biological attack is much more difficult technologically. Recently, there has been success with a prototype instrument which would provide some biological warning capability. R&D efforts in this area will be continued.

Question 12. Does the Army use any discretion as to what types of institutions should be encouraged or pressed into accepting funds for work in chemical and biological warfare? Does the Army see any conflict in asking a purely civilian institution, such as the Smithsonian, to do work that might conflict with the institution's activities abroad?

Answer. The Army certainly uses discretion in selection of all of its contractors. The advice of the Smithsonian Institution was sought in identifying a suitable institute to do this work. As a result, they submitted a proposal, which was accepted. As a direct consequence of this work, there have been 45 papers written by Smithsonian scientists and published in the scientific literature. This has been a remarkably productive scientific investigation brought about by a coincidence of interests in the fauna of the area.

The Smithsonian Institution was never asked to do, nor did they do, any "military" chemical and biological warfare research. It carried out scientific investigations appropriate to its charter and objectives, and published the significant findings in the scientific literature. These results are available for use by the Army, by any other government agency, or by any nation or scientist wishing to do so.

Question 13. Would the United States or any other major nation be risking its national security by dispensing with chemical

XUM

and biological weapons altogether, especially in view of their many skills with weapons that have already been used?

Answer. It was pointed out in the discussion of Question 1 that CB weapons are, in many military situations more effective than conventional weapons. Thus, a nation which lacked CB weapons and could not deter or counter their use would have to consider more extreme measures. Unilateral CB disarmament would adversely affect a nation's deterrent capability, it would decrease its response options, and it would ultimately seriously degrade its CB defensive capability. The U.S. is committed, as President Nixon wrote recently, to "exploring any proposals or ideas that could contribute to sound weapons." The Defense Department is fully in accord with mutual arms control efforts and supports them in every way possible. For example, members of the Department of Defense will join representatives of the State Department and Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in meeting in late April to assist the United Nations Secretary General's group of 14 consultant experts prepare a report to the Secretary General of the UN on the characteristics of CB weapons.

Question 14. Isn't it correct, as Dr. Joshua Lederberg has said, that biological weapons are regarded as a tool of dubious value at best?

Answer. It is difficult to answer this question without knowing the context in which Dr. Lederberg stated his conclusion, nor the rationale he used in arriving at it. There are a number of technical uncertainties about the effects of biological weapons, but this does not reduce the vulnerability of the U.S. to them, nor does it negate the potential hazard they pose. Until such time as it can be proved that they are of little value to any nation, if that is indeed the case, or until reliable mutual arms control agreements are reached, it would be imprudent to dismiss them lightly.

April 7, 1969.

Hon. Richard D. McCarthy,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman McCarthy: The Secretary and the Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency have asked me to reply to your letters of March 10 and March 20, respectively, in which you inquired as to our national policy with respect to chemical and biological warfare.

The answers that follow reflect those aspects of your questions that come within the responsibilities of the Department of State and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. For ease of reference, I have repeated the questions. Questions 3 and 7 can best be answered by the Department of Defense.

Question 1. It is our national policy to respond in kind to a gas attack against the nation? Do we state that we will use lethal gas against a nation that launches a gas attack against us, rather than retaliate with another weapon with which we have had operational experience?

Answer. Should the nation be attacked with either gas or biological weapons, the President would decide upon an appropriate response. As you indicate, there are a number of responses available to the nation.

Question 2. Is it our national policy to respond in kind to a massive biological weapon attack? Wouldn't it be cheaper and infinitely safer for all of mankind to respond to a biological weapon attack with other weapons with which we have had operational experience?

Answer. My comment on Question 1 is equally applicable to this question.

Question 4. Why do we choose to call defoliants herbicides of the type we use in our own agriculture rather than chemical warfare? It is not sufficient to say as Ambassador Nabrit did, that so-called herbicides are not a form of chemical warfare. It only extends the credibility gap between our statements and our practices. What is the distinction between a chemical that is used to destroy crops and a plant disease from the field of biological warfare that could be used against rice or wheat?

Answer. In 1966, at the United Nations, Ambassador Nabrit defended United States use in Vietnam of herbicides which involve the same chemicals and have the same effects as those domestically used in the United States, the Soviet Union, and many other countries, on the basis that such use was not prohibited by the Geneva Protocol of 1925 ("Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare"). Although not a party to the agreement, the U.S. is pledged to observe strictly the principles and objectives of the Protocol. The Protocol is not without ambiguity as to the range of prohibited chemical weapons. For example, few nations, if any, consider the use of smoke, flame and incendiary agents, all of which involve chemicals and are asphyxiating at times, to constitute chemical warfare or to be prohibited by the Geneva Protocol. Similarly, League of Nations records indicate that, in prohibiting poison gas warfare, the Protocol's drafters did not intend to prohibit the use of chemical anti-plant agents. While some nations believe that the use of chemical herbicides in war is prohibited, we have been candid about our use of these materials, and I see no credibility gap between our statements and our current practices.

In regard to your question on the use of chemicals to destroy enemy crops as compared with the use of plant diseases for the same purpose, the distinction is one of scale and control. Herbicides can be employed with some precision and since they do not spread, in the sense that plant diseases spread, they can be controlled. On the other hand, plant diseases are living organisms capable of causing epiphytotics (plant disease epidemics). Moreover, naturally occurring plant disease organisms have been known to be carried by winds and cause destruction of food crops many hundreds of miles from the original source of infection. This is not possible with chemical herbicides.

The U.S. has never used plant diseases, or any other form of biological weapon, as a weapon of war.

Question 5. Do we have in practice or in policy an anti-food policy through the use of defoliants in Vietnam? What are our plans to restore the environment of Vietnam which has been significantly altered as a result of our defoliant policy? Will we establish a commission similar to the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission that operated in Nagasaki and Hiroshima after the war to study and correct some of the damage that we caused?

Answer. There are two purposes served by the use of chemical herbicides in South Vietnam: one is to clear jungle foliage in order to increase visibility on the ground and from the air; the other purpose is to destroy only those specific food crops being grown by Viet Cong forces, thereby increasing the logistics burden on the enemy by causing him to divert human and other resources to non-combat activities. The same chemicals are used for both purposes.

With regard to the effect of the use of herbicides on the Vietnamese environment, Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker established a special inter-agency committee in 1968 to make a comprehensive review of the program. The committee's task was to assess the military benefits of the program in relation to its costs, and to study its effects upon the ecology of the country. The review indicated that, in general, herbicide operations in Vietnam have been accomplished without significant permanent damage to the ecology of the country. In this regard, I am enclosing an article from the 21 February 1969 issue of "Science," which was written by Fred H. Tschirley, of the Department of Agriculture. Dr. Tschirley served on the review committee.

There is certainly much merit in a long range study of the ecological effects of herbicides in Vietnam. Such studies in combat are obviously difficult at present but should be initiated as soon as practicable.

Question 6. Why do we exclude incapacitating gases such as those used in combat operations in Vietnam from the chemical warfare category? Why are vomiting gases, incapacitating gases, and other irritants regarded as being different from other forms of gas? Apparently we have a policy of using non-lethal, or at least non-lethal by intent, gas in combat. Are there occasions under which the gases in use are or have been lethal? Under Secretary Vance has said that these gases are not chemical warfare because they are used by police for riot control and the like. Even if they are this still appears to be a policy of using incapacitating gas as an offensive weapon. Any distinction made by Secretary Vance is semantic and once again opens the credibility gap.

Answer. The only anti-personnel agent used by U.S. forces in Vietnam is the riot control agent CS, better known as tear gas. This chemical riot-control agent has been widely used by governments around the world for the control of domestic disturbances. We have no verified reports from Vietnam of any occasion in which this gas has been lethal. To the contrary, we have many reports of lives being spared by the use of tear gas. The fact that tear gas is used for the control of riots by governments responsible to their people provides an objective standard for differentiating it from other chemical weapons.

Question 8. Would the United States or any other major nation be risking its national security by dispensing with chemical and biological weapons altogether, especially in view of their many skills with weapons that have already been used?

Answer. The potential risk, if any, posed to the security of the U.S. and other states by dispensing with these weapons altogether continues to be a matter for our consideration. It will require particular study in our consideration of the proposed ban on all biological weapons introduced by Great Britain at the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee (ENDC) last summer. It is expected that the results of the current study being undertaken by the United Nations Secretary-General, especially with regard to the security implications of these weapons, will provide additional insights into this problem.

Question 9. Why isn't the United States initiative in chemical and biological warfare control and disarmament as active or apparent as it is in the field of nuclear weapons?

Answer. The very nature of the threat posed by nuclear weapons required that the U.S. join with other nations in achieving agreement in this area on a priority basis.

The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has long been concerned with the problem of controlling lethal chemical and biological weapons. To this end ACDA has undertaken a comprehensive program of research on the verification aspects of possible arms control measures relating to these weapons. While the results of these studies have been encouraging, the research is not yet at the point where specific measures for international consideration could be recommended.

Question 10. Lethal chemicals have not been used at all in warfare by the major powers for the past fifty years and biological weapons have never been used. Why shouldn't we initiate steps at the international level to dispense with those weapons altogether, beginning with biological weapons?

Answer. We would agree with you that it may be advantageous to focus new arms control arrangements on these weapons, beginning with biological weapons. Accordingly, the U.S. has expressed its willingness to give serious study to the British proposal banning microbiological methods of warfare which would supplement the 1925 Geneva Protocol. Submitted to the ENDC in 1968, the U.K. proposal called for a prohibition on the production, possession and use in any and all circumstances of microbiological agents.

Question 11. What are the United States' plans for bringing up limitations on the use of chemical and biological weapons at the United Nations, and other international forums?

Answer. The U.S. has on numerous occasions expressed its interest in participating in discussions which may promote progress in achieving effective arms control measures in the field of chemical and biological weapons. Most recently, on March 18, 1969, President Richard M. Nixon instructed the U.S. Delegation to the ENDC to "join with other delegations in exploring any proposal or ideas that could contribute to sound and effective arms control relating to these weapons." President Nixon's message hopefully will lead each delegation to undertake new and productive approaches to the problem of controlling chemical and biological weapons. It should be recalled that the U.S. in 1966 co-sponsored the operative part of a UN General Assembly resolution which called upon all States to observe strictly the principles and objectives of the 1925 Geneva Protocol. Moreover, just last year the U.S. played a leading role in the creation by the UN Secretary-General of a consultant experts group to study the effects of CB weapons. (The U.S. is one of fourteen countries represented in that group.) The results of that study, expected by July 1969, should contribute to the ENDC's consideration of the problems associated with the control of chemical and biological weapons.

I hope that the above answers will help to clarify some of the policy issues about which you have expressed concern. Please do not hesitate to let me know if I can be of further assistance to you.

Sincerely,

H. G. TORBERT, Jr.,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

MARCH 28, 1969.

Hon. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCARTHY: I have read your recent letter on the subject of chemical and biological warfare with great interest. Frankly I must say that many, indeed almost all of the questions you raise relate to national policy matters which do not come within the purview of my office. I have therefore taken the liberty of forwarding your letter to the Department of State so that an appropriate response can be prepared in the near future.

You ask about the degree to which the U.S. has shown initiative in this aspect of disarmament and you ask what our plans are at the UN for bringing up limitations on the use of these weapons. I am attaching to this letter a copy of Resolution 2454 which was adopted by the General Assembly on 20 December 1968 with our support. Although the U.S. was not itself an original co-sponsor of this Resolution we worked actively behind the scenes in its drafting and along with 106 other members of the General Asssembly voted for it (none voted against it, only Guinea and Malawi abstained). You will note that by this Resolution the General Assembly condemns all actions contrary to the objectives of the 1925 Geneva Protocol and calls for strict observance by all States of the principles and objectives contained therein. It also asks the Secretary-General to appoint experts to prepare a report on the consequences of the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons, and to transmit this report to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva by July 1, 1969, and to the members of the UN in time for consideration of the report itself at the next session of the General Assembly in September.

The Resolution further recommends that governments give the report wide distribution through all media in order to acquaint public opinion with its contents. Since the adoption of this Resolution the Secretary-General has designated the following consultant experts to assist in the preparation of this report:

Dr. Tibor Bakacs, Chief Director of the National Institute of Public Health, Budapest.

Dr. Hotse C. Bartlema, Head of the Microbiological Division of the Medical-Biological Laboratory, National Defense Research Organization, Rijswijk, Netherlands.

Dr. Ivan L. Bennett, Former Deputy Director of the Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President of the United States, Washington, D.C. Currently Deputy Director New York University Medical Center.

Dr. S. Bhagavantam, Scientific Adviser to the Ministry of Defense, New Delhi.

Dr. Jiri Franek, Head of the Military Institute for Hygienic Epidemiology and Microbiology, Prague

Dr. Yosio Kawakita, President of University of Chiba, Professor of Bacteriology, Chiba City, Japan

M. Victor Moulin, Ingenieur en chef de l'Armement, Paris

Dr. M. K. McPhail, Director of Chemical and Biological Defense, Defense Chemical, Biological and Radiation Laboratories, Defense Research Board, Ottawa

Academician O. A. Reutov, Professor at the Moscow State University, Moscow

Dr. Guillermo Soberon, Chief of the Department of Biochemistry, National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico City

Dr. Lars-Frik Tammelin, Chief of Department for Medicine and Chemistry, Research Institute for National Defense, Stockholm

Dr. Berhane Tiumelisan, Bacteriologist of the Imperial Laboratory and Research Institute Addis, Ababa

Colonel Zbigniew Zoltowski, Professor of Medicine, Director of the Institute of Epidemiology, Warsaw

Sir Solly Zuckerman, Scientific Adviser to the Government of the United Kingdom, London

These experts held their first, organizational session in Geneva in late January 1969 and adopted their terms of reference as well as an outline for their study. It was further decided by the group that they would reconvene in Geneva on 16 April for a period of approximately two weeks.

I am sure you will agree with me that the background and expertise assembled in this group give grounds to expect that their report will contribute significantly to the further consideration of this subject at both the ENDC and the General Assembly.

I hope you will find this letter not only responsive to your request but encouraging.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. YOST.

POETIC TRIBUTE TO CHARLES RUSSELL

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, Charles Russell, the great western artist is dear to the hearts of all Montanans. His legacy, a large collection of marvelous depictions of western life which captured the very soul of the pioneer West, is an inspiration to many a poet. In recognition of this, station KRTV of Great Falls sponsors annually the Charles M. Russell poetry contest. The 1969 winner is Don Ian Smith, a Methodist minister from Choteau. I realize that many of my colleagues have long admired Charlie Russell's paintings and will appreciate my sharing this poetic tribute with them. as follows:

CHARLIE RUSSELL

(By Don Ian Smith)

Wild, restless rider of an untamed land,
you held creation's secret in your hand;
deft fingers that could mould the yielding clay;
your brush could capture shades of night and day;
or mirror in a painted warrior's face
the pride and anguish of a hunted race.

You lived life simply, deeply, keen, aware
of beauty, distance, sorrow, toil and care.
Our hurried world has need of such a one
who paused to trace the footsteps of the sun.
You sensed the joy, the fun, the problems, grief;
of cowboy, Indian, miner, cattle thief.
You felt the hopeless rancher's naked fear
of winter in a starving horse or steer.

Beneath Montana's blue and boundless sky
a thousand priceless paintings pass us by
when with our minds on triviality
we neither paint, nor have the eyes to see.
O rider of a rough and rugged land
we do not share the talent of your hand;
but you can teach in words both sharp and quaint
the art to see the scene we cannot paint.

Yours was a creed of life accepted, shared.
In your deep love of earth you surely prayed.
And nature's gracious God must smile on one
who took such joy in all the things he made.

MAIL RUN TO THE MOON

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news release from the Post Office Department, dated July 9, 1969:

MAIL RUN TO MOON

Apollo 11 will mark America's first mail run to the moon, Postmaster General Winton M. Blount revealed today.

An engraved master stamp die and a special "moon letter" will accompany America's astronauts on the journey through space and their historic lunar landing.

Upon its return to earth, the die will be used to produce a special jumbo-size, 10-cent airmail postage stamp commemorating man's first landing on the moon.

The "moon letter" will bear a die proof of the commemorative stamp and will be hand cancelled by moon explorers Neil Armstrong and Edwin Aldrin with a special postmark reading "Moon Landing U.S.A., July 20, 1969."

The "Moon Landing" commemorative stamp will be issued with first-day ceremonies in Washington, D.C., late in August. It will be 50 percent larger than our usual stamp size, measuring 1.05 by 1.80 inches, and will depict a spaceman stepping from

XUM

the space module onto the moon's surface. The inscription "First Man on the Moon" will appear across the bottom in capital letters. The pictorial portion of the first-day cancellation will be a replica of the postmark used in cancelling the envelope on the moon.

The hand-cancelled "moon letter" will undergo a 21-day decontamination period at Houston and then will be returned to the Post Office Department where it will be placed on display in the Philatelic Exhibition Room. It will later become a part of an elaborate traveling exhibit that will be shown throughout the nation and abroad.

Production of the master die that will be used to print the commemorative moon landing stamp was carried out in great secrecy by officials of the Post Office Department and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and had President Nixon's complete endorsement. There was no "paperwork" involved. Rather than the customary use of messengers, materials were hand carried between the two Departments by official staff workers.

Mr. Blount predicted the opportunity to buy stamps made from a die that actually was present on the moon will capture the fancy of stamp collectors and non-collectors alike around the world.

The stamp was designed by Paul Calle of Stamford, Connecticut, who also produced the art work for the twin space commemorative stamps in 1967. It will be printed on the Giori press and issued in panes of 32. The stamp was modeled by Robert J. Jones and engraved by Edward R. Felver (vignette) and Albert Saavedra (lettering). It is a horizontal stamp showing a spaceman emerging from the module. In the background to the right is the earth. Across the bottom in blue Gothic capitals is the inscription, "First Man on the Moon." Vertical, right, in the same type style in red is "United States." Upper left is "10¢ Air Mail."

Persons desiring first-day cancellations may send addressed envelopes, together with remittances to cover the cost of the stamps to be affixed, to the Postmaster, Washington, D.C. 20013. A close-fitting enclosure of postal card thickness should be placed in each envelope and the flap either turned in or sealed. The outside envelope should be endorsed "First Day Covers 10¢ First Man on the Moon Stamp." Orders for covers must not include requests for uncancelled stamps. The exact date of release of the stamp will be announced later. Collectors should bear in mind that this is an over-sized stamp and covers should be addressed low and as far to the left as possible.

GEN. LEONARD H. CHAPMAN ADDRESSES SAN DIEGO COUNTY NAVY LEAGUE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, many people have asserted that our Nation is a troubled one. Not only divided by a war in Vietnam, but torn by student unrest at home. However, there is another side to this picture which is all too easily forgotten in this storm of protest. How is it possible for us as Americans to neglect the tremendous individual heroism which our Armed Forces have demonstrated so many times in recent years. Moreover, the student radicals who so zealously attempt to destroy military recruiting programs and military-sponsored research do not realize they are undermining the very force which on innumerable occasions has defended the right they hold to be so dear—the American right to dissent.

The following speech by Gen. Leonard F. Chapman, Commandant of the Marine Corps, before the San Diego County Navy League of the United States will, I feel, serve to further deepen our confidence in the future course of the United States.

REMARKS BY GENERAL LEONARD F. CHAPMAN, JR., USMC

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen—Shipmates: I will *not* ask if everyone can hear me. The last time I asked an audience that question, a lady in the back answered "No"—well, a gentleman up front said he *could* hear me very well, and offered to trade places with her.

So, I won't ask.

It is a real pleasure to be here, in *old* San Diego. I guess a city, now celebrating its two hundredth year of existence on the American continent, does qualify for the dignity of being called old. I was going to say "a city now celebrating its two hundredth year of *establishment*. . . ." But you can't be too careful how you use that word, these days.

Well, the Navy-Marine Corps team has not been in San Diego for two hundred years, but it has been a long time. We first arrived in July of 1842, when sailors and marines from Commodore Stockton's squadron landed to assist Captain Fremont in securing the city. We've been here ever since, and we've enjoyed every minute of it.

San Diego is a nice place to be. A good home port. The location, the weather, the smell of blue ocean and good land joined together—and more importantly—the people; make this a snug harbor for all men who serve this country on the sea.

And you, shipmates of the Navy League of San Diego, you especially make us feel at home. Your interest, your concern, and your active work for the sea services, is as encouraging as it is vital. Your support, and involvement, have made you indispensable members of our Navy-Marine Corps team.

I am with you today as a fellow member, and spokesman for the Marine Corps element, of our team. I am here to address you on the subject of marines. Now, because of our Corps' heavy commitment in Vietnam, to speak to you of marines, is to speak to you of the war in that place. And in talking about that war, two theaters of action must be considered—the battlefield of Vietnam, and, the battlefield right here, in this country.

To make a report on marines on the battlefield of Vietnam, is a simple, and proud task. Their dedication, courage, and professional ability are everyday facts. These haven't changed.

And also, the operational and tactical situation in Vietnam has changed little. It is that kind of war. Within the borders of South Vietnam, we continue to keep the enemy's main force units away from the people, and generally out of the country. We have made great progress in rooting out the guerrillas, and the Viet Cong infrastructure. It is a fact that local Viet Cong units, as such, have all but ceased to exist. We find more and more that these guerrilla units remain Viet Cong in name only, and are actually cadred, and filled out with regular North Vietnamese troops and specialists. The few South Vietnamese left in these formations are carefully integrated with the people from the North, watched closely, and can hardly be classified as political zealots.

We also note that repeated acts of terror by the enemy seem to have reached their maximum value in coercion. Rather than submit to enemy control, the rural Vietnamese people are turning to a strengthened government. And let there be no mistake about it—the Government of the Republic of Vietnam is stronger. And as the enemy continues to apply pressure, and more Vietnamese from the rural areas turn to the government, it gathers even greater strength. That is the real heart of this war.

You all know this is a guerrilla war. There are no lines of battle, and key terrain is a matter of who holds it at any given time. It is a limited war, but only *our* prosecution of the war is limited. Not the enemy's. The enemy has very definite advantages. He moves to and from the sanctuary of his homeland as he chooses. It is up to him if there is to be a war at all. To stop the war, even for a short rest, he merely removes himself. The only means we have to stop the war is to destroy, or pre-empt the enemy in the area within which we have limited our operations. We continue to seek him in that area, and we continue to destroy him. This keeps him away from the main population centers.

The enemy maintains his advantage of free movement, and a stable rear, only as long as we choose to remain out of his country. If the situation were reversed, North Vietnam would not be able to withstand guerrilla warfare within her borders—without outside help—any more than is the Republic of Vietnam.

But our country, and our allies, did not choose the destruction of North Vietnam. Rather, our forces were committed to deny the North Vietnamese the destruction and conquest of the Republic of Vietnam. And we are attempting to do this, by limiting our action to the area of contention: South Vietnam.

This is a test, a severe test, to determine the feasibility of halting aggression, without the destruction of the aggressor nation. We have no desire to destroy a country—we only intend that another country be left to its own determination. And this war has been an effort to re-establish peace, and order, by making it unprofitable for one nation to impose its will on a neighbor. But it takes great restraint, and an extremely temperate application of power. This country, in the past four years, has shown an unprecedented ability to do just this. But it demands a high price. It demands time. And time demands the surcharge of patience.

The young men who have chosen to serve as a part of the Navy-Marine Corps team, in this war, have shown a remarkable ability to understand this. In ships that steam on humid station in the Gulf of Tonkin; in the Riverine Forces, South, in the delta; and in the III Marine Amphibious Force, North, in the I Corps Tactical Zone; young Americans of the Navy and Marine Corps, willingly fight this war at sea, in the air, along the narrow riverways, and in the rice paddies and mountains. In contrast to those Americans who talk of peace, and man's right of self determination—these young men actually fight for these ideals.

Now, at this time, the enemy has three courses of action he can follow, in his war of conquest.

First, he can continue his current action: Quick hit and run raids and ambushes; and rocket and mortar attacks on American installations. These provide him no tactical advantage, and even though he loses a great many men in their application, he knows that every American casualty he causes—though far fewer in number than his own—creates another chink in the armor of American patience.

Politically coordinated with these attacks against American forces, are his indiscriminate rocket attacks on Vietnamese population centers. Again, no tactical advantage is gained by creating civilian casualties—but as the people rally to the government of the Republic of Vietnam, the rocket attacks are one of the few ways left to the enemy to create an atmosphere of terror. This is *his* war of attrition. He is willing to trade Viet

XUM

Cong and North Vietnamese lives for American patience, and South Vietnamese determination.

A second course of action that the enemy might elect, would be to launch his main force units in an all out effort—as he did in his Tet aggression of 1968. Since the defeat he suffered at that time, he has rebuilt his formations with new men—retrained them, re-equipped them, and at present they are in an attack posture. They are poised, they are ready, and they can be launched at any time.

As happened during Tet of 1968, such an enemy effort could only hope for limited, and temporary tactical success. But the ensuing campaign would be a bloody one. And again, his objective would not be terrain—it would be American patience and resolve.

The third course open to the enemy rests in Paris. He can actually start doing business at the peace table. He could sue for the best possible terms, and wait for another day. Another chance.

All of these possibilities depend on three considerations:

The enemy's determination in the face of his waning assets;

The progress of the government of the Republic of Vietnam, and its armed forces;

And, the determination and patience of the people right here, in the United States.

Now, that last consideration is the most dangerous ground the enemy walks on. Of all the ordnance in the American arsenal, the determination and patience of the American people—and their loyalty to allies—have always been their most potent weapons in the final achievement of victory. This has not changed. The people of this country *will* do the right thing. We *will* honor our commitment to the Republic of Vietnam.

But we are a free society. We question, we examine, we speak—and we dissent. That is our right. That is our strength. A totalitarian enemy can't understand this. There is nothing in his psychological makeup that will admit to individual thought, moral reflection, and questioning voices. This is the eternal flaw of tyranny.

And this brings us to the other theater of action of this war. The battlefield here, in this country.

I think objective historians of the future will have a difficult time summarizing *this* theater of action, and the motives of the participants. Because, at this time, the main point of contention is the one thing all Americans, everywhere, agree on—and desire above all else. An end to the war in Vietnam.

This war is now well into its fifth year. The battles being fought today are, more likely than not, being fought over the same ground as the battles of last year, and the year before. Americans grow weary of war. And not just this war, but the very idea of war, and the need to be prepared. Now, when reference is made to the anti-war sentiment in this country, it is a general statement, covering four entirely different groups:

There are those who oppose all war, regardless of purpose—on moral or religious grounds.

A second category includes the sincere watchdogs of our economy, who oppose big defense spending, and desire to divert the funds saved, to solving internal problems.

Yet another group is opposed only to our involvement in *this* war, in Vietnam.

And, a fourth group. A group of anti-government organizations who oppose our involvement in this war, only because they are in accord with the principles of the enemy. They employ some of the vocabulary of the pacifists in speaking of this war—but wave the flag of the Viet Cong, burn our own flag, practice violence, and preach their own war as a means to destroy our present society.

The first three groups are a traditional interchange of our free society. They disagree, and as Americans they practice dissent. It is this right *to* dissent that we fight to preserve. And it is because we believe in such a right that we must be prepared to fight other aggression.

The fourth group hides behind this right of dissent. Like our enemy in Vietnam, they fight a guerrilla war. They too have a freedom of movement, and the advantage of doing battle when and where they choose. Their sanctuary is the honesty, and integrity of the other three groups—and the knowledge that this is truly a free country.

Now they are on our college campuses. Now they have forced identification with today's generation. The same generation that serves so well in today's Navy and Marine Corps—and, indeed, in today's Army, Air Force, and Coast Guard. The young Americans who fight this war, who choose to serve this country at a time that service is not an expected act of conformity, but an individual act of faith.

How does the young veteran of Vietnam see his association with these people? How does he feel about being inducted into the "turned-on, dropped-out" set? Does he feel that all of his courage, and sacrifice, and faith has been in vain? If it has, ladies and gentlemen, then so too, has the service of all Americans who fought in the American revolution, and all other wars this country has had to fight in the defense of freedom.

You well know of the problems of the ROTC at some schools. I think you know too, of the problems faced by the Marine Corps and other services in recruiting young officers on college campuses. We have had no problems attracting young college graduates to the service as officers. Our problem has been getting on campus, and getting in touch with those who wish to serve.

At some schools our Marine recruiters have been confronted by radicals who resent—in fact reject—the presence of those who defend their freedom. And there are some college administrators who will not afford suitable space to conduct recruiting efforts. Other administrators have given in to militant demands, and ordered the recruiters from the campus.

Where did this generate? How did it start? Last year, the Students for a Democratic Society published an operation order. It is not secret, it was made abundantly available. The title of the plan is: "Smash the Military Machine in the Schools." Among its objectives it lists the destruction of ROTC, campus recruiting for the military and defense industries, and Government sponsored research. It further commands and explains: "It is necessary to make students fight the universities, not as students, but as radicals attacking American imperialism."

Is this dissent? Is this active pacifism? I think not. I think it is an effort to destroy this country's defense establishment. And the effort has had its influence, not only on some students and educators—but on other Americans, sincere, and respected.

This has hurt the Marine Corps. For a number of years we have depended upon recruiting on college campuses to provide nearly 85 percent of all new Marine officers. This gave us a valuable cross section of educated young Americans. Young leaders from every part of this Nation who brought with them fresh skills, and new ideas. Their influence was important not only to the young men they command, but to us, the senior career officers who command them.

Because of this continuing difficulty, the Marine Corps has opened a program to offer the opportunity of officer candidate school to young men who have completed two years of college—aiming primarily at those who have completed a junior college course.

But this does not mean the standards of junior officer leadership, and intelligence have been lowered. Nor does it mean the quality of officer training will be affected. And it has not meant an end to college graduates continuing to seek service as commissioned officers. Like the young Americans who willingly take their places in the enlisted ranks; these young men continue to offer their education, skills, and leadership.

Because of this situation, a new relationship has developed between young officers and their men. There is a silent equality they both acknowledge. Not a lack of discipline, but a warmth of understanding. An unspoken agreement of allegiance and service. And this is the stuff that has made this country.

When this nation was established, it was under an almost forgotten concept of ancient philosophy. The concept that a man owes his allegiance and service not to a sovereign, but to his country. And the sovereign owes his allegiance, and his service to the people. This is the American military tradition, too. We serve our country. We serve the people. We are *not* a cult-of-the-gun. We are citizens who, like all other citizens, demand citizen control of our defense. Our common defense.

In this country, there is a defense establishment, and there is a military industrial complex. That they exist is not as important as *why* they exist. All of the polemics, and turn-about adjectives of the anti-defense dialogue will not change the fact that other men, in other countries, still speak of face to face confrontation, and destruction of this country. And they do not speak of destruction of the rich, the middle class, or the poor. They do not say that they intend to destroy the American way of life. They speak of destruction of this country, this people.

That is why we exist. There is an enemy, and we exist for the defense against that enemy.

Because we tire of war, and the expense and burden of maintaining a strong defense, does not mean our enemies weaken, and wither away. We have had two wars since world war II. How many more have we averted? How many wars have *not* been fought because of our strength, our defense?

In the heart of this country is a small town. Its population rounds out to approximately 250 people—men, women, and children. This village has felt the war in Vietnam. Five of its young men have been killed in action. Not long ago the townspeople petitioned to stop any further drafting of young men from their town. They felt they had given enough. But what of the five who have died? Have they died in vain, now that their town withdraws from the war?

And again, what of all the young men who have given their service in this war? How do they see it? Do we leave them a country weakened in its defense because it grows weary of what it sees on television, and reads in the press?

They are Americans too. And they know this war, not from television, but from day to day dedication and sacrifice. How do they really feel about it? Ask one of the thirty-four thousand marines—young officers and enlisted marines—who have requested to serve an additional 6 months in Vietnam. Ask the young marine who constructed the sign I saw just outside his foxhole at Khe Sanh.

"For those who fight for it," the sign read, "Life has a special flavor the protected never know."

Well, to date, more than three million men have come from the war in Vietnam. Over three million young Americans who have fought in every branch of our armed forces in that war, and indeed know that very special flavor of life.

Except for the return of the 27th Marines to this city last summer, they have come home as they left. Quietly, in small groups, without fanfare, without ticker-tape parades, and without promises. And in the mad rush to ask the youth of today how they feel about everything—these three million young men

XUM

have somehow been overlooked. But they will not remain silent forever.

These young Americans are deeply proud of the service they have given. They believe in freedom for all men. They have proven that fact by fighting for it. They believe in freedom for themselves, too, but have remained quiet about it because it was an assumed right—to be preserved by their elders. But now they question the preservation of that freedom—and the more they question the more they find voice. In a recent letter to a weekly newsmagazine, a young American soldier expressed a growing feeling:

"Many of us here in Vietnam, have been following the stories about unrest on the Nation's campuses with subdued anger. It is demoralizing to read about our underprivileged counterparts vandalizing campus buildings, manhandling institution leaders, and generally making fools of themselves."

He goes on to say:

"Someday this war is going to be over, and millions of angry young men are going to descend on the 50 States with dreams of homes, and families, and education, and jobs. And when they hit the campuses, I sincerely hope someone tries to stop a marine from going to class, or that some sorry, social reject tries to plant a Viet Cong flag next to the artificial leg of a Seabee, or spits in the burned face of an Army medic. I guarantee that it will only happen once.

Do these fine American fighting men deserve a country in order?

Do they deserve a sound defense?

They do. They have payed for it richly.

And I believe that with their spirit, their patriotism, their energy—and with the backing of men and women like you, they will get the wonderful kind of country they deserve.

Thank you.

CRITICAL PROBLEMS CONFRONT OUR PRIVATE HOMEBUILDING INDUSTRY

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Nathaniel H. Rogg, executive vice president of the National Association of Home Builders, in his statement before the House Committee on Banking and Currency on the recent increase in the prime interest rate, reports that the private homebuilding industry is facing a fight for survival. Unfortunately, Mr. Rogg's analysis of this tragic situation is all too true. To all who are concerned with finding meaningful solutions to the critical problems confronting our private homebuilding industry I commend Mr. Rogg's most excellent statement, which follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. ROGG

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: My name is Nathaniel H. Rogg, and I am Executive Vice President of the National Association of Home Builders. Our Association represents a membership of over 51,000 builders and associates. We appreciate very much this opportunity to appear before you today to present our views on the recent increase in the prime interest rate to 8½%.

Gentlemen, the private home building industry is facing a fight for survival. We are told that if we wait two or three months things should get better. We are told that the Federal Reserve is giving some consideration to a program of voluntary credit restraint. We are told that the surtax extension and investment credit repeal will reduce inflation's flames to flickers.

In our opinion, we cannot wait longer. The prime lending rate of the private banks must be rolled back.

The Fed should immediately call on its member banks—as it did in the money crunch days of 1966—to slow their loans to business. The privilege of dealing at its discount window, and it is a privilege, not a right, should be re-emphasized.

We also urge that—

The Fed maintain its current rate on time deposits under Regulation Q, in order to forestall any further outflow of savings from savings and loans and mutual savings banks;

The FHA interest rate not be now raised until there is a clear demonstration of the absolute necessity to do so;

FNMA continue and expand its present level of support of federally backed mortgages;

Lending institutions voluntarily ration scarce credit resources to the end that home builders—as well as small business generally—be given an opportunity to continue operating and make their vitally needed contributions to the economic well-being of our nation. This we urge, not only for the small businessmen we represent, but especially for hard pressed American families seeking to buy or rent housing today and tomorrow;

The Fed be urged to purchase obligations of FNMA and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in order to support, at a reasonable rate, this essential component of housing financing;

Treasury and HUD take immediate steps to resolve their differences and make operational the authority for GNMA to guarantee mortgage-backed securities issued by FNMA and private mortgage holders;

Adequate funding at full authorized levels, be provided for the government-assisted housing programs, such as enacted in 1968;

Full use be made of available GNMA special assistance funds, possibly in conjunction with FNMA purchase, at the going market price, of mortgages acquired by GNMA at par.

These suggestions deal primarily with the immediate crisis. Beyond this, a much longer look and study should be undertaken. The history of recent economic activity indicates to us that much is wrong with the Nation's financial structure, its management, and its regulation.

Certainly the money crunch of 1966, as well as that of today, clearly indicates the present structure and the present regulatory system together are simply inadequate to meet the Nation's declared needs, particularly those of the housing sector.

The Nation's financial structure has evolved over many years. Its current form and regulatory system were established early in this century upon the heels of several monetary panics. It has been improved upon over the years and, certainly in the first two-thirds of this century, has made an enormous contribution to economic growth, though not in the housing field particularly. However, the system, as presently constituted is simply not geared to cope with recently emerging problems, and particularly those we will encounter in the last third of the century.

We therefore urge that a head-to-toe examination of the financial machinery and the regulatory system be begun immediately with a view toward making the system more responsive to the Nation's requirements. Unless this is done, we foresee continuing and intensified problems in satisfying our national aspirations.

But what the Nation needs now is a massive exercise in self-restraint, but this restraint should be more evenly applied, more equitably shared. The home building industry and home buyers seem to be the only ones being restrained, in fact, strangled.

We are now building housing at a rate lower than five years ago. Yet this is a time when—in relation to housing needs and goals—we should be producing at least 50 per cent above our current level.

The severe effects, felt by the home building industry in recent years as a result of the significant increases in interest rates, serve to spotlight the precarious situation it finds itself in relation to the economy as a whole. The least fluctuation severely affects our industry. It may be of some interest to the Committee to examine the chart attached to my statement which demonstrates the percentage of the gross national product that new residential construction has shared since 1915. This chart shows very vividly how our industry has not kept pace with the economy in recent years.

At the minimum, we believe that new residential construction should represent 4.5% of the gross national product. At present it is only 3.5%. Except for the severe credit shortage period experienced in 1966, this is the lowest since the Second World War. A 4.5% level would assure greater stability in times such as we are now experiencing.

Spiraling inflation, fed by record-high interest rates, is pricing a large segment of our population out of the market. This latest hike must be rolled back. And, on behalf of our industry, I so wired the President on the day following the first press stories on the increase.

Unless immediate steps are taken to counteract these rising interest rates, the cost of mortgage money soon will be so high that even middle income purchasers will not be able to afford to buy homes, nor will middle income renters be able to afford to pay the rents made necessary by these high interest rates.

Already the hopes of low and moderate income families to obtain decent housing have been cruelly crippled. It has become increasingly harder to obtain short-term construction money or long-term mortgage money at any rate.

This increase means further loss of manpower to our industry, already seeking desperately to preserve its skilled workers. It means less use of materials. It means fewer jobs in related industries. It means loss of revenues to local communities.

This present situation is especially galling for our industry because we have consistently backed measures in the Congress and the Executive Branch to curb inflation. Home builders have supported—and still support—proposed anti-inflationary measures such as continuation of the surtax, removal of the investment credit, and reduced Federal expenditures. We have supported such measures, knowing full well they will have an impact on our industry. But knowing, too, they are necessary to contain inflation if the overall economy is to survive.

By contrast, we think the banks' recent prime rate increase disregards the lending industry's social and economic responsibilities to the Nation. The banks say this recent increase, and perhaps even further increases, are essential in the fight against inflation. This is illusory. The constant increases in lending rates have only fed an inflationary psychology. Borrowers, especially big corporate businesses, fearing further increases have continued in competition with each other to get at all available funds.

There is simply no evidence in recent experience to support the view that ever higher interest rates hold back inflationary fires of the kind we are now experiencing. They have not cut back the demand for business loans, they have not lowered prices, they have not freed more money for social purposes. Nor will they. Rationing credit, as is now being done by ever-increasing interest rates, results merely in excluding the weaker competitors for scarce creditors and not the less meritorious borrowers. In short, it leaves no room for attention to using our credit resources for our Nation's needs.

Obviously, when it comes to competing for scarce funds, the home buying consumer is a much weaker competitor than are corporate giants, like General Motors. A statement in the June 20 issue of *Time Magazine* vividly illustrates what we are talking about:

"Big companies will be able to pay the new price of credit . . . mortgage rates immediately moved up to 9¼% in California and Colorado, and lenders in many cities raised the fees by which they increase their take from mortgage loans, without actually changing the interest rate. For the immediate future, the higher money rates will add to the upward pressure on prices. Companies figure interest charges as part of their cost of doing business, and the consumer must ultimately pay the bill."

An economic time bomb is ticking. High interest rates have so driven up yields on other obligations that commercial banks have suffered a net outflow of $600 million in savings during the first 5 months of this year as compared to a net inflow of $6.2 billion during the same period in 1968—a difference of nearly $7 billion.

Fortunately, and unlike the situation in 1966, the Federal Reserve Board has not increased maximum interest rates payable on time deposits; this has minimized a potentially significant and adverse effect on the savings inflow to savings and loans and mutual savings banks, thereby avoiding the disastrous results that occurred in the 1966 credit crunch. We welcome this and urge that it be continued, since such an action would only serve to unbalance the economy even more.

In urging a prime rate rollback, we believe that the full influence of the Congress, as well as of the Administration, must be brought to bear on the commercial banks. Such a rollback is necessary to stifle the call now being heard in some quarters for more direct Federal intervention in the allocation of economic resources. We, along with many others, abhor Federal controls. However, we also recognize that for the first time we are engaged in a major military undertaking without some type of controls on the use of credit and on prices and wages. It could well be argued, of course, that general monetary restraints of the kind we are now experiencing are actually a form of selective credit controls imposed on small businesses and the housing industry.

Certainly, of extreme importance now is quick passage of the tax legislation reported by the Ways and Means Committee last week. The continuation of the surtax, the repeal of the 7% investment credit, and a continued effort to hold down unnecessary Federal spending are essential in the fight against inflation.

We are prepared to shoulder burdens in the fight against inflation in order to preserve a healthy national economy. Others should shoulder their share.

RUSSIA BECKONS OLD BUDDY UNCLE SAM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recent gestures by the Russians indicating the desires to lure President Nixon to the summit and to obtain U.S. economic and political support must be analyzed in the light of results of previous dealings with the Soviets.

The Chicago Tribune's editorial commentary this morning discusses the possible Sino-Soviet split and the U.S. relation to it in a most practical fashion, as follows:

RUSSIA BECKONS OLD BUDDY UNCLE SAM

Frank Starr, our Moscow correspondent, has got within 30 miles of the troubled Sino-soviet frontier, where there have been recent exchanges of fire, and discovers that the Russians are counting every American to do his duty to the Soviet Union in the event of all-out war.

The Russians have a convenient memory, and they expect the same of us. They were happy to have lend-lease and the United States as an ally when they got embroiled with Hitler's Germany, but once the enemy was beaten soviet propaganda represented the "Great Patriotic war" as solely a Russian endeavor, with the United States deserving no credit.

Now that the pot gives signs of boiling over again, the Russians say that if there should be war with the Red Chinese it will be our war as well as theirs. Talking to people in Khabarovsk, in the soviet far east, Starr heard such sentiments as these:

"If there's a war, other countries like yours will not be able to ignore it. They'll have to join, and if they do that it will be a world war—the third. You have a responsibility to the well-being of mankind, because such a war would be a tragedy for all humanity."

But out of the same mouth came the usual soviet propaganda condemning the United States for intervening in Viet Nam, altho the reverse of that coin is that Washington could not stand aside and do nothing in a Chinese-Russian war.

Much the same line was enunciated by Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko in his speech last week to the supreme soviet, the hypothetical soviet national assembly. Gromyko said:

"The United States has been waging war against the Vietnamese people for five years now. By invading South Viet Nam with an army half a million strong and thus grossly violating the international Geneva agreements on Viet Nam, the United States acted as an aggressor.

"The Soviet Union is giving and will continue to give assistance to the fraternal Vietnamese people in their just struggle."

Gromyko proposed that American forces get out and accept a blow to prestige in the form of qualified surrender to communism.

On the other hand, he was solicitous that the United States show sympathy with the Soviet Union in its protracted dispute with communist China, and the warnings he addressed to Peking were couched in harsh language.

The experience of the United States in Franklin Roosevelt's crusade to make the world safe for communism certainly should give pause to any inclination to repeat the experiment, which 25 years ago led to the communization of eastern Europe and China.

As former President Herbert Hoover prophesied in 1941, "If we go further and join the war and we win, then we have won for Stalin the grip of communism on Russia and more opportunity for it to extend in the world." He said an alliance with the Kremlin tyranny would reduce Roosevelt's crusade for the "four freedoms" to a "gargantuan joke," and that America's interest was to let the totalitarians exhaust one another.

That is the policy that is in America's interest today.

BROOKVILLE RESERVOIR

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, economic progress in the predominantly rural, 16-county Ninth District of Indiana depends in no small part upon the control and conservation of the water resources of the area.

Through a series of reservoirs, watershed control programs, rural water and sewer lines, a new climate is being created in southeastern Indiana, one which is attractive to industry, which improves health and education standards, which brings about a better standard of living, and improves agricultural production.

I was dismayed to learn last week that the partially completed Brookville Reservoir on the East Fork of the Whitewater River was being made the victim of another construction delay—one of many recently.

I disagree with this thinking and I have stated my objections in the following letter to President Nixon:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., July 14, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT NIXON: I write to express my shock and dismay at learning the Brookville Reservoir project in Southeastern Indiana has been delayed again.

You dealt this project a crippling blow by reducing President Johnson's Brookville construction allocation for Fiscal Year 1970 from $3.9 million to $1.4 million. Your order for a further deferment of the work brings a new sense of frustration and uncertainty to the residents of the area.

I was assured only last month that advertisement for bids for the construction of a dam and spillway would be going out in mid-July. I am informed now, however, that advertisements have been deferred indefinitely.

I find it incredible that this partially-completed and critically-needed project has been delayed again in the name of economy. Allowing this reservoir to languish in its partially-complete state is not saving money, but creating a costlier project.

These continuing delays are permitting a deterioration of already-completed segments of the project . . . creating a personnel problem with the Corps of Engineers in retaining people familiar with the project . . . allowing rising construction costs to push higher the total project cost . . . discouraging public-minded citizens from participating in conservation projects . . . and permitting spring floods and summer droughts to continue to wreak the economic hardships on Hoosiers which this reservoir was designed to alleviate.

I know and appreciate the need for economy, but it becomes false economy to delay a partially-completed project, disrupting mail and school bus routes and farm-to-market roads; to move people off their land, then rent it back to them, and to create a sense of uncertainty which affects the economic climate of Southeastern Indiana.

I am informed that the Corps of Engineers became aware of the report on the Second Supplemental Bill, containing Congress' spending limitations on Friday, and

XUM

on this basis, ordered the delay. That legislation was passed by both Houses of the Congress on Wednesday.

I find the Corps of Engineers' reasoning unacceptable, and I find the continued delays in the name of economy unrealistic.

I urge you to order the immediate reinstatement of construction on the Brookville Reservoir project.

Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Member of Congress.

THE NEED TO INCREASE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CERTAIN STUDENT LOAN PROGRAMS

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the guaranteed student loan program, which was authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965, has met with severe setbacks and has to date been unable to meet its potential.

This program of low-interest insured loans to qualified college students is a commendable one. It was intended to assist middle- and low-income families in financing college educations for their children.

The loan program provides that all qualified students are eligible to receive insured low-interest loans regardless of family income, and that those students from families having an adjusted income of less than $15,000 would have all their interest paid by the Federal Government while they are in school and 3 percentage points of the 6-percent total during the repayment period which begins 9 months after the student leaves college or graduate school.

The loans may be made to students by banks and other lending institutions and insured by State loan guarantee authorities or by private nonprofit agencies. A Federal loan insurance program is authorized on a standby basis, if adequate State and private plans are not reasonably accessible to students. To date the Federal Government has not guaranteed any student loans.

The Federal Government advances money, known as "seed-money," to strengthen or to help establish State and private nonprofit agencies' insurance funds.

This loan program which got underway during the summer of 1966 has provided about $1.4 billion in loans to an estimated 1.6 million students—a praiseworthy achievement, but unfortunately not adequate to the student demand for these loans.

The average cost of attending a public college or university is estimated by the Office of Education at $1,122 an academic year—and for a private college or university at $2,389 a year. Many writers and economists have arrived at considerably higher estimates.

The latest estimates of the Bureau of Census put the median money income of American families with heads under 65 years at $7,974. Clearly those families with incomes of $7,974 or less would find it very difficult if not impossible to support one, let alone two or more children through college. Therefore it is imperative that we, in a nation that honors equality of educational opportunity as a basic principle of justice, aid those families who have present difficulties in sending their children through college.

It has been obvious for several years now that the problems besetting this program have resulted in a reluctance on the part of many private lenders to participate and a refusal of others to accept more than a very limited number of applications for insured loans to students.

Consequently many students have been unable to obtain these loans, and have been unable to continue their educations.

There are two main problems, Mr. Speaker, that have prevented this program from functioning fully. First, the banks and other lenders contend that the maximum interest rate of 6 percent does not cover the cost to the lenders in today's tight money market.

When this maximum interest rate was arrived at 4 years ago, it was considered a "break-even" rate for the lenders. The banks and other lending institutions insist that this was never a realistic appraisal, and 6 percent maximum has proved to be a "loss" rate for them.

Student loans are given for comparatively long terms. The loans do not contribute to bank liquidity through repayment of principle in the way that other loans, including installment loans, do. Repayment of principle on an installment loan—which is comparable to a student loan—begins within a month after credit has been extended, whereas repayment on student loans may not begin until at least 9 months after the borrower completes his course of study. Loans are repaid within 5 to 10 years after graduation. This creates a long time-lag in the "roll-over" time of this money.

This 6 percent interest maximum is 2.5 percent below the rate that many banks charge their prime business borrowers.

Second, there is a burdensome amount of paper work involved in making and processing these loans. Student loans, because of the extra paperwork and the extra time involved, cost more than most other types of loans.

These pressing problems must be remedied before the lenders will decide in favor of allocating their limited funds for student loans.

I will be introducing a bill to increase the effectiveness of the guaranteed student loan programs. This bill will amend provisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and of the National Vocational Loan Insurance Act of 1965 to encourage banks and other lenders to participate fully in this timely and much needed student loan program.

Since the main obstacles to the functioning of this program are the maximum interest rate allowable on loans and the cumbersome and costly paperwork involved in making these loans, my amendments concern themselves largely with these two areas.

My bill will permit the President of the United States, after consultation with the Federal Reserve Board, to set interest rates, by Executive order, in excess of 6 percent when the President has determined that such a rate is necessary for this program to be fully realized, and would provide for Federal payment of the additional interest cost.

I am aware of the fact that 11 States—Delaware, Maine, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia;have usury laws which set contract rates at a 6-percent maximum. These States could, however, amend their usury laws to make an exception of the long-term guaranteed student loans as many States now make other exceptions to their usury laws when it serves an important public purpose.

This interest rate, set by the President in an Executive order, will not be mandatory. A lending institution could charge less than the maximum. But this variable ceiling would prevent the establishment by the Federal Government of any arbitrary interest figure which might become a bar to the effectiveness of this program. It would enable the President to assure that, insofar as the Federal Government would be concerned, there would be no arbitrary barrier across the road of higher education.

I further propose that the private lenders will be entitled to charge certain fees to be set at an appropriate basis by the Secretary, to cover the costs of making these loans that are not adequately compensated for by allowable interest charges.

Private lenders would be permitted up to $35 for processing each approved student loan application and up to $35 for work involved in consolidation or other conversion fees when the repayment period begins. A servicing fee of up to $1 for each installment payable by the borrower will also be permitted. All processing, consolidation and other conversion fees will be paid for by the Federal Government.

The passage of these amendments will insure fulfillment of the great potential of the guaranteed student loan program by giving it a greater appeal to those lending institutions that have to date been reluctant to commit themselves to this program.

Today we are faced with the problem of ever-spiraling costs to the student and his family for attendance at an institution of higher learning. Over the past 10 years the cost of attending a public institution has risen 19 percent and there has been a 41-percent increase in private school costs.

If we are to make meaningful financial assistance to all students willing and able to benefit from a college education, then we must amend the guaranteed student loan program. This program is based on sound principles and with the adoption of my amendments it could make a major contribution to the financing of undergraduate, graduate, and vocational education for students of low-

and middle-income families. A democracy must invest in the education of all its young people if it is to flourish.

THE GREAT SHOE IMPORT THREAT

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak of an extremely serious situation, that of the potential disaster facing the American shoemaking industry. Foreign imports, cheap and of decent quality, are flooding the American market. If we do not act quickly, the damage may be irrevocable.

By all marketing indicators, shoemaking should be among the fastest growing American industries. Considering that U.S. footwear consumption has for many years amounted to approximately 3½ pairs per capita, then on the basis of our population increase alone the market should be growing by 10 million pairs annually. If this in itself were not sufficient, we must note that in the last 10 years we have seen the total integration of footwear into the current fashion outlook. And our booming economy has provided for even further growth.

Of course, I am really not contending that the market has not grown. It has grown considerably from sales of 740 million pairs in 1966 to over 830 million pairs in 1968, but domestic production has not grown at all. The entire net growth of 2 years, more than 90 million pairs of shoes, has gone to foreign imports.

In the "nonrubber" area, imports totaled approximately 34 million pairs in 1959. By 1967, they had climbed to 129 million pairs, and in 1968 they climbed another 35 percent. Overall imports constituted over 20 percent of domestic sales in 1968. Estimates for 1969 run up to 35 percent, with sales to date indicating that this figure is indeed attainable. It appears that by 1975, foreign manufacturers will have taken over at least 50 percent of the U.S. footwear market, and if present trends continue, the foreign share could be as great as a staggering 90 percent. From second-rate competition to dominance in 15 years.

The reason for these changes is not style, nor quality, nor product features. One cannot berate the foreign products; although they are no better than American footwear, they are equivalent in many cases. The great different is in price, and the great difference in price is in labor.

We all know that cheap foreign labor has been a problem for many American industries. In this case, average foreign rates are about 75 cents per hour, or roughly one-third of the present U.S. rate. In the shoemaking industry, this difference is of greater significance than is generally the case, since labor accounts for up to 35 percent of the cost of each unit. Further, because the industry is highly competitive, profit margins are very narrow.

The footwear producers of the United States are not asking for economic isolationism or latter-day protectionism. They are merely asking for a chance to compete fairly. Rather than assisting them positively, or even providing a stable situation, in the last few years we have permitted import duty reductions that have averaged out to about 30 percent. It seems to me that we have unfairly neglected these people, and unless something is done quickly we will witness the accelerating deterioration of a large American industry.

I have already joined over two-thirds of the Members of the House in petitioning President Nixon to negotiate voluntary limitations on shoe imports with those nations sending the bulk of the imported footwear to the United States. I think this is a healthy recognition of the problem at hand, but it is not enough. I take this opportunity to urge the Committee on Ways and Means to make an early and favorable report on H.R. 12466, my proposed Orderly Footwear and Marketing Act of 1969.

The act would provide for negotiated quotas on imports of footwear into the United States and will assure foreign manufacturers and domestic producers alike their fair shares of the expanding U.S. footwear market. Under this act, the President would be empowered to seek agreements with other nations limiting imports of footwear in any category to the average share of U.S. consumption in that category during a 3-year period before 1967. After 6 months, imports not covered by the agreement would be limited to the average amount brought in during the 1962–66 period. This quantity may each year thereafter increase up to 10 percent of U.S. market growth, and the President may adjust any nation's share of imports to accommodate changing economic patterns and developing countries.

I firmly believe that this is the best means of dealing with this astounding import deluge, and I urge committee action as soon as it has finished work on income tax reform, which is now occupying its working hours.

POPULATION GROWTH AND ITS CONSEQUENCES TO SOCIETY

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, this past week the House Republican Research Committee task force on earth resources and population, of which I am chairman, was honored to have Mr. Arthur A. Campbell and Dr. Norman A. Hilmar of the National Institutes of Health and Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, the Science Adviser to the President, testify before us on the question of population growth and its consequences to society.

All the testimony before us has emphasized again and again the need for immediate coordination of existing programs and expanded funding in this most crucial area. We have had studies in untold abundance—now we need positive action. In this light I was heartened by the comments of Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Robert H. Finch on CBS' "Face the Nation" Sunday afternoon when he stated:

> In an era when we had to cut back from many other areas, we made a quantum jump in our allocations for family planning, because we just simply have to come to grips with this. We're kidding ourselves if we think we can make changes in a creative way in these other areas if we're overpopulating ourselves.

In order to keep the Members informed of the progress of our work, I wish to include the highlights of these two meetings at this point in the RECORD:

HEARING HIGHLIGHTS

TUESDAY, JULY 8, 1969

National Institutes of Health: Mr. Arthur A. Campbell, Deputy Director, Center for Population Research; and Dr. Norman A. Hilmar, Chief, Program Liaison Branch, Center for Population Research.

Members present: Bush, Carter, Horton, McCloskey, Pettis.

The Center for Population Research has three major functions: first, it is the coordinating body for all population research presently being conducted by the federal government; second, it is responsible for conducting contract research programs; and third, it authorizes and oversees research grants. Mr. Campbell explained that the President's Health Message of March, 1968 gives the CPR the authority to assume this coordinating function.

For fiscal 1969, the NICHD budget totals over $10 million, of which $8.2 million has been designated for research contracts and grants. In addition, NICHD has received $1.5 million from AID for specific research.

Within NICHD the research priorities are determined by the members of the Population Research Advisory Committee. The members of this committee are trained experts and paid by NICHD as population consultants.

Mr. Campbell explained that the CPR projects must be viewed within the context of various national cultural patterns. For instance, a single injection which would protect women for as long as a year and would eliminate human oversight would be a more satisfactory control method. Mr. Campbell admitted that to be realistic, such a project will need 5–10 years of development.

The CPR feels it must continue to deal with basic research which pertains primarily to reproductive processes, and leave the research of product development and distribution to the private sector as well as to the other offices of NICHD.

Mr. Campbell explained the need for complete national statistics studies. The National Center for Health Statistics was refused funds in 1967 and 1968 by the House Appropriations Committee to complete the type of family survey NICHD feels is essential.

THURSDAY, JULY 10, 1969

Office of Science and Technology: Dr. Lee A DuBridge, Director, OST; Dr. John Buckley, Technical Assistant, OST; Dr. Eric B. Ward, Executive Secretary, Federal Council on Science and Technology; and Dr. Donald R. King, Technical Assistant, OST.

Members present: Bush, Gubser, Horton, McCloskey, MacGregor, Mosher, Pettis, Vander Jagt, Schneebeli.

Dr. DuBridge indicated that the White House is deeply interested in exploring prob-

XUM

lems relating to our environment and our growing population. The OST has recently added five staff members to assist the members of the newly-formed Environmental Quality Council.

According to Dr. King, our population growth has only recently been recognized as an official problem, and therefore, the research data available is inadequate.

Dr. DuBridge claimed that OST, in its workings of the past 2 years, has encountered little or no resistance to family planning programs in this country.

An ad hoc task force has evaluated all the research activities within the federal government and will complete their report to Dr. DuBridge shortly.

Dr. DuBridge explained that the ocean does provide some new areas of food production, but warned that the ocean must not be viewed as the single solution to our food shortage problems. Fish protein concentrate is as nutritious as other protein fortified foods but more expensive to produce than either fortified peanuts or soy beans. Dr. DuBridge did point out however, that extracting minerals from the sea is both feasible and profitable. By improving our mining technology, we should be able to tap the wealth from the ocean's bottom.

In order to bring about better coordination in NASA's Earth Resource Satellite Program Dr. DuBridge explained that the President has established a space task group since the Departments of Agriculture and Interior are extremely interested in using ERS data.

Dr. DuBridge explained some of the conflicting environmental viewpoints on types of power centers. Air pollution is reduced by the smokeless atomic energy plants, but public fear of radioactive contamination is high. Both fossil fuel plants and atomic plants necessarily discharge "waste heat," but at the present scale, fossil fuel plants have proven to be more efficient in terms of a power-waste heat ratio.

STUDENT VIEWS AS WRITTEN BY STUDENTS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share some observations about the campus world of today as they are expressed by three college students who were recognized as youth leaders when they were students at Goodrich Senior High School in Fond du Lac, Wis.

Each of the writers is a former national winner of the Elks Youth Leadership award. Mark G. Petri was awarded first place in the national Elks contest in 1965. David J. Kuter placed second in the same contest 2 years later, and Diane Hull won third place nationally just a year ago.

Their letters are written in reply to Attorney Thomas L. Massey, who serves as chairman of the very successful youth activities committee of the Elks in Fond du Lac. I believe that the letters are perceptive and very instructive about the feelings of many students today. With appreciation for their work, and for Mr. Massey's encouragement, I am pleased to insert these letters in the RECORD at this point:

HARVARD COLLEGE,
Cambridge, Mass., May 1, 1969.

Mr. THOMAS L. MASSEY,
Chairman, Youth Activities Committee, Fond du Lac, Wis.

DEAR MR. MASSEY: Thank you for writing me about the 1969 Elks Youth Activities Banquet. I am most happy to relate some of my activities since I received the Elks Award four years ago and to make some more general comments as well.

I am now completing my senior year at Harvard College, where I have majored in Social Studies, an honors field of concentration including work in Economics, History, Government, and Social Relations. In addition to normal school work, I have been active as a cabinet member and executive committee member of the Phillips Brooks House Association, Harvard's largest undergraduate organization. P.B.H.A., as it is commonly known, has about 1000 volunteers in 15 different programs doing social service work in the Boston area, in Africa, and on American Indian Reservations.

Over the past two summers I have worked as a part of Senator William Proxmire's Washington Senate staff and as Harvard Professor Edward C. Banfield's research assistant for a new (and still unpublished) book on urban problems. Both experiences were rewarding and exciting, allowing me to confront important issues and meet interesting people.

This summer I will begin three years as a Navy Supply Officer, after which I hope to reapply to Harvard Law School (I was admitted for next year, but will have to reapply later because of my Navy obligation). After completing my education I hope to return to Fond du Lac to live, as it compares favorably with the bigness and hurry of the East Coast.

As for advice and encouragement for this year's Elks winners, I suspect they need little of it. Colleges and their futures in general are all exciting enough, rewarding enough, and busy enough to be their own sales pitches for continued activity; and the former activities of the winners suggest that they are likely to take full advantage of such opportunities.

If there is any "trick" in creating a better future through our activities, I feel it is probably combining change and progressive action with a respect for what we have already achieved. Throughout the political agenda of the moment—whether the issue is the war in Vietnam or the recent student unrests that so personally and painfully disrupted my Harvard life—there seems to be a growing awareness of what is *not* wanted without much awarness of what *is* wanted or of what we already have and can too easily risk.

The example of this tendency now on my mind is the occupation of Harvard's main administration building three weeks ago. Not only was this action a frontal assault on the integrity of this university—that would have been serious enough—but it was also an assault without positive goals: there was much talk of tearing aspects of the university apart and all too little of building it into a better place. When constructive talk did finally begin, it was *not* led (or at any rate not meaningfully led) by the original disrupters. In the immediate disorder and confusion slogans were abundant, but real thought about real problems was rare indeed. In the process the virtues and wisdom of a laboriously constructed, but always fragile freedom so vital to a free university—and to a free society—almost became lost.

Writing from that context of disorder, I congratulate the current winners of the Elks Awards because I sense that they have learned the "trick" of working toward positive reform and meaningful action without resorting to obstructionism or disorder. It is a talent all too rare and therefore all the more valuable.

Sincerely,

MARK G. PETRI.

HARVARD COLLEGE,
Cambridge, Mass., May 3, 1969.

Mr. THOMAS L. MASSEY,
Chairman, Youth Activities Committee, Elks Lodge No. 57, Fond du Lac, Wis.

DEAR MR. MASSEY: I most sincerely regret that I could not personally be with you this evening but let me use this letter as an opportunity to convey some of my thoughts and sentiments to you.

I should first like to congratulate all the students the Elks are honoring tonight and especially Julia Becker on her selection for first place in the Youth Leadership Contest. The dedication and effort that these awards represent is indeed outstanding.

It has been almost two years since I left Fond du Lac to attend Harvard and in that time I have encountered many new ideas, people, and experiences. I have uncovered in myself a distinct pleasure in learning and thus my studies, which are mostly biochemistry and history, have taken a great deal of my time. I still intend to go to medical school.

Aside from the always present school work, I had the opportunity last year to help teach second grade in a school for deprived children from the poor sections of Boston. This was indeed a most trying, if not at times shocking experience.

This year my major activity has been to operate a chemistry laboratory for the Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston along with several other students from Harvard and M.I.T. Aside from that, I have been preparing for what I hope to be a most fruitful summer. I have been given a summer research grant by the National Institutes of Health to do some original research on several topics that I have long contemplated at the McArdle Laboratory for Cancer Research at the University of Wisconsin.

As you can well see, my activities have been basically academic these past few years but it has afforded me with a great opportunity to learn and reflect upon subjects both scientific and political. It has been a time of reevaluation and discovery; something which I feel is essential for anyone concerned with the problems of our society.

I feel virtually compelled to consider and relate some of my thoughts on something which has indeed troubled me as well, I imagine, as it has concerned you. The student demonstrations and strikes of this spring have again focused attention on the role of students, of youth in general, in our social structure. Personally I can neither condemn nor praise our actions; I can merely attempt to reflect on the motives for such actions.

The youth of today is in a unique situation, unlike that at any other time in history. We are encouraged to learn and study society most of our young lives—to think on our own and formulate ideals. I think that in many ways this has led to a very moralistic outlook on life; that is also the impression I have gotten from talking to people during our strike here at Harvard. The issues are old ones such as housing and race relations both of which have bothered our society for generations. But today's youth approach these issues from the purest moral sense and when it comes to action, then, it is moralism that dictates action. This is laudable in one sense but yet dangerous in another; for effective social change cannot be had with only a moral dream; dreams too often fade or are distorted.

I feel that the youth of today should by all means act upon their moral convictions but act not from an astigmatic moralism of self-right; rather from a more far-ranged awareness which stems from a personal compassion and understanding of our social problems as well as a true comprehension of the practical problems any reform entails.

It is for the Elks Youth award winners as well as all other youth to search for a direction in society, to dream and to study, and then to act in concert to renovate old institutions as well as build new ones.

It is on this rather optimistic note that I shall close this letter and again send my congratulations to this year's Elks youth winners.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID J. KUTER.

MAY 5, 1969.

DEAR MR. MASSEY: Thank you for your letter. It was a pleasure to hear from you. As you know, I am a second quarter political science major at UCLA and finding it quite an experience. Apart from the fact that studying is suddenly a predominate activity in my life, I have had so many rewarding experiences in the past eight months that I consider myself an extremely lucky girl. I've always tried to take advantage of every opportunity afforded me and in an attempt to carry out this desire, I've found life, thus far, a series of challenges and adventures. My hope is that the eagerness I've felt has, in some way, influenced those I've come in contact with.

Last year, I had an inkling of the characteristics that might describe today's generation—once at UCLA, many of those inklings turned into realities. I've found here a conscientious group of young adults concerned with the problems and shortcomings of our society. Not only concerned, but anxious to change existing shortcomings. Although there is a minority on campuses throughout the country that insist on change outside of existing procedures and rely on violence to achieve their aims, it is my experience, thus far, that the majority of young people see change possible only within the limits of reason and order. However, when goals remain stagnant through this method, many, along with myself, feel stronger measures are necessary. This isn't saying that we condone riots and violence for violence sake, but it does mean that we prefer purposeful activity to apathy.

May I congratulate all those young people present at the Youth Activities Banquet. Each has a right to be proud of his achievements, for hopefully, these young adults represent the core of leadership to come in America. I've always felt that these types of honors also carry with them a responsibility—a responsibility to remain conscientious and active as adults—to remain informed concerning the vital issues facing our community and nation, so that they may continue to "lead" and make intelligent decisions as citizens. I have great confidence in this generation, and it is indeed a tribute to the Elks that they encourage and recognize active young participants and leaders in our communities.

Yours truly,

DIANNE HULL.

REPORT ISSUED ON MARINE MAMMALS ON SAN MIGUEL ISLAND

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of the tragic Santa Barbara oil spill, there has been considerable exaggeration and misrepresentation of the detrimental effects of this spillage on the animal life of the channel area. The following reports from the Department of the Interior and the Navy put the damage to wildlife into clearer perspective, and I would like to take this opportunity to share this material with my House colleagues:

REPORT ISSUED ON MARINE MAMMALS ON SAN MIGUEL ISLAND

A report covering the status of marine mammals on San Miguel Island, California, relating to the oil spill in the Santa Barbara Channel, was released by the Department of the Interior today.

The report concluded there was no evidence that deaths of seals or sea lions on the Island could be attributed to oil pollution.

Laboratory tests and autopsies conducted this spring showed that there was no petroleum residue in the tissues of either living or dead animals.

"Analyses of distressed elephant seals and sea lions were conducted by government and independent scientists," the report said. "Aborted sea lion fetuses, typical of those seen during the period, were analyzed and no petroleum residue was found in the fetuses. Dead elephant seals and sea lions were autopsied and the results indicated that oil had not been responsible for the deaths. Blood samples from live elephant seals showed no evidence of petroleum."

The report pointed out that "there is each year a natural die-off in the rookery areas. Natural deaths during this period occur principally from abortions, physical injuries and other causes.

"There were no more aborted sea lion fetuses on the island this year than in previous years when there was no evidence of oil."

Field reports incorporating scientific testing and surveys were begun by the Department when the first information was received last March that oil had washed ashore on a portion of San Miguel, a marine wildlife refuge.

"No new oil has appeared since the March 19 date on any beaches on San Miguel," the report said.

Full text of the report is attached.

SAN MIGUEL ISLAND: MARINE MAMMALS AS RELATED TO OIL SPILL IN SANTA BARBARA CHANNEL

Considerable interest has been expressed in the marine mammals of San Miguel Island, California, as related to the oil spill in Santa Barbara Channel. This paper has been prepared to present factual information on the subject.

GENERAL COMMENTS

The original and only oil to appear on the island this Spring washed ashore on or about March 19, 1969. Four stretches of beach, totalling approximately one-sixth of a mile, or ½ of one percent of the total shoreline, were affected by the oil. All of these areas were located on the extreme western tip of the island. The largest area affected was inhabited by only about 200 elephant seals during March and April; and by about 200 sea lions and elephant seals during May and June. There were, by comparison, thousands of sea lions and elephant seals on beaches on the south side of San Miguel Island during these same times—beaches that were completely unaffected by any oil. No new oil has appeared since the March 19 date on any beaches on San Miguel.

HERD LOCATIONS

Nearly all of the marine mammals are on the south side and west end of the island near Point Bennett. Here the island has low sandy beaches with some rocky points on the south side and steep boulder beaches on the west and north. California sea lions use all of the western end of the island. Steller sea lions are on rocky beaches or offshore rocks. Northern fur seals are on the sand beach of Adams Cove. Elephant seals also use all of the western end of the island. Harbor seals are few and scattered. The southern fur seal is only an occasional visitor.

Population estimates	Adult	Pups
California sea lions	15,000 to 20,000	2,000 to 3,000 (approximate).
Steller sea lions	100 or less	Not known to breed here.
Elephant seals (northern).	5,000	2,200 to 2,300 (1969).
Southern fur seal	Few	
Northern fur seal	100	40 (1968).
Harbor seal	100 or less	

Pupping and nursing periods	Pupping	Nursing
California sea lions	June	Up to 1 year.
Steller sea lions	May–June	Do.
Elephant seals (northern)	January	1 month.
Northern fur seals	June–July	5 months.
Harbor seals	April–May	1 month.

EFFECTS OF OIL ON MARINE MAMMALS

Adults

In the case of those mammals such as harbor seals, elephant seals, and sea lions, which rely on their heavy layer of blubber for insulation, the presence of oil in the hair would be less serious than in the case of the fur seals, which rely primarily on a heavy underfur for insulation. In the latter case, substantial amounts of oil presumably would result in the loss of the insulating ability of the underfur.

In the case of all these species, there is a likelihood that a heavy coating of oil could cause irritation to external surfaces of the mammals. Oil ingested through the animals' efforts to clean their bodies would also probably be detrimental.

Pups

The pups undoubtedly are more susceptible to damage from oil than are the adult animals because initially they have neither the protection of heavy layers of blubber nor heavy underfur. It is also possible that ingestion of oil could result from nursing.

It has been suggested that since close-range identification of pups by females is dependent on odor, the presence of oil on the pups would prevent the mothers from identifying the young or perhaps would cause the mothers to shun the young. We have no evidence that this is so.

Mortality

There is each year a natural die-off in the rookery areas. Natural deaths occur from abortions, physical injuries, and other causes.

Among the California sea lions there has been observed a substantial mortality from premature births, on the order of several hundred per year. In considering mortalities in 1969, it is necessary to take into account this factor in attempting to judge the effect of the oil. There were no more aborted sea lion fetuses on the Island this year than in previous years when there was no evidence of oil. Analyses of distressed elephant seals and sea lions were conducted by government and independent scientists. Aborted sea lion fetuses, typical of those seen during the period, were analyzed and no petroleum residue was found in the fetuses. Dead elephant seals and sea lions were autopsied and the results indicated that oil had not been responsible for the deaths. Blood samples from live elephant seals showed no evidence of petroleum.

POTENTIAL FOR CLEANUP AND CONTROL

Marine mammals

Assuming it was necessary, it would be unrealistic to attempt to clean the relatively

XUM

few mammals observed with oil on them or transfer them to other areas. In either instance, the disturbance to the rookeries and mammals would likely be more damaging than the oil. Human activity near the rookeries on the island causes adults to stampede, and pups are crushed. Cleaning compounds also could be more of an irritant than the oil. The rookeries are located in an isolated area, with difficult access, which would compound the problem of avoiding damage to the mammals and the rookery structure.

It has been suggested that pups could be transported to other areas and reared artificially. We know of no reason to move them. Moreover, little success has been achieved in rearing these species artificially. We are unaware of any efforts of this kind with elephant seals; only limited success has been achieved after rather extensive efforts to develop artificial methods for feeding Steller sea lion and fur seal pups. To our knowledge, no California sea lion pups have been reared artificially.

On the basis of evidence obtained thus far, it appears that the oil has not depressed the food supply available to the marine mammals of this area.

CONTINUING OBSERVATION

The Department is maintaining a daily monitoring on the condition of marine mammals on San Miguel Island.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Point Mugu, Calif., June 13, 1969.

EDITOR,
Life Magazine,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR EDITOR: Your article "Iridescent Gift of Death" in the June 13 issue of Life Magazine is completely contrary to the expert opinion of qualified scientists, including a group which visited San Miguel Island at the request of Senator Alan Cranston and whose findings were published in the April 25, 1969 issue of the Congressional Record.

A team headed by Dr. James L. Naviaux, Director of the National Wildlife Health Foundation, and including Mr. Mel Morse, president of the Humane Society of the U.S., Dr. John Simpson, a veterinarian specializing in marine animals, and Vern Appling, Chief Ranger for the Channel Islands National Monument, visited the island on Wednesday, April 16.

"I was delighted with his finding that the marine mammals he inspected on San Miguel showed no signs of injury from oil pollution," Senator Cranston states in the Record.

The Congressional Record report by Dr. Naviaux goes on to state that the party found only one elephant seal which appeared clinically sick, and that he had many small bite wounds and an injured cornea. He was treated and released.

None of the elephant seals which had oil on their bodies showed any signs of distress, the experts attested. "No sick or dying animals were found except the one noted . . ."

The report also noted that none of the fifteen or so adult dead elephant seals were fresh carcasses. A large number (75–100) of aborted fetuses were verified by Mr. Appling as having occurred also in earlier years.

In the conclusion of the report Dr. Naviaux states that "there is no evidence that any of the wildlife on San Miguel Island are showing harmful effects from the crude oil at this time."

The conclusions of this investigating party are concurred in by Dr. Simpson, who has visited San Miguel repeatedly over the past two and a half months for the express purpose of removing suffering elephant seals, if any, and treating them. He has found none requiring treatment. In addition, Dr. Simpson has conducted autopsies and ordered biopsies on all fresh carcasses found on the island. In no case have petroleum products been found in the systems of these dead elephant seals.

It is also important to note that only 150 yards of San Miguel's 34-mile coastline are affected by the oil slick.

The National Park Service has also sent marine biologists to the island who have confirmed the findings mentioned above. The Pacific Missile Range, which administers the island of San Miguel for the Navy, has cooperated fully with the National Park Service in the protection, treatment and study of marine mammals there. The Range has also cooperated in flying to the island in the company of experts all news media desiring to cover the story.

Had your reporter visited San Miguel under authorized procedures and in the company of Park Service and Navy marine biologists and veterinarians you would have had the benefit of their opinion and scientific knowledge in the preparation of your story.

I hope that you will make the information contained in this letter available to your readers so that they may consider the merits of this rebuttal.

Sincerely,
PHILIP C. RUSSELL,
Head, Public Information Division.

CLINTON M. HESTER

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD an article about a distinguished American and a friend of my family since my boyhood. Mr. Clinton M. Hester, an outstanding member of the bar for over 50 years, has had a long and outstanding career in public service, culminating in his position as chairman of the executive committee of the James Madison Memorial Commission.

The article from the Phillips Exeter Academy Bulletin follows:

CLINTON M. HESTER

When Clinton M. Hester arrived at Exeter from Missoula, Mont., in September 1915 with $25.00 in his pocket, he was carrying a letter from Assistant Principal Robinson, stating that inasmuch as Clint's parents were deceased, and seemingly no extra monies were available, it would be impossible for him to work his way through Exeter. The Assistant Principal was so amazed and startled at Clint's determination, as well as the distance he had traveled from home, that he allowed him to enter the Academy. Once at Exeter Clint never lacked for sufficient employment to enable him to stay there.

The impetus of his Exeter education, together with Army service overseas in 1917, prompted him to go to night school, obtaining an A.B., from George Washington Univ. and an L.L.B. from Georgetown, paying for his tuition and living expenses by working as a structural iron worker during the day. After a few years in private practice, he worked for sixteen years in various departments of the Federal Government. President Roosevelt appointed him as administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, now the F.A.A., and he became a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, now renamed the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. While Administrator of the C.A.A., Clint made the pioneering survey flights for passenger service across the South Pacific and the Atlantic Oceans in the original Boeing Clippers, and he was responsible for the supervision and the building of the Washington National Airport. Clint believes that his appointment from President Roosevelt was the result of his assignment to draft the original bill for the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

On the basis of his administrative experience and his fine liaison with congressional members, President Eisenhower appointed him chairman of the executive committee of the James Madison Memorial Commission. After four years of persuasion and lobbying, Congress enacted the resolution in 1967 authorizing $75,000,000 for the Madison Memorial Library.

Clint's dedicated services to the government and to our nation have been particularly effective and we congratulate him on behalf of our Class for a splendid career and for his accomplishments. He has now settled down to a private law practice, one of his clients being the National Football League. When he can get away from Washington, he goes to his extensive farm in Hot Springs, Va., where he has re-created a bit of Western living, hunting deer and bear, and trout fishing in delightful mountain streams.

DR. SHELLEY MARK OF HAWAII: URBAN-RURAL BALANCE ESSENTIAL

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the prevalence of so much anxiety and frustration amidst our unprecedented affluence has called into question our basic concerns for the essential dignity and destiny of man. Our present social crisis, as well as our increasing awareness of the squandering of our vital natural resources, has certainly helped us to face up to our past failure to plan for change. It is significant to note, however, that the increasing awareness of the need for better planning has tended to focus on "urban planning" and to obscure what former Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has termed the "rural-urban balance." This broader aspect of planning formed the subject matter of a penetrating address delivered at the farewell banquet held recently in Honolulu for the National Association of Farm Broadcasters. The speaker was Dr. Shelley M. Mark, the very able and distinguished director of the Department of Planning and Economic Development of the State of Hawaii.

In addressing himself to the possible consequences of a disruption of the "rural-urban balance," Dr. Mark asserted:

> Once the green dollar replaces the green field, then we can look only to a dismal future indeed.

He explained that in the process of finding a rational basis for orderly urban growth we have frequently failed to preserve our prime agricultural lands. Our failure to do so in the past has contributed heavily to our present, and ever-developing, "national crisis of environment."

In sustaining our faith in good long-range planning Dr. Mark said:

Trends are not destinies, for the essence of planning is the changing of bad trends to good trends.

If we indeed have hope of achieving a better tomorrow, and not the awesome specter of George Orwell's "big brother" society, immediate efforts must be made to head off our rising "rural-urban" crisis.

In the belief that my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will find Dr. Mark's address thought-provoking, I am pleased to submit it for inclusion in the RECORD:

MAINTAINING THE RURAL-URBAN BALANCE

(Address by Shelley M. Mark)

There are some important concerns facing our Islands and our nation today which call for the most serious attention and study. These are indicated as a new national administration seeks to establish new directions and new priorities amidst a set of age-old problems. We have seen its persistent attempts to extricate this nation from the Vietnam conflict in the face of military, political, and diplomatic realities. We are witnessing attempts to head off inflation in the face of a brewing taxpayers' revolt, interest rates at an all-time high, and the danger of recession in the offing. We have seen attempts to face up to our urban crisis falter in the face of determined political opposition to some who possess the wherewithal for coping with it. And we are witnessing the continued rise of consumer prices with a continued decline in the farmer's share.

It is not my purpose this evening to dwell on all these concerns. We can only wish the President and his advisors well in their valiant efforts. In fact, it may be presumptuous, in these beautiful surroundings before such a joyous occasion, to speak of problems that may seem thousands of miles and eons of time away.

But from our island community, the newest of the 50 states, located in the midst of the Pacific Ocean, with the inter-action of many races and cultures, seeking to attain common goals and solve common problems—I think there is much to be learned, much that is applicable to our broader national concerns. Then too, because we are new, small, and relatively isolated, we in Hawaii are dependent on the nation's strength, prosperity, and well being. With your kind indulgence this evening, I would propose to initiate some dialogue on a matter of some common concern—the problem of maintaining what Secretary Freeman and others have called the rural-urban balance.

I'm sure you have seen, during your brief visit and on your various field trips, much of our agriculture. As you know, it is primarily sugar and pineapple production. These have been our basic agricultural crops for many years. They represent two of the most scientifically produced and processed crops in the nation. In recent years, sugar and pineapple production records have been set, and profits have been high. At the same time, Hawaii's agricultural workers are the highest paid in the United States. We have, through years of experience, found that when an enlightened agribusiness management provides to its unionized employees, through honest and realistic collective bargaining, fair wages, excellent fringe benefits, good working hours and conditions and a variety of incentives, the entire industry and the State's economy prosper. Hawaii—like California—has had her farm labor troubles, and we learned the hard way—through violence and death in the early years of agricultural and unionization—that unless employees have decent working conditions and some hope of sharing in the affluence of others around them, there can be no peace in the fields. We hope this lesson is not lost on those in California and other States where farm unionization is a relatively new problem.

And yet our agricultural situation is not without paradox. Here in Hawaii we have two of the most vibrant and progressive agricultural industries anywhere today. Our sugar accounts for 12 per cent of the U.S. market, and our pineapple still takes 40 per cent of the world market. We lead in research and development and productivity increase, our workers are the highest paid, and our technology is sought after and emulated everywhere. Yet the most many hope for in sugar and pineapple is the status quo! And the worst that some expect is that their days are numbered.

Here in Hawaii we have year-around crop-raising potentials, fertile soils, generations of agricultural skills, advanced research and methods.

Last year the value of marketings of our diversified crops was more than $13 million, and of our livestock products, more than $37 million. We sold more than $6 million worth of vegetables and melons, more than $1.5 million in coffee parchment, about $3 million in fruits, and half a million dollars worth of taro, which is the root from which poi is made.

We have witnessed some breakthrough in such specialty areas as papaya, macadamia nuts, and floral products. But we are nowhere near the massive breakthrough in diversified agriculture that will establish us as world leaders in specialty crop production or enable us to meet a larger percentage of our domestic consumption requirements. Instead our farmers are beset with problems familiar to all of you of uncertain land tenure, limited credit availability, increasing competition for workers, and most importantly perhaps—lack of clear guidelines for future goals, objectives, plans and programs.

Here in Hawaii we have the spectre of large land-owners marking time—waiting for agricultural leases to expire so that the lands can be put to what they consider their "highest and best use". We have corporate management torn between traditional experience with productive agriculture enterprise and the new gold that glitters from potential resort development and suburban subdivisions. We have labor unions, whose strength has been derived from organizing plantation workers, now jockeying to organize expected hordes of hotel and resort workers. I daresay these are not uncommon occurrences throughout the rural communities of our nation. Yet paradoxically, all over the world, there seems to be a resurgence and the new message of our times is the same: Agriculture and aqua-culture can feed the world, and the essential dignity of man, hidden under the grime and dust of poverty, can shine forth as agricultural science is developed and expanded and improved in all parts of the globe.

Recently a study of future land use in Hawaii was prepared for a group of local land owners and developers. The press reports told everyone that in land-hungry Hawaii, some 35,000 additional acres will be needed for urban expansion, and that these acres must come from existing prime agricultural land, since agriculture is on its way out anyway.

If, indeed, agriculture is on its way out, it is only because we have shoved it out the door by bowing to the "inexorable laws of economics" and the relentless pressures to grab agricultural land from productive farmers. By yielding to the prophets of gloom and doom, we may be contributing to maximum economic returns, but at the same time upsetting irretrievably the delicate urban-rural balance necessary for our total well-being in the long-term.

Once the urban-rural balance is upset—once our green farms, long rows of crops, orchards, pastures, and forests are given over to the men who want fast profit now, when there are other lands available for urbanization—once the green dollar replaces the green field, then we can look only to a dismal future indeed.

Indeed, common sense tells us that once our environment of beauty—of agricultural activities properly balanced with commercial and industrial enterprises—is destroyed, then our tourism industry will be destroyed, and the whole economic structure will decay and collapse. We cannot live just for today.

Certainly you members of the Farm Broadcasters Association of America keenly understand this principle of urban-rural balance. You know it is a vast problem; it is a problem which defies rational solution, yet upon its solution may depend the very life of our land in the next generation or two.

You have seen that for many decades, Americans by the millions have been moving from rural regions to urban and metropolitan areas, causing, on the one hand, a great waste of valuable natural and human resources, and on the other hand, a steadily increasing pressure of congestion, unemployment, and poverty in the cities.

Former Secretary Orville Freeman has described the problem in rather dramatic fashion (and I quote): "In the short period since World War II, our population has grown by 55 million—37 per cent. The value of goods and services we produce each year has increased from $280 billion to more than $800 billion. Three million farms have disappeared in a technological revolution that is still sweeping through agriculture. More than 20 million persons have abandoned the farms and small towns for the city. One-third of the population has left the city for the suburbs."

Our nation has consistently measured "progress" in gross national product and by the indices of economics. It has not yet developed an annual "social report" which measures the heartaches resulting from—or at least coinciding with—material affluence. Mr. Freeman reminds us that "many Americans fear we may have lost our way. The fact that 20 million Americans live in poverty stares us in the face . . . modern communications media drum it into our senses . . . The crisis of our environment also burdens our conscience . . . Our pangs of conscience as a nation bite deep because we know it need not have happened this way . . ."

Thus, we seem to have a crisis of human frustrations—our productive efficiency and technological progress permit us to have all the material affluence we desire; our social conscience persistently asked: why and for what purpose?

I suggest there is still another, related type of balance which is upset when cities grow to giant proportions and our agricultural and rural areas become deserted. It is the balance between man and his environment, the so-called ecological balance . . . the mysterious and often hidden balance which keeps life-forces operating in a relationship which the Creator established and which Nature governs. The eminent microbiologist Rene Dubos says that "Human beings can become adapted to almost anything—polluted air, treeless avenues, the rat-race of over-competitive societies. But in one way or another, we have to pay later for the adjustments we make to undesirable conditions."

It is becoming more and more obvious that the food, energy, resources, and technology which are required for the nourishment of our bodies and the operation of our industries, are not all that matters. Just as important is an *environment* in which it is possible to satisfy the longing for quiet, privacy, initiative and open space. In Dubos' words: "These are not frills or luxuries, but constitute real biological necessities."

It follows, therefore, that there can be no basis for orderly growth in human society without a fundamental knowledge of man and his environment. This knowledge must

XUM

be profound if we are to progress. We must understand the principles of heredity and biology as well as economics and engineering. You must remember—like it or not—that the Cro-Magnon man, who lived more than 25,000 years ago, was essentially the same as modern man, mentally as well as biologically. In theory, we could take a Cro-Magnon baby and with a modern fostermother, a diaper, a crib, an elementary school and a college of general studies, fit the Cro-Magnon man into this gathering today as a farm broadcaster and no one would be the wiser.

Certainly we can expect that as we transform green fields and hillsides into concrete highways and subdivisions, as we convert open areas into high-rise apartments, and as we infest the atmosphere with man-made pollutants, the carefully nurtured natural balance between man and his environment will be upset. And with this growing imbalance, his ability to deal effectively in all aspects of his worldly relationships will deteriorate.

Ecological balance, like urban-rural balance, is essential to man. It answers his spiritual needs as well as serving his biological and sociological well-being. And to understand it, we need to study the nature of man.

My purpose and certainly my competence is not to try to solve these intricate problems of balance this evening, but mainly to point up their significance and suggest how we in Hawaii have regarded them. From our vantage point, it is heartening and refreshing to observe that the spirit of the nation always seems to improve once a nagging, serious problem is defined and clarified, and its dimensions made known. "Time to go to work," we then say. And I believe our nation is now at a point where it begins to see the dimensions of the rural-urban imbalance problem clearly, and is ready to go to work to solve it.

Again I exhort you to carry this message nation-wide. Perhaps your Silver Anniversary Convention visit to Hawaii will give you the special *"Handle"* or "angle" you need to spark additional discussions and conferences on this problem. Tell the folks at home that we in Hawaii are joined in spirit and action with all who love the rural life, the green and fresh environment, the environment of beauty and cleanliness which refreshes body and spirit.

Hawaii is a new State. We have had the privilege of studying the histories of our older Sisters in the East and our not-so-old Sisters in the West, and learning much from them. We have had for many years a much smaller, yet parallel, rural-urban problem. and we have been able to do something about it through law and through administrative methods which we believe are both advanced and feasible.

You have seen Waikiki. You may have been a bit disappointed that it is so crowded with high-rise buildings. But have you seen our Neighbor Islands? They are relatively unspoiled.

For many years, our Neighbor Islands lost population because agriculture became more mechanized, the technological and social revolutions following World War II enticed our young people away from the rural areas, and there was little on the Neighbor Islands on which a young family could plan for a decent and dependable future. Today, due to this migration and to a great influx from the Mainland, our capital city of Honolulu is suffering from too-fast growing pains.

With a keen appreciation of the over-all problem, our State Legislatures and the State administration have, in the first Decade of our Statehood, put into effect a unique State Land Use Law. One of its chief purposes is the preservation of rural, conservation and agricultural lands against the pressures of uncontrolled urban growth. We saw long ago that if Hawaii permitted its towns and cities and suburban housing areas to grow willy-nilly into rural and agricultural areas, the best farm lands and agricultural districts would soon disappear. The beautiful Hawaii we knew would have been ruined. We therefore passed the State Land Use Law—the only such State zoning law in the nation—to prevent this imbalance from occurring. This year we are reviewing the first five years of that law, seeking to profit from our past mistakes and strengthen our capabilities for planning into the future. We have not preserved all of our prime agricultural lands in the process, but have provided a rational bases for orderly urban growth.

By another means—the judicious use of the State's Capital Improvements Program, we attempted to halt this trend—which had continued for many past decades—of population movement from the Neighbor Islands to Honolulu. We have encouraged the development of well-planned tourism and other facilities on the Neighbor Islands, and have backed up private enterprise with Government-financed roads, sewers, water systems, airports, harbors, and other basic facilities.

I believe the key to our future urban-rural balance must be good long-range planning. It is worthwhile here to note again Secretary Freeman's comments in the Minnesota Law Review. He wrote: "We have failed to plan for change—to develop public and private institutions and attitudes that would shape and control the technological revolution to serve the needs of society. The result has been a national crisis of environment . . ."

Hawaii saw its own problems in this light and has tried, through its planning processes, to do precisely what Mr. Freeman says the nation has failed to do. We have sought to encourage citizen participation in our planning process. We have had citizen groups on every Island, from every community, meeting regularly to develop and refine the State's planning goals. These have now been published as part of our official planning documents.

And it is noteworthy that our citizens regard the preservation and enhancement of a beautiful environment as one of the fundamentals on which our orderly growth and prosperous development depend. Our citizens have also clearly stated that they want Hawaii's natural resources preserved; they want a stronger agricultural economy; and they want agricultural lands preserved from urban encroachment.

Trends are not destinies. The essence of planning is the changing of bad trends to good trends. If the trend toward chipping away at and chopping up our agricultural lands is clearly evident, then it deserves to be changed. And through our State planning efforts, we try to do just that.

In scores of ways—by legislation, by a very close cooperation of government and private sector, by State Administration action, by the remarkably sophisticated efforts of a great number of private agencies and institutions—Hawaii is seeking to head off its own urban-rural crisis now. We hope to joyously celebrate our Silver Jubilee of Statehood in 1984, rather than gloomily exist in George Orwell's "Big Brother" society. We hope to have a State with agriculture and other industries well balanced on all Islands, a State with clean air, pure waters and a lot less noise, a State where cultural pursuits are found closely related to family farm and small business activities; a State which is a model of racial and economic harmony, visited by millions from East and West; a State where the Aloha Spirit remains as the guide for our relationships with these visitors; a State where poverty is outlawed; where crime is diminished by the environment of good will and prosperity, and where a cheerful, happy citizenry find delight in fruitful work on farms, at home, in clean industrial plants and on scientific campuses from seashore to the snow-covered peak of Mauna Kea.

May I suggest that you plan your next summer convention here in George Orwell's 1984—if not sooner. We can then sit down in comfortable chairs and see how our younger generation is doing with the foundation blocks we prepared for them.

I thank you.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE HOME ON YOUTH

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, each year the Masonic Grand Lodge of the State of New York conducts an annual essay contest. Mr. Donald Freund, an outstanding civic and community leader, is a member of the Grand Lodge Youth Committee.

At his request I would like to set forth for the Record the five winning essays. I think my colleagues will enjoy reading them as I did.

The texts of the winning essays follow:

The Influence of the Home on Youth

(By Jo-Ann H. Nelson)

Many teenagers today have lost the feelings of love and understanding between their parents and themselves; therefore, they cannot bear to wait for the time of departure. But my life has changed from the above feelings to ones I am about to describe, over a period of two years.

Being very unfortunate in my younger childhood years, I was confronted with problems of having a motherless home, whereas I accepted and assumed responsibilities to make disciplinary decisions that affected me the rest of my life. Within two years I lost my grandfather and my father. These were most unforgettable experiences that I have had which has made a more promising and realizing person out of myself.

The most unregrettable decision of my life was made in July 1966, when I was accepted and recognized into the home where my brother had been staying.

My first year in my new home was most promising and hardest to readjust my trends and thoughts of life.

My foster parents taught me to realize the value of life—how to face facts, to be realistic by representing myself as a true individual of monetary value and to bear everyday burdens of life. I also was able to tell the truth and firmly stand behind anything said without someone's doubt. Through telling the truth, my trend of thinking was changed and I was restored to what was right and what was wrong to do in life.

These, of course, are just a few examples of how my home has influenced me. Now, I feel that if there was just a little more construction of feelings for caring and understanding in the home, there wouldn't be flower children or hippies, who turn to love or drugs for an answer to finding a feeling of happiness. But, if these individuals had happiness restored to them as I did in October 1968, coming legally adopted, this world would have a much brighter possibility of happiness.

The Influence of the Home on Youth

(By Bonnie E. McGuire)

The other day I rode through a neighboring town when the school day was just ending. As the students were coming from the building, I watched certain cliques form and others disband. Without much trouble, I could choose which group composed itself of athletes, hot rod owners, studious girls, non-conformists, best-dressed and proud-of-it members, boy-crazy girls, and girl-crazy boys.

From my own experiences I realized that neither money nor brains had been the predominant basis for these classifications, but rather, each student's interests and attitudes had attracted him toward one group or another.

Since each conclusion stimulates more thoughtful questions, I asked myself, "How does a person decide which attitudes toward life he will adopt, and how does one know which interests he should pursue?"

The overwhelming influence of the home on the lives of its youths is what causes certain attitudes to develop and which fosters certain interests to grow. In the course of each youth's preparation for adulthood, these two factors are reflected in every decision and in every action. When a child chooses a drawing set in preference to a dump truck, he does so because his family has favored similar interests. The family's concept of enjoyment determines the child's reaction to the different types of indoor and outdoor recreation. If the family encourages the child in school, this interest reflects the degree of the family's respect for education. When a child observes his parents' continued effort to improve their standard of living, he will take pride in exploring the opportunities available to him.

Finally, the most important influence which the home can exercise over the lives of its youths involves the transmission of civic responsibility from one generation to the next. When a child is taught the value of his family's loyal participation in the various affairs of the community, he has learned the essence of being a good citizen.

Each home is a master die. Cast there are the patterns of our future society.

THE INFLUENCE OF HOME LIFE ON YOUTH

(By Sarah Jordan Rood)

The home life of a young person is perhaps the largest factor in shaping that person as an individual. At home a young person learns, as soon as he is able, to take on responsibility. He is taught manners, and he develops a sense of morals. In short, home life develops the personality of a young person.

Undoubtedly, home is the first place where a young person develops a sense of responsibility. He is taught as a child to pick up his toys and to put them away. As he grows older he is given his share of the household duties, perhaps washing the dishes or making beds or cutting grass. As he gets older he learns to take care of his own needs as well. A well-developed sense of responsibility is essential in a young person if he is to succeed at all. He must not only know how to take care of himself, but he must also be willing and able to take on responsibility—in a job or in college or in whatever he decides to do.

Young people also learn manners at home. Depending on his home life, a young person will be a dependable, courteous individual—or he will be lacking in these traits. He learns how to act in the company of others, how to do what is expected of him. This quality is also essential in a person who wishes to be successful in any way. He learns how to get along with others without offending them, and he will be able to hold his own in almost any situation.

Perhaps most important of all, home life helps a young person develop a sense of morals. From the moment a child is aware of what goes on around him he begins developing a sense of values; most of this development takes place in the home. A young person gleans from the behavior of those around him what he thinks is acceptable and important. Children imitate their elders and will follow the example set in the home by parents or other members of the family. For a young person to develop a good sense of morals is essential. His sense of what is right or wrong will stay with him always, and it will set his pattern of behavior when he ventures into society. His behavior and attitude in school, with his friends, and eventually in a job, will be determined by his sense of values or morals.

Home life has a tremendous influence on a young person and will have a large effect on what he does with his life. Whether or not he develops a sense of responsibility, good manners, and a good sense of values or morals will determine his behavior as a citizen of the United States.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE HOME ON YOUTH

(By Richard Allan Harris)

In order for any institution to survive, it must be flexible. As times and man's knowledge change, so must a particular institution, for if it stagnates, it doesn't keep up with man's wants and needs. Therefore, man will abandon it for another institution that does. However, if it remodels its make-up, its influence can remain strong. This is exemplified by many well known institutions, among them the United States Constitution. This document is as much an integral part of American life in 1969 as it was in 1869. The reason for this is, when the founding fathers composed the Constitution, they made sure that it was flexible enough to weather the tempest of history. They assured this through the amendment process and the elastic clause.

But, the Constitution is a rather lofty example. Perhaps an example more pertinent to everyday existence is the home. Home is an especially good example because this particular institution is in the throes of revolution. The flexibility of the home is being tested by the youth of America. These young iconoclasts feel that the home has lost pace with world progress, so they are looking to other institutions to fulfill their needs. They feel that homes are hypocritical in that their homes preach peace, yet condone war. Therefore, they created their own institution: hippie society. However, I think that they have a misconception in that they think home is the epitome of perfection. It is not. Homes are composed of humans, and humans have flaws—thus homes do. This leads me to conclude that the hypocrisy the hippies detest so heartily will be found in any institution. Furthermore, I feel that homes are flexible to a certain extent for a similar reason. They are composed of people, and since people change with the times so do homes. The hippies are dissatisfied with home, yet the vast majority of my contemporaries that I have come in contact with are influenced for the better by that "hackneyed institution". I believe that the political and social views of the home have changed over the years. Therefore the influence of the home is not the same as ever, yet it is as great as ever. In 1909, the home impressed certain mores and values upon the youth. In 1969, it impresses more modern mores and values upon the youth. Yet its influence has not diminished. In fact, even the hippies are influenced by the home. Even though it is a negative influence, it is nonetheless an influence. Fortunately, most of the influence of the home is good. True enough, it is sometimes hypocritical, yet what institution isn't? That is the nature of man.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE HOME ON YOUTH

(By James Howard Kaye)

A child is born into the world. Will he find his way? . . . Will all of his God-given talents find fulfillment in the years ahead? The answer rests, in large measure, with the home into which he is born.

In today's world, the process of becoming a responsible adult is a complicated one. Great academic and social pressures characterize our society and the young person is constantly faced with the questions, Who am I? . . . What do I stand for? . . . Where am I going? . . . The child's concepts of himself, his feelings of satisfaction and adequacy, his developing notions of decency in human behavior are all related directly to the lessons he has learned as a family member.

Personal values are literally shaped at home. Ideals of manliness and proper masculine behavior are exemplified through the behavior of the father; a child views all women as he observes his mother. Parents are truly the child's first and most important teachers.

The newborn are innocent, unknowing. Yet, why does our world so often speak of hatred and injustice? Why the upsurge in juvenile anti-social acts? A child is not disposed toward delinquent conduct at birth; bigotry is an unknown element in the behavior of the infant. Since early associations are limited mainly to the home, the opportunities are plentiful for the adults within this first small world of the young to open the door to prejudice and distrust. Before long, the willing, searching little student learns the lesson.

Those of us who have matured as members of united, loving families have, indeed, received a priceless gift. The rules and regulations of human conduct which structured our early years . . . and against which we often rebelled . . . now, suddenly, assume new meaning. We find that, when we are now faced with stresses and temptations, the road to follow is clearly marked, for we have been shown the route to proper behavior. It has been a guidepost during those formative years within the family fold; it has been a way of life.

The Bible recognizes the role of home and family as supportive influences in the lives of the young. The inspiring words in the Book of Deuteronomy, Chapter VI, verses 6–9, proclaim:

"And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart."

"And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down and when thou risest up."

"And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes."

"And thou shalt write them upon the posts of thy house, and on thy gates."

With these words as a source of strength, parents can assume the divine responsibility of forging the way to a better tomorrow . . . through the hearts and minds of their children.

THIEU AND DZU

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, time and again I have called to my colleagues' attention the failure of the South Vietnamese Government to protect the rights of free speech and fair trial in the case of Truong Dinh Dzu.

Mr. Dzu, who ran second to President Thieu in the 1967 elections, remains imprisoned although he was never accorded an open, civilian trial. The entire Dzu incident raises serious questions about the willingness of the South Vietnamese Government to adhere to the basic principles of a free society; the very princi-

XUM

ples, I might add, that we are supposed to be protecting in Vietnam.

Yesterday Newsday, a respected daily newspaper, carried a relevant editorial on the Dzu affair and, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include that editorial in the RECORD at this point:

THIEU AND DZU

In March of this year, Newsday columnist Clayton Fritchey wrote: "Which is the real Thieu—the one who now swears he wants to negotiate with the enemy, or the one who some months ago arrested his non-Communist political rival, Truong Dinh Dzu, and had a military court send him to prison for five years at hard labor on charges of advocating peace talks with the Viet Cong?"

Last week Thieu said the Viet Cong can participate in the future elections in the country and promised "there will be no reprisals or discrimination after the elections . . ."

He might be a bit more convincing if Dzu were released.

TLINGIT AND HAIDA INDIANS

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to provide for the disposition of certain funds awarded to the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska by a judgment entered by the Court of Claims against the United States.

This legislation will enable the Tlingit and Haida Indians to receive that money which they have been awarded by the U.S. Government following the litigation and a current determination in their favor.

In 1968 the Tlingit and Haida Indians recovered a judgment against the United States in the gross amount of $7,546,053.80. The case was prosecuted in the court of claims under the act of June 19, 1935 (49 Stat. 388), as amended, and funds to pay the judgment were appropriated by the act of July 9, 1968 (82 Stat. 307). After payment of attorney fees and after reserve for expert witness fees and other expenses of the litigation, the net amount available to the Tlingit and Haida was approximately $6.7 million.

At the present time, the Tlingit and Haida have funds, in an amount in excess of $6,500,000 invested in various U.S. Government securities and other obligations unconditionally guaranteed by the United States. There are also balances of Tlingit and Haida funds on deposit in accounts in the U.S. Treasury. The estimate currently is taking account of accrued interest earnings; the Tlingit and Haida funds currently exceed $7 million.

The funds are presently subject to section 8 of the act of June 19, 1935, supra, as amended by the act of August 19, 1965 (79 Stat. 543).

In part, section 8 provides:

The amount of the appropriation made to pay any judgment in favor of said Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska, and such funds shall bear interest at the rate of 4 per centum per annum. Such funds including the interest thereon shall not be available for advances, except for such amounts as may be necessary to pay attorney fees, expenses of litigation, organizational, operating and administrative expenses of program planning, until after legislation has been enacted that sets forth the purposes for which such funds shall be used. The Council is authorized to prepare plans for the use of said funds, and to exercise such further powers with respect to the advance, expenditure, and distribution of said funds as may be authorized by Congress.

The Program Planning Committee of the Central Council of the Tlingit and Haida Indians proposed plans for the use of the judgment funds in November 1968, which plans were approved by the executive committee. The program committee reviewed and supplemented the plans during the meeting of the central council held at Sitka in April of this year. As revised the plans were approved by the central council—Resolution No. 68–69 C.C.–1.

STOP THE MIRV

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, newspapers last week carried reports of yet another in the series of tests being conducted by this country of multiple, independently targetable reentry vehicles. In view of the hearings currently underway before the Subcommittee on National Security and Scientific Developments of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the announcement that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will begin similar hearings this week, the Members of the House and other readers of the RECORD may find the following advertisement, which appeared in a number of leading newspapers across the country, timely and interesting.

The Institute for Human Values is an organization composed of a small number of rather ordinary citizens who are devoting a considerable portion of their personal earnings to furthering world peace. The proposal contained in this statement was formulated by Dr. Richard Rodgers, president of the Institute for Human Values, in consultation with the Division of Peace of the United Methodist Boards of Christian Social Concerns.

The advertisement follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 8, 1969]

STOP THE MIRV

Mr. President please use the "hot line" to Moscow to stop the MIRV.

Say to Mr. Kosygin, "The U.S. is today suspending the testing of MIRV. The suspension will remain in effect for six months. During that time, let's work out an agreement to end MIRV testing permanently."

Tell Mr. Kosygin he must of course realize that the continued U.S. suspension of MIRV testing will be possible only if Russia also refrains from testing missiles able to strike multiple targets.

Would the U.S. lose anything at all if you should do this? No. The U.S. is already so far ahead of Russia in the development of MIRV that Russia could not possibly catch up in six months' time.

What would the U.S. gain? Much, very much.

1. The gratitude of a humanity spared the new escalation of terror that MIRV would bring as it multiplies the number of poised nuclear warheads, a number great enough now to destroy both nations several times over.

2. The preserving of the present opportunity to reach an arms agreement with inspection acceptable to both sides.

3. The ultimate saving of perhaps as much as twenty billion dollars in arms spending. Billions to help rebuild our inner cities. Billions to improve the quality of American life.

Mr. President, our plea is echoed by some of the most responsible voices in American journalism, such as the Wall Street Journal (June 18), the Milwaukee Journal (June 12), the Boston Globe (June 9), the Minneapolis Star (June 13), the Washington Post (June 12) and the New York Times (June 20).

The New York Times writes:

Mr. Nixon and MIRV. No decision Richard Nixon will face as President is likely to be more momentous than the decision he faces within the next few days on the proposal to suspend the flight-testing of MIRV multiple-warhead missiles. Mr. Nixon yesterday described this proposal as "constructive" and said he would favor it if the Soviet Union would agree to do the same. But his attack on a "unilateral" suspension (of tests only the United States is now conducting) and his statement that this move must be part of an arms control agreement (which may take years to negotiate) confuse the issue.

Immediate suspension of MIRV tests is essential to keep the door open for a strategic arms agreement with the Soviet Union that would freeze the existing nuclear balance, head off further escalation of the missile race and assure security to both sides. *Continued testing for even a few weeks threatens to take the world past a point of no return into an expensive and dangerous new round in the missile race,* it promises a five-fold multiplication of nuclear delivery vehicles in the American strategic missile forces—from 1,700 to about 8,000, an expansion that the Soviet Union would doubtless match. Even if limits on Soviet and American missile strength were later to be set at these higher levels, an era of nuclear nervousness would be almost sure to replace the present situation of stable mutual deterrence.

The bipartisan resolution introduced this week by Senator Brooke of Massachusetts and 40 other Senators urging the President to seek an immediate moratorium with the Soviet Union indicates a growing realization in Congress that MIRV testing is now the main governor on the arms race. It is more urgent than the issues that have dominated the missile debate in recent months, such as the Safeguard anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system, or the Soviet offensive SS–9 missiles and defensive ABM deployments.

These systems can be fully discussed in the approaching strategic arms talks with the Soviet Union. They take years to build and there is time to negotiate cut-offs long before their expansion will significantly affect the nuclear balance. Moreover, they can be monitored easily by reconnaissance satellite without on-site inspection. MIRV is a wholly different matter.

The United States already has staged fourteen full-systems flight tests of silo-based Minuteman III and submarine-launched Poseidon missiles carrying from three to twelve MIRV warheads. The first two of 31 Polaris submarines to be refitted at great expense for the big, MIRV-tipped Poseidon missiles already have gone into drydock for that purpose.

The Johnson Administration proceeded on schedule with MIRV flight-tests last August after advice from the Joint Chiefs of Staff that two years would be required to test to operational confidence. Within two months, it was thought, missile talks with the Soviet Union would be under way to halt MIRV and other aspects of the arms race. But the Soviet-American talks were delayed three months by Czechoslovakia, then another seven months so far by the determination of the Nixon Administration to re-examine the strategic balance and the American negotiating positon at leisure.

Meanwhile the American MIRV tests have moved much faster than the Pentagon originally indicated and operational confidence may now be reached in a matter of weeks, if the tests continue—a year ahead of schedule. *Continuation of the testing this summer thus threatens to carry the world irrevocably into the MIRV era. MIRV can only be headed off in the test stage,* since tests can be detected with relative assurance. Once deployed, MIRV can only be detected by on-site inspection more intrusive than even the United States, not to mention the Soviet Union, would be likely to accept Satellite cameras cannot tell whether a missile is carrying one or ten warheads.

The American national interest lies overwhelmingly in heading off Soviet MIRV tests before they begin or, at least, before they get very far. *The best way to achieve that would be suspension of American tests so long as the Soviet Union refrains from testing as well. An alternative would be an immediate approach to Moscow for a jointly announced test moratorium now. Postponement* of this approach until the overall strategic arms talks begin in August—or, worse, until agreement is reached there—*would risk the true security interests of the United States and the world.* (Emphasis added.)

Mr. President, in the name of humanity, please act! now . . . before the opportunity is irretrievably lost.

This same message has appeared in major papers in Detroit, Pittsburgh, Norfolk (Va.), Nashville, Charlotte, Albuquerque, New Orleans, Seattle, Boise, Miami, Tampa, Jacksonville, Palm Beach, Fort Lauderdale, Orlando, Tallahassee, Gainesville and St. Petersburg.

Institute for Human Values, Dr. Richard Rodgers, President, 3014 Estrella, Tampa, Florida 33609.

PROGRESS OF LUNAR ROVER DEVELOPMENT

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following news release from NASA:

Progress of Lunar Rover Development

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala., has been authorized to release a request for proposal for the development of a small, manned lunar roving vehicle. The RFP to be released to industry today will include the design, development, test and delivery of four flight models.

The new lunar rover is to be ready for flight to the Moon in 1971. It is to be delivered to the lunar surface by a manned Apollo lunar module.

The lunar rover vehicle—much smaller than an automobile—will have four wheels and will weigh about 400 pounds. It will provide lunar surface transportation for two astronauts and their hand tools, collected lunar samples and other equipment and experiments.

The 1971 delivery date is compatible with planned improvements to the Apollo lunar module, command module and astronaut life support equipment. The vehicle will increase the scope of lunar exploration by conserving time of the astronauts, thus providing a greater scientific return for each mission.

MSFC has been conducting research and planning toward a lunar roving vehicle since 1964.

MRS. POST WOWS AID

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, a colleague recently stated that if you really want to know what is going on in Washington, read the women's pages of the Washington newspapers. I did not take him too seriously until I read Betty Beale's column in the July 2 Washington Star, discussing a cookie recipe of Mrs. Marjorie Post, the General Foods heiress, in which one of the ingredients is fish protein concentrate—FPC.

Our Government has been working for some time to develop a suitable flour product from processing fish which would provide as much protein as fresh fish but would require none of the refrigeration. This would enable countries like India, where 250,000 tons of sardines dried up on the beaches last year, to process these fish into an equally nutritious but more stable food product.

As chairman of the Republican task force on earth resources and population, I have been concerned about various methods of feeding the growing number of hungry throughout the world. FPC is one of those promising possibilities, but gaining industry interest and achieving public acceptance has been one of the problems associated with its use.

If a social leader like Mrs. Post is willing to promote the utilization of FPC, it is possible that this important drawback can be overcome. According to Miss Beale:

> The War on Hunger Office was beside itself with joy. Not only did the inclusion of FPC in "delicious cookies" prove that it has no fish taste or smell, but its enjoyment by one of the country's richest women certainly removed the stigma it has had as a poverty food.

Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of Miss Beale's column on FPC in the Record:

Mrs. Post Wows AID

(By Betty Beale)

AID is ecstatic—and for good reason.

The Agency for International Development has—out of the blue—won the backing for a lowly regarded product from one of the most famous and richest hostesses in America.

Marjorie Post, General Foods heiress, read an article about fish protein concentrate (FPC) in the magazine Sea Frontiers and was fascinated by it. She promptly communicated with the editor to find out where she could acquire some FPC, and the editor referred her to AID, which had submitted the story.

Enchanted with her action, the AID sent a cup of the FPC out to MP by taxi. In no time at all, Mrs. Post wrote a letter to Jerry Rosenthal of the Office of War on Hunger telling him that she had promptly had the concentrate included in a recipe for cookies, that she had been eating them for two days, and they were "perfectly delicious."

The War on Hunger Office was beside itself with joy. Not only did the inclusion of FPC in "delicious cookies" prove that it has no fish taste or smell, but its enjoyment by one of the country's richest women certainly removed the stigma it has had as a poverty food. It instantly requested her recipie for the FPC cookies. Here it is:

Cream ½ cup margarine and ¼ cup sugar. Blend 1 egg into the mixture. In another bowl mix together 1 teaspoon of baking powder and 1 cup of flour from which a tablespoon of flour has been substituted by a tablespoon of the fish powder.

Add dry ingredients to creamed ingredients to form a batter. Drop ½ tablespoon of batter at a time onto a cookie sheet. Bake at 350 degrees for 8 to 10 minutes.

There you have the most modern cookies in the country. If you have any doubts as to their beneficial value you should know that ⅓ of an ounce of FPC per day added to an infant's diet provides normal mental as well as physical growth.

Hoping it's not too late, this columnist is going to start eating them right way.

330TH BASE POST OFFICE UNIT RECEIVES COMMENDATION

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the 330th Base Post Office unit (Ty B) (SRF II) of Pittsburgh, Pa., has been commended by the senior officer of the Military Mail Terminal, San Francisco, for its exemplary work in carrying out postal assignments.

The postal service is often the only link that our servicemen have with their families and friends. Thus few things are more important to the GI than prompt delivery of his mail.

It is therefore heartening to know that a military group from my congressional district has been cited for excellence in this task.

At this point, I would like to introduce the remarks of the facility commander, Lt. Comdr. Ferguson to the men of the 330th Base Post Office unit:

Department of the Army, Headquarters, U.S. Army Military Mail Terminal,
San Francisco, Calif., July 2, 1968.

Subject: Letter of Appreciation.

Commanding Officer,
330th Base Post Office (Ty B) (SRF II), U.S. Army Reserve Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.

1. The 330th Base Post Office (Ty B) (SRF II), Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, performed ANACDUTRA at the US Army Military Mail Terminal, San Francisco, California, 23 June through 6 July 1968.

2. Projects assigned to the unit were performed and completed in a superior manner. The leadership displayed by the unit's officers

XUM

and the morale and esprit de corps with which this leadership was received by unit personnel was very exemplary. The unit displayed a high degree of efficiency and initiative in accomplishing not only their postal duties but also their military assignments. It was extremely rewarding to coordinate the various postal activities with a unit with the integrity and aggressiveness possessed by the 330th Base Post Office. The US Army Reserve is indeed fortunate to have this unit in its organization and should be justifiably proud.

3. I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation to the officers and personnel of the 330th Base Post Office for a superior performance.

R. J. FERGUSON.

GUIDELINE BLITZKRIEG

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, because most Americans have lived their lives in freedom, such expressions as "escape," or "forced to comply by every device we have," or "bondage," would seem to be referring to life in Russia, or Red China, or elsewhere under tyranny.

It comes as a great shock to citizens of these United States to hear high-ranking Federal appointees, supposedly the servants and not the masters of the people, complain of the "escape" of white students to Catholic schools in the State of Connecticut. Why should a schoolchild in this country wish to "escape" from his bureaucratically balanced classroom?

Free Americans receive another jolt when they hear their Attorney General callously dispose of parents who are trying desperately to preserve their public schools from the certain destruction of his unlawful edicts by the authoritarian pronouncement:

> They are going to be forced to comply by every device we have.

Such a barefaced threat from Mr. Mitchell places him openly in the company of his infamous predecessors—Brownell, Rogers, Kennedy, Katzenbach, and Clark—all of whom perverted the law and abused the power of the Department of Justice for their own political advantage.

Doubting Thomases who cannot see the assault on freedom until their own freedom is lost might well consider carefully all of the implications of the threat of unlimited force to accomplish an unlawful end. Remember that the law of the land, enacted by this Congress, specifically declares that desegregation does not mean racial balance. Remember also that only a few short years ago the "force" used by this same Department of Justice included Federal troops deployed against Americans in their own homes.

Or consider the statement attributed to HEW Secretary Finch, another unelected lord of our lives, that in denying freedom of choice and enforcing an arbitrary bureaucratic fiat:

> We are moving in a more constructive direction.

Such sick reasoning leads to his interesting conclusion that the President who appointed him is not in "bondage" or otherwise responsible to the people who elected him.

Those who are realistic enough to recognize tyranny when they see it stalking the land cannot understand why this is taking place in America. The answer is simply that those in power are determined to remain in power "by every device we have," and to block the "escape" of any American foolish enough to believe that his Government is his servant, not his master. Again, the loyal, hardworking, taxpaying American suffers—and his children with him.

Mr. Speaker, I include several news clippings:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 9, 1969]

EIGHTH LEGAL ACTION IN WEEK ON DESEGREGATION READIED

(By Lyle Denniston)

The Nixon administration today readied another legal action—the eighth this week—to challenge racial segregation in schools.

For the third straight day, the Justice Department was planning to resort to direct legal challenge to end compulsory separation of Negro and white students.

It is understood that the action today will be a warning letter—a necessary prelude to a formal lawsuit—to school officials in a Northern state.

In the past, it was not customary for the department to make public the fact that it had sent warning letters. The switch appears to be part of the new administration's effort to demonstrate that it is not relaxing on school integration.

The abolition last week of any fixed deadline for total school desegregation had drawn sharp criticism from civil rights forces who complained that the administration was blunting the integration effort.

TOUGH ATTITUDE

In most of its actions this week, the Justice Department has asked for desegregation progress only by "the earliest practicable date." However, the volume of its activity seems designed to show a tough attitude toward holdout districts.

Yesterday's spurt of activity brought out a novel approach: An attempt to stop white students from making an "escape" from non-white public schools by entering all-white Roman Catholic private schools that get some forms of public aid.

This was contained in the department's warning to public school officials in Waterbury, Conn., that they may be sued if they do not act to integrate classrooms.

Indirectly, this could lead to some integration even of the Catholic schools, even though public authorities have no direct control over those schools' racial admission policies. The officials might be forced to stop giving aid to the private institutions as long as they remained almost completely segregated.

FREE TRANSPORTATION

In Waterbury, department officials here said, students from the Catholic schools are given free bus transportation by the public school system, and they make use of gymnasiums, manual training shops and home economics equipment in the public schools.

Assistant Atty. Gen. Jerris Leonard complained in his warning letter to the Waterbury school board that this arrangement, plus the "escape" of white students to the Catholic schools, means that the non-white students and their parents are helping bear the expense of segregated Catholic schools.

Leonard, asked officials to advise him what they were doing to integrate schools, said the Waterbury system has district lines, bus routes and transfer policies worked out to insure that Negroes and Puerto Ricans go to schools separate from whites. He also said the non-white schools are "in the worst condition."

Besides challenging Waterbury's school officials, the Justice Department filed four lawsuits yesterday—all against Southern school districts:

ABBEVILLE COMPLAINT

It complained that the pupils and faculty in Abbeville District 60 in Abbeville County, S.C., are mostly segregated even though a "freedom of choice" desegregation plan has been in effect since 1965. Only 215 out of 2,307 Negro students attend formerly all-white schools, and none of the 2,831 white students attend all-Negro schools, the lawsuit said.

It sued officials of Red River Parish (county), La., contending that it has four schools entirely for white students and four entirely for Negroes, and operates completely segregated school bus routes.

It challenged officials in Tensas Parish, La., on the ground that they maintain three schools only for whites and three only for Negroes, and operate a segregated school bus system.

And, it went to court to challenge a "freedom of choice" plan in Hardeman County, Tenn., contending that the plan has put no whites into Negro schools and only 437 out of a total of 2,439 Negroes into formerly all-white schools. The school bus system remains segregated, too, the suit complained.

NO SET DEADLINE

In none of the four lawsuits did the department ask the federal court to order integration steps by any specific deadline. It asked only that steps be ordered taken at "the earliest practical date."

Among the four school systems sued yesterday, three—the two in Louisiana and the one in South Carolina—had their federal funds cut off earlier because of their refusal to integrate.

The Louisiana parishes have not been eligible for federal financial assistance since 1966. The South Carolina district's federal funds were cut off last Jan. 29.

Since the administration began its new spurt of activity on Monday, it has taken legal steps against five Southern school systems and two Northern systems. It also has cut off federal funds to three Southern school systems.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 14, 1969]

MITCHELL

On the administration's new desegregation policies, which have drawn heavy criticism, Mitchell said in cases where the government determines that it is possible for school districts to desegregate by September, "they are going to be forced to comply by every device we have."

For those that simply cannot desegregate now, he said, "We will make a determination as to the earliest that it can comply."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 14, 1969]

CIVIL RIGHTS AIR CLEARED BY NIXON, FINCH SAYS

The Nixon administration's recent civil rights decisions have helped to clear the air and open communications with blacks and other minority groups, Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Robert H. Finch says.

He also said yesterday President Nixon took office more free of commitments to supporters, including Southern white conservatives, "than any of his predecessors."

Finch, in a CBS television interview, said the administration's recent action in school desegregation cases will demonstrate "that we intend to enforce the (Civil Rights) Act of 1964 and the subsequent court decisions.

REALITIES OF SITUATION

"We are trying to take into account the realities of the situation and not be hypocritical, and I think we've had a candor in this administration, generally speaking, that has cleared the air and helped our communications with minorities," Finch said.

Finch was asked whether Nixon was in "bondage" to Southern supporters.

"I think President Nixon came in freer of any commitments probably than any of his predecessors," he replied, "and I believe that firmly or I wouldn't be here."

RIGHT KIND OF STEPS

As to whether the administration was moving in a liberal or conservative direction Finch said neither was the case:

"We're moving in a more constructive direction. I think speculation about moving left or right or these evaluations of the first 100 days or the first six months are artificial ones, and I think we're making the right kind of steps forward."

Finch also said his department's reform proposal for the public welfare system, which is reported to contain a provision for a type of guaranteed annual income, might be sent to Congress this week.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 9, 1969]

UNITED STATES MAY SUE GEORGIA TO FORCE DESEGREGATION

(By Peter Milius)

The Nixon Administration is preparing to take the state of Georgia into Federal court to bring about desegregation of all 195 school districts there.

Officials said yesterday that the Justice Department will send the Georgia Board of Education a notice later this week, warning that it faces a suit unless it orders statewide desegregation on its own.

FUSILLADE OF ORDERS

Meanwhile, the Justice Department kept up the fusillade of desegration suits and notices that began on Monday, following the Administration's heavily criticized desegregation policy statement of last week.

In rapid order, Justice:

Filed suit against three more Southern school districts that had had their Federal funds cut off and still refused to desegregate. The three are Tensas Parish and Red River Parish in northern Louisiana and Abbeyville County School District No. 60 in South Carolina.

Filed suit against Hardeman County in western Tennessee. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare had been ready to cite Hardeman County, the first step in the process that can lead to a cutoff.

Justice also sent a notice yesterday to the Waterbury, Conn., school board, warning that it will file suit unless the board takes steps to correct "serious deficiencies."

Justice said in its letter that "district lines, bus routes and transfer policies have been drawn so as to insure that predominantly white schools remain 'white' and predominantly nonwhite schools remain 'nonwhite,' " and that "the schools to which nonwhite students are assigned are in the worst condition and have fewer special services."

The Department also said "an arrangement has been made with the Catholic school system of Waterbury that allows white students to escape the predominantly nonwhite school districts in which they reside and to attend the practically all-white parochial school system at the expense of nonwhite students and parents."

In all four suits filed yesterday, as in the two filed Monday, the Department asked for desegregation "at the earliest practical date."

USING NEW POLICY

In its policy statement last week, the Administration said it would no longer hold the South to the old "arbitrary" 1969 and 1970 school desegregation deadlines, adding, however, that it would only grant delays to districts with "bona fide educational and administrative problems."

The Administration also said it would make more use of court orders and less of fund cutoffs to achieve desegregation, and would move against desegregation in the North as well as South.

Critics fastened on the first part of the statement, declaring that any relaxation of the deadlines would only encourage Southern recalcitrants to hold out for more time. This week's flurry of Justice Department press releases is in part an effort to blunt that criticism.

Administration spokesmen said last week that a statewide desegregation suit was in the works, but would not identify the state.

The Georgia suit would be the second of its kind; Justice was a party to a similar suit in Alabama three years ago, and all 118 school districts there are now under court order. Last January, only 7.4 per cent of Alabama's Negro pupils were in desegregated schools, the second-lowest figure in the South. The average in the South was 20.3 per cent.

The figure for Georgia was 14.2 per cent. According to HEW, 36 of Georgia's districts have already desegregated, another 42 have promised to by this or next September, 36 have had their funds cut off, 33 are in the cutoff process, 20 are already in court and the rest are still under review.

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NUTLEY SUN

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, recently the Nutley Sun of Newark, N.J., celebrated its 75th anniversary. This fine newspaper is the oldest paper in Essex County and at this time I want to congratulate Mr. Frank Orechio, the publisher, and his hard-working staff for continuing the traditions of the past and for making the Nutley Sun an even better newspaper.

An article from the Nutley Sun follows:

ESSEX COUNTY'S PIONEER NEWSPAPER NOW A YEAR OLDER

Today marks the 75th anniversary of The Nutley Sun, oldest weekly newspaper in Essex County, and a special color commemorative has been published for this issue to mark the birthday.

The 64-pages of the commemorative section cover a wide variety of Nutley's past, present and future. Featured are complete sections on town history, local government, famed personalities who live here, cultural activities, businessmen, industries, community clubs and finally—the future.

Additionally, today's anniversary has prompted congratulatory messages from political and civic leaders, including one from Governor Richard J. Hughes which has been reproduced on this page. A sampling of the messages received is published in the Speak-Up column on page 4.

Finally, the Sun's birthday was made more memorable when the New Jersey Senate—meeting yesterday in Trenton—adopted a resolution congratulating and commending Nutley's town newspaper.

The issue today marks several firsts—including the use of full-process (four-color) photography. The regular 15 cent per copy price of The Sun has been raised to 25 cents for this issue only. Regular subscribers, however, receive today's commemorative edition at no additional cost.

SENATE CONGRATULATES SUN

TRENTON.—The N.J. Senate yesterday adopted a resolution congratulating The Nutley Sun upon its 75th anniversary and commending the North Jersey newspaper for its "distinguished record of service to the public."

The resolution, reprinted below, was adopted unanimously after being introduced by Senator Alexander J. Matturri, Gerardo L. DelTufo, David W. Doud, Michael A. Giuliano, Milton A. Waldor and James Wallwork.

The special resolution reads as follows:

Whereas, the Nutley Sun, oldest weekly newspaper in Essex County, was established in 1894 and has completed its 75th year of informing, entertaining and serving the people of the Town of Nutley and its environs; and,

Whereas, April, 1969, marked the 10th anniversary of the paper's direction by its present editor and publisher, Frank Orechio, who has ably forwarded the traditions established by its founders and maintained high standards of journalistic excellence and service to the community; and,

Whereas, the Nutley Sun has achieved numerous journalistic awards, including the New Jersey Press Association's award for public service reporting and, on several occasions, the same Association's annual award for general excellence among the weekly newspapers of this State; and,

Whereas, on July 3, 1969, The Nutley Sun will publish its 75th Anniversary Edition; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey:

That this House hereby congratulates the Nutley Sun upon its 75th anniversary and commends its long and distinguished record of service to the public of the Nutley areas; and

Be it further resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the journal and a duly authenticated copy, signed by the President and attested by the Secretary, be transmitted to Mr. Frank Orechio, editor and publisher of The Nutley Sun.

MESSAGE FROM GOVERNOR HUGHES

It is with great pride and pleasure that I join with all the good people of the Nutley area in congratulating you and all associated with the Nutley Sun on the 75th anniversary of this fine newspaper. During my eight years as Governor, my respect and admiration for the news media in our State has grown continually and I share your justifiable pride in the achievements of the SUN, which, over the years, has contributed so much to the lives of its readers. Therefore, my thoughts are with you on the occasion of this Diamond Jubilee and you have my best wishes for a memorable celebration and every continued success in the future.

RICHARD J. HUGHES,
Governor.

NAS TABLES RESOLUTION

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the June-July 1969 issue of National Academy of Sciences News Report tells the story of how a 2½-year effort by a Nobel prize winner to encourage a purely scientific

XUM

investigation has been turned down by the National Academy of Sciences.

Dr. William Shockley, Nobel laureate in physics from Stanford University and a man who was largely responsible for inventing the transistor, has long believed that an investigation of heredity and its relation to welfare could produce information which might be helpful in the solution of some of our racial and other social problems.

I express no personal view regarding the validity of Dr. Shockley's proposal, but I am shocked that men who call themselves scientists are afraid to seek the truth. I sometimes wonder if political and social science is not overpowering the quest for truth in the physical sciences. I ask the question: Is not the logical first step in solving any problem that of learning the truth about that problem?

The article from the National Academy of Sciences News Report follows:

NAS TABLES HEREDITY-INTELLIGENCE RESOLUTION

The National Academy of Sciences has voted to turn aside a proposal that it encourage the undertaking of a scientific study of "hereditary aspects of our national human quality problems."

Academy members meeting in the business session during the 1969 annual meeting tabled the proposal by an overwhelming show-of-hands vote.

The resolution was the latest effort in the two-and-a-half year campaign of NAS member William Shockley, the Nobel laureate in physics from Stanford University, to convince the Academy and the scientific community in general of the need to determine the relative importance of environment and heredity as causes of social problems and as causes of racial differences in behavioral traits.

Dr. Shockley has made clear his interest in seeking answers to such questions as: To what extent are urban slums the result of poor heredity? Is the genetic quality of the human population being eroded by differential birth rates in various social, economic and educational groups? Are genetic factors responsible for a significant part of racial differences in educational and economic achievements?

To this end he has presented papers on the subject at most of the Academy's spring and fall meetings since the fall of 1966, carried out extensive correspondence with Academy officers and other persons throughout the country, and given many talks.

As a response to the issues he raised, the Council of the Academy, with the help of several eminent geneticists, in 1967 prepared a 1,600-word statement on Human Genetics and Urban Slums and presented it at the fall meeting that year. It was published in full in the November 1967 *News Report* and later in the November 17, 1967, issue of *Science*.

The statement emphasized the near impossibility of sorting out environmental and genetic factors in human performance.

"There is no scientific basis for a statement that there are or that there are not substantial hereditary differences in intelligence between Negro and white populations," the statement said in part. "In the absence of some now-unforeseen way of equalizing all aspects of the environment, answers to this question can hardly be more than reasonable guesses . . ."

"[There] is the conviction that none of the current methods can produce unambiguous results. To shy away from seeking the truth is one thing; to refrain from collecting still more data that would be of uncertain meaning but would invite misuse is another . . ."

"We question the social urgency of a crash program to measure genetic differences in intellectual and emotional traits between racial groups. In the first place, if the traits are at all complex, the results of such research are almost certain to be inconclusive. In the second place, it is not clear that major social decisions depend on such information; we would hope that persons would be considered as individuals and not as members of groups."

Dr. Shockley has described the full statement as a "disgrace" and has characterized the Academy's record of performance on the issue as "Lysenko-like."

After this year's business meeting, however, NAS President Frederick Seitz said the 1967 statement was still a valid and accurate presentation of the Academy's view. "The strong feeling among the great majority of members," Dr. Seitz told newsmen, "is that it is essentially impossible to do good research in this field as long as there are such great social inequities. And such research is also so easily misunderstood in these times."

GUARANTEED LOAN PROGRAM

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I have received a number of letters from constituents who are hoping to send sons and daughters off to college in just a few weeks.

They express frustration over inability to get a bank loan under the provisions of the guaranteed loan program to finance their youngsters' education.

High interest rates in the present tight money market have dealt a discouraging blow to many deserving youngsters who were counting on these loans to cover at least some of the costs of college.

But that is not the only program in difficulty. Other student assistance programs such as national defense student loans, educational opportunity grants and the college work-study program have also fallen upon hard times.

Recently, I received a letter from the Michigan Student Financial Aid Association, the professional organization of student financial aid officers in Michigan, which sets forth a persuasive argument for full funding of student assistance programs. I take this opportunity to place this letter in the RECORD, calling special attention to the final sentence:

> Only if funding levels are dramatically increased, can we fulfill the promise of equality of opportunity in higher education.

Then, lest anyone believe that these funds are a waste, I also want to place in the RECORD a letter I received just recently from a young woman who lives in my congressional district.

Miss Mary Konopnick, a 22-year-old cum laude graduate from Western Michigan University wrote me:

> Have you ever wondered just exactly what happens with money that you and other Congressmen earmark for aid to education? Let me offer myself as an example or "proof of productivity" from these educational bills you endorse.

I recommend her letter to you.

Recent demonstrations—some violent, by a relatively few students at a relatively few colleges—a recent Senate investigations subcommittee study found that more than 90 percent of the Nation's colleges have escaped student strife—have raised some questions about students receiving Federal aid.

Most of them, like Miss Konopnick, are very decent youngsters who are assets to the Nation. Good educations are essential if they are to reach their full potential.

We must make certain that students like Miss Konopnick are not denied the assistance they need.

To accept a pinchpenny policy in student aid would be an indefensible waste of our greatest natural resources—our youth.

The letters follow:

MICHIGAN STUDENT FINANCIAL
AID ASSOCIATION,
July 2, 1969.

Hon. JAMES G. O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: We of the Michigan Student Financial Aid Association, the professional organization of financial aid officers in Michigan, are deeply concerned about inadequate 1969–70 funding for federal student financial aid programs. The proposed $155,000,000 federal appropriation (compared to national needs of $270,000,000) for the 1969–70 National Defense Student Loan (NDSL) program will have an adverse effect on efforts to make financial aid available to qualified and needy students. Unless the NDSL appropriation is raised, Michigan schools will receive only 56.6% of the necessary federal funds to support 1969–70 National Defense Student Loans. Financial aid officers from 41 Michigan schools estimate that some 10,675 needy and qualified students will be denied National Defense Student Loans and other federal financial aids at their schools because of insufficient funding.

Breach of promise is a harsh phrase, but we find it difficult to characterize otherwise the inadequate 1969–70 funding proposals for NDSL, Educational Opportunity Grants (EOG), and College Work-Study (CWS) programs. An integral part of the expanded financial aids made available by the Higher Education Act of 1965 was a commitment by schools accepting these funds to make vigorous efforts to encourage promising and needy students *who would not otherwise have attended college* to complete high school satisfactorily and to attend college. Michigan schools have accepted these recruiting commitments willingly and have devoted much time and effort to them. Many low-income students, particularly from minority groups which have traditionally had low percentages of college attendance, have been encouraged to plan for college with the promise that financial aid would be available.

Already this year many qualified high school seniors have been denied financial aid for college because of funding cutbacks. Several schools in Michigan have barely enough NDSL money for 1969–70 to continue loans to returning students, and can make no loans to entering students. Many low-income students are not receiving EOG funds because of lack of available money and because of lack of NDSL funds to make the necessary matching financial aid available to them. The EOG situation is somewhat better than predicted last fall, but funding is still inadequate. A problem, however, is that a crucial part of our effective use of financial aid funds is the timing of firm commitments on money available to us. Because we were uncertain about EOG allocations until early spring, many low-income students were discouraged from making serious college plans, I am sure you will agree that the nation can ill afford to encourage students to pursue advanced education and then refuse to provide the funds and facilities necessary to accommodate them.

The assumption has been made that funding reductions in NDSL can be absorbed by expansion of the Guaranteed Student Loan program. While this may be true in other states, it is decidedly not true in Michigan. Many lending institutions do not participate. For example, only three Detroit and two Lansing banks participate in the program. The participating banks often restrict loans to customers, to students with B-averages, and to upperclassmen and graduate students. We are aware of the serious problems facing lending institutions in a high-interest tight money market. We are also appreciative of the significant increases in lending activity in this program. But we would hope that some legislative action could be taken to improve the attractiveness of these loans to lenders. Possibilities include a federal subsidy to lenders or a further increase in the maximum interest rate because of the continued rise in the prime interest rate.

Because of the lack of available bank funds the guaranteed loan program has not reached its full potential. Until it does, the neediest students just entering college will rarely be able to obtain guaranteed loans. The guaranteed loan program was designed to assist middle-income families. In Michigan it is not doing that adequately, and it is not helping those low-income students who most need substantial financial aid if they are to pursue post-secondary education.

Our hope is that you and other members of Congress will consider carefully the implications of inadequate student financial aid funding for 1969–70 and the years ahead. NDSL funding should be maintained at the $190,000,000 level at the minimum. Preferably all three programs (NDSL, EOG, CWS) will be funded at authorized levels for Fiscal 1970 and future years. Only if funding levels are dramatically increased can we fulfill the promise of equality of opportunity in higher education.

Sincerely,

LEE C. FAWCETT,
Chairman.

MT. CLEMENS, MICH.,
June 3, 1969.

JAMES G. O'HARA,
Congressman, 12th District,
Mt. Clemens, Mich.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE O'HARA: Have you ever wondered just exactly what happens with money that you and other Congressmen earmark for aid to education? Let me offer myself as an example of "proof of productivity" from these educational bills that you endorse.

My name is Mary Konopnick. I'm 22 years old, a resident of Mt. Clemens, Michigan and a recent graduate of Western Michigan University. I attended my four years at Western almost entirely on federal and state funds. If these funds were not made available to me in the form of loans (National Defense), scholarships (Michigan Higher Assistance Authority Tuition Scholarship and University Scholarships), and Grants (Educational Opportunity Grant including the now defunct Government Incentive Award), I would most likely never have attended school or still be in the process of struggling through trying not to become too discouraged.

Instead, today I hold a B.A. Degree and a Secondary Provisional Teaching Certificate. My immediate plans (if I can manage financially) are to attend Medill Graduate School of Journalism at Northwestern University in June.

During the past four years, I feel that I have put government funds to good use by being on the Dean's List for six semesters, by being admitted to a Freshman Woman's Honorary Society, by being inducted into a national Educational Honorary Society (Kappa Delta Pi), by working at the Job Corps in Battle Creek (scholarship funds made it possible for me to hold down only a part-time job giving me more free time to participate in worthwhile programs) and by graduating cum laude.

I recognize the necessity of education in our society today and am most appreciative that I was able to secure a good start on one with your and the government's aid. You may be sure that I totally support any educational bills or programs which allocate funds to universities to be used to provide students with financial aid to complete their education. I hope that you, also, will give your support to continue such programs and to inaugurate new ones. Thank you.

Sincerely,

MARY KONOPNICK.

CHILTON COUNTY CIVIL DEFENSE RESCUE SQUAD

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, Chilton County is one of the counties in Alabama that I am privileged to represent in Congress. The Chilton County Civil Defense Rescue Squad, which has recently celebrated its 13th anniversary, is a dedicated group of volunteers originally established to search for drowning victims in the Coosa River. A few years later, it accepted a partnership with the civil defense network, and now the squad is a countywide emergency unit, equipped to go anywhere, anytime, and for whatever need arises. In addition to being one of the oldest teams of its kind in the State, it is also one of the best equipped and has one of the most loyal memberships of any rescue-emergency operation in the entire region.

The squad is often called on to locate lost children, hunters, and fishermen. One of the sad but necessary parts of their job is to drag a pond, lake, or river for a drowning victim. The men of the rescue squad have spent hundreds of hours on just such work; and, though not boastful about it in the least—they have become expert at it. These operations have continued for days at a time; but the squad is noted for sticking it out, until the job is done. Also, their skill, developed over the years, has allowed them to make several recoveries in a matter of minutes.

Every member of the Chilton County Civil Defense Rescue Squad is a volunteer. They serve without pay and, moreover, each member is required to pay dues and furnish his own uniform. We are fortunate to have dedicated citizens like this in Chilton County, Ala. As a tribute to the men of this squad, I include a list of their names in the RECORD, as follows:

Lally Bates, President; Chuck Avery, Bob Abernathy, Gene Baker, Clyde Blalock, Paul Bavar, Richard Bush, Lamar Blalock, Carl Baker, Jr., Cecil Carter, C. F. Comer, Tom Cox, Dalton Champion, Gordon Conway, John E. Dansby, Alvin Ellison, Jimmy Ellison, Charles Foshee, Don Finlayson, Don Fullen, Jimmy Foshee, Alton Gentry, Bobby Godwin.

Douglas Glass, Donald Giles, Paul Headley, Hollis Hilyer, Richard Headley, Bill Hahn, Willie Johnson, James E. Johnson, Lavonne Jones, Clyde L. Jones, Ronnie Johnson, Emmett Kendrick, Honrie Little, Thomas Liveoak, W. A. "Bing" LeCroy, Raymond Lolley, Jimmy Martin, Bobby Martin, Donald Martin, Calvin Martin, Carl Martin, Dalton Mims, Luther Mims.

Curtis Meank, George Minor, Henry McKey, John McAfee, Ottis Moore, Burton Mullins, Freddie Mayfield, Chester Miller, Gene Mims, Paul Parrish, Ben Popwell, Tommy Powell, Bill Popwell, Jimmy Smith, Alton Sanders, Bill Scott, G. W. Trammel, Don Verner, Earl Wilson, Charles Watts, Jimmy Willis, Charles Wayne Wright, Randel Wright.

DR. EDUARDO MONDLANE: MOZAMBIQUE PATRIOT

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, all too often in recent years the world has been shocked by the assassinations of great leaders in the struggle for human freedom. It is tragic for all mankind that those most compassionately involved in the struggle for human rights have been the victims of the most complete denial of a man's humanity, the act of murder. Eduardo Mondlane as a freedom fighter in Mozambique, Africa, stirred the yearnings of men for liberty, yet now is but another name on the list of martyrs along with Martin Luther King, Robert Kennedy, and only recently, Tom Mboya. All were men of compassion in an age of apathy.

Eduardo Mondlane was the unique combination of an internationally known educator, a man deeply committed to Christian ideals, and the leader of a nationalist revolution in Africa. He was born in Mozambique in 1920 and received most of his early education in Africa. At age 31, after a short stay in Portugal, he came to the United States, where he earned a B.A. at Oberlin College and a Ph. D. at Northwestern. Staying in the United States, he worked for several years in the Secretariat's Office of the United Nations and was later to give up a professorship at Syracuse in order to return to Mozambique and join his countrymen in their struggle for independence.

Emerging as the leader of the Mozambique struggle, Eduardo Mondlane taught compassion where many men learn hatred. He showed understanding where many men are tempted toward intolerance. He viewed the long-range goal where many men come to see only the immediate. In the midst of revolution, he founded a school. In the midst of dissension, he managed reconciliation.

XUM

In a world beset by inequality he practiced tolerance.

To those in his own Mozambique he will be remembered as a nationalist leader. Yet, for all men his life is an example of unremitting dedication to the struggle for human liberty. Thus, I insert the following eulogy for Eduardo Mondlane from the Christian Century in the RECORD:

Mondlane: Guerrilla Christian

Revolution is a word which gushes with sentimentality these days. It is only a folk memory for many of us to recall that our ancestors were revolutionary conspirators engaged in overthrowing the tyranny of colonialism. We are beset, moreover, with some latter-day enthusiasts of revolution who don't seem to have any very clear notion of what a revolution is all about.

Eduardo Mondlane was an authentic Christian revolutionary engaged in the overthrow of colonialist tyranny and endowed with an extraordinary combination of political realism and moral integrity. As president of Frelimo, the Mozambique Liberation Front, he provided an incomparable case study in guerrilla leadership on the part of a steadfast Presbyterian layman. Like Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Mondlane left the security of an academic career in the United States to share in the struggle and passion of his people and to take into his own most sensitive soul the dilemmas of violence as a weapon of last resort in the service of justice.

The willingness of Eduardo Mondlane to employ violence should not obscure the parallels between his leadership and that of another modern martyr, Martin Luther King, Jr. Both were brilliant, patient, unassuming, gentle men who surrendered their preferred vocations to respond to the summons of the freedom revolution. The parallels have been thoughtfully noted by Eugene L. Smith of the U.S. conference of the W.C.C.:

"The loss of Dr. Eduardo Mondlane to Africa and the world is akin to the loss of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., to the United States and to the world. Here were two Christians deeply committed to freedom and to justice with a profound sense of human values. Living in danger, they were unafraid. Suffering injustice, they were above bitterness. Living in racial hostilities, they were too great to be hostile. Living amidst confusion, they had a vision which offered light and hope."

And, we must add, both were murdered at a moment when their lives were most precious to the unfulfilled movements they led.

There are deep cleavages within Frelimo. Mondlane worked miracles of reconciliation to hold contending factions together. His radical critics were impatient with his long-range perspectives on liberation. They felt cheated by his insistence that it was Portuguese colonial policy, not Portuguese culture or the Portuguese people, that Frelimo must fight. They sought to discredit Mondlane's standing as an African nationalist by portraying him as captive to American influences: a bachelor's degree from Oberlin College (via a Methodist Crusade scholarship), a doctorate in sociology from Northwestern University, a white American wife, and a professorial stint at Syracuse University.

As a speaker at the Geneva Conference on Church and Society in 1966, Mondlane said: "As we talk to each other as Christians I think that we should begin to turn from saying to the white man, 'Please continue to help us after independence.' No! Let's begin to build from within." The W.C.C. and other church bodies have aided the Mozambique Institute in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, the city in which a time bomb killed Mondlane on February 3. The institute, directed by Mrs. Janet Mondlane, is an upper primary school for Mozambican refugees.

Frelimo's leadership struggle is likely to be fierce—as the Portuguese government doubtless hopes. At the time of Mondlane's assassination, Frelimo's 8,000 guerrillas were tying down at least 40,000 Portuguese troops in northern Mozambique. Portuguese colonialism remains an anachronistic scourge upon a continent which is otherwise more or less free from the European empires of the past four centuries. On the very eve of Mondlane's death, the Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ took a very forthright position by endorsing the U.N.'s repeated censure of Portuguese policies and their implication in the racism of Rhodesia and South Africa, calling for an arms embargo of Portugal, recommending termination of U.S. use of Portuguese bases and expressing support for "the legitimate claims of the liberation movements in Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea Bissau."

We don't know who was directly responsible for the time bomb that destroyed the body of Eduardo Mondlane. However, insofar as any of us is apathetic about or apologetic for U.S. acquiescence in Portuguese policy in Africa, we share in the guilt for his murder. "I may be killed any day," Mondlane said recently, "but there will be victory."

YOU CAN REMAKE THIS SOCIETY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I suppose every Congressman is asked upon occasion by a concerned citizen who wants to participate in the affairs of his Nation, "What can I do?" "How can I participate?" or "Is there a place for me?"

In these days when Government is massive, unaware and unmindful of the individual at times, these are not easy questions to answer meaningfully.

I recently came across an excellent response to these questions written by John W. Gardner, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and now chairman of the Urban Coalition.

This response, relevant and wise, appeared in the July 15 issue of Look magazine, and it merits the attention of my colleagues in the Congress.

The article follows:

Message for a Revolutionary Generation: You Can Remake This Society

(By John W. Gardner, chairman of the Urban Coalition and former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

This spring, I received a letter signed by three undergraduates at a major university. They said, "We don't like the fanaticism, the coercive tactics and the ego games of the extremist leaders. But we think things have to change in this society. What can we do?"

I have had the same inquiry—"What can we do?"—from many young people. The quick answer is "Plenty!"

But first, you are right to say there are things that must be changed. Our nation is in deep trouble. There are intolerable injustices to be corrected, outworn institutions to be overhauled, new solutions to be found—and you can't live placidly as though you hadn't noticed.

If we are to root out the evils, deal with the swift pace of change, meet new conceptions of human need and preserve the vitality of this society, our institutions must undergo quick, far-reaching adaptation.

As young people, you are well fitted to renew human institutions. You have the necessary freshness of vision. You have the necessary impatience. And you are not yet entrapped in custom.

But if you are to benefit from those assets, you are going to have to think hard about the realities of social change. The extremist student leaders have devised some theatrical and destructive games that provide the thrill of conflict (and great ego inflation for the leaders themselves) but accomplish virtually nothing in the way of real social change. The extremists are dependent for their success on the permissive atmosphere of academic life. For all their talk of changing the world, they are playpen revolutionaries, imprisoned by their own tactics in the only world that will tolerate them.

The weaknesses of most political action by youth, here and throughout the world, have been inexperienced and futile assaults on the wrong targets, aimless and destructive bursts of anger and violence, and the willingness of many to be exploited by irrational, narcissistic and cynically manipulative leaders. Over and over, we have seen that violence and coercion do not lead forward to constructive change but backward to repressive countermeasures.

What are the alternatives for you? To my mind, they are many and exciting. The best proof that they exist may be found in last year's political campaigns.

Those of you who served as campaign workers committed yourselves to disciplined endeavor to cope with the world on its own terms. In doing so, you left an indelible mark on the year 1968. You may have started something that will change everything.

What I propose is that you now bring your enthusiasm and commitment to a very specific set of tasks that *must* be carried through if this nation is to measure up to the challenge ahead: *1) reform of the major parties; 2) reform of the electoral process; 3) reform of state and local government.*

What you have seen in the past year must have whetted your interest in the machinery of party politics and the workings of the electoral process. Some of you have been so repelled or discouraged that you have given up both on the parties and the process. But others, perhaps most of you, are not discouraged because you sense that you have really set some changes in motion. Few professional politicians would have predicted that the Democratic convention of 1968 would outlaw the unit rule not only at the national convention but down to the state and local levels. Few would have believed the convention would require that delegates be chosen under procedures open to the public. Yet those revolutionary steps were taken—and you played a major role.

At the local level, thanks in part to your efforts, new candidates with fresh views appeared in many places. Incumbents were forced to reassess their positions on important issues, including the war. Local party chairmen were in some instances replaced. School boards have been forced to reexamine their policies.

That is only a taste of what can come. You know how badly a fresh breeze is needed. You know that we need to shake up the means by which the parties manage their affairs, choose their delegates, run their conventions. You know what peril for democracy lies in the skyrocketing expenses of political campaigns. You understand how archaic are the processes of the electoral college.

Similarly, you have gotten at least a glimpse of the critical need for reforming state and local government. You care about the idea of participation, and you know that most participation must necessarily be at the grass roots, a level dominated today by antiquated and creaky political machinery. State and local governments are ripe for major changes. You can have a major hand in bringing about those changes.

Here are some of the activities young people could engage in (and I would include many age levels and many kinds of people: ghetto youth with natural leadership capacities but not much education, college undergraduates, graduate students, young professionals, teachers and businessmen):

Sign up for work in your own party; write Sen. Fred Harris or Rep. Rogers Morton, chairmen, respectively, of the Democratic and Republican national committees, and ask what plans they have for involving young people in party work. (They have such plans.)

Run for elective office, or do volunteer staff work for some one running for office.

Enter government service at state or local levels.

Help design and participate in publicly or privately financed internship programs that will enable young people to get a taste of public life before entering it as a career.

Form a local group to study in depth the social problems that confront your community, and present your findings to appropriate legislators and administrators.

Insist on participation by youth in civic organizations concerned with social problems. Say to civic leaders, "You don't like it when we take unconventional action; then give us a piece of the conventional action."

Do volunteer work for organizations dedicated to good government, and recruit others of your age group to do likewise; if you find no organization that suits your purposes, form your own.

Form a local youth organization to study the processes of state and local government, to discover practical means of improving it and to take action.

These suggestions stress state and local politics, but I'm not suggesting you forsake the national arena. Every member of Congress has roots "back home," has ties with local party machinery and worries about what his constitutents say. You can reach him.

College and university professors of government can help you explore the realities of the world you hope to change, through courses for credit, field projects and extracurricular action. Law school professors can advise you on model-state legislation, conflict of interest, new instrumentalities for citizen action and so on.

Mayors, governors, state legislators and members of Congress can give you counsel on the workings of government. (I know that only a few such public figures will have the adventurousness—or is it shrewdness?—to do so, but a few may be enough!)

All civic organizations should make a point of bringing young people into the heart of their activities. Foundations should provide funds for action-oriented research and programs.

I propose that you form local organizations to pursue these matters. I do not wish to suggest the form the organizations should take, because your purposes will vary. Some of you will wish to work through the Young Democratic or Young Republican organizations. Others will be inclined to form new organizations.

Just the fact of your participation in local politics and government will in itself have a powerful and beneficial effect. It will be good for the community and good for you. But mere participation is *not* the goal. You could enter the system, adjust to it perfectly, end up at the top—and leave us exactly where we are now. The purpose is not just to enter the system. The purpose is to change it for the better. Your elders have shamefully neglected the task of improving state and local government. You can correct that.

The object is the redesign of institutions, the renewal of society. It will take all the intelligence and energy and shrewdness you can bring to bear. But the stakes are high.

The object is to win—not to make yourselves feel noble, not to indulge your anger, not to pad your vanity but to renew the society.

Human institutions can be changed, if you care enough to work at it, if you care enough to study the machinery you want to change and find the points of leverage.

At this critical point in our history, we can less and less afford to limit ourselves to routine repair of breakdowns in our social processes. More and more, we must undertake the imaginative redesign of those processes. We see in all clarity that many of our institutions are ill-fitted for the tasks the modern world presses on them; yet they stubbornly resist change, even in the face of savage attacks by those who would destroy them.

Unless we are willing to see a final confrontation between institutions that refuse to change and critics bent on destruction, we had better get on with the business of redesigning our society.

You can renew this society. But not in a fit of impatience and not without effort. You must be discriminating critics of your society, seeking to identify, coolly and precisely, those things about it that thwart or limit human potentialities, and therefore need modification. And so must you be discriminating protectors of your society, preserving those features that strengthen the individual and make him more free. To fit yourselves for such tasks, you must be sufficiently serious to study your institutions, sufficiently dedicated to become expert in the art of modifying them.

The time is ripe for constructive and far-reaching improvement in our institutions. No one person, obviously, can do it alone. But young people all over the country, working together, might produce just the leaven, just the stimulus, just the lift of spirit that this nation needs to move on to the next stage of development.

JOE MONDRES: COMMUNITY LEADER

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to note that Joe Mondres of Miami Beach, a friend and dedicated community leader today reaches the Biblical threescore and ten of an active and productive life.

Mr. Mondres, immediate past president of Maccabee Lodge of B'nai B'rith of Miami Beach, has just been named the district's outstanding lodge president for 1968–69. The honor was announced at the B'nai B'rith District Grand Lodge No. 5 convention recently held in Miami Beach.

Joe Mondres is a fine example of the many thousands of informed and responsible senior citizens who reside in my district and throughout our Nation. A few years ago, having reached the age of retirement he embarked instead upon a new career of civic responsibility and of helping others. A man of limited means, he could offer nothing but his time and effort. This he did with zest and soon he rose to positions of leadership in several organizations whose charitable and worthwhile projects did much good for the less fortunate in the community.

Mr. Mondres' activities in behalf of the Jewish community are particularly notable. He is a member of the campaign cabinet of the Combined Jewish Appeal-Israel Emergency Fund. He is also vice president of the Hillel advisory board, and vice president of the South Florida council of B'nai B'rith lodges.

He is 70 today and still going strong. He is living proof of the valuable services being performed by senior Americans. May he have many active and productive years ahead to serve his religion, community, and Nation.

BOOST PROTEINS OR WORLD STARVES, EXPERTS DECLARE

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Denver Post reported a frank and realistic discussion of world hunger by Robert C. Liebenow, the president of Corn Refiners Association, Inc., and David M. Updegraff, head of the microbiology section of the Denver Research Institute.

The experts emphasized the need for increased protein consumption to prevent malnutrition and starvation, and discussed new scientific methods of producing protein.

At a time when the Congress and the American people as a whole are becoming increasingly concerned about the shocking evidence of hunger both here at home and throughout the world, these comments are particularly relevant and useful. I commend them to the House and include them at this point in the RECORD:

MICROBIAL SOURCE ADVOCATED—BOOST PROTEINS OR WORLD STARVES, EXPERTS DECLARE

(By Monk Tyson)

Proteins, the source of strength, health and life itself, must be drastically increased in food if humanity is to stave off starvation by the end of this century.

This warning was sounded by Robert C. Liebenow, president of Corn Refiners Association, Inc., Washington, D.C., and David M. Updegraff, head of the microbiology section of the Denver Research Institute.

They spoke at a joint meeting of the American Astronautical Society and Operations Research Society, which ended Friday at the Brown Palace and Cosmopolitan Hotels.

Liebenow and Updegraff warned that two-thirds of the world's 3 billion people "either do not get enough to eat, or do not receive food of proper nutritional quality."

SOLUTION PREDICTED

But both held to the hope that the situation could be solved—through more nutrition in foods. Updegraff bases much of his hopes on development of microbial or single-cell protein.

"The microbes concerned are bacteria and fungi," Updegraff said. "They are capable of growing and synthesizing protein hundreds or thousands of times as rapidly as beef cattle.

"Furthermore, they can use such cheap and abundant materials as kerosene, wood pulp and ammonium sulfate fertilizer as raw materials.

XUM

"A great deal of research is needed to develop foods from such materials. For the foreseeable future, social and economic obstacles to the use of such foodstuffs may prove more difficult than the technical problems involved."

MYTHS CAUSE CONCERN

"The magnitude of the task is staggering, despite revolutionary breakthroughs in science and in techniques of production," Liebenow said. His chief concern involves what he calls myths that are often presented as solutions to the problem of world hunger. He presented these figures:

"Although it took all of human history up to about the year 1850 for the world population to reach 1 billion, it reached 2 billion only 75 years later and reached three billion just 35 years after that.

"Now, we are confronted with the prospect that population will increase by another 3 billion people in 30 years—to a globe-shrinking 6 billion by the year 2000. We wonder, with good reason, can they be fed well, or adequately, or even at all?"

Expert opinions have swung periodically like a pendulum from pessimism to optimism and back again, Liebonow said. These attitudes followed bumper crops under a good growing season and poor crops under adverse growing conditions, he added.

FREE FOOD NOT ANSWER

"Needy nations don't want all the free food they can get," Liebenow said. This can have the adverse effect of smothering their own food production, he said.

Exporting this nation's technology and putting it to use in underdeveloped countries isn't as easily done as said, Liebenow explained. Our advanced technology often "fails miserably in a primitive or semiprimitive environment. There is a gulf, not a gap, between the man who plows four or six or more rows at one time and the man who plows one row at a time—with a wooden plow."

"Poor people do not make good customers," Liebenow observed. ". . . Today, our best commercial export markets for agricultural products are countries with highly developed agriculture—Canada, Western Europe and Japan."

Help for poor countries must come from the outside, but this would require political cooperation of those countries, Liebenow said. He cited government restrictions on private ownership of companies in India as an example.

REQUIREMENTS ESTIMATED

"The present world consumption of protein is about 75 million tons," Liebenow said. "It is estimated that 115 million tons are required presently for a balanced world diet. . . .

"In the next three decades, the output of protein must be tripled just to reach a level considered adequate. . . . Incredible as that demand may seem, I believe it will be met."

An important need, he continued, is the "genetic improvement of cereal grains, fortification with essential missing amino acids and development of non-conventional sources of protein from cereal grains and other products."

He cited high lysine corn as an "excellent example." In this type of corn, now being developed, a kernel contains twice as much lysine and trytophan as the conventional type, and other amino acids are improved.

POPULATION CONTROL

Updegraff advocates not only a vast increase in the food supply but said that population control is absolutely necessary.

Speaking on "Microbes as a New Source of Food for the Expanding World Population," Updegraff said cereal grains, the most abundant of foodstuffs, contain inadequate amounts of protein.

Micro-organisms used in single-cell production are algae, fungi and bacteria, Updegraff said. His listings on protein production from these sources, especially bacteria, contain fantastic figures—and sound like bad news for cattle unless protein content of beef can be drastically increased in the future.

For instance, his figures show, a 1,000-pound steer produces one pound of protein a day. The same amount of bacteria will produce 100 trillion pounds of protein in the same period according to Updegraff's figures.

YEAST, SOYBEANS CITED

A thousand pounds of yeast would produce 100,000 pounds of protein a day, and a like amount of soybeans would yield 100 pounds a day, Updegraff's calculations show.

"This enormous growth rate of bacteria provides no very great advantage over yeast," Updegraff said. "Other considerations, such as transfer rates of insoluble hydrocarbon and of oxygen to the bacteria and heat transfer will limit bacterial growth rates in large systems."

Much remains to be done before single-cell production can be put on large scale, Updegraff said.

"For animal-feed supplements," he continued, "single cell protein should be available in the form of algae from sewage and yeast from hydrocarbons within two or three years."

Because large amounts of hydrocarbons are available at low cost from petroleum refining, several countries are setting up protein producing plants.

"Gulf Oil has purchased a small fermentation plant in California and is also planning to produce food yeast from petroleum distillates," Updegraff said. "Esso has carried out extensive pilot plant studies, using bacteria as well as yeast."

Such protein sources as leaves, oil seed, the oceans and improved cereal grains can provide a bigger supply, but Updegraff doesn't believe it's enough. Supplies of edible fish—by modern taste standards—are decreasing, he said.

Updegraff quoted scientists S. R. Tannenbaum and R. I. Mateles, who sized up the arrival of large scale single-cell protein production like this:

"The torch will have been passed to the social scientists, the marketing and distribution people and the statesmen."

SEEKS COMMISSION TO EXPLORE POSSIBILITIES OF FEDERATION

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, recently, along with many of my colleagues, I introduced a resolution to establish a commission of distinguished Americans to explore, with other Atlantic nations, the long-range possibilities of federation. The concept has had the support, over the years, of such men as Richard Nixon, Hubert Humphrey, Eugene McCarthy, and many, many others.

This concept—of a Federal union as the basis of international action and peacekeeping—has been actively and persistently advocated by a distinguished former foreign correspondent for the New York Times, Clarence Streit, for some 30 years, while our colleague, Mr. Findley, has been the principal congressional proponent over the past several years.

Recently, Erwin D. Canham wrote an editorial in the Christian Science Monitor, calling the Atlantic Union, in the words of Victor Hugo, "an idea whose time had come." Mr. Canham correctly cites Clarence Streit as the man primarily responsible for bringing this idea to its time.

I recommend his comments to my colleagues and insert Mr. Canham's article at this point in the Record:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 8, 1969]

AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME

(By Erwin D. Canham)

"An idea whose time has come" is the powerful thought, paraphrased from Victor Hugo, often used by politicians (mostly recently, Sen. Everett Dirksen) to justify supporting something that has long lain dormant.

There is some evidence to believe that the idea of federal union of the Atlantic nations may be now approaching its time.

That is to say, nobody expects that federal union is an early likelihood. But what is more seriously considered than ever before is the resolution supported by a bipartisan group of 70 members of the United States House of Representatives to appoint a commission to explore with other Atlantic nations the long-range possibilities of federation.

ELOQUENT SUPPORT

The idea of federal union as an ultimate basis of international action and peacekeeping has been actively promoted for the last 30 years by one of the most dedicated crusaders alive, Clarence Streit. He published the book "Union Now" in 1939, after almost two decades as a distinguished foreign correspondent for the New York Times.

Ever since, sometimes seeming to be a voice crying in the wilderness, Clarence Streit has talked and written for federal union. He has been supported by some of the most eminent public figures in the Western world. The resolution now pending in Congress was endorsed eloquently in 1966 by Richard Nixon. His 1968 opponent, Hubert Humphrey, and Sen. Eugene McCarthy were long supporters of the idea.

The present chairmen of the Republican and Democratic National Committees are advocates of the exploration of Atlantic union. So was Robert F. Kennedy. So was President Eisenhower. So were Barry Goldwater and Nelson Rockefeller. So have been many outstanding European leaders, notably including Maurice Schumann, now French Foreign Minister.

ENTRENCHED DOUBTS

With these and many other advocates, you would think the resolution calling for a citizens' delegation and then an international convention to examine the possibilities of federation would go through Congress swimmingly. It may. But entrenched doubts are great. American public opinion, at least, would need to know what elements of national sovereignty would be in any way affected by the ultimate plans.

Actually, all that is proposed is to examine carefully whether the present allies of the Atlantic could cooperate any more closely to work out terms of economic and political peace. The proposed federation would correlate with the European Common Market, but not replace it.

Richard Nixon in 1966 had this to say: "It is fitting that the United States, the world's first truly federal government, should be a main force behind the effort to find a basis for a broad federation of free Atlantic nations. Although the accomplishment of the ultimate goal of the resolution may well be impossible to attain for many years, recent events of history and numerous scientific and technological advances of the past 20 years point the way in this direction."

XUM

COMMITMENT

Whether burdened by the responsibilities of the presidency and advised by the State Department, Mr. Nixon feels the same way remains to be seen. But the resolution itself commits the nation only to explore. As its sponsors point out, during the years since World War II, the U.S. Government has spent nearly a trillion dollars seeking national military solutions to problems which are scarcely military. Little time and energy has been spent in projecting other roads to peace.

The Atlantic union resolution is no derogation from the United Nations, or any other existing organization. The United States is the greatest proof in the world of the values of federation. Why should not its great constitutional idea be considered in application with other likeminded nations?

When will responsible governments lift their gaze from armaments and static conceptions and consider new-old paths to peace?

AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE OPPOSES THE ABM

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I noted with admiration today the resolution on the ABM adopted by the American Veterans Committee at its annual convention in June. Congress has frequently been indebted in the past to the American Veterans Committee for its clear and dispassionate appraisal of our country's military posture. This resolution should serve to reinforce this esteem.

AVC recognizes that the ABM can lead to the escalation of the present arms race. Far from encouraging our foes to meet us at the disarmament table, the development of this new weapon, they feel, will engender increased suspicions and mistrust and work to destabilize the present world situation. The committee realizes that, embroiled as we are in a military conflict, our country can ill afford these additional expenditures. Finally, the resolution properly points out that the Defense Department has failed to demonstrate that the proposed system will even function as designed.

I should like to reiterate my agreement with these views. Our cities and our poor beg us for attention. We cannot now divert funds, made scarce by the Vietnam war, from these pressing domestic concerns. Constructing the ABM would accelerate our arms expenditures. Already many speak of the necessity of another weapons system, the MIRV. All of these military efforts will elicit a like response from the Soviet Union and encourage us to even more ambitious and expensive projects. This country's concern should be disarmament, not the sophistication of our existing defense capabilities.

A question even arises as to the capacity of an ABM system to bolster our weapons arsenal. Quite apart from the military advantage of such a system, which evidence suggests may be offset by a very modest increase in the size of the Soviet ICBM stockpile, the ABM appears technically infeasible. The information now available reveals that the vast complex of radar and missile installations required may well prove incapable of coordination.

The American Veterans Committee has shown itself again to be a responsible guardian of the public interest. Its motto "Citizens First" is amply borne out in this considered, timely resolution on this matter of urgent national concern. The text of the resolution follows:

AVC RESOLUTION ON ABM

The American Veterans Committee opposes the Anti-Ballistic Program for the following reasons:

1. The Anti-Ballistic Program tends to make armaments limitation agreement more difficult. It contributes to escalation of the nuclear armaments race and thereby heightens the balance of terror and increases the possibility of nuclear war.

2. As a matter of priorities the funds expended for the ABM Program and the additional funds that would be required by the escalation of the arms race are desperately needed for our domestic needs.

3. The Defense Department has not adequately demonstrated that the proposed ABM System will work. Our present deterrent without the ABM System is such that no country would consider that it could now launch a nuclear attack on us without suffering utter devastation and retaliation.

TWO SIDES TO THE CORPORATE MERGER STORY

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration's activities in the realm of antitrust law enforcement, particularly with regard to corporate mergers, is the source of a most enlightening editorial in the July 1969 issue of Fortune magazine. The currently popular concept that bigness is inherently evil has given rise to what many consider a "horse with blinders" approach to the whole merger concept.

Blanket rules which are both arbitrary and repressive ought not to become the standard measure by which all proposed merger actions are automatically prejudged. Certainly our antitrust laws are a vital and necessary deterrent to oppressive monopolies, but, as with other laws, their enforcement must be thoughtfully and equitably carried out. A superzealous overextension of antitrust law provisions could constrict the economic well-being of many and would serve the best interests of few. The Attorney General would do well to take a more reasoned approach to the situation; perhaps a bit less protection for corporations facing acquisition and a bit more protection for minority schoolchildren in the South is in order.

For a thoughtful presentation of the merger issue, I respectfully submit the following article for my colleagues' attention:

PITCHFORK BEN, MEET WHEELBARROW JOHN

"Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon."—Joshua 10:12

The Attorney General of the United States, John N. Mitchell, has thrown the weight of his office on the side of an extreme and simplistic interpretation of how antitrust law should be applied in merger cases. In so doing, he has used arguments that disclose, more unmistakably than any previous pronouncement of any federal official, the reactionary bias that underlies the trend of the Nixon Administration's antimerger policy.

The Department of Justice, Mitchell says, "may well oppose any merger among the top 200 manufacturing firms or firms of comparable size in other industries." Moreover, it "will probably" oppose a merger between any of the top 200 with "any leading producer in any concentrated industry." These candid new formulations contradict all those passionate denials by previous antitrust enforcers who said that they were not opposed to bigness as such. Under Mitchell's policy, antitrust enforcers will no longer feel it necessary to engage in those tortuous analyses that purported to show how a given merger, because of "verticle" relations or "horizontal" overlap of markets, would diminish competition. Henceforth the Antitrust Division, never noted for acute or diligent research, will be obliged to prove only size—which it can do by buying a copy of Fortune or asking a man who owns one.

The Attorney General's reasoning is even more alarming than the conclusions that emerge from it. After reciting that the top 200 manufacturing companies now "control" 58 percent of U.S. manufacturing assets (up from 48 percent twenty years ago), Mitchell says this fact "leaves us with the unacceptable probability that the nation's manufacturing and financial assets will continue to be concentrated in the hands of fewer and fewer people."

This is unacceptable in a way that Mitchell doesn't mean. In the first place, nobody knows whether the recent trend he notes will continue or be reversed; some observers of business, for instance, believe that "deconglomeration" will be the trend of the 1970's. More significantly, an arithmetic concentration of assets by number of firms does not by any means imply concentration in the hands of "fewer people." Most of these 200 companies, especially the conglomerates at whom his aim is directed, are highly decentralized operations; thousands of individual managers and experts participate in their decisions.

The 200 top manufacturing companies have millions of stockholders, with newly reinforced influence derived from mutual funds, take-over bids, and the general liveliness of the capital markets. Nearly all of these companies sell in increasingly competitive markets where technological improvement and consumer discretion sharply reduce the security of any product line; moreover, competition from foreign firms in the U.S. market is becoming more vigorous.

A POPULIST ECHO

Consumers, whose protection (as Mitchell notes) is the ultimate aim of the antitrust laws, are in a stronger position than ever before, because prosperity and the widening range of choice enables them to postpone purchases or to shift purchases from one industry category to another. A nation-wide market, subject to world competition, has long since broken the concentrated power that many *local* monopolists, some of them small if measured on a national scale, formerly exercised over the necessities of life.

In the same speech (to the Georgia Bar Association) Mitchell disclosed that one of the objectives of his antitrust policy is to preserve the small town and city from what he regards as a growing concentration of power in metropolitan centers. "Most of you," he said in a direct appeal to the prejudice of his audience, "represent economic interests—distant from the centers of financial and managerial power—which may be injured by the current merger trends."

XUM

Just in case any members of the Georgia bar were too obtuse to get the point, Mitchell added that lawyers outside metropolitan areas "should have the opportunity to act as counsel." He continued: "We do not want our middle-sized and smaller cities to be merely 'branch store' communities; nor do we want our average consumers to be 'second class' economic citizens."

This sentiment, of course, is not novel. Playing upon the fear of large corporations and of metropolitan centers was the stock in trade of such Populist orators as William Jennings Bryan, Pitchfork Ben Tillman, Sockless Jerry Simpson, Huey Long, and Alfalfa Bill Murray. When they denounced overconcentration, in many cases using "Wall Street" as its symbol, they had the excuse of not being able to foresee that the rise of large-scale business would in fact become a great liberating movement, dispersing power, generating competition, and giving consumers more and more influence over the allocation of the economy's resources.

But in 1969 an Attorney General of the United States, himself not a crossroads demagogue but a Wall Street lawyer, has no excuse for failure to take cognizance of American business as it actually is. If Mitchell keeps on making these countryboy speeches, somebody is going to call him Wheelbarrow John.

A CHOICE OF HAUNCHES

The anti-bigness, anti-metropolitan bias in American politics has Thomas Jefferson's revered name attached to its origin. For a long time this bias was the chief asset and the chief liability of the Democratic party, whose grip upon the South loosened only when that region began to catch up, thanks to the belated presence there of corporations of national scale. Georgia, where Mitchell spoke, today exemplifies two societies: one of the most backward rural and small-town areas of the U.S. surrounds Atlanta, one of the most progressive metropolitan areas in the U.S. Where are the "second class" economic citizens of Georgia to be found? Are they around Atlanta, which teems with educated, independent decision makers (whether working for "branches" or for local entrepreneurs who wouldn't be there except for the "branches")? Or are "second class" economic citizens to be found in those red-clay counties where most of the people have very little choice about anything except which haunch to scratch?

At the very beginning of his Georgia speech Mitchell revealed a defective premise that may account for his policy. Noting a twelvefold increase in the U.S. national income (in current dollars) since 1890, when the Sherman Antitrust Act was passed, he went on to say that this economic growth "strongly supports our belief that the antitrust laws have served us well." It's true that the antitrust laws, enforced during most of those eighty years with respect for the free and legitimate evolution of business, have served the nation well. But to speak as if these laws were the main cause of the growth of the nation's prosperity is surely a ludicrous example of the logical fallacy known as *post hoc ergo propter hoc*. (A caused B to happen because B happened later than A.)

A CHOICE OF JEFFERSON'S

If the ex-officio prophets of antitrust think that antitrust created the present U.S. economy, then naturally they will assume that they can now bid the economy, as Joshua bade the sun and moon, to stand still. Mitchell prefers the sun to pause over Gibeon; he likes the look of the moon as it shines upon the valley of Ajalon.

But John Mitchell isn't Joshua. If government is to determine the proper size and shape of economic and social units, then the American people would probably prefer to have such decisions made by the likes of Pitchfork Ben rather than the likes of Wheelbarrow John. Any effort to freeze the 200 leading American corporations into their present shape, any effort to freeze the community structure of the U.S., can only result in a most un-Jeffersonian society where the police power of the central government becomes the concentrated site of economic and social decision making. We have here a conflict between two Jeffersons, the one who believed in a free society not shaped by government and the squire of Monticello who believed in small-scale economic units and who hated cities. Mitchell is backing the wrong Jefferson.—M. W.

THE 2-PERCENT ALLOWABLE HEW ACTION SHOULD BE RESCINDED

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution directing the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to rescind the action which he recently took to eliminate the 2-percent allowance in lieu of specific recognition of other costs under the program of Federal health insurance for the aged. The resolution also directs the Secretary to rescind any steps which have been taken to implement his action and further states that he should take no further action to alter or modify such allowance until he has consulted fully with the members or representatives of the hospital industry and other interested persons and reviewed with them the program's reimbursement formula so that any action which might be taken on the matter will afford reimbursement to providers under the program which reasonably reflects the amount of costs it is intended to cover.

During the past 45 days, I have received at least 50 letters from hospital administrations in and around the city of Philadelphia and throughout the State of Pennsylvania protesting the action of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in eliminating this reimbursement allowance as an economy move. When the medicare program was to become effective the principal area of dispute between the prospective hospital participants and the Social Security Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was over the method of apportioning cost to medicare program beneficiaries. Hospital representatives advocated average per diem—allowance costs divided by total patient-days—as the basis for determining medicare patient costs. The Social Security Administration, on the other hand, argued that the elderly were not like other patients because of a much longer length of stay for the elderly which resulted in a much lower usage of ancillary facilities. The SSA argued for the ratio of costs to charges as applied to costs as the method for determining medicare program costs.

In its discussions with the hospital industry representatives, the Social Security Administration was able to demonstrate that average charges per day decreased as the length of stay of the patient increased. Hospital representatives, on the other hand, were able to cite several local studies which indicated that the cost of routine care is much higher for the elderly. The effect of the two factors of lower use of ancillary facilities versus higher costs of routine care were compromised through the acceptance of the SSA's apportionment formula coupled with a 2-percent allowance for nonprofit hospitals—1½ percent for profit hospitals—particularly as a recognition of the higher nursing costs for the elderly. The legality of this compromise has been evaluated by the Comptroller General of the United States, and the General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

An agreement was reached between then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John Gardner and representatives of the hospital industry that they would be consulted and brought actively into any discussions which were conducted about plans to change the reimbursement formula with respect to the 2-percent allowance. I believe that the incoming administration should have honored this pledge and not acted in the precipitous manner it did in discontinuing the 2-percent reimbursement allowance. The apparent rationale for this action was solely for economy reasons. There was no consideration of the effect of such a reduction in the reimbursement on the provision of institutional health care and it was announced without any evaluation or discussions by either the hospitals involved or others connected with the action.

I believe that the Federal Government was clearly committed to discussions with representatives of the hospital industry with regard to any changes which might be considered in the reimbursement allowance. I believe that many hospitals will drop the medicare program because of this lack of candor on the part of the administration. Certainly any hospitals which are not now in the program will think twice about participating in a program in which one day they are receiving a reimbursement and the next are not without any prior notice. One thing is quite apparent and that is that the 2-percent factor was a major consideration in hospitals entering into contracts to participate in the medicare program. Even though the dollar amount that is involved in discontinuance of the reimbursement is relatively small in terms of Government finance, it is most important that the administration realize that the 2-percent factor represents a very substantial amount of the resources essential to hospital operations.

I do not believe that the Social Security Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare could possibly have had sufficient data available to determine the cost of caring for elderly hospital patients. One hospital administrator made the following comment to me in a letter on the matter:

> Secretary Finch has indicated that after 3 years of experience, they should know the cost of caring for medicare patients. This is not possible since the hospitals still do not

XUM

know or have audited data on the final settlements for the first 6 months of the medicare program.

Under the circumstances, I believe that this decision should not have been made until the hospitals had been given the privilege of submitting additional data on their costs.

Mr. Speaker, what I object to most is the manner in which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare announced their decision. They announced it without consulting with the most affected persons, the hospitals of the Nation. This is a flagrant disregard of an agreement which the hospital industry had with the previous administration. I believe in open covenants openly arrived at. I believe that the Federal Government cannot act in a vacuum. Its decisions affect people and when these decisions affect the health of the Nation and the ability of the Nation's hospitals to provide that care then I think it is in the national interest that decisions be reached through deliberation and consultation with all affected parties before the fact not after it. The text of the resolution I have introduced today is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 302

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the recent elimination of the 2 per centum allowance in lieu of certain provider costs under the medicare program

Resolved by the House of Representative (*the Senate concurring*), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare should rescind the recent action taken by the Commissioner of Social Security (and approved by the Secretary) in amending subpart D of Social Security Administration Regulations No. 5 (20 CFR 405.428) to eliminate the 2 per centum allowance in lieu of specific recognition of other costs under the program of Federal Health Insurance for the Aged as well as any steps which may have been taken to implement such action, effective July 1, 1969, and should take no further action to alter or modify such allowance until he has consulted fully with members or representatives of the hospital industry and other interested persons and reviewed with them the reimbursement formula under such program in order to insure that any action taken in connection with such allowance will afford reimbursement to providers under such program reasonably reflecting the amount of the costs it is intended to cover.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join those who today, in the Halls of this national legislative Chamber, pause in commemoration of Captive Nations Week, 10 years after the passage of the resolution by Congress in 1959, and the subsequent signing of the bill into law by President Eisenhower. This observance, designated under the provisions of the act as the third week in July, serves as a solemn reminder of the more than 100 million people in over 25 countries behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains who are daily being denied their basic freedoms.

Captive Nations Week was designed to show those oppressed peoples the continuing support of the citizens of the United States for any effort to regain independence from Communist-dominated and dictatorial rule. It also acts as a reminder to the Communist aggressors of our intention to combat any encroachments upon the free world.

The "captive nations" are the Achilles heel of the Red empire. They comprise an insecure bloc to the Communists, one which, in time of crisis, could throw the balance against totalitarianism. Realizing this, the Communist leaders have traditionally made alarmed responses to any advance news of the annual Captive Nations Week. It is this response which gives final proof of the worth of this commemoration as a reminder of our responsibility as representatives of this great Nation in extending hope to freedom loving people everywhere.

I urge that Americans take time this week to remember those behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains who have lost their freedoms, and to pledge support and action in the continuing struggle to regain peace and freedom in the world.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON URGES PROTECTION OF COYOTE, LYNX, BOBCAT AND OTHER PREDATORY MAMMALS

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues have read about an incident in Florida where ranchers tried to trap coyote parents by driving coyote pups into a burrow, and caging them for over 24 hours in 90-degree heat without food or water.

This senseless torture did not trap the parents. I know that it is often necessary to kill these predatory animals to protect livestock. I have no quarrel with this. But I advocate responsible, selective, and humane methods, not barbaric torture.

Unwarranted killing of predators is leading to the extinction of some species. In some cases, valuable animals, such as the mountain lion, are being hunted professionally for bounty where they cause no threat to livestock. Unnecessary elimination of predators often causes serious rodent problems, and in some cases the deer population gets out of control, and widespread starvation occurs in winter.

I have introduced a bill to encourage positive conservation policies toward these animals. I am advocating the disuse of poisons, and the lifting of bounties in various States for predatory mammals.

This bill would establish that the wolf, coyotte, mountain lion, lynx, bobcat, and several species of bear and other large, wild carnivores are among the wildlife resources of the United States and of special value.

My bill also authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to control predatory mammals when it is necessary to preserve livestock. It establishes a predatory mammal control agency to instruct farmers and ranchers in preventing plundering by predatory mammals, but it forbids the agency to use, demonstrate or advocate poisons as a control agent.

I feel this legislation is necessary to preserve our natural resources of wildlife and I urge full support from my colleagues.

GOVERNMENT CAN'T DO IT ALL

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, regardless of one's particular political bent, each one of us is aware, I think, of the crisis in values which has been growing throughout the decade. The Government has exerted efforts to bridge some of the gaps, ameliorate some of the existing tensions and provide for essential expansions and changes which are always necessary after an ideological flux. Yet, in many instances the Government has been unsuccessful in its efforts.

Urbanologist Daniel P. Moynihan, speaking at the University of Notre Dame commencement, offered a sensitive summation of the situation. Since he presented a side of the problem which we tend to overlook, I include excerpts of his speech in the RECORD:

GOVERNMENT CAN'T DO IT ALL

I would offer * * * the thought that the principal issues of the moment are not political. *They are seen as such:* that is the essential clue to their nature. But the crisis of the time is not political, it is in essence religious. It is a religious crisis of large numbers of intensely moral, even Godly, people who no longer hope for God. Hence, the quest for divinity assumes a secular form, but with an intensity of conviction that is genuinely new to our politics * * *

Having through all my adult life worked to make the American national government larger, stronger, more active, I nonetheless plead that there are limits to what it may be asked to do. In the last weeks of his life, President Kennedy journeyed to Amherst to dedicate a library to Robert Frost and to speak to this point. "The powers of the Presidency," he remarked, "are often described. Its limitations should occasionally be remembered."

The matter comes to this. The stability of a democracy depends very much on the people making a careful distinction between what government can do and what it cannot do. To demand what can be done is altogether in order: some may wish such things accomplished, some may not, and the majority may decide. But to seek that which cannot be provided, especially to do so with the passionate but misinformed conviction that it *can* be, is to create the conditions of frustration and ruin.

What is it government cannot provide? It cannot provide values to persons who have none, or who have lost those they had. It cannot provide a meaning to life. It cannot provide inner peace. It can provide outlets for moral energies, but it cannot create those energies. In particular, government cannot cope with the crisis in values which is sweeping the western world. It cannot re-

XUM

spond to the fact that so many of our young people do not believe what those before them have believed, do not accept the authority of institutions and customs whose authority has heretofore been accepted, do not embrace or even very much like the culture that they inherit.

The 20th Century is strewn with the wreckage of societies that did not understand or accept this fact of the human condition. Ours is not the first culture to encounter such a crisis in values. Others have done so, have given in to the seeming sensible solution of politicizing the crisis, have created the total state, and have destroyed themselves in the process.

I surely do not argue for a quietistic government acquiescing in whatever the tides of fortune or increments of miscalculation bring about; and in our time they have brought about hideous things. I do not prescribe for social scientists or government officials a future of contented apoplexy as they observe the mounting disaffection of the young. I certainly do not argue for iron resistance, as other societies have successfully resisted somewhat similar movements in the past.

I simply plead for the religious and ethical sensibility in the culture to see more clearly what is at issue, and to do its work.

Sympathy is not enough. *Tout pardonner, c'est tout comprendre* is not a maxim that would pass muster * * * with any who have helped us through the recent or distant past. If politics in America is not to become the art of the impossible, the limits of politics must be perceived, and the province of moral philosophy greatly expanded.

DR. ANASTAPLO ON GREECE

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, most of us are familiar with the current military government in Greece. Yet, it has been more than 2 years since this Government came to power, and it is easy to forget the anomaly of such a situation in a country that was the birthplace of the democratic concept.

Dr. George Anastaplo, a lecturer in the liberal arts at the University of Chicago and chairman of the political science department at Rosary College in River Forest, Ill., has commented extensively on the political situation in Greece. Among his statements were three televised interviews on contemporary Greek affairs.

Because of the interest of my colleagues in the Greek situation, under unanimous consent I submit these interviews for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with an introduction by Dr. Anastaplo.

The material follows:

GREECE AND AMERICA: TOWARD THE PRECIPICE TOGETHER?

(By George Anastaplo)

My concern is that Greek affairs not be permitted to drift beyond our ability as Americans to predict and to some extent influence them. The longer the present regime continues in Greece, the more radical and even desperate will become the dedicated men and women who dare oppose the government established in Athens on April 21, 1967 by a handful of junior Army officers exploiting American training and equipment.

The greatest but not yet likely danger for Greece is that of civil war, which (if it should begin and somehow continue more than a few months) could even see one camp being supplied by a reluctant America, the other camp having the massive aid it would require smuggled to it across one of the many frontiers of Greece. *If* civil war should be permitted to settle down on Greece, the Twentieth century would not see that country return again to that threshhold to modernity at which (after great effort and considerable American aid) she finally found herself in the early 1960's. It will, in any event, take many years to repair the damage already done their country by the present governors of Greece—the damage done by the colonels' regime to respect for law, to the national economy and even to military efficiency.

The United States has had to be deeply involved in the affairs of Greece ever since the Second World War. It will continue to be deeply involved for several more decades. Even so, Greek experts in the State Department are, it seems to me, hopelessly divided about the best course for us to encourage the Greeks to follow at this time. Indeed, the State Department is now so divided on this subject that it cannot be said to have a policy at all—and so opportunities are being ignored which cannot be depended upon to return. Thus, the official American attitude reinforces the temperamental reluctance of Greek politicians to subordinate themselves to a common cause.

I do not believe it either moral or expedient for the United States to continue to treat the current Greek military dictatorship as an honorable ally. Rather, our considerable influence in Greece should be directed to helping the Greeks secure the immediate return of King Constantine to Athens and the replacement of the colonels by a coalition government under the leadership of the conservative former prime minister, Constantine Karamanlis.

The United States will not be able to escape either the responsibility for or the consequences of whatever happens in Greece. It is prudent, then, to do what we can to help Greece return to a truly stable government before the costs for us as well as for them becomes higher and the risks larger than they already are. What we do in the next few months may be decisive for determining what life will be like in that country for some years to come.

* * * * *

The foregoing paragraphs, which continue (unfortunately) to be relevant, are taken from two statements on current Greek affairs published by me towards the end of 1968. We have now begun to hear in this country ominous reports of the first outbreak of serious fighting in Greece since the colonels' usurpation of April 1967. I do hope that these reports are not true. I also hope that the Greeks will not be driven, by the oppression of their government and by the paralysis of ours, to violent measures in their gallant effort to restore their country to her rightful place among the civilized nations of the world.

A few weeks ago, Greece's Noble Laureate, the poet George Seferis, issued to foreign correspondents in Athens a statement which included sentiments it is our duty as old friends of Greece both to notice and to do something about:

"It is almost two years since a regime was imposed upon us utterly contrary to the ideals for which our world—and so magnificently our people—fought in the last World War. It is a state of enforced torpor in which all the intellectual values that we have succeeded, with toil and effort, in keeping alive are being submerged in a swamp, in stagnant waters. I can well imagine that for some people these losses do not matter. Unfortunately this is not the only danger that threatens.

"We have all learned, we all know, that in dictatorial regimes the beginning may seem easy, yet tragedy waits at the end, inescapably. It is this tragic ending that consciously or unconsciously torments us, as in the ancient choruses of Aeschylus.

"The longer the abnormal situation lasts, the greater the evil.

"I am a man completely without political ties and I speak without fear and without passion. I see before us the precipice towards which the oppression that covers the land is leading us.

"This abnormality must come to an end. It is the nation's command."

The three televised interviews that follow are offered as an aid to Americans interested in advising our government as to what it should now do about "the abnormal situation" in Greece.

AN INTERVIEW BROADCAST BY WCIU–TV, CHICAGO, ILL., AUGUST 17, 1968

Q. Dr. George Anastaplo is a Lecturer in the Liberal Arts at the University of Chicago and a Professor of Political Science and of Philosophy at Rosary College, in River Forest, Illinois (where he is also chairman of the Political Science Department). Dr. Anastaplo has received both his Doctor of Jurisprudence and his Doctor of Philosophy degrees from the University of Chicago. He has travelled to Greece every summer since the year 1962 and has made an intensive study of that country's affairs. Last year, Dr. Anastaplo travelled as a foreign correspondent to Greece and had the opportunity to engage in conversations there with many people in different walks of life, including some officials of the present Greek government. He is preparing a book on Greece for publication.

Doctor, it is nice to have you with us on "Grecian Panorama." I know from your many visits to Greece that you have many things of interest you could tell us. But because we don't have much time, I suggest we should concentrate on just a few things tonight. I think that the most important subject currently may be the draft of the proposed constitution that is to be voted on by the Greek people next month. I think our viewers would find it interesting if you would review the events leading up to this draft of the proposed Constitution.

A. The most important event leading up to this draft constitution is, of course, the revolution executed by a group of Army officers in April of 1967, the revolution which came after two years of very excited political controversy in Greece and which was thought by some to be necessary to resolve that controversy. Now, anything anyone says about Greece is going to be controversial and anything anyone says in a short time is going to be superficial. But we must take a chance on this occasion.

The first thing that must be said in thinking about Greece, in thinking about the constitution that is to be voted on next month, is the fact that this is a unique situation as far as American foreign policy is concerned. That is to say, I believe this is the only place in the world where an unpopular and repressive government, which is somewhat dependent upon our support, has as its most likely popular alternative a government of the right. This, I think, cannot be found anywhere else in the world and makes somewhat strange the American position in Greece, a position which is not necessarily that of strong support but certainly of acquiescence in and sometimes mild support of the government.

I have said that it appears that the most likely present alternative to the current government is a government of the right. I am referring, of course, to a government that would be led by Constantine Karamanlis, who was for eight years the Prime Minister of Greece and probably the most important Prime Minister in Greece since Venezelos. Mr. Karamanlis is a known conservative, a man of the right, a man of proven effectiveness, and a man for whom everyone of the right and of the left would settle if he could be put back into power.

Now, what does this mean as far as American policy is concerned? The risk is, of course, that something could happen to Mr. Karamanlis. If something should happen to him—he is, after all, a man in his sixties—if something should happen to him, the most plausible peaceful alternative to rule by the present military governors of Greece would disappear, the man who could have brought the country together. The other thing that could happen, of course, is that as time goes by, as people begin to despair of a political settlement, such as Mr. Karamanlis would be, there is greater likelihood of a settlement by arms.

Last Monday afternoon I gave a talk at the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, in which I indicated that time was running short—that the opportunity for a political settlement was disappearing—and that the time had come when one could expect to hear more and more of violent reactions to the regime. The following day—by chance, of course—we heard of an attempted assassination of the Prime Minister of Greece. What really happened in Athens on that occasion, I do not yet know; but certainly, if this was not really an attempt at assassination, it cannot be long before serious attempts will be made. Such are the things that can happen if the plausible alternative represented by Mr. Karamanlis is not encouraged and supported by the United States.

Q. You mentioned that you feel that Mr. Karamanlis could unite the nation. Is this opinion of yours shared by the Greek people, by the Greek politicians? On what do you base your statement?

A. My impression is, from my visit last summer—and I have heard nothing since then that would challenge this—that the people on the right are certainly comfortable with Mr. Karamanlis; even the people on the left, last summer, were anxious for his return: they looked back to his Administration—although at the time they had opposed him—they looked back upon that as a much better alternative, and they realized his return to power was a plausible alternative, especially since the colonels who now run the government could themselves recognize in Karamanlis a man whom they could trust to some extent. This is a political settlement I am talking about. This is a settlement that would permit all factions in the country to be sure that a civilized decent regime would follow and that there would be no bloodletting, no unnecessary punishment, no unpredictable repercussions from a return to political government.

Yet someone might say to the Greeks, "You don't need such a political settlement now; you are about to get a constitution, a constitution which is scheduled to be voted on the 29th of September." But there are some curious things about that situation. It is, first of all, a curiously written constitution in the sense that there was first a draft written by a group of jurists and then, thereafter, there was a draft proposed by the colonels, presumably upon considering the reactions, the responses, the opinions expressed about the jurists' draft. There are other difficulties with this constitution, one of which is the fact that it is being proposed by people who came to power unconstitutionally. That, of course, brings it in under a cloud.

An even more serious difficulty is that I do not see that it is going to make much difference to the political situation in Greece. That is to say, the people who are politically minded do not regard this constitution as something they have to take seriously. Practically every prominent Greek politician I know of—practically every one: there are only two or three exceptions—has come out against it, including Mr. Karamanlis in Paris.

It is very hard to think of the referendum as something that people will really believe to be a legitimate expression of the public will. What I think it will be, rather than a referendum on a constitution, is, in effect, an attempt, by something approaching a plebiscite, to have the colonels' regime legitimated. That is going to be the effect of the voting. It seems to me very unlikely that such a vote and such a constitution would mean much more than such votes and such constitutions did in Stalin's Russia or than they do in, say, Franco's Spain. It is not too difficult, when you control all the means of communication, when you control all major weapons and virtually all means of coercion and when you have available the resources of government—it does not seem to me at all unlikely that you can in such circumstances secure the kind of vote you want.

Q. Then you don't feel that the present regime is about to relinquish its power?

A. No, Miss Vasils, I don't think it is about to. I think that once the Constitution is ratified—as I think it is likely to be in the circumstances: I will be surprised if it is not—, the present government will then decide under what conditions it will implement what parts of it. There is no announced schedule as to how this constitution is to be implemented.

Q. What provisions do you think are significant?

A. There are good and bad features in the proposed constitution. One of the distressing things about it is that there are a number of good features in it which, because of the fact that they will be hereafter associated with this regime—because they have been put forward and endorsed by this regime—will come to be regarded in the future as suspect. That is to say, somebody who, for bad reasons, should want to oppose one of these features in a future constitution, will (instead of having to rely on bad or selfish reasons) simply say, "This is the colonels' idea; you don't want that."

Q. That will be the natural reaction?

A. Yes, that would be a natural reaction with an unfortunate effect. Now, there are several good features in the proposed constitution. Let me just mention two of them. One of them is, of course, the proposed reduction in the size of the Parliament and the provision for a certain regularity in the way it is elected. I think that is probably an improvement. The reduction of the powers of the Parliament, however, I believe has gone too far.

In addition, I think most observers would say that the proposed reduction of the powers of the King is good not only for the country but also for the King himself. That is to say, the King's great powers and, even more important, the King's hitherto undefined powers have put him in a vulnerable situation. It is very difficult for a king—who may be a young man, or who may be old: it depends upon circumstances—to be able to contend successfully with men who have gotten to where they are because they are very good politicians. If he has to put his judgment and prestige on the line against such men, he is likely to be hurt. It is a favor to him, then, in a way—and certainly good for political stability—if his powers are somewhat reduced and defined. I think, however, that these, too, have been cut too severely, that his powers, as I read the Constitution, are even more restricted than those of the British monarchy. And that, I think, is going a little too far.

The provisions I have been talking about are good, except perhaps where they have gone too far. There are, on the other hand, several questionable provisions in the proposed constitution. One is the creation of what is called the Constitutional Court, which would have—which could have—the effect not only of limiting the expression of political opinion but, even more important, of severely restricting the number and kind of political parties that are established in the country. This court will supervise such political activity. Even if the court does not act against any party, it will be known by anyone who brings forward a party for certification that parties can be acted against. When political parties realize that such a court can suppress them, they will conduct themselves accordingly: they will restrain themselves much more than they should and thereby reduce even more the likelihood that they will speak freely on public issues and advance policies opposed to those of the government.

Q. Doctor, I am going to have to interrupt you, because our time is running out. Would you like to summarize or say something briefly, as a concluding remark?

A. The question I think we should keep in mind is, What should be the role of the United States with respect to Greece? I think that, unless something different emerges during our Presidential campaign, we do know one thing: we do know, thus far, that Mr. Nixon's policy has been, so far as I understand it, friendly toward this Greek regime or, at least, acquiescent to it, while, so far as I understand it, Mr. McCarthy's policy, just as Mr. Kennedy's was and as I believe Mr. Humphrey's to be, is unfriendly toward this regime. This juxtaposition [of the Nixon policy and the McCarthy-Humphrey-Kennedy policy] is something that Americans can well take into account as they consider what their government should do.

Q. Thank you for your remarks, Dr. Anastaplo. You prefaced an article on Greece you wrote for the *Massachusetts Review* with words of Abraham Lincoln which I would like to quote for our viewers: "I am very little inclined on any occasion to say anything unless I hope to produce some good by it."

We thank you for your remarks and hope you will soon be back with us on "Grecian Panorama."

An Interview Broadcast by WCIU–TV, Chicago, Ill., November 9, 1968

Q. Professor George Anastaplo has recently returned from a three-week tour of Greece which he conducted for the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations. Doctor, it is very nice to welcome you back for your second visit with us on "Grecian Panorama."

A. Thank you, Miss Vasils. It is good to be back.

Q. We heard today that the Greek government has announced that the constitution which was voted on September 29 [1968] is going to become effective next Friday, November 15. I think you will agree that the 92 per cent vote in favor of the Constitution has given the impression to many that the Greek people are in favor of their military government, that they believe it has saved the country from a threat of Communism and from a breakdown of law and order.

I know that our viewers would be interested in your opinion on these matters. I'd like to ask you about the implementation of the constitution as well as about the 92 per cent vote. Do you believe that this really indicates that now all is well in Greece?

A. No. I do believe it does indicate that all is under control in Greece, which is not the same as saying that all is well, although many Greeks who like to think of their country as one that is prone to disorder may believe it is better to have strict control than to run the risks that freedom brings.

No, I don't think all is well in Greece today, but all is predictable.

Q. I know you were in Delphi the day of the referendum and you did observe the voting there from dawn to dusk. Would you begin with an account of what happened that day and continue with your views on the situation.

A. The voting was in a school house there in Delphi, in a school room, where some 700 people voted. It was one of the places in Greece where the men and women both voted in the same place. In many other polling places, men and women voted separately, as is traditional. The voting I saw was very orderly, very quiet, and in some ways quite relaxed. Of the 684 ballots cast that day in Delphi, only seven were cast against the proposed constitution.

Q. Now, would you tell us the procedure.

A. The voter would come in. He would walk over to the table where the election officials were sitting. He would have his name marked off the voting list and his identity card punched to show he had voted (since voting has long been compulsory in Greece). Then he would take off the table an envelope (which was not transparent), take the ballot or ballots—the YES and NO ballots—take them, if he wanted to, into a curtained-off polling booth and there put the ballot he wanted into the envelope, discard the other ballot or put it in his pocket, come back to the ballot box, place his sealed envelope into the ballot box and leave. That was the procedure. Or, rather, that is the procedure one could go through if one wanted to.

On this occasion, however, out of the 684 voters that day in Delphi, less than twenty of them (as I tallied them that day) took both ballots. That is to say, all but twenty—and I don't think there were even twenty—took only the YES ballot, took it from the piles of ballots in front of the election judge and his assistants and, in most cases, put it in the envelope right there on the spot for depositing in the ballot box.

Q. The voter picked up both ballots? They were not handed to him?

A. The voter picked up what he "wanted" to pick up. That is to say, he was "free" to pick up either ballot. On this occasion, most of the voters took one of the Yes ballots and put that, right on the spot, into the envelope and cast it. Very few voters in Delphi that day took both ballots. Very few of them went behind the curtain—there is not much point going behind the curtain if one takes only one ballot—with the result that only seven voted No. Some of those who took both ballots and voted yes were people who knew one is "supposed" to take both ballots. This is the way one votes if one is an educated man, if one is a man of some prestige. (This is the way people voted in Athens that day, I have been told.) Such people might still vote yes, but at least they would take both ballots and then vote yes.

It was so obvious shortly after the polls opened in Delphi that almost everyone was voting yes that I was soon able to send out a report on the voting to a foreign correspondent friend in Athens who relayed it to London. This report, I am told, permitted the B.B.C. to announce, long before the votes were tabulated that night, that the balloting in Greece that day would be at least 90 per cent in favor of the proposed constitution.

Now, the interesting question is. Why did the people of Delphi vote this way?

Q. Yes, I was about to ask that.

A. One reason they voted that way is that they were told they should vote that way. This was the impression they had gathered from government officials, from government propaganda, and from authorities in the town. Everyone was saying, "You should vote yes, and furthermore, you should do it openly." This was again and again said to people—or, at least, people told me they had been told this.

Q. You mentioned government propaganda. What would this consist of?

A. Government propaganda about the voting was found all over. It was found in newspapers, of course, in signs, in big placards, on walls, in signs painted on buildings of all kinds. You no doubt heard of the very large sign on Mount Lycabettus in Athens the large neon sign which overlooked the city and could be seen from the most populated sections of the city all night—I am not sure all night. I don't know how long they kept it on—but it was visible every night. Then, there were the radio, the speeches, the campaigning.

It was a very intensive campaign on behalf of the proposed constitution. There was no one campaigning against the constitution, to speak of—a few stray voices here and there—but no organized campaign, no signs, no politicians permitted to go around the country speaking against the proposed constitution. Politicians were pretty much told to stay at home, which they did. It was a situation in which virtually all the public efforts being made were made to induce the people to vote and to vote YES.

It should also be noticed that this constitution was voted on under martial law. It was voted on, that is, where there was no effective freedom. I personally know people in Delphi who voted YES and openly—who walked in very calmly, took the YES ballot, voted it without even going into the booth, cheerfully, quite content evidently with the whole business—people who I knew from conversations on other occasions simply detest the regime. Something made them act the way the regime wanted them to act. It is not very hard to figure out why this happened, if one knows anything about how such votes are managed in Russia, how they were managed in Germany during the times of the Nazis. It does not take much imagination to recognize the forces that conspire to get the vote a government wants: propaganda, intimidation, bribery and hope, hope that "if we get a constitution, things may change."

Q. Do you feel, now that the Greek government has announced that the constitution will be implemented next week, that many people will say that the government is showing good faith and that they should cooperate?

A. People don't have much choice about cooperating. I think very few people will run the risk of opposing this government in any serious way. There are still thousands of people who are in island exile: a number of them are labeled Communists, and they may well be, for all I know; a number of them are non-Communists. Some of the island exiles are even senior Army officers, loyal to the King, who have thus been put out of the way. There is still tight control by the government of all means of publicity and of all systems of communications.

The Greeks don't know how much of the new constitution is going to be effective immediately. They have been told that some of the articles will not be immediately effective, such as the article assuring freedom of the press. They were told that before they voted. In other words, there are a number of articles that were suspended even before the constitution came into being. A number of other things would have to be known before one can decide what the implementation of the constitution will mean in practice. Is, for instance, martial law going to be continued?

Thus, the Greeks don't know what kind of a constitution they have gotten, and what is even more important, they don't know—they can't know—how various articles in it will be interpreted and how they will be implemented.

Q. It would seem from the 92 percent vote that the constitution was accepted passively. Yet some days later there was quite an expression of sentiment at the Papandreou funeral. What do you make of that?

A. In special circumstances, when there is a certain kind of anonymity or when passions are very high because of a funeral or for some other reason, one can get an idea of what's happening, of what people really think in Greece. That is to say, one does learn that there are a substantial number of people—we need not say how many there are—who are very much against this regime, and from whom nothing is heard ordinarily.

There have been two incidents, really, that have been very revealing. One of them is the incident of last December 13th [1967], in Kavalla. Kavalla is traditionally a left-wing, anti-royalist center. That was the occasion when the King made his effort to overthrow this regime. He landed in Kavalla; he was there suddenly, spontaneously. He was greeted in a way that he has never been greeted in any other place in Greece. He was carried through the streets. This was not organized; this was not a staged production. There was jubilation at the prospect that finally the colonels' regime was all over.

The second such manifestation was at the Papandreou funeral. When the old man, George Papandreou, died two weeks ago, there was obviously great emotion on the part of many who had been his followers over the years. So there was on November 3rd [1968], in Athens, a massive demonstration. I've seen estimates in American newspapers that speak in terms of hundreds of thousands of participants in that funeral demonstration. I just don't know and I am reluctant to say how many there were until I have had a chance to check with people I consider reliable. But what is certainly clear is that it was a very large demonstration. I would not be surprised to learn that the numbers involved in it were far more than the numbers in that area who voted NO in the constitutional referendum five weeks before. Now the problem is, Where were these people on referendum day? Why didn't they vote against the proposed constitution?

The thing that comes through, as one makes an effort to try to understand what is going on now in Greece, is that it is very difficult too learn what is going on because of the massive effort on the part of the government to present its position, and to present it in a way that has no regard for the truth. The Greek government will use any means, and say anything, in order to advance its position. That means that anyone studying this matter has great difficulty finding out from normal sources—the kind of sources one would use for an investigation in any other country in Europe this side of the Iron Curtain—very great difficulty finding out just what is happening.

One thing that *is* certain is that things are quite different in Greece from what the government says they are. I think it important for Americans interested in Greek affairs to keep that in mind. If we Americans are relying on the assumption that the present Greek government really has the support of its people, it is an assumption that is going to bring us to grief insofar as we are allies of the Greeks and want to remain allies of the Greeks in the years ahead.

Q. There are many people who say it is really none of our business as Americans to comment on what is happening in Greece.

A. That is sometimes said. But when Americans, and especially Greek-Americans, comment favorably on the regime, the Greek government plays it up, without restraint, no matter where they are, no matter who they are, no matter whom they are speaking to. Any comment that is favorable to the present regime will be played up in the Greek newspapers, which means that they think favorable comments are relevant. I should think, by parity of reasoning, that unfavorable comments are also relevant, especially when they are made by people who take the trouble to find out what is really happening in Greece today.

An Interview Broadcast by WCIU–TV, Chicago, Ill., November 23, 1968

Q. Professor Anastaplo, it is nice to have you back on "Grecian Panorama" tonight.

A. Thank you, Miss Vasils.

Q. It is well known, Dr. Anastaplo, that you are an advocate of the return to power in Greece of the former premier, Constantine Karamanlis, as the best solution to the Greek problem today. Some other opponents of the current Greek regime seem to think, however, that this would, in reality, be imposing another form of dictatorship on the Greek people. What are your comments on this?

A. I have heard the same kind of objection raised to the Karamanlis solution—whch is not really my suggestion alone, but the suggestion of many people in Greece as well. I think it is an objection which does not properly take into account what the situation really is in Greece today.

Now, the very fact that we are discussing this sort of thing here, on the air in Chicago, shows that something special is happening in Greece. As you indicated in your instruction of me, I have been to Greece a number of times, including times when Mr. Karamanlis was in power and other times when Mr. Papandreou was in power—that is to say, when there was in power a government right of center as well as a government left of center. Those situations did not compel Americans to discuss Greek affairs as we have been doing in this country the past eighteen months.

Even so, my own position has not been one of trying to suggest what the Greeks should do. It is rather an attempt to suggest what we Americans should do, and particularly what our State Department and our government should do in a situation in which the United States either has some responsibility or at least will have some duties because of its special relation with Greece as an ally. It is from this perspective that I am speaking.

Q. How would you answer those Americans who feel that the United States should not get further involved with any other problems in the world? How much further can we extend ourselves? Some say we are so involved now in Viet Nam that we should not get involved in the Greek situation.

A. That is a perfectly sensible caution, that we should recognize the limits of American power. The "limits of American power" means that we should recognize beyond what mark American power does not extend. But it also means that we should appreciate, if we are to be realistic about what "limits" means, within what limits American power can be effective.

The fact is that Greece is an American ally. It has been an ally of ours for twenty years. It is very much dependent upon the United States for several things—for arms, for example. The United States, on the other hand, wants certain things from Greece. There has long been a connection between the two countries, partly because of the large number of Greeks in this country. There is a traditional friendship between the countries. There has been over the years an affinity of institutions. There have been a number of things that have brought us together. That is to say, this isn't an artificial, a temporary, alliance.

Besides, whatever damage is done in Greece by any government is damage the United States will have to help repair someday. It isn't as if we can walk away from Greece and forget about it. There are a number of factors that require us to be interested in Greece, aside from the question which some people would insist upon, the question of our responsibility for what has happened there. We need not say that the United States is responsible for what has happened in Greece in recent years in order to be able to say that the United States should be concerned about what is going to happen or about what is happening in that country.

I am not concerned simply to settle a historical question about who *is* responsible for what has happened in Greece. The principal problem for me today is, what is the best way of correcting the situation right now, a situation which is so burdensome for our friends there, so burdensome for the people of our forebears. Even if one is living in the United States, even if one has been born here (as have I), one cannot help but feel a concern for that people. One cannot, as an American, simply abandon one's friends and those to whom one is close in that country.

Q. Now, you are speaking of the interest we should have, the concern we should have, because of what has happened there since April 1967. You would not have this concern if Greece had an elected, a duly-elected, government. Is that correct?

A. If there was in Athens a government that had been installed by the Greek people, if it was a government which clearly had the support of the Greek people, which was not a dictatorship, as this one clearly is, and if it was not doing various things that this government is clearly doing, such as torture, such as intimidation (even of Greek-Americans), it would be a quite different matter. You can talk to Greek-Americans in this country who will tell you that they have been approached and threatened, through their relatives back in Greece, for criticizing the regime in Greece. After all, even so courageous a Greek as Helen Vlachou has had to close down her journal [*Hellenic Review*] in London. Why did she have to close down so useful and so successful a publication? Press reports published here speak of pressure put on her by threats to her family in Athens. This is not what she said, of course, but this is what press reports have said. When there is this kind of government in Greece, it is a serious question whether or not we Americans should sit by and accept it *as an ally;* it is a serious question whether we can sit by and, even if only passively or by acquiescence, help it do what it does. I am not concerned, primarily, to tell Greeks what they should do. I am concerned to say what the United States should and should not do. This I am obliged and entitled to do.

Now, let us consider the question of Constantine Karamanlis. Those who say that the best thing for Greece would be immediate free elections which would let the Greeks return whom they would return to power, have something to be said for them. There is, for instance, something to be said for Andreas Papandreou as an alternative to Mr. Karamanlis. Mr. Papandreou is a man who is well-intentioned. I have not yet met him. I have never talked to him, nor even corresponded with him. I know only what everybody knows about him. But from what I do know of him, I am prepared to believe that he means the best for Greece. He has considerable talent and, given the proper opportunity, he might some day do things for Greece. I have no doubt about that.

I have no doubt that there are many other Greeks as well as who can make important contributions to their country. But my concern is, What is the best way the United States can help Greece out of the present circumstances, which are in some ways very, very dangerous? Anything can happen when a people is compelled, as are the Greeks today, to do something it does not want to do. What may happen no one can predict. It is the unpredictable, in a way, that is threatening Greece and that is threatening the United State's role in Greece.

Mr. Karamanlis seems to me the best way out because it is a way that does appeal to people of the left, right and center in Greece. I know this from my own interviews in Greece. This solution appeals to people in the American government. It appeals even to people who are supporting the colonels in Greece: they find Mr. Karamanlis least threatening of all the alternatives to their own rule.

Q. Least threatening in what way?

A. If Mr. Karamanlis should come to power, I believe he would be reasonable about what he would do in the way of calling the colonels to account.

Q. What do you think he should do if he came in?

A. I am in favor of amnesty, as much as possible. I am in favor of closing accounts, rather than settling them. I am not in favor of fighting old battles over and over again. Greece has had too much of that. I am not in favor of shedding blood to settle something. I hope Mr. Karamanlis would take much the same position.

What would Mr. Karamanlis do if he returned to power? Would it be a dictatorship? There is no reason why it should be a dictatorship. I don't know what he would do; no one *knows* what he would do. But there is no reason why he should impose upon himself the extra burden of maintaining a dictatorship. A dictatorship is really a very inefficient form of government to maintain. It is very inefficient in many ways. For instance, information is very hard to get. Reliable information that people need to run their affairs intelligently is often hard to get in a dictatorship of this kind, whether it is in Russia or in Germany of the old days or in the Greece of the colonels today. There is no need for Mr. Karamanlis to impose such burdens upon himself. There is no reason for him to incur the enmity of people left of center. He already has the support of well over half of the Greeks. When a leader has such support, he does not have to impose upon his people the kind of restrictions the colonels are imposing. They impose the restrictions they are imposing, and thus run the risk of provoking a ruinous civil war, because they have no other way of maintaining themselves in power.

The Karamanlis solution is, I believe, the only prudent, political solution that can be depended upon. There are other solutions that might work. But this one is the most reliable for getting Greece past the colonels without a catastrophe. It would put in power a man who has some respect for the ordinary political processes of his country. One thing we should remember is that Mr. Karamanlis was actually voted out of office in the elections of 1963–1964. The colonels will never be voted out of office. That is to say, they will never be voted out of office in a situation where they are actually putting up candidates that they are supporting. They might some day use an election, if they feel themselves going, as a way of making a safe transition—but they will not be surprised by the result of any elections they conduct.

Mr. Karamanlis, authoritarian as he sometimes was, strong-minded as he sometimes was, was nevertheless enough of a constitutionalist, enough of a democrat, to allow himself to be defeated, to be defeated in an election which no doubt had all kinds of irregularities and even fraud on both sides. He was enough of a politician conforming to the rule of law and to normal democratic processes to be willing to submit himself to the electoral process and to be deprived of power after having served eight rather successful years in the highest office.

Q. Do you feel that something could be worked out whereby the colonels themselves could serve their country together with other leaders?

A. I think there are things the colonels could be given to do that would take care of them.

If I were a leader of the Left of Center—in Greek politics, I am nothing: I have no posi-

XUM

tion in Greek politics—but if I were someone left of center, if I were a member of the Center Union, I would be inclined to work out a coalition with Mr. Karamanlis, in which some of our people—if I were left of center—would take certain cabinet posts. If, however, the Center Union should insist on free elections, and if they could somehow get them, they would have nothing. It would be (in my opinion) a landslide for Mr. Karamanlis and his supporters, while the Center Union would be left with nothing at all. I think it is in the interest of the Center Union leaders, if they want to retain some control over the immediate political life of Greece, to join now some kind of coalition under Mr. Karamanlis's leadership.

It is in Mr. Karamanlis's interest, on the other hand, to bring into his government several leaders of the Center Union. After all, everyone knows that if the elections of 1967 had been carried out, the Center Union Party would probably have had a majority. The Center Union has been deprived of what it had, in a way, earned, and consequently, there is a danger of bitterness, a danger of recrimination, that comes from this kind of deprivation. It would surely be prudent for Mr. Karamanlis to head off such a development by recognizing what the Center Union can contribute to Greece.

A *political* decision is needed in Greece today, a recourse to what is possible in present circumstances. The objection that the return of Mr. Karamanlis to power is likely to lead to a dictatorship is not something one hears as much in Greece as out. In Greece, people do feel the present regime as a real dictatorship, and they realize that whatever they remember about Mr. Karamanlis's administration, whatever complaints they had about it, his administration was nothing like this, and they appreciate that.

I think that the most interesting thing about the objections one hears against imposing a dictatorship through Mr. Karamanlis is that they reveal something about the sometimes unrealistic character of Greek political opinion. That is to say, it seems to an outsider, such as I am, extremely unrealistic for Greeks abroad to object, "We don't want Mr. Karamanlis, we want free elections, et cetera", as if free elections would solve everything, as if they are likely to get free elections as an alternative to the colonels. One must, in political matters, consider the practical alternatives and make a judgment. The kind of objection we have been discussing tonight, which can stand in the way of forming an effective coalition in opposition to the colonels, should give Americans who are not familiar with Greek politics an idea of the idealistic shortsightedness that has sometimes characterized Greek politics and that has contributed to the present troubles in Greece.

Certain obvious compromises during the 1965–1967 crisis—certain compromises of a political character, certain prudential solutions—would have prevented the troubles the Greeks have now. I refer to the kind of compromise that an ordinary American politician would have easily been able to make. This the Greeks were unable to do—and this is partly why they have what they have. They certainly don't deserve what they have, but there is a reason why they have it.

ROCKEFELLER'S TRIPS A BLUNDER

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, while no one can blame Gov. Nelson Rockefeller for the violent anti-American demonstrations that marred his visits to Latin America, the Governor can and must be held responsible for the planning of the trip with such a large entourage, for continuation after it became clear that the enterprise was ill-timed, and especially for his willingness to be photographed in an exuberant pose with Dictator Duvalier of Haiti.

I commend to readers of the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Adirondack Daily Enterprise for July 8, 1969, written by the paper's publisher, James Loeb, former Ambassador to Peru:

THE GOVERNOR'S TRIPS HAVE ENDED—FINALLY

Editorial space is supposed to be used for the editor's honest expression of opinion, judiciously articulated but nonetheless straightforward. Within this context, we are constrained to say that Governor Rockefeller's several trips to Latin America have constituted, at least in the short run, a disaster for the United States and even for the Governor himself.

Despite our divergent political affiliation, we have always considered the Governor a fine public servant, a voice of generally constructive moderation, and, with some exceptions, a good governor. We still do.

But everyone makes mistakes, and we believe that Nelson Rockefeller is honest enough with himself to recognize now, after the fact, that these trips have been unhelpful, to put it mildly. We will continue to believe this, despite any public statements the Governor may make to the contrary, simply because he is too intelligent to delude himself.

We recognize that the disturbances do not represent the majority of the citizens of those Latin American countries he was permitted to visit. On the contrary, we suspect that much (but not all) of the opposition expressed was inspired and even maneuvered by forces that would never be friendly to the United States, no matter what our policies are or might be.

We readily concede that, on the basis of his trips, the Governor could make recommendations to the President which would, if accepted and implemented, be of great benefit to the United States and to the Latin American countries. This could be a plus fatcor, but we find it hard to believe that the Governor learned enough to warrant the cost or enough that could not have been learned through less flamboyant investigations.

We would even be prepared to admit, as the Governor has charged, that the press, radio and television exaggerated the negative aspects of his trips without giving sufficient attention to the positive aspects.

But for us the culminating shame was the picture of our smiling Governor with President Duvalier of Haiti waving to the crowds of people whom the most corrupt and ruthless dictator of the hemisphere had brought out to greet him. Added to the deaths that resulted from the various visits, this picture cannot soon be obliterated from history.

There were other dictators visited by the President's envoy . . . in Brazil and Paraguay and Argentina, dictators who had suppressed and/or jailed citizens whose friendship for the United States had been fully demonstrated and documented. But the friendly visit to "Papa Doc" Duvalier's Haiti was the culmination of the disaster.

What kind of impression does this give the Latin American people? If the Peruvian government (also a military dictatorship) nationalizes without adequate compensation one American oil company which, whatever its present legitimate rights, has made many fortunes out of Peruvian oil, we threaten to cut off all our aid. But apparently the ruthlessness and corruption of the Duvaliers of the hemisphere do not bother us at all. What kind of values do we espouse?

We are not suggesting that it is the responsibility of the United States government to intervene in the internal affairs of foreign countries, even to bring justice or to implement democratic practices. On the contrary. But we surely should not go out of our way to lend respectability to governments which are a disgrace, not only to their own people, but to the continent.

What is amazing about the Governor's series of trips is that the idea was first suggested to President Nixon by Galo Plaza, secretary general of the Organization of American States, and then accepted by Mr. Rockefeller. Both Galo Plaza and Rockefeller are thoroughly knowledgeable in Latin American affairs; both are democrats with a small d. And President Nixon might have learned something from his horrible experience in Latin America in 1958.

Maybe the one gain from the recent Rockefeller experience, despite the cost, is the knowledge acquired of the great gap between what experts knew of the feelings of Latin Americans a generation ago and what their feelings are today.

The late Mayor LaGuardia once said of himself, "When I make a mistake it's a beaut!" Governor Rockefeller can echo the remarks of "the Little Flower."

IF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INTEREST RATE BILL MERELY RATIFIES CURRENT PRACTICE, WHAT, THEN, IS THE NEED FOR THIS FAR-REACHING BILL?

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I was prepared yesterday to take the floor in opposition to H.R. 255, the bill scheduled for consideration yesterday dealing with interest rates on installment loans in the District of Columbia, when the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MCMILLAN), announced that action on that bill would be postponed for 2 weeks. I am glad the gentleman from South Carolina decided not to call up the bill yesterday because, frankly, none of us had had sufficient time to give it the study it deserves. The committee report on the bill did not become available to us until yesterday morning.

In view of the discussion yesterday afternoon between the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN), and the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and the statement by the gentleman from South Carolina that the bill merely ratified a practice which has been in existence on the part of the banks here for 61 years, I feel it might be useful to the Members to read the remarks I had prepared for the debate yesterday. I was seeking to put the issue into perspective in relation to the Truth in Lending Act which took effect July 1 of this year.

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DEBATE ON H.R. 255

Had the bill been called up yesterday, and I had been recognized to discuss it, I was prepared to say that this bill is not necessary in order to accomplish what it purports to do, but it does a lot of things it pretends not to do. It is a bad bill. It should either be recommitted to committee for further study—and public hearings on this amended version—or it should be defeated out of hand.

I am amazed that a committee of the House would bring in a bill to extend blanket amnesty to anyone who ever violated a District law which has been on the books for 61 years. Yet that is what this bill does.

Please read section 4 of the bill as amended in committee:

> The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to any loan described in section 28-3307(a) of the District of Columbia Code (added by section 3 of this Act) final repayment of which is due after July 1, 1968.

Mr. Speaker, do you know of any other bill which goes back 1 full year or more to forgive any violation which might have occurred under existing law?

This bill does. I understand that the statute of limitations for the District of Columbia protects any transaction which was completed more than a year ago. So this bill fills in the intervening 12 months, and provides amnesty for that entire period.

Now what does it provide amnesty from? This is the part which is so mysterious. It purports to permit District of Columbia banks and savings and loans to continue offering the same kind of installment loans that they have regularly been providing, and presumably at the same effective rates of interest. But who or what says they cannot continue to offer such loans without the passage of this bill?

NO REFERENCE IN REPORT TO TRUTH IN LENDING ACT

There is no explanation in the committee report for this point. We are led to believe from the committee report that unless this bill becomes law, District of Columbia banks no longer will be able to offer what they call 8-percent discount loans, which are actually at the effective annual rate of 15.75 percent.

Nowhere in the report is there any reference made to the Federal Truth in Lending Act which took effect July 1, yet the implication has been given that the truth in lending law apparently, or presumably, or possibly, or ostensibly, makes the practices of the District of Columbia banks in extending 8-percent discount loans illegal under the District's 8-percent usury ceiling.

That is simply not true. And I assume that, since it is not true, the Committee on the District of Columbia has therefore carefully refrained from using this argument in its report.

All the Truth in Lending Act requires in connection with these 8-percent discount loans is that the bank reveal that the annual percentage rate of the finance charge is actually 15.75, not 8 percent. In order to avoid any confusion, or to avoid the possibility of nuisance suits under the various State usury laws setting maximum rates on interest, the Federal Truth in Lending Act carefully spells out the fact that the finance charge on which the annual percentage rate is based is not regarded as interest under any State usury law.

But because the truth-in-lending law requires the District of Columbia banks, and all other lenders everywhere in the country, to reveal the actual rates of their finance charges—which are far above what the people have generally thought they were paying in terms of an annual rate—the District of Columbia banks now say they fear that some consumers will file nuisance suits against them alleging that they have been violating District of Columbia's 8-percent usury law ceiling.

ARE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BANKS VIOLATING EXISTING LAW?

In the very brief testimony before the subcommittee which considered the original H.R. 255, the witnesses from the banking industry made it clear that they did not think they have been violating the District's usury ceiling with their 8-percent discount loans, and felt they could easily prove this in court.

I think they should be given the opportunity to do so.

The handling of this bill has been mysterious and amazing. The amended bill was approved in committee several weeks ago. Yet the amended bill was not available to us until a few hours before its scheduled consideration by the House. The committee report was not filed until sometime before midnight last Friday. Yet we are being asked to take up this far-reaching measure with no real opportunity to study it carefully.

The committee acknowledges hastiness in its draftsmanship by saying that it does not intend the bill to legalize 16 or 14 or 12 percent interest on home mortgages, and I understand the committee plans to offer an amendment to its amended bill to make that point clear. But the fact that the bill came out of committee with provisions which could apply such high ceilings to mortgages makes us all wonder what else might be permitted or allowed in this bill that the committee does not know about or has not looked into.

The worst thing of all is the amnesty clause. I will move to strike that out of the bill. What right have we to forgive past violations of law, if they have occurred?

IS 16 PERCENT TOO HIGH, TOO LOW, OR JUST RIGHT? WHY?

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that although the committee report implies that all of the testimony received on H.R. 255 when the brief hearings were conducted on it in this Congress was favorable, the record should show that I objected to the bill in its original form, for reasons which I spelled out in detail, in a statement provided to each member of the subcommittee on the morning of the hearing, and later inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 7 at page 11665. No mention is made of my opposition in the report. But in conformance with the recommendations I made in my written testimony, the committee junked the original approach of H.R. 255 and has now come out with an amended bill which straightforwardly raises the legal rates of interest in the District on installment loans. Undoubtedly, the present 8-percent usury ceiling is too low. But what is the right figure? Should it be 16 percent, as this bill proposes, or 12 percent, as is the case in nearby Maryland? No study seems to have been made on that point. So we do not know, from the committee's work on this bill, whether 16 percent is too high, too low, or just right.

All we do know is that the committee has taken the highest rates currently charged by district banks for installment loans and said, in effect, this is a dandy rate, just right, so let us legalize it.

COMPREHENSIVE STUDY NEEDED BEFORE LAW IS PASSED

Mr. Speaker, this bill should be recommitted for further study—and for comprehensive study, not just a whitewash of what has been done. If the Suburban Trust Co., of nearby Maryland can advertise—as it has been doing under truth in lending—that its rate on the kind of installment loans covered in this bill is 12 percent, why do the District banks need 16 percent? Maybe they do. But why?

If we pass this bill, and it becomes law, how soon would it be before the Maryland banks go to their legislature and say that since the District banks can get 16 percent, Maryland banks should not be held to 12 percent. This bill could therefore have tremendous ramifications on all types of consumer loans—on the rates charged.

If the District Committee does not want to undertake the research necessary to come forward with a comprehensive bill on consumer credit rates and charges, then it should let the Washington, D.C., City Council do it. But, in the meantime, I can assure the Members of this House that if 15.75 percent has always been a legal rate in Washington for a so-called 8-percent discount loan, then the Truth in Lending Act does not make it suddenly illegal, so this bill is unnecessary from that standpoint. All truth in lending has done in that respect has been to smoke out the true rate—and that is what truth in lending is supposed to do.

H.R. 255 is a bad bill.

CURB INFLATION HONESTLY—CUT GOVERNMENT SPENDING

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a hysteria hovers over our land to sell an extension of the surtax as if it were some desperate final effort to curb the continuing inflation. The cry is that the taxpayers' spending causes inflation—their money must be taken out of circulation. The tax pushers seem convinced that by repetition of the cliche, "the surtax is necessary to curb in-

XUM

flation," they can hypnotize the taxpayers and voters to blindly accept the hoodwink as being true.

As the surtax extension awaits further action, the Ford Foundation announces grants of better than $3 million in the District of Columbia alone.

Are the U.S. taxpayers to be told that foundation grants do not contribute to inflation—perhaps because they are tax free?

Even the United Nations organization indicated concern over our inflation crisis—not on behalf of our taxpayers—but over our marketplace for foreign imports.

Our constituents are not being taken in. They are writing back, "We're worried about inflation, too. Curb Government spending."

Mr. Speaker, I include several news clippings:

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 13, 1969]

NINE NEGROES IN AREA GET FORD GRANTS

Nine faculty members in the Washington area-are among 104 Negro college and university teachers who have received grants from the Ford Foundation for advanced graduate study this fall.

The grants, totaling nearly $1 million, were made nationally to 70 universities and colleges. They include allowances for tuition, fees, books and travel, plus a salary stipend.

"The purpose of the awards is to increase the number of blacks who are qualified to participate fully in American higher education by assisting them in obtaining the key credential—a doctoral degree," said James W. Armsey, a Ford Foundation spokesman.

Area recipients and their awards are:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Catholic University—Verna L. Cook, $8,150; D.C. Teachers College—Theodore R. Hudson, $14,015; Howard University—Kermit K. Keith, $10,000; Ezra A. Naughton; $7,416, Edna N. Sims, $7,545, and Michael R. Winston, $10,165.

MARYLAND

Bowie State College—Julia C. Elam, $9,616; University of Maryland at College Park—John W. Blassingame, $8,875.

VIRGINIA

Northern Virginia Community College—Joseph B. Myers, $9,067.

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 10, 1969]

URBAN GROUP GETS $2 MILLION GRANT

The National Urban Coalition today received an unrestricted grant of $2.25 million from the Ford Foundation.

The money will be used to help meet expenses of the coalition during the next two years, according to its chairman, John W. Gardner.

It was the third Ford grant to the coalition, which was formed in the wake of riots in Detroit and Newark in 1967 and has tried to marshal business, labor, religious and government groups behind solving the problems of the urban poor.

[From the Washington Post, July 13, 1969]

U.N. FINDS U.S. INFLATION "DISTURBING"

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

UNITED NATIONS.—Continued inflation in the United States during the first quarter of 1969 despite restraining influence was "particularly disturbing," according to a U.N. world economic survey.

Noting that the expansion of demand occured notwithstanding the income tax surcharge, higher Social Security deductions and strict monetary policies, the economic and social council study said further U.S. price increases are "more certain than ever" in view of wage awards.

"The task of slowing down the rate of increase in prices with minimum loss of employment and production is the challenge that faces not only the United States but also France and the United Kingdom," the study asserted.

Nevertheless, the 5 per cent increase in American demand, after an industrial slide in 1966, was "by far the most important single factor" in the impact on other countries, the study pointed out.

American imports jumped 24 per cent to $33 billion in 1968. Some 60 per cent of these came from Canada, Japan and West Germany.

Libya, where an oil boom is in process attained the highest 1968 growth in real domestic product—40 per cent—against a 21 per cent 1960–67 average. Other countries with large 1968 rates of expansion included Israel, 14 per cent; the Republic of Korea, 13, and Japan and Iraq, 12. The Soviet Union registered a 7.2 per cent gain.

Countries with the largest gross products are likely to show the smallest percentages of gain because of their higher base.

Despite the outlook for expanded growth, the report warned that if developed countries resort to defensive measures to restore trade balances or ward off imports, developing countries could suffer. If the flow of capital were checked, the 1960s could end with an aid crisis, the survey added.

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 10, 1969]

GRANTS MADE TO SPUR MINORITY BUSINESSES

(By Philip Shandler)

The Nixon administration has announced the first efforts of its new Office of Minority Business Enterprise—grants to stimulate new private credit and technical aid.

The one-year grants, announced yesterday by Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans, include $200,000 to Howard University for establishment of a National Institute for Minority Business Education.

Another $200,000 in what Stans called "administrative money" is being given to the National Bankers Association, a Negro group, for creation of a locally supported "credit pool."

And the Rev. Leon Sullivan of Philadelphia is getting $650,000—disclosed a few days ago—to help establish in 13 cities Negro-owned shopping centers like his successful Progress Plaza.

The grants were requested by the OMBE, Stans said. They are being made, respectively, by the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and two Commerce Department agencies, the Small Business enterprise, Stans said. Announcement of the funding constitutes a first progress report for the four-month-old OMBE, he said.

The OMBE was set up by President Nixon to coordinate the efforts of various departments to promote so-called black capitalism.

Stans also announced that:

1. The Chrysler Corp. has committed itself to granting 25 car dealerships to minority-group members, and other manufacturers are being pressed to follow suit, for a total of 100 new franchises.

2. Gasoline suppliers, retail franchisers, and accountancy associations are being urged to help start new minority businesses.

3. The creation of more small-business investment corporations is being explored to stimulate new capital, and other money is being sought from big corporations and foundations.

The institute at Howard will "identify successful business and management techniques and make them available to minority businessmen," Stans said. This already is being done on a smaller scale by Howard's Small Business Guidance and Development Center.

PROTESTS INCREASED FEDERAL SPENDING

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have for a long time been protesting the trend toward increased Federal spending and involvement that is promoted by liberals and Washington bureaucrats. Under the guise of "public welfare," the spending power is taken away from the individual and local government and given to the Federal Government to be doled out according to the determinations of individuals with GSA ratings. As a result, all political power comes to Washington and the local and State initiative to undertake constructive programs is destroyed.

My good friend, State Senator James D. Swan, of Elkhorn, Wis., has pointed out another deleterious effect of Federal programs and spending. He points out, correctly, that in recent years the Federal Government often has encouraged State participation in Federal programs by putting up a set proportion of the cost to begin with. Then, with disturbing frequency, Uncle Sam's support has been curtailed or stopped. Meanwhile, the States have geared up to participate with staff and equipment and their citizens grown dependent upon the programs.

When this happens, the States are under pressure to continue, even though they have to foot most or all of the bill. The States have been conned and left holding the bag.

In order to defend the State of Wisconsin against Federal capriciousness, Senator Swan introduced, and pushed through to unanimous adoption by the senate, an amendment to the State budget commonly referred to as the "Swanee Hooker." This amendment provides that in any program financed cooperatively by Federal funds, with State or Federal participation, whenever the Federal share is reduced, the State's share must be cut back by the same percentage. The measure allows local units to follow the same policy.

This amendment was adopted by the Wisconsin Senate as a keystone in the protection of the people against changing programs under changing administrations, and the loathing by local bureaucrats of relinquishing an old program and its payroll, no matter how obsolete the program may have grown.

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in placing the "Swanee Hooker" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend its study as a necessary part of the political education of all Members of the House of Representatives. It is my wish that this measure will eventually work its way into the budgets of all State legislatures, thereby making the Federal Government more responsible in its involvement in the affairs of State and local governments. Its adoption would also protect the individual citizen whose finances are being raided with increasing frequency by taxes, from having to pay for both the Federal and State involvement.

The amendment follows:

All appropriations made in this chapter are subject to the specific provision that when and if the Federal Government funding of any proportion of a program is reduced or terminated, State participation in the program shall be reduced in the same proportion as such Federal reduction, such State reduction to be implemented by the responsible State agency within 60 days. The State agency may appeal to the joint committee on finance for mitigation or temporary relief from this order. Notwithstanding any other provisions of the statutes, local units of government are hereby authorized to make similar proportionate reductions in their support of such programs.

YOUTH'S CONSTRUCTIVE GOALS

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day I had the pleasure of addressing the people of the village of Garden City, N.Y., at their annual Memorial Day ceremonies sponsored by the American Legion.

During the course of the ceremonies, the student council president, Chuck Jacob, addressed the people of the village.

He was the representative of the young, speaking to the parents and taxpayers of the village of Garden City.

His speech struck me as one which made sense, and had a constructive purpose and a rational goal. The contents of it follow:

MEMORIAL DAY SPEECH, MAY 30, 1969

(By Student Council President Chuck Jacob)

America's young people are a source of great concern to many today who feel that youth is heading in a direction opposite to that of the rest of the nation. While it is true that there are those who are misguided and seeking answers in disorder, destruction, and distrust, I think it is safe to say that the majority of the young today possess a sincere concern for America, and act in efforts to improve their country. Many times what is regarded as dissent against America is really constructive criticism intended to bring about improvements in the nation that will, after all, be inherited in not too long a time by the younger generation. Thus, while for many this current dissension portends a bleak future for America, I feel that it is an encouraging sign of return to deep concern in America and her problems, an emotion that may well have been lacking in previous times. This concern is now expressed in methods unsatisfactory to many Americans; but this is due to the limitations of our age, and when, in fact this generation is absorbed into the basic structure of American society such concern will be expressed in the forms of legislation, reform, and justice. Americans should not let the impulsiveness and emotion of youth camouflage the basic desire to improve and maintain this country which, after all, achieved greatness in an effort to improve society.

What many do not appreciate is the price America has paid, and is currently paying, in her efforts to keep men free to improve. Disagreements with American policy must not be stifled, for the right to disagree is what thousands have fought and died for. Conversely, those not in accord with America's actions should consider the dear price paid for freedom, and not take the privilege of dissent lightly.

The very fact that Americans have such great freedom stands as a monument to American servicemen of all eras. These men and women who have given of themselves so unselfishly are the ones to be thanked for the freedom in America and over much of the globe. Unfortunately, many of those to whom we owe the greatest thanks are not here to receive them; and that is the purpose of Memorial Day—to serve as a reminder to all Americans that many have shed their blood to establish America as a bastion of democracy for the entire world.

Our nation is a great nation, but one with problems—problems which must be overcome if America is to continue in her destiny in the future.

I think if every American, old and young, let the sacrifices of those we honor stand as an example for him and then gave more of himself to concern and pride in our nation, then many of today's problems would be on the road to solution and it will be a strong, vital America that the youth of America inherits.

BAY'S AIR POLLUTION UNABATED

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, like many places in the United States, the beautiful bay area of California has its problem with air pollution.

The Oakland Tribune has published a series of articles on this subject which are well written and will be of interest to all those who are concerned with this grave problem.

I include the first three articles with these remarks and commend them for your reading:

[From the Oakland (Calif) Tribune, June 29, 1969]

BAY'S AIR POLLUTION UNABATED—SMOG STAYS DESPITE REGULATIONS

(By Ernie Cox)

When President Nixon on May 29 announced creation of a cabinet-level council on environmental quality, he said: "We have become victims of our technological genius."

The President's move, with air pollution as one of its primary targets, is only the latest in a series of governmental actions at various levels to do something about the air we breathe.

For the past two decades the State of California has had what it euphemistically calls "a program for air resources management." In the battle against smog, Los Angeles and the San Francisco Bay Area are far ahead of most of the nation. It was—and is—a matter of survival.

To the average eye-smarting Californian it is small comfort to know that the problem existed as far back as the year 1215. In that year of the Magna Carta King John of England decreed a ban against foul smelling wood-burning carts that local food vendors pushed through London's murky streets. It was the world's first known air pollution control regulation.

The word smog was coined by a London physician in 1905 to describe a combination of smoke and fog.

To the Los Angeles area went the dubious honor of introducing to the world a new type pollutant—called photochemical smog. The major source: the gasoline-burning motor vehicle.

This brownish haze is the result of nitrogen oxides and hydrocarbons reacting with sunlight to form new compounds which reduce visibility; irritate the eyes, nose and throat; damage plants, crack rubber products, peel paint from buildings, aggravate asthma and possibly is linked with cancer.

In virtually all California cities of 50,000 population or more, an air pollution problem exists. More than half the state's 58 counties have experienced plant damage.

The U.S. Public Health Service says Americans pour 142 million tons of waste into the air every year—more than 1,400 pounds for every man, woman and child.

In the Bay Area a total of 9,473 tons of pollutants per day were emitted into the air last year, according to local air pollution officials, who claim their "tonnage" figures are 85 per cent accurate.

Last year's pollutant figure represents a decrease of 2.7 per cent in total pollution in the Bay Area over 1967 despite a big increase in the number of automobiles.

The Bay Area Air Pollution Control District has been in operation 13 years and has put into force a series of stiff regulations, with more to come.

Despite these efforts, the district's own figures show that stationary sources such as factories and backyard burning still account for 29 per cent of the Bay Area's air pollution. Stationary sources are under jurisdiction of the local district.

The six county Bay Area's 2.3 million automobiles account for 71 per cent of the total pollution problem. Automobile pollution is controlled by the state, not by the local district.

Local air pollution officials state unequivocally that if the Bay Area had 4.4 million automobiles and 8 million people—as in Los Angeles—we would have as serious a smog problem as Los Angeles.

The local district has regulations controlling open industrial or agricultural burning, industrial smoke such as that from factories and ships, and the organic gases given off by inks and paints and by gasoline in uses other than car fuel.

A brand new regulation which goes into effect next January 1 will regulate backyard burning in one and two-family dwellings, considered one of the major sources of smoke and haze.

District officials are satisfied with the regulations as far as they go, but they also know population growth will call for more stringent controls. These are under constant study.

By the year 2000, according to Milton Feldstein, director of technical services for the Bay Area district, this part of California from Sacramento to Santa Cruz will be one vast megalopolis with additional millions of population and at least two cars in every garage.

The state has new control standards on evaporative losses for 1970 model cars; control of oxides of nitrogen will not begin until the 1971 cars are produced. Both controls will be limited to new cars.

Many experts agree that current regulations, state and local, are only buying a little more time—time for something dramatic to happen in the auto industry, probably an alternative to the internal combustion engine; time for the public to become truly concerned; for the planting of more green belts to help purify the air; to develop mass transit facilities, better planning and zoning.

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, June 30, 1969]

A STRATEGY UNFOLDS TO CUT SMOG LEVEL IN BAY REGION

(By Ernie Cox)

On a clear day you can see—not forever—but at least 50 beautiful miles around the Bay Area.

On other days—and they are coming more often—the haze is so heavy you can barely make out the Eastbay end of the Bay Bridge from downtown Oakland.

The average man in the street, if he bothers to look up at all, shrugs and tells himself it's just another one of those gray days. Wedded to the unfettered use of his private automobile, he figures air pollution is somebody else's problem.

Overcoming that attitude is one of the biggest problems of air pollution officialdom. Lending a hand in a public awareness effort is a newly formed group of concerned scientists and laymen calling themselves the Northern California Committee for Environmental Information.

This Berkeley-based group formed just six months ago, has just completed a draft of its first report. It has not been released, but The Tribune obtained an advanced copy of the 20-page document for this series.

The group is an affiliate of the Scientists Institute for Public Information in New York. Its report was prepared by a subcommittee on air pollution headed by Jim Huntziker, a research physicist at the University of California, Berkeley. Others on the subcommittee include Cruz Venstrom of Berkeley, a retired agricultural economist; and Laurence Caretto, assistant professor of mechanical engineering, U.C. Berkeley.

Some of the major points made in the report include the following:

1. Electrical, steam or gas turbine powered automobiles are possible alternatives to the internal combustion engine.

2. Inspection of private autos is needed in order to insure that pollution devices, once installed, remain effective.

3. Coordination of both planning and funds for highways and rapid transit would help reduce congestion and pollution.

4. Fast, train transportation for short runs—with airplane competition prohibited on such—would help reduce auto usage.

5. Progressively higher registration fees, based on pollution emissions, could be used to phase out uncontrolled cars.

6. Two lanes on the Golden Gate and Bay Bridges could be assigned to buses only to encourage more public use.

7. Differential bridge tolls at peak traffic hours and higher tolls for singly occupied cars would encourage mass transit.

8. Maximum piggybacking of trucks by railroads would reduce air pollution, traffic congestion, and highway construction and maintenance costs.

9. As the population in the "poorly ventilated" Central Valley increases, a forward-looking rapid rail transit system could encourage both land and air conservation. Such plans should be begun soon.

"Effective citizen action to help clean our air involves a personal action in two ways," says the report. These are:

Less frequent and more efficient use of personal cars.

Encouragement of effective legislation and controls.

"The population of the United States is still increasing," states the committee, "but even when it stabilizes there would still be the probability of continued migration to the Bay Area—a highly desirable place in which to live. More people imply more cars and consequently more sources of pollution."

The report points out that present laws applying to automobile emissions will have their maximum effect about 1985 but it adds, "there is also room for further reductions in industrial emissions in the Bay District."

The committee cites figures issued in 1968 by the California Air Resources Board predicting impressive reductions in emissions for the Bay Area up to 1985, and adds this comment:

"This would be better air than we now see and breathe. But there are some big 'ifs' which are recognized in the report. One is that the research has not yet been done to design a production car to meet California 1974 emission standards.

"A bigger question is that the initial effectiveness of control devices decreases with age and there is currently no check on the operation of a control device once the car is sold."

What happens when the cool off-shore breeze comes in through the Golden Gate on a typical summer day? The air splits against the Berkeley hills, with one portion flowing east over Carquinez Strait to the Central Valley. The other portion is deflected southeastward to Dublin, Livermore and the San Jose area.

Pollutants from the Richmond area normally move east through Contra Costa County with some southward drift into the Livermore area. However, in the course of a season there will be all kinds of variations from the typical pattern.

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, July 1, 1969]

MASSIVE STATE SMOG STUDY

(By Ernie Cox)

There's a rabbit in a cage out in Berkeley undergoing tests that would take your breath away.

They're pumping smog into his cage to test its effects on his tissues and organs.

Doctors already know a great deal about the poisonous effects of smog on the senses and the human lungs. But the rabbit is part of the State Health Department's continuous search for more knowledge about this public enemy of our environment.

Says Dr. Louis F. Saylor, director of the State Health Department, "Health is no longer narrowly defined as only the absence of disease. Our goal in public health is to provide the means to robust good living."

Dr. Saylor adds that this ideal is modified by the quality of our environment.

The department's Bureau of Air Sanitation was established in 1955 to bring the resources of state government to bear on the growing problems of air pollution. Under contract with the State Air Resources Board, the department is conducting a massive inventory of pollutant emission sources in each of California's 11 air basins.

Dr. John R. Goldsmith, head of the department's Environmental Epidemiology Unit, says four separate annual surveys in California showed that 3 out of 4 persons are bothered by air pollution and 90 per cent of these had eye irritation. One out of 16 in Los Angeles and Orange counties reported air pollution affected his breathing. Dr. Goldsmith also said many local physicians have reported that asthma is aggravated by smog.

The department's own surveys, according to Dr. Goldsmith, found that next to eye irritations, asthma was the most frequently reported chronic condition made worse by air pollution. He added, "The evidence for lung cancer so far is negative."

However, Dr. John Rosen, an Oakland physician, recently told a news conference in Sacramento he considers smog as dangerous to health as cigarette smoking. Rosen was in Sacramento to support a bill by Sen. Nicholas C. Petris, D-Oakland, to phase out gasoline-powered autos in California.

"There is a definite correlation," said Rosen, "between smog and lung cancer . . . a very high correlation."

Dr. Peter K. Mueller, chief of the Air and Industrial Hygiene Laboratory, State Health Department, is convinced smog causes impairment of pulmonary functions in humans and increases susceptibility to respiratory infection.

In a paper presented at the 62nd annual meeting of the Air Pollution Control Association in New York City last week, Mueller notes that laboratory experiments with animals causes him to suspect the aging process may be accelerated by repeated exposure to smog. He also says long-term exposure to smog irritants can produce emphysema-type conditions in the lungs of rats and mice.

"Both ozone and oxides of nitrogen (smog ingredients) are deep lung irritants," says Mueller. "They exert an inflammatory reaction mainly in the lower region of the respiratory tract."

He added that number of experimental studies in animals have demonstrated "the capacity of photochemical pollution to produce changes in lung tissue and lung function at oxidant concentrations compatible with those found in Los Angeles."

At a conference on "Man and His Environment" held May 28–29 at San Jose State College, Dr. H. V. Thomas, a research specialist under Dr. Mueller, noted a national increase of 400 per cent in chronic respiratory disease over the last decade.

"The trends for deaths from chronic respiratory diseases observed during the past two decades," he said, "constitute a chronic disease epidemic."

While there is still no concrete evidence to prove the point, Dr. Thomas said "one can only wonder" whether the upward trend in respiratory disease is caused by a weakening of the lung's defense mechanism from breathing smog.

Might it not be prudent," he asked, "to try to live in harmony with our environment than to adopt an attitude of hostility towards it?"

Independent studies made in recent years in Great Britain, Nashville, Tenn., and Buffalo, N.Y. showed a strong association between the rate of deaths from stomach cancer and the existence of air pollution. The Buffalo study found the death rate among white men and women, 50 to 69 years of age, was almost twice as high in areas of high pollution as in those of low smog levels.

Another study, looking for the prevalence of emphysema, compared heavily industrialized St. Louis, Mo., and Winnipeg, Canada, a prairie-agricultural city, in neither city were causes of severe emphysema observed in non-smokers. But the incidence of severe emphysema in comparable groups of cigarette smokers was four times higher in smoggy St. Louis than in Winnipeg.

The never-ending research goes on at a relentless pace—not only in California, but throughout the nation—indeed, throughout the world.

At least the scientists and doctors—if not the general public and most politicians—know man must find a way soon to avoid befouling the only planet we have.

COL. EDWIN "BUZZ" ALDRIN

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am especially proud that one of our three great astronauts who will be taking off for the moon tomorrow is a New Jerseyite from Montclair. Col. Edwin (Buzz) Aldrin is already my most famous constituent, and I know that his hometown of Montclair will be leading the rest of the world in cheering him on. And I know that the prayers of all of us will be with Astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins as they embark on this historic trip to the moon—"in peace for all mankind."

Three articles follow:

[From Life magazine]

BUZZ ALDRIN HAS "THE BEST SCIENTIFIC MIND WE HAVE SENT INTO SPACE"

(By Gene Farmer)

Buzz Aldrin is a perfectionist and NASA workmen who have to do his bidding at the Manned Spacecraft Center find him a demanding taskmaster. A good many people inside the astronaut community think, with somewhat less justice, that Aldrin is a square as well. "If Buzz has his way," said one of the wives, "the code names for the spacecraft on Apollo 11 would be Alfa and Bravo."

He has practically no hair and, on the testimony of his wife, is a strange mix—"humility and magnificent confidence bordering on conceit." He is without much tolerance for inconsequential talk, but is happy to wrap his fist around a glass of bourbon and branch and talk until the small hours about the subject that interests him, which is his trade. It is then that he chews at the left side of his lower lip as he rambles on about rendezvous and docking in space, his eyes gleaming with the intensity of small volcanoes as he addresses himself to the problems of "ecliptic orbit"—as if everyone understood as much about that as he does.

One eminent geologist flatly calls Aldrin "the best scientific mind we have sent into space." Says Ted Guillory, a flight plan writer at the Houston Manned Spacecraft Center, "Boy, he's really something. He carried a slide rule for his Gemini flight on the rendezvous and I sometimes think he could correct a computer. I can remember hearing him say things like, 'If the computer says I'm 20 feet out of plane I'll believe 10 of that, but not all 20.' He's one of the few people who can figure out all these rendezvous things in his head."

"If Buzz were a trash man and collected trash," Joan Aldrin says, "he would be the best trash collector in the United States." Buzz was the first man to join the astronauts with a doctorate (M.I.T., 1963), having written a thesis which, NASA's Chris Kraft has acknowledged, contributed a great deal to the success of the space dockings achieved in the Gemini program. When he tested his theories successfully in the last Gemini flight in November 1966 (simultaneously becoming the first astronaut to beat the fatigue problem in a space walk—by learning to pace himself properly), he had the satisfaction of knowing that he personally had added significantly to the space program.

"Challenge" is a word Buzz Aldrin uses frequently. "What is challenge?" he asked once. "What determines excellence? In grade school it's the marks that you get, what you do on the athletic field. At West Point the name of the game is, 'Do what people tell you to do, keep your nose clean and work out your academic progress.' I fitted into that pretty well. I'm a sort of mechanical man—or I was."

This is a judgment with which most of his fellow astronauts would agree. He is an easy man to appreciate, but not an easy man to know. To one of his colleagues he "has enormous ability, enormous talent—but he is very much a loner."

Buzz was born in Montclair, N.J., Jan. 20, 1930, about five months after his father, who left the Army Air Corps in 1928 to work for Standard Oil of New Jersey, had bought a comfortably large house there. The elder Aldrin was a distinguished aviator in the 1920s and 1930s (he still holds a pilot's license at the age of 73) and at one time was a close associate of Orville Wright. He was also a student and friend of the American rocket pioneer Robert Goddard; he introduced Charles A. Lindbergh to Goddard in 1929 and is one of the few men who still refer to General Lindbergh by his old nickname "Slim."

Buzz's father was away a lot, flying all over the U.S. and Europe to promote commercial aviation (only the oil companies had money for that in those days), but the income was good and steady; none of the Aldrins remembers the Depression as a time of privation. There was enough money for a nurse and a cook, who indulged Buzz in certain *outré* tastes he had developed in food—sandwiches of peanut butter, sliced banana and a topping of powdered chocolate; whole cans of tuna eaten straight out of the can; packages of Jell-O consumed dry. "I don't know how he got his mouth apart," says his sister, Mrs. Fay Ann Potter of Cincinnati.

His other sister, Madeline, now Mrs. Charles P. W. Crowell Jr. of Tulsa, Okla., remembers that all through grade school Buzz was more inclined to buckle down to neighborhood football games than to his homework—his report cards were mostly C's and D's.

All that changed just before he was due to enter high school. Not surprisingly, considering his father's example, Buzz decided that he wanted to be an aviator, which meant trying for an appointment to West Point or Annapolis. At a conference with his parents and the school counselors it was made frighteningly clear to him that unless his grades improved he would never see the inside of either academy except as a custodian or a tourist. Buzz got the message, and after that it was all A's and B's—mostly A's. He made it look almost too easy. Fay Ann was a year ahead of him in high school but, she says, "If I had a math problem or a science problem I'd go in and work it out with him even though he hadn't taken the subject yet. He seemed to be able to explain it to me. I marvel today at how well he can explain the intricacies of what he is doing and make you understand and not feel stupid."

He still found football a challenge, and played center on the Montclair High School team that won the New Jersey state championship in 1946, compensating for his small size with what French generals call *cran* and football coaches call "desire." He had learned how to make friends, but even then was beginning to draw apart; he chose to walk to and from school (a mile and a half each way) with Fay Ann. This, Fay Ann thinks, was "so that he didn't have to get invloved with finding other people to walk with. We didn't talk an awful lot."

At the end of his plebe year at West Point, Buzz was No. 1 in his class. In 1951 he was graduated as No. 3. He was also a 13-foot 9-inch pole vaulter—with a bamboo pole, before fiber-glass poles started whiplashing 13-foot vaulters to suborbital heights.

For a West Point graduate in 1951, a diploma was a ticket to Korea—in Buzz's case, by way of Bryan, Texas, where he spent a year getting his Air Force wings. Just before going to Korea, at a dinner party in New Jersey, he met Joan Archer, a striking blonde who owned a master's degree in theater arts and was otherwise unattached. But, says Joan, "Nothing happened, no spark." At the time, Buzz was writing to another girl. When he came back from Korea a year later (66 fighter missions, two MiGs destroyed and one damaged, the D.F.C. and other decorations) he again got in touch with Joan. She was soon wearing Buzz's West Point pin and getting thoroughly bored, since she was now off limits to other dates and Buzz was out in Nevada as an Air Force instructor courting her by mail.

"Buzz wouldn't make the move," says Joan. She persuaded her father to take his vacation in Las Vegas for two weeks, and the night before they were to leave Buzz proposed. "I had just about given up," says Joan. "I sensed that," says Buzz. When they got married it was only the fifth time they had been out together.

Buzz shortly found himself in Germany, flying F-100s, surrounded by pilots who were either as hot as he or claimed to be, and increasingly convinced that what he really needed was more formal education. What he was really doing was looking for a new "challenge." By the time he and Joan were flattened simultaneously by hepatitis for six months in 1959 ("from drinking dirty wine in Italy," according to Joan), Buzz had set his sights on the U.S. space program. He got the Air Force to send him to M.I.T. to get a doctorate, bypassing the master's degree. While there he applied for the 1962 class of astronauts and was turned down. Test pilot experience was then required and Buzz did not have it. "I tried for a waiver," he says. "I knew darned well I wouldn't get it, but I wanted the application in the record." He was disappointed nonetheless and even considered leaving M.I.T. to get test pilot experience. Finally he decided, "Here I am. I might as well get the best out of it." So he stayed in Cambridge. "I had some original ideas," he says without false pride or false modesty, "about piloting problems and rendezvous. That thinking fitted beautifully with what they needed for Gemini."

Buzz has had only one space flight—Gemini 12. Characteristically he was about the only person dissatisfied with the results—he would have liked to have pressed extravehicular activity (the "space walk") to new limits, but in the last Gemini mission nobody wanted an extra risk. Then, in January 1967, came the pad fire in which three men died, one of them Buzz's close friend Ed White, and the Apollo program was set back almost two years. For 21 months nobody flew. Joan Aldrin began to sense that something big was up in January of this year when Buzz began acting more withdrawn than usual. When she finally realized that he had been selected for the moon landing crew, she hardly knew whether to cheer or cry. Waiting for the formal announcement was a time "of walking on eggs, normalcy tinged with hysteria. I wished Buzz were a carpenter, a truck driver, a scientist, anything but what he is. Now I understand how Susan Borman felt—wanting to run and hide. I want him to do what he wants but I don't want him to . . ."

No astronaut's wife ever seems able to complete that sentence satisfactorily. For Joan Aldrin, the Apollo 11 flight will be a time of housecleaning—get the rugs cleaned, wash the windows, paint the walls. It will be a way to keep sane. During the months preceding the flight Buzz had not been home much—any more than his father had been home much when Buzz was the age of his 11-year-old son Andrew. During the Apollo 9 mission in March, Buzz called home every night from Cape Kennedy to check on how Andrew's school science project was going, perhaps remembering something missing in his own boyhood. Last month, Joan Aldrin took the three children (Andrew; Janice, nearly 12; and Michael, 13) to the elder Aldrin's beach house in New Jersey for a quiet vacation while Buzz was at the Cape for his final weeks of training. It was her way of staying out of the way. She was wondering if Buzz would be the same man when he got back from the moon. She had wondered the same thing when Buzz flew Gemini 12. She had felt then that "our marriage wouldn't be the same, that it would be so much more magical and meaningful and magnificent because he'd done this wonder-

XUM

ful thing." Then, perhaps six months later, she realized that their marriage was exactly what it had been. "At first I was disappointed," she says, "and then it was comforting to think that it hadn't changed him. I really do believe that after all this is over, and if it is a lunar landing, that he will be the same person. He's not the same person I married, but I don't believe that I am the same person either."

What kind of person was he—or is he? What kind of person is any man who risks a death no man has ever died? Why does he do it? For money? (There isn't that much money.) For glory? For old-fashioned patriotism? There is some of that in all these men. But as Aldrin says, there is something else, a common denominator, perhaps, for all 50 astronauts:

"When you try to answer the question of motivation, you have to ask: 'What type of people are we talking about?' In our business we're talking about airplane pilots, fighter pilots. If you are a fighter pilot, you want to get hold of the hottest thing you can. And having flown that, you ask yourself: 'What else can I fly? What else is available?'

"You come down to the ultimate, the space program. It's *there*. Some people don't think they have a chance and don't bother to try. Others say, 'I'll accept that challenge.' Some make it and some don't. But there's a treadmill going and if you make it, you're on it. You have some control over it by your own performance. Fate determines a lot of where you fit into the puzzle. But why do you do anything? Because you were selected to do it."

[From the New York Times, Nov. 14, 1966]

PH. D. IN ASTRONAUTICS

(By Edwin Eugene Aldrin, Jr.)

HOUSTON, Nov. 13.—When the Gemini spacecraft chased around the earth last Friday night, caught up with and rendezvoused with an orbiting Agena rocket, it was all very familiar to one of the astronauts, Maj. Edwin E. Aldrin Jr., of the Air Force, even though it was his first spaceflight. Major Aldrin had written a dissertation on orbital mechanics and rendezvousing in space for his doctor of science degree at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

On the Gemini 12 rendezvous with the rocket, Major Aldrin and Capt. James A. Lovell Jr. of the Navy were just proving his theory.

Major Aldrin may be the most technically competent of the United States astronauts. He is very serious about his work and his career and is a firm believer in thorough and cautious preparation.

Major Aldrin was able to do more work with less effort while outside the spacecraft for two hours and nine minutes today because he had spent several weeks studying space exhaustion, a problem that has plagued previous United States astronauts during "walks in space."

When Major Aldrin left the spacecraft today he knew exactly what he wanted to do and the best way to do it. It was no accident that he became the first astronaut to overcome the fatigue problem.

This feat followed his performance at an open hatch of the Gemini 12 yesterday when the major set a world record of 2 hours and 28 minutes—the longest time that man has exposed himself to the raw environment outside an orbiting spacecraft.

"POSITIVE ABOUT HIS WORK"

"Buzz is positive about his work," the astronaut's father, E. E. Aldrin, said yesterday in Manasquan, N.J. "When he grabs hold of something, he usually makes it better before he turns it loose."

The major's father also has a Doctor of Science degree from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Edwin Eugene Aldrin, Jr., was born Jan. 20, 1930, in Montclair, N.J., where his father was working for the Standard Oil Company (New Jersey).

He attended public schools in Montclair and despite a somewhat slight build he was center on a high school football team that won a state championship.

Young Aldrin got the nickname Buzz, while still a child. His sister called him "Baby Buzzer" and the family shortened it to Buzz.

He has been accepting responsibility eagerly for at least 25 years. When his father was called into the Army in World War II, he told his son, "You're the man of the family now," and to prove that he was, the boy worked on weekends as a soda jerk.

The young man entered the United States Military Academy at West Point, N.Y., in 1947 and was graduated in 1951. He became an Air Force pilot the next year and flew 66 combat missions in the Korean conflict.

While he was on leave before going to Korea, he attended a cocktail party in New Jersey where he met the mother of Joan Archer, a young actress from Ho Ho Kus, N.J., who invited him to dinner at her home. There, he met Miss Archer, whom he subsequently married.

They now have three children, James, 11, Janice, 9, and Andrew, 8.

After the Korean conflict, the young pilot served a tour in West Germany where he and Lieut. Col. Edward H. White, 2d, also an astronaut now, were good friends.

ALMOST LEFT SCHOOL

When the latter was accepted as an astronaut in September, 1962, Young Aldrin was tempted to end his work at M.I.T. without getting his doctorate and apply to be an astronaut, but, after long discussions with his wife and with his father, he decided to continue in school.

In 1963, he wrote his dissertation on orbital mechanics, dedicating it to "the men in the astronaut program."

"Oh, that I were one of them," he wrote in the dedication.

Later that year he got his wish when he was transferred by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to the astronaut program.

The Aldrins now live near the Manned Spacecraft Center at Houston in a colony of astronauts and engineers.

On weekends, the whole family water skis or rides boats in Clear Lake.

Major Aldrin almost missed being allowed to fly in space. Several years ago, he injured a knee while jumping on a trampoline, and last year he reinjured the knee while playing squash. However, an operation to remove torn cartilage repaired the damage.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 14, 1969]

ALDRIN'S NO ROMANTIC ABOUT LANDING ON MOON

(By Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr.)

Like many things in life attempting to set foot on the moon for the first time is burdened with the unexpected and the risks that the unexpected offers. It is overcoming these risks that makes the taste of triumph so much sweeter.

But risk is not the lure nor the obstacle in space flight. I see my part in the first lunar landing less in a romantic and personal way and more as a contribution to increasing knowledge and the understanding of future generations. Such a long-range contribution may be less celebrated than being first to land on the moon, but it may be more significant.

Being selected for Apollo 11 is an opportunity and a challenge that has come my way for various reasons over which I did not have complete control. It might just as well have been any one of a number of other astronauts who are fully capable of accepting the challenge.

The next big steps will be down that ladder and onto the surface of the moon. And these steps will be taken just after 2 a.m. on Monday, July 21, if everything goes according to plan.

REST AFTER LANDING

We actually land the day before at about 5:30 (EDT). But at this point we've put in a long, strenuous day so the flight plan calls for a thorough checkout of the Lunar Module, followed by a meal, a four-hour rest, then another meal. We check out the equipment that will keep us alive on the moon and open the hatch some 10 hours after the landing.

Neil eases out of the hatch first, belly down and feet first. The back pack carrying our life-support system and the spacesuit are both bulkier than we thought, so he will barely fit through the opening. Going out the hatch you start thinking about when you're going to be getting back in. So you'll be pausing there and maybe moving in and out before proceeding down the ladder.

As Neil squirms out of the hatch. I'll take photographs of him. Coming down the ladder, he pulls a lever that opens a storage compartment known as the modular equipment stowage assembly, or MESA. It holds a television camera which should be looking toward the ladder. If the tracking station at Goldstone, Calif., is in view you might see Neil on your television.

The first thing you do upon touching the moon's surface is assure yourself that you can control your movements. You want to make sure there are no unexpected responses when you try to walk or work.

Probably our biggest problem on the moon's surface will be suit mobility. It's not as difficult to maneuver in that suit as it looks, but it takes getting used to. The first time you get into one it's horrible, but then you learn not to fight it. It's easy to strain against it and expend energy with no productivity. The suit has bellows where the arms and shoulders bend. However, if you want to move your arm around, it's sometimes easier to move your whole body.

SAMPLE FOR GRAB BAG

The first thing Neil does on the moon is take a sample of the soil. He has a contingency sample container—we call it a grab bag—in a pocket of his space suit. Neil extends a folded handle on the bag, opens it up, then scoops up what ever he can from the surface. Then he folds up the handle and puts the sample in his pocket.

This sample is taken in the event that some emergency forces us to lift off the moon sooner than planned. If this should happen we will still bring back a bit of the moon for the scientists to study.

All this time Neil will be evaluating how well man can move on the moon. It's extremely important to come back and tell people how well you can operate on the moon in a space suit with a 50-pound life-support pack on your back.

We also want to determine how well we can see in light and dark areas.

We want to know if there is a tendency to weave because you are such a large mass moving in reduced gravity and you need exert only a small force to leave the ground.

TV CAMERA SET UP

When Neil is sure of his movements, he places the television camera on a tripod out in front of the Lunar Module.

About this time, I am ready to come out. If we have good communications with Earth through the spacecraft, I can come out about 20 minutes after Neil. But if communications are bad, Neil will have to set up an erectable antenna on the surface which will be pointed at Earth. If this is necessary, I remain inside the spacecraft to switch to the

XUM

outside antenna and check how accurately it's pointed by the signal strength. If this has to be done it will be about 40 minutes before I can come out.

Neil gets a rock box out of the MESA and opens it. Inside is a solar wind experiment. It's a piece of plastic film rolled up on a staff and you pull it down like shade. Laid out on the surface it picks up samples of the particles from outer space which constantly bombard the moon and create many of its surface features. While Neil is collecting rock samples, I spread out the collector.

Then the two of us walk around the Lunar Module together to inspect and take pictures of the landing gear, debris underneath, and the descent engine skirt and throat. This extra-vehicular activity is a very subjective effort—very personal—cause it involves an individual and his way of doing things.

"MOVING SHOULD BE EASY"

Moving around on the moon should be fairly easy, but you can't do it automatically like on Earth. You're going to have to think about it because with that big backpack on the center of your weight is not where you are used to it.

The reduced gravity on the moon is probably much closer to conditions on Earth than to floating weightlessly in space. You have something to work against and there is no up and down, so we ought to be able to work much faster than on a spacewalk.

In weightlessness you have to move very slowly, and once you start moving it takes a lot to stop. That's not the situation in the one-sixth gravity on the moon. You can probably get moving quite fast, and if there's a boulder there you could just stick your foot on it and stop, we're not going to be running, though. We're going to be very deliberate, probably taking several steps to stop if we're moving fast.

You have to think when you're putting equipment together, too. If you don't handle it the right way, an easy task becomes difficult. For instance, to fix the legs to the erectable antenna there's a little pin that's supposed to go into a hole. You may think it's in and start working somewhere else, then the leg collapses. That can happen unless you're very deliberate.

CAN'T CORRECT MISTAKES

None of the equipment we're using can be tested first in the surroundings where it will be used. You can't go ahead and make a bunch of mistakes, then make the necessary changes. It has to be designed right in the first place.

As Neil and I come around to the other side of the spacecraft there's a scientific package that we deploy. I put up a seismometer for detecting moonquakes and meteorites crashing into the surface. After we're gone, it will radio evidence of such activity back to Earth. From this information, scientists should be able to determine whether the moon is a cold, dead body, or one with a hot, moving interior and possibly active volcanism.

Neil erects a laser reflector, a complicated array of mirrors and prisms on a frame the size of a large suitcase. The mirrors and prisms catch pulses of laser light sent from Earth and reflect them back. From the time it takes the light to make the round-trip, scientists hope to measure the distance from Earth to moon to within a few inches.

IN COMMUNICATION

All this time we are in communication with each other and, through the Lunar Module, with Earth control and the Command Module when it is overhead.

After the first rock box is filled we go as a team to collect a second documented sample. We will move about a hundred feet away from the Lunar Module, maybe 200 feet, depending on the success in some of the earlier things that were done.

On this final sampling, photographs will be taken from various angles before we pick up a rock. Individual samples are put in separate bags.

These, in turn, go into a larger container. We have scales to weigh the rocks to make sure we don't have too much to carry. With everything else, the Lunar Module can carry about 50 pounds of rocks.

I go back into the spacecraft first, then Neil follows. He will spend a total of about 2½ hours on the moon.

TOSS EXCESS OVERBOARD

Inside the module, we shuffle some equipment around, then start tossing things overboard. We've brought in the rock boxes, the solar wind experiment and the television camera which were stored in the descent stage which will be left on the moon. In the ascent stage our weight margin will be very close, so we get rid of things we no longer need like the two life-support backpacks.

With everything properly stored and the hatch closed, we get ready for the first leg of the trip home. When Mike Collins in the mothership is in the proper position overhead, a computer sequence commands the ascent engine to fire. It must fire to start us home. (If it fails, Armstrong and Aldrin will be stranded on the moon.) There's a high premium in this business for being right the first time.

If everything goes according to plan we'll make a series of burns, then rendezvous with Mike in the Command Module. In the event we cannot dock, or get through the tunnel connecting the vehicles, we will have to spacewalk over to the other craft. For this purpose, we have a chest pack with a 30-minute supply of oxygen.

There is little risk in the moon landing and rendezvous if everything goes according to plan, but nobody can guarantee that it will. We will not know the sweetness of our triumph over risk until it is all behind us.

WILL THE REAL DR. STRANGELOVE PLEASE STAND UP?

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in the one-sided argument which occupies today's headlines regarding the so-called military-industrial complex there is little said to rebut the antimilitary hysteria of the day.

Recently an interesting article appeared in the Air Force/Space Digest for July 1969 entitled "Will the Real Dr. Strangelove Please Stand Up?" in the interest of seeing that both sides of the controversy are properly presented, I enclose this article herewith and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

WILL THE REAL DR. STRANGELOVE PLEASE STAND UP?

(By William Leavitt)

Will the real Dr. Strangelove please stand up? The question is put in all seriousness. It is asked from the point of view of one who views himself as a liberal. It is asked from the point of view of one who is entirely convinced that unless this country focuses its energies on social needs with the same will that has brought us to a manned landing on the moon, we shall be in the kind of trouble that all the technology in the world will not be able to alleviate.

Why put the question? Because now is the time to search for the truth in the national debate over the role of the so-called military-industrial complex in American society. If the truth is drowned in a vortex of hysterical charges, we will not only cripple our ability to influence events in the international arena, but also, and even more important, we will succumb to a new virus of McCarthyism. Instead of looking for Communists under every bed, we will be witch-hunting every American in or out of uniform who, regardless of his views on domestic problems, believes in the necessity for American strength in a world that continues to be dangerous.

Such a belief in the need for US military strength, it should be pointed out, does not require an accompanying conviction that the Russians or Chinese are ten feet tall and about to attack us—or, to move to another sphere, to believe that sex education in the schools is some kind of Red plot. Put another way, to believe in the need for US military capabilities to match those of potential enemies does not make the believer a "kook" who would like to see the country converted into a garrison state.

The brand of neo-McCarthyism alluded to is already leading to a tragic polarization of US society. Now, more than any other time in recent history, there is an overriding need for balanced analysis of how we arrived at the distorted debate now being inflicted on the country, in which "the military" is being pilloried, along with its industrial suppliers, for allegedly taking over US foreign policy, generally corrupting American society, distorting national priorities, and, worst of all, dragging the country into an endless, costly, and immoral struggle in Southeast Asia.

The so-called military-industrial complex, we are also told, is attempting to thrust on the country an unworkable and unnecessary antimissile system, which, if it is deployed, along with new multiwarhead MIRV ICBMs, will destroy for the foreseeable future any real chance for US-Soviet arms-control agreements and will consequently set off an inevitable arms race that may well lead to superpower confrontation and nuclear war. Dr. Strangelove personified. Or so we are told.

Let us explore some of these allegations and examine how we got to where we are now.

Vietnam first. What are we doing there? How did we get into the quagmire? And, not incidentally, what are the moral questions that need to be honestly examined?

Was it really the men in uniform and their commanders who are fighting this frustrating war who advocated our involvement in the first place? In the large, the answer is no. Vietnam is primarily the ultimate and sour consequence of policies that evolved in the early 1960s out of disenchantment with the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles' massive-retaliation policy. Under President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles, massive retaliation had become the keystone of US strategic policy designed to deter Soviet attacks on the continental US and on Western Europe.

Many advisers to the new Kennedy Administration questioned, and properly so, whether massive retaliation, as devised by Mr. Dulles, had serious credibility shortcomings. Did our NATO allies, and the Soviet Union itself, really believe that the US would risk its national existence by going to nuclear war with Russia to protect Western Europe? Was there not a way, if America had to go to war to meet its pledges to Europe, to keep a US-Russian confrontation nonnuclear?

These were not idle questions. They needed to be asked. But the new men who ruled and influenced the Kennedy/McNamara Pen-

XUM

tagon of the early 1960s developed a fascination with what they called limited war. The focus was on Europe at first. And the idea, which excited great enthusiasm, was to reduce the potential horror of war in Europe from nuclear down to conventional terms. The new aim was to develop so-called balanced forces so that we, in concert with what we hoped would be beefed-up European conventional forces, could respond to aggression at any level.

It all sounded very neat. We would develop a mix of forces able to handle virtually any kind of threat from nuclear fireball to brushfire war. Students of the period will recall a spate of enthusiasm for conventional war in Europe that seemed to look back upon the unpleasantness of 1939–45 as a veritable garden party. We were even told that the conventional forces of the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies, in numerical terms, had really been exaggerated and that Western forces were, after all, a good match for the Russians and their satellites, division for division. What happened in Czechoslovakia in 1968 finally shattered that bravado. Or should have.

What began among the Kennedy defense people as a useful critique of massive retaliation and overreliance on strategic nuclear power evolved into a new policy called "flexible response." Its bible was Army General Maxwell Taylor's book *The Uncertain Trumpet*, which brought the General back to prominence in Washington as President Kennedy's military adviser, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and finally as Ambassador to Saigon. But General Taylor was by no means the only advocate of flexible response. And it ought to be pointed out, for the benefit of those who find it convenient to view "the military" as a monolith, that as limited war came to the dogmatic fore, it was not surprisingly, the Army that most strongly supported the concept. Limited war promised to restore the ground service's prenuclear age preeminence.

But the problem, as the future would reveal, was that flexible response was neither particularly flexible nor responsive. To General Taylor's credit, as Mark E. Swenson points out in the article, "The US Involvement in Vietnam—How and Why" (*page 32, June 1969* Air Force/Space Digest), the old soldier has admitted as much. He is among the few who have had the grace and intellectual honesty to do so.

Worst still, what conceivably might have worked in Europe—if NATO allies had been willing to beef up their conventional forces to ensure the numerical balance between Warsaw Pact and Western forces claimed by the new men in the Pentagon—had little or no relevance to Asia. But, as Mr. Swenson also points out, flexible response was extended to cover the expected requirements of conflict in Asia and the rest of the so-called underdeveloped world. Counterinsurgency capability (COIN) was added to the flexible response stew. Thus armed, it was believed, we could meet the anticipated challenges of Maoist "wars of national liberation" around the world.

The Administration in power sets the policy tone in Washington, and in John Kennedy's Washington it rapidly became the style to talk of ways and means of countering and conquering borders of sneakered peasants, mesmerized with Maoism, who would soon be assaulting governments, one after another, in Southeast Asia. South Vietnam and Laos were already under siege and Mr. Khrushchev was proclaiming Soviet support of wars of national liberation.

Overnight, there developed a new mystique of counterinsurgency. The Army and Marines were generally enthusiastic. The Air Force, pressed to doff its A-bomb image, reluctantly climbed on the bandwagon. We were all treated to replays of the post-World War II British triumph over the Communist guerrillas in Malaya and we were subjected to endless computations on how many counterinsurgents you needed to cope with and prevail over one Red guerrilla.

But, for a time, it was mostly talk. In Vietnam, the cautious President Kennedy was willing to try out some of the techniques advocated by the counterinsurgency enthusiasts (*again, see Mark Swenson's June article for an analysis of the roles of some of the principal Kennedy advisers*). But the conflict was then at a low level and the American involvement small. The President had had his fingers burned at the Bay of Pigs, and the Cuban missile crisis had had to be settled by threatening massive retaliation, no less.

What John Kennedy, had he lived, would have done in Vietnam beyond the technical-adviser stage is an "iffy" question that no one, not even Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.—despite his mixed role as adviser and White House note-taker for future memoirs—can really answer. Some argue that, in view of his initial commitment, Kennedy, as disturbed as he was by the repressive Diem regime of the period, would have followed the course his successor in the White House took. Others suggest that for a time, during the worst of the Diem days, there was at least a theoretical possibility that Diem's bankrupt regime and its excesses might be used as an excuse for US withdrawal. The weight of evidence favors the first argument, that Kennedy was in Vietnam to stay, if only Diem could be removed in a US-approved coup, which he was.

Both Presidents Kennedy and Diem were removed from the scene by assassination and Vietnam evolved rapidly into a new kind of dilemma. By mid-1964, the US was faced with an even more aggressive North Vietnam, emboldened by what looked like the inevitable collapse of the South Vietnamese regime. And the decisions were in the hands of Lyndon Johnson, advised by the same people, for the most part, who had sold flexible response and COIN to his predecessor. And by now US forces were being restructured to meet the new orthodoxy of flexible response and COIN.

The new President, convinced by the counterinsurgency advocates and by those who put their faith in what they viewed as the cold logic of strategic persuasion that they believed could be applied successfully against North Vietnam, responded with a series of US escalations, which in sum took the US into a full-scale war. The enemy was no longer just the Viet Cong or even North Vietnam but also Red China by proxy. And the newly avowed purpose of US involvement was to prevent the fall of the rest of Asia to communism in keeping with the well-known domino theory.

To say that President Johnson took the country into a major war under circumstances of questionable legality is to belabor the obvious. To ask whether what he did was right or wrong from the standpoint of national interest, in the long run, is to enter a field of argument where no one can tread with certainty. It may well be that the US effort in Vietnam, whatever the final outcome, has sharply altered, perhaps irrevocably, the timetable of Maoist-style revolutions and spurious wars of national liberation and has given non-Communist Asia breathing space to muster the will and force to protect itself and create some decent future for its peoples. We cannot know the final consequences of Vietnam from the geopolitical point of view.

But there is a set of larger, moral, questions that needs to be asked. Did not President Johnson and the coterie of advisers on whom he leaned, including particularly Secretaries McNamara and Rusk, delude themselves and the people by taking the country into a major war stage by stage, almost by stealth, as it were? Once having done that, did they not compound the deception by pretending that such a war on such a scale could be mounted without seriously affecting the economy? Was it not a cruel hoax on the poor, who had been promised a war on poverty, to tell them and the country that the war in Asia could be prosecuted without effect on the struggle to overcome domestic problems? The hoax was exposed early when civil rights and anti-war campaigns merged.

And, one may ask, did not the Johnson Administration, particularly the ever-quantifying civilian defense hierarchy, also fail the military who were, after all, the people who had to do the fighting and dying in Vietnam, by running the war as if it were some species of war game being played out at a think-tank seminar and with small regard for such variables as public opinion and popular support that so often make the difference?

Looked at in this light, the genesis of the Vietnam War become much clearer. We got into this conflict up to our necks, and, it may be added, isolated from virtually all of our allies, as a consequence of military theorizing by a band of planners who in retrospect were largely dilettantes. The irony is that these Strangeloves, for the most part, are now aboard the bandwagon of critics blaming the whole mess on the "military." If the military is guilty of anything, it is a certain impatience with having been given an escalatory game to play with most of the proscriptive rules applied to our side. It is true, and acknowledged above, that there were enthusiasts of limited war and counterinsurgency in all the services. It is doubtless also true that the military, particularly the Army, believed it could win in Vietnam.

But the overriding and immutable fact that the basic policy decisions to go into Vietnam with a force that built up to half a million men were made by the civilian authority. Here the "monolithic" quality attributed by critics to the military *did* obtain: They followed orders. Under our system, should it have been otherwise?

A further irony, of course, is that the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong turned out to be rather better at the game than our own Strangeloves. For it is *they* who have successfully molded world opinion against America as a bully who bombed the innocent and as the Western busybody who bloodily intervened in a "civil" war.

We have paid an enormous price.

The basic lack of candor about Vietnam, masked primarily by the prestigious public image of Mr. McNamara as the world's greatest manager, lies at the root of almost every major problem the U.S. is currently concerned with. Half of the $80 billion defense budget the military-industry complex is blamed for is attributable to Vietnam. The desperate fiscal gamble involved in waging the war on a business-as-usual basis, with no restraints on the economy, has fed the flames of inflation. In turn, inflation has eroded the purchasing power of both the government and the private economy.

Defense programs and social programs cost more and hence are more competitive for the tax dollar, exacerbating a conflict in priorities which need not ever have developed. A taxpayers' revolt is brewing. Relations with our allies, particularly in Western Europe, have been strained nearly to the point of rupture at times. The inequities of the draft, especially to feed the needs of a war so open to just criticism, have swelled the ranks of the peace movement, provided a focus for campus dissent, and further complicated the economic and social unrest in the nation.

It is the tragedy of Mr. McNamara and of the country that the impeccable management expert failed to manage his most important assignment. The trappings of efficiency were mistaken for its substance. It is analogous to a hospital being administered with a high degree of competence, except for

XUM

the fact that patients were dying needlessly. So put the blame on the doctors.

But as important as Vietnam is, as both a symbol and a reality in the search for the real Strangelove, there are other issues that need exploring—ABM, for example.

The chorus of antimilitary critics now proclaims that the military and a greedy band of profiteering industrialists are forcing on the country an unneeded and unworkable antimissile system. The critics' argument, depending on who they are, is either that the proposed ABM won't work and is therefore a waste of money, or that, even if it does work, it can't do anything but "force" the Soviet Union to press on with complex offensive weapons that could overwhelm any US defense.

What do the critics offer as an alternative? Nothing less than a total US dependence on offensive weapons sufficient to scare the pants off the Russians and the Red Chinese, plus the hope that the Russians will be gentlemen enough to see the wisdom of meaningful arms-control agreements with us.

The question arises: Who are the Strangeloves here? Under the McNamara Pentagon regime this country accelerated the greatest buildup of offensive power in the history of the world, in keeping with the basic theory of deterrence and in support of the delicate balance of terror. But the problem of virtually total reliance on offensive nuclear power is that if deterrence does not work—let the cause be madness on the part of an enemy or merely a miscalculation—then there *can* be a nuclear war. And if there is a nuclear war, no one can really predict the destruction, no matter how much quantification has been done in advance.

Reason would suggest that if there is a chance, however small, the defenses can be mounted, no rational man would oppose their deployment. Oddly, the most "rational" men of all, the disciples of former Secretary McNamara, those who see him as having brought order to the Pentagon, are among the most vociferous opponents of the idea of bringing offensive-defensive balance into US strategic planning. The same people who attacked massive retaliation as devised by John Foster Dulles are now backing that policy, under the label of "assured destruction." Only now the bombs are bigger, and the stakes, if deterrence fails, are even higher than they were in the 1950s.

The ABM issue is thus not so much a question of whether the system the President wants deployed is the best one available—no one can supply the answer to that question barring the test of a nuclear war—but rather whether at long last the United States strategic posture should be allowed to emerge from the Strangelovian shadows of the McNamara era into a new period in which defense can attain some real significance. Despite the claims of those who have written endless numbers of scenarios about assured destruction and all the rest of the jargon of the McNamara era, the world would be *more* hospitable to meaningful arms-control agreements if both the U.S. and Russia developed some measure of strategic defensive capability, by way of having the insurance human beings and governments bank on.

Indeed, rather than calling for U.S. and Soviet pledges *against* deploying defensive systems, serious arms-controllers should be campaigning for an emphasis in arms-control talks on limitations on the *offensive* side. How much more sense it would make in arms talks to *encourage* defensive system development as a preliminary to limiting the deployment of MIRVs and supermegaton bombs!

What the Strangeloves, in their mechanistic approaches to arms control, have not understood, is that arms-control agreements, if they are to have any meaning, must have a base in political reality. And political reality includes the fact that governments, Communist or otherwise, tend to see a duty to afford some measure of defense, if at all technically feasible, for their peoples. Nor do the Strangeloves seems to recognize the quite important arms-control potential in financial terms, of defensive-system development and deployment. For as they themselves suggest, there are limitations to the fiscal resources of even superpowers, as well as continuing resource-allocation problems. Thus, if Russia, the U.S., and other powers began to invest militarily in defensive systems, at least some money otherwise available for offensive developments might not be available.

This possibility never seems to have entered the minds of such people as Robert McNamara, who in the last analysis is probably the greatest Strangelove of them all, in view of his preoccupation as Defense Secretary with assured destruction and other such abstractions, always on the offensive side.

It is a great irony of our times that Mr. McNamara, who presided over the massive U.S. offensive weapon buildup of the 1960s, is viewed as a kind of hero by so many critics who at the same time claim that "the military" has come to dominate U.S. foreign and domestic policy.

What it all comes down to is that many, many Americans, including a sizable collection of civilians who in recent years have played important executive and advisory roles in the design of U.S. military-political policy, are now angry at the way that power has been deployed by the national leadership. Although many of these people helped write the scenarios, worked the abstract computations, glamorized on paper the beauties of limited war, and peddled the nostrums of counterinsurgency, they now are disowning the stunted children of their musings. The nostrums have not worked and now it is time to find a scapegoat. What more convenient scapegoat than the military? It is so easy to characterize those who have borne the brunt of the battle as having brought about the circumstances that led to the battle. And it is so easy to forget that the conceptual framework of our present policies was built by a corps of "experts," largely outside of the military.

And in these divisive times, scapegoating is a foolish tack. It is silly and dishonest to blame the military per se for the basic mistakes of civilian leaders in the recent past. To do so is just as silly and dishonest as it is to blame the poor for being on the welfare rolls. It makes much more sense to search for the causes of the disasters, in both cases, and to honestly admit the errors of the past so that all of us can learn a little something for the future.

Including the real Strangeloves.

JOIN HANDS: FOR THOSE WHO CARE

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to the formation of a group of action-minded citizens in Los Angeles. Their concern—that racial justice and equality be actively pursued—is admirable. The commitment of the members of "Join Hands" came about as a result of a tragedy, the death of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. This leader, who inspired hope for millions of Americans during his lifetime, may, through groups such as "Join Hands" still inspire the brotherhood he sought.

I call to the attention of my colleagues the following article carried in the Los Angeles Times, Sunday, January 12, 1969. The official pledge made by members of "Join Hands" follows the article, along with pertinent information:

JOIN HANDS,
Los Angeles, Calif., July 9, 1969.

Hon. WILLIAM CLAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CLAY: Enclosed are literature and material about Join Hands which we think merit your interest.

This citizens' movement, based on individual commitment to the Join Hands pledge and dedicated to achieving racial justice and equality, has grown rapidly since its birth in Los Angeles the night of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and has attracted national attention.

We know of your concern in this area and would welcome your personal support of the principles embodied in the Join Hands pledge and any help you might give us in promoting the program in your state as well as nationally.

We look forward to your comments and hope to discuss this with you in more detail in the near future.

Sincerely,

JANICE BERNSTEIN,
President.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Jan. 12 1969]

JOIN HANDS: FOR THOSE WHO CARE

(By Maggie Savoy)

Bye Bye, '68!

The year of Chicago, Columbia, Sorbonne—and San Fernando Valley State . . .

The year garbage chocked the streets of New York; people choked with hate . . .

Of "Hair" and Kerner and Pueblo and "The Great White Hope" . . .

Of protestors sitting, the poor marching and rich kids on dope.

Miniskirts and maxihates; bussing and fussing; Czechoslovakia, Khesanh, Biafra and Lebanon.

Black panthers and Gene McCarthy running; assassins gunning.

And, at the end, a country decimated by the flu, watching three earthlings jump over the moon.

Nineteen sixty-eight wasn't all bad. As the nation mourned Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and Sen. Robert Kennedy, many people of good heart—white, red, yellow, brown and black—stopped wringing their hands and put them to work.

Thousands and thousands in Los Angeles asked themselves, "What can I do?" and set about, in ways small and big, alone or in groups, to do something.

A flip back through the pages of this section shows hundreds of women, men and children who put their hands and hearts to work this year.

One such movement (can't call it a group—it began, and stays, unformed and loosely structured)—is Join Hands.

In the shockwave of the night after Dr. King was gunned down in Memphis, three women, in different parts of the city, watched television and asked themselves—as did countless others—"What can I do?"

"We must turn this, somehow, into something creative," said one. "The enemy is despair."

"I suddenly realized that every night I drive home to a sanctuary," said another. "I wanted a better world for my children. I suddenly realized that if I didn't try my darndest to make it one, my children would have to fight for it. I decided to fight."

"We had better decide what it is we are willing to do," said the third to her husband. "And say what we need to say."

They called each other. And sat down and

XUM

pencilled a Bill of Particulars. Then they started calling friends and friends' friends, to see how many would sign it with them, and sign a check to pay for a full page ad in the paper.

The "pledge" is not an easy one. It takes a lot of self-looking, and a great deal of commitment, to sign it.

But in a whirlwind, thousands did. In nothing flat Jan Bernstein's West Los Angeles bedroom, dining room and kitchen became a bedlam office. Some 2,500 people backed up their signatures with checks—to pay for the little group's printing, stamps and phone. Some 50,000 copies of the pledge went out through the mails all over California and 20 other states. Others "doing their own thing" (a tenet of the group), formed groups in Orange County, South Bay, Indian Wells Valley, Long Beach (most recently Bakersfield).

And Join Hands was formed.

Its officers are Janice Bernstein (occupation: Housewife); Ethel Haydon (member of League of Women Voters, Pacific Palisades Human Relations Council); Nancy York (director community resources, Marianne Frostig Center of Educational Therapy).

BOARD NAMED

The men on the board are Arnett L. Hartsfield Jr., chief mediator, Community Mediation Center; Dr. Phillip Oderberg, past president Los Angeles County Psychological Assn.; Winthrop Denison Grove, former supervisor South Central Los Angeles Concentrated Employment Project; computer-programmer C. A. Irvine; Ralph Bernstein, systems engineer. Also on the board is Jacqueline Richman, who works for Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency.

To sign the pledge is to take a step. "It was a shock," said one, now a teacher in her college's Educational Opportunities Program. "It made me take a real hard look at myself. I realized I'd been wrapping my prejudices around me like a blanket against a freezing wind."

To take one step is to take another. To some it was a step to the corner grocery, and a word to the manager, "Why don't you employ someone from the minority groups?" To others, withdrawing savings and putting them in a ghetto bank which lends to minority entrepreneurs. To others, volunteering: For a fair housing committee, a neighborhood center, a PTA, a birth control agency, a youth group, a hospital, a human relations council.

To others, talking with the boss. One star salesman talked hard, then resigned and joined a competing company which was training undereducated men to be salesmen. One couple, after several conferences with their minister, handed in their church letter and joined another church nearby, where they are now conducting adult education classes—all white—on black culture.

PERSONAL THING

Many of the pledge signers realized their confusion. "Prejudice is a personal thing," said one. "I realize there are injustices all around me; I realize change is necessary—I believe it. But I'm not sure what is prejudice and what is truth and fact."

Said another, "I feel so powerless. I hear my mother-in-law say things that boil my blood—but I am afraid to say anything to her. I want peace at any price in my own home—but how can we have peace in America if I can't pay that price?"

Overnight, like mushrooms after a rain, people registered for discussion and encountered groups, led by 50 volunteer psychiatrists and psychologists (who first went through their own encounters under the leadership of Dr. Oderberg).

More than 600—all over the Los Angeles map—have gone through them. They're tough. The discussion groups, primarily aimed at taking issues and commitment, take several days or nights, try to analyze and delineate the issues. The encounter groups are rougher: They are 10-hour marathons, where people (mostly white) knock out their prejudices, fears, concerns, ideals and emotions with others.

These are painful, exhausting, annoying and sometimes frustrating hours. I went to one, conducted by Dr. Ernie White. I won't tell you about it (one becomes concerned—no, involved—with the others). Just to say that the price of insight is pain. "Of course," explains Dr. Oderberg. "It is hard to be honest and open with oneself. It is not the way most of us normally function."

WHITE GROUP

Join Hands is a White group. Tackling White problems. "Bigotry is like a tuberculosis bacillus," said one board member. "In a healthy body they can be capsuled off. In a sick body they will take over. America is healthy—we've got to know that. Black, red, yellow, green and purple polka-dotted bigotry is everybody's problem. We have to begin with us."

Join Hands has committees working with business and industry, speakers, fair housing, education.

It will answer the question, "What can I do?" by sending a booklet, "What Can I Do?" free. (More than 10,000 have been mailed.)

Correction of statement: "Join Hands is a white group." The membership of Join Hands comes mainly from all segments of the broad middle class and, therefore, is predominantly but not exclusively White.

Join Hands—So That Martin Luther King Did Not Die in Vain, Let Us Join Hands

He had a dream that "one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: 'we hold these truths to be self evident that all men are created equal.'"

He had a dream that one day all men "will be able to sit together at the table of brotherhood."

He had a dream that his four children "will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character."

Now is the time for us to help make that dream come true. For all men "to stand up for freedom together."

Martin Luther King's cause was and is America's cause. I recognize and affirm that cause as my own. I therefore make the following moral commitment:

1. I pledge to confront my own fear and prejudice and strive to eradicate them.

2. I recognize the special rights and privileges that I enjoy, and I pledge to demand the same rights and privileges for each and every man.

3. I pledge to actively support both legislation and taxes to provide more and better jobs, housing, health, recreation, and education for all in our country who are poor, under-employed and ill-housed.

4. I pledge to trade with those business concerns which practice fair employment and provide upgraded job opportunities.

5. I will demand that every effort be made to achieve and maintain quality education in all schools and, in particular, to develop integrated schools of the highest quality. I pledge not to remove my children from such schools.

6. I pledge to welcome neighbors of all races and creeds; to support open housing and to rent or sell my home without restrictions.

7. I pledge not to try to escape the problems of my city, but to work to rebuild it as a place where human dignity flourishes.

8. I pledge to support those political candidates, regardless of party, who demonstrate the clearest understanding that the brotherhood and equality of all Americans is the major issue of our times—the one which must receive first priority both morally and economically.

9. I pledge violence will not cause me to react violently, nor will it cause me to abandon my commitment to this pledge.

10. I pledge this is a commitment to action, not just words.

In signing this pledge I commit myself to involve my friends, neighbors and my co-workers in active support of the aims of this resolution.

PROGRAM FOR ACTION

Sign the pledge and make an individual commitment to its aims. Signed pledges can be sent to your oganizations, local officials, and elected representatives. Return this coupon. Receive additional pledges, emblems, bumper stickers, and notices of discussion groups, special events, and opportunities for joint action. Display the Join Hands emblem as a visible sign of your commitment.

What I Can Do—Join Hands Action Booklet

The problem is that in this country there are Americans who do not have adequate food and shelter, who cannot obtain decent employment, who are given an inadequate education, who cannot live where they choose, who do not receive full equality under the law, who do not have equal opportunities for success and who are deprived of their right to self-determination.

The problem is intensified when some Americans build defensive walls, based on fear and prejudice, which dehumanize others and seek to preserve the status quo.

The belief is that still other Americans will take a long, hard look at what is happening around them and determine what their responsibility is.

The belief is that these Americans realize their personal stake in the future and will make a personal commitment to act.

WHAT AM I COMMITTING MYSELF TO?

If you have made the commitment, then you have said that you will not take the easy way out of uncomfortable situations but will state your views when others are opposed. You will let those people with whom you have contact through work, school, friendship or trade know where you stand. You will support those people whose practices are in line with your position and try to influence those whose practices are opposed. You will, at all times, stand by your commitment, especially when it seems most difficult.

WHAT CAN I DO?

One of our most serious problems is that we feel powerless to affect major issues. We fail to realize that, as individuals, we influence other people who, in turn, influence still others. It is only through the cumulative impact of such individual acts that we can effect fundamental change.

Are all your neighbors members of the majority group? If they are, have you ever spoken to them about welcoming members of minority groups to your community? If someone is selling a home, tell him you would welcome a minority family as neighbors. You may find there are others who feel as you do. You can contact realtors in your area and tell them how you feel. Often, they avoid minority group citizens because they are afraid of community reaction.

Look at businesses in your area. Are all the positions, except the most menial, filled by majority group members? Talk to business managers. Tell them you would like to see an effort made to hire and upgrade members of minority groups. If they object to this, tell them you will take your business elsewhere—then do it. No one wants to lose customers.

Have you noticed that all the patients in your doctor's waiting room are white? One reason may be that he discourages minority group patients for fear of losing other patients. Let him know how you feel, and what you think is his professional responsibility. Perhaps you can lessen his fear.

Have you ever stopped to think about the school your child is in? Is he learning American history—or white American history? Let the school know what you want. You may influence a teacher to augment her curriculum. You may get your child a better education.

Do you work in an office or business in which minority group members have a hard time obtaining jobs, or moving up? Talk to your fellow employees about the situation. Let the people who make personnel decisions know your feelings. Volunteer to take on a trainee.

What do you do when you hear others making derogatory remarks or broad generalizations about minorities? Do you answer them? Take a positive stand; put them on the defensive. You may open up a meaningful dialogue. You will make them realize that others don't adhere to or admire their position.

These are some of the ways in which an individual *can* make a difference—ways in which one person can have an effect. Perhaps your greatest influence will be that others who have previously chosen to stay silent and invisible will decide to follow your example and *act*.

If you do not state your position, you and the many who feel as you do will not be represented. Those who disagree with you speak out; it is your responsibility to speak out.

WHAT ABOUT GROUPS?

Personal action involves risk—it means one is willing to rock his own boat. When you're rocking your own boat, it's reassuring to know others are, too. It helps to have people with whom you can share your experiences. Groups provide the support one needs to carry out his personal commitment.

Groups also provide the individual with a source of allies who will join him in tasks too big for one person, and give him the opportunity to join others in the larger, more significant actions.

ACTION LIST

Where you live, you can:

Let your neighbors, landlords, realtors, & minority co-workers know that you welcome neighbors of any race, religion or nationality.

Display fair housing emblem.

Display your join hands window emblem.

If selling—make sure your realtor shows your property to all. Have a nondiscrimination clause in your contract.

In renting—welcome any qualified tenant.

Notify your local fair housing group of any rentals in your neighborhood.

Offer your home as a coffee stop for homeseekers.

Volunteer to go hunting with minority homeseekers.

Join a local fair housing group.

Is your neighborhood all white or all American?

Alert fair housing groups and human relations councils of any problems which arise.

Ask your local realtors for a letter stating their policy on fair housing.

Action: A family living in a semi-rural setting close to the city, in response to an expressed need by Head Start personnel, invited Head Start groups to use their grounds.

Result: Several days a week large numbers of Head Start children, teachers, and parent volunteers use the grounds for a program which includes nature study, fun with farm animals and equipment, and activity in a rustic setting.

In your business or where you work, you can:

Discuss employment practices with coworkers. Press for discussions with management.

Actively recruit minority persons. Use popular publications and those directed toward minority market.

Seek every chance to promote minority employees.

Provide training to upgrade skills.

Volunteer to have a minority student as a trainee.

Hire minority students for part-time and summer jobs.

Work to open up your union or employee organization to minorities. Press for integrated apprenticeships.

Encourage your business contacts to hire minority persons. Refer individuals to them.

Ask your company to state that they are "equal opportunity employers" in their want ads and advertisements.

Place want ads where they will reach the minority market—minority newspapers, magazines such as Ebony.

Deal only with suppliers who are equal opportunity employers. Make this policy public through ads, etc.

Levi Strauss & Co. of S.F. uses the following stamp on all purchase orders:

By accepting this purchase order, seller recognizes that Levi Strauss & Co. requires its suppliers of goods and services to be equal opportunity employers and certifies that it (seller) meets this obligation.

Foster good working relations among all employees.

Clearly state your position to all who work for you.

Seek to have some company funds invested in ghetto-owned and managed financial institutions

Influence your company to establish a subsidiary in the minority community, using local labor and management.

Start a JOIN HANDS group in your company, in your union, in your employee organization.

Display the JOIN HANDS emblem where it can be seen.

Have your company subscribe to the JH business pledge.

Help supply needed transportation for minority employees.

Help find local housing for minority coworkers.

Have your company newsletter announce it will list only apartments and homes available to all. Follow through to make sure it's more than lip service.

In your profession, you can:

Open your practice to serve minority clients.

Work to have your profession render the same quality of service to all persons.

Work within your profession and its societies to eliminate discriminatory practices. Have them take an official stand.

Form a group of colleagues to endorse specific programs or positions on issues. Publicize our stand to public officials, news media and fellow professionals.

Wear your Join Hands button to professional meetings.

Join your colleagues to pressure colleges and universities to recruit and enroll more minority students; to have flexible admission requirements; provide more scholarships, counseling, and tutoring.

Have your colleagues endow scholarships and volunteer as tutors and counselors.

Tell students about your profession and how to prepare for it by forming a group to visit secondary schools in minority communities.

Arrange for after school and summer experiences in your professional area.

Join with colleagues to provide a buddy system beginning with interested 8th and 9th graders, providing tutoring and preparing them for college entrance exams, academic requirements and college life

In your church, social and community organizations, you can:

Encourage membership of minority persons.

Insist upon elimination of any discriminatory practices.

Have your church bulletin organization newsletter publish the Join Hands pledge, endorse its principles.

Plan joint activities and actions with sister churches or groups in minority communities.

Have your church invest funds in integrated housing, minority-owned and managed financial institutions and businesses.

Take a stand and join forces with other churches and groups to fight for constructive change.

Start JH discussion groups, study groups on Kerner Report and related issues.

Establish scholarship/loan funds and camperships for minority students.

Discover needs such as day-care and recreation facilities. Work to fill them.

As an investor, you can:

Make sure businesses you invest in do all they can to increase and upgrade job opportunities.

Invest in financial institutions which serve minority communities and are owned and managed by members of that community.

Buy shares in credit unions which make loans primarily in minority areas.

Make real estate investments only in open housing.

Send a business pledge to every company in which you own stock. Ask for a reply.

Invest a percentage of savings where they are used for integrated housing and minority-run businesses.

Ask your bank's policy.

Action: Someone called a bank which was not making loans in a nearby ghetto area to ask why.

Result: The bank investigated, discovered their appraisers were unwilling to go into the area, and hired someone specially qualified for the job. They further stated they would refuse no qualified applicant.

Help minority persons establish businesses in your neighborhood.

As a citizen, you can:

Support candidates who take a stand and have a history of action; vote accordingly.

Be informed and react to the stands of all officials.

1 Telegram = 10 Letters.

Public Opinion Message Telegrams are a bargain. 15 words to any elected official cost 95¢ to state capitols and $1.01 to Washington, D.C.

Hold elected officials responsible for their appointments—be aware of board and commission activities. Present your views to them.

Become aware of discriminatory practices in public departments, agencies, and by public servants such as police and firemen. React to the agency heads and the elected officials responsible.

Send Join Hands pledges to elected and appointed officials. Ask for their endorsement and reaction.

Invite public officials to speak to Join Hands and other groups about their position. State yours.

As a consumer, you can:

Ask businesses about their hiring and promoting practices.

Support those whose position is in line with yours.

Tell the others why you are taking your business elsewhere.

Write letters, verbally support and buy from businesses which:

Practice fair employment.

Invest in ghetto communities.

Conduct training for the unskilled.

Have integrated store displays.

Have integrated advertisements.

Help minority businessmen.

Help solve the housing and transportation problems of minority employees.

XUM

Ask all businesses what they do in these areas, and what they plan to do.

To get results: When you contact businesses, contact the person in charge and ask for a written reply.

Let others know what you have found to be the attitude and position of the businesses you contacted.

Have supermarkets post fair housing statements on their bulletin boards so only property open to all may be listed.

Ask stores to display the Join Hands emblem.

Enclose the Join Hands business pledge when you pay your bills. Ask them to let you know what parts of the pledge they are implementing.

Action: One person wrote letters to corporate officers of several large department stores, noting the lack of integrated mannequins and models in the stores' displays and ads.

Result: Responsive replies from store managers, presidents, and even a chairman of the board, stating their concern and citing plans to order new mannequins representing minority figures, and to institute integrated ads.

In education, you can:

Join with informed groups to pressure school boards and administrators.

Attend school board meetings, let your presence counter the vocal opposition.

Look at the curriculum in your schools. Speak out for accurate representation of the part minorities have played in our history.

Action: Some parents in a middle class school asked their principal to work with them to institute a new "honest" American history curriculum, stressing the involvement of all peoples in building this country.

Result: The curriculum was developed and introduced in all grades by the following semester.

Volunteer to provide transportation so minority children can attend your school.

Bring your schools up to date. Insist your district incorporate the newest methods and materials.

Pressure for in-service and sensitivity training for teachers.

Volunteer in your local School Volunteer Program.

Make your voice heard at your P.T.A. Ask them to schedule programs discussing minority culture and history, the Kerner Report and movements such as JOIN HANDS.

Work for better and more relevant job training and vocational education programs.

Check to see if minorities are adequately represented at all levels of school administration. Let the Board know you're looking.

Make sure all schools in your district are providing equal education. Point out inequalities to your Board.

Pressure for compensatory services to close the gap.

Action: Group of L.A. citizens formed HELM Foundation to provide college scholarships to minority students with only average grades but with college potential.

Result: Scholarships provided to several students who are also helped to prepare for college entrance. Money will be raised for many more.

Work for early and continuous contact of children in white and ghetto schools.

To affect the mass media you can:

Write letters, send telegrams, make phone calls. They have impact. Contact top management, commentators, writers.

Praise them when they try to tell the whole story, ask for more of such programs in *prime time.*

Object to unfair or inaccurate presentations.

Request that they portray an integrated society in all stories, layouts, ads, programs and movies. A mass letter writing campaign on this issue to all media, including home and popular magazines, is needed.

Action: A few people wrote Charles Schulz suggesting he add a Black character to his comic strip, *Peanuts*.

Result: He added a Black character.

Ask media to take editorial positions on the problems of race relations, riot reporting, ghetto needs and efforts, problems of poverty, etc.

Ask about the employment practices in all phases of their operation.

The media want to hear from you. In July, John E. Campbell of KABC–TV in L.A. invited letters from viewers on how the station's programming served their needs. Other stations make similar requests. Letters from readers and viewers are read, counted, considered. Make your voice count!

Contact local media to publicize the actions of your group and to expose inequities or discriminatory policies. Find the newsworthy aspect of your story—call reporter or commentator directly. They are accessible and interested.

As an individual, you can:

Let others know where you stand at all times. Speak out whenever you witness an injustice.

Challenge any bigoted remarks.

Wear your Join Hands button, display your bumper sticker and window emblem.

Carry Join Hands pledges wherever you go. Show them at every opportunity.

Keep informed, so that you can inform.

Look around you, become aware of situations that need changing.

Write, Write, Write. Set aside at least one hour a week. Thoughtful letters get results.

Join a Join Hands Discussion Group. Invite some "on-the-fence" friends.

Offer your home as a Join Hands Neighborhood Center.

Volunteer at Join Hands headquarters. Be at the heart of things.

Support the work of groups such as Fair Housing, Human Relations Councils, Urban Coalitions, etc.

Add your strength to their numbers.

Have your local library build a collection on the history and culture of minorities.

Be honest. Be more effective. Confront your own fears and prejudices.

Be true to your commitment at all times.

Moments of choice: You have countless opportunities during any day to act, speak up, write—to effect positive change. Will you use them?

BUT HAVE YOU FORGOTTEN THE GHETTO?

No, we have not forgotten the ghetto. The problems of the ghetto are with us in everything we do. Our purpose is not merely to eliminate the problems of the ghetto, but to attack those aspects of society and its institutions which perpetuate it. These exist in your community, not in the ghetto.

If you have the opportunity to work in the ghetto, you must realize a dual responsibility. You must not only fulfill your commitment there but you must bring back what you have learned to the community in which you live. Our goal only can be accomplished if you match your work in the ghetto with work in your own community.

IF YOU ARE ASKING . . . ?

If, when you ask, "What can I do?," you are asking, "What can I do that is easy, comfortable, and takes very little time?," the answer is, "Not enough to make a difference!."

If, after reading this booklet, you still are asking, "What can I do?," What are you *really* asking?

Action Booklet Committee: Jacquie Richman, Editor; Janice Bernstein; Lois Friedman; Joy Lowe; Michaele Pearce.

All those whose ideas for action are in this book.

Join hands, P.O. Box 49955, Los Angeles, Calif.

JOIN HANDS

The time is past for studies, commissions, and reports. The time is here for real and rapid change. White Americans must take relevant, concrete action to do away with injustices which have been tacitly condoned through apathy and indifference. This means not only a just and equitable distribution of social and economic power among all groups, but a just and equitable distribution of decision making power as well. It means free movement of all persons within all areas of society.

Each one of us must see himself, his neighbors, his community, and his country in a new light, realizing that the future of all Americans will be determined by the white response to the present crisis. Each person must resolve to engage himself actively in an immediate effort to make that response one which will ensure America's future as a free, open society.

White Americans ready to respond to this challenge have felt isolated or alienated and powerless. Often invisible to each other or defensive about their position, they have worked in small groups in frustration or lapsed into silent despair. Though feeling a concern, they have had no purchase on the challenge.

Join Hands has broken through this isolation and defensiveness to provide a visible unifying force, strong in numbers. Broadly based, through shared goals, it converts readiness to respond into positive, effective action.

How can *you* act to meet the challenge? You can.

1. Involve friends, neighbors, coworkers, employers, and organizations by encouraging them to adhere to the Join Hands pledge to exhibit the emblem in their home windows and on car bumpers, and to send all of these to newspapers, organizations, public officials, and influential leaders of business and industry. Join Hands will send you copies of the pledge, window emblems, bumper stickers, and buttons. Our goal is involvement and commitment through exposure.

2. Organize discussion groups in which you and your friends can examine your attitudes toward the ten points of the pledge, to bring about inward and outward change where necessary and to illuminate your own feelings about the issues involved. Contact Join Hands for trained discussion leaders.

3. Develop groups especially interested in working on specific programs to implement the pledge. Join hands to support existing agencies and organizations already working in these areas—education, housing, employment, etc. We assist and cooperate with these groups, but do not affiliate with them. Join Hands will, with your permission, put such groups in touch with you.

4. Send the Join Hands message across America encouraging others to declare their commitment to its principles and so create a tidal wave of positive public response. Join in forming new chapters of Join Hands. Materials and other assistance are available.

We welcome your support, your ideas, your involvement. Send in the form at the bottom of the Join Hands Pledge with your contribution and marked according to your interests. You will be called by a telephone interviewer for information to help you get into action. If you indicate interest in discussion groups, you will be contacted about them by mail.

JOIN HANDS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Janice Bernstein, Chairman; Nancy York; Ethel Haydon.

Join Hands—Post Office Box 49955, Los Angeles, California. Telephones: 472–8292; 472–6889.

XUM

Business and Industry Pledge

As one engaged in busines or industry, I recognize and affirm that my company and I have a special responsibility to create a society in which all people may partake equally in the opportunities for economic growth and achievement.

I therefore make the following moral commitment:

1. To seek out and eliminate any subtle and pervasive, as well as any overt, prejudicial practices within my company.

2. To investigate my company's recruitment, evaluation, and hiring practices, and strive to remove any requirements that unduly restrict the employment of the disadvantaged.

3. To acquaint the supervisors under my jurisdiction with the principles of this commitment and encourage their support in its implementation.

4. To establish an active program which will prepare employees within my area of responsibility to meet the challenges of working within an integrated work force and, in particular, of working under minority supervisors.

5. To recognize and understand the special problems of the unskilled and hard-core unemployables. I will attempt to solve these problems as they arise and will not abandon my responsibility.

6. To examine my company's training, job evaluation, and promotion criteria, and to make whatever changes I can to insure equal opportunity for achievement and advancement.

7. To seek out and trade with those companies which provide fair employment and advancement opportunities and, wherever reasonable, trade with companies which are minority owned and operated.

8. To encourage my company to take all positive steps, e.g., by investment of funds, to build and strengthen ghetto owned and managed financial institutions, commerce, and industry.

9. I recognize my moral and social obligation to involve my business associates in this commitment, and to require my social, fraternal, business, and professional organizations to recognize and attack the problems of prejudice in jobs and business.

10. This is my personal commitment to action. To the fullest extent of my authority, I will take all positive steps to promote the aims of this pledge within my company. I realize that the fulfillment of these aims will require the expenditure of time and funds, but I consider it a sound investment in the future of America.

John Hands Business and Industry Committee, P.O. Box 49955, Los Angeles, California. Telephone: 472-6889.

What Is a Neighborhood Center?

A Join Hands Neighborhood Center is a home.

A home open one morning, afternoon, or evening a week for a gathering . . . to talk about how you and your neighbors can further Join Hands objectives.

A home where people can pick up Join Hands pledges and literature.

A home where people know the problem is critical . . . so critical they will share their time and home with neighbors who also know that . . . Together We Can Make A Difference.

CENTRAL

Bruce Fleming, 2326 Fargo St., Los Angeles, CA 90039, 664-5804, Open Monday, 7-10 p.m.

Mr. & Mrs. Dick Friedman, 509 W. Evergreen St., Apt. 5, Inglewood, CA 90302, 776-1380, Call for time.

Norah Cunningham, 629 S. Hobart, Apt. 2, Los Angeles, CA 90006, 382-6864, Monday 8-10 p.m.

WEST

Cathryn Dixon, 2801 Brighton Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90018, 731-3029, Please call for time.

Mr. & Mrs. Marvin Blum, 1101 N. Kenter Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90049, Open Tuesday, 7-10 p.m.

Anne Lowhar, 912-6th St., Apt. 4, Santa Monica, CA 90403, 393-2186, Open Wednesday, 1-4 p.m.

SOUTH

Betsy Foster, 22609 Iris Ave., Torrance, CA 90505, 326-3863, Open Tuesday & Wednesday, 9 a.m. to noon.

Sylvia Lawlor, 2522 W. 234th St., Torrance, CA 90505, 325-5978, Open any time.

Sandy Sarris, 1140 Shelley St., Manhattan Beach, CA 372-9370, Open Friday, 2-5 p.m.

Rev. Robert Shepard, St. Paul's Methodist Church, 2600 Nelson Ave., Redondo Beach, CA 370-7449 (church), 542-2718 (home), Open Monday through Friday, 9 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Rosie Sundeen, 234 28th St., Hermosa Beach, CA 376-1141, Open Tuesday, 4:00-8:30 p.m.

VALLEY

Mrs. Robert Cole, 5752 Ventura Canyon, Van Nuys, CA 91401, 781-6095, Open Monday through Thursday, 3:30-6:30 p.m.

Marjorie Britt, 2025 Lucas St., San Fernando, CA 91340, 365-4839, Call for time.

Mrs. Dixie Langdon, 6000 Wish Ave., Encino, CA 343-4085, Open Tuesday and Wednesday, 7-9 p.m.

Carolyn Rothberg, 4518 Valdez Place, Tarzana, CA 91356, 987-1288, Open Wednesday, 9-11:30 a.m. and Friday, 1-5 p.m.

SAUGUS

Mrs. Ray Schaefer, 20114 Fairweather, Saugus, CA 91350, 805/252-5047, Please call for time.

CHINA LAKE

Mr. and Mrs. William Arnold, 61 A Stroop Ave., China Lake, CA 93555, 714/375-7186, Please call for time. Mailing address: Join Hands, P.O. Box 5401, China Lake, CA 93555.

NORTHEAST

Mrs. J. L. Haight, P.O. Box 403, Verdugo City, CA 91046, 249-1541. Center will be at: Foothill Christian Church (Education Bldg.), 4459 Lowell Ave. (at Foothill), La Crescenta, Open Thursday, 11 a.m.-12:30 p.m.

Mrs. Manon Washburn, 10642 Hillhaven Ave., Tujunga, CA 91042, 353-9577. Open every day, 4-7 p.m.

Mrs. Dollie Smith, 1384 Sunset Ave., Pasadena, CA 91103, 681-9088. Open Friday, 9 a.m.-Noon.

Mrs. James C. Robuck, 415 Oxford Dr., Arcadia, CA 91006, 447-0461, Open Friday, 10 a.m.-Noon.

ORANGE COUNTY

Terri McDonald, 9052 Jennrich, Westminster, CA 714/892-0688. Open Tuesday, noon-2 p.m.

Mrs. David Ewart, 1285 S. Cobblestone Rd., La Habra, CA 90631, 213/943-2884. Open Wednesday, 7 p.m.-10 p.m.

Neighborhood Center Committee Members:

CENTRAL

Carmela Bosko, 606 N. Citrus Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90036, 936-5534. (Does not have a Center.)

WEST

Marge Schnitzer, 1938 Comstock, Los Angeles, CA 277-2234. (Does not have a Center.)

ORANGE COUNTY

Mary Ewart, (see listing).

VALLEY

Carolyn Rothberg, (see listing).

If you, too, want to be a Neighborhood Center Volunteer, or if you have offered and have not yet been contacted, please call Lois Friedman, Neighborhood Center Coordinator, 776-1380.

A Next Step Toward Join Hands Action—Discussion Groups

Why. To review and explain the ten points of the Join Hands pledge. Group interaction to lead to the discovery of shared goals, bring out action ideas and explore how they can be carried out. To find out where each individual is in his personal commitment to action.

What. One two-and-a-half hour meeting a week for three consecutive weeks with a skilled discussion leader furnished by Join Hands. If the group wishes, it then may continue to meet on its own to permit a continued sharing of information, turning up of new action projects and deepening of commitment.

Who. You and ten-to-fifteen other people. Groups should include several persons who have signed the pledge, as well as others who are unwilling or hesitant to sign it but want to talk about it and their feelings about it.

How. Choose one of the following, and check your choice on the form below. (Please acquaint all those whom you invite to a group with the purpose and goals of the discussion.)

1. You join, individually, a group recruited by Join Hands.

2. You invite a few others, including non-signers, to a Join Hands discussion group to which other signers and their guests will be invited by Join Hands.

3. You recruit a complete Join Hands discussion group (including non-signers).

4. And host the meetings of the group.

When. Day or evening. Starting as soon as we can arrange it together.

JOIN HANDS GOAL FOR DISCUSSION GROUPS

That signers be strengthened in their commitment to action and the aims of the Join Hands pledge. That non-signers be helped to understand the aims of the pledge and, perhaps, be moved to take steps toward personal commitment to action.

For further information regarding groups, call GR 2-9779.

For Join Hands information, call 472-6889.

RETURN COUPON FOR JOIN HANDS DISCUSSION GROUPS

1. I will join a Join Hands discussion group.

2. I will invite some others, including non-signers, to a Join Hands discussion group.

3. I will recruit a complete Join Hands discussion group.

4. I will be host for a Join Hands discussion group.

Preferred day of week —— Preferred time: Day —— Evening ——.
Name ———— Phone ———.
Address ———— Zipcode ———.

A volunteer will call you after you return this form in order to set time, place and date of the group meeting and to let you know who the discussion leader will be.

Join Hands First Anniversary Issue Calendar of Action—Highlights of a Growing Year

APRIL 1968

Apr 5 Birth of Join Hands.

**Apr 8 So. Calif. Clergymen distribute pledge.

Apr. 12 400 signatures & money for pledge ad in L.A. Times secured.

Apr 12 News conference announcing Join Hands—extensive TV & radio coverage.

Apr 14 Ad in Easter Sunday edition, L.A. Times.

**Apr 20 Convening of experts to initiate JH discussion program.

**Apr 21 First mailing of pledges, bumper stickers, guide to action, etc.

**A continuing activity of Join Hands.

MAY 1968

Formation of JH Board of Directors.

JH incorporated in State of Calif. as nonprofit corp. May 28.

**First membership cards issued May 28.

**Formation of Business & Industry Committee.

**First newsletter published.

**Published first bibliography.

**First pilot encounter group.

**JH buttons produced & distributed.

3 hr. interview with Minta Palmer, KLAC, Two Way Radio.

**First of 3 session JH discussion groups.

JUNE 1968

JH Working Conference, "A Time of Urgency," June 8. 200 attended.

**Education Committee formed, June 8.

**Business & Industry pledge written & distributed.

**KNXT first station to carry JH public service spots. Beginning of JH campaign to create climate of opinion geared to action.

**Training session for discussion group leaders.

JH seminar at Inter-Com '68, Palos Verdes.

Feature article by Jack Jones in L. A. Times June 5.

JULY 1968

*Formation of JH Chapters in Orange County, So. Bay Area, China Lake

*TV & radio spots distributed to every station in area

*Orientation for group discussion leaders

AUGUST 1968

3-day JH exhibit at Watts Summer Festival, by invitation

*In Newsletter #2 start campaign to transfer savings to minority owned & managed savings institutions.

Orientation for encounter & discussion leaders, followed by 2-day training sessions. Aug. 5, 17, 18

Speech at Annual Workshop in Human Relations, SF Valley State College

SEPTEMBER 1968

*First printing of Action Booklet—10,000 copies

JH & UCLA co-sponsor Conference, "Profit Motive & Social Responsibility" at UCLA. Over 60 companies participate. Covered by KNXT news.

*First Neighborhood Centers established.

*Formation of Action Committee

Operation Awareness Conference, Arcadia—Sept. 28, JH Seminars

OCTOBER 1968

*KFWB records JH individual action spots, with intensive use thru Feb. '69.

*2 Day Discussion Leader Training Workshop

Oct. 30—3 hr. interview KGEE, radio Bakersfield "Private Line"

Heavily attended So. Bay Chapter organizing & fund raising party

*UCLA Research Library requested copies of all JH publications for student & public reference

Oct. 26—Successful emergency fund appeal—"Non-Dinner" night

Participation in Everywoman's Village Community Involvement Conference

JH student group forms in Mira Costa High School.

NOVEMBER 1968

*First JH Open House (Nov. 8)

*Business & Industry Committee forms sub-committees to help establish minority group small businesses; for referral & job placement & to organize "in-plant" JH groups. (Nov. 14)

*JH joins Community Relations Conference of So. Calif.

JH panelists participate with Bishop Pike & others in Bearings for Re-establishment Conference, "Communication Between Communities".

AAUW Conference, "Crisis in our Cities," uses JH material & discussion leaders.

JH presentation to Jewish Fed. Council, S.F. Valley Area Council.

DECEMBER 1968

*Newsletter #3 inaugurates "Letter to your Elected Officials" action project for JH members.

JH guests on TEMPO, KHJ–TV; From The Inside Out, KTTV, and Reach Out, L.A. City Schools program on Ch. 28, KCET.

*Formation of Bakersfield Chapter

*Start of B/1 Committee project "Write a Letter to a Corporation"

*In Newsletter #3, Action Committee encourages support of East L.A. Education needs.

JANUARY 1969

*Beginning of JH Education Workshop Series—6 meetings—co-sponsored by Education Commission, Westwood United Methodist Church. Over 650 people involved in series.

Feature Article by Maggie Savoy in L.A. Times (Jan. 12)

*All day orientation for Neighborhood Center Volunteers.

Interview on BOUTIQUE, KNXT

Interview on KLAC radio, with Len Hilburn re Education Series

*Westdale-Mar Vista JH Community Section formed.

FEBRUARY 1969

Mailed 1000 JH Kits in response to requests in Jan. & Feb.

"Crisis in Education" series co-sponsored by American Assoc. of Univ. Women, S.F. Valley Branch, Valley Interfaith Commission & JH in Feb. and March.

*Formation of JH Seattle, Wash., Chapter.

*First monthly meeting of JH "Committee of the Whole"

KNXT–TV news coverage of Education Series

JH, B/1 Committee presentation to L.A. Chapter, Assoc. for Computing Machinery

MARCH 1969

*Public Relations Society of America, L.A. Chapter, offers support for JH for 1969 & will promote JH concepts & philosophies throughout So. Calif.

*JH helps stimulate formation of citywide Education Coalition

JH designated as tax-exempt organization by Internal Revenue Service

*Formation of "JH for Youth Action", student resource & organizing group.

*Franz Wambaugh designs & donates JH Awards of Merit. Rod Serling accepts Award's Chairmanship.

JH Action Booklet used by school district superintendents & board members at L.A. County Schools seminar.

Every student & teacher at a high school in Syracuse, New York, is wearing the JH button.

*Kick-off meeting, Pleasure Faire fund raising event (3/31)

JH "Strategies for Action" workshop led by Dr. Eva Schindler-Rainman

*JH Education Sub-Committee on Excellence formed.

APRIL 1969

**7,000 people have joined JOIN HANDS.

**65,000 pledges circulated on request (no mailing lists used).

**13,000 Action Booklets distributed on request. Requests for many thousands more not filled due to inadequate funds for printing.

**1,000 people have taken part in discussion & encounter group series.

**10,000 Bumper Stickers distributed.

**20,000 Newsletters circulated.

**35 Neighborhood Centers opened.

25 plus states, in addition to Calif., distributing JH material.

**JH Pledge reprinted as ad in regional newspapers & included in hundreds of publications nationwide.

2 Day Discussion Leader Training Workshop.

JH material distributed at annual Social Action Conference of Jewish Religious Concern, in L.A.

Janice Bernstein speaks at School for Community Action Workshop, Seattle, Wash.

MAY 1969

Jobs to start—or finish

May 11—Renaissance Pleasure Faire fund raising.

**Button Month—wide distribution & wearing of JH buttons.

**Renewal of Memberships—Each JH member is asked to remind himself to renew his year's membership when due.

Telephone Tree—So JH members can be alerted to issues.

Expansion of Education Committees into sub-committees on excellence, community power, etc.

Expansion to other States & Cities.

Becoming adequately funded.

JH Awards of Merit ceremony.

(NOTE.—The most important activity of Join Hands, not listed in this Calendar, is the every day action by the thousands of individuals who singly or in groups of their choice live out their commitment to the Join Hands pledge.)

Join Hands, P.O. Box 49955, Los Angeles, Calif.

JOIN HANDS NEWSLETTER

THE JOIN HANDS FOCUS

The Join Hands focus is on action which members of the majority group can take in their own community to bring about racial justice & equality.

The Join Hands pledge is both a minimal standard of commitment & a tool. When a person looks at the ten points & decides, honestly, which ones he can support & which ones he can't—yet—he finds where he is & has a point from which he can start to act. Join Hands publications such as the business pledge, the newsletter & the action booklet, "What I Can Do," give him concrete pathways to action.

Join Hands committees act as support & catalysts for individual action & provide possibilities for group action where appropriate.

WE'RE TAX DEDUCTIBLE

Join Hands is designated as a tax-exempt organization by the Internal Revenue Service. This allows donors to deduct all contributions made to Join Hands from April, 1968, on their Federal & State income tax returns. Also deductible are all out-of-pocket expenses incurred as a JH volunteer. You may take 1968 contributions on your 1969 return if you have already filed your 1968 return without taking them.

All friends of Join Hands who contribute through A.I.D. (Associated In-Group Donors) where they work may now specify Join Hands as a recipient of their A.I.D. gift.

Join Hands, as a non-political, non-profit citizens group, receives no government funds, & is supported entirely by individual contributions.

MEMBERSHIP

Join Hands membership categories are:
Basic member, $5 to $10.
Supporting member, $10 to $25.
Donor, $25 to $50.
Sponsor, $50 to $100.
Patron, $100 & up.
Membership dues are renewable yearly.

JOIN HANDS BELIEVES

No one should feel his support of the rights of minorities is an act of charity. It is in his self-interest to work for massive improvements in such areas as jobs, housing, & education. This action must take place where one lives & works, because that's where his

XUM

power to insure fundamental change in the basic political, social, & economic institutions lies.

The alternative is repression. If we take that course, we shall end by repressing ourselves.

One nation, indivisible, with liberty & justice for all is not merely an ideal goal, it is a format for the preservation of our free society.

JOIN HANDS OPEN HOUSE

Set aside the second Friday night of each month for the Join Hands Open House. Standard fare: a brief orientation, spirited discussion, coffee, cake, new friends.

Call—472-6889—For Time & Place.

BLACK POWER, BROWN POWER ARE YOU AFRAID OF IT?

We in Join Hands welcome the emergence of Black & Brown Power in the minority communities.

We see it as the social, economic, & political power to bring about self-determination.

Only with the creation of united communities based upon self-respect, pride & control of community affairs can a true, lateral cooperation occur between all groups in our society.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Join Hands is incorporated in the State of California as a non-profit, educational & charitable corporation. Present members of its Board of Directors are: Janice Bernstein, President; Nancy York, Treasurer; Ethel Haydon, Secretary; Arnett Hartsfield, Jr., Dr. Philip Oderberg, Jacquie Richman, Ralph Bernstein & Winthrop D. Grove.

You may want to know: Telephone Numbers.

Here are numbers of some other broadly-based community organizations in the L.A. area:

California State service centers multiagency for assistance

To offer meaningful jobs to minority persons call & ask for employment section:

South Central, 567-1151.

East L.A., 264-5100.

Venice, 392-4811.

Community Relations Conference of So. Calif.

Promotes better human relations thru intergroup cooperation. 295-2607.

Fair Housing Groups.

Housing Opportunities Center, 296-6840.

Metropolitan Fair Housing, 296-6840.

San Fernando Valley Fair Housing, 981-6940.

Westside Fair Housing, 473-0940.

Los Angeles City Commission on Human Relations, 624-5211, Ext. 1287.

Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations, 677-1168, Ext. 63521.

National Alliance of Businessmen Providing Jobs for Poor & Underemployed, 749-2474.

Urban League, Greater Los Angeles, 731-8851.

Greater L.A. Urban Coalition, 749-3088.

Community organization dealing with urban problems.

Southern Christian Leadership Conference, 2824 S. Western Ave. L.A. 90018, 732-7143.

School volunteers

Become directly involved with children in the schools—and go on from there. Call Sarah Davis, Supervisor of the L.A. City Schools Volunteer Program, 628-2284, Ext. 20.

Roster of public officials

To find names & addresses of your local, state & federal officials send for the "Roster of Public Officials" published by the L.A. Chamber of Commerce at $.50 per copy. Send request to Government Relations Department, L.A. Chamber of Commerce, P.O. Box 3696, Terminal Annex, L.A.

Samples of the handy information contained therein: 1) Address all mail to U.S. Senators to Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510; 2) All mail to U.S. Congressmen to House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515; 3) During sessions, address all mail to California State Legislature to State Capitol, Sacramento, Calif.

Information source

The League of Women Voters can give you the answer to such questions as, "Who's my Assemblyman?" or "When does the term of the current Board of Education expire?" Also has excellent research available on many issues.

For L.A. City, 938-3251

For L.A. County, 481-2582

Phone numbers for information

L.A. Rumor Control & Information Center Call 29NAACP.

Dial An Issue—DU 6-6766 Mon.-Fri.

Join Hands Phone Numbers

Headquarters—472-6889, Open 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. weekdays.

Discussion groups—To join a group or host one, call Dolly Carr, 472-9779.

Business & industry committee—372-6889 Letters to corporations, George Elbaum, 474-5609

Education committee—472-6889, Sub-Committee on School Excellence, call Judy Gertler, 467-9301, or Susann Bauman, 279-2135, Sub-Committee on School-Community Advisory group, call Pearl Brickman, 475-3084

Neighborhood centers—to form one, call Lois Friedman, Neighborhood Center Coordinator, 776-1380.

Join hands for youth action (student organizing & resource group)—Call Carol Doose, 393-8838, Marilyn Hornberg 657-1378 or 472-6889.

Fund raising—to plan projects & to help carry out projects now under way, call Harold Boswell, 625-3611, Ext. 65723 (days) or 935-6808 (eves.)

Action committee—Chairman, Jacquie Richman, 823-3047 or 472-6889.

Referral & resource service—Ongoing linkage of individuals & groups with community & media resources as well as with others having similar interests & goals—472-6889.

Speakers bureau—Call Lois Friedman, 776-1380.

Want to put your savings to work?

Write Join Hands for a nationwide list of minority owned & managed banks & savings associations. Join Hands, P.O. Box. 49955, Los Angeles, Calif.

HIGH INTEREST RATES AND "PAIN AND SUFFERING"

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1969

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during his vacation with the bankers in Copenhagen, Denmark, William McChesney Martin had much to say about the "pain and suffering" that the Nation would have to go through to control inflation.

In his speech, Mr. Martin made it plain that he was talking about the little people and not the big boys, the bankers, when he mentioned "pain and suffering."

Mr. Speaker, Newsweek magazine, for July 7, 1969, carries an excellent roundup which plainly establishes that it is the little guy—the small businessman, the farmer, the student, and the housewife—who must bear the brunt of William McChesney Martin's "pain and suffering" because of the current high level of interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of this article:

PAIN AND SUFFERING

A Houston tortilla manufacturer can't buy desperately needed new equipment. A Chicago college junior may not be going back to school this fall. A Novato, Calif., contractor has fewer homes to sell. The owner of an Atlanta computer firm will probably have to take in partners. Four Bridgeport, Conn., merchants may be evicted from their stores.

These were just a handful of the many thousands of Americans whose lives were being altered last week by the credit squeeze that was begun in December by the nation's central bank, the Federal Reserve. The squeeze, which aims at slowing economic growth and inflation by restricting the amount of money available for spending, affected state and municipal bonds first. Many localities can pay no more than 4½ or 5 per cent interest, and other rates have soared so high that lenders have refused to buy the municipals. Next the squeeze hit housing, as many banks, preferring the higher interest yields available on consumer and business loans, stopped issuing new mortgages. Finally, in the last month, money has grown so tight that banks are rationing credit to just about everyone.

IT HURTS

As always, the squeeze is hitting the least credit-worthy small businesses and individuals hardest. Big corporations and wealthy individuals who are willing to pay current interest rates, which start at 8½ per cent and mount skyward, can still get credit for most reasonable projects. "We're being selective and making better loans," said one Los Angeles banker. "But if a man has good credit and good earning potential, we have the money to help him." From there, the pinch shades into men like Novato, Calif., builder Richard Elam, who normally has about fifteen new homes for sale at any given time but is cutting this inventory in half to ease the pressure of his carrying charges. Lawrence Gwin, president of Psychological Computer Analysis in Atlanta, is a step down on the credit ladder. Gwin had expected to get a bank loan to launch his brand-new company's first sales drive but will now have to seek private partners and give them part of his company.

Also left out in the cold are Dennis Goode, who planned to start his junior year at Northern Illinois University this fall, and Gilbert Moreno, owner of La Monita Tortilla factory in Houston. Goode has been turned down for a $1,500 student loan by the bank that supplied him with previous credit. "I just don't know what I'll do," says Goode. Moreno could triple his $6,000- to $7,000-a-month sales volume if he could borrow $20,000 for new equipment, but a loan—if he could get it—would cost him about 10½ per cent. He can't afford it. "The business is there . . ." says Moreno with a helpless shrug.

Some of the effects of the squeeze are bizarre. A Chicago banker tells of a businessman who balked at paying 10 per cent for a loan to meet his income-tax payments. The man told the loan officer that the Internal Revenue Service only charges 6 per cent on overdue taxes and "I'll take that for a while rather than pay you 10." But for other businessmen caught in the crunch, the problems are far less casual.

SEEING RED

There are scattered reports of bankruptcies among businessmen whose credit has dried up. But the case of four small-business men in Bridgeport, Conn., who between them operate a liquor store, a record store and a supermarket, is more typical. Their building is for sale at a bargain $200,000 and on the

XUM

strength of a verbal commitment from a bank loan officer, who offered a $130,000 mortgage, they committed $20,000 in earnest money guaranteeing to close the deal by July 15. Now the bank is balking at giving the mortgage. What's more, a rich speculator is likely to buy the property and, since their leases expire soon, they face eviction or the payment of exorbitant new rents to the new buyer. "My God," says one of the shaken merchants, "what's the world coming to?"

And so the squeeze goes on, drawing increasing cries of anguish from those affected. There promises to be little relief in the period immediately ahead. Last week, the Fed tightened the credit crunch on U.S. banks by proposing restrictions on their ability to borrow dollars on deposit in Europe. As Federal Reserve chairman William McChesney Martin has said, the nation faces continued "pain and suffering" before money eases up.

HISTORY OF AMVETS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, 1969 is a year of great significance for one of the Nation's leading veterans organizations, AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II, Korea and Vietnam). This year the organization, famous for its Silver Helmet Service awards, celebrates its silver anniversary as an organization whose goals, first established 25 years ago, have the same relevancy today; namely, to promote world peace, to preserve the American way of life, and to help veterans in the transition from military to civilian life.

This year, which also marks the 25th anniversary of D-Day finds AMVETS redoubling their efforts to assist the returning Vietnam veterans with their problems just as they helped one another following World War II and later Korean veterans since this organization, by congressional charter, includes both Korean and Vietnam veterans in its membership.

In addition, AMVETS work unceasingly toward the cause of world peace and the preservation of the American way of life, with particular stress on the necessity for the involvement of youth in these programs because, as an organization created from the chaos of war and the disintegration of some of the nations involved in that war, AMVETS is particularly aware of the need for every American to work toward these goals to keep our Nation strong.

I joined AMVETS in 1947 and am proud to be a life member of Post No. 2, Culver City, Calif.

A history of AMVETS follows:

HISTORY OF AMVETS

Truly AMVETS was born in the midst of war, for it was in August 1943, with victory still two years away, that a new organization, later to be known as American Veterans of World War II, had its beginning. Overseas the tide of battle was turning. Allies had swept through North Africa and Sicily. In the Pacific fighting raged in New Guinea. Thousands of Americans had made the supreme sacrifice. Hundreds of others were being mustered out of uniform with battle wounds and medical discharges. These men who fought in history's greatest war found it natural to seek each other's company. They were united by similar experiences . . . in jungles, in the Arctic, in deserts, in mountains, at sea, and in the skies. Thus, out of such comradeship, AMVETS came to be.

Two independent veterans clubs in Washington, D.C.—one formed on the campus of George Washington University, the other among veterans employed by the government—joined together to sponsor a servicemen's party. By September 1944 other such veterans clubs organized throughout America—in California, Florida, Louisiana, New York, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Texas. On November 11, 1944, Veterans Day, an article entitled "12,000,000 in Search of a Leader" appeared in *Collier's Magazine*. This story, written by Walter Davenport, introduced the clubs and outlined their mutual aims—1. To promote world peace, 2. To preserve the American Way of Life, and 3. To help the veteran help himself. In December, 18 leaders, representing these nine groups, met in Kansas City, Missouri. There a national organization was formed, and it was on Decembetr 9, 1944 the name "American Veterans of World War II" was chosen. The word AMVETS, coined by a newspaper reporter, soon became the official name. The "White Clover," a flower which thrives in freedom throughout the world, is symbolic of the struggle during World War II and is the adopted flower of AMVETS.

In October 1945, two months after the end of World War II, the first national convention was called in Chicago. In 1946 AMVETS petitioned Congress for a federal charter. AMVETS, having displayed dignity and sound approach to National problems, won the deep respect of Congress, and on July 23, 1347, President Harry S. Truman signed AMVETS Charter. The words of the Senate Judiciary Committee echoed throughout the land: "the veterans of World War II are entitled to their own organization" and AMVETS being "organized along sound lines and for worthy purposes . . . having demonstrated its strength and stability, is entitled to the standing and dignity which a national charter will afford." President Truman also commented, "Were I a veteran of this war, I would prefer to have a veteran of World War II looking after my affairs than a veteran of some other war." To this day no other World War II veterans groups has been so honored.

When war broke out in Korea in 1950 and again during the Viet Nam crisis in 1966, AMVETS requested Congress to amend the charter so that those serving in the Armed Forces would be eligible for membership. On September 14, 1966 President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the bill redefining the eligibility dates for AMVET membership—"Any person who served in the Armed Forces of the United States of America or any American citizen who served in the armed forces of an allied nation of the United States on or after September 16, 1940 and on or before the date of cessation of hostilities as determined by the government of the United States is eligible for regular membership in AMVETS, provided such service when terminated by discharge or release from active duty be by honorable discharge or separation."

The first National Headquarters for AMVETS was rented quarters at 724—Ninth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. Then on April 18, 1952 President Truman dedicated the first AMVETS-owned National Headquarters. This building, a five-story townhouse, was located at 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W. For fifteen years this building served Headquarters and the National Service Foundation. In 1965 AMVETS moved to a temporary location, and the historic townhouse was torn down. On the same site appeared a modern three-story structure of marble and glass. On the 19th anniversary of the signing of the Congressional Charter, July 23, 1966, President Lyndon B. Johnson dedicated the new building. During the program a beautiful life-like bronze bust of the President was unveiled by Mrs. Johnson. All AMVETS take pride in the Headquarters for the executive offices and conference rooms are most attractive and functional. The Service, Legislative, Accounting, and Public Relations Departments as well as Mailing, Printing and Production rooms are housed in the new building. Its construction and dedication mark a major milestone for AMVETS.

Hourly from Headquarters a Carillon, donated by Schulmerich Carillons, Inc., chimes and then at specific times musical classics resound through the area. These bells are significant of the other AMVET Carillons throughout the United States. The Memorial Carillon at Arlington National Cemetery to honor the memory of those who died in the service of their country was the first installation. This console is in the Arlington amphitheatre overlooking the Tombs of the Unknowns. It was on December 21, 1949 that AMVETS presented the Carillon to the nation with the message: "While these bells ring, safely rest, freedom lives." AMVET Carillons also are now located aboard the USS Arizona Memorial at Pearl Harbor, at the Garden of Patriots at Cape Coral, Florida, Truman Library in Missouri, Jefferson Barracks in Missouri, State Capitol in Salt Lake City, Utah, the Golden Gate National Cemetery in California.

The "Green Hats" of AMVETS have served the hospitalized veteran, the retarded child, the shoeless orphan, and the lonely serviceman. However, the granting of scholarships has been a major endeavor of AMVETS. Each year many scholarships are awarded deserving students. This program, originated in 1952 and has awarded $250,000 in study grants. Positive Americanism, Youth Programs, Veterans Services, as well as participation in the World Veterans Federation, United Nations, All-American Conference to Combat Communism, and Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge all mean that AMVETS take a realistic approach to the problems of the day.

In 1954 the first AMVET Silver Helmet Award—a replica of the G.I. helmets of World War II—was presented to General George Marshall for his "enormous contributions to the United States in war and in peace." Subsequently Silver Helmets have been presented to other great Americans. Recipients include Presidents Hoover, Truman, Eisenhower, Johnson, Kennedy, Vice President Nixon, Comedian Bob Hope, Eleanor Roosevelt, and Dr. Ralph Bunche.

A network of trained National Service Officers across the country provide free expert advice to veterans and veterans' dependents. Annually these officers handle thousands of claims and obtain various benefits for the deserving veterans. These involve hospitalization, disability compensation, and educational benefits.

AMVETS keep a watchful eye and take an active part in the legislation on "The Hill". Action on pending Congressional bills is based on the assumption that "the veteran will ultimately benefit from any measure that benefits the nation and, conversely, any program not good for the country as a whole cannot be good for the veteran." AMVETS are especially proud of their roles in the enactment of the "Korean G.I. Bill of Rights" and the "Cold War Bill of Rights." Domestic issues, national defense, and foreign relations are issues of importance and grave concern to AMVETS.

AMVETS offers to its members many personal services. Life insurance, hospital coverage, discount drugs, and travel tours are such programs; however, the associations and friendships of fellow-AMVETS is with-

XUM

out doubt the most valued benefit of AMVET membership. In addition, participation in the many service programs, whether it be Americanism, Civil Defense, Traffic Safety, or Rehabilitation, will provide a reward of real personal satisfaction. AMVETS is truly a family organization. Wives, mothers, sisters and daughters of AMVETS are eligible for membership in AMVETS Auxiliary, while sons and daughters between 7 and 17 years of age may join Jr. AMVETS. The Fun and Honor Group of AMVETS is known as the Sad Sacks, while its counterpart in the Auxiliary is the Sacketts. Each subsidiary organization, including the National Service Foundation, is governed by its own Constitution and elects its own officers; however, all activities are geared to further the aims and purposes of the parent organization, AMVETS.

Time marches on, and AMVETS continue to work to attain world peace so that every man can live fearlessly under free skies, to make the United States an ever-better land of "freedom for all", and to help the veteran, his widow and orphan live happily as contributing members of society.

Today AMVETS boasts a membership of 200,000, displays a new Headquarters Building in the Nation's Capitol, praises the efforts of dedicated AMVET leaders, and walks side by side with the other veteran groups. However, an organization cannot be measured by size and official recognition alone. The assistance and consideration to one's fellowman gains the greatest respect and admiration. Thus, "a common sense philosophy" has guided AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II, to take the proper action—always keeping faith with the veterans but never losing the respect of the American people.

"We Fought Together—Let's Build Together".

SEX MORALITY GAINS MOMENTUM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the sex pushers are now obviously on the defensive and they cannot sell the public their sordid product.

The moral indignation of mature and concerned mothers and dads has stemmed from efforts to exploit the sexuality of their young children under a camouflage of education. But, it is compounded by the proven record that every fied of endeavor preempted by bureaucrats and their intellectual corps has wound up taxed, socialized, or destroyed.

The sex revolution—an obvious invasion of every individual's right to privacy and morality—has been sneaked into the classroom by the self-appointed guardians of licentiousness who now challenge society to take corrective action to remove this smut and pornography from the environment of their child.

The sexologists would justify the introduction of a vulgar presentation of sex in schools by saying that the children are exposed to it at the movies, on television, and in magazines—that it is all around our children. Conceding that the pornographic exposure is present it would be simpler and more rational to clean up the entertainment field and control the smut magazines. After all, those who created the problem are not the ones to solve it—especially by enlarging it.

Mr. Speaker, I include varied related news articles:

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 4, 1969]

Letters Pour in to United States Opposing Sex Education

(By John Mathews)

Opponents of sex education programs in the schools are sending about 400 letters a week to the White House, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Robert H. Finch, the Office of Education and other government agencies.

An Office of Education official who coordinates responses to most of the letters estimates that about three-fourths of the correspondence appears to be inspired by organized groups campaigning against sex education.

In the latest campaign, letter writers say they are part of the "Eye of the Octopus Movement."

Conservative organizations here—and liberal research groups that keep tabs on conservative movements—were unable to identify the latest organized effort.

The "octopus" seems to be a symbol of subversion with its tentacles reaching out to corrupt children, through sex education programs.

The "octopus" letters are largely answered by a form letter sent out under the signature of Miss Elsa Schneider, comprehensive program manager for health-related activities in the Office of Education.

Like much of the correspondence, "the octopus" letters call for an end to federal funding for any programs that "promote or contribute to family life education, sex education or sensitivity training in any form."

Replying to the letters for Secretary Finch, Miss Schneider stresses that the federal government does not stipulate sex education curriculum and cannot dictate to local school districts what they should or should not teach.

"I think you will agree that one of the most prized principles of government in this country is that of local control of school curriculum," the form letter reads. "Acting within the framework of state law, state and local school authorities make all decisions about what is taught, teaching methods, qualification of teachers and materials used in the classroom."

In many personal responses to letter writers, Miss Schneider said today, she attempts to correct misinformation. The government does not issue any materials or pamphlets on sex education, she tells letter writers. Cooperative research grants are not currently made in the field, and no office personnel sit on the board of the controversial Sex Information and Education Council of the United States.

SEICUS director Dr. Mary Calderone, a favorite target of sex education opponents, did receive a $30,000 grant two years ago from the Office of Education's cooperative research program to produce a guide for professional counselors in sex education and marriage counseling. The office sends letter writers inquiring about its relationship with SIECUS a form letter acknowledging the existence of the grant, but stating also the Office of Education "does not support the program of the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States."

The Office of Education has also awarded grants to schools and universities under provisions of two federal laws which stipulate that grants are originated from the local applicants rather the federal office. Prince Georges County, for example, has been funded to train teachers preparing to instruct sex and health education classes.

Many of the letters are inspired by such groups as MOTOREDE (Movement to Restore Decency), associated with the John Birch Society; MOMS (Mothers Organized for Moral Stability), PAUSE (Parents Against Unconstitutional Sex Education), the Christian Crusade, and others.

The correspondents condemn sex education as immoral, sacrilegious, Communistic, unconstitutional. Some letter writers however, object to being "smeared" as right-wingers because of their opposition to sex education.

A letter writer from the state of Washington described a local meeting, saying "As usual, each time anyone in the group discussion spoke against this sex education, we were subjected to the inference of being part of the John Birch Society. We are not at all interested in the John Birch Society and certainly have no connection with that group."

The parent went on to say she objected to untrained teachers dealing in the classroom with the emotionally charged subject matter.

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 11, 1969]

The Storm Over Sex Education

(By Clayton Fritchey)

With the public schools closed for the summer, the controversy over sex education has temporarily subsided, but only on the surface. All signs point to a renewed and enlarged fight in the fall, for it is increasingly clear that much of the protest is not spontaneous, but inspired by organized agitation.

There no longer is any doubt that the protest campaign has a right-wing, fundamentalist, anti-Communist flavor, although there are a number of unorganized individuals who are also against the program for other reasons.

But, generally speaking, there is a national pattern and an underlying theme to the resistance movement, which has been pointedly expressed by Robert Welch, founder and leader of the John Birch Society. Sex education, he says, is "a filthy Communist plot."

The Birchites have established MOTOREDE committees (Movement To Restore Decency) to combat sex education. Others carrying the torch are the American Education Lobby, headed by Lee Dobson, formerly associated with the Liberty Lobby; the Rev. Billy James Hargis' Christian Crusade, a Texas anti-Communist organization; MOMS (Mothers Organized For Moral Stability) and PAUSE (Parents Against Unconstitutional Sex Education). Washington is now beginning to feel the effects of their letter-writing campaigns.

The chief object of their hostility is the Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S. (SIECUS), headed by Dr. Mary Calderone, who says, "The right wing is using us to whip up a backlash frenzy. Sex education is the best issue the right wing has discovered in years, and they're exploiting it for all it's worth."

Mrs. Calderone acknowledges that "there are some well-intentioned and responsible critics of sex education programs though we hear almost entirely from the extreme right which is recruiting the timid and conservative."

Actually, sex education, like any pioneer program, has its weaknesses, and some of the gaucheries have upset a lot of parents. The situation is not unlike that with the "pill," which also has had its failures and some undesirable side effects, but which nevertheless serves a broad, useful purpose.

It's less than two months before the reopening of school, and the problem in hundreds of communities will then be how to reach a rational resolution of the issue, which is by no means confined to the "Bible Belt." Some of the most passionate protest has been in sophisticated metropolitan areas, including suburbs of the nation's capital.

A protest rally in a community on the outskirts of Washington was, for instance,

XUM

not unlike comparable meetings in smaller towns all over the U.S. A Boy Scout opened with the Pledge of Allegiance. The Gospel Four (a women's quartet) led a crowd of 800 in singing "My Country 'Tis of Thee." Later they sang "Have A Little Talk With Jesus" while ushers collected $426 for the cause.

A Baptist preacher urged parents to take their children out of school if sex education persists. Another preacher likened sex education to "the decadence of topless and bottomless girls in bars . . . the miniskirt, the bikini, the see-thru dress, erotic publications, and co-education rooming arrangements in college where noncredit courses are given in fornication, petting, and how to have an abortion without missing a class."

At a similar meeting in a nearby suburb, one speaker warned that the sex program is "a move by the devil himself to bring us down from within."

The feelings of many earnest critics were perhaps best summed up by a woman reader of The Washington Star who wrote, "Without benefit of sex education in our schools we (the sexually inadequate, guilt-ridden, misguided parents, as we are labeled today) have produced a powerful, morally strong, and great nation of great and noble men and women, with only our belief in God Almighty and His Ten Commandments as our guide."

[From the Washington Sunday Star, June 29, 1969]

PART OF CONTROVERSY—SEX EDUCATION FILMS CANDID, EXPLICIT

The films used in sex education instruction here and around the nation have helped fire much of the current controversy.

Reaction to the films probably is partly McLuhanesque: The visual and auditory impact—on parents particularly—is much greater than that of books, pamphlets and other materials. The films are also much more explicit and candid than many of the textbooks whose publishers strike a middle-ground, hoping for mass adoption of their books by school systems.

Here are notes on some of the most controversial films:

"How Babies Are Made" (General Learning Corp.)—The film qualifies for the Academy Award of controversy in the sex education field. It was prepared in consultation with the embattled Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS) and the noncontroversial Child Study Association of America, (SIECUS' executive director is Dr. Mary S. Calderone, an outspoken exponent of sex education and a favorite target of organized opposition. She stresses continually that SIECUS does not produce sex education materials, but does review materials. Producers of materials are beginning to shy away from SIECUS endorsements as the controversy rages.)

The film, used sparingly in the Washington area, employs paper cutout figures to tell the story of animal and human reproduction. The most controversial scenes depict barnyard animals mating and a father and mother in bed under the covers. The narrative is frank and direct. The producers, who also provide an illustrated workbook, say the film is designed for 3 to 10-year-olds.

"Boy to Man" and "Girl to Woman" (Churchill Films)—Probably the most widely used sex education films in the Washington area. School systems differ as to the appropriate age level for their use, some showing the films in fifth and sixth grades, others waiting until junior high school. Both films use basically the same sequences for explicit descriptions of male and female reproductive organs and the process of human reproduction. The films also deal with teen-age acne and personal health problems. The film for girls has a section on menstruation.

Among the most controversial sequences is a description in both films, using animated drawings, of the male ejaculation. The narrator says, "It is nature's way of passing the male sperm into the female body during sexual intercourse." A sequence in the film for boys, dealing with masturbation and nocturnal emissions, has been criticized for the statement that "neither causes mental disease or physical injury, but both are natural outlets in no way harmful." Critics say the statement appears to condone masturbation.

"Molly Grows Up"—The most widely used sex education film for girls in the District, long discarded elsewhere, is at least 15 years old. Lines like, "Molly, good heavens, you're growing. I've got to put that hem down," draws choruses of laughter from student audiences. Despite its dated quality, the film has a candid discussion of menstruation. The sequence on reproduction describes only the female genital organs, which are sketched on a blackboard by a nurse.

"Parent to Child About Sex" (Rex Fleming Production)—A recent film designed for parents in which two doctors discuss parental attitudes toward sex and sex education. Scenes deal with questions of preschool children about pregnancy, parent reaction to childhood and adolescent masturbation, menstruation, dating and teen-age sexuality. The film is particularly direct in discussing how negative parent reaction to normal development can produce damaging effects in later life.

The first session at Leland Junior High School produced mixed results: Adamant opponents were not converted. supporters were buoyed and uncommitted parents appeared to be somewhat reassured. Lingering doubts, however, centered not on the materials used in the courses but on how qualified teachers are to handle the materials.

Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties are acting to meet this concern. School administrators in both counties say sex education programs will not be introduced until teachers have received special training and are "comfortable" with the subject matter.

Prince Georges County held in-service training sessions last year for 460 teachers before pilot programs were begun in the spring. The county system plans to train 340 more teachers before the programs are expanded next year.

WIDE VARIATION IN AREA

The extent of sex education and the content of the courses vary widely in the Washington area.

Even where the central administration outlines a program of instruction in a school system the local practices in individual schools can differ substantially. Schools operate in a largely autonomous fashion, particularly in the area of sex education where the principal's assessment of community receptivity is decisive.

No area school district has a course that is exclusively devoted to sex education. Only a small fraction of the courses, called health or family living, concentrate on such topics as human reproduction, male-female differences, adolescent problems of dating and relationships between the sexes. Most courses are a mixture of animal and plant biology, simplified individual and group psychology, "character" training, drug and alcohol information and rudimentary sociology.

VIRGINIA SCHOOLS WAIT

In elementary schools, sex education, even as part of another course is far from a universal subject. In Northern Virginia school districts, sex education is much less structured within the curriculum than in Maryland counties or in Washington.

Arlington has no formal elementary school program, although parent-teacher association and school physicians occasionally respond to student or parent demand by organizing after-school sessions, not under school sponsorship, to teach, for example, sixth-grade girls the facts of menstruation.

Fairfax also has not specified an elementary school program. In the last six years or so, however, fifth and sixth-grade classes, segregated by sex, have viewed two of the most widely used sex education films, "Boy to Man" and "Girl to Woman." Parents are invited to preview the films first and can request that their children be excluded from the sessions. Both films give a detailed explanation of human reproduction.

Students in Alexandria are not taught the basic facts of human reproduction in their elementary classes even though they have a family living and health curriculum.

The Alexandria course, part of social studies, deals with such subjects as the neighborhood, community, nation and family. Science classes follow the course outline prescribed by the state, which discusses lower forms of reproduction but steers clear of human reproduction.

PREPARATION IN DISTRICT

In Washington, the school system has had for the last six years comprehensive guides for teaching "personal and family living, not sex education," says Frank P. Bolden, director of health, physical education, athletics and safety.

At the elementary level the guide has units on "Learning to Work and Play Better With Others," or "Exaggeration-Lying-Stealing-Foul Language," which provide heavy doses of moral or character training. A unit entitled "A Study of Responsibility" classifies a child's responsibilities by age group, each beginning with "obedience," and including "worshipping God" for the 5 to 9-year-old group and "practicing religion" for 10 to 14-year-olds.

A unit on plant, animal and human reproduction is included for the "upper elementary level," but in what appears to be a remnant of the now-abolished track system of pupil grouping the unit is recommended by the teacher guide for students of "average or high average capability." Bolden said his department does not have the responsibility of determining to what extent the entire elementary school family living curriculum is used.

In both Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, existing elementary school family life and sex education programs are being revised and formalized as a result of the State Board of Education directive.

PRINCE GEORGES STUDIES

An outline for a kindergarten-through-12th-grade sex education curricula in Prince Georges County is designed for use by teachers who have taken a special in-service training course and in schools that are determined to have the right climate for accepting the courses.

Beginning in kindergarten and first grade the emphasis is on making children aware that "sex can be discussed openly in the classroom" and that sex is "private but not shameful." The outline notes that "the proper names for the genital organs are learned in order to discourage baby or gutter terms."

Through the grades children learn about heredity, growth and body systems, with human reproduction designated for the fifth or sixth grade depending on teacher judgment. In the eighth grade, necking and petting and other topics relating to dating behavior are discussed and, within the context of family living, miscarriage, abortion and illegitimate pregnancy may be brought up.

Problems of premarital sex relations are considered in the ninth grade, and the senior year of high school deals with preparation for marriage and parenthood. The junior and senior high school sex education units in Prince Georges County are not separate courses but part of physical education, biology and even problems in democracy courses.

XUM

MONTGOMERY COURSES

Montgomery County's elementary family life and sex education curriculum, part of the science course, was used in 11 pilot schools this past school year. It is now being revised and will be extended to an-as-yet-undetermined number of schools.

The curriculum begins with basic observations of growth in plants, animals and human beings. In grade two, the teacher's guide suggests a rudimentary discussion of reproduction: "Babies come from their mother and father . . . people reproduce from eggs within the body . . . each sex is especially adapted for its functioning the reproduction process (female egg cells, male sperm cells) . . ."

The discussion of growth and development becomes increasingly sophisticated until in fifth grade, after a discussion of the muscular, circulatory, digestive, nervous and excretory systems, the class deals with the human reproductive system.

Teachers have the option of dividing groups by sex to discuss female and male reproductive systems. Films, film strips, books, pamphlets and diagrams are used for the instruction. Girls get a special unit on menstruation.

SOME SUBJECTS TABOO

At the junior and senior high school levels in the Washington area, most school systems have health education units, usually as part of physical education. While instruction has been greatly liberalized in recent years and materials reflecting the new openness are increasingly available, there still are some taboo subjects.

Homosexuality, masturbation, deviant behavior and premarital sex are treated gingerly, if at all. Despite the fact that one of the longstanding arguments for sex education is that it helps combat illegitimate pregnancies, school curricula bar discussion of contraception. In Washington, for example, nearly 10 years ago the school board banned discussion of contraception and sexual intercourse. The need for classroom discussion of contraception is one issue raised by students calling for "modernized sex education" in the District.

Another area in which the health educators and their colleagues have moved cautiously is in the purchase of human torso models. Traditionally, torso models in biology and health education classes are sexual neuters.

Recently, equipment manufacturers have listed in their catalogues torso models with male and female genital organs. Washington appears to be the only school system that has purchased a set of the new models. The models currently are stored in an administrative office with no immediate plans for use in the classroom.

[From the Washington Post, July 12, 1969]

SECRECY VOTED ON SEX TALKS

The committee studying Maryland's compulsory sex education program for the schools has voted to conduct its weekly meetings in secret.

The decision was reached Thursday after one committee member, Genevieve Fleury of Towson, began to record the panel's first session on a small, portable tape recorder. Mrs. Fleury has been a critic of the program.

"We had a small go-round there," Mrs. Fleury said yesterday. "I didn't see any reason why it shouldn't be used. It's a common business procedure."

The 24-member committee was appointed July 1 by the State Board of Education to review the 1967 bylaw that requires a comprehensive sex education curriculum in all grades. The panel was formed at the suggestion of Gov. Marvin Mandel after widespread opposition to sex education materialized in various Maryland counties.

Elizabeth L. Scull, chairman of the committee, said the panel would review the books and films used in the program and would hear comments from citizen groups. She was empowered by the committee to issue a press statement after each session. The committee's report is due Aug. 20.

ACTIVITIES ON THE MOON

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in answer to my letter of June 19, 1969, to Dr. Thomas Paine, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I have received the following excellent letter of June 30, 1969, from Mr. Robert F. Allnutt, the Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in Washington, D.C.:

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: This refers to your inquiry to NASA concerning activities on the moon by the first astronauts to land there. Our plans in this regard are spelled out in the attachment.

We trust that this information will be of assistance to you. If you wish additional information, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT F. ALLNUTT,
Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs.

STATEMENT BY NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, JULY 1, 1969

Plans for the Apollo 11 mission of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration call for Flight Commander Neil Armstrong to emplant an American flag on the surface of the moon as one of his first duties upon leaving the Lunar Module and stepping onto the surface. The flag will be erected on a two-piece, eight foot mast, which will be carried, along with the flag, in an aluminum tube attached to one of the landing legs of the Lunar Module. The crew will also carry on the flight five-by-eight foot American flags to be presented to the Congress after the flight.

In placing the American flag on the lunar surface, NASA will in no way be claiming the moon for the United States or for any other nation or group of nations. Such a claim would be contrary to the express provisions of the Treaty on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, to which the United States is a signatory.

No other flags will be placed on the lunar surface in this mission. The crew will carry on the mission and return to Earth the following miniature flags: the fifty States and the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the U.S. territories, all nations and the United Nations.

A plaque mounted on the side of the descent stage of the Lunar Module will also be left on the surface. This plaque bears a map of the Earth, the signatures of the President of the United States and the Apollo 11 crew, and the following inscription: "Here men from Planet Earth first set foot upon the moon. We came in peace for all mankind."

THE INCREDIBLE DREAM: A WALK ON THE MOON—PART IX

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in less than a dozen years, the space age has grown from a beeping 184-pound satellite called Sputnik 1 to 100,000 pounds worth of hardware called Apollo 11. In less than a dozen years, man has seen his planet for what it is, a blue and green ball with white streaks framed against the pinpoints of the universe. And now America's astronauts are taking that fateful step—not only from the earth onto the moon, but from the past into the future. They are becoming the first citizens of the solar system, inaugurating a new age of man. New York Daily News Science Editor Mark Bloom, in his revealing series on the history and heartbreak, the sobering and exhilarating scientific and political breakthroughs leading to the moon voyage of Apollo 11, has performed a true service in preparing us for this momentous event. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the record, I include his "Countdown Minus 1X" article preparatory to tomorrow's blastoff and man's first footprint on extraterrestrial soil:

COUNTDOWN TO THE MOON

(By Mark Bloom)

"Perform a manned lunar landing and return."

This is the primary objective of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for Apollo 11. Every other assignment for the astronauts on the surface of the moon, even the planned walk, is "peripheral," to quote Apollo 11 commander Neil Armstrong.

Touchdown on the moon in the lunar module, scheduled for 4:19 p.m. New York time on Sunday July 20, will be *it*. Aboard: Armstrong, 38, and Edwin E. (Buzz) Aldrin, 39.

Flying 70 miles overhead in lunar orbit will be Michael Collins, 38, aboard Columbia, the radio call sign for the Apollo 11 command module.

Armstrong and Aldrin will have three major tasks during the two hours and 35 minutes of outside activities:

Collect up to 130 pounds of lunar rocks and soil.

Set out three scientific experiments, two to remain on the moon and the third to be returned to earth.

Show to their home planet via television what they are doing on the surface, including the historic crunch by Armstrong's left boot, size 11½C.

This step into the future will be taken on Monday around 2:20 a.m., a full 10 hours after Eagle perches on the moon.

In the interim, the astronauts will spend two hours checking the lunar module, having two meals, taking the first lunar snooze, and getting set for the walk.

And to the dismay of hundreds of millions around the world, not to mention some weary, talked-out television commentators, there will be no live TV from the surface of the moon all this time.

The greatest show in history of television begins when Armstrong starts down the nine-rung ladder leading from Eagle's hatch to the surface. When he reaches the third rung from the top, the astronuat will reach

XUM

out with his left arm and pull a D-shaped handle, opening a storage bay and exposing the lens of a black-and-white TV camera.

In 1.3 seconds, the time it takes light to reach the earth, we will see Armstrong's legs carefully moving down the ladder.

A moment later, men on earth will see man walking on the moon.

For the first half hour, Armstrong will test his mobility on the surface, collect a two-pound "grab bag" rock sample, which is a contingency sample in case the walk has to be cut short, and receive equipment and a camera via a conveyor belt from Aldrin.

At this point, Aldrin makes his appearance on the moon.

For the next two hours, the astronauts collect rocks and soil with a scoop on a three-foot-long handle, filling two containers.

Two hours and 40 minutes after Armstrong opens the hatch, both crewmen should be back aboard Eagle.

And at 1:55 p.m.—after a total of 21 hours and 26 minutes on the surface—Eagle will blastoff to rejoin Columbia.

OUR FLAG IN AN AIRLESS VOID

Ever since the Age of Exploration, man has yearned to plant his banners on remote and distant shores. When Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin make it to the lunar surface, the Stars and Stripes will fly on the farthest shore of all.

Plans call for Armstrong and Aldrin to jointly implant a three- by five-foot nylon American flag about an hour after they step onto the moon.

It will be erected on an eight-foot-tall aluminum staff, tubing along the top edge of the flag keeping it unfurled in the airless lunar environment.

Raising of the American flag—and only the American flag—was mandated recently by Congress. Space agency senior officials had favored raising both the American and United Nations standards.

"The planting of the flag is symbolic of the first time man has landed on another celestial body and does not constitute a territorial claim by the United States," the space agency said in a terse statement.

More enthusiastically publicized by Nasa is a plaque which the astronauts will unveil and leave on the moon, bearing images of the earth's two hemispheres, signatures of the three Apollo 11 astronauts and President Nixon, and carrying the inscription:

"Here men from the planet Earth first set foot upon the Moon July 1969, A.D. We came in peace for all mankind."

Also to be left on the moon is a silicon disk about the size of a half dollar bearing messages from more than 100 world leaders. To fit them all on the disk, the messages have been reduced to about 1/200th of their original size.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, July 16, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God.—Isaiah 40: 3.

O God and Father of us all at this high moment in our national life we bow at the altar of prayer invoking Thy blessing upon us and upon our noble endeavors. Shine Thou upon our Nation as we launch out into a new day. Bless our astronauts as they wend their way to the moon, as they land on its surface, and as they find their way back. Grant them safety all the way and may they return with their mission accomplished and their aims achieved.

We thank Thee with glowing hearts that we live in an hour like this. May we play our part as participants in this crowning hour of our Nation's history.

In the spirit of the Pioneer of Life we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

GODSPEED TO OUR ASTRONAUTS AND SUCCESS TO OUR SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, what a wonderful day this is for America and for the world. America, in the name of peaceful exploration, has launched into orbit three brave men—Neil Armstrong, "Buz" Aldrin, and Mike Collins, who are to conduct the first landing on the moon.

No matter how many times a launch has been done before, the potentials for danger are so great that the whole community of mankind pauses as Saturn V lights for the takeoff.

Our country has conducted with great credit as well as success its open program of peaceful exploration of space. The National Aeronautics and Space Act was proposed by President Eisenhower, and was forged and perfected in committees of the Congress of which I was the chairman in the House. We then pledged our program to peaceful goals in the interest of all mankind. I think history is supporting the wisdom of those decisions of 1958.

We welcome the sense of sharing which other nations have had in this endeavor. Their flags are being carried to the moon and statements of many of their national leaders will be left as a memorial on the moon to this epic event in the history of our race.

Today, at Cape Kennedy, Ambassadors of most of the nations have been present to see the launch. In one way they are our guests because of the investment the American people have made financially to bring about this mission. In another way, they have a right to be there as participants, not merely guests. Our space program has been built upon a common heritage of knowledge with the cooperation of many nations over many generations. Also, the conduct of this mission has depended upon cooperative tracking stations in many nations, and our flights are conducted under a regime of peaceful acts of space established by international treaty.

Our men go to the moon not to seize it in the name of ownership but as ambassadors for all men of good will. The mission, the men, the hopes of the world, all represent to the highest aspirations of mankind for peace, for progress, and partnership.

The inspiration of our moon flight is that we can join forces to solve the major problems on earth just as well as we continue to do so in space, and to continue space explorations will have its applications and spinoffs which will pay for the progress of our fellow men here on earth.

This mission has only begun, and many difficult tasks are yet to be performed. We have high confidence in the work and in the equipment but if the mission is not completed, these men would not want us to turn our backs on what they have strived for so hard to accomplish.

Nor would America want us to quit. We, of course, hope and expect that within about 8 days this mission can be a part of history, a wonderful success and a tribute to the astronauts, the engineers and the scientists and the workers, the citizens and the Government which made it possible.

We ask God's blessings on this great adventure of the human spirit.

THEY ALSO SERVE WHO STAND AND WAIT

(Mr. KASTENMEIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish my presence today in this Chamber with a corporal's guard of House membership, while our colleagues enjoy this morning's historic spectacle of the lift-off in Cape Kennedy, to connote lack of support for, indeed enthusiasm for, the enormous achievement of man's flight to the moon.

I join my colleagues in proudly paying tribute to our space team. I wish them a safe trip and every success, and while our astronauts are on the moon, I hope they will pick up and bring back some of that surface because, Mr. Speaker, being from Wisconsin, America's dairyland, where our farmers are burdened by foreign dairy imports, I want Wisconsin dairy producers to be reassured that the moon's surface is not made of potentially competitive green cheese.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman for the statement he has just made about the spirit and attitude which prevails throughout all of the membership of this body. Those of us who are here today are certainly with our astronauts in spirit and share in the very high hopes of all of us for a successful achievement down there at Cape Kennedy and also share in the great pride at what has already been accomplished.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL OF MILITARY SPENDING

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

XUM

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, delivered a speech before the 16th annual Institute on Government Contracts on Thursday, May 8, of this year. His subject was the responsibility of Congress to exercise control over military expenditures. I think the speech is extraordinary in its insight and I recommend its reading to the Members of this House:

Remarks of Congressman William S. Moorhead

Ladies and gentlemen, over the last 6 weeks I have been participating in hearings on the Subcommittee on Military Operations and have heard a key phrase repeated over and over again—maintain capability—as the rationalization for the incestuous relationship between the Department of Defense and our defense contractors. It brings to mind the symbolic but appropriate picture of a million pound dinosaur living in a man's backyard and constantly demanding to be fed—his rationale to the homeowner is what would you do with a dead dinosaur in your backyard?

I come before you today to discuss a dire and dangerous condition in the United States of America. I am referring to our self-perpetuating military budget and the sincere but vain attempts which have been made to bridle this beast.

You might ask me why after serving ten years in the House of Representatives I now bring to your attention that military spending has no governor.

As I look back on my decade in Congress, I would say, indulging in a bit of hindsight, that the $80 billion military budget has been out of control or nearly so for all of those 10 years.

In my first two years in Congress, General Eisenhower was President, and with his great prestige as a General he was able to impose a ceiling of sorts on the military budget. This was not a rational ceiling, however. It was one that, I suspect, contained more spending for officers clubs and less on defense capabilities than the American people wanted.

In 1961, John F. Kennedy became the President of the United States and named the brilliant and budget-minded Robert S. McNamara to be Secretary of Defense.

Even a Defense Secretary, as strong-willed and determined as Robert S. McNamara, faced the threat of the Joint Chiefs' reprisals for his efforts to rationalize the budgetary process. In order to protect himself from these assaults, McNamara insisted that the Joint Chiefs sign off on all Defense budgetary matters thus obviating the possibility that the Joint Chiefs would criticize him for not putting enough money in specific weapons systems and thereby endangering the national security.

If he did not achieve the reality, Robert S. McNamara certainly achieved the illusion that there was a strong civilian control over the military. At any rate, those of us in Congress who were interested primarily in the domestic and civilian programs of the United States were satisfied that the military budget was under control.

Our problem in Congress in those days were conceptual rather than financial.

We were trying to get the Congress to accept dramatic new ideas—Medicare, federal aid to education, the war on poverty, federal support for the arts and humanities, and a few dozen more.

In 1965, in the 89th Congress, we were successful, and most of these new ideas were enacted into law.

But also in 1965 the battle between guns and butter began and inflationary pressures started to build. They rose in intensity in proportion to our growing involvement in the Vietnam morass.

Those of us in the Congress who had fought for new and increased programs in health and housing, for education and for the war on poverty, began to realize that unless we could bring the military budget, and procurement in particular, under control, these vital social programs would die from the malnutrition of underfunding.

The picture was made more discouraging by statements from the military and its supporters. These elements said that when the war in Vietnam ended, the bulk of the resulting savings would still be required by the military to carry out procurement for weapons systems deferred because of Vietnam.

This situation has remained the same—ominous—for the last four years.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff this year requested more than $100 billion to maintain the military strength of the Pentagon. Right now there are 13 major weapons systems—ranging from new fighter planes to missiles and aircraft carriers—whose production has been approved but backed up because of the Vietnam war.

For example, this so called "fiscal dividend" was originally projected at $19 billion after the cessation of Vietnam hostilities. However, Defense Secretary Laird in a recent statement staked the Pentagon's claim for $12 billion of this dividend—so once again the lion's share goes to the military at the expense of our domestic programs.

Last year, I decided to promote for public and congressional sake, what I would call a healthy skepticism about the size of the military budget.

This feeling was brought about in part by the election of a presidential candidate who spoke of increasing our military budget to achieve a clear "superiority" over the Soviets. I shuddered at the implications of the statement. More and more expensive weapons programs—leading to a reaction in kind by the Russians—which would further drive us to still greater heights of arms acquisitions.

I was also impressed by certian testimony delivered before a subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee on which I serve. This testimony showed how insidious the military industrial complex had become and the fact that the military budget and procurement had become self-contained entities, successfully denying outside control.

Building on the findings of the Joint Economic Committee information about the DOD budget in procurement practices and the results gleaned from another set of hearings—the House Military Operations Subcommittee—I came to the shocking conclusion that, outside of the Pentagon, there is almost no control over the military budget.

My research into the budget interplay between the Defense Department and the Bureau of the Budget left me disturbed by what appears to be the inability of the Bureau of the Budget to scrutinize the Defense Department to the same extent that it reviews non-Defense spending.

This is the result of both inadequate manpower and the nature of the Defense budget process itself.

For example, there was one BOB examiner assigned to the Head Start Program, and one examiner assigned to the Anti-Ballistic Missile System.

There is something basically wrong when a government gives equal Budget Bureau attention to an ABM system, with projected expenditures of anywhere from $6 billion to $50 billion and the Head Start Program which has an estimated expenditure of $338 million in fiscal 1970.

Of course, I am not advocating that there be a one to one personnel ratio dollar-wise, but pointing up the fact that there presently seems to be a severe imbalance with only 10% of the Bureau professional staff examining nearly half the budget.

Furthermore, domestic agency budgets are given different and more intense scrutiny than the defense budget. In all departments of government, except for the Defense Department, budget examiners conduct an independent analysis and review which is submitted to the Director of the Budget. In Defense, budget examiners work not independently, but with their Defense counterparts, and the analysis and review are submitted first to the Secretary of Defense rather than to the Budget Director. Only after the Secretary has approved it, is the review submitted to the Budget Director. The result of this procedure is that whereas other Secretaries must go to the President to have him overrule the Budget Director, in the case of Defense, the Budget Director must go to the President to overrule the Secretary of Defense.

This process, of course, shifts the whole budget process power structure and renders the Bureau almost impotent as a force for independent analysis of military procurement programs.

The Bureau of the Budget will not admit that what I've just told you is the truth. But in hearings before the Military Operations Subcommittee, the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, said the "climate" was different in the examination of defense requests.

Referring to the "power relationships" in Washington, Mr. Hughes, the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget conceded that the Defense Department has both political power and muscle. And that "in this power-oriented town," these two attributes give it extra advantage in dealing with the Budget Bureau.

Defense Secretary McNamara in his inimical way made his opinion of the Budget Bureau's role in defense budget-making very clear when he told the Congress:

"I will be quite frank with you, I can't remember a single instance in which the Bureau of the Budget and I differed on a recommendation in which the President accepted the Bureau of the Budget view. There may have been one in 4 years, but I can't remember a single one."

Given the fact of the lack of effective scrutiny of the military budget by any executive agency outside of the Pentagon—what control, then, does the Congress exert over this budget?

I must inform you that the military-industrial complex, against which President Eisenhower warned us in his closing address to Congress, has now become the military-industrial-congressional complex. Just as Members of farm areas seek assignment to the Agriculture Committee, so do Members with large military installations in their districts desire seats on the Armed Services Committee or the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

This constituent concern can't help but color their judgment. I know that constituent concern affects me. Furthermore, service on these Committees brings the Members into continuous contact with the uniformed military. This continuous contact with dedicated men, whose primary concern is the external threat to the security of the United States, has an imbalancing effect.

In the case of agriculture or education, for example, those of us who are not on the relevant committees can make an independent judgment because the issues and the programs are not shrouded in secrecy and wrapped in the flag. When the military matters come before Congress we are told they are too complex to be properly understood by the Congress generally and the American public.

However, I charge that there is no issue as complex as determining how a disadvantaged child should be provided with an education relevant to his background and needs. However, there are 535 education experts in the Congress, each demanding that his ideas be recognized.

XUM

I would conclude, therefore, that the Congress, at least as presently structured, cannot control the military budget.

Therefore I would propose that the House and the Senate should consider the creation of a joint committee, without legislative jurisdiction, similar to the Joint Economic Committee, which would review annually the foreign and military posture of the United States and the size and shape of the military budget.

I would propose further that no member of the Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, or Appropriations Committees be eligible for service on this Joint Committee and that service on this Committee be limited to a term of say 4 or 6 years.

With such restructuring, I believe that the Congress could recapture control of the military budget.

Now then, if the Congress can't control the military budget, what about the office of the Secretary of Defense. Regrettably, I suggest today that the Secretary and the Undersecretary, both men of the highest integrity, come from the military-industrial-congressional complex. The Secretary served for many years on the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations. The Undersecretary was the head of the Hewlett-Packard Corporation, the majority of whose business was with the Defense Department.

As evidence of their attitude, I would point to their decision, long resisted by Secretary McNamara, to proceed with the procurement of a manned bomber, the so-called AMSA or Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft. The manned bomber today is the same object of sentimental attachment and the same military usefulness as the horse was to the cavalryman before World War II.

I think the sentimentality pitch, when applied to today's bomber situation, doesn't hold sway—mainly because the price of sentimentality has gone up.

Yet the logic behind present-day cash outflows for manned bombers seems similar to those reasons set forth back in 1941 for the maintenance of the cavalry.

As a report of the controversy stated, "The U.S. had some tens of millions of horses, and government spending in this direction . . . was a chief source of revenue to all the many horse breeders, hay growers and saddlemakers."

Listen to this testimony given before the Subcommittee on Military Affairs of the House Committee on Appropriations on March 11, 1940 by the Chief of Cavalry; see if you don't think this testimony has a modern ring to it.

"Each arm has powers and limitations. The proper combination is that which arranges the whole so that the powers of each offset the limitations of the others. . . . Mechanized cavalry is valuable and an important adjunct but is not the main part of the cavalry and cannot be. Our cavalry is not the medieval cavalry of popular imagination but is cavalry which is modernized and keeping pace with all developments."

Is the Defense Department through its insistence on a new squadron of manned bombers merely repeating the history of the horse cavalry?

There is in existence today one source for control over the military budget and that is an informed and aroused public.

If the public becomes aroused, the Congress and the President will respond.

If the Congress and the President respond, the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of Defense, and the General Accounting Office will also respond.

You may have noticed that in recent days, I have been highly critical of certain of our procurement practices, particularly with respect to concealment of cost overruns from the public and the Congress.

I have done this, not with any intention of getting any one individual but merely to alert the public and Congress to the dangers of the system.

Of course procurement which consumes over 50% of the military budget, is an area of vital importance.

However, to limit scrutiny of the defense budget to procurement practice, would be putting the cart before the horse.

We must look at the military budget first in light of our foreign policy commitments; second, the extent of the contingencies we are prepared to face—which, at this moment consist of fighting simultaneously two major wars and one minor war; and third, the force levels which must be achieved to meet the contingencies of our foreign commitments.

Only when we have debated the issues surrounding the first three issues can we intelligently decide on what weapon systems to procure and how to do so economically and efficiently. You gentlemen are the experts in procurement. But part of your difficulty comes from the fact that neither the Congress nor the public get an adequate chance to review, debate or pass opinion on the first three items. Therefore, when we in the Congress and the people who elect us believe that our military budget is out of control we turn to the only visable budget category—the $44 billion spent on procurement.

Despite the importance of the three items, I have, in the last few weeks, been devoting my attention primarily to your area of expertise—procurement.

I have done so for two reasons:

1. to develop a healthy skepticism about the supposed infallibility of the military, so that it may be politically possible for Congress, and the people to debate rationally the military budget this year; and

2. because the process of military procurement is, in and of itself, in need of drastic revision.

A few procurement horror stories should illustrate the need for procurement reform and also help to develop the skepticism about the military budget which is so needed today.

Three recent case studies were revealed before the Military Operations Subcommittee.

The first had to do with the Giant cargo airplane known as the C5–A.

Originally the C5–A was devised as part of a new U.S. world-wide strategic concept which included the development of Fast Deployment Logistic Ships (FDLS).

The ships were to be loaded with heavy military equipment and supplies and kept deployed off explosives areas such as Africa and Asia.

When need for armed intervention arose, the troops and light equipment would be ferried to the area by the Giant C5–A's.

When the Congress determined that the FDLS's would be provocative and hence refused to vote funds for them, one would have thought that there would have been a rethinking of the C5–A because it was based on a strategic assumption which no longer existed.

Not so!

The C5–A which began to manifest cost over-runs as early as February 1966 was kept on the books.

Two years later Congress was told there were no expected cost over-runs. Yet in April top Air Force officials were told that over-runs exceeded more than one-half billion dollars.

Top Air Force officials responded by directing that no reports on the C5–A reveal any cost over-runs.

The reason given, for this concealment, privately, of course, was that revelation might hurt the stock market position of the contractor—Lockheed Aircraft.

However, because of an unusual provision of the "trick" contract, Lockheed was in no danger, nor was its stock. Because if Lockheed was sure that the Air Force would agree to exercise an option to buy an additional run of C5–A's, Lockheed would recoup the losses suffered on the first run.

This placed Lockheed in a difficult legal position.

If Lockheed had not "arranged" with the Air Force to be bailed out of its financial difficulties by the Air Force, it was required under SEC regulations to reveal this potential danger.

If it revealed the fact of protection from the Air Force, it might have revealed the violation of an even more serious breach of law.

What to do? Lockheed, with the co-operation of the Air Force, decided upon concealment.

Only the heroics of a lower ranking civilian officer of the Air Force brought this situation to a head.

The scandal of the jet engines for the F–111–B is another sorry story with a similar hero.

Pratt & Whitney originally estimated the cost of certain jet engines at $273,910.

The Navy entered into a contract which put a ceiling for these engines at from $740,000 to $830,000. Later a private management firm estimated that because of various escalation clauses the engines would cost $1.4 million apiece.

The procurement officer, Gordon W. Rule, who was sent to find out what the engines should cost reported the trouble as follows:

"What basically needs to be corrected in this country today with respect to the Defense/Industry relationship is the climate that exists today vis-a-vis this relationship. Industry today is smug and perhaps rightly so. They know that no one in DOD is going to take any action they do not like and today they have much justification for this attitude. No matter how poor the quality, how late the product and how high the cost, they know nothing will happen to them. Until or unless this climate is changed, there will be little or no improvement in our procurements.

In the third procurement horror case, this same courageous officer objected to the way the termination of the F–111–B was about to be handled—with a slight slap on the wrist—if that—for a contractor clearly in default.

I have worked to bring before the Congress and the public these cases not in the vain hope of being able to cure the sins that have passed but to try to prevent their commission in the future.

I hope I'm not too late.

When the C5–A overruns were disclosed, the present Secretary of Defense issued a memorandum much more concerned with the public relations aspect than the fundamental problem. The Memo stated, among other things:

"What sorts of actions on DOD's part can be taken to thwart or ameliorate the continuing adverse commentary on program costs and suspect technical effectiveness."

When the new Nixon ABM—the Safeguard program—was announced, the Defense Department said that it would cost $6.6 billion. Later someone asked what about the cost of the nuclear warhead and DOD said that would be an additional $1.2 billion.

In courts of law we swear a witness to "tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth."

Within security limitations the American people should expect nothing less from the Defense Department, and, ladies and gentlemen, we aren't getting it!

Not only that but the American people are realizing this. And they are beginning to demand that their elected representatives become less accepting and more critical.

This skepticism in Congress should lead to a thoroughgoing review of our commitments, the threats we face and the force levels we need—from ABM to MIRV to 15 attack aircraft carriers.

XUM

However, ultimately we must reach the conclusion that for the foreseeable future there will be a substantial military procurement. And it is your job and mine to see to it that the citizen—the taxpayer—receives the maximum protection for the minimum amount of dollars which, after all, he provides.

One approach to achieve this and one with which almost no one disagrees is for the Congress to pass H.R. 474, the Holifield bill to create an independent procurement commission.

If we create such a commission, I think there are certainly a few clear areas in procurement which the Commission should study.

First, we should elevate the status and treatment of the negotiators who spend the $44 billion of defense procurement.

Second, we should have investigative procedures to examine major procurement mistakes to eliminate and document what happened so that we are not condemned in the future to repeat the same mistakes.

In part this is what the Military Operations Subcommittee has been doing, even though its efforts have been handicapped by the attempts of the services to conceal certain facts from the Congress.

Third, the Congress should insist that the Pentagon change the climate of its relationship with industry. Basically, the Government must be fair but firm and insist upon full compliance with the procurement laws and regulations and the terms of the contract entered into with industry.

Fourth, the Congress, and most particularly the Senate in confirming civilian officers of the defense establishment, should insist that they be men who intend to bring this change in climate between defense and industry.

In his testimony before our Subcommittee, Mr. Gordon W. Rule testified as follows:

"I know of one such secretary who will tell you that he believes no defense contractor should be allowed to lose money on a Government contract and whose test of a contractor who has failed to live up to the terms of a contract is 'could any other contractor in that industry have done better?'

I strongly suggest that no man with such a philosophy should ever be appointed an Assistant Secretary for I&L, because such a person provides the negotiators on the firing line the antithesis of sound procurement leadership."

Fifth, the conflict of interest laws should be modernized. A more meaningful prohibition would be that no officer or civilian can go to work for a company holding defense contracts until all contracts held by that company on the date of the employee's leaving the Government have been completed. This principle should apply whether or not he personally had anything to do with the award of those contracts. To police this situation, the General Accounting Office should keep a personnel inventory of all personnel leaving the Government and going into industry.

Sixth and finally, I believe that the proposed Commission should examine the role of the military in defense contracting.

The basic question here revolves around the average military man's education and training, which may or may not fit him for procurement assignments. These decisions involve dollar and cents business judgments and considerations. And I point out that these important judgments and decisions require considerable patience, consultation and discussion with others because procurement decisions are rarely black or white. Thus the finest officers in the Services at running ships, flying planes, commanding divisions etc. can be—and are—incapable of filling procurement billets when they seek to operate a procurement function by "make it so" *order* rather than by consultation and discussion.

Additionally, what does the average military man below the rank of Admiral or General want? Quite naturally, he wants to be promoted. Thus, Captains in procurement know that many Admirals with whom they deal on contract matters will sit on their selection boards. The result of this situation becomes rather patent to those exposed to it.

In the Navy there are many very qualified Supply Corps Officers who are knowledgeable in procurement. But organizationally most of these men are under line Admirals who mark the Supply Officers' fitness reports and thus control their future military careers. These Junior Officers have little choice but to say "Aye Aye, Sir" when the Admiral wants something, and this is repugnant to sound procurement.

Both Canada and England do their buying through civilian agencies. And I suggest the time has come in this country to see if our military buying could be improved by an all-civilian purchasing group not accountable to the military.

My remarks thus far may have led you to believe that I believe that the military is all vice and the Congress all virtue.

Nothing is further from my mind.

I believe that the Congress has a constitutional duty to be a check and balance on the military. I'm not sure we are adequately performing that duty today.

I also recognize that even as the military is not all wise—as witness the support for the horse cavalry in 1941—so the Congress is not all wise. And I believe that an aboveboard, out-and-out discussion by the military with the Congress would be not only constitutional but also healthy.

To preserve the principle of equal time, I will quote from the most eloquent attack from the military community on the political world. From the rhetoric I would suppose that he was a United States cavalryman because General Riley of Missouri managed to get a good many of the ailments of a horse into his description of a politician when he said:

"The people have been fed on buncombe, while a lot of spavined, ringboned, hamstrung, wind-galled, swine-eyed, split hoofed, distempered, poll-eviled, pot-bellied politicians have had their noses in the public crib and there ain't enough fodder left to make gruel for a sick grasshopper."

MORE ON GENERAL HERSHEY

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, I advised my colleagues that because Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, has failed, indeed refused, to advise the local draft boards of the decision of the U.S. court of appeals, that I would notify them of the decision. This recent court action in effect concluded that the earlier Hershey directive to local boards urging immediate reclassification of registrants who participate in illegal demonstrations was illegal and probably unconstitutional.

I sent a letter to the 56 State directors of the Selective Service System, enclosing with my letter a statement of the decision of the court, asking the directors to advise the local boards within their jurisdiction of the court's decision which declared General Hershey's 1967 action to be contrary to the law. In addition, I sent to 17 local boards located in New York City the complete text of the decision.

I have now received a number of responses from these State directors and I think it would be interesting to the Members of the House to know the contents of those replies. I do this for one main reason—to show that the execution of selective service law is often arbitrary across the country and that if General Hershey will not require compliance with the law, he should be ordered to do so. One need only see the great difference in the attitude of a few State directors to know that, multiplied over 100 times, we would hardly reach the enormous difference in attitudes of the local board members in the country.

Several of the State directors responded affirmatively and thanked me for having sent them the court's decision. In one case, that of the New York City director, he informed me that local boards in his jurisdiction had not reclassified or ordered any registrants to report for induction as a result of Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey's directive of October 26, 1967. The director for the District of Columbia headquarters of the Selective Service System stated his appreciation for my having sent the court's decision and went on to state that he had advised all of the local boards in his jurisdiction of that decision.

I wish I could say that these two letters reflect what has been done in all the jurisdictions I have heard from to date. Unfortunately, that is not the case. Several replies were to advise me that my letter was forwarded to General Hershey and to the General Counsel of the Selective Service System for response. In one letter I was advised that the State director felt he would be remiss in his duty if he were to instruct the local board members how they should classify since they were originally chosen for their judgment and commonsense.

With the thought that such an incredible cross-section of responses might be of interest to my colleagues, I am setting forth the text of some of these letters. It is apparent that only if a directive is issued by General Hershey himself in his capacity as Director of the Selective Service System to each and every local board notifying them of the court's decision can we then be assured that there will be uniform compliance with the intent of the court's declaratory judgment. Would it not be a tragedy if, because the general fails or continues to refuse to notify the boards, one young man was reclassified pursuant to a directive now declared illegal—or worse still, if one young man is now on active duty because of illegal procedure.

The material referred to follows:

Selective Service System,
Montgomery, Ala., July 14, 1969.

Hon. Edward I. Koch,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Koch: Reference is made to your recent letter.

We sincerely appreciate your interest in the Alabama Selective Service System. This State has always classified registrants in the strictest accordance with the regulations of Selective Service.

We shall continue to classify according to the regulations as we have in the past.

Sincerely yours,
Hugh J. Caldwell, Jr.,
State Director.

XUM

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
St. Augustine, Fla., July 7, 1969.
Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 2, 1969 advising me regarding a recent United States Court of Appeals decision.

I am forwarding your letter to the Director of Selective Service, National Headquarters, Washington, D.C. for whatever action he deems appropriate, since this matter does not apply to just Florida boards.

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD C. WALL,
State Director.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Atlanta, Ga., July 7, 1969.
Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: Reference is made to your letter of July 2, 1969.

Since the directive you refer to in your letter was issued by Lt. General Lewis B. Hershey, The Director of Selective Service, Washington, D.C., I am forwarding it to him for whatever action he deems appropriate.

Sincerely,
MIKE Y. HENDRIX,
State Director.

SELECTIVE SERVICE,
New Orleans, La., July 9, 1969.
Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. KOCH: This acknowledges receipt of your letter of July 2nd concerning registrants who participate in illegal demonstrations.

Please be advised that no evidence has been presented to this Headquarters for considering reclassifications because of illegal demonstrations.

However, as soon as a student has been reported as suspended or expelled from attendance, thereby no longer being entitled to the deferment which he was granted or to further consideration along this line, he will most surely be reclassified the same as any other registrant whose reason for deferment ceases to exist.

Sincerely yours,
LEO W. DAVIS,
Acting State Director.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
CONCORD, N.H., *July 8, 1969.*
Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOCH: Thank you for your letter and the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

As you probably know, the Selective Service Law and regulations provide that local board members be chosen for their judgment and common sense. The local and appeal board members are the only one who can classify. As State Director, I would be remiss in my duty were I to instruct the local board members on how they should classify.

I am sending a copy of your letter and a copy of the letter to which you refer to the Congressmen from New Hampshire: Congressman James C. Cleveland and Congressman Louis C. Wyman, who, I am sure, you are acquainted with.

We have excellent cooperation between our Senators and Congressmen in New Hampshire.

Very sincerely yours,
PHILLIPS R. HALL,
State Director.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
NEW YORK, N.Y., *July 9, 1969.*
Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH,
Member of Congress.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: This is in reply to your letters to Local Boards 3 and 4, which were sent to me for reply. Thanks very much for sending me the decision of the United States Court of Appeals in the case of the National Student Association, Inc. against Lewis B. Hershey. I have heard some talk that there is a possibility that this case might go up on appeal. However, in regard to your inquiry, I would like to say that neither Local Board 3 or 4 has reclassified and ordered any registrant to report for induction as a result of the October 1967 letter of Lt. General Lewis B. Hershey.

I hope this answers your inquiry. I remain,

Sincerely yours,
PAUL AKST,
New York City Director.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Oklahoma City, Okla., July 8, 1969.
Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: We have received your letter of July 2, 1969.

This headquarters has received information concerning the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, in the case of the National Student Association, Inc., et al., Appellants vs. Lewis B. Hershey, Appellee.

Thank you for your interest in this matter.

Sincerely yours,
HERBERT HOPE,
State Director.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D.C., July 7, 1969.
Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOCH: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter dated July 2, 1969, enclosing a copy of the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals concerning the letter from Lt. General Lewis B. Hershey.

I very much appreciate your taking the time to send this copy to me and I have advised all those local boards in my jurisdiction of the court's decision.

Sincerely,
JOHN T. MARTIN,
District of Columbia Director.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Cheyenne, Wyo., July 7, 1969.
Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH,
Longworth Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: This is to acknowledge receipt of your July 2, 1969, letter pertaining to General Hershey's letter of October 26, 1967. Your letter has been referred to the General Counsel, Selective Service System, Washington, D.C., for an appropriate response.

Yours very truly,
JACK P. BRUBAKER,
State Director.

NARCOTICS CONTROL

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, this week we received a message from the President of the United States on the subject of narcotics control. It appeared as though we were going to receive a number of legislative proposals to deal with an extraordinarily vexing problem that affects millions of people, hundreds of thousands of whom are presently narcotic addicts using heroin and millions of people using other forms of drugs. And I was shocked today, Mr. Speaker, to learn from reading the press that the President has advised us through the press and through the Attorney General, Mr. Mitchell, that there will be no new or significant legislative proposals coming over to this House.

Surely the administration's concern about the drug abuse problem calls for something more than merely submitting legislation to this House which reorganizes existing laws.

I am disappointed by this clear gap between rhetoric and performance. This Congress must now assume the initiative in seeing to it that the American people get the facts, not the rhetoric, about drugs and drug abuse.

THE ASTRONAUTS' TRIP TO THE MOON

(Mr. JACOBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, On this historic occasion let us recall the words Will Rogers wrote on May 20, 1927:

> No attempt at jokes today. An old, slim, tall, bashful, smiling American boy is somewhere out over the middle of the Atlantic Ocean, where no lone human being has ever ventured before. He is being prayed for to every kind of supreme being that has a following. . . . Every flyer that ever flies the Atlantic again will just be an imitation of Charles Lindbergh.

That quote could be applied today to a young man named Neil Armstrong, and his associates.

CURBING INFLATION THROUGH SAVINGS

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, before the first of the week, I propose to introduce legislation to extend the surtax tables with the provision that all surtax collections be deposited in a special trust account in the Treasury, identifiable to the taxpayer and that the Treasury be directed to issue bonds representing the amount withheld from each individual taxpayer.

It is no secret that a further extension of the surtax collection will be asked before the end of this month. The leadership of the other body has already announced that no action on the surtax itself will be taken until after Labor Day.

In lieu of the extension of the tax collection being sneaked in the back door as an amendment to some unknown excise tax measure—like the heptanoic acid and crude chicory roots expedient—I propose that we face the problem honestly.

Taxpayers have been told repeatedly that extension of the surtax is not necessary for financing Government programs, but only needed to remove excess money from the pockets of the American people, as an aid in curbing inflation.

My bill is designed to accomplish that end. And, in addition, it will provide a savings for our productive taxpayers and prove educational in promoting the pur-

XUM

chase of Government bonds through payroll deduction plans.

My bill will provide:

For extending surtax collection tables to July 31, 1970;

That all moneys withheld representing surtax will be paid into a special trust account in the Treasury;

That IRS be directed to prepare forms so that moneys withheld can be identified by individual taxpayers when returns are prepared;

That the Treasury be directed to issue bonds—full faith and credit of the United States—representing amounts so withheld at interest computed as follows:

That the Treasury be directed to draw on trust funds for short-term borrowing at bid rate of interest—now about 7 percent;

That the bonds redeemable with interest on August 1, 1970—or at such time prior thereto as the President, by proclamation, suspends collection of the surtax.

I urge our colleagues to join in enacting good-faith legislation for a period of 1 year which will allow the administration time to adjust its spending program to its own budget and cure the real problem causing inflation—that is, extravagant Government spending.

I propose, however, that the money taken out of circulation from the taxpayer be only temporarily withheld—and to prevent the Government from spending it. When the need for removing it from circulation has ceased, in the judgment of the President, we would end the surtax collection and repay the funds so withheld to the same individuals from whom the money was collected, together with interest, at the actual rate which the Treasury is required to pay for short-term bank borrowing.

Using this approach we are keeping faith with the working people of America, who are the only ones being forced to sacrifice their money in the fight to curb inflation.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON) the program for the remainder of this week.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. It is my understanding that the program for Thursday will consist of H.R. 7491, a bill to clarify the liability of national banks for certain taxes, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate; and H.R. 8261, a bill dealing with the acquisition of control of air carriers, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate and making in order the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, both of which have been previously announced.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It is hoped that these two bills will be brought up and concluded tomorrow?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it is my understanding that both of these bills are programed and will be brought up. It is hoped that they can be concluded in order that we may adjourn over until Monday at the conclusion of Thursday's business.

A GREAT DAY FOR AMERICA

(Mr. RANDALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, a lot of different adjectives will be used to describe this day. It will be called historic, glorious, courageous, and adventurous. Without a doubt it will become a great day for America. It was my privilege to serve on the House Space Committee—and to support the space program—at the time President Kennedy announced his intention to put a man on the moon during the 1960's. All of us today have lived to see the dream come true. It is sad and unfortunate that the man who planned this journey to the moon did not live to see it completed.

Today we lead the world in space achievement. We responded to the challenge of sputnik in October 1957 and have surpassed the Russians' efforts. We now enjoy the prestige value of being the leader in the space race. Yet it is my considered opinion the time has come to slow down the program because of other objectives with higher priority.

To be at the Cape today would be like seeing Columbus off in 1492. I regret I could not be there but I felt I could not accept the invitation of NASA because I had opposed this year's authorization in the honest belief that we should not attempt further planetary exploration at this time.

When our astronauts succeed on Monday, July 21, to set foot on the moon, it will be one of man's most outstanding achievements. It will be the most ambitious and certainly the most courageous effort man ever attempted. Our good wishes, our hopes, and our prayers ride with our astronauts in the days ahead.

NEIL ARMSTRONG, ASTRONAUT FROM OHIO

(Mr. LATTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, all Americans are proud of the crew of Apollo 11. However, when Neil Armstrong was named to be the first man to set foot on the moon. Ohioans were particularly pleased and elated as he was one of them. Neil, as you know, Mr. Speaker, comes from Wapakoneta, Ohio. With today's successful launching of Apollo 11, all Ohioans are rejoicing and saluting Neil Armstrong and wishing him well on his trip to the moon. In so doing, they are not forgetting the other two brave men, Col. Edwin Aldrin, Jr., and Col. Michael Collins, riding with him on this history-making flight. Their prayers and best wishes are with all of them.

SALUTE TO APOLLO 11

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Apollo 11 is on the way, carrying with it a courageous crew, the diligent efforts of thousands, and the hopes and prayers of millions.

On a day such as this the collective chests of all Americans puff out a little farther, hearts beat a bit faster and, for a time at least, we put aside our differences to become linked by the common bond of pride and accomplishment.

Let the word go out that on this day, July 16, 1969, an American rocket, carrying not a warhead of death, but a message of peace, has split the heavens to reassert to the world the American belief that a free people, joined together in a representative republic, with the help of God, can indeed perform miracles.

I believe all Members join me in congratulating all who had a part in this great adventure, especially the American taxpayer who made it possible; and we wish good luck, Godspeed, and a safe voyage all the way to Michael Collins, Neil Armstrong, and Edwin Aldrin.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT OBLIGATE ITSELF TO PROGRAMS THAT CANNOT BE FUNDED

(Mr. BEALL of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BEALL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, several years ago, as a member of the Maryland General Assembly, I had the opportunity to vote for one of the country's most progressive attacks on the problem of water pollution. At that time Maryland became a partner with the Federal Government under the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966. Water quality standards were adopted for all the waters of the State and standards and plans for the implementation of policies were approved by the Secretary of Interior. The plan required that all municipalities in Maryland arrange financing and have under construction by 1971 the most advanced sewage purification works available through current technology. It seemed as though our State was well on its way to combating one of the Nation's most persistent and serious problems.

However, there was one dark spot in this otherwise encouraging picture. Some of those opposing the plan as it progressed through the general assembly pointed to the reliance being placed on the Federal Government to hold up its end of the bargain. The State was committing itself to expenditures of many millions of dollars on the premise that

XUM

the Federal Government would contribute its share on schedule. The doubters were assured that the Federal Government would produce when called upon, but, Mr. Speaker, it turns out that this was an empty promise.

And so, what do we find in Maryland now? We find that if Congress appropriates the amount of money recommended in the fiscal 1970 budget we will be getting about one-eighth of the amount needed to comply with the approved plan. We find that even if this appropriation is magnified 5 times, it will still fall far short of what has been promised and authorized to States such as Maryland which in good faith relied on the Federal authorities. As a result, because we have planned and cooperated with the Federal Government, our State is in serious financial trouble in this area of concern. At the time of enactment, State authorities were led to believe that they would receive $57.5 million for the fiscal years 1968 through 1971. Instead we can now expect only one-quarter of that amount or $14 million. We can, therefore, expect our sanitary facilities fund to go broke in early fiscal 1970 unless this appropriation is increased.

This is but one, of what has become an increasing number of programs passed by Congress with glowing press notices only to turn out to be an empty shell of legislation. Unless we reverse this trend and begin to realize that it is totally irresponsible to provide this seed money and these seed promises to prod States into action, only to find the necessary financial support missing, we are going to erode the confidence of most of our citizens in this Government.

Mr. Speaker, in the coming months of this session, I hope that we can keep examples such as this one in our minds in considering the proposals that come before us. We must look to the costs of these programs and we must look at the costs over long periods of time before we make a commitment. Authorizations not followed by appropriations have put States in financial difficulties and I think Congress has an obligation to be more careful in committing itself to programs that cannot be funded.

SPEECH BY THE HONORABLE DURWARD G. HALL AT THE DEDICATION OF THE RALPH FOSTER MUSEUM

(Mr. SCHERLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, recently, my friend and colleague, the Honorable Durward G. Hall, spoke at the dedication of the Ralph Foster Museum, located in the School of the Ozarks at Point Lookout, Mo.

In his remarks Congressman Hall made some observations regarding the amount of violence on our Nation's campuses this past year, and discussed some of the reasons why he thought it had occurred.

As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor I include this speech as a part of the Record, and recommend its reading to the Members of this body:

Remarks by Hon. Durward G. Hall, at the Dedication of the Ralph Foster Museum, School of the Ozarks, Point Lookout, Mo., July 5, 1969

Victor Hugo once described responsible progress as, "The onward stride of God." Surely the evidence of both God and progress, is in our midst today.

It is most heartening to stand in this wing, The Ralph Foster Last Frontier Museum named in honor of my good friend who first taught me how to float fish, and view the culmination of years of search and study, of patience and perseverance. It is good to know, that men like Ralph Foster are still around. Men who have dwelt in the past, but live in the present, and continually look to the future.

This museum, located in the "Shepherd of the Hills" country, will become a mecca for the *Scholar* as well as the casual visitor, for here will be found much to study and enjoy. Indian artifacts from central America as well as our own midwest, including many pieces of great interest from the Spiro mounds of Oklahoma.

Items from the bluff shelters overlooking the White River of Missouri and Arkansas, rescued before the inundation.

The renowned *Cameo Collection* of Mr. and Mrs. Ed Smith of St. Louis.

The Sergeant John Butler *Coin Collection*, a treasure of more than 100,000 items of numismatics.

The original Kewpie Moulds, which produced the noted Kewpie dolls of Rose O'Neil, a doll which was to become as much a part of Americana as the Saturday night bath. Its creator came to be heralded as one of the world's most beautiful women, (a fact not disputed by those of us with good fortune to visit with her at Bonniebrook), and, it was Rose O'Neil, who, while living in New York, was the inspiration for the song, "The Rose of Washington Square."

In sharp contrast to the great beauty of Rose O'Neil, is the weapons display, featuring the frontier colt and holster of "Poker Alice", the cigar smoking, poker playing, toughest female gambler ever spawned.

It's been said, that just before Alice died, while on the operating table at the age of 79, she said to the surgeon: "go ahead and operate doc, it's all in the draw."

People like "Poker Alice," Rose O'Neil, the James Brothers, Teddy Roosevelt, and U. S. Grant are all here. Places like Pea Ridge, Wilson's Creek, and Gettysburg are also represented, helping to bring alive and make ever more interesting, the *past;* to be handled with loving care, treasured and preserved, and displayed in beautiful surroundings.

What more fitting place could be found for this museum, than the campus of this fine school.

What a contrast the school of the Ozarks provides with the present-day image of some of our nation's larger schools of learning, where the process of education has at times given way to the point of a gun. Where structures are burned and not builded. Where a small minority will worship a red clenched fist, instead of the God who made us all. Where permissiveness has given way to chaos, and the list of college presidents who have resigned, as a result, now totals more than 80. Pecky-pecky-pecky—weak kneed, not motivated by faith, and steeped in fear.

I think we can safely say, that proper disagreement and dissent are stimulating, but disorder and disruption are *illegal.* No institution can function on a basis of either law or democracy, if the administration of justice is made *selective,* with the rules waived, by weak administrators, on behalf of a coercive few! Forcible takeover of campus buildings by *any* group, should be regarded as grounds for immediate suspension, and a public or private college president should refuse to negotiate with any such group.

Available statistics tend to point up the fact that all that is bad on the Nation's campuses today, cannot necessarily be blamed on the educational system, but must also be laid at the doorstep of a lack of parental care and discipline in the home.

Be that as it may, the fact is, that the education of the youth of America *must* continue unabated, and not be allowed to be brought to a halt by the efforts of the self-proclaimed Marxist-Leninist oriented, so-called Students for a Democratic Society, or for that matter, any other group.

On June 17th, President Nixon sent to the Congress a proposal to deal with campus unrest. It would permit college administrators to seek an injunction in Federal court against any student or group either planning, or actually involved, in violent actions; and it would amend the present law on withholding grants and loans to students involved in campus disturbances. It would give college officials full authority to determine whether a student has been involved in a serious disruption of campus life and should, therefore, lose Federal aid.

The people of America are disturbed about the forces working against this country today. Letter after letter comes into my office protesting the willful vandalism being perpetrated on many of our college campuses. I predict, that if the administrators of our Nation's colleges do not meet this challenge head on, the Congress will be forced to act.

It is axiomatic, that while I speak of campus chaos, here at the school of the Ozarks there is calm. While I talk of disruption, I see noting but unity, and while I refer to a lack of discipline, here there is compatability. The school of the Ozarks could well serve as a model for those who search for an answer to the problems confronting our educational system in 1969. I know that across the land over 98% of all students are lawful, dedicated, and responsibly progressive, but I'm concerned with the moral stamina, will, and mores of a whole people who will let such a minority upset the whole.

Here at Point Lookout, in a part of the world that I like to describe to my fellow members in Congress as "God's Country", is a school created specifically as an institution of learning, where boys and girls with limited means, but will to *do*, can work for the education that will give them an equal or better start with others of their generation. I might add, that this has been accomplished with funds given by people who *care*, not by those with their hands out, expecting the Federal Government to be their mother, father, landlord and teacher, as well as their "big brother."

I've tramped these hills and watched this school grow since 1917. I've watched it emerge from a chinked-up log cabin, to the well-planned campus of today. I was here at the dedication of the magnificent chapel and bell tower. I was here at the dedication of the post office. I've happily and lovingly served my tenure as physician to the students. I've watched in awe at the creation of a four-year college, and beheld in wonderment the accreditation of that college by the North Central Association before its first class ever graduated, a feat claimed by no other like institution. I've basked in the wisdom and counsel of Doctor Good and Doctor Clark, and I have shared in the countless blessings that have heaped upon all those who have been a part of this segment of God's plan, indeed his great commission.

It is with justifiable pride that I have returned to this campus today, to help dedicate this fine wing named in honor of a man who exemplifies all that is good in America. Every piece of memorabilia found in this

XUM

museum will contain a little part of Ralph Foster, for every piece here, has played an important part in his life.

Ralph's generosity could very well be described in the words of William Penn who wrote: "I expect to pass through life but once—if, therefore, there be any kindness I can show, or any good thing I can do to any fellow being, let me do it now, and not defer or neglect it, as I shall not pass this way again."

Thank you Ralph Foster. Thank you ladies and gentlemen.

HIGHWAY SAFETY: COMMENTARY NO. 8

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the Subcommittee on Roads, of which I am a member, of the Public Works Committee, was privileged to have Dr. Robert Brenner testify regarding the effects of the 1966 Highway Safety Act. Dr. Brenner, who is the Acting Director of the National Highway Safety Bureau, provided a good deal of expert information regarding highway safety and the "need to turn people on to safety."

I want at this time to include for the benefit of my colleagues the following excerpt from Dr. Brenner's testimony.

Progress is being made—but clearly not enough. The motorcycle statistics indicate what can be done. Dr. Brenner testified that lack of funding has hampered his efforts. His statement is a thoughtful and challenging one—based on careful analysis and well worth reading by those concerned with all aspects of the problem of highway safety.

The excerpt follows:

EFFECTIVENESS OF COUNTERMEASURES

Despite the discouraging data for 1968, there are some encouraging indications that the programs initiated by the Department under the broad mandate of the law are beginning to take hold. In the 5 years preceding the passage of the two safety laws, highway deaths were increasing at an average of 6.9 percent each year. In the two years following passage of the law, this measure was down to a 2.3 percent annual average increase even though vehicle registration and mileage were up 6.4 percent and 8.6 percent.

Another very promising indicator, derived from data obtained from one insurance company covering four widely separated States, is that a sharp reduction is taking place in the number of casualties per crash. For example, while the number of crashes and casualties increased slightly in Illinois during the first 7 month period of 1968, casualties per crash were down 3 percent.

This downturn in the number of casualties per crash is particularly significant to the Bureau in light of the general approach it adopted in organizing for implementation of the Congressional mandate to bring the problem under control. The problem clearly was highway deaths and injuries, and the challenge was to bring about sizeable reductions in these totals—*by whatever means worked best and most quickly*. Stated simply, our goal is to reduce traffic injuries and deaths. To meet this goal we have identified three principal parts of an all-out attack on the problem:

First, we try to work to reduce those factors that cause crashes to occur.

Second, we are working on ways that, once a crash occurs, will give the vehicle driver and his passengers a better chance of escaping without serious injuries.

Third, we are doing things that will better the chances of the already injured people to later recover. Let me give some examples of this three-part effort to reduce traffic deaths and injuries.

In the first, or accident avoidance attack on the problem, we are working on safety standards which will improve the manufacture of tires. If we lessen the chances of tire failures while driving, we are lessening the chances of a crash. Better designed highways, such as the interstate system of highways, also reduce the chances of a crash—in fact about halving the rate of traffic accidents on some of the older rural roads. Proper driver education and licensing are among our most important crash prevention programs under the Highway Act. But getting after the problem of drinking and driving is another, if not the most vitally important, crash prevention effort, and countermeasures aimed at reducing the incidence of drinking and driving are among our most important crash prevention programs.

To deal with the second, or crash phase of an accident a number of things have been done. This is to give people a better chance of walking away unhurt from a crash. One Federal standard requires that steering columns collapse on impact in a crash so that they do not spear you through the chest. Another standard requires that windshields be made to cushion and resist penetration of the head striking it in a crash.

But the best known crash protection feature is the safety belt—both lap and upper torso types now required in all new cars by the safety regulations we have issued. There is absolutely no doubt that safety belts provide a great deal of protection *if used*—and I repeat—if used. Some studies show that minor injuries have been reduced by about 30 percent and fatal injuries by about 80 percent through the use of combination lap belts and shoulder harness. Even for only lap belts, the death rate per crash is only 60 percent of the death rate for occupants who do not wear such belts.

In short, this is a proven lifesaving device. But we even have problems with it, for it is one thing to require seat belts in every new car, but it is another matter to get people to wear them. Perhaps only about 25 percent to 30 percent of the occupants are using seat belts even when they are available. Manufacturers now are required to equip all new cars with these lifesaving safety belts; but we cannot force people to wear them—this is up to the individual. In this regard in a recent talk to some teenagers I placed this question before them.

"So I ask you—the new generation of drivers—what do you think should be done to 'turn people on' to using proven lifesaving features?"

Let me cite another example of the need to "turn people on to safety." We strongly support and urge helmets for motorcyclists. And this is not based on guesswork either. In 1965 and 1966, the death toll increased by 35 percent in each year. During this period only three States had laws requiring helmets to be worn by motorcycle drivers and riders and we, therefore, urged the States to pass laws requiring that helmets be worn by motorcyclists.

In the two years following the issuance of our standards calling for motorcyclist head protection, 37 States passed laws requiring helmets. Many States also passed laws which require motorcyclists to take special tests before they can get a permit to operate a motorcycle. In the States where the new laws passed, a remarkable decrease took place in the number of motorcycle death rates—as much as 30 percent in some States. By comparison, some States which do not have these protection and special licensing requirements showed a very sharp increase in motorcycle crash deaths for the same period.

Let's take a look at those statistics again—from a whopping 35 percent *increase* in motorcyclist deaths without the safety laws to a 30 percent *decrease* in these deaths when the laws were passed.

Considering this 65 percent swing in motorcyclist death reductions with motorcyclist safety laws it is difficult to comprehend that no less than 10 States and the District of Columbia still have no motorcyclist safety laws. It is even more difficult to comprehend that legislation has been introduced in several States *to repeal* motorcyclist safety laws already on the books!

Returning now to the third part of our three-part attack on reducing traffic deaths. Once people are injured in a crash, their chances of living and later full recovery depends directly on how quickly they receive proper medical attention. We are told that while something less than seven minutes goes by from the instant one of our men is wounded in Vietnam to the time medical attention gets to him, in contrast, 45 minutes is the average time it takes to get medical attention to an injured motorist on the Shirley Highway. In many rural areas of the country, hours may go by while an injured motorist lays dying waiting for medical attention to reach him.

Various types of emergency helicopter service patterned after the techniques developed in Vietnam are now being tried out with Bureau assistance in a number of States:

California, Nebraska, Arizona, Minnesota, Michigan, New York; one of the most important is now pending in Mississippi. We also are working on better systems of radio communication for calling for medical aid—for obviously we have to communicate the need for medical help before it can be dispatched.

These are only a few of the procedures now under development, and which in the years to come will give people a better chance of coming out of vehicle crashes with only minor injuries. The fact that the number of casualties per crash is coming down is a clear indication that the crash survivability phase of our program is working.

These are exciting safety possibilities that we are sure will save life and reduce injuries. But we are even more sure that the best way to avoid injuries still is to stay out of an accident. This adds up to one overriding fact—the overwhelming necessity for programs directed toward crash avoidance, toward the driver and those who would mix alcohol and driving. Because cars and roads are becoming safer all the time doesn't remove one iota of responsibility off the shoulders of any driver—teenager or adult—for safe driving. And the need for a systematic comprehensive approach on the full three-part attack on the problem has never been greater.

PROPOSAL TO CHANGE DEFINITION OF "AMMUNITION"

(Mr. HAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, when the Gun Control Act of 1968 became law, a cumbersome set of regulations were imposed upon American sportsmen. Under the present law and regulations the Congress and the Treasury Department have imposed upon all buyers of firearms and ammunition a clear-cut case of registration. Some will argue that this is not registration but under section 922 of the Gun Control Act you will find it states, and I quote:

XUM

> It shall be unlawful for any licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer or licensed collector to sell or deliver any firearm or ammunition to any person unless the licensee notes in his record—

Required to be kept pursuant to section 923—

> the name, age, and place of residence of such person if the person is an individual—or the identity and principal and local place of business of such person if the person is a corporation or other business entity.

Under section 923 the law reads:

> Each licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, and licensed collector shall miantain such records of importation, disposition, of firearms and ammunition at such place, for such period, and in such form, as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe.

To my way of thinking the Treasury Department has grossly misinterpreted the intent of Congress when it passed the gun control law and has set up what amounts to a de facto or back-door form of registration. The regulations issued by the Secretary call for the following:

First, date; second, manufacturer; third, caliber, gage, or type of component; fourth, quantity; fifth, name; sixth, address; seventh, date of birth; eighth, mode of identification, driver's license—other specify.

This certainly adds up to registration to me and there are a lot of people who will agree with me on this. Yet, Congress very definitely defeated an amendment last year that would provide for gun licensing and registration.

It could be argued that the Secretary of the Treasury has the authority to set up these regulations under section 923 but under section 922 the Secretary is told precisely what shall be required in the sale of ammunition. These include only name, age, and place of residence. Anything more than this—and the Secretary's regulations do require more—amounts to registration of the person, his ammunition, and his firearm. That is why I am introducing today a bill that will change the definition of "ammunition" in the Gun Control Act of 1968 so that shotgun shells, metallic ammunition suitable for use only in rifles or any .22 caliber rimfire ammunition would be exempted from the Treasury regulation. To force registration on folks buying this kind of ammunition will not cut down on the incidence of crime. The average criminal will not purchase this ammunition or will he seek to get it through the proper channels.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of this legislation will not only restore to the sportsman and law-abiding citizen the freedom to once again purchase the necessary ammunition without harassment but it will also serve to curb the bureaucratic excesses which have arisen under the regulations imposed by the Treasury Department. I ask your support on behalf of our sportsmen and the business men who have been carrying on under a heavy burden of redtape and clerical details.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order heretofore entered in my behalf for this afternoon be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MEDICARE FOR MEXICO AND CANADA?

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I discussed the problem facing American citizens who are covered by medicare, but not while out of the country. I discussed my proposal to permit coverage for senior citizens in our neighboring countries—Mexico and Canada.

Today, I received a copy of a letter that was sent to Senator GEORGE MURPHY of California, by Mr. Allen Gleasner who resides in Guadalajara, Mexico. Mr. Gleasner offers some sound reasons as to why H.R. 8926, my bill to extend medicare to American citizens living or traveling in Mexico or Canada, should be passed. He explains that because medical costs are cheaper in Mexico, it could lead to savings on the part of U.S. taxpayers. Mr. Gleason also suggests that if this bill were passed, it might mean a lessening of the crowded conditions that exist in some U.S. hospitals.

I offer this letter as additional evidence for the need that exists for legislation in this area:

GUADALAJARA, JALISCO, MEXICO,
July 10, 1969.

HON. GEORGE MURPHY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Several thousand American citizens residing in Mexico and particularly in Guadalajara, join me in requesting you to do all in your power to extend medicare to cover us during our residence here.

Most of us are recipients of modest annuities or pensions and can ill afford to travel to the United States to receive needed medical attention.

I am enclosing a clipping from the Mexico City News with some of the pertinent facts underlined.

The savings to be realized to the U.S. taxpayers, which includes ourselves, are indeed great inasmuch as a first class hospital private room and bath ranges from $6.40 to $16.00 per day which of course includes meals and professional nursing care, compared to U.S. hospitals at $45.00 a day in a four bed ward.

The medical profession compares very favorably with that in the U.S. In fact the local University of Medicine has many students enrolled to obtain their training due to the crowded conditions in the U.S. Medical Schools.

We read and hear on the radio about the crowded conditions in the U.S. hospitals, if medicare were extended to cover U.S. Citizens residing in Mexico I am sure it would help to alleviate this problem and be of assistance to us as well as the U.S. residents.

All of us here are paying U.S. Income Taxes as well as paying for medicare for which we receive nothing, not even a chance to vote in a Presidential Election.

We all urgently request you to support Rep. Cleveland's Bill H.R. 8926 to extend medicare coverage to Mexico.

I am a former resident of California and an ardent supporter of you and the Party you represent.

Yours very truly,
ALLEN G. GLEASNER.

BRITT FRANKLIN SHARES HIS FEELINGS IN HIS "JOURNAL"

(Mr. HAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that just about all of us at some time, when enjoying our beautiful scenic splendors, can find a few choice words of expression that can be stirringly emotional and deserve a cherished place in our stored-up memories of times well spent.

However, while this is true, I find it almost incredible that a young man who is serving his country in Vietnam can still find time to reflect on his love of home, God, and nature and his comments can provoke in us a further awareness of the extreme beauty of serenity and fulfillment of life that we take so much for granted here.

Mr. Speaker, I call to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues the article from the Bulloch Herald of Statesboro, Ga., about Air Force 2d Lt. Britt Franklin.

Lieutenant Franklin's journal is indeed thought provoking and I sincerely commend it to your attention:

BRITT FRANKLIN SHARES HIS FEELINGS IN HIS "JOURNAL"

Britt Franklin, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Carl Franklin of Statesboro, is hoping to be home for Christmas Day, 1969.

He missed being home for Christmas Day, 1968, for you see he was sent to Viet Nam by the U.S. Air Force in December and arrived at Nha Trang Air Force Base in South Viet Nam on that Christmas Eve.

Britt graduated from the University of Georgia in June of 1968 with an ROTC Commission. Following his graduation he worked with the U.S. Forestry Department for a short period and then entered the Armed Forces and was attached to the Air Force Intelligence at Denver, Colorado.

Second Lieut. Franklin is now stationed in Viet Nam and is doing duty with the Air Force Intelligence.

Since arriving in Viet Nam he has been keeping a "journal" and recently he shared some of these thoughts with his family.

Here are some of the things he's recorded.

"Wanta know what I miss?" My family, my home and friends. These are always on my mind, but my heart cries always for the freedom I enjoyed in Georgia, Colorado, Wyoming. I miss the little things—like the whirr of the wind thru the pines—the lonely way of broom sage—and me—just me—sharing the land with an open day—and God. Just wandering around the oak ridges carrying the old 12 gauge down thru a bottom—the evergreen tangle of gallberries, mingled maddeningly with—and the sharp pain of a mistaken encounter with the bamboo briar.

"What a magnificent experience to walk along—alone or with friends and the dog "Ruff" around the glens—so full of essence of eternity itself—yet I cannot tell what eternity is, let alone put it on paper the feeling inside when I lean against a tree and sweep my eyes across the gently rolling, sandy hills—observe the wavy texture of the wire grass spreading across the ridges.

With the pine and scrubby oak mingled haphazardly throughout. And it's best if there's wind and clouds—the wind makes the grass shimmer, the trees move as with a new life—what does the wind say? Listen to that song—the song of freedom—of a full heart and the pride that comes from being an American—how to explain this burning inside? The clouds viewed thru the trees, they give a dreamy turbulence to the scene—the rolling, boiling seems to swirl the tree limbs, rocking the tops with trembles and swaying.

"Up and going again—down on the old road once used to haul logs from the woods, past the decaying sawdust pile—lying silent for so many years—the home for ants, termites—Down further still, enter the run of Ten Mile Creek—here the gallberries, the briars and the grapevine are at the height of their madness—blackgum, sweetgum, water oak tower overhead, their upper branches bare of leaves but heavy with the succulent mistletoe—so treasured at the Christmas season. And the famous Ten Mile Creek—here in its upper reaches very small, flowing lazily and very uncaring over white sand—and seeming to stop, deep and black in the pools—what a mystery to sit and stare at the tannen-stained whirlpools eddying around the bared root—and cast a glance into the trees—watch them dance to the slow power of the wind—a squirrel barks noisily down—"leave my place—here is my life and heart." So easy to kill. Raise the gun, take aim on the chattering ball of fur—"naw, what's the use—may be a deer close by—rather have a deer any day."

"Crossing the creek—wet and cold—how delightful to be a part of this! So alone here, yet so close to so many things.

Climbing out of the run—up onto the oak ridges again entering the thickets near our beloved "Duck Pond." Now we stalk quietly—hearing only that never ending wind—and the soft splash of water—getting deeper—a lot of rain lately has filled the road and firebreaks "squish, squish." Also "slosh, slosh." The water deepens—we are in the back edge of the "Duck Pond"—the blackgums and sweetgums grow thick and stunted—the wood ducks love the place—it is five o'clock—another 45 minutes yet—we'll find the place and wait. "Water—cold water, waist deep and chest deep—it doesn't matter. The sun drops lower, the clouds race on before that relentless wind—5:45—soon they'll come—or never—5:55—never. We walked all day, sat in the cold 'til "pitch black dark" watching for a duck—any duck. Nothing, but—Oh, God—what a fulfilling day and what an end!!! Alone in the swamp—perhaps it was this way 10,000 years ago—it's positively primeval to watch the night overpower the last flicker of day—and to listen as the sounds of a winter night settle over our little wilderness.

"We trudge back to the car—a mile, maybe two miles away. Two cold, wet miles—yet how warm we are inside—indeed we are bringing home hearts filled with a love no man can explain—and a knowledge of having been a little closer to God."

GODSPEED

(Mr. BRINKLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, as an American citizen I take pride in our space program. As a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee during the 90th Congress, I salute our gallant, dedicated pioneers in space. As a Representative for the Third Congressional District of Georgia, I congratulate the Armstrong-Collins-Aldrin team on embarking today, this morning, on their momentous journey and we shall pray daily for their success and safe return.

The builders of Apollo 11—Dr. Wernher von Braun, Astronaut Roger Chaffee, the taxpayers, and all who have made their contribution—have been mindful of the challenge, "Too low they build who build beneath the stars."

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1969

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, this week is the 1969 Captive Nations Week. July 13 to 19 is the 11th observance of this highly important week. We, in the U.S. Congress, join with millions of our fellow Americans in expressing to the world our firm determination never to forget the freedom aspirations of all the captive nations and to work in every possible manner for the achievement of their eventual liberation from the bondage of Red totalitarianism and Sino-Soviet Russian colonialism. Their fixed objective of national independence and freedom is our objective, and each Captive Nations Week observance stresses this fundamental truth.

The remarkable feature of the annual Captive Nations Week is its steady growth and expansion from year to year. As countless of our fellow citizens come to learn the long list of captive nations, dating back to 1920, the more they are impressed by the significance and importance of the week. Following the leadership of several of our Presidents, our State Governors and our mayors also proclaim the week, urging our citizens to dedicate themselves anew to the study of all the captive nations.

Under the guidance of the National Captive Nations Committee of Washington, D.C., State and local committees have been formed in practically all large States and major cities to observe the annual week. Moreover, the week has attracted the attention of numerous foreign countries so that in the Republic of China, South Korea, the Philippines, West Germany, Turkey, and elsewhere Captive Nations Week is being appropriately observed and free Asian parliaments are being asked to pass similar Captive Nations Week resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, there are already several concrete lessons that can be drawn from these annual observances. I summarize them in this fashion:

First, by their consistent opposition to and vehement castigation of Captive Nations Week, Moscow, Peking, and the lesser lights in the Red empire have shown since 1959 their fear of the total captive nations concept as reflected in Public Law 86–90;

Second, the growth and development of Captive Nations Week in this country and abroad have demonstrated the deepened understanding on the part of our people and others of the basic and fundamental importance of all the captive nations to our national security and that of the free world;

Third, our concentrated support of all the captive nations, including necessarily the dozen in the Soviet Union itself, is one of our most powerful nonmilitary deterrents against further overt Sino-Soviet Russian aggression and a prime, formidable force for peace with freedom and justice in the world;

Fourth, a broad area of detailed work still remains to be done in exposing the complete breadth and depth of Sino-Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism so that once and for all the peoples of the world will know and never forget who the real imperialists and colonialists are, so that the full impact of world opinion will fall heavily on the two last remaining imperiocolonialist centers; namely and solely, Moscow and Peking; and

Fifth, to open the full vista of this area and to prepare the ground for this vital work, a Special House Captive Nations Committee becomes more urgent, more necessary, more indispensable with the passing of every day. On this commemorative occasion, I again call upon the Rules Committee to at least vote on the measures which have been submitted to create this desperately needed committee. I again ask the members of that committee to begin with my own, House Resolution 102.

As part of my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the following material:

Proclamations by Gov. Russell W. Peterson, of Delaware; Gov. Warren E. Hearnes, of Missouri; Gov. Kenneth M. Curtis, of Maine; Gov. Preston Smith, of Texas; Gov. David F. Cargo, of New Mexico; Mayor John V. Morris, of my hometown of Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; Mayor Thomas J. D'Alesandro III, of Baltimore; Mayor James L. Rogers, of Wheeling, W. Va.; Mayor Carmen J. Armenti, of Trenton, N.J.; Mayor Anthony B. Flask, of Youngstown, Ohio; Mayor Carl B. Stokes, of Cleveland, Ohio; Mayor Henry W. Maier, of Milwaukee, Wis.

Also, an article on the 10th anniversary of the Captive Nations Week resolution by Dr. Lev E. Bobriansky of Georgetown University that appeared in the summer issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly of 1969; an article on Captive Nations Week and the National Captive Nations Committee that appeared in the edition of Saturday, July 5, 1969, of Svoboda, the Ukrainian Daily; and an article from the Ukrainian Catholic Daily of Thursday, July 3, 1969, on the 10th anniversary of Captive Nations Week resolution, and a statement by the Women for Freedom, Inc., July 1969, on Captive Nations Week.

The material follows:

STATEMENT BY GOV. RUSSELL W. PETERSON, OF DELAWARE, IN OBSERVANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Communist imperialism has enslaved a substantial portion of the world's population, creating a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations, and constituting a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other countries.

It is vital to our national security that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of these peoples be kept alive, as this desire is a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a lasting peace.

Because the peoples of these subjected nations look to the United States for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence, a joint resolution of the Congress (PL86–90) has designated the third week in July as a time during which Americans are encouraged to join in demonstrations of support of the just aspirations of all captive peoples.

Accordingly, it is a privilege as Governor of the State of Delaware to join with the

XUM

President and Congress, in designating the week of July 13–19 as Captive Nations Week and urge all Delawareans to participate in appropriate ceremonies proving to those enslaved people that we uphold their cherished desire to be free.

RUSSELL W. PETERSON,
Governor.

Proclamation of the State of Missouri

Whereas, all peoples yearn for freedom and justice; and

Whereas, these basic rights unfortunately are circumscribed or unrealized in many areas in the world; and

Whereas, Missouri has an abiding commitment to the principles of independence, personal liberty, and human dignity; and

Whereas, it remains a fundamental purpose and intention of the Government and people of Missouri to recognize and encourage constructive actions which foster the growth and development of independence and human freedom:

Now, therefore, I, Warren E. Hearnes, Governor of the State of Missouri, do hereby designate the week beginning July 13, 1969, as Captive Nations Week and invite the people of Missouri to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for independence and human liberty.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the Great Seal of the State of Missouri, in the City of Jefferson, this 11th day of June, 1969.

WARREN E. HEARNS,
Governor.

Proclamation of the State of Maine

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czecho-Slovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossacki, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, Kenneth M. Curtis, Governor of the State of Maine, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 13, 1969, be observed as Captive Nations Week in the State of Maine, and call upon the citizens of Maine to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

Given at the office of the Governor at Augusta, and sealed with the Great Seal of the State of Maine, this first day of July, in the Year of Our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Sixty-nine, and of the Independence of the United States of America, the One Hundred and Ninety-third.

KENNETH M. CURTIS,
Governor.

Official Memorandum by Preston Smith, Governor of Texas

AUSTIN, TEXAS.

Greetings:

In its thrust toward world domination, communist imperialism has deprived many millions of people of Central and Eastern Europe, Asia and even the Western Hemisphere of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Silenced, but unconquered, these people will never cease to struggle for their inalienable right to a free life.

The national security and well-being of the citizens of the United States is dependent on the continued desire for liberty and justice on the part of the peoples of these captive nations.

By action of Congress, the third week of July has been designated as Captive Nations Week. It is fitting that we observe this period in tribute to the fight for freedom and in recognition of the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world.

Therefore, I, as Governor of Texas, do hereby designate the week of July 13–19, 1969, as Captive Nations Week in Texas.

In official recognition whereof, I hereby affix my signature this 3rd day of July, 1969

PRESTON SMITH,
Governor of Texas.

Proclamation of the State of New Mexico

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Southeast Asia, Eastern Europe, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I David F. Cargo, Governor of the State of New Mexico, do hereby proclaim the week of July 13–19, 1969, as Captive Nations Week in New Mexico.

Done at the executive office this 30th day of June, 1969.

Witness my hand and the Great Seal of the State of New Mexico.

DAVID F. CARGO,
Governor.

Attest:

ERNESTINE D. EVANS,
Secretary of State.

Proclamation of the City of Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czecho-Slovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, *John V. Morris, Mayor of Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania,* do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 13, 1969, be observed as Captive Nations Week in *Wilkes-Barre,* and call upon the citizens of *Wilkes-Barre* to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

J. V. MORRIS,
Mayor.

Proclamation of Captive Nations Week in Baltimore

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czecho-Slovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week, and inviting the peoples of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence.

Now, therefore, I, Thomas J. D'Alesandro, III, mayor of the City of Baltimore, do hereby proclaim the week of July 13, 1969, as "Captive Nations Week" in Baltimore, and call upon the citizens of Baltimore to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the City of Baltimore to be affixed this first day of July, in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-nine.

THOMAS J. ALESANDRO III,
Mayor.

Proclamation of Captive Nations Week in Wheeling, W. Va.

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the people of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, James L. Rogers, Mayor of Wheeling, West Virginia, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 13, 1969, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Wheeling, West Virginia, and call upon the citizens of Wheeling to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

James L. Rogers,
Mayor.

Proclamation of Captive Nations Week in Trenton, N.J.

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czecho-Slovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, Carmen J. Armenti, Mayor of the City of Trenton, New Jersey, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 13, 1969, be observed as: Captive Nations Week in Trenton, and call upon the citizens of Trenton to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the City of Trenton this 7th day of July, 1969.

Carmen J. Armenti,
Mayor.

Proclamation of the City of Youngstown

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czecho-Slovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence.

Now, therefore, I, Anthony B. Flask, as Mayor of the City of Youngstown, Ohio, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 13, 1969, be observed as "Captive Nations Week" and call upon the citizens of this community to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I hereunto set my hand and cause the Seal of the City of Youngstown, Ohio to be affixed.

Anthony B. Flask, *Mayor.*

Proclamation of "Captive Nations Week" in the City of Cleveland

Whereas, by act of the United States Congress and by Proclamation of the President of the United States the 10th Anniversary of Captive Nations Week will be observed July 13–19, 1969, by millions of our citizens throughout our nation as well as those of 17 other Nations in the Free World; and

Whereas, Captive Nations Week provides an occasion for all Clevelanders to show their friends, relatives and allies in 27 Nations, subjugated to enslavement through direct aggression by the imperialist forces and policies of Communist Soviet Union, that they have not been forgotten; and

Whereas, the oppressed and enslaved people of the Captive Nation look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about and restoring to them, their religious freedoms and individual liberties; and

Whereas, it is the Prayer and hope of us all as we commemorate the 10th anniversary of Captive Nations Week, that it will be the Will of the Creator, that all peoples of all Captive Nations, again will enjoy full liberty, complete freedom and rejoin their places in the family of Free Nations.

Now, therefore I, Carl B. Stokes, as Mayor of the City of Cleveland, Ohio do hereby proclaim the week of July 13–19, 1969, as "Captive Nations Week" in Cleveland, and invite and urge all citizens to give renewed devotions to the aspirations of all people for independence and human liberty.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Corporate Seal of the City of Cleveland to be affixed this 10th day of July 1969.

Carl B. Stokes,
Mayor.

Proclamation of the City of Milwaukee

Whereas, This year marks the Tenth Anniversary of the enactment by the 86th Congress, in July, 1959, of Public Law 86–90 which designated that the third week of July is to be set aside each year for the observance of Captive Nations Week in order that our citizens may be reminded of the millions of peoples in the countries to Soviet-dominated East-Central Europe who are struggling valiantly to throw off the yoke of oppression so that they may again enjoy the freedoms which should rightfully be theirs; and

Whereas, Events of the past year throughout several of these countries have offered graphic proof that the fires of freedom are still burning brightly in the hearts of the people, many of whom have given concrete evidence of their willingness to sacrifice even life itself in their intense desire to regain the rights which are their heritage; and

Whereas, We who take our freedom for granted have a solemn obligation to assure these captive peoples that they have our moral support and encouragement in their struggles against overwhelming odds, especially since we know that their desire for liberty and independence constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and offers one of mankind's brightest hopes for a just and lasting peace;

Now, therefore, I, Henry W. Maier, Mayor of Milwaukee, do hereby join with governmental leaders throughout our great country in proclaiming the week of July 13–19, 1969, to be Captive Nations Week in Milwaukee, and I call upon our citizens to reaffirm their faith in the undaunted spirit of the freedom-loving peoples of the nations of East-Central Europe who struggle against Soviet domination. I further urge ethnic groups throughout our city to mark this period with such special observances as they feel are appropriate in order that their friends and relatives living in these countries may be encouraged in their struggle to share again in the blessings of freedom.

Henry W. Maier,
Mayor.

The 10th Anniversary of the Captive Nations Week Resolution

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

The 1969 Captive Nations Week Observance is the occasion for the Tenth Anniversary of the Captive Nations Week Resolution itself. As many know, this politically far-seeing resolution was passed by the United States Congress in July, 1959 and caused a ferment in imperialist Moscow that has continued to express itself in numerous ways down to this day. Ten years ago, headlines read in the vein of "Senators Douglas and Javits Rebuts Khrushchev's Diatribe on Captive Nations Week Resolution," "American Labor Backs Captive Nations Week Resolution," "Resolution Irritates the Bear." [1] In the course of the decade, Moscow and its syndicate members vehemently decried the resolution as "villainous demagogy," "propaganda spectacle," "a despicable animal campaign," to mention only a few choice phrases.[2] In 1968, while Moscow was preparing for the rape of Czecho-Slovakia, a policy of silence was tuned on and, instead, with the blind consent of our Government, Moscow answered the annual observance by

---

Footnotes at end of article.

XUM

pulling off the Moscow-New York air run precisely during the Week. This propaganda stunt, staged a month before the Russian invasion of Czecho-Slovakia, made our officials look silly, but it in no way stifled or curbed the expanding observance of the Week, either here or abroad.

On this 10th, if one can look back for a moment, the most significant reaction to the annual Week was registered by Mikhail Suslov on July 17, 1965 in Vilnius, Lithuania. Coinciding with the observance and seizing upon a Russian-staged event in the Baltic, Suslov railed, "Especially disgusting is the villainous demagogy of the imperialistic chieftains of the United States. Each year they organize the so-called captive nations week, hypocritically pretending to be defenders of nations that have escaped from their yoke. These international gendarmes, stranglers of freedom and independence, would like again to enslave the free nations of Lithuania, Lativia and Estonia. But this will never happen!"[3] The location was Lithuania, the event was Russia's blessings on the forcible annexation of the three Baltic nations twenty-five years ago, but the meaning of this calculated statement was with application to all the captive nations.

Why does the writer select this reaction over those of Khrushchev, Podgorny and others? For the simple reason that Suslov is the chief Russian ideologist, a member of the Central Committee's Presidium, and secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU. Significantly enough, Suslov has weathered all political storms in the Soviet Union. Lest it be forgotten, he has served on the highest echelon under Stalin, he continued without interruption under Khrushchev, and he remains as a prize asset under Brezhnev and Kosygin. Clearly, Suslov is the thinker and principle of continuity of successive totalitarian regimes in colonialist Moscow. He well knows the psycho-political significance of the Captive Nations Week Resolution, even if some of our leaders and many of our citizens don't. Suslov's memorable position on this expresses that of every totalitarian in the Kremlin.

That Moscow's fixed and obnoxious position on the resolution will again reveal itself in full bloom, there can be no doubt. It will play the game of confetti diplomacy with us and our allies as long as it suits its purposes, and in the process hope that resistance to the permanent captivity of all the nations in the Red Empire, particularly as manifested in the annual Week, will subside. Undoubtedly, it will commit more Czechoslovakian rapes with impunity and blatant disregard for Western interests.[4] For several years Moscow has been tightening its totalitarianism and imperialist reins within and outside the Soviet Union, building its military strength at an inordinate pace, and intensifying its cold war operations all over the world, including the United States. To think that all this is being done merely to achieve parity with the United States for a deal on division of spheres of influence is a gross misreading of contemporary developments. We will need the captive nations more than ever as our natural allies in the enemy's camp.

Regardless of the insensitivity and even plain ignorance displayed by some of our leaders toward the captive nations movement, this 10th anniversary bridges the end of one decade and the beginning of another. The 60's have seen its expansion both in the United States and abroad. The expansion has been slow but steady, pinpointed and yet generalized, embattled and doubly persevering. In seventeen Free World countries it has taken hold, and its prospects for the next decade, the 70's are brighter than ever. The following resolution passed in Saigon last December exemplifies the spirit, conviction, and dedication that permeate the movement.[5]

"RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 13–19, 1969

"In view of the fact that since 1959—when the U.S. Congress passed the Captive Nations Week Resolution and President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed it into Public Law 86–90—All Communist Capitols have bitterly denounced the Annual Week as being inimical to their fundamental interests; and also in view of the fact that to the mounting consternation of Moscow, Peiping, Havana and others, the Captive Nations Week Movement has steadily grown in the United States, and every President in this decade has issued a proclamation in behalf of the independence and freedom of every captive nation in Central Europe, the Soviet Union, Asia and Cuba;

"In the belief that the movement to support freedom and liberation of all captive nations has now taken hold in numerous other countries in the free world as evidenced by week observances in the Republic of China, Korea, Argentina, Australia and a number of other countries;

"Maintaining that, for the security of the free world and for cold war victory over the deadly forces of communism and Sino-Soviet, Russian imperio-colonialism, it is indispensible for all free men regularly to make known their determination never to acquiesce to the permanent captivity of the 27 nations in the red empire;

"The Second Conference of the World Anti-Communist League now resolves that:

"The League and its members and associated groups will exert every effort to make the 10th Anniversary of Captive Nations Week on July 13–19, 1969, the most successful yet by:

"1. Urging each head of state to issue a captive week proclamation patterned after that of the President of the United States;

"2. Conducting observances of the Week in member countries and utilizing all media so that our combined message will be conveyed to the Captive Nations; and

"3. Dispatching the published results of this event to the National Captive Nations Committee in Washington, D.C., for their appropriate transmission to the United States Congress and the President of the United States.

"Submitted by

"RAMA SWARUP,
"Chief Delegation, India."

PEACE WITH FREEDOM AND JUSTICE

As we realistically look ahead, the plain fact to be soberly recognized is that the basic issues that existed at the time of the Congressional passage of the resolution still are with us today and will be so as we enter the 70's. The full reality of the captive nations, the ever-growing threat of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, and Moscow's drive for world domination have been, are, and will continue to be the basic issues. And no amount of confetti diplomacy, political zigzags, and boundless rhetoric about domestic priorities, nuclear destruction, campus riots, military-business complexes and other sickly symptoms of an abetted implosion can conceal the urgent pressures of these issues. Those in the movement have no doubt that a recovery of our realism lies ahead. This is the time to readjust our perspectives, cease drifting with every ephemeral upsurge, and begin to view essentials in toto, with a firm reassertion of national principles and goals.

On the occasion of this 10th, one is reminded of the words uttered by Khrushchev in "the spirit of Camp David" ten years ago. Mimicking past dictators, he claimed that the West is "hit by old age."[6] He illustrated his point by quoting Tolstoy: "When I was young, I was strong with women, but now I feel pain and bitterness—I have a great desire for them but I have no strength." "This," opined Nikita the Sanguine, "is exactly the West's attitude." It is obvious that one of the many fundamental subjects he failed to learn during his triumphant cold war visit here was the full power of the American heritage. That boundless power is reflected in all spheres of our society, regardless of some of its imperfections. And it is this power, diversely generated in the solidity of American institutions, that provides the inspirational drive, the intuitive vision, the courage and will, the principled behavior which have helped to shape the soul of America.

Our recurring capacity for placing first things first, for planning under the guidance of fixed principle and toward well-defined ends, is a facility by which the so-called intricacies of international relations could be easily unraveled. A study of foreign affairs and how they impinge on our national security demands the exercise of not only the mind but also the heart. Our gestures, our appeals, whether executed through economic, military, diplomatic or other means, are necessarily directed at both the minds and hearts of peoples elsewhere. The success or failure of these efforts depends primarily on what we stand for, how well and passionately we articulate it, and why we are determined by common will to uphold and advance that for which we really exist. Basically, no matter from what angle of interpretation, the security of our Nation is inextricably tied up with this what, how, and why.

Peace with honor has no meaning without the principles, operational means, and objective ends that are respectively implied by our what, how, and why. Peace with honor carries a price set by these three determinants: by nature, it precludes peace at any price. The very formidability of our military defense structure is also founded on the what, the how, and the why. Billions of dollars worth of the finest military equipment could easily become a heap of junk if the national will to fight were successfully sapped by Moscow's cold war maneuvers. The being of our Nation—what the United States is, means, and symbolizes for people everywhere—subsists in the what of our principles, the how of our methods, and the why of our certitude, will, and vision. Peace with honor is only another way of expressing this national being, which is vitally important to the captive nations as well as to ourselves.

In these times, and on this occasion, it is worthwhile to examine first the what—the principles by which our Nation has become the most powerful on earth. Derived from our rich Judeo-Christian heritage and natural law, the moral and political principles of intrinsic personal dignity, equality before the law, individual liberty, private opportunity and enterprise, communal welfare, and national self-determination have formed the very foundation of the Great Tradition and Experiment which is America. These principles are enshrined in our Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and our Bill of Rights which in whatever age—the machine, the atomic, or space—have steadily mirrored the hopes and aspirations of peoples and nations throughout the world. These documents spell out a living and expanding revolution which affects peoples and nations not only in Africa and Asia but also within the Soviet Union itself. Freely blessed for self-criticism, we are the first to say that in the perennial light of these principles, many of our institutions require improvement, reconstruction, and change; but this is no reason for us to shy from the prodigious truth that our society stands in a contrast of day to night to the totalitarian jungle of Moscow's empire.

Those who today are assaulting our institutions, had no faith in these principles or in themselves before Moscow evolved as a military contender. But since the launching of the Sputnik and, with it, Khrushchev's concentrated cold war campaign against the United States, many strange voices have been

---

Footnotes at end of article.

XUM

raised in this country. Their number and their depth attest to the effectiveness of Russian cold war propaganda. Without even knowing it, many have become efficient, costless tools of this propaganda. Worse still, in addition to the many other "gaps" thrown at us daily, they give witness to the basic intellectual and spiritual gap found in many quarters of our society.

JUSTICE AND FREEDOM FOR PEACE

Ideologically, our firm bent as a Nation can only be along the path of justice and freedom for peace and friendship. Given our time-honored principles, our tested rules of national conduct, logically it could not be otherwise. Moscow's offer of peace and friendship are as spurious as its issue of capitalism versus socialism. Yet it is amazing how many in this country uncritically permitted their thoughts to slide into these contrived conceptual slots. As with Hitler, the overriding issue with the Kremlin and its syndicate is freedom and slavery.[7] One imperialist system was smashed, another surges forth to threaten our national existence. Peace and friendship are the effects, the consequents, of justice and freedom, not their cause. Only through the advance and establishment of justice and freedom can the harmonization of relationships into normal concourse be attained to weld the true bonds of peace and friendship among nations as well as between individuals and groups. As in the case of its predecessors of many centuries, for the present Russian totalitarians the slogan of peace and friendship is only an instrument of calculated deception. Its logic rests only in the complacency, doubt, confusion, and naiveté it can breed in the camp of the targeted non-Russian victim, including the United States.

THE PERSISTENT COLD WAR GAP

The issues of ten years ago are the same today when we now consider the how—the means, ways, methods by which we articulate, translate, and objectify the what. The efficacy of our methods—the how—depends on how well we understand and perceive the object against whom they are forged and employed. This involves our own conception of the cold war, our knowledge and understanding of the Soviet Union, and our awareness of the primacy of propaganda in the cold war arsenal of imperial Moscow.

Here, too, it is amazing that in all the 60's dither about "gaps," the truly most essential gap—the gap that will determine whether we'll plunge disadvantageously into a hot global war or face, in moral surrender, a cold war defeat—has scarcely been mentioned. The cold war gap, rather than any other gap, has accounted for freedom's tremendous losses these past three decades. Just bear in mind that the tides of freedom even receded when the other "gaps" were non-existent. "From Atomic Monopoly and Air Supremacy to the Fear of Annihilation" might not be a pretty caption in the book of some future historian, but it cannot be denied that no nation in modern history has lost so much in so short a time as ours. Even during World War II we failed to understand our hot war ally who bore also the face of our cold war enemy.

"The best way to eliminate war," said Khrushchev openly, "is the gaining of power by Communists all over the world." This statement alone gives one an insight into the nature of the cold war. On every continent Moscow has been feverishly pursuing its goal of world domination while at the same time professing efforts aimed at a lessening of world tensions. This cold war maneuver has even succeeded in generating the illusion of a cold war cessation here and with Pavlovian effect, in developing the implosion factor. The plain fact is that cold war activity is a necessary coefficient of the Russian imperialist system and totalitarian structure. On smaller scales, it has always been. In the same way that the elimination of the Iron Curtain or a genuine and extensive liberalization of conditions in Moscow's empire would seal the demise of this empire, so the cessation of cold war operations would dry up its motivating forces of being. In short, the cold war is a basic motive force for the necessary expansionism of Moscow's empire without which its internal totalitarianism would have no justification for existence.

If eventually, we are not to be cornered into making the drastic, or better, disastrous choice between a hot global war at considerable disadvantage or humiliating cold war surrender, it is indispensable for us now to face up to the persistent cold war gap, to grasp the traditional Russian cold war methods, to establish an efficient cold war apparatus, and to pose our own freedom challenges to Moscow. Those who counter that this might lead to a hot war, not only hide from the realities of the cold war but also, in their thinking, wind up with the *reductio ad absurdum* of this disastrous choice. In a military condition of mutual deterrence "parity" and even in some respects inferiority, the weight of net advantage naturally favors the one better equipped to wage the cold war. With the cold war gap, this advantage is Moscow's. Missiles, boosters, ABM's and evidences of the other gaps have no place in so-called intensive revolutions sparked off by patient subversion, infiltration, blackmail and other devices in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America. Unless one is so far gone with haunting hallucinations of push-button co-annihilation, a skillfully executed cold war operation could even balance off, with much to spare, the effects of the other gaps. After all, man will always be the ultimate weapon; and freedom-aspiring men and nations in Moscow's empire are yet our most formidable weapon in an incessant war of diplomatic maneuvers, propaganda, subversion, and a host of other paramilitary phenomena.

Quite precisely, the cold war is a twilight condition of neither peace nor hot war where all the basic elements of a hot war—predatory design, aggressive strategy, tactics, and techniques—are present, except for open military combat between states. But the cold war, as waged by Moscow, is also a planned process leading to victorious results *in time*. This is why it is an illusion to speak of peace while this process is going on relentlessly and with increasing Russian confidence and arrogance. The prevalence of genuine peace, thus, is measured not only by the absence of a hot war but also by the absence of a cold war and all that it entails.

Our situation in the cold war gap today embraces both a supreme paradox and an imposing irony. The supreme paradox is that while we fear to meet the demands of the cold war because it might lead to a hot war, Moscow shows no fear of a hot war resulting from its intense cold war operations. The imposing irony is that in any hot war we wouldn't think twice about establishing a politico-psychological apparatus which is the same that is desperately needed in the present cold war. For reasons of survival, if not national goals of security and expanded freedom, the cold war gap must be closed. Foreign economic aid, military alliances, and our own adequate military establishment cannot in themselves cope with Moscow's cold war operations.

Of course, the present Russian totalitarians possess the wealth of centuries of experience in cold war methods and techniques. From the 16th century on, their predecessors built an unprecedented empire with these selfsame techniques of subversion, infiltration, conspiracy, blackmail, and divide-and-conquer. There isn't a century for which cases cannot be given of the skillful use of these methods. Lenin learned these from the history of the empire, not from Marx or Engels. Being true Leninist, Stalin and all who have followed have exploited the fake philosophy of communism as a cold war instrument in the same way that the previous Tsars manipulated the equally fake philosophies of Russian Orthodox supremacy and Pan-Slavism. Also true to tradition, they have bellowed non-interference as concerns free interest in their captives just as their forebears had done in connection with their enslaved nations. Interference, in the Russian view, is only a one-way street, outside the empire and the new Brezhnev doctrine surpasses anything of the past. The Tsars were also masters in instigating anti-Jewish agitation to discredit legitimate movements and institutions: the Red Tsars have shown equal mastery in dipping into the sewers of prejudice to accomplish similar ends, particularly with the myth of Ukranian anti-Semitism.[8]

THE INTELLECTUAL GAP RE: U.S.S.R.

When the Captive Nations Week Resolution was passed in 1959, little did we anticipate that it would provoke Moscow to think that this intellectual gap in our country has been spontaneously closed. Its actions showed that it has feared this deeply, and with good reason. Once this gap is filled, in our eyes and the eyes of the Free World, Russia per se would dwindle to proper size. Russian propaganda, which exaggerates the Potemkin Village achievements of science, technology, economics, and education in the U.S.S.R., would suffer irreparable losses. Our added knowledge, understanding, and perception of the Soviet Union, if skillfully used, could render Moscow indefinitely insecure within the Soviet Union itself. They would eliminate, too, many of our baseless fears.

It is not a stroke of super-patriotic rhetoric to declare that, on the basis of projected current trends, easily within the next fifty years no nation could be compared in total power and capability with the United States. The Soviet Union, factually and historically, is not a nation. In addition to Russia and its approximately 110 million people, the Soviet Union consists of many non-Russian nations which, significantly, make up the majority of captive nations in the entire Red Empire.[9] One of them, Ukraine, with its 45 million people, is the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain. Moscow has its internal satellites as well as its external ones. If the external ones, like Poland and Hungary, are deemed unreliable for Moscow's global purposes, the record of the past forty-six years shows that the internal satellites, like Ukraine and Turkestan, are equally unreliable. Without the rich captive resources of these internal satellites, Russia would be a power no greater than an integrated Germany. Most of us are even unaware of the fact that about 35 million Moslems, many with strong ties with Turkey and Pakistan, are held captive in this primary empire of Moscow.

Give some thought to these fundamental facts and what they signify. These facts are expressed in the Captive Nations Resolution and the Russian totalitarians have recognized well their significance and their portent. Unfortunately, many of us still don't. Our economic and military comparisons are drawn on the basis of false and misleading concepts and definitions. There is no more a gross national product in the Soviet Union than there is a gross global product here. A gross imperial product, with phonetic emphasis upon the GIP, is truer to fact. We approach a far more accurate and different picture of relative economic strength by only comparing the total output of Moscow's entire empire and Red syndicate members, which includes mainland China, with that of the Free World Alliances. The difference is staggering. Comparing the United States, which is a nation, with the Soviet Union,

---

Footnotes at end of article.

XUM

which is an empire of many subjugated nations, cannot suit Moscow's propaganda mill better. It conceals all the facts of economic colonialism within the U.S.S.R. itself.

For the same basic reasons, our military comparisons are askewed. If we deem the armed forces of the external satellites as being unreliable for Moscow, there are firm grounds for a similar evaluation of the armed forces in the USSR. About 45% of these forces consist of captive non-Russians, and these, by basic policy, are largely dispersed from their respective homelands in this substrata empire. Our memories are short, and our perspectives are narrow. Only in the past world war, more like yesterday, millions of these non-Russians deserted to take up arms against Moscow. In the Hungarian Revolution, Ukrainians, Russians and others joined with the Hungarian patriots. In Napoleonic times, Alexander I threatened Europe with his armed might; before World War I, Tsar Nicholas II scared Europe with the "steamroller," his imperial armed forces; and now the Red Tsars engage with differing intensity in nuclear blackmail. In three major wars in this century, the multinational forces controlled by Moscow disintegrated early in the deadly game. Contrary to popular myth, both Napoleon and Hitler were defeated not by forces but by the emptiness of their ideologies. Both had nothing but continued slavery to offer to the Russian and non-Russian nations in Moscow's empire.

We, of course, seek to conquer no one. But we richly possess an ideology which emphasizes that freedom is indivisible. And in the permanent cold war it is the deadliest weapon against Moscow's totalitarian empire, the Soviet Union. Terms like "the Soviets," "the Soviet people," "the Soviet nation," or Russia as an equivalent for USSR are marks of our intellectual lag regarding this basic empire.[10] This lag is shown, too, by the fact that nowhere in our Government is there any continuous study made of the sensitive relations between Moscow and its internal satellites. Our ignorance along this fundamental line is appalling. We're like a football team facing an opponent without the advantage of a scout's briefing on his basic weaknesses.

THE WILL FOR FREEDOM

Now, finally, the *why* of our position on peace with freedom and justice during this 10th anniversary of the Captive Nations Week Resolution. Principles and know-how are mute without the human will to enforce them. Our will for freedom is not just an emotion; it is a certitude, a vision with a rational outlook. On the basis of our principles and the capabilities set by our know-how, this will works creatively to mould that world order allowing for the free and maximum fruition of individual and national potentialities. Our conception of world order, based on rights and law, is the very negation of Moscow's colonial and imperialist totalitarianism. This will for freedom creates, not just preserves; it moves forward, not just rests; it is determined to see things through on the time-honored principle that the best defense is the offense. We are so growth-conscious today about our economy, foreign trade, the underdeveloped countries, space exploration and other fields; the one area about which we should be most growth-conscious is the state of world freedom.

In this year of the "10th" and going into the 70's, we can do much to further this will for freedom. One, you can write to the Members of the Rules Committee in the U.S. House of Representatives and urge them to pass the measures for a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. The majority is for it, but the chairman of the committee, Rep. William Colmer of Mississippi, has obstructed its very consideration. Two, you can request your representatives in Washington to demand of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee a full inquiry into U.S. policy toward the USSR. The policy of the last thirty-six years has proven to be harmful to our interests, and there are other courses of action to insure the uneasy peace. Such an inquiry is inevitable in time, but better sooner than later. Third, you can also press for a more vigorous and enlightened policy in U.S.I.A. as concerns all the captive nations. Fourth, to close the serious cold war gap, you can also further the move for the creation of a Freedom Commission and a Freedom Academy. And lastly, you can broaden the observance of Captive Nations Week as a national forum for the basic issues discussed above. With these steps alone, an education for freedom by contrast would be launched to completely dwarf the dangerous nonsense now current on our campuses and in several of our cities.

By doing what you believe in is the true exercise of the will for freedom. Our will for freedom is the backbone of the will to freedom among the enslaved. This will is at the core of peace with freedom and justice. It is the essence and spirit of the Captive Nations Week Resolution.

FOOTNOTES

[1] For these and other accounts, see *The Ukrainian Bulletin*, New York, August 1–15, 1959.

[2] See author's pamphlet *Ten Years of Captive Nations Week*, New York, 1968.

[3] Lev E. Dobriansky, *The Vulnerable Russians*, New York, 1957, p. 154.

[4] For author's interpretation of this, see "We Told You So," *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, Spring, 1969.

[5] *Congressional Record*, February 5, 1969, p. 2859.

[6] Interview by Major Salah Salem, *Reuters*, Cairo, November 10, 1959.

[7] E.G. Russian religious genocide is a striking point today as seen in V. Tancher, "Uniateg—Enemies of the Ukrainian People," *Pravda Ukrainy*, November 27, 1968, p. 4.

[8] For a typically foolish editorial on this, see "Soviet Anti-Semitism, *The Evening Star*, Washington, D.C., May 14, 1969.

[9] Confirming what the author has held for years is Farnsworth Fowl's a "Russians Becoming a Soviet Minority," *The New York Times*, April 27, 1969.

[10] An example of massive misconception is Stephen S. Rosenfeld's "The Ukraine: Questing for Pride," *The Washington Post*, March 14, 1969.

[From the Ukrainian Weekly, July 5, 1969]

NATIONAL CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE SPURS OBSERVANCE OF "WEEK"

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, President of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and Chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, issued a statement urging all American ethnic organizations and patriotic societies to use the maximum of all available media to focus attention on the captive nations.

Officially, the "Week" falls in the period of July 13–20, 1969, and is highlighted as the "Tenth Anniversary of the Captive Nations Week Resolution."

In a letter sent to every U.S. Senator and Congressman, Dr. Dobriansky invited them to make statements on the floor of Congress during the "Week," and stated:

"The basic issues facing our nation today are the same as they were ten years ago, except that we're at a greater disadvantage in coping with them. Our illusions of the 60's have not rendered the captive nations—the peoples themselves—any less captive. While we attend to derivative issues such as Vietnam, the ABM, etc., it would be fatal to have our attention diverted from the original issues of the captive nations and Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. Among the many actions that can be taken both for our security and the freedom of one billion captive peoples, a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations and a full-scale Senate reappraisal of U.S. policy toward the USSR—Moscow being the only formidable enemy—would unleash an Education for Freedom Through Contrast which, more than anything else, would redirect the energies of our youth in constructive union with those of youth seeking liberty and freedom throughout the Red Empire."

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT SOUGHT

In the House of Representatives Cong. Daniel J. Flood (Democrat) and Cong. Edward J. Derwinski (Republican) introduced special resolutions calling for support of the captive nations movement.

During the "Week" a series of manifestations, rallies, and meetings will be held in Washington, New York, Chicago, Phoenix, Philadelphia, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Los Angeles and in other cities.

On July 16, 1969 the NCWC will hold the 10th Anniversary Banquet at the University Club, at which Mr. George Meany, President of AFL–CIO, and Dr. Ku Chengkang, President of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League, will be honored.

OBSERVANCE IN NEW YORK

Dr. Ku will also be honored in Philadelphia and New York City, where special dinners and receptions will be organized in his honor.

As in previous years, the observance of "Captive Nations Week" in New York City will be observed by various groups and organizations. A liturgy for the captive nations will be celebrated at St. Patrick's Cathedral on Sunday, July 13, 1969 during which Rev. George Muresan, a Rumanian Eastern-Rite priest, will preach on the persecution of the Eastern Churches by the Communists.

Following the mass, a rally will be held in Central Park, sponsored by the New York Chapter of the National Captive Nations Committee under the Chairmanship of Judge Matthew Troy. Mayor John V. Lindsay and others will address the gathering. Mayor Lindsay will also sign a proclamation at New York's City Hall.

[From the Ukrainian Weekly, July 5, 1969]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1969

From July 13 to 20, "Captive Nations Week" will be observed throughout the land with appropriate ceremonies, manifestations, meetings and solemn liturgies in churches, as provided by Public Law 86–90. President Nixon is expected to issue his first Presidential Proclamation, calling on all Americans to observe the Week with meaningful dedication to the cause of freedom of the captive nations.

This year the Week will be observed under the impact of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia last August, and the observance itself will have a different significance. Prior to the seizure of Czechoslovakia many leaders, especially the mass communications media people among us, were prone to denigrate the meaning of Captive Nations Week and regarded it as an irritant used by "exile groups" to antagonize Moscow and thus impede "peaceful coexistence."

But the brutal invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet and satellite forces demonstrated the perpetual aggression of Moscow and brought a new threat to Central and Western Europe. Therefore, the position of the captive nations and their unceasing fight for freedom and national self-determination can now be viewed from the viewpoint of the rest of free Europe, which is threatened and which may also become captive, if the free world continues to be indifferent to the enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain.

XUM

The American people, blessed by God with freedom and material wealth have the opportunity to express themselves on the tenth anniversary of "Captive Nations Week" and to demonstrate to the captive nations that they are their true friends and allies. The U.S. Government and the governments of other free countries can enhance their prestige and influence by capitalizing upon the cleavages and discontent which the captive nations create for the Russian Communist masters.

On this occasion, we should make sure that the concern over the captive nations is part and parcel of our foreign policy, and that it is more than just speech-making and ceremonial manifestations, but that it is one of the basic principles and a dedicated policy of our commitment to the cause of universal freedom.

Ten years ago the U.S. Congress enacted this far-sighted legislation which is the Captive Nations Week Resolution in defense of the captive nations. It is now up to our policymakers to make appropriate use of this legislation in our policies at home and abroad. For the "Captive Nations Week Resolution" essentially is a weapon of truth and an instrument of freedom against slavery and oppression.

[From the Ukrainian Catholic Daily, July 3, 1969]

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF CAPTIVE NATIONS TO BE MARKED

PHILADELPHIA.—The 10th anniversary of the Captive Nations Week proclamation will be marked with special ceremonies here at Independence Hall on Sunday, July 20. The Captive Nations Week resolution, authored by UCCA president, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, was passed by the U.S. Congress in 1959. It calls for the proclamation by each incumbent President of the U.S. of the third week in July as Captive Nations Week until such time as all the nations enslaved by Moscow regain their national freedom.

The Philadelphia CNW Committee which is headed by Dr. Austin App, president, Ignatius Billinsky, vice president, Mrs. Margot Rotla, secretary, and Albert Begian, treasurer, has prepared an interesting program to mark this year's anniversary observance.

The keynote speaker will be Dr. Ku Chang-Kang of Formosa, president of the Asian Anti-Communist League, a member of the Presidium of the National Assembly of Formosa and special adviser to the President of Nationalist China.

Other prominent personalities at the Captive Nations Week anniversary observance in Philadelphia will be: Stanley Miller, a member of the Gubernatorial Cabinet of Pennsylvania, the Hon. Mayor James Tate, Mayor of Philadelphia, Dr. Austin App, and others.

Eleven national groups will take part in the manifestation. A special highlight of the program will be the signing of a "Declaration of Independence" by the members of the Philadelphia CNW Committee and representatives of the national groups in the historic Congress chamber where the American Declaration of Independence was signed.

At the close of the program a wreath-laying ceremony will take place at the foot of the Liberty Bell.

The program, which is scheduled to begin at 5:30 p.m., will be directed by the CNW Committee vice president, Mr. I. Billinsky.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Ten years ago, President Eisenhower proclaimed the third week of July as Captive Nations Week. This tenth anniversary will be observed from July 13 to July 20 in 1969. Each succeeding president has called for appropriate observance of such a week.

In this land of the free, it is difficult to believe that there can still exist in this twentieth century, systems of government which deny their people fundamental human rights, and base their industrial and technical progress on the labor of depressed and deprived masses of their people, or that intellectuals and others are still being imprisoned or exiled to slave labor for daring to question or protest the harsh dictatorships that deny basic freedoms. The guilt of many present-day regimes is all the greater because they are signatories to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and, in most cases, members of the United Nations dedicated to implementing those very rights, assuring freedom and justice to all.

While condemning colonialism and assisting in the dissolution of empires, what have the Communist nations of the Soviet empire and mainland China done except deny freedom to their own people, at the same time seeking to reduce to colonial status whatever territories they could dominate as satellites? What has happened to the basic freedoms and fundamental human rights in Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others? Is there nothing free nations can do when people cry out "Come over to Czechoslovakia and help us!"?

Within these United States are many people of many nationalities whose parents sought freedom here from religious, political and/or economic oppression. There are many others who themselves were forced to flee their native lands after World War II, when Communism took over in Eastern and Central Europe, and soon thereafter in mainland China, Tibet and Cuba. On such an anniversary as this, those who walked out on Communism are saddened by the remembrance of relatives and friends still in the satellites and the "People's Republics," another name for the colonies of the Communists. Unlike most Americans, who have known life only under freedom, they understand the true meaning behind Russia's misuse of such terms as "peace," "democracy," and "coexistence". They know that many are serving out 25-year sentences in slave-labor camps for such "crimes" as establishing schools or Red Cross chapters or instilling children with a love of their own language or cultural heritage!

We have reason to believe that Russia's violent opposition to Captive Nations Week is evidence of its effect upon the people of her own republics and satellites, renewing their hope of freedom, strengthening their will to resist. We believe her greatest fear is that the rift with mainland China, the turning from Moscow of Albania and perhaps soon Rumania, and open criticism of Moscow's policies by the Communist Party of Italy, will continue until the non-Russian peoples within the U.S.S.R. may break away from Russia's domination. There is no monolith today. The rifts, schisms, fissures are too wide and too deep.

What can we of the free world do to stop this tyranny and treachery? We can be vigilant and careful not to be duped by those who think Freedom is an ideal and not a living force. It is both. We can urge free nations to abandon trade with those who use enslaved peoples for the purposes of the State. We can impress upon all statesmen that the choice of human freedom is always a higher ideal than the choice of peace, for peace without freedom is no peace at all.

Therefore, we the undersigned, call upon all people in this and other countries who love freedom to continue the pressure of public opinion and public expression, added to our hopes and prayers, until the Communist bloc crumbles and freedom is restored to all captive nations.

BYELORUSSIAN AMERICAN WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION.
CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL OF WOMEN IN EXILE.
GEORGIAN NATIONAL ALLIANCE.
UKRAINIAN NATIONAL WOMEN'S LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.
WOMEN FOR FREEDOM, INC.

(NOTE.—This statement was prepared and distributed by Women for Freedom, Inc., July, 1969.)

(By unanimous consent, Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join in paying tribute to this 10th anniversary celebration of Captive Nations Week. I am grateful to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD), not only for having taken this time today, but for his long leadership in the establishment of Captive Nations Week, and also his fight for the creation of a special Captive Nations Committee in the U.S. House of Representatives. I am proud to have been so closely associated wih him in this long fight.

A good deal of water has passed under the bridge since we first succeeded in establishing Captive Nations Week 10 years ago. Many cynical individuals regarded this action at the time as purely a gesture, without any intrinsic meaning at all. They assumed that the military might of the Soviet Union and the vehemence with which the Soviets held their sway over the captive peoples of Europe and Asia could never be removed, least of all passage of a few well-meaning words and resolutions in the U.S. Congress.

How wrong they were. I would not, of course, suggest that the changes that have taken place in the captive nations area over the past 10 years have resulted solely or even principally from the actions of the U.S. Congress in establishing a Captive Nations Week and fighting for a Captive Nations Committee. But the cracks in the Iron Curtain and the fissures in monolithic Soviet control, which have developed in recent years, and the repeated evidences that the spirit of freedom and desire for liberty on the part of captive peoples are not dead but very much alive indeed, have strongly underscored the faith of those of us who fought this battle in the belief that freedom can never be suppressed and that capitivity must never be accepted as inevitable.

The differences which have developed in the past few years between the Soviet Union and Communist China, for example, erupting even now into actual armed conflict, demonstrate the instability of this kind of totalitarian system.

The brutal actions of the Soviet Union a year ago in the military invasion of Czechoslovakia, followed by a subtle, but nonetheless relentless taking over of control over the lives and activities of the supposedly independent Communist peoples, also demonstrate the fragility of this Communist structure and the complete inability of the Soviet system to live alongside any kind of freedom.

XUM

The upheavals which have taken place in the Soviet Union itself in the years since our resolution was first adopted and Captive Nations Week established, also indicate the difficulties which a totalitarian system unwilling to brook any differences of opinion, must encounter. Mr. Khrushchev, eager to make some concessions in Soviet theory to avoid warfare with the West, has been relegated to limbo of an unperson for his efforts. In his place the hard-nosed Mr. Brezhnev and behind him the even rougher and tougher Soviet marshals, have now taken over full control, unwilling to allow even the very modest gestures toward relaxation initiated by Mr. Khrushchev to continue, lest the spirit of freedom become so intoxicating for the Soviet people as to threaten the future of the communistic dictatorship.

Most recently of all, as still further evidence of the soundness of our cause, was the tremendous reception given to President Nixon on his recent visit to Rumania. Contrary to the dictates of the Soviet masters, the peoples of the captive nations are indeed favorably disposed toward the United States, and welcome friendly relations with our country.

The brusqueness with which the Russians have now warned the Rumanians against any further displays of friendship toward America demonstrates again the tenuous hold over the hearts and minds of the captive peoples.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that we are celebrating Captive Nations Week once again this year. We have indeed made great progress, in these 10 years, and I feel even more strongly now than I did in days past that the day of real freedom for the peoples of Eastern Europe and elsewhere in the world is not really so far away as we had once thought it might be.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Derwinski) is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that we this afternoon are commemorating the 11th annual Captive Nations Week.

I wish to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) for extending his leadership in this field and making the arrangements for all Members to effectively demonstrate their interest and their determination to see that the captive nations of communism achieve their freedom.

Mr. Speaker, as a continuation of my remarks today on this memorable occasion of the 11th observance of Captive Nations Week, I am pleased to include the following material:

Proclamations issued by—

Gov. Paul B. Ogilvie of my State of Illinois;

Gov. Claude R. Kirk, Jr., of Florida;

Gov. Deane C. Davis of Vermont;

Gov. Harold LeVander of Minnesota;

Mayor Nelson Howarth of Springfield, Ill.;

Mayor J. Bracken Lee of Salt Lake City, Utah; and

Mayor Sam Schwartzkopf of Lincoln, Nebr.

An article by Erik A. Dundurs from the Republican nationalities division of Minnesota.

An article by Father Denis Dirscherl, S.J., from the July 20 Our Sunday Visitor, Huntington, Ind.

An article by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky from the spring 1969 Ukrainian Quarterly.

Two news releases issued by the National Captive Nations Committee dated May 26, 1969, and June 9, 1969.

Two news releases issued by the Arizona branch of the Captive Nations Committee.

The material follows:

Proclamation—State of Illinois

The imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led to the enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijam, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba and others and

The desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communistic leaders to initiate a major war and

The freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence, and

The Congress of the United States has by unanimous vote declared the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week so that the people of the United States may express their sympathy with, and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence,

Now, therefore, I, Richard B. Ogilvie, Governor of the State of Illinois, do hereby proclaim the week commencing July 13, 1969 to be observed as Captive Nations Week in Illinois, and I call upon our citizens to observe this occasion in a manner fitting and proper.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Illinois to be affixed.

Done at the Capitol in the City of Springfield, this third day of July, in the Year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-nine, and of the State of Illinois the one hundred and fifty-first.

Richard B. Ogilvie,
Governor.
Paul Powell,
Secretary of State.

Proclamation—State of Florida

Whereas, among all the peoples of the Earth, Americans, by virtue of their constant attention to democratic principles, have become the leaders in mankind's never-ending struggle for freedom, and

Whereas, this position of leadership places upon the people of this nation the great responsibility of keeping the flame of liberty kindled in the hearts and minds of all men everywhere, and

Whereas, great segments of the world's population live in the limbo of complete subservience to governmental doctrines that strip their souls and minds of all individualism, mental and physical freedom, and

Whereas, these people stand in great need of encouragement and reassurance from their fellow men who have the privilege of living in the light of freedom that liberty will ultimately prevail;

Now, therefore, I, Claude R. Kirk, Jr., by virtue of the authority vested in me as Governor of the State of Florida, do hereby proclaim the week of July 13-19, 1969, to be Captive Nations Week in Florida, and urge all citizens to join in this observance by offering their assistance and encouragement to these freedom loving people.

In witness thereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Florida to be affixed at Tallahassee, the Capital, this 7th day of July in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-nine and in the recorded history of Florida four hundred and fifty-seven.

Claude R. Kirk, Jr.,
Governor.

Attest:

Jane Adams,
Secretary of State.

State of Vermont Proclamation

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Serbia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week of July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence,

Now, therefore, I, Deane C. Davis, Governor of the State of Vermont, do hereby proclaim the week commencing July 13, 1969, as Captive Nations Week in Vermont.

Given under my hand and the Great Seal of the State of Vermont this fifth day of June, A.D. 1969.

Deane C. Davis,
Governor.
Frederick H. Reed.
Secretary.

Proclamation—State of Minnesota

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of people of these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, Harold LeVander, Governor of the State of Minnesota, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 13, 1969, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Minnesota, and call upon the citizens to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Minnesota to be affixed at the State Capitol this third day of July in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-nine and of the State, the one hundred twelfth.

HAROLD LEVANDER,
Governor.
JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,
Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION—CITY OF SPRINGFIELD, ILL.

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies, and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, Nelson Howarth, Mayor of Springfield, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 20, 1969, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Springfield, and call upon the citizens of Springfield to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the City of Springfield to be affixed, this —— day of —— 1969.

NELSON HOWARTH,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION—SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of many nations; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week:

Now, therefore, I, J. Bracken Lee, Mayor of the City of Salt Lake City, Utah, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 13, 1969, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Salt Lake City and call upon the citizens of Salt Lake City to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of Salt Lake City, Utah, to be affixed this 1st day of July, nineteen hundred and sixty-nine.

J. BRACKEN LEE, *Mayor.*

PROCLAMATION—CITY OF LINCOLN, NEBR.

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war, and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence.

Now, therefore, I, Sam Schwartzkopf, Mayor of the City of Lincoln, Nebraska, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 13, 1969, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Lincoln, Nebraska, and call upon the citizens of Lincoln to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Official Seal of the City of Lincoln to be affixed this 9th day of July, 1969.

SAM SCHWARTZKOPF,
Mayor.

FREEDOM FOR THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

(By Erik A. Dundurs)

"In providing for the designation of an Annual Captive Nations Week, Public Law 86–90 implies a continuous commitment by the United States to facilitate conditions favorable and conducive to a variety of peaceful means leading to the eventual liberation of nations held captive by the Red tyranny.

With Captive Nations Week of 1969 approaching, we must recommit ourselves to this just cause." (Nationalities Division, Republican Party of Minnesota.)

A BEGINNING OR AN END?

Ten years ago, when Public Law 86–90 was unanimously passed by the United States Congress, it was a sincere manifestation of concern for the Communist-enslaved countries:

"[Public Law 86–90, 86th Cong. July 17, 1959]

"S.J. RES. 111

"Joint resolution providing for the designation of the third week of July as 'Captive Nations Week'

"Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

"Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

"Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

"Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian Communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

"Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Viet-Nam, and others; and

"Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

"Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

"Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

"Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence. Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week

XUM

with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

Providing for the designation of the third week of July as Captive Nations Week, the United States Congress made it clear that proper observance of the Week is of great importance, not only for the extension of freedom but also for its retention.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower issued the first Captive Nations Week proclamation in July of 1959 and invited the people of the United States of America to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities so as to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of the Communist enslaved nations:

"CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1959

"By the President of the United States of America.

"A Proclamation

"Whereas many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

"Whereas the peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

"Whereas the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent; and

"Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

"Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as 'Captive Nations Week,' and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world:

"Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 18, 1959, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations.

"In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"Done at the City of Washington this seventeenth day of July in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and fifty-nine, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-fifth.

"By the President:

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

Since according to the law, the President is requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world, Presidential proclamations of Captive Nations Week have become an annual affair.

As expected, governments of the Communists bloc have reacted to the proclamations with abusive vehemence, since the Captive Nations cause strikes at the very basis of their blueprint for conquest.

When President Eisenhower stated in 1959 that "there can be no true peace which involves acceptance of a status quo in which we find injustice to many nations and repressions of human beings on a gigantic scale . . .", a new hope was injected into the plight of Communist captives.

When Richard M. Nixon, then Vice President, gave strong personal endorsement to the goal of the National Captive Nations Week Observance, the stage was set for the United States to assume leadership in using every peaceable means in bringing about a favorable climate for the restoration of freedom and indepednence in all Captive Nations.

This favorable climate was of a short duration and when the Eisenhower era ended, the winds of accommodation with the Soviet Union increased in velocity. In advancing a Trojan Horse within the framework of peaceful co-existence, the Kremlin's purpose was to gain sufficient time to achieve a "Nuclear Stalemate".

Interpreting the term "peaceful co-existence" at face value, the United States embarked upon a policy of appeasement, carefully avoiding any irritation of the Soviet empire.

This, quite obviously, resulted in diluted Captive Nations Week proclamations with the very minimum of publicity emanating from the White House.

On April 9, 1963 Congressman Clark MacGregor addressed the U.S. House of Representatives in support of a Special Captive Nation Committee.

After commending his colleagues—Congressman Daniel J. Flood and Congressman Edward J. Derwinski, among others, for their efforts to establish this special committee (H.R. 14). MacGregor, among other things, stated the following: "The International Communist organization has consistently shown that it fears a growing world knowledge of and interest in the Captive Nations. We need to do everything we can to bring the facts to all the world". And yet, the White House turned thumbs down! Today, there still is no Special Captive Nations Committee.

During the Johnson Administration the process of building bridges to the Soviet Union was accelerated. If one examines the Captive Nations Week proclamation of 1968 and compares it with the one issued by President Eisenhower in 1959, the U.S. policy of appeasement is clearly in evidence. In fact, the words "Communism" and "Soviet Union" no longer appear in the 1968 proclamation:

"CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1968

"(Proclamation 3875, July 10, 1968)

"By the President of the United States of America.

"A Proclamation

"Whereas the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212) authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as 'Captive Nations Week' until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

"Whereas human freedom, national independence and justice are fundamental rights of all peoples; and

"Whereas the enjoyment of these rights, to which all peoples justly aspire, remains severely limited or denied in many areas of the world; and

"Whereas the United States of America, in keeping with the principles on which it was founded, has sought consistently to promote the observance of fundamental human rights throughout the world;

"Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 14, 1968 as Captive Nations Week.

"In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this 10th day of July in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-eight, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-third.

"By the President:

"LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

"[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 5 p.m., July 10, 1968.]"

One could argue, that changes in the text of the resolution have been so radical, that it no longer express the intent of Public Law 86–90.

And what about Cuba? With the Monroe Doctrine forgotten and with a Communist nation 90 miles from our shores, can we as Americans still claim that we are upholding the moral imperatives and noble declarations in our Constitution?

The year of 1968 represented the 20th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and yet there were more people living in bondage then, than at any time in human history! While Western colonialism has become a thing of the past—Eastern colonialism is rampant. But are we pointing this out to the world?

The answer is no. On the contrary, strange as it may be, we have addressed ourselves to the inequities in human and civil rights of such countries as South Africa and Rhodesia, without even mentioning the slavemasters of the East.

What are some of the reasons for this double standard approach? Is it the realization that an approximate "Nuclear parity" now exists between the United States and the Soviet Union and that they could act and react one upon the other with overwhelming devastation? Or is it an erosion in our desire to uphold the true principles of freedom in supplanting them with the philosophy of "Peace At Any Price"?

I would suggest that it is a mixture of both, producing unfounded fear and stimulating the erosion of principle.

The truth remains, that the Soviet policy of peaceful co-existence, aiming at the moral and political disarmament of the West, will be modified only to the extent of their momentary tactical needs and not by Western conciliation. Anything less than Western military superiority, dedication and firmness, will only stimulate the expansionist tendencies of the Communist world.

"Nuclear parity" has not kept the Soviet Union from the blatant violation of basic human rights of the citizens of Czechoslovakia in malicious disregard of the United Nations charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

North Korea and North Vietnam continue to pursue their aggressive policies in spite of the military might of the United States and so does Red China.

With over 1 billion people in Communist bondage, the United States government must properly and honorably cope with the continued manifestation of Communist aggression. It is clear that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights will become meaningless unless its pronouncements are vigorously enforced by all signatory nations and are equally applied whenever and wherever freedom is threatened or abused.

Public Law 86–90 implies a continuing responsibility by the United States to facilitate conditions favorable and conducive to a variety of peaceful acts leading to the eventual liberation of nations held captive by the Red tyranny.

"Those who want us to relax and who counsel policies of accommodation that would freeze the status quo of a world half enslaved, are betraying our civilization," said Eugene Lyons, Senior Editor of Reader's Digest.

If International Communism would succeed in extinguishing the aspirations of free men held captive, as it temporarily does their civil liberties, a great battle would have been lost by a free world yearning for peace with justice.

XUM

Dr. Walter H. Judd, former U.S. Congressman and an undisputed expert on Communism said recently: "The strongest allies the Free world has, are the captive peoples enslaved by Communism. They know the misery of serfdom first hand and are most strategically located to turn the tide when the right moment arrives. We must never do anything to weaken their hope and their will to survive."

With Captive Nations Week of 1969 approaching, the United States must re-assert its position of the alleged leadership of all free peoples.

The Free World and the Communist captives look upon President Richard M. Nixon to re-assert this leadership. In fact, it is a must, since what is morally wrong can never be politically or diplomatically right!

If the 1969 Presidential proclamation again embraces the intent and language of the original Congressional resolution, the President will have lived up to an early statement of his own-proclaiming that "We will never write off the millions of people enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. Their freedom shall always be our objective. When freedom is threatened anywhere, it is threatened in America . . ."

The test is yet to come . . . and the outcome will signify a beginning or an end to Captive Nations Week as an instrument for freedom.

The captive nations

Armenia	1920
Azerbaijan	1920
Byelorussia	1920
Cossackia	1920
Georgia	1920
Idel-Ural	1920
North Caucasia	1920
Ukraine	1920
Far Eastern Republic	1922
Turkistan	1922
Mongolian People's Republic	1924
Estonia	1940
Latvia	1940
Lithuania	1940
Albania	1946
Bulgaria	1946
Serbia	1946
Croatia	1946
Slovenia	1946
Yugoslavia	1946
Poland	1947
Rumania	1947
Czecho-Slovakia	1948
North Korea	1948
Hungary	1949
East Germany	1949
Mainland China	1949
Tibet	1951
North Vietnam	1954
Cuba	1960

WHO'S NEXT?

South Vietnam?
South Korea?
Algeria?
Colombia?
Congo?
Laos?
Tanzania?
Bolivia?
Thailand?
Greece?
Guatemala?
Chile?

"Humanity is tormented once again by an age-old issue—is man to live in dignity and freedom under God or be enslaved—are men in government to serve, or are they to master, their fellow men? It befalls us now to resolve this issue anew."

[From Our Sunday Visitor, July 20, 1969]

RUSSIA'S CAPTIVE NATIONS

(By Father Denis Dirscherl, S.J.)

"We want and implore you to help us . . . for we cannot oppose this force . . . other than through passive resistance!" This was Radio Prague's agonizing cry to the world on August 21, 1968, when the Russians stormed into Czechoslovakia. The Czech cry of despair repeated the Hungarian plea over Radio Budapest on October 23, 1956: "We ask you to help us, to support us. Time is short. Help Hungary, help us, help us!"

In the last two decades the Czechs, Hungarians, and Poles have all rebelled against the Russian yoke of communism, to little avail. In each case Russian troops and the indiscriminate use of their heavy armor routed the forces of freedom. The freedom fighters, in the last resort, were helpless without outside assistance. The United States and the rest of the free world watched from the sidelines, afraid to aid these captive peoples of the Russian Empire.

After the dramatic events in Poland and Hungary, dedicated Americans and patriots of other countries decided to do something concrete for the peoples held by the military might and political overlordship of the Russians. They formed the Captive Nations Resolution, and now each year the United States and some seventeen other countries mark this observation with parades, memorial speeches, and quiet discussion.

The central motivating factor in the Captive Nations concept is the critical need of all free nations to keep the plight of oppressed people before their eyes, not to allow the routine of everyday monotony to dull our sensivities to all peoples existing without the free exercise of self-determination. This notion is doubly difficult to appreciate because we live in an era of acute self introspection here in the United States. But in spite of our current propensity to "meaculpaism," the Captive Nations notion warrants, even demands, some special consideration.

Professor Lev Dobriansky of Georgetown University helped originate the idea of Captive Nations Week in the late 'fifties. In 1959 President Eisenhower signed the resolution into Public Law 86–90. This year the eleventh annual observance takes place from July 13–19. These yearly observances have enjoyed success because its originators and adherents keenly appreciate the value and need of good propaganda in the best sense of the word. It's role is crucial in our age of so-called peaceful co-existence, convergence, detente and cold war psychology.

Effective propaganda is the one thing that the Soviets have capitalized on in the half century of their existence, achieving goals and concessions from the West often through mere bluff and bluster. Because of these ploys they have become a giant world power, In the West we have repeatedly failed to enter into the real "mind" of the Kremlin leadership and the psychological world view of the Russian masses. As Senator Henry Jackson of Washington has remarked, "We have never been in the same league with the Russians in the psychological war of wits and words."

The response of the Russians to the Captive Nations Week observance is particularly enlightening, and informative of the ideological make-up of the Soviet camp. In July, 1965, for instance, Michael Suslov, Chief Party theoretician, commented on the observance of Captive Nations Week.

Especially disgusting is the villainous demagogy of the imperialistic chieftains of the United States. Each year they organize the so-called Captive Nations Week, hypocritically pretending to be defenders of nations that have escaped from their yoke. These international gendarmes, stranglers of freedom and independence, would like again to enslave the free nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. But this will never happen!

This response of Russian leaders is typical, that is, the Russians project their own designs into the motive, plans, and policies of others.

One of the major emphases of the Captive Nations concept is to bring out into bold relief the gun barrel philosophy of the Russians and its allies. Unquestionably much of the communist success in the past has been achieved because of this old philosophy. As Mao Tse-tung once declared: "Every communist must grasp the truth that political power grows out of the barrel of a gun . . . in fact we can say that the whole world can be remolded only with the gun."

The bulk of Russian and other communist acquisitions and annexations have resulted from a three-pronged attack: by force through overwhelming military superiority, internal infiltration, and political blackmail. Soviet Russian imperialism started in the early '20's with the Outer Mongolia area. Poland was partitioned in 1939, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and a portion of Finland followed in 1940, Bulgaria and Albania in 1946, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Sakhalin, and the Kurile Islands in 1945, Rumania in 1947, Czechoslovakia in 1948, Eastern Germany in 1949, followed by North Korea, North Vietnam, and Cuba in the '50's.

In regard to the Russian carving up of the world's real estate salami style, it is interesting to note Karl Marx's view of Russia in his own day. Writing for the New York *Tribune* of April 19, 1853, Marx asked: "What had to happen? The ignorance, the laziness, the pusillanimity, the perpetual fickleness and the credulousness of Western Governments enabled Russia to achieve successively every one of her aims." Even in his own day Marx called Russia a "conquering nation."

The nationality question also has a central function in the Captive Nations concept. Here it is important to recall that the words "Russia" and "Russian" have been bandied about in the past with little care and necessary distinctions and explanation. The Russian Empire is made up of many different nationalities. And without these other nationalities the Russian Empire would be a second-rate power. As in Czarist times, so too today, Russia is bent on completely "Russifying" every formerly free country in their empire, including the Ukraine, White Russia, the Caucasus area, the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

Latvia is a prime example of Russification. According to recent reports, Latvians constitute only 60 per cent of their own country. It was 75 per cent in 1939. Today even their capital, Riga, has a minority of Latvians. Other Latvians have been "deported" to different sectors of the Russian Empire.

The forces of continuity are indeed powerful, almost overwhelming in that land once called "Holy Russia." And in many respects, Marx's devastating critique of Russia is still valid, even more poignant today when the Russian appetite for aggrandizement grows apace. Too much of Russia's brutal past still lives on in the Russian Empire today. Indeed contemporary Russian leaders have realized the most extravagant dreams of 19th century Russian nationalists and Pan-Slavists. Now after the Czech, Hungarian, and Polish debacles, East Europeans sadly realize what kind of "brotherhood" the Russians are talking about.

The Captive Nations Week is a fitting time to recall and realize that the opposition is not almighty, that it is grossly insecure and suffers pangs of inferiority, hiding as it does behind the facade of concrete walls, war zones, barbed wire fences, guard towers, trenches, empty wastes and no man's lands. Such oppression is surely destined to be short lived. The human spirit will not long tolerate it, as such observances as Captive Nations Week remind the Russians of this shattering truth.

WE TOLD YOU SO

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

The Russian rape of Czecho-Slovakia is a subject that most of our illusionists prefer not to discuss nowadays. They have scarcely recovered from the shock they received in the summer of 1968. Détente, cultural exchange, East-West trade, the psychological sport of reducing tensions, more treaties with the USSR, and all the superficial attitudes induced by almost a decade of confetti diplomacy were suddenly hollowed by the brute reality of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. It still is a real question whether our illusionists in Government, in Congress, the press, and among our numerous organizations will profit from this rude awakening or will continue to blindly pursue their illusions for whatever fearful reason. Regardless, those, like myself, who have consistently and with complete certitude pointed to the real enemy of the Free World—Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism rather than the mythology of communism—can in all humility of truth utter "We told you so."

At an annual function connected with the National War College three months later, the writer was interestingly confronted by this general question raised by colleagues who occupy high positions in State, the Armed Forces, and CIA: "Doc, how do we get out of this bind? For years we have pushed the bridges of understanding policy to fragmentize communist East Europe, only to have it dashed by brute Russian force." My answer very simply was this: "What I tried to teach you ten years ago is that you, and thus we, will never succeed in dislodging the tentacles of the Soviet Russian octopus so long as we do everything to preserve the octopus itself, which in its total form means the Soviet Union." Assuming an accurate knowledge and understanding of the USSR, truly an imperium in imperio, it doesn't require much common sense to perceive its powerful ability to squelch any liberalizing forces at work in its colonial tentacles, particularly a potentially explosive one such as Czecho-Slovakia. It wasn't at all difficult for this writer and others, such as Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki of Catholic University, to publicly predict the crude Russian action in Czecho-Slovakia.[1] At this point one can predict that if Rumania attempts what the Reds in Czecho-Slovakia endeavored to do, it will even be easier for the Russian-directed octopus to move in. Indeed, one can soundly speculate that the security of both Yugoslavia and Albania will inversely diminish with the further build-up of Soviet Russian naval power in the Mediterranean. The specific date and time aren't important; the evolving circumstances and will for action are.

Guided by empirical evidence, of which the tragedy of Czecho-Slovakia is only the most recent in a long string of lessons since World War II, those of us who have rationally maintained that in structural terms the Soviet Russian totalitarians cannot and will not change, are in position once again to contend that the so-called dogmatism ascribed to our posture is actually a time-proven realism based on historical experience and existential analysis. The illusionists may by force of communications media perpetuate their myths and wishful thinking, even in the face of the Czecho-Slovak tragedy, but the oft substantiated premises of the mischaracterized "dogmatic position" will re-emerge with impressive impact again and again.

These fact-founded premises are concrete and yet comprehensive. One, in a positive dimension, answers the fundamental question "How has all this come to be what it is?" by stressing the evolution of the Soviet Russian Empire from the RSFSR in 1917 to the USSR in 1923 to points beyond since 1940. Once this line of evolution is understood, the full view of the USSR as an empire in itself comes into full bloom and mythical conceptions, such as "the Soviets," "the Soviet nation," and "minorities in the USSR," are scrapped for their ludicrous worth. Flowing from this is the second perspectival premise, namely, being an empire in its own essence, the USSR must of necessity expand in influence, control, and domination. There can be no inward-turning other than at the risks of structural erosion, non-Russian nationalist explosions, and certain imperial disaster and collapse. Third, interwoven with this, is the empirical premise covering Moscow's systematic build-up of all necessary instruments for such expansionism—military, propaganda, diplomatic, economic, political etc.—all integrated in a working context of persistent psycho-political warfare. And lastly, as a negative premise, is the accommodation of all this and more by our failures to cope properly and adequately with this last, threatening empire in the history of mankind. What has transpired in Czecho-Slovakia is only one additional bit of evidence certifying to the power of the basic forces dominating Eastern Europe—the prime enemy of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism and the invincible nationalism of all the captive non-Russian nations, particularly those in the Soviet Union. We haven't even begun to tap the latter force and its overwhelming potentialities.[2]

TIME FOR REASSESSMENT OF CONCEPTS AND POLICY

It seems almost like stating the obvious that it is high time for a serious and thorough reassessment of our concepts and policy regarding the Soviet Union. On the heels of the brutal Russian invasion of Czecho-Slovakia, Presidential candidate Nixon sensed this when he declared "And a realistic appraisal of the assumptions and premises that underlie American policy toward the Soviet Union, a policy of realism toward the Soviet today, will be a policy that is directed toward their prudence and not just toward their good will."[3] But, quite logically, before we can sensibly reformulate policy and higher generalizations, we must patiently reexamine our working concepts, the meanings of our words, and the framework of our conceptions. This is a self-evident priority.

Plainly, words have consequences, Repeated over and over again, they can lead or mislead, they can affect or infect, they can persuade or dissuade, they reflect realistic concepts or unrealistic ones. On the world scene today no group comprehends and values this more than do the masters and propagandists of totalitarian Soviet Russia. We, however, pass words uncritically. As a consequence, we continue to wallow in a morass of illusions about Russia, the Soviet Union, and the so-called "Soviet sphere of influence." No matter how you choose to view them, words contain the power of meaning. Needless to say, without them we have no natural way of transmitting our thoughts, be it accurately or inaccurately, truthfully or untruthfully. And no amount of trite and self-indicting utterances. such as "Oh, that's just a matter of semantics," can hide this truth.

It was Socrates who for all time taught, "The beginning of wisdom is the definition of terms." Though we don't always practice it, you and I know that wise behavior presupposes clear thinking. But such thinking—and thus intelligent behavior—cannot be attained without distinct and rationally defined terms. Put another way, prudent action demands clear thinking and this requires logical concepts with conformable terms or words. When we examine the terms and concepts used by many Americans in relation to the Soviet Union, the beginning of wisdom in our policy and action toward this primary empire remains somewhat remote.

Beyond all doubt, the most common and persistent illusion is the verbal equation of Russia and the Soviet Union. Interchanging and equating the two makes them appear identical with reference to territory and peoples. It is equally inaccurate to identify Russia with the old Czarist Russian Empire, again in terms of territory and peoples. Poland was a part of that empire. Were the Poles therefore "Russians"? The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is at least nominally more in conformity with the basic facts of distinctive nations, cultures, and religions which characterize the present Soviet Russian Empire than was the previous Czarist Russian Empire.

For a realistic policy toward the USSR, it is absolutely necessary for us to extinguish this basic illusion and honestly revise our many misconcepts as we face up to the fundamentals of this not too complex empire within an empire. If some would take the trouble to glance at the constitution or a map of the USSR, they would find that what they call "Russia" is only one national area in that empire. At that it is federated with other national units and thus known as the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic. It is only one of the fifteen republics in the USSR. This, in part, is Russia. This is Soviet Russia which by imperialist aggression annexed to itself numerous non-Russian nations to form the first spurious federation called the RSFSR and, through further aggression, the second, even more spurious federation called the USSR. In effect, what emerged is a federation within a "federation." This is confusing to many Americans. Only aggressive Soviet Russia profits by the persistence of this confusion.

When many uncritically use the term "Soviets" with reference to the controlling operations of Russian Moscow, they compound this state of confusion. First, they do violence to the only true meaning of the term "soviet"—a council of workers and peasants. The soviets, in plain fact, do not rule in the USSR. Second, they blur the objective and fundamental distinctions existing between Russian nationals and the different non-Russian nationals in that area. This blinds them to the opportunities open for the building of progressive restraints on Moscow's warlike policies. And third, in their own minds they nurture the self-deluding thought of the USSR being a monolith, a homogeneity of "Soviets," of Soviet men and generations.

The pointed irony of all this is revealed by these facts. In the old Russian empire the Czars made every attempt to erase the distinctiveness of the non-Russian nationals by throwing the wrap of Russian nationality over them. "Peoples of Russia," "Great Russian and Little Russian" and other verbal devices were contrived to create a monolithic appearance. Their policy of Russification failed. Profiting by the lessons of this failure, the Soviet Russian totalitarians have subtly pursued the same policy under the formula "national in form, socialist in content." In plain language, this is designed to eviscerate the national substance of Moscow's captives as it develops a Soviet man, a Soviet people. Their language, their culture, their allegiance will, of course, be Russian. Red Moscow also aims at a monolithic image. Now we find ourselves, the advocates of national self-determination, unwittingly abetting this process by the uncritical use of "the Soviets." Indeed, what irony!

Thus, for a policy reorientation based on accurate and realistic concepts, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that by language, history, culture and religion, the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union are as different from the Russian—in some respects more so—as the French are from the Italians or the Japanese from the Koreans. By all criteria of nationhood they stand in sharp contrast to the tribal conglomerations we mischaracterize as nations in the greater part of Africa. From the viewpoint of truth alone, to subsume the non-Russian nations of Lithuania, Ukraine, Georgia and others under the concept of "Russia" bluntly contradicts objective fact. It makes as much sense as identifying the Irish with England. Obviously, too, the illusion of equating Russia and the USSR weakens our capacity to evaluate the supposedly internal problems of this empire. It blocks a full appreciation of its major sources of weakness. It is as harm-

---

Footnotes at end of article.

XUM

ful and misleading as calling the Soviet Union a "nation," whether Russian or plain Soviet.[4] Finally, it is equally evident that this persistent illusion produces an adverse psychological reaction among the peoples in the various nations so misidentified. The reaction of a Turkestanian, Latvian or Ukrainian being called a Russian is similar to that of a Slovak being misidentified as a Czech or an Irishman as an Englishman. In the eyes of the people involved the illusion suggests a stamp of approval on the present Red Russian Empire which holds them in bondage.

THE PITIFUL JOHNSON RECORD

Expressions of this illusion projecting Russia as the Soviet Union abound in this country. Generally, the press is notorious in this regard and, on the basis of it, spreads other fictions. For example, at the time of the 50th anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik revolution, we read this bit of fiction: "As the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics approaches its 50th anniversary, the theme of Soviet progress is sounded daily . . ."[5] Even as of this writing the USSR hasn't been in existence for 50 years, but then, for the editors of the paper, Russia is the USSR. Many of our intellectuals fare just as badly. For example, a study paper, which influenced heavily the Kennedy Administration, contains these gems of thought and conception: "But since the Soviet Union is now a powerful nation and may in time become an affluent one, it may be possible for the Soviets to learn to identify the cumulative mutual advantages to be gained from restraint, cooperation, or common endeavors"; "American security is precarious because it rests excessively on the threat of punishment against a nation, the Soviet Union, which has and will retain the power to devastate the United States."[6] With a determining conception of the USSR as a "nation," all sorts of wild ideas follow.

My good friend, Senator Peter H. Dominick of Colorado, once wrote to me, "You are, of course, absolutely correct in your article, but the public and most of the Congress consider and treat the Soviet Union as one country. Even the press considers one a 'Kook' if talk veers to the theory of separate nations bound together only by a system of common tyranny."[7] This interesting observation shows the amount of popular education that still is required on this crucial subject. The examples of fiction given above can be multiplied endlessly, for they appear almost daily in our press, periodicals, and other communications media. Here is a choice "intelligence report" on Czecho-Slovakia: "If you study such a map, you will find that Czechoslovakia, put together 50 years ago as an independent nation, is bordered by Poland, Russia . . ."[8] Of course, facts have it that Czecho-Slovakia is a state of two nations, Czech and Slovak, and is bordered not by Russia but rather by Ukraine in the USSR, but these elude what purports to be an "intelligence report." Worse still is this heavy dose of fiction in the report: "in World War I, Russia suffered approximately 10 million casualties at the hands of the Germans. In World War II, Russia suffered another 20 million, so that today there is hardly any family in Russia which has not lost someone to German militarism." As pointed out in my book *The Vulnerable Russians*, this partial myth was disseminated by President Kennedy in the Adzhubei interview in 1961 and in his American University address in 1963. The non-Russian nations bore the greater brunt of both wars, but by this myth you'd think the Russians did all the suffering!

How can we, in the shortest possible time, extricate ourselves from such illusions so that our policies and plans for all contingencies in relation to the Soviet Union may be more realistic and successful? Is the situation a hopeless one, considering the scope and extent of these illusions? Our ordinary, time-consuming processes of education certainly can't perform this task. What can is the enlightened leadership provided both by the Presidency and the Congress. In the former, addresses, pronouncements and policy statements could set the tone of new thought about the USSR; in the latter, a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations, concentrating on those in the USSR, could also provide our general citizenry with a new outlook on the USSR. It wouldn't take long for the press, academia, and other sections of our society to absorb the new concepts and patterns of thought regarding this most vital of all foreign policy subjects. In both instances, rapid re-education by contrast is provided by the pitiful record of the previous Johnson Administration.

Doubtless, the pathetic Johnson record is far more the responsibility of those cast as advisors than of the President himself, who actually had a minimum of interest in foreign affairs. For a political warfare analyst in the Kremlin, the following few examples of misconception and short understanding must have constituted a source of enormous encouragement and inspiration. In one of his earlier speeches, President Johnson observed "The common interests of the peoples of Russia and the United States are many—and this I would say to the people of the Soviet Union: There is no American interest in conflict with the Soviet people anywhere."[9] Here you have it—the USSR is Russia, the people are Soviet, non-Russian nationals are non-existent, and the substrate empire is a ghost. With this preconception, what can you expect of realism in policy formulation?

The President never learned the fundamentals governing the USSR, nor was he expected to with the type of advisors who surrounded him. Two years later he details further his conception of the USSR as follows: "Two days ago, not very far from here, I met with Chairman Kosygin of the Soviet Union. The nations we spoke for are two of the most powerful nations in all of the world. In the family of nations, two of the strongest have two of the greatest responsibilities."[10] Contrary to all facts, the USSR is viewed by the President as "a nation," and the participation of the Byelorussian and Ukrainian nations in the United Nations, albeit by puppet representatives, is also an apparition. The nonsensical aspect of this misconception was seen in many of LBJ's messages to the USSR as, for example, on the 49th anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik revolution: "On behalf of the people of the United States I send sincere greetings and best wishes to the people of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the occasion of their national holiday."[11] A national holiday for the Latvian nation, Armenian, Byelorussian and the other nations making up the peoples in the USSR? The contradiction is obvious.

One of the major foreign policy addresses by Johnson stressed the continuity of U.S. policies toward the USSR and Eastern Europe, based on these same misconceptions, and the bridges of understanding route, citing the nominally foolish Consular Convention, a new cultural exchange agreement, more East-West trade, an air agreement with the USSR and other superficial paraphernalia of our confetti diplomacy that the Russian rape of Czecho-Slovakia denuded to pulp. "Under the last four Presidents our policy toward the Soviet Union has been the same," declared Johnson.[12] When one looks at the record of phenomenal expansion in territory, influence, and domination by Moscow during the terms of our Presidents, extending to only ninety miles off our own shores, it is hardly one to gloat over for the sake of continuity. And this because the continuity applies also to the underlying misconceptions and misunderstanding of this policy. Johnson continued, "We want the Soviet Union and the nations of Eastern Europe to know that we and our allies shall go step-by-step with them just as far as they are willing to advance." What occurred in Czecho-Slovakia is enough to show the naiveté of grouping the USSR and the nations of Eastern Europe together.

The pitiful Johnson record goes on and on, but let us cite just a few more choice examples of unrealism, basic misconception, and negative understanding. In another address the President, with some shallow propagandistic bravado, declares "I call on every industrialized country—including the Soviet Union—to help create a better life for the people of Southeast Asia."[13] Aside from the evident fact that Moscow, through Hanoi, has had the U.S. by the tail in Vietnam for more years than any American wishes to remember, since when is the Soviet Union, a forced imperium of numerous countries, including Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania which formally we still recognize, a single "industrialized country"? The numerous absurd contradictions one is led into by the fundamental illusions should by now be quite obvious. Far worse, of course, are the higher generalizations derived from these contradictions and misconceptions, which shape our policy determination. For example, in his address to the United Nations, Johnson stated, "The great transition from colonial rule to independence has been largely accomplished."[14] Really?—in a period when the largest empire under Moscow has been formed from the Danube to the Pacific to the Caribbean, all within the short span of fifty years!

Nevertheless, leading to the tragedy of Czecho-Slovakia, President Johnson continued to exhort, "We will continue to build bridges across the gulf which has divided us from eastern Europe. They will be bridges of increased trade, of ideas, of visitors and of humanitarian aid."[15] And we were all led in part into the bind crystalized by the Russian invasion of Czecho-Slovakia. First, the bridges possessed too few lanes to allow for intercourse with the captive nations themselves as against the Red state toll-takers. Second, and more important, they failed to extend far enough into the Soviet Union, part of which after all is an integral section of Eastern Europe, to circumvent the impasse created in Czecho-Slovakia. Once again, as a fundamental formula, to get out of similar binds and to minimize wastes of effort, capital and even lives, as in Vietnam, the pressures must be directed toward and concentrated on the captive nations in the USSR itself. What a new and innovative departure this would be from a failing policy under the last five Presidents. It cannot be attained without the extinction of our basic illusions.

A SECOND FUNDAMENTAL ILLUSION

A second fundamental and persistent illusion in this country that hampers our policy is the myth of equating the USSR with the U.S. This myth is usually entertained by those who, unlike Senator Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, realize at least the existence of other people than just the Russians in the Soviet Union.[16] This illusion spreads the fiction that the USSR is a federal union of states like the U.S.A. It underlies the present fallacious usage of the nomer "the Soviets." Yet, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that the federal union of the United States came into being and expanded by the free will of previously independent and autonomous states and territories; whereas, in sharp contrast, the Soviet Union emerged entirely on the basis of armed conquest and the forced incorporation of conquered countries. However, few can forget how some of our experts have uncritically equated Ukraine with Pennsylvania,[17] others paralleling it with Texas, and one or two compar-

---

Footnotes at end of article.

XUM

ing Byelorussia with Massachusetts.[18] A *New York Times* editorial artlessly viewed the Soviet Union as "the second richest nation of the world,"[19] while in a report on the Soviet school system a United States Commissioner of Education simply dubbed "the U.S.S.R., as a nation."[20] These examples of fundamental misunderstanding can be multiplied endlessly, across the board of our society. As a matter of fact, even Khrushchev was inspired by the concepts of our former Vice President to speak of the USSR and the U.S.A. as "the largest nations of the world."[21] This is advantageous but blunt contradiction to USSR's constitution and all his previous and subsequent statements for internal empire consumption.

Sadly enough, this second basic illusion persists to this day. Is it little wonder that our people still cannot appreciate the tremendous fact of Moscow's colonial domain, inside as well as outside the USSR? With no exaggeration, the Soviet Union, behind its nominal facade of federalism, is the greatest and worst empire in the pages of human history. Reading Russian organs, such as *Izvestia, Pravda* or *Trud,* will not convey this basic truth. Unlike American correspondents and observers, European analysts concentrate also on the organs of the non-Russian republics and get to understand the scope of colonialism and imperial rule within the Soviet Union.[22] Nevertheless, to his very last day in office Secretary of State Dean Rusk believed areas such as Ukraine, Armenia and Georgia are "traditional parts of the Soviet Union." Clinging to the USSR—USA illusion, he never repudiated his observation that "Reference to these latter areas places the United States Government in the undesirable position of seeming to advocate the dismemberment of an historical state."[23] Since when is an imperial state scarcely fifty years old "historical" and its parts "traditional"? But such are the absurdities we arrive when our fundamental concepts are invalid, unrealistic and misleading.

It is sincerely hoped that as we enter another decade these and other illusions will be extinguished. Such necessary extinction can only come with a radical revision of our concepts pertaining to the Soviet Union, the sole major threat in this world to the security of the United States. It is ironical, indeed, that Red China, in its rift with Moscow, had alone emphasized the imperial nature of the USSR, so much so that as far back as 1964, Khrushchev screamed "Things have gone so far that the Chinese leaders are making territorial claims on the Soviet Union and one wonders that they do not suggest the dismemberment of the Soviet Union."[24] Other empires have collapsed; there is nothing sacred about the USSR, and its collapse would be the greatest boon to all mankind, including long enslaved Russian people.

The necessary revision of concepts would naturally lead to an equally necessary alteration of policy. Following the Russian rape of Czecho-Slovakia, Lord Caradon, the British delegate to the U.N., was excessively restrained when he retorted to Jacob Malik's defense of the rape in these words, "I like to remind my Soviet colleague that my country has done more to end imperialism than any other country in the history of the world."[25] The Russian's insular retort was, characteristically, "Don't stick your nose into other people's affairs," the old Russian nonintervention technique where it contravenes Russian intervention in other peoples' affairs. Why the U.S. delegate, in the spirit of Adlai Stevenson's memo of 1961, wasn't more forceful in this debate is a good question. Now with the Brezhnev Doctrine, justifying all sorts of Russian adventures into other peoples' affairs in order to maintain Russian hegemony over Moscow's extended empire, we can prepare for more "We told you so's." For the doctrine, with all its nominal socialist embellishments, is nothing more than a contemporary version of traditional Russian imperialism and can be successfully countered only when we begin to center our diverse efforts on the empire within the empire. Then, too, we may also say, "We told you so."

FOOTNOTES

[1] *Congressional Record,* U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C., September 11, 1968, p. H8532.

[2] A few of these are pointed out by Victor Zorza, "Nationalism Has Soviet Union Worried," *The Sunday Star,* Washington, D.C., February 23, 1969.

[3] Richard M. Nixon. Address to American Legion, *Congressional Record,* October 28, 1968, p. E9522.

[4] E. g., John F. Kennedy, *State-of-the-Union Address,* text, January 30, 1961.

[5] "Soviet Progress," Editorial, *The Evening Star,* Washington, D.C., November 2, 1967.

[6] Vincent P. Rock, Study Phoenix Paper, *Common Action For The Control of Conflict,* Institute For Defense Analysis, Washington, D.C., 1963, pp. 20, 58.

[7] *Letter,* August 13, 1965, with reference to article "The Second Treaty of Moscow."

[8] Lloyd Shearer, Ed., "Intelligence Report," *Parade,* Washington, D.C., September 22, 1968, p. 4.

[9] "Text of President's Speech on U.S. Aim to Keep Peace," *The Washington Post,* June 4, 1965, p. A6.

[10] "LJB: 'Count Your Own Blessings,'" *The Washington Post,* June 28, 1967, p. A14.

[11] "Lyndon Sends Reds Note On Anniversary," *Chicago Tribune,* Chicago, November 7, 1966, p. 18.

[12] "On Improving Relations With Eastern Europe," *The New York Times,* October 8, 1966, p. 12.

[13] Text of President's Speech on Viet Nam Policy," *The Evening Star,* May 13, 1965, p. A–7.

[14] United Nations, December 1963.

[15] Text of President's Speech at Marshall Library, *The Evening Star,* May 24, 1964, p. A–23.

[16] See *Congressional Record,* August 10, 1961, p. 14316.

[17] E.g., George F. Keenan, *American Diplomacy* 1900–1950, The University of Chicago Press, 1951, p. 135.

[18] *Review of the United Nations Charter,* Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 1955, p. 1832.

[19] "Khrushchev Asks for Credits," June 6, 1958.

[20] Lawrence G. Derthick, "Inside Soviet School System," *Congressional Record,* June 24, 1958, p. A5746.

[21] Text of Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's Statement, *Soviet News Agency Tass,* August 5, 1959.

[22] E.g., an outstanding account on record, "Colonialism in the Soviet Empire," *New Zuericher Zeitunfl,* Switzerland, November 20, 1960.

[23] Dean Rusk, Letter to the Honorable Howard W. Smith, U.S. House of Representatives, August 22, 1961.

[24] Nikita S. Khrushchev, Address, Prague, Czech-Slovakia, September 5, 1964.

[25] "Briton's Jibe Angers Soviet Envoy," *The Washington Post,* September 12, 1968, p. A22.

[News release, National Captive Nations Committee, May 26, 1969]

MEMORANDUM ON "10TH"

Dear Associated Members: In two months we will be observing the 10th Anniversary of the Captive Nations Week Resolution. As in previous years, NCNC is coordinating the Week observance and, on this special occasion, urges each of our 37 organized committees to prepare and act on the following plans:

1. The Week falls in the period of July 13–19, 1969 and is highlighted as "The 10th Anniversary of the Captive Nations Week Resolution," and calls for maximum use of all available media to focus attention on the captive nations.

2. A quick response to inquiries on the background of the Week can be furnished by providing copies of NCNC's chairman's book *The Vulnerable Russians,* which is now in its second printing and can be acquired by writing to the Georgetown University Bookstore, White Gravenor, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. 20007.

3. The "10th" can also be impressively featured by ordering "10th Anniversary Captive Nations Medals" in silver and bronze from Mr. Viktors Viksnins (312–588–2085) of the Captive Nations Friends Committee, 4146 N. Elston Ave., Chicago, Ill. 60618. These would make wonderful presentations for persons to be honored in your area. NCNC has ordered a quantity to honor Congressmen and Senators at the Washington Banquet.

4. Most important for our cause and the fundamental importance of the captive nations to U.S. security is the 10th Anniversary Banquet planned by NCNC for Wednesday, July 16, 1969 at the University Club, 1135 16th St., N.W., Wash., D.C. at 6 p.m. (reception) 7 p.m. (dinner). To show full solidarity of our effort, your committee is requested to order at least a table of 8 at $12.50 per person. Individual captive nations groups will order their tables according to nationality background. Dr. Ku Cheng-kang of China and Mr. George Meany, AFL–CIO President, will be honored on this momentous occasion. Because of limited seating at 200, orders will be honored on a first-come-first-serve basis, *with a deadline of June 30, 1969* and submitted with check payable to the National Captive Nations Committee to our financial secretary, Mr. Walter Pretka, 797 Princeton Place, Rockville, Md. 20850. This is a high point of this year's observance, and we depend on your enthusiastic cooperation for our mutual success.

5. *The themes we propose are:* "The 10th: Let's Not Forget the Captive Nations"; "Only An Honorable Peace With Self-Determination by South Vietnam"; "A New, Realistic Policy Toward Russia and the USSR"; "Let's Launch Now on This 10th a Drive for America's 200th Anniversary of the Spirit of Independence in 1976."

6. Enclosed is our brochure for publicized use in your area and in preparation for a Captive Nations Conference in Washington this September, about which we would appreciate your views at the forthcoming July Banquet.

Hoping for your full support in July and the best Week ever.

Sincerely,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY.

[News release, the National Captive Nations Committee, June 9, 1969]

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTION

In the interest of our national security and in pursuit of truth through open public discussion, we invite our communications media to undertake for a brief period what can rightly be called "Education for Freedom by Contrast." This can be done through public service time and space. There has been more than enough concentration on campus riots, poverty campaigns, racism and other domestic, implosion factors; for realistic balance, let our people know how the other half of the world lives, particularly the captive nations in the USSR.

The period of such constructive exposure is the 1969 Captive Nations Week Observance, scheduled for July 13–19. It will highlight the 10th Anniversary of the Captive Nations Week Resolution, which our Congress passed in July 1959.

As the record shows, in our times no ideational force has sobered Moscow more than this very resolution. Part of this record is documented in significant detail in the book *The Vulnerable Russians*, which is now in its second printing and can be purchased from the Georgetown University Bookstore, White Gravenor, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. 20007. The work explains the Nixon-Khrushchev encounter over the resolution ten years ago and why to this day the Russian totalitarians have vehemently opposed it for their own comparative advantage.

In advancing the unique captive nations concept, NCNC is coordinating the observances of local and state committees in all sections of the country and, through the World Anti-Communist League in Seoul, Korea, in 17 Free World nations. Large rallies are being planned in Buffalo, New York City, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Chicago, Phoenix, and Los Angeles.

In the Nation's capital, Congress will again observe the Week, and a stronger proclamation by the White House is expected. A highlight of the observance will be a 10th Anniversary Captive Nations Banquet on Wednesday, July 16, 1969 at the University Club, commencing at 7 p.m. On the occasion, Dr. Ku Cheng-kang, first President of the World Anti-Communist League and head of the Asian Peoples Anti-Communist League, will be honored along with ten Honorables of our Government for their unstinted support of the captive nations movement.

NCNC was virtually alone in predicting the Russian rape of Czecho-Slovakia in 1968. It is urging the following themes for the "10th": "No Forced Coalition Government in Saigon," "A New Realistic Policy Toward Russia and the USSR," "Imperio-Colonialist Moscow is the Chief Enemy to World Peace," "No Deals With the Red Empire."

[News release, Captive Nations Committee, Arizona]

July 13–19 has been designated as Captive Nations Week 1969.

This is the 11th observance of a week set aside to remind us that captive nations—the peoples themselves as against the totalitarian Red states and their Communist Party apparatus are still very much captive.

The Captive Nations Week Resolution was passed by the United States Congress in July 1959. The Resolution was adopted as Public Law 86–90 which designated the third week in July of each year as Captive Nations Week.

The purpose of this observance is to remind the world of the plight of the unfortunate people in nations enslaved by the international Communist conspiracy. It also symbolizes for billions of captive peoples the firm dedication of America to their freedom and independence.

More than any event, it shows the right things about America stand out most when contrasted with the combination of political oppression and rampant economic poverty that exists in the Red Empire, particularly, the Soviet Union.

We, the citizens of Arizona, can back up these actions by our whole-hearted participation in our local observance of Captive Nations Week—in a rally that will be held July 15 (Tuesday) at Grady Gammage Auditorium at 8:00 p.m.

[News release, Captive Nations Committee, Arizona]

PURPOSE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEES

The purpose of the National Captive Nations Committee is broad and multiple in scope:

First and foremost, firm adherence to our Declaration of Independence—that we Americans, in the interest of our own national security, will never forget the captive nations or accommodate ourselves to their present captivity.

Promote and accelerate the freedom aspirations of the peoples of the captive nations, to which they are entitled by their Creator.

Continuous rejection of existent colonialism effected by Russian aggression and "wars of liberation," and focusing world attention on the last remaining empire, the Soviet Union itself.

Restore the great image of America and defend every point of NCNC's purpose—a challenge to every American's courage of convictions and conscience.

A resolute stand against misleading Cold War theories of "peaceful coexistence," "lessened tensions," "trade with Red countries," "bridges of understanding," etc., while the rape of nations exists.

Regardless of political persuasion, instill in all men their sacred duty and responsibility for the preservation of freedom in the full tradition of our American Revolution.

Mr. Speaker, it was my priviledge to participate in a Captive Nations Week rally in Taipei, Taiwan, on Thursday, July 10, 1969. From this rally I would like to insert into the RECORD as a continuation of my remarks the following:

Message from President Chiang Kai-shek supporting Captive Nations Week;

Address by Chairman Ku Cheng-kang;

Speech by Vice President Yen Chia-kan;

Remarks by U.S. Ambassador McConaughy;

Cable message to President Richard M. Nixon;

Cable message to captive nations and people; and

Message to the Armed Forces of the United States of America, Korea, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, and Thailand in South Vietnam.

I also insert, Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD, an editorial of July 9 from the China News which typifies the press commentary in the Republic of China on the occasion of Captive Nations Week observance.

The material follows:

PRESIDENT CHIANG KAI-SHEK'S MESSAGE TO THE TAIPEI RALLY SUPPORTING CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Since 1959, the United States has been observing the third week of each July as Captive Nations Week to support the aspirations of people all over the world for justice and freedom. This movement has elicited a profound response and has had a far-reaching effect throughout the world. Sympathy and support have been aroused for captive peoples, strong anti-Communist tides have been raised behind the Iron Curtain and lethal blows have been dealt against the dark reign of Communist wickedness.

As I have said before, the Chinese Communist regime is the source of all the evil in Asia and must be destroyed before the evil can be eradicated. This means that the free world must concentrate its strength and finally dispose of the Mao regime, the most evil enemy of humankind within the Communist camp, so that the people can be delivered from slavery. In the last few years Mao Tse-tung has carried out a "cultural revolution" in an attempt to seize power, prolong his personal totalitarian rule and destroy the cultural traditions of the Chinese people. Last spring he brought together a nondescript group for the so-called Ninth National Congress. This represents not the end of the "great cultural revolution" but the beginning of another round in the bloody struggle of power-seizure. The evidence of this is clearly to be seen since Congress adjournment in the mounting anti-Maoism within the Communist Party and the anti-Communism outside the Party. Now at the end of his rope, Mao Tse-tung can be expected to lash out in a last frenetic struggle and to subject our mainland compatriots to more atrocious persecution and pull tighter the bonds of slavery.

We have always felt the suffering of our mainland compatriots as though it were inflicted on us. We have never failed to push forward in our task of preparing for early counterattack to deliver them from their crucible of suffering. The anti-Mao struggle that our mainland compatriots have carried out in diverse ways is now a solid, substantial movement of Mao suppression and national slavation. This assures a new opportunity for our counterattack and guarantees final success. We are confident that in winning anti-Communist hearts on the mainland and joining with formidable anti-Mao forces, we can deal blows from within and without that will sound the death knell of the Mao regime.

I have often said that we do not need even one soldier from other countries of the free world in our counteroffensive against the traitors on the mainland. What we do require is the free world's moral support. Anti-Communism is the common responsibility of all free people. The Communists will never limit their aggressive ambitions to one country or one region. They seek to conquer the whole world and all humankind. In their counterattack, the free nations should not fight individually and run the risk that Communists will defeat them one by one. Adopting a consistent strategy, we should combine together for joint operations. World peace, security and freedom are not divisible. The loss of any one of these anywhere in the world will affect the destiny of all of us.

Because the root cause of Asian turmoil and insecurity lies in the Maoist usurpation of the Chinese mainland, we must deliver the Chinese people from Maoist slavery and restore their life of freedom and democracy. Only then can we assure the stability of Asia and the world. All the people of this island bastion of the Republic of China, civilians and military have joined hands with the anti-Mao and anti-Communist freedom fighters on the mainland and have sworn to fight to total victory in this sacred struggle. We pray that the peoples and countries of the free world will understand that man cannot exist half free and half slave. If they do so, they will surely summon their courage in the cause of justice and make the sacrifices required to rescue those who are enslaved and to assure peace with honor and freedom without qualification for all the people of the earth.

ADDRESS BY CHAIRMAN KU CHENG-KANG AT THE MASS RALLY IN SUPPORT OF THE STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS AND PEOPLES

Your Excellency, Distinguished and Honored Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: Full ten years have gone by since Congressional leaders in the United States initiated the "Captive Nations Week Movement" in 1959. Events in these ten years have made clear several vitally important trends in the world situation.

First: International Communism and the authoritarian Communist Party rule that exists in various countries—which together constitute the darkest and most barbarian force of enslavement known in the history of mankind—have already revealed themselves to be ideologically bankrupt, fragmented, and the object of everyone's contempt. These phenomena reflect the decline of the entire Communist movement. Fundamentally, it means that man has reached the turning point toward victory in his fight for freedom and in his struggle against enslavement.

Second: In the last decade, the awakening of and efforts exerted by the free peoples toward unity has unceasingly progressed. From anti-Communist unity among the people, we have progressed to strengthened cooperation and mutual assistance among the governments of nations. From a tendency among newly formed nations to placate or align with the Communist nations, we now see them taking up a steadfast anti-Communist stand. From anti-Communist activities in the free areas of the world, we now witness a vast wave of struggles for freedom behind the Iron Curtain.

Third: And yet, there has remained in these ten years an undeniable cross-current; a cross-current caused by the swelling of appeasement. And this surge of appeasement is a result, on the one hand, of a last gasp of the declining Communist influence, and, on the other, of a loss of courage and fighting spirit among certain nations. It represents, as President Nixon said, a decline in idealism.

It is precisely because of these three phenomena that the present complications have arisen. Freedom continues to grow and burgeon, and the movement to achieve freedom continues to expand and advance. But the final victory of freedom has yet to be achieved. And in many areas, the threat of the evil influence of Communism remains unabated.

It is my belief that this is a phenomenon that should not exist, yet exists; a tendency that should not grow, yet grows. We have the utmost faith that, under the present trend of historic development, the enslaved and oppressed peoples will achieve freedom. At present, we have only to hold righteously steadfast and to exert our efforts in the following three areas so that we may achieve our goal of winning the victory of freedom.

First, we must take urgent steps to encourage political turmoil behind the Iron Curtain, aggravate internal contradictions and dangers, and assist the development of freedom movements and anti-Communist uprisings. We must first proceed firmly with the Anti-Mao and National Salvation United Front movement. We must take advantage of the internal unrest and agitation that is following in the wake of the Chinese Communist 9th Congress and offer every assistance to the anti-Mao, anti-Communist movement on the China mainland and to the united anti-Communist, anti-Mao regime activities of the Communist armed forces and cadres, the intellectuals, peasants and workers, and the minority border groups. Then, we must urge world forces of freedom to aid the continuation and expansion of freedom movements in Eastern Europe. This step is especially urgent in our effort to disperse the Communist movement and eliminate the Communist camp since the recent world Communist Congress in Moscow revealed that splits continue among the various national Communist parties and freedom and independence movements are rising in the captive nations. And, finally, we must appeal to the free world, especially to those nations in a position of leadership, not to abandon their basic ideal and moral responsibility of "liberating" the Iron Curtain nations. We strongly believe that removal of the Iron Curtain in Asia constitutes the most effective way to buckle and eventually collapse the Iron Curtain in Europe. By supporting the Republic of China in leading and completing the anti-Mao and anti-Communist fight on the mainland, we will achieve our goal without an all-out war and without the threat of a nuclear war.

Second, we must bind still tighter in unity the forces of freedom throughout the world to form a united front against international Communism in response to President Chiang's call to "let a united free world defeat a fragmented, contradictory Communist bloc." In this respect, we must work hardest at establishing at an early date regional security organizations in every part of the world. Mao Tse-tung and the Chinese Communists are not only the source of all the evils in Asia, but also constitute a serious threat to the well-being of the entire world. Therefore, there is all the more urgent need to accelerate the establishment of a regional security organization for Asia and the Pacific region. We must be determined and united in halting the spread of international Communism and in breaking up its insidious burrowing. In terms of common anti-Communist action among the peoples of the world, we have already laid a foundation in the World Anti-Communist League. But we must advance further to achieve close anti-Communist ranks among the free nations of the entire world and use our combined strength and unit to defend ourselves and to defeat Communist enslavement. In addition, we must seek the speedy formation of a world-wide common strategy against the Communists. Not only must we possess a common strategy in our fight against Communism, but we must also formulate a common strategy in talking with the Communists. Thus, we may achieve victory at the conference table as well as on the battlefield.

Third, it is still more imperative that we should exert effort on the critical struggle to cure at its root the ill of appeasement. The free world must revivify the spirit of idealism, courageously uphold the dignity of man and his freedom, and exert the greatest and most beneficial efforts without giving in to, retreating from, or currying favor with Communism. Therefore, the free world must: (1) remain adamant in opposing the admission of the Chinese Communists into the United Nations; (2) abandon the ill-conceived move of establishing diplomatic relations with the Chinese Communists; (3) eliminate the hallucination and misconception that it is possible to maintain "peaceful coexistence" with the Communist enslaver; (4) give a fatal blow to the expansion and aggression of international Communism; (5) oppose any intrigue of international Communism to set up a coalition government in South Vietnam; the United States must beware of a rise in the tendency toward a new isolationism and take effective preventive measures.

That freedom will be victorious is foreordained, but I have confidence in exerting efforts in the above-mentioned three areas. Freedom will achieve its victory at an earlier date. Today, as we are gathered here in observance of the 10th anniversary of the Captive Nations Week movement sponsored by the United States, I offer a guarantee to you representatives of friendly nations and to Congressman Derwinski, who represents the United States on this occasion. I guarantee that in this bitter struggle of historic importance, the people of the Republic of China will stand shoulder-to-shoulder with all freedom-loving peoples in the world to win freedom for all mankind until the freedom achieves its final and total victory.

Vice President Yen Chia-kan's Address to the Taipei Rally Supporting Captive Nations Week

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Guests, Anti-Communist Fighters, Ladies and Gentlemen: The Captive Nations Week initiated in 1959 by U.S. Congressmen and ever since given universal support by the free world has today attained its tenth anniversary.

In the history of the world anti-Communist movement, the Captive Nations Week and the Freedom Day both symbolize man's struggle to fight against slavery in pursuit of freedom. The Captive Nations movement seeks to tear down the Iron Curtain and help captive peoples regain their freedom. This has not only stressed the free world's lofty ideals in maintaining righteousness and human rights but has also inspired the confidence of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain in the fulfillment of their aspirations to survival and freedom. Though the world still remains only half free, the world-wide anti-Communist revolution is gaining ground and momentum due to Communist disunity, widespread uprisings behind the Iron Curtain and increasing anti-Communist solidarity of the free world. Under these circumstances, observation of the Captive Nations Week in consonance with our political march toward the China mainland is highly significant.

In the last half century, more than a billion people have been shut behind the Iron Curtain. While this tragedy was brought about as a result of Communist infiltration, subversion and armed aggression designed to communize the whole world, it was also attributable to the free world's failure to be on the alert and the rising tendency to appease Communism. Of the peoples thus victimized, the Chinese have suffered the most. As early as 1921, after international Communism was frustrated in its designs to expand into Western Europe, its attention was shifted to China as its new target. Since then the Communists have obstructed efforts at national unification and reconstruction in an attempt to turn the China mainland into a base for expansion and aggression in Asia. Unfortunately, it was not until the fall of the China mainland that the free world community began to understand the role we played in the anti-Communist struggle. Its indifference in place of compassion and its interference in place of support have thus finally led to the communization of the mainland!

With Communist occupation of the mainland, millions of the Chinese people fell under the yoke of Mao Tze-tung's totalitarian rule. In the last two decades, the free world has witnessed many bloody occurrences. Thousands upon thousands of the Chinese people have died under Maoist tyranny. The mainland has truly been turned into the darkest of hells. However, the Maoists are not content with enslaving the Chinese people alone.

As adherents to Marxism, Leninism and Stalinism, they have resorted to the use of force for external expansion to fulfill their dream of world hegemony. From Korea to Vietnam, from Asia to Africa, and from the Middle East to Latin America, virtually not a single place has been spared from the violence incited or instigated by the Maoists. The fall of the China mainland to the Communists, therefore, resulted in the erection of the world's biggest Iron Curtain and has posed a prime threat to world peace.

For the last two decades, we have continuously stood in the forefront of the anti-Communist cause. We have engaged in preparations for mainland recovery and have been steadfastly waging a political warfare against the Chinese Communists. With more than 40 years' experience in anti-Communism, we are convinced that the anti-Communist war is primarily an ideological one. To win the final victory, we must first overwhelm the enemy on the political front.

After years of unremitting efforts, we have brought together the hearts of our countrymen living at home and abroad and within and outside the enemy's frontiers and successfully formed the Anti-Mao and National Salvation United Front. Our righteous call has engendered towering anti-Communist tides on the China mainland and has directly or indirectly prompted schisms in the Chinese Communist Party, violent struggle among Red cadres and demoralization in the ranks of the Red forces.

With the situation becoming increasingly favorable to us, we feel an urgent need to intensify our political march, hasten the collapse of the Peiping regime and thereby eliminate a major source of all the evils in Asia and the world. We are confident that our achievements on the political battlefield will lead to the disintegration of the Iron Curtain and the liberation of our suffering compatriots.

In this decisive stage of our anti-Communist struggle, we must emphasize that such a struggle is not confined to any one country or any one area. We do not expect to involve others in our anti-Mao and national salvation war. However, we do expect moral and material support from friendly countries and, more important, a united stand in the anti-Communist struggle.

The Maoists' evil deeds of the last few years have gradually made many free world people see the true image of the Chinese Communists and have led to increased vigilance. However, appeasement still exists on the international scene. If this is allowed to persist, the free world would not only feel disconcerted at the remembrance of the freedom fighters who have died in Korea and Vietnam and stand abashed before the freedom-loving people who have paid such a great price to assist captive nations in their anti-slavery and freedom-seeking struggle, but would directly abet Communist aggression while discouraging the uprising of enslaved people. Should that be the case, the free world would face endless turmoil.

History tells us that the appeasement of the Nazis almost buried all of Europe and that the appeasement of the Communists has compelled countless people of Eastern Europe and Asia to live a sub-human life. The free world has paid a heavy price for its forbearance and retreat. Such tragedies cannot be permitted to recur. I take this opportunity to urge all freedom-loving countries and peoples of the world to step up their support to enslaved peoples. Let us arm ourselves and clear away the inky appeasement shadows in a global movement of self-purification. The free world can win the ultimate victory in the anti-Communist revolution through steadfast struggle.

Remarks by Ambassador McConaughy at Captive Nations Rally, Taipei, Taiwan, July 10, 1969

Mr. Vice President, Chairman Ku, Committee Members, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is indeed a great honor for me to participate once again in the annual observance in Taipei of Captive Nations Week.

Ten years ago a Joint Resolution of the Congress of the United States authorized and requested the President of the United States to proclaim the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week until such time as freedom and independence should have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world. Human freedom, national independence and justice are fundamental rights of all peoples everywhere in our world. Unfortunately, the enjoyment of these basic rights is still denied in many areas of the world and our observance of Captive Nations Week remains a solemn obligation to remember those deprived of liberty.

The United States of America, in keeping with the principles on which it was founded, has sought consistently to further the observance of fundamental human rights throughout the world. Thousands of Americans have given their lives during the last few years for this very cause in the Republic of Viet-Nam. Americans have not only fought for the liberty of others beyond their own frontiers, but have struggled within their own borders to achieve a just and honorable society for all that could serve as a model for peoples everywhere. The United States, in close association with like-minded countries in all parts of the world, will remain steadfast to the great cause of the defense of man's inalienable right to freedom.

The part of freedom is not an easy one to follow but it is the only course that leads to the full flowering of the human spirit. It is a path that should be denied to none. That it is, in fact, closed to so much of the human race in this supposedly enlightened second half of the Twentieth Century is a cruel and indefensible injustice to which we must not become reconciled. The day when we no longer will need to observe the annual ceremony which we now attend will indeed be a blessed day for all peoples everywhere. In the meanwhile it is fitting that we should pause once each year to pay tribute to the victims of tyranny, and to renew our consciousness that our own freedom is not complete while our brother men in such appalling numbers remain enslaved.

Cable Message to His Excellency President Richard M. Nixon

Your Excellency: In holding a mass rally today in Taipei to observe the Captive Nations Week initiated by the United States in 1959, we, representing various walks of life in the Republic of China, should like to pay our higher respects to the United States for the preservation of human freedom and for smiting the Communist enslaving forces. One of the basic principles the United States ever holds is that freedom is one of the unalienable rights. This principle has been demonstrated by the United States, under Your Excellency's leadership, in her fight against the armed expansionism of the Communism. Your Excellency said in a speech to the graduating class at the Air Force Academy on June 4: "This is why I believe a resurgence of American idealism can bring about a modern miracle—a world order of peace and justice." These words have won praise and respect of all people in the free world.

At present time when the international Communist camp is going to fragment, and when the Peiping regime is confronting chaos and collapse within, The U.S. leadership and help are needed more than ever for the free world in this anti-Communist struggle and for the captive peoples in their resistance against the Communist enslavement. It is the expectation of all the freedom-loving people throughout the world that the United States would carry through her liberation policy and take active action in strengthening the free forces behind the Iron Curtain. In order to deal a deadly blow to the Communist aggressors, we are sure that the United States will support the Republic of Vietnam to win an honorable victory on the battlefield and frustrate the wicked design of the Communists to set up a coalition government in South Vietnam and to compel the unilateral withdrawal of the Allied forces. As the way for uniting the people in the free world into an anti-Communist force has been paved, a further step must be taken to develope a regional security system. Economic and military assistance from the United States is of unparalleled importance for Asian peoples to found a regional security system and to strengthen their defense. The Chinese Communists are the source of all Asia's troubles. The United States should take advantage of the chaotic situation on the China Mainland to help Chinese people in their fight to overthrow the Mao Tze-tung's tyrannical regime, and should stand firm against recognition of the regime, against its admission to the United Nations, and against any diplomatic or trade relations with it.

The people of the Republic of China pledge that they will stand shoulder to shoulder with the people of the United States and all free peoples over the world to set up an international anti-Communist and anti-Maoist united front, and will strive unceasingly until the day when the Iron Curtain has been lifted and the shackles bonding the captive peoples released. We salute you and hope the Sino-American friendship will last forever and our two nations' joint efforts in supporting the captive peoples in their struggle for freedom will score an early victory.

Yours respectively,

Ku Cheng-kang,

Chairman, Mass Rally of the People of the Republic of China in Support of the Struggle of Captive Nations and Peoples for Freedom.

Cable Message to Captive Nations and People

Dear Friends Behind the Iron Curtain: The people of the Republic of China took the lead to respond to the Captive Nations Week Movements a decade ago when it was initiated by the U.S. Congress and proclaimed by U.S. President Dwight D. Eisenhower. Now, this movement and the Freedom Day Movement, which marks the return to freedom of the 12,000 POWs in Korean War on January 23 fifteen years ago, have become two worldwide important occasions of commemorating the struggle for human freedom and against enslavement. To observe the Tenth Anniversary of the Captive Nations Week movement, we people from all walks of life in the Republic of China, are holding our Mass Rally in Support of Captive Nations for Freedom, here in Taipei. We like to reaffirm our support for your unflinching anti-Communist and anti-slavery struggle for freedom and justice.

It is evident that the Communists will bring forth more sufferings to peoples behind the Iron Curtain before their totalitarian and vicious rule comes to its fatal end. On the other side, captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain will also rise to resist in a more drastic pattern. Though the Czechoslovak anti-slavery movement is suppressed for the time being, the seed of the revolution against the Communist rule has been sowed and can never be destroyed. As the international Communist parties are in split among themselves, the anti-Communist camp is growing stronger in various aspects, and anti-Communist forces inside and outside the Iron Curtain are consolidated, the victory of the struggle for freedom and against enslavement has been guaranteed. The armed anti-Communist forces on the China mainland are rapidly developing. Cooperation among Asian and Pacific nations is being strengthened. Especially the so-called "new isolationism" was positively refuted by President Nixon; and the anti-Communist strategy of the U.S. is under an over-all revamping.

All these testify to the fact that a new anti-Communist situation is under development. But we all understand that freedom must be harvested through struggle. We shall never relax our fight. On the contrary, we should intensify our struggle and to deal a deadly blow to the enslaving rule in order to speed up the coming of the victory of freedom.

My dear friends behind the Iron Curtain, the Captive Nations Week movement will mobilize the free world to give you unceasing support in your fighting for freedom and against enslavement. Let us join hands to march toward our common goal and to launch fatal attack at the Communist totalitarian rule!

We wish you continued success and an early victory.

Sincerely yours,

Ku Cheng-kang,

Chairman Mass Rally of the People of the Republic of China in Support of the Struggle of Captive Nations and Peoples for Freedom.

Message to the Armed Forces of the United States of America, Korea, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, and Thailand in South Vietnam

General Creighton W. Abrams, Commander-in-Chief of U.S. Forces in South Vietnam, and all officers and enlisted men of the

XUM

Armed Forces of the U.S., Korea, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines and Thailand in South Vietnam: In response to the U.S.-sponsored Captive Nations Week movement, we, people from various walks of life in the Republic of China, hold our Mass Rally in Support of Captive Nations for Freedom today in Taipei. The Rally unanimously resolved to pay to you our highest respects for your heroic efforts in fighting in the battle front for the independence of the Republic of Vietnam, and for human freedom and world peace.

Having suffered a deadly blow and being on the edge of defeat, the Viet Cong is taking advantage of the "peace talks" to regroup and reinforce themselves. Fighting for human freedom against an undercurrent of international appeasement, your heroic and justice spirit has written down a glorious and brilliant page in the history of human freedom. While Allied forces in Vietnam are revamping their strategical disposition, we people of all circles in the Republic of China pledge to continue our struggle until we have recovered the China mainland and eliminated the Chinese Communists which are the very source of world menace today, to fight in a different field against our common enemy, and finally to win our early victory in liberating all captive peoples from behind the Iron Curtain.

We salute you and wish you continued success!

Yours respectively,

KU CHENG-KANG,

Chairman, Mass Rally of the People of the Republic of China in Support of the Struggle of Captive Nations and Peoples for Freedom.

[From China News, July 9, 1969]

NO MORE CAPTIVES

Tomorrow's Captive Nations Week rally will call attention to the tragic fact that since Communist aggression first began, no enslaved country has been liberated.

Hungary and Czechoslovakia tried and failed. They received no free world help and the Soviet Union did not hesitate to use its military strength.

North Korea was virtually free late in 1950. But the Chinese Communists came crashing across the Yalu and the United Nations forces retreated. In Asia the Communists still hold North Korea, North Vietnam and the mainland of China.

Captive Nations Week, which was started by President Eisenhower, is dedicated to the proposition that in the goodness of time, all the enslaved will be set free. That will be as true in Asia as in Europe.

The movement keeps alive the hopes of those who have waited so long for the free world to come to their rescue. To buoy their faith in liberation sparks anti-Communist activities on the Chinese mainland and elsewhere.

In this particular year, the freedom fighters who speak out during Captive Nations Week have a further obligation to warn against any addition to the list of the enslaved.

There are those in the free world who say that South Vietnam must be handed over to the Communists or to a coalition that in the end would mean the same thing.

Some Americans say they are weary of fighting, that if the South Vietnamese don't want Communism, they should fight their own war. They want to get out of South Vietnam at any cost.

The eyes of these appeasers can see no farther than Saigon. If they looked to Moscow and Peiping, they would find two Communist regimes that have never thought of withdrawing from Vietnam. Both are waiting for the U.S. pullout so they can move into the power vacuum.

What other nations might be captured in East Asia? South Vietnam is the prime target but not the only one. Laos is fighting Communists. So is Thailand. Malaysia fought once and may have to fight again. Communist threats lie just beneath the surface in both Malaysia and Singapore. Indonesia barely survived three years ago. The Huks are gathering strength in the Philippines. South Korea repels Red aggression as a daily occurrence. Communists seek to create civil turmoil to further their goals in Japan.

For 1969, Captive Nations Week dedication should be to the preservation of the nations that are already free as well as to keeping alive the liberation hopes of those who live in chains. The loss of even the smallest part will weaken the whole, as we have already seen in the communization of only three Asian lands.

The Republic of China has a further obligation because the Chinese Communists are the principal reservoir of aggression, danger and evil in this part of the world. If the Maoist Communist hold on the mainland could be broken, North Korea and North Vietnam would not remain enslaved for long. Soviet expansionism could be contained.

If the wall can be held in South Vietnam and further concrete steps taken toward free China's mainland recovery, there is every reason for confidence that the era of Asian captive nations can be ended within the foreseeable future.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago Congress by passage of a joint resolution inaugurated the observance of Captive Nations Week. On this our annual observance of Captive Nations Week in the House, I join in calling attention to the issue of self-determination and fundamental freedoms for 100 million people of East and Central Europe.

The years have been long ones for the people of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. Their subjection to Communist domination during and following World War II has tolled misery, blood, and sorrow.

The plight of these courageous people has testified to the world that individual freedom cannot exist in a Communist state. The incidents in Czechoslovakia last August are a continuing reminder of that fact. The world once again witnessed the undying aspirations of a people struggling for national freedom and their suppression.

This year I have reintroduced a resolution in the House of Representatives calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. Such a committee would focus on the problems of the captive nations and peaceful means by which we can assist the people of these nations in their just efforts to regain individual freedom and liberty.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, this is the 10th anniversary of the Captive Nations Week resolution which Congress passed in July 1959 and President Eisenhower signed into law as Public Law 86–90. Captive nations, of course, are not new to our generation; they date back to the establishment of the first geopolitical units. The history of Europe shows an almost continuing back-and-forth domination of one nation by another. Essentially every ethnic group has been a captive state at some time in its history.

In this century, captive nations have resulted largely from the Communist effort to dominate the world. Since the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 and the subsequent establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, buffer-zone territorial acquisition by the Russians resulted in the subjugation of numerous small neighboring states. In fact, one-half of the 16 constituent republics making up the Soviet Union are captive nations.

Other captive nations were drawn into the Communist bloc when the Iron Curtain was lowered over Eastern Europe and the Bamboo Curtain on the fringes of Asia. Other attempts at national enslavement have been made in Africa and Latin America.

For some national entities, such as Armenia and the Ukraine, captivity dates back almost one-half century. Despite this lengthy period of servitude, we should not assume this is a permanent condition. Nationalism is an unquenchable flame and we have many historical examples which regained independent status after hundreds of years of occupation and domination. Let us hope and pray that it will not take that long for the present captive nations to regain their freedom.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week is traditionally a time set aside to commemorate the noble struggle of weak and oppressed nations for freedom. This is not a new struggle. It is one that has been waged since man first appeared on this earth. And perhaps because it is such an old struggle we may sometimes overlook its overwhelming importance. Let us continually renew our concern for it.

There are peoples who have virtually never been free, who have never known life without the presence of the dark cloud of a dominant government, a repressive government, and a restrictive government. When we look at the tiny Baltic States, at Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and too many others, we realize how lucky we as Americans are. But the very fact that we are free, that we are strong, that we do govern ourselves, places a tremendous responsibility on us. We must strive with every effort to perpetrate our ideals of self-determination and liberty for all. We must let the captive nations know that their struggle is not ignored nor forgotten by manifesting our sympathy with their cause. We must conduct our Government and ourselves in keeping with our highest ideals as an example and inspiration to nations whose faith in democracy is constantly being tried, whose struggle for freedom constantly thwarted.

The repressions that we have witnessed in the past year in Czechoslovakia have drawn our sympathy; the reaction of the courageous Czech people has elicited our deepest respect. Theirs was a daring experiment; one, it seems, that was too daring, too threatening to the Russian system whose continuance depends on hard-line adherence to all its precepts and laws. We must continue to oppose

XUM

the precepts of that system. Our opposition should be focused on its defects, the limits it imposes on individuals and minorities and the freedoms it abridges.

Czechs are suffering and have suffered tremendously. That they are willing to continue to suffer shows their dedication to their beliefs. The setback they received last August in the visible form of Russian tanks was unjust and frightening. It was a shattering blow to the morale of a people who had been riding on the exhilarating crest of a wave of liberalism for six months. Russia had to stop that wave before it became too large and swept away her control. Freedom of the press and of speech were ended; liberal government leaders were removed; and hard line Russian puppets were restored. The Czechs are weary and depressed, but they have not given up. The press continues to be defiant and there is evidence of dissent from many diverse areas of Czech life—from intellectuals, workers, youth, and middle class. The knowledge that we support their efforts at liberalization is very important to their morale. We must continue to express our concern for their struggle and our belief in their ideals. We must let it be known to the world that we are opposed to any form of unjust oppression and that we support the striving of captive nations everywhere for independence and liberty.

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, each year during the month of July the American people and the citizens of 17 other nations of the free world observe Captive Nations Week. This week was established in 1959 by a joint resolution of Congress. Its purpose is to make the people of the world cognizant of the untold millions who suffer under the yoke of Communist imperiocolonialism.

Since its inception, Captive Nations Week has become a significant part of our national lives. Each year, Americans throughout the Nation hold appropriate ceremonies in remembrance of those individuals imprisoned behind the Iron, Bamboo, and Sugar Curtains.

It is fitting that this week should fall in the same month as the celebration of independence in the United States; for the people of the captive nations are striving for that which we have attained: personal liberty, political freedom, and the right of national self-determination.

For some 20 years, the peoples of the captive nations have suffered under the oppression of Communist rule with little or no freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion. These people, however, have not, and with God's help, will not lose their all-encompassing desire to be free.

Thus, with a great deal of pride and sadness do I rise today to speak in remembrance of our fellow men enslaved by communism. I, as I know all of the free peoples of the world, hope and pray for the time when Public Law 86-90 is no longer needed; the day when the peoples of the captive nations are free and are able to shape their own destinies.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in this special observance of the 11th annual Captive Nations Week.

We in Congress join with millions of Americans each year in expressing our determination to strengthen freedom and support liberty for the oppressed. Each year we call for liberation of peoples trapped by the tyranny behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains and those people living in captive nations renew their hopes as a result of our concern and support.

The right of people everywhere to determine their own future is a basic international right which America must continue to recognize in its foreign policy, in the United Nations, and in the hearts of our citizens. If this truth were universally accepted, there would be no bloodshed in Vietnam or in the Middle East and hundreds of millions of people in captive nations would be free today.

Perhaps the most important reason for this special week is to sustain the hope for freedom which continued to burn within the captive nations. Hope and faith in freedom will one day liberate those in captivity.

Just as today, we in America watch the first manned moon flight, so one day will we see millions of oppressed people enjoy the experience of freedom for the first time.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, there are many who are willing to bet the pessimistic prediction of George Orwell is correct, that the symbol of our age will be a boot stamping on a human face, forever. The peoples of the captive nations have long been victims of such a boot and the force it is using to destroy their rights and freedom recently has grown heavier. The example of Czechoslovakia is public notice to all the world and especially the citizens of the captive nations that the rulers of the Communist empire have no intention of recognizing personal liberty or a nation's right of self-determination.

Our proclamation of Captive Nations Week is one portion of a great body of evidence that the United States stands firmly against the oppression of personal liberty. A prediction such as that of Orwell begs for a challenge, and it is answered year after year by free people in words and actions. With our support the hopes of the captive nations will be bouyed to the end that soon they will be able to participate in world decisions speaking with a voice that is their own and not that of the wearer of the tyrant's boot.

America's heritage and character demand that we express full support for all on whom a despot treads. To do less would be to disavow our founding principles and to surrender to the apparent strength of present reality. We are as a nation committed to change when change will bring about self-determination and freedom of conscience and expression. We owe it to the captive nations, from whom we have drawn so much, to ally ourselves wholeheartedly with their efforts against enslavement and oppression.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, once again, we are gathered together solemnly in this Chamber to commemorate and protest the enslavement of untold millions of people behind the Iron Curtain. We commemorate Captive Nation's Week not in celebration, but in mourning for the past and present and hope for the future.

There are those among us, no doubt, who question the need for these ceremonies. Let them look to the treachery of the last two decades. Let them look to the forced detention and privation of the people of Albania, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, the Ukraine, East Germany, and Czechoslovakia. And, if after looking, they still cannot see, let them examine the freedoms afforded those suffering people. The rape of Hungary, the bloody suppressions of Poland and East Germany and only recently the murderous actions of the Russian tanks against the helpless Czechs stand as unimpeached testimony to the callous disregard of the Russian oppressors for their victims.

But, Mr. Speaker, oratory alone will not rent the Iron Curtain, nor will it remove the shackles of slavery. We must resolve not to offer our suffering brothers behind the red wall a hollow bone. We must constantly remind the world of the prostitute governments which rule these people illegally and immorally. And we must afford the people themselves a measure of hope.

The Godless dictators in Moscow have temporarily subdued the bodies of their victims, but they have not and they cannot conquer either their minds or their spirit. A man's mind and spirit remain free so long as he has hope and so long as he believes. Our moral responsibility is to give them reason, valid reason, to hope and to believe.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on this 10th anniversary of Captive Nations Week, I think that we should examine the threat of communism as a whole as well as offer praise and encouragement to the peoples of the captive nations.

Since 1848, when Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels collaborated on the Communist Manifesto, communism has been a threat to free society. The philosophy expounded in this treatise calls for the violent overthrow of all governments by the proletarian classes. This makes communism an international movement, a movement which supersedes all nationalities and national biases. This threat to free society became even worse with Lenin's ideological innovation: the power elite. Thus, communism's ideology changed from that of rule by the people to rule by an elite group of men who impose their will upon the whole country.

This is the threat of communism. We in the free world must not be fooled by false claims of friendship. Communists can never be our friends; they can only coexist with us. And even this cannot go on for long. Despite all claims of friendship and converging philosophies, their basic philosophy dictates the spread of communism. This is what guides all their actions.

It is true that today our country, as well as most other countries of the world, have instituted a great number of social reforms. Communism also stands for such social reforms. But, the one great difference between the free world and the Communist world is freedom itself. We in the United States and the other

XUM

countries of the free world have the freedom of choice; free people can choose their leaders, who respond to their wishes. The people of all Communist countries have their leadership imposed upon them. There is no freedom of choice.

Since the Communist revolution in 1917, when this philosophy was put into practice, they have followed a policy of expansion and coexistence, never retreating, always holding any ground gained. This is shown so well by the example of the captive nations. Back in the period between the revolution and Lenin's death, Soviet Russia expanded its borders by imposing its ideology upon the peoples of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Cossackia, Georgia, Idel-Ural, North Caucasia, Ukraine, Far Eastern Republic, Turkistan, and the Mongolian People's Republic. By aiding minority Communist revolutions, it spread its influence and imposed its power upon those small, proud countries. The first real period of coexistence came between 1924 and 1940, while the Soviet Union was building itself up from a weak, unstable country. Then, due to World War II, communism had the chance to expand, and expand it did. It expanded its influence in the west to Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Albania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and East Germany and expanded in the east to North Korea, Mainland China, Tibet, and North Vietnam. Now is the second period of coexistence. Will the next significant period be expansion, or will it be contraction?

But this coexistence is only a means to an end: that end is world domination by communism. As we can see by the example of Czechoslovakia, Soviet Russia intends to use all means necessary to maintain its influence over all Communist countries. Even though the world Communist movement has been committed to "base their relations on the principles of complete equality, respect for territorial integrity and state independence and sovereignty, and noninterference in one another's affairs," the Brezhnev doctrine supersedes any of these doctrines of "territorial integrity." This doctrine in effect says that Russia can interfere in the relations of any Communist state when the internal and external forces hostile to socialism seek to revert the development of any socialist country toward the restoration of the capitalist order, when a threat to the cause of socialism in that country, a threat to the security of the socialist community as a whole emerges, this is no longer only a problem of the people of that country but also a common problem—and of—concern for all socialist states. This, as well as the example of the captive nations as a whole, contradicts any statements relating to Communist self-determination such as the one in a Kommunist editorial of April 21, 1969, stating:

> Socialism guarantees the right of peoples to their own state system, their national language, their culture, and their national traditions, as well as equal opportunities for the representatives of all nations.

Therefore, we, as the leaders of the free world, have an obligation to lead the support for the oppressed people of the captive nations. The freedom-loving peoples of the Western world just by being free are a threat to communism and a shining light to the people under its yoke. We must not forget these peoples; we are in a never-ending struggle to liberate them. Liberty is the desire of all peoples, and liberty, not totalitarianism, is the world's destiny.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in the House in once again observing Captive Nations Week.

Ten years ago the Congress passed Public Law 86–90, establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week. The late President Dwight D. Eisenhower was the first Chief Executive to issue a Presidential proclamation to that effect.

The purpose of this observance, in part, is to remind those of us who partake of the blessings of freedom here in America that many millions of people in other areas of the world do not enjoy national independence. It also serves as public testimony that we in the United States have not forgotten those who are denied their rights of nationhood and that we have not abandoned our traditional role as champion of the right of independence for all the nations of the world.

It has often been said that the right of self-determination is the foundation on which all other rights rest. If self-determination is denied, no other right is secure. Millions of people today are forced to live in nations under Communist domination where the right to free speech, free press, and free assembly is held in utter contempt.

I know I speak for many in my own State of Illinois whose ancestral homeland is in one of the captive nations and who continue to pray that liberty will soon be restored to these gallant and long-suffering people. I know, too, that I speak for many Americans of all nationalities who share this same dream.

I am proud to join with the voices of the free world in rededicating ourselves in the great cause of liberty for all peoples. Our words and deeds must continue so that we can soon realize a day of true world freedom. I have faith that one day the people of the captive nations will once again be masters of their own destiny.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, the establishment of Captive Nations Week through congressional action in 1959 constituted a formal commitment by the American people through their representatives to reaffirm each year that the plight of the millions of people held in Communist captivity will never be ignored by or acceptable to Americans. The captive nations resolution demonstrates to the prisoners of these immoral and illegal regimes that the United States has not forgotten them. Observance of this week symbolizes our protest of this theft of freedom by the Communists.

We, in the United States, must show our support of the right of all people to pursue their political, economic, and cultural development as they deem best. It is certainly fitting that we in the free world who have enjoyed for centuries the priceless rights of democracy, do all that we can to give hope and support to those captive nations which aspire to national independence. Their moral is their strongest weapon, and we, who often take for granted the rights of democracy, can reinforce this weapon by showing that their plight is recognized and their energies are still appreciated.

There is no better time than today to suggest that we reverently use our freedom in the acquisition and maintenance of justice among men and nations. We would also reassure our brothers in captivity that America has neither abandoned them to the tyranny of communism nor forgotten their long, bitter struggle for freedom and self-determination.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, as I have over the years, I am glad once again to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the gallant peoples who live in involuntary servitude in the captive nations.

It is appropriate that we who enjoy the blessings of liberty pause for a time to reflect on the elemental human rights which are denied to the heroic peoples of Eastern Europe. Freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of the press are so elemental to our democratic way of life that we often fail to consider that oppressed peoples living under Communist tyranny have been brutally denied these basic human and political rights. However, this annual observance affords us an excellent opportunity to show our support for the right of all people to pursue their political, economic, and cultural development as they deem best.

Recent events in Czechoslovakia, Poland, and other Iron Curtain countries clearly demonstrate that the Soviet masters are learning that liberty cannot forever be stifled. The daring bravery of the Czechoslovakian people excited freedom-loving peoples everywhere, and served as a dramatic reminder to the Russian tyrants that freedom is destined to ultimately triumph over slavery.

It is my unceasing hope that the pressure of world opinion will soon force the soviet oppressors to release the captive nations from bondage.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, this week we commemorate the 10th observance of Captive Nations Week. It all began 10 years ago when this Congress passed the famous Captive Nations Week resolution that President Dwight D. Eisenhower thereafter signed into Public Law 86–90.

Since that time, the United States has conducted 10 annual weeks in symbolic behalf of the captive nations. Thus a fine tradition has been built and solidly maintained. And I am joining with my colleagues at this time in order to perpetuate this wonderful tradition.

One of the principal objectives of Captive Nations Week is the education of the American people regarding the captive nations, especially those in the Soviet Union. With a greater understanding of the problem, the people will better recognize and appreciate the current status of these nations and their courageous peoples.

XUM

I am pleased to note that the annual observance of Captive Nations Week has grown over the past 10 years. Evidence of this may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD each year.

One of the outstanding developments of the movement has been its reception in foreign countries. In 17 countries, ranging from Korea to Australia, India to Turkey, and West Germany to Argentina, the observance is now held regularly.

The movement has gained a firm foothold in Asia. For years now, the Republic of China has been in the forefront of Captive Nations Week rallies. And for the first time, the Republic of Korea issued a Captive Nations Week stamp to commemorate the 10th observance.

This is an appropriate time to discuss the issues which are of vital interest to the captive nations. These issues of course focus upon the course of East-West relations.

On a more personal note, this 10th observance of Captive Nations Week represents an important event that we should all remember. The courage and strength displayed by the brave peoples of these nations merits our attention.

I hope that by our action here today we have helped all the captive nations' citizens, as well as the American people, to see that we recognize the problems and are working to solve them.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this opportunity to make these remarks on the occasion of the 10th observance of Captive Nations Week.

Mr. **DINGELL**. Mr. Speaker, this year, Captive Nations Week serves as an especially timely reminder that the Communist threat to national and personal liberty throughout the world is clearly not an anachronistic fiction perpetuated by politicians and overzealous American patriots.

Indeed, the patently belligerent actions of the Communist governments during the past year can only reinforce our distrust to those who continue to suppress their own peoples, to subjugate those nations too weak to resist the use or the threat of armed force, and to strive toward eventual worldwide Communist domination.

Regardless of what those who urge us to trust our self-avowed enemies may intuitively want to believe, we simply cannot ignore the facts; we cannot overlook the manifestly aggressive and hostile actions of those whose foremost goal has never ceased to be the spread of their ideology to all parts of the world through calculated delusion and through overt force.

Certainly the blatantly imperialistic crushing of Czechoslovakia's move toward increased freedom cannot be ignored by those who desire liberation and self-determination for all of the world's subjugated peoples. Indeed, the Soviet military aggression on Czechoslovakian soil cannot be interpreted as anything but a desperate, 11th-hour attempt to suffocate the hopeful stirrings of democratic and libertarian sentiment which threatened to weaken the Soviet grip on that conquered nation.

We must remember also that the Czechoslovakian atrocity was not simply an isolated incident or a miscalculated over-reaction to a specific internal threat. On the contrary, the Soviet response to Czechoslovakia's muffled bid for freedom was yet another chapter in the historic succession of Communist takeovers, subversions, and acts of overt and covert oppression; it was merely a particularly blatant manifestation of the same basic Communist strategy we see being applied in Vietnam, in the Middle East, in Latin America, and in faltering new African nations.

That strategy has always been to forward the fundamental goal of world Communist domination by whatever means deemed necessary by the handful of dictators who pretend to speak for the more than 180 million people comprising the citizenship of the captive nations.

In view of these constant reminders of the plight of our friends imprisoned behind the Iron, Bamboo, and Sugar Curtains, Captive Nations Week should not be necessary to awaken us once a year from our complacency and our increasing tolerance of Communist belligerency. We are constantly confronted with the ruthless tactics of those who would deprive not only the already conquered regions, but also those of us fortunate enough to reside within the tenuous borders of the free world, of the truly essential human freedoms which we have come to take for granted.

In the face of ever-increasing dissatisfaction and criticism within our own country, we have repeatedly demonstrated that very quality which the most vocal dissenters insist is lacking in the United States, and which is indeed conspicuously absent in the captive nations: the right of free speech and lawful dissent. Contrary to the charges of many deluded Americans, the frequent and vociferous dissent which is allowed in this Nation is the mark of a truly free society which is sufficiently secure and confident of the support of its people to tolerate a wide range of divergent viewpoints, and to be responsive to the serious, constructive criticism that is offered.

We must dedicate this week to the heightened awareness of those who are not so fortunate, that we may be always reminded of their plight and may add our encouragement to their continued efforts toward liberation and self-determination. During this week, we must strengthen our determination to protect our cherished liberties where they now exist, and to work toward the ultimate goal of guaranteed basic freedoms for each individual and independence for all nations.

Mr. **HALPERN**. Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate the 10th anniversary of the Captive Nations Week resolution, it seems to me there is a lesson to be learned in the experience of the 27 captive nations of Eastern Europe. The price of freedom is eternal vigilence against despotism and ideologies that imprison men's minds.

For, although we in America are free of the tyranny of foreign domination, the freedoms that we enjoy must constantly be renewed by each generation if they are not to lose their significance.

And yet, as we constantly strive for a better, more decent, and just society, how modest our struggle seems, compared to the energies spent challenging Communist domination in Eastern Europe.

Over a decade ago the Hungarian people attempted to break open the iron claw of Soviet control, and they paid dearly in blood and sacrifice.

And last year, in events that caused the world to cry out in grief, the Czech people were forced to bow before the sheer military brutality of invading Soviet forces.

Although in both instances Soviet troops and tanks crushed the physical resistance to their presence, they failed to crush the fires of freedom that continue to glow in the hearts of these subjugated people.

As we express our solidarity with the citizens of the captive nations then, their hopes of freedom should serve as a reminder to us who so cherish our liberty that America must never cease its efforts on behalf of these people. In this endeavor, as we strive for a world free of war and despotism where a just and lasting peace can be realized for all, it is worth pondering the late President John F. Kennedy's thought that America's mission in the world is based "on a clearer recognition of the virtues of freedom as well as the evils of tyranny."

Mr. **DULSKI**. Mr. Speaker, it was just 10 years ago this week that Captive Nations Week came into being officially under a resolution passed by the Congress and signed into law by the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The resolution authorized Presidents to proclaim Captive Nations Week each year until such time "as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all captive nations in the world."

Our Nation is among 17 nations of the free world which join in this observance—which this year comes while there remains fresh in our minds the Soviet Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia last year.

It is thus especially timely to remind the world that our determination continues in refusing to acquiese, by deals or default, to the permanent captivity of over 27 nations and to continue to seek by every peaceful means to accomplish their eventual freedom.

While it is vital that we attend to immediate issues such as Vietnam and our national defense, we must at the same time continue to press our effort to free the captive nations.

Following is the text of the Captive Nations Week Manifesto for this year:

Captive Nations Week Manifesto, 1969

The undersigned organizations, dedicated to the restoration of freedom in the captive nations, call attention to Public Law 86–90, unanimously adopted in 1959 by the Congress of the United States, by which the third week of July each year was designated as Captive Nations Week.

The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968 and the subsequent enunciation of the so-called Brezhnev Doctrine have once again brought to the surface the entire issue of self-determination and fundamental freedoms for the one hundred million people of East-Central Europe. The tragedy of Czechoslovakia dramatizes the built-in instability of contemporary Europe rooted in the still

XUM

unresolved problems bequeathed by the Second World War. The Brezhnev Doctrine brings into focus the sad fact of the perpetuation in power of unpopular Communist regimes—imposed by a foreign power—that are not responsive to the will of the peoples over whom they rule.

The record of over two decades of Communist rule shows that the legitimate aspirations of the captive European nations have long been thwarted by Soviet hegemony over the area. Now, with the advent of the Brezhnev Doctrine, the USSR has in fact tried to make this arbitrary arrangement accepted on a permanent basis.

In the light of this doctrine, which is a justification for aggressive imperialism, the Soviet Union has in effect placed its own interests over the inherent right to national sovereignty and fundamental human rights of the peoples living in the Communist orbit.

This doctrine can have a far-reaching impact on the future of not only the captive European nations, but also of the free world. If the doctrine remains unchallenged, it may turn the United Nations Charter into a shambles. As a result of this doctrine, all Communist parties are expected to follow automatically the dictates of the Kremlin. The acceptance by the Communist governments in East-Central Europe of the new Soviet doctrine is tantamount to complete abdication of the sovereign rights of these nations.

The Brezhnev Doctrine is against the vital interests of all captive European nations, the Charter of the United Nations, international law and the accepted norms of civilized nations. It is therefore deemed essential that the free world oppose the newly enunciated Soviet policy of aggressive imperialism and defend the traditional principles and norms of international law, in order to maintain world peace, security and freedom for all nations.

For the peoples of East-Central Europe, it is important to learn of the continued determination of the free governments of the world to lend their moral and political support to the rightful aspirations of their captive East-Central European brethren.

While commemorating this year's Captive Nations Week:

We stress that the Soviet Union has demonstrably violated its solemn promises of freedom and independence to the nine nations made captive during and after World War II—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania;

We also stress that the Communist regimes in the East-Central European nations continue to be unresponsive to the will of the people by denying them the right to periodic and genuinely free elections.

We appeal to the free governments of the nations of the world:

1. To declare, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries, adopted by the United Nations on October 14, 1960, their support of the right to self-determination of all peoples held captive by the Communists and, consequently, to make this issue the permanent concern of the United Nations;

2. To repudiate the intent and objectives of the Brezhnev Doctrine, including its implied recognition of the spheres of influence and of the status quo in East and Central Europe;

3. To bring to world attention the urgent need for a responsible attitude by the free nations of the world designed to help bolster the morale of the East-Central European peoples and thus create a climate favorable to their quest for full national independence and individual freedom.

4. As part of this effort, we call on the United States Government and on other members of the Atlantic Alliance to maintain, and where possible strengthen, NATO's defense forces. This alone will help counter any temptation of further Communist aggression—by force or threat of force.

We appeal to the People of the United States of America to manifest during Captive Nations Week, July 13–19, 1969, their awareness of the importance of freedom for 100 million peoples in the Communist-dominated lands to the establishment of a valid European settlement and world peace.

CHRISTOPHER EMMET,
Chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations.

JOZEF LETTRICH,
Chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to take this occasion to call the attention of the Members and others to the article by Msgr. John Balkunas on "Religion Under Communism," as follows:

RELIGION UNDER COMMUNISM

(By Msgr. John Balkunas)

(NOTE.—The author is a noted American clergyman and lecturer. Monsignor Balkunas is also a cultural and civic leader of the American-Lithuanian community and President of the Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent, CACEED.)

The story of Communist persecution of religion in East-Central Europe is a sordid drama of hate and violence. Yet, even today, we see and hear reports by touring Westerners, including in some cases clergymen, who declare: "I have seen the crowded churches, the religious services, the priests and ministers." On the basis of a superficial glance, these tourists thus conclude that there is real freedom of religion in the Communist states.

Ideologically the Communists cannot permit loyalty and faith in a Divine authority. To do so would threaten the very foundation of the official materialistic philosophy. Atheistic communism cannot view man as an individual value possessing an immortal soul.

Although the Communists cannot succeed in rooting out a man's yearning for religion, they seek to replace faith in God with a secular cult dominated by the Communist ideology.

The Communist attack on religion and churches is generally carried out in four forms. First, terror and violence are employed against the clergy and the faithful. Second, religious groups are deprived of their newspapers, publications and books. Third, organized religion is either suppressed or is dominated by the Communist regime. Fourth, indoctrination of youth in Communist ideas is given top priority.

But despite these maneuvers, religion continues to exist and in some areas it even prospers. Parents give secret religious instruction to their children. Young people are insisting upon Church weddings and baptisms for their children. Feast days and religious festivals continue to be observed in spite of regime pressures.

ALBANIA

The Moslem and Orthodox Churches were purged and their hierarchy "nationalized." The Roman Catholic Church, which accounts for 10 per cent of the population, was persecuted by mass arrests of the clergy. All in all, however, the anti-religious campaign has not fulfilled its objective. In June 1967 a meeting of the Party Committee of Gjirokastra dealt with the questions of youth education and stated that it was not justified to assume that religion did not exist any more in Albania because churches and mosques were closed. On the contrary, religion was still alive among the people, including the youth.

BULGARIA

The Bulgarian Orthodox Church was transformed into a "people's Church," serving State interests. The regime created an Exarchate and Patriarchate in order to break off all external connections. According to an article that appeared in the April 18, 1968 issue of *Rabotnichesko Delo,* the percentage of Orthodox believers declined from 84.89 in 1948 to 75.25 in 1962. This could be attributed to the docility of the Orthodox leadership vis-a-vis the Communist regime. Although there was no official Catholic Church in Bulgaria, the number of Catholics doubled between 1934 and 1962. In the same period the number of Protestants quadrupled. The Muslims increased from 13.51 in 1945 to 18.88 per cent in 1962. Only ten thousand Jews remain in the country. Some 40,000 took advantage of the opportunity to migrate to Israel.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

After January 1968 the relations between the State and the Churches improved. The churches were permitted to submit their grievances and demands to the newly appointed special rapporteur of the cabinet for ecclesiastical affairs, the then Deputy Premier Dr. Gustav Husak. A procedure for rehabilitation of church leaders unjustly persecuted in the past was initiated. As a result of this new atmosphere, negotiations between the Holy See and Prague regarding normalization of their mutual relations are now taking place.

All Christian churches and religious communities rallied in support of the liberal Communist leader Dubcek and President Svoboda during the seven months of the "Czechoslovak Spring" (January–August, 1968) and, in particular, during the August invasion and later under the Soviet occupation. This move was spontaneous and sincere, since for the first time after twenty years of oppression the Churches enjoyed relative freedom.

At present, parents reportedly do not have to fear harassment for sending their children to classes of religious instruction. Nor is there yet any visible anti-religious propaganda, even though the Soviet and the Warsaw Pact countries' newspapers and magazines repeatedly stress the need to improve atheistic education and propaganda to ultimately eradicate all religions.

ESTONIA

The Soviet press is usually silent on the question of churches. Therefore little information is available on Church-State relations. For example, the Luthern Church of Soviet-occupied Estonia was granted membership in the Luthern World Federation at the Helsinki Conference of August 1963. The meeting was attended by the Archbishop of the Estonian Church, Jaan Kiivit. Obviously the Church could not apply for membership in an international organization without the approval of Soviet authorities. Despite this, the Estonian papers did not mention the admission of the Soviet Estonian Lutheran Church into the World Federation.

HUNGARY

A new situation has developed in the wake of last year's negotiations conducted in Budapest and at the Vatican. On January 23, 1969 Pope Paul VI filled ten Church posts in Hungary in one of the most sweeping moves to restore Church life in the country. The appointments ended a five-year deadlock between the Vatican and Budapest and affect the government of eight of Hungary's eleven dioceses. However, a Vatican announcement made clear that the two sides were still at odds over the status of Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty, who has been in self-imposed asylum in the American Embassy in Budapest since Soviet tanks crushed the 1956 uprising.

The Protestant Churches also had to face regime attacks. In 1967 the Reformed Church worked out a new constitution. Only persons approved by the regime belong to the new leadership. The Lutheran Church is headed by Bishop Ottlyk, whose direct contacts with the Party are generally known in Church circles.

LATVIA

Latvia is a predominantly Lutheran country. Of the 287 Evangelical Lutheran Churches in service in 1937, only 86 remained open in 1968. According to the regime-supported Church Yearbook for 1968, published in Riga, only 32 pastors are permitted to perform their duties. Others are forced to do manual labor. The Latvian Baptist Church is still administered by 60 pastors. Latvia's half a million Roman Catholics are serviced by only 70 per cent of the prewar clergy.

Latvian clergymen who are allowed to go to international gatherings in the free world do so as a part of Soviet delegations. The separation from the free world is so hermetical that theology students are never permitted to study abroad, and only in a very few cases have Western clergymen been permitted to officiate at church services.

LITHUANIA

Eighty per cent of Lithuania's 3,096,000 people are Roman Catholics. Police action against the clergy and the faithful continues. Churches have to pay high taxes. For example, the Cathedral of Kaunas has to pay an annual tax of 6,000 rubles. All Church buildings and chattels are property of the State for which the faithful must pay high rents. Every clergyman must register with the Council of Church Affairs. Priests are forbidden to communicate with the lay people or to teach children religion; they are ridiculed in the press and have no civil redress.

According to the law of May 20, 1966 parents guilty of any effort to educate a child religiously are liable to three years imprisonment. On June 29, 1968 a new family law was promulgated in Lithuania, requiring parents to bring up their children according to the Communist moral code. In the event they do not fulfill this obligation, the children may be taken from them, and they would lose their parental rights. A student accused of practicing religion or being a believer finds it extremely difficult to continue his studies in the universities. All government employees, teachers and students are under constant surveillance.

POLAND

The Roman Catholic Church in the course of Polish history has always identified itself with national ideals and has been considered a symbol of Polish freedom. Under the pressure of the events of October 1956, the Communist regime agreed to improve the situation of the Church. The Catholic Primate, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, reached a new agreement on Church-State relations. The agreement, while recognizing the lay character of the schools, provides for religious teaching for children who have their parents' consent.

Ever since 1957, the State—by means of administrative measures—has been trying to whittle away these advantages. Nevertheless, the relations between the Gomulka regime and the Church are probably better now than they had been during the past few years. Evidence of this is the granting of a passport to Cardinal Wyszynski for his visit to Rome. Suddenly it is not quite as difficult to pet a permit to construct a new church; it is not as difficult to get a permit for public processions on holy days. In fact, at a Corpus Christi procession in a village outside of Warsaw, the militia were even directing traffic.

But the Communist regime has not withdrawn from the battle. The regime has recently given considerable publicity to what is believed to be the first civil "christening" of a child in a civil registry office, with the authorities bestowing the name on the child in a completely civil ceremony. The same is true of marriages—efforts continue to make more of the civil signing of the registry book and thus denigrate marriage ceremonies in church.

RUMANIA

The era of open religious persecution came to an end a few years ago. The general amnesty of 1964 set free a great majority of political and religious prisoners. The octogenarian bishop Iuliu Hossu, the only survivor of the suppressed Catholic Church Hierarchy of the Byzantine Rite, is still incarcerated. Otherwise, only sporadic arrests and trials on religious grounds have been staged during the recent years.

Both the State and Church contributed to bringing about the uneasy, but relatively quiet coexistence. The clergy and faithful have painfully learned to limit their activities to strictly religious functions on the premises of the churches, and to individual pastoral guidance. Sermons must follow certain pre-established norms. Even anti-religious propaganda and indoctrination have changed their tone by being more subtle and more persuasive. Churchgoers continue to be tailed, but more discreetly. Children and youths generally are kept busy on Sundays with "voluntary programs."

RELIGION AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Since religion is one of the factors in the formation of man's convictions and disposition, and the Church is a repository of his trust and devotion, the resolute efforts of the Communist system to divert the action of religion and church to the service of its cause is understandable. Church and religion must either serve the Communist system, as in the case with the Orthodox Church in the Soviet Union, Bulgaria and Rumania, or the Church must be completely eliminated from social life.

One-third of the world's population is living under an atheistic system which is applying every possible means to destroy Christianity as well as other religions. This is undoubtedly the most dramatic struggle ever witnessed in the world's history of religion. Yet the situation of Christianity in the countries within the Communist orbit is not without hope.

Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights declares: "Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practicing worship and observance."

With this in mind, we hope and pray that the time will come when the free nations will effectively help make the Declaration applicable in the full sense of the word for all peoples. Our efforts and energies should be directed toward this aim. All freedom, it should be remembered, are secure within the freedom of thought and conscience.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, once again this Congress is meeting to proclaim and urge nationwide observance of Captive Nations Week. It is the 11th consecutive year that leaders of this Nation—the symbol of freedom to hundreds of millions still denied that basic right of man—formally issue words of hope and encouragement that one day all men may hold their heads high, proud in the knowledge that they too are free. Free to come and go as they choose; free to worship as they choose; free not only to think as they choose, but to express those thoughts in words and print; free not just to choose those who would govern them but also to criticize those governors.

Many of those living in the lackluster light of Communist domination are bound by ancestral ties with us here today. In some cases these ties may have loosened with the passage of generations; but in others, they are kept strong by communicating with relatives in lands where the liberties we long have enjoyed have either disappeared or never existed.

Just a few days ago, Americans across the length and breadth of this Nation celebrated the most important day in their history—the Fourth of July. That day is our own special symbol, our reminder of the time when this Government's forefathers broke the shackles which bound them to another country and other rulers. Those shattered chains of tyranny acted as a magnet, subsequently drawing millions of people to "the land of the free." America became known as the melting pot of the world where nationalities, religious and political beliefs and philosophies gradually mixed, resulting in a product of men who led this Nation to heights of greatness never before achieved in the history of this world. The strength of its greatness is its freedom; the belief all men are created equal with the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Yet we do not forget the nations of our parents and grandparents. In my congressional district, for example, customs and traditions of a multitude of nationalities are kept alive through various annual summer festivals which includes the famous "International Village," a gala 3-day celebration at McKeesport, Pa. The festival is one of gaiety, drawing together Slovaks, Czechs, Hungarians, Poles, Irish, Scots, Germans, English, and a host of others from the industrial area known as the Mon-Yough Valley. They sing, dance, and dress as did their ancestors, sharing in traditions which have spanned the centuries. But they are aware they can do so only because they are Americans and free to do so.

Last summer, a segment of those people were given a grim reminder how precious that freedom is. They, as you here must, remember Czechoslovakia in the summer of 1968. They, as you, read and heard how the Czech people sipped briefly the heady wine of freedom. They, as you, learned how quickly the sweet turned sour with a brutal retaliation for having even dared try to escape the yoke of domination.

In 1959, the late Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his office as President of these United States, proclaimed the third week of July as Captive Nations Week and invited the American people to observe the occasion with appropriate ceremonies and activities. Included in the official proclamation was the stipulation that similar action be taken each year "until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world." This has been done by the late President John F. Kennedy, former President Lyndon B. Johnson, and now by President Richard M. Nixon. How many such proclamations will be issued until their hopes are converted into reality, no one knows.

But we, as free Americans, and those citizens of captive nations, must never lose the courage to continue striving, in

XUM

any way we can, toward that day when freedom and justice replaces tyranny and terror in every corner of our God-given earth.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the observance of Captive Nations Week, a week which should have special meaning to all of us who have the very great privilege of living and working in freedom within the United States. This annual event serves as a vivid reminder to all Americans of the plight of the 100 million East and Central Europeans living in captivity under the tyranny of Communist rule. Through this observance our citizens, together with those of 17 other nations in the free world, reiterate their deep concern for their captive brethren as well as their determination to work toward the restoration of freedom and self-determination for all peoples.

The 1969 observance of Captive Nations Week, during the period of July 13 through 19, is of particular significance for two important reasons. This is the 10th anniversary of the Captive Nations Week resolution which the Congress passed in July 1959 and which President Eisenhower signed into Public Law 86-90. Most importantly, however, this year's observance comes in the wake of the Soviet Union's brutal reminder in Czechoslovakia last August that the Communists have not mellowed and that they will continue to suppress with any means necessary the natural efforts of people toward self-determination and freedom. Czechoslovakia serves as a critical example that communism cannot succeed in governing people without the use of coercion and suppression of human rights.

It is more than fitting, therefore, that we forcefully renew our conviction that we will not acquiesce to the tyranny suffered by the people of the captive nations. Our determination in this regard could not have been better expressed than through the address recently given by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable Edward J. Derwinski, at the Captive Nations Week rally held on July 10, 1969, in Taipei, Taiwan. Mr. Derwinski has shown great devotion to the cause of human freedom, both as a fellow member of the National Captive Nations Committee and through his leadership in the Congress toward policies of firmness, courage, and realism in our relationship to the Soviet Union and other Communist governments. My distinguished colleague deserves the sincere appreciation of all freedom-loving people, and at this point I include in the Record a copy of his speech on this subject:

Address of Congressman Edward J. Derwinski at the Captive Nations Week Rally, Taipei, Taiwan, Thursday, July 10, 1969

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and friends: I speak to you today as a representative of the National Captive Nations Week Committee of the United States. The goal of this committee is to help produce a world of permanent peace and freedom in which all peoples now held in bondage by communism will enjoy their true national independence.

As a Member of the Congress of the United States I am proud of and impressed by the fact that an overwhelming number of my colleagues have given their personal support to the cause of restoration of freedom to the captive peoples of communism.

This month, the tenth observance of Captive Nations Week is being celebrated in the United States and seventeen free world countries. Since that first July in 1959, after the United States Congress passed the Captive Nations Week resolution and President Eisenhower signed it into law, we have conducted ten annual weeks in symbolic behalf of the captive nations.

Captive Nations Week is accomplishing what it set out to do. The apparent disintegration of the Communist monolith favorably reinforces the course and goals of the movement, particularly the force of patriotic nationalism which we stress. Needless to say, squabbles and rivalries between and among totalitarian Communist parties, which dominate the regimes of the Red states, do not make the peoples, the nations themselves, any less captive.

The international Communist conspiracy is the great threat to world peace and stability. True peace and freedom, the legitimate goal of all mankind will come to Vietnam, Cuba, China, and other oppressed lands only when the peoples are represented by governments of their own true choice.

Let me briefly review the captive nations question and its importance to the free world. The first period of Communist expansion affected those nations of eastern Europe formerly a part of Czarist Russia, such as the Ukraine, Byelorussia, and Armenia, which were incorporated into the Soviet Union soon after the Bolsheviks established power. The second wave of expansion occurred following World War II when the Soviet Union dropped the Iron Curtain of terror between the East European nations and the free world and provided massive support to the Communist forces in China. By direct use of its forces in nations occupied at the close of World War II, the Soviet Union established puppet governments whose power was insured by Soviet military might and terroristic policies against their populations. Resistance to the Communist regimes was crushed by mass executions and deportations. Tragically, millions of people survived the attempted world conquest by the Axis powers only to fall prey to Soviet domination imposed by methods which equaled the atrocities committed by our World War II opponents.

Communism attempts to eradicate the individuality of people and thus runs headlong into the deep-rooted age old nationalistic traditions of the captive peoples. That is why in our struggle against communism we can remain confident of the ultimate triumph of free men over the evil ideology which we combat.

For years communism has claimed to be the "wave of the future." Its pressures in diplomatic, propaganda, economic, and military fields created the image of an irresistible force. However, the failure of any Communist government to provide true progress for the people it controls and the outright rejection of communism in election processes throughout the world clearly demonstrates that communism is a self-defeating philosphy.

In Southeast Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America the Communists continue their efforts to subvert governments. However, their efforts are basically nonproductive.

Just a few years ago many free world statesmen naively proclaimed that "communism is mellowing" and the day would come when free world cooperation with Communist tyrants would be possible. The Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia and the direct military activities by the Communists in South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia show that far from mellowing, the Communists are actually striking out with greater intensity. I regard their efforts as desperate moves by tyrants who know their defeat is inevitable.

I believe that we in the free world have clearly gained momentum in world affairs but to reach maximum effectiveness we must develop a totally coordinated attack against the Communists in propaganda, diplomatic and economic fields. The Communists must be kept on the defensive in all fields and the internal dissent which exists in every Communist-held nation must be effectively nurtured by free world forces.

I re-emphasize that one of the main reasons why communism will meet defeat is the failure of Red efforts to suppress legitimate nationalistic aspirations. The Soviet Russians are attempting to achieve the dreams of the Russian czars for territorial expansion, and thus the people of the captive nations realize that they must maintain their traditional language, culture, religious beliefs and distinctive traditions as weapons to overcome false Communist ideology.

In the United States during this Captive Nations Week we of the National Captive Nations Week Committee are stressing current key issues which are intended to remind free world citizens of the facts of life in world affairs and to encourage free peoples to continue the necessary efforts to see freedom restored in all lands now ruled by Communist governments.

We advocate a full-scale debate in the United Nations of Soviet colonialism. We specifically ask that the membership in the United Nations of the Soviet shadow governments in Byelorussia and the Ukraine be terminated. We strongly oppose the admission of the Peking government to the United Nations. We feel that admission of Red China would be a mockery of the principles of the United Nations. The Chinese Reds are continuing subversive activities throughout Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and admitting them to the U.N. would, in effect, be encouraging their future transgressions.

We strongly oppose any liberalization of trade with any Communist government. Trade experiences with the Red totalitarian states since World War II provide solid historical lessons for not repeating mistakes. We have ample evidence that governments such as the French and British have failed to achieve any positive results for themselves or the free world by recognizing the Peking government. As a matter of fact, the positive and effective steps the free world governments should take are to terminate diplomatic relations with the Communist governments that do not honestly serve and represent their people. An international quarantine of Communist governments would hasten their collapse.

The Captive Nations Week Committee in the United States believes that the proper objective in Vietnam should be victory and liberation by the South Vietnamese of the 17 million captive North Vietnamese.

We believe that it is a sound premise of political warfare that liberation must be the ultimate goal so that we can effectively move forward in all fields of the cold war, thus directly contributing to the internal collapse which is taking place in the Red world.

My dear friends, I am absolutely confident that the free world will triumph over Communist tyranny and that all peoples will ultimately enjoy the blessings of freedom and international tranquility.

In recent years we have seen Communist setbacks in Indonesia and Vietnam, new unrest in Czechoslovakia, and failure to make any progress in Latin America and Africa. The Soviet Union and their puppet governments are at a low point in their effectiveness at the United Nations. On the other hand, the crisis in Czechoslovakia reminded the free world that communism cannot mellow and that Red governments automatically suppress any attempt at intellectual, economic or social freedom.

Time is on our side. Justice is on our side. The spirit developed in Captive Nations Week observances throughout the free world provide the spark to effective year-long efforts in the unending struggle for freedom.

I salute your determination to see that freedom and a legitimate government are restored to your compatriots on the mainland. I am positive that the cause of freedom will triumph over the Communist enemy and the people of Free China will play a major role in the triumph over communism. This is the message of truth of Captive Nations Week.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, President Dwight D. Eisenhower became the first Chief Executive to issue a proclamation expressing this country's concern over the political captivity of the people living under Communist domination in Eastern and Central Europe.

This week, President Nixon has formally declared to be Captive Nations Week in recognition of the continuing plight of those persons now enslaved by Communist totalitarianism in Europe. The President said:

> Ten years have passed and there have been many changes in international affairs, but one thing that has not changed is the desire for national independence in Eastern Europe.

The hard fact remains that the U.S.S.R. has imposed its control over the lives of the people of Eastern and Central Europe by sheer military force. Last year's invasion of Czechoslovakia brought this point home even to those who had begun to believe that the Russians were truly the "good guys" of international relations.

The hard fact remains that the Iron Curtain is not merely a post-World War II phenomenon, but a contemporary reality in Europe today. The hundreds of Germans who have been machine-gunned to death in their desperate flight from East Berlin to freedom in the West are hardly testimony to the "liberalizing influence" we hear so much about.

I realize that those who espouse anti-communism in the United States today are termed either "unfashionable" or, even worse, "McCarthyesque." I would hope, however, that this week will serve to remind all Americans how very precious our freedom is, and to revitalize our opposition to that system which denies the most basic of human rights to over 100 million Europeans as well as hundreds of millions of other people throughout the world.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in the 11th annual observance of Captive Nations Week. Between July 13 and 19, the American people again dedicate themselves in support of the aspirations of the peoples of Eastern Europe for freedom and self-determination.

In the last 20 years, the emergence of many new nations in Asia and Africa has dramatically attested to the desire of men to be free and govern themselves. But, during this same period the desire for freedom has been frustrated and repressed in Eastern Europe. The enunciation of the Brezhnev doctrine, and the 1968 Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, once again regretfully brings into focus the continuance of this repression.

But even in despair the people of Czechoslovakia manifested such courage and valor that we are again reminded of the tenacity of the desire of men to be free. We must attempt to match the courage of those in Czechoslovakia and other captive nations, by reaffirming our Nation's devotion to the principle of self-determination for all men.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to include in the Record the Captive Nations Week Manifesto, 1969, which was adopted by the American Friends of the Captive Nations and the Assembly of Captive European Nations:

Captive Nations Week Manifesto, 1969

The undersigned organizations, dedicated to the restoration of freedom in the captive nations, call attention to Public Law 86–90, unanimously adopted in 1959 by the Congress of the United States, by which the third week of July each year was designated as Captive Nations Week.

The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968 and the subsequent enunciation of the so-called Brezhnev Doctrine have once again brought to the surface the entire issue of self-determination and fundamental freedoms for the one hundred million people of East-Central Europe. The tragedy of Czechoslovakia dramatizes the built-in instability of contemporary Europe rooted in the still unresolved problems bequeathed by the Second World War. The Brezhnev Doctrine brings into focus the sad fact of the perpetuation in power of unpopular Communist regimes—imposed by a foreign power—that are not responsible to the will of the peoples over whom they rule.

The record of over two decades of Communist rule shows that the legitimate aspirations of the captive European nations have long been thwarted by Soviet hegemony over the area. Now, with the advent of the Brezhnev Doctrine, the USSR has in fact tried to make this arbitrary arrangement accepted on a permanent basis.

In the light of this doctrine, which is a justification for aggressive imperialism, the Soviet Union has in effect placed its own interests over the inherent right to national sovereignty and fundamental human rights of the peoples living in the Communist orbit.

This doctrine can have a far-reaching impact on the future of not only the captive European nations, but also of the free world. If the doctrine remains unchallenged, it may turn the United Nations Charter into a shambles. As a result of this doctrine, all Communist parties are expected to follow automatically the dictates of the Kremlin. The acceptance by the Communist governments in East-Central Europe of the new Soviet doctrine is tantamount to complete abdication of the sovereign rights of these nations.

The Brezhnev Doctrine is against the vital interests of all captive European nations, the Charter of the United Nations, international law and the accepted norms of civilized nations. It is therefore deemed essential that the free world oppose the newly enunciated Soviet policy of aggressive imperialism and defend the traditional principles and norms of international law, in order to maintain world peace, security and freedom for all nations.

For the peoples of East-Central Europe, it is important to learn of the continued determination of the free governments of the world to lend their moral and political support to the rightful aspirations of their captive East-Central European brethren.

While commemorating this year's Captive Nations Week:

We stress that the Soviet Union has demonstrably violated its solemn promises of freedom and independence to the nine nations made captive during and after World War II—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania;

We also stress that the Communist regimes in the East-Central European nations continue to be unresponsive to the will of the people by denying them the right to periodic and genuinely free elections.

We appeal to the free governments of the nations of the world:

1. To declare, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries, adopted by the United Nations on October 14, 1960, their support of the right to self-determination of all peoples held captive by the Communists and, consequently, to make this issue the permanent concern of the United Nations;
2. To repudiate the intent and objectives of the Brezhnev Doctrine, including its implied recognition of the spheres of influence and of the status quo in East and Central Europe;
3. To bring to world attention the urgent need for a responsible attitude by the free nations of the world designed to help bolster the morale of the East-Central European peoples and thus create a climate favorable to their quest for full national independence and individual freedom.
4. As part of this effort, we call on the United States Government and on other members of the Atlantic Alliance to maintain, and where possible strengthen, NATO's defense forces. This alone will help counter any temptation of further Communist aggression—by force or threat of force.

We appeal to the People of the United States of America to manifest during Captive Nation's Week, July 13 to 19, 1969, their awareness of the importance of freedom for 100 million peoples in the Communist-dominated lands to the establishment of a valid European settlement and world peace.

Christopher Emmet,
Chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations.

Jozef Lettrich,
Chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations.

NO ROOM FOR ACCOMMODATION WITH CHINESE COMMUNISTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Sikes) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, recent proposals of flexibility and accommodation with the Chinese Communists emanating from small but articulate segments in the United States may not seem to have any relevance to the larger and more vital aspects of American foreign policy and the U.S. global position. This new orientation, or new concept of "open door," is intended to be gradual and not all out, to be sure; nevertheless, it helps to give the initiative to Peking, which is very likely to call a tune discordant with our basic interest and our relations with the Soviet Union.

The accommodation with Peking school generally aims at small but uncertain benefits. It rarely has gone into such matters as the power structure of the world, our leadership in the free world and our position as a Pacific power, which was fully established two decades before we gained recognition as a world power. A brief analysis of this line of thinking will reveal its flaws.

Immediately after World War II the United States had acquired a clear po-

XUM

sition of predominance in the global balance of power, but circumstances soon changed. Today, the power structure of the world is essentially bipolar. There are in the international community two powerful states in terms of military might and other extent and potential factors, and the rest of its members constitute what may be called the "Third World," parts of which are gravitated toward one or the other of these two poles, creating an uneasy balance between them.

To most thoughtful Americans, the concept of "Pax Americana" is repugnant. Whether such a role is distasteful to us from the standpoint of our political philosophy, it is actually beyond our material resources. Conscious of our limitations and the enormous demands on our resources at home, and frustrated on account of war weariness and disunity among our allies, there is even doubt among some that there is sufficient will left to maintain our position of leadership in the non-Communist world. Even the natural desire on the part of some of our people to maintain predominance over the existing Communist world may have little chance of success.

However, whatever our difficulties, we must maintain our national security and preserve our politcial system and democratic way of life. This overriding objective dictates that we are in no position to make this country a bastion which excludes other countries friendly to us. We have to seek fulfillment of this objective in the existing bipolar system and, in cooperation with friendly countries, selectively chosen, maintain as favorable a balance as possible.

There is a broad area of agreement among thoughtful Americans that the first order of business in U.S. foreign relations is to seek a détente or a measure of understanding with the Soviet Union to lessen the friction between the two countries and to prevent eventual nuclear proliferation and confrontation. Should the general climate be improved, and indications are that it can improve, an area of reasonable agreement may be possible. The ultimate aim would be a mutual understanding on arms control to stop the heavy drain on both national budgets. This, of course, is not easy. But as long as this dominant purpose has a hope of success, it would be bad politics or even a diplomatic blunder to introduce any element extraneous to this main effort which might make its success more difficult to attain. To wave an olive branch to the Chinese Communists—who have shown not the slightest interest in such a move—is incongruous with our endeavor to establish a détente with the Soviet Union. The press reports that two of our NATO allies are thinking of according diplomatic recognition to the Chinese Communist regime. Even this is something inconsonant with the interests of the United States.

While the rift between Moscow and Peking is still wide and the polemics go on unabated, the leaders of the Kremlin will not be indifferent to any friendly gesture toward Peking, no matter whether it emanates from a country of the free world or of the Communist camp. Any action that gives comfort or material support to the Chinese Communists, or enhances their prestige, would have such an effect. It could interfere with the prospects for accord between the United States and Soviet Russia—whatever those chances may be, and in view of Red China's attitude toward cooperation with other powers, it would gain nothing.

Proposals of rapprochement with Peking at this juncture are also inopportune in view of the present situation in Communist China. Its failures, deficiencies, and the general dejection of its people seem sufficiently well known to warrant acceptance. During 2½ years of convulsive upheavals and a ruthless general purge under the purposed misnomer of the "Great Cultural Revolution of the Proletariat," the Chinese Communist Party and the Peking regime have had serious differences. The orders of the central authority could hardly be carried out beyond the walls of Peking. There are signs of a general state of anarchy. The end of the regime may in fact be approaching. On this it would be well to read Prof. Allan S. Whiting's report on Red China in the February 21, 1996, issue of Life magazine. Professor Whiting, before his retirement, was our Deputy Consul General in Hong Kong.

It appears that the Mao Tse-tung regime has been accorded by its protagonists in Europe and in the Western Hemisphere an importance far exceeding its capabilities and material and technological resources. On the human side, such assets as leadership, discipline, cohesion, authority, skill, and technical know-how are grossly exaggerated. Red China's enormous population has been erroneously equated with power. The continuous failure of that country to improve living standards for the great bulk of its population places people assets on the debit side of its leader. We did not think of Norway as pro-Hitler when Quisling was at the head of the Norwegian Government during World War II. Nor did we think the French people were for Nazi Germany when Petain and Laval were head of Vichy. If all the relevant facts are carefully analyzed, much of the Chinese Communist charismatic appeal will vanish. There is no convincing reason to hold that the mainland Chinese people are converts to communism because they are under Communist guns. While formidable to the Chinese people, the guns of the Peking regime actually make Red China but a small military power—a power strong enough to play havoc among its neighbors if no restraint is put on it, but too deficient to challenge either of the command centers of the present bipolar system. It is well to note, that situation could quickly cease to exist if the United States should neglect its own security or its leadership position in the free world.

There is one essential fact that we should not lose sight of. During the first part of the history of American-Soviet relations, the difference of political philosophies or ideologies was the chief cause of discord. After World War II, the chief fear of the United States and the NATO countries was Russian imperialism. That fear has lessened to the point that it appears sensible at this time to establish some form of modus viviendi with the Soviet Union, especially in matters relating to nuclear nonproliferation. At the same time, the schism between Moscow and Peking shows incontrovertibly that the United States is confronted with a Communist ideology in which a strong cohesive force exists in theory only. In practice, it fragments and factionizes when Moscow tries to impose its will on the Chinese Communist regime and vice versa. In fact, the Kremlin has not done too well in requiring compliance in the case of Yugoslavia and Rumania. In recent years there has been growing decline in the show of Communist unity, with the Soviet Union trying to reverse the trend. It simply is not in accord with the long-term interests of this country for comfort or support to be given to the Chinese Communists.

A survey of the rift between Peking and Moscow has revealed some interesting facts and implications. Throughout the course of their disputes thus far, there is no sign that either entertains any doubt about the future of its own brand of communism. Both hold fast to tenets of communism usually referred to as "the general line of Marxism-Leninism" which is euphemistically called world revolution but in practice is a hegemony of the master state controlling the puppet states. This is nothing more or less than the Communist form of imperialism. Both nations are committed to the ideology of world revolution and the destruction of individual private enterprise. Neither is a friend of capitalism or of the United States which they consider its chief and most successful exponent. But their explicit disputes over the course for world communism has revealed differences which are deep and growing. Russia has shown at least a modicum of interest in establishing accord with the West. Red China has not. In this situation, friendly gestures towards Peking are not in line with the basic interests of this country. And at the present time, ironically enough any dialogue or help rendered to the Chinese Communists is taking Red China's side against the U.S.S.R. Most of us would say a plague on both their houses, but we have stated that we wish to come to an accord with Russia on nuclear nonproliferation. We will do well to hoe one row at a time.

DRUG ABUSE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 12894, legislation to establish a 5-year, $380 million program of research, education, training, prevention, and treatment of narcotics addiction and drug abuse. This bill is a companion measure to one introduced by Senator YARBOROUGH.

Because New York City has almost half of all the drug addicts in the country, it should have a major role in the formulation of a national drug abuse program.

Any program developed should be tailored to meet the needs of New York City with a large part of the Federal funding made available for city programs.

The drug problem in New York City has reached almost epidemic proportions. The New York City Department of Narcotics estimates that there are today over 150,000 addicts in the city, with direct criminal costs to the taxpayers of one-half billion dollars per year.

This legislation does not deal with the problem of addiction by knocking the addict into the ground with the hope that this will cure his affliction, which appears to be the attitude adopted by the administration. It deals with the problem squarely by providing the kind of facilities such as the Phoenix type of facility needed to treat and medically cure the addict.

New York City has the most advanced drug treatment program in the country. There are currently in operation 24 inpatient—Phoenix—treatment facilities and 17 outpatient facilities, many of them in my district. Yet, these few are drastically underfinanced. The legislation will alleviate this situation as well as provide Federal grants for the establishment of research and training facilities to reduce the shortage of skilled personnel to work in this critical area.

The bill will also provide for a major prevention and education effort designed to reach a wide audience, particularly those youngsters who are most prone to use drugs.

What follows is a discussion of the magnitude of the drug problem prepared by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs:

STATEMENT BY BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

The following statistics are based on an analysis of known active narcotic addicts reported to the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs and should not be construed as the Nation's total narcotic addict population.

ACTIVE ADDICTS

The number of active addicts recorded by the Bureau as of December 31, 1968 was 64,011, an increase of 1,966 compared with December 31, 1967. The number of active addicts under 21 years of age as of December 31, 1968 was 2,688, an increase of 471 compared with December 31, 1967.

The estimated population for the United States as of December 1, 1968 was 202,110,000. With the active addict population at 64,011 at the end of the year, the ratio of addiction to population as of December 31, 1968 was 1 in 3,157 compared with 1 in 3,228 as of December 31, 1967. At the end of 1960, the ratio was 1 in 4,008.

Comparing December 31, 1967 to December 31, 1968, 30 States showed either an increase in active addicts or remained the same.

Nine States and the District of Columbia account for 91% of all active addicts recorded by the Bureau. They are as follows:

New York	32, 240
California	8, 207
Illinois	6, 027
New Jersey	3, 392
Maryland	1, 940
Michigan	1, 876
Pennsylvania	1, 754
Texas	1, 281
District of Columbia	1, 162
Louisiana	561

The Bureau first published an "active addict" figure at the end of 1959, at which time, 3.8% were under 21 years of age. As of December 31, 1968, 4.2% were under 21. This is the first time in the survey that the active addict figure of persons under 21 years of age has exceeded 4%.

Of the total active addicts recorded, 53,402 were males and 10,609 females. Those under 21 totaled 2,688. The 21–30 group had 29,802; the 31–40 group had 22,631. The over 40 group totaled 8,890.

With 1,290 active addicts under 21 years of age as of December 31, 1968, New York accounted for 48% of all active addicts in this category, compared with 52% at the end of 1967 and 60% at the end of 1966.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FARBSTEIN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DERWINSKI, for 30 minutes, today, immediately following the special order of Mr. FLOOD, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) immediately following the approval of the Journal today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHERLE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. CEDERBERG.

Mr. FOREMAN in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN in two instances.

Mr. DENT.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. OTTINGER in two instances.

Mr. BIAGGI in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.

Mr. WOLFF in two instances.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN in four instances.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 648. An act for the relief of Ernesto Alunday.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on July 15, 1969, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1828. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon James F. Wegener;

H.R. 1948. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Pfc. Class Joseph Anthony Snitko;

H.R. 2224. An act for the relief of Franklin Jacinto Antonio;

H.R. 2536. An act for the relief of Francesca Adriana Millonzi;

H.R. 2890. An act for the relief of Rueben Rosen;

H.R. 3167. An act for the relief of Ryszard Stanislaw Obacz; and

H.R. 10060. An act for the relief of Lance Cpl. Peter M. Nee (2465662).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 17, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

970. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effectiveness and administration of the community action program administered by the White Earth Reservation Business Committee, White Earth, Minn., under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Office of Economic Opportunity; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

971. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the administration and effectiveness of the work experience and training project in St. Louis City and St. Louis County, Mo., under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

972. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the administration and effectiveness of the work experience and training project in Jackson County, Mo., under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

973. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third- and sixth-preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

974. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to facilitate the management of the public debt by removing the interest rate ceilings on Government bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

975. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit charges for certain services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Boland, Mr. Brown of Michigan, Mr. Broyhill of Virginia, Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Collins, Mr. Coughlin, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Donohue, Mr. Friedel, Mr. Fulton of Tennessee, Mr. Griffin, Mr. Hagan, Mr. Hechler of West Virginia, Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts, Mr. Kluczynski, Mr. Kuykendall, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Murphy of New York, Mr. Olsen, and Mr. Podell):

H.R. 12891. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage higher education, and particularly the private funding thereof, by authorizing a deduction from gross income of reasonable amounts contributed to a qualified higher education fund established by the taxpayer for the purpose of funding the higher education of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. Pollock, Mr. Powell, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Robison, Mr. Rodino, Mr. St Germain, Mr. St. Onge, Mr. Sandman, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Waldie, Mr. Watts, Mr. Weicker, and Mr. Hammerschmidt):

H.R. 12892. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage higher education, and particularly the private funding thereof, by authorizing a deduction from gross income of reasonable amounts contributed to a qualified higher education fund established by the taxpayer for the purpose of funding the higher education of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL: (for himself and Mr. Moss):

H.R. 12893. A bill to restore the independence of Federal regulatory agencies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 12894. A bill to provide for the comprehensive control of narcotic addiction and drug abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 12895. A bill to change the definition of ammunition for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 12896. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. Clark, Mr. Foley, Mr. Garmatz, Mr. Hungate, Mr. Murphy of New York, Mr. St Germain, Mrs. Sullivan, and Mr. Madden):

H.R. 12897. A bill to establish an urban mass transportation trust fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Biaggi, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Brasco, Mr. Carey, Mrs. Chisholm, Mr. Farbstein, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Lowenstein, Mr. Murphy of New York, Mr. Podell, Mr. Powell, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Nix, and Mr. Tunney):

H.R. 12898. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to transfer certain airspace for use for housing purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RAILSBACK (for himself, Mr. Biester, Mr. Randall, Mr. Wydler, Mr. Anderson of Illinois, Mr. Sebelius, Mr. Cowger, Mr. Button, Mr. Derwinski, Mr. Pollock, Mr. Ichord, Mr. Scott, Mr. Nichols, Mr. Winn, Mr. Andrews of Alabama, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Griffin, Mr. Mathias, Mr. Lukens, and Mr. Quie):

H.R. 12899. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit Federal judges from receiving compensation other than for the performance of their judicial duties, except in certain instances, and to provide for the disclosure of certain finanical information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 12900. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct investigations, studies, surveys, and research relating to the Nation's ecological systems, natural resources, and environmental quality, and to establish a Council on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12901. A bill to provide for the better utilization of scarce medical personnel within, and to improve the efficiency of, the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 12902. A bill to provide for uniform and equitable treatment of persons displaced from their homes, businesses, or farms by Federal and federally assisted programs and to establish uniform and equitable land acquisition policies for Federal and federally assisted programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of the rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL of Maryland:

H.R. 12903. A bill for the relief of Dr. Narciso A. deBorja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12904. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rolando F. Del Rosario; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12905. A bill for the relief of Dr. Arturo De los Santos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—*Wednesday, July 16, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God of this universe and of the universes beyond, who from the dawn of time, and through the processes of all history has been creating from the formless void, the orbs and spheres in the unbounded immensity of space; and in whose wisdom Thou hast placed man as Thy highest creation to have dominion over all Thy works; we thank Thee that it is given to us to live this day when earthbound man, unfettered, soars to lunar lands and spaces.

We thank Thee for man, for the majesty of his intellect, the depth of his soul, and for the sense of wonder and adventure with which Thou hast endowed him. As we hear again the words of holy writ, "What is man that Thou art mindful of him? Thou crownest him with glory and honor, and didst set him over the works of Thy hands"; make us humble and thankful before Thy creation in man and in nature.

Be with us day by day in our labors. Teach us now and always that the true home of the soul is in Thee. Awaken us to the splendors of the new age that we may be pioneers in the vast reaches of the human spirit, and partners with Thee in the emancipation of man from hate and fear, from poverty and disease, from injustice and war, that a better world may come, and Thy will be done in and through us. In Thy holy name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 15, 1969, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 648) for the relief of Ernesto Alunday, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar under "New Reports."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar, under "New Reports," will be stated.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Orville H. Lerch, of Pennsylvania, to be alternate Federal co-Chairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. Willard Roper, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

GENERAL CROPLAND RETIREMENT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on February 28, 1969, I wrote the Secretary of Agriculture asking that he evaluate several land retirement studies, including one completed by the Department of Agriculture.

Yesterday I received his analysis of the programs from which the conclusions may be reached that:

First. A general cropland retirement program of the scope considered—50 to 70 million acres—would cost less on an annual basis than the $3 billion or so spent on present programs during recent years ranging from $759 million to $1,383 million.

Second. Such a program would not restrict production of the major problem crops, except possibly for wheat, at the acreages assumed in both studies. Actually, production of the major crops likely would increase with consequent depression of prices unless the acreage retired was greater than the 70-million-acre level considered in the economic research service study.

Third. Gross and net farm incomes would be reduced below the levels of recent years with current programs. At the 50-million-acre level, reduction of income would be greater than reduction of Government costs. With larger acreages retired, farm income would decline less than the decline in Government costs, assuming that the larger acreage could be rented out of production at the costs indicated and that no new land would be brought into production in response to improved outlook for commodity prices.

Fourth. In the absence of tight control in program administration, the impact of a general cropland retirement program could fall heavily in areas of low productive land. In such areas, however, long-term rental of land could give people an opportunity to adjust out of farming. The benefits of such a program would accrue chiefly to landowners. Tenants and country town businessmen likely would be worse off.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of Agriculture's letter to me and the enclosure "Two Studies of General Cropland Retirement" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, July 12, 1969.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On February 28 you wrote to me asking about results of three publications dealing with general cropland retirement. You questioned particularly the apparent conflict between some statements in an Extension Service leaflet "Adjusting American Farm Output" sponsored by the Farm Foundation, the Agricultural Policy Institute at North Carolina State University, and the Center for Agricultural and Economic Adjustment at Iowa State University and the conclusions reached by our Economic Research Service in ERS 377 "Analysis of a General Cropland Retirement Program," and results shown in CAED Report No. 32 "Farm Programs for the 1970's" published by Iowa State University.

The Extension Service leaflet was prepared as an essay chiefly useful to promote discussion in extension education activities. It neither cites references to support its conclusions nor includes sufficient data to test results given. It is more useful, therefore, to consider the ERS Report No. 377 in comparison with the Iowa CAED Report No. 32. This we have done in the enclosure to this letter.

The main conclusions and estimates given in both of these studies are very similar despite some differences in methods.

Both studies give estimates of cost to the Government of retiring 50 to 70 million acres of cropland. Estimates of annual costs range from $759 million for a 50-million-acre program to $1,383 million for a 60-million-acre program. As a result of methods used, both sets of estimates are probably lower than would actually be required.

Both studies show that production of the major crops—wheat, feed grains, soybeans, and cotton—would be greater than the average of recent years, except possibly for wheat at the 70-million-acre level of land retirement. In recent years, we have had 40 to 50 million acres diverted from the major crops under annual commodity programs.

Both studies show a significant concentration of retired land in the Great Plains despite limitations on the percentage of cropland in any one county or area permitted to participate.

The Iowa study shows commodity prices and gross and net farm incomes to be lower than the 1965–67 average. At the 50-million-acre level, net farm income is estimated at $12.6 billion. It was $14.6 billion in 1967 and $15.4 billion in 1968. Government costs would be lower by about $1.8 billion than costs under commodity programs of recent years.

A general cropland retirement program does not appear to be specifically effective in restraining output and raising prices of the "problem crops," at least within the level of acreages tested by these two studies—up to 70 million acres. However, some land can be shifted out of crop use and into grass, trees, recreation, and other desirable uses at less cost under long-term general cropland programs than under annual programs. Moreover, long-term contracts encourage people—as well as land—to adjust out of crop farming. Thus, much of the land would likely remain out of crop use on expiration of a long-term contract, thereby effecting permanent adjustment in use of resources.

This letter and the attached statement have been reviewed by Dr. J. Carroll Bottum, Purdue University; Dr. Earl Heady, Iowa State University; Dr. Luther Tweeten, Oklahoma State University; Dr. W. W. Wilcox, Library of Congress; and Dr. L. T. Wallace of the staff of the Council of Economic Advisers, as well as by economists in our Economic Research Service and other agencies of the Department.

Our studies of alternative farm programs are continuing. We look forward to sharing the results of these studies with you and your Committee.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD M. HARDING,
Secretary of Agriculture.

TWO STUDIES OF GENERAL CROPLAND RETIREMENT

Iowa State University and the Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, both published studies in 1968 appraising general cropland retirement as a tool for dealing with farm price and income problems.[1] Although each study was done by different people with sligthly different methods and assumptions, the major results are very similar.

The ERS study asks: How much would it cost the Government to retire 50 or 70 million acres of cropland under long-term contracts if (a) farmers expected 1967 prices (1966 for cotton), (b) no more than 30 percent of the cropland of any county could come into the program, and (c) farmers were free to use remaining cropland as they wished? It asks also: How much of the major crops would farmers produce on land remaining in use and where would land coming into the program be located?

The Iowa study gives estimates of the annual cost of retiring 50 and 60 million acres of cropland, the prices and production of major commodities that would be expected with the program, and the probable location of acres coming into the program with no more than 50 percent of the cropland in any one area permitted to participate.

Results of both studies are influenced by the assumptions and estimating methods used. While these differed somewhat, major results are much alike.

---

[1] Leo V. Mayer, Earl O. Heady, and Howard C. Madsen, "Farm Programs for the 1970's," Center for Agricultural and Economic Development, Iowa State University, CAED Report No. 32, Oct. 1968; and James Vermeer and Rudie W. Slaughter, "Analysis of a General Cropland Retirement Program," Economic Research Service, USDA, ERS 377, May 1968.

COST OF LONG-TERM LAND RETIREMENT

The Iowa study says that 50 million acres in long-term whole farm contracts could be retired for an annual cost of $857 million; 60 million acres could be retired for an annual cost of $1,383 million.

The ERS study says 50 million acres could be retired for an annual cost of $759 million; 70 million acres could be retired for an annual cost of $1,345 million.

Both studies assumed that the cost of land retirement would be only the difference between the farmer's cost of production and his gross returns. Thus, both sets of estimates are lower than would actually be required because most farmers are not likely to participate unless putting land into the program gives them a clear advantage over continued cropping.

Further, neither set of estimates made allowance for the cost of "buying the farmer out of his job." Some farmers who have ready alternative uses for labor and capital might participate at the rates indicated.

Differences in the two sets of estimates are largely explained by the fact that the Iowa researchers assumed that whole farms would come into the program, some payment would be made for grass seeding and maintenance of diverted land, up to 50 percent of the cropland of any one area would be permitted, and family, as well as hired labor, is counted as part of the cost of production.

ERS researchers dealt with cropland without regard to whole farm combinations. They assumed that land and crops yielding lowest net returns per acre would come into the program first, they permitted only 30 percent of the cropland in any one county to enter the program, and they made no allowance for cost of seeding or maintenance of diverted land. When these different assumptions and methods of estimating—some of which are offsetting—are taken into account, the two sets of estimates of costs of diverting cropland are very much alike.

EFFECT OF LAND RETIREMENT ON OUTPUT

Both the ERS and the Iowa studies assume that farmers would be compensated for retiring cropland in such a way that the lowest yielding land would be offered first. Thus, several million acres could be retired without substantial effect on total output of major crops. With general cropland retirement and with no constraints on use of land remaining in cultivation, output of the problem crops could actually increase. The table below shows average 1965–67 production of a few crops and production estimated in the Iowa and ERS studies with specified acreages in a general land retirement program.

	1965–67 production	Iowa study, acres retired		ERS study, acres retired	
		50,000,000	60,000,000	50,000,000	70,000,000
Wheat (million bushels)	1,374	1,584	1,653	1,223	891
Feed grains (million tons)	163	168	67	176	172
Soybeans (million bushels)	916	996	996	1,100	1,089
Cotton (million bales)	10.6	14.5	14.5	16.3	16.3

Differences in these estimates are explained by differences in estimating procedures. Except for estimated production of wheat, the differences are not great. According to the Iowa estimates, U.S. farmers would produce more wheat, feed grains, soybeans, and cotton with 60 million acres in general land retirement than they did in 1965–67. According to the ERS estimates, farmers would produce more of each of these crops except wheat. Reduction in production of wheat in the ERS study is explained by the concentration of retired acreages in the Great Plains.

COMMODITY PRICES WITH CROPLAND RETIREMENT

ERS researchers assumed 1967 average prices received by farmers for all commodities except cotton. Prices of cotton in 1967 were abnormal, so 1966 average prices were used for that crop. Some of the prices used were: wheat $1.41, corn $1.07, soybeans $2.49, and cotton $0.208; prices of other commodities were comparable. No attempt was made to equate prices with supply and demand. Actually, with the production estimated, these prices likely would not prevail, they would be lower.

Iowa researchers estimated prices that theoretically would equate supply and demand. With the supplies indicated, projected demand would suggest prices as follows: With 50 million acres retired—wheat $1.29, corn $1.03, soybeans $2.05, and cotton $0.235; with 60 million acres retired—wheat $1.42, corn $1.13, soybeans $2.38, and cotton $0.238.

Differences between the two sets of prices are not large and are explainable by the differences in procedures. The Iowa researchers were using mostly 1966 data and projected estimates of demand. With later data and current outlook for demand, it is doubtful that these prices would hold at the levels of production estimated. The price estimate for cotton especially is questionable; 14.5 million bales of cotton probably could not be disposed of at $0.238 per pound.

If indicated prices are not realized at the estimated volume of production, then estimated gross and net farm incomes would not be realized either.

EFFECT OF LAND RETIREMENT ON FARM INCOME

Iowa researchers estimate that with 50 million acres retired under a general cropland retirement program, net farm income would be about $12.6 billion; with 60 million acres retired, net farm income would be about $14.0 billion. Realized net farm income was $14.6 billion in 1967 and $15.4 billion in 1968.

According to the Iowa estimates, a 50-million-acre retirement program would result in Government payments to farmers of $1,258 million, $1,821 million less than Government payments to farmers in 1967. With such a program, cash receipts of farmers would be $1,295 million less than 1967, and net income would be $1,995 million less than 1967. With a 60-million-acre retirement program, Government payments to farmers would be $1,295 million less than 1967, and net income would be $635 million less than 1967.

The ERS researchers did not report estimates of gross and net farm incomes in the study considered here.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE TWO STUDIES

Neither the ERS nor the Iowa study represents a very realistic appraisal of the probable costs of a general cropland retirement program. Both estimate retirement costs at the difference between gross returns and costs of production. Neither allows for a margin of payment as incentive for farmers to participate. Neither estimates the cost of retiring a farmer's job opportunity, as well as a farmer's land. Thus, the estimates of cost of land retirement, similar in the two studies, must be considered as minimal.

Both studies show that the production of major crops—wheat, feed grains, soybeans, and cotton—would be somewhat greater with a general land retirement program than has prevailed in recent years. The one exception is the estimated reduction in production of wheat in the ERS study which results from heavy concentration of retired land in the Great Plains.

Both studies show that with 50 to 70 million acres of land in a general cropland retirement program, heavy concentration of retired land would occur in the Great Plains and especially in the Northern Plains. This is true despite the fact that no more than 30 percent of the cropland in any one county was permitted to enter the program under specifications used in the ERS study. The Iowa study permitted 50 percent of the cropland in an area to participate.

The Iowa study suggests that a general cropland retirement program would accelerate the decline in number of farms and in farm-generated business in rural communities. Although the ERS study did not deal with the issue of the impacts of cropland retirement on rural communities, there is no reason to question the implications of the Iowa study.

One important consideration not dealt with in either the Iowa or the ERS studies is the effectiveness of a long-term general cropland retirement program in encouraging permanent shifts in land use. Current annual land diversion programs discourage rather than encourage fundamental adjustments in use of resources. Some land can be rented out of production cheaper under a long-term contract than an annual agreement. And even after a long-term contract expires, land affected is less likely to return to crop use. Approximately half the land that was in the Conservation Reserve remains in grass, trees, recreation, or other noncrop uses.

In addition, long-term contracts on land use often give people, as well as land, a better chance to adjust to new opportunities. Farmers who want to retire, those who have or can get off-farm jobs, and those who want to use land more extensively for other reasons are the people most likely to be attracted to long-term cropland retirement. The value of adjustment opportunities for people are difficult to estimate and neither study addressed itself to this issue.

General conclusions that may be inferred from both studies are:

1. A general cropland retirement program of the scope considered (50 to 70 million acres) would cost less on an annual basis than the $3.0 billion or so spent on present programs during recent years.

2. Such a program would not restrict production of the major problem crops, except possibly for wheat, at the acreages assumed in both studies. Actually, production of the major crops likely would increase with consequent depression of prices unless the acreage retired was greater than the 70-million-acre level considered in the ERS study.

3. Gross and net farm incomes would be reduced below the levels of recent years with current programs. At the 50-million-acre level, reduction of income would be greater than reduction of Government costs. With larger acreages retired, farm income would decline less than the decline in Government costs, assuming that the larger acreage could be rented out of production at the costs indicated and that no new land would be brought into production in response to improved outlook for commodity prices.

4. In the absence of tight control in program administration, the impact of a general cropland retirement program could fall heavily in areas of low productive land. In such areas, however, long-term rental of land could give people an opportunity to adjust out of farming. The benefits of such a program would accrue chiefly to landowners. Tenants and country town businessmen likely would be worse off.

INFLATION, CRIME, AND DUTY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, inflation and crime are the two great domestic challenges of the moment. Both are destroyers.

Those who commit acquisitive crimes such as robbery, burglary, larceny, and embezzlement operate in a limited way. Inflation, however, strikes at all—young and old, rich and poor.

Robbery implies violence with a gun. Inflation takes away value without a gun. Burglary means breaking and entering. Inflation is everywhere every moment. Embezzlement is taking value from someone who is unaware of it at the moment. Everyone is aware of inflation every moment, whether he buys, sells, or builds.

Both must be brought to heel if order and our free system are to survive.

The President has sought the cooperation of Congress in dealing with the crime challenge, and Congress has responded generously.

The President has sought and is seeking the cooperation of Congress in dealing with inflation. He has asked for immediate action on the surtax, the repeal of the investment tax credit, and extension of the excise taxes on cars and telephones. That request has languished. He has done so to protect the balanced budget and to siphon off spendable funds. These are weapons in the combat with inflation.

The House of Representatives has acted on the important items, but it now appears that those who shape policy for the Democrat majority in the Senate insist on coupling these important and gravely needed measures with other tax reforms which, perhaps desirable, are not so urgent. This is a serious matter, because the Democrat majority, by long-established practice and custom, has the acknowledged power to call up or refuse to call up this imperative legislation, if it is on the calendar.

Speaking for the administration—and I trust for the entire Republican minority in the Senate—we have a solemn duty to do what we can to bring about the enactment of the surtax and related legislation at the earliest possible date. Delay could be dangerous. We hope those who determine legislative policy in the Senate will aid us in this effort. We hope they will also aid us in getting this legislation out of the Finance Committee and to the Senate Calendar.

There are so many factors to indicate how deadly serious this matter is. A weakening stock market, the confusion of the business community concerning Government policy, the sharp decline in time deposits, the high level of business and real estate loans, the deep concern of the Federal Reserve Board, the drop in money supply, the overextended credit situation, the highest interest rates in a century, the deficit in our foreign trade balance, and others all indicate the seriousness of the problem before us.

We hope, therefore, that those who control legislative policy of the Senate realize the gravity of the matter and that we all have the responsibility of putting first things first. It is hoped also, that if the surtax and related items can be brought to the Senate Calendar that the majority leader and the Democratic policy committee will concur in calling the measure for consideration without a day's delay. We point out that whatever the pending business before the Senate, it should be set aside and action on the surtax bill completed.

The House and Senate can complete action on this proposal before the impending recess on August 13. To wait until after the return of Congress on September 3 could be an open invitation to real economic trouble.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as always, I listened with interest to what the distinguished minority leader had to say, and especially so because of his remarks relative to the state of the economy at the present time, the state of the market, the matter of high-interest rates, and the need for legislation.

He states that tax reform is "perhaps needed." I would, myself, delete the use of the word "perhaps"—abolish it entirely—because, in my opinion, tax reforms are vitally needed to make sure that many of our millionaires pay at least something in the way of taxes, and that the middle class and the poorer people, who are called upon to bear the greatest burden of taxation, are given some tax relief. I think it is high time, that it is imperative, in fact, that tax reform be considered by this body.

I am pleased to note, according to the press, the fine progress being made by the Ways and Means Committee of the House in that field. It is true that the stock market has been declining, but if my memory serves me—and, incidentally, I have no stocks—the decline has been occurring for well over a month. It is true we are undergoing a process of inflation, but everybody in the Chamber knows that has been going on for quite some time now.

The distinguished minority leader said we should consider "first things first." Why not consider first things first together? In that area I would include the extension of the surtax, and also the need for necessary tax reforms.

If we were to take up the surtax alone, it is my very strong belief that a sizable number of the Members of the Senate would use that course as a vehicle to which to attach all kinds of amendments, and that the end result would be not a surtax extension bill but a Christmas-tree bill which would take care of selected segments of our population which would like to receive special consideration and special treatment.

In my opinion, it would be a disservice to the President and the economy of the country to take up the surtax bill on that basis, without the necessary and vitally neded tax reforms long overdue. Indeed, the end result might well be no surtax extension at all and a decidedly further drop in the economy of this Nation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have only one response to make to the majority leader, and generally speaking I take no great exception to what he had to say.

I simply say, Mr. President, that we have to separate the urgent things from those that can wait; and second, we have to separate those things that we can do on the basis of what we see at the moment from those that are going to take time.

The House of Representatives passed on this matter. It will be no great difficult matter to pass on. All we have to do is to bring it in, place it on the calendar, and then have my distinguished friend from Montana call it up with the concurrence of the policy committee on that side of the aisle. It is quite that simple, in my judgment.

I do not decry the fact there should be tax reform, but I do know from my experience on the Committee on Finance that Members are over there now who have been presenting their views on different bills, including excess profits, and a host of other things, which can wait; but the surtax and the investment tax credit, and the return from the excise taxes really cannot wait. They go to the revenue of the country and they go to the integrity of the President's budget.

I call attention to these other things because those are fiscal and monetary phenomena and factors that are in being, and I think we would be rather shortsighted if we undertook to ignore them.

I point out one other thing, Mr. President. My distinguished friend represents the majority party in the Senate. He has the votes. He can determine when a reform bill shall come before this body. I would be the last person in the Senate, not only knowing the rules but also the customs and practices, to try to preempt the leadership; I would never do it. That is why this statement is in the nature of an entreaty to the majority leader; it is an appeal on the basis of trying to look down the road and see how dangerous this could be unless we get this action and get it right soon. That is the only case I can make, so this is an appeal to my distinguished friend who has so much to say, and, in fact, who has the power not to call up or to call up legislation that ought to be before us.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I join the minority leader in expressing the hope that the leaders on the other side of the aisle will give top priority to the consideration of extension of the surtax.

Action on it is needed now. Uncertainty as to whether we shall or shall not act, or what action will be taken, can create chaos in the economic community.

Mr. President, I join the majority leader in expressing not only the hope but also the determination that we do have meaningful tax reform brought before the Senate at an early date. I shall be here presenting some views of my own in that connection, but we should separate the packages.

I realize the argument is made that if the bill is brought out earlier we shall find numerous amendments which can develop it into a Christmas tree. I most respectfully remind the majority leader that the same argument was made last year when President Johnson recommended the tax in its initial stage. At that time, the Senator from Florida and myself joined in the bipartisan effort to put this measure through because we felt that the economy of the country was such that it had to be enacted, and we were confident that, acting together in a bipartisan effort, we could prevent that bill from developing into a Christmas

XUM

tree. We did. There were no amendments of an extraneous nature to that bill. I am confident that we can do it again. All we are asking is the same bipartisan support today in the interest of our country that we as minority Members gave to them when they had control.

I hope that we can get that. I certainly do not think the majority party would want to take the responsibility for what happens if we do not act.

I noticed that when my good friend from Massachusetts spoke here yesterday he proposed a series of reform measures—many with which I agree. On some of them I would go further than he did, but he made a constructive suggestion. But these are controversial. In the colloquy yesterday, as an example, the Senator from Massachusetts indicated he opposed the proposal in the reform package in the House which would levy a tax on foundations. I disagree with him on that point. I realize that will be a highly controversial measure when it comes before the Senate. This is an example of the difference of opinion among those of us who seek the tax reform. On many we shall be in agreement, but those who have different views are entitled to be heard and should be heard. That takes time and is why the two proposals should be separated.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Delaware has expired. Without objection, the Senator from Delaware may proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. I thank the Chair.

But after hearings and ample opportunity to express their views we can report a bill. The chairman, backed by the full membership of the committee, can give the Senate a pledge that it will report a tax reform bill. Then the leadership can bring it up. We need this tax reform, but we certainly need to act responsibly in the meantime by not holding up the other bill.

Finally, Mr. President, as to tax reform I am glad that at last we have some new recruits for that worthy project. I remind them, however, of the fact that others of us have for years been trying to get reforms on the part of our tax laws.

Much to my regret, this is the first administration in the past 10 years which has pledged its support to meaningful reform of the revenue code. This is something that we did not get in the past administration.

Now that we have that cooperation, now that the Ways and Means Committee is working, and now that the Finance Committee is ready to act, let us put it on the statute books and not just make speeches.

The way to put it on the statute books is to take up the surtax quickly and follow that with the controversial tax reforms. These are controversial areas, but in spite of this we should act on them.

In arriving at a decision on procedure the views of the minority should be taken into consideration as well as the views of the majority party. I remind them again that last year, when they needed bipartisan support, I was the one that led it at that time. I think we have a reasonable right to expect that we get a little cooperation at this time.

Mr. **KENNEDY**. Mr. President, in listening to the dialog this morning, those of us on this side of the aisle can look back over the history of the recent election campaign in which the presidential candidate of the Democratic Party indicated his support for extension of the surtax.

At that time, our distinguished present President had some rather serious reservations about the surcharge. As a matter of fact, he expressed his opposition to its extension.

Thus, it is curious for us to be on the Senate floor listening to our good friends on the other side of the aisle attempting to point out the responsibility of the Democratic majority and the members of the policy committee. We are trying to establish what I think is an orderly, constructive, and extremely important procedure for enabling the Senate to exercise its right to vote on the extension of the surtax and meaningful tax reform.

I would also remind our good friends on the other side of the aisle that the fight against inflation is not assisted when highly responsible members of the administration raise the specter of wage and price guidelines. In the face of such talk, it is only natural for businessmen to place orders and work out pending transactions, and thereby obviously feed the inflationary fires.

Nor do I think the administration is contributing to the adoption of a responsible fiscal policy when it raises doubts that the surcharge will really be considered or passed by the Senate. In accord with the position stated so clearly, eloquently, and appropriately by the majority leader and the members of the policy committee, we are proceeding in a way that is responsible in terms of meeting both our fiscal crisis and our monetary crisis.

I was disappointed that the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Illinois did not manifest a greater sense of urgency concerning the millions of taxpayers of this country who are suffering from the inequities of our current tax system. It is clear, of course, that our taxpayers are concerned with the fiscal position of the Nation, but they are also the ones who routinely pay their taxes and are becoming increasingly aware of the abuses in our Internal Revenue Code.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. **KENNEDY**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **KENNEDY**. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

We now have a major opportunity to enact significant and meaningful tax reform. I feel that the policy committee is acting in a most responsible manner in meeting the crises in our fiscal policy and our tax system.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. **KENNEDY**. I yield.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. I find no quarrel with what my friend says. It is only this: It evidences no effort to try. Why does the Senator not help us? We are not in charge. Why does not the Senator say, "We will try?" The Finance Committee is to meet in executive session tomorrow morning. Why does not the Senator get word to the chairman and say, "Do your best to get out a bill and get it to this floor?"

Mr. **KENNEDY**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. The weight of economic advice and authority suggests that this is becoming a dangerous situation.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. I yield.

Mr. **KENNEDY**. There is no problem about trying. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance has met with the policy committee. As a matter of fact, when the Democratic policy committee announced its initial decision about the extension of the withholding rates, it was a unanimous decision that was reached, in full accord with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance. So we on this side of the aisle feel there is no misunderstanding. We have had a number of explanations of the respective positions. We would certainly be heartened if the communications that have come from this administration in the area of tax reform had been more explicit and more reassuring to those of us who are interested in meaningful tax reform. I think, once again, we are willing to try, and we are going to try. As the distinguished Senator from Delaware stated yesterday, I am sure we are going to have a real opportunity to maintain both a strong fiscal policy and to achieve meaningful tax reform.

As I indicated, I think that the tax reform proposals of the administration could be much more substantial. They fail to deal with the substantive provisions of the percentage depletion allowance, or with capital gains, or with interest on State and local bonds, or with accelerated depreciation for real estate. Even the minimum tax proposed by the administration is weak, because it fails to include capital gains and interest on State and local bonds. And, the tax relief for the poor proposed by the administration does not go as far as it should in helping families near the poverty level. In light of these deficiencies, I think we on this side of the aisle may be pardoned for having some doubts as to the administration's real commitment to meaningful tax reform.

Mr. President, last April, at the time the administration submitted its tax reform proposals to the Ways and Means Committee, Joseph A. Pechman, senior economist at the Brookings Institution, pointed out a number of the weaknesses in the proposals, and made the comment that the administration's package was hardly the "Mona Lisa" of tax reform.

Mr. President, because of the importance of the questions that have been raised, I ask unanimous consent that

Mr. Pechman's comments, which appeared in an article in the Washington Post, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 27, 1969]

If You Support Tax Reform, Nixon's Package Is Weak

(By Joseph A. Pechman, Director of Economic Studies, the Brookings Institution)

The Nixon tax reform package was unveiled last week with the fanfare that usually accompanies a major presidential tax recommendation. First, a presidential message proclaimed that "reform . . . is long overdue" and outlined in general terms a series of ten proposals. The next day Treasury officials read to the Ways and Means Committee an inch of technical papers describing in great detail 16 proposals which, they emphasized, are only a "first step in reshaping the Federal tax system to make it fair and efficient."

Chairman Mills and his colleagues listened carefully to the testimony, complimented the Treasury for its diligence, suggested that the package is a bit timid even for a first step, but cautiously avoided committing themselves.

All this was in response to pressures for tax reform which had been building up since it became evident that President Nixon would be forced to propose extension of the surtax to fight inflation. Congress accepted the surtax last year only after attaching to it a requirement that the President submit a tax reform plan by the end of the year. President Johnson balked, partly because he regarded this as an infringement of presidential prerogatives and partly because he isn't a tax reformer at heart anyway.

But Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Stanley S. Surrey took the Congressional mandate seriously. As his last official will and testament, he left behind a tax reform plan which was later transmitted to Congress by the new Treasury.

Armed with this ammunition. Congressional tax reformers served notice that the surtax would not be extended unless it was accompanied by a "real" reform. This movement has a lot of steam behind it because there is simply no way to answer the argument that the surtax penalizes those who already pay taxes, while those who escape paying in one way or another go scot-free.

The Surrey package is a skillful blend of a large number of tax changes which would distribute $1.7-billion of individual income tax revenue—out of a $75-billion total—from those with incomes of more than $15,000 to those below this level. The showpieces of the package are an increase in the minimum standard deduction which would remove 1.25 million families from the income tax rolls; taxation at capital gains rates of capital gains transferred through bequests and gifts (which are not now subject to income tax) before calculating the amount of property subject to estate or gift tax; a device to disallow personal deductions in proportion to the percentage of tax-exempt income received by taxpayers; and a minimum income tax levied at half the regular rates on a comprehensive income tax base which would include most, but not all, of nontaxable income.

In the light of the grave deficiencies in the tax law, the Surrey package is really quite modest. In fact, it fails to do anything about the most important and expensive "special provisions" in today's tax structure—most notably, percentage depletion, tax-exempt interest, the definition and rates of capital gains tax, and the favored treatment of married couples through income splitting.

All told, these provisions cost the Treasury at least $20-billion annually at present tax rates. Surrey would recover less than a billion of this amount by the minimum tax and the allocation of deductions between taxable and nontaxable income sources.

Edwin S. Cohen, Surrey's successor in the Treasury, is also well versed in the intricacies of the Internal Revenue Code. His problem was to satisfy the demand for tax reform and, at the same time, differentiate his product. The package he put together for President Nixon is a work of art, even if it is not the Mona Lisa of tax reform.

Cohen carried over a few of Surrey's proposals with little or no change (example: elimination of multiple surtax exemptions for large corporations that break up into hundreds of small corporations each of which is worth $6,500 in reduced taxes); went further than Surrey in some respects (example: tighter rules for foundations and other tax-exempt organizations); and discarded several of the proposals most likely to meet political resistance (example: imposition of a capital gains tax on gains transferred as gift or death).

The eye-catching change made by Cohen concerns the taxation of the poor. Surrey's hike in the minimum standard deduction would have left three-quarters of a million poor families on the income tax rolls. As a substitute, Cohen devised a new "low income allowance" which raises the minimum taxable income level by a flat $1,100 above the per capita exemptions and happens to duplicate almost to the dollar the official "poverty lines" at this year's prices. To limit the revenue loss, the low income allowance is tapered off by 50 cents for each dollar of income tax above the present minimum taxable levels so that the allowance disappears rapidly (at $3,300 for a single person, $3,700 for a married couple, and $4,500 for a family of four).

This device permits Cohen to claim, correctly, that he has eliminated virtually all the poor from the income tax roll at far less cost than the corresponding minimum standard deduction. (Of course, the heaviest federal tax on the poor is the payroll tax—not the income tax—but the burdensomeness of the payroll tax is ignored because it is legally earmarked for social security.)

The most controversial feature of the Cohen package is the new limit on tax preferences (LTP), a substitute for the minimum tax. The theory of LTP is that no one should be permitted to exclude more than 50 per cent of his income from the tax base. For example, an individual with a $100,000 salary and $300,000 of tax preferences would be taxed on half of the $400,000 total, or $200,000, instead of on $100,000 as he is now.

But the effectiveness of LTP depends on the definition of the term "tax preference." Cohen omitted two items in Surrey's list which are crucial to any attempt to limit tax preferences—tax-exempt interest and long-term capital gains. As a result, Cohen would pick up only $8-million from his LTP, a far cry from the $420-million yield of Surrey's minimum income tax which is also a pittance when compared with the huge benefits that present tax preferences provide.

Many tax experts do not regard the Surrey plan as earth-shaking, and the Cohen plan is even weaker. In the past, the high water mark of tax reform has been the Administration's bill, but things are different this year. Congress may surprise everybody by passing a tougher bill than either the Surrey plan or the Cohen plan. It all depends on the flak congressmen will get from their constituents. If you believe in tax reform, write your congressman and senators!

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, let me just interpose one thought. I am delighted to hear my distinguished friend from Massachusetts say so. When I take my place in the Senate Finance Committee tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, I will be looking for a message from him addressed to the chairman of the Democratic policy committee and from the distinguished majority leader addressed to the chairman of the Finance Committee, and I will be all eyes and ears as I listen when he makes an appeal to the distinguished chairman of that committee to get busy and get a tax bill out of that committee tomorrow, if possible. That is what I call a try—not after Labor Day or Christmas.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 2 additional minutes.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. I yield to the majority leader.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois yields to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, may I say that the Committee on Finance, when it meets tomorrow, will have a message from the majority leader as a matter of courtesy. May I also say there is nothing to stop the Finance Committee from reporting any bill which a majority of its members desire to report, nor is there anything to stop the bill from being placed on the calendar. However, I think I should recall to the distinguished minority leader, who knows this as well as I do, that we have a very important bill on the calendar, now under discussion, undergoing intensive debate. The debate has a long, long way to go. It is a bill which calls for the authorization of something on the order of $20 billion.

When I talked to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Stennis), at the time this bill came up—and he will correct me if I am wrong—it is my recollection it was our thought that we ought to stay with the bill until action on it was completed. The bill will take all of this month. It will go into next month. It is a matter which I think should be played out, so no one should be under any delusion that the present bill will be laid aside for consideration of the tax bill when and if it is reported out of the Finance Committee.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired. The Senator from Illinois did not utilize a great deal of it, but when he yielded, it had the same effect.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 minute.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois requests 1 minute. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator from Illinois is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, I know the sound of the death knell when I hear it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no, no. The Senator is undergoing a poetic flight of fancy.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for a couple of minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California has been seeking recognition since the debate began, and the Chair feels an obligation to recognize the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I ask permission to withhold for a moment, to give the floor back to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator wishes to yield to the Senator from Delaware, he may do so.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I was going to make the suggestion that will perhaps get us out of this dilemma. The Democratic policy committee has apparently taken the unanimous position that it wants reforms in our tax laws. The Senator from Massachusetts, one of the leaders of that policy committee, yesterday introduced his reform package. I am wondering if he will introduce that bill, cosponsored unanimously by the Democratic policy committee, and present it to our committee. If he can I think perhaps we can solve this dilemma. He may be surprised at the results. If there is such unanimity on the part of the Democratic policy committee, then have its members cosponsor that bill and have it presented to the Finance Committee tomorrow.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. It was kind and considerate of the distinguished Senator from Delaware to make that suggestion. His statement that my proposals contained some parts which meet with his approval is obviously heartening to me. However, as I mentioned in my remarks yesterday, there are many areas which I hope the committee will consider. I am really trying to follow the procedure which the chairman of the Finance Committee has outlined. He asked the Members of the Senate who have some ideas or recommendations to submit their proposals for consideration by the committee. I believe this represents the position of the Democratic policy committee. I am hopeful that other Members of the Senate will follow that recommendation. The Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG) has outlined a procedure which is acceptable to members on this side of the aisle. Let me say again, however, that it is heartening to me that any part of the proposal I have made is thought by the Senator from Delaware to be meritorious.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What I want to know is just how unanimous is the recommendation of the Democratic policy committee. At least, it would lay at rest the question of whether the Democratic policy committee is unanimous in supporting the reform proposals.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say that it is up to the Members of the Senate—in this particular case the members of the Finance Committee—to make up their own minds what the committee as a whole wants to do and what it wants to report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Delaware is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MURPHY. Does the Senator from California still have the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair intends to recognize the Senator from California when the Senator from Delaware yields the floor, whether the Senator from California has the floor or not.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to thank the majority leader for his statement that this responsibility rests with the Finance Committee. I hope the Democratic policy committee will abide by the decision rendered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator need not worry about that. It is the responsibility of the policy committee to schedule legislation, not to make it. We are very careful not to cross the line between the policy committee of the Senate and the Finance Committee of the Senate or any other committee of the Senate because, after all, the policy committee is the servant of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from California may yield to me for an insertion without losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, the Chair recognizes the Senator from North Carolina.

PREVENTIVE DETENTION—AN AFFRONT TO CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, a few days ago President Nixon sent to Congress a package of bills pertaining to his war on crime. Two of these bills, court reorganization of the District of Columbia and the creation of a Federal public defender office for the city, are worthy proposals. The third, relating to preventive detention, is quite another story.

The pretrial detention authorized by the Nixon bill is unconstitutional and smacks of a police state rather than a democracy under law.

It repudiates centuries of Anglo-American concepts of fairness, due process, and common standards of justice. The administration would put in jail uncounted numbers of citizens without trial. It would authorize a hearing—a sort of "pretrial trial"—in which the defendant would be convicted if the state could prove a "substantial probability" of guilt, and produce more "evidence" of "dangerousness."

For centuries, the constitutional standard of conviction in this country has been "proof beyond a reasonable doubt," not merely "probable cause" or "substantial probable cause," whatever that means.

Under the Nixon bill, the state has the right to throw an individual in jail for 60 days. The administration concedes that it cannot try these defendants within 60 days. So after that time, the defendants will once again go free. Any danger they represented to the community would once again be present.

The administration bill protects no one. All it does is convict and imprison without due process.

Such detention unfairly deprives an individual of the opportunity to assist in his defense. It may cost him his job. It is detrimental to his family. And it subjects him to the psychological and physical deprivations of jail life.

Judges are not gifted with the prophetic powers necessary for accurate judgments as to which individuals represent a danger to the community. This law will be highly susceptible to abuse. It will result in the imprisonment of many innocent persons.

The real answer to the problem of crime committed by persons while awaiting trial lies not in the preventive detention of individuals presumed innocent, but in the speedy trial of the accused and the swift and sure punishment of the guilty.

PRIVACY AND FREE TRAVEL: PERSONAL BODY SEARCH OF TRAVELERS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the incident I am going to describe was reported to me by a constituent who knows of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee's interest in the protection of individuals from unwarranted governmental invasion of privacy.

In addition to the right of privacy, her story also has a strong bearing on the American citizen's enjoyment of the freedom to travel.

This lady, an English teacher, returned last month from a 3-week vacation-study trip to Europe. Arriving at Dulles Airport, she passed through immigration inspection, and dragged her bags along to the customs barrier. There she was told by an official that she had duty to pay. She was taken to an office, where another official introduced himself and a woman official, and then left her in the company of two women. One of these asked her to remove her jacket, blouse, and underclothes. When she hesitated and asked whether this was standard procedure or a random spotcheck, or what, she was told that "someone" had thought she looked as though she might have something concealed beneath her blouse.

She asks a question the Customs Bureau should be required to answer:

> Are all full-bosomed women to be subjected to this sort of indignity? Being singled out solely because of one's physical structure, taken aside, and asked to undress constitutes an indignity I find peculiarly offensive.

Immediately after this experience and consequent inconveniences including conveyance which she had been forced to miss, my constituent sat down at the airport and wrote me a letter. She was, she wrote, "literally footsore and aching, having been 18 hours out of bed, tired, longing only to get home, and not even remotely acquainted with dope or whatever it was they were looking for, and strongly opposed to its use."

She asks:

> What should I have done? It is a very curious circumstance to be in! I was really too tired and too stunned to comprehend it. Shouldn't they have said at once what they wanted? I went to that room for the purpose of paying duty.
>
> I need to tell someone who has some concern over invasion of privacy. I think that a search of this kind should be undertaken only in an extreme case—and then in such a way that the victim has some foggy idea of what the hullaballoo is all about. Everybody in that room—four or five custom people—everybody except me knew what was going on, why I was there, probably what had been said. I never did find out. If someone said I was carrying something illicit, I think I should have been told who said so and what he said, instead of being left alone with two strange women who began with, "would you mind taking off your jacket?" and then proceeded garment by garment—again, not an honest "Strip to the waist," which is what they meant.

While this case involved an external personal body search, it is related to another problem involving the Customs Bureau which the subcommittee investigated last year: that is, the extent to which due process and the personal privacy of the individual is protected in internal body searches by customs officers.

The practice of internal body searches by customs officials is one of recent origin, and it is not at all clear to me that the basic 1866 statute authorized such techniques or that it established sufficient procedural and substantive protection for the individual in modern times.

In response to subcommittee inquiry about the extent of such practices and the regulations governing them, I received a letter and memorandum from the Treasury Department which describes their attitudes on this matter. Since the administrative policies and issues as well as the constitutional principles involved are similar to those raised by the personal search in my constituent's case, I ask unanimous consent that her letter, with her signature deleted, and the correspondence between the subcommittee and the Treasury Department be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I believe this is an area which deserves the careful attention of the new administration.

We cannot know for sure how often such incidents occur. I am told most people are too embarrassed to write their Congressmen. Since the regulations allow such searches on the mere "belief or suspicion" of the customs official, there is obviously ample opportunity for abuses in this area.

I sincerely hope that travelers returning from abroad this summer are not going to be subjected to the unrestrained zeal of customs officials whose overenthusiastic exercise of their discretionary powers may not only deny constitutional rights of travelers, but equally important, may tarnish the welcome of our borders.

The wise conclusion which Mr. Justice Brandeis drew from the lessons of history might with profit be applied here:

> Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the government's purposes are beneficient. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning, but without understanding.

EXHIBIT 1

JULY 1, 1969.

Hon. SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.
Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ERVIN: Thank you for your prompt response to my letter of 24 June about what I considered unwarranted and unjust treatment by customs officials. It is reassuring to know that you are concerned about such a practice. Certainly I had never heard of it, aside from tales of diamond smuggling, false heels, and the like. All my other encounters with customs had been simple and pleasant, and I still have no notion what changed this one into an experience more fitting in a totalitarian state. Anything that will keep others from having to undergo this distressing and humiliating experience is to the point, and I have no objection to your citing this experience in a speech if you think it will help curb a practice that should never be inflicted upon normal, law-abiding citizens.

Aside from being singled out and set apart from other passengers, I think I object most to the sort of pre-judging involved. I have taught Milton's *Areopagitica* too long not to recall phrases like "their intent not being known to be evil"; and I think that a search of this kind should be undertaken only in an extreme case—and then in such a way that the victim has some foggy idea of what the hullaballoo is all about. Everybody in that room—four or five customs people—everybody except me knew what was going on, why I was there, probably what had been said. I never did find out. If someone said I was carrying something illicit, I think I should have been told who said so and what he said, instead of being left alone with two strange women who began with, "would you mind taking off your jacket?" and then proceeded garment by garment—again, not an honest "Strip to the waist," which is what they meant.

As I am sure I told you, I was led into this office thinking that I was to pay duty there on the two bottles of brandy and gin I had bought in the export shop in London. The man in charge in the office asked whether I had anything about my person, etc., and of course I said I did not have; and I think it was then I asked whether this was standard procedure or random selection—and learned that it had nothing to do with my paying duty: "he didn't want to embarrass me," I was told. Better if he *had* embarrassed me—I'd have been prepared for the humiliation to follow.

None of this, so far as I could tell, had to do with my luggage, my purchases abroad, or anything in my handbag or among my other effects: it was all to do with my person. Maybe that's what offended me—that some unnamed, unseen person could single out my person and have it subjected to what must be considered an indignity—and nothing in my previous life, loyal citizenship, service to society, or normal good citizenship warded off any result of this anonymous allegation. In my forties, I found it hard to absorb this course of events—and felt chiefly a profound sense of shame; and I hate to think of the psychological damage such an experience might do to a younger person less experienced in encountering various kinds of damned foolishness.

On the other hand, there was something terribly amateurish and unknowledgeable about the official approach—nothing sleek and professional about the way I was separated from the herd, nothing complimentary to the intelligence in the assumption that anyone smuggling anything worth going to all this trouble for would be so naive as to let it bulge through his clothes. It didn't really make very good sense, especially when I gathered that it was marijuana I was supposed to be carrying. The official spotter doesn't sound very ept; the employees required to carry on the search were obviously embarrassed and, eventually, apologetic; and the system doesn't compare very well with the British "red and green" system I found when I landed at London Airport. It's a little more like cops-and-robbers, about as sophisticated as the nine-year-old mind.

Any way you take it, if anyone is ever to be subjected to such a search, it ought to be on pretty strong evidence; and the person ought to be told what is going on and why.

The basis for this disruption that left me in such a state that I did not even want to face other Americans is almost frivolous, no matter how many sonorous noises anyone makes about "the drug traffic is wicked" and "we have a job to do." I have a job to do, too—to work with students in very troubled times; and if I went about it as awkwardly as this, they'd laugh me out of existence, and they'd be right. But when I try to do this job well—and anyone in college teaching these days knows that there are many quiet negotiations and meetings intended to forestall possible demonstrations and violence—when I have tried to contribute to my country and my society by work like that of this year just past, it is peculiarly insulting to be set aside as one who would corrupt the young people one has worked so hard to help. I'm not pleading position or rank, and I am fully aware that there are idiots in my profession who praise the beauties of smoking pot; but unless the point of this search is to prove that customs is no respecter of persons, is there any point in harassing and humiliating someone who has been trying very hard to contribute to the society that inflicts this treatment?

When I finally realized that I was not in that office to pay tribute on a bottle of liqueur and asked whether this questioning (about things concealed on my person) was standard procedure or random sampling, I did not receive a direct reply.

I try hard not to see what is not there, like Communists in the woodwork, nor to imagine that significance exists when it is only circumstance I see, but now, after a week's reflection, the whole incident still seems to me a very bad nightmare. At the time, when my leg muscles ached so that I could not even wear heels for the trip, when I had to carry my own luggage several times, when I had sat for more than eight hours at a window seat rather than disturb other passengers so I could get out and stretch, when I had been out of bed for eighteen hours or so, I thought I was in never-never land; and I was not far wrong. My luggage missed the plane to North Carolina, and I had to transport it to National Airport and pay two more sets of tips at Washington rates; I never got to see the friends who were to have met me; I had to find my own way between airports; I was left in an emotional depth; I looked even more travelworn because of the disarray of my hair; and I managed to have dinner, finally, at three a.m. DST—that is, only twenty-seven hours after I got out of bed to make this joyous trip home. This is no tale of a pioneer's travail—merely the result of one woman's being subjected to that inept mess at Dulles Airport because some idiot thought I might be carrying something. Our country was founded in what was supposed to be the age of reason. As Chub Seawell would say, call your next case.

I came back into my native land, by choice, at Dulles Airport, on a Pan Am flight (from London) I arrived at National Airport, where I scrawled my note to you, about 8:10 p.m. To my knowledge nothing in my deeds, words, actions, or dress should have contributed in any way to the impression that I am more or less than I am—a law-abiding citizen. I am most grateful for your concern, because without it, I would be ready to question some of the basic assumptions about our democracy (and republic) that I have always held. I shall be most interested to hear further about this matter and to learn what the traveler may do if he is faced with it—particularly when the customs office holds the trump card of dumping one's possessions and delaying schedules further. If I can be of assistance, please be assured of my cooperation. And thank you again for caring.

Sincerely yours,

———— ————.

July 14, 1969.

Hon. David M. Kennedy,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: It has come to my attention that a constituent, ————, upon her recent return from a summer visit to Europe, was subjected to an unwarranted personal search by Customs officials at Dulles Airport.

Her experience and comments are described in the enclosed letter.

I should appreciate your having this incident investigated and advising the Subcommittee what steps will be taken to prohibit such occurrences in the future.

As you may know, the Subcommittee has also been concerned about the Bureau's use of body searches on citizens in its quest for smugglers.

Certainly, I think that the possibility of being subjected to such offensive techniques without very strong and reasonable grounds pose formidable obstacles to the citizen's enjoyment of travel abroad for vacation or for business purposes. Such practices can be viewed not only as a violation of his personal privacy but also as a deterrent to the effective exercise of the freedom of travel.

While none would argue the merit of government's efforts to prevent smuggling, I believe the principles of a free society demand that a certain element of risk is unavoidable. For myself, I would rather see one smuggler escape than have one hundred American travelers stripped and searched on the mere suspicion that they might be trying to smuggle something through customs.

I would hope that the new Director of Customs would set as his first order of business a thorough review of the policies and practices which threaten the constitutional rights of Americans who travel abroad.

On behalf of the Subcommittee, I would strongly urge that he consider issuing new regulations providing a semblance of due process for disembarking passengers, and that he take drastic steps to assure their enforcement.

With all kind wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

Sam J. Ervin, Jr.,
Chairman.

July 25, 1968.

Hon. Henry H. Fowler
Secretary of the Treasury
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: In the course of this Subcommittee's study of privacy and individual rights, our attention has been directed to reports that citizens and foreign travelers entering the United States may be subjected to offensive and unwarranted personal searches by customs officials.

If these reports are true, I am sure every American would be concerned that his government should engage in such techniques. Such a policy could seriously distort our national image as a country which offers a warm welcome to visitors from abroad.

To assist us in our study I should appreciate your supplying the Subcommittee with replies to the following questions:

1. Are internal examinations ever made of persons entering the United States?

2. If so, what categories of travelers are subject to this practice? For what reasons?

3. Are records kept on the frequency of such examinations and on the circumstances surrounding each case?

4. What specific statutes and regulations authorize such examinations?

5. Are the regulations governing examinations published in the Code of Federal Regulations?

6. Is the individual entitled, under your regulations, to prior notice of such a search and to the presence of counsel or another person if he so requests?

Please supply copies of pertinent statutes, regulations and operating memoranda.

I should particularly like to receive examples of instructions issued to officials at ports of entry for their guidance in determining the need for such personal searches.

With appreciation for your assistance in our study, and with all kind wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

Sam J. Ervin, Jr.
Chairman.

Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. Sam J. Ervin, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: In your letter of July 25, 1968, you express your concern about allegations that citizens and foreign travelers entering the United States may be subjected to offensive and unwarranted personal searches by customs officers.

This Department and the Bureau of Customs place the highest emphasis on courtesy in dealings with the traveling public. At the same time, in processing the overwhelming numbers of such persons, more than 212 million of whom entered the United States during the past year, customs officers have to be concerned with their assigned task of enforcing the customs laws, particularly those laws which prohibit the smuggling of contraband articles into the United States. The focus on this aspect of their responsibilities is assuming increasing importance by reason of the steady and spectacular increase in smuggling attempts. The magnitude of this increase can be seen when it is realized that seizures of smuggled heroin jumped from 78 pounds in fiscal year 1967 to 246 pounds in fiscal year 1968 and those of marihuana from 26,312 pounds to 70,210 pounds during the same period.

Unfortunately, smugglers of both sexes have found it extremely effective to make use of body cavities for the purpose of secreting prohibited merchandise of small bulk and extremely high value, specifically heroin.

There is enclosed for your information a memorandum prepared in the Bureau of Customs which supplies detailed answers to the specific questions raised in your letter of July 25.

If we can provide any additional information or be of further assistance, please feel free to call on us.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph M. Bowman.

August 16, 1968.

Re body searches (letter from Chairman Ervin of the Senate Judiciary Committee, dated July 25, 1968.

Hon. Joseph M. Bowman, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary,
Commissioner of Customs.

The specific questions are answered as follows:

1. Are internal examinations ever made of persons entering the United States? Yes, they are, but on very rare occasions. As an example, during the month of June 1968, at the port of San Ysidro, California, where almost 3,500,000 persons entered the United States, there were five such searches, each of which resulted in the seizure of heroin concealed in body cavities and the arrest of the smugglers.

2. If so, what categories of travelers are subject to this practice? For what reasons?

All that we have any knowledge of in recent times have been returning residents of the United States who cross the border into Mexico for purposes of using and acquiring narcotics. The reasons for their selection were their appearance, i.e., external evidence of the use of narcotics, the presence of narcotics paraphernalia in their effects, criminal record of narcotics violations, *advance information*, or admission under questioning that they had secreted narcotics within their bodies.

3. Are records kept on the frequency of such examinations and on the circumstances surrounding each case?

Such records are kept at each port, but we do not maintain any central record.

4. What specific statutes and regulations authorize such emaxinations?

Statutory authority for such searches is found in 19 USC 1582 and 19 USC 482. Instructions are issued by supervisory personnel in individual cases, and policy is set forth in letters from the Bureau headquarters and in a manual prepared for field guidance.

5. Are the regulations governing examinations published in the Code of Federal Regulations?

No such regulations are published in the Code of Federal Regulations.

6. Is the individual entitled, under your regulations, to prior notice of such a search and to the presence of counsel or another person if he so requests?

No he is not, but such body searches are, by direction, always performed by medically trained personnel such as public health physicians, nurses or doctors attached to hospitals, and not by Customs personnel.

Attached are the following:

Sec. 3.4, "Customs Inspector's Manual" on personal searches, which would include body searches. the latter being one category of personal searches.

Extract from letter dated July 18, 1966, setting forth Bureau policy on body searches.

Copy of memorandum entitled Authority of Customs Officers to Search Persons Entering United States from Abroad; Conduct of Search of Bodily Cavities.

I regret that we do not have available here any local or port directives on this subject, but these are subjects which are covered in formal and on-the-job training programs, and are not necessarily the subject of formal directives or regulations, except as indicated above.

Since searches by Customs officers are in a special category, a fact which was recognized by the acts of the first Congress of the United States and which have been consistently upheld by the courts since that time, it would be impractical to issue specific regulations or attempt to publish prescribing circumstances under which any of the 212 million people who last year entered the United States might be subject to internal searches when, in fact, there were no more than 125 so examined. This is particularly true when the statutes seem to clearly authorize such searches and when the data shows that almost all of those searched were found in possession of narcotics or other contraband; and most of them had prior criminal records and they obviously were thoroughly aware of the risk they run from Custom searches, or they would not have had the contraband so concealed. The following figures may serve to better illustrate this point. San Ysidro, California, is our most active enforcement port in terms of overall searches, seizures, and arrests. During June of this year 3,499,680 persons entered from Mexico. From this traffic there were 345 personal searches, of which 180 resulted in seizures. Five of these personal searches included internal searches, all of which resulted in seizures of heroin and the arrest of the violators. Even so, in every instance our officers have thoroughly explained to each suspect in advance of the personal search the reasons for his search so that he (1) may be fully informed of what is happening; and (2) may be afforded an opportunity to voluntarily produce any contraband concealed on or in his person.

It has never been considered that a person being processed through Customs upon entry into the United States should be entitled to have counsel present before being subjected to such normal Customs processing as the examination of his baggage or, where appropriate, the search of his person. Clearly, a quasi-judicial proceeding for each of the 212 million people entering this country, on an annual rate, at the present time, is not feasible, and would be inconsistent with the authority granted to Customs by the Congress from the earliest days of this country and recognized by the courts as necessary for the enforcement of Customs laws.

———.

Regulations

3.4 Personal Search—The search authority of customs officers is broader than that vested in other federal officers. This is because of the recognition that such search authority is essential to the proper enforcement of the laws governing the entrance of persons and things into the United States. This essential authority must be zealously guarded against any abuse. Customs search authority is based on the suspicion and belief of a customs officer that there is concealed merchandise or contraband which is being introduced into the United States in a manner contrary to law. Therefore, as a customs officer you have full authority under such conditions to make any reasonable search. When circumstances warrant, this search may extend to the removal of any part or all of a suspect's clothing. Normally you should confer with your supervisor before proceeding with such a search.

(a) A search of pockets and women's handbags should not be made as a matter of routine, but may be made when deemed necessary. Such searches should be made as courteously and tactfully as possible, and consideration should be given to the passenger's right to privacy. Search of pockets should not be made in the public view, and in no case should "hipslapping" be used as a method of inspection.

(b) As an inspector, you have full authority to make personal searches. Under the law it is your belief or suspicion which forms the basis for a decision to make a personal search. Full personal searches (i.e., those not limited to baggage, purses and pockets) are authorized, with the concurrence of the supervisor on duty, if deemed necessary because:

(1) There is information at hand that the passenger is, or is believed to be attempting to smuggle, or,

(2) The name of the passenger appears on the soundex list, and it is established that the passenger is the person named and is listed as a potential smuggler of articles or contraband of a nature likely to be concealed on the person, or,

(3) The person appears to be under the influence of narcotics, marihuana or other dangerous drugs, or there are strong indications that he is a user of such drugs for other than medicinal purposes or is a convicted violator of the narcotic or smuggling laws, or,

(4) During the course of your questioning or examination there arises a serious suspicion that articles have been concealed in the clothing or on the person of the passenger. Some reasons for suspicion, further questioning, closer examination and a conclusion that a personal search is warranted may include, but are not limited to, the following: (a) unusual actions on the part of the passenger which cannot be explained logically, such as making a point of turning so that a particular part of his body will be away from your view, the relutance to make a natural movement of his arm or other part of his body or obviously holding a coat or other article so that a particular part of his body will be concealed; (b) unusual appearance which might include suspicious or abnormal bulges, excessive clothing in hot weather, etc.; (c) a hypodermic needle or syringe, a finger-stall, a burnt or smoke blackened spoon, an eye dropper or any other narcotic addiction paraphernalia found in the baggage or effects of a passenger; (d) contraband or articles found in his effects which indicate that the passenger is not acting in good faith. (See also Section 3.6 *Art of Inspection.*)

(c) A personal search is not a routine search, and the decision to perform such a search is not to be taken lightly. No personal search should be made as a retaliatory or punitive measure. If it has been determined that a personal search is to be made, whenever possible you should ask someone, preferably another customs officer, to act as a witness. The search must be conducted in privacy. At airports or seaports if proper facilities are not available ask a representative of the carrier to assign a room for this purpose. At border stations if no search room is provided make arrangements to use other facilities. In making a personal search the following rules should be observed:

(1) Whenever possible, have a witness to any personal search.

(2) Watch the subject closely while en route to, or inside, the search room to prevent him from discarding any contraband, from drawing a weapon or using force to prevent search or arrest.

(3) Conduct the search in a professional or businesslike manner, without frivolity or gratuitous remarks. The less said the better. After first checking to see that the passenger has no concealed weapons, instruct him to remove his clothing one piece at a time. Each piece should be thoroughly searched and the contents placed on a table in full view of the passenger. All bills, receipts, price lists, tags, and other papers, notes, names, addresses and phone numbers, or other articles pertinent to the investigation should be segregated and detained pending further action. You should inform the passenger that the articles are being temporarily detained. You should be able later to identify the articles and the person from whom they were removed if necessary.

(4) Remember the person being searched is a fellow human being. Allow him to maintain as much human dignity as possible. Do not make any remarks about his appearance, clothing, or character. You can be absolutely right in what you do and make one remark that will make you absolutely wrong.

(5) Try to gain the willing cooperation of the person you are searching. This may avoid the necessity of resorting to force.

(6) Avoid any unnecessary physical contact with the suspect.

(7) In case of trouble or anticipated trouble notify a supervisor immediately, if possible.

(8) Be sure the passenger can see what you are doing especially when you examine his wallet or money container.

(9) Answer reasonable pertinent questions if you can do so without detriment to the case under investigation. However, do not engage in lengthy, aimless conversation or volunteer any information.

(10) The extent of the search should depend on the circumstances of the case. For example, if you are looking for watch movements you should not have the subject strip and bend over for you to examine his body. If you are looking for heroin, you should examine his body closely.

(11) Once the decision has been made that a personal search is in order, it should be made to the extent deemed necessary. In no case should any complaint, threat of complaint or physical resistance result in a passenger's not being searched, or in his being searched any less thoroughly than is required by the circumstances. Customs officers have the authority to use such force as is reasonably necessary to accomplish a search.

(12) Make a record of the search, giving the name and address of the subject, the reason for the search, the result, including the seizure number, if a seizure is made, your name and the name of the witness and any other information that might be useful in a subsequent inquiry or investigation.

Extract of Letter

The purpose of this letter is to point out that it is most important that:

(1) body cavity searches, including searches of stomach contents, be held to a minimum,

(2) that they be undertaken only when there is a positive reason to believe that they will be productive, and

(3) that when conducted they be conducted under appropriate circumstances, i.e., by a doctor or nurse, and in suitable surroundings, such as a doctor's office or a public health unit, or a hospital.

This letter should be brought to the attention of all customs agents and customs port investigators and instruct them to be guided thereby.

Sincerely yours,
LAWRENCE FLEISHMAN,
Assistant Commissioner.

Memorandum, August 22, 1968

Subject: *Authority of Customs Officers to Search Persons Entering United States From Abroad; Conduct of Search of Bodily Cavities*

Customs officials are given the authority to search persons crossing borders into the United States by two statutes, 19 U.S.C. 1582 and 19 U.S.C. 482. 19 U.S.C. 1582 provides:

"The Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe regulations for the search of persons and baggage and he is authorized to employ female inspectors for the examination of search of persons of their own sex, and all persons coming into the United States from foreign countries shall be liable to detention and search by authorized officers or agents of the Government under such regulations."

19 U.S.C. 482 provides in part:

"Any of the officers or persons authorized to board or search vessels may stop, search, and examine * * * any vehicle * * * or person, on which or whom he or they shall suspect there is merchandise which is subject to duty, or shall have been introduced into the United States in any manner contrary to law, whether by the person in possession or charge * * * or otherwise * * * and if any such officer or other person so authorized shall find any merchandise on or about any such vehicle * * * or persons * * * which he shall have reasonable cause to believe is subject to duty, or to have been unlawfully introduced into the United States * * * he shall seize and secure the same for trial."

These two statutes have been construed to authorize searches of the broadest possible character. For example:

A reading of this Section (1581) in conjunction with Section 1582 indicates that it was the intention of Congress to create a broad authority for customs officials to conduct reasonable searches necessary to the enforcement of customs laws. Strict construction should not be permitted to defeat the policy and purpose of the statute. *United States* v. *Yee Ngee How,* 105 F. Supp. 517, 522 (N.D. Cal. 1952).

In fact, searches of persons coming into the United States from a foreign country are in a specialized category. This distinction from searches generally was recognized by the fountainhead case on the subject of searches and seizures, *Boyd* v. *United States,* 116 U.S. 616 (1886), in which this language is used (pages 623–624):

"The search for and seizure of * * * goods liable to duties and concealed to avoid payment thereof, are totally different things from a search for and seizure of a man's private books and papers for the purpose of obtaining information therein contained, or of using them as evidence against him. The two things differ *toto coelo*. In the one case the Government is entitled to the possession of the property; in the other it is not. * * * The seizure of goods forfeited for a breach of the revenue laws, or concealed to avoid duties payable on them, has been authorized by English statutes for at least two centuries past; and the like seizures have been authorized by our own revenue acts from the commencement of the Government. The first statute passed by Congress to regulate the collection of duties, the Act of July 31, 1789 (1 Stat. at L. 43), contains provisions to this effect. As this act was passed by the same Congress which proposed for adoption the original amendments to the constitution, it is clear that the members of that body did not regard searches and seizures of this kind as 'unreasonable', and they are not embraced within the prohibition of the amendment.

"* * * in the case of excisable or dutiable articles, the Government has an interest in them for the payment of duties thereon, and until such duties are paid has a right to keep them under observation, or to pursue and drag them from concealment; * * *"

The special character of the search which customs officials may make on entry has been noted by the courts in almost every case in which such a search has been challenged, very often on the authority of the *Boyd* case. *United States v. Ye Ngee How,* 105 F. Supp. 517, (N.D. Cal. 1952); *Blackford v. United States,* 247 F. 2d 745 (9th Cir. 1957), cert. denied, 356 U.S. 914 (1958); *King v. United States,* 258 F. 2d 754 (5th Cir. 1958); cert. denied, 359 U.S. 939 (1959); *Murgia v. United States,* 285 F. 2d 14 (9th Cir. 1960), cert. denied, 366 U.S. 977 (1961); *Witt v. United States,* 287 F. 2d 389 (9th Cir. 1961), cert. denied, 366 U.S. 950 (1961); *Mansfield v. United States,* 308 F. 2d 221 (5th Cir. 1962); *Denton v. United States,* 310 F. 2d 129 (9th Cir. 1962).

That the right of border search does not depend upon probable cause is pointed out by these same cases. Neither a search warrant nor an arrest is needed to search in these circumstances. *United States v. Yee Ngee How, supra.* It has been said that mere suspicion is a sufficient basis for a border search. *Cervantes v. United States,* 263 F. 2d 800 (9th Cir. 1959) and *Witt v. United States, supra.* This is justified on the ground that detention and search are essential to the enforcement of the laws governing entry of persons, and to the detection and punishment of smuggling. *King* v. *United States, supra.*

It can be concluded initially, therefore, that customs officials have an absolute right to stop and search anyone coming into the United States from a foreign country. The question then becomes what the limits of the search are.

It has become a common practice to smuggle drugs across the border in body cavities. Several courts have taken judicial notice of the fact that a large percentage of narcotics smuggling is accomplished in this way. *Blackford v. United States, supra; United States v. Michel,* 158 Fed. Supp. 34 (S. D. Tex. 1957). This method has created substantial problems for Customs officials. Unless the drugs can be removed and seized, convictions would be difficult to obtain.

The constitutionality of physical searches and the removal, or inducing removal, of drugs from a body cavity pursuant to a border search has not been considered by the Supreme Court. While it is true that the Supreme Court found evidence obtained by use of a stomach pump inadmissable in *Rochin* v. *California,* 342 U.S. 165 (1952), the search which culminated in the use of the stomach tube was not a border seizure, and facts as outlined indicate a series of events beginning with illegal entry and an assault upon defendant. The Supreme Court indicated in *Breithaupt* v. *Abram,* 352 U.S. 432 (1957), where an involuntary blood test for intoxication was in the question, that it was the whole chain of events in *Rochin* that the court found brutal and shocking. The court has said that it is not per se violative of the constitution to remove foreign matter from body cavities. See *Breithaupt* v. *Abram, supra.* Since the decision in *Rochin* both the Fifth and the Ninth circuits have considered and upheld border searches where the evidence of narcotic smuggling was obtained by a physical examination. *Blackford* v. *United States, supra; King* v. *United States, supra; Denton* v. *United States, supra; Espinoza* v. *United States,* 278 F. 2d 802 (5th Cir. 1960), cert. denied, 364 U.S. 827 (1960); *Barrera* v. *United States,* 276 F. 2d 654 (5th Cir. 1960). See also *Lane* v. *United States,* 321 F. 2d 573 (5th Cir. 1963), cert. denied, 377 U.S. 936 (1964), cert. denied, 381 U.S. 920 (1965).

The Fourth Amendment proscribes a search only if it is unreasonable. The "reasonable" restriction has dual significance, for a search must be reasonable in the first instance as well as reasonably conducted. *Blackford* v. *United States, supra; United States* v. *Michel, supra,* affirmed sub nom., *King* v. *United States, supra.* The fact that the search is a border search satisfies the first requirement because of the broad authority to conduct such searches. Neither a warrant nor an arrest, nor probable cause is needed to search a person entering from a foreign country. *United States* v. *Yee Ngee How, supra.* Unquestionably, however, not every such person may be subject to the indignity of an extensive physical examination. There must be some circumstance which will confer upon the course of conduct a factually reasonable aura. Therefore, the decision to make a physical search must have reasonable justification and the search itself must be conducted in a reasonable manner. Both criteria have been illustrated in the reported cases. No minimum standard has yet been developed, since no case has found such a search, incident to entry, unreasonable.

Certain standards have been evolved as to the reasonableness of the probe and search itself:

(1) Customs officials must make no attempt themselves to force the removal of the object contained within a body cavity. *Blackford* v. *United States, supra.*

(2) Actual physical examination should be conducted by qualified physicians under sanitary conditions with the use of medically approved methods. *Blackford* v. *United States, supra; King* v. *United States, supra; Barrera* v. *United States, supra, Application of Woods,* 154 F. Supp. 923 (N. D. Cal. 1957); *United States* v. *Michel, supra.*

(3) The examination and/or probing should not be overly painful. (Pain endured due to defendant's action in attempting to impede the examination should not be considered.) *Blackford* v. *United States, supra.*

(4) Officials should not exert more than the least amount of force necessary to enable doctors to examine defendant. *Blackford* v. *United States, supra; Espinoza* v. *United States, supra.*

Thus, if a customs official has reasonable cause to believe that a person is attempting to smuggle drugs or other items into the country within his body, there appears to be no question but that a physician may remove such item or cause it to be removed if reasonable means are used. There is no necessity for consent to be obtained from the one to be searched.

That a peace officer has authority to request assistance from private individuals is not a new concept. At common law a sheriff was authorized whenever necessary for keeping the peace and apprehending wrongdoers to "command all the people of his county to assist him; which is called the *posse comitatus,* or power of the county, . . ." 1 Bl. Comm. *343. Eventually it was realized that every peace officer is authorized to call upon private individuals to aid him in making arrests or preventing crimes. Persons acting under such a request are "not themselves officers, nor are they mere private persons, but their true legal position is that of a *posse comitatus.*" *Robinson v. State.* 93 Ga. 77, 83, 18 S.E. 1018, 1019 (1893). On the theory that due administration of the law is handicapped by refusing to render assistance which an officer has authority to require, a person called upon for assistance is guilty of a misdemeanor if he improperly refuses. He is not entitled to delay while conducting an inquiry into the officer's authority. See *Firestone v. Rice,* 71 Mich. 377, 380, 38 N.W. 885, 886 (1888).

The authority of a customs officer to request assistance stems from statute rather than the common law. Section 507, Title 19 U.S.C., derived from the Act of July 18, 1866, c. 201, section 10, 14 Stat. 180, confers authority on every officer or other person authorized to make search and seizure. Section 507 provides:

"Every officer or other person authorized to make search and seizures by this title, shall, at the time of executing any of the powers conferred upon him, make known, upon being questioned, his character as an officer or agent of the customs or Government, and shall have authority to demand of any person within the distance of three miles to assist him in making any arrests, search, or seizure authorized by this title, where such assistance may be necessary; and if such person shall, without reasonable excuse, neglect or refuse so to assist, upon proper demand, he shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not more than $200, nor less than $5."

This section has apparently never been interpreted in terms of any issue raised with respect to its scope. It has been the subject of such references as that appearing in footnote 8 of *United States v. Collins,* 349 F. 2d 863, 869 (2d Cir. 1965). In line with the common law as it developed, this statute authorizes a demand of any person to assist in any search. In view of the language, it would not seem that a construction might be arrived at precluding a demand for assistance from a physician in the physical examination of a suspected smuggler. The cases have indicated that one of the elements making such a search reasonable has been the participation of a physician. Since the statutes authorizing the search itself have been broadly construed, (see *United States v. Yee Ngee How, supra*), there is no reason to believe that the courts would construe the authority to demand assistance as it appears in section 507 restrictively.

It should be noted that while the officer has authority to demand assistance under penalty for refusal, the area from which such assistance may thus be demanded is limited to three miles. However, a search may reasonably, even necessarily, be conducted in more than one place. In this light, the section is not geographically limiting.

TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, it has been a characteristic of mine that I can never contain my desire to be in good company, and while I have a chance to join in a colloquy with such Senators as the distinguished majority leader, the distinguished minority leader, and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, even though I am not a member of the Committee on Finance, I should like to speak on the matter at this time.

I am pleased that we all recognize the need. I would also point out that the tax reform which I sincerely hope will be forthcoming will be the first since 1954; and I assure my distinguished colleagues that I am as enthusiastic as any Senator for tax reforms. I have paid my share of taxes ever since the beginning—in some years I thought more than my share—and I have done it without complaint. I certainly agree that there must be reform.

Therefore, Mr. President, I join with the distinguished minority leader and the distinguished Senator from Delaware in rising to express my hope that the Senate will recognize the clear public interest which demands swift and affirmative action on the House-passed bill to extend the surtax.

The administration, the Congress, and the public are keenly aware of the urgent need for our Government to take steps to control inflation. Extension of the surtax is an essential step in this direction—and we cannot wait, in taking this step, for the deliberation required in formulating a comprehensive tax reform measure.

It seems to me that there is a serious shortage of logic in the argument of those who would seek to hold up extension of the surtax until it can be tied to a tax reform measure. Just about everyone I ever heard of is for serious, thorough, and comprehensive tax reform—and for achieving it this year. The President is for it. The leaders of this body are for it. The leaders of the House of Representatives favor it. I am certainly in favor of it, as are both political parties.

It is well known that the House Ways and Means Committee is pressing ahead with far-reaching proposals for tax reform, and the chairman of that committee has stated his intention to present such legislation before the August recess. We all intend to have tax reform by the end of this year, but we recognize that enactment of this legislation will take some study and deliberation by both Houses of Congress.

In the need for extension of the surtax, however, we are faced with what is essentially an economic housekeeping measure. It is a stabilization measure, designed to raise desperately needed revenues in order to help stop one of the most serious inflationary crises ever to face this Nation.

An essential part of the program to fight inflation is speedy action to extend the surtax. When we in the National Government show that we mean business about holding down inflation, business and financial decisions will reflect our determination. But until we show that we mean business, decisions by private enterprise are naturally going to assume a softness on our part in facing up to the crisis.

Yet, despite the obvious need for all deliberate speed on this tax measure, we are faced with the prospect of delay—which could extend over several months—because of the misguided belief that it is essential to tie the tax reform package to this legislation.

No one in this Senate seriously questions the need for meaningful tax reform. Nor are there many who question the need for stern measures to battle inflation. Why it is that some Members who are equally concerned about both problems insist on running the grave risk of accomplishing a solution to neither, I just do not understand.

Inflation—and that is just another word for outrageously exaggerated prices on virtually all of life's essentials and luxuries—is striking right now at those least able to defend themselves: the poor, those on fixed incomes, the elderly and retired. Millions of Americans who pay little or no taxes—and who will pay little or no taxes under the terms of this very bill—are faced with constantly shrinking purchasing power. The need to act is urgent.

So it is essential for us to strike deliberately at inflation. Now, if there had been some equivocation on the part of the President on tax reform, if leaders of either party in either House had even hinted that meaningful tax reform would not become a reality this year, if that had been the case I too would be wary of passing this surcharge extension without tax reforms attached, even though I would be playing with the Nation's economic health and would have to search my conscience before agreeing to 1 day's delay.

But that is not the case. The commitment of everyone concerned with tax reform is definite, public, and emphatic. We all know that a real tax reform bill, to be truly effective, must be prepared thoroughly. This takes time.

If we insist on tying these matters together, then we invite inevitable delay on the surcharge—thus inevitably feeding inflationary psychology. In short, we invite a possible disaster if we do not convincingly show our domestic and foreign interests that we mean business in fighting inflation.

Mr. President, I call for this body to act responsibly. No one likes to vote for a tax. We are all tired and hard pressed because of burdensome Federal, State, and local taxes—with the poorest of our citizens suffering the most.

But we must act responsibly. We must vote against the phony tax of inflation, and for the real tax which we can control and limit. That vote must take place just as quickly as our processes will allow.

It seems to me that these two matters, the matter of need and the matter of extreme urgency, must be separated. The passage of the surtax is tied directly to the difficulties caused by inflation. It seems to me that the division should be clear and disinterested, and, as the distinguished minority leader has asked, the surtax should be considered as a matter of immediacy. The serious crisis is upon us.

Then I think we should act as fast as we can to get on with tax reform, which has been so badly needed, and I sincerely hope that the wishes of what is, I am sure, a majority of this body will prevail, and that we will be permitted to separate the two, and not make the one contingent upon the other, because the needs are separate and the one must be done immediately.

I believe every Member of this body feels so, and that the general public is very conscious of the need for the surtax. Then, when that is passed and the immediate crisis is taken care of, we can move with all haste to act upon the tax reform bill that has been so badly needed for so many years.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, we have heard many statements on the surtax made in speeches on the floor of the Senate in the last few days, but I do not think any statements have succinctly brought forth the real need we have in this time of emergency in passing the surtax legislation as has that of the Senator from California.

I commend the distinguished Senator from California for pointing out the emergency nature of this situation.

We hear a great deal said about the tax penalties and the need for reform. I certainly agree that these matters need prompt attention. But I think that the burden imposed upon our people as a result of our taxes, cannot compare with the burden imposed on them by inflation. That is exactly what the Senator was talking about this morning.

He brought out that if we have a tax bill containing the surtax alone or a bill containing the items that are in the House bill passed at an early date, it would help many of the people of our country to a great extent because it would affect the costs they would incur in the purchase of necessities.

Mr. President, we know that today just the purchase of the very necessities of life is a heavy burden. That is why priority should be given to the legislation.

We also have another very important matter that faces us, as the distinguished Senator from California has brought out. That is the feelings of other countries of the world toward our dollar.

This is very important to us, and we must, by action, prove to the other countries of the world that we are willing to curb inflation and take whatever action is necessary to bring our monetary program back into line with the needs of our country and the other countries of the world.

We know that the International Monetary Fund is seeking to adopt a paper gold program and that there is a desire to have the IMF handle the transactions between the different countries of the world.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for another 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Arizona is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. FANNIN. The surtax is an absolute necessity if we are to control inflation. We feel that the surtax extension should be promptly enacted. When this has been done, there would be ample time to consider the other reform measures. And we need time. Many of the proposals, we know, are highly controversial. So we will not have unanimity of feeling, and we will not have a meeting of the minds immediately. But perhaps over a period of time we can iron out some of the programs that have been fostered for many years. However, our immediate need is to do something now to control inflation. We must pass a surtax bill that will, as almost every Senator agrees, assist greatly in easing the financial difficulty that faces us now.

I am very glad that the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) has stated the problem in a manner which can be readily understood. I trust that other Senators will read his remarks.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Arizona for his remarks.

There is absolutely no disagreement; every one is completely certain. All the experts, all the economists, and all others charged with a responsibility for our fiscal policy have said to us, "We must stop inflation. We must have a balanced budget. This can be accomplished only in certain ways. The best way is to have a surtax."

No one is more opposed to imposing additional taxes on the taxpayers than I. The people have been taxed too much in the past.

But this, as I have said, is an emergency. It is a situation that we find it very hard to conceive, unless we have once seen it in action. Runaway inflation—and we are on the verge of it—can destroy the entire set of stable values in the Nation. I have seen it happen in other nations in my lifetime.

I am not even certain that we have not run out of time. It is not a question of putting it off in order to achieve something else. Tax reform will be achieved. No one will work more diligently, I am sure, than the minority leader (Mr. DIRKSEN), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN), and I. Tax reform is needed. But it can best be accomplished with proper deliberation and time. Hopefully, Congress could pass a tax reform bill before the end of this session.

But the tax asked for by the President and passed by the House of Representatives is needed now; it is needed immediately. It is needed for the protection of the values of the goods that are owned by our citizens. That is why I plead, as earnestly as I can, that the Senate be permitted to act upon the surtax bill, even if it be necessary to set aside the pending business, to get it done, and done quickly. When we could return to the other business. Let the proper committee start the wheels of progress toward getting tax reform, reform which, as I said before, we have not had since 1924.

I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, yesterday I had a chance to read Wordsworth's very gentle poem:

> The world is too much with us; late and soon,
> Getting and spending, we lay waste our powers.

When frustrations overwhelm me, then, of course, I have to turn elsewhere for a little comfort. I received that inspiration for a little comfort this morning as that rocket started lunar-bound, and I wondered what they would find.

Then I thought, well, it is all put down here somewhere, because in the very first chapter of Genesis it is recorded that:

> In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.

Fortunately, Mr. President, the long arm of the Supreme Court has not yet reached into this Chamber to interdict prayer, or to prevent one from reading from this majestic book:

> And the earth was without form and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.
>
> And God said, Let there be light: and there was light.
>
> And God saw the light, that it was good: and God divided the light from the darkness.
>
> And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the evening and the morning was the first day.
>
> And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters.
>
> And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament: and it was so.
>
> And God called the firmament Heaven. And the evening and the morning were the second day.
>
> And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so.
>
> And God called the dry land Earth; and the gathering together of the waters called the Seas: and God saw that it was good.
>
> And God said Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth: and it was so.

If that was not in there, you would wonder what would have happened to the subsistence of mankind.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. One of these things we so lightly go over; let me read it again:

> Let the earth bring forth grass.

That is the benediction of the earth.

> The herb yielding seed.

Suppose the herb did not have any seed? It could not reproduce itself. What would have happened in all the centuries and centuries? We could not have subsisted.

> And the fruit tree yielding fruit after its kind, whose seed is in itself.

And it is. We do not know how lucky we are for this benediction.

> And the earth brought forth grass, *and* herb yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed *was* in itself after his kind: and God saw that *it was* good.
>
> And the evening and the morning were the third day.
>
> And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament——

This what I was getting around to—

> of the heavens to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years:

I do not know how long ago that was written, but you cannot improve on it, and no scientist has ever been able to improve upon it.

> And let them be for lights in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth: and it was so.
>
> And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: *he made* the stars also.
>
> And God set them in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth,
>
> And to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness: and God saw that *it was* good.

They are proceeding on this missile program way out there, more than 214,000 miles. It is something whose creation was recorded when this book was compiled.

The thing that I was thinking about, Mr. President, as these brave and courageous astronauts left this globe, was just what will they find among other things? I had hoped that maybe out of it all there could come some truth about space and the interrelationships between all of these planets, whether it is an inferior planet like Mars, Mercury, Venus, Jupiter Saturn, Uranus, or Pluto. They are all up there, and they all have a strange relationship that the astronomers have pointed out. However, these men are going to the Moon. They started this morning. Oh, what a body that really is. Is it all dust? Who knows? It may be impregnated with gold. We cannot tell.

They are going to bring back 180 pounds of material and distribute it to these laboratories. Maybe the rocks they bring back, Senator BYRD (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia), will somehow be loaded with diamonds. We cannot say. I do not know. However, I do know this, because everyone knows it who takes account of what happens on this earth, that that moon up there is a moving force that holds the water up against the earth when we have an ebb tide, and when it gets around and turns loose its attractive power, we get a flood tide.

If one wants to call up the Coast and Geodetic Survey, they can tell him when the tide is coming in at Capetown, South Africa, 10 years from now or longer, or when it is coming into Chesapeake Bay. It has all been worked out, and it works. That is the important thing.

If that moon were any closer, I expect those tides would engulf all of the land surface of the earth. And if it were further away, we might be wanting for water.

If that sun were any closer, we would burn to a crisp. It would burn everything we grow, the flowers I raise, and the vegetables. And if it were much further away, they would all freeze. So would we.

There is an amazing calibration in the whole universe. And so this morning as I watched—and I watched for as long as I could see it—I hoped that out of all this vast expenditure we could at long last develop some truths about these interplanetary relationships, the impact on our weather, the impact on our lives, and our impact on the moon.

We ought to conquer that one first, I think, before we get too uneasy about getting Apollo No. 12 in the air. I would just like to see what they bring back and then have the laboratory tell us all about it. Then we should go back and equate it with what was written in that book a long time ago. I am insanely curious as I think of this amazing venture as the result of our advances in technology.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED LEGISLATION REMOVING THE INTEREST-RATE CEILING ON GOVERNMENT BONDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to facilitate the management of the public debt by removing the interest-rate ceilings on Government bonds, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize charges for certain services together with a comparative type showing the changes that would be made in existing law by the draft bill (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED CONTROLLED DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES ACT OF 1969

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to protect the public health and safety by amending the narcotic, depressant, stimulant and hallucinogenic drug laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, by unanimous consent.

THIRD PREFERENCE AND SIXTH PREFERENCE CLASSIFICATIONS FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports relating to third preference and sixth preference classifications for certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A bill enacted by the Legislature of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE BILL 324

"An act to amend sections 3723.01 and 3723.02 of the Revised Code relative to the Ohio-West Virginia Interstate Air Pollution Control Compacts

"Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio:

"SECTION 1. That sections 3723.01 and 3723.02 of the Revised Code be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3723.01. The 'interstate compact on air pollution' is hereby ratified, enacted into law, and entered into by the state of Ohio as a party thereto with the state of West Virginia, which has legally joined in the compact as follows:

"INTERSTATE COMPACT ON AIR POLLUTION

"The contracting states solemnly agree that:

"Article I

"The party states to this compact hereby provide for the control of the interstate movement of air pollutants through the establishment of an interstate agency with powers to prevent, abate, and control interstate air pollution. And where appropriate, develop and implement ambient air quality standards in any designated air quality control region common to the party States.

"Each of the party states pledges to the other faithful cooperation in the control of air pollution which originates in one state and endangers human health or welfare, animal or plant life, or property, or which interferes with the enjoyment of life or property, in the other state.

"The party states recognize that no single standard for outdoor atmosphere is applicable to all areas within the party states due to such variables as population densities, topographic and climatic characteristics, and existing or projected land use and economic development. The guiding principle of this compact is that air pollution shall not endanger human health or welfare, animal or plant life, or property, or interfere with the enjoyment of life or property.

"Article II

"As used in this compact 'air pollution' means and shall be limited to the discharge into the air by the act of man of substances (liquid, solid, gaseous, organic or inorganic) in a locality, manner and amount as to endanger human health or welfare, animal or plant life, or property, or which would interfere with the enjoyment of life or property.

"Article III

"The party states hereby create the Ohio-West Virginia interstate air pollution control commission, hereafter called 'the commission.'

"The commission shall consist of five commissioners from each party state, each of whom shall be a citizen of the state he represents. In addition, the Chairman of the Commission shall request the President of the United States to designate a Federal representative to the Commission who shall serve as an ex officio member of the Commission, but without vote except as hereinafter provided. The commissioners from each party state shall be chosen by the governor of such state in accordance with the laws of each state, as follows:

"Two of the members from each state shall be chosen from appropriate state agencies, one of whom is the officer responsible for air pollution control, and one of whom is the director of health. The governor of each party state, or his designee, shall be the third member of the Commission. Two other members shall be chosen, one of whom is experienced in the field of municipal government, and one of whom is experienced in the field of industrial activities in choosing said two other members, the governor shall provide for adequate representation of appropriate local interests in any air quality control region designated by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, pursuant to the provisions of section 107(A)(2) of the 'Air Quality Act of 1967,' 81 Stat. 490, 42 U.S. C.A. 1857c–2.

"The governor of each state, unless he appoints a designee, shall serve during his term of office, and if the governor of any state appoints a designee, such designee shall serve at the will of the governor appointing him until the expiration of the governor's term. The Commissioners who shall be appointed by virtue of the offices which they hold shall serve during their continuance in office. The term of the other two commissioners shall be five years. However, the Commissioner appointed by reason of his experience in the field of municipal government and the Commissioner appointed by reason of his experience in the field of industrial activities shall be appointed, one for an initial term of one year and the other for an initial term of two years. Upon the expiration of each such initial term, Commissioners appointed to fill any vacancy shall be appointed for a term of five years.

"Vacancies on the commission shall be filled for the unexpired term in the same manner as appointments to full terms.

"Each State shall have but one vote and every decision, authorization or other action shall require the majority vote of the party States. The vote of each State shall be determined by a majority of the commissioners from each party State present at the meeting where such vote is to be cast. In the event of a tie or stalemate, the Federal representative to the Commission shall cast the deciding vote.

"The commission may sue and be sued, and shall have a seal.

"The commission shall elect annually, from among its members, a chairman and vice-chairman. The commission shall appoint an executive director who shall act as secretary, and who, together with such other commission personnel as the commission may determine, shall be bonded in such amount or amounts as the commission may require.

"Notwithstanding the civil service, personnel, or other merit systems laws of any of the party states, the commission shall appoint, remove or discharge, and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary for the performance of the commission's functions. To the extent practicable, terms and conditions of employment for members of the staff of the commission shall be similar to those pertaining to comparable employees of the individual party states.

"The commission may establish and maintain, independently or inconjunction with one or more of the party states, a suitable retirement system for its employees. Employees of the commission shall be eligible for social security coverage in respect to old-age and survivors insurance: provided, that the commission takes such steps as may be necessary pursuant to federal law to participate in such program of insurance as a governmental agency or unit. The commission may establish and maintain or participate in such additional programs of employee benefits as may be appropriate to afford employees of the commission terms and conditions of employment similar to those enjoyed by employees of the party states generally.

"The commission may accept, or contract for the services of personnal and other services or materials from any state, the United States or any subdivision or agency of either, from any interstate agency, or from any institution, person, firm, or corporation.

"The commission may accept for any of its purposes and functions under this compact any and all donations, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials, and services conditional or otherwise, from the United States, or any agency thereof, from any state or any subdivision or agency thereof, or from

XUM

any institution, person, firm, or corporation, and may receive, utilize, and dispose of the same. The identity of any donor, the amount and character of any assistance, and the conditions, if any, attached thereto shall be set forth in the annual report of the commission.

"The commission may establish and maintain such facilities as may be necessary for the transacting of its business. The commission may acquire, hold, and convey real and personal property and any interest therein.

"The commission shall have power to formulate and adopt rules and regulations and perform any act which it may find necessary to carry out the provisions of this compact, and to amend such rules and regulations. All such rules and regulations shall be filed in the office of the commission for public inspection and copies of such rules and regulations shall be filed in the office in each party state in which rules and regulations of state agencies are filed and shall thereafter be made available to interested persons upon request.

"The commission annually shall make to the governor and legislature of each party state a report covering the activities of the commission for the preceding year, and embodying such recommendations as may have been adopted by the commission. The commission may issue such additional reports as it may deem desirable. These reports shall be available for public examination.

"The commission shall have the authority to collect and disseminate information relating to its functions under, and the purpose of, this compact.

"Article IV

"The commission may, whenever it finds air pollution which originates within the area of its jurisdiction in one of the party states and has an adverse effect in the other party state, make a report recommending measures for the prevention, abatement, or control of any such air pollution. Copies of such report shall be furnished to all existing state and local air pollution control agencies with jurisdiction over the source or sources of air pollution identified in the report. In preparing any such report, the commission may confer with any appropriate national, regional, or local planning body, and any governmental agency authorized to deal with matters relating to air pollution problems and may conduct such hearings and investigations as it may deem appropriate. The commission may consult with and advise the states and local governments, corporations, persons, or other entities with regard to the adoption of programs and the installation of equipment and works for the prevention, abatement, or control of air pollution.

"Without restricting the generality of the powers and duties of the commission elsewhere herein provided, the commission shall:

"(A) Develop and implement ambient air quality standards and, in accordance with such data as are available on the latest technology and economic feasibility of complying therewith, emission standards in order to prevent and control air pollution located within the area over which it has jurisdiction.

"(B) Revise and modify such standards to reflect improvements in knowledge of air pollution and its prevention and control and in accordance with such data as are available on the latest technology and economic feasibility of complying with such standards.

"(C) Engage in action which would insure the use of the latest technologically and economically feasible and effective techniques or devices for the prevention and control of air pollution in new installations proposed for construction in its area of jurisdiction.

"(D) Undertake and carry on air Monitoring activities as a continuing activity.

"(E) Have authority to enter at reasonable times upon any private or public property (excluding any Federal Building, installation or other property) for the purpose of investigating the source, type, character and amount of any air pollutant or emission alledged to violate the standards at any time established by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this compact: Provided, however, that no such investigations shall extend to information relating to secret processes or methods of manufacturing or production.

"(F) Have authority, upon reasonable evidence of a violation of the standards established by the Commission pursuant to the provisions of this compact, which violation presents an imminent and substantial hazard to public health, to issue public notice of such hazard and the cause thereof, by any and all appropriate means, and to issue a cease and desist order or such other reasonable order as may be deemed necessary by the Commission to cause such violation to be discontinued, at such time and upon such conditions as the Commission may determine, and to enforce such order by appropriate proceedings, including but not limited to injunctive proceedings in any court of competent jurisdiction. And, further, the Commission is hereby empowered to institute proceedings in any court of competent jurisdiction to enjoin any air pollution or emission which presents such an imminent and serious hazard to public health as to create an emergency.

"Before any report of the commission which specifically identifies a particular industrial or other installation, structure, or facility as a source of air pollution becomes final, the commission shall give the owner or operator of such installation, structure, or facility notice by certified mail of the anticipated adoption of such report and shall afford the owner or operator of the installation, structure, or facility not less than ten days after the mailing of such notice to file with the commission its written objections thereto. If no such objections are filed with the commission within such specified period, the report shall become final. If such objections are filed with the commission within such specified period, the commission shall afford such owner or operator not less than ten days from its receipt of such objections to discuss with the commission the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the report before it is finally adopted by the commission.

"Within a reasonable time, as determined by the commission, after the commission furnishes a report to the appropriate existing state and local air pollution control agencies pursuant to this Article and, if the recommendations made in such report for the prevention, abatement, or control of air pollution from a specific source or sources have not been implemented, or if the appropriate state or local air pollution control agencies have not taken sufficient action to prevent, abate, or control the air pollution, the commission may, after a duly conducted and constituted hearing, on due notice, issue an order or orders upon any municipality, corporation, person, or other entity causing or contributing to a violation of ambient air quality standards. At any such hearing evidence may be received and a finding made on whether, in fact, a violation of the commission's air quality standards exists and on the sources of such pollution. Any such order or orders may prescribe a timetable for the abatement or control of the air pollution involved. Any such order shall become final and binding unless a petition for review of the same shall be filed and prosecuted pursuant to the provisions of Article V of this compact.

"In a party state, any court of general jurisdiction in any county in which the air pollution originates or any United States district court for the district in which such pollution originates shall entertain and determine any action or proceeding brought by the commission to enforce an order against any municipality, corporation, person, or other entity domiciled or located within such state and whose discharge of air pollution takes place within or adjoining such state, or against any employee, department, or subdivision of such municipality, corporation, person, or other entity, and shall entertain and determine any petition for review pursuant to the provisions of Article V of this compact.

"Article V

"All hearings held by the commission shall be open to the public. At any hearing held pursuant to Article IV of this compact the party states, any agencies thereof, and any affected person, corporation, municipality, or other entity shall be entitled to appear in person or by representative, with or without counsel, and may make oral or written argument, offer testimony, or take any combination of such actions. All testimony taken before the commission shall be under oath and recorded in a written transcript. The transcript so recorded shall be made available to any member of the public or to any participant in such hearing upon payment of reasonable charges as fixed by the commission. No information relating to secret processes or methods of manufacture or production shall be disclosed at any public hearing or otherwise and all such information shall be kept confidential.

"All hearings shall be had before one or more members of the commission, or before an officer or employee of the commission expressly designated to act as a hearing officer.

"Any party state or person aggrieved by any order made by the commission shall be entitled to a judicial review thereof. Such review may be had by filing a verified petition in any of the appropriate courts referred to in Article IV, setting out such order and alleging specifically that such order is:

"(a) Arbitrary, capricious, and abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law; or

"(b) Contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity; or

"(c) In excess of authority or jurisdiction conferred by this compact or statutes in implementation hereof; or

"(d) Without observance of procedure required by law; or

"(e) Not within the purposes of this compact; or

"(f) Unsupported by the weight of the evidence.

"The petition for review shall be filed within thirty-five days after receipt of written notice that such order has been issued. Written notice of the filing of a petition for review and a copy of said petition shall be personally served upon the commission. Any party or person filing a petition for review shall, within fifteen days thereafter, secure from the commission a certified copy of the transcript of any hearing or hearings held in connection with the issuance of the order, review of which is sought, and shall file the same with the clerk of the court in which the action or proceeding for review is pending. An extension of time in which to file a transcript shall be granted by said court in which such action or proceeding for review is pending for good cause shown. Inability to obtain a transcript within the specified time shall be good cause. Failure to file a transcript within the period of fifteen days, or to secure an extension of time therefor, shall be cause for the dismissal of the petition for review by the court or on petition of any party of record to the original action or proceeding. Where more than one person may be aggrieved by the order, only one proceeding for review may be had and the court in

XUM

which a petition for review is first properly filed shall have jurisdiction.

"The court may, for good cause shown, admit and consider additional evidence bearing upon the issue or issues before it.

"No review of a commission order shall be had except in accordance with the provisions of this compact.

"Article VI

"The commission may establish one or more advisory and technical committees composed of such as the following: Private citizens, expert and lay personnel, representatives of industry, labor, commerce, agricultural, civic associations, and officials of local, state, and federal government, as it may determine, and may cooperate with and use the services of any such committee and the organizations which they represent in furthering any of its activities under this compact.

"Article VII

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to:

"(a) Limit or otherwise affect the powers of any party state or any of its subdivisions to enact and enforce laws or ordinances for the prevention, abatement, or control of air pollution within their respective borders.

"(b) Limit or otherwise affect the powers of any party state to enter into a compact or compacts with other states for the prevention, abatement, or control of interstate air pollution.

"(c) Prevent or restrict any party state or any political subdivision thereof from adopting standards to achieve a higher level of ambient air quality than those adopted by the commission for the area covered by the commission's jurisdiction.

"(d) Authorize any party state or any political subdivision thereof to adopt standards which will achieve a lower level of ambient air quality than those adopted by the commission for the area covered by the commission's jurisdiction.

"Article VIII

"The commission shall submit to the governor or designated officer or officers of each party state a budget of its estimated expenditures for such period as may be required by the laws of that state for presentation to the legislature thereof.

"Each of the commission's budgets of estimated expenditures shall contain specific recommendations of the amount or amounts to be appropriated by each of the party states. Aside from such support as may be available to the commission pursuant to Article III, the cost of operating and maintaining the commission shall be borne equally by the party states.

"The commission may meet any of its obligations in whole or in part with funds available to it under Article III of this compact,: provided, that the commission takes specific action setting aside such funds prior to the incurring of any obligation to be met in whole or in part in this manner. Except where the commission makes use of funds available to it under Article III, the commission shall not incur any obligations prior to the allotment of funds by the party states adequate to meet the same.

"The expenses and any other costs for each member of the commission shall be met by the commission in accordance with such standards and procedures as it may establish in its rules and regulations.

"The commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The receipts and disbursements of the commission shall be subject to the audit and accounting procedures established under its rules and regulations. However, all receipts and disbursements of funds handled by the commission shall be audited yearly by a certified or licensed public accountant and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the commission.

"The accounts of the commission shall be open at any reasonable time for inspection by duly constituted officers of the party states and by any persons authorized by the commission.

"Nothing contained herein shall be construed to prevent commission compliance with laws relating to audit or inspection of accounts by or on behalf of any government contributing to the support of the commission.

"Article IX

"This compact shall become effective when enacted into law by the states of Ohio and West Virginia and approved by the Congress of the United States. The compact shall continue in force and remain binding upon each party state until expressly repealed by any party state, but no such repeal shall take effect until one year after the enactment of the statute repealing this compact.

"Any order of the commission issued prior to the termination of this compact shall be enforceable thereafter by any party state in the same manner as though this compact were still in force except that any appropriate officer or agency of the enforcing party state may act in the place and stead of the commission.

"Article X

"The provisions of this compact shall be reasonably and liberally construed. The provisions of this compact shall be severable and if any phrase, clause, sentence, or provision is declared to be contrary to the Constitution of any party state or of the United States, or the applicability thereof to any government agency, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance shall not be affected.

"Article XI

"The present party States hereto, namely, West Virginia and Ohio, hereby agree and consent to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of Kentucky, or either of them, becoming parties to this compact.

"Sec. 3723.02. Pursuant to Article III of the compact set forth in section 3723.01 of the Revised Code, the governor shall appoint two commissioners one of whom is experienced in the field of municipal government, and one of whom is experienced in the field of industrial activities, in addition to the director of health, the officer in charge of air pollution control, and the Governor or his designee, as members of the Ohio-West Virginia interstate air pollution control commission. These five commissioners, acting jointly with like officers from the other party state, shall promulgate rules and regulations to carry out more effectively the terms of the compact. The commissioners shall cooperate with all departments, agencies, and officers of and in the government of this state and its subdivisions in facilitating the proper administration of the compact and all such departments, agencies, and officers shall cooperate with the commissioners. The Municipal Commissioner and the Industrial Commissioner shall be paid fifty dollars for each day spent in performing their duties and shall be reimbursed for all reasonable expenses actually incurred in performing their duties.

"Section 2. That existing sections 3723.01 and 3723.02 of the Revised Code are hereby repealed.

"Chares F. Kurfess,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"John W. Brown,
"President of the Senate.

"Passed May 21, 1969.
"Approved May 28, 1969.

"James A. Rhodes,
"Governor.

"The sectional numbers herein are in conformity with the Revised Code.

"David A. Johnston,
"Director, Ohio Legislative Service Commission.

"Attest:

"Ted W. Brown,
"Secretary of State."

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The PRSEIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, July 16, 1969, he signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 3166. An act for the relief of Aleksandar Zambeli;

H.R. 3172. An act for the relief of Yolanda Fulgencio Hunter; and

H.R. 3376. An act for the relief of Maria da Conceicao Evaristo.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session, the following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John O. Olsen, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Wisconsin; and

Farley E. Mogan, of Oregon, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Oregon.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS (for himself, Mr. Allen, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Dole, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Gravel, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Hollings, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Miller, Mr. Moss, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Packwood, Mr. Stevens, Mr. Thurmond, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 2636. A bill to make the provisions of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 applicable to individuals preparing to be volunteer firemen; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(The remarks of Mr. Boggs when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. Hruska):

S. 2637. A bill to protect the public health and safety by amending the narcotic, depressant, stimulant and hallucinogenic drug laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, by unanimous consent.

(The remarks of Mr. Dirksen when he introduced the bill appear earlier in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2638. A bill to amend section 7(a) of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(The remarks of Mr. Bible when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 2639. A bill for the relief of Miss Maximina Tolentino Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 2640. A bill to amend the Foreign Mili-

XUM

tary Sales Act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

S. 2636—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO MAKE THE PROVISIONS OF THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963 APPLICABLE TO INDIVIDUALS PREPARING TO BE VOLUNTEER FIREMEN

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I introduce for myself and 22 cosponsors, for appropriate reference, a bill which would make volunteer fireman training eligible for assistance under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 as amended in 1968.

This legislation would give to each State the option of apportioning part of its vocational education grant to the training of volunteer firemen.

Mr. President, there are an estimated 1.8 million volunteer firemen in this country, compared to an estimated 200,000 paid firemen. We all are aware of the fine work they do throughout the country. These men devote large amounts of time to their companies and put up with great inconvenience to serve their communities.

The existence of the volunteer companies guarantees many small communities protection from fire and accident at no—or little—cost to the taxpayer.

Several States, including Delaware, have devoted considerable sums of money to establish training facilities to enable these volunteers to perfect their skills. This legislation would give to each State the option of supporting this training by assigning portions of vocational education money to it.

I ask unanimous consent that this bil be printed in the Record at this point

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2636) to make the provisions of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 applicable to individuals preparing to be volunteer firemen, introduced by Mr. Boggs (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2636

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (1) of section 108 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 is amended by inserting immediately after the word "employment" the first time it appears in such paragraph the following: "(including volunteer firemen)".

S. 2637—INTRODUCTION OF THE CONTROLLED DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES ACT OF 1969

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill that is styled "The Controlled Dangerous Substances Act of 1969." This has been submitted by the Attorney General to the Presiding Officer of the Senate. I believe there is a copy of that message at the desk.

I ask that this message to the Vice President, together with a summary of the bill, and the bill itself, be submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary, and that it be regarded as appropriate reference.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it will be so referred.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Permit me to make just one statement.

Mr. President, I think everybody knows the danger that besets our society today in connection with abuses in the drug field. That relates to heroin, marihuana, LSD, and whatever else they have, and it is getting to be quite a menace. This bill, of course, endeavors to really restructure much that is on the statute books today, particularly in the Harrison Narcotics Act, the Federal drug statutes, the drug abuse control amendments, which we passed in 1965, and then the Narcotics Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966. All these are kept essentially intact.

The Attorney General puts it very rightly when he says that we have to develop a legal framework for the control of these narcotics and dangerous drugs, and that is the design and the purpose of this bill. So I introduce it, Mr. President, for appropriate reference.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2637) to protect the public health and safety by amending the narcotic, depressant, stimulant and hallucinogenic drug laws, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. Dirksen (for self and Mr. Hruska), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, by unanimous consent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I merely wish to ask the distinguished minority leader a question. I have some general knowledge of this bill. Under the term "dangerous substances" is anything included other than drugs?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suppose they all could be called drugs.

Mr. COTTON. The purpose of my question is that, obviously, it goes to the Committee on the Judiciary, and properly so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. We passed an act in the last Congress which came to the Committee on Commerce, of which I am a member—the Dangerous Substance Act. If things other than drugs were involved in this bill, I merely wanted to reserve the opportunity to ask subsequently that the Committee on Commerce be allowed to look at the bill after the Committee on the Judiciary has finished with it. If it is just drugs, I am sure that will not be necessary.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If that were the case, I am sure the Committee on the Judiciary would have no objection.

Mr. COTTON. It would be included in the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2638—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT OF 1953

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to make explicit the power of the Small Business Administration to guarantee loans to small business firms.

As presently written, the applicable section of the act does not contain the word "guarantee." It has long been held by the Small Business Administration, without dispute from any Government or private agency, that the existing language is a sufficient basis for its existing guarantee program. My amendment would be of a technical and clarifying nature, to write in the reference to guarantee authority, the existence of which has always been taken for granted.

Section 7(a) of the Small Business Act reads as follows:

> The Administration is empowered to make loans to enable small-business concerns to finance plant construction, conversion, or expansion, including the acquisition of land; or to finance the acquisition of equipment, facilities, machinery, supplies, or materials; or to supply such concerns with working capital to be used in the manufacture of articles, equipment, supplies, or materials for war, defense, or civilian production or as may be necessary to insure a well-balanced national economy; and such loans may be made or effected either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate on an immediate or deferred basis.

These terms reflect the origins of the SBA as the lending agency of last resort. The purpose of the SBA was primarily to make direct loan funds available at a statutory rate of interest, in the event that necessary financing could not be obtained by small firms from commercial sources. However, in order to stretch the Government dollar and to allow maximum involvement of private financial institutions, the act recognized the desirability of immediate and deferred participation arrangements.

There has been a recent trend toward stating these guarantee powers expressly in other statutes. For instance, in the equal opportunity program (42 U.S.C. 2902), the following powers are set forth:

> The Director is authorized to make, participate (on an immediate basis) in, or guarantee loans, repayable in not more than fifteen years to any small business concern . . .

I understand also that Senator McIntyre, the chairman of the legislative Small Business Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, proposed on July 1 a parallel amendment to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 which would be similar in effect to my bill.

Other explicit loan guarantee programs in the law include that of the

Export-Import Bank of Washington (12 U.S.C. 635); the aircraft purchase loan program of the Civil Aeronautics Board (49 U.S.C. 425); and loans for expediting defense production (50 U.S.C. App. 2091).

Therefore, I believe it would serve a useful purpose to add such strengthening language to section 7(a) of the Small Business Act.

This I feel would be especially timely in view of the recent emphasis of SBA on the guarantee program in several of its new, and some of its older programs also. In fact, an entirely legitimate question is whether there is an overemphasis in this direction at the expense of the direct loan activity originally favored by the Congress.

On June 25, I pointed out in this Record that the White House had reduced SBA direct and participation loan authority 58½ percent below the amounts authorized for fiscal year 1969 by the Congress. I feel strongly that such treatment is not in accord with the intention of Congress that the SBA business loan program remain as the lender of last resort.

It is in periods of tight money such as this, with the prime bank interest rate at 8½ percent and small business loans scaled upward from this point, when this Government lending function is most important. These SBA credit programs were designed as a safety valve. But, because of these massive White House cutbacks of the loan authority provided by Congress, the safety valve has been almost shut. In an effort to obtain some relief, a letter was sent to President Nixon urging immediate release of the $170.2 million in loan authority for direct, participation loans, and the SBIC lending programs. We have not yet received an answer to this plea.

Unfortunately, as long as circumstances remain as they are, and rock-bottom minimums of SBA loan funds are released by the Budget Bureau, we must live with these conditions as best we can. It is thus doubly important that all SBA lending authority, particularly the guarantee program, should rest on a sound legal basis.

Accordingly, I hope Congress will take action on a priority basis to enact the amendment which I am proposing, and thus make the guarantee authority explicitly a part of the SBA series of loan programs.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the Record following my remarks.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2638) to amend section 7(a) of the Small Business Act, introduced by Mr. Bible, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2638

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7(a) of the Small Business Act is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking out "make loans" and "such loans" and inserting in lieu thereof "make or guarantee loans" and "loans made hereunder", respectively;

(2) in clause (A) of paragraph (4), by inserting "or guaranteed" after "made";

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking out clause (C) and inserting in lieu thereof "and (C) no loan made or guaranteed under this subsection, including renewals or extensions thereof, shall have a maturity exceeding ten years except that such portion of a loan as is made for the purpose of constructing facilities may have a maturity of fifteen years plus such additional period as is estimated may be required to complete such construction";

(4) in paragraph (5), by striking out "In the case of any loan made" and inserting in lieu thereof "In furnishing financial assistance";

(5) in clause (A) of paragraph (5), by striking out "such loan" and inserting in lieu thereof "any loan made or guaranteed hereunder"; and

(6) in clause (C) of paragraph (5), by striking out "may not be made for a period or periods" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall not have a maturity".

S. 2640—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE FOREIGN MILITARY SALES ACT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act.

The proposed bill has been requested by the Secretary of State and I introduce it in order that there may be a specific bill to which members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the Record at this point, together with the letter from the Secretary of State to the Vice President dated June 30, 1969, and the section-by-section analysis of the bill.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2640) to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act, introduced by Mr. Fulbright, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2640

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Foreign Military Sales Act (82 Stat. 1320) is amended as follows:

Section 1. Section 3 is amended as follows:

In subsection (b) strike out the entire subsection and substitute the following:

"No sales, credits or guaranties shall be made or extended under this Act to any country during a period of one year after such country seizes, or takes into custody, or fines an American fishing vessel for engaging in fishing more than 12 miles from the coast of that country. The President may waive the provision of this subsection when he determines it to be important to the security of the United States or he receives reasonable assurances from the country involved that future violations will not occur, and promptly so reports to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee of Foreign Relations of the Senate. The provisions of this subsection shall not be applicable in any case governed by an international agreement to which the United States is a party."

Sec. 2. Section 31 is amended as follows:

(a) In subsection (a) strike out "$296,000,000" and "1969" in the first sentence and substitute "$275,000,000" and "1970", respectively.

(b) In subsection (b) strike out "1969" and "$296,000,000" and substitute "1970" and "$350,000,000", respectively.

Sec. 3. Section 33 is amended as follows:

(a) In subsection (a) strike out "the fiscal year 1969" and substitute "each fiscal year."

(b) In subsection (b) strike out "the fiscal year 1969" and substitute "each fiscal year."

The letter and analysis, presented by Mr. Fulbright, are as follows:

The Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C., June 30, 1969.

Hon. Spiro T. Agnew,
President of the Senate.

Dear Mr. President: I enclose a draft of legislation to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act (82 Statute 1320).

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

On October 22, 1968 the Congress enacted the Foreign Military Sales Act which consolidated and revised into a single act legislation to authorize sales by the United States Government of defense articles and services to friendly countries and international organizations. The primary purpose of the proposed legislation is to amend Section 31 of the Act by deleting obsolete authorization and aggregate ceiling figures, and substituting new figures for FY 1970; and to amend Section 33 of the Act to extend the regional ceilings on military assistance and foreign military sales to Africa and Latin America. In addition the proposed legislation would make technical changes in Section 3(b) of the Act (the Pelly Amendment) which changes are explained in the detailed Section-by-Section Analysis of the Foreign Military Sales Bill attached to the draft bill.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The proposed ceiling on the aggregate total on the face amount of guaranties and credits extended under the bill by the Department of Defense during Fiscal Year 1970 is $350 million. In terms of obligational authority the amount required within the proposed statutory ceiling will depend on the relative mix of sales financed by the extension of credits and by the issuance of guaranties. As is now required by existing law, 100% of the face amount of any credit extended would be applied against the proposed ceiling and 25% of the face amount of any guaranty issued would be recorded as an obligation against the proposed obligational authority as a reserve for the payment of possible claims under such guaranty.

The President's budget for Fiscal Year 1970 requests new obligational authority of $275 million under the Foreign Military Sales Act to finance approximately $350 million of credit sales made after June 30, 1969 through the extension of credits and guaranties.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation and that its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

William P. Rogers.

Section-by-Section Analysis of Foreign Military Sales Bill

The bill amends the Foreign Military Sales Act (P.L. 90–629) in the following respects.

SECTION 1

This section makes the following changes to section 3(b) of the Act, which prohibits sales to countries who seize American fishing vessels in international waters, in order to perfect the intent and implementation of the restriction:

(i) The words "for engaging in fishing" have been substituted for "engaged in fishing" to make it clear that the restriction is aimed at seizures because of fishing activities.

(ii) A new sentence has been added to make it clear that the restriction does not apply where the seizure is lawful under an international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(iii) In lieu of an indefinite cut off of sales after an unlawful seizure, the revised language specifies that the period of ineligibility for sales shall be one year after each unlawful seizure.

(iv) The words "sales, credits, or guaranties" have been substituted for "sold" to make it clear that an unlawful seizure will make the seizing country ineligible for further contracts of credit or guaranty as well as for further contracts for sale. This change is not intended to require a cut off of the pipeline of undelivered items or of undisbursed obligated funds.

(v) New language has been added authorizing the President to waive the restriction when he receives reasonable assurances from the country involved that future violations will not occur.

SECTION 2

This section amends section 31 of the Act, which relates to authorization and aggregate ceiling on foreign military sales credits. Subsection (a) deletes the obsolete FY 1969 authorization for appropriation of $296,000,000 and substitutes an authorization for appropriation of $275,000,000 for the FY 1970.

Subsection (b) deletes the $296,000,000 aggregate ceiling on credits and guaranties applicable for the FY 1969 and substitutes a ceiling for the FY 1970 of $350,000,000.

SECTION 3

This section amends section 33 of the Act, which relates to regional ceilings on foreign military sales.

Subsection (a) makes the FY 1969 ceiling for Latin American countries a continuing ceiling applicable in each fiscal year. No change is made in the dollar amount of the ceiling.

Subsection (b) makes the FY 1969 ceiling for African countries a continuing ceiling applicable in each fiscal year. No change is made in the dollar amount of the ceiling.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF A BILL

S. 2548

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) be added as a cosponsor of S. 2548, to amend the National School Lunchroom and Child Nutrition Act of 1965, to strengthen and improve the food service programs provided for children under such act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 35—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION EXTENDING THE CONGRATULATIONS OF CONGRESS TO ORGANIZED BASEBALL UPON THE OCCASION OF ITS CENTENNIAL YEAR

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we live in an age of great divergence; a time of marked differences of philosophy and of generation gaps. However, we have one great common denominator, the game of baseball.

At a baseball game, millionaires mix with kids who collected soda bottles to scrape up the price of a ticket. We can see teenagers on their first date, grandparents taking their grandchildren to a ball game, fathers and sons, and whole families. With one swing of the bat by a Frank Howard or the pitch of a Bob Gibson, the crowd is as one.

Similarly, our age is one of great complexity; of computer decisions and machine insensitivity. Baseball remains a bastion of individualized human effort; batter versus pitcher. As Mickey Mantle once said, "You can't steal first base." You have to earn it.

Baseball also represents a great part of the American dream: the kid from Broken Bow, Okla., or Harlem, N.Y., showing up in spring training, owning only one suit and carrying as his only luggage a bat and a wornout glove. From that start, he can become a national hero. This year, baseball observes its 100th anniversary, the highlight of which will be the 40th annual All-Star game here in Washington. Accordingly, Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution commemorating these events.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 35), which reads as follows, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 35

Whereas, baseball is among the oldest outstanding national games of the United States, combining the zest of the amateur with the skills of the professional and providing excitement, drama, interest, and entertainment both for participants and for spectators; and

Whereas, although baseball was already being widely played, watched, and attended in various forms on a largely amateur or recreational basis, the development of the game to its present status as a national institution truly began with the organization of America's first professional baseball team in 1869; and

Whereas, the year 1969 marks the one-hundredth anniversary of organized professional baseball in the United States and is baseball's centennial year; and

Whereas, the playing of the Fortieth All-Star Baseball Game, on July 22, 1969, in Washington, District of Columbia, together with related activities and observances in Washington and throughout the country, is the occasion for the special celebration of baseball's centennial year; and

Whereas, it is fitting that appropriate recognition be given to the many contributions which baseball has made to the American way of life both as a sport and as an expression of the American spirit: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That to commemorate the one-hundredth anniversary in 1969 of the birth of organized baseball, the Congress of the United States officially recognizes the year 1969 as baseball's centennial year and extends its congratulations and best wishes to the Commissioner of Baseball, the President of the National League, the President of the American League, the twelve teams of the American League, and the several minor leagues and all other organizations and individuals participating in or connected with organized baseball.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one final word about baseball at this milestone in its history. Legend has it that Abner Doubleday began the game in roughly its present form in Cooperstown, N.Y.

That is a fine old story, and I do not want to dismay my colleagues from New York, but the record should be set straight.

Actually, the latest research on the subject clearly indicates that the first baseball game was played in Elysian Fields, Hoboken. And Hoboken, of course, is in New Jersey.

If there should be some dispute about this conclusion, I urge that we investigate together in order to prove that New Jersey is really the birthplace of baseball. And if it takes time to resolve this question, let us take the time to do it. Another hundred years might be just about right.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 16, 1969, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 648) for the relief of Ernesto Alunday.

CONTINUANCE OF INCOME TAX SURCHARGE AND CERTAIN EXCISE TAXES—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 78

Mr. NELSON submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 12290), to continue the income tax surcharge and the excise taxes on automobiles and communication services for temporary periods, to terminate the investment credit, to provide a low income allowance for individuals, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 79

Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 12290, supra, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, yesterday, I proposed a series of eight major tax reforms that I believe should be considered by the Senate simultaneously with any legislation extending the current 10-percent income tax surcharge.

As I mentioned in my statement, I agree with the recent resolution of the Senate Majority Policy Committee requesting an extension of the withholding tax rates until September 30, pending action by Congress on tax reform. According to the current tentative schedules of the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, I feel that the September 30 date offer both the Senate and the House a reasonable opportunity to enact meaningful tax legislation in the immediate future.

The eight specific tax reforms I suggested were as follows:

Adoption of a minimum income tax,

calculated on a comprehensive tax base including capital gains, interest on State and local bonds, the excess percentage depletion allowance, accelerated depreciation on real estate, and appreciated property donated to charity.

Allocation of personal deductions between taxable and nontaxable income.

Major tax relief for poor- and middle-income groups.

Reduction of tax preference to the petroleum industry, including a reduction of the domestic percentage depletion allowance for the largest producers from 27½ to 15 percent, elimination of the allowance for foreign production, capitalization of intangible costs, restrictions on the foreign tax credit, and elimination of capital gains treatment for mineral production payments.

Modification of the capital gains tax, including extension of the holding period from 6 months to 1 year, elimination of the 25 percent alternative tax, and taxation of unrealized capital gains transferred by gift or at death.

Modification of the tax treatment of interest on State and local bonds through the use of a Federal interest subsidy or the establishment of an urban development bank.

Elimination of the accelerated depreciation deduction for buildings, with adequate safeguards to protect low- and middle-income housing.

Tighter controls on the deductions allowed for farm losses.

As I emphasized in my statement, the surcharge itself is unfair, because it aggravates the existing inequities in the tax laws and applies only to those who already pay taxes on their income. Equally important, the unfairness of our present tax laws is compounded by the fact that widespread use of tax shelters was available only to the wealthiest citizens.

AMENDMENT NO. 79

In accord with the procedure suggested last week and at the beginning of this week by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the committee on finance, I ask unanimous consent to introduce an amendment containing several provisions along the lines of the specific recommendations I made yesterday for tax reform.

Of course, at the present time, not all of the amendments have been technically perfected. I, therefore, appreciate the statement yesterday by the Senator from Louisiana that the amendments need not be letter perfect. I intend to revise these amendments in the coming days and weeks of the debate on tax reform, and I look forward to the opportunity to work with the Senator from Louisiana and the Committee on Finance in this area.

As I indicated in my statement yesterday, my suggestions for tax reform are in no way intended to be a comprehensive reform package I do hope, however, that my suggestions will help to stimulate and to carry on the debate in this area of vital concern to tens of millions of American taxpayers.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Nathan G. Graham, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years, vice Lawrence A. McSoud;

William H. Stafford, Jr., of Florida, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Florida for the term of 4 years, vice Clinton N. Ashmore.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Wednesday, July 23, 1969, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

THE THIEU PROPOSAL

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, President Thieu's latest speech could represent an important new move in negotiations in which the world has placed so much hope. What he has offered is to open up political competition to the process of elections in the south in which the NLF could take part as an organized group; and in which they would have a voice as to the organization of the elections.

There is no point in debating whether Thieu might have offered more at this juncture or whether in certain respects his proposal lacks precision. What is important now is that the other side take this latest speech as the serious document we hope it is.

There are many possibilities which this proposal opens up. The language is framed in general terms. For example, there is no specific mention of the constitution. If the other side is interested in negotiating, this offer gives them a reasonable basis on which to do so. President Thieu has made his move. It is now up to the other side to make its move and to do so quickly and seriously.

THE MUNICIPAL BOND TAX EXEMPTION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I was disturbed to read in the Wall Street Journal today that the city of New York had to pay an interest rate of 6.156 percent in order to sell $146,250,000 worth of bonds to the public. This interest cost is the highest ever incurred by New York City.

While it would not be accurate to cite one single factor as the cause of the unusually high interest cost to New York City, I think it is fair to note that a new element of uncertainty in the municipal bond market contributed to it. That uncertainty stems from concern on the part of potential municipal bond buyers that this Congress will act to remove tax exemption now granted on interest received on municipal bonds. According to the Wall Street Journal, proposed Federal legislation aimed at discouraging the issuance of tax-exempt bonds was a chief cause both of the city's record borrowing rate and of the slow initial demand for the securities from investors. In short, Mr. President, the mere possibility of such drastic change in Federal tax law has increased substantially the cost which the Nation's largest city must pay to borrow badly needed money.

It is also interesting to look at the "tombstone" advertisement published in connection with the offering. That ad contains the following language:

> Interest exempt, in the opinion of the counsel, from all present Federal income taxation.

Mr. President, the insertion of the word "present" in the traditional legal opinion is a good deal more significant than one might think. It means, to the potential buyer, that the legal counsel of the investment banking firm underwriting the issue is not sure that the interest payments on the bonds will be tax free. To put it bluntly, the word "present" is a red warning flag telling the potential investor to beware of these bonds. He must beware of them because Congress, in a tax reform fervor, may lose sight of reality and commonsense and act to eliminate or drastically curtail the tax exemption now attendant upon municipal bonds.

I am not a New Yorker and I know that most other Senators are not. But what happens in the financial markets in New York City greatly influences what happens in each and every State in the Union. The frequency and size of New York City's bond offerings make them a reliable barometer of the probable course of interest rates on bonds in other municipalities. The investors' fear that the Federal Government will step directly into the municipal bond picture will raise interest costs in municipalities all over the United States.

Mr. President, on July 8 of this year, I endeavored to explain to the Senate why I felt that the proposed changes in the present tax-exemption status of municipal bonds were unacceptable. At that time I placed in the RECORD a list of Texas municipalities which had passed resolutions supporting the position I have taken on this matter. Since that date, I have received the same resolution from other municipalities. I shall place a list of them in the RECORD today.

I shall certainly continue to emphasize the reasons for my belief that the tax-exemption is important to municipalities and to our Nation. I hope that other Senators will speak out on this issue, as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list to which I referred and the article published in the Wall Street Journal be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDITIONAL LIST OF TEXAS MUNICIPALITIES OPPOSING TAXATION OF MUNICIPAL BONDS

Childress, Friona, Victoria, Decatur, Olmos Park, Leon Valley, Jacksonville, Copperas Cove, O'Donnell, Palacios, Belton, Cleburne, Amarillo, Bellville, Tahoka, Cuero.

Livingston, Goldthwaite, Alpine, Allen Mc-

Allen, Karnes City, Sweetwater, Monahans, Taft, Burleson, River Oaks, Bangs, Orange, Hidalgo, Saint Jo, Highland Park.

NEW YORK CITY PAYS TOP 6.1562 PERCENT ON ISSUE OF $146,250,000; YIELD 6.05 PERCENT; SALES LAG

(By Philip Hawkins)

NEW YORK.—A landmark for costly public borrowing was set yesterday when New York City, the nation's largest issuer of tax-exempt securities, incurred a record 6.1562% interest rate in auctioning $146,250,000 of various-purpose bonds.

Following their award at a competitive sale, the bonds were publicly reoffered at prices to yield from 5.70% in 1971 to about 6.05% in 1986–90. As investment returns and borrowing costs are directly related, these levels also were the most liberal ever provided on the city's obligations.

For a New York resident in the 40% tax bracket, the exempted rates of interest were equal to a yield of about 14% on a fully taxable basis, according to financial officials. "Even if an investor obtained such an extraordinary fully taxed profit as 14%, he likely wouldn't have the safety of a class of securities—local government bonds—that rank in protection second only to Federal Government issues," one official commented.

Nevertheless, some sources estimated that less than 50% of the giant New York offering had been purchased by late evening. "The selling effort mainly is concentrated on luring the individual investors away from stocks and from savings accounts, but it requires a lot of time to place such a large issue at the rate of three or five bonds at a clip," one source said.

PROPOSED LAW SEEN COOLING SALES

Proposed Federal legislation aimed at discouraging the issuance of tax-exempt bonds was cited by some as a chief cause both of the city's record borrowing rate and of the slow initial demand from retail investors.

The House Ways and Means Committee currently has several changes to the existing status of tax-exempt bonds under study for possible inclusion in a major tax-reform bill for approval by Congress.

The proposals essentially would encourage states and municipalities to sell taxable bonds subsidized by the Federal Government, although it wouldn't prevent the local governments from issuing tax-free securities. Exemption privileges to investors also would be sharply curtailed.

Mario A. Procaccino, city comptroller, said the "threat of this planned new tax-exempt Federal legislation which certainly might frighten away some of the buyers of municipal bonds, was a major factor" in New York being forced to pay its steepest cost in history. He also blamed current "tight money market conditions," which have sent most interest rates skyrocketing to new highs over the past 10 months.

Infinite terms, the 6.1562% annual net interest cost means New York must pay about $61.6 million in interest alone over the issue's average effective maturity of about $6\frac{5}{8}$ years, financial officials estimated.

It also was learned that an unsuccessful underwriting group in the New York bidding competition had planned to insert a proviso in its advertisement for the bonds warning prospective investors that the tax-exempt privilege might be jeopardized by the proposed Federal legislation.

CHASE BANK TEAM WINS

Ads by the team, managed by First National City Bank, would have stated: "Legislation is currently under consideration in the Congress of the U.S. which, if enacted, could partially affect the exemption from Federal income taxes of certain holders of these bonds," sources said.

The city's offering was won by a rival Chase Manhattan Bank syndicate, which bid a premium of $1000.023 for each $1,000 bond with coupons of 6%, $6\frac{1}{4}$% and $6\frac{3}{4}$%. Sources said the group probably planned to word its ads in the same manner as nearly all previous municipal bond commercials have begun: "Interest exempt, in the opinion of counsel, from all present Federal income taxation."

NEW JERSEY TURNPIKE RECORD

Caught in the middle of the thorny advertising question was a Smith, Barney & Co. team, which yesterday sponsored a negotiated $40 million public offering of New Jersey Turnpike Authority's tax-free $5\frac{7}{8}$% term revenue bonds. A spokesman said ads and other official notices—which, in most bond sales, appear in newspapers on the day following the offering—will be delayed while "our lawyers decide on the language to be used in discussing the tax-exempt status of the bonds."

New Jersey Turnpike, in its sale yesterday, joined New York in setting a new high for costly borrowing. The road, considered the most sizable issuer within the category of public authority revenue bonds, accepted a 5.923% net yearly cost in selling the $40 million offering. Because they are quoted in simplistic terms of dollars for bid and asked prices much like over-the-counter stocks, these revenue bonds are important for providing the less sophisticated investor a handy entry into the market for fixed-income securities.

All the New Jersey Turnpike $5\frac{7}{8}$s were said to have been quickly sold at the offering price of 100, to yield 5.875% in 2008.

Elsewhere in the bond markets yesterday, Government issues sustained a price setback amid dull retail trading, dealers said. Long-term Treasury issues fell as much as $\frac{11}{16}$ point, while intermediate listings eased between $\frac{1}{8}$ point and $\frac{1}{4}$ point, they said.

The important $4\frac{1}{4}$% Government bonds of 1987–92 lost $\frac{9}{16}$ to end at $75\frac{1}{2}$ bid, 76 asked, where an investor's yield was 6.22%.

A majority of prime-grade corporate bonds were unchanged in resale market trading, but a few seasoned issues of industrial companies among the list moved lower in anticipation of competition from two large similar types of offerings due to reach the market today, dealers said. For example, the Standard Oil Co. (Ohio) 7.60% bonds of 1999 slipped $\frac{5}{8}$ point to close at $100\frac{5}{8}$ bid, $101\frac{1}{8}$ asked, to yield about 7.50%.

One of the major industrial offerings expected today is National Cash Register Co.'s $100 million of debentures, slated in a negotiated transaction through underwriters headed by Dillon, Read & Co. Sources guessed late yesterday that the office-machine maker's securities probably will be offered at 100 with a 7.70% coupon, to yield 7.70% in 25 years.

The other principal taxable-debt offering on tap today is Cities Service Co.'s $100 million of 30-year debentures carrying warrants to buy 500,00 Atlantic Richfield Co. common shares. Cities Service is under court order to divest all its stock holdings in Atlantic Richfield by early 1973. A group managed by First Boston Corp. and Loeb, Rhoades & Co. wouldn't disclose its pricing intentions on the Cities Service offering.

CLOSELY WATCHED BAROMETER

Yesterday's record 6.1562% rate was the first time New York had been forced to pay more than 6% for funds since Jan. 1, 1932, according to Comptroller Procaccino, the Democratic mayoral candidate in the city's coming election. The frequency and size of the city's public financings make them one of the most closely watched barometers of the probable course of interest rates generally.

* * * * *

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, this week marks the 10th annual observance of Captive Nations Week in the United States. We live in an era of progress that has brought men to the threshold of the moon, in a time when the sum of man's knowledge has more than doubled, and in a period of history during which man's greatest concern is for his fellow man. But, this has been a barren decade for the 100 million people in Europe who had the misfortune of being "liberated" by the Soviet Union at the conclusion of World War II.

For the past 24 years Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithunia, Poland, and Romania, have existed at the pleasure and for the benefit of their self-proclaimed liberator. The economic recovery of these countries has been manipulated by Soviet planners for the benefit of the Russian nation causing great misallocation of resources in these countries and depriving the East Central Europeans of the quality consumer goods they produce and the excellent price these goods would command in the world market. There is no question that the unfortunate East European nations have been so economically exploited by the Soviets their standard of living does not begin to approach the level that could have otherwise been achieved and which, through their efforts, they richly deserve.

The real tragedy of the captive nations is not, however, economic privation, but rather the debasement of human beings who are truly slaves in their own countries to the will of foreign dictators who came to power in a Kremlin "back room." The brutal reality of the subjugation of these people was demonstrated by the frightening and tragic spectacle of Soviet tanks rumbling through the streets of Prague in August of last year to confront Czechoslovakian patriots armed with banners and cobblestones in defense of their cherished, short-lived, new freedoms. May the world never forget the fate of Alexander Dubcek, who was flown to Moscow handcuffed on the floor of a Russian cargo plane and is now virtually unheard from as a result of his deviation from the Moscow line.

The disbelief in the West that the Russians would risk the gains of a "new detente" with the free world through armed aggression in Czechoslovakia is a tribute to the skill of the Russian propaganda machine that convinced so many in our country that the Russians really were not such bad fellows after all. So successful were they at masking their true intentions that here in the United States many political figures have become advocates of a policy toward the Soviet Union that can best be described as "forgive and forget." The same was true before the Cuban missile crisis.

No man has a greater desire than I that peace and tranquillity should prevail in the world, but I am unable to forgive and forget the tragedy of these captive nations. I am unable to forgive and forget the ruthless oppression in Budapest in 1956. I am unable to forgive and forget the monstrous wall in Berlin. I am unable to forgive and forget Russia's role in the 1967 Middle East war.

Yet, when the Soviet Union, in a vain attempt to influence the election in the United States, rushed to ratify the Consular Convention, advanced and signed the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, called for talks on the control of missile systems, and agreed to Moscow-New York flights, many in this country regarded this avalanche of paper promises from the Soviets as a fundamental change in Soviet foreign policy. But, as is carefully documented in Lawrence W. Beilenson's important book "The Treaty Trap," the Soviets have a long history of signing documents but a considerably shorter history of adhering to the principles they contain. And so, when the Senate considered the Consular Treaty, and the Nonproliferation Treaty, I suggested that perhaps it would be in the best interest of our country to see if the Soviets would demonstrate their sincerity with deeds as well as words. I had hoped that they would begin some construction at their end of the "bridge of understanding" between our countries. Events sadly proved that this was a hollow hope.

I am sure that it is not coincidence that, on the eve of the Senate's consideration of the Safeguard ABM system, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, in his address to the Supreme Soviet, should call for a new era of friendship with the United States. I am not surprised that while he also said the Soviet Union was ready to begin strategic arms control talks with the United States, he carefully avoided commenting on President Nixon's proposal to begin such talks in the first 2 weeks of August.

Let me suggest to Mr. Gromyko, and the Russian leaders, on the occasion of our 10th observance of Captive Nations Week that a drastic alteration of Russian policy toward the captive nations—already long overdue—could be a significant step toward international understanding, from which greater cooperation between our countries could grow. When the promises of World War II for the self-extermination of these great people are finally kept, then we may view the promises of the sixties in a more favorable light. It is my most earnest and heartfelt desire that my colleagues and my countrymen regard a revision of Soviet policy toward the captive nations as a necessary first step in the construction of this bridge of understanding which we all hope can one day link our countries.

THE SAFEGUARD ABM

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, this morning we witnessed the beginning of one of mankind's greatest ventures. The technological expertise and development necessary to send man to the moon is enough to stagger the mind. The underlying tribute to man's spirit is equally important. It proves that what man dreams, he can achieve—if he has the will, and the need exists. The success of America's space program surely will stand the test of time and history. Once it was believed man was not meant to fly, since our Creator did not give us wings. Now the only limit to our ability is man's imagination.

We in the Senate are facing both a monumental test and an important decision. Simply stated, the decision is whether to approve the President's request for an anti-ballistic-missile system. The test is more important. Our success or failure to pass this test may determine our place in history and our very existence. Despite mankind's progress since the dawn of evolution, the human animal has not rid himself of the basic instinct to survive.

Although we reach for the stars today, we continue to be pressed on all sides here on earth by the Communists. We are told they are as peace-loving as we. As a people, perhaps they are. But their leaders are not. We have only to look to the recent lesson of Czechoslovakia for proof. And today, as the world watches Apollo, the Russian people were not given the chance to see it. The leaders of the Communist world are the ones we must fear. They have shown us by their deeds that they are not yet prepared to surrender the goal of world domination.

One reason why I support the proposed ABM system is that I recognize this. I think I am enough of a realist to believe we must be prepared for the worst. There are many who say ABM will not work. To them I say, If man can reach the moon and return, nothing is impossible.

Second, I believe the President of the United States must have his options. Without ABM, he has only two: do nothing and allow 70 million Americans to perish, or launch a counterattack and kill millions of our enemy. Both sides lose. But with ABM, he has a third and most important option. Under an attack, deliberate or accidental, he can fire into the atmosphere to destroy missiles.

And finally, perhaps most important, we must have ABM because of the development of the MIRV—multiple independently targeted reentry vehicle. This is one of the most frightening innovations of nuclear warfare. In the past, if our enemy wanted to kill 100 of our cities or launching silos, he needed 100 missiles. Today, with the Russian SS–9, for example, one missile can carry nine warheads. Instead of a hundred incoming missiles, we could face 900. Or, when 100 missiles were necessary to do the job, only a dozen would be needed.

I cannot accept the argument that our best defense is a larger and larger offense. We must have more protection than simply the threat of total, equal annihilation.

Today, we know Russia has an ABM system. We believe it to be effective because we continue to modify our missiles in order to penetrate it. Development is most important at this time. If we fail to develop an ABM system of our own, who can stand in this body and claim that the Soviets will not continue work on theirs, and thus reach a protective breakthrough which would leave us at their mercy? We cannot approve a policy of intentional and permanent ignorance.

The scientist can tell me his opinion of whether an ABM system will work. But the defense of this country is a political decision that I, as a Senator, must make alone. Eminent scientists are at odds on the question. My decision for defense, therefore, is a gamble. When I look at the stake in the gamble—200 million American lives and our Western civilization—I do not hesitate. I support President Nixon's Safeguard ABM.

PUBLIC TELEVISION COMES TO THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, in a few months we will celebrate the 20th anniversary of education's first real involvement in broadcast television. This effort began at Iowa State College—now Iowa State University—which in February 1950, began the operation of the first educationally owned and operated television station in this country.

The system grew rapidly. As far back as 1953, States were developing plans and starting to build statewide educational television networks—systems of interconnected stations designed to bring a broad scope of programing to all within the boundaries of the States involved. In May 1953, KUHT, in Houston, Tex., became the first licensed, noncommercial, educational television station in the country.

Today, with few exceptions, each State of the Union, as well as American Samoa, is benefiting enormously from broadcast public television.

In addition, we have regional educational television networks—vast systems of interconnected State networks such as the Eastern Educational Network. With such a system, Vermonters, for example, view exciting, live, public television programing from WETA in Washington, D.C.

The number of stations continues to grow. They now number 182. The audience continues to grow. The quality of programing continues to grow. Its impact continues to grow.

The in-school instructional services provided, the many fine programs for children out of school, the cultural, scientific, and public affairs programs for general home viewing and the excellent, course-like programs for special interest groups have caused the average American not only to change his former viewing habits, but participate in his local public television station program activities, and, in many cases, to actively support the operation of his station.

The public television station has become a part of our way of life. So well does it supplement and complement the library, the museum, the symphony hall, the concert stage, the public forum, the seminar room, the sports arena, the theater, and other presentational and demonstration forms that we think of it today in superlative terms.

John Milton wrote:

> Good, the more communicated, more abundant grows.

The purpose of public television is to communicate "good," and it is doing it well.

Now, at long last, a public television system is being developed in the U.S. Virgin Islands. To serve the 60,000 citizens of those three lovely islands, the Virgin Islands public television system, establishing as a public corporation, a government authority, will construct two public television stations.

Public television does not come easily to the islands. Years of preparation and planning, significant local appropriations, anticipated financial support from Health, Education, and Welfare and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and dedicated leadership are required to bring about public television in the islands. The farsightedness of the members of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands in bringing it to pass and the islands' continued support of it will result in the development on one of the Nation's finest educational television systems.

We must recognize that the insular aspects of life have resulted in limiting the experience of most island children. There is a cry for those new enriching and stimulating experiences that are part of the normal way of life of the continental child.

What public television can and often does do so effectively here, in the States, it must and will do meaningfully in the islands.

Lives will be enriched, minds will be stimulated and challenged, children will share new experiences, and the home will become a center for the many cultural, scientific, and public affairs experiences soon to be available to them.

In addition to what we might consider conventional educational fare, the Virgin Islands Public Television System will prepare programs for the special needs of the West Indian and his culture. Programing for special interest groups in the areas of medicine, law, public safety, business management, in-service teacher training, consumer education, and aging, as well as programs for the disadvantaged will be regularly scheduled.

I am confident that special programs produced in the Virgin Island will be available for regular showing on stateside public television stations. What wonderful viewing experiences will be enjoyed as we learn more of these marvelous islands both at home and in school.

I am pleased indeed to report that the management and staff of WETA, channel 26, our local Washington station, is working closely with the public television people in St. Thomas. WETA recently produced special program materials to aid the Virgin Islands public television system in its demonstration efforts.

And as a further point of interest, the general manager of the Virgin Islands Public Television System was, in fact, one of the original staff members of that Iowa station pioneering in educational television in 1950. That pioneer spirit lives on.

As we approach the 20th anniversary of television in education, we may rejoice at our success thus far, but we must continue our efforts to support the development of new and exciting facilities, such as these in our Virgin Islands, that will serve new population groups of Americans for generations to come.

THE PESTICIDE PERIL—XXVII

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, alarmed over the dangers to our environment from the use of persistent, toxic pesticides, the National Audubon Society, America's largest direct-membership conservation organization, has announced plans for an all-out campaign to ban the insecticide DDT.

The Audubon Society has long been concerned about the threat to our environment and to man from pesticides. However, after the recent disastrous poisoning of the Rhine River by insecticides, the society has decided to turn its concern into an all-out campaign. Their message is that "long-lasting insecticides cannot be used safely out of doors, and that other pesticides must be handled and used with extreme care."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press release issued by the Audubon Society on this matter, but I would also like to draw the attention of Senators to the July issue of the society's magazine, Audubon, now available through libraries and local conservation organizations, which features a story entitled, "The Beginning of the End for DDT."

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY UNDERTAKES AN ALL-OUT CAMPAIGN TO BAN DDT

The National Audubon Society, America's largest direct-membership conservation organization, is undertaking an all-out campaign to ban the insecticide DDT. There are substitute chemicals and other insect control measures that are far less dangerous, the Society contends.

"The disastrous poisoning of the Rhine by insecticides this week simply dramatizes the danger inherent in these chemicals," said Dr. Elvis J. Stahr, the Society's president. "In this case, with literally millions of dead fish floating belly-up in a river once noted for its scenic beauty, the world can see the damage from even a non-persistent pesticide. What the world doesn't see so clearly is the damage being built up, day in and day out, by the persistent pesticides such as DDT and its chemical relatives—there is estimated to be a billion pounds of these chemicals—that are slowly polluting the world's environment from pole to pole, on land and sea.

"The reason DDT is especially dangerous is that it is long-lasting. DDT sprayed ten years ago or more still retains much of its toxic property today. So as we continue to spray, and the poison is diffused through the environment by air, water and other means, the levels grow higher and higher.

"We have long been telling this message to the American public. Now that the shock of the Rhine disaster has focused the world's attention on the pesticide problem, we are going to do our best to drive our message home with an all-out campaign. The message is simply that long-lasting insecticides cannot be used safely out of doors, and that other pesticides must be handled and used with extreme care."

Bumper stickers with the slogan BAN DDT in bright red letters will be distributed as a tear-out in the July issue of the Society's magazine, *Audubon*, and there will be a story entitled: "The Beginning of the End for DDT." The magazine goes to all 80,000 members of the Society, plus 20,000 schools, libraries and other such institutions. In addition, it goes to some 250 affiliated garden clubs, natural history groups and other local organizations.

Further, the Society is providing informational materials to these affiliated groups, and also to the Society's own 150 local chapters across the country, in order to back up grass roots efforts toward citizen action and education. For example, the Society wants to back up local chapters and garden clubs with facts to present when a local commission holds hearings on spraying with DDT to prevent Dutch elm disease. The Society maintains that in the case of the elm blight DDT does little good, anyhow. In fact, it does much harm and there are better ways of controlling the disease. (The best method is "sanitation": removing and destroying diseased portions of the trees, including the roots when an entire tree is infected.)

Where some spraying is advisable, the Society opposes all outdoor uses of DDT, aldrin, dieldrin, endrin, toxaphene and Heptachlor, and suggests instead "methoxychlor, malathion, dibrom, diszinon, guthion, naled, abate, Sevin, pyrethrins, rotenone or nicotine sulfate.

Generalizations are difficult, according to the Society's vice president-biologist, Roland C. Clement. Even the acceptable insecticides are powerful poisons to be used with care, he explained, and many have different effects on different types of wildlife or under different conditions.

ARMY OBLIGATIONS IN DISPOSAL OF POISON GAS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, shortly after it was made public that the Army planned to dispose of massive quantities of obsolete chemical and biological munitions by dumping at sea, I drew the attention of Senators to the many unanswered questions surrounding the international legal and political implications of this plan. I followed up my remarks of May 12 by raising this issue in a letter to the Secretary of the Army, and on May 20, I placed this letter and the Army's interim reply in the RECORD, together with some further remarks on the disposal project.

This project has now been reviewed by the National Academy of Sciences' Special Ad Hoc Advisory Committee, headed by Professor Kistiakowsky, of Harvard. In its report, the advisory committee urged that the Army make every effort to avoid disposal at sea. Even in the case of the 418 cement "coffins" with 30 M–55 rockets, each containing almost 11 pounds of nerve gas, the committee recommended that "the Army convene a group of technically qualified individuals to consider whether a practically feasible way could be devised to dispose of the 'coffins' on an Army establishment."

Mr. President, I am sure that all would agree that the National Academy of Sciences has performed a most salutary public service, the value of which has been increased immeasurably by the Army's acceptance of the Academy's recommendations. As the Department of the Army undertakes to implement these rec-

XUM

ommendations, I know that every attempt will be made to dispose of these obsolete chemical and biological weapons in a manner which judiciously recognizes the interests of the Nation, as well as those of the international community.

Accordingly, in the event the Army decides that the M–55 rockets cannot be disposed of safely at one of our military bases, and therefore, must be disposed of at sea, I strongly urge the State Department to insist that this decision be discussed in the appropriate international forums, such as the United Nations Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission. Such consultation is clearly required under article 25 of the Geneva Convention on the High Seas, and as a party to this Convention, the United States must make every effort to meet its full responsibilities. It is now incumbent upon the State Department to make it absolutely clear to the Department of the Army that the United States will not back away from its international treaty obligations.

ABM AND THE PRESS

Mr. **FANNIN**. Mr. President, while we are engaged in the ABM debate another debate is running concurrently. It is the conflict between members of the news media as to who is right and who is wrong.

For my own part, I think it is a mistake for legislators to base their actions or positions on a "what will the press think" basis. The better criterion, which I am sure is recognized by most legislators, is "What is the best course for the Nation?"

Therefore, I think it is particularly dangerous when we come across cases of deliberate or careless misrepresentation of the issues in the Nation's press. Mr. Claude Witze, senior editor, Air Force and Space Digest, has written a most perceptive column in the August issue of his magazine, which I would like to place in the RECORD. Mr. Witze cites at least two cases of severe distortion of the facts surrounding defense matters and I think the RECORD should bear this correcting information.

Additionally, Columnist Holmes Alexander has written a column which cites the almost fanatical preoccupation of certain segments of the media in their attack upon the supposed evils of the military-industrial complex. I have already spoken at some length on this matter, Mr. President. My views are on the RECORD. I would just like to commend these two gentlemen for calling attention to the inaccuracies and deficiencies that are apparent in their own profession as it touches these vital issues of the day.

Thomas Jefferson was outspoken in his defense of a free press, but it is also true that in order for the press to remain free it must first of all be honest.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles to which I refer be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIRPOWER IN THE NEWS—THE WAYWARD PRESS

(By Claude Witze)

WASHINGTON, D.C., July 8.—The Washington *Post* of last April 30 reported that an Air Force colonel had testified on Capitol Hill that "his civilian superiors approved the doctoring of internal Air Force documents to hide the huge cost overruns incurred by Lockheed Aircraft Corp, on the C–5A."

The account, under the byline of a reporter named Bernard D. Nossiter, continued:

"The officer, Col. Kenneth N. Beckman, said the data were suppressed because disclosure 'might put Lockheed's position in the common (stock) market in jeopardy.'"

A transcript of the hearing in question shows that Colonel Beckman did *not* make such a statement.

The proceedings were before the Subcommittee on Military Operations of the House Committee on Government Operations. The group is studying a proposal to establish a commission on government procurement, embodied in a bill (H.R. 474) introduced by Rep. Chet Holifield of California, who is chairman of the subcommittee.

The subject of overrun reports was brought up by Herbert Roback, the subcommittee's staff administrator. Here is what the official transcript reports:

"MR. ROBACK: Let me ask you this question: Why was the information, when you did identify around the middle of the year that there was going to be a substantial cost overrun, why did you not report that information?

"COLONEL BECKMAN: We did, to the highest levels. We reported it to the Secretary of the Air Force, Dr. [Robert N.] Anthony [Defense Department Comptroller], and to the Bureau of the Budget.

"MR. ROBACK: Well, how did you report it?

"COLONEL BECKMAN: We reported it verbally, sir.

"MR. ROBACK: Verbally?

"COLONEL BECKMAN: In the form of a presentation, and the reports of the presentation were put on file in the . . .

"MR. ROBACK. Why did you leave it off your written reports?

"COLONEL BECKMAN: Because of the nature of the overrun, sir. We felt, and Dr. Anthony and Mr. [Robert H.] Charles [Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations and Logistics] agreed at the time, that the projections we were making were actually estimates, subject to actual approval later on, and that the nature of the estimates were such that if publicly disclosed might put Lockheed's position in the *common market* in jeopardy."

Eight pages later in the transcript the subject was brought up again by Rep. William S. Moorhead of Pennsylvania.

Here is the exact quotation:

"Mr. MOORHEAD: You have mentioned, I think, you used the words 'common market,' and I think you meant 'stock market,' the problem of . . .

"COLONEL BECKMAN: I meant the general market, sir, Lockheed's position in the *commercial market.*"

The commercial market, of course, is the one where airlines buy airliners and it is a market where Lockheed competes with other airplane manufacturers. At no time, anywhere in the transcript, did Colonel Beckman, who is project officer for the C–5A, make any reference to the stock market, and it is clear he wanted to disabuse Mr. Moorhead of that impression.

As reported by Mr. Nossiter in the *Post,* the exactly opposite, and erroneous, conclusion was reached.

In the *New York Times Magazine* of June 22 there appeared a long article on alleged transgressions by the military-industrial complex. It was under the byline of Richard F. Kaufman. The author was identified by the *Times* as "an economist on the staff of the Joint Economic Subcommittee on Economy in Government, which Senator William Proxmire heads."

Here is a quotation from Mr. Kaufman's essay:

"Investigations by the General Accounting Office have revealed that the government's money and property have been used by contractors for their own purposes. The most recent incident involved Thiokol Chemical Corp., Aerojet-General (a subsidiary of General Tire & Rubber Co.), and Hercules, Inc. From 1964 through 1967 they received a total of $22.4 million to be used for work on the Air Force Minuteman missile program. The government accountants found that the three contractors misused more than $18 million of this money, spending it for research unrelated and inapplicable to Minuteman or any other defense program."

The report referred to in this matter is dated last May 7. It is GAO report Number 146876 and carries the title: "Use of missile procurement funds to finance research and development efforts." The report is critical of SAMSO (USAF's Space and Missile Systems Organization.) It says SAMSO "used about $18.1 million of missile procurement appropriations to finance work which, in our opinion, was of an R&D nature and which should have been financed with RDT&E funds."

None of the allegations made by Mr. Kaufman in the *New York Times Magazine* can be found in the GAO report. GAO did not accuse the firms of using government money for their own purposes or of spending any money for work unrelated to Minuteman. There is nothing in the GAO report to support the Kaufman conclusion.

What paper d'ya read?

MOMENT OF TRUTH

The Senate Armed Services Committee yesterday reported out the authorization bill for Fiscal 1970 military procurement and the debate, which promises to be prolonged, is under way. The headlines, of course, will center on the antiballistic missile (ABM) proposal. Just to let you know how the atmosphere is being charged, it is reported that last night, at a meeting arranged by a group called the Council for a Livable World, nearly fifty senatorial aides were given a "chalk talk" by leading scientific critics of the Safeguard system.

These include Dr. Jerome Wiesner, Dr. George Rathjens, and Dr. Herbert York, as well as former officials of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. While the chalk talk was underway, the Israeli Air Force shot down seven Syrian MIG 21s, the Egyptians sent their infantry across the Suez to carry out a large-scale assault, and Peking charged that the Russians are provoking armed conflict at the Amur River frontier. It will be interesting to see, before this magazine can be distributed, whether it is the chalk talk or the reality of a couple of wars that most influences the Senate vote. It seems evident, at any rate, that the Livable World does not include the Middle East or the area near Khabarovsk.

Senator John Stennis, Armed Services Chairman, will be giving his own talk, without chalk, in support of the authorization bill. The document recomends appropriations totaling $20,059,500,000. Of this, $12,880,000,000 is for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vessels; $7,179,500,000 is for research, development, test, and evaluation; $12,700,000 is for the construction of missile test facilities at Kwajalein. The total also is about $1.9 billion less than requested in the budget as revised last spring by the Nixon Administration.

The Senate debate will be focused on the ABM, probably almost to the exclusion of other issues. The committee says Congress should appropriate $759.1 million for the

XUM

Safeguard project. This is made up of $345.5 million for procurement, $400.9 million for R&D, and the $12.7 million mentioned above for the Kwajalein facility. There was disagreement in the committee on only the first of these sums. The authorization for procurement passed by a vote of ten to seven. Three of the dissenters, Senators Stuart Symington, Stephen M. Young, and Daniel K. Inouye, felt so strongly about the issue that they filed a minority report.

In the days ahead, the committe reasoning behind its support of the ABM will be overwhelmed, no doubt, in the torrent of the argument. It is worth noting that the report says President Nixon will be in a stronger position for arms-limitation talks with the Russians if deployment is under way. The committee does not believe the procurement program will jeopardize the talks or cause an escalation of the arms race. The requirement for ABM is called part of our over-all defense requirement, or the mix considered essential for security. Without it, the nation's second-strike capability will be in doubt. The committee considers the proposed funding to be minimal. It adds that the 1970 authorization is not an irrevocable commitment to the Safeguard system, but is subject to annual review.

ABM is, of course, an Army project. The authorization bill contains a number of decisions of greater immediate import to USAF. A major one is the recommendation that the Air Force be denied its request for $374.7 million to buy LTV Aerospace A–7D tactical fighter aircraft. With this program canceled, the committee would authorize using the same funds to buy additional McDonnell Douglas F–4E Phantoms. The argument given is that the A–7 price has more than doubled, to the point where the F–4E will cost about the same, but provide more versatility. In addition, the change will preclude the necessity for some expensive training and support programs. The report calls on the Secretary of Defense to shift the purchase to the Navy, or buy the airplanes for the Air National Guard. This would salvage much of the investment already made in the A–7.

The bill, as sent to the floor, would authorize a little more than $1 billion for the now-controversial Lockheed C–5 Galaxy transport. Of this, $225 million is to cover over-target costs in Fiscal 1969 and prior years. There also is included $481 million for twenty-three aircraft to complete four squadrons. $52 million for long-lead-time items that will be needed for the next twenty aircraft, $35 million for R&D, and $210 million for spares.

In a close look at the C–5, and its Total Package procurement contract, the committee chides both Lockheed and USAF for badly underestimating the technical difficulties and costs. Future contracts must be more simple, it said, and be reassessed at least once a year. The committee is satisfied with the airplane and is confident it will add to our military flexibility.

USAF's request for $599,800,000 for procurement of sixty-eight F–111D advanced tactical fighters was approved. The report disclosed, however, that in total only ninety-six F–111Ds—most of them authorized last year—will be equipped with the Mark II avionics system.

"In lieu of the Mark II system, a simpler system will be utilized on those F–111Ds which will constitute the remaining portion of the program," the report says. "Despite its long history of problems, including changes in programs, and cost overruns, the committee is recommending the continuing procurement of the F–111D since its unique and singular characteristic make it the best aircraft in the Air Force inventory for the night and all-weather interdiction mission."

And, the committee adds, they appreciate the advantages of the Mark II avionics system. But "any improvement can cost more than it is worth" and "Mark II has reached this point." There probably will not be any debate on this point, but there should be. The committee is the first on Capitol Hill to have words of praise for the General Dynamics aircraft which has suffered so much criticism. And it singles out virtues—the night and all-weather capability—that derive exclusively from Mark II. As explained elsewhere in this issue, the cost-effectiveness of the F–111D may be higher than they think (*See page 62*).

USAF's Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft (AMSA) is recommended for continuation as a research and development project, with no authorization for production. The committee, however, added to the budget request, bringing the total for AMSA R&D up to more than $100 million for Fiscal Year 1970. It says this should "shorten the competitive design phase and permit the start of full-scale engineering development in Fiscal Year 1970."

Incidentally, the total USAF authorization for R&D is set in the authorization bill at $3,051 million. This is $510 million less than requested. It does include money for work on the new F–15 air-superiority fighter, but the exact sum for this is not broken out in the Senate report. Of equal importance, however, is the fact that the request for $60 million for R&D work on the Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) was slashed by the committee to $15 million, a step that will spread gloom in the Aerospace Defense Command and Tactical Air Command. Both have a high-priority requirement for the system.

The committee says the threat from hostile bombers is not "sufficiently clear and imminent." On this conviction, it also slashed a request for work on an improved interceptor from $18.5 million to $2.5 million.

From this study of the bomber defense issue, the committee decided to "direct" the Secretary of Defense to "study, review, and analyze" the real gravity of the Soviet bomber threat. He is asked to submit, with his Fiscal 1971 budget, "findings and recommendations as to the nature and extent of the threat, the current and future bomber defense requirements, the possibility of phasing down portions of existing facilities, and other matters. . . ."

The committee assumes, of course, that this will be done on the basis of the best possible intelligence evaluation. It hopes that the result will ensure, as it has since World War II, our best effort to achieve a Livable World.

OVERRUN? WHOSE OVERRUN?

Today the House of Representatives voted to spend another $12.5 million of the taxpayers' dollars to complete the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, a gigantic and half-finished Taj Mahal on the shore of the Potomac for opera and theatergoers. The total cost of the building, according to the newspaper, will be $66.4 million. The original estimate, made about five years ago, was $46.4 million. That is an increase, according to our slide rule, of forty-three percent.

A House committee says the price went up because of a "meteoric rise" in construction costs, strikes, and "underestimating"—primarily of structural steelwork—and other unexpected expenses.

Nobody, to our knowledge, has called it an overrun.

THE INTERLOCKING DIRECTORATE AGAINST THE MILITARY

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—You see the U.S. military getting kicked around, and then you look to see who's wearing the boots.

One pair fits Arthur Waskow. He was recently arrested for trespass and nuisance at the Pentagon. He was an organizer last January of the Counter Inaugural, was a founder last year of the New (Eugene McCarthy) Party which became the New Left, was in the infamous Pentagon March a couple of years back. He is mixed up with the pornographic Free Press and is sympathetic with race riots, but against other sorts of warfare. He expresses his governmental philosophy in a book titled "Creative Disorder." He is resident fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies here.

This Institute for Policy Studies is quite a catch-all. A co-director is Marcus Raskin. He was indicted, along with Yale Chaplain Coffin and Dr. Benjamin Spock, for conspiring to violate the draft laws. He belongs to the New Party, the New Left, has got connections with Black Power and Students for a Democratic Society. He was a staff member under President Kennedy on the National Security Council. Raskin and Waskow had their names voluntarily in the magazine Black Panther, last January 25, as signers of a petition to do something nice for Eldridge Cleaver.

Another co-director of the Institute for Policy Studies is Richard Barnet. Like Raskin he was a Kennedy administration insider and was assigned to the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. You find that the Institute, a foundation, goes in big for U.S. disarmament. This has been going on for several years, and the seminars are briefing sessions for young assistants of Senators and Representatives. Often what a Senator or Representative says in a speech has been said before in these briefing sessions.

In the spring of 1969 the Institute's announced subject for the seminars was "military spending." Pretty soon Senator Proxmire and Representative Moorhead are getting headlines for denouncing Pentagon expenditures. Richard Kaufman of Senator Proxmire's Joint Economic staff attended the seminars. So did Pete Stockton of Representative Moorhead's staff.

One of these headlines, a three-column spread in the Washington Post for June 29, read "Six Davids Who Have Rocked Goliath." The first proper name used in the story is A. Ernest Fitzgerald, who is praised for exposing Pentagon cost-jumps. Fitzgerald, who works for the Air Force, addressed an Institute seminar in March on "cost control and contractor inefficiency." The Post reporter who praised him in the story, addressed an Institute seminar in April on "political influence of the defense industry."

You soon get dizzied trying to follow the veinwork of names-and-actions, cause-and-effect throughout this body of anti-military work. It produces tomes of the David-and-Goliath propaganda, where the attackers are represented as nice kids with slingshots and the Defense Establishment as a monster. You don't have any trouble finding that there exists an interlocking directorate of intellectuals who oppose law-and-order, national defense, the two-party system and the majority rule of our American pale faces. The directorate is interlocking in another way. Some of the Institute's board members, trustees and officer corps are respectable and irreproachable citizens.

You remember what Burke said, and you don't try to indicate the whole interlocking directorate. You don't know that a single Communist is involved, but you don't doubt that there are demonic chortlings in the Kremlin when the U.S. military gets booted around.

We're in an age when the in-thing to do is to agitate for the "rights of the accused." Seldom has there been heard so much accusation of the U.S. military. A good defense, I think, would be a strong offense against the accusers. It ought to be the in-thing to defend the Defense Establishment which, while not faultless, is for us and not against us.

If this assault should succeed, we could wake up some day by the dawn's early light and find that the Flag is not "there" any longer.

THE ABA IS ALONE IN ITS STAND AGAINST THE HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday, in speaking of the still unratified international conventions on forced labor and the political rights of women, I described the arguments against them set forth by the American Bar Association, and attempted to show why they were of questionable validity. But I by no means exhausted the objections to these arguments, and I hope today to present further reasons why the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should doubt their value.

The American Bar Association is, first of all, virtually alone in its stand. Over 30 prominent national organizations with long experience in human rights have recommended immediate approval of these conventions. These organizations include labor, religious and service groups of all kinds as well as the Departments of State and Labor of the Federal Government. Their representatives have been virtually unanimous in their support of these conventions.

It might be argued, though, that, despite this overwhelming disparity of opinion, the ABA is singularly well-qualified to judge in this case. This is, after all, a matter of international law, and what better group to advise our government on matters of law than the members of the legal profession?

The stand taken by the association, however, is far from the unanimous position of the entire legal profession. The house of delegates of the ABA, which formulated the association's position, passed its resolution against the conventions by a vote of only 115 to 92.

The strength of the opposition to the ABA stand within the legal profession is demonstrated conclusively by the fact that numerous State and city bar associations—among them the District of Columbia, New York State and city, Philadelphia and New Jersey—have all taken a position directly opposite that of the ABA.

As I described yesterday, Mr. President, the ABA objected to the treaties for the reasons that they would usurp national sovereignty in areas of solely domestic concern and that they would upset the balance between State and Federal jurisdiction by forcing the enactment of new laws. In direct contravention of these arguments, Mr. President, the Bar Association of New York City concluded:

> The Conventions appear neither to conflict with existing state and federal laws nor to require any new legislation for their implementation. . . . [and that] . . . the provisions of these treaties sufficiently reflect an appropriate international concern and that the Conventions are valid subjects of the treaty-making power.

I submit, Mr. President, that these considerations force us to question the value of the position taken by the ABA—a position upon which it stands wholly alone and upon which it is incapable of agreeing even within its own ranks. I therefore once again urge the Foreign Relations Committee to reconsider the faith it has placed in this position and to recommend to the Senate the speedy ratification of these conventions.

SUPPORT FOR BAN ON DDT INCREASES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, editorials published recently in the New York Times and the Janesville, Wis., Gazette, have called for a complete and total Federal ban on the use of DDT in the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the two editorials be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 7, 1969]

TIME TO STOP DDT IS NOW

A groundswell of opinion is building up against the further pollution of this country's air and water with dangerous pesticides. As a sequel to last week's calamity on the Rhine, in which some forty million fish were posioned, a New England legislative committee has warned that the same substance, though in far less quantity, has been found in the waters of Massachusetts and that uncontrolled pesticides in general confront that region with a "disastrous situation." Locally, the New York City Parks Department and Huntington, L.I., have forbidden the use of DDT.

Admirable as regional and local action is, however, it cannot have much more than educational value so long as the free use of DDT and other "hard" pesticides is permitted elsewhere in the country, not to say in the world. Taking years to decompose, these substances accumulate in the environment and are carried great distances by wind and water, by fish and bird, until their toxic presence is felt in creatures as distant as the penguins of the Antarctic.

It is past time for special interests to drop their outworn arguments about the usefulness of DDT in increasing production of crops, timber and livestock. Those who see the enormous threat from "hard" pesticides are becoming as resistant to such arguments as insects are becoming to the pesticides themselves. People can hardly react otherwise as reports come in showing whole species of edible fish with DDT residues approaching the danger mark of five parts per million, the maximum level considered safe for human consumption. In an open letter to Governor Reagan of California, marine scientists have warned that "if use of DDT is continued there is real danger that man's food supply from the sea will decline drastically while world population continues to increase."

It is this very threat that made so shocking the Department of Agriculture's project for combating pests that might be brought in on planes from Vietnam by blanketing a Texas air base with dieldrin. So toxic is that compound and so huge the quantity proposed that conservationists were understandably horrified, and the Air Force has now suspended the projected operation.

With these perils in mind, the National Audubon Society has launched a campaign for a nationwide ban on DDT, such as Senator Nelson of Wisconsin and Representative Dingell of Michigan have proposed in Congress. The prohibition would nationalize the action already taken by the states of Michigan and Arizona. While even this broad and rational approach does not touch the global aspects of the problem, it would reduce the immediate danger in the United States and force substitution of less harmful and more effective chemicals in the war on insects and disease.

[From the Janesville Gazette, June 26, 1969]

DDT REVIEW BOARD NO ANSWER

It will come as no surprise to anyone familiar with the devious nature of politics that a bill to set up a pesticide review board is progressing faster in the Legislature than the bill to ban the use of DDT in Wisconsin.

This is the way it usually works in politics. Someone introduces a bill for a genuine reform—such as outlawing DDT—and someone else offers an alternative bill like the pesticide review board that would have the effect of gutting the original measure. This is what is happening in Madison now.

If the Legislature adopts the bill to set up a pesticide review board instead of banning DDT, the people of Wisconsin will be the losers. Instead of action against a poisonous chemical that is polluting our state and killing our wildlife, we will get nothing but more talk. Meanwhile, the poisoning goes on.

Birds and fish are being killed right now by the deadly accumulation of DDT in their bodies. It is only a matter of time until larger forms of life begin dying too.

Nobody knows what genetic damage the human race has suffered or will suffer because of the indiscriminate use of pesticides like DDT. It is known that pesticides can disrupt the DNA molecule; that the effects are cumulative and may not show up for generations. By the time the evidence is in, it may be too late.

The Legislature should ban DDT in Wisconsin, and do it now. Skirting the issue with a pesticide review board will not make the danger go away.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE GETS RESULTS IN LOWER FREIGHT RATES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last month the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit affirmed the ability of the Federal Maritime Commission to disapprove of ocean freight rates that discriminate against U.S. foreign commerce. This case—American Export-Isbrandtsen Lines, Inc., and others, against Federal Maritime Commission's efforts to effectuate the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended, and correct serious disparities of the ocean freight system, a course of action which the Joint Economic Committee has long urged it to undertake.

Ocean freight rates are administered by international cartels of carriers. In all but seven of the hundred cartels, U.S.-flag lines are greatly outnumbered by foreign-flag lines. This predominance of foreign lines, formerly linked with deficient regulation on the part of our Government, has enabled foreign lines to determine freight rates, sailing schedules, and other conditions vital to the expansion of American commerce. Along these lines, the Joint Economic Committee, be-

XUM

ginning in 1963, undertook extensive investigations of its own to determine the economic effects of discriminatory ocean freight rates on American exporters, American manufacturers, and American consumers, and hence on the international payments position of the United States. These hearings had a salutary effect on the administration of maritime laws. Recommendations stemming from the hearings have been instrumental in stimulating more vigorous regulatory efforts by the Federal Maritime Commission.

One such recommendation counseled the Commission to "utilize its full statutory powers to remove discrimination against American exporters." (JEC Report, "Discriminatory Ocean Freight Rates and the Balance of Payments", August 1966, p. 4). When the Federal Maritime Commission found six ocean freight rates which tended to disfavor U.S. exports, it ordered the cancellation of these rates, the filing of lower rates, and "a written justification of the new rates based upon cost, value of service, or other transportation conditions." After investigations and hearings lasting 2 years, the court upheld this act, declaring that "certainly the United States has a right to protcet its own commerce against injury by carriers, organized or not."

In the past, lack of adequate governmental regulation has made it possible for monopolistic practices to continue shipping policies which are inimical to the U.S. interest. While a good deal has been accomplished in correcting this situation, much remains to be done. Recognizing that past actions of the Federal Maritime Commission have been only moderate and that these moderate actions have encountered entrenched opposition, the Joint Economic Committee urged the Commission to "go further, faster." (JEC report, August 1966, p. 4). In view of the fact that discriminatory ocean rates are a substantial impediment to our export expansion efforts, the Federal Maritime Commission should continue its vigorous efforts to equalize outbound and inbound ocean freight rates between the United States and foreign countries. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in the case of American Export-Isbrandtsen Lines, Inc., et al. against Federal Maritime Commission and the United States of America.

There being no objection, the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, No. 22,402]

AMERICAN EXPORT-ISBRANDTSEN LINES, INC., ET AL., PETITIONERS *v.* FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION AND UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, RESPONDENTS

(On petition for review of order of the Federal Maritime Commission, decided June 27, 1969)

Mr. Burton H. White, with whom *Messrs. Elliott B. Nixon* and *Elkan Turk, Jr.*, were on the brief, for petitioners.

Mr. Kenneth H. Burns, Solicitor, Federal Maritime Commission, with whom *Mr. James L. Pimper*, General Counsel, Federal Maritime Commission, and *Mr. Irwin A. Seibel*, Attorney, Department of Justice, were on the brief, for respondents. *Mr. Robert N. Katz*, Solicitor at the time the record was filed, and *Mr. H. B. Mutter*, Assistant Solicitor, Federal Maritime Commission, also entered appearances for respondent Federal Maritime Commission.

Messrs. Ronald A. Capone and *Robert Henri Binder* were on the brief for North Atlantic Continental Freight Conference, North Atlantic Mediterranean Freight Conference, and Outward Continental North Pacific Freight Conference, as *amicus curiae*.

Before PRETTYMAN, *Senior Circuit Judge*, and BURGER and ROBINSON, *Circuit Judges*.

PRETTYMAN, *Senior Circuit Judge:* This case involves an order of the Federal Maritime Commission relating to ocean freight rates and charges on outbound trade from North Atlantic ports in the United States to ports in the United Kingdom and Eire. The case was enormously complicated and lengthy. The Member Lines of two Freight Conferences were parties; the investigation and hearings lasted two years; the record contained about 5000 pages, plus 1000 pages of exhibits; the examiner's initial report was 100 legal-size pages and the Commission's final report another 42 pages; and the outbound tariff in 1965 contained some 1650 items. The case as it comes to us concerns only six items, presenting three or four issues interwoven into one basic contention.

The Commission determined that the rates upon six [1] commodity items [2] and one general tariff item [3] were so unreasonably high as to be detrimental to the commerce of the United States, and ordered the carriers to cancel those rates and to file lower rates with written justifications "based upon cost, value of service, or other transportation conditions". Petitioners attack the order principally upon the ground that the Commission has misconceived its own authority under the statute and is attempting to impose a rate-making system not found in that act.

Rate-making for ocean freight is a complex problem, involving the manifold intricacies of world trade. It involves many countries, many ports, many carriers, many shippers, many commodities, and a fantastic interlacing of routes. The carriers are organized into "Conferences", which carry on the administrative phases of the trade. They are exempt from the anti-trust laws in this country. By tradition ocean rates are fixed in large measure by the carriers. The factors which fix them are likewise in large measure the necessities of the situation. It is truly said they are what the traffic will bear. World trade is between buyers and sellers in different countries. Its movement is international. No one government controls it. So, if a producer has a product wanted in another country, its movement by ocean freight depends upon the interplay of the supply and the demand. Members of the North Atlantic United Kingdom Conference (known as NAUK) carry 98 per cent of the eastbound liner cargo, practically all at contract rates, with approximately 7000 contract shippers. Proposed changes in the rates and all normal questions relating to rates are submitted to and considered by a special group or committee, consisting of one member from each steamship line, which group meets about once a week. We are told that these groups take many factors into account in a vague, undocumented way, acting largely on their own expertise. We are told [4] that the Conferences consider principally three factors—competition, value of service, and cost of service. The procedure is simple and quick. We are told that in 1966 the Conference of eastbound North Atlantic carriers (NAUK) received 174 requests for rate adjustments and granted 140 of them.

In 1961 Congress amended the Shipping Act of 1916 by inserting a section [5] reading as follows:

> "The Commission shall disapprove any rate or charge filed by a common carrier by water in the foreign commerce of the United States or conference of carriers which, after hearing, it finds to be so unreasonably high or low as to be detrimental to the commerce of the United States."

The present proceeding was brought under that section.

In its wide examination in the present proceeding the Commission found no general disparity between eastbound rates and others, but it found rather startling disparities in the general cargo N.O.S. rates (a catchall classification applying to commodities for which no specific commodity rates are specified) and in the five other items. Thus in regard to N.O.S. it found the outbound rate to be $70.75 [6] and the equivalent inbound rate to be $53.70 or, if the cargo value is very high, "32/6% ad valorem". It found, "This high N.O.S. rate is inhibiting the movement of cargo." The item "onions" is an important commodity in our export trade to the United Kingdom, but there is no westbound traffic in onions. The competition to our commerce is from Canadian ports. The Commission found the rate to be $39.50 per weight ton from North Atlantic ports of the United States, $27 from Montreal and Quebec, and $31 from Toronto.

When it found wide disparities the Commission presumed that such disparities would adversely affect the commerce of the United States. It ordered the Conference to cancel the six rates above named and to file lower rates on those items. It ordered the Conference to "file a written justification of the level of the new rates based upon cost, value of service, or other transportation conditions as outlined in the attached report."

As we understand the argument, petitioners believe that the Commission is attempting to take over the functions heretofore exercised by the Conference, as above described. They find this threat in the direction by the Commission that the Conference submit a schedule of rates to the Commission and "justify" it on the basis of costs, value of service, or other transportation conditions. Thus they see a transfiguration of their long-time, Congressionally-approved system into a new, tightly-bound method of regulation by an agency of the United States Government. We think the petitioners' fears are unfounded. Certainly the United States has a right to protect its own commerce against injury by carriers, organized or not. The Commission made exhaustive inquiry into the matter and made extensive findings. It did not depart from the traditional concepts as we have outlined them. It did not fix the rates or fix a maximum. It called upon the carriers to prepare the tariff schedules. It did not require that carriers measure the proposed rates by prescribed factors. It did not use the terms

---

[1] One item (sleds) has disappeared from the case.

[2] Egg albumen, meat offal, onions, plastic sheeting, and toys.

[3] General cargo N.O.S. (not otherwise specified).

[4] Comm'n Rep. 4.

[5] Sec. 18(b)(5), 75 STAT. 765, 46 U.S.C. § 817(b)(5).

[6] Rates are determined by cargo weight (W), or by cargo measurement (M), or by whichever (W/M) produces the most revenue. Rates when stated are usually marked accordingly—W, M or W/M.

"prove" or "establish". It required "justification" for the proposed new rates, which means an explanation with supporting data; the word is much less stringent than either of the other two. Its prescription of factors was in broad familiar terms—cost, value, "or other transportation conditions". "Cost" and "value" are terms used by the carriers themselves, according to this record, and the term "other transportation conditions" is certainly broad and unrestrictive, especially when coupled to the rest of the sentence by a disjunctive.

We are inclined to think the Commission would have been hard put to fulfill its statutory duty with less disturbance of the traditional practices in the trade.

Affirmed.

Circuit Judge Burger did not participate in the foregoing opinion.

IS THE MOON A LADY?

Mr. **DIRKSEN.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a statement of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT) printed at this point in the RECORD. He is unavoidably away at this time.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR SCOTT

IS THE MOON A LADY?

Mr. President, in most Western languages, I believe, the sun is masculine and the moon feminine. In German, the moon is a man—Der Mond. Is the moon, then, a lady, preparing for the first visit of emissaries from her lover Earth or a male, hostile in stance and spirit to the intruding boot of the invader?

As we wait, with quickening pulse, the outcome of this adventure, this greatest of all adventures, one wishes to believe that the moon is a lady, Teutonic tradition to the contrary notwithstanding, and that she will part for these first brave visitors her veil of mystery with welcoming friendly grace.

UNLIKELY ALLIANCE

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in today's Wall Street Journal, written by Alan Adelson. It is entitled "Unlikely Alliance. Student Radicals Seek Workers' Cooperation in Fighting the 'System'."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNLIKELY ALLIANCE: STUDENT RADICALS SEEK WORKER'S COOPERATION IN FIGHTING THE "SYSTEM"

(By Alan Adelson)

Student radicals seeking revolutionary changes in American society began with confrontations that shook universities and toppled administrators. Now they have a new strategy: Seek alliances with the working class.

This idea was inspired by the 1968 "May Revolt" in France, where workers joined students in an uprising that almost brought down the government. Many U.S. student militants believe the principle of a student-worker alliance can be transplanted here—indeed, that it must be if their revolutionary goals are to be realized.

All this probably strikes most Americans as nonsense. They grumble about inflation and taxes and congestion and other irritants of contemporary life, but there's little doubt that the great majority wants no wrenching change in the system. Also, many people would contend that so far the student radicals have mainly shown a talent for disruption and have given little evidence that they have a coherent program for replacing the organizations they complain of.

A FUTILE STRATEGY

Moreover, the idea of a small minority of students rallying American workers to a revolutionary alliance—at a time when the workers seem to be in a politically conservative mood judging from their apparent approval of "law-and-order" candidates—seems highly dubious. Even within the militant left, a coalition of diverse and sometimes feuding factions, a few dismiss the strategy as futile.

Nevertheless, the concept is shifting the entire thrust of the radical student movement, as well as infusing it with new ferment. After the French uprising, internal dissension erupted within the Students for a Democratic Society as factions quarreled over rival concepts of student-worker cooperation. Last month's SDS convention in Chicago, torn by a power struggle between two factions, ended with each side accusing the other of being "anti-working class."

Despite such conflict, militants are busily trying to apply the basic concept. Some examples:

—This spring students led by Mark Rudd, an SDS leader in last year's massive confrontation at Columbia University, joined black workers on the picket lines outside a Ford Motor Co. plant in New Jersey.

—Striking West Virginia coal miners, protesting what they charged were inadequate protective measures against "Black Lung" disease this year, requested and received help from students at the University of West Virginia.

—When workers struck a Standard Oil Co. of California refinery near San Francisco this year, they and student militants boycotting classes at San Francisco State College evolved an informal alliance: Students helped picket the refinery and workers helped picket the college.

A MARXIST CONCEPT

Experiences like these convince many militants that the new concept holds promise. They believe that without support from workers, students never will break what they regard as "corporate domination" of universities and society as a whole; without help from the students, say the militants, workers never will win a fair share of corporate profits. The idea goes back to the classical Marxist concept of the worker as the proper source of revolution.

Richard L. Greeman, 30, a veteran of the civil rights movement and the New Left and an assistant professor of French and the humanities at Columbia, was one of many American radicals who rushed to France last year to study the May uprising. He explains:

"Mao tells us to build from peasants, but in the U.S. we have no peasants. And Che said it's guerrilla warfare, but I just can't see grabbing a gun and running up to the Catskills. Then in France the students knocked de Gaulle and his government flat on their backs, and the workers saw their chance and called a general strike. That really woke everyone up because it showed that the student movement could play a role in the detonation of a workers' movement."

MIDDLE-CLASS WORKERS

There are, of course, strong and widespread doubts that things would work that way here. Peter Doeringer, a Harvard University professor of labor economics, says that unlike the poorly paid French workers, a great majority of U.S. laborers have been "co-opted into the middle class." Well-paid, insulated from the impact of recession, U.S. workers "have moved from economic insecurity to economic security, and in doing so they have adopted the political philosophy that traditionally goes with security," he says.

The militants readily concede that workers oppose revolution in the abstract but argue that in practice the workers have been driven closer to a revolutionary state of mind than most people realize, largely because inflation is eroding the workers' standard of living despite wage increases. Meanwhile, they argue, a growing number of wildcat strikes indicate union managements have lost control of their members.

"Things don't need to get much more extreme than they are now," says Eric Lerner, a member of the SDS labor committee. "The erosion of real wages already has put the U.S. into a situation of 'sequential strikes' where one union after another has to go out."

But an obstacle to implementation of the concept is that workers don't like student militants. "A well-placed fist could be the welcome that awaits SDS revolutionaries," Karl F. Feller, president of the Brewery Workers Union, has declared. Morever, at least until recently, student militants didn't like workers.

For the second straight summer, however, the students are trying to change all this with a program of summer "work-ins." The idea is for students to take jobs alongside full-time workers, get to know them and their problems and gradually convince them that they and the students have common grievances.

A LEARNING EXPERIENCE

In a successful summer, says Alan Spector, a national official of one SDS faction, "a student can teach a group of workers about American imperialism, and the workers can teach him about exploitation of the workers." But an SDS work-in manual cautions students not to expect change overnight.

"Don't be shocked by the racist remarks of the white workers, by confused political impressions, pro-war talk, 'keeping-up-with-the-Jones' talk,'" the manual advises. "If the workers understood racism, the war, middle-class morality, capitalist manipulation, etc., things would not be the way they are."

Participants say a work-in can be a harrowing ordeal. First the applicant runs a gauntlet of wary personnel officials; if hired, he's expected to risk the workers' hostility by forthrightly, yet diplomatically, telling them where he stands. "He should prod and test, push their opinions and ask questions," says Mr. Spector. Advises the SDS manual: "Don't talk to workers like you know everything and they know nothing. . . . Make it an exchange of experience, not a one-way affair."

One New York City College student who took a work-in job at a New York loading terminal of a trucking company last summer says he found himself in a heated lunch-hour argument with a burly freight handler over the war in Vietnam. Suddenly the handler was loudly demanding: "When push comes to shove, are you for us or are you for the communists?"

NO WAY OUT

The whole lunch table went silent. "All I could hear was the hum of the air-conditioner and my heart beating," the student says. "I figured having blundered this far there was no principled way out, so I answered: 'I'm a communist.'"

For the rest of the summer the student worked on, while co-workers spread the word that he was a "Red," he says. Nevertheless,

XUM

he's encouraged because, to his knowledge, no worker told management, and he was able to bring one worker after another into long political discussions. "I proved it's possible for a student to exist openly as a communist among one of the more reactionary sections of the working-class," he says.

Militants also are involved in a wide range of other activities with workers. Some SDS groups, for example, have demonstrated in favor of the application of real estate profits toward construction of workers' housing. In several cities, students protested because, they said, bus companies were taking profits made in part from worker patronage and investing them in endeavors not related to workers.

A more common approach is to support workers in labor-management disputes. The University of West Virginia students helped the striking coal miners by picketing and circulating pamphlets. Harvard students aiding striking linen delivery truck drivers in Cambridge this spring by seizing the truck of a strike-breaker, throwing all his sheets and towels into the street and then trampling on them. This spring's incident at the New Jersey Ford plant, located in Mahwah, about 30 miles northwest of New York, offers a detailed look at one instance of student support.

Hundreds of radicals from the area threw their support behind several hundred black workers and a few whites who refused to go to work because a white supervisor allegedly had cursed a black worker. Mr. Rudd led a contigent from Columbia—leaving an SDS "occupation" of two buildings at the university in order to join the workers' picket lines.

LEAFLETS AND PICKETING

Every day for a week, the students helped the workers picket, driving out to the plant in car pools to take assignments from a striking worker. They passed out leaflets saying, "Ford has a racist idea" (a parody of a widely used company advertising slogan) and "Join us! An injury to one is an injury to all!"

Mr. Rudd and the other student radicals deliberately subordinated themselves to the workers. In one of the few times that any student took the limelight, Mr. Rudd merely offered to help the workers any way he could. (Mr. Rudd's student followers now say that campus radicals will have to play a much more active role in future incidents of this kind, perhaps by offering the workers a "revolutionary program" to guide them.)

The walkout cut production by about 1,200 cars, Ford says. But despite the student help, the wildcat strike collapsed after a week, largely because most white workers never did join the blacks. What impact had the students had? The assessments varied widely.

Wilbur Haddock, a black strike leader, was enthusiastic. "The students' coming out here is very good for us in many ways," he said. "This is all part of the same revolutionary movement."

But many white workers were angry. "I don't like the idea of students picketing and telling us not to work," grumbled Lou Stecklin, a day shift worker. "They don't want to work, they don't want to study. I feel like going out and rearranging their hair a little bit."

MANAGEMENT'S VIEW

C. A. Kiorpes, manager of the plant, belittled the student effort. "It was spring, and where they used to have panty raids, now they say, 'Let's go picket an auto plant,' " he said. Mr. Kiorpes confessed near the end of the strike, however, that the influx of students was a confusing experience. "We don't know who these kids are, or why they are here," he said. "If we knew who and what was hurting us, we might begin to defend ourselves."

Some observers believe the student work-ins and other activities by militants actually are widening, not closing, the gap between intellectuals and workers. One such viewpoint comes from Robert Weissman, 39, a United Auto Workers Union official who had his own work-in 18 years ago when he graduated from college and then decided to become a labor organizer.

"I camouflaged my student background so I could be a worker among workers," Mr. Weissman says. "These students refuse to camouflage their educations. They want to flaunt the fact that they are student radicals. They are trying to bring their politics to the labor movement instead of coming with open minds. And because they are making this mistake, they are doomed."

Mr. Doeringer, the Harvard professor, thinks the students would have a better chance to influence workers if they focused their efforts on "unorganized sweatshops" such as nonunion warehouses, rather than on the relatively large, unionized plants they are now trying to infiltrate. The unorganized workers are more likely to be low paid and thus more receptive to revolutionary ideas, he reasons. But Mr. Doeringer also believes that while some hard-pressed workers may accept student help temporarily, "they will peel themselves off from the effort as soon as they win their economic demands."

TAKING OVER FACTORIES

Despite such views, many student militants are convinced their movement eventually will succeed among workers. They say that the antiwar sentiment that now pervades university campuses started with a relatively small number of activists.

Some even see the time when a student-worker alliance will wrest control over American factories from management. According to this view, shareholders and executives would be compelled to surrender their rights and money just to keep the system going. "If things happen here the way they did in France," says one militant, "the Army and the police will be unhappy too, and will flatly refuse to move against their class brothers (the workers)."

Some union leaders have claimed to have information that student radicals are planning to sabotage factories as part of their effort to achieve power.

The militants deny the union officials' charge. "Sabotage is absolutely out because its just not up to us to win the strikes for the workers or take over the factories," says Mr. Spector.

"But we do have a lot of people on the inside now, and the workers do listen to us. We make it clear we're not there to use them but to join in smashing the oppressive system. The ruling class is scared silly now, and it should be. We may not be going in to shut down those factories, but we're not going in to play marbles either."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE THAT NO COMMITTEES WILL BE AUTHORIZED TO MEET DURING CLOSED SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I discussed this matter with the distinguished minority leader earlier in the day, and we both agreed, the Senate concurring, that during the closed session tomorrow no committees of the Senate should be allowed to meet. So I wish to make that announcement at this time on behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself. There will be no committee meetings allowed during the closed session of the Senate on Thursday. Committees should now be on notice, as well as their staffs, to that effect.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the orders of Tuesday, July 15, 1969, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 17, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 16, 1969:

IN THE ARMY

Lt. Gen. Richard Giles Stilwell, 021065, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), for appointment as senior U.S. Army member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 711.

I nominate the following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Harry William Osborn Kinnard, 021990, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

I nominate the following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. George Irvin Forsythe, 024510, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 16, 1969:

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Orville H. Lerch, of Pennsylvania to be alternate Federal co-chairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Brig. Gen. Willard Roper, U.S. Army to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, under the provisions of sec. 2 of an act of Congress approved June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 37; 33 U.S.C. 642).

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

U.S. SPACE TV ADVANCES—NASA TWIN TV SPECTACULARS: APOLLO 11 MOON VISIT AND MARS WITH RESOLUTION FROM 900 FEET

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, world television audiences will see a double space feature in the next few weeks, thanks to coincidence and to advanced communications technology.

The coincidence is that the probable timing of history's first human visit to the Moon in Apollo occurs a few days before two Mariner space probes carry unmanned TV cameras close to the surface of Mars.

Thus, shortly after the image of the American astronaut on the lunar surface fades from TV screens on Earth, those screens may be revealing wholly new details of the red planet, transmitted from 60 million miles away.

This twin TV spectacular, as seen by Gerald N. Truszynski, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Associate Administrator for Tracking and Data Acquisition, is made possible by great advances in electronics through which streams of signals can be returned from the surface of the Moon and the distant vicinity of Mars into tracking centers and switching points on Earth, thence by communications satellites into the TV networks of countries throughout the globe.

For Apollo 11, the 7-day period beginning July 17 will see a series of eight telecasts direct from the spacecraft on its epic journey—as in Apollo 10 last May it will be all color TV except the one period when the astronauts step on the Moon's surface: from 2:12 to 4:52 a.m., e.d.t., July 21—current schedule. Only black and white TV will be available from the Moon itself because Apollo's lunar module lacks sufficient power to meet the demands of high-priority data and systems and experiments on top of the much higher power needs of color TV.

The Mars telecast begins from Mariner 6 at 12:58 to 3:21 a.m., July 30, and again that day at 10:28 to 11:55 p.m., e.d.t. The two programs will produce a total of 50 pictures of the planet.

Mariner 7 pictures will be transmitted in three periods: 12:01 to 2:56 a.m., e.d.t., August 3; again at 1:20 to 4:15 a.m. August 4; and finally another 2-hour period at 11:20 p.m. same day. Mariner 7 will deliver 91 more photos of Mars.

The planet was televised before by Mariner 4 in 1965, but engineers of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration promise far higher quality than was possible 4 years ago. Best resolution from closeup will be about 900 feet, compared with 2 miles in Mariner 4, and 100 miles by the best optical means from Earth.

As for the Moon, TV has been there before too, but Apollo 11 promises the first human presence there.

> The really important keys to our recent progress—

Truszynski said—

> are the improvements in the spacecraft and the ground receiver. We have been able to increase transmitter power in the spacecraft, thereby raising the strength of the signal for its long journey back to Earth. On the ground, we have better design of the large antenna and the microwave amplifier and receivers that go with them, to provide much higher sensitivity and lower noise level. Thus, the weak signal from the Moon or planets can be clearly received. And of course, the communications satellites—also produced by the space age—permit the world-wide distribution of these signals as they are received back on Earth.

The power source in spacecraft inevitably involves heavy weight; nevertheless power has been increased in Apollo over previous manned spacecraft; the lunar module fuel cells power a 20-watt transmitter, where in 1966 Gemini had a 5-watt system. Mariners with 20 watts today have twice the power of 1965. At that, 20 watts is only enough energy to light a refrigerator light bulb.

Increased antenna capacity at both receiving and transmitting ends is significant too. Gemini had a nondirectional antenna where Apollo's coil-spring shaped antenna concentrates the signal into a thin 3-degree beam, making it 500 times more effective.

On the ground, the parabolic, or dish-shaped antennas of NASA's tracking networks, are comparable to the telescope, that is, they focus a widely dispersed electronic signal into a very narrow one, and the resulting concentration serves to raise the power and intelligibility of the signal received.

The 30-foot diameter antennas are most useful for Earth orbit and flight below 10,000 miles from Earth; the 85-foot antennas track above that altitude. NASA's largest antenna, measuring 210 feet across, is important for TV transmission from the Moon and from deep space because it has 6.5 times the sensitivity of the 85. The 210-foot dish will be required for future unmanned space flights involving landings on Mars and Venus, probes near Jupiter and beyond—hundreds of millions of miles from Earth, even approaching the edge of the solar system.

NASA's deep space network—DSN—has one 210-foot antenna in operation at Goldstone, Calif., and it is pressed into service for Apollo flights. Apollo 11 will be linked to another 210 at Parkes, Australia, on lease from the Government there, to bring in the TV signal. For the greater demands of the future, NASA has contracted to build two more 210's at the Madrid, Spain, and Canberra, Australia, tracking stations.

All 15 U.S. and foreign stations of the manned space flight network—MSFN—will be working full time on Apollo 11, but the TV transmission will be channeled through the 210-foot antennas and the 85-foot dishes at Goldstone, Madrid, and Canberra. Those locations are nearly equidistant around the Earth so that at least one station maintains contact with the moving spacecraft while the Earth turns on its axis.

The deep space network operates 85-foot antenna stations spanning the globe, with sites a few miles away from those of the MSFN at Goldstone, Madrid, and Canberra, and others at Johannesburg, South Africa, and Woomera, Australia.

To help increase the amount of signal received, the tracking system now uses the higher frequencies of the S-band—2.2 million kHz, or 2.2 billion cycles. Coupled with higher power and larger antennas this has resulted in a huge increase in the capacity to move data, which is important to TV, most important to color TV.

As portrayed by commercial TV, each picture from the Moon will be made up of numerous lines—more than 500 per picture—each containing the elements that make up the image on the screen. They are translated at the rate of 30 pictures per second—a speed too fast for the human eye to perceive at anything but simple motion.

Because of the greater communication distance to Mars, the Mariner data transfer rate is far less. The highest rate for Mariner 4, because of technological limitations, resulted in a transmission time to Earth of about 8 hours for each picture—far slower than the telephoto copy machine. Today, Mariner 6 and 7, with new transmission system and the DSN 210-foot Goldstone antenna, will deliver one picture in 5.5 minutes, 32 pictures in 3 hours.

That rate compares with Apollo 11's 9,900 pictures per 5.5 minutes, hence Mars will not appear as live TV on the home screen but rather as a series of still images, each gradually filling in the face of the TV tube.

Mariner 6 and 7 will snap pictures of Mars at intervals of several hours, first while approaching the planet, while passing around it, and then receding past it into solar orbit. The photos, all black and white, will be stored on tape, then transmitted to Earth on command. Altogether the Mariner twins will return 189 pictures of Earth but they will not duplicate views because Mariner 6 is on course to pass the Mars equator—July 31—while Mariner 7 will fly over the South Pole—August 5.

Large volumes of information are flowing back to engineers, scientists and flight controllers in the course of these flights. Gains made in the recent past have resulted in effective, flexible control from just one center on Earth. Apollo command is located at Mission Control Center, in Houston, while Mariners are commanded from Space Flight Operations Facility, in the Jet Propulsion Laboratory—JPL—Pasadena, Calif.

NASA's Office of Tracking and Data Acquisition directs these operations. JPL, which is operated for NASA by the California Institute of Technology, operates and manages the deep space network for OTDA. Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Md., has the management role for both the manned space flight network and NASCOM, NASA's 3-million-mile communications net, which links the flight operations together all about the globe.

The deep space network, incidentally, has continually tracked the two Mariners since their launches last February 24 and March 27; meanwhile, it continues contact with four other flights in deep space.

SERMON OF REV. ROBERT E. LEE

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in a time which we all know only too well is deeply troubled, it is rare indeed to discover a man who proposes simple solutions to our complex problems. Yet, it is still true that simple, honest answers are sometimes the best. A very good example was a sermon delivered by the Reverend Robert E. Lee, pastor of Atlanta's Lutheran Church of the Redeemer. Reverend Lee called for a recommitment to God's moral law, and to a sense of personal responsibility to accompany personal freedom.

Mr. President, I am sure we can all profit by his message, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extension of Remarks.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNDER GOD—OR WITHOUT GOD?

(Lutheran Church of the Redeemer, Atlanta, Ga., Robert E. Lee, D.D., pastor, The Fifth Sunday After Trinity (Independence Day Weekend), July 6, 1969)

Let us pray: In Thy Word, O God, Thou hast cautioned that the nation whose God is the Lord shall be blessed. Remind us in this brittle age that Thou dost not live only in the cool comfort of a church building, but in the press and traffic and anguish of our daily human affairs. Amen.

Our text for this Festive Service of thanksgiving and of re-commitment to the Christian heritage of our nation is a familiar verse from the 1st Epistle of Peter. It is the kind of text that speaks to us both as individuals and as a nation. It is a stern warning—and God knows we need it!

"The eyes of the Lord are over the righteous, and His ears are open unto their prayers: but the face of the Lord is against them that do evil!"

When Peter wrote those words, the handwriting was already on the wall for the Roman Empire. The seeds of decay had been planted and were sending up their still tender shoots. But the fact that they still seemed easy enough to stamp out and destroy didn't fool Peter! He knew that the weeds of moral and political and social decay were tougher than they appeared on first glance. He also realized that the secret of personal and national greatness and righteousness was faith and trust in God's will and God's revealed way for man!

The stentorian phrase of oratory in the Roman Senate—the proud words inscribed in marble on the public buildings of Rome—the affluent, comfort-seeking social order which the privileged people of the Empire enjoyed—the occasional wars which seemed to keep patriotism at a high level—the still fairly easy domination of the Mediterranean Civilization by the Roman Empire—Peter realized were all a part of a web in which people were trapped in the shallow belief that nothing would ever destroy the great name of Rome and bring it to the dust!

History, as we all know, wrote a different conclusion—and looking back, the words and writings of Peter might have made the difference! "The eyes of the Lord are over the righteous, but His face is against those that do evil!"

The parallels between Rome in the First Century and America in the 20th Century may be more similar or more nearly identical than we like to admit. Without any apologies, our Services today have been planned to bring us to our knees before God, in repentance and in re-commitment, as we face the deep issues of our corporate life in America today! In my mind, that is completely consistent with the Gospel! If for some it seems too much like unquestioning patriotism, and the equating of the Christian Faith with American democracy, then you will miss the point of it all!

You, as a Christian congregation, and I, as a Christian minister, are not here to affirm or to re-affirm political points of view! We are here to ask ourselves whether we are, and whether we want to be, a people under God, or a people without God! The inescapable question is what must happen to us if we are to be truly a nation under God?

We might spend our whole time describing and bemoaning what has been happening. But we all know what has been and is happening—and a hundred different ways of defining and describing it will ultimately end up at the same answer!

Viewed as a whole, we are becoming a nation of pagans—of raw secularists—of pleasure-crazy individuals—and callous, unidealistic pragmatists! Millions and millions of unhappy, unfulfilled people, snatching pleasure and success and security on a "catch as catch can" basis—consciously or unconsciously belittling and ridiculing and deserting the ideals, the standards, the institutions and the faith that gave us hope and vision and greatness in the past! There are those who say it is too late to change the tide—and their shrill voices are drowning out those who still have faith in what we have been—in what we ought to be—and in what, under God, we may still become!

At least for these few moments, in the splendor and freedom of worship, we can and may have our say. There are three deep needs in America today, and unless the present mood of life is reversed, we shall, like the Roman Empire in which Peter lived, ultimately destroy ourselves, and tourists of the future centuries may swarm over our ruins—intrigued by the fact that so rich and powerful and great a nation couldn't produce enough people of faith and character to make its ideals work!

The first deep and obvious need we face today is the need for a rebirth of commitment to law and order—God's moral law—God's clear design for His world and universe! The bitter truth is that we have talked far too much in recent times about law and order as a political commitment, rather than as a moral commitment, or a faith commitment!

Whenever there is a breakdown in civil law and order, it is because there has already been a breakdown in respect for moral law and order! What made America great at its inception nearly two centuries ago was not it civil code, but its moral perspective. God's blessings upon us as a nation are not the fruit of obedience to our statutes and laws, but of our obedience to His revealed Truth. God's mercy never operates out of the context of His law and justice!

We seem, as a nation, to be all hung up on the idea that God's mercy is the reward of obedience to our civil code of laws; whereas the deeper truth is that His mercy is the reward of righteousness toward Him! Justice, in the ultimate senses, is not what a court deals out. It is what God deals out to the unrighteous! Mercy is not a clever lawyer and a loose judicial system, but God's response to a repentant man!

It is profoundly true that what we all need is mercy—and God's mercy always depends upon our commitment to be obedient to His Law and His Truth! What will bring renewed greatness to us as a nation is not better statutes, but a holy fear of God's justice!

And this is second. As a nation, we deeply and desperately need a resurrection of faith in the ideals of the Gospel. Is that too obvious, or too pious sounding? A thoughful young man said to me recently, "Faith is for the birds!" Sometimes it seems to me that the birds may have more faith than many people.

What has happened to our conviction about the dignity of all men? What has happened to the virtues of courage, and sacrifice, and self-discipline? What has happened, as we asked last week, to the spirit of charity? What has happened to our sense of obligation to each other, upon which our nation was founded? What has happened, deep within us, to our instinctive longing for eternal meaning and eternal life? What has happened to us that makes us measure everything, pretty nearly everything, in terms of economics? What has happened to us that has turned thousands and thousands of youth on the loose, barefooted, unbathed, long-haired, hollow-eyed, and camouflaging their anger with trips and love-ins?

Headed in the present direction, we are surely not headed for any deep and great renewal in our nation. The issue is not a matter of going back to some imaginary old days, but going forward in a new direction, like Peter and James and John, in the Gospel for today, to follow the Master! The direction signs at the crossroads where we are today are clear! This way to hope! This way to no hope!

And that brings us to the third deep and obvious need of our nation. We need a powerful renewal of the sense of personal responsibility. What we have been experiencing, particularly in the past few years, is an angry demand by millions of people for personal rights! A crack-pot woman doesn't like prayer in our public schools, so we eliminate that. Ten million people don't want to work, so we put them on welfare. We arrest a known criminal and then tell him how to beat the rap!

When you read the Gospel and think about it, one of the unmistakable facts about it is that it puts the responsibility for a man's life, first of all, upon each man himself. To be sure, it calls men to concern for others, but only because, first of all, we are called as individuals, to stand before God!

I still remember that sentence in Life Magazine, many years ago:

"We shall never achieve true greatness in America until we get over the idea that what one man does or believes is not important to all of us."

You can reword it, in the light of 1969, and put it this way: We shall never know true greatness until every man, as an individual, feels and bears the weight and burden of his own life—and his own ultimate destiny!

The words of Peter, in the Epistle for today, pull it all together:

"The eyes of the Lord are over the righteous; but the face of the Lord is against them that do evil!"

To be sure, in conclusion, there are no simple answers. The problems are complex but there is one basic decision—which must be consciously made, deep in the soul of every man, and which, if it is not consciously made, will be made by default! It is this: Do we want our nation to be a nation under God, or without God? The decision seems, in this perilous time, to hang in the balance!

LET'S SET BLACK HISTORY STRAIGHT

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, William Loren Katz, author of last year's award-winning "Eyewitness: The Negro in American History," in an interview that was presented in the Reader's Digest, recently stated that the most valid of the student demands on campuses today is the request that Negro history and culture be taught on a vastly expanded scale.

Mr. Katz' answers to many of the problems that the American educational system faces today are very valid and merit every American's attention. The answers that Mr. Katz gives show that we can innovate our present system in respect to Negro culture and history without a revolution on our college campuses and in our secondary and elementary school systems.

One of the unfortunate things today is that most Americans are not aware of the contributions that black individuals and black groups have made to our country. Americans should be aware of these contributions and strive to learn more about the accomplishments of the Negroes in the history of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I submit this article to my colleagues and to the body of the RECORD as an effort toward increasing our general awareness of the contributions of our black citizens to the quality of American life:

LET'S SET BLACK HISTORY STRAIGHT

(An interview with William Loren Katz)

(NOTE.—William Loren Katz is author of last year's award-winning *Eyewitness: The Negro in American History* (Pitman), which the Negro Book Club has called "the best history book in print on the American Negro." He has served as consultant to the education departments of New York and North Carolina, and to the Smithsonian Institution. He is general editor of the Arno Press-New York *Times* reprint series. *The American Negro: His History and Literature*. For the past 15 years he has taught American history in New York City and Hartsdale, N.Y., high schools.)

Q. Mr. Katz, in recent months, campuses all over the nation have been in an uproar over student demands. One of the most vehement and persistent demands is that Negro history and culture be taught on a vastly expanded scale. Do you think this is justifiable?

A. I do. I think it's probably one of the most valid of the student protests. I hate to see it linked in people's minds with the more unreasonable demands of extremists, because the need for black history is great throughout our educational system.

Q. Why is it suddenly so important?

A. It has always been important. When you teach partial history, everybody loses. It's high time to teach the new generation of youngsters to avoid the ignorance, distortions and falsehoods of the past.

Q. In fairness to black citizens?

A. In fairness to all our citizens. Certainly black people should know about the contributions that black individuals and black groups have made in the building of America. This is terribly important for their pride, their self-image, their self-esteem. But it's perhaps even more important for white people to know. For if you believe that a man has no history worth mentioning, it's easy to assume that he has no humanity worth defending. Let's face it: we have a major racial problem in this country—and the only way we'll finally eradicate it is through education. Nothing else will destroy the stereotypes and myths that have been built up through the years.

Q. What sort of myths?

A. The chief myth is the conviction that since the Negro's accomplishments don't appear in the history books, he didn't have any. Most people are genuinely astonished when they learn that blacks sailed with Columbus, marched with Balboa and Pizarro and Cortés, fought side by side with white Americans in all our wars. They're amazed when you tell them about Phillis Wheatley, who learned English as a slave in Boston and wrote poetry so successfully that Voltaire praised her and George Washington asked her to come to see him. They never heard of Benjamin Banneker, a mathematician and surveyor who was appointed at the suggestion of Thomas Jefferson to the three-man commission that planned and laid out the city of Washington.

Q. Why has the black contribution been ignored by historians? Is it some kind of conspiracy?

A. Conspiracy is too harsh a word. But certainly there has been a tendency all along to treat the black man as if he were invisible. Paul Revere's famous drawing of the Boston Massacre shows a battle among whites, despite the fact that blacks were present and one leader, Crispus Attucks, a Negro, was among the five Americans shot down. Little has been written about the 5000 American Negroes who fought in the Revolution, but they were in every important battle. James Armistead, a slave, spied so successfully for Lafayette that the Frenchman asked the Virginia legislature to grant him his freedom—and it did. In the War of 1812, at least one out of every six men in the U.S. Navy was a Negro. At the Battle of New Orleans, Andrew Jackson had two battalions of free Negroes, all volunteers. In the Civil War, more than 200,000 black troops fought in the Union army and navy, and won 22 Medals of Honor.

Q. How, then, did the image of the Negro as a proud fighting man disappear?

A. To justify the hideous institution of slavery, slaveholders had to create the myth of the docile, slow-witted black, incapable of self-improvement, even contented with his lot. Nothing could be further from the truth. The slave fought for his freedom at every chance he got. There were numerous cases of successful uprisings on slave ships, and Nat Turner's plantation revolt of 1831 was only one of many. Yet the myth of docility has persisted.

Q. In what other areas has the truth been distorted or suppressed?

A. There are many. If I had to single out two, I think I'd choose the role of the black as an inventor, and then the part he played in the winning of the West. Most people have heard of George Washington Carver, who devised scores of new uses for the lowly peanut. But who ever heard of Norbert Rillieux, who in 1846 invented a vacuum pan that revolutionized the sugar-refining industry by speeding up the mechanical process and making the sugar smooth and white? Or of Elijah McCoy, who in 1872 invented the drip cup that feeds oil to the moving parts of heavy machinery and who held more than 57 patents for other devices? How many know that Negroes are credited with inventing such diverse items as ice cream, the golf tee, potato chips, the player piano, the gas mask and the first traffic light? Not many!

As for the winning of the West, the black cowboy and the black frontiersman have been almost totally ignored. Yet in the typical trail crew of eight men that drove cattle up the Chisholm Trail, at least two were blacks. The black troopers of the Ninth and Tenth Cavalry composed one-fifth of all the mounted troops assigned to protect the frontier after the Civil War—but you'd never know *that* from watching television!

Some people don't think these omissions are very important. Not long ago, a woman teacher asked me scornfully, "What difference do black *cowboys* make?" They make a great deal of difference. The cowboy is the archetype of American folk hero. Youngsters identify with him instantly. The average horse opera is really a kind of morality play, with good guys and bad guys, and right finally triumphing over wrong. You should see the amazement and relief on black youngsters' faces when they learn that their ancestors really had a part in all that.

Q. Does a whiff of this sort of knowledge stimulate their interest in learning in general?

A. It certainly does. One day, in one of my classes, I wrote on the blackboard that between 1870 and 1901 there were 22 Negroes in Congress, including two Senators from Mississippi. Immediately, a black youngster in the back row yelled out, "I don't believe it!" When he finally went to the library and found that I was right, he really came alive. Once considered a non-reader, he wrote a ten-page paper on the Negro in World War II, and another one on James Baldwin.

Q. What specific teaching changes would you recommend?

A. What we really need, from the earliest grades up through college and even into the postgraduate level, is preparation for life in a multi-racial society. For years, our elementary-school textbooks have depicted only white middle- or upper-middle-class children. We need teaching materials that reflect other aspects of American life, especially picture materials, because pictures convey ideas to youngsters far better than words.

At junior-high and high-school levels, we should start blending this material into courses on American history. Until this is done, it may be necessary to offer separate courses on black history. The problem often is how to motivate the white teacher. The old complaint that teaching materials aren't available is no longer valid: teachers' guides are available; the homework has been done. What we must do now is make teachers realize how exciting and stimulating all this fresh new material can be. If it causes a few sparks to fly in a classroom, why so much the better! It's a lot more constructive to have a confrontation in a classroom, with the teacher as arbitrator, than to have it in the streets.

Q. What about college level?

A. At college level we can begin to specialize. African history, until recently, has been badly neglected. By the 15th century, for example, the kingdom of Songhay in West Africa has developed a banking system, a school system and a complete code of laws. Its university at Timbuktu offered courses in surgery, law and literature to scholars from Europe and Asia as well as from Africa.

I think a course on the so-called Negro Renaissance in Harlem during the 1920s, focusing on such black poets as Claude McKay, Langston Hughes and Countee Cullen, could be just as rewarding as, say, a course on the English Lake-District poets of the 19th century.

Q. Do you agree with those who say that black history should be taught only by black teachers?

A. No, I don't. The color of your skin has nothing to do with your qualifications as a teacher.

Q. Why is this proposal made so often, then?

XUM

A. Look at the situation from the black point of view. If for generations you've been knocking on a door that won't open, you may easily become convinced that the keepers of the door are your enemies forever. Also, I think there's a feeling among some blacks that when whites and blacks get together in a joint effort the whites, sometimes more articulate or better educated, tend to take over. It's a psychological thing. Understandable, but in my opinion wrong.

Q. Do you think that college students should have a say in what courses are taught?

A. Let me answer that question this way. If I were a high-school principal or college dean, and students came to me with a demand for any legitimate body of knowledge, I would find it hard to turn them down. After all, the biggest problem that teachers generally face is student apathy. If they're already fired up with a hunger for knowledge, I'd be inclined to give three cheers and to make it available.

Q. In this whole area of black history, do you see any hopeful signs of progress?

A. Certainly. Rep. James H. Scheuer, of New York, has introduced a bill to establish a national commission on Afro-American history and culture. Many states, including Southern ones, now reject textbooks that don't reflect our pluralistic society. Magazines and other media are doing their part. The most hopeful sign of all, I think, is the way youngsters devour this information. And why not? It's new, it's exciting—and it's *true*.

Q. What can the average parent do to help?

A. He can take an interest in his children's history books. If they're inadequate, he can complain. If they're honest, he can read them himself. He can be concerned about summer reading lists. He can try to get good books on black history into his public library. He can even donate such books himself.

It's really just a matter of replacing ignorance, and the prejudice that springs from ignorance, with knowledge. And what a painless and satisfying way to help solve racial conflict: read a book, digest its information, absorb its meaning, relive history—and discuss it all with friends. Surely that's better than bricks or clubs in the streets!

Once, I remember, several youngsters stopped after class to discuss the topic that we had been studying. One of them, a white student, observed that after all the years of neglect it might be easy to fall into the error of exaggerating black achievements or contributions. A black youngster standing beside him spoke up. "There's no need for that," he said proudly. "The truth will do."

It's a phrase, I think, that might well be engraved over every classroom door and on every teacher's heart and mind. We need no more; we should not settle for less. *The truth will do.*

MICHAEL L. BENEDUM, OIL PIONEER AND PHILANTHROPIST, BORN 100 YEARS AGO IN WEST VIRGINIA

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Members of the Senate regularly call attention to the anniversaries of notable events. This is a worthwhile tradition. The Nation and our citizens must remember their vast and varied heritage. We need to know of the people who created it as the building stones on which we live in the present and are constructing for the future.

I call attention today to an event, like most great events, inauspicious when it occurred, that resulted in far-reaching developments in our State of West Virginia and the rest of the Nation.

Today is the 100th anniversary of the birth of Michael L. Benedum, surely one of the unique men America has produced. Mike Benedum, whom it was my privilege to know well, contributed much to the industrial strength of the United States and other countries. In the process he amassed an immense personal fortune which he regarded as entrusted to him only for safekeeping and which he used for the benefit of mankind. He was a genius at his business, one of the most competitive in existence, yet he was a gentle, philosophical man filled with warm, human compassion.

Mike Benedum lived a long, active, and useful life, filled with personal accomplishments and with many valuable achievements in building a better world.

Like so many of our truly great men, Mike Benedum's beginnings were humble. He was born July 16, 1869, in the little town of Bridgeport, W. Va., the son of a farmer. Life on the mountainous farms of West Virginia was difficult in those days, and young Mike's formal schooling lasted for only 10 years, and then only for 4 months a year, before he had to devote full time to work.

At the age of 20, he left home and immediately encountered one of those strange quirks of fate that can suddenly and permanently change lives. Riding on a train to Parkersburg, W. Va., he offered his seat to an older person. The man was impressed by this polite youth and in the course of conversation offered him a job. The man was John Worthington, then a supervisor for the South Penn Oil Co., and this job started young Benedum on a fantastic career that was to earn him the title of the "King of the Wildcatters."

For more than 50 years Benedum ranged about the world bringing in new oil fields at a rapid rate, discovering more oil reserves than have ever been found by a single individual.

It was not an easy task, but Benedum's inexhaustible energy and his lusting for the adventure of exploring the unknown depths of the earth urged him on throughout his exciting life. And, for a man who never played a hand of poker and never placed a wager on a sports event, Mike Benedum was one of the most avid gamblers. All of his career was a gamble. Sometimes he lost, but more often he won in the game where the stakes were high.

While the benefits of the game were big, the losses were of the same magnitude, and Benedum suffered setbacks that might have broken lesser men. One such loss resulted from the only time that he elected to play it safe in the business world. Shortly after making his first fortune, his brother advised him to abandon the oil business, so Benedum put his money into glass and ceramics. It was not long before he was broke and hurried back immediately to the sticky, black oil which was his first love.

His own words best describe the attitude that carried him through adversity:

> I've had no ulcers because I've had confidence, faith and patience to carry me through. If half-way up an obstacle I'd meet a streak of bad luck, I kept right on going 'till I was over the top.

There were plenty of obstacles in the rough and tumble world of oil well drilling, but Mike was a master of perseverance, and it paid off handsomely. He opened the great oil fields of west Texas, pioneered in Illinois, drilled in Colombia and the Philippines, and was instrumental in the development of the vast oil reserves in Rumania.

Even when he was past the age of 80, Mike Benedum personally directed the prospecting activities of his company in Canada and the Gulf of Mexico. On his 85th birthday he gave this formula for his continuing vigor:

> I have been asked how I keep going at my age. My formula is to keep busy so that the years go by unnoticed. To despise nothing except selfishness, meanness and corruption; fear nothing except cowardice, disloyalty and indifference; covet nothing that is my neighbor's except his kindness of heart and his gentleness of spirit; think many, many times of my friends and, if possible, seldom of my enemies.
>
> So long as I can work and enjoy the kind words of approval of my associates and the warm handclasp of the younger generation, I see no reason why every day should not be as much of a challenge to a man of 85 as it is to them.
>
> As I see it, age is not a question of years . . . it is a state of mind. You are as young as your faith, and today I think I have more faith in my fellow-man, in my country and in my God than I have ever had.

With this philosophy to guide him, Mike Benedum remained active in business until 2 years before his death 10 years ago, shortly after his 90th birthday.

Mike Benedum proved that the American dream can come true for anyone with the initiative and energy to grasp the opportunities that exist in our country. How else could a poor farm boy from the West Virginia hills gather in a fortune while discovering great reserves of oil and gas to power the Nation's economy?

Although Mike Benedum made Pittsburgh his home for most of his adult life, he never forgot his West Virginia birthplace, and he came back very often. Just before his death he longed to journey to Bridgeport for one more visit and, indeed, wondered if perhaps he should never have left. He recognized that the nature of his business made it necessary for him to live in Pittsburgh, but he also recognized the needs of his native State, a State he loved and whose people were "his own."

The great wildcatter's only son, Claude Worthington, died as a young man in 1917. But his name is widely known through the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation, which Mike Benedum established as the vehicle for distributing a sizable portion of his fortune.

The foundation was the crowning achievement of Mike Benedum's life, a life based on giving, always doing more than was expected of him without expecting return.

Mike Benedum chose his hometown of Bridgeport as the recipient of substantial portions of his philanthropy. He started by restoring the town's old cemeteries, then built a new Methodist church and provided the town with a civic center.

But his generosity was widespread. Many small colleges in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and other States have benefited through grants from the foundation, and tens of thousands of young people have been aided in obtaining a college education by Benedum scholarships.

Equally important with personal success in the life of Mike Benedum was the concern and compasison for his fellow men. This prompted him to devote a substantial portion of his wealth to charitable and humanitarian pursuits. The heart of Mike Benedum has touched unnumbered people, especially our youth.

Mike Benedum has been dead for 10 years, but his work goes on as before through the foundation, now under the capable leadership of his nephew, Paul G. Benedum, Sr., as president. I am privileged to serve on the foundation's board with such devoted and able men as Henry A. Bergstrom, John A. Byerly, David A. Johnson, James G. Harlow, and Byron B. Randolph. All of them are dedicated to the ideals of Mike Benedum and to carrying out his wishes through the foundation.

For many years one of Benedum's close associates was Sam T. Mallison, a talented newspaperman and author who came out of West Virginia to work with the great wildcatter. Mallison believed in Benedum and was fascinated by his career. This intense interest resulted in a book about Benedum and other writings. In one moving little story, Mallison tells of the last days of Mike Benedum before his death in 1959. In it he includes a codicil Benedum had added to his will and which I believe states succinctly and with feeling, in his own words, the essence of the man and his character.

It reads:

> The disposition of a not inconsiderable estate is never an easy assignment. It has been a thorny and laborious problem for me because, recognizing my frailty and inadequacy, I have not been able to lose sight of the awesome responsibility involved.
>
> If I could have looked upon my material goods as personal property, belonging to me alone, my task would have been immeasurably lighter. But I have never regarded my possessions in that light. Providence gives no fee simple title to such possessions. As I have seen it, all of the elements of the earth belong to the Creator of all things, and He has, as a part of the Divine Purpose, distributed them unevenly among His children, holding each relatively accountable for their wise use and disposition.
>
> I have always felt that I have been only a trustee for such material wealth as Providence has placed in my hands. This trusteeship has weighed heavily upon me. In carrying out this final responsibility of my stewardship, I have sought to utilize such wisdom and understanding of equity as the Creator has given me. No one with any regard for his responsibility to his God and his fellow man should do less. No one can do more.
>
> I will not attempt to deny that in certain provisions of this Last Will and Testament, I have been swayed to some extent by the tender sentiment that I have for the land of my birth and by my affection for those who are nearer and dearer to me than life itself. While I may seem to have been generous to these loved ones who are the blood of my blood, I know from experience that I am in reality merely passing a responsibility to them.
>
> The book is not closed. The responsibility is merely lessened and divided. It is none the less fearful. I hope that these loved ones of mine will bear with me in this last word of counsel, as I again remind them of the obligation that goes with their material heritage. I have unlimited confidence that they will be faithful to this trust.
>
> As I have seen it, life is but a proving ground where Providence tests the character and mettle of those He places upon the earth. The whole course of mortal existence is a series of problems, sorrows and difficulties. If that existence be rightly conducted, it becomes a progress towards the fulfillment of human destiny. We must pass through the darkness to reach the light.
>
> Throughout my adult life, day by day and year by year, I have been instilled with the conviction that wealth cannot be measured in terms of money, stocks, bonds, broad acres or by ownership of mine and mill. These cannot bear testimony to the staple of real excellence of man or woman. Those who use a material yardstick to appraise their wealth and foolishly imagine themselves to be rich are objects of pity. In their ignorance and misanthropic isolation, they suffer from shrinkage of the soul.
>
> All of us aspire to a higher and better life beyond this, but I feel that the individual who seeks to climb the ladder alone will never find the way to Paradise. Only those who sustain the faltering ones on the rungs above and extend a helping hand to the less fortunate on the rungs below, can approach the end with the strength of sublime faith and confidence.
>
> At the end of life each of us must face the great teacher that we call death. Stern, cold and irresistible, it walks the earth in dread mystery and lays its hands upon all. The wealth of empires cannot stay its approach. As I near my rendezvous with this common leveler of mankind, which takes prince and pauper alike to the democracy of the grave, I do so with resignation to the will of God and with faith in His eternal justice.
>
> Life has been sweet to me—sweet in the loved ones that have been mine, sweet in the friends who have surrounded me, and rewarding in the opportunities that have come my way. I could not leave this earth with any degree of happiness or satisfaction if I felt that I had not tried to bring some of these joys to those less fortunate than I have been.
>
> We know not where seed may sprout. In the poorest and most unregarded child who seems to be abandoned to ignorance and evil, there may slumber virtue, intellect and genius. It is our duty to sow and to nurture, leaving it to others to harvest the fruits of our efforts.
>
> While I am conscious that my love for the land that gave me birth has been an influence in guiding the disposition of my estate, there are other practical reasons why I have favored my native state of West Virginia. It is not that I am unmindful or unappreciative of my adopted home of Pennsylvania, but rather that I have sought to appraise and balance the needs of each and the available potential for supplying those needs.
>
> I cannot close my eyes to the realistic consideration that Pittsburgh and Pennsylvania abound in riches, having a citizenship in which men of great wealth are more common than rare. West Virginia is in a less fortunate position. There can be no question but that its needs are much greater than those of my adopted home. Consequently, in making specific provisions for West Virginia institutions, I have done so in good conscience, with a sense of equity and with recognition of a responsibility to distribute my estate in a way that will bring the greatest good to the greatest number. This decision was not made lightly or impetuously.
>
> Conscious that in this Codicil to my Last Will and Testament, I am figuratively speaking from the grave, and that the great book of my account with the Creator has been closed beyond change or amendment, I submit my soul to His tender mercy, and my memory to the generosity and compassion of my fellow man.

This, then, was Mike Benedum, a man I believe was the embodiment of the American ideals of enterprise and responsibility. He saw his poor start as no insurmountable handicap to success, and through his own strength and intelligence reached the pinnacle of success. But he never lost sight of the fact that others were not so fortunate. He worked hard, but he generously shared the fruits of his labor with others.

This singular man will not soon be forgotten.

URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the city of Dearborn Heights, in my congressional district of Michigan, recently received a $317,685 loan from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to proceed with plans for an ambitious urban renewal project.

Approval of this loan was the culmination of several years' work by Dearborn Heights city officials, working with my office and with the Chicago regional office of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

I take this opportunity to bring Dearborn Heights' plans to the attention of my colleagues in the House to show them how one typical American city is utilizing one of the many programs that Congress has authorized to help communities solve their problems and plan for the future.

Dearborn Heights is a city of some 80,000 persons, with an area of 12.7 square miles. It is located in central Wayne County, adjacent to the city of Dearborn and a few miles south of Detroit. It is bisected by U.S. 24—Telegraph Road—and I–94—the Detroit Industrial Expressway—two of the most important highways in Michigan.

The city was incorporated in April 1963, from an area that had formerly comprised Dearborn township. Progressive and intelligent planning has resulted in a city of fine homes, well-planned industrial areas, and modern schools. Dearborn Heights has no central business area, but stores, restaurants, banks, and other commercial establishments are scattered conveniently throughout the entire city.

In 1965, Mayor John Canfield and other city officials sought my help in applying for a survey and planning grant to begin plans for residential redevelopment of a 40-acre site, north of Cherry Hill Road between John Daly and Amboy

Streets. A grant of $111,000 was secured and long-range planning was begun.

The $317,685 loan just approved will enable the city to carry out this development. Part of the land will be used for construction of much-needed multiple housing and the rest will be developed for single-family homes. Some of the housing may be reserved for senior citizens and officials are also considering a plan to set aside some of the land for a park.

When the project is completed, the city will have transformed a partially blighted and largely unused area into a tax-producing tract of land that will provide modern homes for hundreds of families. The Federal loan will be used by the city to purchase the land from its present owners, and the money will be repaid when the property is sold to private developers. The city will seek bids and sell the land to whichever bidder submits the most acceptable plan.

At the same time, I am continuing to work with Mayor Canfield and other city officials on plans for another renewal development, a 42-acre tract bounded by Van Born, Inkster, Sylvia, and Powers, in the southern section of the city. This land is to be cleared and redeveloped for light industry.

Current members of the Dearborn Heights city administration responsible for planning these far-reaching programs include Mayor Canfield, who has been the chief executive since the city was incorporated; Clerk Robert McLachlan; Treasurer James N. Greenlaw; and Councilmen John M. Harris, F. Earl Caldwell, James T. Doyle, Thomas W. Plunkett, Leo K. Foran, Frank Lubinski, and Lyle C. VanHouten.

Primary responsibility for directing the program falls on Harold F. Brunner, urban renewal director, assisted by Duane Dunick, city attorney, and Theodore Monolidis, assistant city attorney.

Others who have served as city officials during the planning stage of the urban renewal program include John H. McGreevy, Charles Westphal, G. Daniel Ferrara, Robert J. Bullinger, Albert Bates, Houston Lovelace, and Patrick Hackett, members of the city council, and Ronald Prebenda, former city attorney.

To all of these dedicated men, I offer my sincere congratulations on their public service and their contribution to the future of their community. They have given us an outstanding example of how enlightened cooperation between local officials and the Federal Government can help progressive communities plan for the future, and put Federal tax dollars to work solving local problems and benefiting local residents and taxpayers.

PROGRESS REPORT ON THE METROLINER

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when railroad passenger service is deteriorating in every respect, it is heartening to see any meaningful effort to reverse the trend. One recent development which many of us looked to as a step toward revitalizing rail passenger service was introduction of the Penn Central's Metroliner service between New York and Washington. Although the Metroliner has some problems, its overall performance has been a success, and demonstrates that fast, efficient rail passenger service does have a future.

The Metroliner experience has a message for Americans in all parts of the Nation, for it demonstrates a feasible alternative both to the alarming and increasing air traffic congestion menace, and the tendency to pave over all our transportation problems with ribbons of concrete.

Robert Lindsey, writing for the New York Times, presents a balanced and perceptive analysis of the Metroliner, and I am pleased to call his article to the attention of my colleagues:

EARLY RETURNS INDICATE THE METROLINER IS A SUCCESS ON WHEELS

(By Robert Lindsey)

American railroaders, who frankly prefer hauling cargo to people, could have an embarrassing success on their hands.

The Metroliner, the nation's first train that offers speed and comfort to rival airliners, seems to be a hit.

As the shiny steel-skinned train, which races between New York and Washington at speeds up to 120 miles an hour, ended its first six months of operation yesterday, the men running the Metroliner said it was too soon for projections about its long-term power to lure people from airplanes and automobiles.

But there was at least tentative evidence to suggest that the railroaders may be wrong when they say that nobody, except commuters, people who are afraid to fly, and nostalgic railroad buffs, like passenger trains.

THE POSITIVE EVIDENCE

The evidence includes:

Since the service began Jan. 16, the trains have been filled to 76 per cent of capacity—a level almost 50 per cent higher than conventional trains. In all, more than 250,000 persons have traveled in the Metroliners.

Total train travel between the five cities served by the Metroliner increased 8 per cent over a year ago. The Metroliner accounted for more than two-thirds of the increase, although conventional trains on the route also showed traffic gains.

Early passenger surveys indicate most Metroliner passengers are "new" to train travel—principally businessmen who have flown in the past.

Although airline traffic exceeds the Metroliner between Washington and New York by more than eight to one, travel on Eastern Airlines "air shuttle" service on this route dipped by 2.8 per cent during the six months. Eastern officials blamed the drop partially on increased airline competition and flight cancellations caused by the mid-June "sick out" of air controllers. They conceded that some airline regulars may have defected to the Metroliner.

SURVEY ON TRAIN

The Metroliner experiment was begun by the Federal Government to test whether faster speeds and greater comfort could attract passengers away from autos and airplanes, especially in congested medium-distance "corridors" such as the 226-mile route between New York and Washington.

Currently three Metroliners move between the two cities on week-days and two on week-ends. The weekday trains stop only at Newark and streak over the route in two hours and 30 minutes. The two other trains, with brief stops at Newark, Trenton, Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore, take two hours and 59 minutes.

A survey of passengers aboard the Metroliner yesterday indicated that most travelers—as they have since the service started—like its speed and comfortable coaches, which to many seem more like an airliner cabin than a train car.

Although not all the passengers were quite so enthusiastic, one Metroliner rider seemed to voice the opinion of many:

"I think it's stupendous," said Ralph Locke, a Sacramento, Calif., sales executive. "I think if we had trains like this in California, you'd get more people on trains."

As he spoke, the trim Metroliner sped through a pastoral setting in Delaware.

In the train's coaches and parlor cars, which have wide picture windows, wall-to-wall carpeting and deeply padded seats colored a vivid burnt orange, many passengers pored over business papers. One man dictated a letter into a small recorder.

"This is my fourth time on the Metroliner," said Joseph Higgens, an attorney from College Park, Md. "I like the speed. I've flown and driven, but I like the train best."

His wife, sitting next to him, interjected with a smile, "I miss a dining car." The Metroliner parlor car passengers can order airline-type meals on a tray, while coach passengers can buy sandwiches and drinks at a snack bar.

Although praise outweighed criticism, a few passengers complained of heavy sway at some points and that the train's "automatic doors frequently stuck. Others were pleased that the train's piped music, a controversial subject since service began, had been shut off.

Despite the Metroliner's apparent success, it faces some problems, among them:

Some Federal safety experts are worried about the possibility of a derailment at such high speeds. The National Transportation Safety Board has convened a hearing Aug. 18 to review the June 28 derailment of a Seaboard Coastline passenger train on welded rail installed for the Metroliner near Glen Dale, Md. Reliable sources have indicated that the board plans a broad investigation of all safety aspects of the Metroliner.

Many passengers still complain of difficulty in buying a Metroliner ticket—particularly, long depot ticket lines. Efforts to develop an airline-type computerized system have faltered, although the railroad said the system should be operating by next month.

Serious technical bugs continue to plague the program.

FREQUENT DEPARTURE SOUGHT

The demonstration program developed by the Federal Office of High Speed Ground Transportation, headed by Dr. Robert Nelson called for a schedule of nine departures daily, from New York and Washington. Such frequent departures are needed, he explains, to offer an attractive service to travelers.

However, principally because of what Dr. Nelson described as enormous "reliability problems" with the Metroliner cars, the Penn Central Company has asked for a trimming back of the program.

The railroad has asked for permission to schedule six trips daily in each direction, adding the three additional trains next month.

Dr. Nelson said in an interview that the Government was considering the request, but had not reached a decision.

Bugs in the Metroliner cars have hampered the program since its inception three years ago. The Penn Central ordered 50 cars from the Budd Company of Philadelphia—30 powered by General Electric Company electric propulsion systems and 20 by Westinghouse Electric Corporation motors.

TROUBLE WITH EQUIPMENT

Of the General Electric powered cars, 28 have been delivered, but, Dr. Nelson said, there has been such difficulty keeping them in operation because of technical flaws, that the Penn Central has just "barely" managed at times to keep the service running. Two of the 30 G.E.-powered Budd cars have been "cannibalized" (taken apart for spare parts) by the Budd Company, adding to the equipment shortage.

SENSITIVITY TRAINING—SEQUEL TO DESEGREGATION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, educators natonwide who have been trying, in good faith, to produce desegregation in schools are all encountering similar experiences.

It seems that if the community or the students are not segregated racially they tend to segregate themselves by learning potential.

A typical report comes from the city of New Orleans where a school that was white 10 years ago now as a result of the progress of integration, has become for all practical purposes resegregated as a Negro school. This sounds like Washington, or Chicago, or New York a few years ago.

Everybody has a solution to the problem. The students are told that they are wrong—the parents are blamed and of course, the teachers do not understand the problem. So, the very reformers who have created the problem and can never admit their tragic guilt and error now propose to straighten the entire matter out—or make it worse—by brainwashing all involved parties. They will just convince them that there is no problem.

Sensitivity training to cure the problems of integration which results from sensitivity training. What progress.

At least it keeps the expert fixers well employed.

Mr. Speaker, I include a column from the New Orleans Times-Picayune for June 26:

Audubon School Fighting Decline Through Therapy—DePaul Assistance Project May be Making a Dent

(By Don Lee Keith)

The Audubon School at 428 Broadway sprawls languidly in uptown New Orleans, accented by tree-lined streets and velvet-green lawns. Its stucco-type exterior has been aged by time and humid elements to give the place a look of the stately, the established, the dependable.

During the school season, youngsters romp and play ball and stop occasionally to search for four-leaf clovers while awaiting the bell that ends recess. But in the classrooms and in the offices behind that strong looking beige facade, there lurks a constant spectre of trouble.

That ever-present trouble comes in a variety of disguises—a total change in the makeup of registration; serious discipline problems, even more serious achievement problems; resentment of students for teachers, and vice versa. Regardless of its outward appearance, the trouble, when peeled down to the raw, means that Audubon is a school which has undergone an overwhelming change, and that change must be dealt with carefully, skillfully, and with more devotion than most persons are willing to give.

AMONG TOP FIVE

Ten years ago, it was reported that the elementary school rated among the top five in the entire New Orleans Public school system. It was located in a most respectable neighborhood. Its students were gladly received in the major high schools of the area, and their scholastic achievement could be substantiated not only by grades on report cards, but by their accomplishment in future endeavors.

Then it happened—the school desegregation order. The school began accepting Negro children; white parents pulled out their youngsters and sent them to other schools. In only a few years, Audubon's enrollment began to show a sharp imbalance on the scale of racial factors. From a totally white school, it has gone virtually all Negro, with only seven white students enrolled last year.

And from the top scholastic ranks, it sank to among the very lowest.

Faced with a barrage of problems to stunt any she's known since she became the principal in 1944, Miss Nelda Villarrubia realized that while she needed help, she wasn't down yet. She had watched the deterioration of scholastic rating of a school she'd given her professional life to, and she was saddened by it. But she wasn't giving up. She'd tried stronger discipline—no better than softer discipline. Stricter academic demands met with no more success than less demands. Still, she figured, there must be a way, and anything was worth trying.

RESULTS INDICATED

At this point, Miss Villarrubia agreed to cooperate with the DePaul Community Mental Health Center, in an effort to upgrade the school through better understanding between the students, teachers and parents, and through an intensive program of therapy for all.

For a year, the program has progressed. Parents have been counseled and their problems shared by student social workers from Tulane University. Teachers have been allowed to pour out their frustrations in discussion sessions focusing on every classroom activity from throwing spitballs to overaggression. And students, those targets of the educational system in the first place, have known the feeling of being cared about by someone other than their families.

Results? Few, and even those so intangible that their evidence will probably not be noticeable when classes at the Aubudon School resume this fall. Nevertheless, fingers are being crossed that a dent, however slight, may be in the making for what had seemed an impenetrable situation. There is, moreover, the satisfaction that efforts are in progress, and that concern for improving where improvement is possible did not go out with Ned and the First Reader.

DESPITE FUND LACK

The project is one which has continued despite the fact that the National Institute of Mental Health declined sponsorship funds. Dr. Mottram Torres, the Health Center's director of research and training and Chief Social Worker Jan Harris, decided to go ahead anyway with their plans of action which included a study of the families and the pupils, training and consultation to the principal and teachers, and various kinds of mental help to those families and children requiring it.

Last fall, prepared questionnaires were distributed to the approximately 150 families of the Audubon School. The questionnaires included questions about vital statistics, plus intimate family conditions and problems. A coding of the interviews was developed to be key punched onto IBM cards to analyze some of the data collected.

Groups of parents were organized and a series of 10 weekly meetings were arranged. The meetings were designed to lead parents into discussions of their problems with their children and to get them to reach consensus on better ways of dealing with them. Parents were to create a common bond with each other, resulting with the children benefiting from better parental guidance.

Harris says that the results were discouraging. Most of the parents who agreed to come to the meetings never appeared. The ones who did come came late and usually for only one or two sessions. After only a few meetings, the procedure had to be ceased.

"Failure seemed to be due to the Negro families not being able to relate to the white group leaders and not having a full understanding of what the meetings were to accomplish. The mothers also wanted the meetings to focus more attention on themselves rather than their children," the social worker says.

Still, the parent discussion groups revealed many things. One lady had 14 children; she said she couldn't take the time to help each child with his homework. Another said she was the grandmother and didn't know how to contend with this younger generation. The new math threw several others.

Said one of the social workers: "The most important thing that came out of these meetings was the fact that the parents all felt that their children craved more attention. This craving is so intense that some parents admitted that their children actually seemed to enjoy the punishment they received from misbehaving. They wanted attention, no matter what means they had to use to get it."

This spring, a volunteer psychiatric consultant from Tulane, Dr. Eric Anders, and Miss Jeanette Jennings, a student social worker, started a "teachers group" at the Audubon School, with weekly meetings.

"At first, I noted hostility toward the change in the school, and toward the school board for expecting the teachers to do more than they were able to do," Miss Jennings said. "One teacher who had been with the school for a long time resented the fact that the white families had pulled out. However, two of the school's teachers had been trained specifically in teaching in lower socio-economic schools and were better able to cope with disciplinary problems."

The teachers group discussions usually began with the mention of an incident during the school day. From there, the teachers applied the situation to growth and development, incorporating suggestions for possible changes or methods of control.

Miss Jennings says that there has not yet been any change in attitudes, "but there has been a change in understanding. Now the teachers are beginning to understand why some children steal or act out in order to get attention. For the first time, teachers are talking together about their problems."

Harris believes that the most obvious change is the increase in families receiving mental health help. "In 1967, none of the families in the area were being helped. Now, between 25 and 30 families are getting counseling, therapy, or are participating in activity groups."

BIGGEST PROBLEM

He said that the program is trying to understand if the setting can provide a system that is preventative of clinical problems.

"The biggest problem is lack of acceptance culturally; it hasn't so much to do with race," he says.

This month, the program is applying to the Citizens Participation Branch of the National Institute of Mental Health, asking for funds. It is requesting money to hire indigenous workers who could help allay assistance in the area. "If we can get enough blacks involved," Harris says, "then the focus will be on education, not race."

Vicki Boling, a second year student in social work at Tulane who was a co-leader of one of the children's activity groups, thinks

XUM

the youngsters are finally realizing their responsibilities. "At first, when the talk sessions began, the kids could speak of nothing but 'bad teachers.' After several meetings, they admitted that some of the problems were their own fault, and this, in effect, is a form of accepting responsibility."

NEW EFFORTS

When school resumes this fall, so will the activity groups and the teacher groups. Efforts will continue to break through the hard-core stigma of nonlearning that seems to have gotten a toe-hold on Audubon School.

If the funds come through to hire a couple of Negro workers for the DePaul project, then chances of success are expected to increase. "Black workers could help teach us to apply better skills to the problems," Harris says.

In the meantime, the Audubon School sits in the middle of its playground. Empty swings, no sound of bouncing balls. When the reverberations of children's playtalk begin again in a few months, perhaps the building will have begun to be the scene, once more, of academic accomplishment and successful preparation for the future.

WHAT CITY NEEDS IS SLURP

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, for the outsider, and in effect, for the insider, New York politics has the aura of considerable confusion. Certainly, the recent mayoralty runoff might leave one with the feeling that it is virtually impossible to tell the players even with a scorecard.

I recently came across a column by clever Dick Zander, a talented reporter who I know personally, in the daily newspaper Newsday, which holds a well deserved reputation for interesting and well written news. Since it offers a humorous social comment on current politics, I include it in the RECORD:

[From Newsday, June 27, 1969]

WHAT CITY NEEDS IS SLURP

(By Dick Zander)

Now that the primary is over and voters have had their say, how about setting up a new political party?

It's simply not fashionable to be the candidate of just one political party anymore. And because of that, just what a given candidate or party stands for may be a bit blurred. Take John Lindsay for example. He lost the GOP mayoral nomination but he has the Liberal Party's endorsement. So what's he doing? He's forming a new urban party. He won't be any more Liberal or Republican as that party's candidate than he now is. How about calling the party the Save Lindsay Urban Party (SLURP)?

Only the state election law, which prevents a candidate from running on three lines on the ballot, would restrict Sen. John Marchi (R-Staten Island) from striking back. Marchi, of course, won the GOP mayoral line. He also has the Conservative Party endorsement. Even so, Marchi might put together in fun an elite fund-raising group to keep up with the Lindsays, something like the Best of Marchi's Backers (BOMB).

The New York City Democrats are the ones who really will be hurting for another party line this fall. Because Lindsay was able to hold onto the Liberal label, the Democratic primary winner, Mario Procaccino, may feel forced to come up with another line for himself. He now is stranded out in right field without a second party. To hold conservative party regulars, he might try Procaccino's Organization Party (POP) or Procaccino's Old Organization Party (POOP). But his trouble looks like it will be attracting the more liberal elements in the city. How about a Procaccino party called Citizens-Reformers-and-Youth (CRY)?

If Robert F. Wagner had made it, the job of naming a second party would have been easy. The second line could read: People Honestly Eager for Wagner (PHEW). Even closer to political reality might be Wagner's Independent New Democrats (WIND). But Wagner finished second, leaving the problem to Procaccino.

And CRY may not be enough to lure the liberals to Procaccino. There seem to be too many of them in the city who already have gone on record in opposition to the controller's candidacy. One can image Paul O'Dwyer's followers dreaming up an organization such as O'Dwyer's United Independents (OUI!)

And if that isn't enough, there was another liberal in the Democratic primary who finished in last place despite the fact that he spent more money than any of the other candidates. Rep. James Scheuer (D-Bronx) poured about $500,000 in the race. With that much invested, is it hard to picture the emergency of a party such as Scheuer's Particularly Energetic New Democrats (SPEND)?

The candidates could arrive in droves. Rep. Hugh Carey (D-Brooklyn) plans to run as an independent. And it will be his chore to name his own party. Herman Badillo, the outgoing Bronx Borough president who did surprisingly well, could be standing in the wings mulling a future run. And then, how about the talk of Steve Smith for mayor? Could the New York City Democrats go for Smith's Organization of United People (SOUP)?

All this makes one wonder if the primary had any value at all. In the past couple of years, Albany legislators have considered the idea of proposing legislation that would prohibit cross party endorsements. If such a law were on the books, it would mean that in November Marchi could run only as either a Republican or a Conservative; that Lindsay could be only a Liberal or an independent. Such a law would tend to draw a clearer distinction between what the parties and the candidates stand for.

Until that time arrives, the politicians will be pulling all the tricks they know to gain more votes for themselves. That includes forming instant political parties. Maybe New York City should become the 51st state. How about a party to Activate Breslin-Mailer (ABM)?

COMPREHENSIVE NARCOTIC ADDICTION AND DRUG ABUSE CARE AND CONTROL ACT OF 1969

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I outlined the contents of H.R. 12882, a bill that I introduced for the purpose of preventing and controlling narcotic addiction through the authorization of Federal aid in the construction, staffing, operation and maintenance of facilities for the prevention and treatment of narcotic addiction and drug abuse. In addition, this proposed legislation will aid in the development of drug abuse education programs and in the training of professional and other personnel who are needed to effectively combat this problem. Demonstration projects to drug use and research studies concerned with all ramifications of dilemma shall also be fostered.

I include in the RECORD today the complete text of H.R. 12882 which follows:

H.R. 12882

A bill to provide for a comprehensive and coordinated attack on the narcotic addiction and drug abuse problem, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Comprehensive Narcotic Addiction and Drug Abuse Care and Control Act of 1969."

DECLARATION OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) Narcotic addiction and drug abuse are major health and social problems afflicting a significant proportion of the public and private agencies to develop effective prevention and control.

(2) Narcotic addiction and drug abuse treatment and control programs should whenever possible: (A) be community based, (B) provide a comprehensive range of services, including emergency treatment, under proper medical auspices on a coordinated basis, and (C) be integrated with and involve the active participation of a wide range of public and non-governmental agencies.

(3) There is an urgent need to educate young people and the public in general on the abuse of drugs and that insufficient manpower currently are available to undertake such educational programs.

(4) There is a serious shortage of professional and other personnel trained to work more effectively in relation to the prevention and treatment of narcotic addiction and drug abuse.

(5) Current knowledge regarding the causes, prevention, and treatment of narcotic addiction and drug abuse are inadequate.

(b) In order to preserve and protect the health and welfare of the American people in meeting these needs, it is the purpose of this Act to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish a program of grants and contracts for the construction, staffing, operation, and maintenance of facilities for the prevention and treatment of narcotic addiction and drug abuse, for the development of narcotic addiction and drug abuse education programs, for the training of professional and other personnel, for the conduct of appropriate study, research, and experimentation, and for the creation of appropriate demonstration projects relating to narcotic addiction and drug abuse.

TITLE I—CONSTRUCTION, STAFFING, AND OPERATION OF TREATMENT FACILITIES

SEC. 101. (a) Section 251(a) of the Community Mental Health Centers Act is amended by striking out "of compensation of professional and technical personnel for the initial operation" and inserting in lieu thereof "of operation, staffing, and maintenance."

(b) Section 251(b) of the Community Mental Health Centers Act is amended by striking out "in excess of 66⅔ per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "in excess of 90 per centum".

(c) Section 251(c) of the Community Mental Health Centers Act is deleted and the following is inserted in lieu thereof:

"(c) Grants under subsection (a) for the costs of operation, staffing, and maintenance of a facility may be made only for the first eight years that such facility is in operation and the amount of any such grant shall not exceed 90 per centum of such costs for the first two years of the grant and 75 per centum of such costs for each of the next six years."

(d) Section 261(a) of the Community Mental Health Centers Act is amended to read as follow:

"(a) There are authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; and $75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; for construction, operating, staffing, and maintenance grants under parts C or D. Sums so appropriated for any fiscal year shall remain available for obligation until the close of the next fiscal year."

(e) Section 261(b) of the Community Mental Health Centers Act is amended to read as follows:

(b) There are also authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and each of the next eleven fiscal years such sums as may be necessary to continue to make grants for staffing with respect to any project under part C or D for which a staffing, operation, and maintenance grant was made from appropriations under subsection (a) of this section for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1970, through 1975.

"(c) For purposes of parts C and D, the term 'staffing' means salaries, fringe benefits, and travel allowances for professional, technical, and support personnel needed to provide services to administer, evaluate, operate, and maintain the facilities and program of a treatment center.

"(d) For purposes of parts C and D, the term 'operation and maintenance' means upkeep and repairs, supplies, utilities, rent, equipment cleaning, food and drugs, and similar items of cost incurred by a treatment facility."

TITLE II—TRAINING AND EVALUATION, AND DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION

SEC. 201. (a) Section 252 of the Community Mental Health Centers Act is amended to read as follows:

"TRAINING AND EVALUATION

"SEC. 252. (a) For the purpose of assisting in overcoming the critical shortage of scientific and professional personnel trained to deal with drug abuse and addiction, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to States and political subdivisions thereof and to public or nonprofit private agencies and organizations, and to enter into contracts with other private agencies and organizations, for—

"(1) the development of specialized training programs or materials relating to the provision of health services for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse;

"(2) the development of inservice or short-term refresher courses with respect to the provision of such services;

"(3) training personnel to operate, supervise, and administer such services;

"(4) the conduct of a program of research and study relating to (A) personnel practices and current and projected personnel needs in the field of drug abuse (including prevention, control, treatment, and rehabilitation), (B) the availability and adequacy of the educational and training resources of individuals in, or preparing to enter, such field, and (C) the availability and adequacy of specialized training for persons such as physicians and other health professionals who have occasion to deal with drug addicts, including the extent to which such persons make the best use of their professional qualifications when dealing with such persons; and

"(5) the conduct of surveys and field trials to evaluate the adequacy of the programs for the prevention and treatment of narcotic addiction within the several States with a view to determining ways and means of improving, extending, and expanding such programs.

"(b) Training grants under this section may be made only upon recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council. Such grants may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement as may be determined by the Secretary, and shall be made on such conditions as the Secretary finds necessary.

"(c) As used in this section, the term 'professional persons' shall include but not be limited to persons in the fields of medicine, psychiatry, nursing, social work, psychology, education, and vocational rehabilitation.

"(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the provisions of this section $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; and $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; and $6,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974."

SEC. 202. The Community Mental Health Centers Act is amended by redesignating sections 253 and 254 as sections 255 and 256 respectively, and by inserting after section 252 the following new sections:

"FELLOWSHIP GRANTS

"SEC. 253. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make fellowship grants (including such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) as the Secretary may deem necessary) to professional personnel for training in relation to drug addiction and other drug-abuse-related problems. Each applicant for a fellowship shall present a plan for his training which includes appropriate information regarding the participation of the institutions or agencies who will be providing the training.

"(b) Training grants under this section may be made only upon recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council. Such grants may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement as may be determined by the Secretary, and shall be made on such conditions as the Secretary finds necessary.

"(c) As used in this section, the term 'professional persons' shall include, but not be limited to persons in the fields of medicine, psychiatry, nursing, social work, psychology, education, and vocational rehabilitation.

"(d) The term 'fellowship' shall include such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) as the Secretary may deem necessary.

"(e) Training and fellowship awards under this title shall be made at such levels as may be required to facilitate the recruitment of the necessary professional manpower to this high priority area.

"(f) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the purpose of this section $400,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; $600,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; and $1,000,000 for each of the next three fiscal years.

"DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION

"SEC. 254. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to States and political subdivisions thereof and to public or nonprofit private agencies and organizations, and to enter into contracts with other private agencies and organizations, for—

"(1) the collection, preparation, and dissemination of educational materials dealing with the use and abuse of drugs and the prevention of drug abuse, and

"(2) the development and evaluation of programs of drug abuse educations directed at the general public, school-age children, and special high-risk groups.

"(b) The Secretary, acting through the National Institute of Mental Health, shall (1) serve as a focal point for the collection and dissemination of information related to drug abuse; (2) collect, prepare, and disseminate materials (including films and other educational devices) dealing with the abuse of drugs and the prevention of drug abuse; (3) provide for the preparation, production, and conduct of programs of public education (including those using films and other educational devices); (4) train professional and other persons to organize and participate in programs of public education in relation to drug abuse; (5) coordinate activities carried on by such departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government as he shall designate with respect to health education aspects of drug abuse; (6) provide technical assistance to State and local health and educational agencies with respect to the establishment and implementation of programs and procedures for public education on drug abuse; and (7) undertake other activities essential to a national program for drug abuse education.

"(c) The Secretary, acting through the National Institute of Mental Health, is authorized to develop and conduct workshops, institutes, and other activities for the training of professional and other personnel to work in the area of drug abuse education.

"(d) All grants made under this section can be made only upon recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council.

"(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the purposes of this section $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; $4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; and $8,000,000 for each of the next two fiscal years."

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT FOR RESEARCH AND STUDIES RELATING TO DRUG USE, ABUSE, AND ADDICTION

SEC. 301. (a) Section 302(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 242(a)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "depressant or stimulant drugs and" before "narcotics" in the first sentence;

(2) by striking out "the use and misuse of narcotic drugs," in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "(1) the use and misuse of depressant or stimulant drugs and narcotic drugs, and (2)"; and

(3) by striking out "at his discretion" in the second sentence.

(b) Section 302 of the Public Health Service Act is further amended by adding a new subsection (c) at the end thereof to read as follows:

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to establish a program of grants to be administered by the National Institute of Mental Health to—

"(1) support and conduct programs of research into all phases of drug use and abuse, including the origins, causes, incidence, and prevention of drug use and abuse, the abuse potential of drugs, and the therapeutic and rehabilitation agents and techniques;

"(2) make grants to State or local agencies and other public or nonprofit agencies and institutions, and to enter into contracts with any other agencies or institutions, for the conduct of investigations, experiments, demonstrations, studies, and research projects with respect to the development of improved methods of diagnosing drug addiction and abuse and of care, treatment, and rehabilitation of drug addicts and drug abusers;

"(3) make grants to State agencies responsible for administration of State institutions for care, or care and treatment, of drug addicts or abusers for developing and establishing improved methods of operation and administration of such institutions;

"(4) conduct surveys evaluating the adequacy of programs for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and for necessary planning studies;

"(5) develop field trials and demonstration programs for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse;

"(6) establish a National Registry of Nar-

XUM

cotic Addicts to facilitate research in drug addiction; and

"(7) make project grants to State or local agencies and other public or nonprofit agencies or institutions for the establishment, construction, staffing, operation, and maintenance of regional centers for research in drug abuse and related problems, one of which centers shall be established as a National Addiction and Drug Abuse Research Center as part of the National Institute of Mental Health, and shall be located in close proximity to the central research facilities of such Institute so as to avoid duplication of basic science laboratories and to allow for exchange of scientific information in collaboration between researchers in these closely related areas.

Any information contained in the National Registry of Narcotic Addicts, established under paragraph (6), shall be used only for statistical and research purposes and no name or identifying characteristics of any person who is listed in the Registry shall be divulged without the approval of the Secretary and the consent of the person concerned except to personnel who operate the Registry. The Secretary may authorize persons engaged in research under this subsection on the use and effect of drugs to protect the privacy of individuals who are the subject of such research by withholding from all persons not connected with the conduct of such research the names or other identifying characteristics of such individuals. Persons so authorized to protect the privacy of such individuals may not be compelled in any Federal, State, civil, criminal, administrative, legislative, or other proceeding to identify such individuals.

"(d) The following amounts are hereby authorized to be appropriated:

"(1) For carrying out the purposes of section 302(c) (1) through (6), $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; and $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

"(2) For carrying out the purposes of section 302(c) (7), $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and $15,000,000 for the establishment of the National Addiction and Drug Abuse Research Center, to remain available until expended."

TITLE IV—CONTROL OF DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES

SEC. 401. (a) The Congress finds and declares that the importation, manufacture, distribution, possession, and use of narcotic drugs and depressant and stimulant drugs for nonmedical and nonscientific purposes have a substantial and detrimental effect on the health and general welfare of the American people, that the medical and scientific use of such drugs are important elements of the practice of medicine and of scientific research, and that adequate provision must be made to insure the availability of controlled drugs for such legitimate purposes.

(b) The Congress further finds that there is a need for a single comprehensive code which makes the necessary distinctions among narcotic drugs and depressant and stimulant drugs with respect to the degree of control required and between their medical and scientific use as against their abuse for nonmedical and nonscientific purposes. It is therefore the purpose of this title to provide for the establishment of such a code, by utilizing the medical and scientific expertise of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the particular competence and expertise of persons versed in the fields of mental health and pharmacology.

SEC. 402. (a) In order to aid the States and communities, the medical and scientific professions, law enforcement authorities and other concerned groups and individuals in coping with the problems of drug abuse, while at the same time encouraging ready access to certain substances for scientific, therapeutic, industrial, or other legitimate purposes, the Secretary shall—

(1) carry out the studies and investigations pertaining to narcotics and depressant and stimulant drugs as directed by section 302(a) of the Public Health Service Act;

(2) determine which substances should be subject to control because of their ability to produce physical or psychological dependence which could lead to abuse;

(3) place these substances in such classes and categories as he shall find necessary, ranked according to the extent of their ability to produce physical or psychological dependence and their relative capabilities for abuse;

(4) promulgate a list of all such substances classified or categorized as directed by paragraph (3); and

(5) amend such list from time to time by adding, deleting, or changing the classification or categorization of a substance as he shall find necessary in the light of new scientific knowledge.

(b) No substance may be included on such list unless it is a narcotic drug (as defined in section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code) or is a depressant or stimulant drug determined under section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and not exempted under section 511(f) of that Act.

(c) The initial list promulgated by the Secretary shall not take effect until after such list has been published in the Federal Register, and not less than thirty days shall have passed thereafter. If within such thirty-day period any person adversely affected by such listing shall require opportunity for a hearing, the Secretary shall provide for such hearing, in conformity with the procedures prescribed in section 701 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with judicial review available in conformity with such section. After such list shall have become final, any change in the category of any substance may be carried out by the Secretary only after similar notice, opportunity for a hearing, and opportunity for judicial review in conformity with such section 701.

SEC. 403. Before making any of the determinations required by section 402, the Secretary shall consider the advice of the Advisory Committee on Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, established by section 503 of this Act, and shall consult with the Attorney General.

CONTROL OF ILLEGAL TRANSACTIONS IN MARIHUANA

SEC. 404. (a) Section 201(v) (3) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(v) (3)) is amended (1) by striking out "and any other" and inserting in lieu thereof, "marihuana, and any"; and (2) by striking out ", and marihuana as defined in section 4761, of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 4731, 4761)" and inserting in lieu thereof "of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954".

(b) Section 201 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(y) The term 'marihuana' means all parts of the plant Cannabis sativa L., whether growing or not; the seeds thereof; the resin extracted from any part of such plant; and every compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of such plant; its seeds, or resin; but shall not include the mature stalks of such plant, fiber produced from such stalks, oil, or cake made from the seeds of such plant any other compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of such mature stalks (except the resin extracted therefrom), fiber, oil, or cake, or the sterilized seed of such plant which is incapable of germination."

REGISTRATION OF RESEARCH ESTABLISHMENTS

SEC. 405. Title V of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section

"REGISTRATION OF RESEARCH ESTABLISHMENTS

"SEC. 513. (a) No person may conduct any research project with any narcotic drug (as defined in section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) or with marihuana (as defined in section 201(y) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act) unless such research is conducted by an establishment currently registered by the Secretary under this section. Registration under this section shall be for one-year periods, and shall be renewable for like periods.

"(b) (1) No establishment may be registered under this section except pursuant to application which shall set forth—

"(A) the name of the applicant;

"(B) his principal place of business;

"(C) the number or other identification of any applicable Federal, State, or local license or registration, relating to narcotic drugs or marihuana, currently held by the applicant including the number or other identification of any such Federal license or registration previously held by the applicant;

"(D) procedures for accountability for drugs used in research projects of the applicant and the methods to be used and the safeguards to be instituted against diversion of the drugs used in such projects to nonmedical or nonscientific uses; and

"(E) any other information required by the Secretary by regulations.

The Secretary may not register an establishment under this section unless he determines that the applicant has established adequate procedures to provide for accountability for drugs used in research projects of the applicant and adequate methods to safeguard against diversions of such drugs to nonmedical or nonscientific uses, in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary, with the concurrence of the Attorney General. Such regulations shall permit the conduct of double-blind studies.

"(2) Each applicant registered under this section shall, before any drugs are administered to human beings under a research project of the applicant, submit to the Secretary, in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may require, a research protocol, describing the research to be conducted, listing the investigators (each of whom must be registered under section 4722 or 4753 of the Internal Revenue Code, as applicable) and their qualifications to engage in such research, and otherwise conforming to the requirements of section 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. No such research protocol may provide for the dispensing or administration of drugs to human beings except by persons licensed to dispense or administer such drugs under applicable State laws.

"(c) (1) The Secretary may revoke or suspend the registration of any establishment granted under this section if he finds (A) that the application for such registration contains any untrue statement of material fact, (B) that research projects in such establishment are not being conducted in accordance with approved procedures or methods relating to accountability for drugs or safeguards against diversion of drugs used in such project to nonmedical or nonscientific uses, or (C) research projects involving the dispensing or administration of drugs to human beings are being conducted by persons not licensed under applicable State law to dispense or administer drugs.

"(2) Regulations of the Secretary shall provide for notice and opportunity for a hearing before revocation or suspension of registration under this section, except that, upon a finding of imminent hazard to the public health, such registration may be suspended or revoked prior to such hearing, but opportunity for a hearing shall be granted immediately in such cases."

XUM

AMENDMENTS RELATING TO DRUG RESEARCH IN REGULATED ESTABLISHMENTS

SEC. 406. (a) Section 4704(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "; or", and by inserting immediately below paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) RESEARCH.—To the dispensing or administration of narcotic drugs in the course of a research project conducted by an establishment currently registered under section 513 of the Public Health Service Act, if records of the drugs so dispensed or administered are kept as required by this subpart."

(b) Section 4705(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(5) RESEARCH.—To the dispensing or administration of narcotic drugs to any person in the course of a research project conducted by an establishment currently registered issued under section 513 of the Public Health Service Act. Such registrant shall keep a record of all such drugs dispensed or administered, showing the amount dispensed or administered, the date, and the name and address of the person to whom such drugs are dispensed or administered, except such as may be dispensed or administered to a patient upon whom a physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner shall personally attend; and such record shall be kept for a period of two years from the date of dispensing or administering such drugs, subject to inspection, as provided in section 4773."

(c) Section 4721(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out "research, instruction, or analysis" and inserting in lieu thereof "instruction or analysis, or for the purpose of research by an establishment currently registered under section 513 of the Public Health Service Act,".

(d) Section 4742(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(6) RESEARCH PROJECTS.—To a transfer of marihuana to or by a person in the conduct of a research project conducted by an establishment currently registered under section 513 of the Public Health Service Act. Such registrant shall keep a record of all such marihuana used in such project, showing the amount used and the name and address of the person using such marihuana, and such record shall be kept for a period of two years from the date of such use, and be subject to inspection as provided in section 4773."

(e) Section 4751(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out "research, instruction, or analysis" and inserting in lieu thereof "instruction or analysis, or for the purpose of research by an establishment currently registered under section 513 of the Public Health Service Act,".

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

TRANSFERS OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 501. The functions, powers and duties of the Attorney General under Reorganization Plan Number 1 of 1968 to designate a drug as a depressant or stimulant drug under section 201(V) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and to make a finding that a drug or other substance is an opiate under section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to determine the medical, scientific, and other legitimate needs of the United States for the purpose of establishing manufacturing quotas for narcotic drugs under section 509 of the Narcotics Manufacturing Act of 1960, and the amounts of narcotic drugs that should be imported or exported under sections 173 and 182 of title 21 of the United States Code, are transferred to the Secretary.

AMENDMENTS RELATING TO TRANSFERS OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 502. (a) The Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 4702(a)(1) is amended by striking out "The Secretary or his delegate" where it appears after subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General".

(2) Sections 4702(a)(3) and 4702(a)(5) are each amended by striking out "The Secretary or his delegate" where it appears in those sections and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General".

(3) Section 4705(c)(2)(C) is amended by striking out "The Secretary or his delegate" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General".

(4) Sections 4731(g)(1) and 4731(g)(2) are each amended by striking out "The Secretary or his delegate (after considering the technical advice of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or his delegate, on the subject)" and inserting in lieu thereof in each such section "The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General".

(b) Section 2(b) of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act is amended by striking out "the board" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General".

(c) Section 10(a) of the Opium Poppy Control Act of 1942 (21 U.S.C. 188) is amended by striking out "The Secretary of the Treasury" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General".

(d) The Narcotics Manufacturing Act of 1960 is amended as follows:

(1) The second sentence of section 5(b) (21 U.S.C. 503) is amended by striking out "The Secretary or his delegate" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General".

(2) The second sentence of section 5(d) is amended by striking out "The Secretary or his delegate" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General."

(3) Section 6 (21 U.S.C. 504) is amended by striking out "The Secretary or his delegate" the first and third time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General".

(4) Section 7(b) (21 U.S.C. 505(b)) is amended by striking out "if the Secretary or his delegate" and inserting in lieu thereof "if the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General".

(5) Paragraph (1) of Section 8(a) (21 U.S.C. 506(a)) is amended by striking out "which will produce" and inserting in lieu thereof "which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General, determines will produce".

(6) Section 11(a) (21 U.S.C. 509) is amended by striking out "the Secretary or his delegate" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General".

(7) Section 11(b) is amended by striking out "the Secretary or his delegate" the first time it appears in that section and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General".

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 503. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall appoint a committee of experts to advise him with respect to any of the determinations pertaining to drugs which he is required to make under amendments made by this Act. This committee shall be known as the Advisory Committee on Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. It shall be composed of not less than twelve persons of diverse professional backgrounds, including the fields of pharmacology, psychiatry, psychology and other behavioral sciences, manufacturing, and distribution, who, in the opinion of the Secretary, qualify as experts on the subject of narcotic drugs or depressant or stimulant drugs.

THE GREAT ADVENTURE

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the July 21 issue of Newsweek:

THE GREAT ADVENTURE: VOYAGE TO THE MOON

The odyssey is at hand, computed to the tiniest margin of error. All the ingenuity of technology is marshalled, thousands of contingencies have been calculated. But it remains for man, not the computer, to venture into the unknown.

Apollo 11 is, quite simply, man's greatest adventure—his first flight to the surface of another body in the space that encompasses his familiar earth. And though much of the count-down at Cape Kennedy last weekend retraced the now-familiar steps for a momentous journey, there were new signs to point up the majesty and portent of Apollo 11's mission.

There was, first of all, the beauty and national pride reflected in the names selected by the astronauts for their ships—Eagle, symoblic emblem of the United States, for the landing craft that is to carry Neil A. Armstrong and Edwin E. Aldrin to the floor of the moon; Columbia, the shining symbol of the nation, for the mother ship that Michael Collins will pilot while his crew mates explore the moon. As Armstrong, the commander and the man scheduled to be first to set foot on the moon, recently noted: "The names are representative of the flight and of the nation's hopes." And there was the quickening interest in the eight-day, 500,000-mile odyssey, as hundreds of thousands of ordinary folk—plus former President Lyndon B. Johnson, the representatives of 60 foreign nations, and U.S. congressmen and senators—began descending on Florida to see the start of the journey. Beyond the Cape, hundreds of millions more were expected to watch the launching via TV and communications satellites.

What they will see is some 160 seconds of powered flight as the 363-foot-tall Apollo-Saturn vehicle leaves Pad 39 at 9:32 a.m., EDT, Wednesday.

But that lift, calculated to the second and the foot-pound, should be enough to thrust Armstrong, Aldren and Collins into the ranks of man's pre-eminent explorers. And to Columbus's Santa Maria, Lindbergh's Spirit of St. Louis and Yuri Gagarin's Vostok, will be added the names of Eagle and Columbia. In less than twelve minutes after launch, the Apollo 11 crew hope to be 115 miles in a temporary orbit, their three-segment ship still attached to the Saturn 5's third stage.

A little less than three hours later, the third stage will be started up again and, in a nearly six-minute-long burn of its 227,000-pound-thrust single engine, increase the speed of the Apollo 11 ship from about 17,400 mph to 24,200 mph and drive the spaceship onto a translunar trajectory. About 25 min-

XUM

utes after they have begun the three-day-long coast out to the moon, Collins is to separate the Apollo command and service modules—Columbia—from the third stage. Eagle will still be attached to the spent stage; Collins will nudge Columbia back to Eagle, docking and taking it over for the coast to the moon. Then Eagle and Columbia will be in the "barbecue mode"—rotating slowly so the sun heats them evenly.

The silent minutes

Around 1:26 p.m., EDT, next Saturday, the Apollo 11 ship is to sweep behind the moon. For 34 minutes, officials at NASA's Mission Control Center in Houston have no way of knowing if the ship's 20,500-pound-thrust engine, in a six-minute burn, braked Apollo 11 from a speed of 8,279 mph to 5,476 mph and dropped it into lunar orbit with a pericynthion (low point above the moon) of 69 miles and an apocynthion of 195 miles. If the engine—which has so far been successfully fired 34 times in previous Apollo flights—does not ignite, Apollo 11 will be traveling too fast for the moon's weak gravitational field to hold it and will head back toward earth.

On Saturday evening, Aldrin and Collins are to open the hatch in the top of the cone-shaped Columbia, remove the docking mechanism, and clear a 32-inch-diameter, 3-foot-long tunnel leading to Eagle. Aldrin is to wriggle down the length of the tunnel and swing open Eagle's hatch. After a quick check that everything is in working order inside the landing craft, Aldrin is to return to the three-man cabin.

Four days out, the schedule calls for Aldrin to re-enter Eagle, followed—an hour later—by Armstrong. At 2:12 p.m., EDT, Sunday, Armstrong and Aldrin will shove off from Collins. While Armstrong fires small thrusters to keep Eagle on an even keel, the guidance computer will operate the 10,000-pound braking engine.

At 50,000 feet above the moon, Armstrong is to turn Eagle over—it will have been descending until then on its back, with its two triangular windows looking out toward black space—for a good close-up view of the moon. At that point, Eagle will be about 276 miles west of the landing site.

It will take the four-legged, spidery-looking craft just under twelve minutes to cover those 276 miles and descend those final 50,000 feet. A radar on the underside of Eagle's descent stage will bounce signals off the moon, and the ship's computer will calculate not only how far above the craters the LM is at any instant, but also how fast it is sinking.

Below 10,000 feet altitude, Armstrong will gradually begin to right his ship. By the time Eagle passes through 7,600 feet altitude—called the "high-gate" mark—the ship will have been tilted vertically enough so that the crewmen will be able to see the landing site almost 5 miles directly ahead. On the windows in front of Armstrong and Aldrin are a series of lines, like the marks on a measuring cup and numbered from zero through 70. The computer, after calculating the coordinates of the landing site, then prints out a number; by looking through designated lines on the panes, the crewmen will know where their craft is to settle down.

At 500 feet, Armstrong will have Eagle almost completely right side up and, like a helicopter, beginning a steep—but slow—descent to the surface. At 78 feet altitude, Eagle will be sinking gently at a rate of 3 feet per second, and the two astronauts are to give the landing area a very close inspection for deep craters or large boulders that might tip their craft on landing. If they spot any potential hazard, they will have enough propellant left in the tanks of Eagle's descent stage at that point for about two minutes of hovering flight in which to pick out a smoother site and then maneuver the LM to it. NASA engineers say this is sufficient fuel reserve for the astronauts to reach a better site.

Touchdown in Tranquillity

On the bottom of three of Eagle's four large saucer-shaped landing pads are 68-inch long probes that, like curb feelers on an automobile, alert the crew that they are about to land. The first probe to touch the lunar surface will turn on a light on the astronauts' instrument panel to indicate that contact has been made; the crew is to shut down the engine one second after the light flashes and allow the craft to free-fall the final few feet to a comparatively smooth corner in the Sea of Tranquillity. The landing jolt is not expected to be harder than what an airline passenger feels when his jet lands.

At about 4:19 p.m., Sunday, July 20, if everything has gone well up until then, Armstrong and Aldrin expect to be peering down on the grayish-tan surface of the moon approximately 15 feet below them. And the flight plan, a model of prudence, calls for the two men to prepare the ascent, or upper, stage of Eagle for take-off (see the following two pages for a detailed account of the moon stay).

That part of the Sea of Tranquillity where Eagle is to come to rest may seem about as exciting to viewers back on earth as a televised view of the Sahara desert. The landing site, according to Navy Capt. Lee Scherer, the NASA director of the Lunar Exploration Office, was chosen because it appears to be empty of large craters and big boulders that could destroy a landing craft. Most of the craters in this area, Scherer thinks, are no bigger than 10 feet across. The surface of the moon here is thought to be largely made up of fine-grained basalt, with the cohesiveness of wet beach sand. Like the footprints found by Robinson Crusoe, Armstrong and Aldrin are expected to leave the imprint of their heavy thermal boots to a depth of ¼-to-½ inch in the virgin surface of the moon. Physicist Robert Jastrow, an adherent of the theory of a cold moon where geological activity has ceased, suggests the astronauts' footprints might last a million years.

The crewmen hope to return to earth with 130 pounds of soil and rocks for 142 scientists and laboratories in the U.S. and abroad to analyze, in samples weighing from 0.1 to 300 grams. The material, unaffected by weather, may provide clues to the origins of the universe.

Armstrong, Aldrin and Collins have trained diligently for this mission, since being notified last January that they had been assigned to Apollo 11. Armstrong, the civilian who is commander of the epochal journey, has driven the crew like a "czar," according to observers around the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston. All three are extremely competent, intelligent men, but there is little of the camaraderie that the crew of Apollo 9 and 10 exhibited.

For the past several days, the three astronauts have been taking elaborate steps to avoid catching a last-minute cold. President Nixon, whose signature the astronauts will carry to the moon on a special plaque attached to a landing leg of Eagle, had planned to have dinner with Armstrong and his crew the night before the launch. But NASA's Charles A. Berry, the astronauts' physician, expressed his concern that the President or some of his staff members might be carrying germs. The President canceled out. He still intends, however, to be aboard the recovery carrier in the Pacific July 24 when Apollo 11 is scheduled to return to earth.

Although he will not be able to shake hands with the triumphant moonmen—they will be strictly quarantined against the remote possibility that they have taken back unknown microorganisms to earth from the lunar surface—Mr. Nixon nevertheless will be able to talk to Armstrong, Aldrin and Collins through a telephone to their sealed trailer. What he has to say may be of more than passing interest; there have been reports that the President might announce a new major goal for the U.S. space program, just as John F. Kennedy committed the nation to the moon more than eight years ago.

EAGLE'S NEST: THE LUNAR COUNTDOWN

It all comes down to 22 hours on the moon. Five years of planning, ten manned Gemini and four manned Apollo flights, long meetings of the Lunar Surface Operations Planning Group representing a dozen NASA offices and scores of doctors, suit designers, geologists, lighting and photo experts, human-factors engineers—all these events and men had to coalese in the last few months to produce the Lunar Surface Operations Plan. For, after $24 billion had launched the astronauts to the moon, what were they to do there? And what could they feasibly do within the physical limitations of man and his technology? Tests revealed, for example, that an astronaut was likely to burn up 1,600 British Thermal Units of energy per hour on the moon. So one contractor developed a back pack designed to keep an astronaut cool for four hours, and NASA programed a maximum time of three hours for Extravehicular Activity (EVA). Other human parameters, such as the size of an oxygen unit an astronaut could conveniently carry, began to chisel down the endless list of things man might like to do on the moon.

What finally emerged from the debates at NASA was a "time-line"—a schedule precise to the split second that detailed time allotments for everything from the deployment of sophisticated equipment on the lunar surface to the spontaneous expression of joy likely to be emitted by the astronauts once they realize that they, after all, are the first men on the moon. Apollo 11's planned time-line, subject to the X—for unknown—factor, follows:

Sunday, July 20, 2:12 p.m., EDT: Lunar Module (Eagle) separates from Command Service Module (Columbia). Armstrong and Aldrin stand like motormen at the controls of the LM, firing the descent rocket to begin breaking Eagle's orbital speed from 3,500 mph. On final approach the craft tilts to the vertical and the crew for the first time can look out their windows to reconnoiter the planned landing site. Descent engine still thrusting, speed dropping to a few feet per second. Eagle's four landing pads—three with 68-inch probe extensions—touch moon surface.

4:19 p.m.: Touchdown: When the tip of the first probe touches the lunar contact indicators on the control panel light up blue. A second later the crew cuts descent engine.

4:19:01 pm.: Eagle settles onto surface as probes break away. The astronauts will confirm verbally with Houston what Apollo Control's instruments on earth have recorded. The crew's first action once they've landed will be to try to decide whether to leave. They will punch "V 37 E 12 E" into their computer, the normal program for ascent. The computer will then prepare the ship for blast-off. Less than 60 seconds later the computer will flash: Engine ready enable. Armstrong and Aldrin will then check out their instruments. If they find something wrong, they will punch the computer proceed button to rocket the ship off the moon and back to Columbia. If they feel, however, that all systems are working properly and the ship has suffered no damage in landing, they will punch "P–68" (the Landing Confirmation Program), automatically entering their exact position into the computer, shutting down the systems and putting the ship in an idle state for a later departure.

6:23 p.m.: By now, the astronauts have completed their laborious post-landing checkout. Next, they are to eat reconstituted freeze-dried food packages in their pantry and rest for four hours (they may

XUM

take a Seconal sleeping pill to dim their excitement). According to NASA officials, they are not likely to skip their rest period because they anticipate at least two grueling hours moving about in a space suit that adds 30 moon pounds—or 180 earth pounds—to their burden. "Unless the controllers said 'Go out early,' I don't think they would pass up that rest," says Richard J. Green, of NASA.

10:58 p.m.: The astronauts eat once again to build up energy.

11:58 p.m.: Armstrong and Aldrin begin putting on their Extravehicular Mobility Units (EMU), which consist, essentially, of a pressure suit, a thermal garment, a helmet, and a Portable Life Support System (PLSS) back pack containing the oxygen supply, electrical power, communications gear and a liquid cooling unit. The space suit is a 28-layered, white-colored network of synthetic fibers. The outer layer is made of a heat-resistant glass fabric layered with plastic that, despite its smooth, silky texture, is tough enough to insulate against an expected moon temperature of 150 degree Fahrenheit. The helmet is a clear sphere, a plastic fishbowl of Lexan. There are two visors. The outer one is tinted gold to shield infra-red and ultraviolet light without appreciably altering the color of the moon. The inner one is slightly tinted, to reduce interior fogging. The astronauts will also put on "lunar overshoes."

Monday, July 21, 1:01 a.m.: The astronauts struggle within the confines of the LM to suit up. They already have to adjust to a new world. The PLSS back pack (a $250,000 unit) redistributes the total weight of astronaut and equipment so that the center of gravity is raised from "earth point" around his wishbone area to "moon point" at chin level. Adjusting to lunar gravitation—one-sixth of earth's—can be hazardous. "If he bends forward slightly, he pitches forward," explains Angelo Micocci, a Bendix project engineer in Ann Arbor, Mich., where the moon science experiments were built. "He can't squat either. If he does fall on his chest, he can do a push-up that will put him back on his feet." Originally, the back pack was a sharp-cornered square box. "When they were square," says Micocci, "the astronauts had an awful time rolling over." Now that the back pack edges are rounded, "falling down is not a prime concern," says Micocci. "They've practiced."

1:58 a.m.: Gradual depressurization of Eagle begins to make its interior of equal atmosphere with the airless moon and enable crew to open hatch.

2:12 a.m.: Armstrong opens the forward hatch and pauses on the exit platform: he hunches over and backs out of the LM slowly. On his way down, he pauses to pull a D-shaped ring of a lanyard that pops open the Modularized Equipment Storage Assembly (MESA); this also exposes a TV camera. Aldrin photographs Armstrong with a Maurer 35-mm. movie camera. Armstrong is to take five minutes to execute a semi-slide down the ladder—being wary of tearing the suit.

2:17 a.m.: Armstrong touches left foot to lunar surface, keeping his right foot solidly on an LM footpad and his arms wrapped around the landing gear to make sure that the moon crust isn't softer than NASA thinks it is. Armstrong will then probably look toward the horizon, which, on the moon, will only be a mile and a half away. Next, he will determine if he can move around freely—and if he can retrace his steps to the ladder. "The first priority," says one official, "will be to see whether we can get him back off the moon."

2:20 a.m.: Armstrong will lift his arms to see how high he can reach, take a few steps near the ship, and report to Houston—over the $100,000 PLSS gold-plated radio—how the moon feels. "He'll be building up his confidence," says Green.

2:26 a.m.: Armstrong will then pull out a collapsed "contingency-sample" tool—a 25-inch-long aluminum handle with a loop at the end to which the astronaut attaches a Teflon bag. With this tool, Armstrong doesn't have to bend over—his space suit wouldn't allow him to do that anyhow—or even bend his arms and legs more than slightly. He is to scrape together some lunar soil and rocks.

2:38 a.m.: Aldrin leaves to join Armstrong. While Aldrin is feeling his way around, Armstrong will walk back toward MESA and mount the TV camera on a tripod.

2:48 a.m.: Armstrong will take the bundle to a spot about 30 feet away and set up the camera: earthbound audiences may then have a fairly panoramic view of the astronaut's activities from then on. The sun will be about 10 degrees above the eastern horizon and the astronauts will have to be careful not to point the camera toward it—just like any tourist snapping pictures. If Houston says the reception is poor, Armstrong may deploy an umbrella-like antenna 12 feet high and with a 10-foot-diameter wire-mesh dish to improve the signal.

2:51 a.m.: Aldrin is to go back to MESA, pull a lever, and set up the solar-wind collector. Little more than a screen of aluminum foil and easel, it unfolds like a home-movie screen. If it sticks, Aldrin will probably abandon the experiment.

3:28 a.m.; The Early Apollo Scientific Experiments Package (EASEP) is deployed by Aldrin. The major item in EASE is the Passive Seismic Experiments Package (PSEP), a seismograph fifteen to twenty times more sensitive than any so far used on earth.

3:31 a.m.: The PSEP is to be set up 70 feet from the LM and to work properly, it must be lined up on the moon's east-west axis. To do this, Aldrin must deploy a spring-loaded gnomon (a car-antenna-like unit) that will cast a shadow on the sundial contained in the PSEP baggage and indicate compass directions. PSEP is so sensitive that NASA hopes to record the astronaut's footsteps as he walks away from the experiment. Simultaneously, Armstrong will set up the Laser Ranging Retro-Reflection Experiment (LRR) about 10 feet away. The astronauts will only estimate—not pace off—distances in deploying the equipment. In all they will stay within a 70- by 10-foot area—about the size of a modest home lot.

3:42 a.m.: Aldrin and Armstrong begin to fill NASA's "sample-return containers," or, as the astronauts call them, the "rock boxes." Each box is about 19 inches long 11½ inches wide, and 8 inches high—a single unit that has been hollowed out of an aluminum block (a multisheeted box would require welding of the joints, the solder being too heavy an addition for the weight-conscious NASA). The astronauts will carry the boxes perhaps 100 feet from the LM and—using an aluminum scoop resembling a steam shovel—jam as many samples in the boxes as possible (up to about 50 pounds). Armstrong, however, may photograph some rocks, seal them in numbered plastic bags, and photograph the area from which the rock was taken. Armstrong will fill one small aluminum can with loose dirt and one with rocks and cap them to seal in lunar "atmosphere." Aldrin starts back to the LM.

4:18 a.m.: By now the astronauts will be close to departure—and perhaps close to exhaustion due to all the excitement and hard work. Armstrong will hook the sample boxes one at a time to the Lunar Equipment Conveyor (LEC)—a pulley system with one end attached to a hook on the ship's exterior and the other to a hook on the sample box. Green fears that if the LEC is given too much to pull, "it may act like an overloaded clothesline and bang against the steps." Armstrong pulls, and Aldrin, waiting at the hatch lifts the boxes inside.

4:29 a.m.: About twenty minutes after Aldrin's return to the LM, Armstrong will follow, shedding his overshoes and wiping his feet on the rungs before entering the ship. They will have left behind the scientific equipment, litter such as springs that were released and discarded bags, a plaque with Richard Nixon's signature, the American flag, microfilmed messages from leaders of foreign nations on earth, and the footprints of the first men on the moon.

4:42 a.m.: By this time the hatch may have been shut long enough for the oxygen-pressure buildup to reach a point where the astronauts can discard their helmets—thus releasing the pressure inside the space suits. They will then eat and sleep for a scheduled four hours and 40 minutes.

9:22 a.m.: Houston will awaken the astronauts for their next task—breakfast and then the countdown.

1:55 p.m.: They fire the ascent engine to leave

5:32 p.m.: Columbia and Eagle dock in lunar orbit.

Tuesday, July 22, 12:57 a.m.: Armstrong fires Columbia's engine, on the moon's far side, for return to earth.

MEN FOR THE MOON

(NOTE.—*To many outsiders—and to the scoffers—the three men who are to embark for the moon this week seem hard to tell apart: close-cropped, small-town, family men—three WASP-ish peas in a space pod. On closer inspection, however, the Apollo 11 crewmen are distinct individuals. No one need mistake them for the man next door—they are much too intelligent and complex. In a matter of days, these three Americans are to become historical figures for all time and for all men. Here are three candid portraits of the men of Apollo 11—and of their views—on the eve of their adventure.*)

Civilian Neil A. Armstrong, 38, the Apollo commander who is scheduled to be the first man to walk on the moon, has been known to smoke a cigar and enjoy himself at parties. But he can also be a diffident, tightly controlled individual whose intensity may come to the surface only in the form of small gestures: nose-rubbing, blushing, ear-pulling, a slight stammering. "He appears cold," says Dr. Charles A. Berry, chief of medical operations at NASA's Manned Spacecraft Center, "but actually, he's bashful. When you know Neil, you find that he can be a very warm individual." There are not, however, many people who know Armstrong.

Armstrong was born in Wapakoneta, Ohio, the son of a state auditor. "We would do an audit, which would take about a year," Armstrong's father recalls, "and then move on." By the time he entered high school, Neil Armstrong had lived in more than half a dozen different towns.

His bedroom, his mother remembers, was stacked with books, magazines and drawings of aircraft; model airplanes—which Neil bought with money earned from after-school jobs and built with meticulous care—dangled from the ceiling. Among the non-technical books he recently read are "We," given to him by Charles Lindbergh, and early science-fiction by Edgar Rice Burroughs.

Armstrong started taking flying lessons at the grassy Wapakoneta airfield when he was 15. It cost him $9 for a one-hour lesson and Neil carefully saved the money he earned from a drugstore job to pay for the instruction. He received his private pilot's license at 16 and proudly pedaled his bicycle home to tell his parents—he had yet to learn to drive a car.

A superior student, Armstrong won a Naval Air Cadet scholarship and in 1947 entered Purdue University to study aeronautical engineering. When the Korean War began, Armstrong was called to active duty at age 19. He flew 78 combat missions in Korea and

XUM

was forced to eject from one crippled plane and lost a wingtip of a second.

Armstrong returned to Purdue and was graduated in 1955; one year later, he married Janet Shearon, a sorority queen he had met on campus. They are the parents of Eric, 12, and Mark, 6, and Armstrong's idea of a good weekend is "to go scuba diving with my family."

After graduation, Armstrong joined the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics—NASA's predecessor—and flew the X–15 rocket plane. His initial reaction to the manned-spaceflight program, back in 1959, was one of mild disdain. "We had spent years developing the rocket airplane concept and Mercury looked like a dark horse to us," Armstrong said recently. "We tended to regard the Mercury people as inexperienced intruders in our business. I am frank to admit I gave them too little credit."

In 1962, test pilot Armstrong applied for astronaut training and was accepted in the second "class"—along with Frank Borman, James A. McDivitt, the late Edward H. White and five others. He drew the commander's role for the Gemini 8 mission, with David R. Scott as his co-pilot, in early 1966—the first U.S. attempt to link two craft together in space. No sooner had the two craft docked than the combination began to spin wildly. Armstrong brought the ship under control and made an emergency landing in the Pacific Ocean.

Armstrong showed equal piloting skill last year when a jet-powered training craft in which he was practicing lunar landings suddenly skittered out of control. Sensing that the wingless craft was about to turn over, he ejected and parachuted to safety while the vehicle crashed and burned.

In the past two months, Armstrong—who is not particularly fond of physical training and tends to pudginess—has managed to diet away 15 pounds to a "mission status" of about 165 pounds. In his quiet, diffident way, he says of Apollo 11: "I think if historians are fair, they won't see this flight like Lindbergh's. They'll recognize that the landing is only one small part of a large program."

Air Force Col. Edwin E. Aldrin Jr., 39, who expects to be the second man to set footprints on the moon, is better known by his nickname of "Buzz." But, says a friend, "Aldrin is the kind of guy who really shouldn't have a gee-whiz nickname. He should be called Edwin."

Aldrin has the stony face of a police detective. His voice is flat, his speech laconic, and his gaze penetrating. "If you didn't know what he did, you wouldn't be at all interested in him," says a woman who knows him and his family. "He's a very forgettable man, but he's a nice man." Yet, Aldrin is the spiffiest dresser of the three Apollo 11 crewmen—and the most bejeweled. He wears a wedding band on the ring finger of his right hand and a Masonic ring on the little finger, and his West Point class ring on his left hand. He wears a tie clasp fashioned from pilot wings and dangling from it are the Greek symbols of two engineering honor societies.

Aldrin's grade-school principal in Montclair, N.J., recalls that the astronaut had an IQ score of 150. Aldrin was graduated third in a class of 475 cadets from West Point in 1951, entered the Air Force (his father was also an Air Force colonel) and flew 66 combat missions in the Korean War. He earned a doctor of science degree from MIT as part of a special USAF program in 1963. His doctoral thesis dealt with orbital rendezvous—a feat he performed during the flight of Gemini 12 in late 1966. When the radar failed, Aldrin—the co-pilot—himself worked out the computations.

Aldrin keeps in shape with gymnastics and pole-vaulting; he occasionally puffs on a corncob pipe. His idea of relaxation, he recently said, is "sitting around in the sun up at Dad's place on the New Jersey shore, eating corn on the cob, swimming and taking it easy," along with his wife, Joan, and children Michael, 13, Janice, 12 in August, and Andrew, 11.

What will he feel when his landing craft bumps down upon the moon? "I would hope," he said, without intonation, "there will be a normal amount of adrenalin flowing in me that would help, rather than impede, the mission."

Air Force Lt. Col. Michael Collins, 38, had been assigned to the flight of Apollo 8. But a bone spur on his spine, near his neck, was pressing against nerves controlling his legs and the slight, muscular astronuat last summer suddenly found himself falling down for no apparent reason. Given the choice between long-range treatment or risky surgery that would eliminate the problem, Collins unhesitatingly decided on the operation. It cost him his seat on Apollo 8.

Typically, Collins accepted the situation with realism—and determination. When he finally shed the neck brace that he wore during the three-month recuperation, he worked hard to get back in shape, playing handball.

Collins is one of the best-liked astronauts. "If there was a contest for 'Everybody's Favorite Astronaut,'" says one close friend, "Collins would win it going away and then discreetly refuse the title." Still, Collins dislikes the prospect of becoming a world hero. "There are two kinds of people in this world," he says, "those who like publicity and those who prefer to do without it. I prefer the latter."

The son of the late Army Maj. Gen. James L. Collins, Mike Collins was born in Rome, Italy, and grew up on a succession of different Army bases. So he cherishes his family life with wife Patricia, daughters Kathleen, 10, and Ann, 7, and son Michael, 6. "For anybody who lives out of a suitcase as much as I do," he says, "it's fun to be at home."

Collins, a '52 West Point graduate, is a nonsmoker who prefers Martinis and small dinner parties, usually with crew members. When the men wind up in the kitchen talking about the state of the flight preparations, the wives fret about why the men don't spend more time talking to them.

Collins has made two spacewalks. Now he will be in the mother ship. He says it does not bother him to come that close and not land—and those who know him believe him.

MOON WATCHING

"Walter Cronkite, more than anyone else, sees us through these shots," Art Buchwald wryly remarked not long ago, "and we really count on him to get the Apollo capsules back safely to earth."

This time, with Apollo 11, Cronkite and his colleagues have their hands fuller than ever. Before the Apollo mission is over, it will be encapsulated in millions of words and tape and film footage—the most watched and written about single event in history.

The European TV networks expect 225 million viewers during the Apollo mission. In the United States, CBS, ABC and NBC confidently expect to attract 150 million television viewers in the nation at 2 a.m. Monday, July 21—when even Johnny Carson is over but when the astronauts hope to step out onto the moon. Each network revised and juggled plans almost hourly, hiding as much from the competition as possible, right up to launch time.

The high stakes involved—ABC, NBC and CBS are spending well over $1.5 million each—reflect in the network epics themselves. As a group, they are loose, ambitious catchalls, by turns ingenious and banal. CBS has both Lyndon Johnson and ex-astronaut Walter Schirra. Johnson will reminisce about how the moon program developed. Schirra will team with Cronkite and the science-fiction writer Arthur Clarke to give CBS's commentary an authoritative edge.

CBS's largest New York studio houses a projection screen plus nine film projectors that will create special effects and imagery to blend with live coverage. The synchromeshed projectors, controlled by a computer, can flash anything from words, charts and diagrams to simulations of docking maneuvers and star sightings on the screen. "We probably won't project more than six or seven images at once," says executive producer Robert Wussler. "We have to remember the people with their 9-inch Sonys."

TV poetry

CBS also has a package of space films dating from a 1900 spoof to "2001," along with a parade of widely diverse guests, including Bob Hope, Sir Francis Chichester, Arthur Miller and Marianne Moore.

ABC is matching Marianne Moore with James Dickey. It has stockpiled special film, too, mostly for the time between 4:30 p.m. on Sunday and 12:30 the next morning, when the astronauts will be sleeping or checking equipment. The obvious worry at all the networks is dead time. ABC is readying—among other things—a new concerto in honor of the landing by Duke Ellington, who will also sing in public for the first time; a "philosophical" panel featuring Marshall McLuhan and Bill D. Moyers, and a children's panel, around which commentator Frank Reynolds and a group of 7- to 10-year-olds will swap reactions and theories.

NBC has a secure thematic lock, at least, on its epic. "Our theme is 'a state of the earth'," says James Kitchell, NBC's executive producer. "We're going to look at what's going on in the world while two men sit on the moon's surface." The familiar NBC faces, Chet Huntley, David Brinkley, Frank McGee and company, will be commenting, backed up by scientific luminaries such as Harold C. Urey.

Space and TV were meant for each other—a marriage made in heaven—but the print men have not surrendered the story. "Certainly there are some things that television can do that we can't," concedes Nick Williams, editor of The Los Angeles Times, "but we can do some things ourselves that television can't." For most newspapers, that meant an accent on quality rather than quantity, on backgrounding rather than trying to match TV's on-the-spot coverage. The Los Angeles Times and The Washington Post will emphasize staff-written pieces, rather than articles by guest experts. The Post also has developed a technique for shooting the image of the first man on the moon off a TV screen for reproduction on Monday morning's page one. The New York Times is planning three specials. The first one, the day after lift-off, will run to more than 100 columns, and include essays by Wernher Von Braun and the ubiquitous Arthur Clarke. The Times may also try for its first news color pictures.

Payoff

Finally, book publishers hope to knit up the loose ends left by the other media. Norman Mailer stands to make more than a million dollars doing just that, with a book for Little, Brown (serialized in three parts by Life magazine, which is paying him $100,000).

Mailer's book will not appear in completed form until 1970. At least half a dozen Apollo books are on the pad in Great Britain alone awaiting publication. In the U.S. John Barbour's "Footprints on the Moon," an Associated Press production, is already in galleys—with the last chapter to come—scheduled for serialization in 400 newspapers. The book should be on sale the last week in July—even before the astronauts get out of their quarantine. About the same time, both Columbia Records-CBS and Time-Life Records will produce multi-volume albums with the first sounds heard from the surface of the moon.

A magnificent effort—to match a magnificent event. Or is it? To some, these frantic books, TV extravaganzas, and record albums are mere drives for the fast buck. To others, they seem, taken as a whole, spirited and vigorous—a classic example of challenge bringing out new qualities in media that respond to it.

Blue cheese

Any good McLuhanite must be delighted, furthermore, by the lunar celebration, created by August Heckscher and the New York City Department of Parks for the night of July 20. The city's "Moon Watch" in Central Park will feature huge screens showing live TV coverage, a synthetic aurora borealis created by artist Forrest Meyers, searchlights, a collage of films, inflatable sculpture, dancing, "moon music," Mayor John Lindsay perhaps reading poetry—and a blue-cheese picnic.

Everyone at the "moon-in" is to wear white clothes. Indeed, when New Yorkers dress up for an overnight in the park, the millennium is here. As composer John Cage observes: "The moon landing will expand the media just as it is expanding our minds—that is, our sense of what we are capable of doing."

K. L. POMIERSKI—A TRIBUTE TO A DEDICATED LONG ISLAND LEADER

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, recently, K. Stefan Pomierski, a resident of Glen Cove for more than 31 years died. A descendant of Polish nobility, Mr. Pomierski was a significant influence in Polish American affairs.

It is therefore with sadness that I would like to take leave and acknowledge the passing of my dear friend, a gentle and dedicated individual who never forgot his heritage but could not have been any more devoted to this country and its ideals.

Born in Lubawa Poland, he had an extensive education in Germany, Poland, and England. He spoke 11 languages fluently and had a good grasp of several more.

After arriving in New York as an immigrant, he studied real estate and general insurance. During World War I he was a junior officer with the U.S. Shipping Board of the U.S. Merchant Marine. From 1935 to 1940 he was senior area supervisor in the National Young Administration on Long Island. During World War II he served in an administrative position with the United States War Manpower Commission and in the Korean War acted as Civil Defense director of Glen Cove.

Mr. Pomierski, throughout his life was a capable and devoted citizen who imparted a devotion for America to others who had the privilege of a similar Polish-American background. Mr. Pomierski, I might add, was cofounder of the "I Am An American Day" and the president emeritus of the American Order of General Pulaski, as well as being a former member of the Polish National Home of Glen Cove and an honorary member of the Polish American War Veterans of Glen Cove.

Despite the onset of illness, he maintained many of his community activities. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I express the sentiments of many who knew and admired Mr. Pomierski, and will miss him sorely.

I would like to take the opportunity to express my sympathies to his widow Anna, his family, friends, and the community of Glen Cove on their incalculable loss.

THE ABM'S QUESTIONABLE TECHNOLOGY

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the three major components of the Safeguard ABM system will be its computer—which is reported to be one of the most complex computer systems ever devised.

Recently, a group of over 200 professional computer technicians has raised some very important and pertinent questions regarding the feasibility of this proposed computer system, including its development, testing, and operation. This ad hoc committee, headed by one of my very able constituents, Mr. Daniel D. McCracken of Ossining, N.Y., includes computer technicians employed by current or possible Safeguard contractors.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the questions raised by these computer professionals deserve the full and careful attention of Members of both Houses of the Congress and I am pleased to insert herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, the statement of these technicians:

COMPUTER PROFESSIONALS AGAINST—JUNE 14, 1969

Chairman: Daniel D. McCracken, Consultant, 7 Justamere Drive, Ossining, New York. (914) 941-8899.

Executive Committee: Paul Armer, Stanford University, Prof. Joseph Weizenbaum, M. I. T., Gregory P. Williams.

We, the undersigned members of the computing profession, wish to record our professional judgment that there are grave doubts as to the technical feasibility of the computer portion of the Safeguard Antiballistic Missile system. These doubts range from a profound skepticism that the computing system could be made to work, to a conviction that it could not.

Although no project of precisely this nature has ever been attempted before, the difficulty may be understood in terms of a close analogy. Suppose the task were to design and implement the computer portion of a national air traffic control system, and that it were part of the design requirement that at some unspecified instant the control of the air traffic of the entire nation would be transferred to the computer, without any period of parallel operation, testing under actual operating conditions, or evolutionary development. This, by analogy, is what Safeguard would require. Our experience with large-scale computer systems convinces us that such a pattern of development is highly unlikely to lead to a successful computer system.

Another analogy that may be instructive is the use of computers in predicting and reporting election results. These have been used in presidential elections since 1956 and in many local contests, allowing steady evolutionary development. The task is well defined. Realistic testing is possible and is done. It is known in advance exactly when the system will be required to act.

Despite these favorable factors the election systems often fail. In 1968 the data-gathering computer malfunctioned, delaying results by hours. One computer, because of a programming error, reported a total vote exceeding 100%.

If such systems produce blunders, we must conclude that the Safeguard computer probably could not be made to work at all, since the conditions for it are much less favorable:

1. The computing task is much more complex than those of the examples cited.

2. The precise nature of the computing task cannot be defined. It cannot be known what kinds of electronic and other countermeasures would be used, for example, or what evasive maneuvers the attacker might employ. The offense has more strategic options than the defense in any case, and the defensive reactions have to be programmed and tested well in advance of an attack.

3. Realistic testing is impossible since it would require nuclear explosions in the atmosphere. Only artificial test data could be used.

4. Evolutionary development is out of the question. The computer systems for elections are used every four years or oftener and are improved on the basis of experience. The Safeguard computer would never get a second chance.

It is important to realize that the computer would have virtually all of the decision-making power, because the warning time in a nuclear attack would be so short—minutes at most—that presidential or senior military review would be almost impossible. Our experience with the failures of large computers (not to mention those that send out department store bills) makes us extremely reluctant to place so much life-and-death power in the control of a complex and untested machine.

Worse, the ABM system could by itself initiate a firing sequence without any attack taking place. This could happen through misinterpretation of radar signals from harmless objects, or because of machine malfunction or programming error. Since the defensive missiles themselves would carry nuclear weapons, destruction of American cities might result, or the action might be misinterpreted by other nations as hostile.

Our grave doubts as to the technical feasibility of the Safeguard computer system, coupled with our recognition of the possible consequences of system failure, lead us to the view that the project is a dangerous mistake. Whatever other arguments may be brought to bear, for or against Safeguard, our conviction is that on technical grounds alone the project does not deserve the support of the Congress.

ABOUT THE COMMITTEE

Daniel D. McCracken is a consultant and writer, with ten books on computer programming in print. He worked for General Electric from 1951 to 1958 in a variety of assignments in computer programming and training, at Hanford, Cincinnati, Phoenix, and New York. He has been a national lecturer for the Association for Computing Machinery.

Paul Armer entered computing in 1947 at the RAND Corporation. After serving there as associate head of the computer sciences department until 1968, he moved to his present position, director of the computation center at Stanford University. He is president of the American Federation of Information Processing Societies (AFIPS). He was a consultant

XUM

to the Presidential Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress, and has testified before various Congressional committees. In 1959 he was a member of the team of US scientists who toured the USSR to assess Soviet computer capabilities.

Joseph Weizenbaum is Professor of Electrical Engineering and Political Science at MIT. He is the inventor of several languages for communicating with computers. He was a charter member of Project MAC, the first major computer time-sharing project in the world. He was responsible for software development and software-hardware interface for the General Electric-Bank of America project that pioneered bank deposit accounting automation. He helped design and build two of the earliest computers, in the early fifties.

Gregory P. Williams has also been in computing since the early fifties, beginning with the Army Ordnance Corps. Since 1954 he has been with a major manufacturing concern, in computing assignments ranging from operations research and design automation to automating university libraries and installing commercial computers.

The sponsors are without exception men who have pioneered the development and application of computers and now hold responsible positions in the field. It is doubtful whether another list of Americans with such fundamental and long-standing contributions to the field could be compiled. Some accomplishments:

Development of FORTRAN, by far the most widely used computer language: Backus.

Membership in committees that developed ALGOL and COBOL, two other widely used languages: Backus, Bemer, Bromberg.

Development of special-purpose languages that greatly expanded the horizons of computer usage possibilities: McCarthy, Minsky, Newell, Weizenbaum.

Leadership, both in early years and today, in the use of computers in education: W. Dorn, Forsythe, Scott.

Foundational work in artificial intelligence: Feigenbaum, McCarthy, Minsky, Newell.

Some of the earliest studies, the first implementation, and current leadership in computer time-sharing, a technique on which much of the Safeguard computer system would be based: Corbato, Fano, Licklider, McCarthy, Minsky, Weizenbaum.

Leadership positions in major professional organizations in computing: Armer, P. Dorn, and Ralston currently, but almost everyone listed has held such positions at some time. Forsythe and Huskey are past presidents of the Association for Computing Machinery, and Hoffman is a past treasurer.

Fundamental publications on the mathematical theory of computation: Knuth, McCarthy.

Leadership in the application of computers to the solution of practical problems in industry: P. Dorn, Weiss, Williams, others.

The founding of a major computer manufacturing company: Palevsky.

Major studies in linear and dynamic programming, basic techniques of operations research: Bellman.

It would be futile to try to list even a sampling of the publications of these men, who as a group have produced literally dozens of books and hundreds of papers on the design, programming, applications, and implementations of computers. A complete program of computer education, from high school introductions to post-doctoral studies, could easily be based on the writings of this group.

Partial list, as of June 26, 1969, of signatories of the June 14 statement.

Organizations, where shown, are given for identification only. Such listing should not be construed to mean that the statement is supported by the organization.

Daniel D. McCracken, Ossining, N.Y., McCracken Assoc., Inc.; Paul Armer, Menlo Park, Calif., Stanford Univ.; Prof. Joseph Weizenbaum, Concord, Mass., MIT; Gregory P. Williams, Phoenix, Ariz.

John W. Backus, San Francisco, Calif., IBM Corp.; Prof. Richard Bellman, Univ. Southern Calif.; R. W. Bemer, Phoenix, Ariz.; Howard Bromberg, San Francisco, Calif., Information Management, Inc.

Prof. Fernando Corbato, Cambridge, Mass., MIT; Phillip H. Dorn, New York, N.Y., Union Carbide Corp.; Prof. William S. Dorn, Denver, Colo., Univ. Denver; Prof. Robert M. Fano, Cambridge, Mass., MIT.

Prof. E. A. Feigenbaum, Stanford, Calif., Stanford Univ.; Prof. G. E. Forsythe, Stanford, Calif., Stanford Univ.; Prof. Walter Hoffman, Detroit, Michigan, Wayne State Univ.; Prof. Harry D. Huskey, Santa Cruz, Calif., Univ. of California.

Prof. Donald E. Knuth, Princeton, N.J., Stanford Univ.; Prof. J. C. R. Licklider, Cambridge, Mass., MIT; Prof. John McCarthy, Stanford, Calif., Stanford Univ.; Prof. Marvin L. Minsky, Cambridge, Mass., MIT.

Prof. Allen Newell, Pittsburgh, Penn., Carnegie-Mellon Univ.; Max Palevsky, Santa Monica, Calif., Scientific Data Systems; Prof. Anthony Ralston, Buffalo, N.Y., SUNY, Buffalo; Prof. Norman R. Scott, Dearborn, Mich., Univ. of Michigan.

Eric A. Weiss, Springfield, Penn.; Umberto Garbassi, Esso Math & Systems, New York, N.Y.; Prof. Melvin Klerer, White Plains, N.Y.; Dr. Leon Davidson, White Plains, N.Y.

Robert M. Shapiro, New York, N.Y., Meta Information Appl.; M. L. Lesser, Armonk, N.Y.; Dr. M. K. Haynes, Armonk, N.Y.; Dr. Paul S Menitz, Armonk, N.Y.

R. B. Hitchcock, Putnam Valley, N.Y.; Jean D. Lesser, Yorktown, N.Y.; Robert W. Floyd, Menlo Park, Calif., Stanford Univ.; A. R. Shriver, Phoenix, Ariz, General Electric Co.

Dr. Charles DeCarlo, Bronxville, N.Y., Sarah Lawrence College; Prof. John D. Herriot, Stanford Calif., Stanford Univ.; David Gries, Stanford, Calif., Stanford Univ.; Prof. J. A. Feldman, Stanford, Calif., Stanford Univ.

Prof. Raj Reddy, Stanford, Calif., Stanford Univ.; Alvan R. Feinstein, New Haven, Conn.; Walter A. Ramshaw, Stony Creek, Conn.; Thomas A. Dewey, Juneau, Alaska, Lockheed Missiles & Space.

Richard H. Frank, Albuquerque, N.M.; Carol E. Shanesy, Mt. Kisco, N.Y., IBM Corp.; Prof. S. H. Unger, New York, N.Y., Columbia Univ.; Robert O. Winder, Princeton, N.J., RCA Laboratories.

Marvin C. Paull, Princeton, N.J., RCA Labs; Kenneth R. Kaplan, Princeton, N.J., RCA Labs; Anthony D. Robbi, Princeton, N.J., RCA Labs; Justin Kodner, Princeton, N.J., RCA Labs.

Chitook Srinivasan, Princeton, N.J., RCA Labs; Saul Y. Levy, Princeton, N.J., RCA Labs; Danial A. Walters, Princeton, N.J., RCA Labs; Ann L. Block, New York, N.Y., Computer Guidance Corp.

Dr. Ned Chapin, Menlo Park, Calif; Frederick B. Banan, Phoenix, Ariz., General Electric Co.; L. Wheaton Smith, Palo Alto, Calif.; Philip N. Armstrong, Santa Ana, Calif.

P. Z. Ingerman, Cherry Hill, N.J., RCA Corp.; William L. Kelly, Skillman, N.Y., Kepner-Tregoe, Inc.; Sidney L. Lida, Prairie Village, Kan.; M. D. Fisher, Philadelphia, Penn.

B. Hasbrouck, Swarthmore, Penn.; David A. Nelson, Moorestown, N.J.; Milton Bauman, Swarthmore, Penn.; Philip R. Bagley, Bala Cynwyd, Penn., Information Engineering.

Robert H. Penny, Bethesda, Md., General Electric Co.; Peter B. Salisbury, Potomac, Md., GE; R. Black, Beltsville, Md., GE; Albrech J. Neuman, Bethesda, Md., GE; J. Peter Manzo, Jr., Arlington, Va., GE.

William E. Massey, Fairfax, Va., GE; William H. Johnson, Potomac, Md., GE; Chas. H. Anderson, Fairfax, Va., GE; Clinton L. Jeffries, Manassas, Va., GE; York Wong; Fred Katz.

Prof. Jack Minker, College Park, Md., Univ. of Maryland; Rita G. Minker; Sharon B. Weinberg, New York, N.Y.; Lawrence H. Levine, New York, N.Y.; Geraldine B. Zimmerman, New York, N.Y.; R. K. Brier, New York, N.Y.

Joyce Toy, New York, N.Y.; Dr. Donald L. Shell, Schenectady, N.Y., General Electric Co.; Prof. Fred Gruemberger, Woodland Hills, Calif., San Fernando Valley State C.; Nicholas V. Findler, Amherst, N.Y., State Univ. N.Y., Buffalo.

John S. Hale, Amherst, N.Y., St. Univ. N.Y., Buffalo; Gilbert R. Begglass, Amherst, N.Y., SUNY Buffalo; P. J. Eberlein, Amherst, N.Y., SUNY Buffalo; Joe N. Adams, Idaho Falls, Idaho, Computer Appl. and Studies.

Norman B. Saunders, Weston, Mass., Circuit Engineering; Calvin N. Mooers, Cambridge, Mass., Rockford Research Inst.; Mrs. John W. Drake, Lexington, Mass., self-employed; Robert J. Buchanan, Bismarck, N.D., Bismarck Junior Coll.

Myron W. Curtis, Brunswick, Maine, Bowdoin College; Dr. J. Paul Roth, Ossining, N.Y.; Gordon J. Lasher, Briarcliff Manor, N.Y.; James W. Thatcher, Peekskill, N.Y.; Joseph D. Rutledge, Mahopac, N.Y.

Prof. Herbert Greenberg, Denver, Colo., Univ. of Denver; Prof. John E. Skelton, Denver, Colo., Univ. of Denver; C. Denison Makepeace, Plainfield, Vt., Univ. of Vermont; James M. Adams, Larchmont, N.Y.

Eric G. Wagner, Peekskill, N.Y., IBM; J. Coche, Mt. Kisco, N.Y., IBM; Joseph E. M. Harry, Yorktown Heights, N.Y., IBM; John D. Bagley, Katonah, N.Y., IBM.

Robert D. Tennison, Stamford, Conn., IBM; Elsa Horowitz, New York, N.Y., IBM; Franklin Gracer, Yorktown Heights, N.Y., IBM; C. J. Evangelistic, Jefferson Valley, N.Y., IBM.

I. Lee, Yorktown Heights, N.Y., IBM; Kurt Fuchel, Bayside, N.Y., Brookhaven Natl. Lab.; Jerry M. Friedman, East Setauket, N.Y., Brookhaven Natl. Lab.; Sidney Heller, Stony Brook, N.Y., Brookhaven Natl. Lab.

Margaret Kind, Moriches, N.Y., Brookhaven Natl. Lab.; Prof. Stuart E. Dreyfus, Berkeley, Calif., Univ. of California; W. Wayne Black, Idaho Falls, Idaho; Edwin B. Parker, Stanford, Calif., Stanford Univ.

Jesse M. Caton, Stanford, Calif., Inst. for Communications Research; Dell Washington, Stanford, Calif., Inst. for Comm. Research; Thomas H. Martin, Stanford, Calif., Stanford Univ.; Charles J. Swift, Ph. D., Los Angeles, Calif., Computer Sciences Corp.

Michael Lewis, Topanga, Calif., Computer Sciences: Diane Kravil, Los Angeles, Calif., Computer Sciences; Linda Gillogly, San Pedro, Calif., Computer Sciences; Gary S. Berman, Hermosa Beach, Calif., Computer Sciences.

Michael D. Scott, Torrance, Calif., Computer Sciences; Bruce H. Katz, Los Angeles, Calif., Computer Sciences; Roy Roqowaki, Los Angeles, Calif., Computer Sciences; Alan Bell, Gardena, Calif.

Barry Gordon, New York, N.Y.; Beth Lewis, New York, N.Y., IBM Corp.; Joseph T. Rego, New York, N.Y.; Lois H. Mallory, Albuquerque, N.M.; Eleton Hoy, Placita, N.M.

R. Neil Horton, Albuquerque, N.M., Sandia Corp; James H. Griesmer, Ossining, N.Y., IBM Corp.; Richard Goldberg, New York, N Y, IBM Corp.; Patricia A. Cundall, New York, N.Y., New York Univ.

Jerry R. Hobbs, New York, N.Y., NYU; Susan M. Merritt, New York, N.Y., NYU; Bruce Knobe, New York, N.Y., NYU; Edward H. Elkind, New York, N.Y.; Phylis Winston, New York, N.Y.

Victor M. Ricci, New York, N.Y., Geran Applied Systems; Philip A. Bernstein, Port Washington, N.Y., Cornell Univ.; Vicki Robere, New York, N.Y., SYSTEMP, Inc.; Anthony A. Gockel, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Paul J. Millstein, New York, N.Y.

Additional list, as of July 12, 1969, of signatories of the June 14 statement.

Organizations, where shown, are given for identification only. Such listing should not be construed to mean that the statement is supported by the organization.

Prof. Scott Herman-Giddens, Durham, N.C., Duke Univ.; Prof. Thomas M. Gallie, Jr., Durham, N.C., Duke Univ.; Prof. Merrell L. Patrick, Durham, N.C., Duke Univ., Prof. R. Bruce Briggs, Durham, N.C., Duke Univ.

Daniel F. Langenwalter, Phoenix, Ariz., General Electric Co.; Richard L. Young, Albuquerque, N.M., Sandia Corp.; Prof. Alston S. Householder, Knoxville, Tenn., Univ. of Tennessee; Prof. Leonard Uhr, Madison Wisc., Univ. of Wisconsin.

Prof. James W. Daniel, Madison, Wisc., Univ. of Wisconsin; Prof. Larry E. Travis, Madison, Wisc., Univ. of Wisconsin; Prof. Richard L. Venezky, Madison, Wisc., Univ. of Wisconsin; Prof. Seymour V. Parter, Madison, Wisc., Univ. of Wisconsin.

Prof. Ralph L. London, Madison, Wisc., Univ. of Wisconsin; Prof. Lance Hoffman, Stanford, Calif., Stanford Univ.; Saul I. Gass, Potomac, Md., World Systems, Inc.; Charles Sheffield, Bethesda, Md., World Systems, Inc.

K. R. Runt, Rockville, Md., World Systems, Inc.; Prof. W. McKeeman, Santa Cruz, Calif., Univ. Calif. Santa Cruz; Rosanne Hesse, Plainfield, N.J., Bell Telephone Labs; Thomas A. Keenan, Potomac, Md.

Harold B. King, Bethesda, Md.; Donald N. Streeter, Katonah, N.Y., IBM Corp.; Daniel O'Connell, Albuquerque, N.M., Missouri/New Mexico Computer Systems; Karl L. Zinn, Ann Arbor, Mich., Univ. of Michigan.

Tom Schunior, Ann Arbor, Mich., Univ. of Michigan; Gerald A. Jayne, Idaho Falls, Idaho, Idaho Nuclear Corp.; Max L. Hammon, Idaho Falls, Id., Idaho Nuclear; Cathy Miller, Idaho Falls, Id., Idaho Nuclear.

Jay R. Clark, Idaho Falls, Id., Idaho Nuclear; Gail A. Cazier, Skelley, Id.; M. J. McKernan, Gibbsboro, N.J.; Irvin H. Rinard, New York, N.Y., Halcon International.

Eunice Pollack, New York, N.Y., Halcon Int.; Walter B. Dills, Jr., Floral Park, N.Y., Halcon International; Robert J. Beeber, New York, N.Y., Programming Methods, Inc.; Bruce J. Wiley, New York, N.Y., Programming Methods, Inc.

Margaret Gordon, New York, N.Y., Programming Methods, Inc.; Jessica Hellwig, New York, N.Y., Columbia Univ.; Lawrence Buckingham, New York, N.Y., Columbia Univ.

APOLLO 11

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this morning at 9:32 eastern daylight saving time the Apollo 11 began its first steps toward its goal of a manned lunar landing and safe return in this decade. The American people have the right to be proud of the marvelous foresight, ingenuity, and hard work that have gone into the development and execution of the program by all sectors of our country. To be sure there are risks and problems as this flight continues to its ultimate goal. However, I am confident that everything that is humanly possible to do has been done to assure maximum safety and maximum confidence in the successful accomplishment of this mission. All of us applaud the outstanding performance of Astronauts Neil A. Armstrong, Michael Collins, and Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr., as they journey to where no man has been before so that other men may follow them and equally distinguish themselves in the service of our country and the world.

Today is the day to reaffirm our resolve that a strong national space program for the future is a cornerstone of the successful progress of the United States as a nation. The people of the world join us in our aspirations not only for the successful Apollo 11 and the safe return of our astronauts, but also in the future contributions that our national space effort can make to all mankind.

SEX EDUCATION—A DOCTOR'S PROGNOSIS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, an informative and well-documented warning on the excesses of sex education to our young people and our country appeared in the Journal of the Sarasota County Medical Society.

I include the full text of Dr. James M. Parsons' remarks, "The Gathering Storm: AMA's Erotic Samaritans":

THE GATHERING STORM: AMA'S EROTIC SAMARITANS

"There is one thing we can be dead certain of: the 'perversions' allow considerable chances to achieve human happiness. And therefore the 'perversions' are in themselves good, and therefore they ought to be encouraged."

Would you believe that? Yes? Then you are "informed" and eligible to play your "obvious leadership role" in sex education programs, according to the AMA's editorial staff (JAMA, May 12, 1969, Editorial: Sex Education in the Schools)[1] Really, you are.

You don't believe perversions are good? Then, you are misled by propaganda, "uninformed," If all this sounds too fantastic to believe, then get that editorial and read it along with this article and decide for yourself. Fair enough?

That quotation about perversions above is from Lars Ullerstam, M.D., a 40-year-old Swedish doctor, author of De Erotiska Minorieteterna, copyrighted in Sweden in 1964. His title in English translation, A Sexual Bill of Rights for the Erotic Minorities,[2] explains why Lars put in quotes that word, perversions. Groups of sexual perverts Lars calls, "erotic minorities."

But let us understand Lars, if we can. Since 1946, Swedish schools have had the enlightenment of sex education. In 1946, Lars would have been just a teenager, so we really don't know what kind of book he might have come up with if they had got to him with sex education at 3 years of age, such as is advocated for children here in the U.S., by Mary Calderone, Executive Director of the Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S. (SIECUS). SIECUS is the prime mover in the "sex-ed" arena, and the AMA editorial strongly endorses sex education.

Can perverts and/or deviates be created? Most assuredly. Binet[3] placed great importance on accidental occurrences in childhood. Factors which reinforce deviant tendencies include: (1) suggestion, (2) repetition, and (3) imitation. Where perversions have become quite widespread, mere imitation becomes an important factor. Given these considerations, let us consider Lars Ullerstam's whole-hearted endorsement of perversions.

Sweden's drive for sex education began in 1918, when the *lex veneris* provided for 2 years in prison for anybody who knowingly gave VD to anybody else. Whereupon, Elise Ottesen-Jensen, a highly charismatic woman, organized a group like magic, and said: "A 'knowing' contamination presupposes knowledge of the disease."

Immediately Elise began an implacable campaign in which she traveled all over Sweden, ending by organizing in 1933, the *Riksforbundet for Sexuell Upplysning,* or "National Society for Sex Education." Elise's program was: sex education in schools, laws providing contraceptives, centers for unrestricted information, and repeal of the abortion statutes, as well as two of the laws governing perversions. Specifically, homosexuality and zoophilia (sexual attraction to animals, bestiality, sodomy) became legal in 1944.

Lars Ullerstam was only 15 years old then, but the event apparently had a profound effect. "The only positive event during this century has been the abolition of the law against homosexuality and zoophilia."[4] If that was the only positive event of Lars' century then it was like his entire life ended right then, wasn't it? And in a way, it did. We could think that sex education propaganda should have helped his attitude, except that Lars displays on occasion in his book tendencies toward depression when things relating to deviant sexual enjoyment he anticipates in other people do not turn out as he expected. For example, anticipating that others will enjoy anal penetration during medical examinations, he tells us: "I must have made at least a hundred such examinations, but I cannot remember a single case in which I observed any obviously sexual reaction." But Lars' fleeting depressions lifts when an immediate rationalism comes to mind: "It is probable that the circumstances surrounding a visit to the doctor are such that sexual stimuli are strongly inhibited in most cases."[5] Ah, joy! Lars was not really sexually rejected; the patients were sexually inhibited.

Any reader of this book will sense immediately that Lars Ullerstam, M.D., is (1) obviously a brilliant individual, (2) an advocate of every perversion imaginable, and (3) a product of sex education a-la-Ottesen-Jensen. His book would seem lighthearted at times to some, especially when he is describing deviant behavior and trying to figure out ways for the "erotic minorities" to enjoy life more.

However, the ending of his remarkable description of the results of sex education in Sweden since 1946, shows us the man: "Our only certainty is that we all share the same miserable conditions. We have one another, we have a little company, to carry us through the episode of life. And also, we have been given the ability to experience happiness. One of its sources is our sex, and the happiness stemming from this source is of such drastic power that it at times even allows us to forget the prospect of annihilation for a while."[6]

Observe, if you will, the curious phraseology. "Annihilation" would be, of course, "drastic," but Lars' associations reveal that actually he views his sexuality as something of drastic power. Of course, human sexuality can be of drastic power, if unduly stimulated before one's character has been formed, and before physical sexual maturity. In Lars' case, what could have been a life of great purpose became a futile confusion when sex education in Sweden turned him into one obsessed by sexual variations to the extent that no goal in life could exist, except that of seeking to justify the "happiness" of perversions to others. Hence, his book.

Any reputable psychiatrist or clinical psy-

Footnotes at end of article.

XUM

chologist will tell you that sexual deviates and perverts are among the unhappiest people in the world. A superficial jocularity is necessary for them to defend against an almost continuous underlying depression; this jocularity is the reason they are called "gay." Moreover, most perverts are quite adept at rationalizing their "happiness" in order to induce others into perverted behavior. Why? Every fox who has lost his brush wants every other fox to lose his brush also.

Yves de Saint-Agnes in the introduction to The Erotic Minorities describes Lars Ullerstam thusly: "Lars Ullerstam is the smile on the face of the sexual revolution." [7]

Thus, indirectly, it is admitted that the results of sex education in Sweden have been far less than happy. For if one as depressed as Lars Ullerstam's book would indicate, is the "smile on the face" of Sweden's sexual revolution, then the phrase "keep smiling" in Sweden must be a hedge against suicide. Perhaps that explains the suicide rates there. Also, the incidence of alcoholism. Sex education in Sweden has led to widespread sexual promiscuity, perversions, illegitimacies, marital failures, veneral disease—all on a scale that beggars description.

Moreover, no sexual problems have been solved by sex education. There evolves only a new approach toward sexual problems. For instance, in cases of impotence and frigidity, Lars has an answer that's different: "Send impotent and frigid people to competent doctors, so that these can coax latent 'perversions' out of them." [8] Those physicians who believe they support AMA's endorsement of sex education should note that one of their new duties as "competent doctors" will be to promote sexual perversions in their patients. Of course, right now, it's our "obvious leadership role" to support sex education and fight those "uninformed" ones who oppose it.

You say, if all this is true, why would the AMA back sex education? Dear Reader, anyone who is interested is more than welcome to send a copy of this article to the AMA, 535 N. Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60610. Ask AMA. The replies from Chicago should be interesting.

Of course, the reply might come back that AMA's editorial specified "proper" programs of sex education, by which they meant "Family Living" or "New Health Education Series" as comprehensive approaches which include "some sex education."

The sad truth is that SIECUS resorts to euphemism (some say frank deception) to dress up its offerings. In other words, "Family Living" and "Health Education," etc., are the sugar-coating for the SIECUS-sex-education pill. Such matters were covered by Lester Kirkendall, Ph.D., of Siecus' Board, in A Series of Two-Day Institutes on Sex Education, December 4–5, 1968, Anaheim, California, Charter House Hotel, Sponsor: "Science Research Associates" (a subsidiary of the IBM corporation). Kirkendall's subject: "The Opposition to Family Life-Sex Education and Measures for Coping With It." [9]

One wonders. Why would the AMA endorse any organization so reluctant to reveal its true purposes? Undoubtedly, as this storm continues to gather, we shall see SIECUS masquerade under other names because, Dr. Kirkendall reportedly "warned the assembled educators not to call it by its right name." Moreover, ". . . sneak the sex program in as an experimental course and see how people react," is another pearl that has dropped from the lips of Dr. Kirkendall as a solution to parental opposition to SIECUS' program.

It comes to mind here, do not ethical persons and organizations do their business in the light of day? If so, is there not a very grave question of ethics involved in AMA's editorial endorsement of this SIECUS-sex-education business?

AMA could try to claim that Mary Calderone's SIECUS is not connected in any way with the Swedish system, has entirely different goals, *et cetera ad infinitum*.

But that gambit falters, and quickly. Professor Ira Reiss of SIECUS has been quoted: "Where Sweden is today is where we're going to be in ten years. Sweden has a culture that accepts 'permissiveness with affection' standards."

Interesting, what? Now, was there any person of influence in America who was ever in contact with Sweden's Elise Ottesen-Jensen? Come to think of it, Mrs. Margaret Sanger was. In 1942, she formed the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, remember? "In 1952 she joined with Mrs. Elise Ottesen-Jensen of Sweden, Lady Dhanvanthi Rama Rau of India, and other birth control pioneers to form the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF). By 1965, membership of this body comprised the national family planning organizations of more than 40 nations on five continents." [10]

And we do know, don't we, that for many years Mary Calderone served as Medical Director of the Planned Parenthood organization here before she started up this SIECUS group. Since Mary's "sex education" ideas have become so controversial, she probably would be reluctant to tell us now if she was one of those "other birth control pioneers" who met with Elise Ottesen-Jensen. But isn't it all the strangest coincidence? Elise Ottesen-Jensen starts out with a Naional Society for Sex Education, and ends by forming the International Planned Parenthood Federation. Mary Calderone starts out as Medical Director of the Planned Parenthood group, and ends by forming the Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S. (If any reader has valid information that Mary Steichen Calderone did meet with Elise Ottesen-Jensen in 1952, this writer will appreciate its being forwarded to him for inclusion in his files on sex education.)

The pros and cons of "planned parenthood" aside, it is pertinent that via a common organization American contacts were made with Elise Ottesen-Jensen, of the Swedish National Society for Sex Education, and there must have been an exchange of ideas. The program of SIECUS is so uncannily similar to that of Sweden's that the factor of coincidence as explanation is out. But, for the benefit of those who are skeptical, let us see how "sex education" here in the U.S. compares with that of Sweden.

Here is Dr. Gerald Sandson, U.S. psychiatrist, commenting on a sex education "workshop" held here in the U.S.[11] "During the workshop, I found many individuals in my audience who appeared quite threatened by some concepts of child mental health, usually readily accepted by those in the field. For example, I offer the concept that to sexually stimulate or be stimulated by one's child is not in the best interest of that child's mental health. I was accused of instilling guilt in my audience and taking quite a Puritanical view, whereas I attempted to point out that incest was a universal taboo, and I knew of no culture where it was acceptable."

Here is sex educated Lars Ullerstam.[12] "In my experience sexual games between parents and children (in the infant age) are becoming increasingly common in young families. In any case, they do occur with most of my friends. These games have all sort of affectionate designations ("the tunnel game"), and I cannot see that this is anything but a healthy and happy state of affairs."

Please note: Sex educated Ullerstam is describing the wholehearted acceptance of a perversion, *incest*. Contrariwise, Dr. Sandson tries to oppose the promotion of incestual perversion by the sex educators in their "workshop" and he is accused of being Puritanical. (Incidentally, Lars Ullerstam devotes a chapter of The Erotic Minorities to what he calls "Puritanical counter-arguments.")

Here is Dr. Sandson again, commenting upon the sex education "workshop" here in the U.S.[13] "I found others who felt that their purpose was to be able, and help their students to do likewise, to *use four-letter words with ease and freedom* in mixed company."

Here is sex educated Lars Ullerstam.[14] "There are masturbators who specialize in looking up 'dirty words' in works of fiction. Vilhelm Moberg once gave them the sour epithet 'word-snoopers' but I cannot see that theirs is not a legitimate method of seeking sexual enjoyment. An author ought to be grateful for being able to provide fellow men with this pleasure. It isn't only young boys who scribble sexual graffiti on public lavatory walls, even grown men can find this sexually exciting. Some men find it enormously gratifying to use the word 'cock' in mixed company, and men are often taken to court for trying to conduct obscene conversations with switchboard girls."

This perversion, *coprophemia*, the use of four-letter and obscene words to shock others (thereby allowing the coprophemic to become sexually excited) is often combined with pornography as a stimulant, leading to sexual orgasm. Individuals with such a stunted development psychosexually are certainly pitiable. However, it is this writer's contention that we should not subject children to deliberate sexual stimulation by use of obscenities administered by sex educators, and thereby help to create such miserable people. If we do, then we can only offer them our pity later, unless we want to follow Ullerstam's advice: "As often as not very little is required—perhaps only that we should be present when they masturbate, or that we should say *a few dirty words*." [15]

Do skeptics remain that SIECUS sex education is not patterned on the Swedish system? If so, read this from the American Handbook of Psychiatry: "Zoophilic perversion may take any one (or a combination) of at least three possible forms: (1) sexual arousal through observation of sexual activities of animals (voyeurism); (2) a form of fetishism whereby animal objects, such as furs, acquire special sexual significance; and (3) actual intercourse with animals (zooerasty). This is an excellent example illustrating how many different aspects a perversion can present." [16]

Fine. How does that apply to Mary Calderone's SIECUS? "Their program would start a child on 'sex education' in the nursery, and follow through in every grade, with both boys and girls in the same classrooms viewing everything from graphic illustrations, to plastic replicas of human sexual organs, to animals copulating in classrooms for the edification of the young. For example, slides have been used in a Westchester County elementary school which show the copulation of dogs, this followed by a human couple under sheets, while a recorded voice explains: "Mummy and Daddy are doing the same things the dogs do." [17] This SIECUS tactic has been sharply criticized by the highly respected child analyst, Dr. Rhoda Lorand of New York, as producing an "emotional split" in children by stimulating sexual excitement in children right in an environment where they must simultaneously suppress it. Dr. Rhoda Lorand is most certainly correct.

And there are these considerations too. In children who become highly stimulated, the associations may be repressed; that is, some children would not remember later the associations which had stimulated them. As Freud points out, "Repression . . . is, at bottom, an attempt at flight." [18] The SIECUS slide series referred to above, by comparing human sexual relations with the copulation of dogs, would induce in susceptible children an unconscious association of sexual excitement with animal copulation.

And that is zoophilia—*by definition*—isn't

Footnotes at end of article.

it? And the legalization of zoophilia was one of the cherished goals of that charismatic Elise Ottesen-Jensen, Swedish founder of the National Society for Sex Education, wasn't it? You ask, is the implication being made that Mary Calderone's SIECUS favors zoophilia? Who can say? It can be stated accurately that Isadore Rubin, a Founder and Treasurer of SIECUS, has published in Sexology Magazine (which he edits) titles such as: "Can Humans Breed With Animals?" However, although the names of 5 members of SIECUS' Board also appear on the masthead of Sexology Magazine, Mary's name isn't listed (at least the last time this writer looked at Sexology's masthead). So, as far as Mary's *personal* views on zoophilia are concerned—ask Mary. Better yet, ask the Editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association. He's "informed."

We have said that the SIECUIS program of sex education seems patterned in detail upon the prototype of Elise Ottesen-Jensen's National Society for Sex Education. There are differences, of course. While Mary's SIECUS has not come out to legalize homosexuality and zoophilia yet (at least to this writer's knowledge, and at the time of this writing), Mary Calderone would start children on sex education at age 3. On the other hand, Elise's National Society for Sex Education didn't get at the kids until they entered elementary school. Maybe Professor Ira Reiss of SIECUS quoted an undisclosed authority when the statement was made:—"Where Sweden is today is where we're going to be in ten years." Professor Reiss may have read Freud, "The age to which the content of the earliest memories of childhood are usually referred back is the period between the ages of two and four." [19] If we split the difference, we arrive at the age 3; and that is the Hitching Hour, a-la-Calderone. If SIECUS can get at our children at age 3, the sex educators apparently believe they can turn the U.S. inside out like Sweden, or worse—and in *one-half the time* it took Sweden's Elise Ottesen-Jensen's National Society for Sex Education.

If a few still doubt that SIECUS intends to do to our children what sex education did to Lars Ullerstam's generation, then we have, perhaps, a few die-hards holding cut for their personalized "Bitter End?" so here it is: As a source of information about sex, SIECUS lists Barnet L. Rosset, Jr., of the Grove Press, Inc. How does that relate, other than the fact that one Barney Rosset of Grove Press, Inc. has been brought into court several times for publication of pornography, and was featured in that Saturday Evening Post article of January 25, 1969: How to Publish "Dirty Books for Fun and Profit."

How does it relate, you say?

Note very carefully, please: Lars Ullerstam's book was published in Sweden, as De Erotiska Minoriteterna, Copyright 1964 by Lars Ullerstam. His book was published in English translation as a Sexual Bill of Rights for the Erotic Minorities, Copyright 1966 by Grove Press, Inc. Again, Grove Press, Inc., is a recommended source of sex information, as listed by SIECUS. And SIECUS is the prime mover behind sex education. And sex education was strongly endorsed by that AMA editorial which stated that those who oppose sex education are "uninformed."

Well, now, that really puts the AMA up on a stump, doesn't it? Since the editorial states that those who oppose sex education are "uninformed," then we must assume that the AMA has informed itself. The only way an organization like AMA could inform itself would be to set up committees to study the detailed history of sex education in other countries, and its social results, and particularly to screen very carefully, the publications of sources recommended by the sex education groups in the U.S. Since the AMA editorial reminds us pointedly that AMA is a "responsible" organization, then we shall have to assume that all of the committees' work has been accomplished, the reports are in, and the committee members who reviewed the erotic minorities noted with unruffled brows how sex education actually promotes sexual perversions, among other types of anti-social behavior.

Moreover, we must assume that the AMA's committees have studied the publications of Elysium Institute, e.g., Nude Living, a magazine which lists its connection with Siecus and similar types of the "growing number of organizations in this country which are concerned, as is the Institute, with seeking means to man's physical, emotional and intellectual development in an environment of openness, understanding and tolerance." Moreover, the "informed" AMA must know that Siecus runs advertisements in Elysium Institute's Nude Living, thereby aiding in the financial support of a magazine whose format is comprised mainly of photographs of nude males and females posed in such manner that even a child can clearly understand that Nude Living is suggestive of perversions and appealing to sexual perverts, all the way down to *necrophilia* (sexual relations with corpses).

There is an immense back-log of further information which could be adduced here, but space prohibits. In any event, since the AMA is an "informed" and "responsible" organization, we must assume that AMA committees know of all this, and approve, since the AMA has endorsed sex education.

Therefore, there is no refuge—is there—from the harsh rigour of these facts. We have to assume—don't we—that AMA gives its blessing to this statement: "There is one thing we can be dead certain of: the 'perversions' allow considerable chances to achieve human happiness. And therefore the 'perversions' are in themselves good, and therefore they ought to be encouraged." Remember, that statement comes from a recommended source of sex information as listed by Siecus, which is the prime mover behind sex education, and sex education has been strongly endorsed by the prestigious American Medical Association.

First, Elise Ottesen-Jensen and Sweden's National Society for Sex Education; then Mary Calderone and the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States; next endorsement by the American Medical Association—and the Arc of Fate sweeps full circle and closes upon itself.

Sex education. *How Swede it is!*

AMA's editorial exhorts physicians to fight the "serious threat" that this *programmed perversion* of school children (called sex education) may be eliminated entirely from public school curricula. Oh, really? A "serious threat" to whom? Well, to the pervision-peddlers, and to those Wall Street giants who have banked millions on sex education in schools, and now naturally expect a great windfall of profits from the sale of sex-books and plastic penises and other "audio-visual aids."

As a dues-paying member of the AMA, this writer offers this sex education article in order to educate the AMA hierarchy as to the true meaning of sex education. Further, he offers to them this unsolicited advice: *Take your stand where you belong*. Repudiate so-called sex education; it is a proven cultural sickness. Take your stand—foursquare—behind the great mass of responsible American parents who *will* see to it that sex education never really gets off the ground in the U.S. AMA or no AMA, responsible American parents are going to see to it that *their children have a future*. If, as this storm continues to gather, you find that decision is lacking while time passes you by, then AMA's doctors will learn that the telephoned question, "Is the doctor a member of the AMA?," is asked by prospective new patients in order to *screen out* doctors whose secretaries answered in the affirmative.

Should the AMA hierarchy persist in its "death-wish" by continuing its pro-sex-education stance; then, from the psychiatric point of view, the following comes to mind: mature and intelligent people gather all possible information, project future results, and follow through with a realistic attitude as to predictable difficulties. AMA's hierarchy will know beforehand, therefore, that a veritable army of sexual perverts will be on our hands in 10–12 years. They will also know that very soon, possibly, a book may have to be written delineating a "bill of rights" for so-called erotic minorities, right here in the U.S.

And because, as we have seen, those who have been "sex educated" go to any and all lengths, AMA should now be working on plans for a soon-to-be-needed corps of "erotic Samaritans" (as Lars Ullerstam calls them). "Erotic Samaritans" would staff van-type vehicles prepared to go anywhere to bring sexual pleasures to those disabled, institutionalized, or "inhibited." This notion may seem *avant-garde* to some. But since it has spawned itself from sex education a-la-Ottesen-Jensen-et-Calderone, and sex education is now endorsed by the American Medical Association, then it is well for each of us to consider "erotic Samaritans" with great solemnity.

Sex educated Lars Ullerstam's heart particularly goes out to those paralyzed in all four extremities: "Here the erotic Samaritans could perform a labor of love. Even if all physical components of sexuality have disappeared, the physical lust experience remains, and I am convinced that many tetraplegics would find pornography, strip tease, and other sexual performances rewarding. And even if the penis has gone totally numb to the touch, I still think that the patient is able to enjoy the ceremony of masturbation visually." [20]

Of course, AMA must set standards. We can't let just anybody become an erotic Samaritan.

Already AMA, for instance, has set commendable standards for personnel involved in the sex education movement, as stated in its editorial: ". . . those persons involved in supporting the efforts of the home through sex education in churches, schools, and other appropriate agencies *must be exemplary individuals who are carefully selected and properly prepared for this important responsibility.*" [21] (Emphasis added.)

Now, as our first and most elite corps of erotic Samaritans, this writer would suggest the editorial staff of the AMA Journal, since these are dedicated, "responsible" and, most of all, *informed*. And we desire to relieve all candidates of possible anxieties that they might not qualify—and thereby miss their first van-run.

Dear Readers, let us—if you will—become Samaritan-like and try at least to understand how those who would endorse sex education must feel about the prospect of not qualifying as an erotic Samaritan. Their poor souls must undergo intolerable anxieties. They should not have to suffer so, since Lars Ullerstam's criteria for his erotic Samaritans are very similar—perhaps a bit more stringent—than the qualifications of the AMA (quoted above) for those involved in the basic sex education movement.

Therefore—as Samaritans—let us write them letters, and give to them an overwhelming vote of confidence so that they may know that we who view the activities of AMA's editorial staff feel supreme confidence that all members of the staff bear such sterling qualities of character that they need feel no anxieties at all.

They will—like butterflies—undergo metamorphosis, transforming themselves from their sex education Fantasy-World into the sex education Reality-World, and will emerge, certified, by Lars Ullerstam's requirements, as erotic Samaritans: [22] "One would wish that cheerful, generous, talented, and ethically

XUM

advanced persons with the knowledge of the joys of giving would feel attracted to this humanitarian profession."

FOOTNOTES

[1] Editorial: "Sex Education in the Schools," JAMA, Vol. 208, No. 6, May 12, 1969, p. 1016.

[2] A Sexual Bill of Rights for the Erotic Minorities, Lars Ullerstam, M.D., Grove Press, Inc., 1966, p. 43.

[3] American Handbook of Psychiatry, Silvano Ariest, M.D., Editor, Basic Books, Inc., 1959, Vol. 1, p. 591.

[4] Ullerstam, op. cit., p. 12.

[5] Ullerstam, op. cit., p. 78.

[6] Ullerstam, op. cit., pp. 163–164.

[7] Ullerstam, op. cit., Introduction, p. xix.

[8] Ullerstam, op. cit., p. 150.

[9] Anaheim Bulletin, Anaheim, California—Articles and Dates: "Moral Issue Debated in Sex Session" (12–19–68), and "Need For More Money For Sex Courses Told" (12–20–68).

[10] Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., William Benton, Publisher, 1967 Edition, Vol. 3, p. 705.

[11] Comments, May 10th Institutes, "Sensitivity Training in Sex Education," Gerald Sandson, M.D., May 10, 1968 (American Association of Sex Educators and Counselors, 815 15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.)

[12] Ullerstam, op. cit., pp. 46–47.

[13] Comments, May 10th, Institutes, "Sensitivity Training in Sex Education," Gerald Sandson, M.D., May 10, 1968 (American Association of Sex Educators and Counselors, 815 15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.)

[14] Ullerstam, op. cit., p. 76.

[15] Ullerstam, op. cit., p. 163.

[16] American Handbook of Psychiatry, Silvano Arieti, M.D., Editor, Basic Books, Inc., 1959, Vol. I, p. 603.

[17] "The Gathering Storm: Sex Education vs. The 'No-No' Moralists," James M. Parsons, M.D., The Journal, Sarasota County Medical Society, Vol. 16, No. 2, March, 1969, p. 16.

[18] Freud: Dictionary of Psychoanalysis, Fawcett Publications, Inc., Greenwich, Conn., 1963, p. 133.

[19] Freud: Dictionary of Psychoanalysis, Fawcett Publications, Inc., Greenwich, Conn., 1963, p. 26.

[20] Ullerstam, op. cit., p. 153.

[21] Editorial: "Sex Education in the Schools," JAMA, Vol. 208. No. 6, May 12, 1969, p. 1016.

[22] Ullerstam, op. cit., p. 152.

GODSPEED, GENTLEMEN, OUR ASTRONAUTS ON APOLLO 11

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD an advertisement of Philco-Ford that gives a good sample of thinking of American business supporting the historic launch of Apollo 11 to the moon on July 16, 1969:

LOOK AT IT THIS WAY: ON JULY 21 THE ENTIRE EARTH BECOMES JUST ANOTHER COUNTRY

When man steps onto the surface of the moon, he will take the biggest evolutionary step since his early ancestor tottered erect million of years ago.

Beyond merely seeing the moon close-up, it gives man his first chance to see Earth as it really is. A single small globe hanging in space. With no dotted lines or different colors to separate one man from another. Only a single community to join us. One country in the world of space.

We at Philco-Ford Corporation are proud to be part of the team that made this possible. At the Mission Control Center, the TV monitor system, designed and built to NASA specifications by Philco, will follow man's most fantastic adventure.

Over 1000 Philco employees in Houston provide support for Mission Control. We also made components for the guidance computer and other instruments on board the spacecraft.

As much as Philco has contributed to the success of the venture, ours is only a mere supporting role. The stars, of course, are the astronauts themselves.

Godspeed, gentlemen.

PRESIDENTIAL MOVE ON NARCOTICS HAILED

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I was certainly gratified this week to read the President's message to Congress on the narcotics problem this Nation faces. This message shows a clear understanding of the nature and extent of drug abuse and narcotics addiction, along with the special laws and law-enforcement measures which are required to combat these abuses at an effective level.

The President's 10-point program which he presented in the message should, with the cooperation of foreign countries and our own State and local law-enforcement officers, go a long way toward cutting back on narcotics sales and usage in this country.

I do believe, however, that the President has within his means another important weapon to combat the drug traffic, and that is manpower. He calls for increases in personnel for the Bureau of Customs and the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, but he does not provide for the sizable increase in narcotics enforcement personnel which many believe is required.

Mr. Speaker, in April I joined five other Members of this body in a letter to the President proposing that the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the U.S. marshal force be given jurisdiction over narcotics violations. Those of us who signed the letter representing both sides of the aisle all have experience in the field of law enforcement. It was my opinion then, and it is my opinion now, that even with the increases proposed in the President's message, we are going to fall far short of the manpower necessary to wage an effective fight on the shameful trafficking in narcotics in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it was a disappointment to note that this suggestion was not adopted in the President's message. By taking the action we proposed, the number of Federal law-enforcement officers with jurisdiction in narcotics cases could be increased from just over 700 today to 8,500.

I sincerely hope that the President will take another look at this proposal and act upon it in conjunction with the excellent program he has offered.

THREE KEY DOCUMENTS ON LATIN AMERICA

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the existing relationships between the United States and Latin America are currently undergoing basic reappraisal. On June 11, 1969, Mr. Gabriel Valdes, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Chile and President of the Latin American Special Coordinating Commission, consisting of representatives from 21 Latin American nations, presented President Nixon with "The Latin American Consensus of Vina del Mar," a document detailing the areas which the Coordinating Commission—known as CECLA—strongly feels merit reexamination.

At a time when there is a growing resentment against the policies of the United States throughout Latin America, this document is extremely pertinent. The challenge is critical; as Foreign Minister Valdes has said:

> All that can be said has been said; the time has come for action.

This report, which discusses the U.S. policies in trade, development and investment in Latin Amercia, should be made a part of the public record.

In addition I am submitting the address of Foreign Minister Valdes upon delivering the report to President Nixon and the Address of President Eduardo Frei of Chile to the opening session of the special meeting of CECLA at ministerial level at Vina del Mar on May 15, 1969. Both addresses reaffirm the great need for a change in our policies in Latin America.

The addresses follow:

THE LATIN AMERICAN CONSENSUS OF VIÑA DEL MAR

The Member States of the Latin American Special Coordinating Commission (CECLA) which met at the Ministerial level in Viña del Mar (Chile) to exchange views on the conditions governing international cooperation and the way it influences our external situation and to propose new approaches that respond to the realities of the Continent have agreed on the following common position to elaborate jointly with the United States of America new bases for the social and economic inter-American cooperation:

The Governments of Latin America and the Government of the United States of America have in the Declaration to the Peoples of America the Charter of Punta del Este, the Economic and Social Act of Rio de Janeiro and the Declaration of the Presidents of America, defined commitments and common programmes of action expressing the aspirations of the Latin American countries towards the development and progress of the region. These commitments and programmes have not, so far, been properly implemented or given due attention.

The Governments of the States members of the Latin American Special Coordinating Commission (CECLA) reaffirm the validity of the principles and aims contained in the above-mentioned official documents and the need to fulfill the obligations and carry out the actions specified in them to the full.

They further emphasize the principles

XUM

contained in the Charter of Alta Gracia and the Charter of Tequendama the acceptance of which by the United States of America and its support of them in its dealings with other industrialized nations will be a positive contribution to the Latin American countries' struggle to obtain more equitable treatment in their international relations.

Despite the fact that the solution of development problems has become one of the major concerns of the international community, the decisions, recommendations, principles and programmes of action adopted up to now, although valuable, have not been enough. Therefore, the member countries of CECLA consider it necessary to agree on more effective forms of inter-American and international cooperation.

The ideas in the following paragraphs, which are not intended to be either negative or hostile, are the logical outcome of the historic process in the course of which the Latin American countries have reaffirmed their own value and become aware of their common interest.

I. THE NATURE AND SUBSTANCE OF INTER-AMERICAN AND INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

1. The CECLA member countries affirm the distinctive personality of Latin America. The process of development of the region and the changes which are taking place in each of the Latin American countries, together with the changes taking place in the world, impose important changes in the nature of Latin America's relations with the other members of the international community. It is therefore imperative that the Latin American countries should endeavour to reach solutions born out of their own criteria which reflect their national identity.

2. Determined to overcome under-development, they reiterate their conviction that economic growth and social progress are the responsibility of their people and that the attainment of national and regional goals depends fundamentally on each country's own efforts, and also on increasingly closer cooperation, coordination and harmonization of the policies and attitudes of the Latin American nations, which are expressed in the decisions of the Presidents of the Latin American countries to achieve a common market.

3. The attainment of these goals depends to a large extent on the international community, recognizing and assuming their responsibilities, and particularly those countries which now have greatest influence in international decisions.

The acceptance of these responsibilities and the accomplishment of the duties are indispensable if domestic resources are to be mobilized and used more rapidly and fully and if inter-American and international cooperation is to grow and be perfected so as to complement up the efforts made by each country. This will also contribute greatly to the process of Latin American economic integration.

4. During the last decade, international and inter-American cooperation for the development of Latin America have been very far from satisfying the aspirations of the countries of the region, as defined in important inter-American and international documents and forums. The resolutions, decisions and declarations at the Conference of Bogota of 1948; the Act of Bogota of 1960; the Declaration to the Peoples of America and the Charter of Punta del Este of 1961; the Charter of Alta Gracia of 1964; the Economic and Social Act of Rio de Janeiro of 1965; the Buenos Aires Protocol and the Declaration of the Presidents of America of 1967; the Plan of Action of Viña del Mar and the Charter of Tequendama of 1967, and the Declaration of Santo Domingo of 1968—all these, inspired by the ideal of Latin American unity, were aimed at promoting, consistently and progressively, profound changes in the economic and trade relations between Latin America and the United States, and also between the developing countries in general and the industrialized nations. The proposed changes are based on principles of cooperation, solidarity, respect for national sovereignty and the people's right to self-determination and on the need for a fairer international division of labour that will favour the rapid economic and social development of the developing countries, instead of impeding it, as has been the case hitherto.

5. Now, towards the end of the present decade, the economic and scientific-technological gap between the developing and the developed countries has widened and is continuing to do so, and the external obstacles impeding the rapid economic growth of the Latin American countries not only have not been removed, but are tending to increase. The continued existence of such obstacles is particularly apparent, for instance, in the tariff and non-tariff restrictions which impede access to the world markets on favourable and equitable terms, of the developing countries' manufacturers and semi-manufactures; in the progressive worsening in the volume, terms and forms of international financial assistance which is practically wiped out by the burden of debt servicing, with the result that the import capacity of the Latin American countries is seriously weakened; in the problems deriving from the operations of the international monetary system; in the conditions of maritime transport which hinder and add to the cost of Latin America's foreign trade; and in the difficulties involved in transferring modern technology to the countries of the region, difficulties which hinder its use and its adaptation to their particular needs, and also the modernization of their production structures.

6. The situation described demands, on one hand, the fulfillment of the general commitments contained in the Charter of the Organization of American States and the Economic Agreement of Bogota; the Act of Bogota, the Charter of Punta del Este and the Economic and Social Act of Rio de Janeiro, the Buenos Aires Protocol and the Declaration of the Presidents of America; and requires, on the other hand, a reformulation of international and inter-American cooperation in order to achieve the aims of the Latin American countries. Most of these aims have been accurately defined and identified and clearly presented to the rest of the world; if these aims had been achieved, many of the problems faced by those countries would have been solved or would have arisen, and firm bases would have been established for effective international cooperation.

7. Concrete practical measures, which will be described later, must be adopted to remove the external obstacles hindering the accelerated development of the Latin American countries.

These measures must be based on the principles already accepted by the inter-American and international communities which safeguard the political and economic independence of the countries involved. The principles which must be borne specially in mind are the following: the legal equality of States; non-intervention in the internal or external affairs of other States through any form of threat to the State as an independent entity or to its political, economic and cultural components; respect for the validity of the treaties, the sovereign right of every country to use its natural resources as it sees fit; and, lastly, the principle that no military or political strings can be attached to financial cooperation. Another equally important principle is that no State may apply or encourage economic and political coercion to compel another State to grant it advantages of any kind; on the contrary, every effort must be made to avoid policies, actions and measures which may endanger the economic and social development of another State.

8. It is essential that the principles of solidarity underlying inter-American cooperation in the political field and in matters of security should apply also to the economic and social field. If these principles are not respected in the economic and special sphere, prevent peoples from living together in harmony and endanger peace and security.

9. The effectiveness of the international measures that have been and are to be taken in the future greatly depends on the measures and procedures for inter-American cooperation being adopted to the political and economic requirements described above and on their being really operative.

It will be necessary for the organizations and bodies responsible for cooperation in the hemisphere and on the international plane to speed up their activities and redirect them toward the central objectives of development. Also, these activities must be based on full knowledge of the economic and social conditions of each country and on respect for the decisions and national programmes of each Government. Continuing evaluation of the programmes and their results is also essential if more effective cooperation is to be achieved.

10. The counterpart of these common aims must be coordinated and effective action by the Latin American countries in the different international forums, institutions and international organs of cooperation of which they are members. In this way, the united action of the Latin American countries will have greater weight on the world plane and will lead to the attainment of their objectives.

II. PROPOSALS FOR PRACTICAL MEASURES

11. In accordance with the above concepts, principles and statements and in jointly proposing a dialogue with the United States of America, the countries of Latin America have decided to communicate to the United States their main aims in the fields of international trade transport, finance, investment and invisibles, scientific and technological development, technical cooperation and social development, with a view to making a real stride forward in inter-American cooperation, through action and negotiations in these fields.

In their view, the following measures are necessary:

A. Trade

12. To insist on the fulfillment of the agreements on the *status quo*, as regards raw materials as well as manufactured and semi-manufactured goods. To reiterate the need for the consultive machinery envisaged by UNCTAD and GATT to be put in motion before the adoption of any measure which might signify a setback in the treatment of imports of Latin American products. To perfect this machinery at the inter-American level in accordance with the Declaration of the Presidents of America.

13. To continue to take steps to eliminate tariff and non-tariff obstacles as, for example, quotas, safety and health regulations, etc., which affect the entry and marketing of primary commodities. To negotiate with the United States timetables for the elimination of these market restrictions on Latin American products of special interest, jointly identifying the obstacles in question. To press for another special round of negotiations with GATT for primary commodities not properly dealt with in the previous round.

14. To point out the vital importance of observing the timetable fixed at the II UNCTAD on commodity agreements, which include provisions to ensure fair and remunerative prices for Latin American exports, respect for the commitments estab-

lished by previous agreements, the conclusion of new agreements, and, the broadening of their sphere of action where necessary.

15. To revise and request the modification or abolition of policies which encourage uneconomic production of primary commodities and prejudice the sale of Latin American products in world markets, and a periodic review of these policies.

16. To make joint efforts to eliminate, within the near future, discriminatory preferences militating against the sale of Latin American primary commodities in the markets of certain developed countries, and to suggest measures or actions which will enable and encourage developing countries favoured by those preferences to give them up.

17. To demand the effective operation of consultive machinery with regard to the sale of surpluses and the disposal of reserves, which should respect the general principles already accepted in this field, and also prevent the distortion which takes place in Latin American trade flows as a result of AID tied loans and the haphazard sales of surpluses.

18. To review bilateral and multilateral food aid systems, with a view to considerably expanding multilateral programmes on the basis of the principles approved in CECLA resolution 9/68M.

19. To stress the urgent need to put into effect, within the specified periods, and in accordance with the timetables of scheduled meetings, a general, nonreciprocal and non-discriminatory system of preferences to facilitate the exportation of manufactures and semi-manufactures from the developing countries. Within this framework, measures should be considered which will allow the relatively less developed countries to make full use of the ensuing advantages.

20. In accordance with a timetable jointly drawn up, to eliminate restrictions on imports of manufactures and semi-manufactures of interest to Latin America, in close connection with the system of general preferences. To give particular attention in this matter to the problems of applying escape clauses, which requires the establishment of suitable criteria and consultive machinery. To avoid the applications of discriminatory practices of any kind in this respect.

21. In conjunction to single out industrial sectors or branches wherein the adoption by the United States, within a suitable period, of measures to change some production structures, can help to improve and expand the United States market for manufactures and semi-manufactures of special interest to Latin America. The effects of these measures should be periodically assessed.

22. By means of greater technical and financial cooperation, to make national and regional machinery to promote exports stronger, broader and more flexible, systematizing Latin American trade information and seeking the collaboration of official and private bodies in the United States in order to intensify and diversify Latin American exports, and also to facilitate the supply of regional markets from regional resources.

23. To underline the importance of active support from the United States for Latin America's position vis-a-vis other areas, as agreed upon in the Declaration of the Presidents of America. The fulfillment by the United States of the agreements it has entered into will considerably strengthen the value of this support.

B. Transport

24. To prevent, as far as possible, increases in operating costs effected outside the Latin American region from being reflected in increases in freight rates which might affect exports of particular interest to the Latin American countries.

25. To press for the lowering of freight rates in inter-American trade, when there is a reduction in the operating costs for ships in port, on the basis of real improvements in each port and not of the average productivity of a group of ports.

26. To recognize the right of Latin American countries to adopt measures to develop national or regional merchant fleets. Providing that such measures are based on fair participation in the cargoes making up the respective national or regional trade flows, they would not be considered discriminatory nor could they give rise to decisions to abolish them.

27. To expand both bilateral and multilateral inter-American financial and technical cooperation designed to expand and organize the merchant fleets of the countries of Latin America and, in accordance with their own programmes, to develop their ship-building industry and improve port installations and other components of the transport infrastructure in general.

C. Financing, investment, and invisible exports

28. Inter-American financial cooperation, which complements internal efforts, should be governed by the following basic criteria:

(a) It should be a real transfer and be granted in accordance with national development policies and plans, since this will guarantee an adequate and continuing flow of financial resources and the right of the receiving country to fix its own priorities, thus improving the efficiency of external financing in situations which require an overall approach.

(b) Lending countries and international financing organizations should base their cooperation on economic and social criteria that respect the development concepts of the borrowing country:

(c) It is indispensable that external financial cooperation should not be subject to conditions which limit the borrowing country's capacity to make basic economic policy decisions;

(d) Particular attention should be paid to relatively less developed countries in the region;

(e) All stipulations and criteria which tie the use of loans to the acquisition of goods and services in given countries or from given sources should be abolished;

(f) The vital need to strengthen real multilateralization in external financial cooperation. Because of their multilateral nature, international financing organizations should not allow their decisions to influence possible bilateral programmes between countries;

(g) The need to create effective mechanisms to liberalize external credit, reduce interest rates and expand the volume and length of credits, taking into account such circumstances as the fact that certain projects and programmes last more than one year. To propose the establishment of an interest equalization fund whose resources, like those required by other future mechanisms, should be contributed by international financing bodies and developed countries;

(h) Greater participation by public bodies in the channelling and utilization of external financing;

(i) Steps should be taken to see that the terms of external financing are not less favourable for Latin America than for other developing areas of the world.

29. To consider it indispensable to free external financing from all strings because of their many adverse effects on the Latin American economy, such as, the artificial creation of trade flows, including those produced by applying the criterion of additionality; the demand for an excessive local contribution to expenditure and investment, the creation of unnecessary organizations, the exercise of undue influence on internal decisions, the compulsory use of certain shipping lines and buying on the basis of unsuitably made-up lists, which result in high costs and distortion of regional trade. As a possible temporary solution the use of credit funds from AID and other similar institutions for purchasing in Latin America is being considered.

30. To underline the need for the renewal of financial contributions to the International Development Association and Latin American support for easier utilization of these credits by all countries of the region. For this purpose the criteria of eligibility should be modified and the concession of such credits should not be tied to certain conditions.

31. To facilitate the access of Latin American countries and their regional and subregional bodies to the United States capital markets by reducing costs and making administrative and other requirements more flexible.

32. To increase the availability of funds and improve the use of machinery for financing Latin American exports, with regard for the need to grant such credits under terms and conditions which maintain and improve the competitive capacity of Latin American products and their access to world markets, including the use of soft loans, when this depends basically on financial conditions. In this respect, it is considered important to revise the conditions for the use of IDB funds in order to increase pre-loading credits, to make financing available for exports of manufactures and semi-manufactures and not to limit such loans to trade between Latin American countries.

33. To agree that private foreign investment should not be considered as aid or calculated as part of financial cooperation for development purposes. Foreign private investment, subject to national decisions and priorities, should try to promote the mobilization of internal resources, create income and prevent outflows of foreign currency, promote saving and national technical research, make a real technological contribution, and act as a complementary factor in national investment, preferably in association with it. This has not always been so in the past. Concern was shown for the over-all scale of the external financial flow caused by private foreign investment and also for the excessive use of local financial resources and the effect of certain marketing agreements, which distort competitive conditions in internal and external markets, and their possible effects on the economic development of the region.

34. To express their interest in the greater international cooperation in the financing of multinational projects, and to extend this cooperation to the financing of multinational projects which promote economic integration in response to decisions by the integration organs in their specific field. The cooperation should be given in accordance with the principles laid down in the Declaration of the Presidents of America.

35. To insist on the need for Latin America to take a bigger part in the discussions on the reform of the international monetary system, including those which may take place outside the sphere of the International Monetary Fund, and particularly within the so-called Group of Ten. It is considered important to ratify and implement the provisions on Special Drawing Rights without delay and to search for mechanisms to obtain additional funds for development when necessary.

36. To point out the importance of increasing the flow of tourists to Latin American countries, to avoid the adoption of measures which might hinder it and to support the improvement of tourist services and infraestructure by means of technical and financial aid.

37. To include all countries in the inter-American system in CIAP's annual country revisions, in order to review the implementation of the commitments undertaken, including national policies which might affect the economic development of the Latin American countries.

D. Social development

38. To reaffirm that:

(a) Their economic development should lead to real social change, whose basic aims should be to make substantial improvements in the living levels of the population particularly in rural areas, and to bring the least favoured or marginal groups into active participation in the process of economic and social progress and full enjoyment of its benefits.

(b) Investment in social development is a way of raising the living levels of the population, a very important factor in increasing productivity and redistributing income, which should thus be given particular attention with due regard for the individual situation of each country;

(c) The aims expressed in the Declaration of the Presidents of America with respect to the social development of Latin America can be fully and promptly achieved only if international technical and financial cooperation for social development is considerably increased.

This cooperation should be given on the basis of the programmes and policies of each country, with due regard for their national characteristics.

Financial cooperation should therefore be granted without discrimination and on particularly flexible terms. Consequently, much greater use should be made of such machinery as the Special Operation Fund of the IDB, whose resources should be increased accordingly.

E. Technical cooperation

39. To state that the following principles should be observed in the field of technical cooperation:

(a) Technical cooperation should be the joint task of the parties concerned. The volume, terms and form of coordination should be in line with the national aims of each country as laid down in their economic and social development plans.

(b) Technical cooperation should be channelled through the national coordination agencies of each country and, when applicable, through regional or subregional bodies.

(c) Technical cooperation should be directed towards supporting and complementing national programmes in each country and the bodies entrusted with carrying them out and not towards the replacement of those programmes and bodies.

(d) Multilateral technical cooperation should be strengthened and considerably increased.

(e) Latin American experts should be used as much as possible in programmes of technical cooperation.

(f) Technical cooperation should not be reduced as the countries of Latin America reach more advanced and complex stages of growth, but should be adapted to the new conditions of the development process.

(g) On the light of the needs and responsibilities arising from the process of national and regional development, technical cooperation should be fundamentally granted on the basis of nonrepayment.

F. Scientific and technological development

40. The Latin American countries realize that, in order to carry out their programmes of economic and social development, it is necessary to give a vigorous impetus to the process of scientific and technological development, based on the greatest possible internal efforts supplemented by international cooperation. For this purpose, the countries of Latin America should take joint action, by means of a large-scale programme of scientific and technological cooperation for which international cooperation would be required, from the United States in particular.

41. The Action Programme, concerning science and technology, approved by the Presidents of America, must be put into full operation. In view of the fact that scientific and technological development demands far greater resources than those now invested either nationally or regionally, it is therefore necessary to have access to special funds, which should be granted without repayment obligations.

On the basis of this complementarity of efforts, the United States should:

42. Support Latin American countries in scientific and technological matters by channelling aid according to the goals and priorities laid down by those countries through the medium of the national and regional bodies concerned.

43. Adopt suitable measures to improve the transfer of technology to the region. For this purpose they should:

(a) Contribute to the improvement of scientific and technological information by training experts and helping to set up national information centres which would pave the way for the creation of a regional scientific and technical information mechanism, covering patents, trade marks, licenses, etc.

(b) Intensify aid in order to improve the scientific and technological infraestructure of the region by *inter alia*, increasing the exchange of scientists, promoting joint research programmes on problems of importance for Latin America, and strengthening and supplementing the physical base necessary for scientific and technological research.

44. Improve the transfer of science and technology among thé countries of Latin America, for which purpose they should:

(a) Greatly increase their financial support for the multinational projects of the Regional Programmes for Scientific and Technological Development.

(b) Support cooperative activities among Latin American countries in teaching and research involving State, private and university organizations.

45. Contribute to the efforts of the Latin American countries to speed up the creation of their own science and technology, for which purpose they should:

(a) Encourage research in Latin American countries by United States firms with branches or subsidiaries in them, with the aid of national or regional scientific and technological skills.

(b) Study, within the framework of national or regional programmes, the execution in Latin America of certain specific programmes of scientific and technological research of interest to the region, which are now being carried out in the United States by official or semi-official bodies.

(c) Support national development programmes drawn up by Latin American countries to promote scientific and technological development.

(d) Support national efforts to integrate the activities of entrepreneurial, government, university and technological research sectors in order to increase the capacity for innovation.

46. It is also necessary for the countries of Latin America and the United States to agree on joint international action to encourage scientific and technological development in the region. For this purpose the United States should:

(a) Cooperate in the revision of existing international conventions on patents, in order to give the developing countries freer access to industrial processes and knowledge, and to eliminate restrictive practices, thus making for more efficient use of the benefits of science and technology protected by those conventions, as well as rapid and effective industrial use of such benefits within these countries. United States cooperation in this field should include facilities for better access and the assurance of fair and non-discriminatory treatment for industrial processes subject to licenses and for technical service contracts. For this purpose, it is necessary to give urgent attention to a joining study of the problems of transferring and absorbing technology, in relation to the patents system.

(b) Work together with the countries of Latin America to encourage international financing institutions and credit organizations in developed countries to grant credits for scientific and technological research on favourable terms, within the framework of national priorities.

(c) Similarly, ensure that the financing of development projects should always comprise funds for any research required by the projects, for which the scientific and technological skills of the region would be used.

(d) Support the prompt organization of a Conference on the Application of Science and Technology to Development in Latin America.

In witness thereof the undersigned representatives being duly accredited have signed the above Latin American Consensus of Viña del Mar.

Done at Viña del Mar on the seventeenth day of the month of May of the year nineteen sixty-nine.

Argentina: Elvio Baldinelli, Secretary of State for Foreign Trade.

Barbados: Philip Greaves, Minister of the Interior.

Bolivia: Rene Candia Navarro, Minister of Economy.

Brazil: Jose de Magalhaes Pinto, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Chile: Gabriel Valdes Subercaseaux, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Colombia: Alfonso Lopez Michelsen, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Costa Rica: Alvaro Bonilla Lara, Ambassador of Costa Rica in Chile.

Ecuador: Rogelio Valdivieso, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

El Salvador: Oscar Lacayo Rosales, Under-Secretary of Economy.

Guatemala: Eduardo Palomo, Former Representative of the United Nations Organization in Geneva.

Haiti: Gerald S. Bouchette, Chargé d'Affaires of Haiti in Chile.

Honduras: Cupertino Nuñez Murillo, Under-Secretary of Treasury.

Mexico: Jesus Rodriguez y Rodriguez, Under-Secretary of Treasury.

Nicaragua: Armando Luna Silva, Ambassador of Nicaragua in Uruguay.

Panama: Victor Sogandares, Ambassador of Panama in Peru.

Paraguay: Raul Sapena Pastor, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Peru: Edgardo Mercado Jarrin, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Dominican Republic: Fernando Amiami-Tio, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

Trinidad and Tobago: Salomon S. Lutchman, Minister Counsellor.

Uruguay: Cesar Charlone, Minister of Treasury.

Venezuela: Aristides Calvani, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

ADDRESS OF THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF CHILE AND PRESIDENT OF THE LATIN AMERICAN SPECIAL COORDINATING COMMISSION, MR. GABRIEL VALDES, UPON DELIVERING THE DOCUMENT, "LATIN AMERICAN CONSENSUS OF VIÑA DEL MAR," IN THE HANDS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, MR. RICHARD M. NIXON, JUNE 11, 1969

Mr. President: The meeting of Ministers of the Latin American Special Coordinating Commission (LASCC) bestowed upon me the honor of bringing to you the Consensus reached in Viña del Mar, last May 17th.

For the first time Latin America expressed at this meeting its unity in the definition of the principles and in the identification of the problems which affect its relations with the United States of America. There we agreed that the President of the Latin American Special Coordinating Commission, in the

XUM

company of our Ambassadors in Washington, would personally present the Conclusions to you in order to emphasize the importance with which our Governments view this step, as well as the political will to which they are committed, to find new terms of relationship in the Hemisphere. I wish to express my gratitude for the opportunity you have given me to fulfill the mandate I have been entrusted with.

Aware of the interest you expressed, Mr. President, at the outstart of your Administration, to know America's ideas on the relations between our countries and the United States, we agreed to convene our Coordinating Commission which is the only organization exclusively Latin American.

The document I bring you, called "Latin American Consensus of Viña del Mar," is the result of a serene analysis. It reflects our unanimous decision and its purpose is to convey a genuine Latin American position. We hope to find the understanding of your Government for our view on hemispheric relations and we seek joint and active negotiations at the highest levels for the solution to the problems affecting our development. We believe this to be, Mr. President, the best answer to your desire that concrete deeds, rather than good intentions, be the foundations of a just and mutually profitable cooperation between the United States and Latin America.

We believe, that our action has far-reaching importance for the United States, because never before has your country encountered a Latin America united on its own definition. This is a new and precedent-breaking situation. This is good because we are conscious of the deep crisis in the concepts, actions, and institutions of the inter-American system which is seriously affecting the hemispheric relations. This crisis can be solved to the extent in which Latin America's unity is recognized as necessary, and a constructive dialogue between the United States and Latin America is started, with political decision and frankness. Consequently, it is necessary that a corresponding attitude be evolved by your country towards us.

In this respect, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Brazil, Mr. Magalhaes Pinto, said in our meeting: "We are aware that our unity derives of Latin American characteristics and national physiognomy whose common traits, from country to country, form a continental personality. The conscience of this identification must be the inspiring source of our solidarity."

In the Latin American Special Coordinating Commission we exercise the sovereign and legitimate right of nations to consult among themselves, to coordinate their actions and to formulate joint positions. On this opportunity, it is the expression of the Latin American will to determine with respect to the United States of America the external conditions necessary to its development. The Latin American Special Coordinating Commission's actions transcend the framework that up to now has determined inter-American relations, and should not be constrained by it.

Accordingly, and as President Frei said at the inauguration of the Latin American Special Coordinating Commission: "so that Latin America can fulfill itself as it wishes, the cooperation received must emerge from an agreement between two autonomous parties, and not from the monologue—however brilliant it might be—of one of them, to which the other, for lack of something better, adheres to with no alternative."

We have declared that our development is the responsibility of the effort of each of our societies and of the integration policies we are implementing. Nonetheless, we have the need of international cooperation, particularly coming from this nation which has reached the highest level of power and well-being.

International cooperation and specially inter-American cooperation have been defined in countless meetings and documents by the highest officials. However, not only have we been unable to bring nearer the results to the objectives, but the distance between them is increasing. It is not surprising then to see frustration expanding in Latin America and a growing and harmful resentment expressed in large sectors.

The explanation of this lies in the fact that the present interests of development in Latin America are not identical to those of the United States. They even tend to become progressively contradictory in many aspects.

These are profound realities that cannot be superficially explained or solved through traditional mechanisms or institutions. It is generally held that our continent is receiving real financial assistance. Figures say the contrary. We can assert that Latin America is contributing to finance the development of the United States and other affluent nations. Private investments have meant, and mean today for Latin America, that the amounts that leave our Continent are many times higher than those that are invested in it. Our potential capital is diminishing while the profits of the invested capital grow and multiply at an enormous rate, not in our countries but abroad.

The so-called assistance with all the conditions attached to it, which represents markets and further development for the developed, has certainly been incapable to compensate the sums that leave Latin America as payment of the Foreign debt and as a result of the profits generated by direct private investment.

In a word, we have the conscience that Latin America gives more than what Latin America receives. No solidarity can be based upon these realities. Not even stable and positive cooperation.

In our meetings we have not denounced faults or responsibilities; neither have we elaborated a petition draft.

We state principles that must be respected and specific measures that should be implemented on matters of trade, transportation, financing, investments and invisibles, technical cooperation and social, scientific and technological development. We seek an inter-Amerian relation, just and equitative, dynamic and creative. It will be obtained if the principles are respected and the specific measures adopted.

Among the principles to be respected are:

1. The emergence of a growing continental nationalism that seeks an affirmation of Latin American personality, with conceptions, values and patterns of organization of its own, must be accepted as legitimate and irreversible.

2. The principles which must be borne specially in mind are the following: the legal equality of States: non-intervention in the internal or external affairs of other States through any form of threat to the State as an independent entity or to its political, economic and cultural components; respect for the validity of the treaties; the sovereign right of every country to use its natural resources as it sees fit; and, lastly, the principle that no military or political strings can be attached to financial cooperation. Another equally important principle is that no State may apply or encourage economic and political coercion to compel another State to grant it advantages of any kind; on the contrary, every effort must be made to avoid policies, actions and measures which may endanger the economic and social development of another State.

3. The cooperation to Latin America's development cannot be conditioned to the acceptance on our side of a given political, social or economic pattern.

4. Private foreign investment cannot be considered as assistance, nor can it be counted as a part of financial cooperation for development.

5. Cooperation must meet the necessities and priorities established by the interested nations themselves.

I am not afraid to address Your Excellency in such a clear way, because I know that one of your virtues is frankness. Our position is honest and we are moved by the conviction that it is necessary for Latin America and for the United States of America that our Governments should find ways of living together and of frank cooperation that will be translated into a trustful and friendly relation between our people.

The United States of America and its people can very well understand the spirit of these Latin American positions, because your great historical tradition is based upon the same spirit of profound moral liberty in front of all the realities that are affecting man. The Constitution of the United States proclaimed as the first purpose of its existence, "to establish justice", in absolute terms.

A country that sets itself this moral goal must understand the spirit of justice that moves us.

But we are not only searching for and needing a constructive cooperation with the United States in our geographic area. In order that this should be truly effective, the determining influence this Nation has on the decision of the world organisms and in other areas must be exercised in the same sense.

Our statements are realistic, concrete and constructive.

It is in your hands—at this particular moment of your Administration—to adopt the political decisions to start a new hour of hemispheric cooperation.

These decisions cannot be left for tomorrow. Every day, events show us the urgency with which it is necessary to act and the need to find a new and effective procedure to achieve the dialogue. This urgency is not a rhetoric expression: it reflects a situation that has reached its final limits and might provoke at any moment irreparable actions.

We are here because Your Excellency has expressed that a new policy is required as well as new programs and new approaches.

We are here, convinced that Your Excellency sincerely desires a friendship and a reciprocal cooperation between Latin America and the United States, and because we believe that Your Excellency has the power that is needed to promote this new policy.

Upon solemnly delivering this document in your hands, I take the liberty of recalling your own expressions. The Latin American Consensus of Viña del Mar does not indicate what the United States should do for Latin America, but it proposes what we—you and us—should do together.

The challenge is the same to build free, just, dynamic and peaceful societies.

The methods we have sought have not yielded up to now the expected success. We hope that from the understanding and the response of Your Excellency the dialogue we have been searching for, through ad-hoc mechanisms, practical and of continued action, will be generated.

You told Latin America that your policy would be one of open eyes, open ears, open mind and open heart. Let me ask you at this time to exert also a virtue that has been the key to the creativity of the United States, inside your country and in the open world: an imagination at the same time fresh and sound enough to accept realities unknown before or not yet acknowledged, a comprehensive imagination, capable of warmly identifying itself with others.

This comprehensive imagination is what we expect.

ADDRESS GIVEN BY THE PRESIDENT OF CHILE, MR. EDUARDO FREI, AT THE OPENING SESSION OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF CECLA AT MINISTERIAL LEVEL, VIÑA DEL MAR, MAY 15, 1969

Your Excellencies, Gentlemen: Nothing could give me greater pleasure than to greet on behalf of the Government and the people of Chile the representatives of the Government and peoples most akin to our own; from neighbouring lands and united to ours in a kinship of ancestry and spirit; united too by common interests, by past history and by the future history which we are forming and all imbued by the desire of demonstrating through practical action Latin America's identity.

This meeting fits in with those we have held during past years in this town and in others. It is not a meeting that contradicts former ones or stands above them. It is rather their natural consequence though at the same time it constitutes obvious advancement in the definition of Latin American interests, ideals and objectives and the means whereby to achieve them.

The fact that this meeting should concern our common relation with the United States of America and that they, in turn, should not be present should not be mentioned explicitly. The foregoing conferences to which I have referred, particularly the Meeting of Presidents at Punta del Este and the meeting of the ECOSOC in Viña del Mar itself, logically indicated the need for clarifying our own attitudes at a Latin American forum such as CECLA. The United States of America so understood it too when the idea of this meeting was first raised and this view was expressed by that country's highest representatives. This Conference finally prepares the terms of our position for a direct dialogue with the United States of America.

Latin America must unite its voice and its action. Failure to do so would mean the presence of a permanent element of disorder and frustration which would increasingly affect our life as nations and would cause disturbances throughout the international community. Such united voice and action are also essential for our independent development not only from the economic standpoint but also from that of human growth. Failure to achieve this union would imperil mankind because a Latin American dispossessed of wealth and deprived of security would surely find itself in the axiomatic position that "no one constitutes a greater threat for he who holds riches or power than he who has nothing to lose".

This continent is under going a profound crisis. Historic circumstances could hardly be more difficult and at the same time more passionately interesting. External and domestic pressures, advancing ideas and uncontainable aspirations, a greater awareness in the masses, more knowledge, more information and greater stimulae, are all maturing and increasing speedily in the midst of immense possibilities and dramatic contrasts. Rebellion growth and what barely a few years ago was hardly more than a dream, today constitutes a moderate demand.

Such forces cannot be merely squashed. They should be guided towards the creation of a new awareness. The displacement of irrational movements, in order to replace them by strategies able to attain full independence and full development of all, offer the men and women of this continent a vocation that would vainly be sought were destruction and violence to be adopted as a method and system.

Well worn words and good intentions are no longer the answer. The peoples demand ideas to guide them and actions which could justify their lives. Particularly the youth which populates this continent not knowing whether a real destiny awaits them should receive direct proposals of undertakings that may absorb their energies and constitute a true justification of their devotion. Such programs should stem from significant and irreversible political decisions. It is such decision that we all hope will come from a Conference of this nature. There can be no peace, there can be no rationality, or logical thought in vast masses tortured by poverty, pain and ignorance, lacking faith and therefore courage, determination to win through to victory and the necessary willingness to make sacrifices to achieve the desired result. Hence the importance of the conclusions we may jointly attain.

Concord between countries linked by all kinds of interests and memories, as is the case of Latin American countries, is creative in the political sense both at the national and international levels. Latin American consensus creates the legitimacy of common postulates. Hence the fact that the agreements which you may reach in the fields discussed by the Conference will constitute a further and very decisive step towards a common charter which will link us more strongly within our own Latin American relations and also in our relations with other countries.

We have met to agree upon specific and positive matters that may lead to economic development, social progress and the exclusion of violence and poverty. We have not met only to complain and to make a list of grievances against the powers that have been able to obtain a high degree of development. Theoretical judgments no longer satisfy anyone; on the other hand the establishment of rational terms for a satisfactory economic, financial and trade relationships for Latin America does indeed contain a moral value as well as the obvious physical values; it means more education for our people, greater possibilities of economic growth both at the individual and collective levels, more health for each and everyone of our inhabitants. Let us then replace continuous recrimination by continuous and continuing diagnoses undertaking the responsibility for our own Faith and indicating the paths that we must follow.

Let us cease to blame other whose faults we already know.

Let us understand that progress will never come through the assistance which may be given us; rather it will come because we are willing to defend our objectives and know how to fight for them and how to seek the necessary cooperation for their achievement.

Let us not wait for others to tell us how they are going to help us. Let us rather say how we are going to advance and thus we will be able to undertake a useful dialogue with proper dignity. Let us cease to look outward seeking a yardstick of our own action; instead let us look inward courageously into our own hearts and minds.

I believe that there are sufficient valid reasons for being dissatisfied with the terms in which the relations between Latin America, the United States of America, and other great powers have developed.

This is not only due to others; to a very decisive extent the responsibility for these terms lies with us because we have failed to define, state and defend our principles and rights with clarity, force and in a united manner.

Pray allow me now to state at length what I regard to be our duties: Our first duty as nations and Latin American States consists in reaffirming our independence. Our lives as independent countries stems from the spirit of the men who cleared and farmed the land, built cities, mingled their blood with that of other races and created a code of moral and human values which prevails throughout the continent.

It is Latin America's duty to preserve this heritage; it is not a duty incumbent upon the rest of the world. It will be Latin America's efforts and sacrifices and the foresight of those who look towards a real future for the region that will keep our countries as living cohesive bodies and not as relics of the past or as perennially immature territories.

The problem, however, lies in the fact that Latin America in order to be fully independent and not only in the political sense of the term, must grow and develop; such growth and development requires facing all developed countries, not only the United States, at the same level, without inhibitions, cooperating, negotiating, agreeing or dissenting in the course of international relations. All of this requires a united Latin American position.

Thus the terms of understanding would arise from negotiations with greater powers and will no longer be as they have sometimes been through our own fault the result of a unilateral decision adopted by such powers.

For Latin America to attain the true identity which it seeks, any cooperation received should be born of an agreement between the autonomous parties and not of a monologue of one of them, no matter how brilliant, to which the other countries, "faute de mieux", adhere.

Our Continent's historic destiny is at stake and will be won or lost in the forthcoming years. These are not simply empty words.

None of the existing groupings of countries which have arisen from political, ideological or geographic reasons is either sufficiently broad or wealthy to enfold us exclusively. None of the existing organizations can fully represent what we are and freely accept what we will become.

Our historic salvation as a whole and consequently the historic salvation of each one of our countries, will only be possible through a body of legitimately Latin American objectives, measures and values.

The Latin American system is the most faithful expression of the identity of our objectives and interests and of our commitments toward closer cooperation. It also expresses faithfully our common nature as developing nations.

The birth of a continental system of relations with industrialized countries and particularly with the United States of America promotes efforts towards economic and regional integration but, so far, achievements have been more spiritual than practical. Its political strength stems from the fact that its existence is a necessity; this meeting proves that we are aware of such a need. The United States of North America and its people will easily understand the spirit of these Latin American positions because their great historic tradition is based upon the same spirit of profound moral freedom in the face of all mankind's realities. Their constitution states as a first purpose for the existence of the United States of America "the establishment of justice" in absolute terms and with no exceptions. A country that sets itself such a high moral objective and hence acknowledges man's most important critical faculty, that of dissent, must understand the spirit of justice which inspires us.

In latter years new phenomena have arisen increasing the urgency of a new approach to the relationships between Latin America and the United States of America. I have referred to some of these in the earlier part of my statement; they are connected with the greater awareness which our peoples have acquired regarding domestic and world realities and consequently, regarding our own possibilities and potentials. In turn, this has generated uncontrollable pressures which shorten the terms we had set ourselves for overcoming profound injustices and inequalities. Amongst the phenomena mentioned others are connected with increasing world interdependence. Still others are linked with the fact that the governments and their experts and our thinkers and scholars have identified the factors of development far more clearly and precisely; amongst the latter, external obstacles whose removal is beyond our possibilities and desires if we continue to be divided and confused in thought, are acquiring overwhelming importance. We all know that in existing conditions which prevail in international trade and in the transportation of our products to the major markets continue and present practices which govern the transfer of financial and technological resources are maintained, underdevelopment will continue for many decades and the gap of wealth and power between the world of abundance and the world of poverty will not be eliminated and perhaps will not even be narrowed.

The cooperation of the United States of America cannot ignore such very real and tangible phenomena. Hence the approach towards cooperation which we uphold and which complements commitments entered into under the various systems of the past, should stem from certain new principles in which is implicit a full understanding of the historic circumstances in which our continent is living.

There are some principles in this connection which I regard as basic:

1. It is essential to assert a Latin American personality having its own criteria and values; this is generating an increasing but healthy and justified continental nationalism. The development of our own line of thoughts and the establishment of new patterns of political, economic, social and cultural organizations implies changes in existing structures which affect powerful domestic and foreign interests. These changes of Latin American "national" nature should be regarded as legitimate and irreversible,

2. It is necessary to develop a policy of cooperation with change. Aid cannot be used to maintain the status-quo and to strengthen retrograde structures. The United States of America and the other countries which export capital should clearly distinguish between the interests of a nation and its government and the interests of some of their citizens. These interests cannot be regarded as identical.

3. Latin America requires a major mobilization of domestic savings. Nevertheless, a considerable flow of foreign capital is necessary. The terms in which such capital has flowed has not satisfied development's needs: it is necessary to devise new formulae for accepting foreign capital and to agree upon a common Latin American Code for such investments.

4. The right of Latin American countries to adopt decisions regarding the preservation and utilization of their basic resources within the framework of postulates such as a United Nations resolution on permanent sovereignty over natural resources cannot be regarded as an aggression to anyone. Even from a juristic and historic standpoint the Latin American States inherited from the Spanish or Portuguese crown absolute authority over the manner in which such wealth should be used for the common weal. On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that this basic right of the Latin American States to attend to their natural resources can lead to the rigid institutionalization of situations which may become a form of economic aggression leading to irrational conflicts whose mere existence is disadvantageous for Latin America, the United States or America and all other countries.

5. No type of economic cooperation may carry the proviso that the country receiving aid must submit to a given political social or economic pattern stipulated by the country granting such cooperation.

6. Development plans must respect, within a technical framework, priorities and schemes of action devised by the interested countries themselves as an expression of their autonomy and freedom to seek their own development patterns.

Developing countries' right to use their own human resources to prepare and carry out such plans should be encouraged and granted priority.

7. The disparity between nations today lies essentially in the levels of concentration of knowledge, in the access to knowledge and in the technological application thereof. Latin America's liberation will become possible through new channels for the transfer of technology so that know-how is no longer tied to the properties of the countries providing it because such a scheme syphons off resources, maintains a dependency status and fails to give birth to national and autonomous centers of knowledge and learning.

8. The foregoing principles lead us to conclude that we face the need to set new bases for a new system of relations and it is in the interest to both parties that there should be a mutual understanding of all these facts and realities in order that the change may be effected in an atmosphere of harmony and concord.

The validity of this meeting and of the agreements that will be reached is "revolutionary" in the most profoundly moral sense of the term. This meaning is one which the United States, of all countries in the world appreciates, has practiced and can reiterate in its relations with Latin America both at the moral and at the political levels.

A great thinker whose ideas continue to nourish spiritually the people of the United States, Thoreau, in his work "Civil Disobedience," stated that "to act in accordance with a moral principle based upon what is just and practicing justice alters the relationships of things and is essentially revolutionary in that it breaks off all relations with the previous state of affairs.

What we are now seeking is a change based upon justice. In our personal meeting here and the moral confrontation with the United States of America I perceive the prospect of fruitful economic agreements, bold financial proposals, firm provisos to avoid the excesses which great power or irritational violence can cause. I perceive political understanding amongst Latin Americans which will create mutual competence without arising distrust in countries of other continents. I perceive each nation's liberation from ill judged political movements and irrational and disorganized social pressures, and equally, I perceive that each of our countries will become freed of the unjustified fears caused by the lack of permanent communication amongst themselves. I perceive the liberation of economics and true freedom of thought. I can also foresee new Latin American patriotism nourished by adequate common measures and by shared ideals, by the lack of suspicion and by the confidence in ourselves, in our children and in future generations that may proudly call themselves "Latin Americans".

I am honoured to receive you in Chile. As President of this Southern Republic and on behalf of its people, I extend to you a cordial welcome, a wish of the greatest success in your undertaking.

We are deeply touched by the fact that Ministers of State and high authorities of the sister countries of Latin American should have chosen our homeland to hold so transcendental a meeting. Therefore, I consider it my duty to state Chile's unceasing and unyielding determination to fight for Latin American unity and the harmonious development of our countries.

Since I took office as President, I have enthusiastically devoted a considerable part of my efforts to the creation of the circumstances necessary to make Bolivar's dream come true. Some may have regarded my efforts as absurd and exaggerated, others may have considered me naive. Nevertheless, I am more than ever convinced of the splendid future that awaits our peoples if we are able to overcome past differences, defeat privileges and look towards the future with the peaceful and determined attitude of he who knows how to thank the Almighty for the wonderful tool He has given us to enhance the dignity of every man in America.

SANDOVAL IS DOING A GOOD JOB AT SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, the July 15 issue of the Washington Post carried the extremely good news that the Small Business Administration has reported the largest annual volume of loans in its history.

This record was compiled despite the fact that the agency's direct loans were seriously curtailed late last year by a shortage of funds. Consequently, SBA was able to obtain a much greater share of participation by private banks.

I should note also that SBA's minority loans increased more than 200 percent over the previous fiscal year. To be sure, some rather far-fetched predictions about the rate of increase were made last August, but pie-in-the-sky promises come rather easily in an election year.

Despite the mess he inherited, and the constant harping of some irresponsible critics, Administrator Hilary Sandoval, Jr., has done an outstanding job during his first few months in office. I have personally witnessed the tremendous talents of our new SBA Administrator, and I know he is the man the small business community of this country needs.

Mr. Sandoval has been given a difficult task at a difficult time, but I believe the following article indicates that President Nixon made a wise choice in selecting him to head this important agency.

The article follows:

RECORD LOANS BY SBA

The Small Business Administration yesterday reported the largest annual volume of loans in its history, including a large rise in loans to minority groups.

According to the SBA's figures, it approved 14,234 loans worth more than $660 million during the year that ended June 30. The previous records were 13,835 loans (fiscal 1965) and a volume of $597.7 million (fiscal 1968).

Minority loans jumped from 1676, worth $29.9 million, in 1968, to 4120, worth $93.6 million, the SBA said.

In the regular business loan program, two-thirds of the loans were made by banks and only guaranteed (up to 90 per cent) by the SBA. The comparable figure for 1968 was 39 per cent.

In addition, another 28 per cent of the regular loans were shared by both the SBA and a bank, and only 6 per cent of the total represented direct loans. In 1968, 26 per cent were direct loans.

SBA officials have mixed feelings about bank participation. In general, they favor the trend, but recognize that bank loans—which have no restrictions on interest rates—pose special problems for new minority businessmen.

XUM

> In the minority program, the borrower's contribution (equity) to his business can be reduced from the normal 50 per cent to as low as 15 per cent. But this raises the size of his loan and, consequently, his monthly repayments.
>
> With bank loans, the monthly repayment can grow even larger. As interest rates rise generally, small businessmen are paying more, too. From January to March, the average rate on SBA-guaranteed bank loans was 7.9 per cent, but by June, the average had increased to 8.5 per cent.

EVOLUTION OF THE GEAR ART: A FASCINATING TREATISE

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, when a man highly skilled in the technology of gear manufacturing can find romance and humor in his product, he is rare enough to merit the attention of my colleagues in the House.

Such a person is Darle W. Dudley of San Diego. Mr. Dudley is chief of gear technology at the Solar Division of the International Harvester Co. in San Diego. His latest book, "The Evolution of the Gear Art," has just been published.

I would like to convey something of its fascination. Let me quote him on gear noise:

> In many situations, powerful gears do everything that is desired of them but they make enough noise to impair human hearings. . . . The gear of the future must be a gentleman who speaks with a soft voice. It is becoming uncouth to aggravate people and impair their hearing with noisy ill-mannered gears.

In listing the new developments that will be important in the future, he cites "noiseless gears" and adds parenthetically with saving accuracy and humor—"almost noiseless." In that list I noted that some gears are being designed to operate at temperatures of 1,000 degrees Farenheit or more.

Mr. Dudley was especially interesting on the subject of the "mortise" gear with wooden teeth set in a cored rim in which they are driven and keyed. Surprisingly enough, they are still in demand for mills. Of their use today he wrote:

> The business of making replacement teeth for these mills is mostly handled by the Thompson Manufacturing Company in Lancaster, N.H. In 1967 the president, Robert D. Hilliard, showed the writer through the plant and explained that there was still a very active business in supplying maple gear teeth (literally tens of thousands per year) for use primarily in paper mills, roofing mills, and grist mills for customers in nearly every State east of the Rocky Mountains. Many old mills are scattered throughout New England, upstate New York and Pennsylvania. Most of those mills are still using water power and are carrying on enterprises that go back over 100 years.

Man has been using gears for at least 5,000 years. As Mr. Dudley pointed out:

> The toothed wheel takes its place with the level, the inclined plane, the screw and the pulley as one of man's earliest devices to increase the force that could be applied to an object. The gear has been a basic element of machinery from its earliest beginnings.

Noting that most writers assume that the mechanical arts of Greece and Rome were lost to the world and then rediscovered, Mr. Dudley said:

> Several pieces of evidence indicate that they were never really lost. There are indications that technical knowledege was preserved in the Near East, India and Egypt and then reintroduced into Western Europe. The Moors, for instance, brought many technical ideas into Spain.

Mr. Dudley's history was written for the 50th anniversary celebration of the American Gear Manufacturers Association in 1966 but only now published in a beautifully illustrated volume.

John C. Sears, executive director of AGMA, wrote about its San Diego author in the foreword:

> No one but Mr. Dudley could have written this book because we know of no one so uniquely experienced in the ramifications of the gear field. This was shown in 1958, when AGMA gave Mr. Dudley its highest honor, the Edward P. Connell Award.

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, there have been many eloquent tributes to the late Congressman from the Sixth District of Massachusetts, WILLIAM H. BATES. I thought the comments made on the floor of the House on July 8 were among the most moving.

The directors of the Republican Club of Massachusetts have passed a most fitting resolution in honor of the late and beloved Representative from the Sixth District. I therefore include it in the RECORD at this point:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS OF THE REPUBLICAN CLUB OF MASSACHUSETTS, JUNE 25, 1969

> The story of Congressman William H. Bates is that of a life well lived, but which was cut short at the age of 52.
>
> He served with distinction in the U.S. Navy during World War II and thereafter later rising to Captain in the Naval Reserve. In 1949, when he was on active duty, his father, Hon. George J. Bates, met with an untimely death.
>
> It was only natural that Bill should have been elected to fill his father's place in the halls of the U.S. Congress, which position he held until the time of his death.
>
> He was respected and admired by all of his colleagues and rose to the position of Ranking Republican Member of the Armed Services Committee.
>
> He was a good family man and his place in public life of this community will not easily be filled.
>
> Be it therefore resolved that the Board of Directors of The Republican Club of Massachusetts, on behalf of its entire membership, expresses its sincere regret at the passing of Congressman Bates, and offers its deep sympathy to Mrs. Bates and family; and
>
> Be it further resolved that a copy of this Resolution be spread upon the records of the Club and that a copy of the same be sent to the widow and family of the late Congressman William H. Bates.
>
> WILLIAM D. WEEKS,
> *President.*
> ALBERT M. FORTIER, Jr.,
> *Secretary.*

FREEDOM BECOMES ILLEGAL V

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I think what the people of my State are thinking about the ruling by the Federal court to the effect that freedom of choice is illegal because it does not attain a desired social order is best expressed by a column by Ben Garris which appeared in the July 10 edition of the Denham Springs News:

A RAMPANT FEDERAL BUREAU

(By Ben Garris)

> The 1964 Civil Rights Act states that "desegregation shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance." In the past, Supreme Court decisions have generally supported this command. But not so the Fifth Circuit Court.
>
> No one in his right mind doubts that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare had a big finger in the last decision of the Fifth Circuit Court, which threw "freedom of choice" out the window.
>
> Even the language used in the decisions is that of the fuzzy bureaucrat in HEW who is hellbent on attaining whatever is his personal idea of desegregation.
>
> No one in his right mind can doubt that HEW had a hand in the decision, and knew what it was to be well in advance of its being made public by the judges.
>
> How else was HEW able to throw a bunch of "teams" in the field the very next day, with orders to achieve total integration in all the schools in the South? (Yankeeland is still exempt.)
>
> These teams obviously have express orders, from no one less than Secretary Robert Finch, to be sure that black pupils and white pupils be assigned to schools in numbers that reflect the population percentage of each race in each area.
>
> In doing so, HEW is going 180 degrees against the 1964 Civil Rights Act. They are paying no attention to the language of the laws passed by our representatives in Washington.
>
> Rather, they are doing what they think should be done. They are governing us by edict, without our having any representation at all.
>
> The imposing of the will of one group on another group who have no say-so is called dictatorship, and that, kiddies, is what we have at the gentle hands of HEW. It is the type of situation that brought on the Boston Tea Party.
>
> It is also the type of situation that existed in many Latin American countries just prior to military dictatorships. A rampant bureau like HEW is almost sure to meet the military headon, if left unchecked, as it rides roughshod over the people.
>
> The one consolation is that the military always wins such encounters. Put that is a terribly small consolation. Who wants to be under a military dictatorship?
>
> Judge E. Gordon West of Baton Rouge was the unfortunate soul who had to relay the first Appeals Court ruling that threw out "freedom of choice." He relayed the rulings, but uttered the most critical words about his

superiors we have ever heard from a federal judge.

Judge West told all school boards that they should appeal the case to the U.S. Supreme Court. He said, "I believe a full review of this entire matter by the Congress and by the Supreme Court of the United States is long overdue."

The issue is clear and serious. The issue is simply whether or not the federal courts, by judicial decree, shall be allowed to continue to substitute their version of what they think the law ought to be for what the legislative branch of the government has decreed it to be . . .

"I make these observations because I fear for the very future of the public school system in this country if the federal courts, who have clearly demonstrated their ineptness at running public school systems, persist in their present policy of governing school boards by personal decree rather than simply requiring them to administer the schools in accordance with the clear language of the law enacted by the Congress."

About 100 years ago a very wise Yankee said, "The tyranny of the court is the most terrible tyranny of all. It strikes not only at the action of man, but at his thoughts as well."

SENATE—*Thursday, July 17, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers and our God, direct us in all our doings with Thy most gracious favor, and further us with Thy continual help; that, in all our works begun, continued and ended in Thee, we may glorify Thy holy name, and finally by Thy mercy obtain everlasting life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 16, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JULY 18, UNTIL 11 A.M., TUESDAY, JULY 22, 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be no meeting of the Senate on Monday, in compliance with the President's expressed wish. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tomorrow, it stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. on Tuesday, July 22, 1969.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MUNDT AND SENATOR INOUYE ON TUESDAY, JULY 22

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, July 22, after the Journal, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) be recognized for not to exceed an hour and a half.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I also ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), the distinguished Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS ON TUESDAY, JULY 22, 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), on Tuesday, July 22, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with a time limitation of 3 minutes therein.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOSED SESSION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, under rule XXXV, I move that the Senate doors be closed, and that the Presiding Officer direct that the galleries be cleared.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the motion seconded?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I second the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion having been made and seconded that the Senate go into closed session, the Chair, pursuant to rule XXXV, now directs the Sergeant at Arms to clear the galleries, close the doors of the Chamber, and exclude all officials of the Senate not sworn to secrecy.

(At 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m., the doors of the Chamber were closed.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, would the Chair read the names of those officials who will be allowed, under rule XXXVI, to be in the Chamber?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under section 2 of rule XXXVI, "When acting upon confidential or Executive business, unless the same shall be considered in open executive session, the Senate Chamber shall be cleared of all persons except the Secretary, the Chief Clerk, the principal legislative clerk, the executive clerk, the minute and journal clerk, the Sergeant at Arms, the Assistant Doorkeeper, and such other officers as the Presiding Officer shall think necessary; and all such officers shall be sworn to secrecy."

The Chair understands from the Parliamentarian that "Assistant Doorkeeper" has been expanded to include the minority and majority secretaries.

The Chair would also like to have the Parliamentarian and Assistant Parliamentarian present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed. I thought the two Parliamentarians were on the list.

In addition to that, the joint leadership has asked the Parliamentarian for a memorandum on the question of the Official Reporters. On the basis of previous sessions, I should like to make a unanimous-consent request that the Official Reporters be authorized to be present to take notes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the closed session, the transcript of the remarks of each Senator who participated in the proceedings be delivered to him by the chief of official reporters; that the Senator shall have the right to revise his own remarks; that such Senator shall deliver his revised remarks to the Chief Reporter, who shall then deliver the transcript to the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services; that the expurgated version of these proceedings be prepared under the direction of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), and that there be deleted from the transcript anything which might be classified; that such record of proceedings be made public by being printed in the permanent CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the date on which they occurred; and that the Chief Reporter turn the shorthand notes of the Official Reporters over to the Secretary of the Senate, to be kept in secret and not to be disclosed without leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask a question?

I am concerned only with the preparation that has been made to take care of these notes when they go through the process of the reporters handling them, where they necessarily have to be handled by other people. I assume that that has been checked into.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. STENNIS. Because some of this material could be very sensitive.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is right. The Chief Reporter is personally charged with the delivering of these transcripts to the individual Senators concerned and to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. STENNIS. I was not concerned about that—just the handling of the raw notes, for example.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. STENNIS. It is so easy for something to be lost or misplaced.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—I do not intend to

XUM

object—the officers named by the Vice President do not include staffers, let us say, of either party's policy committee, any party instrumentality, any standing committee of the Senate, or the staffers of any individual Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has the last request been granted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the further information of the Senate, under rules XXXV and XXXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, all confidential communications and all remarks, votes, and proceedings thereon shall be kept secret until the Senate shall, by resolution "take off the injunction of secrecy. Any Senator or officer of the Senate who shall disclose the secret or confidential business or proceedings of the Senate shall be liable, if a Senator, to suffer expulsion from the body; and, if an officer, to dismissal from the service of the Senate, and to punishment for contempt."

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. It will be a live quorum.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Briefly. I want to get going.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator intend to have a brief recess so that we can have lunch?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I had not thought of it. I would suggest Senators might want to have lunch during the live quorum. I think we should keep on going.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), are necessarily absent.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 57 Leg.]

Aiken
Allen
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bayh
Bellmon
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Cranston
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dole
Dominick
Eagleton
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Goodell
Gore
Gravel
Griffin
Gurney
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Hughes
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy
Long
Magnuson
Mansfield
Mathias
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Montoya
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Packwood
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Saxbe
Schweiker
Scott
Smith
Spong
Stennis
Stevens
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. TOWER obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MISSILE TEST FACILITIES AT KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE, AND RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. S. 2546—to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to its consideration.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if we are to have a closed session, can we not have close attention? May we have order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, in light of the discussion of the reliability based on testing of the Spartan missile, it is interesting to note that at 11:50 p.m. eastern daylight time, 16th of July—that was yesterday—there was a very successful launch from the Kwajalein test site and the flight was successful in all of the test objectives.

We have had to date 10 Spartan flight tests. Seven have been successful. Two have been partially successful. There was one failure.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, inasmuch as the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) is eager to make a short speech and then catch a plane, I ask unanimous consent to yield to him at this time for 10 minutes without losing my right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, the issues with which we are grappling at the moment are the gravest and most complex this body will consider for many years. I believe it is imperative that the Senate probe as deeply as possible into the difficult dilemmas which the arms race presents.

As other Senators may know, I have opposed a commitment to deploy an ABM weapons system at this time. That remains my position, although I believe much can be learned from a large-scale test and evaluation of the electronics for such a system. I have been impressed by the argument of such scientists as Dr. Wolfgang Panofsky, Dr. Hans Bethe, and Dr. Gordon Macdonald that an effective hard-point defense of our deterrent is probably feasible and is, in principle, a sensible response to the possibility of MIRV deployment by the Soviet Union. As the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) pointed out in this Chamber some days ago, if we cannot stop MIRV, a number of us may find ourselves more sympathetic to some kind of ABM deployment.

It is my considered judgment, however, that we still have time to seek agreed limitations on strategic weaponry and that we do not have to make the decision to deploy the Safeguard weapons system, or an alternative ABM capability, at this time. I believe it wiser to defer that commitment until we have assessed more completely Soviet intentions in the planned SALT talks. In the meantime it is prudent, I believe, to pursue an active research and development program and to do what is necessary to retain the option of expeditious deployment of ABM should it prove necessary.

In that context, I would like to address one of the most fundamental points which has arisen in the course of our national debate over ABM. A number of individuals, knowledgeable and well intentioned, have suggested that we could best meet a growing Soviet threat to the deterrent by increasing our offensive capabilities. Close analysis of that option reveals it to be both dubious and dangerous on several scores.

There is probably no better prescription for a vastly intensified arms race.

The classified chart I have asked to be distributed shows why this is so. This display has been developed by Alton Frye of my staff, and is largely derived from the seminal work of the famous mathematician Lewis Richardson and recent research on strategic stability by George Pitman of UCLA. However, Dr. Frye has employed specific and classified data regarding the reliabilities and performance characteristics of particular weapons systems; namely, the Minuteman III and the SS–9. Accordingly, this chart is a reasonably realistic portrayal of the likely interactions between United States and Soviet force levels if we enter another round of offensive weapons competition.

Because the data are sensitive, I hope that each Senator will return his copy before leaving the Chamber. I will be happy to see that any Senator who wishes to keep a copy has one delivered to his office for proper safekeeping.

The basic point of the graph is that, if we rely solely on offensive systems to

XUM

meet the possible MIRV threat, the Soviet and American requirements for mutual deterrence will be incompatible until we reach extremely high levels of armaments.

The chart assumes that each side will feel it must be assured of at least (deleted) surviving missiles in order to be confident that it can deter a first strike against its forces. In other words each side must be certain it will always have a second-strike capability of (deleted) missiles.

The upper line, or stair-step curve, shows that if the Soviet Union deploys 500 SS–9's with the assumed capability of delivering three 5-megaton warheads with a 1,500-foot CEP, the United States would have to increase its Minuteman force to (deleted) to be confident—that is, better than 99 percent sure—that at least (deleted) Minutemen would survive a Soviet counterforce attack. But if the United States deploys (deleted) Minutemen with the described capability of only one warhead of (deleted) megatons and an accuracy of (deleted) feet, the Soviets would have to deploy (deleted) missiles to maintain a second strike force of (deleted) missiles.

However, if the Soviets build as many as 1,000 SS–9's the United States would have to deploy (deleted) Minutemen to assure its deterrent capability in this manner. Should this occur, however, the Soviet Union would need (deleted) missiles to keep its deterrent intact.

And the cycle would continue upward. For 1,500 Soviet missiles, the United States would have to build (deleted), for 2,500 Soviet missiles, the United States would require (deleted); for 3,000 Soviet missiles, we would need (deleted). Only at the extremely high levels of approximately (deleted) American missiles and (deleted) Soviet missiles, would a stable point be reached. At that level the projected reliability factors involved in a first strike by either side would not suffice to reduce either side's deterrent force below the specified level of (deleted) missiles.

Obviously, this is not a prediction of what will happen. It is merely an outline of what could happen if the two powers seek to meet the impending deployment of MIRV by continued expansion of offensive force levels. In such a contest stability is extremely precarious, very difficult to define, and more costly to achieve than anything yet contemplated in our discussions.

The oversimplified presentation in this graph deals only with possible interactions between the Minuteman forces and the SS–9's. It does not take account of the several hundred SS–11's in the Soviet inventory or the sizable Polaris force of the United States. But if the Polaris and the Minuteman force are MIRV'ed—and remember this chart only shows the less provocative configuration of a single-warhead Minuteman III—they will exert the same pressures on the Soviet Union to multiply its missile force that I have shown a Soviet MIRV to exert on the United States.

Nor should we readily adopt the frequent suggestion that we can rely entirely on Polaris and abandon the land-based deterrent. We may eventually have to abandon the fixed-base Minuteman force, but if international hostilities are not reduced and the arms race is not curbed, exclusive reliance on sea-based weapons would be hazardous. After all, we should recall that our decision to deploy hardened missiles on land was based on the expectation that missiles would never become accurate enough to threaten them. The declining survivability of Minuteman in the face of technological progress is a caution against any overconfidence that ballistic-missile submarines will be forever invulnerable. It is prudent to believe that, with only 50 or 100 or even 200 Polaris boats, a breakthrough could make them vulnerable.

The general point holds: The notion of increasing offensive forces to compensate for the imminent deployment of MIRV is extremely ill considered. It is a recipe for an arms race such as the world has never seen. We must not entertain the thought that we have an easy or comfortable fallback option of this kind.

I have made this presentation for one reason only: to indicate as forcefully as I can where the priorities ought to lie in our national security policy. We must have prompt and serious negotiations to see if it is possible to stabilize the strategic balance at roughly the present levels. I have made clear my conclusion that we should not commit the Nation to an ABM deployment at this time. Nevertheless, if the arms race continues, I think we should be able to agree that a hard-point deployment of ABM to protect the deterrent, if that proves necessary and feasible, may well be preferable to the oftproposed option of increasing our offensive forces. I understand that to be the view both of Safeguard opponents such as Dr. Bethe and Dr. Panofsky, and of Safeguard supporters such as Dr. MacDonald and Dr. Wohlstetter. On this point there is much wider agreement than the debate may so far have implied, and, given the intensity of this controversy, I believe this significant consensus should be highlighted.

What all this means, of course, is that none of the weapons options before us or the Soviet Union is attractive or economical. There is unprecedented urgency in achieving successful arms negotiations between the two great powers. I hope that every Member of this body will renew his appeal to the President to expedite his efforts in this direction.

Mr. SYMINGTON obtained the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Provided I do not lose my right to the floor. But I would like to get on with this if I could. The Senator said he had to catch an airplane.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, an inquiry. Are we to conduct this in the usual fashion and forgo questioning, or are we going to be allowed to proceed as we normally do?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A question is always in order, the Parliamentarian advises the Chair, provided the Senator having the floor yields for that purpose.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I find myself in great agreement with most of what the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has talked about, but I should like to ask him one question.

Excluding the alternative of successful negotiations, is there any other alternative than the one of buying more ICBM's if we do not provide an ABM?

Mr. BROOKE. Excluding negotiations, I would say that there is no alternative other than ABM.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Of course, this is what has disturbed me to a great degree. We all want to have arms talks with the Russians. I do not think there is any argument about that. But I cannot see any alternative to having to supply this country—the figures he has used, coming up to (deleted), coincide pretty much with the general thinking in the field, if we do not provide an ABM. If anyone during the course of the debate can supply an alternative, I would like to hear it.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I notice that these are labeled "Top Secret," and there are numbered copies.

Mr. BROOKE. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think caution should be exercised to see that they get into the hands of Mr. Trice.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I ask that they be collected, and if any Senator wants a copy, he may secure it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it is with some regret that we have requested this closed session today, and I do hope that it has not inconvenienced any of my colleagues.

Because of the nature of the current problems incident to our national defense, however, and also the logical position of the Defense Department that much of the information given various congressional committees by that Department could only be discussed in closed session, that is the basis of the request.

The premise of these remarks this morning is my conviction that there must be some limitation to the resources of the United States, and that is brought home by the fact that some witnesses have testified that even though the Vietnam war is ended, it would appear doubtful that there could be any appreciable reduction in the military budget.

Some 20 years ago, when the so-called cold war was warm indeed—Berlin airlift, Stalin alive, and so forth—our total defense budget was $13.8 billion. Today that budget is close to $80 billion.

As we face increasing political and economic problems, we know only too well that there are also other great and growing needs which require increasing participation of these limited resources.

As mentioned on the Senate floor yesterday, we have the problems of crime and inflation, and we also have problems incident to education, employment, poverty, transportation, and clean air and water.

It is for these reasons that for some time I have believed we in Congress should exercise increasing discrimination with respect to approval of such new weapons systems as are now requested in this gigantic military budget.

Accordingly, after studying the matter to the best of my ability, last year I opposed the Sentinel ABM system proposed by the previous administration; and today, I oppose the Safeguard ABM system proposed by this administration.

This opposition is based primarily on the following:

First, the five major component parts, some of which have not yet been built, let alone tested, may work properly in the laboratory and in tests; nevertheless, and especially because these component parts were not designed for hard site defense under sudden attack, it is very possible they will not work satisfactorily when ultimately joined together.

Second, one of the two radars, designed for city defense, is admittedly unnecessarily expensive as against what the design would have been if it had been created originally for missile site defense; and it is freely admitted that this radar is even vulnerable to the smaller SS–11 Soviet missiles, of which the Soviets have hundreds.

Third, and to me most convincing, the testimony of the Department of Defense makes it clear that but a slight addition in the production of Soviet SS–9 missiles would not only nullify any protection resulting from the installaton of phase I of the proposed Safeguard system—even if this system worked perfectly—but would also nullify any effective protection which would be provided by the installation of Safeguard phase II.

May I say in concluding this brief introduction that my conclusions have been reached after giving full consideration to the thoughts of all those who are proponents of the Safeguard ABM system; and therefore I would hope with respect that everyone would give consideration to the thinking of some of us who oppose this system, presented herewith.

Now may I proceed to the classified presentation?

THE VULNERABILITY OF THE RADARS OF THE SAFEGUARD ABM SYSTEM

During the hearings and floor debate regarding the deployment of the Safeguard ABM system, there has been considerable discussion about the various components of this system and whether they would work as designed when integrated into "a single functioning unit."

It is a "well-known fact" that the components of the Safeguard system—the Sprint, Spartan, missile site radar (MSR), and the perimeter acquisition radar (PAR)—were originally designed for the Sentinel ABM system, proposed by the previous administration; and also that the latter system was designed for defense of cities, with only incidental protection of Minuteman sites as part of an overall area defense.

The present administration, however, has apparently "ruled out" such a defense of cities as not feasible under current missile defense technology; and in its place has proposed the Safeguard system, for hard-point defense of Minuteman against a possible all-out Soviet attack; and an area defense against a possible future Chinese ICBM threat.

But in spite of this change in configuration of the system—from city defense to "missile site" defense—the components remain the same.

This apparent "mismatch" of components to a revised mission has caused many experts in this field to challenge whether the Safeguard is really the right system to defend our deterrent.

In testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee on April 22, 1969, Dr. Wolfgang Panofsky, director of the Stanford linear accelerator, testified:

> An economical and effective hardpoint defense—that is a defense of sites which have already been hardened to withstand impact of megaton weapons at relatively close distances—requires an optimum design greatly different from a defense of soft targets such as cities. The Sentinel system was originally designed to defend soft targets, but now the same components have been taken over for a completely different purpose.

Dr. Panofsky continued:

> The only acceptable excuse for deploying a system as unsuitable as the Safeguard system for a hardpoint defense would be extreme urgency to protect Minuteman against first-strike attack. As discussed earlier, I do not believe that such urgency exists. Moreover, the Soviets could offset the effect of the present system, with its relatively small number of antimissiles, by increasing their offensive forces correspondingly; accordingly, the effect of the proposed Safeguard system can be nullified by increased enemy firepower of only a few percent. (pps. 1130–1131—Armed Services)

As I shall present later, even on Safeguard 2 it would be a maximum of only (deleted) percent.

During this same series of hearings, Dr. Gordon J. F. MacDonald, former executive vice president of the Institute for Defense Analyses, and one of those witnesses whom Secretary Laird suggested the committee might hear, expressed concern that the Sentinel components adopted for the Safeguard system "had been developed for a purpose very different from that of protecting relatively low value targets such as missile sites."

Dr. MacDonald also voiced his reservations about the system when he stated:

> The technology used in Safeguard is not optimal for the total job of defending the deterrent. The components are expensive. They were designed with high value targets, cities, in mind. These components may be what is required for defense of elements of the command system, but the Minuteman fields could be better defended with lower cost, short range radars and Sprints. Research and development need emphasis, so that new opportunities for more effective systems will develop.

Perhaps the most mismatched component of the Safeguard system is the missile site radar in that its transfer from a role of city defense to missile site defense makes it highly vulnerable to attack. In recent testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations, Secretary Laird acknowledged that "the radars, both radars, are the most vulnerable parts of the system. This is the most vulnerable component, and that is why we deploy the Sprints around the radars themselves in order to protect the radar in case the Spartan missiles, with their area defense capability, should have a failure."

The Secretary did not mention in this open session, however, the number of Sprints it is planned will be deployed around these radars, nor the fact that this number makes it relatively simple for an attacker to overcome the defense, and knock out the radar.

The vulnerability of the MSR radar is particularly crucial because this is the component which not only operates in concert with the perimeter acquisition radar—PAR—in tracking the incoming vehicles, but guides both the Spartan and Sprint missiles to the point of intercept.

If this MSR is blinded or knocked out, then the entire missile defense ceases to function. It does not operate like a rifle, a case where once the bullet is fired, the gun is no longer of use in reaching the target. The MSR must continue to guide the missile after launching until the incoming vehicle has been intercepted.

In other words, if the MSR radar is put out of commission between the time the Safeguard missile is launched and the time it would have been successfully guided to intercept, there would be little or no chance of the Spartan or Sprint reaching target.

Although the actual hardness or P.S.I. of the MSR radar is classified, public testimony has already revealed that it is less than one-tenth of the hardness of the Minuteman silos it is designed to defend—more on that later.

In this connection, it should be noted that whereas primary concern has centered around the threat of the Soviet SS–9 missile to our Minuteman force, the MSR radar, because of its relative softness, is also vulnerable to the smaller Soviet SS–11 missile of which they reportedly have (deleted).

In effort to explain the background of the currently proposed Safeguard ABM system, I would emphasize that whereas the Minuteman missile program is an Air Force program, the Safeguard ABM system is under the direction of the Army; and it was the latter service which, beginning in 1956 with the Nike-Zeus program, was assigned the task of developing an ABM system for the defense of cities and an area defense of the continental United States.

It was to that end that the major portion of anti-ballistic-missile research and development has been aimed; and which resulted in the recommendation to deploy the Sentinel ABM system as a defense of population centers; and also a light defense of the entire Nation.

But because the Air Force was naturally concerned about the future survivability of its Minuteman force, should a credible Soviet threat develop, that service requested a number of studies concerning hard point defense of the Minuteman silos.

One of these studies which was recently brought to my attention is a classified report by the Institute for Defense Analyses. According to the Institute's own definition this report "embodies the results of a major research project undertaken by IDA and is intended to be an authoritative contribution on its subject."

Although a considerable portion of this report is technical, I believe all Senators would be interested in the comments and recommendations contained therein, particularly in view of the fact that the institute's recommendations to the Air Force for a hard-point defense of Minutemen are quite different from those set forth in the proposed Safeguard deployment under the direction of the Army.

In the opening summary of conclusions, the report states:

> As is pointed out in several of the following sections, active hard-point defense requirements are much different than those for urban defense.

With respect to the radar component of an ABM system, the report makes the following observation:

> A radar for hard-point defense is expected to meet different requirements than a radar designed for a large city defense. Its hardness should be comparable to the hardness of the silo it defends, while its cost should be low enough to make hard-point defense economically attractive.

Moreover, it is further suggested "that the number of radars used be approximately 50 percent of the number of silos to be protected. The use of a large number of radars is proposed, so that the radars do not become particularly attractive targets for the enemy."

Now it is extremely important for all of us to note that this proposed Safeguard ABM system does not meet any of these suggested requirements made to the Air Force for hard-point defense of Minutemen.

May I repeat that, Mr. President: Its hardness should be comparable to the hardness of the silo it defends.

The hardness of the Minuteman silo it (deleted) PSI and the hardness of the MSR radar is (deleted).

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri explain that PSI?

Mr. SYMINGTON. PSI is a term which I was going to explain later, but actually it is the resistance strength, based on the amount of concrete that is located to defend the target in question.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Moreover, it is further stated: That the number of radars used be approximately 50 percent of the number of silos to be protected. The use of a large number of radars is proposed so that the radars then become particularly attractive targets for the enemy.

We have exactly one radar for every battery.

Now it is extremely important for all of us to know that this proposed Safeguard ABM system does not meet any of the suggested requirements made to the Air Force for hard-point defense Minuteman—not one.

The hardness or PSI of the MSR radar is approximately (deleted) PSI or less than one-tenth of the (deleted) PSI of the Minuteman site; therefore "not comparable to the hardness of the silo it defends."

More later about cost.

In addition, it is planned that there will be 12 MSR's and seven PAR's if phase II is fully deployed. This is only 19 radars for 1,000 Minutemen, far from the 500 radars recommended by the report in question; in fact, only four MSR's would be deployed in the Minuteman fields in direct defense of those missiles.

Let us note that the organization which made this report is not headed by any former Air Force or Navy officer, many of whom are in strong opposition to this proposed Army Safeguard system. It is headed by Gen. Maxwell Taylor.

In its conclusions the authors of this Institute of Defense Analyses Report make the point that any ABM which we might deploy should be deployed to meet a real threat—and not an imaginary threat posed by theoretical U.S. technology.

Mr. President, as this is a closed session, I should like to bring up something that I think is important and, in a way, distressing.

It is my understanding that this IDA report is only one of several which were submitted to the Defense Department; and that there is also one, entitled "Radar for Hard Point Defense." This latter is by the Aerospace Corp.; and for many weeks we have been requesting both these reports, as well as some others. I have been repeatedly requesting them and I have now finally received the one that I am reporting to the Senate on this afternoon.

The Defense Department tells us, however, that the only one they can find to date is the one referred to above, which we understand from the scientists, is, nevertheless, the least critical.

There are a number of experts in this field who have expressed grave concern that this Safeguard system is a "mismatch" of components to the purpose intended; also that the radars could be far more effective at much less cost; also that to date it is clear ABM research and development has been directed primarily toward city defense. I would earnestly hope that the Senate would support in every way further research and development as expressed in the Cooper-Hart amendment rather than agreeing to deployment at this time.

Mr. President, a friend of mine, Dr. Edward Teller, whom I have known since the beginning of missile development, perhaps longer than any other Member of the Senate—I have often seen quoted. He was in my office the other day, and I said, "Edward, you are on a sticky wicket on this. You told one of my colleagues that you could interlock these radars, and you know that cannot be done because there is only one radar. How can you interlock something into itself?"

He replied, "But you could redesign the radar."

I asked, "If you admit it has to be redesigned to work, why do you now want to deploy it?"

So as to present what an Achilles heel this radar as currently planned for Safeguard really is, let me read a summary of some statements from Dr. Panofsky. They are clear and concise:

> Valid technical criticism relating to the Safeguard System derives from the fact that the highest priority mission of the original Sentinel System (which in turn was derived from the earlier Nike-X was defense of *cities;* when defense of the deterrent became the primary mission of Safeguard the original components were changed in *siting,* but were not redesigned. As a result the weakest part of the Safeguard System lies in two areas: (1) the inadequate number of anti-missiles, and (2) the vulnerability and design of the MSR radars. As a result of these weaknesses the Safeguard System as now conceived will do very little in protecting Minuteman even if it works perfectly as designed; and the inadequacies of the radar can only be cured by an alternate radar system which would be conceptually quite different from the MSR's.
>
> It simply does not make sense to protect an entire field of Minuteman missiles costing a few million dollars each with a single radar which costs $150 million, and which in terms of "hardness" or vulnerability is more than ten times inferior to that of the missiles it protects. Clearly such a radar would become the primary target of attack and would itself have to be heavily defended to survive. Therefore, any adequate defense of Minuteman should incorporate a multiplicity of radars—

Which is what Dr. Teller was getting at—

> so that loss of any one of them cannot blind the total system.
>
> This, of course, is economically disastrous as long as each radar costs as much as the MSR. Fortunately the mission of defending Minuteman is vastly simpler than that of defending cities, and therefore it is indeed possible to design cheaper and smaller radars which could be economically deployed in considerably larger numbers, possibly one radar per 1–4 missiles.

He does not say 1 to 2, as the Institute for Defense Analysis does; he says 1 to 4. We have, as the Senate knows, one radar per battery, one to (deleted).

I continue to read:

> I believe that should a decision be made now by the Department of Defense to undertake vigorously the RDT&E of simple radars specifically adopted to the simple mission of hardpoint defense, then actually better and cheaper protection could be bought for Minuteman at an earlier date than is possible with Safeguard.
>
> This is particularly true since it appears promising that adaptation of simple radars already developed might well offer a rapid solution for defending Minuteman against the SS–9 threat.

Mr. President, I have here one short page of previous floor statements made, I am certain, in good faith, with respect to the position of component parts. Inasmuch as we sent a staff man to Kwajalein last week, and he was well briefed before he went, I would read this page of facts as against statements previously made in this debate. Those are as follows:

The statement: "All the components have been tested."

The facts: the PAR has not even been built, let alone tested; and the PAR computer is scheduled for completion in the first quarter of 1971.

The MSR at Kwajalein has had some preliminary tests, and is scheduled to track an ICBM for the first time in (deleted) 1969; but the MSR computer does not yet have its necessary software.

The statement: "Both the radars have been built in model form" at Bell Laboratories.

The facts: There are no PAR models at the Bell Laboratories or anywhere else.

The statement: The interceptor missiles of Safeguard have been used successfully against missiles sent from Vandenberg Air Force Base.

The facts: The Spartan and Sprint have not been tested against targets. The first Spartan intercept at Kwajalein is scheduled for 1970. The first Sprint firing at Kwajalein is scheduled for [deleted] 1970. The Sprint is being developed at the White Sands Proving Ground.

The statement: The Safeguard system has been tested as an integrated unit in the area of Kwajalein.

The facts: There is no intention to build the system as an integrated unit in Kwajalein. The only components which will be built at Kwajalein are the MSR, its computer, and Spartan and Sprint launch cells. Some of these have not yet been built, much less tested.

COMMENTS RE CLASSIFIED ABM CHART

Now I would like to refer to the chart.

It is a matter of common knowledge that for months I have been urging the Defense Department to make public a chart which they have presented in executive session to the Armed Services and Defense Appropriations Subcommittees not only to the Armed Services Committee, but to many scientists around the country; and four experts immediately got in touch with us and said, "The chart proves our case." I asked the Pentagon to declassify the chart. They said, "No." I took all numbers off the chart, all numbers except the numbers of missiles. I took off the 5-megaton estimate, and also the quarter of a mile CEP. Nevertheless they would not declassify, even with all those numbers off.

This chart shows the effectiveness—or lack of it—presented by Safeguard against the Soviet threat to Minuteman sites.

Unfortunately, although the Pentagon has seen fit to declassify statistics and other information with respect to said Soviet threat, this particular chart, along with vital statistics concerning Safeguard's ability to meet the purported threat, remain classified.

I now welcome the opportunity to present this chart and its significance to the Senate in this closed session; and only regret that the same information is unavailable to the American public, those who are being asked to pay for this multi-billion-dollar system.

I suggest to the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), who has been so helpful, that perhaps the Vice President could see the chart if we could turn it another way.

Mr. **PASTORE**. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, it was in the best spot. We decided that long ago.

Mr. **SYMINGTON**. Will the Senator from Rhode Island help the Senator from Tennessee? I suddenly noticed the Vice President could not see it. I certainly did not mean to be rude.

This same chart was presented by the Defense Department to many scientific experts, including Dr. Wolfgang Panofsky, director of Stanford linear accelerator; and it is his opinion, as well as that of many other experts, that the Safeguard package the American taxpayers are being asked to purchase is not worth this heavy investment.

For example, the first phase of Safeguard—that is, deployment at Malmstrom and Grand Forks—provides virtually no protection for Minuteman, a fact the Defense Department apparently now admits. During the recent Armed Services hearings on Military Procurement, the distinguished senior Senator from Maine asked:

> In the event that Congress approves Phase I of the Safeguard program, is it not true that this phase alone would afford no real protection to our missile force?

Deputy Secretary of Defense Packard replied:

> It is correct that the Phase I deployment provides very limited protection for the two Minuteman sites.

Only a short time before, however, Secretary Laird stated that phase I of Safeguard would protect about 30 percent, or 350 of the total Minuteman force with a "thick cover"; and it is this type and character of discrepancy in the position as to just what this costly system will accomplish that reinforces the need for every Senator to be aware of all the facts.

Here is something interesting. Despite the fact the membership of the Foreign Relations Committee is three less than the membership of the Armed Services Committee, after those two committees were thoroughly briefed on the ABM system, 17 members of the combined committees are against the ABM, and 14 for it. One member of each committee has not yet expressed his position. I am grateful for this attendance, because it is my conviction that if and when the facts become known we will want to continue with the R.D.T. & E., but not deploy something obviously wrong for the job to be done.

With that premise, I now present a blowup of this chart, reproduced from the original, except the original did not have color; the one before us does.

Let me first outline the assumptions on which the chart is based, as well as additional assumptions by the Defense Department with respect to the Soviet threat.

First. The Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles referred to are SS–9's, each with three 5-megaton multiple independently targeted reentry vehicle, MIRV—not MRV—warheads, with a quarter of a mile CEP. Circular error probable is a measurement of the warhead's accuracy and means that 50 percent of the arriving warheads will fall within a specified radius and 50 percent will fall somewhere outside that radius.

At this point, we should note that the accuracy which the Pentagon has assigned to these SS–9's on the chart is far greater than any currently known accuracy of any Soviet missile.

It is also assumed that the Soviets will have MIRV, not MRV, warheads by the time frame in question, 1974–75.

Second. Another premise of the chart is that our Minuteman sites will remain hardened to the same extent they are now—(deleted) pounds per square inch. No consideration is given to the possibility of more hardened silos, which is being researched at this time.

Third. The Defense Department allows for an 80-percent reliability factor in the number of arriving Soviet missiles. In other words, it is estimated that without any defense, if the Soviets fired a thousand warheads at the U.S. Minuteman force, approximately 800 would reach target, and moreover, the Defense Department assumes that the Soviets will have capability to instantaneously retarget additional missiles to make up for those 20 percent which fail at launch.

Mr. President, I have studied that particular aspect, and have grave reservations about it; but in any case, it must be accepted to obtain the 80-percent reliability.

Fourth. The Defense Department assumes that at least (deleted) Minutemen must survive an all-out Soviet nuclear attack if we are to have adequate second-strike capability; as we know, second-strike capability is the ability to respond with sufficient force so as to inflict unacceptable damage on the enemy.

Now let us turn to the chart itself. The figures on the vertical axis of the graph show the Minuteman surviving after arrival of the number of warheads that are represented on the horizontal axis of the graph. In effect, therefore, if the Soviets deliver successfully 1,000 warheads, they would knock out nearly all our 1,000 Minuteman. Only about 50 are estimated to survive such an attack.

As we look at this chart, please remember it was submitted to us by the Pentagon. The straight diagonal red line on the chart shows what a Soviet attack under the ground rules laid down by the Defense Department, would do to our Minuteman without any Safeguard protection.

The blue line shows what protection would be obtained by the phase I deployment of Safeguard, that is, with (deleted) Spartans and (deleted) Sprints; and the green line shows what protection would result from the deployment of the 12 sites of Safeguard, phase II, of our Minuteman defense, with (deleted) Spartans and (deleted) Sprints.

According to latest intelligence—which is really interesting—the Soviets have currently approximately 230 SS–9's. If they do, with three MIRV warheads on each, that would give a total of 690 warheads. With an 80-percent reliability factor, 552 of the 690 would reach effectively the same number of Minuteman silos—this with no Safeguard protection.

According to this chart, that attack would leave us some 500 Minutemen intact—far more than enough to provide what the Defense Department states is necessary to assure second strike capability.

By 1974, the year it is estimated phase I of Safeguard will be deployed, the Defense Department estimates that the Soviets could have 420 SS–9's, which would mean they would have a total of 1,260 warheads.

Once again, under the same ground rules, all favorable to the Soviet Union, 1,008 warheads would arrive successfully,

XUM

and all but some 50 of our Minuteman force would be destroyed—this without any Safeguard protection.

With phase I of Safeguard, however, the chart shows that, with 1,000 arriving, all but 135 to 150 of our Minutemen would be destroyed. This is far below the number of Minutemen the Defense Department asserts are needed for an adequate second strike capability.

Under phase II of Safeguard, that is, full deployment of the now $10 to $11 billion system, again according to their chart—from (deleted) to (deleted) Minutemen would be protected from such an attack. In other words, under ideal conditions, the full system as now envisaged might protect the minimum number of surviving Minutemen considered necessary for second strike capability.

Therefore, I am sure all Senators will note with interest that an increase of not more than a few tens of (deleted) SS–9's, which would be no problem whatever to the Soviets within the time frame considered, would reduce the number of surviving Minutemen well below (deleted). In other words, that relatively very small additional production efforts of approximately (deleted) percent—and all of us who have had any experience in production know the relative simplicity of just adding on to what is going out the end of the production line—would nullify any Minuteman protection that could come from the installation of this proposed Safeguard system; and this would be true even if the full 12 Safeguard sites were installed.

Referring again to this chart, these (deleted) additional SS–9's would give us a total of (deleted) warheads, with approximately (deleted) arriving successfully. Note that these (deleted) successfully arriving warheads would reduce the number of surviving Minutemen well below (deleted)—that is, well below the number the Department of Defense estimates as necessary to survive. Again, and to be sure every Senator understands, this would be true even after phase II of Safeguard was deployed. In public testimony, Dr. John Foster, the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, has predicted a possible SS–9 force in 1975 of 500, and in 1976 of 600. In this connection, it is important to note that if the Soviets did produce this number with MIRVed warheads, these very facts and figures from the Defense Department prove conclusively that all the billions it is planned to spend on Safeguard, as this chart so well demonstrates, will have been wasted.

In addition, these figures on this chart are presented with the premise that the Safeguard ABM system will work as designed. Any deviation in its performance due either to failure of radar or the computers, or in the missiles themselves, would, of course, further decrease any possible effectiveness.

Let me emphasize that in this presentation we are accepting the Defense Department's most favorable assumptions regarding the capabilities of the Soviet Union with regard to numbers, accuracy, and warhead capacity within a particular time frame.

It is significant to note also that the Soviet Union and the United States could reach a meaningful agreement concerning arms limitation—and every thoughtful person could only have fervent hope to that end—then the threat to our Minuteman force by the present Soviet SS–9 force would not be nearly enough to threaten our second strike capability.

On the other hand, if the arms race continues to spiral, and the Soviets do deploy (deleted) MIRVed SS–9's, then our Minuteman force would indeed be vulnerable without some form of protection. But this chart reveals conclusively that this Safeguard ABM is not the right system to meet this threat, should it materialize; and that is the chief reason why some of us oppose its deployment without further research and development to make it right.

No opponent of Safeguard would be against protecting our deterrent capability if in fact that capability was becoming vulnerable. But it is clear to me, and I have done my best for many months to understand that Safeguard is not the right way to accomplish that end.

Those who argue in this case that some defense is better than no defense, in effect, are misleading the American people, because it could be extremely dangerous to our national security if the American people were led to believe they could rely on a defense which later turned out to be no defense at all.

It is also important to consider whether or not our current deterrent capability is really being threatened. In this connection, let us remember that the Defense Department chart I am presenting to the Senate today deals only with one aspect of our deterrent force; namely, our land-based ICBM's. No mention is made of the 41 Polaris submarines, shortly very possibly to be multiplied in effectiveness by the Poseidons, our some 650 nuclear armed bombers, our more than 7,000 tactical nuclear weapons located in Western Europe and on surface ships, as well as in other locations around the world.

In this arsenal, the United States has the capacity to destroy the Soviet Union many times over; and they, too, can destroy us. This is Mr. Churchill's "balance of terror." As has been pointed out earlier in this debate, the important point is to make sure, first, that we do have adequate deterrence; and, second, that this position is fully known to any possible aggressor.

Let us note also that the points I have set forth with respect to this Defense Department chart are in reference to an attack by a certain number of SS–9's on our Minuteman silos.

No mention whatever has been made, however, about the effects of an attack by Soviet SS–11's—that smaller missile of which the Soviets currently have (deleted)—if the Soviets made what would appear a logical decision to attack the extremely vulnerable missile site radars which are the key to the Safeguard system.

What has worried us as much as anything elise in the debate is that, time and again, the proponents of the system get off discussion of the system itself and talk incessantly about the danger of the Soviets. I agree there is danger from the Soviets, having run the Berlin airlift myself, and was at the meeting in the Pentagon in March 1948, when we got a telegram from General Clay.

The Soviets are dangerous, and the Chinese are dangerous. I am only sorry we are not closer to the Soviets, because they are killing Chinese, and the Chinese are killing Soviets.

The proponents always talk to us about the danger. They come up with a new danger today and almost every day. It is like going to one of those famous oil well dinners designed to promote an oil company's interest. With the first course they say, "A new well was discovered today." Then we have dinner. They then say that two new wells—two new dangers—have been discovered. By the end of the dinner, there are 10 new oil wells, and the issue is oversubscribed. I have been through this, and am sure others have also.

The proponents say we have a new Soviet danger, but there are a few dangers also around this country.

A great Missourian, Mark Twain, once said:

> Courage is recognition of fear, mastery of fear; not absence of fear.

The opponents of this system talk about the fact they do not think the system will work; and that, even if it does work, it does not give any real protection.

I pledge the Senate that I have never tried to understand anything since I came to the Government a quarter of a century ago more than I have tried to understand this decision.

It is a matter of public record that the MSR has less than one-tenth of the hardness of a Minuteman silo—to be exact in this closed session, whereas the pounds per square inch of the Minuteman silo is (deleted), the MSR pounds per square inch is only (deleted)—and the destruction of this relatively soft radar would blind the entire system, because it is this MSR radar which guides both the Spartan and Sprint to its intercept.

Accordingly, if we charted the results of an all-out Soviet attack on the radar by the smaller SS–11's, the effectiveness of the system would be even less.

Whenever the problem of overriding or saturating Safeguard is raised, Defense Department witnesses, as well as other proponents of this particular ABM system—and this is a very important point, in my opinion—reply that if the Soviet threat develops further, we could add more Sprints, Spartans, and radars to the system.

It would seem to me, therefore, that proponents of Safeguard actually agree with the opponents, in the Safeguard is not really the system they desire; rather they favor a thicker system, and support the Safeguard ABM to that end.

If a thicker system is actually what the administration is planning, then it is important for the American taxpayer to be aware of that thinking; because the addition of more missiles and radars, especially as presently designed, would escalate the cost of the ABM system tens of billions of dollars beyond the present estimate of $11 billion for phase I and phase II—we had that testimony in commitee from the proponents of the system—an estimate which all previous experience demonstrates will be far lower than actual ultimate cost.

Do not forget, as we go into this venture, that we had two studies, the details of which were brought out by the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE).

One stated that 12 weapon systems, taken at random, had an average cost increase of 220 percent.

Another, later, by the famous Brookings Institution, states that systems studied showed the cost increases as high as 300 to 700 percent as against the original cost estimate.

We are considering a system that even its greatest advocates will admit could be improved in design, because it was never designed to do this particular job.

In summary, it is vitally important that every Senator knows all the facts about the type and character of ABM system the administration is proposing; and I would respectfully hope that the above presentation has been useful in pointing out the limitations of this system, as well as the need for further research and development before actual deployment is considered.

Mr. President, I seldom take the time of the Senate on the floor. Let me express my gratitude first for the attendance and second for the kind attention paid.

I will be glad to try to answer any questions.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for an extremely able presentation.

The Senator from Missouri is the one Senator who serves on both the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee. In this dual capacity, the Senator has an opportunity to give double study, so to speak, to the problem.

Two Senators serve on both the Foreign Relations Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. One Senator serves on the Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee. Of these four Senators who have heard secret testimony and have participated in their analyses on two committees, three oppose the deployment of the ABM. And this includes senior Senators, diligent Senators. The opposition includes, let me point out, the ranking minority member of both the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee. So, this is in no sense a partisan issue.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Disarmament, I have presided over two extensive hearings on this issue when it was previously before Congress. We decided to hold them in executive session.

The Senator attended nearly all of them. The subcommittee concluded at that time—almost unanimously, as I think the vote was on the floor—that it was not wise to deploy the Sentinel model of the ABM.

But few of us, however, took an active part in the debate. I did not, and I will tell the Senator why I did not. I thought there was some protection in the Sentinel model of the ABM. That is, it proposed some possible protection of people in cities in case of atomic war.

I had doubt that it was needed, that it would work, enough doubt that I voted "No." But I had enough concern that it just might reduce the loss of life in case of an all-out attack that I did not take any active part except to make a very brief statement.

Now, when was it changed from the Sentinel model of ABM to the Safeguard model of ABM? It was changed overnight—not I believe upon recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Why was it changed from the protection of people in the cities to the suggested protection of missile complexes in North Dakota and Montana? Because of some commotion around Boston and Chicago and Seattle. This was a quick decision. But the decision was not made, as the able senior Senator from Missouri has so effectively pointed out, to change the components to serve a different mission. Indeed, there is little difference now. I do not know of any difference. Does the Senator know of any difference in the components of ABM in protecting cities and that which is proposed now?

Mr. SYMINGTON. With the possible exception of the software that would go into the computer, I know of no difference.

Mr. GORE. Which has not yet been made.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct. It has not yet been placed into the computer, and we have letters from some people working on the system who do not think that it can be placed in the way they say it should be.

Mr. GORE. With this very brief background, I hope the Senate will understand now why the Subcommittee on Disarmament, which has held extensive hearings on this—and I think has probed it to the depths of our capability—has come out so nearly unanimously, if not unanimously, in opposition to its deployment.

We conclude, No. 1, that it is not necessary to protect the integrity of our deterrents. If it is not necessary, then who would wish to embark upon this doubtful but surely expensive mission? If it is necessary to protect the integrity of our deterrents, then I respectfully suggest that far more than the Safeguard ABM model would be needed. Indeed, as the Senator has pointed out, instead of adding to our security, this would lessen our security in more ways than one, but certainly in one important respect—by giving to the American people a false sense of security.

So with this brief analysis of my own conclusion, I hope at a later time to deal with the technical phases.

I wish to thank the able Senator for dealing with the technical questions in a very expert way.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from Tennessee.

Those of us who have children and grandchildren do not look at this problem as one which should be considered in any political sense. Rather what is best for our country. Over the years I have been directly connected with national defense, I have become convinced that with the proliferation of nuclear weapons, the one great contribution which our President could make in the next $3\frac{1}{2}$ years is some meaningful form of arms agreement with the other super power.

It is a privilege to say, on the floor of the Senate, that no one has worked to that end more consistently and in a more dedicated fashion than the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. First, I wish to compliment the Senator. I think he has made a magnificent presentation of the case as he has seen it, as already has been remarked, from both the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services; and likewise the Senator from Tennessee, who is chairman of the subcommittee which held the hearings in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator has done a thorough job, in my opinion.

I have a great many secret documents taken in our committee, particularly from the CIA, which are available; and at a later time, if there seems to be interest in them, I should like to present them.

I should like to throw out this suggestion, because it is very unusual to have a meeting such as we now have. I do not recall seeing so many Senators on the floor of the Senate, listening attentively, and with such conditions in which they could hear, as I have seen here today. It is a great compliment to the Senate as well as to the Senator from Missouri that he has had this attention.

This is an important matter, and I do not wish to presume to dictate any procedure; but since the Senator from Missouri has made, in my view, such a complete statement, I would, with all deference, suggest that I should like very much, before I engage in debate, to hear from the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, if he does not object to that. I simply wanted to put this matter in perspective, so that I and other Members of the Senate could then address our questions with the background of both of them, because we will not have other days like this, I assume. I do not remember having a day like this in my 25 years as a Member of the Senate.

If that meets with the Senators' approval—I do not wish to cut anybody off—I should like to hear the other side; in other words, to join issue.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In reply to my distinguished colleague, I have already talked with the able and distinguished Senator from Mississippi and told him that under no circumstances would I interfere with anything he would like to say.

XUM

Some of us have worked hard on this matter. It is known that at least the top of the Pentagon, top to bottom, is strong for the system, although some of the others are not so strong.

I should like to yield to two Senators who rose, and then I would be glad to yield to him all the time he would like.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr STENNIS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Arkansas has made an excellent suggestion—to get this matter in issue on the scientific or technical points involved.

My remarks on the ABM never have been intended to include those features of it. We have on the Committee on Armed Services a gentleman who has been a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, also, for a number of years—the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON). I have asked him, as well as other Senators who so desired, to prepare on this phase of it. He is prepared, as are other Senators.

The Senator, without losing his right to the floor, wishes to yield to Senators who can help him, and I think that is fine.

We had an understanding, and after the Senator from Missouri has yielded to those who have helped him, I think that would be the time to let the Senator from Washington give the other side of the matter. I hope that will be agreeable to the Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as we all know, the leading advocate in the Senate for the Sentinel system was the Senator from Washington; and the leading advocate in the Senate, certainly, on this side of the aisle and in committee and in the scientific fraternity is the Senator from Washington. I am anxious to hear anything he has to say on this vital matter.

The Senator from Mississippi announced he would like to have a closed session. I said, "When would you like to have the closed session? After we have debated the issue in open session or immediately after your statement?"

He said he would like to have it immediately thereafter. I said, "Reserving the right to object, I would not object if we may have a second closed session."

Then the Senator from Mississippi decided he did not want a closed session. But I began to think about it. In spite of all the propaganda flowing through the biggest organization in the world, the biggest business in the world, and an organization which represents the biggest manufacturers in the world—fine and able people; I mean no criticism of any kind—but in spite of that of the two committees which have been given all the facts, one committee being the Committee on Foreign Relations which has three members less than the Armed Services Committee, 17 members of the combined committees are against deployment of this system and 14 members are for it. When that thought occurred, I thought, "A closed session might persuade a majority of the Senate, which has the ability to reduce the dreadful albatross of taxation we are saddling around the neck of the people of the United States."

Every Member of this body wants the right defense, whatever the cost, but nobody wants a defense that is not necessary, because if we do not have credit problems in this country and currency problems abroad, I do not know my own name.

Following that thinking, it is my privilege to yield to the Senator from Washington. In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I am glad to yield to floor.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I think that will serve the purpose.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I think we have had a most valuable session this afternoon and I hope all Senators can stay to the conclusion of the comments of the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Washington because it is important that we all get both the pros and cons on this important issue.

There is only one point I would like to make that requires this executive or secret session. I have tried, as has the distinguished Senator from Missouri, to spend as much time as I possibly could on this particular issue of the ABM.

I have looked at this matter from the perspective of a naval officer, which I was 25 years ago here in Washington. I was in charge of production control for aviation fire control instruments for the Navy, and after the war a defense contractor for 20 years. It is that background that I hold in common with the Senator from Missouri.

I know that in all those years of production the greatest mistakes I ever made were when organizations, whether they be Navy or civilian, rushed me into production before the design or system involved was really ready for production.

In fact, almost without exception when I did so against my better judgment and because some proponents said we had to go into production—or in this case deployment—we have actually lost time because the very same people in design, development and research departments, once production is begun, are not installed from the problems production. The work of design, development, testing, and evaluation is impaired because you are over here now producing and you have been frozen into a design which, if it is not ready for production, can end up in a countless grief.

If we take the simplest problems in production and compare them with the highly complex system here involved, we can visualize the kind of grief we might have.

The information on which I base my judgment is I believe sound. It was arrived at quite independently from the testimony, some of which is brand new to me, that we have had this afternoon.

The information I have on the MSR, missile site radar, is that many people in the Department of Defense itself know that the MSR is too vulnerable and much too expensive—$150 to $165 million now estimated, for one single installation—and not designed essentially for the job of point defense. It is designed also for area defense and in fact it was designed primarily for that purpose. It is unwise to rush into deployment of this system, which has now been moved back to Montana and South Dakota in its first phase. It has not been publicly revealed, and that is why I have never commented on it, but I can assure Senators in this session that from every source I have been able to check with, the Department of Defense has now established a panel of technicians and scientists, and they have been directed, on what might be called a crash basis, to do something about redesign of the MSR.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad the able Senator brought this out.

Mr. PERCY. Highly qualified scientists tell me that the MSR should be redesigned for this new mission of Safeguard. What is needed is a multiplicity of more precise, more easily hardened, and invulnerable radars.

This is not to mean that we must start all over again, and this was what concerned me so much originally. If we had to start all over again, it would take years to do it. I think there is now an insight into the problem indicating that the existing air defense radars provide a point of independence for the development of such new type radars that might be required. Maybe we need 500 such guidance radars, not just 12.

I would like to ask——

Mr. SYMINGTON. Before the Senator asks his question, I would like to relate one story, very short about why, even if the units worked perfectly separately, they might not work when put together.

For many years I was in the electrical business. The company had a license from the Radio Corporation of America in the days of the ascendency of David Sarnoff. It was a tough license. We paid them a heavy minimum and 7 percent of sales; and in addition RCA kept the best circuit of the time—the superheterodyne circuit. We were only allowed to build an inferior circuit, the neutrodyne. We had to sue for a license. He compromised the suit and we obtained the superheterodyne. As everybody knows, a radio consists of two circuits, a radio circuit and an audio circuit. In an effort to meet Christmas trade with the new circuit, we took the radio circuit just released and put it with the audio circuit. The trouble was that, when put together, the superheterodyne circuit destroyed the tone quality of the audio circuit. So we were in deep trouble. Both worked well apart. Neither worked when joined.

All this ABM business has to work instantaneously, in case of a sudden attack remotely comparable to December 7, 1941.

Mr. PERCY. The Senator from Missouri's experience is similar to mine. Could I ask the Senator this question: A great deal has been said about the SS–9 and its tremendous power and the number of SS–9's which the Soviets have. But, would it even be necessary for them to use the SS–9 to knock out in effect this whole ABM Safeguard system? Could they not use (deleted) percent of the existing store of SS–11's, or (deleted) SS–11's which have (deleted) each, to knock out all 12 MSR's without anywhere near the degree of sophistication and accuracy needed to knock out the ICMB's bordering missile cities and not even touch their store of SS–9's?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have not extrapolated, as he has on (deleted), but why would anyone want to use a weapon of the size, type, and character of the SS–9 to destroy the Safeguard system, when they could use a much smaller and much less powerful weapon, of which they have many more, to destroy Safeguard. According to testimony, they could do so without difficulty because of the lack of almost any PSI incident to the MSR?

Naturally they would attack and destroy the radar to blind the effectiveness of the Safeguard missiles.

Mr. PERCY. In effect, what we are being asked to do is go into production and deployment on the Safeguard system and to say thereby that the design is certified and is ready for production without feeling that it is.

My own independent analyses indicate that this system is not ready for production. I think that when I saw some of this information for the first time this afternoon, and heard about the expert testimony we now have from Kwajalein, that they are not even scheduling tests until 1970 or 1971 on certain parts of it, I am reaffirmed in my thinking, as I was when I saw the $400 million requested in this authorization bill for research. Many of us opposed to deployment and going into production have been quite willing to say, "Do not cut 1 penny out of the authorization. We are not asking for it to be an expense-reduced item. If they can find other places to spend money for research and development, evaluation and testing and redesign, spend even more than is being asked to accelerate that end of it, but do not go into production until, (A) we see whether we can both go out of business, as the President and the Secretary of State have said, or, (B) we know that we have a sound design."

I would ask Senators to take into account the grief all of us have witnessed in our past experience in going into production on military designs when we were not ready for them.

Take the M–16 rifle. When they jammed at Vietnam, many young men were killed as a result. We suffered a great deal of difficulty trying to produce that rifle. Yet we have been making rifles for many, many years. We also remember the grief we suffered trying to correct the difficulties once we were in production on the M–16 rifle, because the production line was going, and only one source of supply was available at the time.

The Sheridan reconnaissance vehicle was sent out to Vietnam to go into combat, and the first one that went out was split up the belly by a 20-pound mine, killing its commander. The repeated failures of the vehicle and its fantastically expensive modifications were revealed to the House of Representatives in an investigation it carried on, on a design put into production before it was really fully tested, evaluated and ready for production.

Of course, I do not have to remind Senators about the F–111. All members of the Armed Services Committee now in the Chamber know all about that. But that airplane was produced and deployed even though the avionics and the wing pivot section had not been perfected. If we had waited until that design was ready and not let someone rush us into it, men would not have been needlessly killed and we would have saved months and probably hundreds of millions of dollars.

The Cheyenne helicopter was put into production even though the rotary blades did not work properly. After crashes, production was ended, and the system is now back in research and development.

The Minuteman II ICBM was actually produced and deployed before the guidance system was perfected. For months, this country had less deterrent and second-strike capability because nonfunctioning Minuteman II missiles had replaced many effective Minuteman I missiles. After months and many modifications of the deployed missiles, the problems were finally overcome.

Then there was the Navy's subsonic plane, the A–7, which was put into production with guidance systems and avionics problems still unsolved. Extensive modifications caused the plane's price to skyrocket. Many people really would like to see it absolutely canceled.

Talking about a defense system, I happened to be at NORAD a few years ago when I was in business, at the very moment that NORAD sensed on its radar screen what it thought was a missile coming into this country. The coincidence of my visit and that occurrence would not have happened in many years. I was there with a group of industrialists—five of us in there, and we witnessed the confusion and chaos that reigned. I certainly witnessed the imperfections of our NORAD system at that time. We wondered later whether it would not be better to remove the NORAD defense establishment which was in Colorado, housed in frame buildings. The control building was in an above-ground building. Any saboteur could have thrown a bomb over the fence and hit it. Would it not have been better, we thought, to put the whole system somewhere else and make it impregnable and test it properly before depending upon it. We know it has now been buried in the mountains and that the system has been vastly improved. I think it would have been better to have improved it more in the first place.

That is all I would urge in this case. We know we need to have the technology. We do not want to shortchange one bit the development of this system. But we want the right system. I do not see how, today, we can say that we have the right system. Certainly I would hope that while we perfect it and use that time to perhaps gain time by getting the right system, perhaps we can find out whether the Soviet Union has a community of interest with us in trying to cut out this kind of weapon.

I take the President and the Secretary of State at their word, verified by the distinguished Senator from Washington, when he said on the floor of the Senate a few days ago—and wisely so—that he would like to see negotiations go ahead and get underway.

I cannot perceive that not going ahead right now will in any way shackle the President's hand in negotiations.

I keep wondering why the Russians do not seem very much concerned about our ABM's. I do not think they really are. It is no secret to them. Most of the scientists in this country think it is not worth very much. The Russians know they can knock it out. They know they do not have to use SS–9's to knock it out when they see its vulnerability, and we see the vulnerability of what they have got around Moscow right now.

I went out in a Polaris submarine several months ago and talked with the crew to see what they would do to get through the Russian ABM system. Admiral Smith is the head of the missile section there, and he was with us, and they were not impressed by the Russians ABM system. They told me it was no problem, that they could penetrate it or saturate it, and they could use one more missile than they possessed.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri. He has made a very valuable contribution here. I know that all of us who have made up our minds to date will continually try to keep our minds open as we listen to the evidence from men whose judgment is respected. We have in this Chamber 100 men who honestly have different points of view and are earnestly seeking the right answer.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin and then will yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. NELSON. I just have a brief question: Is this the chart that the Senator referred to in his nationwide television broadcast when he said to the American people that if they could see the chart, they would be overwhelmingly opposed to deployment?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is the chart, yes.

Mr. NELSON. Do I understand my mathematics correctly that with all the assumptions the Department of Defense makes, when they deliver 1,000 warheads we will have only 50 to 100 surviving ICBM's? Is that correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Let us put it this way. The figure of futures which they used on Monday, which they say is the right figure, is 420. Multiplying that by 3 gives 1,260. Eighty percent of that for reliability gives 1,008. If we had 30 additional missiles we would have a net addition of 72 warheads on target, which would give us 1,080. If we go to 1,080 there is no question, based on the chart, that the Soviets would destroy more than the (deleted) Minutemen considered necessary to maintain deterrence. We would not have anything like (deleted).

Mr. NELSON. When I said "1,000," I meant targets for 1,000, whether they were of warheads of one kind or another.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The figures of 1,000 and 1,080 are presented.

Mr. NELSON. If the Soviets have deployed them and they bring 1,450—is that the number?

Mr. SYMINGTON. It would be 1,400 on the chart.

Mr. NELSON. If they bring them in, we reduce our deterrent to practically the same level.

XUM

Mr. SYMINGTON. If they go far enough. If they added 500, or 600 SS-9's, which Dr. Foster said they might do, there would be no protection whatever.

Mr. NELSON. So we would be back to what it would be without an ABM at all?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is right.

Mr. NELSON. Upon this matter of manufacturing sufficient warheads?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is right. Nobody has ever said up to now that this system could not be saturated. What I have tried this afternoon is to show how easily it could be saturated.

I yield to the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, Members of the Senate, our purpose today is to secure information which has not been heretofore available, particularly classified information. I will not make an exclusive argument on the ABM system, but I want to present some classified information.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator speak a little louder?

Mr. COOPER. I said that I want to present classified information, before the proponents of the system speak. The Senator from Missouri has referred to the chart as posed by the Department of Defense. In the words of Secretary Laird, referring to page 27 of the report, with a force of 420 of SS-9 missiles, with an assumed failure rate of 20 percent, the Soviets could place on the Minuteman fields about 1,000 warheads. He estimates a failure of only 20 percent, although many scientists have testified that the failure rate would be much higher, and I believe the Senator from Missouri would agree.

The Secretary of Defense—and I say this with respect—has presented rather firm estimates of the capabilities of the Soviet Union and has been very precise about the number of warheads which could be delivered upon Minuteman fields. There is an element missing from his presentation. If it is assumed that one warhead from an SS-9 can destroy one Minuteman, a rate of 20-percent failure, then we have to assume that at least one interceptor, a Sprint or a Spartan, must be available to destroy an incoming SS-9 warhead, if the Safeguard is to be effective to protect the Minuteman.

I heard a scientist testify yesterday, and others have testified previously, that the first phase of this system is a research and development demonstration; they have testified that if Sprint and Spartan are to be successful as interceptors, it would require more than a 1-to-1 ratio. The command posts also must be protected; the radars, if they can be defended; and the city of Washington. One would have to assume that a large number of Sprints and Spartans is required.

If I am wrong in my next statement, I will expect the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) or the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) to contradict me. I have searched the record, I have read the report and the testimony in volume II of the hearings on Safeguard. I cannot find any information regarding the number of Sprints or Spartans which will be deployed to intercept incoming warheads. Yet the number of Sprints and Spartans bears not only upon the effectiveness of the Safeguard system but its cost. I have said that, if an ABM should cost $100 billion and would protect our country, I would vote for it; but we have the duty to examine its cost if it is not effective.

The administration provides the estimated cost on page 27 of the report. The first-phase $26.5 million is allocated for Sprint; $76.6 million for Spartan and about $250 million for ground equipment, and $300 million a year will be required for its operation. Additional funds are requested for research and development because it is admitted that the system is not ready for deployment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The figures I have given have to do only with defense of the missile sites. We know that full deployment will include (deleted) interceptors, (deleted) Spartans and (deleted) Sprints. The Spartans would have to be discounted for hardened site defense, because they would be used for area defense. Of the (deleted) Sprints, only (deleted) will be deployed in defense of Minuteman missiles. The remaining number will be around the MSR's and at other locations around the United States, in defense of bomber fields, or the command and control center in Washington. This is to say, it is only for the defense of the Minuteman. Therefore, only those designated for that specific defense were included in the chart submitted to the Armed Services Committee and to the scientists.

If the Defense Department has changed its mind and intends to deploy a greater number of Sprints and Spartans and radars, then, as I said, it should inform the American people that the system will actually be more expensive than originally estimated. If they have added to a poor system, why not redesign it so as to have a system specifically designed to do the job intended? I mention that because the Senator has raised the point.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, that is the point. I will read classified material furnished me. If the system is to be effective, additional missiles will be required to intercept the incoming warheads, as the Senator from Missouri has demonstrated. As I could not find any evidence in the record about the number of Sprints and Spartans planned, I wrote the Secretary of Defense. I will place his answers in the RECORD. It is unclassified, except for one question.

I asked, "How many Spartans and Sprints are to be deployed?"

His letter gives the number for phase I, that would be deployed in 1974.

The letter is dated June 23, 1969. I ask the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, if it is proper to read and place in the RECORD?

Mr. STENNIS. I expect it is; this is a closed session.

Mr. COOPER. I believe so.

The letter reads as follows:

DEAR SENATOR COOPER: Enclosed are answers to the 10 questions posed in your letter of 12 June with regard to the Safeguard ABM system. These pertain just to the Phase I system which is all that the President has requested.

The letter did not provide information about the number of Sprints and Spartans that would be needed if the full system should be deployed.

To go on with the letter:

The attached material is unclassified but, to do this, I found it necessary to omit the following classified information from the answer to question one regarding the production schedule:

The classified material deals with the Intercept missiles.

Spartan and Sprint missiles, quantity, January 1974 and July 1977

Spartan missile:	
January 1974	(Deleted)
July 1974	(Deleted)
Sprint missile:	
January 1974	(Deleted)
July 1974	(Deleted)

The total of Intercept missiles by July 1974 is (deleted) and of Sprint missiles (deleted).

I hope this information will be helpful.
Sincerely,

JOHN S. FOSTER, Jr.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD. I make the point that the number of Spartan and Sprint missiles to be deployed is an essential factor bearing upon the effectiveness and cost of the Safeguard system. Yet no public information has been provided on this subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(DELETED)

DIRECTOR OF DEFENSE RESEARCH
AND ENGINEERING,
Washington, D.C., (deleted).

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR COOPER: Enclosed are answers to the 10 questions posed in your letter of 12 June with regard to the Safeguard ABM system. These pertain just to the Phase 1 system which is all that the President has requested. The attached material is unclassified but, to do this, I found it necessary to omit the following classified information from the answer to question one regarding the production schedule:

	Quantity
Sprint Missile:	
January 1974	(Deleted.)
July 1974	(Deleted.)
Spartan Missile:	
January 1974	(Deleted.)
July 1974	(Deleted.)

I hope this information will be helpful.
Sincerely,

JOHN S. FOSTER, Jr.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. With the approval of the Senator from Washington, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. As I understand, the Senator from Washington will come next?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes. I asked the Senator from Tennessee to get permission from the Senator from Washington, or I could not yield to him.

Mr. GORE. I asked the Senator to yield only because this has a direct bearing upon the conclusion which he and many of his colleagues have reached, that even if deployed, the ABM's would be easily saturated.

I now wish to read to the Senator the testimony—I was conducting the examination at the time—of Mr. Richard Helms of the CIA, who says the Soviets reached the same conclusion about their ABM's around Moscow that the senior Senator from Missouri has reached about this proposed deployment.

A lot of people ask me, when I am home, "Well, why have the Russians built an ABM, if it is no good?" One might as well ask why the French built the maginot line.

But anyway, to make it brief, I should like to read. This is Mr. Helms:

(Deleted).

Senator GORE. (Deleted).
Mr. HELMS. Yes, sir.
Senator GORE. OK.
Mr. HELMS. (Deleted).

I read that to show that according to the CIA, the Soviets reached the same conclusion about the limitations of their ABM's that the Senator has reached about this proposal.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from Tennessee; and yield the floor to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, do I correctly understand I am recognized in my own right?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I think the sensible thing to do at this point is to follow through on the chart, the so-called Panofsky chart, that has been presented here by Senator SYMINGTON and discussed here this afternoon. I should like to present the chart with some supplementary follow-on overlays.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, while we are waiting, if the Senator will yield, I do not know why the chart is called the Panofsky chart, because the chart was submitted to the committee by Dr. Foster, and it was also submitted to the Armed Services Committee by Secretary Packard.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I refer to it as the Panofsky chart for the reason that he himself has made an issue of that chart, and the able Senator from Missouri has discussed Dr. Panofsky in relation to it.

I think the controversy, basically, gets down to this chart and I should like to talk to the Members of the Senate here very informally about the real meaning of the chart.

Now, looking at this chart, gentlemen, it is quite clear that the real problem represented here is the possibility, in the mid-1970's—1974 or 1975—that the Soviets will be able to lay down what we commonly refer to as about 1,000 RV's—meaning reentry vehicles—whether they come from a single propulsion system, or whether they come from one missile with three reentry vehicles. So we are talking about warheads or reentry vehicles, for which the common parlance is RV's.

What this chart says is that if the Soviets continue to build up their SS–9 missile force and we do nothing, then we will get into trouble. That is not surprising, we have been saying that all along. If we do not do anything now and the threat continues to grow we will be in trouble.

If you stop with just this initial chart, it gives the impression that we could never maintain the minimum requirement of (deleted) surviving Minutemen. The point is that if the threat continues to grow we are going to have to meet it. We cannot allow the Russians to get us down below the (deleted) Minutemen.

Let me just turn now to a follow-on overlay. This puts in perspective, with this overlay bar across the chart, the minimum requirement on a survivable Minuteman force.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The figure the Senator has is (deleted). We had (deleted). Am I in error?

Mr. JACKSON. Well, there is argument as to whether it is (deleted) or (deleted).

I think, however, the able Senator from Missouri would want also to put this into its full proper context, and that is, this is the minimum requirement of Minutemen only. This requirement takes into consideration that there will be some survival of both B–52's and Polaris.

Let us understand that point very clearly. Let us not get the idea that if there are (deleted) Minutemen, or (deleted), we can deter the Soviets with the force, and that force alone.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, we were told (deleted). Has that now been changed to (deleted)?

Mr. JACKSON. This is the figure I have been using. As I understand, it is (deleted). Some say it is (deleted) to (deleted). This is the figure that was given to me. And this is what this overlay to the chart is based on.

So that we know where we are with reference to the SS–9, I think it is well to point out that the Soviets have exceeded the NIE—that is the National Intelligence Estimate—of last year as to what we thought they would have at this time in the way of SS–9's deployed or under construction.

That estimate was 250 SS–9's by calendar year 1969. What we find is that right now the Soviets already have (deleted) SS–9's either deployed or under construction on site. So, they have a capability on the way right now—using the same general factors that the Senator from Missouri referred to, allowing for 80 percent reliability—it could be 75 or 80 percent reliability—(deleted) to have about 600 reentry vehicles. It would be 80 or 75 percent of (deleted) times 3.

There is a big argument as to whether it is a 75 percent or 80 percent reliability. But 80 percent is a pretty high figure. Let us say 75 percent. The total, therefore, is around 600 reentry vehicles.

The time period we are basically concerned about is 1974–75. The big argument has been whether the Russians will be willing to go to 420 SS–9's. The Secretary of Defense has referred to that number of SS–9's which could give the Soviets as many as 1,260 RVS.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I took the figure not only of 420, which would be 1,260, but also the figure of 500, which would be 1,500, and 600, which would be 1,800 RV's into consideration. So my extrapolation actually embraced a greater Soviet potential.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, to make it simple, we must talk about the number of reentry vehicles. The figure for RV's used in the so-called Panofsky chart is 1,000. So this is the basis on which we are discussing the issues at this moment. Now, we can see that with phase I of Safeguard, if the threat grows as pictured, we have about 120 to 150 surviving Minutemen. Without Safeguard, that is, with no protection, we would have just 50 Minutemen surviving.

I take it that all Senators would agree that when the Soviets see we are going ahead to protect our deterrent, they may be discouraged from spending the money to go to 420 SS–9's. SS–9's cost in terms of dollars about $30 million apiece. And 400 of them would cost $12 billion. We are hoping—and I take it that we are all hoping—that the Soviets will be interested in connection with the SALT talks to reach an agreement to limit the number of SS–9's.

Let us get something very clear. We are trying to protect a second-strike force.

If the threat continues to mount we will have to meet it. If the Soviets elect to develop the capability to go after that second-strike force continuously, then we have to respond by providing that added protection.

The chart presented by the Senator from Missouri, without this overlay, leaves the impression that we cannot do more to protect our deterrent. The point is that if we go to phase II of Safeguard, we have a capability of providing protection, and we will be able to help save again (deleted) Minutemen.

Then, if the decision is made by the Soviets to keep on producing SS–9's, or some follow-on missile, we can increase our protective response. I assume that all Senators are determined to protect the credibility of our Minuteman retaliatory force and do not wish to let the Russians get us below (deleted) survivable Minutemen.

Bear in mind that the Soviets are already going beyond what we anticipated with the SS–9's. If they keep building up, what do we do about it?

I suggest that we have two alternatives at this time—perhaps three.

One is to go ahead and add protection of Minuteman by the ABM.

The other is to go ahead with more offensive Minutemen and Polaris. The figures will show, if we increase our offensive systems, that the cost will run almost 2 to 1, Minutemen versus ABM, to provide the survivable numbers.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, does

XUM

that include the cost of the necessary new radar?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; I have those figures. If we go ahead with Minuteman and build up to about 2,000 missiles and silos for survivability the cost would be about $9.3 billion. If, on the other hand, we go ahead with Safeguard and include the additional MSR's, the cost would run about $5.2 billion. Those are the figures that are available.

I mentioned the Minuteman.

Another approach is to go to a hard rock silo.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I want to be sure that we are talking about the same thing. Does that include new radars, a new design, or just one radar, as it is now?

Mr. JACKSON. I believe it is based on the same philosophy that we are applying now.

One alternative to ABM is to go to the hard rock silo. What we would do instead of relying on (deleted) PSI is that we would go to (deleted) PSI. However, with respect to the (deleted) PSI's, or hard rock silos, as accuracy of adversary missiles improves, violence is done to the hardening. Hardening can be overcome by improving accuracy.

It seems to me when we get down to the fundamental question, that it is better to provide for a defensive system that will still give us a credible deterrent, rather than substantially augment our offensive systems which move, I am sure, will be treated by the Russians as provocative and more destabilizing than our defensive ABM. If we are interested in successful SALT talks we should favor the defense alternative at this stage, rather than more nuclear offensive capability.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, yesterday in nonclassified testimony, Dr. Herbert York and Dr. Ruina, both of whom have had a long association with this policy, testified that they believed the improved accuracy of the vehicle—that is the reentry vehicle—would increase to the point where our silo or any fixed Minutemen was obsolescent; and they believed that none of the Senator's alternatives was proper, even if it were hardened. I believe they agree with what the Senator has said. The alternative that seemed to be in their minds was to make this mobile—either mobile in the sea, as with additional Polaris or similar to that, or mobile on land, on something like railroad cars. In other words, what they were saying is that what you are doing in putting in a Safeguard is to try to protect an obsolescent system, and they thought this was a very bad investment.

Mr. JACKSON. That is interesting, because when Dr. York was before the Committee on Armed Services—and I think Senators who were present will corroborate it—a month or two ago, his position was that if we have to do something about the SS–9 and if the Soviets go on to these projected figures, then it would be better to have more Minuteman, more Polaris.

I think the effect of what he had to say is that what you need is an active defense.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Dr. York?

Mr. JACKSON. That is the burden of his argument.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not understand that.

Mr. JACKSON. It is very simple. It is that you cannot provide security solely and simply by hardening. If you rely solely on digging a hole big enough for protection, you would not get it. That is what I am saying.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. When the Senator talks about protection, this point about the hardening, are we assuming that the premise is that we have to take the first blow? Is that what we are talking about? Or are we talking about hardening of our silos, of our own offensive missiles?

Mr. JACKSON. We are talking about providing protection for our offensive missiles.

Mr. PASTORE. In other words, the opposition is anticipating that the best kind of defense is our offense and wait to be hit first?

Mr. JACKSON. No. I think that what we are saying, as the able Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY) so ably stated on the day before yesterday, is that the President should have the additional option of being able to protect our deterrent by having an active defense.

For example, he should not be in the position, if a couple of missiles come over, that he must shoot the works at whoever is shooting the missiles at us. The missiles might be coming from some secondary nuclear power—not the Soviet Union.

We want to give the President that additional option, which he should have, and which, in fact, should be of some reassurance to the Soviet Union itself.

So we continue to address ourselves now to the basic question of what we do about this growing adversary nuclear missile threat in the time frame of the mid-1970's and beyond. I think it is quite clear that the sensible move here is an act of defense—to add protection of Minuteman. This is precisely what is proposed in Safeguard Phase I.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for some questions?

Mr. JACKSON. If I may just finish this presentation, I shall try to be generous about yielding time.

Now, suppose the Soviets continue to increase the RV threat. If they build up beyond 1,100 and go up to almost 1,400 reentry vehicles, we could then add four more missile site radars, which would cost $700 million—still maintaining the 200 minimum survivable Minutemen.

Now, here is an interesting point. If the Russians continued to pursue their three warhead configuration of 5 megatons each it would cost the Soviets $3.6 billion to neutralize this step of defense which we could make at a cost of $700 million.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. To be sure we understand, I went as high as 600 SS–9's in my extrapolation. The weakest testimony Dr. Foster gave was his effort to justify the SS–9 cost. We have no idea of what is the missile cost to the Russians. As the Senator from Wisconsin has pointed out, we do not know the details. There is great difference of opinion about it. Actually, they can sell $10 billion worth of oil for 10 percent less, and can charge it off as a political expense. So I challenge anything about what they would do that has to do with the dollar value of a ruble under their system.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, we had the privilege of hearing the Senator from Missouri without interruption, and I think that under the circumstances we should have the same privilege with respect to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I respect what the able Senator from Utah has stated. I asked if I could keep the floor, and then agreed not to keep the floor.

This is the first and only time I have been engaged in this debate. The Senator from Washington was not present all the time I spoke. If he does not object, I do not see why the Senator from Utah objects. But I will not interrupt again.

Mr. BENNETT. May I say, as a Member of the Senate who has not participated in these discussions in those two special committees, we become more confused by interruptions. It is much easier for us to hear the story out.

Mr. JACKSON. Let me just say that if the Soviets go on building up the threat, electing to take that course, we will have to add to the Safeguard system. But what I am pointing out is that in terms of dollars and in terms of relative resources, they are going to have to pay a very dear price. I do not care whether at any given stage it is measured as $3 billion versus our $700 million. The key point is that it costs much less to add protection to Minuteman by an ABM than it costs the Russians to try to offset the ABM. Moreover, the Soviet GNP is one-half of ours.

If I correctly understand the opponents of the ABM system, the big argument that was made before one committee, the committee of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE), is that the Soviets simply do not have the resources that we have and that there is a real need in the Soviet Union to cut back on some of these costs in the military area; that, therefore, there is a good chance to reach an agreement to reduce or limit nuclear weapons.

I would hope that is true. In any event, the Safeguard ABM is a signal to the Russians that the prospect is poor that they can ever remove our second-strike capability. For we can offset their big offense investments with relatively cheaper defense arrangements. That is the real meaning of the so-called Panofsky chart, which I hope the overlays I have provided have helped make clear.

The basic question that the Senate has to decide is what means we are going to recommend to protect the minimum number of survivable Minutemen we must have to assure deterrence and prevent a thermonuclear holocaust. That is the issue.

I submit that it is far better to provide for an active defense—at least at this point in history—than to go to more offensive weapons or to rely on hardening at this time. That is really the nub of the issue.

The big argument is made, "Let us research the ABM some more." Well, if we were not deploying the ABM at the present time, if the President had not recommended it, the argument almost certainly would be that "We have been researching this since 1956; when are we going to deploy it?" Would that not be the argument?

The suggestion is that we go out and do some more research—put Phase I of Safeguard at Kwajalein. It will cost—check this figure carefully, because this gets to the heart of the Senate's decision—$2,165,000,000 to go to Kwajalein. We can go to the two sites in North Dakota and Montana—which is part of a continuing R. & D. effort—for $2.1 billion. Bear in mind that after we have invested all that money at Kwajalein, if we decide to go ahead with Safeguard, we will then have to spend $2.1 billion all over again here in the States.

In addition, by reverting to R. & D., we are going to incur a nonrecoverable loss of over $300 million in termination of production of components that were authorized for fiscal year 1969.

I want to make clear what we are talking about.

The proposal to limit the Safeguard program to research and development and testing on Kwajalein is not a compromise. It is a defeat for the program. Obviously, after all of that is gotten into place out there in the Pacific it would hardly be defending strategic sites. It would be defending those atolls which have no strategic importance at this point of time.

On the other hand, by going ahead with Phase I as recommended by the President, we would be providing protection for two sites, one at Malstrom and the other at Grand Fork, with 150 Minuteman missiles in each wing, a total of 300 Minuteman missiles.

What sense does it make to pay such a high price simply for the symbolism of taking Safeguard out of the country? This step would also delay deployment of Safeguard for at least 2 years.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, Admiral Rickover said that after all the R. & D. in the final analysis the only way to find out if something will work is to haul off and make one of them. We talk about R. & D. but the T. & E., testing and evaluation, have been left out. I do not see how anybody can argue logically that we can do it better than in place at the sites.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator has made a very good point. I wish to follow that up. This is not the first time we have had this argument. I have been involved in national security since I was in the House of Representatives, when I was on the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. In 1949 we had to make a decision on whether or not to go ahead with the hydrogen bomb. I was one of five men on the subcommittee appointed by the late Brien McMahon to make a recommendation. We were operating in an environment where every member of the prestigious General Advisory Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission—the only one absent was Dr. Glenn Seaborg—recommended that we not go ahead with the hydrogen bomb, and for the same kind of reason heard now in opposing going forward with the ABM.

I need not repeat the story. Our subcommittee recommended that we go ahead with the hydrogen bomb. The gentlemen who were opposed were a "Who's Who of American Scientists." As things turned out, the Soviet H-bomb test came about the same time as ours at Eniwetok and was also a successful one.

I do not get excited when scientists recommend this or that. One can find distinguished scientists on all sides of a question. I find them more reliable when their opinions are on matters of their own disciplines, rather than on morals or theology.

The argument is made we should research the ABM more. What we have done historically for certain key weapons systems is to move concurrently with research and development on the one hand, and to start production on the other.

That is what we did with the successful Polaris system. I was one of the movers on the Polaris system to get the program going. We were told it would not work. We heard that argument over and over again, the same argument now being made against the ABM. I must say it was a little embarrassing to find that shot after shot of the Polaris missile they were firing from that special ship that was rigged up, proved to be one dud after another.

I suppose it is pertinent on this day to remark that we were not exactly proud of Vanguard because of its blowing up on the launch pad—our first effort in space. But did that mean we would not launch a rocket? If we listened to the timid ones, we would have abandoned the effort. I remember that period after the Russians successfully orbited sputnik in October 1957. Then, in December, we had a total failure and could not get off the launch pad. We had the same thing with Polaris. Do we want to talk about Titan? It was one failure after another at the start.

With respect to Polaris and Titan we undertook research and development and testing at the same time as we manufactured and commenced to deploy these strategic systems. That is what is now called for with the ABM.

Do Senators want to do research and development and have a weapons system deployed in the Kwajalein Islands where it has no strategic value, or, do the research and build the PAR and put it in at those two sites in North Dakota and Montana where we can help defend 300 Minuteman missiles?

I submit that the Kwajalein proposal does not make sense if you are interested in saving time and/or money. You are going to spend the $2.1 billion in Kwajalein in research and development and have nothing to show for it.

I wish to touch on one or two other matters. All this talk about the MSR and how vulnerable it is, is completely understandable. It has an overpressure limit of (deleted) PSI as against (deleted) PSI. But what the critics are not saying to you is that we have those radars heavily guarded and that while we have an 85-percent reliability with Sprint, the system is going to be designed so that interceptors which fail will be replaced immediately by other interceptors. When one Sprint fails, another comes in afterward. This tactic is known as shoot-look-shoot. With 118 Sprints you should have a capability of intercepting 100 warheads.

One thing that is not usually mentioned by the opponents of ABM and explains why the numbers are so classified is that the enemy does not know which of our MSR's we are going to defend. He would have to shoot at all of our MSR's. He has to shoot at all of them because he does not know which ones are going to be defended. That gives us added capability of being able to knock down the adversary warheads coming in.

Obviously, as I have pointed out, the problem of defending our cities against any large attack is well-nigh impossible. All the opponent has to do is get one warhead through on a city and they have got it. We are talking about defending cities and hard-point sites. We are not talking about apples and apples; we are talking about apples and oranges.

What we are talking about in defending Minuteman sites is not knocking down all of the adversary's incoming missiles or warheads, but to have enough missiles and warheads intercepted so that we could expect a minimum survivable force of (deleted) Minuteman.

If one listens to all the scientists he will get as many answers as there are questions. But I have no doubt about the effectiveness of this ABM system to give us this minimum deterrent figure of (deleted) Minutemen during the time frame we are talking about.

Of course, it is very important that we recognize the crucial problem of lead-time in developing an ABM system. We are talking about 5 years. If we fool around and delay until 1976 or 1977 we are going to be in a serious situation.

Personally, I am confident that the President is going to be in a lot stronger position when he, through his representatives, sits down with the Soviet negotiators on arms control, if the Senate has voted to give him the authority to move ahead with Safeguard phase I.

Negotiations on arms control are going to be a long, drawn-out affair. Let us not kid ourselves.

Some people have said that there has been a heavy emphasis in the ABM discussion on the nature of the Russian leaders, and that it is old hat to talk about Soviet leadership.

Well, I have spent a lot of time studying Soviet leadership. I think that a good lawyer or a good businessman would want to know something about his adversary. He would want to know what he is up to. I submit to the Senate that if we read carefully into the reports from outstanding Western analysts of Soviet developments, we will find that the men in control of the Soviet Union are a hard-boiled, unpredictable bunch, knowing little of foreign reality. They are not sure of themselves. Anything can happen. If Senators have any doubts about it, ask Marshal Tito, or Luigi Longo, Secretary of the Communist Party in Italy. I think we are in a very dangerous period with that sort of leadership in the Soviet politburo.

That is why many experts missed the boat on the intervention by Russia into Czechoslovakia. We cannot find any basis for the Brezhnev doctrine in anything written by Marx or Lenin. In fact, Stalin's Foreign Minister, Litvinov, in 1937, denounced the idea of unilateral intervention on the part of the Soviet Union in these matters.

Now there is the situation along the Sino-Soviet frontier, where the Russians have deployed their grounds forces more and more along that frontier.

We face a critical situation in central Europe, with the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia and the pressures on Yugoslavia and Rumania. We also face a potentially explosive situation in the Middle East. I think it is fair to assume that the Israelis, in the defense of their area, may be turning out nuclear weapons.

The point I am making is that there can be a blowup in any of those regions, and others I have not mentioned, spilling over into a wider area, and involving us more directly.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator going to comment on the observation made by the Senator from Missouri that many essential components have not been tested?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; I shall do that, as soon as I finish this point.

I do not want my country or the President, should there be a blowup in any of the areas I have mentioned, to be faced with the situation where the options would be limited to doing nothing or to launching offensive weapons. I want to be sure that we take the precautionary steps to provide protection for a second-strike force, and to give our President what Senator PROUTY so well described as the third option.

Now to answer the question of the Senator from Rhode Island about full-scale tests, first of all, going back, we have had the intercepts with Nike-Zeus. We have not had intercepts with the follow-on Spartan but we have had, I think, six out of 10 firings of Spartan which were successful and——

Mr. TOWER. Seven out of 10 counted successfully through yesterday.

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; with the events of yesterday, seven have been successful. But these did not involve intercepts. Contrary to some statements made recently, an MSR has been built and operated successfully at Kwajalein. We cannot have a full-scale, integrated test for the full system until probably about 1971 or 1972, I believe.

The question is, Do we wait until we complete the full integrated testing or move concurrently with testing and production as we did with Polaris and Titan, and as we move with every important weapon? The Sprint tests at White Sands, N. Mex., have been highly successful. Thus we have to take certain risks, just as our astronauts on Apollo 11 are taking risks on their way to the moon at this very moment.

If we wait until we have a full test, then we will be doing the very thing we seem to object to, we will be deploying a system that is not up to date. What we are aiming at is 1974 or 1975 when we see the possibility, based now, not on speculation but on undisputed Central Intelligence Agency estimates, that our adversary, the Soviet Union, will have (deleted) SS-9's with a capability of a little over 1,000 reentry vehicles.

That is not dreamed up out of thin air by the President or the Secretary of Defense. Those are Central Intelligence Agency estimates.

Mr. THURMOND. If the Senator would yield, is it not a fact that all components of the system have been tested except the perimeter acquisition radar?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct. But that was not the question posed by the Senator from Rhode Island. The Senator from Rhode Island asked if it had been tested on an integrated basis. That has not been done yet, and cannot be completed until 1972.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Washington will recall that even before this, he knew it, but we had four prominent scientists before the committee, two for the ABM and two against. The Senator will remember that all four expressly asked and all four agreed that of all the possible ABM systems we could consider now, this was by far the one that was more developed and the best one. The Senator recalls that?

Mr. JACKSON. That is right.

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator agree, based on his experience from the standpoint of a legislator, with that?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. I am like the Senator from Mississippi. I opposed going ahead with the old Nike-Zeus. I stated to the Senator that I was not satisfied that enough had been done, but I am convinced in light of the work that has been completed and the outstanding research effort made and the tests made, prudence tells me that we should go ahead with the Safeguard ABM system.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator will recall—I mention this for the benefit of those who have arrived in the Chamber lately—that a few years ago there was a closed session, when the Senator from Georgia was chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and we had a very fine debate which was aided by knowledgeable Senators on both sides of the aisle, on each side of the question, of a deployment earlier than now. The Senator recalls that he and I were both opposed, at the time, solely on the ground of the stage of development in which it was then——

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Following through on that, with the Senator's vast experience, does he consider the Safeguard ABM system we are now discussing to be as far along in the progressive field they all have to pass through—and bear in mind, too, the objective; namely, the date of need, which means the 1970's—is this as far along now, relatively, as was Polaris or any of the others that the Senator is familiar with? What is the comparison?

Mr. JACKSON. The best way I can respond to that question is that we have spent much more time and effort——

Mr. RUSSELL. And money.

Mr. JACKSON. And money on the ABM than we did on Polaris and on the ICBM programs in general.

I am convinced that in light of all the factors, and we have to consider everything, prudence tells me, as I look at this chart and the Central Intelligence Agency estimates, that we have to do something to assure an adequate deterrent in this 1974–75 time frame. As I look at it, at this point in time, we either build more offensive weapons or provide for an active defense. I must submit that active defense makes sense to me, and it is the moderate, less provocative path.

In this connection, let me emphasize that the Russians have had a lot of experience in this area of missile defense. They were able to get data that we were not able to get.

The Soviets broke a voluntary nuclear test ban moratorium in September of 1961 by setting off a 60-megaton bomb. We are not dealing with an adversary that plays under ordinary rules.

The information that the Soviets received from that test has been invaluable to them in designing an ABM system, because of the information they obtained on effects. Shortly after that, in the fall of 1961, they proceeded to use live warheads in connection with the testing of one of their first ABM's, and they undertook a follow-up test in 1962. Right after that, they started deploying their ABM system, which is called the Galosh system.

The inference is commonly made that the Russians have stopped working on their ABM system. The intelligence information, as of yesterday, is that they have a vigorous program. They have done what we are trying to do now. They did their R. & D. right on the sites. They got invaluable information through deployment at the Moscow sites.

What did they pause for? They are in the process of developing a follow-on system to the Galosh. We do not know the details of it, but, in all probability, it will provide not only area defense, which the Galosh does, but it will involve point defense, as the Sprint system does. So they have a very vigorous program in this field.

In short, the Russians had all this

valuable information from breaking the test moratorium, which we cannot obtain because of the nuclear test ban and the prohibition against the testing of nuclear warheads in the atmosphere. They have all that added information.

I wanted to emphasize the point because the Senate should not get the idea that they have abandoned their missile defense program. On the contrary, there is a pause while they are approaching their follow-on system. I was advised, as of yesterday, that the Soviets have a very vigorous ABM program under way.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, one or two other questions. This is also my comment at this point. The Senator from Washington has measured this matter and considered it a long time, I know. The Senator says it is safe to do this as others have had a considerable start. What is in the bill for the ABM is really an intermediate step between what we ordinarily call research and development and actual, full deployment. Does not that characterize it?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is absolutely right. It is a phased approach.

Mr. STENNIS. A phased approach to actual deployment, before we reach the point where it is almost that intermediate step now or nothing, as far as getting results is concerned?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct.

I want to emphasize the fundamental point that more research and development is needed in order to fully integrate the components, and that we can do that in Montana and the Dakotas. Why should we waste that money in Kwajalein when we know that with Safeguard deployment there we are not in a position to defend any part of America's deterrent, the Minuteman?

Mr. STENNIS. This will be my last question on this point. If I may put it this way, based on my observation of this matter over the years, I believe we have reached the point, with reference to the deterrence of large missiles and the Soviet potential, with respect to which I am disappointed as compared with 3 years ago, where we had better get ready. We pray the time will not come, but we had better get ready for the worst in the mid-1970's. This is the best system we have. All of them are faulty. It is in the intermediate stage now. We must move forward or more or less just stop it in its tracks.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct.

I have not discussed the Soviet threats to other elements of our deterrent. I have not discussed the threat to our B–52 force and the threat to our Polaris force.

I mention this for the benefit of Members of the Senate. We now find, through estimates of the CIA, that the Soviets have operational or under construction, (deleted) class submarines, meaning Polaris-type submarines with 16 launchers. According to official estimates, we must assume that by the 1974–75 time period the Soviets will have more than the 41 Polaris-type submarines which we will have. The threat on the part of their Polaris to our SAC bomber sites is obvious.

I also want to remind you of the letter from Admiral Rickover, in which he warns about the threat to the Polaris in the mid-1970's.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE How many Polaris submarines do we have under construction?

Mr. JACKSON. None. We have no Polaris submarines under construction or planned. In 1968, we put out six submarines all of one nuclear-attack class. In the same year the Soviets put out about three times as many submarines including a new type ballistic-missile submarine as well as several new types of nuclear attack submarines. They are now experimenting with six new classes of submarines.

Admiral Rickover pointed out this problem and the seriousness of it.

So what do we see here as we look at the record? I wish I did not have to mention these things. I want to reach an agreement with the Soviet Union to limit arms. But we need to know the facts. The threat, as we look into the 1970's, is not just to the Minuteman, but the Soviets are moving ahead on capabilities which threaten the other elements of our deterrent, the Polaris and the B–52.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Has the Senator any information as to why, on June 21, 1968, Dr. John Foster came before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and, in effect, recommended slowing up on the Polaris submarine program until 1974, at which time he said we would be able to build good ones, whereas at the same time classified evidence showed the Russians were building (deleted) a year as compared with our five or six? I wonder why the Defense Department took that attitude when the Polaris has been our major deterrent to any war. A deterrent is a far greater defense. I would rather prevent an enemy missile from starting it than try to stop it after it gets here.

Mr. JACKSON. I cannot speak for Dr. Foster, but I can point out that in June 1968 we did not have the estimates I obtained as of yesterday.

Mr. AIKEN. They are in print.

Mr. JACKSON. But we do not discover all these submarines at once. The Senator has followed these intelligence estimates, and he knows it is a very difficult thing. (Deleted.)

Let me further respond to the Senator by saying I do not know whether at this point in time it is advisable to go ahead with more Polaris submarines or whether it is advisable to provide more attack-type submarines. I am not advocating more offensive systems at this stage; I am suggesting that we protect our deterrent. As I understand strategy, one of the steps proposed is to provide more attack submarines to prevent the enemy from going after us.

It does not follow that we need, necessarily, more Polaris submarines at this time.

Mr. AIKEN. It seems to me that David Harum's philosophy was as practical as that of Dr. John Foster. David Harum said:

> Do unto others as they would do unto you, and do it first.

Dr. Foster says:

> Let them knock the daylights out of us, and then, if we have any retaliatory power left, we will do what we can with it.

That is stupid and unsound philosophy.

Mr. JACKSON. I must say, the accusation has been made that by going ahead with the ABM, you accelerate the arms race. On the contrary, even the Russians do not agree with that.

Mr. AIKEN. No——

Mr. JACKSON. I do not say the Senator said that, I am saying that certainly it is far less provocative to take defensive steps to protect key parts of your deterrent. I think this is the sensible course. It is the first course, in any event, to take, to give protection to your deterrent. This is less provocative than to keep adding on and on to your offensive systems.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think that the ABM disturbs the Russians particularly, at this time.

Mr. JACKSON. That is not the view of a lot of the ABM opponents, as the Senator knows.

Mr. AIKEN. The Defense Department is also trying to stop the development of the noiseless atomic submarine.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator knows we have recently taken care of that.

Mr. AIKEN. Well, they will not release the money. They will do as they have done before when we have instructed them to do something to improve the Polaris submarine—they have held up anywhere from 18 to 22 months before they let it get started.

Mr. JACKSON. We have had fights, and we have won those fights. We got the money released that Admiral Rickover needed. It will be interesting to see if someone tries to knock out the submarines we have in this bill.

Mr. AIKEN. They will.

Mr. JACKSON. At this point, I am worried about the U.S. Senate, not the Defense Department. I am concerned about what Congress will do.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. I think it should be made clear to the Senator from Vermont that it was not the professional Navy men who opposed this sub; it was the civilian leadership, and there has been a change in the civilian leadership. In any case, we have always been sympathetic, as the Senator knows.

I wanted to expand on what the Senator said on projecting what the Russian capabilities can be; and I think we must always think not in terms of what we think they might do, but what we know darn well they can do if they choose to do it.

Based on that, we are either going to have to have a defensive system by the midseventies, or have more offensive missiles.

If nothing else, the cost exchange should make Senators want to opt for the defensive system, and also because it is the system least provocative. Talking about escalation of the arms race, if, in

XUM

the course of the arms race, in order to stay secure we have to start ordering more offensive missiles, is every Senator going to object to that, too, on the grounds that it might escalate the arms race?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I desire to ask a question on the subject of submarines, because I think we all want to get the facts.

I heard the Senator say that (deleted) Y-class submarines——

Mr. JACKSON. (Deleted) Y-class, referring to Polaris-type submarines.

Mr. COOPER. Did the Senator say they had been launched?

Mr. JACKSON. I said—let me state it very clearly—the Soviet Union has operational or under construction——

Mr. COOPER. How many?

Mr. JACKSON. (Deleted) Y-class submarines.

Mr. COOPER. Has there been a change since May 22?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. This is information I obtained yesterday.

Mr. COOPER. The testimony given by Secretary Laird on May 22, not quite 2 months ago, and I from page 9——

Mr. JACKSON. Well, I have given the new figures. That is what concerns some of us.

Mr. COOPER. Has intelligence discovered this in 2 months?

Secretary Laird talking about Y-class submarines, said:

> We now know this submarine . . . is in full scale production, at a very large facility near Archangel——

Mr. JACKSON. Will the Senator speak a little louder?

Mr. COOPER. I will.

> We now know this submarine designated the Y class is in full scale production at a very large facility near Archangel, and possibly at another smaller yard. These two facilities can accommodate a total of 12 complete hulls.

Two facilities.

> The intelligence community estimates that the two facilities can produce somewhere around eight submarines a year.

The two.

> I think that as production experience is gathered, the rate of output from these two facilities might very well increase significantly.

This is Secretary Laird's testimony of May 22:

> Eight or nine Y-class submarines have already been launched, and several are believed to be operational.

That is all he said.

Mr. JACKSON. All right, I will give it to the Senator straight, right out of the book. Here it is: Y-class submarines, meaning Polaris, under construction, (deleted). Operational, (deleted). Total, (deleted).

Does the Senator want me to continue, and give all the other figures? This is from the CIA.

Mr. COOPER. Are you talking about Y-class submarines?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Why did not Secretary Laird say this on May 22?

Mr. JACKSON. I do not think he had the total figures. He did not say anything inconsistent with that, just that he did not give the total.

Mr. COOPER. He said "Our intelligence tells us," and this is all we got. He talked about the capacity of production as 12 a year.

Mr. JACKSON. Exactly.

Mr. COOPER. And that eight or nine have been launched. I do not understand; if their capacity is only 12 a year, and they had only launched eight or nine on May 22, where did the additional submarines come from?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator must know we do not have an exact means of determining the output. We get into some very sensitive information here, and I do not want to go into further detail, other than to say that we have been able, through going back and extrapolating the information, to tell how many are under construction and about how many they can produce.

Now, the point is, we have known for a long time they were going for the Polaris, but here are the hard figures, and that is my responsibility, I guess, to try to respond to the Senator's question. The Soviets have under construction (deleted) Polaris-type submarines and (deleted) operational. I cannot speak for Dr. Foster.

Mr. COOPER. What date was this information given?

Mr. JACKSON. July 17. That is yesterday.

Mr. COOPER. It was not Dr. Foster; it was Secretary Laird testifying.

Mr. JACKSON. I asked them to supply me the information as of last night.

Mr. COOPER. Since that time, I remember, in briefings by intelligence, the same facts provided by Secretary Laird were given somewhat later. It is amazing that in a month the figures can change from eight to nine to (deleted).

Mr. JACKSON. In all deference, I do not think he gave the Senator the total of submarines operational or under construction. He gave him the production rate. Frankly, I try to ask the $64 question in these matters.

Mr. COOPER. But it is amazing to me that at the time the Secretary was posing the threat against this country—and I must say he posed a very grim threat; and he made many extrapolations of weapons systems, but, curiously enough, with respect to submarines, he said, "This is our intelligence as of May 22." It seems to me he would have pointed out that the Soviets had several more under construction.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I wish to say that I was present with the Senator from Washington when we were briefed on this very situation, and we were told that our intelligence evaluators went back over the informational sources from which they had made their estimates, and they found out that there were more under construction than they had previously thought. I heard that myself, from the intelligence sources that were briefing us.

This conforms very closely to information which I was given prior to this time, and information which was given to the committee as a whole in some sessions when we had briefings by intelligence agencies to show what the progressive threat was going to be.

One thing we have been most concerned about has been the increase in the Soviet submarine force.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on that point, just to show how these things work, we should bear this in mind. Just a few months ago, what was the figure on Soviet starts of SS-9 missiles?

Mr. COOPER. As I recall, it was about 230.

Mr. JACKSON. It was 232. Now they have found new sites, and the Soviet starts of SS-9 missiles are up to (deleted). And that has only been since the date in May that the Senator mentioned. This has been discovered in the last 30 days. They are up to (deleted) confirmed SS-9 launcher sites.

This is why I am concerned about the whole trend of strategic weapon deployment by the Soviets—not only the SS-9's, but also the Polaris.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, for clarification, testimony was given discussing several types of submarines that the Russians were producing, differentiating the Y-1, which was described as a Polaris.

Mr. JACKSON. It is just plain Y.

Mr. COOPER. Other types of submarines which bear missiles were described, but was testified that they posed no threat to the United States.

Is the Senator speaking only of the Polaris type which could carry Polaris type missiles, or the smaller type?

Mr. JACKSON. Let us be very clear. I am talking about the Polaris type submarine with 16 launchers for nuclear missiles.

In addition, the Soviets have some 60 air-breathing missile submarines and also some ballistic missiles on other nuclear powered submarines with three to six launchers. Air breathers with a range of about 250 nautical miles could be used against SAC sites, command, and control positions, or against cities.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is speaking now of the Soviet threat and its development. Is it not a fact that in addition to the proposed anti-ballistic-missile system, there are funds in the pending bill to carry out a program of refitting 31 of our Polaris submarines to Poseidon? And is it not also a fact that money is contained in the bill to carry out the program of arming Minutemen with MIRV, and also a program to build attack submarines to protect our Polaris submarine?

The question has been asked whether opponents support offensive systems as an alternative.

But the Senator knows all of these programs I have just mentioned are in the bill—and they are offensive weapons.

Mr. JACKSON. I was going to say that we do have in the bill money for MIRVing both the Polaris missile, which we call the Poseidon, and the MIRVing of the Minuteman, which is Minuteman III.

This is not new. It is being done. Money was authorized last year, as I recall. Money is in the measure for fiscal year 1969. There was money earlier for research and development.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a clarification?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I had the same colloquy with the Senator from Kentucky just the other day. All of it is contained in the RECORD.

We are not making more in terms of missiles. We may be increasing the number of warheads on a missile, but if someone knocks out the missile to begin with, it does not make any difference what we have on top of it. It is dead. The same thing is true with the nuclear submarines, whether they armed with the Poseidon or the Polaris. It does not make any difference if the submarine is destroyed before the missiles are fired.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COTTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, regarding an inference I have derived from the Senator's answer: The able Senator from Missouri raised the point that the components of the proposed ABM missile system which were pointed to the defense of cities included radar and other components that were inapplicable for the new version and the new purpose of concentrating on the defense of our striking power.

I did not quite get the Senator's answer.

Mr. JACKSON. I do not agree with that. As I pointed out at the outset, the problem in trying to defend a city is entirely different than in trying to defend a strategic site of Minutemen missiles.

The point is that when Sentinel was considered, the suggestion was that there would be this threat in the midseventies of 50 to 70 Chinese missiles coming at our cities and that they could hold us hostage with that limited number of missiles and that we could save many millions of people by the utilization of the Sentinel system.

Since that time, two things have happened.

First, the Chinese nuclear weapons program is off schedule. They have not yet deployed their IRBM, although they have that capability. And they have not yet deployed an ICBM.

Second, we have learned that the Soviets are moving much faster than had been anticipated in numbers of SS–9's which pose a threat to the Minuteman.

When I defended the Sentinel system on the Senate floor last June—and it is good to recall this—I made the point—and the able Senator from Georgia made a similar point—that the Sentinel system being designed was not only for cities but also included the option to deal with the Minuteman problem.

The Senator from Georgia went into some detail, as I recall his position. It is much easier from the standpoint of designing an ABM system and providing a number of survivable Minutemen to have the ABM deployed in connection with the Minuteman sites. And the reason is very simple. If adversary missiles get through and knock out some of our Minutemen, we can still save enough of our missiles to save the site. That is not true, however, with respect to a city. If we have one ICBM get through to a city, the city has had it.

The adversary's problem with missiles targeted on a Minuteman site is to get a very large number through.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am afraid I did not make my question quite clear. I understand the new purpose of the Safeguard is to defend our silos and our striking power. However, if I understood it correctly, the distinguished Senator from Missouri indicated or asserted or at least suggested that the research that we have gone through and the components we have developed, designed for an antiballistic missile for the protection of cities, would not apply to the needs of an antiballistic missile concentrated on protecting our missile sites and that it would require new research and development before we could start. Was that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, we are using money authorized and funded in fiscal year 1969 for the Spartans and Sprints, as I recall, which we are going to use in the Safeguard system.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield since my name came into the discussion?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It is clear we may have to have another closed session, so as to develop some of the points now brought up.

The Senator is correct. I know of no one with expertise knowledge who would design the Spartans this way to defend hard missile sites. Second, and as mentioned in my statement, one of the technological reports created by our organization headed by that famous Army missile man, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, pointed out conclusively that this overall system was wrong for the defense of missile sites.

That report is available to us now. We had been trying to get it for weeks. There are others. We are going to analyze all the reports we can obtain, all of them paid for by the taxpayer, in detail. Regardless of how this vote goes, I would hope we could ultimately present that information to the Senate.

It seems the more we get into such discussions, we end up by asserting, "So-and-so said."

I am ready, at a certain point, to use my own judgment, and not be influenced by new information given very recently to only a few. "Yesterday we found this out; the day before yesterday we received this new information; that of last week is obsolete." If we go along this way, discovering a new danger to make every new point, we are going to bankrupt this country with this type of steadily rising Defense budget.

Mr. COTTON. I had hoped that is exactly the way the Senator would respond. I got the idea that it was asserted that much of the research has been wasted, with the object in mind to defend cities, and that we have to start over again. I wanted an answer to that.

Mr. JACKSON. There was a big protest because production was continuing on Spartans and Sprints.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. Please let me just finish this point.

It was said that this continuing production is not fair, because Congress had not approved. Yet Congress had authorized this production earlier, and the Sprints and the Spartans will knock down Russian missiles, whether these missiles are going into a Minuteman site or to a city.

If anyone can say on the floor of the Senate that you have to change a Spartan as an area defense because the adversary's missile is headed for a Minuteman site rather than a city, I would like to hear about it. It is silly.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is the Senator asking me?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Spartan operates outside the atmosphere——

Mr. JACKSON. That is right.

Mr. SYMINGTON. And cannot discern between such things as balloons and chaff. The Spartan, long-range, was designed for area defense. It is far better for the defense of a hard missile site to have more Sprints than it is to have more Spartans.

Not one expert I know in this field, but who agrees that if we are going to defend the hard missile sites, we would need many less Spartans and many more Sprints.

Mr. JACKSON. What the Senator is saying now is entirely different. Tell me what changes must be made in a Spartan, in the production and research.

Mr. SYMINGTON. No change is the answer, rather more Sprints. I want to put the Pentagon chart up at the next closed session, because that is not the chart I presented; and I would like to talk from the chart I did present.

The Spartan is a missile designed for area defense. It is not a missile designed for a hard missile site defense.

I am truly astonished if the Senator from Washington does not agree with that.

Mr. JACKSON. This is not the point.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It was the question asked by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator from New Hampshire wanted to know whether the Spartans and other elements that had been produced had been wasted. Am I correct?

Mr. COTTON. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator from Missouri had said that you would have to change the main elements and the overall system, that you could not use it. Obviously, you change your tactics when you are planning to defend a different kind of defense point. No one disputes that.

Mr. COTTON. But you do not have to start over.

Mr. JACKSON. Of course not. The production is under way, and you do not have to change those elements. You will change configurations as to numbers. That was not the impression given by the arguments of the Senator from Missouri.

XUM

Mr. SYMINGTON. All I say is that if you had originally designed this ABM system for defense of a hard missile site, you would not design it this way. You would have a lot more radars and a lot less expensive radars, and you would have a lot more Sprints and a lot less Spartans.

It is just not the right system if we had started off with the idea we wanted to defend a hard missile site. That is the firm opinion of every objective expert I know.

Mr. JACKSON. That is not what the discussion was about. The discussion was whether or not we are wasting what has been authorized. I submit that we are not.

I agree in many respects with the Senator from Missouri when he talks about configuration, with regard to the number of Spartans and Sprints in connection with defending hard sites and cities.

Speaking of waste, I submit, as I pointed out earlier, that if we shut down the production lines, as some opponents of ABM advocate, we will have incurred a nonrecoverable loss of over $300 million.

I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, on that point, I should like respectfully to disagree with the Senator from Missouri. The Spartan is designed and essential to the present concept of anti-ballistic-missile defense.

I ask the Senator from Washington if it is not a fact that especially in view of the development of MIRV—the multiple independent reentry—and even with MIRV, we have only two ways of trying to successfully defend against this multiple attack from one rocket; first, with a long-range effort such as Spartan, which will try to intercept and destroy the missile before it separates and before the warheads are directed to multiple target, and, second, with the larger charge of Spartan which will create a sufficiently large X-radiation bombardment envelope to deform all the outcoming missiles sufficient to destroy them on reentry.

It seems to me that the inclusion of Spartan, essentially in its present posture and essentially for the original purpose, is absolutely necessary if we are to cope successfully with the idea of multiple reentry vehicles. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator has outlined the matter beautifully. That is exactly the point. I was not able to get to that particular aspect in my discussion. But this is critical, because the Spartan operates outside of the atmosphere. It has a high yield—I think of about (deleted)—and outside of the atmosphere it emits X-rays. It creates a situation in which within many, many miles—it does not have to come close to the adversary missile—it can invalidate the effectiveness of the warheads in an incoming MIRV missile. By getting the missile, it gets all the warheads in it. It is an area defense. It is the same use you would make of it if you were defending a city or a hard point. This is a defense in depth, and the point defense comes in with the Sprint.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question which I think is a little more basic, with all respect.

We have been war-gaming here most of the time, which is legitimate; but is it not a fact that all that the opponents of the ABM and this bill contend for is delay—a year? That is all for which they contend. They are not necessarily in opposition to the war-gaming. It may be right or it may be wrong. The Senator, himself, has said that the whole stationary defense may be invalidated. Therefore, as the ABM is defending a defense which may be invalidated in a year the ABM may be similarly invalidated.

Mr. JACKSON. Let me correct one thing.

Mr. JAVITS. Let me get to my question.

With all respect, what the Senator, in my judgment, needs to address himself to is what will be the effect upon the impending negotiations for control of armaments by our decision "Yes" or "No" on the ABM now. If it has no effect, then the "Noes" win. Why spend $8 billion if it is going to have no effect? If the Senator claims an effect for it, what is it?

I think that is the key question which in a secret session should be buttressed.

I think the Senator has given a brilliant performance; he really has. He knows his subject, and he is terrific on it. I ask him to tell us, therefore, what he thinks will be the effect upon the disarmament negotiations of the decision to deploy the ABM in two sites, based upon all the secret information he knows.

Mr. JACKSON. That is a very good question. I will try to give a simple and straightforward answer to it. I cannot conceive of the Soviet Union agreeing to dismantle its ABM's in light of the present situation that they face with Communist China. We now know that they have reoriented certain of their radar to cover missiles that might be sent in from Communist China. I think this is a very significant point. I submit it does not make sense to me that the Soviet Union would agree at an arms control conference to give up their ABM's when we do not have any.

What I am hoping for, if we help steady the hand of the President and through him the hand of the negotiators, that we will be able to get an agreement with the Russians to limit the number of ABM's on both sides. I believe very strongly in the need to end the arms buildups, but it does not make sense at all to me, none whatever, to expect the Soviets to sit down and really talk in serious terms about giving up their ABM when we do not have one and when we have taken a vote in the Senate to deny the President the right to go ahead.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I asked this categorically of President Nixon and his answer to me categorically was "The ABM would strengthen my hand in negotiations and not weaken it."

Mr. JAVITS. I think that is what the Senate has to decide, whether it will or will not make more likely a disarmament agreement.

I would like to ask the converse of that question. If the deployment of the ABM will cause the Russians to increase the number of their SS–9's is it not likely they would be less willing to agree to arms control if we gave them the impetus for increasing that number by deploying the ABM?

Mr. JACKSON. I do not agree with the Senator. One must look at the history of the Russians. The Russian people have had a strong predilection toward defensive measures. After World War II the first thing they did was to turn out thousands of Mig–15's, followed by Mig–17's, before they moved to offensive weapons. They were working hard on nuclear weapons and it made no sense to put the main delivery effort into manned bombers with missiles coming along. They went for fighters. The Soviets are both defense oriented and offense oriented.

When we first undertook hearings on the ABM in 1967, we asked three scholars to come before the committee: Dr. Philip E. Mosely, of Columbia University, who is tops in the field of Soviet studies; Alice Hsieh, an expert on China; and Dr. Thomas Wolf, an expert in weapons and the Soviet Union. There was general agreement that by moving forward with our ABM system, it would not have the kind of adverse impact the Senator is talking about. Multiplying our offensive missiles might be considered provocative, but an ABM, designed to help protect our second strike capability, cannot be interpreted by our adversaries as provocative.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to complete my remarks, that is not the burden of proof.

Can the Senator from Washington and those who espouse his point of view demonstrate not only that the Russians are not going to care if we deploy, but can they demonstrate materially and objectively that it will help us in negotiations? Otherwise, why place the new $10 billion chip on the table?

Mr. JACKSON. In June 1968, we had a week's debate on the military construction bill which involved the question of the deployment of our ABM. Senators who oppose the ABM generally made the argument that if we went ahead with the ABM, the Russians would not talk with us. We had been trying for 18 months to get them to talk on the limitation and reduction of offensive and defensive nuclear weapons.

I took the position that the best way to get them to talk would be to go ahead with our ABM. We took the vote on a Monday and on Thursday Gromyko asked for talks. As I said at the time, I did not claim that Gromyko's statement was only the result of our ABM vote; but I did say that Gromyko's position refuted the arguments that had been made that if we voted for the ABM the Russians would refuse to talk.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator has not answered my question.

Mr. JACKSON. Why have I not answered the Senator's question?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator has not answered my question because I am not saying that in order to induce the Russians to talk you have to deploy the ABM. I say they have agreed to talk, that they are not going to be discouraged from talking because the ABM system is deployed; therefore, why deploy until you have an opportunity to see in the SALT negotiations if you do not have to do it at all?

Mr. JACKSON. Why change the ground rules? They must think we are made of mush over here. Gromyko asked that we go ahead. The Soviets asked for talks. They asked us to have those talks. I wonder what they must think of us. One year we authorize the ABM system and the next year——

Mr. JAVITS. They may think that we finally have gotten a lot of brains and do not have our feet fixed in concrete, that we are not playing positions but doing what is substantively correct.

The matter has been debated enough to bring out all the doubt on this matter. If it is not going to make or break the SALT discussions why move forward and deploy?

I have one other specific question. The Senator said something about leadtime items being the big disadvantage in delay of deployment. That is an important point. It goes to the time question. I notice in the committee report it is stated:

> (3) Procurement of hardware in the amount of a total of $600,000 for long lead time components of the Sprint and Spartan missiles.

Have we a right to assume that is about the order of magnitude in respect of long leadtime items.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is talking about hardware. We are talking about the entire family of components in the Safeguard ABM. It is a 5-year leadtime.

We don't have extra time on this one now. I wish to point out to the Senator that right now, with what the Soviets have under construction with the SS-9 (and other ICBM's) they have over 1,200 against our 1,054—1,000 Minuteman and 54 Titans. In addition, I point out that they have more megatonnage in their land-based missiles than we have.

Mr. JAVITS. Is the Senator contending the Russians have decisive superiority over us today in nuclear weaponry?

Mr. JACKSON. No, sir. I am talking about 1975. We have leadtime and we must take prudent steps.

Mr. JAVITS. Until 1975, we would be alive and able to move. The Senator speaks as if we would sit still, and we would not.

Mr. TOWER. What we are talking about is not what we can do versus what they can do now; but what that situation is likely to be in the mid-1970's.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TOWER. If we should determine, for example, that the Soviets had not only a first strike policy, but had so deployed and aimed their ICBM's to carry out that first strike policy by going for our Minuteman missiles, I think we would be a little foolish to stand around here wondering if we should be developing the ABM. Because they had committed an additional provocation by aiming their missiles at our Minuteman that would require a response on our part, and we would achieve some degree of safety in defending our retaliatory power.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Senator from New York raises a very basic question.

Are we arguing a maneuver in the negotiations with the Russians, or are we arguing the basic defense of the United States? I think we are arguing the basic defense of the United States.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct. I am a small-town boy, but I must admit that it does not make sense to me that the Russians will really talk seriously about dismantling or eliminating their ABM's when they have them, and we do not. I do not think we have to be sophisticated experts to know that. That is just plain horsesense. Every man in America endowed with commonsense would agree to that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. First, I should like to inquire as to procedure. I have a number of classified documents which I thought Senators would be interested in, primarily from the written testimony taken by the committee with Mr. Helms. It has not been made public. Of course, Senators individually could see it, but have not the time, I am sure, to come down there.

I intended to be able to read part of it to Senators. I have some here particularly of Mr. Helm's specific observations about the Galosh system and I was wondering whether the Senator would allow me to do that now, or if he will yield, or yield the floor, and then I will do so on my own time.

Mr. JACKSON. I want to be as fair as possible. I should like to respond to questions and then I will yield the floor. I do not know that I would care to have the Senator get into a long detail about something right now. I should like to respond first to questions asked by Senators.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator proposes to do that——

Mr. JACKSON. I am ready to yield the floor, except for questions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would be willing to do this in the form of a question, if the Senator does not mind.

Mr. JACKSON. How long will the predicate be?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is rather long. I would rather do that on my own time. I should like to make available to Senators, not on either the Armed Services Committee or the Foreign Relations Committee, the specific statements made by the Director of the CIA. The Senator several times in this debate has stated "as of yesterday." He did not say, "as of yesterday" that "Mr. Helms told me XYZ." Am I correct in that impression?

Mr. JACKSON. The information I read, with reference to the Soviet Y class of submarine, and with reference to the number of SS-9's, came directly from his office——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Just those two items?

Mr. JACKSON. From Carl Duckett.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is right.

Mr. JACKSON. Does the Senator know him?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do.

Mr. JACKSON. This is specific.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me give the Senator one example, an example of what I had in mind about the Galosh system. It will take only a minute or two. I am sure this is what Senators are interested in at the moment concerning the Russian ABM. This is an interrogatory that the committee——

Mr. JACKSON. How long will it run?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This particular statement is about a minute.

Mr. JACKSON. OK.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But of course I have a number of others which I think are equally pertinent. They were written in order to be specific. I also have the hearings here. They are classified. Mr. Helms appeared before the committee and was very cooperative and responsive. But this is a short one on the Galosh system:

SOVIET ABM PROGRAM

1. When was development of the Galosh system begun? When was deployment begun?

Research and development on the large radars now associated with the Galosh system began in the late 1950s. Construction of the large ABM radars began at field sites in late 1962. Construction of launchers for flight testing the Galosh missile began in 1961 at the Sary Shagan test range. Construction of Galosh launch sites around Moscow began in late 1962.

2. How many missile launchers did the Galosh system contemplate originally? How many missile launchers have been deployed?

The original deployment of the Galosh system was to consist of [deleted] launchers at [deleted] locations around Moscow. This deployment has now been cut back to [deleted] launchers at [deleted] locations. Some [deleted] launchers are now believed to be operational.

3. Why has there been a slowdown over the past year?

We believe that the Soviets cut back the deployment around Moscow mainly because they recognized that their present system cannot cope adequately with existing or proposed US strategic attack systems. The Soviets apparently are trying to improve the Moscow system, however, and the logical first step in any future ABM deployment would be to augment the defenses of Moscow.

Notice he says "defenses of Moscow." He never says "of my missile site."

4. What US weapons system does the Galosh system most closely resemble?

The Nike Zeus.

5. Do you still believe that the Tallinn system is designed against aircraft and air breathing cruise missiles only?

It is unlikely that the Tallinn system now has an ABM capability, and we doubt that the system will be modified for an ABM role.

6. What kind of sophisticated simulated ABM defense systems have the Soviets set up?

We are unaware of any sophisticated ABM system which the Soviets may be simulating for purposes of defining design goals for further research and development.

That is only one example of specific answers of the CIA. I have a number of others on other subjects.

Mr. JACKSON. Then what is the Senator's specific question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Well, I was asking, the Senator does not dispute that as being CIA's——

Mr. JACKSON. No, but suppose the Senator explains what else is going on. I pointed out to the Senator earlier that the information shows the (deleted) launchers, with some (deleted) operational, and that the Soviets are undertaking extensive research and development (deleted).

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is all in here. There is no mystery about that. But they themselves are doing research and development which we are proposing we do. But they are not deploying, which the Senator is wanting us to do.

Mr. JACKSON. Indeed, the Soviets have been deploying and they are learning a lot and they are getting research and development advantages through operational undertakings in missile defense. We have had no such deployment, operational experience.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield right there?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They are not using sites around Moscow for experimental research. They are doing their research at their center in Siberia which is similar to Kwajalein. That is where they are doing research. Certainly there is no evidence that they are using the sites around Moscow for research purposes.

Mr. JACKSON. I am not going to yield any further. I will point out——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wonder whether the Senator——

Mr. JACKSON. That their research and development draws on the knowledge they get from deployment of the radars and the operation of the computers and the launchers around Moscow. This is all part of research and development.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wonder whether the Senator would yield to me to ask a question on another subject.

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He stated a moment ago in very dramatic terms about the dangerous times we are living in.

Mr. JACKSON. What?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator a moment ago stated in very dramatic terms about what dangerous times we are living in. He cited troops along the Sino-Soviet border, and the difficulties in the Middle East which have been accumulating for a long time. This is certainly nothing new in the Middle East. There is also the trouble in Honduras and El Salvador—in fact, troubles all over the world. Right at this moment Columbia University and the University of California are quiet, I hear, but does the Senator mean to leave an impression to frighten us. How does the Senator evaluate Gromyko's speech last week? Does not the Senator give credence to the idea that the Russians are interested and now want to negotiate. I thought the Senator's comments were not very conciliatory with respect to the directors of the Russian Government last week when he referred to some of them as "butchers" I believe—"bloody butchers" it was, or something to that effect.

Mr. JACKSON. I did not use the term "bloody butchers."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What was the term?

Mr. JACKSON. My statements are in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is right.

Mr. JACKSON. I am amazed that the Senator would think that we should not discuss the nature of our adversary.

Let me respond to his question on Gromyko, and then I want to yield to the Senator from Michigan and then I shall conclude.

The Senator brought up Mr. Gromyko. I do not know what is on Mr. Gromyko's mind. I can point out what he did to the late President John F. Kennedy in his office. He walked into his office on that fateful day in October 1962 and told the President of the United States that the Soviets did not have any missiles in Cuba. But that very morning Mr. John McCone had brought in pictures to President Kennedy showing exactly where the Russian missiles were located in Cuba.

I do not know how to take Mr. Gromyko, except I am going to be pretty tough and pretty prudent, and not rely on just what he says. I just hope the Kremlin is serious about these arms control talks, but I also have in mind the perfidious nature of many of its policies.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator from Washington has demonstrated that he has not the slightest idea that there is any possibility of agreement with the Russians. There is nothing I have heard the Senator say which indicates that he believes it is possible to make any kind of agreement with the Russians. He has demonstrated that, and if that is to be the procedure——

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

Mr. JACKSON. I supported the limited nuclear test ban treaty, but I am not going to enter into a treaty with the Russians based only on words and pious assurances. I want to be sure that such a treaty is verifiable—that it can be monitored. If we have an agreement with the Russians under which we do not know where we are, it will destabilize rather than stabilize the world situation. If we can get a rascal-proof treaty on arms control that can be monitored and verified, I will support it. I have supported the series of treaties, including the nuclear nonproliferation treaty, but I am not going to be so naive as to believe that what the Soviets say verbally can be relied on to the degree that we can count on our allies in the Western World.

I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I know the Senator has been on his feet a long time. Mine is not a question that has to be asked in secret session, yet, because it has to be dressed up in 17 different kinds of laudatory comments on both sides——

Mr. JACKSON. Why do we not mutually agree that we love everybody?

Mr. HART. Fine, and with the understanding that it is in the family.

Let us turn our minds back to about a year ago. We sat here, and some of us said we were not ready to deploy the Sentinel system. The Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) said we were ready to deploy it and that this system would save 20 million or 30 million lives. It was not perfect, but he thought we should deploy it. We were defeated in our effort to stop it.

All of us now understand that the Sentinel system would not work in that fashion. The Senator from Washington today said it is well nigh impossible to defend those cities——

Mr. JACKSON. I made my comments in the context of a massive missile attack.

Mr. HART. The RECORD will speak.

In any event, we have abandoned the proposal of a year ago that we save those 20 or 30 million lives. Let us be sure the representations and assurances we get this year with respect to the readiness to deploy this Safeguard system this year is 100 percent better than it was last year, because last year they were wrong.

Mr. JACKSON. I can respond to that.

Mr. HART. I know that is a blunt way to put it.

Mr. JACKSON. Let me respond. I think that is the only question the Senator has. Last year we were talking about the threat of the Chinese Communists with missiles in the 1970's. I pointed out at that time—and it still pertains to what we can do—that with 50 to 70 missiles incoming, we could not stop all of them, but we would stop the bulk of them, and we would save x million lives——

Mr. HART. Twenty to 30 million.

Mr. JACKSON. Whatever the figures are. Those figures still stand, in that kind of environment. The truth is that as we deploy the Spartan, we provide some population protection, because it is an area defense system.

What has happened since that time? I want to emphasize that I did not buy the idea last year—and the RECORD will so disclose—that our ABM system was oriented chiefly to providing population defense. Rather, I pointed out its capability to deal with the threat to the Minuteman. But, at the same time, that ABM system design was based on intelligence estimates at that time that the Chinese would have intercontinental ballistic missiles in the numbers of 50 to 70 in the mid-1970's. We were dealing with that timetable. Also, the information was given us that the Soviets would be expected to level off with their SS–9's at the maximum of 250.

Since that time both situations have changed. The Chinese are behind in their ICBM development, probably due to their cultural revolution and possibly other problems. They have not deployed even an IRBM, let alone an ICBM. What has developed is a new Soviet threat to our deterrent force and our second-strike retaliatory system, that we are talking about here today. But it would be wrong to say the ABM does not provide some population protection. Because of the way it will be deployed, it will have that necessary result. I did want to emphasize that there is a logical reason for the reorientation.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just one question?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator has made a fine statement, showing a tremendous knowledge and full analysis of this matter. When we talk about the cities and

XUM

missile sites, is the Senator not fully convinced that the aiming, to use an ordinary term, of the SS–9's are on a beeline with our missile bases, to the exclusion of the cities, one might say? Is the Senator convinced of that?

Mr. **JACKSON**. Yes; I am convinced of that, based on the information made available. We find the orientation of the Soviet SS–9's—the way they have been oriented—gives us every reason to believe that they are—shall we use the term—not just aiming, but zeroing in on our Minuteman sites.

Mr. **STENNIS**. So what was once an inference is almost now a certainty?

Mr. **JACKSON**. The Senator is correct, based on the information I have received.

Mr. **TOWER**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **JACKSON**. I yield.

Mr. **TOWER**. Of course, this indicates——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. **JACKSON**. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator from Texas. I am ready to yield the floor. I have had the floor for some time now.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. Mr. President, I was going to take a very brief period. I understand we are going to have another session. I was going to take only 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. **JACKSON**. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. **TOWER**. Mr. President, if this is the plain inference and it appears that they are zeroed in on our missile sites, does it not mean that the Soviets have a first-strike policy that they intend to launch the first blow? Therefore, we have to have some defense to retaliate. Certainly, their ABM is going to be deployed to defend the cities. Again, this is a first-strike policy. One tries to knock out his opponent first. If he does not succeed, he has to have defenses against his cities, because the enemy is going to retaliate against his cities. This should be obvious.

Mr. **JACKSON**. I am convinced that the Soviets are building toward a first-strike capability. I do not know what their intentions will be with respect to the use of that capability. But if I am a prudent Senator, I have to ask what they can do with that sort of capability. I can only say they are building toward a capability, and whether they intend to use it, I do not know. But I know what prudence tells me to do. I want the United States to be in a position to deal with Soviet capability, and Soviet actions point toward the building of a first-strike capability. They do not have a first-strike force now.

Mr. **TOWER**. Therefore, the only way we can provide a credible deterrent to that first strike would be to convince them that there would always be enough missiles left over to retaliate.

Mr. **JACKSON**. This is the prudent thing to do.

Mr. **GOLDWATER**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. **JACKSON**. I yield for a question to the Senator from Arizona.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. **GOLDWATER**. The Senator has yielded to me for a question.

Mr. **SYMINGTON**. I thought the Senator yielded to me.

Mr. **JACKSON**. I yield first to the Senator from Missouri; then I shall yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. **SYMINGTON**. Mr. President, I have done my best, over a period of weeks, to obtain as much information as possible in the shortest possible time. Because the combined committees I am on—Armed Services and Foreign Relations—as mentioned before, upon being thoroughly briefed on this ABM, had a combined vote of 17 to 14 against going ahead with the deployment of this system, it occurred to me we should have a closed session to develop the facts to the entire Senate.

I have the greatest respect for those who have spoken for the system, but do not believe in the accuracy of some of the information presented here today.

Mr. President, I am somewhat over a barrel, because, although a member of the Armed Services Committee, the Military Appropriations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, the CIA Subcommittee, and the Committee on Foreign Relations, and have tried to do my homework, much information has been given here this afternoon of which I am ignorant.

One reason no doubt is that apparently some information was received only yesterday. One Senator, according to the ticker, received new information only this morning. Again, I go back to my oil well promotion dinner analogy, a new well every course.

Therefore, I believe it best to take all this information, put our staffs to work, digest it, and then answer what I think are some very important inaccuracies presented today.

I thank the able Senator from Washington for yielding to me.

Then we can again discuss it. One favorable aspect of this debate is that, this time, many Senators will decide how much we appropriate for national security, with close to $80 billion of the already overburdened taxpayers' money involved.

Mr. **JACKSON**. Mr. President, let me just observe there is nothing mysterious about the intelligence information that I got. All of us tried to work hard on this. I will say that I asked the Central Intelligence Agency, as of yesterday, "I want all the latest information, right up to date, on Soviet capabilities."

I got it. I do not think there is any secret about it. I do not know; is there a Senator on this floor who asked for information yesterday, who did not get this information, or was denied the information? I do this quite regularly.

I just wish to say that this is the first time we have disagreed on a weapons system. We may get a little heated here; we are in closed session. I have nothing but the greatest admiration and respect for him, and I am just sorry we disagree. But I have tried to do, as I think every other Senator has done, what I think is best for the country.

I just want to point out, lest any other Senator have any suspicious ideas, that there is not a bolt or a nut of the ABM system made in the State of Washington. I have been arguing against Minuteman, and I think Senators know who makes Minuteman.

I will say, for the Senator from Missouri, that he is in an even more difficult situation, because one of the major components for the ABM system is made by one of the largest defense contractors in his State. I say this to show him how objective he has been.

But I wish to conclude by saying I have not walked onto this floor to pretend to any special knowledge relating to intelligence information. The information I got was what I requested as of yesterday. I will say that the reason I asked for it was that I have had a hunch right along as to the direction of the Soviet effort, and I wanted to find out whether they were constructing 232 SS–9's, or whether they had gone beyond that. So I asked for that information.

I was also suspicious as to the direction they are moving with the Polaris-type submarines, because I have worked with Admiral Rickover for over 20 years. I must say that that man, as much as one might disagree with him on some issues, has been uncannily correct in his estimates of the Soviet Union. Perhaps he has a way of knowing; he was born in Russia.

So I simply wish to say to my friend, the information I received in this regard is available to every Senator. I did not try to pull any surprises, and did not get any information not available to any other Senator.

Mr. **SYMINGTON**. Mr. President, the Senator knows of my deep respect and affection for him. I may be wrong, but I do not believe I have a better friend in the Senate. It is always a privilege to listen to him; he is articulate, intelligent, and sympathetic to one's problems. He is a great Senator and a great American, and the Sentinel system of last year and the Safeguard now is our first disagreement in 17 years.

I do believe, and so told him yesterday while we were talking informally, that one aspect which is beginning to separate us some on the military budget is the financial problem. When he and I first came together on it, this country had some $24.6 billion in gold, and owed $7 billion abroad. Now we have $10.8 billion in gold, and owe $35 billion abroad in current liabilities redeemable in our gold. I am more apprehensive about current credit and currency problems, perhaps, than he. But together, we have worked for and voted for, since the end of World War II, $953 billion for military defense. The question, as I see it, is fairly simple: Is there anyway or anywhere we can cut this strangling budget? If there is not, in my judgment, this Nation is going bankrupt one way or the other.

Second, if we can reduce, where is the best place to cut at minimum cost to our security?

I noticed on the ticker that one Senator—and I am not talking about the Senator from Washington—says he has just received new information about submarines and greatly increased Russian strength.

I say again, there is no one on this

XUM

floor more apprehensive about the plans and ambitions of the Soviet Union than I. I do not believe any nation has real and certain long-term friends. Who would have thought, a quarter of a century ago, shortly after I came into Government, that today probably the best friends the United States has in the world, aside from Britain, would be Germany and Japan? And who could have guessed that our two worst potential enemies would be Russia and China; and we have had grave difficulties with the French.

I think a country primarily has interests as against friends or enemies. And, based on the future of the United States and the future of the children we want to have the same opportunities we have had, I would hope that ultimately we could make some form of meaningful arms control deal with the Soviets; because the Soviets are people having many of the problems in their own bloc and their own parts of the world as are we; and I think it would be wise for the future of the United States to if possible make some meaningful arrangement with them.

One other point: We have jumped this defense budget, as I mentioned, from about $10 billion shortly after World War II—and I think the dollar has decreased in value about half during that time—some eight times, to some $80 billion. So now I am convinced that to avoid economic tragedy something has to give somewhere. It occurred to me suddenly, when they started coming around last March a year ago to tell us we had to spend new billions in worry about protecting our children against the Red Chinese, but not to worry too much about the Soviet Union, that I had had it.

I said then I would not go for any of that. In my opinion even though it was the previous administration that Chinese business was strictly a political decision and not a military decision.

Inasmuch as I felt that way, and inasmuch as the people without any entangling alliances I respect most in the scientific fraternity say this system is better in theory—the defending of hard missile sites—but the wrong design to defend such sites, I cannot be for its deployment now.

In any case, what we should do is to study the record. We have had a fine presentation on the part of the proponents of the system.

Let us study the record and let us have another session before we have a vote, so that those of us who do not agree with statements made on the floor this afternoon can analyze them and present our opinions in rebuttal to the entire Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is to be understood perfectly that this record is not to be gone into by any attachés or any administrative assistants.

The record is to be gone into only by Senators. If the laws are violated, a Senator is subject to expulsion.

If an attaché gets in there somewhere, he is subject not only to expulsion, but punishment in the courts as well.

No attachés, but only Senators, can study the record.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I yield briefly to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I will be brief. I am not a member of the Armed Services Committee or the Foreign Relations Committee. I am like most of the other Senators who are members of other committees.

I have been in the Senate a good long time. I know that we are talking about an authorization bill and not an appropriation bill—nor the spending of the money after the appropriation is made, but an authorization merely.

And we are doing it just before what is probably the most important conference that our President will ever enter into is about to begin, and that conference is on the question of the control of armaments.

Insofar as I am concerned, I have a good, long memory. I remember what the Russians did to keep their promises about our having access to Berlin.

I remember what the Russians did about their promises about nuclear explosions in outer space.

I remember what Gromyko said to our late beloved President John F. Kennedy at the time of the Cuban missile crisis.

For us to take a position of refusing an authorization in an important matter which affects this most critical confrontation between our President and the Russians—a position which would leave him in the situation of not being able to say that his Congress stands back of him—and for me to cast a vote of that kind, I am not about to do it.

I am certainly going to vote for this particular authorization project, in its beginning stage just now procedurally, so that the President will not find the ground cut out from under him as he enters into this important confrontation with the Russians.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Washington has made a very fine contribution here this afternoon. I am not a technician or a scientist. But what the Senator has said makes good sense to me.

It seems to me that he has clarified what the Russian intention is. I know that there is a great debate going on as to whether this is the perfect system.

My distinguished colleague, the Senator from Illinois, pointed out the difficulty with the M-16 rifles and NORAD.

I ask my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Illinois, who won World War II?

I join the distinguished Senator from Washington in the belief that we should take all the steps we can take now on the basis of our best judgment to protect the security of our country.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, just for the information of Senators, I propose to read a few excerpts from the classified hearings before my committee. Primarily about 90 percent of it is expressions of statements by the CIA Director, Mr. Helms.

The reason why I do it is that a number of Senators are not members of the committee. It would be more troublesome to go to the room and read it there. However, the record will be available to read there if Senators desire.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator mentioned the bits of classified testimony before the two committees. Are they available to us at any time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They are available only to those Senators who go to the room and personally read them. They are not available to assistants. Senators cannot send for the records.

That is why I said it would be more convenient to have it read now. If a Senator personally goes to the director of our staff and asks for it, he will make them available to the Senator personally. However, the Senator cannot take them out of the room. He can read them there. That is a rule of the committee for preserving the classification of this kind of document.

That is the reason that I presume to take the time of the Senate to read some of them.

These are fairly recent, although they were not as of yesterday.

The one item the Senator mentioned on the SS-9's is something on which we had the same figure as that given by the Senator from Washington. We had it 2 weeks ago.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will yield in a moment.

The Senator called attention to the fact that this is the first time the Senate has ever discussed the weapons system. I think he is quite correct. For that reason, I congratulate the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Missouri for precipitating it.

I think one of the great problems that has arisen in recent years has been the proliferation of weapons systems in the Pentagon which have proved to be ineffectual. This has been written up at length. I think, as one Senator that the Senate has neglected to inquire into these matters in the past and that if we had engaged in a discussion in the past such as we have had recently, and done so more often, it might have saved the country $10 billion or $20 billion. Whatever the outcome, I think it is a very worthwhile operation.

I think it is one that the Senate ought to engage in every year. I refer to subjecting the Pentagon requests for money to scrutiny.

I have never seen it before. I have been here in Congress for 27 years. I have been in the Senate for 25 years.

Many times appropriation bills, re-

XUM

quests, and authorizations for amounts of from $10 billion to $50 billion have been submitted to the Senate, and a very perfunctory statement has been made about them. There has been literally no debate, but only a few congratulatory statements about what a fine job had been done. Usually the votes on some bills in the past have been unanimous. Perhaps two or three people voted against them. We used to have one maverick who used to vote against them as a matter of principle.

I do not believe that I ever voted against one in my life. I rarely read one. I rarely tried to cut one. It was utterly unthinkable that one would succeed.

Whatever else might have happened, under the leadership of the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Missouri, I think that the Senate has made great progress in undertaking to discuss a problem which is a very important one.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield first to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I do not know whether we will have another closed session tomorrow. Because of the death of a relative, I cannot be present tomorrow.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Missouri said not. He said he would ask for one later. There will be an open session tomorrow.

Mr. GORE. I rise to point out that with reference to the so-called overnight information about the number of SS-9's, if one comes to the chairman's desk, he will see that Mr. Helms gave us this testimony on June 23. Let me make sure of the date. Yes, it was in June.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. June 23.

Mr. GORE. June 23.

I want to advert to one other thing. I was really astounded to hear the junior Senator from Washington and the Senator from Texas refer to the Russians' intention of going for a first-strike capability. It seemed to impress the able junior Senator from Wyoming, because he said that now the Senator from Washington has clarified the Soviet intentions.

Well, Mr. President, Secretary Laird based his whole case, in his first testimony, on an assertion, to quote him, that the Soviets are going for a first-strike capability; there is no question about that. Well, we found there was a great deal of question about it; and if Senators will come to the desk and read, they will find that the National Intelligence Board did not support that conclusion and the CIA does not support that conclusion. The committee heard no such estimate of the Russians' intentions from anyone else.

Therefore, it comes somewhat as a surprise that it is asserted on the floor of the Senate, after Secretary Laird backed away from that. We spent a whole day examining this question. He backed completely away from that justification of ABM.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would say that is correct. The Senator from Tennessee developed it, and it is in the record.

What Secretary Laird finally came to, it seemed to me, was that the SS-9 itself was the kind of weapon that could be used to destroy other weapons and in that sense perform part of the function of a first strike weapon. But he did not mean they were going for a first strike capability. I think that is a fair interpretation of what he said.

I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly upon the inferences about information that might be available to some and not to others. I get my information by digging hard and getting into those estimates and comparing and trying to find what I want, and getting the assistance of people who write it up. It is a long, hard chore.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is.

Mr. STENNIS. I do not have an advantage over any other Senator, even though I am chairman of the committee.

I say to the Senator from Arkansas that many appropriation and authorization bills for the military have come to the floor of the Senate which already had quite large reductions. I recall that one year over $1 billion was taken out of an appropriation bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On the floor?

Mr. STENNIS. No, by the committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was talking about on the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. A good deal has been said about just nodding one's head and giving the Pentagon what they wanted. But that is over a period of years.

The bill to which I referred was a big bill, handled by the Senator from Georgia. I handled the military construction.

I have just decided that I should bring this up about reductions. For approximately 10 years, and every year except one, we showed reductions of from 5 to 10, 15, 20, and 22 percent. I am satisfied that we did not hurt the bone and muscle. But my point is that we went over everything.

A few years ago, I handled the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense and complained on the floor of the Senate because not enough money was in it. I knew that not enough money was in it, because a war was going on. They had not asked for enough. I said so here, and I asked them to send in some real estimates so that we could be more realistic. They did not send them in, and in January we had a deficit of $12.6 billion because of the war.

That is a kind of two-way street and a two-sided matter. My point is that the committees have tried to cope with these things.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator, in all fairness, misunderstood what I said. I certainly did not say the committee had never dealt with these. I was talking about on the floor of the Senate. It is the first time we have had a debate on a missile system.

I think the record will show that is what I said. I was not criticizing the Senator from Mississippi, and every word he has said is true. I do say that on the floor of the Senate I cannot recall a serious debate about a military appropriation or authorization, and I do not recall any serious cuts ever having been proposed and put into effect on the floor of the Senate.

I am not on the committee, and obviously I was not talking about the Senator's committee.

Mr. STENNIS. I welcome debate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I certainly did not mean to criticize the Senator from Mississippi and his committee. I was talking about my own function as a Senator and not a member of the Senator's committee.

I have never really seriously debated nor considered nor had anything to do with a matter similar to the one we are debating today. I think the Senator will agree with that, and I do not think he can recall any comparable debate on any item in an authorization or appropriation bill for the Military Establishment.

Mr. President, I should like to read a few relatively short excerpts from some of these hearings. I have tried to pick out some of them that are pertinent to the debate.

I point out that the record I hold in my hand was taken on June 23, which was not very long ago, with Director Helms and Mr. Laird. It contains 235 pages, so obviously I cannot read it all.

On the matter of the SS-9, which has occupied so much time here today, I am not sure it is all that important, but I do this just for the record. I will make a few citations. On page 62, I read a quotation from the testimony of Mr. Helms, and I shall only read those areas which I think are especially pertinent:

(Deleted.)

This is what I meant—what the Senator from Tennessee mentioned a moment ago.

(Deleted.)

I submit that these are exactly the same figures the Senator from Washington gave, and they are not new in the sense that they discovered it yesterday, because this was said on June 23.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I think that what the Senator from Washington said—and I thought the inference was plain—was that when the Safeguard system was decided upon, it was done on the basis that the intelligence in 1967 and 1968 as to the number of Soviet ICM's estimate had shown less than the (deleted) in place or under construction as of the first of the year, when the new administration came in. They found out that instead of leveling off at 250, which had been expected, it had gone up to (deleted), which indicated that the Soviets were going to go forward with their production instead of leveling off as had been originally estimated last November.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The only difference between June 23 and the previous meeting with Mr. Helms, which was—it was (deleted). That was in the previous meeting. In the interrogatory of May 7, he had, in 1969, one (deleted) known to have been started so far.

Since that time he added these (deleted) new groups, which I just read.

XUM

Mr. DOMINICK. (Deleted) new groups?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. I am just trying to straighten this out. This is not my opinion. I am only trying to put this in the record.

Mr. DOMINICK. I understand.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On page 65 of this same record Mr. Helms, talking about MIRV or MRV, said:

> The intelligence community—

This is the community because the CIA is the chairman of that community—

> (Deleted.)

This is what surprised me:

> (Deleted.)

In other words what he said is that if they put three in it, it will not be as reliable as with one. The implication is clear. There is nothing to fear from having three instead of one.

> (Deleted.)

He is saying that the Pentagon says it is deliberate and the community does not. That is one of the differences that occurred. Much was said in the press about the differences without specifying what it was.

Then, on page 102, this has to do with the PAR radar. There has been some apparent difference also on some of these other reports. This is Mr. Laird and this is the meeting when Mr. Laird and Mr. Helms appeared before the committee. I am reading from page 102 of the same record:

> Secretary LAIRD. MSR, is in place and has been constructed at Kwajalein. A PAR radar has never been constructed at any site, but the components have all been tested, and I am confident it will work.

Secretary Laird testified on page 103:

> We have not built the computer. The computer is within the state of the art, however.

Then, on page 201 the following appears. I am not reading all of these because of the time. I might use them later if we get into another session when there is more time, but the hour is late. This is on page 202 and this was when we were discussing the question of the finding with regard to Soviet capability for a first strike. Secretary Laird said:

> The answer is it has not been considered.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. The answer is, no, they have made no such findings.
>
> Senator GORE. All right.
>
> Has the National Intelligence Board made a finding that the Soviets are going for a first strike capability with any other meaning of that term in mind?
>
> Mr. HELMS. (Deleted.)

The only reason I cite that is on the specific question that the Defense Intelligence Agency and the intelligence community never made a finding that they are going for first strike capability.

Mr. DOMINICK. Is the Senator distinguishing between capability and intent?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They made no finding of intent and they made no finding they are going for capability.

Mr. DOMINICK. There is a distinction?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There are a great many pages on that. The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE) examined Mr. Laird for an hour or longer on this point. I am trying to give the Senator the final answer. If the Senator wishes to pursue it, he may. The point about what is meant by capability and intent is developed at length.

Secretary Laird, at page 203, said:

> The Defense Intelligency Agency—

He is talking about the Defense Intelligence Agency. That is distinct from the Defense Intelligence Board, of which Mr. Helms is chairman. I continue to read:

> Secretary LAIRD. The Defense Intelligence Agency, and I want to choose my words very carefully, their experts do believe that (deleted) is used on the SS–9 has the capability (deleted).

There is this difference of attitude. That happens in the question of the SS–9 and also on capability. There are some other matters at page 229 of the record. This deals with the SS–9.

> Secretary LAIRD. Well, the present number of sites under construction and in being of SS–9's goes above the high estimate as far as 1971; isn't that about it?
>
> Mr. HELMS. (Deleted.)
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Is that the only significant difference?
>
> Secretary LAIRD. That is the only significant difference.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. It is upon that basis that your feeling is so strong?
>
> Secretary LAIRD. It did not taper off. It has continued.
>
> There is one other disagreement that may exist between DIA and the CIA, but this did not exist at the time the Intelligence estimate was drawn up, and that is an item that has to do with the guidance system used in the SS–9 and, Chairman Fulbright, I want to make it very clear that I have not been drawn into that disagreement because as far as the discussion for the ABM is concerned it does not make a substantial difference as far as that argument is concerned because of the pattern, the so-called footprint, of the 3 reentry vehicles that we have seen tested in the Pacific.

This is what I was looking for. It appears on page 232. I was not sure of the page. This goes back to first strike capability.

> The CHAIRMAN. First strike capability means only a weapon which can get a hardened target?
>
> Secretary LAIRD. It is a weapon that has the capability of going after hardened targets. Now, that does not mean to say that it does not have a second strike capability, too.

My own view is that that could be said of our own Minuteman. It has capability and it could be used either way if it were accurate enough.

On April 23, Mr. Helms appeared at a meeting. I will not read all of it. I think it would be interesting if I were to refer to pages 21 and 22.

This is, I believe, page 21—Senator SYMINGTON talking:

> In fact, one hit on the MSR at (deleted) psi is worth a lot more than a hit on the Minuteman because if you hit the radar you knock out a lot of the Minuteman. Is there anything wrong with that extrapolation that you know of?
>
> Mr. HELMS. (Deleted.)

Mr. President, I think that is really uncontested.

Now this is Mr. Duckett, the man referred to a moment ago from the CIA by the Senator from Washington. It is on page 64 of the executive hearings of April 23—Mr. Duckett is speaking now for the CIA:

> We are convinced that they are what I like to describe as at least one generation of computers behind that of the United States.
>
> That is to say, if you look at our computers, theirs are like ours were the last time around before our most modern machines.
>
> Senator GORE. In number of years what would that be?
>
> Mr. DUCKETT. That would be on the order of 3 to 5 years, Senator GORE, and so if one is going to make a comparative statement, I think that is the kind of difference we see.

Pertinent to this is the discussion of how far along the Russians are and whether they are in a position to move immediately. The conclusion is that they are 3 to 5 years behind us in computer development.

There were other places in the hearings where a number of people responded to questions about computers, especially Software for computers. We received letters from people in the business stating that they believed this was the most difficult of all the components of an ABM system.

On page 74, this is on the Soviet view of balance. This is Mr. Helms talking:

> SOVIET VIEW OF THE BALANCE
>
> (Deleted.)

Now I skip over to page 75:

> Mr. HELMS. (Deleted).
>
> Senator GORE. Well now, doesn't that relate itself to whether or not they are seeking to achieve a so-called first strike capability? What is your view of that—not your view, but what is the intelligence estimate of that?
>
> Mr. HELMS. (Deleted).

On page 77:

> Senator GORE. I gather from what you have said that you have some question in your mind as to whether or not the Soviets are aiming for a first strike capability.
>
> Mr. HELMS. (Deleted).
>
> Senator GORE. Well, you used the pronoun "I". Is it the intelligence estimate that there is uncertainty as to whether they are aiming at a first strike capability?
>
> Mr. HELMS. (Deleted).
>
> Senator Gore.
>
> Mr. HELMS. (Deleted).

Mr. President, for my own benefit I say this, that the testimony we heard from Mr. Helms convinced me he was a competent man who was not swayed by any outside influence, that he was giving us the nearest to an honest and accurate assessment of all the combined forces of the intelligence community. He has given the committees, either this committee or the special committee chaired by the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), the best available information. That is what inspired in us confidence and trust in the integrity, honesty, and good judgment of Mr. Helms.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. All I want to say is that I concur fully with what the Senator has had to say about Mr. Helms, who has brought respectability and integrity to the CIA and who has given it the kind of standing which it lacked prior to the time he took over.

I must say, like all those who have come in contact with him, I have been tremendously impressed. I think he is by far the best Director the CIA has ever had. Because of Mr. Helms, that agency's integrity and standing have increased considerably, at least in the congressional community.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the Senator's comments.

Mr. President, let me read one other excerpt. This matter was pursued at great length. It shocked me a little bit to hear the Senator from Washington say that he believed the Soviets are going for a first-strike capability. There is a good deal in here about it. It is on page 79:

> Senator GORE. Then, to bring you right to the point, you could not say that they are aiming for a first strike capability, no question about it?
>
> Mr. HELMS. (Deleted.)
>
> Senator GORE. Thank you. Go ahead.
>
> Senator FULBRIGHT. Could I pursue this a bit, Mr. Chairman, to try to be as precise as I can. First, what does the national community, intelligence community, consist of, who is represented?
>
> Mr. HELMS. (Deleted.)

That is the one for which he was speaking. For the record, those are the voting members.

I asked:

> Has this board ever found that the Russians, that Russia has ever gone for a first strike?

Mr. Helms said:

> (Deleted.)
>
> Senator FULBRIGHT: You did not find that they are, so that the Community has not found either then—

That is, last fall—

> or at any one of those weekly meetings, since, have they?
>
> Mr. HELMS. (Deleted.)

A meeting is held every week. The board meets every week. They also make an annual estimate in the fall. It has been said on occasion that all the figures that some of us have been using go back to the annual meeting of last fall. That is not quite so, because the board meets every week. That is why I put it that way—not only then, referring to the annual estimate, but also at any one of the weekly meetings. That is what he said.

I invite Senators to read the whole discussion. I know I have not the time to read it all.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true that any Senator may, within the confines of the Committee on Foreign Relations room, read this record in full?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I explained that procedure before. The Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) inquired about it. I said that under the restrictions, Senators may not take the record out or have their clerks or assistants read it. A Senator must read it himself. He can come to the committee room and read it himself. If he is interested, he can come to the committee room and read it.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to associate myself with the expressions of the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Montana in showing my high regard for Mr. Helms. He is an excellent Director of the CIA. He is candid and forthright. I admire the fact that he always refuses to inject his personal speculation into any answer.

I think probably, in fairness to Mr. Helms, in view of the questions and answers discussed here it should be pointed out that at no place in his testimony did he say, either, that the CIA had found that the Russians were not aiming at a first-strike capability. I forget whether it was in that particular hearing or at other meetings, we had the very same kind of answer. When we ask, "Have you made any finding that they are going for a first-strike capability?" he says, (deleted). However, when we ask, "Have you made a finding that they are not going for a first-strike capability?" he says, (deleted) also.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is right.

Mr. MUNDT. He stresses throughout his testimony, both here and elsewhere—and that is good—that there is a difference between capability and intentions. He says the CIA is set up pretty well to determine capability. It can make pretty good estimates as to what capabilities are. But he also resorts to the answer—which we all know is correct—that nobody can read the minds of the Russians. Nobody can read our minds, either. Intentions are not something that can be gathered very accurately by intelligence.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me point out that in the statements made that the Russians have an ABM system protecting their country the clear implication is that it is an effective one. Otherwise they would not put out full-page ads or speeches saying that the Russians have an ABM. If one reads the record, Mr. Helms did not draw any conclusions about that except that he just reported the fact. It is the kind of ABM that, it is clear to any reasonable person, does not serve any useful purpose. He says flatly in one place that his opinion is they stopped deploying it because they decided it could be so easily offset or overcome by us—in other words, it is ineffective.

That is a different thing from saying that the Russians have an ABM; therefore we must have one. If it means that we have to have one like theirs, it means nothing. As of this moment, the record shows clearly that the Russians do not have an ABM that is in any sense of the word satisfactory or that gives them any real protection.

Mr. MUNDT. I do not think the Senator should put Dick Helms in a position, which he has consistently refused to assume, of being an authority on American capability.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On what?

Mr. MUNDT. On American capability.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He does not comment on that. Did I leave that impression?

Mr. MUNDT. I thought that was implicit in the Senator's concept that he thought the ABM system is no good.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I refer to the Galosh system in Russia.

Mr. MUNDT. He did not say either that their system is not any good.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What he said amounts to that. That is a reasonable interpretation from what I have read here. I do not see how one could say, from what he says, that it amounts to anything; that the Russians themselves consider it satisfactory.

Mr. MUNDT. He gave that as one hypothesis, not as a mind reader but as a speculative hypothesis, as to why they had stopped the construction, and also pointed out in his testimony that they stopped it and they later resumed it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. Resumed tests, not deployment.

Mr. MUNDT. Resumed the encirclement of Moscow.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think so; not deployed.

Mr. MUNDT. He said that in the committee meeting yesterday, or another one. He emphasizes that is guesswork on his part. He does not know.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There was evidence that they were testing what he thought was part of an improved ABM, but, from what appears in this testimony, they have not reached a point where they themselves have solved the problems and are again resuming deployment. I read part of it. I will not read it again.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I do not know whether it was Mr. Helms, but certainly we were told by Mr. Helms, or Mr. Durkett of his Agency, yesterday, that they were in the process of completing construction of (deleted) more sites around Moscow. So they are continuing with the deployment of the ABM.

Mr. MUNDT. After a cessation, they are resuming, and nobody can guess why.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On (deleted) they were continuing. They were continuing as of that time. They had not completed. They were still continuing and working on them. They had completed and were working on (deleted). That is in the record. I do not know if it is very significant, but he did in that case draw the conclusion that the reason why they stopped was that it was unsatisfactory.

Mr. MUNDT. While he did say that, he also said: (deleted).

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. I would say his speculations are a little better formed than mine.

Mr. MUNDT. He left an anchor out to leeward by saying: (deleted).

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that same point?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. There is nothing in Mr. Helms' testimony which would indicate, even if that inference were correct—namely, that the Russian ABM system is not effective—that ours will not be effective.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He does not comment upon ours. He does not bring that in at all. The only inference is that it is much more difficult than the Russians thought it would be and that some of us think it is, because they have not tackled the software, the computer and the radar.

We have not built the radar. The testimony is quite clear that we have not built the PAR radar and have not tried to build a computer and do not have a computer that will work.

This list of questions is very important. May I ask the majority leader if I may put material of this kind into the RECORD without reading it?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Surely.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does it need unanimous consent?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the remainder of these questions into the RECORD. They are relatively short. I do not refer to the long hearings. They are relatively short questions and answers by the CIA, all of which bear upon this matter. I shall put them into the RECORD for the information of the Senate.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object—and I shall not object—solely to interrogate the majority leader as to just what happens to a record of this kind. We do not have this kind of record often enough to be sure about this. During the course of the afternoon we have today stripped the confidential label off records and put them into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Is that record to be ultimately published?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. May I say I was surprised that information which was classified as top secret last night was made free for use today. I am really getting tired of declassification of information to suit a particular purpose which may be before us.

But at the beginning of the session today, I did make the following statement:

> I further ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the closed session, the transcript of the remarks of each Senator who participated in the proceedings be delivered to him by the Chief of official reporters; that the Senator shall have the right to revise his own remarks; that such Senator shall deliver his revised remarks to the Chief Reporter, who shall then deliver the transcript to the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Stennis) as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services; that the expurgated version of these proceedings be prepared under the direction of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Stennis), and that there be deleted from the transcript anything which might be classified; that such record of proceedings be made public by being printed in the permanent Congressional Record of the date on which they occur; and that the Chief Reporter turn the shorthand notes of the official reporters over to the Secretary of the Senate, to be kept in secret and not to be disclosed without leave of the Senate.

Furthermore, before that, I made a statement under rules XXXV and XXXVI, which state as follows:

> All confidential communications and all remarks, votes and proceedings thereon under these rules shall be kept secret, until the Senate shall, by their resolution, take off the injunction of secrecy.
>
> Any Senator or officer of the Senate who shall disclose the secret or confidential business or proceedings of the Senate shall be liable, if a Senator, to suffer expulsion from the body; and if an officer, to dismissal from the service of the Senate, and to punishment for contempt.

Mr. MUNDT. That certainly would seem to give us the protective mantle I think we need.

I feel, myself, that this afternoon's session has been very informative and very worthwhile.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very worthwhile.

Mr. MUNDT. I am not going to object to the Senator putting this in the RECORD. I just wanted to be sure we were not violating top secret documents.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I raised this question. The Senator, I think, is familiar with the document. Does he object to it?

Mr. MUNDT. No, I do not object. The Senator's document is not as sensitive, I believe, as some of the other statements were.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. On the same basis the others were put in, I would assume they would take it out before they publish the RECORD. I certainly have no objection to it going in, but I have no overwhelming desire. I thought the Senator might not want it in.

Mr. MUNDT. No; I do not object. I was just reserving the right to object for the purpose of making an inquiry.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Deleted.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has a conference report to bring before the Senate, and I think I have put enough in, depending on how this develops, some of the other information may be more pertinent at a later date.

Therefore, I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go out of closed session and into open session.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would suggest to the staff that the desks be screened and cleared, and whatever else they do to make sure that there is no information lying around loose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon, at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m., the doors of the Chamber were opened, and the open session of the Senate was resumed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

TRANSACTION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of morning business, with statements of Senators limited to a period of 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EAGLETON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HANSEN TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the prayer and after the Journal tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN) be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes. I am not sure that is the length of time he wants, but whatever it is, the time can be adjusted accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN) tomorrow, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with a 3-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 300

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 300) commemorating the 100th anniversary in 1969 of the birth of organized baseball.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives on House Concurrent Resolution 300.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 300, which was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That, to commemorate the one-hundredth anniversary in 1969 of the birth of organized baseball, the Congress of the United States officially recognizes the year 1969 as baseball's centennial year and extends its congratulations and best wishes to the Commissioner of Baseball, the President of the National League, the President of the American League, the twelve teams of the National League, and the twelve teams of the American League, and to the several minor leagues and all other organizations and individuals participating in or connected with organized baseball.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, House Concurrent Resolution 300 was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to, as follows:

> Whereas, baseball is among the oldest outstanding national games of the United States, combining the zest of the amateur with the skills of the professional and providing excitement, drama, interest, and entertainment both for participants and for spectators; and
>
> Whereas, although baseball was already being widely played, watched, and attended in various forms on a largely amateur or recreational basis, the development of the game to its present status as a national institution truly began with the organization of America's first professional baseball team in 1869; and
>
> Whereas, the year 1969 marks the one-hundredth anniversary of organized professional baseball in the United States and is baseball's centennial year; and
>
> Whereas, the playing of the Fortieth All-Star Baseball Game, on July 22, 1969, in Washington, District of Columbia, together with related activities and observances in Washington and throughout the country, is

XUM

the occasion for the special celebration of baseball's centennial year; and

Whereas, it is fitting that appropriate recognition be given to the many contributions which baseball has made to the American way of life both as a sport and as an expression of the American spirit: Now, therefore, be it

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I am delighted that we have saluted baseball on its 100th year.

If there is no unanimity on this proposal, there is serious doubt we could agree on the virtue of motherhood and the beauty of the flag.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1072) to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, and titles I, III, IV, and V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended; that the House instisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1072) to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, and titles I, III, IV, and V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HARSHA, and Mr. CLEVELAND were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6508) to provide assistance to the State of California for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent storms, floods, and high waters; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DON CLAUSEN, and Mr. DENNEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 300) extending the congratulations of the Congress of the United States to organized baseball upon the occasion of its centennial year, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS FOR APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 1072.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1072) to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, and titles I, III, IV, and V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Regional Action Planning Commission Amendments of 1969".

SEC. 102. (a) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 505 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3185) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and planning, investigations, studies, demonstration projects, and training programs which will further the purposes of this Act."

(b) The second sentence of subsection (b) of section 505 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "Thereafter, such expenses shall be paid 50 per centum by the Federal Government and 50 per centum by the States in the region, except that the administrative expenses of the Federal cochairman, his alternate, and his staff shall be paid solely by the Federal Government. The share to be paid by each State shall be determined by the Commission. The Federal cochairman shall not participate or vote in such determination."

(c) Subsection (c) of section 505 of such Act is repealed.

SEC. 103. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 509 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3188a) is amended (1) by inserting after "share," the following: "or for which there are insufficient funds available under the Federal grant-in-aid Act authorizing such programs to meet pressing needs of the region,", and (2) by striking out "for the sole" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "for all or any portion of the basic Federal contribution to projects under such Federal grant-in-aid programs authorized by Federal grant-in-aid Acts, and for the".

(b) The next to the last sentence of subsection (a) of section 509 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "In the case of any program or project for which all or any portion of the basic Federal contribution to the project under a Federal grant-in-aid program is proposed to be made under this subsection, no such Federal contribution shall be made until the responsible Federal official administering the Federal grant-in-aid Act authorizing such contribution certifies that such program or project meets all of the requirements of such Federal grant-in-aid Act and would be approved for Federal contribution under such Act if funds were available under such Act for such program or project. Funds may be provided for programs and projects in a State under this subsection only if the Commission determines that the level of Federal and State financial assistance under titles of this Act other than this title, and under Acts other than this Act, for the same type of programs or projects in that portion of the State within the region will not be diminished in order to substitute funds authorized by this subsection."

(c) Subsection (c) of section 509 of such Act is amended by striking out in the first sentence thereof "December 31, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1970".

(d) Subsection (d) of section 509 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this title, for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971, to be available until expended, not to exceed $225,000,000. Not less than 10 per centum nor more than 30 per centum of the amounts appropriated under this authorization for any fiscal year shall be made available for any one regional commission."

SEC. 104. Title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3181 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"COORDINATION

"SEC. 511. The Secretary shall coordinate his activities in making grants and loans under titles I and II of this Act with those of each of the Federal cochairmen in making grants under this title, and each Federal cochairman shall coordinate his activities in making grants under this title with those of the Secretary in making grants and loans under titles I and II of this Act."

TITLE II—APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1969

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1969".

SEC. 202. Subsection (b) of section 105 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 105) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) To carry out this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission to be available until expended, not to exceed $1,900,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971. Not to exceed $475,000 of such authorization shall be available for the expenses of the Federal cochairman, his alternate, and his staff."

SEC. 203. (a) The second sentence of section 201(a) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 201) is amended to read as follows: "The provisions of sections 106(a) and 118 of title 23, United States Code, relating to the obligation, period of availability, and expenditure of Federal-aid highway funds, shall apply to the development highway system and the local access roads, and all other provisions of such title 23 that are applicable to the construction and maintenance of Federal-aid primary and secondary highways and which the Secretary determines are not inconsistent with this Act shall apply, respectively, to such system and roads."

(b) Subsection (g) of section 201 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 201) is amended by striking out "four-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971." and inserting in lieu thereof "five-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1972, except that not to exceed $195,000,000 of such amount may be obligated for any one such fiscal year."

SEC. 204. (a) The first sentence of clause (2) of subsection (a) of section 205 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 205) is amended by striking out "in accordance with the" and inserting in lieu thereof "or to make grants to the States for carrying out such projects, in accordance with the applicable".

(b) Subsection (b) of such section 205 is amended by striking out "and 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "1969, 1970, and 1971".

SEC. 205. Subsection (c) of section 214 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 214) is amended by striking out "December 31, 1967" in the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1970".

SEC. 206. Section 302(a)(1)(B) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 302) is amended by inserting before "a local" the following: "a State agency certified as".

SEC. 207. Section 401 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 401) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and not to exceed $250,000,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971, to carry out this Act, of which amount not to exceed $85,000,000 is authorized for section 202, $15,000,000 for section 203, $15,000,000 for section 205, $2,000,000 for section 207,

$50,000,000 for section 211, $75,000,000 for section 214, and $8,000,000 and section 302.".

Sec. 208. Section 403 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (48 App. U.S.C. 403) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The President is authorized and directed to make a study of the extent to which portions of upper New York State, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine which are geographically part of the Appalachian region and share the social and economic characteristics thereof should be included in the region in order to carry out the purposes of this Act. He shall submit the results of such study together with his recommendations to Congress no later than June 30, 1970."

Sec. 209. Section 405 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 405) is amended by inserting immediately after "Act" the following: ", other than section 201,".

And amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for the renewal and extension of title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendments and agree to the conference requested by the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Montoya, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Spong, Mr. Baker, Mr. Cooper, and Mr. Mr. Packwood conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

THE WAR MUST END

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have inquired of the Defense Department as to the U.S. casualties suffered in Vietnam during the week ending July 2, and they have reported to me that the total casualties for the week were 1,760. This brings the total number of casualties suffered in Vietnam since the inauguration of President Nixon to more than 50,000.

Mr. President, this war must be ended.

S. 2645—INTRODUCTION OF BILL RELATING TO TAX REFORM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, today the Committee on Finance, by a vote of 9 to 8, refused to consider amendments to the surtax bill, and reported it to the Senate without consideration of any tax reform amendments or amendments of any other kind.

I have just now introduced a tax reform bill, which will be offered as a substitute for the surtax bill when it is made the pending business of the Senate. The bill I have introduced is not a comprehensive measure; it is not all inclusive; it does not cover all that needs to be done in the tax reform area. But this bill does contain a number of provisions covering subjects in which I have had a longtime and continuing interest. In some of these areas I have already been instrumental in helping to bring about changes, but these changes have been insufficient to bring true equity even in these limited segments of the Tax Code. Some points with which I desire to deal are omitted because of time required to make technical drafts and the desire of the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee that proposed amendments be introduced by July 18, as had been indicated by the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

As has been pointed out in the Senate in recent days, it is not practicable to attempt to rewrite the entire Tax Code in the Finance Committee during the next few weeks. But it is possible to bring about changes in areas which have been studied—usually studied to death—for years, and in which Senators have already formed judgments in connection with, and as an integral part of, the surtax extension bill.

As I have said, the Senate Finance Committee acted today without consideration of amendments, even though the Finance Committee is scheduled to begin hearings next week on several specific reform proposals, including those contained in the bill I have introduced. Other Senators have indicated bills or amendments they wish to have considered. I think it may be possible to consider many items in a relatively short time in the committee.

I think that by the narrow vote of 9 to 8 the committee today voted to report the surtax bill without giving any consideration whatsoever to any amendment, even though announcement had publicly been made that hearings would be held and Senators had been publicly invited to offer amendments and had been assured that consideration would be given to any amendment introduced by July 18.

I would like to point out, Mr. President, that it was the distinguished chairman of the committee, the junior Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Long), who announced this invitation on the part of the committee and who had scheduled public hearings on tax reform amendments to begin next week.

I would like also to call attention to the fact that the chairman of the committee was not one of the nine who voted to report the bill today, despite this pledge of the consideration of amendments.

Incidentally, the Senator from Louisiana made a strong statement in the committee in opposition to such action.

Sentiment for reform is in the air, and I do not believe it can be safely ignored. A beginning must be made now on tax reform. A revolt of taxpayers all over the country has been felt by every representative of the people. I do not believe it is sufficient to tell the long-suffering lower- and middle-income groups on whom the heaviest burden of taxation has fallen, and who have no way of escape from the grasp of the withholding system on wages and salaries, that we are preparing for uncertain activity which may lead to tax reform. We must enact some important reforms now as a good-faith beginning. We can then follow that up by a really comprehensive tax reform which will, of course, take some time.

Now, Mr. President, since Senators do not have time to study in detail all bills which are introduced, and since they have had no chance to study the bill which I just now introduced, I would like to state very briefly what the bill I have introduced contains. And let me say, too, that I am not necessarily wedded to the exact wording of all parts of this bill. There have been some drafting difficulties in certain areas, and I am sure that further discussion in the Finance Committee will result in improvements.

Also, I would emphasize that my bill contains one revenue loser of significance. I refer to section 4, which would increase the personal exemption deduction to $1,250. As Senators will note, I propose to make up the lost revenue, thus presenting a balanced package from a revenue standpoint, by adjusting corporate and upper individual income tax rates. Here again, let me point out that additional revenue producing loophole closers will be under discussion, and I would hope we can get together on a package which will be balanced as to revenue losers and gainers without having to resort to increased rates. There is certainly sufficient opportunity for this, after all, particularly in the individual income area, the tax base has been badly eroded. Probably not more than 40 percent of what is defined as personal income in the national income accounts enters into the computation of the personal income tax, and recent studies have turned up some $50 billion of tax preferences under existing tax laws.

At any rate, here is a brief statement of the contents of this bill.

Section 1 contains the usual language, including the title.

Section 2 would extend the surtax at the full 10 percent rate for the entire fiscal year. I regret that the administration hesitated so long in making a recommendation to extend the surtax, and it did seem a mistake to me to have given the impression that the tax really might have been dispensed with altogether. Such an impression was fostered both by the delay and by the changing of the terms of the surtax as applied after January 1, 1970.

Section 3 would repeal the investment tax credit. My terms are somewhat tighter than the proposal as worked out in the Ways and Means Committee and in the bill reported today by the Finance Committee.

Section 4 would increase the personal exemption to $1,250 for the taxpayer and each of his dependents. This is the surest way of removing most of the poor from the tax rolls, and, at the same time giving badly needed relief to the middle-income groups who are concerned, and properly so, with the cost of supporting and educating their children. This would give to the married couple with two children a tax-free base of $5,000 upon which to construct a minimum household budget. This is a simple and gimmick-free way of accomplishing this purpose.

Mr. President, I emphasize that I know of no more unrealistic provision in the tax law than the $600 exemption for a taxpayer and for a taxpayer's dependent. Where is there a parent who can decently feed, clothe, and provide shelter for a child for $600, or for himself or for his wife?

It is utterly unrealistic. The cost of living has so increased that this simply must be changed.

In order to raise this exemption, the Government will suffer a big loss in revenue. Why? Because the middle-income taxpayer is bearing an undue proportion of the load. Therefore, when we provide some equitable relief for the middle- and low-income taxpayers, we lose revenue. But there are places at which to recoup the revenue while promoting equity in the tax law. This I have done in presenting a tax reform bill balanced as to loss and gain in revenue.

Section 5 would repeal the unlimited charitable contributions deduction provision now in the code.

This code makes a mockery of charity. What is called charity is self-serving tax avoidance in many instances.

Section 6 would terminate, as of this date, both the older style restricted and the newer, and almost as bad, qualified stock options. I have fought this battle off and on for years.

Section 7 provides for the tax treatment of so-called ABC and carved-out transactions as mortgage loans.

This is a well recognized tax loophole to those who understand the technicalities of the tax law, particularly its relationship in connection with percentage depletion.

This particular tax problem may not be familiar to all Senators, but there will be no need for long or drawn-out proceedings to arrive at a decision as to what to do about it.

Section 8 would eliminate the tax exempt status now enjoyed by private foundations, and it would place a limit of 25 years on the life of any foundation not operating a church, educational organization, or hospital. I have taken a somewhat different approach from that taken by the Ways and Means Committee, but my solution is simpler and will, I believe, remove abuses more surely. Let me say, parenthetically, that section 501 of the code needs a thorough overhaul about as badly as any section in the code. There are problems of definition which need resolution. We need to sort out diverse elements and provide different treatment for organizations serving different purposes.

Section 9 would repeal percentage depletion, thereby putting all oil, gas and minerals operations on a cost depletion basis. I have not treated with intangible drilling costs, partially for lack of time properly to draft an amendment, but this, too, should be examined in a more comprehensive review and dealt with effectively.

Section 10 provides for repeal of section 911 of the code. This is the section which exempts from U.S. income tax the first $20,000, and in some instances the first $25,000, of individual overseas earnings.

Mr. President, it may sound to some Senators as an act of generosity to the middle-income taxpayer to raise his personal exemption and that of his dependents to $1,250. If that is overly generous, what of the provision that gives American citizens living and working abroad a $20,000 exemption or, in some instances, as I have said, a $25,000 exemption? Surely, here is a loophole that needs closing.

Section 11 would provide for the current taxation of the earnings and profits of foreign subsidiaries of U.S. concerns. An exception is made for certain operations in less-developed countries.

I will have more to say later about this tax preference given to income earned abroad. Briefly, let me say that it operates as a subsidy to move American factories and American jobs out of the United States, and we suffer the consequences.

Section 12 extends the holding period for capital gains purposes to 1 year in order for a transaction to qualify for long-term capital gains treatment. The alternative method of computing the tax which gives the taxpayer a 25-percent maximum rate would also be abolished.

Section 13, as an effective means of curbing "hobby" farming tax losses, would raise the useful life of livestock for depreciation purposes from 7 to 10 years and double the holding period for capital gains purposes for livestock held for breeding from 1 year to 2 years.

Section 14 adjusts the tax rate schedules upward on higher bracket income in order to keep this bill in fiscal balance. Let me again stress that it would not be necessary to raise rates if loopholes of favoritism can be closed. But as between raising some rates and raising the personal exemption for all, I strongly suggest this bill as the fairer. Furthermore, the extension of the surtax at the full 10-percent figure will allow somewhat more leeway in making adjustments.

I am sure all Senators will want to participate actively in a major effort to make our tax laws more equitable and efficacious. In this spirit I invite consideration of this bill, which I offer as a substitute for the House-passed surtax extension bill, H.R. 12290.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2645) to continue the income tax surcharge for an additional year and to terminate the investment credit, increase the amount of the personal exemptions, and provide other reforms in the Federal income tax laws, introduced by Mr. GORE was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR ALLOTT TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming on tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Following his remarks, there will be a brief period for the transaction of routine morning business.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar under "New Reports."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations on the Executive Calendar, under "New Reports," will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Justice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FROM SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July 1968-March 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED PAYMENT OF NON-FOREIGN DIFFERENTIALS TO CERTAIN U.S. CITIZEN WAGE BOARD EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5941 of title 5, United States Code, to provide payment of nonforeign differentials to certain U.S. citizen wage board employees serving in nonforeign areas outside the continental United States and Hawaii (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint memorial of the Legislature, State of Oregon; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 6

"To the Honorable President of the United States and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Fifty-fifth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas the present system for drafting young men into the military service of this country has aroused widespread dissatisfaction; and

XUM

"Whereas much of this dissatisfaction and the current unrest among young people stems from the uncertainty as to jobs, education and personal decisions; and

"Whereas an adequate and fairer system of selective service can be devised; now, therefore,

"Be it Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

"(1) The Congress of the United States is memorialized to establish a selective service system based on a lottery whereby all eligible persons are subject to the draft for one year after they reach 18 years of age and are allowed to elect to defer the one year of being subject to the draft for a period of four years.

"(2) The Secretary of the Senate shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States Congress, to each member of the Oregon Congressional Delegation, and the Presiding Officers of each house of the Legislative Assemblies of all of the states.

"Adopted by Senate May 12, 1969.

"Cecil L. Edwards,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"E. D. Potts,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by House May 19, 1969.

"Robert F. Smith,
"Speaker of the House."

A joint memorial of the Legislature, State of Oregon; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Fifty-fifth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, respectfully represents as follows:

"Whereas fish constitute one of the prime natural resources of this state, not only supporting an important commercial fishing industry that furnishes a livelihood to many citizens, but also providing a recreational activity available to all citizens; and

"Whereas research and study of the habits of fish and the effect of a changing environment on fish are more vital than ever if this important natural resource is to continue to serve the people of this state; and

"Whereas the Bureau of the Budget of the United States has indicated that reductions in the federal budget for the fiscal year 1970 are anticipated with respect to research programs involving the survival of juvenile salmon passing through turbines, the effects of transportation on the survival of juvenile salmon, racial migration rates and timing of juvenile salmon, and prediction of environmental effects on fisheries; now, therefore,

"Be It Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

"(1) The Congress of the United States is memorialized to provide sufficient moneys for the research projects referred to in the preamble to this resolution to be carried out by the appropriate federal agencies without any reduction during the fiscal year 1970.

"(2) The Secretary of the Senate shall send a copy of this memorial to the presiding officer of each house of the Congress, and to each member of the Oregon Congressional Delegation.

"Adopted by Senate March 26, 1969.

"Cecil L. Edwards,
"Secretary of Senate.
"E. D. Potts,
"President of Senate.

"Adopted by House May 7, 1969.

"Robert F. Smith,
"Speaker of House."

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 12290. An act to continue the income tax surcharge and the excise taxes on automobiles and communication services for temporary periods, to terminate the investment credit, to provide a low income allowance for individuals, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–321).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bill were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Hansen, Mr. McGee, and Mr. Moss):

S. 2641. A bill to amend section 613 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 2642. A bill to amend section 8(e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, as re-enacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1961, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to imported olives; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 2643. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on olives packed in certain airtight containers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TYDINGS (for himself, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bible, Mr. Cranston, Mr. Cook, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Goodell, Mr. Gravel, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Hollings, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Moss, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Packwood, Mr. Pell, Mr. Percy, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Williams of Delaware, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 2644. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for reports to the Congress by the Comptroller General concerning certain price increases in Government contracts and certain failures to meet Government contract completion dates; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(The remarks of Mr. Tydings when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. GORE:

S. 2645. A bill to continue the income tax surcharge for an additional year and to terminate the investment credit, increase the amount of the personal exemptions, and provide other reforms in the Federal income tax laws; to the Committee on Finance.

(The remarks of Mr. Gore when he introduced the bill appear earlier in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 2646. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make structural changes with respect to the income tax in order to achieve a greater degree of equity in the Federal income tax system; to the Committee on Finance.

(The remarks of Mr. Ribicoff when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2647. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; and

S. 2648. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to suspend the investment credit during the remaining period of applicability of the tax surcharge; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. EAGLETON:

S. 2649. A bill for the relief of Patrick J. Gilligan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAVEL:

S. 2650. A bill to provide for the disposition of certain funds awarded to the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska by a judgment entered by the Court of Claims against the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(The remarks of Mr. Gravel when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH (by request):

S. 2651. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act, and to provide additional Federal assistance in connection with the construction, alteration, or improvement of airports, airport terminals, and related facilities; to provide relief of congestion at public airports; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(The remarks of Mr. Randolph when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

S. 2644—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL AMENDING THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it has been said that, "Buying what you do not need is an easy road to needing what you cannot buy." I believe this accurately summarizes what we in Congress have found to be the case in our deliberations over this year's budget.

Hearings held by several Senate committees this session have uncovered billions of dollars in Federal waste; billions of dollars wasted on programs we do not need or wasted by overpaying for what could have been obtained at a lower cost through more efficient management and procurement procedures.

At the same time, we have discovered a great shortage of funds for the development and operation of programs in areas such as education, health, and conservation, areas in which the pressing need for Government action is well documented.

Thus, we have reached a point where substantially reducing Federal waste is more than simply a matter of good government; it is essential if we are to meet our urgent civilian and defense needs. No less than our national well-being and security are at stake.

However, merely stating that waste is an evil that must be expurgated hardly gets to the heart of the problem. No Member of Congress consciously supports the inefficient use of a single tax dollar. Yet, as the record uncontestably reveals, waste in Federal spending persists at an unparalleled level.

Most of the waste occurs in the military sector. This is not surprising in view of the fact that 80 percent of all controllable costs in the Federal budget are military or military-related. The military authorization requested by the administration for fiscal year 1970 is more than $81 billion.

However, even when the size of the military budget is taken fully into account, the amount of waste that occurs is staggering.

Senator Symington, the distinguished Senator from Missouri and a former Secretary of the Air Force, has documented the expenditure of $23 billion in recent years on missiles now acknowledged to be unworkable or obsolete. More than $4 billion of this total was invested in missile systems that were abandoned before they were ever deployed.

In a recent study of the performance of complex weapon systems, Richard Stubbing, a defense analyst at the Bureau of the Budget, found that in 13 aircraft and missile programs undertaken since 1955 at a total cost of $40 billion, fewer than 40 percent of the electronic components performed acceptably. Two of these programs were canceled at a cost to the Government of $2 billion, and two programs costing $10 billion were phased out after 3 years owing to low reliability.

The Pentagon lavished $1.1 billion on the development of an atomic-powered bomber that was finally abandoned as unworkable. This story was repeated with a jet-powered seaplane that never materialized at a cost to the taxpayers of $400 million. The list of fruitless military investments is a long one.

A survey of major military contracts also reveals numerous instances of sizable cost overruns and late deliveries.

For example, SRAM, a short range attack missile boasting predecessors which failed to the tune of $962.6 million, has already undergone design changes accounting for cost overruns totaling $326 million. And the Pentagon still does not know if the missile will work.

The MBT–70 is a battle tank program conceived in 1963. Its completion date has already been extended 5 years from 1969 to 1974, and its research and development costs currently exceed original estimates by 528 percent.

The much-publicized C–5A program has already generated overruns of approximately $2 billion, and this figure is likely to grow before the program is either completed or terminated.

And so the record runs.

Why is Pentagon procurement plagued by so much waste and inefficiency? As the Subcommittee on Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee has brilliantly documented, the causes are many and varied.

However, the principal reason for the billions in waste is the breakdown of an effective marketplace in the defense industry. Open competition for Government contracts, which would severely penalize contractors who persistently produce cost overruns, late deliveries, and equipment that fails to meet performance standards, virtually has disappeared.

Competitive bidding for military contracts—which is supposed to be the rule for awarding these often multibillion dollar agreements—has become the exception. Last year, less than 10 percent of the Defense Department's procurement was handled through competitive bids. Thus, the Pentagon is deprived of any objective criteria for measuring the fairness of approximately 90 percent of its contract awards.

In the absence of real competition, many of the large defense contractors—the 100 largest industrial suppliers received 67.4 percent of defense contracts of $10,000 or more last year—employ the technique of "buying in." This is a common practice which finds a contractor offering to do a job at a lower cost than he knows will be incurred, or offering to meet performance specifications which he knows are unattainable, or offering to deliver a finished product before he knows it will be completed.

Unfortunately, the Pentagon has often been guilty of reenforcing this practice by adjusting contracts to cover potential losses incurred when contractors fail to meet their own deliberately dishonest terms. Instead of penalizing contractors when they fail to live up to contractual agreements, the Government foots the additional bills.

The obvious result is cost overruns, inferior equipment, late deliveries, and excessive profits in the defense industry—all of which add up to billions of wasted tax dollars.

As I mentioned earlier, merely decrying waste does little to eliminate it. Clearly, Congress must begin in earnest to devise ways to effectively exercise more complete control over spending by the Pentagon and the other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

Certainly, a necessary prerequisite for fuller congressional control is adequate information. For as the investigations of the past year have revealed, we in Congress have little detailed knowledge of how money we appropriate is being spent in many parts of the executive branch.

Right now there is no agency of Government which critically scrutinizes major Federal projects and systematically reports its findings to the Congress. The Bureau of the Budget is responsible solely to the President.

Therefore, as a first important step toward the reassertion of Congress responsibility to oversea Federal expenditures, I am introducing a bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to make quarterly reports to the Congress on all Government contracts in which substantial cost overruns or late deliveries have been recorded. Joining me as cosponsors of this measure are Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bible, Mr. Cranston, Mr. Cook, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Goodell, Mr. Gravel, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Hollings, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Moss, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Packwood, Mr. Pell, Mr. Percy, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Williams of Delaware, and Mr. Yarborough.

Utilizing an existing agency to provide Congress with contract information represents the most economical way of seeking to cut waste. In addition, the General Accounting Office was created for the sole purpose of providing Congress with independent reports on the financial and managerial operations of the executive branch. So GAO was the logical choice.

Again, accurate and detailed information regarding Government contractual relations will not automatically eliminate Federal waste. But it will give Congress the necessary raw material to approach its oversight responsibilities with hope for success.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2644) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for reports to the Congress by the Comptroller General concerning certain price increases in Government contracts and certain failures to meet Government contract completion dates, introduced by Mr. Tydings (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2644

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 206 of part 1 of title II of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (31 U.S.C. 60) is amended by—

(1) inserting "(a)" immediately following "Sec. 206.", and

(2) adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) Within thirty days following the close of each fiscal quarter the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on each contract of the United States

"(1) in which the price was increased to an amount 10 per centum or $100,000, which ever is lesser, in excess of the price estimated by the person contracting with the United States at the time the contract was signed, or

"(2) which was completed or remains uncompleted more than six months after the completion date estimated by the person contracting with the United States at the time the contract was signed.

"(c) For the purposes of subsection (b), the term 'contract of the United States' means any contract executed by the United States (including contracts subject to chapter 137 or 139 of Title 10 of the United States Code) for—

"(1) services, including research and development,

"(2) the construction, alteration, or repair of any public building or public work of the United States, or

"(3) the manufacture or furnishing of any materials, supplies, articles, or equipment, in which the price estimated by the person contracting with the United States at the time the contract was signed was $100,000 or more, or in which the price has increased to $100,000 or more."

(b) The heading for such section 206 is amended by adding at the end thereof "; REPORTS ON GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS".

S. 2646—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL ON TAX REFORM

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to reform the Federal Tax Code in an effort to insure that we treat all taxpayers equitably.

The Congress must reform our tax laws this year. The American citizen is fed up with unfairness and discrimination in the present laws.

Our tax system is based on the honesty and integrity of the individual taxpayer who must, each spring, assess his own taxes and pay them voluntarily. Our faith has been well justified as shown by the overwhelming majority of Americans who annually return accurately completed forms.

But this integrity is necessarily based on the broad trust that other Americans in similar economic circumstances bear similar tax burdens in relationship to

XUM

their ability to pay and that the tax laws themselves are equitable for all citizens.

This integrity is threatened not by the burden of taxation, which is great in itself, but the widespread knowledge today that there are many individuals who are not required to pay a fair share of taxes because the laws unjustifiably reduce the tax burden on many of our high-income citizens.

Taxes affect all of us. Each year some 75 million individual tax returns pay $95 billion into Uncle Sam's Treasury. These dollars come from rich and poor, black and white, young and old.

Taxes are the financial cost of organized society. Our system was designed to share this burden in accordance with the ability of an individual citizen to pay. In other words, those who benefited most in a financial sense from the society were correspondingly called upon to contribute the most.

But it is clear today that this design has not been fulfilled and that the burdens of government are not shared according to the ability to pay. Frankly, our tax system is shot through with inequities, discrimination and special privilege. These loopholes provide excessive tax benefits to a few while increasing the burden on the majority.

The 10-percent surtax has magnified this unfairness. By imposing a tax on a tax we have illuminated the weaknesses of the system. The American taxpayer has responded with a growing and justified demand for greater fairness.

It is time we in Congress faced up to the important task of restoring a larger element of equity to our tax laws.

Mr. President, I offer a comprehensive bill to reform the tax code and provide a major step forward toward the goal of tax equity.

This bill by no means covers all the needed or desirable reforms. Others on this floor have presented different tax reforms which will have my wholehearted support and vote.

Nevertheless, this package includes the basic reforms which I believe must be the foundation for any meaningful and fair tax revision.

Today, the Federal Government is taking an extraordinarily large slice of the workingman's income. On top of this, State and local governments are increasing their demands on the citizen's pocketbook. In these uncomfortable circumstances it is incumbent upon us to have Federal tax laws which are fair, up to date, as simplified as possible, and which accurately reflect the needs and priorities of the Nation.

Unfortunately, our present tax system fails to meet these goals. I cannot defend a system which asks us to condone the fact that 155 citizens with incomes over $200,000 do not pay any taxes at all; or a system which allows an individual with an income of $23 million in 1 year to pay no tax; or a system which includes the fact that a greater percentage of those people with incomes over a million dollars pay taxes of less than 5 percent than at any other income level.

The present system is indefensible. I have introduced a package of tax revision which would be a major step in restoring an element of equity in our laws. The package has two goals. First, it seeks to end the great "tax shelters" which permeate the code and permit taxpayers to protect otherwise taxable income by incurring artificial tax losses. Second, this package seeks to redistribute the heavy tax burden away from those with low and middle incomes, while at the same time emphasizing greater simplicity in the standard tax forms. This is done by increasing the standard deduction and permitting a tax credit for the expenses of higher education.

TAX SHELTERS

The concept of a tax shelter is best described as a tax provision allowing normally taxable income to escape taxation by the occurrence of deductible losses which, though real in the fiscal sense, are artificial in the sense that they are more than regained upon sale of a capital asset. Moreover, while the losses have been deducted against ordinary income, the gains have been taxed at the low capital gains rate, resulting in an overall tax saving.

TAX STATUS OF THE PETROLEUM AND MINERAL INDUSTRY

The first section of the bill would reduce all percentage depletion allowances available to industries extracting oil, gas, and other minerals. The second provision will end the option of treating as current expenses those development costs which are normally treaty as capital costs in any other industry.

The present tax laws permit two practices resulting in substantial benefits to the mineral and petroleum industries and investors. These are first, percentage depletion which is an immediate deduction of a stated percentage of gross income limited only by 50 percent of the net income of the property and, second, the option to deduct currently the "intangible" costs of drilling oil and gas wells. "Intangibles" are all costs of drilling other than the cost of the actual machinery in use which is depreciable. It is well known that in most other industries it is common practice to capitalize the expenses of developing or constructing a capital asset and to recover those costs by the method of depreciating them over the life of the asset.

The favored tax status of the petroleum and gas industry has long been a monument to tax inequity and a thorn in the side of those who would seek meaningful reform. For years the industry and the majority of Congress have treated percentage depletion as sacrosanct. But the growing dissatisfaction of the great majority of American citizens demands a new appraisal of this status.

No one questions that the exploration for and development of new national reserves of minerals and petroleum can be a risky and sometimes expensive undertaking. Likewise, no one denies that the costs of these ventures should be offset against income. This is common, accepted and equitable tax practice.

Nevertheless, we must also recognize that only in the industries favored with percentage depletion allowances do we permit not only the cost of developing an asset but also a stated percentage of the gross revenues from the sale of that asset to receive tax-free treatment, regardless of the cost of the asset. In the oil industry, for instance, 27½ percent of the gross revenues of a producing well are charged off each year as long as the well remains in production and often long after the actual cost of the well has been recovered. This is a practice completely unknown elsewhere in our tax laws and foreign to our concept of fairness. In fact, it has been shown that percentage depletion allows the cost of certain properties to be deducted 10 or 20 times.

Because so many companies have elected to deduct immediately the intangible drilling costs and then take percentage depletion over the life of the property it has become extraordinarily clear that these provisions are not cost recovery provisions, but are, in fact, a governmental subsidy to the industry.

Let us take an example of how depletion works to the enormous benefit of the oil industry. Assume that ABC Oil Co. drills five wells—four of which are dry holes and the fifth which has oil with a market value of $600,000.

Assume also that each well costs $20,000 to develop.

Assume once more that it costs $50,000 to raise the oil from the fifth well and transport it to the market.

The following tables demonstrate how the tax code unfairly favors ABC Oil Co.

(1) Without percentage depletion and the option to expense development costs, ABC Co. would be taxed like this:

Gross income	$600,000
Deduction of losses on dry holes	80,000
Cost of lifting oil from ground to market	50,000
Depletion and depreciation	20,000
Subtotal	150,000
Taxable income	450,000

(2) Under existing law, ABC received this tax treatment:

Gross income	$600,000
Deduction of losses on dry holes	80,000
"Intangibles" plus depreciation	20,000
Cost of raising samples	50,000
27½ percent depletion	165,000
Subtotal	315,000
Taxable income	285,000

The above example, while hypothetical, illustrates very clearly the highly favorable tax position of the petroleum industry which is the prime beneficiary of the percentage depletion allowance and the option to expense intangibles. The proof, of course, must lie in actual tax figures.

The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) who has long been instrumental in the fight against percentage depletion has placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain statistics demonstrating the ability of the oil industry to escape from Federal taxation. These most recent statistics show that the major refiners and producers paid an average of 7.7 percent of their net income in Federal taxes in 1968. When you consider that the lowest individual income tax bracket is 14 percent and the corporate tax is 48 percent, it becomes apparent that the rest of us are paying extra to make up the amount which the petroleum industry avoids.

Over the years a great number of arguments have been presented to support retention of the percentage depletion allowance. These arguments boil down to the belief that the incentives of the market place are insufficient to encourage the necessary exploration and development costs to achieve a proper level of oil reserves in this country for purposes of meeting emergency situations.

Mr. President, we have all heard these arguments many times. I want to briefly describe the most recent data which rebuts these points.

First, the latest estimates show that complete elimination of percentage depletion and the option to expense intangibles would reduce the level of known reserves of oil and gas by only 7 percent. Furthermore, this estimate does not take into consideration the possible efficiencies and new exploratory and development techniques that might be initiated by a reduction in the depletion allowance.

Second, it has become clear in recent years that, if percentage depletion is in fact an incentive to explore and develop, it is most inefficient to base it on the gross revenues of a producing property. Exploration does not always turn up oil or gas fields. Therefore the incentive should be placed in close conjunction with efforts to explore and drill, not with gross revenue.

Third, it seems likely that the present depletion provisions may have hampered the development of new techniques of finding and extracting petroleum because the tax system favors present methods.

Mr. President, the percentage depletion allowances and the option to expense certain capital costs provide a loophole resulting in the loss of over $1.6 billion in tax revenues annually. My amendment would permit the recovery of approximately $1 billion of this revenue by discontinuing the option to expense intangible drilling costs and by providing a staged reduction of all percentage depletion allowances over 3 years to a level of 50 percent of present allowances.

It has often been said that no meaningful tax reform can occur without revision of the present discriminatory tax status of the oil and gas industries. The present law provides little more than a direct and unwarranted subsidy to the industry. Yet, this subsidy has long escaped full public recognition and scrutiny and has been allowed to exist on the basis of irrelevant and specious reasoning.

Congress must end its reluctance to consider fully the merits of this tax favoritism and to alter the long-existing provisions. Prompt action on the percentage depletion allowance will give credence to our professed desire to reform the tax system.

REAL ESTATE DEPRECIATION RULES

A second area of our tax laws which must be revised is the accelerated depreciation schedules now permitted to owners of real estate. Under these tax provisions, owners of real estate can deduct up to 40 percent of the cost of a building in the first quarter of its expected life. The large current deductions allowed by such accelerated schedules create artificial losses which are used to protect otherwise taxable income of the owners from taxation. The losses are artificial in the sense that in most cases income from rentals is enough to offset expenses and mortgage interest. They are artificial also in the sense that the rising market value of the building often belies the rapid depreciation schedule which the tax law permits.

An example will illustrate the "sheltering" aspects of this provision. Mr. A. purchases a building with a useful life of 40 years for $250,000. By using permissible depreciation schedules he is able to deduct $100,000 over the course of the next 10 years at which time he sells the property to Mr. B for $300,000. Assuming A is in the 70-percent bracket he has saved himself $70,000 in the last 10 years because his real estate "losses" have been deducted from ordinary income. Yet, when he reports his gain from the sale of property he pays a tax of only $37,500 (25 percent of the difference between the depreciated value of the building—$150,000 and the sale price—$300,000).

Recent studies by the Treasury Department have pointed up the magnitude of the inequities perpetrated by the real estate "shelter."

A sample of 1964 income tax returns of individuals heavily involved in real estate investment showed an average income from sources other than real estate of $144,000. Despite the fact that, generally, the income from rentals exceeded management expenses and mortgage interest, the rapid depreciation was enough to create "losses" of $77,500 per man and an average tax saving of $45,000.

Another study showed that a taxpayer who had $5.5 million in capital gains over the course of 7 years, mostly from sale of real estate, and other income of nearly $2 million paid only an effective tax rate of 11 percent—about the same as a married wage earner with two children and a salary of $10,000.

This amendment would prevent the use of accelerated depreciation on real estate property and require it to be depreciated by methods which more closely conform to reality. However, one important exception would be made to permit accelerated depreciation for residential housing designed for low- and moderate-income citizens. This exception is required to permit the continued expansion of private and governmentally sponsored housing programs. The incentive would have relatively little effect on the revenue gain expected from closing the loophole. The Treasury Department has estimated that ending accelerated real estate depreciation would increase revenues by $750 million of which only $50 million would be attributable to low income housing.

ALLOCATION OF LOSSES FROM FARMING OPERATIONS

The third great loophole which my bill would close involves the use of special tax accounting rules applicable to farmers by other citizens who wish to protect high incomes received from nonfarm ventures.

The general purpose of these accounting rules remains valid today as a legitimate attempt to ease the burden of bookkeeping on the average farmer. But in the light of recent events and evidence it is incumbent upon Congress to add a provision to the law to correct the abuse of these rules by those who seek to escape taxation.

In brief, the abuse results from tax provisions which permit a farmer to use the cash basis accounting system rather than the accrual or inventory system. The former method permits a taxpayer to deduct expenses in the year they occur despite the fact that the sale of goods to which the expense is related does not happen until another year. This law provides greater simplicity for the farmer—it also provides a major loophole for the nonfarmer who knows how to use it.

A second important provision allows a taxpayer to expense and therefore immediately deduct the costs of developing a herd of livestock or commodity crop.

An example will make the effect of these provisions clearer. Mr. A., who is a $200,000 a year executive, invests in a citrus grove. The costs of developing the grove are $20,000 annually for 5 years before any fruit is ready for the market. A may deduct this expense from his salary income and thus reduce his taxes substantially. At the end of 5 years A sells the grove to B for a capital gain of $100,000 which results in a tax of $25,000, although A has saved considerably more in taxes through his deductions of losses in the previous 5 years.

The artificiality of these losses is readily apparent. In reality, they are expenses of developing a capital asset which is subsequently sold for a handsome profit and taxed at the low capital gains rate.

The effect of this "shelter" is illustrated by statistics from the Treasury Department which show that farm losses tend to increase proportionately with the amount of nonfarm income which is subject to taxation at ordinary tax levels. These statistics have shown that those with adjusted gross incomes between $50,000 and $100,000 report an equilibrium between farm gains and losses while those with incomes above $100,000 and hence subject to greater personal taxes show farm losses three times greater than gains.

The amendment which I propose would limit the availability of farm losses as an offset against nonfarm income. This bill would not prohibit a farmer who has no outside income from deducting these losses. However it would stop a taxpayer from offsetting farm losses against more than $15,000 of nonfarm income.

Closing this loophole will generate another $145 million in tax revenue.

TAXATION OF COOPERATIVE CORPORATIONS

One of the basic tenets of our tax system is that people in similar economic circumstances be taxed in a similar and equal manner. It has become increasingly apparent that the present tax treatment of cooperative corporations violates this maxim in the extreme.

Cooperative corporations are corporate enterprises incorporated for the

XUM

most part under State laws. They compete in the open market for profits. They manufacture, wholesale, and retail goods just like any other business entity. Unlike other corporations, however, they pay very little Federal income tax.

The earnings of the ordinary business corporation are subject to two taxes. The earnings are taxed at the corporate level at rates ranging from 22 to 48 percent. When the net income of the corporation is passed on to stockholders—the owners—this income is included in personal income and taxed at the individual income tax rate.

Cooperative corporations, however, receive a highly favored tax treatment from the Federal Government. All the net income of a cooperative which is passed on to investors in the form of "patronage dividends" is excluded from the taxable income of the cooperative. Thus most cooperatives pay little or no Federal income tax despite the fact that much of the income which is theoretically passed on actually stays right in the cooperative coffers.

Cooperative corporations have generally escaped the close scrutiny of the public eye. Many cooperatives are no longer limited to small groups of farmers banding together to market their produce. They are no longer confined to the local level.

Cooperatives have moved into the fields of manufacturing and processing goods on a national scale. They own huge manufacturing facilities to produce fertilizer, refine oil, and to manufacture hundreds and thousands of other everyday products.

Cooperatives have become permanent institutions with centralized management and complex corporate structures. In fact, the average cooperative is now larger than the average ordinary corporation.

At the same time, the present law taxes the patrons who own the cooperative corporation when they receive paper IOU's from the cooperative having no market value. A shareholder of an ordinary corporation, on the other hand, is not taxed until he receives a dividend in money or other valuable property.

To correct these inequities, my bill includes a provision which imposes a corporate tax on these large and growing cooperative corporations. At the same time, this provision would tax the patron only if he receives money or property having a fair market value. As a special aid to the small farmer or other cooperative member, the bill also provides that each patron may exclude annually from his personal income $300 in distributions from cooperatives.

It is estimated that these changes should increase Federal revenues by about $200 million.

THE STANDARD DEDUCTION

Mr. President, any tax reform package must emphasize the need to distribute the tax burden equally on all citizens in accordance with the principle of the ability to pay. Additionally, reform should stress simplicity in an effort to induce the greatest amount of voluntary taxpayer compliance.

In the past few years it has become apparent that it is increasingly difficult for the taxpayer to insure that he pays no more than his fair share without the assistance of a tax attorney, accountant, or both. This tendency is anathema to our concept of self-taxation.

In 1944, Congress introduced the standard deduction concept which allowed taxpayers to deduct 10 percent of their adjusted gross income up to $1,000 in lieu of itemizing deductions. At that time about 80 percent of the taxpayers availed themselves of this simplified method of computing income tax without financial loss.

Today, because the number and amount of deductions has increased markedly and incomes in general have risen, only a little over half the taxpayers use the standard deduction form. The result is that many people have been once again forced to endure the agony or tedium of collecting receipts and itemized bills in order to calculate each individual deduction. The present standard deduction is simply out of date for many citizens who cannot afford to use it for fear of paying the Government more than they legitimately owe.

Therefore, my tax package includes an increase in the standard deduction to the lesser of 14 percent of adjusted gross income or $1,800. By increasing the deduction to this amount, it is estimated that over 80 percent of the American taxpayers would once again be able to use this simplified form without tax loss.

Furthermore, revision of the standard deduction will lower the present tax level for many of our low- and moderate-income citizens. The Treasury Department has estimated that my proposal would save the taxpayers about $1.4 billion annually, and 70 percent of this would benefit those with income between $10,000 and $20,000. Fully one-third of all taxpayers would receive a tax reduction from this provision.

In connection with this proposal, I draw attention to the admirable efforts of the House Ways and Means Committee which has added a provision to increase the minimum deduction allowable to low-income taxpayers. This provision has my full support.

TAX CREDIT FOR TUITION EXPENSES

Mr. President, I also offer a fifth proposal to allow a tax credit for the expenses of providing tuition and required fees for higher education up to a level of $1,500 per year.

Over 6 years ago I proposed legislation on this flood to offer susbtantial tax relief to ease the heavy burdens of the high cost of undergraduate and graduate education. Since that time the concept of relief has been advanced many times, and in 1967 the Senate approved the legislation only to see it dropped in conference.

Today, the need for this legislation is greater than ever before. Increasing tuition costs and a higher level of Federal, State, and local taxation have combined to squeeze the low- and middle-income citizen out of any possibility of sending a child to a private college without substantial financial assistance.

Today, there are an estimated 7 million students working toward degrees. This is more than three times as many students as were in institutes of higher education in 1955. Six years from now we can look forward to a student population level of 9 million.

These enrollment figures mean that tuition rates must increase as colleges and universities seek to expand their hard-pressed facilities. At the same time our advancing knowledge and the need to teach new concepts and technology continues to inflate the cost of education.

In 1967, the estimated required tuition fees for a full-time undergraduate student at a public university was $274; at a private institution tuition and fees averaged $1,292. Only 2 years earlier these figures had been $200 and $812, respectively. Since 1967, all indications have pointed to an ever more rapid increase in rates.

In fact, the average total cost of higher education was estimated in 1967 to be $1,052 in a public institution, and $2,187 in a private university. These costs include room and board as well as tuition and fees.

The results of this inflationary spiral spell financial disaster for the average American who seeks to provide his children with a decent education.

The costs have become an impossible burden, and the time has come to recognize that relief is necessary if we are to continue to promote better education in America.

The average American family needs prompt tax relief to meet the increasingly onerous expenses of higher education. We must decide, as a nation, whether we will continue to give tax relief for interest payments, flood damage, and health expenses while denying similar relief for the expenses of education.

The education of our children is an investment in our most important resource. We have made similar investments before through such laws as the GI bill. The results have surpassed our greatest expectations. We must learn from these lessons and apply this knowledge to the future.

This bill would provide a maximum tax credit of $325 per student. The credit would be allowed to anyone who paid the required tuition and fees for himself or another student.

Mr. President, this amendment is designed to relieve the heavy costs of education which are borne by those citizens in the low and middle tax brackets. The bill will not benefit those with high incomes who can afford the costs of higher education.

The bill has been drafted to begin a phase out of the available credit at the $15,000 income level. Thus, a taxpayer who has an income of $15,000 would be permitted to deduct the full $325 credit if it was available to him. However, the same individual if he had an income of $25,000 would only be allowed a credit if he were supporting more than one student since one full $325 credit is phased out at each $10,000 level above $15,000. Similarly, a person with an income of $35,000 would have a credit only if he were supporting three children.

Thus, the effect of the credit is spread upward only in relation to the amount of educational expenses being borne by the taxpayer.

The $325 credit would be computed on the basis of 100 percent of the first $200 of eligible tuition and fees per student, 25 percent of the next $300, and 10 percent of the subsequent $1,000. No credit would be available for expenses above $1,500.

This bill is nearly identical to previous legislation I have introduced on this subject. The major change would recognize that families with more than one college student have greater need for tax relief. Thus, the available credits would be phased out one at a time rather than simultaneously.

The great bulk of this tax relief would benefit those citizens in the lower and middle tax brackets, who are the one's facing the greatest financial pressures from both taxes and education expenses.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2646) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make structural changes with respect to the income tax in order to achieve a greater degree of equity in the Federal income tax system, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2650—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL PROVIDING FOR THE DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN FUNDS AWARDED TO THE TLINGIT AND HAIDA INDIANS OF ALASKA

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill of major significance to the Tlingit-Haida Indians of Alaska.

In 1968 the U.S. Court of Claims awarded the Tlingit-Haida Indians a judgment against the United States in the gross amount of $7,546,053.80. It is generally and justifiably held that this judgment is grossly inadequate as payment for virtually all of the southeastern panhandle of Alaska. However, the judgment was awarded at the same time that the Alaska Federation of Natives, representing all of Alaska's natives, was forcefully pressing a claim for native land rights throughout the State. Rather than go their own way and appeal the U.S. Court of Claims' decision to the Supreme Court, the Tlingit-Haida Indians elected to accept the judgment and render whatever assistance they could to the claims efforts of the rest of Alaska's native people. Having just suffered 35 long years of agony and frustration in their claims litigation, the Tlingit-Haida people recognized the advantages in time and equity which could accrue to a legislative claims settlement pursued before the U.S. Congress.

Mr. President, this bill provides for the use of the net judgment "in any manner authorized by the Central Council of the Tlinget and Haida Indians of Alaska." It is my certain feeling and observation that the Tlingit-Haida people have the same capability and desire as any group of American citizens to see that these judgment funds are used wisely for the betterment, in all areas, of all their people.

It is my deep and abiding conviction that the Tlingit-Haida Indians do not need the demeaning provision of law which provides for the "approval of the Secretary of the Interior" in the use of funds which is theirs exclusively, awarded after long and frustrating litigation by the U.S. Court of Claims. We have here an opportunity to reassess our thinking toward the American Indian, to redress the grievances wrought by the second-class citizenships status accruing to the Indian people as a result of denying them the opportunity to achieve their own destiny, in their own way, at their own pace, at their own discretion. If we do allow this exclusive determination and use by the Tlingit-Haidas, we will find that the American Indian as personified by the Tlingit-Haida people are as conscientious, as responsible, as honest, as capable, as prudent as other Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be placed in the RECORD as well as the Tlingit-Haida Central Council's Statement of Plans for the Use of Tlingit-Haida Funds and a supplement thereto. I respectfully request prompt consideration of this important measure.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2650) to provide for the disposition of certain funds awarded to the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska by a judgment entered by the Court of Claims against the United States, introduced by Mr. GRAVEL, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

S. 2650

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the unexpended funds and interest thereon on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of and otherwise invested by the Secretary of the Interior for the account of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska which were appropriated by the Act of July 9, 1968 (82 Stat. 307), to pay the judgment of the Court of Claims in the case entitled *The Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska, et al* v. *The United States,* No. 47900, after payment of attorney fees and expenses, may be advanced, expended, invested or used for any purpose and in any manner authorized by the Central Council of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska (not withstanding any other statutory provision). Any of such funds that may be distributed under the provisions of this Act shall not be subject to Federal or State income taxes.

The statement presented by Mr. GRAVEL is as follows:

STATEMENT OF PLANS FOR THE USE OF TLINGIT AND HAIDA FUNDS

NOVEMBER, 1968.

A. INTRODUCTION

This memorandum presents (1) a summary of the current Tlingit and Haida funds, (2) an explanation of the authorization given by the Congress to the Central Council of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska, to prepare plans for the use of the funds, (3) a brief description of a tentative program consisting of six plans for the use of a portion of the Tlingit and Haida funds.

The fundamental objectives of the plans will be to provide the maximum benefits and advantages which will contribute to the economic and social progress of each of the Communities of Tlingit and Haida Indians, which are represented in the Central Council of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska. Further, the procedures and mechanics for the administration and operation of the plans and criteria and standards for benefits under the plans will be designed to provide, to the fullest practicable extent, self-determination by each of the Communities and their members.

B. SUMMARY OF THE TLINGIT AND HAIDA FUNDS

At the present time the Tlingit and Haida funds comprise (1) funds invested in securities, (2) funds deposited in the U.S. Treasury, and (3) budgeted funds.

(1) *Invested Funds:* Certain funds belonging to the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska, in a total principal or face amount of Six Million Five Hundred Ninety-Two Thousand Dollars ($6,592,000.00), are invested in United States securities as well as other securities or obligations which are guaranteed by the United States or are collateralized by United States Securities, follows:

Security	Face or principal amount	Maturity date
U.S. Treasury bills:		
(a) Of Apr. 22, 1969	$41,000	Apr. 22, 1969
(b) Of May 31, 1969	51,000	May 31, 1969
Subtotal	92,000	
Bank certificates of deposit:		
(a) Marine Midland Trust Co.:		
(1) Certificate No. 11379	500,000	July 29, 1969
(2) Certificate No. 11371	1,250,000	Jan. 23, 1970
(3) Certificate No. 11372	1,250,000	July 23, 1970
(b) Manufacturers & Traders Trust Co.:		
(1) Certificate No. 24252	1,250,000	Jan. 23, 1970
(2) Certificate No. 24253	1,250,000	July 23, 1970
Subtotal	5,500,000	
Federal National Mortgage Association participation certificates:		
(a) 4.7 percent certificates	500,000	Dec. 1, 1972
(b) 6.45 percent certificates	500,000	Apr. 9, 1973
Subtotal	1,000,000	
Total	6,592,000	

It is estimated that on these investments, the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska are presently earning interest at the rate of more than Four Hundred Thousand Dollars ($400,000) on an annual basis. When the interest on these investments is paid from time to time, it is automatically deposited in a Tlingit and Haida account in the U.S. Treasury.

(2) *Deposited Funds:* In addition to the above-described invested funds, there is on deposit at the present time in a Tlingit and Haida account in the U.S. Treasury a total of $111,592.19. Also, the sum of $16,214.56 is in process of being deposited. However, the great bulk of these "deposited" funds are being held in reserve to pay the costs and expenses of the litigation in the U.S. Court of Claims which resulted in the award to the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska.

(3) *Budgeted Funds:* A total of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars ($150,000), which was withdrawn from the Tlingit and Haida funds in the U.S. Treasury, has been

XUM

made available to the Central Council of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska for organizational, administrative, operating and program planning expenses in accordance with an approved budget.

C. THE CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORIZATION TO PREPARE PLANS FOR THE USE OF THE FUNDS

By Section 8 of the Act of June 19, 1935 (49 Stat. 388) as amended by the Act of August 19, 1965 (79 Stat. 543), Congress directed that the Tlingit and Haida funds (which were derived from an appropriation made by Congress to pay the judgment against the United States, awarded by the U.S. Court of Claims to the Tlingit and Haida Indians) may not be made available for expenditure by the Tlingit and Haida Indians, except for certain specified uses,[1] until after Congress has enacted legislation that sets forth the purposes for which the funds shall be used.

In this same Section 8, Congress authorized the Central Council of the Tlingit and Haida Indians to prepare plans for the use of the funds, and to exercise such further powers with respect to the advance, expenditure and distribution of the funds as may be authorized by Congress.

D. THE PLANS

The Executive Committee of the Central Council, in consultation and cooperation with the Program Planning Committee, has formulated a program providing for six plans, which will call for the making available, from time to time as needed, upon requisition by the Central Council, of sums up to a total of two million dollars ($2,000,000), out of the proceeds of the above-described Tlingit and Haida invested funds, deposited funds and the interest accrued and accruing thereon. As may be noted, this sum of two million dollars comprises less than one-third of the present Tlingit and Haida invested funds. It is contemplated that the balance of the Tlingit and Haida funds, amounting to more than four and one half million dollars, as well as the interest earnings thereon will remain substantially intact and be invested and reinvested, and be on deposit in the U.S. Treasury, until such time as future plans are developed for the use of such funds.[2]

The six plans fall under the following descriptive headings and the amounts tentatively allocated to the plans are as follows:

(1) Scholarship grants and assistance for education and professional and vocational training	$200,000.00
(2) Plans for services for the "special" (that is, the elderly) Tlingit and Haida people	250,000.00
(3) Housing guaranty and loan fund	$500,000.00
(4) Community development fund	200,000.00
(5) Industrial and commercial development fund	500,000.00
(6) Revolving fund for loans or organization of a T–H Bank	350,000.00
Total	2,000,000.00

The plans are intended to fulfill purposes and meet problems for which other programs—federal, state or local—are not available or to facilitate the use of such other programs where suitable, to help carry out the objectives of the plans.

The financial arrangements of the plans will be designed to maintain and conserve the assets of the Tlingit and Haida to the extent feasible within the purposes sought.

The following is a statement of certain recommended general principles and guidelines under the plans.

(1) *Scholarship Grants and Assistance for Educational and Professional and Vocational Training:* The purpose is (a) to encourage, through financial means, and to assist in other respects in the achievement of higher educational levels for the Tlingit and Haida youth, (b) to advance the education and the technical and professional training of the adult members of each of the Communities of the Tlingit and Haida, and (c) to increase their earning capacity.

Fuller use of existing scholarship, loan and other assistance (both public and private) for education and training will be encouraged by information services to the Communities, by guidance and referrals, and by establishing lines of commmunication with colleges, universities and other educational and training institutions. Emphasis will be placed on training and education that is consistent with occupational requirements in Alaska.

Barriers to fuller use of existing programs will be reduced where review of such barriers indicates need for supplementary financial assistance and action (for example, transportation payments, clothing and boarding allowances, etc.).

Combinations of training grants and loans will be designed to facilitate the upgrading of occupational skills and earning levels of those already at work.

(2) *Plan for Services to the "Special" (that is, the Elderly) Tlingit and Haida People:* The purpose is to provide needed housing, health and nutritional services and facilities not otherwise available for the "special" T–H people so as to permit these persons to live out their lives with dignity.

Fuller use of existing health and public aid programs will be encouraged by such additional measures as are appropriate to the needs of the special T–H people, including, for example, referrals, guidance, and transportation allowances. In addition, housing developments, nursing homes, training of health personnel, provision of prosthetic appliances, subsidization of nurse services will be assessed in terms of needs and having regard to supplementation of existing programs.

(3) *Housing Guaranty and Loan Fund:* The purpose is to assist the members of the Communities of the Tlingit and Haida to obtain satisfactory housing through various measures, such as guarantees of mortgage loans made by financial institutions or direct loans.

Present housing facilities of the Tlingit and Haida in each Community will be assessed and plans made for moving toward satisfactory housing that takes account of the current and prospective income available for housing purposes of the Tlingit and Haida.

To the extent that housing would facilitate other community development projects, and other sources of support (loans and grants) are not available, housing loans would be extended to encourage and finance the necessary constructions.

Fuller use of existing public aid (both grant and loans) programs will be encouraged and facilitated (for example, housing projects would be designed and planned, and services would be made available for matching public programs).

(4) *Community Development Fund:* The purpose is to promote and encourage community participation and development by the provision of resources including facilities for community activities, such as cultural, educational and recreational activities.

Financial support for community facilities will be supplementary to those which can be obtained from other sources and will be considered along with plans for improved housing.

(5) *Industrial and Commercial Development Fund*: The purpose is to develop satisfactory employment opportunities and to raise the earnings and income of the Tlingit and Haida.

A fund will be set aside to foster industrial and commercial development that will have a comparative advantage because of the special characteristics of each Community of Tlingit and Haida by (a) the making of loans, (b) the guarantee of loans, (3) and subsidization of interest on loans.

Included among the activities to be funded are (1) training of Tlingit and Haida in the skills required to administer and carry on business enterprises, and (2) formulation of proposals for outside financial support.

(6) *Revolving Fund for Loans or Organization of a T–H Bank:* The purpose is to provide a fund which will enable the members of the Communities of the Tlingit and Haida to obtain loans not available from other sources for various essential purposes, such as repair of homes, acquisition of housing facilities, capital for small business operations, etc.

It is proposed that a portion of the loan fund be reserved so as to provide for each Community a fund for temporary financial assistance that can tide Tlingit and Haida families and persons over emergency situations until the emergency has passed or until appropriate channels can be found in longer range situations.

As a future alternative, consideration will be given to the organization and funding of a bank owned by the Tlingit and Haida which will provide loans to the members of the Communities of the Tlingit and Haida on a preferential basis.

SUPPLEMENT TO STATEMENT OF PLANS FOR THE USE OF TLINGIT AND HAIDA FUNDS

APRIL 1969.

On November 10, 1968, the Program Planning Committee of the Central Council of Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska submitted to the Executive Committee of the Central Council a "Statement of Plans for the use of Tlingit and Haida Funds." After considering the "Statement of Plans", the Executive Committee adopted a Resolution (Resolution No. 68–69 Ex. 8) approving the Statement of Plans.

The Program Planning Committee now presents this memorandum as a "Supplement to the Statement of Plans" and recommends that the Statement of Plans of November 1968 and this Supplement to the Statement of Plans be presented for the consideration of the Central Council of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska at its meeting to be convened in Sitka, Alaska, commencing on April 24, 1969.

It is noted that the Statement of Plans formulated a program providing for six plans, which will call for the making available, from time to time as needed, upon requisition by the Central Council, of sums up to a total of Two Million Dollars ($2,000,000.00) out of the proceeds of the Tlingit and Haida invested funds. The Program Planning Committee, after further consideration and review, has concluded that the allocation of funds to the six plans should be increased to $4,000,000.00. The six plans fall under the following descriptions:

---

[1] The specified permitted uses were for (1) the organizational, administrative, operating and program planning expenses of the Central Council of the Tlingit and Haida Indians; and (2) payment of attorney fees and expenses of the litigation. As has been stated, $150,000 has been withdrawn from the Tlingit and Haida account in the U.S. Treasury and made available to the Central Council for organizational, administrative, operating and program planning expenses. Also, the sum required for attorneys' fees for services in the litigation in the U.S. Court of Claims has been withdrawn from the Tlingit and Haida account in the U.S. Treasury and paid to the attorneys. Further, as has been noted, funds have been reserved in the Tlingit and Haida account in the U.S. Treasury in an amount believed more than ample to pay all expenses of the litigation, including expert witness fees and costs.

[2] Pending the development of such future plans, the only expenditures from such balance of funds may be for organizational, administrative, operating and program planning expenses of the Central Council.

(1) Scholarship grants and assistance for education and professional and vocational training	$200,000.00
(2) Plans for services for the "special" (that is, the elderly) Tlingit and Haida people	250,000.00
(3) Housing guaranty and loan fund	500,000.00
(4) Community development fund	1,000,000.00
(5) Industrial and commercial development fund	1,500,000.00
(6) Revolving fund for loans or organization of a T-H Bank	550,000.00
Total	4,000,000.00

In addition, there will be a reserve of invested funds which exceeds two and one half million dollars.

Considering the best interests and welfare of the Tlingit and Haida Indians as a whole and of the various Communities of Tlingit and Haida Indians, the Program Planning Committee believes at this time, that the foregoing allocations to the six plans are appropriate. However, it is emphasized that as experience makes it desirable and as conditions change, the allocations may be modified, including substantial increases in the allocations to one or more of six plans. In the event of such increased allocations, it is contemplated that funds will be requisitioned pursuant to resolutions duly adopted by the Central Council or the Executive Committee of the Central Council from the reserve of the Tlingit and Haida funds, which reserve as noted presently amounts to more than two and one-half million dollars.

Similarly, it is contemplated that as experience is gained in the operation of one or more of the six plans, additional plans will be formulated of a nature similar to the above described six plans. Such additional plans will be funded from the reserve of Tlingit and Haida invested funds. The basic standards for such additional plans will also be the betterment of the social economic welfare of the Tlingit and Haida Indians as a whole and of the local Communities and the conservation, protection and enforcement of the rights, land and other resources of the Tlingit and Haida Indians, including (1) contribution of funds to be expended, advanced or loaned to assist in protecting their rights and claims in connection with the legislative proposals to settle on a Statewide basis the Alaska Native land rights as well as (2) their rights and claims to the 2.6 million acres of lands in southeast Alaska to which the United States Court of Claims has decided that the ownership of the Tlingit and Haida based on Indian title remains unextinguished and has survived.

S. 2651—INTRODUCTION OF NEW AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT MEASURES WITH EXTENSIVE AVIATION INDUSTRY SUPPORT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, during the first phase of hearings before the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce, a number of aviation industry witnesses and representatives of airport operators stressed the need for consideration of a bill which has as its objective the solution of the needs of our Nation's airports, both with respect to landing areas and terminals and terminal areas.

Today, I introduce, by request, a proposal with that objective. It is the culmination of months of study by major elements of aviation which seem to have agreed on a valid approach to the airport problem. Indeed, this legislative proposal is reported to me to be supported by the Airport Operators' Council, the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, the three major aircraft manufacturers, and the Air Transport Association of America. I understand that other organizations may join in supporting the program proposed in the measure I introduce.

In view of prior testimony during the Aviation Subcommittee hearings, when the framework of this measure was endorsed by airport and aviation industry witnesses, and in view of the broad effort which seems now to be joined in support of the bill's approach to airport financing, I believe it would be helpful to the Committee on Commerce and to the Senate as a whole to have this proposal officially in the legislative process in bill form. My distinguished West Virginia colleague, Representative HARLEY O. STAGGERS, chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, has introduced a like bill in that body. I will introduce or cosponsor within the month a separate measure on airways.

By studying and considering the industry-sponsored program in legislative draft, perhaps we can better analyze its provisions and more carefully determine its value.

In a desire to be helpful, therefore, I introduce the bill to amend the Federal Airport Act and to provide additional Federal assistance in connection with the construction, alteration, or improvement of airports, airport terminals, and related facilities, as well as to provide relief of congestion at public airports. I request unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the RECORD following these introductory remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2651) to amend the Federal Airport Act, and to provide additional Federal assistance in connection with the construction, alteration, or improvement of airports, airport terminals, and related facilities; to provide relief of congestion at public airports; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH (by request), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2651

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Federal Airport Development Act of 1969."

TITLE I—FEDERAL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 101. As used in this title—

(1) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Transportation:

(2) "airport development" means the construction, alteration, and improvement of airfield facilities and related support systems, airport terminal buildings and other public use airport facilities at air carrier airports or reliever airports, including but not limited to roads within the airport boundaries and passenger and baggage handling facilties; and for any acquisitions of land needed for such development, as well as lands adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of such airports, including any interest therein, or an easement through or any other interest in airspace, for the purpose of assuring that activities and operations conducted thereon will be compatible with normal airport operations;

(3) "air carrier airport" means an existing or proposed airport at any air traffic hub or nonhub receiving or scheduled to receive service by an air carrier or air carrier certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board under the provisions of section 401 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended. As used in this title, the meaning of the term "large air traffic hub", "medium air traffic hub", "small air traffic hub" and "nonhub" shall be defined in the most recent issue of the publication "Airport Activity Statistics of Certificated Route Air Carriers", published jointly by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Administration on or before the effective date of this Act;

(4) "reliever airport" means an airport which is designed or is intended primarily to serve nonair carrier aircraft which otherwise might use and contribute substantially to congestion at air carrier airports;

(5) "public agency" means the United States Government or an agency thereof; a State, or Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, or any agency of any of them; a municipality or other political subdivision or a tax-supported organization;

(6) "sponsor" means any public agency which, either individually or jointly with one or more other public agencies, submits to the Secretary an application for assistance for airport development; and

(7) "project" means a project for the accomplishment of airport development.

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 102. The Congress hereby finds that the existing system of airports and airport terminal facilities within the United States is rapidly becoming inadequate to meet the present and future needs for civil aviation operations required in the interests of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense; that there is a responsibility in the Federal Government to encourage and assist in the development of a system of airports adequate to meet those needs; and that financial assistance beyond that provided under existing laws is necessary to assure an adequate system of airports and airport terminal facilities.

AIRPORT ASSISTANCE CONTRACTS

SEC. 103. (a)(1) The Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance for airport development under the programs hereinafter established. Such financial assistance may be provided only if the Secretary finds that (a) the project for which assistance is sought will be consistent with the national airport plan developed by the Secretary pursuant to his authority under this Act, the Department of Transportation Act and section 3 of the Federal Airport Act; (b) the project sponsor will, to the greatest extent possible, utilize all of its airport revenues for the operation, maintenance and improvement of such airport; and (c) the project sponsor will not seek to recover from airport users the funds granted to it under this Act or the Federal Airport Act.

(2) The provisions of sections 11, 15, 19, and 21 of the Federal Airport Act, as amended, shall he applicable to all programs under title I of this Act.

(b)(1) Within the limits established from time to time in appropriation Acts for each fiscal year for the period beginning July 1, 1969 and ending June 30, 1979, the Secretary may enter into contracts, in accordance with the provisions of this subsection, with any sponsor, to make annual payments to it equal to 100 per centum of the principal payments due on obligations issued by the sponsor to finance any airport development project. Such obligations shall be issued for periods not exceeding thirty years.

(2) The Secretary also may enter into contracts for airport development, in accordance with the provisions of this subsection with any sponsor, to make a payment or payments by installment to it over a fixed period of not to exceed thirty years in an amount equal to one-half of the costs of any airport development project.

(3) With respect to amounts in the direct airport account established under section 104(c)(2) the Secretary shall, after project approval, enter into contracts under paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection to the extent of the sponsor's percentage share under section 104(c)(2).

(4) Any contract executed by the Secretary under this subsection shall be an obligation supported by the full faith and credit of the United States.

(c) In order to assist and encourage the sponsorship of airport development projects, the Secretary is authorized, within the limits established from time to time in appropriation Acts for each fiscal year, for the period beginning July 1, 1969 and ending June 30, 1979, to make advances to public agencies which will cover the planning costs of engineering and architectural surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, or other actions preliminary to and in preparation for airport development projects, including such activities as may be necessary to meet the requirements of the Secretary for obtaining such assistance. No advance shall be made hereunder with respect to any airport development project unless it is planned to be initiated within a reasonable period of time and unless the public agency contracts with the Secretary to complete the plan promptly and to repay such advances or parts thereof when due with interest at an agreed rate specified in the contract and agreed to by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the average market yield during the month preceding the making of such advance on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the average maturities of such advances, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum, plus an allowance adequate to cover administrative costs: *Provided, however,* That such repayments and the interest thereon shall be considered a part of the total airport development project cost for purposes of determining the amount of financial assistance allowable under this section.

(d) The proceeds from repayments of advances made under the provisions of subsection (c) of this section, including interest thereon, shall be paid into the trust fund established by section 104 of this Act.

(e) Projects for which funds are committed by a public agency within one year prior to enactment of this Act shall be eligible for assistance under this section on the same basis as any other airport development project initiated after enactment of this Act.

OPERATION OF AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT FUND

SEC. 104. (a) There is hereby created within the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the airport development fund (hereinafter called the fund). The fund shall consist of such amounts as may be appropriated or credited to the fund as provided in this section and such payments into the fund as may be made under the provisions of section 103(c).

(b) There is hereby appropriated to the fund, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, amounts equivalent to 100 per centum of the taxes received in the Treasury after June 30, 1969, under the provisions of section 4265 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, hereinafter provided.

The amounts appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall be transferred at least monthly from the general fund of the Treasury to the fund on the basis of estimates by the Secretary of the Treasury of the amounts received in the Treasury under the provisions of section 4265 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Proper adjustments shall be made in the amounts subsequent transferred to the extent prior estimates were in excess of or less than the amounts required to be transferred.

(c)(1) The fund shall be composed of two accounts, the direct airport account and the discretionary account. Each account shall be credited with an amount equal to 50 per centum of the revenues appropriated to the fund pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. All other amounts appropriated or credited to the fund under this title shall be paid into the discretionary account.

(2) Amounts in the direct airport account shall be available as provided by appropriation Acts, for making expenditures to meet the obligations incurred by the Secretary under the provisions of section 103(b) of this title and shall be apportioned to each sponsor based on the ratio which passenger enplanements at that airport for the year preceding that in which the contract is made, bear to passenger enplanements for that year at all airports. The total amount of contracts for each sponsor payable from this account shall not exceed the annual amount so determined multiplied by the number of years during which it is intended that such contracts will be in effect.

Each airport sponsor shall be credited each year with the apportioned amount of the preceding year's taxes as provided above and to the extent such credit exceeds the amount of all payments to such sponsor in the current year under contracts entered into pursuant to this subsection (excluding payments under discretionary allocations), such excess shall remain to the credit of the sponsor throughout the next following two years. If at any time during the current year or the next following two years, the Secretary shall approve an airport development project for such airport sponsor, such remaining credit, plus any remaining credit which may have been accumulated in the next succeeding two years, shall be available to the sponsor as a grant toward the payment of construction cost for such approved project. If the Secretary shall not have approved an airport construction project for such airport sponsor prior to the end of the second fiscal year following the crediting of any sum to such sponsor, such sum shall be transferred to the Secretary's discretionary fund, to be applied to the hub category in which such airport or airports fall.

For the purposes of this section, the term "passenger enplanements" shall include United States domestic, territorial, and international passenger enplanements as annually compiled by the Civil Aeronautics Board: *Provided,* That enplanements of connecting passengers shall be given a value of 65 per centum of that afforded originating passengers.

(3) Amounts in the discretionary account shall be available, as provided by appropriation Acts, for making expenditures to meet any obligations incurred by the Secretary under the provisions of section 103 of this title or payments made by him thereunder, to sponsors of airport development projects under the apportionment formula contained in section 105 of this title.

(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the fund, as repayable advances, such additional sums as may be required to make the expenditures referred to in subsection (c), to the extent that amounts in the fund are not adequate to meet current obligations. The Secretary shall not enter into any new contracts until such time as amounts in the fund are adequate to meet current obligations.

(e)(1) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to hold the fund, and (after consultation with the Secretary) to report to the Congress not later than the 1st day of March of each year on the financial condition and the results of the operations of the fund during the preceding fiscal year and on its expected condition and operations during each fiscal year thereafter. Such report shall be printed as a House document of the session of the Congress to which the report is made.

(2) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to invest such portion of the fund as is not, in his judgment, required to meet current withdrawals. Such investments may be made only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States, or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States. For such purpose such obligations may be acquired (A) on original issue at the issue price or (B) by purchase of outstanding obligations at the market price. The purposes for which obligations of the United States may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are hereby extended to authorize the issuance at par of special obligations exclusively to the fund. Such special obligations shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average rate of interest, computed as to the end of the calendar month next preceding the date of such issue, borne by all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt; except that where such average rate is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum, the rate of interest of such special obligations shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum next lower than such average rate. Such special obligations shall be issued only if the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the purchase of other interest-bearing obligations of the United States, or of obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States on original issue or at the market price, is not in the public interest. Advances to the fund pursuant to subsection (d) shall not be invested.

(3) Any obligation acquired by the fund (except special obligations issued exclusively to the fund) may be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury at the market price, and such obligations may be redeemed at par plus accrued interest.

() The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligations held in the fund shall be credited to and form a part of the fund.

(f) Advances made pursuant to subsection (d) shall be repaid and interest on such advances shall be paid to the general fund of the Treasury when the Secretary of the Treasury determines that moneys are available in the fund for such purposes. Such interest shall be at rates computed in the same manner as provided in subsection (e)(2) for special obligations and shall be compounded annually.

APPORTIONMENT OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 105. During each fiscal year, the amounts authorized to be paid or obligated from the discretionary account shall be apportioned by the Secretary on the following basis:

(1) 62 per centum shall be apportioned to projects at air carrier airports which serve or will serve large air traffic hubs;

(2) 18 per centum shall be apportioned to projects at air carrier airports which serve or will serve medium air traffic hubs;

(3) 10 per centum shall be apportioned to projects at air carrier airports which serve or will serve small air traffic hubs; and

XUM

(4) 10 per centum shall be apportioned to projects at air carrier airports which serve or will serve nonhubs.

TITLE II—FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

EXISTING AIRPORT PROGRAMS

SEC. 201. The Federal Airport Act, as amended, is hereby extended, and nothing in this Act shall prevent the carrying out of the Federal-aid airport program to the extent authorized and funded by the Congress: *Provided, however,* That the scope of the national airport plan developed by the Secretay pursuant to section 3 of the Federal Airport Act, as amended, shall be expanded to include projects eligible for financial assistance under either or both the Federal Airport Act, as amended, and this Act.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

SEC. 202. The Federal Airport Act (60 Stat. 170, 49 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.), as amended, is further amended as follows:

(a) Section 5 is amended by relettering subsection (e) thereof as subsection (f) and inserting a new subsection (e) as follows:

"(e) For the purpose of developing airports to serve general aviation, of relieving congestion at airports having high density of traffic serving other segments of aviation, of providing assistance to nonhub airports, and of providing assistance to other locations at which the only certificated air carrier service is that provided by air carriers who are paid compensation by the Civil Aeronautics Board under clause 3 of section 406(b) of the Federal Aviation Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1376), appropriations amounting to $50,000,000 are hereby authorized to be made to the Administrator for each fiscal year, beginning July 1, 1969 and ending June 30, 1979. Such appropriations shall become available for obligation, by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12, beginning July 1 of each fiscal year, and shall continue to be so available until expended."

TITLE III

AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT TAX

SEC. 301. (a) Subchapter C of chapter 33 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on transportation of persons by air) is amended by adding a new section 4265 as follows:

"Sec. 4265. Imposition of Airport Development Tax.

"(a) There is hereby imposed upon the amount paid within or outside the United States for the transportation of any person by air which begins after June 30, 1969—

"(1) a tax equal to percent of the amount so paid if such transportation begins and ends in the United States,

"(2) a tax of $ per person transported by air from a point within the United States to a point outside thereof.

"(b) The tax imposed by this section shall not apply to any transportation exempted from payment of the tax imposed by section 4261."

(b) The tax imposed under section 4265, subchapter C of chapter 33 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall cease to have force and effect, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall not collect the tax, at such time as amounts in the Fund established in section 104 of this Act are sufficient to meet all commitments and obligations of the Federal government under Title I of this Act.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION

S. 2029

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) be added as cosponsors of S. 2029, the Omnibus Civil Rights Act of 1969.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2360

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) be added as a cosponsor of S. 2360, which proposes to enlarge the boundaries of the Grand Canyon National Park in the State of Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 61

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) be added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 61, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE RESOLUTION 215—RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON THE UTILITY CONSUMERS' COUNSEL ACT OF 1969

Mr. MUSKIE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 215); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 215

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations one thousand additional copies of part one of the hearings before its Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations during the Ninety-first Congress, First Session, on the Utility Consumers' Counsel Act of 1969.

CONTINUANCE OF INCOME TAX SURCHARGE AND CERTAIN EXCISE TAXES—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 80

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 12290) to continue the income tax surcharge and the excise taxes on automobiles and communication services for temporary periods, to terminate the investment credit, to provide a low-income allowance for individuals, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 81 AND 82

Mr. TYDINGS submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 12290, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 83

Mr. HARTKE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 12290, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PROHIBITION OF USE OF CERTAIN INTERSTATE FACILITIES FOR THE TRANSPORTATION OF CERTAIN MATERIALS TO MINORS—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 84

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2073) to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of certain materials to minors, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

NINTH ANNUAL ALL-AMERICA YOUTH BOWLING CHAMPIONSHIPS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is my very great pleasure to call attention to a unique event which combines our most popular participant sport—bowling—with scholarship and youth. I refer to the Ninth Annual All-America Youth Bowling Championships to be held in Washington, D.C., August 1 to 4. During this tournament, more than 100 high school seniors from all over the country will compete for $21,000 in scholarships awarded by the National Bowling Council. The unusual thing about this tournament is that scholarship counts more than athletic ability. All of these youngsters, from every part of the country, take college entrance-type tests before they bowl in the tournament. Their performance here counts 60 points, their academic performance in high school counts 10 points, while their performance as tournament bowlers counts 30 points.

So contestants will not only be good bowlers, but will be top-ranked scholastically, too.

The All-America Youth Bowling Championships are sponsored by the National Bowling Council—NBC—and conducted by the Bowling Proprietors' Association of America, with headquarters at Hoffman Estates near Chicago. In addition to the proprietors group, the NBC is composed of the Woman's International Bowling Congress—WIBC; American Bowling Congress—ABC; American Machine & Foundry Co.; and Brunswick Corp.

This year, according to the NBC, a number of colleges plan to match the dollar value of scholarships won so that a winner who chooses and is accepted by one of these participating schools is actually doubling the value of the scholarship.

The young participants are all bowlers graduating from high school this year who regularly bowl in a youth league. They qualified for the national event by bowling in local and, in some cases, in regional and State elimination contests.

Each participating State sends one bowler for each of the three divisions: girls' handicap, boys' handicap, and boys' scratch. In each division, the NBC will award seven $1,000 scholarships for a total of $21,000. The youngsters are accompanied on the Washington trip by parents or other chaperones.

XUM

My hope is that other organizations which offer athletic and other scholarships for specialized skills like sports will emulate the practice of the National Bowling Council and the BPAA in placing great stress on scholarship and academic performance.

BUILD BROTHER BUILD

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Rev. Leon Sullivan, of Philadelphia, founder of the highly successful Opportunities Industrialization Center, which trains disadvantaged youth for productive careers, has written a book based on his experiences. The book, entitled "Build Brother Build," was reviewed in the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 16. The Reverend Mr. Sullivan is an extraordinary man, and I know that this recounting of his experiences and his philosophy will be useful reading for everyone interested in contemporary American life. I ask unanimous consent that the book review be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"I WANT TO BUILD AMERICA UP": LEON SULLIVAN TELLS HIS STORY

(By Harold J. Wiegand)

"Build Brother Build," by Leon H. Sullivan. Macrae Smith Co. 186 pp. $4.95.

"We black people must become partners at the helm of the national economy and not continue just in menial role, for in the final analysis black men will be respected only in proportion to what they produce to strengthen the nation. No one wants a beggar in his living room . . . I have no intention of tearing America down, but I want to build America up."

This is the Rev. Leon H. Sullivan speaking, and they are the words of a patriotic American dedicated to the uplift of his own people.

He is not only a preacher of the principle of helping others to help themselves; he has done something about it, and in the process he has gained nationwide recognition and commendation and become one Philadelphian whose name is literally a household word among those who genuinely want to rescue Negroes from their plight.

Leon Sullivan is no militant, no apostle of violence and hatred toward the whites. He is an activist and what he has accomplished since coming here from a West Virginia slum by way of Union Theological Seminary, Adam Clayton Powell's Harlem church and a five-year pastorship in South Orange, N.J., makes an astonishing story, which he tells here in his own words.

When he became pastor of Zion Baptist Church in 1950 he was in the heart of a North Philadelphia community where the concentrations of black people was to become greater than in Harlem.

His first step was to organize a Citizens' Committee against juvenile delinquency and its causes, a white and black volunteer organization which had extraordinary success among Negro black youths.

Then he set up a Youth Employment Center which got young Negroes off the streets and into about 1000 jobs a year.

The energetic minister soon found, what others had found in other cities, that there was discrimination against blacks in a number of business firms; jobs were available, but not if you were black.

So he started something that, in the beginning at least, aroused anger and resentment among many white employers.

Negro ministers exert a considerable influence in the Philadelphia black community. Leon Sullivan got 400 of them to join in what he called a Selective Patronage Program but was better known as a succession of business boycotts.

The ministers called on corporations known to have few or no Negro employes and asked for the hiring of Negroes in jobs that were available and where there would be equal opportunity in promotions. When the delegation was turned down, congregations were advised not to patronize these particular firms.

The response opened up more than 2000 skilled jobs to black workers—after all, the purchasing power in the black community of Philadelphia in 1968 was in excess of three quarters of a billion dollars.

Leon Sullivan found a further step was necessary to help the unemployed blacks. Jobs were available, but only for the skilled.

So he established the Opportunities Industrialization Center, starting out with headquarters in an abandoned jail. Youths received training for skilled jobs in such numbers and with a display of such competence that the OIC became a standard pattern for job training in many other cities.

The OIC has had its glamorous spin-offs, a $1.7 million shopping center where all the managers and most of the store-owners are blacks; a nonprofit garden apartment complex; an aerospace plant; a dress industry; a home education program; a center to train Negroes to operate their own businesses.

It all adds up to drive based on hope, and the new patterns now established for America's underprivileged communities stand as remarkable monuments to a remarkable man.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT INTERVENTION IN TABLE GRAPE BOYCOTT

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, on Tuesday, at a hearing of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, I listened to very disturbing testimony from Mr. Dale Babione, a representative of the Defense Supply Agency of the Department of Defense. Mr. Babione stated that in fiscal 1969 table grape purchases for the Armed Forces rose 40 percent and that table grape shipments to Vietnam skyrocketed 350 percent during the same period. Coming at a time when the shameful working and living conditions of farmworkers are being challenged by a nationwide boycott of California table grapes, these increases seem to indicate a most regrettable lack of perception and neutrality in a labor dispute on the part of the Defense Department.

This appearance of partisanship and the antiboycott impact seem to me to be a clear violation of a highly commendable, recently issued Defense Department policy calling for a social consciousness by Department officials in evaluating the domestic impact of all DOD actions. Accordingly, I wrote to Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird on July 15, stating my views on this distressing situation and urging the Defense Department to demonstrate true neutrality in the table grape boycott and adherence to its social consciousness policy by immediately cutting back on table grape purchases so as to return to a level of purchases approximately the same as that which prevailed before the boycott began. I also have recommended that the DOD adopt a general policy under which its procurement of products grown or manufactured by a supplier engaged in a bona fide labor dispute would not be significantly increased or decreased during the existence of such dispute, barring, of course, the necessities of national security.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of my letter to Secretary Laird be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 15, 1969.

Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This morning, at hearings of the Migratory Labor Subcommittee, we heard testimony from Mr. Dale Babione, Deputy Executive Director, Procurement and Production, Defense Supply Agency, Department of Defense.

Mr. Babione was asked to testify because of reports that Department of Defense Procurement of table grapes in fiscal year 1969 had rapidly and substantially increased over the last fiscal year. I am sure you are aware of the impact of the Defense Department procurement and must know that increases in D.O.D. grape procurement have serious implications for the effectiveness of the nationwide boycott of table grapes currently being conducted by the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, AFL, and numerous religious and civic groups.

Mr. Babione revealed that over the last fiscal year, Department of Defense purchases of table grapes increased approximately 40 percent over-all, and approximately 350 percent in shipments to Vietnam. He stated that the enormous Vietnam increase was due to the unavailability of seasonable oranges for Vietnam shipment during the fall of 1968, along with the newly-developed ability of the Department at that time to improve drastically the method of shipping such perishables overseas.

At the same time, it was brought out in the questioning of Mr. Babione that there was absolutely no nutritional requirement that grapes, as opposed to other available fresh fruits, be consumed by our servicemen in Vietnam. He also indicated that all alternative fresh fruit substitutes for oranges were not explored—including nectarines, which apparently were not even being offered at the time.

Mr. Babione took the position that Department neutrality toward the boycott was established by its mere intention not to favor one side or the other in the dispute.

I must disagree with that statement. In fact, I believe that such a narrow conception of public service reflects either incredible ineptitude or surprising naivete on the part of the Department.

It seems to me fundamental that those directing Governmental action—and certainly those of the largest Governmental unit—are charged with the responsibility of considering and responding to public opinion. It is not enough that Government officials convince themselves of their own subjective purity of intention; public servants must not ignore the implications of their actions and how they will be construed, especially when those actions may be construed as showing favoritism.

That is exactly the import of a May 10, 1965, statement by the President of the United States upon issuing an executive order (No. 11222) establishing Government-wide standards for ethical conduct by government officers and employees. On that occasion, the President said: "We cannot tolerate favoritism—or even . . . conduct which gives the appearance of (favoritism)."

In the case of table grape procurement, Department of Defense actions are being widely interpreted as partisan intervention in a labor dispute, not as neutrality.

I wish to commend you on your recent order calling for a social consciousness in the Defense Department in evaluating the domestic impact of all its actions. (Mr. Babione stated your order had not come to his attention.) I think that a very substantial part of any such evaluation must be a realistic estimate of the expected public interpretation of a particular policy.

Therefore, I call upon you to establish a policy under which Department of Defense procurement of products grown or produced by suppliers engaged in bona fide labor disputes would not be significantly increased or decreased during the existence of such disputes, barring, of course, the necessities of national security. Such a policy would be a logical corollary to the very responsible guidelines which you have promulgated.

It seems to me that only such a "freeze" policy on procurement can qualify as true neutrality on three key counts: intent, effect and appearance.

With specific regard to grapes, I believe that only by sustaining table grape procurement at the fiscal year 1968 level (inasmuch as the boycott started in May, 1968) can your social consciousness policy be meaningfully implemented. I strongly recommend that the necessary decreases in procurement be instituted immediately.

I am sending a copy of this letter to the President, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Agriculture for their consideration.

Sincerely,

Alan Cranston.

OUR FAILURE TO RATIFY THE HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS IS HARMFUL TO OUR POSITION IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, the failure of the Senate to ratify the International Convention on Forced Labor, the political rights of women, and genocide has had many adverse effects. At various points in my continuing effort to have these conventions approved I have described most of these effects, but I would like today to concentrate on one particularly detrimental result of our inaction.

It is the responsibility of our representatives at the United Nations and other supranational groupings to assert and defend this country's interests in the international arena. This is indeed an awesome task. Our representatives' effectiveness in performing this vital task is severely compromised when our actions do not conform with their statements. In a body that relies more than any other on the influence of words and examples, our considerable influence suffers when our words are not supported by our Government's example.

This is precisely the case with human rights. In the United Nations and elsewhere we have long been among the most consistent and vocal pleaders of this cause. Yet our effectiveness as leaders in this field and the integrity of our entire position in that body declines when we fail—as we have—to affirm the simple guarantees of what we aspire to internationally and practice domestically.

Numerous prominent men entrusted with the task of representing us in the international arena have spoken eloquently of the frustration of defending our high-minded assertions in the light of our inconsistent actions. Mr. Richard N. Gardner, a distinguished professor of law who has represented our country at numerous international conferences, said:

> Our membership in the small company of U.N. members who have refused to ratify any human rights treaties has become an increasing embarrassment. Our friends cannot understand it. Our adversaries exploit it. It is a costly anachronism which should be eliminated without delay.

Mr. Morris Abrams, an attorney serving as U.S. representative to the U.N. Commission on Human Rights, spoke of "the serious embarrassment to the conduct of our policy at the United Nations stemming from our failure to ratify these conventions." He said:

> The Soviet Union holds our record in this field over our head as a club ready for use to counter any initiative in the human rights field of which they do not approve. It makes little sense for us to play into their hands, to hand them a gratuitous propaganda weapon with which to flagellate us.

I am at a loss to understand how we can expect to maintain the international respect to which we aspire if we fail to earn this respect by making our deeds conform to our words. I urge the Senate to stop undermining our effectiveness in the international forum and act swiftly to ratify these conventions.

"THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE: KEY TO DEFENSE AND TRADE", A PAPER BY GUADALUPE DE LA CRUZ, JR.

Mr. **MURPHY**. Mr. President, I frequently express concern on the Senate floor over the sorry state and condition of our merchant marine which is such an important asset to this Nation, both at the time of war and during peace.

A student in California, Mr. Guadalupe De La Cruz, Jr., of Le Grand High School has written a paper entitled, "The American Merchant Marine: Key to Defense and Trade."

We can only be encouraged that the younger generation is taking a look at the problem and perhaps they will point the way. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The American Merchant Marine: Key to Defense and Trade

Someone once said, "America, always growing, never-ending, never ceasing." Can we as Americans proudly raise our heads and still say to ourselves that this is true, when statistics and history show that we are slowly declining in our most vital industry? It is shameful how we, once the world's most foremost shipbuilding power, now rank fourteenth. Let us examine our world around us and take note how important our merchant marine is to you and me and all Americans.

Today in America, we enjoy the highest standard of living in the world. We enjoy and consume many commodities every day that in other parts of the world are considered luxuries. Almost everything you come in contact with everyday is affected by our merchant marine. Those canned peaches you eat during the winter are canned in tin; tin ore is 100 percent imported by ship, and, of course, thousands of items from peanuts to lubricating oil are packaged in cans. What about your car? That's right. That piece of machinery which is now considered a necessity is very strongly affected by the merchant marine. Nearly all of your car is in some way or another made of steel. That's right from your engine blocks to those bolts that hold your door together! Manganese which is needed in the production of steel is 93 percent imported. What about the tires that keep your car going? Yes, even though modern researchers are producing synthetic rubber, we still rely on natural rubber which is 100 percent imported. What if one morning you woke up and there was no coffee to drink because our merchant marine was unable to bring in America's number one drink? Fortunately, our small merchant fleet is efficient enough to supply us with the 100 percent imported coffee beans needed to make that good old hot cup of coffee and all of those everyday things which we don't think of as being very important. We could continue on naming item after item, from bananas to Volkswagens, until we'd grow old naming items affected by our merchant marine.

Our merchant marine helps our economy too, not only nationally but internationally as well. Approximately 3.1 billion dollars annually flows through the hands of those involved in the maritime industry. This vital industry employs more than 104,000 employees but this is only a small number when compared with those people that are indirectly involved. In fact, no major industry in this nation is not affected in some degree by the maritime industry, an industry which has been neglected by our government.

Although we are the world's leading trading nation, we must rely on foreign vessels to haul 92.3 percent of our exports and imports. The world's merchant fleet totals about 40,000 ships, with carrying capacity of about 153 million gross tons. More than nine million gross tons of new shipping are built every year. Japan, Great Britain, and West Germany lead the world in ship-building. According to the latest figures released by the American Merchant Marine Institute, the size of the American fleet has declined about 26 percent since 1951, while the world fleet has steadily increased to a 62 percent gain over 1951. During the same period, the cargo capacity of the American fleet decreased by 2.7 percent, while that of the world rose by 156 percent. In a current report, Paul Hall, president of the AFL–CIO Maritime Trades Department, gave us a wrap-up on the state of the merchant marine today. He said, "For the past two decades, the story of the United States merchant marine has been one of deterioration and decay. Where we once were the world's foremost shipbuilding power, we now rank fourteenth." He also urged more government assistance to American shipbuilding.

In the field of defense our merchant marine is an auxiliary to our armed forces. Our merchant marine fleet is by far the most versatile fleet in the world. By this I mean that during peace time it serves the world of trade and in times of crises it must be ready to transport men and material whenever and wherever they are needed. Today, for example merchant seamen man an 8,000 mile-long lifeline over which moves 98 percent of the supplies and two-thirds of the servicemen bound for Vietnam. History shows us that the success of merchant shipping has been the keystone to victory in every war. If America were to declare an all-out war, could she depend on foreign ships

XUM

to serve her needs? Without a strong merchant marine, America would be at the mercy of her friends, as well as her enemies. History also shows us that we were prepared in the eighteenth century to wage war on the high seas, but that we were unprepared in 1812 . . . unprepared in 1917, in 1941 . . . and we are today in the sixties unprepared. Because of the merchant marines' vital service to our armed forces, there is no doubt as to the honor they have won for themselves as our "Fourth Arm of Defense."

We are a leading nation in many ways, but not in shipping. Let's urge our government to take steps to build up our merchant marine through federal aid as well as to encourage American companies to ship American. Let us join those who hope to see that American flag shipping carries more than 9 percent of our total trade and commerce. That's why I say, no matter who or what you are, where you live—in urban or rural areas, everyone should know that the merchant marine builds up our country. So why not build up our merchant marine!

MASS TRANSIT TRUST FUND—A SOLUTION TO OUR NATION'S TRAFFIC PROBLEMS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on February 17, 1969, I introduced S. 1032, the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1969. The intent of this legislation is to provide the Federal funding which is necessary if we are to meet the present and future mass transportation needs of our Nation's cities. S. 1032 takes an established program of proven value, urban mass transportation, and weds it to the trust fund method of financing which has been used successfully over the year to pay for other forms of transportation such as our Nation's highways.

The urban mass transportation trust fund created by this bill would be financed by earmarking portions of the existing excise taxes on automobiles. Over a 4-year period of time, an estimated total of $1.8 billion would be made available for urban mass transportation as contrasted with out current expenditures of approximately $170 million a year.

Mr. President, this proposal is supported by the National League of Cities—U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Counties, the American Transit Association, the National Association of Railroad Passengers, the National Association of Homebuilders, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, as well as by individual experts who work daily with the problems of urban mass transportation. All of these groups have, over the years, been in the forefront of the struggle to upgrade our Nation's transit facilities so that they will be able to meet the needs of the 1970's.

The Trenton, N.J., Evening Times of June 26, 1969, in an excellent editorial entitled "Transit's Day Coming?" after endorsing the trust fund approach, went on to state:

> Doubtless the auto lobby will protest vigorously at the use of the excise tax for this purpose. But a strong case can be made for financing an even heavier share of mass transit out of auto and truck user taxes. Obviously, the sooner large numbers of commuters can be lured from their cars to decent mass transit, the safer, swifter and more pleasant the highways will be for those who continue to use them.

The Macon, Ga., Telegraph and News in a July 6, 1969, editorial also supported trust fund financing. The editorial stated:

> The Advantage of trust fund over other forms of financing is that the former provides a steady, predictable flow of funds. . .
>
> With more than 70 per cent of Americans living in urban areás, and the trek to the city still increasing, our large cities need mass transit systems to compliment good highways for private vehicles.

Both editorials also compliment Secretary of Transportation, John A. Volpe, for his purported support of the trust fund concept of financing. This support was unequivocally given on March 10, 1969, in a press conference preceding Secretary Volpe's address to the Fourth International Conference on Urban Transportation in Pittsburgh, Pa. Over the last 4 months, the Secretary has continually reiterated his support. He has repeatedly promised to forward legislative proposals to the Congress specifically setting out the administration's views in this area. Unfortunately, as of this date, Secretary Volpe has not backed up his words with the appropriate deeds. He has not recommended any legislation whatsoever in the area of mass transportation.

On June 17, 1969, the senior Senator from Alabama, JOHN SPARKMAN, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, publicly announced that hearings would begin on July 15 on all housing and mass transit proposals pending before the committee. Hearings on S. 1032 have been scheduled for July 23, 24, and 29. Secretary Volpe has been invited to appear before the committee on July 23 as the leadoff witness. I sincerely hope that the Secretary of Transportation will be able to take time away from his busy schedule to appear before the committee and publicly set forth his views concerning the urban mass transit trust fund or any other alternative legislative action which he may now wish to recommend.

Mr. President, in conclusion I wholeheartedly recommend that Secretary Volpe read the July 13, 1969, New York Daily News editorial, which clearly and concisely states:

> And the federal government has the means to provide long-term remedies, if it will only give mass transit a fraction of the attention lavished on highways. Listening, Transportation Secretary John Volpe?

So that all Members of this body and Secretary Volpe may have the benefit of these three excellent editorials which go to the heart of our Nation's mass transit problems, I now ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Trenton (N.J.) Evening Times, June 26, 1969]

TRANSIT'S DAY COMING?

Urban mass transit is getting some belated but welcome attention in Washington.

President Nixon took a helicopter ride over the capital's jammed freeways and bridges the other day and said his sympathies were with the commuter. "I'm glad we don't have to drive to work," he added.

Meanwhile, the U.S. Transportation Department let it be known that Secretary John Volpe is ready to produce a $10 billion program for overhauling the nation's mass transit systems in the next decade.

The legislative package would give transit systems the same kind of guaranteed annual income for capital construction purposes that interstate highways have enjoyed, through their trust fund, since 1956.

It would provide money for research, loans and grants through a "designated account," paid for from the existing seven percent auto excise tax and new taxes on cigarettes and liquor.

The federal aid would be aimed at improving the speed, comfort and convenience of travel by bus, subway or surface rail line.

It would encourage dozens of metropolitan areas to emulate or better the exciting new rapid transit system the San Francisco Bay area is now building at a total cost of over a billion dollars. Locally, it could provide funds for the Mercer County Improvement Authority and other bus operators to dramatically upgrade the quality of their service within Trenton and to the New Jersey and Bucks suburbs.

Doubtless the auto lobby will protest vigorously at the use of the excise tax for this purpose. But a strong case can be made for financing an even heavier share of mass transit out of auto and truck user taxes. Obviously, the sooner large numbers of commuters can be lured from their cars to decent mass transit, the safer, swifter and more pleasant the highways will be for those who continue to use them.

[From the Macon (Ga.) Telegraph and News, July 6, 1969]

MASS TRANSIT SOLUTION TO BIG CITIES' TRAFFIC

"Where are they going to put all the cars?" President Nixon exclaimed on a recent helicopter tour of Washington during the morning rush hour.

Whereas the President asked the question only one day, not having to drive to work, regular automobile commuters in large cities ask the question every weekday.

The U.S. Department of Transportation has estimated that the average auto commuter in major cities spends 13 per cent of his Monday-Friday waking hours in traffic.

The commuter would spend less time and money getting to and from work if his area were served by adequate rapid transit facilities. When it comes to mass transit, however the United States is an underdeveloped country.

Urban transportation policy since World War II has catered almost exclusively to automobile highway interests, but President Nixon must have realized as he hovered above the capital, viewing the morning traffic, that changes in emphasis are in order.

Transportation Secretary John A. Volpe, rated as a strong highway man, has even been pressing for a greatly enlarged program of federal aid to urban mass transit systems.

Volpe favors creation of a trust fund, similar to that which finances the Interstate Highway System, to pay for the mass transit program.

The advantage of trust fund over other forms of financing is that the former provides a steady, predictable flow of funds. However, Congress often objects to trust funds because they intrude on its appropriation power.

Until recent years, big city governments have sought to alleviate traffic congestion mainly by building additional highways and parking facilities. But growth of motor traffic has more than kept pace with new road construction.

With more than 70 per cent of Americans living in urban areas, and the trek to the city still increasing, our large cities need mass transit systems to compliment good highways for private vehicles.

[From the New York Daily News, July 13, 1969]

SICK, SICK, SICK

is about the only way to describe the mass transit situation in the metropolitan area.

Subways are hot and crowded; the Penn Central hobbles along one short step ahead of chaos; the Long Island Rail Road is plagued with cancellations due to "shortage of equipment."

Who's to blame? Just about everybody, in our opinion.

The Metropolitan Transportation Authority deserves some of the brickbats thrown at it for the failures of the subways and the LIRR. But in all fairness, the MTA inherited decrepit equipment and, on the LIRR, must back long-established union featherbedding practices.

The MTA can also claim, justly, that its record is no more shoddy than that of the private railroads, whose operators have permitted service to deteriorate over the years in what sometimes appears to be a program of deliberate neglect.

It is little wonder that commuters and straphangers are sullen and rapidly turning mutinous.

The situation urgently demands action by established regulatory agencies such as the Public Service Commission and the Interstate Commerce Commission. They have the power to make the carriers toe the mark—if they will but wield it.

And the federal government has the means to provide long-term remedies, if it will only give mass transit a fraction of the attention lavished on highways. Listening, Transportation Secretary John Volpe?

OBSCENITY IN THE MAILS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the citizens of my State are wondering why Congress has not begun to move on legislation to control the flood of obscene mail which continues to invade their homes. I am certain that decent citizens in all areas of the United States are expressing the same, urgent pleas as are my constituents that something be done to protect against this invasion of their privacy.

It is indeed a sad commentary on our times when people have to write their Senator to take action against this kind of trash. They find it incredible to discover that the laws of the land are not adequate to stamp out the delivery to their households of this unsought and unwelcome material. They find it very strange that the laws on the books are unworkable and they demand our immediate attention to correcting this situation.

If I may read aloud a few sentences contained in one of the numerous letters being sent to me almost daily, I believe it will bring home to Senators the great sense of anxiety and irritation which is felt by most Americans in regard to this problem. The letter begins as follows:

> I apologize for sending the enclosed material to you. It would have been impossible, however, to describe such garbage in words ... I did not believe such trash could be printed in the United States.

Then the writer poses the question to which we must address ourselves:

> Are our laws so poor or our enforcement so lax as to permit such pornography to be manufactured? How can this be controlled? What can I do?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pertinent portions of this letter and of a representative sampling of similar ones which I have received from my State be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Perhaps this personal indication of the vast depth and sincerity of feelings expressed by the American public against obscenity in the mails will help to convince Members of Congress that there must not be any further delay in this area.

For my part, I agree 100 percent with my constituents that it is high time we decide to roll up our sleeves and get to work on this problem. It was encouraging to note the prod given us all by the majority leader recently when he asked the Senate to start hearings on this subject promptly after the Fourth of July recess, and I would like to associate myself with his request.

This marks the third occasion on which I have spoken to the Senate this year on the need for action to control this misuse of the mails. It was in March that I first expressed my strong concern in this Chamber that the present situation had reached the state of a national menace insofar as the danger it poses to children. At that time, I was pleased to join as a coauthor with the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) of the first Senate bill to propose a law aimed squarely at protecting minors against indecent materials.

Our bill has been followed by several important measures along this line—chief among which is the proposal submitted by President Nixon in his message of May 2. In view of the excellent nationwide interest which the administration bill received, I offered a series of eight amendments to it last month designed to increase its effectiveness in the event it becomes law. In case any members are interested, these amendments were offered on June 5, and have been designated Senate amendments numbered 29 through 35.

Today, I would like to examine in detail a particularly important aspect of the administration's bill. This provision is founded on what I believe to be a worthwhile purpose, but is drafted in such a way that I fear it will not pass muster by the courts.

The language which I would like to examine closely is set out in subsection (c) of the proposed statute. In short, this provision creates a presumption that indecent material which is sent to a household where a child resides shall be considered as having been put in the mails for delivery to a child. An exception is made only when the material is sent in an envelope or wrapper that "completely conceals the contents" and is "clearly, specifically, and personally addressed to an adult."

Frankly, Mr. President, I believe there are serious questions whether this device will stand up to the test of constitutionality which has been set forth by the U.S. Supreme Court.

The most current announcement of the Court's criteria is found in Leary against United States, decided May 19 of this year. In this case the Court had before it a presumption established in the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act which authorized the jury to infer from a defendant's possession of marihuana that the drug was illegally imported and that the defendant knew of this fact. The Court weighed the provision against its standards and found that it lacked a rational basis.

The nub of the test applied by the Court is whether there is any "substantial assurance that the presumed fact is more likely than not to flow from the proved fact on which it is made to depend." In making this judgment, the Court stated, significant weight is to be given to "the capacity of Congress to amass the stuff of actual experience and cull conclusions from it."

Applying this rule to the subsection (c) presumption, I regret to say that I cannot perceive of any legislative record upon which Congress can make conclusions in favor of the facts we are asked to presume. But, before treating this question, let me state what kind of mail it is which may lead to a defendant's conviction. For it must be kept in mind that we are discussing the great bulk of direct advertising mail—which includes the millions of letters that are addressed to "head of household" or to "occupant" or "resident."

And, under the literal terms of subsection (c), we must add to this mail all letters that fail to show the addressee's name "clearly, specifically, and personally." This would seem to include all cases in which a significant error is made in the use of a person's name.

The upshot of the matter is that the presumption covers a tremendous portion of all mail delivered—some of it being sent in the name of persons who are children, to be sure, but a great deal of it consisting of "occupant" mail and mail actually meant for adults.

This background sets the stage for an examination of whether there are definite reasons to believe that the disseminator of this kind of mail has actual knowledge, or should be aware, that most of such mail will be delivered to persons who are younger than 18. To prove this, I believe two elements must be shown. First, it must be proven with substantial assurance that most of the mail I have just described is actually received by minors and not by adults. Second, it must be shown that most mailers of this matter are aware of this fact and have deduced that unless their merchandise is mailed in the exact manner set out in the provision it will be delivered to a child.

Mr. President, a close study of the existing materials persuades me there is no direct or circumstantial evidence available at this time to sustain either conclusion.

In the course of my search for evidence, I have been in touch with several agencies of the Government—including the Bureau of the Census, the Post Office Department, the Justice Department, the President's Commission on Obscenity

XUM

and Pornography, and the Library of Congress—to determine whether they have conducted any surveys to ascertain the letter-opening habits of American families and whether they possess any statistics bearing on this question. In each instance, the reply was negative. I should add an encouraging note, however, because one agency—the Presidential Commission—is aware of this gap in research data and has informed me of its plans to conduct a national survey next fall to learn if some pertinent evidence can be developed in this field. I ask unanimous consent that the letter submitted to me by the Commission be printed immediately at the end of my remarks. Nevertheless, Mr. President, I must conclude that as of this moment there is no agency in the Government which possesses any evidence that can be used to sustain the presumption we have been asked to approve.

The result is the same if we turn to private sources. I can imagine that if any precise information is available from these sources concerning the participation of minors in opening the mails, it will be found among the firms which are active in the mail advertising industry.

This medium seems to break down into two broad categories of mailing houses and mail advertising users. The former is primarily involved with the mechanics of mailing, such as the addressing, folding, and automatic mailing of materials. The latter is more oriented toward the follow-up of mailings, including the analysis of who reads the mail and what response is given to it. Consequently, in order to obtain a worthwhile reply, I directed my inquiries to the major and responsible national associations representing each of these kinds of firms—one being the Mail Advertising Service Association and the other being the Direct Mail Advertising Association.

Mr. President, I must report that neither group knew of any evidence which would seem to indicate that most mail of a general nature is opened by minors. It is significant, however, that some information came to light which may point to the opposite conclusion. This data is contained in the report on a national consumer survey made for the Direct Mail Advertising Association in June and July of 1964 by the Nielson marketing service. Among the highlights of this deep research effort were the findings that direct mail is opened by the head-of-the-family in three-fourths of U.S. homes and that it is only in 16 percent of the homes where each family member opens his own mail of this type. I wish to emphasize that these are the results of one study only and that there may be millions of families in which the practice is different. Therefore, in order to thoroughly pursue this trail, I also have examined whether any secondary material exists that may provide circumstantial data from which the presumed facts may flow.

One source which may give a clue as to the percentage of minors who open unsolicited mail sent to their homes is the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which publishes a report on marital and family characteristics of workers. For if it can be shown that in the case of most families with children both of the parents are absent from home on account of work when the mails are delivered, it might be said that their children are likely to be the first persons to open the mail in such homes.

But here again, the official statistics fail to give any support to the credibility of such an inference. The most current figures available disclose that the wife is not employed in two-thirds of American homes with children under 18 years. From this I conclude that in at least two-thirds of American families with children, it is just as likely that there will be one parent at home when the mail arrives as it is that there will be a child there.

The only other statistic that looks at all relevant is the impressive fact that there are children under 18 years in almost 59 percent of American households. However, the mere fact that it can be proven that there are children living in most American homes by no means justifies the conclusion that most mail sent to American homes is meant for delivery to minors. In the absence of any pertinent evidence to show that in most homes minors, and not adults, open the mail, the inference simply will not pass muster. It must be remembered that we are not talking about situations where the dealer can actually see the consumer. Here, where the dealings are through the mails, the sender does not see who the addressee is and cannot be charged, without proof, of knowing the age of the addressee.

Therefore, in the face of a complete lack of any supporting evidence, I must conclude that it is not constitutionally permissible to authorize a jury to infer that most defendants who send mail to homes where children reside have intended such mail for delivery to a minor. Granting that the courts will pay the utmost deference to the findings of Congress, in this instance the legislative record falls short of furnishing a basis upon which to make any findings.

Even if the evidence had borne out a preliminary decision in favor of the validity of the statutory presumption, there are other serious problems which might crop up. For example, I suspect that the U.S. attorneys would be hard put to explain to a court the differences between the requirements that an envelope or wrapper be "clearly, specifically, and personally" addressed. I assume that for an envelope to be "personally" addressed, it must show the name of the person to whom it is directed. But what reasonable distinctions in construction can the courts give to the other terms?

Webster's defines "specific" to mean "precise" or "accurate." Applying this usage to the bill would mean that a person can be liable for conviction because of a misspelled name or an erroneous initial.

What then of "clearly"? I wonder what could be more clear than the personal name of the addressee. In his search for a distinct interpretation, perhaps the judge looking over this word will decide that the only meaning left open is for all envelopes or wrappers to be free of smudges and marks.

In any event, Mr. President, I feel it is apparent that the use of this triumvirate of requirements is open to challenge on the ground of vagueness. Further, it may develop that the Court will hold that the presumption must also meet the strict "reasonable doubt" standard of criminal cases because proof of an essential element of the crime charged depends upon its use. The Court alluded to this possibility in the Leary case.

Mr. President, this concludes my analysis of the questions raised by subsection (c). But, I do not want to convey the impression that Congress is left helpless to impose reasonable and stronger controls in this field. I definitely believe that there are two worthy motives behind subsection (c) which we can act upon in framing a stronger law. First, there is the desire to curtail the practice of mailing pornographic matter simply addressed to "occupant" or "resident." Second, there is the purpose of preventing the mailing of sexually provocative materials if the merchandise is not completely concealed.

Mr. President, I believe these purposes are sensible and deserve inclusion in the criminal statute in a proper form. Therefore, I am submitting an amendment to erect prohibitions against the use of "occupant" mail as a means to disseminate publications which are obscene to minors and against the deposit of such indecent material in the mails unless the matter is completely concealed.

By shifting the question of what conduct Congress might legitimately make a crime, I am confident the courts will sustain the power of Congress to impose these requirements. There is no longer any question that Congress may regulate the dissemination to youngsters of, and their access to, material objectionable as to them, but which could not be regulated as to adults. The landmark case which established this rule, *Ginsberg* v. *New York*, 39 U.S. 629 (1968), persuades me that Congress may restrict the mode of distribution of publications which are obscene to minors if there is a significant possibility that children will receive or have access to such materials.

In this area, the available data offers an adequate foundation for the enactment of the reasonable controls I am proposing. We can start with the statistic that there are children living in almost six out of every 10 homes in America, with a total of almost 28.6 million families having at least one child under 18. Next, we can note that there are 35 million children in the age group to which Congress is addressing itself. And, in view of the ever-increasing proportions of married women with children who continue to enter the labor force, it might well be concluded that the access of children to mail is so great that reasonable steps should be taken to decrease the chances they will be exposed to mail which is harmful to them. The highest labor force rate among women of all ages in March 1967, was that of married women with children ages 6 to 17. This group represented 45 percent of the entire women's labor force and totaled over 6 million.

From this, Congress might properly infer that several millions of children who have arrived at a crucial, inquisitive stage of life will have an unsupervised opportunity to open the mail before their working mothers and fathers return home. And, based on this finding, it would not be arbitrary for Congress to make the judgment that these children will be much less than likely to notice and unseal objectionable mail if it is sent to a specific addressee and its contents are well concealed. The indiscriminate flooding of the mails with indecent matter is a plainly reckless action which shows a complete indifference to the fact that a substantial portion of this harmful material may reach young children. In my opinion, the time has arrived when Congress should shift some of the burden of keeping this trash out of the hands of minors to the purveyors of filth, even if it ups the cost of their product.

The Supreme Court has clearly established that the Government may legitimately determine that the exposure of children to erotic materials will have a harmful effect on their normal and healthy development. In a previous address to the Senate, I called attention to the testimony given to Congress by Dr. Benjamin Karpman, when he was Chief Psychotherapist at St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia. Dr. Karpman expressed his professional opinion that if a perfectly healthy boy or girl is exposed to obscene materials it can virtually crystallize and settle unhealthy attitudes in such children for the rest of their lives.

There are several medical doctors among my own constituents who have written to me in protest at the disgusting matter which intrudes into their homes. Contrary to the bizarre opinions of some of the knee-jerk civil libertarians whose reports I have read, these distinguished professionals of the medical field have no difficulty in recognizing the potential for harm in prurient merchandise. In fact, one of the leading medical administrators in Arizona has written to me:

> It's getting so that I feel that I cannot even open my mail in the presence of children.

This gentleman has an additional concern. His letter advises me as follows:

> I understand that federal legislation is to be proposed to deal with this type of mail and I sincerely hope that you will be sufficiently interested to see that the law will be written responsibly and intelligently so that it will even pass the scrutiny of a permissive Supreme Court Justice!

His comment pretty well sums up the role which a legislator should assume in working on this problem. I agree that we must seek to frame a sensible and strong piece of legislation, which, if enacted, will prove to be workable and successful in controlling this menace to the Nation's children.

Let us develop a clear and comprehensive record which will assure the millions of concerned parents and decent citizens who are looking to us for action that we will pass the most effective law of which we can conceive to stamp out this danger to America's youth.

I ask unanimous consent that general exhibits be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT I

COMMISSION ON OBSCENITY AND PORNOGRAPHY,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1969.

Hon. BARRY GOLDWATER,
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: I am not aware of any research concerning the letter-opening habit of Americans or relevant to the question to the extent of which children of 18 open mail received in American homes. The Commission is interested in this issue as you are and is planning to secure information relevant to it. This is one of the items that will be included in a national survey that the Commission is planning to have conducted next fall.

We now have underway a pilot study of high school juniors and seniors to get some preliminary information about the extent of exposure of high school students to erotic materials. The question of exposure to erotic materials that have come through the mails addressed either to parents or to the adolescents themselves is being included in the study. Unfortunately, these data will not be available until next fall or winter.

We will be issuing a Progress Report later this month which will describe the various kinds of information that the Commission is securing as background for the recommendations that it has been asked to make. As the Progress Report indicates, however, most of these data will not be available until next winter and spring. The Commission's findings and recommendations are due to be printed next summer.

We appreciate your continued interest in the Commission and its work.

Sincerely yours,
W. CODY WILSON,
Executive Director.

EXHIBIT II

JULY 1, 1969.

Re Senate bills 2073 and 2074.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: On several occasions residents of Mohave County have comc in to my office for help and demanded prosecution of certain individuals for sending them pornographic matter through the mails. On each of these occasions I have forwarded the matter to the United States Attorney for the State of Arizona and he, in turn, has forwarded the same to the Post Office Department for investigation.

The results in each of these cases, I am afraid, will be no prosecution due to the current status of the law regarding obscenity and pornography.

While I have not had an opportunity to review the above captioned bills, I sincerely urge the enactment of these bills, or similar bills, which will give law enforcement some means of prosecuting the people responsible for sending this, for the lack of a better word, "filth" completely unsolicitated through the mails. . . .

Very truly yours,
Mr. L. C. L.,
County Attorney.
KINGMAN, ARIZ.

JUNE 23, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: As a concerned parent, a patriotic American and a decent citizen I am shocked and dismayed that anything such as the attached brochure can be sent through the United States mail. It is tragic that peddlers of such filth can hide behind and indeed be protected from prosecution by interpretations of our Constitution and the laws that support it that were never intended by our forefathers who founded this great country.

During World War II I fought as an infantry soldier from Sicily to Germany, but when I observe the decay and rot that is causing everything I believe in to crumble and fall around my feet I wonder what was gained.

Is there nothing that can be done about this sort of thing? . . .

Perhaps this is a cry in the wilderness but maybe we all have remained silent too long.

Yours most sincerely,
Mr. E. A. Z.,
President, Auto Dealership.
TUCSON, ARIZ.

JUNE 21, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: Enclosed you will find a letter and advertisement I received through the mail June 18, 1969. I called the Postmaster and asked what I should do about it. He suggested I send it to you, so that you could see just what *smut* and *pornography* is being sent through our U.S. mail.

It's a direct insult to receive such literature, and I would like to see it stopped . . .

It is appalling and will I am sure get worse, if something is not done about it, *and soon.*

Sincerely,
Mrs. L. E. T.
MIAMI, ARIZ.

JUNE 20, 1969.

Hon. BARRY GOLDWATER,
Washington, D.C.:

I'm so tired and disgusted with having to either tear up or burn this sort of stuff!

There should be a law against mailing it!

Mr. Z. M. M.
PHOENIX, ARIZ.

JUNE 19, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR BARRY: The enclosed letter came in the mail here, several days ago, and I am forwarding same to you unopened . . .

Things of this nature aren't doing any of us, or the Country in general, any good, and I will ask that you please turn this over to the Postal authorities, or whoever you consider might be the proper ones to take action thereon.

I consider this sort of thing to be in the class of the very lowest type of pornography.

This is a small-town family business . . . Mrs. L. keeps the books, local girls work in the office, our son, now 16, is a pretty-fair field- and office-hand, and the two daughters (13 and 11) have duties around "the shop" (including opening the mail!). .

Fortunately, none of them happened to be on the job at the time this little gem showed up.

Regards,
Mr. R. L.,
Professional Engineer.
PATAGONIA, ARIZ.

JUNE 18, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: This enclosed trash is being mailed to us without our permission or knowledge. Can you imagine a group of small children reviewing this before we get our hands on it?

What's happening to our country? Isn't there something that can be done?

Sincerely yours,
Mr. and Mrs. S. W.
PHOENIX, ARIZ.

JUNE 2, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: I apologize for sending the enclosed material to you. It would have been impossible, however, to describe such garbage in words. . . . I did not

XUM

believe such trash could be printed in the United States. . . . Are our laws so poor or our enforcement so lax as to permit such pornography to be manufactured? How can this be controlled? What can *I* do? Please, do what you can to stop this.

Sincerely,

Mr. T. W. S.

Tempe, Ariz.

May 29, 1969.

Hon. Barry Goldwater,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Goldwater: The enclosed clipping from the Arizona Republic prompted me to write to you.

You will also find a piece of "mail" which I had intended to return to the Postmaster. I cannot believe that any decent family would enjoy getting this type of advertising literature. I found it obscene and repulsive.

I felt degraded to think that my name was on any such a mailing list and incensed that it came to me for 3¢. It just can't be possible that good American people want this type of literature and to think that thousands of letters must have been sent from New York—if they pick someone from a little town like Kingman.

Further, you will note that my letter to you carries 12c postage. This letter has a 3¢ bulk rate. Perhaps the Post Office Department would not run in the "red" if all obscene or "junk" mail carried the same postage as we are required to pay in a legitimate business.

I wish you success in the movement you are sponsoring aimed at obscenity.

Sincerely,

Mrs. B. R.,
Insurance Agent.

Kingman, Ariz.

May 7, 1969.

Dear Mr. Goldwater: Enclosed is an example of the garbage which is coming to me in ever increasing frequency, and the same is happening at my home. It's getting so that I feel that I cannot even open my mail in the presence of my children.

I am far from a Puritan, but most of this trash is of appeal to deviates primarily. The enclosed pamphlet is one of the more benign examples, but its primary aim is to prurient interest.

I understand that federal legislation is to be proposed to deal with this type of mail and I sincerely hope that you will be sufficiently interested to see that the law will be written responsibly and intelligently so that it will even pass the scrutiny of a permissive Supreme Court Justice! A formidable task!

Sincerely,

D. J. C., M.D.,
Chairman, Department of Internal Medicine.

Tucson, Ariz.

May 1, 1969.

Dear Senator Goldwater: My attention has been drawn recently to a bill now in the House Judiciary Committee, against "SMUT". It is H.R. 5171.

Since you are a "Fighter" for good causes, and hopefully you will agree this bill is a good cause, will you exercise your influence in the House and Senate, so that a bill may be passed to take care of this stuff.

I am a victim of it twice, and having two small daughters, it hit the core. I would like to use stronger language, but it has to go thru the mails. . . .

Sincerely yours,

Mr. M. D. H.

Phoenix, Ariz.

April 26, 1969.

Dear Senator Goldwater: The post office claims it is unable to enforce pornography laws because of the recent Supreme Court rulings, and suggested that I write my congressman when I complained about receiving a copy of the enclosed mailing, as well as submit form 2150, a copy of which is enclosed. . . .

Having neither the time nor resources to pursue this matter personally, I send you this copy of material which was sent to many other faculty members as well, hoping that you will help us to overcome the tide of moral decay which is sweeping our nation. . . .

Sincerely,

Mr. W. O. C.

Chandler, Ariz.

April 25, 1969.

Dear Senator Goldwater: I receive in the mail approximately 4 times a month literature that is undesirable. I am forwarding one of these masterpieces. This particular piece of pornography is mild compared to others. Can something be done to stop this dissemination of pornography?

Sincerely,

D. C. B., M.D.

Scottsdale, Ariz.

April 22, 1969.

Dear Mr. Goldwater: My doorstep is being desecrated and my government allows it. The enclosed came *unsolicited*. Have I no protection? It seems not . . .

I've already heard the thousand and one words about the recent Supreme Court rulings, etc., and I am an advocate of free speech and against book burning. I also firmly believe that the rules (laws) of organized society should protect me in my home, but I believe the law should work both ways. Let's look at it this way. If I wanted that stuff in my home, my privacy should be respected. Just recently a Court in Tucson made that decision (pornographic films that were confiscated by the Police from someone's home had to be returned.) But look at the other side of the coin—if I *don't want* trash brought into my home, unsolicited (in an unmarked envelope so I've no way of knowing what's in it until I open it)—then I feel I should have protection of some kind to keep it out and be able to mete out punishment of some kind to anyone who brings it in. Simply turning a cold shoulder, as I would be doing through the Postal Authorities, doesn't do the job. The character who would send me, *unsolicited*, this cesspool collection of perversion and debauchery, so fearlessly, couldn't care less about any cold shoulder I might turn on him. Nothing short of a blow from a club of sufficient strength to annihilate him would do any good.

If our laws don't do something for us citizens soon, we will be forced to resort to Vigilantes. Can't something be done through legislation before this happens?

Sincerely,

Mrs. S. M. R.

Tucson, Ariz.

April 15, 1969.

Sir: Yesterday (April 14) my wife opened the mail to find this pornographic filth.

My two small children—Loretta Jo, 8, and Dereck, 5—were in the room with her. She hid the mail immediately but, as you might guess, the kids are still wondering why their mom hid the mail.

Although they have been told never to open the mail, my children often bring it in from the box, and they are as curious as any children their ages.

The Post Office advised me to send this material to you. We understand you are attempting to have legislation passed that will protect people from this type of mail. If so, you certainly have our support.

We can't understand why—with all the words in the English language and all of the competent Federal Judges—someone can't adequately define "pornographic."

Sincerely,

Mr. R. L .D.

Glendale, Ariz.

April 15, 1969.

Dear Sir: We are a group of parents concerned about the amount of filth in our movies, on television and in our books. Our magazines are filled with nudity and things considered obscene . . .

We can screen reading material brought into our homes. We can turn off the television and stay away from the movies. But what about the children whose parents don't care? They deserve something better than a lot of obscenity . . .

Isn't there something people like me, with very little money can do?

We need some answers plus a lot of advice on how to combat this force that is invading us from all sides.

We would appreciate a direct reply.

Thank you,

Mrs. M. G.

Phoenix, Ariz.

April 15, 1969.

Dear Sir: Now don't get excited! How do you like opening your mail to such pictures? . . .

Let's work together on this. I am truly worried about our country! What can we do? Help us help ourselves by making these kind of things illegal to mail. Surely this type of person needs to be jailed so he'll have time to think of what he's doing. Where will it stop? You say it is okay in the privacy of your own home. This is more poison to our youth than a man making counterfeit money or whiskey. If you are the man I think you are, you will do something about this . . .

I am a business man, a Christian, and a worried father! I would appreciate an answer.

Sincerely,

Mr. H. S.

Phoenix, Ariz.

April 11, 1969.

Dear Senator Goldwater: Enclosed, for your eyes to see, is a copy of advertising material we just received in the mail. It is abominable that we must be subjected to unrequested trash like this.

The Post Office informs us our only right is; to fill out a form within 30 days which will take us off the mailing list. This is ridiculous. . . .

My immediate reaction now is to send a copy of this filth that came out of California to every Congressman in Washington and directly to his home, this I am sure would get a reaction.

However, prior to such a drastic movement, I request your opinion on changing the law on the United States assisting these peddlers of pornography and your advice on the effect of mailing the list to every Congressman in Washington.

I don't often write my Congressman because I feel overdoing diminishes the value of a sincere request. This I assure you, is a sincere request and I await your reply.

Very truly yours,

Mr. E. S. S.,
Treasurer.

Yuma, Ariz.

March 21, 1969.

Dear Barry: Enclosed is the second mailing to me from a firm know as Cybertype Corp. The first mailing was forwarded to our Phoenix Postmaster registering our opposition. Frankly, this type of literature which is mailed at random should be strictly prohibited. The results of such filth will lead to further moral decay throughout our Country.

Barry, you know me as not being a prude, but I do object strongly to the distribution of such rot. The publishers and printers responsible should be prosecuted to the full extent of the law. If current laws are not adequate, then Congress should take drastic action.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. G. R. C.,
President, Steerhide Co.
PHOENIX, ARIZ.

REFUSAL TO ADMIT CARLOS FUENTES TO UNITED STATES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senate will recall that last February the Immigration and Naturalization Service refused to allow the prominent Mexican Novelist Carlos Fuentes to go ashore in San Juan, P.R., when a ship on which he was traveling from Europe to Mexico made a call at that port.

I have long been disturbed over incidents of this kind which do nothing to protect the internal security of the United States and do a great deal to confirm the worst suspicions which are held about the United States by intellectuals abroad.

When I learned of this embarrassing treatment of Mr. Fuentes, I wrote to the Secretary of State and the Attorney General asking if it would not be possible to administer the law with a little more flexibility.

A rather considerable exchange of correspondence followed and has now been happily concluded with the adoption of changes in procedures by the Immigration and Naturalization Service designed to avoid repetition of the Fuentes incident.

I think the changes which the service has adopted are constructive and I congratulate both the Department of Justice and the Department of State for their responsiveness in this case.

I ask unanimous consent that two news stories from the New York Times concerning the Fuentes matter as well as my complete correspondence with the the Departments of State and Justice may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEFTIST NOVELIST IS BARRED BY UNITED STATES; FUENTES HALTED AT SAN JUAN AS AN "UNDESIRABLE ALIEN"

(By Henry Raymont)

Carlos Fuentes, a leading Mexican novelist with leftist leanings, was denied permission by United States immigration officials to land in San Juan, Puerto Rico, last Saturday on the ground that he was "an undesirable alien."

In a letter made public here yesterday by Mr. Fuentes' literary agent, Carl Brandt, the 39-year-old author said immigration officials had torn up his transit card and treated him "like a common criminal."

A Justice Department spokesman in Washington confirmed that Mr. Fuentes had been prevented from leaving the tourist vessel Virginia de Ohurruca, on the way from Barcelona to Veracruz, Mexico. The spokesman, Jack Landau, said the author's name was listed as "a person considered undesirable" by the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service, but he declined to give any reason.

Mr. Fuentes, whose father is the Mexican Ambassador to Portugal, has long been identified with leftist causes, and has been known for his sympathy to Premier Fidel Castro of Cuba. Last August, however, he joined a number of French and Latin-American intellectuals in denouncing the Soviet-led invasion of Czechoslovakia, which Mr. Castro endorsed.

The young author's problems with the United States immigration authorities go back to April, 1963, when he was refused an invitation to participate in a television debate on the Alliance for Progress with Richard N. Goodwin, at that time Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-America Affairs. State Department officials said then that the visa had been refused in the belief that Mr. Fuentes might be a member of the Communist party.

A year later, a visa was granted, but the publicity did not brighten the United States image in cultural circles in Latin America, where Mr. Fuentes' works have been steady best-sellers. His latest novel, "A Change of Skin," received widely favorable reviews in the United States and Europe.

The new ban against Mr. Fuentes drew immediate protests from the publishing and academic communities, which have long been sensitive to the exclusion of foreign artists, writers and scientists who are suspected of belonging to the Community party or to Communist fronts.

Roger W. Straus, Jr., president of Farrar, Straus & Giroux, Mr. Fuentes' publisher here, called the ban against the author "absolutely outrageous" and said he would demand an explanation from the Departments of State and Justice.

Two Columbia University officials, who have invited Mr. Fuentes to lecture at the university next year, sent a letter of protest to Attorney General John N. Mitchell. They are Frank MacShane, chairman of the writing division of the School of the Arts, and Charles Wagley, Franz Boas Professor of Anthropology and director of the Institute of Latin-American Studies.

Mr. Fuentes, who has been living in Paris for the last two years, is returning to Mexico despite warnings of friends who fear he may be arrested as a result of his denunciations of the Mexican troops' attack on a student demonstration just before the Olympic Games last August. Scores of persons were killed in the attack.

In an essay in the forthcoming March 18 issue of The New York Review of Books, Mr. Fuentes criticizes the Mexican government as an "autocracy" and warns against "the sinister world order that is taking shape with the formidable trappings of nuclear terror, peace by blackmail, spheres of influence, and the promise of a planetary fascism that denies both individual rights and socialist experience."

REFUSAL TO LET FUENTES ENTER PUERTO RICO REVIVES CONTROVERSY OVER IMMIGRATION POLICY

(By Henry Raymont)

The old controversy over whether aliens should be prevented from visiting the United States because of their political beliefs has been revived by the refusal of immigration officials to admit Carlos Fuentes, a prominent Mexican novelist with leftist leanings, into San Juan, P.R.

The issue was raised by two former officials of the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations amid a mounting storm of protest over the Fuentes case.

Mr. Fuentes said last week that he was stopped by immigration officials and "treated like a common criminal" when he attempted to land in San Juan on Feb. 22. He had been on his way from Spain to Mexico aboard the tourist vessel Virginia de Churruca.

Abba P. Schwartz, former head of the State Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs and an advocate of liberal immigration and travel policies, said here yesterday he hoped the action represented "an isolated instance" and not a reversion to the more restrictive policies of the 1950's.

In a telegram to Senator J. W. Fulbright, Democrat of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Schwartz said that the Fuentes case illustrated the need for change in the immigration law "to prevent further senseless and embarrassing situations" in the United States' foreign relations.

He specifically urged the revival of legislation to strike from the law the exclusion of persons who are past or present members of the Communist party or other proscribed organizations.

Another former high State Department official, William D. Rogers, who was head of the Alliance for Progress program and is now a Washington lawyer and president of the Center for Inter-American Relations, in New York, called on the Nixon Administration to make clear that the Fuentes incident "was an aberration" and not general policy.

"The notion that Fuentes's presence among us could in any sense damage our national interest is unworthy of serious discussion," he said in a letter to Secretary of State William P. Rogers, who is no relation.

"To the contrary," he continued, "it is his rejection which will cause us immense harm. It will be interpreted by the youth and intellectual community in Latin America as meaning that our commitment to free expression is superficial and will confirm the impression to some that we are timid and fearful of criticism of Latin-American writers."

Observing that in recent years there has been a growing effort by the United States universities and private foundations to expand contacts with Latin-American authors, Mr. Rogers urged the Nixon Administration to announce "in clear and convincing terms that it would welcome Fuentes and other leading Latin-American writers to our shores, regardless of their political opinions."

Meanwhile, protests to Secretary Rogers and Attorney General John N. Mitchell were made public over the weekend by several literary societies.

The Authors League of America, Inc., disclosed that a telegram had been sent to the officials by its president, Rex Stout. The telegram said:

"The refusal to permit Carlos Fuentes to land in Puerto Rico is shocking and reprehensible and on behalf of the 5,000 writers who are members of this organization we deplore and condemn it and urge that it be revoked forthwith."

Robert Halsband, president of the American Center of the International Pen Club, sent a similar message noting that as "one of Latin America's outstanding writers" Mr. Fuentes had participated in the organization's international congress in New York in June, 1966. He called the recent action against Mr. Fuentes "a disgraceful, unbelievable muddle."

A Justice Department spokesman said yesterday that Mr. Fuentes' presence at the Pen Club meeting in 1966 and an earlier visit in 1964 had been made possible through a temporary waiver, which the Attorney General can extend to persons otherwise excluded from the United States by the immigration law.

He said that there was no record that the author had asked for such a waiver for his planned temporary stop in Puerto Rico.

MARCH 8, 1969.

The Honorable WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have been much disturbed over the refusal of the United States Government to allow Carlos Fuentes to disembark from a tourist ship in San Juan, Puerto Rico on February 22.

XUM

believe such trash could be printed in the United States. . . . Are our laws so poor or our enforcement so lax as to permit such pornography to be manufactured? How can this be controlled? What can *I* do? Please, do what you can to stop this.

Sincerely,

Mr. T. W. S.

TEMPE, ARIZ.

MAY 29, 1969.

Hon. BARRY GOLDWATER,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: The enclosed clipping from the Arizona Republic prompted me to write to you.

You will also find a piece of "mail" which I had intended to return to the Postmaster. I cannot believe that any decent family would enjoy getting this type of advertising literature. I found it obscene and repulsive.

I felt degraded to think that my name was on any such a mailing list and incensed that it came to me for 3¢. It just can't be possible that good American people want this type of literature and to think that thousands of letters must have been sent from New York—if they pick someone from a little town like Kingman.

Further, you will note that my letter to you carries 12c postage. This letter has a 3¢ bulk rate. Perhaps the Post Office Department would not run in the "red" if all obscene or "junk" mail carried the same postage as we are required to pay in a legitimate business.

I wish you success in the movement you are sponsoring aimed at obscenity.

Sincerely,

Mrs. B. R.,
Insurance Agent.

KINGMAN, ARIZ.

MAY 7, 1969.

DEAR MR. GOLDWATER: Enclosed is an example of the garbage which is coming to me in ever increasing frequency, and the same is happening at my home. It's getting so that I feel that I cannot even open my mail in the presence of my children.

I am far from a Puritan, but most of this trash is of appeal to deviates primarily. The enclosed pamphlet is one of the more benign examples, but its primary aim is to prurient interest.

I understand that federal legislation is to be proposed to deal with this type of mail and I sincerely hope that you will be sufficiently interested to see that the law will be written responsibly and intelligently so that it will even pass the scrutiny of a permissive Supreme Court Justice! A formidable task!

Sincerely,

D. J. C., M.D.,
Chairman, Department of Internal Medicine.

TUCSON, ARIZ.

MAY 1, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: My attention has been drawn recently to a bill now in the House Judiciary Committee, against "SMUT". It is H.R. 5171.

Since you are a "Fighter" for good causes, and hopefully you will agree this bill is a good cause, will you exercise your influence in the House and Senate, so that a bill may be passed to take care of this stuff.

I am a victim of it twice, and having two small daughters, it hit the core. I would like to use stronger language, but it has to go thru the mails. . . .

Sincerely yours,

Mr. M. D. H.

PHOENIX, ARIZ.

APRIL 26, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: The post office claims it is unable to enforce pornography laws because of the recent Supreme Court rulings, and suggested that I write my congressman when I complained about receiving a copy of the enclosed mailing, as well as submit form 2150, a copy of which is enclosed. . . .

Having neither the time nor resources to pursue this matter personally, I send you this copy of material which was sent to many other faculty members as well, hoping that you will help us to overcome the tide of moral decay which is sweeping our nation. . . .

Sincerely,

Mr. W. O. C.

CHANDLER, ARIZ.

APRIL 25, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: I receive in the mail approximately 4 times a month literature that is undesirable. I am forwarding one of these masterpieces. This particular piece of pornography is mild compared to others. Can something be done to stop this dissemination of pornography?

Sincerely,

D. C. B., M.D.

SCOTTSDALE, ARIZ.

APRIL 22, 1969.

DEAR MR. GOLDWATER: My doorstep is being desecrated and my government allows it. The enclosed came *unsolicited*. Have I no protection? It seems not . . .

I've already heard the thousand and one words about the recent Supreme Court rulings, etc., and I am an advocate of free speech and against book burning. I also firmly believe that the rules (laws) of organized society should protect me in my home, but I believe the law should work both ways. Let's look at it this way. If I wanted that stuff in my home, my privacy should be respected. Just recently a Court in Tucson made that decision (pornographic films that were confiscated by the Police from someone's home had to be returned.) But look at the other side of the coin—if I *don't want* trash brought into my home, unsolicited (in an unmarked envelope so I've no way of knowing what's in it until I open it)—then I feel I should have protection of some kind to keep it out and be able to mete out punishment of some kind to anyone who brings it in. Simply turning a cold shoulder, as I would be doing through the Postal Authorities, doesn't do the job. The character who would send me, *unsolicited,* this cesspool collection of perversion and debauchery, so fearlessly, couldn't care less about any cold shoulder I might turn on him. Nothing short of a blow from a club of sufficient strength to annihilate him would do any good.

If our laws don't do something for us citizens soon, we will be forced to resort to Vigilantes. Can't something be done through legislation before this happens?

Sincerely,

Mrs. S. M. R.

TUCSON, ARIZ.

APRIL 15, 1969.

SIR: Yesterday (April 14) my wife opened the mail to find this pornographic filth.

My two small children—Loretta Jo, 8, and Dereck, 5—were in the room with her. She hid the mail immediately but, as you might guess, the kids are still wondering why their mom hid the mail.

Although they have been told never to open the mail, my children often bring it in from the box, and they are as curious as any children their ages.

The Post Office advised me to send this material to you. We understand you are attempting to have legislation passed that will protect people from this type of mail. If so, you certainly have our support.

We can't understand why—with all the words in the English language and all of the competent Federal Judges—someone can't adequately define "pornographic."

Sincerely,

Mr. R. L .D.

GLENDALE, ARIZ.

APRIL 15, 1969.

DEAR SIR: We are a group of parents concerned about the amount of filth in our movies, on television and in our books. Our magazines are filled with nudity and things considered obscene . . .

We can screen reading material brought into our homes. We can turn off the television and stay away from the movies. But what about the children whose parents don't care? They deserve something better than a lot of obscenity . . .

Isn't there something people like me, with very little money can do?

We need some answers plus a lot of advice on how to combat this force that is invading us from all sides.

We would appreciate a direct reply.

Thank you,

MRS. M. G.

PHOENIX, ARIZ.

APRIL 15, 1969.

DEAR SIR: Now don't get excited! How do you like opening your mail to such pictures? . . .

Let's work together on this. I am truly worried about our country! What can we do? Help us help ourselves by making these kind of things illegal to mail. Surely this type of person needs to be jailed so he'll have time to think of what he's doing. Where will it stop? You say it is okay in the privacy of your own home. This is more poison to our youth than a man making counterfeit money or whiskey. If you are the man I think you are, you will do something about this . . .

I am a business man, a Christian, and a worried father! I would appreciate an answer.

Sincerely,

Mr. H. S.

PHOENIX, ARIZ.

APRIL 11, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: Enclosed, for your eyes to see, is a copy of advertising material we just received in the mail. It is abominable that we must be subjected to unrequested trash like this.

The Post Office informs us our only right is; to fill out a form within 30 days which will take us off the mailing list. This is ridiculous. . . .

My immediate reaction now is to send a copy of this filth that came out of California to every Congressman in Washington and directly to his home, this I am sure would get a reaction.

However, prior to such a drastic movement, I request your opinion on changing the law on the United States assisting these peddlers of pornography and your advice on the effect of mailing the list to every Congressman in Washington.

I don't often write my Congressman because I feel overdoing diminishes the value of a sincere request. This I assure you, is a sincere request and I await your reply.

Very truly yours,

Mr. E. S. S.,
Treasurer.

YUMA, ARIZ.

MARCH 21, 1969.

DEAR BARRY: Enclosed is the second mailing to me from a firm know as Cybertype Corp. The first mailing was forwarded to our Phoenix Postmaster registering our opposition. Frankly, this type of literature which is mailed at random should be strictly prohibited. The results of such filth will lead to further moral decay throughout our Country.

Barry, you know me as not being a prude,

XUM

but I do object strongly to the distribution of such rot. The publishers and printers responsible should be prosecuted to the full extent of the law. If current laws are not adequate, then Congress should take drastic action.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. G. R. C.,
President, Steerhide Co.

Phoenix, Ariz.

REFUSAL TO ADMIT CARLOS FUENTES TO UNITED STATES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senate will recall that last February the Immigration and Naturalization Service refused to allow the prominent Mexican Novelist Carlos Fuentes to go ashore in San Juan, P.R., when a ship on which he was traveling from Europe to Mexico made a call at that port.

I have long been disturbed over incidents of this kind which do nothing to protect the internal security of the United States and do a great deal to confirm the worst suspicions which are held about the United States by intellectuals abroad.

When I learned of this embarrassing treatment of Mr. Fuentes, I wrote to the Secretary of State and the Attorney General asking if it would not be possible to administer the law with a little more flexibility.

A rather considerable exchange of correspondence followed and has now been happily concluded with the adoption of changes in procedures by the Immigration and Naturalization Service designed to avoid repetition of the Fuentes incident.

I think the changes which the service has adopted are constructive and I congratulate both the Department of Justice and the Department of State for their responsiveness in this case.

I ask unanimous consent that two news stories from the New York Times concerning the Fuentes matter as well as my complete correspondence with the the Departments of State and Justice may be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Leftist Novelist Is Barred by United States; Fuentes Halted at San Juan as an "Undesirable Alien"

(By Henry Raymont)

Carlos Fuentes, a leading Mexican novelist with leftist leanings, was denied permission by United States immigration officials to land in San Juan, Puerto Rico, last Saturday on the ground that he was "an undesirable alien."

In a letter made public here yesterday by Mr. Fuentes' literary agent, Carl Brandt, the 39-year-old author said immigration officials had torn up his transit card and treated him "like a common criminal."

A Justice Department spokesman in Washington confirmed that Mr. Fuentes had been prevented from leaving the tourist vessel Virginia de Churruca, on the way from Barcelona to Veracruz, Mexico. The spokesman, Jack Landau, said the author's name was listed as "a person considered undesirable" by the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service, but he declined to give any reason.

Mr. Fuentes, whose father is the Mexican Ambassador to Portugal, has long been identified with leftist causes, and has been known for his sympathy to Premier Fidel Castro of Cuba. Last August, however, he joined a number of French and Latin-American intellectuals in denouncing the Soviet-led invasion of Czechoslovakia, which Mr. Castro endorsed.

The young author's problems with the United States immigration authorities go back to April, 1963, when he was refused an invitation to participate in a television debate on the Alliance for Progress with Richard N. Goodwin, at that time Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-America Affairs. State Department officials said then that the visa had been refused in the belief that Mr. Fuentes might be a member of the Communist party.

A year later, a visa was granted, but the publicity did not brighten the United States image in cultural circles in Latin America, where Mr. Fuentes' works have been steady best-sellers. His latest novel, "A Change of Skin," received widely favorable reviews in the United States and Europe.

The new ban against Mr. Fuentes drew immediate protests from the publishing and academic communities, which have long been sensitive to the exclusion of foreign artists, writers and scientists who are suspected of belonging to the Community party or to Communist fronts.

Roger W. Straus, Jr., president of Farrar, Straus & Giroux, Mr. Fuentes' publisher here, called the ban against the author "absolutely outrageous" and said he would demand an explanation from the Departments of State and Justice.

Two Columbia University officials, who have invited Mr. Fuentes to lecture at the university next year, sent a letter of protest to Attorney General John N. Mitchell. They are Frank MacShane, chairman of the writing division of the School of the Arts, and Charles Wagley, Franz Boas Professor of Anthropology and director of the Institute of Latin-American Studies.

Mr. Fuentes, who has been living in Paris for the last two years, is returning to Mexico despite warnings of friends who fear he may be arrested as a result of his denunciations of the Mexican troops' attack on a student demonstration just before the Olympic Games last August. Scores of persons were killed in the attack.

In an essay in the forthcoming March 18 issue of The New York Review of Books, Mr. Fuentes criticizes the Mexican government as an "autocracy" and warns against "the sinister world order that is taking shape with the formidable trappings of nuclear terror, peace by blackmail, spheres of influence, and the promise of a planetary fascism that denies both individual rights and socialist experience."

Refusal to Let Fuentes Enter Puerto Rico Revives Controversy Over Immigration Policy

(By Henry Raymont)

The old controversy over whether aliens should be prevented from visiting the United States because of their political beliefs has been revived by the refusal of immigration officials to admit Carlos Fuentes, a prominent Mexican novelist with leftist leanings, into San Juan, P.R.

The issue was raised by two former officials of the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations amid a mounting storm of protest over the Fuentes case.

Mr. Fuentes said last week that he was stopped by immigration officials and "treated like a common criminal" when he attempted to land in San Juan on Feb. 22. He had been on his way from Spain to Mexico aboard the tourist vessel Virginia de Churruca.

Abba P. Schwartz, former head of the State Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs and an advocate of liberal immigration and travel policies, said here yesterday he hoped the action represented "an isolated instance" and not a reversion to the more restrictive policies of the 1950's.

In a telegram to Senator J. W. Fulbright, Democrat of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Schwartz said that the Fuentes case illustrated the need for change in the immigration law "to prevent further senseless and embarrassing situations" in the United States' foreign relations.

He specifically urged the revival of legislation to strike from the law the exclusion of persons who are past or present members of the Communist party or other proscribed organizations.

Another former high State Department official, William D. Rogers, who was head of the Alliance for Progress program and is now a Washington lawyer and president of the Center for Inter-American Relations, in New York, called on the Nixon Administration to make clear that the Fuentes incident "was an aberration" and not general policy.

"The notion that Fuentes's presence among us could in any sense damage our national interest is unworthy of serious discussion," he said in a letter to Secretary of State William P. Rogers, who is no relation.

"To the contrary," he continued, "it is his rejection which will cause us immense harm. It will be interpreted by the youth and intellectual community in Latin America as meaning that our commitment to free expression is superficial and will confirm the impression to some that we are timid and fearful of criticism of Latin-American writers."

Observing that in recent years there has been a growing effort by the United States universities and private foundations to expand contacts with Latin-American authors, Mr. Rogers urged the Nixon Administration to announce "in clear and convincing terms that it would welcome Fuentes and other leading Latin-American writers to our shores, regardless of their political opinions."

Meanwhile, protests to Secretary Rogers and Attorney General John N. Mitchell were made public over the weekend by several literary societies.

The Authors League of America, Inc., disclosed that a telegram had been sent to the officials by its president, Rex Stout. The telegram said:

"The refusal to permit Carlos Fuentes to land in Puerto Rico is shocking and reprehensible and on behalf of the 5,000 writers who are members of this organization we deplore and condemn it and urge that it be revoked forthwith."

Robert Halsband, president of the American Center of the International Pen Club, sent a similar message noting that as "one of Latin America's outstanding writers" Mr. Fuentes had participated in the organization's international congress in New York in June, 1966. He called the recent action against Mr. Fuentes "a disgraceful, unbelievable muddle."

A Justice Department spokesman said yesterday that Mr. Fuentes' presence at the Pen Club meeting in 1966 and an earlier visit in 1964 had been made possible through a temporary waiver, which the Attorney General can extend to persons otherwise excluded from the United States by the immigration law.

He said that there was no record that the author had asked for such a waiver for his planned temporary stop in Puerto Rico.

March 8, 1969.

The Honorable William P. Rogers,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: I have been much disturbed over the refusal of the United States Government to allow Carlos Fuentes to disembark from a tourist ship in San Juan, Puerto Rico on February 22.

XUM

This is the latest of a series of similar instances affecting various left wing intellectuals over the past several years. There are few things which do more to damage the image of the United States among articulate leadership groups abroad.

I understand the requirements of the law, but wonder if it would not be possible to administer the law with a little more flexibility. I am writing to the Attorney General in this same vein, and I would appreciate it if I could have the joint comments of your two departments with respect to this embarrassing problem.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

MARCH 8, 1969.

The Honorable JOHN N. MITCHELL,
Attorney General of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I have been much disturbed over the refusal of the United States Government to allow Carlos Fuentes to disembark from a tourist ship in San Juan, Puerto Rico on February 22.

This is the latest of a series of similar instances affecting various left wing intellectuals over the past several years. There are few things which do more to damage the image of the United States among articulate leadership groups abroad.

I understand the requirements of the law, but I wonder if it would not be possible to administer the law with a little more flexibility. I am writing to the Secretary of State in this same vein, and I would appreciate it if I could have the joint comments of your two departments with respect to this embarrassing problem.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1969.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of March 8, 1969 concerning Carlos Fuentes. We have consulted with the Department of Justice with respect to this letter and it reflects the views of both Departments.

Mr. Fuentes has in the past been found to be ineligible for a visa by consular officers of the Department of State under Section 212(a) (28) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. On two separate occasions, upon the recommendation of the Department of State, this inadmissibility was waived by the Department of Justice and he was then granted a visitor's visa to enter for a specific period of time and for a specific purpose.

On February 22, 1969 when Mr. Fuentes applied for landing privileges at San Juan, he was not in possession of a visa. He sought to go ashore under a "special transit without visa" procedure. A condition of this privilege is that the alien must be completely admissible to the United States. This does not, of course, preclude a person seeking, prior to embarkation, a transit, tourist or other appropriate visa and obtaining, as Mr. Fuentes has in the past, a waiver of a ground of inadmissibility. Mr. Fuentes did not, however, avail himself of this avenue, as he has in the past.

We are consulting with the Department of Justice with respect to the question you raised as to whether the administrative practice in such cases might be modified and I will promptly inform you of the results of these consultations.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

APRIL 17, 1969.

The Honorable WILLIAM MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I refer to my letter of March 8 concerning the case of Carlos Fuentes and to your reply of March 26.

I note that in your reply you say that you are consulting with the Department of Justice as to whether the administrative practice in such cases might be modified. I would appreciate at least an interim report on the result of these consultations.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., April 25, 1969.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have received your letter of April 17 regarding possible changes in the administrative practice which was followed in the case of Carlos Fuentes.

The Department of State and the Department of Justice have recently had some discussions regarding possible changes in the regulations. Further discussions are scheduled for next week and I hope to have something substantive to report as soon as possible thereafter. I will, of course, inform you promptly of the results.

If we can be of help in any other matter, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

JUNE 4, 1969.

The Honorable WILLIAM MACOMBER, JR.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I refer to my letter of March 8 concerning the case of Carlos Fuentes and to your reply of April 25.

I note that further discussions with the Department of Justice were scheduled for the last week in April. I would appreciate a report on the result of these consultations.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

JUNE 17, 1969.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have received your letter of June 4 in further reference to the case of Carlos Fuentes and possible changes in the administrative practice which was followed in that case.

We have discussed this matter further with the Immigration and Naturalization Service. We understand that the Service is changing its regulations to eliminate the mandatory custody requirement for persons ineligible for admission under the provision of the law applicable to Mr. Fuentes. It was primarily this requirement which resulted in the refusal of Mr. Fuentes' application for landing privileges at San Juan. We also understand that the Service is taking other steps in Mr. Fuentes' particular case which should avoid a repetition of his experience in San Juan.

We appreciate your interest in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

JUNE 23, 1969.

The Honorable WILLIAM MACOMBER,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you for your letter of June 17 reporting on the State Department's discussion of the Carlos Fuentes case with the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

I am gratified to know that the Service is taking steps in Mr. Fuentes' particular case to avoid a repetition of his experience in San Juan.

However, I still have a few questions.

What is the "mandatory custody requirement" which you say the Service is changing its regulations to eliminate?

What are the "other steps" which the Service is taking with respect to Mr. Fuentes?

Why could these steps not be made of more general application?

I will appreciate an early reply.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., July 7, 1969.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of June 23 requesting further information regarding the changes in procedures which are being made, primarily by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, to avoid an incident such as that which occurred with respect to Carlos Fuentes at San Juan.

The mandatory custody requirement I mentioned in my letter of June 17 appears in 8 C.F.R. 214(c) (1) relating to an alien seeking admission under the transit-without-visa procedure. This regulation provides that in the case of an alien who requires a waiver of ineligibility under Section 212(d) (3) (B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in order to be admitted, "the alien shall be in the custody of the Service at carrier expense and must depart on the earliest and most direct foreign-destined plane or vessel." The effect of this requirement is often to prevent the granting of the transit-without-visa privilege to an alien ineligible under the provisions of the law applicable to Mr. Fuentes. The elimination of this requirement will permit granting the transit-without-visa privilege to Mr. Fuentes and other aliens similarly ineligible.

We understand that the Service is also taking steps to insure that once a person ineligible under the provision of the law applicable to Mr. Fuentes has been granted a waiver of that ineligibility, all ports of entry will be informed of the granting of the waiver in order that that fact may be taken into consideration in future applications by the alien for admission. This procedure will be applicable not only to Mr. Fuentes but to other aliens ineligible under the same provision of the law.

I hope this information is helpful. If we can be of any further help on this or any other matter, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

FRANCES KNIGHT, DIRECTOR OF PASSPORT OFFICE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, one of the persons in Washington whom I admire most is Frances Knight, Director of the Passport Office, who has administered her shop in a practical and efficient manner which would be the envy of any private business. This, I believe, is a goal toward which all Government operations should work.

In recent years the increase in foreign travel by our citizens has placed an increasing burden on Miss Knight's Office, and unfortunately administrative problems have prevented her from taking steps she has thought necessary to meet the increasing demand for passports.

This situation is well described in a column written by Marquis Childs appearing in this morning's—July 17—Washington Post, entitled "Passport Unit Snowed Under by Boom in Foreign Travel."

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Childs' column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PASSPORT UNIT SNOWED UNDER BY BOOM IN FOREIGN TRAVEL

(By Marquis Childs)

Now it's a travel explosion. As though not a word had ever been spoken about seeing America first, the perils of the dollar balance and the gold outflow, Americans in unprecedented numbers are rushing off to foreign shores.

The fly-now, pay-later plan is said to account for a large part of the travel boom. The low rate on chartered flights is another reason. Clubs, often improvised for the purpose, sign up for a charter at a cost to members far below that of regular airline fares.

Travel bargains are attracting those who never before ventured out of the United States. An example is a 22-day escorted tour of six countries (if it's Tuesday, this is Belgium) for $495, which includes round-trip fare, meals and hotel. At that rate, the bargain hunter argues, you can hardly afford to stay home.

An unhappy consequence of the travel boom is a virtual breakdown, or at any rate a frustrating slowdown, in the issuance of passports. Long lines of irate citizens at every passport center, and particularly in New York, reflect the clogged passport machinery. The most irate citizen is Director Frances G. Knight of the State Department's Passport Office. The tart-tongued Miss Knight has run an efficient shop. She was caught in the travel deluge without the essential extra personnel through no fault of hers, according to her staff.

What happened is an example of the penny-wise, dollar-foolish economy policies prevailing in other departments as well as State. Miss Knight has asked State's budget makers for funds for the fiscal year just ended to hire an additional 22 persons on a permanent basis. For the current fiscal year she asked for another 24. A total of 64 is considered the minimum to handle the ever-rising demand.

Nothing quite like the present travel boom had been anticipated. Total applicants for passports in June were 36 per cent above June a year ago. The daily average is close to 12,000, running 30 per cent above 1968. The staff of the Passport Office is on a 10-to-12-hour-a-day schedule which includes Saturdays. Especially galling to Miss Knight is that the passport operation more than pays its way. The operating budget is $5 million, while the office takes in more than $15 million in fees.

The travel boom is expected to slacken as the rush of summer trippers subsides. The plight of the passport office is evidence of the urgent need for an overhaul of the system. Aside from the passport offices in 10 cities, reliance has been on Federal or state courts. With clogged court calendars there is increasing reluctance to perform this function. Passport applicants complain of delays of two months or more.

The passport tangle is only one comparatively small example of how the narrow frame of Government has been inadequate to encompass the swiftly expanding economy or the rise in the number of educated people bent on foreign travel. Both high-school and college students are on the move as never before.

The expansion has been sparked by a credit explosion. Ever-new credit devices have sent the debt total of private individuals soaring to unprecedented levels. How much fly-now, pay-later has contributed, it is too early to say, since this powerful appeal through every advertising medium is fairly recent.

The total of installment credit as of May 31 for autos, home appliances, television sets and the whole range of the buy-now-and-pay-by-the-month goods was an almost incredible $91.8 billion. This represented a jump of $9.5 billion in the previous 12 months. An added $2.3 billion was outstanding in credit-card and check-credit plans. These figures do not include real estate and insurance loans.

The outflow of tourist dollars is an important factor in the balance of payments problem. Various cures were considered under the Johnson Administration, including taxes on airline tickets and a limit imposed on the amount the tourist could spend. The travel industry was powerful enough to fend off these remedies and now the Nixon Administration is faced with the same situation enhanced by the travel boom.

An effort has been made with limited success to offset the outflow by persuading foreign visitors to come to America. For the first five months of this year 557,948 foreigners bent on either business or pleasure came to the United States, an increase of 17 per cent over the same period in 1968. It did not include nearly 11 million visits of over 72 hours by Canadians and a half million Mexican visitors. Measured against the horde of Americans leaving by every available plane and ship, the offset is small.

A far more serious side of the narrow frame of Government is the airport and airways squeeze. At principal airports the overcrowding is intolerable and the air controllers repeatedly testify to the hazards of hundreds of near misses in the corridors where traffic is heaviest. This is without the jumbo jets to come into service in the fall. The White House has proposed a long-range plan calling for quick expansion and the taxes to pay for it. Delay will imperil life and limb as well as a major industry.

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE AND THE ALLIANCE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, one aspect of President Nixon's decision to deploy Safeguard, that has far too long gone unremarked, is the impact of the decision to deploy on our relations with our NATO allies. NATO, now in its 20th anniversary year, has recently come through a troubled period, a period marked both by French withdrawal from the military organization and U.S. neglect of serious political issues. President Nixon in his April 10 address to the NATO ministerial correctly identified these concerns and said: "The alliance today will be judged by the content of its cooperation, not merely by its form," and called upon all NATO countries to "devise better means of harmonizing our policies."

Safeguard proponents maintain that the decision to deploy was welcomed, or at least not objected to, by our NATO allies. Proponents point to a lack of official or unofficial evidence to the contrary to buttress their view.

In light of this, I bring to the attention of the Senate a recent study commissioned by the Atlantic Institute in Paris entitled "Ballistic Missile Defense and the Alliance." The study was authored by Laurence Martin, professor of war studies at the University of London and associate of the Washington Center for Foreign Policy Research at Johns Hopkins University. Professor Martin cooperated with a group of 25 defense experts from nine NATO countries in producing the study. The Atlantic Institute, which issued the study, had as its founding director general Henry Cabot Lodge; among the distinguished industrial, political, and intellectual leaders on its board of governors are Kurt Birrenbach of West Germany, Dirk Stikker of the Netherlands, Paul Henri Spaak of Belgium, Christian Herter, Jr., John McCloy, and Lauris Norstad, of the United States, and Manlio Brosio, of Italy, currently serving as Secretary-General of NATO.

The study concludes that while new technological developments, including MIRV, are upsetting the strategic balance Safeguard is more immediately disruptive of the accepted frames of strategic thought. With regard to the Alliance, the study states that European official and public reaction has been overwhelmingly hostile both to the idea of ballistic missile defense and to its adoption by the United States and continues:

> Many Europeans regard it as an attempt to buy a superfluous margin of American security at the expense of Europe, at the same time introducing a new element of European inferiority into the Alliance.

I ask unanimous consent that the summary and that portion of the study covering the Alliance be printed in the RECORD. The study is 50 pages in length and is available from the Washington office of the Atlantic Institute, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE AND THE ALLIANCE

BRIEF SUMMARY

New developments in the field of arms technology seem to upset what seemed to be a relatively stable strategic relationship between the two superpowers. While the multiple individually targetable re-entry vehicle (MIRV) is likely to compel new strategic calculations, Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) is more immediately disruptive of the accepted frames of strategic thought.

Professor Martin's paper analyses the effects the deployment of an American BMD system could have both on the relationship with the Soviet Union and on the Atlantic Alliance. It points out that the two powers are deploying BMD on very diferent patterns: the Soviet Union is trying to provide some protection for her population against attacks by the United States, whereas the U.S. has shifted emphasis from an attempt to afford protection against China to improving the defense of the U.S. land-based intercontinental missile against Soviet attacks.

While it does not automatically follow that BMD entails a new arms race, it may well invite a further improvement of offensive

XUM

weapons by which BMD might be overcome: there are strong arguments to suggest that BMD cannot offer anything approaching immunity. Furthermore, these new technologies might complicate attempts to limit the level of strategic armaments, make arms control measures still more difficult and at the same time breach the political requirements of equal sacrifice laid down by non-nuclear powers as a condition of their signing the nonproliferation treaty.

Nevertheless there is a case for BMD and it seems that argument over the merits of this particular technological possibility has been allowed to obscure the more fundamental requirements of strategic stability.

The European reaction to BMD has on the whole been unfavourable, the argument weighing most heavily against BMD being that it accelerates the arms race and thus it will worsen East-West political relations. Many Europeans regard it as an attempt to buy a superfluous margin of American security at the expense of Europe, at the same time introducing a new element of European inferiority into the Alliance. The author sees very little likelihood in a "European BMD" coming off, the main obstacles being financial and political. In his view a BMD deployment by the superpowers could prove a decisive political blow to the two small nuclear forces of Britain and France. From a strictly technical view, however, it is not yet clear that these forces will become ineffective. There is no reason to believe that BMD will undermine the Alliance. Current technological developments do, however, afford an appropriate occasion to reassess the strategic basis of the Alliance in general and the future of European nuclear power in particular. The new American Government should ask itself whether the hostility of the United States to European nuclear forces in recent years should not be replaced by a more constructive effort to build them safely into the common structure of Western deterrence.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Laurence W. Martin graduated from Christ's College, Cambridge and from Yale University. He has taught at Yale, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, The Johns Hopkins University School of International Studies, and at the University of Wales. At present he is Profsesor of War Studies, King's College, University of London, and Research Associate of the Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research, Johns Hopkins. His latest book is *The Sea in Modern Strategy*, published for the Institute for Strategic Studies, London.

* * * * *

BMD AND THE WESTERN ALLIANCE

The European reaction

Informed discussion of BMD in Western Europe has been confined to very limited circles, although some generalized and occasionally sensationalized treatment has been afforded the subject in the popular press. Such official and public reaction as there has been has taken an overwhelmingly hostile attitude both to the idea of BMD and to adoption of it by the United States. In 1965–66, when existence of the Soviet Union's network was confirmed and the possibility of American emulation became real, the British Foreign Office attempted to take something of a lead in establishing a European viewpoint. The American announcement of the Sentinel system came as a considerable shock to those Europeans who had begun to feel they were having some influence upon debate in the United States. This announcement was, in fact, not one of the happier pieces of American alliance management for, by being made without previous consultation only a few days before a meeting of the NATO nuclear planning group, it appeared as an affront casting doubt on the whole concept of consultation. The omission seems to have been intentional, reflecting a correct anticipation that European reaction would be unfavourable, and that extended debate could do nothing to bring consensus but might very well reinforce the already heated controversy within the United States. Nevertheless, the timing and style of the announcement did nothing to alleviate the misgivings of Europeans at perceiving yet another aspect of their fate held in hands patently beyond their control.

Europe's negative response is typical of a paradoxical attitude to American strategy, in which anxiety at the least sign of American weakness and infirmity of purpose goes hand in hand with readiness to denounce American plans and behaviour as provocative This paradox is partly to be explained no doubt by the fact that it is frequently different individual and factional voices which are raised in varying circumstances. But there are other and more significant reasons for the phenomenon. The chief, perhaps, is that NATO has never devised or been willing to pay for a strategy for fighting a war in a way that can offer much prospect of survival to Western Europe. Europe thus both depends upon and fears American deterrent power. As a consequence Europe has been overwhelmingly more attracted to strategies for deterring wars than for fighting them.

Success in deterrence is always, and for everyone, preferable to fighting a defensive war, because it promises a complete absence of damage or casualties. But for Europe such success is vital, for in general war Europe is open both to devastation by the large nuclear forces the Soviet Union maintains for this express purpose, and to being overrun by the Red Army. Thus Europe has great aversion to conditions of tension under which the outbreak of war appears very possible and also to periods of relaxation if they result in an apparently reduced American determination to oppose the Soviet Union's designs.

At least at first sight, BMD seems to be entirely concerned with fighting wars rather than with deterrence. This has assured it a chilly reception in Europe, similar to that accorded Mr. McNamara's advocacy of flexible responses involving provision of capacity to sustain a prolonged conventional engagement in Europe. Concomitantly, the recent period of sustained détente bred optimistic reassessments of the sources of the Soviet Union's conduct, embracing a spate of revisionist history of the origins of the Cold War, and thereby strengthened the never wholly absent belief that much of what passed for Soviet hostility was largely a nervous response to Western pressure. Such an attitude was particularly conducive to fears that Western military policies of strength would be merely counterproductive, and thus encouraged receptiveness to the charge that BMD would stimulate the arms race.

To this endemically hypercritical attitude to American strategy a number of special European considerations doubtless contribute. There is a certain amount of "sour grapes" about policies which Europeans cannot afford. In the case of BMD this feeling may reinforce the general sense of falling behind in military technology. The field of nuclear weapons is an especially sensitive one because of European dependence on a type of military endeavour in which Europe is at best a marginal participant. NATO's elaborate mechanisms for nuclear consultation testify to the trouble this asymmetry in the alliance can breed. An American programme of BMD against the Soviet Union would, unless precautions are taken, add yet another instance of European inferiority and subordination in the critical areas of national security.

Thus a variety of peculiarly European circumstances disposes Europeans to accept the negative view of BMD expressed by its American critics. The argument weighing most heavily in the general European opposition is that BMD, by accelerating the arms race, will worsen East-West political relations. Still the chief focus of East-West confrontation, Europe has a special interest in the state of tension. Anything which may tend to worsen East-West relations is particularly deplored because of the hopes bred in Western Europe over the past two or three years that changes in the Soviet Union's outlook were about to permit a much greater degree of flexibility in political relations within Europe itself. Thus BMD could be presented as imperiling a prospect in which Europe had a more direct interest than the United States. While Europeans know, of course, of the Soviet Union's investment in BMD, the impossibility of acting so directly upon Russian as upon American policy produces the usual and not unnatural European tendency to minimize the conduct of the USSR as a consideration that should influence the United States or justify American imitations.

The decision to design Sentinel as a defence against China was not well calculated to win favour in Europe. There has been a longstanding divergence between European and American views about the proper policy to pursue towards Communist China and an established tendency for Europeans to regard American fears as hysterical and dangerous. While European optimism about the results of an amiable policy towards China has suffered some disillusionment in recent years, the Vietnam war has done at least as much to reinforce lack of faith in American judgment regarding Asia. Being accustomed to life under the shadow of nearby Russian power, many Europeans regard American fears of China's embryonic nuclear force as exaggerated and fail to see why deterrence by offensive weapons should not work in this case also. Thus the dangers that are thought to arise from BMD deployment seem to be incurred for no good reason. As many of the dangers most vividly envisaged in Europe naturally affect chiefly European concerns, it was easy to regard Sentinel as an attempt to buy a superfluous margin of American security at the expense of Europe. In the instance of Korea, Vietnam, and elsewhere, there has been a long history of European complaints that the United States endangers vital interests at the heart of the power balance in Europe for much lesser purposes in Asia.

The American plan to build BMD against China also served to cast some doubt on the credibility of the American deterrent as a protection of the Europeans from Russian attack. For, goes the argument, if the United States has come to doubt its capacity to deter the Chinese, it can scarcely be expected to stand up to the much more terrible power of the Soviet Union on behalf of others. This argument fails to take account of the different stakes that might be at issue in a confrontation. Most Europeans are confident that Europe is a more vital interest to America than most Asian countries. Nevertheless the rapid growth of Soviet striking power may well reopen the old doubts in NATO about the credibility of American nuclear guarantees. This debate, though dear to the hearts of academic students of strategy and to a few official builders of designs both grand and small, has never actually disrupted the alliance. But its ups and downs, the degree of faith and suspicion, certainly affect the level of political and military cohesion within NATO, while the possibility of some truly disruptive degree of mistrust cannot be ruled out entirely. At the present time, moreover, the issue of the strategic balance is entangled with the erratic move towards "flexible response," a concept which is itself evoked by the deteriorating nuclear balance—deteriorating, that is, from the American near monopoly of the early fifties—and which is sufficiently disturbing to allied confidence as to have evoked a series of nervous paraphrases for its terminology.

Thus it is possible to depict American interest in BMD as evidence of timidity in the face of growing Soviet strength, as the often-heralded age of American vulnerability finally dawns in reality. BMD could be seen as part of a retreat into a nuclear Fortress America. The official justification for Sentinel ought, of course, to suggest another interpretation: that a defended United States could afford to be more staunch in defence of its allies. Now that Safeguard has succeeded Sentinel one could argue that it does not affect American vulnerability enough to raise such fundamental questions about the reliability of the United States as an ally and should be welcomed as at least a small addition to the potency of American retaliatory forces. But it is doubtful whether European opinion makes such subtle distinctions. The general if erroneous impression that BMD is always a matter of defending population is reinforced by the suspicion that a defence of population is the ultimate American purpose, whatever justification may be advanced in the interim.

There does not seem to be any logical connection between the adoption of BMD and a disengagement of American power from Europe. While BMD might form part of the array of forces with which the United States retreated into her continental fortress, it might as easily be part of the arsenal with which the United States tried to maintain her position in Europe. Any temptation to disengage from Europe would presumably arise from the perception of Russian power and the risks of opposing it rather than from the adoption of a particular mode of defence.

Whatever the role of BMD in American policy, it remains possible that were the day to come when the United States, and the Soviet Union, were covered by a supposedly not ineffective defence, and Europe was not, the resultant sense of nakedness would be qualitatively different from that experienced now. It is true that Europe has been almost totally vulnerable since the late forties, while for much of this period the United States was virtually immune from attack. But there is a big psychological difference between being unprotected because technology can suggest no answers and remaining so out of poverty and disunity. At the very least a new asymmetry and instance of European inferiority would be introduced into the alliance.

There is also the unpleasant suggestion that when both superpowers had acquired a high degree of defence they would be tempted to place a higher hostage value on each other's half of Europe and might conduct nuclear or conventional wars more freely on European territory, either for want of any other strategy or because their fear of the consequences would be much reduced. The possibility of nuclear war at Europe's expense has frequently been mooted, as, for example, in the debate over tactical nuclear weapons. While such a development is not impossible, it is not very easy to see what rational purposes would be served by such combat or whether—leaving on one side the rather unrealistically high levels of effectiveness implied for the defences—would really enhance the attractiveness of such a course. Indeed, it might well be that interest in Europe as a hostage would be much reduced by a greatly increased sense of domestic security for the superpowers. It would then be important to Europe that American disinterest did not outpace Russian before Europe was ready to do more in its own defense.

BMD for Europe

History suggests that if the superpowers acquired defences denied to Europe, the European nations would learn to accept it without much fuss, as they have learned to become resigned to other indications of their secondary status. Their preoccupation with deterrence and their lack of faith in defence would tend to support such an adjustment. But it is only natural that the provision of BMD for Western Europe has already been proposed. Officially, NATO has discussed such a proposal and dismissed it as unnecessary and impractical for the moment. Other voices have suggested that it would be both desirable and attainable.

There are few hard targets in Europe and little prospect of any substantial number appearing. BMD in Europe must therefore mean defence of population. Indeed, no other purpose seems remotely likely to inspire sufficient enthusiasm to produce the money. Although there is much argument about it, the technical problem of defending Western Europe against long-range missile attack is probably not insurmountable. Warning-times would be less, but the intermediate-range missiles chiefly involved in the Soviet Union's present pattern of attack are somewhat easier to intercept than intercontinental missiles because they have a slower re-entry speed. The concentration of population in some areas of Europe might facilitate rather than impede defence. According to one expert, the task of mitigating damage to Europe by a missile attack from the Soviet Union would be no more daunting than that of coping with the threat by aircraft.

This observation may be correct but it also uncovers the prime obstacle to strategic defence for Europe. The Soviet Union's bases are so close to Western Europe that she would enjoy a wide range of alternative ways of wreaking destruction if the use of ballistic missiles were obstructed. It has already been remarked that really great strides in defensive technology against missiles might stimulate other methods of delivery in the superpower confrontation. In Europe these alternatives already exist in abundance. With aircraft, cruise missiles, tactical missiles and the possibility of retargeting ICBM's, the Soviet Union enjoys a massive overkill capacity against Europe. Thus the rewards of BMD appear to be even more dubious in Europe than elsewhere. The European belief that if war comes it will bring virtually unmitigable consequences, will make it necessary to produce very convincing proof of the efficiency of BMD in Europe if it is to be taken seriously. This is not to say that European indifference can never be overcome if technology makes great strides and the superpowers testify to this by massive deployment.

Even if BMD in Europe came to be thought desirable, the impediments to its realization would be formidable. Not the least of these would be financial. Although the United States has studied such ideas as a seaborne BMD system that might, in certain forms, afford a degree of mobile protection for others, the main burden would presumably fall on Europe. Even with generous American technical assistance to spare Europe development costs, the expense of a BMD network is probably far beyond the sums European nations are currently inclined to devote to defence, especially as BMD would not necessarily have priority if some crisis loosened the purse-strings for military purposes. The most practical approach would be to see what could be built for a set sum within the accustomed scale of NATO endeavours. It might, for example, be possible to build a single *Spartan* site centrally located to afford as wide a thin defence of Western Europe as the range would allow. Whether this would have much military effectiveness or would go very far to meet the requirements of those who think BMD necessary in Europe seems doubtful. But this is probably the proper order of magnitude with which to consider the prospects in Europe.

For financial, technical and political reasons, any BMD in Europe ought to be approached on a co-operative basis. This presents problems of its own. Arrangements for control might be more tractable than in the case of proposed joint offensive forces because the occasion for use would be a nuclear attack on Europe. This contingency has given little trouble even in establishing the NATO guidelines for retaliation by offensive nuclear weapons. Even so, there would remain some taxing problems. In the United States the allocation of defence to specific areas was solved by providing this defence everywhere. This would probably be impossible in Europe and the necessary decisions to include or exclude populated areas could be expected to provide ample ground for controversy. In the American debate about a thicker defence involving close-point defence of particular cities, the latent controversy was amply revealed. Moreover, the positioning of defensive weapons arouses fears about attraction of enemy fire, besides taking up valuable real estate and establishing an unwelcome reminder of unpleasant possibilities. All such disputes would assume an additional sharpness in an international setting.

Nor can the problem of control be finally dismissed. Even though the decision on use may appear a relatively easy one, as such matters go, none who have watched European efforts at joint military endeavour can underestimate the capacity for disagreement over strategic and military management, especially when large sums of money are involved. The presence of Germany constitutes an additional complication because the BMD systems would almost certainly require nuclear warheads. Such non-nuclear systems as have been suggested appear impractical for reasons which include excessive cost. They are therefore unlikely candidates for European employment, however much they would relax political constraints.

With nuclear warheads involved, the German role would become of great concern to the Soviet Union, to Germany's allies, and to Germany herself. It would be possible to design a method of control that kept independent national decisions by Germany remote from the heart of the defensive system and still satisfy Germany's security requirements. Equally, it would be feasible to design the physical components of the defence so that they would only be used for defence. Warheads can be made to work only in the ascent, above certain altitudes or in defined geographical areas. Yet even so it would be difficult to eliminate all suspicions that the BMD system was a backdoor to acquisition of nuclear weapons by Germany, perhaps the more dangerous for being sufficiently innocuous in appearance to disarm really powerful reactions. Thus the requirement for design of a control system is more rigorous than it would appear at first sight, for it must not only prevent abuse but also provide conspicuous proof of this to a suspicious audience. The political climate may well change, Germany become less suspect or Europe less solicitous of the Soviet Union's feelings, but for the immediate future the problem of control and Germany's relation to it appears a real one.

BMD and the European deterrents

In so far as BMD may be thought to offer the superpowers immunity from attack by lesser nuclear powers, as was once the hope of the United States in relation to China, it casts great doubt upon the future of Europe's own national nuclear forces. Indeed, not a few American proponents of BMD see the adoption of a "high posture" of armament by the superpowers as the most effective of antiproliferation strategies, pricing small fry out of the nuclear business. Thus Soviet BMD would serve a longstanding purpose pursued by many American policy-

XUM

makers ever since 1945: the elimination of independent centres of nuclear power in the West. Such an achievement would be welcomed by some as a simple measure of arms control, by others as the consolidation of American dominance over aspects of strategic relations that could involve the United States in major catastrophe against her will.

So far, statements from the Soviet Union have paid little if any attention to the lesser nuclear powers as an argument for BMD. This may imply lack of respect for the small forces or a conviction that they are so much a part of a unified Western threat as to require no special consideration. But quite obviously a growing BMD system in the Soviet Union would pose an insurmountable obstacle to small forces of missiles, supported by weak technological and economic resources, long before it would succeed in shutting out the United States. Irrespective of the advent of BMD, the future of the European nuclear forces is in doubt for both political and financial reasons. The cost of creating strategic nuclear forces strains the limited resources which European states are willing to make available. These costs were just manageable in Britain and France when technology seemed to promise a plateau upon which a generation of missiles might remain effective for a long time. Even then mere wear and tear would have presented a problem of replacement. All these difficulties are compounded now that technology is unmistakably seen to be still on the move. The French nuclear forces, yet to come into serious existence, have encountered well-publicised troubles in development and appear very vulnerable to the shifting stresses of the political and economic situation in France. Official policy in Britain, while maintaining research and development, at present holds out little concrete promise of new generations of weapons to follow the *Polaris A 3* now coming into service. Heavily dependent on American assistance as they are, the British nuclear forces will be much affected by the future of Anglo-American nuclear relations. The way forward for Europe so far as finance and technology are concerned is clearly a co-operative European venture. But political obstacles to this are formidable.

With the existing European nuclear programmes so delicately poised, a new element like BMD could well prove a decisive blow. Whatever the strictly technical implication of BMD, it forms the kind of talking point around which political positions are often taken.[1] Yet if European powers wished to stay in the nuclear business, it is far from evident that BMD need prevent them in practice.

The Soviet Union's defensive network poses little difficulty. Its technical quality is probably not high and its coverage is so limited that the small European forces need not suffer from lack of valuable targets. If the Soviet Union undertakes a general deployment, the process must take some time, although careful preparation for upgrading existing systems might shorten this. Moerover, if European capacity to develop penetration aids is less than that of the United States, it is not negligible. Only the device of massive saturation attacks seems in principle beyond Europe's reach. The existing British force, and the French one when it materializes, thus seem likely to remain a factor to reckon with into the medium-term future. It must be recalled, after all, that the existing British force is far more potent than that which China is likely to possess for several years, yet this has been sufficient to produce alarmist reactions in the United States. Admittedly the geopolitical context is vastly different, but the conclusion remains that the European forces are not militarily negligible, whatever their political significance.

There is, however, yet another card for Europe to play. Were the European powers determined to maintain some nuclear capability against the Soviet Union yet dubious of the continued efficiency of their long-range missiles, they could concentrate upon exploiting precisely that geographical propinquity to the Soviet Union from which their own vulnerability arises. Although anti-aircraft defence is likely to make great strides in the next few years, it will scarcely attain perfection. The effort to establish better air defences will be particularly taxing for the Soviet Union if undertaken along with a full-scale attempt at BMD. Thus the European powers could provide themselves with a full range of aircraft, cruise missiles and shorter-range ballistic missiles to exploit types of delivery not primary to the main Soviet-American contest, some of which might also be of use in the task of local European defence.

The pros and cons of European nuclear forces will have to be debated in a much wider context than can be explored here. Preliminary consideration does not suggest, however, that those types of BMD that can be foreseen now should dictate a European decision to abandon nuclear efforts if they otherwise seem to serve useful purposes. The evaluation of these purposes will presumably depend in large part on the adequacy of the other arrangements made, especially within the Western alliance, to ensure the security of Europe. With American vulnerability high, with elevated tension in Europe and yet with ambiguous signs of bilateral Soviet-American arrangements on nuclear questions, the present hardly seems the time for Europe to relinquish its nuclear option on the future.

It is indeed possible that BMD may reinforce the arguments for European nuclear forces. If, for instance, the view should gain ground that, once protected and facing an enemy protected by BMD, the superpowers would be tempted to adopt strategies of controlled nuclear warfare executed by limited nuclear action in Europe, European nuclear forces might acquire purposes more plausible than a crude deterrence of aggression. For even if it is thought implausible that the European powers would ever initiate nuclear strikes in reaction to diplomatic pressure or conventional invasion, because of the catastrophic retaliation this would bring on them, it would be another matter to threaten such action as retaliation for any employment of nuclear weapons by the superpowers which, though limited for them, was disastrous to the local nations. In other words, it might be useful to be able to break any rules which the superpowers tried to observe in their own interest at European expense. The European nuclear force would be exploiting the superpowers' own interest in refraining from the full-scale use of nuclear weapons so as to make the otherwise overwhelmingly outnumbered European forces politically effective. As an American analyst has put it: "the role of allied strategic forces—British or French *Polaris*-type submarines, for example—looks very different when the advantages of preserving weapons are commensurate with the advantages of expending them."

A strategy of this kind might be held within the limits of a no first-use doctrine and reserved for retaliation for nuclear acts on Western European territory. This might both reduce the provocativeness of the posture and facilitate solution of the problem of control. It goes without saying that such a European venture is open to objections and that history may well take another course. But it seems very possible that the advent of BMD is going to stimulate a fresh look at many strategic questions that once appeared safely disposed of in the trans-Atlantic debate.

---

[1] It is not at all obvious that BMD is a more dire blow to small missile forces than modern Soviet air defence has been to small bomber forces. The prevalence of assertions that it is may reflect changed American attitudes to independent nuclear forces as much as technological prospects.

ABM: THE BEST OR THE WORST ALTERNATIVE?

Mr. **KENNEDY**. Mr. President, in a number of colloquies recently on the Safeguard ABM, various Senators have discussed whether the ABM is "provocative" to the Soviets, and whether alternatives to the ABM would be equally, more or less "provocative." These alternatives include further hardening of our missile sites; increasing the number of ICBM's; increasing the number of Polaris/Poseidon submarines; dispersing our intercontinental bombers; and other more advanced steps.

During these discussions, it has been suggested that some of us who oppose the ABM recommend instead that we deploy one or more of these alternatives. The senior Senator from Kentucky has pointed out—quite correctly, in my view—that this is not so. What we have said, on the other hand, is that if at some point over the next few years the Soviet or Chinese threat to our retaliatory forces becomes real—as opposed to projected—these alternatives would provide us ample time to react to guarantee the viability of our second-strike forces.

We should not dwell too long on whether the ABM is "provocative." Anything which shifts the balance of strategic power is provocative, in the sense that it calls for a response by the other side to seek to restore the balance. Thus, whether we call a particular weapons system "defensive" or "offensive" has as much actual relevance to the dynamics of the arms race as whether we called the Pentagon the Department of Defense or the Department of Offense.

But there is another aspect of alternatives to Safeguard which merits examination. This is the military effectiveness of the alternatives. If, for example, we were to decide to add a few more Polaris submarines, in lieu of deploying the ABM, the dollar cost would be far less. We must also know, however, before we decided to take this step, what the effect of the additional submarines would be upon the strength of our retaliatory force, vis-a-vis the deployment of our ABM.

It is very difficult to make these measurements of the military effectiveness of the various alternative weapons systems without using computers, because the measurements involve balancing thousands of variables. As a result, most of the studies of the effectiveness of various alternative weapons systems remain the province of the Defense Department.

Recently, however, I have had the opportunity to read the narrative analysis of one such computer analysis. This analysis was prepared by a student at MIT, Mr. Peter Peckarsky, using unclassified material, and I think it merits study by all of us interested in the ABM.

His conclusion is significant: that of four alternative ways of meeting a hypothetical Soviet move toward a first-strike force, the Safeguard ABM is the worst. I should emphasize that this conclusion is not an intuitive, educated guess; rather, it is a carefully drawn conclusion based on facts. In carrying out his analysis, Mr. Peckarsky makes a series of assumptions which give Safeguard more effectiveness than it actually has, while concurrently overstating the Soviet's capabilities. Thus, the case against Safeguard is even stronger than indicated by the analysis.

In deciding on whether to approve the funds requested for Safeguard, we should know why, with some specificity, the other three alternatives were rejected. It does no good to say that the ABM is "not provocative," while the other three alternatives are "provocative." This is particularly so because Safeguard is not designed solely as a point defense for our offensive forces. Rather, it is a mixture of area defense, Spartan missiles, and point defense, Sprint missiles. In addition, it would change the balance of strategic power.

For these reasons, the paper, which I will have placed in the RECORD, reinforces my own belief that we would do best not to deploy Safeguard at this time. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPUTERIZED COST-EFFECTIVENESS STUDY OF ASSURED DESTRUCTION CAPABILITY DEFENSE ALTERNATIVES

(By Peter Peckarsky)

ABSTRACT

This paper is a study of the United States' and Soviet Union's strategic forces (excluding bombers) as they may exist on January 1, 1974. Four alternative defenses of the United States' assured destruction capability are postulated as responses to what may become a Soviet Union first strike capability. The four options are:

1. Incrementing the current Minuteman force;
2. Incrementing the current Polaris force;
3. Superhardening the current Minuteman silos;
4. Deploying a hard-point ABM defense of the current Minuteman silos.

For a fixed cost, the degree of protection afforded the assured destruction capability by the four responses is analyzed assuming a Soviet Union first strike with varying levels of effectiveness.

The Main conclusions are:

1. An increment in the Polaris fleet is the best response to the postulated Soviet threat.
2. Deployment of a hard-point ABM defense of the Minuteman force is the worst response due to the low confidence in the system's reliability and the high sensitivity of the ABM defense to increases in the number of attacking re-entry vehicles.

DEFINITION OF PROBLEM

It has been apparent to members of the U.S. defense community for some time that hard, fixed, land-based Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMs) would be vulnerable to an attack by an opponent's ICBM force if such a force were of sufficient size and if the attacking ICBM warheads were of sufficient accuracy and yield.

Recently, it has been stated by the responsible persons within the U.S. Government, namely Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird and Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard, that the Soviet Union was, in fact, attempting to develop and deploy an ICBM force which would possess a first strike capability against the U.S. Minuteman force which consists of 1000 hard, fixed, land-based ICBM's.[1]

In the face of this threat, the Nixon Administration has decided that it is necessary to protect a fraction of the current Minuteman force with a hard-point Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) defense. The rationale offered for this decision is that it is necessary to protect this fraction of the Minuteman force in order to preserve the U.S. assured destruction capability.[2]

There are at least three other possible responses to the threat of a Russian strategic force increment of sufficient size and effectiveness to constitute a first strike capability against the U.S.

The three options analyzed in this paper, in addition to a hardpoint ABM defense of the Minuteman silos are:

1. An increment in the Minuteman force;
2. An increment in the Polaris fleet;
3. Superhardening of the Minuteman silos.

The method of analysis was to fix the budget available for the mission of protecting the U.S. assured destruction capability five years from now and to determine what effectiveness each option would provide if all of the money available for the above mission were spent on the given option.

The scenario for the study was a Soviet Union counterforce first strike against the U.S. strategic forces followed by an U.S. countervalue attack against the population centers and industrial plants of the attacker.

A computerized model, which will be explained next, was constructed to determine the effectiveness of each option in responding to various Russian attacks.[3]

THE MODEL

A. Parametric assumptions

There are two basic ways to solve a cost-effectiveness problem. Either the cost may be fixed and the variations in effectiveness analyzed or the effectiveness may be fixed and the variations in cost observed. This investigation was conducted using the former method of solution.

It was assumed that a fixed budget of four billion dollars ($4 B) would be spent in defense of the U.S. assured destruction capability over the next five years. At this level of spending, the following forces may be purchased under each of the four options:

1. At a unit cost of $7 million ($7M) per Minuteman, an additional 570 Minutemen could be added to the ambient force level. The unit cost includes the cost of procurement for the missile, missile silo, warheads, and the five year operating and maintenance cost. Under this option, the Minuteman force would consist of 1,570 Minutemen as of January 1, 1974.

2. At a unit cost of $200 million ($200M) per Polaris boat, an additional 20 Polaris submarines could be purchased. The unit cost includes the procurement cost, five year operating cost, and the cost of the Poseidon missiles with their associated warheads. Under this option, the Polaris fleet would consist of 61 boats as of January 1, 1974. Fifty-one of these boats were retro-fitted with missiles carrying Multiple Independently-targettable Re-entry Vehicles (MIRVs) while ten of the boats were not retro-fitted with MIRV-carrying missiles.

3. At a unit cost of $4 million ($4M) per silo, the current 1000 Minuteman silos could be superhardened to withstand up to 1000 pounds per square inch (psi) of blast overpressure. Under the superhardening option, the Minuteman force would consist of 1000 Minutemen in superhardened silos as of January 1, 1974.

4. At a unit cost of $1.2 million per Sprint (the Sprint is a short-range interceptor missile which would serve as the last line of defense in an ABM system), it would be possible to purchase two Sprints for each of the current 1000 Minuteman silos at a price of $2.4 billion. This would leave an additional $1.6 billion for the purchase of radars necessary to control the Sprints. The current price range of ABM radars is $130 million to $165 million per radar site. The lower figure represents the cost for a Perimeter Acquisition Radar (PAR) capable of scanning 90 degrees while the higher figure represents the current high estimate of the unit cost for a Missile Site Radar (MSR) capable of scanning 360 degrees. Thus it would be possible to purchase some mix of radars (e.g. 3 PARs and 7 MSRs, for example), which would by assumption, suffice to control all of the interceptors, with the remaining $1.6 billion. The unit cost for the Sprint includes the cost of its warhead while the unit cost for the radars includes the procurement, operational, and maintenance costs for five years. On January 1, 1974, with an ABM defense of the Minuteman force, each of the 1000 Minutemen would be defended by two Sprints.

The U.S. force structure and capability were assumed to be specified by the following input variables:

1. The total number of U.S. ICBMs (USICBM) was set at 1,570 in the Minuteman option and 1,000 in the other three options.

2. The number of MIRVs per Minuteman (USMPMM) was set at 3.

3. 200 Kilotons was assumed to be the warhead yield for each Minuteman MIRV (USICWY).

4. The Minuteman "bus" reliability (USICBR) from pre-launch to MIRV separation, inclusive, was set at 0.9.[4]

5. The Minuteman MIRV reliability (USICMR) from immediately after MIRV separation to immediately after warhead detonation, inclusive, was assumed to be 0.95.

6. A fraction of the U.S. ICBM force will be inoperative at any given time due to maintenance, testing, and other related problems. This fraction was set at 0.05 and given the label USICNO in the computer program.

7. The hardness, or blast resistance, of the Minuteman silos was derived by using figures cited by Deputy Secretary of Defense Packard in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Subcommittee on International Organization and Disarmament Affairs of said committee, and the Senate Armed Services Committee. When Packard's figures were used in conjunction with the Rand Corporation's "Bomb Damage Effect Computer," the silo hardness (USMMSH) was ascertained to be 300 psi.[5] The silo hardness was varied during the analysis of the superhardening option.

8. The total number of Polaris MIRV-carrying submarines (USMS) was set at 51 in the Polaris option and 31 in the other three alternatives.

9. The total number of Polaris submarines which were not retrofited with MIRV-carrying missiles (USNMS) was set at 10 in all four options.

10. The number of Sea-Launched Ballistic Missiles (SLBMs) per Polaris submarine (USSLPP), of either variety, was 16.

11. The number of MIRVs per SLBM (USMPSM) was assumed to be 10.

12. 50 kilotons (50 KT) was presumed to be the SLBM MIRV warhead yield (USSLWY).

13. the SLBM "bus" reliability (USSLBR) from pre-launch to MIRV separation, inclusive, was set at 0.9.

14. The SLBM MIRV reliability (USSLMR) from immediately after MIRV separation to immediately after warhead detonation, inclusive, was set at 0.95.

15. The percent of Polaris submarines in

Footnotes at end of article.

XUM

port at any given time (USSNO) was assumed to be 25 per cent.

16. The hardness of the Polaris submarines in port (USSBPH) was assumed to be 20 psi.

17. The number of Sprints per silo in the ABM defense option (USAMNM) was 2.

18. The single-shot kill probability, or effectiveness, (USAMSK) of each Sprint in the AMB system was varied as will be explained below.[6]

The Soviet Union force structure and capability were specified by the following input variables:

1. The total number of Soviet Union ICBMs (SUICBM) was varied during the course of the analysis.

2. The number of MIRVs per ICBM (SUMPIC) was set at 3.

3. 5 MT was assumed to be the ICBM MIRV warhead yield (SUICWY).

4. The ICBM accuracy (SUCEP) was varied during the course of the study as will be explained below.[7]

5. The ICBM "bus" reliability (SUICBR) from pre-launch to MIRV separation, inclusive, was set at 0.9.

6 The ICBM MIRV reliability (SUICMR) from immediately after MIRV separation to immediately after warhead detonation, inclusive, was set at 0.95.

7. The percent of the Russian ICBM force which was inoperative due to maintenance and testing at any given time (SUICNO) was presumed to be 5 per cent.

8. The total number of U.S.S.R. SLBMs (SUSLBM) was fixed at 400. This is based on the assumption that over the next five years, the Russians will add 4 Polaris-type submarines per year to their current fleet of 5 such boats. It further assumes that each submarine is capable of carrying 16 missiles.

9. The number of MIRVs per SLBM (SUM PSL) was assumed to be 3.

10. One megaton was presumed to be the SLBM MIRV warhead yield (SUSLWY).

11. The SLBM "bus" reliability (SUSLBR) from pre-launch to MIRV separation, inclusive, was fixed at 0.9.

12. The SLBM MIRV reliability (SUSLMR) from immediately after MIRV separation to immediately after warhead detonation, inclusive, was assumed to be 0.95.

13. The SLBM accuracy (SUCEP) was presumed to be the same as the ICBM accuracy.

14. The percent of the Soviet SSBM (Submarine Ballistic Nuclear) fleet in port for maintenance (SUSLNO) at any given time was set at 25 per cent.

15. The number of interceptors in the ABM system around Moscow (SUAMMN) was set at 100.

16. The number of interceptors in the ABM system anchored at Tallinn (SUAMTN) was fixed at 2,000.

17. The number of interceptors in the ABM system anchored at Odessa (SUAMON) was assumed to be 400.

18. The SSKP of each interceptor in any of the Soviet ABM systems (SUAMSK) was varied during the course of the simulation as will be explained below.

19. The Soviet Union Anti-Submarine Warfare (SUASW) capability against the Polaris boats which were not in port was varied in the simulation as will be discussed below.

This completes the parametric specification of the problem. In Part B the operational characteristics of the model are discussed.

B. Operational characteristics

The following operational assumptions constrained the model:

1. The bomber forces on both sides were excluded from the model due to the high vulnerability and consequent low survivability of the U.S. bombers and the problems of a Russian surprise attack by bomber at intercontinental range.

2. It was assumed that any given weapon could have only one target and could have an effect on only that target. In other words, an U.S.S.R. ICBM could, at most, destroy one Minuteman silo. An interceptor missile in either side's ABM system could, at most, destroy one incoming object.

3. It was assumed that the numbers given on the Rand Corporation's "Bomb Damage Effect Computer" accurately represent the effects of nuclear weapons.

4. It was assumed that the force increments postulated in each of the four options would be deployed as of January 1, 1974.

5. There are at least four methods for coping with an ABM system. They are evasion (i.e. attacking targets out of the range of the system), leakage (i.e. targeting a number of warheads on the ABM system less than the number of interceptors in the system and relying on inefficiences in the system to allow a number of weapons to leak through to their targets), destruction (i.e. destroy the radars which control the interceptors), exhaustion (i.e. presenting N+1 targets, all of which are weapons, to the system, where N is the number of interceptors, will insure that at least one weapon will penetrate the system). Exhausting an ABM system requires more missiles than any of the other possibilities. It was assumed that each side would have to exhaust the other side's ABM system. Hence, it was assumed that the radars would be indestructible (i.e. no attack on the radars was allowed) and the radars and their associated computers would always be available to guide the remaining interceptors.

6. The U.S. ABM system is assumed to have a shoot-look-shoot capability. It is assumed that the Russian ABM systems do not have this capability.

7. It was assumed that the only way to destroy a Minuteman was to destroy the Minuteman silo. This implies that the Minuteman control centers, including the airborne command center, were less attractive targets than the Minuteman themselves.

8. It was assumed that during the U.S. countervalue attack all of the surviving Minutemen and one-half of the surviving Polaris force would have to penetrate the Tallinn ABM system and that the other half of the surviving Polaris force would have to penetrate the Odessa ABM system.

9. It was assumed that Moscow would not be targeted unless the total of the number of warheads penetrating the two outer ABM systems (i.e. Tallinn and Odessa) was 700 or more warheads. In that case, 200 warheads, or twice the number of interceptors in the Moscow ABM system, were targeted, through the use of terminal guidance, on Moscow after penetrating the outer defenses.

10. The maximum SSKP allowed for either an ICBM, a SLBM, or an interceptor in an ABM system was 0.99.

11. It was assumed that the explosion of each warhead was an independent event. That is to say, the attacking warheads would be in the correct orientation in space and time to prevent one incoming warhead from destroying another due to time delays in their respective detonation times. In addition, there would be no reinforcement or cancellation of shock waves. Furthermore, the U.S. warheads when landing on Russia would land with their maximum effect and would also not destroy one another due to time delays in detonation. For the warheads to land with maximum effect, it is necessary that the area destroyed by one blast not overlap with the kill area of another weapon.

12. It was assumed that each side's ICBM fleet would be able to target any area within the borders of the other country. The same type of assumption was made for SLBMs. In other words, no area in either country would be considered safe from attack by virtue of its being out of range of the other side's arsenal.

13. The Soviet Union's ICBM fleet was presumed to consist entirely of SS–9s. The U.S. force was assumed to consist entirely of Minutemen since the Titan missiles are scheduled for phase-out before 1974.

14. The missile accuracies referred to were assumed to be those of the MIRV itself and not those of the ICBM or SLBM launcher.

15. It was assumed that each ICBM or SLBM "bus" would deploy all of its MIRVs before coming into the range of an ABM system.

16. Since the Minutemen silos were equally protected in each of the four options, it was assumed that the Soviet Union targeting doctrine would be to target each silo with the same number and type of warheads insofar as was possible.

ANALYSIS

A semi-complete specification of the problem would require varying each of the 37 variables over a representative range of values. Assuming each parameter were given 10 values, 10^{37} iterations should be necessary. Even assuming that some of the values were fixed, such as the number of launchers per Polaris submarine, a semi-complete specification of the type discussed above would require on the order of 10^{18} continuous years of computer time, on the system utilized (the IBM system 360/65/40). The computer program would generate a stack of data 10^{17} miles thick. Since the necessary computer time was unavailable and since it would probably have been unlikely that the data produced could be analyzed within the allotted time, another approach was chosen.

It was decided to vary those parameters about which there is the greatest uncertainty. These parameters and their ranges were as follows:

1. The number of Soviet Union ICBMs was 2000, 3000, and 4000 in the primary computer run.[8] This variable was allowed to run over the range of values from 300 to 2000 during the crossroad analysis which will be explained below. Since this was a worst possible case simulation, a high range of values was chosen for the primary run.

2. The accuracy of the Russian ICBMs and SLBMs was set at high, medium and low values of 1000, 2000, and 3000 feet.

3. The SSKP for the interceptors in the Soviet ABM systems was fixed at .3, .6, and .9.

4. The percent of the Polaris boats, not in port, which the Soviet anti-submarine warfare forces could destroy was varied from 0 per cent to 25 per cent to 50 per cent to 75 per cent.

5. The SSKP for an interceptor in the American ABM system was varied at .3, .6, and .9.

6. The degree of hardness which could be obtained for a Minuteman silo in the superhardening option was assumed to be 400, 700 or 1000 psi.

Since the Minuteman silos were equally protected, the Soviet Union targeting doctrine was to target each silo with the same number and type of warheads insofar as was possible.

Under the conditions of the primary run, 972 different cases were analyzed by the computer.

The measures of effectiveness used were the number of warheads delivered outside of Moscow (USWDOM), the number of warheads delivered on Moscow (USWDM), and the number of surviving Minutemen (USIS). Histograms of the above three measures of effectiveness were constructed for the 324 cases in the primary run in which the hardness of the superhardened silos was 1000 psi.

In addition, a crossover analysis was performed. By crossover point, one means the point below which a given option is more cost-effective than a second option and above which the second option is most cost-effec-

---

Footnotes at end of article.

tive than the first. The crossover analysis determined the point at which the Polaris option became more cost-effective than the option with which it was being compared. In this case, the cross-over was measured in terms of the original number of Soviet Union ICBMs under the assumption that all of the other variables were held constant.

The results of the analysis are presented next.

RESULTS

Since this paper is concerned with the preservation of the American assured destruction capability, it would be beneficial to keep in mind an operational definition of the assured destruction capability. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara postulated in his 1968–72 posture statement that 400 1-MT equivalents would be sufficient to destroy 30 per cent of the Soviet Union's population and 77 per cent of its industrial capacity.[9] The important point to remember is that 3 200-KT weapons or 7 50-KT weapons would yield a 1 MT equivalent in terms of the area over which each type of weapon could deliver 30 psi of blast overpressure. The figure 30 psi was chosen because it seems to be well above the highest blast overpressure which a concrete building reinforced with steel rods could withstand.[10]

Accordingly, each Minuteman launcher will carry a 1-MT equivalent and each Polaris launcher will carry 1.42 1-MT equivalents.

The specific results obtained from the data generated by several computer runs were:

1. The crossover points between the Polaris and ABM options, measured in terms of the number of Russian ICBM launchers, were calculated by setting SUAMSK=USAMSK=0.9. Then SUCEP and SUASW were allowed to vary over their complete ranges of 1000, 2000, and 3000 feet and 0 per cent, 25 per cent, 50 per cent, and 75 per cent respectively. The resultant matrix of values and crossover points is given below.

SUASW	SUCEP	Crossover[1]
No percent	1,000	(2)
Do	2,000	(2)
Do	3,000	(2)
25 percent	1,000	790
25 percent	2,000	810
25 percent	3,000	810
50 percent	1,000	760
50 percent	2,000	770
50 percent	3,000	820
75 percent	1,000	750
75 percent	2,000	770
75 percent	3,000	810

[1] Number of Soviet ICBM launchers above which Polaris dominates.

[2] None (Polaris always dominates).

There is also a crossover point for USAMSK=SUAMSK=0.6 and SUASW=75 percent. These crossovers are:

SUASW	SUCEP	Crossover[1]
75 percent	1,000	(2)
75 percent	2,000	700
75 percent	3,000	760

[1] Number of Soviet ICBM launchers above which Polaris dominates.

[2] None (Polaris always dominates).

Polaris always dominates the ABM option for SUASW=0 per cent, 25 per cent, or 50 per cent and USAMSK=SUAMSK=0.3 or 0.6.

There is no crossover for SUASW=75 per cent and SUCEP=1000 feet. Similarly, there is no crossover between Polaris and ABM for SUASW=0 per cent, 25 per cent, or 50 per cent and USAMSK=SUAMSK=0.3 or 0.6.

Other possible payloads for the SS–9 are 15 500-KT weapons or, assuming advances in MIRV technology, 3 100-KT warheads. For either of these two payloads, Polaris is always the dominant option.

2. For three pairs of values of SUASW and SUCEP there is a crossover between the Minuteman option and the Polaris option. The values are:

SUASW	SUCEP	Crossover[1]
50 percent	3,000	340
75 percent	2,000	420
75 percent	3,000	820

[1] Number of Soviet ICBM launchers above which Polaris dominates.

For all other pairs of values of SUASW and SUCEP, the Polaris option always dominates the Minuteman option.

3. For two pairs of values of SUASW and SUCEP, assuming the superhardened silo hardness is 1000 psi and that each Soviet ICBM carries 3 5-MT weapons, there is a crossover between the superhardening option and the Polaris option. The values are:

SUASW	SUCEP	Crossover[1]
75 percent	2,000	160
75 percent	3,000	1,050

[1] Number of Soviet ICBM launchers above which Polaris dominates.

In all other cases, the Polaris option delivers more warheads on Russia than any other option.

4. For a large Russian threat on the order of 2000 to 4000 SS–9 launchers (i.e. 6000 to 12,000 re-entry vehicles), the minimum number of warheads the Polaris option would deliver on Russia was 324 which was roughly 5 times the minimum number (68) of warheads the other three options could deliver outside of Moscow in their worst response to a Soviet first strike. The maximum number of warheads delivered by the Polaris option on Russia was 4,398 which was on the order of 1,700 more warheads than any of the other three maximum responses. The other maximum responses were 2,529 for the Minuteman option, 2,644 in the superhardening option, and 2,498 for the ABM alternative.

5. Under the assumption that SUMPIC = 3 and SUICWY = 5 MT, the point at which the Minuteman, superhardening, and ABM options failed to deliver any warheads on Moscow was at SUICBM = 300, SUASW = 50 per cent, SUCEP = 2000 feet, USAMSK = 0.3, and SUAMSK = 0.9. However, the Polaris option continued to deliver warheads on Moscow until the following capability was attained by the Russians: SUICBM = 300, SUASW = 75 per cent, SUCEP = 1000, USAMSK = 0.3, and SUAMSK = 0.6. At this latter point, the Polaris option failed to deliver warheads on Moscow. It should be added, that in the cases where the Minuteman force* left and it alone accounted for the damage inflicted on the Soviet Union. In addition, the Polaris option delivered its best response more frequently than the other options and its worst response fewer times than the other options.

6. The general conclusion is that the Polaris option delivers better coverage across a wider range of Soviet Union force structures and capabilities than do any of the other options. This is because the Polaris option is relatively insensitive to variations in SUICBM, SUCEP, SUICWY, and SUMPIC. However, the other three options are highly sensitive to even small variations in these parameters.

MODEL DEFECTS

There are a number of obvious idealizations in the model which may cause the results to be slightly inaccurate. A few of these idealizations and their effects on the results are:

1. No radar or decoy attack on either ABM system was allowed. This would tend to make the U.S. ABM system look even worse in comparison with the other three options. In addition, it would also mean that a higher number of warheads would penetrate the Russian ABM system if an attack on the ABM radars or a precursor decoy attack were attempted.

2. The assumption that the MIRVs would deploy before coming into the range of an ABM system tends to make the ABM system look worse than they actually are.

3. The 10 Polaris boats which were not retro-fitted with MIRV-carrying missiles would probably carry warheads on the order of 1 MT rather than the 50 KT with which they were credited in the model.

4. The question arises as to whether or not the ABM system in the model is as good a defense as the proposed Safeguard system. Currently, the Safeguard system calls for the deployment of about 700 *(phase left out): was essentially destroyed, the Polaris fleet was the only component of the U.S. retaliatory force Sprints (short-range interceptors) and 350 Spartans (long-range interceptors) to defend 350 Minutemen, several SAC bases, two command and control centers, and the 12 ABM radar sites. The system in the model employs 2000 interceptors in defense of 1000 Minutemen and does not have an area defense capability. Assuming that the Spartans will be used mainly for area defense, and not for the hard-point Minuteman defense, it is quite obvious that if there is a large enough number of SS–9s to pose a threat to the Minuteman force then the system in the model is better than the Safeguard system since the Safeguard system leaves 650 launchers unprotected. Also, the model's ABM system protects each of 1000 missiles to the same degree or better than the Safeguard system protects each of 350 missiles.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of this paper, the following defense policy recommendations are made:

1. If it is decided that there is a threat to the U.S. assured destruction capability, the most cost-effective way to cope with the threat is to purchase additional Polaris submarines.

2. The worst way, in terms of cost-effectiveness, to cope with such a threat would be to buy the currently proposed Safeguard ABM system. However, research should be continued into ways to provide a cost-effective active Minuteman defense to hedge against the possibility of future increases in the Soviet anti-submarine warfare capability which would compromise the security of the Polaris fleet. Such a defense would ideally have the ability to respond with the speed of light over hundreds of miles and to shoot many times at each incoming object (i.e. a shoot-shoot-shoot-shoot . . . capability). One obvious possibility for such a system would be a laser ABM system.

FOOTNOTES

[1] "SS–9 Helps Administration Score Points in Missile Debate" by John W. Finney, The New York Times, March 24, 1969, Page 30.

[2] An assured destruction capability is the ability to achieve the destruction of an opponent's society after incurring a first strike by the opponent's entire strategic force on one's own strategic forces.

[3] Copies of the computer program and print-out may be obtained on request from Peter Peckarsky, 4425 West Spencer Place, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53216.

[4] The so-called "bus" of an ICBM or SLBM is the part of the launcher which carries the MIRVs to the point where they depart on their independent trajectories. The MIRVs may be pictured as passengers on the "bus" while the points of departure may be thought of as the "bus" stops. The "bus" reliability includes such things as pre-launch main-

tenance, inflight guidance, component failures, and effectiveness of MIRV separation. The MIRV reliability includes the same types of factors for the portion of the flight after the MIRV has departed from the "bus." In addition, the MIRV reliability includes the probability that the warhead will detonate at the right time, in the right place, and in the proper manner.

[5] "SS–9 Helps Administration Score Points in Missile Debate" by J. W. Finney, The New York Times, March 24, 1969, Page 30. In his testimony, Packard said that with an accuracy of about 3000 feet and a warhead yield of 20 MT, the SS–9 could destroy a Minuteman silo. Ninety-four per cent of the time, 300 psi would be produced at the Minuteman silo under the above conditions (i.e. warhead accuracy of 3000 feet and warhead yield of 20 MT). After assuming that a confidence level of 90 per cent or above was sufficient to consider a target "destroyed," the silo hardness was set at 300 psi since the confidence level in the destruction of the silo is 94 per cent.

[6] The single-shot kill probability of a given missile is the probability that the missile will destroy its target. Since a missile's utility drops to zero after the missile's warhead explodes; the missile has only a single shot at its target.

[7] Missile accuracies are measured in terms of circular errors of probability. The circular error of probability of a missile is defined as the radius of the circle, whose center is the point at which the missile was aimed, within which the missile lands 50 per cent of the time when fired over the distance the missile is supposed to travel in combat. The circular errors of probability (CEPs) in this study will be given in feet.

[8] A computer run is one complete execution of a set of instructions given to the computer. In this case, the set of instructions given to the computer told it to compute the results of 972 different types of Soviet attacks and U.S. counter-attacks and then to print the results of each attack and counter-attack.

[9] "Statement of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara before the House Armed Services Committee on the Fiscal Year 1968–72 Defense Program and 1968 Defense Budget," Robert S. McNamara, published by the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1968, Pages 41 and 43.

[10] "The Effects of Nuclear Weapons," edited by Samuel Glasstone, published by the USAEC, April 1962, Washington, Chapter 5.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 7215) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Diplomatic Courier Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 18, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, July 17, 1969:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

John O. Olson, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years.

Farley E. Mogan, of Oregon, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Oregon for the term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, July 17, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Make Thy face to shine upon Thy servants; and teach us Thy statutes.—Psalm 119: 135.

Eternal Father of our spirits, whose love never lets us go, whose strength never lets us down, and whose truth never lets us off, in the glory of a new day we lift our hearts unto Thee seeking guidance as we face the trying tasks of this turbulent time.

We quiet our spirits in Thy presence and rest in the assurance that Thy strength makes us strong, Thy wisdom makes us wise, and Thy love makes us loving.

Grant that in this hour we and our Nation may be messengers of hope to the nations of the world, particularly to those who sit in darkness without freedom but with faith in the coming day when liberty shall be the life of all.

Bless us in our endeavors to lift humanity to the heights from whence cometh our help.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE BILL

(Mr. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, today several of us on the House District Committee are introducing a District of Columbia revenue bill.

This bill represents substantially the position taken by the District of Columbia government with some changes that we feel are necessary, particularly in the area of advertising services, the theater and special events tax, and in limiting a Federal payment formula to 5 years.

We introduce this bill for consideration by the committee without necessarily advocating each and every one of its provisions or closing the door to further amendments.

The District of Columbia Committee has held lengthy hearings on various revenue proposals. We want, therefore, to urge prompt consideration of this matter and thus have introduced this bill today.

Mr. Speaker, we have now passed the beginning of the fiscal year, yet the District of Columbia has neither a revenue bill nor appropriations for fiscal year 1970. Starting July 1, 1969, the passage of each month without a revenue bill has cost the District of Columbia government an estimated $2 million per month in lost revenues.

We hope by introducing this bill that we can expedite the establishing of a sound financial situation for the District of Columbia.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 15, I was recorded as not voting on rollcall No. 106, the passage of H.R. 4018 to provide for the renewal and extension of certain sections of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

At the time of this vote, I was in conference with officials of the executive branch and a group of my constituents here in the city on a matter of great importance to the Third District of North Carolina.

I have consistently supported the Appalachian Regional Development Act, both in committee and on the House floor.

I should like for the RECORD to show that had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 106.

GOLDEN EAGLE—PASSPORT TO AMERICA'S GREAT OUTDOORS

(Mr. MEEDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, to restore the popular Golden Eagle program for a unified system of annual admission fees to Federal outdoor recreation areas.

This bill would repeal the provision of the 1968 amendment to the fund act by which the Golden Eagle program would go out of existence on March 31 of next year. This would continue to raise needed money for the development of additional outdoor recreational facilities. Although in the first years of the program, these fundraising powers were not as great as had been hoped, this has been improved. The amount raised has grown ninefold since 1965, and over $5 million are projected revenues for 1969. Such a program should not be terminated.

Mr. Speaker, the Golden Eagle program has been more than a fundraiser, however. It has been a particular boon to the thousands of American citizens who frequent our parks and outdoor recreation areas. Some of these, particularly the retired and the elderly, whose resources are limited, could not otherwise afford to vacation, as the common resort areas are beyond their means. For them, the Golden Eagle has been a "passport" to America's great outdoors.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the repeal of the Golden Eagle program was a mistake, and I urge prompt, favorable consideration of this measure to restore this worthwile program to the American people.

LAUNCH OF APOLLO 11

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I know that our thoughts, our hearts, and our prayers are with our three astronauts who are now hurtling through space toward the moon.

I bring Members nothing new. All are familiar with this, but I feel it is appropriate that something be said in the RECORD today about the launch of Apollo 11 as of yesterday.

This great rocket flew off after a perfect countdown. The fact that we are able to accomplish a mission such as this, with a vehicle two-thirds as high as the Washington Monument, weighing as much as that portion of the monument, without flaw or hitch is a great compliment to NASA but also is more of a compliment to American industry, to American education, to our university complex, to American management and to American labor.

I know that our prayers go with them because the hardest part of their trip is yet in the future.

PEACE IN VIETNAM

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our country has done everything humanly possible to end the Vietnam war. This administration is doing and has done everything possible consistent with honor, decency, and justice to end this war. The previous administration did likewise. We have done everything short of complete capitulation and surrender. We are not responsible for the continuation of this war. We have even discarded the sane military principle of hitting enemy military bases of supply and assembly. We have placed in jeopardy the security and lives of our men in the field in the hope the carnage can be ended. The government of North Vietnam has not made one single move toward peace. They are entirely responsible for the continuation of this conflict. They could end this war in 1 hour by agreeing to a simple ceasefire while negotiations are in progress. They could have done so last year.

Mr. Speaker, the North Vietnamese Communists have no intention of ending this war as long as they are encouraged by certain irresponsible leaders in this country who hope that we will completely withdraw and leave a free people to their mercy. Hanoi has abandoned hope of a military victory in South Vietnam, but they are counting heavily on dissension, divisions, and downright encouragement by vocal misguided elements in the United States itself. My plea today to my colleagues in the Congress and responsible citizens throughout the country is to unite behind the President in standing firm for peace. These dissident elements in the United States should make it crystal clear to Hanoi that the next move is up to them. The peaceniks, doves, and isolationists in the United States hold in their hands the key to peace. They can end this war by ceasing to encourage Ho Chi Minh.

ADDRESS BY VICE SPEAKER CHANG, OF THE KOREAN NATIONAL ASSEMBLY, THIS AFTERNOON

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, early in March it was my pleasure to accompany at the request of the Speaker a delegation of Members of the House of Representatives on an official visit to the Republic of Korea in response to an invitation extended to the Speaker by the Korean National Assembly.

This week the House of Representatives is privileged to host, in response to an invitation extended by the Speaker, a distinguished delegation of members of the Korean National Assembly headed by the Honorable Kyung Soon Chang, Vice Speaker. Today marks the last day of the official visit of our Korean friends, and, as chairman of the U.S. delegation to Korea, I would like to extend to Members of the House of Representatives and their staffs an invitation to hear a brief address by Vice Speaker Chang at 3:30 this afternoon in the Foreign Affairs Committee Room, 2172 Rayburn Building, immediately followed by a joint press conference with our two delegations.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 107]

Abbitt
Addabbo
Aspinall
Baring
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Brademas
Brasco
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Burton, Utah
Button
Cahill
Carey
Celler
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clay
Cohelan
Conte
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Esch
Feighan
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Green, Pa.
Halpern
Harsha
Hawkins
Helstoski
Howard
Jacobs
Jones, N.C.
Kirwan
Latta
Lipscomb
Mayne
Mollohan
Murphy, N.Y.
Nix
Ottinger
Pollock
Powell
Purcell
Reid, N.Y.
Ronan
Schadeberg
Scheuer
Springer
Steed
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Tiernan
Tunney
Vander Jagt
Watkins
Watson
Weicker
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wright
Young

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 355 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1970, UNTIL MIDNIGHT MONDAY, JULY 21, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight, Monday, July 21, 1969, to file a report on the State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1970.

Mr. BOW reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7491, STATE TAXATION OF NATIONAL BANKS

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules and in behalf of my colleague the gentleman from Texas (Mr. YOUNG) I call up House Resolution 476 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 476

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7491) to clarify the liability of national banks for certain taxes. After general debate which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instruction.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. Smith) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 476 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 7491 to clarify the liability of national banks for certain taxes. The resolution also provides that it shall be in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The purpose of H.R. 7491 is to subject national banks to the same taxation as State banks.

The bill provides a uniform rule respecting the applicability of any tax law to a national bank. The national bank would be subject to the law to the same extent that it would be if it were a bank chartered under the laws of the State or other jurisdiction where its principal office is located.

The bill applies to all taxation of national banks. Under our Federal system, there are only two sources of sovereign authority: the States, and the Federal Government. Thus, the phrase used in the bill, "any tax law enacted under authority of the United States or any State," covers all possible tax laws in this country, whether State, local, territorial, national, or whatever.

No change whatever is made in the application or effect of the Federal tax laws. The policy of the bill is that there should be no difference in the tax liability of a bank simply on the basis of whether it is State or federally chartered.

The provisions of the bill would become effective on the first day of the calendar year after enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 476 in order that H.R. 7491 may be considered.

However, Mr. Speaker, I should like to utilize just a moment or two to call to the attention of the House some things I believe are worthy of the attention of the House on this piece of legislation. I raised certain questions at the time of its consideration in the Rules Committee, with reference to procedures, because there were no hearings on this particular piece of legislation.

The question of the taxing of national banks I believe is one we all agree should be carried on exactly the same as for State banks. I understand the banking community itself does not seek to be treated otherwise, but because of certain Supreme Court decisions recently some questions have arisen.

The only thing I am concerned about in connection with the consideration of this legislation is fairness and equity and making certain that the affected people will have an opportunity to express their opinions and very clearly define what is intended by the committee and finally, of course, by the Congress if the bill becomes law.

I understand amendments will be offered, and I also understand there will be a substitute offered for the particular language in the proposed bill.

I might say that the commitee in its consideration before passing the bill out did substitute new language for what was the original language. Of course, this resolution calls for that language to be considered as an original bill.

There have been some questions raised about why the change and why the substitute. I am sure the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. Patman) will explain the reasons for this.

I should like to alert the House to the fact that there will be some discussion about the language and the interpretations and some of the committee procedures. With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution to permit the explanation of the legislation to the House.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 476 does provide an open rule for 1 hour of debate for the consideration of this bill, H.R. 7491, which is entitled "State Taxation of National Banks."

According to the committee report, the purpose of the bill is to provide a uniform rule respecting the applicability of any State tax law to a nationally chartered bank.

Under the bill all nationally chartered banks would be subject to the State tax laws of its State, just as if it were a local State-chartered bank. This would apply only in that one State specified in the banks' organization certificate now required by Federal law, thus eliminating any question of a bank's domicile for State tax purposes.

No change in Federal tax law is made by the bill. Nor does the bill enter the question of multistate taxation of interstate commerce.

The question of jurisdiction and venue was raised during consideration of the bill. This issue could arise if a State attempted to tax a national bank doing business within its borders but domiciled elsewhere. The committee believes existing law—12 U.S.C. 94 and 1880 Supreme Court decision—are controlling and that the venue issue will not arise.

There are no minority views included in the report. Support for the bill comes from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The Treasury supports the purpose of the bill but did raise a question about the venue problem.

That is the information in the report. Now I would like to offer my own personal comments regarding this particular measure.

As originally introduced, the bill was much more limited in scope. It applied to sales taxes, use taxes, and personal property taxes levied by the State. Only the State in which a national bank's principal office is located could levy such taxes against a national bank and only to the extent that the State taxed its own State-chartered banks. This was in response to the recent Supreme Court decision—*First Agriculture National Bank* v. *State Tax Commission*, 392, U.S. 339, 1968—which held that the States could not tax resident national banks. Somehow within the committee the situation turned around, and a substitute for the original bill was adopted. In my opinion, the thrust of the substitute language appears to subject a national bank to the same taxes that a State-chartered bank is subjected to in each State it is found to be "doing business."

I believe that the Treasury Department now opposes the bill as reported because I think they feel it goes beyond the action which is deemed necessary to obviate results of the recent Supreme Court decision.

Mr. Speaker, under section 5219 of the Revised Statutes—12 U.S.C. 548—at the present time the taxation of banks is as follows:

First. Banks can be taxed only by the State of their domicile, which provides a basis for resistance to demands for income taxation by the States of the domicile of borrowers. Demands of this type are made on both State and National banks.

Second. The section limits the taxation of national banks to a selection of one of the four methods specified in the Statute and does not permit the broadening of the tax base burden on banks by the imposition of gross receipts taxes, value added taxes, taxes on intangibles such as promissory notes, taxes on the encashment of checks and other operational activities, and taxation on rental receipts from real estate and safe deposit boxes.

Third. Nonuniform taxes cannot be imposed. If this provision is removed each county or other taxing body in which a bank branch is located may levy taxes on the bank.

Fourth. Discriminatory tax rates are prohibited.

Now, Mr Speaker, there is not any argument about our national banks being taxed exactly in the same manner as State banks. Everyone agrees that that should be done. But the problem is whether or not the new language in the bill will actually permit additional taxes which are not identical and where the State banks and federally chartered banks will not be taxed the same.

As the gentleman from California (Mr. Sisk) stated, no hearings were held. This language was substituted. The rule makes the amended language in order for consideration. The statement was made to us that no hearings were held because no one requested hearings. That may be true. By the same token, however, the language was changed, as I understand it, in executive session, and I do not know that the banks really had time to know whether or not they should be provided the opportunity of hearings or requested them. But be that as it may, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Brown) is going to offer an amendment to section 5219. The text of the amendment will read as follows:

> In addition to the other methods of taxation permitted herein, a State or political subdivision thereof may impose on a national bank having its principal office within such State in the same manner and to the same extent as such taxes are imposed upon a State-chartered bank having its principal office within such State, sales and use taxes, tangible personal property taxes, intangible personal property taxes, a documentary stamp taxes, and license, registration, transfer, excise or other fees or taxes imposed on the ownership, use or transfer of motor vehicles: *Provided, however*, That the taxes im-

posed under the provisions of this Section 5219 shall not effect a greater total tax liability for a national bank than for a State bank similarly situated.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, that is what the legislation is attempting to accomplish. I think the amendment is correct. I intend to support it. I have spoken to the distinguished ranking minority member on the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL), and he has authorized me to state that he intends to support that amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule and the adoption of the amendment as well as the passage of the bill, if it is amended.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8261, ACQUISITION OF CONTROL OF AIR CARRIERS

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 474 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 474

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8261) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 474 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 8261 to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes. The resolution also provides that it shall be in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

H.R. 8261, as reported, would require CAB's approval of the acquisition of control of an air carrier by any person. At the present time, the Board does not have jurisdiction for such approval, if the person acquiring control of the carrier is not an air carrier, a person controlling an air carrier, some other type of common carrier, or is not engaged in a phase of aeronautics.

Ownership of 10 percent of any class of the capital stock or capital of an air carrier would raise a presumption of control. Annual reports would be required, and the Board would be empowered to require additional reports, as to holdings of 5 percent of any class of the capital stock or capital of an air carrier. The bill also requires that specific notice be given to the Attorney General of the hearings on mergers or acquisitions and he is entitled to demand a hearing on acquisitions which could otherwise be approved without hearing.

No additional cost or personnel increase is contemplated.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 474 in order that H.R. 8261 may be considered.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, this to me is a very interesting situation and a very interesting piece of legislation. House Resolution 474 does provide an open rule with 1 hour of debate for the consideration of H.R. 8261, Acquisition of Control of Air Carriers.

According to the report, the purpose of this bill is to require Civil Aeronautics Board approval at the time of the action of the acquisition of control of any person in any air carrier.

The present law gives the CAB such approval authority when the one seeking to acquire control is a person, or who is an air carrier, controls an air carrier, or another type of common carrier, or is engaged in some phase of aeronautics.

This bill thus seeks to have all persons in the same status when an air carrier acquisition is involved.

The bill creates a legal presumption that ownership of 10 percent of any class of capital stock or of the capital of an air carrier, is control of that carrier. In such instances hearings by the CAB are to be held to obtain its approval. The Attorney General must be notified of such hearings.

The committee notes the rising number of conglomerate companies, and believes that the current law does not adequately protect either the public or the air carriers—which must be viewed as a quasi-utility.

Persons or companies which seek to acquire control of an air carrier will not be placed in any disadvantage by the bill. Any other person or carrier in the business must now submit to the CAB hearing in order to obtain approval; this places the same requirements on those outside the business.

There is no additional cost anticipated by passage of the bill.

Support of the bill has come from the CAB, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Department of Justice and the Department of Transportation. The bill is reported unanimously.

The gentleman from California (Mr. Moss) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH) have filed additional views supporting the bill, but question whether this solution should not also be applied to other common carriers. They have urged a study in that area.

That is the situation as set forth in the committee report.

Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to offer my personal comments. I do not know of any bill this year that I have had so much pressure to get on the floor of the House than this particular measure. I guess every major air carrier in the United States, or their representatives, have called me and said it is very important that they have this particular bill.

But, and I will say now, after discussing it with a good many people clear up to the White House, I have come to the agreement that if they will take the retroactive date out, which is in section 5 of the bill which makes it retroactive to March 7, I will support this particular legislation.

I do not believe in retroactive legislation. I do not think it is fair. There is not any situation now existing between March 7 and the effective date of this act that needs to be investigated.

There was one situation where an airline got frightened which apparently is the basis for this resolution. But I do want to make it clear for the record that this is particular class legislation.

Incidentally, in connection with the amendment to delete the retroactive language, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS), and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER), have agreed to accept the amendment and I believe the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) will offer it.

This bill requires a formal approval after formal hearing by the CAB every time a corporation acquires 10 percent or more of the stock of the air carrier. It does not make any difference whether the acquired shares are voting or nonvoting stock or whether it is purchased for investment only, or whether the airline recommends and encourages the purchase.

There are certain airlines in this country that may have some financial difficulty and may need some help from some outsiders to invest more than 5 or 10 percent in the stock to give the airline some money to carry on or go bankrupt.

If an airline wants to go to some millionaire who might be, and I know and you know that some of them are, in the airline business or to somebody else and say, "We need some help." "Buy stock in our company," and they will say, "Give us the capital so we can continue to operate." You know what they are going to have to do. They are going to have to go to the CAB and have the CAB hold hearings and sometimes the CAB may

XUM

function in a year and sometimes they may not function for 2 years. I think they are pretty slow in arriving at decisions.

So once again we are taking a step toward big government in special interest legislation. It does not apply to any other common carrier, such as rails, trucks, buses, barges, or pipelines—but just to airlines.

Apparently there is a fear that some foreigners, some other group might take over one of our airlines and we would not be alert enough to know it. Thus we are going to set up this special procedure.

So far as I am concerned, I would like to state we have a lot of inflation—that is true—and we are trying to do everything to stop it. We realize people under social security, the senior citizens and others are having a difficult time paying their bills.

But if we start attacking conglomerates when they want to come together in corporations and organize and if the Attorney-General keeps bringing injunctions and law suits, we are just liable to kill the patient when we are trying to cure the cold. We may end up with a recession and a depression in spite of ourselves.

If we are going to hamstring every business and turn everything over to the Government, we are going to be in serious trouble. I do not believe that big business is bad simply because it is big.

The FTC is investigating and the Committee on the Judiciary is investigating and we have the Committee on Ways and Means, the Banking and Currency Committee and others investigating. All this may be fine and they may come up with appropriate legislation, but I want to make my statement clear right now in connection with the overall problem. If we attempt to control everything from a Federal standpoint, and attempt to put the brakes on too fast, we may end up in giving the patient with a common cold so much medicine in an effort to cure him that we will kill him instead of curing him.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the remarks of the gentleman from California with reference to his remarks as to the amendment concerning the retroactive clause of this bill.

This legislation was passed earlier in the year and there were undesirables who almost seized one of the main airlines.

For this reason, this bill will fully protect not only the Government, but the people in America. I think this is good legislation.

Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from California have any further requests for time?

Mr. SMITH of California. No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE TAXATION OF NATIONAL BANKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7491) to clarify the liability of national banks for certain taxes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7491, with Mr. ICHORD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple bill. It is not complicated. There is nothing complicated about it. It is a matter of providing equality of taxation between the State banks and national banks. Our system is a dual banking system. There are twice as many State-chartered banks as there are national banks. But the national banks have about 75 or 80 percent of the money in the entire banking system. We do not want the States to favor either the State banks or the national banks over the others. We want complete tax equality. We do not want anything to happen to our dual banking system.

H.R. 7491 is, therefore, an uncomplicated bill. If enacted, it would do nothing more than provide the 50 States with the tools needed to provide equality in taxation between State-chartered banks and national banks chartered by the Federal Government. It is a bill which, if enacted, would eliminate the now outmoded and inequitable formula that exists for State taxation of national banks, and replaces it with a very simple law of fairness and equity, and complete equality between the two.

The bill provides that national banks shall be subject to the same taxation as a State bank: The bill says nothing more. Under existing Federal law, States may tax national banks on the basis of their outstanding shares, dividends, and net income, according to tax measured by their net income. The Supreme Court in a decision handed down in June 1968, stated that these specific methods of taxation of national banks are exclusive, and therefore banks chartered by the Federal Government are wholly exempt from any taxes which specifically fall into these categories. Therefore, the State banks are required to pay all taxes—sales taxes, use taxes, and everything else—but the national banks now, under this ruling of the Supreme Court, do not have to pay any of those taxes at all because they were not specified in a law written way back there 50 to 100 years ago.

This is for the purpose of seeing that they shall pay exactly the same State taxes under similar and like circumstances. There could not be anything fairer than that, according to my view.

Therefore, for example, the national banks do not pay State taxes on their motor vehicles, and the difference today is that although the national banks have about 75 percent of the assets in the banking business throughout the country, they do not pay even motor vehicle taxes, and the difference in the cost to the States is about $50 million that we can figure up right now, that it is costing the States right now because of their failure to be able to impose the same taxes on national banks that are imposed on State banks.

The legislation before the Committee, as introduced, would have extended the right of the States to tax national banks for the following specific types of taxes: First, sales tax; second, use tax; and, third, personal property tax.

During the deliberations on H.R. 7491 as originally introduced, it was decided by your committee on an overwhelming vote that it would be better to not specify any particular tax which States might levy against national banks, but rather, it would be more equitable to allow States to tax national banks to the same degree that they tax banks chartered under the laws of the State. In other words, in order to assist in providing full and fair competition, it was deemed by your committee that the only way to assure this in this instance would be to allow the States the right to provide for equal taxation between State-chartered and federally chartered banking institutions.

Members should be aware of the fact that this proposed legislation treats a national bank exactly like a State bank chartered in that same State. In other words, if the question were asked to what extent can the State of Texas tax the First National City Bank of Oklahoma City doing business with a firm in Texas, the answer is that it could tax the national bank from Oklahoma to the same degree that it would tax an Oklahoma State-chartered bank doing business in Texas.

It has been brought to my attention that some banks are arguing that this legislation, if enacted, would create a situation whereby nationally chartered banks would be forced to pay double taxation. There is nothing within this legislation to permit this occurrence. This legislation neither directs the States to impose or not to impose taxes on national banks. It merely says—and I reiterate—that the States will have a right to impose the same types of taxes on national banks and to the same degree that they impose on State-chartered banks. In other words, whatever taxes are imposed upon State banks within the State border and doing business in that State will apply to a national bank which has its principal office in that

XUM

State. In addition, if a national bank domiciled in State A had a loan production office in State B, State B could tax that loan production office to the same extent that its laws provided for taxation of a loan production office operated in State B by a State-chartered bank from State A.

The question of venue for suit also was before the committee. It was decided by your committee that this question went beyond the question of tax equality between State and nationally chartered banks and, therefore, the committee did not consider this matter. There is no question that national banks, as well as State banks, have the same identical problems concerning venue for suit. Therefore, in this regard, even though the problems exist, equality in this matter also exists.

There has been some unfair criticism levied against the committee for the way in which this bill was handled. The criticism has been made that no hearings on the legislation were held. It is true that no public witnesses testified before the committee, but this was not due to any fault on the part of the committee. All affected agencies of the Government did submit statements or letters on the legislation and all of the bank trade associations, including the American Bankers Association, Independent Bankers Association, and National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, were contacted and asked if they desired to testify. None of these organizations wanted to formally testify; however, statements from them are included in the printed testimony received in consideration of this legislation. The committee, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, cannot be faulted if these groups did not care to make public presentations to the committee.

It has also been argued that the Treasury Department, which, of course, has control over the Comptroller of the Currency—the bureau within the Treasury Department that grants charters to national banks—opposes the bill as reported. I would state, Mr. Chairman, that the letter received from the Treasury Department on this legislation, which you will find on page 2 of the printed testimony and pages 6 and 7 in the committee report states:

> If the Congress believes that it is desirable to add other taxes (in addition to sales and use taxes), the language could be changed accordingly.

This is precisely what the committee did. Our action was to subject national banks, if the States so desire, to all forms of taxes to which the States subject their own State-chartered banks.

Mr. Chairman, this is a reasonable, fair, and equitable bill. It provides for equality of taxation between State-chartered and nationally chartered banks. I have said—and in this I do not mean to be facetious—that it is a States rights bill. Up until now, Federal law discriminated against the States in this case because they could not treat in the most vital area of taxation State-chartered and federally chartered banks equally. This legislation would provide the States with this opportunity. I most heartily, Mr. Chairman, recommend its adoption.

But after considering that, the committee said, "Why just specify those three types of taxes?" That is where we got into trouble before. When we amend the law, we should amend the law looking to the future and not trying to specify specific taxes. Our bill states that all banks, National and State, should be treated equally by the State legislatures. Nothing could be simpler than that. Therefore, it was decided by the committee that our language as amended would include everything and we would not have to use what is commonly known now as a "laundry list."

If the State banks pay a certain tax, then the national banks under the same and similar circumstances should be compelled to pay the same. That is all we are asking for. We do not want to have the legislatures in a position where they can favor the national banks.

I certainly ask Members of the House to give serious consideration to this, so we will have perfect equality between the two banking systems. We do not want either one to be hurt, either the State banks or the national banks to be hurt, but we want complete equality between the two. That is all this bill is asking.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I will not take any time at the present time to discuss the bill itself. The chairman has presented the main facets of the bill. I will support the bill, but amended I hope by the Brown of Michigan amendment that will be offered. I will speak at length to that at that time.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Brown).

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7491 as reported by the Banking and Currency Committee would inject more confusion into an already confused situation regarding the collection of taxes by States and municipalities from national banks. The basic problem with H.R. 7491, which was approved by the committee after 2 hours of executive session and without the benefit of hearings or witnesses, is that it uses a broad-gage shotgun approach to remedy a specific problem.

There is general agreement among bankers and State and Federal taxing authorities that an amendment to the present law is needed to equalize the State and local tax burden on State-chartered and national banks. This need, which has existed for a long time, was highlighted within recent months by two U.S. Supreme Court decisions. In the case of *First Agricultural National Bank of Berkshire County* v. *State Tax Commission*, 392 U.S.C. 339, the Court held that a national bank domiciled in Massachusetts did not have to pay Massachusetts sales and use taxes since this tax was not included in the methods States could tax national banks listed in section 5219. The Dickinson case was a similar holding involving Florida documentary stamp taxes. Both of these cases involved attempts by a State to collect taxes from national banks domiciled within its borders which State-chartered banks similarly situated were required to pay. There is general agreement that this result was inequitable and that national banks should be subject to the same taxes in their home States and localities as are their competitors.

It was to correct this obvious inequity that a series of bills was introduced in this session. H.R. 7491 as originally introduced by Chairman Patman, H.R. 3826 by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Podell), H.R. 2182 by the gentleman from California (Mr. Hosmer), H.R. 9794 by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Sikes) for himself and on behalf of Reprsentatives Bennett, Haley, Cramer, Fascell, Rogers of Florida, Pepper, Fuqua, Gibbons, Burke of Florida, Chappell, and Frey, taken together, list all of the State and local taxes which national banks have been escaping. The amendment I propose will provide for the collection by the home State of all of the taxes listed in the aforementioned bills. H.R. 7491 as reported would do the same, but its broad-gage language would also have far reaching and unknown effects in the field of interstate taxation.

The Judiciary Committee has agonized over the whole problem of interstate taxation for the past 10 years. As of this date, no comprehensive legislation has been enacted to remedy this problem and I believe it would be unwise for the House of Representatives to attempt to dispose summarily of this complex problem as it relates to banks, without even the benefit of a public hearing.

H.R. 7491 as reported, repeals entirely section 5219 of the Revised Statutes which was originally enacted in 1864 and was last amended in 1926. This section spells out in detail the methods of State taxation of national banks and has stood the test of time. Now because of a relatively minor problem relating to a few forms of taxation which were unknown at the time of the last revision, the committee has seen fit to scrap this detailed statute without adequate consideration of the implications of such action. Many States have enacted over the years various taxes affecting State-chartered and national banks in reliance on the existing provisions of section 5219. There is no necessity for repealing the entire statute in order to bring up to date the list of State and local taxes contained therein.

The amendment which I will offer authorizes the States to tax national banks in all those areas where there may have been some doubt about their ability to do so. This includes sales and use taxes, tangible personal property taxes, intangible personal property taxes, documentary stamp taxes, license registration, and all the taxes applicable to motor vehicles.

As I have indicated, the adoption of my amendment will take care of all the problems that are known to date.

It certainly is not an attempt in any way to favor national banks but, rather, is an attempt to make sure that they

XUM

are treated equitably, without getting into the whole problem of interstate taxation. No one in this Chamber can assure me we will not create more problems than we resolve by the approach the committee amendment undertakes.

I think it is also interesting to note that the chairman of the committee indicated he does not like the "laundry list" of taxes. I remind all of those familiar with the one bank holding company legislation that it was the laundry-list approach which the chairman supported.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. The gentleman is certainly taking the proper approach in order to correct the problems if the proposal of the committee is adopted. I wish to commend him and indicate that I will support his amendment. This, however, will not remove all of the problems facing some of the States. Is it possible, I ask the gentleman, that it may be necessary for State legislatures, in order to remove some of these inequities, to enact legislation?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Yes. There are many areas, as the gentleman knows, where there may be a need for State legislation because of the enactment of this legislation. I think we ought to deal with the problem areas as they have been identified to us and not go far beyond them and possibly create more problems.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. The gentleman is correct. I am happy to support his amendment and will be pleased to be here when he offers it.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Ashley).

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will not take my full time, but I rise in support of the measure before us.

It is with some reluctance that I must say I am constrained to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Brown).

I would like to take just a moment, Mr. Chairman, to establish the record in one or two respects.

First of all, the amendment that the Committee on Banking and Currency has reported is substantially the same as the text of H.R. 8642, which I introduced on March 11. My bill was before the committee when invitations to testify on this subject were issued. We must be very clear about it. Invitations were issued. If there is any complaint from Members on the other side of the aisle that hearings were not held, they should at least acknowledge that invitations were issued and there were no requests to be heard.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman will remember that the bill before the committee, H.R. 7491, and discussed by the committee, included in its provisions only those provisions relative to sales taxes, use taxes, and personal property taxes.

Mr. ASHLEY. The gentleman is entirely mistaken on that. The bill that I introduced and which was the first bill that was introduced on it was not so limited. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ASHLEY. I will in just one moment. I want to say that my bill was before the committee for two and a half months when the executive session was called on this and similar bills.

Mr. Chairman, more than 2 weeks elapsed between the executive session at which this bill was ordered reported and the filing of the report. There was certainly ample time for the gentleman from Michigan and anyone else on the committee to file dissenting views or views such as the gentleman indicated this afternoon. No such views were filed or expressed. It is quite clear that those who might have had objections to the bill reported, did have an ample opportunity so to express themselves both before and after the committee acted on it. They did not do so, and this should be made a part of the Record.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is an eminently reasonable one. It would remove the privileged status presently enjoyed by national banks in their immunity from certain forms of State taxation for which State-chartered banks are liable. The bill would close the loophole in the National Bank Act favoring national banks and thus foster competitive equality between National and State banks within our dual system.

When the National Bank Act was enacted in 1864, it deliberately discriminated against State banks and in favor of national banks in two ways. First, it limited the kinds of taxes that States could levy on a national bank and, second, it limited taxation of national banks to the State in which the bank's principal office was located.

This policy made sense against the 19th-century background of "wildcat" State banking and the performance by national banks of currency and public debt functions. However, times have changed. State banks are now responsible institutions and the currency and public debt functions of national banks have long since been taken over by governmental agencies.

National banks now perform essentially the same functions as State banks. Like their State-chartered counterparts, national banks are privately owned, privately managed, and operated for private profit. Not only do national banks perform no significant Federal Government function not performed equally by State-chartered banks, but they also receive a myriad of State and local services.

As national banks perform no peculiar functions not served by State banks, there can be no justification for continuing this invidious discrimination. It is unfair to the State banks, it is unfair to the States, and it is a threat to our dual system of banking.

The present system gives national banks, with their many operations outside the State where their principal office is located, a significant competitive advantage. Not being subject to many State taxes nor to interstate and foreign State taxation, they can, very simply, make more money than State banks. This money is made at the expense of the States. It has been conservatively estimated that the privileged status of national banks costs the State $50 million in revenue annually.

Morever, if we continue this system, we may see an end to our dual banking system. As Frank Willie, New York State superintendent of banks, pointed out recently, unless Congress removes this inequity, there may be "an increased number of conversions by commercial banks from State to national charter," to take advantage of the privileged tax situation. This would leave the States with even less revenue in this time of great State need.

The committee adopted this approach rather than that of merely adding a laundry list of taxes that States could impose on national banks because the laundry list would not impose a lasting solution. The laundry list would not even solve the present problem, because national banks would still be exempted from interstate and foreign state taxation while State-chartered banks would not be. Second, as soon as any State instituted a different form of tax, the exact same problem of discrimination would be thrust back into our laps.

Mr. Chairman, the problem is clear and so is the solution. In short, we have an invidious tax discrimination between State and National banks—indivious because it has no rational grounding in terms of differentiation of function. Since that is the case, the only fair and lasting permanent solution lies in putting National and State banks on equal footing. This is what the bill before us does and for this reason it should be enacted.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I did not intend to suggest that your bill limited itself to those areas. I am saying the bill that was before the committee, H.R. 7491, as introduced originally by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Patman), did not cover the total area as your bill did, by saying they would be immune. The bill before the committee on September 3 or the bills before the committee, including the first one which was introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Podell), limited themselves to sales and use taxes which I have included in my amendment. Yours is the only bill that did not.

Mr. ASHLEY. I think the record will speak for itself. However, I believe I understand the purpose of the gentleman's amendment but that discussion can be delayed and I shall address myself to that at the appropriate time.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time but I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Podell).

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency upon considering this long overdue legislation. I was involved in a similar type of legislation some 2 years ago where I myself dealt with the question of taxation of national banks on sales and use taxes and held hearings in the State of New York. I invited the American Banking Association to come in and testify but they refused to do so.

Mr. Chairman, the problem with which we are now confronted is a very simple story. For instance, my daughter is 9 years old. If she buys something in the five and dime store for 20 cents, she pays a sales tax. Yet when banks purchase desks and refurbish their offices, they pay no sales tax.

Mr. Chairman, a recent Supreme Court decision restated the concept that national banks were immune to State sales and use taxes, recommending a change in the law. The Court delved most fruitfully into constantly growing pressures on State and local sources of revenue. The problem was very simple. When the original law was passed permitting the taxation of Federal national banks, sales taxes were not in existence. Now, State and local budgets are badly out of balance and sales tax revenues are not only badly needed, but represent a major source of State income.

One of the problems involved with the amendment which is to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Brown) is the fact that he sets forth those taxes and does not say that certain other taxes may come into being later on when we would have to come back to the Congress and ask for further relief.

Mr. Chairman, when considering this bill we must keep in mind the state of America when the original law was enacted. The relationship between national banks and the Government was markedly different from today. These are days of sales taxes, undreamed of in the era of Nicholas Biddle and Attorney General Taney.

The present levels of such taxes in New York City and New York State amply support my contention. Today, sales tax for every shopper in New York City is 6 percent. That is one reason why we must reevaluate our traditional stand on State sales and use taxes as they affect national banks.

Mr. Chairman, I sent a letter to every State in the Union asking that State to advise me as to whether or not it had suffered a loss as a result of the immunity of the national banks as of today. I received communications from 33 of those States, some of whom were not familiar with the exact amount of revenue it was losing but of the 33 States which responded to that letter they reflected that they were losing approximately $25,303,000, including over $1 million from the State of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Brown). The total projected figure for the entire Nation of revenues lost by the States of our country today as a result of its failure to tax national banks is close to $50 million.

Mr. Chairman, banks are not privileged members of our business community as witness the recent actions in raising the prime interest rate which is an illustration of a rampant privilege. The question is fundamental with reference to intergovernmental immunities, tracing its origins back to the formative years of the Republic. In 1819 Chief Justice Marshall, in McCulloch against Maryland, held invalid a State law levying a tax on currency issued by the Second Bank of the United States. Every law student remembers the famous concept therein enunciated "that power to tax is also power to destroy." Accordingly, we have this bill now pending before us.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment as will be introduced by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Brown)—and I intend to address myself at length to the language of that amendment—is that it still gives national banks a privileged status, and this is one thing we cannot do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the additional time.

Mr. Chairman, we do not want to afford to national banks the status of privilege. Let me cite a brief example:

We in the State of New York lost 47 employees who are bank examiners merely because every single State-chartered bank in the State of New York is now applying for a Federal charter to get the benefit of privileges extended to national banks. We have lost some $400,000 in State licensing revenues alone, which are not referred to in the laundry list submitted by the gentleman from Michigan.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the present bill as introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency is an excellent bill, and one that should pass in its present form.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman again for the additional time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to cite a second example as to why I believe the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan is not only wrong but will destroy the fundamental concept of the committee bill. The amendment provides us with a list of taxes that States may now levy upon national banks. I would ask the gentleman from Michigan what if there should be new laws or new State taxes introduced over the years that are not now familiar to us—and as time goes on we can be assured these will enlarge and expand in scope—and then once again we will have to come back to the Congress for legislation that would permit States to tax national banks accordingly? The concept of privilege for national banks must not be continued. I believe that both State banks and National banks should be treated alike.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one last point on this amendment. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan provides that banks may only be taxed on their principal place of business. This creates a very serious question. If I was the chairman of a national bank I would establish my principal place of business in a State where the sales tax is 2 percent, and then open branch offices in those States where the sales tax is 6 percent, and thus be subject only to a 2-percent sales tax.

So, Mr. Chairman, for those reasons I believe that we should pass the bill as introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I believe that the amendment proposed to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan, certainly in good faith, does not really do the job that is required.

I have included herewith a list of jurisdictions which I have received communications from:

State Estimates of Amount Lost Annually

Alabama: $250,000 to $300,000.
Alaska: No sales or use tax.
Arizona: No response.
Arkansas: No loss.
California: $2,000,000.
Colorado: No response.
Connecticut: No loss.
Delaware: No response.
Florida: $2,000,000 to $3,000,000.
Georgia: $2,047,000.
Hawaii: Only has two national banks.
Idaho: $250,000 to $500,000.
Indiana: No response.
Illinois: No estimate.
Iowa: No information.
Kansas: No loss.
Kentucky: $65,000.
Louisiana: No response.
Maine: $50,000.
Maryland: $1,000,000.
Massachusetts: $250,000.
Michigan: $1,000,000.
Minnesota: No information available.
Mississippi: No response.
Missouri: No loss.
Montana: No response.
Nebraska: 375,000.
Nevada: No response.
New Hampshire: No response.
New Jersey: No response.
New Mexico: No response.
New York (N.Y.C. $3.5 million included): $5,000,000.
North Carolina: $185,000.
North Dakota: No response.
Ohio: No response.
Oklahoma: $250,000.
Oregon: No response.
Pennsylvania: $5,000,000.
Rhode Island: $125,000.
South Carolina: No response.
South Dakota: No response.
Tennessee: $1,500,000.
Texas: No information.
Utah: $106,000.
Vermont: No response.
Virginia: $1,500,000.
Washington State: $900,000.
West Virginia: $150,000.
Wisconsin: No response.
Wyoming: No estimate.
Total estimated: $25,303,000.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Brown) will give a greater privilege to national banks over State banks. The national banks now have twice as much business and assets as do the State banks.

Let me give an illustration: Let us take a national bank in New York—and there are lots of them—operating in 49 other States. Now, there is a State bank in New York operating in 49 other States. Now, what will the situation be in regard to this language?

The State banks operating in 49 States will have to pay in New York, and also the 49 States, but the national banks will not because they have their principal place of business only in one State.

Now, this amendment applies only in the national banks in the State in which they have their principal place of business.

It is just as plain as the nose on your face. The Brown amendment is discriminatory. That is what we are trying to get away from now, the discrimination caused by the Supreme Court, when the Supreme Court correctly ruled, I will admit, that they could not require a national bank to pay sales taxes and use taxes because when the law was written back 50 or 100 years ago, taxes like that were not even contemplated and never even dreamed of.

Therefore, we have to amend the law and if we put a whole laundry list in here as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Brown) tried to do, there is no assurance that that includes all the taxes that are now imposed.

The gentleman just took them from the bills that were introduced by Members of the House dealing with this legislation and every tax that was mentioned, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Brown) picked it out and put it in his bill.

That is the question—and that is all right provided he has checked all the other taxes and made sure that these include all the taxes that are now imposed. But the gentleman said he just picked them out of the bills that were already introduced and made no statement as to the fact that they are all of the taxes, and I am sure they are not.

How can we legislate that way? We will get into worse trouble than we are in now.

The amendment of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Brown) basically was considered before the committee and we discussed it for a long time on both sides and we had a record vote on it. That vote resulted in 3 votes for Mr. Brown's amendment and 18 votes against it I believe. That was a pretty decisive vote. That was in the committee where there was a full and free discussion given to it.

I hope the gentleman will be agreeable to that and not create a situation here that is even worse than what we have now. Do not make this House of Representatives go on record as favoring the big banks and in favor of doing something against the little banks.

We do not want to do that. We want equality. We want the national banks and the State banks to be taxed under similar and like circumstances in exactly the same way and not favoring either one or discriminating against either one. We want them to be treated exactly the same. That is what the bill we have proposes to do.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I would like to remind the gentleman that the vote on the amendment I offered in the committee was not as he indicated. The vote that he recited was on reporting the bill out of committee. It was not as the gentleman indicated it to be on my amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. The vote on the gentleman's amendment was 16 to 6. I made a mistake when I said it was 18 to 3.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. If the gentleman read his own report on the bill, he is well aware of the fact that the report says we are not attempting, because we do not feel we can, deal with all of the ramifications and problems of multi-State taxation. That is the very thing I am trying to do by my amendment. I deal only in the limited areas where we know what we are doing rather than attempt to do something about which we do not know the total ramifications.

If I may go on just a little further, the gentleman made the point that we were favoring somebody—that is not my intent at all. I am in favor of the equality of taxation, but I think we have to recognize that measures have been taken by the States, counterbalancing measures, and we are not totally aware of their full impact.

I do not think anyone on your side has said to me that he knows all of the ramifications of the language that you are proposing the House should accept. But I can explain at least what my amendment does.

Mr. PATMAN. That is why I am not proposing a laundry list—but to make laws so we will know. You have no assurance of that and I know you do not have, that we would be in worse shape now than we have been in the past.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Does the gentleman know any tax or any method of taxation that is not included in my so-called laundry list and would not be covered by section 5219 as amended?

Mr. PATMAN. It would take a lot of research and take a lot of time to find out. But the gentleman did not take that time and he admits he did not.

He just took things out of bills that have been filed in the House since January. He took something out of each bill and put in the name of some tax, and that is all he claims. But even though the amendments were offered in that way, that is no assurance that we have covered all taxes. They do not even give us that assurance. It requires months of research to get that information. The best way to do it is to provide exact equality under any circumstance or condition, and then we will have no fears, because one cannot be discriminated against as compared to others.

Any time we get one provision in a bill favoring one group, we will be branded as being for the big banks and against the little banks. We will be criticized for favoring the large banks and against the small banks of the country. There will be no way to get out of it under the terms of your amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I would much prefer to be branded, possibly demagogically, as being in favor of these things which are not true—and the gentleman knows they are not true—than to do something in ignorance. I will assure the gentleman I have probably spent as much time on research of this question as he has, if not more. I did not take the laundry list, as you have called it. I did not pick out specific taxes.

Mr. PATMAN. In the letter the gentleman sent around to the Members you said——

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I thought the gentleman had yielded.

Mr. PATMAN. I must correct that statement. This is over your signature.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. That is correct. Read it.

Mr. PATMAN. It says:

> The amendment I propose will provide for the collection by the home state of all of the taxes listed in the aforementioned bills.

And the bills listed are bills introduced by Mr. Podell, Mr. Patman, Mr. Sikes, for himself and on behalf of Representatives Bennett, Haley, Cramer, Fascell, Rogers of Florida, Pepper, Fuqua, Gibbons, Burke of Florida, Chappell, and Frey.

You admit that yourself. You took it from these bills. But that does not include all taxes. You cannot make that statement.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I would suggest to the gentleman that because the amendment incorporates those taxes it does not mean that we have covered only the taxes mentioned. Rather, all the subjects and methods of taxation about which Congress has suggested there is need for remedial legislation have been included in my amendment. The amendment does not come just from a picking and choosing from other bills with respect to this field.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not want to take too much time. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Widnall) has indicated that he has no further requests for time. I am anxious to end the debate. If the gentleman feels strongly about his amendment, the measure before the Committee does not foreclose his efforts. He can introduce a new bill, and I will guarantee now that we will give him a full hearing. He can make a showing before the Committee, and if a majority of the members of the Committee vote for it, we will bring it out here for a vote. That is fair enough, is it not? Do not bring it in here at the last minute. The gentleman knows the consequences of an effort to insert a few little words in an amendment at the last moment.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I do not think the gentleman is suggesting that this is a new subject of discussion, that I am surprising anyone with this amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; you are.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. This subject was discussed in committee on a limited scale. We were talking about sales and use taxes. There was a discussion about Treasury letters and adding other taxes to the measure if there were other problems in other areas. The discussion we are now having is a better discussion of the bill than we ever had in the committee, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, no. We discussed your amendment half the time and voted it down.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, in the votes today, if any, on H.R. 7491, the bill regarding State taxation of national banks, I intend to vote present. I am an officer, director, and a substantial stockholder in the New London Trust Co., New London, N.H., a State-chartered bank. Some correspondence which I have received and general comment which I have read has guided me toward this decision.

There is a good deal of loose talk and loose thinking regarding the general area of conflict of interest, however. In my opinion the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct should hold hearings and establish some positive guidelines. Such guidelines could be of positive benefit to Members and the public.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield back the balance of his time?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. A national bank has no immunity from any sales tax, use tax, or personal property tax which it would be required to pay if it were a bank chartered under the laws of the State or other jurisdiction within which its principal office is located.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"§ 1. Amendment of section 5219 of the Revised Statutes

"(a) Section 5219 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 548) is amended to read:

"'SEC. 5219. For the purposes of any tax law enacted under authority of the United States or any State, a national bank shall be deemed to be a bank organized and existing under the laws of the State or other jurisdiction within which its principal office is located.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) becomes effective on the first day of the first calendar year which begins after the date of enactment."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MICHIGAN TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Michigan to the committee amendment: Strike all of the Committee amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following as a substitute:

"SECTION 1. AMENDMENT OF SECTION 5219 OF THE REVISED STATUTES.

"(a) Section 5219 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 548) is amended by adding at the end thereof a subparagraph 5 to read as follows:

"'5. In addition to the other methods of taxation permitted herein, a State (including the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) or political subdivision thereof may impose on a National bank having its principal office within such State in the same manner and to the same extent as such taxes are imposed upon a State chartered bank having its principal office within such state, sales and use taxes, tangible personal property taxes, intangible personal property taxes, documentary stamp taxes, and license, registration, transfer, excise or other fees or taxes imposed on the ownership, use or transfer of motor vehicles: Provided, however, that the taxes imposed under the provisions of this Section 5219 shall not effect a greater total tax liability for a National bank than for a State bank similarly situated.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) becomes effective on the first day of the first calendar year which begins after the date of enactment."

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Fifty Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 108]

Abbitt
Addabbo
Ashbrook
Aspinall
Berry
Betts
Boggs
Brasco
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Burton, Utah
Button
Cahill
Carey
Celler
Clancy
Clark
Clausen,
 Don H.
Cohelan
Conte
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Devine
Diggs
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Esch
Foley
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Gilbert
Halpern
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Hawkins
Hébert
Howard
Hungate
Jacobs
Joelson
Jones, N.C.
Kirwan
Latta
Lipscomb
McEwen
May
Mayne
Miller, Calif.
Moorhead
Nix
O'Hara
Ottinger
Pollock
Powell
Purcell
Ronan
Schadeberg
Scheuer
Shipley
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Steed
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tunney
Watkins
Watson
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
 Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Young

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ICHORD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 7491, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 350 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. Before the Committee rose, the Chair had recognized the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN) for 5 minutes to speak on his amendment. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is well to again ask ourselves why we are here today on this bill. The reason that we are discussing the State taxation of national banks is because the U.S. Supreme Court, within the last 2 years, ruled in two different cases that States cannot assess and collect sales and use taxes in one case and documentary stamp taxes in other cases from national banks, although they can do so with respect to State banks. But this was because section 5219 of the Revised Statutes is treated as the sole basis for the taxation of national banks.

I do not think there is anyone here—including the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, thinks that I want to favor national banks over State banks, or big banks over small banks—but we want to get tax equity within the area in which we know there is inequity without creating a lot of problems that could exist if we should attempt to take a broadbrush approach and cover everything that is involved in interstate taxation, multiple taxation, and dual taxation because of activities by a bank in a State in which the bank is not domiciled.

The committee bill eliminates all of the present language of section 5219. This is language which has been on the books over 100 years and which has not been revised since 1926, and it has worked reasonably well until the two Supreme Court decisions I mentioned.

My bill by including sales and use taxes, documentary stamp taxes, motor vehicle taxes, personal property taxes, both tangible and intangible, would give States permission to levy these taxes. These, once again, are the only areas in which we know there are problems regarding the ability of States to tax national banks.

My bill takes care of these known problems. It leaves the statute otherwise as it is.

What does the committee bill do? It attempts with a broad brush to cover everything by saying the national banks shall be treated as State banks domiciled in that State. This brings in the whole problem of multistate taxation. The question of taxation of loans by out-of-State institutions is a thorny one. It involves a long history of several hundred decisions by the Supreme Court. The American Bar Association has promulgated a uniform act, but so far only one State, Alaska, has adopted it.

The whole field of taxation of interstate commerce is a difficult one. How far must States be required to refrain from taxing interstate commerce in order to achieve the benefits intended by the Constitution of providing a nationwide market? These and other questions have occupied much time and attention of the Judiciary Committee of this House for the past 10 years in fields other than

XUM

banking. In an interstate taxation bill we passed recently in this House for the second time, we specifically exempted banking legislation because of this very troublesome area.

I frankly do not know the answers to the problems of multistate taxation and of taxing interstate commerce and of taxing interstate activities of banks. I do not think there is a member of this committee who can tell me what problems the bill creates, or the problems that are resolved by it. I am satisfied they cannot. Rather, if we are to deal in multistate and interstate taxation problems, then I think the Banking and Currency Committee ought to hold some hearings, which we did not do on the bill before the Members. I think we ought to bring in some experts who can tell us what States are doing in this area and what counterbalancing methods States have adopted in order to resolve the problems between the national and the State banks. I do not think this House is in a position today to act upon a bill, as comprehensive as the one before us if we adopt the committee language.

I ask Members to keep the language of the law we have known and which has worked reasonably well over the years, and adopt my amendment, which will bring in those areas of taxation where any problem has been suggested.

Then, if any further action is needed with respect to multistate and interstate areas, let us give proper consideration to that problem and correct inequities, if there are any that need to be corrected.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Brown).

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will decisively reject the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Brown). The committee bill is simplicity itself and says simply this, that a State shall have the same power to tax a national bank as a State bank, even Steven, not one penny more, but not one penny less.

The Brown of Michigan amendment sets forth a number of specific taxes which a State may levy against a national bank on the same basis as it may levy against a State bank. Listed in the Brown of Michigan amendment are documentary taxes, intangible property taxes, sales taxes and a couple of others.

I have no quarrel with listing those, but the trouble is that this leaves out dozens and dozens of important taxes the States find necessary to levy, such as excise taxes, value-added taxes, real property taxes.

Under the Brown of Michigan amendment, for example, a New York bank may set up a loan production office in the State of Michigan, and may build a veritable Acropolis in which to house it, costing millions of dollars, yet the poor State of Michigan would be unable to impose a local property tax on that bank.

The States as well as the United States desperately need revenues. We should not cut them off.

Equally, we have a dual banking system, a system in which the State bank is considered to be every bit as good as, but no better than, a national bank. National banks should not be made first-class citizens and State banks made second-class citizens.

It is interesting that the commissioner of banking of the State of the gentleman from Michigan, Robert P. Briggs, the Michigan commissioner of banking, has wired the committee, and it is of record, that Michigan heartily approves the committee bill, and by implication does not want an on again off again, halfway approach to fair State taxation of national banks which is envisaged by the proposal of the gentleman from Michigan.

I would remind the Members that this amendment was offered in committee, that it was overwhelmingly turned down by something like 16 to 6.

I would hope that in the interest of equal treatment, no more and no less, for State and national banks, we would preserve the committee proposal and vote down the Brown of Michigan amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do not believe the gentleman would want to leave in the Record of the House the suggestion that real estate of a national bank in any State is not taxed. By keeping in all of the provisions of section 5219 of the Revised Statutes real estate would be taxed. This is specifically provided as a tax to be levied by the States.

Mr. REUSS. I will cite to the gentleman, and I hope in flawless Latin:

> Expressio unius est, exclusio alterius.

By listing the few penny-ante taxes, such as documentary taxes, the amendment would leave it wide open for a national bank which erected an Acropolis in the State of Michigan to frustrate taxation by Michigan.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. My amendment would not eliminate the first four paragraphs of the Revised Statutes, which cover such things as income taxes and real estate taxes. Those taxes are in the law now and would remain in the law. I would add an additional paragraph that would bring in five more taxes.

Mr. REUSS. I can name dozens of other taxes. I have named several.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Name one.

Mr. REUSS. Value-added taxes, and excise taxes.

Why in the world the gentleman seeks to name a few taxes out of his memory and say these are the only taxes which a State may impose on national banks, I do not know, instead of doing what the committee says, which is that if a State may constitutionally tax a State bank, it may equally apply that tax to a national bank.

I see no reason for a special interest exemption of national banks. If the shoe were on the other foot, I would feel the same way.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. It seems to me—and does it not seem logical to the gentleman—if the State of Michigan had a justifiable complaint regarding the language of my amendment I would not be suggesting this amendment.

I do not believe the contention of Michigan in this area is necessarily valid, until we take care of the whole problem of interstate taxation and multistate taxation. So when the commissioner of banking of the State of Michigan writes, I believe he wanted something done in this area. He wants the national banks subjected to sales taxes, use taxes, and personal property taxes.

Mr. REUSS. And all other taxes.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Brown amendment. Virtually all of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency support the broad general principle that both the committee bill and the Brown amendment would be a significant move today protecting State and local revenue sources and toward achieving competitive equality between national and State banks. The problem that has arisen, however, in connection with the committee bill is that it enlarges the potential problem of multistate taxation of interstate banking business. The Brown amendment, on the other hand, avoids this potential problem by retaining the language in section 5219 of the Revised Statutes wherein the existing law states:

> The legislature of each state may determine and direct, subject to the provisions of this section, the manner and place of taxing the shares of national banking associations *located within its limits.*

The committee report avoids the potential problem of multistate taxation when it says:

> The committee bill does not attempt to solve the problems created by multi-state taxation of interstate businesses, and it does not deal per se with questions of jurisdiction and venue in state and federal judicial procedure.

I agree that the committee bill does not attempt to solve the problem created by multistate taxation, but surely the potential problem is enlarged by the manner in which the committee bill would permit multistate taxation to occur.

In short, as acknowledged by the committee report, the bill reported from our committee raises serious questions, the scope of which cannot be predicted. In this connection, the House just 2 weeks ago had before it H.R. 7906, a bill to regulate and foster commerce among the States by providing a system for the taxation of interstate commerce in which banks were specifically excluded. The question of multistate taxation of banks is a thorny issue which should be treated separately.

I am disturbed that the committee report accompanying this bill appears to contain some misleading statements. On page 5 of the report, under the heading "Wide Support for Committee Bill" the report asserts:

> It is clear that there is wide support, and no substantial opposition, for the policy embodied in the bill as reported by your committee. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation submitted a letter supporting the principle of the committee's bill without reservation.

On the same page that this statement appears is the letter from the FDIC dated May 22, some 2 weeks prior to the date that the bill was reported. Contrary to the implication of the report, the FDIC only supported the principle of parity between State and National banks with respect to State and local taxation. The FDIC supported the several bills that had been previously introduced and the Corporation specifically supported the language submitted to the committee by the Department of the Treasury.

Also contrary to the claim of wide support, is the letter from the General Counsel of the Treasury, reprinted on page 6 of the report, where the Department stated in emphatic terms that it believes that—

> A national bank should be subject to the same taxation in its home state as a state-chartered bank in that state.

The Treasury letter went on to say that the recent Supreme Court decision which triggered the need for this legislation "dealt only with the question of taxation by the home State." The letter stated further:

> That case did not involve the broader question of taxation and regulation by other states in which a national bank may do business. This so-called doing business question raises different issues from that involved in the sales tax controversy. The question of taxation of foreign corporations including banks is interwoven with other complex issues such as venue for suit, and necessity for compliance with doing business statutes. We recommend, therefore, that the question of taxation of national banks by states other than the home state be considered and treated separately.

It is clear to me that contrary to the claim of wide support made in the committee report that both the FDIC and the Treasury Department oppose any bill which raises multistate taxation problems.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the House should treat lightly the potential problem of multistate taxation of banks with interstate operations. Hearings should be held on this separate issue. Congress should think long and hard before it enacts legislation which would even tempt certain States to erect tax barriers against the free flow of capital—especially at a time when such action would increase the cost of borrowing money and diminishing banking competition.

I, therefore, wholeheartedly support the Brown amendment which will remedy all of the known problem areas created by recent Court decisions which have precluded certain States from imposing certain forms of taxes against national banks. Notwithstanding my strong support of the Brown amendment, however, should a majority vote against it, I shall support the committee bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WIDNALL was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I invite the distinguished gentleman's attention to this language in the amendment. It restricts it only to national banks. It says that taxes may be imposed upon a national bank having its principal office within such State.

Now, how can the gentleman answer this question? There are principal offices all over the Nation. The national bank of New York State also operates in the other 49 States and State banks operate in 49 other States under similar circumstances. But under this amendment the national banks cannot be taxed in those other 49 States but only in the State of its principal office. However, the State banks can be taxed in all of the other 49 States.

Does the gentleman from New Jersey think it would be possible for our dual system to survive when a national banking system has such a great advantage?

Mr. WIDNALL. I believe that the original bill said exactly what we are trying to do at this point.

Mr. PATMAN. No; this restricts it to national banks.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment which has been offered by my friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN), because I feel very strongly that our dual banking system is in trouble. It is in trouble because the State-chartered banks are in trouble and there cannot be any real question about this. Deposits in large State banks in just the last 4½ years have gone from 44 percent of all deposits in large banks to 33 percent, a one-third collapse in the deposits in large State banks. And, Mr. Chairman, it can come as no news to anyone who has been following the scene that hundreds of State banks have been converting to Federal charters. Why do you suppose this is the case? Well, the main fact is that State-chartered banks have not found it possible in recent years to compete with Federal banks. It is just that simple. One of the reasons that State banks have not been able to compete is because of the inequitable and discriminatory tax situation with which they have been faced. It is a matter of constitutional law that national banks cannot be subject to State taxation other than with the permission and the authority of the Congress.

We have not given that authority to date. That is why we are here this afternoon, to say to the States "You can tax federally chartered banks just as you tax your own State banks." We are here this afternoon to eliminate the one area of discrimination that distinguishes tax treatment between Federal and State banks.

The Brown amendment would eliminate just part of the immunity that is enjoyed by Federal banks today. It says that if a national bank is doing business in a State where its principal office is located, then it can be subject to the same taxes as the State banks in that State. But this does not go far enough to eliminate the inequity and the discrimination that is wrapped into the present situation, because national banks do business out of State. What the Brown amendment says is that in that situation leave them alone. Why? The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN) says because it is just fraught with complexity.

Well, so is our dual banking system fraught with complexity and with difficulty. Choose your course. Postpone the day when we are going to have to look at this because of the complexity of it, but in the meantime there will be more conversions from State charters to national charters, and deposits will continue to go down in the State banks. But do not say that the matter has never been before the Congress, because it is before the Congress this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN), should be voted down.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the gentleman wants to leave the wrong impression about some of the things the gentleman has said.

Would not the gentleman agree that in more States than not, counterbalancing provisions are made in the tax laws so that the State banks are not disproportionately taxed to the national banks?

Mr. ASHLEY. No, I would not concede that, and the reason I would not, if I may say it—and I will continue to yield to the gentleman—is that we have telegrams from present supervisors of the State banks pleading for this legislation. They are pleading for it, because they know that the countervailing actions that are sought are not effective to offset the discriminatory taxes that the gentleman knows are implicit in the situation.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. And, does the gentleman as a "moderate" look favorably upon tax treatment of financial dealings within a State which has the effect of building walls to prevent commerce between the States? Is that right?

Mr. ASHLEY. No, it is not right.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. That is the impact that your amendment would have if it is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the Brown amendment.

I would like to ask the author of the amendment several questions.

In connection with the committee amendment as offered, without the Brown amendment, is it not a fact that the committee bill makes a major change with regard to State taxation of inter-

XUM

state banking operations, and where does this change occur?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. In reply to the question asked by the gentleman from California, I will state that it does make a substantial change, because the committee bill, if it is adopted, covers the whole area of interstate taxation of banking activities.

The gentleman knows that the Committee on the Judiciary reported out a bill, the House voted on the bill and passed it. That interstate taxation bill, because of the tremendous complexity of the interstate problem, specifically exempted banks, not just national banks, but all banks, removing them from the ramifications of the interstate taxation bill that we passed.

The committee bill in one stroke of the pen would take care of this interstate problem—it says.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I want to approach the question you just mentioned in connection with the Committee on the Judiciary. But before I get to that, to what extent could States erect tax barriers against the inflow of, for instance, mortgage funds from out-of-State banks—that is out-of-State national and State banks, if those barriers are erected under the committee bill without your amendment?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Let us assume that the State banking institutions within a State do a very limited out-of-State business—a minimum or none—in order to develop a monopoly within that State's financial institutions the legislation could enact taxation measures which would discriminate against national banks that might be doing business in the State; mortgage funds, housing funds and other funding for business would stop coming into that State, because of the taxation that could be imposed upon this multistate activity.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Let me use this specific example and use my own State of California. If the Chase Manhattan Bank in New York had operations in the State of California and was providing millions of dollars for mortgage funds and the committee bill was adopted without your amendment, is it possible then for the State of California to impose any restrictive taxes on this out-of-State banking operation?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Certainly, it is entirely possible the State of New York and the State California both could tax the amount of the activity carried on in the State of California.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. So we get multistate taxation unless your amendment is adopted?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. That could be dual taxation—that is correct.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. To the extent that an interstate banking operation is taxed at increased levels as you have just described, would there not be a tendency to increase the cost of money, for example, on housing and mortgage money?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. It seems to me that to the extent you permit the possibility of double taxation and to the extent that you permit a monopolization within a State of financial activity within that State there will likely be an increase in the cost of money.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Then really the person who is going to be affected by that is the consumer; is that not true?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. When it comes to using or borrowing the money, I think the consumer is the one who is going to be hurt.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I do not see the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and I would like to ask him a question or a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, because of the exclusion that they made in interstate taxation.

This is the question I want to ask. Banks are specifically excluded from the coverage of H.R. 7906, entitled "A bill to regulate and foster commerce among the State by providing a system for the taxation of interstate commerce."

This was reported on June 2, 1969. Why the exclusion of all banks, both National and State? There must be a reason.

I want to ask members of the Committee on the Judiciary about that since they are the ones who reported it.

I see the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ROGERS)—would he care to comment?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Unfortunately, I was not a member of the subcommittee that considered this. This is a special committee that was set up and they had some expertise in connection with it.

I would refer the gentleman to other members of the subcommittee who are more familiar with it than I am.

But the intention was to try, and this is my interpretation of it—to try to get away from State taxation in interstate transactions.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. It is my understanding then that you feel the subcommittee had this in mind?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. What is that?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. That is what you feel the subcommittee had in mind?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. There is no question whatever but that the extensions that were extended to interstate transactions were intended to relieve or should I say prohibit a State from making such taxes.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN).

It seems to me we are trying to make a very simple bill, through an amendment to the bill, a very complicated matter. It is a simple question that is before us today. The question is whether or not we are going to put State banks and Federal banks on an equitable basis. That is the simple issue.

I would like to call attention to the principal words of difference in the two bills. First, the committee bill for tax purposes will deem national banks as State banks. We have heard a great deal of conversation here today about the great changes that the bill will bring about in the law and the great complications that we are going to have as a result. If there are any complications in the law as it exists today, they will still be there, but there will be no new ones created.

The only intent and purpose of the bill as reported by the committee is to put all banks on the same basis. It has no other purpose.

On the other hand, if you follow the logic of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN), you will notice the specific exemptions to what appear to be certain favored banks. I call your attention to the specific words in the amendment. In the applicable part it states:

> In addition to the other methods of taxation permitted herein, a State may impose on a National bank—

And here are the key words, as I understand them—

> having its principal office within such State in the same manner and to the same extent as such taxes are imposed upon a State chartered bank having its principal office within such State—

If I understand correctly, a bank in my general locality which has its principal place of business in Georgia could come to Florida and do such banking business as it is permitted to do in Florida, and stand exempt from the taxing laws of my State.

Let me say to you that in Florida—and I believe this is true in many other States of the Nation today—you are facing a serious problem because of the recent court decisions. In Florida alone we are going to lose more than $20 million in taxes previously collectable from national banks unless we take the kind of action which this committee is attempting to take here. I say to you we do have a simple question here. It is not complicated. We are not going to add any new problems. There has not been a single problem enumerated on the floor of the House today, as I can see it, and it seems to me we are trying to make a mountain out of a molehill.

If we are interested in protecting the small- and middle-sized banks of the Nation, our State banks, and in putting them on a par with national banks, it seems to me we ought to vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN), and support entirely the committee amendment.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAPPELL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. The Florida delegation, which has a strong interest in this matter, supports the committee position. Our State is directly affected. The distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. CHAPPELL) has pointed out simply, clearly, and emphatically the reasons the committee should support the committee bill. The amendment which is before you is based in considerable measure on the language of a bill introduced by the Florida delegation, and that we applaud, but the amendment does not stop there. It contains an additional proviso which, as I interpret it, sets up a tax loophole of which the big national banks can take advantage. It reestablishes the very situation which we are attempting to correct. I do not think the House wants to do that. I think the House wants to treat all banks alike and all banks fairly under the law in matters of taxation. That is what I understand the committee bill does and I know it is what the Florida delegation supports.

Mr. CHAPPELL. I thank my colleague from Florida (Mr. SIKES). I point out that 36 States in the Nation, through their principal banking officials, have requested this legislation. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that I voted this committee bill out of committee. I want to state that at no time were there any public hearings held on this bill, and we had only one executive session.

The purpose of H.R. 7491, which we have before us here today, and the purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan are one and the same purpose.

I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Florida that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN) accomplishes exactly what the Florida delegation wants and does it much more clearly and concisely than does the bill H.R. 7491.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN), was never offered before the committee. This is an entirely new amendment. This amendment was never offered to the committee.

We have also heard today time and again that the simplicity of H.R. 7491 is something that makes it highly desirable. The fact is that the simplicity of H.R. 7491 carries with it the very danger we are trying to avoid—the danger of mass confusion.

We are not trying to help the big banks but simply trying to treat the State banks and the national banks the same, so that everybody is treated fairly.

The Judiciary Committee has agonized over the years about the whole problem of interstate taxation, and as of this date no comprehensive legislation has been enacted on this subject relative to banks.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I will yield when I have finished.

What I want to say is this: We hear a lot of talk here today about the State in which the principal office is located. Both the bill and the amendment carry the identical language. Let me read the bill to Members:

> For the purposes of any tax law enacted under authority of the United States or any State, a national bank shall be deemed to be a bank organized and existing under the laws of the State or other jurisdiction within which its principal office is located.

The language in the amendment is virtually identical and it says:

> The national bank shall be taxed to the same extent as such taxes are imposed upon a State-chartered bank having its principal office within such State.

So we do not have to worry about the "principal office" condition. Both the bill and the amendment carry precisely the same language.

Here is another thing that has not been mentioned here today. The bill, H.R. 7491, as reported, repeals entirely section 5219 of the Revised Statutes, which was originally enacted in 1864 and last revised in 1926. This section in its present form spells out in detail the methods of State taxation of national banks and has stood the test of time. Now, because of a relatively new problem involving some new taxes, H.R. 7491 wipes out this entire section of the statute. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN) simply revises it to meet the necessities of present-day conditions.

So I urge the passage of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have a copy of the transcript of the proceedings, by the Official Reporter, which has a rollcall, which has each Member's name and how he voted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman directing his comments to the fact that I said this amendment was not introduced in the committee?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman said it was not voted upon in the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman please to read the amendment that was voted upon in the committee.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman possibly changes it a little bit.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, if he changes it a little bit, I am saying these are important changes.

Mr. PATMAN. He did not change it substantially.

Mr. WILLIAMS. When I say to this House the amendment as it is offered today was never offered in the committee, it never was offered in the committee.

Mr. PATMAN. But this amendment was before the committee and it was defeated by a rollcall vote of 16 to 6.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not talking about any improvements which have been made on anything. I simply made the true and correct statement that this amendment was never offered to the committee.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and Members, I take this time to pose some questions to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS), and I ask the gentleman to give me his attention.

As I understand the drafting of the bill before us, it will substitute its language for the present language of section 5219, is that correct?

Mr. REUSS. That is correct.

Mr. HANNA. Under the presently existing language of section 5219 banks could be taxed only by the State of their domicile; is this correct?

Mr. REUSS. It is pretty close. There were some exceptions, but that is pretty close.

Mr. HANNA. One of the major differences, then, which this bill will provide is that it will introduce the possibility of interstate taxation on banks to the extent that the States could now and in the future impose taxes upon the operations of banks in other States doing business in their States.

Mr. REUSS. It would treat, extrastate, national, and State banks identically.

Mr. HANNA. In the present law section 5219 limits the taxation of national banks to a selection of methods. The language which is now proposed would put no limitation on the methods of taxation so long as those were the methods by which State banks were also taxed; is that correct?

Mr. REUSS. That is correct; and subject, of course, to the limitation upon State and National banks doing business in another State alike, of compliance by the State tax statutes with the interstate commerce clause.

Mr. HANNA. Yes.

The language of section 5219 as it now reads provides that there can be no nonuniform taxes imposed. Is it the intention of the committee, and do I have your assurance, that with the passage of this bill the national banks would be protected against nonuniform taxation?

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman has that absolute assurance from the entire committee. It would probably be unconstitutional, but that question aside, we have in mind no extra burden on national banks taxwise over that imposed on State banks.

Mr. HANNA. At the present time there is a provision in the law that discriminatory tax rates are prohibited. Do I have the assurance of the committee, and can we have that assurance to the House, that the bill we have before us today will not allow for any discriminatory taxes to be applied to national banks?

Mr. REUSS. Yes.

Mr. HANNA. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

I would merely say to the Members of the House that at the present time I am not really jubilant about the language of the present bill because I was not so deeply assured at the time we passed this that we had our hands on all the handles which might ultimately develop because of passage of this bill, and particularly in the interstate taxation field.

On the other hand, I do not feel that the Brown of Michigan amendment really provides the base upon which we can move toward uniformity, which I think should be available so that the State banks do have an opportunity to stay at the operational level as strong competitors to the national banks.

On the other hand, I would not like to see by the action we take here something simply to reverse, to give a benefit to the State banks that would work against the national banks.

If we are striking for parity, then let us have a record on the floor of the House

XUM

to indicate we want to go no further than equity, parity, nondiscrimination, and uniformity. If that is what the committee strongly will move as the expression of the House, then perhaps we can be safe in moving with something. We have been moving on rather thin ice, because we did not have a great deal of discussion or a great deal of testimony upon which to predicate this important decision.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANNA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Do I correctly understand the response the gentleman received from the gentleman from Wisconsin that he has committed the State legislatures against the passage of any discriminatory taxes?

Mr. HANNA. He has indicated, in his judgment, that in this bill and in the existing supporting constitutional provisions no State legislature would be in a position to legally pass such a law.

Is that the gentleman's intent?

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is a statement of my intent. We are granting by this bill to the State legislatures certain powers. The legislative history here this afternoon makes clear that the place where those powers to tax stop is at the precise point where they would depart from the rule of complete equality between State and National banks.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make the unanimous-consent request that we have 15 minutes to close debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the debate close in 20 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Is this on the amendment and all amendments thereto or is it on the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. On the amendment and amendments thereto.

Mr. GROSS. Is this on the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. No; it would not be on the bill, but on the Brown amendment and all amendments thereto.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL).

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, I think anyone who feels that the bill and the amendment are similar in nature merely because of the fact that the language is similar would be utterly mistaken. There is no question that Mr. BROWN's amendment will prevent equality between State and National banks while the bill itself seeks to cause such equality.

Under the amendment anyone who organizes a national bank would not do so in that particular State where there is a high sales tax or where the taxes are higher in a State that has lower sales taxes. This would create inequality immediately in certain States. For example, in the State of New York almost every bank sought Federal charter. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN) asked whether I could think of one tax that each State would lose as a result of the passage of his amendment. I know of one. There is a franchise fee paid to every State by a State-chartered institution. The State of New York lost $400,000 in franchise fees.

Point 2, for those gentlemen who are interested in preserving States rights, we have a situation where bank examinations are conducted on national banks by national bank examiners. Bank examinations of State-chartered institutions are conducted by State examiners. We have 47 individuals who were fired from their jobs in the State of New York last year because of transfers from State to Federal charter.

Insofar as discriminatory use taxes are concerned that argument is not tenable because we all know any such tax introduced by any particular State must be declared unconstitutional on an action brought for the same.

These are the major differences. The Brown amendment will frustrate completely the intent of the bill before the House, and therefore I urge the defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA).

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee substitute because I feel as though we do need to treat our national banks as equally as we do our State banks.

As has been pointed out the State of Florida stands to lose some $20 million in the coming year in revenue. I particularly feel that we should not have any loopholes so that large national banks will have an advantage over State banks. Likewise, I feel that we should not permit State banks to have any advantage over national banks. I feel that this amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN) would give the large national banks an advantage over State banks. Therefore, I support the committee substitute and hope that the House will support this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MYERS).

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, all of us, of course, agree that there must be equity in taxation. I have some question, however, as to whether this bill is designed to provide for tax revenues or to provide for regulation.

Under section 5219, there is provision made to the effect that a State may impose a basic tax in a number of four ways. In Indiana we have an income tax, an income tax that is called a gross income tax. We now have this income tax placed against State banks, but we do not have it against national banks because they pay intangible taxes while State banks pay both.

I, therefore, pose this question. Must the State of Indiana continue then, under the same plan or does this allow them to collect both from the federally chartered national banks?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

My MYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I might point out to the gentleman that the situation which exists in Indiana is exactly the same as that which existed in the State of Michigan where the banks pay intangible taxes. Tax measures adopted by the State attempted to effect an equalization of taxes which are paid by the State and national banks. I think that is the situation in Indiana, unless the gentleman has at hand information on the operations in the State of Indiana as contrasted with those in Michigan. In other words, the situation in Michigan is multiplied many times throughout this country. The situation would remain the same in Indiana as it exists today. My amendment, if adopted, would add a paragraph listing five more taxes which States may impose upon national banks which it does not now impose. If counterbalancing measures have been adopted by States, they may need to be repealed.

Mr. MYERS. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) made the statement that this would give an unfair advantage to the State banks over the national banks, or the national banks over the State banks. I see the same language in both.

In what way does the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN) change this language, when both provide for exactly the same thing?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, when this bill first came before the committee as introduced by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) on February 24 it stated as follows:

> A national bank has no immunity from any sales tax, use tax, or personal property tax which it would be required to pay if it were a bank chartered under the laws of the State or other jurisdiction within which its principal office is located.

That is the very language we are trying to accomplish so that national banks would have to pay those taxes as a result of the Florida decision. Then, all of a sudden, came this amendment onto the floor of the Banking and Currency Committee which destroys the language of the original Patman bill as follows:

> For the purpose of any tax law enacted under authority of the United States or any State, a national bank shall be deemed to be a bank organized and existing under the laws of the State or the jurisdiction within which its principal office is located.

I want to tell you that when we adopted that amendment we opened up a can of worms insofar as taxation of banks is concerned. Banks should not be treated separately but they should be equalized because of the sensitive nature of taxing a national instrumentality.

In Pennsylvania we tax banks shares. Why? Because it is a tax on individuals. It is not a tax on the bank. Here we are now saying that national banks for taxation purposes are State banks. I say that this is going to go to the courts, and this could well be stricken down, because what we are saying, actually, is that the national bank is something that exists under State law, the law of the State in which its principal offices are located.

That brings up the charter, the bylaws, everything the bank has ever done, brings it into play and makes it amenable to the laws of that particular State.

Mr. Chairman, I say that we are doing a dangerous thing that we cannot well regulate. I would take the language of the Treasury Department. Here is what the bill should say, according to them, and this was on May 22, before June 9, when we adopted the amendment to this bill.

The Treasury Department said this:

> In addition to the other methods of taxation permitted herein, a State or political subdivision thereof may impose sales and use taxes on a national bank having its principal office within such State in the same manner and to the same extent as such taxes are imposed upon a State-chartered bank having its principal office within such State.

It does not say that a bank should be deemed to be organized and existing under the laws of any particular State; it says you have to pay the same use taxes and other taxes as the State bank.

I say that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN) answers the problem—and takes care of Florida, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN).

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DEL CLAWSON).

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise only to make two points rather clear.

First, it would not be my intention to discriminate within the dual banking system between national banks over State banks, nor do I find any place in the Brown amendment where that discrimination is possible.

Mr. Chairman, both the State of Florida and the State of California are importers of money, and we need outside money in order to support our economies, and if we do not adopt the Brown amendment we could very easily find some of these sources of funds from outside of the States drying up by reason of multiple State taxation, as already has been indicated is possible under the committee amendment without the Brown amendment.

Also, there has been rumored throughout the committee the statement that branches of national banks in other States would receive the same taxation as State-chartered institutions. It is impossible under existing banking law for a national bank to have branches in other States. They might have loan production offices, but they do not have branches. Of course, this is also impossible with State-chartered banks. That discussion should be removed from the debate. Branches are not permitted outside the boundaries of a State where a bank is chartered, whether national or State chartered.

I rise to make these two points clear, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I think in conclusion we can summarize the argument very quickly.

With respect to all matters other than interstate taxation, that is, the taxation of activities within and by the States, there will be the same result under the amendment I have offered as there would be under the committee bill with respect to all taxes of which we have knowledge, at least, 99 percent of them; and by adoption of my amendment we are legislating in areas in which we know what we are doing, and what the problems are.

I do not believe that this House at this time wants to solve the interstate taxation problem of the banks, which the Committee on the Judiciary decided it could not do, and on which the Committee on Banking and Currency held no hearings. Even in the committee report, if you read it, it is said that we are not touching the problem of multistate taxation. That issue is not before the committee. I believe that is almost a direct quote from the report.

That is why I say that we ought to take care of those situations regarding taxes that have recently developed. The multistate taxation problem cannot be resolved in the short time that the Committee on Banking and Currency considered this legislation, and we certainly cannot do it here on the floor of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) is recognized to close debate.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN) a question.

Suppose a State bank which is chartered in New York is doing business in Michigan. If your amendment became law, could this bank that is chartered in New York State, a State bank doing business in Michigan, a loan production office or otherwise—could the State of Michigan tax that business?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. The State of Michigan? Is the gentleman talking of the situation under your language or mine?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I am talking about yours.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. If the situs of the tax is in Michigan, under your language it could be taxed.

Mr. PATMAN. No; I did not ask you that. Just give me a categorical reply.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I cannot answer a question that is confused as to the facts.

Mr. PATMAN. No; it is not confused. It is your amendment that is confused.

This is a State bank that is doing business in Michigan. It is chartered in New York. Could the State of Michigan—could the legislature tax that business in the State of Michigan?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. They could? All right. Now suppose it is a national bank and this national bank is doing business in Michigan—could the Michigan Legislature tax the business of the national bank?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Probably not. Although the State of Michigan could get a proportion of the income tax, in fact, I think it presently does.

Mr. PATMAN. I know—you said "probably." Under the same circumstances a State bank—you see dealing with a State bank—you said they could tax a State bank and I think you are right.

Now then the national bank cannot be taxed. You cannot say that they can be taxed under your amendment in Michigan because the amendment says you can only tax them in the States of their principal office.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Will not the chairman acknowledge, assuming the the same situation, that both the State of Michigan and the State of New York could tax the same subject of taxation?

Mr. PATMAN. No; the State of Michigan could not.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Under your language?

Mr. PATMAN. No, no.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Then you do not understand your own language.

Mr. PATMAN. I am talking about your amendment. Suppose the gentleman's amendment becomes law, can a State bank chartered in New York and doing business in Michigan be taxed in Michigan? You said "Yes." You said "Right." But then when I asked you if it was a national bank domiciled in New York doing business under the same circumstances in Michigan, could you tax them and you do not reply. What is your answer to that?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. My answer is that they can—taking your language.

XUM

Mr. PATMAN. No; I am not talking about my language.

Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further to the gentleman. I have just asked the gentleman very plainly about your language, if that is adopted, and you are changing the subject entirely.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. No; I am not changing it.

Mr. PATMAN. The proof of it is that you put the State banks out of business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN) to the committee amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BROWN of Michigan and Mr. PATMAN.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 65, noes 66.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

GOLF COURSE FOR INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we heard a good deal this afternoon about first- and second-class citizens. Earlier this afternoon an interesting little item came to my attention. I would not mention it at this time except that the Banking and Currency Committee is present in full force, and, being the astute committee it is, and having the astute chairman that it has, perhaps the chairman can supply me with some facts that up to this point I have not yet been able to obtain. It is sometimes rather difficult to get certain information from the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

I understand that the International Monetary Fund has a brand new golf course and country club along the banks of the Potomac in nearby Maryland; that this outfit, heavily financed with U.S. dollars, has bought 282 acres of land along the river at a cost of $1,127,000 to provide for the golf course, swimming pools, a soccer field, tennis courts, and I do not know what else. Is the committee aware of the way the funds of the International Monetary Fund, and perhaps of the World Bank, are being spent? I would ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas, if he can give the House a little information on this subject.

Mr. PATMAN. The International Monetary Fund is an international organization. The Banking and Currency Committee of the House does not have membership in the organization.

Mr. GROSS. You say you do not have membership in this country club?

Mr. PATMAN. We do not have. I do not know a member of the committee who has. I do not suppose that membership would be illegal or anything like that. But the international organizations—and there are plenty of them operating in Washington—are always looking for investments that will accommodate their members and also be lucrative investments. I would consider that that would be a pretty good investment here in Washington, D.C. I do not know anything about what the gentleman has said on the subject. I have not heard anything about which you could criticize any Member of the House or the Government.

Mr. GROSS. I am not criticizing any Member of this House. I am looking for information.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not have the information.

Mr. GROSS. I thought I might get some help from the gentleman. It seems that membership is limited to officials and employees of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Can the gentleman help me on that?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has already indicated more knowledge than I have on this subject. I assume he is going into it rather fully, and he will give us all the facts. I will appreciate them.

Mr. GROSS. I have only a few notes on it. I was hoping the gentleman, whose committee supplies funds for both the International Monetary Fund and World Bank, and who only a few months ago pushed a bill through the House to give the World Bank another $460 million, would be able to tell us how much of the money the House has so freely approved, went into this plush country club on the banks of the Potomac.

Mr. PATMAN. No one has accused the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund of misapplying any funds.

The gentleman is not even accusing them of doing anything wrong.

Mr. GROSS. But I would think the gentleman would want to find out whose money is being used. Incidentally, it is appropriately named the Bretton Woods Recreation Center. Bretton Woods, as many will remember, was the hatchery for many of the international schemes that haunt this country.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I can perhaps enlighten him on this.

Not one penny of the money the Congress recently appropriated for the World Bank institutions is in the golf course.

I do not know the reasons behind their setting up the golf course. No doubt the World Bank, being in this country and noticing the hundreds of golf courses at bases throughout the country, thought it would be a good idea. But in any event, let the gentleman ask Secretary Kennedy to ask the Governor of the World Bank to find out the answer.

Mr. GROSS. I do not have to ask the question of whether the $43,000 annual salary of Robert Strange McNamara, now President of the World Bank, is tax exempt. It is, and it is my further information that this country club setup, located in nearby Montgomery County, Md., is also tax exempt.

I intend to go into this matter as thoroughly as possible, for I certainly want to know how much more foreign handout money is being used elsewhere for the construction of pleasure resorts for the downtrodden of the international financing fraternity.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair (Mr. ICHORD) Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7491) to clarify the liability of national banks for certain taxes, pursuant to House Resolution 476, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MICHIGAN

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BROWN of Michigan moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7491 to the Committee on Banking and Currency with instructions to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: Strike all of the Committee amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following as a substitute:

"SECTION 1. AMENDMENT OF SECTION 5219 OF THE REVISED STATUTES.

"(a) Section 5219 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 548) is amended by adding at the end thereof a subparagraph 5 to read as follows:

"'5. In addition to the other methods of taxation permitted herein, a State (including the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) or political subdivision thereof may impose on a National bank having its principal office within such State in the same manner and to the same extent as such taxes are imposed upon a State chartered bank having its principal office within such State, sales and use taxes, tangible personal property taxes, intangible personal property taxes, documentary stamp taxes, and license, registration, transfer, execise or other fees or taxes imposed on the ownership, use or transfer of motor vehicles: Provided, however, that the taxes imposed under the provisions of this Section 5219 shall not effect a greater total tax liability for a National bank than for a State bank similarly situated.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) becomes effective on the first day of the first calendar year which begins after the date of enactment."

Mr. BROWN of Michigan (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the motion to recommit be dispensed with and that it be printed in the Record.

Mr. Speaker, it is the amendment I offered in the Committee of the Whole, and it is the subject of my motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I want to make sure that this is the identical amendment which was considered in the Committee and discussed this afternoon and voted on by tellers.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. It is, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 123, nays 227, answered "present" 7, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

YEAS—123

Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ayres
Belcher
Bell, Calif.
Biester
Bow
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clawson, Del
Collier
Collins
Colmer
Conable
Corbett
Cunningham
Davis, Wis.
Denney
Dennis
Derwinski
Dickinson
Dorn
Dowdy
Duncan
Eshleman
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Ford, Gerald R.
Foreman
Fulton, Pa.
Goldwater
Goodling
Griffin
Grover
Gubser
Hall
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Hastings
Horton
Hunt
Hutchinson
Johnson, Pa.
King
Kuykendall
Kyl
Langen
Lloyd
Lukens
McClory
McCloskey
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
MacGregor
Mailliard
Martin
May
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Minshall
Mize
Mizell
Montgomery
Morton
Mosher
Myers
Nelsen
O'Konski
Pettis
Price, Tex.
Quie
Railsback
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rhodes
Riegle
Robison
Roth
Roudebush
Ruth
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Sebelius
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Utt
Vander Jagt
Whalley
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Winn
Wold
Wyatt
Wyman
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—227

Adams
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Annunzio
Ashbrook
Ashley
Barrett
Beall, Md.
Bennett
Bevill
Biaggi
Bingham
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brinkley
Broyhill, N.C.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Caffery
Carter
Casey
Celler
Chappell
Chisholm
Clark
Clay
Conyers
Corman
Coughlin
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Daddario
Daniel, Va.
de la Garza
Dellenback
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Frey
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Garmatz
Gaydos
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Gude
Hagan
Haley
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hathaway
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Hogan
Holifield
Howard
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Tenn.
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kluczynski
Koch
Kyros
Landgrebe
Landrum
Leggett
Lennon
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
Lujan
McCarthy
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
Madden
Mahon
Mann
Marsh
Mathias
Matsunaga
Meeds
Melcher
Meskill
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Mink
Mollohan
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nichols
Obey
O'Hara
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Podell
Poff
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Rarick
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rivers
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Satterfield
Scherle
Scott
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Springer
Staggers
Stanton
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Taft
Taylor
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Watts
Weicker
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Wilson, Charles H.
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7

Cleveland
Evins, Tenn.
Hull
Kleppe
Pelly
Quillen
Wydler

NOT VOTING—75

Abbitt
Addabbo
Albert
Aspinall
Baring
Berry
Betts
Blanton
Brasco
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Burton, Utah
Button
Cahill
Carey
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Cohelan
Conte
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Devine
Diggs
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Esch
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Gettys
Halpern
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey
Hawkins
Hosmer
Hungate
Jacobs
Joelson
Jonas
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Kirwan
Latta
Lipscomb
McKneally
Mayne
Nix
Ottinger
Pollock
Powell
Purcell
Ronan
Ruppe
Schadeberg
Scheuer
Slack
Stafford
Steed
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Tiernan
Tunney
Watkins
Watson
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wright
Young

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. McKneally.
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Abbott with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Mayne.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Schadeberg.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Button.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Gallagher with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Young with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Stafford.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Joelson.
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Powell.

Mr. GAYDOS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GOODLING changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. HULL changed his vote from "nay" to "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 344, nays 4, answered "present" 7, not voting 77, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—344

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Albert
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Beall, Md.
Belcher
Bell, Calif.
Bennett
Bevill
Biaggi
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brinkley
Brock
Broomfield
Brotzman
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Calif.
Bush
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Caffery
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clark
Clawson, Del
Clay

XUM

Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Coughlin
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniel, Va.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Dellenback
Denney
Dennis
Derwinski
Dickinson
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Foreman
Fountain
Frey
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Garmatz
Gaydos
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Gubser
Gude
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hastings
Hathaway
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Hogan
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
King
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Landgrebe
Landrum
Langen
Leggett
Lennon
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
Lujan
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McCloskey
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Mann
Marsh
Martin
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Melcher
Meskill
Michel
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mizell
Mollohan
Monagan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Obey
O'Hara
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Podell
Poff
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Quie
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roybal
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Springer
Staggers
Stanton
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Watts
Weicker
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wold
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—4

Brown, Mich.
Collins
Mize
Sebelius

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7

Camp
Cleveland
Evins, Tenn.
Hull
Kleppe
Pelly
Quillen

NOT VOTING—77

Abbitt
Addabbo
Ashley
Aspinall
Berry
Betts
Blanton
Brasco
Bray
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Burton, Utah
Button
Cahill
Carey
Chisholm
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Cohelan
Conte
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Devine
Diggs
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Esch
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Gettys
Grover
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey
Hawkins
Hungate
Jacobs
Joelson
Jonas
Jones, N.C.
Kirwan
Latta
Lipscomb
McKneally
Mayne
Nix
Ottinger
Pollock
Powell
Purcell
Ronan
Ruppe
Schadeberg
Scheuer
Slack
Stafford
Steed
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Tiernan
Tunney
Watkins
Watson
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wright
Young

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. McKneally.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Mayne.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Stafford.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Button.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Young with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Schadeberg.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Joelson.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Dawson.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Powell.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 11363 UNTIL MIDNIGHT SATURDAY, JULY 19

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until midnight Saturday, July 19, to file a report on H.R. 11363.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 12549

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until midnight Saturday, July 19, to file a supplemental report on H.R. 12549 to correct a printing error in that report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 99 on Tuesday, July 8, I am recorded as absent. I was away from the Capitol on official business and returned too late to be recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

ACQUISITION OF CONTROL OF AIR CARRIERS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8261) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 8261, with Mr. ICHORD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair at this time recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, as amended, was passed unanimously by both the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics and by the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It does not involve any additional cost or increase of personnel on the part of the Federal Government.

Briefly, what it does is provide for review by the Civil Aeronautics Board where there is a possible acquisition of control of an air carrier by any person.

The Board now has power under the Federal Aviation Act to review air carrier control changes when such changes involve other air carriers, surface carriers or those engaging in some phase of aeronautics. As an example, if Pan American Airways were, through stock purchases, to seek control of Trans World Airlines, such action would require review by the CAB before a new control situation could be approved and legalized. However, if Sears, Roebuck were to make the same financial moves against Trans World through stock purchases, the Board would not presently have the power to review the acquisition of control. Simply put, the committee feels that the Board should have the same reviewing authority whether the changes in the transportation rights of a corporation are effected by the carrier or by a noncarrier.

Our air carriers are certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board. They are authorized to provide service in the public convenience and necessity. Under the statute, the carrier, before it receives this authority must establish that it is fit, willing and able to provide safe and adequate service, pursuant to its certificate, under honest and efficient management. The public has a continuing interest in this, and the CAB should be in the position to review changes in the control of an air carrier to ascertain whether or not the purpose for which the carrier was licensed; namely, to provide transportation, has been altered to the detriment of the public.

As I said to start off with, the bill was considered by the subcommittee and was voted out unanimously. All the different interests which appeared before the committee were in agreement that the bill should be passed. No one appeared in opposition to the bill.

I might say since the bill was agreed to by the committee, there has been some question and some objection to the retroactive provision setting the effective date of this action as March 7 of this year. I have told those who have objected to it that I would offer an amendment myself to say that the bill would become effective as of the date of enactment. There has been agreement on both sides about this, that this is all right.

There is some question on the part of those who feel perhaps different noncarrier groups ought to be able to buy into airlines, and we have no quarrel with this whatsoever. I would like to repeat that those who appeared, such as CAB, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Department of Transportation, and the Department of Justice all supported this—as does the Air Transport Association.

There is some objection to it from my friend, the gentleman from Colorado, who will be offering an amendment in a few minutes. We have tried to settle these difficulties ahead of time, and we have not, and I have agreed to yield the gentleman the time he needs to discuss this.

I think we ought to proceed with this bill and pass it.

I remember about 7 years ago, when there were over 90 servicemen killed in a plane accident, a plane that crashed near Richmond. Then there was a whole football team from the west coast eradicated when a plane went down in Ohio, and there were other plane accidents which caused many deaths across the Nation.

To clean up the irregular or no-scheduled carriers, I stood fast for almost 1 year against any compromise with the other body. There are men still in this House who remember that controversy.

I said then we should not have any group operating an airline in America that is not competent. I still believe that, and I do not believe someone should be able to come in, after a company has acquired know-how and knowledge of how to operate, and just acquire the airline. For that reason I believe this bill ought to be passed. I will not go further into the history of it. If there is any question, I will answer it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, in view of the last statement made by the gentleman, which he gave with such vehemence and I am sure with such conviction? Is this applicable to the nonscheduled airlines?

Mr. STAGGERS. The supplementals are certificated. All of them are. We have made them certificated.

Mr. HALL. I understand that the supplementals are now certificated.

Mr. STAGGERS. They are.

Mr. HALL. There are certain nonscheduled airlines, both domestic and overseas, to which this would not be applicable.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is right, at least domestically. I believe perhaps we will have to pass laws to put them under closer supervision.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, conglomerates are news. The gobbling up of many diversified. industries into one monster corporation is taking place constantly. Perhaps this is very good and perhaps it is very bad. There is not yet enough experience with the phenomenon to justify a decision either way. As this process goes forward, however, it is bound to touch and has touched some industries in which the public has a special interest. These are industries which are commonly referred to as the "regulated industries" and include those whose whole economic life and mode of operation are subject to Government scrutiny and regulation. Among these are such things as electric power, telephones, such things as electric power, telephones, securities, and all modes of transportation.

H.R. 8261 confines itself to the problem as it affects the air transportation industry. That does not mean that the others are less important or that they are adequately provided for. It does mean that the air industry in this particular regard is, for a while at least, to be the guinea pig.

For years it has been recognized that an air carrier should not acquire its competition in the field without some look at the effect upon the public. Consequently, the Federal Aviation Act gave authority to the Civil Aeronautics Board to pass upon transactions which would tend to reduce the number of air carriers and the consolidation of them. Acquisition of an air carrier by anyone else in the air business generally must be passed upon by the CAB. When that provision was put into the law, it seemed entirely adequate to protect the public interest against undue concentration of ownership in the industries related to air transportation. But today the problem itself has changed considerably. Concentrations of ownership, when they occur, tend to be the diversified kind which we call conglomerates for lack of a more accurate term.

The bill before us today would grant authority to the CAB to take a look at proposed takeovers of air carriers by people not in the air business at all. That is desirable. The whole broad question of what happens to a regulated industry when it is submerged into a conglomerate should be explored. It may hurt the public interest or it may help, but we must, at the very least, protect the means to determine the effect of such arrangements.

To do this H.R. 8261 sets out four elementary requirements:

First. One who acquires ownership of 5 percent of any class of the stock of an air carrier must make reports to the CAB annually on such holding. That gives the CAB some idea where to expect takeovers and also some information about people who may acquire large blocks of stock in several air carriers and who may, at the same time, be acquiring large blocks of stock in other enterprises, including other modes of transportation.

Second. When the holdings of an individual—or company—climb to 10 percent of the stock of an air carrier, it is presumed that he has control. It is recognized that control may be acquired with somewhat lesser percentages and that larger holdings do not really make control possible under some circumstances. Nevertheless, a guidepost of 10 percent seems reasonable and merely raises the flag for the Board to look closely at the deal.

Third. If in fact control does seem to be involved, the CAB must approve that acquisition. In the course of such a determination much can be learned about the effects of such a course of action

XUM

upon the operations of the air carrier. Also it would reveal much about the ways and means of such activities. Such information could be very valuable in other fields.

Fourth. Because the larger problem of conglomerate mergers is inherent in this one sector, and because the decisions required may synthesize the broader problem, the bill requires that the Attorney General be brought in as a routine matter on such proceedings.

So here we have one of the early efforts to ferret out the real consequences of conglomerate activity. The fact that it arises in the air carrier industry rather than railroads, trucks or some other regulated industry is greatly a matter of happenstance. Lightning just happened to strike there, and we are reacting to it. The other body has already announced that it will proceed to examine the same issues in other industries, and I think it safe to assume that we shall do likewise. For the time being I believe that this act will be a useful addition to the Aviation Act, and I recommend it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join with our distinguished chairman, and call attention to the fact that there really is a unanimous approach to this bill and in support of the bill in the committee. Even in the separate views the final sentence is:

> While we support the present legislation, we strongly urge a prompt, comprehensive examination of all facets of these complex problems before additional legislative action is taken in this area.

They do endorse the bill.

There is a feeling, of course, which was expressed earlier when the rule was adopted, regarding the retroactive feature. It is my understanding that the chairman has agreed to an amendment to take care of that.

I urge the adoption of the bill.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Rogers).

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill for the simple reason that it is a special interest bill. I direct attention to the hearings which were held, when for the first time this was called to the attention of the Congress, as indicated in questions presented by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Devine). On page 13 of the hearings he said:

> I am not sure that we are being completely frank here in these hearings. I have read in Forbe's magazine, I have read in some of the weekly news publications and in the Wall Street Journal and others that this whole thing is motivated by Mary Carter Paints or its successor, Resorts, Inc., is possibly connected with the Cosa Nostra or Mafia and this is clearly from rumor, allegedly tied up with some sinister organization, and that is why people are upset about the possible acquisition of x percentages or shares of stock in Pan American or something. I am wondering if we are trying to resolve a specific situation with general legislation that will affect the entire industry.

I point out that until the time the Chase Manhattan Bank disposed of some of the stock they owned, when they came close to getting some control of Pan American Airways, we did not hear anything about this legislation. Not only that, but if my information is correct, they went to the President of the United States, and he had some Members of this body come down, and in effect told them, "Do not let the management of Pan American be turned over to anybody else."

The result was the bill we have before us here today, which makes it absolutely necessary that before any individual, or 95 percent of the stockholders of any company, can run an airline it is incumbent upon them to go to the CAB and get permission to operate their own company.

I would refer you to section 408, which we are amending, under section 5. If you will take a look at the report, in part 3 it says:

> It shall be unlawful unless approved by order of the Board as provided in this section.

Now let us skip down to 5. According to the Ramseyer rule, the only amendment you are making is:

> For any air carrier or person controlling an air carrier, any other common carrier, or any person engaged in any other phase of aeronautics—

There is where we stop, and that is what the law was until you added these words—

> or any other person . . . Provided, That the Board may by order exempt any such acquisition of a noncertificated air carrier from this requirement.

This is the air carrier that the gentleman testified about. You permit the CAB to exempt them. However, under this, if I get control of 95 percent of Pan Am's stock and am elected to its board of directors, before any action can be taken, I must come and get approval of the CAB. That is No. 1.

No. 2 is that there is some question as to whether or not this does not give more authority to the CAB to grant immunity for violations of the antitrust laws. I think the chairman will agree and the members of the committee will agree that under section 414 persons affected by the CAB orders pursuant to section 408—and that is the section we are amending—are accorded inter alia immunity from antitrust laws.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Colorado 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. This is even if there is such expressed immunity. The Supreme Court has held such statutory regulation is to be narrowly construed. We have this situation here, and the Attorney General, when he appeared before the committee, pointed out that there was a serious problem as to whether or not this did not give more authority to the CAB.

The question arises in this manner: If the board were to authorize an acquisition or control of an airline on the grounds that it saw no harm in the acquisition, the acquiring company might contend that the antitrust laws could not be applied to any aspects of the transaction even though it would have substantial opportunity to render harmful effect on competition outside of air transportation. This creates a situation similar to this: Suppose you have a company controlled by an airline and in turn you have a hotel company that would acquire that airline. Then thereafter the hotel company and the airline together would acquire another company. The immunity granted to the airline at the time it acquired the company—does that immunity continue on until they can acquire other hotels and still be immune from the antitrust laws?

Now, I want to point out one thing further, and that is this. If you will take a look at the hearings and particularly at page 29, you will find there a list of the trucklines wherein more than 10 percent—mind you, this bill has a proposed limitation and it says that any time that anyone obtains 10-percent control of an airline or gets 10-percent interest therein, they have got to go to the Board.

Now, if you will take a look at page 8 of the report you will find that the following language appears:

> For the purposes of this section, any person owning beneficially 10 per centum or more of any class of the capital stock or capital of an air carrier shall be presumed to be in control of such air carrier unless the Board finds otherwise.

Now, directing your attention again to page 29 of the hearings one will find a list of the airlines and one will find that there are seven companies that have more than 10 percent.

Mr. Chairman, they say that this is not to be retroactive. Well, probably, one of the reasons it is not is because Braniff Airlines is owned by Ling-Temco-Vought—and incidentally, they are one of the conglomerates—and Northeast Airlines is owned by a broadcasting company, they own only 85 percent——

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, these questions were thoroughly considered by the Board and already have come under their control. There is no question about that.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. But suppose I bought 10 percent of the stock of this company and then I got enough stockholders together to oust the board of directors, can I take over the company without the approval of the CAB? That is my contention.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, all we are asking is that we feel the Board should take a look at all these matters. We want to see that protection is afforded in every way.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. But, in order for the Government to have this control, for instance, does the gentleman and I have the power to see that they live up to the certificate but still have to go and obtain the approval of the CAB? I say this because otherwise the bill would be absolutely meaningless.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has again expired.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

XUM

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I would like to ask the chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. Staggers), a question:

I understand that this bill is not intended to diminish the applicability of the antitrust laws. At present, a merger of two hotel chains is subject to the antitrust laws. If one hotel chain were to acquire an airline, and then another hotel chain were to acquire the first hotel chain, thereby acquiring, indirectly, control of an air carrier, this joinder of the two hotel chains would come before the CAB for approval under this bill. I take it that the intent of the bill is that the merger of hotel chains would still be subject to the antitrust laws, and the CAB approval of the transaction would not exempt the nontransportation lines of commerce from the antitrust laws?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Dingell) to answer that question, but I think the answer to it is already in the record, and it is in the committee report on pages 4 and 5.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would say that I had the same apprehension, and, as the chairman of the committee, the distinguished and able chairman and my good friend pointed out to me this morning, and as I feel as a member of the subcommittee, I feel the answer to the question raised by the gentleman from Colorado is yes, the laws would still continue to apply, and——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to refer to one segment from the report—see page 4—questions were raised in the hearings governing the effect of this legislation on the antitrust laws. Some thought was given to amending the bill to define such effect, and the committee determined that this was neither necessary nor desirable, and that the intent of the bill as reported is that the antitrust laws are not affected by the amendment to the Federal Aviation Act in any manner. That is, the law now governing this subject would neither be strengthened nor weakened.

I would also like to say again, as my friend (Mr. Adams), from Washington, has pointed out to me, that section 1, the reporting requirement, applies to all. This should give the CAB the information that it needs.

I also want to say that the 10 percent was debated and this is an arbitrary yardstick—a measure—used only for presumptive purposes. Control may, or may not, exist above or below the 10-percent line.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, is further amended as follows:

Section 1. Section 407(b) (49 U.S.C. 1377 (b)) is amended by adding the following additional sentence: "Any person owning, beneficially or as trustee, more than 5 per centum of any class of the capital stock or capital, as the case may be, of an air carrier shall submit annually, and at such other times as the Board may require, a description of the shares of stock or other interest owned by such person, and the amount thereof."

Sec. 2. Section 408 (48 U.S.C. 1378) is amended by striking subsection 408(a)(5) in its entirety, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(5) For any air carrier or person controlling an air carrier, any other common carrier, or any person engaged in any other phase of aeronautics, or any other person, to acquire control of any air carrier in any manner whatsoever: *Provided,* That the Board may by order exempt any such acquisition of a noncertificated air carrier from this requirement to the extent and for such periods as may be in the public interest;".

Sec. 3. (a) Section 408 is further amended by deleting the first sentence of subsection 408(b) and substituting in lieu thereof the following: "Any person seeking approval of a consolidation, merger, purchase, lease, operating contract, or acquisition of control, specified in subsection (a) of this section, shall present an application to the Board, and thereupon the Board shall notify the persons involved in the consolidation, merger, purchase, lease, operating contract, or acquisition of control, other persons known to have a substantial interest in the proceeding, and the Attorney General of the time and place of a public hearing."

(b) Section 408 is further amended by inserting in the third proviso of subsection 408(b) after the words "determines that no person disclosing a substantial interest" the following: "or the Attorney General".

Sec. 4. (a) Section 408 is further amended by adding the following new subsection 408(f):

"Presumption of control

"(f) For the purposes of this section, any person owning beneficially 10 per centum or more of any class of the capital stock or capital of an air carrier shall be presumed to be in control of such air carrier unless the Board finds otherwise."

(b) That portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which appears under the heading "Sec. 408. Consolidation, merger, and acquisition of control." is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "(f) Presumption of control."

Sec. 5. The provisions of section 2 of this Act shall take effect on March 7, 1969; and the other sections shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. STAGGERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute committee amendment be considered as read, printed in the Record, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Staggers: On page 5, strike all of lines 12 through 14 and insert in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 5. The provisions of this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act."

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out that all this amendment does is strike out the retroactive provision, and the bill will take effect as soon as the bill is enacted into law.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this record ought to be full as to what brought about this particular piece of legislation. Back in the first part of this year—and may I say the distinguished gentleman from Colorado only alluded to it a few moments ago, but did not tell the full story—in February of this year Resorts International, which started out as the Mary Carter Paint Co., became a conglomorate. Resorts International owns real estate in the Bahama Islands. A part of this was a gambling establishment or establishments. They decided to make a tender of an offer as a conglomorate to the stockholders of Pan-Am Airways.

Apparently, they have the financial backing to consummate this kind of a deal which it is my recollection involved between $1 billion and $1,200,000,000. This was no peanut affair.

Now why did Resorts International want to own or control Pan American Airways? In almost every country in the world to which Pan American Airways flies, gambling in one form or another is legalized, except in the United States. Many of the hotels all over the world have gambling establishments in them. This was a ready-made setup for Resorts International to have an international gambling establishment made for them. They were purchasing this already made. In some hotels that Pan American owns there are gambling establishments.

What better could an organization like Resorts International have than something already built into it that they were buying? You had the airplanes of Pan American Airways to carry all the people you wanted to, to the gambling tables all over the world.

Nothing could have been more perfectly set up for Resorts International than to purchase Pan American Airways.

This was immediately brought to our attention. The committee felt that we had a public responsibility to see that there was at least a fair hearing of a company that was regulated by an agency created by this Congress, which was the Civil Aeronautics Board.

There came immediately the question: Is it in the public interest for any company to take over unilaterally and without a hearing any company subject to regulation of an agency which we are supposed to be watching in the public interest?

Now may I say to my colleagues, you can talk about this all you want to but this was the fundamental question.

This bill is not as broad as I would have wanted it to be. If I could have written this bill, I would have prevented, in different language, a takeover of any company regulated by an agency of this Government including all seven of the

XUM

regulatory agencies instead of just one—the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Let me give you an example. Would it be in the interest, we will say, of someone to take over a transcontinental gasline from Texas to California or from Texas to the Northeast States without provision even for a hearing or without knowing what this company was going to do with the gasline after they got possession of it or without knowing whether it is going to be in the public interest or not, or whether this is the kind of company that ought to be able to administer and run such a company?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McCORMACK).

Mr. McCORMACK. Without knowing in some cases where some of the money might be coming from.

Mr. SPRINGER. The Speaker has touched on a very sensitive but a very important matter here—that is, without the public being aware, the people being served, of what the source of income was which is purchasing the company that is regulated. That certainly is a point that was raised in this case because we had the feeling after we got into this thing, and I think there would be some rather substantial evidence, that there was a lot of gambling money that came as the result of gambling in the Bahamas that was going into the purchase of Pan American Airways.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I direct this question to the attention of the committee. After the Chase Manhattan had disposed of some of this stock, was it called to the attention of the committee?

Now has there been any investigation as to who got that stock and the terms and conditions under which it was purchased?

Mr. SPRINGER. You are talking about stock of what company?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Of Pan Am. I made the accusation that this was a special bill for the benefit of Pan Am in order to keep the management in control and not let the stockholders run it. I started out by making the statement that Pan Am directed it to the attention of this committee because Chase Manhattan had disposed of the stock and Pan Am and its officers became apprehensive that they would lose control of their company.

Now, this company you talk about does not fly within the United States. It has no certificate to do business within the United States. What it does is international business. If that is the case, why should we permit, as we now permit, Pan Am and all other carriers to enter into agreements with all other international carriers as to rates and things of that nature? You want to protect them further by saying that he who might get control of the company through ownership of the stock of Pan Am cannot run it until such time as they go down here and convince the CAB. Is that not what this amounts to?

Mr. SPRINGER. No, it is not. I do not understand what the gentleman has said at all. If he is asking about Chase Manhattan, I say that nobody has spoken to me about Chase Manhattan. I know nothing about Chase Manhattan. That was not the purpose of it. Chase Manhattan was never mentioned. Chase Manhattan was never mentioned in my presence, and I was present in several of the conferences that took place with the chairman and several other Members of this body with reference to it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Where did you first start the conferences in connection with it? Was it a call from the White House?

Mr. SPRINGER. No, not that I know of. I will say that we did meet in the Speaker's office and, may I say, the Speaker was there, the minority leader was there, the chairman was there, and I was there. It was related to me, as I saw it, that this is exactly what was going to happen unless some action was taken, and it was only because the chairman announced that we would start hearings—and that is all in the world we said we were going to do was to start hearings to find out what the facts were—and upon the announcement of the chairman that those hearings were going to take place, the resort to international was withdrawn.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I take it from what you have said that nobody ever said to you that Chase Manhattan disposed of this stock and that the disposal of the stock came before the meeting in the Speaker's office? You never knew that?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not know that that is a fact. If it is a fact, and you say it is, I do not know that. Nobody has informed me of that and, so far as I know, our hearings do not bear it out.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If you will call Chase Manhattan, they will verify it.

Mr. SPRINGER. I know nothing about the facts or the reason it was done. What I am trying to state here is what we are trying to accomplish by this legislation. This does not apply necessarily to Pan Am. It applies to any carrier, domestic or international.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman from Illinois took the well of the House to acquaint us with his view as to what this legislation is all about. I was particularly glad when he said were he to have his way this proposed legislation would be applicable to all regulated industries and carriers.

For many months, in fact for years, I have been concerned with the growth of the conglomerate phenomenon, and early in this year, prior to the Ways and Means Committee getting interested and prior to the Banking and Currency Committee getting involved, I filed legislation with the Commerce Committee asking for a study of the conglomerate phenomenon as it pertained to regulated carriers.

I would have filed more general legislation going to the Committee on Banking and Currency or Ways and Means, but I felt that insofar as the Commerce Committee jurisdiction was concerned, we had a primary responsibility because of our legislative oversight of the activities of the various regulatory bodies, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the CAB, and others who have jurisdiction in these particular fields.

I regret the hearings have not been held on this whole question. I am glad this is being aired today, that we may be reminded of our responsibility.

We cannot be against business just because it is big, because bigness can be in the public interest, but when that big business is organized in a way that does not contribute to the regulated industry within the jurisdiction of an independent agency of this Congress, we are being lax in our duties.

I would hope and trust that we would take the words that have been expressed by the gentleman from Illinois to heart, those of us on the Commerce Committee in particular, and move forward to build on this legislation before us, because we have a real opportunity to contribute to a much more viable transportation system and communications network, as well as to safeguard many other aspects of our economy.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, at the time I first knew of this and at the time I talked with other Members of this committee and Members of this House with reference to the conglomerate situation, I said there were many conglomerates that I assumed were doing a good job, and some that were desirable, but what we were saying to them was simply this. We believe there are some conglomerates we have some serious doubts about, and this always happens in any industry or business.

What we tried to get was an explanation out in the open as to what a conglomerate does, and to get out in the open those conglomerates that were bad. If they were operating illegally we wanted to know about it. But this is not against the great majority of the conglomerates that are doing legitimate business in a good fashion. But the people want to know the extent of the conglomerates that are doing business, and we think this ought to be on the table.

I wanted to redefine it as to what we were interested in, and especially the regulatory agencies ought to have notice when conglomerates attempt to take over regulated industries.

Mr. KEITH. This has been described as being class legislation. This is not class legislation. It is legislation in the public interest. Legislation dealing with size alone would be class legislation, but this is dealing with the broad regulatory problem.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, when did the gentleman learn the stock was disposed of by Chase Manhattan Bank of the Pan Am stock?

Mr. KEITH. I brought the overall problem to the attention of the committee in January of this year, with the introduction of House Joint Resolution 315, long before the legislation before us today was filed.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Does the gentleman know the amount of stock sold by Chase Manhattan?

Mr. KEITH. I do not know.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. But the problem is created by virtue of the fact that Chase Manhattan disposed of the Pan Am stock, which would threaten the ownership or management of Pan Am, and when that happened, this bill started on its way, so that is why I am asking the gentleman, when did the gentleman hear anything in the hearings about the Pan Am sale?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

(On request of Mr. GROSS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KEITH was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER) said, we do not think these points are relevant in this legislation. The issue is that the Congress has created certain independent agencies which set guidelines for regulated industries to insure that they operate in the public interest; Pan Am happens to fall within the jurisdiction of these regulatory bodies. So do many other corporations.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield further, was there any other company discussed in the hearings except Pan Am?

Mr. KEITH. I am not a member of the Transportation Subcommittee and accordingly did not attend the hearings.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. No reference is made to the other seven companies that had more than 10 percent?

Mr. KEITH. I think the chairman made the point, that those companies to which the gentleman referred did have to receive approval by the regulatory agencies prior to that stock being disposed of.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is because the stockholders elect the board of directors. This bill would prohibit the stockholders from electing a board of directors and taking over management without the approval of the CAB.

Mr. KEITH. These stockholders bought into this regulated company knowing it to be regulated as such and expected it to be regulated in the public interest as long as they were stockholders.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. This bill was reported unanimously by the subcommittee and unanimously by the full committee. The gentleman from Colorado has indicated a very good reason why we were unanimous.

In fact, here we have a regulated industry. The question is, Do we want gamblers moving in on a regulated industry? The answer is "No."

The question is, Do we want people going in on regulated industries who are going to have interests other than the interests of providing the kinds of service the regulated industry is going to provide? The answer is "No."

Then the question is, How do we devolve a mechanism for preventing these kinds of circumstances from taking place? The answer is very simple. We have given the regulatory agency concerned a specific statutory direction to direct itself to this point and to see to it that these regulated industries not only function in the public interest but also that they are manned by boards of directors and by control which will assure that fact.

That is the reason this bill is before us today.

There was not a member of the subcommittee or of the full committee who did not want to go more broadly than this. The answer is that the jurisdiction of the subcommittee was involved in the handling of this matter, and it was limited to its jurisdiction.

The gentleman from Colorado ought to know something else which is quite important to this body. We have inquired with great care of the CAB to find out what the policy was. The CAB said it had no policy whatsoever. The subcommittee now gives them the policy which is enunciated in the public interest.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado, if I have time remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The answer to the gentleman from Michigan is very simple. There was nobody here willing to admit they ever heard of the sale of the Pan American stock by Chase Manhattan.

As I make the allegation, it is only since that sale was perfected that they moved with dispatch and speed to move in to protect the now management.

There is another thing. Does the gentleman from Michigan or any member of this committee want to deny that the stockholders of the company have the right to elect the board of directors and to run the company?

Mr. DINGELL. Does the gentleman want an answer from me?

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I should like to yield to the gentleman from Maryland to answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF COLORADO

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On page 4, line 3, after "aeronautics," strike out "or any other person."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, this is one of those simple little amendments. If it is passed it will completely annihilate the bill. I want to be frank about it.

We read in section 5, that is the law at the present time, so at the present time we prohibit air carriers or persons controlling an air carrier, or any other common carrier, or any other person engaged in any other phase of aeronautics, from going to the CAB and asking permission to take over the company. Now, that is those who are engaged in this kind of business and those who may have a certificate either from the ICC or the CAB.

Now you are expanding, and this is why special legislation is necessary. You are expanding this to include any other person. That means if I get 95 percent of the control of any airline and I elect a board of directors, before I can take over—and I am the other person now—before I can take over the management I must go down here and submit it to the CAB.

There is one other thing I should mention. This committee itself last year adopted a little piece of legislation giving to the SEC the right to demand of anyone having stock registered with them in excess of 10 percent—and the SEC under the law which we passed in the last session has this power—it gave the SEC the right to require and it will require any person who would like to take over to file their certificate of intention and thus divulge who the owners are.

If you are going to protect against gamblers, why do you not call on the SEC to perform its duty? When it performs its duty, if there is a bunch of gamblers there that are not protecting the interests of the certificate and are not giving any service, then they are exposed and the SEC can take action if it is wrong.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that my amendment should be adopted.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. I might point out to the gentleman from Colorado in answer to the gentleman's last statement that on page 7 I asked specific questions of the commissioner and the representatives of the SEC as to whether they could control this matter. Their answer is that they could not.

Your amendment, which I oppose—and you are correct on it that it would take the heart out of the bill—would kill this bill. The precise reason why this is in the bill is that the prior language was in order to control the so-called horizontal monopoly situation where one airline carrier buys out another. Therefore you should be able to have CAB approval of it before that is done. This bill does expand it to say "any person." This is to control the new type of merger, the

XUM

monopoly caused by the conglomerate merger where we have these things happen.

I listened to the gentleman with great interest and to his comments about the Chase Manhattan Bank. We have been involved with the Chase Manhattan in the prior Hughes merger, which was not mentioned in this one at all.

This bill came from your part of the country. It happened because of Western Airlines and Mr. Kenhonian and his group in Las Vegas coming in and buying Western Airlines. Prior to that you had Mr. Hughes buying West Air. You had control of some of the largest airlines in the West in Las Vegas.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I will be glad to yield in just a moment.

You had control of the major airlines going into the hands of people who have interests which are far different from that of operating an airline. We do not say that they cannot do it, but we are just saying that the regulatory agency of the United States that could originally say that you have been certificated or not certificated and you are qualified to run an airline or you are not qualified to run an airline should also be able to look at somebody who comes in and gets control by buying out stock rather than going in and applying for a certificate in the first instance.

Mr. Chairman, this is very, very compatible with the entire regulatory scheme that has been established in the United States. It is simply an effort to move in and use a new, highly sophisticated system of taking over control rather than buying the certificate. Therefore I oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado. I think I have also answered why the SEC Commissioner cannot control these activities.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado very briefly.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I direct the gentleman's attention to page 33 of the hearings where the Commissioner, Mr. Owens, accompanied by Mr. Loomis, General Counsel, of the Securities and Exchange Commission, stated:

> Our responsibilities with respect to takeover efforts were recently increased when Congress enacted Public Law 90–439, effective July 29, 1968.

Under that, if you want to get any information, the SEC under this public law has a right to demand it and if they want to get it and get it from the Western Airlines or anyone who might want to take it over, you could do it under this procedure. Furthermore, you are talking about the domestic lines when you talk about this. However, when you talk about Pan Am, that is an overseas operation. It has no domestic connection whatsoever.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. I want to say this, that the gentleman is not correct. The same is being considered for domestic lines in the United States, including cross-U.S. service.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. They do not now have a certificate, do they?

Mr. ADAMS. I cannot answer that question offhand but I will ask counsel for that information. I think they do now have it or at least they have applied for it. That is my information. Perhaps, they have received it.

On the second question which has been posed by the gentleman from Colorado, I asked this question of Mr. Loomis during the course of the hearings:

> In other words, who is going to bell the cat here? Is the SEC, the Department of Justice, or the individual regulatory agency?

Mr. Loomis replied:

> I would think insofar as regulated industries such as carriers and so forth are concerned, the agency which should have authority to determine whether a take-over should occur or should not occur would be the CAB or the ICC, rather than the SEC taking on a general responsibility to approve or disapprove take-overs.

In other words, that it should be done by the regulatory agencies and not by the SEC. He made it very clear that the SEC was not going to approve it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I want to point out that the gentleman from Colorado keeps making arguments to the bill while trying to gut it. Perhaps the best point he has raised is that Pan Am is an international carrier and they are certified and protected by the antitrust laws.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is right.

Mr. DINGELL. What I say and I think the House will endorse this viewpoint is this: That with reference to an agency of this kind subject to antitrust laws, that the management should be reviewed by some agency of our Government to see who they are and to see whether they have a standing under the antitrust laws. Further, to see whether that acquisition is in the public interest and whether the airline once so managed or taken over is going to operate in the public interest or in the interest of a good transportation policy. That is the crux of the whole thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. STAGGERS was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I hope this will end the debate on the bill. This amendment, if adopted, would completely defeat the purposes of the bill. The subcommittee held hearings for a long period of time and it came out of the committee unanimously. They heard all of these points both pro and con. We discussed it at some length before the full committee. It has the endorsement of the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Transportation, the Department of Justice and so forth. In other words, there was no opposition to it. In my opinion this represents strong evidence that there is a need for the bill.

I would like to say briefly to the gentleman from Colorado that this is not special legislation. I am sure no member of this committee would try to do that.

Mr. Chairman, this is good legislation and I support it wholeheartedly and ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ROGERS).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute committee amendment, as amended.

The substitute committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ICHORD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8261) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 474, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill (S. 1373) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes, a bill similar to H.R. 8261 just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have been advised by a colleague that the Senate bill does differ from the bill just passed, substantially so as far as the retroactive feature is concerned.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. KEITH, is correct. There is a difference in the bill. And accordingly I will offer an amendment to substitute the language of the House bill after the enacting clause.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1373

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

XUM

America in Congress assembled, That the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, be further amended as follows:

(1) Section 407(b) is amended by adding the following additional sentence: "Any person owning, beneficially or as trustee, more than 5 per centum of any class of the capital stock or capital, as the case may be, of an air carrier shall submit annually, and at such other times as the Board may require, a description of the shares of stock or other interest owned by such person, and the amount thereof."

(2) Section 408 is amended by striking subsection 408(a)(5) in its entirety, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(5) For any air carrier or person controlling an air carrier, any other common carrier, any person engaged in any other phase of aeronautics, or any other person to acquire control of any air carrier in any manner whatsoever: *Provided,* That the Board may by order exempt any acquisition from this requirement to the extent and for such periods as may be in the public interest;".

(3) Section 408(b) is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and adding a colon and by adding the following: "*Provided, further,* That in any case in which an order of approval is required hereunder only by reason of the requirements of section 408(a)(5), the Board may enter such order pursuant to such procedures as it by regulation may prescribe."

(4) Section 408 is further amended by adding the following new subsection 408(f):

"For the purposes of this section, any person owning beneficially 10 per centum or more of the voting securities or capital, as the case may be, of an air carrier shall be presumed to be in control of such air carrier unless the Board finds otherwise. As used herein, beneficial ownership of 10 per centum of the voting securities of a carrier means ownership of such amount of its outstanding voting securities as entitles the holder thereof to cast 10 per centum of the aggregate votes which the holders of all the outstanding voting securities of such carrier are entitled to cast."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall be effective as of March 7, 1969: *Provided, however,* That no criminal penalties shall be applicable to any person who acquired control of an air carrier between March 7, 1969, and the actual date of enactment of these amendments.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAGGERS: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1373, and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 8261 as passed, as follows:

"That the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, is further amended as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 407(b) (49 U.S.C. 1377 (b)) is amended by adding the following additional sentence: "Any person owning, beneficially or as trustee, more than 5 per centum of any class of the capital stock or capital, as the case may be, of an air carrier shall submit annually, and at such other times as the Board may require, a description of the shares of stock or other interest owned by such person, and the amount thereof.".

"SEC. 2. Section 408 (49 U.S.C. 1378) is amended by striking subsection 408(a)(5) in its entirety, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(5) For any air carrier or person controlling an air carrier, any other common carrier, or any person engaged in any other phase of aeronautics, or any other person, to acquire control of any air carrier in any manner whatsoever: *Provided,* That the Board may by order exempt any such acquisition of a noncertificated air carrier from this requirement to the extent and for such periods as may be in the public interest;'.

"SEC. 3. (a) Section 408 is further amended by deleting the first sentence of subsection 408(b) and substituting in lieu thereof the following: 'Any person seeking approval of a consolidation, merger, purchase, lease, operating contract, or acquisition of control, specified in subsection (a) of this section, shall present an application to the Board, and thereupon the Board shall notify the persons involved in the consolidation, merger, purchase, lease, operating contract, or acquisition of control, other persons known to have a substantial interest in the proceeding, and the Attorney General of the time and place of a public hearing.'

"(b) Section 408 is further amended by inserting in the third proviso of subsection 408(b) after the words 'determines that no person disclosing a substantial interest' the following: 'or the Attorney General'.

"SEC. 4. (a) Section 408 is further amended by adding the following new subsection 408 (f):

"'*Presumption of control*

"'(f) For the purposes of this section, any person owning beneficially 10 per centum or more of any class of the capital stock or capital of an air carrier shall be presumed to be in control of such air carrier unless the Board finds otherwise.'

"(b) That portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which appears under the heading 'SEC. 408. Consolidation, merger, and acquisition of control.' is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: '(f) Presumption of control.'

"'SEC. 5. The provisions of this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 8261) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of the week, and the schedule for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we have finished the legislative business for this week, and we will ask to go over until **Monday.**

Monday is Consent Calendar day, and there are four suspensions:

H.R. 11651, temporary emergency assistance to provide nutritious meals to needy children;

H.R. 10987, to extend National Commission on Product Safety;

H.R. 11609, to authorize the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park, N.C.; and

H.R. 11363, to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States.

Tuesday, H.R. 12781, Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, fiscal year 1970.

Wednesday, H.R. 9825, civil service retirement financing and benefits, with an open rule, 2 hours of debate.

Thursday and the balance of the week, the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies appropriation bill, fiscal year 1970; and

H.R. 2, separate Federal Credit Union Agency, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 21, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to establish a Council on Environmental Quality.

By the introduction of this legislation, I join with an increasing number of my colleagues both in the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, who believe that serious attention and increased importance must be given to the preservation of our environment.

The bill would establish a Council on Environmental Quality within the Office

XUM

of the President. The council would direct itself solely to the task of protecting and insuring a quality environment for all Americans.

It is alarming to realize that efforts to protect our environment have, unfortunately, not been afforded the attention they so urgently need within the appropriate agencies of our Government. At a time when many agencies and departments base their policy decisions purely on economic or political considerations, one cannot overemphasize the need for a concentrated attack against the threats which exist to our environment.

The council which this bill proposes would have as its onlv task, focusing attention on the environmental consequences of the everyday decisions and policies of other departments and levels of government.

It is because I believe that a direct focus of attention on environmental problems is so critically important, that I am today introducing this bill, the text of which follows:

H.R. 12928

A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act is amended by redesignating section 5A as section 5B and by inserting immediately after section 5 the following new section:

"Sec. 5A. (a) The Congress, recognizing the profound impact of man's activity on the interrelations of all components of the natural environment, both living and nonliving, and the critical importance of restoring and maintaining environmental quality to the overall welfare and development of man, declares that it is the continuing policy of the Federal Government, in cooperation with State and local governments, urban and rural planners, industry, labor, agriculture, science, and conservation organizations, to use all practicable means and measures, including financial and technical assistance, in a manner calculated to foster and promote the general welfare, to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans.

"(b) The President shall transmit to the Congress annually beginning June 30, 1970, an Environmental Quality Report (hereinafter referred to as the 'report') which shall set forth (1) the status and condition of the major natural, manmade, or altered environmental classes of the Nation, including, but not limited to, the air, the aquatic, including marine, estuarine, and fresh water, and the terrestrial environment, including, but not limited to, the forest, dryland, wetland, range, urban, suburban, and rural environment; and (2) current and foreseeable trends in management and utilization of such environments and the effects of those trends on the social, economic, and other requirements of the Nation.

"(c)(1) There is created in the Executive Office of the President a Council on Environmental Quality (hereafter referred to as the "Council"). The Council shall be composed of five members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one of whom the President shall designate as chairman, and each of whom shall be a person who, as a result of his training, experience, and attainments, is exceptionally qualified to analyze and interpret environmental information of all kinds, to appraise programs and activities of the Government in the light of the policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section, and to formulate and recommend national policy to promote the improvement of our environmental quality.

"(2) The Council may employ such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out its functions under this Act. In addition, the Council may employ and fix the compensation of such experts and consultants as may be necessary for the carrying out of its functions under this section, in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code (but without regard to the last sentence thereof).

"(3) It shall be the duty and function of the Council—

"(A) to assist and advise the President in the preparation of the Environmental Quality Report;

"(B) to gather timely and authoritative information concerning the conditions and trends in environmental qualities both current and prospective, to analyze and interpret such information for the purpose of determining whether such conditions and trends are interfering, or are likely to interfere, with the achievement of the policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section, and to compile and submit to the President studies relating to such conditions and trends;

"(C) to appraise the various programs and activities of the Federal Government in the light of the policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section for the purpose of determining the extent to which such programs and activities are contributing to the achievement of such policy, and to make recommendations to the President with respect thereto;

"(D) to develop and recommend to the President national policies to foster and promote the improvement of environmental quality to meet social, economic, and other requirements of the Nation; and

"(E) to make and furnish such studies, reports thereon, and recommendations with respect to matters of policy and legislation as the President may request.

"(4) The Council shall make an annual report to the President in May of each year.

"(5) In exercising its powers, functions, and duties under this section—

"(A) the Council shall consult with such representatives of science, industry, agriculture, labor, conservation, organizations, State and local governments, and other groups, as it deems advisable; and

"(B) the Council shall, to the fullest extent possible, utilize the services, facilities, and information (including statistical information) of public and private agencies and organizations, and individuals, in order that duplication of effort and expense may be avoided."

Sec. 2. (a) Section 5313 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(20) Chairman, Council of Environmental Quality."

(b) Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding, at the end thereof, the following:

"(92) Members, Council on Environmental Quality."

SCIENCE OF SURVIVAL

(Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a most important meeting which will be held in Washington next year, on August 9 to 14, 1970, the Third International Congress of Food Science and Technology.

The Congress has named this meeting, SOS/70, which stands for "science of survival." The more than 3,000 food scientists and technologists who will attend this meeting will concern themselves with the grave problems of hunger, famine, and acute malnutrition which plague millions and millions over the world.

Within the past 2 or 3 years, talk of world hunger has been somewhat muted in the United States. For one thing, strains of wheat and rice have been developed for use in India and other food deficit countries which are highly productive when compared to strains previously used. The weather in India, Pakistan, Algeria, and other countries threatened by famine has been better.

I have tried, time and time again, to emphasize the importance of the efficiency and productivity of American agriculture. Since World War II, we have maintained the food reserves of the world and we have given food from these reserves worth billions of dollars to nations in need. If we had not had these reserves on hand and had not dispensed them liberally and generously, famines raging like forest fires would have killed millions of people and would have brought political chaos in many countries. Political chaos resulting from hunger and famine would have greatly enhanced the strength of the Communists in the countries where upheaval and tumult prevailed.

The efficiency and productivity of American agriculture also gives our people food cheaper, in comparison, than food in any other major country. Nevertheless, it is exceedingly difficult, in this inflationary period, to get the consumers to accept this fact. Also, with the decline in rural population, the political influence of the farmers also has declined. Inevitably, most urban Congressmen are busy with their own affairs and few have time to study agricultural problems carefully.

The Department of Agriculture is a cosponsor of the Food Congress, which I hope will help to acquaint the Congress and the public with the agricultural situation over the world.

Furthermore, it should serve as the vehicle to better acquaint consumers with the veritable revolution in food preparation and utilization which scientists and technologists have brought about. The life of our housewives today is in most dramatic contrast with the life of the housewives only a few generations ago. Then, on the farm and in the cities, women had to spend long hours of drudgery in the preparation and cooking of food.

The food technologists and scientists literally have freed most of the women of this country from a form of slavery, necessitated by the lack of conveniences and resources which have now been assembled by our food industries. Nor can we overlook the accomplishments of the food scientists and technologists. They have brought about a vast transformation in living habits in the United States and other countries. This Congress will bring these achievements together, and will bring them to the attention of the world.

SEARCH FOR HONORABLE CONCLUSION OF WAR IN VIETNAM

(Mr. KLEPPE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, today the eyes of the world are upon Apollo 11, while the prayers of countless millions ride with the three brave Americans on their journey to the moon. Successful completion of this mission will represent a giant step in man's pursuit of scientific knowledge.

Meanwhile, here on earth, the quest for peace—for an early and honorable conclusion of the war in Vietnam—continues to present perhaps even more difficult challenges than those confronting the men of Apollo 11.

Again and again, President Nixon has made clear his willingness to walk the extra mile toward a solution in Vietnam. Again and again, the other side has indicated its determination not to budge even a single inch.

I would review briefly the steps the United States has taken to effect a settlement:

First. Prior to January 20, we halted the bombing of North Vietnam and agreed to sit down at the conference table with the National Liberation Front, as well as the governments of Hanoi and Saigon.

Second. We remained at the table and refrained from resumption of the bombing despite Hanoi's shelling of South Vietnamese major cities, its violation of the demilitarized zone and its refusal to deal with the Saigon government.

Third. On March 25, South Vietnam President Thieu offered to meet with the NLF for private talks, without preconditions, on a political settlement.

Fourth. On May 14, with Thieu's support, President Nixon put forward an eight-point plan for peace. It included the renouncement of reliance on a military solution, the offer of withdrawal of U.S. and allied forces within 12 months under international guarantees, and emphasis on our desire only to secure the right of the people of South Vietnam to determine their own future, without outside interference.

Fifth. On June 8, the President announced the withdrawal of 25,000 U.S. combat troops.

Sixth. At Midway, both Thieu and the President declared their readiness to accept any political outcome arrived at through free elections.

Seventh. Thieu has now offered a concrete program by which free elections can be held and the will of the South Vietnamese people can be determined.

All of these conciliatory moves by the United States and the South Vietnamese Government have been greeted by Hanoi and its representatives at the Paris peace talks either with stony silence or violent denunciation.

It may well be that the Communists believe they have only to sit tight and wait for the United States to "cut and run." They must follow, with at least some satisfaction, the mounting attacks here at home on the continuing American military presence in Vietnam. They may believe that the United States is tired, weak willed, and hopelessly divided.

They hear demands for unilateral withdrawal now from some of the very men who were a part of the preceding administration when the big buildup of U.S. military forces was taking place. One wonders why these experts did not speak out then.

I do not believe the voice of despair is the voice of the American people.

I think President Nixon has the support of most Americans in his quest for an honorable peace. But I do not believe that most Americans want peace at any price—peace under terms dictated entirely by the Communists.

A few weeks ago, I conducted a poll on the Vietnam question in my district. More than 7,500 persons responded, a number far larger than the professional pollsters query in their nationwide samplings of public opinion. I asked the people which alternatives they would favor "if the Paris peace talks fail to produce agreement leading to at least some disengagement in Vietnam within the next few months."

Ten percent favored "withdrawal of U.S. military forces from Vietnam, even though this might mean a Communist takeover."

"Withdrawing U.S. troops as rapidly as they can be replaced with South Vietnamese forces" was selected by 47 percent as the best course.

Thirty-nine percent favored "an all-out offensive against North Vietnam, utilizing full available military power, short of nuclear weapons, in an effort to win a clear-cut victory."

Only 4 percent were undecided.

Certainly these responses reflect no great support for a "cut and run" policy. And I suspect that public sentiment in most congressional districts across the country is not greatly different from what it is in mine.

President Nixon has not yet had quite 6 months to solve a problem which was many years in the making. For the first time since 1960, the number of American troops in Vietnam is being decreased, rather than increased. A sure and swift route toward peace has been opened to the other side.

The time has come for the Communists to show some willingness to negotiate seriously—to show some evidence of good faith.

I believe the possibility of achieving at least the beginning of a settlement would be enormously improved if a few individuals here in the United States would voluntarily stifle their shrill cries of dissent long enough to let the Communists know that these United States are united in their determination to obtain a just and honorable peace in Vietnam.

VOTERS OVERWHELMINGLY FAVOR INSTALLATION OF ABM SYSTEM

(Mr. DENNIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, I have recently sent out a questionnaire to voters in my district, as we do from time to time. One of the questions I asked the people in my area on that questionnaire was with regard to deployment of an ABM defense system. I gave them three choices: First, that we should begin deployment of the safeguard system, starting with two installations, as recommended by the President; second, that we should undertake research and development only, possibly including experimental radar but without the installation of any antiballistic missiles; and, third, that the ABM should be abandoned entirely.

I consider it of some interest to report that 60.3 percent of the people who have so far replied to my questionnaire stated we should install two safeguard systems at the present time, according to the plan recommended by President Nixon. An additional 21.7 percent thought we should proceed with research and development and installation of radar. Only 18 percent answered that the project ought to be abandoned.

In other words, a solid 60 percent voted for the President's plan and 82 percent voted for at least some form of installation of an ABM system at this time.

I consider the matter of interest, because I believe my district—seven counties along the Indiana-Ohio line, balanced between industry and agriculture—is a very typical Midwestern and Indiana area. If it varies from the norm at all, it would not be in favor of militarism but rather the other way, because we have three institutions of higher learning, two of them church connected, and a very strong Quaker influence throughout the entire area.

It is, therefore, my submission that Members of the other body who are now locked in debate on this subject, and particularly perhaps the distinguished Members of that body from the State of Indiana, should pay some heed to the voice of the people who are apparently strongly in favor of the President's position on the ABM.

STOP THE FEELTHY PICTURES

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing further legislation to protect minors from the onslaught of pornographic materials. Publishers of obscene materials simply ignore the rising indignation of the public about the shocking increase in this slimy traffic. Our people are looking to their officials to put a stop to this flagrant abuse of freedom of communication. The publishers and peddlers of pornography know the popular revulsion but they have shown nothing but contempt for public concern for the moral well being of our youth. All indicators show that the flow of pornographic materials has increased, and publishers have expanded their disregard for any standards of decency in the materials they print and peddle. The money that is being made in this vile traffic staggers the imagination.

The first of the three bills I am intro-

XUM

ducing today makes it illegal to mail or transport in interstate commerce matter which is offensive to prevailing community standards concerning materials suitable for minors and which is without any redeeming social value for minors. Minors are defined to be persons under 18 years of age. Under my bill, a person convicted of violating the provisions against mailing or transporting obscene materials in interstate commerce will be fined up to $50,000 and/or imprisoned up to 5 years for a first offense. A second offender can be fined up to $100,000 and/or imprisoned for 10 years.

The second bill I am introducing today punishes persons who knowingly transport in interstate commerce, or who mail, any advertisement or solicitation designed or intended to appeal to a prurient interest in sex. While this is also intended as a protection for minors, its provisions are not limited by the age of the audience, but only by the content of the advertisement or solicitation. A person who violates the provision of this measure will be subject to a $50,000 fine and/or 5 years in jail for a first offense, and a $100,000 fine and/or 10 years in jail for a second offense.

The third bill I am introducing permits a person to file with the Postmaster General a statement that he desires to receive no sexually orientated advertisements. The bill prohibits any person from mailing any sexually orientated materials to any person whose name and address has been on the Postmaster's list for more than 30 days. A person violating the provisions of this bill will be subject to a fine of $5,000 and/or 5 years' imprisonment for a first offense, and a $10,000 and/or 10 years for a second offense. Enforcement of the provisions of this bill would bring welcome relief to persons whose names have been included against their will on an unscrupulous publisher's mailing list. By registering with the Postmaster General, persons can maintain their right to privacy and even more important, protect their children from exposure to obscene materials.

I believe that prohibitions and penalties in my bills are sufficiently stringent to slow the pace of the current flouting of standards of minimum decency by money-hungry and calculating publishers. If enacted into law, the bills will afford some protection to the public from affronts to their sensibilities caused by the receipt of pornographic materials.

Earlier this year I introduced H.R. 11090, a bill to strengthen the antiobscenity laws in order to protect minors against the distribution or sale of obscene materials through the mails or interstate commerce. That bill is directed against publishers who mail obscene materials to minors or publish the materials knowing that they will be sent to minors. It requires a publisher of pornographic materials to clearly label the cover of such mail as obscene, and forbids the delivery of labeled materials to minors. A person violating the provisions of the bill is subject to a $5,000 fine and 10 years in jail.

The bills I am introducing today are good adjuncts to H.R. 11090, and taken together the package of bills will provide law-enforcement officials with sturdy and effective weapons to meet and halt the illicit traffic in pornographic materials. Because of the hypertechnicality of our courts in these matters, prosecution has become increasingly difficult and pornographers are plying their trade under the protection of constitutional guarantees that were meant for other purposes. However, these bills should provide further legal tools for the efforts of our law-enforcement agencies. Whatever the sharpness of the legislation scalpel needed to cut out this cancerous growth, the Congress must take immediate and adequate steps to provide our officials with it.

ROGERS INTRODUCES BILL TO EXTEND CLEAN AIR ACT FOR 3 YEARS

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would extend the Clean Air Act, as amended by the Air Quality Act of 1967, for 3 additional years. The present law expires on June 30, 1970.

I am proposing that the authorized appropriations to carry out the provisions of the act be $100 million for fiscal year 1971, $125 million for fiscal year 1972, and $150 million for fiscal year 1973.

I am also proposing to extend for the same period of time the separate authorization for appropriations for section 104 of the act for research relations to fuels and vehicles. This section of the law actually expired on June 30 of this year, but the other body has already passed a 1-year extension of this section, and the House, will within the next week or two, also have an opportunity to consider a 1-year extension of section 104. I would hope that the House will approve the measure and, assuming approval, I am proposing that authorized appropriations for section 104 for 3 more years be $25 million for fiscal year 1971, $35 million for fiscal year 1972, and $50 million for fiscal year 1973.

Mr. Speaker, I am not at this time proposing any major changes in the law, but rather seek to bring to the attention of my colleagues that this very important legislation will expire this present fiscal year and that we need to get moving after the August recess to hold hearings, and I would hope that extension of the law could be accomplished before adjournment this session. If it is not, then technically the law could very well be excluded from the President's budget for fiscal year 1971.

I am not proposing major changes in the law primarily because the States and the National Air Pollution Control Administration are yet in the initial planning stages to implement the amendments to the Clean Air Act provided by the Air Quality Act of 1967. The legislation of 1967 offered significant changes in the law of 1963 which first gave the Federal Government regulatory authority to abate interstate air pollution problems and for the awarding of Federal funds to encourage the development of regulatory control programs at the State and local levels.

Among some of the significant amendments of 1967 were: authorization of financial support of air quality planning programs set up by Governors to recommend air quality standards and implementation plans for interstate air quality control regions designated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; preservation of the rights of States, political subdivisions and intermunicipal or interstate agencies to adopt and implement programs which will achieve a higher level of air quality than approved by the Secretary; provision for a study of the need for and effect of national emission standards for stationary sources of air pollution and a report to the Congress within 2 years, and requiring reevaluation of air quality criteria issued prior to enactment of 1967 amendments, and if necessary, revisions and reissuance of such criteria.

Moreover, pursuant to the Air Quality Act of 1967, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare must designate air quality control regions and issue air quality criteria and reports on control techniques. State governments then are expected to establish air quality standards for the air quality control regions and to adopt plans for implementation of the standards. This program is just now beginning to take shape.

To date, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has designated 13 air quality control regions: National Capital, New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Denver, Los Angeles, St. Louis, Boston, San Francisco, Pittsburgh, Buffalo, Cincinnati, and Cleveland.

Five other regions are proposed: Kansas City, Hartford-Springfield, Minneapolis-St. Paul, Baltimore, and Indianapolis.

By the summer of 1970 a total of 57 air quality control regions are expected to have been designated. In addition, the National Air Pollution Control Administration reports that air quality criteria for sulfur oxides and particulate matter—two of the most common types of urban air pollutants—were issued in February of this year. Criteria for other pollutants such as carbon monoxide, photoreactive organic compounds, oxidants, nitrogen oxides, and others will be issued within the next 2 years.

The progress we are making to improve the quality of the air we breathe is moving—but slowly—and I feel that the Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare needs to hold hearings on this problem. At the time, as a member of the subcommittee, I intend to closely review the accomplishments made with a particular emphasis on possible amendments to hasten our efforts to clean up the air about us.

I know, for example, that the National Air Pollution Control Administration has not had the necessary manpower to move as quickly as it would have liked to implement amendments. Too, we may be giving the States too much time to gear up for meaningful controls within the designated air quality regions. Under the law, the States have 90 days to file a letter of intent to set up air quality control standards for any portion of an air quality control region lying within its boundaries following publication of air quality criteria by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The States would then have 180 days after the filing of such letter to set such standards and then another 180 days to develop plans for implementing the standards.

Thus, for voluntary compliance with the act, the States have 15 months from the date of regional designation to come up with standards and a plan for implementing the standards, assuming HEW air quality criteria have been issued. Since the first criteria were issued in February of this year, some States will have until 1972 to come up with implementation plans, and these plans only have to show a reasonable time for meeting the standards. Moreover, this does not even get into the matter of enforcing the standards within the region, and the eventual enforcement, if necessary, by the Federal Government, which could take another 6 months just to begin.

These are just some of the matters that I would like to go into as we review this law.

Mr. Speaker, at no time in our history have we been faced with such a menacing problem as confronts us with the pollution of our air. There is evidence that air pollution contributes greatly to respiratory diseases such as tuberculosis, influenza, and pneumonia.

There is not a single major metropolitan area in the United States that does not have an air pollution problem. There are few places, if any, where control efforts are adequate to deal with the problems that already exist, let alone the much greater problems that lie ahead. All the trends that contribute to growth of air pollution problems are rising.

By 1980 the Nation's urban population will be one-third greater; the number of motor vehicles in use will increase by 40 percent; and demands for energy will be 50 percent higher.

I am hopeful that hearings can be scheduled soon after the August recess in order that we can review our accomplishments, and make any necessary adjustments as we chart the future course toward cleaner air for all.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE H. R. GROSS OF IOWA

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give comment to remarks which can only be described as "slurring" made against a distinguished Member of this body, last July 10, 1969.

Understand that I said comment, not defend, because the motives and integrity of H. R. GROSS, of Iowa has never been in doubt.

The remarks to which I refer were made on the occasion of the objection, by the Member from Iowa, to the unanimous-consent request that the House adjourn on Wednesday, the 16th of July, to attend the launching of Apollo 11.

The remarks had to do with—if my memory serves me correctly—the gentleman from Iowa lifting his sights above the cornstalks, his sour grapes attitude and his poor sportsmanship.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to this body, that anyone who has ever visited the cornfields of the great State of Iowa with H. R. GROSS has truly beheld a glorious sight, for there, the perfectly parallel rows of corn, would give anyone who worked the field the uncanny ability to look straight ahead with an unwavering eye and realize that slipshod planting, or lack of care, could not help but result in a poor harvest.

As one looks up between the tall stalks of corn, he is captivated by the clear blue Iowa skies, dominated only by the bright and glorious sun which makes him realize that, contrary to the notions of some, we all have the God-given right to think for ourselves, whether we use it or not. At the same time, the coloring given to the trunk and leaves of the stalk, by the chlorophyll it contains, makes one recognize that there are a considerable number of dyed-in-the-wool greenhorns, who really have no idea of why they are here, what it is all about, or the fallacy of artificial use of dyes and coloring.

As to the sour grapes, I do not believe that the distinguished Member from Iowa either raises, stomps, or boycotts them, but I can assure you, that his sportsmanship is of the highest caliber, a "must" for anyone who would participate in any kind of activity in the great State of Iowa, whether it be sporting events or debates.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. GROSS' concern for the taxpayers of this Nation has been entered in the records of this Chamber for over 20 years. It is there to be read by anyone who would doubt or defile his intentions. It is an honor to serve with him, and a credit to this body that he has the courage to speak out and let the chips fall where they may.

HISTORIC BLASTOFF OF APOLLO 11

(Mr. LLOYD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, as a member of the U.S. House delegation accompanying members of the Korean Parliament visiting the United States, I was privileged to witness the historic blastoff of Apollo 11 which, if successful, will land the first human beings on the moon this Sunday, July 20.

We went to Cape Kennedy the previous day and had the opportunity to see the general area in broad perspective and toured through the vertical assembly building where the Saturn V was assembled. In this huge building, said to be the largest building in the world, approximately one and one-half times the size of the Pentagon, for example, was demonstrated the culmination to this point in history of the scientific and mechanical genius of man in the development of space exploration.

The blastoff itself on a hot Florida morning, we viewed from a distance of 3 miles, along with the others assembled in the bleachers and on the field, resembling somewhat the American scene at a State fair. But what was to follow was unforgettable. On returning to Washington, and contemplating the experience, I watched the television report which included the statement of Eric Sevareid, familiar journalist for whom the morning had also been a first-time experience. The words he expressed were also an expression of my own experience. As questioned by Walter Cronkite, Mr. Sevareid said:

> CRONKITE. I'm so glad you could get down for this historic occasion. It's only right that you should be here. You've seen so many of the historic moments in your distinguished reporting career. But I believe this is your first launch?
>
> SEVAREID. It is. The launch itself already seems hours and days away in the past; so much has happened. I've seen it only through the eyes of the television camera before, Walter. You see it that way, you can hear much of it, but you can't feel it. When you stand out there, on the ground, just with the naked eye to see this thing, this is really a, a religious experience, which you watch as a biblical scene. The ground really trembles; the air hits you in the face. And all that flame that comes out of the motors is a whole ocean of flame. The clouds on both sides of the Apollo 11 are like atomic mushroom clouds. There's that column of fire, supporting this thing so delicately, and that turns into a plume, and finally it disappears into the clouds like a, like a feathered dart. There's a reverential feeling in the crowd out here when this happened. There wasn't any shouting that I heard. When it was up and gone, there was a few, a little bit of hand clapping, and a lot of people wiping tears away. A sense of relief, and of course a sense of relief for the safety of those three frail mortals in that craft that has vanished in the skies. That's what people were thinking of, these men, braced in straps and metal, and I suppose you could say, Walter, embraced in that iron embrace of the sense of duty and purpose. And there is a, a gratitude, a thanksgiving, really a reverential sensation to watch this.
>
> CRONKITE. This, and it affects, it affects all, all walks, all types, all the people out here, workers who have been with the program from the very beginning, and the newcomer who has never seen it before. And it doesn't stop, either, Eric. It's not a first time experience. There's something about this, as you suggest, that, with every liftoff, with man going out there to the heavens.
>
> SEVAREID. All the—all the arguments, sociological arguments, philosophical arguments, you've heard and thought about for weeks and months and years, should we do this or something else. Somehow they vanish in a cloud of smoke. This can be done and therefore it's done. There really isn't any argument about it.

SETTLEMENT OF VIETNAM WAR IS PRESIDENT'S NO. 1 TASK

(Mr. DELLENBACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon, since taking office last January, has fulfilled his pledge made a year ago that, if elected President of the United States, he would make the settlement of the war in Vietnam his No. 1 task and dedicate his best energies toward such settlement.

His hoped-for goal—and indeed the hoped-for goal of the Nation—of an early and sound peace has not yet been achieved. This we all regret. But we should not let that regret blot out an objective evaluation of the strides that have been made in the direction of such a peace.

President Nixon has kept in constant touch with our negotiators in Paris—he traveled to Paris and discussed the problem on the scene—our civilian and military leaders in Southeast Asia—his conference at Midway enabled him to review the situation with them personally—and with Congress. His close working relationship with the Government of South Vietnam has had a great deal of influence on that Government's attitude during the negotiations. Certainly President Thieu's concessions of late are, in part at least, direct offshoots of that relationship.

Unfortunately all the concessions seem to be coming from only our side of the conference table. But there have been and still are rays of hope which could eventually lead to a settlement. Our President is pursuing these to the utmost. I am sure it is frustrating for him not to be able to open all the records and tell all Americans each and every detail involved in the negotiations. Needless to say, for countless and understandable reasons this is an impossibility, and to do so could well hinder and hurt our chances for ultimate success. But, to a substantial degree, he has reported to the American people on what we've done and where we are going, and I commend him for this.

President Nixon is not grabbing for straws in the wind, nor is he willing to succumb to the many pressures exerted on him and exude false hope. He is moving cautiously, deliberately, paying attention to detail and doing his very best to make sure that when the puzzle is put together it will not fall apart. This is the delicate part of diplomacy, something too few people understand. On certain critical points our President has moved boldly, as evidenced by such actions as our recent troop withdrawals, improving the capabilities of our South Vietnamese allies, and hard pushing for free elections as soon as possible.

This is a crucial time in the history of our country. Peace could be at hand—if all the ingredients are at hand for making that peace. Certainly one of those ingredients is united support for our President as he struggles to see it through. I think that the other side truly believes that this ingredient is missing. I suggest that this is one of the reasons for the other side's refusal to sit at the conference table in the spirit of compromise.

President Nixon has acknowledged his own responsibility for conducting negotiations on behalf of America and for implementing those actions which seem most soundly calculated to bring success in our national reach for the goal of an early and sound peace in Vietnam. So long as he is moving with dedication and soundness in that direction he deserves the full support of each of us.

I call on all Americans to recognize: First, that our President is carrying out his pledge to resolve this conflict as soon as soundly possible; second, that there are signs of meaningful progress along the way; and, third, that patience and confidence are two ingredients which must go into the whole process of negotiation if we are to see a free and peaceful Vietnam.

If we are to succeed, the Nation must remain united behind our President. President Nixon's actions and conduct to date deserve our support.

THE EMERGENCY DETENTION ACT OF 1950

(Mr. WALDIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I have joined several of my colleagues in calling for repeal of title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950. This provision allows for the establishment of emergency detention camps, and gives the President of the United States the power to declare an "internal security emergency." In such an emergency the Attorney General could detain anyone he "believes" will "probably" engage in, or "probably" conspire to engage in, sabotage.

I favor repeal of title II because it is dangerous, unnecessary, and destructive of confidence in our political system.

The dangers of a provision such as this are obvious; they were obvious to President Truman, who vetoed the act in 1950. Title II is broad and vague, a horrible potential tool, characteristic of a totalitarian society. The President may declare an internal security emergency in the event of domestic insurrection "in aid of a foreign enemy; but the line between domestic protest and foreign-inspired insurrection is often unclear and further blurred by protesting groups themselves.

Once the emergency is declared, the Attorney General may apprehend and detain each person whom he has "reasonable ground" to believe will "probably" engage in, or conspire to engage in, espionage. But what do these vague phrases mean? Do they mean that an American disgrace such as the detention of the Japanese-Americans during World War II can recur? Yes, the act is designed to specifically sanction such actions; experience should have taught us to avoid such abusive and broad blunders.

And once apprehended, the detainee has no meaningful rights of appeal; he cannot examine information against him if the Attorney General believes the evidence would expose the accusing agents. The burden of proof is on the detainee.

By no far stretch of the imagination, then, this provision fits into the repertoire of a police state, a totalitarian system we all wish to avoid.

But is it foreseeable that a situation might arise where it would be necessary to suspend constitutional rights, as when martial law is declared? Yes; and as in Hawaii during World War II, martial law might then be declared; but a system of incarceration of a minority for suspected political belief or inclination should not be established. We have laws and constitutional provisions to deal with treason.

Heinous as the potential of the Internal Security Act of 1950 is, it has never been invoked. We might consider it merely as a disused, harmless pecularity of the law. But we cannot, the need for repeal is urgent because of the sensitive situation of minorities in this country today.

We must realize that certain political and racial groups have lost faith in much of our political system. On the campuses and in the ghettos, there is an alarming barrier of belief; this is too well exemplified by the current fear that concentration camps have been readied to be filled with dissidents. Despite repeated Government denials, the belief continues that, on this question, we are both dishonest and repressive.

I suggest that we show our good faith to them and to the whole country, in reaffirming American freedoms, guarantees, and integrity by repeal of title II.

LOCAL NO. 5 OF THE BRICKLAYERS' & MASONS' INTERNATIONAL UNION CELEBRATES ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, 1969 marks the 100th anniversary of local No. 5 of the Bricklayers' & Masons' International Union which is located in my congressional district. They can well be proud of 100 years of dedicated service to their members and significant contributions to the residents of the Greater Cleveland community. Homes, commercial buildings, churches, and other structures are an enduring monument to the master craftsmanship of local 5's members. The high level of workmanship characteristic of every job undertaken by local 5 is well recognized throughout the Greater Cleveland area.

Local 5 also has earned the admiration of many through the outstanding services it offers to its membership. Benefits have a long history in Cleveland local No. 5. In 1908, a death benefit group was formed known as the Cleveland Bricklayers' Benevolent Association. In the ensuing years, the local union has expanded its benefit programs in a continuing effort to accommodate the various needs of its members. Today, local 5 has three exceptional benefit plans—the health and welfare plan, the pension plan, and the vacation and savings plan. These plans clearly demonstrate the depth of the commitment the local union has to its membership. From the time a man commences union membership until demise, the union programs offer the member and his family security.

Local 5 provides aditional services to its members. The Bricklayers' credit union was inaugurated in 1954. The ability to borrow money through this organization has proven to be most advantageous to the members of the local union.

The Bricklayers' apprentice program in Cleveland has served as an example for numerous similar programs throughout the country. It has been in existence

XUM

for 48 years and during that lengthy period acquired a reputation for producing exceptionally capable craftsmen.

Members of local 5 have frequently been selected for executive positions with the International Union of Bricklayers and Masons as well as in the Building Trades Council. Just to mention a few, George King was chosen general treasurer of the international union in 1960 and elevated to the office of first vice president in 1966. Martin Graham was elected secretary-treasurer of the Ohio State Building Trades Council in 1963 and is presently the representative of all building trades unions of Ohio before the Ohio Legislature. In the past Gus Mencke, Al Taubman, and John Mulligan all began with local 5 and eventually became vice presidents of the international union.

In 1906 the Ohio State conference was established under the direction of the international union. John W. Jockel was elected secretary-treasurer and was a dominant figure in the conference until his death in 1951. Tom Davis then assumed this role and still maintains the position today.

Before closing, I must mention the names of the current leadership of local 5 because I would like each of my colleagues to know the individuals who together are responsible for the outstanding achievements of local 5: president, Donald Thiele; vice president, James McGuirk; secretary-treasurer, Archie Stephen; recording and assistant secretary, Tom McMahon; business agents, George Christian and Bud Jones; executive board member, Charles Ahrens, and arbitration board chairman, Ray Atkinson. For years these men have been coming to Washington to ably represent the interests of local 5.

I wish to congratulate the members of the union on this significant 100th anniversary.

MID-EAST AGE-OLD CLICHES RESENTED BY MODERN ISRAELI

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, all who are friends and admirers of Israel, as so many of us have so long been, have been very much pleased to read a most excellent article entitled Mid-East's Age-Old Cliches Resented by Modern Israeli, appearing in the July 6, 1969, issue of the Sunday Star, by Ben J. Wattenberg. This excellent article points out especially that it is not true—as critics have asserted—that Israel is a "tiny," "new," "artificial" state surrounded by hostile Arabs. This article emphasizes the size, the strength, the native character and the generally favorable environment of the State of Israel and, above all, this article movingly reveals the greatest thing about Israel, the indomitable determination and spirit of its people.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this article to my colleagues and to my fellow countrymen and include it following my remarks in the RECORD:

MID-EAST'S AGE-OLD CLICHES RESENTED BY MODERN ISRAELI

(By Ben J. Wattenberg)

TEL AVIV.—My grandfather was S. Ben-Zion, a Hebrew poet and teacher who, in 1910, moved his family to a plot of vacant sand dunes in the Palestinian desert just north of the city of Jaffa. Today on that same site rises the 34-story Shalom Tower—the tallest building between Milan and Tokyo—and around it sprawls Greater Tel Aviv, now a city of 700,000.

If one says—as some do—that modern Israel can be dated from the founding of its major metropolis, then Israel will be 60 years old next year.

But David Ben-Gurion, a little man with a voice like thunder, still spry, visionary and opinionated in his 83rd year, will have none of that. For Ben-Gurion, a nation starts with land and farmers, not cities and writers.

His blue eyes flashing, his brow curled in reminiscence, Ben-Gurion insists that modern Israel dates back to 1870—a hundred years ago. That was when Mikveh Israel, the first agricultural school in Palestine, was established. Ben-Gurion came to Palestine from Russia in 1906 and he says that what his generation did as farmers on the desert land and on the swamp land was not a beginning but a continuation of what began at the Mikveh Israel agricultural school.

But to many others, modern Israel is regarded neither as 100 years old nor 60 years old. The standard cliche now afloat around the world goes something like this: "Israel is a tiny, 20-year old state established by the United Nations and the conscience of the world because of what Hitler did to the Jews in Europe." To which the Arabs add that the Jews in Israel are an artificial, Westernized, neocolonial foreign body surrounded by a sea of 100 million Arabs. The Arab position has its allies. At a cocktail party recently one middle-level American diplomat who had spent most of his career in the Arab states described Israel as a "monster state."

Artificial. Tiny. New. Surrounded. These are the words that send Israelis up the walls and they are the words that confound most of the attempts to see the Middle Eastern situation for what it is.

MANY NATIVES

There is first the matter of "artificiality." It is perhaps a bit too easy to note that Ben-Gurion has lived in Israel far longer than Nasser has lived in Egypt. But there is a seed of an important truth there. For when one looks at the Israeli demography one does *not* see a group of European newcomers set down in the Middle Eastern desert. Of the Jews in Israel today:

42 percent were born in Israel.

29 percent were born elsewhere in the Middle East (mostly Algeria, Morocco, Egypt, Iraq and Yemen).

10 percent were born in Western countries but emigrated to Israel before World War II.

Only 19 percent are "non-Middle Eastern, relatively recent immigrants" (within the last 30 years).

The official Arab position is that they hold no grudge against the 29 percent of the Jews born in Arab lands—not, conceivably, even their children, who comprise a good portion of the 42 percent "born in Israel."

There is no reciprocity to this kindly view. While many Israelis of European origin display a love-hate fascination with Arabs, the Jews from Arab lands feel little but contempt for the Arabs. They have lived under Arab rule for centuries and their attitude is simple: "They have their countries, we have our country. Let the Arabs stay in their own countries and we'll stay in ours."

So, the Israelis don't feel artificial. More than half are from the Middle East; eight in 10 are native-born, Middle Eastern or residents of Israel since before most of the Arab guerrillas were born.

Israel is habitually described as "tiny." Today, there are 2.5 million Jews in Israel, compared to the 80,000 when my grandfather built his house on the first street of Tel Aviv. Since the Six-Day War the birth rate has risen slightly and the immigration rate has risen substantially.

EXPANDING MARKET

Each year, between birth and immigration, about 60,000 new Jews are added to the net population. Two and a half million is a small population by the standards of India or the United States but is more than that of Jordan or Lebanon or Libya. There are more Israelis in Israel than there are Irish in Ireland or Uruguayans in Uruguay. There are, in fact, enough Israelis so that Israeli economists now begin to talk of "a domestic economy of scale," which suggests that there are now enough people to provide a domestic market large enough to profitably produce certain goods that require large set-up costs.

Chaim Sharrett is the son of the late Israeli Prime Minister Moshe Sharrett, and his parents grew up in early Tel Aviv on the same street as my grandfather, childhood friends of my mother. Chaim Sharrett lives now on a kibbutz near the Jordanian border (where his children sleep in underground bomb shelters). Each morning he commutes to a small factory in Haifa where he directs a small new enterprise that manufactures Fiberglas sailboats of a new design. The basic market for the boats will be Israel—the 2½ million Jews, none of whom live very far from the Mediterranean Sea. In the last 10 years, Israel's population has grown by more than 35 percent and per capita income went from $740 to $1,350. Before that economic and demographic surge, a fullscale domestic market for products like sailboats did not really exist. Most new industry had to be predicated on an always risky export market. Now Chaim Sharrett still has his eye on exports to be sure, but he sees that his business can survive on a domestic market.

What is small? As measured by dollars of gross national product, Israel produces more than Portugal, more than Taiwan, more than Guinea, Ghana, Senegal and the Ivory Coast combined, more than Peru or Algeria or Iraq or Saudi Arabia and not very much less than Egypt with her 32 million population.

What is small? With the current boundaries, Israel is roughly the same size as Hungary or Austria. It is 350 miles from the Northern tip of the Golan Heights to Sharm el Sheik at the Southern tip of the Sinai. Even with the old boundaries and adding Jerusalem and Golan the area of Israel is not much different from that of Holland or Belgium.

SEA OF ARABS

"Surrounded by a sea of Arabs" is also misleading. If one puts the point of a compass on Tel Aviv and inscribes a 2,000-mile arc around the nations of the Middle East the resultant population breakdown works out something like this: 88 million Arabs (all the Arab nations except Morocco and Algeria, each more than 2,000 miles away) and 92 million non-Arabs (Israel, Turkey, Iran and Ethiopia). Israel has friendly and productive relations with the non-Arab nations and these non-Arab states are quite anxious to see to it that Nasser's dreams of Pan-Arabism for the entire Middle East do not reach fruition, particularly not Pan-Arabism sponsored by Moscow. In short, Israel, like most of the nations of the world, has neighbors of different kinds—some friendly, some not. Like many other nations of the world the Israelis live in an "un-defused" situation; not dissimilar to the U.S. and Russia, or Russia and China, or North and South Korea, or India and Pakistan. Have you ever spoken to a Hungarian

XUM

about what he thinks of Romania? Such "un-defused" situations have been known to last for generations, even centuries.

The point is a simple one. Israel is not a freak state. Not artificial, not tiny, not new, not really surrounded, Israel has come of age. The time for clucking over the precocious infant is past—and the Israelis realize this today better than anyone else.

As a successful non-freak national entity, Israel and her leaders and people can be expected to behave in normal national ways. As a state confronted by enemies, that means firstly, that Israel will do what it must do to remain secure. And that means that international pressure is not going to push the Israelis to do what they feel is detrimental to their own national interests. They are prepared to do it all themselves if they have to. Some of the military ramifications are fascinating.

THE GENERAL

Gen. Ezer Weizman, tall, dashing and candid, is 45 and was born in Tel Aviv. He was formerly the Commander of the Israeli Air Force and is now deputy chief of Staff of the Israeli armed forces. He has fought in four wars, starting as a Spitfire pilot with the R.A.F. in World War II.

Before the Six-Day War, when he was still Commander of the Air Force, he told a skeptical Israeli columnist that if war came, his fliers would destroy the Arab air forces in three hours. On June 5th, 1967, an aide of Weizman's called the columnist and said: "Ezer said to tell you he miscalculated. It only took two hours and 55 minutes."

Today, Weizman believes that the Egyptians may try war again in the future and knows that the Israelis will win again if they do. Flying over Sinai with Weizman and several other Israeli officers, one is inclined to accept their word. At an air-base in the Sinai one sees the sleek jet fighters on quick-alert leaning forward in their hangers as if on a short leash, only about 10 minutes flying time from Cairo. At one such base in Sinai stands a former Egyptian Officers Club, where in May of 1967, Gamel Nasser toasted his pilots: "If Rabin wants a war, we'll give it to him." That remark is remembered by Israeli military men when the rhetoric of Egyptian power floats across the Nile.

To Ezer Weizman, native-born Israeli and professional military man, Israel today is in good shape.

The Suez Canal is constructed as if it were designed to be the world's best anti-tank ditch. The Sinai desert is Orchard Beach as far as the eye can see, apparently designed by a God of History as the prefect buffer zone, with a wealth of oil thrown in for good measure.

As one travels through this vast expanse of desert (15,000 square miles crossed only by a few roads), the wonder of it all is how the Egyptians were able to evacuate it so quickly. Weizman, a former air general, says: "With air power we could hold this territory against any force on earth," and one of his tank commanders mutters in Hebrew: "Also without air power."

SINAI THE KEY

Militarily, the Sinai would seem to be the key to the Middle East situation. The Egyptians are the only Arab force that are even in the same league with the Israelis. To wage war, they must make a complex amphibious or airborne landing, only to get to an open, invulnerable desert—a highly dubious proposition. For this reason, many Israelis see no serious territorial war in the immediate future. The Arabs can't; the Israelis won't.

(That, at least is the rational way of looking at it. But there is that potent old story about the scorpion and the camel that haunts any rational approach. It seems that the scorpion wanted to cross the Nile and, not being able to swim, asked a nearby camel for a lift. "Scorpion," said the camel, "I am not crazy; If I give you a ride across the Nile you'll sting me and I'll die." The scorpion considered that for a moment and countered, "Camel, this is nonsense. If I sting you while we are crossing the Nile together, we'll both drown." The camel was convinced, and the two set out to cross the Nile. Midway across the river—wham!—the scorpion stings the camel and soon the camel is floundering. It is apparent that both camel and scorpion will soon meet a watery grave. The camel talks: "Scorpion, idiot, why did you do it? Now we'll both die." The scorpion pauses thoughtfully as the water inches up to his neck and then says quietly, "Camel, you forgot one thing. This is the Middle East.")

Middle-Eastern irrationality aside, most Israeli military men regard the Arab guerrillas as no real threat. They are thought of as killers, not fighters, who will squeal on their brothers and are vastly overpublicized and overrated, only a few thousand in number drawn from a pool of millions of Arabs and capable only of nuisance value within the borders of Israel.

(That Israel is secure within her own borders can be verified by Wattenberg's First Law of Human Behavior, which states, "If there is something to be nervous about, Wattenberg will be nervous about it." And to a traveler in Israel these days the feeling is not one of nervousness despite the roadblocks leading into major cities and the Uzzi machineguns slung on the shouders of young soldiers who are just in from the front. There are many Israelis who also claim they are not nervous when traveling through the Arab towns on the occupied West Bank of Jordan—but they are crazy. I found Wattenberg's Law clearly applicable in Jenin, Nablus and other West Bank Arab communities.)

EARNED CURRENCY

To Ezer Weizman, Israel's current military security and her economic, psychological and demographic booms are not providential gifts from the Six-Day War. They are earned currency accumulated by Israelis by many years of back-breaking work, by many dead soldiers, by boys today who volunteered for paratroop training, and by mothers who in a classic reversal of the Jewish Mother story now plead with the generals to get their boys in the paratroops so that there will be peace in the house.

Weizman's view of recent Jewish history has variations in emphasis from Ben-Gurion's. Of course, like Ben-Gurion, Weizman likes to remind a visitor that there have been Jews in their land for 4,000 consecutive years, but he also notes that if Israelis ever have to cross the Suez Canal they will find pyramids built by Jewish slave labor in the time of the Pharaohs. He remembers that the Sinai is not historically a part of Egypt but only an uninhabited region that has been tacked on to that country for the last 50 years. He remembers that in his boyhood there was a great national celebration each time the Jewish National Fund was able to purchase land from the Arabs, and he sees lots of purchasable land in the West Bank territory that would be ideal for Jewish settlement. He remembers that the Palestine of the 1917 Balfour Declaration included both sides of the Jordan River (as did Biblical Israel) and that if there is an "artificial" state in the Middle East it is Jordan.

As Weizman flies a military plane from base to base around Israel, he often observes: "It's a big country now," and it is clear that he wants it to stay big even if this means that the present deadlock will have to continue. If shells must fall, better they fall in Suez and Sinai than on Tel Aviv and Jerusalem. And that seems to be the mood throughout the rest of the country, unless some real peace can be guaranteed.

If Weizman is regarded as somewhat of a hawk, Israel's Ambassador-At-Large, Michael Comay, former U.N. Ambassador for Israel, is certainly not a hawk in any man's aviary. Yet, in London earlier this year he described in blunt terms what would be the results of any imposed solution regarding the Mideast. "If you dictate a solution that Israel does not accept," he said, "you must be prepared to see it become a worthless scrap of paper or else mount an invasion of Israel. Are you prepared for that?"

DOOMSDAY TALK

The same question can be asked of the U.S., of France—and of Russia.

When the hour is late and the drinks are low and Israeli military men gather, the doomsday possibilities surface, as they do with military men all over the world. Because the Arabs pose no real military threat in the foreseeable future the military guessing game turns to what the Russians might or could do.

The ultimate questions are asked. Question: "Could the Russians invade?" Answer: "Very doubtful militarily. It would make Vietnam look like a tea party." Question: "Suppose the Russians attacked Israel with missiles?" The retort is quick: "Nuclear-tipped or conventional warhead?" And the breakdown is that the idea of Russians using nuclear missiles on the Israelis is most far-fetched, that conventional missiles hurt no worse than bombers, and that Tel Aviv could survive bombing from Egyptian or from Russians if it ever came down to it.

Political and economic pressures are another matter, and they could most effectively be wielded by the United States. The Israelis are deeply friendly to the United States, by kinship and by ideology. They are grateful for past help and understand that good relations in the future are crucial. But they know that the first order of national business is survival, and they are aware that no pressure that the U.S. can bring to bear could make them risk that survival. Israel's survival, they know, is ultimately in Israel's hands.

So Israel today is settled down for the long pull.

David Ben-Gurion looks to the future and says the Arabs could conceivably win a fifth or sixth or seventh war and what Israel needs for long-term survival is more Jews. He says that if Hitler had not killed the European Jews the current population of Israel might be 5 million or 7 million instead of 2½ million. Still, there are 14 million Jews in the world, 11½ million not living in Israel. Ben-Gurion is hopeful that many Russian Jews and some American Jews will one day find their way to Israel. He also hopes the Jewish birth rate in Israel will rise, and to this end supports plans for new and larger forms of housing, for creating part-time jobs for working mothers, for nursey schools. In Israel these days one also hears talk about making abortions much more difficult to obtain.

A FEW

Ben-Gurion views Jewish history as an eternal struggle of quality versus quantity. Moses said the Jewish nation would be "a few among people." This has proven to be true, but Ben-Gurion and most other Israelis are casting about for ways to boost the quantity in order to preserve the quality for the generations ahead.

In the meanwhile, the quality is still there. My grandfather's family has flourished and prospered. In their number today are a leading artist, a bulldozer driver, an agronomist, a micro-biologist, several English teachers, and my beautiful young cousin whose mother didn't let her compete in the Miss Israel contest (she would have won).

Two years ago one of the great-grandsons of my writer grandfather was in the Israeli Army force that stormed the Golan Heights. A slight young man with horn-rimmed glasses, he was creased by a bullet that came within an inch of his heart. He continued up the Heights and boarded a half-track that pursued the Syrians across the plains. The half-track hit a mine and shrapnel pierced his legs. He climbed aboard another half-track, which also hit a mine and sent additional shrapnel into his legs. He was on his way to a third half-track when he fainted from loss of blood.

Today, he is fine and preparing to take entrance exams for the Hebrew University. The shrapnel is still working its way out of his legs.

He is a fourth generation Israeli. He does not feel that he is in a new, or tiny, or artificial, or surrounded nation. He is there to stay.

He is the young man to remember while the dance of the diplomats continues in the capitals of the world.

FOR THE PEACE OF THE WORLD RED CHINA MUST NOT BE RECOGNIZED OR ADMITTED TO THE UNITED NATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ANDERSON of California). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, recently Italy and Canada opened negotiations with the Chinese Communists with a view to recognizing the Peking regime. A similar demarche is being considered by Belgium. The ostensible reason given is that such moves were motivated by the exigencies of internal politics. Yet no plausible reasons are given in that the recognition of Mao's regime is so fraught with grave international repercussions that it cannot in anywise be justified simply as a measure of political expediency. Besides, one should ask, Is a measure of political expediency ever advantageous and lasting for the purpose of obtaining peace for which it is so devised, let alone to say if it is at all wise?

Take Canada, for example. The establishment of a Red Chinese Communist diplomatic mission in Ottawa would furnish Mao with an important base of operations in the Western Hemisphere. The geographical propinquity and extensive common frontier between Canada and the United States will make it infinitively more difficult to guard against Communist activities of subversion and infiltration than to ward off similar activities from insular Cuba. It is a matter involving the vital security interests of the United States.

Italy, one of the most important members of NATO, has the largest Communist party in Europe. The opening of a Red Chinese Communist diplomatic mission in Rome would undoubtedly result in the expansion of the Maoist influence in Western Europe and give the Chinese Communists a field day for promoting social unrest and disruption as they did during the commotion in France last May. By the same token, a Red Chinese base in Brussels would mean Chinese Communist penetration into the heart of NATO, the cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy in Europe.

Though the United Kingdom and France recognized the Red Chinese Communist regime for different reasons, they shared the same bitter and humiliating experiences in their dealings with the Chinese Communists. This lesson should not be lost to us and to Canada and other European nations.

The United States has many friends and allies among the free nations in Asia who look to her for leadership in their efforts to resist the Red Chinese Communist threat and aggression. Living under the shadow of the Chinese mainland, these nations realize that, if left to their own devices, they cannot hope to safeguard their own security. In this connection it might be worthwhile to read a report "Which Will Be the Next Vietnam?" printed in the Reader's Digest of March 1969. This report states that any weakening of the U.S. posture in the Far East would have a great unsettling effect on their morale and their determination to stay on the side of the free world. Nothing but resolute leadership can insure the position and interests of the United States as a Pacific power.

It goes without saying that recognition of the Red Chinese Communist regime would be a shot in the arm for Chinese communism, teetering and tottering as it is, under internal turmoil and self-imposed isolation. Moreover it would give impetus as well as encouragement to persist in their policy of militant adventurism and setting aflame more of the so-called wars of national liberation in different parts of the world.

Recognition of the Red Chinese Communist regime would imply, as a corollary, voting in favor of its admission to the United Nations. The U.S. Congress over the years has repeatedly made known its position of being dead set against Red China's admission to that world organizations. It requires no stretch of the imagination to envision the disruptive influence the Peiping regime would wield in the United Nations if it were admitted to that body. Admission to membership of the Red Chinese Communists would upset the present, already delicate balance in the United Nations and seriously undermine the position of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the foregoing, it is eminently in the interests of the United States and world peace that we should not confine our efforts to an expression of deep concern to the authorities of Canada, Italy, and Belgium about their overtures or intention to recognize the Red Chinese Communist regime. We should make it emphatically clear to them that we are firmly opposed to such a move which cannot fail to have a detrimental effect on their relations with the United States. Merely to convey our deep concern without expressing our strong objection could be construed as tacit approval of their present course of action. Furthermore, the U.S. Congress should reaffirm its past resolution that, in the event of the Red Chinese Communist regime being admitted to the United Nations, the U.S. Government will have to reconsider its position vis-a-vis that world organization and the cost thereof.

TWENTY-FOUR YEARS AGO TO THE DAY, ANOTHER SCIENTIFIC MILESTONE WAS RECORDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the launching of Apollo 11 to the moon yesterday, for man's first walk on that planet, follows by 24 years to the day the testing of the world's first atomic bomb at a lonely site near the old town of Alamogordo, N. Mex.

The atomic age came into reality on July 16, 1945. The Alamogordo test was followed by the use of two nuclear weapons over Hiroshima—on August 6 of that year—and Nagasaki—on August 9—Japan, to end World War II.

During the intervening 24 years, large strides have been made in use of nuclear energy for constructive purposes—generation of electricity and use of radioactive materials in industry, medicine, agriculture, and space. As one example, a form of plutonium different from that used in the atomic weapon over Nagasaki is being utilized as a fuel in a heart pacemaker. The material, plutonium-238, is produced at the Savannah River Plant.

From the Alamogordo test on the morning of July 16, 1945, a message went over telephone wires to Washington. It said "New York Yankees," a prearranged code signal to report "successful beyond expectations." The code was based on the names of big league ball clubs. Had the experiment there that morning ended in failure, the code "Cincinnati Reds" would have been used. "Below expectations" would have been "Cleveland Indians" and "as expected" would have been "Brooklyn Dodgers." The code reflected the status of the baseball world at that time.

That the first attempt at an atomic explosion should have been successful was as though James Watt had sat down in 1763 and built a locomotive after watching steam lift the lid of his grandmother's teapot.

A flash with the intensity of the noonday sun and with a deep, growling roar marked mankind's transition to a new destiny at 5:30 a.m. on July 16, 1945. Like a Wagnerian opera, darkening heavens, pierced by sharp shafts of lightning, from which poured great gusts of rain, heightened the drama and added to the tension immediately before the detonation.

But Americans now live in a more benign era of nuclear energy. In one space application, a heater, fueled with plutonium-238, goes to the moon in a seismic recorder to be left there by the astronauts.

GONZALEZ PROPOSES ALTERNATIVE TO SURCHARGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, a vote on a tax measure is not a simple and uncomplicated thing for one to make. For one thing, procedurally a Member who is not a member of the Ways and Means Committee has no alternative over the traditional method normally enjoyed by the House to consider a tax measure, known as a closed rule, except to vote the measure up or down. He has no opportunity to offer amendments. Why this should be has never been clearly or satisfactorily explained. Why

XUM

a tax bill should have a sacrosanct status different from such important bills as appropriations, and authorizations, and housing bills, is very difficult to understand. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the power to tax is still the power to destroy. And I have detected in the mood of the constituency in particular and the public generally, dissent and outright distrust of the tax system as it has developed.

The contradiction of special privilege for the privileged and inordinate tax burdens for the lesser privileged are not only puzzling the American taxpayer but causing a serious erosion in the traditional faith in the taxing system that has made America so preeminently an example heretofore. There are valid reasons for this malaise. One does not have to resort to bombastic and dramatic examples such as millionaires paying no income taxes, billion dollar corporations paying no income taxes, and so forth. For example, the ludicrous and absolutely unexplainable administrative fiat by IRS in the case of some of the largest corporations in our country, who after being convicted on conspiracy to regulate prices and being fined by the Government to write off the fines and thereby for all intents and purposes make null and void the finding of the court.

The average citizen does not have to be a tax expert to know that the IRS has not had this consideration for him when he has had to pay traffic fines and other judicial impositions or penalities.

Yet, neither the Congress nor the administrations have done anything about this sorry and inexcusable conduct. But, so much for that. The more serious aspects of a tax impasse that are very eloquently revealed is the history of the enactment of the surtax and its extension by the House just a few days ago this year.

President Johnson first recommended strongly the enactment by the Congress of some tax measure in early 1967. By August of 1967, it was obvious to me that the Congress not only would not consider such a bill but also even refused to entertain conducting hearings on the subject matter.

This was the most distressing to me because it meant that while the executive branch of the Government was reporting very distressing and imperious matters, the legislative branch was apparently unaware and unconcerned. If the executive branch was correct, it simply would mean that the national interest would be imperiled unless the Congress, while not rubber-stamping the President's proposal, would at least offer an alternative.

It was at this point that I offered for the first time in all seriouness a suggestion borne of much study and research which I again announced last week and which I called NEST, the national economic stability trust fund. I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of my news release on NEST:

GONZALEZ PROPOSES ALTERNATIVE TO SURCHARGE

Texas U.S. Rep. Henry Gonzalez is proposing an alternative to the surcharge tax to be known as "NEST."

In a letter to President Nixon dated July 11, Gonzalez proposed a new National Economic Stability Trust fund which would replace the income tax surcharge. Gonzalez said he first proposed such an approach in 1967 in a letter to the House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur Mills and in speeches on the floor of the House.

Gonzalez said, "My idea is to have each taxpayer contribute to the NEST Fund an amount equal to the present surtax. When inflationary pressures ease, or economic conditions show a need, the money would be returned to the taxpayer in the form of a tax credit or a cash payment, but in no case would the fund keep anyone's money for more than five years."

Gonzalez said that the NEST concept would take money out of circulation ("which is what the surtax is supposed to be doing"), but would restore the money at the earliest practicable date.

"In fact, taxpayers could not use money in the NEST fund, but would simply hold it out of circulation until inflationary pressures cool," he continued.

"Contributions to the NEST fund," he said, "would be collected only in periods when economic indicators show serious inflationary threats; repayments would be made when recession is threatened; or when conditions permit."

The San Antonio Congressman is one of the 205 members of the House who voted against the extension of the surcharge tax.

"I believe that a substantial number of House members agree with me that the tax surcharge is apparently failing to meet its objectives, and that it is necessary to consider some alternative measure," he said.

Gonzalez pointed out that through the "NEST" plan, the government would have available a flexible method of controlling inflationary pressures, and could quickly remove restraints in case of recession.

"No such flexibility is presently available, since specific tax laws are required for making economic adjustments, and recent experience suggests that such laws may not be enacted quickly enough to be effective," he said.

"Every citizen," he continued, "who pays the income tax surcharge loses his money forever. Under the NEST plan, his money would be set aside by the government for repayment to him. This fact, together with the flexibility of the system, would provide a method that is effective and which would merit wide public confidence."

Prior to the news release, again in all seriousness, and sincerity, I wrote the President and the senior Senator as well as the junior Senator from Texas, asking their consideration when the Senate deliberated on the House-passed extension of the surtax.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point both letters:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1969.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States, White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you know, the House has approved an extension of the income tax surcharge by a narrow margin. I was among those who voted nay. I believe that substantial number of House members agree with me that the tax surcharge is apparently failing to meet its objectives, and that it is necessary to consider some alternate measure.

I proposed in 1967 that in lieu of an income tax surcharge Congress enact a loan system, whereby taxpayers would contribute the equivalent amount of the surcharge to a special government fund. Proceeds of the fund would be repaid to the taxpayers either through tax credits or direct payments when economic conditions permitted. This idea never received the serious study that it should have. I believe that experience with the surtax system is now sufficient to judge it less than a success, and accordingly urge that you give close study to the plan I propose.

It is said that the purpose of the income tax surcharge is to combat inflationary pressures by removing money from circulation. I propose a National Economic Stability Trust, which would have as its purpose stabilizing the national economy by means of a flexible application of fiscal controls.

The National Economic Stability Trust would be established by having each taxpayer contribute to the Trust fund an amount of money equal to five to ten per cent of his corporate or personal income tax liability. The trust would repay to the taxpayer, either through tax credits or direct payments, the amount of his contribution (possibly with interest) at such time as economic conditions permit, but in no case later than five years. Thus, the government would have available a flexible method of controlling inflationary pressures, and could quickly remove restraints in case of recession. No such flexibility is presently available, since specific tax laws are required for making economic adjustments, and recent experience suggests that such laws may not be enacted quickly enough to be effective.

Every citizen who pays the income tax surcharge loses his money forever. Under the National Economic Stability Trust plan, his money would be set aside by the government for repayment to him. This fact, together with the flexibility of the system, would provide a method that is effective and which would merit wide public confidence. I hope that you will give this your most careful consideration.

With kindest regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,
HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.

JULY 11, 1969.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: As you know, the House has approved an extension of the income tax surcharge by a narrow margin. I was among those who voted nay. I believe that substantial number of House members agree with me that the tax surcharge is apparently failing to meet its objectives, and that it is necessary to consider some alternate measure.

I proposed in 1967 that in lieu of an income tax surcharge Congress enact a loan system, whereby taxpayers would contribute the equivalent amount of the surcharge to a special government fund. Proceeds of the fund would be repaid to the taxpayers either through tax credits or direct payments when economic conditions permitted. This idea never received the serious study that it should have. I believe that experience with the surtax system is now sufficient to judge it less than a success, and accordingly urge that you give close study to the plan I propose.

It is said that the purpose of the income tax surcharge is to combat inflationary pressures by removing money from circulation. However, income from the surcharge is pressently appropriated and spent by the government, and therefore remains in circulation. I propose a National Economic Stability Trust, which would have as its purpose stabilizing the national economy by means of a flexible application of fiscal controls.

The National Economic Stability Trust would be established by having each taxpayer contribute to the Trust fund an amount of money equal to five to ten per cent of his corporate or personal income tax liability. The trust would repay to the taxpayer, either through tax credits or direct payments, the amount of his contribution (possibly with interest) at such time as economic conditions permit, but in no case later than five years. Thus, the government would have available a flexible method of controlling inflationary pressures, and could quickly remove restraints in case of recession. No such flexibility is presently available, since specific tax laws are required for making economic adjustments, and recent experience suggests that such laws may not be enacted quickly enough to be effective.

Every citizen who pays the income tax surcharge loses his money forever. Under the National Economic Stability Trust plan, his money would be set aside by the government for repayment to him. This fact, together with the flexibility of the system, would provide a method that is effective and which would merit wide public confidence. I hope that you will give this your most careful consideration.

With warmest regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

Henry B. Gonzalez,
Member of Congress.

I do hope that serious consideration is given to this suggestion for I sincerely believe that it is a way out of the tax impasse.

HIGHWAY SAFETY: COMMENTARY NO. 9

(Mr. **CLEVELAND** asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. **CLEVELAND.** Mr. Speaker, although the hearings on highway safety held by the Subcommittee on Roads of the Public Works Committee concluded some weeks ago, the problem is very much alive. As I have taken pains to point out in this series of commentaries, the problem involves many complex and interrelated factors.

My subcommittee is now having hearings on truck lengths, widths, and weights. Interestingly enough, we find safety considerations also involved. Although definitive study and research is lacking, there is evidence that increases in the length, width or weights of trucks could be an added threat to highway safety. There is a real need for research and study in this area of highway safety—as there of course is in other areas also.

Yesterday, Assistant Prof. John J. O'Mara, of the University of Iowa, presented a statement to the Subcommittee on Roads of the Public Works Committee in which he thoughtfully discussed vehicle size and weights as they relate to highway safety as well as other considerations such as damage to bridges and pavements, and so forth. The statement is perceptive and deserving of wide reading and careful consideration. I offer Professor O'Mara's discussion at this point in the Record, commending it to the attention of all who are interested in highway safety and improving our transportation policies.

Statement of John J. O'Mara

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is estimated that there were 21,060 persons killed on our nation's highways in the first five months of 1969. This total compares with 20,420 fatalities during the corresponding period of 1968, an increase of more than 600 persons killed, or approximately 3%, over the 1968 period. Thus, the traffic accident toll not only continues but continues to increase, as it has increased relentlessly since 1961.

Any proposal to change any facet of public policy concerning highway transportation must be evaluated in the context of this grievous and worsening problem which results in thousands killed and millions injured each year. The problem has been given more attention in recent years, but so far, countermeasures have not reduced the toll nor even stemmed the rise.

It is quite apparent that if the acceleration of the highway slaughter is to be stopped, firm resolution and action is required. One fundamental act would be to firmly resolve that no change in highway transportation policy should be adopted by any legislative body or other governmental agency *unless that change holds definite promise of improvement in the accident situation.*

SCOPE OF THE TRAFFIC ACCIDENT PROBLEM

From 1936 through 1961 the annual death toll of traffic accidents remained at about 38,000 per year with fewer during World War II. In 1962 the toll jumped above 40,000 for the first time in history, and it has continued to rise ever since then. The fatality rates, both on the basis of vehicle miles and of population, have increased also. The tragic total for 1968 is estimated at 55,500, an increase of almost 50% in seven years. See Table 1. Approximately 2,000,000 persons are injured each year and economic losses exceed $10 billion annually.

TABLE 1.—MOTOR VEHICLE DEATHS AND DEATH RATES

Year	Number of deaths	Mileage rate[1]	Population rate[2]
1961	38,091	5.2	20.8
1962	40,804	5.3	22.0
1963	43,564	5.4	23.1
1964	47,700	5.6	24.9
1965	49,163	5.5	25.4
1966	53,041	5.7	27.1
1967	53,100	5.5	26.8
1968	55,500	5.5	27.8

[1] Deaths per 100,000,000 vehicle-miles.

[2] Deaths per 100,000 population.

Even before 1962 it could be said that:

1. Motor-vehicle accidents are the third leading cause of death in the United States.
2. More American lives have been lost in motor-vehicle accidents than in all the wars in which the United States has engaged.
3. More children die as a result of motor-vehicle accidents than from any other cause.
4. Half of the victims are in the prime of life, between 15 and 45 years of age.
5. From the social and economic viewpoint, motor-vehicle accidents could be considered the most serious cause of death and injury in the United States.

VEHICLE SIZE AND WEIGHT

The physical characteristics of vehicles govern the design of many highway features including the steepness of grades, dimensions and strength of bridges, sharpness of curves, the geometry of intersections and interchanges, and the width and thickness of pavements. Consequently, it is necessary that the public regulate the size and weight of vehicles in order that they not exceed the traffic and structural capacities of existing highways and streets and their components.

However, safety is the primary factor to be considered in establishing most limiting criteria, and this is true of maximum dimensions and weights of vehicles. Public authorities, however, in adopting controls for these characteristics often enact measures which compromise safety and endanger the public. Such actions are primarily due to the paucity of reliable information concerning traffic and accidents.

LACK OF INFORMATION

The meager size of the accident data bank available is almost incredible. Highway transportation in the United States is an economic activity which exceeds $125 billion annually of which the various governments spend approximately $17 billion directly. The Federal government alone directly spends approximately $5 billion each year. Yet little money or effort has been spent to determine the essential facts of traffic accident occurrence.

One important aspect of this situation is that almost all accident investigation and reporting is directed toward the purpose of establishing who was at fault. The type of and condition of the vehicles most often are not recorded at all.

It is, therefore, difficult if not impossible to relate with certainty the incidence of traffic accidents to any single characteristic or pair of characteristics of vehicles. The same can be said of characteristics of roads, drivers and pedestrians. In most cases, however, general inferences can be drawn, e.g., the incidence of traffic accidents is higher among teen-age drivers.

There is considerable difference of opinion as to the relative accident involvement rates of passenger cars and of trucks. However, the preponderance of evidence of accident experience, especially that on Interstate Highways, toll roads and other arterial highways, suggests that the heavy truck is involved in serious accidents to a greater extent than is the passenger car. Probably the latest information along this line was that presented by the American Trucking Association and others in Congressional hearings in 1968. That testimony showed that heavy trucks accounted for 1.54 percent of vehicle registrations in 1964, traveled 5.33 percent of all the miles operated in this country, but were involved in 11.6 percent of all the fatalities.

At this time any increase in the maximum allowable values of the length, width, height or weight of vehicles can only aggravate this situation and lead to an increase in the number and severity of motor vehicle accidents on the highways.

VEHICLE LENGTH

There are many safety aspects of the length of vehicles operating on highways. One is the fact that the rear wheels of a highway vehicle on a curve usually follow a path closer to the center of the curve than the path of the front wheels. For example, a long truck making a right turn at a street intersection often must encroach upon the left lanes of both streets in order that the rear wheels clear the curb on the inside of the turn.

The same phenomenon occurs on a highway curve to a lesser extent. The longer the truck, the wider the truck and the sharper the curve, the more the rear end of the truck will be displaced toward the adjacent lane.

Although the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways has been built to high standards, it is likely that some parts of the system cannot safely accommodate trucks longer than 50 to 55 feet. These lengths were the design lengths recommended by the American Association of State Highway Officials prior to 1968 and used for the design of most of the Interstate System and for most primary highways.

It is certain that trucks longer than these lengths cannot negotiate some of the ramps, loops and similar components of the Interstate System and keep the whole of the truck within proper confines. The lateral displacement of the rear wheels of long trucks on the regular curves of the System could result in serious sideswipe accidents or could generate accidents by causing other drivers to shy away from the threatening truck. Furthermore, there are many miles of two-lane access roads over which Interstate Highway traffic must operate in order to use the Sys-

XUM

tem, which cannot safely accommodate longer trucks. On these highways and on the primary system, because of the narrowness of the pavement and the sharpness of the curves, it will be impossible to operate longer trucks without the rear of the unit encroaching on the opposite lane or coming dangerously close. If this should be true, it could be disastrous to the unwarned, unsuspecting drivers and passengers of vehicles in the opposite lane.

PASSING TIME AND DISTANCE

Another hazardous aspect of increased length is the increase in time and distance required for a passenger car to pass a longer vehicle, or for one long truck to pass one or more long vehicles. Standard procedures of the American Association of State Highway Officials usually are used for computing passing time and distance. However, those procedures do not suffice for many situations although the results can be quite critical in matters of safe sight distances, capacity and other factors.

AASHO policy is very broad, and the procedures for computing passing distances are generalized to approximate average passing maneuvers as they occur in passenger car traffic. It is questionable that those passing operations are representative of today's traffic as it operates on Interstate Highways, other freeways and even ordinary primary highways carrying a large percentage of truck traffic.

For example, the highest speed group covered by AASHO, 60–70 mph with an average passing speed of 62.0 mph, is somewhat representative of current traffic on such highways, but for the passing maneuver AASHO allows 11.3 seconds for occupancy of the left lane by the passing vehicle which makes the distance traveled during this part of the maneuver 1030 ft., all at a speed differential of 10 mph between the two vehicles. This policy does not encompass a very common situation of the type of highways under discussion: the passing of one long truck by another long truck at a very small speed differential.

It is quite common today to encounter such an operation, and for the driver of a following car, even on a freeway, it involves an aggravating delay. The slow speed differential is common, because nearly all traffic is moving at or near the maximum speed limit, and drivers desiring to pass often must do so at speed differentials of 2 to 3 mph. If trucks become longer, such passing operations may become intolerable.

At speed differentials of 2 to 3 mph, left lane occupancy may be of the order of 200 seconds, and, at 62 mph, the corresponding distance traveled while the trucks are essentially side by side will be of the order of 18,000 ft. or 3 to 4 miles.

In periods of inclement weather trucks splash particles or sheets of water or slush over other vehicles in passing operations. These passings now last upwards of 30 seconds and often the visibility of car drivers is almost completely obscured during this time.

A common type of accident occurring with today's truck combinations is the accident which involves "jack-knifing," an action in which the rear of the trailer unit skids sidewise, and beyond the control of the operator, to the extent that it swings 90° or more, sometimes almost 180°, about the swivel at the rear of the tractor unit. This type of accident often causes serious injury or death to drivers and passengers in nearby vehicles as well as to the truck occupants. Longer trucks will increase this hazard, and, if multiple trailers are authorized, the increase will be compounded.

NUMBER OF TRUCKS

The number of trucks and the percentage of trucks in the vehicle population are increasing steadily. The number of trucks affects both the safety and capacity of highways.

The traffic capacity of a highway usually is expressed in terms of vehicles per hour or vehicles per day. These are passenger car volumes, the trucks being included as "passenger car equivalents." The passenger car equivalent of a truck depends on many factors one of which is the truck length. AASHO estimates this equivalent to be as low as 2 passenger cars for small trucks in ideal conditions to as much as 20 for large trucks in more involved circumstances.

Thus, increases in numbers of trucks, coupled with increases in length, seriously reduce the capacity of a highway facility. When both increases are concurrent the reduction in capacity occurs in an exponential fashion. Many highways are operating at or over capacity not because of the number of vehicles per hours but because of the high percentage of trucks in the traffic stream.

VEHICLE WIDTH

Increasing the width of vehicles presents additional hazards in many ways. One is that they will be too wide for the width of existing lanes on existing highways.

As truck width has increased over the years, lane widths have needed to be increased from 7 or 8 feet to 9 feet to 10 feet to 11 feet and now 12 feet. A lane width of 12 feet is generally provided wherever there are more than a few trucks. These lane widths are because of 8′–0″ trucks. If trucks become 8′–6″ plus allowances, which implies actual widths of more than 9′–0″, pavements should be widened additionally. The situation is compounded for wider, as well as longer, trucks on curves.

There is a limit to lane width, and we may have already reached it. When lanes are widened to 13 or 14 feet, some drivers try to force-fit 3 lanes of traffic into 2 lanes of a highway or street.

TRUCK WEIGHT

Heavier trucks pose a very serious hazard to highway safety. A truck requires more distance in which to stop than does a passenger car.

Everyone understands that a body set in motion tends to continue in motion and that this phenomenon is a function of the mass or weight of the body. It is true of vehicles—a heavy vehicle is more difficult to stop than a light vehicle.

The ordinary semi-trailer now in common use requires more than twice the distance to stop as that of a passenger car at low or high speeds, see Table 2. If the weight is further increased without a drastic change in truck braking systems, the stopping distance will become longer still, and this will increase hazards in many ways.

TABLE 2.—APPLICATION AND BRAKING DISTANCES FOR VARIOUS TYPES OF VEHICLES AT 3 SPEEDS

[In feet]

Vehicle type	Application and braking distance at—		
	20 m.p.h.	40 m.p.h.	60 m.p.h.
Passenger cars	20	72	182
Lightweight trucks:			
2-axle, 4-tire	25	104	228
2-axle, 6-tire	36	149	329
Heavyweight trucks:			
3-axle single unit truck 3-axle semitrailer combination 4-axle semitrailer combination	40	166	365
5-axle semitrailer combination	46	168	375
Truck with full trailer, and truck tractor with semitrailer and full trailer	54	197	440

Source: H. Doc. 354, 88th Cong., 2d sess.

Another safety aspect of truck weight concerns the manoeuverability of heavy vehicles. It is much more difficult to change the direction of a heavy vehicle than a light one and this is particularly true at high speeds. It is often difficult or impossible for a truck driver to perform evasive actions in potential accident situations in high speed traffic, and this fact probably accounts for some of the excess involvement of heavy trucks in accidents. This situation would worsen seriously with any sizable increase in truck weights. Quick manoeuvering of a 60 or 65 ton combination probably would be a virtual impossibility.

DAMAGE TO BRIDGES

Probably the first adverse effect of increased weights which comes to mind is that of damage to bridges. This is emphasized by the recent rash of bridge failures, some of which have resulted in very extensive loss of life.

Serious damage and failure would occur. At the Congressional hearings in 1968 the president of AASHO pointed out that Interstate bridges are designed for a 32,000-pound loading, and it was estimated that increasing permissive weights from the present 32,000-pound limit to 34,000 pounds would overstress many bridges by 30 percent or more.

DAMAGE TO PAVEMENTS

Structural damage to pavements because of heavier trucks will affect safety in at least two ways. First, the pavement will become rough and the serviceability index will decrease at a much more rapid rate than the present rate. Rough pavement is a definite traffic hazard especially at high speeds.

Second, the rapid deterioration of the pavement will result in earlier and more frequent patching and repair operations and complete resurfacing projects. The latter also will require rehabilitation of the roadway and part of the roadside in order to bring shoulders, drainage structures, guard rail, etc., in compliance with the new elevations of the pavement. All this work will need to be done "under traffic", and there is no highway situation more fraught with danger than that produced by working in the roadway under traffic, especially high speed traffic accustomed to the relatively unrestricted and unconcerned driving conditions of freeways. Highway department experience continually verifies the extreme danger of working under traffic, danger not only to the workmen but to the highway users as well.

That heavier trucks will cause considerable extra damage to pavements almost goes without saying. The AASHO Road Test at Ottawa, Illinois clearly demonstrated the degree of distress imposed on pavements by heavy trucks. It is not a purpose of this report to present a discussion of the numerical values of indexes expressing such distress, but it can be said that an increase from 18,000 to 20,000 pounds axle loads is likely to increase the wear and tear on pavements by some 25% or so.

An important factor in pavement distress is the number of repetitions of the loads. This factor should be considered in any evaluation of future truck traffic, because the growth in the use of trucks in the United States is much greater than that anticipated by most highway planners. To cite one instance, design criteria for Interstate 80 in the vicinity of Iowa City, Iowa showed the estimated 1975 traffic volume (AADT) to be 20,010 vehicles per day of which 12% was estimated to be trucks. The actual traffic volume in 1968 is running about 15,000 v.p.d., which is probably about 2,000 v.p.d. more than anticipated, but the trucks constitute about 25% of the traffic volume. This means that the number of trucks in 1968 is almost twice the number for which the highway was designed to carry in 1975. Thus, the number of repetitions of heavy loads already greatly exceeds design values. Many miles of Interstate 80 in Iowa have needed extensive pavement patching and resurfacing in only about five years of operation.

These truck volumes also bring the traffic flow up to or above the traffic capacity of the facility because of the large number of equivalent passenger cars indicated and because of the high operating speeds during peak flows. During these periods the speeds average about 70 mph on Interstate 80 in Iowa. Capacity traffic volumes at such speeds probably breeds many accidents.

NEED OF RESEARCH

The assessment of prospective structural damage to bridges and pavements can be predicated upon a reasonable body of knowledge, but the same cannot be said of many of the other aspects of vehicle size and weight. For example, the geometry of the positions and paths of wheels and the overhang portions of combination truck units on curves and turns is so complex that much design data is based on measurements of small models. Other aspects of the truck-on curve situation, such as the likelihood of sliding toward the inside or toward the outside, must be resolved intuitively.

One area of needed research is, then, that associated with the operations of trucks and truck combinations of various sizes and weights under actual field conditions. Testing should be done with full size vehicles under all kinds of roadway, traffic and climatic conditions. This research also should include determination of the involvement of trucks in traffic accidents as one part of a comprehensive data collection and analysis program.

NEED OF TRANSPORTATION POLICY

It is more important still that research be done in the more fundamental aspects of the total transportation problem. A common expression for the state of transportation in this country is that it is "a mess". There is a lack of an effective and coordinated effort to establish and pursue long-range goals and objectives.

For example, it is ironic that present public policy is increasing the highway slaughter by encouraging more and more highway travel while at the same time it is throwing away a railroad transportation system which is at least ten times safer than highway transportation. The relative safety of rail travel is usually expressed in terms of passenger miles, but the same advantage holds true for freight: if some freight traffic could be shifted from the highway, safety would benefit.

Air transportation is in a critical state and has been for some time, and other media and situations present serious problems. The nature of the road system to be encouraged and supported by the Federal government is the subject of current deliberation.

A national transportation policy is needed, a policy such as that developed by the study initiated by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, which was begun in January, 1940 and completed in May, 1942. The report was published as "Transportation and National Policy," a very comprehensive summary of the situation at that time and a competent statement of worthy goals and objectives for the future. With proper support a similar study could be performed now and similarly could be completed in a relative short time.

For the present it would be well to hold in abeyance any critical policy changes, especially those which are of a piece-meal nature. In highway transportation no such change concerning traffic regulation should be adopted unless it shows promise of lessening the tragic toll of motor vehicle accidents.

REFERENCES

1. Accident Facts, 1968 Edition, and Accident Statistics. National Safety Council, Chicago, Illinois.

2. Hearings, Subcommittee on Roads, Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, 90th Congress, 2nd Session, Washington, D.C., 1968.

3. Hearings, Subcommittee on Roads, Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, 90th Congress, 2nd Session, Washington, D.C., 1968.

4. Traffic Control and Roadway Elements. Bureau of Public Roads and Automotive Safety Foundation. Washington, D.C. 1963.

5. A Policy on Geometric Design of Rural Highways, American Association of State Highway Officials. Washington, D.C. 1954 and 1965.

6. The AASHO Road Test. HRB Special Reports and Records. Various dates. Highway Research Board, Washington, D.C.

7. House Document 354, 88th Congress, 2nd Session. Washington, D.C. 1964.

8. Transportation and National Policy. National Resources Planning Board, Washington, D.C. 1942.

9. Design documents. Interstate Highway No. 80. Iowa State Highway Commission, Ames, Iowa, 1962.

10. Highway Design and Operational Practices Related to Highway Safety. American Association of State Highway Officials, Washington, D.C. 1967.

CHEMICAL WARFARE IN VIETNAM

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent study on chemical warfare in Vietnam by J. B. Neilands, professor of biochemistry at the University of California, Berkeley, as a further contribution to the ongoing discussion of chemical and biological warfare:

CHEMICAL WARFARE IN VIETNAM

(By J. B. Neilands, professor of biochemistry, University of California)

INTRODUCTION

This paper will furnish certain technical information on the particular chemical agents in use in the Vietnam war. It will also estimate the magnitude and purpose (or intent) of such use, and the relationship of this program of chemical warfare to international law. Finally, some suggestions will be made for appropriate action on the part of the scientific community.

So far as the author is aware, agents of biological warfare have not been deliberately deployed in Vietnam. It is true that rats, which are vectors of plague, are ecologically favored in the defoliated zones. The rat population also tends to build up in the garbage dumps around the refugee camps. Infectious agents follow all wars and the conflict in Vietnam is no exception. The incidence of plague in South Vietnam is such that, by the standards of the World Health Organization, all ports in the country should be closed.

Where does one draw the line between chemical agents and incendiaries? How should napalm be classified?

Napalm was first compounded by Professor Louis Fieser of Harvard University during World War II (29). The word was coined from the names of *na*phthenic and *palm*itic acids; subsequently it was found that the crude ingredients used by Fieser were not especially rich in palmitic acid. The original name has persisted, however, and is applied to all formulations of gelled gasoline. In a letter to me dated September 26, 1966, Fieser states: ". . . We certainly had no thought of use of napalm against non-military personnel . . ." But it is now accepted that napalm is dropped on open hamlets, incinerating civilians in their huts (30). The use of napalm has accelerated on the following scale: 2181 tons dropped in 1963; 1777 tons in 1964; 17,659 tons in 1965; 54,620 in 1966; by March of 1968 the total tonnage dropped by the Air Force had reached 100,000 tons (the Navy also drops napalm bombs and the Army uses the substance in flame-throwers) (8). Some years ago a type of napalm with superior adhesive quality was developed. This form, napalm B, consists of 50% polystyrene, 25% benzene and 25% gasoline (9). Dow Chemical is the sole supplier.

Most casualties from napalm probably arise from asphyxiation. This is a consequence of the fact that burning napalm sucks all of the oxygen from the atmosphere and, because of incomplete combustion, gives rise to carbon monoxide (6), (7).

White phosphorus is the classical ignition substance for napalm. Elementary phosphorus does not occur in Nature; on exposure to air it ignites spontaneously. As a munition, phosphorus can be delivered via either bombs or shells.

The maximum allowable concentration of white phosphorus in air is 0.1 mg/cu. m. (10). Dr. A. Behar, a French physician, writes: "Phosphorus has the particularity that inside the wound or burn, it burns slowly. On occasion this slow combustion lasts up to 15 days. At night can be seen the greenish light produced by the material that continues burning the flesh and bones. Besides this, accompanied by the wounds and the profound burns, the victims suffer a severe intoxication produced by the augmentation by three or more times the quantity of inorganic phosphorus in the body." (11). According to a manual of civilian defense: "One thing to remember about these phosphorus bombs is to be sure that the solid particles that are in the air do not touch your skin. They cause terrible burns . . ." (12). Evidently, this weapon is being directed at human targets: "We killed them one by one with grenades, direct hits with Willie Peter—white phosphorus artillery shells—or with napalm" said Major John Borgman of Aurora, Ind., commander of the Special Forces' Fifth Mobile Strike Force. (13).

AGENTS

Chemical weapons presently in use in Vietnam, as announced by official U.S. sources, may be classified as either (a) Herbicides or (b) Anti-personnel gases.

(a) Herbicides.[1] In late 1942 Dr. E. J. Kraus, Chairman of the Botany Department at the University of Chicago and an expert on plant hormones and growth regulators, suggested to committees of the National Academy of Science that "the toxic properties of growth-regulating substances for the destruction of crops or the limitation of crop production" might be of military significance (14). The U.S. Army then set up a large program on herbicide research at the recently established Camp Detrick; by the end of World War II more than 1000 different chemicals had been tested. In June, 1945, the Army was prepared to recommend the use of ammonium thiocyanate as a defoliant in the Pacific but the idea was rejected by higher civilian authorities on the basis that ". . . If we used this chemical, we would be accused of conducting poison gas warfare . . ." (14).

Following a field test of the butyl esters of the phenoxyacetic acids at Camp Drum in New York, the government of South Viet-

---

[1] Professor A. W. Galston of Yale University has published critical analyses of the defoliation of Vietnam in: *Scientist and Citizen, 9* #7, 1967; *CBW:* Chemical & Biological Warfare (S. Rose, ed.) Harrap, 1968; *New Republic,* Nov. 25, 1967; *New Scientist,* June 13, 1968.

XUM

nam asked the U.S. Army to apply defoliants for control of guerilla forces. Preliminary tests carried out in Vietnam between July, 1961, and April, 1962, demonstrated that the esters of 2,4–D and 2,4,5–T were capable of killing most of the plant species in that country. Thailand, having similar vegetation, was used as a test site for development of other sprays; simultaneously, the Army conducted tests in Texas and Puerto Rico. A seventy mile stretch of Highway 15 out of Bien Hoa was sprayed in early 1962 and a high Vietnamese official said: "Tests have shown that manioc and sweet potatoes die four days after having been sprayed. These are the two most important food staples for the communist bands in the mountains." (14). The first operational spraying of herbicides for crop destruction in known Viet Cong strongholds was carried out in late November, 1962 (14).

The first group of C–123 cargo planes, equipped with tanks and spray nozzles, arrived at Tan Son Nhut airport on November 29, 1961. From this modest beginning, "Operation Ranch Hand" has escalated to a level which requires the better part of $100 million annually for chemicals alone. Table I shows estimated areas sprayed through 1968. In the first 9 months of 1967, over 10% of the area treated was crop land.

TABLE I.—ESTIMATED AREA TREATED WITH HERBICIDES IN SOUTH VIETNAM (14)

[Acres per year]

Year	Defoliation	Crop destruction	Total
1962	17, 119	717	17, 836
1963	34, 517	297	34, 814
1964	53, 873	10, 136	64, 009
1965	94, 726	49, 637	144, 363
1966	775, 894	112, 678	888, 572
1967 (January–September)	843, 606	121, 400	965, 006
1967	1, 486, 446	221, 312	[1] 1, 707, 758
1968	1, 297, 244	87, 064	[1] 1, 384, 308

[1] These data from the Guardian, May 3, 1969.

Three main types of herbicides have been used, viz, phenoxyacetic acids (2,4–D and 2,4,5–T), cacodylic acid and picloram. Table II gives some characteristics of these substances:

TABLE II.—HERBICIDES USED BY U.S. MILITARY FORCES IN VIETNAM

Chemical	Name		Toxicity	
	Common	Code[1]	Man	Plants
2,4-dichlorophenoxy.cetic acid	2,4-D	Orange	Low	General defoliant.
2,4,5-trichlorophenoxyacetic acid	2,4,5-T	do.		
Dimethylarsinic acid	Cacodylic acid.	Blue	Moderate	Rice.
3,5,6-trichloro-4-aminopicolinic acid	Picloram	White	Low	Broadleaved crops.

[1] "Orange" is a 50–50 mixture of the n-butyl esters of 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T; agent, "purple" is similar with some isobutyl ester of 2,4,5-T replacing the n-butyl ester of this herbicide.

The phenoxyacetic acids are the favorite herbicides for Vietnam; in 1967 and 1968 the Department of Defense commandeered the entire U.S. production of 2,4,5-T, amounting to some 13 or 14 million pounds. (15). If applied once, the phenoxyacetic acids probably will not kill trees; if applied repeatedly, trees may be killed. In the soil these particular herbicides are rapidly degraded to harmless products. The greatest threat from their massive application in Vietnam is that they may denude the land, alter the ecology (including that of the soil) and possibly change the climate. Up to half of the dry weight of many soils may be microorganisms—bacteria, fungi, other organisms—and much of this life exists in a rhizosphere fed by organic substances excreted by plant roots. Total destruction of the vegetation could lead to extensive soil erosion. Much of the soil of South Vietnam is lateritic and unless it is covered by plant growth it could become baked into a rock-like consistency (laterite) and irreversibly lost for agricultural purposes. (16).

Cacodylic acid is being used to kill rice in the Viet Cong areas. It contains 54.29% arsenic. The LD_{50} in dogs is about 1^{g} kilo, which means that it is a fairly toxic substance. U.S. authorities have stated that it is no more toxic than aspirin. Nothing is known about the fate of this substantial amount of arsenic introduced into the biosphere. Once reduced from the 5+ to the 3+ state, arsenic becomes much more toxic. Demethylation of cacodylic acid renders it 10 times more poisonous, and biochemical systems are known which are capable of this reaction.

Picloram, the third main herbicide applied in Vietnam, is similarly hazardous. In one test, only 3.5% of the administered dose vanished from the test plot in 467 days. It thus retains phytotoxicity for a very great period, possibly decades. Picloram, which is also manufactured by Dow Chemical, is not authorized for use on a single American crop (17).

Obviously, total destruction of vegetative life results in the elimination of all animal life as well. No one can say what Operation Ranch Hand will ultimately do to the ecology of Vietnam (18, 19). One study has been made of possible consequences, without any field work in Vietnam (14). The Department of Defense then sent one plant scientist to Vietnam but he stayed for only one month, ventured no more than a few yards out of camps and made no attempt to examine the crop destruction program. (20). The latter amounts to the use of starvation as a weapon (31).[2]

(b) Anti-personnel gases. On March 22 and 23 of 1965 the New York Times and other news media made the first report on the use of antipersonnel gases in Vietnam. White House Press Secretary George Reedy called the gases "riot control" agents and said President Johnson was not consulted on their use. There was an immediate world-wide reaction. Secretary Rusk stated that the gases used in Vietnam were not banned by the Geneva Protocol of 1925, and he implied they would be used only in "riot control" situations. A State Department source was quoted as saying: "The Geneva protocol of 1925, prohibiting the use of 'asphyxiating, poisonous and other gases', was never ratified by the U.S. Senate. So, the U.S. is not bound by it. But the State Department does not consider the use of riot-control gas in Vietnam as a violation of this agreement anyway."

Secretary McNamara then released data on CN, CS and DM, the three gases he said were chosen for use in Vietnam (see Table III).

TABLE III.—CHARACTERISTICS OF ANTIPERSONNEL CASES ADMITTED TO BE IN USE IN VIETNAM (32)[1]

Agent	Code	Effect	LCt_{50} mg/-min/m³
Chloroacetophenone	CN	Harassing, lachrymation.	8, 500
o-chlorobenzalmalononitrile	CS	Harassing, nausea.	Large
Diphenylaminochloroarsine	DM	do	30, 000

[1] There is an unconfirmed report that use of DM was withdrawn.

By late 1965 it was not difficult to find news items such as: "Marines Use Tear Gas in Caves to Oust Vietnamese Civilians" (23), i.e., the "riot control" use had given way to underground application (24). An air pump, called a "Mighty Mite", was devised for pumping the gas into tunnels (5). A compilation of press reports indicates that these gases are in massive use in various ways in Vietnam (5).[3]

Thus far there has been no detailed accounting of the number of casualties arising from the use of gas, but the total must be a substantial figure. In one operation an Australian soldier, Robert Botwell, was killed by a combination of smoke and "non-lethal" gas even though he was wearing a mask (6, 25). A Canadian doctor who spent several years at the Quang Ngai Hospital in South Vietnam writes:

"During the last three years I have examined and treated a number of patients, men, women and children, who had been exposed to a type of war gas, the name of which I do not know. The type of gas used makes one quite sick when one touches the patient, or inhales the breath from their lungs. After contact with them for more than three minutes one has to leave the room in order not to get ill.

The patient usually gives a history of having been hiding in a cave or tunnel or bunker or shelter into which a cannister of gas was thrown in order to force them to leave their hiding place. Those patients that have come to my attention were very ill with signs and symptoms of gas poisoning similar to those that I have seen in veterans from the first World War treated at Queen Mary Veterans Hospital in Montreal. The only difference between these cases was that these Vietnamese patients were more acutely ill and, when getting over their acute stage, presented a similar picture to that of the war veterans.

Patients are feverish, semi-comatose, severely short of breath, vomit, are restless and irritable. Most of their physical signs are in the respiratory and circulatory systems . . .

The mortality rate in adults is about 10% while the mortality rate in children is about 90% . . ." (26).

An article in the Saigon Post, October 11, 1967, titled "U.S. Tear Gas Use Saves Lives of Viet Innocents" provoked this response from an eyewitness: "About three and one half months ago I was involved in an attempt to be of assistance to some six thousand new refugees that had been created in Quang Ngai Province by a forced evacuation of an area under Viet Cong control . . . I took two of them, a ten year old boy and a twelve year old girl, by far the most serously ill, and drove the eight miles back to Quang Ngai. Emergency measures proved fatal for the boy, he was in the morgue the next morning when I went to the hospital: he died from an overdose of tear gas . . . The victims reported that about twenty women and children did not even make it out of the cave . . ." (27).

---

[2] Admiral Wm. Leahy, in response to a suggestion made in 1944 that biological agents be used to destroy the Japanese rice crop, said such activity would ". . . violate every Christian ethic I have ever heard of and of all the known laws of war." (*I Was There*, Wm. Leahy, McGraw-Hill 1950).

[3] CS gas is exploded in bunkers to render them uninhabitable (Montreal Star, April 19, 1969 p5)

There have been unconfirmed reports that agent BZ, an "incap", has been released in Vietnam; so far as the writer is aware, these reports have never been documented and verified. In late 1968 a chemical trade journal announced that plans exist to manufacture 2.16 million pounds of an "irritant", presumably CS(28).

APPLICABLE LAWS(6)

The Hague Convention of 1907, signed and ratified by the U.S., declared in its Article 25: ". . . belligerents do not have unlimited right concerning the choice of means of doing harm to the enemy." After World War I there was universal horror about the effects of gas, and this led to the Geneva (Gas) Protocol of 1925. The text of the substantive part is: "Whereas the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases, and of all analogous liquids, materials or devices, has been justly condemned by the general opinion of the civilized world. . . ."[4]

By the 1930s there was a common agreement among nations, or at least an understanding, that the laws and customs of war had been well codified. Then came the Nazi atrocities, followed by the Tribunal at Nuremberg. While aggression, or a crime against the peace, was recognized as the most important fracture of international law, Nuremberg took note of two other types of crimes, viz., ". . . murder, ill-treatment or deportation to slave labor or for any other purpose, of civilian populations of or in occupied territory, murder or ill-treatment of prisoners of war or persons on the seas, killing of hostages, plunder of public or private property, wanton destruction of cities, towns or villages, or devastation not justified by military necessity . . .", and "Murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation and other inhuman acts done against any civilian population . . . in connection with any crime against peace or any war crime." These were the war crimes proper, and the crimes against humanity, resp. Another relevant statute is the Genocide Convention adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1946. The following articles are pertinent:

"Article I

"The contracting parties confirm that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, is a crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and punish.

"Article II

"In the present convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

"(a) Killing members of the group

"(b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group

"(c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part.

"(d) Imposing measures intended to prevent birth within the group.

"Article III

"(Enumerates the acts to be punishable)

"Article IV

"Persons committing genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article III shall be punished, whether they are constitutionally responsible rulers, public officials or private individuals."

To what extent are citizens and soldiers of the U.S. bound by these agreements. The U.S. Constitution in Article VI, Cl. 2, states: "This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States, which shall be made in Persuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the Supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding." The responsibilities of military personnel are enunciated in Section II, Par. 498 of the Department of the Army Field Manual: "Any person, whether a member of the armed forces or a civilian, who commits an act which constitutes a crime under international law is responsible therefore and liable to punishment. Such offenses in connection with war comprise: (a) Crimes against peace, (b) Crimes against humanity, and (c) War Crimes . . ."

We have already noted that the U.S. claims that the Vietnam antipersonnel gases are not covered by the Geneva Protocol and, even if they were, this country is not a party to the agreement. But the U.S. supported a United Nations resolution in 1966 which asked all states to adhere to the Protocol. Furthermore, the Protocol explicitly outlaws *all* gases without exception.[5]

It is interesting to compare this body of international law with a statement attributed by US News & World Report (2-15-65) to Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge: "As far as I'm concerned, the legal aspect of this affair is of no significance . . ."

CONCLUSION

1. By the massive and unrestrained use of herbicides and anti-personnel gases in Vietnam, the U.S. is in violation of numerous international laws, including those pertaining to genocide.

2. The land of Vietnam, in the South, has been drenched with herbicides on a scale unprecedented in history. Certain of the agents used, i.e., picloram, have not and would not be approved for similar use in the United States. No one can forecast what effect these herbicides will have on the human population, the total ecology and the future agricultural productivity of the soil.

3. By maiming and killing civilians, most of whom are children under five, pregnant and lactating women, the aged and infirm, with application of anti-personnel gases in confined spaces, the United States is guilty of crimes against humanity. Furthermore, such use of anti-personnel gases has tended to legitimize chemical warfare.

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE AMERICAN SCIENTIST

Existing scientific associations being compromised beyond redemption, the onus is upon scientists to form a specific organization which will educate the public on the facts of (a) chemical warfare abroad, as in Vietnam, and (b) research on chemical warfare agents such as is conducted at military installations (Detrick), universities (most) and in the colonies (islands, Latin America). Such an organization, named "Scientist's Committee on Chemical & Biological Warfare", was set up at the Dallas meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in December, 1968. Professor E. W. Pfeiffer of the Zoology Department of the University of Montana and the writer are serving as Executive Secretary and Chairman, respectively.

The Geneva Protocol should be ratified by all nations and attempts should be made to secure international agreements for elimination of research on Chemical and Biological weapons.

REFERENCES

Seven books especially recommended[6]

1. Hersh, Seymour. Chemical and Biological Warfare: America's Hidden Arsenal. Bobbs Merrill, 1968
2. Rothschild, J. H. Tomorrow's Weapons. McGraw-Hill, 1964
3. Rose, Steven (ed.) CBW: Chemical and Biological Warfare. Beacon, 1968
4. Clarke, R. The Silent Weapons. McKay, 1968
5. Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam. In the Name of America. Turnpike Press, 1968
6. Duffett, John. (ed.) Against the Crime of Silence. O'Hare, 1968
7. Takman, John. (ed.) Napalm, An International Symposium. Raben & Sjogren, 1967

Additional citations

8. San Francisco Chronicle, Mar. 19, 1968
9. C & E News, Mar. 14, 1966
10. Merck Index, Vol. 7, p. 810
11. Statement of Dr. A. Behar, a French physician who visited North Vietnam
12. Fairhurst, Isabelle. Manual of High Explosives, Incendiaries, and Poison Gases. 1942
13. San Francisco Chronicle, Mar. 31, 1969.
14. Report of the Midwest Research Institute, 1967. Available from U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Clearing House for Federal, Scientific and Technical Information, 5285 Port Royal Rd., Springfield, Virginia 22151, $3.
15. Letter by Thomas O. Perry to *Science*, May 10, 1968.
16. Galston, A. W. Lecture on herbicides in Vietnam, AAAS, Dallas, Dec., 1968.
17. Harvey, G. R. and Mann, J. D. Picloram in Vietnam. *Scientist* and *Citizen*, 10, #7, p 165, 1968.
18. Pfeiffer, E. W. Chemical Warfare in Vietnam and the American Scientific Community. *Scientific World*, #6, p 16,, 1968, Science Journal. Feb., 1969.
19. Pfeiffer, E. W. Ecological Effects of the Vietnam War Science Journal. Feb. 1969.
20. Tschirley, Fred H. Defoliation in Vietnam. *Science, 163,* 779, 1969.
21. Nottingham, Judith *Pax et Libertas* Vol *33,* p. 29, 1968.
22. New York Times, Mar. 23, 1965.
23. New York Times, Sept. 8, 1965.
24. See letter from Canadian physician at Quang Ngai Hospital.
25. See reference #5, p. 21; reference #6, p. 344.
26. Letter to E. W. Pfeiffer dated Nov. 23, 1967.
27. Letter by David Neufeld to Saigon Post, dated Oct. 20, 1967.
28. C & E News, Nov. 11, p. 27, 1968
29. Fieser, L. F. The Scientific Method. Reinhold, 1964.
30. Harvey, Frank Airwar-Vietnam, Bantab, 1967.
31. Meyer, Jean See Chapter #6, reference 3.
32. See reference #5, p. 120.

ADDENDUM

Professor E. W. Pfeiffer, Executive Secretary of the Scientist's Committee on Chemical and Biological Warfare, visited South Vietnam in the period March 17 to April 1, 1969, under the auspices of the Society for Social Responsibility in Science and Scientific Research Magazine (McGraw-Hill), Pfeiffer flew on a defoliation mission, made a 3 hour trip by boat through the lower Saigon River and talked with military personnel,

---

[4] Originally ratified by 42 nations, subsequently by many more; signed but never ratified by the United States.

[5] Even in the absence of ratification, the U.S. can be charged with crimes "recognized as such by common, public demand, and by the existing laws of humanity" (Nuremburg Judgment).

[6] Review articles appear in *Science* 155, 174, 299, 1967 (Elinor Langer); Viet Report, June/July, 1966 (Carol Brightman); *Scientist & Citizen,* Vol. 9, No. 7, 1967

XUM

plantation owners and scientists. Hardly any animal life was sighted in the estuary of the Saigon River. Elsewhere, a substantial fraction of the forest trees were observed to have been killed. (The Pentagon reported in 1967 that 16% of the forest area in South Vietnam had been treated; spraying in the Mekong Delta or in North Vietnam has been denied). Pfeiffer concludes that if sufficient equipment were available, the entire country would have been defoliated as of this date (*Missoulian*, Missoula, Mont., April 13, 1969, p. 33–34).

Note added in proof: The use of the persistent herbicide picloram has been justified on the grounds that insufficient phenoxyacetic acid type herbicide are produced in the United States to satisfy the demand in Vietnam. However, in early 1969 the Department of Defense announced cancellation of a contract for reactivation of a herbicide manufacturing plant in St. Louis (see *Science*, *164*, 373, 1969).

THE WONDROUS DEPLETION ALLOWANCE COLORING BOOK

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about depletion allowances, and tax privileges gained by certain industries through them. The theory involved is simple. If a mineral or other substance is being removed on a profitable commercial basis from the earth, it is being depleted. Future generations will be unable to take fullest advantage of the deposits. Color it gray for partially diminished.

So Government kindly allows a percentage depletion allowance to the company depleting a natural resource by engaging in a most gainful enterprise. Color the Government most generous.

Almost everything which can be removed from its natural state and turned into a salable item is entitled to a depletion allowance of some sort. Color all depletion allowances enormously valuable. A list of minerals and substances and what percentage of depletion they are allowed for tax purposes by the Government is as follows:

1. 27.5%—Oil and gas wells.
2. 23.0%—Sulphur and uranium. If mined domestically . . . asbestos, bauxite, and the ores of the metals cobalt, lead, manganese, mercury, nickel platinum, thorium, tin, titanium, tungsten, zinc and 23 other strategic minerals. Certain domestic deposits of clay, leterite and nephelite syenite.
3. 15%—Certain clays, asphalt, vermiculite. Clam, oyster and mollusk shells. All other minerals except soil, sod, dirt, turf, water or mosses, or minerals from sea water, the air or similar inexhaustible resources.
4. 10%—Asbestos, coal, lignite, salt and three other minerals.
5. 5%—Brick, gravel, sand, peat, primice, scoria, rough stone and certain brine well products.
6. 7.5%—Clay and shale.

Please note that at the very top of this list are oil and gas wells. All in a class by themselves. Color them most highly privileged of all taxwise by our Government. Untouched save by any foolhardy challenging party. Color them silly to attempt to cut oil industry tax privileges. Color the oil companies very powerful.

I have a serious suggestion to make to the powers that be, our Internal Revenue Service and the public at large. Is an average working person not entitled to a personal depletion allowance? After all, he labors daily, depleting the finite store of energy, good health and vitality nature and the Almighty endow him or her with. As his efforts are expended in toil he swiftly becomes a badly diminished resource to those dependent upon him for sustenance. He is never as valuable or good tomorrow as he is today.

He is never as good today as he was the day before. As he tires, collapses, becomes ill or dies, he becomes a totally depleted resource which eventually must be written off by those dependent upon him for their wherewithal. Illnesses and accidents all deplete his real value in priceless terms. If an oil well can be written off 16 times over, as has been proven, can a man not be written off at least once for his own tax purposes? Color the individual victimized by inflation and highly overtaxed.

If we grant depletion allowances in some amount to almost every extractive industry in the Nation, shall we not consider the average head of a household? Is he not as valuable as a pool of oil, a pocket of natural gas or a coal seam?

Another step follows. Shall an individual not be allowed to incorporate and sell stock in himself, taking the same tax privileges other businesses are allowed? Should he not be able to deceive the rest of our public with false gambling games which promise much and give little? How about issuing credit cards, including totally unsolicited ones? Every free American should have the same right to plunder the Treasury as individual oil companies now do. Color the rest of us temporarily deprived. Sauce for the goose and all that, you know.

Mr. Speaker, oil companies are using their depletion allowance, the largest granted, to extract not only oil from the ground but gold from the American taxpayer's goose. Color it cooked. Color our National Treasury white as it is drained. Color our Government helpless and inactive. Color our Congress passive and surtax minded. Color the taxpayer outraged. Yessirree. That wondrous depletion allowance. Color it bright green for profits and black for oil.

WHERE IS REAL OBSTACLE TO PROGRESS IN PARIS—SAIGON OR HANOI?

(Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we have heard in this Chamber and in our press many criticisms of the South Vietnamese Government and its leaders. I find it curious that we hear so little criticism of the leaders of Hanoi and of the so-called National Liberation Front, or Provisional Revolutionary Government as it is now called. Each side in this bitter, protracted conflict has ample cause to suspect the other. But at least the South Vietnamese Government knows that negotiations are the only way out of this tragic situation, they are ready to have these negotiations. President Thieu's latest speech has shown this. But what does the other side insist on? The replacement of the elected leaders of South Vietnam before negotiations can even get started in a serious way.

Last fall, at the time of the bombing halt, the other side agreed to sit down with representatives of the Republic of South Vietnam and ourselves to negotiate seriously and productively, yet now they demand that the South Vietnamese Government somehow transform itself before talks can proceed. Does this show any serious interest in negotiating? Where is the real obstacle to progress in Paris—Saigon or Hanoi? This is the question which I think should be squarely faced by those who are always ready to criticize the South Vietnamese Government and yet curiously fail to criticize the real obstructionists—the North Vietnamese leaders and their southern associates in the National Liberation Front. I think it is time to place the criticism where it belongs.

IMPROVEMENT AT DULLES

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, over a decade ago with the aid of comprehensive airport consultant studies Federal authorities selected the Chantilly, Va., site for the construction of the major Washington area airport, later to be named Dulles International Airport. In selecting the location authorities were influenced in great measure by the then projected U.S. highway system. Unfortunately, a portion of the projected system has not come to reality. The extension of Route 66 to the Potomac River, joining a bridge upstream from Georgetown, was then planned.

The Dulles site was predicated on what had been planned as a 30-minute journey by U.S. highway standards. The proper development and use of all three Washington area airports will not be achieved until we have the necessary surface transportation to these facilities, by highway, by bridge, and by transit. The conversion of National Airport to a short haul facility resulting in the increased use of Dulles and Friendship, will not be achieved until the fields are more readily accessible.

We must halt the shocking waste of taxpayers' money invested in Dulles which result from the failure to fully and properly utilize these facilities. Failure to properly utilize Dulles Airport has sent National Airport traffic to unheard of volumes as the stream of jet traffic increases over the city's cultural and residential centers.

The presently planned regional transit authorization legislation has been updated to provide for a planning and feasibility study to extend the transit to Dulles. May such planning and the pursuant studies lead to suitable application.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of July 8, 1969:

IMPROVEMENT AT DULLES

It is good that passenger traffic at Dulles International Airport increased by some 30 percent in the first five months of this year as compared to the same period in 1968. But this isn't good enough.

The five-month passenger total at Dulles was 832,095. During the same time period at National Airport, however, the total passenger count was 4.1 million. This was a 5.2 percent increase at National, which was dangerously overcrowded a year ago.

Both the plane-riding public and the airlines prefer National, despite the risks, because it is close to downtown Washington. But this is no excuse for tolerating an increasingly hazardous condition when the splendid facilities at Dulles are under-used.

The gain at Dulles demonstrates that it can be attractive to an increasing number of people, and every effort should be made, by persuasion, compulsion, or both, to divert more traffic to its runways. The main hitch, of course, is distance. It now takes longer to get to Dulles and back than is the case with National. But this is not an insuperable problem.

There is no good reason why rapid transit cannot be made to serve Dulles, and Senator Spong of Virginia wants to include $100,000 in the pending Washington metropolitan rapid transit authorization bill for a planning and feasibility study to this end. Senator Spong's idea is to extend the rapid transit system from its currently planned terminus in Falls Church to the international airport, using the median strip of the Dulles access road. This is the least that should be done—and done before disaster strikes at National.

PROTECTION OF THE BLUE CRAB

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, one source of the greatness of the State of Maryland is the blue crab. Maryland citizens have long sung its praises in its stellar roles as crab imperial, soft shell crab, and in the incomparable crab cake. We even affectionately call our State Capital Crabtown. But today there is a growing concern in Crabtown—the decline in the blue crab is a serious problem. In 1965 the blue crab industry was worth $3,434,000 and in 1968 $1,392,000. This represents a drop in crab poundage from 34,692,000 in 1965, to 9,561,000 in 1968. (All 1968 figures are preliminary.) Possibly there could be an upswing in catch, but scientists do not fully understand the habits of the blue crab when it is in the waters of the Chesapeake Bay.

The Department of the Interior has allocated study funds to learn more about the reduction of the blue crab population. I hope the Maryland and Virginia authorities give serious consideration to matching these funds which can help in determining how the population of the valuable Bay resource can be increased. However, authorities are pretty much in agreement that poaching the immature crabs—less than 5 inches in spread—seriously reduces the potential crab population.

The inhabitants of the Chesapeake Bay are traditionally under the jurisdiction of the States in which they reside. Therefore, the responsibility of protecting the blue crab rests with the States involved. Maryland State marine police are working hard to stop the poaching of young crabs by halting truckers shipping the young or underdeveloped crabs to Baltimore and Annapolis and confiscating the undersized crabs. I hope our neighbor to the South will actively follow Maryland's example by enforcing existing laws to stop the stealing of the young crab. It would be entirely inappropriate that we in Congress would have to consider Federal legislation to protect the blue crab in order that it best fulfill its culinary and economic role in life.

A SALUTE IN POETRY TO OUR HONORED SERVICEMEN IN VIETNAM

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine, Jim Nolan, of Sidney, N.Y., recently wrote to me of some of the conversations he has had with young men coming back from duty in Vietnam.

Mr. Nolan told me he had found the sentiments of these men in accord with your ideals and mine, that the United States is needed in Vietnam and our presence there has not been in vain. He said:

> I have written a poem, "Soldier's Lullaby," which I believe depicts the feelings of these young men fighting a war many thousands of miles away from home, so that we, all of us, might enjoy the freedom that other thousands have died for over the years.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include this very eloquent poem by Mr. Nolan:

A SOLDIER'S LULLABY

(By James Nolan)

Up in the sky so bright and clear
I see my star my guiding light.
Over shattering guns that are so near
I tell myself, we must be right.
My Mom I'm sure is thinking of me
But how I wonder what the rest do feel.
My foe across the River Red, I do not see.
He lays in wait with gun and zeal.
The day is over and night creeps in.
I choose my bed in thickets high,
The mud and cold not that of an Inn.
My solitude tonight while bullets fly.
A gun replaces the pillow I knew.
The blanket of dew so very wet
It could be worse, we have no snow
But why complain, we will win this yet.
And Mom of Mom's, my very own,
Tonight I ask your prayers for him,
The boy I'll fight and hear his groans;
A soldier like I, he fights to win.
My Guardian Angel I know is close.
If God decides he wants me next,
I leave this message for all to host.
I die not in vain, just read the text
"The Declaration of Independence."

APPALACHIA INCLUDES OZARKIA

(Mr. RANDALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I supported H.R. 4018, the bill to extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 on Tuesday, July 15. Because I have opposed this legislation in the past and voted against the authorization, and the appropriation, both in 1965 and again in 1967, I concluded I should set out for the RECORD the reasons why I withheld support in those other years and why I find the present measure worthy of support.

In the earlier Appalachia proposals I was of the belief that the project undertaken had not been carefully conceived. I saw the possibility of wasteful administration. I was fearful there would be an inordinately small benefit in ratio to the cost. Part of my objection against the earlier Appalachia bill was due to the fact that I supported the first war on poverty only to see it evolve into a sort of grab bag from those many administrative people, to the exclusion of help among the disadvantaged who should have been the recipients.

I announced as one of my reasons for being against Appalachia in former years was the fact that we in the Missouri, Arkansas, and Oklahoma Ozarks really had our own Appalachia with problems similar, if not identical, to those which existed in the Appalachian Mountains. Now I find that H.R. 4018 includes five economic development regions in addition to Appalachia, such as the Ozarks regional development area, the New England regional development area, the Upper Great Lakes regional development area, the Four Corners regional development area, and the Coastal Plains regional development area.

There are 44 Missouri counties now included in the Ozarks Regional Commission. Three of these counties are in the Fourth Missouri District which I have the privilege to represent. They are Barton, Benton, and St. Clair Counties. Moreover, the Missouri Legislature recently added Morgan County to the Fourth Missouri District and this county is contained within the area to be administered by the Ozarks Regional Commission.

One of the longstanding objections to the Appalachia program has been the contention that this is simply another development program or another overlapping layer of assistance. I had reasoned that there was basically the Economic Development Act, then the poverty program, and on top of all that, Appalachia. Of course, it has been argued that all these Federal programs were in addition to State assistance programs.

But, Mr. Speaker, in this bill, there have been new safeguards written to assure against overlap and duplication from other programs. I have confidence that the way this bill is written that such programs as the Federal water pollution program, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, the Land and Water Conservation Act, may have application in these areas, but there will be no duplication or overlap in the effort, to correct one of the greatest problems in America today, which is rural-urban imbalance. One objective of this program is to attract light industry to locate in rural areas by means of certain incentives. This is to prevent further migration of marginal farmers from the rural areas to the big cities. I have confidence that H.R. 4018 will help in this effort because there is a provision for plantsite development. We are never going to solve the problems of the big cities alone unless we keep the people in the rural areas from migrating to the big cities. The only way to prevent this is to create a sound economic base in rural areas. I think this Regional Development Act will be effective toward this objective.

It is encouraging to know this act calls for the promotion of programs to attract the investment of private capital in regional districts. This device I heartily applaud because it was one of the key provisions of my H.R. 332 or, the rural revitalization bill.

The theory of the programs contained in the Regional Commission's provision of the bill is to assist in self-help toward creating better opportunities for the people in the area. I was delighted to observe that the element of welfare was completely missing because matching funds from local sources are required before the programs of this act can be implemented. This is the principal of local-Federal partnership at its best.

During hearings before the House Public Works Committee on this legislation, Mr. William M. McCandless, Federal Cochairman of the Ozarks Regional Commission presented testimony which I understand had been previously endorsed by the Honorable Warren Hearnes, Governor of Missouri. In outlining the program planned by the Ozarks Commission for the next 2 years, Mr. McCandless delineated these areas of activities:

First. Technical education, consisting of training programs for developing and sharpening occupational skills.

Second. Industrial and recreational access roads. This is a long range program, but one which is vitally needed for making industrial locations attractive to outside investors of private capital, and for bringing Missouri's vast recreational facilities more conveniently to the public.

Third. Airport development and modernization; a very worthy undertaking looking toward the anticipated expansion of private air transportation in the coming years.

Fourth. Industrial park and plant site development. This, too, is a forward-looking project for gathering new industry into southwest Missouri.

Fifth. Hospital and health facilities. This region requires an upgrading of its medical facilities in order to adequately care for its present residences, and as a vital element in making Missouri more attractive to potential employers.

There is no denying I had such great misgiving about the overlap and duplication of effort in the first Appalachia bill that I could not support it. I also believed that all the taxpayers of America should not have to pay for special benefits for one small region. Now that there have been six regional development areas included as a part of what was once only Appalachia and which new areas are located in the West, the North, the Midwest, the Northeast, and the Southeast in addition to the old Appalachian area, the program is truly national in its scope and extent. The old objection no longer prevails.

As this authorization is approved, I know we all hope and, yes pray, that it may contribute on a self-help basis toward the solution of what remains one of our greatest problems—rural-urban imbalance. There is not enough money in the Treasury to rebuild our cities as long as the migration to these great cities continues. Unless those living in the rural areas can be persuaded to remain in the rural areas, the problem of the cities will never be solved. That is why I supported the extension of the Regional Development Act.

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, early in March it was my honor and pleasure, at your direction, to serve as Chairman of a group of Members of the House of Representatives who visited the Republic of Korea in response to an invitation extended to you by the distinguished vice speaker of the Korean National Assembly, who suggested in his invitation that an exchange of views between our two legislative bodies would be beneficial to our respective countries.

Our delegation was impressed with the character of the people of Korea. We were impressed by their courage and their desire to remain free. We were impressed at the extent to which that determined country had been able to build an increasingly productive economy out of the very ashes of war. Above all, we were impressed with the warmth of the friendship which was displayed on every turn. Every person whom we met greeted us as a friend. We were so pleased that in the National Assembly all party lines were melted in the friendship which that great parliamentary body showed to our delegation and, what is more important, through us, to the American people.

We were pleased by the honors which were bestowed upon us on every hand. The faculty and the students of the great Seoul National University welcomed us with a friendship that is rarely seen. We were so pleased that they desired to identify us with that magnificent institution whose scholarship is world renowned.

The President of the Republic, the leader of a great friend and ally, opened not only the doors of the Blue House, but his heart and the hearts of his countrymen to us. For all this, we were and are very grateful.

At the end of our Korean visit, our group unanimously expressed the hope that a similar delegation from the Korean National Assembly might visit the United States in the near future. You, Mr. Speaker, generously and wholeheartedly concurred with this and issued an invitation to Speaker Hyo Sang Rhee of the Korean National Assembly for a delegation to visit us. To our great pleasure the invitation was accepted and this week we have been privileged to have visiting the United States a distinguished delegation of members of the Korean National Assembly.

The delegation has had an opportunity to meet with the President, the Vice President, former President Lyndon Johnson, Secretary of State Rogers, and Secretary of Defense Laird. We were happy also that their visit to this country coincided with yesterday's launch of Apollo 11 and the delegation was able to view that magnificent accomplishment.

The bipartisan Korean delegation is led by a distinguished Korean statesman, the Honorable Kyung Soon Chang. He and his delegation, representing all segments of the National Assembly, exemplify and truly represent the great Korean people.

Today, the last day of the official visit of the Korean delegation, Vice Speaker Chang delivered a major address to Members of Congress and invited guests. He made a most eloquent statement on the difficulties faced by that courageous nation in the light of the consistent threat from the Communist enemy in North Korea, and on the many accomplishments of that country. The vice speaker proposed that the people of our two countries rededicate ourselves to our common supreme commitments that have brought us so far together. The vice speaker's address was extremely well received and I am pleased to insert it in this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF HON. KYUNG SOON CHANG, VICE SPEAKER, KOREAN NATIONAL ASSEMBLY, CHAIRMAN OF KOREAN PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION TO THE UNITED STATES

Along the turbulent fronts across the Pacific, numerous sentinels of the Free World are valorously holding to their positions with varying visions and performances, yet the role of Korea is unique. The people of America have in Korea a small but most dedicated and dependable ally which has undergone many trials with them and, in the process, has become even more tempered and resolved to withstand further trials together and meet challenges together in the more uncertain days ahead. Indeed, with the American people's generous consent, Korea can pride itself as a living monument to the selfless struggle of the pioneers of freedom and justice and as an undecaying milestone on the arduous road leading to this supreme goal of the age.

Korea is resolved to make itself a success story of the crusade committed to this highest cause of man in which the sons of our two countries are indivisibly joined together. The heartbreak ridges running across the middle of Korea overlooking two different worlds and over which many gallant sons of our two countries and many other free nations have shed their precious blood do not allow us to desert them and turn Korea into a failure story. I know I'm not alone in hoping that those heartbreak ridges will someday be made the blessed hills that weld north and south together and where hope and reality are reunited.

It is gratifying to note that Korea is now at a take-off stage in many respects, but it will be many years before it is completely airborne. It is indeed at this take-off stage that Korea requires a concentrated and sustained thrust. If such thrust is lacking at the take-off stage, the consequences will be more disastrous than at the pre-take-off stage. We can certainly be proud of the impressive progress made in our country in the past several years, but what we prize more than this tangible progress is the amazing growth of the aspirations of the people to develop the country and meet challenges squarely, not shunning responsibilities and not retreating an inch from the bulwark the free world built for us and with us and counts on us for its defense. I assure you that these aspirations will continue to grow in us and with us and that the dedicated and disciplined leadership of our country will not fail its people and the people of its trusting allies.

We do not propose to pray for the automatic collapse of our enemy. Our enemy is not going to falter so easily, nor is it going to fade away on its own. Our goal is to harden our military bone and economic muscle as much as we can so that the enemy will not be tempted to destroy us. Our enemy is the most inscrutable monster that has ever inhabited the world. It is being guided by its own superstition that requires worship of tomorrow at the permanent cost of today, sacrifice of the people for the sake of people, destruction of many to make room for a few, and which takes delight in uprooted minds and proliferation of distress. This monster has sworn by its own superstition to fall upon us whenever it decides that we are off guard.

We politicians tend to talk big and loud regardless of the size of the countries and issues they represent. But I wish I could talk even louder in heralding the urgent reality of realities faced by Korea which is most sensitive to the danger and which cannot compromise itself, hoping that anyone and any ally on vacation might soon return. It is time for us to end the honeymoon with a false sense of security and vain hope of peace and stability. How hard have we tried to have a sensible dialogue in Geneva, Paris, Panmunjom, and many other places, but how often and how ruthlessly have we been abused and betrayed! The rest of the agenda demands of us the display of deeds more than the trading of words.

It may be more than a coincidence that the people of America today get two different messages from two different places. One is, of course, from the moon, and the other is from Korea. The message from the moon is: "All is calm, all is peace." But the message from Korea is: "All is tense, all is astir." The message of Korea that I'm conveying to you now is not tinged with racist chauvinism, militant adventurism, and profiteering opportunism. Korea is pitted against its own race ruling out any racist motivation, Korea is wedded to orderly modernization outlawing any adventurist outrages, and Korea places justice and true alliance before amassing material wealth and comfort. Tasks confronting Korea are bitter but sublime.

Some might regard Korea, a divided nation, as being less than a nation. But it is, to all intents and purposes, more than a nation, because it symbolizes and represents the hopes and interests of all the free nations and because it duly demands international attention and exertion and as, above all, its own requirements and efforts are extraordinary and supernational. Korea is the first serious test of the age to see if free men and free nations can rally together in the pavilion of the world community and march together under the banner of a crusade repelling all temptations and challenges. With this epochal test and with this supreme call before us, we cannot afford to vacillate however severe the trials may be, nor can we fall into self-complacency however rosy our tiny progress may appear, nor can we defer however deeply we may seem to differ.

Taking this opportunity, I propose to rededicate ourselves to our common supreme commitments that have brought us so far together and that demand of us greater wisdom, courage, and unity now and hereafter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. DEVINE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of death of a close, personal friend.

Mr. EDMONDSON (at the request of Mr. JARMAN), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ROONEY of New York, for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. MIZELL), for 5 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. MIKVA), for 10 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. RANDALL in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MIZELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHADEBERG.
Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.
Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.
Mr. LUKENS.
Mr. AYRES in two instances.
Mr. ROBISON.
Mr. CARTER.
Mr. BURKE of Florida in two instances.
Mrs. MAY.
Mr. HOSMER in two instances.
Mr. UTT in two instances.
Mr. FOREMAN.
Mr. MIZELL in three instances.
Mr. MINSHALL.
Mr. LLOYD.
Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. CUNNINGHAM in three instances.
Mr. CRAMER in three instances.
Mr. MORSE in four instances.
Mr. SCHWENGEL.
Mr. BROCK in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MIKVA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington.
Mrs. CHISHOLM.
Mr. EILBERG.
Mr. BOLAND in four instances.
Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON in two instances.
Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.
Mr. JACOBS.
Mr. DINGELL in four instances.
Mr. BLATNIK in three instances.
Mr. RONAN.
Mr. ASHLEY.
Mr. FRASER.
Mrs. GRIFFITHS in two instances.
Mr. RARICK in four instances.
Mr. WOLFF in three instances.
Mr. LOWENSTEIN in 10 instances.
Mr. VANIK in three instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.
Mr. FARBSTEIN in two instances.
Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.
Mr. RODINO.
Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.
Mr. DONOHUE in two instances.
Mr. PREYER of North Carolina.
Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania.
Mr. GIBBONS in two instances.
Mr. BRADEMAS in eight instances.
Mr. PATTEN.
Mr. CONYERS in five instances.
Mr. BIAGGI in three instances.
Mr. MOORHEAD in two instances.
Mr. O'HARA in two instances.
Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia in two instances.
Mr. LEGGETT.
Mr. ROGERS of Florida in five instances.
Mr. RYAN in four instances.
Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.
Mr. DULSKI in three instances.
Mr. MONAGAN in two instances.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 7215. An act to provide for the striking of metals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Diplomatic Courier Service.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on July 16, 1969, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3166. An act for the relief of Aleksandar Zambeli;

H.R. 3172. An act for the relief of Yolanda Fulgencio Hunter; and

H.R. 3376. An act for the relief of Maria da Conceicao Evaristo.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 21, 1969, at 12 o'clock.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

976. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July 1968 to March 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

977. A letter from the Director, District of Columbia Bail Agency, transmitting an explanation that Judge Roger Robb did not participate in the executive committee deliberations related in the Agency's executive communication (No. 962) submitted to the House on July 15, 1969; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

978. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5941 of title 5, United States Code, to provide payment of nonforeign differentials to certain U.S. citizens wage board employees serving in nonforeign areas outside the continental United States and Hawaii; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 12906. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to retain the effectiveness of materialmen's and mechanics' liens; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 12907. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to make crime protection insurance available to small business concerns; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12908. A bill to provide for orderly trade in footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 12909. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BELL of California:

H.R. 12910. A bill to amend title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide for a program of urban and rural education grants to local educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 12911. A bill to improve judicial machinery by amending provisions of law relating to the retirement of justices and judges of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 12912. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, relating to enrollment charges for Federal employees' health benefits; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 12913. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 12914. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIGGS (for himself, Mr. Fraser, and Mr. Adams):

H.R. 12915. A bill to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 12916. A bill to make "Lunar Landing Day" a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 12917. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide that employers shall not be required to bargain with labor organizations whose representative status has not been established by a secret ballot election; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 12918. A bill to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950 (title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950); to the Committee on Internal Security.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 12919. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage higher education, and particularly the private funding thereof, by authorizing a deduction from gross income of reasonable amounts contributed to a qualified higher education fund established by the taxpayer for the purpose of funding the higher education of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 12920. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs, and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.R. 12921. A bill to improve the judicial machinery in customs courts by amending the statutory provisions relating to judicial actions and administrative proceedings in customs matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 12922. A bill to restore the Golden Eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 12923. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in relation to industrial development bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 12924. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize payment under the program of health insurance for the aged for services furnished an individual by a home maintenance worker (in such individual's home) as part of a home health services plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 12925. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of certain materials to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12926. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12927. A bill to afford protection to the public from offensive intrusion into their homes through the postal service of sexually oriented mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 12928. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12929. A bill to provide a more effective approach to the problem of developing and maintaining a rational relationship between building code requirements and building technology in the United States, through the establishment of a National Institute of Building Sciences which can establish standards and make definitive technical findings available to all sectors of industry and government; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 12930. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code with respect to the qualifications for appointment as a Veterans' Administration chaplain; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12931. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 12932. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 12933. A bill to authorize the Secretary concerned to apply the pay and allowances of a missing member of an armed force to the purchase of U.S. savings bonds and saving notes under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 12934. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to authorize appropriations to carry out such act through fiscal year 1973; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUPPE (for himself and Mr. Esch):

H.R. 12935. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bears Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 12936. A bill to continue certain rules relating to the deductibility of accrued vacation pay; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 12937. A bill to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (for himself, Mr. Purcell, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Waldie, Mr. White, Mr. Derwinski, Mr. Meskill, and Mr. Scott):

H.R. 12938. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a mid-decade census of population in the year 1975 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 12939. A bill to strengthen voluntary agricultural organizations, to provide for the orderly marketing of agricultural products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12940. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to retain the effectiveness of materialmen's, mechanics', and artisans' liens; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

XUM

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 12941. A bill to authorize the release of 4,180,000 pounds of cadmium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 12942. A bill to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system, to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 12943. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of November 2, 1966, to extend for 3 years the authority to make appropriations to carry out such act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 12944. A bill to provide emergency salary adjustments for certain employees in the postal field service to offset the increase in the cost-of-living index; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 12945. A bill to improve the health and safety conditions of persons working in the coal mining industry of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. Adams, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Brown of Michigan, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Button, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Dent, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Farbstein, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania, Mr. Koch, Mr. Hechler of West Virginia, and Mr. Leggett):

H.R. 12946. A bill to amend the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 to aid in developing and maintaining a more rational relationship between building code requirements and building technology in the United States, particularly as they relate to residential housing, through the establishment of a National Institute of Building Sciences which can establish standards and make definitive technical findings available to all sectors of the economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. Lowenstein, Mr. Matsunaga, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Olsen, Mr. Ottinger, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Podell, Mr. Pollock, Mr. Quie, Mr. Rees, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Rosenthal, Mrs. Sullivan, Mr. Tunney, and Mr. Whalen):

H.R. 12947. A bill to amend the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 to aid in developing and maintaining a more rational relationship between building code requirements and building technology in the United States, particularly as they relate to residential housing, through the establishment of a National Institute of Building Sciences which can establish standards and make definitive technical findings available to all sectors of the economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Biaggi, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Button, Mr. Dent, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Hathaway, Mr. Koch, Mr. Lowenstein, Mr. McKneally, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Ottinger, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Podell, Mr. Saylor, Mr. Tiernan, and Mr. Tunney):

H.R. 12948. A bill to provide the Civil Aeronautics Board with authority to assist in relieving airport congestion; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 12949. A bill to expedite delivery of special delivery mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 12950. A bill to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system, to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILBIN (for himself, Mr. Donohue, Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts, Mr. Boland, Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts, and Mr. Burke of Massachusetts):

H.R. 12951. A bill to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system, to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 12952. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the credit for foreign taxes shall not be allowed in the case of taxes paid in any form to a foreign country in connection with the production of oil and gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 12953. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Education to make vocational education opportunity grants; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 12954. A bill to require that accurate data be used as the basis for congressional redistricting until the results of the 1970 census are available, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12955. A bill to provide for special programs for children with learning disabilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 12956. A bill to amend section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act as it relates to the reallotment of construction grant funds; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SPRINGER (for himself and Mr. Gerald R. Ford):

H.R. 12957. A bill to provide for the expansion and improvement of the Nation's airport and airway system, for the imposition of airport and airway user charges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.J. Res. 818. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DANIEL of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 819. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.J. Res. 820. Joint resolution designating Monday, the 21st of July 1969, a legal public holiday in commemoration of Apollo 11; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.J. Res. 821. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.J. Res. 822. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 823. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for revenue sharing with the several States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H. Res. 484. Resolution urging the President to resubmit to the Senate for ratification the Geneva Protocol of 1925 banning the first use of gas and bacteriological warfare; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. Res. 485. Resolution authorizing reprinting of "Centralization of Federal Science Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

242. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to requesting that the Department of Transportation purchase ships built in the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

243. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to protection and promotion of the shoe industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 12958. A bill for the relief of Central Gulf Steamship Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.R. 12959. A bill for the relief of Gloria Jara Haase; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 12960. A bill to validate the conveyance of certain land in the State of California by the Southern Pacific Co.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 12961. A bill for the relief of Anna Veltri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 12962. A bill for the relief of Maureen O'Leary Pimpare; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 12963. A bill for the relief of Dr. Naveed A. Sadiqui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. Res. 486. Resolution to refer H.R. 12885, entitled "A bill for the relief of Antoni de Januszkowski and Maurice Lemee," to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims in accordance with sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

179. By Mr. PHILBIN: Memorial of the Board of Aldermen, city of Newton, Mass., calling for the observance of January 15 as a national holiday in honor of the birthday of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

180. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Commission, Miami, Fla., relative to the antiballistic-missile system; to the Committee on Armed Services.

XUM

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BIBLE SAVES SOLDIER'S LIFE IN VIETNAM

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we often overlook the fact that our servicemen in Vietnam need more than the regular issue of equipment, clothing, food, and ammunition.

There is a spiritual need that cannot be fulfilled with military appropriations measures. This point was made clearly and concisely in a letter from a soldier in Vietnam which was reproduced in the Donaldsonville, Ga., News.

The soldier owes his life to his faith in God. In sharing his letter with readers of the Record, I ask, How can we turn aside his simple but eloquent request: "Please America, please pray for us"?

Soldier Says Bibles, Prayers Needed in Combat

(Note.—Let us pray fervently that God in His wisdom, will bring us and the world to find peace and an end to this fearsome strife. O God help us!)

(Letter received by Soldier's sister, Mrs. Pearle Parrish, Rt. 6, Covington, Ga., who has so graciously shared it. (Reprinted at the request of several readers.))

"Dear Sis:"

"I don't know where to start first. So many things have happened since I last wrote you. Well, to begin with I have escaped death at the hands of the enemy in a way so amazing I am still in a daze. You remember I told you I was going over armed with the Bible too. That Bible is the reason I am still here and able to write this letter to all America. Here is the story:

"My buddy and I were sent out on duty with our equipment in the work I told you before was our job. We had just received information—the most important for weeks. But we were discovered by the enemy.

"I gave my buddy the information we had collected, told him to beat it and prepared myself to face the enemy. It was the first time I had been face-to-face with the necessity of pointing my gun at a man to shoot the life from his body. I thought fast, then I said 'Lord, it's Your responsibility now.' As I reached for my carbine a shot from one of them struck me in the breast and blasted me down. But my buddy had not obeyed my order. He had not gone. Thinking I was dead, he turned for me, grabbed my carbine as well as his own, stood astride my body, and blasted away with both guns. He was hit too—his knees with three bullet wounds. But when he finished there were not any of the enemy left.

"He was amazed when I rolled and tried to get up. The force of the bullet had only stunned me. Dazedly I wondered why. I pulled that little Bible out of my pocket and in utter muteness looked at the ugly hole in the cover. It had ripped through Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, through Samuel, Kings and kept going. Where do you think it stopped? In the middle of Psalms 91, pointing like a finger at this verse—"A thousand shall fall at thy side and ten thousand at thy right hand, but it shall not come nigh thee." Sis, when I read that verse, it raised me off the ground. I did not know there was such a verse in the Bible. I'd been reading most in the New Testament. In utter humility I said, 'Thank you, precious God.' "

(This soldier goes on to relate in his letter to his sister, that when he got his buddy back to the post, his buddy called him over to say, "This convinces me. I want to get right with God." He wouldn't even let them tend his wounds, saying, "Nothing matters now but this."

"Falling on his knees with the three wounds he prayed until his body became almost numb. But he wouldn't give up. And when he knew the Lord had heard his cry, and had come into his heart and saved him he ran outside and shouted to the whole camp.

Continues this soldier's letter, "since that time I have talked with the boys, held meetings, and prayed with them.

"Twenty-five of the men have come out for God. God has even reached my general.

"I tell you, Sis, prayer is going to win this war. Not guns alone, fervent agonizing prayer.

"Pray Sis, pray as you have never prayed before. Tell everyone to pray. Tell all Americans to go on their knees.

"Until nations and people have paid in blood and tears for thrusting God out of their hearts, out of their homes, nations and lands this war will not end.

"Tell them to send Bibles and more Bibles. A Bible will give a soldier the confidence that God is with him. Try to get this letter on the air, in the papers in anything that is printed. Make copies of it. Send it from coast to coast. Tell them the Army wants prayer—and Bibles.

"Please America, Please, Pray for us."

THE MASSACHUSETTS AMERICAN LEGION'S ANNUAL CONVENTION

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Congressman Silvio O. Conte and I had the privilege last week of addressing the final session of the Massachusetts American Legion's annual convention in my home city of Springfield, Mass. Celebrating the Legion's 50th anniversary, the convention took as its theme "Fifty Years of 100 Percent Americanism." It is refreshing—indeed, almost startling—to find an organization pledged to its Nation's highest ideals in this era of often heedless dissent and demonstration.

The Legion, wholly devoted to what it considers this country's best interests, has taken political stands that have stirred spirited controversy over the past few decades. This, Mr. Speaker, is a good sign. It means the Legion is actively taking part in the national debate over U.S. goals, stating its position plainly and explicitly instead of timidly evading the issues. The vague and muddled political "stands" that many organizations issue are designed to please the greatest possible number of people—and, as a result, contribute virtually nothing to the dialog on national problems. The Legion's stands do not even approach this category. Frank, honest straightforward, the Legion's positions help stimulate the kind of debate this country needs to unravel the host of knotty problems it faces.

The Massachusetts Department of the American Legion is among the best in the country. Its convention—held in Springfield's giant municipal auditorium—reflected this reputation for excellence. Brisk electioneering for Massachusetts department offices and spirited debate over resolutions showed that Bay State Legionnaires are concerned—genuinely concerned—about their Nation's problems and the Legion's role in helping to resolve them. James H. Denver of Springfield, chairman of the convention, could not have been more accurate in terming the convention a "huge success."

The convention elected William J. Watts, of East Longmeadow, past Hampden County American Legion commander, as its new State commander. I know my colleagues join me in wishing Mr. Watts every success in his new post.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in the Record at this point newspaper articles published by the Springfield Union and the Springfield Republican on the convention:

Legion Ends Conclave

"For the true Legionnaire there can be only one ultimate goal—and that is the swift coming of the day when there will be no veterans because there are no wars."

500 DELEGATES

This concluded a major address by U.S. Rep. Silvio O. Conte, R–Pittsfield. He and U.S. Rep. Edwin P. Boland, D-Springfield, were key speakers at the final day Saturday at the 51st anniversary convention of the Massachusetts American Legion at Springfield's Municipal Auditorium.

An estimated 500 delegates were on hand for the morning session to hear the two congressmen.

The afternoon parade down Main Street was postponed, then cancelled because of heavy rains.

Before adjourning, the convention installed William J. Watts, 46, of East Longmeadow, as its commander and Charles L. Muskes of Springfield was sworn in as state historian.

Frank Nietupski of Ludlow was installed as national delegate-at-large.

NEXT IN HYANNIS

Also the convention voted to met next year from June 11 through 13 in Hyannis.

James H. Denver of Springfield, convention chairman, termed the gathering a "huge success" and said that while the convention officially ended Saturday afternoon, it is expected that many delegates will remain until Sunday before going home.

Miss Mary Barletta of Somerville, president of the state Legion Auxiliary also spoke to the morning meeting, bringing her organization's appreciation for past favors during the year and best wishes to the newly elected officers.

ESTIMATED 500 DELEGATES

Miss Barletta served 14 years with the Army Nurses Corps in World War II and is the first Disabled Veteran to be president of the auxiliary, officials said.

An estimated 500 delegates were on hand to hear Conte and Boland at the morning session.

Conte said: "In 1919 a group of veterans who had just fought what was then known as 'the war to end all wars' got together and determined that this nation should not be allowed to forget the sacrifices made by the American fighting man in behalf of his country.

"Fifty years and three wars later we are here today to attest to the fact that America has not forgotten those men and their sacrifice.

CITES LEGION ROLE

"The country has not forgotten because the American Legion has not let it forget.

"I only wish that the success of the Legion could have been matched by the country itself in its efforts toward peace on earth.

"But as we know, little more than 20 years after the Legion was founded, the United States was again embedded in war . . . bloodier than America's involvement in World War I, but still a war popularly supported across the land.

"America emerged from World War II as the most powerful nation on earth and five years later was at war again in Korea.

PRAISED FIGHTING MEN

"Today as we gather here young American boys are still getting the call to combat and, despite well-publicized cases of those who balk, thousands are doing their duty every day."

Conte praised the fighting men and the 36,000 who were killed in Vietnam, and then said:

"But my friends, in the America of 1969 war has finally been unmasked. Our country, I believe has always hated war. But it has taken the tragedy of Vietnam to bring this hate to the fore.

QUOTES EISENHOWER

"The lesson, unfortunately, is too long taught and too quickly forgotten. But one who did not forget was the late, great soldier and President, Dwight David Eisenhower. He stated the case best when he said:

" 'I hate war as only a soldier who has lived it can, only as one who has seen its brutality, its futility, its stupidity.'

"As we here gather today to rededicate ourselves to overseeing and protecting the rights of the American veteran, let us not forget that important message from one who was perhaps our greatest soldier.

"But also let us always remember that throughout our long and troubled history there has been one constant factor—the bravery and dedication of the American fighting man."

ONE ULTIMATE GOAL

Conte concluded by saying that for the "true legionnaire" there can only be one ultimate goal and that's the swift coming of the day when there are no veterans because there are no wars.

Boland, speaking on his concern for the arms race between major nations and the U.S., made a two-part proposal:

"The first part is that without waiting for anyone else, we immediately stop all flight tests of our MIRVs (Multiple Independently Targetable Reentry Vehicles).

"The second part is that we resume MIRV testing anytime the Soviets do so.

SEES NO RISK

"My proposal would entail no risk to our national security—no risk whatsoever—for these reasons:

"We are substantially ahead of the Soviets in MIRV technology.

"We can monitor their flight tests—as they can monitor ours. If they resume tests, we will know.

"We can maintain our readiness to resume testing as we must assume the Soviets would also do. Obviously this is not unilateral disarmament or anything even remotely approaching it.

ASKS ARMS CONTROL

"The only path to national security in the nuclear age lies in arms control, not in arms proliferation.

"The plateau on which the United States and the Soviet Union now stand is one that may be uniquely suited to a mutual halt.

"We have not many months, perhaps not many weeks, before it may be too late. If we wait for a mutual agreement to limit MIRV testing and deployment the chances are we shall be too late.

"Under this proposal, we would seize the initiative. We would do something while there still is time. We would not just dither about doing nothing until the deadline for action has passed.

"We must seize this opportunity to take the initiative. The future of our nation . . . the future of the world . . . may hinge on it," Boland said.

CONGRATULATES LEGION

The U.S. Representative noted that this is a milestone year in the history of the American Legion and congratulated them on their golden anniversary theme, "50 years of 100 per cent Americanism."

Boland said it was refreshing and even startling in this era of dissent and demonstration to talk to a group of men pledged to the security of the country . . .

Actual deployment of MIRVed missiles by Russia and the U.S. which would cost "many additional billions over the next few years" would bring us to a point of no greater security than exists today, Boland said.

"The gravest threat of MIRV, however, is to the concept of deterrence. For such weapons point to the possibility of destroying so many of the other side's offensive missiles before they could be fired that a 'first strike' would no longer be so plainly suicidal," he said.

"IS SO WORRISOME"

Boland added that it is the development of such a first strike capability that is so worrisome to all who have looked closely at the strategic weapons problem.

"In deed, Secretary of Defense Laird has based the administration's case for building the safeguard antiballistic missile system on the contention that the Soviets are: 'going for a first-strike capability' by adding MIRVs to their largest missiles.

"All of this would appear to be beyond the natural control of man were it not for two facts:

"First, neither the United States nor the Soviet Union has fully developed MIRVs.

"Second, both nations are preparing to enter bilateral negotiations for a strategic arms limitation treaty."

Boland said that taken together, these facts offer a real if fleeting opportunity to stay the mad momentum of nuclear armaments.

RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

"I and other members have introduced in the Congress a resolution calling for a moratorium on MIRV testing by the United States.

"I believe that President Nixon should suspend flight tests of MIRV's for so long as the Soviet Union does the same," Boland said.

Because of independent surveillance systems, both the U.S. and Russia can count the other's offensive missiles and estimate with some assurance the damage they might do.

"The only real hope of avoiding the deployment of MIRV warheads by both sides is to ban the testing of MIRVs before they have been fully developed," he said.

LEGIONNAIRES ELECT WATTS STATE HEAD—VICTORY WON BY 37 VOTES

(By Carl Winters)

William J. Watts, 46, of East Longmeadow, past Hampton County commander of the American Legion, Friday night was elected commander of the Massachusetts American Legion following at least three ballot recounts in Municipal Auditorium.

ENG PLACES SECOND

Watts, an employe of the New England Telephone Co. also former head of American Post 293 in East Longmeadow, squeaked to victory by a 37-vote margin over his nearest opponent.

Watts garnered a total 450 votes to 413 for Robert L. Eng, 44, of Quincy and 154 for George Jeffers, 42, of Granby, former commander of Hampshire-Franklin Legion District 2 and an unsuccessful contender for the top state post at the Legion convention two years ago in Chicopee.

Only two other Greater Springfield residents figured in election proceedings that wrapped up the second day of the Legion's 50th anniversary three day convention in Springfield.

MUSKES IS HISTORIAN

Charles L. Muskes of Springfield, also a past Hampden County commander and past commander of American Legion Post 430 here, was elected without opposition to the post of state historian.

Frank Nietupski of Ludlow, another past Hampden County commander and a member of American Legion Post 286 in Wilbraham, came out sixth in a six-way race for five positions as national delegate-at-large.

Tense electioneering occupied legionnaires from 5 to 9 while balloting was conducted in the auditorium. Throngs of anxious candidates and their supporters crowded auditorium steps and made their pitch as antique fire trucks with wailing sirens and campaign banners zipped by in Court Street.

Convention officials said a total of 1037 ballots were cast out of 2558 eligible convention delegates.

Major afternoon proceedings saw the passage after heated debate of a 35-cent increase in annual per capita dues to the state Legion, boosting the rate from $3.10 to $3.45.

Convention delegates also passed a series of resolutions ranging from a call for the retention of the ROTC regardless of militant pacifist actions on college campuses; opposition to any change in Civil Service veterans preference; and the 24-hour display of the American and the state flag on all state and municipal buildings and American Legion posts in Massachusetts, with the flags to be illuminated by lighting from dusk to dawn.

Resolutions to be forwarded to the national Legion conclave opening Aug. 18 in Atlanta, Ga., include a call for greater federal veterans services to meet needs of returning Vietnam veterans; opposition to the planned federal change in observance of Veterans Day on the Monday before Nov. 11 instead of on Nov. 11; establishment of a national veterans cemetery in New England, preferably in Massachusetts; and federal use of funds now in GI insurance programs to lower the rate on GI mortgages.

In his acceptance speech in the auditorium following announcement of voting results, Watts pledged to utilize his state post to insure continuation of programs aimed at benefitting veterans and to back the resolutions passed at the convention. He also said he would press for Legion programs aimed at increasing membership strength.

FAVORS WITHDRAWAL

In earlier statements before balloting, Watts advocated withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam involvement, but on a graduated basis.

"I don't think we'll lose face if we pull out gradually," he said. "I think we have to watch out for the welfare of the fighting men, but I think a gradual pullout as more beneficial than a total withdrawal all at once."

Convention officials estimated that close to the expected 5000 legionnaires were in Springfield Friday night and "the fun will really begin now that the business sessions are over."

FIRETRUCK ARMADA

Fireworks, colorfully costumed young women campaigning for state candidates, campaign posters everywhere and the armada of siren-sounding antique fire apparatus gave Court Square a carnival atmosphere through the afternoon proceedings and nighttime balloting.

Conventioneers in their resolutions also called for the legalization of beano in Massachusetts and asked enactment of legislation preventing the issuance of special permits for store operations on "Sunday" holidays except in the case of perishable commodities or extreme personal emergency.

The convention delegates also proposed that the American Legion include the words "For God and country" on all its stationery; increase its current schedule of one $500 college scholarship and four $100 scholarships awarded annually in the state; and develop a broader range of public relations programs providing awards, citations and incentives to citizens.

INSTALL OFFICERS

Installation of officers is scheduled to begin with proceedings at 9 this morning in the auditorium and the conclave will officially be capped with a parade in Main Street starting at 1.

Featured contingents will include drum and bugle corps, antique autos and fire trucks and marching and drill teams from Legion posts throughout New England. Parade units will form up at Locust Street and march to Liberty Street.

CONSIDER CUMBERLAND'S CONTRIBUTION

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, Cumberland College is located in Williamsburg, Ky., in my district, and I wish to express commendation for the work done by that institution to enrich the life of the people of Appalachia.

Cumberland's mission, since its founding in 1889, has been to serve the mountain area in which it is located. It enrolls more "strictly Appalachian" students than any other private or denominational college in the Nation. About 1,250 of its 1,700 students originate in these hills within a 100-mile radius of the college. A very high percentage of its graduates return to the hills as teachers with the lateral effect that more than 100,000 Appalachian grade and high school students are taught each school day by Cumberland alumni.

More than 52 percent of the students at Cumberland receive some degree of financial assistance. The average family income in this area is only 30 percent of that of the Nation taken as a whole. Statistics reveal that 50 percent of the college students nationwide come from homes with family incomes in the upper 25-percent income level. By contrast, at least 50 percent of the students at Cumberland come from the socioeconomic environment where family incomes are in the lower 25-percent income level.

At this point in the RECORD, I include an article taken from the current alumni publication:

GRADUATES RETURN TO APPALACHIAN AREA

It will be noted that Cumberland College graduates return in large numbers to the geographical area from which they come, namely the Appalachian sections of Kentucky and East Tennessee.

There is a large concentration in the Greater Cincinnati Area, including Northern Kentucky, since Southern Ohio and Northern Kentucky school superintendents make a strong effort to get Cumberland graduates as teachers.

Recognizing that education affords the best and only permanent solution to the economic and social problems of the area, Cumberland seeks to meet the needs of the section through the provision of higher education.

Located in and serving an area in which the per capita income is 70 per cent less than that of the nation as a whole, the college has as its main objective the helping of the people in the section in which it is situated.

CUMBERLAND'S STUDENT ENROLLMENT

A statistical survey of the fall enrollment at Cumberland College reveals the unique service that Cumberland College renders to the mountain region surrounding the college.

From the tri-county area, composed of Whitley, Laurel, and Knox, statistics show that 467 students from these three counties are enrolled at Cumberland. Whitley County has 295 students at Cumberland; Laurel, 97; and Knox, 75.

Five other mountain counties have a total enrollment of 409 at Cumberland. These are Harlan, Bell, Clay, McCreary, and Leslie. From Harlan County, 109 students are enrolled; from Bell, 107; Clay, 83; McCreary, 65; and from Leslie, 45.

An additonal 150 students from the mountain region of Kentucky are attending Cumberland this fall.

Over 200 students from the Appalachian sections of Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia enrolled at Cumberland this fall, making a total of around 1,250 Appalachian students in attendance at the Williamsburg institution of higher learning.

Cumberland College, which was founded in 1889 as Williamsburg Institute, has always had as its primary purpose the serving of the Appalachian student.

According to President J. M. Boswell, the college enrolls more Appalachian students than any other denominational college in the nation with most of these coming from Kentucky.

Richard Brashear, student aid officer at Cumberland, has revealed that the student aid budget at the college for 1968–69 will approximate $650,000, with around $575,000 of this amount going to assist mountain students.

Mr. Brashear says 275 mountain students are given total aid and an additional 500 are given varying amounts of financial assistance ranging from complete aid to scholarships as low as $90 per year.

President Boswell says that as far as he knows, the cost to the student at Cumberland is the lowest of that of any of the denominational senior accredited colleges in the nation.

With a teaching faculty of more than 100, a number of whom are now on leave working on their doctorates, Cumberland has several programs involving college students and staff which are for the improvement of the general educational and economic situation which prevails in the mountains.

CUMBERLAND'S SPECIAL PROGRAMS

In keeping with its main objective, the college has special programs to aid in enriching the spiritual lives of the people of this geographical area.

Under one program Cumberland supplies interim ministers to the many churches in the section from both its student body and its staff. The college makes available gospel teams composed of three to seven students who on invitation go to churches in the area for special religious services of duration from one to two days. Special non-credit courses in religion and particularly in Bible, are taught off campus by members of the Religion Department of the college.

Cumberland's program in teacher education plays a vital role in the relationship of the college community. Cumberland also sponsors annually both a science fair and mathematics contest for students in the region, and a meeting of guidance counselors for public schools in the area. Cumberland students, under the direction of staff members, conduct special story hours for children of the community. The college students also engage in a home reading program for the benefit of children in the area. This program has an uplifting influence on the parents of the children in whose homes the reading is done.

OUTSTANDING ALUMNI

Among the graduates and former students of Cumberland are two governors of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, missionaries and ministers serving at home and abroad, educators of national prominence, physicians, attorneys, dentists, optometrists, pharmacists, engineers, business executives, judges in local, district, state and federal courts, legislators and leaders in several branches of the armed services of our country.

RESERVE MINING COMPANY EMPLOYEES COMPILE REMARKABLE SAFETY RECORD

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, it was recently called to my attention that the Babbitt, Minn., local No. 4757, United Steelworkers of America, won its fifth I. W. Abel Presidential Safety Award when employes of the maintenance department in Reserve Mining Co.'s Babbitt Division worked more than a million man-hours without a lost-time accident.

This taconite mine is in my district, and I can assure you that this is a remarkable safety record. The mining and processing of taconite involves the use of massive machinery and vehicles, and employees must be extremely safety conscious to minimize possible hazards.

I wish to join in congratulating local No. 4757 for its efforts in maintaining high safety standards. The union's intense interest in safety is most commendable, and I certainly encourage the membership to continue their exemplary performance in working toward an accident-free record.

I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following news article from the July edition of Steel Labor announcing local No. 4757's award:

BABBITT LOCAL WINS ABEL SAFETY AWARD

BABBITT, MINN.—Local 4757 won its fifth I. W. Abel Presidential Safety Award when employes of the plant maintenance department in the Reserve Mining Company's Babbitt Division completed 1,019,873 man-hours without a lost-time accident.

The accident-free period of time began on Oct. 30, 1967 and continued through Feb. 28, 1969, according to Paul Robichaux, chairman of Local 4757's Safety Committee.

Local 4757 has taken seriously the problem of maintaining safe working conditions and insists upon adherence to safety rules by all concerned. Company officials are under constant pressure from the union's Safety Committee to operate the open pit iron ore mine and crushing station with the least possible danger to the members of the local.

MONTE CASSINO MARCH

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on July 9, I took the occasion to relate the great historic achievement of the stubborn, gallant, and undaunted Polish Second Army Corps in the capture of the abbey at Monte Cassino, which occurred on May 18, 1944.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in this House an article which appeared in the July 16 issue of the Post Eagle, New Jersey's only American-Polish newspaper, published in Clifton, N.J., by Mr. Chester Grabowski.

The article refers to a New Jersey resident, of Polish extraction, who wrote the "Monte Cassino March" which will be played at the 25th anniversary commemoration of the battle; at the cemetery in Italy.

The article follows:

BLOOMFIELD MUSICIAN'S "MONTE CASSINO MARCH"

BLOOMFIELD.—When the crowds gather at the cemetery in Monte Cassino, Italy to commemorate the 25th Anniversary of the Battle of Monte Cassino, where the Polish 2nd Corp headed by General Anders stormed and captured the Monastery opening the way for Allied troops to Rome, a March of the Polish Soldiers will be played by the Military Band leading off decorations of the Graves of the soldiers.

The composer of this March happens to be a New Jersey resident, Mr. John Niewiadomski of Bloomfield, who is also invited to attend the ceremonies. Mr. Niewiadomski, although a Veteran of the U.S. forces, thought seriously of the bravery and valor of the Polish Soldiers who took what others could not, the Monte Cassino Hill. He felt that these brave soldiers should be recognized and therefore, being a professional musician all of his life and composer of numerous works, he rolled up his sleeves and composed the "March of the Polish Soldiers." This March was submitted and has been accepted as the official March for the coming commemoration services.

Mr. Niewiadomski was born in Lublin Poland and migrated to these shores in 1909. He lived in Paterson, Passaic where Mr. Niewiadomski was educated and settled with his wife, the former Lucille Kisielewski in Bloomfield where they have been residing for the past thirty years. Our composer-musician studied music in private conservatories and has played the trumpet in a number of symphony orchestra's including the New Jersey Symphony, from which he has retired over fifteen years ago.

Throughout his musical career he was a member of the Bloomfield Symphony, and a symphonic group in New York, which played the Opera Halka. Although he is retired he still plays his trumpet as well as the violin and presently is dabbling with ideas on composing a symphony of his own.

The Niewiadomski's are the parents of one daughter, Mrs. Viola Porter who resides in Phoenix, Arizona. They spend their winters in Arizona and summers in the East. They are communicants of St. Valentine's Polish Parish in Bloomfield and members of various Polish organizations—including the P.N.A. and Sons of Poland. They are also active members of the Aria Choir of Passaic and practice with the Paderewski Choir in Phoenix, Arizona, at the Pulaski Club. Mr. Niewiadomski and his wife are leaving for Poland on the 27th of this month, this being his second trip and her third to the place of their birth. While in Poland they will visit Mrs. Niewiadomski's brother Marion Kisielewski of Oliva, outside of Warsaw and the Wielgus family. From there they will arrive at Monte Cassino for the ceremonies and then on to Rome before returning to the States.

Mr. Niewiadomski during his musical career has composed a Polonez, Waltzes and Religious Hymns as well as a special composition for his wife. The family including his daughter, who plays the piano, is musically inclined.

E. Z. "EASY" JONES

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is with a real sense of loss that I insert into the RECORD an editorial from the Daily Times News of Burlington, N.C., which comments on the life and death of E. Z. "Easy" Jones.

As the editorial points out, "Easy" was one of the pioneers of radio in this country. His personality and human warmth made him a personal friend of every North Carolinian within the sound of his radio station.

There is no way to measure the influence that a man like "Easy" has on a community. He exerted this influence through his campaigns for building a better community, and most of all, through the feeling of friendship and unity which he brought to an entire area. He is one of the last of a great group of radio pioneers. Although he spent most of his career in the relatively small city of Burlington, N.C., he often traveled abroad. He enjoyed the friendship of many of the great people of the world, such as Queen Frederica of Greece. He was a man who walked with kings and never lost the common touch.

The editorial follows:

E. Z. "EASY" JONES

There were countless times through the years when many close friends and acquaintances, knowing of the career of E. Z. (Easy) Jones, could have wished for that earlier day and an opportunity to see him perform in vaudeville, in radio shows, and in other entertainment outlets.

He had some memorable experiences and achievements. He was proud, naturally, that he could introduce Irving Berlin's "Always," or more popularly identified as "I'll Be Loving You Always." He had his time with Jack Benny, Gracie Allen and George Burns, then with Red Barber, the famed sports announcer in a later year. He had the thrill of seeing his Crazy Water Crystals radio show, which he wrote and produced in Atlanta, move to a national audience.

Then, as experience mounted, he turned toward radio ownership and management, working in Greensboro and then organizing a station and holding part ownership in High Point before coming to Burlington in 1941 to become a stockholder and the first general manager of WBBB, which later added a FM affiliate.

It was an eventful and interesting career which he followed, bringing much success and many honors to him as his effectiveness and leadership were registered far beyond the local scene and into the policy-making levels of radio interests in the state and with the Mutual Broadcasting System. He also deserved everything which came his way, for he gave himself that completely to duty and to the interest which his radio voice served the public.

Yet, Easy never really left the showmanship of his earlier days. It was a part of him and something which he handled well. He had presence on any scene, and he probably never forgot a joke which he had ever heard.

Then, too, he had a sense of timing for his radio stations, projecting them into new opportunities and trends, as he also held a big part of the past for the appeal it maintained. Then came the growing role of radio in news coverage, and he took his place on the featured 12:30 p.m. newscast, a time period which, through his direction, became one of the more popular and professional programs of the area. He used his radiotorials to bite, to suspicion, push and, then, to cuddle and to gently respond with warmth and feeling. Honors came to him through what he said and did as he took a subject—international, national, state or at home—and gave it his treatment. Then, too, his "Snag-Solvers" program became a purely personal time with his audience, and his approach allowed him to be an unseen friend and family-member of countless households.

He served his radio stations well, giving them a showmanship which he loved and a strength which he helped to build for them in other services. He was a devoted friend to his friends, a man who was close to his family and who loved this area and his day on the scene with it. No one can accurately measure the service he gave to building a better city and county—the radio station's call-letters stand for "We're Building Better Burlington"—but he had a vast influence.

His voice, indeed, represented more than words. It projected a movement in progress for us all for which we long since have raised our arm in respectful and sincere salute—and now in tribute to his memory.

TAX BONANZA

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with all Americans in saluting the bravery and skill of our astronauts and the technological prowess which made their great space feat possible yesterday. I watched it on TV and it was a splendid sight.

But I could not help but remember, watching the commercials, that Gulf is one of the primary beneficiaries of a huge tax bonanza.

Because of this gift to Gulf by Congress and the American taxpayer, Gulf was able last year to make more than a half billion dollars in profits, yet paid less than 1 percent—eighty-one one-hundredths of 1 percent, to be exact—in Federal income tax.

This is 42 percent less than the average American industrial corporation had to pay in such taxes.

It is nice for Gulf Oil to sponsor this television show but it would be even nicer for them to pay their fair share of taxes.

As I sat there and watched those three brave men soar into space and listened to that commercial, I wanted to add to their commercial that this big and thriving oil company paid exceedingly little of those billions it took to send them aloft.

I have opposed the 27½-percent oil depletion bonanza which Gulf and other oil companies have long enjoyed at the expense of the ordinary taxpayer and I will continue to oppose it.

In concluding, let me add just one word. I have used some of that good Gulf gasoline in the past but I guess I will have to turn in my credit card in protest.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, centuries ago, John Donne told us "For Whom the Bell Tolls"—it tolls for thee, and it tolls for me, and for generations now it has been tolling for the captive nations of the world, some of them without national, intellectual, or civil liberties for generations.

This week has been designated by the U.S. Congress as Captive Nations Week—in fact this is the 10th anniversary of this provision in Public Law 86–90, passed by the Congress in 1959.

In the decade that has passed, have we seen any liberation of the minds and bodies of a billion human beings from the subjugation they have endured for so many, many years?

Unfortunately, no. In the past decade, we have had a lot of rhetoric, a lot of pity, a lot of righteous indignation; but if anything, the situation seems to be worsening instead of improving.

The recent debacle in Czechoslovakia is a case in point. Like Czechoslovakia, more and more nations seem to be losing their national identity to naked, brute force. More and more people seem to be losing their native freedoms to dictators who have arisen in their midst.

Let me insure that my position here is not misunderstood. I speak here not against the use of words; heaven forbid that. I speak here of the uselessness of sterile words; of colloquy among ourselves in this body that never reach the very people who should and must learn the meaning of freedom.

The word is the most powerful weapon of modern civilization; yes, Mr. Speaker, more powerful even than those stockpiles of instruments of utter destruction which world powers have accumulated.

This is because words are the weapons which capture men's minds and not those which destroy their hearts. Therefore, I say to you, sir, we are underutilizing the battle of words to teach men that they too were created with "certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

We now have whole generations of citizens of captive nations who never even knew what it was to have their own national government, who never even knew what it was to have liberty, who never even knew what it was to have freedom of thought, freedom of action and freedom of emigration.

I regret to say that we are not without fault in this battle that the forces of democracy appear to be losing to the forces of darkness. We lack almost as much knowledge of what goes on in many of these captive nations as they know of what transpires in the free world.

To a great degree, the latter is understandable. These captive nations are devoid of a free press and the residents are fearful, upon pain of imprisonment or even death, to discuss publicly the events of the day. But the United States has a free press—without Government control or censorship. But too often, the laws of economics are the determining factor rather than the desire for thorough news coverage.

I ask you how many newspapers, how many broadcasting stations or networks in even recent years have even sent correspondents to Turkestan, to Tibet, to Lithuania, to Ruethenia—to so many of these captive nations where entrance is permitted—to bring us the true facts of the lives these people must endure.

And while our opposite number in the battle for man's mind and heart spends billions in broadcasting lies and half truths in hundreds of languages, how much time, effort, and money does the free world utilize to counter these measures; to convince these people of the fact which must seem inconceivable to them—that a free world does indeed exist.

That as long as their minds are free, the imprisonment of their bodies cannot stifle the age-old dream that governments derive their power from the people and exist for the betterment of their citizens.

There is much we can do as Members of Congress to contribute to the fight to free men's minds and bodies. Captive Nations Week would be an appropriate time to begin that struggle.

DENTON J. QUICK

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we are all diminished when government at any level loses a man who has rendered devoted and superior service. Such a loss has occurred in my district with the untimely death of Denton J. Quick, director of the Sussex County Board of Chosen Freeholders.

Denton Quick epitomized throughout his 34 years of public service everything we respect in a dedicated public servant. He was a man of great compassion who spent much of his lifetime advancing the cause of public health. His record in this regard includes terms as president of the New Jersey Public Health Association, membership on the State Health Facilities Council, the New Jersey Crippled Children Commission, the New Jersey State Mental Health Advisory Council, and the New Jersey Hospital Association. Just 3 weeks ago here in Washington, as chairman of the education and welfare steering committee of the National Association of Counties, he worked on arrangements for a national welfare conference.

Denton Quick demonstrated early in his public career outstanding courage in helping to safeguard the public interest. As sheriff of Sussex County in the latter portion of the 1930's, he drove out a nest of the German-American Bund who were intimidating the local citizenry.

Not the least of Denton Quick's service to his community was his unselfish and long standing activity on behalf of the youngsters of his home county. For 34 years he led a troupe of youngsters, presenting Christmas entertainment for schools, churches, and civic organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place before my colleagues the following editorial from the New Jersey Sunday Herald which expresses far better than I a tribute to Denton J. Quick. The editorial is as follows:

DENTON J. QUICK

The passing of Denton J. Quick, director of the Sussex County Board of Freeholders, comes as a shock to the county. He had been so much a part of the county that his loss will be felt personally by almost everyone.

A native of Newton, Denton Quick knew through first hand knowledge every section of the county. He became a public figure almost from the time he was graduated from college. He started his political career as a young man and became active in the old Sussex County Republican Club, and within a few short years took his first public office in the county as undersheriff. He then went on to become sheriff and, still later, county freeholder, a position he held for 19 years.

Besides his political activity, he played leading roles in many state and county welfare and improvement organizations. He earned the admiration and affection of hundreds of youngsters for his annual portrayal of Santa Claus for almost two generations. His energy and enthusiasm seemed inexhaustible.

Denton Quick's untimely death has saddened the hearts of all who knew and worked with him. Regardless of political affiliation or conflict of views that mark the career of every person in public life, he leaves an indelible record of devotion and service to the community.

AMERICA AS SEEN BY A NEWCOMER

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a speech recently made by Rev. Eddy Ie to the Wednesday Morning Prayer Breakfast Group. Reverend Ie is assistant pastor at the Fourth Presbyterian Church, Bethesda, Md. He also conducts a radio broadcast four times weekly to

XUM

Southeast Asia. This is in the Indonesian-Malay language.

Reverend Ie was ordained by the Dutch Reformed Church in Indonesia, trained through the Melbourne College of Divinity in Australia. Reverend Ie has traveled widely and has spoken at many student conferences in the Far East and Southeast Asia.

In September 1963, he migrated to the United States. He is married and has a 4-year-old son.

Mr. Ie was invited to speak to the breakfast group by the group's president, Homer McMurray, to tell what he thinks of the United States of America and to share with the members his personal impression and hope for this country, as seen by a newcomer. Members of my staff regularly attend this breakfast meeting.

Mr. Ie's presentation follows:

AMERICA AS SEEN BY A NEWCOMER

Five years ago, when my wife and I arrived in this country, we were absolutely amazed at the affluence of this nation!

Although prior to coming to the States, we saw attractive magazines like the National Geographic, Life and Look magazines, and many others, yet when for the first time I stood on the soil of the United States of America, and observed the magnificent and majestic buildings and freeways, I could hardly believe that they were true! To me, it is like Alice in Wonderland coming into reality.

Thereafter, when I was exposed to the technology and the American Art—I mean real representative art—I became the more excited!

It is a great country.

There was, however, something else, that really captured my mind and imagination for a long time!

It is the unique and noble history of this nation, with some of its abiding heritage.

Before migrating to this country, I read some of the history of the United States, in order that I might be acquainted with the basic principles of this nation.

In my reading, I learned that the founding fathers had deep religious beliefs in God as their Guide and Guardian.

For instance, they believed that "knowledge" and "Godliness" were two inseparable elements. Quoting the words of John Spencer Basset in his Book, A Short History of the United States, he said: "In all these institutions, except the university of Pennsylvania, the chief impulse to found the college came from a church. Higher education in America now so well able to stand on its own feet, was born of religion, and long nourished by it."

Honestly, I was frequently astounded at some of the statements made by the distinguished leaders of this country. To me, it was so inspiring to read the following statement made by one of your greatest presidents:

"Whereas both Houses of Congress have, by their joint committee requested me to recommend to the people of the United States a Day of Public Thanksgiving and Prayer to be observed by acknowledging with grateful hearts the many signal favors of Almighty God . . . ! Now therefore, I do recommend and assign Thursday the 26th day of November next, to be devoted by the people of these States to the service of that Great and Glorious Being, who is the beneficent author of all the good that was, that is or that will be. . . ."

Indeed, students in Asia are asking the questions: "What Makes America Great?" and "How come the U.S. has grown so strong and steady?" They realize that the citizens of this country work hard. They recognize that this is a rich and fertile continent. They know that America has a great number of scholars and scientists; men and women who shape their society to a "Technetronic Society."

Yet, there is one thing that they do not know about. That is the *spiritual resources of this nation*. Maybe, if those students and analysts in the Orient would turn to the pages of the history of the United States, they might learn the secret in the National Motto, "In God We Trust."

It is quite possible, that other than the Kingdom of David and Solomon, America is the only nation that God has bestowed so much upon—and that because of the dedication and devotion of her leaders and the people.

But what about the confusing present?

1. The Memphis Incident and the Assassination of Senator Robert Kennedy surely shocked and rocked the whole nation, and even the world.

2. The American political scene at the moment is also puzzling.

a. It seems to be preoccupied with "power"—black power, student power, poor power, flower power, etc.

b. Discussion has been superseded by uproar.

c. Debate by demonstration.

d. Dialogue by confrontation.

e. Civil disobedience by overt resistance.

3. Furthermore, conditions in the nation are changing so swiftly that American traditional props of ancient religious tenets and humanitarian principles are kicked out from under us. We feel at times that we are left to make urgent "moral decisions" virtually on our own. We are informed that major crimes in the U.S. have increased five times faster than the population since 1950.

4. Although the communications revolution has made it possible for a new top-level order or proclamation to be carried immediately by radio and television; yet many Americans today have little faith that any leader could master either of the two major problems we face: RACE and WAR.

Many foreign observers realize that America is in the midst of a transition, a transition that is both unique and confounding. It is even frustrating to the Marxists.

Even though they see the marks of mounting contradictions in the "internal American turmoil," but . . . that "commotion" does not fit classical categories:

Well-fed alienated youth from well-to-do families.

Middle-class dis-affection.

Racial issues taken into the hands of brilliant and militant religious leaders.

5. Finally, the skyrocketing of scientific discoveries contributes to a mixed feeling among the individuals. An eminent student in National Affairs currently said:

"If the present transition of America to the technetronic age achieves no personal satisfying fruits, the next phase may be one of sullen withdrawal from social and political involvement; a flight from social and political responsibility through inner-emigration."

In his December 2, 1968 U.S. News & World Report editorial, "Why 49 million did not vote," Mr. Lawrence states:

"Indifference may possibly have been a more potent factor than sheer ignorance in keeping 49 million persons away from the polls in a presidential election. This can be overcome only by placing more emphasis on the responsibility of citizenship."

The following statement made by Walter Lippmann can be interpreted as a solemn and serious prediction:

"The art of invention has become a deliberate and organized thing in our times. We cannot predict its outcome, because we cannot predict what will be invented. All we know is that the changes will be great and fast."

But even though these are depressing thoughts, we may take courage as we consider: the wheels of the gods grind slowly, but they are turning! Thus human history is never static.

Secondly, America is not alone in facing these kinds of complex crises. At this moment, numerous countries in the West, as well as in the East, are going through tremendous changes.

Thirdly, this could be America's greatest test. If she can endure the trials, she will enjoy great triumph.

But if she should capitulate, then, like a ship in the midst of a storm, she shall capsize.

Perhaps all this chaos is to remind America of something she should heed. At this moment, I am thinking of the admonition of Benjamin Franklin to the members of the Constitutional Convention when he said:

"In this situation of this assembly, groping as it were in the dark to find political truth—how has it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Lights to illumine our understanding? In the beginning of the contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayer in this room for Divine protection. Our prayers, sir, were heard, and they were graciously answered. And have we now forgotten that Powerful Friend?"

And in addition, Benjamin Franklin might have reminded them and us:

"No king is saved by the great size or power of his army. Neither is a mighty man delivered by his much strength. Behold, the Lord's eye is upon those who revere and worship Him. . . . He will undertake to deliver from death, and to sustain in every crisis of life."

PRAYER

O God of our Fathers, We are grateful that here in this land, after ages of political convulsion, the common man has come into his own.

It is our prayer that all over this land there may be a return to the faith of those men and women who trusted in God, as they faced the exposures and danger of the frontier.

May all of us come to understand that "right living" alone exalts a nation; that only in Your will we can enjoy peace and potential possibilities.

The world surely cannot be changed until the hearts of men are changed. Even our hearts need to be transformed.

Therefore, may our ultimate reliance in America not be placed in mere knowledge or material power, but in the character of the average man, knowing that "Happy is the Nation" whose God is the Lord.

This we pray in the Holy and Precious Name of Christ. Amen.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, while many things have happened since the captive nations' resolution was passed 10 years ago, the situation is quite the same as far as the satellite countries are concerned. One major difference is that the Soviet empire has extended the tentacles of communism into the New World and brought Cuba within its sphere of influence. Its major move during the past year was the invasion of Czechoslovakia, during which it transported tens of thousands of troops into that little satellite.

XUM

The Kremlin continually stirs up trouble in numerous other ways. It exacerbates the ancient quarrels between tiny Israel and the Arab world. A Soviet naval force has been established in the Mediterranean. The supply of arms to our enemies in North Vietnam continues. The Soviet empire can, at any moment, cause "all hell to break loose" at almost any point on the globe—in Berlin, in the Mideast, in Africa, and in Latin America.

The one fact that stands out 50 years after the Bolshevik takeover in Russia is that nations do not become Communist voluntarily. The Russian people did not choose communism—it was forced upon them by a little gang of revolutionaries during World War I.

Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Cossackia, Georgia, Idel-Ural, North Caucasia, Ukraine, the Far Eastern Republic, and Turkistan did not choose communism during the years immediately after the First World War—they became part of the Soviet Union without their consent. The Baltic states, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, became unwilling Soviet "republics" during the early part of World War II when the National Socialists of Germany were allied with the Communists of Russia.

Following the defeat of the Nazis, a number of other countries were forced into the ranks of the captive nations: Albania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and East Germany. The peoples of these lands had no voice in the matter. One day they were independent nations—the next they were swallowed up by the Soviet Union.

Not only did these people lose their right to determine their own destinies when they were absorbed by their ruthless neighbor, they lost other rights as well—the right to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences, the right to speak and write their own thoughts, the right to petition the government for a redress of grievances, the right to a fair trial, and numerous other rights that free people take for granted.

Here in the United States of America, where we still retain our own fundamental freedoms, we must continue to support the right to self-determination of the peoples who inhabit the captive nations. We must repudiate the Brezhnev doctrine, which proclaimed the right of Communist Russia to intervene militarily in any Socialist country threatened by a "capitalist order."

Let us hope and pray that the subjugated nations behind the Iron Curtain will soon be free and that Captive Nations Week will no longer be necessary.

DEFENDING THE ENGINEERING MENTALITY

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, it seems that a popular thing to do these days is to attack the mentality of those with whom we may disagree.

A case in point is attacks from certain quarters of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in carrying out the civil functions of the Department of the Army.

I was, therefore, pleased to find that some of this hysteria is put into good perspective in an article appearing in the June 26, 1969, issue of the Engineering News-Record.

I commend to my colleagues the following article by Robert Moses, retired chairman of New York's Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority:

DEFENDING THE ENGINEERING MENTALITY

A reporter, Gene Marine, has written a book entitled *America the Raped—The Engineering Mentality and the Devastation of a Continent*. This volume he felicitously dedicated to his mother. The jacket features a tin garbage can topped by mountain scenery in color.

Marine starts off as follows:

"I am a reporter and uncomfortable in the role of sociologist, political theorist or scholar. As a reporter, then—albeit a concerned one—I have decided to stay with my 'story,' to try to be clear at the expense of scholarly apparatus, rather than meticulous at the expense of readability."

"Marine's main target," says the publisher, "is the Engineers (with a capital E) and what he calls the engineering mentality." It takes a really gifted, brash reporter to dispose of the entire record of the U.S. Army Engineer Corps, founded in 1775, in a few nasty epithets. "The Army Engineers," says this bright boy, "get the men who are left over after the good jobs are gone."

I am an engineer only by association with the profession and with no better passport than a few honorary engineering degrees which are supposed to grant privileges, such as speaking out, and immunities, such as defenses against charges of ignorance. The author has grossly libeled the engineering profession. There are, to be sure, dumb engineers just as there are dumb authors, conservationists, sanitarians, mayors, legislators, budget directors and park officials.

Similarly, public servants who work for the Port of New York Authority, U.S. Forest and Park services as well as the Corps are pictured as fanatics who don't work for the people. Says Marine: "They build bridges and dams and highways and causeways and flood-control projects. They *manage* things. They commit rape with bulldozers."

I could, if there were space, cite a dozen gross misrepresentations of public works and as many crass errors of fact in this book. What, for instance, does the reporter mean by "walling off the rich estuaries of Long Island?" He says that all Long Island's wetlands are threatened. I have been mixed up with Long Island estuaries for a long time. Does Marine refer to the big jetties which keep the South Bays open to tides, fish and boating and prevent erosion of the shore? He says this is "a rape from which America can never, never recover." Another characteristic Marine whopper reads: "Can you imagine *filling in the Grand Canyon?* That's what they're doing. And they're going to charge us for doing it." Again, as to DDT. Marine fails to comprehend that whatever its limitations DDT has rid us of the mosquitoes which made part of Long Island uninhabitable in summer.

EXAGGERATED

This pretentious, exaggerated, grossly inaccurate and fanatical piece of propaganda was of course written to sell. There is no evidence of research, documentation, or accuracy. Note, for example, the extravagant space given to a proposed Consolidated Edison pumped storage plant on the Hudson Palisades. There is no reference to almost 70 years of persistent, successful effort to preserve some 60,000 acres of suburban Hudson shorefront and Ramapo mountain land All that interests the author is cursing a small plant proposal involving three or four hundred acres.

Marine refers to "Cosmopolitas," an imaginary, ideally planned city, and says: "It would be as silly—if the ecological point of view is going to be applied to problems other than saving the ebony spleenwort—to build a Cosmopolitas without planning for *racial* ecology as it would be to overlook problems of water supply or air pollution."

There are numerous other distortions. When was a Jones Beach causeway under water and what is the point of such a charge which is wholly fictitious? What's wrong with Jones Beach, which the author sneers at? This is a book for a few thousand of bigoted and uninformed conservationists. There are no doubt some engineers short on esthetics, some bungling rapists and bulldozers, and despoilers of nature, but not nearly as many as there are phony conservationists.

Marine's quaint notion that all engineers have by birth, disposition, training and practice no patience with landscaping, architecture, esthetics, amenities, etc., etc. is sheer hokum. I can testify as head of the United Nations Construction Committee that far and away the most knowledgeable and useful of the distinguished foreign planners of the World Capitol picked by the several participating nations, was Basov, the Russian, who was an engineer, Gilmore Clarke, one of our ablest planners, is a civil engineer who happens also to be one of our best roadbuilders and landscape consultants, was dean of architecture at Cornell and on the U.S. Art Commission. Has the author ever heard of him?

Marine's wholesale denunciation of pollution of the great commercial waterways is another example of his purple prose. These waters can not be as pristine as mountain brooks, though they can be kept relatively unpolluted by law and policing. Rivers have long been water roadways. Fish swim in the midst of astonishing raw stuff, especially in tidal streams. This is no argument for sewage. It is a word of caution to those who do not comprehend the many often conflicting objectives and uses of mankind and the necessity for sanity as well as sanitation. Even Marine admits that "if we are to live as we want to live, there must be some dams, some 'thermal pollution,' even some sulfur dioxide—and some fish who can't make it home to their spawning grounds."

President Nixon has appointed a Cabinet-level advisory group to battle "deterioration of the environment." It includes the President, the Vice President, six Cabinet secretaries, a scientific adviser, and a 15-member Citizens Advisory Committee. Unfortunately, Lee DuBridge, the presidential scientific adviser, already anticipates drastic action and mentions that electric autos may replace internal-combustion cars, surely a wild, unrealistic beginning of a practical study.

EMOTIONALLY CHARGED

The Christian Science Monitor, quoting Glenn T. Seaborg, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and Nobel Prize laureate, says, "There is a certain hysteria in the country about environmental problems. Environment has become an emotionally charged word today, almost on a par with 'crime in the streets' or 'student revolts.' It is obvious that enough is not being done in controlling and regulating the environments. But much more is being done than the public is aware of and more than ever before." Glenn Seaborg is right. The extreme conservationists contributes little. We are not yet a nation of poisoned, strangulating hypochondriacs doomed to choke on foul air, swallow our own smoke and gaze vacantly on a devastated countryside. Education, leadership, money and time will see us through.

Here we have the clever reporter suddenly turned scientist who treats the entire subject of man despoiling nature as if it were a sudden dramatic disturbance like a typhoon, earthquake or flood, civil war, riot or a raging fire.

Nobody but a fool will deny that there has been a selfish despoiling of nature, that selfishness has often masqueraded as public service and that industry has in many places injured nature. But oversimplifying the problem by manufactured evidence and misrepresentation will only promote prolonged and bitter argument. Armchair philosophizing and academic chatter will not save us from engineering rape. Our salvation requires realism, sober, steady, reliable courageous day-by-day hard work, balance and serenity.

One must admire the boundless, fathomless indignation of Marine over the rape of the universe. To be sure, the basic remedy is at hand—stop breeding by the two-legged, reduce populations and thus guarantee uninterrupted enjoyment by the survivors.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, today one can pick up almost any newspaper and know that somewhere in the world there is turmoil and hostility. From one hemisphere to another people are fighting—fighting for freedom. In the almost 200 years that have passed since we fought for our independence, I think Americans sometimes forget what it was we were after and how precious a commodity it is.

The week of July 13–19 is of special significance to all those countries fighting for freedom. This is Captive Nations Week, and it is a time for special remembrance for our brothers who have not yet won their fight. This year the observance has added meaning in that it represents the 10th anniversary of Captive Nations Week, as it was established by a congressional resolution, signed into Public Law 86–90 by President Eisenhower in July, 1959.

Over the last 10 years there has been much growth in the observance of Captive Nations Week. Today as we pay tribute to those nations still struggling under the yoke of captivity, we are joined by others the whole world over who have succeeded in their efforts to be free.

Many good people in my district have settled in New Jersey after fleeing the tyranny rampant in their homelands. It is in talking with them that I have come to treasure even more the freedom and independence we have here in our own country. These many friends, however, have loved ones that still live in countries abroad dominated by the rule of Communist aggression. It is to them that we must offer the hope of a time when they too can enjoy again the freedom to think as they please, to worship in their own way, to elect their own officials, to make an honest living by a means of their own choosing.

Let us during this week rededicate ourselves to the struggle to free all men. Furthermore, we cannot make this a goal for only 1 week out of the year. Man must always be on guard to protect his independence. For those people from whom this precious liberty has been taken, we must work every day.

CHARLES CASTLEMAN A MASTER VIOLINIST

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of the House to the spiraling career of one of my constituents who has proven himself to be a master violinist. His name is Charles Castleman. Born in Quincy, and later moving to Braintree, Mass., he began taking violin and piano lessons when he was only 4. Just 2 years later, he performed with Arthur Fiedler, and the Boston Pops. In 1951, Harold Schonberg of the New York Times said:

> When Charles was only 9, his bow arm was strong and flexible, his ryhthm superb. There was plenty of assurance and dash in his performances, and a prevalent musicianship that appeared to stem from his own instincts. Careful training, of course, was responsible for the accuracy of his conceptions but no coaching that ever existed could have supplied the natural flow one heard yesterday afternoon. (New York Times, Oct. 15, 1951.)

Three years later, he soloed at the New York Philharmonic. Between the ages of 13 and 16, he played Carnegie Hall four times and appeared on the Frank Sinatra, Lawrence Welk, Arthur Godfrey, and Jackie Gleason shows. He entered Harvard after receiving a National Scholarship Award even though he was only 15. For this accomplishment, he received a personal letter from John F. Kennedy.

After attending Curtis Institute in Philadelphia, he won two major international contests, the Tschaikowski Competition in Moscow, U.S.S.R. and the Queen Elizabeth Concours in Brussels, thus becoming the only American violinist to successfully represent the United States in two major international contests. Having played tour dates all over Canada and the United States he went on his first full-fledged European tour in the spring of 1968. Here are some of the reviews he received:

> "Crisp Rhythm of Young U.S. Violinist. This unassuming young American has great gifts—a firm, crisp rhythm, bright tone and a lively rapid vibrato that imparts vitality to every phrase. Highlights of the concert were his beautiful 'shaping' of the running passages in the finale of Hindemith's Sonata Op. 31, No. 1, the ringing octaves in the Paganini Caprice and the astonishing skill with which he overcame the difficulties of the Ysaye Sonata." (London Daily Telegraph.)
>
> "Charles Castleman is a devil of a violinist, of the romantic caliber of a Paganini and Saraste. The powerful tone of his instrument filled the auditorium to the last corner, always pure in intonation and clear even in the most complex passages. Castleman masters all the tricks and subtleties of his trade. His contact with the almost hypnotized audience was terrific, and so was the enthusiasm." (Berlin, Die Welt.)
>
> "The fascination of Castleman's violin is among the rare surprises of a season. He choreographs the music down to the last note, and has almost all the techniques one could wish for in an international virtuoso. Technique and virtuosity, however are only the means to an end for him. Rarely does one hear so little superficiality in a violinist. If things go as they ought to, he will have an outstanding career" (Munich Abendzeitung.)
>
> "A Violinist Extraordinary. The audience found all its expectations surpassed, and everyone applauded for three. Castleman offered a program that only a few artists can master; with admiration, we have to report that this young violinist cannot be rated high enough as an interpreter and technical wizard. We shall long remember the rich, clear tone of his Guadagnini violin." (Salzburger Volksblatt.)

The reviews he received in the United States were no less complimentary.

> "A clear sense of musical style and purpose . . . a performer of international stature, Castleman has the stuff brilliant careers are made of." (Washington Post.)
>
> "It is hard to believe that the source of this complex tonal edifice was a single violin. Rhythmic intricacies were flawlessly executed; technical problems seemed nonexistent—he sang with humanly expressive power." (Boston Christian Science Monitor.)
>
> "New Violinist Scores Big Triumph Here. The pièce de résistance was Charles Castleman. He attacks with much bravura and continues with a rich tone that is often as smooth as velvet. His style is persuasive, his phrasing beautiful." (Houston Chronicle.)
>
> "Castleman Stylish Violin Soloist. This was a stylish, mature playing by an artist with taste as well as technique. Mr. Castleman's attack's were clean, his phrasing crisp in the outer movements of Mozart's Concerto in D, and there was both warmth and elegance in the Andante. Whether in the intimate context of the Mozart or the all-out bravura playing of Wieniawski's Concerto No. 1, Mr. Castleman was unreservedly involved most effectively to his audience which responded with a storm of applause. (New York Times.)

Few men will ever receive such acclaim much less at such a young age. Far be it for us to try to add to the praise of his peers, nevertheless, the service he has rendered our Nation's image demands our attention. Consequently, I wish you and the rest of the House to applaud this young American and wish him continued success.

I include at this point the letter he received from John F. Kennedy 12 years ago:

> U.S. SENATE,
> *Washington, D.C., June 25, 1957.*
>
> Mr. CHARLES CASTLEMAN,
> *Braintree, Mass.*
>
> DEAR CHARLES: I wish to send my sincere congratulations to you on recently receiving a National Scholarship Award from Harvard University.
>
> With every good wish for the future, I am
> Sincerely yours,
> JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE END OF LINE POWER

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a fine article which recently appeared in the Boston Jewish Times. One of the regular features of this newspaper is the "State of Affairs" column, normally written by Mr. Emanuel "Manny" Goldberg, who following experience in journalism, now serves as assistant dean for university planning at Brandeis University. In addition, Mr. Goldberg has taken an active and exemplary interest in both Massachusetts and community politics and civic affairs.

However, he has been upstaged for the moment by his daughter Betsy, who has made a significant contribution to "State of Affairs." Betsy's comments on the generation gap and the "line problem" offer insight to both young and old. To me, one of the most impressive aspects of this article is that such mature and provocative comments are written by one so young. Miss Goldberg is 13 years old, and will be a ninth grader at the Beaver Country Day School in Boston this fall. It seems as though Betsy is more than following in her father's footsteps—she is forging ahead. At this time I should like to offer "State of Affairs," by Miss Betsy Goldberg:

THE END OF LINE POWER

I want to apologize to those of you who were expecting my father this week—but at the end you might realize that the lapse was worthwhile.

The purpose for this column (my first) is to bring a different view into the traditional "State of Affairs" column. I would like to express some of my own opinions about the world, America and society.

When you hear the word "America," what do you think of? Hot fudge sundaes; red, white and blue; peace? Or a run-down city and ghetto with poverty-stricken people? Many of us find that our ideas about this country change as we grow older, experience more, and learn more about the views and problems of others.

Most people with a clear and honest mind are able to think about both the good and bad things in our country. Fortunately, so far, the bad things have never seemed to get us down. Maybe this is because we are optimistic and believe that all problems can work themselves out in America.

Now let me consider the world's problems. Are they really so complicated and threatening? Let me tell you my ideas and how I think some matters can be solved.

Human woes all started when man invented the line; yes, a simple line as long or short as you want to make it. These lines are a part of everyone's life. A simple line separates people. It is a boundary, border or restriction. It segregates black and white; it separates state from state. Eventually, it leads to Country versus Country.

Is there any hope for mankind so long as we "draw the line"? The answer is to try to eliminate boundaries and the wrong kind of discrimination.

Hopefully, a century from now, mankind will have invented something so overpowering that it can destroy "line-power." It will be something precious that everyone can own, rich or poor. It will be able to transcend all artificial boundaries, even the ones that now separate people. It will rush on without being stopped. Maybe the invention will simply be love and brotherhood.

Getting back to today and the demonstrations, sit-ins, riots, etc. on the leading college campuses, all I can add is "example." Wasn't it great how the matter was handled at Brandeis? Perhaps Brandeis had a special appeal and challenge for the students.

I don't agree completely with the views of every college student who uses non-violent methods to express them. But I admire these methods. Outsiders and unlawful groups rush in to use violence, merely to get publicity for the situation, and this soon gets out of hand. I still haven't figured out why the demonstrations against war, poverty, discrimination, etc. arise mainly on college campuses. They'll be more effective if they are directed to the U.S. Capitol in Washington, D.C.

I don't agree with non-negotiable "demands" unless these are things that have already been promised. When students or anyone else "demand" things unlawfully, they must realize that in the end they can be dismissed from school or face other consequences.

Nobody can predict what all these outbursts at the college will eventually lead to The situation is dangerous but all responsible teenagers hope it results in a change for the better and a good society.

I don't understand why the SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) call themselves that because the last thing they are for is a democratic society. Maybe it seems that the contradiction is the best approach for them to get attention. Do you think they are succeeding?

I just hope the voice of the best in young America will continue to be heard. Already youth knows it will not be able to accept important commands without having something to say about them.

With all the things they are doing to be articulate, youth sometimes wonders if it is accomplishing anything besides a joke. But everyone has a unique way of doing things, their own "flair", from the hippies to the brilliant Harvard students.

The joke is really on the adults who won't listen to the kids, who themselves don't realize the harm they can do if they use violence, and on the people, kids and adults alike, who want to destroy things but put nothing in their place.

The kids keep asking the right questions. It is up to the adults to help them find the right answers so that the two, together, can live in a better world.

STEVE DUNFORD

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, a week ago, a distinguished citizen of Utah, an old friend of mine and thousands of others, died in Salt Lake City. He was Stephen Love Dunford, former chairman of the board and president of Dunford Bakers.

Steve's mother baked bread in her kitchen in the early days of the depression, and her sons sold it door to door. After the death of their mother, the Dunford boys decided to carry on the tradition. There were three of them. Steve who was the oldest, was the business developer. His brothers performed the other essential production sales and procurement activities of a new and growing business. They established first retail outlets, then they started selling at wholesale and established foodstore retail bakery outlets.

The Dunford Bread Co. became the largest and best known business of its kind in the Intermountain West. All the brothers, and later their sons, worked hard in their local, family-owned business and made it a giant, by local standards, and all through the growth, Steve was the business developer, a smiling, open-hearted, friendly, compassionate man. He was a great citizen, a loyal husband and father, and a wise and practical counselor. In addition to his widow, the former Mae Christensen, he leaves the following sons and daughters: Larry Stephen, Craig C., Jayne, Mrs. David E. "Kay" Thomas, James Clark, Steven Mark, Christopher Richard, all of Salt Lake City; one grandchild; brothers, L. Clayton, Burns L., both of Salt Lake City.

Steve was a great sportsman and made herculean contributions to the growth of competitive golf in Utah, where many affectionately called him, "Mr. Utah Golf" after he received the award from the Utah Golf Association.

Utah and the West have lost a great and progressive citizen. His family has lost a husband and father who loved them with great devotion.

SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS MUST BE BUILT AND ADEQUATE FINANCING IS NEEDED AS PROVIDED IN MY BILL H.R. 12913

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when all the world observes the magnificent accomplishment of our Nation in the exploration of space and the broadening of the world's horizons, there are many Americans who feel we must hide our heads in shame because of the water damage that we are doing here to the good earth the Almighty has given us. At the same time that we are proudly and properly able to send our intrepid astronauts to the moon, we look about us and see the natural resources of our waterways polluted and filthy—almost unusable by human beings in many instances. We are obviously on earth abusing the heritage which has been given to us here on earth.

There are many Americans, Mr. Speaker, myself included, who are fed up with this filth. They are fed up with what must appear as hypocrisy on the part of their Government. This House has in the past frequently and consistently enacted legislation with the view to controlling pollution of our Nation's waters. It has done so in a sincere effort by Members on both sides of the aisle, and, in fact, usually unanimously, to rid

XUM

ourselves of a situation that is deplorable and horrifying. And yet when it comes down to the cold hard facts of life—when it comes down to the spending of money, we baulk at spending a small amount per citizen to construct and aid in the construction of sewage treatment works.

There is no question that we are not putting enough into our effort to clean up the Nation's waters and there is no question that we cannot continue to mark time while pollution abounds about us.

We must face the facts, Mr. Speaker. There appear to be only two possible alternate solutions. The first is that we appropriate the funds necessary to do the job. The second is that we provide a means of financing for the funds we do not appropriate. Let me make myself perfectly clear. The best means of doing the job is to appropriate the money and see to it that it is spent where it will do the most good. A financing scheme is a second best solution. We all know that.

We are all aware, however, that frequently we must accept the second best solution until we can accomplish the first best. Now, personally, I favor an increase in appropriations for our construction grant program for treatment works. As a practical matter, I realize that at this time, even though we might be able to increase appropriations in this area to some extent and should increase these appropriations, the sad truth appears to be that we will not be able to appropriate the full amount that this Congress has authorized. Accordingly, I have introduced a bill today, H.R. 12913, that is in all substantial regards the same as was suggested by the administration and conveyed to the Speaker with executive communication 967. I think that the text of that communication is most interesting to this body and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring it to the attention of all of the Members now. It says:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., July 15, 1969.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill, "To amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes."

We recommend that this bill be referred to the appropriate Committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

As indicated during the recent Congressional hearings on the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969, this Administration has given considerable attention to the serious problem of financing the construction of needed waste treatment works. Last year, both houses of the Congress passed S. 3206, a bill which would have provided a supplementary method of financing waste treatment works. That legislation was not enacted because of problems regarding other parts of last year's water pollution legislation and the lack of time to resolve them. Enclosed is a proposal which is very similar to that approach.

The problem of cleaning up our rivers, lakes, and coastal waters is critical. This bill would provide a mechanism to provide the necessary Federal financing to help meet water quality standards. The proposal would provide additional financing alternatives to the States. It would allow significant increases in capital investments within State programs for the construction of new facilities to help meet abatement schedules presently established in accordance with the water quality standards.

The bill would add a new subsection (f) to section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. The subsection would provide a new and additional method of financing the construction of waste treatment works. This method would be in addition to the direct grants for such works authorized under section 8(b) of the Act.

Under this new method the Secretary of the Interior would be authorized to enter into long-term, not to exceed 30 years, contracts with a State or local governmental unit to pay in installments the Federal share of the costs of constructing such works. The Federal share would be determined in the same manner as the Federal share is determined for grants; that is, 30, 40, 50, or 55 percent as the case may be.

Before entering into any contracts under the bill, the total sum available for contracts will have to be established in appropriation Acts for each of the fiscal years 1970 and 1971. This sum cannot, however, exceed the sum authorized to be appropriated under section 8(d) of the Act in those fiscal years, less the sum appropriated for such grants.

The sum available for contracts would be allotted to the States by the same formula as funds appropriated in excess of the first $100 million are allotted for grants under section 8(c) of the Act—that is, by population.

These allotted sums will be available to the States for obligation for the fiscal year it was allotted, plus 6 months. In fiscal year 1970, these sums will be available for obligation for 18 months from the date of enactment of this legislation.

The payments made under each contract would be available to cover the cost of items listed in the definition of the term "construction" in section 8(e) of the Act.

The proposal would authorize the use, at the discretion of a State, of up to 25 percent of the sum available to a State from its contract allotments in each of fiscal years 1970 and 1971 to enter into long-term agreements to provide reimbursement payments for eligible treatment works for which construction was initiated after June 30, 1966, without a Federal grant or with only a partial Federal grant. These treatment works are those that are found to be eligible by the Secretary for reimbursement under section 8(c) of the Act.

AUTHORIZATIONS PROPOSED

The Department has given serious attention to the problem of the level and duration of authorizations. We have also closely scrutinized estimates of needs for the waste treatment grant program.

Our analysis of needs to meet water quality standards during the 1970–3 period indicates that a Federal grant level of about $750 million a year would be adequate. These figures are based on total needs over the four year period of $4.7 billion for new treatment plants and upgrading; $2.7 billion for replacement and expansion of existing plants; less $1.1 billion for investments made in 1968 and 1969; $.5 billion for new industrial connections to municipal plants; $.5 billion for phosphate removal facilities for communities in the Great Lakes area and the 20 largest cities; and $.2 billion for allowances for cost increases.

Although based upon the best available data and assumptions concerning needs, these estimates must still be considered somewhat tentative. For example, cost differentials among various regions of the country may exert a significant influence on costs. Changes in the rate of industrial connections could add or subtract to the overall municipal needs. Improvements in technology or greater use of regional treatment facilities could reduce costs while higher treatment requirements could increase them. Ongoing review of these and other related issues are expected to provide a significantly more accurate estimate than the current one.

Because of these considerations, the Department is not proposing, at this time, any extension of the waste treatment grant authorizations beyond fiscal year 1971. The refined estimates that will be part of the 1970 "Cost of Clean Water and Its Economic Impact" should be tailored to needs as closely as possible to assure they can be used for planning purposes by State and local governments. The Department expects to come forward with new proposed authorization levels early next year.

FUTURE OF THE WASTE TREATMENT CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

One of the most important areas of concern to us is the priority system followed by the States in connection with the treatment works grant program. Section 8(b) of the Act requires that a project for which a Federal grant is sought must, among other things, be in conformity with the State water pollution control plan approved under section 7 and be certified by the States as entitled to a priority over other eligible projects on the basis of financial and pollution control needs. The Act provides that the State plan set forth the criteria used by the State in determining the priority of projects. The Department is greatly concerned that heretofore adequate attention has not been given to developing criteria that will achieve the objectives of the Act. In our review of such State plans in the forthcoming fiscal year we will begin to pay more attention to the "criteria" and to the adequacy thereof. We will work with those States where improvements are needed to accomplish this, to the extent that this can be done in FY 1970 without disrupting State planning already underway, and we will where necessary, consider disapproval of State plans that are not adequate despite our efforts to cooperate. In fiscal year 1971 we will expect such considerations to be fully implemented in the State planning process.

As the review of the criteria progresses, we will want to know what consideration, if any, is being given to the extent to which treatment works contribute to the realization of public benefits, including assurance that other sources of pollution will not preclude the realization of such benefits; provisions for training, surveillance, and adequate project planning and design will assure effective management of the treatment works; the project is part of an effective river basin pollution control plan or management program already developed or under development; the area served takes advantage of economies from large-scale treatment works; and the extent to which the community has established a system of charges or other revenue measures to meet current operation costs of the treatment system, amortization costs, and other requirements.

Section 8(a) of the present Act authorizes us to make grants subject to a number of limitations. Section 8(b)(1) requires that a grant cannot be made "unless such project is included in a comprehensive program developed pursuant to this Act" which includes the comprehensive programs developed under sections 3 and 7(f) of the Act. These programs, among other things should consider the possibility of regional collection and treatment systems. Besides taking full advantage of economies of scale which result from such systems, we believe this practice is consistent with section 8(b)(1) of the Act in the making of construction grants. We

XUM

should avoid a proliferation of small inefficient systems that increase costs to all levels of government and achieve less than optimum water quality. Similarly, foreseeable growth patterns and needs and plans developed to meet those news should be considered in the development of plans. We will review applications to determine whether regional treatment systems are feasible, and if they are, we will encourage their becoming a reality.

Another area of concern is the requirement for assuring proper operation and maintenance of treatment works. We believe the State and the applicant should be able to demonstrate at the time of the approval of the grant under section 8(c) of the Act that a sufficient number of operators will be provided and that operator personnel will be adequately trained; that equipment will be adequately maintained; and that laboratory and surveillance facilities are adequate to assure that the treatment plant will perform according to design specifications. We will insist on such assurance.

The Department is looking very closely at the problem of funding of facilities used primarily for industrial treatment. The Congress has indicated support for joint municipal-industrial treatment systems. More consideration and study is needed in this area, however, on proper cost allocation. We are reviewing very closely any project for which the industrial treatment is a significant portion of the total, and will present to the Congress our findings on what we believe to be an appropriate cost-sharing arrangement. We also plan to develop an overall proposal on this problem, after study.

These are just a few areas of concern where we are acting now to improve the program. I have directed that a total review of this program be undertaken immediately to see what its successes, shortcomings, and failures have been and to develop effective administrative and legislative proposals for the purpose of improving the program. Our objective is to propose needed legislative changes early next year in connection with the re-authorization changes that will be needed in fiscal year 1971.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that this legislative proposal is consistent with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER J. HICKEL,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that I am introducing differs by some language, which was developed here with the aid of our committee and legislative counsel, for the purpose of eliminating one or two possible ambiguities in the bill as suggested by the Secretary of Interior and preserve the objectives of the bill as intended by the Secretary of the Interior.

I have been given to understand, Mr. Speaker, that certain Members of the other body are considering raising the appropriation for this purpose, and I say more power to them. The purpose of my bill is to assure that the maximum amount of money will be available for the building of these works. It seems unlikely to me, and I am sure that there are many Members who will agree, that whatever the appropriation is for the forthcoming fiscal year and year following, that it will equal the full authorization under the law. Therefore, this bill will still serve a purpose. It provides that during fiscal year 1970 whatever amount that has been authorized by the unappropriated for construction grants-in-aid are authorized to be made available for a contract program by the United States will contract to pay the Federal share over a 30-year period. For fiscal year 1971 a formula is devised to encourage increased appropriations for grants and to supplement those grants by a contract authority. In this case, the contract authority can be up to three times the amount of the grants appropriated. The purpose of this formula is to preclude any idea on the part of anyone that we are encouraging a contract program in lieu of a grant program. With this approach, it is clear that the primary intention of Congress is that there be a grant program, if necessary to be supplemented by a contract program.

I feel that we cannot delay this vital program any longer. We must take action to indicate to all that it is the intent of Congress that higher priority be given in the saving of our Nation's waterways. I feel we must do this now. We cannot wait.

Mr. Speaker, we have only a limited amount of water and even more limited clean water. We are not going to be able to bring more into being. We must make do with what we have and if we poison it, there will be no more and what there is will to that extent be defiled. The pinch is already being felt—even in the Washington area—with the water shortage and filth in the Potomac River. How much greater must the crisis become before action is taken?

This legislation is essential.

EXPOSING THE POSTAL CORPORATION MYTH

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, today I had the pleasure to hear the excellent testimony of Mr. James Rademacher, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on Postal Reform.

Mr. Speaker, our committee and the American public have heard a great deal about a great salvation—the coming of a new idea that would solve all the problems of the Post Office Department—the so-called Postal Corporation. To hear the advocates of the Postal Corporation you would be led to conclude that the adoption of this concept would, within 5 years after its commencement, produce an efficient, economical, business-oriented Post Office Department. And here lies the crux of the issue. Can such a business, removed from the control of the people, achieve its promised goals without raising postal rates and fees, lowering Post Office employees' wages, and decreasing postal services? I think not.

This was the thrust of Mr. Rademacher's testimony—the Post Office Department would no longer be a service for the people, but rather it would be a cold, aloof business run by strangers. However, make no mistake about it, like myself, Mr. Rademacher recognizes the need for postal reform. What he is really saying is that a Postal Corporation is not necessary to solve the problems of the Post Office Department for, "There are better ways of ridding a dog of fleas than drowning the dog."

I wish that the American people could have the opportunity to read Mr. Rademacher's thoughtful and incisive statement.

I, therefore, submit Mr. Rademacher's statement for inclusion in the RECORD so that my colleagues who do not sit on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee will have an opportunity to read it. Mr. Rademacher's statement follows:

POSTAL REFORM STATEMENT OF JAMES H. RADEMACHER, PRESIDENT NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

For the purpose of the record, I would like to state that my name is James H. Rademacher, and that I am President of the National Association of Letter Carriers, with offices at 100 Indiana Avenue, Northwest, Washington, D.C. We have approximately 210,000 members in more than 6,500 branches located in every State of the Union and in all our possessions.

Today I am accompanied by J. Stanly Lewis, Vice President; William T. Sullivan, Secretary-Treasurer; J. Joseph Vacca, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer; George A. Bang, Director of Life Insurance; Austin B. Carlson, director of Health Insurance; Glenn M. Hodges, Assistant Director of Health Insurance; Dr. Joseph S. Smolen, Director of Training and Union Development; and Gerald Cullinan, noted postal historian and my Administrative Aide.

Needless to say, we are extremely grateful for the opportunity to appear before you and express our views concerning postal reform.

GENERAL PHILOSOPHY

I would like to begin this statement with a simple pronouncement of fact:

The National Association of Letter Carriers is solidly in favor of postal reform.

This should not be necessary to state at this time and in this place. We have been on record for many years, urging certain basic reforms in the structure of the postal establishment. We were, indeed, urging such reform long before the proponents of a postal corporation were ever heard from.

Unfortunately, however, there have appeared in many newspapers throughout the country a series of "canned" editorials attacking and insulting the National Association of Letter Carriers, its leaders and its members, by claiming that we are opposed to postal reform of any sort.

I say these editorials are "canned" because certain phrases run through them, repeated time after time, to such an extent that the possibility of coincidence must be excluded.

One such recurrent phase concerns the "cozy relationship" which we are alleged to have with the Congress and which, it is charged, we are unwilling to lose.

It is true that we have tried to enjoy over the eighty years of our existence, a friendly relationship with Congress. We would be foolish if we did not do so, since time after time, Congress has represented the only source from which we could obtain justice. We are, naturally enough, opposed to having this relationship destroyed through a reorganization program which would leave us literally at the mercy of a group of corporation managers.

But, the word "cozy" is, frankly, irritating and misleading. It smacks of indelicacy. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if our relationship with the Congress were as intimate as the phrase implies, our members would be far better off than they are today!

These editorials have sought to imply that there is something improper about the letter carriers exercising their constitutional rights by presenting our case to the Congress in as attractive a light as possible.

One would think, after reading such holier-than-thou editorials, that no lobbyist for the newspapers or the magazine ever darkened the corridors of Capitol Hill with his presence, or tried to urge the Congress to keep their rates of postage at an abnormally low level.

The NALC is for reform—total reform—of the postal establishment, but we see no reason why such reform cannot be accomplished under the present structure of the Post Office. We support, in short, your bill, Mr. Chairman—H.R. 4—which, in our opinion, would do just about everything the corporation proposal would do and would still keep the Post Office—the most essential system of communications in the free world—in the hands of the people through their elected representatives in the Congress.

It has been interesting to me, during these hearings, to find that neither the Postmaster General nor Mr. Frederick Kappel, could come up with a decisive answer when asked why reform could not be achieved under the present structure of the Post Office. Their answers, when boiled down, amounted to the unsupported assertion that they thought the corporation concept would be better, but they gave no solid or convincing reasons *why* they thought this way.

Mr. Chairman, it is our basic contention that the Post Office is, and always must be, a *service* to all the American people. It is not a moneymaking scheme; it is not a public utility.

Time and time again Congress has insisted on this public service concept of the Post Office, particularly in the Acts of 1794, 1844, 1851, 1930, 1958 and 1962. Time and time again the postal managers and other representatives of the Executive Branch (particularly the Bureau of the Budget) have nibbled away at the corners of this Congressional policy. It was significant to us that during the Postmaster General's extensive testimony before this Committee there was very little emphasis placed on the sanctity and importance of the postal service; the major emphasis was always placed on the need for economies; the need for *saving a buck,* rather than the need for *serving a patron.*

I am not maintaining that there is anything beautiful or desirable about the postal deficit. I am sure that the Post Office can be operated more efficiently and economically than it is, and every effort should be made to keep the deficit at a minimum.

But, I also think the postal deficit has been grotesquely magnified in the public mind. Since 1950, the Gross National Product has more than tripled. During that same period, the population of the United States has increased by one-third. But in 1957–1959 dollars—"real" dollars—the postal deficit is actually less per capita today than it was in 1950. In real dollars the deficit in 1950 came to $4.29 a year. In 1968 it came to $4.22 a year.

And, while $4.22 a year is probably too much—I still say it is the greatest investment the average American citizen can possibly make. It returns to him economic advantages amounting to hundreds of times his investment—and it also, of course, returns to him educational, social and political advantages which are beyond computation.

We hear a great deal of adverse criticism of the so-called "subsidies" built into the postal deficit. These subsidies amount to approximately $700 million a year. There may be some unnecessary subsidies involved in the figure, but by far the majority of them are in the public interest and have been repeatedly designated by the Congress as being desirable and necessary for the welfare of our society.

But, it puzzles us why this $700 million in postal subsidies should be singled out for scorn and attention, when so many other and more formidable subsidies festoon the Federal Budget.

The farm subsidy runs to about five times the postal public service deficit, but it doesn't get nearly the same publicity or criticism. The military budget is interlaced with subsidies of one sort or another which, if examined objectively, would dwarf the public service budget of the Post Office. I am certainly not arguing one way or another about the 27½ percent oil depletion allowance (we have enough troubles of our own without getting into *that* controversy), but I do suggest that this is a subsidy far in excess of that for which the Post Office is so derisively abused.

The public service deficit of the Post Office—six tenths of the total deficit—has been built into the postal policy of the Post Office by the Congress. In my opinion it has returned to the people of the United States more benefits than any other subsidy permitted to any other group in the country. It is a subsidy to *all* the people of the United States and, for the most part, it falls upon all our citizens, great and small, with admirable impartiality.

The postal deficit probably is too large. But it is far less important than the *service* deficit for which the management of the Post Office—at the dictation of the Bureau of the Budget—must bear the principal responsibility and blame.

Our second point, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, is that the postal service is far too important to the people of the United States ever to be permitted to be removed from the control of the people through their elected representatives in Congress.

I shall touch on this subject more thoroughly later on in this statement, but I want to establish our philosophical point-of-view on this very important matter.

The postal service, directly or indirectly, affects every single man, woman and child in the Nation every working day of the year. It must *never* be let out of the hands of the people.

Some say that a corporation would handle the mails more efficiently than the Government can handle them. I seriously doubt the truth of this. But as desirable as efficiency is in any kind of operation, I do not think that, in this case, it is the sole or even most important objective of the postal establishment.

Democracy is not the most efficient form of Government, it is merely the best. Certainly Fascism is more "efficient," and, perhaps, even Communism is more "efficient," if we disregard the human values involved. But the human values are the important ones, and they must take precedence when we consider government—or the system of communications on which our form of government depends for its success, and its very existence.

Those who control the communications of a country as large as ours, control the nation. We must not let that control get out of the grasp of the people. We must not permit Congress to relinquish its prerogative of oversight.

I do not see in the corporation bill—H.R. 11750—nearly enough safeguards, or sufficient checks and balances, to protect the American people from serious incursions upon their freedom and their rights.

The bill gives to the Chief Executive Officer of the Postal Service almost unlimited powers, but does not supply, in our opinion, sufficient protection against the misuse of such powers.

Your bill, H.R. 4, Mr. Chairman, gives to the Postmaster General far more extensive powers than he has now, but it still retains in the hands of the people—through their Congressmen—the means of preventing such abuses. We must never relinquish such means.

The Post Office must be reformed, but it must be reformed in a prudent way. There are, in short, better ways of ridding a dog of fleas than drowning the dog.

THE CORPORATION MYTHOLOGY

In recent months, I have been particularly impressed—and rather appalled—by the almost blind and child-like faith that so many Americans have in the efficiency of corporations *per se*. This faith—which seems to be equally shared by a large section of the American press—a large segment of the American people—and a surprisingly large number of Members of Congress—seems to hold that a corporation—by very virtue of its *being* a corporation—can do no wrong, and that Government—by very virtue of its *being* Government—can do no right.

This is part of the American mythology.

I might say that, like all other myths, it is inconsistent.

Something goes wrong with the Post Office Department, and a large number of citizens want to scrap it and turn it into a corporation.

On the other hand, something goes wrong with the privately-owned Washington transit corporation, and a large number of citizens want to scrap it and turn it into a Government agency!

There is a certain element of restlessness apparent, a desire for change for change's sake. I submit that in a matter so important as the structure and ownership of the Post Office, we cannot afford to indulge in such capriciousness.

When Mr. Frederick Kappel—who is certainly one of the most devoted and distinguished citizens in the land—testified before this Committee recently, he exhibited an almost *naive* faith in the efficacy of paying top executive majestic salaries as a means of curing the Post Office of all its ills.

This seems to me almost a classic case of an overcommitment to *expertise*.

The payment of enormous salaries to top executives is no guarantee of managerial efficiency.

Probably no industry in America today pays more monumental salaries than does the automobile industry—and no industry has been guilty of more monumental boo-boos.

It was not the Government, for example, which produced the Edsel or the Corvair, or which turned out hundreds of thousands of automobiles which had to be recalled because of faulty or unsafe features in basic design.

It was not the Postal Inspection Service which perpetrated that appalling and childish persecution of Ralph Nader; it was private detectives hired by the very top management people in General Motors.

If mistakes of such magnitude were made in Government, heads would roll and, in some instances, criminal proceedings would be imminent.

Every week we read of mergers in the private sector which have been made necessary because of managerial ineptitude in one, if not both, of the amalgamating corporations. And, I remember reading, in a national magazine recently, that at least 30 per cent of those mergers turn out unsuccessfully because of poor managerial planning.

Of course, there are thousands of beautifully-run corporations in America today. But there are a good number of badly-run corporations, too. Just by calling the postal establishment a corporation, we are not assured of its being, automatically, a managerial success.

And what happens if we get a corporation that is *not* a managerial success? What happens if we get a *badly-run* corporation? We would be far worse off than we are now, because the remedies could not be so quickly

XUM

applied as they can be today. The hands of the Congress would be comparatively tied and the entire economy and social life of the Nation could suffer serious harm before the situation could be cured.

I remember during these hearings, Postmaster General Blount was asked what would happen if the corporation were tried out, and failed. The Postmaster General laughed and said: "I don't know. Things couldn't possibly be worse than they are now."

With all due respect, I beg to differ. Things could be one *hell* of a lot worse than they are now. Certainly the operation of the Post Office is in a state of some disrepair today, but its faults and inefficiencies are being greatly exaggerated by the corporation proponents. The Post Office is handling 84 billion pieces of mail a year. The mail is getting through—sometimes a little slower than we would like—but it *is* getting through.

If the corporation concept were tried—and failed dismally—(a possibility which the most ardent advocates of the proposal will not deny)—we would have instant chaos, instant dissolution, instant financial and economic crisis. If the crisis continued for any length of time, we could even have serious political upheavals.

It is, in my opinion, unpardonably frivolous for the Postmaster General to say that the postal service couldn't be worse than it is today.

It is also, in my opinion, frivolous of the advocates of the corporation concept to admit that they have no idea whether or not the corporation would succeed, but they think it is "worth a try."

It is also not only frivolous,—but wickedly false,—for the advocates of the corporation concept to say—as they have said in correspondence with me—that the postal service is no longer the most essential system of communications available to our citizens.

We are dealing, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, with the most important—the most essential—system of communications in the free world today. There is a very clear line of demarcation which separates bold and thoughtful reformation from reckless and irresponsible experimentation. I submit that those favoring a postal corporation have passed that dividing line without even giving it a wave of recognition.

I cannot resist adding one more point on this subject. We of the National Association of Letter Carriers admit completely that the Post Office Department would benefit by more able and more enlightened leadership. We do not agree, however, that this is the only, or even the major, problem blocking the road to postal excellence.

The quality of the postal service ultimately and basically depends upon the quality of the people who work in the service. All the mechanization and automation in the world cannot compensate for the handicap of a disillusioned and disheartened work force which is turning over every year at an increasingly accelerated rate. All the mechanical improvements known to man cannot overcome the obstacle of perennially decreasing quality among the average applicants for postal jobs. The following chart contains statistics on turnover in the postal service during the past five years. Certainly we need continuity of top management, but what is more important to an efficient postal service is continuity of productive employees.

TURNOVER, SEPARATIONS, AND SEPARATION RATE[1]

	Separations	Separation rate
Year:		
1964	69,687	11.83
1965	89,534	14.86
1966	155,703	23.32
1967	193,703	27.4
1968	166,726	23.2

[1] Source: Post Office Department.

As I have said before, I have tremendous admiration for Mr. Kappel, even though we have some basic disagreements in our respective philosophies. However, I would like to submit, Mr. Chairman, that the solution to most of the present postal problems does not lie with the creation of hundred-thousand-dollar-a-year postal tycoons; it lies with the creation of $10,000-a-year letter carriers and postal clerks.

"End of commercial."

THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE PROPOSAL

We were especially pleased during the hearings when the question of the constitutionality of the corporation proposal was raised. Indeed, we had hoped that this question would be more extensively explored. It has, in our opinion, and in the opinion of counsel, a considerable degree of validity.

It is true that the General Counsel of the Post Office Department has—upon request—supplied an opinion that the creation of a postal corporation would be permissible under the Constitution of the United States.

If I may say so, we would like a somewhat more objective opinion on the matter. Traditionally, it has been the nature—even the function—of Departmental lawyers to utter opinions supporting positions already taken by their bosses.

(Many of you will remember an incident which occurred eleven years ago when the Judicial Officer of the Post Office Department was fired out of hand because he had issued an opinion—on request—that the Federal courts would not declare *Lady Chatterley's Lover* an obscene book. It turned out he was perfectly right—but he remained fired. Objectivity among Federal lawyers is not usually encouraged and can be fatal.)

Certainly, the constitutionality of this proposal should be tested before any action is taken.

Article One, Section 8 of the Constitution says "the *Congress* shall have power . . . to establish post offices and post roads." This is the same section, as you know, which gives Congress the power to declare war, to raise and support armies, and so forth.

It would certainly seem to me no more constitutional to turn over the operation of the Post Office—including the creation and abolition of post offices—to a corporation than it would be to turn over the Pentagon to a corporation.

Most important of all, Section 8 of Article One, says that "Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises." Postage, Mr. Chairman, is just as much a tax as is the income tax. Congress has traditionally considered it so. Certainly, it is also, by definition, an impost.

If there is any significant sentiment for demolishing the Post Office Department and creating some kind of corporation in its place, it would seem to us far more advisable, and considerably more legal, to try to achieve this through amending the Constitution.

Certainly if an attempt is made to achieve this radical change through simple legislation, the legislation will be seriously challenged in the Federal courts. And, if the courts decided the action was indeed unconstitutional, a considerable amount of serious confusion would ensue.

Now, I would like to speak very frankly for a moment—if I may—on another aspect of this business which I find very disturbing.

There has been a tendency—a somewhat unwholesome tendency, in our opinion—among certain elements of the Congress, to delegate unpopular, difficult, or, perhaps, politically embarrassing functions to the Executive Branch. (The recent decision of the other body to get rid of the obligation of confirming Presidentially-appointed postmasters is an example.)

Some intimidations of this were heard during these hearings. It was suggested that Congress admit that it is incapable of managing the postal establishment and that it should quickly wash its hands of the whole burdensome business.

This seems to me a very defeatist attitude. If Congress really feels it is handling Post Office affairs badly—and I think this charge is exaggerated to the point of untruth—then would it not be more inspiriting to the American people if Congress were to determine to improve its performance in this area so essential to the welfare of the people it represents?

Congress must perform many functions which are burdensome, and even distasteful, but which are essential to the safety and even the continued existence of the Nation: The setting of taxes, for one thing; the creation of a military draft; the declaring of war, and so forth and so on.

If Congress decides to rid itself of the burdensome (and Constitutional) duty of running the Post Office, where will it all end? Will the imposing of all other taxes—including the income tax—be handed over to a group of bureaucrats who are not directly responsible to the people? If this trend is carried on to an absurd length, will Congress reduce itself to the performance of purely ceremonial functions, like Great Britain's House of Lords?

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I think the American people—especially because of recent events—expect Congress to assume *more* responsibility, not less. I think the American people believe they have a right to expect Congress to improve its performance and increase its responsibilities, instead of throwing up its hands in despair and getting rid of vital functions which it finds burdensome.

THE PROBLEM OF FINANCES

Mr. Chairman, the National Association of Letter Carriers, and, obviously, many Members of this Committee, were surprised—and more than a little alarmed—by the bland optimism of the Departmental witnesses when they discussed the problems of financing the proposed postal corporation.

They were so euphoric in their attitudes that we got the impression that they were willing to make almost *any* affirmative statement—no matter how improbable—just as long as it helped to sell the corporation concept. At times the spokesmen were so free with their claims that I was reminded of the spiels of the old-time medicine men who used to sell snake-oil to the yokels.

First of all, there was the absolute assurance that the corporation—without raising rates or reducing service or mistreating postal employees—can save the Post Office a billion dollars a year and, within five years, place it on a self-sustaining basis.

Certainly, new procedures, new facilities, new machinery, *et cetera* can do a great deal toward moving the mails faster and better, and they can, undoubtedly save the Post Office a considerable amount of money, but—a billion dollars a year?

As you know, about 82 cents out of the postal dollar go for wages. About 15 cents more go for transportation costs and for other charges (such as the building or the leasing of facilities) which are controlled by the Department (and would be controlled by the corporation) only to a relatively small degree.

That leaves only 3 cents out of the postal dollar which can be saved. And in that 3 cents is the appropriation for research and development—an area in which every thoughtful student of the Post Office agrees, a great deal *more* money must be spent, not less.

We were startled to read in the Kappel Commission report one specific instance of how enormous savings could be realized. The Report says that they estimate that 15% of the *total cost* of city delivery can be saved "partly through mechanization and partly through better methods" in the sorting and bookkeeping that letter carriers must perform.

XUM

Anyone who knows anything at all about postal operations realizes that these functions are relatively minor and take up very little of a lettercarrier's time. Anyone who thinks that better procedures and mechanization in this area can save 15% of the total cost of the city delivery system simply doesn't know what he is talking about.

If this is the kind of thinking which has inspired such cheerful optimism about operating the postal establishment on a break-even basis within five years, then we would advise the utmost caution in treating the proposal with any seriouness.

As the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) pointed out earlier in these hearings, the Congress, after 35 years, still finds it necessary to pour $55 million a year into the Tennessee Valley Authority—which has been extolled as such a paragon among Government corporations.

If this is true of a relatively small operation such as the TVA—when compared to the postal establishment, that is—then Congress can expect to be pouring hundreds of millions of dollars a year into the postal corporation for many decades to come!

If the corporation were to last that long, of course.

It is quite possible, of course, that a certain amount of money could be saved by the corporation if it were to contract out some of the functions which are now losing money for the Department—such as rural delivery service, parcel post, the collection of mail from mail boxes, and so on. The contractors could conceivably use non-union casual labor for these operations and undercut the costs which the Post Office Department must now pay.

I suppose this *could* be done, but I firmly believe it would be highly inappropriate—dangerous—irresponsible—and, perhaps, illegal to contract out the handling of the people's mail in this way. These proposals are far different from the highly-controlled Star Route procedures.

It would mean that trillions of dollars each year—not to mention the most personal communications between individuals—would be placed in the hands of strangers who would not be directly responsible to the United States Government. I hope we never live to see *that* take place in this country.

The mail is far too important to be handled in such a haphazard way. We have been struck, during these hearings and in conversations with the advocates of the corporation proposal, by the comparative lack of understanding among them in this area. There is a tendency among them to consider the mail as simply another commodity—not as the precious, irreplaceable, essential thing that it is.

But, to our way of thinking, the corporation-mongers really went into optimistic orbit when they stoutly assured this Committee that they would be able to sell on the open market $10 billion worth of postal corporation bonds *without the backing of the United States Treasury.*

I can assure you that the skepticism which many Committee members showed on this point was shared by the National Association of Letter Carriers. It is also shared by the union's financial advisers. And, I was very interested to note, it was shared even by Mr. Kappel, whose Commission had envisaged a *five*-billion dollar bond issue which would be supported and backed by the Treasury—quite a different matter.

We were also interested to note that the Postmaster General—when asked why he had doubled the size of the proposed bond issue from five billion to ten billion, finally admitted that he and his staff had more or less picked the larger figure out of thin air. This seemed to us significant—symbolic, almost—of the rather cavalier way in which the entire corporation proposal has been presented.

For example, there seemed to be far too little concern among the proponents as to what would happen if the corporation were to be created—and then went bankrupt! Surely no one believes that such a calamity could not occur.

Well, what *would* happen? Shouldn't the results of such a contingency be worked out well in advance before this proposal receives serious consideration?

Would the entire postal service of America grind to a stop? Would it be taken over by its creditors? What can the people of America expect?

It is customary in bankruptcy proceedings to sell off the liquid assets of the corporation so as to pay the bond holders at least something on the dollar. Would this mean selling the General Post Office in New York or the headquarters building here in Washington to the highest bidder? I think not. But what *would* happen?

What would happen if a single corporate entity—like A.T. & T., let us say—controlled enough of the bonds to become the dominant force in the corporation? Would A.T. & T. then control the policies of the postal service—their principal rival in the communications field? And, if the corporation went bankrupt, would A.T. & T. then take over ownership of the postal service and inherit the entire communications monopoly in the United States?

I know, Mr. Chairman, that these contingencies I have mentioned sound way out. But, when we are discussing the postal service of the United States, we are discussing the way we live—all of us, everyone in America. We cannot afford—and the entire free world cannot afford—any reckless assumptions in a matter as grave as this. There is, in the proposal, an appalling lack of safeguards, of checks and balances, of certitudes and defenses against disaster. The line which separates cheery optimism from irresponsibility seems to have been totally obliterated.

I would like to point out also, Mr. Chairman, that the corporation advocates have been most optimistic—overly optimistic, in my opinion—about their ability to save a billion dollars a year if they can only get their hands on the Post Office.

I submit that, to break even, they will have to save not one billion dollars a year, but *two* billion dollars.

If they manage to sell their unsupported bonds in today's unreceptive market, they will have to offer an interest rate sufficiently high to attract great lashings of "risk" money—gambling money. Our financial advisers tell us that the interest rate would have to be at least close to 10 percent. This adds another billion dollars a year which the Post Office would have to "save" through better methods, better systems, better procedures.

Two billion dollars a year!

In my humble opinion, this simply cannot be done.

The only way such a goal could even remotely be approached would be through a combination of three alternatives!

—They would have to raise the rates to astronomical heights.

—They would have to reduce service to a whisper, except perhaps in the highly concentrated urban areas, where delivery is comparably easy.

—They would have to keep the pay of postal employes at an intolerably depressed level.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, the National Association of Letter Carriers is totally and unalterably opposed to all three of these alternatives.

And, if they knew the facts, I am sure the American people would be, too.

THE POSTAL CORPORATION—A NIGHTMARE FOR THE PATRONS

Actually, the postal corporation, if it ever came into being, would be a nightmare for almost every segment of our population.

Above all, it would be a nightmare for the patrons of the postal service—the individual user and the large professional mailer would suffer equally under its provisions.

As I mentioned at the beginning of this statement, Mr. Chairman, there was no evidence, during the testimony of the advocates of the corporation concept, of any deep concern for the integrity of the postal service—*as a service*. The emphasis was placed almost everywhere on cutting costs and effecting economies.

As a matter of fact, H.R. 11750—the bill which would create the corporation—makes it very clear that *service*—as we think of it—would be only a secondary consideration. On page 15, lines 1 and 2, for instance, we read that the Postal Service (which is the current euphemism for the corporation) shall "serve *as nearly as practicable* the entire population of the United States."

The corporation would, of course, determine the meaning of the words "nearly" and "practicable"—and, in regard to "nearly" I predict the managers would prove to be mighty poor judges of distance.

There is no economically "practicable" way to deliver the mail to ranchers in Montana and Texas, for example, or even to the farthest end of the average rural route, without charging extra fees for the service the patrons receive.

The U.S. Census Bureau tells us that at the end of 1968, 69.9% of the American population was living on slightly more than one percent of the Nation's land area. What kind of service would this corporation give to the 30.1 percent who live on the other 99% of the land area?

When one is pledged to "save" two billion dollars a year in operating the mails, would it be deemed "practicable" to give this large segment of the population the same free delivery it has become accustomed to receiving?

Also on page 15 (lines 10, 11, 12) we come upon some very ambiguous language which sets up alarm bells in our minds. It says that facilities will be maintained so that patrons will *"consistent with reasonable economies of postal operations* have ready access to essential postal service."

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I submit that every American—no matter where he lives—has the absolute right to free and frequent and regular delivery of his mail.

And I also submit that all American citizens—no matter where they live—have the absolute right to have "ready access to essential postal service" whether such access is consistent with reasonable economies of postal operations or not!

Does the language of the bill mean that any service that wasn't consistent with economy of operation would be deemed "non-essential"?

The individual patron—the ordinary citizen—can only expect from the proposed corporation higher and higher postage rates and less and less essential service. He would find it a nightmare.

I have been amazed, Mr. Chairman, with the complacence—and indeed the enthusiasm—with which some publishers have accepted the corporation idea. A careful reading of the bill indicates (at least to us) that the Chief Executive Officer of the corporation would have the power of life and death over every publication in the country that depends upon the mails for its existence. While the language of H.R. 11750 has been considerably tempered, when compared to its predecessor, H.R. 1382, it still gives the Chief Executive Officer more power over the mails than any single individual should have in a

XUM

free society. Certainly, as a publisher myself—of our own magazine, The Postal Record—the lack of safeguards frightens me, and if I were in the publishing business for profit, I would be very scared indeed of the potentials for autocratic censorship of dissident opinion.

Although it has never been the policy of the National Association of Letter Carriers to involve itself in the rate-making process, we feel that the corporation issue is so vital that we must at least comment on some attitudes prevailing among the users of second-class mail.

It has seemed to us that the major publishers have been overly-encouraged by the enthusiasm of the Postmaster General and the corporation advocates for the institution within the postal establishment of a true Incremental Costing procedure which would replace the Cost Ascertainment System, which we all know is inadequate and inaccurate.

They feel that since the Post Office was established to transmit and deliver—primarily—first-class mail, then the major share of postal costs must be laid at the door of this class of mail. The rates for first class would then be raised sharply while the rates for other classes of mail would remain undisturbed.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps these gentlemen know something I don't know, but I have certainly failed to detect any enthusiasm in the Congress for the acceptance of any proposal that would raise first-class rates sky-high and not raise the rates on second-class and third-class mail. I personally haven't heard any Member of Congress say that he would like to raise the postage on Aunt Minnie's personal letter to 10 cents, while permitting the *Wall Street Journal* or *Reader's Digest* magazine to proceed through the mails at less than three cents apiece.

And, perhaps these publishers are underestimating what a true system of incremental costing could do to them. The principal historian of the Post Office Department has told me that it is at least arguable that the Post Office was established, and its facilities erected and maintained, just as much for the transmission of what we now know as second-class mail, as for first-class mail. The original purpose of the Post Office was not only to transmit personal messages among our citizens, but also to transmit news and editorial opinion so as to keep the people of this country informed.

This being the case, it would be interesting and most informative if an amendment were offered to H.R. 11750, the corporation bill, which would insure that the burden of incremental costing be divided equally between first- *and* second-class mail. The effect of this amendment on the enthusiasm of the publishers for the corporation concept would be most enlightening.

Or, Mr. Chairman, there could be an alternative resolution which would permit the editorial matter of magazines and newspapers to go through the mails absolutely free of charge—but which would charge the *advertising* material in such publications exactly the same rates as third-class mail is charged.

Certainly, the acceptance of either of these amendments would be of material benefit in reducing the postal deficit. It would also help determine whether the enthusiasm of certain publishers for the corporation concept is based on purely philosophical grounds, or whether it is based upon somewhat less exalted considerations.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, we are getting sick and tired of reading in certain major publications editorials denouncing the efficiency of the Post Office. The public is being brainwashed into believing the service is far worse than it actually is.

I cannot see what the publishers have to complain about. There is nothing wrong with *their* service.

Who can remember ever not getting the *Wall Street Journal* on time? In post offices all over the country, when the *Wall Street Journal* arrives late, letter carriers are still made to wait—and all the first-class mail in their satchels is made to wait—until the *Journal* is distributed to them for delivery.

Who can remember failing to get *Time*, or *Life*, *The Reader's Digest*, or *Newsweek* late?

They arrive at our doorsteps as promptly as the sun appears over the eastern horizon. Could they expect such efficient and inexpensive treatment from a corporation-type operation?

They all wring their hands and decry the postal deficit. This is their privilege and, we all know, the postal deficit is too large. But, at least, it would be a great deal more honest if they were to admit their own enormous contribution—through low rates and special considerations—to that deficit.

And, of course, the size of the postal deficit has been widely (and, I think, purposely) distorted and misconstrued by many of the Nation's editorialists.

As the Chairman of the Senate Post Office Committee (Senator McGee) has pointed out, talk of a $1.2 billion deficit is "grossly misleading." Approximately $735 million of that deficit is the direct cost of public services, identified by the Congress, and required by law to be paid out of the general fund of the Treasury and not from postage rates. The actual deficit of the postal establishment is less than five hundred million dollars a year.

This is a sizable sum and, undoubtedly, it can and should be reduced. But, if the editorial writers would refer to the true figure of $500 million instead of the inflated figure of $1.2 billion, the public would be able to keep the postal problem in proper perspective, and would not be so susceptible to mass hysteria concerning their post office.

Yesterday (July 16) our great country sent men to the moon. This realizes a nine-year ambition during which time the taxpayers have spent over $24 billion on just the ultimate landing on the moon. During the past 40 years, tax dollars to operate the postal service have totaled only $14 billion. In comparison, considering beneficial effects, have not both been worth the investment? Should the U.S. Government offer to all the people a subsidized postal service which has little glamour in the same manner it is subsidizing the glamorous trip to the moon?

We have been especially surprised, Mr. Chairman, at the way some of the smaller publications have joined the clamor for the creation of a corporation.

Since the corporation is pledged to operate on a break-even basis—which will mean saving two billion dollars a year—within five years—and since it is inconceivable that Congress will permit the revenues necessary for the performance of such a miracle to be milked out of first-class mail exclusively, then—if the pledge is to be redeemed—second-class mail would have to sustain very substantial rate increases.

The very largest publishing houses could conceivably absorb such a rate increase, but many of the smaller publications would necessarily be forced to the wall. This would give the largest publications a virtual monopoly in their fields, but it would cause a significant shrinkage in the diversity of editorial opinion in this country, which would be an enormous pity in a free society such as ours.

So—for the users of the mails, large and small—we can see in the corporation proposal only greatly increased rates, greatly reduced service, and a greatly diminished spectrum of editorial opinion and interpretation of the news.

In short, we see nightmares all around.

A NIGHTMARE FOR EMPLOYEES AND THEIR UNIONS

A number of newspapers and magazines have attacked the postal employees because they have had the audacity to oppose the creation of a postal corporation.

So, I ask today, Mr. Chairman, why *shouldn't* we oppose this plan?

In the first place, we shall all be taken out of Civil Service. We are told that we shall be given something just as good, if not better. We have only the word of the corporation proponents for that—and, to be perfectly frank, the history of the past thirty years in the postal service has not exactly persuaded us to accept the promises and assurances of management with blind and unquestioning faith. We have earned the right of skepticism!

Many thousands of letter carriers, and other postal employees, joined the postal service because of the job security and other protections that Civil Service affords. All that would evaporate under the corporation.

We would have to negotiate with management in such areas as pay—health and life insurance—workmen's compensation—sick and annual leave—the works.

That sounds perfectly normal and straightforward . . . until one reads further. We would still be denied the right to strike, and binding arbitration could be achieved only through *agreement* of the Postal Disputes Panel. (Sec. 808, (f), H.R. 11750)

I want to make it perfectly clear that we—and every other group of postal union leaders that I know—realize the grave implications of a strike in the postal service.

I have gone on record with my membership—and have placed my own political future in our organization on the line in doing so—urging them to "Cool It" and not let their frustrations lead them to unlawful actions.

But no one, surely, can reasonably expect us to accept a proposal which would take away from us every weapon we can legally and reasonably use against cases of managerial aggression.

We would be denied access to the Congress, and Congress would be virtually incapable of coming to our aid.

We would be denied the right to withhold our services.

And, even in the most serious matters of disagreement, we could go to binding arbitration *only if management agreed to permit us to seek such relief*.

The proponents of the corporate concept, when they speak of operating the establishment on a break-even basis, give us the impression that they have not taken into consideration the possibility of any postal pay raises during the next five years.

I hasten to add that postal employees do not share this point of view.

The advocates of the corporation talk grandly of collective bargaining, but what they offer us is an ugly parody of any known collective-bargaining process. They would, in short, have us precisely where they want us—even more so than they do today—and we would be deprived of the recourses we now have—the appeal to Congress, or even to the Civil Service Commission.

I direct the attention of the Committee to the language of the bill, as it appears in Chapter VIII "Personnel," pages 45–58.

The language is vague, the protections hazy, the safeguards almost nonexistent. The words *"mutual agreement"* are twice employed on page 52, when discussing the means available for the settlement of disputes. I know the Postmaster General did a great deal of artistic verbal shadow-boxing when he was persistently asked about the implications in these sections of the bill, but, in our opinion, the words can be interpreted only one way: We would be able to get relief only if the corporation managers were good and willing to give us such relief. We would go to the bargaining table with our hands tied and with all the weapons on the side of management.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, there is *no way* that the postal employees could accept a unilateral arrangement such as this.

The labor-management provisions of the bill open the gates to virtual serfdom. They are absolutely unacceptable to us.

So, if the corporation ever were to be created, we, the employees would have a more than ample share of nightmares.

A NIGHTMARE FOR THE CONGRESS

I want to treat delicately, for just a moment, around another aspect of the corporation proposal: The difficulties it would present to Congress itself.

I want to preface these remarks by saying that they are motivated by genuine concern, and not because of any desire, or inclination, to intrude in your business.

Nonetheless, it has struck me very forcibly that the creation of a postal corporation could be so troublesome to Congress that it could very well constitute a political nightmare.

Certainly I know that the barrage of newspaper editorials and comment has stirred up some superficial support for the corporation among the folks back home—people who want a better postal system, and who have been brainwashed into thinking that the simple creation of a corporation will, by itself, perform miracles just through the waving of some magical wands. The average people who now favor the corporation concept, of course, don't know what is in store for them.

But, what is going to happen when the rates go up (as surely they must, if the goals of the corporation are to be met), and the service recedes (as surely it must), and the people go to the Congressmen, indignantly demanding relief?

Will it be enough to tell them you cannot do a thing about the situation because a Big Bad Corporation (which Congress itself has created) has come into being, and Congress is now almost powerless?

Will it be enough to tell them that their rates can be reduced only if Congress passes a Joint Resolution negating the action of the Rate Commission. Particularly since—not ever before in the history of the Republic—has an action of the Executive Branch been rescinded by virtue of a Joint Resolution?

It seems to my naive and untutored mind that all this could add up to a considerable degree of electoral unhappiness.

Particularly, I might add, at a time when the people expect Congress to assume *more* responsibility, not to abrogate it; when the people expect *more* performance from their elected representatives; not less.

The present postal service may make the constituents grumble; the postal service under the corporation will make them mutinous.

And, if this happens—and I think it would—the corporation would become a nightmare for Congress, just as much as it would for every other segment of our population.

The postal service affects, directly or indirectly, every man, woman and child in the country every working day of the year. *Nothing* could be more the business of Congress than this uniquitous, universal and essential national function. If disaster falls upon it because Congress has washed its hands of it and left its operation up to a band of corporate strangers who are not answerable to the people, then, it seems to me, serious and searching questions will be asked in every Congressional District in the land.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, you may have received the impression by this time that the National Association of Letter Carriers is opposed to the postal corporation concept.

Certainly, that is the impression I have been seeking to convey.

Then, what are we *for?*

We are for total postal reform as detailed in your bill, Mr. Chairman—H.R. 4.

We have never been able to see—and we cannot see now—why total postal reform cannot be carried out within the present framework of the Department without removing it from the control and the influence of the American people through their elected representatives in Congress.

And, if you will remember, neither the Postmaster General nor Mr. Kappel nor Mr. O'Brien nor former Senator Morton came up with any clear and convincing argument why reform cannot be accomplished without sacking the Post Office Department and replacing it with a huge and unresponsive corporation. Their replies to the questions of the Committee were elusive. It is perhaps oversimplifying the problem but, in essence, they added up simply to a preference for the corporation concept *per se* and a distaste for the Government concept.

In our opinion, this isn't enough. Not nearly enough.

Could it be that there are those who are afraid H.R. 4 will work—and then it would be proved that there is no need for a corporation at all? What is so holy about this corporation concept that its advocates would rather have no reform at all than have reform achieved under present conditions?

We are beginning to wonder, Mr. Chairman: *What is going on?*

What is behind this determined and unswerving and well-financed insistence upon taking the Post Office away from the control of the American people—and away from the control of the Congress?

The assistants in the Post Office Department have been talking vaguely and grandly about the great improvements in employee relations that can be effected once a corporation is created. If the reforms are so wonderful, why cannot they be placed in effect now? Why is a corporation necessary to do these things?

When we look at the recent efforts of the postal administration to reduce and eliminate services while raising rates and fees—and when we look at their sluggishness in trying to alleviate the economic and working conditions of the employees—we wonder if they are not *purposely* trying to run the present postal establishment into the ground in order to make the corporation concept more attractive to the Congress, the employees and the people?

Under your bill, H.R. 4, Mr. Chairman, the Postmaster General will be able to do everything that the Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation would be able to do—except that he would still have to be responsive to the needs and desires of the American people. He should, indeed, be able to do *more*—because he will remain in the Cabinet and will still have ready access to the ear of the President.

Under your bill, Mr. Chairman, the Post Office Department will have the same freedom in using its revenues as the corporation would have. It would be free of the ridiculously antiquated appropriations procedures which now make the efficient operation of the mails almost impossible.

The rate-making process under your bill, Mr. Chairman, seems to us to be even more just—and more constitutional—than does that provided for by H.R. 11750, and Congress would have a far better opportunity of regulating and participating in the procedures, and the patrons and large users of the mails would have a far better protection against sudden and damaging changes in their rates.

(You will remember, Mr. Chairman, we originally recommended that the Congress set up its own rate commission, independent of the Department, which would make its own recommendations to the Congress directly. We still feel this procedure would be more constitutionally correct, but we certainly have no objection to the system provided for by H.R. 4.)

H.R. 4 provides for mechanization and modernization of the postal plant just as fully as does H.R. 11750.

Although we have some minor differences with the labor-management procedures outlined by H.R. 4, we vastly prefer them to those offered by H.R. 11750. Under your bill we would be assured of the right to compulsory arbitration and would not have to seek the permission of management to achieve it.

Your bill, H.R. 4, Mr. Chairman, will rid the Post Office of undue political interference more effectively than would H.R. 11750. Those who claim otherwise simply have not read your bill. This provision could be further strengthened by incorporating the provisions of H.R. 6959.

There is, in short, nothing that the corporation-mongers promise which cannot be achieved through H.R. 4. Certainly—at the very least—we should try H.R. 4—try to reform the Post Office from within its present Governmental structure.

But, we are totally convinced that, with the help of Congress, the Post Office *can* be totally reformed while still remaining an integral part of the Government. We are also totally convinced that, at this time, the formation and creation of a postal corporation is both unnecessary and highly dangerous.

Last November and December, before his swift and marvelous death-bed conversion to the corporation concept, Postmaster General Watson offered a $500 million blueprint for the modernization of the Post Office without running the extreme risk of taking the Post Office away from the people. The Report, which went to the White House in November, has been virtually ignored ever since the new Administration came into power. His call for 74 *module* post offices—mail factories—in the 74 largest cities (which account for 52 percent of the mail volume) made a great deal of sense to those who read it. We have not heard it even referred to since last January 20. We think it should be restudied before any irreversible action is taken.

As we have said, over and over again, the postal service is far too essential to the social, economic, industrial, mercantile and political life of the American people ever to permit it to be removed from the ultimate control of the people. We cannot turn it over to a band of corporate strangers.

In closing, I would like to quote a statement by Rep. Tom Steed, Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office in the House. In the Shawnee, Oklahoma *News-Star* of last November 24, he had this to say:

"If Congress were willing to give the suggested powers to a corporation, why wouldn't they give them to a Postmaster General? If he had the powers complained of, most of the things reported by the (Kappel) Commission wouldn't exist.

"The postal service is too important to the people to entrust it to one man, one commission, a group not responsible to the people. Congress is so sensitive to this, it just is not conceivable to me they will ever do this."

I agree with Congressman Steed's sentiments in this regard, and I sincerely hope he is right.

We have attached an exchange of correspondence between the Postmaster General and myself, relative to our position on postal reforms. Also attached is a very important analysis of the reasons for the so-called "crisis" in the Chicago post office in 1966.

XUM

We want to thank you for permitting us this opportunity to express our views on the subject that is so close to the hearts of all Americans—the United States Post Office Department.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, as free citizens of the United States, we take this opportunity to mark the 10th anniversary of the observance of Captive Nations Week. This is the week during which all Americans from all walks of life will commemorate it in nationwide manifestations, rallies, ceremonies, and other public gatherings.

In 1959, Congress passed Public Law 86–90, commonly known as the captive nations resolution. The third week in July is set aside to remind the world of the plight of our fellow human beings behind the Iron Curtain. Americans must be informed of the fact that communism is not "mellowing" because we may be put to sleep and wake up some morning in another "workers' paradise."

These captive nation observances serve as a powerful moral symbol underscoring the fact that Americans will never forget or abandon the captive nations or accommodate themselves to their permanent enslavement. The captive nations themselves need this peaceful demonstration of our solidarity with them. They must know that they are not forgotten. This will restore their hope that someday they will be free of the alien governments and alien leaders.

As we observe Captive Nations Week we must do everything in our power to help these people in their struggle for national and religious freedom and in their desire for independence.

We can appreciate the fact that in the last 50 years of communism's ascendancy that some 100 million human beings have been murdered through civil wars, manmade famines, purges, genocidal deportations, and executions. The very magnitude of this figure of those who lost their lives under communism escapes us. One must think more of this figure as human beings rather than statistics, for each of these persons was loved by someone. They had relatives, friends, dependents who shared their agony and then had to bear the void in their lives when they were gone. With the demise of these hundreds of millions the hopes and plans of a better tomorrow were shattered in the lives of many more millions.

The captive nations will not be freed from the yoke of Communist tyranny until communism in Russia itself is defeated. This is the center of an ideology that is determined upon taking over the whole world. To battle an ideology that has already brought over a third of the human race under its domination in less than 50 years requires an ideology that is even more dynamic, more powerful. Communism will not be defeated by power politics, military power, nor economic sanctions—which may impede its growth—for it is basically a spiritual warfare, a war of ideals which touch upon the nature of man and his final end.

The battle is a battle of forces of good and forces of evil which must be carried into the enemy's territory—the captive nations. And, it is upon the grounds of these captive nations that victory over communism can be attained.

Pope Pius XII expressed his concern for the people of the captive nations when he stated, in one of his prayers, the following words:

> May our fervent prayer be of help to them. May our fraternal solidarity make them feel that they are not alone. May their example be edifying for the whole Church, especially for us who think of them with so much affection.
>
> "Grant, O Lord, that the days of trial be shortened and that very soon—together with their converted oppressors—they may freely serve and adore You, who with the Father and the Holy Spirit live and reign forever and ever. Amen.

In the spirit of freedom, we cherish the symbolic day of July 4 as our day of liberation. The French regard July 14, Bastille Day, as a significant event in French history, so should Captive Nations Week emphasize even more our commitment to democracy, and the concern which free people must feel for those who do not possess it.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this week, American, as well as citizens of 17 other nations in the free world, are observing Captive Nations Week.

This observance is notable because it is the 10th anniversary of the Captive Nations Week resolution which the 86th Congress passed in July 1959, and was signed by the late President Eisenhower.

With the sobering lesson furnished by the Soviet Russian takeover of Czechoslovakia last year, it hardly seems necessary to reiterate to the Red Empire the determination of the 27 nations behind the Iron Curtain never to acquiesce to permanent captivity and ever to seek, by all peaceful means, their eventual freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues' attention the following Captive Nations Week Manifesto 1969:

Captive Nations Week Manifesto 1969

The undersigned organizations, dedicated to the restoration of freedom in the captive nations, call attention to Public Law 86–90, unanimously adopted in 1959 by the Congress to the United States, by which the third week of July each year was designated as Captive Nations Week.

The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968 and the subsequent enunciation of the so-called Brezhnev Doctrine have once again brought to the surface the entire issue of self-determination and fundamental freedoms for the one hundred million people of East-Central Europe. The tragedy of Czechoslovakia dramatizes the built-in instability of contemporary Europe rooted in the still unresolved problems bequeathed by the Second World War. The Brezhnev Doctrine brings into focus the sad fact of the perpetuation in power of unpopular Communist regimes—imposed by a foreign power—that are not responsive to the will of the peoples over whom they rule.

The record of over two decades of Communist rule shows that the legitimate aspirations of the captive European nations have long been thwarted by Soviet hegemony over the area. Now, with the advent of the Brezhnev Doctrine, the USSR has in fact tried to make this arbitrary arrangement accepted on a permanent basis.

In the light of this doctrine, which is a justification for aggressive imperialism, the Soviet Union has in effect placed its own interests over the inherent right to national sovereignty and fundamental human rights of the peoples living in the Communist orbit.

This doctrine can have a far-reaching impact on the future of not only the captive European nations, but also of the free world. If the doctrine remains unchallenged, it may turn the United Nations Charter into a shambles. As a result of this doctrine, all Communist parties are expected to follow automatically the dictates of the Kremlin. The acceptance by the Communist governments in East-Central Europe of the new Soviet doctrine is tantamount to complete abdication of the sovereign rights of these nations.

The Brezhnev Doctrine is against the vital interests of all captive European nations, the Charter of the United Nations, international law and the accepted norms of civilized nations. It is therefore deemed essential that the free world oppose the newly enunciated Soviet policy of aggressive imperialism and defend the traditional principles and norms of international law, in order to maintain world peace, security and freedom for all nations.

For the peoples of East-Central Europe, it is important to learn of the continued determination of the free governments of the world to lend their moral and political support to the rightful aspirations of their captive East-Central European brethren.

While commemorating this year's Captive Nations Week:

We stress that the Soviet Union has demonstrably violated its solemn promises of freedom and independence to the nine nations made captive during and after World War II—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania;

We also stress that the Communist regimes in the East-Central European nations continue to be unresponsive to the will of the people by denying them the right to periodic and genuinely free elections.

We appeal to the free governments of the nations of the world:

1. To declare, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries, adopted by the United Nations on October 14, 1960, their support of the right to self-determination of all peoples held captive by the Communists and, consequently, to make this issue the permanent concern of the United Nations:

2. To repudiate the intent and objectives of the Brezhnev Doctrine, including its implied recognition of the spheres of influence and of the status quo in East and Central Europe;

3. To bring to world attention the urgent need for a responsible attitude by the free nations of the world designed to help bolster the morale of the East-Central European

peoples and thus create a climate favorable to their quest for full national independence and individual freedom.

4. As part of this effort, we call on the United States Government and on other members of the Atlantic Alliance to maintain, and where possible strengthen, NATO's defense forces. This alone will help counter any temptation of further Communist aggression—by force or threat of force.

We appeal to the People of the United State of America to manifest during Captive Nations Week, July 13–19, 1969, their awareness of the importance of freedom for 100 million peoples in the Communist-dominated lands to the establishment of a valid European settlement and world peace.

CHRISTOPHER EMMET,
Chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations.
JOZEF LETTRICH,
Chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations.

CALIFORNIA NATIONAL GUARD, A COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CHARACTER BUILDING ORGANIZATION

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, during the past few years the National Guard has received a good deal of public exposure as a result of its role in helping to quell civil disturbances.

I have noted through the news media that the Guard has consistently shown itself to be a highly disciplined force, controlling mob action with the minimum amount of damage and injury. This is especially true of the performance by the California National Guard during the recent disturbances at Berkeley.

Another facet of Guard activities has escaped public notice; however, I feel my colleagues will be pleased to know of these programs. I am referring to the many public-spirited activities that the California National Guard has engaged in during the past 2 years.

These activities ranged from providing equipment for community activities, to demonstrations of Guard missions, to sponsorship of Boy Scout troops, to full service training programs for disadvantaged youths.

I include now a report by Maj. Gen. Glenn C. Ames, commander of the California National Guard, outlining the full range of Guard activities for 1968–69:

COMMUNITY RELATIONS PROGRAMS AND IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS, CALIFORNIA NATIONAL GUARD, JANUARY THROUGH MARCH QUARTER, 1969

Unit	Number of youth involved	Nature of activity	What guard did to assist
Headquarters, 3d Battalion		Provided equipment to San Fernando Valley Archer Club, Chatsworth, Calif., Mar. 28–30, 1969.	Furnished 1½-ton water trailer from unit.
76th Aviation Group, California Air National Guard	124	Helicopter demonstrated medical evacuation procedures for California high school cadets, Brea, Calif., Apr. 2, 1969.	Flew OH-23C helicopter with litter pod and answered questions about aviation program in California Air National Guard.
Headquarters, 144th	(1)	Conducted familiarization tours of air defense wing activities for grade students, Scouts and agriculture group. Fresno, Calif., Mar. 31, 1969.	Explanation and demonstration of radar systems and jet engine principles.
HHC, 217th Transportation Battalion	3	Participation with Neighborhood Youth Corps of the Equal Opportunities Commission, Fresno, Calif., for quarter ending Mar. 31, 1969.	In-training program for youth in varied administration positions. Engagement of youth in typing, filing and office procedures to increase proficiency in writing, reading, and earning capabilities.
2d Battalion, 159th Infantry, 49th Infantry Brigade		Blood donated to American Red Cross, San Jose, Calif., Mar. 23, 1969.	Guardsmen donated 109 pints of whole blood to Red Cross facility in San Jose.
Company C, separation detachment, 579th Engineer Battalion.	30	Sponsors Boy Scout Troop No. 81, Napa, Calif., quarter ending Mar. 31, 1969.	Sponsors troop at local armory during weekly meetings. Assists in instructing scout subjects.
Company C, separation detachment, 579th Engineer Battalion.	80	Armory provided for California Cadet Corps, Napa, Calif., quarter ending Mar. 31, 1969.	Provides assembly point for California cadet training.
Company D, 579th Engineer Battalion	35	Sponsors Boy Scout Troop No. 61, San Rafael, Calif., quarter ending Mar. 31, 1969.	Sponsors troop at local armory during weekly meeting and helps in merit badge requirements.
2d Signal Platoon, 249th Signal Company	50	Civil defense seminar at University of Southern California. Seminar held at San Diego, Calif., Mar 21, 1969.	Unit supplied 3 guardsmen to operate 33 telephones and 2 switchboards in support of civil defense operations.
Hq, 144th Air Defense Wing		Airlifting California Air Patrol members to Edwards AFB, May 18, 1969.	Furnished aircraft for trip.
Do		Airlift of Military Affairs Committee to the Twentynine Palms U.S.M.C. base, May 24, 1969.	Furnished aircraft and crew for trip.
Do		Rendered plans and made preparations for the Armed Forces luncheon May 16, 1969, and the military ball on May 17, 1969.	Furnished personnel to help in scheduled events.

---

[1] 132 prekindergarten students; 65 2d grade students; 114 4th grade students; 80 8th grade students; 45 Indian Guide Scouts; 142 Cub Scouts; 32 Boy Scouts; 38 adults, Department of Agriculture group.

YOUTH ACTIVITIES PROGRAM, CALIFORNIA NATIONAL GUARD

Unit	Number of youth involved	Nature of activity	What Guard did to assist
Sep. detachment, Company C, 579th Engineer Battalion (combat).	25	Sponsors Boy Scout Troop No. 81, Napa, Calif.	Unit provided meeting place and assisted at meetings.
Do	10	Napa High School gymnastic class, gymnastic training	Provided meeting place.
Company D, 579 Engineer Battalion (combat)	35	Boy Scout Troop No. 61, Marin County	Unit acts as sponsor and furnished armory for meetings, technical advice on formations, and merit badge examiners.
112th Engineer Company (dump truck)	150	Construction of baseball field for Susanville Little League	Provided equipment and personnel to construct field; also provided trucks and drivers.
Headquarters and Headquarters Company 40th Armored Brigade.	80	Boy Scout Explorer Post No. 70 of Los Angeles—pancake breakfast.	Supplied field ranges and a cook.
49th Aviation Company, 49th Aviation Battalion	35	Boy Scouts safety and marksmanship instruction	Provided rifles, instruction and armory.
3d Battalion 143d Artillery	1,200	Boy Scout jamboree, Foster City	Furnished drivers, trucks, and water trailers.
Aircraft maintenance platoon, Company D, 40th Support Battalion.	35	Boy Scout safety and marksmanship instruction	Provided rifles, instruction, and armory.
Headquarters, 146th MAW (Air National Guard)	[1]6,500	Tour of Van Nuys Base	Hosted by guardsmen.
Service Battery (175 mm.) (SP), 143d Artillery	800	Contra Costa County Boy Scout field exercise	Provided 4 water trailers with 1,600 gallons of water.
Headquarters, 175th Medical Group	Unknown	Youth conference, Lake Tahoe	Loaned tentage.
HHC(–) 2d Battalion 185th Infantry	3,000–4,000	Display (firing of M-60 machinegun) established by unit in a major shopping center in Modesto.	Set up and manned the display.
Headquarters, 1st Battalion (HERC) 250th Artillery	450	Tours and facilities provided sponsors, Boy Scout troop and Cub Scouts.	Provided instructors and facilities.
Headquarters 76th Aviation Group	150–200	Christmas party at Compton Armory, Long Beach, Calif	Planned and carried out party.
Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 160th Infantry.	180–200	Cub Scout family outing in Angeles National Forest	Provided trucks, trailers, and licensed drivers to transport food, clothing, and equipment.
Do	50	Cub Scout event, Glendale Armory	Armory and kitchen facilities provided.
Company B, 579th Engineer Battalion (combat)	200	Construction of access road and clearing of area for camp sites for American Sunday School Union.	Unit provided crew and a dozer.
Company A and B, 579th Engineer Battalion (combat).	35	Sponsors for Boy Scout Troop, No. 28, Eureka, Calif	Armory used—including rifle range, classroom, and drill floor.
Headquarters, 146th MAW (ANG)	Unknown	Base film library loans to Boy Scouts and junior athletic associations.	Assistance in transporting film to various groups.
Headquarters, 3d Battalion, 185th Armor	40	Cub Scout pack, annual tour of armory	Assisted by guardsmen.
Do	500	Christmas program for underprivileged children	Hosted by the Guard.
Headquarters, 129th Special Operations Group (ANG)	2	On-the-job training program during summer months	Motor pool provided training in field of automotive servicing.
Headquarters, 111th Armor Group	42	Cub Scout outing, La Jolla	Provided equipment, vehicles, and men.

See footnote at end of table.

YOUTH ACTIVITIES PROGRAM, CALIFORNIA NATIONAL GUARD—Continued

Unit	Number of youth involved	Nature of activity	What Guard did to assist
Headquarters 2d Battalion, 144th Artillery	5,000	Arcadia band days, 40 bands in competition	Battalion CO was reviewing officer; color guard, transportation, water trailers, provided by Guard.
Headquarters 163d Fighter Group (ADC) (ANG)	4	Annual awards to outstanding scholar of 4 high schools	Donated the plaques.
Do	200	Talks presented to 8th grade students on career in military	Provided speaker.
Do	Unknown	Films on democracy and foreign countries in Upland School District.	Procured film for occasions.
Do	2,850	Elementary schoolchildren given 30-minute tours of base, Ontario, Calif.	Arranged for and escorted children on tour of base.
Headquarters, 217th Transportation Battalion	2	Neighborhood Youth Corps program—trains young people to become productive members of community.	Initiated training program furnishing administrative and technical on-the-job training for young people.
1112th Transportation Company	8,000	Operation Santa Claus for underprivileged children	Provided transportation and personnel to transport and deliver gifts.
263d Transportation Truck Company (lt-med)	Unknown	Support of U.S. Marine Reserve in assistance of pickup for "Toys for Tots."	National Guard vehicles and men were used.
Do	91	Headstart program in San Mateo	Day's outing with National Guard members providing transportation, food, tickets to Santa's Village for rides in park, and gift for each child.
Headquarters, 3d Battalion, 144th Artillery	Unknown	San Fernando Valley element of Boy Scouts—Reseeding of 13,000 acres in Angeles National Park with pine trees.	Furnished 7 trucks, lumber for construction of scout camp building and National Guard drivers.
Headquarters, 40th Infrantry Brigade	38	Neighborhood Youth Corps program—Training in secretarial, supply, or mechanical fields.	National Guard personnel used for training.
Company B, 579th Engineer Battalion	3,000	Completion of bridge to allow year-round access to Boy Scout camp.	Volunteer National Guardsmen built bridges.
Do	50	Painted Boy Scout hall and erected fence at Ferndale fairgrounds.	National Guardsmen involved.
Company B, 579th Engineer Battalion	3,000	Repairs to Boy Scout camp and general cleanup of area, and transportation of equipment from one camp to another.	National Guardsmen worked on this project.
Do	250	Handicapped Scouts jamboree at Elk River Boy Scout Camp	National Guardsmen cooked meals and a driver was used as ambulance/emergency vehicle driver.
1st Battalion, 184th Infantry	7	Boys trained for mechanics positions; girls for clerical	Instructed in training.
Do	30	High school field trips to airbases	Loaned trucks and drivers for transportation.
Company A, 1st Battalion, 184th Infantry	4	Training in general office work	Instructed in training.
Company B, 1st Battalion, 184th Infantry	2	do	Do.
Company B, 49th Support Battalion, 49th Infantry Brigade.	30	Thanksgiving dinner and trip to San Francisco Zoo for the children in Hunter's Point area.	Undertook and participated in complete project.
256th Engineering Company	6	Job training program, clerical and mechanical	Training and supervising by guardsmen.
Military Department, State of California	4,050	California Cadet Corps	CCC program is operated by California National Guard.

[1] Including adults.

RICHARD A. JONES ADDRESSES SAN ANTONIO HOUSING AUTHORITY

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much absorbed in my duties as a member of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee.

As you know, housing continues to be one of the critical areas of need in America today. It has been popular in recent years and in fact for quite some time to downgrade and knock public housing. And yet this is very unjust because public housing has rendered a most valuable contribution to the well-being of America.

I recall the beginning of the housing program in San Antonio, Tex., back in the late 1930's. But that is actually recalling another time and another epoch which to me is very difficult to conjure to the minds of modern America and therefore, I will not go further into that subject at this time.

But suffice it to say for the present that having had the great privilege to have worked with and under the great Marie McGuire, when she was the director of public housing of the San Antonio Public Housing Authority and later nationally famous as the Commissioner of Public Housing, I earned a deep and abiding respect and recognition for the contributions and validity of the public housing program.

San Antonio today is very fortunate to have as its executive director of the San Antonio Housing Authority, Mr. Richard G. Jones.

I have gotten to know Mr. Jones over the years and respect him for his tremendous ability as an administrator and as a compassionate human being who has also been sensitive and responsive to human need. Under his leadership, the San Antonio Housing Authority has contributed tremendously to the well-being of the city. It has cooperated magnificently with all of the ideas, from the war on poverty efforts in San Antonio to the various and sundry social and welfare projects of the city; it has cooperated in every possible way that it has been able to including the use of property for rental purposes and for sites for social and community programs.

I manage to maintain a close and personal contact with every housing project in my district and can personally attest to the success of the program even though it faces serious and crippling obstacles, some statutory, some local, and some partaken of the traditional enmity toward the program by those who have the most prejudice against it. Recently, at the 29th annual conference of the Southwest National Association of Housing and Renewal officials in New Orleans, La., Mr. Jones made some revealing and important remarks which I take the liberty of placing into the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS OF RICHARD G. JONES

INTRODUCTION

Borrowing a technique from the television media, I would like to move into the story before stopping to identify the program and some of its characters . . .

The scene opens in the office of a local savings and loan institution where a young couple anxiously make application for their first home in Dreamwood Acres. Priced at a bargain $13,500, this three-bedroom brick beauty is located only minutes from the elementary school, shopping, the expressway to downtown, and not too far from the grandparents who loved to babysit. In the couple's mind, it represented a complete victory in house-hunting after countless weekends of searching and those endless newspaper ads which were so filled with promise.

With the easy questions behind them and the uneasy ones about income, credit rating, installment payments and the prospects for continued employment moving along toward that hoped-for approval, our young home buyers were elated when loan officer, George Orwell, made his educated guess that they would probably qualify for a $13,500 home.

Suddenly, the heady atmosphere of that room changed as Loan Officer Orwell informed our friends that instead of Dreamwood Acres, the particular home for them was being *assigned* in Dreary Valley, across town, where FHA's Master List revealed the largest number of subdivision vacancies in the metropolitan area. All homes were being assigned to qualified buyers on the principle of "first come, first served" in the most vacant subdivision. The principle was jokingly referred to around the loan office as "the first get the worst" policy.

Sensing the couple's sagging spirits, Loan Officer Orwell tried to make matters better by pointing out that a *second offering* could be made from the Master List in the "second most vacant subdivision" . . . after our young couple had given him a "yes" or "no" answer on the three-bedroom brick home in Dreary Acres across town. And it seemed to matter even less in the stifling atmosphere of that office when Orwell valiantly tried to rescue things with even a *third offering* in the "third most vacant subdivision" revealed by the Master List published daily by the local FHA Office.

It was a puzzled Loan Officer who watched this bewildered young couple retreat from his office with crushed spirits and a helpless comment that "they guessed they'd just wait a while for something else."

Well, as you have already detected, that deadly little scene is being enacted daily in housing authority offices throughout the land where families search for low-rent housing to meet their needs. And this brings us to the subject of our panel discussion today: "Administering HUD's Tenant Assignment Policy." As my former boss at the Denver Housing Authority, Lee F. Johnson, was fond of saying when the outlook appeared bleak—"this is probably going to be an exercise in futility, but anyway, here goes" . . .

To my knowledge, there has never been a policy in the low-rent public housing program which has so divided the Federal-local partnership envisioned by Congress in the Housing Act of 1937, as the policy contained in that now famous Circular of July 10, 1967, entitled "Revised Requirements for Administration of Low-Rent Housing Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964."

It seems ridiculous always, but sometimes a little humorous, that for reasons unknown to most of us, tenant assignment is a subject which is not open for discussion at the national or regional level of the Department of HUD. To that stock answer, I would reply: "Since when isn't the *survival* of a local housing authority open for discussion?" Because *survival* of this rather frail institutional structure of a local housing authority is now at stake.

Under the circumstances, it's probably some sort of minor miracle that the subject is even on the Southwest NAHRO program today and Earl Bullington, Director, Tenant and Operations Services Division, HAO, HUD, in Fort Worth, and I can even discuss this most sacred of cows in the HUD barnyard—the Method of Administration which we affectionately refer to as "tenant assignment." It goes without saying that there is nothing personal intended if the remarks about this most hated policy get rather heated.

A BRIEF HISTORY

If you will recall, the tenant assignment policy came into being on the first workday following the departure of former Public Housing Commissioner, Mrs. Marie C. McGuire. This was probably not coincidence, and eternal credit is due Mrs. McGuire for protecting this bunch of innocents for I can't guess how many months before July 10, 1967.

In my own case, I read this most enlightening answer to the racial and ethnic problems which haunt our cities while on an airplane headed for Washington. My first reaction was that "the HUDsters must be kidding." The "tone" of the HUD Circular of July 10, 1967 and its attachments struck me as bordering on the ridiculous because of the uncompromising language. Just for fun, I counted no less than thirty-three "shall do's" or "must do's" and the word "may" crept into the circular only three times—obviously naked and afraid in such stern company.

Early attempts to discuss the tenant assignment policy with HUD officials proved fruitless and met with stallout until the policy was safely settled in the Federal Register on October 19, 1967. I'll not try to detail the efforts of the multitude of state housing associations and NAHRO chapters and national officials who tried without success to open up the subject for discussion with the hierarchy of HUD. Such stalwarts as our own Keith Ables, leading the charge for the Texas Housing Association, finally retired from the battlefield with a badly bent lance after jeopardizing the future of the new low-rent program in his community.

And some of you may recall that "yours truly" won the "Chicken of the Year" award at this same gathering last year in Oklahoma City after an ignominious surrender required to preserve San Antonio's new $30 million expansion program and to receive the first installment of a requested $42 million modernization program. On the humorous side, the HUD partners reminded me of the wife in a divorce case who told the judge that "she had tried everything to make her marriage work—she had scolded, screamed, nagged, and threatened her husband." If we are unable to resolve this problem, then I would strongly recommend that the "Chicken of the Year" award be given annually to Southwest NAHRO for the most dramatic surrender. Perhaps our friends in Little Rock, Dallas, Houston, and New Orleans, could be considered for this year's high honor . . .

RELATIONSHIPS

The *unilateral* decision to amend all Annual Contributions Contracts of local housing authorities and the Police State methods of enforcement certainly constitute the blackest page in the history of low-rent public housing since 1937. This entire episode, which is still not finished, has ruptured and disrupted the spirit of friendship and mutual assistance which must prevail in any partnership, more than any other event in history, and left deep scars on all participants. It accrues to the benefit of not a single person inside or outside of HUD or in the entire housing profession. It is a national disgrace.

On the positive side, we can recall with great admiration the contribution of such Federal partners as Joe Burstein and "Turnkey III;" Abe Silverman and Ken Cavanaugh on the R.A.P.E.-T.I.P.S. program; Marie McGuire for the advance of the elderly housing program; Tommy Thompson and Marie McGuire for their encouragement of architectural excellence. Then going back to our beginning, Warren Jay Vinton for devising a financing formula for lha's which is still superior to all other methods.

On last election night, when our national NAHRO organization held its Housing Workshop in Atlanta, many of us felt that the narrow margin of victory could probably be accounted for by multiplying the number of local housing authorities in the country times the number of executive, directors and concerned lha employees, plus the number of lha Commissioners, plus the number of low-income families who might have understood the nature of the deadly game which was being played with them on tenant assignment. Personally, I hoped that the vote heralded an end to the arrogance of Government which we had witnessed over this issue. Apparently that was a rather dreamy wish, or perhaps that has not been time to analyze this complex subject. Or, perhaps like Viet Nam, it's here, and now what do we do about it or with it?

ASSUMPTIONS

In searching for the key to unlock this whole business of tenant assignment, I think that it might be well to look at some of the assumptions on which it was built.

Let me read from Secretary Robert Weaver's letter of November 24, 1967 to Congressman John Dowdy:

"* * * We have prepared a statement of the legal basis for the new tenant assignment provisions, which also covers the underlying reasons for the new policy. A copy of the statement is enclosed. As you will note, the statement also includes an explanation of the choices that may be made available to eligible applicants in deciding where they wish to live, and the choices available to local authorities in adopting a tenant assignment plan. The new provisions were put into effect after it was concluded that the requirements issued in 1965 were not achieving the objectives of the Federal policy in this area."

And attached to the same letter from a "Statement of the Basis for LRHM Section 102.1 Exhibit 2, "Requirements for Administration of Low-Rent Housing Programs Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964" we read:

"It was the experience of this Department under the requirements as stated in the 8–27–65 Circular that in many instances where Local Authorities had adopted freedom-of-choice types of plans, dwelling units in projects or portions thereof occupied exclusively by members of one race remained vacant while applicants of another race were waiting to be admitted to housing. Consequently, not only have losses of revenue occurred, but applicants needing housing have not obtained it or were substantially delayed in obtaining it, with resultant added cost to the Federal Government as well as unfulfillment of the purposes of the United States Housing Act.

"Efficiency and economy in the administration of low-rent housing are basic requirements of the United States Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 1402(1), and the Federal assistance contracts with the Local Authorities expressly require them to operate the projects in such manner as to promote efficiency and economy. (Annual contributions contract, section 201.) The provision in revised Exhibit 2 requiring Local Authorities to offer first the locations containing the largest number of vacancies, has as a basic purpose to insure Local Authority compliance with the aforesaid requirements of the United States Housing Act and with the contract obligations thereunder.

"It was also the experience of the Department under the requirements stated in the Circular of 8–27–65 that in many instances so-called freedom-of-choice types of tenant assignment plans did not afford freedom-of-choice in fact. Under these plans, the entire burden for expressing a choice of project or location was upon the individual applicants, who were to make this choice in many communities in which segregated housing patterns have been traditional. In such situations, for various reasons such as the mores of the community, fear of reprisals, types of neighborhoods, inducement by Local Authority staff—whether by subtle suggestion, manipulation, persuasion, or otherwise—or other factors or combinations, such "freedom of choice" plans, in their operation, did not provide applicants with actual freedom of access to, or full availability of, housing in all projects and locations. The existence of a segregated pattern of occupancy was in itself a major obstacle to true freedom of choice, since few applicants have the courage to make a choice by which they would be the first to change the pattern. Even without inducement of Local Authority staff, the plans tended to perpetuate patterns of racial segregation and consequent separate treatment and other forms of discrimination prohibited in section 1.4(b) of the Department regulations.

"Under the foregoing circumstances, it was determined by the Secretary in his discretion that the Department should, therefore, no longer permit Local Authorities to adopt and operate under unrestricted freedom-of-choice types of plans. Accordingly, the requirements were revised to place some limitations of freedom-of-choice, as set forth in the revised Exhibit 2. These are intended to eliminate the discriminatory results of unrestricted freedom-of-choice plans mentioned above, and, thus, to effect full compliance with section 1.4 of the Department regulations and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964."

Perhaps the fallaciousness of the assumptions underlying the tenant assignment policy were best revealed by the HUD official at the NAHRO Conference in Portland, Oregon, in October, 1967. At that time, he disclosed the HUD conclusions that after giving "freedom of choice plans" two years in which to desegregate the low-rent projects, that policy had failed. I wonder if it ever occurred to him and others at HUD that the freedom of choice plans had not failed nor had the local housing authorities trying hard to implement the freedom of choice policy, but rather, that HUD was witnessing a cultural phenomenon . . . one that we witness daily in our cities. That people are not responding to the way HUD officials think that they should respond. That housing patterns developed over many generations could not possibly change dramatically in HUD's two-year trial period, nor any other agency's trial period.

CONCLUSIONS

In concluding my remarks about tenant assignment, I would only say that we should examine the basic assumptions and purposes of this policy and measure the results of this policy. In San Antonio, for example, it has seriously reduced income at a critical time in our history; it has increased vacant apartments from less than 50 when we implemented the policy to more than 300 apartments now—with no limit in sight; it has hampered the efficiency of our operation and brought serious misunderstandings about between the LHA and its puzzled applicant families and social agencies; it has depleted our supply of applications as families dropped to the bottom of the non-existent "communitywide waiting list;" and that it has not accomplished integration of projects as rapidly as did the "freedom of choice" policy. In short, it has failed miserably on every count.

INCONSISTENCIES

If our Federal partners can be persuaded to look at the tenant assignment policy with us, I think that they will also discover an impressive array of HUD policies which are inconsistent with the goals of tenant assignment. For example, how does the arbitrary assignment of eligible families displaced from an urban renewal area square with the stated goals of that program? How does the roll-of-the-dice tenant assignment plan square with the stated purposes of Model Cities to rebuild the worn-out fabric of the neighborhood for the benefit of the residents within that area? And wouldn't a total waiver of the tenant assignment policy be required to participate in the highly selective home ownership program, Turnkey III, where applicants are selected on the basis of sufficient income and motivation for home ownership and willingness to learn and perform their own maintenance? I predict that it would not be too long until some enterprising young Legal Aid attorney would be challenging the obvious discrimination in the way we apply the tenant assignment policy within the same operation.

And more important than any of the conflicts with HUD's other programs, can anybody tell us what tenant assignment does for the dignity, self-respect, and personal esteem of the individuals caught up in this nightmarish policy? When we administer the heavy-handed tenant assignment policy, aren't we really communicating a message to our applicants that Big Brother Housing Authority knows best where each should live? . . . that they do not have the God-given and acquired intelligence to make up their own minds about the neighborhood in which they want to live and raise a family? Why should local housing authorities be made to insult low-income families who are already burdened with a good many of the inequities and injustices of our society?

Frankly, I think that we can all do better than this. I would like to suggest that we reopen this entire subject with the present HUD administrators. The ego of the former administrators is no longer at stake and alternative courses would now be open. It is not too much to ask that HUD, with its 15,000 employees and $3 billion dollar annual program, assign a small team of competent social scientists to visit a few local housing authorities and gather the facts surrounding this most hated and ineffective tenant assignment policy. Surely the new administrators in HUD will hear our plea. My thanks for your attention.

DDT THREATENS BREATH ITSELF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the July 1969 issue of the SFI Bulletin, the official publication of the Sport Fishing Institute, carries an article entitled "DDT Threatens Breath Itself." So that my colleagues may be aware of the tremendous dangers posed to mankind by the excessive use of DDT and similar pesticides, I include the text of the article at this point in the RECORD:

DDT THREATENS BREATH ITSELF

An alarming report by Dr. Charles F. Wurster; Jr. (Department of Biological Sciences, State University of New York), appearing in SCIENCE (Vol. 159:1474–5) over a year ago (29 March 1968) has been widely overlooked. It should, however, become widely publicized, and the studies and calculations involved should be repeated by others to secure adequate confirmation or modification of Wurster's findings. For, if what he reported therein becomes verified as correct, the full dimension of the implications of accumulating contamination of the global environment by DDT may represent a far greater threat to life on Earth than a nuclear war between the major powers.

Dr. Wurster's paper simply indicates that DDT significantly reduces photosythesis by marine phytoplankton!

The main findings, in short, were that concentrations of DDT [1,1,1-trichloro-2, 2-bis (p-chlorophenyl) ethane] as low as a few parts per *billion* in water reduced photosynthesis in laboratory cultures of four species of coastal and oceanic phytoplankton, representing four major classes of algae, and in a natural phytoplankton community from Woods Hole, Massachusetts. Toxicity to daitoms increased as cell concentration decreased. As he stated in the last sentence of his paper: "Such effects . . . may be ecologically more important than the obvious, direct mortality of larger organisms that is so often reported."

The possibly alarming aspect of this stems from two additional facts, when coupled with Dr. Wurster's findings, that: (1) about 70 per cent of the free atmospheric oxygen we breathe is generated by photosynthesis of algae in the sea, and (2) DDT is sufficiently widespread in the sea that it has been recovered from bodies of penguins that inhabit Antarctica, far removed from any area of pesticide use.

According to advice received by the Sport Fishing Institute from Dr. LaMonte, C. Cole, world renowned ecologist at Cornell University. "The figure of 70 per cent oxygen generated in the sea is based on months of intensive study and analysis which led to the conclusion that average productivity per unit area can be considered equal on land and in the sea. This was far from an arbitrary choice and involved very careful consideration of such divergent estimates as those of Vernadsky and Steeman Nielsen. Three particular factors received special attention.

"1. Seasonal cessation of photosynthesis is less drastic in the sea than on land.

"2. Local nutrient deficiencies are more rapidly repaired by circulation in the sea.

"3. In the rain forest and in the sea, light that escapes the highest producers is still available to forms farther down with different pigments, whereas many terrestrial communities have only a single photosynthesis stratum."

CONNECTICUT PASSPORT CRISIS

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say that conditions require that I speak out again on the passport application problem in Connecticut. This is a mess which has gotten steadily worse over the last few years and, notwithstanding my constant prompting of the State Department, which has not been given the constructive attention it deserves.

I have now been informed by the State Department that the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts is providing two additional clerks to assist the Federal courts in Connecticut in handling passport applications. Unhappily, this positive move by Federal officials is to be offset by the recent decision of the superior court judges of the State of Connecticut to discontinue as of November 1, 1969, the handling of passport applications by the State courts of Connecticut. Thus the Connecticut passport application problem, even with the additional Federal input, will be worse than before once the State court decision goes into effect.

The very perceptive article by Marquis Childs in the Washington Post of July 17, 1969, explains the multiple and expanding social forces which are responsible for the accelerating demand for passports and the diminished capability of our Government to meet that demand. Once again I urge the State Department to exhibit the ingenuity and the efficiency needed to solve Connecticut's passport application problem. The correspondence between the State Department and myself, and the article by Marquis Childs follow:

PASSPORT UNIT SNOWED UNDER BY BOOM IN FOREIGN TRAVEL

(By Marquis Childs)

Now it's a travel explosion. As though not a word had ever been spoken about seeing America first, the perils of the dollar balance and the gold outflow, Americans in unprecedented numbers are rushing off to foreign shores.

The fly-now, pay-later plan is said to account for a large part of the travel boom. The low rate on chartered flights is another reason. Clubs, often improvised for the purpose, sign up for a charter at a cost to members far below that of regular airline fares.

Travel bargains are attracting those who never before ventured out of the United States. An example is a 22-day escorted tour of six countries (if it's Tuesday, this is Belgium) for $495, which includes round-trip fare, meals and hotel. At that rate, the bargain hunter argues, you can hardly afford to stay home.

An unhappy consequence of the travel boom is a virtual breakdown, or at any rate a frustrating slowdown, in the issuance of passports. Long lines of irate citizens at every passport center, and particularly in New York, reflect the clogged passport machinery. The most irate citizen is Director Frances G. Knight of the State Department's Passport's Office. The tart-tongued Miss Knight has run an efficient shop. She was caught in the travel deluge without the essential extra personnel,

XUM

through no fault of hers, according to her staff.

What happened is an example of the penny-wise, dollar-foolish economy policies prevailing in other departments as well as State. Miss Knight has asked State's budget makers for funds for the fiscal year just ended to hire an additional 22 persons on a permanent basis. For the curent fiscal year she asked for another 24. A total of 64 is considered the minimum to handle the ever-rising demand.

Nothing quite like the present travel boom had been anticipated. Total applicants for passports in June were 36 per cent above June a year ago. The daily average is close to 12,000, running 30 per cent above 1968. The staff of the Passport Office is on a 10-to-12-hour-a-day schedule which includes Saturdays. Especially galling to Miss Knight is that the passport operation more than pays its way. The operating budget is $5 million, while the office takes in more than $15 million in fees.

The travel boom is expected to slacken as the rush of summer trippers subsides. The plight of the passport office is evidence of the urgent need for an overhaul of the system. Aside from the passport offices in 10 cities, reliance has been on Federal or state courts. With clogged court calendars there is increasing reluctance to perform this function. Passport applicants complain of delays of two months or more.

The passport tangle is only one comparatively small example of how the narrow frame of Government has been inadequate to encompass the swiftly expanding economy or the rise in the number of educated people bent on foreign travel. Both high school and college students are on the move as never before.

The expansion has been sparked by a credit explosion. Ever-new credit devices have sent the debt total of private individuals soaring to unprecedented levels. How much fly-now, pay-later has contributed, it is too early to say, since this powerful appeal through every advertising medium is fairly recent.

The total of installment credit as of May 31 for autos, home appliances, television sets and the whole range of buy-now-and-pay-by-the-month goods was an almost incredible $91.8 billion. This represented a jump of $9.5 billion in the previous 12 months. An added $2.3 billion was outstanding in credit-card and check-credit plans. These figures do not include real estate and insurance loans.

The outflow of tourist dollars is an important factor in the balance of payments problems. Various cures were considered under the Johnson Administration, including taxes on airline tickets and a limit imposed on the amount the tourist could spend. The travel industry was powerful enough to fend off these remedies and now the Nixon Administration is faced with the same situation enhanced by the travel boom.

An effort has been made with limited success to offset the outflow by persuading foreign visitors to come to America. For the first five months of this year 557,948 foreigners bent on either business or pleasure came to the United States, an increase of 17 per cent over the same period in 1968. It did not include nearly 11 million visits of more than 72 hours by Canadians and a half million Mexican visitors. Measured against the horde of Americans leaving by every available plane and ship, the offset is small.

A far more serious side of the narrow frame of Government is the airport and airways squeeze. At principal airports the overcrowding is intolerable and the air controllers repeatedly testify to the hazards of hundreds of near misses in the corridors where traffic is heaviest. This is without the jumbo jets to come into service in the fall. The White House has proposed a long-range plan calling for quick expansion and the taxes to pay for it. Delay will imperil life and limb as well as a major industry.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., July 17, 1969.

Mr. WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MACOMBER: I have your letter of July 11 in response to my several letters addressed to the Secretary of State and to the Director of the Passport Office concerning the continuing urgency of the passport application problem in Connecticut. I had learned through newspaper accounts that due to the efforts of another Connecticut Congressman the administrative office of U.S. Courts is providing two additional clerks to assist the Federal Courts in Connecticut in handling passport applications. Since I have been working on this problem for several years I should have received this information earlier, but I am grateful to you for including it in your letter.

It is regrettable that you do not have a breakdown, by city, of applications made through State Courts in Connecticut, for the urgency of the problem has now been magnified by the decision of the Superior Court Judges of the State of Connecticut to discontinue as of November 1, 1969 the handling of passport applications by the State Courts of Connecticut.

I have endeavored, apparently without success, to point out to the State Department that Connecticut taxpayers are entitled to proper service in the handling of passport applications. This in truth is a service and not a privilege. I thank you for telling me that the State Department is presently giving consideration to two of my suggestions—1) providing additional temporary assistance to the State and Federal Courts to handle passport applications during the busy seasons and 2) that notaries public be authorized to handle passport applications.

The closing of the passport-handling facilities in the State Court is going to further inconvenience the people of my State and particularly those in my Congressional District. I must seriously recommend to you that you call the Secretary's attention to the urgency of my recommendation that immediate action be taken and that a proper passport facility be established in Waterbury, Connecticut, on a temporary basis, pending the completion of the U.S. District Court facilities currently under construction there.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICE

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, for many long months now, I and others have been working to secure enactment of a bill to establish a Capitol Guide Service.

Both Chairman FRIEDEL and I have introduced the bills, H.R. 6965 and H.R. 894 respectively. Radio Station WMAL here in Washington, in a recent editorial made a most eloquent plea for enactment of this legislation. I commend the editorial and the bill to all Members.

The editorial follows:

CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICE

Caught in a seemingly endless squeeze are the members of the United States Capitol guide force.

The guides who show visitors around the Capitol Building are not, technically, employees of the United States Government. They are free lance workers selected by Congressional leadership, who depend on the 25 cents a head collected from each tourist to pay their salary. The guides work co-operatively with the money being pro-rated among them. They have no pension fund, no sick leave, no benefits of any kind—unlike Congressional employees.

For years the guides have tried to get on the Congressional payroll where they would be adequately taken care of. In turn, they have pointed out, the chinzey demand that every American taxpayer pay 25 cents to be shown around his own Capitol could be done away with. But red tape, which is manufactured somewhere in the bowels of the Capitol by shifts of nameless men and women working around the clock, has successfully blocked this.

Since 1956, 13 years ago, this is what has happened to a few guides who had to quit work because of old age and illness. One died in the poor house at Manassas, Virginia; another, (one of the most colorful guides to ever show tourists around the Capitol) had to be taken care of by a daughter until he died, impoverished. Another is in a nursing home but her social security pension is not enough to continue her there, and because she was not a Capitol employee she has no other income.

The Capitol guides are the only representatives of the United States Congress most people meet in their visits to Washington.

The Capitol guides should be treated for what they are, human beings needing consideration and fair treatment. They have a compelling case, if only those who are responsible would pause long enough to listen!

COMMERCE UNION ACTS IN NATIONAL INTEREST IN MIDST OF INTEREST INCREASES

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. William F. Earthman, president of the Commerce Union Bank in Nashville, announced his firm intention not to increase the prime rate of interest, regardless of outside pressures. This was a courageous and statesmanlike stand to make, and an example that concerned bankers around the country might follow. The July 7 issue of the Nashville Tennessean contained an article by staff reporter Frank Ritter on this gratifying development. I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

COMMERCE UNION PRESIDENT VOWS NO NEW INTEREST HIKE

(By Frank Ritter)

In the midst of speculation that the nation's banks are preparing for another hike in their prime lending rate, Nashville's Commerce Union Bank announced yesterday it will not go along.

William F. Earthman, president of Commerce Union, said he strongly opposes any increase in the record high 8½% rate and that he hopes no increase will occur.

"But in any event," the bank president added, "Commerce Union pldeges to its customers, and to the public, our resolve not to increase our prime rate."

Andrew Benedict Jr., president of First American Bank, said he also is hopeful that the prime rate will not be increased. He declined to say what First American's position will be if other banks across the nation raise their prime rate, but added:

"Politically, this would certainly not be a good time to increase the prime rate, and I don't think it will be increased."

John W. Clay, executive vice president of Third National Bank, said he does not know what position the bank will take if a rate hike occurs. However, he added:

"I would hope we can abstain from any further rate increase. An increase is just not in the interest of the customer, the bank or the country at large. I hope we can maintain our rates at the lowest possible level so customers can take advantage of the funds we do have to loan."

The prime rate—which is the interest that banks charge their biggest and best customers—has been raised several times in recent months. Early last month the rate was raised again, from 7½% to a historic high of 8½%, and the nation's bankers are now considering another hike of 1 to 1½%.

Other bank rates, such as interest rates to small businessmen and farmers are scaled upward from the prime rate.

In response to reports of possible further increases in the prime rate, treasury secretary David M. Kennedy has called a meeting today in Washington of 25 of the nation's biggest banks. Kennedy is expected to caution against any further increase.

Earthman, in his statement yesterday, said:

"Higher rates are a traditional method of curbing loan demands, but in my opinion prime rate increases alone will not slow down the economy. In my judgment, a further increase in the prime rate would not be in the public interest."

Instead, Earthman explained, Commerce Union "will further drastically curtail its lending activities, with particular emphasis on curtailing inflationary loans."

A bank spokesman explained that "inflationary loans" would be defined as those which add nothing to the economy—such as loans for speculation in the stock market, or to individuals for purchase or expansion of a business.

One principal reason why a further increase in the prime rate is being contemplated is because most banks in the nation are short of funds to loan—due in large part to action by the Federal Reserve System.

The Federal Reserve has made it more expensive and difficult for banks to borrow money by increasing its lending rate to the banks.

However, the corporate sector of the economy has continued a strong demand for money and this has caused pressure for the banks—pressure which some bankers are saying will be alleviated by another prime rate hike.

Benedict, while emphasizing that he hopes the prime rate will not be increased again, said yesterday that banks outside New York, Chicago and the West Coast have little to do with setting the prime rate.

If other banks across the nation do increase their prime rate, the risk which Commerce Union would be taking in refusing to go along would be less than the risk some other Nashville banks would be taking in similar circumstances. This is because Commerce Union does not have as many national customers as some other Nashville banks.

Most banks have some national customers, such as Ford Motor Co., General Electric, Genesco and others, to whom the banks have pledged a certain amount of money throughout the year. The customers may ask the banks to lend them this money at any time.

If the nation's major banks hiked their prime rate—which, in most instances, is the rate charged the national customers—most of the smaller banks would be forced to go along.

The reason for this is that if a bank declined to go along its national customers likely would immediately ask for all the money which that bank had committed to the customer for that year. This is only natural, since the national customer could be expected to seek money at the cheapest rate possible.

CHICKEN HOT DOGS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit News of July 8, 1969, carried a column by the distinguished newsman Will Muller headlined, "Less Fat, More Chicken In Your Hot Dog?" Mr. Muller very properly takes exception to the practice of meat processors these days to load hot dogs and other cooked sausage products with excessive amounts of fat. He also very properly takes exception to the proposal to permit up to 15 percent of a frankfurter to be composed of chicken parts without this fact being noted on a label. So that my colleagues may have the benefit of Mr. Muller's comments, I submit the text of his column for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

LESS FAT, MORE CHICKEN IN YOUR HOT DOG?

(By Will Muller)

Out of Washington recently came a glowing account of how Mrs. Virginia H. Knauer, special assistant to President Nixon for consumer affairs, opposed more than 30 percent fat in hot dogs.

The occasion was a U.S. Department of Agriculture hearing on revision of its restriction on what goes into frankfurter.

Mrs. Knauer will win the applause of ladies anxious about the constrictions of the new fall styles and those over-indulgent worried over the prospect of arteriosclerosis. She has done little for the present hot dog eater, who, under some proposals for revising regulations, might clamp down on the sex organs of a chicken just as Al Kaline is rounding third at the Tiger ball park.

As understood here, the average fat content of sausage today is 32 percent. The USDA favors a maximum of 33 percent. The meat industry is for 35 percent.

This numbers game probably is germane to public nourishment. But what the man in the street wants to know is what the fat comes from and what he is eating.

The poultry interests want up to 15 percent of their product admitted to the frankfurter without a warning label.

The department would ban kidneys and sex glands from chickens used in franks. This prohibition is questioned by the poultry industry.

Its argument is made reasonable when viewed with the suggestions advanced for the content of sausage by the meat industry. For instance: From beef, fat, lips, lungs, spleen and tripe. From pork, fat, lips, pate snout, spleen and stomach.

In with the chicken would go its gizzard, heart and skin. Into the hot dog of the future would be dumped assorted pork and mutton parts, goat lungs and spleen, all glued together with spice, milk powder, cereal, soy protein concentrate and water.

The proposal to admit the chicken into the casing of a hot dog is only the distraction for the public's eye while the magicians are dumping in various scraps. These would include defatted pork, the residue of lard making.

In this land which enjoys the highest standard of living of any in the world, the frankfurter is the favored food of its children. On many tables it is served as an economy staple.

Suppose every hot dog sold in the city carried with it a description of its contents, a procedure advocated by leading statesmen for cigarets. The USDA hearings are a part of the country's groping toward "wholesome meat laws." Whatever emerges should be forced to conform to recent legislation requiring honest packaging.

How does the frankfurter addict get and keep his delicacy down? Proposed seasonings deal with that problem this way:

"A condimental amount of salt, natural spices, oleoresins and-or other spice extractives; mustard in an amount not exceeding one percent of all the ingredients, not including water, in the sausage; and-or corn syrup solids, corn syrup; glucose syrup, dextrose, sucrose; natural smoke flavoring and-or artificial smoke flavoring."

With a chaser like that a man could eat a saddle. Or swallow the myth that something good for the consumer is going to come out of all those proposals for revising the hot dog.

What the outcome of those wiener hearings will be is unknown. But this department will eat its next frankfurter when Mrs. Knauer and Mr. Nixon are seen sharing one at Kennedy Stadium.

VATICAN WARNED UNITED STATES ON RED DANGER LONG AGO

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the New World, the official newspaper of the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago, has from time to time carried articles reviewing the publications of old Vatican memos.

Of special interest in view of the continuing problems inherent in any dealings with the Communists is the recent review of papal documents which show that the Vatican had warned U.S. officials of dangers of communism sometime before the Red threat became evident to our statesmen.

This article, which appeared in the July 4 edition of the New World, follows:

OLD VATICAN MEMOS PUBLISHED: HOLY SEE WARNED THE UNITED STATES ON RED DANGER LONG AGO

VATICAN CITY.—In its newly published fifth volume of a series giving hitherto secret documents of papal diplomatic and humanitarian activities during World War II, the Holy See has detailed an attempt by the late Domenico Cardinal Tardini to warn the United States that Europe under communist domination would be no better off than under nazi domination.

This is found in a memo of Cardinal Tardini to President Franklin D. Roosevelt's personal representative at the Holy See, Myron C. Taylor.

The memo is one of 500 and more documents published in the new book, which has a historical introduction of 63 pages, plus almost 600 pages of documents.

The new volume is part of a series begun by the Holy See in 1965, apparently in reply to attacks on Pope Pius XII's motives launched by German playwright Rolf Hochhuth in his play "The Deputy."

This volume—and most of its predecessors—was edited by an international team of Jesuit historians: the Revs. Pierre Blet of France, Robert A. Graham of the United States, Angelo Martini of Italy and Burkhart Schneider of Germany.

Cardinal Tardini, who then held the post of secretary of the Congregation for Extraor-

XUM

dinary Ecclesiastical Affairs and the rank of monsignor, cautioned Taylor against a naive view of communist Russia during the presidential representative's first visit to the Vatican, in 1941.

Monsignor Tardini's memoranda—written in a style that matched his frank and incisive personality—are a biting critique of Roosevelt thinking about the alliance with the Soviet Union and the religious problem in that country.

In a memo to Taylor, the prelate wrote: "At present, Europe is faced with two great dangers: nazism and communism. Both are opposed to religion, to Christian civilization, to personal liberty, to peace. At the present moment nazism is better organized and boasts greater strength."

"If the war now in progress were to mean the end of both dangers, a period of tranquility would be possible for Europe," he continued. "If even one of these evils—communism, for example—were to remain an active force, Europe would, within a few years, be in a situation identical with that in which it finds itself today."

Communism, "notwithstanding its pacifist claims, pursues a program which is eminently militaristic," Monsignor Tardini asserted.

Myron Taylor was very pleased, and for good reasons, with the results of his two trips. The Pope and the President shared the same general ideas. When Taylor sought the Pope's sympathy for the newly declared Atlantic Charter, this was easily done. It was simple to demonstrate that the Pope had expressed comparable ideas in his own Five Point peace program and in his encyclical of October, 1939.

The Pope, moreover, acceded to Roosevelt's request to remove a political difficulty that was troubling the Administration—the opposition of Catholic isolationists to Lend-Lease for the Soviet Union. If the Pope had been as fanatically anti-communist as he is made out to be sometimes, he could have folded his hands and expressed his surprise that the President of the United States should ask him, the Pope of Rome, to interfere in pending domestic legislation or to intrude upon the right of American citizens to express their political opinions freely.

As it was, in order to convenience the President, the Pope had Archbishop McNicholas of Cincinnati make the decisive statement that met all Roosevelt's desires and expectations.

The Pope's perhaps surprising permissiveness on U.S. aid to embattled Russia is consistent with his refusal, at the same time, to say a word in favor of the Axis "crusade" against Russia.

Just before Taylor arrived, the Italian ambassador had complained about the Pope's "mutism" on the Russian war. He suggested that at least some Italian cardinal be prompted to say what the Pope couldn't or wouldn't say. The Pope decided that he could not ask an Italian cardinal to make any such statement unless he at the same time mentioned the religious persecution in Germany.

Of course, the Pope himself never made any statements that could be taken as referring approvingly to the war on Russia. The new documents confirm that neither did he support the war in secret conversations—rather the contrary, as his concession to Roosevelt shows.

The memoranda of Monsignor Tardini demonstrate, however, that the Vatican was greatly concerned about the course of Roosevelt policy. Monsignor Tardini's judgment of the President of the United States was not complimentary.

Commenting on the President's optimistic letter on the future of religious freedom in Russia, dated Sept. 3, 1941, he wrote that the phrases are "too vague and studied all too closely." In his judgment, "It is extremely distressing to see how Roosevelt foresees with such imperturability the continuance of bolshevism. That would signify for Europe and the world's future certainly nothing better and even probably worse."

Monsignor Tardini did not accept the distinction Roosevelt made between communism and nazism. "From the ideological aspect," he wrote, "both communism and nazism are equally false and pernicious. Both are materialist, both anti-religious, both destructive of the most elementary rights of the human person, both implacable enemies of the Holy See."

The President's letter, he said, was no compliment to his acumen. He spoke with equal bluntness and logical preciseness to the Axis diplomats.

Rejecting the demand for an open Vatican condemnation of communism, he said that the condemnation of years past still stood. A new statement, he said, would have a political meaning and not a religious character. Besides, said Monsignor Tardini to an Axis diplomat, it was Hitler who made the pact with Stalin, claiming it was a guarantee for peace in the East. Thus it was Hitler who should explain himself.

Monsignor Tardini said that communism is the worst enemy of the Church and he would be glad to see it destroyed, but it was not the only enemy. "The swastika," he told Ambassador Attolico of Italy, "is not exactly the cross of the crusader."

Supreme skepticism about the peaceful intentions of the Soviet leaders dominated Tardini's memoranda and his conversations with Taylor. On Sept. 16, 1942, he asked whether President Roosevelt had thought of the day after the war when Europe was prostrate and communism would be the only force, invading every country.

The United States would find itself in the exact same situation in which it finds itself with regard to Nazi Germany, he told Taylor. Had the President thought of that? Taylor was surprised and when he returned to Washington he carried Monsignor Tardini's memo on this subject for presentation to the President.

The poor estimate that Monsignor Tardini had of President Roosevelt's program had not improved by the time of the second Taylor trip to Rome, a year later, again in September. He noted that the United States had always had a blind spot on the religious problem in Russia.

"It should not be surprising at this time," he wrote in recording his views for the Pope's attention, "that Roosevelt not only minimizes the communist danger but asserts that communism has evolved and that it would be good for the Holy See to make a kind of modus vivendi with Russia."

"This memorandum on Russia," he wrote, referring to a document brought by Taylor, "demonstrates the error and illusion of the Americans who believe it possible that the communist government, once victorious in the war, would enter into the family of nations like a meek lamb. The truth is quite the opposite. If Stalin wins the war, he will be the lion who devours all Europe."

"I said to Taylor that neither Hitler nor Stalin can remain quiet and still in a family of European nations. I am surprised that such evident things are not realized by leaders and high-level political personalities."

"Stalin," wrote Tardini again, "is no peace leader forced into war. He is himself a warmonger, who was beaten to the punch by a criminal more daring than he."

It is small wonder that Monsignor Tardini's own draft reply to the President's letter was rejected by the Pope and a milder one sent in its stead.

The Pope did not entirely share the Tardini point of view, but the Monsignor's doubts about American leadership during and after the war were no doubt very much in his mind.

"The United States," warned Monsignor Tardini, "intend to reorganize Europe as they see fit. And since they know little or nothing of the European situation their wishes can bring enormous harm to Europe."

Monsignor Tardini lived long enough to see the reversal of American policy in Europe, rearmament and the beginning of NATO in response to the Soviet challenge. Few men in a similar position are better entitled to say, "I told you so."

Other major events covered in the new volume—entitled "The Holy See and the World War, July 1940–October 1942"—are the creation of diplomatic relations with Japan and China, and the British demand for the recall of all Italian missionaries from the Middle East, including Vatican representatives of Italian origin.

Also covered are the efforts of Pope Pius XII to secure guarantees against the bombardment of Rome and the reports of the future Pope John XXIII, Angelo Roncalli, from his post in Turkey.

It was in this period that religious persecution in the German-controlled areas, notably in Poland, was reaching its height. Despite this, the German government demanded the rights to be consulted by Rome on the appointment of Church leaders in the Reich sphere of influence. This was turned down by Pius XII.

In his second visit (September, 1942), Taylor stressed the vast military preparations of the United States and the determination of the American people to pursue the war to ultimate and complete victory, no matter how long this would take.

In particular, Taylor was instructed to warn the Pope against any moves that might be suggested to him by the Axis in view of a negotiated peace, which could only be illusory.

Pope Pius XII replied that he had never been a partisan of peace at any price but only of a peace based on justice and morality.

Dispatches from the Apostolic Delegates in Washington (Archbishop Amleto Cicognani) and London (Archbishop William Godfrey) described the political and religious situation in their respective countries under war conditions.

In 1941, for instance, Archbishop Cicogani gave ample details of the open controversy between Bishop Joseph Hurley of St. Augustine and Archbishop Francis I. Beckman of Dubuque, the former urging support of the Roosevelt policy of intervention and the later siding with the isolationist opposition.

Writing to the Pope on Sept. 4, 1941, Archbishop Francis Spellman of New York said that the prevailing sentiment of the country at that time was against intervention. He himself, however, had a different view, "I feel that eventually America will finally be an actual participant."

Tempers were short at this time in both the Vatican and London over the question of Italian missionaries in Egypt and Palestine. On instructions from his government, the British minister, Sir D'Arcy Osborne, demanded that the Pope recall not only these priests but also the Apostolic Delegate in Alexandria, Archbishop (later cardinal, recently deceased) Gustavo Testa. He was accused of being responsible for pro-Italian sentiment among the local clergy.

The Vatican's reply was to ask for proof of the charges and to stress that the missionaries and above all, Vatican representatives, have standing instructions to remain out of politics.

Vatican aides pointed out to the British minister that short of proof that these instructions had been disobeyed, they could not in fairness recall the missionaries. Besides, the precedent was dangerous for the Church insofar as it could be used equally well by the Italians and the Japanese against missionaries of enemy countries.

The Vatican denied that in pointing out the bad propaganda this would make for the British cause any attempt was being made—

as the diplomat charged—at "extortion." If the British wished to expel the missionaries on their own authority, they would have to reckon with the consequences. In the end Archbishop Testa was recalled to Italy on leave of absence. Soon after, the threat to the Suez Canal—which had enhanced the British security consciousness in the area—was removed by the defeat of Rommel at El Alamein.

A similar crossing of swords took place in the spring of 1942 when both the United States and Great Britain objected strongly to the assumption of Vatican diplomatic relations with Japan. This crisis, however, was softened when the Republic of China also asked and was granted diplomatic relations with the Vatican. President Roosevelt, according to the documents, finally dismissed the matter as of no importance.

Other matters covered in the 800-page fifth volume of the new Vatican publication include the dispute over the reception of Anton Pavelic, head of the puppet Croatian regime. He was received in the Vatican only as a private citizen. To protests from the Royal Yugoslav embassy, the Vatican denied that this constituted recognition of the Ustasha regime.

In the fall of 1942, several Allied diplomats in the Vatican also asked the Pope for an open condemnation of the nazis. The reply was to state that the Pope had already condemned crimes by whatever side committed but that the Holy See could not descend into particulars without entering into political matters and requiring documentation and proof.

In Latin America, where the United States in the spring of 1942 was trying to mobilize the hemisphere against the Axis, the Holy See was accused of using its influence to block this policy. The documents and correspondence on this controversy show, on the contrary, that no attempt had been made by the Vatican to influence the conference of Rio de Janeiro, called for the purpose of speeding diplomatic rupture with the Axis.

GARDENA VALLEY NEWS CELEBRATES 65TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to one of California's outstanding newspapers, the Gardena Valley News, as it begins to celebrate its 65th year of distinguished service to the people of Gardena Valley.

Under the able leadership of William J. Hunt, publisher, and George P. Algie, copublisher, and Mrs. Dolly Warfield, managing editor, the 60-member staff of the Gardena Valley News has increased the circulation, prestige, and community influence of local newspapers in southern California.

Recognition of their achievements these past few years is well acknowledged. The Gardena Valley News received the California Newspaper Publishers Association Award for the best front page in 1968, Outstanding Community Service in 1967, best spot news picture in 1965, and best front page in 1963.

The Gardena Valley News was the recipient in 1969 of the George Washington Honor Medal from the Freedom's Foundation at Valley Forge for the 1968 editorial entitled "Home Ownership, the American Way."

I am proud to commend before my colleagues in the Congress of the United States, the publisher and copublisher and the staff of the Gardena Valley News for their significant contributions to the people of their community, and to extend my congratulations upon the occasion of the paper's 65th year of publication.

STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 11870

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong opposition to H.R. 11870, which would allow increases in the weight and width of trucks and buses traveling on our Interstate Highway System.

In New York City, vehicular traffic has become a source of increasing annoyance and danger for many residents—especially those living near highways. And I am sure residents of other cities share the same problem.

In my own district in the Bronx, for example, a fine apartment complex known as Co-op City is under construction near a highway. Some families are already occupying the units which have been completed and they have found that the nearby highway has become a disturbing part of their lives.

Vehicles speed by at all hours of the day and night, often interrupting sleep as they generate noise and fumes. In addition, parents are constantly worried about children who might wander too far from home and too close to the highway.

It is largely middle-income families who occupy apartment complexes such as Co-Op City. They are decent, hardworking Americans who are often committed to ownership of the apartment units or long-term leases. They cannot readily afford to dispose of their commitments and move elsewhere.

It is this aspect of it all—the human ingredient—that is a matter of deep concern. Are we to give people or trucks and buses priority? That is the question that we must ask ourselves when we consider this bill. I, for one, will not deviate from the proposition that the welfare, comfort, and security of our people must come above anything else.

We who are privileged to serve in Congress must seize upon opportunities that enable us to make life a little more bearable for the people that we represent. That is truly the greatest reward of public service. When we move away from that purpose, we serve only to tarnish the mantle of public service.

Last year, vehicular accidents became the fourth leading cause of death in the country. Some 53,000 deaths and 1.9 million disabling injuries resulted from 13.7 million accidents. In addition, the economic loss totaled $10.7 billion. Those are the hard, staggering statistics, but they alone do not tell the whole story.

When we pause to relate those statistics to all the elements of American life, a graphically tragic picture emerges. The grief from the loss of life, the pain from injuries—the anguish, the suffering, the worry and the financial loss. These are basically the things that I am talking about—the elements that represent the human side of this issue.

Remember, too, there is no way of really measuring how many more lives have been thrown into turmoil because of other problems on the highways—the problems of noise, fumes, and general hazards that directly affect so many Americans who live near highways in the co-op cities of America.

Surely our highway problems will become more acute if we permit an increase in the weight and width of trucks and buses. The added weight is bound to make it more difficult to stop within a safe and reasonable distance. The inevitable result would be more accidents, more deaths, more injuries, more property damage, more noise and more fumes.

These problems become no less serious when we consider increasing the width of trucks and buses. Just imagine how they would obstruct the view of passing motorists? I shudder to think of the consequences.

I know of no sound reason for the passage of this bill. In fact, I would be totally bewildered if it was enacted into law because there are so many valid reasons that warrant its rejection.

The conclusion that this would be a worthless, costly, damaging and cruel piece of legislation is inescapable.

JAYCEES REQUEST UNITY BEHIND PRESIDENT'S EFFORT TO EFFECT A LASTING AND POSITIVE WORLD PEACE

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the North Miami Junior Chamber of Commerce recently passed a proclamation in support of President Richard M. Nixon's peace proclamation.

I wish to take this opportunity of commending this outstanding group of Jaycees in their timeliness and interest in bringing this proclamation and its contents to my attention. It is heartwarming to see that there are many individuals in our country who still are aware of the fact that we, as a nation, favor world peace; but that we, as a nation, should not, however, compromise our honor and capitulate or accept peace at any price.

Certainly the statements made in the proclamation by the North Miami Junior Chamber of Commerce should give encouragement to our representatives who are presently negotiating on behalf of the United States for a fair and lasting peace on terms fair to all instead of one brought about solely to appease in an effort to extricate our country from the web of this war which in the long run may well bring disastrous results not only to our country and our own security, but to the security of other peace-loving nations of the world as well.

I am proud, therefore, to call this proclamation to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress. The proclamation reads as follows:

A Proclamation in Support of President Richard M. Nixon's Peace Proposal

Whereas, the North Miami Jaycees stand in full support of the efforts of President Richard M. Nixon in his quest for an honorable and positive peace in the country of South Vietnam, and,

Whereas, we support the more than one-half million Americans in South Vietnam and proudly salute and pay tribute to those 35,000 men who have gallantly and unselfishly sacrificed their lives in this quest for peace, and

Whereas, we seek nothing for America, but rather a climate for a self-determination of the peoples of South Vietnam, and,

Whereas, we believe that now is the time to indicate to the other side that they should not plan on the resolve of the United States to crumble from within,

Be it therefore resolved that we, the North Miami Jaycees seek the individual support of every organization, every American to provide a positive unity between the President of the United States of America in his efforts to effect a lasting and positive world peace.

BLACKS URGED TO CHANNEL RAGE INTO POSITIVE POLITICAL STRATEGY

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, some men distinguish themselves by their ability to reach to the heart of an issue, to dissect it into palatable bits, and by so doing—to communicate understanding. Bayard Rustin has so distinguished himself. We know it is his overwhelming urge to communicate understanding which enables him to forcefully clarify the confusions which stifle many efforts.

Until white and black can approach America's problems together, we are severely inhibited in our ability to overcome them. Mr. Rustin has made very clear the basis and the need for the cooperation we seek. I commend to the attention of my colleagues this article from the AFL–CIO News, June 28, 1969:

To Escape Cycle of Violence: Blacks Urged to Channel Rage Into Positive Political Strategy

(By Bayard Rustin)

(Note.—The author of the following article, Bayard Rustin, is executive director of the A. Philip Randolph Institute and a prominent civil rights leader.)

We have reached a point in the political development of America that can legitimately be called an emergency. Our country is in trouble, very severe trouble, and those who are most profoundly threatened by this unhappy situation are black Americans.

Within recent weeks we have seen a conservative appointed a Chief Justice of the United States. We have seen two integrationist candidates for the school board of Denver, Colo., go down to a resounding defeat. We have seen an obscure police chief from Minneapolis run away with the mayoralty election on a platform of nothing more than "law and order." In Los Angeles we have witnessed the defeat of a talented and idealistic Negro candidate for mayor and the victory of an incompetent and unprincipled demagogue. And now in New York City we have seen both the Republican and the Democratic Parties nominate right-wing candidates for mayor.

As these developments have come in the wake of a Republican presidential victory and the racist Wallace movement—the size of which was unprecedented—we can understand the gravity of the present situation, and we must recognize the necessity to change the course of our common political destiny.

There are many reason for this reaction that is victimizing all people concerned with social justice, but the fundamental reason lies in the dynamic of fear.

There exists today a dangerous relationship between the extreme Left and the extreme Right, and between black rage and white fear. The confrontationist tactics of the one evoke a reactionary response from the other. When the pseudo-revolutionaries of the New Left manhandle professors, occupy buildings, and destroy property, the Right wins new adherents. When sincere but misdirected young black people engage in violence in the name of justice, they are strengthening those very forces which in the past have inflicted violence and injustice upon the Negro Community. Such acts of protest may be cathartic, they may appear to be bold and militant, but let us be very clear—their primary effect is politically reactionary.

These acts have set loose a wave of panic in this country. And there are opportunistic rightwing demagogues who understand the nature of that panic and are building their political futures upon it. These demagogues don't believe in meeting the urgent needs of the black community for income and education. Indeed, social justice would threaten the very base of fear upon which they stand, for it would remove the cause of social unrest. Their program is the billy club and their staunchest ally the police arm of the state. They believe in repression.

The lessons of the past month should be clear. An assault upon our democratic institutions will not reform those institutions but destroy them. Violence will lead to more violence, not to social justice. And the fundamental tragedy is that the absence of justice will provoke more people to engage in violent acts. We must find a way out of this vicious cycle.

The needs of the black community for adequate jobs, housing, and education can be met only by developing a political strategy that will attract a majority of Americans to a program for social change.

There are whites who are unemployed and white workers whose real income is steadily decreasing as the cost of living rises. Both these groups share with blacks the desire for increased and upgraded employment opportunities. Let us build a movement with them. There are whites living in substandard housing and paying exorbitant rents. Their children attend schools that are over-crowded and under-staffed. They share with blacks the desire for massively funded programs in housing and education. Let us build a movement with them, too. And there are those more affluent whites of liberal persuasion who sincerely desire social justice. They too should be our allies.

These are positive points around which a political majority can be built. Such a strategy is the only means by which black people will achieve social and economic equality within the context of contemporary American society.

This strategy demands the repudiation of racial separatism which can only isolate Negroes. It also demands the rejection of extremism and violence which increase fear and heighten animosities between groups that might otherwise be united.

Black people are enraged because there are social injustices which provoke rage. But if that rage is not expressed politically, if it is not devoted towards achieving constructive goals, then it will be self-defeating and ultimately self-destructive. Let us be enraged about injustice, but let us not be destroyed by it. Let us act now with forcefulness but restraint, with militancy but wisdom, in the hope of liberating ourselves from rage and injustice, and our white brothers from the fear which now enslaves them.

A WHOLE NEW LIFE

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that "when you give a man a book, you do not just give him 12 ounces of paper, ink, and glue, you give him a whole new life."

Unfortunately, with a budget proposal currently before Congress to cut aid to education by 25 percent and to slash library funds 66 percent, there is the strong possibility that many of our children will never experience the tremendous satisfaction of "a whole new life."

In the past, Congress has shown itself to be a champion of education, placing it among the top priorities of national concern. It, therefore, is even more discouraging and objectionable to see the increasing disregard for the importance of adequately financed educational and library organizations. The immediate case in point is the current proposal for a $500 million reduction in Office of Education programs and a $90 million reduction in library programs, both of which I strongly feel the Nation can ill afford.

Within recent years, learning has become a much more exciting experience for our young people. A wealth of books and equipment designed to spark curiosity and intellectual excellence, plus teachers and librarians dedicated to imparting a love of knowledge in youth, has enabled us to improve the lives of a major portion of America. Yet, we now stand on the brink of losing this momentum, should we vote a cutback in essential funds.

It is not however only those who have tasted the fruits of learning who will be deprived if funds are removed from these programs. The effect will be felt throughout the Nation. For there are still more than 40,000 schools in need of their own libraries. Moreover, there are urban poor and those who live in rural wilderness who have come to rely on the so-called missionary libraries which are virtually an oasis for many.

We puzzle over the younger generation and lament that their behavior will precipitate the Nation's destruction. But, Mr. Speaker, we are the ones who will be accessories to the fact, should we close our eyes to the needs of education and library systems.

XUM

It is undeniable that reductions in Government spending are necessary if we are to set our fiscal house in order. Nevertheless, these cutbacks should occur in those areas which time and again have demonstrated fiscal irresponsibility. Pork barrel legislation, farm subsidies, outmoded and excessive defense projects are just a few considerations in which we could and virtually must economize; not education.

How can we consider such substantial cutbacks in education and libraries when we have pledged our efforts to cure the vast and appalling domestic problems which plague us. Our ghetto problems are based on the roots of prejudice, ignorance, insensitivity, and lack of awareness that has been festering in America for some time. It is through books and education that we can provide our citizens with a better life and pave the way for man's increased understanding of man. For it is through books and education that we can free men from the shackles of ignorance and the iron bonds of prejudice.

I strongly feel that it is time for us to economize in the areas of wanton spending, mismanaged funds, and misused appropriations. But Mr. Speaker, let us not jeopardize our entire educational system for the lack of foresight, responsibility, and a sense of realistic priorities.

A REVIEW OF THE SILVER SITUATION

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, in a recent address before the Commodity Club of San Francisco, Mr. H. F. Magnuson, vice president of the Golconda Mining Corp., Wallace, Idaho, emphasized the need for the Federal Government to adopt policies that will provide for an orderly transition to a free market in silver. Mr. Magnuson points out that the amount of silver in coins held by the Treasury and Federal Reserve Banks is nearing exhaustion, after which time the Treasury will no longer be able to supply the needs of industrial silver consumers.

Mr. Magnuson urges the U.S. Government, as the critical supplier of silver to industry, to make plans immediately to provide for an orderly transition to a free silver market to avoid a violent dislocation in the silver market. Encouraging exploration for and development of new silver ore bodies will help to accomplish an orderly transition. Mr. Magnuson suggests that this can be done by having silver producers and users join with the Government in formulating a new policy pertaining to silver.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I include the full text of Mr. Magnuson's important message in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

A REVIEW OF THE SILVER SITUATION

A year ago I told the members of the Commodity Club of San Francisco that the price of silver would rise once the Treasury was no longer a dominant factor in the silver market.

The latest figures available from the Treasury Department indicate that by mid-July, 1970 the Treasury will have exhausted its supply of silver, if it continues to sell coinage silver at the rate of 2 million ounces a week.

Consequently, it is vital that the administration immediately formulate plans for phasing out the weekly silver sales so that an orderly transition can be made to a free market. Only if the transition is orderly, will a violent dislocation in the price of silver be avoided.

I will go into detail on this in a few minutes.

Since I last spoke to you, the price of silver rose to $2.565 an ounce in mid-June last year, then began retreating and now it is quoted at around $1.75 an ounce, 30 per cent below its 1968 high.

The weakness in the price of silver during the past ten months has not been due to any fundamental change in the silver situation, but rather to factors extraneous to the fundamental supply-demand picture that will, in the final analysis, determine the price of silver.

These factors include the liquidation of silver inventories and the smuggling of hoarded silver from India during the period when the price was above $2 an ounce. It also includes the continued presence of the U.S. Treasury in the silver market, through its sale of 2 million ounces of the metal each week

Last year about 64 million ounces of silver, an amount equal to 18 per cent of the total amount of silver used by the Free World for industrial purposes, was smuggled out of the Far East and exchanged for gold.

Now that the price of gold has risen to better than $43 an ounce, this smuggling no longer is profitable, because the people of the Far East are not willing to trade their silver for paper money and the price of silver is too low in relation to the price of gold to make such smuggling activities attractive.

We must also keep in mind, in reviewing the 1968 silver situation, that the U.S. Treasury supplied the world markets with 179 million ounces of silver—105 million ounces through the GSA weekly auction and 74 million ounces through the redemption of silver certificates prior to June 24th, 1968.

But these factors are extraneous to the fundamental silver supply-demand picture, and in order to keep the silver situation in perspective during this period of transition to an entirely free supply-demand market, it is necessary to review some relevant facts.

In the first nine years of this decade industrial consumers of silver in the Free World have used 719 million ounces more of the white metal than has been mined.

In the same nine-year period, the U.S. Treasury has supplied the world market with 859 million ounces of silver.

It must be kept in mind that I am counting only the silver used for industrial purposes during this nine-year period, and not silver that went into coinage.

The deficit between Free World production of silver, and Free World industrial consumption of silver, has risen six fold in the period between 1960 and 1969, from 16.8 million ounces in 1960 to 109.1 million ounces in 1968.

There is no reason to believe that there will be any material change in the immediate future in the gap between silver production and consumption of silver by industry. The problem we face is that of increasing production to meet increasing demands, and this problem, as I will explain later, is one that should concern the administration in Washington.

I cannot emphasize this point too strongly, for it is basic to the entire silver situation now, and in the years to come.

It means:

That once the Treasury no longer is able to supply the needs of industrial silver consumers, the price of silver will rise.

That the U.S. government, as the critical supplier of silver to industry in this transition period, must make plans immediately to provide for an orderly transition to a free silver market in order to avoid a violent dislocation in the market, and that it should make every effort to stimulate increased production of silver.

Let's take up these two points in order.

First, the ability of the Treasury to supply silver to Free world industry. And keep in mind that I said Free World industry, not domestic industry. I will return to this point later in my discussion.

The ability of the Treasury to continue to supply silver to the Free World depends almost entirely on the amount of silver it will recover from silver coins.

As of March 28, 1969, the Treasury's adjusted inventory of silver in coins amounts to 108.2 million ounces. This is enough silver to enable the Treasury to continue its sale of 2 million ounces a week for 54 weeks, or until mid-April, 1970. To this, must be added the 22.6 million ounces of coinage silver the Treasury had on hand at the end of March. This would prolong the sales until early in July, 1970.

However, it is significant that the Treasury has in the past over-estimated the amount of silver it would recover from coins, and has, since last November, revised downward its estimated inventory by a total of 40 million ounces.

Mr. Thomas W. Wolfe, director of the Office of Domestic Gold and Silver Operations, Department of the Treasury, in making his estimate of changes in combined silver inventory on April 18, made this comment, which, I believe, deserves emphasis.

"The actual yield of silver from the separation of mixed dimes and quarters since January, 1969, is proving lower than previous samplings indicated. Accordingly, a ten million ounce downward adjustment has been made in the total estimated silver remaining in mixed coin inventories at the Mints and Federal Reserve Banks."

Previously the Bureau of the Mint had reduced its silver coin inventory by 30.2 million ounces with the explanation that silver dimes and quarters containing this amount of silver had to be recirculated last November and December, because of the shortage of clad coins during the Christmas shopping season.

Between July 1, 1968, and March 28, 1969, a period of nine months, the Treasury estimate of its inventory of silver in coins has decreased by 130.6 million ounces, from 238.8 million ounces to 108.2 million ounces. Should this rate of decline continue (14.5 million ounces a month) the supply of silver coins—not necessarily the silver bullion derived from such coins—will be exhausted by mid-November.

Now this situation is in distinct contrast to the statement made by Assistant Secretary of Treasury Robert Wallace on May 4, 1968, when he declared "it still seems to be a pretty safe guess that we ought to be able to continue our GSA sales another three years at least, and depending on our silver coin recoveries, perhaps considerably longer."

In reference to this last remark of Mr. Wallace, concerning future recoveries of silver coins, it is significant that while the Treasury's estimate of its silver in coins has declined 55 per cent in the nine-month period ending last March 28, the amount of fractional coins held by the Treasury and Federal Reserve Banks, which includes the silver coin inventory, has declined only 36 per cent.

XUM

This is, of course, further confirmation of the remark by Mr. Wolfe that actual yield of silver from coins is lower than had been expected.

Now, as to my second point—that the Federal Government should direct its efforts to bring about an orderly transition from a silver market that it dominates to a free market governed only by supply and demand.

Once the government withdraws as a supplier of silver, where it has provided an average of more than 95 million ounces of silver a year to the Free World in the past nine years, and an average of 172.4 million ounces in the past three years, there is certain to be a violent dislocation in the market price.

This is not healthy for either the mining industry, the silver users or the public. We only have to look to the situation in copper, where excessive price increases have resulted in substitution of other metals for copper. The uses of silver, fortunately, do not lend themselves readily to substitution, but an excessive price could result in a fall-off of marginal uses for silver, including that in jewelry.

I believe that silver producers and users alike should address themselves to this problem, and that the Federal Government should take the lead in bringing them together by forming a new silver commission, to replace the old Commission on the Coinage, so that this transition can be planned.

The transition is only a little more than a year away, at most.

After the Treasury is no longer able to supply silver to industrial users, there will be of necessity a greater need for increased production of silver.

But production of silver cannot be increased overnight, or in one season as is the case in raising wheat or corn. New deposits must first be found, then explored and developed, and finally brought into production. It requires six or seven years, at the best, to bring a new mine into production after the ore body has been discovered.

This fact, which we in the mining industry call "lead time", makes it imperative that exploration and development of new silver ore bodies be stimulated, and such stimulation can be provided only by an adequate price for the metal.

Such stimulation is lacking when the price of silver falls while the price structure generally, and the cost of money, spirals upward.

The Secretary of the Treasury in the new administration, Mr. David Kennedy, has been making a review of the silver situation and Treasury silver policy. It is my understanding that he has been obtaining views of all interested parties, including producers, users and Treasury and Mint officials.

The fact that the Commission on the Coinage is scheduled to meet with him next Monday may be significant, in light of this review.

Changes in silver policy in the past, you will recall, have been made at meetings of the Coinage Commission. In view of reports prevailing during the past several weeks that Treasury sales of silver may be curtailed, the meeting next Monday is being awaited with great expectation by those interested in silver.

A few minutes ago I referred to the fact that the Treasury supplies silver to Free World industry, and asked you to keep that remark in mind.

I would like to explain it now.

In the past three years, this nation has been a net exporter of more than 92 million ounces of silver. This is just 19 million ounces short of the United States silver production in those three years. In that three-year period, mines in the United States produced 111 million ounces of silver, while American industry used 440 million ounces, leaving a 329 million ounce deficit. In the same three-year period, the U.S. Treasury made available 517 million ounces of silver. This has closed the gap between U.S. production and consumption, and has made silver available for export.

Although the Treasury sells coinage silver only to domestic industrial consumers, this nation has continued in the first two months of this year to be a net exporter of silver, to the extent of 5.2 million ounces or at an annual rate of 31 million ounces a year.

In February, our net export of silver amounted to 4.6 million ounces. We exported 9.3 million ounces and imported 4.7 million ounces.

Our exports in that month consisted of 5.2 million ounces in refined bullion and 4.1 million ounces in ore and base bullion.

Let's examine our export of silver in ore and base bullion in more detail.

Previous to 1967, our export of silver in ore and base bullion had been negligible. For example: in the three years 1964–1966, our total export of silver in ore and base bullion amounted to only 1,555,000 ounces, or less than half our export of silver in ore and base bullion in February this year.

In 1966 our exports of silver in ore and base bullion totaled 369,000 ounces. In 1967, that figure jumped to 2,365,000 ounces, and in 1968, to 23,129,000 ounces. If our exports of silver in this form continue at the pace of the first two months of this year, the 1969 exports of silver in ore and base bullion will amount to more than 32 million ounces.

This requires an explanation.

This nation has sufficient smelting capacity to make the export of silver in ore unnecessary, so we can assume it is silver in base bullion that is being exported.

The definition of base bullion, I have learned, includes coinage silver.

I am informed on good authority that the major cause for heavy exports of silver last year was a substantial exportation of coinage silver for refining.

Early in 1968, when the United States nonferrous metals industry was struck, the U.S. Treasury agreed to the exportation of silver under .999 fineness which it had sold for domestic consumption, on the condition that the exporter arrange for importation into the United States of refined silver as an offset.

However, in 1968 this nation exported 55 million ounces of silver more than it imported.

I am further informed that because of the heavy Treasury sales of coinage silver, some of the purchasers of such metal have found that refining costs outside the U.S. are lower than those charged by domestic refiners.

The bulk of this coinage silver that is being exported goes to Belgium and the United Kingdom. Belgium recently increased the capacity of its silver refinery at Hoboken from about 15 million ounces a year to 40 million ounces, and the United Kingdom has substantially increased its refining capacity.

The domestic refining industry is not protesting such exports, despite the fact coinage silver ostensibly is sold by the Treasury only to domestic industrial consumers.

It will be recalled that the Silver Committee of the American Mining Congress has consistently urged that restrictions on the sale of Treasury silver be removed and all buyers should be eligible to bid, since under such a procedure the taxpayer would be assured of getting a higher price on Treasury silver sales.

It also should be pointed out that silver derived from the illegal melting of coins also probably is being shipped to foreign refiners, and is included in the export figures. While the melting of coins is illegal, the export of the resultant silver bars, which is base bullion, is not illegal.

Be that as it may, the important fact to be considered, I believe is that we are exporting more silver than we import, even though domestic production of silver runs about 110 million ounces a year under domestic industrial consumption.

Once the Treasury halts the sale of silver, this country will of necessity be a net importer of silver in order to make up this deficit, and silver we are selling cheaply now will have to be purchased back at higher prices.

It can be argued that our net exports of silver now help our balance of payments situation. It can be argued just as successfully that necessary imports of silver in future years will worsen our balance of payments picture.

So far, I have confined my remarks about the silver supply situation to the silver that is being obtained from melting down coins. As you are aware, this is our principal supply of silver, and the only kind of silver the Treasury is selling at its weekly auction.

However, because the Treasury does publish statistics relative to its total supply of silver bullion, any review of the silver situation would be remiss if no reference were made to these statistics.

The March 31 report on silver bullion is the latest one that is available. It shows that Mint holdings of bullion silver amount to 86.3 million ounces.

However, upon examination we learn that the Mint holdings actually total 71.6 million ounces, after deducting 4.3 million ounces of coinage silver sold at GSA sales and not yet paid for; .4 million ounces that have excessive nickel and which are not suitable for sale; and 10.0 million ounces of .999 plus and .999 silver committed and not available.

In addition, nearly 14 million ounces of this bullion silver is .400 fine, reserved for minting the clad half dollars, and 22.5 million ounces are in unrefined silver largely mixed with gold, which will become available over a long period of time.

The remaining 35.5 million ounces held by the Mint includes 22.2 million ounces of coinage silver, 8.6 million ounces of .833 to .995 silver, and 4.7 million ounces of .996 to .998 silver. The coinage silver is the only silver that is being sold.

And it must be kept in mind that there is pending in Congress a bill that would make available to purchasers 8 million ounces of silver that was allegedly contracted for just prior to the time the Treasury discountinued sale of silver at $1.29 an ounce, and which was not delivered.

Some of you will recall that a year ago I said a considerable quantity of silver reported by the Treasury to be on hand was "paper silver", existing only on paper.

The truth of this remark is borne out, I believe, in the statistics of the past year, which show the downgraded estimate of silver in coins, and the silver actually available for sale in the classification "silver bullion."

There is one other point I think should be made in any silver review.

That point concerns the disposition of the silver remaining in the Treasury, including coinage silver.

The Treasury justifies its sale of 2 million ounces a week on grounds that it is needed to close the gap between domestic production and consumption, yet we have seen that much of this silver is finding its way to overseas markets.

This is an argument for phasing out the sale of Treasury silver, so as to provide for a more orderly transition to a free market.

This silver remaining in the Treasury belongs to the U.S. taxpayer. It is a national asset and thought should be given to its most profitable use.

It now brings the Treasury—and the taxpayer—about $1.70 an ounce.

It could be sold at $3.38 per ounce if it were used for the minting of silver Kennedy half-dollars or silver Eisenhower dollars, as has been suggested.

XUM

Last year Mexico monetized silver it had purchased from the United States at $1.29 an ounce, and sold it at $4 an ounce by minting 30 million 25-peso Olympic commemorative .720-fine coins, each containing one-half ounce of silver.

Surely we could do as well with coins commemorating two great Presidents, John F. Kennedy and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

In summation, I would like to emphasize these points:

The amount of silver in coins held by the Treasury and Federal Reserve Banks is nearing exhaustion, having been reduced 130.6 million ounces in nine months to 108.2 million ounces at the end of March.

This brings closer a free market in silver. The Federal Government should concern itself with providing for an orderly transition to such a free market and encouraging exploration for and development of new silver ore bodies. This should be accomplished by having silver producers and users join with the government in formulating new policy pretaining to silver.

The domestic industrial silver consumption will continue to run about 100 million ounces above production and this fact will create a serious situation once the Treasury no longer is a supplier of silver. Silver exported now will return to these shores at a higher price.

Treasury figures indicate that it will be out of the silver market by mid-1970.

The short term price outlook for silver remains obscured as long as the Treasury continues to sell silver and as long as the world monetary uncertainties exist. However, as to the longer term, I am confident that we can look forward to higher silver prices.

FREE WORLD INDUSTRIAL CONSUMPTION AND PRODUCTION OF SILVER (MILLIONS OF OUNCES)

	Total	1968	1967	1966	1965	1964	1963	1962	1961	1960
Industrial consumption	2,659.4	347.3	348.6	355.1	336.6	299.2	260.7	247.8	239.5	224.6
New production	1,940.1	238.2	216.8	224.7	218.4	210.7	214.6	205.7	203.2	207.8
Deficit	719.3	109.1	131.8	130.4	118.2	88.5	46.1	42.1	36.3	16.8
Treasury silver made available	858.8	179.5	195.2	142.5	80.4	151.0	25.2	.9	62.6	21.5

U.S. SILVER PRODUCTION, NET EXPORTS AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION

	Total	1968	1967	1966
Production	110.8	35.0	32.1	43.7
Consumption	440.0	145.0	145.0	150.0
Net exports	92.4	55.1	15.2	22.1

U.S. TREASURY ESTIMATE OF CHANGES IN COMBINED OUNCES, SILVER INVENTORY

	Coins	Bullion	Total
Inventory, July 1, 1968	[1] 238.8	80.3	319.1
Inventory, Mar. 28, 1969	[1] 108.2	86.7	196.9
Change	−130.6	+6.4	−124.2

[1] Estimated range, plus or minus 10,000,000 ounces.

CRITICISM FOR OBLIQUE PURPOSES

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial in the July 6 Chicago Tribune.

Citing an article by Clark Mollenhoff, Washington correspondent for the Cowles publication, in the July bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the editorial joins Mollenhoff in urging that responsible discussion of the management of the Defense Department replace frequently unjust and misplaced criticism. The full text of the editorial follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 6, 1969]

CRITICISM FOR OBLIQUE PURPOSE

Clark Mollenhoff, Washington correspondent of the Des Moines Register, says that there is plenty to criticize in the operations of the department of defense, but he objects to attempts to misapply the criticism to wholly unrelated subjects.

Writing in the July Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Mollenhoff says that the news media have been tardy in calling public attention to a decade of corruption, mismanagement, and waste in the Pentagon. He is especially critical of broadcast journalism for following the official line and says that many writers gave fawning and noncritical coverage to former Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara.

"Reporters," Mollenhoff says, "have placed the blame for waste, corruption, and mismanagement at the feet of 'the military-industrial complex.' Without using names, admirals and generals are pictured as corrupt or stupid. Senators and congressmen are often characterized as incompetent or corrupt parties to the waste of billions, tho no details are spelled out.

"Some of the writers seemed bent upon proving a preconceived notion that the generals and admirals, the senior men on the armed services committees of the House and Senate, and the bosses of defense industries have conspired to push the United States into the Viet Nam war and other confrontations for the sake of business profits, promotions, and political deals.

"Certainly there has been waste and mismanagement, but the evidence hardly sustains the general conspiracy theory. Somehow many of the stories ignore the dominant role of the political bosses at the Pentagon or tend to absolve them from blame for what has gone wrong."

Many reports, Mollenhoff says, give the impression that the Nixon administration or Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird has the responsibility for what took place in 1963 or in 1968. Seldom, if ever, is the name of former Secretary McNamara mentioned in a critical manner, even when he was personally involved in a questionable decision or when the decision was dictated out of his office under some much-heralded new system that was to save billions of tax dollars.

"Frequently," Mollenhoff writes, "the whole mess of scandals originating under the Kennedy or Johnson administrations are lumped together and presented as evidence of a general Pentagon laxity. Then this Pentagon laxity is projected into certain waste of money if President Nixon's Safeguard anti-ballistic missile program is permitted to move forward.

"Certainly past scandals should serve as a warning about what could happen to the ABM in the future, but unless there is a direct connection these should not serve as arguments for rejecting a program that the President and the defense secretary believe is essential.

"The merits of constructing the Safeguard ABM should be considered by the press and the public without regard for scandals of an earlier administration, unless there is some evidence of misjudgment and misrepresentations of the Safeguard decision that are clearly linked to past scandals."

Mr. Nixon and his secretary of defense have been unfairly attacked, by such senators as Fulbright and McGovern, not only as if they were being stubbornly perverse in arguing for the ABM defense but also as if they were solely responsible for our being at war in Viet Nam and for the existence of "the military-industrial complex," whereas these developments arose under previous administrations. The carping senators and opposition press are trying to use apples to make arguments against oranges. They are doing the same thing that McNamara's assistant secretary for public administration admitted he was trying to do—manage the news to their own ends.

POLL ON ABM

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I recently conducted a public opinion poll in my district, the Fifth District of North Carolina, the results of which I would like to share with my colleagues.

There were three questions which reflected overwhelming opinions of the people in my district and I would like to single these out today:

Of the more than 10,000 persons who answered the poll, more than 73 percent favored the deployment of the anti-ballistic-missile system around our major defense sites. Twenty-two percent voted against the proposal and another 16 percent failed to answer the question. These we could only determine as being undecided on this vital issue.

The results of the poll indicated that the people of the district were also in accord with the way the President is presently handling the war in Vietnam. There were 92.1 percent who said they favored the President's gradual withdrawal of U.S. troops as the South Vietnamese take over the responsibility of the fighting. Only 7.9 percent voted against the gradual withdrawal policy.

Those answering the poll also took issue with the student militants by voting overwhelmingly to take strong measures against those who disrupt campus activities; 94.5 percent voted to expel faculty members as well as students who take part in disruptive campus activities. In answer to still another question on the subject, 90.7 percent agreed that Federal funds should be taken away from the colleges and universities which fail to take disciplinary action against the lawbreaking students. This can only be interpreted, in my opinion, as an indication that the people of America are sick and tired of the rabble rousers and lawbreakers running loose on the campuses of our colleges and universities.

The following is a list of the questions and the results as computed by my office. I want to make it clear that each and every questionnaire was counted, not just a sampling of them; so the results are exact and not just projected figures:

Question	Number answering out of 9,924 total		Percent of each question		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you think the best way to settle the war in Vietnam is through negotiation?	5,973	3,276	64.25	35.75	6.8
2. Do you favor a gradual withdrawal of American troops as the South Vietnamese are trained and equipped to do their own fighting?	9,068	777	92.1	7.9	.8
3. Do you approve of legislation which would return to the States to use as they see fit part of revenue now collected in Federal income taxes?	8,214	1,382	85.6	14.4	3.3
4. Do you favor expulsion of faculty members and students who violently disrupt orderly academic procedures in our colleges and universities?	9,350	544	94.5	5.5	.3
5. Do you favor withdrawal of Federal funds from colleges which take no disciplinary action against faculty members and students who violently disrupt orderly procedures at our colleges and universities?	8,767	899	90.7	9.3	2.6
6. Draft—which do you consider the most fair?					
(a) Extension of the present draft program?	2,729	913	27.5	9.2	....
(b) A lottery at age 18?	2,699	784	27.2	7.9	....
(c) A volunteer career military service after Vietnam?	4,506	715	45.3	7.2	....
7. Do you think Government financial support to farmers under the various programs should be limited to $25,000 per farmer?	7,607	1,295	85.45	14.55	10.3
8. Do you believe the farmer is receiving a fair price for the crops he produces?	4,774	2,560	65.1	34.9	26.1
9. Do you favor total registration of all guns?	2,741	7,084	27.9	72.1	1.0
10. Do you favor registration for purchasing shotgun and 22-caliber ammunition?	2,841	6,567	30.2	69.8	5.2
11. Electoral college—do you favor:					
(a) Award of electoral voted by congressional district?	992	1,538	10.0	15.5	....
(b) Abolish it and elect President by popular vote?	6,629	665	66.8	6.7	....
(c) Apportion electoral votes of each State according to votes candidates received?	2,173	1,190	21.9	12.0	....
12. Do you believe the voting age should be lowered to 18 for Federal elections?	4,175	5,650	42.5	57.5	1.0
13. Do you favor deployment of the ABM around our major defense sites as President Nixon proposes as insurance to retaliate in case of enemy attack?	6,428	1,898	77.2	22.8	16.1
14. Office of Economic Opportunity—do you favor?					
(a) Transfer to other agencies?	2,203	944	22.2	9.5	....
(b) Retaining OEO in its present form?	1,032	1,290	10.4	13.0	....
(c) Abolishment?	5,102	854	50.4	8.6	....
15. Do you favor increased financial support in the form of bloc grants from the Federal Government to assist State and local law-enforcement agencies?	6,333	1,599	70.9	29.1	10.0
16. Do you favor seating Red China in the U.N.?	3,241	5,889	35.5	64.5	8.0

POLLUTION CONTROL, A HOLDING ACTION

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on July 15, I was pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three articles which appeared in the Oakland Tribune dealing with a vexatious problem, that of air pollution.

At this time I submit the concluding four articles and hope that they will be of interest to my colleagues:

[From the Oakland Tribune, July 2, 1969]

POLLUTION CONTROL, A HOLDING ACTION

(By Ernie Cox)

Industrial smokestacks, open burning of garbage dumps, agricultural burning, ships in port and fumes from paints and other solvents—all are controlled in six Bay Area counties.

Starting next Jan. 1, burning of rubbish in backyards of one and two-family dwellings will also be regulated.

It is all the work of the 13-year-old Bay Area Air Pollution Control District.

The regulations have made substantial inroads against many types of air pollution but the overall Bay Area effort is a losing battle—or at best a holding action—against automobiles and trucks, over which the local district has no jurisdiction.

The district operates from its new six-story office building at 939 Ellis St., San Francisco. What goes on inside its walls more closely touches the man in the street than do many other better-known agencies of government.

Ninety district employes will be operating in the upcoming fiscal year under a $1.8 million budget financed mainly from property taxes in the counties of San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara.

The budget provides for the operation of the district's 10 air monitoring stations and another soon to be opened in the smog-plagued Livermore Valley.

The 1955 legislation setting up the district also contemplated the inclusion of Napa, Sonoma and Solano counties but it contained a loophole requiring affirmative action of each board of supervisors before the counties to the north could be included in the district.

After 13 long years the three counties are still holdouts and it is becoming increasingly an irritant to the local district—almost as smarting as smog itself.

D. J. Callaghan, the district's $27,500-a-year chief administrative officer, says the three north bay counties are producing 1,800 tons of pollutants per day, some of which is carried down into the air of the six counties where residents are taxing themselves to fight smog.

The district is governed by a 12-man board of directors composed of a city councilman and supervisor from each of the six counties. A 20-man advisory council, appointed from a cross section of industry, commerce and business, recommends policy decisions to the board.

A three-man hearing board sits as a quasi-judicial body to consider individual cases. On the hearing board are J. Joseph Sullivan, San Francisco attorney; E. Spencer Bodine of Marin County, a retired engineer for Shell Oil Co., and Joseph G. Hunter of San Francisco, a retired chemical engineer.

Severest criticism of the district setup has come from a four-year-old San Jose-based group called Citizens Against Air Pollution, Inc. It is headed by Peter B. Venuto, assistant professor in the School of Business, San Jose State College. Others on the board of directors are A. Bepristis, a San Jose chemist; attorney Walter V. Hays of San Jose, and John H. Bloomer, a Palo Alto engineer.

Venuto said his main criticism of the district is that Callaghan is an administrator and not a technician in air pollution, and that Callaghan is appointed by a "politically oriented" board of directors rather than being elected by the voters of the district.

"Air pollution is a technical problem," said Venuto, "and our smog chief should be technically qualified. There also are no checks and balances under the present setup. The voters have no say as to which councilman or supervisor is to serve on the pollution district board.

"We do not need a board of directors. The smog chief should be directly elected by the district and given full responsibility and authority."

Venuto said he also feels the advisory council is "loaded in favor of industry" and that certain members have a direct conflict of interest because their employers are some of the major air polluters in the area. The advisory council and hearing board are both appointed by the district directors.

Venuto charged also that district officials have refused to make public the names of major polluters, and won't identify the pollutants coming from individual sources.

"There are so many loopholes in the present law," he said, "that the district is able to grant repeated continuation and variances which actually allow an industry to pollute the air legally."

District officials say what Venuto has asked for is the name and address of the "25 biggest polluters" even though the industries may be meeting all current legal requirements of the district. They say also that pollution would have to be defined in order to pinpoint individual sources, because pollution is made up of numerous ingredients and the ingredients vary widely from one industry to another.

The district also refuses to divulge the component breakdown of emissions from individual industries. This information is supplied by the industries and, said a district spokesman, it is "privileged" information because it might be used by a competitive industry to learn of a plant's processes.

Out in Martinez, 88 residents became so impatient with their own board of supervisors and the pollution district they filed a suit in U.S. District Court in San Francisco seeking an injunction and $13.2 million from Shell Oil Co. which operates a new $80 million refinery in the Contra Costa County seat. The suit was filed last August and is still pending.

Thomas Fuller of Martinez, a retired teacher and long time spokesman for the citizens group, said the court action finally came after months of hearings before the Contra Costa County supervisors and the smog district board.

Fuller said as far as he is concerned the Shell refinery in Martinez has still not improved its operation to any great extent.

"My personal feeling," he stated, "is that the smog board has got too many political strings attached to it."

District officals disagree sharply. They say Shell is tearing down its 12 plants within the refinery "brick by brick" to get to the cause of breakdowns which produce smoke and smog.

The refinery still has an "occasional breakdown", said a spokesman, but he contended the Shell operation has improved greatly in the past year. The district advisory council currently is looking into the possibility of strengthening the "breakdown" provisions, of the present regulations, he said.

Another citizens group, called Clean Air Now, was founded by Mrs. Sarah Feldner, a Palo Alto housewife.

She said 120 Bay Area families belong to the group which has lobbied for legislation in Sacramento and frequently compares notes with citizen groups in Los Angeles.

Mrs. Feldner, who regularly attends smog district meetings, said the meetings are poorly attended by the public and added, "it is hard for the directors to get much feedback from the public when the public doesn't attend any of the board meetings."

Air pollution, she said, has been thought of as the "concern of the middle class" but she added, "this must change. Air pollution is everybody's business."

[From the Oakland Tribune, July 3, 1969]

CALIFORNIA PASSED FIRST SMOG LAWS

(By Ernie Cox)

The first laws in this nation requiring smog controls on cars were passed in California.

The old Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board, a state agency in operation about two decades, was the first of its kind in the United States.

California's regulations were so far ahead of the rest of the states, the Federal Government adapted many of them in the Federal Air Quality Act of 1967.

The Legislature passed the Mulford-Carrell Air Resources Act of 1967 which revamped the statewide smog control setup. The state's Pure Air Act of 1968 set new and more stringent standards for cars.

Despite all the laws and controls to date, there has been no significant reduction in total air pollution shrouding California cities each day.

As more people move into the state, as they buy and use more cars, the increase in smog is running ahead of the controls.

More stringent controls are planned for the future but many scientists and others are not optimistic that the problem is anywhere near to being solved.

The battle is being carried on statewide by the Air Resources Board, which was created in 1967 to replace the old Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board. The new board, headquartered in Sacramento, has been given broad powers over non-vehicular pollution as well as that from cars.

The board is presently considering air quality standards for the entire state, which has been divided into 11 so-called air basins. The standards, if adopted, will be higher in many cases than those now followed by the Bay Area Air Pollution Control District under its own six-county regulations.

California's Pure Air Act of 1968 went into effect last November and test procedures were adopted by the Air Resources Board on November 20. The standards spell out a five-year program of increasingly stringent standards for 1970 to 1974 model cars.

The act will prohibit the sale in California of new vehicles which cannot meet the state requirements.

Scientists and public health officials agree the automobile is the main culprit in the smog problem.

They do not all agree with some of the state's own rather optimistic predictions for the future.

In its 1968 annual report the board says regarding new cars, "control of evaporative losses will not begin until 1970 . . . control of oxides of nitrogen will not begin until the 1971 models . . . strictest standards for exhaust hydrocarbons do not go into effect until 1972 . . . those for oxides of nitrogen, not until 1974."

The board says this "timetable . . . will progressively reduce the emissions of all three pollutants to a minimum point by about 1985."

At least one group, the Berkeley-based Northern California Committee for Environmental Information, does not share the optimism of the State Resources Board. The committee, which includes scientists and engineers, says the state board's predictions for 1985 "rest on potentials in law, but not in fact; on administrative problems of inspection and joint jurisdictions, and on a combustion technology not yet available."

In simpler terms, the Berkeley committee says "research has not yet been done to design a production car to meet California 1974 emission standards."

The state board is well aware of that fact. It acknowledges its predictions for Los Angeles and San Francisco cleaner air by 1985 are "based on the projected growth in these areas, together with the assumptions that vehicle emissions will comply with the standards . . ." It adds that "research and development will be required of the automobile industry and others to produce vehicles that will meet these standards."

Chairman of the Air Resources Board is Dr. A. J. Haagen-Smit, professor of bio-chemistry at California Institute of Technology, Pasadena. The board operated in fiscal 1968–69 with a $2,470,000 state budget and Federal grants totaling $533,800. These funds support a staff of 56 technical and administrative personnel and a $968,500 contract with the State Department of Public Health for technical services.

A statewide air monitoring network of 50 sampling stations is concentrated mainly in Los Angeles and the Bay Area. Little is known of the pollutant concentrations in the state's huge agricultural areas. Federal grants over the next three years are expected to help establish more monitoring stations.

The board works closely with the National Air Pollution Control Administration, a Federal agency with offices in San Francisco, and with local control districts such as the Bay Area Air Pollution Control District.

Twenty-four of the state's 58 counties are now in local control districts. This embraces only 50 per cent of the land area but about 90 per cent of the population. The state hopes to encourage the formation of more districts.

A number of the new districts are small and confined to single counties, although smog is no respecter of political boundaries. Problems are expected in these cases in achieving a coordinated air pollution program and in finding trained technical personnel.

The new federal law provides that a state may enforce its own controls on new auto emissions—provided it first obtains a waiver from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The procedure is complicated and time consuming. Unless the federal government simplifies the procedure, said the State Board, California will "continually be in the process of seeking these waivers."

[From the Oakland Tribune, July 4, 1969]

UNCERTAIN EFFECTS IN SMOG CONTROLS

(By Ernie Cox)

A spokesman for Bay Area industrialists says industry has spent $100 million on air pollution control equipment since industry controls were adopted in 1960.

An official of the Bay Area Air Pollution Control District placed the industry cost at between $30 million and $50 million.

Whatever the actual figure, it is evident that most Bay Area industries have gone a long way toward eliminating many objectionable features of their plants. Total elimination of industrial air pollution probably is a Utopian goal which never will be achieved.

Critics of the local air pollution control district say current regulations contain too many loopholes for variances and continuances for violators.

Industry spokesmen, however, contend that pollution control regulations must take into account both the technological and economic feasibility of control devices—and these factors may vary widely from one industry to another.

Principal spokesman for Bay Area industry is Eveleth E. Hayden, executive vice president of the Bay Area League of Industrial Associations, Inc., with offices at 3124 E. 14th St., Oakland.

To put the problem of industrial air pollution into perspective, one must keep in mind figures released recently by the Bay Area Air Pollution Control District. These showed that automobiles and trucks contribute 71 per cent of the Bay Area's air pollution; back yard burning, 11 per cent, and industries the remaining 18 per cent.

Hayden says local industry leaders originally supported the formation of the Bay Area control district, formed in 1955, for several reasons.

They wanted to avoid a critical problem which they could see developing; they wanted to avoid some of the problems of the Los Angeles Air Pollution Control District, and they preferred a locally controlled district rather than a state agency.

The League and its forerunner organization, the Alameda County Industries, Inc., has been closely associated with the writing of Bay Area air pollution regulations No. 2, which controls industrial smoke, and regulation No. 3, controlling fumes and other pollutants from solvents, inks and paints.

Its lobbying efforts with the smog control board and its 20-man advisory council have been both vigorous and effective when the industrialists felt proposed regulations would be too expensive or impractical.

Hayden says Bay Area industry favors, for instance, the broad "performance standards" used by the local district instead of so-called "specification standards" applied to industry in Los Angeles. The difference is important to industry.

The Bay Area pollution board simply sets a standard of performance required of industry and says in effect, "This is what is expected of you—how you accomplish it is your problem."

The Los Angeles district, on the other hand, sets up much more detailed specifications for individual industries, allowing for little flexibility or adaptation. Hayden says the latter method causes unnecessary technical problems. while adding nothing to the final result.

Bay Area industry was instrumental in writing the original information law as well as subsequent regulations.

In the key provisions for enforcement the Los Angeles and Bay Area districts are poles apart.

In Los Angeles, a suspected violating industry is given a misdemeanor citation, hailed into court and required to defend itself against possible fines.

The Bay Area district follows an "injunctive procedure" whereby suspected violators may either correct the conditions or apply to the district's three-man hearing board for a variance. Repeated violations can result in court injunctions or fines, but the process is a slow one.

Hayden and local pollution district officials both say they prefer the local setup because, while it is slower, it has resulted in far greater voluntary cooperation from industry—which they consider one of the keys to an effective control program.

In justifying industry's prominent role in writing regulations applicable to itself, Hayden explains, "We feel we have been helpful to the nontechnical members of the (Bay district) advisory council. Air quality is a technical matter—not a political problem."

He added somewhat ruefully, "There is a tendency on the part of uninformed members of the public to brand industry as the bad guys. We are the guys with the black hats."

In Contra Costa County oil refineries have been one of the biggest problems. One of them, Shell at Martinez, is still embroiled in controversy with neighbors who have filed a federal court action for damages.

Bob Crothers, whose title was recently changed from air sanitation director to in-

XUM

dustrial health director in the Contra Costa County Health Department, says he receives more complaints against sulphur compounds than any other. These are caused by refineries or related industries making sulphuric acid.

"The public is demanding increased controls," said Crothers. "A few years ago they might have put up with something objectionable. Now they demand it be eliminated. This creates a never-ending task for industry."

Crothers called the Antioch plant of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. the "best setup in the country." The plant, he pointed out is surrounded by farm land owned and controlled by du Pont; the plant is at least one-half mile from its nearest neighbor.

While such an ideal setup is not always possible, it seems clear that industry's annoyances will no longer be tolerated by the public as a necessary evil.

The California Air Resources Board currently has under study a set of new and stiffer air quality standards recommended by the State Department of Public Health.

These standards, if adopted, would be higher in many cases than standards currently in effect for the Bay Area. The state standards would have to be met in the local district.

[From the Oakland Tribune, July 5, 1969]

HOPES DIM FOR CLEAN AIR

(By Ernie Cox)

Can residents of the Bay Area ever expect to breathe really clean air again?

Probably not—if you're thinking of our pre-World War II environment.

Air pollution officials are sorry about that, because it's their job to clean up the air.

A simple fact of life is this: people cause pollution. More people cause more pollution. As certain as night follows day the Bay Area can expect thousands, perhaps millions, more people in the years ahead.

They will drive more cars, work in more factories, burn more private rubbish, light more furnaces and fireplaces, operate more diesel trucks, fly more jet airplanes.

A genuine concern for the future came recently from A. E. Schuck, professor at the Air Pollution Research Center, University of California at Riverside, where research is being done on the effects of air pollution on plants.

Professor Schuck believes man's use of fossil fuels such as gasoline and diesel fuel will result in the creation of 25 per cent more carbon dioxide in the earth's atmosphere in the next 30 years. This, he says, will cause a greenhouse effect, resulting in a rise in world temperatures warming the oceans and melting the polar ice cap. The combined effect, he says, could raise the levels of the oceans by 400 feet. High on his list for smog reduction is the replacement of the internal combustion engine.

The State Air Resources Board has adopted standards calling for successively tougher controls of auto emissions to 1974. But the attainment of such goals may not be technically or economically feasible. The auto industry has not yet indicated it will be able to meet the 1972 standards, much less those for 1974.

There is strong feeling on the part of some experts that the internal combustion engine has been made about as "clean" as is technically and economically feasible and that some radical new breakthrough is needed.

Alternatives suggested have included the steam engine, battery powered cars, and even the use of compressed natural gas. The state is currently involved officially in programs to test all three types of vehicles. Successful tests could have far-reaching effects on the future of motor transportation.

One of the first to go—assuming impressive test results—may be the diesel driven urban bus. If you've even been caught behind one of these belching behemoths, trailing its black and stinking cloud, the news will be welcome.

There are about 57,000 diesel-powered vehicles in California. Ninety per cent are trucks and 10 per cent are buses. The Air Resources Board says the California Highway Patrol has authority to issue citations to any vehicle smoking excessively—and that in 1968 the CHP issued 8,686 citations and made 7,846 arrests.

Smoke from jet aircraft, increasingly significant as more and more planes come into use, is not now regulated by the Air Resources Board, nor does the Federal Aviation Agency have any regulation governing emission into the atmosphere. The National Air Pollution Control Administration has been directed by Congress to study the problem and report its findings.

The United States Public Health Service has estimated that the annual cost of air pollution is about $65 per person. In the Bay Area the cost of pollution control equipment to industry, alone, is estimated at upwards of $100 million, plus incalculable additional costs of maintenance and operation.

In addition, Bay Area motorists have spent an estimated $12 million for exhaust controls on their cars and another $15 million for crankcase devices required by tough new laws.

In the Bay Area there are 2,250,000 automobiles and about 10,000 industrial operations—all potential air polluters—such as auto body shops, refineries, foundries, paint shops, food processiing plants, metal grinders, rock crushers, cement plants, chemical products, house painters—the list is almost endless.

A great deal is being done to abate air pollution but some local officials feel we are only "buying a little more time" with all the regulations. They expect the air pollution to reach a plateau, level off for a few years, then begin to climb again—unless something dramatic happens to eliminate the overwhelming pall of smog from the automobile.

While you cough and sneeze, wipe your eyes and worry and wait for "progress," there are several things the experts suggest you might do:

Learn as much as possible about smog, its sources, effects and control.

Keep your own car properly maintained and serviced through regular checkups of smog control equipment, ignition and carburetor.

Be prepared to foot the bill and support legislation for better smog control.

Make up your mind that everyone is a potential air polluter and decide to do what you can to lessen the problem.

The results could be like a breath of fresh air.

VIEWS OF HON. FRANK G. SISCOE

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, recently the New York Times printed a letter addressed to it by Frank G. Siscoe, one of our outstanding diplomats, now retired.

The Honorable Frank G. Siscoe served 20 years with our Department of State and prior to that spent several years in international service with the Department of Justice.

During his long career with our Department of State, he was principally concerned with our relations with the Iron Curtain countries. Before his retirement, he was director of the Soviet and Eastern Europe Exchanges. He is recognized as a leading authority on these nations.

Mr. Siscoe has now reassumed the practice of law in his native city, Plainfield, N.J. He is also teaching at Rutgers University and authoring a book on international affairs.

His views as expressed in the New York Times follows:

[From the New York Times, July 6, 1969]

VISIT TO RUMANIA

To the EDITOR:

While reaching for a plausible component to build his rather creaky structure of President Nixon's capricious image, James Reston in his June 29 column instantly assumed that the projected Nixon trip to Rumania is a blunder. True, it may prove to be; but it is much too early to make such a judgment. And if the decision to stop in Bucharest is ill conceived, the reasons will probably be others than that of affront to the Soviet Union.

The trip will almost certainly be hurried and frenetic, with men on the moon (hopefully) and too much else thrown in; another time might have been better. Too, probably Turkey and Iran deserve pats on the back more than does Rumania.

Despite these considerations, and within the context of U.S.-Soviet relations, a Presidential visit to Rumania (and to Yugoslavia, for that matter) is a sound move, especially if the astute Rumanians are willing. If the Soviets are ready for serious arms limitation discussions, then the talks will go forward, despite any flying visit.

One of the most egregious errors of the last year of the Johnson Administration was the anxiety to avoid giving offense to the Soviet Union during the extended Czechoslovak crisis. By its timorousness the United States completely eliminated itself as a factor to be assessed during the Soviet decision-making process. Granted, the Soviet Union might still have invaded Czechoslovakia, but it would have done so forewarned of prospective U.S. displeasure.

During last August-September I was on a trip to Eastern Europe, and I sharply recall the fears in Rumania and the expectation in Poland and Czechoslovakia that Rumania would be next. Whether President Johnson's hastily prepared warning to the Kremlin had any effect on the final Soviet decision not to intervene, no one in the West can say.

The Soviet Union is now on notice that the United States does have an interest in the peaceful development of Rumania. That is just about all that the Nixon trip will mean, and it does not serve any useful purpose to read more into it. It does not remotely mean any move directly prejudicial to Soviet interests.

Another salutary aspect of the forthcoming Nixon visit to Rumania could be the demonstration that we want friendly and, to the extent possible, normal relations with all countries, regardless of the character of their internal governments.

The time has long passed when anyone in authority should think that the U.S. is going to reform the world, or even parts of the world. This is a far more tenable and constructive position for the U.S. to follow than the pernicious meddling to insure "democratic" governments in countries with cultures and environments far different from our own. This view has its lesson for us in Vietnam as well.

To come back to Rumania: let us not be fearful of Soviet reactions, and let us not automatically condemn it as a mistake; but, on the balance, let us welcome the Nixon

XUM

trip, with its built-in limitations, as a sound move in a realistic world.

FRANK G. SISCOE.

WASHINGTON, *June 30, 1969.*

A VETERANS' VETERAN

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on May 23, 1969, I had the pleasure of attending the 23d annual testimonial dinner and dance honoring Louis Del Balzo. Known as the veterans' veteran, Louis devoted many years of dedicated and unselfish service to the Greater New York Newsdealers Post No. 5810, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. I commend to readers of the RECORD a portion of the statement presented before this honored group by Louis Del Balzo:

Reverend Clergy, Honored Guests, Mr. President, Fellow Veterans:

Perhaps the first thing I should say is that being a little fellow, I have always been advised that I should say as little as possible, so you can rest assured this speech isn't going to be long at all.

At any rate, the important things to me is that somehow this honor being tendered to me tonight is something I never expected or hoped to receive.

I don't have to tell you that many, many years have passed since I saw military service; and I feel blessed tonight many times:

1st: To my God for watching over me and making it possible for me to do my share in the service of the V.F.W., and, if I may modestly say, a few other organizations, some of which have been nice enough to send representatives here tonight to share with me this momentous evening.

2nd: To my wife for putting up with me all of these years while I was out on various chores for not only this organization but other worthy causes.

3rd: To my buddies in this post for this tremendous evening; and

4th: For being an American and blessed with the opportunities of living in this wonderful land of ours.

Now, I know that we have serious problems here, the college campus demonstrations all over the country, the poor people's poverty problems, young people's opposition to the service of their country, opposition to the draft, housing, labor, medical services, and many more. But if you think we have it bad, talk to some of the people who have visited South America, Mexico and most of the European countries.

Those of us who have been living here are blessed.

These past few years as Chairman of the Youth Activities Committee, I have been troubled by the draft card burnings, and draft evasion. Incidentally, a recent survey of the draft dodgers who have fled to Canada shows them to be very, very unhappy, and I predict that most of these youngsters will return to the United States and beg for an opportunity to serve in our military service, or if not, they will return and take the punishment the courts will impose upon them so that they can live in this country—the greatest in the world.

Youth activities—frankly with what some youths are doing today, I seriously wonder what they will be doing when they grow up. Now, when I was a kid, a person was a youth until old enough to enlist in the Army—and that was 17. Today, a person is a youth until he completes school and that can be from age 23 to 28 or so.

Yet, despite this, our fighting youth—(Men—I call them)—are distinguishing themselves every day in the line of fire and we are all very proud of them.

I would like to tell you of my experiences as youth activities chairman, but these are too numerous to mention.

However, on the whole, my experiences have been gratifying and have given me a great deal of satisfaction.

This has been a memorable evening for me to have so many of my friends come and share it with me. I want to thank all of you for giving me the opportunity to serve you.

AS SPACEMEN LOOK BEYOND THE MOON

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the July 7 issue of U.S. News & World Report contains an incisive interview with Dr. Thomas O. Paine, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Because of the significance of Dr. Paine's answers to a number of questions on the future of our national space program, I am including excerpts from that interview:

AS SPACEMEN LOOK BEYOND THE MOON—INTERVIEW WITH THOMAS O. PAINE, HEAD OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Q. Dr. Paine, what is the real meaning of America's putting a man on the moon? What benefit is there to people on earth?

A. There are a lot of benefits, and one important one is that America's view of itself—and the world view of America—has been upgraded and made more realistic. We are showing that we are a people who can do anything we set our minds to do.

I think Russia's first sputnik—which was a sort of "space Pearl Harbor"—startled us and raised some basic questions: whether we really were the adventurous people we thought we were, and whether we actually had the technical preeminence that we thought we had.

The manned landing on the moon, in a sense, is the culmination of America's satisfying everyone that it is indeed the leading technological nation that it thought it was before Sputnik blazed across the skies.

Q. How do you rate this as a technological achievement?

A. It is, of course, a major step forward on many broad fronts. It has required the United States to move boldly ahead in almost every branch of technology. We have involved directly some 400,000 Americans in the space program over the last decade. We've involved thousands of industrial contractors and universities, graduate students, workers, engineers.

The impact that all of this has had on our ability to do things in the United States—and to do them in new, novel and improved ways—has been very great.

Q. Yet people frequently ask: Is a moon landing worth 24 billion dollars?

A. The real answer to that question will have to await the judgment of history.

I think it is worth it. The 24 billion, of course, was spent over a decade. The average cost to individual Americans over the period has been a modest one in view of the returns that we have had. But history will have to be the judge.

Q. Will landing on the moon mean that the U.S. has won the space race?

A. Let me answer in this way: It's perfectly true that when the Soviets surprised us with the prowess which they had developed in space science and technology, we undertook a race, if you like, to redress this imbalance.

I don't believe, however, that the trip to the moon can be classified as a race in itself, and I don't believe that the attainment of a first landing on the moon marks a situation where two nations are coming down to a celestial finish line where one breaks the tape as it lands on the the moon.

What the landing on the moon will demonstrate is that American space technology has matured, has come of age. It will demonstrate that we can do the thing we set out to do—which is to be able to leave the earth, to sail out on this new ocean of space for a matter of days to a destination measured in hundreds of thousands of miles, to be able to descend safely on the far shore, to get out and walk about and perform useful activities, and then to return safely to the good earth.

That's the real meaning of the accomplishment—not that we beat Russia in a moon race.

Q. Where does the space program go from here? Is the moon just a steppingstone?

A. The answer to that depends on the time scale you have in mind. If you mean next year, that's one thing. I'll interpret it as meaning: Where do we go from here, in the long-range sense?

It seems to me that in many ways our landing on the moon is analogous to the situation of the Portuguese navigators when Henry the Navigator sent them farther and farther down the coast of Africa and they were able to successfully navigate their crude caravels, to support their seamen for long periods of time, to maintain them healthy and alert, and were able to solve the problems of how you withstand the storms and how you land and bring home cargoes of ivory and slaves and spices.

We're, in a sense, at that initial stage now in space. The great exploration of the world which the European navigators were able to carry out following Henry the Navigator—the settlement of North and South America and Australia—these are things which still lie ahead in the space program. We haven't yet reached that point, but we have mastered space navigation.

WHAT $4 BILLION BUYS

Q. That's another subject that people bring up: With all these problems on earth, is there any reason for spending 4 billion dollars a year in space?

A. Of course, 4 billion dollars a year is a lot of money—I'd be the last to deny that, being a skinflint Yankee. But you have to recognize that NASA's budget is only 5 per cent of our defense budget and only 10 per cent of what we spend on women's dresses, for example. NASA is only half the size of the General Electric Company. It represents, for our 200 million Amerians, just cigarette money: 40 cents a week apiece.

So, although it is a lot of money—for the value that we're getting in challenging every part of American technology, in providing an exciting focus for a great deal of our new scientific and university work—this expenditure seems to me to be very well justified.

As to whether we should be doing it now, when we have so many problems here on earth, I will say this: If all programs, past and present, had to meet that test, everything would come to a grinding halt. Columbus would never have set sail, the Pilgrims would never have left home, men would have written no books or music.

We simply can't hold up all progress in art, in literature, in science and exploration until we solve all of the problems of mankind.

New-technology programs like the space program create new wealth which, in turn, gives us the ability to distribute the wealth more broadly within our society to help meet some of our welfare and poverty problems.

Q. Is there a matter of national security involved in space exploration?

A. Yes, but in a somewhat secondary way. You may recall that, at the time of Sputnik and afterward, Premier Khrushchev used to brag audaciously about the great Soviet technological supremacy which their space spectaculars demonstrated. I think it was very dangerous for the United States to let the notion get abroad that it had become technically inferior.

It would now be very unwise of us to allow any other nation to think that they have attained great superiority over us in an area as important as space. It would be a destabilizing force in the world today to have such a situation exist—tempting others to rash action.

We don't know all of the ways in which space technology may affect future defense posture. We do know that, in the past, wherever man has flown farther and higher and faster, wherever he has developed new capability to observe from higher areas, to carry out operations in new media, this has had a major effect on the equations of international power. We're quite confident that this will probably be true again in space.

In any case, though, you have to remember that NASA is a civilian agency. Our job is to do the research, to develop the new capability. When it comes to applying this in the defense area, that is a job for the Department of Defense.

Q. Will you be doing more work with earth-orbiting stations now that the Air Force's manned orbiting laboratory has been canceled?

A. The main jobs that the Air Force was planning to do with a manned orbiting laboratory—essentially to prove out man's capability to carry out military operations in space—are not things that we will do in our Apollo applications program. We do not consider Apollo applications of any kind of substitute for MOL.

Q. Just what is the Apollo applications program?

A. The applications program will use the smaller Saturn I–B rockets left over from our Apollo moon program for earth-orbital missions. These are rockets which weren't used up in preliminary Apollo flights because we made substantially more progress than our rather conservative early estimates had led us to believe we would.

What we're going to do is put men into space for, first, 28 days and then 56 days at a time, giving them some advanced astronomical equipment with which to study the sun. We're going to find out how effectively man can exist in a weightless, space-station atmosphere and carry out useful work in orbit over extended periods of time.

We will get from this the engineering data that we'll need to design a subsequent large space station.

LOWER THE VOTING AGE?

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of principle I support the lowering of the voting age to 18, although I feel that individual States should take the initiative since they maintain control over the voting regulations.

I was very impressed with an editorial in the Polish American, Chicago, Ill., Saturday, July 12, commenting on the 18-year-old vote and insert it into the RECORD at this point:

LOWERING THE VOTING AGE?

A resolution was recently introduced in Congress calling for lowering the national minimum voting age to 18. This is the latest move in the drive to lower the voting age which officially began in 1942 when legislation to that effect was first introduced.

It is argued by partisans of the resolution that our citizens in the 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old bracket should be given the opportunity to participate in decisions which determine the course of the country they will be leading in the coming years, since they are better educated, better read, and more conscious of the expanding world around them than ever before in our history.

There also, however, seems to be a more basic reason for giving the 18- to 20-year-old citizens the privilege of voting. In most States in the Union, 18-year-olds must stand trial in criminal court—they are no longer considered juveniles under the law. In most States one need only be 18 years of age to marry without parental consent. In many States 18-year-olds may enter into written contracts and be held responsible. In many States this age group can make wills and purchase insurance.

The child labor provision of the Fair Labor Standards Act, it may also be noted, does not apply to one 18 or older. Welfare aid cannot be given to one 18 or over unless he or she is handicapped. Those in this age group have been given the responsibility of the lives of others as they drive cars and purchase guns and ammunition. All these privileges and responsibilities are given at or by the age of 18—but what about the privilege and responsibility of voting?

Since many Americans at the age of 18 hold jobs and pay taxes, whatever happened to the old principle of "no taxation without representation?" Further, our young men who are drafted into the armed services at 18 are carrying out our country's policies but have had no voice in choosing those who make those policies.

At the age of 18, most Americans have completed their formal education. They have just completed courses in the functioning of a democracy, and the founding of their country. They are at their highest peak of interest. That is the time, proponents of lowering the voting age argue, when they should be initiated into the responsibility and privilege of voting.

It may seem unusual, but the average person at 18 is better informed regarding his government than at 21. The young person at 18 is generally still in a stable home environment, while afterwards the average young person leaves home to work, serve in the armed forces, attend college, or be married. Often these young people move to other States with difficult residence requirements on registration and absentee voting.

Those who study voting behavior have noted that persons in the 21–30 year age bracket have one of the lowest voting participation averages in the electorate. They suggest that one cause of this is the denial of the vote between the ages of 18 and 21, when the enthusiasm is the highest. On the other hand, studies of the 18 and 21 voting group in Kentucky—where 18-year-olds may vote in state elections—have indicated that this unfortunate trend is to some extent offset by permitting this age bracket to vote.

The notion that youngsters do not reach an age of maturity and responsibility until their 21st birthday had its roots in antiquity and in a social order whose circumstances are no longer relevant to contemporary times. Just a half century ago, less than 30 percent of the high-school-age population attended high school and only 17 percent of that group graduated. Today, more than 85 percent of Americans of that age group attend high school and more than three-quarters of them receive diplomas.

Proponents of lowering the voting age also point out that 50 years ago less than 600,000 attended college, less than 8 percent of the 18-to-21 population, while college enrollment today exceeds 5,000,000, pointing to the fact that almost half in that age group are attending college.

Finally, it should be noted that there is nothing sacrosanct about setting the voting age at 21. Both Kentucky and Georgia set the voting age at 18. Alaska and Hawaii set the age at 20.

It would thus appear that the proponents of lowering the voting age—a group which includes both of the recent presidential candidates—have a strong case in their favor. Whether they will succeed in their cause, however, remains quite another matter.

YOUTH AND TURKS

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, in a recent speech, Peter Bommarito, international president of the United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, AFL–CIO, said:

> There's a new look in the Labor Movement—and that is the healthy look of youth.

Mr. Bommarito, in reminding us that close to half of our population is under 25 years of age, called for a greater degree of communication between our generations so that we can assist these young people in preparing for the positions of leadership that someday will be theirs.

Those who know this outstanding labor leader are not surprised at this forward-looking position taken by him. Though he has been a member of the United Rubber Workers' Union for 30 years, Peter Bommarito is still a comparatively young man possessed with the desire to try new approaches to old problems. The young people of his great union will not find a "generation gap between themselves and their able International President.

We, in Akron, know of Peter Bommarito as a man with great concern for civic affairs. I have had the privilege of serving with him on the advisory board of the Salvation Army, and so know of the great contributions of time and effort that he has made in assisting this fine organization.

A veteran of the 1st Marine Division, Pete Bommaritto saw action at Guadalcanal and a half dozen other Pacific battle areas. As a youth, he was a successful participant in the Golden Gloves tournament and many other athletic activities.

Peter Bommarito is proof that in the United States of America, there are no limits to the rise of a determined and dedicated young man. Most assuredly, the young people of his union might be assured of a fine future life if they were but to follow the example of their international president.

One of the outstanding national columnists, John Herling, recently devoted his column to Peter Bommarito's speech.

XUM

John Herling is known to all of us in the U.S. Congress as one of the greatest authorities on matters affecting the labor situation and on our economy. He is also author of the widely read John Herling Labor letter.

His column which appeared in the Washington News and other papers follows:

YOUTH AND TURKS

(By John Herling)

Pete Bommarito, president of the United Rubber Workers, is one of the lesser known labor leaders, which doesn't bother him as much as the danger that many of his rank and file membership don't know why they belong to a union at all.

More than 70,000 members of the Rubber Workers—with headquarters in Akron, Ohio, but more than 160,000 members spread over the country—are now under 25 years of age.

What in hell do they know about their union, President Pete demanded of a series of off-the-record conferences of middle leadership in his union? Very little, he says. They know nothing of what preceded them in this vale of insecurity. Nor will the union equivalent of flag-waving rouse them to an understanding of the advantages of their trade union.

"What can this young person be expected to know of the Great Depression, the sweatshops, the sitdown strikes . . . ? Many of the benefits for which union members struggled, bled and died were here when this young person arrived—so he easily assumes the benefits he enjoys always existed."

So the simple appeal to labor history, said Mr. Bommarito, cannot be expected to excite a young member to embrace unionism with passion. The appeal must be to the present: "Before he really accepts unionism, he is going to have to recognize it as a helpful method of getting at the things bothering him today."

He makes a point by recalling that in the late 1930's and early 1940's, men and women did not rush to join the unions just because the Knights of Labor had had a tough time of it in the last decades of the 19th century. The motivations of the 1930's were much more immediate.

The union leader's warning to his associate in long earnest meetings runs something like this:

"Young people will be concerned with issues that affect their way of life. If they find in our union a means of self-expression, a vehicle that will carry them toward participation, as full partners in our society, they probably will begin to develop respect for our union and its programs . . . If our union leaders just take their membership for granted because the contract has a union shop clause and a dues checkoff—then they will react with hostility."

This communication gap between the young members and the older Turks in the union, said Mr. Bommarito, can only be widened by impatiently hollering. "Why don't they understand, why don't they understand?" To which Mr. Bommarito replies: "If they don't understand, then you haven't really told them. You've just been talking to yourself."

Such a soliloquy is a dangerous artform for a union leader, Mr. Bommarito says. He urges that the union waste no time in starting an aggressive program of "new" and novel ways of involving young people in union affairs.

"We must make it clear that the union is their ally in the struggle for self-fulfillment. We must create for the young of this generation the same kind of opportunities for leadership expression of idealism that once were given us," Mr. Bommarito said.

"Most young people today are impatient, more independent and more aggressive than most people of the older generation. If they are interested in something, if they really want it, they will go after it and count the cost later. Young people may not know much about 'solidarity forever', but they do know when they are being used. They resent injustice. They want to be heard. But that does not automatically lead them toward organization. They do not pound on the doors of union halls asking to be let in. Perhaps more of them would do so, but for one little fact—many of them do not yet know what a union is. It's our job to tell them."

That, said Mr. Bommarito, is what his union has set out to do. So, let's see how they do it.

THE CENSUS QUESTION

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a friend and constituent of mine, Mr. Karl O. Spiess, of Arlington, Va., recently called my attention to two editorials which he feels should have the wider distribution gained by insertion in the RECORD.

The first is an editorial from the Wall Street Journal, dated July 7, 1969, relative to the census question. The second, from the New York Times of July 4, 1969, concerns a doctrine somewhat lacking in this age of violent dissent.

The two editorials read as follows:

THE INDEPENDENT SPIRIT IN AMERICA

(By James Reston)

EDGARTOWN, MASS., July 3.—The spirit of independence is obviously strong in the American people this year. It is not the old "my country right or wrong" patriotism of the past—though this endures much more than the flag-burners think—but there has seldom been a time in American history when so many people in this country were publishing their own declarations of independence.

They are at it in the Congress, in the churches, and the universities. Everywhere, authority is being questioned and even challenged and defied. Presidents and priests, party leaders and chairmen of the board, city bosses, pompous editors, headmasters, and all other Establishment characters are in trouble.

The question on this year's "glorious Fourth" is whether this modern spirit of independence in America is destroying us or saving us. Who is the "patriot" on this Fourth of July—the protester who is defying the sordid horrors of the war in Vietnam or the man who says, right or wrong, let's go along?

THE FUNDAMENTALS

You can argue it either way, but the main point is that the country is probably strong enough to handle the independent spirit of the American people, no matter how violent. The country goes on. It listens to the President and occasionally to the press and the protesters of the right and left in Washington and the universities, but mainly it deals with the fundamentals of family and community life.

For a minority of Americans, family and community life are intolerable. In fact, they are a disgrace, particularly for the Negroes, but the Negroes are finally expressing the independent spirit too, and the nation has to listen to them, whether it likes it or not.

The violence in the universities dramatizes the same independent spirit. It often gets out of hand. It can be silly and destructive, but it is trying to say something important.

It is saying, I think, that the spirit of independence is not merely a national Fourth of July celebration. It is often saying this very badly, but it is asserting what it feels to be a "new patriotism"—not of the nation alone, but of the human family.

This is not a wholly new idea. Loyalty began with the family and expanded to the tribe, the community, the state, and the region. It went on in ever-widening circles as the human mind expanded. It is going on now, for good or bad, to the even wider circle beyond nations to the world.

NEW WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

At least, this is one more expression of the independent American spirit. The country was founded on it and still makes room for it, on the right and on the left.

So we are having in the process a tremendous battle between opinion and authority, between the individual and the state, between loyalty to the nation and loyalty to mankind.

This is a rough business, but the spirit of independence in America is strong, and we shouldn't knock it on the Fourth of July, for that is what America is all about.

NO MYTH HERE

In suggesting there's something uncomfortably sweeping about the laws allowing the Census Bureau to ask whatever it wants and compel everyone to answer, we once asked, "Shall we become a nation where the government can jail anyone who declines to discuss the condition of his plumbing?"

We now find ourselves called to task by columnist Sylvia Porter, in an article based on an interview with a census official and entitled, at least in New York, "Census: Count the Myths." Here we find ourselves in the uncomfortable company of an otherwise unidentified "Southern newspaper" and a "recorded telephone message," both spreading malicious nonsense about the forthcoming census.

The fact is, though, that the Government *can* throw a citizen in jail for refusing to discuss the state of his plumbing. To be sure, it has never done so. The 60-day jail sentence for refusing to answer census questions has never been imposed, and the $100 fine only rarely. Yet there is the law.

After telling us the compulsory provisions practically never need to be enforced, census officials next tell us the same provisions are absolutely necessary to statistical accuracy and the common weal. Also they add that we can trust them; they would never pry.

Well, some of us still believe the civics books maxims about a government of laws being preferable to a government of men. And in establishing the purity of present census-takers, Miss Porter provides a dandy illustration of the unwisdom of leaving everything to bureaucratic discretion.

She reports, "In 1880 and 1890, individuals were asked [such] questions as whether they often had to be restrained by a strait-jacket; the head size of any 'idiot' in the family; whether the respondent was 'habitually intemperate,' a 'tramp,' 'syphilitic,' or a 'habitual drunkard.' Now that was nosy!"

You bet it was; and the laws that allowed it are still on the books.

POSTAL CORPORATION

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the issues that seems to be developing considerable controversy in the 17th Congressional District of California is the administration's proposed Postal Corporation.

As an example of this controversy, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues, first, a letter from the Torrance Postal Union of the National Postal Union, Post Office Box 3705, Torrance, Calif. Second, I would like to bring to their attention an article from the Gardena Valley News, Gardena, Calif., dated July 9, 1969, reflecting the position of Mr. Cruz Sosa, president of Local 1239, United Federation of Postal Clerks, AFL-CIO.

The above referred-to letter and the newspaper article follow:

JULY 10, 1969.

HON. GLENN ANDERSON,
San Pedro, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: Please accept this letter as an expression of opposition to the President's proposed corporation plan. The National Postal Union, California Postal Union, and Torrance Postal Union are vitally concerned about this Corporation Plan because it appears that for the first time the Corporation idea will receive some serious consideration in Congress. Our opposition is not so much to the Corporation Idea as to "this" Corporation Plan in particular, and for the following reasons.

First must come the decision as to whether Post Office is to provide a "service" or a "profit." If the answer is "service" then much needs to be done to improve the lot, not merely the economics, of the Postal Employees which this Corporate plan does not do, for he is the one who actually performs this "service" and upon his selection, training, and skills will depend the success or failure of this venture. If the answer is to be "profit" then how much and what kind of service will be provided, and or curtailed, and at what price to insure a "profit"? Providing either adequate service or insuring a profit will involve or affect the employee a great deal and there is very little if anything for the employee in this Corporation Plan. Forgetting the "Right to Strike," there is not even the assurance of Binding Arbitration (Mr. Blount's testimony before full House P.O. & Civil Service Committee), and the loss of Civil Service Benefits—except for existing Retirement benefits—leaves the employee with a "Whole lot Less" than at present, which is pretty bad at best.

Right now there is the feeling among the Union ranks that the Postal Department is an embarrassment to the Administration and this is an opportunity to "dump" it. It is also our view that this would be very unwise at this time because there are also a number of Proposals, including your own Union Recognition by Law H.R. 9702, that deal with most of the Dep't's problems and I believe a lot more effectively as well as a lot less expensively in the long run. If a Corporate Structure is necessary or beneficial at the top of the Department, why cut the legs from under it with the poor Labor-Management situation now in effect?

It is our hope that you concur with our findings and will oppose this Corporation Plan.

Sincerely,
FRANK A. DUSSEL, Jr.,
President, Torrance Postal Union.
CARLITA R. WOOD,
Secretary, Torrance Postal Union.

[From the Gardena Valley News, July 9, 1969]

LOCAL POSTAL CLERKS OPPOSE CORPORATION

The nations organized postal clerks are mustering "active opposition" in Congress against the Administration's postal corporation bill "for what it fails to do," a top union official said here today.

Cruz Sosa, President of Gardena Local 1239, United Federation of Postal Clerks, AFL-CIO, listed three major objections to pending legislation which would convert the postal service into a Government corporation:

"First," President Sosa said, "it fails to give employees the right to strike even though we would no longer have civil service status.

"Secondly, it fails to give us unilateral access to binding arbitration.

"Third, it fails to establish true wage comparability with private industry prior to the transfer of employee into the corporate structure."

"MAKES US SCAPEGOATS"

The Gardena local spokesman cited an additional reason why the union, which represents the nation's 300,000 postal clerks, is mobilizing opposition to the bill in its present form.

"It would definitely make employees public scapegoats," Sosa explained, "by tying postal rates to every future salary increase."

"In other words," he added, "postal employees would be the only large group of Federal workers whose wages and fringe benefits would depend on the Corporation's ability to pay, either at the level of current rates (doubtful) or by forcing the public to pay increased fees for mail service."

Cruz Sosa, President, Gardena Local 1239, said the union's national leadership had reached its decision "reluctantly" and "only after fruitless consultation with top postal officials in Washington and a thorough study of the legislation itself."

RECOGNIZE NEED

He charged that "the Postmaster General himself has failed to give any consideration to the fact that even with the meager 4.1% pay increase effective in mid-July postal clerks are still more than $800-a-year behind their counterparts in the private sector as of June, 1968—to say nothing of the astronomical rise in living costs during the 13 months since that time."

President Sosa emphasized that postal employees "do recognize the needs for postal reform," and are supporting the Postal Reform Act (H.R. 4) proposed by Representative Thaddeus J. Dulski (D-N.Y.), Chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee."

He said even this bill needs to be amended, however, to establish statutory labor-management procedures and true collective bargaining for postal workers in place of the "very limited, management-weighted bargaining presently in effect through a Presidential Executive Order."

BILL TO COMPENSATE OUR SERVICEMEN IN KOREA

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I have been concerned for some time with the dangerous plight of our American servicemen in Korea. In light of the appalling war in Vietnam, we have a tendency to forget that Korea continues to be a hostile area in which tenuous peace is often shattered by attacks near the demilitarized zone. Only when we are faced with devastating matters such as the *Pueblo* incident do we open our eyes to the unhappy fact that Korea is as dangerous to our servicemen as Vietnam.

As you are aware, I have filed H.R. 9636 which would provide servicemen in and around Korea with tax exemptions comparable to those received by men serving in Vietnam. Over 200 Congressmen have cosponsored it, I might point out.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a June 30 New York Times article which supports the need to compensate our servicemen in Korea who face such continual hazards:

SOUTH KOREAN TROOPS GUARD LONELY 36-MILE STRETCH OF CHAIN FENCE

(By Takashi Oka)

KOSON, SOUTH KOREA.—"Vigilance!" shouted the sentinel guarding a gun emplacement on the beach of this lonely, beautiful coast, the eastern anchor of the 151-mile demilitarized zone that separates South Korea from North Korea.

Vigilance is the watchword of the 12th Republic of Korea Division, which mans the easternmost 36 miles of the demilitarized zone. It is the longest sector held by one division and has the most rugged terrains along the demalitarized zone.

INCIDENTS INCREASE

"We anticipate North Korea will try to penetrate through the demilitarized zone and our security positions along the coast," said Col. S. Kim, assistant division commander. "Last year there were more than 200 incidents involving North Korean soldiers in my division area."

Last year was described by the United Nations command in Korea as the "bloodiest" since the 1953 armistice, which halted the fighting but brought no formal conclusion to the Korean war. In the last few years the North Koreans have stepped up their efforts to send agents into the south in what is regarded as an attempt to set up bases for guerrilla warfare.

Reaction Base 70—where the colonel was standing—sits atop a small hill overlooking the eastern end of the demilitarized zone. At the crest on the hill is a small wooden structure, which was the original guard post.

Below it, tunneled through the hill, are concrete bunkers connected by narrow underground passageways. The base, manned day and night by a 36-man platoon, was built five months ago at a cost of two million won (about $7,150). Similar bases line the demilitarized zone from east to west, keeping guard over the chain link fence that has recently been built along the entire length of the zone.

The view from the base is spectacular. The eastern end of the chain link fence—built two years ago when North Korea stepped up attempts to infiltrate the South—marches across a stretch of beach and sinks into the Sea of Japan just below the base. Beyond the fence is a two-and-a-half-mile no-man's land, the demilitarized zone. Beyond that North Korea begins.

The coastline in this area, both north and south of the zone, is a series of gently curving beaches alternating with hillgirt promontories. It was off this deceptively quiet coast, about 90 miles to the northwest, that the United States intelligence ship *Pueblo* was seized by the North Koreans in January, 1968.

Inland, the mountains are sharp and steep. The chain link fence runs up and down the hills, and sometimes clings to their sides. It reminds a visitor of the Great Wall of China, and its message is similar: Keep out.

"The fence is useful," Colonel Kim said. "We also have claymore mines to trip infiltrators, flares, guns with starlight scopes, and early detection devices of various kinds. But our most important asset is our men—here in this platoon, and others like them."

PATROLS ARE NERVOUS

"It takes the enemy only 30 seconds to slit a hole in the fence, once he gets there," the colonel went on. "But we have men patrolling night and day right up to the mili-

XUM

tary demarcation line [the actual frontier with North Korea, running down the exact center of the demilitarized zone. As long as our boys stay awake and alive the enemy can't break through."

Sgt. Kim Moo-nam, a slim, straight-backed sentry peering out at the DMZ with binoculars, said that he and his comrades were often nervous when they went out on night patrol.

"A couple of nights ago," he said, "we heard a rustling reaction. We waited all night, nervous as hell. The next morning, we found a dead boar."

Sergeant Kim rises at 6 A.M., goes through a brief basic drill, has breakfast, trains throughout the morning, cleans his weapons, and has lunch. In the afternoon he goes out on patrol for two or three hours, and again at night.

He has been in the army three years, and has a month more to go before being discharged in July. Before entering the army, he worked in a paper mill. He expects to go back to this job.

USE OF DDT CONDEMNED

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the July 1, 1969, issue of Conservation News, a newsletter published by the National Wildlife Federation, carries a news item reporting that a distinguished group of biologists at Stanford University had joined together to condemn the continued use of DDT and other chlorinated hydrocarbons. I feel that the report on the Stanford biologists' views would be of considerable interest to my colleagues and, therefore, I insert the text of the Conservation News article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STANFORD BIOLOGISTS SLAM DDT

The undersigned members of the Department of Biological Sciences of Stanford University condemn the continued use of DDT and other chlorinated hydrocarbons. We deplore recent efforts by the agricultural chemicals industry and its trade publications to discredit responsible scientists who are calling attention to the dangers of the dispersal and accumulation of these chemical compounds. The evidence is overwhelming that these persistant substances threaten the ecological systems upon which human life depends. Recent studies also suggest that chlorinated hydrocarbons which are now being stored in human tissues may have direct harmful effects on man himself. A list of scientific references supporting these statements is available on request from this Department.

Donald Kennedy, Professor and Executive Head.
Donald P. Abbott, Professor.
Isabella Abbott, Lecturer.
Marcia K. Allen, Instructor.
Allan M. Campbell, Professor.
Elizabeth M. Center, Instructor.
Paul R. Ehrlich, Professor.
David Epel, Assistant Professor.
John A. Hendrickson, Jr., Instructor.
Malvern Gilmartin, Professor.
Richard W. Holm, Professor.
Welton L. Lee, Assistant Professor.
Harold Mooney, Associate Professor.
Joseph F. Oliphant, Professor.
John H. Phillips, Associate Professor.
Peter Raven, Associate Professor.
Peter M. Ray, Professor.
John H. Thomas, Lecturer and Curator.
Donald M. Wilson, Professor.
Charles Yanofsky, Professor.

(Also signed by 59 Post-doctoral fellows, research fellows, associates and graduate students.)

THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION AND THE WAR IN VIETNAM

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, I am not very impressed with those who continually allege that this administration has done nothing to solve the Vietnam war. The Nixon administration has done more than the previous two administrations—who inadvertently involved us in this open end commitment in Vietnam—to reach lasting peace in Southeast Asia. It has combined long-range goals of regional peace with the immediate and pressing task of stopping the war. This administration has demonstrated its willingness quite patently, and I would like to enumerate the commendable efforts of both this Government and the South Vietnamese Government to bring the war to an end:

First, prior to January 20, we halted the bombing of North Vietnam and agreed to sit down at the conference table with the NFL, as well as the governments of Hanoi and Saigon.

Second, we remained at the table and refrained from resumption of the bombing despite Hanoi's shelling of South Vietnamese major cities, its violation of the demilitarized zone, and its refusal to deal with the Saigon government.

Third, on March 25, Thieu offered to meet with the NFL for private talks without preconditions on a political settlement.

Fourth, on May 14, with Thieu's support, the President put forward an eight-point plan for peace. It included the renouncement of reliance on a military solution, the offer of withdrawal of U.S. and allied forces within 12 months under international guarantees, and emphasis on our desire only to secure the right of the people of South Vietnam to determine their own future without outside interference.

Fifth, on June 8, the President announced the withdrawal of 25,000 U.S. combat troops.

Sixth, at Midway, both Thieu and the President declared their readiness to accept any political outcome arrived at through free elections.

Seventh, Thieu has now offered a concrete program by which free elections can be held and the will of the South Vietnamese people can be determined.

I also want to commend the South Vietnamese Government for their cooperation and realism in adopting a workable and flexible policy in negotiating peace.

Now the burden of proof rests with the Communists. They have not demonstrated both in the immediate and far past any desire to conclude the war. The allies have repeatedly demonstrated their willingness to negotiate and end the war. Let the Communists demonstrate their earnestness to end the war.

CURRENT POSTAL RESEARCH

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago, with my full support, the Congress enacted legislation which finally gave status in the Post Office Department to its vital research and engineering activity.

Great strides have been made in the Department under that law, although—as is being made abundantly clear in our current full committee hearings on postal reform—there is still much to be done. The Department needs to have more authority, particularly over its financial affairs, if it is to really do the job at hand.

Nevertheless, progress has been made and much of the credit very properly can go to the original assistant postmaster general for research and engineering, Dr. Leo S. Packer, who regrettably was not continued in the new administration this year. Dr. Packer and his staff have laid an excellent foundation.

A story of the postal research work appears in the July 1969 issue of Government Executive, and I include the text of the story as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT'S ENTRY TO RESEARCH IS RECENT, PRACTICAL AND CONSERVATIVE

Only 3 years ago, Congress passed Public Law 89–492 to "encourage, advance and accelerate the research and development and construction engineering programs of the (Post Office) Department and to improve the administration of those programs." It was overdue.

The Department developed a basic plan to accelerate the application of modern technology to solve some of its outstanding problems, and divided it into four general elements:

It expanded technical program inputs to bear down on those problems which "are amenable to technological solutions."

In-house R&D capability was expanded and improved in such areas as conducting tests and evaluations of new equipment and systems in realistic environments.

It adopted a systems approach developed by the Department of Defense.

It expanded application of professional engineering talents in the field.

THE SORTING PROCESS

"The basic plan was primarily a simple one," Paul G. Hendrickson, Director of Operations for the Department and Acting Assistant Postmaster General, Bureau of Research and Engineering, told the House Subcommittee on Appropriations earlier this year, "and remains essentially the same."

In the last year, the Department let a major systems engineering contract to get advanced concepts for the processing of letter, flat mail and parcel post, as well as the collection and delivery systems. "This work should continue into Fiscal Year 1972," said

Hendrickson, "with the concept for an advanced letter mail processing system to be provided this year, followed by the parcel post and flat mail processing and collection and delivery systems concepts in Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971."

To understand some of the problems, Hendrickson cited the six-step procedure for mail handling, during an interview with *Government Executive*. "It is done fairly much by the numbers," he said:

1—The mail is flattened out so that it will be able to go through a letter sorting machine (LSM).

2—The envelope is "faced"—address side up, stamp in the canceling position.

3—The stamp is canceled.

4—A manual operation follows in that the letters are taken to the LSM for reading by the machine.

5—The machine sorts the mail according to areas of the country.

6—The letters are then "swept" manually into bundles and tied and placed in a sack.

"The manual operations," he observed, "are the holes in the present system. We believe we can get better equipment and do a more reliable job." (Of automation, he said: "We can stop the pyramiding of hiring a lot of people, but we have never believed we could eliminate jobs.")

Of specific machinery that will modernize the Department, the Bureau is working on:

ADVANCED OPTICAL CHARACTER READERS

Three design study contracts have been awarded, to process a much larger percentage of business mail. About 75 percent of post office business is done by large business, Hendrickson told *Government Executive*. "Even the third class [junk] mail is pretty good for us to handle. It is uniform size—unless there is a coupon on it or samples in it. Third class mail helps smooth out the work load; it can be set aside and processed later, when the higher class mail dwindles." (*Government Executive*, April 1969, p. 26).

(Of the ZIP codes, he said that in major post offices, non-ZIP mail is set aside to be handled by specially trained people—especially in large cities. Many times it misses a train because of this. "So," he said, "you're taking a chance.")

SMALL LETTER SORTING MACHINES

"We have over 250 of the multiple position machines in post offices right now. These are large machines about 70-feet long. One of our new programs is getting a six-position machine which can do the same job at about the same cost for the smaller post offices, which don't have the space of floor loading capacity that permits the use of a big machine.

"We are going to develop an electronic memory that can be replaced in the older units and included in newer letter sorting machines."

CODE SORTING

Said Hendrickson: "We believe the letters in the future will be delivered by a coding system. Every letter that comes into a post office now is treated as if it never went through another—even if it had in some different area. With a coding system, the mail will pass the facing and canceling operation and go directly to the decoders. It would automatically sequence the mail—down through the carrier, who now spends about an hour sequencing his own delivery by street and number."

The coding system is not a new one: Australia and Germany both use it; most of the large oil companies use it for billing.

"The machines, therefore, are already developed," Hendrickson said. "The Department would buy off-the-shelf equipment and use it in conjunction with other equipment it has in the system."

Another post office official told Congress: "We believe this may also reduce the amount of training required to operate the letter sorting part of the process." Budget restrictions this year curtail the start on the scale "that it demands."

In a move to improve the letter sorting process, the Post Office Department let a $3.9-million contract with the Vurroughts Defense, Space and Special Systems Group in Paoli, Pa., for the production and installation of 39 sorting machines in 36 post offices across the Nation.

PARCEL SORTING MACHINES

The Department has completed some engineering tests on a new tilted belt parcel sorter—the first of its kind in the U.S. It is American-made prototype, built in modular form.

"The preliminary tests indicate that we really should go ahead and get finally engineered units of each of the modules so that we can build parcel sorters for whatever post office requirements we may have, using the erector set kit of pieces," the witnesss told Congress. "We plan to do the final engineering on this system in the coming year."

MORGAN STATION FIRE

Conveyer belt handling of packages and heavy sacks of mails is an overdue project, Hendrickson indicated to *Government Executive*. "A large industrial (human) engineering program is now going on throughout the country—in all post offices."

Records show that a post office is generally an unsafe area to work. Officials started to look at this when the Morgan Station (Long Island) fire destroyed the office in late 1967. There were no casualties, but there could have been.

The Department is now going back to 50 large post offices to find out what the hazards are and to develop new designs.

The medical report of "casualties" closely examined during the study turned up an unexpected number of cases of hernias and mashed toes. This put a heavier emphasis on the studies under way. "It wasn't until we looked at the safety records and discovered the loss of time that we got concerned and found out why." Many women are hired by the Department to handle mail; they do not get special privileges, in this regard, "and they don't ask for any."

For the past two years, the Department has held symposia for industry to acquaint the business community with what it is trying to do. "This is patterned after something the Department of Defense has been doing for years," Hendrickson said.

"We started this in 1967 and we had one this year." About 200 firms participated in 1967 and about 300 last year. As an indication of the results here, when we first started we had about 34 contractors who were doing research and development work for the Post Office. Today, we have somewhere around 130 to 135 research and development contracts. So we have expanded our program into the business world and we have gotten a lot of attention."

Despite this involvement in mechanization, Hendrickson said: "Our prime job is not equipment development, but in getting equipment maintained, operated and managed correctly. We have enough equipment to handle mechanizing the post offices thoughout the country, but we don't have enough people to maintain, operate and manage.

"We get a new piece of equipment, for example, and the contractor provides a maintenance man for a year at a salary of $12 to $13 thousand. Then the post office hires a man at $7 to $8 thousand under training—and when he is trained, he becomes valuable to industry." A solution to this dilemma would appear to make the trained man's salary competitive with industry, but this point was not commented on.

There is an inadequacy in laboratory facilities. He told Congress: "Last year we came to you and said we had a plan. We still have that plan. At the present time we have 30,000 feet of test faclity over the Washington Post Office. We feel that this is totally inadequate for our use. We need to be near a live mail facility." The Bureau is not allowed to test equipment in a post office. "Until we can," he said, "we cannot really show as rapid progress as we should."

THE BUDGET

Of future budget requirements, Hendrickson told Congress: "We have a five-year budget that continues to rise for the next two or three years. It was felt that this budget was nearing as much as could be handled this year. We could have handled a little more than this, perhaps, but this is a start. I think we are going to project about twice this amount before we are through."

And of advanced planning and the techniques being used by the Department: "For some time we did not really know where we needed to work. In short, we did not really know where we were. We have now defined where we are. We know what we are working on and what programs we are going to have for the near future. We now have to look to see where the payoff is going to be in the future and we are defining that now."

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the floor today on the occasion of our observance of Captive Nations Week to pay special tribute to the 100 million people behind the Iron Curtain who are forced to bear the heavy yoke of communism. It is also a time to renew our opposition to the cruel Soviet policy of maintaining a tight Communist stranglehold on East and Central Europe.

The people of East and Central Europe who comprise the countries of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania have traditionally been a self-governing people who thrived on intellectual, religious, and economic freedom. Innovation, piety, and prosperity which were once the conspicuous hallmarks of a people in love with life are now, under Russian tutelage, only sporadically discernible. While the Russian overlords have spared no device in their nefarious scheme to enslave these freedom-loving peoples, the recurrent need for the Russians to use brutal force shows upon what fragile support their Communist "order" rests.

That the 100 million people of East and Central Europe have maintained their desire and love for freedom is a tremendous tribute to a brave people whose spirit will not and cannot be forced into submission.

The necessity of our maintaining a constant awareness and concern for the plight of the peoples caught behind the Iron Curtain and the continuing threat of Soviet dominance was illustrated with absolute clarity in August of 1968 when Czechoslovakia, in the throes of unshackling its restive democratic spirit, was brutally and ruthlessly crushed by a

XUM

Russian invasion and occupation. The Russian action provided free nations of the world with a hard lesson, and we should never allow the significance of that brutal event to diminish in our minds. In this 11th observance of Captive Nations Week we pay special tribute to the Czech people and pledge our solidarity with their goals and aspirations. Their undying democratic spirit is lauded by free men everywhere.

Today, I received a letter from Mrs. Ann Zemleduch Muryn, a constituent concerned with the plight of persons caught behind the Iron Curtain. She eloquently stated what I think Captive Nations Week signifies when she wrote:

> The list of captive nations is long, but someday those who are the captives will become freed from their bondage, for the spark of freedom has not died in their breasts. As witness the Czechoslovakians this year. All these nations will once again raise their own flags, for even while they have borne their chains and shackles these many years, even these bands of steel will break.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, since the end of the last war the Soviet Union has become the captor and jailer, the oppressor and tormentor of tens of millions of helpless peoples in Europe in their homelands. Even before the end of that war some peoples in Eastern Europe had already been drawn within the Soviet network, but both these victims and their sympathizers in the West hoped that soon these peoples would be freed. Unfortunately, however, events took a decidedly different turn, and instead of succeeding in their attempt to free these peoples, the governments of the West witnessed the postwar enslavement of the Czechoslovak and Hungarian people. Gradually the Iron Curtain, raised by the Soviet Union between the East and the West, became stabilized and the isolation of 100 million souls from the free West was completed.

Many have hoped that the passage of time would gradually erode this barrier but the cruel crushing of the Hungarian revolution in 1956 and last summer's invasion of Czechoslovakia clearly show the Soviet Union's consistent dedication to the domination and oppression of the captive nations.

The governments of the West are most anxious to help these peoples to regain their freedom. For more than two decades we have tried to negotiate with the Soviet Union for the betterment of the lot of these peoples, but our efforts have proved abortive. The Soviets have not even shown any willingness to negotiate in earnest about the fate of these nations, declaring that these peoples, living under "people's democracies" in their homelands, are "free and enjoy the overall protection of the Soviet Union." Of course such talk has not deterred the statesmen of the West, and they have done their utmost to keep the issue alive in international diplomatic circles. But the Government of this Republic has done something definite to do just that, hoping that it will eventually help the cause of the captive nations in Europe.

In a joint congressional resolution and by a Presidential proclamation the Captive Nations Week was established in 1959, to be observed in the third week of July of each year. By enacting this joint resolution the Congress and the President were not only carrying out the wishes of the people of this country, but they were also carrying out our fine tradition of showing our utmost sympathy for the oppressed peoples. I am indeed proud to say that we have always felt, and still feel, that the cause of the captive nations is a righteous cause, a just and noble cause, a humane and humanitarian cause, and I am glad to participate in its observance on the 10th anniversary of the Captive Nations Week.

THE MOON SHOT

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we have all been hearing and watching and reading so much about the moon shot that one is almost at a loss to be able to add anything further.

However, yesterday morning when I had, along with my colleagues, the opportunity to personally view this spectacular launch, I fully realized, perhaps for the first time, how stupendous and unbelievable the achievement of blasting off from this earth actually was. The experience was far beyond my expectations and I noted that most of the surrounding audience, seasoned legislators, hardened Government officials, and worldly diplomats were all deeply affected by the incredible magnitude of the launch. It was certainly a day that I shall never forget and it will stand out as the most exciting event that I have ever witnessed.

I also had a personal interest in this particular historic launch, because Col. Buzz Aldrin, who will be the second man ever to set foot on the moon, comes from Montclair, N.J., a fine town in my congressional district. I know that I was, by my presence, representing the hopes and prayers of the people of Montclair for the safety and success of this historic exploration into outer space.

Colonel Aldrin himself has set the tone of his adventure in a very low-key yet profound manner when he said:

> I see my part in the first lunar landing less in a romantic and personal way and more as a contribution to increasing knowledge and the understanding of future generations. Such a long-range contribution may be less celebrated than being first to land on the moon, but it may be more significant.

POST-WORLD WAR II OPPRESSION OF UKRAINE BY COMMUNIST RUSSIA

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on this 10th anniversary of the resolution which established Captive Nations Week, it is timely to take a look back at the oppression of the Ukraine by Soviet Russia which has occurred since World War II.

A summary of this oppression is a feature of the July 1969 issue of the WACL Bulletin, published in Seoul, Korea, by the World Anti-Communist League. Following is the text:

Post-World War II Oppression of Ukraine by Communist Russia

STALIN'S REVENGE ON UKRAINE

As the Soviet Union emerged one of the great victors over Nazi Germany, Stalin took pains to make it clear that the Soviet victory had been achieved by the Great Russians almost exclusively. Consequently, he initiated bloody purges and persecution in the non-Russian republics. The autonomous republics of the Crimean Tartars and the Volga Germans were liquidated as their punishment for collaboration with the Germans, a fate which likewise befell the autonomous oblasts of the Chechens and Ingushes in the Caucasus. (cf. Communist Takeover and Occupation of Ukraine, Special Report No. 4, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1955).

But Stalin's vengeance was wholly pschopathic in Ukraine. His promises of "national concessions" to Ukraine were soon forgotten. The MVD (the new name for the NKVD) hounded all those Ukrainians who were supporting the UPA—a herculean task, indeed. Moscow ordered wholesale requisitions of all foodstuffs in Ukraine and called up a general mobilization of all men from 16 to 60—this was before the final collapse of Germany. Thousands, untrained and ill-armed, were slaughtered under the fire of German tanks and guns.

(a) Fight against the UPA:

One of the primary tasks of the Soviet troops was to liquidate the Ukrainian underground resistance. Special detachments, known as istrebitels ("exterminators"), hunted members of the OUN (whom the Reds called "Banderites," after Stephen Bandera, OUN leader) and the UPA.

The underground warfare of the UPA embraced the Western regions of Galicia, the frontier zones of both sides of the Curzon line and the Carpathian Mountains, including some areas of Carpatho-Ukraine and Slovakia. The fighting raged for several months, despite constant appeals on the part of Khrushchev and Manuilsky to Ukrainian insurgents to lay down their arms, automatic pardon being their reward. Since there were no surrenders, the Soviet command mounted large-scale offensives with as many as 30,000 special troops. Through the spring and summer of 1945 entire Soviet divisions were engaged in combating the UPA. In 1946 General Vasyl Ryasny, the Minister of Interior of the Ukrainian SSR, threw large contingents of MVD troops into the fray. In 1947 the seemingly unconquerable UPA units ambushed and killed General Karol Swierczewski, Polish Defense Minister ("General Walter" of the Spanish Civil War).

On May 17, 1947, a tripartite agreement was signed between the USSR, Poland and Czechoslovakia, whereby all three Communist governments agreed to join forces in putting down the Ukrainian guerrilla forces. This blow proved too much even for the Ukrainian spirit to sustain. Hundreds of the underground fighters were killed, several hundred others escaped through Czechoslovakia to West Germany or simply faded away throughout the USSR. On March 5, 1950, Soviet security troops ambushed and killed the UPA Supreme Commander, General Taras Chuprynka, in Western Ukraine.

It is estimated by Ukrainian guerrilla warfare specialists that by 1950 some 36,000 Soviet officers and enlisted men of the security forces had fallen at the hands of UPA freedom fighters. Although large-scale operations and raids by the UPA subsided after 1950, underground resistance, under different forms and techniques, exists to this very day.

(b) Destruction of Ukrainian Catholic Church:

Another form of Stalin's revenge over the Ukrainian population was his savage destruction of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine.

After the death of Metropolitan Andrew Sheptytsky on November 1, 1944, his successor Metropolitan Joseph Slipy tried to preserve the church and its 5,000,000 Catholic faithful within the existing Soviet laws and constitution. But in 1945 the MVD arrested all the Ukrainian Catholic Bishops: Metropolitan Joseph Slipy, Bishops Gregory Chomyshyn, Ivan Latyshevsky, Gregory Lakota, Mykola Charnetsky, Mykyta Budka, many other high-ranking prelates, and a number of priests, monks and nuns—all on the spurious charges of "collaboration" with the Nazis or of supporting the UPA. In 1946 a Soviet-approved committee of a few apostate priests and laymen, called a "synod" at which they abolished the Union of Brest (1596), by which the Ukrainian Catholic Church had been reunited with the Roman Catholic Church. They liquidated all church properties and schools, closed monasteries, and imposed the Russian Orthodox Church upon the Catholic population of Western Ukraine. Subsequently, other Ukrainian Catholic bishops were arrested or killed, such as Bishop Josaphat Kotsylovsky, who was arrested by the Polish security police and handed over to the Soviet government, and Bishop Theodore G. Romzha, who was killed in Carpatho-Ukraine.

Of 11 Ukrainian Catholic bishops only Metropolitan Joseph Slipy survived. Released in 1963 upon the direct intervention of Pope John XXIII, he was first made Archbishop Major, then Cardinal; he now resides in Rome.

(c) Cultural Russification:

Once the Soviet government had reorganized after the critical war years, it again commenced a shrewd and systematic policy of Russification in Ukraine. The Ukrainian language, although the official language of the Ukrainian SSR, was discriminated against. The so-called "linguistic theory" of Stalin was introduced to justify the Russian language as an "international language"; above all, it was the "language of Lenin" and the "language of Communism." Russian books, art, plays, films flooded Ukraine in unprecedented fashion. Ukrainian history and literature were ordered to be revised in order to demonstrate their dependence in the past, present and future in the "elder Russian brothers."

(d) Economic Exploitation:

Although Ukraine had been ravaged by World War II, the Soviet government paid scant attention to the economic needs of the Ukrainian people. It did restore a certain number of factories, mines and hydro-electric plants which had been destroyed by the war. But enormous quantities of machinery which had been moved to the east from Ukraine were never returned to Ukraine. Under the pretext of bringing in sorely-needed specialized personnel and technicians, Stalin inundated Ukraine with Russians, while Ukrainian technicians, specialists and engineers were dispatched to other parts of the USSR.

In its agricultural policy the Kremlin revived and tightened the collective farm regime, making life on them even more unbearable. Western Ukraine and parts of Volhynia and Carpatho-Ukraine were collectivized, and all those Ukrainian farmers who showed the slightest opposition were sent to slave labor camps in Siberia and Kazakhstan.

2. UKRAINE UNDER KHRUSHCHEV'S RULE

(a) "De-Stalinization," "Thaw" and Ukraine:

The death of Joseph Stalin on March 5, 1953, ushered in a new and uneasy period in the history of the USSR and of Ukraine. "Collective leadership" in the Kremlin masked a bitter struggle for supremacy. An early casualty of the intra-party struggle was Leonid Melnikov, abruptly dismissed as secretary general of the Communist Party of Ukraine. He was publicly charged with forcing the Russification of Western Ukraine, a charge brought to the fore for the first time anywhere. He was replaced by Alexander Kirichenko, the first native Ukrainian ever to hold this post. With the execution of Lavrenti Beria and the dumping of Georgi Malenkov, the surviving contestants, Khrushchev and Bulganin, embarked upon a policy of "peaceful coexistence" abroad and "peace" with their own hapless citizenry at home.

In 1954 Khrushchev, Stalin's "iron man" in Ukraine in 1938 and the holder of direct responsibility for many of the crimes committed against the Ukrainian people, began a new policy toward Ukraine. He now sought to woo Ukrainians by granting some nominal concessions and by cautiously following and espousing certain pro-Ukrainian policies, all with the obvious intent of appeasing the ever-recalcitrant Ukrainians.

On the occasion of the 300th anniversary of the Treaty of Pereyaslav (1654), the Communist Party came up with new "theses" on the relations between Russia and Ukraine. Advanced was a "theory" to the effect that Kievan Rus had given rise to three Eastern Slavic peoples: the Russians, Ukrainians, and Byelorussians. Hence the Russians could call Kiev "the oldest Russian city," leaving Lviv as the oldest Ukrainian city, since it was founded by the Ukrainians after "the division of languages."

Furthermore, in the same year of 1954 the Council of Ministers of the USSR made the Crimea a part of Ukraine to demonstrate the affability of Russian "brotherhood." (It is to be recalled that it was from the Crimea that Stalin had ruthlessly deported all Tartars for disloyalty to the Soviet regime and collaboration with the Germans.)

These and other gestures were intended to make the Ukrainians amenable to a new '"economic scheme" Khrushchev had concocted: cultivation of the "virgin lands" of Kazakhstan. Some 800,000 young Ukrainian men and women were half-persuaded, half-coerced into leaving Ukraine as "volunteers" for the task.

Moreover, during the Khrushchev rule, large-scale strikes and rebellions erupted in the Soviet slave labor camps, most of them organized by Ukrainian political prisoners, notably by former members of the OUN and UPA. The first such insurrection flared up in Karaganda, the movement quickly spreading to slave camps in Vorkuta, Kingir, Tayshet, and elsewhere. Moscow reacted with its customary measures: mass executions and indiscriminate killing, as for instance the brutal slaying of 500 Ukrainian women prisoners in Kingir under the treads of Russian tanks. However, the revolts brought some relaxation of terror in Soviet prison camps (cf. *Encounter*, April 1956, London).

It was at the XXth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in February, 1956, that a now righteous Khrushchev assailed Stalin's crimes against the people and his unbridled terror, especially in Ukraine. Khrushchev stated:

"Stalin had wanted to deport all Ukrainians, but there were too many of them and there was no place to which they could be deported."

In fact, it was impossible to effect these deportations because of the activities of the UPA.

This "de-Stalinization" policy of Khrushchev blew up in his face. It resulted in anti-communist and anti-Russian upheavals throughout the Soviet Russian empire, the rebellion in Poland and the world-rousing insurrection in Hungary in 1956.

By 1957 the Kremlin was confronted with a dilemma: whether to revert to the old Stalinist policy, thereby risking even further insurrections, or to initiate a truly liberal policy, which would favorably impress the emerging Afro-Asian nations which the Kremlin had begun to woo, posing as their great "protector and emancipator."

Khrushchev compromised by devising a series of measures which gave the appearance of "liberalization" but which in reality tended to enchain the Soviet Russian empire more tightly. These measures included decentralization of planning and management of agriculture, spiced with a few concessions to farmers; some decentralization of management of industry and some extension of local authority for the non-Russian republics. Much was made of an amnesty granted political prisoners, especially as it entailed liquidation of a number of the troublesome slave labor camps; "liberalization" of literature, whereby limited criticism was permitted party writers; "liberalization" of travel abroad by a limited number of citizens, and admission of foreign tourists. A number of Ukrainians and other non-Russian Communist leaders were elevated to the highest echelons of the party leadership and the administrative apparatus.

But parallel with this relaxation of terror, Moscow rigorously pursued a systematic Russification course in Ukraine.

(b) Khrushchev's Crimes against the Ukrainian People:

In 1959 the ebullient Khrushchev traipsed across the ocean to the United Nations in New York, provoking vast resentment and opposition on the part of U.S. ethnic groups and labor and veteran organizations.

Extensive hearings on the rule and policies of Khrushchev were held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the House of Representatives in Washington. In its final report, *The Crimes of Khrushchev*, Part II, his brutal treatment of the Ukrainian people were summarized as follows:

(1) As a Communist official he played a leading role in the Moscow-made famine in Ukraine in the early 1930's in the course of which over 5 million Ukrainian peasants died from hunger and starvation;

(2) As Stalin's emissary in Ukraine in 1937–38, Khrushchev liquidated the entire organization of the Communist Party and the puppet Ukrainian Communist government; his hand was clearly visible in the genocidal murder of 10,000 Ukrainian men and women in the city of Vynnytsia in 1937–38;

(3) He played a vital part in the destruction of the Ukrainian Orthodox Autocephalous Church and the liquidation of the Ukrainian intellectual elite (for instance, he ordered the arrest of Metropolitan V. Lypkivsky in January, 1938);

(4) During World War II, as a General in the NKVD forces Khrushchev was responsible for the wholesale liquidation of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), including eradication of its members' families;

(5) In 1945–46, teaming with Molotov, Khrushchev ordered the liquidation of the

Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine. Before it had run its course, over 2,000 Ukrainian Catholic priests were deported, executed or forced to accept Russian Orthodoxy, dominated by the Kremlin;

(6) Khrushchev was responsible for the "voluntary resettlement" of hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians and other non-Russian peoples in the "Virgin lands" in Kazakhstan, thereby contributing again to the genocide of the Ukrainians as a nation.

(7) Finally, he was guilty, as a member of the "collective leadership," of the mass murder of Ukrainian political prisoners in 1954-55 in Karaganda, Vorkuta, Norilsk and Tayshet.

Irresponsible and amoral, Khrushchev brought the world to the brink of atomic war when he placed Soviet missiles in Cuba in 1962. Alarmed by excess unusual even in Communist Russia, his cohorts banded together and deposed him.

3. UNDER THE BREZHNEV-KOSYGIN RULE

No improvement or change in the position of the Ukrainian people has been noticeable since the removal of Khrushchev in the fall of 1964 and the assumption of power by a new "collective leadership," composed of Leonid Brezhnev, secretary general of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and Alexei Kosygin, Premier of the Soviet Union.

The widening rift ideologically and politically between the Soviet Union and Red China began to preoccupy the Kremlin leaders. In addition, the constant unrest and opposition in the satellite countries, notably in Rumania, the perennial crises in agriculture, the rebellious Soviet intellectuals—all added to the trials of the new Kremlin chieftains.

Against this backdrop, the following developments are easily distinguishable during these past few years of the Brezhnev-Kosygin "collective leadership":

(a) Policy of Wooing Ukrainians Continues:

The policy of making Ukrainians feel as if they were "junior partners," begun under Khrushchev, has continued under the present regime.

Of the 12 members of the new Politbureau of the Communist Party's Central Committee, three are Ukrainians: Nikolai V. Podgorny (Pidhorny in Ukrainian), Alexander P. Kirichenko and Peter Y. Shelest, the latter succeeding Podgorny as secretary general of the Communist Party of Ukraine when the former was elected Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR in 1965.

Podgorny, accompanying Nikita S. Khrushchev to the United Nations General Assembly meeting in 1960, delivered a scathing address in Ukrainian assailing the United States, Prime Minister John G. Diefenbaker of Canada and those Ukrainian American leaders and organizations who sponsored "Captive Nations Week" and Ukrainian Independence observances in the United States Congress. (In January, 1967, Podgorny also visited Pope Paul VI in Rome, apparently to discuss the "religious situation" in the Soviet Union. There was no public announcement to indicate whether the religious plight of the Ukrainian people had been discussed at all.)

Another prominent Ukrainian in the top echelon of the Soviet political hierarchy is Marshal Andrei A. Grechko, who succeeded Marshall Rodion Malinovsky, also a Ukrainian, as Soviet Defense Minister. Ukrainian generals and admirals are to be found in the Soviet army, air force, navy and other branches of the armed forces, and a number of Ukrainians serve in the diplomatic service, including the ambassadorial level.

(b) Religious Persecution:

The Soviet press in Ukraine periodically reports arrests, trials and deportations of "religious fanatics" and "superstitious people." Such trials were held in 1965 in Lviv, Western Ukraine, at which some 20 persons were charged with practising "underground Catholic religion." Among those arrested were Ukraine Catholic priests, nuns and several lay persons. In March 1966 the Soviet government sponsored widespread celebrations commemorating the 20th anniversary of the "liquidation" of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine. These jubilees evoked a strong protest on the part of the Ukrainian Catholic hierarchy in the free world. A special Pastoral Letter denouncing the destruction of Catholicism was signed by 18 Ukrainian Catholic bishops, headed by His Eminence Joseph Cardinal Slipy. The Soviet presses continue to spew forth books and pamphlets denouncing the Ukrainian Catholic Church as "always in the service of the counter revolutionary imperialists, including the American imperialists."

Religious persecution is not limited only to the Catholic Church in Ukraine. The number of Orthodox Churches has shrunken to a skeleton network. In October, 1966, in the city of Zhytomyr several persons were tried for giving religious instruction to children; all were either of the Orthodox faith or belonged to the Ukrainian Baptists' organization, A vicious attack on the Baptists in Ukraine appeared in the November 1966 issue of *Ludyna i Svit* (man and the World), published in Kiev.

Anti-religious tactics of the Communists include propagandistic undermining of the people's faith in baptism and matrimony and the discrediting of Christian burial by priests or ministers.

The present Kremlin leadership is thus not unique in betraying its fear of religion as a powerful force against the Communist ideology.

(c) Cultural and Linguistic Genocide in Ukraine:

But what is perhaps the most insidious and telling damage the Russian imperialists inflict upon Ukraine is that wreaked by the policy of cultural and linguistic genocide.

In 1966 the world was outraged by the trial and condemnation of two Russian writers, Daniel and Sinyavsky, for their non-conformist literary activities. Regrettably, little attention has been paid to what takes place in the cultural and literary sphere in Ukraine.

In 1965 and 1966 a number of Ukrainian writers, poets, researchers, journalists, literary critics and professors were arrested, tried and sentenced in Ukraine. At least 30 of these Ukrainian intellectuals were meted out this treatment in such Ukrainian cities as Kiev, Lviv, Odessa, Lutsk, Ternopil and Ivano-Frankivsk. Most prominent among them are Ivan Dzyuba and Ivan Svitlychny, who were accused of writing anti-Soviet works and of smuggling to the West anti-Soviet works of another Ukrainian poet Vasyl Symonenko, who died in 1963 at the age of 29. Detailed reports on the arrests of the Ukrainian intellectuals appeared in the *Neue Zuricher Zeitung* (April 1, 1966) and *The New York Times* (April 7, 1966). Protests by the Ukrainian Writers' Association in Exile were addressed to the International PEN, the European Commnity of Writers, and UNESCO. Protests to the State Department in Washington were sent by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the Shevchenko Scientific Society.

The anti-Soviet and anti-Russian opposition in Ukraine was officially if unwittingly acknowledged recently (1966) by Peter Shelest, secretary-general of the Communist Party of Ukraine, and Alexander Korneichuk, top-ranking Communist playwright and ideologist. Among other things, they felt impelled to warn Ukrainian youth against listening to Western radio broadcasts, ending by assailing the United States for alleged support of Ukrainian "subversive nationalist elements" which, they claimed, were systematically infiltrating into Ukraine.

CONCLUSION

The history of the Ukrainian people for the past 50 years has demonstrated the undying desire of Ukraine to attain its national freedom and independence. Untold sacrifices in human and economic resources have been paid by the Ukrainian nation in quest of that objective. The severe and harsh persecution of the Ukrainian nation by Communist Russia, Nazi Germany and other oppressors and aggressors, past and present, have not been able to deflect the will of the Ukrainian people or to kill what might well be man's deepest instinct—that of being free.

In its search for freedom and national independence Ukraine is by no means alone.

Recognition of its plight, and that of other hapless nations, was formally extended by the United States in its famous "Captive Nations Week Resolution" of July 17, 1959:

"The imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, north Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others . . . ."

In giving a haven to Ukrainians fleeing from oppression and outright genocide in their native land, the United States and other hospitable countries of the free world have, in the last analysis, acted in their own best interest.

Where conditions have at all permitted, the Ukrainian infusion has invariably enriched both soul and body of the host country. Law-abiding, industrious, naturally independent of spirit and deeply aware of God and His grace, Ukrainians have often proved to be an invaluable catalyst on every continent they have reached, anywhere man seeks to build a viable society, everywhere where Nature's forces have had to be channeled into constructive directions.

But it is in coping with destructive forces within man himself that Ukrainians in the Diaspora have contributed most. Everywhere they have gone they have inevitably awakened man's conscience. They have served—and continue to serve—as the Free World's surrogates in an experience whose very existence too many men refuse to acknowledge: the extinction of freedom for individual and for nation.

It is in this wise that Ukrainians abroad have repaid many times over the many helping hands. The fate of Ukraine, they have demonstrated, is the fate of man and nation everywhere unless man continues to prize and to fight for freedom, not only in his own country, but over a globe that modern technology has miniaturized.

WAR-LIKE PROTESTATIONS

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, discussion of how a great Nation spends its resources and tax revenues is timely and vital to each of us. Mr. Rolf Stromberg, a writer for the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, had interesting observations in his July 12, 1969, column about the appropriations bill scheduled for consideration by the House next Tuesday. I include his column, "War-like Protestations," in the RECORD:

XUM

War-Like Protestations

At the most conservative estimate, the undeclared war in Vietnam costs us $2.3 million an hour. An hour! Stun you? If you were earning $10,000 a year, it would take you 230 years to make that much money.

If you read the newspapers, you'll learn that only a few Congressmen are distressed by those fantastic expenditures. But if you want to hear protests listen to the members of the House of Representatives, vigilant as always, when the 1970 appropriation for the National Endowment for the Arts reaches the floor on July 22, the scheduled date.

The amount being sought that fiscal year is at the most $13.75 million plus administrative expenses. The administration's request is for $7.5 million plus those expenses. Now, neither sum need be accepted by the House, which can lop away at these funds to its heart's content and probably will.

Congressmen who see nothing wrong with farm subsidies, who see it in the national interest to tolerate waste in defense spending, who approve of the oil-depletion allowance will vehemently argue against aiding the arts.

These men will look on artists as bearded beatnik types who are potentially subversive. If you think that's far-fetched, you should read some of the comments made at hearings held by the Appropriations Committee.

What does this prove? That people who talk like that know nothing about art and artists and nothing about national culture. Those attitudes make a mockery of any discussion about priorities in American life. People who cannot understand the imperative and immediate value of the arts prove also they know little about history nor, for that matter, their own society.

Look back over the centuries. What do we remember best of ancient Athens? Poets like Pindar; playrights like Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides and Aristophanes; sculptors like Praxiteles. Who was the wealthiest grain merchant in Periclean Athens? Esoteric scholars might know. The only reason most of us know Maecenas was one of the wealthiest men in Rome is that Horace wrote poems about him.

More people know more about Shakespeare than they do about Elizabeth I. Tourists visit tombs in Italy not for those buried there but to gape at statuary by Michelangelo. The arts are the culmination—if you will, the apex—of a civilizaion.

But the arts are more than mere monuments. There is in each of us a creative instinct, a yearning to—in the ancient Greek sense—make something. Few of us have the talent; even fewer the genius.

The arts fulfill that inner urge in all of us. As a Gestalt psychologist might point out, it completes us. Not only in a creative sense but a practical way. Rarely in our daily lives do we have a day that is complete, with a beginning and an end, a feeling of order.

The theater, for example, music, too, gives us that. And we haven't even mentioned the need for beauty, or that artists usually mentioned the need for beauty, or that artists usually anicipate the future. They speak to us not only of our time, with sensitivity, but of the human condition in general. They do this with a candor and an honesty, with a set of standard that are rare anywhere.

We face in this country a crisis, and we aren't even aware of it yet. In the next several decades technological advances will increase leisure time for Americans. What will they do with it? Under population pressures present facilities will be utterly inadequate. Where are the appropriations to enlarge them?

Over a $150 million in fund requests has been received annually by the National Endowment, which, prudent in its understanding of Congress, has always been pared to the minimum. To be even pared further by a niggardly Congress. Sometimes soon you would think we'd realize we'd starved for the arts far too long.

You would think that Congress would know that Americans purchased almost a billion dollars' worth of musical instruments in 1967; that 17,000,000 students play musical instruments against only 2,500,000 twenty years ago. Somebody out in this sprawling nation really cares. Does Congress?

It would take just four hours of Vietnam spending to account for the minimum art request. What would we prefer to be remembered for a hundred years from now; having in this year 1969 furthered the career of a possible Shakespeare or having fought another battle in Southeast Asia? That's the question Congress must answer, and for such a small sum.

WORCESTER'S PARTICIPATION IN THE HISTORIC MISSION OF APOLLO 11

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, when Apollo 11 successfully blasted off at Cape Kennedy yesterday morning, the special pride and prayers of the people of Worcester, Mass., and all the people of our Fourth Congressional District rose and are riding with it and with the astronauts on their historic journey.

The special pride of the people of Worcester is generated first because Worcester is the birthplace of the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the acclaimed "father of modern rocketry." Dr. Goddard was educated in our Worcester schools, attended the renowned Worcester Polytechnic Institute, received his M.A. and Ph. D. degrees and taught at the internationally recognized Clark University in Worcester, and he conducted his early rocket experiments in the Worcester area.

It is interesting to reflect that his first liquid-propelled rocket rose 41 feet, traveled 184 feet in 2.5 seconds, and fell when the lower half of the nozzle burned off.

In New Mexico, on December 30, 1930, Dr. Goddard flew a rocket to an altitude of about 2,000 feet at a speed of about 500 miles per hour, which was perhaps the real beginning of our almost unbelievable modern achievements.

In 1945, Clark University awarded him an honorary doctor of science degree on which occasion he gave one of his extremely rare and limited press interviews. I think that all Record readers will be deeply interested in the prophetic words he expressed at that interview, as follows:

> I feel we are going to enter an era comparable in its progress to that in which the airplane advanced, although that's saying a good deal.
>
> It's just a matter of imagination how far we go with rockets and jet planes . . . I think it's fair to say you haven't seen anything yet.

Of course, we are doubly gratified that his gracious and vibrant widow, Mrs. Esther Goddard, sees fit to maintain her home in Worcester and maintains also a tremendous and vital concern in the continuing projection of her husband's original, inventive genius.

We, in Worcester and the surrounding area, are naturally and additionally extremely proud of the substantial contributions our skilled workers and directors in the various industrial plants here have made to the technical integrity of the Apollo 11 mission vehicles.

I shall include below, by means of excerpts from newspaper articles, a partial listing of such contributions, together with an account of some key Federal personnel associated with the Apollo 11 mission who are of Worcester area origin.

Mr. Speaker, all the people of Worcester and our Fourth Congressional District join with every citizen of the United States and good neighbors throughout the world in fervent prayer for the safe return of three highly motivated, wholesome men, dedicated to the self-development of disciplined mind, persevering diligence, and invincible spirit. Upon their safe return from the moon, please God, we will further join our prayers in humble thanks and heartfelt entreaty that the real success of their mission will be reflected in a resultant global good will and understanding so essential to the final achievement of peace on earth.

The listing referred to above follows:

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Gazette, July 15, 1969]

City Products in Key Roles on Apollo 11

(By Robert A. Wood)

When the Saturn rocket blasts off Wednesday carrying its payload of astronauts to an historic moonlanding, a little bit of Worcester will be riding along.

Parts manufactured in Wyman-Gordon's North Grafton plant will be providing some of the muscle that hurls the multimillion ton payload into space.

In addition to the thrust package, Wyman-Gordon manufactures some 50 other types of parts for a variety of structural, propulsion, guidance and propellant handling applications.

These components are forged from virtually every metal and alloy known, including the high temperature super-nickel alloys and refractory metals.

Norton Co. worked on the exhaust nozzles that will be handling the hot output manufactured by neighboring Wyman-Gordon parts. Norton's protective products division has applied an aluminum oxide coating to the exhaust nozzles in the Agena rockets.

Once past the blast off stage, the Apollo astronauts still will depend on Worcester know-how, for Norton Co. has supplied the fancy recrystalized silicon carbide nozzles used to control steering changes in orbit.

Communication between the three adventurers in space and Earth-fettered Americans depends on the efforts of another Worcester firm, the David Clark Co. They manufacture a gadget that goes by the tongue twisting name of Apollo Extravehicular Mobility Unit Communications Carrier. This polysyllabic gizmo is a hearing-and-talking cap representing five years of design, development and redevelopment carried out jointly between David Clark and the NASA Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston.

TALK CAP

What looks like a skull cap and weighs less than 26 ounces is able to bring the sound of astro lingo back from close to the

XUM

moon with clarity comparable to that in a neighborhood telephone call.

Man will also land on the moon courtesy of Worcester's Honematic Machine Corp., one of the few companies in the United States to specialize in making cylinders, "And," says Allan Glazer, corporation president, "we're one of the few to go out on these way out specials."

The spindly shanks that will support the Lunar Excursion Module (LEM) on the moon's surface are manufactured by Honematic.

Engineered to perform at moon gravity, these supports are so slight that they would collapse under the 16 ton weight of the module here in earth's stronger gravitational field.

REMAINS ON MOON

The bottom half of the LEM, including legs, will be used for a launching pad for the module's return to the Apollo mother ship. Accordingly, it is left behind when the astronauts return to Earth. Honematic and Worcester will then have produced some of the first resident gadgetry on the moon.

Worcester also fathered the historic Apollo 11 time capsule. Created in the Sprague Electric laboratories by Dr. Robert S. Pepper, director of research, development and engineering, the silver anodized aluminum capsule contains messages from 74 heads of state, lists of NASA officials, and messages from Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon etched on a pure silicon disc.

Alden Research Center in Westboro is responsible for charting weather conditions all over the world pertinent to NBC coverage of Apollo 11, Westboro's Irving R. Tatro, manager of meterological systems for Alden, will be shepherding some of the companies finest facsimile reproduction machines at NBC's Apollo coverage center in New York.

SON OF CITY NATIVE

Tatro has charge of the APT (Automatic Pictures Transmission) device which reproduces what weather satellites see as they scan weather patterns on Earth. Other Alden machines receive weather patterns from the U.S. Weather Bureau, and pictures and print from Houston Control Center and all over the world in an effort to cover the astronauts from pad to water.

Perhaps the most important Worcester product to blast off for the moon is astronaut Edwin E. Aldrin Jr., son of a Worcester native. The elder Aldrin graduated from Clark University where he studied under Robert H. Goddard, pioneer rocket scientist.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, July 15, 1969]

MOON TIME CAPSULE DEVELOPED IN CITY

Apollo 11 will leave a time capsule on the moon that was developed and made in Worcester.

The 11-sided silver anodized aluminum capsule, a little larger than a quarter, resembles a lady's compact.

It contains a disc of pure silicon on which microscopic messages have been placed. This is a result of a new process in information technology called "Microperm," developed on a crash basis by Sprague Electric Co., 115 Northeast Cutoff.

The process was developed by the semiconductor division personnel, under Dr. Robert S. Pepper, director of research, development and engineering.

On the disc will be messages from 74 heads of state, lists of National Aeronautic and Space Administration (NASA) officials, congressional committees, a quotation from the NASA Act signed by President Eisenhower in 1958, and quotations from Presidents Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon.

At the top of the wafer is an ultra miniature replica of the plaque which will be attached to the leg of the landing gear of the lunar module. The plaque is signed by President Nixon and the three astronauts. It reads, "Here men from the planet earth first set foot upon the moon July, 1969, A.D. We came in peace for all mankind."

[From the Framingham (Mass.) News, July 15, 1969]

FRAMINGHAM.—The Honeywell Computer Control staff in Framingham has reason to be even more excited than the people in other parts of the world in the Apollo 11 exploration of the moon, as the blast-off time approaches.

Not only has Honeywell at Framingham produced equipment for simulators in the training of astronauts, but it has also produced computers for the ground support of the space flights.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, July 15, 1969]

FORMER AREA MEN IN APOLLO 11 PROGRAM

Three former Worcester area residents have taken an active part in the preparations for tomorrow's Apollo 11 lunar landing mission.

Lt. Col. Frank W. Harding III, U.S. Air Force, son of Frank W. Harding Jr. of 35 Tory Fort Lane, is an engineer at the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston. He has primarily worked on the lunar landing module and during the mission, he will monitor the flight from an engineering evaluation room at the Mission Control Center in Houston.

Lt. Col. Harding previously served as project engineer for Apollo 9. He is a 1945 graduate of the old Classical High School, and received a bachelor of science degree from Worcester Polytechnic Institute in 1950 and a master of business administration degree from George Washington University, Washington, D.C., in 1961.

Harrison K. Brown, son of Harrison G. Brown of 10 Boyce St., is a project engineer at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala., where the Saturn V rocket was developed. Brown is a graduate of North High School and received a bachelor's degree from Worcester Polytechnic Institute in 1939.

Lt. Kerry R. Sandstrom, U.S. Air Force, son of Mr. and Mrs. Richard E. Sandstrom of Jefferson, is an electrical engineer at the Houston Manned Spacecraft Center. He is assigned to the flight support division and has been responsible for scheduling the equipment used in simulating the space flight for training personnel both at the Space Center and Cape Kennedy.

He was graduated from Wachusett Regional High School, Holden, in 1963 and received a bachelor of science degree from Lowell Technological Institute in 1967.

[From the Framingham (Mass.) News, July 15, 1969]

ASHLAND MAN HAS ROLE IN APOLLO MOON MISSION

ASHLAND.—David L. Winterhalter, son of Mr. and Mrs. Philip E. Winterhalter of 27 Tri St., Ashland, has an important role in the Apollo 11 lunar landing mission.

He is a program manager, auxiliary propulsion systems, in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Office of Manned Space Flight in Washington.

This office is responsible for the planning, direction, execution and evaluation of NASA's overall manned space flight program.

Winterhalter, a graduate of Ashland High School, received a B.S. degree in mechanical engineering in 1959 from the University of Mass.

His wife, Suzanne, is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. J. K. Bradstreet Sr. of 97 Pleasant St., Ashland.

IN DEFENSE OF THE YOUNGER GENERATION

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, a little over a year ago, a few hours after the death of Senator Robert F. Kennedy in Los Angeles, the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president of the University of Notre Dame, delivered a commencement address at the University of Southern California.

This address, "In Defense of the Younger Generation," is an eloquent analysis of some of the problems facing the young people of our own country and the world and bears reading again today.

As Father Hesburgh observed, his talk "reflects a dark moment in American history. The problem discussed in this talk will be with us increasingly in the days ahead, but, as you will see, I look upon them as opportunities, as much as problems. The uneasiness of modern youth has some legitimate bases and, hopefully, some better outlets than those we are presently seeing all over the world. The modern university is not blameless. It can stand some basic reform."

Mr. Speaker, I insert Father Hesburgh's perceptive address on this occasion at this point in the RECORD:

IN DEFENSE OF THE YOUNGER GENERATION

(Address by Father Hesburgh)

On the way across town to the University of Southern California this morning, I stopped at the Good Samaritan Hospital, where Senator Kennedy died a few hours ago, to sympathize for a moment with his brother, Senator Ted Kennedy, and the widows of John and Bob. I told them that I would dedicate my remarks this morning to the memory of these two brothers, with the prayerful hope that their example might be much more persuasive than my words. The talk I have written is in defense of youth—something I know they would understand as they exemplified what I am trying to say: that the world needs the idealism, the generosity, the service, the concern, the great dedication of the young. These two brothers might have used their wealth for fun and games, luxury and ease. Instead, they gave their lives unstintingly to public service, in the interest of the poor, here and about the world. They gave what none of us will be called upon to give: their very lives and their youthful hopes. In doing so, they left both the young and the old of this world a legacy, and a new hope too, that out of their sacrifice will emerge a better America and, indeed, a better world.

I would like to begin today with a quotation from a famous author: "What is happening to our young people? They disrespect their elders, they disobey their parents. They ignore the laws. They riot in the streets inflamed with wild notions. Their morals are decaying. What is to become of them?" These words were written more than 2,300 years ago, by Plato, the Greek philosopher.

Another equally famous Greek philosopher, Aristotle, took an almost equally dim view of the young: "Young people have exalted notions, because they have not yet been humbled by life or learned its necessary limitations; moreover, their hopeful disposition makes them think themselves equal to great things. They would always rather do noble deeds than useful ones: their lives are regulated more by moral feelings than by reasoning—all their mistakes are in the direction of doing things excessively and vehemently. They overdo everything—they love too much, hate too much, and the same with everything else."

I begin thus today just to assure the older generation that the generational gap looks much the same at a distance of twenty-four centuries, and likewise to remind this younger generation that they did not invent youth and all that makes it both attractive and difficult. I would like to say of the younger generation what Frenchmen are purported to say of women: *vive le difference*—long live the difference between generations. We need it. They do too.

This is not to say that the difference between generations is always exactly the same—even though Plato and Aristotle may strike a few responsive chords. For one thing, there are not only many more people around today—about half of them are young people. Twenty years ago there were thirty million Americans under twenty years of age. Today there are over eighty million Americans under twenty, and, in a few years, half of the population will be aged under twenty-five. This makes the younger generation more visible, more omnipresent, and, let's face it, a very substantial part personally of what America *is*. There is no reason to believe that they will be satisfied to be a silent or passive part of America either. Nor should they be.

If, as Aristotle says, they love too much and hate too much, that's a whale of a lot of vehement love and hate. But the real question is: What do they love and hate? I suspect that they do not love excessively the world we have created, or at least allow to exist and I suspect that they hate some things that are well worth hating and difficult to hate excessively: like war, inequality for millions of human beings on earth, poverty in the midst of affluence, hypocrisy in stating one set of values and following another, rhetoric instead of action, promises without fulfillment, empty words, qualities they often find in the adult generation. Maybe the most discouraging thing about youth is that every day they are getting older. On days like today they come of age, with the great temptation to become like everyone else. To compromise with the world as it is and ultimately, alas, to become the unwilling target of their own children's ire, as they, the youth of yesteryear, begin to do the useful rather than the noble deeds they once dreamed about in their youth.

Maybe the world of youth is too good to be true and lasting. Maybe instead of being so concerned about the idealism, the generosity, and the vehemence of youth, we should rather mourn the fact that youth passes all too quickly into the grim life of adulthood, when we find it so difficult to really love what is good and hate what is evil, and lose the simplicity of youth that can so easily repeat the prayer of the great Hindu poet, Rabindranath Tagore: "Lord, God, only let me make my life simple and straight, like a flute of reed, for Thee to fill with music."

During the past few months, I have visited over twenty large American cities, from Boston to Seattle, from Miami to San Francisco and Los Angeles, from Chicago and St. Louis to New Orleans and Dallas, attempting to raise money for higher education in general and Notre Dame in particular. A dismal task. Everywhere, the newsmen from press, television, and radio have asked me: "What's happening to this generation? Why the unrest, the protest, the revolt? Why pour so much effort and money into the education of a bunch of kooks?" I admit to a certain amount of unpriestly impatience at this line of questioning. Once in a New York press conference, I let myself go. "What you're really saying is that unless students are nice fellows like you, we shouldn't be interested in trying to educate them." "I didn't say that," the reporter countered. "Then what are you saying?" I asked. This drew a large silence. I started over again—on the offensive, Notre Dame-like, I confess, "What is so good about you or your world", I asked this reporter. "Is there nothing to be uneasy about, nothing to protest, nothing to revolt against?" Another silence, with the unspoken question in his eyes: "What set him off?" I tried to explain it. We might begin by trying to understand what causes the unrest, the protest, the revolt of the young people today, as in so many past generations, but even more so today.

I think there are several immediate causes. First, the young people of today have grown up in an affluent society that prizes intelligence, that provides the best schooling that this country has ever seen. The affluences of many of their parents has freed many of them from the grimy business of worrying where the next dollar is coming from. They have had more time to think, to discuss, to criticize, to read, to travel, to compare, to judge—this is the stuff of which good education is made. And it does have consequences.

In their earlier years, these young people probably took the American dream seriously and uncritically to heart: One nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. How often they recited it in grammar school, without thinking what it really means. Then, for many of them, as they began to think critically, the dream seemed to acquire some of the aspects of nightmare: they learned that thirty million Americans, Negro, Mexican, Indian, poor white, but mostly black Americans, unlike them, attended inferior schools where twelve years of segregated education equaled only eight or nine years of the white school standard achievement. Partially because of this, much of the best of higher education was foreclosed for these deprived Americans. Then, they found that these thirty million represented twice as many unemployed and unemployable as whites, with the young non-white, four times as much. Black Americans, they found, generally lived in the worst houses, in the worst section of our cities, and were fated to continue to attend the worst schools which are located there, so that their frustration and lack of social mobility upward seem ever cicular and inevitable.

Thus, the American nation they discovered is not indivisible, but clearly divisible into two nations: black and white, poor and affluent, hopeful and hopeless. Liberty means one thing to the whites, the affluent, and the hopeful, another to the black, the poor, and the hopeless. Justice likewise.

And so this generation of the young began to doubt the sincerity of the slogan they had repeated so often. It was the dawn of disillusionment, a coming of age even in youth. What I say here of the white youngster is, of course, even more poignantly true of the black youngster. For a while, they marched together in the South, together sensed new confidence in the rightness of their cause, new power in what they were able to achieve by protest and organized action against what they knew to be wrong, much less un-American.

Then the blacks, at least many of the new leaders of the new power structure called Black Power, decided to go it alone and the great majority of active, protesting white young people felt momentarily alienated again, with the loss of their newly-found cause of civil rights and their active participation in social change.

A new target was quickly found. Escalation gave greater visibility to the war in Vietnam, the draft bit more deeply into the company of the youth, the issues involved were more hotly debated nationally and internationally, and again the youth found a new outlet for their newly-learned tactics and their yearning for personal involvement in a cause. They aimed indiscriminately at the obvious targets: draft cards, ROTC, Dow and napalm, induction centers, troop trains, and military recruiters. Even the flag took a beating at times, unfortunately, and patriotism, old style, almost became suspect in certain quarters.

Perhaps distracted or possibly annoyed by the noise of it all, too few of the elders really debated the issues or drew back from the mounting cost in lives and dollars. Few really asked about the morality of our national course in spending thirty billion dollars a year tearing up a plot of land and people, no-where near the size and population of the state of California, while the whole world of dire human need and misery merited only two billion dollars annually in critical assistance, with the bulk of our technical assistance manpower concentrated in the same small plot of land that absorbed over a half million of our troops at war.

THE STUDENT REVOLT

I have somewhat oversimplified and possibly overstated the problem, as do the young, but this was and is a real question of justice and morality that has many of our youth hung up as never before. This issue has poisoned the atmosphere of our campuses, has vitiated many other good and noble endeavors, has rocked our national political scene, complicated our foreign relations, and has more than anything else led to a deep and abiding frustration on the part of our youth.

It is one thing to disagree with compulsory military service, or to be disillusioned by the course of a particular war. But this generation is really hung up at the thought of having to take life and face death in a war that they not only do not like, but often abhor as alien to all that they think America should be doing in the world.

Some simply cop out, as the saying goes. They become conscientious objectors, or move to Canada or to the local equivalent of Haight-Asbury, taking refuge in drugs, or bizarre hairdoes, or love-ins, or the other appurtenances of hippiedom. It should be said a very small number take this road which is, for the few that take it, the worst kind of blind alley and dead end. The great majority suffer in quiet frustration or erupt in occasional violence, or worry along hoping that somehow they will find a personal escape hatch in the walls that continue to close in around them.

It was all of this malaise over Vietnam that really triggered what I believe to be the final and probably most important act in the drama of the younger generations today: the campus revolt. Having been forced out of meaningful civic rights action, feeling themselves more or less helpless in the face of the Vietnam action seemed to worsen despite all their protests, the students finally decided that maybe they should seek involvement and reform where they were—in the colleges and universities. After thinking about it for a while, some even found here the root cause of their alienation from an establishment or a society that they judged to be impersonal, often irrelevant, sometimes immoral, and generally more difficult to move than a cemetery. Again, one must avoid oversimplification, for the targets for youthful criticism are many: their parents, neighborhoods, and cities, their church if they have not already disassociated themselves from it, their adult leadership from the President to their father, anyone exercising authority over them, even those faculty members or deans they judge as really disinterested in them and their lives and, especially, their hopes. You may ask at this juncture, how did it all get mixed up so quickly? How did the apathetic, disinterested generation of a decade ago suddenly get so critical, so ready to revolt against law and authority in any form, so quick to protest, to sit-in, to lie-in,

XUM

to tear-up-in, to raise-hell-in? How does a whole generation get so exercised, so suddenly, about the general state of society and humanity that they begin waving signs in Berkeley and end up by tearing Columbia apart, bringing down the government in Belgium and closing 23 of the 27 Italian universities, immobilizing France and the all-powerful De Gaulle, and telling their elders all over the world that everything is going to change or else. However it happened, it is happening and the phenomenon is no longer local, but national and international. Pick up a newspaper in London, Berlin, Tokyo, New York, or Caracas this week and you will find that half of the news is related to the student revolt.

WE HAVE STIMULATED THE YOUNG TO HOPE FOR THE BEST

While all of this is explosive, it need not be judged as all bad, unless you begin by assuming that all is presently good in the world, and that is a very difficult assumption to make in this city on this day. An atomic bomb is bad if it destroys people, their homes and their cities. But it is possible to control atomic energy and use it to accomplish a whole series of useful tasks.

This, it seems to me, is the opportunity that presently faces us today as we regard the revolt of the younger generation in the university. The world needs energy, imagination, concern, idealism, dedication, commitment, service. The world, with all its problems gets all too little of these great human qualities from the older generation. The world also needs reasonable criticism and peaceful protest as a constant spur to progress and for the re-dress of many horrible inequities and injustices that perdure in the world at its best. The world needs to change its structures too because, obviously, many of them are not producing the climate in which justice is available to all, not to mention opportunity, which is even more important to the young.

The problem is that we have stimulated the young to hope for the best. Twenty years ago, the United Nations proclaimed the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, but it is still only a declaration, not a fact for millions of human beings here and around the world.

Somehow, somewhere, we have to get the young back into the human family, as a working part of the establishment, if you will. The price for this may well be a different kind of establishment, but that may not be a bad idea either. Perhaps because I have spent all of my adult life in the world of the university it seems to me that here is a good place to begin, for this is where the action presently is. After all, we in the universities have stimulated most of the ideas that set off this youthful explosion. We, better than any other part of the total establishment, should be able to devise the ways and means of involving the young in fruitful rather than destructive uses of their energy and their concern, their idealism and their generosity.

We might begin by devising new structures in the university for the active and meaningful participation of the students in their university life and education. We do this by creating on campus a community in which students have a real and not a phony role. If they are dissatisfied with the education they are now getting, there ought to be ways for them to be heard and to have their ideas seriously considered by the faculty and administration. This does not mean that all their ideas are good or that their desires should always be compelling, and it certainly does not mean that their ideas should be forced through under threat of violence. Rather, there should be a real dialogue which in itself is educative. One bit of advice our active students need to hear from faculty today is that action is most fruitful when it is backed up, not by emotion, or mass hysteria, or noise, or violence, but by intelligent and competent leadership which is the fruit of a good education that is taken seriously during the years when it is available. Students need to hear that what seems most relevant to them today may be quite irrelevant ten years from now. Students need to hear that action without good ideas and goals and true values is empty posturing, a truly juvenile distraction from doing what is most important to the young: getting a first rate education.

The President of Yale University, Kingman Brewster, put this well:

"The tragedy of the highly-motivated, impatient young activist is that he runs the serious risk of disqualifying himself from true usefulness by being too impatient to arm himself with the intellectual equipment required for the solution of the problems of war and poverty and indignity. You and I have seen too many among our students of high promise squander their talent for a lifetime of constructive work at a high level for the cheaper and transient satisfaction of throwing himself on some immediate barricade in the name of involvement. Posturing in the name of a good cause is too often the substitute for thorough thought or the patient doggedness it takes to build something. . . . The chance to make a constructive difference in the lives of others, not the full dinner pail, is the highest reward of a higher education. If the impatient, anti-intellectualism of the radical left is not to seduce many of our best brains away from true usefulness, we and our faculties have to reassert again and again that emotional oversimplification of the world's problems is not the path to their solution."

I am in complete agreement with President Brewster, but, in defense of youth, we must see their side, too. They can buy this scheme of things if at least we elders really share their concerns, which should also be our concerns, and do something about them ourselves. We have to face head on and to discuss with students their concern for the relevancy of their education, and how we can improve our university structures to make them a more vital part of the learning community—both inside and outside the classroom. We have to give them an alternative to violent and destructive protest by sharing their concern for meaning in life, and by creating with them right now a meaningful community in the university, with all of us working together to establish and maintain worthwhile goals and values, and a vital expression of these in many university activities that are consonant with the university's role as a critic of society and an institution dedicated to the path of wisdom, and the achievement of justice for all, not just the favored few.

I am confident that this can be done if the elders have time for the young and if they both can learn to respect each other, and have greater tolerance for each other, and for the complementary rather than competitive roles that each can play in the university community. Students who like to learn by doing should give their elders credit for having learned something by what they have done, and it is not all bad. The Peace Corps, the poverty program, the teacher corps, VISTA, new civil rights legislation, the disarmament treaty, tutoring programs in the inner city, the conquest of hunger—all these were devised and launched by the elders, even though most of these programs were given new life and brighter spirit by the young. There can be many more such developments, and they will all make for better education and better community of life in the university. It is always better to revitalize a basically good system than to destroy it violently while having nothing with which to replace it. And, if that is true of our universities, it is even more true of our families, of our cities, of our nation and our world.

LAUGHTER AND LOVE

The whole point of my remarks today is that the young can and should contribute to man's perennial task of remaking the world, especially since they are half of the world that needs remaking. Neither half, young or old, can do it alone. We elders may at times grow restive at their prodding, protest, and revolt, and they may find us impossibly slow when we do not think we can remake anything by tomorrow morning, with or without their help. It is likely that history will repeat itself and the gap between the generations will never be completely bridged by understanding, but I like to believe that there are other workable bridges, at least more workable than anything in common use today, and their names are laughter and love. Indeed, I can think of no better way of redeeming this tragic world today than by love and laughter. Too many of the young have forgotten how to laugh, and too many of the elders have forgotten how to love. Would not the dark tragedy of our life be lightened if only we could all learn to laugh more easily at ourselves and to love one another. It may sound quixotic, but I think this says a lot about the generation gap—how to understand it and how to cure it while we still have time.

ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS ENDORSES H.R. 10618

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, since the 1965 amendments to the immigration law became effective, there has been a decline in immigration from Ireland. Although visas are currently available in Ireland, some provisions of law make it difficult for the Irish to qualify for immigrant visas.

I am, and have been, most disturbed by the decline in immigration from Ireland, and I have, therefore, introduced H.R. 10618 to resolve the situation. I am pleased to say that my distinguished colleague from New Jersey (Mr. CAHILL), who is also ranking Republican member of the Judiciary Committee's Immigration Subcommittee, joined me in introducing this bipartisan legislation.

Our bill meets the need as it exists today—a need to keep the avenues of immigration to the United States open and thus bridge the gap until intending Irish immigrants will be able to meet the criteria for all immigrants, no matter from where they come.

H.R. 10618 proposes that unused visa numbers from fiscal year 1968 be returned to those countries which were unable to make use of them because of the new strict requirements in the law. Applicants for such visas will not be subject to the restrictive labor certification and system of preferences.

Mr. Speaker, I was happy to learn that the National Board of the Ancient Order of Hibernians has studied the provisions of H.R. 10618 and has endorsed it, and I submit a letter from the national president of the organization, Mr. Michael L. Delahunty, for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS IN
AMERICA, INC.

July 11, 1969.

Hon. PETER W. RODINO, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for your letter of July 1, 1969, and I sincerely apologize for the delay in not informing you that the National Board of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, Inc. has endorsed Bill H.R. 10618.

The reason for the delay in not advising you earlier of our decision, was to check the attitude to the Bill throughout the country, and we can honestly say that we have found no adverse reaction.

I might mention that our National Chairman of Immigration, J. Frank O'Connor, was supposed to advise you of the aforementioned decision, however, I believe his delay in not bringing this matter to your attention was simply a question of finding an opportune moment to meet with you to discuss the Bill in detail, since he would like to see the period extended from two (2) years to at least three (3) or four (4) years, and the quota cumulative.

On behalf of our Organization and Ladies Auxiliary, I wish to thank both Congressman William Cahill and yourself for introducing this legislation. Let's look forward to the hearings and having the Bill out of Committee and on to the floor of the House.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL L. DELAHUNTY,
National President.

THE COMING GUERRILLA WAR

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, in March, Alan Stang issued a report on an investigative trip to New Mexico, where he covered the trial of Reies Tijerina. Entitled "The Coming Guerrilla War," the report appears to be quite factual and contains some interesting information.

The author of the report, Mr. Alan Stang, is a former business editor for Prentice-Hall, Inc., and has been a television writer, producer, and consultant, and has written some bestsellers.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Stang's report in its entirety.

Mr. Speaker, I call particular attention to the reference made in the report to one Carlos Cansino, in these words:

> At about the time of the famous guerrilla raid on the Courthouse, a revolutionary outfit called Brown Berets was formed among Mexican-Americans in Los Angeles. Some time afterward, Carlos Cansino, who apparently came from San Antonio, established the Brown Berets in Albuquerque. He lived at 2801 Socorro, N.W., and drove a 1968 Ford Falcon, light blue in color, bearing 1968 New Mexico license plate 2–94567. It almost goes without saying that Cansino worked for the Office of Economic Opportunity and, while in Albuquerque, for the New Mexico State Welfare Department as a case worker. He also worked with *La Verdadera Asociaçion de los Durantes*, helping the members collect donations for the needy, but left town after about two years, when some money turned up missing. He apparently went to Wisconsin, and at last word is now back in San Antonio.

From OEO sources, it is learned that upon his return to the city, Cansino managed to get himself employed in one of San Antonio's OEO's projects, at $700 per month. After considerable revolutionary agitation and hate-filled speeches, according to a San Antonio report, he was dismissed from OEO. The dismissal was vigorously protested by the Civil Liberties Union.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that "a new broom sweeps cleaner." With that in mind, let us hope that under new management the Office of Economic Opportunity will apply that broom to the Brown Berets, the Black Panthers, and any other agitators and revolutionaries who are found to be on the payroll of the OEO and who are not doing the job they are hired to do. From a variety of reports, there appears to be a considerable number in this category.

It follows:

THE COMING GUERRILLA WAR

Friday, the thirteenth, is said to be unlucky. And it is. On Friday, December 13, 1968, a jury in Albuquerque acquitted Castroite terrorist Reies Tijerina of kidnaping, false imprisonment, and assault on a jail—crimes committed when he led an armed guerrilla raid against the Rio Arriba County Courthouse on June 5, 1967. (See American Opinion, October, 1967.)

"I saw you, Reies Tijerina, at the side of the booth, with a pistol in your right hand, pointing it toward an office or door behind the phone booth," reporter Larry Calloway testified at the trial.

E. R. Gleasner, an Albuquerque real estate man, testified that Tijerina clubbed him on the head with a rifle butt.

Undersheriff Dan Rivera testified that Juan Valdez, a Tijerinista, pistol-whipped him in the jury room in Tijerina's presence.

"After a few minutes," Deputy Sheriff Pete Jaramillo told the jury, "Tijerina came up from behind me and stuck a gun in my ribs.

" 'Where's Sanchez?' he asked me. 'Tell me where the ——— is or I'll kill you.' "

And Jaramillo also testified that one of Tijerina's raiders later told another: "Get some wire. . . . Reies has ordered us to take some hostages."

Witness after witness testified that Castroite leader Tijerina was at the Courthouse; that he led the guerrilla raid; that he had a gun and hit somebody; and, that he kidnaped two of the hostages he held in the Courthouse. For more than a month the trial went on. Then, after less than four hours of deliberation, the jury turned him loose. The verdict came "as a complete shock—and I guess I'm still in shock," says attorney Jack L. Love, one of the prosecutors (Ed Meagher, Los Angeles Times, December 15, 1968). "Never can I remember so completely misreading what the mood of a jury seemed to be."

Maybe Friday, the thirteenth, had nothing to do with it. An aura of violence surrounded the trial. Eulogio Salazar had been murdered before it. In a preliminary hearing, after all, he had testified that Reies Tijerina had shot him in the face. The star witness was simply beaten to death and shot in the head. As State Police Captain T. J. Chavez told the New York Times after the killing. "The people in that area . . . know pretty well now that some of these people can get to them." And, Reies reminded U.P.I. on the day of the killing: "Salazar was the only witness against me." So overt was the intimidation that Mrs. Dolores Romero, another prosecution witness who nailed Tijerina, was insulted, or threatened, or both, during the trial—right in the courtroom, by someone in the audience.

Maybe the jury got the message.

Indeed. maybe Judge Paul Larrazolo got the message too. In his instructions to the jury, he said as follows:

"The court instructs the jury that anyone, *including a state police officer*, who intentionally interferes with a lawful attempt to make a citizen's arrest does so at his own peril, since the arresting citizens are entitled under the law to use whatever force is reasonably necessary to effect said citizen's arrest and to use whatever force is reasonably necessary to defend themselves in the process of making said citizen's arrest. (Emphasis added.)

And this lends validity to Tijerina's argument that he and his troops went to the Courthouse to make a citizen's arrest of District Attorney Alfonso G. Sanchez. That's right, the District Attorney. Indeed, it creates the impression, does it not, that it was perfectly all right when the Castroite raiders shot and critically wounded New Mexico State Police Officer Nick Saiz, after ordering him to surrender his sidearm.

The concept of "citizen's arrest" makes sense only in the absence of a police officer. Since the police naturally cannot be everywhere—and should not be—it follows that crimes will often be committed where an officer is unavailable, in which case a citizen may make an arrest. But if an officer is available, a "citizen's arrest" becomes unnecessary. If an arrest should be made, the officer will make it. Now, however, at least according to Judge Larrazolo, a guerrilla-style mob apparently may make an "arrest" not only in a police officer's presence, but against his orders. Indeed, a gang apparently may occupy a government building, announce the "arrest" of various officials—Judge Larrazolo, for instance—and if a police officer "interferes," it would be his own fault if he is hurt; which will come in very handy to the Marxist terrorists now operating openly in our streets.

In fact, if the mob happens to be a "lynch mob," bent on a lyching, it now conceivably could overrule a protesting police officer with the claim that it is making an "arrest."

Ed Meagher reports (Los Angeles Times, December 5, 1968) that, only a few days earlier, Judge Larrazolo said he might change his mind, "but I don't now think there is any legitimacy to their citizen's arrest, from what I've heard so far." Apparently, what he heard later did the trick.

Whether or not it means anything, I don't know, but Judge Larrazolo is a member of the Albuquerque affiliate of the Far Left's notorious Council on Foreign Relations.

As I sat in on the trial, the courtroom was full of Tijerinistas, who day in and day out apparently had nothing else to do. Once, just before a session, they passed the *Daily World* along a front row. The *Daily World* is published by the Communist Party. Directly in front of me was Patricia Bell, who has been writing Tijerina's appeals for funds, and at the same time was Santa Fe correspondent for the Communist *World* when it was called *The Worker*. Behind me, believe it or not, was an agent Tijerina had placed there to hear any secrets I might spill. Reies apparently still recalled my articles about him, and our earlier run-in on the Joe Pyne show. Reies' agent looked extraordinarily like Manolete, the bullfighter killed in Ronda in Spain, in 1947—a resemblance, which in that audience made him strangely out of place. He leaned forward as one of the ladies with me discussed potato salad with another.

Now Tijerina knows!

On the other side of the rail sat Tijerina's attorneys. They included Beverly Axelrod, a conspirator and former fiancee of Eldridge Cleaver, Minister of Information of the Communist Black Panther Party and a fugitive from justice. In *Color, Communism And Common Sense*, former top Communist Manning Johnson described how the Comrades assign white women to blacks they are trying to recruit—which perfectly reveals Communist racism. Of course, now that he is recruited, Comrade Cleaver has a proper black wife. Imagine a Master Racist like Eldridge married to a honky like Beverly. What would Fuhrer Stokely say?

Apparently, Eldridge had too often kept her busy quite late. The bags under Beverly's eyes could hold her briefs.

Then there was Reies' attorney John Thorne, of San Jose, California, and of the American Civil Liberties Union—preeminently founded by Harry F. Ward, one of the top Communists in the United States.

And there was Reies' man William L. Higgs, who has also represented agitator James Meredith, and who entered the courtroom shirt unbuttoned and tie askew, his clothes literally streaked with dirt. He's not all bad, though. In the courtroom, he was very cordial to the boys under sixteen. In 1963, "civil rights attorney" Higgs was convicted of sexually abusing a minor male, and disbarred in Mississippi, where he lived.

Higgs, by the way, is white and a gringo. So is Thorne, and, of course, Beverly. But Judge Larrazolo is a Latin, as are District Attorney Shanchez and Assistant District Attorney E. E. Chavez—which adds more farce to Tijerina's claim that the gringo in New Mexico is denying the Latin his rights.

Indeed, the victorious Tijerina was later quoted (*New York Times,* December 22, 1968) as follows: "The cricket had no chance against the lion, so he jumped into the lion's ear and tickled him to death. That's what we're going to do to the United States—we're going to tickle him to death."

Could anything be clearer? The State of New Mexico gave Reies a trial costing about $150,000 and did everything possible to protect his rights; but, he says he is trying to destroy the United States.

It sets the stage.

While the preparation continues.

BROWN BERETS READY FOR ACTION

At about the time of the famous guerrilla raid on the Courthouse, a revolutionary outfit called the Brown Berets was formed among Mexican-Americans in Los Angeles. Some time afterward, Carlos Cansino, who apparently came from San Antonio, established the Brown Berets in Albuquerque. He lived at 2801 Socorro, N.W., and drove a 1968 Ford Falcon, light blue in color, bearing 1968 New Mexico license plate 2-94567. It almost goes without saying that Cansino worked for the Office of Economic Opportunity and, while in Albuquerque, for the New Mexico State Welfare Department as a case worker. He also worked with *La Verdadera Asociaçion de los Durantes,* helping the members collect donations for the needy, but left town after about two years, when some money turned up missing. He apparently went to Wisconsin, and at last word is now back in San Antonio.

Another founder of this paramilitary group in Albuquerque is Maria Varela, of 1307½ Marble, N.W. She was born on January 1, 1940, in York, Pennsylvania, and attended Malverno College in Wisconsin, majoring in Speech and minoring in English and Art. She is a professional photographer. It goes without saying that Maria is a "civil rights worker": On June 29, 1965, she was arrested by the Jackson, Mississippi, Police Department for parading without a permit and resisting arrest. She has also participated in the Communist-backed harassment of grape pickers in Delano, California, directed by her good friend, Marxist Cesar Chavez. And during the 1968 campaign Maria worked as a Kelly Girl at Republican headquarters in Albuquerque, leaving with the intention of going to Mexico City to enliven the riots during the Olympics.

Miss Varela is a close associate of Castroite terrorist Reies Tijerina.

Then there is Gilberto Ballejos, also known as Gilbert Vallejos, of 1313 Marble, NW., who apparently took over the paramilitary Brown Berets in Albuquerque when Cansino left. American Opinion readers will remember him (March, 1968) as the same Gilberto Ballejos who bought and paid for the manufacture of bumper stickers praising Communist terrorist "Che" Guevara, while working for the local Office of Economic Opportunity affiliate. Gilberto left that job soon after American Opinion blew the whistle, and at last word is still out of honest work—devoting himself to the Revolution.

Brown Beret leader Ballejos is approximately thirty-two, and was born in Mountainair, New Mexico, where his mother, Cruzita, teaches school. His brother is Fred Ballejos, a graduate of Denver University now living in California. Gilberto attended the University of New Mexico for one year, and then a university in Washington, D.C., on a scholarship. About three years ago, he returned to Albuquerque, and went back to school majoring in Sociology.

While in Washington, he married—*Caramba*—Sandra, an Anglo. In fact, some of Gilberto's best friends are gringos.

The point is that the system apparently has been good to revolutionary Brown Beret leader Gilberto Ballejos. He isn't exactly an "oppressed toiler."

But he is a member of Reies Tijeirna's *Alianza Federal de Mercedes,* also known as the Confederation of Free City States.

In a manifesto published by the Brown Berets at 318 North Soto, Los Angeles, California, we learn that these revolutionaries have a list of ten demands, one of which is the Communist-supported Civilian Police Review Board scheme, "to screen all police officers, before they are assigned to our communities."

The police are the enemy!

And there is a motto, "To Serve, Observe and Protect"; to serve with "vocal as well as physical support"; to observe with "a watchful eye," especially on law enforcement agencies; and to protect "by all means necessary. How far we must go in order to protect these rights is dependent upon those in power. If those Anglos in power are willing to do this in a peaceful and orderly process, then we will be only too happy to accept this way. Otherwise we will be forced to other alternatives."

David Sanchez is "chairman" of the Los Angeles Brown Berets, and the April 1968, issue of El Gallo—published by Marxist conspirator Rudolpho "Corky" Gonzales, who advocates violent revolution—says Sanchez has a great deal of respect for the heroes of many young Latin intellectuals. Che Guevara and Fidel Castro. The Berets' uniform of jaunty beret and washed-out Army fatigue jacket is an obvious takeoff on Che and Fidel."

Indeed, says John Bryan in the same story:

"Many of the policies of the Brown Berets are similar to those of the militant Black Panther Party for Self Defense with whom the Brown Berets have just signed an alliance for mutual defense.

"Like the Panthers, they advocate that their community arm itself for defense against the establishment and its police army."

In September of 1968 the Albuquerque Brown Berets* printed a "Proposal for a Training School for Brown Beret Organizers," who would take a course lasting four to six weeks, five hours a day. We read that nine young people have been selected, who are "life-long victims of racism and oppression and therefore are the most qualified to assist their communities in fighting for change.

"Because of their new awakening to the movement, they are open to self-education and growth of perspective. This is the crucial moment to provide them an opportunity for study and analysis of the society they live in."

The school would be run, says the proposal, by revolutionaries Gilberto Ballejos and Maria Varela. Its staff would include Beverly Axelrod, teaching "Legal rights"; Reies Tijerina for the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo; Rudolpho "Corky" Gonzales—the Red-Nosed Mutineer—for "Urban organizing, racism in education, the Chicano and Latin America"; Luis Valdez, who was trained in Red Cuba, for "Nationalism and culture"; Communist Eldridge Cleaver, for "Politics, Black Panther Party"; Castroite David Sanchez, for "History of Brown Berets"; Marxist Cesar Chavez, for "Organizing cooperatives, the campesino [peasant]"; and Maoist Ron Karenga of US, a revolutionary group from Los Angeles, for "Training youth."

In short, the Brown Berets is a racist, Communist-oriented outfit threatening violence. It is tied to Castroite Reies Tijerina, and led by professional revolutionaries, who, like their Communist partners, the Black Panthers, are attacking the police as part of the Communist plan to destroy our country.

REVOLUTIONARIES ATTACK POLICE

As everywhere else, the attack on the police in Albuquerque has many parts. For instance, there is Allen Cooper, a Caucasian about thirty, who claims to have been a founder of the Brown Berets, which Ballejos denies. Cooper is a member of Students for a Democratic Society, the youthful terrorists now doing their best to destroy our universities, and is President of Resistance Rush, located at 9621 Fourth Street, N.W., in Albuquerque. At one time, he was arrested in Caracas for leading violent demonstrations at the American Embassy there, and was expelled from Venezuela shortly thereafter. He went to Mexico City, where he participated in the usual militant, Marxist "student" activity, which led to the murderous Communist violence of the fall of 1968.

Cooper has been working with the Brown Berets and circulating a petition to recall the City Commissioners, in the hope that new Commissioners acceptable to the conspirators could install a "civilian police review board" which would harass the police.

Also part of the plot to handcuff the police by petition is Father Luis Jaramillo, of Old Town parish, and Reverend Titus R. Scholl, also known as Timothy Scholl, of St. Timothy's Lutheran Church, 1028 Tulane Drive, N.E. In 1968, Scholl was active in the Communist-staffed "Poor People's March." He attends Albuquerque City Commission meetings, where he criticizes the police.

These worthies have asked that completed petitions be sent to 119 Sycamore, N.E., the residence of one Katherine K. Hattenbach. Mrs. Hattenbach was born on October 27, 1939, in Maplewood, New Jersey, where she last lived at 476 Walton Road. Her maiden name is Karassik and she is a divorcee at this time. She arrived in New Mexico on or about March 22, 1968.

Mrs. Hattenbach is a graduate of Oberlin College in Ohio, and spent a year in Paris at the Sorbonne. From 1963 to 1966 she worked in Paris as a translator. Then for a year or so she worked in Madrid. She is now employed at the Bernalillo County Medical Center as a secretary to Dr. Ernest Simon, for which she gets $330 a month from the University of New Mexico.

Why would a woman with such a background work for $330 a month?

It seems she is close to Ed Vickery, a militant gringo revolutionist from Los Angeles, who accompanied Reies Tijerina to Washington for the Communist "Poor People's Campaign." Mrs. Hattenbach herself worked on the Campaign, during office hours, to the dismay of Dr. Simon, her boss. Indeed, she apparently has been using office supplies to print and mimeograph material for Tijerina's *Alianza* and the Brown Berets.

---

*Others involved in local agitation include attorney William J. Fitzpatrick, of the Legal Aid Society; Richard J. Knott, another attorney; attorney Paul A. Phillips, head of the local American Civil Liberties Union—founded primarily by Communist Harry F. Ward, Gerald Goodman, another attorney; Allen V. Robnett, an electrical engineer at Sandia Corporation, and his wife, Jean; Bainbridge Bunting, a professor of sociology at the University of New Mexico; and Dorelen F. Bunting; and Mrs. Helen H. Ellis, Social Consultant of the First Unitarian Church.

In fact, her assignment in the war on the Albuquerque police is apparently to make available to the Brown Berets all medical reports on patients allegedly injured while being arrested, so that the information can be used in complaints of "police brutality."

Then there is Howard Butler Durham, also known as Jim Durham, of 8408 La Camila Dr., N.E. Mr. Durham is still another gringo, born on August 4, 1925, in Rigby, Idaho. He is a graduate of the University of California at Berkeley, and an electrical engineer. He is a member of the Socialist N.A.A.C.P., of the Marxist Americans for Democratic Action, and of the United World Federalists, which is trying to dissolve the United States.

Mr. Durham is also very active in the scheme to impose a "civilian police review board" on the people of Albuquerque. The guidelines for his proposed board include the following: "A name which is not 'loaded' should be selected for the grievance committee (for example, 'Albuquerque Grievance Committee') in order to avoid the kinds of misunderstandings inevitable in the use of the phrase, 'civilian police review board'—care should be exercised not to refer to the grievance committee as the 'civilian police review board.' "

In other words, don't say "civilian police review board," because the idea has been thoroughly discredited throughout the country as a scheme to harass the police. Don't alert the victims in Albuquerque. Call the proposed civilian police review board a "grievance committee."

Mr. Durham works in the Systems Research Department of the Sandia Corporation in Albuquerque, which is vital to the production of our nuclear weapons. He holds a Top Secret clearance.

What it means, I don't yet know, but Gilberto Ballejos has been trying to get various Brown Berets to undergo some sort of sensitivity test at Sandia—the test to be administered by Jim Durham.

There is also a Stephen W. Denlinger, of 3004 Morris, N.E., Apt. 19, who is an instructor at the University of New Mexico's Center for Community Action Services, which naturally is supported with federal funds. His office is located at 2001 Gold, S.E., where the telephone number is 277-5321. His number at home is 299-6120. Mr. Denlinger has been distributing calling cards including both numbers, and stating that anyone brutalized by the police should call him at any time, so that he can immediately photograph the injuries.

And there is Beverly Axelrod, who lives in Espanola, and besides being Tijerina's attorney is editor of *El Grito Del Norte* (The Cry of the North). Every Friday night, the Tijerinistas gather at Beverly's, where under her supervision they write various articles about "police brutality" for the next issue of her newspaper.

In her yard, Beverly keeps about six German Shepherds which she claims she has trained as watch dogs. One can't be too careful what with the crime rate these days.

SUPPORT FOR REVOLUTION

Indeed, the web of subversion in Albuquerque contains the usual endless strands. For instance, Henry Munoz, Jr., of Austin, Texas, is Equal Opportunity Director of the Texas A.F.L.-C.I.O. A man named Sherman Miles is also a Union official. On August 24-26, 1968, they stayed in Albuquerque at the Hilton Hotel, where they held several meetings with various Brown Berets. It seems they want Carlos Cansino to return to Albuquerque, where they believe he can best use his talents as an Organizer. They told Ballejos they would try to arrange it and possibly hire Cansino at about $12,000 a year; or get him a state or federal job in Albuquerque.

On one occasion, Munoz gave Ballejos $300. He also mentioned that he might possibly be able to supply the Brown Berets with $57,000 to train other Organizers.

Then there is Jerome A. Bailey, of 2908 Shirley St., N.E., who is State Representative of the Communications Workers of America, Local 8611, with an office at 2745-F San Mateo Blvd., N.E. Bailey has met with the Brown Berets and invited them to an Organizers' school for six weeks of training he would conduct, during which he would pay each of them thirty dollars a week. During the 1968 election campaign, Mr. Bailey worked for the Democrat Party, and gave the Brown Berets a sizeable supply of campaign material to instruct their "neighbors."

Bailey is also very interested in the Albuquerque City School Commission, which he would like to control. Toward this end he asked the Brown Berets to march on the Excelsior Laundry, which is owned by a member of the Commission.

Bailey is also a close associate of Castroite terrorist Reies Tijerina.

And there is an outfit called the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, which is located in the International Building in San Antonio, Texas, where its telephone number is 224-5476. The Executive Director of M.A.L.D. is Pete Tijerina. I do not know whether he is related to Reies Tijerina. On the Board of Directors are Levi Martinez of Pueblo, Colorado (one of Tijerina's lawyers) and Jack Greenberg, of the Socialist N.A.A.C.P.'s Legal Defense Fund in New York.

It seems that M.A.L.D. has a fund of two million dollars—donated apparently by the Ford Foundation—for use in the defense of Latins in trouble with the law. The establishment of organizations of attorneys to defend captured terrorists is of course a standard Communist technique, the best known example of which at the moment is the Communist National Lawyers Guild.

That the Ford Foundation is involved will not surprise readers of American Opinion. (See November, 1968.) Its President is Marxist conspirator McGeorge Bundy, formerly of the staff of the subversive Council on Foreign Relations. It was the Ford Foundation which financed the "experimental school district" in Brooklyn which almost caused the complete destruction of New York City's educational system in the fall of 1968. And it was the Ford Foundation which in July, 1968, sent $630,000 for use in agitation among Mexican Americans to the Southwest Council of La Raza, headed by Maclovio R. Barraza—already officially identified by the federal Subversive Activities Control Board as a member of the Communist Party. When testifying about the matter in 1963, Communist Barraza invoked the Fifth Amendment *sixty* times.

Indeed, on November 6, 1968, Stuart Black, Thomas Wolman, and Norma Bragg flew into Albuquerque on T.W.A. and registered at the White Winrock Motor Hotel. They stayed in rooms 156 and 157, and paid with American Express credit card 040-827-035-3-808. They gave their address as 112 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

While in town the above worthies met with the Brown Berets and said they were employed by an O.E.O. outfit in New York called L.E.A.P. (Lower Eastside Action Project), which, they said, furnishes their credit card. They said that they had already been able to provoke some wonderful trouble in New York—in the schools, for instance, where they got about a thousand students to protest and walk out; and that with the funds they had now they would provoke much more trouble. They said they wanted to establish communications between revolutionary groups from New York to California, that this was their reason for being in town, and that the Brown Berets had L.E.A.P.'s full support.

They also said that while in Albuquerque they might buy a ranch in the Manzano area belonging to somebody named Armijo; and that if they did it would be used as a hideout by fugitives from New York, after the usual spontaneous riots in that city were arranged.

And they said that they were also getting money from the Ford Foundation.

Fascinating, isn't it? People paid with your tax money, to provoke revolution in New York, turn up provoking revolution in Albuquerque.

They stayed in Albuquerque only one night, leaving via T.W.A. at 2:30 a.m. on November 7, 1968. Their rooms at the motel cost twenty-five dollars each.

Many of us wish we were "poor" enough to afford that.

BASE FOR REVOLUTION

Crucial to all the Communist activity in New Mexico is the famous San Cristobal Valley Ranch, about twenty miles north of Taos, in the heart of the territory Reies Tijerina is terrorizing. Readers will recall (American Opinion, March, 1968) that on March 17, 1950, at a meeting in Denver, the Communist Party decided to run the ranch for its own benefit; that the owner of record is Mrs. Craig Vincent, who previously was married to Henry K. Wells, a teacher at the Jefferson School of Social Science in New York—for years the most important Communist training school—and that on June 12, 1953, Craig Vincent himself, under oath before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, refused to deny that he and his wife are Communists.

As far as I know, Comrade Vincent is still a member of the board of the Community Action Program in Taos—an O.E.O. agency—happily spending your hard-earned taxes.

His Communist ranch can easily house a few hundred people. In one room alone there are about 150 mattresses and cots. Indeed, Cleofes Vigil, who apparently lives there, says the residents have what they need to go underground for months at a time with no problems whatsoever, and that all vehicles entering the area can easily be seen. What it means, I do not know, but behind one of the cabins on the ranch there is a small building enclosed by barbed wire and bearing a large sign which reads: "Danger—Stay Away."

The informative Señor Vigil is a middle-aged man with a Cuban accent, who apparently finds time to write revolutionary poetry for *El Gallo,* the Marxist newspaper run by Rudolpho Gonzalez, the Red-nosed Mutineer.

Another resident of the ranch is William Longley, also known as Bill Vasquez. His wife is Henrietta Vasquez Tafoya, one-time secretary of the U.S. Attorney in Denver. At last word, he drives a white 1962 Plymouth, registered to Henrietta Tafoya, of 3360 W. Louisiana, in Denver.

Longley is a close associate of Rudolpho's. At meetings in his home with such guests as Reies' brothers, Anselmo and Cristobal, he has laughingly mentioned how amusing it would be if the Kit Carson National Monument were blown up by revolutionaries.

The brothers Tijerina apparently are often at the Communist ranch. So are Rudolpho and his gang from Denver. Vincent has so many friends. Once, for instance, a large group of Mexican nationals met there for two weeks. And Vincent has told the revolutionary Brown Berets to make themselves at home. It seems he "feels sorry" for the Mexican-American people. He says he wants the Brown Berets to meet at his Communist ranch quarterly.

Then there is Phil Reno, of 448 Hermosa Drive, N.E., who works as an economist at

XUM

the University of New Mexico. Reno writes extensively on "poverty" in Albuquerque. Recently, for instance, he handed a thirty-page report on the matter to the Albuquerque-Bernalillo Equal Opportunity Board, where Ballejos used to work.

Phil Reno is intimately associated with Comrade Vincent, and has been a Communist for about thirty years.

Among the many other revolutionaries now swarming over the Albuquerque area is Shirley Hill Witt, of 520 Sixteenth St., N.W. Mrs. Witt is a divorcee with two children, and came to Albuquerque, apparently from Ann Arbor, Michigan, on or about August 23, 1967, shortly after the raid on the Tierra Amarilla Courthouse. She is attending the University of New Mexico with a federal grant, and is working for a doctorate in Philosophy and Anthropolgy.

Since her arrival, Shirley has been a very active member of Tijerina's organization. She is also very interested in Indians, claiming to be part Indian, and is now agitating among the Indians in the Taos Pueblo area.

Then there is Aquiles Trujillo Jr., also known as Joe and as Gil Trujillo, of 300 Conchas, N.E., where his telephone number is 299–9351. He was born on March 3 1932, in Madrid, New Mexico, and is a brother of Brown Beret leader Tony Trujillo. Indeed, he has met many times with the Brown Berets, and is trying to help them in various ways.

He is employed as a Staff Assistant at Sandia Base, where his number is 264–8603. He has a Top Secret clearance.

Tony Trujillo, also known as Tony Garcia and as Albert Trujillo, was also born in Madrid, New Mexico, on February 12, 1936, now lives at 1305 Princeton, N.E., and is known to the F.B.I. as 839–305–A. On October 27, 1968, he was arrested for aggravated assault and given thirty days in jail, and will possibly be returned to the pen for a parole violation.

And there is Wayne G. Andrews and his wife Palmyra, of 140 Pleasant Ave., N.W., where the telephone number is 345–0723. Mr. Andrews works as a draftsman at Flatow, Moore, Bryan & Fairburn, Architects, in the First National Bank Building in Albuquerque. At one time, his wife worked for the O.E.O.

Andrews is a very close associate of Craig Vincent's, and he and his wife have met many times with the Brown Berets.

Also there is Maria Horn, of 315 Sixth St., S.W., Apt. B., who recently was convicted of disorderly conduct after attacking Albuquerque police sergeant Ben Chavez with a beer bottle. She is now working for S.E.R. (Service, Employment, Relocation, another O.E.O. outfit), as a secretary to S.E.R's boss, Robert S. Barela. Mrs. Horn is very closely associated with Katherine Hattenbach and Maria Varela.*

REIES WORKS FAST

As for Reies Lopez Tijerina himself, he has been busily revolting during the past year as you would expect. In the summer of 1968, he was a leader of the Communist "Poor People's March" in Washington, where he stayed at the Embassy Hotel with Higgs, the Mississippi molester. You don't catch a fancy gent like Reies sleeping in a muddy tent with the rabble. No, sir! And wouldn't you too like to be "poor and oppressed," so you could fly wherever and whenever you liked? For instance, on July 6, 1968, Reies flew in from Washington with the molester for the weekly meeting of his *Alianza* at 1010 Third St., N.W., in Albuquerque. Afterward, in private, his brother Cristobal Lopez Tijerina talked about training and arming their followers in the north.

Reies gave his approval.

"We're going to have to dig up the machine-guns and clean and oil them," said Cristobal. "They've been buried for the past year."

Reies approved again.

There was also some talk that, two or three days later, some twenty-five South Americans were to be brought to northern New Mexico for demolition and firearms training. Whether or not the training took place at the Communist San Cristobal Valley Ranch, I don't know.

Reies also reported that one John DePugh was still in Chicago, soliciting money for a revolutionary school among the faculty at the University of Chicago. The school apparently is planned for Albuquerque and ostensibly will be a "vocational workshop."

Tijerina returned to Washington at two a.m. on July 8, 1968.

Along these lines, Reies has recently formed an outfit called the *Comancheros del Norte*, headed by Pete Archuleta, the purpose of which is to give military training to his young followers in the north. Archuleta lives with Reies' brother, Anselmo Tijerina. And the Comancheros have met several times with the Brown Berets, presumably to coordinate their various activities. On November 10, 1968, for instance, at a meeting in Tierra Amarilla, the speakers included Ballejos, Archuleta, Anselmo Tijerina, and a Gilberto Romero, who apparently advocated violence. Romero has been trying to get his good friend Ballejos to help him start a cell of the Brown Berets in Santa Fe, where he lives at 831 Calle Ninita, and his telephone number is 982-1622.

Gilberto Leandro Romero was born in Santa Fe on April 5, 1942, has a lengthy record and is known to the Albuquerque Police Department as Suspect 40–480.

On the weekend of October 19–20, 1968, Reies Tijerina held his latest "convention," this time very near the Echo Amphitheater, which probably reminded him of his conviction for having insulted two forest rangers there two years before. Most of the revolutionaries you have been reading about were present of course, and Tijerina and the other speakers as usual denounced the police, calling them names.

Reies announced that he was running for Governor to take votes away from Democrat Fabian Chavez, and that if the courts removed his name from the ballot, he expected all his followers to vote for Republican Governor David Cargo. You will remember that Mrs. Cargo has been a member of Tijerina's organization and that the Governor has run interference for Tijerina.

Reies of course has become a hot cargo—red hot.

His real identity remains unknown. You will remember the demonstration, in my earlier article on the affair, that no proof exists that he was born in the United States. Since then, interested police officials in various places and agencies have unsuccessfully asked for help of the U.S. Department of Immigration and Naturalization in this matter. To no avail!

A source close to Tijerina now tells us, however, that in 1961 or 1962, Reies went to Cuba, where he met with Communist dictator Fidel Castro; and that among other things Reies says Castro gave him a Chinese manual on guerrilla warfare.

And in January, 1964, Tijerina apparently got in touch with Gordonio Hernandez Monroy of the P.S.M. (*Partido Communista Mejicano*), who arranged a meeting in Mexico City with other P.C.M. leaders, to whom Tijerina tried to sell the *Alianza* idea. They didn't buy it.

But Tijerina has been getting money from Mexico which conceivably comes from Cuba, says the source, and has established a Mexican branch of his organization. The plan apparently is to begin guerrilla warfare in New Mexico with the aid of hidden caches of arms, and when necessary to escape into Mexico and make raids on the United States. Whether or not it is the usual braggadocio, I don't know, but Tijerina claims the Mexican Government has promised that it will refuse to extradite him to the United States if the request is made.

He also says that, in the spring of 1969, he and his followers will execute a "mass occupation" of an area in New Mexico called the *San Joaquin del Rio de Chama*, which as you would expect was "ruthlessly stolen" about a hundred years ago from its "rightful owners," the "Indo-Hispanos" (don't ask me). And he has entered into a federal suit against the local boards of education, charging "discrimination" against the "Indo-Hispanos."

As far back as May and July, 1949, in "The Plight and Struggles of the Mexican-Americans," the official Communist magazine *Political Affairs* was laying down the line:

"The special historical development of the Mexican people in the United States as a conquered people, victim of American imperialist expansion, with close ties to Latin America, requires a new and special approach of our Party to the Mexican problem."

And in 1954, reformed Communist Louis Budenz, once Managing Editor of the *Daily Worker*, wrote as follows in *The Techniques of Communism:*

"At the Fourteenth National Convention of the Communist Party, held in 1948, the Mexican-Americans came in for special consideration. Here, again, the Soviet fifth column adopted an attitude which was designed to promote conflict in the United States and to make the Mexican-American issue one that could promote Communist agitation in Latin America against the United States." (Page 272.)

The Communists apparently have realized that there just aren't enough black people in the vast American Southwest who could be bribed, terrorized, killed and conned, as usual, into serving as the cannon fodder necessary to the creation of Communist revolution in the area. That is why the area until now has been so calm. But the plan is to use the large minority of Americans which is there—Americans of Latin descent; there are four or five millions of them throughout the Southwest—and to join that campaign, to the dismay of many of Tijerina's former followers, to the war the Communists are fighting in the rest of the country against American blacks.

As I write, a change in the revolutionary leadership is being made. Gilberto Ballejos apparently is out. It seems he has an insensitive and mercurial personality, and has been cancelling and rescheduling meetings with very short notice. Why waste your time, Gilberto? We are always there.

And at a meeting in Denver on July 18, 1968, several conspirators discussed the possibility of ousting Reies Tijerina and merging his organization with the Crusade for Justice run by their boss—Rudolpho Gonzales, the Red-Nosed Mutineer. The plan included the appointment of Cristobal and Anselmo Tijerina to important positions in New Mexico.

But whoever runs it, it is going on. New Mexico is now beginning to experience the state of terror which the Communists have imposed on Vietnam—and on New York. In northern New Mexico, for instance, people are getting "assessment notices" from Tijerina's Confederation of Free City States, demanding three dollars per month, per household—whether or not they have ever belonged to his organization. The only qualification, apparently, is that one be Latin in origin. If the "assessment" isn't paid within ten days, the delinquent gets another notice, warning of a visit by El Mano Negro—the Black Hand, to you gringos.

And this of course is one of the same techniques the Communists have used to capture country after country; levying "taxes," not just because they want the money, but to create the impression that they are the legitimate government. The Communist Vietcong are doing that right now in South Vietnam, aren't they? You may even read that in your newspaper—which is the last to know.

Along these lines, in Canjilon, one of Tijerina's headquarters, where the raid on

XUM

the neighboring Tierra Amarilla Courthouse was planned, U.S. Forest Rangers John Drake and John Hayden have both been threatened. Reliable witnesses have heard machine-gun fire, from the home of Juan Valdez, for instance. New Mexico State Police Officer Nick Saiz says it was Juan who shot him at the Courthouse.

Jaun probably just "doesn't know" it is illegal to own a machine-gun. Maybe some advocate of confiscatory firearms legislation could explain it to him.

And on July 15, 1968, in the woods around Canjilon, an observer spotted two hairy, bearded white men, wearing combat boots and army fatigues, and armed with what appeared to be M-1 or M-2 carbines with thirty-shot clips. If I remember correctly, that's illegal too. The men also wore belt cases for fifteen-shot clips.

Indeed, in Albuquerque itself, in the South Valley, Tijerinistas have actually been going from door to door to terrorize Latins. As everywhere else—as in Cuba, Algeria and China, and Harlem—the people the Communists are making suffer most, are the very people the Communists claim are demanding "independence" as the solution to their suffering.

In one case, a terrorist appeared at an Anglo home, presumably believing it was Latin, asked the lady of the house, through the screen door, what she thinks of Tijerina, and when she was less than enthusiastic asked what her horses are worth, whether she owns guns, and when her husband is home—and accused her of "racial prejudice" when she refused to answer.

Don't you know we don't need you people and there are enough of us to fill your jobs? he said. Dont you realize we could tie up this town and stop you from getting everything you need? "We can torch this town," he said.

He also tried to force his way into the house, but reconsidered when she showed him the muzzle of her gun.

We wouldnt let her do *that* in New York!

Certainly one of the saddest aspects of this calculated terror is the fact that among the young men recruited into the revolutionary Brown Berets—as in Cuba, Algeria, China and Harlem—are victims who really believe, at least at first, that Tijerina is trying to do good. Hopefully, someone can get to them before they ruin their lives.

So there it is. Incredible though it may be—and it *is* incredible—a Castroite guerrilla war is being arranged for the American Southwest. Reies Tijerina, or whoever it is who gives the orders, may already have selected a day this spring or summer as *Der Tag*.

Only the people of New Mexico—regardless of origin—can stop it.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, three American astronauts are today streaking toward the moon to attempt man's first landing. The plaque they will leave behind says, "We came in peace for all mankind."

Those brief words say more about America's goals and objectives in space and on earth than all the books and speeches ever written.

This week commemorates another Captive Nations Week. The very thought of men and women and children held in perpetual bondage by an alien system is repugnant to people who wish to be free to think for themselves. The terrorism that is so characteristic of totalitarian regimes has no place on this earth. The very idea of enslaving whole peoples and whole nations behind a wall of silence and injustice belongs to the dark ages of man's past. It has no place in this age of exploration, discovery, and universal rejoicing over man's accomplishments and achievements.

One of our astronauts once described earth as "an oasis in the vastness of space." Unless men begin to treat this planet and all those who inhabit it with the reverence they deserve as fellow human beings, none of us will long survive.

With God's help, man will set foot on the moon within 4 days from now. Let us all sincerely pray that this greatest of all man's adventures will signal the start of a world where justice and tranquillity and human dignity are nourished and perpetuated for all time. A world where all people may be free and a world where nations like America will not have to observe a Captive Nation Week because the nations now held in Communist bondage will again be free as members of the world community.

GOLDA MEIR STANDS FIRM

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the tense situation which exists today in the Middle East; a situation which is constantly aggravated by the murderous acts of Arab marauders and by the continued refusal of the Arab governments to conduct face-to-face negotiations with the State of Israel.

While these wanton acts of Arab aggression continue, the four powers are involved in what may be an attempt to impose a settlement upon the Israelis and the Arabs. Israel bitterly opposes such a settlement, to the utter consternation of the rest of the world.

Is this, Mr. Speaker, merely an act of intransigence, or is it simply commonsense? Let us deal more fully with this matter.

I am reminded, Mr. Speaker, of the third verse of the 30th chapter in the Book of Numbers which states:

> If a man vow a vow unto the Lord, or swear an oath to bind his soul with a bond; he shall not violate his word, but he shall do according to all that goeth forth from his mouth.

Since 1938, the world community has sworn many oaths to the Jewish people and to the State of Israel; as of today, not one has gone inviolate. In 1938, Adolf Hitler vowed to the British that Czechoslovakia would be his last conquest; by 1945, 6 million Jewish souls had been turned to soap and ashes.

In 1948, the United Nations called upon Jordan to allow the members of the Jewish faith free access to the Old City of Jerusalem; yet until 1967, no Jew, regardless of whether he were an Israeli citizen or an American in uniform, was permitted to set foot in the Holy City.

In 1957, the United Nations swore to maintain Middle Eastern peace through the use of its Emergency Force; in 1967, however, the world body reneged on its vow and meekly removed its forces at the insistence of President Nasser, thus leaving Israel at the mercy of her warlike neighbors.

Also in 1967, Israel watched in horror as the major maritime nations, who had previously vowed that free access and use of the Straits of Tiran were to be guaranteed to all nations, stood silent and inactive as Egypt closed that waterway to the ships of Israel.

The nations of the world, Mr. Speaker, have consistently "sworn an oath to bind their souls with a bond" in regard to Israel; and they have all too willingly and all too quickly violated their word. Can Israel now rightfully be assailed for refusing to accept the solemn vows of the four powers? Should she truly trust the words of the Soviet Union, a nation which professes, in its constitution, to grant freedom to all of its minorities, but which mercilessly and without cause persecutes its Jewish citizens?

Should she trust France, a nation which took her money but which refuses to furnish the arms which were purchased with that money?

Israel has fought three wars to maintain her independence and her very existence. We have no right, Mr. Speaker, to expect such a valiant people to stand idly by and watch as the four powers attempt to bargain away her hard won freedom.

Only by a face-to-face meeting between Israel and her Arab neighbors, the only just and righteous course, can peace finally be achieved. We must, Mr. Speaker, redouble our efforts to bring this about.

In an address before the Israel Parliament on June 30, 1969, the Prime Minister of Israel, Mrs. Golda Meir, dealt with the very subjects of the four power talks and of Arab terrorist activities. Under unanimous consent, I submit excerpts from that statement for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHLIGHTS FROM THE ADDRESS OF PRIME MINISTER GOLDA MEIR IN THE KNESSET (PARLIAMENT), JUNE 30, 1969

1. ISRAEL'S POLICY TOWARDS CEASE-FIRE VIOLATIONS

Ever since the opening of the Knesset's (Parliament) summer session on 5 May, belligerence along the cease-fire lines has increased in severity. Thousands of shells have been lobbed across the lines at the Israel Defense Forces positions and posts, as well as at peaceful villages and farmers working in the fields. There can be no doubt as to who initiated the firing. Witness thereto are the reports of the U.N. observers along the Suez Canal, who have determined the true facts. The President of Egypt admits it in his own declarations. The Prime Minister of Jordan proclaims his identification with Fatah and its actions. The actions of the Egyptian and Jordanian arms along the cease-fire lines are tantamount to a de facto cancellation of the cease-fire arrangements.

The frivolity of the authorities responsible for the violations of the cease-fire has resulted in the need for tens of thousands of people to evacuate the firing zones, not only in the Suez Canal area but also east of the River Jordan. We regret the suffering caused to peaceful residents and we should be glad to see them return to work their fields. We should be happy if conditions were to be created which would enable farmers from both banks of the river to do their work in peace.

Israel, for instance, is well aware of the value and the blessing of water for development and growth, and I declare herewith that Israel has decided not to interfere with repair works of the Ghor Canal in Jordan, on the assumption that the Jordanian authorities will take effective measures which will stop their army and the Fatah in the region, as in other regions, from continuing to shell our villages and from infiltrating into our territory for the purpose of mine-laying and murder.

Israel has never initiated nor will she ever in future initiate fire if peace will be kept and if no attacks or shellings on our villages will be waged. I shall not go into the details of a series of actions taken in self-defense by the Israel Defense Forces with the purpose of silencing the sources of fire and shelling in the vicinity of the cease-fire lines and even at some depth from them. As I said on 5 May 1969, we shall act along the cease-fire lines on the basis of reciprocity. Anybody who fails to honor the cease-fire agreement and shoots at us cannot claim impunity from the results of his aggression. Those who attack us should not be surprised if they are hit sevenfold in response, since our main purpose in retaliating is self-defense and deterrence. Once again I wish to declare that Israel desires that the cease-fire arrangements be complied with fully, but he who violates them should not expect Israel to stand by idly.

2. THE IMPACT OF THE FOUR-POWER TALKS

It is impossible not to note the fact that the method of violating the cease-fire arrangements has grown in intensity and severity at the very time when the Four Power talks were being held. It is also impossible not to reach the conclusion that the rulers of the Arab States see in the Four Power talks an opportunity, nay, even a backing for ever growing belligerence. We are strengthened in our opinion that the rulers of the Arab States are encouraged by the hope that, in as much as they persist in their belligerence during the Four Power talks, even if they achieve no real military purpose thereby, they stand a chance of being the gainers politically.

I wish to re-emphasize that we are not accusing the United States and Great Britain, nor France, of the intention to aid or abet military aggression against Israel, but it is our duty to acquaint them with the results to which we are witness in reality: the Four Power talks have not brought about any détente nor the curbing of belligerence; they have not led to a more restrained and responsible attitude by the Arab States, nor have they promoted the creation of a climate of peace. The Powers' intervention is being construed by the Arab States as acquiescence to their refusal to open negotiations with Israel, and possibly even as a justification of this refusal.

Of a surety, the Four Powers which have undertaken to discuss the destinies of the Middle East are not of one piece and should not be treated as such, for each one of them has its specific attitude towards the State of Israel and to the problems of the Middle East.

The attitudes of countries, even though they be friendly towards each other, do not tally, but a distinction must be drawn between debate and the hostility which characterizes the policy of the U.S.S.R. towards the State of Israel. It is a fact that this Power undertook to represent the dangerous policy of the most extremist elements within the Arab States.

3. THE SOVIET POLITICAL TACTIC

Israel's attitude throughout the years has been to encourage any move designed to ease tension in the world, and to welcome colloquy between the Powers aimed at peace. Our attitude all the years has been that it were better for our region not to become an arena for rivalry between the Powers, and as long as there was no identification of the Soviet Union with Nasserism, we hoped that colloquy with her on regional matters might make it easier to find a peaceful solution. But in view of the Soviet Union's recent policy, and recalling that her dangerous moves in the months of May and June 1967 kindled a conflagration in our region, we ask: what sign is there and what is the foundation for hoping that there exists a basis for colloquy with her on problems of the Middle East, which would take into account the requirements of the existence and development of Israel? What use can there be in attempts to reach conciliatory formulas and definitions with representatives of the Soviet Union, when there is no agreed common basis concerning Israel's right to attain such a peace, the content and pattern of which are customary and prevalent between nations and countries? Even if joint formulas are arrived at, what is their real worth when their basic content is not agreed upon?

On the eve of the Soviet Foreign Minister's recent visit to Egypt, somebody took the trouble to create the impression that there had been beneficial progress in the Soviet attitude towards the region's problems and concerning Israel's rights. Various publications set out to explain that Mr. Gromyko had gone to Egypt to secure Nasser's agreement to a moderate stand which the Soviet Union was about to propose to the U.S. We had no faith in these hopes, and indeed, after Gromyko's return from Egypt, we learn from those same journals that Gromyko has not secured Nasser's agreement to his proposals. Furthermore, from the joint communique issued by Gromyko and Nasser and from the Soviet declarations following the visit, we learn that despite their talks with U.S. representatives, the Soviets have become more accustomed to Nasser's stand than before the Four Power talks. Soviet policy—as heretofore—continues to subserve the Egyptian attitude, and the "progress" of which we were advised was as nought.

Let us hope that this experience will help in dispelling faith in baseless substitutes, and will acquaint political factors of the true situation. The tactics of Soviet diplomacy in serving the Arab States are not aimed at securing peace. The demarches of Soviet diplomacy are aimed at extricating the Arab leaders from peace negotiations, at creating as wide a gap as possible between the U.S. and Israel, and in the main, at regaining for the Arab rulers the losses sustained by them owing to their own belligerence, without their being obligated to make peace. And whilst diplomatic efforts persist, there is continued Soviet assistance for the military strengthening of Egypt, in arms, in training and in planning.

4. ISRAEL'S PRINCIPAL VIEW ON FOUR POWER INVOLVEMENT

There are those who complain of Israel's intransigence, and quote as an example our attitude to the Big Four talks. It would be a fatal error to try to explain Israel's stand in psychological terms such as stubbornness, suspicion and the like, whilst disregarding our balanced attitude, both in principle and in practice.

In principle, we do not hold with a situation whereby Powers arrogate to themselves the right to discuss the destinies of nations and countries, without the participation of those concerned, and in lieu of immediate colloquy between the nations themselves.

From the political and practical point of view—we cannot but react negatively to the discussions of Powers concerning our destiny, while we are fully aware that one of them is engaged in a trend hostile to us, as the outspoken representative of the Arab States, the rationale of the discussions being that the representatives of the other countries should try to reach a compromise with this Power.

5. DEVELOPMENT OF THE ISRAEL-ADMINISTERED AREAS

Two years have passed since we have established Israeli rule throughout the cease-fire territories. Within a few days after the fighting stopped, we succeeded in restoring normal life to the new areas. This was rendered possible, of course, not only due to the abilities of the Israel Defense Forces, nor owing to a correct policy, but thanks to the fact that the population of the areas, with few exceptions, has abstained from aiding sabotage operations of the terrorist organizations and other irresponsible elements.

We have made it a line of our policy to have the inhabitants of the new areas administer their civil life themselves and, as far as possible, without the intervention of the military governments. In spite of the heavier burden this imposed upon the security forces, we have chosen not to disrupt the ties between the population of Judea and Samaria and their relatives and fellow Arabs in Jordan. We have done a good deal for the economic advancement of these areas. For instance: the Ministry of Agriculture, by means of local staffs from these areas, has initiated widespread operations in Judea, Samaria and in Gaza for the advancement of agriculture. My means of "field-days" and various training operations the acreage under cultivation has been considerably increased. Tobacco plots in Judea and Samaria, for instance, have grown in size from 15,000 dunam to 18,000 dunam (4,500 acres); citrus plantations have been sprayed with insecticide; cattle have been immunized and branded; successful operations have been carried out for the immunization of all poultry against disease, and indeed, poultry mortality, which two years ago exceeded a rate of 60 per cent, has been radically reduced. In the Gaza Strip manifold actions have been taken to advance local citriculture. Citrus exports are now carried out most efficiently thanks to mechanized packing plants set up for the first time in this area. Wage levels, standards of sanitation and transportation, as well as the employment situation, have of late shown improvements.

I am happy to point out that in the field of education, tuition during the second school year proceeds according to full normal routine—of course, without our interference in school curricula.

It is perfectly obvious to us that the Government of Israel is the only government in existence and in operation in the areas and must, therefore, shoulder the responsibility for the supply of services to the population—primarily, sources of livelihood. The ministerial committee for the administered areas is making progress in formulating agreed rules for increasing employment for the jobless, primarily within the areas proper.

Exemplary action has been taken amidst the Sinai Bedouin in all matters concerning their education and public health.

In spite of hesitations, we have decided again this year to enable Arabs who are foreign citizens to spend their vacations with their relatives in Judea and Samaria. Their sojourn in areas under Israeli administration will show them the extent of the distortions spread abroad about Israel and they will find out for themselves what abyss yawns between the lies and factual reality.

In general, it is our intention to persist in this balanced policy as long as security considerations will not oblige us to alter it.

XUM

Moreover, we have no reason to alter what we have laid down in the basic principles of the government:

"Israel will persist in her readiness to conduct negotiations—without prior conditions by any party—with every one of her neighbors, for the purpose of concluding a peace treaty. In the absence of peace treaties, Israel will continue to maintain fully the state of affairs as determined with the cease fire, and will fortify her position, with due consideration for the vital needs of her security and development."

We are fully determined to pursue this policy, in its security and in its constructive significance, both de jure and de facto.

6. ISRAEL-UNITED STATES DIALOG

I have already informed the public that I have received an invitation from the President of the United States, Mr. Richard Nixon, to meet him for talks in the White House. The date of the visit has not yet been fixed. I was happy to accept this invitation, not only for the opportunity it affords to establish contact with the President of the greatest Power on earth, but—no less important—for the precious occasion it affords to meet an old friend of the State of Israel. In view of the situation in the Middle East and of Israel's vital needs, the Government of Israel attaches great value to this friendly dialogue on problems shared by Israel and the U.S. I do hope that these debates will promote the fortifying of Israel and will advance the cause of peace in the Middle East.

7. ISRAEL HAS THE CAPACITY TO STAND FIRM UNTIL PEACE

I reject any fatalistic approach to the region's affairs. The situation in our region does not lack a remedy nor is it intractable of a solution.

Responsible political factors, friendly factors, can help in remedying the situation.

Governments desirous of advancing peace and security can influence the Arab leaders to forego the hopes for solution by means of a military decision, and to turn towards a solution by means of peace, colloquy, agreement—to encourage the heads of the Arab States to agree to meeting with Israel and to negotiate with her, with due respect and equality of values and a mutual regard for the future of all the region's nations. The forgers of public opinion can assist by casting a true light on the situation in our region, which would not permit forgetting the fear of the danger facing Israel all the years up to the climax of May 1967, would not distort Israel's desire for peace, and would not cover up for belligerant trends against Israel.

Anyone favoring the advancement of peace in the region will not deny Israel the right to acquire the conditions and weapons requisite for her defense, for strengthening her defensive-deterrent power. There is no better guarantee for the protection of Israel and of peace as well. For only if those who wish us evil despair of the hope for a solution by means of violence and our destruction, only then will the beacons of peace be kindled.

Enemies who look forward to our failure comfort themselves with the hope that Israel will not be able to survive for long under such tension. We have heard this version continuously for twenty years now, and even more so since our victory in the Six Day War. In spite of false prophesies, Israel stands firm along the entire length of the cease-fire lines; and we shall not be moved from our positions.

Sabotage activity has disappointed all those who hoped by means of terror to undermine our way of life.

The laying of mines and booby traps along the way to the Western Wall and in the crowded street of a town is a typical indication of the nature and methods of the sabotage organizations. The intention is to sow panic and fear among us. But I can speak for the whole nation when I say: these shameful deeds achieve exactly the opposite effect. All honor and respect to the Israeli men and women who continue their way to the Western Wall, without regret or restraint, and continue their way of life in busy Tel Aviv. These provocations teach the people of Israel to carry on bravely and purposefully.

And we are right to put our faith in this people, its sons and daughters, in the border villages and the cease-fire lines, whose bravery is revealed in every hour of danger and in all its pride.

We cannot ignore our difficulties, but the tension and want prevalent throughout the Arab countries are demonstrating to the Arab leaders, perhaps for the first time, the acuteness of the dilemma of choosing between aggression and peace. Responsible, thinking people in the Arab world must sooner or later begin to doubt the policy of impasse of their leaders.

The Arab leaders would do well to correctly evaluate the results of their aggression and should truly estimate the suffering they are bringing upon their people.

Our military activity, in reaction to the aggression, has already proved our potential. Although acts of aggression are multiplying along the Suez Canal, we again appeal to the rulers of Egypt to reconsider and change their policy. They intend to cause us suffering and harm, and may create a situation which is even more unbearable to them than to us.

We have no better alternative than to stand firm against tension and pressure. We did not choose the firing situation along the cease-fire lines or the existence of shelters in the border villages, and we are not the ones to determine how long this situation will last. It will not succeed in weakening our strength. We have the power and ability to stand firm and we have enough breath to wait as long as necessary, until our attackers prefer peaceful co-existence to aggression.

"SOUNDS OF SUMMER"—PUBLIC TELEVISION AGAIN HAILS PITTSBURGH

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, we can all be grateful to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the Ford Foundation for providing the country with a different and refreshing 18-week series, entitled "Sounds of Summer," seen each Sunday evening between 8 and 10 p.m. over the national educational television station.

By focusing on the most outstanding summer festivals and cultural events taking place around the United States this summer, the series has the twofold advantage of providing viewers with a wide variety of entertainment while also bringing to the TV screen many events that would not otherwise find a national audience.

I am very pleased that last Sunday's program saluted Pittsburgh. "Pittsburgh: A Festival of Folk" featured the Tamburitzan folk dancers of Duquesne University—who are now on a cultural exchange tour in the Soviet Union—and the American Wind Symphony, performing the "Pickel Suite," dedicated to the H. J. Heinz family of Pittsburgh for their encouragement and support of Pittsburgh music.

The summer series is another feather in the cap of "public TV," which merits our support as well as our attention.

REPORT ON MAY–JUNE 1960 TRIP TO WESTERN EUROPE, MIDEAST

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ray McHugh, chief of the Washington Bureau of the Copley News Service, has just returned from an extensive trip to Western Europe and the Mideast. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the very fine report Mr. McHugh has written on his 5-week trip. It is an excellent analysis of the current situation in that part of the world, and I believe that it deserves wide attention. The report follows:

REPORT ON MAY–JUNE 1969 TRIP TO WESTERN EUROPE, MIDEAST

(By Ray McHugh)

The five-week trip took me to Britain, France, Spain, Greece, Austria, Israel, Lebanon, Jordan and occupied areas of Syria. Combined with my late winter visit to Scandinavia and West Germany, it has formed some strong impressions of the European and Mediterranean scenes.

Two major points stand out:

1. Western Europe faces a period of intense political uncertainty aggravated by increasing inflation. Communist and socialist parties are making determined efforts in several countries. France has just named a new president who faces major tasks; the unpopular Labor government clings doggedly to power in Britain; West Germany votes in September and Willy Brandt, the leading disciple of "détente", will run a strong race; the Italian government has finally collapsed and we may see the Communists bid for a place in a coalition; Greece finds itself more isolated and more frustrated; Turkey faces elections this fall and while conservatives are expected to win there promises to be much more turmoil and more anti-American displays.

(Turkish ports are now closed to the Sixth Fleet because of riots, leaving only Greek and Spanish ports and Naples open to U.S. warships.)

2. Basic solutions in the Middle East seem as remote as before the Six-Day War of 1967. If anything, the Arab and Israeli positions are hardening. A new war does not seem likely this year, simply because Nasser is not ready and the Soviets are fearful of the consequences of another Arab defeat. Next year? Events in Cairo and Moscow will probably answer that question.

I still found no evidence to support the wishful-thinkers who claim Russia is eager for détente and waits only a signal from the West. On the contrary the picture of Russia that was painted for me was a country growing more repressive at home, more dangerous abroad.

I had heard more than one warning that as the Kremlin clamps down on a pregnant liberalism at home, it is losing any interest in cooling useful distracting international tensions—unless, of course, it can get unilateral concessions from the west.

XUM

The political uncertainty in Europe range from Sweden to Turkey.

There will be a change of leadership in Sweden in October with the ultra liberal, anti-American Olov Palme succeeeding Tag Erlander as Social Democrat premier. Palme is deeply involved in the Swedish anti-Vietnam propaganda program, is a darling of student radicals, a public supporter of Hanoi and the Viet Cong and a vocal critic of the United States. The anti-American demonstrations in Stockholm on July 4 are an indication that things are going to get worse before they get better. It's my personal opinion that we should continue to withhold an ambassador, follow up protests already made by Frank Shakespeare, director of USIA, and resist all suggestions that U.S. deserters given sanctuary in Sweden be granted amnesties.

France has weathered the resignation of Gen. DeGaulle in surprisingly good fashion. In fact, a visitor is struck by a sense of relief that DeGaulle has left the scene.

It's interesting to note that President Nixon is highly regarded in all the countries I visited and there are still many favorable comments about his February-March trip. With the exception of Sweden, anti-American and anti-Vietnam war fever seems to be cooling. In Spain and Greece the governments simply won't tolerate any displays.

Although few Europeans would put it as well, the London Economist recently gave this enlightened appraisal of Vietnam:

"It is arguable that the cost of victory, in terms of bloodshed, is proving to be too great; but the cost of betrayal would be even greater . . . It is an illusion to imagine that the United States can agree to a compromise peace that would amount to a sell-out and retain any credibility in Asia. Nor in Asia alone; for in this shrunken world credibility is indivisible."

Europeans fears that America might return to isolationism also seem to be declining since the election of Mr. Nixon, although I think the bigger factor is the ever-growing involvement of American business in Europe. This constitutes an expanding commitment of its own.

At any rate, Paris is once again a friendly city or as one restaurant owner put it:

"France has got her smile back."

How long this continues will depend on Pompidou's ability to check inflation, the threat to the franc and a scheduled round of wage demands by French unions, heavily backed by the Communist party.

Alain Poher who was the anti-Gaullist center candidate for president made a disappointing showing in both the first and second round elections primarily because the French farmer and small merchant was worried about his ability to withstand the Communists. You noted that Jacques Duclos, the Communist leader, almost beat Poher in the first round voting June 1. That narrow squeak sealed his doom in the runoff against Pompidou.

Poher would probably have moved faster than Pompidou to restore traditional U.S.-French cooperation and to rekindle French interest in NATO. Pompidou cannot turn abruptly away from the DeGaulle pattern. But a significant change has already taken place in Paris. There is an obvious effort underway to woo Americans and the strength the Communists showed in the election has raised again the fears of a Popular Front government.

Communist hopes obviously hinge on confusion. Pompidou is under great pressure—because of DeGaulle excesses—to devalue the franc. Inflation is eating up the wage increases that were granted workers last June after the near revolution. If he can stabilize the situation, France will move step by step back into full Western partnership, I think. If he fails, France will see turmoil and demands for new elections that could sweep away the substantial Gaullist majority in the Assembly and open the door to a possible Socialist-Communist coalition.

It should not be overlooked that West Germany, the most prosperous country in western Europe, has already made several responsible moves to help lessen French economic problems. And there is honest appreciation for the U.S. moves in late 1968 and early 1969 to slow up the franc.

The departure of DeGaulle does not make British entry into the Common Market automatic, but Pompidou's early moves indicate that French opposition will be much less severe. The French seem ready to let other ECC members decide the issue. France once held itself aloof from Common Market programs, but Paris, I think, now has come to the realization that it needs all the help it can get from its neighbors if it is to solve its economic woes. DeGaulle's haughty ideas of grandeur are fading rapidly.

Entry into the Common Market—even if it comes—is not likely to solve the mess Harold Wilson has led the British into.

Wilson has not been able to increase Britain's productivity, he has surrendered to the extreme left elements of his party and the Trades Union Council in dropping a very mild Taft-Hartley type of law that would have limited some of the outrageous wildcat strikes that are costing Britain millions and now he finds the IMF and the World Bank imposing "banana republic" conditions to credits.

The British are getting only 50 per cent of a loan at the time of agreement. The other half is held back, contingent on reviews by international bankers of the British economy and the government's policies. It shows how far the once proud British have fallen.

Despite the fact that Labor has not won a significant election in two years and must stand today as one of the most unpopular governments in British history, there is little likelihood of an early change. Wilson does not have to call elections until March of 1971 and it is unlikely that his members of parliament will rebell in any "no-confidence" vote. They are as vulnerable as the prime minister. Things can't get worse for them they reckon; but they can get much worse for Britain. In fact, several bankers in the "City" told me candidly that they expect another devaluation of the pound this fall.

London has fallen behind Rotterdam and Antwerp among European ports and traffic is declining steadily. A British ship line owner told me he refuses to use British ports because of the intolerable labor conditions created by the Communist-influenced Dock Workers Union.

The wildcat Ford strike late last winter also is costing Britain a substantial part of the European car boom. (Western Europe has outgrown even the United States as a market for new automobiles.)

From the military point of view, the situation in Britain is critical. Defense cuts are leaving the army and RAF nothing but shells and the Navy is fast becoming a home defense force. The Labor Government's glowing pledges of full NATO cooperation can be looked at as a smokescreen to hide the pathetic state of affairs.

Military men in London are beginning to speak quite bluntly to Americans. It's off the record, but I've never heard such anti-government sentiment from generals and admirals. I heard one fairly high defense official use the word "traitorous" in describing Britain's military state. Words like that were unthought of only two years ago.

Even if the Tories can reclaim power in the next 12 months, the retreat from east of Suez appears to have reached a point of no return and for all practical purposes it's a retreat from east of Gibraltar. The services are losing their best NCOs and junior officers. The reserves are being scrapped on the theory that they won't be needed in a nuclear war. (The burden this theory puts on the United States as a "policemen" is obvious.)

Labor cites money as the cause of the defense cuts, but the pacifist and militant left of the party is determined, in the view of Tories, to destroy the British military establishment and all it stands for before they are forced from office.

One word about the Tories. Ted Heath is the titular head of the Conservative party, but he is a lackluster leader with problems. I heard many who believe Sir Alec Douglas-Home (Macmillan's successor) will head the next government in an interim role until a younger, more articulate figure emerges. Don't count out someone like Julian Amery, particularly if the Conservative tide is running strongly.

While I was in London, the Rhodesian issue came to a head and I had a chance to talk with Rhodesia House officials, "City" bankers with wide African experience and with members of parliament. The consensus was that the Wilson government, through errors of omission and commission—particularly its resort to the U.N. to brand Rhodesia "an enemy of world peace"—has solidified a situation that may take 25 years to resolve.

On Rhodesia, I refer you a recent statement by Elspeth Huxley:

"We in Britain cannot now extricate ourselves from the mess. We are on the escalator, going down, and there's something nasty in the basement. The United States is about the only hope we have. If it could persuade Mr. Wilson to snap out of his imperialist dreams of flags, rebels, governors, oaths of allegiance and so forth, there is no reason why a reasonable compromise that would secure the political advancement of Rhodesia's Africans without first obliging them to starve to death could not be reached."

In Spain I had the privilege of talking with Gen. Franco, Minister Fraga, the men who negotiated the U.S.-Spanish treaty extension, the American officers who manage our military aid programs and those who command the big air base and communications hub at Torrejon.

Despite rumors to the contrary, Franco looks hale and hearty at 76. His mind is quick and there seems no doubt about who is in charge. He is reportedly set on restoring Prince Juan Carlos de Bourbon to the Spanish throne. The prince, 31, is the son of Don Juan, the exiled pretender to the throne.

Also, despite reports prevalent in Washington, Torrejon is vital to the Air Force. The base pumps more jet fuel than any base in Europe. Its troposphere communications center is essential to Sixth Fleet operations and handles traffic from all over southern Europe, the Mediterranean and the Middle East—even as far as Pakistan.

Gen. Ben LeBailly, who commands the U.S. bases in Spain, calls the Spaniards "the best friends we have anywhere in the world."

This judgment was confirmed, apparently, in the Madrid decision to accept a two-year extension of the treaty. This spared the Nixon administration a bitter fight with Fulbright's forces over ratification of a new pact.

The current treaty runs until September of 1971. Now talks are to begin this summer. The Spanish want help to modernize their armed forces that are largely equipped with World War II weapons; they feel they should get some kind of favored trade treatment and they want some kind of security arrangement with the United States because they feel the presence of the bases and the changing nature of the Soviet power threatens to involve them quickly in any crisis.

President Nixon has talked of bringing Spain back into "the European family of nations." This could mean NATO, but the Spanish indicate they would prefer a regional defense pact that would not involve them with Scandinavian and northern European states who they believe have been unfairly critical of the Franco regime.

The Spanish have close ties to many of the Arab countries (they just returned the enclave of Ifni to Morocco to remove a point of tension). They represent U.S. interests in Egypt and they are critical of American policy in the Middle East. They express fear that it is opening wide the door for Russian penetration of the Mediterranean and will lead to eventual Soviet domination of all of North Africa.

Madrid officials argue that the United States should put its prestige solidly behind the 1967 United Nations resolution on the Mideast. They argue that this would give the U.N. the primary responsibility for peace and the integrity of Israel, would release the U.S. from its unspoken commitment to the Jewish state and would allow the United States to begin rebuilding its once excellent relations with the Arab world. (Many officials in Greece share this view.)

In Greece, economic activity is intense, but the still resolved political and diplomatic issues hang heavy. The military-backed government has now been in power for two years and there are some dangerous signs of frustration. Most of it is aimed at the United States.

The government resents the delay in the appointment of a Nixon ambassador and sees it as an attempt by Washington to express displeasure with the Athens government. The top men in Athens regard this as interference in Greek affairs and liken it in many ways to the Soviet attitude toward Czechoslovakia.

Gen. George Anghalis, chief of the defense staff and regarded as the No. 2 man in the Greek setup, was particularly outspoken. Premier Papadopoulus is more restrained, but nevertheless critical.

The Greeks also resent the embargo of arms promised them under NATO defense agreements. While their cooperation with U.S. forces, particularly the Sixth Fleet, remains exemplary there is growing anger. The criticism of Greece, which is outspokenly pro-U.S., compared to Washington's silence on Turkey's anti-American demonstrations, the insults from Sweden, the leftist moves of Italy and other countries outrages them.

Even erstwhile political leaders of the center and right regard the situation as dangerous. One former high cabinet officer who was once imprisoned by the military-backed government recommends that a new ambassador be named as soon as possible and that the appointee be a private citizen, not a career diplomat. (The government is very suspicious of our State Department.)

One man who might have great influence in Athens is Gen. William Quinn, USA, Ret., who is now a vice president of the Martin-Marietta Co. Quinn once headed the military aid mission in Greece and his name has been submitted to Preisdent Nixon.

I understand that Quinn is opposed in the State Department on the grounds that since he is a professional soldier his appointment would be construed as support for the government. Nonsense. It seems far more important that the next ambassador be a man who can command the respect of the government and its attention. A career diplomat might well find himself ignored and the situation would simply grow worse.

Many in Athens with prominent business posts or former political experience fear that a continued cold shoulder from Washington will (a) force the military leaders into some form of neutral left-leaning Nasserism, or (b) lead to political chaos in which the loud and leftist Andreas Papandreau would emerge as a leader.

There is argument as to whether the present government would win an election. Prices are going up and this brings discontent in a city like Athens, but in rural areas and smaller cities, the colonels appear to be popular.

A man like Quinn might negotiate with the colonels to secure the much-sought elections. He could quietly use the NATO arms as a lever, restoring them in return for pledges.

If some such tactic is not employed, I'm afraid we risk a serious situation in Greece. Looking around the Mediterranean, we can hardly afford to lose such a friend and such geography. (We might also look at Britain's experience in Rhodesia.)

"Since World War II," Anghalis said, "you have pursued your own self-righteous concept of democracy and look what it has cost you—China, Egypt, most of the Arab world and much of Africa.

"People in your State Department insist that they know how to run countries better than the people who live in them. Your record isn't very good.

"Are you going to throw Greece away, too?"

Despite this political backdrop, the Greek economy is moving ahead, though men like Economics Minister Evamblios frankly admit that the country desperately needs more foreign investment.

Tourism is up about 20 percent this year—some 2 million people, about 500,000 Americans. Hotel construction is being pushed and Evamblios is talking about doubling the tourist traffic next year.

Extremely attractive terms have just been announced for foreign investors and these will probably bring another influx of money, but the do-nothing stance of Washington is probably as big a barrier to economic growth as to political stability.

Austria, by contrast, is a country which is enjoying both prosperity and political stability. I stopped in Vienna primarily to get Austrians' views of the eastern European situation and to make an effort to enter Czechoslovakia. (The Czechs said "no.")

The fears of last summer that Moscow might decide to march into Romania and Yugoslavia, too, have subsided, although the Yugoslavs are described as still "anxious" about the Brezhnev Doctrine. There is great uncertainty about Kremlin policy. Russia is looked on as increasingly repressive, particularly toward its own would-be liberals. This augers ill for the satellites, most Austrians agree.

"It's unfortunate that the mood of nationalism in the satellites coincides with a mood of nationalism in Moscow," said one Viennese official. "There's no doubt who will prevail.

"There also is not doubt that there will have to be liberalization inside Russia, before there can be true relaxation and independence in the satellites."

The Austrians continue to argue against any American trade offensive in eastern Europe, "unless you and your Congress is ready to extend long-term, low-interest credits."

The view is that the Communist nations have little to sell to the United States and that Americans are at a disadvantage in what is essentially a barter economy.

An interesting Austrian sidelight is the fact that the country continues to receive a steady trickle of political refugees from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, Yugoslavia and even Albania.

They are processed in camps and most are whisked away to Canada, Australia or South Africa, three countries that compete vigorously for eastern European exiles.

I've left the confused Middle East for last, because it is so contradictory. Seeds of truth can be found on both sides. So can seeds of ambition, avarice, hatred and stubborn pride.

Little Lebanon which has tried for 20 years to remain on the Arab sidelines may ironically be the next victim. The presence of more than 250,000 Arab refugees in a country of 3 million is developing finally into an explosive situation that the pro-Western Lebanese may not be able to handle.

While Israel feels time is on her side, Lebanon—and Jordan—feel time is running against them. In both countries the hatred of Israel remains intense, but the organization of the refugees into guerrilla forces has added a new dimension. Backed by anti-Israel, anti-American demonstrations, the refugee groups literally forced one Lebanese government to resign. The refugee groups are demanding the right to harass Israel from bases inside Lebanon. They already have won this concession from Jordan.

Lebanese business and political leaders fear, with reason, that if the guerrillas attack Israel from Lebanon, the Israelis will occupy the water-rich southern region of their country. But if they don't permit the raids, the refugees could spark riots that would tear Lebanon apart and end the country's delicate Moslem-Christian balance.

Incidentally, Arab intellectuals and El Fatah leaders from the American University in Beirut can argue tellingly about the "legality" of the Arab claims in Palestine, but one can't escape the impression that the time for legalistic arguments has long passed

Neither Jordan nor Lebanon appear to have the military force either to threaten Israel, or to control the Arab refugeas. The Jordan army apparently gives the El Fatah some support—I experienced one of its barrages at a kibbutz near the Sea of Galilee—but the loss of equipment in the Six-Day War and the loss of strategic territory leaves it at a definite disadvantage.

The real local contest in the Middle East is between Israel and Egypt, with Algeria growing in importance as an Egyptian ally. Even in that contest, despite her lack of size, Israel holds important strategic advantages, notwithstanding the huge Russian input of arms.

I met and interviewed Golda Meir, Abba Eban, Moishe Dayan and other top Israeli officials. They are adamant. They do not want a Big Four settlement or an "imposed" peace. They insist they will not withdraw from occupied areas until Nasser comes to the conference table—a highly unlikely event. They insist that Jerusalem is now an integral part of Israel and that they will not give up the Golan Heights that were wrested from Syria or the lands controlling the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba.

There will have to be major changes in the Arab and Soviet positions—or another war—before these views will change, I'm afraid.

Mrs. Meir also flatly rejects any resettlement of Palestinian refugees in Israel, although she offers them indemnity payments and technical assistance to resettle in other Arab lands.

"They would constitute a Fifth Column here," she said. "If you ask us to commit suicide, at least allow us to choose the method."

Israeli leaders are bitter about the refusal of Arab states to undertake the resettlement of refugees who have lived in squalor in Lebanon, Jordan, the Gaza Strip, etc., for more than 20 years. They charge that the Arab leaders have looked on these hapless people as a weapon to be used against the Jews, not as human beings in need of assistance.

(Israel recently contributed $3 million to UNRRA for Arab refugee relief, although Mrs. Meir admits "it is only a token.")

Men like Dayan and Gen. Haim Bar-Lev, chief of staff, minimize the threat of the guerrillas and the border clashes with regular Jordanian, Syrian and Egyptian forces.

Dayan says the guerrillas have been "schmaltzified" by the American press.

Bar-Lev says much of the action along the Suez Canal has been a figment of Nasser's propaganda machine, although he confirms that there have been many artillery duels, some raiding by both sides and some air battles.

Israeli jets, he said, have shot down Egyptian MIGs within sight of Cairo.

He also said Nasser is continuing with the systematic removal of the civilian popula-

XUM

tion from a 30-mile wide strip along the canal and he regards this as the prelude to concentrated Egyptian military action.

One factor that could change the military situation dramatically, in the view of U.S. officers in the Mediterranean, is the presence of an estimated 400–500 Egyptian and Algerian student pilots in Russia.

"If they came back overnight, flying fighters and bombers, it would be a new ball game," said one Air Force general.

Both Bar-Lev and Dayan, however, seem confident that a new war will not come this year. No Israeli, however, looks beyond the spring of 1970—if Nasser is still in power.

In virtually every conversation in Israel, there is an undercurrent of hope that if the Jews stand firm, Nasser will be overtaken by the pressures of Egypt's needy millions.

Might they get someone worse?

"It's hard to imagine anyone worse," said Mrs. Meir.

The price for Israel also is high. Military service has been extended. Economic growth is affected. Prices creep higher and the "garrison" atmosphere can be depressing. But civilian morale appears to be high. A visit to the Hebrew University in Jerusalem uncovered no anti-war signs.

SPOTLIGHT ON VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to an article appearing in the July 7, 1969, edition of The Nation. It refers to an interreligious study team which visited South Vietnam to investigate political arrests and imprisonments under the Thieu-Ky regime. A member of that group was my distinguished colleague from Michigan, Representative JOHN J. CONYERS.

The report of the imprisonment of President Thieu's opponent, Truong Dinh Dzu, in the last election for advocating a negotiated peace was certainly disturbing. The Conyers' group found that the practice of political arrest and imprisonment in the Republic of South Vietnam is even more widespread than this seemingly isolated case indicates. There are at least 20,000 political prisoners in South Vietnam, most of whom are classified as Communists. As The Nation points out:

> The de facto criterion of communism is opposition to the war policies of the dictatorship, but even that is not essential.

A citizen of South Vietnam who advocates coalition government or steps toward ending the war is liable to arrest and imprisonment as a "Communist."

I congratulate Mr. CONYERS and his associates for their efforts in verifying the nature of political freedom under the Thieu-Ky regime, and submit the Nation's report of their findings for the reading of my colleagues:

SPOTLIGHT ON VIETNAM

If the American people have not lost all collective moral sense, then the full significance of continuing intervention in the Vietnamese civil war must have been kept from them. That the latter alternative is the case is suggested again by the media attention paid to the May 25–June 10 visit to South Vietnam of a U.S. interreligious study team, sent to investigate stories of arbitrary arrest and imprisonment by the Thieu-Ky regime. The coverage was so scanty that there was little danger the average newspaper reader or TV viewer would be diverted from his preoccupation with the troubles of Joe Namath.

Members of the study team were Robert F. Drinan, S.J., dean of the Boston College Law School; Rep. John J. Conyers (D., Mich.); Bishop James Armstrong of the United Methodist Church; Mrs. John C. Bennett, wife of the president of Union Theological Seminary; Allan Brick of the Fellowship of Reconciliation; John deJ. Pemberton of the American Civil Liberties Union; Rabbi Seymour Siegel of the Jewish Theological Seminary and Adm. Arnold E. True, U.S.N. (Ret.).

The itinerary was as respectable as the participants. The delegation met with President Thieu and South Vietnamese government officials, Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker and members of his staff, and conferred with religious leaders, legislators, attorneys, students and a variety of persons of different political persuasions.

"The government of South Vietnam," the report acknowledges, "was helpful in providing data, permitting team members to visit prisons, and in making accessible certain prisoners." The auspices under which the tour was conducted, and the character of the investigators, preclude any suspicion of bias or unfairness. What emerges must be accepted as definitive—and it could scarcely be more destructive of the claim that we are fighting for the free choice of the people of South Vietnam in determining their future.

Before leaving for Vietnam, the team conferred with members of the White House staff and received assurances that the number of political prisoners in South Vietnam was decreasing. In Saigon a few days later, the American Embassy official most familiar with the problem of political prisoners admitted that the number is increasing steadily and, further, that this increase will continue as the U.S. "pacification" program extends further into the countryside. The American Embassy stand is that the prisoners are an internal concern of the South Vietnamese government. This is a convenient fiction to cover an inconvenient fact—that the U.S. mission is ferreting out suspected "Communists" in Vietnamese villages and turning them over to extra-constitutional "Military Field Courts" which lack any procedural safeguards and which in many cases employ torture to extract confessions or information.

Political prisoners in South Vietnam number at least 20,000, and 25,000 is a more likely figure. All are classified as "Communists," although many are guilty of nothing more than advocating a coalition government or steps toward ending the war patterned on President's Nixon's proposals. The *de facto* criterion of "communism" is opposition to the war policies of the dictatorship, but even that is not essential. In the Chi Hoa jail the survey group saw 200 children between the ages of 10 and 14; the charge against some of them was likewise communism.

The group met Truong Dinh Dzu, runner-up in the 1967 Presidential election, who was arrested in May 1968 for an interview in which he advocated a dialogue with the National Liberation Front. As Dzu had envisioned future developments, the real Communists would get only 20 per cent of the vote in a free election, and would thereafter have a role like that of the Communist parties of France or Italy. This probably underrated the Communist strength, but it would hardly justify a five-year sentence, subsequently commuted to three.

Another celebrated prisoner interviewed by the group was the Buddhist leader, the Venerable Thien Minh. Although Thien Minh speaks excellent French and adequate English, a condition of the interview was that he could talk with his visitors only in Vietnamese. Thien Minh asserted: "I have committed no offense except that I want peace." Originally he was sentenced to ten years on a charge of assisting draft resisters; his term was subsequently reduced to three years.

If the number of political prisoners in South Vietnam is assumed to be 25,000, that, in a country with a population of 17 million, is the equivalent in the United States of 300,000 political prisoners. In his talk with the study group President Thieu pleaded that in wartime, and considering the unfamiliarity of his country with the democratic process, he cannot relent in his severely repressive policies. But in that case there never will be democracy in South Vietnam; authoritarianism only breeds more authoritarianism. Even if all American forces should be withdrawn, leaving the Thieu government or a successor supplied with American arms, the prospect is for a permanently repressive regime patterned on Chiang Kai-shek's police state on Taiwan. No doubt such an outcome would be quite acceptable to many in the Nixon Administration, but that peace can be established on any such terms is political fantasy. And time is running out, both for Mr. Nixon and the dubious allies we have selected to represent us in that unhappy country.

"A CALCULATED RISK"

The Army's new Sheridan tank has just completed its first round of combat tests in Vietnam. The kill score: one dead, three severely burned and several other casualties reported—all Americans.

The dead GI and his hideously burned comrades are victims of an Army "calculated risk." This gamble was to send the newly designed Sheridan tank into battle even though a test manager warned long before it left the United States that it was prone to breakdowns and deficiencies that would jeopardize U.S. troops.

High-ranking Army officials have repeatedly told Congress that the Sheridan tank has been operating satisfactorily under Vietnamese combat conditions. Yet, in a still secret report, the Pentagon admits that the "calculated risk" has "shaken the confidence" of the crews operating the new tank. The report elaborates further on the reasons the crews feel somewhat insecure:

The tank has had "16 major equipment failures, 125 electrical circuit failures, 41 weapons misfires, 140 ammunition ruptures, 25 engine replacements (caused by overheating) and persistent malfunction of the 152-mm. cannon."

Also depressing the crews is the Army's field manual on the Sheridan, which did not arrive in Vietnam until after the first sixty-four tanks had been in combat for six weeks. The 20-page manual advises the Sheridan crews as follows: The electrical system is prone to failure; the weapons firing system is not reliable; the new type of combustible cartridge is subject to malfunction.

This is not to say that any of these deficiences were unknown before the "calculated risk" was taken. The test manager warned:

The Sheridan is of questionable dependability and unknown limitation. I do not believe that a combat situation where mission and lives depend so heavily on equipment reliability is the best environment to question and resolve these problems.

The project manager made this statement on November 5, 1968; on February 8, 1969, the tank was on its way. On February 15, one week after the tank went into combat, one of the Sheridans hit a mine that would not have severely damaged some of the Army's older tanks. The explosion ruptured the hull of the Sheridan, ignited the ammunition and killed the driver.

Later, an enemy round struck one of the new combustible shells as crew members wrestled to extract it from the chamber of another tank after it had misfired. Three GIs suffered severe burns.

What effect have these "accidents" and the critical combat field report had on the Army's current plans for the Sheridan tank and its continued deployment in the field? Just announced: 171 new Sheridans are to be shipped to Vietnam.

THE ANSWER TO POVERTY

One year ago the poor of the nation sat on Congress' doorstep, believing that if they drew attention to their poverty, they would receive adequate federal assistance. They came to Resurrection City from great distances, trusting in strangers for their daily needs. Some traveled from California to Washington in school buses, bearing the bounces, the weariness, the strangeness, the homesickness and the homelessness because of their hope in the government.

They endured torrential rains, flooded "streets" and poor plumbing in their plywood town. From most persons they received derision; the contempt of the many mingled in unequal ratio with the real kindnesses of the few.

Some attention was paid to them by Congress, and some concessions were made—an increase of food stamps, investigations like that of Sen. George McGovern's Select Committee on Hunger and Human Needs. But the most tangible result of their ordeal came to them last month when Congress acted in direct response to Resurrection City. The House voted 327-50 to ban all sit-ins, camp-ins and sleep-ins in the capital. The poor, they stated, had "disrupted the seat of government and destroyed public property."

The cost of living rises and welfare is being cut; the poor have the answer to their demonstration of what poverty really is: no more Resurrection Cities. Congress dislikes being bothered, especially by the poor.

TO HIM THAT HATH

The National Council on Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States reports that the Department of Defense plans to spend nearly $4 billion in fiscal 1970 to feed an average of slightly under 3.5 million servicemen. A major part of this sum goes for labor, capital items, etc. For food alone the allowance is $1.7 billion, which breaks down to about $500 per person per year. Even allowing for the government's purchasing power this does not seem excessive, but the government has the same advantage in purchasing food for the poor, and under the Nixon Administration's present allocations the poor stand to get only $77 per person per year.

The ratio of 6.5 to 1 may be regarded as reflecting the solicitude of any prudently managed, normally predatory government for its armed services; but in another, purely civilian, area an even more atrocious discrimination is practiced. Confronted with statistics on malnutrition in the United States, the average well-meaning citizen comforts himself with the thought that at least the poor kids get a good hot lunch at school. But do they? A story by Gene Blake in the June 4 *Los Angeles Times*, and some nationally collected data, indicate that they don't.

According to a suit brought in federal court in San Francisco by the California Rural Assistance League on behalf of needy children in three counties, the state last year received $25 million in federal funds and commodities to subscribe an average of about 825,000 lunches daily in participating school districts; but school officials arranged to supply to all the children a lunch worth 55c at a reduced price of 35c. Those who have the 35c eat, those who haven't go without. The papers set forth that in one Monterey school district, one out of every two wealthy or middle-class children benefits by the program, but only eleven of the district's 803 needy children receive a free or reduced-price lunch, and three times as many teachers and other adults eat the cut-rate meals.

CONGRESSMAN BURKE AND FAMILY ENJOY RELIGIOUS SERVICE AT WHITE HOUSE

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a Congressman I have often wished that the many people I represent could spend some time with me and share some of the happy events that occur and happen to a Congressman here in Washington. One recent event, which I am sure had they been granted opportunity, they would have enjoyed as much as my family and I did, occurred on Sunday, June 29, 1969. My wife, Evelyn, my two daughters, Shelly and Kelly, and I, were invited by President and Mrs. Nixon to join them on the occasion of what was the seventh in a series of nondenominational services held at the White House. Perhaps one thing that was important to me was the fact that it was a family occasion and I was not only extremely impressed with the simplicity, but also with the sincerity of the event.

As we drove onto the White House grounds on that beautiful sun-drenched Sunday morning, the quiet and beauty of the gardens and the house which the President calls home, easily placed one in the proper frame of mind for the service.

My family and I and the other guests of the President, which I estimated to be about 250, were greeted by Mr. and Mrs. Nixon in the foyer of the White House, and then were guided to the East Room, the largest room.

In the East Room the guests generally dance to the music of one of the service bands or string orchestras or witness popular acts of the day, after elaborate dinners; but on this particular Sunday morning, the room was filled only with empty chairs, a movable pulpit, and the scent of the many beautiful flowers.

There was no indication merely by looking at this room what particular religion or sermon would be presented on this Sunday, but we soon learned that we were to be a part of a history-making event since we were to hear the first rabbi in history to conduct religious services for the President in the White House.

Representatives from other major faiths in America had conducted the nondenominational services on prior Sundays. It was Rev. Billy Graham who opened the first service for President Nixon and this was followed by Dr. Richard Halvorson, Presbyterian; Dr. Louis Evens, Presbyterian; Dr. R. H. Espy, Baptist; Dr. Edward Latch, Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives; His Eminence Terrence Cardinal Cook, Catholic; Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, Reformed Church of America; and now by Rabbi Louis Finkelstein, chancellor of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York City.

The choirs which sing the opening selections and other hymns during the service are selected from local churches in the Washington, D.C. area.

In opening the White House for these services, the President has invited guests from every strata of life from the White House cooking staff to Members of the Cabinet and the U.S. Congress.

On the Sunday that I attended the service, guests included Julie and David Eisenhower, members and family of various White House staffs, some from the public, newly appointed Supreme Court Justice Warren Burger and his family, Secretary of HUD and Mrs. George Romney; Secretary of the Treasury and Mrs. David Kennedy; Secretary of Commerce and Mrs. Maurice Stans; Secretary of Labor and Mrs. Shultz and their daughter, Cathy; a number of foreign ambassadors and their families including those from France, Niger, and Guinea.

Also attending with their families were Congressmen Ross Adair of Indiana; Del Clawson and Craig Hosmer of California; William Cramer of Florida and John Duncan of Tennessee, Senators Gurney, Goldwater, and Bob Dole with their families.

The service on June 29 opened with the prelude and opening remarks by President Nixon. This was followed by the doxology and prayers by Dr. Finkelstein. Mr. Geoffrey Simon directed the choir which represented the long established Washington Christ Lutheran Church which was founded more than 75 years ago. The choir itself during worship service at the church performs anthems ranging from compositions of the 11th century to present day arrangements. The choir at the White House service sang the hymns, "We Gather Together", "Now God Be Praised in Heav'n Above", and "O God, Our Help in Ages Past." This was followed by the benediction and the postlude.

It is true that the East Room of the White House, where the services were held, can hardly be compared with some of the cathedrals, churches, or temples throughout the world, but to me, the simple but dignified setting for the service by Dr. Finkelstein at the request of the President of the United States, was one of the most memorable that I ever had attended.

I had a warm feeling as I looked around, and my mind wandered over some of the many problems that we face in our country today. I thought of our Constitution and of its framers. I share the belief with many others, that our constitution as drafted by our forefathers, was guided by God Almighty. I could not help but feel that this government of ours was truly a government under God". I had the feeling that we, in our Nation, still have unbounded faith in God and in ourselves, and that we—with God's help—will find answers to the many problems that are dividing our country today.

I left feeling in my heart that we Americans will as a people, go forward in the name of God Almighty to even greater greatness. That we are a good people and that we are not filled with hate but with love, and for this reason we will work not only toward solving the problems facing our people today, but that we shall follow the light to a path which will give to all a better tomorrow for God, our country, and for all of our people.

XUM

ASTRONOMY TEAMS WATCH FOR STRANGE HISTORIC MOON FLASHES—POPE ASKS PRAYERS

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, July 16, 1969]

TWO ASTRONOMY TEAMS TO HELP TELL SCOPE OF APOLLO 11

(By Dolores Frederick)

The eyes of 200 worldwide observatories—including two astronomy teams in Pittsburgh—will be focused on the Apollo-11 as three U.S. astronauts attempt the first lunar landing.

Astronomers at Allegheny Observatory in Riverview Park aimed their telescopes at the moon last night—hours before the scheduled Apollo-11 blast-off—to look for clues to events which were missed in former missions.

MOON FLASHES

Wallace R. Beardsley, assistant professor of astronomy at the University of Pittsburgh, said astronomers will be especially on the lookout for "moon flashes."

"Astronomers for 400 years have individually spotted these flashes," Prof. Beardsley said, "and we're not sure if they exist or even if they are caused by what is believed to be escaping gas from lunar cracks."

His team and other astronomers at the Clutter-Dorseyville Observatory manned by Rody J. Clutter and Charles H. Le Roy are working in Project LION—a Lunar International Observers Network set up by Smithsonian Institution at Cambridge, Mass., to observe the Apollo-11 mission.

Astronomers have failed to determine whether these flashes are volcanic emissions or just sunlight reflected from a glassy surface rock.

If moon flashes are spotted, Prof. Beardsley said "we will radio Smithsonian Institution which in turn will contact NASA so that the astronauts can investigate the sightings."

Prof. Beardsley pointed out flashes have been sighted around the crater Aristarchus which was suspected of having a volcanic eruption during the Apollo-10 mission.

NOT CONFIRMED

However, the eruption was not confirmed because the spacecraft was behind the moon and out of radio contact with Mission Control at Houston.

Other lunar areas, including the smooth spot known as Mare Crissium, and eight suspected craters will be closely watched by the worldwide astronomy network.

The craters are Messier, Theophilus, Menelaus, Manilus, Hyginus, Alphonsus, Gassendi, and Grimaldi—all of which can be seen by the command module at times during its lunar orbit.

The flashes, Prof. Beardsley said, usually appear as reddish spots when they hit the space vacuum and are particularly bright on the dark side of the moon.

Prof. Beardsley related that confirmation of the flashes and of the existence of lunar gases will help scientists determine the composition of that celestial ball of reflecting light which has stirred the hearts—and minds—of man since the beginning of history.

In addition to the "moon flashes," Prof. Beardsley said astronomers will be looking for:

The reflection of Apollo-11 as it soars to and from the moon. The spacecraft carrying Astronauts Neil A. Armstrong, Michael L. Collins, and Edwin E. Aldrin Jr. will be registered as a flashing light—much like a star.

"Water dumps"—the ejection of excess water from the spacecraft. It should appear as a brilliant flash, Prof. Beardsley said, adding that "nobody saw them during Apollo-10 because it was cloudy."

District astronomers will begin viewing the Apollo-11 at 9 p.m. today when the moon becomes visible in the night sky. Viewing will be limited to two hours—the time it takes for the moon to sink below the horizon.

However, astronomers will gain more viewing time each day. Prof. Beardsley said Saturday and Sunday the moon will be visible to astronomers until midnight and 1 p.m.

OUT OF VIEW

Although the actual landing of a man on the moon will be out of view for the Pittsburgh astronomers, Mr. LeRoy, coordinator of Pittsburgh's moonwatch teams since the first satellite was launched in 1957, said astronomers "in other parts of the world might see it as a reflection of ruffling moon dust."

The Allegheny Observatory—headed by Dr. Nicholas E. Wagman—will use its 13-inch refractor, 31-inch Keeler reflector, and a giant 30-inch Thaw refractor. A 21½-inch reflector will be in operation at the Clutter-Dorseyville Observatory.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 14, 1969]

POPE ASKS WORLDWIDE PRAYER FOR APOLLO 11 ASTRONAUTS

CASTEL GANDOLFO, ITALY.—Pope Paul VI asked Christians around the world yesterday to pray to God for the Apollo 11 astronauts. He said their mission shows man is a "giant."

Pope Paul devoted his first public speech since he arrived here Thursday to the moonshot. He spoke extemporaneously and enthusiastically from a window of the papal Renaissance palace where he is spending a period of rest before his planned trip to Uganda July 31.

An audience of tourists and Romans on a weekend outing packed the courtyard below the window and the square outside the palace, where loudspeakers relayed the papal words.

"Let's devote our thought to the astronauts," the Pope began. He called the Apollo 11 mission a "most unique and wonderful fact."

"Science and technique manifest themselves in such an incomparable and audacious way as to mark the peak of their conquests and to allow for the forecast of more conquests of which even the imagination fails to dream now."

"Science fiction comes true," the Pope said.

"Man is at the center of this undertaking and appears to us as a giant, appears to us as divine, not in himself but in his principle and in his destiny.

"Honor, then, to man, honor to his dignity, his spirit, his life. And let us pray for the scientists and the heroes of this fabulous undertaking."

AFRICAN CULTURE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, President Banda and the National Parliament of Malawi have taken positive steps to preserve the culture of their part of the world.

Not only does the President find miniskirts or trousers on women offensive and repugnant in public places, but it is indicated that persistent offenses of this nature could result in deportation.

Apparently the President is trying not only to maintain decorum, but to perpetuate a high standard of morals and decency in his country.

I include a news article from the Washington Daily News of Wednesday, July 16, 1969:

MALAWI PRESIDENT BANS FEMALES IN PANTS

LANTYRE, MALAWI.—Women may not wear trousers when the president is present, according to a statement from the office of Malawi President Hastings Kamuzu Banda.

A statement Monday said any woman with the audacity to wear miniskirts or trousers in the presence of Banda could be deported.

Those types of dress are "offensive and repugnant," it said.

"To save embarrassment to all, no female wearing a mini skirt or short dress which exposes any part of the thigh, or trousers, will be allowed entry to any state residence, parliament cr any function where his excellency the president is present," it said.

Banda banned short shorts and miniskirts last March after a young European girl wearing shorts stared at him as he drove thru Blantyre.

"Deportation cannot be ruled out for any * * * in wearing them to the embarassment of President Banda and the government," the statement said.

Trousers are not subject to a general ban. But Malawi members of parliament attacked trousers as unfeminine earlier this year.

POLITICS ON THE AIR ROUTES

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the issue of international air routes to the South Pacific is one with which we are all familiar. With increased transportation needs and subsequent air transportation problems, it is a matter that must be resolved as soon as possible.

One of my constituents, Mrs. Etta Wexler of Great Neck, brought a July 5 New York Times editorial to my attention. Since it bears consideration, I would like to include it in the RECORD:

POLITICS ON THE AIR ROUTES

When President Nixon first upset the trans-Pacific airline route awards made by the Civil Aeronautics Board in the last days of the Johnson Administration, it was said that he was undoing an act of political favoritism.

But hope that Mr. Nixon would thereupon eschew politics in exercising his authority over the granting of international air routes is now dead. He has gone far beyond the interventions of the Johnson Administration by twice rejecting C.A.B. recommendations that Continental Airlines be awarded a South Pacific route and by framing his own suggestions in such a way as to make Eastern Airlines the only acceptable candidate.

Even when generous allowance is made for the inordinate complexities of trans-Pacific routing, it is difficult to find a reasonable

XUM

defense for President Nixon's action. It denies a through route to Continental, a small airline already operating in the Pacific with an excellent record for efficiency, a reputation as a fare-cutting maverick and friendly connections with the Johnson Administration. It confers another benefit upon Eastern, a giant airline in which the Rockefeller family has a substantial holding. It will neither contribute to balanced competition in the airline industry, nor enhance public confidence in the Presidency.

Mr. Nixon is not the first chief executive to play politics in granting international air routes. President Eisenhower's record was bad and President Truman's was worse. It might be possible to limit, if not eliminate, such political intrusions by repealing the President's power to reverse the C.A.B. But that is only one of a number of feasible solutions to a vexing regulatory problem. The Commerce committees of the House and Senate ought to lose little time in holding public hearings for a full airing of the issues.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, we are now marking the 11th observance of Captive Nations Week. It is a melancholy anniversary, for it reminds us that, in spite of the great wars for freedom in this century, in spite of the outlays of treasure and blood, vast areas of the globe, and a vast portion of humanity, do not yet know the freedom and independence that they deserve, and that we have sought for all mankind.

There is something appalling in the very idea of "Captive Nations"—entire lands, with all their peoples, held in bondage, literally walled in, subjugated by the armed might of a totalitarian empire, ruled by despised countrymen who serve only the dictates of their Kremlin masters and the imperatives of Marxist ideology.

It is a sorry duty to call the roll of the two dozen States that have passed into captivity in the 50 years since the October Revolution in Russia. No more lamentable catalogue exists in the annals of human history.

These lands of great pride and ancient heritage have all fallen before the juggernaut of the armed doctrine of communism. They have had imposed on them regimes so grotesque and so vicious as to deny their history and efface their culture. Their arts are stultified, while only propaganda thrives; their religions are persecuted, while a secular cult is established. Individual liberty is stifled, for the Communist regimes know they could not survive unfettered political activity by free men.

The nature of the Communist rule is in defiance of all civilized tradition, and in violation of the ideals of personal liberty and national sovereignty that we all honor. These nations have become prison-houses for the human soul, presided over by men whose dogma denies the existence of the spiritual realm.

Valiant challenges to this Bolshevik hegemony date from its very beginning. The resistance to tyranny, widespread but most spectacular in such states as Poland and Hungary, has been as heroic as its brutal and bloody suppression has been odious. Only last summer, the Communists overwhelmed the frail, incipient independence of Czechoslovakia by armed might, brazenly revealing their repulsive character for all to see. The Brezhnev Doctrine has served to put all on notice that suppression by force is to be the fate of any captive nation whose people are not sufficiently subservient.

It is not only consolidation the Communists seek, but expansion—relentlessly into South America, into the Mideast, into Southeast Asia, wherever men would be free. When this process is completed, when all the world is captive, then, the Marxist dialectic proclaims, we will have arrived at the "end of History."

Mr. Speaker, it is during Captive Nations Week that we have special occasion to express throughts that are always with us. We have the opportunity, and we acknowledge the obligation, to tell the jailers of those unhappy lands that we are wary of them, and alert to their designs; and to show the captive peoples that the world has not forsaken or forgotten them. The American people reject the Communists' claim that these people must remain forever in servitude. We renew the efforts we are making in behalf of justice throughout the world and rededicate ourselves to the ideals that have kept us and so much of the world free.

Our dedication, though, could not be greater than that of the captive nations. For the fact remains, that in spite of decades of propaganda and indoctrination, in spite of all terror and repression, the will to be free still moves and inspires the captive millions, more so now than perhaps ever before. No greater tribute to their inward strength and resolution, no more telling accolade to the indomitability of the human spirit, could be imagined.

Mr. Speaker, we have need to hope, and compelling reason to believe, that the future holds the deliverance of the captive nations. Where the Communists expect the future to bring "the end of History," free men foresee and promise instead the end of tyranny.

HELPS HANDICAPPED YOUTH

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, on April 30, President Richard M. Nixon recognized that—

> One of the great, distinguishing characteristics of the American people is their readiness to join together in helping one another.

In giving recognition to individual efforts that extend the human dimension to persisting forms of need, the President gave his support to the great contribution being made by those persons who work for the betterment of their fellow man.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call the attention of the President, the Members of Congress, and the American people to the efforts of United Cerebral Palsy Kenosha County, Inc., in Kenosha, Wis., to meet the problems that confront handicapped youth. Following is an article from the Kenosha News of July 1 which explains this great effort:

EFFORTS MADE TO MEET PROBLEMS THAT CONFRONT HANDICAPPED YOUTH

(By Sheri Nye Seefeldt)

"Just because he's handicapped, why can't my child go to camp?" is many Kenosha parents' plaintive cry when the balmy days of summer arrive. For their children who are kept busy in organized activities during the school year are left to shift for themselves in the summer months.

The sadness of this situation lies in that the handicapped child is almost forced to stay indoors, watching television or playing by himself, because most summer activities offered are geared for the child with no real disabilities. The handicapped child just can't compete. Even if he has the will, he often doesn't have the way.

But thanks to a group of concerned Kenoshans who saw and filled the great need of the handicapped child in Kenosha, there is a place named Friendship Camp, located on the grounds of the Kenosha County Conservation Club in Bristol. The camp serves children aged six and over who are physically or emotionally handicapped.

One Kenosha parent had this to say about the camp: "The children look forward to it for months in advance and always talk about it. It's a supervised activity and I'm so grateful that we have such a thing."

The day camp, which serves more than 50 handicapped children a week and will serve a total of more than 100 by the time camp is out July 31, will open its doors to the public for the first time Sunday. Open house will be held from 1 to 5 p.m. at the campsite on Hy. AH west of Hy. 45. Rain date will be July 20.

SHE HAD A GOOD TIME

When I visited the camp, I was approached by one little girl who was waiting for the bus to take her home (camp runs from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. Monday through Thursday). She tugged on my arm and made it a point to tell me "I had a good time today."

Kenoshans who visit the camp Sunday will be able to see these "good times" for themselves. Luther Metcalf, camp director and his counselor staff will take visitors through a simulated camper's day.

The activities at Friendship were about the same as at any other day camp with swimming, boating, fishing, arts and crafts, nature hikes, archery, singing, games and a rifle range. However, at Friendship Camp, the activities are adapted to the disabilities of the campers.

"The different handicaps make no difference with the campers," Metcalf told me, "only personalities."

One longtime camper is confined to a wheelchair. But she has no trouble with running relays because she's pushed by the campers who can walk.

During boating on the lagoon at the Conservation Club, the campers wear life jackets and are rowed by a certified Red Cross instructor. Hot dogs are used mostly for the cookouts because they are easiest for the campers to roast by themselves.

MASTERS TRAMPOLINE

A trampoline is set up for the campers who can use it. One boy who is hard of hearing, learned to operate perfectly on the trampoline through only signs and gestures with a counselor.

In arts and crafts, the campers have made

XUM

self-portraits out of material remnants, shakers for July 4, sit-upons (what camper doesn't) and a Friendship Camp banner. They complete one project each session.

Music is a favorite with many of the campers. Guided by their counselors, they sing and do actions to sing-and-dance-a-story records. One of these is "Noah's Ark."

While the majority of the campers go swimming in the afternoons at Paddock Lake, the ones who can't do so stay at the campsite and participate in arts and crafts or watch movies. There are also a slide, swings, teeter-totters, and a merry-go-round on the campsite, as well as perceptual motor equipment (a pyramid, balance beam, mats and tires).

Although camp is now in its second week, parents may still register their children for one or all five of the remaining weeks. Parents can contact the Kenosha Achievement Center (KAC), 1218 79th St., which operates the camp and provides bus transportation for the campers. One week of camp is $7.

A few paid camperships are available to allow parents of limited financial means to send their handicapped child to Friendship Camp.

SPONSORED BY UCP

The state-approved camp is sponsored by United Cerebral Palsy Kenosha County Inc. (UCP). The camp executive committee is made up of William Hearron, executive director, KAC; Mrs. Michael Thompson, president UCP; Dr. John Richards, president of the Kenosha County Day Care Services; Donald Ricci, educational consultant; Elmer Ungemach, legal consultant; George Connolly, commerce consultant; and the Rev. Paul Mitchell, Kenosha County Association for Retarded Children (KCARC).

Metcalf and Elwood Knutson, assistant director, lead a staff of 15. Veteran counselor, Miss Donna Courson, a special education teacher at Weiskopf Special Education Center, is chief counselor and assistant; and Mrs. Robert Durdik, a music teacher for the Kenosha Unified School District, Mrs. Charles Malinsky; a guidance counselor at Lincoln Junior High School; and Miss Lillian Larson, a speech therapist in the Unified District, are her counselors.

Assistant Counselors are Susan Buss, a physical therapy student at Marquette University; Jacqueline Koos, nursing, University of Wisconsin at Madison; Susan Walker, psychology, Ripon College; Therese Rozinski, special education, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee; Carolyn Ruffolo, elementary education, Edgewood College, Madison; Ruth Rodgers, special education, University of Wisconsin-Parkside; Alice Bode, special education, Cardinal Stritch College, Milwaukee; and Wayne Hansen, social work, Wisconsin State University-Eau Claire.

Laurence Bruch is a former Friendship camper who is now putting his valuable experience to work as a counselor there. He is a special education student at UW-M.

Tremper High School students, Keith Tallon and Rosemary Quilice are camp aids.

REBUTTAL TO THE WASHINGTON POST

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a friend and constituent of mine, Mr. William B. Covert of Alexandria, Va., has written to me expressing his grave concern about the editorial policy of the Washington Post, and particularly about a lengthy and quite opinionated article carried in the Post recently entitled, "Alexandria, After 100 Years Still Facing to the South."

Mr. Covert intends his letter to serve as a rebuttal to the Post, and I insert it in full at this point in the RECORD:

ALEXANDRIA, VA.,
July 7, 1969.

Hon. JOEL T. BROYHILL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BROYHILL: As a loyal and conscientious employee of the Washington Post, I find myself in the embarrassing position of having to voice my disapproval of that journal's editorial policy, which I think is typical of a tendency on the part of the liberal press to divide the country. I have particularly in mind the recent dig in the Post about "Alexandria After 100 Years Still Facing to the South."

As a rebuttal to this slander on the good name of the Southern people you may, if you wish, use this item which appeared in a project of mine (The Potomac Sentinel) on July 1, 1969:

PROPAGANDA STRETCHES THE TRUTH

On the night of June 15, 1969, Georges Pompidou, who served as Charles de Gaulle's Prime Minister for six years, was elected President of France. In commenting on Pompidou's victory a Washington Post foreign correspondent in Paris wrote:

"During a heated National Assembly debate last year one of George Pompidou's opponents told the then Prime Minister: 'With your sardonic smile and your thick eyebrows, you remind me of the devil.'

"In his successful campaign for the French presidency, Pompidou trimmed his bushy eyebrows, and as one opponent complained he came across not as Satan but as Santa Claus."

This kind of talk is reminiscent of the description of the current American President as the "New Nixon" in contrast to the "Old Nixon." The "Old Nixon" was the devil incarnate in the eyes of the ultraliberals, whose bad image of him was a creature of their own concoction. Since winning the election in 1968 a disgruntled member of the opposition complained: "Too bad the new Nixon is no improvement over the old one."

As a matter of fact there is a "new Nixon" and an "old Nixon." The "new Nixon" is an older Nixon, with the wisdom gained through experience, whereas the "old Nixon" was a younger man, but keenly aware that he "did not know it all."

Propaganda, according to the dictionary, is a means of "spreading doctrines, principles, printed matter, or speeches, for the purpose of promoting a cause, political, religious, or military." Propaganda became an important phase of modern warfare and was well organized by both Germany and Britain in World War I. More recently, it has become evident that propaganda has developed into an important activity of government and private interests at all times. Propaganda can be either a truth or a lie, depending on which cause one is espousing. If one is forced to accept an ideology against his will that process is known as "brainwashing." If a lie is repeated often enough, according to the Marxist theory, it will eventually become accepted as truth.

I learned about propaganda as a weapon of deception during World War I. On being discharged from the Canadian Army during that conflict I returned to Washington in March, 1918. Asked to join a campaign to raise funds for the Liberty Loan Drive, I offered my services. I found myself on a stand with two other soldiers who had returned from the front. I was dismayed to hear them accuse the Germans of brutality during the invasion of Belgium, such as, for example, officers cutting off the hands of babies. I would have had to see with my own eyes such barbarous acts before making a testimony to that effect. There may have been some isolated cases; I do not know. But a German version might have changed these innocent little babies into 14-year-old "Monsters" who were struck down just as they were on the verge of tossing hand grenades into the ranks of the oncoming troops of the Kaiser.

I have seen propaganda used in political campaigns—scurrilous attacks made on members of both parties, the names of men of integrity dragged in the mud while knaves of the worst sort were elevated to the status of national heroes.

Pursuing the matter further, in the July issue of the Potomac Sentinel is another reference to propaganda, as follows:

"We are greatly disturbed by the statement of a lady psychiatrist in a TV broadcast, who cited figures to insinuate that conscientious objectors were the recipients of more medals proportionately, than combat troops. Also they were more masculine and less inclined to homosexualism. With all due respect to the lady, one questions the source of her information. Sounds like propaganda designed to create an army of conscientious objectors. If that result were achieved wouldn't the Nation find itself in a sorry mess?

As ever,

(Bill)
WM. B. COVERT.

P.S.—You may use this in part, in whole, or not at all, as you see fit.

If this is published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, please send me a copy.

ROAD TO A PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT IN VIETNAM

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, President Thieu's proposal on elections is a clear and ringing challenge to the Communists to "put their money where their mouth is." In so many words, he has asked them to prove—in fair and free electoral competition—their claim that they represent the majority of the South Vietnamese population. He says he and his government will pledge from the outset to accept the results of such elections and has urged the other side to do the same. And to assure that the vote is a fair and fully representative one, he has offered eminently reasonable conditions for holding elections.

This is surely a major step by our Vietnamese ally toward peaceful settlement of this terrible conflict. It is an offer to settle by ballots rather than bullets, and entirely on the basis of the freely determined will of the South Vietnamese people. President Thieu and his colleagues have clearly placed their nation's interests above their own by taking this risk for peace. They have indicated to their own people and to the world that they want an honorable end to the war. They have shown the way to the other side.

Let us hope the other side will take up this challenge. They have so often proclaimed their interest in restoring peace to the Vietnamese people. They now have

XUM

the opportunity to help do so, and in the fairest and most democratic means possible—through the free and open voting process.

President Thieu's proposals deserve our full support. They are entirely consistent with our own objective of helping assure self-determination for the South Vietnamese people, and they are in the tradition of democracy and fair play, which we, as a people, so widely admire. We urge the Communist side to give them serious heed.

A BILL TO AID THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the utility of the St. Lawrence Seaway—a transportation link of fundamental economic importance to this Nation—is being seriously threatened by a financial crisis. Under its present funding structure, the Seaway Corporation is being forced to steer a course between Scylla and Charybdis.

On the one hand, if it maintains its present toll rates it will be unable to fulfill its financial obligations to the U.S. Government. On the other hand, if the Corporation raises its rates, it is likely that trade will slacken, thereby leaving the Corporation in similar financial straits and causing grave harm to the economy of the Midwest.

It is thus with a sense of great urgency that I introduce today legislation to solve this dilemma—legislation which balances the right of the U.S. Government to receive a reasonable return on its investment and, at the same time, permits the seaway to perform its vital economic function.

The mechanism for getting the debt-ridden seaway off its financial shoals is a simple one. The bill provides that the $148 million of outstanding St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation indebtedness to the U.S. Treasury shall be converted into a permanent U.S. investment in the Seaway Corporation. This is very easily accomplished by exchanging preferred stock of the Corporation for its $129 million of outstanding 50-year bonds and $19 million of accrued interest debt.

The Seaway Corporation would thus no longer be obligated to repay the $148 million debt, which it must now pay by the year 2009. Instead, it would pay, in perpetuity, a fair dividend return on the Government's equity investment. This dividend would be the same amount as the Seaway Corporation is now paying to the U.S. Treasury in interest payments.

If this measure is not passed, there is a danger that the Corporation will fall hopelessly behind in meeting its statutory financial obligations over the next 4 years. Under the present arrangement as set forth in the St. Lawrence Seaway Act of 1954, as amended in 1957—the Corporation is required to pay from toll revenues its operating expenses, maintenance expenses, interest on its indebtedness and, in 50 years time, the capital which it borrows from the U.S. Treasury.

On the basis of the Seaway Corporation's own estimates of cargo to be shipped over the waterway during the next four shipping seasons, the Corporation, after paying operating and maintenance expenses, is likely to fail to pay $2 million in interest on its outstanding indebtedness. It will, moreover, be unable to make any repayment of the $19 million of back interest which has accrued since the seaway's opening in 1959, nor will it be able to repay a single dollar of its $129 million bond indebtedness, either in the next 4 years or in the foreseeable future.

The past record of the seaway supports the feasibility of my proposed solution. In the first 10 years of its existence the seaway has been more responsible, financially, than any other waterway in the continental United States. It has paid the entire costs of its operation and maintenance, nearly $15 million. In addition, during this period, it has paid to the U.S. Treasury over $29 millon of interest.

If this bill were enacted, the seaway would continue to pay its own way. The only significant change would be to make the Federal Government's investment in the Corporation permanent, thus relieving the Seaway Corporation of its obligation to repay the $148 million indebtedness.

Toll revenues would continue to pay operating and maintenance expenses and to yield in dividends, the same return on the Treasury's invested capital that the Corporation is now obligated to pay in interest. In addition, with tolls maintained at the present level, increased traffic on the waterway would allow the Corporation to return to the Treasury some $220 million in dividends over the next 40 years.

In short, under this bill the seaway would continue to operate without Federal subsidy.

Since the seaway together with the Great Lakes is quite literally a fourth seacoast of the United States, the Federal Government should retain ownership of the U.S. share of the seaway in perpetuity. The Government should not try to amortize the costs of its investment over 50 years—it should, instead, seek to be paid a fair annual rate which in time will repay its investment many times over.

The U.S. Government has made a long-term, if not permanent investment in every other major U.S. transportation system.

The seaway is very much like an ocean ship channel serving a particular geographical area; yet ocean ship channels have not had to repay invested capital or to pay interest, and, in fact, have not even had to pay their operating and maintenance costs.

For example, through fiscal year 1965, the Federal Government has paid on behalf of the Delaware River channel from Philadelphia to the sea, $54,631,336 in construction costs and $113,346,844 in operating and maintenance costs; the Houston ship channel $34,449,257 in construction costs and $32,605,276 in operating and maintenance costs; the Sacramento deep water channel, $39,551,254 in construction costs and $10,740,586 in operating and maintenance costs; and the Mobile, Ala., channel $14,275,026 for construction costs and $15,221,599 for operating and maintenance costs.

Furthermore, over $2 billion of Federal funds have been invested in inland waterways in addition to some $113 million annual appropriations for their operation and maintenance. Inasmuch as tolls are by statute not allowed to be charged, not one cent of this huge capital investment has been repaid.

Mr. Speaker, by any measure the bill which I am introducing today is a modest one. It is in keeping with the principle of the 1954 St. Lawrence Seaway Act—that the seaway is to pay the full costs of its construction and operation. No subsidy is provided for in this bill.

The bill in no way puts the seaway on comparable footing with other major U.S. transportation systems, all of which have enjoyed for many years and continue to enjoy large direct or indirect Government subsidies of capital expenses, operating and maintenance expenses, or both.

In terms of the seaway's financial dilemma, the bill works no miracles. The Seaway Corporation would continue to be financially responsible for all major costs of the great waterway. As a result, the Seaway Corporation would probably continue to operate in the red until some 56 million tons of cargo annually are carried over the seaway. Last year 48 million cargo tons were shipped. It is estimated that the 56-million-ton level will be reached sometime in the early 1970's.

The bill is, however, clearly sufficient to achieve its objective: it would eliminate any foreseeable need for increasing seaway toll rates above their present levels, either in the next four shipping seasons, 1969 to 1972, or thereafter, and within the next decade it would probably make possible a decrease in the present toll rates.

Mr. Speaker, I urge prompt action on this measure that would be fair to everyone involved—to the Seaway Corporation, the U.S. Treasury, the users of the seaway, and to the American public.

DR. ABE SILVERSTEIN CERTAIN FOR SPACE HALL OF FAME

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, Ohio has made a massive contribution to putting a man on the moon, including, of course, the man himself, Neil Armstrong of Wapakoneta. Our Case Institute of Technology at Cleveland gave the United States its first Administrator of NASA, Dr. T. Keith Glennan. And, right from the beginning of America's space efforts, Dr. Abe Silverstein of the Lewis Research Center was in a key role. His efforts have contributed immeasurably to the magnificent achievements our Nation has made in space. As the following salute from the Plain Dealer points out, Abe Silverstein's name will be among the first on the list in history's hall of fame for pioneers in the spage age.

The article follows:

[From the Plain Dealer, July 14, 1969]

Dr. Abe Silverstein Certain To Rate in Space Hall of Fame

(By William D. McCann)

Cape Kennedy.—When historians write about persons who played vital roles in America's man-on-the-moon program, one of the first on the list undoubtedly will be Dr. Abe Silverstein, who gave the Apollo project its name.

Dr. Silverstein, director of the Lewis Research Center here, was one of a handful of men who in 1958 organized the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and most of its subsequent manned and unmanned projects.

In a recent interview, he recalled picking the title Apollo out of a Greek mythology book in 1960 after his committee had failed to come up with a suitable name.

"I thought the image of the god Apollo riding his chariot across the sun gave the best representation of the grand scale of the proposed program," he said. "So I chose it."

When the first Russian Sputnik was launched in October 1957, the United States began to take a hard look at its space plans.

The decision to set up a civilian agency to conduct a massive space program grew out of a March 1958 report by a presidential committee headed by Dr. James R. Killian, then president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The committee's recommendation for an aggressive exploration project was endorsed by President Dwight Eisenhower.

In April 1948, Dr. Hugh Dryden summoned Dr. Silverstein to Washington to help put the civilian space agency together. At the time Dr. Silverstein was associate director at Lewis. Dr. Dryden was then director of the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics (NACA), the forerunner of NASA.

Congress passed the National Aeronautics and Space Act in July 1958 and NASA was established officially by law the following October. Dr. T. Keith Glennan, then president of Case Institute of Technology, was named first administrator. Dr. Dryden became his deputy, and Dr. Silverstein became director of space flight programs.

Under Dr. Silverstein's leadership Project Mercury, the nation's first man-in-space project, was organized and the groundwork laid for Gemini and Apollo.

"When Mercury got started and was successful, there was no doubt that we needed to develop followup programs," he said. "So we went ahead."

Then late in 1959 at Wallops Island, Va., Dr. Silverstein headed a meeting in which the Apollo idea was born.

In early Apollo planning three alternatives were studied for getting man to the moon: direct landing, earth orbit and direct landing and lunar orbit and landing. Scientists finally settled on the third choice after deciding that building a massive rocket capable of direct landing on the moon—without the need for a lunar landing vehicle—was out of the question.

In addition to pioneering plans for manned space flight, Dr. Silverstein also laid early plans for innumerable unmanned flights including communications and weather satellites.

He also headed a committee that set up the Saturn series of launch vehicles, including the use of liquid hydrogen and liquid oxygen propellants.

In November 1961, Dr. Silverstein returned to Lewis as director and headed a major expansion of the center. Within two years he increased Lewis personnel by 2,000 to 4,800 and made the center NASA's primary installation for both research and development of rocket propulsion.

Today Lewis is responsible for NASA's Atlas, Atlas-Agena, Thor-Agena and Thrust Augmented Thor-Agena launch vehicles. Atlas-Agenas sent Mariner IV to Mars, the Ranger Spacecraft to the moon and launched such satellites as Nimbus and Lunar Orbiter.

Lewis also was responsible for developing the Atlas-Centaur rocket, the nation's first high-energy vehicle, which sent Surveyor flights to the moon. Centaur also launched the two Mariner spacecraft that will fly by Mars on July 31 and August 5.

Lewis scientists have been working on nuclear and electric-powered rockets for future long-term space missions to distant planets.

Although he has been away from Apollo programs for several years, Dr. Silverstein has his hopes and plans riding high with Apollo 11. He believes the pace of the U.S. space program may speed up rather than slow down after a successful manned moon landing.

"Our space program is one of our few national projects that have been successful," he said. "I think that Apollo will be successful and the American people do not turn away from success."

Dr. Silverstein added that an end to the Vietnam war should bring an even greater expansion of the space program—and other national projects, too.

One of the biggest values of the space program so far has been its effect in stimulating education, he declared. "Its role in encouraging new ideas and encouraging invention is often overlooked."

A native of Terre Haute, Ind., Dr. Silverstein was graduated from Rose Polytechnic Institute with a mechanical engineering degree in 1929. He began his scientific career at Langley Research Center, Hampton, Va., where he helped design the full-scale wind tunnel.

At Langley, he headed aerodynamic research that led to increased high-speed performance of most of the combat aircraft of World War II.

Later at Lewis, he was responsible for the idea, design and building of the nation's first supersonic propulsion wind tunnel. This research contributed greatly to the development of supersonic planes.

MAYOR CHARLES STENVIG OF MINNEAPOLIS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, an American-style revolution—at the ballot box—occurred in Minneapolis, Minn., on June 10, 1969. Police Detective Charles Stenvig, running as an independent candidate for mayor, was elected by the people of his city.

Certainly Mayor Stenvig's election is classic "grassroots" political action. His victory is an example of what American people can do when they close ranks and work toward a goal which they themselves believe in.

Mayor Stenvig and his independent supporters—which included none of the old-line politicos and heavily financed pressure groups—took on the whole establishment and by hard work and people-to-people contact have secured for themselves the leadership that they felt was necessary for their city.

Mr. Speaker, an interesting report on Mayor Stenvig appeared in the summer 1969 issue of the Law Officer, official publication of the International Conference of Police Associations, which I place in the Record for our colleagues' attention:

Minneapolis Police Detective Sweeps In—Stenvig Elected Minneapolis Mayor

When 41 year old Police Detective Charles Stenvig filed to run as a candidate for Mayor of Minneapolis, the general comment by politically sophisticated was, "He doesn't stand a chance!"

Today he is Mayor.

And he swept the election by grabbing a whopping 62% of the vote.

The almost unbelievable story of Stenvig's accomplishment includes the fact that his opponent was a prominent alderman and President of the City Council.

Even though Stenvig led the field of the three major candidates in the Primary, the results of the election caught the most knowledgeable by surprise. Stenvig, himself, admits that he never expected to beat his opponent by so overwhelming a majority.

Stenvig, a political independent, completed a surprising drive to power by defeating Republican Dan Cohen.

Stenvig overwhelmed Cohen, who is president of the City Council, by 75,748 votes to 46,739.

The turnout was considered heavy for a city election.

Stenvig told admirers jubilantly after the outcome, "Maybe some people would say this isn't the time and place to do it, but I'm going to make my first appointment now. My chief adviser is going to be God, and don't you forget it."

Earlier Stenvig, who emphasized law and order throughout his campaign, appeared at a victory celebration of his campaign workers.

He said: "Ladies and gentlemen, I want to thank all my terrific workers and especially my wife and family for everything they've gone through in this campaign, and that's been plenty.

"I also want to thank all you good citizens of Minneapolis for your vote of confidence, and I won't let you down. Thank you."

Stenvig, who is also president of the Minneapolis Police Officers' Federation and a vice president of the International Conference of Police Associations, will be sworn in July 7 as the city's new chief executive.

Stenvig is also chairman of the ICPA Periodicals Committee.

He will succeed Arthur Naftalin, a DFLer who decided not to seek reelection after holding the office for four terms beginning in 1961.

Stenvig entered the mayor's race last January but was rated an underdog in the primary campaign against Cohen, 7th Ward alderman since 1965, and Gerard Hegstrom, 8th Ward alderman and the DFL endorsed mayoral candidate.

Stenvig, however, led in the April 29 primary election with 30,230 votes, or 41 percent of the total. Cohen finished with 21,899 votes, or 30 percent. Hegstrom finished third and was eliminated.

XUM

Hegstrom, who had Naftalin's support in the primary subsequently endorsed Cohen. Naftalin, however, remained aloof following Hegstrom's defeat.

Stenvig's performance represents a break with tradition in a city that normally gives its votes in citywide elections to candidates affiliated with a political party.

One City Hall personality who has been close to local politics since the 1930s said recently that he could not recall another case of an independent who has fared as well as Stenvig.

Royce Givens, Executive Director of the ICPA said from Washington, D.C. that he knew of no other police officer who had become Mayor of a large metropolitan city while still employed in police service.

Cohen attempted to build a coalition of labor, DFLers and Republicans after the primary, but Stenvig with his stress on a need for firm law enforcement clearly had broad support throughout the city.

Stenvig's strength is reflected in the fact that he outpolled Cohen in all but two of the city's 13 wards.

According to unofficial figures, 55 percent of the city's registered voters went to the polls. In the mayoral race two years ago, the turnout was 48 percent.

One question raised by the outcome of the mayor's race is the administration of the police department.

During the campaign Stenvig would not say whether he would reappoint Chief Donald Dwyer, although he said frequently that Dwyer would be "at the top of the list."

Stenvig adhered to a basic campaign platform that he spelled out in a position paper (consisting of a single sheet) which he circulated before the primary election.

The first of 12 points in the position paper dealt with law enforcement, which Stenvig described as the "mayor's No. 1 responsibility."

In the paper, Stenvig said "I believe in strong, fair, law enforcement, and as your mayor would not let a few hoodlums dictate the policies for the majority of the hard-working, law-abiding citizens of Minneapolis."

He did not name the "hoodlums" but said that they frequently could be found leading demonstrations on behalf of causes espoused by black and white civil-rights militants.

He publicly advocated taking "the handcuffs off our police" to allow them "to do the job they were hired to do by protecting the lives and property of the responsible, law-abiding citizens from the hoodlum and criminal elements that are so evident in our city today."

Stenvig said his human-relations program could "be summed up in one saying, the Golden Rule. If everyone followed this we would take big steps forward."

Stenvig ran an unconventional compaign that consisted of virtually no media advertising and that relied heavily on personal contacts by the candidate. He cruised the city in a 1940 sound truck and attempted to blanket all wards with lawn signs.

In a preliminary statement filed with the City Clerk's Office last week, Stenvig reported donations of $14,971, disbursements of $7,997 and unpaid obligations of $3,314.

He had a volunteer committee of about 800 workers. Some of his hardest campaigners came from the ranks of the police federation.

Cohen's campaign statement showed expenditures of $36,797. His campaign structure was headed by five paid staffers, including John Deardourff, a campaign consultant from Washington, D.C.

He was endorsed by the Minneapolis Central Labor Union and the Minneapolis Building and Construction Trades Council.

He also had the backing of President Nixon, Minnesota Gov. Harold LeVander and a committee of city DFLers headed by James Rice, chairman of the 5th Ward DFL Club.

The Charles Stenvigs live in a neat, three-bedroom rambler in the southeastern corner of Minneapolis and worry about everyday things like mortgage payments, permissive social attitudes and their own lack of leisure time.

A visitor to the white house in the 5600 block of 35th Ave. S. would find that the mayor-elect of Minneapolis is a man of positive attitudes about things other than politics.

He would also find that Stenvig is an occasionally frustrated man who hopes that the pressures of public life will relent enough now that the election is over to allow him to play some golf or to fly a plane.

But Stenvig, a police officer for the past 13 years, is definite about one thing:

"I'll have to take more time with the boys in the future," he said during a recent interview. He gestured towards his two sons who were playing on the floor, Todd, 3, and Tommy, 14 months.

The Stenvigs also have two daughters, Terri, 13, and Tracy, 11. Taken together, the Stenvigs call their children "the four Ts."

The Stenvigs are frank in discussing their family life and they make it clear that they subscribe to old-school notions about things like discipline, the value of the home and family life, and sex education.

"You have to start them young," Stenvig said in discussing discipline. "I can't see my children going over and wrecking someone else's furniture."

"They look for discipline. They need it," Mrs. Stenvig said.

"I think to have love in the home you need discipline," Stenvig concluded.

"I definitely don't see the need for sex education starting in kindergarten," said Mrs. Stenvig, as the conversation switched to another topic. "We got along fine. We were in junior high school when they started."

"I think it has its place in school but I think they also can go overboard," Stenvig said.

"It used to be that playing Monopoly and having popcorn was a big thing. Now home is just a stopping-off place. It isn't the Rock of Gibraltar it used to be. I feel there's just too much outside activity. As far as morals go, I think they are too loose. We need more of a return to home. I also think we need a little bit more of a return to God," Stenvig said.

Stenvig was brought up in south Minneapolis as a member of St. Luke's Lutheran Church where his mother sang as a soloist. His father sang in an American Legion male chorus.

Although he and his family now attend Minnehaha Methodist Church, an early interest in music has continued.

He was a drummer in bands through grade school, high school, and the Army.

Tracy plays the clarinet and Terri plays the violin. Both girls study the piano.

Stenvig himself talks somewhat wishfully about some day joining a "combo," perhaps after he is retired.

"Dixieland and jazz, that's what I like," he said.

Mrs. Stenvig, 38, is three years younger than her husband. Like him, she went to Roosevelt High School and they started dating in 1948, shortly after he was discharged from the service.

Although she was several years behind him in high school, she remembers Stenvig as an athlete—and particularly as a champion golfer.

They were married in 1951, while Stenvig was working towards his degree at Augsburg College. She worked as a teller in a bank to help him through Augsburg, Stenvig recalls now.

Once a par golfer, Stenvig has had to let his game slip since becoming an officer in the Minneapolis Police Officers' Federation in 1963.

"I hope to play a lot more golf," Stenvig said. "But I'd probably shoot in the middle 80s now. That's kind of a letdown. You have to play a great deal—really concentrate—and with a family, that's not fair."

Stenvig began flying a plane after he was recalled into the service following his graduation from Augsburg.

He has pursued his interest in flying since then and now belongs to a flying club. Through the club he has part ownership in a four-seater Cessna.

The Stenvigs now live in a $20,000 house at 5604 35th Ave. S. in what Stenvig describes as a "working neighborhood."

Stenvig simply shakes his head when he thinks of the years of house payments ahead.

However, he isn't bothered too much by the little-sleep routine of a campaign because "I'm used to it."

He describes himself as a "night-owl," who rarely goes to bed before 1 a.m. and is usually up by 6:15 a.m.

Neither Stenvig nor his wife smoke but each will drink a highball or beer.

Stenvig's tastes in food are easily satisfied.

"He doesn't like anything fancy," his wife said. "I eat a lot of hamburgers and french fries," Stenvig explained.

The furnishings in their home aren't fancy either, but were chosen for comfort. A sofa and a couple of chairs covered in a simple brown pattern are arranged in the living room with Formica topped tables nearby. Hanging on a wall over a piano is an oil painting entitled "Moonlight: Fisherman's Village."

A stereo is placed underneath a picture window, next to a television set—black and white. Stenvig's drums are set up in a rumpus room downstairs.

In a hallway off the living room a set of book shelves with an encyclopedia and other educational books are conveniently located for the Stenvig youngsters.

Stenvig said he would like to be able to do more "light" reading but as federation president his time was spent studying "things from a police angle and from a business agent's angle."

"Now," he said, "I'll have to keep up with the business of the city.

TRIBUTE TO DR. FRANK PORTER GRAHAM

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, a fine American has recently retired after many years of outstanding and faithful service to his country, his State of North Carolina, and the University of North Carolina from which he graduated.

During his long and distinguished career Dr. Frank Porter Graham upheld a strong American tradition—that of uplifting and improving his community and his country.

He has always been a stanch advocate of academic freedom, "the open platform," the right of labor to organize and bargain freely with employers, racial equality, the ultimate triumph of human wisdom and the best impulses of the human spirit.

He has shouldered his obligations with

good humor and fierce dedication and has time and again proved that honest, decent citizenship is the most vital feature of democracy. Mr. Graham's citizenship is living proof that democracy can never be better than are the citizens who make up that democracy.

Since 1951 he has been an international civil servant—the United Nations Representative for India and Pakistan, trying to get those two Nations to resolve their differences. He has spoken with eloquence all over the country on the merits of the United Nations; his energy is boundless.

He was called upon repeatedly during and after World War II by the administration to handle difficult assignments. He served on the National War Labor Board, 1942 to 1945; the President's Commission on Civil Rights, 1946; U.S. Representative on the Good Offices Committee of the United Nations Security Council to effect a cease-fire between the Dutch and Indonesians, 1947 to 1948.

He served out an uncompleted term as U.S. Senator from North Carolina in 1949 and 1950 but was defeated in a runoff primary for reelection.

For many years he was president of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and under his inspired leadership that institute of higher learning proliferated handsomely.

Frank Graham's service to this Nation will be greatly missed; his ability as an educator, however, will continue to influence our future generations.

He can be justly proud of his career and accomplishments. It is indeed a privilege and a pleasure to send along my warmest personal wishes for a long and happy retirement.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, on this commemoration of the 10th anniversary of the Captive Nations Week resolution, and as one who has consistently introduced, advocated, and supported congressional resolutions and other efforts designed to encourage and promote the restoration of freedom to captive nations, I am, indeed, very happy to again participate in this further and most worthy salute to the courageous peoples still suffering under the suppressive yoke of Communist domination.

The people of these United States and this Government very deeply regret, and most earnestly urge the Communist leaders to give up their unlawful dictatorship over all these captive peoples and permit them to resume their right to self-government. The captive countries that suffer under the oppressive rule of these dictators have the continuing, pledged support of our Government and our citizens in their just aspirations for personal freedom and national independence.

Through this annual formal observance of Captive Nations Week, we shall continue to work and urge and hope that the Communist regimes may be persuaded and convinced that subjugated nations should be granted their God-given right to freely govern themselves as they see fit.

Let us persevere in our cause and may the good Lord speed the day of our common success in united effort to promote the liberty of the heroic peoples of the captive nations.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the Captive Nations Week Manifesto, 1969, which was adopted by the American Friends of the Captive Nations and the Assembly of Captive European Nations:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK MANIFESTO, 1969

The undersigned organizations, dedicated to the restoration of freedom in the captive nations, call attention to Public Law 86–90, unanimously adopted in 1959 by the Congress of the United States, by which the third week of July each year was designated as Captive Nations Week.

The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968 and the subsequent enunciation of the so-called Brezhnev Doctrine have once again brought to the surface the entire issue of self-determination and fundamental freedoms for the one hundred million people of East-Central Europe. The tragedy of Czechoslovakia dramatizes the built-in instability of contemporary Europe rooted in the still unresolved problems bequeathed by the Second World War. The Brezhnev Doctrine brings into focus the sad fact of the perpetuation in power of unpopular Communist regimes—imposed by a foreign power—that are not responsible to the will of the peoples over whom they rule.

The record of over two decades of Communist rule shows that the legitimate aspirations of the captive European nations have long been thwarted by Soviet hegemony over the area. Now, with the advent of the Brezhnev Doctrine, the USSR has in fact tried to make this arbitrary arrangement accepted on a permanent basis.

In the light of this doctrine, which is a justification for aggressive imperialism, the Soviet Union has in effect placed its own interests over the inherent right to national sovereignty and fundamental human rights of the peoples living in the Communist orbit.

This doctrine can have a far-reaching impact on the future of not only the captive European nations, but also of the free world. If the doctrine remains unchallenged, it may turn the United Nations Charter into a shambles. As a result of this doctrine, all Communist parties are expected to follow automatically the dictates of the Kremlin. The acceptance by the Communist governments in East-Central Europe of the new Soviet doctrine is tantamount to complete abdication of the sovereign rights of these nations.

The Brezhnev Doctrine is against the vital interests of all captive European nations, the Charter of the United Nations, international law and the accepted norms of civilized nations. It is therefore deemed essential that the free world oppose the newly enunciated Soviet policy of aggressive imperialism and defend the traditional principles and norms of international law, in order to maintain world peace, security and freedom for all nations.

For the peoples of East-Central Europe, it is important to learn of the continued determination of the free governments of the world to lend their moral and political support to the rightful aspirations of their captive East-Central European brethren.

While commemorating this year's Captive Nations Week:

We stress that the Soviet Union has demonstrably violated its solemn promises of freedom and independence to the nine nations made captive during and after World War II—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania:

We also stress that the Communist regimes in the East-Central European nations continue to be unresponsive to the will of the people by denying them the right to periodic and genuinely free elections.

We appeal to the free governments of the nations of the world:

1. To declare, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries, adopted by the United Nations on October 14, 1960, their support of the right to self-determination of all peoples held captive by the Communists and, consequently, to make this issue the permanent concern of the United Nations;

2. To repudiate the intent and objectives of the Brezhnev Doctrine, including its implied recognition of the spheres of influence and of the status quo in East and Central Europe;

3. To bring to world attention the urgent need for a responsible attitude by the free nations of the world designed to help bolster the morale of the East-Central European peoples and thus create a climate favorable to their quest for full national independence and individual freedom.

4. As part of this effort, we call on the United States Government and on other members of the Atlantic Alliance to maintain, and where possible strengthen, NATO's defense forces. This alone will help counter any temptation of further Communist aggression—by force or threat of force.

We appeal to the People of the United States of America to manifest during Captive Nation's Week, July 13 to 19, 1969, their awareness of the importance of freedom for 100 million peoples in the Communist-dominated lands to the establishment of a valid European settlement and world peace.

CHRISTOPHER EMMET,
Chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations.

JOZEF LETTERICH,
Chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations.

THE TECHNIQUE OF PERPETUAL CRISIS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the recent disclosure that the FBI had tapped the phone of the late Reverend Martin Luther King for internal security reasons emphasizes the warning that civil rights leaders are targets for subversive elements who are not the least bit interested in furthering the social progress of the Negro people. In extensive remarks on October 4, 1967, for instance, I pointed out that testimony by various Negro ex-members of the Communist Party in the United States confirmed the charge that the CPUSA used the aspirations of the Negro people to create dissension in the Nation. With regard to Dr. King it was noted that:

While one would be shocked to find Martin Luther King consistently cooperating with the KKK, his history regarding pro-Communist persons, causes and organizations is a matter of record.

Apparently, I was not the only one concerned about Dr. King's questionable associations. The Washington Star of June 19 reported that the then Attorney General Robert Kennedy and the FBI were concerned enough to tap Dr. King's phone in the interest of internal security. The Star article by Jeremiah O'Leary stated that FBI Director Hoover revealed the contents of two memorandums in which the Attorney General "expressed concern about possible infiltration of the race issue by Marxists and spoke of allegations that the Negro leader was closely associated with Marxist ideas and followers."

The article further stated:

> Kennedy, according to the Evans memo, was concerned about reports that King was a student of Marxism, that he was associating with a New York attorney with known Communist connections, but that he did not espouse Marxism because of his religious beliefs.

The nationally syndicated columnist, Edith Kermit Roosevelt, in a column appearing in the Shreveport Journal of July 5, commented on the perpetual crisis technique which was used by Dr. King and which has been a standard device used by the Communist movement throughout the world. Unfortunately, the technique of creating crises to attain a predetermined goal has been refined and implemented by violence by such anarchistic groups as the Students for a Democratic Society.

I insert the Roosevelt column in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Shreveport (La.) Journal, July 5, 1969]

"PERPETUAL CRISIS"—KING'S TECHNIQUE

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—The recent revelations that the late Atty. Gen. Robert F. Kennedy had authorized a wiretap on the telephones of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. have made it possible to begin to examine objectively King's actions and behavior.

Hitherto, objectivity had been almost impossible in an emotionally charged atmosphere. To supporters of Dr. King he had become a symbol of the legitimate drive by Negroes for progress, identity and achievement. Some revered him as a quasi-saint but his enemies hated him as an agitator and a radical supporter of Communist causes. There were those too who would have disliked anybody who supported social change, however needed.

Who then was the real Martin Luther King? Why is it important that we seek to understand this controversial man whose influence reaches beyond the grave? The reason is simply that his behavior presented a pattern which increasingly characterizes the American political scene today—this is the so-called "perpetual crisis" technique. King admitted his role in creating a "crisis packed situation" in his book "Why We Can't Wait." He declared:

"The purpose of our direct-action program is to create a situation so crisis-packed that it will inevitably open the door to negotiation . . . Actually, we who engage in non-violent direct action are not the creators of the tension. We merely bring to the surface the hidden tension that is already alive. We bring it out in the open, where it can be seen and dealt with."

In other words, Dr. King was admitting that he was acting as a catalyst of "crisis-packed" situations. But at the same time, he dialectically used the slogan of "non-violence" as a cover. Consider how his physical presence in cities throughout the nation led to violence of riot proportions. Violence accompanied King during his early days in Birmingham. It was present during the death of a fellow pastor at, of all places, a Baptist convention. It was with him in Albany, Ga. It returned with him to Birmingham and Albany. It followed him to St. Augustine, and they were together in Chicago. Thus, everywhere King went, he left a trail of violence in his wake—bringing "tension" as he called it "out in the open."

The power of Dr. King to promote violence was recognized early. Arrested for loitering in 1958, he was charged with irresponsibility by a judge who said:

"It was regrettable that this case arose . . . there was serious danger of an incident."

On many occasions, like Chicago in 1966, he went to the scene of violence and instead of trying to settle troubled waters, added to the riot-producing tension. This is the pattern of behavior revealed in the still unpublished reports circulating in the Justice Department. On the floor of the House, Rep. John R. Ashbrook (R-Ohio) referred to these reports saying that in July of 1966, King and his assistants were "contacting and enlisting street gangs" and inciting them to violence against Mayor Daley, policemen, slum lords, bankers, businessmen and school administrators. Ashbrook pointed out that in the same month, "during looting, gunfire, rock-throwing, Molotov cocktail barrage, King reportedly sped from one spot to another ostensibly to quiet things, but reporters noted he seldom got out of his car."

King's actions disappointed many Americans, black and white, who felt he had a rare opportunity to align himself with an important cause and work for the solution to social ills through our democratic process. But it became increasingly clear to those who were not blinded by political expedience or emotional propaganda that he was in fact not doing this. Shortly before King's death, Louis Waldman, a leading labor lawyer in Chicago, made this perceptive analysis of Dr. King's "perpetual crisis" politics. Waldman said:

"The philosophy and purpose of Dr. King's program . . . is to produce 'crisis' situations and 'tension.' Such a purpose is the very opposite of nonviolence, for the atmosphere-of-crisis policy leads to violence by provoking violence . . .

"The perpetual crisis technique has been used by the Communist movement throughout the world, both Communist governments and parties follow it . . . It was used by Hitler in Germany both on his road to power and after power came to him . . . It is disruptive of democratic society and institutions. Whether Dr. King knows it or not, or wills it or not, the policy of perpetual crisis, or provoking 'tensions' as he calls it, and of civil disobedience, are disastrous to the Negro people themselves, to civil liberties and to constitutional government."

This was a damning indictment from a man who praised nonviolent approaches to problems of civil rights and it came not from a racist, but from a man who has been a champion of civil rights for decades. Now it is clear that such hitherto unheeded warnings had a solid foundation which was known to a number of top government officials at the time although they cynically supported Dr. King's disruptive activities. As a result, the "perpetual crisis technique" continues to be used on the nation's streets and is escalating on our campuses.

THEY ARE ON THE WAY

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, July 16, 1969]

THEY'RE ON THE WAY

CAPE KENNEDY.—Apollo-11 hurtled into space on a pillar of flame today, carrying three astronauts and the dreams of mankind on a historic voyage to sift the dust of the moon.

Astronauts Neil A. Armstrong, Michael Collins and Edwin E. Aldrin rode their 3,242-ton space machine toward a brief earth orbit exactly on time at 9:32 a.m. If all goes well, Mr. Armstrong and Col. Aldrin early Monday morning will become the first men ever to set foot on the moon.

"Everything is go," reported the astronauts as Apollo-11 curved gracefully over the Atlantic, visible for miles in the cloudless sky.

Apollo-11 rose majestically off launch pad 39A, leaving earth on man's greatest adventure with an awesome bellow that shook the beaches where hundreds of thousands of spectators, the largest crowd ever to watch a launch, were jammed.

After making final checks in their 115-mile high parking orbit over earth, the astronauts were to kick their spaceship off on the 250,000-mile journey to the moon.

The next step, almost immediately after leaving orbit, was to separate from the third stage of the enormous Saturn-5 rocket, spin around and pull the lunar landing module out of its housing atop the rocket stage.

"All engines are looking good," reported Mr. Armstrong four minutes into the flight.

"It's bright," remarked one of the crew, peering out the moonship window as the spaceship raced at 8,500 mph toward earth orbit.

The astronauts were pronounced "rested, fit as a fiddle and ready to go" by a physician after they awoke at 4:15 a.m. They breakfasted on the ritual meal of steak, eggs, toast, coffee and orange juice.

Last night President Nixon told them "you carry with you a feeling of good will in this greatest adventure man has ever undertaken."

The eight-day flight returns to earth on Thursday of next week, bringing back precious samples from the moon. But they may not be the first samples. As Apollo-11 soared aloft, the Soviet unmanned spacecraft Luna 15 was rushing toward the moon.

Launched last Sunday, it was expected to reach the moon early tomorrow and many experts felt the Russian flight would turn out to be an attempt to scoop up lunar rock and return it to earth before Apollo can come back.

Former President Lyndon B. Johnson and many other government leaders watched the launch. An estimated million or more spectators jammed the coast.

Janet Armstrong was here to watch her husband begin his adventure, but the wives of Col. Collins and Col. Aldrin remained home in Houston.

The astronauts retired early last night after eating a steak dinner. The final portion of the six-day countdown began on schedule at 11 p.m. Technicians began pumping frigid liquid oxygen into the Saturn-5 rocket two hours later.

It was the climactic step in America's

eight-year, $24 billion drive to fulfill the goal set by President Kennedy when he challenged the nation to try to land men on the moon this decade and safely return them to earth.

The men of Apollo-11 are scheduled to turn man's ages-old dream into a reality Sunday when Mr. Armstrong and Col. Aldrin leave Col. Collins in lunar orbit and fly their landing ship "Eagle" to a gentle touchdown on the moon's vast arid Sea of Tranquility.

Mr. Armstrong, 38-year-old civilian commander of the mission, is set to crawl feet first through a 32-inch square hatchway, ease slowly down a nine-rung ladder and set the first foot on the dark, sandy surface at 2:21 a.m. Monday.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 14, 1969]

THERE ARE 5,600,000 PARTS, SIGN REMINDS SATURN WORKERS

ORLANDO, FLA.—The Martin Marietta plant here makes a small instrument package for the Apollo spacecraft. It is no bigger than a small suitcase, but workers here are not allowed to forget its importance.

On one window of the "clean room" where they put the parts together hangs a sign warning:

"If all of Saturn 5's 5,600,000 parts worked with 99.9 percent reliability, there would still be 5,600 defective parts."

APOLLO 11—U.S. PRIDE IN ACHIEVEMENT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, with Apollo 11 successfully in orbit and the landing of the first human on the surface of the moon expected Monday, I join with millions of Americans in hearty congratulations and thanks to NASA and Dr. Werner von Braun, along with their many prime contractors, for their unswerving dedication in pursuit of expanding man's horizons and to keep America first in space.

Special commendation must go to the many, many unnamed members of the teams of scientists, technicians, craftsmen, engineers, and workers, both military and civilian who have backed up America's commitment for aeroscience progress.

Likewise, acknowledgment must be given to the role of the American people—the taxpayers and productive Americans who were called upon, gave of their substance and who now, with pride in U.S. achievement, follow the moonshot with a rewarding sense of personal contribution—that they, too, participated in this historic first.

And, finally, I share with millions of Americans in every walk of life—with free men the world over—in lauding the courage and daring of Neil Armstrong, Michael Collins, and Edwin Aldrin, our U.S. astronauts, for undertaking the personal risk involved in realizing this new page in earth's progress.

We all follow their journey—with prayer and pride in achievement—anticipating the proudest moment of all when Old Glory, the symbol of the Nation and people who make this possible, is unfurled, the first flag to fly on the surface of the moon.

STUDENT OPINION

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Council on International Relations and United Nations Affairs is one of the finest of the student organizations seeking to represent student opinion on some of the questions that have stirred so much concern on campuses.

The council meets in an annual conference to study and discuss international problems, and to adopt resolutions reflecting its point of view. The example of day-in day-out concern set by the council over the years, and the informed and rational dialog that marks these annual conferences, is enormously encouraging, especially in these confused times. I commend to the House for study the conclusions of the 1969 conference on several of the most important problems facing the United States:

RESOLUTIONS

NOTE.—Resolutions passed by a majority of the participants of the 24th Annual National Student Leadership Institute on World Affairs, sponsored by the Council on International Relations and United Nations Affairs, June 14–21, 1969.

RESOLUTION ON HUNGER

Faced with the acute problem of world starvation, we feel the urgent need to express our feelings on this problem. First is the understanding that starvation brings about an immense physical and mental health problem; secondly, it promotes pain and misery among human beings; thirdly, it causes ill feeling between the have and the have-not peoples of the world. Therefore, we will dedicate our services to waging a battle against world starvation. We urge your help in all projects aimed to battle hunger, such as our March on Hunger, and aiding migrant workers, ghetto dwellers, and other deprived peoples of the world.

Noting the hunger which is prevalent in many rural and urban areas in the United States,

Further noting that CIRUNA is a strong advocate and adherent to the principles embodied within the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,

Cognizant that Article I of the above-mentioned Declaration states that "All Humans are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood."

Pleased to mention that the preceding statement means that all humans should express solicitude about others who are not adequately fed,

And distressed and wretchedly disappointed at those who orally condemn the right of hunger to exist, but yet fail to yield to the tenents of practicality and activeness,

Therefore be it resolved that we concern ourselves with the problem of hunger, by asking each delegate to pledge to return to his or her campus, and seek to raise funds which will be sent to the national office for distribution to the needy.

RESOLUTION ON MIRV

We call upon the President of the USA and the Congress to immediately halt the testing of Multiple Individually Targetable Reentry Vehicles (MIRV). We further ask, in the name of future generations, that the U.S. immediately initiate strategic arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union, including in some way representatives of the People's Republic of China, France and the United Kingdom. We are of the opinion that completion of testing of MIRV and its deployment by the U.S. will increase Soviet uncertainty about our nuclear strategic capacities, endanger the prospects for an agreement to limit offensive/defensive strategic missile systems, and initiate a new dangerous spiraling of the nuclear arms race. It would decrease, not improve, our national security. Further, the deployment of MIRV warheads on land and sea-based ICBM's would complicate the problem of inspection of any missile system arms limitation agreement. While present systems can be identified with aerial satellite surveillance, if MIRV warheads were deployed it would necessitate on-site inspection of missile sites, greatly complicating the opportunities for agreement with the Soviet Union.

We urge that the President freeze the development and deployment of MIRV now, and that he call upon the Soviet Union to reciprocate by freezing its development of its less advanced MIRV system. We believe that this action, coupled with delay in approval and deployment of the Safeguard Anti-Ballistic Missille System, will ensure the most propitious atmosphere and context for successful strategic arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union.

We, the participants of the National Student Leadership Institute, are in a generation unsure that there is a future. Our lives have known only the threat of global nuclear destruction. We look for hope and optimism, but see none in the spiraling nuclear arms race. If we are to create a future for ourselves, for our children, for all those we love, we need to begin first by ending an insane nuclear arms race by halting ABM and MIRV deployment and entering into arms talks with the Soviet Union *NOW*, so that the future of world peace will be secured.

RESOLUTION ON APOLLO 11 FLIGHT TO MOON

Considering the resolution in the UN General Assembly on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, and

Believing that outer space should be utilized for the advance of all nations, and

Realizing that the Apollo 11 flight is man's initial venture into this international domain,

We therefore condemn the decision of the U.S. Congress stipulating only the American Flag should be carried to and placed on the moon, and

Furthermore express disappointment over the U.S. Government's violation of the above-stated principles and

Urge that both the United States flag and the United Nations flag be carried aboard the Apollo 11 flight.

LOANS FOR MEDICAL STUDENTS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the paradox of American medical education is that only the truly rich can afford the long and expensive training needed to enter the exceedingly well-paid ranks of the American doctor. Others who apply must borrow money, depend on parents, in-laws and working wives to survive the 10 to 12 years of training to become a doctor.

This system has several very unfortunate consequences. First, medicine becomes a socially inbred profession with, in a recent typical year, about 60 percent of medical students coming from the upper 14 percent of the population's income segment. A further defect is an attitude, bordering on bitterness, among young doctors who understandably resent many years of deprivation during training and who then abandon part or all of the humanitarian motivation which brought them into medicine. Too many then concentrate on making up for lost time in achieving high earnings.

One way to remedy this situation is to provide much better scholarship and loan programs for medical students. The resistance to this approach has been, again paradoxically, a general lack of sympathy for students who will soon be earning large incomes.

To break this cycle, we established, under the Health Professions Education Act, a student loan program to allow more middle- and lower-income students to enter medical training. Another goal was increasing physician production.

These goals are jeopardized today by a sharp reduction in funds available in fiscal year 1970 for this loan fund. Unless the $15 million requested for this fund is increased by at least $10 million, many medical students will have their continued education threatened.

The president of the Student American Medical Association, Edward D. Martin, recently testified before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on this need. His statement was enhanced by numerous excerpts from letters written by medical students who described what the loan fund has meant to their education. I include Mr. Martin's statement, with these excerpts, below.

I also include a summary, by medical school and congressional district, of what the reduced loan fund allocations mean to specific schools.

The House will soon consider this matter when the appropriations bills are presented. We shall do our country a distinct disservice if we fail to supply funds for loans to medical students, especially since we have encouraged these same medical schools, through other programs, to expand their classes. Without loan funds available, there may well be empty seats this fall in our medical school classrooms.

The material follows:

STATEMENT OF THE STUDENT AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee. I am Edward D. Martin, of Kansas City, Kansas, a senior medical student at the University of Kansas. I am appearing here today as President of the Student American Medical Association. S.A.M.A. is an autonomous organization with more than 24,000 active medical student members in 93 American medical schools, and over 35,000 affiliate intern and resident members.

The purpose of my testimony is to strongly urge on behalf of our membership that this subcommittee increase the 1970 appropriation for the Health Professions Education Loan from the proposed $15,000,000 to the full amount of $35,000,000 authorized in section 742 of the Public Health Service Act.

There are eight facts which, in themselves, speak for the necessity of an increased appropriation in this critically important loan program.

(1) There is a clearly *documented health manpower shortage* in our country which is becoming more acute year by year.

(2) Medical education and living *expenses* across the country *have risen* sharply in the past few years.

(3) An appropriation of $15,000,000 this year will result in *an effective decrease of $10,316,000 as compared to last year*. Thus, the number of medical students assisted (at an average loan of $1,146) would drop from 12,375 to 7,545 leaving *4,830 students without necessary funds*.

(4) The projected *increase of 900 entering freshmen* next year over last year will compound this problem considerably.

(5) Each year, significantly larger numbers of students come from middle and lower income families and from minority groups and have *less available family support*.

(6) The availability of long-term loans from private sources is decreasing and are unevenly available both by state and by individual students.

(7) The Guaranteed Loan Program of the Office of Education *will not* be able to substitute for the increased need for financial support.

(8) There are a significant number of medical students for which this program is the primary means of support and a significant number would be forced to leave school if funds were not available.

The shortage of physicians in the United States is clearly documented. In order to maintain the 1959 ratio of physicians to population—"a minimum essential to protect the health of the people of the United States"—we will require 40,000 more physicians by 1975 than the present output of U.S. medical schools and continued immigration of foreign psysicians can provide.[1] The Board of Trustees of the American Medical Association in 1967 stated that the nation's shortage of physicians was reaching "alarming proportions".[2] The shortage of physicians in our inner cities and in rural America is acute and is rapidly worsening. The President's Commission on Health Manpower, the A.M.A., the A.A.M.C., and numerous other organizations concerned with health care have all stated that there is an acute need for more physicians and health professionals. Without increased and sustained support of the federal government for student, faculty and schools alike, this need will not be met.

School expenses which averaged $1,271 in 1964[3] have increased substantially. *The median annual tuition for 45 private schools is $1930 with some tuitions as high as $2595 per year. The median tuition for public schools is $618 for in-state students and $1220 for non-residents.*[4] Books and supplies average $200–$250 per year and the mandatory microscopes cost incoming freshmen another $700–$750. Living expenses have increased proportionately and where the average non-school costs were $2,000 in 1959, $2,846 in 1964[5] they were closer to $3500 in 1968. These increases have placed an increasing burden on the already strained financial sources that help sustain the medical student through the 4–5 years past an already costly college education. A family's contribution to these expenses (which represented 32% of the medical students income in 1964) is heavy even in families with income up to $15,000, critical when other children are in the home or in school, and overwhelming to the increasing number of families with incomes less than $10,000 whose children are in medical school.

The Federal Capital Contribution of $15,000,000 last fiscal year was *supplemented with $11,429,000 from the revolving loan fund* which was not extended for this year and will augment the proposed 1969–70 appropriation by only $1,113,000. Thus, while $26,429,000 was available last year, *an appropriation of $15,000,000 this year will result in a real cut of $10,316,000*. (See Appendix A). The result of the $15,000,000 appropriation this year *will decrease the percentage of medical students aided from 35% to 20%*, and decrease the amount funded of that requested by medical schools from 74% to 39%. The medical school share of the cut will reduce funds for medical students by $5,558,000 and if the *average loan remains at $1,150, 4830 medical students who received loans last year will have no funds available this September*. (See Appendix B).

The *substantially increased demand* on existing school, state and federal funds is reflected by the projected increase of entering freshmen next fall. The AAMC has estimated that there will be an increase of over 900 new freshmen next year which is almost an increase of 10% over last year's entering freshman class of 9,727.

A most important factor in the consideration of funds available for students is that there has been a successful and widespread effort by medical schools to increase the number of medical students from minority groups and lower socio-economic families. Coupled with this is the clear trend which has been established in many schools toward an increasing percentage of students who are not from affluent professional families. These students cannot obtain the considerable family financial backing that children of affluent families can. In the past this has served as a major obstacle to many students and it is *only through programs such as the Health Professionals Education Act Loan Program that less privileged students can be guaranteed equal opportunities to become practicing physicians*. The $15,000–25,000 total expense of 4 years of medical school is a considerable barrier to overcome when you are from a family with limited income, and are unable to work part-time because of increasing clinical and basic science responsibilities.

There are some who argue that the *Guaranteed Loan Program* of the Office of Education would substitute for the decrease in the Health Professions Education Loan Program. From all data available *it is clear that this will not be the case*. A 1968 U.S. Office of Education Survey[6] concluded that these loans were not available to all students on an equal basis due to lack of lender participation, or a lack of available funds in a *majority of states*. Also students unknown at a bank, out-of-state students, *students from rural areas*, and *students from low-income families* were found to have difficulty obtaining loans. The experience of students in a large number of states indicates that these loans are quite difficult to obtain. With the current prime rate of 7½% and the rate of interest on the loan being 7%, it is even more unlikely that this source will serve as a replacement source or even provide the funds provided in 1968–9. The uneven characteristics of the program are further demonstrated by the fact that, for both 1967 and 1968, 60% of the total amount loaned and 55% of the total number of loans originated in *only seven (7) states*. This report's general conclusion was that the *Guaranteed Loan Program had not fulfilled the need in the past and it is our feeling that there is no indication it will in the future.*

---

[1] *Health Manpower Perspective 1967*, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Public Health Service, 1967.

[2] Janson, Donald, AMA Panel Asks Drive to End Doctor Shortage. New York Times. June 20, 1967, p. 1.

[3] Marion E. Altenderfer and Margaret D. West, How Medical Students Finance their Education. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, June, 1965.

[4] Medical School Admission Requirements, 1968–69, ed. Association of American Medical Colleges, Evanston, Illinois.

[5] Altenderfer, op. cit.

[6] *A Study of Federal Loan Programs*, coordinated by the College Entrance Examination Board and supported by the U.S. Office of Education, John I. Kirkpatrick, Study Director, 1968.

The availability of long-term loans from the private sector is decreasing due to increasing prime interest rates and the inability of students to have enough collateral to meet the requirements of local banks. In fact, the largest single source of private guaranteed loans, the American Medical Association Education and Research Foundation, is having increasing difficulty continuing their program and are seriously considering ceasing their efforts in this area—possibly leaving another 1200 students a year without funds.

We have, in the past month, received over 1700 letters from students across the country supporting *an increase* in the funds available over last year. Over two hundred of these students have indicated that they have exhausted their sources of possible income and without the support of this program will be in jeopardy of having to leave school. For example, I have included selected comments from these students in Appendix C.

The House of Delegates of the Student American Medical Association with representatives from 86 schools unanimously support increased federal loan programs for all health science students for the reasons above and a recent survey of medical students at schools as diverse as Bowman Gray, Cincinnati, SUNY-Downstate, The University of California at San Francisco, North Dakota, Kansas and Georgetown has shown that over 90% of the students support an increase in the appropriations for this program. We have also received over 400 letters from faculty members who strongly support such an increase. The Illinois State Medical Society has recently passed a resolution supporting an increase in the appropriation to medical students through this program, and the Massachusetts Medical Society in a recent letter to a national officer supported at least a continuation of the program at the $26,000,000 level. I quote from this letter: "With the present manpower problems in the country it would be short-sighted policy to reduce any program that will give us more doctors" (John W. Norcross, M.D., President, The Massachusetts Medical Society). Of the 2100 letters from students and faculty we have received on this issue, only one has supported the cut.

Mr. Chairman, we strongly urge an increase in this appropriation to the authorized level of $35,000,000. Without increased resources for long-term loans, medical students all over America, many without adequate support and facing increased living and educational expenses, will be facing a severe financial crisis next September. There are no alternative sources for many of these students and a significant number will be forced to compromise their education or leave school altogether. In a nation facing a growing health care and manpower crisis, and in those states where 1 physician must often serve up to 8,000 or 10,000 people, these future physicians, each and every one, is a national resource that cannot be considered anything but as a high priority concern of Congress. This is the generation of physicians who with a renewed concern and committment face the health care problems of tomorrow and they sincerely request your aid in helping them through the hard school years until they become physicians and can begin to provide medical care for the American people.

APPENDIX A

HEALTH PROFESSIONS STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM—PROGRAM SUMMARY

[Funds available from Federal capital contributions and revolving fund]

Type of school	Number of participating schools			Total enrollment of participating schools			Number of students assisted			Percentage of students assisted		
	1968	1969	1970[1]	1968	1969[1]	1970[1]	1968	1969[1]	1970[2]	1968	1969[1]	1970
Medical	93	98	100	33, 595	35, 117	36, 017	12, 484	12, 375	7, 544	37	35	21
Dental	47	50	52	14, 075	14, 833	15, 392	5, 944	5, 892	3, 593	42	40	24
Osteopathy	5	5	5	1, 819	1, 876	1, 915	977	969	590	54	52	31
Optometry	10	10	10	2, 031	2, 243	2, 355	745	739	450	37	33	19
Pharmacy	48	51	73	10, 025	10, 907	18, 309	2, 097	2, 079	1, 268	21	19	7
Podiatry	2	3	5	425	643	1, 070	211	209	127	50	33	12
Veterinary medicine	12	14	18	2, 561	3, 774	4, 942	797	790	482	21	21	10
Total	217	231	263	64, 531	69, 383	80, 000	23, 255	23, 053	14, 054	36	33	18

FISCAL SUMMARY

	Fiscal year 1968 amounts allocated	Fiscal year 1969 amount allocated	Fiscal year 1970[2] amounts allocated
Type of school:			
Medical	$14, 736, 357	$14, 240, 726	$8, 681, 922
Dental	6, 822, 117	6, 777, 734	4, 133, 098
Osteopathy	1, 044, 946	892, 880	544, 634
Optometry	856, 113	883, 332	538, 189
Pharmacy	1, 810, 357	2, 019, 517	1, 231, 067
Podiatry	234, 800	306, 034	189, 916
Veterinary medicine	1, 154, 786	1, 308, 777	797, 616
Total	26, 659, 476	26, 429, 000	16, 113, 000
Federal capital contribution	(15, 000, 000)	(15, 000, 000)	(15, 000, 000)
Revolving fund	(11, 659, 476)	(11, 429, 000)	(1, 113, 000)
Average loan	1, 146	1, 146	1, 146

[1] Estimated.

[2] Estimated on basis of Nixon's budget recommendation (15,000,000 + 1,113,000).

APPENDIX B

Fiscal year	Federal capital contribution (in thousands)	Revolving fund (in thousands)	Total (in thousands)	Medical student share (in thousands)	Funds requested by schools (in thousands	Percent	Borrowers		
							Number	Percent total	Average loan
1968	$15, 000	$11, 659	$26, 659	$14, 736	$16, 884	87	12, 404	37	$1, 180
1969	15, 000	11, 429	26, 429	14, 240	19, 030	74	12, 375	35	1, 150
NIXON BUDGET									
1970	$15, 000	$1, 113	$16, 113	$8, 681	$22, 023	39	7, 545	20	$1, 150

Source: Based on figures available from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the American Association of Medical Colleges.

ALABAMA

C. Paul Perry, Jr. Since my father is disabled, my *entire* financial support for medical school comes from this fund. Please urge the House Appropriations Committee, on my behalf, to reconsider this proposed cutback.

William M. Patterson. It is only with this assistance that I have been able to complete this first year in medical school . . . I was one of these students and could not have possibly financed my first year without it. My father is employed by the Gadsden, Alabama Fire Department with a modest salary. He has raised seven children of which three of us are still in school and he is due to retire this coming year. My wife is employed as a typist also with a very modest salary therefore, my sources of income are very limited.

George D. Miller. During the past two years, I have received a substantial loan from Health Professions, but I have had to work part-time approximately 19 hours per week to make ends meet in spite of the loans . . . I am sure that my case is typical of many medical students in this country. We need the Health Professions money in order to continue our education.

ARIZONA

Thomas S. Bailey, Jr. If it had not been for this program, I don't believe I would have been able to finance my way through my first two years here at the University of Arizona.

ARKANSAS

Ernest C. Clifton III. Presently I am a sophomore medical student. For the past two years I have received a total of $2675 from the Health Professions Loan Program. Without this program my first two years would have been a serious financial problem, one which would have prevented my attendance.

SAN FRANCISCO

W. C. Southworth. Personally, it would have been difficult if not impossible for me to complete medical school without funds from the Health Professions Loan Program.

John Asarian. I have received loans in the past under the program and would not have been able to be in medical school without those loans due to financial limitations.

Fredric S. Mendes. The financial aid I have received as part of the Health Professions Loan Program has been essential for my entering and my continuing my medical education. Without the aid of this program a medical education for myself would have been fraught with unsurmountable financial hurdles which, I believe, would have prevented by participation in higher education.

Stephen J. Bartok. I am receiving my M.D. degree in June, some five weeks away. If it had not been for the financial aid that I have received from this program, I would not be receiving this degree. I am married, the father of three children, my wife is a medical secretary—but even with her help off and on throughout these four years, I could not have managed without outside financial aid. This program is invaluable to some twenty or so of our friends, also. I cannot stress enough to what degree many of us owe our higher education to this program. If there is a cutback, I can assure anyone who asks that there will be a drastic cutback in the number of doctors who can serve the public.

Robert E. and **Bonita K. Vestal.** Considering the exorbitant cost of medical education, whatever we have saved or can earn in brief periods of academic holidays is grossly inadequate to meet the years expenses. We are forced to rely heavily on borrowed funds, realizing fully the weight of our responsibility to commence repayment as soon as possible. We are anxious to complete our training soon, to begin putting our service to use in the community and to remove our debt quickly. If loan funds are not available, this already long and expensive process will simply have to be prolonged and made even less efficient, perhaps even more costly than it is.

CALIFORNIA

Richard R. Hamilton. My parents own a 40 acre farm in Colorado and work out to support me as it is now, but this fall my younger sister will enter college and cause additional stress on the family budget. I've received $2,000 in loans that have made my attendance here possible where otherwise it wouldn't have been.

Gwen J. Hall. I am a freshman student at the University of California, Irvine-California College of Medicine with no means of support other than what I can earn or obtain through student financing. I have attempted to work during the school year because I was unable to obtain financial aid and found that my studies have definitely suffered; in other words, I have not been able to take full advantage of my education, and that which I have missed has been wasted. Also, I have not been able to work enough to meet my expenses and have just about exhausted my savings for next year.

E. N. Carlsen. My medical education just would *not* have been possible without your loans as I had no private sources to go to who could afford giving loans.

COLORADO

Philip K. Dirksen. As a third year medical student at the University of Colorado Medical Center, the Health Professions Loan Program is the only source available to me for a substantial amount of financial aid which has been required yearly . . . Without this financial assistance I will be unable to continue my medical education.

ILLINOIS

Jerry L. Haog. My home bank will not grant me a loan because of "tight money," my state refuses my loan application because I am "studying out of state" and now the federal government wants to diminish one of the few remaining channels of support open to me.

Luther V. Rhodes III. Quite simply I could not survive the expenses of my medical education without the money from the program.

Edward Oklan. I am a first year medical student at the University of Chicago and have received a Health Professions Loan for the current academic year. The money is vital to my being able to continue my medical studies. My father is disabled and unable to aid me in any way and the amount of time necessary for medical students does not permit me to work to finance my education.

Jeffrey D. Beckwith. My wife and I live in a "change-over" (semi-slum) area of Chicago, with no car, no shower, no lawn, no air-conditioning, and 3rd hand furniture we have repainted. We eat well by comparison—shopping 6 local food stores (that takes time). I walk my wife to and from the laundromat so she won't be attacked.

We would save money except for my medical school and $2000/year tuition fee; to make up the difference, I have to have a loan of $1200 a year.

Gordon Baumbacher. As a third year student at Northwestern University Medical School, I, like many of my classmates, would have found it impossible to finance the high cost of my medical education without aid from the Loan Fund.

Elliot G. Levy. I hope to be able to continue these loans in the next few years, but if such an act goes through Congress, I don't know where I will turn for money.

Thomas Filardo. Without the financial assistance of the Health Professions Loan Program, medical school would be a nearly impossible burden.

Randall L. True. I am a medical student who would not be a medical student were it not for the money I have received through the loan and scholarship program.

Richard Ellis. I am currently a sophomore medical student at the University of Illinois School of Medicine. I am from a lower income family and presently am living in a sixty dollar a month apartment which I share with another student. I eat one meal a day and spend $7.50 a week on food. I get $35 every 6 weeks selling my blood at Pres. St. Luke's Hospital and I get an occasional $10 for participating in research experiments as a "guinea pig". My mother sends me an occasional $5 from money she gets from social security (my father died in March 1968). I pay $134 a quarter in fees and am fortunate in having a legislative scholarship which waives tuition of about $66 a quarter.

I work on my vacations and have spent my summers as a factory worker in a zinc plant and as a laborer for the New York Central railroad. I am presently $7,000 in debt. I have never owned a car and presently I live in an Italian-Puerto Rican neighborhood near the school.

I want you to understand, I do not need more than what I have now. I am proud to be in medicine and I hope I will someday be able to help people like the ones here in this neighborhood, but what I have now is possible because I am currently in the Health Professions Loan Program. I haven't borrowed more than I need just to keep above water. Without it I'll drown—as will my roommate and the four other guys living in this area.

Last week they paid money for volunteers for liver biopsies which carries about a quarter of a per cent risk of fatal hemorrhage. I inquired the day after I heard about it but they already had more than enough volunteers which shows that many others are in my situation.

Randall D. Gore. I am currently attending the Chicago Medical School, for which the tuition and fees alone amount to $2600 per year. Up until this time I have borrowed a $2000 from the Health Professions Loan Program, and without further assistance in the coming year I will not be able to continue my medical education.

My wife is currently employed at three jobs; she is a full time elementary school teacher, engages in tutoring children after school hours, and is a restaurant cashier on weekends. She has not had a day off since Christmas and will continue unless her health is jeopardized.

Up until this past summer I have been able to contribute substantially to the costs of attending medical school by parachuting into remote areas of the western states for the purpose of suppressing forest fires in the capacity of a U.S. Forest Service Smokejumper. Due to the increasing body of knowledge the medical student must now master, summer vacations have been eliminated by our school for the sophomore, junior, and senior years, thereby curtailing any source of summer income.

My father is a lumber salesman and is unable to contribute funds for my education.

GEORGIA

Michael N. Harris. I attend medical school 10 months a year. It costs me $4,500 a year to pay for medical school and living expenses. I am only available for 2 months to earn money to pay my expenses. My parents are not living, I have no income from my family, and last year I borrowed $2,500 from the Health Professions Loan Program. I am grateful for the availability of the loans. This program enables me to pay for my medical education.

INDIANA

Long G. Andrews. I have calculated that my first year of medical school has cost me around $3,000 and at my summer job previous to this school year I made approximately $1,500. Thus as you might guess it would have been impossible for me to get to school without the Health Professional Loan and Scholarship . . . With the increased expenses, tuition and decreased pay it will be impossible for me to continue without the support of the Health Professions Loan Program.

Jon Kelly. Now I have a hundred and eighty dollars in savings. I have no extra sources of income now but this summer I will get $700. I can get no help from any friends or relatives. My tuition next year at I.U.M.C. the Indiana University School of Medicine will be $1,000. I am really depending on the Health Professions Loan.

Patrick L. Foley. I am presently a medical student at Indiana University School of Medicine completing my first year. I was able to attend medical school this year only because I was fortunate enough to receive a loan. I feel that there are many medical students presently enrolled who have found and will find themselves in the same situation.

IOWA

Richard Frankhauser. Many of us are already deeply in debt, due to our previous education, and could not stand to borrow large sums of money at high interest rates. I depend on this loan as a means for obtaining money for my education.

Thomas M. Altemier. Unless adequate financing is available it shall be extremely difficult for me to continue school. My father is unable to either give or loan me sufficient amounts of money to permit the loss which a 50% reduction in my loan application would require. Furthermore, I shall not be able to work for a long enough time this summer to earn sufficient amounts.

Shan R. Baker. Most of the medical students I know are in the same position that I am. I worked during my entire undergraduate work and I am currently holding a part time job. Medical school is so demanding that one cannot possibly support themselves on a part time job.

I have borrowed $4400 since I entered medical school two years ago and I will have to borrow more to continue my education the next two years.

Sarah J. Chilton. I am currently twenty-five years of age, single, and financially independent as of ten years ago. As I entered into Medical School with little financial reserve, I have had to rely heavily upon scholarship and loans for financing my medical years of tuition, room, board, and living. As a result of obtaining only 50% of my financial requests from the two previous years, I am presently working 25–30 hours weekly in order to meet monthly financial demands in addition to increased tuition and living costs. As a single female, with no financial assistance I am finding this financial situation increasingly more difficult to meet.

XUM

KANSAS

Kent Huston. I feel I could not have financed my first two years of medical school without these loans. Other sources for loans are not adequate at present and would be much less so with the proposed reduction. These loans keep medicine from being the "profession of the rich."

Robert Morris Wentz. As I prepare to begin my third year of medical school at Kansas University, I find myself in serious need of financial assistance for the coming year. I had hoped to obtain a loan from the Health Professions Loan Program, but funds for these loans have been cut rather drastically over the past few years at our school. If the cut proposed for this year occurs, many medical students, including myself, will find themselves in serious financial difficulty with few other sources of financial assistance available.

Jay Paul Consolver. While I can obtain a student loan from my hometown bank (and I have and will most likely continue to do so), this still does not offer a large enough amount for me to pay for my education. The Health Professions Loan Program is the essential part of the financing of my medical education. If the program is cut as drastically as indicated, the continuance of my medical education will be in doubt.

KENTUCKY

James K. Barnes. In medical school the only possible way I could have gotten to where I am now (I am finishing my junior year) is through the scholarships and loans offered through the national Health Prof. Services, I have no other sources of finances to support myself, my wife, and my children through the remaining part of my education.

G. L. Nicholson. I have devoted the last six years of my life, and have already expended what resources I had, to arrive at the place I now occupy. I, like many others, had little to start with and have nothing now. It is no exaggeration to state that since I am already living on an absolute minimum, any lack of this substantial aid could bring my medical studies to an abrupt halt with two years still to go.

Richard J. Taylor. To put it simply, if you cut the loans, you may also cut my throat. I am a freshman, married, and both my wife and I are in school, and we direly need the money.

Marc H. Tanenbaum. I am very personally involved as without the financial aid from this program I *would not* be able to afford medical school.

Paul David Reese. My total expenses every year are approximately $3500, including $1500 tuition. I receive $1800 to $2000 in loan and scholarship through the Health Professions Program. To help make up the deficit of $1500 I borrow $1000 a year from the Ohio State Higher Education Loan Assistance Program and work summers. However, since there is no summer vacation the clinical years part of this deficit cannot be made by loans alone. What further source of income is there now? My parents, of course, but with my father a clergyman and my sister in college this source is also very limited.

LOUISIANA

Eugene M. Louviere. At this moment, I am completing the final weeks of my first year of medical school. Had it not been for the money available to me from the Health Professions Loan Program I would have been financially unable to attend school this year. My expenses for the term amounted to approximately $3000. Of this amount, I was able to pay $1300 from personal resources; the remainder was loaned to me through the program.

Thomas Rickey. I'll be a sophomore at LSU Medical School next September and without such a loan as the H.P.L.P. I'm not sure I can make ends meet. If it weren't for the $2200 I received from the H.P.L.P. I couldn't have spent my freshman year in medical school.

Michael P. Haydel. When I decided to enter medical school I was led to believe that I could count on this program to finance my education. I am completely dependent on this program, as well, as the money I make during the summer months, to pay for my books and fees.

James P. Davis. Without the Health Professions Scholarships and loan programs it would be impossible for me and many of my friends to be in medical school—it is almost the difference between me becoming a doctor and not.

Thomas B. Anderson. I am at present completing my sophomore year at Tulane University Medical School, and am writing because I fear that such actions may seriously affect my ability to continue my medical education.

CONNECTICUT

Fred Hyde. I have personally benefitted from federal loans as an undergraduate and during my first two years of medical school. Many of my brightest classmates have also benefitted from these loan programs and have made and will make in the future inestimable contributions to the health professions. Without these kinds of loan programs we and many others could never have considered entering health professions.

MICHIGAN

Michael D. Moleski. As a student at the University of Michigan Medical School, I have used this fund since my first year of medical school, and with the arrival of our first child, my wife and I will be forced to rely even more heavily on this fund. I also am acquainted with several students at other universities (Wayne State and Marquette) who would not have been able to begin their medical educations without being able to draw freely from the Health Professions Fund.

Peter M. Boruta. I have been able to put myself through the last two years of medical school only with the help provided through the Health Professions Loan and Scholarship Program, even though I received only about 64% of the amounts applied for. Still, with a part-time job, and some stringent economy I managed to keep my debts to a minimum. A further reduction in loans and scholarships, in the face of rising tuition and costs, will be a financial disaster for me.

David Sperry. I want to work in Appalachia under the health programs set by the Appalachian Regional Commission in concert with local groups. This job does not lead to affluence. If money for medical education is not available, I and a number of my fellow students, would have to concern ourselves explicitly with making money so that we can finish our education. Appalachia would be passed over.

Milton Yolles. As a married medical school student with 1 child, I would find it impossible to complete my medical education without adequate aid from the Health Professions Loan Program.

Gregory Zemenick. There are very few other pathways open to me. Without this loan I would be seriously affected, even to the point of dropping from school.

With the shortened vacation time, the work load and the jobs that are available, the money I earn is insufficient. Loans are difficult to get and interest is often prohibitive.

David A. Vander Wall. If such programs are not available to me my medical education may be seriously jeopardized—as well as, indirectly, the health care of those persons I would have treated as a physician.

R. M. Fisher. I have received health Professions Loans and scholarships for the first two years of medical school. My financial status is such that it would be impossible for me to continue my medical education without this aid.

James D. Brodeur. Presently, my wife is unemployed and recovering from a recent pregnancy and successful delivery. Our new son is well and healthy, but of course is an added expense to our already overburdened budget.

Our only hope of continuing as we are is through our ability to obtain low cost loans and grants from the medical school. If this money was cut off we would surely flounder.

Ellen K. Hinterman. I myself am supported in my education entirely by these loans and a scholarship, and without the loan, I would be forced to discontinue my education. I personally know of many other medical students in the same position.

James Yeckley. If this occurs my medical education will likely be delayed or even stopped. Even with the present appropriation I have found it necessary to borrow money from outside sources which due to the high interest rate have put me in tremendous financial debt. Should I have to borrow more extensively from these sources I will be forced to drop out of medical school in order to make money to continue my education.

NEW JERSEY

Stephen M. Sachs. This is to express my great distress and concern over the proposed cutback in funds available under the Health Professions Loan Program. I, for one, am at a loss as to how I shall be able to continue my medical education next year without this program's aid in paying my tuition of $2350.

MISSISSIPPI

Thomas E. Sheffield. I am now in my second year of medical school and I have received approximately 33⅓% of my finances through the loan program, provided to medical students, specifically the Health Professions Loan Program. This source of money is vital for my continued status as a medical student due to the fact that my wife has a low paying job and my parents are unable to provide financial assistance since they make approximately $6,000 per year. Because of the increasing cost of medical education, the necessity of loans such as that provided by the Health Professions Loan Program will be of increasing importance to me.

Sidney Simpkins. Over 75% of my medical school financing comes from a Health Professions Loan. The other 25% comes from summer jobs and in-school work. It is essential for me to continue to receive this loan if I am to continue my medical education.

I would estimate that at least two-thirds of the rest of my class share this same situation.

Carl W. Graves. I am a first year medical student at the University of Mississippi Medical School. I am a veteran and also draw a 10% disability compensation check from the VA. I feel that if appropriations were cut back to what the House Appropriations Committee requested I would be unable to continue my education.

Barbara J. Sanford. With the cutback in this loan program, it would be extremely difficult for me to continue my medical education, for my medical education is totally financed through loans.

Ronnie Christian. I am a freshman medical student here in Jackson and I intend to return next year, to this school. However, if this bill is passed by Congress, it may be a near impossibility for me to continue school.

Jack A. McNeil. This year is my freshman year at the University Med. Center. It would not have been possible if it weren't for the loan funds which were made available to me.

I am married and have a five year old daughter, who starts to school in September. My wife works and earns our personal living expenses. She is now expecting our second child in the fall.

Without further aid my medical career will be over. There is no way I can finish my education without loan funds.

NEW YORK

Alan M. Hollace. Any large cutback in the Health Professions Loan Program threatens my ability to remain in medical school.

Steven H. Golde. My enrollment in New York Medical College is currently being financed by a Health Professions Loan. Neither myself nor my family are able to contribute substantially towards the required tuition and fees. Without the aid of a long-term, low interest loan, my medical education might well come to an end.

Joseph Paul Geiss, Jr. I am a first year medical student at State University of New York Upstate Medical Center in Syracuse, New York, and have utilized these funds to assist me in financing my first year of medical school.

My mother is a schoolteacher and is the sole provider for our family of four children. Her salary is not sufficient to support a family and also meet the constantly rising costs of education in this country. Two of us are students at this time and a third will enter college in September, 1969. We are all attending State supported institutions since we can't afford tuition at private institutions. We assume summer and part-time jobs to help defray expenses, but we cannot finance our educations entirely on our own and must rely on financial aid in the form of scholarships and loans.

Rosemary Bellino. I am from a rural Upstate area. I would have found it extremely difficult to finish college and go to medical school if it were not for state and federal aid.

Allen I. Berliner. After having just managed to survive financially this year after already being cut in loan funds I see very little way that I could continue my education if further cuts are made.

Michael A. Samach. From a personal point of view, such a cutback would be disastrous. A significant portion of my medical education has been financed by these loans, and if they were lost or even severely diminished in amount, I truly would have trouble finishing school.

Mr. and Mrs. **Frank Bin.** My wife and I are both medical students at Cornell, and we have full scholarships and borrowed $1,500 this year and still had to work in labs to get enough money *this year*. If funds are cut—we got to work more in labs etc. and our studies begin to suffer.

Paul A. McGee. I am writing this letter because of the fact that I am graduating in June and have, over the last 4 years, borrowed $7400. Without this money, it would have been impossible for me to go through medical school.

Martin Ecker. My entire medical school career was based on the assumption that there would be federal funds available in the form of loans if and when I needed them.

MINNESOTA

Dorothy Ann Ritter. I am a sophomore medical student at the University of Minnesota. Because of my Illinois residency, I must pay non-resident tuition here, which is currently $420/quarter. Next year we expect a minimum tuition increase of $125/quarter. Books and supplies are also expensive; very few medical books are less than $20.00 plus tax. This past year my *only source* of income was my Health Professions Loan of $700/quarter; out of this came tuition, books, rent, food, bus, insurance, etc. I am completely self-supporting of necessity since I come from a family of seven children of which five are now below college level and living at home. It is financially impossible for my parents to give me any aid. There is no time to hold down a job.

Without the Health Professions Loan Program I will not be able to finish. I am as certain of that as I am that I would not now be finishing my second year if it were not for my current loan.

Gary Cooney. I have relied heavily on this source in financing my education thus far and frankly don't know where to find the necessary money to make up the deficit which will result should the proposed reduction in funding be effected.

DuWayne A. Hansen. I am a sophomore at the University of Minnesota Medical School. I am married and have 3 children. I am absolutely dependent on this source of funds to continue my education. Without it for the coming two years, the last two years have been wasted, for I shall not be able to continue.

NORTH CAROLINA

Fredrica E. Smith. During the past two years I have been able to go to medical school because the Health Professions Student Loan Program has lent me money for tuition. Tuition at Duke University is increasing by $300 for the year 1969–70, to $2050. A decrease in loan money available to me would be a financial disaster at this time.

John M. Peterson. I am enrolled at the Duke University School of Medicine, where in the next twelve months tuition alone will cost me $2487.50 (This represents a small savings, since by taking a summer course I will avoid a portion of the tuition increase which is effective in September). To this must be added board and room. I take most of my meals in the hospital cafeteria, where for about $2.50 per day one can eat adequately. The demands of medical studies leave me too little time to economize by doing my own cooking. The apartment which I rent costs $70 per month. It is small, old, and minimal as regards comfort and appearance; nevertheless, I hope to save by finding a cheaper one in the fall at, hopefully, about $50 per month. The items listed total $4,000, and include no books, instruments, laundry, clothing, insurance, travel, or recreation, which will bring the figure to about $5,000.

Against this amount, I am able to borrow $200 per month from my parents, who tell me that this is about the limit of their means, and who have already had the major part of the expense of my undergraduate education. I hope to obtain another Health Professions Student Loan for this year. If it is not granted, then I don't know what I will do.

James Boylston. As a senior medical student, I will no longer be affected by changes in federal loans to students. However, were it not for such loans, I would not have been able to begin, much less complete, my medical education.

PENNSYLVANIA

Philip John Klemman. I will be as direct as possible in stating my case: without the Health Professions Loans, or with any substantial reduction therein, I will not be able to finance my medical education. I am already $5,000 in debt from my undergraduate loans.

Judy Briggs. What more can I say than this: for me, medical school would have been impossible without Health Professions.

Stephen J. Gergantz. My parents left Hungary after the 1956 revolution and came to this country in 1959 with $200.00. In the beginning they were unable to find employment only as unskilled laborers due to language difficulties.

Today my father works as a machinist in a local factory. My mother worked as a maid just a year ago. She now works as a cleaning woman for the local college.

My father had an injury at work in 1956 whereby he became 25% disabled.

My approximate expenses for this school year were $3,500. I don't expect to earn a sufficient amount from summer work. I still haven't found a summer job. If I wouldn't receive a Health Professions Loan next year I would have to apply for a regular bank loan at higher interest rate, and may not even receive one, or drop out for one year from school and work.

Helene Pavlov. I am a freshman student at Temple University School of Medicine. Two weeks prior to commencing classes my father became ill and unable to work. Had it not been for the Health Professions Loan money available for emergency purposes I could not have started and completed my first year in medical school.

Arthur Glaser. Eight years of education is a great expense and many students, including myself, have been, and are, dependent on loans to continue their education. Without these loans I would not have been able to pursue an education, especially a medical education.

Arthur S. Tischler. I am a medical student at Jefferson Medical College in Philadelphia. For the past academic year I have been completely dependent for medical school tuition and living expenses on a health professions loan and a small amount of summer earnings. The prospect of a large cut in appropriations for the program is most disturbing since this could seriously hamper or even end my medical education.

Lewis Yecies. Personally, I depend upon the Health Professions Loan for a large part of my financial aid. If this loan had not been available and without any substitution, I seriously doubt that I would have embarked upon a medical career; rather, I would have probably remained in the field of biochemistry where my tuition was covered by my grant as well as providing a stipend.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Daniel D. Whitcraft, III. In my own case, approximately one half of my medical expenses must be met by scholarships and loans I have received from this program. A reduction of any size especially one as formidable as that currently being considered by the House Appropriations Committee may very well make the cost of a medical education prohibitive for me.

M. Brita Bergen. Since I am also receiving a private bank loan and $1,000 in state aid (Pennsylvania), there is little likelihood of finding another source of financial aid should my health professions loan be decreased. In effect, this program is *critical* to the continuance of my medical education.

Francine San Giovanni. I am entering my 3rd year at Georgetown U. Medical School and our tuition alone is $2,250. I rely very heavily on your loan funds and see no possible way to obtain enough money to continue my education in their absence.

VIRGINIA

Rodney L. Hite. I will be entering my third year at the Medical College of Virginia in August of this year. The threat of decreased financial aid for the coming session is a serious one. I have had no family support for my undergraduate studies, and I am unable to receive any for medical school. Medical school is a full-time responsibility, and I am unable to work and receive an M.D. degree from evening studies as I did in undergraduate school. I am dependent upon financial aid in the form of scholarships and loans.

Daniel C. William. I am a single 23 year old first year medical student at the Medical College of Virginia. Economically, my family would probably be classified as lower-middle class; my widowed mother earns about $7,000 per year as a purchasing clerk, I financed myself via summer work and a substantial low interest loan. I've decided this was the only feasible way to finance my medical school education since my family funds became exhausted. Originally, I intended to continue working and borrowing the necessary balance for my remaining three years in medical school.

It was frightening enough to realize that in just three years I'd be 26 years old, $8,000 in debt, and still many years away from medical practice. I'm sure this fact alone had discouraged many would-be doctors in the past.

And now, this proposed cut-back in loans! Just how in heavens am I supposed to get through medical school? I can work just so many hours a day, can sell my blood and plasma just so often, and prostitute my body so many times for medical research. It's no wonder so many doctors lose their idealism by the time they graduate.

If, in the future, I'm denied a loan, frankly I don't know where I'll turn.

OKLAHOMA

Gerry L. Maddoux. Having first earned a BS degree in chemistry and an MS degree in virology/cancer research in order to obtain the needed background for my intended life work, I found myself in dire need of financial aid upon entering medical school. Since first-year students are not permitted to engage in part-time work (at least at this medical school) I found that a health professions loan would be the *only* feasible way in which to borrow a large sum of money (in my case, $1,400) for a considerable period of time (4 years at least).

Failure to obtain a health professions loan could possibly necessitate my temporary withdrawal from medical school.

UTAH

Mary Ann McDonnell. To be very blunt, without almost complete financial aid of some kind, I do not go to medical school. This year I received help through a Health Professions Loan and Scholarship. If I do not receive help in the next three years (I am a freshman), I can forget about becoming a physician.

I have been told all my life that I cannot ever become a doctor because my family has no money to put me through school. Without this financial aid, this may become a reality.

NEW JERSEY

Aron H. R. Swerdlin. Presently, I am on a full scholarship and a partial low interest loan. Without this assistance, it is almost impossible for my financial needs to be met. My family cannot assist me in any way and between summer employment and financial assistance I am able to get by. Without this assistance, I might be forced to withdraw!

F. R. Schwarz. There are many other students who are intelligent enough to become doctors but who also do not have the finances necessary. This fund makes it possible for not only the wealthy to become doctors but those who are from more moderate income backgrounds with the desire and ability to become doctors.

OHIO

Everett M. Bush, Patric M. Wall, Jeffery L. Rizor. We feel that such drastic cutbacks in the funding of this program will have serious effects on our securing the necessary educational funds. There are three reasons for our concern:

(1) After the first year Ohio State's program is a 12 month program thus precluding summer employment for its students. The cost of a medical education, more than $3000 yearly, would then rest solely on the shoulders of our families.

(2) None of our fathers are professional men themselves and such an expense would be a difficult burden on our families.

(3) Most importantly we want and need only loans, not gifts, to finance our education. Our ability to fulfill the terms of these loans would not be questionable.

Marshall Zablen. I am a junior medical student in my 7th year of college. I am 24 years old. I devote 80–90 hours/week to my studies eleven and one-half months of the year.

I am unable to earn the $1700 tuition and my living expenses ($1300) while I am pursuing my studies.

Lawrence D. Krabill. I am married and we have just had our first child. I am ready to enter my third year of medical school and really need the support that the Health Professions Loan Program offers to keep going for the next two years.

Marvin Shie. I have been anticipating borrowing almost the total amount of the cost of my education over the next three years. Should the Health Professions Program not have sufficient funds available to advance me the amount I need to continue my medical education, I would be quite hard pressed to meet my financial obligations to the medical school.

Dennis R. Wenger. I am a medical student from a rural area who was fortunate enough to receive aid through the Health Professions Program. This program has also been of tremendous benefit to many of my classmates who would otherwise have had tremendous financial difficulty in getting a medical education.

Robert Frischer . . . without the money coming in from one of the Health Professions Programs next year, I will be forced to drop out of medical school and try to find a job.

TENNESSEE

Isaac Ravizee. Let me say that it would have almost been impossible for me to receive my freshman year medical education had it not been for this loan program.

WISCONSIN

Robert J. Schlager. At the present time I have a Health Professions Loan which is enabling me to attend the university. Without such a loan, or even with a substantial cut in my present loan, I am afraid that I would not be able to afford the high cost of education.

——— ———. I have used the money from the program to help get me through my first year of medical school, and am hoping to achieve the same loan for next year. If I don't receive the loan I don't think I'll be able to continue medical school.

Loren G. Larsen. Several years ago after I had decided that I could not go to medical school because I was receiving no financial aid from home, I learned that the federal government was making funds available to medical students since there was such a great shortage of doctors. So I took a chance. I have now invested two years of my life and piled up an enormous debt.

Without the same level of financial aid I will not be able to continue school.

MARYLAND

Elizabeth Carol Lancaster. From this program I was able to borrow one-fourth of the tuition for my first year of medical school at Johns Hopkins. This fall tuition is increasing, but my resources are not. My sister is still in college, and my father's salary as a public school teacher is the same that it was during the past years. This cutback would seriously affect the finances of my family.

NEBRASKA

Merlene F. McAlery. The Health Professions Loan Program is absolutely essential for the continuation of my medical education. My family is able to give only token assistance and four years of pre-med depleted my own savings from summer jobs.

Dennis F. Koziol. Many students at this medical school apply for loans through this program, and most find the present amount of support available inadequate, thus requiring a difficult search for other loans. In the past year, many of these other loan sources have been required to restrict those students who are eligible to a smaller and smaller number. Government guaranteed loan money through local banks is just not available, the banks refuse to loan out money to students at the interest rate these loan programs specify, government backed or not.

TEXAS

William R. Nelson. I would certainly have been unable to complete my first three years of medical school without the loan program. I have utilized the program all three years and plan to use it next year. In fact, I was expecting Congress to increase the funds to this program so that I could obtain a maximum loan for the first time since I started medical school. A 50% cut in this program could very well prove disastrous to my medical career at this point.

WASHINGTON

Max D. Walker. I come from a family of seven with an income less than $5,000 per annum. Obviously, I have not received, nor could reasonably expect to receive any financial assistance from the family. I was able to put myself through college by tightly regulating my budget, working long hours during the summer, and part-time during the academic year.

However, with the added expenses of medical school education: books, instruments, microscopes, tuition, inter-hospital transportation; and with the exhausting demands upon the evening and weekend hours; I find it is no longer even fictitiously possible to pay for my education. There simply are not enough hours in the year for me to work enough to meet the astronomical expenses.

Since I cannot earn enough to pay for a medical education, and since I cannot anticipate assistance from my family or relatives, I find it obligatory to accept a loan in order to continue my education. Without the loan there is no choice; remaining in medical school is impossible.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM MEDICAL SCHOOLS

	Congressional district	Fiscal year 1968	Loan allocations, fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970
ALABAMA				
Medical College of Alabama	06	$175,000	$157,064	$72,300
ARIZONA				
University of Arizona	02	15,810	30,461	27,708
ARKANSAS				
University of Arkansas	02	162,000	192,285	88,103
CALIFORNIA				
Loma Linda University	33	$171,934	$175,151	$81,609
University of California, Irvine	35	144,761	125,175	54,334
Stanford University	10	160,077	158,492	76,846
University of California, Davis	04	0	22,845	21,646
University of California, La Jolla	35	0	22,845	21,430
University of California, Los Angeles	26	163,041	186,574	97,410
University of California, San Francisco	05	201,000	212,000	114,729
University of Southern California	21	161,461	136,598	65,806

XUM

HEALTH PROFESSIONS STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM MEDICAL SCHOOLS—Continued

	Congressional district	Fiscal year 1968	Loan allocations, fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970
COLORADO				
University of Colorado	01	$172,428	$168,487	$96,587
CONNECTICUT				
University of Connecticut	01	0	14,277	13,637
Yale University	03	167,488	167,535	78,578
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
Georgetown University	00	131,000	218,939	103,039
George Washington University	00	235,937	197,520	94,163
Howard University	00	203,060	196,568	90,050
FLORIDA				
University of Florida	02	117,587	112,525	54,118
University of Miami	12	160,000	159,920	78,578
GEORGIA				
Emory University	04	143,279	135,000	65,373
Medical College of Georgia	10	100,000	95,931	89,401
HAWAII				
University of Hawaii	00	24,703	24,887	16,235
ILLINOIS				
Chicago Medical School	07	40,000	43,966	49,710
Loyola University	10	205,237	178,958	87,020
Northwestern University	13	310,414	262,250	122,305
University of Chicago	02	169,988	145,166	71,002
University of Illinois	07	183,000	202,500	169,716
INDIANA				
Indiana University	07	478,128	375,531	193,318
IOWA				
University of Iowa	01	242,585	236,549	107,151
KANSAS				
University of Kansas	03	225,293	230,362	108,235
KENTUCKY				
University of Kentucky	06	165,440	145,643	67,971
University of Louisville	03	180,000	176,103	79,660
LOUISIANA				
Louisiana State University	01	291,652	251,303	112,997
Do	04	0	0	6,926
Tulane University	02	280,000	245,116	111,697
MARYLAND				
Johns Hopkins University	03	190,000	178,006	83,557
University of Maryland	03	216,000	225,000	116,892
MASSACHUSETTS				
Boston University	08	135,000	105,300	71,651
Harvard University	09	268,277	277,005	122,954
Tufts University	09	97,000	91,159	106,070
MICHIGAN				
Michigan State University	06	12,846	30,600	18,832
University of Michigan	02	390,805	384,099	174,694
Wayne State University	13	260,372	254,635	120,573
MINNESOTA				
University of Minnesota	05	180,000	205,200	141,355
MISSISSIPPI				
University of Mississippi	03	175,000	152,780	71,218
MISSOURI				
St. Louis University	02	258,678	220,842	105,420
University of Missouri	08	166,006	171,819	77,496
Washington University	01	170,000	173,247	81,176
NEBRASKA				
Creighton University	02	130,000	139,500	67,105
University of Nebraska	01	90,000	85,500	84,638
NEW HAMPSHIRE				
Dartmouth Medical School	02	36,000	45,000	22,945
NEW JERSEY				
New Jersey College of Medicine	13	135,000	157,541	66,240
Rutgers the State University	15	15,000	9,788	6,612
NEW MEXICO				
University of New Mexico	00	42,000	47,118	24,677
NEW YORK				
Columbia University	13	$100,000	$127,000	$108,451
Cornell University	17	45,000	72,000	76,846
Mount Sinai School of Medicine	17	0	23,797	26,842
New York Medical College	18	162,000	242,260	114,079
New York University	17	286,536	206,762	116,027
State University of New York, Brooklyn	12	166,000	198,000	167,766
State University of New York, Syracuse	34	172,000	138,600	87,886
Albany Medical College	29	155,775	133,742	62,127
State University of New York, Buffalo	39	222,861	193,712	89,185
University of Rochester	36	94,000	133,900	66,672
Yeshiva University	24	226,842	192,285	96,545
NORTH CAROLINA				
Duke University	04	186,476	56,500	75,114
University of North Carolina	04	90,000	66,600	54,000
Bowman Gray School of Medicine	05	100,000	108,993	53,467
NORTH DAKOTA				
University of North Dakota	01	45,000	29,000	20,564
OHIO				
Ohio State University	15	270,000	135,000	134,643
University of Cincinnati	02	130,000	140,000	92,648
Medical College of Ohio	09	0	0	7,576
Case Western Reserve University	21	198,415	167,059	77,927
OKLAHOMA				
University of Oklahoma	05	201,578	196,568	95,678
OREGON				
University of Oregon	03	168,970	167,059	76,629
PENNSYLVANIA				
Hahnemann Medical College	03	247,308	207,038	96,111
Jefferson Medical College	03	339,916	344,114	159,539
Pennsylvania State University	17	18,000	41,881	32,685
Temple University	04	256,000	164,162	127,932
University of Pennsylvania	01	90,000	157,500	118,624
University of Pittsburgh	14	129,000	152,863	88,318
Womans Medical College of Pennsylvania	02	108,694	118,035	51,951
RHODE ISLAND				
Brown University	01	0	9,518	4,112
SOUTH CAROLINA				
Medical College of South Carolina	01	32,000	45,000	67,500
SOUTH DAKOTA				
University of South Dakota	01	45,454	46,166	20,563
TENNESSEE				
Meharry Medical College	05	143,836	131,837	65,372
University of Tennessee	09	0	0	0
Vanderbilt University	05	94,000	110,420	50,652
TEXAS				
Baylor University	22	172,000	155,913	74,464
University of Texas, Galveston	09	234,000	224,238	131,179
University of Texas, Dallas	03	108,000	116,100	91,565
University of Texas, San Antonio	21	10,869	46,080	49,570
UTAH				
University of Utah	02	130,000	124,699	56,281
VERMONT				
University of Vermont	01	81,000	85,500	54,333
VIRGINIA				
Medical College of Virginia	03	148,000	168,300	99,790
University of Virginia	07	60,000	63,000	63,000
WASHINGTON				
University of Washington	01	117,000	122,159	74,031
WEST VIRGINIA				
West Virginia University	02	121,540	26,100	58,012
WISCONSIN				
Marquette University	04	215,000	195,616	90,049
University of Wisconsin	02	153,000	192,760	89,400
PUERTO RICO				
University of Puerto Rico	00	110,000	104,225	65,155
Total		14,736,357	14,240,726	7,924,353

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA ON DR. ROBERT HUTCHINGS GODDARD, AMERICAN PHYSICIST, PIONEER OF MODERN ROCKETRY AND SPACE FLIGHT (1882–1945)

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this country's ability to land men on the moon—the most staggering technological achievement in history—stems largely from the pioneer work in rocketry carried out by Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard. Born in Worcester, Mass., educated at Worcester Polytechnical Institute and Clark University, Dr. Goddard paved the way for the United States space program with the experiments he conducted while teaching physics at Clark University. On March 16, 1926, he launched the world's first successful liquid fuel rocket from a field on the outskirts of Auburn, Mass., a community in my congressional district.

Dr. Goddard's early experiments—hooted at by people outside the scientific community 40 years ago—have earned for him the title "father of the space age."

With permission, Mr. Speaker, I put in the RECORD at this point a biographical sketch on Dr. Goddard prepared by his widow and a Washington Evening Star article written by his early patron and friend, Harry F. Guggenheim.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA ON DR. ROBERT HUTCHINGS GODDARD, AMERICAN PHYSICIST, PIONEER OF MODERN ROCKETRY AND SPACE FLIGHT (1882–1945)

Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, American physicist and engineer, was the pioneer scientist and engineer who laid down the technical foundations for most of today's prodigious developments in long-range rockets, missiles, earth satellites, and space flight. He founded a whole new field of science and engineering, now grown into a multibillion-dollar industry.

In the course of his pioneering work, Dr. Goddard—

1. Was first to develop a rocket motor using liquid propellants (liquid oxygen and gasoline) (1920–25).
2. Was first to develop and launch a liquid-fuel rocket (March 16, 1926, at Auburn, Mass.).
3. Was first to launch a liquid-fuel rocket which attained a speed greater than that of sound (mach 1) (1935, near Roswell, N. Mex.).
4. First developed gyro stabilization apparatus for rockets (1932).
5. First used deflector vanes in the blast of the rocket motor as a method of stabilizing and guiding rockets (1932).
6. Received the first U.S. patent on the idea of multistage rockets (1914).
7. First explored mathematically the practicality of using rocket power to reach high altitudes and escape velocity (1912).
8. Was first to publish in the United States a basic mathematical theory underlying rocket propulsion and rocket flight (1919).
9. First proved experimentally that a rocket will provide thrust in a vacuum (1915).
10. Developed and demonstrated the basic idea of the bazooka during World War I (1918), though his plans lay unused in the U.S. Army files until they were put to use in World War II.
11. First developed pumps suitable for rocket fuels, self-cooling rocket motors, variable-thrust rocket motors, practical rocket landing devices, and forecast jet-driven airplanes, rocket-borne mail and express, and travel in space.

At his rocket proving range near Roswell, N. Mex., Dr. Goddard developed during the 1930's large and successful rockets which anticipated many features of the later German V–2 rockets, including gyroscopic control, steering by means of vanes in the jet stream of the rocket motor, gimbal-steering, power-driven propellant pumps and other devices.

A crowning irony is that if his countrymen had listened to Dr. Goddard, the United States today would be far ahead of the present position in the international space race. There might, in fact, have been no race. Several times in his career, and especially in 1940, he tried to interest our Armed Forces in the potential of rockets, but met only with courteous inaction.

Dr. Goddard began his pioneer experiments in rocketry long before other scientists or engineers in the United States or Europe had perceived the full value and promise of the rocket. He continued until his death in 1945, at which time he was engaged in developing jet-assisted takeoff and variable thrust liquid propellant rocket motors for the U.S. Navy.

Dr. Goddard was born in Worcester, Mass., on October 5, 1882. He was graduated from Worcester Polytechnic Institute in 1908. Upon graduation he obtained a position as an instructor of physics at W.P.I. and at the same time began graduate work at Clark University. He received his M.A. from Clark in 1910, his Ph. D. in 1911. He was a research fellow in physics at Princeton University in 1912–13, and the following year joined the faculty of Clark University, where he became a full professor in 1919.

He began his interest in rockets at the age of 17, in 1899. As early as 1908 he carried out static tests with small solid-fuel rockets at Worcester Polytechnic Institute. In 1912 he worked out the detailed mathematical theory of rocket propulsion, and showed that the rocket, because it needs no air to push against, could be sent to the moon or into space, provided an efficient motor could be developed.

Upon returning to Clark University in 1914, he began to experiment with larger rockets. By 1916, he had reached the limit of what he could do on his own resources. The Smithsonian Institution came to his aid, and with this help he was able not only to continue his work on solid-propellant rockets, but to begin the development of liquid-propellant rockets as well.

After the entry of the United States into the first World War in 1917, Dr. Goddard volunteered his services to the Nation, and was set by the U.S. Signal Corps to the task of exploring the military possibilities of rockets.

He succeeded in developing several types of solid-propellant rockets intended to be fired at tanks or other military objectives, from a launching tube held in the hands or steadied by two short legs—devices similar in many respects to the bazooka of World War II. These developments he successfully demonstrated at Aberdeen Proving Grounds a few days before the close of the First World War. They were the basis of the great U.S. developments in solid-propellent rockets in the Second World War.

In 1919 he summarized his mathematical explorations, the results of his solid propellent research, and some of his space flight ideas, in a classic paper entitled "A Method of Reaching Extreme Altitudes," published by the Smithsonian Institution. That paper today is one of the basic documents in technical rocket and jet propulsion literature, and the source of numerous developments that have come about since its appearance.

In the following two decades he produced a number of large liquid-propellant rockets at his shop and rocket range at Roswell, N. Mex. These rockets are now in the National Air Museum, Washington, D.C. Other early components are displayed at the museum at Roswell, N. Mex.

This research work was made possible by financial assistance from the Smithsonian Institution, Daniel Guggenheim, and the Daniel and Florence Guggenheim Foundation. In the mid-1930's he reported on the progress of his liquid propellent work in "Liquid Propellant Rocket Development," published by the Smithsonian Institution in 1936. The work in New Mexico was described in further detail in 1948 in a book edited posthumously from Dr. Goddard's notes, and published by Prentice-Hall, Inc., under the title "Rocket Development."

He again offered his services in the Second World War, and was assigned by the U.S. Navy to the development of practical jet-assisted takeoff, and liquid propellent rocket motors capable of variable thrust. In both areas he was successful, and demonstrated the resulting devices in tests at Annapolis. The work continued until his death in 1945.

Dr. Goddard was the first modern scientist who both perceived the possibilities of rockets and space flight, and undertook the enormous work of bringing them to practical realization. He lived to see his dream of rocket power come to fruition. His idea of the ultimate in rocket development—flight into space—has now become a reality. His contributions are recognized as among the most important technical achievements of modern times, marking as they do a turning point in the history of mankind.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 16, 1969]

GODDARD DESERVES NICHE AS FATHER OF ROCKETRY—A SCIENTIST'S DREAM OUTLASTED THE TAUNTS

(NOTE.—Harry F. Guggenheim, president and editor-in-chief of Newsday, a Garden City, Long Island, newspaper, was for many years a close friend and supporter of Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of modern rocketry. Goddard's research and experiments, many of which were supported by the Guggenheim Fund for the Promotion of Aeronautics, paved the way for the Apollo project. Here Guggenheim reminisces on the impact of this pioneer of space flight.)

(By Harry Guggenheim)

There is a special place in our thoughts for Robert H. Goddard. He was to the moon rocket what the Wright brothers were to the airplane.

He has been dead now for almost 25 years. He died without the fame that accrued to the Wright brothers in their lifetime. But he died still believing that man would one day shatter the fetters of Earth's gravity and stride majestically into the vast reaches of space. I wish he were here now to share this moment. It belongs to him.

Goddard was a physicist and professor at Clark University in Worcester, Mass., when I first heard of him.

In 1898, when he was 16, he read H. G. Wells' "War of the Worlds" which, as he would later write personally to Wells, "made a deep impression. The spell was complete about a year afterward, and I decided that what might conservatively be called 'high altitude research' was the most fascinating problem in existence."

He devoted himself to that problem with prodigious energy for the rest of his life. It would cost him isolation, ridicule, and eventually years of his life. "God pity a one-dream man," he wrote as he began his work.

Goddard began to experiment with small rockets as early as 1908.

Eleven years later he published a paper entitled "A Method of Reading Extreme Altitudes," which espoused the theory that

XUM

rocket power could lift a large payload to great heights if the rocket were designed to use its fuel effectively.

IDEA OF LUNAR LANDINGS

He was careful to mention the possibility of lunar landings only casually, lest he frighten away potential sponsors. But despite his almost indifferent mention of the subject, the press seized upon the paper with gross exaggeration.

The headlines were all similar to this one: "Modern Jules Verne Invests Rockets to Reach Moon."

It wasn't so, of course, but the effects were to cause Goddard considerable humiliation.

Goddard was embarrassed—he had intended to stress only the scientific aspects of his research—but he was not deterred. He continued his experiments, without public attention, and on March 16, 1926, launched the first liquid propelled rocket. It rose 41 feet and traveled 184 feet in 2.5 seconds.

The flight was so inconspicuous that no one paid any attention. But Goddard considered it a feat equivalent to the Wright's first airplane flight.

Three years later, on July 17, 1929—almost 40 years to the day before Apollo 11 would take off for the moon—Goddard tried again. This time he had a model 11½ feet long, 26 inches wide, and weighing 35 pounds when empty. It rose 20 feet above the 60-foot launching tower, turned right, rose another 10 feet and then crashed to earth 171 feet away.

Goddard instantly considered the experiment a success. But as he and his associates were surveying the scene, according to his biographer, Milton Lehman, "they heard the shriek of a siren. They looked up to see a police patrol car, two ambulances and a convoy of automobiles stopping in Aunt Effie's farmyard. Two policemen, perhaps expecting catastrophe, inspected the rural scene, saw the steel tower, and asked questions. . . . Neighbors were saying that an airplane had crashed and exploded."

Goddard tried to quiet the policemen's fears, but two reporters who had come with them were already inspecting the charred field.

"The moon-rocket man," one reporter said. "How close did you get this time?"

Again Goddard was adrift in a sea of publicity. Lehman wrote:

"He wanted to tell the public that, yes, the rocket would be man's great prime mover. Yes, it would eventually reach the moon. But the public kept asking the same old question. When would it happen? When will your rocket do what you say it can do?"

"The headlines and front-page stories were all that he feared. They made him out as a reckless moon seeker, a public amusement." His neighbors in Worcester, afraid that "Moony Goddard" was going to wipe them all out in some mad experiment, demanded that he remove his tests. Goddard was distressed.

But, ironically, that very publicity was to give him a new lease.

At that time, Charles A. Lindbergh was a guest in my home in Port Washington, N.Y. I had met him when he came to Roosevelt Field for his historic flight to Paris—from which, I anticipated, he would never return. He did get back, much to my surprise, and subsequently became a consultant for the Daniel Guggenheim Fund for the Promotion of Aeronautics. This was a fund created by my father to promote research and education in aeronautics and to help encourage flying as a means of transportation. I was then the fund's administrator.

Lindbergh and I had talked on several occasions about the potential of spaceflight. He had often expressed the opinion that airplanes, confined as they were to the Earth's atmosphere, would ultimately prove too "limited" for the full scope of man's aspirations. We had discussed rocketry for its potential in delivering large quantities of mail over great distances.

On this particular day, we were discussing the work of the fund, when Mrs. Guggenheim interrupted us to read aloud from the New York Times an item about a rocket exploding near Worcester, Mass., the day before. When she finished reading the fascinating account of the scientist and his problem with his neighbors, I suggested to Lindbergh that he visit this man Goddard in behalf of the fund and discuss his work.

Lindbergh did call and Goddard, quite surprised, invited him to come to Worcester.

In their meeting, Goddard confessed his vision of one day soaring through the Earth's atmosphere into the reaches beyond. He explained the differences between rockets and the techniques he believed could be employed for invading the unknown limits of space.

From this meeting, Lindbergh returned impressed by the scientist and his ideas. We agreed that support should be obtained to underwrite Goddard's experiments. Lindbergh made the case to my father, Daniel, as I left to begin my duties as ambassador to Cuba. Daniel Guggenheim endorsed our proposals and agreed to provide the funds for a 2-year period. After his death, the Daniel and Florence Guggenheim Foundation took up support of Goddard's work until 1941.

These grants made it possible for him to give up teaching and, for the first time, to devote his full energies to rocket research. They also enabled him to move from New England, where his neighbors regarded him as a nut, to Roswell, N.M., where he would have freedom, privacy and open space.

During the years that followed, I was able to observe the man and his work first-hand. I was deeply touched by his modest, self-effacing manner, his cheerfulness, and his optimism.

NUMEROUS DISAPPOINTMENTS

His disappointments were considerable.

Once, in 1935, Lindbergh and I journeyed to Roswell to watch a test flight. It failed. He refused to accept it as any more than a temporary setback, a problem to be solved. He did solve it, and later, in writing to explain what happened he said, with that wry pleasantness that marked his whole demeanor: "I have not yet forgotten fate for bringing the matter of the gasoline orifices to my attention just at the time you and Colonel Lindbergh were here."

His letters were examples of clear and descriptive prose.

By 1940, Goddard had built a rocket that was very similar to the German V2 missiles which were to assault London three years later.

Goddard and I visited Washington to urge military leaders to consider the military potential of rockets, but they were not interested. It was not until the end of the war that the oversight was obvious. Questioned by Army officers about the devastating V2, a German scientist incredulously replied: "Why don't you ask your own Dr. Goddard?"

His investigations, as the American Rocket Society would say after his death, covered almost every principle involved in both the theory and practice of high-power rockets.

Among his inventions are included the first liquid-fuel rocket, the first smokeless powder rocket, and the first practical automatic steering device for rockets. It is no wonder that the rocket society would concede to Goddard the almost single-handed development of rocketry "from a vague dream to one of the most significant branches of modern engineering."

But it goes far beyond that. He left us more than inventions. He left an example of the extraordinary accomplishments that await the man who perserveres. He left a testimony to the power of one solitary individual to effect change and to transform the future.

And most of all, he left a vision.

"He never lost the dream," his wife, Esther, has said.

"He knew that he would build something that would go higher than anything had gone before, and that eventually man would explore space, with the moon only the first step."

"Have thought of him often in these days of preparations for that 'first step.' When he died his work was generally unrecognized; now it is about to be fulfilled.

"How many more years I shall be able to work on the problem I do not know," Goddard wrote to H. G. Wells in 1932. "I hope as long as I live. There can be no thought of finishing—for aiming at the stars, both literally and figuratively, is a problem to occupy generations.

"So that no matter how much progress one makes, there is always the thrill of beginning."

CHESAPEAKE BAY THERMAL POLLUTION PROBLEM

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, environmental scientists and conservationists for many years have warned of the dangers posed to fish and wildlife by "waste heat" which is introduced into your waterways by nuclear electric power generating plants. The Atomic Energy Commission in its licensing of such plants refuses to take into consideration the thermal pollution resulting from use of huge amounts of water for cooling purposes.

The Washington Post of July 10, 1969, carried an article on this thermal pollution problem, particularly as it relates to the Chesapeake Bay, by Hal Willard. So that my colleagues will be assured of an opportunity to be familiar with this problem, I include the text of Mr. Willard's article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PLANT'S WASTE HEAT A MAJOR CONCERN

(By Hal Willard)

A new phrase is being injected into the language to describe a phenomenon scientists are beginning to regard as one of the most important problems in our environment.

The phrase is "waste heat," the residue from one of the greatest aids to man's progress, comfort and convenience: electricity.

It has become important because of the tremendous increase in recent years in the consumption of electricity and the consequent need for more and bigger generating plants.

"Waste heat" is replacing "thermal pollution" because the new term is more accurate and in some cases heat can be beneficial.

Waste heat and what to do about it is of particular concern to the Washington region, because nuclear power plants produce considerably more of it than do conventionally fueled plants. More than a dozen nuclear reactor units are either operating, under construction or planned in the Middle Atlantic area. That is more than in any other area of the country.

One of the installations is the two-reactor plant being built on the Bay at Calvert Cliffs. A safety and licensing board of the Atomic Energy Commission authorized issuance of

XUM

a construction permit for the plant on June 30. The permit was issued Tuesday.

An immediate protest was filed with the AEC, Interior Secretary Walter J. Hickel and Maryland Gov. Marvin Mandel by Del. Werner Fornos (D-Anne Arundel).

Fornos said the permit, which the AEC can countermand if it acts within 45 days, "leaves me exasperated and shocked, and is totally contrary to the public interest."

He said he hoped the AEC would hold the "construction permit in abeyance until such time as all parties concerned are absolutely certain that irreparable harm will not be caused to the Chesapeake Bay."

Scientists and engineers alike admit that no one is "absolutely certain" at this point what effects the increasingly larger nuclear-powered generating plants will have on the environment.

One of the Nation's leading environmental scientists, Jerry Davis, an aquatic ecologist with the AEC, says "the accelerated growth of the electric power industry will result in so much hot water that the thermal loading of our lakes and streams must now be considered a major stress, whose impact on the environment is largely unknown."

Davis spoke recently in Pittsburgh at a conference of the Health Physics Society and illustrated the newness of the problem by saying that less than $1 million in public money is being spent this year to study it.

(The Baltimore Gas and Electric Co., building the Calvert Cliffs plant, has budgeted about $1 million for ecological research over a seven-year period that began in 1968.)

He said electric companies cause the problem, but the AEC supports most of what little research there is—even though waste heat from nuclear reactors being used now by power companies constitutes less than 1 per cent of the actual pollution problem.

The rest of the waste is heat disgorged into the air and water from fossil-fueled (coal or gas) generating plants. But the number of nuclear plants is on the upswing. Only 13 are operating now, but 46 are under construction. Many more are planned.

Lee C. White, outgoing chairman of the Federal Power Commission, said in a speech in Seattle last month "it has been estimated that by 1980 the power industry will require one-sixth of total freshwater flows from the entire land mass of the United States for cooling purposes."

The great quantites of water are needed to cool reactor components, but don't actually come in contact with radioactivity. In the case of the plant being constructed on the Chesapeake Bay, the water will be used to condense steam that operates turbines back into liquid so that it can be recycled through the plant.

White said, "There is serious debate as to the extent of damage thermal pollution can cause with many in the utility industry pointing to the experience of existing atomic plants to show the lack of significant deleterious effects. However, with the great increase in use of nuclear generation . . . we cannot afford to wait until many more plants are built before action is taken to determine what impact heated cooling water will have, and how we can avoid undesirable effects."

Ecologist Davis points out that the experience of one plant in a body of water cannot be used to illustrate what will happen in another body of water.

"There are too many variables," he said. "Water temperature varies for one thing, and sometimes a degree or two makes the difference."

He said in a paper for the AEC that "it is certain that the release of large quantities of heat to an environment will induce alteration, sometimes with profound changes in the local flora and fauna."

"Paleoecological studies indicate that vast plant and animal communities have developed, flourished and perished in the past in phase with, and probably in response to, small, persistent changes in temperature. Even the great glaciers of the past ages are believed to have been caused by climatic temperature shifts of but a few degrees.

"Under some conditions an increase of only a degree or two may cause profound changes in the species composition, with those species less tolerant of the higher temperature either reduced in number or eliminated. . . . In aquatic environments, temperature changes trigger migration and spawning of both invertebrates and fishes. Temperature controls the hatching of all eggs, the emergency of aquatic insects, the continuance or cessation of parthenogenetic reproduction, the multiplication rates of plankton organisms and many other activities . . . aquatic organisms generally have narrower limits of tolerance to temperature extremes than most land forms."

In his Pittsburgh speech, Davis also pointed out that it is possible for benefits to be derived from temperature increases.

He said there are places where "warm water in effect is being used for irrigation in aquaculture." He cited an instance in Japanese waters in which oysters were not spawning because the water was too cold. The oyster beds were "irrigated" with warm water and went into production.

In his paper, he said "spawning of oysters and many other mollusks is triggered by no more than a one-degree change in temperature. Some fish and other animals, particularly in cold-water environments, are attracted to areas of warm water. Although this may benefit the angler, there are unanswered questions about the ultimate result of luring animals away from their normal habitat to live with a higher metabolic rate in restricted warmer sites."

Broadening the scope of his observations, Davis said "biological accumulation of radionuclides or poisonous industrial and agricultural wastes from a contaminated aquatic environment is strongly influenced by water temperature. In general, the rate of uptake increases with rising temperature.

"Warm water lessens the capacity of waters to assimilate organic wastes, since oxygen solubility decreases with increased water temperature. Some of the important diseases of marine and fresh-water fishes and of marine shellfishes appear to flourish at higher temperature."

Existing Maryland standards for Calvert Cliffs area of the Chesapeake Bay stipulate that the water drawn out, used to cool and then discharged back into the Bay not exceed 90 degrees when it is returned—and it cannot be more than 10 degrees warmer than it was when it was taken out.

The Baltimore Gas and Electric Co., builder of the plant, is making its plans based on this standard.

The company admits that it has no idea what effect the plant operation will have on the Bay, but has hired Dr. Ruth Patrick, an ecologist with the Philadelphia Academy of Sciences, to conduct a continuing study of the situation.

Company spokesmen say that if Dr. Patrick discovers that anything harmful is happening to the Bay and its environs as a result of plant operations changes will be made. Opponents of the plant maintain that corrective measures could come too late.

The Bay's environs take in a lot of territory, in the view of Dr. Clifford Beck, the AEC's deputy director of regulation.

In addition to the two-unit plant being built at Calvert Cliffs, he cites a two-unit plant under construction at Surry on Hog Island, Va., in the James River, which empties into the Bay near its mouth on the Atlantic Ocean.

One plant is producing electricity at Peach Bottom, Pa., and two more are under construction. A plant also is under construction at Three Mile Island, Pa., and one is proposed at Susquehanna in Salem Township. All of these are on the Susquehanna River, which flows into the Chesapeake Bay at Havre de Grace.

Another plant is operating at Shippingport, Pa., and others are under construction and proposed in New Jersey, Beck pointed out.

The only other parts of the country where there are similar, but not as extensive, concentrations are in New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Vermont and Maine, Michigan and Northern Illinois.

No evidence has yet been produced of deleterious effects on the Bay but Del. Fornos, in his protest to the AEC about the construction permit for the Calvert Cliffs plant, cited troubles in Florida.

In a letter to the AEC chairman, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Fornos said he had recently visited the Turkey Point generating plant of the Florida Power and Light Co. on Biscayne Bay and that "hot water" discharged from the plant "killed shellfish, algae and crabs in a 300-acre area . . ."

The existing plant there is fossil-fueled but the company has two nuclear plants under construction, which would produce much more heat than fossil plants.

Fornos told Dr. Seaborg: "I hope that you will see fit to call a special meeting of all agencies concerned to make sure that the public is protected before it is too late. We cannot afford, for temporary economic gain, to destroy this great body of water (Chesapeake Bay) on which so many of us depend."

STUDENT OF RELIGION, PAUL WYCKOFF, OFFERS A REFRESHING VIEW OF TODAY'S YOUTH

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the radical student, the student advocating violence as a means for change, has been so much in the media that one does not get a very positive picture of today's youth. Having recently participated in a tour of 50 American college and university campuses, I know the majority of today's youth have a much more positive approach to life than that. I would like to make available for my colleagues a clipping from the Dayton, Ohio, Daily News by staff reporter Benjamin Kline picturing one such young man, Paul Wyckoff. He epitomizes the idealistic youth of today, but he has gone a step further. He is not looking for the answers. He has them through his faith.

The article follows:

PURDUE ENGINEERING GRAD—ALL A'S AND A RELIGION THAT MAKES IT ALL POSSIBLE

(By Benjamin Kline)

Very few of Dayton's new college graduates came home this past week with a diploma that notes "highest distinction" for perfect, straight-A grades.

Even fewer would tell you that "God worked in my heart" to make the achievement possible.

But that is the message of Paul W. Wyckoff, of Kettering, who received a bachelor of science degree in mechanical engineering at Purdue university last Sunday.

About five minutes with Paul at the Wyckoff home, 932 Cottonwood Rd., introduces you to a young man who may be the most radical radical this side of Berkeley.

"Yeah, I'm a fanatic," he says. He grins and opens his Bible to the 12th verse of the first chapter of the Book of John:

"But as many as received Him. He gave them power to become the sons of God, to those who believe on His name".

The son of a Chrysler Airtemp division vice president, who is also an engineer by training, Paul says he made his decision to accept Christ when he was a small boy.

"I was curious, you know, about who God is, who I am and how the two might fit together. The Bible is the key emphasis at our church, Fair Haven Christian and Missionary Alliance, so I knew some of the things the Bible said.

"The main thing I knew was that God loved me, and that sin cuts off the possibility of getting to know Him; that sin is spiritual death, that Jesus Christ died to pay the penalty for the sins of men."

Paul says he made his personal commitment following a Sunday night church meeting, but he made it at home, by himself. He wants you to know he "didn't go rolling down any aisle."

Paul acknowledges that he was no juvenile delinquent at Fairmont West high school and, by standard societal measures, hadn't fallen from earthly grace.

"But that's the danger," he quickly interjects. "We kinda stack ourselves up against each other instead of trying to measure up to God, whose standard is perfection."

During his freshman year at Wheaton college, where he got B's in a creative writing course and in ROTC, Paul doesn't feel he was "stacking up" very well.

Then, as a Purdue sophomore, he says his faith began to grow and he became involved with a campus group called Navigators, a nonsectarian organization whose members meet for prayer and Bible study.

He thinks he knows some of the reasons why God—particularly organized religion—has been taking a beating from the "now generation" of college students.

"One thing is the image. Whatever you picture God in your mind, it's not what He is. He's a spirit; he operates independently of time and space."

College students almost without exception, Paul believes, "are searching for joy, peace, security, purpose and meaning in their lives and hope for the future."

It's all in the Book, John says, and he plans to enter some form of Christian ministry—perhaps campus ministry—to promote it.

"The idea of what it means to be a Christian has been all fouled up," he believes, "as a series of thou shalt not, nots, instead of a love relationship with God."

To a generation of cynics, it's perhaps rather idealistic, and Paul, the mechanical engineer with the fantastic 6.0 grade average understands that.

"It's ridiculous, let's face it, in rational terms to pray and ask Christ to come into your life, but somehow God makes it work."

Paul leaves Monday for a summer training program conducted by the Navigators in Washington, D.C. He has applied to a Chicago theological seminary but if the draft board calls, he says he probably will not seek C. O. status.

War, poverty, racial discrimination—"a fairly advanced result of sin," he says simply. "And the answer is to preach the word."

The way a lot of people view religion these days. Paul's enthusiasm, his truly radical stance, is kind of weird.

The way he tells it, though, is kind of wonderful.

GEORGE WASHINGTON ON PEACE TALKS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, excerpts from Gen. George Washington's letters covering peace talks with the British following their defeat at Yorktown indicate how we would be dealing with Communists at the Paris talks—if knowledgeable patriots were in charge.

Neither war nor enemies change in tactics it seems. General Washington, in 1872, felt the British were stalling at peace talks and wrote, "their only aim is to gain time that they may become more formidable at sea, form new alliances, if possible, or disunite us."

General Washington's admonition against the common enemy then should be basic foreign policy today against the Communist menace.

> We, if wise, should push our preparation with vigour; for nothing will hasten Peace more than to be in a condition for War—and if the Contest is to continue, 'tis indispensably necessary.

What a variance from the leadership of today. George Washington exerted positive action and got peace for his people—where are we going?

I include the following article:

[From the Washington Post, July 12, 1969]

PEACE TALKS IRKED GEORGE

(By Ferrel Guillory)

In much the same way Americans are showing impatience at the sluggishness of the Vietnam negotiations, George Washington once expressed exasperation at the slow pace of peace talks in Paris in 1782.

Writing to James McHenry, one of his secretaries during the Revolutionary War and later a Secretary of War, Washington accused England of stalling the Paris talks which followed the British military defeat at Yorktown.

The original manuscript of Washington's letter to McHenry was recently donated to the Library of Congress by Sol Feinstone, a collector who lives in Washington Crossing, Pa. The letter, in a good state of preservation, is now on display in the second floor gallery in the Library of Congress.

A statement announcing the exhibition of the letter says it is "written in Washington's clear distinctive hand." A Library spokesman said the letter is authentic.

The letter was written by Washington on Aug. 15, 1782, ten months after Cornwallis surrendered for the British at Yorktown. The peace talks in Paris began soon after the battle with Benjamin Franklin, John Jay, John Adams and Henry Laurens as the American team of negotiators.

Early in the negotiations the British conceded the American demand for total independence, but later raised as an issue the restoration of property to British loyalists living in the colonies or compensation for property lost in the war.

Washington felt the British were stalling and wrote that they "are guilty of more duplicity than comports with candid Minds."

" 'Tis plain," Washington wrote, "their only aim is to gain time that they may become more formidable at Sea—form new Alliances, if possible—or disunite us."

At this time still the top general of the colonies, Washington advised continued military readiness. "Be their object what it may," he wrote, "we, if wise, should push our preparations with vigour; for nothing will hasten Peace more than to be in a condition for War—and if the Contest is to continue, 'tis indispensably necessary."

The negotiations finally ended on Sept. 3, 1783, when the peace treaty was signed, the colonies having won most of the vital negotiating points. The issue of property restoration and compensation was settled by the American negotiators pledging to have the congress of the states pass a resolution urging the colonists to adjust claims with the loyalists—a compromise favorable to the Americans.

The Library of Congress also announced that Feinstone soon will donate a collection of documents pertaining to the Revolutionary War, including additional letters by Washington, along with letters of Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Paine and Lafayette. The Library said the manuscript collection will be included in the historical materials it will assemble to celebrate the Bicentennial of the American Revolution.

SENATE—*Friday, July 18, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who art from everlasting to everlasting, with whom there is neither beginning nor end, we beseech Thee to accompany the voyagers in space, granting unto them sturdy spirits, peaceful souls, poised minds, wisdom and power in every action that their mission amid the splendors of Thy universe may open to mankind a new age of spirituality, of international morality and universal peace.

O God, be with us in the Senate of the United States teaching us not only to do Thy will but how to do it, that we may faithfully serve Thy purposes for this Nation and all mankind.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 17, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

THE POPULATION PROBLEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the

XUM

President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

In 1830 there were one billion people on the planet earth. By 1930 there were two billion, and by 1960 there were three billion. Today the world population is three and one-half billion persons.

These statistics illustrate the dramatically increasing rate of population growth. It took many thousands of years to produce the first billion people; the next billion took a century; the third came after thirty years; the fourth will be produced in just fifteen.

If this rate of population growth continues, it is likely that the earth will contain over seven billion human beings by the end of this century. Over the next thirty years, in other words, the world's population could double. And at the end of that time, each new addition of one billion persons would not come over the millenia nor over a century nor even over a decade. If present trends were to continue until the year 2000, the eighth billion would be added in only five years and each additional billion in an even shorter period.

While there are a variety of opinions as to precisely how fast population will grow in the coming decades, most informed observers have a similar response to all such projections. They agree that population growth is among the most important issues we face. They agree that it can be met only if there is a great deal of advance planning. And they agree that the time for such planning is growing very short. It is for all these reasons that I address myself to the population problem in this message, first to its international dimensions and then to its domestic implications.

IN THE DEVELOPING NATIONS

It is in the developing nations of the world that population is growing most rapidly today. In these areas we often find rates of natural increase higher than any which have been experienced in all of human history. With their birth rates remaining high and with death rates dropping sharply, many countries of Latin America, Asia, and Africa now grow ten times as fast as they did a century ago. At present rates, many will double and some may even triple their present populations before the year 2000. This fact is in large measure a consequence of rising health standards and economic progress throughout the world, improvements which allow more people to live longer and more of their children to survive to maturity.

As a result, many already impoverished nations are struggling under a handicap of intense population increase which the industrialized nations never had to bear. Even though most of these countries have made rapid progress in total economic growth—faster in percentage terms than many of the more industrialized nations—their far greater rates of population growth have made development in per capita terms very slow. Their standards of living are not rising quickly, and the gap between life in the rich nations and life in the poor nations is not closing.

There are some respects, in fact, in which economic development threatens to fall behind population growth, so that the quality of life actually worsens. For example, despite considerable improvements in agricultural technology and some dramatic increases in grain production, it is still difficult to feed these added people at adequate levels of nutrition. Protein malnutrition is widespread. It is estimated that every day some 10,000 people—most of them children—are dying from diseases of which malnutrition has been at least a partial cause. Moreover, the physical and mental potential of millions of youngsters is not realized because of a lack of proper food. The promise for increased production and better distribution of food is great, but not great enough to counter these bleak realities.

The burden of population growth is also felt in the field of social progress. In many countries, despite increases in the number of schools and teachers, there are more and more children for whom there is no schooling. Despite construction of new homes, more and more families are without adequate shelter. Unemployment and underemployment are increasing and the situation could be aggravated as more young people grow up and seek to enter the work force.

Nor has development yet reached the stage where it brings with it diminished family size. Many parents in developing countries are still victimized by forces such as poverty and ignorance which make it difficult for them to exercise control over the size of their families. In sum, population growth is a world problem which no country can ignore, whether it is moved by the narrowest perception of national self-interest or the widest vision of a common humanity.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

It is our belief that the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and other international bodies should take the leadership in responding to world population growth. The United States will cooperate fully with their programs. I would note in this connection that I am most impressed by the scope and thrust of the recent report of the Panel of the United Nations Association, chaired by John D. Rockefeller III. The report stresses the need for expanded action and greater coordination, concerns which should be high on the agenda of the United Nations.

In addition to working with international organizations, the United States can help by supporting efforts which are initiated by other governments. Already we are doing a great deal in this field. For example, we provide assistance to countries which seek our help in reducing high birth rates—provided always that the services we help to make available can be freely accepted or rejected by the individuals who receive them. Through our aid programs, we have worked to improve agricultural production and bolster economic growth in developing nations.

As I pointed out in my recent message on Foreign Aid, we are making important efforts to improve these programs. In fact, I have asked the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the Agency for International Development to give population and family planning high priority for attention, personnel, research, and funding among our several aid programs. Similarly, I am asking the Secretaries of Commerce and Health, Education, and Welfare and the Directors of the Peace Corps and the United States Information Agency to give close attention to population matters as they plan their overseas operations. I also call on the Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development to investigate ways of adapting and extending our agricultural experience and capabilities to improve food production and distribution in developing countries. In all of these international efforts, our programs should give further recognition to the important resources of private organizations and university research centers. As we increase our population and family planning efforts abroad, we also call upon other nations to enlarge their programs in this area.

Prompt action in all these areas is essential. For high rates of population growth, as the report of the Panel of the United Nations Association puts it, "impair individual rights, jeopardize national goals, and threaten international stability."

IN THE UNITED STATES

For some time population growth has been seen as a problem for developing countries. Only recently has it come to be seen that pressing problems are also posed for advanced industrial countries when their populations increase at the rate that the United States, for example, must now anticipate. Food supplies may be ample in such nations, but social supplies—the capacity to educate youth, to provide privacy and living space, to maintain the processes of open, democratic government—may be grievously strained.

In the United States our rate of population growth is not as great as that of developing nations. In this country, in fact, the growth rate has generally declined since the eighteenth century. The present growth rate of about one percent per year is still significant, however. Moreover, current statistics indicate that the fertility rate may be approaching the end of its recent decline.

Several factors contribute to the yearly increase, including the large number of couples of childbearing age, the typical size of American families, and our increased longevity. We are rapidly reaching the point in this country where a family reunion, which has typically brought together children, parents, and grandparents, will instead gather family members from *four* generations. This is a development for which we are grateful and of which we can be proud. But we must also recognize that it will mean a far larger population if the number of children born to each set of parents remains the same.

In 1917 the total number of Americans

passed 100 million, after three full centuries of steady growth. In 1967—just half a century later—the 200 million mark was passed. If the present rate of growth continues, the third hundred million persons will be added in roughly a thirty-year period. This means that by the year 2000, or shortly thereafter, there will be more than 300 million Americans.

This growth will produce serious challenges for our society. I believe that many of our present social problems may be related to the fact that we have had only fifty years in which to accommodate the second hundred million Americans. In fact, since 1945 alone some 90 million babies have been born in this country. We have thus had to accomplish in a very few decades an adjustment to population growth which was once spread over centuries. And it now appears that we will have to provide for a third hundred million Americans in a period of just 30 years.

The great majority of the next hundred million Americans will be born to families which looked forward to their birth and are prepared to love them and care for them as they grow up. The critical issue is whether social institutions will also plan for their arrival and be able to accommodate them in a humane and intelligent way. We can be sure that society will *not* be ready for this growth unless it begins its planning immediately. And adequate planning, in turn, requires that we ask ourselves a number of important questions.

Where, for example, will the next hundred million Americas live? If the patterns of the last few decades hold for the rest of the century, then at least three quarters of the next hundred million persons will locate in highly urbanized areas. Are our cities prepared for such an influx? The chaotic history of urban growth suggests that they are not and that many of their existing problems will be severely aggravated by a dramatic increase in numbers. Are there ways, then, of readying our cities? Alternatively, can the trend toward greater concentration of population be reversed? Is it a desirable thing, for example, that half of all the counties in the United States actually lost population in the 1950's, despite the growing number of inhabitants in the country as a whole? Are there ways of fostering a better distribution of the growing population?

Some have suggested that systems of satellite cities or completely new towns can accomplish this goal. The National Commission on Urban Growth has recently produced a stimulating report on this matter, one which recommends the creation of 100 new communities averaging 100,000 people each, and ten new communities averaging at least one million persons. But the total number of people who would be accommodated if even this bold plan were implemented is only twenty million—a mere one-fifth of the expected thirty-year increase. If we were to accommodate the full 100 million persons in new communities, we would have to build a new city of 250,000 persons each month from now until the end of the century. That means constructing a city the size of Tulsa, Dayton, or Jersey City every thirty days for over thirty years. Clearly, the problem is enormous, and we must examine the alternative solutions very carefully.

Other questions also confront us. How, for example, will we house the next hundred million Americans? Already economical and attractive housing is in very short supply. New architectural forms, construction techniques, and financing strategies must be aggressively pioneered if we are to provide the needed dwellings.

What of our natural resources and the quality of our environment? Pure air and water are fundamental to life itself. Parks, recreational facilities, and an attractive countryside are essential to our emotional well-being. Plant and animal and mineral resources are also vital. A growing population will increase the demand for such resources. But in many cases their supply will not be increased and may even be endangered. The ecological system upon which we now depend may seriously deteriorate if our efforts to conserve and enhance the environment do not match the growth of the population.

How will we educate and employ such a large number of people? Will our transportation systems move them about as quickly and economically as necessary? How will we provide adequate health care when our population reaches 300 million? Will our political structures have to be reordered, too, when our society grows to such proportions? Many of our institutions are already under tremendous strain as they try to respond to the demands of 1969. Will they be swamped by a growing flood of people in the next thirty years? How easily can they be replaced or altered?

Finally we must ask: how can we better assist American families so that they will have no more children than they wish to have? In my first message to Congress on domestic affairs, I called for a national commitment to provide a healthful and stimulating environment for all children during their first five years of life. One of the ways in which we can promote that goal is to provide assistance for more parents in effectively planning their families. We know that involuntary childbearing often results in poor physical and emotional health for all members of the family. It is one of the factors which contribute to our distressingly high infant mortality rate, the unacceptable level of malnutrition, and the disappointing performances of some children in our schools. Unwanted or untimely childbearing is one of several forces which are driving many families into poverty or keeping them in that condition. Its threat helps to produce the dangerous incidence of illegal abortion. And finally, of course, it needlessly adds to the burdens placed on all our resources by increasing population.

None of the questions I have raised here is new. But all of these questions must now be asked and answered with a new sense of urgency. The answers cannot be given by government alone, nor can government alone turn the answers into programs and policies. I believe, however, that the Federal Government does have a special responsibility for defining these problems and for stimulating thoughtful responses.

Perhaps the most dangerous element in the present situation is the fact that so few people are examining these questions from the viewpoint of the whole society. Perceptive businessmen project the demand for their products many years into the future by studying population trends. Other private institutions develop sophisticated planning mechanisms which allow them to account for rapidly changing conditions. In the governmental sphere, however, there is virtually no machinery through which we can develop a detailed understanding of demographic changes and bring that understanding to bear on public policy. The federal government makes only a minimal effort in this area. The efforts of state and local governments are also inadequate. Most importantly, the planning which does take place at some levels is poorly understood at others and is often based on unexamined assumptions.

In short, the questions I have posed in this message too often go unasked, and when they are asked, they seldom are adequately answered.

COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND THE AMERICAN FUTURE

It is for all these reasons that I today propose the creation by Congress of a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future.

The Congress should give the Commission responsibility for inquiry and recommendations in three specific areas.

First, *the probable course of population growth, internal migration and related demographic developments between now and the year 2000.*

As much as possible, these projections should be made by regions, states, and metropolitan areas. Because there is an element of uncertainty in such projections, various alternative possibilities should be plotted.

It is of special importance to note that, beginning in August of 1970, population data by county will become available from the decennial census which will have been taken in April of that year. By April 1971, computer summaries of first-count data will be available by census tract and an important range of information on income, occupations, education, household composition, and other vital considerations will also be in hand. The Federal government can make better use of such demographic information than it has done in the past, and state governments and other political subdivisions can also use such data to better advantage. The Commission on Population Growth and the American Future will be an appropriate instrument for this important initiative.

Second, *the resources in the public sector of the economy that will be required to deal with the anticipated growth in population.*

The single greatest failure of foresight—at all levels of government—over the past generation has been in areas connected with expanding population. Government and legislatures have frequently failed to appreciate the demands

XUM

which continued population growth would impose on the public sector. These demands are myriad: they will range from pre-school classrooms to post-doctoral fellowships; from public works which carry water over thousands of miles to highways which carry people and products from region to region; from vest pocket parks in crowded cities to forest preserves and quiet lakes in the countryside. Perhaps especially, such demands will assert themselves in forms that affect the quality of life. The time is at hand for a serious assessment of such needs.

Third, *ways in which population growth may affect the activities of Federal, state and local government.*

In some respects, population growth affects everything that American government does. Yet only occasionally do our governmental units pay sufficient attention to population growth in their own planning. Only occasionally do they consider the serious implications of demographic trends for their present and future activities.

Yet some of the necessary information is at hand and can be made available to all levels of government. Much of the rest will be obtained by the Commission. For such information to be of greatest use, however, it should also be interpreted and analyzed and its implications should be made more evident. It is particularly in this connection that the work of the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future will be as much educational as investigative. The American public and its governing units are not as alert as they should be to these growing challenges. A responsible but insistent voice of reason and foresight is needed. The Commission can provide that voice in the years immediately before us.

The membership of the Commission should include two members from each house of the Congress, together with knowledgeable men and women who are broadly representative of our society. The majority should be citizens who have demonstrated a capacity to deal with important questions of public policy. The membership should also include specialists in the biological, social, and environmental sciences, in theology and law, in the arts and in engineering. The Commission should be empowered to create advisory panels to consider subdivisions of its broad subject area and to invite experts and leaders from all parts of the world to join these panels in their deliberations.

The Commission should be provided with an adequate staff and budget, under the supervision of an executive director of exceptional experience and understanding.

In order that the Commission will have time to utilize the initial data which results from the 1970 census, I ask that it be established for a period of 2 years. An interim report to the President and Congress should be required at the end of the first year.

OTHER GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES

I would take this opportunity to mention a number of additional government activities dealing with population growth which need not await the report of the Commission.

First, increased research is essential. It is clear, for example, that we need additional research on birth control methods of all types and the sociology of population growth. Utilizing its Center for Population Research, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should take the lead in developing, with other federal agencies, an expanded research effort, one which is carefully related to those of private organizations, university research centers, international organizations, and other countries.

Second, we need more trained people to work in population and family planning programs, both in this country and abroad. I am therefore asking the Secretaries of State, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Interior along with the Administrator of the Agency for International Development and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to participate in a comprehensive survey of our efforts to attract people to such programs and to train them properly. The same group—in consultation with appropriate state, local, and private officials—should develop recommendations for improvements in this area. I am asking the Assistant to the President for Urban Affairs to coordinate this project.

Third, the effects of population growth on our environment and on the world's food supply call for careful attention and immediate action. I am therefore asking the Environmental Quality Council to give careful attention to these matters in its deliberations. I am also asking the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare to give the highest priority to research into new techniques and to other proposals that can help safeguard the environment and increase the world's supply of food.

Fourth, it is clear that the domestic family planning services supported by the Federal Government should be expanded and better integrated. Both the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Office of Economic Opportunity are now involved in this important work, yet their combined efforts are not adequate to provide information and services to all who want them. In particular, most of an estimated five million low income women of childbearing age in this country do not now have adequate access to family planning assistance, even though their wishes concerning family size are usually the same as those of parents of higher income groups.

It is my view that no American woman should be denied access to family planning assistance because of her economic condition. I believe, therefore, that we should establish as a national goal the provision of adequate family planning services within the next five years to all those who want them but cannot afford them. This we have the capacity to do.

Clearly, in no circumstances will the activities associated with our pursuit of this goal be allowed to infringe upon the religious convictions or personal wishes and freedom of any individual, nor will they be allowed to impair the absolute right of all individuals to have such matters of conscience respected by public authorities.

In order to achieve this national goal, we will have to increase the amount we are spending on population and family planning. But success in this endeavor will not result from higher expenditures alone. Because the life circumstances and family planning wishes of those who receive services vary considerably, an effective program must be more flexible in its design than are many present efforts. In addition, programs should be better coordinated and more effectively administered. Under current legislation, a comprehensive State or local project must assemble a patchwork of funds from many different sources—a time-consuming and confusing process. Moreover, under existing legislation, requests for funds for family planning services must often compete with requests for other deserving health endeavors.

But these problems can be overcome. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—whose Department is responsible for the largest part of our domestic family planning services—has developed plans to reorganize the major family planning service activities of his agency. A separate unit for these services will be established within the Health Services and Mental Health Administration. The Secretary will send to Congress in the near future legislation which will help the Department implement this important program by providing broader and more precise legislative authority and a clearer source of financial support.

The Office of Economic Opportunity can also contribute to progress in this area by strengthening its innovative programs and pilot projects in the delivery of family planning services to the needy. The existing network of OEO supported community groups should also be used more extensively to provide family planning assistance and information. I am asking the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to determine the ways in which his Agency can best structure and extend its programs in order to help achieve our national goal in the coming years.

As they develop their own plans, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity should also determine the most effective means of coordinating all our domestic family planning programs and should include in their deliberations representatives of the other agencies that share in this important work. It is my intention that such planning should also involve State and local governments and private agencies, for it is clear that the increased activity of the Federal Government in this area must be matched by a sizable increase in effort at other levels. It would be unrealistic for the Federal Government alone to shoulder the entire burden, but this Administration does accept a clear responsibility to provide essential leadership.

FOR THE FUTURE

One of the most serious challenges to human destiny in the last third of this century will be the growth of the population. Whether man's response to that challenge will be a cause for pride or for despair in the year 2000 will depend very much on what we do today. If we now begin our work in an appropriate manner, and if we continue to devote a considerable amount of attention and energy to this problem, then mankind will be able to surmount this challenge as it has surmounted so many during the long march of civilization.

When future generations evaluate the record of our time, one of the most important factors in their judgment will be the way in which we responded to population growth. Let us act in such a way that those who come after us—even as they lift their eyes beyond earth's bounds—can do so with pride in the planet on which they live, with gratitude to those who lived on it in the past, and with continuing confidence in its future.

Richard Nixon.

The White House, *July 18, 1969.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Vice President laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

AUTHORIZATION OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO CONVEY TO THE STATE OF TENNESSEE CERTAIN LANDS WITHIN GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK AND CERTAIN LANDS COMPRISING THE GATLINBURG SPUR OF THE FOOTHILLS PARKWAY, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 288, H.R. 2785.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 2785) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Tennessee certain lands within Great Smoky Mountains National Park and certain lands comprising the Gatlinburg Spur of the Foothills Parkway, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 91–297), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 2785 is to authorize a conveyance to the State of Tennessee of certain existing road rights-of-way under the administration of the National Park Service. This would be accomplished by conveyance to the State of the Gatlinburg Spur of the Foothills Parkway and portions of two Tennessee highways bordering the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

BACKGROUND

Existing roadways form portions of the north and west boundaries of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Four segments of Tennessee Highway 73 (totaling approximately 3.38 miles) were constructed along one boundary of the park by the State pursuant to three special use permits granted by the National Park Service. Another 2.33 miles of the north-bound lane of Tennessee Highway 72 (also designated U.S. 129) was relocated on park lands pursuant to a similar special use permit. Since this park is under the exclusive legislative jurisdiction of the United States, State authority does not extend to accident investigation or traffic control along these portions of the two highways.

The Gatlinburg Spur of the Foothills Parkway was constructed to provide access to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. Since it is also used by general traffic, as well as by park visitors, it has added to the traffic congestion in the city of Gatlinburg. As a result, it was agreed in 1962 that a bypass should be constructed from the spur to the park. The State acquired the necessary rights-of-way, conveyed them to the National Park Service, and the bypass was completed in June 1968. It was understood that, upon completion, the spur would be conveyed to the State if authorized by the Congress.

NEED

The conveyance of these roadways to Tennessee, under the terms of H.R. 2785, will enable the State to exercise uniform jurisdiction along the routes involved without impairing the administration of the park or isolating any part of the park. It should be noted that the legislation authorizes the conveyances to be made subject to such conditions as the Secretary deems necessary for the protection of the park environment. By relieving the Federal Government of the administrative and maintenance costs arising from its jurisdiction over these roadways, it is estimated that a savings of approximately $25,000 annually can be realized.

COST

No Federal expenditures are required under the terms of this legislation.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR YOUNG OF OHIO AND SENATOR CURTIS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that under a previous order the distinguished Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Hansen) is to be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes, to be followed by the distinguished Senator from Colorado (Mr. Allott), who is to be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes.

I ask unanimous consent that, following the remarks of the Senator from Colorado, the distinguished Senator from Ohio (Mr. Young) be recognized for not to exceed 10 minutes and that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Curtis) be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the previous order, the Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 6 or 7 minutes, without losing his right to the floor and without infringing on his time?

Mr. HANSEN. I yield.

THE SURTAX EXTENSION AND TAX REFORMS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Finance Committee overrode the judgment of its own chairman, Senator Long, in voting out the House bill on surtax extension at this time; the action was regrettable, even though the committee was within its rights in doing so, because Senator Long was seeking a way to break through the impasse which had been developing.

On top of that, the tax extension came out by a seriously split vote of 9 to 8, without hearings; yet, this is a most controversial bill which passed the House by only a handful of votes.

Insofar as the leadership is concerned, it has no intention of calling the surtax extension up at this time in this context; under the rules, however, any Member of the Senate is at liberty to do so by a simple motion which, of course, is fully debatable.

It should be noted that an attempt to call up the surtax measure and make it the pending business will be at the expense of consideration of the vitally important military procurement authorization bill which is now before the Senate.

There may well be a prolonged discussion of the question of displacing military construction as the pending business and taking up the surtax measure at this time. The question is procedural, and every hour spent on it will be an hour wasted insofar as considering the substance of either issue is concerned.

If the Senate votes to take up the surtax extension in preference to continuing on military construction, what then? Amendment after amendment can be offered, debated, and tacked on to the surtax extension—reform amendments, special interest amendments, exemption amendments and what-not amendments—until, as I have said on many occasions, the bill is an overloaded Christmas tree.

After that there are two alternatives: send the bill back to the Finance Committee to lop off the decorations and start all over again or forward it, packed with goodies, to conference with the House. In conference, the process of reducing the bill once again to reality will get underway, the process of undressing the Christmas tree will begin. How long it will take is anyone's guess.

If the measure comes out of conference stripped to the bare essentials, it will be in jeopardy in the House, where it passed in that form on the first round by only the skin of its teeth.

A stripped-down conference report, moreover, will also be in jeopardy in the Senate, where a very serious determination exists—as evidenced by the unanimous decision of the Democratic policy committee—that reform in the direction of more equitable taxation for Americans of moderate and lower incomes is no less significant to the economic health

XUM

of this Nation than continuing the burdens of the surtax extension which also fall heaviest on these groups.

What started out, therefore, as an understandable effort on the part of the Finance Committee to hasten the extension of the surtax may well end up without any extension at all, along with a long delay in the military procurement authorization bill, and with uncertainty for many weeks for the Nation's economy. What may well come out of this action, in short, would be an exercise in futility or, worse, in legislative mischief.

Whether to move this bill now in the context in which it has emerged from committee is a judgment which rests with the Senate. In my judgment, however, it will hurt American wage earners and salaried employees, it will hurt the Senate, it will hurt the President, and it will hurt the Nation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HANSEN. I yield, with the understanding that I will not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader, and my friend, paints a rather dismal picture, except I am afraid it is not quite that dismal. One would almost have to consider it as a confession that this body reasonable when times require, cannot work to purpose—and it can.

If the majority leader called up that bill, which was reported by the Committee on Finance yesterday morning, any Senator would be free to move to delete anything except the surtax. He could even delete the surtax, if he so desired. It is within the province of the Senate to vote to table any so-called Chrismas tree amendment. It is a question of what the Senate, as a responsible body, wants to do at a time when the economic factors are such as to portray for us a somewhat dangerous situation ahead.

I had my chance to speak my piece in the Committee on Finance yesterday morning. I reached across the table and asked the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT) when he had come to the House of Representatives. He said in 1943. I said, "I was there 10 years before you arrived, and I came on the crest of the wave of economic dislocation which began on black Friday in 1929."

I remember so vividly how bankers and others jumped out of 15-story windows, and I lived through that aggravated period. Then came the New Deal and it continued, lo, for many years.

Mr. President, when I came to that body, they elected a Member from my own State as the Speaker of the House of Representatives. I refer to the Honorable Henry T. Rainey, my congressional neighbor. I recall from the lips of Herbert Hoover himself, at an intimate little dinner, that he said to me that he called Mr. Rainey and said, "I need this, I need that, and I need this. The storm clouds are gathering." They were not fashioned in this country; they were fashioned when the banks, known as the Big Three D Banks in Europe, failed. That is when it began and we got caught in the backwash. But they refused in that Congress to give Herbert Hoover what he wanted and the country paid in the gloom, doom, sweat, agony, and misery of a depression that lasted many years.

Maybe I paint a picture of gloom. Let it be what it is, but the economic factors have not been good. So I have been impelled to do what little I can as a Senator to get something on this floor on which we can work our will. I do not cross any bridges until I get to them. Let it be the responsibility of this body first to do what is necessary and then we will see what else is necessary beyond that point.

I listened to all the arguments. It is amazing how a committee like the Committee on Finance can toy with one idea and then another idea, overturning a good many suggestions there. But finally, by a vote of 9 to 8 they voted the bill out of committee. To be sure, they overrode the chairman. Is that unusual? Chairmen are overridden every day around here in both the Senate and in the House. There is nothing unusual about that.

We were impelled by the exigencies of the situation that confronts us now and will confront us to do what we did. Two members of the other side certainly appreciated it and they voted with us and that is how the bill came out. Now, the responsibility is here.

I say this with all kindliness to my distinguished friend—and he is my distinguished friend, and he has been a great majority leader. I say the responsibility is now here. And if I can undertake anything, if I can help, I am at his beck and call to help get this job done. I will humble myself in any possible way and prostrate myself at his feet, because this is serious business, and we are playing with the destiny of 202 million people, for if some kind of economic disaster strikes, it will not be merely us, it will be every chit and child, every man and woman in the country, high and low, rich and poor, whoever they may be; they will all be affected by it.

That is all I have to say, Mr. President.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. HANSEN. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, what the distinguished minority leader has said about his recollection is entirely correct; and he is even modest in his appraisal of what happened to this country at a time when Congress denied the President of another party an opportunity to fix the economic wheels of the Nation so that they would not go off the tracks.

I recall that in addition to that, in those days, a majority in Congress rode down and refused to act favorably on a bill by the late Senator Vandenberg of Michigan providing for the insurance of bank deposits in this country. They delayed and they politicked and did everything they could to keep Senator Vandenberg from getting credit for guaranteeing the first $5,000 of deposits by the people in this country against loss. When the banks failed those people failed with them.

Let there be no mistake about it. We are in the process of establishing who killed Cock Robin. In the course of doing it, I want to point out that I think, with all due respect to the majority leader, whom we all love and respect, that the pessimism expressed is hardly warranted here unless the pessimists plan to say that there is not any tax bill until we go into recess. I am not concerning myself here immediately with the timing. That is a matter for the majority and its policy committee, which made a certain ominous decision; and I am not critical of anybody on the Committee on Finance. I understand the chairman's feelings. He had to vote against reporting the bill. He had stated he desired to give Senators an opportunity to appear to offer amendments until July 18, and he could not go back on his commitment. That does not mean we can draw inferences as to where he stands on the bill.

However, let it be understood that if there is legislative mischief, as the majority leader has said, the legislative mischief is in the action of those Senators who delay action on the first of two tax relief and reform bills, the first one being the phasing-out of the surtax in an orderly manner, and the relief to 13 million people in this country, dollarwise.

Those people who delay that first tax relief and reform bill will have to assume the responsibility in answering to a public which will see what kind of legislative mischief is going on here and who killed Cock Robin. They will see who are the people who indulged in legislative mischief. I am one Senator who intends to hold to responsibility those people who must take the burden of the continuing inflation and the rise in the cost of living in this country if they do not want to let us vote on the tax bill. I know that efforts will be made to load it down like a Christmas tree. There will be amendments which I will favor; and some of the amendments will bear on improving the condition of people in this country; social security, and all the rest. I may have to vote against some amendments I favor, and some may even be my amendments, because I intend to support them on the second tax relief reform bill and let them take their chances there.

But I do not think anything overrides the importance of the right of the people of the United States today to have some assurance that steps are being taken to stop this dreadful, helical spiral, this series of ascending helical planes, which is the spiral of inflation.

So I say if this tax bill is not voted on before we go into recess, I am one of a good many Members of Congress who are going to hit the streets. I am going to use a helicopter in the course of it, by the way, and hit the rural areas and visit 18 counties in the first week when I leave here.

Wherever I go, I am going to carry the message. They will say to me, "Why did we not get a tax bill?" I am going to tell them who is to blame. I am going to say, "It is inflation. It is the cost of living. The increase in the burden that you daily pay comes from the people who would not give you a tax bill." I am going

XUM

to identify them. As I carry the message through the 18 counties, along the hot streets of our cities, I will say to the people there, "The burden of inflation lies upon the people who would not act."

How many Senators want to face that? How many Senators want to go home and face that? Some of them would be well advised to stay here, in my opinion, because at least it is cool and air-conditioned. It is a lot quieter than it will be at home. Because when I go home my people do not talk to me about the ABM very much. They talk to me mostly about ending the war in Vietnam, the great and overriding concern they have with the immense tax burden they are carrying, and the constant rise in the cost of living.

Yes, Mr. President, let us have a second tax relief and reform bill. I hope that we will act on it promptly. I hope that it will be calendared; but what concerns me is the mischief involved in having to listen to my friends talk about their being friends of the people: "We are the friends of the people," or "How we love the people," or "How we worship the people," or "We want the people to remember us on election day and send us back." How hot the tears are.

When they go home, how are those people going to explain it to the 5 million people, whom they love, whom they worship, who are in the lowest income brackets, and whom this bill will take off the tax rolls entirely—the first time in many years that such numbers of people have been taken off a tax roll? What will they say to the other 8 million who will benefit, dollarwise, by this bill, those people who love people so much, they love them so much they will keep them on the tax roll indefinitely? They love them so much they are keeping higher taxes rather than lower taxes for the 8 million who would benefit.

All right, I say, the people who want to take that path, let them take it; but I say to them that I will take the other side and I will carry that other banner.

I will say to the 5 million people who will be taken off the tax rolls, these benefits, these mercies which would have happened to them are being withheld by the people who say they are their friends.

I am going to tell them, "I am for taking five million people off the tax rolls. I am for improving the condition of the other 8 million people who will benefit from it. I am for an orderly phasing out of the surtax, which has not been done before."

No one else has proposed ending the surtax. No one else has said, "Phase it out." We are the ones who say it.

Whenever any group of people in a political party come up with something that is so good, so workable and so appealing, and the other side does not have a better answer, they plead delay, delay, and more delay, and defer, and then go out to the people and say, "We did it for your good. It was for your benefit that we did not take you off the tax roll. It was for your good that we allow inflation to continue. It was for your good that we are keeping you on the hot seat. It was for your good we did those things."

I submit, Mr. President, without any humility at all, because there is no humility in me on this issue, let them have that side of the argument. I will take the side of the orderly phasing out of the surtax—and do it now.

I will take the side of taking 5 million people off the tax rolls—and do it now.

I will take the side of the 8 million people who benefit, dollarwise, from the bill—and do it now.

Then when we come to the second tax relief and reform bill, some people will get hurt and some will get helped.

Let us face that when it comes up. Let us improve the conditions of those people whose condition should be improved. Let us penalize those who are doing too well under our tax system. Let us close up some of the loopholes. Let us find areas of relief. Let us find areas where the Federal Government will be able to count on an orderly source of income.

But, in the meanwhile, the first priority is not to engage in a fight between the Democratic policy committee and certain members of their party, or certain members of our party.

We are not concerned here about personalities, or whether some group in the Senate wants to get the jump on another group in the Senate. In the course of it, I will tell the people who will get jumped. It will be them—the people of the United States. They will get jumped on. They will be jumped on every day if they do not get some kind of tax relief. Inflation will cool itself a little more and a little more and get tighter and tighter around them as it spreads its burden more seriously and harder upon the people of this country.

Mr. President, the weather yesterday registered its highest discomfort index for the year in Washington. I hope that today I may have raised the level of the discomfort index of those people who would dare to say to the people of the United States, "Stay on the tax roll. Face inflation. We have got a little family argument going on our side and we have not been able to decide it."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield me 2 minutes to reply to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HANSEN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I say, first, that I am not interested in dispensing "mercies" to the low-income groups in this country.

What I am interested in is, if possible, to dispense justice to all our citizens.

So far as holding up this legislation is concerned, I would say to my distinguished friend, the assistant minority leader, that we on our side would be willing—very willing—to extend the withholding levels added by the original surcharge for 60 days, 90 days, or to the end of the year.

We would like to see at the same time something in the way of justice done for all our people. So far as I am concerned, let me say that I am willing to take my case to Montana's 56 counties.

So far as my index is concerned, it is quite comfortable. I feel that I am doing what I think is right. I do not believe there is a Member of this body who has ever accused me, even though I am a politician, of playing politics with any issue.

I think that the welfare of the country—and that means the people of this Nation—must always come first.

What I have tried to do is not place the blame, as my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania has, and who, in his philippic, without mentioning the Democratic Party, has in effect threatened us on the basis of the present issue.

If that is the case, so be it.

The gauntlet has been thrown down.

We accept it.

We will not allow anyone to blame us for the increase in the interest rate by 2½ percent since the beginning of this year, for the increase in the cost of living, and for all the other inflationary spirals that have come into existence during the past 6 or 7 months while the surtax has been in full effect.

We both have a case. We should rest that case. I will not decide it. The Senator from Pennsylvania will not decide it. The Members of this body will decide it—both Democrats and Republicans.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for being so gracious in yielding me this time.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR JAVITS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS) has concluded his remarks, and there are quite a succession of unanimous-consent requests to speak, that I may be recognized for 20 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOSED SESSION ON ABM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me briefly without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the Senator from Missouri, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from Wyoming.

Mr. President, after noting remarks made to the press just prior to the closed session yesterday, and also reports this morning in the press about that session, and also statements made on the television media last night, I now see no reason for another closed session on the ABM.

Later, during further discussion of this matter in open session, I shall present to the Senate in greater detail my reasons for this course.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina for 1 minute, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

XUM

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, this morning an article in the Washington Post reported that I stated in a speech to Prince Georges County Young Republicans last night that opponents of the Safeguard antiballistic missile are "people who don't believe in America, in free enterprise, people who are against our way of life." While the words actually quoted were a portion of my remarks, they were given in a context referring to radicals and violent-prone leaders who are disrupting the processes of law and order in our cities. My remarks on the ABM and violence in America were both contained in this speech, but it is incomprehensible how the reporter confused my remarks on these two completely different subjects. I hasten to set the record straight.

I certainly did not question the sincerity of those who are not supporting the President's Safeguard program. The people in America who are fighting the ABM are fully within their rights and are doing what they consider best for this country. In supporting the ABM, I am doing likewise.

A SWORD AND A SHIELD

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the decision to deploy Safeguard stands on a solid foundation of reasoned judgment. It was developed on demonstrated fact—not conjecture. It was conceived from a proven capability—not wishful thinking. It took into account all factors—not just isolated incidents.

The structure of the decision has withstood the test of dissent.

Objections have been raised against it, but each has been satisfied—each rejected—to leave the basic decision even stronger for its examination.

I think it would be worthwhile at this time to review two basic reasons for supporting the President's phased Safeguard program—the first is its ability to do the task for which it is designed—the second, to examine its role in the arena of arms control.

Last Wednesday, this Nation launched a mission to place a man on the moon. It seems inconceivable to me that anyone could doubt the technical competence of a nation that could achieve such a feat. The United States of America has the scientific, technological, and industrial base to put an American on the moon. The United States of America has the scientific, technological, and industrial base to develop an anti-ballistic-missile defense that will work.

Mr. President, the Safeguard program is the culmination of more than 13 years of research and development effort and the expenditure of about $5 billion, including all the various projects related to ballistic missile defense. An ABM program was first presented to the Congress in 1955. It moved into full-scale development in 1958. In 1963, the initial program—the Nike-Zeus system—was abandoned because, with the mechanically steered radars which it employed, it could not cope with the kind of attack the Soviets could mount in the late 1960's. For this reason, a new improved system, known as the Nike-X, was placed in development. This system was to use new phased-array radars and a new high acceleration terminal defense missile, the Sprint. In 1964, a program was initiated to develop a new, long-range interceptor with a high-yield warhead. This was the Spartan missile.

This review was just to give you some indication of the time our scientists have spent on the system and the confidence the Congress has shown in these scientists by our continued allocation of funds for this development.

For our investment, those scientists have provided us with a missile site radar that works—they have developed the long-range Spartan missile that works—they have successfully demonstrated the short-range Sprint missile. Now they say, let us put them all together in a single system and we will make the whole thing work. Can we doubt them? Can we doubt this type of demonstrated performance? I think not. These men are equipped with the facts—their recommendations are based on proven capability. They have testified before us that no question has been raised by outside experts that they had not raised in their own internal debate and for which satisfactory answers had been found. With these types of assurances, how can we doubt them.

The chance of a nuclear war today, I believe, is zero due to our overwhelming strategic deterrent. As I conceive it, the primary job of our Government is to keep this chance at zero—for without security, we have nothing. Nuclear war is the one thing that we absolutely cannot afford. We have two routes available to do this job. The first is to counter any attempt by any nation to overcome our deterrent force. We do this by improving, modifying, adding to or substituting weapons systems to insure that we can respond overwhelmingly in the case of attack. The second, and in my judgment the best course, is to reach some meaningful international agreements limiting strategic arms and thus insuring through agreement, rather than through investment in arms, that we can deter nuclear aggression.

These two courses are not separate routes. They are closely interrelated and intertwined to that point in the road where the arms agreement is signed. We must approach the bargaining table with the Soviets fully conviced that we will not allow them to overcome our deterrent no matter what the cost to us—no matter what the cost to them. We must approach the arms limitation talks with a club in one hand and a pen in the other, allowing them their choice. They must be convinced of the futility of proceeding with an arms race. We must present them with a posture that leaves no doubt as to our resolve.

The initial result we are looking for in strategic arms limitation talks is a method of insuring ours and the Russians' mutual deterrent capability without the need to further engage in the arms race and without reducing our security.

A properly designed agreement to limit strategic forces can better insure the security of both the United States and the Soviet Union. Our task in negotiating such an agreement should be eased by the growing realization on both sides that a first strike capability will not be permitted to develop regardless of the effort and money expended for that purpose. The Safeguard decision would be a clear indication of intent to the Soviets of our attitude in this regard.

The needs of the world are too urgent to waste the world's wealth on useless competition in strategic weapons. But the prospect for ending this competition rests on the attitudes and actions of both the Soviet Union and ourselves—not us alone.

The opposition to the Safeguard system strongly advocates the opposite position. They say that the deployment of these defensive weapons will accelerate the arms race and will make it more difficult to negotiate with the Russians. My answer to them is this—and please listen to these words carefully—"I believe that the defensive systems, which prevent attack, are not the cause of the arms race, but constitute a factor for preventing the death of people." These words represent well the point of view of those supporting the Safeguard system, but they were not spoken by a Safeguard advocate. These are the words of Soviet Premier Kosygin. This statement by Mr. Kosygin certainly does indicate an understanding of a defensive system.

Safeguard is a defensive system. The United States' decision to deploy a defensive ABM has been matched by an intensified Soviet interest in arms control. The Safeguard system makes it very clear to all nuclear powers, large and small, that we seek only to protect our deterrent forces—so that, in case of attack, we will be assured of the ability to destroy the attacker.

As someone once said:

> Our pleas for peace are measured not by the sincerity with which they are spoken, but by the strength we can array to enforce them.

We cannot read the minds of the Soviet leaders, nor can we readily determine their intentions. We must base our decisions on their known capabilities. It does appear, though, that they understand the defensive nature of our Safeguard system. If they are ready for arms control—so are we. But, if arms control should fail, then the Safeguard system will give us the edge on deterrence.

A prudent person seeking a prudent decision on the difficult question of our strategic posture can do no other than to conclude that the phased Safeguard system is the prudent answer.

Mr. President, we must remain secure as a free nation. Our days must be days of preparedness and reality. One of the realities we must not forget is that weakness invites aggression, while strength deters it.

Preparedness in this nuclear age must constitute more than a sword; it must include a shield, as well.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

XUM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do so only to express my deep personal thanks to the distingushed Senator from Wyoming for his graciousness in allowing so many of us to infringe on the time which he had asked for yesterday. I want him to know that I am deeply grateful and thankful for his graciousness, his courtesy, and the kindness he has shown us; but these are attributes of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I am indeed grateful and appreciative of the very kind remarks of my beloved friend, the distinguished majority leader. The things he says about me have been said about him so many times that I shall not repeat them now; but I do appreciate his kind remarks.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HANSEN. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I want to thank the Senator as well as commend him for taking time to put together in such concise and definite form his thoughts on this important question. As always, we know where he stands; he has expressed himself well, and has made a great contribution to the debate on this subject.

Mr. HANSEN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi very much.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to previous order, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE MANAGEMENT OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, George B. Hartzog, Jr., who is director of the National Park Service, was chosen to deliver the distinguished alumni address to the Federal Executive Institute in Charlottesville, Va., on July 12. Mr. Hartzog is a graduate of the Institute, which serves the development needs of career executives in the upper levels of our Government; and because his speech, "National Park Service Management," evidenced insight which I know will be of interest in the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Hartzog's remarks be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MANAGEMENT

(By George B. Hartzog, Jr.)

It is a great privilege and pleasure to participate in this reunion of the graduates of the first and second sessions of the Federal Executive Institute. For the high honor you have bestowed on me to present this first Distinguished Alumni address, I am deeply grateful.

I remember my attendance here as one of the highlights of my career. I shared many hours of good fellowship; made new friends among my colleagues in the Federal service; and gained new insights into our mutual problems and aspirations.

It is my firm belief that this Institute has the highest potential existing today for significant improvement in the quality of management within the Federal career service. I congratulate the Civil Service Commission, Dr. Sherwood, the faculty and the staff of the Institute for creative leadership in Executive Education. This pioneering effort has been difficult. You have accepted the challenge with vigor and imagination. You have achieved results and I predict even greater success in the years ahead.

Dr. Sherwood, in extending the invitation on behalf of the Alumni, suggested that I discuss with you the management of the National Park Service, with particular emphasis on policy leadership, the relationship of management to the political processes, and the special management needs of the National Park Service. Since you are all "old pros" of management in the Federal Government, I shall not presume on your time and your patience to treat literally all of the ramifications of the broad subject he has suggested.

By numerous legislative enactments, the Congress has granted the National Park Service a broad charter:

(a) To manage and develop the National Park System for public use and benefit by such means and in such manner as to leave its resources and values unimpaired for future generations.

(b) To cooperate with Federal, State, and local Governments and the private sector in programs to preserve the natural and cultural inheritance of our Nation.

To establish a frame of reference for this discussion of the management of the National Park Service, I wish to mention, briefly, three basic factors, as follows:

First, the National Park Service is not an independent agency of the Executive Department. The National Park Service was established as—and remains—a Bureau of the Department of the Interior. The positions of Director and Deputy Director are in excepted Schedule C. My Deputy Director and I serve, therefore, during the pleasure of the Secretary, in supportive policy making roles with him in the management of the National Park Service. Within the Department of the Interior, the Director of the National Park Service reports to the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, Parks, and Marine Resources.

There have been seven Directors of the Service since it was established in 1916. Five of the seven Directors have been appointed to this position from the ranks of the National Park Service after many years of service in the Federal career system. Moreover, no Director has ever been changed with a change in Administration. This record is one in which all employees of the National Park Service take justifiable pride for it bespeaks of the high professional integrity of our work. It bespeaks, likewise, I suggest, of the responsiveness of each Director to the principal policy making officers in the Department and to the goals of the Administration.

Second, the area of the National Park System are public lands of the United States. Under our constitution, the Congress is charged with the responsibility of establishing the public land policies of the United States. These policies, for the most part, are broad guidelines leaving large areas of discretionary authority in the President and in the Secretary. For example, the Antiquities Act of 1906 authorizes the President of the United States by Proclamation to set aside, from lands owned or controlled by the United States, national monuments having scientific significance or containing artifacts of antiquity.

Moreover, the Historic Sites Act of 1935 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to determine the national significance of historic sites and in his discretion to designate them as National Historic Sites either in private ownership or as a part of the National Park System, with fee simple title vested in the United States. In connection with the exercise of this latter authority, President Franklin D. Roosevelt directed that the authority should be exercised with respect to placing areas in the National Park System only after clearance by the Bureau of the Budget.

In the decade of the 1960's, through negotiations with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, an agreement was reached by President Kennedy and Secretary Udall—and adhered to by succeeding Administrations—that the authorities of the 1906 and the 1935 Acts would be exercised only after consultation with the legislative committees of the Congress.

Third, the resources of the National Park System represent values far beyond their significance as public lands of the United States. They are, in fact, the strands of the natural and cultural inheritance of a great Nation and a proud people. This Nation perhaps more than any other, was richly endowed with a superlative natural environment. Its creative, ingenuous, hard-working people have laid on this land the foundations of our American way of life.

Thus, the natural, historical, and recreational resources of your National Park System have a tremendous tug at the heart strings of America. The manifestation of this reality is that thousands of citizens through numerous organizations—with funds to employ full-time professional staff—intimately involve themselves not only in day-to-day management decisions but also in policy decisions of both the Administration and the Congress.

The National Park Service—like all of your organizations—is a public agency. Policy making—and even more significantly the implementation of policy—in public agencies is, in actuality, a function of all its members. Policy, to be creative in its making and constructive in its implementation, must be validated by the members of the organization. Thus, while the employees of the National Park Service are, on the one hand, members of the management body they are also, on the other hand, a very special and important public.

In light of these "facts of life" I have, quite naturally, formed certain fundamental beliefs that undergird my approach to management of the National Park Service. In stating these beliefs and reporting our management program as it has been shaped by these beliefs, I do not presume to suggest that the way we have approached our responsibilities is either the only way or, indeed, even the best way to manage—although, certainly, the latter is the ideal and the objective we seek.

My first belief is this:

A public agency, such as the National Park Service, cannot operate successfully in a vacuum;

Its programs are executed in a political environment—not a partisan environment; that is to say, its programs are scrutinized, evaluated, validated or rejected in the arena of public discussion among the Congress, the administration and the taxpayers and within the context of national priorities.

It is, therefore, the function of management to open lines of communication—and keep them open constantly—with our Departmental policy making leadership, the Congress, and the public to facilitate this evaluation process.

An essential keystone for building channels of communication, in my judgment, is a concise—easily understood—statement, of management philosophy. As a public agency responsive to the policy making authority of the Congress and the Administration, our statement of management philosophy must necessarily embody the mandates of these policies. Thus, our statement of management

XUM

philosophy—summarized in the National Park Service Pledge of Public Service—is a synthesis of the numerous public land policies enunciated in a series of legislative enactments concerning the National Park System.

Stripped of all technicalities generally associated with legislative enactments, it distills the essence of the philosophies expressed in these statutes. To make it even more useful for communication—especially with our employees—we have duplicated the statement of management philosophy on wallet-sized cards for each employee—whether permanent or seasonal—of the National Park Service.

Of equal importance to a statement of management philosophy in communication, is the development of long-range objectives. Our long-range objectives—confirmed by the Honorable Walter J. Hickel, Secretary of the Interior on June 18, 1969, are as follows:

1. To provide for the highest quality of use and enjoyment of the National Park System by increased millions of visitors in years to come.

2. To conserve and manage for their highest purpose the natural, historical and recreational resources of the National Park System.

3. To develop the National Park System through inclusion of additional areas of scenic, scientific, historical, and recreational value to the Nation.

4. To participate actively with organizations of this and other nations in conserving, improving, and renewing the total environment.

5. To communicate the cultural, inspirational, and recreational significance of the American heritage as represented in the National Park System.

6. To increase the effectiveness of the National Park Service as a "people-serving" organization dedicated to park conservation, historical preservation, and outdoor recreation.

In his management directive of June 18, Secretary Hickel also established policy guidelines for the management of the National Park System. Briefly summarized, they are as follows: The National Park Service shall—

1. operate campgrounds rather than lease them to concessioners;

2. initiate study of opportunities which may exist, as well as financing proposals, for an expanded program of Federal acquisition and federally-assisted acquisition of park and recreation lands in large urban centers in order to bring parks to people;

3. innovate programs, especially in the Nation's urban parklands, to make parks more meaningful to people;

4. make parks and park facilities more available for neighborhood school districts;

5. initiate mass transportation services, such as shuttle busses, tramways, etc., to lessen the impact of private automobile congestion now threatening the quality of several of our most popular National Parks;

6. explore possibilities for increasing the participation of private citizens, the business community, and organizations in nature and historic preservation;

7. speed up wilderness studies to get this program on schedule;

8. identify gaps in the National Park System that should be filled by establishing new parks to preserve the heritage of our history and our natural environment;

9. work with colleges and universities to develop joint training opportunities for young people seeking careers in park and recreation programs;

10. plan appropriate activities to commemorate the Centennial of National Parks in 1972;

11. work in cooperation with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to plan programs for developing the recreational and cultural resources of the Indian people, thus enhancing the economy of our Indian Reservations.

Long-range objectives and policy guidelines serve several useful purposes in the communications process:

First, they establish a clear understanding between the Secretary—the policy making official appointed by the President to oversee the management of the National Park System—and the Director of the National Park Service appointed by the Secretary to manage the National Park System.

Second, through objectives and policy guidelines we communicate to the Congress—which has constitutional responsibility for public land policy—the direction we are heading in implementing their policies and the programs to be emphasized in the execution of our missions.

Third, they are useful in communicating with the several publics interested in the management and the policies of the National Park Service.

And, lastly, they set the broad parameters for our work program and serve as guidelines for day-to-day management.

Of course, our agency, like yours, appears annually before the Subcommittees of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees to support the President's budget for its programs. During these hearings we have an opportunity to communicate to the members of our Subcommittees significant accomplishments of the Service and also trends which we see developing that may affect future management and funding needs of the agency. A copy of my statement to the House and Senate Subcommittees on Appropriations for the Interior Department and Related Agencies is available as reference material.

Additionally, with the cooperation of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I have been provided the opportunity each year that I have served as Director of the National Park Service to report to the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation on my stewardship. Occasionally, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has also scheduled such oversight briefings.

These have been extremely useful sessions since they afford the members of the legislative committees a formal opportunity to address themselves to programs initiated in implementation of their broad policy mandates. Occasionally, the committee members have challenged the merit of our management decisions. For instance, in 1968, as a result of personnel ceilings and budgetary restrictions, we adopted an administrative policy to lease campgrounds to concessioners for operation. Historically, campgrounds had been operated by National Park Service personnel. A great many complaints were received from the public concerning this decision to switch to concessioner-operated campgrounds. In the meantime, Secretary Hickel advised the House Committee that he had this particular administrative policy under review. At the briefing session, the House Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation expressed itself very strongly in opposition to the administrative policy.

After reviewing the basis for our initial decision, the public complaints, and evaluating the views of the Subcommittee, the Secretary reversed this administrative policy and directed that in the future the National Park Service operate its campgrounds and not lease them to concessioners.

In another instance, the House Subcommittee took an unusual and tremendously supportive action. It passed a resolution requesting the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation and of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to direct a letter to the Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Interior Department and Related Agencies urging approval of the entire budget for the National Park Service as recommended by the President.

These briefing reports, of course, are only a part of the communication process with the Congress.

Throughout the course of a year there are dozens of individual meetings with members of the Congress to discuss matters of concern to them—to us—and to their constituents. There are, moreover, thousands of letters from the Congress referring for attention subjects of concern to their constituents with respect to the management of the National Park System. These Congressional referrals are an extremely important part of the communication process with the Congress.

As a result, one of the first actions I took upon becoming Director of the National Park Service was to consolidate all congressional mail in one office. This has enabled us to acknowledge every congressional inquiry within 48 hours. We cannot provide the answer in the great majority of instances within this time frame, but, importantly, we have said to the member of the Congress, and he, in turn, can say to his constituent, "the matter is receiving attention." A follow-up system has been established for these communications to insure that the final answer is supplied as quickly as possible.

Of course, there are many other forms of communication with the Congress associated with legislative hearings, special inquiries, etc.

With respect to communications with our several publics, I shall touch briefly on only two matters. First, the citizen conservation organizations. To maintain channels of communication with them, I have tried to meet with their professional staff representatives each three to four months during the period of my Directorship. This is an unstructed meeting, usually, two to three hours, at which they can present any subject of interest to them and at which I report to them on significant management and policy matters in which I believe they may have a particular interest.

Second, the National Park Service employees are our unique and all-important public. To meet a part of the communication need with them, we initiated a Newsletter—published biweekly—which contains important matters of Service-wide interest to all employees. The Newsletter also includes a special column for the ladies of the National Park Service.

The cardinal principle in communications in a public agency, I believe, is complete candor. If you don't know the answer to a question—say so. It is much better for people to conclude you are ignorant than for them to find out later that you are a liar! Your personal integrity in fulfilling your commitments is an absolute irreducible minimum in maintaining communications with your policy making officers of the Department, the Congress, and the publics concerned with your management.

My second belief about management of a public agency is this:

People do not work for money alone;

Efficiency is a byproduct of personal interest and achievement;

People do wish to achieve and to grow.

It is, therefore, a function of management to create an environment in which people may grow and achieve to the limit of their potential.

One of the long-range objectives established by the Secretary to guide our management is "to increase the effectiveness of the National Park Service as a 'people-serving' organization dedicated to park conservation, historical preservation, and outdoor recreation." This objective recognizes that our management in its essence is of human beings and not of theories and charts. We shall

XUM

achieve this objective only as the employees of the National Park Service grow in their capabilities and in their commitment to the agency and its programs.

To assist us in meeting this challenge, we have established objectives for personnel management, as follows:

1. Encourage highly motivated people of talent and high potential to seek employment with the National Park Service.
2. Provide equal opportunities to all employees for individual growth.
3. Encourage an attitude of constructive inquiry, a receptivity to change, and a determination to find better ways of doing our job.
4. Encourage, recognize, and reward individual initiative.
5. Require consistent and demonstrated productivity and achievement as the essential requirement for advancement.
6. Provide opportunities for transfers, details, and other assignments of employees that contribute to the good of the Service and the career development of the employee. Foster the development of a climate that recognizes and accepts the benefits of such interchanges.
7. Make fullest utilization of modern management methods and technology.

The National Park Service had 56 volumes of Administrative manuals and handbooks. Some of these were absolutely essential. They contained the accounting, procurement, and personnel requirements and procedures established pursuant to law. But, the vast majority of these handbooks and administrative manuals dealt with the subject of "how to do the job."

Sometime ago, I appointed a committee to evaluate our handbooks and manuals and make recommendations on the subject. The committee concluded, in part, that these volumes—many of which they acknowledged were out of date and not current—should be maintained in order "to insure uniformity in management." My experience in Government leads me to believe that, generally, "uniformity" is a synonym for "mediocrity."

Uniformity is not what I seek in management! Rather, I seek creativity and personal growth.

Accordingly, I issued a memorandum abolishing all handbooks and administrative manuals as of July 1, 1969, except those essential to guide our field personnel in adhering to legal requirements of personnel, property, and money.

In lieu of administrative manuals, we have provided different management tools.

First, we have promulgated administrative policies to guide day-to-day management in the field. Each of these policies is accompanied by an explanation of "why this is the policy." These poliices do not provide answers to specific problems. They do, however, establish boundary lines within which a decision can be made consistent with the policy of the organization and in light of the circumstances that exist in the particular case at hand.

These administrative policies recognize the three different categories of areas making up the National Park System, i.e., the natural, historical, and recreational. Each category of area was established by the Congress to serve a different purpose and these different purposes are reflected in the administrative policies.

Secondly, we have established program standards for the execution of each major field function—administrative management, maintenance, protection and visitor services, resources management, and interpretation. These program standards define three appropriate levels for the operation of these programs depending upon season of the year, public use and similar demands on the local operations. For example, the maintenance program standards recognize that all facilities do not require the same degree of maintenance care. Thus, a back-country administrative road does not have to be maintained at the same level as does a major park road having high density visitor use. Importantly, therefore, the standard of maintenance established for each facility is designed to achieve the best balance between meeting the public needs and preserving the public investment at reasonable cost.

Third, we have initiated personal performance standards for each employee of the National Park Service. These standards describe the conditions which will obtain when the job has been done satisfactorily. We initiated this as a four-year project. In the first year, we have developed personal performance standards for Regional Directors, Superintendents, and District Rangers. In the second year, it is our goal to develop performance standards for Assistant Directors and for each member of the Regional offices. Our third year program will involve the development of personal performance standards for each member of the park organization; and our final year's program will involve the development of personal performance standards for each member of the Washington Office and the Service Centers.

These performance standards establish a channel of communication between the employee and his supervisor for objective dialogue concerning job performance. They represent an agreement in advance between the employee and his supervisor as to the job to be done and the results that will be obtained when the job is done adequately. In my mind, at least, their greatest value is to enable the employee to know in his own mind that he is, indeed, doing an adequate job, or he is not doing an adequate job, even before his supervisor knows it.

My third belief about management in a public agency is this:

The support of one's partner—either husband or wife—is essential to top performance in the job;

Retirement—like recruitment—is simply a change in occupational status.

It is, therefore, the function of management to provide the avenues by which an employee's family (as well as former employees and their families) may relate to the organization and its programs in meaningful ways.

The "team" is generally the basic work unit in day-to-day park management, such as, mountain climbing, rescue, fire fighting, underwater swimming, wildlife management, and a wide variety of other responsibilities.

One of the most effective applications of the "team" principle in the National Park Service is the family. We have conscientiously and systematically tried to encourage this family team effort. For example, as I mentioned earlier, one section of our employees' Newsletter is devoted to the activities of our park wives. We have encouraged them in maintaining a national park wives organization. They do much significant work without which our programs would simply founder. They are the hostesses in the parks, many of which are isolated; they are a vital link between the official organization and the community; in an emergency they serve as the unpaid—yet indispensable—communication link between a rescue team and home base; they advise constructively and creatively on many of our management programs such as employee housing, park communications, etc. The stories that I could share with you—based on my personal experience in the field—as to the invaluable contributions of our park wives would require a second alumni presentation. As a matter of fact I am so thoroughly convinced of the value of the wife's commitment and contribution to her husband's career and the agency's mission that I suggest it would be well worth the money for the Institute to provide a training opportunity for Government wives. I suggest that the taxpayers would get the biggest dividend for their money ever offered by a sovereign!

In many ways the National Park Service is a young agency; and, yet, we are older than we sometimes realize. For example, we now have third generation employees in the Service. The result is that we have a growing body of alumni. These are talented men and women who have devoted decades of their lives to the management of this Nation's natural and cultural inheritance, and to providing opportunities of inspiration, relaxation, and recreation for millions of citizens in God's great out-of-doors.

To encourage their continued interest in the programs of the Service and to provide meaningful ways in which they can continue to relate to the agency, we initiated several years ago a "reemployed annuitant program." In this program was employ those retirees who are interested in pursuing part-time active work. The pay for this part-time work is the difference between the annuitant's retirement and the salary of the position he occupies. It is a small amount, indeed. Generally, we can reemploy a GS–15 annuitant for an amount roughly equivalent to the salary of a GS–5—and where can you improve on that bargain today? We have also adopted a "trial retirement" program.

Several years ago our employees and our alumni organized an Employee and Alumni Association which publishes a monthly paper "The National Park Courier." Through this paper we are able to communicate with our retirees on important aspects of park programs and thereby continue their link with the Service.

There are many other things that we have done to improve the management of the National Park Service. For example, we have consolidated our professional disciplines, i.e., planners, architects, engineers, landscape architects, etc., in Service Centers; grouped parks in the immediate vicinity of each other under centralized management, providing common administrative services, such as, accounting, purchasing, etc.; expanded our training and manpower development programs; restructured our Washington Office to recognize the growing dimension of our urban parklands; initiated ecological master planning and joint regional planning; improved resource management based on scientific data; designed an environmental education program integrated with the secondary school curriculum; started studies to determine the "carrying capacity" of parks—to mention just a few things.

So much for management of the National Park Service—more importantly, what are we managing for?

I believe a National Park is more than a physical resource. I believe a National Park is an idea which in the fullness of its meaning is a link between the generations of men in their continuing search to be "at home" in their world.

National Parks and historic landmarks help give us all a "sense of place" in a mobile America. They contribute to our sense of both the beautiful and the familiar. Love of locality is one of the roots of social cohesion, according to Charles E. Merrian, who was one of our greatest political scientists. But in a new country like the United States, and in a society where one family in five moves each year, and where we have over 80 million automobiles, we have a hard time developing local roots of the kind familiar to Englishmen in Sussex, Frenchmen in Brittany, or Irishmen in County Cork. Our National Parks like Yosemite and Grand Canyon, and our historic places like Independence Hall and the Washington Monument take the place of local roots for tens of millions of mobile Americans. They give us the assurance of a "sense of place" expressive of our country

XUM

that we can tie to permanently, wherever we move or live.

I believe many people go to the National Parks and historic landmarks not simply to satisfy a need to get back to nature from crowded cities or for outdoor recreation. Many people go to the National Parks and landmarks to strengthen their identity with their country. "Seeing is believing," and touching the Liberty Bell or setting foot in Yosemite Valley is worth a long trip to experience a sense of identity with America where it is unchanging. It isn't subtle. It's the deep human need to know "I was there" at Independence Hall or Yosemite Valley; and, as a result am a little more an American. This experience is especially needed in these times of war, turmoil, and technological change.

When the bill to create a National Park Service was under consideration in Congress in 1916, J. Horace McFarland testified before the House Committee on Public Lands. His words echo today's needs of our urban society:

". . . the word 'park' in the minds of most of us suggests a place in which there are a number of flower beds, and probably stone dogs, and iron fountains, and things of that kind, and a road over which an automobile may travel. We forget that the park has passed out of that category in the United States. *The park now serves the people; the park decreases the demand on the forces for keeping order; the park is the direct competitor, in the United States, of the courts, of the jail, of the cemetery, and a very efficient competitor with all of them.*" (Italic supplied.)

The beauty of the parks in the National Capital was just coming to fruition in 1916 when Congress was talking about a National Park Service. The McMillan Commission had made its great report on the plan for Washington in 1902, the Mall was rescued shortly afterward, the Lincoln Memorial was authorized in 1911, and the Arlington Memorial Bridge followed along. In his testimony, McFarland linked this to the idea of establishing a National Park Service:

"I had the great pleasure one day to bring here a sort of wild man from Iowa, who had never seen the East at all; who had never seen any great buildings, and, while a man of tremendous business ability, he had no conception of the value of beauty. We reached Washington about nine o'clock one night and he was so eager to see what this town looked like that we went on top of one of the buildings just back of the Capitol, and he had his first glimpse of the whole scene by moonlight. He was fairly crazy about it. *He said he had never been a good American citizen before. There was made that very instant a good, strong, fighting unit out of a man who was merely a business man before—in it for what he could get out of it. There was born in his bosom at that instant a devotion to the country because of the beauty of the city which has been created by the hand of man.*

"Now, gentlemen, if that can happen in Washington—and it happens constantly— . . . it will happen to a much greater extent in connection with these great national wonders that are comprised in the national parks."

The National Park System has a deep stake in the urban park idea, and it goes back to the founding of the Service in 1916; and, to a realization that the National Capital and the National Parks are both symbols of the Nation.

Beyond our need to identify with the nation is the urgent need to understand our place in the world environment and to join hands in doing our part to rescue it from impending ecological disaster. As Freeman Tilden put it, we need "to understand our place in nature and among men." We will reach this objective more quickly and we will heal our environment more rapidly if we develop social cohesion "at home" by learning we are one people with a common heritage well expressed in your National Park System. As we achieve social harmony we will do better in joining together to recover our natural heritage and that of the world around us.

With innovative programs, such as Living History demonstrations and Summer-in-the Parks we are striving to make parks more meaningful to people in their search to be "at home" in their world. In assessing the impact of Summer-in-the-Parks on his work, one park policeman, recently, observed, "we now play with the youngsters in the parks, rather than chase them on the streets."

"Through program innovation in response to the changing needs of our society and by sensitive management," Secretary Hickel has said, "the National Park System can contribute enormously to our national goals of enhancing the life of every American and supporting the effort to articulate an environmental ethic as a rule of human conduct." He has challenged us to make this larger objective our "constant guide as we approach the decade of the seventies."

Thank you very much.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, this week has been officially proclaimed Captive Nations Week by President Richard M. Nixon.

As Mr. Nixon said there have been many changes during the past 10 years since the first Captive Nations resolution passed the Congress, but to quote the President:

> One thing that has not changed is the desire for national independence in Eastern Europe.

During the past year, in Czechoslovakia, we witnessed the sad truth that the Soviets, contrary to prevailing opinions in some circles, have not mellowed, nor reoriented themselves, but rather are as ruthless as ever in suppressing elementary freedom of those under their jurisdiction.

In the Ukraine at the present time, the Soviet Government is pursuing a policy of horrible religious persecution. Members of the clergy are being arrested and thrown into prison. Indeed earlier this year, a Ukrainian bishop was murdered, after a Soviet secret police agent, through impersonating a French tourist, was able to obtain the locations of "underground churches" from the bishop. These churches have all been closed, needless to say.

The renewed religious terror in the Ukraine is part of the Soviet plan to destroy the church there by 1970, or the 100th anniversary of Lenin's birth. Lenin, we are told, expressed a particular wish to see the church in the Ukraine obliterated.

Certainly our policies must be tailored to deal with this very real threat to the freedom of millions of brave people.

The invasion of Czechoslovakia occurred in 1968, not 1918. The persecutions in the Ukraine are taking place in 1969, not 1939. Yet, it is the governments of Eastern Europe, not the people, which concern us.

As any visitor to Moscow will tell you, decades of continuing propaganda have not been able to diminish the friendship of the people of Russia for the people of America.

I have long maintained that our greatest potential allies in the great struggles of this world are the people of the captive nations.

As we once again pay homage to their bravery, let us firmly hope that the day has arrived when soon we will be able to offer the people of the captive nations real encouragement instead of false hopes.

THE ABM

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have asked for time to speak today on the ABM because in my opinion it is one of the most vital questions for decision. I shall attempt to avoid technical references to MIRV's, FOB's, overpressures, delivery systems, PAR's, and MSR's. All these highly technical components and relationships are part of the offensive and defensive missile vocabulary which we have heard so much. In fact, the more I read, analyze, and study these technical matters, the more I become convinced that confusion is rampant in the minds of much of the public.

Since I am not a psychologist, a psychiatrist, or a clairvoyant and cannot state with precision what is in the collective mind of the Russian leadership, I shall not attempt to forecast the intentions of either Russia or any other possible enemy of this Nation.

My colleagues on the Armed Services Committee, in accordance with their responsibilities, have immersed themselves in the scientific details presented by the experts, and have rendered the considered judgment of that committee. I accept that judgment. As a member of the Defense Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I have spent many hours and days in hearings on these same subjects. My most careful examination supports its correctness and nothing that I have heard or read, classified or not, persuades me the committee is wrong.

My purpose instead, is to swing the pendulum of deliberation toward a reasonable perspective which not only can we, but also our constituents, more easily understand.

I represent a State with a citizenry in which I take great pride. I believe the questions, and expressions I have received on the Safeguard ABM system are representative of those throughout the country and frame the issues to be resolved. I, therefore, propose to set forth representative questions together with what I believe are the proper answers, in language with which laymen are familiar.

As my views on the matter before us are delineated, I can only add my hope for an early resolution of the issue before us. The studies have been made, the protracted committee deliberations have transpired, its conclusion delivered. I therefore believe we should be able to proceed shortly to make our decision.

What is the ABM system?

The ABM is a weapons system to provide a defensive shield from nuclear missiles fired against our country. The Safeguard ABM system will use two dif-

XUM

ferent missiles which are not designed to be fired at any other country, but which are designed only to intercept and destroy incoming missiles. Its pattern of deployment and mix of components will protect a portion of the most important part of our deterrent—the Minuteman ICBM's.

Why is the Senate considering ABM systems?

For many years our Government has been considering, testing, evaluating, and improving prospective ABM systems. In 1968 Congress voted funds to proceed not only with continued research but actual production and location, or deployment, of an ABM system. I voted in favor of that. This year it is necessary to make the annual provision of further funds. S. 2546, the bill before the Senate, includes as part of the Department of Defense funds authorization, funds for the continuation of work on the ABM program including limited deployment. The actual Safeguard system proposed by President Nixon and the Department of Defense is different in some important respects, from what was initially authorized. The Safeguard system is strictly a defensive system designed to protect our deterrent capability.

Is there opposition to Safeguard?

No. According to a recent statement by Senator PERCY before Congress, the great majority of opponents to the ABM portions of S. 2546 favor continued Safeguard research and development. What is opposed and has been opposed is the actual deployment, for which only a small portion of the funds would be used. Two sites are involved in this initial deployment—one in Montana and one in North Dakota.

Why is deployment, as contrasted to only research and development, desired?

The initiation of deployment at this time is specifically sought in order to obtain preliminary operating experience at the earliest practicable time. It will permit production of components for the Safeguard system which require up to several years of leadtime.

What is the ultimate plan for deploying Safeguard?

Construction of approximately 10 sites in defense of our land-based deterrent forces.

Why is beginning of deployment now opposed while continuation of laboratory research and development is not, in view of the fact that the result of research and development is a deployed system to be used if needed?

The essential reasons mentioned are to maintain, or to engender, good will on the part of any potential enemy—to avoid appearing aggressive, and because it will not cost as much money if we defer all deployment.

How can it be said that Safeguard, a purely defensive system, is aggressive, particularly when it is understood that most opponents to Safeguard are in favor of continuing upgrading and deployment of our ICBM missiles, and other offensive forces?

The only way I see that any potential enemy might label our Safeguard system as aggressive is to believe that we might use it to launch an aggressive "first strike." I do not believe any American President would ever "push the button" first. In fact, there is evidence that Safeguard will actually increase international stability and ward off increases in the arms race. Russian Premier Kosygin has said:

> It seems to me that defensive measures do not accelerate the arms race.

Do the Russians have an ABM system?

Yes.

Is it deployed?

Yes.

Why?

Purportedly for the same reason we want it, to bring down our missiles if we should fire them at Russia and also for protection against Red China when and if she attains a delivery capability. If our ABM were ever used it would simply be directed against an enemy's "first strike" against our missile sites.

I do not believe the United States will ever fire its ICBM missile strike force first, and Safeguard will help to prevent an enemy from knocking our ICBM's out of action before we could fire them in response to any attack they might initiate.

Russian ABM's, therefore, would most likely be used to ward off our so-called "second strike."

Do we know we can launch a retaliatory "second strike" after we are attacked?

A vital factor in answering this question is the point in time about which we are speaking. Today, our announced strategy is to absorb any first strike and then fire our ICBM's in retaliation. Helping this situation today is the fact that we believe our missile firing submarines would survive any "first strike" and still be able to fire their missiles in retaliation. In other words, even if many of our land-based missiles are destroyed, our submarines still would be able to send their missiles hurtling toward any attacking enemy.

However, if we are talking about some date after Safeguard is deployed, we are much less sure of this strategy. By that time we will need Safeguard to protect sufficient land-based missiles to do extensive damage to whomever the enemy might be. This is necessary, in my opinion, because it is a real possibility by that date that we no longer can rely on having our missile firing submarines untouched by an enemy's first strike, due to advances in undersea warfare which would permit some neutralization of their effectiveness.

In the future, would we be able to launch a "second missile strike" if we do not have the Safeguard system to protect our strike force?

Without Safeguard, our land-based missile force could be virtually nonexistent after a large-scale attack. And, if our subs were to be substantially neutralized, we would have a negligible second strike missile capability. The only thing we might be able to do is detect and identify the incoming missiles and launch all of our missile strike force against the enemy. This is a very dangerous strategy for this country.

What does it mean to have a doubtful second strike capability?

If we do not have Safeguard, it means that an enemy could confront the President with a choice of either yielding to overt aggression or being forced to push the button first to annihilate that country with our missiles, knowing that the result, aside from other considerations, will be a "second strike" against us which undoubtedly would completely destroy our Nation. That is not a situation into which I would ever want to put a President of this country. Right now, we must guard against it and give the President the Safeguard missile system.

How do we know any enemy will react in the way just dsecribed if they believe our deterrent is insufficient?

We do not know it. We will never know what they will do at some future date. We have not built our missile strike force on the basis of knowing that Russia, or any other country, intends to institute a nuclear war. Rather, we must judge by evidences of intent, knowledge of military capabilities, and knowledge of the general attitudes of those people who are now making strategic decisions in other countries. We must judge these various possibilities and provide for them. If an enemy should unleash an attack against us, it might be sudden and without warning. It might be preceded by unsuccessful attempts to coerce and intimidate us. It might be preceded by an unfounded fear that we are preparing an attack upon them. Hence, so far as I am concerned, our course of action at this time should be to make sure that any potential aggressor will not at some future date believe it can carry off such an attack. We are confident no country believes it can do it now. Safeguard is the best way known to me by which we can keep Russia and other nuclear powers convinced of this in the mid-1970's.

Must the Safeguard deployment be authorized now for the two sites mentioned?

Yes, in order to have the system operational by the time it is believed that any potential enemy might decide it could launch a satisfactory attack.

What about an arms control agreement with Russia?

If we could achieve an effective arms control agreement with Russia, it would be highly desirable. I hope we soon can commence talks in this regard. However, I feel it would take a long time, even after talks were started, to arrive at an exact agreement which must include ways of assuring against cheating. The mere possibility of achieving such an agreement, and the time which may be involved in negotiations, cannot be allowed to stop us from proceeding with our Safeguard system. We must commence the two initial facilities without delay. As a matter of fact, there is considerable and convincing evidence that beginning our Safeguard deployment will serve to cause the Soviets to more seriously consider an effective arms control agreement.

If the construction of the two operational Safeguard sites is authorized by Congress, is this an irreversible decision?

No, it is not. If the situation regarding arms control or if the Russian escalation of offensive weaponry production ceases,

XUM

the Safeguard system can then be halted.

Is your position supported by your constituents?

Yes, it is. The majority of the great volume of mail I have received favors uninterrupted progress toward providing the President with the Safeguard ABM system as he has requested, including deployment at the two initial sites. The majority do not believe that uncertainty regarding our own intentions and abilities will benefit us.

What I have given is a nontechnical discussion of the issues as I see them, and my conclusions. I sincerely believe that the Senate must act favorably on Safeguard to assure the future security of our country.

A man whom I deeply admired, Sir Winston Churchill, has spoken wisely concerning both our Russian competitors and the issue of war, especially nuclear war. In his famous "Iron Curtain" speech in 1946, he stated:

> From what I have seen of our Russian ~~friends~~ and allies during the war I am ~~convinced~~ that there is nothing they admire so much as strength, and there is nothing for which they have less respect than for weakness, especially military weakness.

Before a joint session of our Congress in 1941, he said:

> Do we not owe it to ourselves, to our children, to tormented mankind, to make sure that these catastrophes do not engulf us for a third time?

And, before a similar joint session in 1952, he pointed out:

> If I may say this, Members of the Congress, be careful above all things, therefore, not to let go of the atomic weapon until you are sure, and more than sure, that other means of preserving peace are in your hands.
>
> It is my belief that by accumulating deterrents of all kinds against aggression we shall in fact ward off the fearful catastrophe, the fears of which darken the life and mar the progress of all the peoples of the globe.

Mr. President, I believe the Safeguard ABM system to be one of those great deterrents.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the Senator's analysis of the situation here, especially with respect to trying to judge or guess about the Soviet leadership as it may be now or as it may vary in years to come. I think the Senator made his decision on the right basis. We cannot rest our decisions here solely on speculations as to what they may do; no one can tell. It is a matter of their minds. We measure their capabilities; we know their strategic capability, which has to be greatly respected. I could not be more positive in my belief than that their major strategic capability is oriented on our missile bases rather than on our cities.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator.

There has been a great deal of discussion perhaps too much discussion, about psychology and psychiatry on the floor of the Senate. I do not believe anyone can read anyone else's mind. However, if I go out onto the street and see that the straws are pointing in a certain direction I can assume the direction from which the wind is coming.

Mr. STENNIS. I agree with the Senator. I commend the Senator for his discussion and in looking for a sound basis to make a decision. We have to look at the way straws are lining up, regretfully, and be prepared. I think the analysis of the Senator is sound.

We have to look 6 years ahead to do even that and make a judgment. The Senator has made a fine presentation. I thank him very much for taking the time to put his thoughts together. I feel his contribution is one of the strong pegs on which we can hang a decision.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator, but rather I think it is we who should thank the Senator for his monumental and massive effort in connection with this bill, not only this year but last year, which has brought these issues so clearly to the American people.

I wish to add one other thought. Something the Senator said impressed me. I am not sure that the average American today really understands that if we were to wait until next year to start again, the system would still be 6 years off. It would take 6 years to deploy this system. It is not something we can go to like a Coke vending machine, drop in a nickel, and pull the bottle out of the bottom. There is involved a long leadtime. We have to look at what the Russians have done and are continuing to do now. In my opinion, any cautious and prudent man would look at these factors and be very much concerned about delay in the deployment of an ABM system.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. It is a pleasure to work with the Senator in the Committee on Appropriations. We are on more than one subcommittee together and we get the benefit of his fine knowledge and his painstaking and consistent efforts year after year.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is too kind.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator for his excellent speech. These are not easy times in which we live. Individual Senators must make decisions that are most difficult. I know of the conscientious efforts of the Senator on the Committee on Appropriations. As he sits on the Committee on Appropriations he has an opportunity to realize the great demands and the many requests for tax dollars. I know his decision to support the ABM is based upon one thing and one thing alone, and that is that he is convinced that it is the wisest course for our country. I commend him for that.

I believe that in these matters we have to trust someone. Those authorities who support this system, and who have through the years, may not have greater knowledge than some of the authorities who disagree, but in my opinion they have arrived at the conclusion that puts America on the safe side of the issue.

I commend the Senator for his fine contribution to this debate.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator very much for his remarks and I thank him for his contribution to the discussion. His contributions to the Senate are so well known they hardly need be commented on. However, his remarks prompt me to make two statements.

As a conscientious member of the Committee on Appropriations—and I believe I am conscientious—I am probably as aware as almost anyone of the competition, the fight, and the pressure for the Federal dollar. In the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, on which I have the honor to be the ranking minority member, we see these pressures in requests from such diverse agencies as, for example, NASA, the Veterans' Administration, the National Science Foundation, and HUD. Certainly, we have the complete two ends here: housing representing human needs, and NASA, and the National Science Foundation, representing the other end of the spectrum. This competition for the dollar is extremely intense. I can assure the Senator I would not have arrived at my decision if I had not thought that the need was extremely necessary.

Then, with respect to the Senator's second remark, I would like to say that my colleague from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) the other day, as he spoke in favor of Safeguard, referred in his remarks to the duties of the President and his obligations for the safety of the country. I was prompted to remark then, and I say it again here, that it seems to me that the obligations of the President are great, of course, because it is he who is the Chief Executive. However, each of us, I believe, realize that we also have an obligation which is just as deep seated to provide for the protection of this country. I am sure everyone in the Chamber recognizes that he has a deep obligation for the safety of this country; my sense of obligation on this question is that while others may be esoteric in their thinking, and others may get out on cloud 9 they may not bear this awesome responsibility. I feel that I personally bear an awesome responsibility in this field and that I cannot gamble with my country's future. I think we will be doing just that if we do not deploy the ABM.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Pursuant to the previous order, the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 10 minutes.

AMERICAN TRAGEDY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it will be many years before all is known of the tragic mistakes that caused our

XUM

Nation to become involved in a major air and ground war in Southeast Asia. The repercussions of the escalation of that war by President Johnson and its continuation by President Nixon will haunt Americans for generations to come. Hardly an aspect of our national life has remained unaffected by our becoming involved by sending combat troops to fight in a civil war in South Vietnam.

Gradually, some of those who were directly or indirectly involved in the decisionmaking processes during the Johnson administration have begun to make public their observations of the events that led to this tragedy. In the July 29, 1969, edition of Look magazine and in a recent edition of the Saturday Review, Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review, in an article entitled "How the United States Spurned Three Chances for Peace in Vietnam" made startling revelations concerning the failure of the Johnson administration to go along with or accept the opportunities for peace negotiations; or its refusal to do so. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the most shocking fact revealed by Mr. Cousins was his disclosure that Secretary of State Dean Rusk failed to inform President Johnson of the results of U.N. Secretary General U Thant's efforts to bring about negotiations in late 1964 and early in 1965. He narrated how U Thant sent a handwritten note to Ho Chi Minh supporting President Johnson's desire to begin meaningful negotiations as soon as possible, and of Ho Chi Minh's reply indicating willingness to enter into secret talks. For more than 4 months U Thant waited for Washington's reply. Finally, toward the end of January 1965, he told Ambassador Adlai Stevenson that Ho Chi Minh's offer could not be kept open much longer. Ambassador Stevenson then went to Washington and on his return reported to U Thant that the State Department was reluctant to enter into negotiations at that time for fear that such talks would result in a collapse of the Saigon government. Think of that and of the thousands of fine young Americans killed in combat since that time.

In 1966, when President Johnson met personally with U Thant to emphasize the importance of the personal role that he could play in helping to spur negotiations, the U.N. Secretary-General asked the President why the United States had not accepted the opportunity for negotiations he had helped to bring about 2 years earlier. President Johnson said he was puzzled by this response and listened with increasing concern to U Thant's account of the events of late 1964 and January 1965. Cousins reports President Johnson as saying this episode was news to him and that he was hearing about it for the first time. The President turned to Dean Rusk, who was present and asked whether he had knowledge of the matter. According to Norman Cousins:

> Rusk replied that Stevenson had not been authorized to reject the negotiations. He did not say, however, whether Stevenson had been authorized to accept them. Nor did he say why the State Department had not acted promptly and affirmatively when Stevenson first reported, in September 1964, Hanoi's willingness to have exploratory talks.

Mr. President, it is terrifying to realize that the Secretary of State withheld from the President information which might have prevented the bombing of north Vietnam, the tragic escalation of the war and all that has resulted since. Secretary of State Rusk's views on the Vietnam war are well known. He was one of the chief warhawks of the Johnson administration if not the most warlike of all the President's advisers. However, the accusation was never made that he did not act in good faith. Now, Norman Cousins raises that question.

Former Secretary of State Rusk should report the facts to the American people and either affirm or deny that he withheld information from the President which might have saved thousands of young American lives as well as the lives of thousands of Vietnamese soldiers and innocent civilians.

Mr. President, our involvement in a civil war in Vietnam by the Johnson administration and its continuation by President Nixon and his warhawk Defense Secretary Laird is a policy of madness. It is, in fact, the most inexcusable, the most tragic military and diplomatic blunder in the history of our Republic. This continuing folly has already resulted in the deaths in combat and also what Pentagon terms "accidents and incidents," which in reality are combat deaths, of more than 50,000 men of our Armed Forces—soldiers, airmen, marines and sailors—and more than 240,000 wounded. It is said that 3 percent of the wounded are either maimed for life or will die of wounds. Also, thousands of our GI's have been afflicted with bubonic plague, hepatitis, malaria fever, and other tropical diseases. Some have died. Some will suffer recurrent effects of these ailments as long as they live.

With our tremendous air power and napalm bombing we are devastating a little nation and killing many thousands of unoffending Vietnamese including women, children, and old men. We are destroying this small Asiatic country, Vietnam, which is of no importance whatever to the defense of the United States. Americans are horrified that in every community in the United States, even the smallest, priceless lives of young Americans have been snuffed out in this unpopular, immoral, undeclared war, now the longest war in the history of our Republic and the bloodiest with the sole exception of World War II.

Very definitely, we should withdraw all of our fighting men from Vietnam. Let us give sole consideration to saving lives of our own youngsters and bring our young men home, at least 200,000 this year and in the same manner we sent them overseas—by ships and planes.

Unfortunately, the Saigon regime of General Thieu and that flamboyant so-called air marshal, Ky, does not want the fighting to stop. Thieu and Ky really represent the views of but 10, or possibly as much as 20 percent of the people of South Vietnam.

Without the support of our Armed Forces, the Saigon militarist regime would be ousted within a matter of days, or even hours. That regime is made up of 10 generals, nine of whom served with the French forces against their own fellow countrymen in the war of liberation that ended in 1954 and were born and reared in North Vietnam. In a midnight coup, they overcame the civilian government of Saigon and took over and have been in power since.

In the fighting, week after week more Americans have been killed and wounded in combat than the total number of the so-called friendly forces of South Vietnam, which are entirely too friendly. They desert at the rate of 30 percent a month. They do the deserting while the Americans do the fighting. Without our support, the Saigon regime would collapse. Then, Vice President Ky and President Thieu would hurriedly depart and rendezvous with their unlisted bank accounts in Hong Kong and Switzerland. Madame Thieu, the first lady of the Saigon militarist regime, recently purchased a villa in Switzerland so there would probably be a peaceful haven there for her and General Thieu to enjoy gracious living.

Our colleague, Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, reported that 15 million Americans, most of them children, suffer from malnutrition. I reiterate the views of Senator MCGOVERN. Why not quit killing Asians and begin feeding Americans? Remember the late John F. Kennedy shortly before his assassination said:

> I don't think that unless a greater effort is made by the Government to win popular support that the war can be won out there. In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Vietnam—against the Communists.

EXHIBIT 1

[From Look magazine, July 29, 1969]

HOW THE UNITED STATES SPURNED THREE CHANCES FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM

(By Norman Cousins, editor, Saturday Review)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This article is published jointly by Look magazine and the Saturday Review because of the conviction of the editors that the questions it raises should have the widest possible airing. Mr. Cousins based this account upon his notes of episodes in which he took part and conversations with others who were involved.)

On October 7, 1966, President Lyndon B. Johnson emerged from a meeting at the United Nations with Secretary General U Thant. Waiting newsmen were handed a statement saying that the President had expressed his gratitude to U Thant for his efforts toward improving the world's chances of peace.

The full story of that meeting, however, was not covered by the communiqué.

The President's visit had come at a critical time. U Thant, discouraged by his inability to bring about negotiations to end the war in Vietnam, and desiring to return to private life, had made known his intention to retire from the UN within a matter of months.

Accompanied by Secretary of State Dean

XUM

Rusk and U.S. Ambassador to the UN Arthur Goldberg, the President called on U Thant in his office on the 38th floor. Ralph J. Bunche, UN Under Secretary for Special Political Affairs, joined the group at U Thant's request. The President emphasized the importance of the personal role U Thant could play in helping to get negotiations started that could in turn help end the war in Vietnam.

U Thant asked the President why the United States had not accepted the opportunity for negotiations he had helped to bring about two years earlier. The President said he was puzzled by this response and asked U Thant to explain.

U Thant described in detail the initiatives he had taken in the fall of 1964 to stop the fighting. He reminded the President of his visit to the White House early in August, 1964. He had come away persuaded that the President's main purpose in Vietnam was to end the war under conditions of continuing stability. U Thant said he had been convinced at that time that the United States had no desire to extend the war or to bring about the destruction of North Vietnam. He had recognized that the President was looking beyond the end of the war to wide-scale reconstruction for the benefit of all the Vietnamese.

U Thant said he had then sent a handwritten letter to President Ho Chi Minh of North Vietnam. The letter supported President Johnson's desire to begin meaningful negotiations as quickly as possible. It said that the only alternative to fast-mounting destruction was peace talks, and that the sooner they came, the better it would be for all concerned. U Thant proposed immediate secret talks as a prelude to more formal negotiations.

Three weeks later, U Thant received his reply from Ho Chi Minh: North Vietnam accepted his proposal and was willing to enter into secret talks.

U Thant notified Adlai Stevenson, then U.S. Ambassador to the UN. Stevenson went immediately to Washington to convey the good news to Rusk and to seek instructions. A week later, U Thant told Stevenson in New York he was eagerly awaiting the reply from Washington to communicate to Hanoi. After all, the original impetus for the meeting had come from the President himself. Stevenson said he was certain Washington would respond before long.

For more than four months, U Thant waited for Washington's reply. Finally, toward the end of January, 1965, he told Stevenson that it was not reasonable to expect that the offer could be kept open much longer. Stevenson went to Washington again, and on his return, reported to U Thant that the State Department was reluctant to enter into negotiations at that time because it feared the talks might result in the collapse of the South Vietnamese Government.

U Thant told Stevenson that the State Department might or might not be correct. After all, six governments had already collapsed in Saigon. But if the best way of ending the war was at the peace table, then it would seem axiomatic that this need should come first. Stevenson could only repeat that he had conveyed the position of his government as he understood it. Several days later, the United States began systematic bombing of North Vietnam. The rationale for the bombing was that it was necessary to increase pressure on Hanoi to persuade it to come to the peace table.

President Johnson listened with visibly increasing concern to U Thant's account of the failure of the United States to take advantage of the kind of initiative he was now, in 1966, strongly urging upon the Secretary General. He said this episode was a new book to him and that he was hearing about it for the first time. The President turned to Dean Rusk and asked whether he had knowledge of the matter. Rusk replied that Stevenson had not been authorized to reject the negotiations. He did not say, however, whether Stevenson had been authorized to accept them. Nor did he say why the State Department had not acted promptly and affirmatively when Stevenson first reported in September, 1964, Hanoi's willingness to have exploratory talks.

Some time later, Rusk asserted in a separate conversation with U Thant that the United States had received word from the Canadian representative on the International Control Commission in Vietnam to the effect that Hanoi had no interest in secret talks with the United States. This statement, however, was not supported by the Canadians.

The terrifying question, of course, that emerges from this episode is whether it is conceivable that the President would not be informed by his own State Department of a development of such obvious significance. The bombing of North Vietnam was one of the most crucial decisions in the history of American foreign policy. That decision, the American people were given to understand, was the direct result of North Vietnamese intransigence in the matter of a nonmilitary settlement. Many observers feel the decision to start the bombing resulted in the expansion and prolongation of the war, costing many thousands of lives. Why was the President not informed of an event that might have averted this terrible consequence? What makes the matter all the more ominous is that this occasion was only one of several in which chances for establishing peace were passed over or mismanaged. I have firsthand knowledge of two of these occasions.

On December 1, 1965, I received a telephone call from Jack Valenti, President Johnson's assistant, asking me to come to the White House. At his office the next day, Valenti said the President hoped I might suggest some ideas for the State of the Union message. I replied that I would be honored to do so.

Valenti then gave me a briefing on the President's ideas on major questions of domestic and foreign policy, with special reference to Vietnam. I was impressed by the detailed recital of our position on Vietnam. Any settlement in Vietnam would have to take into account the future security and stability of the area. The President had ruled out as adding to the risk of world nuclear war the pursuit of military victory through overwhelming force. He believed in the need for a negotiated peace, but he also believed that Hanoi would be extremely reluctant to get into negotiations if it thought the United States would quit out of sheer fatigue or indifference.

Valenti detailed his private conversations with the President to buttress his point that the President's major objective was to get the U.S. out of Vietnam under conditions of stability and honor. I agreed to work on a draft and to submit a text within a fortnight.

On December 13, something happened that enabled me to put to good use the information Jack Valenti had given me. Bohdan Lewandowski, Polish Ambassador to the United Nations, had dinner with me in New York. Lewandowski said his government was eager to be useful in bringing about talks in Vietnam but that some questions had been raised as to whether the United States actually wanted a negotiated peace or intended to press for a military solution.

I drew heavily upon Valenti's briefing (without identifying the source of my information) to provide substantial evidence of U.S. sincerity in seeking a negotiated peace. The Ambassador said he found my recital convincing and then added that he was sorry that the government leaders in Hanoi couldn't have heard it too. I told the Ambassador I would be most happy to go anywhere, including Hanoi, for the purpose of repeating what I had just told him if he felt it would have even the most remote usefulness.

The Ambassador replied that a mission to Hanoi for this purpose might indeed be desirable—all the more so in view of my unofficial status. Ever since the end of the Second World War, both the United States and the Soviet Union had relied on private missions to clear the way for more traditional approaches.

The next day, I spoke to William P. Bundy, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, and told him of my conversation with Lewandowski. He encouraged me to take advantage of any other similar openings to put across the idea that the United States was pursuing a policy of limited warfare and was genuinely eager to end the war through a political rather than military settlement.

On December 22, 1965, I received a telephone call from the White House. Valenti and Bill Moyers were on separate extensions. Valenti said the President wanted me to go to the Far East with Vice President Hubert Humphrey to represent President Johnson at the inauguration of President Ferdinand E. Marcos of the Philippines. I would also accompany the Vice President on a special mission to Japan, Korea and Taiwan. Moyers said the White House wanted to encourage me to take private soundings to find out what I could about the readiness of Hanoi to start talks. I agreed to go.

In Tokyo, I saw a member of the House of Councillors of Japan, Kanichi Nishimura, who had recently returned from Cambodia and North Vietnam. He had had an audience with Prince Sihanouk, who had said the only solution for the Vietnam war was a policy of complete neutrality for Cambodia, Laos and South Vietnam, in the spirit of the Geneva agreements.

In Hanoi, the Rev. Mr. Nishimura had seen President Ho Chi Minh and brought up his conversation with Prince Sihanouk in Cambodia. Ho Chi Minh then indicated that he didn't think the Prince went far enough; he believed that North Vietnam should be included in the neutralization. Mr. Nishimura asked whether this meant that the United States would be expected to withdraw all its forces from South Vietnam. Ho Chi Minh didn't seem to think this was necessary right away, so long as the fixed purpose of the United States was to support the neutrality of all Vietnam, North and South.

On January 3, we returned to Washington and reported to the President. The Vice President told of his conversations with Asian leaders. He reported the emphasis he had given to the importance placed by the President on nonmilitary approaches to Asian problems, not only in Vietnam but everywhere. The Vice President said he had stressed the commitment of the United States to upgrading the prospects for a better life for the peoples of Asian nations.

The President said he was especially pleased that the Vice President had emphasized this point. Everyone knows about the Vietnam war, the President said; very few seem to know about the Asian Development Bank and its potential for rebuilding and developing large parts of Asia. Even our allies sometimes fail to appreciate the importance of the Bank; when the President had spoken to Prime Minister Harold Wilson and Chancellor Ludwig Erhard recently, the first point he made was that he expected them to increase their contributions to the Bank.

The President went on to state that one of the difficulties we had to face frankly was that Ho Chi Minh still didn't believe we were sincere when we said we wanted to talk. North Vietnam didn't want to commit itself until it was sure. Everything possible, said the President, should be done to convince them we meant business. I reported on my

XUM

meeting with Mr. Nishimura. The President then said that we should continue to do everything we could to get across to North Vietnam the idea that the United States was ready to explore every opening that gave promise of a nonmilitary end to the war.

A week later, I met with Ambassador Lewandowski, who asked whether anything had happened on my trip to change my view that the United States was genuinely interested in getting to the peace table. I said my conviction had actually been strengthened. The Ambassador said this was fortuitous because he had come with good news; he had just received word that Hanoi would be happy to have me meet with a representative of the North Vietnam Government for the purpose of having me, as a private citizen, bear witness to the good faith of the President in seeking negotiations. The proposed date and place for the meeting would be made known to me before too long, he said.

I telephoned Valenti who asked that I come to the White House the next day. He took me to see McGeorge Bundy, Special Assistant to the President for National Security, who had been tagged in some liberal circles as a hawk on Vietnam. It didn't take me very long to recognize that the designation was inaccurate. Bundy was the principal opponent in the White House of the view often pressed upon the President that the United States should use maximum force in Vietnam.

It quickly became apparent in Bundy's questioning that he wanted to arrive at a precise calibration of the events that led up to Hanoi's willingness to see me. Was this the result of my own initiative or of Lewandowski's? Actually, I said, it was the product of an interaction of ideas addressed to a simple question: "How serious was Washington about negotiations?" Bundy said the White House would give me all the information that might be useful on my trip and asked that I notify him as soon as I had specific word from the Poles.

On January 27, I received a telephone call from Eugene Wyzner, Deputy to Ambassador Lewandowski. We met within the hour. Wyzner said that the Ambassador was now in Warsaw and had just cabled him that Hanoi was now ready to have its representative meet with me at my earliest convenience. I could select the place for the meeting from any of the diplomatic stations that North Vietnam maintained anywhere in the world. He indicated, in response to my question, that the Polish Government would be happy to facilitate arrangements if the site selected were Warsaw. I asked whether he considered the message from Hanoi as a sign that North Vietnam was ready to move toward negotiations. He said his own view was that Hanoi would not wish to see me unless there was a strong probability it was also prepared to move to more formal approaches.

When I telephoned Valenti, he said he would call me back shortly. Fifteen minutes later, he asked that I come to Washington immediately and that I pack my bag for a trip to Warsaw.

The next morning, Valenti told me of several other recent probes indicating that Hanoi might be ready to start talking. Unfortunately, he said, as soon as Washington pursued these indications, they tended to dissolve. Therefore, the White House was now very careful to avoid giving Hanoi the impression that it could vibrate the President or reduce his options. It was important that Hanoi should not think it could get the United States to extend indefinitely the bombing halt then in existence just by teasing us with negotiation come-ons.

Obviously, I said, this was a matter for the Government to decide. But I said I thought it might be useful at least to pursue the matter.

At this point, Bundy entered the room. He said he feared that Hanoi's response on the matter of my visit might be too little and too late. There was a strong feeling inside the Government that "the string had run out," he said. Bundy was then called out of the room to see the President.

I told Valenti that it seemed apparent from the conversation that a decision had been made to resume the bombing. I also said that the President had publicly announced that he was looking for some sign, however vague or slight, that Hanoi wanted to get into negotiations. Could we say for sure that we did not now have such a sign? The history of dealing with the Communist nations showed that private approaches not infrequently opened the way to more consequential exchanges. Valenti said that we had to take into account that the President had just been through an episode originating in India that resulted in a prolongation of the bombing halt, only to discover that Hanoi was somewhat less ready to talk than had been indicated. The President should not be exposed to another such false start.

Bundy returned to the room and said he wondered whether there was some way of getting me into and out of Warsaw during the next 48 hours. That sounded very much as though the decision to resume the bombing by Monday had already been made, I said. Bundy said he was unable to give me any definite word on that; but it was a serious error to suppose the bombing halt would be continued indefinitely without respect to other major factors bearing on the course of the war. He recognized, however, that there might be some value in getting through to Hanoi the view that a resumption of bombing, if it did occur, certainly did not mean that essential U.S. policy about limited war had changed, or that we were not still interested in serious negotiations.

I said I wasn't sure I could be very persuasive under those circumstances. How could I get North Vietnam to believe that the purpose of the bombing halt was to probe for peace if the bombing were resumed just after it indicated a desire to undertake preliminary conversations?

Bundy was called out of the room again.

I told Valenti I thought it was tragic that the President should be deprived of what might well be the success of his policy. The President hadn't said the response from Hanoi had to take any particular form. It could be very slight. We now had a response. It was indirect, but how could it be ignored?

Valenti agreed that no opening should be ignored. Then he asked me to follow him, and he took me to the conference room next to the President's office and asked me to wait for a few minutes. When he returned, he said that I should telephone Wyzner immediately and tell him I was leaving that night for Warsaw and would be prepared to meet with the representative from Hanoi some time tomorrow afternoon or early evening.

Later, in the conference room, I had a long meeting with Ambassador Goldberg, who asked for a full recital of the events to date. He agreed that no sign should go unexplored, but that the feeling was now very strong that it was necessary to have something far more definite than a statement of willingness to meet with a private American citizen if the halt were to be extended. If Hanoi were really serious about getting into talks, it would have found some way of getting word to one of the President's representatives on their various missions, he said.

It was possible, I said, that Hanoi was skittish about going through official channels.

Ambassador Goldberg was completely candid and forthright. He said that he did not think my proposed trip to Warsaw would be propitious or fruitful. This confirmed my fear that a hard decision to resume the bombing had already been made. I asked the Ambassador whether he felt anything could be done to forestall resumption. At this late date, he said, he believed that only specific word direct from Hanoi unmistakably indicating a desire to get into talks could change the present course.

I said that I would immediately cancel the arrangements for my meeting in Warsaw.

Two and a half hours later, in New York, I met with Wyzner. I was as diplomatic as possible in telling him of Washington's feeling that a more direct and substantial indication of Hanoi's willingness to enter into or explore negotiations was now in order.

Everyone knew, Wyzner said, that Hanoi felt it had been tricked before and that it feared the U.S. had declared the bombing pause only because we were more concerned about propaganda than about a genuine strategy for peace. He felt Washington had underestimated the significance of the step Hanoi had taken in being willing to see me.

I told Wyzner that the situation now called for a substantive indication by Hanoi of a desire to move on the official level.

Wyzner had received word that Ho Chi Minh had drafted a letter to Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri of India, with copies to concerned heads of state throughout the world. This letter, if read correctly, was directly responsive to the questions I had raised earlier in the day, he said. It was intended also to respond to points made by Ambassador-at-Large Averell Harriman in his visit to Warsaw two weeks earlier. Wyzner asked me to convey the following message to Washington:

Foreign Minister Adam Rapacki [of Poland] wishes to call attention to the letter from Ho Chi Minh appearing this morning [January 29, 1966] in the New York *Times*. He understands there may be a disposition by Washington to interpret the letter as containing nothing essentially new since it repeats a position stated previously. However, the same paragraph asking for acceptance of Hanoi's four points also contains a major phrase, which properly read, provides the key to something essentially new in Hanoi's position. In particular, this paragraph says: 'If the U.S. Government really wants a peaceful settlement, it must accept the four-point stand of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam Government and prove this by actual deeds.' The key words in this sentence are not the reference to the four points, but the reference to 'actual deeds.'

"What is meant by 'actual deeds'? The next paragraph in the letter is vital, for it refers to the need to end the bombing. This means that a resumption of the bombing would destroy the possibility of talks, while a continuation of the suspension of the bombing will lead to talks. Herein lies the key to Ho Chi Minh's letter. This paragraph should be regarded as the implicit and specific indication of Hanoi's intention to begin talks. . . ."

The letter also said: "All openings should be seized at this time for such contacts, including the contact with [Norman Cousins]."

I said I could speak only as a private individual, but I was deeply concerned by the use of the term "must accept" in Ho Chi Minh's letter. After all, the United States was not demanding that Hanoi *accept* in advance our own position. The purpose of negotiations was to arrive at agreements, not to endorse fixed positions.

I telephoned Valenti, who took the message down word for word. He, too, reacted sharply when we came to the words "must accept." If Hanoi holds to this position, he said, it is difficult to see how negotiations can be possible."

Wyzner telephoned to say that he had sent through the message calling off my Warsaw meeting but that a request had just been received asking that the meeting be rescheduled. I conveyed this message to Valenti and was told that the North Vietnamese representative should communicate directly with U.S. Ambassador John A. Gronouski.

I suggested to Valenti that I believed I should remove myself from the discussions at this point. I told him I would like to tell the Poles that it was unnecessary for me to be involved in further discussions and that the regular diplomatic channels ought to be used. I don't want to be in a position where any failure of mine to convey precise shadows of meaning might lead to an erroneous impression.

Valenti told me not to remove myself at this point, but to continue on the same basis so long as the Poles or others wished to maintain this contact. After all, my involvement was a natural one, taking into account the trip with the Vice President to the Far East.

Early on Sunday, January 30, Wyzner telephoned. Clarification about the use of the words "must accept" in Ho Chi Minh's letter had now come from North Vietnam. The letter had been translated from the French. In the original, the term *"doit reconnaitre"* had been used. Both *doit* and *reconnaitre* have several meanings. *Doit* could mean *must*. It could also mean *should* or *ought*. *Reconnaitre* could mean *accept*. It could also mean *recognize* or *consider*. Unfortunately, the meaning farthest removed from the original intention appeared in translation. Ho Chi Minh had intended his letter to say that the United States *ought to consider* certain positions as a basis for negotiations. There was no intention to issue an ultimatum. It was expected that Washington would also state a position that it wished the other side to consider.

It was Sunday afternoon. Valenti was out. So was McGeorge Bundy. So was Goldberg. So was Harriman. I left messages for all four. Late in the afternoon, I was able to reach Vice President Humphrey in West Virginia. He said he would telephone the White House to urge reconsideration.

Early that evening, Valenti and Bundy returned the call. They said the new information from Wyzner would be passed along. I was told that Goldberg would call me if there were any reply to give Wyzner.

The call from Ambassador Goldberg came near midnight. He said he didn't think the additional information about the correct meaning in Ho Chi Minh's letter had changed Washington's decision to resume the bombing.

When would the bombing start, I asked.

He said the order has already gone out.

It was shattering news. I told Goldberg I hoped he would communicate personally with the President in an effort to have the bombing order rescinded. Once the bombing started, no one knew how long it would take or mow many lives would be lost before we worked our way back to where we were now.

Goldberg said the decision was made and was only a few hours away from being put into effect.

At seven the next morning, I turned on my radio and heard the news that the bombing had been resumed. Later, the statement was made that we had hoped for some indication from Hanoi of a positive response to the halt in the bombing.

Almost one year to the day later, I learned about another abortive effort to get negotiations started. On November 15, 1966, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge had met in Saigon with Janusz Lewandowski, the Polish representative on the International Control Commission, at the home of the Italian Ambassador. Lodge presented ten points covering the American position on Vietnam. The Polish Ambassador reviewed them fully and said he was prepared to put them before Hanoi.

Lewandowski flew to Hanoi and had a series of meetings with the North Vietnamese leaders. He said that the United States had offered to stop the bombing if it had any assurance that the cessation would lead to some reciprocal measure or would open the way to peace talks. He said he was convinced that once Ho Chi Minh agreed to hold exploratory talks, the United States would demonstrated its good faith by stopping the bombing.

Finally, Ho Chi Minh agreed to withdraw his demand for an unconditional halt to the bombings. He would send emissaries to meet secretly with the Americans. Warsaw was acceptable as a site. The United States would not be committed to halt the bombing while arrangements for the meeting were being pursued. North Vietnam was given to understand that, at an appropriate time, the bombing would be discontinued.

On November 29, 1966, Lewandowski gave Lodge the good news that his mission had been successful. Lodge thanked Lewandowski for the Polish Government's intercession. A few days alter, the outskirts of Hanoi were bombed for the first time. Ho Chi Minh informed Poland that the projected talks, of course, were cancelled.

Lewandowski relayed to Ambassador Lodge the distressed feelings of the Polish Government. Lodge begged Lewandowski to believe that the bombing of Hanoi was an error. The authorization for extending the bombing had been given some ten days earlier, but no one had thought to cancel the authorization in the light of the new developments.

The message about the error was communicated to Hanoi. The talks were rescheduled. On December 13 and 14, the city of Hanoi was bombed again.

At first, the United States denied that the bombing had taken place, then attributed it to pilot error. Goldberg was asked by the President to persuade Poland to intercede on our behalf again. It was no use. Hanoi had made up its mind that any interest it might show in peace talks would result in an extension of the destruction.

How could a military decision to bomb Hanoi—if it were in fact a military decision—be allowed to supersede and destroy a decision, made at the highest political level, to bring about negotiations? To what extent do military decisions in the field force the hand of the President? These questions call for discussion and debate.

It is difficult to see how the ordeal of Vietnam can be brought to an end unless the American people themselves are given straight answers by their Government about the war—and unless the Government itself is united in the determination to seek peace through negotiations.

It may be asked why I have waited until now to put down all these notes. I feared that the effect of anything I might write on the subject would weaken even further the chances for peace talks, by reinforcing Hanoi's view that the United States did not have a consistent and unswerving policy for ending the war through a nonmilitary settlement.

But a new Administration is now in office, with new options, new opportunities, new responsibilities. These advantages, however, can fade quickly if U.S. policy and action come off separate spools.

The strength of U.S. foreign policy depends not on force alone but on the genuineness of our purposes, on an outlook unsmudged by cynicism, on our ability to be understood and believed in the world, and on the pursuit of goals that have to do with the making of a better world.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS) has the floor for a period of 30 minutes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, only for the purpose of having a brief quorum call?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nebraska may yield for the purpose of having a brief quorum call, without losing the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the Senator from Nebraska has the floor for 30 minutes.

THE SURTAX

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I rise to speak concerning the financial crisis facing our country.

The imposing of taxes is never a pleasant or easy task for Congress to perform. It has been my observation, however, that the American people are very much concerned. The American people love their country. They want the fiscal policy of their country to be sound, and they will reward those who speak and vote for fiscal responsibility. Although the notion I have just expressed might be contrary to what many people might consider to be the fact, I believe there is a very good reason why it is true.

If we permit the deficits to go on, if we continue to spend money beyond the amount of our receipts, it is all the people who will suffer. If there is one program in the entire operation of the Government that is totally bipartisan, it is the collecting of taxes and the spending of the money. If the affairs of our country are so conducted that our budget is brought into balance and the dollar is stabilized and maintains its purchasing power, who benefits? Everyone. All the people benefit, regardless of their political beliefs or persuasions.

On the other hand, if the fiscal policy of our country is not on a sound course, if deficits continue, if foreign nations lack confidence toward the United States, who suffers? Everybody does. Individuals of every political belief and every persuasion suffer when we have runaway inflation.

Mr. President, it was my high privilege to serve for 10 years on the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives. I have a very high regard for that committee. It carries a tremendous burden. I regard the chairman of that committee, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, as one of the great men of our time.

On that committee falls the responsibility, for the most part, of initiating tax programs. The members of that committee do not have the opportunity to pass out benefits, usually, but they have the responsibility of receiving recommendations from the Treasury Department, hearing the testimony of individuals and representatives of American industry, and then deciding what must be done for the good of the economy of our country.

The Ways and Means Committee reported out, and the House of Representatives passed, a tax bill, H.R. 12290. There is involved in this tax bill about $9 billion of revenue. If we do not pass this bill, the deficit will increase by about that much.

The amount of revenue involved in this bill alone equals as much as was spent annually by the entire Government up until the late 1930's; and even after its enactment, if we disregard trust funds, we will still be operating at a deficit. Is it any wonder that there is an uneasiness in the country? Is it any wonder that foreign financial institutions look upon the United States and ask the question, "Does Uncle Sam have the courage and the fortitude to set his financial house in order?"

Mr. President, I believe that Uncle Sam has the courage and the fortitude to do that. I believe that the Senate will do what the House of Representatives has already done: face up to the proposition that our expenses are great, that a costly war is going on, and that we have commitments to our own people, to States, and to localities, involving all manner of programs. Some may think there are too many of them, as I do. But they are here. They were voted in by a majority vote. The question now is, shall we pay the bill?

The great issue before the U.S. Senate today is whether we shall pass this bill involving about $9 billion in revenue, and thus say to our own people, who are feeling the inflation, "We are taking this important step to lessen the deficit, to move toward putting our financial house in order, for the good of all the people."

When the Senate passes this bill and sends it to the President, we will be saying to every nation in the world, "You will not make a mistake if you follow Uncle Sam."

We will be saying to the nations of the world, "It is not true that the United States will spend itself to death as has been predicted by the Communist spokesmen."

Oh, Mr. President, this is not a partisan proposal. This is not a matter that should ever get into political controversy. Whether the United States stands or falls financially will redound to the credit of the people who have the courage to say no when they can on expenditures and have the courage to say, "Here the expenditures are; we will impose sufficient taxes to pay the bill."

If we fail to do that, if the uneasiness continues, if inflation continues to run rampant, and if the cost of living continues to increase, it will not be borne by any one class of people. It will be borne by all of the people of the country. Therefore, I believe that in due course, and before we depart for the summer recess, the Senate should—and the Senate will—pass a bill which extends the surtax and repeals the investment credit.

We cannot, of course, take action that involves $9 billion in revenue without having some rough spots. Perhaps there will be some amendments that will make the transition better and provide more equity. These should be considered, but in the main the important business before the Senate at this time is to rise to its responsibility, as did the House of Representatives, and pass a bill that will provide revenue and save our country from financial disaster.

Mr. **MUNDT**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **CURTIS**. I am happy to yield.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. **MUNDT**. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to what the Senator has had to say about the tax bill and the controversy which has revolved around it.

Along with other Members of the Senate, I have great respect for the ability of the Senator from Nebraska in this field of fiscal policy. He is one of the few Senators who has served not only on the Ways and Means Committee of the House, but also on the Finance Committee of the Senate.

So, down through the past three decades, he has had an opportunity shared by very few of the other Members of either the House or the Senate.

As I understand the situation, the controversy which we confront, or the delay which is apparently being instigated, revolves around the timing of the passage of the bill. I have not heard many say they will oppose it. There are some amendments which may need to be added, as the Senator suggested. However, I have heard no one say, "I will turn my back on the obligation."

The discussion in the Senate today has indicated that for reasons best known to itself, the Democratic policy committee has voted, I think the majority leader said unanimously, to delay consideration and action on the package which came from the House.

I ask the Senator from Nebraska if he thinks that time indeed is of the essence. Does it make any real difference whether we act on the House package and finalize it and make the law definite next week, 2 weeks from now, or a month from now, or delay action until October or November?

Does the Senator feel there is a significance attached to our action on the package?

Mr. **CURTIS**. Mr. President, in response to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota I believe that it is not only important that we act very soon, but it is also important that within the last 2 days the Secretary of the Treasury appeared before the Finance Committee and stated it was important that all of the sensitive situations involving interest rates, inflation, the difficulty of Government borrowing, and our dealings with foreign countries hinge on this measure and that it should not be delayed.

Further, and this is in a sense in defense of the Democratic policy committee, they have really expressed an interest in tax reform. And I believe that the vast majority of Senators want tax reform.

I do disagree with the contention that the best way to bring that about is to delay the bill and add to the crises we are facing in the hope that somehow that will bring about tax reform.

I am thoroughly convinced that we will have two bills. The Ways and Means Committee is committed to it. They have been holding hearings for weeks. I am satisfied that the majority of the Members of the Senate want tax reform.

I have in my hand the Treasury Department's proposals for tax reform. It is a sizable document. The pages are not numbered consecutively. However, the document consists of at least 100 pages typewritten on both sides.

Some of the things they have directed their attention to are limitation of tax preferences, allocation of deductions, relief for poverty level taxpayers, mineral production payments, private foundations, curbing of abuses in debt financing of acquisitions, expansion of taxation of income from unrelated business and from investments of certain organizations—we did something on that in 1950—revision of charitable contribution deductions, corporate securities, multiple corporations, farm proposal, treatment of accelerated depreciation by public utilities, stock dividends, consistency of capital gains and loss rules, restricted stock plans, taxation of income accumulated trusts, and on and on.

These are important matters that deserve attention. Practically every one of them relates to a section of the code that has been the law for 20, 30, or 40 years. Business has adjusted to it. Municipalities have adjusted to it.

It would be unthinkable to make broad changes in these measures without exhaustive hearings and without an opportunity being afforded to all sides to be heard.

The way to bring about tax reform is through the usual channels of thorough committee hearings, collaboration with the Treasury Department, and then making a determined effort to do justice and spread the burden as equitably as possible.

Mr. **MUNDT**. Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator calls attention to the significance of the action of the Democratic policy committee to delay this very essential passage of the House package.

It is an understandable desire which I think is shared by all Senators, that we should have tax reform legislation in this session of Congress.

The Senator is a member of the Finance Committee and is privileged to a lot of information concerning the various attitudes of members of the committee to a degree not shared by those of us who are not members of the committee.

Can the Senator tell us whether a recalcitrant group of members of the Finance Committee is determined to deny tax reform legislation this year, so that in his opinion it becomes justifiable for the Democratic policy committee, a strictly partisan element in the Senate, to take the unprecedented attitude of making a partisan issue out of an economic problem? Does he feel that this kind of whiplash from the Democratic leadership is needed in order to get tax reform legislation out of the committee?

Mr. CURTIS. No, I do not. I believe that the tax burden is so great upon all individuals and upon all business concerns that all reasonable people want to see justice done and the burden spread as evenly as possible.

I do not disagree with any group that has come out strong for tax reform. I do contend that to make a determined drive to link tax reform with this revenue bill could very well deny passage of the revenue bill for a long, long time, add to the confusion and to the financial crisis, and end up in not very much tax reform. This is because we have to deal with the other body and because the business of tax reform is a hard, tedious job which takes considerable time.

I have heard of tax relief being used as a weapon to get tax reform passed, at a time when taxes are about to be reduced, to incorporate in the bill some reforms that need to be passed which are a little distasteful. That is understandable.

I agree with the policy committee's position that we need tax reform. I disagree with their contention that the way to get it done is to tie it to the revenue bill, or, in other words, hold up the revenue bill until you get it.

Mr. MUNDT. This is so unusual and so unprecedented that I am trying to find out why the Democratic policy committee has done it.

Mr. CURTIS. I think they acted in totally good faith.

Mr. MUNDT. I know the members; they are friends of mine; I like them individually. To me, it is almost unprecedented that they would apply this kind of legislative blackmail to the chairman of the Committee on Finance and the Finance Committee itself, without some good reason. That is why I asked the Senator from Nebraska whether he, being privy to what goes on within the secret confines of the committee, senses that there is a rebellion there against tax reform measures which could justify this unprecedented action by a partisan group.

Mr. CURTIS. No, I think not. There will always be disagreement on tax reform.

Mr. MUNDT. Everyone has different ideas, of course.

Mr. CURTIS. We are affected by the type of economy around us, sometimes a geographical interest, and otherwise. But that has to be.

Mr. MUNDT. I do not think the policy committee said, "You have to bring out a bill that has the kind of tax reform which we specifically desire." It seems to me that, somehow or other, they question the good faith of the Committee on Finance in reporting any kind of tax reform legislation at all. They did not go so far as to say, "Unless you have tax reform legislation which includes a, b, c, and d, which we want, we will not let the Senate vote on the House package." All they said is that there must be a tax reform bill reported by the committee.

Is there good reason to doubt that the committee is going to report some kind of tax reform package?

Mr. CURTIS. I think they will. As I said earlier, the Ways and Means Committee is committed to it; the Treasury Department has spelled out its recommendations; the chairman has announced his intention to hold hearings.

I wish to stress this: It is tax reform that is enacted that counts, not a tax proposal that might pass one body or the other and get no further. I believe that the orderly way to get tax reform, the sure way to get tax reform, is in cooperation with the other body—not that we surrender our rights, but that we cooperate with them.

Mr. MUNDT. Is the Senator saying that he believes there is a better likelihood of getting tax reform legislation finalized in this session of Congress by going along with the pattern already cut by the House, to take its package now, so far as the surtax is concerned, and its associated reform, and then work together, as two branches of Congress, on the other aspects of a tax reform bill? Is the Senator saying that there is greater likelihood of getting it that way than if we try to merge the measures someplace along the line?

Mr. CURTIS. I think that is true. If we hold up this bill, which would raise the revenue, until after the August recess, and then entertain all manner of tax reform amendments to it, I think we would prolong the raising of the revenue and injure our country and fan the fires of inflation. But, in addition, I think we would be less likely to get some important tax reform actually enacted.

Mr. MUNDT. Speaking of tax reform, there is a tax reform I should like to see added to the surtax package, if, as, and when we are permitted to vote upon it on the floor of the Senate.

While I share the general disposition to repeal the 7-percent tax forgiveness, I feel that there is an element in our economy which needs some kind of stimulus, even in this era of prosperity. I think the Senator will recognize this, because he comes from a rural part of America, as does the Senator from South Dakota.

Wherever there are small towns in America today and wherever there are small businessmen in America today, struggling to maintain a viable economy in this era of high interest rates, mergers, conglomerates, and stiffened competition, it seems to me that we should give some consideration in our tax reform legislation to trying to stimulate economic activity in an area which needs stimulation, just as we try to slow down a little the economic activity in other areas where, because it is whirling so rapidly, it helps feed the fires of inflation.

So I have offered and propose to call up an amendment to the surtax bill which proposes to exempt the first $25,000 for every taxpayer from being applied and applicable to the 7-percent tax suspension repeal. It seems to me that when a farmer—who still is the only worker in this economy who is struggling along for less than anything remotely resembling an honest day's pay and who, as a class, is the only element in our country still operating at a parity of less than 75 percent—buys a big tractor and has to pay all the rising costs of inflation in that involvement, granting him suspension of taxation to the extent of 7 percent on the first $25,000 of his purchase still makes good sense. Also, a businessman in a small town, who has to put in expensive equipment, should still be enabled to get the benefit of a 7-percent tax deduction on the first $25,000. That also makes good sense. I do not believe it would materially affect the overall results so far as the impact on inflation is concerned.

Mr. CURTIS. I might say that this bill, which was reported by the Committee on Finance, extends the 10 percent surtax, and the other important revenue-raising matter is that it repeals the 7 percent investment credit.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, for everybody.

Mr. CURTIS. It would be my guess that amendments dealing with those two things probably could and should be considered on the floor of the Senate. There is the matter of timing, there is the phaseout, there is the question of what to do about small business, and so forth.

What I am suggesting is not that they take the bill as is, without dotting an "i" or crossing a "t," as passed by the House and reported by the Committee on Finance. I do not believe anyone is trying to shut off debate or amendments to that extent, so that the big overall problem of tax reform, dealing with so many amendments, will not be merged in this bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is speaking about tax reform measures extraneous to what the House has done?

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator is correct. What the distinguished Senator mentioned is certainly germaine to this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, of course, I would beg the Senator to leave it at that because I have been waiting all afternoon and I have appointments with Cabinet people.

Mr. CURTIS. Very well. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Ten minutes is satisfactory.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MISSILE TEST FACILITIES AT KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE, AND RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTH

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2546) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of air-

XUM

craft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the selected reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

THE SURTAX

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I merely wish to say that it seems to me that the most urgent tax legislation before the Senate and before the country is the passage of this bill involving some $9 billion in revenue. If we fail to pass it, our deficit increases by that much. I believe that the wisest political course is that course which is geared to sound fiscal policy. I believe that the best political vote one can cast in the Senate is a vote that is for the good of our country. I think that to neglect this measure to provide needed revenue to meet expenditures would not be for the benefit of the country.

Mr. President, I would leave this further thought. The experience I have had in the tax-writing committees in the Senate and in the House of Representatives leads me to the firm belief that we will end up with more real tax reform enacted into law if we proceed along the lines suggested, and the course that has already been started by the House, of enacting the revenue bill and then giving our attention to tax reform, tackling these hard problems, listening to the witnesses, and doing our utmost to do justice and to spread this heavy burden as equally and as equitably as we can among the various taxpayers of the country.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I would simply like to summarize what I have been trying to say on my position. I think the economic situation is far too serious to permit politics to be injected in this question. I think any political party or any segment of a political party assuming the responsibility for delay of consideration of the tax matter, when the stock market is dropping day by day and there are all kinds of dangerous signs flickering in our overall economy, would be unnecessarily gambling with the future of our country. I cannot believe that is going to take place in the Senate.

I note that the Democratic policy committee is going to meet next Tuesday to reconsider this matter, and I hope they will come up with some kind of approach to enable the Senate to do its duty to avoid what could be a financial crisis in this country. I have enough confidence to believe the Democraitc policy committee is not going to want to assume such a direct and heavy responsibility in a dark hour like this.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I commend the able and distinguished Senator from Nebraska for a masterful presentation on this subject. I have had the pleasure of serving with the distinguished Senator from Nebraska since I have been in the Senate. He has impressed me as being one of the best-informed men in this country on financial matters.

His position that we should pass this tax bill at this time without attempting to bring about tax reform certainly seems to be a sound approach. His position that we should later consider tax reforms would appear to be a sound approach also. I feel this is a very important matter. It means a great deal to this country. We have had a balanced budget in this country in only 7 years of the last 39 years. In my opinion, we cannot fail to take the necessary steps to preserve the finance of our country.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator.

I yield the floor.

TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I felt it my duty to speak today on the issue of taxation which has been much debated. The issue was debated today by the majority leader, the minority whip, the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Curtis), who is a member of the Committee on Finance, and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Mundt), one of our distinguished senior Members, who is also a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and other committees.

I wish to speak on this matter today because I am deeply concerned whenever a struggle over money threatens to be divided along liberal and conservative lines. Inasmuch as I am generally identified with the liberal point of view in this Chamber, and I am very proud of it, I thought it particularly important that I speak on this issue.

Mr. President, it will be remembered that on a previous occasion when we first passed the surtax, by an entirely fortuitous circumstance the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Williams) and I both sought the floor at the same time, although we had not concerted our views, in order to urge Congress to act. We believe we brought about action at that time which would not have been brought about.

It is in the same spirit of responsibility—and coming from an area of the country which is the center of business and finance, both national and international; that is, New York—that I speak today.

I believe it is essential that we should pass a law extending the surtax. I believe also that in order to do that it is necessary to consider the House bill as it came over here. That does not mean the House bill is holy and cannot be touched. I do not agree with that, as the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Curtis) just said. But if we are going to make changes, it should be within that general context rather than by endeavoring to have it as the vehicle also for a tax reform bill. I shall lend myself to that purpose, at the same time presenting to the Senate the opportunity to make this, for political purposes, a tax reform bill, by including in it an amendment which reads as follows:

It would be entitled "Sense of the Congress Concerning Tax Reform." It would provide:

> It is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that passage of this Act commits the Congress to consider and enact meaningful tax reform at its earliest practicable opportunity and in any event before the close of the first session of the 91st Congress.

Mr. President, in using the word "meaningful," I am aware of the fact that there is some dispute in the press—which I cannot understand because I do not think it has any validity—about whether that word includes a reduction of the oil depletion allowance and a general method of treating oil extraction. I am for such reduction. I have voted for it many times. It is contained in my own tax reform bill and I shall favor it again. I consider the world "meaningful" to include precisely that concept, and many others, such as the concept of a minimum income tax, the concept of a realization in tax terms of capital gains upon the death of a person holding securities, and so on. There are many other tax reforms which I favor.

Mr. President, a decision, expressed as that of the Senate Democratic policy committee, was announced recently by our esteemed colleague, Senator Mansfield, that would have critical consequences for this Nation, for the administration's battle against inflation, for our international balance-of-payments position and even for international confidence in the dollar.

I refer to Senator Mansfield's statement:

> It will not be possible to bring up the surtax extension prior to July 31.

The distinguished majority leader further said:

> There is no chance to consider and dispose of a tax bill containing extension of the surtax with the attendant amendments prior to July 31 or for that matter to August 13—the last day before the summer recess.

His reason for this is the decision not to bring up the surtax extension until a tax reform measure is simultaneously reported out of the Finance Committee and put on the Senate Calendar. This in turn probably means waiting for a tax reform bill to be forwarded to us from the House of Representatives. The consequences of this decision could put off the surtax extension—including such tax reforms as it contains—until the end of this session in December. The chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator Long, this week has publicly stated:

> To act *responsibly* on tax reform measures would require a wait until at least December or maybe until some time next year.

Mr. President, I regret this decision of the Democratic policy committee and feel that the indicated delay in the extension of the surtax will worsen the inflationary dangers threatening this Nation. Any delay in the extension of the surtax will be seen— by those whose decisions cause inflationary price and interest rate increases—as major evidence that the Congress is not willing to continue to take the steps necessary to halt the inflationary peril. It will also further strain the faith of Americans in the ability of their national leaders in Washington to restrain the spiraling cost of living.

Tax reform is an urgent problem and the inequities of our tax system must be rectified—and in this legislative session. I am as committed to these reforms as any Senator and have shown it in my votes on bills and amendments and my introduction of bills over all the years I have been here. And, it is my opinion that tax reform is an idea whose time has finally arrived and that it will be legislated in the very near future—it cannot be stopped now. But, if we delay the urgently needed surtax extension, whom are we holding hostage? We would be holding hostage only ourselves and the Nation. The opponents of tax reform will not be intimidated—but encouraged—if the surtax extension cannot be passed except with tax reform accompanying it. The reason is that those on the path of responsibility—including the administration—know they must have the surtax extension for fear of suffering an even worse penalty than no major tax reform—to wit: more inflation. Those who wish to block tax reform have selfish individual interests and do not carry the same sense of responsibility. Hence, it is we, rather than they, who would be at a disadvantage if a protracted delay on tax reform can really hold up the surtax extension. In short, such a "tieing" strategy would have a reverse and self-defeating effect, exactly the contrary to the Democratic policy committee's view as to its effect.

We have the impressive documentation of the Senate Democratic policy committee which was announced by the majority leader, saying that he will only put the extension or renewal of the income tax surcharge bill on the calendar if, at the same time, he has a tax reform bill to put on simultaneously. Obviously, he will not have that until the other body actually enacts a tax reform measure because, obviously, the Senate Finance Committee will not act until the other body has acted.

It seems to me, therefore, that this is a built-in means by which, at the very earliest, as I see it, I deeply believe there is a responsible timetable and we will be unable to extend the surtax until along about the end of November, perhaps even the beginning of December, but certainly not before the middle of November, considering the difficulties that there will be in tax reform and the tremendous controversy on every part of it.

Under these circumstances, the Democratic policy committee, being a representative body like the Republican, and like the Senate itself, I note will meet again. Therefore, I speak now, because I hope very much that the impact of my voice and that of many others, as well as the people of this country, will make itself felt with a body which I know will wish to follow the highest public interest, and will convince it that its decision was unwise in terms of the future of the country, and that it should agree with what the Finance Committee, though by a narrow margin, has in effect already done, which is to report the surtax bill and urge the Senate to deal with it promptly and pass it before we take our recess on August 13.

According to Senator MANSFIELD, the Democratic policy committee based its view in part on the consideration that "the only impact" which surcharge extension has on inflation is the slowdown effected by removing an added 10 percent of revenue from the private sector. In this regard, we are told that the committee felt that temporary extension of the surcharge pending enactment of a combined surtax-tax reform package "has the same effect on the economy as immediate passage" of the surcharge.

The key to the situation as outlined by Senator MANSFIELD is found in his use of the words "the only impact" and "has the same effect." In other words, if the temporary extension of the surtax is equivalent in the eyes of the American people, the American investors and the international community to immediate passage of the surtax, and these people act accordingly, then the Democratic policy committee is right. But if this is not so, and people are left in doubt by the proposed timetable and even question whether the surtax will be extended at all, then it is wrong and bad policy. I believe the latter to be the case and therefore urge that the surtax be promptly extended based upon the House-passed bill.

As supporting proof I point out what has happened in the financial and stock markets, which are depressed and demoralized due to what they consider to be uncertainty as to our determination to halt the inflationary spiral—one major evidence of which is delay in extending the surtax. I point also to the harmful effects upon the economy of the delay of the Johnson administration in recommending enactment of the surtax until almost a year after the economic indicators showed that the cost of the war in Vietnam made a tax increase critical to the health of the economy. Finally, I ask members themselves to ascertain the views of U.S. and world business and financial leaders and economic thinkers and I believe they will find that the overwhelming sentiment favors immediate extension of the surtax as the principal step we must take now to sustain world confidence in our determination to restrain inflation and keep the dollar strong.

I realize fully the frustrations that many of the citizens of this Nation are feeling. These frustrations are reflected in the Congress. The previous administration, after following a guns and butter policy since 1965, then fed the expectation that passage of the surtax would cool the inflationary fires which are so rapidly consuming our incomes. Almost a year has passed since the passage of the surtax, but we still have seen little relief from rising inflationary pressures. I can understand that our burdened taxpayer may have the feeling of being deceived—a feeling that the extra tax he is paying is not having any effect on halting the price spiral affecting the cost of food, meat, gasoline, services, and rent and mortgage interest, just to mention a few. I can understand the "tax revolt" particularly when the income of most Americans is being chipped away from both ends—from continued high taxation on one hand and by burgeoning price spiral on the other.

Inflation has forced the fixed income pensioner to lower his standard of living. It has forced young families in this most productive of nations to forego essential purchases. It has priced the single-family home—one of the vertibrae in the backbone of our democracy—out of the range of many families.

However, I would urge the consumer, who encompasses all of the American people, and this Congress, to give the surtax a fair deal. For, one cannot reverse overnight the problems resulting from the policies of the past. Failure to integrate this Nation's fiscal policies with the restrictive monetary policies presently being followed by the Federal Reserve System will have most undesirable effects. Monetary policy alone cannot succeed in repressing the severe inflationary pressures facing the economy.

This inflation, which is the key problem facing our economy, must be curtailed. It is for this reason that the surtax must be extended now.

So let us get on with this urgent task. And, once this temporary measure has been extended—and I emphasize the surtax is a temporary measure—let us move on at once to tax reform. We all know now that the mood of this Congress will brook no slowdown on tax reform once it has committed itself to the taxpayer with the surtax extension—indeed, that is the very way to speed up tax reform.

Mr. President, with the tremendous help of the Senator from Delaware, the last time we dealt with the surtax, I was successful in having adopted a provision that—

> Not later than December 31, 1968, the President shall submit to the Congress proposals for a comprehensive reform of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Under that provision, which became the law, both the outgoing Johnson administration and the incoming Nixon administration sent their complete tax reform packages to Capitol Hill. I believe, in the same spirit and with the same result, the sense of Congress commitment which I have offered as an amendment, and which I will offer as an amendment to this bill, will get us meaningful tax reform.

The only reason for the difference in the terms that are used—"meaningful" is the word this time; "comprehensive" was the previous word—is that "meaningful" is the word which is now being used. There is no difference in the content or meaning of the words.

I believe the provision will get for us, in time, before August 13, extension of the surtax, and then we can have meaningful, comprehensive—whatever one wishes to call it—tax reform, as to which Congress will work its will before it goes home.

I am therefore, offering this resolution so that it will help speed enactment of the surcharge and provide a concrete commitment to the millions of American taxpayers who look to their representa-

XUM

tives in Congress to establish equity and justice in our tax structure and to safeguard the economy of the Nation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I compliment both the Senator from New York and the Senator from Nebraska on the remarks they have made here today pointing out the urgent necessity for prompt consideration of the bill which would extend the surtax.

I cannot conceive of anything that would render a greater disservice to our country than continued delay and continued uncertainty as to whether Congress will or will not extend the surcharge, and if so at what rate, or uncertainty as to whether Congress will or will not repeal the investment credit, and if so, the expected date and what the exemptions will be. I do not think there is any question that the uncertainty will continue to bring about what amounts almost to chaos in our financial community. This uncertainty is hurting the economy and many American citizens.

I am glad the Senator from New York pointed out the fact that last year we had the same tax bill before us. It was then approached from this side of the aisle in a strictly bipartisan effort. I joined the then Senator from Florida, Mr. Smathers, in cosponsoring the Johnson administration bill to which the surtax was attached.

Mr. President, this is not a Democratic proposal. It is not a Republican proposal. It is not a question of liberals or conservatives. The Senator from New York is identified as a liberal and is proud of it. I am identified as a conservative, but on the question of responsibility, on the question of what is best for the country, and on the question of financing this Government we are all one as Americans, no matter which side of the aisle we are on.

I cannot conceive of the leadership on the other side of the aisle acting in any manner other than a responsible one. I am confident we are going to get this measure to a vote before the recess comes. We have no choice. This must be done. I say that as one who for years has been advocating tax reforms.

The Senator from New York pointed out that in last year's tax bill it was his amendment, which I strongly supported at the time, that called on the President to deliver to us by December 31 the administration's recommendations for tax reform. I regret to say that they were not delivered by December 31. Since it has been mentioned, I point out that the past administration refused to send them to Congress. We did not get these recommendations until after the new administration came into office.

Immediately after the new administration took over Secretary Kennedy released those recommendations for major tax reforms to the House Ways and Means Committee and to the Senate Finance Committee. Using those recommendations as a background we are now in the process, for the first time in many years, of bringing meaningful tax reform before the Congress.

I think such a bill will be reported very soon by the House Ways and Mean Committee, but, by all means, these proposals should be kept as two separate packages, with the determination of both the House and the Senate that we will follow the surtax measure later with major tax reforms.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

With the indulgence of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE), I would like to take only 1 minute more to say two things. First, we have been extending the withholding by 30-day periods, but that is not the same thing, in the eyes of the whole banking——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. That is not the same thing, in the eyes of the whole banking and business community of the world, which does not regard the implicit promise—because we are withholding—as being the extension of the surtax. The fact that my statement is a valid assumption is shown by the fact that if we do have a Christmas tree bill on the surtax, what happened to the previous one will happen to this one. It will fall somewhere between the two Houses or it will go back to the committee of the Senate, and we will fail in that effort.

The only thing of interest to those who make the interest rates and those who charge the prices and those who determine the economy in our country and the world will be the extension of the surtax, showing that we mean business; that we know we cannot, in a war, have both guns and butter, which we have done for too long, and which has brought us to the present condition. The surtax is to be deplored, but it is paying for past mistakes. The sooner we pay for those mistakes, the sooner we go forward again in a rise of 4 to 6 percent in production, which for this country is absolutely indispensable if it is to continue in its position of world leadership and strength.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of routine morning business under a 3-minute limitation. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes on a matter of morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1373) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7491) to clarify the liability of national banks for certain taxes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 7491) to clarify the liability of national banks for certain taxes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR CRANSTON FOR 30 MINUTES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) be allowed to proceed for 30 minutes at the end of the consideration of routine morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letter, which was referred as indicated:

REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration and effectiveness of the work experience and training project in Carroll, Chariton, Lafayette, and Saline Counties, Mo., under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session, the following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William L. Martin, Jr., of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Georgia.

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joseph O. Rogers, Jr., of South Carolina, to be U.S. attorney for the district of South Carolina.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Joseph A. Greenwald, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development;

Eileen R. Donovan, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Barbados;

Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Philippines;

J. Raymond Ylitalo, of South Dakota, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Paraguay; and

Leonard C. Meeker, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Romania.

XUM

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions of the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Adopt Legislation To Protect and Promote the Shoe Industry

"*Whereas,* Many shoe factories have closed down in the Commonwealth; and

"*Whereas,* The import of low-cost shoes with low-tariff duties has glutted the shoe market to the detriment of the shoe industry and threatens to destroy one of the Commonwealth's most vital industries; therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to protect the shoe industry so vital to the economy of the country and to subsidize said industry in areas where it may be necessary so that the industry will not be wiped out in various parts of the country, particularly in the New England area and the Commonwealth; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress of the United States and to each member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"House of Representatives, adopted, July 8, 1969.

"Wallace C. Mills,
"*Clerk.*

"A true copy. Attest:

"John F. X. Davoren,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

A resolution adopted by the City Commission of Miami, Fla., praying for a reconsideration of the sums of money planned to be spent in the anti-ballistics-missile plan, in light of the needs of urban areas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

The petition of Allan Feinblum, of New York, N.Y., praying for the withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from the Alleboro Area Clowns, of Attleboro, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to designate August 1 to 7 as "National Clowns' Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Associacion de Abogadas Cubans en el Exilio, dealing with the visit of a Soviet naval force to Cuba; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 92. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Wong Yui (Rept. No. 91–322).

By Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 3379. An act for the relief of Sfc. Patrick Marratto, U.S. Army (retired) (Rept. No. 91–323); and

H.R. 6585. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. F. Elgin (Rept. No. 91–324).

Report Entitled "Revision and Codification"—Report of a Committee (S. Rept. No. 91–325)

Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to S. Res. 244, 90th Congress, second session, as extended, submitted a report entitled "Revision and Codification", which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY ACTIVITIES, 1968"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS—(S. REPT. NO. 91–326)

Mr. HART. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary I submit a report entitled "Antitrust and Monopoly Activities, 1968," pursuant to Senate Resolution 233, 90th Congress, second session, as extended. I ask unanimous consent that the report, together with the minority views of Senators Dirksen and Hruska, be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received; and, without objection, the report and minority views will be printed.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MANSFIELD, on behalf of Mr. Tydings, from the Committee on the District of Columbia reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 220); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Ninety-First Congress, $5,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 2652. A bill for the relief of Miss Namiko Yoshino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 2653. A bill for the relief of Miloye M. Sokitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND (by request):

S. 2654. A bill for the relief of Wylo Pleasant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 2655. A bill to exclude from the mails obscene material sold or offered for sale to minors; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(The remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. CRANSTON:

S. 2656. A bill to establish an urban mass transportation trust fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(The remarks of Mr. Cranston when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. Dirksen):

S. 2657. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make qualification under State law a prerequisite to registration under the narcotic drug and marihuana laws; to eliminate the provision permitting payment of tax to acquire marihuana by unregistered persons, and for other related purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(The remarks of Mr. Williams of Delaware when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2658. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to entitle veterans of World War I and their widows and children to pension on the same basis as veterans of the Spanish-American War and their widows and children, respectively; to the Committee on Finance; and

S. 2659. A bill for the relief of Glenn W. Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the bill (S. 2658) appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Cranston, Mr. Eagleton, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Pell, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey):

S. 2660. A bill to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act for migrant health services; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(The remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2661. A bill for the relief of Kathryn Talbot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 2662. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States, its territories, and possessions, to include privately owned property; to the Committee on Public Works.

(The remarks of Mr. Nelson when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2663. A bill to expand the definition of deductible moving expenses incurred by an employee; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HART:

S. 2664. A bill for the relief of Dr. Teodoro A. Calinog; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2665. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to assure availability of rent supplement payments and food coupons for certain seriously disabled veterans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency; and

S. 2666. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to assure availability of rent supplement payments and food coupons for certain seriously disabled veterans; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(The remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the bills appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 2667. A bill to provide additional penalties for the use of firearms in the commission of certain crimes of violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. Dominick when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. CRANSTON (for himself, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Schweiker, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 2668. A bill to amend chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional education and training assistance to veterans, and to provide for a predischarge education program; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(The remarks of Mr. Cranston when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

S. 2655—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL EXCLUDING FROM THE MAILS OBSCENE MATERIAL SOLD OR OFFERED FOR SALE TO MINORS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill the enactment of which I believe will go a long way toward curbing the ever-increasing flow of objectional and obscene printed and audio material, and the sexual devices and advertisements for them, which are now being circulated to young people through the U.S. mails.

In recent months sexual panderers have literally solicited thousands of decent families in Utah and elsewhere right in their own homes in a new high tide of permissive morality.

These families have received, through the mails in a plain envelope, nauseating illustrations of all types of sexual activity and depravity. The purpose of this solicitation has been a come-on to sell other pornographic material which is even more obnoxious.

I have had hundreds of letters from Utah citizens protesting this floodtide of obscenity. Parents have pled with me, both by letter and in person when I have been in Utah, to do something to keep this smut from infecting our youth.

I am moving today to do this. My bill will make it illegal to use the mails of the United States to send to anyone 19 years of age or younger any printed material, photographs, phonograph records, or devices, or advertisements of a sexual nature which are clearly obscene as defined in the bill and are, therefore, inappropriate for the young. The bill will also make it illegal to send through the mails such material unsolicited to an adult with young people under 19 years of age residing in the household.

I am convinced, Mr. President, that enactment of this bill would be a giant step toward destroying the smut industry in this country.

In 1957, the U.S. Supreme Court said, in Roth against United States, that obscenity was not within the area to be protected by speech or press. But the standards that the Supreme Court established in that case made it practically impossible to curb the increasing flow of pornographic materials. Since that time pornography has become a billion dollar business. Recent Associated Press investigations disclosed that about 200 companies in the country produce pornographic books, magazines, and films, and that total sales range upward from $500 million a year. Postal authorities are swamped with complaints. They received 167,000 in 1968 alone, and this amount will undoubtedly increase in 1969.

Recently, however, the Supreme Court has given clear indication that constitutional restrictions on the smut industry are at hand. In Ginsberg against N.Y., the Court held that it was constitutional for the State of New York to restrict the access of young people to very clearly defined classes of printed and other pornographic material. In its opinion, the Court made it very clear that the State has the power and the responsibility to provide a healthy environment for its youth, and that material which would not be obsence under the standard for adults, could constitutionally be restricted by a State as unfit for its youth.

The Ginsberg decision has logically led Members of both Houses of Congress to the conclusion that, by analogy, the Federal legislature would have the same constitutional power and responsibility to establish a higher standard for youth in the area of obscenity. Therefore, as a result of the Ginsberg opinion, Members of Congress of both parties and in both Houses, have introduced legislation patterned after the New York statute prohibiting the interstate dissemination of clearly defined classes of pornographic material. My bill also takes this direction, but with a very significant difference which I believe is important to the people of Utah, and the Nation as a whole.

The post-Ginsberg bills which have been most widely sponsored in the Senate and in the other body as well, attempt to preempt completely for the Federal Government the power to restrict distribution of obscene material to youth. I believe this approach would encroach on the power of the States and is, therefore, unwise. For this reason I have introduced this bill which deals with material sent through the mails only.

I hold that it is completely proper for the Congress of the United States to stop the ever increasing flow of obscene material through the mails, but I prefer to see local government legislate local distribution processes. It is the prerogative of the States, cities, and towns to decide, for example, what standards they want to establish in their areas.

As Salt Lake county attorney, I prosecuted a number of pornography cases, and I assure you, from my experience, that control of the newsstand sales and other local distribution of objectionable material should be left in the hands of the local authorities. Only the local officials truly know the standards of the community; only they know to what degree the people in their cities and towns desire control measures enacted and enforced.

In my view, Mr. President, the Supreme Court, in the Ginsberg case, did not intend to indicate that obscenity control should be monopolized by the Federal Government. What they did in fact say was that the State of New York had the constitutional power to act in this area. I, for one, believe that Congress should limit its jurisdiction over pornography control to the interstate use of the mails. My bill does this.

Mr. President, the Supreme Court has finally given us the constitutional method whereby distribution of pornography can be firmly and effectively controlled for the segment of our society which more than any other must be protected from the smut peddlers: the youth of our Nation.

We in the Congress have the duty affirmatively to respond to the Court's lead.

My bill is the first of its type to be introduced in the Senate in the 91st Congress. I shall do what I can to see that it is given early consideration. It offers a sound and constitutional approach to the control of pornography. Especially will it help us keep obscene materials out of the hands of our youth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2655) to exclude from the mails obscene material sold or offered for sale to minors, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2656—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH AN URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION TRUST FUND

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish an urban mass transportation trust fund and for other purposes.

This bill is identical with several House bills, the principal author of which is Congressman EDWARD I. KOCH of New York.

The major provisions of the bill include the establishment of an urban mass transportation trust fund, funded in part through the present 7-percent automobile excise tax, the authorization of a $10 billion expenditure from 1970–74 for mass transit, the removal of the 12½-percent limit on the amount which may be spent in any one State so that the needs of each city can be separately studied and met, a change in the formula of dollar participation to apply the same formula which the highway trust fund uses: 90-percent Federal participation, relocation assistance for individuals and businesses displaced by construction under the program, and advance acquisition of lands adjacent to the proposed facility so that the local transit program might reap the profit from escalating land values resulting from transportation development.

Mr. President, this is one of several proposals to meet the growing transportation crisis in our heavily populated areas. Across our Nation and particularly on the Pacific coast, we simply must develop alternatives to our total reliance on the automobile. Ever-spreading freeways have enmeshed our cities and countryside in coils of concrete and exhaust fumes. A majority of the surface space of Los Angeles is devoted to the automobile. Meanwhile, public transportation dwindles yearly into economic oblivion, a vanishing species of abandoned trolley cars and bankrupt bus lines. Bright new proposals are rejected by the already severely overtaxed local property owners. The need is great; our progress is miniscule. We must infuse substantial funds into our faltering mass transit program.

Furthermore, it would be a mistake to see a stepped-up mass transit program as simply a matter of convenience or a question of efficiency.

My basic concern in this area is that our growing overdependence on the internal combustion engine proliferates our alarming environmental pollution, the dangers of which we are finally beginning to understand. To keep the atmosphere of our cities breathable, we must find better ways to move our people through them. When our cities can seriously consider the possible need to ban automobile travel during smog alerts, it is inconceivable that our planning for an alternative transit system should be so undeveloped.

Major legislation is required in the area of mass transit and this bill as well

XUM

as other legislation such as Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS' bill, S. 1032, should receive our immediate and thorough consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2656) to establish an urban mass transportation trust fund, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CRANSTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2657—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 WITH RESPECT TO NARCOTIC DRUG AND MARIHUANA LAWS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIRKSEN) and myself, I introduce a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make qualification under State law a prerequisite to registration under the narcotic drug and marihuana laws; to eliminate the provision permitting payment of tax to acquire marihuana by unregistered persons, and for related purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be appropriately referred, that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD, and that the letter of transmittal from the Attorney General be also printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter of transmittal and the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2657), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make qualification under State law a prerequisite to registration under the narcotic drug and marihuana laws; to eliminate the provision permitting payment of tax to acquire marihuana by unregistered persons, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2657

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4722 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding the following sentence to the existing section:

"The application of every person shall show that, under the laws of the jurisdiction in which he is operating or proposes to operate, he is legally qualified or lawfully entitled to engage in the activitites for which registration is sought."

SEC. 2. Section 4741 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) *Rate.*

"There shall be imposed upon all transfers of marihuana which are made pursuant to section 4742 a tax of $1 per ounce of marihuana or fraction thereof.

"(b) *By whom paid.*

"Such tax shall be paid by the transferee at the time of securing each order form and shall be in addition to the price of such form."

SEC. 3. The first sentence of subsection (c) of section 4742 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary or his delegate shall cause suitable forms to be prepared for the purposes mentioned in this section, and shall cause the same to be distributed to each internal revenue district for sale to those persons who shall have registered and paid the special tax as required by sections 4751 to 4753, inclusive, and he shall require that the same be sold only to persons who have registered and paid the special tax as required by said sections."

SEC. 4. Section 4742 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding a new subsection (f) to the existing section to read as follows:

"(f) Unlawful use.

"It shall be unlawful for any person to obtain by means of said order forms any marihuana for any purpose other than the use, sale, or distribution thereof by him in the counduct of a lawful business in said drug or in the legitimate practice of his profession."

SEC. 5. Paragraph (1) through (5), inclusive, of section 4751 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are amended to read as follows:

"(1) Importers, manufacturers, and compounders.

"Importers, manufacturers, and compounders, lawfully entitled to import, manufacture, or compound marihuana, $24 a year;

"(2) Producers.

"Producers lawfully entitled to produce marihuana (except those included within the paragraph (5)), $1 a year, or fraction thereof, during which they engage in such activity;

"(3) Dealers.

"Dealers, other than physicians, dentists, veterinary surgeons, or other practitioners, lawfully entitled to sell and deal in marihuana, $3 a year, or fraction thereof, during which they engage in such activity;

"(4) Physicians, dentists, veterinary surgeons, and other practitioners.

"Physicians, dentists, veterinary surgeons and other practitioners, lawfully entitled to distribute, dispense, give away, administer, or prescribe marihuana to patients upon whom they in the course of their professional practice are in attendance, $1 a year, or fraction thereof, during which they engage in any of such activities;

"(5) Persons engaged in research, instruction or analysis.

"Any person not registered as an importer, manufacturer, producer, or compounder who is lawfully entitled to obtain and use marihuana for the purpose of research, instruction, or analysis, or who produces marihuana for any such purpose, $1 a year, or fraction thereof, during which he engages in such activities;"

SEC. 6. Section 4753 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding a new subsection (c) to the existing section to read as follows:

"(c) Evidence of qualification.

"The application of every person shall show that, under the laws of the jurisdiction in which he is operating or proposes to operate, he is legally qualified or lawfully entitled to engage in the activities for which registration is sought."

SEC. 7. Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 4755 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Liability.

"It shall be unlawful for any person to import, manufacture, produce, compound, sell, deal in, dispense, distribute, prescribe, administer, or give away marihuana. However, nothing contained in this subsection shall apply to persons who have registered and paid the special tax as required by sections 4751 to 4753, inclusive."

SEC. 8. Section 4755 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding a new subsection (c) to the existing section to read as follows:

"(c) Possession.

"Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, it shall be unlawful for any person to have marihuana in his possession or under his control: *Provided,* that this subsection shall not apply to a person who has registered and paid the special tax as required by sections 4751 to 4753, inclusive, or to an employee or agent of such registered person acting in the course of his duties; or persons possessing marihuana which has been prescribed in good faith by a practitioner registered under section 4753; or to any Government or State official as provided by section 4744(b): *Provided further,* that it shall not be necessary to negative any of the aforesaid exemptions in any complaint, information, indictment, or other writ or proceeding laid or brought under this subsection, or subsection (a), and the burden of proof of any such exemption shall be on the defendant."

The letter presented by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., July 15, 1969.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a bill "To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make qualification under State law a prerequisite to registration under the narcotic drug and marihuana laws; to eliminate the provision permitting payment of tax to acquire marihuana by unregistered persons, and for other related purposes". There is also transmitted a comparative type showing the changes which would be made in the existing law by the bill.

The purpose of the proposed changes and additions is to cure the constitutional defects found in the Marihuana Tax Act by the Supreme Court in its decisions of May 19, 1969 in *Leary* v. *United States* and *United States* v. *Covington.* The thrust of these rulings is that 26 U.S.C. 4744(a) is directed primarily towards persons inherently suspect of criminal activities and requires unregistered transferees of marihuana to obtain an order form and thus provide information incriminating themselves under State law, in violation of the constitutional right against self-incrimination.

These amendments are offered to fill the void in the current Federal enforcement scheme created by the aforementioned cases. These changes will restore, in substance, the situation regarding Federal marihuana enforcement which existed prior to those decisions.

The bill would add to the existing registration provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, dealing with narcotic drugs (section 4722) and marihuana (section 4753), the prerequisite that any person seeking registration must be legally qualified under the laws of the jurisdiction in which he is operating or proposes to operate, to engage in the particular activity for which registration is sought. By requiring as a condition precedent to registration that the person is properly qualified under State law, the statute cannot be said to be framed primarily toward persons inherently suspected of criminal activities, and it would preclude any possible requirement of self-incrimination. The result is that unauthorized persons who intend to carry on illicit activities could not incriminate themselves as they could not register or pay the tax.

Section 2 of the bill would amend subsection (a) of section 4741 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make all transfers of marihuana required to be taxed by section 4742 subject only to a transfer tax of $1 per ounce. Presently, section 4741 imposes a transfer tax of $100 per ounce on all transfers to non-registered persons. The amendment contemplates that only registered persons may apply for marihuana order forms and pay the transfer tax, and that non-registered persons could not acquire it pursuant to an order form even if they could afford a heavy tax.

Sections 3 and 4 of the bill amend section 4742 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prevent unregistered persons from obtaining order forms and to make it unlawful to obtain any marihuana by means of order forms for other than specified proper purposes.

Section 5 of the bill revises paragraphs (1) through (5), inclusive, of section 4751 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 dealing with the imposition of tax on marihuana activities. The bill would amend each paragraph to indicate that the person who engages in such marihuana activity must be "lawfully entitled" to do so. Section 5 of the bill also adds paragraph (3) to section 4751 entitled "Dealers." The inclusion of this paragraph allows the deletion of existing paragraph (5) entitled "Persons not otherwise taxed," which will eliminate any doubt that only certain legally qualified persons may register and pay the occupational tax.

Section 6 of the bill amends section 4753 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require the application for registration to show the qualification or entitlement of the applicant to engage in the activities for which registration is sought.

Section 7 of the bill would amend section 4755 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, making it unlawful for any person to engage in various marihuana activities except those persons who are properly registered under section 4751. The purpose of amending section 4755(a)(1) in this manner is to make it clear that this paragraph is intended to reach both persons "in the business" of handling marihuana and illicit traffickers.

Section 8 of the bill would amend section 4755 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by adding a new subsection (c) to effectively reach those illicit traffickers in possession of marihuana who have obtained the marihuana by harvesting it. The proposed new subsection (c) dealing with possession of marihuana is similar to those presently included in 26 U.S.C. 4724 (b) and (c) dealing with transportation and possession of narcotic drugs.

We urge the immediate passage of this bill as an expedient. The Department of Justice has prepared and previously submitted to the Congress a legislative proposal which would bring together in a single Act substantially all of the Federal statutes relating to narcotics, marihuana and dangerous drugs. This bill, which is entitled "The Controlled Dangerous Substances Act of 1969" is more than a mere compendium of statutes. If enacted it will effect significant and far-reaching changes in almost every facet of the Federal approach to the suppression of drug abuse and will, inter alia, close the gap created by the *Leary* and *Covington* cases. We would prefer the passage of "The Controlled Dangerous Substances Act of 1969" rather than the changes recommended herein, but believe that immediate passage of the latter measure is necessary as an interim stop-gap while the more complex and comprehensive proposal is being considered.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that enactment of this legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

ATTORNEY GENERAL.

S. 2658—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL ON WORLD WAR VETERANS PENSION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on July 12, at a convention of the Illinois Department of the Illinois Department of the Veterans of World War I in Peoria, Col. Waldron Leonard of the organization's national headquarters, aptly referred to veterans of this war as not forgotten, only neglected. He said:

> I dispute the statement that we who served in World War I are forgotten veterans."
>
> The numerous bills introduced in Congress each year, with little or no final action, will bear me out. But I do contend that the lack of legislation for the veterans of World War I, compared with that given veterans who served in others wars, certainly proves that the veterans of World War I and his dependents are the neglected veterans.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Colonel Leonard's address be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

It is unquestionably true that unlike veterans of any other war, those who served in World War I alone are considered more on the basis of welfare standards than on the basis of their service in time of war.

The general pension laws for men who served in the Spanish-American War make no mention of the income of the veteran in fixing eligibility. The GI bills we enacted for veterans of World War II or Korea or the cold war or Vietnam make no mention of outside sources of income in fixing eligibility for education or training benefits, for home loans, business loans, or veterans' preference in Federal employment. There are no ceilings on income after which assistance is cut off, no lengthy tables showing a declining benefit as income goes up, terminating entirely if the individual has as much other income as $1,900 if single and $3,200 if he has one dependent. There are no sworn statements of net worth, of spouse's income, of income from social security or railroad retirement, or other savings and investments.

In practice, this is the World War I veterans who are unfairly "stuck" with these trappings of a welfare system.

This situation is exactly contrary to the recommendations made last March 18 by the U.S. Veterans Advisory Commission on the Veterans Benefits System. Virtually every national veterans organization provided a technical consultant to that Commission, with Waldron Leonard representing the Veterans of World War I.

Mr. President, in that report to President Johnson the Advisory Commission stated, and I quote:

> The Commission recommends that pension, as a benefit for war veterans and their survivors, should be maintained as a federal program providing financial aid above and beyond the levels of public assistance and that, within reasonably improved limits, increases in other forms of income should not adversely affect veterans' pension benefits.

The sad fact is that in a great many States, public assistance is more generous and easier to obtain than the pension benefit. Remember that the average age of the World War I veteran is now 74. These men are, with few exceptions, past the age when their income from wages or salaries rises with the general price level. Nearly all now depend upon sources of income established 10, 20, or 30 years ago. For most, this means social security, railroad retirement, or some private pension. As the Advisory Commission pointed out, their incomes are largely static.

For this group of veterans, it is time to provide a general pension that is not tied to the welfare criterion of a means test. I think veterans of World War I are entitled to the same statutory treatment the Nation has provided to those who served in the Spanish-American War.

Therefore, I introduce and send to the desk a bill equating World War I veterans pension eligibility with that of Spanish-American War veterans. My bill is patterned after a similar measure introduced in the other body by Congressman KEN GRAY, of Illinois.

It would permit World War I men to receive a straight pension benefit of $67.73 if he served 70 days or more while World War I was in progress; he would receive $101.59 if he served 90 days or more. He may elect, however, whether to receive this pension or to elect the current pension rates.

In a message to the Chairman of the U.S. Veterans Advisory Commission, President Johnson wrote:

> Our government and our people have no greater obligation than to assure that those who have served their country and the cause of freedom will never be forgotten or neglected.

It is unfortunate that with each new war, we tend to honor and serve only those who take part in it, and push out of our minds the men who made the same sacrifices and performed the same service to their fellow citizens in a war remembered more in history than in our daily lives. Perhaps we do not forget, but we tend to neglect.

I urge that Congress provide for World War I veterans in a manner that will be in keeping both with their own dignity and the dignity of the Nation they served.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at the conclusion of my and Colonel Leonard's remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement and the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2658), to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to entitle veterans of World War I and their widows and children to pension on the same basis as veterans of the Spanish-American War and their widows and children, respectively, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2658

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 512 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 512. Veterans of the Spanish-American War and World War I

"(a) (1) The Administrator shall pay to each veteran of the Spanish-American War or World War I who meets the service requirements of this subsection a pension at the following monthly rate:

"(A) $101.59; or

"(B) $135.45 if the veteran is in need of regular aid and attendance.

XUM

"(2) A veteran meets the service requirements of this subsection if he served in the active military or naval service—

"(A) for ninety days or more during the Spanish-American War;

"(B) during the Spanish-American War or World War I and was discharged or released from such service for a service-connected disability; or

"(C) for a period of ninety consecutive days or more and such period began or ended during the Spanish-American War or World War I.

"(3) Any veteran eligible for pension under this subsection shall, if he so elects, be paid pension at the rates prescribed by section 521 of this title, and under the conditions (other than the service requirements) applicable to pension paid under that section to veterans of World War II. If pension is paid pursuant to such an election, the election shall be irrevocable.

"(b)(1) The Administrator shall pay to each veteran of the Spanish-American War or World War I who does not meet the service requirements of subsection (a), but who meets the service requirements of this subsection, a pension at the following monthly rate:

"(A) $67.73; or

"(B) $88.04 if the veteran is in need of regular aid and attendance.

"(2) A veteran meets the service requirements of this subsection if he served in the active military or naval service—

"(A) for seventy days or more during the Spanish-American War or World War I; or

"(B) for a period of seventy consecutive days or more and such period began or ended during the Spanish-American War or World War I."

SEC. 2. (a) The heading and subsection (a) of section 521 of title 38, United States Code, are each amended by striking out "World War I,".

(b) Subsection (g) of such section 521 is amended to read as follows:

"(g) A veteran meets the service requirements of this section if he served in the active military, naval, or air service—

"(1) for ninety days or more during either World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era;

"(2) during World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era, and was discharged or released from such service for a service-connected disability;

"(3) for a period of ninety consecutive days or more and such period began or ended during World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era; or

"(4) for an aggregate of ninety days or more in two or more separate periods of service during more than one period of war."

SEC. 3. (a) The subheading immediately before the heading of section 531 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"WARS BEFORE WORLD WAR II"

(b) Sections 536 and 537 of title 38, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"§ 536. Widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War and World War I

"(a) The Administrator shall pay to the widow of each veteran of the Spanish-American War or World War I who met the service requirements of section 512(a) of this title a pension at the monthly rate of $65, unless she was the wife of the veteran during his service in the Spanish-American War or World War I, in which case the monthly rate shall be $75.

"(b) If there is a child of the veteran, the rate of pension paid to the widow under subsection (a) shall be increased by $8.13 per month for each such child.

"(c) No pension shall be paid to a widow of a veteran under this section unless she was married to him—

"(1)(A) before January 1, 1938, in the case of a widow of a veteran of the Spanish-American War, or (B) before December 14, 1944, in the case of a widow of a veteran of World War I; or

"(2) for five or more years; or

"(3) for any period of time if a child was born of the marriage.

"(d) Any widow eligible for pension under this section shall, if she so elects, be paid pension at the rates prescribed by section 541 of this title, and under the conditions (other than the requirements relating to the service of her spouse and of section 541(e)) applicable to the payment of pensions to widows of veterans of World War II. If pension is paid pursuant to such an election, the election shall be irrevocable.

"§ 537. Children of veterans of the Spanish-American War and World War I

"Whenever there is no widow entitled to pension under section 536 of this title, the Administrator shall pay to the children of each veteran of the Spanish-American War or World War I who met the service requirements of section 512(a) of this title a pension at the monthly rate of $73.13 for one child, plus $8.13 for each additional child, with the total amount equally divided."

SEC. 4. (a) The subheading immediately before the heading of section 541 of title 38, United States Code, the heading of such section 541 and subsection (a) of such section 541 are each amended by striking out "World War I,".

(b) Subsection (e) of such section 541 is amended to read as follows:

"(e) No pension shall be paid to a widow of a vetrean under this section unless she was married to him—

"(1) before (A) January 1, 1957, in the case of a widow of a World War II veteran, or (B) February 1, 1965, in the case of a widow of a Korean conflict veteran, or (C) before the expiration of ten years following termination of the Vietnam era in the case of a widow of a Vietnam era veteran; or

"(2) for five or more years; or

"(3) for any period of time if a child was born of the marriage."

(c) The heading and subsection (a) of section 542 of such title are each amended by striking out "World War I,".

SEC. 5. The analysis of subchapters II and III of chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"SUBCHAPTER II—VETERANS' PENSIONS

"SERVICE PENSION

"510. Confederate forces veterans.
"511. Indian War veterans.
"512. Veterans of the Spanish-American War and World War I.

"NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY PENSION

"521. Veterans of World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era.
"522. Net worth limitation.
"523. Combination of ratings.

"SUBCHAPTER III—PENSIONS TO WIDOWS AND CHILDREN

"WARS BEFORE WORLD WAR II

"531. Widows of Mexican War veterans.
"532. Widows of Civil War veterans.
"533. Children of Civil War veterans.
"534. Widows of Indian War veterans.
"535. Children of Indian War veterans.
"536. Widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War and World War I.
"537. Children of veterans of the Spanish-American War and World War I.

"WORLD WAR II, THE KOREAN CONFLICT, AND THE VIETNAM ERA

"541. Widows of World War II, Korean conflict, or Vietnam era veterans.
"542. Children of World War II, Korean conflict, or Vietnam era veterans.
"543. Net worth limitation."

SEC. 6. (a) The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar month which begins more than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall affect the eligibility of any person receiving pension under title 38, United States Code, on the effective date of this Act, for pension under all applicable provisions of that title in effect on that date for such period or periods thereafter with respect to which he can qualify under such provisions.

The statement presented by Mr. YARBOROUGH follows:

ADDRESS BY WALDRON E. LEONARD TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ILLINOIS VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

Commander Carr, Madam President of the Ladies Auxiliary, my Buddies and Sisters:

After my talk with you this morning, you might draw the conclusion that your convention got off to a very slow start, but may I assure you with such an outstanding speaker as Congressman Ken Grey to ring down the final curtain at your annual banquet, those attending this convention will find the time spent most rewarding.

Now I would like to talk with you about the future possibilities of membership and legislation of our organization. From time to time we hear there are so many members dying each year that we can not except to continue our efforts as an organization for more than three or four years. Now ladies and gentlemen, I ask you, have you ever met a veteran of the Spanish American War that was not a member of the United Spanish War Veterans organization? Second, have you ever stopped to realize their organization and their members, on an average, are more than 20 years older than the veteran of World War I.

And third, please remember there are approximately one and a quarter million veterans of World War I eligible for membership in our organization that have not joined with us. So with this, the only chartered organization exclusively representing World War I veterans, may I assure you I am not going to be a pallbearer to bury our efforts as long as we have World War I veterans and their dependents needing our assistance to maintain the present laws in their behalf, and to seek additional legislation for a decent standard of living. Which brings me to the subject of *what* legislation.

Now my Buddies and Sisters let us take a look at the Report of the U.S. Veterans Advisory Commission and their Recommendations regarding World War I veterans and their dependents.

Please remember as I quote from this book, the Members of this Advisory Commission included Past National Commanders of our largest chartered veterans organizations, also several of the outstanding State Directors of Veterans Affairs, and the staff and consultants of the Commission were members who worked for the Veterans Administration.

In an introductory letter to the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, the members of the Commission wrote and I quote in part "This report is the result of many hours of hearings and consideration and is one in which each member of the Commission takes justifiable pride". Now Buddies and Sisters, this statement was submitted after about two years study, visiting and obtaining testimony all over the country at a cost of perhaps a quarter of a million dollars. They personally submitted their Report and Recommendations to the Members of the Veterans Affairs Committee in Congress and both Republican and Democratic members praised their work. For example, one member stated, "I think it historic and a significant milestone in the progress in the administration of our veterans affairs. I think this will be a great contribution and we are deeply grateful to each Member of the Commission". Receptions and cocktail parties were given to honor the members for this outstanding report, often referred to as the "Bible" for all future legislation. The members were received by the President of the United States. He expressed thanks for a job well done and presented each members with a citation and placed a medal around their neck. A top official of the Veterans Administration was given the highest award from a national veterans organization for his outstanding contribution as a representative of the Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

When suggesting certain veterans legislation the National Commander of Veterans of World War I, USA Inc., recently was quoted as saying, this report superceded the Bradley Report on veterans legislation and would be followed for the next several years.

Now permit me to quote Recommendation No. 17, Page 15, Chapter 11, the caption reads "Alleviation of Financial Needs of Veterans and Survivors Not Connected With Military Service":

"The Commission recommends that pension, as a benefit for war veterans and their survivors, should be maintained as a Federal program providing financial aid above and beyond the levels of public assistance and that, within reasonable improved limits, increases in other forms of income should not adversely affect veterans' pension benefits."

This is followed by a background to the recommendation which spells out as indicated above that "increases in other forms of income shall not adversely affect a veterans or a survivor's pension benefit". I would interpret this to mean, Social Security, Railroad Retirement and other retirements where the veteran has contributed financially. I would interpret this recommendation as saying the veteran is entitled to out patient treatment, hospitalization, free medication, care of teeth, rental subsidy, food stamps and many other fringe benefits, including $279 per month paid a family of four on public assistance in Illinois; or in proportion to the size of the family of the veteran.

On Page 17, Recommendation No. 19 states: "The Commission recommends that pensioners who have reached age 72 and who have been receiving disability or death pension for two years shall not have their pension reduced by reason of fluctuation in annual income or estate." This would eliminate the income questionnaire, as well as reprisals if the veteran receives an inheritance or exceeds his pension income, this also is provided by Social Security benefits.

May I refer you to Page 51, Recommendation 48, which reads as follows: "The Commission recommends that veterans with nonservice-connected disabilities and who have reached the age of 65 not be required to sign an affidavit stating they are unable to pay the cost of hospital care". This is self explanatory and would eliminate as well as the affidavit, the customary interview that pries into the veterans personal history and has no connection with his need for hospitalization.

I would be less than fair with you if I did not point out that this Report of the Commission states: "the payment of pension to veterans for nonservice-connected conditions is soundly based on the principle of economic needs".

If the Members of Congress are going to ignore the recommendations of this Report, "that pension, as a benefit for war veterans and their survivors, should be maintained providing financial aid above and beyond the level of public assistance" then they should ignore the above recommendation regarding pension benefits and support a separate and distinct pension such as the bill introduced by Congressman Gray, H.R. 5195 or one of the similar pension bills that would assure the veteran at least partial financial assistance for his service during World War I.

At the meeting of your National Legislative Committee, February 18–19, 1969; in a question and answer period with the Staff Director of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, I called attention to the benefits granted by our Government to those on welfare and asked why, in view of the President's U.S. Advisory Commission Report, the veteran should not expect these recommendations to be enacted into law. This was his answer and is a direct quote from the minutes of this meeting:

"This is one of the most serious problems facing us. Here's what's happened. The veterans' programs have been straight-laced; it is business-like, and we like it that way, but in the last 5–7 years, we have had free programs coming up all around us. Free medicine, free dental care, etc. Then we take a look at our veterans' programs. This is a problem to us. How do you keep these veterans' programs in philosophy, purpose and intent, abreast of the times."

So I conclude my remarks with this question: Should we pursue the program for a separate and distinct pension for all who served in World War I or should we confine our efforts and concentrate on Recommendation No. 17, in order to provide at least the benefits given those on public assistance for our members in similar circumstances for a decent standard of living, with the full understanding that these benefits will be administered and provided by the Veterans Administration.

Now my friends, I dispute the statement that we who served in World War I are the forgotten veteran. The numerous bills introduced in Congress each year, with little or no final action, will bear me out. But I do contend that the lack of legislation for the veterans of World War I, compared with that given veterans who served in other wars, certainly proves that the veteran of World War I and his dependents are the neglected veterans.

S. 2660—INTRODUCTION OF THE MIGRANT WORKER HEALTH AMENDMENTS OF 1969

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, for the Nation as a whole, 900 counties furnish seasonal homes, or work areas—or both—for an estimated 1,000,000 migrant farm workers and their dependents. About one-fifth of the Nation's total migrants live seasonally in 117 counties of Texas, and go out from Texas, their homeland, to work the fields in other States.

For a variety of reasons, migrant farm workers and their families are the group most likely to be bypassed by national health gains. They are poor, live in inadequate housing, are often geographically isolated, belong to various minority groups—chiefly Mexican-American and Negro—and frequently lack knowledge of good health practices and of community health resources.

The "channels" to gain access to health care frighten and confuse them, for they fear the sterile atmosphere of the typical clinic or hospital. Moreover, their constant movement hinders continuity of the scanty services they do receive. Many of their temporary communities look upon them as transients for whom the community feels no responsibility. These communities often lack enough physicians, dentists and nurses to meet the needs of local residents, let alone the needs of people "just passing through."

The result is a heavy burden of illness and disability. Tuberculosis is 17 times more frequent and infestation with worms 35 times more frequent among migrants than among ordinary patients. Mortality from tuberculosis and other infectious diseases is 2½ times the national average. Mortality from accidents is nearly three times the national average. Infant mortality is at the national rate of 20 years ago. As late as 1966, in two Texas border counties—Cameron and Hidalgo—which are home for many thousands of Mexican-American migrants, 20 percent of the births occurred outside of hospitals, compared with 2 percent for the Nation as a whole.

The Migrant Health Act was passed to help meet migrants longstanding health needs. The act authorizes the Public Health Service to grant funds to public or private nonprofit agencies to pay part of the costs of migrant family health service clinics and services to improve migrants' health conditions.

A typical grant-assisted project is operated in a northwestern Ohio county with a seasonal influx of 4,000 members of Texas-based Mexican-American families. The people start coming in April and some stay until November. At the season's peak, twice weekly family health service clinics, held in the evening, provide remedial treatment for men, women and children. The clinics also provide immunizations, family planning, prenatal and postnatal care, and general health counseling. The clinic sessions are held in a remodeled dwelling to which people from surrounding camps have convenient access. Volunteers provide transportation for those who need it.

Each weekday, a nurse is on duty at the clinic headquarters. She refers emergencies to local physicians between clinic sessions. She also makes referrals to local dentists. In addition, she follows up on services given in the evening clinics under standing orders, changing dressings, giving medications, and advising individuals and groups on such problems as diabetic care, prenatal care, and diet.

When the Migrant Health Act was first passed in 1962, organized systems to extend community health services to migrants were extremely rare. Not more than a half-dozen existed in the entire Nation. Now, the Public Health Service informs me that 118 single- and multi-county projects assisted by migrant health grants serve migrants in 317 counties in 36 States and Puerto Rico; 170 hospitals and nearly 1,000 physicians are involved. Of the estimated 300,000 migrants living in project areas for at least brief periods during 1968, 110,000 received medical care and 3,400 were hospitalized. A widely used interarea referral system helped avoid duplications and gaps in services as people moved.

So the work is well begun. However, the potential of the program is far from reached at the present time.

Medical services must be expanded and improved. The present family clinics are swamped with patients at the season's peak. Nearly 600 counties, each with an influx of 100 or more migrants, still lack a system for getting care to the people. What care migrants receive in most of these counties is sporadic, crisis-oriented, and unrelated to care obtained elsewhere.

A similar need exists for expanding dental services. Some project counties have no resident dentist. Little more than emergency extractions are provided for adults in most existing project areas. Some projects provide no dental care for either adults or children. Hospital services are lacking in about half of the projects and limited in many others.

Many projects have recognized some of these unmet needs but continued grant assistance has had to be scaled down to the funds available, regardless of the merit of proposals for expanded service. A backlog of approved projects to extend services to new areas, and approval requests for project increases, is constantly on hand, with no possibility of providing grant assistance. Nor can the present policy of discouraging new proposals be changed without a substantial increase in the annual authorizations for appropriations.

At the present appropriation level of $8 million, the amount available nationally per migrant is $8. Even when contributions from other than migrant health grant sources are added, the total per migrant is little more than $12. This can be compared with the national average per capita health expenditure of over $200.

Therefore, I am introducing today legislation which would extend the Migrant Health Act for 5 years and increase the appropriation authorizations from $15 million in 1970 to $40 million in 1975. The extension and the increases are absolutely necessary if we are ever to meet such great needs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the text of the bill be printed in the Record at this point.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2660), to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act for migrant health services, introduced by Mr. Yarborough (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2660

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 310 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out "$9,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the next fiscal year, and $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970", and inserting in lieu thereof "not to exceed $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975".

S. 2662—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN THE COST OF PROTECTING THE SHORES OF THE UNITED STATES, ITS TERRITORIES, AND POSSESSIONS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am introducing legislation today designed to combat an emergency situation which exists in all States bordering the Great Lakes. Shoreline erosion has become a problem of major proportions; during the past few years, a rising water level in the Great Lakes has resulted in a continual and increasing threat to shoreline homes and property. Not only is erosion destroying miles and miles of beautiful and productive lands, it is contaminating the lake with large amounts of sediment.

The problem along the Kenosha, Wis., shoreline can no longer be ignored. Damage this year in Kenosha alone is already estimated at $200,000. One report notes that damage to Lake Michigan shoreline in 1951 and 1952 was $20 million; this same report estimates that damage this year will be several times that amount due to rising water levels.

One property owner writes that on one particularly windy day the lake claimed 100 feet of land, large trees, bushes, and her garage.

Another reports that damage is so extensive that some residents are abandoning their homes.

A third tells of a storm which swept away 4,500 square feet of footage. He built a retainer wall only to have it destroyed a year later.

A multitude of such stories might be told: homes once 300 feet from the shore now rest within 10 feet of the water, garages have tumbled into the lake, once-useful roads are cracked and perched precariously on the edge of the water. All illustrate the same point.

Individual efforts to halt erosion have failed. Concrete culverts and pilings undercut by rushing water, 10-ton boulders pushed aside, tree trunks deposited on the lake floor all attest to the need for Federal action.

Possibilities for Federal assistance are totally inadequate. The Army Corps of Engineers can provide assistance for damaged privately owned property only when the President declares that a disaster exists. This is aid after the fact, when the damage is already done.

Private property owners purportedly can borrow money from the SBA at 3 percent interest rates. This, however, has not been the case. The Administrator of the SBA writes:

> The matter of consideration of beach and shore erosion goes on almost constantly along both the East and West coasts of Florida and various other ocean coastal and lake areas. To provide disaster funds for protection of such areas and replace the eroded land would be far beyond the capabilities of the Agency. . . . it will not be possible for the Milwaukee Office to give consideration to any disaster loan applications filed there . . . we regret that we are unable to provide the desired assistance.

Concerted Federal assistance is necessary. The Federal Government, acting through the Army Corps of Engineers, must coordinate the placement of abutments and jetties which will have lasting preventive value. Individual efforts may result in twice as much damage to unprotected property and are, at best, temporary relief.

Only a coordinated effort will protect our lakeshores. This bill would allow private property owners to qualify for assistance from the Corps of Engineers in accordance with already established procedures for civil projects relating to shore erosion on public lands. The bill would permit the Federal matching grant formula of 50–50 reimbursement to be met by responsible local interests. In this manner, private citizens, through the process of special municipal assessments, would be able to match Federal aid to solve a problem whose effects are of national importance.

In addition to the assistance provided by this bill, long-range erosion control must include adequate zoning measures which would assure wise development policies in erosion-susceptible areas. Only with such a two-pronged effort can we assure truly lasting control.

This bill has been introduced in the House by Congressman Henry Schadeberg, of Wisconsin, who has the support of Representatives from Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, and California. This is a bipartisan effort and I would hope for the support of as many Senators and Congressmen as possible.

Mr. President, the present situation can only worsen. Unless we authorize preventive measures immediately, the threat of irremediable damage will become reality.

I ask unanimous consent for the text of this bill to be printed in the Record at this time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2662), to amend the Act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States, its territories, and possessions, to include privately owned property, introduced by Mr. Nelson, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2662

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled, That (a) subsection (b) of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property", approved August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C., sec. 426e(b)), is amended by inserting immediately after "in which the project is located," the following: "or by responsible local interests, or both,".

(b) Subsection (d) of the first section of such Act of August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426e (d)), is hereby repealed, and subsection (e) of such first section is hereby redesignated as subsection (d).

S. 2665 AND S. 2666—INTRODUCTION OF BILLS TO ASSURE AVAILABILITY OF RENT SUPPLEMENT PAYMENTS AND FOOD COUPONS FOR CERTAIN SERIOUSLY DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduced two bills making veterans with low income automatically eligible for rent supplement and food stamp programs. I offer them as a means of implementing one recommendation of the U.S. Advisory Commission on the Veterans Benefits System.

That Commission urged that veterans' pensions be maintained above and be-

XUM

yond the levels of public assistance. It would seem evident that where a veteran's income is so low as to entitle him to relief under the pension system now based upon a means test that he should also be eligible for such Federal assistance programs as are also based on a means test; namely, rent supplements and food stamps.

Pension rates for non-service-connected disability begin with a payment of $110 a month for the single veteran having other income less than $300 a year. If his other income is between $900 and $1,000 a year, he may receive a pension of $88 a month. If a single veteran has as much income as $2,100 a month, he is no longer eligible for any pension. These rates bring his total income to a point barely above poverty income levels.

Many veterans believe—with justification—that public welfare is more generous than the Nation's support of its veterans, especially its veterans of World War I. Yet they are not willing to go on welfare. They should not have to. Those whose financial circumstances are limited should have what anyone could receive through welfare, plus additional compensation to maintain himself and any dependents in dignity.

That is not too much to expect from a wealthy Nation.

Most Americans are convinced we cannot do too much for the servicemen of today who jeopardizes his life and health in a current war about which we read every day in the paper and see depicted on our television screens. They are right in that conviction.

But we must not neglect, either, the veterans of earlier years who put themselves in the same jeopardy. They, too, are entitled to live out their lives in decent economic circumstances.

These bills would assure that any veteran whose income is so small as to make him eligible for the present meager pension will also receive Federal benefits for low-income families and individuals in the form of rent supplements and food stamps.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these bills be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the Record.

The bills (S. 2665), to amend title 38, United States Code, to assure availability of rent supplement payments and food coupons for certain seriously disabled veterans, introduced by Mr. Yarborough, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record; and

S. 2666, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to assure availability of rent supplement payments and food coupons for certain seriously disabled veterans, introduced by Mr. Yarborough, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2665

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part II, title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new chapter:

"Chapter 25.—Rent Supplement Payments and Food Coupons

"Sec.

"1001. Rent supplement payments.

"§1001. Rent supplement payments

"Any veteran receiving (1) pension based on need of regular aid and attendance under chapter 15 of this title or under the first sentence of section 9(b) of the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 436), or (2) the rate of pension provided by subsection (e) of section 521 of this title or by section 110 of the Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967 (81 Stat. 180), shall be conclusively presumed to be a 'qualified tenant' in determining entitlement to rent supplement payments authorized by section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701s).

"Sec. 2. The analysis of part II of title 38, United States Code, and the analysis of such part at the head of such title are amended by adding at the end of each the following:

"'25. Rent Supplement Payments and Food Coupons ------------------ 1001'".

S. 2666

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part II, title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new chapter:

"Chapter 25.—Rent Supplement Payments and Food Coupons

"Sec. 1010. Food Coupons

"Any veteran receiving (1) pension based on need of regular aid and attendance under chapter 15 of this title or under the first sentence of section 9(b) of the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 436), or (2) the rate of pension provided by subsection (e) of section 521 of this title or by section 110 of the Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967 (81 Stat. 180), shall be conclusively presumed to constitute an eligible household in determining his entitlement to food coupons authorized by the food stamp program under the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended (chapter 15, title 7, United States Code). In any case where such a veteran resides in a political subdivision which does not participate in a State agency plan under that Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall extend the food stamp program to him under a Federal plan of operation which accomplishes the purposes and functions of a State agency plan consistent with said Act."

Sec. 2. The analysis of part II of title 38, United States Code, and the analysis of such part at the head of such title are amended by adding at the end of each the following:

"25. Rent Supplement Payments and Food Coupons -------------------- 1001".

S. 2667—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL PENALTIES FOR THE USE OF FIREARMS IN THE COMMISSION OF CERTAIN CRIMES OF VIOLENCE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference. It is my understanding the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency will begin hearings shortly on various amendments to the Gun Control Act of 1968, including proposals for a change in the penalty system for use of a firearm in crime.

I think it imperative that the subcommittee have before it my penalty bill which the Senate passed on September 17, 1968, during the general firearms debate.

My bill was designated S. 3681 in the 90th Congress.

When it passed the Senate, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, Mr. Dodd, stated:

> I believe this is a good amendment. I think it should be agreed to. I commend the Senator from Colorado for his work and for having offered it. I am sorry I did not cosponsor it.

Two other members of the present Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency were cosponsors, Mr. Hruska and Mr. Tydings.

In addition, there were 13 other cosponsors last year: Mr. Allott, Mr. Bible, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Mundt, and Mr. Tower.

When the bill went to conference, however, the only portions of it which survived and became law were provisions prohibiting a suspended sentence or probation for a repeat violator.

My bill provided an added penalty up to life in prison for an individual who is armed with any type of firearm while engaged in a Federal crime of violence.

One characteristic which sets it apart from other proposals is that it is based on the same formula, insofar as practicable, as that approved by the Congress and signed into law for the District of Columbia in 1967.

Under the terms of the bill, any person who is convicted of commiting or attempting to commit Federal crimes of violence, as defined in the bill while armed with a firearm may first, in addition to the punishment for the crime, be punished by imprisonment for an indeterminate number of years up to life, as determined by the court; and second, if convicted more than once, be precluded from receiving a suspended or probationary sentence.

There remains in my own mind some question as to the effectiveness of the new District of Columbia law, and whether it is being used. In what I hope is not an isolated case, U.S. District Judge Hart imposed a sentence of 15 years to life, in addition to the penalty for the crime, on a District of Columbia criminal earlier this year because he carried a gun. I ask unanimous consent that newspaper articles about the case be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DOMINICK. However, one of the obvious problems in evaluating the formula now in operation in Washington is that most cases which have reached the trial stage have, until recently, involved offenses which occured prior to enactment of the new law. I would hope that the subcommittee will conduct thorough hearings into what has happened with respect to utilization of the formula in eligible cases this year. This would be of considerable benefit in judging whether it should be made applicable on a national scale.

I recognize there are bills before the

subcommittee to impose mandatory sentences. I am not against that approach, but I believe my bill strikes a middle ground between mandatory sentences and existing Federal law.

Let me keep in mind the concluding lines of the conference report on the 1968 act providing a hybrid form of indeterminate sentence for substantive crimes:

> Testimony submitted at the hearing on this legislation disclosed that terms served under indeterminate sentences average longer than do terms under the fixed system.

During Senate debate on my bill last year, I referred to the reservations about mandatory sentencing expressed by both the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, and the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia. I also listed the six instances where Federal law already provided special penalties for use of a firearm. I think the points brought out at that time would be helpful to the subcommittee, and I ask unanimous consent that the debate which appear in the Congressional Record, volume 114, part 21, page 27142, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. DOMINICK. I believe the provisions which became law last year can be strengthened and urge the subcommittee to examine carefully the possibilities of indeterminate sentencing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2667), to provide additional penalties for the use of firearms in the commission of certain crimes of violence, introduced by Mr. Dominick, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The material presented by Mr. Dominick follows:

Exhibit 1

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 31, 1969]

Comes Under 1967 Law: Robber Gets 15 Years to Life

(By Donald Hirzel)

A federal judge today tapped a section of the D.C. Crime reduction Act of 1967 which permits life sentences for crimes of violence with use of weapons to impose a 15-year-to-life sentence on a man who robbed a liquor store of $622.

U.S. District Court Judge George L. Hart Jr. gave notice that "anyone else convicted by a jury before me on an armed robbery can expect similar treatment."

The law became effective on Dec. 27, 1967, and is believed to have been used only once before in the court.

The reason it has not, according to court officials, is that the court backlog is so great most crimes tried within the last year were committed prior to its enactment.

However, from now on most of the cases being processed will involve offenses which occurred following enactment.

The defendant before Hart today was James McCoy, 25, of the 1600 block of Kenyon St. NW, who had been found guilty of armed robbery, assault with a dangerous weapon and possession of a prohibited weapon—a sawed-off shotgun.

He received 15 years to life for the armed robbery, 40 months to 10 years for the assault and one year for the prohibited weapon. The two lesser charges will be served concurrently with the armed robbery sentence.

McCoy was charged with the $622 holdup of the Congressional Liquor Store, 406 First St. NE, last June 22, with another man.

McCoy was armed with the shotgun and his partner had a pistol. The store owner resisted the robbery and was hit with a whiskey bottle and the pistol butt as the two escaped.

Witnesses noted the tag number of the escape car and on July 11 McCoy was arrested and charged with the robbery.

He was released on bond and on Sept. 9 was arrested on charges of forgery and released on personal bond until his trial on the robbery charge.

McCoy denied any involvement in the holdup.

Defense attorney James Hughes filed an appeal and asked that McCoy be released pending the outcome.

Hart replied that "the nature of the attack indicates that he is a walking keg of dynamite on the street," and refused release.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 1, 1969]

Stiff New Penalty Imposed on Thief

(By Thomas W. Lippman)

A District Court judge invoked a little-noticed provision of the 1967 D.C. Crime Act yesterday to impose a prison term of 15 years to life on a convicted liquor store robber.

Judge George L. Hart, Jr., also "served notice," he said, that "anyone else convicted by a jury before me of armed robbery may expect a similar sentence."

The crime bill provided that a judge may impose life imprisonment for any crime of violence in which a dangerous weapon is used. Court officials said they could recall only one previous case in which such action had been taken.

Without the crime act, Judge Hart said, the longest sentence he could have given to James E. McCoy would have been 15 years.

McCoy, 25, of 1636 Kenyon st. nw., was convicted of the robbery of Congressional Liquors, 406 1st st. ne., last July. The jury also found that McCoy used a sawed-off shotgun to threaten the store's owner, Bernard Levine.

"At close range," Judge Hart said, "a sawed-off shotgun is the most dangerous weapon known to man."

Judge Hart also noted that McCoy had been charged with forgery while awaiting trial in the robbery case. The sentence he imposed yesterday, he said, will be consecutive to any sentence given to McCoy in any other case. McCoy will have to serve at least 15 years before becoming eligible for parole.

Exhibit 2

Amendment No. 958

Mr. Dominick. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 958, and ask that it be stated.

The Presiding Officer. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. Dominick. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be waived, and that the amendment be printed in the Record.

The Presiding Officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the Record, is on page 62, after line 10, add the following new title:

"TITLE IV—USE OF FIREARMS IN THE COMMISSION OF CERTAIN CRIMES OF VIOLENCE

"Sec. 401. (a) Part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately after chapter 115 the following new chapter:

" 'Chapter 116.—Use of Firearms in the Commission of Certain Crimes of Violence

" 'Sec.

" '2401. Use of firearms in the commission of certain crimes of violence.

" '2402. Definitions.

" '§ 2401. Use of firearms in the commission of certain crimes of violence

" 'Whoever, while engaged in the commission of any offense which is a crime of violence punishable under this title, is armed with any firearm, may in addition to the punishment provided for the crime be punished by imprisonment for an indeterminate number of years up to life, as determined by the court. Upon a subsequent conviction under this section by the same person, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the court shall not suspend the sentence of such person or give him a probationary sentence.

" '§ 2402. Definitions.

" 'As used in this chapter—

" 'Crime of violence' means any of the following crimes or an attempt to commit any of the following crimes: murder; voluntary manslaughter; Presidential assassination, kidnaping, and assault; killing certain officers and employees of the United States; rape; kidnaping; assault with intent to kill, rob, rape, or poison; assault with a dangerous weapon; robbery; burglary; theft; racketeering; extortion; and arson.

" 'Firearm' means any weapon (including a starter gun) which will or is designed to or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive; the frame or receiver of any such weapon; or any firearm muffler or firearm silencer; or any destructive device.

" 'Destructive device' means any exposive, incendiary, or poison gas bomb, grenade, mine, rocket, missile, or similar device; and includes any type of weapon which will or is designed to or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of any explosive and having any barrel with a bore of one-half inch or more in diameter."

"(b) The analysis of part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately before the last item the following:

" '116. Use of firearms in the commission of certain crimes of violence__ 2401' ".

Mr. Tydings. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name may be listed as a cosponsor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

The Presiding Officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. Dominick. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The Presiding Officer. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. Dominick. Mr. President, I welcome the support of the Senator from Maryland. The cosponsors of my amendment are Senators Allott, Bible, Cannon, Curtis, Fannin, Hansen, Hruska, Jordan of Idaho, McGovern, Mundt, Murphy, Tower and Tydings.

The amendment provides and added penalty up to life in prison for an individual who is armed with any type of firearm while engaged in a Federal crime of violence.

The language of the amendment is identical to S. 3681 which I introduced earlier this year. I offer it today with bipartisan cosponsorship.

Several alternatives have been advanced in the 90th Congress regarding penalties for criminal use of a firearm. However, there is one characteristic which sets my amendment apart and makes it unique. It is based on the same formula, insofar as practicable, as that approved by the Congress and signed by the President just 9 months ago as part of the Omnibus Crime Law for the District of Columbia.

Under the terms of the amendment, any person who is convicted of committing or attempting to commit Federal crimes of violence, as defined in the amendment while

XUM

armed with a firearm may first, in addition to the punishment for the crime, be punished by imprisonment for an indeterminate number of years up to life, as determined by the court; and second, if convicted more than once, be precluded from receiving a suspended or probationary sentence.

There was no similar provision in the national crime bill signed into law in June of this year. There is no similar provision in the pending bill.

I believe enactment of such measures in conjunction with effective enforcement and widespread dissemination of the knowledge of their utilization will do more to curtail gun crimes than any of the proposals before the Senate.

We have been dealing in the pending bill with problems in connection with interstate sale of guns. However, my amendment is not designed to get at the gun itself but to get at the man who is using it in Federal crimes of violence; because, after all, it is the fellow who pulls the trigger which really determines what the crime level is going to be, and it is that person we should be deterring.

There are other factors which substantiate the commonsense of the approach taken in this amendment.

No new crime would be created. Penalties have just been increased when one particular element—a gun—is presented in the perpetration of the enumerated crimes. As a result, there would be no additional strain on already overburdened courts.

The provision could go into effect immediately upon passage, without any lag time while enforcement procedures are created.

And, most important, it would give a clear mandate to the Federal courts of this country to deal more severely with criminals who use or carry firearms.

The amendment specifies the offenses which are to be considered crimes of violence, instead of extending to "any felony" as some proposals have done. My reason for this is twofold. First, it is the procedure used in the new District of Columbia crime law, and second, it is apparently the preference of enforcement personnel. A memo prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, during the drafting of my amendments contains the following statements:

"THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
"Washington, D.C., June 25, 1968.

"To: Honorable PETER H. DOMINICK,
"From: Education and Public Welfare Division.
"Subject: Special penalties provided under Title 18, U.S. Code, for the use of firearms or other deadly weapons in commission of crimes.

"Under title 18, special penalties are provided for the following:

"The wording employed to describe the weapons covered in each section is as follows:

"Sections 111 and 112: 'deadly or dangerous weapons'.

"Section 113(c): 'dangerous weapon'.

"Section 2113(d): 'dangerous weapon or device'.

"Section 2231: 'deadly or dangerous weapon'.

"Section 3611: 'firearms and ammunition'.

"Section 1752: 'firearms, weapon, explosive, or any lethal or poisonous gas, or any other substance or thing designed to kill, injure, or disable any officer. . . .'

"Section 2277: 'dangerous weapon, instrument, or device, or any dynamite, nitroglycerine, or other explosive article or compound.'

"DICK MENAKER."

Mr. DOMINICK. They are section 111—assault upon U.S. official—section 112—assault upon foreign official—section 113(c)—assault in maritime or territorial jurisdiction—section 2113(d)—robbing bank—and section 2231—resistance to legal search or seizure. Section 3611 is different in that it allows the court to order confiscation of a firearm used by the criminal once he is convicted.

"According to Mr. Marvin Helter, the Justice Department's specialist on federal criminal jurisdiction, it is highly desirable, in drafting a measure such as the one you contemplate, to be specific about the Title 18 offenses to which it is desired that the act would apply."

All of the serious crimes of a violent nature are included as well as racketeering which involves many elements of both violence and lack of violence. Let me read them as listed in the amendment: murder; voluntary manslaughter; presidential assassination, kidnaping, and assault; killing certain officers and employees of the United States; rape; kidnaping; assault with intent to kill, rob, rape, or poison; assault with a dangerous weapon; robbery; burglary; theft; racketeering; extortion; and arson.

"Firearm" is defined with the same definition as in the pending bill and includes any type of firearm.

This, I submit is the better approach, because it selectively applies greater penalties to those crimes in which firearms are most extensively used and in which if firearms were not used, the crimes would be much more difficult to execute. These are the crimes in which the life of the victim is most in danger.

Existing Federal law containing special penalties for use of a firearm in crime is quite limited. There are only six instances in title 18, the title of the United States Code dealing with crimes and criminal procedure. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table of these sections.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Section of title 18	Imprisonment and/or fine	Other
111 (assault upon U.S. official)	Up to 10 years and/or up to $10,000	
112 (assault upon foreign official)	do	
113c (assault in maritime or territorial jurisdiction)	Up to 5 years and/or up to $1,000	
2113d (robbing bank)	Up to 25 years and/or up to $10,000	
2231 (resistance to legal search or seizure)	Up to 10 years and/or up to $10,000	
3611 (commission of felony with firearm)		Immediate confiscation.

OTHER TITLE 18 OFFENSES RELATING TO FIREARMS

	Imprisonment	Fine	Other
1792 (carrying firearm into Federal penal or correctional institution)	Up to 10 years		
2277 (carrying dangerous weapon aboard vessel without permission)	Up to 1 year	Up to $1,000	

To that list should also be added section 2114 regarding postal and other property.

My amendment would not repeal these provisions nor would it diminish their effectiveness. While the terminology varies, in general it may be said that each of these sections covers any dangerous or deadly weapon. On the other hand, my amendment covers only firearms. As such, it is not intended to detract from these existing sections, but it would be available if the prosecutor and the court desired, for the purpose of stronger penalties in those cases where firearms were involved.

Within the debate over stiffer sentences, some have argued for mandatory minimum fixed terms without regard to the circumstances. Another possibly is what has sometimes been called the pure form of the indeterminate sentence—a sentence for a term without a minimum or maximum, with release depending upon rehabilitation. I am not against these, but I have some reservations as to whether either is as effective or as strong as the formula in my amendment. Let me explain why.

Mandatory sentencing was examined by a task force of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. It said this:

"Because of the need to deter potential offenders and to isolate dangerous persons from the community, it is necessary that long prison sentences be available for those who have committed the most serious offenses or for those who are likely to commit further crimes. Mandatory sentences, however, prevent the courts from basing their sentences on the relative importance of these factors in each case. Judges and prosecutors often regard punishment by long mandatory terms as unreasonably harsh, and they are faced with the dilemma of adhering to the statutory requirement of avoiding it to produce results that seem to be just in individual cases. . . ."

There is persuasive evidence of nonenforcement of these mandatory sentencing provisions by the courts and prosecutors. For example, where certain offenses carry long mandatory prison terms, prosecutors frequently reduce the charge to a lesser offense if the defendant agrees to plead guilty. . . .

By denying adequate sentencing discretion to the courts, the legislatures have unintentionally increased the bargaining power of the prosecutor in plea negotiations. . . .

A dim view of mandatory minimum fixed sentences was also taken by another commission—The President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia. After an analysis of sentencing practices in the District, the Commission concluded:

"Until reliable and detailed data are gathered, the Commission cautions against insufficiently informed responses to reports of rising crime, which assume unproved relationships between sentence severity and flexibility of the courts and correctional authorities to deal with convicted offenders. Unfortunately, such responses mask the need for experimentation with new sentencing alternatives and methods in the light of current knowledge in the fields of correction and the behavioral sciences."

Indeterminate sentencing, in its many forms, is another matter. It preserves discretion and flexibility for the courts and correctional authorities to deal with each case as the circumstances may require. In 1958, Congress authorized Federal courts to impose a hybrid form of indeterminate sentence within the limits of the provisions of each substantive offense, 18 U.S.C. 4208. It was only a limited beginning, but it was a recognition of the merits of indeterminate sentencing patterns.

I said before that I wanted to be sure we provide swift punishment for gun crimes. I also said I had reason to believe my amendment would result in a stronger sentencing structure than mandatory fixed minimums. Let me emphasize, therefore, the concluding lines of the conference report on the 1958 act, when Congress began to enter the field of indeterminate sentencing. The report said:

"Testimony submitted at the hearing on this legislation disclosed that terms served under indeterminable sentences average longer than do terms under the fixed system."

The formula which we approved as the new law for the Nation's Capital, and which is contained in my amendment, is a reasonable compromise. It encompasses elements both indeterminate and mandatory.

My amendment fits nicely into the framework authorized by the 1958 act, 18 United States Code 4208. That act covered offenses punishable by a term exceeding 1 year. Under its terms, the Federal court may, within the limits set by the substantive offense, fix a minimum and maximum term with the minimum not more than one-third of the maximum. Alternatively, it may fix the maximum term to be served within those limits without setting a minimum term and vest the parole board with discretion to release the offender at the proper time.

At the same time, the formula in my amendment has a mandatory aspect. If the prosecutor brings an action against a repeat offender and he is convicted, it is mandatory that the criminal go to prison. The court could not suspend his sentence or give him a probationary sentence.

This new formula strengthens law enforcement, but it maintains the needed flexibility and discretion in the sentencing process. It overcomes the principal objection to mandatory sentencing—the rigidity which does not allow individual cases to be judged solely on the merits. Under the form and substance of congressional policy set forth, it permits Federal judges to sentence more in accord with the relative merits of each offender, in terms of record, type of offense, degree of magnitude of harm to victim, and other related factors.

I recognize the need, as do the American people, for improved enforcement of existing laws. I also recognize the need for obtaining solid convictions of criminals. The changes we recently made in Supreme Court decisions on the admissibility of confessions and other evidence may help. But I also recognize the need for stamping out violence by directing our efforts at those who perpetrate it. My amendment would do that.

The majority of crimes are, of course, State crimes, so the impact of my amendment would be limited in the sense of number of convictions under its terms. But, by limiting its application to Federal crimes—and Federal crimes which are enumerated—we respect and preserve the traditional separation between State and Federal jurisdiction over law enforcement.

By its enactment, Congress can make it clear to every potential criminal in America who contemplates using a gun in crime that he runs the risk of imprisonment for life.

By its enactment, we can stress to State and local legislative bodies the desirability of their enacting similar measures.

We recently took this step for residents of the District of Columbia. Let us now do it for the rest of the Nation.

Mr. President, I have been asked by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] to request unanimous consent to have his name added as a cosponsor of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DODD. Mr President, I believe this is a good amendment. I think it should be agreed to. I commend the Senator from Colorado for his work and for having offered it. I am sorry I did not cosponsor it, but I was not aware of the amendment. I think it is a good amendment and I know of no opposition to it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 1 minute?

Mr. DODD. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have a similar amendment which I had proposed to bring up later in the debate.

I ask unanimous consent to have my name added as a cosponsor of the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Do Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DODD. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HRUSKA. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

S. 2668—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING ASSISTANCE TO VETERANS AND TO PROVIDE FOR A PREDISCHARGE EDUCATION PROGRAM

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, today I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish four new programs to provide special educational and training assistance to veterans and preveterans, basically those from disadvantaged backgrounds, who may have certain academic deficiencies preventing them from or hindering them in pursuing higher education or vocational training. These programs would all be administered directly by the Veterans' Administration and would be financed by payments made by the VA to or on behalf of the eligible veteran or preveteran. There would be coordination and consultation with the Secretary of Defense, in certain instances, and with the Commissioner of Education. Since these are new programs, it is felt that workable guidelines can best be developed utilizing the expertise of the Office of Education in establishing special programs for these purposes.

I also think it important at the outset to acknowledge and express my gratitude for the direct contribution that has been made to this bill by the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), my immediate predecessor as chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. In his bill, S. 2361, which he introduced on June 12, 1969, with cosponsorship by the distinguished chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) and myself, the basic outline of the first two programs which the bill I introduce today would establish were set forth.

This new bill seeks to achieve a number of the ends of S. 2361 through a different method, by establishing direct entitlements to benefits for special educational and training assistance on the part of the veteran and the preveteran rather than through a system of grants to educational intitution which S. 2361 would authorize. I wish to make clear, however, that neither Senator KENNEDY nor I view the approach in the present bill as a substitute for S. 2361, but rather, as will be made clear in the discussion which follows, a coordinate and complementary program.

In his floor statement of June 12, 1969, upon introducing S. 2361—page 15527–15529—Senator KENNEDY poignantly outlined the dimensions of the problem: the great need to encourage and assist toward necessary education and training the hundreds of thousands of those men and women released from service each year who are high school dropouts. Since these veterans have been participating in cold war GI bill benefits at the rate of only one out of 10, it seems quite clear that our programs under present statutory authority are not doing the job that is so vitally necessary. This point is also made very forcefully in a July 4, 1969, article in the Los Angeles Times, entitled, "GI: Why Viet Veterans Ignore Benefits—Lack of Motivation by Dropout Returnees Cited as Main Reason." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of that article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Thus, I wish to congratuate and commend Senator KENNEDY for his outstanding leadership in breaking ground to highlight the need for special educational assistance for veterans from disadvantaged backgrounds, who have academic deficiencies and for proposing constructive and imaginative programs to provide that assistance. I am delighted to have him join me, today, as a cosponsor of the legislation I am introducing.

As I stated earlier, this bill would provide for four new programs.

First, providing educational assistance allowances for college preparatory refresher or academic deficiency courses in other than secondary schools.

In 1967, the Congress established a new program of special training for the educationally disadvantaged, section 1678 of title 38, United States Code. This program was designed to give the high school dropout the chance to acquire higher education or vocational education and training. The provisions, in the Cold War GI Bill Amendments of 1967, provide that the veteran who needs additional high school training or its equivalent will be paid the full educational assistance allowance without having it charged against the period of educational entitlement—up to 36 months—which the veteran has earned. This amendment just has not done the job. Whereas approximately 23 percent of all discharged veterans were high school dropouts, participation of all returning veterans in high school level educational programs is running at only 2.4 percent.

In his June 12 floor statement on S. 2361, Senator Kennedy suggested reasons for this low utilization: essentially that a high school environment is not very attractive to a 22- or 23-year-old veteran, especially one with a family, and that high school adult education

XUM

courses have not been geared to the needs of veterans or of an individual veteran.

To help solve this problem, section 1 of the bill would make a very slight, but I think potentially very significant, change in the section which was added to the code in 1967 to provide special training for the educationally disadvantaged veteran. Presently, a veteran with academic deficiencies who needs refresher or deficiency courses to qualify for admission to an appropriate educational institution where he can pursue a program of education for which he would otherwise be eligible must take such special courses at a secondary school. The bill would permit such refresher or deficiency courses to be pursued at any appropriate institution offering such courses, including therefore, a junior college, college, or university offering precollege preparatory assistance. Presently, there are a number of colleges, such as the California community college system and Pennsylvania State University, which offer such special courses. It is hoped that, with the creation of this broader educational assistance allowance entitlement, many more institutions will offer college preparatory assistance.

As I indicated earlier, this method of financing college preparatory work for the academically deficient veteran in other than a secondary school setting would be complementary, rather than an alternative, to the grant approach in S. 2361. Senator KENNEDY and I contemplate that there would be a substantial need for "seed" money to help institutions establish effective preparatory programs and seek out the servicemen and veterans with academic deficiencies. These funds would be provided under S. 2361 by grants to institutions for employment of special counselors and teachers to design, administer, and recruit for the preparatory courses.

I again wish to thank Senator KENNEDY for developing this idea and working with me to find an additional method of implementing it in this bill.

Second, providing for direct payment of expenses of refresher courses, counseling, tutorial or remedial assistance, or other special assistance to veterans already enrolled at educational institutions.

This is also one of the features of S. 2361. It is approached in this bill by providing for payment, on behalf of the individual veteran, directly to the educational institution offering such supplementary courses to student veterans pursuing courses of study at those institutions. Once again, S. 2361 would be complementary in providing "seed" money for such institutions to hire administrative and professional personnel to design and administer such programs for veterans with academic deficiencies.

The amounts which the Veterans' Administration would pay to an educational institution for such supplementary assistance provided to an eligible veteran under this program, as well as the terms and conditions under which such assistance may be provided, would be prescribed in regulations set forth by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs after consultation with the Commissioner of Education. A consultative and advisory function, without administrative responsibility, is given to the Office of Education.

The supplementary assistance program would be added as part of the section 1678 on special training for the educationally disadvantaged veteran. As with the other programs established under that section, payment of the special assistance training or educational expenses—here directly to the educational institution concerned—would be made without charge to the veteran's period of entitlement under the GI bill.

Third, providing that noncredit deficiency courses may be counted toward full-time status for purposes of receiving a full-time educational assistance allowance.

This third new program under the bill covers another aspect of the provision of special supplementary assistance to eligible veterans.

Under this provision, a veteran would be considered to be pursuing a full-time course at a junior college, college, or university even though he is carrying only half or somewhat more of the normal credit hours considered to be full-time study when, at the same time, he is carrying noncredit courses which he is required to take—because of some educational deficiency—in order to pursue his course of study. In order to be so eligible for a full-time educational assistance allowance, the veteran would be required to be taking the number of noncredit hours which, when added to the number of credit hours, would equal the usual full-time semester-hour requirement, or the equivalent thereof.

Also, this provision would not apply to any noncredit courses which were being paid for directly by the VA under the second program in this bill.

This provision would permit, for example, a veteran attending college under the GI bill who wished to change his major from liberal arts to engineering to take certain basic mathematics courses which he may be lacking and which were prerequisite for entering the engineering course of study and to have those courses counted toward establishing entitlement to a full-time allowance even though he was not granted credit toward an engineering degree for the mathematics courses.

It should also be noted that, if for some reason the second program in this bill is not enacted, this program would go a long way toward providing the necessary funds for special supplementary assistance to the academically deficient veteran, although it would not do so by direct payment to the institution and would not, therefore, necessarily cover all the expenses of obtaining such assistance.

Fourth, establishing predischarge education program—PREP program. In terms of impact on the number of potential participants, this is the major program which would be established by this bill. It aims essentially at providing training and assistance to the preveteran—that is, a person in the Armed Forces prior to discharge from active duty—preparatory to future education or training, or in some instances, directly preparatory to a vocation.

At hearings before the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on June 24, 25, and 26, dramatic evidence was presented regarding the underutilization of the entire post-Korean GI bill education and training program. The present rate of participation is only approximately 20 percent, less than half of the rate of participation in the Korean program and substantially less than half of the rate of participation in the World War II program.

I am not able at this point to accept the explanation of the Veterans' Administration that the participation rate is destined to improve over time. I fully agree with Senator YARBOROUGH, who has deplored this low participation rate and has introduced S. 338 to attempt to improve participation and provide equitable assistance by substantially increasing the education and training allowances under the post-Korean GI bill. I have joined Senator YARBOROUGH as a cosponsor of that bill and of an amendment to it which would make these increases across-the-board, including increases in the augmented allowance rates for veterans with dependents. Hopefully, a more realistic and fair allowance rate will improve participation, but I am not convinced that it is the only answer.

Increasing GI bill utilization is the principal purpose of the PREP program which would be established by this bill. This program would seek to reach the veteran before his discharge by involving him, in the last year of his military service, in education or training which would prepare him to pursue education or training under the regular GI bill. Benefits which such a veteran would receive under the PREP program would be without charge against his educational entitlement under the regular GI bill.

Although this preparatory education and training would not by statute be limited to those from disadvantaged backgrounds who have academic deficiencies, it is clear that such persons are the ones most in need of the type of assistance which the PREP program would provide. The high school dropouts, who constitute 23 percent of the approximately 1 million servicemen who will be discharged in fiscal year 1970, are prime prospects for participation in the PREP program. Most of these 230,000 men and women are not generally inclined to seek out and pursue their educational entitlements under the GI bill. It would be the purpose of the PREP program to seek them out and draw them into that program while they are still on active duty and then, hopefully, into further education and training under the regular GI bill.

In addition to these approximately 230,000 high school dropout veterans, there are perhaps 200,000 other veterans who will be discharged in this fiscal year who will have acquired in the service no usable civilian skill or who will have acquired skills which are only partially usable in civilian life, such as low level administrative and clerical skills which are

XUM

often of limited immediate transferability into the civilian job market.

The PREP program would have two essential aspects. First, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, would be directed to pay directly to an educational institution the expenses of providing the necessary preparatory education and training assistance, but not to exceed $150 per month on behalf of each eligible person. As was the case with the World War II GI bill program, this benefit would cover the full cost of the education and training since it would be paid directly to the educational institution concerned.

No benefits for subsistence would be necessary since the eligible preveteran would already be receiving all other services at the expense of the Department of Defense.

After having served on active duty for at least 1 full year, the preveteran would be eligible to participate in this program during his last 12 months of active-duty service. The discharge date would be established by certification to the Administrator by the Secretary of the Armed Services branch concerned.

The PREP program would be directly administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in accordance with regulations which he would prescribe jointly with the Secretary of Defense and the Commissioner of Education. Additional educational and training expenses reimbursable to the educational institution would include the cost of determining suitability for enrollment, the cost of job placement and career guidance, and the cost of books and supplies to be provided to the eligible person by the institution.

Such regulations would also specify the standards which the Administrator would apply to approve the educational institution and the course in question. For purposes of such approval, the general requirement of section 1675(a) of title 38, United States Code, that a course in operation for less than 2 years shall not be approved, would be waived. Application of such a requirement would be entirely inappropriate to a program such as PREP which is attempting to attract and provide incentives for educational instiutions to establish new preparatory education and training programs. However, it is important to emphasize that the Administrator would be expected to exercise the same degree of careful scrutiny in the approval of courses that he does now for all GI bill education and training programs, as required by title 38 of the code.

Generally, the Administrator would not be permitted to approve types of courses under the PREP program which would be required to be disapproved under the requirements for approval of courses under present GI bill programs—section 1673 of title 38, United States Code. The one exception to this restriction on the Administrator would be the prohibition against approval of noncredit courses at the college level offered by proprietary profit or proprietary nonprofit educational institutions when such courses are more than 85 percent filled by students receiving GI bill assistance. Obviously, to impose any such restriction with respect to the PREP program would be unrealistic and counterproductive and would serve only to eliminate the valuable contributions proprietary institutions would be able to make to the PREP program.

The second major aspect of the PREP program would be to mandate the Administrator on Veterans' Affairs with responsibility for arranging for and coordinating educational and vocational assistance and job placement assistance to persons eligible for the PREP program. This would include three separate classes of preveterans in their last year of military service: First, those who are potentially eligible to participate in the PREP program itself; second, those PREP program participants who will need career guidance and job placement assistance after they complete that program; and third, those who are not participating in the PREP program, but who are in the last year of their military service and who will likely be eligible for full benefits under the regular GI bill program.

It is not contemplated that the Veterans' Administration would necessarily carry out all of these activities directly. For example, some might be performed by the Department of Defense and some by the educational institutions involved in the PREP program. But it would be the clear responsibility of the Veterans' Administration to insure that the necessary educational and vocational guidance and job placement assistance are provided to the eligible veteran.

The PREP program would operate as an adjunct of the "transition program" presently run by the Defense Department. That program has been more generally known as "Project Transition." It was established in 1967 on the basis of a Presidential directive to the Secretary of Defense, and its purpose is to provide maximum inservice training or educational opportunities to servicemen during their last 6 months of duty in order to prepare them for a productive reentry into civilian life. The program operates on a decentralized basis at 254 bases in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. The majority of these installations are within the United States. Servicemen are contacted normally 6 months prior to separation by questionnaire in order to determine their interest in participation. The program is completely voluntary.

The program is primarily for those individuals in most needs of vocational skill training or education in order to make a proper readjustment to civilian life. Emphasis is placed on four basic items: counseling, skill training, education, and placement.

Priority in the program is given to those enlisted personnel in any one of these categories: combat disabled, ineligible to reenlist, entered service with no civilian job experience and did not acquire a civilian-related skill during their period of active duty, served almost exclusively in the combat-type military specialties, have low educational achievement, desire upgrading of their military skills which are civilian-related, require refresher training in civilian skills acquired prior to service, retiring and desire to obtain a useful civilian skill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point the text of the fact sheet on the transition program prepared by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Department of Defense.

There being no objection, the fact sheet referred to was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Transition Program

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this program is to provide maximum inservice training or educational opportunities to servicemen during their last six months of duty in order to prepare them for a productive reentry into civilian life.

II. ORGANIZATION

The program operates on a decentralized basis at 254 bases in the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps. The majority of these installations are within the United States. Servicemen are contacted normally six months prior to separation by questionnaire in order to determine their interest in participation. The program is completely voluntary.

III. TARGET POPULATION

The program is primarily for those individuals in most need of vocational skill training or education in order to make a proper readjustment to civilian life.

Priority in the program is given to those enlisted personnel in any one of these categories:

Are combat disabled.

Are ineligible to reenlist.

Entered Service with no civilian job experience and who did not acquire a civilian-related skill during their period of active duty.

Served almost exclusively in the combat type military specialties.

Have low educational achievement.

Desire upgrading of their military skills which are civilian-related.

Require refresher training in civilian skills acquired prior to service.

Are retiring and desire to obtain a useful civilian skill.

IV. SCOPE

The program emphasizes four basic items: counseling, skill training, education, and placement.

V. COUNSELING

All men with 1–6 months' service time complete a questionnaire containing information about preferences. A counseling session is established to discuss the serviceman's qualifications and outlook, including the preferences stated on the questionnaire, and to display to the serviceman the array of alternatives open to him. Transition training or education may be alternatives. Reenlistment may be another. For some men, returning to their community for immediate job placement after completion of certain types of training available in their home community may be a third alternative. A fourth may be to pursue benefits of the GI Legislation. A fifth may be to seek aid in appraising the skills acquired during their military service in order to prepare them for the most favorable placement in the civilian job market. The advantage of this counseling, well in advance of separation, is the opportunity it affords the serviceman to think carefully about his future. At no other time will there be available to a counselor the wealth of personnel data upon which to help the man make critical decisions.

VI. SKILL TRAINING AND EDUCATION

The Skill Training provided in Transition is from three sources:

Military—existing formal school courses, on-the-job training programs in military skills which are civilian-related, programmed learning courses which can be individually pursued.

Local-State-Federal—courses established on or off-base through the facilities of local governments, Department of Labor, HEW, and Office of Education, appropriate State agencies, and agencies of the Federal government which have large employment demands.

Courses provided by private industry to meet specific employment requirements. Companies are given the opportunity to train servicemen prior to their release, on or near a military base, in skills for which they have a specific requirement.

The skills for which men are trained reflect the desires of the individual, the requirement of the company, and/or the employment estimate supplied by Federal and State Agencies through the facilities of the Department of Labor and private industry. The aim of the program is to provide the returning serviceman with a marketable skill which will enhance his chances of good employment. Training is in skills which are needed in the areas to which the servicemen are returning.

In addition to skill training needs, some men require further *education*. The project identifies those in need of educational upgrading and assists in placing those who desire it in programs which will upgrade their educational status to the completion of an 8th grade or high school equivalency, as needed, or provide them specific academic subjects needed in a particular occupation, such as mathematics. Educational programs are related to enhancing job opportunities. Certain programs are developed with colleges which lead to careers in the public service.

Some men require *both* education and skill training. In such cases the counseling program assists them in selection of the best path within the service time remaining.

Individuals take the offerings after normal duty hours or during duty hours if the local command can accommodate such released time. Arrangements are made between a company and the base for the time and facilities needed to conduct the formal or O.J.T. programs. O.J.T. type training on or off base, by military or private resources, is encouraged since it provides for greater flexibility and greater "hands on" opportunity. Programmed learning materials are used to facilitate training of individuals or small groups and to extend the number of training opportunities. The latter training program is appropriate where there are insufficient personnel to establish regular courses.

The major thrust in the training area is to involve American industry to the maximum in providing skill training for jobs for which it has a specific requirement. If a serviceman receives such training and a placement opportunity prior to separation, he is in a good position for making a good economic reentry into civilian life.

VII. PLACEMENT

Through the facilities of the Department of Labor, State and local agencies, the local regional and national job opportunities are made known to the counselors at each military installation where Transition training is conducted. In addition, the local, regional or national industrial community augments the employment requirements information provided through Department of Labor sources. The intent of the placement program is to make the job opportunities in the area in which the serviceman intends to reside known to him prior to his release from active duty. Mobility will be encouraged in those cases where a serviceman may be returning to a critical employment area.

VIII. CURRENT COURSES

Representative of the courses which are being conducted:

Computer Technician, Fish and Wildlife Management, Postal Worker, Office Machine Operator (various types), Industrial Electrician, Small Appliance Repairman, Drafting, Welding, TV/Radio Serviceman, Service Station Management, Office Machine Repairman, Auto Mechanic, Warehousemen, ADP Machine Repairmen, and Salesman (various types).

IX. SUMMARY

The Transition Program is designed to bring to the serviceman, prior to his separation, the maximum number of resources available in the private and public sectors. The Department of Defense operates as a catalyst to bring this about. It does not itself duplicate the functions of government services and the training resources of industry but merely serves to make them more readily available prior to discharge.

Course offerings depend upon the resources which become available through the cooperative efforts of public sector: Federal, State, and local governments, schools and colleges and the private sector—business and industry, labor and management and private educational institutions.

The Program:

1. Is reaching many men at a very critical point in their life when they want to build upon their recent military service in the very best way possible.

2. Is increasing the services to the veterans at a very critical time when they have some opportunity to reflect positively on what kind of aid they may desire.

3. Helps to counterbalance immediately some slippage in concern for the returning soldier, sailor, airman, or Marine at a time when attention is riveted upon other pressing problems.

4. Provides to the men while still in uniform a very meaningful expression of the public interest and concern for their immediate future in a manner heretofore not demonstrated to the returning serviceman.

5. Enables servicemen to make rational choices in a favorable decision-making climate while they still have the security of the uniform, including an opportunity to take a hard look at the realities of civilian life, weighing his goals against his own capabilities.

6. Provides an opportunity for those who would otherwise be returning to a critical urban or rural environment to make a choice for mobility and follow a good industry job to a new community.

7. Helps universities and colleges to provide innovative programs to men who may never have sought such training under the GI benefits.

8. Enables American industry to convert to immediate use a very ready, capable, and interesting manpower pool through training according to its own requirements.

9. Enables the Armed Forces to offer a recruiting incentive to all prospective applicants by providing not only a career program with security, but an option for closing the loop back to civilian life with an educational or training advantage for all personnel when they leave the service at the conclusion of their military obligation.

10. Permits the Veterans Administration, Department of Labor, Office of Education, Department of Commerce, Justice Department, as well as local and state governmental jurisdiction to give wider and more immediate support to the servicemen in the fields where they have the responsibility and capability.

11. Lays the basis for a more meaningful use of GI benefits to those individuals who most need to consider the value of these benefits.

12. Enables those who have developed or realize their leadership potential while still in uniform to give more positive expression to this capability by training in public service or other occupations where the leadership quality can be fully utilized.

13. Eliminates the possibility for some men entering the category of disadvantaged by giving them the opportunity to become immediately self-sufficient.

14. Enables many men who would otherwise spend long periods in job search or uncertain training to acquire a skill and enter immediately into the role of a positive economic contributor to American life.

Mr. CRANSTON. This DOD transition program is, I think, an excellent beginning in the area of predischarge education and training. However, in its first fiscal year of operation—this past fiscal year—it reached only about 60,000 of the 940,000 men and women separated from the service during that period. Although it has achieved considerable success in trying to reach those in minority groups—19 percent of those enrolled are black—it does not seem that the program has been reaching enough of the most disadvantaged. Only 26 percent of the participants in the program are high school dropouts, only slightly higher than the militarywide high school dropout percentage. The program would be far more successful if high school dropouts constituted a substantial majority of the participants. Once again, this program may be the victim of the old adage that those who already know how to take advantage of available special benefits are those who really need them the least.

In any event, it is very clear, as I indicated earlier, that many many more than 60,000 discharges require predischarge education and training if they are to make a meaningful transition to civilian life and achieve reasonable career goals. One of the particular deficiencies in the present transition program is that colleges, universities, and other educational institutions participate in only a token way. The vast bulk of the training is carried out by the military services themselves—especially by the U.S. Armed Forces Institute and as an extension of the General Education Development—GED—program—by private industries meeting specific employment requirements, and by certain local, State, and Federal agencies. Although the transition program lists 25 percent of its enrollees as pursuing education, only a very few men are participating in college preparatory work. These are the several dozen men sponsored by Webster College, Mo., who later entered a special veterans' program at that college, and a program at Fort Dix in New Jersey sponsored by the Staten Island Community College.

The problem has been that funds are not available to pay educational institutions the cost of providing the necessary screening, instructional, counseling, guidance, and placement services either on or near the base. The PREP program is designed to fill this gap. The Webster College program has already elicited interest from nearly 200 colleges, and I would hope that this interest would yield a high participation rate by such colleges once the PREP program is enacted.

Mr. President, I am preparing a chart, which I hope can be printed in the Record at a later date, which will show the principal military bases in the United States, the number of military personnel assigned there, the transition program contact officer for those bases participating in that program, the average monthly separations from those transition program participants, and the colleges, universities, or technical schools within 10 to 20 miles of each base. This chart will indicate that there are educational institutions in the immediate vicinity of more than 91 percent of all the bases listed. It will also show, for example, that there are approximately 67,000 servicemen separated annually in the State of California who are stationed there for a substantial period of time prior to discharge. California is the leader in this regard. The State with the second most such separations is Texas, with approximately 57,000.

Thus the logistical and geographical situation seems ripe for the influx of funding to make it possible for these institutions to provide the necessary preparatory education and training assistance to the preveterans in the last year of their service at these bases.

By showing on the list only bases in the United States, I do not wish in any way to imply that the PREP program would not be available to preveterans serving overseas during the last 12 months of their service. I am advised that there are a substantial number of American colleges and universities and other educational institutions which are equipped to provide the necessary educational training and assistance to servicemen overseas, although the logistical arrangements and payments may be somewhat more difficult for the Veterans' Administration to administer.

If the PREP program is to operate at its fullest potential as an adjunct to the transition program, I would strongly recommend to the Secretary of Defense that he reconsider certain DOD guidelines. For example, it may become desirable for that program to be opened up to officers in addition to enlisted personnel. Perhaps of greater necessity would be a modification of the 5-months-early discretionary discharge policy for servicemen who have served in Vietnam. It would seem desirable for a pre-veteran wishing to participate in the PREP program to be able—and to be encouraged—to remain in service for that purpose and to have the flexibility of chosing to remain in service less than the full 5 months left in his tour of duty.

It is my belief, Mr. President, that the four new special education and training assistance programs which this bill would establish would make a substantial contribution to our society's repayment of its obligation to our veterans, especially those from disadvantaged backgrounds. As all of our experience with the three prior GI bills has indicated, the investment we make in education and training for veterans is returned manyfold in terms of the increased earning power and taxpaying capability of these veterans throughout their lives.

Senator KENNEDY put this point very well in his June 12 statement when he stated:

> This Nation has a rare opportunity to assist and benefit from the men who have broken out of disadvantaged backgrounds and matured in the service. If we follow through with full veterans programs, including educational services for veterans, we can insure that returning servicemen will not revert to unproductive lives in ghettos or other areas. Rather, veterans whose horizons and aspirations have been broadened in the service can continue to contribute to our national welfare as constructive, well-educated citizens.
>
> We have an obligation both to the men as individuals and to society as a whole to give them the chance.

I am pleased to be joined in introducing this bill, along with Senator KENNEDY, by the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) who is a former chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee and the ranking majority member of the full Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and by the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER), the ranking minority member of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee.

I plan to call hearings on this bill before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs by the end of this month.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point and the Los Angeles Times article which I mentioned earlier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the fact sheet and the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2668), to amend chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional education and training assistance to veterans, and to provide for a predischarge education program, introduced by Mr. CRANSTON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2668

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1678(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "or" at the end of clause (1);

(2) by striking out "secondary school" in clause (2), and inserting in lieu thereof "education or"; and

(3) by adding "or" at the end of clause (2).

(b) Section 1678(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) In the case of any eligible veteran who is enrolled in and pursuing a course of education or training at an educational institution and who, because of a deficiency in his education or training, needs one or more refresher courses, or counseling, tutorial, or remedial assistance, or some other form of special supplementary assistance in order to successfully pursue such program, the Administrator shall pay the educational institution concerned for providing such veteran with the special assistance required. The amounts which may be paid to any educational institution for special assistance provided any veteran under this subsection and the terms and conditions under which such assistance may be provided any veteran shall be prescribed in regulations issued by the Administrator after consultation with the Commissioner of Education."

(c) Section 1678 of such title is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) The educational assistance allowance authorized by subsection (b) of this section and the amount paid to any educational institution under subsection (c) of this section shall be paid without charge to any period of entitlement the veteran may have earned pursuant to section 1661(a) of this title."

SEC. 2. Section 1684(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding the following immediately below clause (3): "Notwithstanding the provisions of clause (3), a veteran shall be considered to be pursuing a full-time course at a junior college, college or university if he is carrying a total of fourteen or more semester hours, or the equivalent thereof, and if (A) credit is granted toward a standard college degree for not less than half the number of those hours, (B) the veteran is carrying one or more courses which are not paid for pursuant to section 1678(c) of this title and for which no credit is granted toward such a degree but he is required to take such course or courses because of a deficiency in his education, and (C) the number of such hours for which no credit is granted, when added to the number for which credit is granted, equals not less than fourteen semester hours, or the equivalent thereof."

SEC. 3. (a) Chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subchapter V as follows:

"SUBCHAPTER V—PRE-DISCHARGE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

"§ 1691. Purpose

"The purpose of this subchapter is to assist veterans to prepare for their further education or training or for a vocation by providing them with a program of education or training prior to their discharge from active duty with the Armed Forces. The program provided for under this subchapter shall be known as the Pre-Discharge Educational Program (PREP).

"§ 1692. Definition

"For the purposes of this subchapter, the term 'eligible person' means any person serving on active duty with the Armed Forces who (1) has served on active duty not less than one full year, and (2) has twelve months or less active duty service remaining prior to the time he is expected to be discharged or released from active duty, as certified to the Administrator by the Secretary concerned.

"§ 1693. Predischarge educational program

"(a) The Administrator, under such regulations as he shall prescribe jointly with the Secretary of Defense and the Commissioner of Education, shall pay the education and training expenses (including the cost of determining suitability for enrollment, job placement and career guidance, and books and supplies furnished to the eligible person by the institution) for any eligible person who enrolls in and pursues a course of education or training offered by an educational institution if such course of education or training is required for or preparatory to any program of education or training or any vocation such eligible person intends to pursue after his discharge or release from active duty with the Armed Forces.

"(b) The Administrator shall in no event pay more than $150 per month for any course of education or training pursued by any eligible person.

"(c) The cost of any education or training course paid for by the Administrator under this subchapter shall be paid directly to the educational institution furnishing such course.

"(c) In no event shall education or training expenses be provided to any eligible person for any period in excess of twelve months.

"§ 1694. Approved educational courses and institutions

"The Administrator shall pay the expenses of a course of education or training pursued by an eligible person under this subchapter only if such course and the educational institution providing such course have been approved, without regard to section 1675, by the Administrator in accordance with regulations issued jointly by the Administrator, the Secretary of Defense, and the Commissioner of Education. The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible person in any type of course under this subchapter if enrollment therein would be required to be disapproved for an eligible veteran under subsections (a), (b) and (c) of section 1673 of this title.

"§ 1695. Educational and vocational guidance

"The Administrator shall be responsible for arranging for and coordinating educational and vocational guidance and job placement assistance to persons eligible for education and training under this subchapter.

"§ 1696. Effect on educational entitlement and benefits

"(a) The educational or training assistance authorized under this subchapter shall be paid without charge to any period of entitlement an eligible person may earn pursuant to section 1661 (a) of this chapter.

"(b) No person shall be eligible to receive educational benefits under this subchapter for any period for which he is receiving an educational assistance allowance under subchapter IV of this chapter."

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SUBCHAPTER V—PRE-DISCHARGE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

"1691. Purpose.
"1692. Definition.
"1693. Pre-discharge educational program.
"1694. Approved educational courses and institutions.
"1695. Educational and vocational guidance.
"1696. Effect on educational entitlement and benefits."

SEC. 4. Section 1681(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(except subchapter V)" immediately after "this chapter."

The material presented by Mr. CRANSTON follows:

GI BILL: WHY VIET VETERANS IGNORE BENEFITS—LACK OF MOTIVATION BY DROPOUT RETURNEES CITED AS MAIN REASON

(By Linda Mathews)

The GI Bill, which a generation ago educated millions of American veterans, today is being taken advantage of by only a fraction of the young men returning from the war in Vietnam.

In fact, those veterans who could profit most—the youths from depressed rural areas and big city slums who went off to war without high school diplomas—virtually ignore the benefits that await them.

Despite their poor job prospects, these high school dropouts regularly pass up federal subsidies that would permit them to finish high school and go on to college or vocational school.

Even their better educated peers, who also won the right to government support for undergraduate and graduate study, are not rushing back to the campuses on the scale predicted by government planners.

PRESIDENTIAL COMMITTEE NAMED

The situation perplexes federal officials and recently prompted action from President Nixon.

Disturbed by the first reports that the new GI Bill is woefully undersubscribed, Mr. Nixon last month appointed a Presidential Committee on the Vietnam Veteran, charged with the task of "finding new programs for a new generation of veterans."

The committee—which includes the secretaries of defense, labor and health, education and welfare—has yet to meet.

Veterans' Administration officials, however, have been preparing reports for the committee.

The studies present a sad picture of a nation sending off to war the least skilled members of the younger generation and, despite some genuine government efforts, returning many to civilian life in the same condition.

The statistics show that nearly one-fifth of the 2.7 million Vietnam veterans mustered out so far lack high school diplomas.

ONLY 4 PERCENT RETURN TO SCHOOL

These 500,000 dropouts are those congress had in mind in 1967, when it enacted an unprecedented high school subsidy, which allows a veteran who wants to finish high school to draw full education allowances without losing any of his college or vocational training benefits.

Yet of the group entitled to the "high school sweetener"—as it is called—only 21,000, about 4%, have gone back to the classroom.

The others are presumably working or looking for work, probably in the poorer neighborhoods of major cities, according to VA spokesmen.

The irony of their predicament is that while most antipoverty and job-training programs are being cut to the bone, the GI benefits for which these men are eligible are in no danger. Even in a time of budget-cutting, the GI Bill is considered sacrosanct.

Beyond this group of dropouts with special problems, Vietnam veterans in general have been slow to seek further education.

As of April 1, 1.25 million Vietnam-era veterans had entered college, vocational programs or on-the-job training. This represents 20% of the 6 million who are eligible under the three-year-old GI Bill, which extended benefits to all men discharged after Jan. 31, 1955.

Just how many of the 1.25 million actually are veterans of the Vietnam conflict is uncertain, since some may have served the late 1950s and early 1960s.

In any case, the 20% rate is far below the participation after World War II, when 50% of the veterans went to school, or after the Korean war, when 42% participated.

Even if all 1.25 million were among the 2.7 million discharged since Vietnam became a major military effort, which seems unlikely, that would put the rate of participation at 46%—still considered inadequate by critical members of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Among these is Sen. Ralph Yarborough (D-Tex.), who calls the situation "a tragedy" in light of growing national emphasis on education. He blames the low rate of participation on the VA and veterans groups, which, he charges, are preoccupied with pensions and disability benefits for the veterans of the world wars.

"The VA is never going to admit this," Yarborough has said, "but they're not doing anything to get these men into school.

"And the reason they're not advertising it is to hold down their budget (for personnel and office costs). They're doing everything they can to keep down the numbers, on orders from the White House and the Bureau of the Budget."

DENIED BY OFFICIALS

VA officials, both here and in Washington, deny Yarborough's charges, insisting, in fact, that they are doing more than ever before to acquaint veterans with the benefits that are available.

Since January, 1967, VA counselors have been on duty at two major Vietnam bases, Cam Ranh Bay and Long Binh, to advise servicemen as they are about to return to the United States. Other VA officials are stationed at armed forces separation centers around the country.

The agency has "outreach" or "search and assist" programs to contact men after they are home, especially those considered educationally disadvantaged. In theory, counselors call on these men by telephone or in person soon after they are discharged—not an easy task when addresses are incomplete or obsolete.

Every man—whatever his education or background—is supposed to receive a letter detailing available programs, with a return postcard enclosed. But a Los Angeles GI, home more than a month, has yet to receive such a communication—and neither have his friends, he says.

Mort Webster, manager of the VA's Southern California regional office, admits the efforts have been hurt by the governmentwide lid on hiring. Locally, there are only five "outreach counselors"—and 4,500 veterans streaming back to Southern California each month.

"We are spread too thin," Webster acknowledges, "and we may have to cut down on doorknocking."

"But, I think, that at least for this area, there are no real problems in finding the men. Most of them are pretty savvy about what's due them, and they call us or come into the office.

"At the moment, as a matter of fact, we're flooded. Half the time, you can't get through on the phone, even though we have 20 lines coming into the office."

The local situation may be somewhat anomalous, Webster says, since a larger percentage of veterans here are enrolled in school than is the case nationwide.

The climate, the agreeable job market and, most importantly, the availability of free education make Southern California particularly hospitable to young veterans.

"The come here knowing they can go to school virtually for free," Webster says, "and they enroll once they get here."

CONFIDENT OF FUTURE

Even nationally, VA administrators express no alarm over the current level of participation. They are confident that, in time, the Vietnam veterans will take advantage of GI Bill schooling at the same level as previous veterans.

Typically, says the agency's benefits director in Washington, a returnee waits a few months to enroll in school, "either taking it easy or working to put aside a little extra money."

Studies which compare the Korean GI Bill with the current one indicate that participation after 18 months has been slightly higher this time, officials claim. At the current rate, they predict that Vietnam usage will exceed the total of the Korean GI Bill in less than half the time.

Yarborough, who campaigned unsuccessfully for a "Cold War GI Bill" in the early 60's, says comparative studies are "pure fakery."

"What is important to remember is that the further a man gets away from the service, the less incentive he will have to go back to school."

It is Yarborough's contention that the VA is unequipped or unwilling to deal with the particular problems of this crop of veterans, a substantial number of whom entered the service with educational handicaps at a time when the general educational level of society was on the rise.

Asked about the disadvantaged veterans, Webster conceded that the greatest difficulty in dealing with them is that "the least educated are the least motivated."

Many found school disagreeable the first time around and are too caught up with personal problems, both emotional and financial, to resume training where they left off, Webster says.

To do something about this, Webster has plans to add a social worker and a counseling psychologist to the staff at a special Veterans Assistance Center in Compton. They are

XUM

expected to "clear away personal obstacles" that may interfere with a man's education, he explains.

Another reason a returnee, especially a high school dropout, may be reluctant to go back to school is summed up by one such man, a recently separated marine with the still-raw haircut that sets him apart from others of his generation.

"I am 23 years old," he said, "and I have a wife, a baby and a mother to look out for. Do you really think I am going to go sit in a classroom, even though I would like to finish high school? I need a job."

For this man, like others, the plethora of "outreach centers" and home calls are too little, too late.

The Johnson Administration's major effort to reach such disadvantaged GI's was a program, still in operation, called Project Transition which is aimed at those without high school diplomas and civilian skills.

At several major bases, in cooperation with private industry, the services give selected servicemen with up to six months to serve a skill they could sell in the marketplace. The four-hour a day courses include instruction in computer programming, service station management, postal processing, food retailing and equipment repair.

Some of the companies allied behind the project—all major government contractors promise jobs to those who complete the courses.

Project Transition has unquestionably helped those men it reached but it has never grown to the capacity envisioned by former President Johnson, who once said 15% of all veterans could be trained this way.

The trouble was that Project Transition ran contrary to another new defense policy, which called for discharging men who come back from Vietnam with less than five months to serve. The latter policy was intended to save money and boost morale, and it did while at the same time short circuiting Project Transition.

The men with enough initiative and interest to apply to schools find that, in terms of GI benefits, they actually make out worse than their counterparts of earlier wars—which also discourages returning to the classroom.

A World War II vet, for example, drew full tuition, fees and book costs, plus a $75 a month living allowance. His son, were he coming back from Vietnam today, would get $130 a month to cover everything, despite the skyrocketing costs of education.

ENTRANCE DIFFICULTY

The Vietnam vet may find, too, that it is harder to be admitted to college today than it was after World War II, when institutions hungry for students would take all comers. Even many state universities have selective admissions policies today.

Yarborough and others have pushed annually for more liberal education benefits. Their efforts have been stymied by opponents who argue, rightly or wrongly, that the veteran interested in an education can go to school for practically nothing, if he only finds the right institution.

Other legislators, notably Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.), have proposed a system of federal grants to colleges and vocational schools interested in setting up programs of counseling and tutoring for homecoming veterans.

EXPERIMENTAL PLAN

Such programs would give disadvantaged students remedial training in skills needed to enroll in regular college classes. (An experimental project of this type recently ended its first session at UCLA, with the "graduates" due to enroll in degree programs this fall.)

For the thousands of young men who slip through this network of programs—who were ineligible for Project Transition or happened to be at a base without the program, who were unable or unwilling to go back to school, who were suited only for the lowest-paying jobs—there is not much comfort in reading about proposals for the future.

"I try not to be paranoid about the kind of treatment we get, since I know veterans of every war in history have groused about what was due them," says one veteran, himself bound for school.

"But I can't help feeling that the real problem is money. Doing anything on the scale that is needed would cost too much, so what you have are all these little programs, each helping a few hundred or a few thousand guys."

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am happy to cosponsor the bill on veterans' education introduced today by Senator ALAN CRANSTON. The legislation clearly reflects the view, which I share with Senator CRANSTON and many of my other colleagues, that education is of critical value in our society and that we must give high priority to offering the fullest possible educational opportunity to the men and women who have served so well as members of our Nation's Armed Forces.

The PREP program which Senator CRANSTON has proposed would establish a broad-range approach to encourage large numbers of educational institutions to go out to military installations and bases to offer training even before the veteran-to-be is actually discharged. As these young men and women formulate future plans and anticipate leaving the service, it can be extremely constructive to give them a number of educational opportunities.

All too often returning veterans fail to take advantage of the educational benefits which are available. Indeed, I am disturbed by the fact that to date only 21.4 percent of Vietnam veterans have utilized the GI bill, in contrast of 50 percent after World War II, and 42 percent after Korea. PREP would reach these individuals before they even leave the service—giving them further background, exposure, and incentive to pursue a course of education, or if they choose giving them preparation to take a job or further vocational training.

Section 1 of the bill incorporates part of the thrust of S. 2361, the Educational Services for Veterans bill which I introduced earlier this year. S. 2361 provides for grants to postsecondary institutions to develop counseling, tutorial, remedial, and other special services for veterans. The aim is to encourage schools to recognize that returning servicemen with apparently weak academic backgrounds deserve our special attention and also, in many cases, have deceptively strong potential as students because they have developed discipline and maturity in the service. S. 2361 would authorize, among other things, a limited PREP-type program where schools might give courses to servicemen right on the base for a few months before discharge and then take them into special or regular programs when they are released. Especially, the thought was that S. 2361 might support "upward bound" type and other special programs for veterans right on a college or other campus. Senator CRANSTON is to be commended for developing this comprehensive approach to meet a clear need.

Section 1 of the bill introduced today would encourage postsecondary schools to carry out such projects, not by a grant program to the institution but rather by an entitlement paid to or on behalf of the veteran. Section 1, then, would supplement S. 2361 and also offers a limited alternative approach.

I have worked with Senator CRANSTON in developing this section of the bill, and I am pleased to have made this contribution to an important overall piece of legislation.

I would like to add, Mr. President, as the chairman last session of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare it is extremely satisfying to see the vigorous, committed, imaginative, and thorough job which Senator CRANSTON is doing as present chairman. It is a pleasure to cosponsor the bill which he has introduced today.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

S. 437

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) be added as a cosponsor of S. 437, to amend chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the reduction in the annuities of employees or Members who elected reduced annuities in order to provide a survivor annuity if predeceased by the person named as survivor and permit a retired employee or Member to designate a new spouse as survivor if predeceased by the person named as survivor at the time of retirement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2070

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) and the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 2070), to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage to $2 an hour, to provide for an 8-hour workday, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2346

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) be added as a cosponsor of S. 2346, to amend title 28, United States Code, section 753(e), to eliminate the maximum and minimum limitations upon the annual salary of reporters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2482

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Kennedy) be added as a cosponsor of S. 2482 to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to add to such act a new title dealing especially with kidney disease and kidney-related diseases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2487

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Tydings) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2487) to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2520

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Eagleton), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. Bennett), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. Yarborough) be added as cosponsors of S. 2520, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide a means of preventing civil disturbances from disrupting federally assisted programs and activities at institutions of higher education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2523

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Church) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2523) to amend, extend, and improve certain public health laws relating to mental health, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2548

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Talmadge), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Packwood) be added as a cosponsor of S. 2548, to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to strengthen and improve the food service programs provided for children under such acts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2608

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. Javits) and the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Hartke) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 2608) to provide for the comprehensive control of narcotic addiction and drug abuse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2622

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Hansen) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Packwood) be added as cosponsors of S. 2622, to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE RESOLUTIONS NOS. 216, 217, 218, AND 219—SUBMISSION OF RESOLUTIONS TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted the following resolutions (S. Res. Nos. 216, 217, 218, and 219); which were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 216

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations two thousand additional copies of Part 19 of the hearings before its Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations during the ninety-first Congress, first session, entitled "Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders."

S. Res. 217

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations two thousand additional copies of Part 20 of the hearings before its Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations during the ninety-first Congress, first session, entitled "Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders."

S. Res. 218

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations two thousand additional copies of Part 18 of the hearings before its Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations during the ninety-first Congress, first session, entitled "Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders."

S. Res. 219

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations two thousand additional copies of Part 17 of the hearings before its Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations during the ninety-first Congress, first session, entitled "Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders."

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MISSILE TEST FACILITIES AT KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE, AND RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTH—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 85

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I am today submitting an amendment to S. 2546, the defense procurement authorization bill, to formally institute an auditing and congressional reporting system on major defense contracts. Joining me as cosponsors of this measure are Mr. Case, Mr. Cook, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Mathias, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Packwood, Mr. Saxbe, Mr. Scott, Mr. Stevens, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of Ohio.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee for over 5 years, and now as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I have been increasingly disturbed by the lack of accurate and up-to-date military procurement information which we have received, and which is so vitally needed if Congress is to properly perform its oversight and legislative role on defense spending.

Defense spending accounts for 41 percent, or about $80 billion, of our national budget, and yet we lack even the most basic accounting and auditing tools so essential in modern-day fiscal management. The serious problem was demonstrated dramatically this year when the estimated $2 billion overrun in the C-5A transport plane contract, the $4 billion overrun in the Minuteman II contract, and the 2,700 percent cost overrun in the Navy's deep submergence rescue vehicle were revealed.

The tragic fact of these excessive cost revelations was that the Congress was informed of them long after the fact, when there was nothing we could do about them. Instead of learning about them in an orderly fashion, when detailed analysis and recommendations could be made in time to correct them, we heard about them under the glare of television lights in publicized hearings, when no amount of talk could return the wasted money.

I think there is no other fiscal operation in this country, either in the Government, or in private business, which is responsible for so large a budget with so little accurate information on which to base its key spending decisions or its judgments on spending priorities, whether they be military or domestic.

My amendment will begin to remedy this situation by putting into statutory form a requirement that the Defense Department make quarterly reports to Congress on all major weapons systems, including, but not limited to, original and current estimates of cost completion dates, and performance standards, evaluations of any discrepancies between these estimates, and status reports or any options pending under the contract terms and the cost of such options.

My proposal goes further, however, than just requiring the submission of the reports. I require the Comptroller General, through the General Accounting Office, to audit this reporting system, and provide an annual report to Congress, including recommendations for improvement in the reporting. In addition, I authorize the Comptroller General to conduct an audit on any individual contract he feels warrants such special attention, and give him authority to demand additional information on such contract from both Government agencies and private contractors in order to make the audit.

The advantage of this system is that Congress would receive accurate and current information in time to take appropriate remedial action. In addition, the GAO auditing, of both the system and any individual contract, will hopefully serve as an incentive to efficiency and a deterrent against carelessness on the part of Government and private parties to these defense contracts.

The wasted money on the few projects which have been investigated recently is staggering. But I fear that it is just the tip of the iceberg which would be revealed if every major defense contract received this scrutiny. If my system is instituted immediately, maybe some of these unknown overruns can be avoided.

With our economy under such a severe expenditure strain, and with questions of tax reform, surtax, and spending priorities so important, it is imperative that we institute statutory reporting and auditing requirements, and not merely rely on informal data supplied by the Pentagon without anyone auditing the system.

Mr. President, I submitted individual views on this amendment, which were joined in by the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG), with the Armed Services Committee report on this bill. I ask unanimous consent that these views, and the text of my amendment, be printed in the RECORD at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the text of the amendment and the individual views will be printed in the RECORD as requested.

The amendment (No. 85) submitted by Mr. SCHWEIKER, for himself and other Senators, is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new title:

TITLE V—QUARTERLY CONTRACT REPORTING AND GAO AUDITS

SEC. 501 (a) The Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the Comptroller General, shall develop a reporting system for major contracts entered into by the Department of Defense, any department or agency thereof, or any armed service of the United States, for the development or procurement of any weapons system or other need of the United States.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall cause a review to be made of each major contract as specified in subsection (a) during each period of three calendar months and shall make a finding with respect to each such contract as to—

(1) The estimates at the time the contract was entered into of the contractor and the procuring agency as to the cost of the contract, with separate estimates for (a) research, development, testing, and engineering, and for (b) production;

(2) The contractor's and agency's subsequent estimates of cost for completion of the contract up to the time of the review;

(3) The reasons for any significant rise or decline from prior cost estimates;

(4) The options available for additional procurement, whether the agency intends to exercise such options, and the expected cost of exercising such options;

(5) The estimates of the contractor and the procuring agency, at the time the contract was entered into, of the time for completion of the contract, any subsequent estimates of both as to the time for completion, and the reasons for any significant increases therein;

(6) The estimates of the contractor and procuring agency as to performance capabilities of the subject matter of the contract, and the reasons for any significant actual or estimated shortcomings therein compared to the performance capabilities called for under the original contract or subsequent estimates;

(7) Such other information as the Secretary of Defense shall determine to be pertinent in the evaluation of costs incurred and expected to be incurred and the effectiveness of performance achieved and anticipated under the contract.

(c) The Secretary of Defense after consultation with the Comptroller General and with the Chairmen of the Committees on Armed Services and the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall prescribe criteria for the determination of major contracts under subsection (a).

(d) The Secretary of Defense shall transmit quarterly to the Congress and to the Committees on Armed Services and to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives reports made pursuant to subsection (b), which shall include a full and complete statement of the findings made as a result of each contract review.

(e) The Comptroller General shall, through test checks, and other means, make an independent audit of the reporting system developed by the Secretary of Defense and shall furnish to the Congress and to the Committees on Armed Services and the Committees on Appropriations not less than once each year a report as to the adequacy of the reporting system, and any recommended improvements.

(f) The Comptroller General shall make independent audits of major contracts where in his opinion the costs incurred and to be incurred, the delivery schedules, and the effectiveness of performance achieved and anticipated are such as to warrant such audits and he shall report his findings to the Congress and to the Committees on Armed Services and the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

(g) Procuring agencies and contractors holding contracts selected by the Comptroller General for audit under subsection (f) shall file with the General Accounting Office such data, in such form and detail as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General, as the Comptroller General deems necessary or appropriate to assist him in carrying out his audits. The Comptroller General and any authorized representative of the General Accounting Office is entitled, until three years after final payment under the contract or subcontract as the case may be, by subpoena, inspection, authorization, or otherwise, to audit, obtain such information from, make such inspection and copies of, the books, records, and other writings of the procuring agency, the contractor, and subcontractors, and to take the sworn statement of any contractor or subcontractor or officer or employee of any contractor or subcontactor, as may be necessary or appropriate in the discretion of the Comptroller General, relating to contracts selected for audit.

(h) The United States District Court for any district in which the contractor or subcontractor or his officer or employee is found or resides or in which the contractor or subcontractor transacts business shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such contractor, subcontract, officer or employee to furnish such information, or to permit the inspection and copying of such records, as may be requested by the Comptroller General under this section. Any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

(i) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required to carry this section into effect.

The views presented by Mr. SCHWEIKER, are as follow:

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF MESSRS. SCHWEIKER AND YOUNG

In the course of the hearings and debate conducted by the Senate Armed Services Committee concerning the military procurement authorization bill for fiscal year 1970, there has been considerable attention focused on defense contracts, and procurement policies.

Two points have become clear:

(1) Extra millions of dollars have been spent in defense procurement and development contracts because of cost overruns, completion delays, and inadequate enforcement of performance standards.

(2) The Congress has not been aware of the enormity of the cost until long after they have occurred, and often has not been informed about them until nothing could be done to correct the errors.

The estimated $2 billion overrun in the C5A transport plane contract, the $4 billion overrun in the Minuteman II contract, and the amazing 2,700 percent cost overrun in development of the Navy's deep submergence rescue vehicle are indications of the significant problems which have developed.

The Congress must take its share of the responsibility for this breakdown in our procurement system. Along with Budget Bureau reviewers, Department of Defense managers, and private contractors, we have encouraged neither strict contract review nor tight accounting procedures.

It is imperative that Congress now enact legislation to insure that it can adequately and effectively review and control the defense budget. It is not enough to state our intention, obtain promises from all parties that stricter guidelines will be followed, and then hope that reforms can be made. We must, in addition, enact statutes which set forth clearly our intention to give defense procurement and development careful scrutiny and the procedures we will follow to do it.

One of the problems that Congress faces in taking on the enormous job of reviewing defense procurement is that we simply do not have adequate resources. Capable as this Committee and its staff are, we cannot do more than begin to review defense contracts in depth. Even Bureau of the Budget officials have admitted that with 50 personnel assigned to review of the defense budget, they have not been able to control defense procurement excesses. The Pentagon has not had a uniform accounting system. Information and responsibility on major contracts are spread throughout dozens of offices. Better access to contract information is vitally necessary.

However, Congress does have a vital instrument at its disposal, the General Accounting Office. GAO is independent of the executive branch, has professional accountants and auditors, and has the basic resources to do the job.

The Committee earlier this year, obtained on loan two GAO men to help the Committee staff review the major defense contracts, and they have been a valuable addition. We feel, however, that more is needed. The Comptroller General should be authorized to utilize the full resources of the GAO by audits and other means, to help Congress effectively perform oversight and watchdog functions over defense procurement.

We recommend that a fifth title be added to the bill to enumerate specific duties with respect to defense contracts, as follows.

(1) Require that the Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the Comptroller General, develop a reporting system for major defense development or procurement contracts whereby he would provide quarterly reports to the Congress on the status of these contracts.

(2) Specify that the following information would be included in these reports:

(*a*) Original cost estimates, with separate estimates for (1) research, development, testing, and engineering and (2) production.

(*b*) Similar cost estimates as of the date of each quarterly report.

(*c*) Explanations of any significant rise or decline in cost estimates.

(*d*) Enumeration of any options available for additional procurement, including a statement of whether the agency intends to exercise such option, and their expected costs.

(*e*) Original and current completion date estimates, and reasons for any delays.

(*f*) Original and current estimates of per-

XUM

formance capabilities and reasons for any shortcomings.

(*g*) Any other information determined by the Secretary to be pertinent for evaluation of costs and performance effectiveness.

(3) Require that the Comptroller General make an independent audit of the Secretary's reporting system, and report annually to the Congress on the adequacy of this reporting system, including any recommendations for improvements in it.

(4) Require that the Comptroller General make independent audits of individual defense contracts when he feels it warranted because of concern over discrepancies or increased estimates in the Secretary's quarterly reports. He shall have the authority to procure statements and additional information from both the agencies and the private contractors involved in any individual contract he decides to audit.

Some steps have already been taken in the area of defense contract review. This report has already referred to the important step taken by the Committee Chairman to obtain staff assistance from GAO. In addition, the Chairman has used the staff of the Preparedness Investigation Subcommittee to great advantage, and he has asked the Pentagon to submit quarterly cost reports on 31 major defense contracts, the first several of which have already been received.

Congress must face up to its responsibilities. We must put into statutory language, methods by which we can receive accurate and detailed information on a regular basis so that our review of defense contracts can be in an orderly fashion, and so that mistakes and inefficiencies can be spotted in time to correct them before costs have already skyrocketed.

In short, congressional review, with GAO assistance and audits, should be a matter of law. This will serve the end of providing continual up-to-date status reports to the Congress. It will give the agencies and private contractors involved clear notice of exactly what information will be received by the Congress, and should serve as an incentive to efficiency.

The seriousness of this issue goes far beyond the fact that money is being wasted under current procedures. We are living in a time of serious inflation. The taxpayers have every right to expect that elected and appointed officials of their Government are exercising the utmost care in allocating and spending the vast sums necessary to maintain our country's defense capabilities.

They also have the right to know, within the bounds of national security, the details of how this money is being spent, and what problems are being experienced with respect to the administration of these contracts.

Enactment of this amendment will be a significant step in bringing about these goals.

Richard S. Schweiker.
Stephen M. Young.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MISSILE TEST FACILITIES AT KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE, AND RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTH—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 86

Mr. EAGLETON (for himself and Mr. Hatfield) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2546) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein missile range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 87

Mr. MOSS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2315) to restore the golden eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, which was ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONTINUANCE OF INCOME TAX SURCHARGE AND CERTAIN EXCISE TAXES—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 88

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I submit a small business amendment intended to be proposed by me to the surtax bill, H.R. 12290, designated as the bill "to continue the income tax surcharge and the excise taxes on automobiles and communication services for temporary periods, to terminate the investment credit, to provide a low income allowance for individuals, and for other purposes."

This bill is vitally needed to save the small business community of this country from the triple credit squeeze which I described in my remarks of June 25.

In the private money markets interest rates are at record levels and any liquidity that remains is rapidly drying up.

The Small Business Administration business loan programs were cut back 58½ percent in the years ending June 30, 1969, below the levels authorized by the Congress, and requests for the coming year are at rockbottom.

The repeal of the investment tax credit would thus be the third pressure to fall upon small firms this year.

The tax credit is particularly important, because we know that small business relies on its internally retained earnings for two-thirds or more of its growth capital. The credit mechanism thus allows these firms to keep more of the money which they have already earned. That makes them less dependent on outside sources of capital for which they must compete with the giant national corporations.

The present credit squeeze has meant that increasing burdens are being piled on the back of small and independent businessmen this year; I just do not know how long they can continue to take this kind of a beating.

My proposal to preserve the 7-percent investment tax credit for small firms was originally placed before the Ways and Means Committee on May 20 during its deliberations on the surtax bill. However, neither the committee nor the House acted to include such a provision.

The issue is therefore up to the Finance Committee and the Senate. We believe there is considerable sentiment for this kind of legislation. The Senator from Alabama (Mr. Sparkman) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGovern) have sent amendments parallel to mine to the Finance Committee. I believe that these Senators, and others supporting these small business amendments would be interested in joining in any measure along these lines which the committee would devise, for the purpose of getting this vital job done for the Nation's small business community.

It is my hope that the committee and the Senate will act accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 89

Mr. METCALF submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 12290), supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 90

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the surtax bill reported out yesterday by the Senate Finance Committee, H.R. 12290, an amendment to increase the personal exemption from $600 to $1,000.

Mr. President, along with millions of Americans, I was shocked and greatly concerned to learn of the action taken by the Senate Finance Committee yesterday in voting 9 to 8 to report out the surtax proposal to the Senate floor. I was shocked and concerned, Mr. President, because for months now—and especially in recent weeks—the majority of this body have made it explicitly clear that we should not concur in the action taken by the House of Representatives in extending the surtax unless there was meaningful and substantive tax reform legislation coupled with it.

And only this week, Mr. President, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, Senator Long, took to the floor of the Senate to assure Members of this body on behalf of the Finance Committee, that there would be no action taken by his committee until scheduled hearings were held on tax reform proposals. I would like the Record to show that the distinguished chairman of the committee, Senator Long, did try and he tried valiantly to have the committee live up to their pledge on yesterday. He voted against reporting out the surtax yesterday because Senators had not had the time that was promised them for hearings on tax reform proposals. I commend the chairman for his actions. I regret, however, that because a majority of the committee did not agree with the chairman on holding hearings on tax reform measures before reporting out the surtax measure, that those hearings may now have to be held on the Senate floor.

Mr. President, I have voiced my opposition time and again to an extension of the surtax. My opposition will be, as it has been, particularly vociferous if an attempt is made, as it now has, to extend the surtax without tax reform. How this can be justified is beyond me. We were told the surtax was needed this past year to hold down inflation and because of rising costs in the Vietnam conflict. The surtax has not held down inflation or even slowed it. Military costs in Vietnam should be cut this year with the first American troops already having been withdrawn.

When the surtax was instituted last year, many raised the question of whether we would be asked to continue it again this year and possibly again next year and on and on. Assurances were given that this was a 1-year request only and would not be extended. Yet here it is before us again for approval.

President Nixon assured Americans last year he was against the surtax. Yet here he is lining up support and fighting vigorously for it.

Mr. President, I recently sent a newsletter to my constituents on the case for tax reform. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the newsletter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSLETTER OF SENATOR JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

THE CASE FOR TAX REFORM NOW

The working men and women of America have been carrying the real tax burden of this Nation on their backs for a long time. This unbelievable situation can not long endure, and vigorous action must be forthcoming immediately to give them the break they deserve.

Because I feel so strongly that these injustices must be brought to an end, I am hopeful that the United States Congress will—this year—enact drastic reforms in our Federal Tax laws. Without these reforms, good, decent, hardworking American wage earners will continue to shoulder this unfair share of the taxload, while loopholes will permit the wealthy and privileged to avoid paying their share.

THE SURTAX AND CLOSING LOOPHOLES

I have concuded that the best way to close these unfair loopholes is to insist that meaningful tax reforms be included with any extension of the present surtax. Promises of future reform legislation are not enough. New Mexicans—and all Americans—need action now!

Early this year I introduced a measure, S. 1054, to increase the personal income tax exemption from $600 to $1,000. The last time the personal exemption was revised was in 1948, and the Consumer Price Index has risen by 44.6% since that time. A $1,000 personal exemption would more realistically represent the costs of providing for the needs of each individual and is certainly modest.

I have also introduced another measure, S. 2095, which would eliminate other injustices and inequities of our present tax structure. While we cannot bring about all of these reforms overnight, nevertheless we can correct immediately some of the more obvious and flagrant inequities, and then aim at seeking reform of complex issues that will of necessity take time.

But unless major loopholes are closed at the same time that the surtax is extended, our low- and middle-income workers and wage and salary earners will pay a 10% surtax for 1969, while those who have already been avoiding fair taxes cannot and will not be assessed with a surtax. (The surtax is a tax on a tax and no taxes can be collected if none are paid.)

Let me emphasize my basic objection to a simple extension of the surtax with no real tax reform. Last year, wage earners paid a 7.5% surtax. A simple extension would mean an actual increase for those same wage earners to 10%. I oppose any such increase because I know that it only compounds the problem by adding to the burdensome tax already shouldered by those who can ill afford it, and because any needed additional Federal revenue can be obtained easily by closing loopholes instead of continuing to boost the taxes of working men and women.

PRESENT TAX STRUCTURE UNFAIR

The 1969 Economic Report of the President showed statistically that the combined Federal, state and local tax systems operate in such a way as to redistribute income "away from the poor." At the same time, the figures demonstrated that people with modest and middle incomes are bearing a disproportionately high share of the tax burden, while those with wealth and ability-to-pay are able to structure their income and escape their fair share.

In my view, this situation demands immediate attention by Congress to:

Close the loopholes of special tax privilege which cost our government money and help only wealthy families and businesses.

Reduce the relative tax burden for low- and moderate-income families.

Remove the truly impoverished families of our country from the tax rolls.

$16 BILLION IN LOOPHOLES THAT MAKE NO SENSE

Our Federal Government loses annually approximately $16 billion in revenue through present legal loopholes that are of no real benefit to working people. Let me list just a few examples:

A married worker earning $8,000 a year paid a $1,000 tax bill. During the same year, 134 people with reported incomes of more than $200,000 didn't pay a penny in taxes.

While the same married worker paid $1,000 in taxes on his $8,000 in wages, another married person who made $8,000 during the year on the stock market alone, paid but $345 in taxes.

A $10,000 per year married wage earner with two children pays taxes at the same effective rate as does a real estate operator with a total income of $7.5 million.

A number of large business organizations pay tax almost entirely at the same rate designed for small businesses by organizing their operations in the form of a chain of small corporate units, and claiming exemptions from the corporate surtax rates.

Almost $2 billion is spent by the Office of Economic Opportunity as part of the "War on Poverty." But despite our national commitment to eliminate poverty, many of these same poverty-level families have Federal taxes withheld from their wages, while the wealthiest pay nothing.

Loopholes such as the ones I have just mentioned not only are unfair, they also make no sense. All too often, they work against national policy. Their only excuse is to help the privileged few.

STATE AND LOCAL TAXES

All New Mexicans are aware of our own galloping state, county and municipal taxes. We have seen how waste and incredible inefficiency have resulted in higher rates, but no increase in services.

Effective July 1, 1969, not only will the State sales tax be increased from 3% (or 3 cents on the dollar) to 4% (or 4 cents), but an additional $10 million in State income taxes will be taken from the hard-earned wages of New Mexico's working men and women. And we can add to this the soaring property taxes and other taxes levied upon the consumer.

Most of our New Mexico taxes result from levies on property and sales to consumers, and have no relation to "ability to pay." In fact, they work in the opposite direction—hitting hardest those with the least ability to pay.

Clearly our state needs to tighten the administration of its programs. And, we also should look at the source of our present revenue.

WHERE I STAND

I am determined that the Nixon Administration will not have its way on the surtax without some firm, concrete, and drastic action in the way of tax reforms, and am delighted that the Congress is taking such a close and hard look at the facts.

Again, I believe that Congress can—and must—close glaring loopholes in our present tax laws. I am determined to wage such a fight when tax legislation is considered by the Senate.

The closing of loopholes can provide some $16 billion in added Federal revenues. Approximately half of this should be used to bring much-needed tax relief to low- and middle-income families. The remainder should be used to better fund essential Federal programs in such areas as education and health.

Not only will this represent long overdue tax justice, but it will be good for the country as a whole.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, the amendment I submit today is only one of many reforms that should be made in our tax system. Others of my colleagues have either already introduced other amendments or are planning to do so. The amendment which I introduce today to increase the personal exemption from $600 to $1,000 is identical to the provisions of S. 1054 a bill I introduced on February 18, 1969, and which I have introduced before. It is also contained in S. 2095 a bill which I introduced on May 8, 1969, proposing a number of changes in our tax structure.

Mr. President, the low- and middle-income taxpayer of this Nation cannot wait any longer for tax relief. He needs relief now. This past year he witnessed the highest annual increase in his cost of living in 17 years. In general, he is not concerned with capital gains or stock options. Unless he owns a house or has high medical deductions, he is almost certain to take the standard deduction and list but one source of income. Therefore, the chief tax factors affecting him are the level of personal exemption and the tax rate applying to his taxable income.

The personal exemption today is $600 for each taxpayer and each of his dependents. The last time this figure was revised was in 1948. It has not been increased with the rising level of prices. In fact, since 1948 the Consumer Price Index has risen by 44.6 percent—based on average levels of the index in 1948 and 1968. What we consider a reasonable standard of living has also changed in these last two decades. There are more demands by today's society than was true 20 years ago.

Mr. President, the low- and middle-income taxpayers need relief. They have been carrying the burden too long. They have been carrying more than their share of the load. Let us assist them by enacting the proposal I have just introduced.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 90), submitted by Mr. Montoya, to H.R. 12290, supra, was received, ordered to be printed, lie on the table, and printed in the Record, as follows:

Amendment No. 90

On page 52, line 15, insert the following:

"That (a) the following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are amended by striking out '$600' wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$1,000':

"(1) Section 151 (relating to allowance of deductions for personal exemptions);

"(2) Section 642(b) (relating to allowance of deductions for estates);

"(3) Section 6012(a) (relating to persons required to make returns of income); and

"(4) Section 6013(b)(3)(A) (relating to assessment and collection in the case of certain returns of husband and wife).

"(b) The following provisions of such Code are amended by striking out '$1,200' wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$2,000':

"(1) Section 6012(a)(1) (relating to persons required to make returns of income); and

"(2) Section 6013(b)(3)(A) (relating to assessment and collection in the case of certain returns of husband and wife).

"Sec. 2. (a) Section 3 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to optional tax if adjusted gross income is less than $5,000) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(c) Taxable Years Beginning After December 31, 1968.—In lieu of the tax imposed by section 1, there is hereby imposed for each taxable year beginning after December 31, 1968, on the taxable income of every individual whose adjusted gross income for such year is less than $5,000 and who has elected for such year to pay the tax imposed by this section a tax determined under tables prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. The tables prescribed under this subsection shall provide for amounts of tax in the various adjusted gross income brackets approximately equal to the amounts which would be determined under section 1 if the taxable income were computed by taking either the 10-percent standard deduction or the minimum standard deduction.'

"(b) Section 3(b) of such Code is amended by insertingf after 'December 31, 1964' each place it appears ', and before January 1, 1969'.

"(c) Section 4(a) of such Code is amended by striking out 'the tables in section 3' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the tables prescribed under section 3'.

"(d) Paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 4(c) of such Code are amended to read as follows:

" '(2) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, in the case of a husband or wife filing a separate return the tax imposed by section 3 shall be the lesser of the tax shown in the table prescribed under such section which uses the 10-percent standard deduction or in the table which uses the minimum standard deduction.

" '(3) The table prescribed under section 3 which uses the minmum standard deduction shall not apply in the case of a husband or wife filing a separate return if the tax of the other spouse is determined with regard to the 10-percent standard deduction, except that an individual described in section 141(d)(2) may elect (under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) to pay the tax shown in such table in lieu of the tax shown in the table which uses the 10-percent standard deduction. For purposes of this title, an election made under the preceding sentence shall be treated as an election made under section 141(d)(2).'

"(e) Section 4(f)(4) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

" '(4) For nonapplicability of the table prescribed under section 3 which uses the minimum standard deduction in the case of a married individual filing a separate return who does not compute the tax, see section 6014(a).'

"(f) The last sentence of section 6014(a) of such Code is amended to read as follows: 'In the case of a married individual filing a separate return and electing the benefits of this subsection, the table prescribed under section 3 which uses the minimum standard deduction shall not apply.'

"Sec. 3. (a) Section 3402(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to percentage method of withholding income tax at source) is amended by striking out the table therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" '*Percentage method withholding table*

" '*Payroll period*	*Amount of one withholding exemption*
Weekly	$21.20
Biweekly	42.30
Semimonthly	45.80
Monthly	91.70
Quarterly	275.00
Semiannual	550.00
Annual	1,100.00
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	3.00'

"(b) So much of paragraph (1) of section 3402(c) of such Code (relating to wage bracket withholding) as precedes the first table in such paragraph is amended to read as follows:

" '(1)(A) At the election of the employer with respect to any employee, the employer shall (subject to the provisions of paragraph (6)) deduct and withhold upon the wages paid to such employee on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph a tax determined in accordance with tables prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, which shall be in lieu of the tax required to be deducted and withheld under subsection (a). The tables prescribed under this subparagraph shall correspond in form to the wage bracket withholding tables in subparagraph (B) and shall provide for amounts of tax in the various wage brackets approximately equal to the amounts which would be determined if the deductions were made under subsection (a).

" '(B) At the election of the employer with respect to any employee, the employer shall (subject to the provisions of paragraph (6) deduct and withhold upon the wages paid to such employee before the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph a tax determined in accordance with the following tables, which shall be in lieu of the tax required to be deducted and withheld under subsection (a):'.

"Sec. 4. The amendments made by the first two sections of this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1968. The amendments made by section 3 of this Act shall apply with respect to remuneration paid on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act."

AMENDMENT NO. 91

Mr. McGOVERN (for himself, Mr. Church, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Gravel, Mr. Hart, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Moss, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of Ohio), submitted an amendment intended to be submitted by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 12290), supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 92

Mr. McGOVERN (for himself, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Church, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. Young of Ohio), submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 12290), supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 93

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I submit as an amendment to H.R. 12290 the Tax Redistribution Act of 1969, intended to be proposed by me.

I realize that the Senate Finance Committee yesterday reported H.R. 12290, that my amendment will lie on the table and that it will not be referred to committee.

Let me explain why I decided to introduce an extensive tax reform package as an amendment to a reported bill.

Even before the Democratic policy committee, of which I am a member, unanimously endorsed a resolution linking tax reform with extension of the surtax, I stated my opposition to placing a 10-percent addition on top of an already inequitable tax system.

I stated that I might vote for extension of the surtax if it were tied to major tax reforms, but that I much preferred to close enough tax loopholes to make up for any revenues lost by letting the surtax expire.

Earlier in the session I introduced several tax reform measures, including one which would require persons taking advantage of tax loopholes to pay a minimum tax.

This week in a discussion on the Senate floor, the chairman of the Finance Committee indicated he wanted tax reform proposals submitted by today in the form of amendments to H.R. 12290. It was my understanding that if that were done, the amendments would be printed and considered by the committee.

It was with those suggestions in mind that I had the Tax Redistribution Act of 1969 prepared as an amendment to H.R. 12290, not expecting the House bill to be reported yesterday.

When the Finance Committee reported the House bill yesterday, there was not time to redraft the amendment as a separate bill before today's deadline.

Also, it is my understanding the chairman of the Finance Committee stated he was not so interested in having tax bills technically perfect, but was more interested in having specific proposals to consider.

Therefore, with that thought in mind and wishing to meet the guidelines set by the chairman, I decided to introduce the Tax Redistribution Act of 1969 in the form of an amendment. In order to get the bill before the committee, I am prepared to have it redrafted as a separate measure for introduction next week.

Mr. President, the Tax Redistribution Act of 1969 is designed to provide tax relief to the low- and middle-income families while closing loopholes favored by the wealthy.

For example, the tax relief provisions will offer annual maximum savings to four-member families of $165 if income is $10,000; $263 if income is $12,000; and $345 if income is $15,000.

The tax bite on four-member families making $5,000 would be cut 42 percent.

Taxpayers in all brackets would receive some relief, but the greatest portion of the relief would go to persons earning less than $20,000 a year.

The tax-relief proposals in my bill

XUM

would save taxpayers an estimated $6.7 billion a year. Tax-reform provisions would generate $17 billion in new Federal revenues.

The $10 billion difference between the loss and gain in Federal revenues could be used to provide funds for domestic programs or to replace revenues which would be raised by the surtax extension.

I will outline briefly the provisions of my bill.

Tax savings would result from:

Lowering the tax rate on the first $1,000 of taxable income from 14 to 9 percent, and on the second $1,000 of taxable income from 15 to 13 percent;

Increasing the minimum standard deduction from $200 to $600;

And increasing the standard deduction from 10 percent, with a limit of $1,000, to 15 percent, with a limit of $2,500.

Low-income families would benefit from the increase in the minimum standard deduction.

These families now get a small break by being allowed to deduct $200, plus $100 for each dependent, if that amount is more than 10 percent of his income.

For example, a family of four with an adjusted gross income of $3,000, can now deduct 10 percent—$300—or $600 using the minimum standard deduction. Under my bill, the family's exemption would be $1,000.

The combined effect of increasing the minimum deduction and reducing tax rates on the first $2,000 of taxable earnings reduces the tax load on families with incomes at or below the poverty level to less than $25 a year.

Turning to tax relief designed primarily for middle-income families, taxpayers who do not itemize deductions now may claim a deduction of 10 percent, up to $1,000.

Under my proposal; for example, a person with an adjusted gross income of $15,000 could claim an unitemized deduction of $2,250, or $1,250 more than allowed under present regulations.

Not only will this provision increase deductions for many persons, but also would greatly simplify filling out and monitoring tax returns.

The Tax Redistribution Act of 1969 would close loopholes by:

First, taxing capital gains of individuals and corporations as regular income.

Second, taxing appreciation on property transferred at death at regular rates.

Third, limiting mineral depletion allowances to cost of property.

Fourth, establishing a Federal guarantee program for municipal and State bonds, with the Federal Government paying grants to the State or local government issuing the bonds equal to one-third of the interest cost. Interest on bonds sold under this program would be taxed. Interest on bonds sold without the subsidy would continue to be tax exempt. The intent of this proposal is to encourage State and local governments to issue bonds which yield taxable interest.

Fifth, repealing the 7-percent investment tax credit—already part of H.R. 12290.

Sixth, eliminating accelerated depreciation on real estate, with the exception of low- and moderate-income housing.

Seventh, limiting deductions granted for farm operations.

Eighth, repealing provisions which permit unlimited charitable contribution deductions.

Ninth, requiring individuals and corporations to allocate certain deductions between taxable and nontaxable income.

The package also includes two bills which I introduced earlier this session:

S. 1773 which establishes a minimum tax on individuals and corporations taking advantage of tax loopholes,

And S. 2156 which amends a ruling of the Internal Revenue Service allowing violators of antitrust laws to deduct penalties as "necessary business expenses."

Also, I have included S. 35, which I cosponsored this session, which will extend tax benefits given heads of households to unremarried widows or widowers and to persons 35 years of age or older, single or separated or divorced for more than 3 years, who maintain their own households.

Mr. President, my purpose in introducing this package is to ensure that the Senate Finance Committee will have a comprehensive tax package on which to work.

There are many ways to accomplish tax relief, including an increase in the $600 exemption given each taxpayer and each dependent. Any of my proposals can be adjusted if it is feasible to reduce Federal revenues by more than $6.7 billion through tax relief measures.

However, by considering a package the Finance Committee and the Senate will be able to assess the overall effect of the various proposals included in that package.

Also, at the completion of my hearings on the effect of government policies on the oil industry I may have additional recommendations relating to the 27.5 percent mineral depletion allowance.

Mr. President, I want to emphasize at this time my support for the position of the majority leader not to call the surtax extension bill to the floor until a tax reform and tax relief bill is also ready for consideration.

I would not demand, of course, that the reforms match the ones I proposed today, but I cannot in good conscience vote to place a 10 percent surcharge on top of a system shot through with inequities. We all know the reports about corporations or individuals who pay far less than their fair share of the tax burden—in some cases, pay no tax at all despite incomes in excess of $200,000. Even with limited mathematical ability, I know that 10 percent of nothing is still nothing.

There are those who say that we who hold up extension of the surtax will be responsible for any new inflationary pressures.

I reject that contention out of hand.

We have had the surtax with us for more than a year, and we still have inflation.

Economists of various persuasions disagree on the effectiveness of the surtax as an anti-inflationary weapon.

If the aim of the surtax is to take money out of circulation by achieving a surplus in the Federal budget, we can accomplish that in fairer ways, such as eliminating tax loopholes.

We can accomplish that goal by reducing unnecessary military spending which puts $80 billion a year into the economy but no goods in the marketplace.

And we can better discipline prices by encouraging competition in the marketplace. The Department of Labor has released figures which show that the prices of products subject to competition have held relatively steady, while a lack of competition has allowed prices of other products to climb.

But even more important, a tax system in any society should be fair. In an open society which claims to be based on equality, in an open society which prides itself on a high degree of citizen cooperation in making its tax system work, it is imperative that the tax system be fair.

It is at least as important to the spirit and morale of this Nation to have a fair tax system as it is to have a surtax in the name of providing a psychological barrier to inflation.

Those who would dilute chances for meaningful tax reform by pressing for immediate passage of the surtax, should bear responsibility for failure to enact meaningful tax reform.

And in the event no meaningful reform is forthcoming, they should bear the responsibility for increasing existing inequities by 10 percent.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 94

Mr. **JAVITS** submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 12290) supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 95, 96, 97, 98, AND 99

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of New Jersey submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 12290) supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The **VICE PRESIDENT** announced that on today, July 18, 1969, he signed the enrolled bill (H.R. 7215) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Diplomatic Courier Service, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON THE REFORM OF THE FEDERAL TAX LITIGATION SYSTEM—S. 1793 TO S. 1979

Mr. **HART**. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Maryland, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I announce the continuation of hearings for the consideration of S. 1973, S. 1974, S. 1975, S. 1976, S. 1977, S. 1978, and S. 1979. These bills are designed to reform the Federal tax litigation system.

The hearings will be held at 10 a.m.

XUM

Friday, July 25, 1969, in the District of Columbia Committee hearing room, 6226, New Senate Office Building.

Any person who wishes to testify or submit a statement for inclusion in the RECORD should communicate as soon as possible with the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, room 6306, New Senate Office Building.

ANNOUNCING RESUMPTION OF HEARINGS OF AMENDMENTS TO VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights will resume hearings on S. 818, S. 2029, S. 2456, and S. 2507, bills to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965, in room 1114, New Senate Office Building, at 10:30 a.m. on Wednesday, July 30, to hear Attorney General John N. Mitchell.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEALTH SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS ON JULY 28, 29, 30, AND 31

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate and the press, I wish to announce that on July 28, 29, and 30 the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am the chairman, will hold hearings on the Community Mental Health Centers Amendments of 1969, S. 2523.

On July 31 we will hear the views of witnesses on the Medical Library and Health Communications Assistance Amendments of 1969, S. 2549, and related bills.

It is my firm belief that these hearings will constitute an important step toward the goal of better health care for all Americans.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert T. Lawley, of Illinois, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Illinois for the term of 4 years, vice Richard E. Eagleton.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, July 25, 1969, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement, whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT DESERVES COMMENDATION FOR ANTITRUST ACTION AGAINST POWER COMPANY

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I commend the Department of Justice for filing an antitrust action against a power company on the grounds that it refused to sell and transmit power to proposed municipal power systems, and otherwise obstructed and defeated attempts by cities and towns to establish their own power systems.

During recent years a number of investor-owned utilities have stepped up their campaign to choke consumer-owned power systems. The latter systems, most of them small, have sorely needed a friend in court. They now have one—the Department of Justice.

The Department's complaint was filed against Otter Tail Power Co., an unregulated Minnesota utility which has long pursued a "starve and buy" policy against small municipal systems to whom it refused to transmit wholesale power.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the complaint filed by the Department of Justice, the accompanying July 14 press release, and my most recent exchange of correspondence with the Department of Justice regarding this case and similar cases involving electric utilities.

There being no objection, the complaint, the press release, and the correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
July 14, 1969.

The Department of Justice filed an antitrust suit today accusing Otter Tail Power Company of monopolizing the sale of electric power to 464 towns in Minnesota, South Dakota, and North Dakota.

Attorney General John N. Mitchell said the civil action, charging the Fergus Falls, Minnesota, company with violation of Section 2 of the Sherman Act, was filed in United States District Court at St. Paul, Minnesota.

Otter Tail distributes electric power in western Minnesota, northeastern South Dakota, and eastern North Dakota. In 1967, it sold 867,621,740 kilowatts of electric energy, deriving revenues in excess of $25 million.

Since 1955, the suit said, Otter Tail has monopolized the sale of electric power in the area it serves by seeking to prevent municipalities from shifting local electric services from Otter Tail to other power systems.

Otter Tail has done this, the complaint alleges, by refusing and threatening to refuse to sell power at wholesale to proposed municipal systems, by refusing to transmit electric power from other wholesale suppliers to proposed municipal systems, and by engaging in other activities designed to obstruct and defeat attempts by municipalities to establish their own electric power systems.

In the three states, each municipality has the option of awarding a distribution franchise for a term of years to an electric utility or of establishing and operating a municipally-owned electric system.

The suit asks that Otter Tail be permanently enjoined from engaging in and continuing the alleged practices in violation of the Sherman Act.

(United States District Court for the District of Minnesota Sixth Division)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF, v. OTTER TAIL POWER COMPANY, DEFENDANT

COMPLAINT

The United States of America, by its attorneys, acting under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, brings this action against the defendant named herein and complains and alleges as follows:

I. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This complaint is filed and this action is instituted against the defendant under Section 4 of the Act of Congress of July 2, 1890, as amended (15 U.S.C. § 4), commonly known as the Sherman Act, in order to prevent and restrain the continuing violation by the defendant, as hereinafter alleged, of Section 2 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. § 2).

2. The alleged violation of law hereinafter described has been and is being carried out in part within the Sixth Division of the District of Minnesota where the defendant has offices, transacts business and is found.

II. THE DEFENDANT

3. Otter Tail Power Company (hereinafter "Otter Tail") is made a defendant herein. Otter Tail is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Minnesota with its principal place of business in Fergus Falls, Minnesota. It generates, transmits and sells electric power at retail and wholesale.

III. TRADE AND COMMERCE

4. The electric power industry is comprised generally of three functional levels: production, transmission and distribution. Production encompasses the conversion into electric power of energy obtained from combustion of fossil fuels, from moving water, or more recently, from atomic reaction. Transmission refers to the transportation of electric energy via a network of high voltage lines from points of generation to distribution areas. Distribution involves the delivery and sale of electric current to ultimate consumers. Although most large electric utilities, including Otter Tail, perform all three functions, some companies perform only one or two of such functions. For example, the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior (hereinafter "the Bureau") and many electric cooperatives restrict their activities to the production and transmission of electric power. Also, many municipal power systems and electric cooperatives engage solely in distribution of electric energy to ultimate consumers.

5. Otter Tail operates an integrated electric power system as western Minnesota, northeastern South Dakota and eastern North Dakota. It maintains generation facilities having a capacity of approximately 280,000 kilowatts. In addition, the company purchases substantial amounts of electric power produced by the Bureau.

6. Otter Tail has 5,900 miles of transmission lines which blanket its tri-state area of operations. These lines cross state boundaries and carry power produced both by Otter Tail and the Bureau. Although various electric cooperatives have transmission lines within the tri-state Otter Tail area, Otter Tail's network of high voltage lines is the dominant factor in the transmission of power in the area. Bureau-generated electric power is transmitted ("wheeled") by Otter Tail to certain Bureau customers pursuant to an agreement between the Bureau and Otter Tail. In addition, Otter Tail has agreements with various electric cooperatives under which each party agrees to wheel electric power over its lines for the other. In 1966, Otter Tail wheeled a total volume of 523,704,610 kilowatt hours of electric power, from which it derived revenues of $508,613.

7. The statutes of the States of Minnesota, South Dakota and North Dakota give to each municipality the option of awarding a distribution franchise for a term of years to an electric utility company or of establishing and operating a municipally-owned electric power distribution system. Selection of the method by which electric power distribution is to be performed is made by the electorates of the respective towns. Changes in the method of distribution are authorized by the respective state statutes.

8. Otter Tail distributes electric power at retail in approximately 464 towns, which constitute the vast majority of towns in its service area. (Electric power distribution in rural areas within Otter Tail's service area is performed principally by electric cooperatives; however, the latter are restricted by

law from distributing electric power within towns.) In 1967 Otter Tail sold 867,621,740 Kilowatts of electric energy in the 464 towns, from which it derived revenues of $25,179,979.

9. In 1966 the municipal electric power system of 18 towns located within the Otter Tail service area purchased all or part of their electric power requirements at wholesale from the Bureau. 122,864,314 kilowatt hours of electric energy were wheeled over Otter Tail transmission lines part of the distance between Bureau generation facilities and the municipal systems.

10. Otter Tail is a member of the Upper Mississippi Valley Power Pool and sells to and buys from its fellow members electric power for resale. The members of the pool are located in several different states, and the power exchanged among them crosses state lines. In 1967 Otter Tail sold 166,107,600 kilowatt hours to pool members, from which it derived revenues of $1,607,616.

IV. OFFENSES CHARGED

11. Beginning in or about 1955 and continuing thereafter up to and including the date of filing of this complaint, defendant Otter Tail has attempted to monopolize and has monopolized the aforesaid trade and commerce in the sale of electric power in or to towns located in the areas of Minnesota, North Dakota and South Dakota which it serves, in violation of Section 2 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. § 2). These offenses are continuing and will continue unless the relief hereinafter prayed for is granted.

12. Pursuant to and in furtherance of the aforesaid attempt to monopolize and monopolization, defendant Otter Tail has sought to prevent municipalities from shifting local electric service from Otter Tail to another electric power system, supplied either by Otter Tail or another supplier of power, by doing among other acts, the following:

1. refusing and threatening to refuse to sell power at wholesale to the proposed alternative local electric power systems;
2. refusing and threatening to refuse to wheel electric power from other wholesale power suppliers to the proposed alternative local electric power system; and
3. engaging in other activities designed to obstruct and defeat the attempt by municipalities to establish alternative local electric power system.

V. EFFECTS

13. The aforesaid offenses have had, among other things, the following effects:

(a) Otter Tail has been able to preserve a monopoly of retail distribution in towns in its service area;

(b) Competition for local electric power distribution franchises has been eliminated;

(c) Yardstick competition in the retail distribution of electric power has been lessened;

(d) Competition in the wholesale sale of electric power has been restrained.

Prayer

Wherefore, the plaintiff prays:

1. That the Court adjudge and decree that defendant Otter Tail has attempted to monopolize and has monopolized interstate trade and commerce in the retail distribution of electric power in violation of Section 2 of the Sherman Act.

2. That defendant Otter Tail and all persons, firms, and corporations acting in its behalf or under its direction or control be permanently enjoined from engaging in, carrying out, or renewing any contracts, agreements, policies, practices, or understandings, or claiming any rights thereunder having the purpose or effect of continuing, reviving, or renewing the aforesaid violation of the Sherman Act or any contract, agreement, policy, practice, or understanding having like or similar purpose or effect.

3. That the plaintiff have such other and further relief as the nature of the case may require and the Court may deem just and proper.

4. That the plaintiff may recover the costs of this action.

JOHN N. MITCHELL,
Attorney General.
RICHARD W. MCLAREN,
Assistant Attorney General.
BADDIA J. RASHID.
KENNETH C. ANDERSON,
Attorney, Department of Justice.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C., May 19, 1969.

Hon. RICHARD W. MCLAREN,
Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCLAREN: More than two years ago one of your predecessors, Donald F. Turner, advised me that "we have been engaged for some time" in investigation of possible violations of antitrust law, including "possible exclusion of municipal and cooperative electrical systems from pooling and other arrangements among investor-owned power companies."

Last year I met with another of your predecessors, Edwin M. Zimmerman, who assured me that the staff work would be completed last year. I was advised late last year that the staff studies in key cases had been completed.

Small municipalities, such as Elbow Lake, Minnesota, and cooperatives, such as those in California, do not have the resources to hang on, year after year, waiting to hear whether the Department of Justice will or will not respond to their pleas for assistance. Long delays at the decision-making level in Justice can damage their case and render more difficult and costly their own planning for reliable electric service.

In all fairness to these small systems and their customers, I urge you to make appropriate decisions based upon the information in your files.

Very truly yours,

LEE METCALF.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., June 3, 1969.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: This has reference to your letter of May 19, 1969, referring to several investigations in the electric power industry which have been the subjects of correspondence and meetings between my two immediate predecessors in office and yourself.

When I assumed office, the investigation of alleged antitrust violations by Otter Tail Power Company had been concluded and the staff recommendation was under review. The matter is now before me and I hope to make a decision on it very shortly. The other possible violations about which you have communicated with us have also been receiving attention. It appears that relief for the affected small companies may be achieved in some instances through administrative agency procedures. The Department is actively pursuing several matters in this way. Difficult and novel legal and economic issues are presented by the remaining situations to which you allude. While work on these is continuing, progress is dependent upon manpower availability. In this connection, I assume you are aware of our numerous present commitments in connection with electric industry matters. The Department is currently involved in four administrative or judicial proceedings involving the electric power industry and is also engaged in an interagency study of the problems of small systems. In addition, we are conducting a number of other investigations concerning utility practices.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD W. MCLAREN,
Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division.

AMERICA'S MAINTENANCE OF LEADERSHIP

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I have received a thoughtful, thought-provoking, and perceptive letter from George Douth, the producer of Keep in Touch, 125 East 84th Street, New York, N.Y.

Because I think it merits serious attention, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 11, 1969.

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
New Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: On the road to progress in America, it is good to pause and see just how far we have come in achieving our goals.

America's educational system has been transformed during the last hundred years from a small, highly intellectual institution concerned with a minority of the population, to a large and important branch of public service.

Within our democratic system, there has evolved a universal system of tax-supported public schools offering every child, regardless of station, an equal educational opportunity.

Senator Smith, it gives one a sense of pride in our Congress to review its role in the establishment of our nations excellent educational system.

It was 184 years ago that the Land Ordinance of 1785 set aside a portion of the public lands in the Northwest Territory for the endowment of schools. It was recognized that special help was needed on the Great Lakes frontier if our pioneers were to catch up with the better established, the more developed and settled parts of the country.

Seventy-seven years later, in 1862, Congress passed the Land Grant College Act, giving the new States of the growing Union a substantial subsidy, in the form of special grants of land, to further higher education in agriculture and the mechanical arts. The program continues to the present day, and many a landgrant college draws financial assistance from it.

In 1917 Congress added a new dimension to Federal aid to education with the passage of the Vocational Training Act. This program also continues to the present day.

The third major addition to the Federal aid program was approved by Congress 23 years ago, when the School Lunch Act of 1946 was passed.

The next enactment of Federal financial assistance to our public schools, one with which we have long been familiar, related to impacted areas, that is, to communities affected by a heavy concentration of Federal activity.

Then, in 1958, following Russia's launching of Sputnik, came the passage of the National Defense Education Act, which embraced both colleges and secondary schools. Federal loans to needy college students were included under one title of the act; other titles provided Federal money for equipment and improved supervisory services in the secondary schools in the fields of science, mathematics, history, civics, geography, modern foreign languages, English, and reading.

The year 1963 saw the enactment of the Higher Education Facilities Act, providing Federal grants and loans to colleges for classroom buildings, science laboratories, and libraries. By any standard of measurement, the greatest year for public education in the history of Congress was 1965. In that year, the Elementary Secondary Act was signed into law.

Our democratic way of life has emphasized that teachers are, more than any other class, the guardians of civilization. American educators have been given a feeling of intellectual independence. This is essential to the proper fulfillment of the teacher's functions, since it is his business to instill what he can of knowledge and reasonableness into the process of forming public opinion.

America has dispelled the widespread belief that nations are made strong by uniformity of opinion and by suppression of liberty. In a sense, Senator Smith, your "Declaration of Conscience" of 1950, which made a profound stir both in and out of Congress, pointed out that nations have been brought to ruin much more often by insistence upon a narrow-minded doctrinal uniformity than by free discussion and the toleration of divergent opinions.

The thing, above all, that a teacher should endeavor to produce in his students, if democracy is to survive, is the kind of tolerance that springs from an endeavor to understand those who are different from ourselves. The educators of these United States, as exemplified by the World's foremost anthropoligist Dr. Margaret Mead, have indeed demonstrated their ability to instill in our students the fact that the people of our country have common ground with people of other countries.

Our educators, the finest in the world, have made a great contribution to our modern educational system which is matched by few nations and excelled by none.

Not since the founding of our Republic—when Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence at 32, Henry Knox built an artillery Corps at 26, Alexander Hamilton joined the independence fight at 19, and Rutledge and Lynch signed the Declaration for South Carolina at 27—has there been a younger generation of Americans brighter, better educated, or more highly motivated than our present day youth.

The legislative achievements of the Congress in the field of education illustrates that the decisions for progress rests principally upon our public officials.

In our great human experiment in large scale democracy, the United States Senate has played an important role in establishing moorings for the present and guidelines for the future of our great nation.

As an advocate of the strongest possible national defense—and of a firm foreign policy to match it, Senator Smith, you have shown courage and wisdom in your efforts to insure the continuance of our democracy.

The Dean of the Republicans in the United States Senate, Vermont's distinguished Senator George D. Aiken, personifies the man of tradition who works toward the changes that will improve and preserve our world.

The President Pro Tempore of the Senate, the distinguished Statesman from Georgia, Richard B. Russell has dedicated and devoted most of his lifetime to the Senate. A man of his word; his dignity is both seen and felt.

The legislators of "the world's most deliberative body" have brought together a wide diversity of background and experience to work out legislative solutions in the broad interest of all.

They are renowned for their expertise in parliamentary procedure and friendly persuasion.

The relationship between government and business is vitally important under our system. The stability of our democratic way of life depends on the policies of American business. Successful business provides the base for all the revenues from which we obtain our local, national and international objectives.

It is in the breadth and diversity of interest and approach that we find the greater strength of our society. American industry has recognized that the function of modern institutions is not to repress individuality, but to provide the theatres of action for it. In our multi-racial society our people are greatly different from one another; the unique personal skills, views, and hopes of each demand functional contact with the skills, views, and hopes of others.

The business leadership of this country has shown a spirit of good will in its responsibilities in meeting the challenges and seizing the opportunities that have given Americans a standard of living unparalled in the history of man.

It is a natural tendency for people to forget victories and concentrate instead on the losses. Perhaps this is as it should be, for there is yet much to be done. But at the same time, we should take heart and find inspiration in the thought that the accomplishments of the American people have been many. And they come, not by coercion, but rather through example, persuasion and good will.

Senator, I greatly appreciate the privilege of having shared with you my thoughts of how America has maintained the leadership in man's quest to seek a newer world.

Respectfully,

GEORGE DOUTH.

HIGH SCHOOL ORIENTATION PROGRAM

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, in 1968 the Virginia Association of Student Governments initiated a high school orientation program to be conducted during Educational Opportunity Week to inform high school juniors and seniors of the importance of postsecondary education and training. The Virginia Association of Student Governments, consisting of student government leaders from more than 80 percent of Virginia's colleges and universities, presented a series of programs designed to acquaint secondary students with the benefits and problems involved in postsecondary education. In addition to the programs, the association prepared a comprehensive guide to colleges and universities in the State of Virginia and detailed financial assistance which was available. The programs and guides reached an estimated 140,000 high school students in 1968.

Encouraged by last year's success, recent favorable comments on the guide from officials in the U.S. Office of Education and the possibility that the U.S. Association of Student Governments may adopt the program as a model program for associations throughout the United States, the Virginia Association of Student Governments plans to present a similar program this fall during the week of November 17 through 22, 1969.

No one can doubt the importance of education. As technological developments require more highly trained and skilled workmen, as daily life becomes more complicated, as our governmental and international relations become more sophisticated, we cannot be unaware of the need to increase our knowledge and understanding. That increase often comes through postsecondary education endeavors. For this reason, it is most important that we urge and encourage our young people to seek education and training beyond high school.

The program organized and operated by the Virginia Association of Student Governments can effectively contribute to this goal. As the association itself has noted, its members can play a special role:

> Because we ourselves are recent high school graduates, we feel uniquely qualified to communicate with high school students regarding the benefit and responsibility of seeking postsecondary education.

At a time when strife and dissension have torn many campuses throughout our Nation, it is especially encouraging that the members of the Virginia Association of Student Governments have undertaken a constructive and useful project.

In order that the Senate and students from other States may know of the accomplishments and prospects of this worthwhile program, I ask unanimous consent that an outline of the 1969 program be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the outline was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT GOVERNMENTS, HIGH SCHOOL ORIENTATION COMMITTEE PROGRAM

(A program originated and presented by college students for the high school students in the state of Virginia, 1969)

INTRODUCTION

The Virginia Higher Education Study Commission reported in 1965 that the level of educational attainment in the Commonwealth was substantially below the national average. Using population and economic indices, the Commission concluded that it would be reasonable to expect that Virginia's performance in education would approximate 2.0 per cent of national performance. Virginia's institutions, however, enrolled a significantly lower percentage of the total number of the post secondary students in the Fall of 1964 than its 2.0 per cent population and economic ratio would have predicted. To have raised the percentage to 2.0 per cent would have necessitated an increase of 25,000 students over the number Virginia's institutions actually enrolled. It is our hope that through this High School Orientation Program we, as responsible student leaders, can make a positive contribution to the efforts presently being made to close this gap.

The High School Orientation Program was prepared by the Virginia Association of Student Governments because we, as college student leaders, are assuming what we believe to be our responsibility to challenge youth to realize the significance and availability of further education or training after one graduates from high school. Because we ourselves are recent high school graduates, we feel uniquely qualified to communicate with high school students regarding the benefit and responsibility of seeking post-secondary education.

RATIONALE

In recent years the State of Virginia has made great strides forward in her commitment to higher education. In addition to the major expansion of established liberal arts oriented Universities and Colleges throughout the Old Dominion, the state has witnessed a rapid growth in the educational opportunities available in vocational-technical and apprenticeship fields. Through these, coupled with the Community College network which offers numerous post-secondary educational opportunities, various types of programs and opportunities for post-secondary training and education are available to the youth of Virginia. Such growth in institutions has unfortunately not been matched with an equal increase in the percentage of Virginia's youth who have taken advantage of such opportunities. Virginia lags behind the national average of eligible students seeking some form of higher education. A multitude of complex factors contribute to this situation and as students we do not attempt an in-depth analysis of the cause of such a situation nor do we presume any particular expertise in an area which poses a significant challenge to educators across the nation. We do feel, however, that our present status as students affords us a unique vantage point from which to communicate the vital importance of seeking post-secondary training or education compatible with a student's abilities and aspirations.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Virginia Association of Student Governments is a state-wide organization founded by college students in May of 1967 in an attempt to better meet the needs of its member schools student populations through numerous activities and programs. These programs are designed to facilitate the development of mature and responsible student government. Since our founding, with four charter member schools, the Virginia Association of Student Governments has grown to include over 80% of Virginia's institutions of higher learning. Conferences and programs held throughout the years have done much to improve communications and understanding among the student bodies of member schools, their faculties and administrations, and educational leaders throughout the state. Such activities have done much to improve the relationships between and among the many facets of our state-wide educational community.

As the Virginia Association of Student Governments began expanding its activities we felt it necessary to devote considerable attention to the problems we ourselves had not too long ago faced regarding future vocational or educational aspirations. Although numerous established means of assisting the high school student with his post-secondary planning are presently functional, we believe that a further positive contribution of significant impact can and should be made available to Virginia's youth. Last year the Virginia Association of Student Governments, through its High School Orientation Committee Program, conducted such a state-wide service for 140,000 high school juniors and seniors throughout the state. Our program included a welcoming speech by a local college student government president, a speech by a guest speaker, a narrated, split-screen slide presentation followed by a question and answer period. Immediately following the presentation of the program, high school students received copies of *Educational Opportunities in Virginia*, a 130 page booklet of educational information published by the Virginia Association of Student Governments.

We believe that our program and the progress made last year was of significant value to the 140,000 high school students we reached during "Educational Opportunity Week" which the Governor of Virginia proclaimed in conjunction with our program. We do feel however, that significant improvement can and should be made in a number of specific areas of our program since we now have the benefit of last year's experience with the program to guide our activities this year. We strongly believe that the basic thesis behind our program, that of communicating to high school students, as peers, the values and benefits of seeking post-secondary education, is a sound one. It is our hope to continue this program during the coming academic year.

THE PROGRAM

The program itself is divided into several parts:

A. To begin the program, the Student Government Association President of the participating college will deliver a welcome address. His address will explain the purpose of the program. It is essential that the President's speech touch on all the major issues in the total presentation. Points to be introduced by the President include economic and social values of post-secondary education, opportunities in the state for continuing education on a college level, and availability of financial assistance. Also emphasized will be the idea that anyone who successfully finishes high school is able to pursue further development of his talents and abilities. Finally, the President will introduce the guest speaker. This speaker will be one of two individuals: a student enrolled in a community or a vocational school; an individual who did not go to college immediately after high school but has since enrolled in college or vocational school (and why he did so).

B. Following the guest speaker, a short slide presentation will be shown. The slide presentation will consist of 160 slides showing "typical" scenes of college life, both social and academic. Also shown will be various scenes of vocational-technical schools. Additionally there will be slides showing business and apprenticeship programs. In general, all types of post-secondary education will be visually represented. The slides will also picture some alternatives to education. This last however is not to be presented in a black or white, no compromise manner.

C. The next section of the program will be a panel discussion. The suggested composition of this panel is students from state colleges other than the participating college and, where possible, a representative of a vocational-technical school. The purpose of the panel will be to bring out new points on the subject of post-secondary education and to recapitulate the important points that have already been made. In this discussion no single institution will be emphasized, and although emphasis will be placed on the institutions in Virginia, out-of-state institutions will also be considered. It has been suggested that a more effective panel would be one composed of students outside of the student government. In general the purpose of the panel discussion is to cover all facets of post-secondary education. We stress that we do not have answers to every question, that we have not come up with a panacea for all student problems. If we are able to answer a student's question we will. We talk in a straightforward manner with the students on an equal to equal basis. If there is an unpleasant answer, we give it. We would much rather tell the truth than lose the value for our program and ourselves by glossing over a situation. We as students have found in our education that the unvarnished and total truth is preferable, no matter how unpleasant, to a fabrication or an evasion. From past experience with this program we have found that the students feel this way also.

D. Finally, a booklet will be handed out to each student as he leaves. The booklet will contain the following information:

1. Information directing the student to appropriate addresses for admissions information.
2. A discussion of Virginia's community colleges.
3. A brief discussion of each of the colleges in the state with specific distinguishing information about the enrollment of the college, the social life, the types of studies offered, and inclusive data regarding expenses.
4. Statistics on the amount of scholarships and loans that are available and specific addresses where further information may be obtained.
5. Information explaining all facets of Virginia's opportunities for vocational-technical school training and apprenticeship programs.

MILWAUKEE SENTINEL SAYS: FIGHT INFLATION BY CUTTING SPENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Sentinel published an editorial last week that should be required reading for every Member of the Congress.

The Sentinel points out that neither Congress nor the administration is fighting inflation in what is without question by far the best and most effective way.

Last year the Congress passed a surtax as its principle contribution to the inflation fight. That surtax—enacted more than a year ago—has done exactly nothing to stem inflation. Congress was told, and a majority obviously believed, that higher taxes would cut public spending, that lower public spending would mean less demand, and that less demand would slow down the rise in prices.

But what happened? Did the public reduce their spending? It did not. It increased its spending, by simply reducing its rate of savings. The result: more demand, higher prices.

Now we are asked to try the same old discredited patent medicine; that is, to extend the surtax.

Mr. President, it did not work during the past 12 months. It will not work now.

What should we do? The Milwaukee Sentinel has an answer we should try. We should cut Federal spending. And this will work. When the Government reduces spending, resources, which are in short supply, are freed, and the price of those resources tends to moderate.

But what are we doing? The Sentinel has some interesting statistics. It points out that far from following a policy of restraint, the administration's budget actually calls for a bigger increase over fiscal 1969 than the increase in Federal spending by President Johnson in 1969 over 1968.

As the Sentinel points out:

> The Nixon 1970 budget total of 192.9 billion exceeds the current estimate of $185.6 billion for the fiscal year just ended by $7.3 billion, while the increase in spending in fiscal 1969 over the prior year was $6.7 billion. Some restraint.

Mr. President, the budget can and should be cut, and cut big. If we are going to reduce it, the bill now before the Senate containing some $20 billion in military procurement is a logical target. The Nixon administration has already cut military procurement by $1 billion, the Armed Services Committee reduced it by another $2 billion, and we can cut more.

When the full military appropriation comes before the Senate later in the year carrying the huge amount requested for military personnel, that level can be cut by additional billions without endangering our national security.

We can and should also cut at least a billion dollars out of the space program by following the advice of the President's Scientific Advisory Council and confining our space exploration, after the current flight, for the next 3 or 4 years to unmanned space flight. In this way we could cancel most of the more than $1.6 billion requested for the Apollo program.

With a helping hand from the administration, we can, and heaven knows we certainly should, cut back, cancel, or postpone much of our present $10 billion high inflationary public works program.

This kind of cost-cutting by Congress would be the most decisive and effective

XUM

signal to the American people that this Congress could give, that it means business on inflation. It would make the surtax unnecessary.

I ask unanimous consent that the Milwaukee Sentinel editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUT SPENDING, TOO

Neither the Democratic congress nor the Republican White House appear bent on fighting the basic cause of inflation by cutting federal expenditures significantly.

The Nixon administration asserts it is pursuing a "policy of restraint" for fiscal 1970. But, as the Council of State Chambers of Commerce points out in an analysis of the 1970 budget situation, the emphasis on restraint is being applied more heavily through taxation than through expenditure control.

NIXON BUDGET TOPS JOHNSON

Despite the talk about restraint, the Nixon 1970 budget actually calls for a greater increase in spending over last year's fiscal spending than was the Johnson budget increase from 1968 to 1969!

The Nixon 1970 budget total of $192.9 billion exceeds the current estimate of $185.6 billion for the fiscal year just ended by $7.3 billion, while the increase in spending in fiscal 1969 over the prior year was $6.7 billion. Some restraint!

It must be the new logic. They are going to reduce spending by spending more. But don't try it on your household budget. It only works if you are a politician with the power to tax and to print money.

And speaking of the power to tax and to print money, what is the Democratic controlled congress doing for its part about fighting inflation by reducing federal spending? So far, not much. Although fiscal year 1970 is underway, the house and senate, operating at their usual turtle pace, have yet to act on the bulk of the appropriation measures.

Both the house and the senate have made provisions for limiting 1970 expenditures. But they are designed to be broken. Judging by past experience and going by appropriation actions taken thus far this year, congress seems bound, while paying lip service to economizing, to end up increasing instead of decreasing expenditures.

CONGRESS LOOKS AT TAX REFORM

Unfortunately for the taxpayers, and all the victims of inflation, congress shows little willingness to cut spending. Instead, attention is focused on tax reform. Without minimizing the importance of eliminating inequities in the federal tax system, it can be said that this is not getting at the root cause of the inflation now threatening national security.

The first step to taming an economy that is running out of control is to reduce federal government spending—drastically. It's too bad the White House and congress aren't giving as much energy and attention to that as they are giving to the surtax and tax reform.

For, if the economy is not controlled in this way, the alternative is likely to be to try to do it by wage and price controls, a cure that generally turns out worse than the disease.

Don't be distracted by the tax reform issue. The main thing to watch is what action is taken on appropriations. That's where the fate of the economy hangs.

POPULATION CRISIS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I have read President Nixon's population message, and recommend it as a statement of impressive scope and thrust. It is surely one of the most incisive comments on this phenomenon which has come to this distinguished body, and I certainly hope my colleagues will give it serious consideration.

I noted with particular interest the President's concern for environmental change which he suggests is in part the result of rapidly growing population. Pure air and water are fundamental to life itself. Parks, recreational facilities, and an attractive countryside are essential to our emotional well-being. Plant and animal and mineral resources are also vital. An increasing population will create greater demand for these resources. As the President explained in his message:

> The ecological system upon which we now depend may seriously deteriorate if our efforts to conserve and enhance the environment do not match the growth of the population.

I could not agree more and was very pleased to see that the President has called on his Environmental Quality Council, under the direction of Dr. Lee DuBridge, to examine the nature of change in environmental conditions with particular respect to population trends.

This is certainly an important aspect of the entire question, and I share the President's concern.

FORT WORTH EXPERIENCE ILLUSTRATES NEED FOR IMPROVEMENT OF FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, recent problems with the food stamp program in Fort Worth, Tex., are symptomatic of problems with this program throughout the United States. In spite of what the intent of the program may have been when it was created, it often appears to the person seeking food stamps that it is designed not to provide them.

An excellent article published in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram told of the difficulties with the food stamp program in Fort Worth, Tex. It is an unhappy narrative. It speaks of redtape and expense and difficulty for food stamp users. It tells of the resulting failure of this program in Fort Worth. I urge all Senators to read it.

I ask unanimous consent that the well-written article by Kathi Miller, entitled "Food Chit Recipient Mired in Redtape," published in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of July 4, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD CHIT RECIPIENT MIRED IN REDTAPE

(By Kathi Miller)

The impoverished person who finally takes his food stamps to the grocery store has already run a gamut of paperwork and red tape.

The process of judging people to be eligible for the program at all, then deciding how many stamps they can—and must—buy is complicated in the extreme.

The final result also is highly unsatisfactory to many food stamp recipients.

Mrs. Ralph W. Estes, chairman of the welfare committee of Neighborhood Action, Inc., Thursday listed several drawbacks to the food stamps program as it is now operated:

Recipients must pay too much for the stamps.

They cannot buy enough stamps to purchase food to eat for a full month.

The program has not kept pace with today's highly inflated food prices.

The stamps are distributed in Tarrant County in only two locations, both downtown, and many people have difficulty getting downtown.

One of the biggest drawbacks to the programs is that stamp recipients must pay a set sum of money—generally a bit more than one-fourth their entire monthly income—in cash each month.

They cannot pay less, and if they miss a month completely they are dropped from the program until they can be recertified as eligible.

Four categories of persons are eligible for the program—low income individuals, low income families, individuals or families who receive public welfare and individuals and families who receive assistance from county welfare.

Income eligibility is based on a scale. One person must have a monthly net income of $110 or less. A family of two persons must have a monthly net income of $150 or less; three persons, $170 or less; four persons, $190 or less, and so on up to 10 persons, $310 or less.

Net income is defined as the amount remaining after certain expenses are deducted:

Mandatory deductions, such as social security, from paychecks or the costs of production if the recipient is self-employed.

Deductions for medical expenses or health and hospitalization insurance.

Deductions for the costs of child care if the parent is employed.

Allowances for housing and utility costs if that cost is more than 30 per cent of the income considered in food stamp eligibility.

Once eligibility has been established, it must be determined how much in food stamps a person can buy. Here the complexity of the system increases.

The number of food stamps a person can purchase each month at face value, and the number of bonus stamps he receives, depends on size of family and amount of income.

Persons with large households and small incomes receive more bonus stamps. Persons with small households and large incomes receive fewer.

The scale is broken down into number of family members, then into exact incomes.

For instance, a person with less than $49.99 monthly income pays $10 a month for $10 worth of stamps, plus an additional $10 in bonus stamps for a total of $20 in stamps.

A lone person with income between $80 and $99.99 buys $18 worth of stamps and receives $6 in bonus stamps for a total of $26.

A family of two persons with less than $59.99 income buys $16, receives $20 in bonus stamps for a total of $36.

A two-person family with income between $120 and $139.99 buys $36, receives $14 in bonus stamps for a total of $50 in stamps.

A family of three persons with less than $59.99 income buys $18, receives $34 in bonuses for a total of $52.

A family of three persons with income between $270 and $299.99 buys $78, receives $18 in bonus stamps for a total of $96.

So, on the scale, a mother with one child and a monthly income of $59.99 receives $14 a month less in food stamps than the mother with one child and an income twice as high, $120 to $139.99.

However, the mother with the higher income is required to pay more than twice the amount for the stamps than the lower income mother.

Each of the above examples is lifted from a scale in which family categories contain as many as 22 levels of income.

Each example also is on the monthly basis. Persons can choose to buy stamps twice a month if they are paid semimonthly, buying one-half their allotment at a time. However, everyone must buy either monthly or semi-monthly. There are no weekly arrangements.

Also as stated earlier a person cannot buy less than the amount allotted on the scale.

For example in the last example above of the three-person family the buyer must pay $78 a month in cash.

Many families Mrs. Estes pointed out simply don't have $78 in cash at any one time.

"I don't think anybody would disagree that the stamps are too high," she said. "The costs just have to be brought down."

She said it is a case of paying too much for too little, and said the stamps usually do not last a full month.

"I know of cases where the parents just don't eat at all at the end of the month so the children can eat," she said.

"We need to be more realistic about what food costs these days," Mrs. Estes added.

She pointed out that the stamps can be used only for food and cannot be used for such non-edible but essential items as soap.

RESOLUTION ON THE AGING BY NEW YORK STATE COUNCIL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at present 20 million Americans are 65 or older; by 1985, this total is expected to be 25 million. Forty percent of these older people are classified as poor or near-poor, despite the fact that many of them spent their lives working and earning decent incomes. Most of our senior citizens live on minimal fixed incomes which become increasingly inadequate as living costs rise and medical needs expand.

I believe that it is the responsibility of the Nation to insure that our senior citizens are able to lead lives of comfort, dignity, and purpose. At the same time that we provide programs to improve opportunities for our youth, we must keep in mind the needs and desires of the elderly.

I have recently received from the New York State Council of Regional Associations of Clubs and Centers for Older Persons a resolution which expresses the importance of programs for the elderly. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY NEW YORK STATE COUNCIL OF REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF CLUBS AND CENTERS FOR OLDER PERSONS

Whereas: Publicity, particularly the Wall Street Journal article of June 10, 1969 stated that the emphasis of your administration will give priority to the needs of the young over the needs of the elderly in Federal expenditures. Government should be concerned with the basic human needs of *all* people regardless of age or other classifications. Critical social needs of all groups should be a major consideration of government. One segment of the population should not be curtailed or penalized at the expense of another. In the present economic and social environment in this country, the individual social needs of our elderly adults are extremely critical and in need of careful consideration as well as early government action, and

Whereas: Two-thirds of the elderly population are considered by Federal Standards below the poverty level, and

Whereas: The highest per capita percentage of income for the elderly is actually derived from trust funds into which employees and employer payments have been made over a period of years (more than one-third of a century, in the case of social security) and do not come from general budgetary funds, and

Whereas: This segment of our population were productive, self supporting citizens throughout their lives and presently due to the inflationary spiral, find themselves in need of help over and beyond their present Social Security Income, and

Whereas: During the 1930's when the concept of Social Security was developed and the program initiated, there was a common understanding by members of Congress and the general populous that by 1965, to be effective, the program would require supplemental subsidies from the general fund as a part of the regular annual Federal Budget, this action is long overdue, and

Now therefore be it resolved: That the New York State Council of Regional Associations of Clubs and Centers For Older Persons representing three million persons over 60 years of age in this state do hereby call on you, Mr. President, to express the philosophy and the commitment of the present Administration to the interests and problems of the more than 20 million Americans now age 65 or over and of the population rapidly approaching the retirement age brackets which will greatly increase the proportion of our population in this age group, and

Be it further resolved: That representatives of the member associations of this Council will seek from their organizations and agencies an expression of concern similar to that of this resolution.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Cleste Fried, Chairman, Resolutions Committee (Elmont, N.Y.).

Bette Dale, Lockport, N.Y., Helen D'Amanda, Rochester, N.Y., Besshunter Jackson, Brooklyn, N.Y., Adele Nelson, Syracuse, N.Y., Members.

Lucile Kinne (Snyder, N.Y.), President.

Dr. Carol Lucas (Hempstead, N.Y.), Vice President

Lynn LeBlanc (Rochester, N.Y.), Secretary.

Joseph Mossara (Schenectady, N.Y.), Treasurer.

CRISIS IN PUBLIC EDUCATION

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, much has been said recently concerning the public schools and the administration's policy in regard to desegregation. There have been guidelines from the executive branch, and there have been words from Members of Congress. But, as yet, little prominence has been given to the words, thoughts, and ideas of the average citizen, the man on the street, the parents of the children who must enroll in the public schools this fall.

Mr. President, it is this individual who should be heard, who deserves to be heard, for, after all, this is America. I maintain that we should stop and listen to what the average citizen has to say.

I think we will all be shocked and surprised, and a bit dismayed, at what is taking place in our public schools. In my own State, for example, we are truly facing a crisis in public education. The complete disregard by the Federal Government of the circumstances in many communities is leading the public schools of Mississippi down the road to chaos. The educational system of my State as we know it today stands in jeopardy.

All this has been brought about by the Federal Government and its policies, by its refusal to treat each community for what it is, and by its blind insistence on integration at the expense of education.

I think it is time we stopped, and listened, and learned from our citizens.

It is for this reason that I present a news clipping from one of Mississippi's leading newspapers, the Clarion-Ledger of Jackson. I feel that this article accurately describes the situation, and, perhaps more important, it is told in the words of the citizens and parents of the schoolchildren of Mississippi.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

In addition, I have received today a letter from a friend and constituent at Holly Springs, Miss. I do not include the name of the writer of this letter because I do not have his permission to publicize it, but it is an accurate portrayal of the conditions in countless small communities in the South. In addition, I ask unanimous consent that a news clipping from the South Reporter, a weekly newspaper of Holly Springs, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger]

MIXING DECREES BRING CRISIS IN DELTA SCHOOLS—WHITE EXODUS STIRS PRIVATE SCHOOL RUSH

(By Billy Skelton)

These rather alarming statements about public education in the Mississippi Delta were not collected on the street corners or at a fund-raising rally for private schools.

These paragraphs below are quotations from public school leaders and knowledgeable newspapermen familiar with the situation and concerned about it. They are saying about the school outlook:

"It looks pretty fearsome up here."

"The court orders are expected to empty the public schools of white students."

"What they're throwing at us out of the courts now is just not acceptable."

"Unless something is done, it is generally conceded that the public schools, as far as the whites are concerned, won't exist for a while."

"It's obvious that many whites will shift to private schools. There is more talk of private schools than ever before."

"People will move to California or the hills or Jackson or wherever they can get a job."

"There is almost an attitude of desperation."

"In a very short time you are going to have a Negro public school system."

And so the comment goes in the Mississippi Delta, where the school population ratio is 3, 4 and 5 blacks to 1 white in most counties and which ranges up to 8 to 1 in the small towns.

NEW CRISIS

The end of the freedom of choice method of desegregation and the insistence of the courts and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare that the racial identification of the schools be removed and that all vestiges of the dual system be erased has brought about a crisis in nearly all Mississippi schools but especially in the Delta where the Negro population is concentrated.

The dislocation will be much more drastic than the first desegregation steps several years ago.

Although 59 private schools qualified for state tuition grants in 1968–69 (grants which have subsequently been ended by the courts), the enrollment totalled only about 6,500 pupils, a small fraction of the approximately 600,000 still in the public schools, including about 310,000 whites.

However, enrollment in private schools in the Delta is tripling and quadrupling, and plants are being expanded.

At Pillow academy 4½ miles west of Greenwood in Leflore County, 750 have enrolled where 215 attended last year, and there is a good chance that it could reach a maximum enrollment of 1,100.

A 30-classroom junior-senior high school building has been added to the school plant, located on a 52-acre campus.

TEACHER SHIFT

The new principal of Pillow Academy is Seth Dillon, who was Greenwood High School principal last session. The move is significant for the private schools have filled their faculties with former public school teachers.

Humphreys Academy in Humphreys County is expanding from 9 grades to 12, and in enrollment from 100 to 400 pupils, according to Supt. A. E. McGahey. A 12-classroom building was constructed in Belzoni this year to accommodate the high school, while the elementary school will continue to be operated at Silver City.

Those signed up for next session in Humphreys Academy include 75 pupils from Hollandale in Washington County and others from Yazoo County.

Bayou Academy at Skene in Bolivar County is expanding from 9 grades to 12 and 450 or 500 students are expected where 160 attended last session.

Supt. John Shearer said that 100 applications have already been turned down. However, he added that there is a "strong possibility" that a 3-grade school will be operated in Duncan next session.

A Presbyterian school at Cleveland is expanding from a kindergarten and two grades to four grades this next fall.

Eight classrooms are being added to Indianola Academy where a large increase in enrollment is expected.

INVERNESS SCHOOL EMPTIED

In addition, a new private elementary school has been organized in Sunflower County—Central Delta Academy at Isola, organized by the citizens of Inverness.

The white public school at Inverness is expected to be empty of its 285 white pupils this fall, with the high school students going to Indianola Academy and the elementary school students to nearby Isola.

The new school was financed by a drive in which $80,000 reportedly was raised in 24 hours.

Will Jacobs, Jr., the principal of the Inverness School last year, is the principal of the new private school at Isola.

Citizens in north Sunflower County in the Drew area are investigating the use of the old Tutwiler School, an abandoned public school, in western Tallahatchie County, for use as a private elementary school.

In Quitman County, where an elementary private school was operated last year, citizens are planning to add a high school in the old Walnut school building, a onetime public school.

Tunica Institute, which last year had about 225 pupils or nearly a third of the white pupils in Tunica County is adding a 12th grade to the 11 it had last year.

An expansion of enrollment is expected in seven other private schools in the Delta.

While private citizens in many places are active in private school development, public school administrators are struggling to preserve the public school system.

DOUBLE STRUGGLE

On the one hand they are faced with the difficult task of working out with the courts and HEW a desegregation plan that will be acceptable and at the same time tolerable to the community.

On the other they are faced with another difficult task—assembling a faculty for an uncertain year ahead.

It is most difficult to attract teachers in a condition of turmoil," said one administrator.

The desegregation orders include the faculty, and getting both black and white teachers to cross over to schools previously occupied by the opposite race is not easy.

In one district a $400 bonus was offered for a crossover, and there were few takers.

In Quitman County only two white teachers have signed.

The others declined because they could not get an assignment to a school of their choice.

Administrators also don't know how big a faculty to employ.

There's no way to tell what the community reaction will be until a pupil appears or doesn't appear," said one superintendent. "We are just playing it in the dark."

However, he said when he has a vacancy he is not in too big a hurry to fill it.

There is much talk of migration, but little evidence of it so far. If it develops, it may take three forms: (1) a move from rural areas and small towns where the ratio of Negroes to whites is highest to larger towns of the Delta such as Clarksdale, Greenville, Cleveland or Greenwood where a larger proportion of the population is white; (2) a move to other areas of Mississippi which have a higher percentage of whites; and (3) a move to other states.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

The economic impact of the drastic desegregation proceedings could be "very great," two newsmen said.

Perhaps the biggest unanswered question is how the whites will be able to sustain the financial burden of sending their children to private schools.

Although there is much wealth in the Delta, and capital financing of private schools has not been a problem, the great majority of parents would be financially pressed to pay the approximately $400 a year per child tuition for any period of years.

"They can do it on emotion this year," one Deltan said. "But it would be a tremendous financial burden over a period of years."

However, another said that while it would work a hardship, "where there's a will there's a way."

A third pointed to scholarship funds set up to help children of people of limited resources.

"People feel so strongly they will make sacrifices," he said. "Many wives have gone to work."

A number of "second cars" appear to be headed for the block.

One observer said the move to private schools was a "frantic gesture, the only thing they know to do," but that it was only a "short gap" answer.

TIMING IS FACTOR

The way the desegregation crisis is developing may leave many citizens with even less of a desirable option.

By the time they decide the integration is intolerable, there may be no private school left with an opening and no time to organize one.

One schoolman hazarded the opinion that some white pupils may not go to school at all next year. The state has no compulsory school attendance law.

Asked how much of a racial mix they thought their white citizens would tolerate in the schools, administrators agreed that this would vary by individual and community—after all, one pointed out, even the thought of any led to the organization of many private schools—but most thought 25 to 30 per cent the "trigger point."

They think generally withdrawal of white students would begin at that point and that, if the white percentage dropped markedly after that, the exodus could become "an avalanche," as one described it.

One said flatly he believed pairing of schools, which would throw all white and black pupils together, with the division being by grades, would "empty the public schools of white students."

However, the court orders differ, and the HEW guidelines are in a state of confusion.

Plans to divide students by sex and by means of basic abilities tests (with those rating higher to attend the previously all white schools) have received preliminary approval.

Other plans which have been advanced include pairing, zoning and consolidation.

Freedom of choice is being ruled out as not producing the degree of integration required by the courts and HEW.

However, developments in the Delta indicate that stiff desegregation rulings and guidelines will re-segregate the schools.

It's a tough experience for many communities.

"We're in the most challenging period in American history right now," one superintendent declared. "To get something stable and functional is going to be a whale of a job."

JULY 16, 1969.

Senator JAMES EASTLAND,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EASTLAND: Thirteen years ago my husband and I moved our Architectural firm from Jackson, Miss. to Holly Springs, Miss. Our decision to make this move was a "pioneer effort" to help spread the Architectural profession out over our state. One reason we chose this location was because we own much property here, and pay heavy taxes here.

As you know, this is a "black county", and this county seat is a "black town", also. How much longer we can continue to live here we don't know, for our schools are under Federal court order, and we have a 10 year old son to educate. What is done to our schools will, of course, give us our answer, for we will never consent to send our son into a negro neighborhood to school.

As we watch white families moving away, we wonder how much longer we can keep a professional office here. One of the town's three dentists will move away by Aug. 15, 1969, and one of the two dentists left is almost 80 years old. A new Hill-Burton Hospital, being built under my husband's supervision, will open in about two weeks—with no surgeon (applicants come, take a look around the town and schools, and leave). I am a nurse by profession, but I would not accept a position on a hospital staff here; many other nurses here feel the same.

Enclosed is an article from the newspaper published by Ex-Senator George Yarbrough (Miss. Senate), which gives the answer of many Southerners to our Federal Government regarding schools. Our son was sent to Private School here the first semester last year, but was returned to Public School because we felt it would be best for him.

Most respectfully yours,

——— ———.

[From the South Reporter, Holly Springs, Miss., July 10, 1969]

PRIVATE SCHOOLS FORM ACADEMY CONFERENCE

Twelve private schools from the central and northern part of Mississippi met on June 28, 1969, and formed the Academy Athletic Conference. At this meeting the

Conference was divided into the Northern Division and the Southern Division. The Northern Division will be comprised of: Marshall Academy of Holly Springs, Fayette Academy of Sommerville, Tennessee, Tunica Institute of Learning of Tunica, Kirk Academy of Grenada, Bayou Academy of Skene, and Pillow Academy of Greenwood. The Southern Division is comprised of: East Holmes Academy of West, Tchula-Cruger Academy of Cruger, Indianola Academy of Indianola, Humphrey Academy of Silver City, and Council Schools No. 2 and No. 3 of Jackson.

Each school will play the members of their division, plus games with members of the other division. The teams with the best record in the two divisions will play the championship game on November 14th.

Because of the tremendous growth in the private schools of Mississippi, it was felt that an outstanding Athletic Conference could be formed. Most of these participating schools will have over 200 high school students next year.

Other sports that were decided on at this meeting were basketball, baseball, track, tennis, and golf. To close the basketball conference this coming year, a tournament will be played at the Marshall Academy, Holly Springs.

The following officers were elected for the coming school year: president, Glenn A. Cain, Indianola Academy; vice-president, Donald Hopper, Marshall Academy; secretary-treasurer, Peter Jernberg, Indianola Academy. North Division Director will be Tommy Crenshaw, Pillow Academy, and South Division Director will be Frank Trammel, Humphrey Academy.

STUDENT DISSENT

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, on July 1, Mr. Edward Callan, acting president of the Association of Student Governments, testified before the Subcommittee on Permanent Investigations on the causes of student dissent.

Mr. Callan and his organization represent the majority of the students on our college campuses. These are not the young radicals whose violence expresses their views, but the concerned young people who have constructive suggestions for change on the campus and in society.

These are the students who are dissatisfied with some of the policies of their school administrators and their government and who want an opportunity to work peacefully to change them. They want to have their voice heard in the operation of their schools and their country, to be active participants in affecting change. These young people are saying, "Listen to us. We have been saying things that are important for you to hear." But they are frustrated because they are not being heard.

Mr. President, I believe we must listen to these responsible students. They do have something to tell their faculty, their school administrators, and us. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Callan's testimony be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF EDWARD "NED" CALLAN

Good morning. My name is Ned Callan. I am a student on leave from Colorado State College, where I was Student Body President. I am presently serving as Acting President of the Association of Student Governments, headquartered in Washington, D.C.

I want to thank the committee for affording the Association of Student Governments the opportunity to speak before you today on behalf of the great majority of college and university students that you and the public never hear about; the ones that are constantly working within the framework of society for much needed change, the ones that are more times than not, overlooked or ignored.

The Association of Student Governments is a national, non-profit non-political, educational organization which is striving to return reason as the hallmark of the university, which seems to have been replaced by coercion in many instances. We represent over 300 colleges and universities across the nation, through the memberships of their respective student governments, the duly elected representatives of the student community.

ASG recognizes the need to offer students an alternative to groups that would employ extra-legal means to accomplish desired, and very often worthwhile, modifications to the campus community, thus we offer and promote better student government.

We are working to strengthen these governments through our various programs and services, to more effective, more responsive, and most of all, more relevant actions in these crucial times. We represent the attitudes of the constructive activists of the nation's student population; the serious minded students, desirous of an education, sharing little ground with Students for a Democratic Society.

Today our society witnesses a body of students, highly intense and serious about the problems and issues that face our society, and convinced that our present system cannot adequately cope with them.

James Russell Lowell, the poet and critic, once said, "It is not the insurrections of ignorance that are dangerous, but the revolts of intelligence." Some brilliant minds have chosen to follow and lead radical organizations such as the Students for a Democratic Society, and in this is a greater danger than the threats to destroy our society and eliminate economic capitalism. It is unfortunate that minds such as these, creative, concerned, socially aware, will be lost to society, a loss that we can ill afford. It would be an even greater tragedy if more students felt compelled to follow a path similar to that taken by the youth in Nazi Germany; and yet this is a tragedy we face.

The questions remain: why have these students chosen to follow the paths they do, and more importantly. What can we do to bring them back? We must take into consideration how various influences within society directly affect not only the mood of students, but the spirit of the nation itself.

Today's youth abound with an extreme degree of impatience. We view an economy which is approaching an amazingly high level, and yet are witness to malnutrition and poor housing. Despite numerous laws, there is still discrimination, particularly in employment and participation in the workings of American life. We are involved in an educational system which tells us it is our duty as citizens and human beings to prepare ourselves for positions of leadership, but which frequently allows little or no participation in its decision making. Young people, while sometimes bewildered, are struggling to find palatable solutions to these and other far-reaching contradictions; problems which most concerned citizens agree are contrary to the basic concepts upon which this country was founded.

The average American student still has faith, pride and patience with the presently established channels, but these are wearing thin. No longer will pats on the head be accepted by those who do not protest or riot or burn, for they are tired of the action and attention paid those who scoff due process. Placating those who demonstrate against, rather than for, must cease.

If higher education and the higher orders of our society are unwilling to respond to the constructive activism of those who represent the student community, but will only respond to the shouting and demanding of those who misrepresent this community, how can our other institutions be expected to react differently? If the machinery within the system is going to be unresponsive to the legitimate grievances articulated by the student community, then no concerned student organization, no matter where it is on the political spectrum, can urge students to invoke that machinery. If those in control of higher education, and the rest of the nation's institutions don't start proving that the principles of our society are sound, that society is able to and will solve the problems within it, that it wants and needs the responsible participation of its young in all of this, many students will feel compelled, through dissatisfaction, discouragement, and distrust, to turn to the ranks of the radical left. I must warn that administrators and the public must start listening and attending to the responsible voices, for if not, many more of the seven and a half million college students will turn to groups like the Students for a Democratic Society.

But how has society reacted to all this? Society has been conditioned to relying on television, radio, the newspapers and magazines. Unfortunately, front pages are often its only basis for expertise and understanding, and today we read about the myriad of student riots, student's belligerent attitudes, their anarchistic dreams. Today's news has forged in the minds of millions of Americans an image depicting most college students as irresponsible, unclean and immoral. This image was skillfully produced and directed by the publicity-conscious radicals, knowledgeable of the reactions from the public to such a picture; the small percentage has made itself seem like 100%.

It has been said that the call for law and order has simply been a call for peace and quiet, and this approach does not reach the heart of the real problems. SDS is not the cause of America's ills, but a manifestation of problems in our society. It has far overstepped the bounds of reason and order, but still must be taken as a warning of what is and will be happening unless solutions are sought and provided.

To emphasize this point I will point to some facts:

(1) There are over 7,500,000 registered college students in the country.

(2) SDS, by its own claims, has only 30,000–40,000 members, or less than ½ of 1% of our total student population; of those perhaps only 7,000 are "hard-core."

(3) There are 2300 institutions involved in higher education.

(4) Violent disorders have taken place on just over 200 of these, less than 10%.

In a just completed survey by ASG, of representatives from 200 schools across the country, student leaders in all but a few cases, failed to consider SDS or other radical groups as the major problems of their campuses. More important were the effects these groups were having on the future of the institutions.

The problems of our society and the misunderstanding of our college students have given impetus to the growth of SDS. Many students in SDS are intensely interested in the problems of our society and the world; are brilliant and highly motivated. They have a very deep concern for all the people who don't enjoy the full benefits of our economy. Their creative minds have developed many proposed solutions, most of which aim at the destruction of our society, but also many that could be implemented into our present system of democracy.

It is clear that most within SDS have given up working within the framework of our economic and government systems; because of this, their discussions are confined to socialist and communist theories of control and government. Their dissatisfaction has led to embracing these theories as the only possible answers to the world's wrongs.

Their tactics often include sloganeering, attempting to arouse people with emotional phraseology. We hear, "Power to the People," "Power to the Worker," "Long live the People's War," and "Fight Racism." Yet the blacks and labor, for whom they fight and ideologize, are but a tiny minority in their number. For that matter, much of their leadership is not collegiate, in age or enrollment. This points to an effective tool of SDS: to capitalize on legitimate and popular grievances and issues, for general sympathy and acceptance. Talk still dominates SDS, and it would be a disaster if the actions of which it is capable are not "beaten to the draw" with action from society to solve the problems around which they band together and foster support.

The strategy of the New Left is to play upon the ills of society and build discontent among the people. They hope that the level of discontent will be such that a revolution will come about. Some advocate violence. They often deny the rights they demand, and destroy the freedoms they are seeking to defend. Our system has always sustained itself by meeting the problems of society headon, providing adequate measures to solve or eliminate them. This cannot be done with rhetoric, but only with action. Not by demonstrating the greatness of the past, but by meeting the present needs of America.

Students today are challenging the institutions they feel are aligned with the evils of our society. In that colleges and universities are microcosms of our society, students mirror the times. These institutions have become the targets of protest, simply because they occupy the lives of students. Students do not easily identify with other institutions such as business, industry, and government, so naturally they turn their dissatisfaction on the institution they can most readily influence. They seek to affect the directions the colleges and universities are taking.

The institutions of higher education must respond to our call for communication and participation. Since this is the area of which the Association of Student Governments is a representative, we address ourselves to a few specifics for action on campuses.

Of utmost priority on every campus, whether experiencing student unrest, anticipating trouble, or expecting no violence, is the immediate implementation of discussions with student government leaders, faculty, and administrators. These talks should be held weekly or even more often, in a responsible manner and properly publicized through the campus news media. The topics of discussions and actions should be:

Definition of the legal relationship of the student to the university. Too often all parties are unaware of this relationship. Exact definition of the legal relationship will acquaint the students, administrators and faculty with the basic legal rights and responsibilities of the students. This should be done through the implementation of a code of conduct.

A clearly defined organizational chart of duties for administrators. Many administrators often do not know what their specific areas of authority and accountability are. As a result, students do not know what position in the administration can answer their specific questions. With the duties clearly defined and made public, students will find the established procedures more open and operable.

The position and placement of students on joint faculty-administration committees. Discussion should try to uncover what committees students should have a legal right and interest to serve on, what their participation should be, and what percentage of the committee positions should be granted students.

More administration-student communication. Administrators should make every effort to make known the decisions affecting the education and well-being of their student body, the rationale behind them, and the events that led up to the decisions.

If these topics are discussed and acted upon, the majority of students will see definite, positive and constructive steps being taken to improve and maintain the institution. If those responsible for the direction of the university begin demonstrating a sincere concern for the students, most students will then recognize that administrators are working in their behalf.

Curriculums must be updated and more applicable to the times. Educators who think that higher education should be limited to the strict cultivation of the mind, are the ones who make colleges irrelevant to the real world. If higher education is to be of consequence, students must have opportunities to practice putting thought into action. The test is not an ability to verbalize, but to live.

Campus-community relations must be improved, and I suggest the first job of any campus building program is to tear down the walls between itself and the community.

We cannot improve the institution merely by criticizing, discrediting and condemning the rioters. We can only improve the institutions by filling the void that the riots and disruptions have already proven exists.

On campus after campus, SDS has exploited student concern over justifiable issues in order to create the illusion of grassroots support; this is for the benefit of the news media, and at the expense of an already confused campus situation.

Moderates and the rest who have nourished SDS with their silence, are guilty of lending their approval to SDS tactics. Their sympathy has been felt and shrewdly manipulated by SDS leadership. The silence must be broken; not with confrontation, but by taking a position against SDS goals and methods, thereby removing the great source of moral support.

The ruse is apparent, students have played the Trojan Horse for SDS long enough. We are beginning to realize the facts, and we are going to clean house. It is about time our higher institutions did the same. The emphasis by critics of the activities of the Students for a Democratic Society has been misplaced. The SDS is a political movement, not an education organization. To suggest crippling higher education in order to attack the SDS is no more valid than prescribing brain surgery for a broken arm. This, in fact, is what SDS is seeking: the system destroying itself, institution against institution, with SDS left erect in the rubble.

There has been a failure of college discipline to present a clear choice between overkill and surrender. It is tragic that even now when we should have realized the need to explore the middle ground, we don't see the alternatives coming forth, even for those who claim to represent responsible leadership. If the intolerance of the left is merely going to be replaced by a more-iron tyranny on the right, then the gap will widen and the triumph of either will bring a plague on all our houses. You cannot open minds by cracking skulls.

A critical point has been reached, and it is the duty of every college student to say what he does and does not stand for. The Association of Student Governments stands for universities where all questions are open to inquiry, deliberation and debate. We will not stand for a university where these questions are decided by violence and the arbitrary use of authority.

McGEE SENATE INTERNSHIP CONTEST

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, each year it is my pleasure to conduct for high school students in my State of Wyoming the McGee Senate Internship contest, which brings back to Washington one boy and one girl for a week of observing democracy in action—here in the Senate and in Washington. The contest is designed to stir up interest among high school students in national and international questions.

As a part of the contest each student was required to complete an essay on "Our President: How Should We Choose Him?" Frankly, it was a study of our electoral college system. This year, as I am each year, I was impressed with the depth of understanding and the dedication to our democratic principles displayed by these young people in their essays. This topic is one of vital interest today, and the essays reflect sound reasoning which should be of interest to us all.

Of course, it would be impossible for everyone to read all these essays, but I think some of the most outstanding ones selected by an impartial panel of three judges should receive wider circulation, and I ask unanimous consent that two of these essays, written by Steven W. Sackman of Cheyenne, Wyo., and Linda Stahle, of Basin, Wyo., which received honorable mention in the McGee Senate Internship contest, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Our President: How Should We Choose Him?

(By Steven W. Sackman)

The single, most-discussed facet of the United States Constitution in 1969 has nothing to do with civil rights or the Supreme Court. It concerns, instead, the 59-word paragraph in Article II that establishes the Electoral College as the mechanism for choosing a United States President. What if no one—not Richard M. Nixon, Hubert H. Humphrey, or George C. Wallace—had won a majority of the electoral votes in the November 5, 1968 presidential election? In that event, who would have become the President of the United States? How would the choice have been made? These questions underlie the conclusion of the Brookings Institute Study which stated: "The Electoral College and its Presidential Electors are useless if they perform their duties, and dangerous if they do not." Some authorities are advancing admonitions suggesting that the failure of any candidate to win a clear majority in the Electoral College in the election of 1972, might plunge the United States into a "grave constitutional crisis." Dealing with these serious implications, we must establish the following program which will provide for: the direct election of the President by the people; eliminate "winner takes-all policies"; and solidify a modern, just, system of selection of the President of the United States.

First, the Electoral College (system of presidential electors) will be eliminated. Second, because the nominating conventions of the two major parties are largely political carnivals consisting of extravagant oratory, wild cheering, marching delegates, and the vanity of non-serious honorary nominees who allow themselves to be praised from the rostrum for 35 minutes, the nominating conventions should be eliminated. Senator Frank Church (Democrat of Idaho), described this superannuated cluster of delegates and "barkers" as belonging to the "horse and buggy era." With these two eliminations, it is now possible to proceed to the mechanics of a new presidential electoral system.

Original selection of presidential candidates will be by the two major political parties (Democratic and Republican). The responsibility of eliminating the originally selected candidates to two (one Democrat and one Republican) will be referred to a direct vote of the citizens of the United States in a direct national presidential preferential primary. The two remaining candidates, Democrat and Republic would immediately have their names placed on the national presidential election ballots of the 50 states, and be entitled to select a Vice Presidential running mate. In the case of independent candidates running for the office of the President, the following criteria will apply: Independent candidates would not be subject to primary elections, but instead; if the said independent candidate can gain the majority of the signatures of the constituents of 26 states before the completion of the primary election; the said candidate's name would be placed on the national presidential election ballot of all the 50 states; and be entitled to select a vice presidential running mate. Finally, the plurality winner in the national presidential election (by popular vote of the people), running perhaps against two or more candidates, would be elected President of the United States.

The advantages accruing from adoption of this system of selection are as follows: First, because of the elimination of the Electoral College, the President will not be elected by electoral votes—wherein the entire electoral vote of a state has formerly been credited to the candidate who receives a mere plurality of the popular vote in a state. In the past, candidates winning a plurality in popular votes, have lost elections in the Electoral College. Second, because the President and Vice President will be elected by a direct vote of the American people, the political bargaining that so often characterizes convention nomination, will be alleviated. Finally, the fact that there will be but one ballot for the candidates for President will eliminate the inequity of having independent candidates whose names have appeared (formerly) on the ballots of only 22 states. All of these advantages will serve to inaugurate an up to date, just, system of election of the President of the United States.

Our President: How Should We Choose Him?

(By Linda Stahle)

The system by which we elect the President of the United States has created one of the most important issues now facing our country. Few features of the Constitution have caused more difficulties in the past or remain a greater menace to the future. The Electoral College system is a time bomb which could explode in any national election. Some Americans are hesitant to change the system for fear of tampering with the Constitution. However, the Constitution is *not* inflexible; it has been amended in the past in order to correct other defects. Why, then, should our electoral system remain out-dated and inadequate?

For more than 150 years our Electoral College system of choosing a President has been recognized as faulty, in need of repair. Over the years, many amendments have been introduced in Congress for the purpose of changing our Presidential election system. Of all these proposals, I feel that the Proportional Method, which was first introduced by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge in 1950, and more recently by Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr., would be the most adequate improvement over our present system.

This method would abolish electors. Everyone would vote directly for a President and each vote would be counted as it was cast. The electoral vote of each state would then be divided according to the popular vote.

This system would accomplish many reforms and still avoid the defects inherent in other proposals. First, it would abolish the electoral college, which has proven useless since the rise of political parties. It was assumed originally that the electors, in their great wisdom, would exercise individual judgment in voting for the various candidates. But as communications improved and Americans became more educated and better informed, they insisted on a more direct voice in choosing their highest official, and with the quick emergence of political parties, the electors became transmuted into mere agents of the party. The electors, however, are not legally bound by the Constitution to cast their vote for the candidate to whom they are pledged, and in a close election the apostasy of only a few electors could thwart the popular will.

Further uncertainty has been induced by what is sometimes called "blind voting." This is practiced in some of the Southern states, where the chief interest in a Presidential election is the race issue. These states do not allow the names of the Presidential candidates to appear on the ballot; hence the electors are not pledged to any nominee.

Second, the Proportional Method would also abolish the unit-rule system of counting electoral votes. The winner-take-all rule aggravates sectionalism. In the "solid" states, many minority-party voters do not go to the polls because they know their votes would be wasted. The unit-rule system also gives great advantage to candidates from pivotal states which have big electoral votes. The attention of the nominees in the planning of their campaigns is greatly concentrated in those large states from which they expect to receive the greatest return.

It happens that in the five states with the most electoral votes—New York, California, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Ohio—the voting population is closly divided between the two major parties. The prospect, therefore, of tipping the balance and capturing a large number of electoral votes by a small change in popular vote encourages the organization of economic, religious and racial blocs within these critical states and gives great power to local political bosses.

In the past there has been some opposition to the Proportional Plan, based on the argument that urban interests are justified in having great power because State Legislatures and the National House of Representatives were far overbalanced in favor of rural interests due to malapportionment. Today, however, "one man, one vote" is clearly the law of the land, and population is the only constitutionally permissible criterion a state may use in drawing districts for its own Legislature or for the seats of its Congressional delegation.

Defenders of the Electoral College argue that the College helps the two-party system by inhibiting growth of splinter parties, but there is evidence that our present system actually gives these parties exaggerated bargaining power. The United States came near to a Constitutional crisis in 1968, when a third party could have prevented any candidate from receiving the required 270 vote majority, thus forcing the election into the House of Representatives. In such a case, the Electoral College could be used as a weapon to overrule the will of the majority and force a candidate to bargain with the minority.

Another ever-present danger lies in the possibility of a President's being elected by receiving a majority of the electoral votes but at the same time receiving less than a majority of the popular vote. This occurred in 1888 when Harrison won the presidency with a majority of electoral votes; yet Grover Cleveland had a plurality of almost 100,000 votes over Harrison. Electoral vote and popular vote are often wildly disproportionate. It is possible for a candidate to carry just 12 states by a small majority and win the Presidency, with less than 25 per cent of the nation's popular vote.

The Proportional Plan also provides that, if no candidate receives 40 per cent of the total electoral votes, the election would be decided by the Senate and the House in Joint Session, with each Senator and Representative having one vote. This provision eliminates the present undemocratic and unfair method by which each State delegation—no matter how large or small the State might be—would have one vote in an election thrown into the House. The power of third parties would also be considerably reduced under these terms.

Several other proposals have received serious consideration in the past. One of the most appealing is the direct election approach. The Proportional Plan, however, has the advantage of preserving the identity of the states. The traditional system of separation of powers between state and national governments has been constantly diminishing as state governments have become less independent. I feel that divided geographical power is vital to democracy, and the Proportional Plan would help to preserve the Federal system.

The District Plan, which provides that electors be chosen as are members of Congress—two per state, with additional members according to the number of districts—has several defects also. Gerrymandering could be used to thwart the will of the majority, and the votes of those not voting for the winner in a particular district would still not be registered.

The Administration Proposal has suggested the abolishment of the electoral college and changing the method of selection when no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes, but leaving the unit-rule system intact. Since any change in the process of election would necessitate a constitutional amendment, it seems hardly worth the effort of going through that complex process to accomplish as little as this Proposal would do.

Perhaps there is no perfect method for electing a President, but the Proportional Method would correct most of the inequities inherent in our present system and still maintain the fundamental ideas of shared power between the State and National governments.

It is evident that our electoral system is in acute need of reform, and this change must come soon while the dangers faced in last year's election are still fresh in the memory of the American people. Otherwise we are likely to slide back into a condition of apathy until some future presidential contest again threatens to capsize the election system—and by then it may be too late!

RESTORING THE COMPETITIVE POSITION OF AMERICAN WHEAT

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture's announcement of steps to assure the favorable competitive position for American wheat in the world market is most welcome. The export price structure in existence since last summer, in accordance with the International Grain Agreement, has placed American wheat, particularly Hard Red Winter, at a great disadvantage. This has resulted in a sharp reduction in export sales. As a consequence surpluses have accumulated, and domestic prices have tumbled.

It is encouraging to hear that the Department of Agriculture has moved aggressively to protect the interests of the American wheatgrower. Too often in the past our Government has sat back and done nothing while other countries have

XUM

violated international trade agreements to the detriment of the American farmer.

I am hopeful that this adjustment in gulf and east coast prices will restore American export volume to its earlier levels. This will help to reduce the buildup of stocks here at home and will have a positive effect on domestic prices.

THE WIMODAUSIS CLUB OF STERLING, TEX., ENDORSES 100,000-ACRE BIG THICKET NATIONAL PARK

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Wimodausis Club of Sterling, Tex., has recently passed a resolution urging the creation of a Big Thicket National Park which would contain at least 100,000 acres of the most unique areas of the Big Thicket in southeast Texas.

The Big Thicket is a land of champions. It is the home of the world champion eastern red cedar, black hickory, holly, plane tree, red bay, yaupon, sparkleberry, common sweetleaf, silverbell, and probably many others. In 1967 the world's tallest cypress tree was found in the bottomland along the Trinity River. I have been told that a still larger cypress towers back in a remote swamp, but no one has gone back to measure it: salt water overflow from oil wells killed it years ago.

The Big Thicket is disappearing at a rate of 50 acres per day. We must act now if we are to rescue the Big Thicket from its desperate flight toward destruction. We owe our children and our children's children a greater legacy than the graying snag of a once world champion cypress tree standing in a once remote swamp. Once the Big Thicket is gone, it will be gone forever.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution passed by the Wimodausis Club of Sterling, Tex., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Whereas, the Big Thicket of Texas is a meeting place for eastern, western and northern ecological elements; and
>
> Whereas, this is the last stand in Texas of the nearly extinct Ivory-billed Woodpecker; and
>
> Whereas, this beautiful and unique area is rapidly being destroyed by bulldozer and chain saw; therefore
>
> Be it resolved that the Wimodausis Club of Sterling City, Texas, urges the preservation of at least 100,000 acres containing the most unique areas of the Big Thicket, these areas to be connected by environmental corridors; and
>
> Be it further resolved that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate of the United States be requested to set immediate hearings on S 4 which would create a Big Thicket National Area.
>
> MRS. DAVID GLASS,
> *Club President.*

THE GROWING MENACE OF DRUG ABUSE

Mr. DOLE. I wish to commend President Nixon for his recognition of the necessity for immediate action to cope with the growing menace of drug abuse. The President's message suggests a balanced approach to this problem and one that will attack, not only the symptoms, as seen in the growing number of juvenile arrests for illegal possession of dangerous drugs, but also the causes, of which there is very little substantive evidence.

The widespread use and possession of dangerous drugs is a relatively recent phenomenon. As a result, our laws are inadequate and outmoded. Federal and State statutes must be revised to provide a more realistic and flexible approach to control the production and sale of illicit drugs.

The most heartening recommendation of the President is to increase emphasis on education and research. As he stated in his message:

> Proper evaluation and solution of the drug problem in this country has been severely handicapped by a dearth of scientific information on the subject.

Without sound information on the potential danger to the health of the drug user, our young people will not be convinced of its ill effects.

As the President indicates, new proposals can be drafted and further studies conducted, but the problem cannot be solved without the active support of local communities and parents.

THE PESTICIDE PERIL—XXVIII

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, James J. Kilpatrick's column in yesterday's Washington Evening Star credits the pioneering efforts of Rachel Carson as leading to the current concern about the threat of the continued use of DDT to the environment and potentially human health.

It was Rachel Carson's book, "Silent Spring," which first brought home the pesticide warning to people throughout the country. However, at the time Miss Carson received only savage denunciations for her fearless and bold attack on established methods of insect control. Her point was that "the earth's ecology is so arranged that a natural balance obtains. The balance is not absolutely fixed: Man can rid his environment of housefles, mosquitoes, and rats without great peril. But when man's tinkering goes too far, the balance shifts, and the insects" which might have been eaten by a natural predator "soon begin to multiply."

It has taken 7 years for her message to begin to penetrate the consciousness of our society. Hopefully, the recent action by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in suspending the departmental use of DDT and eight other persistent pesticides will be a prelude for future, more meaningful action by that agency.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Kilpatrick's column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 17, 1969]

RACHEL CARSON VINDICATED IN PESTICIDE FIGHT

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

A quiet announcement from the U.S. Department of Agriculture last week was almost lost in the national excitement over Apollo 11. While everyone was thinking of exploration of the moon, the department at last moved toward preservation of our earth: It suspended the use of DDT and related pesticides in all federally sponsored programs.

The suspension is for 30 days only, while additional "expert advice" is sought, but the probabilities are strong that the suspension is for good. Over the past year, and especially as a consequence of the massive hearings in Madison, Wis., overwhelming evidence has accumulated against DDT and its chemical cousins—dieldrin, endrin, aldrin, chlordane, toxathene, lindrane, and heptachlor. All these are now banned.

The department's action provides one more belated vindication for the late Rachel Carson. Her 1962 book, "Silent Spring," presented the first dramatic challenge to the widespread use of DDT. The ominous points she made seven years ago were essentially the same points developed at Madison: Man can go just so far in playing at being God; beyond a certain point, man invites disaster.

Miss Carson ran into savage denunciations for her temerity in taking on the agri-chemical industry. She was derided as a little old lady bird watcher. She was charged with being indifferent to the world's need for food. Her scientific credentials were scorned. In the view of agricultural spokesmen, DDT was not an enemy, but a savior of mankind.

She was a fighter. For the remaining two years of her life, she lashed back at her critics. She spoke widely around the country. Liberals and conservatives alike found common cause in Miss Carson's crusade; and little by little, the evidence began to mount: Dying fish showed massive concentrations of DDT. Whole colonies of robins disappeared. Birds of prey appeared especially vulnerable

The trouble with DDT, as fellow biologists urged, is not that DDT is ineffective. On the contrary, it is too damnably effective. Its toxic effects linger for ten years after application, but these effects cannot be localized. The pesticide gets into ground water, travels with rain and snow, and contaminates wide-ranging fish and birds. In the course of time, the deadly stuff does unintended work.

Ironically, it was not an agricultural application that at last brought action from Agriculture. Acting Secretary J. Phil Campbell issued his suspension order when a storm broke in Congress over the spraying of National Airport with dieldrin. Quite suddenly the controversy was close at hand. Why dieldrin? Well, said the Federal Aviation Agency defensively, one good spraying would last for years. And what harm would be done to marine life in the Potomac and to bird life in the area? The FAA passed the buck to Agriculture. And that was that.

Some profound lessons ought to be drawn from the whole story of DDT. Perhaps the first of them is that you can beat City Hall. Miss Carson was one woman, convinced of the right. Her example inspired others. The critics of DDT never had the financial resources to take on the manufacturers and the government. Biologist Charles F. Wurster, Jr., and lawyer Victor J. Yannacone, who led the fight at Madison, had to travel from New York on a threadbare budget. They served without compensation. But they won.

A second lesson is the great lesson Miss Carson tried to teach. She wasn't concerned with robins simply as song birds on a lawn. Her point was the earth's ecology is so arranged that a natural balance obtains. The balance is not absolutely fixed: Man can rid his environment of houseflies, mosquitoes and rats without great peril. But when man's tinkering goes too far, the balance shifts, and the insects the robins might have eaten soon begin to multiply.

Now, if we only had a Rachel Carson to take on the problem of smog, or a Rachel Carson to tackle stream pollution, or a Rachel Carson to quiet the noise of urban life . . . just possibly, reckless man might not foul up the other planets as he's fouled up his own.

POPULATION CRISIS

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the growth of the world's population has reached staggering proportions, as President Nixon has so clearly explained in his recent message. It took many millenia to reach a population of 1 billion people on this planet. But if our present rate continues, by the year 2000 we will have 7 billion people and will be adding them at the rate of a billion every 5 years.

As we look with awe and admiration at the astronauts soaring to the moon, we must reckon also with a world whose population may be soaring to unmanageable proportions. The President has exercised wise leadership in giving population and family planning programs high priority among our foreign aid activities. More importantly, he has asked us all to recognize the necessary leadership that the United Nations must be helped to exert in this vital area of human life. John D. Rockefeller III recently presided over a panel of the United Nations Association of the United States, a panel which recommended a series of key actions by the U.N. to manage the world's population increase, especially in less developed countries.

The President's message also pays close attention to the special kind of population problem that we have within the United States. It is true that our numbers will grow to 300 million by the year 2000. And yet, as the President observes—

> The great majority of the next hundred million Americans will be born to families which looked forward to their birth and are prepared to love them and care for them as they grow up.

Ours, then, is not a problem of unwanted population growth; it is a problem of learning to plan ways of accommodating that growth.

In 1966, I spoke at some length about the awesome decisions which we and the entire free world will face if we do not find a means to bring some measure of balance to the growing disparities between surging population growth and food production capabilities. Let me refer to my remarks:

> Food production is daily losing the race against population explosion in Latin America, Asia and Africa. Only the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand remain as major food surplus nations in the world. The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe are barely meeting their own needs. The rate of population growth in the rest of the world threatens to surpass even our ability to fill the growing world food deficit—even at the bare subsistence level.
>
> It is most paradoxical that the greatest increase in population is occurring and will continue to occur in those areas of the world which are now producing less and less of their food needs. It has been estimated that, if the present ratio between population increase and food production continues throughout the world, in the next dozen years the world will face a food deficit of as much as 240 million metric tons annually. Under these conditions, the same source has estimated that 48 million human beings will be left to starve and the specter of disease stalking quietly through whole populations debilitated by malnutrition will become a terrible reality. Who has the wisdom to make that decision: "Who shall live and who shall be left to starve?"

At that time I recommended a four-point program, and I believe it is appropriate to mention that program in connection with President Nixon's message:

> First, in order to meet this crisis which has already begun to appear in India, we must unleash our farmers; unharness the full productive capacity which American agriculture has demonstrated it is capable of doing in order that we may begin at least partially to meet growing food shortages around the world. Secondly, we should work toward the establishment of Regional Agricultural Development Banks structured along the lines of the World Bank with the resources of such banks available to participating nations. The capital of the Regional Development Banks should be provided by the nations of the free world, such as Canada, Australia, New Zealand, West Germany, France and the other nations of Western Europe—not just the United States. The function of the Bank shall be to make loans to developing nations for the purchase of equipment and machinery for agricultural development, and for the processing and distributing Agricultural production. Third, we need to expand our programs of extending education to developing nations, teaching them to read and write and to comprehend and use the technology of agricultural development. In addition, such educational programs should include such assistance as shall be needed to bring population growth within reasonable limits of an estimated 1.5 percent per year to match the average growth rate of agricultural productivity. And finally, we should enact programs to assure the participation of the private enterprise capital in the development of these nations. In our dealings with other nations, we should strive to assist them to attain the needed social and technological reforms and encourage their leaders to demonstrate the will and determination to obtain maximum progress toward meeting the approaching crisis through accelerating their agricultural production.

President Nixon has proposed a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, at the same time as he has directed the Federal agencies to take a series of immediate steps to plan for our anticipated rise in numbers. Congress should respond to the President's leadership by speedily creating the proposed Commission and by endorsing and supporting the many other measures that the President describes.

ABM NO BAR TO NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the following message was received yesterday in identical telegrams to Senator John Stennis, chairman, and Senator Henry M. Jackson, of the Armed Services Committee:

> July 17, 1969.
>
> In our varied experiences of negotiating with the Soviet Union nothing suggests that a Congressional decision to authorize President Nixon's Safeguard ABM proposal will in any way hinder the start of strategic arms limitation talks with Moscow or impede the negotiations once they are under way.
>
> Dean Acheson.
> Charles Bohlen.
> Arthur Dean.
> Frederick Eaton.
> Foy Kohler.
> Robert Murphy.
> Herman Phleger.

LEON HERMAN MEMORIAL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I pay tribute today to Leon Herman, who died suddenly on May 31 of this year. In his long years of service to this country, he distinguished himself as both a scholar and an American dedicated to the understanding of other peoples.

In 1961, Mr. Herman traveled with me to the Soviet Union and was a major factor in writing the subsequent study of the Joint Economic Committee on Soviet economic power. His understanding of the technical side of Soviet economic policies and the language, culture, and institutions of that country were invaluable to me in the course of the trip. Recently, he conducted a similar study on mainland China which was invaluable to the committee.

The studies which resulted from the Soviet trip and the other studies of the Joint Economic Committee bore the unmistakable imprint of Leon Herman's thought. Eschewing the rhetoric of the cold war, he put into clear perspective the economic realities of the Soviet Union. He understood, long before many, the advantages of East-West trade. His last work, a supplement to Senator Magnuson's East-West trade Relations Act of 1969 reveals the precision of thought and the high intellectual standards which were his trademark.

Yet Mr. Herman's contributions were not solely scholarly. He was profoundly devoted to the betterment of mankind and to achieving of peaceful relations among nations. The Members of this body and other Government officials benefited greatly from his knowledge as the senior specialist in Soviet economics in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. In our untiring efforts to preserve the slender thread of peace, his contributions were inestimable. As an adjunct professor at the American University School of International Service and a frequent lecturer, he imparted his knowledge to a generation in whose hands our future lies.

The loss of Leon Herman is untimely and sad. I share with his wife, children, and numerous friends some part of the warm recollection and benefit of his life.

FOUL WATER, FOUL AIR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, at a time when man is hurtling toward the moon, we tend to sweep aside some of our more mundane problems here in earth while we revel in the glamorous achievements of science. But by the middle of next week, the Apollo 11 astronauts will have returned from their epic journey, and we will have to face up to our earthly needs. One of the most pressing of these needs is the battle against pollution.

Mr. President, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration has estimated that to meet the Nation's needs, $24 to $26 billion should be spent on water pollution control over the next 5 years. Admittedly, this is a gigantic sum; it would include all municipal and industrial water treatment works, plus sewage construction. But when one reflects upon it, $24 to $26 billion is the same sum that has been spent on the program to put a man on the moon.

Certainly this Nation should be willing to invest the same amount of money and energy to improve the environment here on earth—where all of us will have to live for the foreseeable future—that we have put into our effort to reach a barren and lifeless satellite. Surely we are capable of this same single-minded commitment for the effort to control pollution.

Mr. President, last week the Milwaukee Journal ran an editorial entitled "Foul Water, Foul Air" which pointed out that after Vietnam, crime, and inflation, the problem of pollution is the fourth major concern in this country. This should demonstrate amply that the Nation is willing to make the type of commitment that is needed to lick this very serious threat to our environment. I ask unanimous consent that the Milwaukee Journal editorial of July 10 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUL WATER, FOUL AIR

A recent Gallup poll, taken at the request of the National Wildlife federation, indicated that three out of four persons were willing to pay more taxes to improve their surroundings. Readers of This Week magazine have ranked reduction of pollution fourth, and conservation of natural resources sixth, in goals for a better America. (Top three were ending the Vietnam war, combatting crime and controlling inflation). Ten years ago, in a similar poll, conservation ran 10th and pollution abatement wasn't in the running.

Despite the rising national concern, congress has not bestirred itself to provide funds for a serious start on the problem.

Grand plans were laid, in the national water quality act, to clean up lakes and streams. Yet less than one-fourth of authorized funds has been appropriated. The Nixon budget does not promise to step up the pace.

One-third of Wisconsin's communities still do not provide secondary treatment of sewage wastes. Milwaukee's beaches teeter on the edge of pollution each summer, are closed periodically when the sewage plant bypasses too much raw human waste. Separation of storm and sanitary sewers would cost untold millions in a community already reeling under property taxes.

Some industry is responding to public indignation over pollution, and to governmental orders, with research and waste treatment. A steel plant on the Ohio river, for instance, which cost $5.5 million to build, had to spend $2.25 million to handle its pollution and water supply problems. All-out efforts, at industry expense, would increase prices of consumer goods.

The air is growing grimy as fast as waters are growing filthy. Smokestacks, auto exhausts and chemical plants now are spewing out an estimated 142 million tons of noxious fumes a year. Even Milwaukee county, a pioneer in air pollution control, is only holding its own in "particulate deposition"—an engineer's way of expressing the tons of fallout. Los Angeles' smog recently stretched 110 miles to the affluent resort community of Palm Springs. A plume of dust from Chicago's steel mills has been traced to Madison, Wis., 160 miles away.

No nation has been blessed with greater natural resources than this one. No nation squandered them more shamelessly. The people at last seem ready to turn with resolve, energy and money to the task of cleaning up what we have befouled. It is time our leaders in government respond.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—10TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this is Captive Nations Week. Ten years ago, President Dwight D. Eisenhower issued a proclamation so designating the third week in July, following the authorization and request of Congress.

We mark this decennial anniversary with renewed commitment.

The observation of Captive Nations Week reminds the world that the United States cannot forget the Communist subjugation of once free peoples. Our own history, our struggle for independence, teaches the meaning of freedom. From this knowledge comes the obligation not to abandon those who have lost their freedom.

Many of our fellow citizens trace their roots to those lands now conquered. In those lands, freedom once flourished. It does no longer.

The courage and dreams of the millions under Communist rule cannot be doubted. But the response of the Communist masters to the sparks of freedom has been brutally repressive. The Poles of Poznan, the Hungarians, and the Czechoslovakians resisted totalitarianism and paid for their temerity.

This is a part of the Russian past, and to quote George Santayana:

> Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.

We all hope and pray for meaningful negotiations with this country. But as we proceed in this direction, we should keep the nature of our adversary in mind.

Communist Russia can be known by its friends—from Vietcong terrorists to Arab guerrillas. It can be known by its foreign policy—from the invasion of Czechoslovakia to Middle East intrigue. It can be known by its domestic policy—from anti-Semitism to the Ginsburg trial.

Seeing Communist rule for what it is, we should not be surprised that efforts toward conciliation are blunted by the Communist view that capitalism and communism are "opposed systems" and absolutely irreconcilable. We cannot expect much from countries that regard our political and economic system their principal enemy.

Captive Nations Week serves a valuable purpose. It makes us think of these things. But to think about them only once a year is not enough. Many who have suffered the most still refuse to bow to the cruel despotism of communism. Such indomitable spirits demand our concern and sympathy every day of the year.

In making us think about the effects of Communist imperialism, Captive Nations Week accomplishes more. It reminds us not only of the character of this evil, but also that there is much to be done to combat it.

A basic goal is the right of self-determination for the peoples in captive nations, and it should never be abandoned. Captive Nations Week serves to assure these peoples that they are not forgotten. Such assurances will be no more than empty phrases, however, unless we insist on a quid pro quo in dealing with the oppressors.

Self-determination and political freedom are what is sought. As a nation cannot survive unless all its peoples are free, so neither can the world find peace while freedom is denied to many.

We, all of us in this country, hope for the day when the cold war will end. We cannot let our hopes color our view of the world as it really is. As much as we may wish it were not so, the Communist policy to dominate the world has not been modified. Public Law 86–90, the original resolution adopted by Congress in July of 1959, designating Captive Nations Week, is as applicable today as then. That resolution tells the story and should be read and reread by all Americans. For this purpose, I will ask at the conclusion of my remarks that it be printed in the RECORD.

It is an honor to join in the observation of Captive Nations Week. The history it calls to mind should make us vigilant. In rededicating ourselves to the cause of liberty for all, we strengthen the chance for peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Public Law 86–90 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, Public Law 86–90 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC LAW 86–90

(Adopted by the 86th Congress of the United States of America in July 1959)

PROVIDING FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE THIRD WEEK OF JULY AS CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

XUM

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a Proclamation designating the third week of July, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

CENTENNIAL OF WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on Saturday, July 5, at South Pass City, Wyo., the centennial of women's suffrage was celebrated. Today, women's suffrage is taken for granted in the United States, and through much of the world. South Pass City, where it all started, is a ghost town, recently turned over to the Wyoming Recreation Commission, which now will administer it as a historic site in the history of our State.

In preparation for the July 5 event, Mrs. Edness Kimball Wilkins, State senator from Natrona County and a woman steeped in the history of Wyoming, wrote an article for the Casper Star-Tribune which recounts some of the events surrounding the institution of women's suffrage in the Territorial Legislature of Wyoming. I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Wilkins' article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Famous Ghost Town To Host Women Suffrage Centennial Celebration

(By Edness Kimball Wilkins)

When the first territorial legislature of Wyoming in 1869 passed the famous law that first gave equal suffrage to women the toast in the saloons in Cheyenne was "Here's to the lovely ladies, once our superiors, now our equals." Otherwise there were no demonstrations or celebrations, probably because there were few women in Wyoming at that time. Only a handful were among the 8,012 citizens counted in the official census of the new territory.

Among the men in Wyoming territory two stood out as especially loud in their protests against the unprecedented privilege for women, Ben Sheeks and Dr. R. S. Barr.

Sheeks had fought the bill after it was introduced in the legislature, and offered dozens of boisterous amendments in a futile effort to kill it. Two years later, when the second legislature was in session, he was successful. Only two of the original legislators returned to the capital that year, one of them Ben Sheeks, Speaker of the House. A bill was immediately introduced to repeal the suffrage law, and after a lively fight passed both the House and Senate. Only the wisdom and farsightedness of Governor John A. Campbell saved the law for the ladies. In a 20-page handwritten message to the legislature he vetoed the measure that would have repealed the equality act. Many years later Ben Sheeks in a letter to friends in Wyoming admitted that he realized how mistaken he had been in his views, and was pleased that the law had been retained.

Esther Morris who gave a famous tea party and exacted a pledge from the legislative candidates to introduce a bill giving women the right to vote, and Col. William Bright who remembered his promise and introduced the bill in the first territorial legislature, both lived in the wild gold-rush town of South Pass City, as did another important man, Dr. R. S. Barr. Barr was not only a doctor, but also held the proud position of Justice of the Peace, presiding over the county of Sweetwater which at that time comprised approximately one-third of the entire territory of Wyoming.

Dr. Barr, bitterly critical of the new legislation for women, wrote a sarcastic letter to the county commisisoners and ended it with the warning that if and when they found a woman who was qualified to be a justice of the peace they could consider this his resignation. Imagine his chagrin when they took him at his word and appointed Esther Morris in his place, the first woman justice of the peace in the world.

What happened then? Did the ex-justice speak to the lady J. P. if they met on the snow-packed main street? Did he belittle her decisions, and loudly proclaim to the boys gathered in the warm saloons that "She don't know what she's doing. She don't know the law. She's just an ignorant woman!" Did friends take sides and split the town, isolated by the deadly blizzards of winter on top of the Continental Divide?

Certainly all was not tea parties and politics in South Pass City that winter and spring. There was rugged weather, hard work, privation, and constant attacks by savage Indians. Finally on July 6, 1870, just ninety-nine years ago this week, Governor Campbell wrote a report to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in Washington that pictured in stark words the early and tragic death of Dr. Barr, opponent of equality for women:

"Sir: I have the honor to report that on the 25th ult. Indians made a raid on South Pass City in the Sweetwater Mining District, where they killed three citizens and stole a large number of horses, mules and cattle. The names of the murdered men were Dr. R. S. Barr, Justice of the Peace, Harvey Morgan and Jerome Mason. The bodies of the men were found the day after the raid. Dr. Barr's body was found with his head placed under the the wheel of a wagon, the torn condition of the sod around him giving evidence that he had been scalped and placed in that condition while yet alive and that he died in extreme agony. Harvey Morgan was scalped, an iron bolt driven through his head and the tendons of his body extracted for bow strings. The Indians escaped with the captured stock."

The tragedies and triumphs of a century ago will be told and retold Saturday, July 5th, as South Pass City stirs from its long sleep and relives its colorful history. Mountain Men and trappers from Sublette and Fremont counties will arrive over the old Oregon Trail, and the players from the Diamond Lil Theater in Jackson will stage their gay musical comedy "Petticoats and Pettifoggers," or how equal suffrage came to Wild Wyoming. The Cheyenne Little Theater players will present their operetta. "A Wyoming Tea Party," with interest centering on one of their number, Bill Dubois, great great grandson of Esther Morris.

Governor Stanley K. Hathaway will tell of the events leading up to passage of the first woman's suffrage law, and its impact on national and world events in the 100 years since its passage. The program will start at 10 a.m. Mr. Alice Messick of Douglas is serving as chairman.

The celebration of the Centennial of Woman's Suffrage in South Pass City "where it all started" will be the last official act of the Old South Pass Historical Preserve Commission before turning the famous ghost town over to the Wyoming Recreation Commission which will hereafter have responsibility for its administration and maintenance.

COMMUNICATIONS SKILLS BANK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in these trying times when our society is faced with increasing polarization between the haves and the have nots—when there is a communications gap between the white and nonwhite sectors of our society—it becomes increasingly important that there be adequate opportunities available to blacks, Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, and other minority group members, to break into the news and communications media.

In this connection, I wish to call to the attention of Congress a most worthwhile program just undertaken by the New York Urban Coalition.

The program is called a Communications Skills Bank for Minorities, and it is designed to help members of minority groups find editorial jobs in the communications industry. The aim is to take talented, but often untrained, members of minority groups and to bring them and jobs together so that they may become reporters, editors, and news announcers or editorial employees in advertising, book publishing, and public relations.

The program is being undertaken on a nationwide basis with a far-reaching registration effort centered in New York City. So that Congress and the Nation at large may become acquainted with this forward-looking effort—an effort that will help bridge the communications gap by bringing more nonwhites into the presently white-dominated communications and news media—I ask unanimous consent that the New York Urban Coalition's explanatory brochure be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the brochure was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New York Urban Coalition Communications Skills Bank for Minorities

WHY A SKILLS BANK IS NEEDED

The New York Urban Coalition has created a Communications Skills Bank to help members of minority groups find editorial jobs in the communications industry.

The need for such a Communications Skills Bank for Minorities was documented by the reports of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, the Governor's Committee on the Employment of Minority Groups in the News Media, and the Federal Equal Employment Opportnunity Commission.

Each of the task forces studied the problem of minority editorial employment—particularly in the news media. Each unanimously urged the employment of more members of minority groups as reporters, editors and news announcers.

The National Advisory Commission, which

devoted much space to the employment of Negroes in the mass media, said:

"The journalistic profession has been shockingly backward in seeking out, hiring, training, and promoting Negroes. Fewer than 5 per cent of the people employed by the news business in editorial jobs in the United States today are Negroes."

The Commission added:

"News organizations must employ enough Negroes in positions of significant responsibility to establish an effective link to Negro actions and ideas and to meet legitimate employment expectations. . . . The recruitment of Negro reporters must extend beyond established journalists, or those who have already formed ambitions along these lines. It must become a commitment to seek out young Negro men and women, inspire them to become—and then train them—as journalists."

The New York Urban Coalition agrees with these findings.

WHAT THE SKILLS BANK DOES

The New York Urban Coalition believes that more non-whites can be attracted to editorial jobs by the same incentives that attract whites.

The Coalition has thus established the Communications Skills Bank for Minorities to help recruit more Negroes and Puerto Ricans into communications and to help those already employed in the industry to advance.

For the Communications Industry, the Skills Bank is a centralized source of editorial talent among members of minority groups.

For members of minority groups, the Skills Bank is a central clearing house for jobs and training opportunities. It is also a place to which minority members can turn for counseling, evaluation and information.

HOW THE SKILLS BANK OPERATES

Recruitment

The Skills Bank is recruiting—on a national scale—Negroes, Puerto Ricans and other minority group members for editorial jobs on newspapers, magazines, television and radio stations.

The Skills Bank is also seeking minority members who are interested in editorial careers in advertising, book publishing and public relations.

Advertising, direct mail and publicity are being used in the recruitment effort. The outlets include the Negro and Puerto Rican press, the trade press, college newspapers, education journals, community and race relations organizations, youth programs, media that reach civil service employees and professional organizations.

The Skills Bank is cooperating closely with the predominantly Negro colleges, and with educational institutions that have sizable minority group enrollments.

The skills bank registry

As a result of these recruitment efforts the Skills Bank is developing a growing registry of minority members with editorial talent.

The registry comprises both persons with no previous contact with communications and editorial employees who are qualified for advancement or who desire movement between media or geographic change.

The registry includes candidates who are suited for immediate employment and those who have the potential and ability to succeed after completing a training program.

Evaluation and counseling

Each applicant's file contains his resume, work samples where available, and an evaluation of his abilities and aptitudes. The file also contains the results of a standardized reference check.

The counseling and evaluation are done by the Director, by volunteers from the Communications Industry, or by an out-of-town newsman or editor cooperating with the Skills Bank.

Candidates who qualify for immediate employment are sent out for interviews. The Director arranges for these interviews, briefs the employer and the candidate, and follows up in all cases.

Candidates who have the ability and aptitude for success but who need journalism training are helped to enroll in print and broadcast training programs.

If a candidate cannot be placed in a job or a training program because of indentifiable shortcomings, he is told about these. He is then advised about possible remediation, including further study of English, speech training for broadcast, or additional work experience and education.

Job development

To be aware of employment opportunities, the Skills Bank is maintaining close contact with key editorial employers in the New York Metropolitan area and across the country.

Other Industry contacts are being established by the Skills Bank Advisory Panel, the Communications Division of the New York Urban Coalition, and the Coalition's Communications Committee.

These contacts, vital for the success of the Skills Bank, are established at the highest policy level.

In working with the Industry, the Skills Bank is not only answering specific requests for minority editorial talent, but is also selectively suggesting suitable candidates for employment.

WHO OPERATES THE SKILLS BANK?

The Skills Bank was developed by the New York Urban Coalition's Communications Division, headed by John Murray, Vice President. The Coalition is actively supporting the project.

A Skills Bank Advisory Panel is playing a crucial role in implementing this new program. The Panel is comprised mainly of media representatives. It also includes educators and representatives of professional organizations. Members help set policy for the program and advise the Director. The Panel also provides applicants with guidance, advice and counseling. In addition, members work with industry to find jobs for applicants.

The director

Stuart Dim is the Director of the New York Urban Coalition Communications Skills Bank for Minorities. He is former Deputy Director of Public Affairs for the New York City Human Resources Administration and a former reporter and copy editor for Newsday on Long Island, the Times-Herald Record in Middletown, New York, and the Courier Post in Camden, New Jersey. Mr. Dim, who is 33, holds a Bachelor's Degree in Journalism from New York University.

Registration requirements

The Skills Bank has only a few formal registration requirements. A high school diploma is preferred, but no specific educational level has been set. Applicants should be between 18 and 35 years old, although this is not a rigid stipulation.

Applicants must type 25 words a minute. They must also have a reasonable knowledge of grammar and demonstrable writing ability. In addition to submitting a 500 to 1,000 word biography along with the application, applicants must take a two-hour writing test at the Skills Bank office and meet with a member of the Advisory Panel.

Applicants who have the potential to succeed after special training will be registered for enrollment in an appropriate training program.

The Skills Bank regretfully will not register candidates who do not have the requisites demanded by the communications industry.

POPULATION GROWTH AND THE AMERICAN FUTURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, President Nixon today made proposals on population control efforts including increased cooperation and aid with international organizations and underdeveloped countries. Certainly, the speed with which these countries develop both socially and economically is greatly dependent on their ability to lower their explosive birth rates and to adequately care for the people they already have. Our aid to them in both assistance and programs can be invaluable to those countries and to our image abroad.

In the United States, our population has doubled in the past 50 years and it will increase by that same amount before the turn of the century. Although our birth rate has been on the apparent decline during the past 5 years, examination of the more significant statistics of births per 1,000 females in the 20 to 35 age group reveals that the decline has been very small. A great deal of study is needed on these problems and the effects of population growth on the United States.

I am therefore gratified that the President has also recommended the creation of a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. This Commission can give an indepth analysis to the problem of overpopulation as it relates especially to housing, conservation, urban development, transportation, and ways to generally preserve a high quality of life for everyone.

Let us hope that the Senate can have the vision to assist in solving the overpopulation problem now before it reaches the proportions it has in so many countries around the world and before inadequate transportation and recreation facilities makes city life unbearable and yet the only way to live.

I am confident that Congress will approve the creation of the President's proposed Commission on Population Growth so that we may begin to search for far-reaching solutions to the problem.

TO BUILD FOR AMERICA AND PROMOTE UNITY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Armed Forces Journal of July 5, 1969, contains a report on a most impressive address by a veteran fighter pilot. The fact that Col. Daniel "Chappie" James is a Negro makes the words carry an even greater impact.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "To Build for America and Promote Unity," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO BUILD FOR AMERICA AND PROMOTE UNITY

Col. Daniel "Chappie" James, in a speech to more than 125 Air Force officers at Williams AFB, Ariz., leveled a double-barreled attack on both the high pitch of dissent in America and the apathetic citizenry which fails to involve itself in promoting law and order and American values in general.

The veteran Negro fighter pilot, known popularly as the "Black Panther" from Ko-

XUM

rean War days, said, "There are a lot of forces at work to separate us. And Uncle Ho (referring to Ho Chi Minh, North Vietnamese Communist leader) sees the results of all the dissent—he sees the Berkeley scenes, he sees the Detroits and the Chicagos, he sees the foment and the unrest in the streets. He saw the Democratic Convention. He doesn't see you sitting here getting ready to graduate, and proud of it. He doesn't see any of that. And he thinks that he can take you . . . he thinks he's won the war."

The 26-year AF veteran, whose son is a recent AFROTC graduate from the University of Arizona in Tucson, lashed out against anti-ROTC factions. Pointing to the fact that most military officers come from ROTC, he termed proposals to eliminate ROTC from universities or withdraw academic credit "the most damaging form of reasoning." To say that officers in command should not be a product of a university environment, that the military presence is detrimental to the university atmosphere, is stupidity, he said.

Colonel James said all citizens should "get involved on the side of right." "The silent 85% should speak up" and become responsibly involved "against the forces at work to separate us," he urged.

"Today," he said, "the man who knows the black man or the white man who throws the brick and lights the torch and loots the store and doesn't try to stop him is equally guilty." The man who knows someone who practices bigotry every day and segregates and discriminates against a man because of race, creed, color, or religion "is equally guilty" if he doesn't speak out against the bigot, he said.

He added: "The student who stands idly by and sees college campuses disrupted," and with it "his ability to get a degree and to get the type of learning where he can stand up and contribute to this great nation and doesn't try to stop it or head it off—by God, he's guilty."

He urged the young officers to build for America and promote unity. "This is our country," he said, "and she's the greatest in the world, and if she's got ills I'll hold her hand until she can put them right . . . You stand by her, and remember that you'll prosper in proportion as you contribute to her welfare.

"Don't get so busy practicing your right to dissent, he went on to say, "that you forget your responsibility to contribute. Go for the things that are important: patriotism and reverence. and morality, and braveness, and cleanliness, and love. And keep your sense of values in the right line. And by the way you live your daily lives, and by the way you influence people with whom you come in contact, build for yourself your link in that chain that is the unity that has always preceded the states of America and made her strong, and show that unity to the world, and they won't stand against us—*they wouldn't dare.*"

The 30-minute talk by the man who led a 1966 flight of F-4 "Phantom" aircraft which downed seven MiGs in 15 minutes without loss of an American pilot or aircraft damage was typical of his widely-editorialized fervent patriotism, and received prolonged applause from the audience. A similar speech on Americanism delivered to the Air Force Association Convention's air war symposium last year was read into the Congressional Record.

Colonal James has logged over 9,500 hours as a fighter pilot, including 6,500 in jet aircraft. Formerly vice-commander of the 8th Tactical Fighter Wing at Ubon Air Base, Thailand, where he was part of BGen Robin Olds' famed "Wolfpack" MiG killers (they used to call them the "Black Man and Robin" team, James recalls), he is now vice-commander of the 33rd Tactical Fighter Wing at Eglin AFB, Fla.

Nearing the close of a 30-year career as an AF pilot, Colonel James has a 23-year old son, Daniel III, who is "taking up the stick," as the senior James puts it. Second Lieutenant James is a member of the 61-man graduating class of pilots which his father addressed at Williams.

USDA'S PESTICIDE REGULATION EFFECTIVENESS QUESTIONED

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, an editorial published in last Saturday's Milwaukee Journal registers serious doubts as to the effectiveness of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's pesticide regulation activities.

The editorial reports that during the recent DDT hearings in Wisconsin, one of the Department's pesticide regulation officials admitted that the agency does not double check a manufacturer's claims of toxicity or effectiveness.

Other cases are cited when USDA regulation officials have balked at relabeling pesticides or bringing data furnished by the Public Health Service to the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO'S WATCHING PESTICIDES?

There are mounting doubts about the effectiveness of the federal department of agriculture's pesticide regulation division as a result of recent developments.

Harry W. Hays, the director, told a Chicago conference of midwest governors, upset over federal seizure of DDT laden coho salmon in Lake Michigan, that the USDA planned no action against DDT. Then, in the recent DDT hearing at Madison, he raised questions about how enterprising his agency was in checking a pesticide. He testified that the USDA did not make tests itself to double check the manufacturer's claims of toxicity or effectiveness. Independent studies could be made, he added, but he left discretion up to his staff.

Hays recently told a congressional committee that there had been no public notice from his department that products containing thallium—a possible hazard to children—were on the market long after its registration had been canceled. Examples of confusing and contradictory labeling were introduced by the committee's counsel. In one case, the USDA's general counsel office had overruled Hays and ordered relabeling of insect strips, after Hays had called relabeling unreasonable and impractical. In another case, testimony indicated, a challenge on a product's safety by the public health service never was taken to the agriculture secretary, although an interagency agreement provides for this.

The USDA recently ran into public opposition to its plan to spread 69,000 pounds of dieldrin on a Texas air base.

Now the department has suspended use of nine persistent pesticides including dieldrin and DDT on government property for 30 days, pending a review. It's about time firm action was taken in Washington about pesticides.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—1969

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this week we are once again reminded that great numbers of Europeans do not enjoy the freedom that those of us in the United States exercise. On this 10th anniversary of the Captive Nations Week resolution I take honor in thanking those who have advanced the cause of Captive Nations Week thus far and in encouraging them to continue their valiant efforts.

I do this on behalf of the numerous citizens of Wisconsin who have relatives in these captured nations and the many others in Wisconsin who believe in freedom for all people. I think that it is only fitting this year to pay special homage to those courageous people of Czechoslovakia who have most recently felt the chains on their country pulled taut.

SCOTTS BLUFF COUNTY, NEBR., PROGRAM TO CURB JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on April 29 last, I informed the Senate about a very fine program which is being conducted in Scotts Bluff County, Nebr., to curb juvenile delinquency.

In particular, I praised the work of a citizens' advisory committee in attempting to improve television programing for children and young adults.

The Scotts Bluff County Juvenile Advisory Committee has continued its efforts in connection with television programing while also carrying out a comprehensive voluntary program to improve conditions for young people.

This local committee's work attracted significant national attention, along with similar work being done by a local group in Boulder, Colo., in an article in the Christian Science Monitor for June 28–30.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article written by Howard James of the Monitor staff. I commend it to the Members of the Senate as an illustration of what communities in other States can do with proper local leadership and initiative to solve the problems of youth.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ALTERNATIVE TO DETENTION: ATTENTION

(NOTE.—If a county's officials provide leadership and if its individual citizens care, children headed for delinquency can be 'turned around.' Today's article takes a look at two such counties: Scotts Bluff in Nebraska and Boulder in Colorado. Both offer programs that show great promise for helping children in trouble.)

(By Howard James)

Marian was 12 when she was arrested for forging checks and passing them at a clothing store.

A small, plain girl with long black hair, she would have been a prime candidate for reform school in many communities. But not in Scottsbluff, Neb. For in Scottsbluff people care about children in trouble.

Marian is 14 now. For the past two years she has been living as a foster child on a 13,000-acre ranch on the Wyoming border. She has her own horse, is active in 4-H, and is strong, suntanned, and happy.

Marian was born of an incestuous relationship between her father and her older sister, who was twice committed to a mental hospital. When Marian was six, she saw another older sister, who had been caring for her, shot to death by the sister's husband.

Until she was arrested by buying clothes with the forged checks her life had been confused, even desperate.

XUM

A GOOD PLACE TO BE ARRESTED

Marian's case—and dozens of others—show that being arrested in Scotts Bluff County can be the best thing that ever happened to some youngsters.

Much of the credit must go to the county's highly effective juvenile probation officer, James L Miller, a former policeman and narcotics expert.

Mr. Miller is compassionate, yet firm. He can deal effectively with children in trouble because he has been there. His father and mother were divorced. He describes his childhood home as "tough, with a lot of drinking." Things got so bad that he was placed in a series of foster homes. From this background he made it through two years of junior college.

Unlike many probation officers with police background, he understands that sending children to reform school can do more harm than good. Thus institutionalization is limited to extreme cases.

At present he has found more than 50 foster homes. They are scattered across western Nebraska. And while some foster parents are given a small amount to care for children, either through the Nebraska Children's Home, or through the Welfare Department, many provide foster care free.

This is the case with Marian's foster parents, who have 14 children of their own. In fact, when Marian's father passed on some months ago and she began receiving $53 a month social security, her foster parents decided they would bank $50 for Marian's higher education, giving her the $3 a month to spend.

When I visted Scottsbluff a few days ago, I found that not only did Marian's foster parents have her and two other foster children, but that they had agreed to accept four more—all from the same family.

Scotts Bluff County is an unusual model for the rest of the nation because it is small, rural, isolated, with limited financial resources, and has serious problems.

DENVER NEAREST CITY

A large number of poverty-stricken Mexican-Americans live in rundown shacks on Scottsbluff's fringes. And teen-age drug use has been growing through out-of-town students who attend Hiram Scott College—a new four-year institution. (Marijuana grows wild along the roadsides and creek beds.)

Slightly more than 39,000 people make up this high, dry county that is split diagonally by the North Platte River. Half of those live in the adjoining towns of Scottsbluff and Gering.

Located just east of the Wyoming line, about midway between the South Dakota and Colorado borders, the nearest major center is Denver, some 200 miles to the south (and slightly west). Cheyenne, 100 miles southwest, is the nearest medium-sized community.

Cattle ranching and irrigated row crops are the major source of income, with sugarbeet processing the main activity.

Until about four years ago Scots Bluff handled its juvenile problems in a rather traditional way. County Judge Richard S. Wiles did what he could with limited resources, but far too many children were locked in the awful children's section of the county jail or shipped off to reform school.

Judge Wiles then formed a juvenile-court advisory committee, made up of local citizens. A year later he hired Mr. Miller as his probation officer.

COMMUNITY TURNED ON

For more than two years the advisory committee struggled along. Then a new minister in town, the Rev. James F. Landrum, was persuaded to take the presidency. The Rev. Mr. Landrum had once taught Sunday school in an Indiana reform school and had helped form two private institutions (Illini Children's Christian Home, St. Joseph; and Indiana Children's Christian Home, Ladoga) for youngsters. Imaginative, determined, he began to devote most of his time to Scotts Bluff County children in trouble.

This was what Judge Wiles and Jim Miller needed. With the strong support of the local radio station, KOLT, and the newspaper, the Star-Herald, Scotts Bluff County "turned on."

Not only did the number of foster homes grow from a handful to more than 50—housing some 65 children in trouble—but other things began to happen.

When I visited Scotts Bluff County, I found 17 committees at work, trying to eliminate juvenile delinquency in various ways.

A summer recreational program had begun that day with a $2,300 grant from the Scottsbluff city fathers and the help of student volunteers. Mayor C. A. Thomas says that next year $7,000 will be available; that $12,000 is being budgeted for the following year; and that eventually his community will have a "full-time, year-round recreational program."

FENCED PLAYGROUNDS UNLOCKED

The city became interested in spending money on recreation last fall when Mrs. Jeannie Westervelt, a former schoolteacher and member of the court advisory committee, began making speeches to service clubs and other groups on the subject.

School playgrounds are fenced and had been locked to prevent vandalism. The school board agreed to open them. The city money was used, in part, to hire a recreation director and two assistants for two months. Local groups have donated supplies for arts and crafts. The schools are providing balls and play equipment. And youngsters will be able to rent other games from a mobile recreational unit.

In the basement of the county jail one room is filled with children's clothing donated by local citizens. This was the result of court officials' discovering that many children skipped school, stole, or otherwise got into trouble because they had no shoes or underwear or were poorly dressed.

Jim Miller and others from time to time dipped into their own pockets to provide basic needs for these youngsters.

Parent counseling is used with families of children in trouble. One 17-year-old girl dating college students was constantly in trouble with her mother who (falsely) accused her of using narcotics and being a prostitute. (Her older sister is a prostitute.) Her father was working two jobs and never had time for his family.

HOW COMMITTEES COOPERATE

It was discovered that the girl felt totally rejected. She recalled only one good time in her life—a family camping trip. The mother agreed to take her daughter for two weeks in the Black Hills. The father visited them there. The family got to know each other better, and the girl is not only getting along better, but says she she will return to school in the fall.

Sometimes committees work together.

One 12-year-old boy arrived in court without underwear and was dressed in rags. He had been picked up as a truant. Mr. Miller took him home, found the family without heat or food, with only a small camping stove to cook on, and the electricity cut off.

The father had disappeared, leaving the mother and five children. She worked as a part-time waitress and as a maid in a cheap hotel to provide food. Welfare turned the family down because they had not lived in the state long enough. When Mr. Miller reached the home, he found the youngsters hadn't eaten for a day and a half.

Clothing was provided. Mr. Miller and others on the council started asking for donations. The newspaper told of the family's need. Soon they had furniture. A job was found for the young mother as a receptionist for a local dentist. The welfare department was persuaded to find her a baby-sitter so the children wouldn't be left alone. The boy went back to school.

Scotts Bluff County also has what it calls the "Listening Post." This, too, is a significant delinquency-prevention program, although not yet fully utilized by the community. Professional counselors make up the committee.

PARENTS, EVEN CHILDREN CALL

Sometimes a parent will call, asking what to do to keep a child from running with the wrong group or one on the edge of delinquency from getting into worse trouble. Now and then children ask for help.

One 17-year-old was picked up by police in a street brawl. (Later it was found he was fighting in self-defense.) His father, an ex-convict, was determined to give the boy a beating, according to Mr. Miller. As usual, the mother opposed this (part of a long-time family battle). The boy, tired of the conflict, and "brighter than either of his parents," called the Listening Post.

The boy had been failing in school. But after a series of family-counseling sessions he is "doing fine." The father now holds a steady job, and the home is relatively calm for the first time in years, according to Mr. Miller.

When counseling fails, the Listening Post has other communities to turn to. A 14-year-old girl was promiscuous and defied her mother. She was first placed on probation, eventually put in a foster home. The mother had wanted the girl "locked up."

The juvenile court advisory committee also has a committee working with school dropouts and tutoring students in reading and other subjects. Students from the Platte Valley Bible College do much of the tutoring.

These students haven't been afraid to tackle the dirty jobs. One Mexican family lived in a rundown shack on the riverbank on a farm owned by an exteremely wealthy farmer. The mother passed on. The father supporting his family of 15 by working for the farmer from dawn until after dark at $40 a week.

Mr. Miller learned of the family when one of the children, a 12-year-old boy, was arrested for breaking into a church. He found the children covered with lice, and suffering from malnutrition and a variety of skin diseases. Eight of the children slept in one bed, the father and two boys slept in a second bed, and the rest of the children slept on the floor—pine boards with spaces between them. Their used clothing was burned for heat when it became too filthy to wear. They cooked on a wood fire in a broken-down gas stove.

The students joined Mr. Miller and worked from 5 a.m. until midnight for three days to clean the filthy house. Furniture was provided. A registered nurse was sent out to talk to the older girls. The youngsters were bathed. Medical treatment was given. And after much pressure the farmer piped in cold water for bathing and gas for cooking—increasing the rent deduction from the meager paycheck.

Further pressure through church members on the farmer's wife over several months eventually produced a larger home for the family. And a Spanish minister began calling on the youngsters and sooon they were attending church.

SPECIAL SPEAKERS BROUGHT IN

The Scottsbluff-Gering Fellowship of Christian Athletes also has worked with children, as have other groups.

Three prisoners from Colorado have been flown in to speak to high-school groups on how to avoid a life of crime. Two nationally known speakers in the field also were brought in. Their talks were broadcast on the local radio station and picked up in schools throughout the area.

XUM

A community meeting was held by the advisory committee in the county jail. A display on drug abuse has been set up, and pamphlets distributed. A film on narcotics was purchased and has been shown across western Nebraska. "Shining Light" awards are given to those who contribute to delinquency prevention. Efforts continue to establish a big-brother and big-sister program for youngsters in need of a friend.

Efforts are beng made to establish a halfway house for youngsters who cannot adjust to foster home living and cannot stay in their own homes.

Dependent and neglected youngsters are temporarily held in a shelter-care facility, rather than jail—the St. Christopher Child Care Center operated by the Order of Corpus Christi Carmelite Sisters. (Because of a shortage of funds and climbing costs, the center is reported to be in danger of closing.)

JOBS HUNTED DOWN

The committee also tries to find jobs for youngsters. This is hampered by outdated child-labor laws designed to prevent exploitation of children and by the demise of the local Neighborhood Youth Corps unit.

Youngsters who are caught with alcohol in their possession are fined $100 and costs. Other older youngsters may also be fined for certain offenses. All are permitted to work off the fines on community projects. Five youngsters are developing small islands in the river into recreation areas with the voluntary supervision of Earl Shultz, a local carpenter.

Other children make restitution for vandalism by working under adult supervision. One group of 7-, 8-, and 9-year-olds is cleaning up a construction company's yard. The youngsters had stolen radiators, spark plugs, and other parts to sell.

Since the only swimming pool is located in a middle-class neighborhood, city fathers have just agreed to build a second pool more accessible to the poor, says Mayor Thomas.

In the past, the police department has followed a policy of harassment of young people, the Mayor adds. But a bright young California officer with a degree in police science has just been hired as police chief. James A. Teal makes it clear that not only will he work with the juvenile advisory committee, but that he intends to give his men training and insight into better ways of handling youth.

CHANGES THREATEN LEADERSHIP

Problems threaten to knock Scotts Bluff County from its status as a national leader in delinquency prevention. The county judge, Richard S. Wiles, has taken a state post in Lincoln.

The new judge, James L. Macken, who has been on the bench only a few days, admits that he is uncertain which direction he will go. Some fear he will be far more rigid and less imaginative than Judge Wiles, or fail to use the advisory committee properly. Yet Judge Macken says he "wants to learn," and is a "strong believer in probation."

Mr. Miller, probation officer, says he may quit, since his frequent requests for help have been turned down by the county board. Judge Macken replies that the decision on help for Mr. Miller is not final, but believes Mr. Miller is an outstanding juvenile officer and will urge him to stay.

Scotts Bluff County officials openly admit that many of their ideas are really not original. They give much credit to Boulder County, Colo., for pointing the way.

In recent years Boulder's juvenile court has gained national recognition for pioneering in the volunteer field and in opening Attention Homes for children in trouble—attention as opposed to detention.

BOULDER COURT COOPERATES

Beyond this, Boulder has an outstanding year-round recreation program and a welfare department that not only is concerned about children in trouble—and doing something about them—but also is able to work in harmony with the juvenile court. (In Scottsbluff and in many other cities the court and welfare department are at odds.)

Boulder's widely copied volunteer program is an outgrowth of a project begun by a University of Colorado sociologist, Gordon H. Barker. In 1957 he began assigning university students to work in the reform school in Golden, Colo.

In 1961, Professor Barker and Boulder County Juvenile Court Judge Horace B. Holmes began using carefully selected students as volunteer probation officers, after learning of a Laurence, Kan., judge who used law students in this capacity.

(During this same period Judge Keith Leenhouts was also pioneering in the use of volunteers in court in Royal Oak, Mich.)

From time to time Boulder residents offered to help in the juvenile court. But it was a few days after the slaying of President Kennedy that Dr. Ivan H. Scheier, a psychologist specializing in testing, "numbed by the assassination" walked in, asking for something to do.

"I had read that Oswald [Lee Harvey Oswald, accused of assassinating the President] was in a juvenile court but that no one had any time to do anything for him." said Dr. Scheier.

VOLUNTEER HELP WELCOMED

Judge Holmes and his wife, June, had known Dr. Scheier casually as a member of the same folk-dancing group. When Dr. Scheier volunteered, Judge Holmes knew how to use him. For he had long been concerned with the almost impossible job of helping children in trouble with the sketchy information provided by even the best probation officer.

Judge Holmes listed the questions he needed answered. Dr. Scheier used a short personality test to answer the questions. He now spends 20 to 30 hours a week without charge helping the court and supporting the volunteer movement.

Soon another psychologist volunteered to give children attitudinal tests.

Later, an optometrist walked in and began to give free eye tests. He quickly found that roughly half of the children in court had eye trouble. Hearing tests were added. The third child tested had a sever hearing problem that neither he nor his parents were aware of.

Many children are also given reading and IQ tests, proctored by volunteer women.

When court officials became weary of dealing with dropouts, a volunteer tutoring program was launched. So far, 35 different jobs have been performed by volunteers.

College students continue to work as volunteer probation officers. Now adults from the community also serve in this capacity—giving youngsters far more attention than they might get from a professional.

CHURCH PROGRAM TRIED OUT

A church referral program was tried. It failed because ministers and other church people were too busy doing other things. Those ministers who did do a good job "were already involved" with children in trouble, adds Charles Cameron, chief juvenile officer.

In the past year youngsters caught shoplifting have been asked to provide a day's service for each dollar's worth of merchandise stolen. Children may work for the city, help in the halfway house for ex-alcoholics, or in the parks. So far no child in this program has repeated the offense. Work programs are being tried for other violations, but so far with less success.

A sociologist teaches a course in family living for older boys and girls who want to get married. Often these youngsters only want to escape from home.

A group of volunteers has planned "retreats" into the mountains for youngsters who have used drugs. Each group will have 15 boys and girls. Follow-up meetings are planned. This program has been put together by Mrs. Sharon Fenner, a probation officer.

While Boulder still has a cold, prisonlike jail for holding children for courts, it has three volunteer-supported Attention Homes for those either waiting placement in institutions or foster homes or for a crisis in their own homes to end.

PARSONAGE RENTED FOR $1 A YEAR

These are older homes—the first was a Methodist parsonage rented for $1 a year—that blend into a neighborhood.

Young house parents are hired, often married college students, for $200 a month plus room and board. The program is built on trust of children in trouble.

During the school year they attend local public schools. They also are permitted to go to the store for a soft drink or personal need or a movie or some recreational activity without supervision.

A report published by the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, points out that "behind the volunteer-powered Attention Homes and individual foster-homes programs in Boulder is a belief that much of juvenile 'acting out' behavior is, at least at first, a plea for help. . . ."

The report adds that "the problems of children brought before the court are the problems of the entire community and, sooner or later, must be solved by the community."

In the big, old red-brick Attention Home a few blocks from downtown Boulder I met Don, a 14-year-old who was quietly playing an Attention Home guitar in his room.

Don had been involved in a series of burglaries. His 18-year-old brother is already in the reformatory.

Don "hates" his stepmother, a woman who broke up his home by having an affair with his father several years ago. Now he refuses to live with her. Yet his own mother, who has been ill, cannot keep him.

Don likes living in the Attention Home, not only because of the house parents, but because his father, a middle-class businessman, was always too busy to take him to the places he now goes—horseback riding, rodeos, the YMCA, the swimming pool.

HOME LIFE DESCRIBED

Perhaps even better evidence of the value of the Attention Home came from Carlos, a 15-year-old who has been "running since I was 13."

Carlos' father is divorced from his mother. His stepfather, a man he liked, has passed on.

He shyly talks about how he and his sister dislike the men his mother brings home, and how he is disturbed because "some of them stay half the night with her."

Carlos first went to a boys ranch, but ran from there, too. He has been in several foster homes, but has run from all but the last one, which he had to leave when the husband and wife developed problems of their own.

One of Carlos' problems has been at school where Anglo children "make fun of you and make you feel left out." Carlos is Mexican American. He has not run from the Attention Home, although doors and windows are unlocked.

Several federal studies have been made. One shows that the Attention Homes save a minimum of 500 child-days in jail each year.

(Niagara County, N.Y., has also pioneered, with even greater success, the use of open group homes for holding children in trouble. The jail in Niagara Falls is used far less than that in Boulder.)

PUBLIC FUNDS PROVIDED

Boulder County had a population of less than 75,000 in 1960. It has grown consider-

XUM

ably since. Yet its welfare department boasts 60 foster homes, plus three group homes that can accommodate up to 14 children each. One group home has been going for 12 years, a second for 6 years, the third for 3 years. Thus, Boulder is years ahead of many small or medium-sized counties.

Those who run group homes are paid $227 per month per child plus complete medical care. Foster parents taking one or two children receive from $66 a month for infants to $115 for each teen-ager, with varying rates between, depending upon age. Youngsters in foster homes also are provided clothing and medical care.

As in many counties, however, they find it difficult to place teen-agers, especially those who have been to court.

Children with special needs are often sent to private institutions in Colorado and other states for help and care.

The Welfare Department also employs three full-time homemakers who deal with families in trouble—teaching mothers money management, how to feed their families nutritious meals, how to clean and care for the house and otherwise maintain their families. Group meetings also are being tried.

There are other programs that might well be adopted by welfare departments in other states.

In recent months the Boulder Welfare Department has been successfully using volunteers, says Lew Wallace, the department's Director of Public Welfare.

In fact, the use of volunteers is the Boulder story.

INFORMATION CENTER OPENED

Dr. Scheler has opened a national information center in the basement of the courthouse. A federally financed study shows that volunteers—if properly used—do make an important impact on solving the problems of children in trouble.

From July 14 to 18 a national seminar on volunteerism will be held in Boulder. Other seminars have been held in the past, and the volunteer movement is rapidly spreading.

Not long ago a volunteer and information center was opened in downtown Boulder serving 35 community agencies. Both adults and young people are involved. They may play games with retarded or crippled children, teach art, music, drama. Some tutor. Others work with alcoholics, the elderly, and mental-health patients.

Men and boys serve as fix-it men—repairing buildings, radios, playground equipment, whatever needs to be done.

Other volunteers are being asked to provide transportation to the poor to the health center, welfare office, or wherever else they need to go.

Boulder County has a day nursery that cares for children from broken homes with working mothers, as well as others who require this kind of help.

While this kind of day care is still being talked about as new in many corners of the nation, it has been in operation since 1922 in Boulder. Mothers who can afford it pay a fee. But much of the cost is carried by the United Fund (the Red Feather drive) and by private donations. The program runs year round.

Boulder County has an outstanding recreational program. Not only are there two swimming pools, but the city has 8,000 acres of parkland, some of it in the mountains. More parkland is being added every year.

During the year 400 different recreational classes are offered, both in the parks and in the city schools, which remain open evenings. Both youngsters and adults can learn to draw, dance, bowl, play bridge, guitar and banjo, tennis, make pottery, play golf. The program also includes hiking, swimming, and a variety of other activities.

While small fees are charged, children on welfare have pass cards that are as "good as cash anywhere," says Paul Swoboda, superintendent of recreation.

SUMMER JOBS PROVIDED

Each summer 100 boys, 14-16 years old, are hired to work four hours a day, five days a week, up in the mountain parks to construct trails, build foot bridges, and do other jobs.

Although pay is only 50 cents an hour, the youngsters get swimming passes, passes to the nine summer teen dances, and to other activities. Appreciation parties are held. The boys are also issued hard hats and tee-shirts.

In its fifth year, large numbers of youngsters, rich and poor, compete for the opportunity to take part.

Another group of youngsters—boys and girls 14-16—compete for volunteer jobs as water-safety aides. All must pass junior Red Cross life saving tests.

Still another group of 75 girls volunteer each summer as playground assistant leaders. These youngsters also are trained and after one year may qualify as playground leaders. The girls get the same pay—50 cents an hour—and benefits as the boys who work on the park trails.

Mr. Swoboda strongly opposes Little League and other sports because he "detests parents out there pushing their own kids." Only "one in five is qualified to coach anyway," he adds.

Thus a Young America program has been developed for youngsters in the 4th, 5th, and 6th grades. Experienced, paid coaches teach youngsters to play football, wrestling, gymnastics, track and field, and other sports. Every child—skilled or clumsy—plays half a game. Emphasis is on "fun, safety, basic knowledge of the sport, physical conditioning, and competition"—and in that order of importance.

SPENDS $250,000 A YEAR FOR RECREATION

Boulder, which has a population of between 50,000 and 60,000 (the 1960 census shows 37,718) spends $250,000 a year on recreation for children, adults, and senior citizens.

Boulder offers much, much more. One could devote a book to the things going on there.

Take Alex Warner, a youthful but retired English teacher from the University of Colorado. He is running year-around science classes for 15 to 20 "black, white, and brown" youngsters in a corner of an old Quonset hut used by an Office of Economic Opportunity community-action center.

Children bring in leaves, feathers, spiders, snakes, bones—anything that interests them. They go on field trips up the mountainsides. Mr. Warner encourages them to collect and work with "junk," styrofoam packing material, plastic or cardboard containers from the grocery store—whatever they find. A few days ago the telephone company gave him cable they no longer needed.

"We don't spend a cent on this project," he says. Nor is he paid for the many hours he devotes.

The material the youngsters bring in always leads to the excellent children's room at the large new library. Not only do children learn about natural science here, but they are "tricked into improving their reading." Mr. Warner laughs.

This is the kind of imaginative approach—like the efforts in Scotts Bluff and Boulder Counties, Hughson, Calif. (see June 2 article in this series), and the Michigan communities described in last Monday's article—that offers the most promise in dealing wth children in trouble.

WE NEED FEAR NO CRITICISM AFTER RATIFYING THE HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a persistent fear of some opponents of the human rights conventions now before the Senate is that their ratification would open us up to criticism—both deserved and undeserved—from other nations.

I intend to show today that we have nothing to fear from either kind of criticism.

If indeed we would be criticized deservedly after ratifying these conventions, is not such criticism in our best interests? I have said repeatedly—and we have it on the best authority—that there is nothing asserted in these conventions that is not already a part of our Constitution. Thus, should we be criticized correctly for failing to live up to them, that criticism would apply equally to our domestic practice whether or not we ever ratified the conventions. And if we cannot absorb and act upon valid criticisms of how well we live up to our own Constitution, we are indeed in serious trouble.

But this concern—as I have long said—is wholly academic, for there is nothing in these conventions that we do not practice, as well as promise in our Constitution.

And we have as little to fear from undeserved as from deserved criticism. In the words of Mr. Morris Abram, who has represented the United States on the United Nations Commission on Human Rights—

> This concern reveals an unwarranted underestimation of our capacity to defend ourselves in international forums. The truth is that by becoming a party to these conventions we would not give our "enemies" any propaganda weapon that they do not already have, and that we are not capable of effectively resisting. As an open society, with our practices widely discussed in our own as well as the world information media, we risk nothing.

And far better, Mr. President, undeserved criticism, that we can absorb with ease, than the deserved—I say, deserved—criticism we now receive in abundance for claiming these standards as our own while continually failing to ratify the treaties that contain them.

I suggest, then, that we have nothing to lose by ratifying these conventions, while the effects of leaving them untouched can only be detrimental to our policy and to our hopes for a peaceful world order. I therefore urge once again that the Senate act promptly to put our name in the long column of those who have already approved these treaties.

FOREIGN TRADE ASSISTANCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as the ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee, I have been particularly concerned for some time about the need to increase U.S. exports. The favorable impact this would have on improving our balance of trade is of major significance, particularly since our best forecasts indicate that we will be running a sizable deficit this year.

Thus, I read with great interest an article in the June 18 issue of the Journal of Commerce entitled "Treasury May Allow Exporters Cost Break."

This news item was a report on the speech made by Morris Victor Rosenbloom, president of American Surveys International of Washington, D.C., at the luncheon meeting of the International Executives Association during its annual meeting in New York City the previous day. It made reference to the results of a survey of association members on the type of changes that this organization, comprised principally of businessmen engaged in export operations, deemed of most importance with respect to U.S. Government policy and programs in this vital area of our foreign economic policy.

Of 12 choices provided on the questionnaire, the respondents expressed the view that exports from this country could be benefited best by providing assistance in the following four categories: first, tax treatment comparable with foreign competitors; second, vigorous nontariff barrier removal; third, fairer export freight rates; and fourth, better export financing.

Following these first four categories, eight more were ranked in the order of preference:

Fifth, guarantees/insurance program strengthening; sixth, more tariff lowering abroad; seventh, more practical AID regulations; ninth, a tie between expanded market development programs and realistic export controls; tenth, more effective trade attachés; eleventh, enlarged containerization support; and twelfth, more market research.

Because of the importance of these findings and the relevant observations on some likely future developments presented by Mr. Rosenbloom, I asked him to provide me with a copy of an annotated text of his remarks.

I recommend Mr. Rosenbloom's speech to the attention of Senators and to those Government officials and businessmen who are involved with international trade matters. I believe that his presentation—with its survey of needed changes in export policy and programs by the Government, the evaluation of these findings and developments to be anticipated in this area—is an excellent delineation which will prove of value in advancing a better understanding of the benefits to be derived from foreign trade.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address and the report on it, published in the Journal of Commerce, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EFFECTIVE GOVERNMENT RELATIONS—HOW IT HELPS YOUR INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS

(Address by Morris Victor Rosenbloom, president of American Surveys International, Washington, D.C., at the annual meeting of the International Executives Association, June 17, 1969, New York City)

It is truly a great pleasure for me to be here today and I am particularly pleased to have been invited to participate with you at the time of your annual meeting.

The excellence of the work your Association has performed since its founding 55 years ago in, as your slogan indicates: "Helping Each Other in International Trade", I believe—both from chatting with some of you and noting the scope, as well as the significance, of the IEA Conference you held last March—expresses better than any words of mine how you are surging forward toward the goals and objectives you seek for the group itself and for your individual members as well.

I

From learning about the work of your Association, it was clear to me that a major aspect of its orientation is in the field of exports. Thus, in devising my questionnaire which Fred Lehn kindly arranged to have forwarded to the membership, its first question was: "What changes does your firm want most in U.S. Government policy and programs?"

I provided 12 choices and asked that the respondee (who would not be identified) number them in the order of their importance. We have made several types of tabulations from the forms that were returned and believe you will be particularly interested in the major findings.

To this question on changes desired in U.S. Government policy and programs—after giving a weighted value of 3, 2 and 1 respectively to the first, second and third choices—the winners were (as they say in announcing the awards presented on television!):

	Percent
1. Tax treatment comparable with foreign competitors	20.6
2. Vigorous non-tariff barrier removal	18.5
3. Fairer export freight rates	13.6
4. Better export financing (3. and 4. were neck-and-neck)	13.0

The four categories chosen reflect 65.7% of the vote cast and the remaining eight categories together represented 34.3% of the vote.

The findings are, in my judgment, significant. This view is underlined by setting forth the eight other categories in the order of the vote cast:

5. Guarantees/insurance program strengthening.

6. More tariff lowering abroad.

7. More practical AID regulations.

8. and 9. were a tie between expanded market development programs and realistic export controls.

10. More effective trade attachés.

11. Enlarged containerization support.

12. More market research.

With respect to the three questions in our survey that were aimed at exporter-government communications, the findings again should prove of considerable interest. In responding to each of these three questions, the following choices could be made: Industry trade associations, exporter organizations, own Washington office, Washington consultants, news media, letters, phone calls and visits.

Response to the first question—"How does your firm keep abreast of export policy and program developments in Washington?"—resulted in a ranking of:

1. Industry trade associations.
2. News media.
3. Exporter organizations.

The vote on the second question—"How does your firm communicate its problems with Washington?"—indicated the following ranking:

1. Letters, phone calls and visits.
2. Industry trade associations.
3. Exporter organizations.

The third question—"How does your firm deal with the international lending agencies and embassies in Washington?"—showed this ranking:

1. Letters, phone calls and visits.

2. and 3. were a tie between industry trade associations and own Washington office.

It was quite interesting to note that, of the six categories shown on the form for selection as those used in order of their importance, only one (Washintgon consultants) did not receive a ranking vote in response to any of these three questions on exporter-government communications! Whether this implies your "underlying spirit" on this subject or—as I should prefer to believe—it is in the area of "My best I haven't designed yet" appears to be the $64 question!

II

As our opinion survey which the Chairman of your Program Committee, Peter Greene, sent to IEA members turned up the most substantive interest in four areas of U.S. Government policy and programs, I should like to spend a few minutes in outlining the present and possible future situation with respect to them. Thus, I shall touch on export tax incentives, non-tariff barriers, export freight rates and export financing.

Let me begin these remarks by saying that this is an especially important time for you to get your message across to the policymakers in Washington. I call it a critical moment because, with our trade surplus dramatically weakened, the prospect of positive government action is very favorable. If the thin export surplus persists, or if it disappears and we have a trade deficit, the government is apt to be compelled to provide some substantial assistance to exporters. This, then, is the time for your suggestions to be presented—and they are likely to find more receptive ears in Washington than has normally been the case.

I don't mean to paint a one-sided picture, however. Not all those in government who have responsibilities in our foreign trade policy are ready to come to the aid of exporters. Far from it. The diagnosis of our trade situation is being vigorously debated. The cure, as you might imagine, is therefore equally unclear.

Right now, two agencies are calling for fresh programs, policies and legislation to give our U.S. exports a shot of much-needed vitamins. I am referring to the Department of Commerce and the Export-Import Bank. Commerce, as you probably know, issued a few weeks ago its forecast of the trade outlook for the next five years. It painted a rather gloomy picture—continuing thin export surpluses, maybe even thin deficits. In Commerce's view, the deterioration in the U.S. trade position is basic and enduring, not merely the result or reflection of the terrific inflation we've been living with in this country. Even when and if inflation is controlled, the report says, we will be faced with a weak trade situation. That is somewhat startling news for American business and, in my judgment, a rather remarkable admission for U.S. officials.

The views have not gone unnoticed within other agencies. I don't want here to explore the disagreements that have been expressed over the methodology of the Commerce trade survey. The important point is that some other agencies disagree with Commerce's conclusions.

A month ago, no less formidable an expert than Andrew Brimmer, a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, took the position that the U.S. trade posture has been weakened by inflation, that high American prices had brought astronomic import levels, while exports had done pretty well. So long as influential officials, like the men in the Fed, doubt that we have entered an era of prolonged basic trade weakness, we are going to face divided ranks in government over this dilemma. And that means divided ranks over the necessary prescription to cure the illness. If the Fed thinks that inflation is our problem, it isn't likely to go along with recommendations for boosting exports—beyond controlling prices, of course. But, again, I should like to repeat that if the trade balance remains weak, the government will probably act regardless of the debate over our predicament. Even Mr. Brimmer left the door open to that possibility, though he obviously limited his endorsement for positive remedial steps.

The two main recommendations for government help for exporters have been in the field of export financing and export taxation—which bear directly on the interest you expressed in response to my survey to IEA members. The Commerce Department ex-

XUM

perts who are advocating these measures point out—and I think you will agree—that only through financing and taxation can much of a dent be made in the problem relatively quickly. Other actions obviously would help. Dismantling foreign non-tariff barriers would open up markets, and cutting transport costs would make your products more competitive. But government efforts to create those conditions will take a considerable amount of time to be productive. And even when they have been successful, it will be a while before you will be able to take full advantage of them and feel their effects.

I know many of you have complained at one time or another that the U.S. is not competitive in export financing. Doubless you have felt that either the German or Italian or Japanese exporters could offer better terms, or that they could usually count on funds being available. Finally, in the Commerce five-year forecast directed by Paul Porter, an ex-businessman now a government strategist, a government agency at last admitted that we are heading into an era in which we will probably not be adequately prepared for financing exports.

The Commerce Department, therefore, has advocated several measures to overcome this problem. It has called for the creation of an automatic rediscount facility, preferably in the Federal Reserve System. It has urged the Fed to ease up on its commercial bank foreign lending guidelines. And at least some Commerce officials are insisting that the proposed Private Export Financing Corporation will not make much of a splash unless it offers subsidized interest rates.

Since the diagnosis is not agreed upon, however, neither is the cure. And all of these recommendations are finding strong opposition. Mr. Brimmer made it very clear the Fed is unwilling to ease up on the bank guidelines, and he doesn't see any special need for a discount facility. By his calculations, even with the present foreign lending curbs, U.S. banks could provide another $6 billion in export financing this year, which is far more than any possible increase our exports will enjoy. He kept the door open to a rediscount facility, but indicated it ought to be located in the Export-Import Bank, which already operates a limited discount program. Eximbank operations, on the other hand, are subject to budgetary limitations, and we are living through a period of tight budgetary restraints. It looks like it will be pretty difficult to persuade the Bureau of the Budget to boost Exim's authorized lending volume. I think Andrew Brimmer recognized this situation when he said he thought the reason many proposed a facility in the Fed is that it would be lost in the total central bank lending operations. In other words, it would escape budgetary scalping. But if the Fed doesn't want it, and Exim isn't going to get past the Budget Bureau, prospects must be characterized as dim.

Before turning from this subject, I want to mention that another evaluation of the U.S. trade position has been completed recently by H. S. Houthakker, a member of the Council of Economic Advisers who is the CEA foreign trade specialist. He undertook it with another economist on a private basis, not connected with his present official capacity. Though the conclusion is that this country faces a deteriorating position in trade, the method of study is altogether different from the one issued by the Commerce Department. Houthakker's approach has been to compare aggregates of income and import, measuring elasticities for the U.S. and other major trading nations. Time does not permit going into further detail. Suffice to add, exporters appear to have a friend in the Council of Economic Advisers who, though he obviously sees the situation as deteriorating, would be receptive to constructive proposals.

The only idea, then, which is getting wide support within government is the Private Export Financing Corporation, or PEFCO. The Fed has given it its blessing, though with the reminder that even here it would be pointless to extend credit for export of products that would sell anyway, without additional U.S. lending facilities. The Fed is worried that we don't really need more export financing, and that if we lend more we will merely create capital outflows without necessarily boosting exports. In other words, we will replace cash sales with credit transactions. If PEFCO gets "off the ground" by the end of 1969—as now appears likely—that is all to the good. But how many of you are in the aircraft business? Even though PEFCO probably will be broadened later to cover other capital goods, this is not the case today. In any event, this is the time to get your message across to Washington if you feel you need better export financing.

With respect to new developments regarding non-tariff barriers, it appears that they may be the subject of a GATT conference later this year. The idea here is that free trade proponents in the U.S. and other governments are fearful that protectionism is making headway and that the holding of such a conference would help to give fresh momentum to free trade, meet some of the criticism the protectionists are throwing up about NTBs. Otherwise, chances are that such a conference would be held in 1970.

The GATT has completed its so-called "gripe book," the collections of government complaints about other governments and their practices, though Secretary Stans has referred to still further collection and exchange of these lists. Clearly, vigorous efforts by the government to eliminate non-tariff barriers and unfair foreign trade practices is of major importance to our overall trade picture.

In export taxation, the picture is even more discouraging. In the face of a taxpayer's revolt, the chances of getting special treatment for exporters passed by Capitol Hill are dim. Some think that if the situation in trade really gets sticky that we can expect the Administration to work out an arrangement with Chairman Wilbur Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee which would get export incentives into a broader tax package as a sort of "piggy-back." It's true that the Treasury could, through administrative changes, provide some help to exporters—for example, by allowing foreign market development costs to be written off. This may make some headway during the latter part of this year. But it's still too early to tell. The idea, on the other hand, of the U.S. adopting a tax on a value added system like the Europeans and a border tax system doesn't seem to hold out much hope at the moment. At best this would take some pretty big changes, and lots of time.

In my judgment the best way to deal with export tax incentives is for the government to redouble its efforts to try to have other countries limit their border tax benefits. If this could be achieved in the not-distant future, it would be the wisest solution to this thorny problem. Of course, how feasible this will be is another matter.

I think we can expect some additional help from the Commerce Department, though even there officials involved don't expect all of these activities to boost U.S. sales abroad much more than another $250 million. You can count on a vastly enlarged marketing research effort. As some of you may know, Commerce recently signed 27 new contracts covering a wide range of products in eight Western European countries. That research should make it easier for you to know your markets and pinpoint your sales efforts. Commerce is talking about boosting its market research budget by 250 per cent in the fiscal year starting next month. Now is the time to suggest the product areas that you think deserve government-sponsored research. The government has its own ideas, based on past performance in leading exports. They may be right in their choice, but you are now presented with a timely opportunity to get your own message across.

There are some changes coming in the transportation field that will benefit exporters. Here, again, these will take many months to see the light of day. A major reorganization in the Maritime Administration is due very soon, though what impact on this the new maritime strike will make is hard to predict. The Department of Transportation is trying to put the finishing touches to its legislation proposing through rates and single bills of lading for international intermodal shipments. That bill has been circulating within industry; perhaps some of you have participated in the talks. DOT would like to find some practical, perhaps modest, way of getting the first step behind us in this whole matter. Last year's bill generated quite a bit of opposition. Hopefully, this year's version will smooth out some of the rough spots.

It is clear that export freight rates are a long-range issue. Containerization should help to hold them down eventually since the labor content of transport will be reduced. But inflation is likely to offset this outlook.

On other aspects, as you are aware, the Federal Maritime Commission is attacking the conferences currently and the Department of Transportation is at work in an endeavor to untangle the ports/airports cargo logjam.

Another current transport topic is close to my theme of exporter-government relations. As you know, the U.S. signed an agreement at The Hague last year that would—at least as the U.S. negotiators saw it—give shippers a better break from losses in ocean transport. The carriers opposed the U.S. interpretation, which would give individual packages within containers separate liability limits of their own, providing that the shipper stipulated them on the bill of lading. The carriers, naturally, are willing to accept this idea provided they are able to pass along the higher insurance costs to the shippers in the form of higher freight rates.

In these comments I prefer not to get involved in the merits of this issue. For a number of years I have been the Washington representative of the National Customs Brokers & Forwarders Association, assisting in policy formulation and helping with government relations activities. Though I prefer not to go into more detail on the liability issue at this time, I think both sides have a point. Obviously carriers, if they are going to be saddled with higher liability limits, want to protect themselves.

The point I do want to make, however, is that there now appears to be a good chance that the U.S. may not ratify the agreement. The result of our letting the issue slip would be to let other governments ratify first, and that would mean that their interpretations of the agreement would prevail. Since some of them, particularly the British, took the carriers' position and assumed that higher freight rates would be permitted, U.S. shippers would not get the break that the U.S. negotiators wanted. The carriers are well organized, and have indicated they would fight ratification tooth and nail. Since the two officials who formulated and presented the U.S. position have now left government, it is possible that within the ranks of the Administration the 1968 interpretation no longer has strong advocates. Again, the point to be stressed is that shippers such as yourselves should be communicating effectively with Washington to get your message through. Recent handling of this matter suggests that carriers are better able to get their thinking across than exporters and importers. It is clear that they have a bigger stake, but it may also be time for exporters to find the ways and means of bringing pressure where it can do them the most good.

As a sort of summation to this section of my remarks, I believe it pertinent to quote a statement made by one of this country's outstanding industry leaders, William Blackie of the Caterpillar Tractor Company. What he told the 1965 National Foreign Trade Convention is just as true today as it was then:

"We in business should recognize that while our tariff and most of our non-tariff barriers have sanction in laws or governmental regulations, these are generally the political response to business pleadings. Our national policy, it is said, is one of freer trade—and we certainly have no compunction about promoting exports. But when it comes to imports, there is too frequently an all-around 'pussyfooting'—mealy-mouthed declarations by business associations, oblique opposition by otherwise outstanding trade associations and an inconsistent sort of propaganda which overtly lauds the general principle of competition while covertly seeking to make sure that it is not allowed to work in particular instances. Let us not, therefore, be too hasty to condemn government. If, as a nation, we really favor a policy of the freest possible trade, then it is high time that all business and its representative associations get unequivocally behind the policy and, by both advocacy and practice, help to make it effective. This means facing up to competition without the protection of quotas, 'phony' customs valuations, antidumping sophistries, and narrow 'nationalistic' restrictions against foreign bids to meet public tenders."

[From the Journal of Commerce, June 18, 1969]

Treasury May Allow Exporters Cost Break

Although prospects are dim that Congress will expand, export financing funds this year, or adopt a value-added tax and the border taxes that go with it, the Treasury might permit exporters to write off costs of developing foreign markets, an international trade consultant said here yesterday.

In another important area, Morris Rosenbloom said, American shippers may not get the better break from losses in ocean transport that many had expected from an international agreement the U.S. signed last year, because the U.S. may not ratify it.

The important subject of nontariff barriers to trade may be taken up at a conference this year or next by the General Agreement on Tariffs & Trade (GATT), Mr. Rosenbloom told a luncheon meeting of the International Executives Association. Mr. Rosenbloom, president of American Surveys International of Washington, D.C., spoke at the IEA's monthly meeting at the Statler Hilton Hotel.

Exporters can count on a "vastly enlarged" marketing research effort by the Department of Commerce, he said.

IEA SURVEY

A survey of IEA members conducted by Mr. Rosenbloom showed that most respondents said U.S. exports could be helped most in four ways:

1. Export tax incentives.
2. Vigorous removal of nontariff barriers.
3. Fairer export freight rates.
4. Better export financing.

The survey found support, but less enthusiasm for the following: strengthening of the export guarantees and insurance program; more tariff lowering abroad; more practical regulations in the Agency for International Development; expanded market-development programs and realistic controls on exports to Communist countries; more effective trade attachés, enlarged support for containerization, and more market research.

The speaker told the IEA gathering that the idea of the Treasury administratively allowing foreign market-development costs to be written off "may make some headway during the latter part of this year. But it's too early to tell."

However, he said, it is not likely that the U.S. will adopt a tax on a value added system like the Europeans and a border-tax system. "At best this would take some pretty big changes, and lots of time."

It has been pointed out that this would constitute a complete change in the U.S. tax system to a national sales tax from the present corporate income tax, a shift Congress is unlikely to approve.

On the agreement on losses from ocean transport that the U.S. signed in The Hague last year, Mr. Rosenbloom noted that the two government officials who interpreted the pact favorably to shippers have left the government. They would have allowed separate liability limits for individual packages within containers, if the shipper stipulated them on the bill of lading.

Meanwhile, the ocean carriers have a well organized drive to win the right to pass on higher insurance costs in the form of higher freight rates, he said.

He pointed out that "the result of our letting the issue slip would be to let other governments ratify first, and that would mean their interpretations of the agreement would prevail." Some, particularly the British, took the carriers' position.

DEFICIENCIES IN PUBLIC WELFARE SYSTEM

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, it is now accepted wisdom that our public welfare system is inadequate, inequitable, and inefficient.

Recently an excellent series of articles entitled "Welfare: A Bankrupt System," written by John T. Dauner, was published in the Kansas City Times and Star. These articles graphically illustrate the deficiencies of the present system and the need, at the very least, for national minimum standards for our public assistance programs.

I ask unanimous consent that the series of nine articles be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Welfare: A Bankrupt System—I: Costs Threaten Poor Aid

Awash in a sea of red tape, intellectually bankrupt, and threatening the financial ruin of state and local government, the public welfare system is rapidly becoming a national issue as heated and divisive as the urban crisis, Vietnam and black nationalism.

It can, in fact, hardly be called a system. It is a morass of 50 state laws, all different, thousands of pages of federal and state regulations and local traditions and interpretations that attempt to implement and administer the public assistance provisions of the Social Security act.

The welfare system is supposed to provide an ultimate guarantee against poverty and social privation. But it breeds poverty and continuing dependency rather than independence.

Shrouded in myth, it is one of the most unpopular endeavors of our government—with taxpayer and recipient alike. It is inequitable, arbitrary, costly, inefficient. And the system is in trouble.

On these points, Republican and Democrat, conservative and liberal, taxpayer and recipient alike can agree.

"It's a mess," sighed a White House staff member working on alternatives for change. "It's a hell of a mess."

A glance at the scope of the welfare problem is at once frightening and enlightening.

There are 8.5 million persons on welfare and they are organizing, much as industrial workers early in the century, to enforce their rights and bring change in basic laws.

There are 22 million more Americans living beneath the poverty line ($3,300 a year for an urban family of four). There are an estimated 17 million more eligible persons who are not on the rolls. And welfare rolls are skyrocketing as welfare rights organizations and antipoverty programs steer eligible persons into public assistance programs.

The country spent almost 9 billion dollars on welfare last year, about half federal funds and half state and local moneys. Costs are zooming upward as programs are broadened to include persons previously ineligible and as recipients' organizations demand all that is due their clients as well as higher benefits.

The potential and the challenge can be seen in the growth of public assistance in the last 19 years. In 1950, the country spent 2.3 billion dollars on welfare, of which 95 per cent was in direct cash payments to recipients and 5 per cent was for administration and training. By 1963, the program had more than doubled to 4.6 billion dollars, with 72 per cent in direct payments, 20 per cent for medical care and 8 per cent for administration, services and training.

The Health, Education and Welfare department's projection for this year is 10.4 billion dollars, with 50 per cent in direct payments, 40 per cent for medical care—the fastest growing segment of the system—8 per cent for administration, services and training, and 2 per cent for new work-incentive programs.

Surprisingly, these galloping increases have taken place in a period when the number of poor persons has dropped from 40 million (22 per cent of the population) in 1960 to 22 million (11 per cent) in 1968. And, although the dollar cost of welfare has taken an immense leap in the last four years, it has increased only from 1 to 1.4 per cent of the gross national product.

But it is the rapidly increasing dollar cost—coupled with mounting pressure from welfare rights organizations—that is forcing federal and state officials toward a complete overhaul of the welfare system.

"The welfare system is bankrupting our cities and must be scrapped and replaced," Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York told President Nixon recently.

Declaring the welfare system must be changed this year, Lindsay said, "We in the cities have reached our limit. We cannot ante up more and more every year at the expense of other essential services."

State and local responsibility for administering and, originally, for financing, public assistance is deeply rooted in the American tradition. But in 1935, the federal government, through the Social Security act, began helping the states finance their welfare programs. Since then, five programs—old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, aid to families with dependent children, and Medicaid—have been set up, each with state and federal eligibility requirements.

The federal government will pay 50 to 80 per cent of the costs, depending on the program and the state's ability to pay.

The nonfederal share may be borne solely by the state, as it is in Missouri, or split between the state and its counties as it is in Kansas.

States are free to participate in the programs only to the extent they wish, controlling that participation by the amount of money they are willing to make available. Both the states and the federal government put a maximum on the amount they will contribute to any one individual, and some states put a ceiling on the amount a family can receive.

It is in the federal-state partnership that the problem lies in this period of rapidly expanding rolls and increasing costs.

The Federal government's revenues respond to the economy, to inflation and to the gross national product. State revenues have not kept pace, and local revenues, based mainly on property taxes, have hardly increased at all. While potential of the federal government to pay and its willingness to pay have increased, that of the states has not.

The rift in the partnership also has been widened by what many state and local officials complain of as federal meddling.

"If the federal government is going to make the rules, they should run it and pay for it," says Gov. Warren E. Hearnes.

It is true that HEW, in an effort to push states toward improved services and benefits—as well as less arbitrary and more dignified treatment of recipients—has put strings on its funds through regulations that state and local officials would rather disregard.

A federal takeover is being seriously studied and may be proposed by President Nixon as part of a move to a guaranteed annual income system.

There is no doubt that the federal government will assume a larger share of the financing—and a bigger role in the regulation of programs.

The already critical problems of the welfare system are going to get worse at an increasingly rapid rate if the system is not revamped, streamlined and made more efficient and equitable both for the taxpayer and the recipient.

To understand these problems and the possible solutions, it is necessary to strip away the numerous myths that surround the system:

Myth: Most welfare recipients are lazy scoundrels living off the taxpayers and could support themselves if they would just go out and get a job.

Fact: Of those on the rolls, half are children or those caring for them. Twenty-five per cent are 65 years old or older. Ten per cent are blind or permanently and totally disabled. It has been estimated by HEW that if all of the able-bodied adults now receiving public assistance were put to work it would reduce the rolls by only 2 per cent.

Last September, according to HEW figures, 5,882,000 persons in 1,471,000 families were receiving aid to families with dependent children (AFDC), the fastest growing and most controversial direct payment program. The cost on an annual basis was $2,541,699,000. Of these 4,408,000 were children and 1,300,000 were mothers caring for those children. There were 55,600 temporarily unemployed fathers in the program in the 24 states that permit fathers to stay in the home without making the children and mother ineligible for payments.

Of the physically able fathers capable of working and living with AFDC families, only 5 per cent were unemployed. Of the 1.3 million mothers, only 300,000 had marketable skills or could be trained to support or help support themselves—if day care were available for the children, which, in most cases, it was not.

Under recent amendments to the law, mothers whose children are over 6 months of age have to accept work training when day care is available.

HEW figures from 1967 show that 6.6 per cent of the AFDC mothers were working full time, 7.1 per cent part time, 38.6 were needed as homemakers, 13.6 per cent were incapacitated and 11.5 per cent had no marketable skills.

In a New York study, seven out of 10 AFDC mothers said they preferred to work rather than stay at home on welfare, and two-thirds had plans to work in the future. Answering the same question, six out of every 10 mothers with preschool children said they preferred to work.

An Illinois study revealed nearly half the state's AFDC mothers were not employable. The leading reason was poor health.

There were 2,026,000 persons 65 years of age or older who received $1,814,319,000 last year. This program gradually has diminished as the Social Security system has been broadened and its benefits increased.

The 691,000 persons on the disabled rolls received $653,696,000 and 81,000 blind got $90,648,000. Both programs have stabilized.

The cost of medical care for the indigent, Medicaid, in the 39 states that participate to some degree in the program, was $3,265,618,000—far above government estimates. Medicaid promises to get more expensive as medical costs go up. Unless the law is amended, states will be forced by 1975 to expand Medicaid benefits to all persons under the poverty line.

The program is under fire in state capitals and in Congress with allegations of inflated charges for medical services. New York already has cut back its Medicaid program and other states are following the lead. Federal ceilings on medical charges are being considered.

"Medicaid needs to be revised to reduce costs," said Sen. Charles Goodell of New York. "There is evidence of excessive charges. The program needs to be self-policed by the medical profession or will be controlled by the government."

An estimated $63,362,000 was spent for medical care under the Kerr-Mills program which is being phased out.

In addition to the federal-state programs, state and local governments spent $436,878,000 on general assistance—aid to those who do not qualify under the categories set up under the Social Security act.

Myth: Recipients live well on welfare.

Fact: While payments are supposed to provide recipients with a decent and healthful, if modest, standard of living, the payments in many states—Missouri for example—do not even equal what the state itself sets as the standard to meet basic needs.

The largest average payment for a AFDC recipient is $71.50 a month in New York. In only six states is the average payment $50 or more. The payment in 16 states averages less than $30. Five states pay less than $20 a month and Mississippi averages $8.50 a month. The average for the country is $41.35 to each recipient a month.

The highest average payment for old age assistance is $120.55 in New Hampshire and the lowest $38.45 a month in Mississippi. Highest average payment to a blind recipient is $136.85 a month in California and the lowest $46.50 in Mississippi. The highest average paid the disabled is $127.20 in Iowa and the lowest $45.70 in Mississippi. Added to these payments is the value of medical care through Medicaid in the states that participate in the program and the value of commodity foods or food stamps in the places where they are available.

Myth: Most people on welfare are Negroes.

Fact: While a larger percentage of the Negro population receives welfare benefits than the white population, Negroes constitute less than half of the recipients in any of the public assistance programs.

For all programs, Negroes represent 40 per cent of the recipients. They make up 47 per cent of the AFDC rolls, 37 per cent of the permanently and totally disabled, 31 per cent of the blind and 25 per cent of the old age assistance.

Myth: Most welfare recipients live in larger Central cities.

Fact: Three-fifths of the recipients live in rural areas. About 40 per cent live in cities of 250,000 or more population; about 14 per cent in cities of less than 250,000. The rest live in smaller towns, or farms or in other rural circumstances.

Myth: Aid to families with dependent children encourages illegitimacy.

Fact: Based on the national average payment for AFDC, a woman would increase her income $1.37 a day for adding a child to her family. In Missouri, where the AFDC payment is $24 a month for each additional child, the mother would increase her income by 80 cents a day—hardly enough to feed, clothe and care for a child.

There is a problem with illegitimacy in this country that transcends economic and racial lines. But it is particularly serious among the poor. Social scientists studying illegitimacy say there are many factors that lead to a high illegitimacy rate among the poor—ignorance, lack of birth control information and devices and sociological factors—but not welfare benefits.

Among the culprits blamed for encouraging illegitimacy among the poor are persons who made and administer AFDC laws, which tend to break up families by making it difficult, if not impossible, to obtain the benefits when there is an unemployed man in the house.

Myth: Because of the inequities in welfare levels among the states, people migrate from low-benefit states to high-benefit states.

Fact: This is a half truth. In the 1950s and 1960s there has been a massive migration to the larger industrial cities mainly from the agrarian South and other rural areas. As agriculture has become mechanized and family farming has faded, these areas no longer offer a livelihood or opportunity. People, most of them black and not equipped with the skills to work in industry or the sophistication to cope with urban environment, move to areas where the economy is better and jobs available.

It's the hope for opportunity that attracts migrants to the cities, not higher welfare benefits, says Frances Fox Piven of the Columbia university school of social work.

This is borne out by studies that show that most of the migrants do not apply for welfare until two or three years after they relocate—long after they become eligible. In New York, only 2 per cent were residents for less than two years before applying for welfare. Little work has been done on how the migrants survive in the meantime. But it is thought that help from relatives and friends and menial and part-time jobs would be major factors, she said.

Welfare: A Bankrupt System—II: Many Inequities Plague the Poor

Traditionally, welfare in America has been considered a dole, a handout from society to help individuals or families temporarily unable or unwilling to support themselves.

It was considered a privilege, not a right. To be poor, to be supported by the state, ran directly counter to the American work ethic. It was to be maladjusted. Therefore the poor were considered a ward of the state, partly or wholly disenfranchised and without the normal rights and freedoms of other citizens.

Through the years, some of these inequities have been broken down. Many still permeate the system.

But today, with 8.5 million Americans living on public assistance—the vast majority children, elderly, blind or disabled—at a cost this year of over 10 billion dollars and both figures increasing, there is a growing realization that welfare will be a way of life for many for the foreseeable future.

About the best that can be hoped for is the 4,408,000 children receiving public assistance will not need it as adults. There is hope, too, that at least some of the 1.3 million mothers of these children can be trained to support or help support themselves.

Those over 65 years old, who do not qualify for social security, the blind and the totally disabled will continue to be the responsibility of the welfare system.

There is growing pressure to provide a decent, healthy and dignified life for those people who do receive public assistance.

In Colonial times, America adopted a sys-

XUM

tem of welfare based on the English poor laws and pretty much maintained it until the passage of the social security act in 1935.

"Welfare has never been guided by economy as many believe," said Edward V. Sparer of the Yale law school, an authority on welfare law and policy. "It is guided by the best interests of the affluent community. It has led to disenfranchisement and many other abuses of the poor.

"Under the old poor laws, welfare was made as rough as possible to encourage recipients to get off the rolls.

Several states used to prohibit those on welfare from voting. Maine, in fact, had such a law until 1965. Some states, including Maine, still prohibit a welfare recipient from marrying without the permission of the welfare agency.

Until 1920 children whose families could not support them were virtually auctioned off to foster parents, some shipped to farm areas where they were little more than farm hands or domestics to their foster parents.

With the rise of the mothers aid movement in the early part of this century, it was believed that some mothers with children should be brought onto the welfare rolls, but that the aid should be used to remold the family. The mothers literally became wards of the state.

Missouri, in 1911, became the first state to enact a mothers aid law.

The welfare system also has fallen victim to the social-worker ethic, says Lee Albert, director of the Center on Social Welfare Policy and Law at Columbia university.

"This is the idea that the social worker knows what is best for the client and what they do, legal or illegal, is for the good of the client," Albert says.

With the passage of the social security act, welfare was established as a right—something many congressmen, state legislators, welfare administrators and welfare workers still manage to ignore.

The act provided for a federal-state partnership with the states administering the programs and the federal government sharing the cost.

Five categories—aid to families with dependent children, Medicaid, old-age assistance, aid to the permanently and totally disabled and aid to the blind—were set up under the act.

A recipient must fit into one of the arbitrary categories. If he does not fit, he is out, and this is a major weakness of the federal-state welfare system. Eligibility is based on arbitrary qualifications, not on need.

Most states maintain general assistance programs that are supposed to fill in the gaps, but there are few places where the gaps actually are filled. Only in six states and the District of Columbia do average monthly payments exceed $50, Missouri with a payment of $51.90, is one of those. The national average is $39.40, lower than aid for dependent children (A.F.D.C.).

The size and cost of welfare programs, 1968

Medicaid	$3, 265, 618, 000
AFDC (5,882,000 recipients)	2, 541, 699, 000
Old age (2,026,000 recipients)	1, 814, 319, 000
Disabled (691,000 recipients)	653, 696, 000
General assistance (800,000 recipients)	436, 878, 000
Blind (81,000 recipients)	90, 648, 000

In implementing the categorical program, each state sets up a budget which outlines a monthly cost standard for basic needs for a decent and healthy life. The budget is supposed to, but usually does not, reflect the local economy.

A few states set a realistic budget and pay 100 per cent of it. Nebraska, for instance, is one of 13 states whose budget for old-age assistance is at or above the poverty line. The state says an aged woman requires $182 a month, and pays that much.

Five states set their budget at or above the poverty line, but pay only a percentage of need. Missouri is an example. The state says it requires $150 a month for an aged woman to live in health and decency, but pays a maximum of $80.

In 21 states the budget is below the poverty level and the state pays 100 per cent of the need it sets. Kansas is one. The budget for an aged person is $114 and that is what the state pays.

Ten states' budgets for old age assistance are below the poverty line and the state will pay only a percentage of need.

In the A.F.D.C. program, there are only five states whose budgets meet or exceed the poverty level and payments are 100 per cent of budget.

Generally speaking, states that pay less than they declare is necessary to live in decency and health permit recipients to keep any income up to the budget level without reducing the grants.

But until recently, in most states, for every dollar of income that pushed a recipient's total income over the budget, a dollar was lopped off his grant.

In Kansas, which pays 100 per cent of need, an A.F.D.C. family of four would receive $237 a month. But if that family had an outside income of $50 a month, $50 would be lopped off their grant.

The practice was self destructive. It stifled any incentive for a recipient to try to increase his income or to work to get off welfare. For that reason, the Health, Education and Welfare department ordered a modification.

Under it, the first $30 of income and one third of all the rest will be disregarded when figuring payments.

That means that a Kansas A. F. D. C. family with an income of $50 a month would have its grant reduced by only $6.30.

New York City, in a test project, disregarded the first $85 and 30 per cent over that in figuring payments for 5,300 families. The result, said Jack R. Goldberg, city welfare director, was a 50 per cent decrease in welfare costs relating to those families and a 50 per cent increase in the families' incomes.

From the point of view of the general public, congressmen, state legislators and local officials, the rapid rise in the cost and the number of recipients added to the rolls are the most alarming aspects of the welfare system. They react accordingly.

The recipients, on the other hand, complain bitterly about the inadequacy of the grants, the restrictive qualifications, exhaustive investigations and the arbitrary and generally undignified manner in which they are treated by welfare aggencies and workers.

While these are problems of all of the welfare programs, nowhere are they as critical and vividly illustrated as in the A.F.D.C. category.

No one in 1940, when there were 891,000 children on the A.F.D.C. rolls, could foresee the program's rapid growth—to 5.8 million persons last year. HEW officials now estimate that one in every six children in the United States will receive A.F.D.C. at some time.

The most regressive pieces of welfare legislation in two decades were the 1967 amendments to the social security act.

Faced with rapidly rising A.F.D.C. rolls, Congress put a ceiling on the number of children any state could have on A.F.D.C.—not more in proportion to population than were on the rolls in January 1968.

The act was to become effective July 1968, but created such a stir its implementation was postponed until this July. It is doubtful that it ever will be put into effect and probably will be rescinded by Congress, HEW officials said.

"It was an emotional and intemperate action by a Congress that was reacting to unanticipated increases in the national and state welfare budgets," said one high official. "It never will be enforced."

Another amendment that rankles welfare recipients attempted to force A. F. D. C. mothers whose children were over six months old to take job training when jobs and day care were available in the community.

Many social scientists believe that welfare mothers, like any other mother, ought to have a choice of working or staying with their children.

The reaction of State and local welfare agencies to growing A. F. D. C. rolls was and continues to be to make welfare as restrictive—and sometimes as unpleasant—as possible, often in open violation of federal law or regulations.

Local agencies' first weapon was secrecy. As little information as possible was put out on what was available to recipients and their rights.

Voluminous manuals of regulations that guide case workers were not made available, though access is clearly demanded by the law. The Greater Kansas chapter of the National Welfare Rights organization literally had to steal copies of the Missouri and Kansas manuals.

Access to the manuals has enabled the organization to force the Wyandotte and Jackson County welfare offices to grant benefits that were provided for by law, but had not been known of by recipients.

Another weapon is red tape, a sea of paperwork that bogs down welfare agencies and keeps them weeks behind and unable to react to recipients immediate needs.

Present methods for getting on the welfare rolls require an investigation by a case worker—and they are in short supply—to establish eligibility. Federal law requires that a person be accepted or rejected within 30 days of applying for welfare. But in many cases persons are forced to wait much longer.

Many social workers spent 50 to 90 per cent of their time on investigations and have little time to use their professional knowledge and skills to help recipients.

In an effort to change the situation, HEW had ordered the phasing in over the next year of a new declaratory application.

On a single form, applicants are to be asked to provide information that will enable a high school graduate—rather than a higher paid, college-trained social worker—to determine the person's eligibility. These would be spot checked for control.

Many local and state welfare officials have reacted with a howl of alarm, predicting a sudden upsurge in the rolls, fraud and general chaos.

In the 22 states where declaratory applications have been tried, however, they have been found to work, freeing social workers for social work. Processing costs have been reduced 30 to 60 per cent.

HEW notes that declaratory forms are in general use in business and government—for income tax, applications for farm subsidies, oil depletion allowances and the like.

The implied threat by a local agency of a reduction in grant or being cut off of the rolls also often is used to keep recipients in line.

A common practice has been to reduce or cut off recipients grants without a fair hearing, which agencies, if requested, are required by law to hold. Recipients simply are not told of their right to a hearing.

Since January the Federal government has required that recipients be notified of a reduction or termination of their grant, be offered a hearing and provided with a lawyer. Grants must continue to be paid until the end of the month after the hearing is held and a decision reached.

These are some of the problems faced by the taxpayer who supports the welfare system and the recipients who must live with it.

The overriding problem, increasing costs and inadequate grants, remains.

Welfare: A Bankrupt System—III: New York City's Load a Nightmare

New York City is a welfare disaster area.

The designation is as justified as if the city had been devastated by flood, fire or earthquake.

Welfare rolls have trebled since 1960. A million persons—one in every eight residents—are on welfare, and from 7,000 to 20,000 persons a month are being added.

The city is spending $1,350,000,000 this year on welfare and the figure will jump to 1.5 billion dollars for the fiscal year beginning July 1. That is 23 percent of the city's budget, more than is spent on education.

Welfare rights groups are campaigning to get on the rolls as many as possible of the estimated 200,000 persons in the city now eligible but receiving no welfare. They are encouraging the 150,000 to 300,000 eligible, low-income workers to apply for income supplements. Higher benefits and improved services are being demanded.

The New York Legislature has revolted against the high cost of welfare. Two years ago it lopped a million poor persons off the Medicaid program by passing tighter eligibility requirements. This year it reduced by 8 per cent the level of state support of welfare. Result: The grants of 75 per cent of the recipients will be decreased.

Taxes, particularly the income and sales taxes which hit the lower wage earners hardest, are going up.

Welfare payments, which average $71.50 a month, highest in the nation, have outstripped the minimum wage. A nonworking welfare family of three now has a net income that is more than $1,000 a year higher than a man with the same size family working for the minimum wage. If the latter accepts a tax-free wage supplement his income is more than $1,000 a year higher than the nonworker on welfare, and more than $2,000 higher than that of the minimum wage earner.

Taxes and welfare payments have polarized middle- and lower-income whites and the 93 per cent of the Negroes and Puerto Ricans who are welfare recipients. They form two angry camps in this already racially explosive city.

"Welfare is now beyond the power of the city to handle," says Mitchell I. Ginsberg, New York City's human resources administrator. "It is getting too big for the state."

"This is a national problem," he said, noting the effects of massive migration of nonwhites from the South and Puerto Rico, "but we are paying for it. The state of Kansas does not contribute to the payment of farm subsidies. Why should New York City and state pay 50 per cent of the cost of welfare here?"

Jack R. Goldberg, the city's commissioner of social services (welfare director), does see some possibility that the number of nonworking welfare recipients will level out. He estimates that there are 1.4 million persons eligible for welfare. There are a million already on the rolls, and he believes 200,000 more would not accept welfare out of pride or for other reasons. That would leave a potential increase of 200,000 recipients before a plateau might be reached.

But those figures could be thrown into a cocked hat through inflation or an upturn in unemployment.

There is no such hope that the wage supplement program, now with 26,000 recipients, can be stabilized. More likely it will pick up momentum.

Of the million New Yorkers now on relief, Goldberg said, 930,000 are blind, disabled, elderly or children and their mothers.

Of the rest, 20,000 work, but earn so little in relation to the size of their families that they get wage supplements.

"The other 50,000 are ostensibly employable, but they are marginal employees—drug addicts, alcoholics, illiterates, the highest-risk employees," Goldberg said.

"Most people do want to work," he said. "There are plenty of good jobs in New York City, but they require skills that most poor people do not have, especially the Negro and Puerto Rican immigrants.

"Our job-training programs have worked well, but are not large enough to dent the problem. We have day-care facilities for 10,000 children. We need twice that many immediately.

"Blue-collar jobs, good jobs that people can be trained for, are leaving the city at the rate of 100,000 a year. The poor simply are not in a position to follow them to the suburbs.

"There are plenty of minimum wage, $1.60-an-hour jobs, but many people will not take them. We created a monster by discouraging people from taking dead-end jobs. This is an economic thing. You cannot support a family in New York City on $1.60 an hour, but it is a beginning.

"These people need income subsidies," Goldberg said. "We must find a way to subsidize these people with federal money without putting them on welfare, just like we use public funds to subsidize airlines and farmers, oil and other industries. It's time we decide it's worth subsidizing the poor, just like we subsidize others."

The present wage subsidy is financed completely by the state and city. The federal government does not participate.

An alternative, Goldberg said, would be to raise the minimum wage to a point that anyone who worked would not need welfare or wage supplements. But both business and the unions are against that. Organized labor has become one of the harshest critics of the welfare program and constantly demands investigation of the system and lower welfare benefits.

The Medicaid program—medical care for the indigent—is one of the hottest issues in New York. It has been tremendously expensive. Its critics in the Legislature succeeded once in cutting it back and are trying again.

But Ginsberg defends it as the best program since the passage in 1935 of the Social Security act and a sound investment in the future.

"Poor health generates welfare clients," Ginsberg said. "It is cheaper to provide medicaid now than to have to maintain these people on welfare later for the rest of their lives.

"I think we can afford Medicaid. We just have to make up our minds we are going to, just like we decided to stay in Vietnam and to go to the moon."

New York's welfare system is one of the most liberal in the country. Its benefits are among the highest in the country—so is the city's cost of living.

It also is one of the most innovative.

"We have to be to survive," Ginsberg said. "We will try anytihng that looks like it will work."

The city tested declaratory welfare applications. Applicants fill out the form designed to give the welfare department the information it needs to determine if the applicant is eligible for public assistance.

Rather than exhaustively investigating each applicant for eligibility, only a small percentage were checked to provide a control. High school graduates were hired and trained to process the applications, releasing college-trained and higher-paid social workers to provide services to recipients.

The test has been judged a success. There was a slight decrease in the number of ineligibles admitted to the rolls, and personnel costs dropped while efficiency in the use of professional workers increased.

Goldberg estimated that full implementation of the declaratory applications would represent a savings to the city of 80 million to 100 million dollars a year.

While HEW was drawing up regulations providing for the disregard of first $30 of recipients outside earned income and one-third of the amount over that from consideration in figuring welfare payments as a work incentive, New York City was testing an $85-plus-30-per-cent formula on 5,300 welfare families, about 20,000 persons.

"It has reduced our outlay to those people by 50 per cent," Goldberg said, "and the income of those families is up 50 per cent. Put people in a position to work and they will try to increase their income. We should encourage people to move into the labor market, not kick at them all the time."

Prior to the work-incentive program, the participants had a $1 reduction in welfare for every $1 they made on the outside, in effect a 100 per cent tax on their earned income.

Despite some improvements, Ginsberg noted, there is no way a welfare problem of New York's magnitude can be solved by the city or even the state.

"There is a national recognition that the welfare system doesn't work," he said. "Changing it is beginning to be popular with all segments of the community—business, labor and the general public.

"In the end, it will be the overburdened states and cities that will pressure Congress into acting."

Who's on welfare in New York City [1]

	Percent
Children	59.8
Adults caring for children	18.7
Disabled persons (social and physical)	8.5
Aged over 65	5.8
Employables [1]	4.3
Employed persons receiving supplements	2.9
Total (1 million people [2])	100

[1] Categorized as technically employable, including mothers with children.

[2] A majority of the million persons in New York City who receive welfare payments are children and the adults caring for them. Of the others, few are employed or employable, and many of those who are technically employable but not working are marginal or high-risk employees. The percentages shown on this chart are from last year, but have changed only slightly.

Welfare: A Bankrupt System—IV: Missouri and Kansas Treat Recipients Differently

Mrs. Lila Davis and her three young children live in a small rented apartment just east of State Line near Thirty-eighth street.

Abandoned two years ago by her husband and unable to leave her children to work, Mrs. Davis and the youngsters live on welfare—aid to families with dependent children.

The Missouri Welfare department says that the family needs $305 a month for food, shelter, clothing and incidentals to subsist with decency and health, as state law demands.

But the family receives only $124 a month, 41 per cent of the need declared by the state, because the state Legislature, the same body that said welfare recipients should live in health and decency, put a statutory limit on the size of welfare payments.

If the Davis family lived in Kansas, a few blocks west, its welfare benefits would be considerably higher. Kansas says Mrs. Davis and her three children need $237 a month and would provide that much.

The Davis family is fictitious. But the example is not. There are hundreds of Missouri welfare families who can look across the state line and see the inequities.

The comparison is valid for other types of federal-state welfare programs—old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the perma-

XUM

nently and totally disabled and Medicaid. Only in the state-funded, general assistance program—which is highly restrictive in Missouri—does that state's average payments exceed those of Kansas.

The contrast points up the differences in the problems of the two states and the philosophic and administrative-legislative approaches to their solution.

Almost three times as many persons in Missouri—231,599—receive some form of welfare benefits compared with Kansas.

Missouri also has a much larger proportion of its population on welfare rolls—166 per 1,000 on old-age assistance, 57 per 1,000 on A. F. D. C.—than Kansas, which has 62 and 40 per 1,000 respectively.

While the per capita income in Kansas is $52 a year higher than in Missouri, Missouri spends $2.15 more per inhabitant per year in federal and local funds.

In terms of dollars, Missouri spent 160.5 million dollars on welfare payments and Medicaid last year, while Kansas spent 75 million for maintenance and medical care.

One reason for the wide variation between the benefits offered by the two states is that while both have limited local funds to participate in the federal-state programs, Missouri has a much larger welfare population.

But there apparently are other reasons too. One might be the county-state partnership in Kansas. The federal government picks up 57 per cent of the cost of the federal-state programs. The nonfederal share is split between the counties, which pay 48 per cent financed by real and personal property taxes. The state pays its share out of general revenues.

In Missouri the whole nonfederal share is financed by the state and must be appropriated by the state Legislature.

Another reason for the more liberal Kansas system is the progressive character of the state through the years in the fields of welfare and particularly health.

Kansas, for instance, implemented the entire Medicaid program, while Missouri took only the first step to comply with federal law. Medical care of the indigent represents about one-third of Kansas welfare expenditure. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare points to Kansas Medicaid as the model program in the country. Probably its only major flaw is that it does not provide for preventive and prenatal care.

"If Blue Cross-Blue Shield were to pay Kansas medical benefits they would have to charge a $70 a month premium," says Robert Anderson, Ottawa lawyer and former state representative who served as chairman of the State Welfare board from 1962 to 1968.

"Right here in conservative old Kansas, we have the best medical program and the third highest payments," said Anderson, who is recognized as one of the most knowledgeable persons in the state on welfare.

Commenting on the philosophy of the program. Anderson said that the state had tried to keep the programs as broad as possible so persons with actual need could be admitted.

"Many States try to qualify a large number of people for welfare and pay them very little," Anderson said. "We try to find the real needy and then take very good care of them."

Anderson was critical of those who condemn welfare and its recipients.

"If payments come from the Department of Agriculture, they're called subsidies, and that's good clean money," he said. "But if it comes from the welfare department, it's a different color.

"There is a stigma attached to welfare. We have run it down for so long that the public concept is that the recipients are no good bastards and cheats.

"But that doesn't square with the facts, you find, when you visit some of the 15,000 people receiving old-age assistance and learn their average age is 78 and half are in nursing homes."

Marvin E. Larson, director of Kansas welfare, estimates that there are twice as many persons in the state eligible for welfare than the number who now receive benefits. The stigma is a factor.

The stigma, however, has not rubbed off on the Medicaid program, Larsen said. But recipients of medical services do not yet get a check from the state, just a medical identification card. They can choose their own doctors and hospitals. Bills go directly to the state.

While Anderson generally is proud of the Kansas welfare system, he is not entirely satisfied with it.

Benefits need to be increased, he said, particularly rent payments. In Kansas, each county sets its rent level, which is supposed to reflect the housing market in the area.

"Many times they are unrealistic," Anderson said. "If counties would raise their rent allowances they would get extra state funds. That would take state board approval, but it would be easy to get."

Kansas payments for food, clothing and other nonrent items have not kept pace from year to year with the increases in the cost of living.

The present allowance, excluding rent, for one person living alone is $74. That is what the state says it takes to live a decent and healthy life. The $74 is based on 1965 prices. Since then the cost of food has risen 12 per cent, clothing 17.5 per cent, utilities 3.8 per cent. The present need, because of inflation, is $80, Miss Ruth Laing, Kansas director of public assistance, said.

The federal government has directed all states to increase their welfare grants by July 1 to reflect increases in the cost of living. But there is widespread fear among welfare recipients—especially in states like Missouri that pay only a percentage of need—that the budgets will be increased to reflect inflation, but that the state will reduce the percentage it pays on that budget. The grants then could remain the same as they are.

Anderson said he did not think Kansas was ready to accept an income maintenance plan such as the negative income tax or guaranteed annual wage.

"I think any kind of income maintenance would be hard to sell now," he said. "In Kansas, the power structure doesn't mind taking care of those who need help. But I don't think they would buy taking care of everyone."

Anderson viewed the state-county relationship with mixed emotions.

"The Kansas system of administering welfare through the county commissioners and requiring financial participation from the counties is supposed to be out of date," Anderson said. "And I suppose we have been moving away from county financial participation for several years.

"We could run a more efficient system without the county involvement. But I think there is something to be said for having two or three elected officials on the county level interested in the program. I think it gets the program closer to the people."

State Rep. Rex Borgen, chairman of the House public health and welfare committee, has introduced a proposal in the Kansas legislative council that would eliminate county participation in financing welfare. The plan, he believes, could save taxpayers about 20 million dollars a year.

Borgen said that the financial squeeze being put on urban counties in Kansas, particularly Wyandotte, Shawnee and Sedgwick, was becoming serious.

"We are going to have to give the overburdened counties a means other than the real and personal property taxes to raise funds for welfare," he said. "Or the state must assume the financial burden."

Borgen said he was not alarmed at the increasing costs of welfare in the state. The A. F. D. C. program is growing about 13 per cent a year. Old-age assistance is declining as Social Security covers more persons. Aid to the blind, disabled and general assistance is stable.

"Medicaid has gotten out of hand in some other states," Borgen said. "We are watching it closely here, but we really haven't had enough experience with it to know what it will do. What is worrying us is the rapid increases in the cost of medical and hospital care."

Kansas has had a food-stamp program in seven counties since the early 1960s. Six other counties, including Johnson and Leavenworth, recently have been added. In other counties the state still uses the commodities program, under which staples declared surplus by the Department of Agriculture are distributed to the poor.

The stamp program is designed to permit welfare recipients and some other low-income persons who qualify to purchase stamps based on their income and spend them at the grocery store of their choosing. They are good for any food item—but not alcohol or tobacco—giving families a much larger variety than the commodities program. The stamps are worth about 40 per cent more than the buyers pay for them.

In Wyandotte County, both the welfare rights organizations and Homer Crown, county welfare director, oppose the present stamp program.

The rights organizations argue that it forces recipients to funnel too much money into food; money, they say, that is needed to pay rent because the county's $45 rent allotment is far too low.

Crown said that because of federal regulations, the stamp program would turn his office into chaos.

WELFARE: A BANKRUPT SYSTEM—V: MISSOURI RANKS LOW AMONG STATES

Few states say a person needs more income to live in health and decency than Missouri and pay their welfare recipients less.

Only eight states set as high, or higher, level of need. Five of them pay their welfare recipients 100 per cent of that need.

Yet only Mississippi pays its aged citizens the same or less than Missouri. Only seven states, all in the South, provide lower payments to families with dependent children.

State law is explicit in setting up the standard at which the eligible poor are to be maintained. It says:

"The amount of benefits, when added to all other income, resources, support and maintenance, shall provide such persons with reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health in accordance with the standards developed by the division of welfare. . . ."

The division of welfare says an old person needs $150 a month.

But the state Legislature, the same body that legislated that welfare payments and other income should provide a reasonable subsistence as determined by the division of welfare, set a statutory limit of $80 on old-age assistance. The grant may go up to $125 a month if the recipient needs professional care.

The welfare division says that a family of four receiving aid to families with dependent children needs $305 a month.

The state Legislature set a $124 maximum on that payment—$33 a month for the needy parent, $43 for the first child and $24 each for all other children.

"The statutory maximums on payments are clearly in direct contradiction of the spirit and intent of the law," Proctor Carter, director of welfare, says.

He sees little hope that the Legislature will remove the maximums.

"Bills are introduced at every session to raise payments," he said. "Some pass, but the maximums always are retained."

XUM

Carter estimated it would cost the state an additional $35,973 a year to meet the full-budgeted needs of the recipients.

The grant to an A.F.D.C. recipient amounts to about 40 percent of what the state says he needs. An elderly person living alone receives 50 percent of the need budget and a couple on old-age assistance receives 71 percent. The blind and totally disabled are above 50 percent.

Exact figures are not available, but Joseph Stokes, director of welfare research, estimated that only 10 percent of the 231,600 persons receiving welfare in the state earn enough money—coupled with their grant—to have an income equivalent to what the state says they need.

The average A.F.D.C. family, with mother or children working full or part time, has an income equal to about 70 percent of the state level of need, Stokes said, A.F.D.C. families with no working members and only their grant to live on have only 36 to 41 percent of what the state sets as a necessary income.

Because many elderly, blind and disabled receive some Social Security in addition to welfare grants, Stokes estimates that the average person in one of these categories gets about 85 percent of what he needs to live decently.

Gov. Warren E. Hearnes looks at welfare and its cost with a critical eye.

Asked how he could justify the difference between the level of maintenance called for by state law and the actual payments, the governor said:

"The words of the law are not important. The philosophy of welfare has changed. Federal participation poses a serious question. If the federal government is going to make the rules, then they should run the program."

The governor noted that the state spends an amount equal to 21 percent of its general revenues—$160,506,000 last year—on welfare. What he did not add is that two-thirds of that is federal funds. The state expenditure was $53,541,000.

The governor did introduce a bill that would make slight increases in some welfare payments, and, to prevent the threatened loss of 30 million dollars in federal welfare funds, bring state law into line with federal requirements.

The bill, passed by the House and earmarked for special handling in the Senate, would provide for a $5-a-month increase in general-assistance payments, aid to the elderly, and totally and permanently disabled.

The provisions required by federal law would tie A.F.D.C. payments to the increase in the cost of living last year, increase A.F.D.C. foster home-care payments from $60 to $100 a month, pay expenses such as bus fare and other incidentals of needy children in work-training programs, and provide emergency ambulance service for those on Medicaid.

The changes were estimated by the state administration to cost 10 million dollars, 6.7 million financed by the state.

Missouri's largest program, dollarwise, is old-age assistance, which cost $79,869,000 last year. As more persons are covered by Social Security, that program decreases. Old-age assistance has shrunk from 154,000 recipients in 1953 to 91,800 this year.

There now are 107,609 persons on Missouri's A.F.D.C. rolls and the program is showing a 6.3 per cent annual increase compared with a 12.7 per cent annual increase nationally. A.F.D.C. costs in Missouri totaled $34,009,000 last year, up 5.2 per cent over the previous year. A.F.D.C. expenditures nationally went up 27.1 per cent for the same period.

The state, with great trepidation recently joined 23 other states that permit an unemployed father—who has a recent connection with the labor market and is actively looking for work or is in training—to remain in the home without jeopardizing aid for his children.

Carter had estimated that it would add 2,800 families to the rolls. In fact, there were only 87 fathers taking advantage of the program, he told the House appropriations committee in February.

He said that because of the maximum on payments and the relative stability of the welfare program, he expected to return 5 million dollars to the state treasury at the end of the fiscal year—a statement that has infuriated recipients.

Aid to the permanently and totally disabled has leveled off at 17,500 cases, as has aid to the blind with 3,600 cases. Aid to the disabled carries a maximum payment of $75 a month, which can be increased to $125 a month if institutional care is required. The cost of the program last year was $15,503,000.

Aid to the blind and a small state-financed pension program for the blind cost $3,275,000 last year and carries payments of $85 a month. Again, payments may be increased to $125 a month if institutional care is required.

Missouri has comparatively high general-assistance payments, but relatively restrictive eligibility requirements for the state-funded program.

To qualify, the person or family must be unable to work because of physical or mental incapacity, have no one in the family who is employable and be unable to qualify for any other assistance program.

Each person may receive up to $65 a month, or up to $125 if he must have professional care.

About 11,700 persons receive general-assistance grants that average just more than $50 a month, $12 above the national average.

Under heavy pressure from Kansas City and St. Louis, whose support for their general hospitals were straining their finances to the breaking point, the Legislature in 1967 implemented a basic Medicaid program.

An expensive and controversial program at the national level and in many states, Medicaid in Missouri is strictly limited and tightly controlled.

Missouri is one of 22 states that opened Medicaid only to those receiving welfare benefits. Kansas and 27 other states implemented the complete program, which includes the near-poor or medically needy and provides a wider scope of services.

The State spent $23,726,000—14.8 per cent of its welfare budget—on Medicaid in the first year of its operation, a relatively small amount compared with many other states.

The cost line has been held by limiting those eligible, putting a ceiling on the amount the state will pay for various types of medical services, limiting the drugs that can be prescribed under the program and the price paid for them, and scrutinizing bills for medical services to be sure not too many services are rendered.

"We have Medicaid under control," Carter said. "We don't anticipate any fiscal danger as long as we stick with the welfare people."

Under the present federal law, however, by 1975 the state will have to make Medicaid available to all the medically needy, something the state administration already is actively opposing.

"The change would qualify over a million more people," Carter said, "and that would put the state into fiscal trouble, without a burdensome tax increase. The federal law ought to be changed to make it optional."

Persons receiving assistance per 1,000 population in Missouri and Kansas

Old-age assistance:	
Missouri	166.0
Kansas	62.0
Aid to dependent children:	
Missouri	107.0
Kansas	75.0
Aid to the blind:	
Missouri	129.0
Kansas	27.0
Aid to the disabled:	
Missouri	7.0
Kansas	4.6
General assistance:	
Missouri	3.1
Kansas	2.0

WELFARE: A BANKRUPT SYSTEM—VI: COUNTY AGENCIES FLIRT WITH LAWS

The county welfare office is the confrontation point beween persons in need and the often cold and impersonal system.

With the rise of welfare rights organizations, it is the place where the poor go to demand, not beg, for all the law permits them. More often than not, the meetings between the poor and the representatives of the system are bitter, angry and loud.

Increasingly, it is the battle ground between the old, paternalistically motivated welfare workers and the new generation of case workers who represent and sympathize with the recipients as much as they do their employer.

The welfare offices of Jackson and Wyandotte Counties are no exception.

Both offices suffer under "system" leadership, largely dedicated to holding down the rolls and saving the state money.

Secrecy and sleight-of-hand are keystones of the operations.

Recently, for example, Edward I. Dunkin, director of Jackson County welfare, asked his case workers to examine their files and determine how many of their clients were suffering from hunger.

The survey revealed that 1,600 recipients had so little income that they obviously suffered hunger and malnutrition. Several of the persons were screened.

Later, Dunkin stated in a television interview that only one case of hunger had been found in Jackson County. His definition of hunger, however, was insufficient food to sustain human life.

One of Dunkin's workers said that Dunkin did not want to alarm or embarrass the county by admitting that hunger was a serious problem here.

Arbitrary treatment of clients is another weapon of welfare offices.

"People who qualify for welfare according to the laws and regulations often are turned down just to save a few dollars," said a Wyandotte County case worker who asked not to be identified for fear of being fired. "It happens because the director (Homer Crown) and the supervisors know most applicants don't know they have a right to appeal their cases."

The worker cited the example of a 64-year-old woman with no income who lived with two sons, one an alcoholic and the other unable to support her because he paid child support.

"It was established that her sons did not contribute to her support, and the case worker recommended that she be given assistance," he said. "But Crown and the supervisor turned her down on the grounds that she had not applied for Social Security.

"She applied and was denied Social Security because her late husband did not have enough time in the labor market.

"Eight months after her first welfare application, she reapplied and again was turned down for no legal reason. She was not even told why she was rejected.

"A supervisor told me that if the woman did not know enough to appeal her case, the department could get away with it."

Another Kansas City, Kansas, woman was taken off the rolls when a neighbor reported she had moved out of the county. Without checking the report, which was false, the

Wyandotte County office stopped her check. The "mistake" was corrected only when she appeared and asked about her check.

John Landis, a Legal Aid society lawyer, told of several welfare cases he had handled recently.

A father of eight children, disabled by tuberculosis, had received aid to the permanently and totally disabled for 10 years.

In October his file was reviewed, and, without even a medical examination, his assistance was stopped.

"He was cut off of welfare on the same evidence that had kept him on the rolls for 10 years," Landis said.

The man applied immediately for a fair hearing, to which he was entitled by the law. It was not granted until January. He won his case, but was not put back on the rolls until February. The family was without assistance for four months.

Federal regulations require that when a fair hearing is requested a decision must be rendered within 60 days.

"We seldom get a decision within 60 days," Landis said.

He also criticized the method used for informing persons that they are entitled to a hearing before their grants are reduced or stopped.

"The federal regulations require that recipients be given written notice of the right to a fair hearing," Landis said. "The welfare office here sends out a pamphlet with the paragraph outlining the right underlined in red pencil. They ought to write the person a letter in clear, understandable language."

Several cases, including one rising out of St. Louis, have been filed in federal courts arguing that recipients should continue to receive their full grant until a full hearing is held and a decision made.

One of the suits, a New York case, has been upheld by the lower courts and now is before the Supreme Court.

There also is a lack of communication between the higher officials of the Jackson and Wyandotte County offices and the recipients and public at large.

Welfare recipients are viewed with suspicion, though Dunkin admits "you can't assume everyone is crooked." To some extent, they simply are ignored or lied to.

The case of Mrs. Martha Ross points up the problem.

February 11, Mrs. Ross, the mother of seven children, told her case worker that her mailbox at Wayne Minor court had been broken into that day and her welfare check stolen. The case worker told Mrs. Ross that could not have happened, because her case was under review and the check had not been mailed. It would be along in four or five days, the case worker said.

When six days later the check still had not arrived, Mrs. Ross called the case worker's supervisor. The supervisor told Mrs. Ross that her case still was under review and she would get a check on February 20.

Having not yet received her check, Mrs. Ross called the supervisor February 23. She was told that the check still had not been mailed.

On February 28 she called again and was told that the department did not know when she would get the check.

Mrs. Ross then turned to the Human Relations commission, which brought the case to Dunkin's attention. Dunkin checked the payroll and found that the check had been mailed and in all probability had been stolen February 11.

Mrs. Ross then took a day off of work to go to the welfare office to sign papers that the check was stolen and make application for its replacement. She was told she would have to wait until the check had cleared a bank and was returned to the department before the papers could be filled out.

The check cleared March 5. She signed the papers. Then she was told that it would take five to six weeks for the papers to be processed and a new check mailed.

All the while, Dunkin refused to issue an emergency food or rent order. He tells the public that he has emergency funds. But questioned by The Star, he admitted that in his 17 years at the department he has issued emergency food and rent orders only twice.

Dunkin and his organization are coming under greater attack by organized and angry welfare mothers armed with the welfare laws and manuals.

"Dunkin is not doing his job," complained Mrs. Lucille Johnson, president of New Organized Welfare. "He's not concerned about poor people. He has no understanding of them or compassion for them."

The ill feeling and mistrust was evidenced at a meeting between Dunkin and some welfare mothers when Dunkin brought in policemen dressed in street clothes. One posed as a news photographer.

Both the Jackson and Wyandotte County welfare offices have serious intraoffice problems. The turnover in personnel has been running about 30 per cent a year.

Supervisors tend to be older persons who have come up through the system and are incapable or unwilling to change their traditional methods of operation.

"You get to be a supervisor by showing over the years that you can get the paper work done," complained a Wyandotte County case worker.

Many of the case workers, on the other hand, are young, progressive and professionally trained in the modern concepts of welfare.

The frustrations aroused by intraoffice conflicts, poorly conceived and financed programs and an inability to bring about change forces many younger persons out of county welfare work and into better-paying federal and private jobs.

The turnover also throws an additional load of paper work on remaining case workers. More and more time is devoted to bureaucratic paper work and less to helping recipients—the real job of case workers.

Federal regulations require that applications for welfare be processed and the person notified within 30 days. Many applicants wait much longer.

"We are so overloaded that applicants who don't keep calling the office and insisting that their papers be processed don't get on the rolls for as long as four or five months," said a Wyandotte County case worker.

"Dunkin's whole attitude is demoralizing to the staff," said a case worker who has been at the Jackson County office for two years. "He is more concerned that we don't take more than 10 minutes for coffee breaks and 45 minutes for lunch than he is about us working with the recipients.

"The paper work comes first with him. I get wound up trying to help the recipients and am always in trouble for not keeping up the paper work."

Welfare: A Bankrupt System—VII: Area Wealth Hides Suburban Poor

Tucked away among the wealth and abundance of the metropolitan area's best suburbs are the invisible poor.

A walk down any street in the inner city leaves no doubt that there is poverty there, lots of it.

But poverty, privation and hunger in prosperous and booming Platte, Clay and Johnson Counties? It is there. You would have to look for it, and not many persons want to.

"People don't like to admit that there are poor people here," Mrs. Elsie Wells, Platte County welfare director, said. "They turn their heads and think they will go away."

Johnson County is the nation's fourth wealthiest county. Yet there are 2,700 families—about 10,800 persons—whose income is below the poverty level. There are 1,627 persons in the county who receive direct welfare payments and 198 who receive only medical assistance.

Johnson County's welfare recipients are mainly in three places—the Fairview district of Olathe, the South Park community in Merriam and Shawnee and at Sunflower Village.

Fairview and South Park are both old settlements with relatively stable populations, Mrs. Dorothy Martin, Johnson County welfare director, said.

Sunflower has a high population turnover.

"People who move in from outside the county and have trouble finding low-rent housing seem to gravitate there," Mrs. Martin said. "They stay until they can find better housing then they get out. We have lots of problems there."

Platte County is quite different. About 50 per cent of its 503 welfare recipients are scattered in towns and villages throughout the county. The other half are on farms they rent or own.

In Clay County, the 1,573 recipients live mainly in Kansas City and Excelsior Springs.

Suburban recipients suffer most of the problems experienced by urban recipients—acute shortage of money, poor housing, marginal health, budgeting difficulties and poor nutrition.

While they do not live in intensely crowded areas of urban recipients, they face problems not generally known to their urban counterparts.

"Clay County has the highest median income in the state," said Ed Rittenhouse, coordinator of the Human Resources corporation neighborhood service center at Platte City. "Platte County is fourth in the state. Both are growing and the economy is inflated.

"Housing is expensive. People here pay more for it. So a person on welfare spends more of his limited budget on housing than he would in the city.

"Food is more expensive. There isn't a chain supermarket north of Platte Woods, so recipients up north can't take advantage of the weekend specials because many don't have transportation."

Aside from low welfare payments, the lack of transportation is one of the biggest problems in Clay County, Mrs. Margaret Spalding, county welfare director, said.

"How is a person supposed to get a child from Excelsior Springs to Mercy hospital?" she asked. "We don't have time to take them and the insurance would be prohibitive. We have to beg churches and other agencies to help with transportation."

Education is another problem. In the inner city the children of welfare recipients usually attend schools with a student body drawn largely from the same economic bracket.

Scattered in small numbers through the suburbs, however, welfare children stand out as poor.

"How would you like to send your youngsters to a school where everybody had twice as much or more than you did?" Mrs. Spalding asked. "Every night the kids come home asking for the same things all of their schoolmates are getting, but the money isn't there to give it to them."

The result is an inferiority complex and other emotional problems leading to undesirable behavioral problems.

In recent months hunger has become a major issue among suburban welfare recipients.

In Platte County, one of 50 Missouri counties without any form of food program, a group of low-income residents is suing the State Division of Welfare and the U.S. Agriculture department, contending they illegally are depriving the counties of commodities or food-stamp programs.

The case was being argued earlier this week before Judge John Oliver of the U.S. District Court.

Clay County has a commodity food program and Johnson County has the food-stamp program, which Mrs. Martin criticizes as too restrictive.

"The food-stamp program forces families to spend more than they can afford on food," she said, "and the qualification requirements are took strict. Food stamps should be available to all persons whose income is under the poverty line."

Mrs. Wells said that while she could not agree with those from Platte County who filed the suite, she believed there was starvation and that many, maybe most welfare recipients, were undernourished.

"We have malnutrition here," she said.

Unlike the inner city, welfare in the suburbs is almost lily white. Less than 2 per cent of the recipients in Johnson County are black. There are only eight Negro welfare cases in Platte County and just a few more in Clay County.

Welfare: A Bankrupt System—VIII: Organization Aids Drive for Rights

"The National Welfare Rights Organization is making sure that every welfare recipient gets everything to which the law entitles him," George A. Wiley, the militant group's director declared.

"We'll fight'm in the streets and we'll fight'm in the welfare offices, one step at a time, just like the labor unions.

"We have one goal, to see that every American is guaranteed enough money to live with dignity."

In a decade of feverish activity in the organization of the poor and minorities, the N.W.R.O., has emerged as one of the most dynamic and effective groups organizing the poor and helping them obtain their rights.

The 3-year-old group with 30,000 members, is an aggressively led organization of vocal welfare mothers and a few elderly welfare recipients. It has managed to double its ranks every six months.

Their major objectives attained, their leadership and ranks split by ideological differences, the older civil rights groups—C.O.R.E., N.A.A.C.P., S.C.L.C., S.N.C.C. and the Black Muslems—have faded as national powers in the last two years. They no longer are capable of speaking for even a large minority of the poor.

But the N.W.R.O. has a relatively fresh subject, improved welfare benefits. It also has a broad, cohesive group of members.

Unlike any other group of disadvantaged pursuing primary goals today, N.W.R.O. has access to the White House and federal agencies at the highest level.

The organization has found itself capable of working with the Nixon administration to develop improvements in the welfare system.

At the same time, N.W.R.O. has constantly pressured state and local welfare bureaucracies with law suits and demonstrations, demanding for its members all the law allows them as well as increased benefits.

Wiley, the 38-year-old founder-director of the organization and former associate national director of C.O.R.E., explained N.W.R.O.'s strategy recently after he and his executive committee had met with Robert H. Finch, secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

"We have the real sense that Nixon wants to be able to govern the country," Wiley said. "To do so he realizes that he must overcome major problems of our society. Welfare is a problem and the administration wants to grapple with it. They want to take a fresh approach."

Just sitting down with Finch constituted somewhat of a new approach, Wiley said. It was the first time welfare recipients had been able to get to top HEW officials.

Since that meeting, a joint HEW-N.W.R.O. committee has been set up under John Veneman, under secretary to assist in the search for new approaches.

There also have been meetings with Daniel Patrick Moynihan, urban affairs advisor to the President, and other White House staffers.

At the same time, N.W.R.O. has mounted a sustained attack on local and state welfare offices, signing up every eligible person the organization can locate and forcing welfare offices to provide every benefit to which the law entitles recipients.

"Our philosophy is that there is a constant movement toward some form of income maintenance," Wiley said. "Our strategy is based on that philosophy.

"We are out to see that every recipient collects every benefit to which he is entitled, not passing up anything that costs the system money.

"This is putting tremendous financial pressure on local and state government. They are running to the federal government for help."

A political realist, Wiley, who has a doctor's degree from Cornell university in the very nonpolitical subject of organic chemistry, knows that whatever the administration can do in the forseeable future isn't going to solve welfare problems.

"But it can be a step in the right direction," he said, "and that's the reason we can support it."

The ultimate goal is federally financed direct payments to recipients—a guaranteed annual wage.

N.W.R.O.'s assets don't stop with a group of cohesive angry welfare mothers and access to the highest level of government.

It also has the active backing of the Center on Social Welfare Policy and Law at Columbia university, a foundation-supported legal-research organization boasting a half dozen of the sharpest young legal minds in the country. In addition, it has the advice and research support of several members of the faculty of Columbia's school of social work and Professor Edward Spares of the Yale Law school and some of his associates.

It was these support forces that filed and won cases in the Supreme court which knocked down state substitute-father and residency laws.

There are several reasons for the mutual attraction between welfare rights groups and the legal profession.

Welfare rights leaders realized that while their organizations could force some changes on the local level by demonstrations and sit-ins, the big barriers would have to be removed in court. By bringing about change through the courts, moreover, additional pressure was put on the states, and in turn on Congress and the administration.

Never before have there been so many bright young lawyers interested in putting their legal talents to work to bring about change in American society.

The welfare system provided a neat body of state and federal laws, not available to the civil rights movement, for lawyers to get their teeth into.

The legal attack has been on a broad scale.

Substitute father laws—which permitted welfare officials to assume that any man associating with an A.F.D.C. mother was contributing to the support of her children—have been voided by the U.S. Supreme Court.

More recently the court held that laws requiring a person to be a resident of a state for a certain length of time before becoming eligible for welfare were in violation of the Constitution's equal protection clause.

Cases arguing that a hearing must be provided and a decision rendered before a recipient's grant be stopped or reduced have been filed in several states and have been successful in a few. They now are pending in higher courts, but, meantime, HEW has ruled administratively in favor of the recipients.

Federal courts in Arizona, Maine and Maryland, and the State Supreme court in Iowa have struck down state laws that set a ceiling on the amount of welfare that can be paid to any one family. The U.S. Supreme court now is considering the question. The court's decision could affect similar laws in about half the states.

Suits have been filed against some states that pay only a percentage of the minimum amount they say is necessary to maintain a decent and healthful life. Such a case was won in Maryland and is pending in a higher court.

"The role of lawyers is to provide services to knock down arbitrary practices that have grown up with the welfare system," Lee Albert, director of the Center on Social Welfare Policy and Law, said "Lawyers and recipients do not have the power to create a new welfare system. That is up to the Congress."

"Eventually," said Spares from his post at Yale, "we will establish the right to life. That will make it impossible for the government to deny anyone in need."

While the lawyers grind their way through the courts, the organized welfare mothers themselves have been a formidable force for change.

N.W.R.O.'s New York City organization, the City-Wide Co-ordinating committee—which has 5,000 paying members in 75 affiliates—claims credit for much of the increase in the welfare rolls and sky rocketing costs.

"The city gave 1.5 million dollars in special grants in 1966 and 10.5 million in 1968," Hulbert James, director, said recently before he moved to N.W.R.O.'s headquarters in Washington. "We are convinced we are responsible for that increase.

"In 1966 half of those who applied for welfare were rejected. Now the rejection rate has dropped to 20 per cent.

"Prior to 1966, there were less than 200 hearings for people whose grants were being reduced or cut off. In 1967, the number of hearings had increased to 3,000, and last year to 8,000.

"We have accomplished this by informing people of their rights and encouraging them to demand their rights. People don't forget that. That's why we are growing.

James estimated that there were 300,000 workers in New York eligible for state wage supplements because of their low incomes when compared to the size of their families. The N.W.R.O. is trying to get as many as possible to sign up for the assistance in an effort to bankrupt the state.

One of the keys to N.W.R.O.'s strategy is to put so much financial pressure on state and local welfare systems that the federal government will have to take over and, hopefully, shift to some form of guaranteed annual income.

So far, City-Wide, while attacking the welfare system, has worked through it for improvements in benefits.

"Now we are beginning to talk about controlling the system, running the welfare offices ourselves," James said.

N. W. R. O. has formed chapters in more than 100 cities from coast to coast, including an aggressive one in the Kansas City area.

The organization here has three affiliates in Kansas City, Kansas, where most of the accomplishments so far have been recorded, and five in Kansas City.

From its beginnings in June 1967—when 30 mothers marched on the Wyandotte County welfare office to protest denial of emergency aid to a mother of five after she had waited 45 days to be put on the rolls—the organization has grown to 350 members.

The members, as in most chapters, pay a $2 initiation fee and $1 a month dues—not enough to pay the overhead.

In April 1968 the organization here got a $3,600 grant from the Episcopal church, followed by an additional $1,200. Since then, it has depended on contributions, most coming from the 32 members of the Friends of Welfare Rights, each of whom has pledged to give on a monthly basis. This spring, the national organization took over paying the salary of Robert C. Agard, director.

The Kansas City, Kansas, welfare mothers have chalked up several victories in the last two years and are battling for more.

In July 1967 the original affiliate group, which calls itself the Wyandotte County Welfare council, extracted from Homer Crown, county welfare director, a letter listing the basic household items—stove, refrigerator, table, chairs, beds, and the like—to which recipients are entitled under state law. Prior to that time, the welfare office was silent about household items and did not provide them. That victory gave the group something to build on, an incentive to keep trying.

Two months later the mothers succeeded in getting the commodity foods dispensary moved into the area where most recipients lived.

In May 1968 the organization pushed through an increase in rent payments from a flat $35 a month to a graduated scale based on family size.

"We called that our million-dollar victory because that's about what the increase cost the welfare office," said Mrs. Vera Walker, Kansas representative to the national coordinating committee.

Last summer the organization campaigned to force the Wyandotte County office to provide a school clothing allowance with the result that the children of members received $15 each in October and another $15 later for winter clothes.

Nonmembers did not receive the payments, which, Agard said, was an added incentive for recipients to join the organization.

The local organization takes at least part credit for a recent $57,000 contribution by the United Campaign to the Coaches council for its participation in the Human Resources corporation summer program. The contribution was an indirect outgrowth of a march led by Wiley on a campaign luncheon last fall when the Kansas City chapter was host to the N.W.R.O. national convention.

Just before Christmas the mothers succeeded in getting the Montgomery Ward company to extend credit to welfare recipients who otherwise were qualified. The organization still is working to get the same commitment from Sears, Roebuck & Co.

The Kansas City, Kansas, group's latest major thrust has been aimed at the city's school board in an effort to get the board to initiate a hot lunch program in all schools. The only schools in the system that now have a lunch program are those in the affluent western part of the district.

After failing to attain its goal through persuasion, the N.W.R.O. group filed a law suit (prepared by the Center on Welfare Policy and Law) charging that the board was in violation of federal regulations and its contracts with the state for not participating in the federally assisted program, which provides for free lunches for children of welfare recipients.

The suit could become a landmark case.

The welfare mothers on the Missouri side have had a tough row to hoe and the few issues they have won seem small compared to their counterparts in Kansas City, Kansas. But considering the unresponsive nature of the Jackson County welfare office, their victories have not been insignificant.

"It's a major victory for us when we can get a person an emergency grant or get a lost check replaced," said Mrs. Lucille Johnson, president of the New Organized Welfare Mothers. "That's about all we've been able to get out of Jackson County welfare. Dunkin (Edward I. Dunkin, Jackson County welfare director) treats that money like it's his, not the people's."

Welfare: A Bankrupt System—IX: Guaranteed Income in Federal Plans for Aiding the Poor

The Nixon administration is nearing a decision to recommend to Congress a guaranteed annual income for the nation's poor. For political reasons, however, it will not be called that.

Officials involved in the White House decision-making machinery have been extremely reluctant to talk about the new plan, but reliable sources have begun to reveal its general outlines and some details.

First, these sources emphasize, the proposed program would not in the beginning—provide an across-the-board increase in welfare benefits. It would give increases to recipients in low-payment states.

The program is designed to close the gap between high and low-payment states by putting a federal floor under payments. It also would give financial relief to states since the federal government would assume a greater share of the welfare cost.

The plan would attempt to make welfare more fair, equitable and humane. It would be tied closely to jobs and job training and to keeping families together.

Thus far the decision makers have agreed that a floor of about $50 a month would support assistance to the elderly, blind and disabled. The states would not be required to maintain their present financial effort, but they would be expected to continue to provide some funds in the three categories.

The administration plan would provide a $31 a month federally financed payment to persons receiving aid to families with dependent children, the sources said. That would provide a guaranteed annual $1,488 income for a family of four.

Still not decided by the administration is whether to offer to pay a percentage above that, matching any state payment. If matching funds were not made available, it would not provide relief for high-payment states.

Also still being debated is whether to require states to maintain their present effort. Sources close to the decision making process say that it probably will not be required. Otherwise, the states would get no financial relief.

One thing almost is certain. President Nixon *will* recommend that all states be required to make A.F.D.C. available to families with an unemployed father in the house.

The administration is concerned over the fact that A. F. D. C. has tended to drive fathers out of the home so the family would be eligible for benefits. Only 24 states now permit payments to families with an unemployed father in the home.

Moreover, since the Supreme court ruled unconstitutional the substitute—father provision—which permitted welfare officials to assume that any man associating with an A. F. D. C. mother was contributing to the support of her children—the government has found itself, in effect, supporting immorality.

It is unfair, the administration believes, to support a couple living together out of wedlock and deny A. F. D. C. to a married couple.

Probably the most interesting facet of the administration plan is the guaranteed annual income for intact, working families. It has been dubbed the family security system by Robert F. Finch, secretary health, education and welfare.

It would provide for the federal government's paying 50 per cent of the difference between a family's income and an amount set roughly at the national poverty line. The government, for example, would pay 50 per cent of the difference between income and $3,000 a year for a family of four.

Another facet of the plan would supplement the above. Under this proposal the federal government would match any funds contributed by a state which pushed a family's total income above $3,000. It might require states to match federal funds up to $3,000.

There is opposition to the family security system within the highest councils of the Nixon administration. Dr. Arthur F. Burns, economist and counselor to the President, is known to question its wisdom and fears that it might prove more of a deterrent to employment than an incentive.

"This is the really hot issue now," said a source involved in the debate.

Dr. Burns has pushed the idea of tying the welfare system to revenue sharing with the states. The welfare system would not be changed nor would the formula for payments. But low-payment states would be required to raise their minimum payments.

A $30 to $40 a month minimum for A. F. D. C. and $50 to $65 for the elderly, blind and disabled have been discussed. That would qualify a state to share federal revenue with a guarantee of receiving more than the increase to the state in welfare cost.

Most administration officials, however, believe that President Nixon is committed to more sweeping and basic changes in the welfare system.

One proposal that seems to have been dropped, at least for now, is the guaranteed job.

It would provide incentives to private industry to hire and train the poor and underemployed and make the government the employer of last resort.

"Politically, we don't like the guaranteed job plan," said a source. "The emphasis will be on job training and jobs, but without any guarantee."

It is assumed that the work incentive (W.I.N.) program would be beefed up and that other job training programs would be given a boost.

Officials now are estimating the cost of the welfare program at about 2 billion dollars a year above what the federal government is spending now. But, they say, if the states are not required to maintain their present efforts, they would reap a savings of 700 million to 800 million dollars.

That President Nixon is contemplating recommending what amounts to a guaranteed annual income is surprising only at first glance.

In the election campaign, Nixon seriously considered taking up guaranteed annual income and making it an issue. He did not because it was so contrary to the traditional thinking of Republicans and a large part of the voting public. He even criticized the guarantee plans.

They "would have a very detrimental effect on the productive capacity of the American people," Nixon said as a candidate. "I take a dim view of these programs."

After his election the President charged a task force to come up with recommendations for changing the welfare system to reduce dependency and make it more fair and equitable. The task force was headed by Richard P. Nathan, then of the Brookings Institute in Washington and now an assistant director of the Bureau of the Budget and director of the bureau's human resources division.

"The challenge to the administration is to look at systems, not at programs," Nathan said recently. "People are frustrated with institutions that don't work. Welfare does not. It is sick. People have tinkered with the system, but they haven't looked at the basics. That is what the task force did and that is what the administration is continuing to do.

"We knew that we couldn't do everything at once. Money was limited. So we asked ourselves what was the least we could spend and still turn the system around? We knew the link between welfare and jobs needed to be strengthened. Welfare for too long promoted dependency rather than independence."

A task force member, Mitchell I. Ginsberg, head of the human resources administration for New York City, elaborated.

"We came to the conclusion that most important was the eventual federal take-over of the administration and financing of welfare and that the government set the standards," he said. "Financing was most important, but the most pressing problem was to see that the lowest-payment states raised their payments and that the higher-payment states did not lower theirs. That meant that the federal government had to assume a greater share of financing."

Just before the inauguration the task force report was ready. It recommended immediate and sweeping changes, the most important calling for increasing federal financing with a 1½- to 2-billion-dollar price tag.

The Task Force recommended two alternatives to the President.

The first would have put the elderly, blind and disabled under the Social Security administration and raised minimum benefits to all persons to $70.

It would have placed a minimum $40 floor on payments to persons on A.F.D.C. The federal government would have picked up the first $30 and 50 per cent of the next $40.

The increased cost to the federal government was estimated at 959 million dollars for the Social Security provision and 903 million for A.F.D.C. The savings to the states again was estimated at 700 million to 800 million dollars.

The second alternative would not have used the Social Security system and simply would have put a floor under all categories. The cost to the federal government was figured at an additional 1.3 billion dollars with a savings to the states of an estimated 547 million.

The task force also recommended implementing declaratory application forms for welfare—which now are being phased in—and separation of payments from supportive services within welfare offices to attain greater staff efficiency.

More important, it recommended that A.F.D.C. payments be made available to families with an unemployed father in the house.

The urgency of the welfare issue has become clearer and clearer to the Nixon administration. Since just after Nixon took office it has worked its way up to rank among the President's top domestic priorities.

For a considerable period, administration officials—both in the White House and HEW—leaned toward one form or another of the task force's second and less-expensive alternative.

Thoughts of a guaranteed annual income or any plan that smacked of income maintenance lay fallow.

As welfare took on a higher priority, and the administration began to broaden its horizons, reaching for a genuine beginning at turning the system around plans began to smack of a guaranteed annual income.

"If you are going to change the whole welfare system and base it on need with the federal government providing a floor on benefits," as one insider put it, "what you've really got is a guaranteed annual income. It won't be called that, but that in effect is what it is."

The seriousness with which Nixon regards welfare and the problems surrounding it can be judged by his proposal to Congress last month that 2.5 billion dollars be appropriated to insure a nutritionally complete diet for all persons.

Basically, the food-stamp program would be expanded with provisions that no family would spend more than 30 per cent of its income on stamps and that food stamps be provided free to families in the lowest income bracket. The Agriculture department also would be permitted to operate both food stamp and commodity foods distribution programs concurrently, which now is banned.

Also being planned is a program to provide special foods to pregnant women and mothers and their babies.

Since Nixon's message was delivered to the Congress May 7, the Bureau of the Budget has estimated that it would require 4.4 billion dollars to provide nutritional diets for about 20.8 million persons believed to be hungry in the United States.

The administration has not said, but it seems likely that it will raise its own requests on the basis of the study, which has been called a working paper and starting point for administration discussions on legislative proposals.

WELFARE: A BANKRUPT SYSTEM—CONCLUSION: WAY OUT OF POVERTY?

Persons are poor because they don't have enough money, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, urban affairs adviser to President Nixon, once said.

Some of the results of not having enough money are suggested by these photographs—squalid housing, inadequate food and the human indignities of a system riddled with arbitrary and inequitable practices.

Poverty is debilitating. But even more frightening is the fact that the welfare system in the United States locks persons into poverty and creates dependence rather than enabling recipients to raise themselves to independence and creativity.

In considering the reform of the system, the question should be asked: "What does the country expect to accomplish with welfare?"

Are Mrs. Burns' children and grandchildren going to grow up in abject poverty only to spend their lives on the welfare rolls, or should they get enough assistance to provide incentive to work their way out of poverty?

Is Mrs. Brickner going to be freed of red tape and paper work so she can use her talents as a professional social worker to assist her clients?

Should Mrs. Peterson receive enough assistance to buy fresh meat, vegetables and milk for her children.

Can Mrs. Sparks, whose health prevents her from getting a job, be expected to live in health and decency on $87 a month?

These questions and many more must be answered before meaningful reforms can be carried out.

THE SUCCESS OF CUBANS IN FLORIDA

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, many waves of immigrants have come to the United States of America to enjoy the benefits of the great freedoms available to everyone in this Nation. Yet no group of immigrants has ever enjoyed a greater success story in their new home than our Cuban citizens. Too little is heard of Florida's refugee colony of Cubans in regards to the contribution they have made to my State, and consequently, our Nation. No one has ever publically congratulated the Cuban community for being the most energetic, progressive, and prosperous émigré group in history. At this time I would like to tell of the accomplishments of these people, and offer my sincerest regards for their efforts.

The economy of south Florida is bolstered today by 5,000 Cuban commercial, service, and small industrial establishments. These thriving business ventures have literally put life back into many areas of Miami which had been threatened with financial disaster.

In the labor market, too much cannot be said praising the Cubans for their evidenced ambition and industriousness. Of the total work force of 435,200 in Greater Miami, the Cubans constitute close to 12.5 percent. Notably, the Cubans also hold 8.2 percent of the white collar jobs, while 10.6 percent of Miami's craftsmen are of this refugee group. Miami, being a tourist town, finds the airlines employing 21,415 people. Cubans make up 8.2 percent of the airline employees. A recent study done of the Cuban community is quoted as saying:

> Almost all exiles have proved to be able, conscientious, versatile workers and employees, who are today contributing to the economic growth of this community (Miami), and are being wooed by firms from all over the United States.

This is highly commendable for an exile group that arrived in this country less than 10 years ago.

Florida has done much to aid the Cuban youth in the field of education. We feel these efforts to be justified upon finding that the Cuban student is rated as equal to or above his American counterpart in school work performance. It was also discovered that the Cuban child rarely holds his class back because of the language barrier, and works hard to master English.

By far the most encouraging of all the findings is that which shows the crime rate among the Cubans to be far below that of either blacks or whites. This has been the case for years, even when the exiles arrived, literally with only the clothes on their backs as all of their worldly goods. Along these same lines it should be mentioned that the refugees have little or nothing to do with civil unrest. They do not participate in the popular forms of activity today which advocate the disruption of our society. To put it simply, the Cubans are Miami's most law-abiding citizens.

In all fairness, the Federal Government must also be commended for the help they have given the Cubans. Through this Government aid, and their own self-help, the refugees have been able to regain a foothold in prosperity here in the United States. Although the Cubans are a highly successful people the Federal Government should not presume that this community can now be ignored. Problems still exist and a few of these now need highlighting.

The Cubans have been economically active, but in most cases they have remained politically inactive. In fact, until very recently many have evidenced a reluctance to take up U.S. citizenship. There are a few outstanding reasons behind this political stagnation in the exile group.

The refugees resent the fact that in the past our Government has discouraged the organization of responsible groups of men to fight for their homeland. They also cannot understand why we persist in intercepting their guerrilla task forces wishing to harass Castro's regime and infiltrate Cuba. President Kennedy's promise to see that the nation of Cuba would soon be free remains unkept. The Cubans question the desire that our Nation has to preserve freedom wherever and whenever possible. Many of them continue to doubt the value of becoming part of a political process which seems to work against itself and, more specifically, against a free Cuba.

Obviously then, there is still room for

XUM

the Federal Government to get involved with this prosperous exile community. Our work in this area is not yet complete. It might be a wise move on our part to reevaluate some of the policies that we now harbor with respect to Cuba. This would benefit both Cubans and Americans alike.

I wish to congratulate the Cubans again for all they have done for my State economically and otherwise. To them I say: Your success has been a pleasant surprise, and one that few would have predicted 10 years ago. Thank you.

NERVE GAS ACCIDENT ON OKINAWA

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, a most disturbing story appeared in the Wall Street Journal of July 18. Reporter Robert Keatley has revealed that there has been another accident with nerve gas VX, the same gas that killed 6,400 sheep near Dunway Proving Ground, Utah, in 1968. This time the accident took place on the island of Okinawa and 25 persons were hospitalized. Fortunately no deaths occurred.

Apparently a container of a weapon filled with the deadly nerve gas began leaking and people began to become ill. The fact that no one died should give us only slight comfort.

The most serious question is what is the military doing with nerve gas in Okinawa? If the military is stockpiling chemicals at Okinawa, which is the main American strategic base in Asia and a jumping off place for planes and troops going to Vietnam, are there other stockpiles in other places around the world? If this kind of stockpiling has been going on then neither the public nor Congress knows about it.

Congress has not had the opportunity to discuss or debate the appropriateness of such deployment of chemical-biological weapons. Had this opportunity been made available to the Congress, there might have been some chance of averting the grave repercussions this accident will surely have within Japan, one of our most important Asian allies.

Congress should call for a full scale investigation of this incident. Obviously there is slim possibility that the North Vietnamese will use nerve gas since they neither have it nor do they have the capability of delivering it. It simply cannot be argued as a deterrent to the North Vietnamese and does not belong on Okinawa.

The fact that we have moved the gas to a base that is so important to our military activities in Asia, raises grave moral and public policy questions. It has always been assumed that the United States was following the policy set by President Franklin Roosevelt that this Nation would never be the first to use chemical or biological weapons in wartime. If the Defense Department believes that policy should be changed they had better come to Congress and the Nation and explain their position.

The Okinawa accident points up the need for the immediate enactment of my resolution calling for the immediate ban of all open-air testing of CBW weapons until a Presidentially appointed panel of 10 scientists make a full investigation of the public health and environmental effects of such testing.

I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal article be printed in the RECORD so that every Member of Congress can study it. It is too important to be overlooked.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NERVE GAS ACCIDENT—OKINAWA MISHAP BARES OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENT OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS—LEAK AT U.S. BASE FELLS 25; ANGRY REACTION EXPECTED AT HOME, FROM JAPANESE—COUP FOR RED PROPAGANDA?

(By Robert Keatley)

WASHINGTON.—The United States has apparently deployed operational weapons armed with lethal chemical agents as part of its deterrent force overseas.

That conclusion is indicated by an accidental release of deadly VX nerve gas at the U.S. base on Okinawa last week. A container of the gas or a weapon carrying it broke open there, and some 25 persons were hospitalized after exposure to it. Word of the incident has just gotten back to Washington. At a late hour last night, high Defense and other Administration officials were debating what to say about the matter or whether to say anything at all.

Their sensitivity springs from awareness that disclosure of the unsuspected deployment could have broad and adverse repercussions for the U.S. overseas and for the Administration at home. It could create a wave of anti-American feeling abroad just as President Nixon sets forth next week on a planned triumphal tour following the U.S. moon voyagers' Pacific splashdown. More important, it could touch off violent leftist demonstrations in Japan on the eve of Secretary of State William Rogers' visit there to discuss continued U.S. use of Okinawa as the main American strategic base in Asia. The news will almost certainly prompt propagandists in all Communist countries to attack Washington's political and military objectives.

CAPITOL HILL CONTROVERSY

The information seems certain, in addition, to arouse new Congressional opposition to the development of toxic weapons in particular and to the military in general. Word of the Okinawan accident may come at a particularly bad time for advocates of deployment of the Safeguard antiballistic missile, since that project is now being debated by the Senate.

Chemical and bacteriological warfare (CBW) has become highly controversial on Capitol Hill recently. An accident at the Utah testing range killed some 6,400 sheep last year. This spring Americans learned that the Army planned to dispose of some 27,000 tons of "surplus" CBW agents and equipment by transporting them across country by train and dumping them into the Atlantic Ocean off the New Jersey coast; this plan was widely condemned as dangerous and has since been dropped.

On top of such controversy comes the surprise and troublesome disclosure that such deadly gases are on Okinawa. The island is officially Japanese property; Tokyo retains "residual sovereignty" over the big U.S. Army, Air Force and Marine Corps complex, though the U.S. has nearly complete freedom in managing it. The base also hosts giant B52 bombers and some medium-range missiles deployed as a deterrent against Communist China. Nuclear explosives are kept on the base for possible use by these planes and missiles, and that's a main reason for Japanese opposition to continued American use of the island.

The news reaching Washington about the Okinawa accident is little more than that it happened. There is no detail on how it took place. But it is believed that all the victims were American soldiers and none were Okinawan employees of the U.S. Apparently no deaths occurred, though Pentagon officials will not discuss the matter in detail.

The VX nerve gas that escaped at Okinawa is a mainstay of the U.S. CBW arsenal. It is this agent that drifted outside the Utah testing range last year and killed the sheep in nearby Skull Valley.

A DEADLY GAS

VX is one of the deadliest nerve gases in existence, since it persists longer than others when released into the atmosphere. A few milligrams, if inhaled, cause death within seconds; a slightly larger dose on the skin can kill in minutes if certain countermeasures, such as artificial respiration and special drugs, are not taken immediately. In the Okinawan accident, it is believed that countermeasures were quickly taken and that no large area was contaminated.

It is possible that a previous instance of CBW contamination on Okinawa occurred last summer. About 100 Okinawan children became mysteriously ill after swimming near a U.S. base; several were hospitalized with such symptoms as high fevers. American military authorities investigated allegations that chemical agents might have leaked into the sea but told worried Okinawan officials they couldn't find evidence of any such mishap.

An Army technical manual describes the symptoms of nerve gas poisoning as "running nose, tightness of chest, dimness of vision, pinpointing of eye pupils, difficulty in breathing, drooling, excessive sweating, nausea, vomiting, cramps, involuntary defecation and urination, twitching, jerking, staggering, headache, confusion, drowsiness, coma, convulsion, cessation of breathing, death."

Thus far, it has never been disclosed that the U.S. has deployed any lethal chemicals agents outside this country. And apparently the Japanese government has never been notified officially or otherwise, of the presence of nerve gases on Okinawa. The disclosure seems certain to prompt an angry storm of reaction in Japan. Leftists there have demonstrated frequently against the U.S. use of nonlethal tear and nausea gases in South Vietnam, and the use of napalm against North Vietnam. And now experts on Japan are expressing concern about new outbursts in Tokyo against the storage on Okinawa of CBW agents, which are more feared and closer to home than any weapons deployed in Vietnam.

The Army recently told Congress that it spends about $350 million annually on various phases of CBW research and development. The chemical agents include nerve and other gases that produce various physical effects ranging from temporary incapacitation to death. Biological agents, including germs and viruses, cause diseases, some fatal; current Army research involves studies, for example, of ways to spread plague and other disabling illnesses. But the Okinawa accident did not involve such biological weapons, and there is no reason to believe that any such agents are located there.

Recent protests over the existence of chemical and biological weapons—certain to mount now—have already caused the Senate Armed Services Committee to cut from this fiscal year's budget $16 million planned for research and development on lethal offensive CBW weapons. Democratic Sen. Thomas McIntyre of New Hampshire explained: "Measured against this nation's traditional opposition to the offensive use of such agents, we could not justify research and development expenditures for that purpose."

Though it isn't known just what weapons

XUM

or gas containers were involved in the Okinawa incident, several ways of delivering CBW agents have been developed by military researchers. These include grenades, shells and small ground-to-ground rockets that would explode on impact, releasing the agents. There are also bombs and airplane-launched rockets; such bombs would probably be triggered just above ground rather than on impact so the CBW agents would cover a large area.

The CBW material the Army recently proposed to sink off the New Jersey coast included 2,660 tons of rockets and 12,322 tons of Air Force bomb clusters, both filled with nerve gas.

Another system involves the use of generators. A CBW generator includes a tank filled with an agent, a source of pressure and a nozzle through which the agent is pumped into the atmosphere—upwind of the target area.

One report says the Army missiles called Corporal and Sergeant were designed at least partly for delivery of CBW agents. Sergeant, it has been claimed, can fire a 1,600-pound payload about 85 miles; according to one estimate, if this missile's warhead were filled with nerve gas and the gas were dispensed by an aerosol spray process, it could kill about one-third of the people in an area one mile in diameter. These missiles are deployed in Western Europe, but it's not known if they are armed with CBW warheads.

Years ago President Franklin Roosevelt vowed the U.S. would never be the first to use chemical or biological weapons in warfare, and this presumably remains official policy. But the Pentagon has consistently opposed efforts to restrict sharply U.S. development of such hardware; military men contend this country must know about ways of devising CBW weapons, if only for deterrent reasons.

The Soviet Union, it is reported, has a large CBW research and development program of its own. Back in 1960, Lt. Gen. A. G. Trudeau, then the U.S. Army's research chief, told Congress that "we know that the Soviets are putting a high priority on development of lethal and nonlethal weapons, and that their weapons stockpile consists of about one-sixth chemical munitions. Russian leaders have boasted that they are fully prepared to use new chemical weapons of great significance, and we know Soviet forces are trained in their use."

A 1960 Army study claims each Soviet division has a "specific unit devoted to the field of chemical warfare." A Russian general was quoted as stating: "Many of our scientists . . . regard research on the actions of poisons and on the development of antidotes to be their patriotic duty."

To justify its CBW activities, the U.S. Army emphasizes the idea of "retaliatory capability as a deterrent." The generals also stress they must know what the offensive capabilities of such weapons are before they can devise defenses. In addition, many military men justify such weapons as being more efficient and much less destructive than nuclear weapons; they emphasize that many CBW agents are only temporarily disabling but not lethal.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S MESSAGE ON THE PROPOSED COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND THE AMERICAN FUTURE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I congratulate and commend President Nixon for his outstanding message on the problems of population growth.

With the candor and objectivity that are required in dealing with this urgent and controversial problem, President Nixon presented a clear and frank statement on the population crisis that threatens to engulf and smother mankind's quest for a better life for all.

The population explosion is a threat not only to the industrial nations but also to the developing nations. It places a heavy burden on a country's economic development, its housing and educational needs, its natural resources, and its ability to provide adequate medical and other health services.

I thoroughly agree with the President that this explosive issue must be handled with "a new sense of urgency" and that this problem must be approached "from the viewpoint of the whole society." Although population growth influences governmental actions on all levels, very seldom do our national, State, and local governments pay "sufficient attention to population growth in their own planning. Only occasionally do they consider the serious implications of demographic trends for their present and future activities." But, most importantly, there is a glaring absence of coordination, cooperation, and sharing of information among our local, State, and national governments.

President Nixon's proposal for the creation by Congress of a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future is most welcomed. The Commission could do much to investigate and make recommendations regarding: First, the probable course of population growth, internal migration, and related demographic developments between now and the year 2000; second, the resources in the public sector of the economy that will be required to deal with the anticipated growth in population; and, third, ways in which population growth may affect the activities of Federal, State, and local governments.

Mr. President, in recognition of the population crisis and a need for urgent action, I introduced a bill on July 15 that authorizes and requests the President to convene a White Houes Conference on Population Growth and Family Planning, to be preceded by a State conference on the same subject in 1970. Such a conference will help to focus attention on this issue and to develop recommendations for further research and possible legislative action to cope with the population crisis.

Mr. President, I welcome the cosponsorship of any Senator who believes that a White House Conference on Population Growth and Family Planning is urgently needed. I am sure such a conference could contribute immensely toward assisting the President's proposed Commission on Population Growth and the American Future.

THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION'S NEW RULES ON DISCLOSURES BY CONGLOMERATES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Securities and Exchange Commission this week has taken an important step toward bridging an "information gap" that has long troubled the investment community. I commend the Commission for its adoption of the long pending proposed amendments to forms S–1, S–7, and 10, to provide for greater disclosure of financial data on the separate operations of diversified corporations.

The policy issue that is involved in these new rules is simply stated, although the details are extremely complex. The policy issue is: How much should the public know about the ways in which our large corporations make their profits and sustain their losses?

On June 20 I wrote to the Chairman and each member of the Commission to express my concern about the length of time the proposed rules changes had been pending in a sort of administrative limbo. In that letter I expressed by own philosophy on the issue in these terms:

> Generally, in my judgment, the direction of our public policy should be toward an ever more open society, with the widest possible availability and dispersion of scientific, industrial and economic information. The accelerating conglomerate merger movement is pushing us in the opposite direction: every year more information about leading factors of production in major—and concentrated—industries drops out of sight behind the veils of consolidated balance sheets and operating statements.

The Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee pursued this idea further at hearings July 9, 10, and 11 on the role of giant corporations in the American and world economies: automobile industry, 1969. The inequities in the amounts of information available to small and large competitors appeared very plainly in some of the testimony.

Welcome as the action of the SEC is, no one should be unaware of the areas of our economy that will still be permitted, under these new SEC rules, to remain shrouded behind the veils of secrecy called consolidated balance sheets in the future, as in the past.

Most importantly, there will be only irregular and infrequent disclosures of the additional information now required. No corporation will be called upon to report line-of-business data on an annual or any other regular, periodic basis, beyond the present sketchy requirement. The new information will be required to be divulged only when a new issue of securities is being registered with the SEC. A first, obvious step for a stronger, better bridge over the "information gap," therefore, will be to extend the line-of-business reporting requirements to the annual report form, form 10–K. I understand that the Commission is studying a recommendation to that effect by Commissioner Wheat, and I hope that the study may not take quite as long as did the study of the revisions of forms S–1, S–7, and 10.

Additionally, it is regrettable that the new requirements for information on assets used in each major line of business, and for itemized reporting on foreign operations, contained in the amendments as first proposed, have been dropped or diluted in the amendments as adopted.

Finally, these new rules should be recognized as intended for the alleviation of the information problems of the share-purchasing public, and not for the alleviation of the competitive informa-

XUM

tion problems of the small business community. It is, of course, the latter problem area that has so long concerned the Senate Small Business Subcommittee on Monopoly, both under its prior chairman, Senator Russell B. Long, and under my chairmanship. While I welcome the new SEC rules, I am by no means convinced as yet that the small business competitive information problem has been significantly eased by them. I am not convinced as yet that that problem can be solved by any administrative action. Additional legislation may be required.

In any event, we shall closely and diligently study what application the new SEC requirements may have, if any, to the small business competitive problems, and we shall welcome the help and advice of all having any expert knowledge or experience to offer.

Mr. President, I have a number of exhibits which I shall shortly ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record; but first I want to identify or describe them. The exhibits are in two parts. The first part consists of official correspondence and documents. The second part consists of newspaper articles which, I think, will be helpful to Senators interested in getting a quick overview of this extremely complex subject.

These exhibits are identified as follows:

PART I. OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE AND DOCUMENTS

Exhibit 1, letter dated June 20, 1969, from Senator Gaylord Nelson to Chairman Hamer H. Budge of the Securities and Exchange Commission, with copies to each member of the Commission and each member of the Senate Small Business Committee—enclosures omitted.

Exhibit 2, letter dated July 9, 1969, from Chairman Budge to Senator Nelson, with its enclosures identified as follows:

Exhibit 2A, memorandum prepared by Office of Chief Accountant and Division of Corporation Finance, Securities and Exchange Commission, with respect to letter dated June 20, 1969, addressed to Chairman Budge by Senator Gaylord Nelson.

Exhibit 2B, Securities and Exchange Commission, Securities Act release No. 4922, dated September 4, 1968: "Notice of Proposed Amendments to Forms S–1, S–7 and 10."

Exhibit 2C, Securities and Exchange Commission, Securities Act release No. 4949, dated February 18, 1969: "Notice of Revision of Proposed Amendments to Forms S–1, S–7 and 10."

Exhibit 2D, Securities and Exchange Commission, Securities Act release No. 4936, dated December 9, 1968: "Guides for Preparation and Filing of Registration Statements."

Exhibit 2E, Securities and Exchange Commission, Securities Act release No. 4886, dated November 29, 1967: "Adoption of Short Form for Registration of Securities of Certain Issuers and Amendment of Rule 174."

Exhibit 2F, Securities and Exchange Commission Form S–1.

Exhibit 2G, Securities and Exchange Commission. Securities Act release No. 4718, dated August 27, 1964: "Adoption of Amendments to Form S–1, Form S–8 and Form S–11, and so forth."

Exhibit 2H, Securities and Exchange Commission Form S–10.

Exhibit 3, Securities and Exchange Commission, Securities Act release No. 4988, dated July 14, 1969: "Adoption of Amendments to Forms S–1, S–7 and 10."

PART II. NEWSPAPER ARTICLES

Exhibit 4, article, "Revision of Divisional Reporting Proposals Draws Negative Comment," from Securties Regulation & Law Report, June 25, 1969.

Exhibit 5, article by Jan Nugent, "Big Firms Fight Data Requests," from the Journal of Commerce, July 9, 1969.

Exhibit 6, article by Edwin L. Dale, "Disclosure Rules For Big Divisions Adopted by SEC," from the New York Times, July 15, 1969.

Exhibit 7, article, "SEC Sets Conglomerate Reporting Guide; Regulation Altered To Help Small Firms," from the Wall Street Journal, July 15, 1969.

Exhibit 8, article, "SEC Ordering Conglomerates To Explain Net," from the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, July 14, 1969.

Exhibit 9, article, "SEC Adopts Disclosure Regulations," from the Washington Post, July 15, 1969.

Mr. President, the last five enclosures with Chairman Budge's letter to me—identified as exhibits 2D through 2H—are all familiar documents to the investment and business community. Since they are quite long and are easily available from the Securities and Exchange Commission, I see no useful purpose in inserting them in the Record. The remaining exhibits I have identified are an important part of this statement.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the exhibits I have identified as numbers 1 through 9, including the first three subparts of exhibit 2, identified as exhibits 2A through 2C, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. Senate,
Select Committee on Small Business,
Washington, D.C., June 20, 1969.

Hon. Hamer H. Budge,
Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: For many years the Senate Small Business Committee has been concerned with the problem posed to small, single-line businesses by the consolidation of operating data in the public financial statements of their large, vertically integrated and/or diversified competitors, the giant corporations. This is especially galling, at best, and disastrously damaging, at worst, when the giant competitor is also the principal or even the sole source of supply. In the too-familiar, typical situation, the small business cannot get any data at all on the giant's operations in the particular line or level of commerce that is the small firm's only business. The reverse is not true: the giant can usually ascertain or estimate the small business competitor's operating data with ease and accuracy.

Some years ago, Senator Russell B. Long, my predecessor as chairman of the Subcommittee on Monopoly, proposed legislation to correct this competitive inequity between large and small business in one type of situation, that of dual distribution. At hearings on the Long bill (S. 1843, 89th Congress), one argument that opponents made against it was that the SEC already had the power to require disclosure, from public corporations, of a type that would sufficiently meet the small business competitive need, incidentally to meeting a long-felt need of the investing public.

A speech by your predecessor, the Honorable Manuel F. Cohen, before the Financial Analysts Federation, May 24, 1966, was inserted in the record of the hearings in support of this point. (Hearings before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, on S. 1842, S. 1843 and S. 1844, 89th Congress, 2d session, part 2, p. 375 (1966).) The SEC was not otherwise represented by testimony or a statement at the hearings on the Long bills; however, your Commission had earlier contributed written information on its existing authority in this area to the same subcommittee in another study. (Hearings before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, etc., on economic concentration, 89th Congress, 1st session, part 2, p. 1069 (1965).) That material was submitted on June 4, 1965.

On September 20, 1966, Chairman Cohen appeared in person at the economic concentration hearings (*ibid.*, 89th Congress, 2d session, part 5, p. 1981 (1966)) * * * to discuss the necessity and desirability of requiring "conglomerate" corporations to include in their financial statements meaningful information about the results of operations in each of their distinct lines of activity. (*Id.* at p. 1982.)

Mr. Cohen stated unequivocally that the Commission had power to require such disclosures * * * if and to the extent that the Commission finds them necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors. There is no need to amend these statutes for this purpose. (*Ibid.*)

The subcommittee never reported S. 1843.

Much later, in September 1968, your Commission announced proposed amendments to Forms S–1, S–7 and 10, three forms used in the registration of securities under your Acts, * * * to require that a registrant shall state for each of the past five years the approximate amount or percentage of sales or operating revenues and contribution to net income attributable to each class of related or similar products or services, which contributed 10 percent or more to total sales and operating revenues, or to income before extraordinary items and income taxes, during either of the last two fiscal years. * * * To the extent practicable, the approximate amount of assets employed in each segment of the business is to be reported. Comparable data on revenues and earnings received from foreign sources and from government procurement or any single customer are also to be reported. (SEC, Securities Act of 1933 Release No. 4922, Securities Exchange Act of 1934 Release No. 8397, Sept. 4, 1968.)

Still later, after consideration of comments on the September proposal, your Commission issued a notice of revision of the proposed amendments to the three forms. (Securities Act of 1933 Release No. 4949, Securities Exchange Act of 1934 Release No. 8530, February 18, 1969.)

It is my understanding that, although the period for filing of comments on the February revisions expired on March 10, the Commission still has not finally adopted or promulgated the amendments to the forms.

On July 9, 10, and 11, the Senate Small Business Subcommittee on Monopoly will hold three days of hearings on the role of giant corporations in the American and world economies, with particular reference, at these sessions, to the automobile industry. I anticipate that there will be considerable discussion of the issue of needless and excessive secrecy on the part of the large corpora-

XUM

tions. In this connection, it would be helpful to have, for the record of those hearings and, if practicable, before they begin, your answers to these questions:

1. Under existing forms S-1, S-7 and 10, under the amendments of the forms proposed in September, and under the February revisions of the September amendments (three separate situations), what are and would be the tests of sufficient significance of a portion of a registrant's business to require an itemized account or disclosure thereof in the registration statement? What are and would be the definition and limitations of fractions of the business to be separately reported?

2. Under each of the three conditions of the registration forms—existing, September proposal and February proposal—what are and would be the requirements for disclosure of:

(a) Relative importance of the separately reported fractions of registrant's business?

(b) Dollar amounts and percentages of sales or revenues of the separately reported fractions of registrant's business?

(c) Dollar amounts and percentages of contributions to net income of the separately reported fractions of registrant's business?

(d) Dollar amounts and percentages of assets employed in the separately reported fractions of registrant's business?

(e) Dollar amounts and percentages of losses incurred in the separately reported fractions of registrant's business?

3. Under each of the three conditions of the registration forms—existing, September proposal and February proposal—what are and would be the requirements for separate, itemized disclosure of:

(a) Foreign operations?

(b) Sales to the U.S. Government?

(c) Sales to single important customers?

(d) Significance, in terms of both sales and income, of transfers within the registrant corporation, its divisions and subsidiaries?

(It would be helpful if your answers to the above three questions, and to each sub-part of those questions, were numbered to correspond to the question and were in three parts: "Existing." "September proposal" and "February proposal.")

4. To what extent, if any, would the September proposal have served, and would the February proposal serve, the long-standing interest of the Senate Small Business Subcommittee on Monopoly in making public the extent to which, in giant diversified and integrated corporations, some operations may be conducted at high profits for the purpose, in part, of subsidizing other operations on a low-profit, no-profit or loss basis, to drive out competition?

5. If, as I surmise, neither the September nor the February proposals for revision of your registration forms would have made or would make any significant contribution to the type of revelation contemplated by question 4, would you agree with me that new legislation would be required to accomplish that purpose?

In connection with question 5, please note the testimony of former Chairman Manuel Cohen before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly on September 20, 1966:

> I think there is a general statement that I should make in the light of series of questions that you are putting. I am not interested officially in the sense of having responsibility for the anti-competitive concerns that have been expressed here.

(Hearings on economic concentration, part 5, p. 1991.)

6. Of what considerations, in the securities laws, should the Congress be especially aware in drafting and studying new conglomerate corporation disclosure legislation? Is there any compelling reason why Congress should not be considering new legislation of this type concurrently with your Commission's study of the proposed amendments to your registration forms?

7. What is the status of the proposed amendments to Forms S-1, S-7 and 10? When may we expect them finally to be promulgated, or rejected?

Notwithstanding my feeling that the proposed amendments will be of little utility in ameliorating the competitive information problem that has so long troubled my subcommittee, I do believe that they are desirable and I regret that they have been delayed for so many months in becoming effective. Generally, in my judgment, the direction of our public policy should be toward an ever more open society, with the widest possible availability and dispersion of scientific, industrial and economic information. The accelerating conglomerate merger movement is pushing us in the opposite direction: every year more information about leading factors of production in major—and concentrated—industries drops out of sight behind the veils of consolidated balance sheets and operating statements.

I would urge the Securities and Exchange Commission to help stem this tide of concentration promoted by undue secrecy. I intend to pursue the problem in the Congress, in particular at the July hearings and through the new legislation that I hope shortly thereafter to introduce.

I am enclosing a copy of the Senate Small Business Committee's press release no. 564, describing the July hearings, and a copy of my report to other Committee members, mentioned in the release.

Sincerely,

GAYLORD NELSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Monopoly.

EXHIBIT 2

SECURITIES AND
EXCHANGE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., July 9, 1969.

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: In response to your letter of June 20, 1969, I am transmitting a memorandum prepared by the Commission's Office of Chief Accountant and Division of Corporation Finance.

The Commission expects to announce on July 14, 1969 its determination with respect to the proposals set forth in Securities Act Release No. 4949 as mentioned in the enclosed memorandum, for disclosures with respect to volume of operation and earnings of different lines of business carried on by one company. We shall furnish you the Commission's announcement as soon as it is released.

Please let me know if you have further questions in regard to this matter.

Sincerely,

HAMER H. BUDGE,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT 2A

MEMORANDUM PREPARED BY OFFICE OF CHIEF ACCOUNTANT AND DIVISION OF CORPORATION FINANCE, SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION, WITH RESPECT TO LETTER DATED JUNE 20, 1969, ADDRESSED TO CHAIRMAN BUDGE BY SENATOR GAYLORD NELSON

In responding to the inquiries in the letter of June 20, 1969, it will be helpful first to state the Commission's jurisdiction to require, where a company is engaged in different lines of business, disclosures of the respective contributions of various segments of a business to the overall income.

Statutory authority to require disclosures in this area is found in Schedule A of the Securities Act of 1933 which calls for disclosures of "(8) the general character of the business actually transacted or to be transacted by the issuer." Section 7 of the Securities Act provides that a registration statement under that Act "shall contain such other information . . . as the Commission may, by rules or regulations, require as being necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors." Similarly Section 12(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 grants power to the Commission to require in an application for registration of securities on a national securities exchange, "Such information, in such detail, as to the issuer . . . as the Commission may by rules and regulations require, as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, . . ." in certain specified areas including "the nature of the business." Section 12(g)(1) of the latter act gives the Commission similar power with respect to registration of the prescribed securities traded "over-the-counter" in interstate commerce. Pursuant to these provisions of the statutes the Commission has adopted forms which further specify disclosures required. The Commission's Form S-1, the form of general applicability for registration of securities under the Securities Act, and Form 10, for registration of securities under the Securities Exchange Act, contain the same requirement (in Item 9(a) and Item 3(a), respectively, headed "Description of Business"), as follows:

> Briefly describe the business done and intended to be done by the registrant and its subsidiaries and the general development of such business during the past 5 years. If the business consists of the production or distribution of different kinds of products or the rendering of different kinds of services, indicate insofar as practicable, the relative importance of each product or service or class of similar products or services which contributed 15 percent or more of the gross volume of business done during the last fiscal year.

The Commission's Form S-1 has contained the requirement quoted since 1951. Since 1942 a similar requirement, however without reference to the 15% qualification, has been a part of the disclosure required by the form. The requirements of Form 10 mentioned were adopted in 1949.

The Commission's Form S-7, mentioned in Senator Nelson's letter, adopted November 29, 1967, calls for similar disclosures with respect to the business done and intended to be done but not the development of the business during the past five years. Reference is made to Item 5 of Form S-7 enclosed. Copies of Form S-1 and Form 10 are also enclosed.

Under the mentioned requirements for a description of business done or proposed to be done by a diversified company, we seek appropriate disclosures where the contribution of a line of products or services to sales and revenues is not proportionate to the contribution to earnings by the line of products or services. We seek disclosure of financial information not provided by consoldiated financial statements which may be important to a sound analysis of a company's net worth and future prospects. In some instances a reliable calculation of the contribution of earnings may not be practicable. In many instances the calculation may not produce a precise result. What constitutes an adequate response to the requirement for disclosure of "the relative importance of each product or service or class of similar products or services" depends on the facts and circumstances of a particular company.

We turn now to the specific questions put by Senator Nelson, pages 4 to 6 of the letter of June 20, 1969.

It does not appear practicable to attempt to set forth more precisely "the definition and limitations of fractions of the business to be separately reported," as mentioned in question 1, other than the references to the provisions of the Commission's forms and the description of the policies followed by the Commission's staff as stated above.

In approaching question 2 we refer again to the statement above to the effect that the Commission's policies require disclosures appropriate to specific requirements of the mentioned forms, our rules require such additional statements as may be necessary in order to make the statements made not misleading. Specifically, Rule 408 under the Securities Act of 1933, applicable to Form S–1 and S–7, states "In addition to the information expressly required to be included in a registration statement, there shall be added such further material information, if any, as may be necessary to make the required statements in the light of the circumstances under which they are made, not misleading." Rule 12b–20 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, applicable to Form 10, is similar.

With the explanations and qualifications set forth in the preceding paragraph we now turn to the specific areas mentioned in question 2. Generally, the Commission's existing rules call for disclosures by 15% segments of the business of a company. The proposals of Securities Act Releases 4922 and 4949, dated September 4, 1968 and February 18, 1969, respectively, provide disclosure of 10% segments. The present rules contain specific reference only to percentages of sales and revenues. The proposals refer to tests based on contribution to income also. Under both present requirements and proposed requirements disclosures in terms of percentages or approximate dollar amounts would be acceptable. The proposals of Release No. 4922 with regard to disclosure of amounts of assets employed in separately reported fractions of the registrant's business were withdrawn by Release No. 4949. There is no present requirement with respect to assets employed in segments of a business.

While the Commission's present forms do not refer specifically to operations conducted at loss, the general disclosure requirements mentioned would apply where losses are material. Specific reference to loss operations appears in the proposals of Release No. 4949.

With respect to foreign operations, again, the Commission's present forms do not contain specific provisions for disclosures. However, we have generally secured disclosures along the lines of Chapter 12 of the Accounting Research Bulletin No. 43, American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, which specifies that adequate disclosure of foreign operations should be made including, among other things, a summary of foreign subsidiaries' assets and liabilities and their income and losses. The proposals for disclosures of foreign operations in Release No. 4922 were modified in Release No. 4949.

The Commission's present policies with respect to disclosures of sales to the United States Government and to single important customers are set forth principally in "Names of Customers and Competitors," paragraph 27 of Securities Act Release No. 4936 entitled Guides for Preparation and Filing of Registration Statements. In addition, it has been our practice to secure pertinent disclosures of government business subject to renegotiation and orders or contracts subject to termination at the convenience of the government. The proposals in these areas set forth in Release No. 4922 were modified in Release No. 4949.

Neither our present disclosure practices nor any of the proposals of Releases 4922 and 4949 provide for disclosure of the significance of transfers between companies whose results of operation and financial position are consolidated with the results of operations and financial position of the parent company.

In developing the proposals in Release No. 4949 we considered comments received with respect to proposals set forth in Release No. 4922 and other materials including the section "Public Financial Reporting By Conglomerate Firms," pages 86–7, Studies by the Staff of the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability, January 1969.

Neither the proposals of Releases No. 4922 or No. 4949 if adopted would necessarily provide disclosure of "the extent to which, in giant diversified and integrated corporations, some operations may be conducted at high profits for the purpose, in part, of subsidizing other operations on a low-profit, no-profit or loss basis, to drive out competition" as mentioned in question 4.

The disclosure provisions of the Federal securities laws are basically designed to provide information useful in making investment decisions rather than to provide disclosure in the interest of furthering competitive equality. We are not in a position to determine whether additional legislation is necessary to accomplish the latter objective.

In respect to question 6 of the letter of June 20, 1969 we see no reason Congress should not consider new legislation of the character mentioned concurrently with the Commission's study of the proposed amendments.

EXHIBIT 2B

[From the Securities and Exchange Commission, Sept. 4, 1968]

NOTICE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO FORMS S–1, S–7 AND 10

(Securities Act of 1933, Release No. 4922; Securities Exchange Act of 1934, Release No. 8397)

(Deleted matter enclosed in black brackets, new matter printed in italic)

Notice is hereby given that the Securities and Exchange Commission has under consideration certain proposed amendments to Forms S–1, S–7 and 10. Form S–1 is a general form for registration of securities of commercial and industrial companies under the Securities Act of 1933. Form S–7 is a short form for registration under the Act of securities to be offered for cash by listed companies, and domestic companies which have securities registered under Section 12(g) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and which have long records of earnings and stability of management and business. Form 10 is a general form for registration of securities of similar companies under Section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

In view of the increasing number of companies which are engaged in more than one line of business, the Commission has for several years been studying the necessity for clarification of its requirements for disclosure of the importance of the various lines of business to companies' end results. The proposed amendments would supply information on the basis of which existing security holders and new investors may be able to determine the approximate contribution which the various lines of business make to a company's overall profitability, or lack of it.

Item 9 of Form S–1, Item 5 of Form S–7 and Item 3 of Form 10 require a brief description of the business done and intended to be done by the registrant and its subsidiaries. Where the registrant is engaged in different lines of business, the item also requires an indication, insofar as practicable, of the relative importance of each class of similar products or services, which contributed 15 percent or more to the gross volume of business done during the last fiscal year. It is proposed to amend these items to require that a registrant shall state for each of the past five years the approximate amount or percentage of sales or operating revenues and contribution to net income attributable to each class of related or similar products or services, which contributed 10 percent or more to total sales and operating revenues, or to income before extraordinary items and income taxes, during either of the last two fiscal years. However, if it is not practicable to indicate the contribution to net income, then disclosure is to be provided as to the contribution most closely approaching net income or loss. To the extent practicable, the approximate amount of assets employed in each segment of the business is to be reported. Comparable data on revenues and earnings received from foreign sources and from government procurement or any single customer are also to be reported. The Commission believes that such disclosure with respect to a single customer merits consideration and invites comments thereon.

Comparable amendments to other disclosure requirements have been deferred pending the completion of the study which is currently being made by the Commission of disclosure under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

In developing the proposed amendments the Commission has considered a study sponsored by the Financial Executives Research Foundation, entitled "Financial Reporting by Diversified Companies," prepared by Dr. Robert Mautz, the publications and suggestions of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, the National Association of Accountants and others. The Commission has also observed that some companies in their annual reports to stockholders have segregated operations down to net income.

The text of the proposed amendments is set forth below:

I. FORMS S–1 AND 10

A. Item 9(a) of Form S–1 and Item 3(a) of Form 10 would be amended as follows:

(a) Briefly describe the business done and intended to be done by the registrant and its subsidiaries and the general development of such business during the past five years. [If the business consists of the production or distribution of different kinds of products or the rendering of different kinds of services, indicate insofar as practicable, the relative importance of each product or service or class of similar products or services which contributed 15 percent or more to the gross volume of business done during the last fiscal year] *State for each of the five years the approximate amount or percentage of sales or operating revenues and contribution to net income, excluding extraordinary items, attributable to each class of related or similar products or services which contributed 10 percent or more to the total of sales and revenues, or to net income, before extraordinary items and income taxes, during either of the last two fiscal years. If it is not practicable to state the contribution to net income, excluding extraordinary items, by any such segment of the business, disclose the contribution to earnings most closely approaching such net income or loss. In addition, state, if practicable, the amount of assets employed in each segment of the business for which operating results are reported. Where 10 percent or more of total sales and revenues or net income as stated above are derived from operations outside the United States and Canada or from Government procurement or any single customer, similar information with respect to each such source shall be set forth and for any categories of products or services within each source which contributed 10 percent of the total company sales and revenues or net income as stated above.*

B. The following new Instruction 3 would be added to the instructions to the abovementioned items:

3. (*a*) *In classifying products or services, appropriate consideration shall be given to all relevant factors, including rates of profitability of operations, degrees of risk and opportunity for growth. The basis for classifying products or services and any material changes between periods in such classifications shall be described briefly.*

(b) *Where substantial amounts of products or services are transferred from one unit to another, the receiving and the transferring units may be aggregated for reporting the* *operating results of a segment of the business pursuant to this item.*

(c) If the method of pricing intra-company transfers of products or services or the method of allocation of common or corporate costs materially affects the reported contribution to income of a segment of the business, such methods and any material changes between periods in such methods and the effect thereof shall be described briefly.

II. FORM S-7

A. Item 5(a) of Form S-7 would be amended as follows:

(a) Briefly describe the business done and intended to be done by the registrant and its subsidiaries. **[**If the business consists of the production or distribution of different kinds of products or the rendering of different kinds of services, indicate, insofar as practicable, the relative importance of each product or service or class of similar products or services which contributed 15 percent or more to the gross volume of business done during the last fiscal year.**]** *State for each of the last five years the approximate amount or percentage of sales or operating revenues and contribution to net income, excluding extraordinary items, attributable to each class of related or similar products or services which contributed 10 percent or more to the total of sales and revenues, or to net income before extraordinary items and income taxes, during either of the last two fiscal years. If it is not practicable to state the contribution to net income, excluding extraordinary items, by any such segment of the business, disclose the contribution to earnings most closely approaching such net income or loss. In addition, state, if practicable, the amount of assets employed in each segment of the business for which operating results are reported. Where 10 percent or more of total sales and revenues or net income as stated above are derived from operations outside the United States and Canada or from Government procurement or any single customer, similar information with respect to each such source shall be set forth and for any categories of products or services within each source which contributed 10 percent of total company sales or revenues or net income as stated above.* In the case of an extractive enterprise, give appropriate information as to development, reserves and production.

B. The following new instructions would be added to the above-mentioned Item 5(a):

Instruction. 1. In classifying products or services, appropriate consideration shall be given to all relevant factors, including rates of profitability of operations, degree of risk and opportunity for growth. The basis for classifying products or services and any material changes between periods in such classification shall be described briefly.

2. Where substantial amounts of products or services are transferred from one unit to another, the receiving and the transferring units may be aggregated for reporting the operating results of a segment of the business pursuant to this item.

3. If the method of pricing intra-company transfers of products or services or the method of allocation of common or corporate costs materially affects the reported contribution to income of a segment of the business, such methods and any material changes between periods in such methods and the effect thereof shall be described briefly.

* * * * *

All interested persons are invited to submit their views and comments on the proposed amendments, in writing, to the Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C. 20549, on or before October 4, 1968. Except where it is requested that such communication not be disclosed, they will be considered available for public inspection.

By the Commission.

Orval L. DuBois,
Secretary.

EXHIBIT 2C

[From the Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C., Feb. 18, 1969]

NOTICE OF REVISION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO FORMS S-1, S-7, AND 10

(Securities Act of 1933, Release No. 4949; Securities Exchange Act of 1934, Release No. 8530)

On September 4, 1968 the Commission published, in Securities Act Release No. 4922 (Securities Exchange Act Release No. 8397) certain proposals for amendments to Forms S-1, S-7, and 10. Forms S-1 and S-7 are used for the registration of securities under the Securities Act of 1933 and Form 10 is used for the registration of securities under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

A large number of helpful comments were received in response to the invitation for comments and all of such comments have been carefully considered. As a result of the review of such comments and further consideration of the various matters involved, the Commission has revised the proposed amendments and is publishing them for comment by interested persons. In view of the length of time the proposals have been under consideration, the wide publicity they have received and the extensive consideration they have received from registrants, trade and professional groups and other persons, the Commission believes that a limited period of time should be adequate for the submission of additional comments.

The amendments relate to Item 9 of Form S-1, Item 5 of Form S-7 and Item 3 of Form 10, which require a brief description of the business done and intended to be done by the registrant and its subsidiaries. The revised items require, where the registrant and its subsidiaries are engaged in more than one line of business, the disclosure for each of a maximum of five fiscal years ending susbequent to December 31, 1966, the approximate amount or percentage of total sales and operating revenues and contribution to income before income taxes and extraordinary items attributable to each line of business which contributed, during either of the last two fiscal years, 10 per cent or more to (1) the total of sales and revenues, or (2) income before income taxes and extraordinary items. Similar disclosure is also required with respect to any line of business which resulted in a loss of 10 percent or more of such income before deduction of losses. Where the number of lines of business exceeds ten, the disclosure may be limited to the ten most important lines. Where it is not practicable to state the contribution to income before income taxes and extraordinary items for any line of business, the contribution to the result of operations most closely approaching such income is to be disclosed.

The revised requirements provide for grouping similar or related products or services in lines of business upon consideration of all relevant factors. Where material amounts of products or services are transferred from one unit to another, the transferring and receiving units may be considered a single unit for the purpose of disclosure.

Where the registrant and its subsidiaries are not engaged in more than one line of business, the revised items require disclosure of the amount of sales or revenues during each fiscal year of the specified period for each product or service or class of similar or related products or services which contributed 10 percent or more to the total of sales and revenues in either of the last two fiscal years.

Where a business is dependent upon a single customer, or a very few customers, the loss of any one of which would have a materially adverse effect, disclosure of the identity of the customers is required together with material facts with respect to their relationship and the importance of the business to the registrant.

Appropriate disclosure is required with respect to business which is subject to renegotiation of profits or termination of contracts at the election of the government.

If the registrant and its subsidiaries engage in material operations outside the United States, or if a material portion of sales or revenues are received from customers outside the United States, appropriate disclosure is required with respect to the importance of that part of the business to the registrant and the risks attendant thereto.

The revised proposals also provide that the Commission may, upon the request of the registrant, and where consistent with the protection of investors, permit the omission of any of the required information or the substitution of appropriate information of comparable character. By this provision management may exercise judgment in designing disclosure suitable to the operations of a particular company. The Commission may also require the furnishing of information other than that specified where necessary or appropriate for an adequate description of the business.

The text of the amendments as proposed to be revised are attached to this release.

All interested persons are invited to submit their views and comments on the revised proposals, in writing, to the Securities and Exchange Commission on or before March 10, 1969. All such communications will be considered available for public inspection.

By the Commission.

Orval L. DuBois,
Secretary.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS TO FORMS S-1, S-7, AND 10

I. FORMS S-1 AND 10

Item 9 of Form SX1 and Item 3 of Form 10 would be amended as follows:

(a) Briefly describe the business done and intended to be done by the registrant and its subsidiaries and the general development of such business during the past five years, or such shorter period as the registrant may have been engaged in business.

Instructions

1. The description shall not relate to the powers and objects specified in the charter, but to the actual business done and intended to be done. Include the business of subsidiaries of the registrant only insofar as is necessary to understand the character and development of the business conducted by the total enterprise.

2. In describing developments, information shall be given as to matters such as the following: The nature and results of any bankruptcy, receivership or similar proceedings with respect to the registrant or any of its significant subsidiaries; the nature and results of any other materially important reorganization, readjustment or succession of the registrant or any of its significant subsidiaries; the acquisition or disposition of any material amount of assets otherwise than in the ordinary course of business; any materially important changes in the types of products produced or services rendered by the registrant and its subsidiaries; and any materially important changes in the mode of conducting the business, such as fundamental changes in the methods of distribution.

3. The business of a predecessor or predecessors hsall be deemed to be the business of the registrant for the purpose of this item.

4. Appropriate disclosure shall be made with respect to any portion of the business subject to renegotiation of profits or termination of contracts or subcontracts at the election of the government.

(b)(1) If the registrant and its subsidi-

XUM

aries are engaged in more than one line of business, state for each of its past five fiscal years, for each fiscal year ending subsequent to December 31, 1966, or for each fiscal year the registrant has been engaged in business, whichever period is less, for each line of business specified in (2) below—

(A) the approximate amount or percentage of total sales and revenues, and

(B) the approximate amount or percentage of income (or loss) before income taxes and extraordinary items.

If it is impracticable to state the contribution to income (or loss) before income taxes and extraordinary items for any line of business, state the contribution thereof to the result of operations most closely approaching such income, together with a brief explanation of the reasons why it is not practicable to state the contribution to such income or loss.

(2) The information specified in (1) above shall be furnished with respect to each line of business which, during either of the last two fiscal years, accounted for——

(A) 10 percent or more of the total of sales and revenues,

(B) 10 percent or more of income before income taxes and extraordinary items computed without deduction of loss resulting from operations of any line or lines of business, or

(C) a loss which equalled or exceeded 10 percent of the amount of income specified in (B) above.

Instructions

1. If the number of lines of business for which information is required exceeds ten, the registrant may, at its option, furnish the required information only for the ten lines of business deemed most important to an understanding of the business. In such event, a statement to that effect shall be set forth together with a brief identification of each line of business for which the information is not furnished and an indication whether such line is comprehended by (A), (B) or (C) of paragraph (2) above.

2. In grouping products or services as lines of business, appropriate consideration shall be given to all relevant factors, including rates of profitability of operations, degrees of risk and opportunity for growth. The basis for grouping such products or services and any material changes between periods in such grouping shall be briefly described.

3. Where material amounts of products or services are transferred from one unit to another, the receiving and the transferring units may be considered a single unit for the purpose of reporting the operating results thereof.

4. If the method of pricing intra-company transfers of products or services or the method of allocation of common or corporate costs materially affects the reported contribution to income of a line of business, such methods and any material changes between periods in such methods and the effect thereof shall be described briefly.

5. Information regarding operations regulated by federal, state or municipal authorities may be limited to the information required by any uniform system of accounts prescribed by such authorities.

(c) If the registrant and its subsidiaries are not engaged in more than one line of business, or if two or more lines of business have been combined pursuant to instruction 3 to paragraph (b), and the business consists of the production or distribution of different kinds of products or the rendering of different kinds of service, state for each fiscal year of the applicable period specified in paragraph (b) the amount of sales or revenues contributed by each product or services or class of similar or related products or services which contributed 10 percent or more to the total of sales and revenues in either of the last two fiscal years.

(d) If a material part of the business of the registrant and its subsidiaries is dependent upon a single customer, or a very few customers, the loss of any one of which would have a materially adverse effect on the registrant, the name of the customer or customers and other material facts with respect to their relationship, if any, to the registrant and the importance of the business to the registrant shall be stated.

(e) If the registrant and its subsidiaries engage in material operations outside the United States, or if a material portion of sales or revenues are derived from customers outside the United States, appropriate disclosure shall be made with respect to the importance of that part of the business to the registrant and the risks attendant thereto. Insofar as practicable, furnish information with respect to volume and relative profitability of such business.

(f) Indicate briefly, to the extent material, the general competitive conditions in the industry in which the registrant and its subsidiaries are engaged or intend to engage, and the position of the enterprise in the industry. If several products or services are involved, separate consideration should be given to the principal products or services or classes of products or services.

(g) The Commission may, upon the request of the registrant, and where consistent with the protection of investors, permit the omission of any of the information herein required or the furnishing in substitution therefor of appropriate information of comparable character. The Commission may also require the furnishing of other information in addition to, or in substitution for, the information herein required in any case where such information is necessary or appropriate for an adequate description of the business done on or intended to be done.

II. FORM S–7

Item 5 of Form S–7 would be amended as follows:

(a) Identify the business done and intended to be done by the registrant and its subsidiaries. In the case of an extractive enterprise, give appropriate information as to development, reserves and production. Appropriate disclosure shall be made with respect to any portion of the business subject to renegotiation of profits or termination of contracts or subcontracts at the election of the government.

(b) (1) If the registrant and its subsidiaries are engaged in more than one line of business, state for each of its past five fiscal years, for each fiscal year ending subsequent to December 31, 1966, or for each fiscal year the registrant has been engaged in business, whichever period is less, for each line of business specified in (2) below—

(A) the approximate amount or percentage of total sales and revenues, and

(B) the approximate amount or percentage of income (or loss) before incomes taxes and extraordinary items.

If it is impracticable to state the contribution to income (or loss) before income taxes and extraordinary items for any line of business, state the contribution thereof to the result of operations most closely approaching such income, together with a brief explanation of the reasons why it is not practicable to state the contribution to such income or loss.

(2) The information specified in (1) above shall be furnished with respect to each line of business which, during either of the last two fiscal years, accounted for—

(A) 10 percent or more of the total of sales and revenues,

(B) 10 percent or more of income before income taxes and extraordinary items computed without deduction of loss resulting from operations of any line or lines of business, or

(C) a loss which equalled or exceeded 10 percent of the amount of income specified in (B) above.

Instructions

1. If the number of lines of business for which information is required exceeds ten, the registrant may, at its option, furnish the required information only for the ten lines of business deemed most important to an understanding of the business. In such event, a statement to that effect shall be set forth together with a brief identification of each line of business for which the information is not furnished and an indication whether such line is comprehended by (A), (B) or (C) of paragraph (2) above.

2. In grouping products or services as lines of business, appropriate consideration shall be given to all relevant factors, including rates of profitability of operations, degrees of risk and opportunity for growth. The basis for grouping such products or services and any material changes between periods in such grouping shall be briefly described.

3. Where material amounts of products or services are transferred from one unit to another, the receiving and the transferring units may be considered a single unit for the purpose of reporting the operating results thereof.

4. If the methods of pricing intra-company transfers of products or services or the method of allocation of common or corporate costs materially affects the reported contribution to income of a line of business, such methods and any material changes between periods in such methods and the effect thereof shall be described briefly.

5. Information regarding operations regulated by federal, state, or municipal authorities may be limited to the information required by any uniform system of accounts prescribed by such authorities.

(c) If the registrant and its subsidiaries are not engaged in more than one line of business, or if two or more lines of business have been combined pursuant to instruction 3 to paragraph (b), and the business consists of the production or distribution of different kinds of products or the rendering of different kinds of services, state for each fiscal year of the applicable period specified in paragraph (b) the amount of sales or revenues contributed by each product or service or class of similar or related products or services which contributed 10 percent or more to the total of sales and revenues in either of the last two fiscal years.

(d) If a material part of the business of the registrant and its subsidiaries is dependent upon a single customer, or a very few customers, the loss of any one of which would have a materially adverse effect on the registrant, the name of the customer or customers and other material facts with respect to their relationship, if any, to the registrant and the importance of the businesses to the registrant shall be stated.

(e) If the registrant and its subsidiaries engage in material operations outside the United States, or if a material portion of sales or revenues are derived from customers outside the United States, appropriate disclosure shall be made with respect to the importance of that part of the business to the registrant and the risks attendant thereto. Insofar as practicable, furnish information with respect to volume and relative profitability of such business.

(f) Briefly describe any pending legal proceedings to which the registrant or its subsidiaries is a party which may have a substantial effect upon the earnings or financial condition of the registrant.

(g) The Commission may, upon the request of the registrant, and where consistent with the protection of investors, permit the omission of any of the information herein required or the furnishing in substitution therefor of appropriate information of comparable character. The Commission may also require the furnishing of other information in addition to, or in substitution for, the information herein required in any case where such information is necessary or appropriate for an adequate description of the business done on or intended to be done.

Exhibit 3

[From the Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C., July 14, 1969]

Adoption of Amendments to Forms S–1, S–7 and 10

(Securities Act of 1933, Release No. 4988; Securities Exchange Act of 1934, Release No. 8650)

On February 18, 1969, the Securities and Exchange Commission published in Securities Act Release No. 4949 (Securities Exchange Act Release No. 8530) certain revised proposals for amendments to Forms S–1, S–7 and 10. Forms S–1 and S–7 are used for the registration of securities under the Securities Act of 1933 and Form 10 is used for the registration of securities under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

A considerable number of comments were received in regard to the revised proposals and were very helpful to the Commission in reaching a decision on the proposed amendments.

The amendments relate to Item 9 of Form S–1, Item 5 of Form S–7 and Item 3 of Form 10, which require a brief description of the business done and intened to be done by the registrants and its subsidiaries.

Where a registrant and its subsidiaries are engaged in more than one line of business, the amendments require the disclosure for each of a maximum of the last five fiscal years subsequent to December 31, 1966, of the approximate amount or percentage of total sales and operating revenues and of contribution to income before income taxes and extraordinary items attributable to each line of business which contributed, during either of the last two fiscal years, a certain proportion to (1) the total of sales and revenues, or (2) income before income taxes and extraordinary items. For companies with total sales and revenue over $50 million, the proportion will be 10 percent; for smaller companies, 15 percent. Similar disclosure is also required with respect to any line of business which resulted in a loss of 10 percent or more (or 15 percent or more for smaller companies) of such income before deduction of losses. Where the percentage test as applied to both sales and earnings contributions results in more than ten lines of business, the disclosure may be limited to the ten most important lines. Where it is not practicable to state the contribution to income before income taxes and extraordinary items for any line of business, the contribution to the results of operations most closely approaching such income is to be disclosed.

Various suggestions were made for more specific indications of the meaning of "line of business." However, in view of the numerous ways in which companies are organized to do business, the variety of products and services, the history of predecessor and acquired companies, and the diversity of operating characteristics, such as markets, raw materials, manufacturing processes and competitive conditions, it is deemed feasible or desirable to be more specific in defining a line of business. Management, because of its familiarity with company structure, is in the most informed position to separate the company into components on a reasonable basis for reporting purposes. Accordingly, discretion is left to the management to devise a reporting pattern appropriate to the particular company's operations and responsive to its organizational concepts.

The amendments continue the existing disclosure requirements on breakdown of total volume of sales and revenues by principal classes of similar products or services, except that the percentage test has been reduced from 15 percent to 10 percent in the case of companies having total sales and revenues in excess of $50 million during either of their last two fiscal years. This continued requirement is appropriate in view of the relative freedom given management in determining "line of business." Of course, for a company using classes of similar products or services as its basis for determining lines of business, repetition of the disclosure will be unnecessary. It should also be noted that to the extent such classification is not coincident with the company's determination of its lines of business or where the company is not engaged in more than one line of business, disclosure is limited to proportion of sales and revenues and does not require a showing of contribution to earnings.

There were various comments with respect to the percentage test used in the proposed amendments. The Commission has carefully considered all of these comments and has examined financial data voluntarily furnished by numerous companies in which the information as to contribution of lines of business has been broken down on a basis of less than 15 percent and in some cases on a basis of less than 10 percent. The data indicated that in the case of many larger multiline companies, a substantial portion of the aggregate business done was represented by lines of business which individually contributed less than 15 percent to the company's aggregate business. The Commission has concluded that in the case of larger companies a breakdown of lines of business on a basis of 10 percent will provide material information regarding a significant portion of the company's aggregate business represented by lines which individually contribute less than 15 percent to its business. With respect to smaller companies, however, the Commission has concluded that a breakdown of lines of business on a basis of 15 percent will provide adequate disclosure. Accordingly it is provided that where the total sales and revenues exceeded $50 million during either of the last two fiscal years the 10 percent test shall be used and where they did not exceed that amount the 15 percent test may be used.

Comparable amendments to other disclosure requirements are being deferred pending the completion of consideration of the recently completed study of disclosure under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Th foregoing amendments, the text of which is set forth below, shall be effective with respect to registration statements filed on any of the specified forms on or after August 14, 1969.

By the Commission.

Orval L. DuBois,
Secretary.

I. FORMS S–1 AND 10

Item 9 of Form S–1 and Item 3 of Form 10 have been amended to read as follows:

(a) Briefly describe the business done and intended to be done by the registrant and its subsidiaries and the general development of such business during the past five years, or such shorter period as the registrant may have been engaged in business.

Instructions. 1. The description shall not relate to the powers and objects specified in the charter, but to the actual business done and intended to be done. Include the business of subsidiaries of the registrant only insofar as is necessary to understand the character and development of the business conducted by the total enterprise.

2. In describing developments, information shall be given as to matters such as the following: The nature and results of any bankruptcy, receivership or similar proceedings with respect to the registrant or any of its significant subsidiaries; the nature and results of any other materially important reorganization, readjustment or succession of the registrant or any of its significant subsidiaries; the acquisition or disposition of any material amount of assets otherwise than in the ordinary course of business; any materially important changes in the types of products produced or services rendered by the registrant and its subsidiaries; and any materially important changes in the mode of conducting the business, such as fundamental changes in the methods of distribution.

3. The business of a predecessor or predecessors shall be deemed to be the business of the registrant for the purpose of this item.

4. Appropriate disclosure shall be made with respect to any material portion of the business which may be subject to renegotiation of profits or termination of contracts or subcontracts at the election of the Government.

(b) (1) *Information as to lines of business.* If the registrant and its subsidiaries are engaged in more than one line of business, state, for each of the registrant's last five fiscal years, or for each fiscal year ending after December 31, 1966, or for each fiscal year the registrant has been engaged in business, whichever period is less, the approximate amount or percentage of (i) total sales and revenues, and (ii) income (or loss) before income taxes and extraordinary items, attributable to each line of business which during either of the last two fiscal year accounted for—

(A) 10 percent or more of the total of sales and revenues,

(B) 10 percent or more of income before income taxes and extraordinary items computed without deduction of loss resulting from operations of any line of business, or

(C) a loss which equalled or exceeded 10 percent of the amount of income specified in (B) above;

provided, that if total sales and revenues did not exceed $50,000,000 during either of the last two fiscal years, the percentages specified in (A), (B) and (C) above shall be 15 percent, instead of 10 percent.

If it is impracticable to state the contribution to income (or loss) before income taxes and extraordinary items for any line of business, state the contribution thereof to the results of operations most closely approaching such income, together with a brief explanation of the reasons why it is not practicable to state the contribution to such income or loss.

Instructions. 1. If the number of lines of business for which information is required exceeds ten, the registrant may, at its option, furnish the required information only for the ten lines of business deemed most important to an understanding of the business. In such event, a statement to that effect shall be set forth.

2. In grouping products or services as lines of business, appropriate consideration shall be given to all relevant factors, including rates of profitability of operations, degrees of risk and opportunity for growth. The basis for grouping such products or services and any material changes between periods in such groupings shall be briefly described.

3. Where material amounts of products or services are transferred from one line of business to another, the receiving and transferring lines may be considered a single line of business for the purpose of reporting the operating results thereof.

4. If the method of pricing intra-company transfers of products or services or the method of allocation of common or corporate costs materially affects the reported contribution to income of a line of business, such methods and any material changes between periods in such methods and the effect thereof shall be described briefly.

5. Information regarding sales or revenues or income (or loss) from different classes of products or services in operations regulated by Federal, State or municipal authorities

XUM

may be limited to those classes of products or services required by any uniform system of accounts prescribed by such authorities.

(2) *Information as to classes of products or services.* State for each fiscal year specified in (1) above the amount or percentage of total sales and revenues contributed by each class of similar products or services which contributed 10 percent or more to total sales and revenues in either of the last two fiscal years, or 15 percent or more of total sales and revenues if total sales and revenues did not exceed $50,000,000 during either of the last two fiscal years.

Instructions. 1. Paragraph (2) calls for information with respect to classes of products or services regardless of whether the registrant is engaged in more than one line of business as referred to in paragraph (1) above. However, this information may be combined, where appropriate, with the response to paragraph (1).

2. Instruction 5 to paragraph (1) above shall also apply to paragraph (2).

(c) If a material part of the business of the registrant and its subsidiaries is dependent upon a single customer, or a very few customers, the loss of any one of which would have a materially adverse effect on the registrant, the name of the customer or customers and other material facts with respect to their relationship, if any, to the registrant and the importance of the business to the registrant shall be stated.

(d) If the registrant and its subsidiaries engage in material operations outside the United States, or if a material portion of sales or revenues is derived from customers outside the United States, appropriate disclosure shall be made with respect to the importance of that part of the business to the registrant and the risks attendant thereto. Insofar as practicable, furnish information with respect to volume and relative profitability of such business.

(e) Indicate briefly, to the extent material, the general competitive conditions in the industry in which the registrant and its subsidiaries are engaged, or intend to engage, and the position of the enterprise in the industry. If several products or services are involved, separate consideration shall be given to the principal products or services or classes of products or services.

(f) The Commission may, upon the request of the registrant, and where consistent with the protection of investors, permit the omission of any of the information herein required or the furnishing in substitution therefor of appropriate information of comparable character. The Commission may also require the furnishing of other information in addition to, or in substitution for, the information herein required in any case where such information is necessary or appropriate for an adequate description of the business done or intended to be done.

II. FORM S–7

Item 5 of Form S–7 has been amended to read as follows:

(a) Identify the business done and intended to be done by the registrant and its subsidiaries. In the case of an extractive enterprise, give appropriate information as to development, reserves and production. Appropriate disclsoure shall be made with respect to any portion of the business which may be subject to renegotiation of profits or termination of contracts or subcontracts at the election of the Government.

(b) (1) *Information as to lines of business.* If the registrant and its subsidiaries are engaged in more than one line of business, state, for each of the registrant's last five fiscal years, or for each fiscal year ending after December 31, 1966, whichever period is less, the approximate amount or percentage of (i) total sales and revenues, and (ii) income (or loss) before income taxes and extraordinary items, attributable to each line of business which during either of the last two fiscal years accounted for—

(A) 10 percent or more of the total of sales and revenues,

(B) 10 percent or more of income before income taxes and extraordinary items computed without deduction of loss resulting from operations of any line of business, or

(C) a loss which equalled or exceeded 10 percent of the amount of income specified in (B) above.

If it is impracticable to state the contribution to income (or loss) before income taxes and extraordinary items for any line of business, state the contribution thereof to the results of operations most closely approaching such income, together with a brief explanation of the reasons why it is not practicable to state the contribution to such income or loss.

Instructions. 1. If the number of lines of business for which information is required exceeds ten, the registrant may, at its option, furnish the required information only for the ten lines of business deemed most important to an understanding of the business. In such event, a statement to that effect shall be set forth.

2. In grouping products or services as lines of business, appropriate consideration shall be given to all relevant factors, including rates of profitability of operations, degrees of risk and opportunity for growth. The basis for grouping such products or services and any material changes between periods in such groupings shall be briefly described.

3. Where material amounts of products or services are transferred from one line of business to another, the receiving and transferring lines may be considered a single line of business for the purpose of reporting the operating results thereof.

4. If the method of pricing intra-company transfers of products or services or the method of allocation of common or corporate costs materially affects the reported contribution to income of a line of business, such methods and any material changes between periods in such methods and the effect thereof shall be described briefly.

5. Information regarding sales or revenues or income (or loss) from different classes of products or services in operations regulated by Federal, State or municipal authorities may be limited to those classes of products or services required by any uniform system of accounts prescribed by such authorities.

(2) *Information as to classes of products or services.* State for each fiscal year specified in (1) above the amount or percentage or total sales and revenues contributed by each class of similar products or services which contributed 10 percent or more to total sales and revenues in either of the last two fiscal years.

Instructions. 1. Paragraph (2) calls for information with respect to classes of products or services regardless of whether the registrant is engaged in more than one line of business as referred to in paragraph (1) above. However, this information may be combined, where appropriate, with the response to paragraph (1).

2. Instruction 5 to paragraph (1) above shall also apply to paragraph (2).

(c) If a material part of the business of the registrant and its subsidiaries is dependent upon a single customer, or a very few customers, the loss of any one of which would have a materially adverse effect on the registrant, the name of the customer or customers and other material facts with respect to their relationship, if any, to the registrant and the importance of the business to the registrant shall be stated.

(d) If the registrant and its subsidiaries engage in material operations outside the United States, or if a material portion of sales or revenues is derived from customers outside the United States, appropriate disclosure shall be made with respect to the importance of that part of the business to the registrant and the risks attendant thereto. Insofar as practicable, furnish information with respect to volume and relative profitability of such business.

(e) Briefly describe any pending legal proceedings to which the registrant or any of its subsidiaries is a party which may have a substantial effect upon the earnings or financial condition of the registrant.

(f) The Commission may, upon the request of the registrant, and where consistent with the protection of investors, permit the omission of any of the information herein required or the furnishing in substitution therefor of appropriate information of comparable character. The Commission may also require the furnishing of other information in addition to, or in substitution for, the information herein required in any case where such information is necessary or appropriate for an adequate description of the business done or intended to be done.

EXHIBIT 4

[From Securities Regulation & Law Report, June 25, 1969]

REVISION OF DIVISIONAL REPORTING PROPOSALS DRAWS NEGATIVE COMMENT

Critics of the proposed S–1, S–7, and Form 10 changes are not placated by the SEC's revised release (No. 33–4949, Feb. 18, 1969). The Commission's original proposals for tightening divisional reporting requirements, as a means of handling the growing number of diversified registrants, were published in Release No. 33–4922 (Sept. 4, 1968). Comments were invited and considered by the Commission. The second release reflects some of the suggested revisions—but not enough to satisfy the critics. In the second comment period, negative votes from industry, accounting firms, and professional organizations once again flooded the Commission.

Presently, registration forms require only "an indication, insofar as practicable, of the relative importance of each class of similar products or services which contributed 15 percent or more to the gross volume of business done during the last fiscal year." (Release No. 33–4922, Sept. 4, 1968). If proposed changes go through, 15 percent will be tightened to 10 percent. "Relative importance" will be explicitly defined as "amount or percentage of sales, or contribution to net revenue." The "last year" will be extended to cover the "last five years." "Class of products" will be changed to read "line of business" and companies will have to indicate the rate of profitability, degree of risk, and opportunity for growth within each line of business reported.

UNPOPULAR 10 PERCENT REQUIREMENT

The proposed 10 percent divisional reporting criterion still ranks highest on the list of objections. The requirement that rate of profitability, degree of risk, and projected growth information be discussed is the target of almost as much criticism; and the possible extension of the reported time period to cover a maximum five preceeding years is another very unpopular provision retained in the revised proposals.

BEYOND THE PALE

Most writers favor retention of the present 15 percent criteria for determining a reportable line of business. Many note in their arguments that the 15 percent figure was recommended in the Mautz study, "Financial Reporting by Diversified Companies" prepared by the Financial Executives Research Foundation and referred to by the Commission in Release No. 33–4922. Excessive fragmentation of reported data was frequently cited as a reason against 10 percent reporting. One particularly strong comment, registered by J. D. Terrell Couch, General Counsel for Marathon Oil Company, claims that "the effect of the proposed amendments is to force financial reporting beyond the pale of accepted accounting principles."

While 10 percent reporting as applied to companies with less than $1 million annual sales might produce some fairly exhaustive data, 10 percent as applied to billion dollar conglomerates could still leave huge areas of their financial operations concealed. This point was made in a letter by James R. Russell, Vice President of Illinois Tool Works, Inc. "In a $2,000,000,000 sales conglomerate a 10% line is a $200,000,000 business and operations of this size are still in the minority. In contrast, in a small to medium size company a 10% line could be $5,000,000 to $20,000,000."

COMPETITIVE HARM

Possible competitive damage to a company as a result of revealing information about its operations was the major argument used against the requirement covering rates of profitability, degree of risk, and opportunity for growth. It was also used by some as an argument against the 10 percent reporting requirement, since this could place smaller companies in more revealing positions than their larger competitors. Charles W. Stewart, President of the Machinery and Allied Products Institute, said that adoption of such requirements would result in "providing priceless signals to existing or would-be conglomerates to deploy their financial resources in those areas where the registration statements of competitors suggest that better-than-average profits are to be made."

Incentives to innovate could be undermined by requirements forcing companies to reveal areas of high profitability, others warn. Attempts to innovate expose a company to the risk of financial loss if a new project is not a success. The potential rewards of innovation must outweigh the risks if companies are to be induced to undertake R & D projects. The high profits enjoyed by companies that first enter a hot, new area provide such incentives. Publicized information on high profit rates would serve as a signal for competition to enter the field, however, and the period of high return to the innovator would be cut prematurely short.

COMPLAINTS FROM STOCKHOLDERS

Revealing areas of low profitability would place companies under the burden of having to justify their actions to stockholders, say other critics.

Management's decisions, even when sound, might be difficult to explain to the layman. James B. Ammon, Vice President and Treasurer of Baxter Laboratories notes, "An investor might conclude that a non-profitable line of business (when charged with allocated overhead) could and will be dropped to improve earnings. Yet if marginal income exceeds marginal expense for this line, the continuation of the line contributes to the overhead for the common facilities and disruption of it would adversely affect earnings." Many writers point out that new lines under development often operate at a deficit before they start to show a profit, and revealing their status could produce pressure against innovation.

IRRETRIEVABLE DATA

The requirement that companies supply information on their various lines of business extending back over a five-year period meet vigorous opposition. Many commentators feel that this would contribute little meaningful information, and that in any case the value of such data would not justify the expense involved in gathering it. Other companies flatly deny their ability to comply, stating that such information was not maintained in their records, and would be irretrievable.

WHAT IS A LINE OF BUSINESS?

The lack of clear definition as to what is meant by a "line of business" is attacked as a particular area of weakness in the SEC proposals. The difficulties such a loose definition could cause are explained with great clarity in a letter from 3M: "[T]he Company has in recent years divided its business into six product groupings. These six groupings have various components. For example, the Tape and Allied Products group has three operating divisions; the Electrical Products group has eight operating divisions. We deem it important to avoid any controversy on whether the Electrical Products group is a single line of business or eight lines of business or that any different combination of the eight are lines of business."

UNITARY COMPANIES GET UNFAIR TREATMENT

Another requirement in the revised SEC proposal would make a unitary company, engaged in only one line of business, report on sales and profitability of each product or service accounting for 10 percent or more of its gross revenues. Many writers feel that this would place small unitary companies in an extremely unfair position because they would have to reveal product information that would not have to be made public by their large conglomerate competitors.

SINGLE CUSTOMER, FOREIGN REVENUES, AND GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

The proposed SEC changes would require further that registrants supply information on revenues from foreign customers when those revenues represent a significant portion of total sales; that they discuss the government contracts they hold subject to renegotiation or termination at the election of a new administration; and that they reveal the identity of major customers when the loss of their business would materially affect the company's earnings.

The government contract requirement is fairly well received. The foreign business requirement attracts only minor comment, with some writers suggesting that where political risk is not a factor (as would be the case in trade with West European nations) the information was unnecessary. But the requirement to reveal the identity of key customers draws strong protest. Many express the view that this information is purely confidential in nature, and that revealing it is unprecedented in business practice. Wells-Gardner, a small specialized electronics firm, makes the following argument:

"Today, we are limiting ourselves to seven accounts—each of them important to our operation. Upon contemplation, the reason is obvious. Each account requires their own styling of their line, even though the chassis used may be quite similar. To serve more than seven accounts with their 'own lines' becomes difficult, especially in the final assembly area. Contrast this with 'national brand' manufacturers who own or control their own distribution, manufacturing only one complete line."

"To disclose publicly the importance of each of these customers would have a disastrous effect on this company's operation. It would not only be unhealthy information for each of our accounts to be privy to, but would make us 'open prey' for competitive action."

ACCOUNTING METHODS

The Commission's proposals leave the choice of accounting methods to the discretion of the registering companies, requiring only that such methods be explained where decisions on intra-company pricing, or allocation of costs between divisions, materially affect the "reported contributions to income" of the various lines of business. Several commentators express concern over the looseness in this area. The Machinery and Allied Products Institute notes:

"Given the flexibility of generally accepted accounting principles as well as the almost endless variety of methods by which common costs are distributed among differing lines of business within a diversified company, even the most sophisticated investor would be unable to compare directly the operating results of quite different companies. Moreover, cost allocation methods change over time with changes in corporate organization and product development so that year-to-year comparisons of figures within the same company are not altogether meaningful without providing a technical explanation that is unlikely to be helpful to the average investor."

ADEQUATE FOLLOW-UP IN PERIODIC REPORTS

Even the most stringent requirements covering divisional data in registration statements would be of little value to potential investors if they are not backed up by equally stringent periodic reporting requirements. Especially where fast-acquiring conglomerates are involved, the information filed on the S–1, S–7, or Form 10 could be rendered effectively useless within a matter of weeks. The SEC Releases covering proposed changes in S–1, S–7, and Form 10 make no mention of the need to bring periodic reporting requirements into line with registration forms, but the Commission Staff has explained in response to specific questions on this point that there are proposals made in the Wheat Report for changes in the 10–K annual reporting form.

WHEAT'S NEW 10–K GOES FURTHER

The proposed 10–K Form printed in the Appendix of the Wheat Report would go well beyond the proposed S–1, S–7, and Form 10. Companies would be required to comment on the competitive conditions in their industry, and to give some indication of their own competitive position therein. Information would have to be supplied on the firm's backlog of orders from the past fiscal year, and estimates made on how much of that backlog was expected to be eliminated in the next fiscal year. Sources and availability of raw materials would have to be discussed. The relative amounts of research being financed by the company and by its customers would have to be revealed, to name just a few of the provisions.

The Staff has no comment to make on the possibility of simultaneous implementation of the proposed registration changes and the revised 10–K however, and as yet the Commission has given no indication of when it might implement the changes in the S–1, S–7, and Form 10 requirements.

The Commission's February release contained the following statement:

"In view of the length of time the proposals have been under consideration, the wide publicity they have received and the extensive consideration they have received from registrants, trade and professional groups and other persons, the Commission believes that a limited period of time should be adequate for the submission of additional comments."

The time period for accepting comments on the revised proposals was limited to 20 days so that another release formally adopting the proposals could be issued promptly. That was four months ago. As yet the final release has not appeared.

SRLR Comment: Protection of the investor is the concern of the Commission, and its objective in tailoring the S–1, S–7 and Form 10 changes has been to provide the investor with adequate information. The Senate Select Committee on Small Business (SCSB), on the other hand, serves the interest of the small businessman, and the Committee does not feel the proposed S–1, S–7, and Form 10 changes will give enough protection to small business. The SCSB supports the new registration requirements, but it feels that adequate information for the investor is not necessarily adequate information for the small businessman. Senator Gaylord Nelson (D–Wisc.), Chairman of the SCSB Subcommittee on Monopoly, has repeatedly urged the Commission to adopt the proposed registration changes without further delay, and he has also promised (in a June 15 Release) "early introduction of a bill that would go 'substantially beyond' the pending SEC requirements." Committee spokesmen explain their position in the following manner: Given present registration and reporting requirements, the non-diversified company completely reveals its competitive position in its annual report. Anyone can tell at a glance how it is doing, but the single-line-of-business company is not able to obtain comparable information on its diversified competitor. The unitary company is thus placed in an unfair competitive position. For example, a firm in one line of business, the manufacture of laminated windshields, may have as its supplier one of the huge basic glass manufacturers. If the supplier is diversified, the windshield manufacturer will have no way of determining what kind of profit the basic glass company is making on its business with him, whereas the supplier knows exactly how much profit it can squeeze from its customer. Committee spokesmen further point out that, behind their consolidated balance sheets, the nation's largest corporations could conceal financial details greater than the state budget of New York.

The Nelson bill is still being written. As yet the SCSB is not ready to make a prediction as to when it will be introduced, or the form it will take.

EXHIBIT 5

[From the Journal of Commerce, July 9, 1969]

FROM COMPETITORS, CRITICS, CAPITAL—BIG FIRMS FIGHT DATA REQUESTS

(By Jan Nugent)

WASHINGTON, July 8.—The most bitter "freedom of information" battle may be waged, not over the musty file cabinets of government bureaucracy, but over the profit and loss statements of some of the country's large diversified firms.

As multi-product companies have grown, so have the demands from single-line competitors, corporate critics and official Washington for detailed financial breakdowns by conglomerate enterprises on a product by product basis.

Presently, most diversified firms lump together profits and losses from all divisions in reports to the Securities and Exchange Commission and their stockholders.

The SEC believes the practice does not provide investors with enough information to make sound investment judgments and has proposed a rule, not yet final, for more detailed reporting.

The diversified firms argue that this kind of disclosure would require complicated, time-consuming bookkeeping for no legitimate purpose. They also maintain it would place them at a decided competitive disadvantage.

The detailed financial data also has important antitrust implications. It could help validate or lay to rest a traditional charge made against large, diversified firms—they use earnings from their profitable divisions to subsidize their money-losing ventures and squeeze out smaller, local competitors.

If the data substantiate that accusation, it could inspire a rash of private (or federal) antitrust suits.

A Senate Small Business Subcommittee is holding hearings on the auto industry this week, zeroing in on "needless corporate secrecy" practiced by the Detroit Giants.

Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D-Wisc.) subcommittee chairman, feels the auto makers make too big a mystery of production costs and divisional profits and losses. He noted that the four largest auto companies had earlier refused to disclose production costs, divisional financial data or unit-cost figures to his panel.

KEY PART

The House Judiciary Committee, midway in its conglomerate investigation, regards the detailed financial information as a key part of its probe. So far, success in attaining it has been mixed.

The SEC softened its initial proposal on the issue, which has now been pending since September 1968. The present version would require companies to disclose separately profits and losses from products or services which made up 10 per cent of total sales, operating revenue, or before-tax income for the past two fiscal years.

The SEC decided not to make diversified companies report the amount of assets used in a particular type of activity, or to require a breakdown of sales and earnings received from foreign sources, from a single customer or the government.

The agency's arm has been nudged by some legislators on Capitol Hill who feel the present proposal is too little and too late (since it is still not in effect).

Sen. Nelson has threatened to introduce legislation going "substantially beyond" pending SEC requirements. Sen. Philip Hart (D-Mich.), chairman of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, indicated in recent public remarks he was not satisfied with the SEC proposal, or with the speed with which it was emerging.

CABINET COMMITTEE

President Johnson's cabinet committee on price stability criticized SEC's 10 per cent requirement, contending it would produce product line reporting from corporations with only a few product classes, but very little information from huge conglomerates which make hundreds of items.

The cabinet committee recommended extension of detailed reporting to product categories which accounted for 5 per cent of sales. Under the 10 per cent requirement, the 50 largest manufacturing companies would have to give data for only 14 per cent of the industry categories they operated in 1963, the committee's report contended.

More detailed data could also dash or enhance the management mystique in which conglomerates formerly gloried. "If you were to find one or two divisions were supporting the rest of the company, it would take away some of the romance," one source commented.

EXHIBIT 6

[From the New York Times, July 15, 1969]

DISCLOSURE RULES FOR BIG DIVISIONS ADOPTED BY SEC

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, July 14.—The Securities and Exchange Commission announced the final adoption today of its new rules requiring corporations to report the contribution to sales and earnings by each of their different product lines.

Thus, conglomerate companies will now have to report on the results of the various divisions that contribute 10 per cent or more to sales or earnings. However, details will have to be reported on only the 10 most important product lines.

For companies with total sales of less than $50 million, only separate product lines contributing at least 15 per cent to sales or earnings will have to be reported.

SOME DISCRETION ALLOWED

The commission decided to leave up to management the definition of a separate "line of business." It said:

"Various suggestions were made for some specific indications of the meaning of 'line of business.' However, in view of the numerous ways in which companies are organized to do business, the variety of products and services, the history of predecessor and acquired companies and the diversity of operating characteristics, such as markets, raw materials, manufacturing processes and competitive conditions, it is not deemed feasible or desirable to be more specific in defining a line of business.

"Management, because of its familiarity with company structure, is in the most informed position to separate the company into components on a reasonable basis for reporting purposes. Accordingly, discretion is left to the management to devise a reporting pattern appropriate to the particular company's operations and responsive to its organizational concepts."

EXHIBIT 7

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 15, 1969]

SEC SETS CONGLOMERATE REPORTING GUIDE; REGULATION ALTERED TO HELP SMALLER FIRMS

WASHINGTON.—The Securities and Exchange Commission adopted a slightly modified version of its earlier proposal to require more detailed financial reporting from conglomerates and other diversified companies.

The new regulation will change SEC registration forms, so that when companies register securities with the SEC they must disclose the relative contribution that major product lines and services make to earnings. The action stems from the SEC's growing concern over companies that have diversified and, as a result, tended to lump together revenue and profit from a number of different activities.

The SEC said the new requirements will be effective with respect to registration statements filed starting Aug. 14.

The heart of the disclosure rule requires companies with sales of more than $50 million a year to report separately on those products or services that, during the previous two fiscal years, contributed at least 10% to total sales and operating revenue, or to income before taxes and extraordinary items have been deducted.

The requirements were lightened for smaller companies, on which a 15% test would apply. This is a change from the earlier proposal. It would have used 10% for all companies.

The new regulation also requires separate disclosure of any product line that resulted in a loss equal to at least 10% of the gross income of the larger companies, and 15% for the smaller ones. It provides that where a company has more than 10 lines of business, disclosure may be limited to the "10 most important lines."

The SEC declined to define "line of business." It said that "management, because of its familiarity with company structure, is in the most informed position to separate the company into components on a reasonable basis for reporting purposes."

EXHIBIT 8

[From the Evening Star (Washington, D.C.), July 14, 1969]

SEC ORDERING CONGLOMERATES TO EXPLAIN NET

The Securities and Exchange Commission ordered today new rules that would force large diversified corporations to disclose earnings and losses of their subsidiaries—or at least of their various lines of business.

The new regulations, which go into effect Aug. 14, will require such reports any time one of these corporations decides to issue securities which will be made available to the public. The rules, therefore, will hit particularly at mergers in which a corporation would have to issue stocks or other securities as part of the transaction.

The regulation, however, will not affect annual reports that corporations must make to the SEC, and the only time that this information will be required to be made public will be in connection with a new securities issue.

FOR LARGE AND SMALL

Under the new rule conglomerate corporations with total sales and revenue greater than $50 million will have to list separately the sales, operating revenue and contributions to profit separately of any of their lines of business which account for at least 10 percent of total income before taxes or 10 percent of sales and revenue.

For smaller corporations—those with less

XUM

than $50 million—a similar disclosure would have to be made for lines of business that account for 15 percent of sales and profit.

Similar statements will also have to be made in connection with losses.

The SEC did not specifically define what it means by "line of business" which must be the subject of these reports. It cited the fact that companies are organized in a variety of ways, and left up to the corporations the discretion to devise proper reporting procedures which reflect their own organizations.

Presumably, for many corporations, the line of business would be tantamount to divisions or subsidiaries.

MATTER OF CRITICISM

Conglomerate corporations have been criticized for decisions in some instances against showing the profits or losses of individual divisions. Some critics contend that conglomerates use this as a means to mask the actual financial results of subsidiaries that might not be doing very well. This is especially true in the case of newly merged subsidiaries.

The SEC announced last February its proposal to make these new rules forcing the conglomerates to disclose more of their financial activities. The SEC later studied comments furnished by a number of companies.

The SEC action to impose new rules was by a 4–0 vote. But the chairman, Hamer H. Budge, voted against the 10 percent disclosure requirement for large corporations. Budge would have required them to report only in those instances in which a line of business accounted for 15 percent of sales or profits.

Exhibit 9

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 15, 1969]

SEC Adopts Disclosure Regulations

The Securities and Exchange Commission yesterday adopted new rules that will require diversified corporations, including conglomerates, to make public more detailed financial information.

The regulations, which become effective Aug. 14, will require companies to report separately on lines of business that contribute 10 per cent or more to total sales or income, if the company sells more than $50 million annually.

Smaller companies must report separately on items that contribute 15 per cent or more to the company's earnings.

Losses must also be reported in the same proportion as earnings.

The new rules are part of an SEC drive toward greater disclosure of corporate information. The SEC contends this is necessary to give investors a better assessment of stocks they contemplate buying or selling.

The adopted rule is a modification of one proposed earlier. The main change made by the SEC, after receiving comments from those interested, was to insert the 15 per cent requirement for smaller companies. The earlier proposal called for 10 per cent for all companies.

The SEC did not attempt to define "line of business," but left that to the discretion of management to separate on a reasonable basis for reporting purposes.

STRATEGIC FORCE LEVELS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, in the debate over the ABM, a great deal of information has come forth concerning the strategic balance between the United States and the Soviet Union. We are all aware of the differences in emphasis and interpretation of this information among authorities on the nuclear deterrence system.

One very important point in these differences involves the Soviet Union's intermediate range missiles. It has come to my attention that a study prepared by the National Strategy Committee of the American Security Council titled "The ABM and the Changed Strategic Military Balance, U.S.A. versus U.S.S.R.," cites at 2,750 the total number of Soviet strategic missiles including medium and intermediate range weapons. The U.S. total is cited at 1,710.

It is my understanding, Mr. President, that the actual number of existing Soviet ballistic missiles that could strike the United States is about 1,000 although that number will increase as the Soviet construction programs for the SS–9 missile and submarine-based missiles proceed.

Mr. President, while I have the fullest respect for the experience and sincerity of those who wrote this report, and the members of the American Security Council who have endorsed it, I believe the picture of Soviet missile superiority presented by the report is misleading, and should be understood with the qualification that well over half of the Soviet missiles cited in the 2,750 figure do not enter the strategic balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R. To support this qualification, Mr. President, I submit for the Record figures supplied to me by the Department of Defense indicating the number of Soviet intercontinental missiles at 1,077.

	United States	U.S.S.R.
ICBM's	1,054	1,000
Polaris missiles	[1] 656	[2] 77
Total	1,710	1,077
Intercontinental bombers	646	150
Deliverable warheads	4,200	1,200

[1] 41 submarines.

[2] 5 submarines.

A further point of difference, Mr. President, concerns the number of Soviet strategic bombers. The American Security Council study cites the total number of Soviet bombers at 1,150. The U.S. total is cited at 680. The number of Soviet heavy bombers is cited at 150.

The fact that 1,000 of the bombers cited in the overall Soviet total are medium-range bombers not designed to deliver a nuclear weapon against the United States, should not be left out of this particular picture. If we were to include in the strategic balance all such medium-range weapons, Mr. President, we would have to bring in our own carrier-based planes and our tactical nuclear weapons in Europe. This would not be a productive approach to the measurement of the strategic balance. As we go about the important business of evaluating our strategic position in the world, let us not make the error of oversimplifying facts related to our long-term security in order to gain support, one way or another, for a decision that may determine our policy in seeking this security.

THE INTERNATIONAL GRAINS ARRANGEMENT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the International Grains Arrangement should be subjected to an immediate review and evaluation.

If such a review results in recommendations to withdraw from the agreement or that it should be amended, then there should be no hesitation in doing so.

In simple terms, the International Grains Arrangement, as ratified by the Senate on June 13 a year ago, is bust. My warnings to the Senate at the time have been borne out.

We were assured at the time that U.S. wheat would be kept competitive in the world market. The reverse has been true. The International Grains Agreement has influenced the loss of price competitiveness in our world wheat market. The organizations which supported the IGA—Great Plains Wheat, Inc., Western Wheat Associates, U.S.A., Inc., and National Association of Wheat Growers—all now admit that their support was misplaced. To quote from a speech by Carl Dumler, president of the Great Plains Wheat, Inc.:

> In fact, we have had to price below the IGA minimum in order to make sales. And we have lost sales because of this non-competitiveness.

We were assured at the time that our wheat exports would not suffer. But they have. U.S. wheat exports are more than one-third lower than at the same time last year.

I warned at the time of ratification—and I said so—that the agreement would require a U.S. export tax on wheat. Within a few days after ratification, export taxes were applied. And they have ranged from 21 cents to 17 cents a bushel since. In fact, if a Wall Street Journal article of July 15 is accurate—and I have no reason to doubt it—we will soon be engaged in what would amount to an export subsidy war with other nations. To quote from the article:

> The U.S. will pay substantial wheat export subsidies, ranging up to $50 million a year or more, if other wheat-exporting nations don't act soon to adjust their prices upward . . .

The article takes note of this fact:

> The Common Market countries already are subsidizing export wheat sales and this [the U.S. threat] would mean they would have to increase their subsidy payments to maintain their sales volume . . .

These sets of circumstances, fueled by growing wheat surpluses, have resulted in depressing U.S. wheat prices and reduced net income of our wheat farmers.

Several meetings of officials of the leading wheat exporting countries have occurred in recent months, the last as late as last Friday. All were called to probe the problem. All have resulted in vague communiques, expressing concern and the need for corrective action.

Our interests have clearly been prejudiced under provisions of article 21 of the International Grains Arrangement. This article clearly sets out that in such a case the matter should be brought to the attention of the International Wheat Council. If the Council doesn't provide the relief—and two-thirds of the votes cast by the exporting countries and two-thirds of the votes cast by the importing countries are required for a decision granting relief—then the United States may withdraw

XUM

from the arrangement at the end of the crop year by giving written notice.

Mr. President, such action is clearly indicated.

I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal article, entitled "United States Threatens To Pay Wheat Export Subsidy Near $50 Million a Year," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES THREATENS TO PAY WHEAT EXPORT SUBSIDY NEAR $50 MILLION A YEAR—HARD-LINE POSITION SEEKS TO GET OTHER NATIONS TO MOVE SOON TO ADJUST THEIR PRICES UPWARD

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. will pay substantial wheat export subsidies, ranging up to $50 million a year or more, if other wheat-exporting nations don't act soon to adjust their prices upward, a Government source disclosed.

It's possible that the subsidies would be paid to exporters, dealers or others to permit them to quote lower export prices.

The U.S. position wasn't spelled out in the communique issued here last Friday at the close of two days of world wheat-price discussions by representatives of the European Common Market, the U.S., Canada, Australia and Argentina. But a U.S. official said the Common Market delegation, in particular, got the message, and it's expected there will be some follow-up development in Brussels this week on the "corrective action" mentioned in the communique.

The threat by the U.S. to put on wheat export subsidies would be felt most strongly by the Common Market countries (Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and West Germany). They already are subsidizing export wheat sales and this would mean they would have to increase their subsidy payments to maintain their sales volume, particularly since Canada also probably could be counted on to lower its export wheat sales prices.

The official International Grains Agreement minimum price for key grades of U.S. wheat is $1.60 a bushel, at Gulf ports.

The word on the hard line taken by U.S. officials in these talks apparently didn't surface sooner because the negotiators had agreed to say nothing beyond the text of the communique at the time it was made public.

U.S. officials concede that nearly all major wheat-exporting nations that were parties to the International Grains Agreement that came into force on July 1, 1968, have been undercutting the treaty's minimum export prices for wheat. In recent months, a Washington official said, price cutting by France and Australia especially had been hurting U.S. and Canadian sales.

The communique issued by the major wheat-exporting nations said only that they had reviewed current world prices and recognized "distortions," and that "corrective action" would be taken by some exporting countries to bring prices into a proper competitive relationship.

For France, the major wheat-exporting country within the Common Market, to adjust its export pricing practices would require some policy decisions within the Common Market as a whole, U.S. officials said. A higher export price for French wheat presumably would involve additional costs to the Common Market for its agricultural price supports.

It's understood that Australia, represented in the wheat talks by John McEwen, deputy prime minister, who also is his country's minister of trade and agriculture, also may adjust its wheat export selling practices to avoid undercutting U.S. and Canada on competitive varieties.

The price-cutting competition among major wheat exporters is traceable, U.S. sources say, to the prospect that the current world surplus isn't likely to disappear for "a year or two."

In the wheat negotiations here last week, there apparently wasn't any effort to reach agreement on lowering of the price floors in the International Grains Agreement for all the big exporting countries. That's something "we may have to take up later," a U.S. official said.

U.S. VISIBLE GRAIN SUPPLY

Chicago—U.S. visible grain supply, according to the Chicago Board of Trade (in bushels, thousands omitted)

	Week ended July 11, 1969	Change from week ago	Year ago
Wheat	195,188	+22,908	161,264
Corn	90,732	−16	79,475
Oats	35,319	+1,687	19,060
Rye	6,922	+201	5,353
Barley	25,022	+2,782	14,276
Soybeans	33,449	−793	12,764
Grain sorghums	31,638	−261	32,312

THE SURTAX HAS NOT AND WILL NOT STOP INFLATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, for the last 2 or 3 days, at least, the Senate has been treated to speeches on the surtax. The assumption is made that all we have to do to stop inflation is to continue the surtax. I think that must puzzle many Americans who recognize that, more than a year ago, July 1, 1968, we passed a surtax.

We were told, and most Members of Congress unfortunately believed it, that all we had to do to stop inflation a year ago, or at least to slow down the rise in the cost of living and the rise in interest rates, was pass the surtax bill.

What happened? That bill was passed July 1, 1968, and it obviously has not worked. We have had a much sharper rise in the cost of living, so that now the poor American taxpayer not only has to pay more for everything he buys, since the cost of living is higher, but he has to pay more in taxes as well. In addition, interest rates are higher than they have ever been in the history of this country. Now those who advocate that we continue the surtax say that, in the cause of responsible government, we must extend the surtax for at least another 6 months.

I do not know why so many are so sure this is the way. The Joint Economic Committee, which has the responsibility to inform Congress of its judgment, after extensive hearings, on what economic policies we should adopt, did not recommend that we extend the surtax. It is true that the administration is asking that we do it; but even those who are the strongest advocates among the economists have begun to recognize that in a trillion dollar economy—the level of our gross national product is now virtually $950 billion—whether we have a $10 billion surtax or do not have it is not really going to be the decisive factor. After all, that amounts to only about 1 percent of the gross national product. It was not decisive in the past year, and it will not be decisive in the coming year.

Furthermore, Mr. President, there are far more sensible things that this Government can do, and I think very well might do, to stem inflation—steps which we could take that I think would receive a great deal more approbation from the American people, and I think would be economically more responsible as well.

One is to cut Federal spending. We have an opportunity to do it. The bill we are now working on is an excellent example. The Nixon administration has taken steps—and they deserve credit for doing it—in cutting the amount of the procurement bill presently before the Senate by about $1 billion. The committee, under the distinguished chairmanship of the Senator from Mississippi, did an excellent job in reducing that bill another $2 billion.

This was a $23 billion budget to begin with; it is already down to $20 billion, and some of us feel it can be cut further. If we can cut another billion dollars out of this item, I think we can see the possibilities for cutting the overall military budget, which was close to $80 billion. The bill on which we are working represents only one-fourth of the total military budget. If we can cut $4 or $5 billion out of this part of it, I think we would have a pretty good chance of cutting, perhaps, $10 billion out of the overall military budget. Of course, in doing so we would have to make some painful decisions.

I would hope that we can reduce the space budget. I realize that now, when we are on the verge of putting an astronaut on the moon, is not the best possible time for discussing the space authorization bill, which I presume will come up shortly after the bill we are now considering.

We all recognize that the present effort in space is a response to President Kennedy's announced goal of putting a man on the moon in this decade. Now we are about to achieve that goal. The space budget for the coming year is about $1.7 billion, based primarily on the assumption that we want three lunar landings next year, and three the year after that. But if we follow the recommendations of the President's Advisory Council, and confine ourselves this year and next year to unmanned space exploration, we can save most of that $1.7 billion—certainly more than $1 billion.

In short, I believe there is a chance for the Senate and the House of Representatives, in those two areas, to cut Federal spending by at least the $10 billion involved in the surtax. If we do that, the surtax, on the basis of any kind of assumption, will not be necessary.

PROXMIRE CALLS FOR BUDGE TO END HIS CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 3 additional minutes on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It grieves me to do this kind of thing, but unfortunately, a conflict of interest of the most serious kind has developed and I believe it is necessary that it be called to the attention of the Senate.

I have written a letter to the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission about it, in which I have asked him to recognize this conflict, and act accordingly. I shall read that letter.

The Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission is Hon. Hamer

XUM

Budge, and I have written him as follows:

DEAR MR. BUDGE: Recent press reports have indicated that you are negotiating for a job with the nation's largest mutual funds managed by Investors Diversified Services (IDS). If these reports are true, they represent a gross conflict of interest. It is difficult to see how you can render a fair and impartial judgment on matters affecting IDS while you are in the process of negotiating a position with IDS managed mutual funds. Moreover, it is difficult to see how you can render impartial advice on current mutual fund legislation since IDS funds account for over 10 percent of the entire mutual fund industry.

An immediate matter pending before the Commission represents an even more compelling conflict of interest. On May 27th the Senate Banking Committee requested a special SEC study on the desirability of permitting face amount certificate companies to deduct substantially all of the sales commission during the early years of the certificate. Face amount certificates are long term, fixed interest bonds sold to small investors on the installment plan. According to an earlier SEC study, the result of this front-end-load on face amount certificates was that 55% of the public who invest in these instruments lose money.

Because of the questionable propriety of continuing the front end load on Face Amount Certificates, the Senate Banking Committee called for SEC to update its earlier findings. As you know, IDS has captured over 95% of the Face Amount Certificate market. During 1967, the IDS complex received over $9 million in net income from Face Amount Certificates which is more than 50% of its entire net income. In view of the dominant position of IDS in the Face Amount Certificate Market, I urge that you immediately disqualify yourself from this study.

Since IDS accounts for over 10% of the mutual fund industry, I also believe you should immediately disqualify yourself from rendering any advice on the mutual fund legislation now pending before the House of Representatives. This legislation could save the investing public millions of dollars a year in excessive fees and sales commission charged by mutual funds.

Press reports also quote you as conceding that you have talked with IDS people about a job and that "the negotiations are still open". I hope upon reflection that you will realize you have placed yourself in an absolutely untenable position. Either these negotiations should be broken off forthwith or you should submit your resignation promptly to the President. It is highly improper for the head of a regulatory agency to negotiate for a position with the industry he supposedly regulates.

While no regulatory official should seek employment with the industry he regulates, this rule is particularly important with respect to the SEC. Investor confidence in the securities market and in the impartiality of the SEC is vital to our economy. If investors got the feeling that the SEC was dominated by the industry it regulates, public confidence in the securities market could collapse. This is why it is so important not only to avoid an actual conflict of interest, but also to avoid the mere appearance of a conflict.

I hope that you can assure the Congress that you have broken off negotiations with IDS and that under no circumstances will you accept a job with IDS mutual funds. If you cannot provide these assurances, fairness dictates that you submit your resignation to the President.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "SEC Chairman Seeks To Resign His Post," written by Philip Greer and published in today's Washington Post, reporting on the Budge conflict of interest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC CHAIRMAN SEEKS TO RESIGN HIS POST

(By Philip Greer)

Hamer H. Budge, chairman of the Securities & Exchange Commission for less than five months feels frustrated and overburdened in his post and has been negotiating to leave the Government.

According to reliable Wall Street sources, Budge was offered—and accepted—a post as president of the mutual funds managed by Investors Diversified Services, Inc., of Minneapolis.

The acceptance, however, was conditional upon approval by the Nixon administration, which turned down the idea, the sources said.

Asked about the report yesterday, Budge conceded that he has talked with IDS people and said "the negotiations are still open." But he denied that he has ever submitted his resignation to the White House.

He pointed out that the job would not be with the IDS management group, which supervises more than $6.2 billion in assets, but as president of the semi-autonomous funds themselves. "I wouldn't be interested in going with the management company," he said when asked about the report, "but representing the shareholders would be another thing."

Budge was appointed to the SEC chairmanship on Feb. 22, succeeding Manuel F. Cohen, and was named to a full five-year term on May 28.

The Budge nomination was generally applauded in Wall Street, but it was mostly because of a feeling of relief at the departure of Cohen, who pushed hard for industry reforms. The low-key Budge was regarded as the champion of smaller broker-dealers, since he often charged that the SEC levied milder penalties against large firms accused of wrong-doing than against smaller houses.

Since his appointment, the securities industry has gone into a period of dramatic upheaval. (The board of governors of the New York Stock Exchange approved yesterday a recommendation that brokerage firms be allowed to sell their own shares to the public.)

Industry leaders have complained that the SEC under Budge has not been as clear or as helpful as it was under his predecessor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO UTILIZE CERTAIN PERSONNEL IN EXPURGATING THE TRANSCRIPT OF YESTERDAY'S CLOSED-SESSION PROCEEDINGS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Senator from Mississippi, be authorized, under proper security, to utilize sworn and security-cleared personnel to examine the transcript of yesterday's proceedings in closed session, for the purpose of censoring and expurgating the copy for publication.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MISSILE TEST FACILITIES AT KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE, AND RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTH

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2546) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the selected reserve of each reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from California.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I took my position against present deployment on antiballistic missiles only after the most careful study and thought of which I am capable, and only after receiving Pentagon briefings.

I have listened to virtually every word of the current Senate debate since the pending bill was reported from committee.

And I participated, of course, in yesterday's secret session.

I now speak out against ABM with deeper conviction than ever before.

Mr. President, I wish to comment first on the statements made by our distinguished colleague from Washington when he spoke so thoughtfully last week about the nature and intentions of the Soviet leadership. He noted that a struggle for power and influence was evidently underway within the Politburo, with hard-line advocates seemingly gaining ground, but with the ultimate outcome uncertain. Citing repressive measures applied within the Soviet Union and the brutal invasion of Czechoslovakia, he described the Soviet Union as "a dangerous, unpredictable opponent" and recommended strongly that the United States "maintain a solid and prudent stance."

As I listened to the erudite analysis presented by Senator JACKSON, I tried to picture to myself what a comparable report would sound like if it were presented within the Politburo by a Soviet analyst of American affairs. I tried to imagine the evidence such an analyst would consider particularly relevant, and the hypothesis about the probable behavior of the United States which he would extract from that evidence.

Our imaginary expert in the Kremlin would look back over the last decade at the ways in which American power has been used, and at the statements which have most recently been made about our intentions. He would have to take into account such actions as the abortive invasion attempt at the Bay of Pigs in 1961 and the landing of troops in the Dominican Republic in 1965. He would have to weigh the contradictory implications of American intervention in Vietnam, half a world away from our own shores, and the network of American bases which girdles the globe and circles the Soviet Union. And he would have to look hard at the current debate over American defense policy in an effort to decide whether the United States was really concerned only with protecting its own security, or whether our recurrent claims of "superiority" implied other intentions.

In this last category, he would have to pay particular attention to the implications of our announced intention to deploy both MIRV's and an ABM system at the same time. For, as Secretary of Defense Laird has testified on several occasions, projected improvements in the accuracy of our MIRV warheads will significantly enhance their effectiveness "against hard targets"—that is, Soviet offensive missile silos. This capacity, combined with the potential damage-limiting role of an ABM system made more effective in the future, could give this country the first-strike capability which the Secretary of Defense recently asserted was being sought by the Russians. Certainly, it is hard to believe that our imaginary analyst in the Kremlin could afford to conclude otherwise than that the United States was quite possibly building toward such a capability. Our reassuring statements to the contrary notwithstanding.

What, then, would he have to report to his superiors in the Politburo? That, from the evidence, he could only recommend that they use great caution in dealing with the Americans, who appeared to him to have aggressive intentions and an almost neurotic hostility toward the Soviet Union.

This report, of course, would delight the hard-liners in the Politburo and reinforce their Marxist-Leninist view of the capitalist world. It would, presumably, reduce the influence of those who had been arguing for greater flexibility and accommodation in the Soviet stance. It would thus become, to some extent, a self-fulfilling prophecy if its recommendations were followed. For as the Soviets further chilled their relations with the United States and armed to meet the threat as they perceived it, we would be forced to respond in kind, and the cycle of mistrust and hostility would enter another unnecessary round.

This "spiral of interaction," as Prof. Marshall Shulman of Columbia described it, would be nowhere more evident than in the arms race. For weapons systems are the steel and concrete evidence of hostility and mistrust. Their deployment is normally decided on the basis of the worst feasible assumptions about a potential enemy's capacity and intentions, and each weapons system provokes its own countereffort. Thus, our elaborate air defense system was built in response to a Soviet bomber effort that never materialized; their partial ABM system replied to our expansion of offensive missile installations; and our MIRV was designed in part as an answer to their ABM. Their SS–9 missiles with multiple warheads might be seen as an answer to our announcement several years ago of plans for an ABM, which we in turn now justify as necessary to meet the threat of their SS–9.

It seems to me there is only one way to break this cycle of mistrust, this spiral of interaction that leads us to ever-increasing armaments and the instability they in turn bring to the balance of terror we call mutual deterrence. To do this, we must assume that there are rational men on both sides, in the Soviet Union as well as in this country, and we must give those rational men a chance to bring their shared concerns to the negotiating table in search of mutually beneficial agreement.

Here again, I should like to recall the testimony given by Professor Shulman on March 13 to the subcommittee headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE). Dr. Shulman at that time described the Soviet attitude toward the new Nixon administration as "tentatively hopeful," as willing to believe that circumstances might be favorable for agreed moderation of the strategic arms race. He explained Russian interest in such an agreement in cold economic terms—"the drain on resources generally and on advanced technology in particular" as a result of the heavy burden of armaments. The decision to seek agreement, he concluded, had come only after "a hard-fought debate," and "a serious concern about economic costs has been an important factor in impelling the Soviet leadership to want to find out how far the United States is prepared to go in checking the upward spiral of the strategic arms race."

This concern with wasted resources pointed out by Professor Shulman is surely one we can share. For, as the Soviets face the problem of allocating resources for the period of 1971–75 in their next 5-year plan, so we face the parallel problem of allocating our own finite resources to meet the many demands which are daily impressed on our consciousness. We must insure the most efficient use of our resources if these demands are to be met. The Armed Services Committee has already demonstrated under the leadership of the able Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), that substantial savings can be made in our Defense budget, for example, without in any way endangering our national security. Other savings may become possible in the course of this floor debate.

Yet let us imagine how much greater still those savings would become if the strategic arms race could be curbed, and how much could be done to improve the quality of American life if some of the billions now destined for offensive and defensive missiles could be made available for other purposes. This same consideration evidently motivates some, at least, of the decisionmakers in Moscow. It may not seem like much of a base on which to erect an arms limitation agreement, but this initial common ground need not by itself fill that broad purpose. Indeed, it need only serve as a shared interest sufficient to bring the two sides together in negotiations—a first small breach in the wall of mutual mistrust which can at least permit talks to begin.

No one suggests that arms limitation negotiations will be easy. No one suggests that they will be short. No one has the temerity to guarantee that they will be crowned with success.

But it is hard to quarrel with the proposition that a successful conclusion to arms limitation talks would be worth all the sweat and tears and patience which negotiations will undoubtedly require. And so long as a favorable outcome is even possible, I believe we must do everything in our power to improve the underlying conditions for negotiation and to test the oft-repeated Soviet expressions of strong interest in seeking a mutually acceptable and mutually beneficial agreement.

What American actions, at this point in time, would be most conducive to the creation of a more promising negotiating climate? As I noted earlier, one of the strongest pieces of evidence on which our hypothetical Kremlin analyst would rely in predicting future American intentions would be our plans for simultaneous deployment of MIRV's and ABM's and the conclusion to which they give rise in the Kremlin—in this hypothetical situation—that the United States is moving toward a first-strike capability. In order to change the analyst's recommendation—that the Politburo deal warily with what he deems an aggressive and neurotically hostile America—we might well consider what we can do to modify the facts on which Kremlin decisions will be based.

Mr. President, I believe the most important contribution we can make at this time to future world peace is to seek mutual world agreement on deferring further testing of MIRV-equipped missiles and to defer deployment of an ABM system—and I further believe that we can take these steps without in any way jeopardizing our national security. I have expressed my support for the concept of a mutual moratorium on MIRV testing by cosponsoring the resolution proposed by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts. I have taken similar action to record my opposition to ABM deployment at this time by joining my distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Michigan by cosponsoring the amendment which is currently under consideration.

As the authors of the ABM amendment pointed out, its essential function is to make the distinction which I consider vital between research, development, testing, and evaluation on the one hand, and actual deployment on the other. I favor, as I have said before, continued efforts to develop a truly effective ABM system which could be deployed at a future date if it should then appear necessary to maintain the credibility of our strategic deterrent. I do not believe this is the case today, nor do I believe that the delay in deployment which this amendment envisages will expose our retaliatory capacity to an unacceptable level of risk in the years ahead.

For such a risk to be present, the Soviet Union would have to acquire the capability to launch successful simul-

XUM

taneous attacks on all three elements of our strategic offensive force and also on our tactical forces abroad which have a capacity to deliver nuclear warheads against targets in Russia. Despite the warning sounded by Secretary of Defense Laird and others that the Soviets are seeking such a first-strike capability, no convincing evidence has been presented that they can attain this level of offensive competence in the foreseeable future. Indeed, the eighth annual report of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which President Nixon sent to Congress on March 11, concluded that—

> Neither the United States nor the Soviet Union has a "first-strike" capability . . .

The report adds, more significantly:

> Most authoritative analysts are agreed that neither power can hope to achieve such a capability.

The complexities of such a multiple attack have been pointed out before. To achieve success—defined as an ability to reduce the American retaliatory blow to an acceptable level—the Russians would have to destroy our strategic bombers on the ground before incoming ICBM's were detected by our radars. For such a radar signal would undoubtedly stimulate an order to get our SAC alert force airborne and would permit them ample time to get off the ground. Yet, I cannot believe that such a strike at our entire, scattered bomber force, whether delivered by low-trajectory submarine-launched missiles or by a fractional orbital bombardment system—or FOBS—would not result in the order being given to launch our Minuteman and Polaris—or Poseidon—missiles before Soviet ICBM's could match the strike at SAC bases with a direct assault on our missile complexes.

While this fine play at timing was going on, the Soviets would face the needle-in-a-haystack problem of dealing with the substantial number of ballistic-missile submarines which are constantly on station, each bearing 16 missiles and capable collectively of destroying the Soviet Union. Finally, there would remain the nuclear-equipped tactical air units in Europe and the Far East, which again would either have to be destroyed first—thereby presumably triggering a command to launch our strategic forces—or else attacked simultaneously with the longer range assault in an incredibly intricate command and control operation.

In short, the idea that our deterrent forces could be credibly menaced by the Soviet Union in the foreseeable future to such an extent that they would in fact have a first-strike capability appears to me so remote that it will not bear close examination—and thus does not seem a valid argument for the immediate deployment of the Safeguard ABM system.

Mr. President, we have all been exposed to a variety of arguments on both sides of this critical issue. There are, among others, technical questions concerning the likelihood that an ABM system, in the present state of the art, will function with sufficient reliability to justify its construction.

These questions relate to the various components of the system, both individually and in combination, and particularly to the ability of the planned computers to deal adequately with the incredibly complex command and control machinery which will be involved in Safeguard.

Questions such as these find the scientific community deeply divided, though it is worth noting that all former Presidential science advisors are lined up with those who doubt the workability of the system. I do not personally feel qualified to judge such technical matters as these with any degree of confidence. But I do believe strongly that any system which is under such severe challenge on technical grounds from many eminent scientists who are professionally competent to judge its merits should be subjected to additional research and development work before we commit vast sums to its deployment.

As I suggested earlier, however, the critical issues raised in this debate over the ABM are not technical, but are instead the basic issues with which we constantly grapple here in this Chamber: How our actions help to shape the world and how they shape our own society.

To me, the most important and most compelling consideration in this regard is the adverse impact which I am convinced ABM deployment would have on the prospects for successful negotiations to limit strategic arms. I have already discussed this point at some length, and wish to add only one further comment. Several Senators have argued that we need ABM's so we can, in effect, trade them off against the Galosh ABM missiles which the Soviet Union has installed around Moscow.

That system, however, was never completed by the Soviets. We have been told, by our own experts that the Galosh is roughly comparable to the Nike-Zeus, a system which we opted not to deploy because it would have been obsolete before its projected completion date. This suggests that the Soviets probably stopped their own ABM deployment because they felt the system was not worth the cost. This hypothesis is reinforced by the testimony of former Defense Secretary Clark Clifford, who said in his Posture State last January:

> It is the consensus of the intelligence community that the Galosh system as presently deployed could provide only a limited defense of the Moscow area and could be seriously downgraded by currently programmed U.S. systems.

Indeed, President Nixon's decision to switch his own ABM proposal from Sentinel to Safeguard was based in part on the conclusion that city defense like that attempted in the Russian Galosh system was not permanently feasible.

Since the Galosh ABM thus offers the Soviets no significant advantage in the strategic arms balance, I see no reason why we should feel any obligation to match the Russians in their mistakes, particularly in view of the other considerations which militate against ABM deployment at this time.

This kind of action-reaction cycle in strategic arms would, indeed, serve largely to demonstrate the dangers to the present balance of mutual deterrence which lie in any decision to deploy ABM's or MIRV's at this time. The point was illustrated by former Defense Secretary McNamara and present Defense Secretary Laird, both of whom specifically testified with regard to a possible heavy Soviet ABM that it would require an American response in the form of a greater offensive capability. The point was perhaps made most succinctly a couple of months ago by a Soviet Embassy official in Washington:

> If the Americans want to throw away $7 billion on this toy—

He said of the ABM—

> it only means that our militarists will want more missiles, and that your militarists will want more missiles, and there it goes.

And there it goes. With it, Mr. President, would probably go the faint glow of hope which shines in the prospect of serious talks on a possible limitation of strategic arms—the hope that we can begin to shape a more peaceful world in which the rule of law can be substituted for the balance of terror.

With it, too, would go some of our hopes for the reshaping of American society through reallocation of resources from armaments to programs for human betterment. For the ABM debate has become symbolic, in some ways, of the dichotomy between those who believe that security rests primarily in strength of arms and those who, like myself, are convinced that until we achieve the rule of law in the world our national security demands both military preparedness and a healthy domestic economy and society. If substantial savings could be achieved in military expenditures without endangering national security we could take great strides toward improving the quality of American life. We could also remove a significant part of the inflationary pressures which currently affect the economy if major resources were shifted from military purposes—which, in general, create demand without any commensurate expansion in the supply of usable goods—to more productive uses.

For all these reasons, Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by Senators COOPER and HART, which would forestall deployment of an ABM system at this time. I very much hope that continued research and development will in the near future offer us a reliable ABM system which could be deployed if it becomes necessary, and I believe this amendment makes clear that we wish this exploratory effort to continue unabated. But I am convinced that deployment at this time would reduce, rather than enhance, our national security, and would dim our hopes both for a better world and for a better America.

TAX REFORM AND THE SURTAX

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, yesterday the Committee on Finance voted to report the surtax extension without any amendment.

Earlier today, on the floor of the Senate, the majority leader explained the position of the majority that a tax bill this year should include a reasonable tax reform. He was immediately answered by the minority leader and the assistant minority leader, arguing that we should proceed at once with just the modified simple extension of the surtax.

XUM

As everyone knows, the Democratic policy committee decided on June 24 that meaningful tax reform must be considered simultaneously with the extension of the surtax. The Nixon administration, however, insists on separating the two, and is now stepping up its attack on our distinguished majority leader for what the administration calls "delay." But, Mr. President, it is the Nixon administration that is causing any delay.

Despite all the ballyhoo and pledges made over tax reform, the administration has been excessively timid in making any specific proposals. Glaringly absent from the administration's so-called tax reform package was any mention of the most notorious loopholes: Capital gains, tax-free bonds, hobby farming, foundations, oil depletion, and unlimited charitable deductions. How can the President expect us to believe his pledges to push through tax reform when he has not even mentioned these loopholes? How can the President cry "delay," when it is he who has been dilatory?

The Democrats in Congress can, of course, put together a tax reform package and enact it without any help from the Nixon administration. But it will take time, Mr. President. The structure of Congress makes any tax measure easy prey for the special interests unless the institution of the Presidency is solidly behind it. If President Nixon will join with us in the thick of the fight, we can have both tax reform and the extension of the surtax. The President should know that there is probably no louder cry in the country than the cry for tax reform—for assuring that the rich pay their share of taxes, and the burden is correspondingly lifted from the shoulders of the middle and lower income taxpayers.

Mr. President, even the President of the United States is not above needing an occasional "tax incentive." Should the surtax be extended without meaningful tax reform, the President's tax incentive would be gone and Mr. Nixon may again listen to those who financed his campaign. We cannot allow tax reform to go the way of Dr. Knowles.

THE SAFEGUARD ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, we have just heard an excellent speech made by the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON). Much of what I have to say is in the same vein as his speech.

Mr. President, it is a privilege to be a participant in what history may record as one of the truly great debates in the U.S. Senate. That it will be a thorough debate I have no doubt, for already a great many Members of this body, leaders of both parties have spoken on this momentous question which concerns the nuclear security and nuclear future of the United States, the Soviet Union, and indeed all other nations who must live today in the shadow of the nuclear bomb. And as complicated as is this subject, it is clear that many in this body have mastered its complexities, and that ultimately what we are debating is not differences over technical capability or scientific estimates, but differences over the shape of our national destiny and the kind of nuclear security which we can have on the one hand by relentless and unending nuclear weapons races with the Soviet Union, and on the other hand by advancement of nuclear restraint and nuclear arms control on both sides.

Nor could it be doubted that this will be a historic debate. Some 30 years ago we commenced the effort to construct our first nuclear weapon, and since that time we have gone from one escalation to the next, from atomic bombs to hydrogen bombs, from strategic weapons to tactical weapons, from airborne nuclear bombs to self-propelled nuclear missiles, from land-based nuclear launchers to a naval nuclear capability, from tens to hundreds, finally to thousands, in the numbers of our strategic weapons alone.

And in all this time, Mr. President, while succeeding administrations made agonizingly important judgments, and often most expensive judgments at that, concerning new nuclear weapons programs, we have not had a semblance of a Senate debate or national debate concerning our choices. Today, however, we are in the midst of a great national and congressional debate precisely on what are our national choices in the nuclear weapons area. And surely there is not a more important subject for this Nation and the entire world than that which we are discussing here today.

Indeed it may ultimately appear that more important than the outcome of this debate is the fact that it will have taken place. Those of us who are deeply opposed to the commencement of this nuclear weapons program cannot truly lose in our present struggle even were it ultimately to appear that by a narrow one or two votes the President could muster a majority in his favor in this body. I say, Mr. President, that we cannot lose even in that event because our larger vital objective will still have been met. That objective, which I believe to be the very heart of the present controversy and division over the Safeguard ABM system, is our aim to replace nuclear sanity with the present condition of nuclear terror and irresponsibility which prevails among the superpowers in their endless escalation of nuclear weapons races. When I say irresponsibility, I mean just that. For there is no order and no sense when both we and the Soviet Union have reached a point when within an hour's time we could annihilate each other's populations, cities, and resources. Yet, we both continue to add overkill upon overkill. Surely in a world where we have achieved the ultimate unthinkable horror of being able to destroy any potential enemy totally and within minutes, it is irresponsible to plunge heedlessly into any new nuclear program which some overeager scientist, some insatiable industrialist, or some 1984-minded military officer conjures from his nightmare dreams.

And when I say nuclear sanity is what we seek, again I mean just that.

For what we ask in this debate concerning the Safeguard ABM is the most modest rudiments of sane government and responsible military programing. We ask that before billions are spent on a new nuclear weapons program, there be some fair hope that it serve some understandable military purpose. We ask that before we put billions into defense, we are sure that the other side could not overcome our defense structure with a modest and inexpensive enlargement of his offense. We ask that the contingency for which so large a weapons and fiscal effort is to be made, be a real, not a fanciful, contingency.

In other words, we doubt the virtue and wisdom of spending billions against a supposed Soviet attack which is utterly beyond any sane person's imagination since it would bring about a retaliatory annihilation by our forces of the Soviet Union. Most of all, we ask that the reason why so large and unsettling a new weapons effort should be undertaken at this time be made clear and understandable to the Congress and the people.

This is what proponents of the Safeguard ABM have least been able to provide. There is veritable chaos in the changing and inconsistent explanations we have been given for the ABM system since it was first proposed to the Congress.

Are we building it against the Chinese or the Russians? If the latter, are we building it for what the Russians can do or could do or might do in their own weapons capability?

Are we building it merely to offer as a pawn in arms control negotiation or because we really want the Safeguard system?

Are we building it because we think it would work or, as Senator RUSSELL stated in the debate last year, so that we could test it to see if it might work?

Are we building it, as we were once informed, to save American lives in the case of a nuclear exchange or simply, as President Nixon has suggested, to give some added protection to our strategic missile forces.

If the latter is the purpose, will Safeguard, in case of the imagined enemy attack, secure a majority of our strategic weapon sites from being overwhelmed, or as Secretary Laird's testimony suggests, protect only a handful of those sites. If the latter is the case, what use is the Safeguard system, and particularly when we consider that we are assured that we have in our sea-based strategic weapons alone a fully adequate and genuine safeguard against nuclear attack and therefore nuclear war.

Are we building two Safeguard sites, as Mr. Nixon announced to the Nation, or 10 sites as the Department of Defense now suggests, and will the system cost $8 billion, $12 billion, or closer to the $35 to $40 billion originally projected by House Minority Leader FORD back in 1966 and the testimony of Secretary McNamara in 1967?

My point is, Mr. President, that when we ask such questions and demand answers by the proponents of Safeguard in the Congress of the United States and before the people of this Nation, we are advancing nuclear sanity. Simply by calling on those who want to move further onward in the nuclear weapons race to explain precisely why we must do so and what we are doing will bring the agonizingly important elements of reason, projection, and responsibility to play

XUM

on a subject which so badly needs the very best thinking of our leaders and our people. If we can establish, as I think we have established already, that we will not go on spending billions upon billions for new weapons programs and endlessly heating up the arms race without an explanation to our people and to the world, and if we can bring from those who insist upon escalating the nuclear arms race clear and understandable and persuasive reasons why we must do so, then the larger cause will have been won.

If we look back upon the history of mankind, how many great and tragic wars and confrontations might have been avoided if the governing bodies of the great nations had taken time and mastered the principle that great national issues affecting matters of war and peace must be debated in advance of the fateful decision.

We need not look far back for such examples. In this century millions died in World War I, whose origins remain shrouded in historical mystery because even our great historians cannot explain how responsible nations with responsible leaders were pulled into so hopeless and tragic a struggle.

But we need not look even that far back, Mr. President. I am persuaded that if the Congress at the time of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution had courageously faced the national choices in Vietnam in a great debate something like the one on which we are now engaged on the ABM question, we would have had in that unhappy corner of the globe a more honorable, less bloody, and more successful development than we have had in the last 4 years. At the very least such a debate would have established whether the administration's direction and policy had the thoughtful support of the representatives of our people in the Congress assembled. When we consider how grave are the responsibilities placed upon one man in our system in such matters, one would think that every President would welcome and not fear a friendly and open debate in this body where 100 men of experience and wisdom could express their views for the guidance of the President.

I say then, Mr. President, that we will win this debate in its ultimate purpose of insisting that nuclear sanity replace nuclear irresponsibility in our future decisions in this vital and paramount area of national decisions. And surely the mad momentum of the nuclear weapons race which has prevailed under the conditions of irresponsibility too often in the last 30 years can and will be broken only as we establish in this area the rule we insist upon in every other major area of national activity—that those who would act and in a way onerous to the Nation and its resources make a clear case for the virtue of the action and against the virtue of restraint and moderation.

Let me say too, Mr. President, that I come to this debate with a deeply held belief that our nuclear security is better advanced by restraint and moderation to perpetuate the present relative stability between us and the Soviet Union rather than any step that will force the pace further. But I am here first of all to listen with all my attention to the arguments on either side. When we consider that what is at stake is the nuclear security of the United States and the world, no one in this body can afford to turn this into a forum for scoring debaters' points or promoting his next election campaign. The stakes are too large, Mr. President, when we are playing with millions of lives in a possible nuclear war, for any Senator of the United States to use this debate for political advantage rather than for reaching the very best decision that we can.

The proponents of Safeguard say that the nuclear security of the United States will be advanced if we go ahead with this new weapons program even though it might escalate the weapons race. On the other hand, the opponents say that the nuclear security of the United States will be advanced if we hang on to the relative stability we have at this time with the Soviet Union and by moderation and restraint prevent a new round of escalation in the arms race, leaving everyone poorer and more nervous and in a more precarious situation.

Presently there is a very distinct difference between situations that call for the use of conventional weapons and those dire situations that call for retaliation with nuclear weapons. One could observe that there is a flexibility with conventional weapons and an inflexibility with nuclear weapons. This flexibility and inflexibility principle is observed, respected and feared by all nuclear powers. With a faulty ABM system, a lax attitude toward this principle of holocaust could and I believe would develop among the nuclear powers. Different defense planners would begin to plan strategy with less reluctance to use nuclear weapons because of their misconceived and ill-founded confidence in an antiballistic-missile system. Both sides cannot be right, and it is our highest obligation to use this debate for the purpose of reaching the right decision in a difficult and terribly important area.

Now let me say what it is that we who oppose Safeguard ABM are for. What we are against is clear: We oppose the present deployment of an ABM system in the United States. However, we are not against continuing research and development and we do not say that world conditions or Soviet nuclear activities might not force us into an ABM deployment at a future time. We are only saying that now is not the time. But it has perhaps been less clear so far what it is that we are for rather than what it is we are against. If there is not a good and worthy reasons for deploying Safeguard at this time, its vast expense alone might be reason enough for us not to do so.

Even agreeing to continue to spend for research and development, we are indeed for something, Mr. President. Because there is something which we cannot have if we go ahead with ABM deployment now. It is precious and it will not be available to us forever. It may be our last clear chance, now that both we and the Soviet Union have reached mutual power of nuclear annihilation. At this point the United States and the Soviet Union should move to avoid a new and endlessly escalating offense-defense weapons race. We have a breather at this point, Mr. President. A time out, if you will, in the nuclear arms race. Both sides have lasted the 12 rounds though both are the wearier for it, and if neither side starts punching again we might just avoid having to start another and perhaps much bloodier face-off.

Now I know that there are many who say why should we be for restraint if we are not sure that the Soviets will not also show some restraint. Why should we avoid a massive ABM deployment if we cannot be absolutely sure that the Russians will not try for a massive ABM deployment. The answer, Mr. President, is perfectly clear. Right now the Soviets are not in the process of deploying any ABM system, and if we plunge ahead, whatever the chance there be that the Soviets would also welcome putting a limit on the nuclear arms race, could be destroyed by our own zeal for the competition. So what we are for in this great debate is for that modicum of moderation and restraint in the nuclear weapons race at a moment of relative calm which gives us hope that the calm can be made permanent. Surely it is our responsibility to promote the great and important goal of halting the nuclear race. We should not be the side that broke the lull.

Before I yield the floor, Mr. President, I want to say one last word, too, about the question of a nuclear arms treaty with the Soviet Union and the present debate. First I would emphasize that even if we cannot quickly achieve a strategic weapons treaty, I am for holding the line on the present situation in the hope of encouraging the Soviet Union also to desist from any new and unsettling nuclear program. For even without a treaty it is not written on the wall that the Soviet Union is going to plunge billions into an offense-defense strategic weapons race. Even without a treaty, if we do not force the pace, the Russians may not do so either and we will all be the safer for it. We all must recognize how much better in the long run it would be if the present strategic nuclear balance could be secured from further escalation by a treaty with the Soviet Union. Discussion on such a treaty, long overdue, will commence in the coming weeks between representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union. There are those who say that our ability to get that treaty will be advanced if the Congress approves a beginning on the deployment of the Safeguard ABM. These advocates argue that the way of avoiding the Safeguard ABM deployment is to have a treaty with the Russians against any new offense-defense system, and the best way to get such a treaty, they say, is actually to start building the Safeguard system.

I confess that I do not understand those who make this claim. If the Safeguard ABM is truly necessary and useful to the United States, then we should not be talking about renouncing nuclear defense systems in a treaty with the Soviet Union. If, on the other hand, the pronouncements, including President Nixon's, seem to be saying the Safeguard system is not really valuable and should be given up in a treaty, how does it ad-

XUM

vance the Soviet willingness to sign that treaty if we go ahead with deploying the system? If Safeguard is not a genuine asset for our side, which the proponents seem to be saying in connection with their treaty argument, how does it become a bargaining power in the negotiations? If, as I deeply believe, this new dubious and most expensive weapons program is not an asset but a liability for the United States, how do we buy anything with it in arms talks with the Soviets? Far from buying anything with the Safeguard deployment, it is likely that the Soviet negotiators will insist upon some extra consideration in the treaty. In the end the Soviets may pull us out of the Safeguard hole of our own digging, once we have fallen into it.

But maybe all of this is too subtle, Mr. President. Is it not the simpler wisdom that if we do not want a defense race with the Soviet Union—and we clearly do not want it—the best way for us to avoid it is not to begin it. I believe that in these great matters of international relations just as in the everyday affairs of ordinary people the rule is that if you do not want to go in a certain direction, do not begin going there. If we genuinely want to preserve the present relative stability and security of the existing nuclear balance, the best way to achieve it is to preserve it rather than to shatter it with a new program to which the Soviets almost surely will respond. This will force us then into some new expensive nuclear weapons race programs.

So I say, Mr. President, let us avoid overly clever rationalizations about promoting arms restraint negotiations by showing an utter lack of arms restraint on our side. The issue is not how to bargain away the ABM. The issue is whether at this time we should deploy ABM at all. If it is not in our national interest to do so, then it is the solemn responsibility of the Congress to vote "No" to the proposed commencement of the ABM. If it is in our national security interest, not for the moment, but for the long run, to commence deploying Safeguard ABM now, then it is our equally solemn responsibility to vote "Yes." At this point in this debate, it appears that approximately half the Members of this body, many of whom have given great and long consideration to the issue, believe that our long-range interest in nuclear security and nuclear survival is promoted best by showing moderation and restraint. They prefer today's balance of nuclear terror to tomorrow's possible imbalance of nuclear terror. What is at stake is the shape of our national future. If we can hold to the present balance with the Soviet Union, won by years of enormous national weapons efforts and untold billions of dollars, we can have the relative assurance and security on both sides that nuclear war will not come, because neither side could survive no matter which struck first. If we can hold to the present balance, we can turn our resources to urgently important national problems demanding attention but too long starved by the military budget. If we can hold to the present balance, we can end the surtax as the Vietnam war diminishes and give relief to our hard-pressed taxpayers. So, while preserving the present nuclear balance is itself a great important goal, there are other great national interests which would be promoted if the cause of restraint could now prevail against the forces of passion and escalation on both sides. So I plead with every Member of this body to give the greatest and most careful attention to the debate, for the lives and futures of millions upon millions of people will be intimately affected if we make the wrong decision. We must master the nuclear genie before he becomes the master of us all.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOSS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thought it might help if we had a little colloquy on this matter. I gather that the Senator from Utah is saying he is against the deployment of the ABM.

Mr. MOSS. That is correct.

Mr. DOMINICK. I had the privilege of reading the Senator's speech while he was delivering it, and there were some points in it that I think perhaps might be clarified.

On page 2 of the speech, the Senator said:

> We ask that before billions are spent on a new nuclear weapons program, there be some fair hope that it serve some understandable military purpose.

Is the Senator implying by that that there are military programs in this bill which have no clear military purpose?

Mr. MOSS. Yes. I do not think the military purpose is entirely clear. We had before us last year the so-called Sentinel ABM system, which was an area defense of cities. This year, the proposal is changed, and we are to have an ABM system called Safeguard, which has as its purpose, apparently, some defense of our own nuclear weapons, which we have deployed in silos hardened against assault, apparently the only rationale being that we might preserve enough of them that we could fire back. It does not take into account the seaborne nuclear power that we have, nor even the airborne nuclear power.

Mr. DOMINICK. From the remainder of his speech, I gather that the Senator agrees that a nuclear balance constitutes a nuclear deterrent?

Mr. MOSS. Yes. I think we do have a rough nuclear balance now with the Soviet Union, such that neither side could feel that it could start with the first strike, because there would be a second-strike capability that would cause unacceptable damage on any country that made a first strike.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator realizes, does he not, that we are talking about only $345.5 million in deployment funds for this year? He is not against the research and development, he says.

Mr. MOSS. No; I am not against research and development. I think that we should continue our program, to make sure that we know how to make a system, in the event we cannot get any kind of agreement with the Soviets; and I would be first to admit that there is no assurance that we will achieve such an agreement.

Mr. DOMINICK. So we are not really talking about millions of dollars with no military purpose; we are talking about $345 million for a specific purpose of defending our deterrent weapon.

Mr. MOSS. Perhaps it is only $345 million at the beginning, but it will end with billions being spent. Experts now estimate, I understand, a total of about $7 billion is needed to complete the Safeguard ABM. One can get a different estimate from every source, almost, whether it be the Pentagon or our colleagues on the committees who have studied the matter. It will eventually involve many, many billions of dollars if we start the deployment.

Mr. DOMINICK. One thing I should like to ask the Senator from Utah is what steps he would think the President of the United States should take, in the mid-1970's in the event a nuclear weapon targeted on the United States should be discovered in an incoming role? Assuming we do not have the deployment of the ABM, which is what the Senator is against, what steps should the President take? Just allow it to come in and eliminate millions of Americans within our country? Or should he push the button and strike back, even though he knows it will eliminate millions of people? Should not the President have another alternative?

Mr. MOSS. If he had, as a reasonable alternative, that he could neutralize the incoming ABM, I would say that would be desirable. But I think there is no assurance, under the present state of the art, that he could do that, with the ABM system we are talking about now, even if it were deployed.

Second, of course, I think it is not likely he would have to exercise any such option as long as we maintain the relative balance that we have now with the Soviet Union; and hopefully long before the mid-1970's we would have an agreement on limitation of nuclear weapons that could keep the balance stabilized.

Mr. DOMINICK. The distinguished Senator is talking about the Soviet Union; but what about all the other countries that have nuclear capability, including Red China, which has already said that it would welcome a nuclear war, because it would survive, since it has more people?

Mr. MOSS. At the present time, of course, China does not have the capability to deliver a nuclear weapon. Certainly we must continue our intelligence assessment of the capability of the Chinese; we must have continuing surveillance and estimates of the situation. There may be a time when, because of China's program, we might have to take some different position; but who knows? Conditions may change with the Chinese. We might even be talking with them in a matter of a year or two. We might find some point where we could bring the thing into balance including China.

Mr. DOMINICK. Would it not be easier to talk with the Chinese if we knew we were relatively secure from sneak attack by them, than if we were relatively insecure?

Mr. MOSS. I do not think we are insecure at all. I think we have the ability now to retaliate, if the Chinese should send nuclear weapons toward us, to such a degree that it would effectively deter the Chinese from launching a nuclear attack. But if they did, we certainly would have to meet it.

Mr. DOMINICK. Going back to the Soviet Union, if the Senator is willing to continue the colloquy a little longer, because I think it displays the two sides of the question pretty well: The Senator is aware, is he not, of the continued production, by the Soviet Union, of nuclear ICBM's and nuclear submarines, while, in terms of numbers, we have not matched their production?

Mr. MOSS. My understanding is that Soviet production has continued, and that the Soviet Union now has roughly the same number of ICBM's as we do. They still do not have anywhere near the number of submarines we have, according to my understanding, although they are building additional submarines, and the time may come when they have as many as we.

Mr. DOMINICK. The report will show that they presently have 230 more submarines than we do.

Mr. MOSS. Not nuclear.

Mr. DOMINICK. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. MOSS. They are not nuclear submarines of the Polaris type.

Mr. DOMINICK. They are not the Polaris-type submarine, that is correct, but they are, in many cases—some 65 of them—nuclear powered.

That is in the report, so there is no classified information in that. The point I am making is that they are continuing the production of weaponry which is designed to change the balance which the Senator talked about in his speech. If so, and if they continue this, then how is it the Senator came to the conclusion that we have a balance which has to be kept when they are not keeping the balance?

Mr. MOSS. Well, I do not think that we can characterize what the Soviet Union is doing now as severely impairing the balance or that it will not severely impair it for a considerable period of time.

I think we are in a sort of a lull or a quieter period than we have had for some time. And we have now agreed with the Soviet Union that we will begin the talks with them on nuclear weapons.

I want our country to go into those talks with the best possible prospects that the talks will be successful and that we can get some kind of agreement. If we do not get an agreement, we still have an adequate force now and we will not be in severe jeopardy, at least not for a considerable period of time.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the Senator will recall—I think it was at the close of the debate of a similar nature in 1967—when the Senate authorized the go-ahead with the Sentinel system, a totally different and much more complex system, on Monday, and on Thursday of that same week the Soviet Ambassador went to the President and said:

> We would like to have arms reduction or a limitation talk.

It would certainly appear from that that the question of whether we deploy an ABM has anything to do with their concept of negotiations on ABM's, if it does have any effect at all, has increased the opportunity for having such discussion. Would not the Senator come to that conclusion?

Mr. MOSS. No, I do not come to that conclusion at all.

In the first place, I do not believe that the fact that we would vote in the Senate to deploy the ABM would hasten the Soviet Union to the bargaining table a bit faster or would increase the likelihood of their agreement.

Second, I rather think the contrary, that it might well convince them that there is less opportunity for getting an agreement and that they had best pick up the race again and begin further deployment of the ABM missile.

It should be noted that after the 1967 decision the Soviets continued at an even more rapid rate to produce ICBM missiles with nuclear capabilities.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the Senator is aware, is he not, of Mr. Kosygin's speech in England when he came to that point in the questioning as to why he was building an ABM system—which incidentally they are still continuing to construct, which incidentally they are still continuing to improve, and which incidentally they are still continuing on the second brand of an ABM system, as I think the Senator knows—Mr. Kosygin said, and I will not quote him exactly, that in effect he was somewhat surprised that anyone should question him about building what is purely a defensive weapon, that he thought it was as important and more important from his own country's point of view to defend his country than it was to build more offensive things with which to kill people.

It would seem to me that if he takes that attitude, it will be very difficult for him—and, as a matter of fact, he has not done so—to raise any objection to the construction of an ABM system by the United States.

Mr. MOSS. That is a fallacious argument that was made by Kosygin to the effect that the ABM is purely defensive and would not kill anyone when the ABM figures in the whole balanced situation we have talked about. Should we or the Soviets be able to get effective defensive systems that we felt were perfect enough to defend against ICBMs, then the balance has tipped and there is a freedom on the side of the ABM and we or they would have a first strike capability because we or they could ward off any domination and freely dominate the other side.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is an interesting argument, because the only country that has an ABM at the moment is the Soviet Union.

Mr. MOSS. The Soviet Union has a sort of Nike-Zeus system that is rather ineffective and a partially complete system called the Galosh around Moscow. There are 72 of these missiles deployed. They are not effective.

Mr. DOMINICK. How does the Senator know they are not effective?

Mr. MOSS. We have only our intelligence reports to depend on, of course. But the intelligence is that they are not effective and are no longer being deployed by the Soviet Union.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the construction is still going on.

Mr. MOSS. The assumption is that they are now doing some research and development, some of the things that we say we are willing to go on with.

Mr. DOMINICK. While doing it, they are doing some construction on this same system.

Mr. MOSS. That is not my information. They are no longer deploying the Galosh.

Mr. DOMINICK. I think the Senator will find that he is mistaken on that. They are continuing the system. It is just part of the argument. However, the speech indicated that they were not. And I thought that ought to be cleared up. They are in fact doing it.

I will be delighted to have the Senator briefed on this matter if he would care to have me do so. However, I am sure he can get his own briefing on it.

I would agree with the statement of the Senator at the bottom of page 8 except that in the context of the speech it seems to me to be misleading when he says:

> So, I say, Mr. President, let us avoid overly clever rationalizations about promoting arms restraint negotiations by showing an utter lack of arms restraint on our side.

I do not think the United States has been showing any lack of arms restraint.

I point out that we have not built any more Polaris submarines. We have a finite number of them. We have not built any more ICBM's. We have a finite number of them.

We have tried to make these deterrents credible so that someone cannot knock them out. I do not think that is an utter lack of arms restraint. Perhaps the Senator disagrees.

Mr. MOSS. We have not ceased to continue to build our forces. We moved from Minuteman I to Minuteman II to Minuteman III.

There is debate going on now as to whether we should continue our work on MIRV—multiple independently targeted reentry vehicle. So, we have not been dormant in this field. However, I think with the time having arrived and the agreement having been reached as to when we are going to sit down with the Russians and start talking about the restraint of nuclear weapons, that one of the best ways we can show good faith and perhaps inspire a degree of that in the negotiators is to withhold deployment now of an additional weapons system, the ABM, and say that we really genuinely want to talk about control of nuclear weapons as between the two countries.

Mr. DOMINICK. I do not think anyone would disagree with the Senator about the hope and the advisability of

XUM

getting arms limitation talks going as soon as possible. But there is no point in our sitting down and discussing this ad infinitum, while whatever nuclear adversary we have—the Soviets or the Chinese—build up their potential so that they can be totally destructive of the United States.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I must agree in part with the thesis of the Senator that certainly we should not close our eyes or take a permanent, inflexible position.

I think our good faith at this time, and especially in view of the circumstances which surround us, would enhance greatly the chances for successful nuclear arms talks, if we withheld deployment and continued with the research and development on the ABM.

Mr. DOMINICK. The R. & D. would go along, would it not, with the idea of testing on Kwajalein and Eniwetok?

Mr. MOSS. Yes. That is where the principal testing is done.

Mr. DOMINICK. I think the Senator heard the statement made, which is from very responsible sources, that it would cost approximately $2.6 billion to complete that testing.

Mr. MOSS. Yes, I have heard that figure used, that the R. & D. may run that high.

Mr. DOMINICK. And if we decide, after havng done this, to deploy this system, under the Safeguard system, we have to scrap that $2.6 billion and start over again at a cost of approximately $2.1 billion.

Mr. MOSS. Not at all. R. & D. means to develop the system and find out if it will work and get it integrated. If we complete our research and development, then we build whatever we have researched and developed, and we build it on the site where we need it; but that is a long way down the road.

Mr. DOMINICK. If we do not start deploying it now on these sites, as the Senator knows, we will be delaying the possibility of having any kind of ABM for anywhere from 18 months to 3 years.

Mr. MOSS. I am not well versed in the technical matters of the operation of the whole system—the ABM Safeguard system—but I have listened with some care to others who have discussed it, and I have been briefed on the matter. I am persuaded at this time that there are many parts of this in which we have not yet done the research and development; we do not know whether it will work. The radar acquisition, for example, is one of those elements that was discussed at some length. This is the reason I say we can proceed on Kwajalein with our R. & D., to work out the problems, to make sure it is effective, before we start building in North Dakota or Montana.

Mr. DOMINICK. Let me say to the Senator that when I entered on this colloquy, I did not expect to change his mind, because I can see that that has been determined. The Senator has made his decision on this matter already. But I did think it was important to have this colloquy just to clear up some of the matters that bothered me about the Senator's presentation.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. MOSS. I appreciate the colloquy with the Senator. As I tried to make the point in my prepared remarks, I think the discussion and the debate are of prime importance, to try to clarify many of the elements that divide those in the Senate who think one way and those who think another on this most important subject.

I yield the floor..

SAFEGUARD: COMMENT BY PROF. ALBERT WOHLSTETTER

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the able junior Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) wishes to bring to the attention of Congress a short, authoritative report prepared by Prof. Albert Wohlstetter, of the University of Chicago, in connection with the proposed Safeguard program.

The report was prepared under the auspices of the Committee to Maintain a Prudent Defense Policy, and the Senator from Washington has requested that the text of this report be printed in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAFEGUARD: COMMENT BY PROF. ALBERT WOHLSTETTER

Compromises limiting the Safeguard program to research, development, and testing, and especially to testing in the Pacific, are no compromise at all, but are plain defeat for the program. They would delay deployment for at least two years. They would not provide the planned 24-hours-per-day training for military operators of the system. At best they would fail to test major links for the Safeguard system and would test the rest at an expense at least equal to the cost of the entire first phase of Safeguard—over two billion dollars. Some proposals are vague but apparently would omit any test of the interactions among radars. Others would attempt to build new radars in the Pacific and test interconnections there. If it were decided not to deploy Safeguard, this investment in the Pacific would, of course, be lost. However, if the decision is made to deploy Safeguard, this investment would be a complete waste since the vast installations in the Pacific would then have to be repeated in the U.S. All of this is a very high cost to pay for the symbolism of taking Safeguard out of the country. The Safeguard program proposed in March of this year was already a substantial compromise. It put off the date of initial operation by nearly two years. Further compromise would be extremely damaging.

The first phase of Safeguard is intended to provide:

1. A limited defense for Minuteman at two places, in Montana and North Dakota;
2. A basis for going on to the next phase (when, if a growing threat calls for it, another four to five billion dollars will be spent to increase the defense of Minuteman, to protect bombers against submarine-launched missiles, to provide a thin shield for population adequate against a Chinese or other small attack, and finally, of great importance, to protect the National Command Authority);
3. A training ground and a test bed which would allow meshing the components of Safeguard with each other and with the major elements of our government that would be engaged in a possible strategic crisis. These would include SAC's retaliatory forces and their control center at Omaha, the North American or Continental Air Defense Command in Colorado Springs, and the National Command Authority in Washington.

To be specific, the effective operation of Safeguard will involve interactions among many components of that system and between Safeguard and other elements of national defense. Some of the interactions of Phase I would relate four gigantic radars, two Perimeter Acquisition Radars (PARs) and two Missile Site Radars (MSRs). Since more than one PAR would see an incoming warhead, these multiple observations need to be combined to make a single track. During a high-density attack, the least burdened radar would be chosen to do the tracking, and for this purpose, a PAR at one site could hand over a track to an MSR hundreds of miles away. In the face of nuclear blackout, the widely separated radars would support each other, one PAR would take over the tracks of an incoming warhead temporarily concealed from another PAR by blackout.

To test this working together of the radars, some proposals would attempt to add to the one MSR now at Kwajalein in the Pacific another MSR, perhaps at Eniwetok, and two PARs to go with these MSRs. Building and operating such equipment in distant primitive places costs substantially more than building it in the U.S. But it could be done if it were a sensible principle to keep these installations out of the country so they could not possibly be used in the future. That would still leave other extremely important interactions untested: For example, the vital connections with SAC Command, with satellite warning systems, with the Continental Air Defense Command and with the National Command Authority. Even were it to make sense to try to reproduce the radars and their interactions in the far Pacific, it would hardly be feasible to reconstruct on still other widely dispersed Pacific atolls Omaha, Colorado Springs and Washington, D.C. Radio-telephone and satellite communication links would not simulate the actual, planned and yet to be designed land line and other connections in the U.S., and the political and military commanders who would take part in such exercises are hardly subject to duplication at all.

In summary, such compromises would hardly accomplish all the development, testing and evaluation aspects of Safeguard Phase I. Moreover, they would assure our being unable in the mid-70's to meet a threat of visibly increasing gravity, and would waste billions of dollars that could be better used for other defense or foreign needs or for domestic purposes.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M., TUESDAY, JULY 22, 1969

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m., Tuesday, July 22, 1969.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, July 22, 1969, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 18, 1969:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Jack W. Lydman, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Malaysia.

XUM

U.S. Marshal

Donald M. Horn, of Ohio, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Ohio for the term of 4 years, vice Arthur C. Elliott.

Environmental Science Services Administration

The following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Environmental Science Services Administration:

To be commander

Philip J. Taetz

To be ensigns

Richard L. Baker
Thomas Ballentine
Andrew N. Bodnar, Jr.
Arthur N. Flior
Roger P. Hewitt
Alan D. Hirschman
John R. Hudson, Jr.
Robert E. Hunt, Jr.
David H. Johnson
Lawrence L. Lake
Robert B. Lawson
Norman L. Lovelace
Stephen J. Mangis
Richard K. Muller
Andrew L. Sikes
James L. Stokoe
Donald L. Suloff
Warren K. Taguchi
Lloyd K. Thomas
Michael E. Wagner

Public Health Service

The following candidates for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations, for permanent promotion:

To be medical directors

John H. Ackerman
John W. Cashman
Bertram E. Eggertsen, Jr.
David M. Fried
Norman J. Galluzzi
Robert S. J. Gordon
Martin D. Hicklin
Alfred S. Ketcham
Sherman N. Kieffer
Nicholas C. Leone
Charles H. Lithgow
Robert A. Marks, Jr.
Clifford E. Nelson
Robert N. Philip
Richard A. Prindle
Warren A. Rasmussen
Leon Rosen
Carl S. Shultz
Maurice L. Sievers
Albert Sjoerdsma
Norman Tarr
Karl F. Urbach
James L. Wellhouse
Jan Wolff
Stanley F. Yolles

To be senior surgeons

Harry Allen
Samuel Baron
William K. Carlile
Frederick Dykstra
George G. Glenner
Stanley Graber
Lloyd Guth
Harold E. Hall
Peter V. Hamill
F. Gentry Harris, Jr.
Patrick J. Hennelly, Jr.
M. Walter Johnson
Willard P. Johnson
James C. King
Charles Lewallen
Frank E. Lundin, Jr.
Frank R. Mark
Donald M. Mason
Cuvier D. McClure
James H. McGee
John R. McKenna
William C. Mohler
Stuart H. Mudd
Lewis E. Patrie
R. Gerald Suskind
Eugene T. Vandersmissen

To be surgeons

Lewellys F. Barker
Frank R. Brand
Donald W. Dippe
Ernest Feigenbaum
Robert G. Goderski
Robert A. Hartley
Kenneth Herrmann
Ward B. Hurlburt
Amos C. Lewis
James D. MacLowry
Robert G. Martin
Ralph L. Morris
Richard A. Naimann
Hugh F. Walker
Henry N. Wellman
Van R. Williams
John J. Witte

To be senior dental surgeons

John C. Greene
Edward J. McCarten
James J. McMahon
Kenneth T. Strauch
John D. Suomi

To be dental surgeons

Richard R. Baker
Robert C. Birch
Merwyn C. Crump
Richard Q. Dunn
Robert C. Faine
Ralph A. Frew
Karl J. Hettwer
John H. Holt
Philip Lightbody
Richard D. Lowe
Horace E. Lyon
Robert J. McCune
Albert J. Munk
Regis M. Nairn
Tomm H. Pickles
Dale S. Pyke
Richard P. Ribisl, Jr.
Wayne E. Stroud
John W. Topping, Jr.
John O. Wilson

To be nurse directors

M. Elizabeth L. Darden
Helen V. Foerst
Esther C. Gilbertson
Myra I. Johnson
Germaine S. Krysan
Beatrice Marino
Ruth E. Simonson
Elizabeth G. Sullivan
Hermoine S. Swindoll
Elizabeth Walker

To be senior nurse officers

Antoinette M. Antetomaso
Lucille T. Fallon
Marie Herold
Hazel Kandler
A. Naomi Kennedy
Jean A. McCollom
Elizabeth Mullen
Florence Seidler
Lena F. Turner
Ruth P. Tweedale

To be nurse officers

Kathryn G. Ames
Juanita M. Barkley
Jennifer Boondas
Virginia B. Brown
June G. Michalski
M. Ethel Payne
Frances G. Snyder

To be sanitary engineer directors

James A. Anderegg
Ronald E. Bales
Richard D. Coleman
William H. Davis
Joseph W. Fitzpatrick
Everett MacLeman
Godon E. Stone
Albert P. Talboys
Wilbur J. Whitsell

To be senior sanitary engineers

Hugh H. Connolly
Frederick A. J. Flohrschutz
Robert L. J. Harris
Ernest D. Harward
Ralph K. Longaker
George F. Mallison
Donald W. Marshall
John E. Munzer
Francis L. Nelson
Richard B. Vaughan
Gene B. Welsh
Harold W. Wolf

To be sanitary engineers

James E. Channell
James H. Eagen
Santo A. Furfari
John J. Henderson
Francis G. Mattern
Anton J. Muhich

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

George E. Anderson
David L. Calkins
Joseph A. Cochran
Willard G. Hopkins
Pong N. Lem
Dale A. Stevenson

To be scientist directors

Richard Q. Bell
Thomas W. Haines
Kelsey C. Milner
Albert S. Perry
Edward M. Scott
Elizabeth K. Weisburger
John H. Weisburger

To be senior scientists

Ibrahim J. Hindawi
Eldon P. Savage
Earl S. Schaefer
W. Daniel Sudia
Gerald C. Taylor

To be scientists

Arthur D. Fynn
Harley G. Sheffield

To be sanitarian directors

Charles J. Hart
George R. Hayes, Jr.
Donald E. Summers

To be senior sanitarians

William J. Beck
William F. Bower
Gerald J. Karches
Donald C. Mackel
Raymond A. Marden
Edison E. Newman
Kenneth L. Pool
Warren V. Powell
George E. Prime
Jack W. Sadler
Thomas J. Sharpe

To be sanitarians

Gene P. Burke
Daniel F. Cahill
Norman G. Edmisten
Harry Haverland
Dale J. Johnson
Alfred B. Kline, Jr.
Joseph Lovett
Michael B. Musachio
Charles R. Porter
Philip J. Robbins
Donald R. Smith
Geswaldo A. Verrone
William P. Wollschlager
Litsey L. Zellner

To be veterinary officer directors

Preston Holden
William Kaplan

To be senior veterinary officer

James F. Wright

To be veterinary officers

George M. Baer
David L. Madden
Donald D. Smith

To be pharmacist director

Joseph J. Hackett

To be pharmacists

Clarence Fortner
Ronald D. Gilbert
Philip R. Hugill
James L. Snowden

To be senior assistant pharmacists

James V. Anderson
Robert A. Epstein
Francis A. Quam
Anthony R. Zelonis

To be senior therapists

John R. Desimio
Jean M. Gosselin
Howard A. Haak

To be therapists

Richard S. Mazzacone
Gordon S. Pocock
Robert D. Skinner
William D. Wallis

To be dietitian director

Jeanne M. Reid

To be senior dietitian

Lois M. Gamble

To be senior assistant dietitian

Arlene M. M. Lawrence

To be health services directors

Jason N. Calhoun
Viola Cunningham
Sheldon A. Miller
Elsa J. Nelson
Ruth F. Richards

To be senior health services officers

Martha G. Barclay
James M. Hardin
David D. Haworth
Daniel A. Hunt
Lucia N. Mason
Ernest G. McDaniel
Roberta E. Peay
Pauline N. Rabaglino
Clarence F. Szwed
James L. Verber

To be senior assistant health services officer

In the Army

Lee A. Bland, Jr.

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be general

Gen. Charles Hartwell Bonesteel III, 018655. Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Jean Evans Engler, 019198, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grades as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. John Hersey Michaelis, 020328, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Joseph Miller Heiser, Jr., 043773, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Charles William Eifler, 032614, U.S. Army.

In the Army

The following-named person for reappointment in the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, from temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

To be colonel

Nida, Glenn E., 074100890.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283 through 3294 and 3311:

To be majors

Barrett, Ortie B., 449405251.
Brophy, Edward R. Jr., 014249257.
Brown, Howard E., 160221019.
Crittenden, Forest G., 527229847.
Farmer, Harold D., 44232653.

XUM

Otey, Lyman J., 226345779.
Smith, Orvie D., 456489725.
Vann, Claude O., Jr., 260202432.

To be captains

Bassett, Franklyn B., 040309648.
Buffone, David A., 197289379.
Cady, George P., 562403703.
Colello, Joseph Jr., 319267995.
Crawford, Charles W., 509343269.
Cukjati, Donald E., 509388589.
Damato, Earl J., 040309385.
Faubion, Merle L., 489349950.
Follmer, Ronald L., Jr., 206287334.
Grushetsky, Philip J., 208287407.
Hughes, James R., Jr., 447329908.
Johnson, Benjamin F., 455567241.
Kull, Donald H., 324288651.
Kulmayer, Joseph L., 139286105.
Lewis, William R., 356329719.
McClung, Henry J., Jr., 430642108.
McCollam, Myrna H., 504442760.
McManus, Ronald T., 569444059.
Mobley, Gordon S., III, 263529847.
Nicklas, Harold H., Jr., 310408871.
Smith, Guy A., Jr., 254546120.
Sorenson, Wilbert W., 523502603.
Strope, Michael B., 516444267.
Thompson, David A., 426849324.
Trevino, Francisco, Jr., 457520981.
Watson, Dwane C., 503283161.
Wheeler, Marvin W., 414446269.
Wood, Ernest M., Jr., 253465495.

To be first lieutenants

Addison, Wilbur D., 227526706.
Adlesperger, Ray D., 524407411.
Babson, Beverly R., 007408011.
Beres, Charles E., 209320809.
Bialkowski, John R., 381368343.
Billups, Leonard H., 228463539.
Choate, Philip S., 006400055.
Duke, Terrance M., 354245741.
Duvall, William E., III, 247703416.
Easley, Ronald E., 236602140.
Espinosa, John L., 531383357.
Farrell, Anne E., 130307221.
Fisher, William P., 401560174.
Freeman, Lawrence W., 461602119.
Gilbertson, Clark D., 471409479.
Greenberg, Joseph H., 471489971.
Hames, William H., Jr., 258644781.
Johnson, Stephen F., 263645060.
Jones, James E., Jr., 423547119.
Karr, Kennard G., 421565061.
Kelly, Dennis M., 555585019.
Kennedy, Kevin E., 023300307.
Kerner, Herbert V., 436608569.
King, Gerald F., 519468990.
Latimer, John D., 460681057.
Mathias, Phil A., 519464955.
McAleer, Charles F., 576443144.
Naylor, Robert H., II, 426849859.
Needham, Thomas H., 022323854.
Nicolini, Alexander, 119327291.
Paxton, Robert C., 545529286.
Platte, Ronald J., 284347806.
Reed, John F., Jr., 046343984.
Roberson, Bernard E., 368383119.
Robinson, Edwin R., Jr., 422582754.
Sanford, Steven D., 293362529.
Schlenker, Austin C., 097225046.
Schofield, Grant A., 021303072.
Schuyler, Linden E., 538348068.
Shamblen, James F., 235663056.
Sylvester, Marilyn J., 535346708.
Whitsett, Thomas N., 464684936.
Young, Edward J., 131301459.
Young, Robert S., 402488982.

To be second lieutenants

Bishop, Ronald M., 535429410.
Cole, Clyde N., 046323442.
Daniels, John E., 161322520.
Davis, Francisco S., 433567582.
Elam, John R., 261721719.
Fisher, Richard C., 553605695.
Koerselman, Benjamin, 484526540.
Lipton, William V., 137385677.
McCarthy, Joseph T., II, 561624924.
Proctor, Frank T., Jr., 252687523.
Thomas, William G., 257684179.
Wright, Cephas C., 524509077.

The following-named scholarship student for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2107.3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Cox, Gerald D.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NEW USES FOR HELIUM—THE WONDER ELEMENT

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 18, 1969

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, one of the major scientific breakthroughs of our time was made possible in 1905 when the element helium was found in natural gas flowing from a shallow well near Dexter, Kans. The subsequent work of University of Kansas scientists confirmed that this rare element could exist in relatively substantial quantities in natural gas fields. Today the United States controls the major source of economically recoverable helium in the free world and much of this gas continues to be recovered in my State of Kansas. Helium-recovery plants exist at Bushton, Ulysses, Liberal, Otis, Scott City, and Elkhardt, Kans. Among the firms recovering helium in Kansas are Northern Helex, Inc., Cities Service Helex, Inc., National Helium Corp., Kansas Refined Helium Co., and Alamo Chemical Co.

The United States is able to recover from natural gas, supplies of helium which sustain a wide range of spectacular scientific achievements. The first modern use of helium was as a safe, nonflammable lifting gas for balloons and airships. Today, however, helium plays an indispensable role in the launching and operation of our rocket flights to the moon, including Apollo 11; sustains human life in our exploitation beneath the sea; makes possible the phenomena known as lasers and masers; is essential to operation of nuclear reactors, gas chromatograph chemical analysis and shielded arc welding—to name but a few uses.

Yet helium is not a plentiful item here on earth. Prior to 1960, we wasted about 6 billion cubic feet of helium per year just by burning natural gas as fuel. However, thanks to a program enunciated by the late President Eisenhower and carried forward under the late President Kennedy, an effort has been made to conserve this valuable element. The Federal Government and a group of private helium producers have been able to put 22 billion cubic feet of helium into underground storage to meet future needs. Still, even with this program, half of the helium in natural gas production is wasted into the atmosphere. This, when there have been no substantial new sources of helium discovered since 1943.

Underscoring our need to use our helium resources wisely, is the fact that science is only just now beginning to discover still wider applications for helium. One such use is the new field of cryogenics, or supercold. Scientists already have shown us that loudspeakers immersed in liquified helium at temperatures of minus 452° F. can pick up broadcast signals from communications satellites. This is what makes it possible for us to see the Olympic games televised across the ocean or receive television pictures from space capsules.

But cryogenics may also make it possible for us to enjoy improved electric power at reduced costs. Improved generators and underground cables which eliminate above-ground high voltage cables are just two of the possibilities.

Mr. President, the need for a clear policy to conserve and make optimum use of our helium resources is self-evident. I believe that our Nation and its citizens in general should become aware of the importance of helium to our country and the possible ways in which they may benefit from a wise use of helium.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Research To Develop Superconductors," published in the Wall Street Journal of June 13, 1969.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESEARCH TO DEVELOP NEW SUPERCONDUCTOR—CABLE SEEN CAPABLE OF HANDLING POWER LOADS 25 TIMES THAT OF OTHER EXISTING METHODS

NEW YORK.—Union Carbide Corp. said it's initiating an $8 million, 12-year development program to produce an underground superconducting power cable capable of handling electricity power loads 25 times greater than the largest existing conventional cables.

The conducting element in Union Carbide's new cable will be ultra-pure niobium deposited by a patented process on copper backing. This would be cooled by liquid helium to 452 degrees below zero Fahrenheit; at that temperature it is superconductive, displaying almost no resistance to electrical current.

A Union Carbide spokesman said the program is designed to provide a solution to long-term power transmission problems expected by the early 1980's. The new cables, he added, would be utilized to carry electricity from suburban generating stations to cities, where local distribution by conventional cable would take over.

CABLE'S POTENTIAL

Scientists at the company's Linde division, which is to conduct the development program, believe that a single 24-inch-diameter super-conducting cable could carry more than enough power to supply New York City's present needs. At least 20 conventional 10-inch cables would be needed to carry the same load, it was announced.

By 1990, when New York City's power needs are expected to be triple today's, two superconductive cables could theoretically handle all of the city's needs, compared with at least 40 conventional, 345,000-volt cables, the scientists believe.

Utilities are facing pressure to put their transmission cables underground, despite the fact that it is cheaper and technically easier to use overhead power cables. Existing underground cables will be inadequate, engineers believe, to handle the increased power demands of urban centers within a few years.

The superconducting cables would have vastly greater capacity than any conventional cables, even the ultra-high voltage overhead cables currently under development. Superconducting cables, a Union Carbide scientist said, are "only slightly beyond the conceptual stage today."

RESEARCH TIMETABLE

According to the timetable drawn up by Union Carbide, two years and about $2 million would be spent on initial research and development, followed by seven years of prototype construction and testing, costing about $4.8 million. Final design modification would take an additional two years, and would cost about $1 million.

The increased load capability of superconducting cable, a Union Carbide scientist said "results in an effective decrease in the cable cost per unit power, especially at the higher voltage level." In addition, the power loss from a conventional cable is about 6,000 times greater than that from a superconducting cable, he said.

The Union Carbide program is a continuation of advanced research studies already conducted by the company for the Edison Electric Institute, a utility industry group.

AMERICAN INDIAN CONGRESS ENDORSES THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON INDIAN OPPORTUNITY

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Executive Council of the National Congress of American Indians—NCAI—recently issued a position paper on the Federal administration of Indian affairs. In its paper, NCAI strongly endorses the National Council on Indian Opportunity, a new Federal agency established by Executive order in March 1968. NCAI calls the National Council "a vital mechanism for Indian involvement in their own progress. There is no other like body which gives the Indian people such vital participation in the discussion and solution of their problems."

The Council's function is to review Federal programs for Indians, make broad policy recommendations and insure that Federal programs reflect the needs and desires of the Indian people. The Council is chaired by the Vice President. Its membership includes the Cabinet members responsible for Indian programs and six American Indian leaders. One of the Council's first projects was an investigation of the problems of urban Indians, a problem area that had been ignored by virtually all Government agencies before the formation of the Council.

Unfortunately, delays have occurred in the development of Council programs during the last 6 months. The House Appropriations Committee has understandably been concerned about these delays and has recommended that funds not be appropriated for the Council during the 1970 fiscal year.

Despite the organizational problems facing the Council, I know that this agency has an extremely important function to serve, and I would hope that it could be continued.

I want to take this opportunity to submit the NCAI position paper for inclusion in the RECORD:

A POSITION PAPER: NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS

(Adopted on May 6, 1969, Albuquerque, N. Mex.)

The National Congress of American Indians would like to project several views and ideas that we have concerning the Federal Administration of Indian Affairs during the present and subsequent Administrations.

The creation of the National Council on Indian Opportunity by President Johnson was a milestone in the involvement of Indian people with the administration of this country, and as such it can be a vital mechanism for Indian involvement in their own progress. There is no other like body which gives the Indian people such vital participation in the discussion and solution of their problems. The National Council on Indian Opportunity must be continued and funds appropriated for its continued operation.

There is no question about the desirability of appointing an Indian of recognized ability to the Indian Claims Commission.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs for a long period of time has handled matters involving Indian people. After a fair consideration of all the issues involved, we believe that the Bureau of Indian Affairs has, in good conscience, attempted to carry out its programs and functions, but we believe that the time has now arrived to take a long and analytical look at this Bureau.

The abolition or dispersal of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and all of its services among other government agencies certainly is not the answer. We believe that the Bureau of Indian Affairs can effectively perform its present duties if the organization is revised. It has the experience and know-how that is required in areas that it directly involves the Indian people in management.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs should, by legislation, be made an independent commission or agency. At the present time the Bureau of Indian Affairs must compete for funds with other agencies and bureaus within the Department of Interior who are also the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior. The Department of Interior is basically a land oriented organization, rather than a human oriented organization. The Department's Budget Managers are also land oriented. They do not have the required empathy regarding basic Indian problems which are human in nature, such as the community problems of education, housing, etc. The Secretary of the Interior often finds himself hamstrung by the Department and other interests which are more interested in other areas. This conflict of interest at the Secretarial level cannot contribute to the fair and impatrial administration of Indian Affairs.

The very bureaucratic structure of the Bureau of Indian Affairs insulates the Secretary of the Interior from the Indian people. The Secretary's chief representative of the Indian people, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, is also further insulated from the people by the Area Offices. With these insulations, it is no small wonder that many critics of the Bureau of Indian Affairs claim that the job is not being done, and that top heavy administration results. Limited funds are now being wasted on useless office support, which also breeds excessive red tape and reporting requiremants. Direct access to the top administrators is needed. The establishment of an independent Indian Commission will remove most of the bureaucracy that makes it so cumbersome for Indian people to communicate with those who are responsible for Indian Affairs. We believe that this proposed Indian Commission will be more responsive to the Indian people and speed the day when full-scale development can be implemented in Indian communities.

We would recommend the establishment of a committee or commission to study the operation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Included in this body should be a broad representation of responsible Federally recognized Indian leadership. One of the primary tasks of this body should be a complete study and evaluation of the present Bureau of Indian Affairs budget process. The present process has built-in pitfalls which not only encourage, but promote and nourish the building of empires by bureaucratic Branch Chiefs through their control of funds, promotions, etc., at the Central, Area and Agency levels.

We believe that funds appropriated by the Congress for the benefit of Indians and Indian Tribes should be appropriated with broad discretionary powers for their use given to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and especially to the Agency superintendent. The present line-item-functional appropriations result in waste for some functions through an overabundance of funds while other necessary functions are curtailed because of fund limitations. The revision of the budget process should also include the approval or the veto power by Tribal governing bodies during the local Agency budget submittal process.

The Indian Agencies at Reservation level should be reorganized, taking into account local needs and the total Reservation development programs. The present Bureau structure, which calls for an Agency Branch to complement every Washington Branch Chief whether it is essentially needed or not, should be eliminated. The local Agencies should be revamped to include an effective combination of facilities and services urgently and ultimately needed to achieve the human resource, natural resource and economic developments in the Indian Community.

We have some reservations about Indian Tribes contracting to perform services for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In many cases, Indian Tribes do not have the necessary capital to contract to perform these services. If Indian Tribes are to be encouraged to contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the necessary working capital and equipment must be made available on an outright grant basis to permit the Tribe to function economically. It should be specifically understood that if Indian Tribes are to contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, that a fair return by the Tribes is to be expected and that the Tribes should not be expected to pay sub-standard wages to perform these services. Also, the Tribes should be offered not only the dirtiest, smallest and most difficult jobs which the Agency must accomplish, but Tribes should be encouraged to accept major tasks that may require them to develop their own staffs of skilled experts. In many instances, Tribes are offered just those jobs that the Bureau of Indian Affairs has never been able to successfully accomplish, or those which are insignificant, or those which the Bureau of Indian Affairs does not want to be bothered with.

If Indian Tribes with very little capital contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, this contracting can bankrupt them unless payment procedures by the Bureau are improved. Further, the failure of Congress to give continuity of appropriations for Indian contract programs and developments could leave Indian contractors with costly, but unusable equipment. Excessive contract supervision and red tape requirements should also be kept in check if Indian Tribes are to be expected to contract successfully.

We have many years to go before the Indian people and their communities reach optimum development; therefore, any thoughts of abolishing or parceling out the services of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to other Federal agencies is out of the question at this time. If another Federal agency attempted to take over one of the present functions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, that agency would have to learn the difficult task and would be faced with the same problems which the Bureau of Indian Affairs faces. We suggest that the change of the present Area-Agency system is the most expedient route to take.

If the Bureau of Indian Affairs is abolished or its services fragmented it will again jeopardize, and in many cases it will terminate the present services of the Federal government. It will be termination in disguise. Indian people have never been successful in competing for services through other government agencies, and the services received from these agencies have been very small or practically nil except for the excellent services now received from the Economic Development Administration and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Politically and socially it is almost impossible for the Indian to compete for services among other Federal agencies. With the huge backlog of services and developments needing to be accomplished, at best, the parceling out of Bureau of Indian Affairs services to other Federal agencies would only be an injustice to these agencies because of their already insurmountable work load. A revamped and revitalized Bureau of Indian Affairs with sufficient funds can and will do a better job.

ALAN JAY LERNER'S SONGS FOR AMERICA

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 18, 1969

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, music and the words which go with it as lyrics, a universal language that transcends the borders of the countries of this world, has an outstanding examplar in Alan Jay Lerner. Songs bridge the so-called generation gap of today. The leaders of today's youth communicate with their contemporaries through songs. They tell the establishment of the thoughts, desires, sociological goals of today's youth. Down through the history of the world songs have truly reflected the moods and aspirations of the people of the times. From the hymns and psalms of Biblical times through the era of the Renaissance to the present day, songs have told the history and the longings of their times. The history of our generation has been put into songs by Alan Jay Lerner.

The year 1969 marks the 25th anniversary of this distinguished lyricist's career.

A native of New York, Alan Jay Lerner has served his country with words and deeds. He has served President Johnson and President Nixon as a member of the President's Committee for the National Cultural Center here in our Nation's Capital. He serves on the boards of governors of the National Hospital for Speech Disorders and the New York Osteopathic Hospital.

Of equal importance has been his contribution to the field of music in songs that have endeared him and our country to the people of the world. Starting with his first production, "The Patsy," he went on to "Brigadoon," "An American In Paris," "My Fair Lady," "Gigi," "Camelot," "On A Clear Day You Can See Forever," and "Paint Your Wagon."

The year 1969 is a historical year for this musicial American. In recognition of his 25 years of musical contributions, the American Academy of Dramatic Arts in New York City recently held an anniversary tribute to Alan Jay Lerner on the occasion of his silver jubilee and I had the personal pleasure as a friend of long standing of presenting the academy's award to him on that occasion. Simultaneously, two of his most famous stage musicals are being transferred to the motion picture theater screen by Paramount Pictures. They are "On A Clear Day You Can See Forever" and "Paint Your Wagon." "Paint Your Wagon," will make its screen debut this fall. They reflect in songs and music one of the most spectacular periods of Americana, the gold rush of many years ago which was the catalyst for the expansion of our great country's borders as we know them today. Much of the historical material of the time was clouded in romanticism. Through the traditional sources of history and researching the music of the time, Mr. Lerner was able to create a composite picture of those spectacular days of the wild west. It is for these contributions to our country that we join in the salute to Mr. Lerner, a music man of America, on the occasion of his 25th anniversary.

DILEMMA IN OUR SCHOOLS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the problems today in our schools.

I am impressed by the analysis and the suggestions that have been made by one of our Buffalo, N.Y., teachers, James A. Farley, in his remarks recently upon retiring as president of the Buffalo High School Teachers Association.

Following is the text of the brief lament by Mr. Farley, a teacher at Seneca Vocational High School, 666 East Delavan Ave.

A HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER SPEAKS

Now, I would leave a message with you—I am concerned, distressed and alarmed about the current philosophy of education or perhaps the lack of a philosophy of education especially on the secondary level.

In the past, one could simply say the purpose of education was basically to teach the 3 R's, citizenship and the other allied subjects on the high school level.

In the past two decades we have witnessed a vast expansion of educational empires—plans to start school at age 3 and 4—current legislation proposed to increase mandatory attendance age to 18—a lighted school program—life adjustment courses—sex education program, programs for the emotionally disturbed and mentally retarded. And all of this centered under one big top—the High School.

For every problem, the country seems to demand a program from the schools. We simply are not equipped to solve every problem of the world—nor should we attempt to do so—or be asked to do so.

We should set our limiting goals and attempt to reach them and cease the expansion of educational empires. We simply can't be all things to all people.

Now there is a popular slogan: "Support your schools". We need help. We welcome the support of parents and the community. However, we do not need the support of self appointed vigilante groups who daily verbally assault our schools and indeed, sometimes invade and physically assail and assault our students and teachers.

The schools are asked to assume more of the functions of the home—the law calls it "in loco parentis". That is, the schools stand in place of the parents. More and more responsibility is given to the school including responsibility for health and safety—but at this very time less and less authority is given to the teacher and the schools.

In short, it is a whole new ball game with little or no new rules available for the players. At times it seems as if the ship has lost its rudder. Yes, we need help. Your schools need support. We need the support of the parents and the community. We need new laws at the state and local school board level which will allow schools and teachers to do their jobs—namely, teach. We need the courts and Congress to support us also.

Now for an even more positive approach. I urge that the various high schools hold a conference a week before schools reopen—a conference of students, parents and faculty—and establish a set of rules for conduct and dress applicable for that given academic year.

I ask that these rules be upheld by the school boards and the courts. At least this would be a beginning. We need your support. We need help.

OUR FREEDOM AND THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the beginning of a very monumental event in the course of human development. On the morning of July 16, the United States of America launched the most ambitious scientific investigation ever attempted by man, with the lift-off of Apollo 11 on its voyage to the moon. However, with millions of Americans listening and watching the event, and the entire world keeping an attentive eye on the attempted moon landing, I am somewhat inquisitive with regard to another aspect of human development which I believe to be the genesis of this ambitious space program. I speak of American freedom and I hold this freedom to be not only a deciding factor in America's overall quest for achievement, but also the major motivating factor in dividual accomplishment.

How many Americans actually live in constant appreciation of this important fact? One has only to look to nations such as Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, East Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, and Albania to fully understand the reason that America has produced or harbored the type of men capable of realizing such dreams as the current Apollo moonshot. It is because America is the citadel of freedom—and the one place in the world where there is truly no limit to the broad-ness and boldness of the peoples' outlook, and no tethers on expression of thought or confidence in man's ability to solve the great social as well as physical problems which still confront the world.

We must continue to express our concern for those other peoples who struggle and yearn for similar freedoms; and so I hail America's expression of such concern during this, the eleventh annual observance of Captive Nations Week.

The three lone Americans who have now embarked on history's most incredible venture, represent more than this Nation; they represent mankind. For their success, for which we pray, will not really diminish the earth, as some have suggested, but will make it all the larger in the sense that they will be helping men everywhere in their determination to meet the challenges which, for a moment only, these three earthlings have left behind.

One of the greatest of those challenges is to push forward the frontiers of freedom, and it is entirely fitting that we pledge to do so, in this occasion, by reaffirming our Nation's devotion to the principle of self-determination for the people of all lands.

JAMES N. FAZIO—PASSING OF A COMMUNITY LEADER

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I join the people of the Fifth Congressional District and thousands of people on Long Island in mourning the passing of an outstanding community leader—James N. Fazio, of Island Park. We needed him for years more of service to community and country and we will feel his loss for years to come.

Jim Fazio served as district administrative assistant to my very distinguished predecessor, Congressman Herbert Tenzer, from 1965 to 1968 and in that capacity earned the respect and friendship of thousands of people in the Fifth District for his dedication and compassion. He was Herbert Tenzer's dedicated representative in the district while the Congressman was in Washington.

A graduate of Syracuse University—Phi Beta Kappa, 1938—and Harvard Law School—1941—Jim engaged in the active practice of law in New York City and Nassau County from 1941 until his death. He served as counsel to the OPA, 1944–45; corporation counsel for the Village of Island Park for 8 years; village urban renewal counsel—1952–65—and drafted zoning ordinances, building codes, and village laws.

In the political field, he was actively involved in the Democratic Party at both the local and national levels. He was Democratic zone leader of Island Park, and was a candidate for the New York State Assembly, town of Hempstead, supervisor and delegate to the National Democratic Convention. He took an active role in several presidential campaigns and was always available to Democratic candidates on Long Island.

Perhaps his most outstanding contribution to the community was in the field of civic leadership. He served as president of the American Field Service, Oceanside chapter; the Island Park PTA and Dante League. He was also director of the Italian-American Historical Society, vice president of the Kiwanis Club and chairman of fund raising efforts for Heart Fund, Cancer Fund, Boy Scouts, and many other organizations.

The blow of his untimely passing that is suffered by the whole community is of course felt with infinitely greater intensity by his family.

Many of my colleagues knew Jim and I know they will want to join me in sending our prayers to all the Fazios. Our hearts go out especially to Jim's gracious and devoted wife, Catherine and their four children, Karen Janice, Frank Scott, Linda Grace, and Elissa Camille.

SOUNDING BOARD FOR SLANDER

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the recent hearings held by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations regarding campus disorders have caused concern due to the use of hearsay, very damaging to certain individuals, as accepted public testimony.

Congressional immunity and the congressional power of investigation can serve as effective and essential parts of the legislative process. But Congress abuses these two constitutional powers when they are applied without concern for other constitutional guarantees, such as due process, and the common law protections against libel and slander. The possibility for defamation of character and other abuses occurring due to the wide legal immunities given by these congressional powers is frightening. Congress must exercise the eternal vigilance necessary if we are not to make a mockery of the constitutional protections of due process and our own constitutional responsibilities.

I wish to commend the Washington Post for helping to draw attention to this question through their editorial on July 8, 1969, entitled "Sounding Board for Slander."

The editorial follows:

SOUNDING BOARD FOR SLANDER

There is something frighteningly familiar about the two-bit circus that Senator John McClellan has been conducting lately under the auspices of his Permanent Investigations Subcommittee. The ostensible purpose of its current investigation is to look into the causes of college campus disorders, a form of inquiry now flagrantly fashionable and already undertaken redundantly by far more competent investigating bodies. The McClellan formula is wonderfully simple: offer congressional immunity from suits for libel or slander to any malcontent or crackpot who may want a free forum for expressing his crotchets or paying off old grudges.

This was the formula parlayed into a national frenzy by the late Senator Joseph McCarthy. It created an atmosphere in which Americans tended to look with distrust upon their fellow Americans and in which national security was sought through a general repression of individual freedom. It was surely one of the unhappiest times in American history.

Senator McClellan opened his show with an appearance by Eric Hoffer who set the tone for the investigation by saying of the rebellious students at Columbia University, "It would have been a wonderful thing if Grayson Kirk got mad and got a gun and killed a few." But more serious than this sort of bloodthirsty nonsense has been the careless dropping of names by witnesses, denounced the other day by Senator Percy as "guilt by association of the worst type."

Senator Percy was roused to his thoroughly justified wrath by the testimony of a member of the Chicago Police Department's Subversive Unit who characterized a personal friend of the Senator as a contributor to Black Power and other radical groups. The sheer vagueness of this defamatory reference affords a pretty good measure of its value. Senator Percy pressed the policeman to be more specific about what groups the lady in Chicago had supported; but that expert on "subversion" said he could not do so "without reference to our files."

Not everyone slurred in a proceeding of this sort is lucky enough to have a senatorial friend on hand to spring to her defense. A committee of the United States Senate ought not be lending itself to such carelessness. The purpose of the legislative investigating power is to enable Congress to obtain information necessary for legislation—not to punish people by publicity, without any semblance of due process and without affording them any chance to defend themselves.

BILL SHAY

HON. DANIEL J. RONAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Speaker, 1,000 friends of Bill Shay gathered in Chicago last evening on his 60th birthday, to honor the veteran Catholic League basketball mentor, who has announced his retirement from the coaching profession. Mr. Shay has been one of the most successful coaches of basketball and builders of young men in the Chicagoland area during the last 36 years.

After starring in basketball at St. Phillip High School and DePaul University, Bill returned to St. Phillip as head coach and remained there for 10 years before enlisting in the Navy in World War II. Upon his discharge from service, he returned to the Chicago Catholic League at De La Salle High School, where he was head coach for the next 4 years before assuming the coaching reins at Fenwick High School.

Mr. Shay left Fenwick in 1954 to become freshman basketball coach at Loyola University in Chicago, where he was again instrumental in developing many outstanding players over the next 5 years. In 1960 Bill returned to Fenwick High School where he remained until the present time.

Throughout his career, Coach Shay has been notable for his success in producing an incomparable parade of great teams, great players, and fine young men. His record for sectional, league, and city championships in both junior and senior competition is unequalled in the history of the Chicago Catholic High School League.

At this time, on behalf of myself and my congressional colleagues from the Chicago area, I would like to extend to Bill Shay our heartiest congratulations for the outstanding job he has done in developing both the minds and the bodies of the thousands of young men with whom he has come in contact during his coaching career. His influence on their lives will continue to benefit them, and their country as well, for the rest of their lives. We also wish Bill Shay many more years of good health and happiness, and thank him for his untiring efforts on behalf of our youth.

ALUMNI INTEREST IN YOUNG PEOPLE

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Attorney Aaron Fishman in New York City, believes that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has served a wonderful purpose in disseminating matters of a cultural interest to the Nation and he writes to report on the continuity and development of matters that were reported here before. The interest of alumni in the children of an elementary school is rare since we find alumni interest directed to schools of higher learning. But it is well directed when we consider the importance to young children of an awareness of affiliation with a tradition and with alumni of importance. In these perilous days of our educational system the efforts of alumni "to give a damn" as they say in New York City, about the disadvantaged have impressed the board of education which had our last CONGRESSIONAL RECORD report distributed to the almost 1,000 schools so that they could follow good example. Items like the following may serve as guidelines of commendable conduct that the Nation should know about as being in the national interest. It is about what is probably the best known elementary school alumni group in the country.

Alumnus Charles H. Silver, a former president of the board of education of New York City and now an assistant to the mayor of New York City, is the president of the Beth Israel Medical Center which has just celebrated its 80th anniversary by tendering a testimonial dinner to Dr. Albert Sabin of antipolio vaccine fame.

At the medical center is inscribed a credo which will be a permanent statement of the philosophy of Charles H. Silver:

> I know of no phase of human endeavor which is nobler in purpose than the healing of the sick and the alleviation of suffering. I know of no institution that serves a community with such utter unselfishness and such great effectiveness as a modern hospital. I know of no personal relationship that is more genuine and tender than that which exists between the patients in a hospital and the men and women in white who function within its walls. This, our credo for more than half a century, will endure long after those who now serve Beth Israel Hospital have passed on.

For the past 20 years Mr. Silver has also served as chairman of the annual Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation dinner. The dinner raises funds to provide for the poor, the sick, and the underprivileged, regardless of race, creed, or color, distributing millions of dollars to hospitals, especially St. Vincent's and Beth Israel and to Catholic Relief Services and other charitable organizations.

In the past Francis Cardinal Spellman headed the foundation as president and Mr. Silver was the vice president. At the last dinner Archbishop Terrence J. Cooke, now a cardinal, succeeded as the president. The occasion was a historic one which Charles H. Silver presided over. In an unrehearsed, brilliant display of wit, good taste, and good will, appeared the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, and Richard Nixon. Assembled on a six-tier dais were, among others, Mayor John V. Lindsay, Governor Rockefeller, Governor Hughes, of New Jersey, Senators JAVITS and GOODELL, ex-Governor of New York, Thomas E. Dewey. The guest of honor was James A. Farley.

Referring to these guests in his remarks Dinner Chairman Silver, said:

> They are leaders in the human parish that fuses men of all faiths in search for a way of life to ease the tensions of today and to meet the trials of tomorrow. They are leaders and followers, too, of those who minister to the human spirit—those men of God who will give us the strength to carry on despite seemingly overwhelming odds—despite the rage and riot in our streets and the bitterness and bloodshed between men and nations. Today's frustrations and anger—today's injustice and insecurity—should remind us that America is what we make it—for ourselves—and for our children.

When Archbishop Cooke traveled to Rome to receive from Pope Paul VI the pallium, the symbol of the fullness of episcopal office included in the party that traveled to Rome was his good friend, Charles H. Silver.

Alumnus Israel Cummings who is the president of the Shamokin Woolen Mills refers to his schoolmates as "those ghetto kids." He is very proud of them since in addition to Charles H. Silver, their names include Senator JAVITS, Ben Javits, George and Ira Gershwin, Paul Muni, Edward G. Robinson, Irving Jacobson, Irving Caesar, Harry Golden, Surrogate Silverman, Judge Simon Silver, and Judge Samuel J. Leibowitz. He said:

> A half century ago we referred to the ghetto children as underprivileged. Today we speak of the disadvantaged.

But semantics aside, an editorial entitled "A Clue to Decency" that appeared in the New York Journal-American said:

> They grew up in a neighborhood of immigrant parents huddled in tenements, and they rose above their environment

Perhaps the reason was summed up best by Charles H. Silver, former president of the board of education, an alumnus, when he said:

> Maybe we do not know all the answers to the problems of delinquency * * * but we know that the regard we had for our teachers and the love we had for our parents made a great difference in our lives. We believe that a new generation can find inspiration in these words.

A big event in New York City was the occasion of Cummings' 80th birthday when Mayor Lindsay, Borough President Percy Sutton, Attorney General Louis Lefkowitz, Congressman LEONARD FARBSTEIN, Samuel Silberman, president of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies and Frank Weil, president of the Education Alliance joined representatives of community organizations in honoring him. Part of this event was the gift of a building to the Education Alliance of a recreational center containing a new gymnasium, 15 recreational rooms and a roof playground by Israel and Leah Cummings. An honor paid to Mrs. Cummings on this occasion was the renaming of one of the summer camps which they founded to be known as Camp Leah.

Because his beneficence remembered the place he came from he has been stamped as "the man who did not forget." He has discovered a great personal satisfaction in establishing Israel Cummings Day at the circus. He recently sent down eight buses to the East Side and picked up over 500 children from the Anna Silver School, the Education Alliance, the Rabbi Jacob Joseph School, the University Settlement and the Henrietta Szold School and a police squad car led them up to the new Madison Square Garden. Ice cream was as always part of the visit.

Because to help support his family he had to drop out of elementary school, aiding dropouts became a specialty of his. For his generosity to the U.S. Navy League he was presented with an admiral's sword. Many groups have honored him, but he had an overwhelming desire for that elementary school diploma which he had left behind. After 65 years the board of education decided that he had probably earned one and it was presented to him by schoolmate U.S. Senator JACOB K. JAVITS at an alumni reunion dinner. He says:

> I have made it my business throughout my whole life to help others to help themselves and I have felt that the satisfaction of giving has paid me back manifold.

Good habits and his selflessness are probably the reasons for his longevity.

We pay a last tribute to some of the "Ghetto Kids" who have just left our midst: Charles Guttman, president of the Paddington Corp., whose philanthropy included gifts of a building for the Henry Street Settlement and the Beth Israel Medical Center; Dr. William F. Rosenblum, community and religious leader; Irving Alpert who worked for better housing legislation; Hyman A. Mintzer who spent a lifetime in the Immigration Service, and George Levy, the oldest alumnus, Spanish-American war veteran and famous ballpark announcer.

An illustration of the enterprise and imaginative behavior of East Side teenagers who were part of the disadvantaged living of that early era is that of the Forton Club. Made up largely of boys of Public School No. 20, who lived in the school area of Forsyth and Rivington Streets, a group which had Irving Mandell—later a chancellor commander of the Grand Lodge of the Knights of Pythias of the State of New York—Morris Fishman, William Alpert, and Jack Kamlet as the leaders of this social club in 1910. The name Forton stemmed from the two streets and they first met at the corner of the street where they lived, at times in the University Settlement at the other corner, and most of the time in each other's homes. With their small dues they later hired a clubroom for their dances and socials, away from dance halls. The group stuck together and, when family relationships came into their lives, they formed a lodge, bought cemetery land, and became pretty well established when, under the leadership of Judge Max Meltzer, Harry Perlis, Lou Seltz, Sam Stackell, William Alpert, Irving Alpert, William Steirman, Moe Hellman, Irving Mandel, and Allan Bienstock, they incorporated their lodge.

They were a community-minded group and community welfare was their program. They shared in the relief of disasters that occurred on the East Side. The Forton Ladies Auxiliary have taken on the project of distributing Passover baskets to the needy. The lodge has created a scholarship fund for the deserving of the community and has concerned itself with the committee working for better housing. After some 60 years the lodge now has 320 members, among them Attorney General Louis Lefkowitz and Supreme Court Judge Samuel Spiegel. Harry Perlis, a recent 20 alumni association president has been slated as the Forton Man of the Year for 1969. They maintain their clubhouse at 301 East 14th Street in New York City.

Alumnus Irving Jacobson has developed an international reputation by his portrayal of Sancho Panza in Man of La Mancha. He has within a period of 4 years of the play's run used up 11 Don Quixotes. Jacobson, despite a lifetime of comedy background, chose not to present Sancho Panza as a funny man but as Miguel de Cervantes intended him, a simple peasant whose love and loyalty to his master Don Quixote moved many viewers to tears, watching them set out on their glorious quest to right wrongs, dreaming impossible dreams, and reaching for unreachable stars.

When Lynda Johnson and her mother visited with Jacobson backstage Lynda remarked that her father could use a Sancho Panza in Washington, he answered with the now famous remark, "Well, I'm off on Mondays." Ethel and Robert Kennedy were both very much moved by Sancho and the Senator was very much interested in Jacobson memorabilia which revealed him as a schoolmate of the senior Senator JACOB JAVITS. When Ethel urged Sancho to persuade Robert to take a much needed haircut, Jacobson said, "Don't you do it, Senator, you may yet have to play Sancho." When Congressman CELLER visited with him he revealed an indepth acquaintance with Cervantes.

Sensing the importance to the children of meeting and mixing with professional actors, Jacobson brought down to his school the principals of his Man of La Mancha company, Don Quixote—David Atkinson—and Dulcinea—Bernice Massey—to watch the children's glee club put on a miniature performance of the play and to mix with them, join in their singing and talk "theater." He also traveled to the St. Albans Hospital with members of the company to entertain servicemen returned from Vietnam.

Ben Bloom, alumnus and music publisher, is proud of the photo of George Gershwin, an old-time student, which reads, "To Ben Bloom who gave me my first job in the music business." Ben Bloom delights in organizing with the help of the Brandt Pictures office parties to the movies for groups of children.

Out in Las Vegas alumnus Charles Kandel is one of the Sands Hotel executives. At the request of the Honorable WALTER S. BARING, one of the flags which had flown over the U.S. Capitol was presented to Kandel, "In recognition of your outstanding service to your former comrades in arms and your patriotic service to your country." Kandel sent it to his old public school in New York City where it is exhibited for the children to see.

Kandel has made a special project of veteran welfare, rehabilitation, and hospital assistance, and scholarships for youngsters of all faiths. He is national deputy rehabilitation officer of the Jewish War Veterans and a national aide de camp of Veterans of World War II. His interests have also included the American Cancer Society and the Shrine Club. He is a brother of the well-known writer, Aben Kandel.

Ralph D. Cole, who heads the Consolidated Lithographing Corp., has made a special project of a multiple-purpose certificate of commendation which carries on the very important recognition program which the alumni have fostered among faculty and alumni to intensify interest in the aims of their tradition. The principal uses them to encourage excellence in every direction by presenting them in public to the deserving.

Alumnus Aaron Fishman, who has been involved in theater journalism, was responsible for bringing the La Mancha cast over to the school to meet the children. He has worked with the New York State Legislature in effecting legislation in behalf of health related facilities. He has shown special interest in immigration and minority problems. For his civic interests the French Government recently decorated him with the chevalier and officer ranks of the Order of Le Dévouement Civique.

The last reunion of the alumni held at the Statler-Hilton in New York City featured a tribute in honor of the birthday of the organization's founder, attorney and old time teacher, Nathaniel Phillips. The evening also paid tribute to its illustrious alumnus, Irving Caeser, world famous lyricist of "Swanee" and "Tea For Two." Participating in the tribute were Congressmen LEONARD FARBSTEIN and EMANUEL CELLER, and Harry Hershfield and Harry "Only in America" Golden and representatives of ASCAP.

The pledge to the flag used the music which Caesar had written and presented to the Congress in behalf of ASCAP. It was recalled that when the new song for the pledge was introduced to the country at a joint session of Congress the Marine and Air Force bands and the singing Marine sargeants participated. The entire Congress assembled, faced toward the gallery, and applauded a little East Side boy, now grown to full manhood, Irving Caesar, the author of the Nation's new song.

Principal Benjamin Falon continued the tradition of reissuing the diplomas to the 50th anniversary graduating class. The alumni are teacher minded and rose in recognition of the 90th birthday of their old principal, Dr. I. Edwin Goldwasser, and the 80th birthday of their physical education instructor, Herman Brown. Peter J. Massaro, happy about the reunion, offered this tribute to his hometown New York City:

> She's mine—no matter where I roam. My well being is secure in knowing that she will be there when I return. Despite the hustle and bustle which annoy strangers, to me her sounds are the beat I need.

He is the proud possessor of a letter of appreciation from His Holiness Pope Paul VI for the Christmas prayer that he composed and sent titled: "Carillons on High Ring in His Praise." The reunion dinner was chaired by Jack Kamlet and emceed by Judge Simon Silver, president of the organization.

You will recall the fact that Carl Sandburg, the poet laureate, was made part of the tradition of a New York East Side school. In impressive ceremonies a tablet was erected at the Anna Silver P.S. 20. The statement was obtained by alumnus Harry Golden, Sandburg's neighbor and biographer. It reads:

> The restless and venturing human spirit of youth may perform tomorrow with exploits today called visionary and impossible. What the young people want and dream across the next hundred years will shape history and more than any other motivation to be named. The walls of this school might be saying, "youth when lighted and alive and given a sporting chance is strong for struggle and not afraid of any toils or punishments or dangers or deaths."

That statement prepared in 1961 reveals a timely admonition of the importance of our maintaining confidence in youth. To perpetuate the memory and ideals of the great poet laureate the alumni will yearly vie for the honor of being the donors of the Carl Sandburg Memorial Prize to the student selected by the teachers as one who characterizes the teachings of the great poet laureate.

Margaret Sandburg, a daughter, writes from Connemara Farms in Flatrock, N.C., that the resolution of North Carolina's Senator ERVIN to make a national historic site of the Sandburg homestead passed both Houses by voice vote and obtained the President's signature. The Secretary of the Interior was authorized to acquire it. From Cleveland, Helga Sandburg, the wife of Dr. Crile, has come a letter containing a poem "Addressed to a Father." It is a beautiful poem in tribute to Carl Sandburg and it is comforting to know that he has left us a heritage in a daughter who inherits his own great talent. She has sent it to the children of the school where a permanent Sandburg exhibit is being set up. Part of the display, in addition to the Sandburg plaque, is the color photo sent by President Johnson of himself with Carl Sandburg. Through the kindness of Kate Rodina Steichen there has been added a copy of the famous Sandburg profiles which her father Edward Steichen took of his brother-in-law Sandburg. This is the poem "Addressed to a Father":

I remember you in various ways;
The picture I have of you of those days
Differs perhaps from what you'd think it is.
Living is an unprobed game that children play
Since everyone else is doing it too.

You sat on the house's top above three stairways,
Your skin caging the sun with brassed felicity,
And spoke to me father's counsel
To which I gave little mind,
Though admiring your glad attitude, and being
Sure that the world was firm, since you held
Its reins so exceeding well. The smoke
Had gone from your cold clenched cigar; the wood
Of the orange crate was hot to touch; in back
Of you the iron grill was flooded by a trumpet vine;
The tropical blooms hid clustering from
The sun which was stamped with your name,
Which belonged I knew to you.

That was one thing, the sun; another was
Your voice humming as you descended uncounted stairs
To where the rest of us were at table.
Two mad beautiful Irish setters howling joy
Prefaced your arrival. A song started lusty
When you reached the second staircase; it might be,
"Everybody works at our house! But my old man!"
The faces in the room went wheeling to your voice. Then

Your affection for night, your walking through it,
Into its blackness where occasionally glowed
One evening star like a tiny sun
Or the beginning moon like a cobweb looped
Or an old sated one in a blue blaze.
For these thanks: the globe and bugle blooms, the red dogs
And song; the night that I hold on temporary loan.

A visit to the school would show that its corridor referred to as the P.S. 20 Alumni Hall contains a museum of the tradition that the alumni are so proud of and which they believe should serve as a shrine and a source of inspiration to the generations of children who will follow and will be guided by the standards which have been set.

The Hall of Fame tablet contains the 100 best names in the history of the school, honoring those who have succeeded in their vocations and who have served the community, and it is intended to acquaint future generations with the alumni with whom they share the school's tradition.

Exhibit cases show the works and the story of achievement of many of the alumni. The internationally famous muralist Lumen Martin Winter who designed the murals for the Air Force Chapel in Colorado Springs and the AFL–CIO building in Washington created the mosaic glass immigration mural which tells the story of the background of the students who came to the school. It contains the famous lines of Emma Lazarus:

> Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.

John F. Kennedy's statement "America is a Nation of immigrants, descendants of immigrants" emphasizes the ideology behind the school's tradition. The most valued statement is probably the one that gave rise to the school's anthem "Ecce Quam Bonum, Quamque Jucundum Habitare Fratres In Unum" which are the Latin words for the ideal that we all strive for—"Behold, How Good and How Pleasant It Is For Brethren To Dwell Together in Unity." Lumen Martin Winter recently donated a sketch of the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy with the inscription that he was so proud of:

> Some men see things as they are and say why. I dream things that never were and say why not.

Noteworthy are the legends set in brass on the marble walls by Emerson, Lincoln, John F. Kennedy and Silver. Uncannily the legends of Presidents Lincoln and Kennedy were set together on the same wall, long before the tragic Kennedy incident—two men whose presidential lives contained many parallels. Worthy are the Lincoln statement:

> Let us have faith that right makes might and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it.

And the Kennedy statement:

> And so my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

The statement of Charles H. Silver who served for many years as president of the board of education contains a rich message:

> Human aspiration reaches one of the highest expressions in the sacred and noble act of building a school. Because the children of today are the parents of tomorrow there are no limits of time or distance to the enrichment of all mankind everywhere that begins in a single classroom.

"Reaching the unreachable star" has become part of an inspiring vernacular. The inspiration of such an idea was already present in the school's slogan engraved on every graduation pin—Per Aspera Ad Astra.

Over 50 years ago the school had instituted the Davis School State. It honored a superintendent and its purpose was to give the children an opportunity to learn live civics by having them select judges and mayors for the upper grades and a governor, secretary of state, and prosecuting attorneys. In a sense it catered to the desires of the immigrant population that was so anxious to do things the American way. As alumnus Harry—Only in America—Golden said in his New York Daily column:

> P.S. 20 is more than the repository for the names of successful persons sprung from the lower East Side. It represents one of the most visionary experiments in the history of human relationships, the making of an immigrant population into a citizen body politic. The teachers in public school 20 not only taught American History but shared it.

Note should be taken of the program of recognition and awards which were effective as an incentive to building alumni interest. The creation of the "Our Teacher Award" called attention to the service which retired men and women had given in a lifetime of teaching of children. At the instance of Senator JAVITS a joint resolution was introduced in the Senate establishing National Teachers Recognition Day on the fourth Wednesday in April.

Alumni who had achieved notably and had served the community were awarded a "Certificate of Appreciation." The nostalgic sentiment of the alumni was captured by the idea of "Time for Another Diploma" when the members of the 50th anniversary class each year were presented with a duplicate of their elementary school diploma very few of which were still extant among the alumni.

At the school, restored as the Anna Silver P.S. 20, the faculty is tendered a luncheon annually by Mr. Silver and there is presented a community award by the faculty. Most recently Mrs. Rose Shapiro, formerly the president of the board of education, was presented with the award for her great interest in the children of the New York City school system.

The Sandburg statement which the poet laureate had prepared for the school inspired other friends of the school to do some writing for presentation. Theodore Reade Nathan, the aide of Charles H. Silver, and director of the Lincoln Square Academy which is interested in children talented in writing, composing, music, art, and the performing arts has created the poem "East Side Mother" in keeping with the concept of the school which was dedicated to Anna Silver, the symbol of all east side mothers.

I'd gladly give up gold or fame
  To seek again that poorer place
Where when the hour of bedtime came,
  I gazed up at my mother's face.

The hours have gone, the days have fled
  The years have washed away like sand . . .
I stand upon the shore of dread
  And cannot find my mother's hand.

What wisdom—oh, what wealth is there
  To change that rumpled little fool—
Who pushed her fingers from his hair
  Before he hurried off to school.
She watched him on his way to class
  Admonishing from up above:

'Be sure to let the horse-car pass'—
  And so we heard the voice of love.

The East Side Mother long ago
  Gave us her strength, her faith, her youth—
Gave us the will to learn and grow
  And so we knew the voice of truth.

Look down once more from where you are
  To watch the children of our day,
And be again their guiding star—
  Mother, help us find our way.

Smith and Dale, the internationally famous comedians and founders of the Avon Comedy Four, with its Dr. Kronkite and Mr. Dubious, met at the site of the original P.S. 20 when they ran into each other while riding on bicycles. They never graduated from their elementary school but they had many friends at the old school. In recent years they were made honorary members of the Alumni Association. In 1963, on the occasion of the dedication ceremonies of the new school building, after some 60 years, the board of education decided that their accomplishments had fulfilled the requirement for an elementary school diploma and superintendent Dr. Donovan presented them with special diplomas.

One of the honored guests participating in the dedication program was His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman. In his remarks he congratulated Joe Smith and Charles Dale and referring to the elementary school diplomas which they had just received, said with a twinkle in his eye, "I hope that someday I will merit one of those."

Joe Smith who is an artist with a brush, and with the poetic line, was inspired by the Sandburg effort to add his contribution to the poetry of the day with his poem, "Mothers of The East Side":

> Go children, hurry. Don't be late for school. Be a steady scholar—learn the golden rule. Listen to your teachers—they are your safety shields. Helping to mold your youth, leading on to higher fields. We mothers of the East Side wholeheartedly attest to the integrity of your teachers to do their level best. We have faith in their system for better education. We have faith in their wisdom and allegiance to our Nation. So go children, hurry. Don't be late for school. Be a steady scholar and learn the golden rule.

So that we may joyfully sing "America, the Beautiful," and as has been our practice in the past we pass on some words of value to our school successors. The full meaning maybe a bit advanced, yet deserving of enlightenment and explanation by their teachers.

David Neiswanger, Menninger Foundation:

> If each of us can be helped by science to live a hundred years, what will it profit us if our hates and fears, our loneliness and remorse will not permit us to enjoy them?
>
> In approaching your fellow men hold these principles as your foremost guides—sincerity, kindness, graciousness.

When Robert F. Kennedy was asked what he thought leadership was, he said it was the ability to inspire people to develop their best talents.

Sidney Hillman said:

> We want a better America, an America that will give its citizens, first of all, a higher and higher standard of living so that no child will cry for food in the midst of plenty. We want to have an America where the inventions of science will be at the disposal of every American family, not merely for the few who can afford them. An America that will have no sense of insecurity and which will make it possible for all groups, regardless of race, creed or color to live in friendship, to be real neighbors; an America that will carry its great mission of helping other countries to help themselves.

The Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame, and Chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights speaks of the need of a vision:

> Part of that vision must certainly include law and order. But, curiously enough one cannot really have law and order without another part of the vision: greater achievement of justice in our times, more compassion for all, real love between generations.

AS SPACEMEN LOOK BEYOND THE MOON

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a recent interview with Dr. Thomas O. Paine, Administrator of NASA, has been published in the July 7 issue of U.S. News & World Report. Dr. Paine, in this interview, comments on several aspects of the future of our national space program, including deep space voyages and chances of life in other parts of the universe. Because of the significance of Dr. Paine's remarks I am including excerpts from this interview in the RECORD:

AS SPACEMEN LOOK BEYOND THE MOON

TO MARS AND VENUS

Q. Dr. Paine, what are the prospects of going on out beyond the moon and sending men to the planets?

A. This really is a question that we would like to answer after we've had a much closer look at the planets. We will have two TV probes flying by Mars this summer—on July 30 and August 4. And two years later, when Mars comes around again in 1971, we're going to put a pair of orbiters around Mars that will give us a complete map of the surface. Then in 1973, when Mars comes around again, we're going to put two surface probes down in the areas of highest interest that will search for life and give us a much better understanding of conditions on the surface of Mars.

Until we have a better idea of surface phenomena on Mars, it's difficult to say whether the American people will decide that an expedition to Mars is something in which we should invest substantial sums.

Q. Would Mars be a more likely first target than, say, Venus?

A. Yes. Mars is the logical next target after the moon. It has the kind of temperature and atmosphere and surface conditions that would make it possible for man to operate, although with difficulty. He would have to wear a heated space suit, but it is a possible place for man to go and explore—and eventually even to colonize.

Q. How long would it take to get there?

A. The voyage would vary from something like 400 days to 1,100 days, depending on what particular mode you selected.

One of the very attractive trips to make is the longer voyage of about three years—about a year on the way out, and then a year there orbiting Mars, descending to the surface, analyzing samples and giving the planet a very complete and intensive study, taking another year for the return journey.

Q. We've seen estimates of 100 billion dollars for such a project. Isn't that pretty forbidding?

A. That would be extremely forbidding, but I believe such a price is probably substantially more than actually would be required.

Current NASA projects that would contribute to such a venture include our NERVA nuclear-rocket program, which would provide an efficient propulsion system, and our spacestation programs, which would demonstrate that we could keep men alive in space for the length of time required. Further, our unmanned probes to Mars should give us the information that we need on surface conditions there, and whether or not it appears worthwhile to undertake such a voyage of exploration.

Q. Are you convinced man can stand up under a three-year expedition to Mars and back?

A. Sure. Our ancestors in whaling-ship days used to set sail from Nantucket and go to sea for three years in very cramped quarters exposed to many dangers—and come back healthy and vigorous. The trip to Mars would put similar demands on today's astronauts, but now we have far-superior medical and life-support technology.

Q. There must be some limits to the extent to which man can explore the universe. What are they?

A. There are substantial limitations in temperature, in pressure and gravity on many of the other planets. The surface of Venus appears much too hot for men to endure, although it might be possible to balloon around in the upper atmosphere. On Jupiter, the gravity would be too high for men to sustain, although some of the moons of Jupiter might be places that men could explore.

Q. Is it conceivable that man could journey to another solar system?

A. At the present time, that is completely out of the realm of possibility. With the kinds of chemical propulsion systems and the primitive nuclear propulsion systems we have today, man will be limited to travel within the solar system for the next generation.

But in the more-distant future, if it were ever possible for us, for example, to control the energy of nuclear fusion and adapt it in some efficient way to the propulsion of spacecraft, it might be possible to think in terms of longer voyages to another star. At the present time, we don't see this at all; a fundamental breakthrough would have to be made.

CHANCE OF LIFE IN UNIVERSE

Q. Do you think that there is life elsewhere in the universe? Is that one of the attractions of journeying so far from earth?

A. It seems to me the chance of life in other solar systems is absolutely 100 per cent. It's inconceivable that life would have uniquely originated only on this particular minor planet going around this rather modest sun in this ordinary galaxy. I'm sure that conditions leading to the formation of life have occurred in many parts of the universe. We certainly are not alone.

Surely one of the great discoveries of mankind will be its first contact with life of an extraterrestrial nature and—even more dramatic, of course—if the day ever comes, man's first contact with intelligent life in some other part of the universe.

Q. Dr. Paine, getting back to our coming moon landing—everyone seems extremely confident that it will be a "breeze." Do you also feel that way?

A. Quite the contrary. The people who are so confident of the success of Apollo 11 are simply extrapolating from the fact that we have had a series of successes. But we should never forget that these are inherently risky missions, that the demands we are making of our astronauts and the equipment are very high. Men are going into an area where no man has ever been before. They are landing in an unexplored area which is not known in detail to us. It's unknown territory—*luna incognita*—and we're doing many things for the first time.

There are unavoidable risks which we've taken every possible step to minimize. But you cannot eliminate them. Many hazards are still there. This is the moment when we are putting to test eight years of NASA effort. We think we understand all the problems, but we're doing something brand-new and it is quite possible that we will not be successful on our first landing attempt.

Q. What's the most dangerous single moment on the mission?

A. In my opinion, the touch-down on the surface of the moon—making a successful landing in such a way as to permit the return to orbit with the upper stage. Those few minutes are the most critical part of the mission.

We must land in such a way that a takeoff is then possible—so we don't tip the lunar module too far over, we don't skid it into a boulder or crater, or use up too much fuel avoiding them.

This landing operation on the surface of the moon—which we have never done before, only simulated—is, in my opinion, the most critical operation. But, of course, there are many other critical steps from launch to splash-down.

Q. If an accident does happen to either one of the astronauts on the moon or to their lunar module, is it possible to rescue them at that point?

A. No. There is no rescue capability once the two astronauts are on the surface of the moon. While they are in lunar orbit it is possible for the command module to come over and make a rendezvous and docking if the lunar module, for some reason, is incapacitated.

But once the men are on the surface of the moon, they are in the same position as the passengers in a commerical jetliner: The jetliner has got to return safely—you can't rescue individual passengers. But we have built in redundancy—duplicate systems—for every possible contingency.

Q. Can you explain why the command module can't go down to get them?

A. The command module does not have the capability to make a landing. It is strictly a flying beast: It only flies in lunar orbit and doesn't have the ability to settle gently down and take off again.

Q. Why couldn't you send Apollo 12 up there on a rescue mission?

A. The length of time that would be required to do this—the difficulties of precisely locating and landing right on the spot—preclude this. It is not practical.

Q. Dr. Paine, to return to a happier thought—is it going to be an American flag or a United Nations flag that is going to be planted on the moon?

A. We looked at this question very carefully and concluded that the planting of the American flag is the appropriate action. This mighty enterprise has essentially been carried out by hundreds of thousands of Americans and funded by the American taxpayer, although many other nations have contributed.

Although we all recognize that our Apollo program is built on technology and science from around the world—not only in this generation but in all previous generations—still it's an American program, and we are proud and pleased to have the privilege of unfurling our American flag there—not to take possession of the moon for America but to recognize our nation's achievement.

Q. Is one reason because Congress insists that it be an American flag?

A. No. Actually there's divided opinion. Some Congressmen feel that we shouldn't do anything chauvinistic because this is really a great human adventure.

I've just come back from a couple of weeks in Europe, where I found that the American space program is widely regarded as a space program of the planet earth in which all men are participating through the miracle of global TV satellites.

It was interesting that from time to time Europeans would refer to "our" space program and use the word "we." This is obviously right: It's a program which America, as the wealthiest nation in the West, is undertaking, but it's a program which depends on tracking stations around the world and on the generations of scientists and engineers who have made contributions from every nation.

And from that standpoint it's very much a triumph for all mankind who dwell on the blue planet—earth.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK 1969

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, July 13 through July 19, this year, marks the 10th annual observance of Captive Nations Week.

In Chicago the week-long observance of this important event will culminate tomorrow in a gigantic parade on State Street. Many thousands will march in this parade in order to demonstrate their empathy and support for those unfortunate peoples still enslaved in the captive nations which include: Armenia; Azerbaijan; Byelorussia; Cossackia; Georgia; Idel-Ural; North Caucasia; Democratic Republic of Far East (Siberyaks); Ukraine; Turkestan; Estonia; Latvia; Lithuania; Albania; Bulgaria; Outer Mongolia; Serbia; Croatia; Slovenia, et cetra in Yugoslavia; Poland; Rumania; Czechoslovakia; North Korea; Hungary; East Germany; Mainland China; Tibet; North Vietnam; and Cuba.

I come before this body today with a keen awareness of the growing complexities in international relations. As millions of people behind the Iron Curtain look to the free world for leadership, they are discouraged by an international situation that is, more than ever, in a state of flux.

We must provide these people with a sense of hope reflected through our policies in the next decade. We thus cannot isolate ourselves from the world community at a time when continued inequities are imposed on people throughout the world.

In the past year we have witnessed with sadness the repression of the Czechoslovakian people in their quest for greater freedom. While no nation can forcibly dominate world politics, we must not abandon our role as leader of the free world. It is essential that we involve ourselves in world affairs with the ultimate goal of peaceful coexistence and cooperation among the nations of the world. To do so will require a great deal of time, effort, and creative planning.

In a speech prepared for delivery on the day of his assassination, President John Kennedy commented on the importance of nonmilitary aid when he said:

> In today's world, freedom can be lost without a shot being fired, by ballots as well as bullets. The success of our leadership is dependent upon respect for our mission in the world as well as our missiles—on a clearer recognition of the virtues of freedom as well as the evils of tyranny.

We must heed President Kennedy's words and devote our efforts to helping people acquire the technical skills necessary to aid their own native countries.

We have seen the great sense of nationalism that has been exhibited so often in recent years. The growing friction between the Soviet Union and her Eastern European satellites is partially a result of nationalism and the feelings associated with it. In an address to the Senate earlier this month Senator FRANK CHURCH of Idaho stated:

> The critical factor (in international politics) is nationalism which far more than any ideology has shown itself to be the engine of change in modern history.

We must realize that the feelings of nationalism will ultimately cause the Russians to lose control of the iron curtain countries. As the desire for national sovereignty increases, Russia's ability to dominate will diminish.

Millions of Amercans who trace their origin to the captive nations and to other lands, join each year during this special observance to express their support for policies which will hopefully free the people of the captive nations from the yoke of Communist domination.

It is a pleasure for me to join in this observance for I feel that our commitment to freedom compels us to dedicate ourselves to the cause of freedom whereever it is denied and to support efforts to liberate the captive nations of the world. It is my hope that the time will not be too distant when the totalitarian form of government can be overcome and each country can function as a strong independent nation in a free world.

At this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include Mayor Richard J. Daly's proclamation on captive nations. The mayor's proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION BY THE CITY OF CHICAGO

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czecho-Slovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azarbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, Slovakia, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 36–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the City of Chicago is linked to these captive nations through the bonds of family, since numbered among the people of Chicago are hundreds of thousands of our citizens who through nativity or ancestry treasure the heritage which endowed them with the culture and industry which are theirs; and

Whereas, these nations have been made captive by the imperialistic, aggressive and heartless policies of communism; and

Whereas, the peoples of these communist-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

Whereas, it is appropriate and proper to demonstrate to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the people of the City of Chicago for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas, the people of Chicago, as do all the people of the United States, want for the peoples of the world the same freedom and justice which is theirs:

Now, therefore, I, Richard J. Daley, Mayor of the City of Chicago, do hereby designate the week beginning July 13, 1969 as "Captive Nations Week."

I urge the people of Chicago to join in the programs arranged for observance of the occasion, and I urge all of our churches, our educational institutions and all media of communication to observe the plight of the communist-dominated nations and to join in support of the just aspirations of the people of the captive nations.

I especially encourage everyone to concretely demonstrate his or her interest in the people imprisoned in the captive nations by their attendance at or participation in the parade to be held on State Street on Saturday afternoon, July 19 at 12:00 P.M.

Dated this 26th day of June, A.D., 1969.

RICHARD J. DALEY,
Mayor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, July 21, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth His handiwork.—Psalm 19: 1.

Eternal God, our Father, as we come to Thee in prayer may Thy spirit expand our hearts with the life of Thy love, our minds with the wonder of Thy wisdom and our spirits with the security of Thy strength.

On this glorious day when our astronauts have landed on the moon and walked on its surface the heart of our Nation rejoices and together we are filled with joy at the achievements of man in cooperation with Thee.

Grant that we may wisely interpret the meaning of this event and be given insight into Thy great and gracious purpose for all mankind.

While we look at the moon and are moved by the magnificence of this mission may we also look at the miseries of men on this planet and seek to master them that all may live with dignity, respect, and good will. Thus may every heart rejoice at what man can do when he walks with Thee.

In the spirit of Him who went about doing good, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 17, 1969, was read and approved.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JULY 18, 1969.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's Office at 12:10 p.m., on Friday, July 18, 1969, and said to contain a message from the President on population.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk.

POPULATION GROWTH—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-139)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Congress of the United States:

In 1830 there were one billion people on the planet earth. By 1930 there were two billion, and by 1960 there were three billion. Today the world population is three and one-half billion persons.

These statistics illustrate the dramatically increasing rate of population growth. It took many thousands of years to produce the first billion people; the next billion took a century; the third came after thirty years; the fourth will be produced in just fifteen.

If this rate of population growth continues, it is likely that the earth will contain over seven billion human beings by the end of this century. Over the next thirty years, in other words, the world's population could double. And at the end of that time, each new addition of one billion persons would not come over the millenia nor over a century nor even over a decade. If present trends were to continue until the year 2000, the eighth billion would be added in only five years and each additional billion in an even shorter period.

While there are a variety of opinions as to precisely how fast population will grow in the coming decades, most informed observers have a similar response to all such projections. They agree that population growth is among the most important issues we face. They agree that it can be met only if there is a great deal of advance planning. And they agree that the time for such planning is growing very short. It is for all these reasons that I address myself to the population problem in this message, first to its international dimensions and then to its domestic implications.

IN THE DEVELOPING NATIONS

It is in the developing nations of the world that population is growing most rapidly today. In these areas we often find rates of natural increase higher than any which have been experienced in all of human history. With their birth rates remaining high and with death rates dropping sharply, many countries of Latin America, Asia, and Africa now grow ten times as fast as they did a century ago. At present rates, many will double and some may even triple their present populations before the year 2000. This fact is in large measure a consequence of rising health standards and economic progress throughout the world, improvements which allow more people to live longer and more of their children to survive to maturity.

As a result, many already impoverished nations are struggling under a handicap of intense population increase which the industrialized nations never had to bear. Even though most of these countries have made rapid progress in total economic growth—faster in percentage terms than many of the more industrialized nations—their far greater rates of population growth have made development in per capita terms very slow. Their standards of living are not rising quickly, and the gap between life in the rich nations and life in the poor nations is not closing.

There are some respects, in fact, in which economic development threatens to fall behind population growth, so that the quality of life actually worsens. For example, despite considerable improvements in agricultural technology and some dramatic increases in grain production, it is still difficult to feed these added people at adequate levels of nutrition. Protein malnutrition is widespread. It is estimated that every day some 10,000 people—most of them children—are dying from diseases of which malnutrition has been at least a partial cause. Moreover, the physical and mental potential of millions of youngsters is not realized because of a lack of proper food. The promise for increased production and better distribution of food is great, but not great enough to counter these bleak realities.

The burden of population growth is also felt in the field of social progress. In many countries, despite increases in the number of schools and teachers, there are more and more children for whom there is no schooling. Despite construction of new homes, more and more families are without adequate shelter. Unemployment and underemployment are increasing and the situation could be aggravated as more young people grow up and seek to enter the work force.

Nor has development yet reached the stage where it brings with it diminished family size. Many parents in developing countries are still victimized by forces such as poverty and ignorance which make it difficult for them to exercise control over the size of their families. In sum, population growth is a world problem which no country can ignore, whether it is moved by the narrowest perception of national self-interest or the widest vision of a common humanity.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

It is our belief that the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and other international bodies should take the leadership in responding to world population growth. The United States will cooperate fully with their programs. I would note in this connection that I am most impressed by the scope and thrust of the recent report of the Panel of the United Nations Association, chaired by John D. Rockefeller III. The report stresses the need for expanded action and greater coordination, concerns which should be high on the agenda of the United Nations.

In addition to working with international organizations, the United States can help by supporting efforts which are initiated by other governments. Already we are doing a great deal in this field. For example, we provide assistance to countries which seek our help in reducing high birthrates—provided always that the services we help to make available can be freely accepted or rejected by the individuals who receive them. Through our aid programs, we have worked to improve agricultural production and bolster economic growth in developing nations.

As I pointed out in my recent message on Foreign Aid, we are making important efforts to improve these programs. In fact, I have asked the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the Agency for International Development to give population and family planning high priority for attention, personnel, research, and funding among our several aid programs. Similarly, I am asking the Secretaries of Commerce and Health, Education, and Welfare and the Directors of the Peace Corps and the United States Information Agency to give close attention to population matters as they plan their overseas operations. I also call on the Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development to investigate ways of adapting and extending our agricultural experience and capabilities to improve food production and distribution in developing countries. In all of these international efforts, our programs should give further recognition to the important resources of private organizations and university research centers. As we increase our population and family planning efforts abroad, we also call upon other nations to enlarge their programs in this area.

Prompt action in all these areas is essential. For high rates of population growth, as the report of the Panel of the United Nations Association puts it, "impair individual rights, jeopardize national goals, and threaten international stability."

IN THE UNITED STATES

For some time population growth has been seen as a problem for developing countries. Only recently has it come to be seen that pressing problems are also posed for advanced industrial countries when their populations increase at the rate that the United States, for example, must now anticipate. Food supplies may be ample in such nations, but social supplies—the capacity to educate youth, to provide privacy and living space, to maintain the processes of open, democratic government—may be grievously strained.

In the United States our rate of population growth is not as great as that of developing nations. In this country, in fact, the growth rate has generally declined since the eighteenth century. The present growth rate of about one percent per year is still significant, however. Moreover, current statistics indicate that the fertility rate may be approaching the end of its recent decline.

Several factors contribute to the yearly increase, including the large number of couples of childbearing age, the typical size of American families, and our increased longevity. We are rapidly reaching the point in this country where a family reunion, which has typically brought together children, parents, and grandparents, will instead gather family members from *four* generations. This is a development for which we are grateful and of which we can be proud. But we must also recognize that it will mean a far larger population if the number of children born to each set of parents remains the same.

In 1917 the total number of Americans passed 100 million, after three full centuries of steady growth. In 1967—just half a century later—the 200 million mark was passed. If the present rate of growth continues, the third hundred million persons will be added in roughly a thirty-year period. This means that by the year 2000, or shortly thereafter, there will be more than 300 million Americans.

This growth will produce serious challenges for our society. I believe that many of our present social problems may be related to the fact that we have had only fifty years in which to accommodate the second hundred million Americans. In fact, since 1945 alone some 90 million babies have been born in this country. We have thus had to accomplish in a very few decades an adjustment to population growth which was once spread over centuries. And it now appears that we will have to provide for a third hundred million Americans in a period of just 30 years.

The great majority of the next hundred million Americans will be born to families which looked forward to their birth and are prepared to love them and care for them as they grow up. The critical issue is whether social institutions will also plan for their arrival and be able to accommodate them in a humane and intelligent way. We can be sure that society will *not* be ready for this growth unless it begins its planning immediately. And adequate planning, in turn, requires that we ask ourselves a number of important questions.

Where, for example, will the next hundred million Americans live? If the patterns of the last few decades hold for the rest of the century, then at least three-quarters of the next hundred million persons will locate in highly urbanized areas. Are our cities prepared for such an influx? The chaotic history of urban growth suggests that they are not and that many of their existing problems will be severely aggravated by a dramatic increase in numbers. Are there ways, then, of readying our cities? Alternatively, can the trend toward greater concentration of population be reversed? Is it a desirable thing, for example, that half of all the counties in the United States actually lost population in the 1950's despite the growing number of inhabitants in the country as a whole? Are there ways of fostering a better distribution of the growing population?

Some have suggested that systems of satellite cities or completely new towns can accomplish this goal. The National Commission on Urban Growth has recently produced a stimulating report on this matter, one which recommends the creation of 100 new communities averaging 100,000 people each, and 10 new communities averaging at least 1 million persons. But the total number of people who would be accommodated if even this bold plan were implemented is only 20 million—a mere one-fifth of the expected 30-year increase. If we were to accommodate the full 100 million persons in new communities, we would have to build a new city of 250,000 persons each month from now until the end of the century. That means constructing a city the size of Tulsa, Dayton, or Jersey City every 30 days for over 30 years. Clearly, the problem is enormous, and we must examine the alternative solutions very carefully.

Other questions also confront us. How, for example, will we house the next hundred million Americans? Already economical and attractive housing is in very short supply. New architectural forms, construction techniques, and financing strategies must be aggressively pioneered if we are to provide the needed dwellings.

What of our natural resources and the quality of our environment? Pure air and water are fundamental to life itself. Parks, recreational facilities, and an attractive countryside are essential to our emotional well-being. Plant and animal and mineral resources are also vital. A growing population will increase the demand for such resources. But in many cases their supply will not be increased and may even be endangered. The ecological system upon which we now depend may seriously deteriorate if our efforts to conserve and enhance the environment do not match the growth of the population.

How will we educate and employ such a large number of people? Will our transportation systems move them about as quickly and economically as necessary? How will we provide adequate health care when our population reaches 300 million? Will our political structures have to be reordered, too, when our society grows to such proportions? Many of our institutions are already under tremendous strain as they try to respond to the demands of 1969. Will they be swamped by a growing flood of people in the next 30 years? How easily can they be replaced or altered?

Finally we must ask: How can we better assist American families so that they will have no more children than they wish to have? In my first message to Congress on domestic affairs, I called for a national commitment to provide a healthful and stimulating environment for all children during their first five years of life. One of the ways in which we can promote that goal is to provide assistance for more parents in effectively planning their families. We know that involuntary childbearing often results in poor physical and emotional health for all members of the family. It is one of the factors which contribute to our distressingly high infant mortality rate, the unacceptable level of malnutrition, and the disappointing performance of some children in our schools. Unwanted or untimely childbearing is one of several forces which are driving many families into poverty or keeping them in that condition. Its threat helps to produce the dangerous incidence of illegal abortion. And finally, of course, it needlessly adds to the burdens placed on all our resources by increasing population.

None of the questions I have raised here is new. But all of these questions must now be asked and answered with a new sense of urgency. The answers cannot be given by Government alone, nor can Government alone turn the answers into programs and policies. I believe, however, that the Federal Government does have a special responsibility for defining these problems and for stimulating thoughtful responses.

Perhaps the most dangerous element in the present situation is the fact that so few people are examining these questions from the viewpoint of the whole society. Perceptive businessmen project the demand for their products many years into the future by studying population trends. Other private institutions develop sophisticated planning mechanisms which allow them to account for rapidly changing conditions. In the governmental sphere, however, there is virtually no machinery through which we can develop a detailed understanding of demographic changes and bring that understanding to bear on public policy. The Federal Government makes only a minimal effort in this area. The efforts of State and local governments are also inadequate. Most importantly, the planning which does take place at some levels is poorly understood at others and is often based on unexamined assumptions.

In short, the questions I have posed in this message too often go unasked, and when they are asked, they seldom are adequately answered.

COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND THE AMERICAN FUTURE

It is for all these reasons that I today propose the creation by Congress of a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future.

The Congress should give the Commission responsibility for inquiry and recommendations in three specific areas.

First, *the probable course of population growth, internal migration and related demographic developments between now and the year 2000.*

As much as possible, these projections should be made by regions, States, and metropolitan areas. Because there is an element of uncertainty in such projections, various alternative possibilities should be plotted.

It is of special importance to note that, beginning in August of 1970, population data by county will become available from the decennial census, which will have been taken in April of that year. By April 1971, computer summaries of first-count data will be available by census tract and an important range of information on income, occupations, education, household composition, and other vital considerations will also be in hand. The Federal Government can make better use of such demographic information than it has done in the past, and State governments and other political subdivisions can also use such data to better advantage. The Commission on Population Growth and the American Future will be an appropriate instrument for this important initiative.

Second, *the resources in the public sector of the economy that will be required to deal with the anticipated growth in population.*

The single greatest failure of foresight—at all levels of government—over the past generation has been in areas connected with expanding population. Government and legislatures have frequently failed to appreciate the demands which continued population growth would impose on the public sector. These demands are myriad: they will range from pre-school classrooms to post-doctoral fellowships; from public works which carry water over thousands of miles to highways which carry people and products from region to region; from vest pocket parks in crowded cities to forest preserves and quiet lakes in the countryside. Perhaps especially, such demands will assert themselves in forms that affect the quality of life. The time is at hand for a serious assessment of such needs.

Third, *ways in which population growth may affect the activities of Federal, state and local goverment.*

In some respects, population growth affects everything that American government does. Yet only occasionally do our governmental units pay sufficient attention to population growth in their own planning. Only occasionally do they consider the serious implications of demographic trends for their present and future activities.

Yet some of the necessary information is at hand and can be made available to all levels of government. Much of the rest will be obtained by the Commission. For such information to be of greatest use, however, it should also be interpreted and analyzed and its implications should be made more evident. It is particularly in this connection that the work of the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future will be as much educational as investigative. The American public and its governing units are not as alert as they should be to these growing challenges. A responsible but insistent voice of reason and foresight is needed. The Commission can provide that voice in the years immediately before us.

The membership of the Commission should include two members from each house of the Congress, together with knowledgeable men and women who are broadly representative of our society. The majority should be citizens who have demonstrated a capacity to deal with important questions of public policy. The membership should also include specialists in the biological, social, and environmental sciences, in theology and law, in the arts and in engineering. The Commission should be empowered to create advisory panels to consider subdivisions of its broad subject area and to invite experts and leaders from all parts of the world to join these panels in their deliberations.

The Commission should be provided with an adequate staff and budget, under the supervision of an executive director of exceptional experience and understanding.

In order that the Commission will have time to utilize the initial data which results from the 1970 census, I ask that it be established for a period of two years. An interim report to the President and Congress should be required at the end of the first year.

OTHER GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES

I would take this opportunity to mention a number of additional government activities dealing with population growth which need not await the report of the Commission.

First, *increased research is essential.* It is clear, for example, that we need additional research on birth control methods of all types and the sociology of population growth. Utilizing its Center for Population Research, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should take the lead in developing, with other federal agencies, an expanded research effort, one which is carefully related to those of private organizations, university research centers, international organizations, and other countries.

Second, *we need more trained people to work in population and family planning programs, both in this country and abroad.* I am therefore asking the Secretaries of State, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Interior along with the Administrator of the Agency for International Development and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to participate in a comprehensive survey of our efforts to attract people to such programs and to train them properly. The same group—in consultation with appropriate state, local, and private officials—should develop recommendations for improvements in this area. I am asking the Assistant to the President for Urban Affairs to coordinate this project.

Third, *the effects of population growth on our environment and on the world's food supply call for careful attention and immediate action.* I am therefore asking the Environmental Quality Council to give careful attention to these matters in its deliberations. I am also asking the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare to give the highest priority to research into new techniques and to other proposals that can help safeguard the environment and increase the world's supply of food.

Fourth, *it is clear that the domestic family planning services supported by the Federal Government should be expanded and better integrated.* Both the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Economic Opportunity are now involved in this important work, yet their combined efforts are not adequate to provide information and services to all who want them. In particular, most of an estimated 5 million low-income women of childbearing age in this country do not now have adequate access to family planning assistance, even though their wishes concerning family size are usually the same

XUM

as those of parents of higher income groups.

It is my view that no American woman should be denied access to family planning assistance because of her economic condition. I believe, therefore, that we should establish as a national goal the provision of adequate family planning services within the next five years to all those who want them but cannot afford them. This we have the capacity to do.

Clearly, in no circumstances will the activities associated with our pursuit of this goal be allowed to infringe upon the religious convictions or personal wishes and freedom of any individual, nor will they be allowed to impair the absolute right of all individuals to have such matters of conscience respected by public authorities.

In order to achieve this national goal, we will have to increase the amount we are spending on population and family planning. But success in this endeavor will not result from higher expenditures alone. Because the life circumstances and family planning wishes of those who receive services vary considerably, an effective program must be more flexible in its design than are many present efforts. In addition, programs should be better coordinated and more effectively administered. Under current legislation, a comprehensive State or local project must assemble a patchwork of funds from many different sources—a time-consuming and confusing process. Moreover, under existing legislation, requests for funds for family planning services must often compete with requests for other deserving health endeavors.

But these problems can be overcome. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—whose Department is responsible for the largest part of our domestic family planning services—has developed plans to reorganize the major family planning service activities of his agency. A separate unit for these services will be established within the Health Services and Mental Health Administration. The Secretary will send to Congress in the near future legislation which will help the Department implement this important program by providing broader and more precise legislative authority and a clearer source of financial support.

The Office of Economic Opportunity can also contribute to progress in this area by strengthening its innovative programs and pilot projects in the delivery of family planning services to the needy. The existing network of O.E.O. supported community groups should also be used more extensively to provide family planning assistance and information. I am asking the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to determine the ways in which his Agency can best structure and extend its programs in order to help achieve our national goal in the coming years.

As they develop their own plans, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity should also determine the most effective means of coordinating all our domestic family planning programs and should include in their deliberations representatives of the other agencies that share in this important work. It is my intention that such planning should also involve state and local governments and private agencies, for it is clear that the increased activity of the Federal Government in this area must be matched by a sizable increase in effort at other levels. It would be unrealistic for the Federal Government alone to shoulder the entire burden, but this Administration does accept a clear responsibility to provide essential leadership.

FOR THE FUTURE

One of the most serious challenges to human destiny in the last third of this century will be the growth of the population. Whether man's response to that challenge will be a cause for pride or for despair in the year 2000 will depend very much on what we do today. If we now begin our work in an appropriate manner, and if we continue to devote a considerable amount of attention and energy to this problem, then mankind will be able to surmount this challenge as it has surmounted so many during the long march of civilization.

When future generations evaluate the record of our time, one of the most important factors in their judgment will be the way in which we responded to population growth. Let us act in such a way that those who come after us—even as they lift their eyes beyond earth's bounds—can do so with pride in the planet on which they live, with gratitude to those who lived on it in the past, and with continuing confidence in its future.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 18, 1969*.

The message was, without objection, referred by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

POPULATION GROWTH—MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's proposed Commission on Population Growth and the American Future cannot begin work too soon.

President Nixon has said what has needed saying by an American Chief Executive for many years, that our planning in relation to population growth has been woefully inadequate, that such planning is vital if we are to improve the quality of life in America, and that family planning service should be made readily available to all women who want it but cannot afford it.

The President's message on population growth is a singular document. It is the first of its kind ever sent to Congress. It is a document which should excite much thought and careful action. The objectives outlined in the President's message deserve the full support of Congress and of the American people.

The President has dramatically set forth the staggering immensity of the problems posed in projections of U.S. and world population growth. He has focused on the key to meeting these problems—planning. He has also called for action. I subscribe fully to the approach he has outlined.

The President said:

> Society will not be ready for this growth unless it begins its planning immediately.

I agree, and I therefore urge Congress to implement as soon as possible legislation establishing the President's proposed Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. I would add that President Nixon is correct in observing that the work of this Commission will be as much educational as investigative.

Key portions of the President's message also deal with administrative actions which President Nixon is taking in advance of any report by the proposed Commission.

There is a clear and present need for the President's moves to expand and improve domestic family planning services.

I subscribe wholeheartedly to the President's proposal that we establish as a national goal the providing of adequate family planning services within the next 5 years for all American women who want them but cannot afford them.

However, I would also underscore my agreement with the President's pledge that—

> In no circumstances will the activities associated with our pursuit of this goal be allowed to infringe upon any religious convictions or personal wishes or freedom of any individual, nor will they be allowed to impair the absolute right of all authorities to have such matters of conscience respected by public authorities.

I endorse at this time Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Finch's plans to reorganize the major family planning service activities of his department into a separate unit. This plan deserves the support of Congress.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the pictures being transmitted from the Apollo 11 spacecraft have not only given us our closest look at the moon, they have also given us our most distant views of our own planet. We have come to see our planet for what it really is—a tiny lump of earth hanging in a vast universe. We have been confronted with the stark reality that we live on a very limited piece of real estate with limited resources and yet a rapidly expanding population. We are beginning to realize that our planet cannot possibly hold an infinite number of people nor continue to yield unlimited resources.

We are told that the world's population of 3.5 billion people will double by the year 2000 and that our own country will contain another 100 million inhabitants by the turn of the century. We are told that the population crisis stands second only to the risk of nuclear war as the greatest threat to mankind. We have little reason to doubt this analysis. The question is: Will mankind make any effort to save himself from this impending disaster, or will he, by default, eliminate himself from this planet?

President Nixon has sent to Congress a message which addresses itself to this question by pledging a national commitment to a world problem. The administration is to be commended on its foresight and courage in speaking out on this heretofore sensitive issue. It is obvious that we can no longer skirt this issue or avoid its implications.

The world population problem, as the President has wisely pointed out, should be dealt with primarily by the world community through the United Nations; and the United States should join with other nations in lending its full support and cooperation in these efforts. At the same time, we should continue to maximize our efforts in offering family planning assistance to those nations which request it, through our Agency for International Development.

Although the population crisis in the United States does not manifest itself in the same way as in the third world where hunger and economic development are the most pressing issues, we are feeling the pinch for greater social services such as jobs, housing, and education as our own population expands. The population problem in our urban areas has already reached crisis proportions in terms of transportation, overcrowding, crime, and pollution. Planning for another 100 million people—most of whom will live in urban areas—in the next 30 years, will be a monumental task which will require the highest of priorities.

To meet this challenge the President has called for a new orientation to this growing problem. In referring to the next 100 million Americans, the President said:

> The critical issue is whether social institutions will also plan for their arrival and be able to accommodate them in a humane and intelligent way. We can be sure that society will *not* be ready for this growth unless it begins its planning immediately.

The President points out that this will not only involve questions of housing, environment, education, and jobs, but of family planning as well. In his words:

> One of the ways we can promote that goal is to provide assistance for more parents in effectively planning their families.

There can be no question about the need to expand services to the poor who request such assistance. We know, for instance, that of 5 million women who would probably use these services, only one in five now do; that in 1966 there were an estimated 450,000 unwanted births in America; that one in five American families report that their last child was unwanted; that the infant and maternal mortality rate and birth-related diseases among the poor is distressingly high; that malnutrition among pregnant low-income women and their infants is a serious problem often causing permanent disabling effects both mentally and physically.

There can be no question that we have a national responsibility to improve the welfare of all Americans by enabling them to better plan for a healthy and prosperous family environment.

This will require a commitment not only on the part of the Federal Government, but on the part of State and local governments as well as private groups and community action agencies. It will require a greater awareness by all Americans as to the full implications of these problems and what they portend for the future of America and the world.

In this regard, the President has called for a 2-year National Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. The Commission would be charged with the responsibility of first, plotting future demographic trends in the next 30 years with a view toward proper planning for the expected growth; second, determining what public resources will be available for handling this growth and how they should be allocated; and third, analyzing the expected impact of this population growth on the activities of Federal, State, and local governments.

The President has also called for greater research into birth control methods and the sociology of population growth; more training of people to work on these problems; a closer study of the population problem in terms of the world food supply; and the expansion and coordination of family planning services supported by the Federal Government. On this latter point the President has said:

> No American woman should be denied access to family planning assistance because of her economic condition. I believe, therefore, that we should establish as a national goal the provision of adequate family planning services within the next five years to all those who want them but cannot afford them. This we have the capacity to do.

We in the Congress have a responsibility to see that these goals are met by considering and acting on the necessary legislative changes and by strengthening the roles of HEW and OEO in these efforts.

This year the Republicans in this body recognized the need to examine population problems more closely. It was decided that a task force on earth resources and population should be created to study these related questions. Under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUSH) the task force has thus far heard from 20 authorities in the fields of population and environment.

As chairman of the House Republican conference I wish to commend the task force on the fine work it has done to date and for helping to focus the attention of the administration and the American people on these crucial issues. I am confident that the earth resources and population task force will make a substantial contribution to legislative thinking in these areas as well as to administration planning and reorganization. I would expect that this task force will be in the vanguard of efforts to implement the excellent recommendations set forth in the President's population message.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the President for his message to Congress proposing a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future.

I applaud his political courage in creating public awareness and calling for the high-level study that the population problem deserves.

As chairman of the House Republican task force on earth resources and population, I am very much aware of the urgency and need for congressional action in this area. Our task force in the past 16 weeks has heard from over 20 prominent authorities active in the population and environment fields. These concerned professionals have told us of the need for action similar to that suggested in the President's message.

I am delighted to see that the President's proposals are very close to legislation I have introduced in the 91st Congress. My two major concerns are the need for increased support and better coordination of existing family planning programs, as well as increased research activity, both in population and resource utilization. The President stated:

> In order to achieve this national goal, we will have to increase the amount we are spending on population and family planning.

I could not agree more.

The President also called for Secretary Finch and OEO Director Don Rumsfeld to coordinate with the other agencies all domestic family planning programs. I am convinced that this is essential.

We now know that the fantastic rate of population growth we have witnessed these past 20 years continues with no letup in sight. If this growth rate is not checked now—in this next decade—we face a danger that is as defenseless as nuclear war.

The study reports of this Population Commission must bring these facts of life home to every American man and woman. Unless this problem is recognized and made manageable, starvation, pestilence, and war will solve it for us.

As our task force seeks solutions to the problems of resources, environment, and population, it becomes apparent to us that the present rate of our population growth is related to many of our economic and social ills.

The Nation can be proud of the leadership shown by President Nixon in his recognition of the urgency of this problem.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the term "population explosion" is not a mere catch-phrase, but a stark reality which this country has heretofore not fully recognized. President Nixon has now committed this Nation to the goal of checking unsought population growth at home as well as making it a part of our policy to help other nations do the same.

There are growing signs that the world is fast approaching its maximum population level. In Latin America, for example, the population will more than triple its 1965 level by the year 2000, at which time the world population will approximate 7.5 billion persons. This means that merely to maintain the present inadequate standard of living in those countries will require a threefold increase in their gross national products. Under this set of circumstances, where a greater proportion of the available capital must be used for investment simply to maintain a constant per capita GNP, the chances for any increase in real income are extremely remote. Hundreds of facts and comparisons have been carefully assembled with reference to this problem. The inescapable conclusion, in my opinion, is that rapid population growth is the greatest single problem facing the world today.

Many Americans who recognize overpopulation in the lesser developed nations refuse to recognize it as a problem in this country. While it is true that the United States, fortunately, does not face the immediate prospect of mass starvation present in so many of the underdeveloped countries, it is becoming increasingly clear that we could face a serious decline in the quality of life as the claim upon potential resources becomes more and more intense.

For example, colleges and universities had to absorb a 91-percent increase in enrollment between 1960 and 1968. Certainly, much of this increase is due to a growth in enrollment rates, but mainly it reflects an increase in the number of persons within the college age group—an increase which continues to be dramatic. Our national resources, whether they be in the form of colleges or open spaces, are limited and cannot continue to absorb a "population demand" at this rate without there being some effect upon the quality of the resources available to each individual.

There is a tendency on the part of us all to attribute every conceivable problem to a single cause. Recognizing this fact, I think we must nevertheless ask ourselves certain questions regarding the relationship between serious social problems and the staggering increase in human beings. Does rampant population growth help to explain the increasing cost and complexity of the Federal Government, or the inability of State and local governments to finance the multiplicity of demands placed upon them? Is it related to the continued existence of crowded schools and highways, or to the shortage of new homes, in a time of unprecedented construction? Does it have causal significance with regard to the growing contamination of our environment in the form of air and water pollution?

The ultimate solution to all of these problems does not lie wholly with an intelligent approach to the population challenge. However, in our assessment of the most serious national problems which we confront, over-population must loom large.

President Nixon has become the first Chief Executive to address himself to this most urgent situation. This is, in itself, significant. Moreover, his proposals are sound ones which, I believe, will mark the beginning of this country's dedication to solving perhaps the greatest challenge the world has yet faced.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the President's message, just read to the House, on population growth.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

OUR MEN ON THE MOON

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in the RECORD succeeding the remarks I shall make and also that they shall have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, at this hour two Americans are preparing to leave the surface of the moon to join a third circling overhead waiting to take all three back to the earth. This historic event is truly a turning point in the history of mankind. Much of the population of the nations of all continents have shared through television and radio in this great experience. This also shows the marked difference between an open society such as ours and a closed society such as the Soviet Union where at the same time both countries have flights to the moon, one manned in the case of our country and open to the view of all of the world and one unmanned as in the case of the Soviet Union.

These dedicated, skilled, and brave Americans went as ambassadors of all men of all races to land for the first time on another world. Distinctions of nationality, and politics, and social system briefly disappeared as we saw these men set foot on the moon's surface after their gripping descent from orbit.

The Members of this body may recall that on July 16, 1958, 11 years ago, the House passed the National Aeronautics and Space Act. The launch of Apollo 11 last week came on the anniversary date. The Space Act, which I introduced as H.R. 12575, was a completely bipartisan effort. In the two Houses, select or special committees were created to consider space legislation. In each case the majority leader chaired the respective committee. President Johnson, then majority leader of the Senate, headed the Senate committee. In the House, I was then the majority leader and chaired the House Select Committee on Aeronautics and Space Exploration. Our late friend and colleague, the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, my dear and valued friend and then the minority leader, was the ranking Representative of the Republican Party. I want to pay tribute to all the Members who served on that committee with me because I have never served on a committee with a more dedicated group of men. During the public hearings there was never any difference of opinion when penetrating examination of witnesses was made by Members, and in executive session there was never a difference in the vote of the subcommittee on any action. Everything we did in executive session was unanimous.

President Eisenhower sent us a draft administration bill in April of 1958 on which we held extensive hearings, building a detailed record of the problems and potentials of space. We then went through many weeks of committee work to perfect the bill which established both the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the present peaceful policies of the United States on the use of space.

Since July, 11 years ago when the bill was passed, the Members may not know that I had directed the staff of the select committe to prepare a report on "The Next Ten Years in Space." This was written that July, although not released until the following January when the work of the select committee came to an end. This was the first congressional report which disclosed that the United States was capable of landing men on the moon in about 10 years. Our consultants who especially held this view were Dr. Herbert York, Mr. Roy Johnson, and Rear Adm. John Clark of the Department of Defense, Dr. Wernher von Braun of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency, and experts of the North American Aviation Corp., and others, and particularly the members and staff of the select committee of which I had the honor at that time to be chairman. They and the select committee were prophetic in their forecast.

For the next few hours, we and our fellow citizens, and our fellow men the world around will have at least one ear tuned to events on the moon and in the space around the moon until Neil Armstrong, the civilian commander, and Colonel Aldrin rejoin Colonel Collins for the trip back to earth. It happens that I have known the wife of Lieutenant Colonel Collins since she was born. She was born in my district to a family who are close and dear friends of mine, and one of the most prominent families not only in Boston but of the State of Massachusetts.

We thank God for the success these brave men and competent engineers and scientists have attained in opening to human experience more of the mysteries and glories of an infinitely varied universe.

Eleven years ago many of the Members joked about those of us holding hearings and drafting the Space Act, as if we were somehow misguided enthusiasts in a new field we could not understand. There has been much to learn, but it is worth noting that when it came time to vote on the space bill the Congress in both Houses passed the legislation without dissent.

The world has shown for a few days that all men of good will can overcome their differences in a commonsense of participation in the exploration of space by fellow men. Let us hope this speaks well for the future.

This time the men happen to be Americans—and how proud we are of them. We congratulate them—flying openly, as we said, and not secretly on a peaceful mission for all mankind. Important discoveries will flow from space exploration. Perhaps foremost will be an awareness of brotherhood, unity, and understanding we share, a voyage through the heavens on the blue and green spaceship Good Earth.

So, speaking for myself and my colleagues, I extend to these three daring, brave Americans our hearty congratulations and our appreciation. The whole world paused, and we Americans particularly paused, because the feat was being performed as a result of American effort and by outstanding and courageous Americans.

So, as I said earlier, this is a turning point in the history of mankind, and from this mission we hope and pray will come that broad understanding that will cause people everywhere on earth to realize how close we are to each other, rather than how far apart we are from each other.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCulloch).

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished Speaker for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a time for all of us to be proud that we are Americans. The momentous feat of landing a man on the moon by Apollo 11 will surely rank in history with the day in 1492 when Columbus landed on this continent, and thus discovered a New World.

It overwhelms the imagination that now in 1969, only 66 years after Orville Wright—an Ohioan, by the way—first put a manmade flying machine in the air and flew 100 feet, three men have traveled a quarter of a million miles to the moon, two of them to walk on the moon and to bring back specimens of moon dust and rock.

I am especially proud of this historic occasion, Mr. Speaker, because Astronaut Neil Armstrong, who is the commander of Apollo 11 and who was the first man from this planet to set foot on the moon, comes from Wapakoneta, Ohio, a city of about 7,000 people in my congressional district, the Fourth Congressional District of Ohio. I know his fine parents. I know Neil, and I know his lovely wife.

He was born in 1930, and he was a combat pilot in Korea for the Navy. After his naval service he studied aeronautical engineering at Purdue University under the GI bill. As has been the case, Mr. Speaker, with many motivated young men, after the act of this Congress, the GI bill helped Neil Armstrong start his climb up the ladder of success which took him to the moon.

In observance of this historic role of Neil Armstrong, our Governor has proclaimed July 21 "Neil Armstrong Day."

Neil Armstrong, followed closely by fellow astronaut Edwin Aldrin, stepped onto the lunar surface from the lunar landing craft yesterday evening, July 20, and remained on the moon's surface until this morning, July 21.

Mr. Speaker, on this great voyage, Neil Armstrong represents not just the Fourth Congressional District of Ohio or the State of Ohio, or even the entire United States—but he represents all mankind. Indeed, as Neil Armstrong so dramatically said, during that historic moment when he first set foot on the moon. "That is one small step for man, one giant step for mankind."

So these brave astronauts, Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins, have been praised around the world for their magnificent achievement.

Men and women of all faiths, all races, and all countries are today united as one in praying for the safe return to earth of these three brave men.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might point out that during my service in the House of Representatives I have been chairman of two committees, both special or select committees.

In 1934 I was chairman of the committee investigating communism, nazism, facism, and bigotry. The other committee of which I was chairman was this particular select committee on aeronautics and space exploration.

I will say that I am proud of this committee. They made significant contributions. Every member on that committee was dedicated in their service and they made tremendous contributions for our country, as I referred to previously.

We held hearings and went into these problems so deeply and so profoundly that when the House committee reported it to the House, it was passed by the House of Representatives and then it was sent to the Senate. The other body did not find it necessary to hold hearings and they considered in view of the profound depth of the work of the House committee that the Senate did not find it necessary to conduct hearings.

So the Senate adopted our bill with one slight amendment which the House concurred in when the bill came back to the House for its consideration of that amendment.

I am particularly proud of that one committee that I had the privilege to serve on as chairman, and I am very proud of each and every Member who participated there.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished Speaker of the House yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Arends).

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, truly "our cup runneth over" with pride on the achievement of our three astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins, in the landing on the surface of the moon and its mysteries to reveal. And in our pride we are not unmindful of the thousands who made this possible.

While it was our own brave young men who first walked on the moon, and while it is the American flag that was first placed there, other men of other countries made their contribution. "Our cup runneth over" with thanks to Copernicus and Galileo, and to Von Braun and to many, many others whose discoveries and dreams whose genius made this achievement in our day possible.

As the poet William Cowper wrote:

> God moves in a mysterious way, His wonders to perform.

And there came to mind last evening, as I viewed this historic event through the miracle of television, the lines from the Eighth Psalm:

> When I consider Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which Thou hast ordained; What is man, that Thou art mindful of him?

The question we now hear asked: What does all this mean? It is a question to which only time will give an answer. It was the same question that was asked when man explored the unknowns here on earth: when Magellan made his trip around the world and when Columbus set sail from Spain.

Who knows what secrets the soil and the rock found on the moon will reveal? Who knows what ingredients they may have that will lead to other achievements in medical science or some other area of human endeavor?

Through the miracle of television we shared this achievement with the entire world. "We came in peace" is written on the plaque our astronauts left on the moon. In peaceful pursuits for the betterment of all mankind we will share not alone this achievement but all that may result from it.

It was as Astronaut Armstrong stated:

> One small step for man; one giant leap for mankind.

My congratulations to our three remarkable astronauts. My congratulations to all who contributed to this great event.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Pucinski).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join in congratulating the distinguished Speaker and the members of that first space committee who made possible the beginning of a program that culminated last night with the spectacular landing on the moon by these great Americans. As we congratulate the Speaker, we also congratulate American educational institutions, the scientific community, the American industrial complex, the people on NASA and, of course, the brave Astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins, themselves, who have made all of this possible.

It occurs to me if there is one lesson to be learned from the spectacular achievement last night, it is that the genius of man can reach unlimited heights of achievement when there is total commitment.

This historic achievement was accomplished last night because the scientists, the industrial community, the scholars, and all of those involved, were free to pursue their main goal of reaching the moon and placing a man on the moon, unfettered by obstructions from vested interests, narrow special interests, or the petty jealousies that so often interfere with our other commitments.

The world needed desperately this lesson which we learned last night. We needed to be reminded that man can indeed find a solution to his most vexing problems and ambitions if he has a total commitment. We all ought to remember this indisputable truism proven so dramatically last night as we look at other problems which confront America and the rest of the world today.

It would be my hope that we use our great accomplishment in the Sea of Tranquillity last night as an inspiration for the world's future actions.

It would be my hope that President Nixon would invite all of the world leaders—yes, including those who are our enemies—all the world leaders to participate personally here in Washington in an international tribute honoring these three young men when they come back to the United States after they complete their 21-day quarantine. Per-

XUM

haps such an international meeting can indeed begin a new "era of tranquillity" for mankind.

Our prayers go out that these men return to the United States safely and upon their return, they and their achievement may serve as an inspiration for mankind to resolve its differences in manners other than mass destruction.

When they left the moon, Armstrong and Aldrin said they were leaving behind an olive branch of peace.

May this beautiful and unselfish gesture be an inspiration to all mankind that the world has embarked on a new era of imaginative creativity to replace the past decades of wanton destruction.

I hope a meeting of the world's leaders would provide the means for new lines of communication toward meaningful and lasting peace. We know from our most recent experience that such informal contacts between world leaders offer many opportunities for meaningful contacts and communications that are too often impossible within the confines of formal diplomatic relations.

Mr. Nixon could become the architect of a new world social order—an "Era of Tranquility" by inviting these world leaders to join in our tribute to the world's first moon team.

Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins are proud Americans and all Americans are proud of them but such an international assemblage would prove that their historic achievement should be shared by the entire world, particularly since they left on the moon messages of good will from 73 nations.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON), a member of the committee.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to congratulate the three astronauts, Neil Armstrong, civilian commander, Col. Edwin Aldrin, and Lt. Col. Michael Collins, the top flight Apollo 11 crew, and the 420,000 people in NASA, industry, laboratories, shops, and Congress, that have worked for 9 years to make this signal success possible for our good United States. We American citizens can now say we have won the peaceful race of courage and technology to land the first men on the moon, and are the first nation in space without question.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, as well as the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee, I know this success of Apollo 11, is worth 100 foreign aid programs of the United States. Apollo 11 is also good for our U.S. security and the safety of the American people, to be able to operate in space, and likewise a giant step forward for our U.S. technical progress and competence.

I would like to tell the Speaker and the House, as a member of the opposition party I feel his contributions and leadership to the development of the U.S. space program have been outstanding and vitally necessary to our present U.S. success

When the Speaker took the chairmanship of the House Select Committee on Space, it was a field which was not only pioneering, but it had never been done before in Congress. Nobody thought it was possible we could go into space and to operate as we are doing now. I congratulate the Speaker on his foresight and progressive work for the development of the U.S. program on the peaceful uses of outer space.

That House select committee set up the National Aeronautics and Space Committee, which has been competently managed without politics ever since. As one of the working members on that original select space committee team, I want the Speaker to know what a privilege it has been to me to follow his leadership in space and science matters.

I hope Congress will go ahead on space progress with Apollo 11 as a beginning and not call it a finish to U.S. peaceful space programs. Competition is good in peaceful pursuits, let us have more. We need a moon installation for exploration and astronomy purposes. We need space laboratories to develop the tremendous new fields of space science. We need a shuttle service in space. We likewise need higher-energy liquid and solid propellants for boosters, and to upgrade the Saturn 5, the capsules. We need nuclear fuels for space, and should proceed promptly with the Nerva nuclear rocket which is showing such success so far. My high compliments to Vice President AGNEW, chairman of the U.S. National Space Council, for his recommendation of a manned landing on Mars. This is a fine idea for U.S. progress in space. We can do it. We have the know-how, the installations, communications, and fine crews and personnel—Let us maintain our space leadership for the United States.

We likewise need to develop reusable rockets and boosters. We need reentry vehicles that can bring these capsules back as if they were planes. We can reduce space costs to a fraction of present costs by intelligent planning.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the others here in wishing Apollo 11 crew every success, and again I compliment the Speaker, and express my deep gratitude for being on that first House select space committee, and the opportunity for hard work.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate very much the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I yield now to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks of our great Speaker in complimenting these men who have accomplished more than man has ever done before in the entire history of the whole world.

I think the landing on the moon is a vindication of the vision and the faith of our great Speaker, who is really the father of the Science and Astronautics Committee. There are those of us who remember the lean days when the Speaker could see these things, when they were just blurred in our vision. That is a great tribute to our own Speaker.

I think this is only the beginning.

Were I to have any criticism of this feat, it would be that I have not seen enough credit assigned to the help of Almighty God in getting these men onto the moon. Somebody has overlooked that. I wish to point out that without His help, the men would not be there. Without the order of the heavens and the order of the firmament and all the celestial bodies, we would not have gained the information to have accomplished this feat. It is with the help of Almighty God and our faith in Him, Mr. Speaker, that the Speaker's faith was founded, founded in that same faith in God, which is the reason for this great success. I think it will be with the continuing help of God that they will leave there and return home safely, which I am sure is the wish and prayer also of our great Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate very much the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina.

I yield now to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE).

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Speaker for yielding.

Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin, and Michael Collins are men of courage and skill whose names will live forever with Columbus and Wright and Lindbergh.

We give them the thanks of a grateful Nation.

This is an incredible feat, made even more unbelievable by our being able to watch every move from a quarter million miles away.

A great day has dawned for the entire world. Landing on the moon is so significant that I doubt we yet realize what has happened for mankind. I prophesy it will be for the good of the entire world.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his remarks.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join our distinguished Speaker and my colleagues in expressing the thanks of a proud humanity to three brave astronauts, Neil A. Armstrong, Edwin E. Aldrin, and Mike Collins, upon the almost unbelievable success of their momentous and historic mission. As they walked on the moon the whole world watched in wonder. This accomplishment was described most graphically and correctly by Neil Armstrong when he took that "one giant leap for mankind."

May God bring safely back to earth these courageous heroes of the new age which they have heralded. Thank you, thank you, brave hearts and skillful hands, for what you have done for your fellow man.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the phrase "the Eagle has landed" has been added to the permanent collection of imperishable expressions that have marked man's march toward progress. Today those of us in the Congress join millions of our countrymen in expressing heartfelt thanks to God, the Creator of our universe for the success that marked the flight of Apollo 11 to this moment. We shall continue to pray for the successful completion of the entire mission. Meanwhile, I wish to express my pride in the accomplishments of Astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins as well as the many other thousands who have assisted them in this triumph of both the human spirit and the marshaled resources of science and technology.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, this is a day of great significance in the history of our country and in the history of man.

I join our distinguished Speaker in saluting the brave astronauts who have placed our flag on the moon, and in hailing the thousands of other Americans who have contributed in countless ways to this major scientific achievement.

Many Oklahomans have shared in the work and the industrial production which made today possible, and many Oklahomans will be praying for the safe return on Thursday of the astronauts.

Let us all hope and pray they will soon be reunited in safety with their families, and that their brave conquest of space—and the new frontiers of knowledge and understanding that will follow—will lead to a better day for all people.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, millions of words are being written and spoken in tribute to the magnificent courage and fantastic American technology that have combined to place two American astronauts on the moon in a most historic event.

But the most eloquent of all of these countless words were those spoken by pioneer astronaut Neil Armstrong after the lunar module settled into the moon dust.

"The Eagle has landed," he reported.

And later as he stepped from the module to the crinkly surface of the moon, Astronaut Armstrong added:

> That's one small step for man—one giant leap for mankind.

This was truly a fantastic feat for the United States of America—and a remarkable achievement for mankind.

The American eagle—the symbol of our great Nation—has soared to the moon and planted his symbol there, the flag of the United States.

The greatness—the excellence—the courage—of our three astronauts is in the tradition of the greatness of America itself. The determination and the ability to overcome all obstacles is reassurance to mankind throughout this planet that he can solve his problems.

Mr. Speaker, as the Nation and the world watched, Astronauts Armstrong and Edwin "Buzz" Aldrin, together with Astronaut Mike Collins in the parent ship orbiting the moon, achieved the climactic objective of reaching the moon in the sixties.

An estimated half-billion people throughout the world watched in awe as the astronauts bounced across the moonscape.

Our chests swell and our hearts pound with pride as we reflect on this amazing, fantastic, fabulous feat of man and science.

I join my colleagues and people throughout the world in commending and congratulating our three cool, courageous astronauts—our modern-day pioneer explorers—who took giant steps into the future as they left their footprints in the moon.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, all men of good will are joining in saluting the gallant Americans whose craft still rests on the surface of the moon, as they prepare to set forth on the return portion of man's first voyage to that distant planet. It was my great privilege to represent the people of northwest Iowa last Wednesday at the launchsite and to wish our astronauts well as Apollo 11 took wing. This morning I watched with my family in Sioux City as the television cameras recorded the culmination of this great mission when man first set foot on the moon.

While we have much unfinished business ahead of us, let us not permit this to detract from this day of supreme achievement, not just for America, but for all mankind, the day when man truly conquered space. This is not the time to cavil and complain about those areas in which our beloved country may still fall short of the mark. This is not the day to raise our voices in behalf of the special interests of individual constituencies. There will be time enough for that when Apollo 11 has returned we pray safely to Mother Earth. This is the time to respond wholeheartedly to President Nixon's call to make this a day of national dedication and participation in man's triumph over space.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, all of us are proud of our great country and the success of Apollo 11. We are proud of the astronauts, proud of the technology, and proud of the fact that it was America that could lead the world to this historic occurrence.

This is by far the most historic event to happen in our lifetime, but we wish God's blessing for these brave men as they continue the flight of Apollo 11.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, we are celebrating today, not a narrow national victory in competition with other nations, but rather a victory of mankind over the limits to his existence.

Centuries from now men will look upon this lunar landing as man's first and most fundamental assertion that the earth will not be his final resting place. "How exciting it must have been," they will say, "to have been alive then."

And they will be right, as any one of the hundreds of millions of those who watched the events of this past week could testify. For with the success of the Apollo program, man has truly "slipped the surly bonds of earth."

One of the most significant contributions of this Nation's space program, often overlooked, is its unique ability to uplift and inspire the spirit and imagination of men. What other event has brought together so many people, at home, and abroad, in awe and pride at the capability of man to master the challenges of his existence? Pioneer astronaut Neil Armstrong did that at 10:56 p.m., eastern daylight time, July 20, 1969, when he stepped out onto the moon and said, "That is one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind."

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of other challenges which confront us now—those of war, poverty, hunger, and the pollution of our environment. But surely we must be heartened and encouraged by this dramatic demonstration that man can overcome even the most complex of problems in order to achieve the goals which he sets for himself.

While the flag of the United States proudly stands implanted on the moon, let us beware of regarding this magnificent achievement in purely chauvinistic or military terms. If we can be moved to commit ourselves to solving the complexities of the urban crisis, as we committed ourselves to setting foot on the moon, then there is a great and promising future for man here on earth, as well as in the heavens.

It is in that spirit, Mr. Speaker, that I introduced legislation to create a national holiday, designated as "Lunar Landing Day," to be celebrated on July 20 in 1970, and thereafter on the third Monday of every July.

It will be a day to commemorate and honor the courage of Astronauts Neil Armstrong, Edwin "Buzz" Aldrin, and Michael Collins. It will be a day to reflect on the beginnings of man's exploration of outer space just as we celebrate the beginning of the exploration of the New World on Columbus Day. But most important, it will be a day to renew our confidence in man's inherent potential for mastering his own destiny.

That confidence and resolve can ultimately lead us to the successful resolution of the Nation's and the world's problems; and we are indebted to the men and women of the space program for showing us how much we can do, and how far we can go.

"Lunar Landing Day" will honor all of them.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, even now man has become a physical presence on the moon, a celestial body other than his home planet. We have crossed the threshold of space and stand on the brink of infinity as well as a new era in the unfolding story of the race of men. A dream of the ages has been realized.

Throughout recorded history there have been those few men who have dared raise their eyes to distant horizons, conceiving new destinies for all their fellows. Such names are few, their deeds are enshrined, their footsteps huge. Our Nation has been blessed with a rare few of them. Presidents Kennedy and Johnson dreamt the dream. Others have now fulfilled it.

Who among us can ever forget the shock sputnik threw into all of us, as our entire way of life stood challenged? When President Kennedy pledged America to a goal of reaching the moon, he knew what he was doing. History today has vindicated him.

Americans who have reached the moon follow a path trodden by only an elect few. Neil Armstrong, "Buzz" Aldrin, and Mike Collins follow the footsteps of Magellan, Columbus, Balboa, and every towering pioneer who dares unplumbed deeps and vast unknowns in the name of courage, exploration, and advancement of all men. Many aspire to such stature. Few attain it. Even fewer are truly deserving. These who reached the moon will be men among men as long as history is written. No monument can do their accomplishment justice. No words can adequately describe their deeds. Honor is due not only those who made the commitment, those who honored it, and those who made it possible for them to reach their goal, but to so many others. American technology, education, and industry have done all of us proud. Those who built the systems and sent them on their way are due a generous share of the glory.

Let us remember those who perished both Americans and Russians, in pursuit of this glittering, and now realized vision. They who dare in the name of pathfinding are truly due honor and respect.

Mr. Speaker, in times to come, other men shall look back in amazement at our era. It is such a mixture of the sublime and the degraded, the superb and the horrid, the noble and disgusting, the pinnacle and the nadir. Starvation abroad and domestically mixes with heart transplants and wonder drugs. Curing of disease is blended with nerve gas and MIRV. Man is an ultimate mixture himself, the saintly and the demoniacal.

This morning he approached the topmost peak of technological achievement. I pray that in future, other generations will testify to his ability to ascend to equally rarified heights of human understanding and compassion. The beginning of this new age can only be signified by a question mark on the sands of time, at last disturbed by a man's footprints.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, today we, as Americans, share the pride merited by the success of the Apollo 11 mission in making the first footprints of man on the moon those of Americans.

One physicist has estimated that those first footprints will remain stamped on the moon's surface for a million years.

American technology and ingenuity have been proved the most advanced in the world, and our space effort has earned for us a place in history which time can never erase.

Mr. Speaker, I speak for all Alabamians when I express our pride that the Saturn 5 rocket, which powered this and previous Apollo missions through the tenacious grip of the earth's gravity, was developed at NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Ala.

Some 300,000 Alabamians participated in the Apollo project at its peak.

The mighty Saturn rocket, which stands 36 stories tall, can deliver 7½ million pounds of thrust, twice that of the original Redstone rocket that launched the first Mercury manned flights.

Mr. Speaker, Alabamians are proud that the Saturn 5 originated within our State, and even more proud, as Americans, to have been part of the space effort.

And when the glory of this new accomplishment fades with time, we pray that mankind will continue to strive for the same purpose expressed by our three astronauts, Neil A. Armstrong, Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr., and Michael Collins, on the plaque placed on the moon's surface yesterday.

The plaque reads, "We came in peace for all mankind."

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, on this day words are inadequate to express our feelings. Man has for the first time walked on the moon. As our astronauts performed this history-making feat, I am sure that the hopes and prayers of the world were with them. This is a great day for the United States of America but it is also a great day for our friends throughout the world.

We have, indeed, now begun the conquest of space and I am sure all who saw it shared with me the thrill of seeing on televisions Americans walking on the surface of the moon—the first men there.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the Record my feelings following the highly successful landing by our U.S. astronauts on the moon and their movements on its surface.

Mr. Speaker, our prayers today are for a safe return of the astronauts to earth and with this utterly fantastic achievement of man landing on the moon, I hope and pray that this technological event will serve as a rallying cry to unite our country and all mankind once again.

The activity on the moon by our astronauts was a terrific demonstration of courage, faith, and dedication, and I am sure all America is proud and the rest of the world, too. I, myself, was so proud to see our heroes plant the U.S. flag on the moon as a sign of the strength of America.

This event further instills in mankind the continued search for even greater achievements, just as in the early growing years of this Nation, that same drive by our forefathers, then, as now, undoubtedly will continue into the future.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today's Day of Participation, honoring our Nation's successful landing on the moon, has my full support and endorsement, and I feel such a day of recognition is fully justified.

It was with considerable pleasure that my appeal on Friday in behalf of our postal field service employees played a role in the decision by Postmaster General William Blount to grant these dedicated public servants full participation in this special day. According to a policy decision by Postmaster General Blount, these employees have been either granted the day off from their duties, or will be granted compensatory pay or time off at a future date.

An inequity occurred to these employees earlier this year when a national day of mourning was declared for our late President, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. On that occasion, Federal offices were closed and the majority of our Federal employees were granted leave from their duties. Our postal clerks and other postal field service employees, who also held our late President in great respect, continued at their jobs.

In an effort to avoid concern in the future over whether or not these employees will be treated equally with other Federal workers, I have introduced legislation today which would grant these employees time off, of compensatory pay or compensatory time off in the event a future Executive order creates a national day of mourning, day of participation, or special holiday.

This legislation will, I feel, correct what has been an injustice in the past, and prevent such an injustice from occurring in the future.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, on a cloudy, rainy day yesterday and a cloudy, rainy night last night the glow from the moon lit up not only the dreariest night but all of mankind.

As man stood for the first time on another planet there was a compelling need to find perspective in this moment of light in history. Man is technically intelligent enough to visit other planets, but is he wise enough? In the name of all mankind man went in peace to the moon, but on the planet he calls home four separate wars were being fought. Two men could be heard distinctly across a quarter million miles of space, but on the planet he calls home, billions of voices are unheard in their daily cries for food or for freedom.

Man can accomplish that which man agrees it is essential to do, but man has not agreed that it is essential to live in peace, to control pollution and population, to feed the hungry, to free those ethnically or economically enslaved, or to preserve the resources of the planet called earth.

We must not, and we cannot, abandon the quest for the new and the elsewhere, for it is of man's nature to quest. Let us pray that it is not a necessary part of man's nature to war, to pollute, to enslave, and to destroy, for if it is there may be something pathetic and prophetic in a lonely flag standing for eons on a windless barren plain, seen by no one, surrounded by some incredibly expensive litter—an eternal memorial to an animal smart enough and brave enough to place it there, but so stupid it destroyed the planet from whence it came, and to which it had to return.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a proud day for America. Late last night and early this morning, the whole world witnessed the end of a long, hard journey begun nearly 8 years ago when President Kennedy committed us to a manned landing on the moon. As I watched astronaut Armstrong step onto the surface of the moon, I could not help but feel that all of us were right there with him. This could never have happened had not the majority of Americans supported our space program. It could never have happened had our colleges and universities not trained the thousands of scientists and technicians who designed and built the space vehicles used in this historic flight.

My State of Alabama played an important part in the moon landing. It was at the Marshall Space Flight Center at Huntsville that the giant Saturn V rocket was developed. Hundreds of other industries throughout our State also participated in the program either directly or indirectly. Thousands of Alabama-trained people helped with the various parts of the space program.

I join today with all Alabamians and all Americans in saluting not only the Apollo 11 crew, but every man and woman who has assisted in bringing about this historic moon landing.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the following articles from the Birmingham Post-Herald and Birmingham News, which describe further the part Alabama played in the space program, printed in the Record:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) Post-Herald]

IN APOLLO 11 MISSION: REDSTONE ARSENAL HAS SENSE OF PRIDE

(By Beth Russler)

HUNTSVILLE.—The atmosphere at Redstone Arsenal Wednesday, the day that the Saturn V engines which had their birthplace here lifted three American astronauts toward the moon, was not once of "business as usual."

Neither was it a day of celebration with noisy jubilation in the streets.

The expression of one NASA spokesman who said "we knew it would work," pretty well summed up the general attitude throughout the various agencies represented on the sprawling military compound.

More than 1,050 Arsenal employes made the trip to Cape Kennedy to see the culmination of their efforts when the Apollo 11 was borne aloft by a cluster of the mighty Saturns.

Only 150 of these were on assignment while at least 900 more paid their own way.

Meanwhile back at the Rocket Center in Huntsville, an undetermined number of employes took a few hours of annual leave to stay home and watch the spectacle on television.

Those who arrived at work on time watched the proceedings with single minded attention on closed circuit television in the offices and auditoriums of their own divisions.

Col. Paul Schuppener, commandant of the Army Missile and Munitions Center and School, reminisced over the launchings which have been a part of his career for the past 11 years.

Remembering the morning of Jan. 31, 1958, when he sat in the chief of staff's telecom room in Washington, he and the secretary of the Army, Gen. John B. Medaris, then commanding general of the Army Ballistics Missile Agency, and Dr. Wernher von Braun, director of the Marshall Space Flight Center, waited for the word that Explorer I was indeed in orbit and was likely to stay there.

"None of us dreamed that day," Col. Schuppener said, "that in only 11.5 years we would have the capability of putting a man on the moon."

Commenting on Vice President Spiro Agnew's prediction that we will have a manned Mars mission before the end of the century, Col. Schuppener said, "we have made such marvelous progress so far, now anything can happen."

Even though six previous launches have conditioned the people of Huntsville to expect success, there was nevertheless a feeling of pride and tense anticipation caused by the attempt of a new dimension in space travel until it was apparent that Apollo 11 too had performed flawlessly on the first phase of its mission.

Then the old complacency returned, because as the man said, "we knew it would work."

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, July 16, 1969]

THOUSANDS OF SATURN'S PARENTS CHEER BABY OFF

(By Hoyt Hartwell)

HUNTSVILLE.—The mighty rocket that propelled Apollo 11 toward the moon today was the dependable Saturn V developed by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Marshall Space Flight Center here.

Never has the Saturn failed.

The 41-engine rocket launched two unmanned space vehicles and then the Apollo 8, 9 and 10 crews. And now the biggest of all—the flight that is to put the first man on the moon.

The Saturn's three stages total 281 feet long, making that part of the moon ship taller than a 36-story building. At liftoff, the rocket weighed 6.2 million pounds.

It becomes lighter each second as the powerful engines gulp the six million pounds of fuel. The first stage's five engines, for instance, consume 2,230 gallons per second, providing 7.5 million pounds of thrust.

Engineers and housewives, scientists and dairymen—everyone at Huntsville is as excited as children at Christmas time.

So excited, in fact, that an estimated 10,000 of them were at Cape Kennedy to watch the space ship rise toward the moon today.

They went there in a 250-car caravan on 65 buses, three transport planes and in campers, commercial planes and family cars. Some took their vacations in order to be in Florida for the historic occasion.

Many homes in Huntsville contained only mother and children today. The men were at Kennedy—some to work, others to watch their Saturn perform.

Dr. Werner von Braun lead a staff of 150 from the Marshall center to the cape to serve as support personnel.

Another 900 Marshall employes, given paid leave, went there at their own expense.

So many Huntsville people were there that a bus shuttle service was set up in Florida to take them to within view of the launch and then return them to the staging points.

Meanwhile, just about all NASA activity here ceased during the launch time as employes huddled around 70 television monitors set up for them.

It was reminiscent of the first orbital flight of a free world satellite on Jan. 31, 1958, when the Redstone rocket, also developed here, was the launch vehicle.

The entire city of Huntsville celebrated that event and similar celebrations are planned here on Thursday of next week when the Apollo 11 astronauts splash down in the Pacific at the end of their mission.

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, I have never been prouder to be an American. What a difference from the emotional frustration when we learned of sputnik in 1958.

The moon landing of Apollo 11 marks the start of a new era in the history of the world. No longer is man contained by his environment. The success of Apollo 11 is proof that Amerca's greatness does not lie in its material assets, but in its spirit, courage, and determination to conquer the unknown.

This country has been recently torn by internal strife. Apollo 11 truly united this country in purpose and prayers—regardless of race, creed, color or political philosophy. Perhaps the success of the space program, due to the teamwork of individuals possessing various skills and backgrounds, can teach all of us a lesson. A new era of understanding and cooperation, marked by the rebirth of the human spirit, can now begin on the planet earth.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, the marvelous scientific accomplishment of the Apollo 11 mission is a singular historic event. I congratulate the Apollo 11 crew, Mike Collins, "Buzz" Aldrin, and Neil Armstrong, and the outstanding backup and support crews and controllers, scientists, engineers, professionals, and countless others who made this possible. It is my hope that the aurora of this magnanimous achievement will help light the way toward peaceful understanding and harmony between all of the people on earth.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join the distinguished Speaker and my colleagues to pay tribute to the Apollo 11 astronauts, Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin, and Michael Collins, and to all who participated in their journey, from the lowliest to the highest, may all share in their glory.

"The Eagle has landed" and "A small step for man; a giant leap for mankind" will forever be a part of recorded history, so shall the words, "We came in peace." I speak for the people of the 15th District of Texas when I say "Well done." May your courage, and the genius that made all this possible bring inspiration to mankind to continue to explore and conquer the vastness of space, and may your humility and devotion to the duty inspire us to continue our search for solutions to the problems of mankind.

God bless you; "Brave Eagles"—Godspeed and a safe return to your loved ones, and to us, because now you belong to history, and this day in history belongs to you.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to join our beloved and distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCCORMACK), in paying tribute to those who made possible our successful landing on the moon. Mr. Speaker, we are proud of all our astronauts, these gallant, courageous, and dedicated men who have made our country first in space. I commend you, Mr. Speaker, for your foresight as one of the principal architects of this successful program. I commend President Lyndon B. Johnson for his role. Here in the House, I would like to pay tribute to GEORGE MILLER, "TIGER" TEAGUE, and the members of the committee who never faltered or wavered in their belief that America would succeed.

This is the proper time to acknowledge and express our appreciation to the leaders in the House who made this magnificent triumph possible. It is a good time to thank the American people for their support of this program and their belief in the future of our great Nation. I remember the Speaker was one of those leaders in the House during World War II who did not hesitate to provide the means for this Nation to split the atom without any hesitation or question about its future success. The House leaders, when challenged by sputnik, again did not hesitate, and the conquest of space is now a reality.

Our lunar landing yesterday is a peace mission. We are there for the freedom of all mankind. We are there because we believe in the brotherhood of man throughout the world. We are indeed one community. I am reminded today of Wendell Willkie, who traveled throughout this land speaking of one world. Wendell Willkie's dream is near at hand.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we are on the dawn of the greatest era in this history of our Nation and the history of the world. It is a time for reverence, thanksgiving, and great rejoicing. This is another milestone in human progress. We as a nation can be grateful to our divine Creator who created the "heavens and the earth."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, all Americans share pride in the magnificent accomplishment of Apollo 11. Throughout the thrilling events of Sunday we were more united in thought and purpose than in many years.

Most of the world was one in the fervent wish and concern for the success of the Apollo 11 mission and its courageous crew.

The magnitude of the achievement and its inestimable impact on man dwarfs description.

The infinity of the universe demands more clearly humility of man that should move finite conflicts to solution.

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to

join the citizens of the free world in voicing my congratulations and a "well done" to the three astronauts who participated in man's first journey to the moon.

I am extremely proud that the first men on the moon were Americans, although their accomplishment was on behalf of all mankind.

I agree with Dr. Wernher von Braun that such space exploration can only bring men nearer to God, and make His existence more real to the doubting Thomases.

With this unparalleled achievement we can look forward to still further unequaled and undreamed of space advances. It is my earnest hope and prayer that our moon landing will help further the cause of peace throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, while so much is being written about this great lunar feat, I feel the article entitled, "A Dream: A Man on the Moon" from the July 17 issue of the Bulloch Herald of Statesboro, Ga., best describes the many scientific and technological efforts which are now historic achievements of the American space program.

I, therefore, commend that article to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues in the House:

A DREAM: A MAN ON THE MOON

John Milton, English poet during the 1600's called her "The Silver-Footed Queen." Thomas Tickwell, English essayist and poet, called her "The Silver Empress of the Night," during the 1700's. Thomas Otway, English dramatists, called her "The Queen of Night" during the 1600's. William Shakespeare, English poet in the 1500's called her a "Silver Bow New Bent in Heaven."

Other poets have called her Goddess of the Night, Selene, Artemis, Cynthia, Luna, Musicians have ennobled her, lovers swore by her. And dogs howled at her.

Men worshipped her, feeling that her mystical powers influenced life on earth. She was unreachable, remote, the focus of poets, of shepherds and nomads, of lonely astronomers and not-so-lonely lovers.

The moon has inspired more superstition than any other celestial body. It has long been considered an omen of evil, especially when it eclipses the sun, or when its dark orb, faintly lit by earthshine, lies cradled in a silver crescent.

And even the full moon has held its terrors. From the remotest times it has been supposed that sleeping in full moonlight can cause blindness or madness. The very word "lunatic" derives from the Latin for moon.

Many farmers to this day plant some crops "by the moon."

As a boy we were fascinated by Jules Verne's story, "From the Earth to the Moon," written in 1865. The flight of Apollo 8, which began on December 21, 1968 and carried Astronauts Frank Borman, Jim Lovell and Bill Anders to the Moon, had some haunting parallels to that book. Verne had a crew of three in his spacecraft. They took off in December. They took off from near Tampa, Florida. And when they finally got back to earth they landed in the Pacific.

In 1969, in the twelfth year of the Space Age, the moon, earth's natural satellite, has become the concern of every man, and the object of the most intensive scientific and technological effort in man's history. It is estimated that more than a million people were gathered in the launch area at Cape Kennedy on yesterday morning, July 16, when Neil Armstrong, commander; Michael Collins, command module pilot; and Edwin Aldrin, lunar module pilot, took off in Apollo 11 for the Moon.

For centuries man has been looking at the moon, in wonderment and puzzlement. Then in 1609, a man named Galileo built the first astronomical telescope and looking at the moon discovered that it, shining with reflected light, had an uneven mountainous surface.

Since then the moon has claimed the full attention of astronomers, astrophysicists, astrochemists, stargazers, astrologers and soothsayers.

It was not until October 4, 1957, that man's hope of someday going to the moon was stimulated into the possibility of realization with the launching of the first man-made satellite, Sputnik I, by the Russians.

Two months later on December 6, with the world watching, our nation's "Vanguard" stood ready to boost a three-pound minisatellite into space. When fired for lift-off, the slender rocket rose just two feet off its pad, lost thrust and crumbled to the ground in a massive explosion. American prestige in the space field tumbled with it and man's hope dimmed.

But hope burns eternal in the breast of man and it flamed up again with the first earth satellite, Explorer I, being sent into orbit from Cape Kennedy on January 31, 1958.

And just a little more than three years later, on April 12, 1961, man broke his earthly bonds when Russian Major Yuri Gagarin went into orbit and returned to earth after one circuit. Less than one month later on May 5, America's first spaceman, Navy Commander Alan B. Sheppard Jr., rode a Redstone rocket briefly over the threshold of space on a 15-minute suborbit flight. By this time, the United States began recovering from shock of the December 6, 1957, failure of the Vanguard.

Then on May 25, 1961, President John F. Kennedy went before a joint session of Congress and told its members, "I believe this nation should commit itself to achieving the goal, before the decade is out, of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to earth. No single space project in this period will be more impressive to mankind, or more important for the longterm exploration of space; and none will be more difficult or expensive to accomplish."

With the flames of hope fanned into new heights, a massive industry-government-military team went to work and miracles began happening.

On February 20, 1962, John Glenn Jr. became the first American to orbit the earth when he was sent into space atop an Atlas rocket in Friendship 7 Mercury capsule. He became the nation's hero and man's hopes soared.

Three months later, on May 24, 1962, Commander M. Scott Carpenter made a three-orbit flight in the Mercury capsule, Aurora 7, and then on October 3, Commander Walter M. Schirra Jr., orbited the earth six times in the Mercury capsule Sigma 7.

In August of that year, the Russians sent their third and fourth cosmonauts into orbit on August 11 and 12. One orbited the earth 64 times and the other 48 times.

The era of the Mercury flights ended May 15–16 of 1963 when Air Force Major Gordon L. Cooper Jr. orbited the earth 22 times. The next month on June 14, the fifth Russian flew in space and made 81 orbits. Two days later on June 16, the first woman space traveler, a Russian, made 81 orbits around the earth.

It was not until March of 1965, that the Gemini flights were inaugurated, but in the meantime on July 31, 1964, the United States sent Ranger 7 to the moon to make pictures. It relayed thousands of close-up photographs of the moon before crashing on the lunar surface.

And the Russians continued sending men into space. A spacecraft carrying three men was launched by the Soviet Union on October 12 and made 16 orbits.

It was a Russian, Alekser A. Leonov, who on March 18, 1965, went into orbit and became the first man "to walk in space," when he stepped out into space from his spaceship Voskhod 2.

With the first Gemini flight by Air Force Lieutenant Colonel Virgil I. Grissom and Navy Lieutenant Commander John W. Young, in March of 1965, the United States moved ahead in its objective to reach the moon.

Two months later, on June 3, Major Edward H. White, stirred the hopes of Americans that man was getting closer to the dream of landing on the moon. It was Major White who stepped out of his Gemini 4 spacecraft and "walked in space" for 20 minutes.

And on December 4, Air Force Lieutenant Colonel Frank Borman and Navy Commander James A. Lovell Jr. were successfully lanuched into space in Gemini 7. They circled the earth 206 times in 330 hours and 35 minutes. On December 15, Gemini 6 Astronauts Walter M. Schirra Jr. and Thomas P. Stafford were launched to conduct a rendezvous exercise with Gemini 7. They made 16 revolutions around the earth in its 25-hour, 48-minute flight. During that time the spacecraft maneuvered to within six feet of Gemini 7 and maintained formation with it for five and one-half hours.

It was in 1966 that the moon began to feel the impact of the determination of the United States and Russia to put a man on it.

On February 3, 1966, the Russians made the first soft landing on the surface of the moon by an unmanned spacecraft.

At 10 a.m. on March 16, 1966, an Atlas rocket, carrying Gemini 8's Agena target began its journey into orbit. One hour and 41 minutes later, Astronauts Neil Armstrong and David Scott rode their Titan rocket skyward. During the next six hours, Armstrong and Scott pursued Agena four times around the earth, and succeeded in "docking" with it. But trouble developed and when they persisted, Gemini 8 splashed down in the Pacific. There was disappointment, for Scott's scheduled "walk in space" was cancelled.

On June 2, four months later, the United States made its first soft landing on the moon with Surveyor 1. Then on September 12, the U.S. spacecraft Gemini 11 successfully performed a "docking" operation with a 26-foot Agena-D target.

And with the last Gemini Flight in November of 1966, the United States was set to move into its program of manned Apollo flights and the word was that we'd have a man on the moon in 1968.

But it was not to be so. For 1967 brought disaster and tragedy to the space programs of both the United States and Russia.

It was on January 27, 1967, that the United States and the world went into a state of shock upon learning that three U.S. astronauts died in a sudden fire which engulfed the capsule of their Apollo 1 spacecraft while it was on the ground at Cape Kennedy. They were Air Force Colonel Virgil I. Grissom, Air Force Lieutenant Colonel Edward H. White and Navy Lieutenant Commander Roger F. Chaffee. Colonel Grissom was one of the first seven Mercury project astronauts. Colonel White was the first American to "walk in space." And Commander Chaffee was preparing to make his first flight. The tragedy occurred at 6:31 p.m. while the men, dressed in their spacesuits were participating in a full-scale simulation of the Apollo program's first launching which had been scheduled for February 27.

Three months later, on April 24, Russian Cosmonaut Vladimer M. Komarov was returning to earth after a day in orbit when his spacecraft's parachute straps became twisted, causing the ship to crash, killing its pilot.

The January 27th fire was a tragic blow to America's hope to land a man on the moon. But space officials continued to work on the program, despite the delay they knew would develop in meeting their space program schedules. Before another of the Apollo series was to get off the ground, three U.S. Lunar Orbitors and three Surveyors were sent into space to collect thousands of photographs of the moon and made chemical analyses of its surface.

Then on November 9, Apollo 4, was sent on an unmanned flight. It was the first since the January 27 fire and the first launch of the giant Saturn 5 booster designed to send man to the moon.

1968 began with the launching of Surveyor 7 on January 7. It was the last of the robot moon-landing series to shoot more photographs and analyze the lunar surface. Surveyor 7 also revealed earth-type basalt and volcanic rock to support the theory that the moon was born either with or from the earth.

And before the month was out, Apollo 5, on January 22, was sent on an unmanned mission, carrying the first "Lem" which is the short name for the lunar module which will set Neil Armstrong and Edwin Aldrin on the Moon at 4:19 p.m., July 20.

Then on April 4, the huge Saturn 5 booster got its second test when it carried Apollo 6 into space. It was considered a success despite excess vibrations in the first stage, a malfunctioning engine in the second stage and the failure of the third stage to restart in space.

By October, the January 17, 1967 disaster had become history and man was ready to challenge space. On October 11, Apollo 7, atop a Saturn, carried Navy Captain Walter M. Schirra Jr., Air Force Major Don F. Eisele and Civilian Walter Cunningham into orbit for 11 perfect days during which they circled the earth 163 times. Apollo program director, Air Force Lieutenant General Samuel C. Phillips, declared the flight "the first space operation that has accomplished more than 100 per cent of its preplanned objectives."

And the stage was set for that most fantastic voyage climaxed by Apollo 8's rendevous with the Moon, which began with lift-off at Cape Kennedy at 7:51 a.m. on December 21, 1968.

This was the flight when three Americans became the first human beings to escape from the gravitational pull of the earth and to orbit another celestial body.

And man almost touched the moon.

This was the flight during which millions of people all over the world heard Command Pilot Air Force Colonel Frank Borman describe the moon as being "a vast lonely forbidding type of existence, a great expanse of nothing, that looks rather like clouds and clouds of pumice stone . . . It certainly would not appear to be a very inviting place to live or work." Navy Captain James A. Lovell declared "the vast loneliness of the moon up here is awe-inspiring, and it makes you realize just what you have back there on earth. The earth from here is a grand oasis to the big vastness of space." And Air Force Major William A. Anders was impressed by the lunar sunrises and sunsets.

It was these three men who touched the hearts and souls of men on earth, when, near the time for them to head for home. Major Anders introduced what many people remember as the most moving moment of the flight when he said, "For all the people back on earth, the crew of Apollo 8 has a message that we would like to send to you.

And so these three astronauts, who more than any other men have seen the evidence of creation, paused in their voyage to the moon to read, in turn, the most appropriate words imaginable for the scene below them—the majestic opening words of the book of Genesis.

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth and the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light: and there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good: and God divided the light from the darkness . . . And God saw that it was good."

"And from the crew of Apollo 8, we pause with good night, good luck, a Merry Christmas, and God bless all of you—all of you on the good earth."

And with the first light of dawn on Demember 27, just five days before the end of 1968, Apollo splashed down in the Pacific and the astronauts climbed out—to the plaudits of a waiting world.

And man's spirit was lifted and his hopes for landing on the moon seemed ever so close.

Yet, there remained one more test to be made. The vehicle, which is to ease man down to the surface of the moon was yet to be proven—in space, with men at its controls. Called "LEM" the lunar module has made one Apollo flight—unmanned and unsuccessful.

And so Apollo 9 was given the business to answer the question, "Can man be put ON the moon and be lifted OFF safely? And on the fifth day of Apollo 9's flight which began on March 3, 1969, U.S. spacemen had their answer, loud and clear, "It can be done."

The big test came on March 7 when Astronauts Col. James A. McDivitt and Civilian Russell L. Schweickart, put "LEM" through its paces about 150 miles above the earth—zipping through space at 17,500 miles an hour. For nearly six and a half hours, the astronauts flew the "space spider" independently of its mother ship, simulating a moon landing.

Then they returned to the waiting Apollo command, piloted in their absence by David R. Scott. Five more days of other testing and maneuvers were carried out before Apollo 9 splashed down in the Atlantic near Bermuda on March 13.

And man reached still closer to the moon. America was now ready for a final flight, the flight which was to be the dress rehearsal to tie up all the loose ends for putting man on the moon.

On May 18 Apollo 10 was sent into space. Riding it were Astronauts Thomas Stafford, John Young and Eugene Cernan. They were to get the answers to the questions, is it safe to land on the area selected for the touchdown? and will LEM (the lunar module) slow down enough for a "soft" landing?

On May 26, Apollo 10 splashed down in the Pacific with the answers . . . Yes.

They had guided LEM to within nine miles of the surface of the moon to scout the site which had been selected for Apollo 11.

And yesterday morning, Wednesday, July 16, at 9:32 o'clock, Apollo 11 lifted off with Astronauts Neil H. Armstrong, Michael Collins and Edwin E. Aldrin Jr. on their way to the realization of man's age-old dream to land a man on the moon.

Riding with them are the prayers of all men of good will.

If it be God's will, let it be so.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the words "that is one small step for man, one giant step for mankind," pioneer astronaut Neil Armstrong set foot on the surface of the moon for the first time in the history of mankind.

Shortly after, his companion, Edwin "Buzz" Aldrin was on the moon's surface and together they began the scientific exploration of that planetary body. The data they bring back will enable our scientists to make studies of the composition of the lunar surface and provide us with information in furthering the space program and better scientific understanding of that celestial body and earth as a part of the solar system.

This great achievement in man's desire to reach the moon is the culmination of a dream by the "father of rocketry," Dr. Robert H. Goddard. On March 16, 1926, Dr. Goddard demonstrated the practicality of rockets at Auburn, Mass., with the first liquid fuel rocket flight; the rocket traveled 184 feet in 2.5 seconds. After that trial flight, he stated that some day man will travel to the moon by rocket. Yesterday this dream became a reality.

It is unfortunate that the man who did so much to advance the space program was not with us to share in the glory of this historic flight. President John F. Kennedy, who had set as a national goal a moon landing in the 1970's would have rejoiced with all of America that this achievement was made possible before the timetable set by him. In proposing this, President Kennedy said on May 25, 1961:

> I believe that this nation should commit itself to achieving the goal, before this decade is out, of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to the earth.

Much credit must be given to the late President for his determination to proceed with this moon mission, in spite of opposition from many sources.

There is much in our space program which shows it to be a wise investment for the future. Looking behind the fanfare of the space flights, we can see the steady and significant contributions of our space program to education, medicine, communications, weather forecasting, and the whole range of technological development—electronics, computers, metallurgy, and more.

We have trained thousands of scientists under space grants. Almost $800 million have been distributed directly to colleges and universities under the space program. These grants have helped to break down the compartmentalization of our universities—there is now more interdisciplinary cooperation. The schools of engineering are working with the schools of medicine, and physicists are working with psychologists.

Space has required a more exact science of medicine than we have ever known before. We are learning much more about the human body and how it reacts to stress.

Without the space program, there would have been no communications satellites, which are revolutionizing worldwide communications and which will help make education available to people in every area of the world.

Weather satellites can save billions of dollars for farmers and industry through more accurate forecasting. The advance warning of storms can save both lives and property.

The space program, more than any other single development, has upgraded American industry and management. In fact, the space program is just another name for excellence in American technology. It has helped fuel our fantastic economic growth and contributed to our capacity to compete with other countries, despite their lower labor costs.

Our mastery of space has contributed significantly to our national security, and beyond that, has opened the skies to allow the kind of inspection that will have to accompany arms control agreements.

Space exploration has promoted international cooperation—the best minds of different nations are working together to solve common problems. If we pursue this opportunity, we can work with the Soviet Union and other nations in the peaceful exploration of outer space.

Earth resource satellites can help us feed the people of earth. These satellites will find water to make deserts bloom. They can detect disease in crops. They can find schools of fish and discover mineral deposits.

These earth resource satellites, in themselves, will repay our investment in the space program.

Perhaps most important of all, our voyage to the moon has shown us that if we make a commitment and work together, we can do almost anything.

We made a commitment to put a man on the moon, and we kept it.

The landing of Americans on the moon is one of the most thrilling moments in history. If we can spend billions on a vast space program, then we can also create a world where hunger, war, and economic insecurity are no longer problems of man. While we have been successful in meeting scientific challenges in a flight to the moon, man has failed in many of the other important issues of life.

We must make a similar commitment to rebuild our cities, to clean up our air and water, to provide quality education and health care to all of our people.

If Government, private enterprise, and our colleges and universities work together to rebuild our cities in the same way they cooperated on the space program, we can do it by 1976—the 200th anniversary of our birth.

To put a man on the moon requires the best we have in private and public sectors. To put a man on his feet here on earth also calls for the best that is in us.

Our space program has given us pride and confidence as a people. Man does not live by bread alone. Our space achievements represent more than just wealth and power. They are testimony to the quality of our people. Our astronauts grew up in America, and they represent the hopes and aspirations of all the American people.

So the space program is more than just adventure, scientific miracles, expensive hardware, and costly experimentation. It has enriched all of us, and someday it will carry us into our neighborhood of tomorrow—the solar system.

We are all children of the sun, and our journeys into space will both increase our knowledge of the universe and improve the lives of all of us here on this good earth.

There are still several Apollo missions planned in this series and will cost an estimated $300 to $350 million each. The monumental achievement of yesterday's moon landing is something which the Nation must consider in the future—continue probing the space on a wider base or to turn to our domestic problems which could become a lever toward making the earth a better place to live in.

We must not minimize the achievements of the two astronauts who actually imprinted their footprints on the lunar surface, but we must also salute Mike Collins who is to bring back the heroic trio of Apollo 11.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my personal congratulations to astronauts Collins, Armstrong, and Aldrin for their success in reaching the moon, and I pray that their return will be in accordance with all previously determined flight plans.

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, last night the whole world was watching when first one and then a second American set foot on the moon. In one sense, this historic event was the culmination of a long series of events known as our moon program, yet in a larger sense it might more likely be characterized as another beginning in our exploration of outer space.

This signal accomplishment cannot pass without a personal expression of appreciation and admiration for all of the dedicated individuals who have participated in our space program. Obviously, tremendous contributions have been made by our courageous astronauts, and also by those scientists, technicians, and workers directly and indirectly involved in the program.

But, Mr. Speaker, in our rush to share the glory and wealth of this fantastic experience and accomplishment with all the world—as we should properly do—let us not forget for a moment that this is an American achievement in which we as a nation and as a people should have justifiable pride. Our Nation has expended vast sums of its national resources to accomplish what we have in space, and in this regard, Mr. Speaker, all Americans have certainly participated.

MOON DAY—NATIONAL DAY OF RECOGNITION

(Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today Neil A. Armstrong, Col. Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr., and Lt. Col. Michael Collins are about to successfully conclude one of history's most incredible ventures.

Through the magic of television, almost the entire world last night watched with fascination as these three men demonstrated they were not only finely trained, but that they possessed that intangible extra something—an awareness that they were pioneering for all men everywhere.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a joint resolution which calls for the designation of the third Monday of July as a national day of recognition, to be known as Moon Day, in honor of Apollo 11, its crewmembers, and man's achievement.

This measure also provides for the issuance of commemorative postage stamps and medals in honor of astronauts Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin, and Mike Collins.

Because of the significance of this event, I propose the issuance of a three-value set of commemorative postage stamps showing the faces of the three Apollo 11 crewmen. The moon stamp previously prepared does not show the faces, because postal regulations normally prohibit showing the faces of living persons on U.S. stamps. Certainly the triumph of Apollo 11 will be magnified if we waive that provision to honor this successful mission which equals some of the most astonishing dreams of fiction.

The three astronauts would receive a special gold commemorative medal, with silver copies of the design presented to the other American astronauts who participated in space flight or their next of kin. Bronze copies of the medal, at the cost of manufacture, will be prepared for sale to the public.

Mr. Speaker, the unequaled historic significance of the successful landing on the moon by the astronauts is worthy of continued commemoration by the people of the United States, and, indeed, all mankind.

The skill, energy, and courage with which we have approached the exploration of space helps restore the national confidence in the strength of our own powers of commitment and determination to tackle man's earthly ills and meet the challenges which, for a moment, the astronauts have left behind.

LUNAR DAY

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the greatest scientific and technological accomplishment in the history of the world. When our men planted the Stars and Stripes of our country on the moon, it was a tribute to the dynamic progress, ingenuity, and cooperation of the American people. It was a tribute to our private enterprise system. It was a tribute to our form of government with its emphasis on the dignity and worth of the individual. It was a tribute to the incomparable team of Government, industry, and academic community which made this feat possible. It was a tribute to the Congress which authored the program and the American people who supported it. It was a tribute to the valor, courage, and gallantry of America's spacemen, their families, and the millions who supported them.

Mr. Speaker, it is a time for reverence and thanksgiving to the Creator of the universe and Creator of man whom He endowed with dominion over all the creatures of the earth.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution designating this day as a national holiday and a day annually to pay tribute to these brave pioneers of space, who today unlocked the door to a billion secrets.

While flying to this session this morning from Columbia, the capital city of South Carolina, I read a very excellent and timely editorial in The State which prompted me to introduce this resolution calling for a Lunar Day. This outstanding editorial follows:

A DAY FOR APOLLO

"The Eagle has landed," said Astronaut Neil Armstrong matter-of-factly.

Those simple words, spoken Sunday afternoon, packed as much drama, perhaps more, than any ever spoken up to that moment. And the world applauded spontaneously.

They marked man's first touchdown in space and assured a place in history for Apollo 11 and her valiant crew even if no other parts of the breath-taking mission were carried out.

By the time this appears in print, another momentous milestone should have been reached. Armstrong should have made the first human footprint on the moon's surface in full view of a nation too proud and too excited to sleep.

Old Glory has never flown so high, literally and figuratively, and America surely will want to commemorate the event in an appropriate manner for as long as the flag flies.

This journey is not over. Other milestones, dangerous ones, lie just ahead. But whatever happens now, this day, July 21, 1969, will forever be etched in memory. The President has declared it to be a National Day of Participation, and that is entirely fitting. But each anniversary of the first touchdown or the first footfall, which ever seems most appropriate, should be declared a permanent national holiday by Congress.

If the mission continues according to plan, the most appropriate day would seem to be July 21.

Objections to making July 21 a national Holiday do arise, but they are minor. Chief among them is this: as the space age progresses, other achievements will rival the Apollo 11 mission in drama, daring, and importance. It will be impossible to honor each of these coming events with a separate holiday.

But it will be unnecessary to do so, any more than separate days are set aside to honor the veterans of each of America's wars. One day, November 11, has been made a time for remembering the sacrifice of all these veterans. The day selected for this observance, however, is the day on which hostilities ceased in World War I.

So it could be with space exploration: one day honoring all the nation's space achievements, that day being July 21, the climax of the Apollo program. On this day in 1969, "men from the planet Earth first set foot upon the Moon," as the plaque on the lunar module reads. No matter what new adventures lie ahead, this day will be remembered always as the first major step in man's quest of the universe.

How would the new national holiday be designated? This close to the Apollo mission, the temptation would be strong to call it "Apollo Day," and this name would do well enough in the beginning. But later on, as other breath-taking landings and explorations occur, the name would become less and less appropriate. "Space Day," though otherwise suitable, has an unpleasing ring to the ear. "Exploration Day" is a possibility, but too general a designation, the "Space Exploration Day" is too much of a mouthful.

The name is really unimportant. A tentative designation could be adopted and then changed as the need arose. But surely the nation will not fail to recognize the historic significance of the Apollo 11 mission and see that it is suitably commemorated.

SHOE INDUSTRY

(Mr. KEITH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the domestic shoe industry in general, and its New England segment in particular, are being especially hard hit by the influx of foreign-made shoes. Those of us from shoe-producing districts are well aware of the great harm being done to this important industry and are doing our best to generate congressional and Executive support for remedial measures.

Last February a number of us filed legislation to establish a shoe import quota system in the United States. More recently a concerted effort was made by concerned legislators to persuade the President to work toward voluntary shoe quotas similar to those contemplated for textiles. A letter urging such a step, and signed by over 300 Members of Congress, was recently sent to the President and we are awaiting his reaction to it.

It is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that concern with this problem exists at all levels of Government. On July 8 of this year the Massachusetts House of Representatives passed a resolution urging Federal action to protect and promote the domestic shoe industry. So that all Members might take note of this important resolution, I include it at this point in the RECORD under unanimous consent.

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ADOPT LEGISLATION TO PROTECT AND PROMOTE THE SHOE INDUSTRY

Whereas, Many shoe factories have closed down in the Commonwealth; and

Whereas, The import of low-cost shoes with low-tariff duties has glutted the shoe market to the detriment of the shoe industy and threaten to destroy one of the Commonwealth's most vital industries; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to protect the shoe industry so vital to the economy of the country and to subsidize said industry in areas where it may be necessary so that the industry will not be wiped out in various parts of the country, particularly in the New England area and the Commonwealth; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress of the United States and to each member thereof from the Commonwealth.

House of Representatives, adopted, July 8, 1969.

WALLACE C. MILLS,
Clerk.

Attest:

JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

APOLLO 11

(Mr. BRAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the successful landing upon, exploration of, and take-off from the moon has been truly the most significant achievement of the 20th century. In years to come, it well may be regarded as the most important of all human history up to that time.

Not only where no man ever stood before, but where no life as we knew it had ever existed; not only attaining supremacy over his own environment, but over one totally alien to human experience; not only a step in mastery of his own world, but the first step in the seven-league-boot strides that will take him to the stars.

This solely American achievement has given our Republic a lead over other nations, it is true, but a lead with responsibilities and implications far, far beyond what we may imagine.

For is it not only truly man's destiny to push on? Let us remember, man is the only animal among all the vertebrates whose head does not point toward the ground when he walks. Man's eyes have always been fixed upon the horizon, or the stars.

Voices have been raised and will be raised again in days to come to attempt to play down this feat. By implication, what was done will be defamed and defiled, and we will once again be lashed by small and petty men who deal in terms of mass guilt and mass shame. We will be chastised, as individuals and as a nation, because while many ills exist upon the earth, we have set our goal into the heavens.

But these men forget that there come times in human existence when singular or collective efforts of men, or of nations, rise to the greatest challenge of all: the challenge of meeting what man's destiny must surely be. There come times when the pace of man's advance surges and roars ahead with one gigantic bound.

Man must make this jump, when the time is there, or he stands in danger of turning his back upon what he was ultimately meant to be, what he ultimately can be, and what he ultimately will be. We have our dreams; we have our faith; we have our courage; and we have our hope. These things rode with Apollo 11, as they will always ride on more such journeys to come.

In 1935, H. G. Wells wrote that:

> For man there is no rest and no ending. He must go on—conquest beyond conquest. This little planet and its winds and ways, and all the laws of mind and matter that restrain him. Then the planets about him, and at last out across immensity to the stars. And when he has conquered all the deeps of space and all the mysteries of time—still he will be but beginning.

So it will always be—so it must always be, for we are men and we do not live by bread alone. If some wish to cast their eyes on the ground, then it is they who go against the laws of nature and the laws of creation. Man is meant to look upwards and outwards. He has ventured beyond his horizons on earth and his head, still held high, now looks upwards, beyond the stars.

SYMBOL AND REALITY

(Mr. LUJAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the President's trip to five Asian countries and to Romania can be measured in two ways:

First, the trip will symbolize the President's concern for peace in Asia and his belief that Asians can and must themselves be the source of a progressive, peaceful last third of this century in Asia. The trip to Romania will symbolize the President's deep commitment to the furtherance of mutual understanding between the nations of Eastern Europe and the United States.

Yet, as important as this journey will

be as a symbol, more important will be the actuality of what the trip is; an act of personal diplomacy on the part of the leader of the most powerful nation in the world, an act which, more than any words, will impress upon the nations of Asia, of Eastern Europe, and of all the world that here is a President willing to go where the action is, eager to see for himself the problems and the promise of Asia and of Eastern Europe.

So, both as a symbol and as a reality, the President's trip will help to show the world that the quest for peace and progress among the nations of the world is uppermost on the President's mind and that he wants to see at firsthand these complex, dynamic, profoundly important sections of the world.

MAN ON THE MOON

(Mr. COUGHLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, man on the moon in our lifetime is a wondrous milestone in the eternity of the universe and the history of our planet earth.

Conceived in the ideals of peace, demonstrated for all the world to see, and executed with man's unfailing response to extreme challenge, the moon adventure symbolizes mankind's unlimited capacity.

The courage and competence of Astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins as they led all mankind to the gateway of the universe strengthens our faith in man's ability to conquer problems.

The wondrous technology that compressed time to produce this feat reassures us of the strength of our country, our system, and its ability to provide a better life for all people.

AMERICA'S PIONEERS ON THE MOON

(Mr. SHRIVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, on this historic day for all mankind I take this moment to congratulate and pay tribute to America's pioneers on the moon, Neil Armstrong and Edwin Aldrin, and to their fellow astronaut, Michael Collins, who awaits their return to the command ship.

Their accomplishments, publicly viewed on television by hundreds of millions of people throughout the world, truly have brought all of us on earth closer together. This is a proud day for every American. We owe a great deal to these brave men who have blazed the long and unknown trail to the moon, and to our other astronauts who contributed to the knowledge which resulted in last night's fantastic event.

There also are thousands here on earth who have helped make the impossible dream come true. Some 300,000 technicians and 20,000 corporations were involved in this program. I want to salute the men and women in the Fourth District of Kansas who played and important part in the success which we commemorate today. The aerospace capabilities of the Wichita Division of the Boeing Co. were instrumental in the building of the Saturn V booster which rocketed the men of Apollo 11 into orbit and Beech Aircraft Corp. of Wichita also contributed valuable technology to this program.

While we pray for the safe return of our astronauts on Thursday, we revel in the success already recorded. Man has conquered the moon, and by this victory he has demonstrated that he is able to conquer the perplexing problems which confront him here on earth.

MAN WALKS ON THE MOON

(Mr. WOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, it is the nature of man to find new frontiers and to conquer them. But no step into the unknown has eclipsed the feat of the Americans of Apollo 11 who have carried man and his technology to another celestial body. The accomplishment speaks as much for our politics as for our scientific ability. No nation that has entered space has had the courage and candor to permit its people to witness the events as they unfolded. We allowed not only our people, but all the peoples whose governments would permit them free access to information sources, to watch the dramatic and historic first step of man onto earth's space satellite.

A popular magazine commented not long ago that one cause of the campus unrest in our Nation is that America had run out of heroes; that machines and technology had replaced the mighty men of adventure and grit who opened our land to make America the most powerful of nations. I hope that those who wrote that comment watched their television last night when Americans with solid roots in traditional society and culture wrote history in large letters across the heavens. We found our new heroes. All Americans who have brought the Apollo program from infancy to history have a legitimate share of this unprecedented accomplishment.

What the men of Apollo 11 and the thousands who supported them have done will live through all of recorded history and we join their families now in praying for the successful conclusion of their flight and their safe return to earth.

A DAY OF NATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT FOR MANKIND

(Mr. McDADE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to believe that there will ever be a day in the lives of any of us that will be more significant than was yesterday, the 20th of July.

Through the magic of radio, we listened while man achieved the dream of all ages by landing on the moon. Later that evening, through the miracle of television, we watched while the feet of Neil Armstrong took the last step to make him the first man to walk on any other celestial body in this universe.

No words we speak here could begin to match the enormity of that triumph. I know that all of you, my colleagues, join me in extending the warmest congratulations and best wishes to Neil Armstrong, "Buzz" Aldrin and to Michael Collins for their remarkable accomplishment. I know, also, that all of you join me in prayer that God will bring these three brave and splendid Americans home in safety to their families, to the Nation and, indeed, to the whole human race which awaits their return.

A man on the streets of Paris said:

> I have always had faith in America. I knew it would be successful. After all they have done for the world, I knew they would be first on the moon; and I am proud for them.

We will share that pride.

A girl at Disneyland said:

> Here I was visiting Tomorrowland, and suddenly it became today.

It is indeed a new world.

A Brazilian visiting in New York said:

> It was fantastic, incredible. I take off my hat.

We all do.

Sir Bernard Lovell, that distinguished British astronomer, said:

> There are no words to match the significance of this fantastic achievement.

No one will ever find words to match it.

Mr. Robert Heinlein, the distinguished science-fiction novelist, said:

> We do not really understand how great this achievement is. It is the most remarkable thing that has ever been done in the history of the human race. Today is New Year's Day of the Year One. And if we do not change the calendar, history will do it for us.

All mankind was left virtually speechless by the grandeur of this achievement.

So to these three astronauts, to all the other astronauts who made this flight possible, to Robert Goddard and the men who followed him in planning this mission, to the thousands of industries, large and small, who built this spacecraft, to the hundreds of thousands of men and women who performed all the tasks to make this flight possible, and to you, my colleagues here in Congress, who voted the funds necessary for this fantastic voyage, I extend my warmest congratulations.

We came in peace. It is my hope that we may find that same peace here on earth. It is my hope that we will bring nothing but peace on all of the journeys across space that still lie before mankind. This is indeed the year 1 of mankind's history as a citizen, no longer of the earth, but of the universe.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

UPPER NIOBRARA RIVER COMPACT BETWEEN WYOMING AND NEBRASKA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 38) to consent to the Upper Niobrara River compact between the States of Wyoming and Nebraska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 38

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is given to the upper Niobrara River compact between the States of Wyoming and Nebraska. Such compact reads as follows:

"UPPER NIOBRARA RIVER COMPACT"

"The State of Wyoming, and the State of Nebraska, parties signatory to this compact (hereinafter referred to as Wyoming and Nebraska, respectively, or individually as a 'State', or collectively as 'States'), having resolved to conclude a compact with respect to the use of the waters of the Niobrara River Basin, and being duly authorized by Act of Congress of the United States of America, approved August 5, 1953 (Public Law 191, 83d Congress, 1st Session, Chapter 324, 67 Stat. 365) and the Act of May 29, 1958 (Public Law 85–427, 85th Congress, S. 2557, 72 Stat. 147) and the Act of August 30, 1961 (Public Law 87–181, 87th Congress, S. 2245, 75 Stat. 412) and pursuant to the Acts of their respective Legislatures have, through their respective Governors, appointed as their Commissioners: For Wyoming, Earl Lloyd, Andrew McMaster, Richard Pfister, John Christian, Eugene P. Willson, H. T. Person, Norman B. Gray, E. J. Van Camp: For Nebraska, Dan S. Jones, Jr., who after negotiations participated in by W. E. Blomgren appointed by the President of the United States of America, have agreed upon the following articles:

"ARTICLE I.

"A. The major purposes of this compact are to provide for an equitable division or appointment of the available surface water supply of the Upper Niobrara River Basin between the States; to provide for obtaining information on groundwater and underground water flow necessary for apportioning the underground flow by supplement to this compact; to remove all causes, present and future which might lead to controversies; and to promote interstate comity.

"B. The physical and other conditions peculiar to the Upper Niobrara River Basin constitute the basis for this compact; and neither of the States hereby concedes that this compact establishes any general principle or precedent with respect to any other interstate stream.

"C. Either State and all others using, claiming or in any other manner asserting any right to the use of the waters of the Niobrara River Basin under the authority of that State, shall be subject to the terms of this compact.

"ARTICLE II.

"A. The term 'Upper Niobrara River' shall mean and include the Niobrara River and its tributaries in Nebraska and Wyoming west of Range 55 West of the 6th P.M.

"B. The term 'Upper Niobrara River Basin' or the term 'Basin' shall mean that area in Wyoming and Nebraska which is naturally drained by the Niobrara River west of Range 55 West of the 6th P.M.

"C. Where the name of a State or the term 'State' or 'States' is used, they shall be construed to include any person or entity of any nature whatsoever using, claiming, or in any manner asserting any right to the use of the waters of the Niobrara River under the authority of that State.

"ARTICLE III.

"It shall be the duty of the two States to administer this compact through the official in each State who is now or may hereafter be charged with the duty of administering the public water supplies, and to collect and correlate through such officials the data necessary for the proper administration of the provisions of this compact. Such officials may, by unanimous action, adopt rules and regulations consistent with the provisions of this compact.

"The States agree that the United States Geological Survey, or whatever Federal agency may succeed to the functions and duties of that agency, insofar as this compact is concerned, may collaborate with the officials of the States charged with the administration of this compact in the execution of the duty of such officials in the collection, correlation, and publication of information necessary for the proper administration of this compact.

"ARTICLE IV.

"Each State shall itself or in conjunction with other responsible agencies cause to be established, maintained, and operated such suitable water gaging stations as are found necessary to administer this compact.

"ARTICLE V.

"A. Wyoming and Nebraska agree that the division of surface waters of the Upper Niobrara River shall be in accordance with the following provisions.

"1. There shall be no restrictions on the use of the surface waters of the Upper Niobrara River by Wyoming except as would be imposed under Wyoming law and the following limitations:

"(a) No reservoir constructed after August 1, 1957, and used solely for domestic and stock water purposes shall exceed 20 acre-feet in capacity.

"(b) Storage reservoirs with priority dates after August 1, 1957, and storing water from the main stem of the Niobrara River east of Range 62 West of the 6th P.M. and from the main stem of Van Tassel Creek south of Section 27, Township 32 North, Range 60 West of the 6th P.M. shall not store in any water year (October 1 of one year to September 30 of the next year) more than a total of 500 acre-feet of water.

"(c) Storage in reservoirs with priority dates prior to August 1, 1957, and storing water from the main stem of the Niobrara River east of Range 62 West and from the main stem of Van Tassel Creek south of Section 27, Township 32 North, shall be made only during the period October 1 of one year to June 1 of the next year and at such times during the period June 1 to September 30 that the water is not required to meet the legal requirements by direct flow appropriations in Wyoming and in Nebraska west of Range 55 West. Where water is pumped from such storage reservoirs, the quantity of storage water pumped or otherwise diverted for irrigation purposes or other beneficial purposes from any such reservoir in any water year shall be limited to the capacity of such reservoir as shown by the records of the Wyoming State Engineer's Office, unless additional storage water becomes available during the period June 1 to September 30 after meeting the legal diversion requirements by direct flow appropriations in Wyoming and in Nebraksa west of Range 55 West.

"(d) Storage in reservoirs with priority dates after August 1, 1957, and storing water from the main stem of the Niobrara River east of Range 62 West and the main stem of Van Tassel Creek south of Section 27, Township 32 North, shall be made only during the period October 1 of one year to May 1 of the next year and at such times during the period May 1, and September 30 that the water is not required for direct diversion by ditches in Wyoming and in Nebraska west of Range 55 West.

"(e) Direct flow rights with priority dates after August 1, 1957, on the main stem of the Niobrara River east of Range 62 West and Van Tassel Creek south of Section 27, Township 32 North, shall be regulated on priority basis with Nebraska rights west of Range 55 West, provided, that any direct flow rights for a maximum of 143 acres which may be granted by the Wyoming State Engineer with a priority date not later than July 1, 1961, for lands which had Territorial Rights under the Van Tassel No. 4 Ditch with a priority date of April 8, 1882, and the Van Tassel No. 5 Ditch with a priority date of April 18, 1882, shall be exempt from the provisions of this subsection (e).

"(f) All direct flow diversions from the main stem of the Niobrara River east of Range 62 West and from Van Tassel Creek south of Section 27, Township 32 North shall at all times be limited to their diversion rates as specified by Wyoming law, and provided that Wyoming laws relating to diversion of 'Surplus Water' (Wyoming Statutes, 1957, Sections 41–181 to 41–188 inclusive) shall apply only when the water flowing in the main channel of the Niobrara River west of Range 55 West is in excess of the legal diversion requirements of Nebraska ditches having priority dates before August 1, 1957.

"ARTICLE VI.

"A. Nebraska and Wyoming recognize that the future use of ground water for irrigation in the Niobrara River Basin may be a factor in the depletion of the surface flows of the Niobrara River, and since the data now available are inadequate to make a determination in regard to this matter, any apportionment of the ground water of the Niobrara River Basin should be delayed until such time as adequate data on ground water of the basin are available.

"B. To obtain data on ground water, Nebraska and Wyoming, with the cooperation and advice of the United States Geological Survey, Groundwater Branch, shall undertake ground water investigations in the Niobrara River Basin in the area of the Wyoming-Nebraska State line. The investigations shall be such as are agreed to by the State Engineer of Wyoming and the Director of Water Resources of Nebraska, and may include such observation wells as the said two officials agree are essential for the investigations. Costs of the investigations may be financed under the cooperative ground water programs between the United States Geological Survey and the States, and the States' share of the costs shall be borne equally by the two States.

"C. The ground water investigation shall begin within one year after the effective date of this compact. Upon collection of not more than twelve months of ground water data Nebraska and Wyoming, with the cooperation of the United States Geological Survey, shall make, or cause to be made, an analysis of such data to determine the desirability or necessity of apportioning the ground water by supplement to this compact. If, upon completion of the initial analysis, it is determined that apportionment of the ground water is not then desirable or necessary, reanalysis shall be made at not to exceed two-year intervals, using all data collected until such apportionment is made.

"D. When the results of the ground water investigations indicate that apportionment of ground water of the Niobrara River Basin is desirable, the two States shall proceed to negotiate a supplement to this compact apportioning the ground water of the basin.

"E. Any proposed supplement to this compact apportioning the ground water shall not become effective until ratified by the legislatures of the two States and approved by the Congress of the United States.

"ARTICLE VII.

"The provisions of this compact shall remain in full force and effect until amended by action of the Legislatures of the Signatory States and until such amendment is consented to and approved by the Congress of the United States in the same manner as this compact is required to be ratified and consented to in order to become effective.

"ARTICLE VIII.

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit or prevent either State from instituting or maintaining any action or proceeding, legal or equitable, in any court of competent jurisdiction for the protection of any right under this compact or the enforcement of any of its provisions.

"ARTICLE IX.

"Nothing in this compact shall be deemed:

"A. To impair or affect any rights or powers of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities, in and to the use of the waters of the Upper Niobrara River Basin nor its capacity to acquire rights in and to the use of said waters; provided that, any beneficial use of the waters allocated by this compact hereafter made within a State by the United States, or those acting by or under its authority, shall be taken into account in determining the extent of use within that State.

"B. To subject any property of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities to taxation by either State or subdivision thereof, nor to create an obligation on the part of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities, by reason of the acquisition, construction, or operation of any property or works of whatsoever kind, to make any payment to any State or political subdivision thereof, State agency, municipality, or entity whatsoever in reimbursement for the loss of taxes.

"C. To subject any property of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities, to the laws of any State to an extent other than the extent to which these laws would apply without regard to the compact.

"D. To affect the obligations of the United States of America to Indians or Indian tribes, or any right owned or held by or for Indians or Indian tribes which is subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

"ARTICLE X.

"Should a court of competent jurisdiction hold any part of this compact contrary to the constitution of any State or of the United States, all other severable provisions shall continue in full force and effect.

"ARTICLE XI.

"This compact shall become effective when ratified by the Legislatures of each of the Signatory States and by the Congress of the United States.

"IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Commissioners have signed this compact in triplicate original, one of which shall be filed in the archives of the United States of America and shall be deemed the authoritative original, and one copy of which shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States.

"Done at the city of Cheyenne, in the State of Wyoming, this 26th day of October, in the year of our Lord, One Thousand and Nine Hundred Sixty Two 1962.

"Commissioner for the State of Nebraska
"Dan S. Jones, Jr.
"Commissioners for the State of Wyoming
"Earl Lloyd
"Andrew McMaster
"Richard Pfister
"John Christian
"Eugene P. Wilson
"H. T. Person
"Norman B. Gray
"E. J. Van Camp

"I have participated in the negotiation of this compact and intend to report favorably thereon to the Congress of the United States.

"W. E. Blomgren
"Representative of the United States of America".

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is reserved.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to impair or affect any rights or powers of the United States, its agencies, instrumentalities, permittees, or licensees in, over, and to the use of the waters of the Upper Niobrara River Basin; nor to impair or affect their capacity to acquire rights in and to the use of said waters.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, S. 38 will give the consent of Congress to a compact between the States of Wyoming and Nebraska through which these States will divide and apportion the waters of the Upper Niobrara River. The Congress authorized the negotiation of this compact by the act of August 5, 1953, and provided at that time that the compact so negotiated would not become binding until approved by the Congress. Such approval is the sole purpose and function of S. 38.

The Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs conducted hearings on this measure and found that the compact had been duly ratified by the legislatures of both Wyoming and Nebraska, that the executive branch has no difficulty with the compact and that it is widely supported by officials of both States and their congressional delegations.

Specifically, the compact which will be ratified by enactment of S. 38 does several things. It defines the limits of the Upper Niobrara River Basin, establishes criteria for apportionment of surface flows, and provides for subsequent inventory and apportionment of the ground water resources of the basin.

The passage of S. 38 would not authorize any Federal expenditures other than those involved in participation of the U.S. Geological Survey in the ground water inventory. This cost would be minimal and would be carried out as an adjunct of ongoing programs within the States and by the permanent continuing staff of the Geological Survey.

For the foregoing reasons, we have reported S. 38 favorably and urge its passage at this time.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF CANAL ZONE CODE TO PROVIDE COST-OF-LIVING CASH RELIEF PAYMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7517) to amend the Canal Zone Code to provide cost-of-living adjustments in cash relief payments to certain former employees of the Canal Zone Government, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 7517

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 181 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code (76A Stat. 20) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) of such section as subsection (e) thereof; and

(2) by inserting immediately following subsection (b) of such section the following new subsections (c) and (d):

"(c) Each cash relief payment made pursuant to this section shall be increased on the same effective date and by the same per centum, adjusted to the nearest dollar, as civil service retirement annuities are increased under the cost-of-living adjustment provisions of section 8340(b) of title 5, United States Code.

"Such increase shall apply only to cash relief payments made after the date of enactment of this Act as increased by annuity increases made after such date of enactment under section 8340(b) of title 5, United States Code.

"(d) The Governor of the Canal Zone may pay cash relief to the widow of any former employee of the Canal Zone Government who, until the time of his death, receives or has received cash relief under subsection (a) of this section or under the Act of July 8, 1937. The term 'widow' as used in this section includes only the following:

"(1) a woman legally married to such employee at the time of his termination for disability and at his death.

"(2) a woman who, although not legally married to such former employee at the time of his termination, had resided continuously with him for at least five years immediately preceding the employee's termination under such circumstances as would at common law make the relationship a valid marriage and who continued to reside with him until his death.

"(3) a woman who has not remarried or assumed a common-law relationship with any other person.

Cash relief granted to such widows shall not at any time exceed 50 per centum of the rate at which cash relief, inclusive of any additional payment under subsection (b) of this section, would be payable to the former employee were he then alive."

SEC. 2. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the month following that in which it is enacted.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, lines 8 and 9, delete section 2 and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 2. The increase in cash relief payments authorized by section 181(c) of title 2, Canal Zone Code, as added by this Act, shall apply only to cash relief payments made after the date of enactment of this Act and shall be based only on annuity increases under section 8340(b) of title 5, United States Code, that are made after the date of enactment of this Act. The cash relief payments authorized by section 181(d) of title 2, Canal Zone Code, as added by this Act, shall be payable to eligible individuals as determined by the Governor on the first day of each month following the month in which this Act is enacted."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The **SPEAKER.** This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

ENTRANCE ROAD AT GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11609) to amend the act of September 9, 1963, authorizing the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11609

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act approved September 9, 1963 (77 Stat. 154), authorizing the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park in the State of North Carolina, is amended—

(1) by striking out, in the first sentence of section 1, the words "on North Carolina Highway Numbered 107 close to its point of

XUM

interchange with Interstate Route Numbered 40, near Hepco, North Carolina, to the eastern boundary of the park in the vicinity of the Cataloochee section, and to accept, on behalf of the United States, donations of land and interests in land for the construction of the entrance road, and to contruct the entrance road on the donated land:" and inserting in lieu thereof the words: "near the intersection at White Oak Church of North Carolina Routes Numbered 1338 and 1346 to the eastern boundary of the park in the vicinity of the Cataloochee section, and to accept, on behalf of the United States, donations of land and interests in land for the construction of the entrance road together with the necessary interchange with said Routes 1338 and 1346, and to construct the entrance road and the interchange on the donated land:";

(2) by striking out the words "four and two-tenths" and "five hundred and twenty-five" in the proviso of section 1 and inserting in lieu thereof the words "five and two-tenths" and "six hundred and fifty", respectively; and

(3) by striking out the figure "$1,160,000" in section 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the words: "$2,500,000 (1969 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the type of construction involved herein".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 111]

Abbitt
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson, Tenn.
Ashbrook
Ashley
Baring
Beall, Md.
Berry
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Brademas
Brock
Cahill
Camp
Carey
Casey
Clawson, Del
Clay
Corbett
Cowger
Culver
Cunningham
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Findley
Flood
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Gaydos
Gettys
Goldwater
Green, Oreg.
Halpern
Hanley
Hanna
Hastings
Henderson
Howard
Jonas
Kee
Kirwan
Kleppe
Leggett
Lipscomb
Lowenstein
Lukens
McCarthy
McCloskey
May
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Minshall
Mizell
O'Konski
Ottinger
Passman
Pepper
Pettis
Powell
Purcell
Quillen
Railsback
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rooney, Pa.
Roudebush
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Scheuer
Sebelius
Shipley
Snyder
Springer
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tiernan
Tunney
Waldie
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Zion

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 331 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ENTRANCE ROAD AT GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11609 amends the act of 1963 which provides for the construction of the entrance road to the Cataloochee area of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in North Carolina.

As amended by the committee, H.R. 11609 is essentially the same as H.R. 14074, which was approved by the House last year. The only substantive change in the bill recommended to the House by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee this year involves an updated cost estimate. The bill approved last year authorized an appropriation of $2,200,000, based on 1967 prices; H.R. 11609 authorizes $2,500,000 based on 1969 prices. This represents an increase of $1,340,000 over the original authorization.

The original act in 1963 authorized the construction of the entrance road, but it expressly provided that the road would be 4.2 miles in length and would involve approximately 525 acres of land. After enactment of that legislation, more detailed studies were made and it was determined that a modified route would more appropriately satisfy the public need and more adequately provide for the safety of the traveling public. It is this revised route which this legislation would authorize.

The route contemplated by H.R. 11609 involves a road approximately 1 mile longer than the original road. It traverses a more complex area and it, also, includes an interchange rather than an at-grade crossing. The increased cost involved is largely attributable to these features.

As with other projects, Mr. Speaker, the State of North Carolina has agreed to acquire and donate the right-of-way for the entrance road and the interchange. In return, the National Park Service has promised, subject to this authorization and to the appropriation of the necessary funds, to construct the entrance road and the interchange in accordance with acceptable design standards.

I want to emphasize that the Great Smoky Mountains National Park is one of the most popular units of the national park system. In 1968, it had more visitors than Grand Canyon National Park, Yellowstone National Park, and Yosemite National Park all put together. The construction of this new entrance road will connect with an existing, but not easily accessible road, inside the park. In doing this, it will afford access to an outstanding wooded area of the park. It should help to distribute some of the visiting load within the park and, at the same time, afford park visitors with a new opportunity for camping, picnicking, and other outdoor activities.

It is unfortunate that the construction of this entrance road has been delayed since its authorization several years ago. Detailed studies have been made and project plans are programed for the next fiscal year. Hopefully, it will be possible to commence construction, if funds can be made available, in the not too distant future.

In the course of the consideration of the merits of this legislation, the members of the committee have become very familiar with it. It was approved by the committee without dissent. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I recommend the favorable consideration of H.R. 11609, as amended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I am now happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Do I understand that 4.2 miles were to be built for $1,160,000.

Mr. ASPINALL. No, the amount of the new construction will be the added amount of mileage made necessary to lengthen the road about 1 mile and the needed new interchange facilities necessary to take care of the safety of the traveling public.

There is no money authorized in this legislation to procure property for the park.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I understand that, but I do not know about the construction of the road.

According to the report, page 3 thereof, changing the length of the road right-of-way from 4.2 to 5.2 miles and the acreage of the right-of-way from 525 to 650 acres, increased the amount authorized to be appropriated for construction of the road from $1,160,000 to $2,500,000, an increase of $1,340,000?

Mr. ASPINALL. I understand now what is bothering my friend. If you take the 1969 cost of construction, as I said in the beginning of my statement, it is not the figures that my friend from Iowa uses that are comparable. It is the $2.2 million as compared to $2.5 million. In other words, what is involved here is a difference of $300,000 for that increased mileage and additional safety features. The other legislation did not have the prices brought up to the 1969 levels. This is where we find the additional $1,340,000.

Mr. GROSS. So, what I thought was a 100-percent increase for 1 mile of roadway, based upon the figures set forth in the report, does not add up quite that way; is that right?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will bear with me for just one further question, I note in the bill this language:

> $2,500,000 (1969 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved herein.

Is this language which is normally used these days with reference to authorizations of this nature?

Mr. ASPINALL. This is the language

we use in all of our reclamation projects at the present time. This permits us to take advantage of a receding of the cost of construction and at the same time it permits, without another authorization, us to go ahead and construct the facilities authorized without coming back for another authorization.

Mr. GROSS. Well, if it was more, would you not have to come back, if the plus factor was brought into effect? In other words, you would have to come back would you not?

Mr. ASPINALL. For no more than any amount that may be in addition to that amount shown above cost increases are determined by price indices. In other words, we would not have to come back for any other authorization. That is the reason for this language.

Mr. GROSS. I know, but it seems to me that it is kind of an open-end proposition.

Mr. ASPINALL. We closed it, may I say to my friend. It is closed, very definitely, because the cost indices for increased costs of construction is well known and well used in all construction programs.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, to further relieve the mind of my colleague from Iowa, the increase in costs are primarily the result of increased volume construction and a change in design. The increased cost also involves some work in grading, a more permanent surface, and in marking, as well as other factors not included in the previous bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11609, a bill to amend the act of September 9, 1963, which authorized the construction of an entrance road to the Cataloochee section of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in the State of North Carolina.

H.R. 11609 amends the original authorization because a study in conjunction with the North Carolina State Highway Commission for selecting the location of the entrance road has shown that a different route and crossing than that initially contemplated is necessary to provide the needed access to this much visited national park.

The act of September 9, 1963, authorized the Secretary of the Interior to accept donations of land for the road right of way of approximately 4.2 miles in length and involving 525 acres. The act further authorized the appropriation of $1,160,000 for construction of the entrance road on the lands so acquired.

Since the passage of the original authorization the construction of Interstate Highway 40 and other factors require this change in plans. H.R. 11609, therefore, amends the act of September 9, 1963, by revising the route of the road; increases the acreage of right of way from 525 acres to 650 acres, and increases the amount authorized to be appropriated for construction from $1,160,000 to $2,500,000.

This project has been a cooperative Federal-State effort. The State of North Carolina has secured the necessary right of way and constructed the eight-tenths of a mile connecting link between Interstate Route 40 and the proposed entrance road and interchange.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this legislation.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I appreciate the explanation made by the gentleman.

I seek information about this bill, and I believe I understand the enhancement of the highway safety, better construction, more ready accessibility for more people, to our national park, and all that part; but I recall several bills in the past Congress having to do with the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in North Carolina, and other improvements including highways in that particular area.

Am I correct in assuming that this is one of those bills that we have passed in the last year or so for the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in North Carolina, and this is just an upgrading of the bill because of the increase in cost of construction, and because of enhancements of highway engineering; and, are we just enlarging one that we have previously passed, and that this is not another particular promotion—brought to mind by the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the ranking minority member on the committee—as to North Carolina's contribution? Or are we again making another matching-the-funds grant to North Carolina for a turnout into their State?

Mr. SAYLOR. I might say to my colleague from Missouri that the answer to his inquiry is "No," what we are doing in this bill is vacating the action which we took in the House several years ago, when we authorized highway construction, and substituting an interchange for the intersection which has already been authorized.

Mr. HALL. This really supplants our prior action for the same general area, but it is not in addition thereto?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is right. This is not in addition to it. This is in place of the one that was authorized.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I want the gentleman from Missouri to be absolutely knowledgeable about this.

Last year the gentleman will remember we did extend the Blue Ridge Highway authorization authority. That has nothing to do with this legislation.

Last year we also sent to the House, but it was not acted upon by the other body, legislation identical to this with the exception of the upgraded prices to the additional amount of $300,000.

We have already passed through the House this year a bill which gave certain land from the west side of the park to be used as a State highway and put under the jurisdiction of the State. This legislation took the dual jurisdiction away from the Park Service and gave it to the State.

Those are all the bills that we have had relative to this particular area.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this additional information that the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Pennsylvania have given. Both gentlemen with their usual discernment have noted what was worrying me. This helps to relieve the situation.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, during each of the last 2 years over 6,600,000 people visited the Smoky Mountains National Park, making it the most visited national park in the Nation. Most of these people entered the park on U.S. 441, which runs from Gatlinburg, Tenn., to Cherokee, N.C. The National Park Service states that the most serious traffic problem in any national park in the Nation is in the Smoky Mountains National Park and on Highway 441. On a summer weekend or October weekend, traffic is bumper to bumper for 30 miles.

In an effort to alleviate this condition and disburse visitors into other sections of the park, the National Park Service is seeking to take advantage of the fact that I-40, running from Knoxville to Asheville, close to the eastern edge of the park, was completed and opened to traffic last fall.

In 1963, Congress passed a bill authorizing the construction of a scenic road from I-40 to the edge of the Smoky Mountains National Park. The road was to continue inside the park 4 miles to the heart of the Cataloochee Valley, which has great potential for development of campsites, picnic areas, nature trails, and so forth.

It will enable park visitors to have access to a beautiful, somewhat isolated section of the park for camping, picnicking, and other outdoor activities, but it is not within a wilderness area. People once lived in this area, and some old homes and barns are still standing in the open valley. This is not the road in the Smoky Mountains National Park which has been opposed by conservationists. This road will make the Cataloochee area the most accessible section of the Smoky Mountains National Park, being only 1 hour's drive from Asheville and a 1½-hour drive from Knoxville on an interstate road.

The 4-mile section of this road located within the park has been completed and is ready for use.

The section of road authorized by the 1963 act was to be a cooperative Federal-State effort. The State of North Carolina has acquired the entire right-of-way for the road and is building an eight-tenths of a mile connecting road between I-40 and the beginning of the Park Service road. The National Park Service, as authorized by the 1963 act, will construct the entrance road.

As plans became more definite and detailed, it became evident that the cooperative Federal-State plan required an entrance road of greater length than had been anticipated earlier. It also became evident that an interchange was

XUM

needed at a point where the road crossed an existing State road. The decision to build the interchange was dictated by safety considerations. It also became evident that in order to build a road of the desired standards, the 1963 authorization was inadequate, and that an increase in the cost limit was necessary.

H.R. 11609 contains the recommended cost increase authorization, which amounts to $1,340,000, and authorizes lengthening the road from 4.2 miles to 5.2 miles, and revises the description of the route. One-half of the extra cost was made necessary because of the decision to construct the interchange.

The situation in brief now is that we have constructed one-half of the scenic road designed to ease traffic congestion and open up an additional section of the Smoky Mountains National Park. This is the authorization that we need in order to build the other half.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 11609, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present. In view of the holiday and the importance of this bill and the scheduling of the session today, I think we ought to have a rollcall, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 341, nays 3, not voting 88, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—341

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Albert
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Belcher
Bell, Calif.
Bennett
Betts
Bevill
Biaggi
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Caffery
Cahill
Carter
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chappell
Chisholm
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Collins
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corman
Coughlin
Cramer
Daddario
Daniel, Va.
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Dellenback
Denney
Dennis
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fish
Fisher
Flowers
Foley
Ford, William D.
Foreman
Fountain
Fraser
Frey
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks
Hogan
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Keith
King
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
Lujan
McClory
McCloskey
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McKneally
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mann
Marsh
Martin
Mathias
Matsunaga
Mayne
Meeds
Melcher
Meskill
Mikva
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Mize
Mollohan
Monagan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Podell
Poff
Pollock
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Quie
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roybal
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St. Onge
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Symington
Taylor
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Watts
Weicker
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Charles H.
Wold
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Zablocki
Zwach

NAYS—3

Conyers
Jacobs
Landgrebe

NOT VOTING—88

Abbitt
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson, Tenn.
Ashbrook
Ashley
Beall, Md.
Berry
Blatnik
Brock
Camp
Carey
Casey
Clay
Corbett
Cowger
Culver
Cunningham
Davis, Ga.
Delaney
Dent
Diggs
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Evins, Tenn.
Findley
Flood
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Gaydos
Gettys
Goldwater
Green, Oreg.
Halpern
Hanley
Hastings
Hébert
Henderson
Howard
Jonas
Kee
Kirwan
Landrum
Lipscomb
Lukens
McCarthy
Mailliard
May
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Minshall
Mizell
O'Konski
Passman
Pettis
Powell
Purcell
Quillen
Railsback
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Roudebush
St Germain
Sandman
Sebelius
Shipley
Sisk
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Tunney
Waldie
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Young
Zion

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Beall of Maryland.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Gaydos with Mr. Michel.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Mizell.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Clay with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Sebelius.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Stuckey with Mrs. May.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Young with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Watkins with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. Watson with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Winn with Mr. Zion.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TEMPORARY EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE TO PROVIDE NUTRITIOUS MEALS TO NEEDY CHILDREN

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11651), to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to provide funds and authorities to the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of providing free or reduced-price meals to needy children not now being reached.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11651

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1752) is amended by adding at the end of the Act the following new section:

"TEMPORARY EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE TO PROVIDE NUTRITIOUS MEALS TO THE NEEDY CHILDREN IN SCHOOL AND IN OTHER GROUP ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE OF SCHOOL

"SEC. 14. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to use during the fiscal year 1970, not to exceed $100,000,000 per annum in funds from section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c), to formulate and carry out a program to improve the nutrition of needy children in group situations away from home, excluding situations where children are maintained in residence.

"(b) (1) Of the funds to be used for the purposes of this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve 3 per centum for apportionment to Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall each be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to the total of such reserved funds as the number of children aged three to seventeen, inclusive, in each bears to the total number of children of such ages in all of them. For the purposes of this section "State" includes the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(2) From the remainder of the funds to be used for this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall pay to each State, other than those listed in paragraph (1) of this subsection, an amount which bears the same ratio to such remaining funds as (1) the number of children in that State aged three to seventeen, inclusive, in families with incomes of less than $3,000 per annum, and (2) the number of children in that State aged three to seventeen, inclusive, in families receiving an annual income in excess of $3,000 per annum from payments under the program of aid to families with dependent children under a State plan approved under title IV of the Social Security Act bears to the total number of such children in all the States. For the purposes of this section, the Secretary shall determine the number of children aged three to seventeen, inclusive, of families having an annual income of less than $3,000 on the basis of the most recent data available from the Department of Commerce. At any time such data for a State are available in the Department of Commerce, such data shall be used in making calculations under this section. The Secretary shall determine from data which shall be supplied by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the number of children of such ages from families receiving an annual income in excess of $3,000 per annum from payments under the program of aid to families with dependent children under a State plan approved under title IV of the Social Security Act, on the basis of the latest calendar or fiscal year data, whichever is later.

"(c) State educational agencies, or the Secretary as provided for under sections 10 and 13(d) of this Act, shall use the funds authorized in this section to provide meals to children whose parents or guardians do not have the financial ability to provide for the adequate nutrition of the children and to children determined by local officials as in need of improved nutrition. Such funds may be used to finance such children's participation in a nonprofit food service program under this Act or the Child Nutrition Act of 1966; to assist in financing the purchase or rental of equipment needed to operate such programs; and not to exceed an amount equal to 2 per centum of the total funds to be used for the purposes of this section in any fiscal year may be used in such fiscal year to defray part of the administrative costs of the Department of Agriculture and of the States in carrying out this section.

"(d) The authority contained in this section is intended to supplement the authority and funds available for use under other sections of this Act and the Child Nutrition Act, except that not to exceed 5 per centum of the funds available to any State under this section may be used for the purposes of section 13 of this Act.

"(e) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to issue regulations for the operation of the program under this section.

"(f) The withholding of funds for and disbursement to nonprofit private schools will be effected in accordance with section 10 of this Act, exclusive of the matching provisions thereof.

"(g) The withholding of funds and disbursement to service institutions will be effected in accordance with section 13(d) of this Act."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Is a second demanded?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11651 would amend the National School Lunch Act by adding a new section giving authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to use during the current fiscal year $100 million from section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935—7 United States Code 612C—to improve the nutrition of needy children in schools, in day care facilities, and other organized activities in which children are concentrated away from their homes.

These funds would be in addition to the funds that have already been appropriated by the House and Senate in the Agriculture appropriation bill, H.R. 11612, the differences in which are yet to be resolved in conference.

The disposition of section 32 funds for the fiscal year 1970 as a result of the passage of H.R. 11612 and the passage of H.R. 11651 is reflected in the following table which I request be placed in the RECORD at this point:

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1970 (H.R. 11612)—DISPOSITION OF SEC. 32 FUNDS

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	1970 House	1970 Senate
Appropriation or estimate	+665, 000	+665, 000
Balance from prior years	+300, 000	+300, 000
Transfers to—		
(1) Child nutrition	−194, 266	−194, 266
(2) Special milk	−120, 000	
(3) Agricutlure research	−15, 000	−15, 000
(4) FAS	−3, 117	−3, 117
(5) Interior Department	−7, 703	−7, 703
Total available after transfers	+624, 914	+724, 914
Obligations	−444, 914	−444, 914
Unobligated balance carried forward to subsequent year	+180, 000	+300, 000
H.R. 11651	−100, 000	−100, 000
Unobligated balance carried forward to subsequent year	+80, 000	+200, 000

The total funds thus being made available in fiscal year 1970 as a result of the House passage of H.R. 11612 and H.R. 11651 for child feeding programs would be $858,015,000, as reflected in the following table which I request be placed in the RECORD at this point:

H.R. 11612 and H.R. 11651 fiscal year 1970 funds

[In thousands of dollars]

CHILD FEEDING PROGRAMS

Cash grants to States:	
School lunch (sec. 4)	168, 041
Special assistance (sec. 11)	44, 800
School breakfast	10, 000
Nonfood assistance	10, 000
State administrative	750
Nonschool food program	10, 000
Special milk	120, 000
Special section 32	89, 000
H.R. 11651 section 32	100, 000
Total cash to States	552, 591
Commodities to States:	
School lunch (sec. 6)	64, 325
Section 32	90,411
Section 416	146, 838
Total commodities	301, 574
Federal operating expenses:	
School lunch	3, 100
Nonschool feeding	750
Special milk	------
Total operating expenses	3, 850
Total, child feeding	858, 015

Mr. Speaker, I cannot emphasize too strongly the urgent need for the passage of this legislation. It is quite evident that we have not provided sufficient funds to adequately provide for food services for needy schoolchildren throughout this Nation. Of the fifty-one and a quarter million children enrolled in elementary and secondary schools, thirty-two and a half million do not have school lunch programs at the present time. Three and a quarter million of the children not now participating in the school lunch program need a free lunch. Approximately nineteen and a half million of those not now participating require a reduced price lunch.

In this regard, I would like to refer you to the hearings of the House Education and Labor Committee conducted on May 13, 1969, page 2481 and those that follow, which were reported on page 7 of House Report 91-379 that accompanies this bill.

The steps to be taken in the program's administration include payments to the school to permit it to acquire the food and the service equipment to be able to provide nutritious meals to children.

Funds are distributed among the States so as to focus on the low-income groups in the poor sections of the major metropolitan areas and in the rural areas of our country. It is very similar to the formula we have in title I of ESEA.

Three percent of the funds would be allotted among Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

In all of these areas that I have mentioned, many needs are in common—school buildings are old and lack food preservation and preparation facilities—local financial resources are extremely limited to expand school budgets to include food services.

To serve all the children not now being served we realize this bill would not do the complete job. That would take some $225 million, the best authorities estimate. But if we fail to make available the $100 million which we propose to make available here we are not going to make any progress toward the solution of this pressing problem.

I recognize some will question this legislation because they have maintained that we would diminish the availability of section 32 funds and we would deplete the fund from the standpoint of some commodity which might need to be supported or might need to be purchased.

Here we are attempting to carry out, and I believe we are carrying out, the true intent of section 32 when it was originally enacted in 1935, by purchasing commodities. Many of the commodities are presently supported with a support price, and can be purchased for the needy children in this country.

Let me stress that the funds under this bill are spent in the local communities. I will say that 80 percent of the funding is spent in the local communities, and the other 20 percent, of course, is spent for commodities that are not perishable that can be distributed to the various school systems and stored in the warehouses.

I believe we should also make it perfectly clear that in many years since 1935 we have had a reduction of the carryover, and some years it has been as small as $47 million, and $73,724,000.

In addition to the $300 million carryover, which was carried over this year from section 32 funds into fiscal year 1970, several years ago this House authorized $500 million as the permanent appropriation to support section 32 purposes and section 32 commodities. We are not depleting this fund. We are really carrying out the true purposes of this fund. On any occasion the Committee on Appropriations can take action if there is an emergency anywhere in the country without coming to the Congress for an authorization.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Do I understand the gentleman to say that we would be taking $100 million from Department of Agriculture's funds, whatever they may be? Is that what the gentleman said?

Mr. PERKINS. I said we were taking $100 million from section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which this Chamber has done time and time again.

Mr. GROSS. And that is for the purpose of feeding children in the cities as well as elsewhere. Is that not true?

Mr. PERKINS. This is for the purpose of helping the most needy children with school lunches, in the cities as well as those in the rural areas.

Mr. GROSS. I just want the gentleman to emphasize for the benefit of a few Members here what is happening to this $100 million; where it is being taken from and what is is being used for, so that they may have some comprehension of how this money is being used and that it will all be charged to the farmer.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, who has always supported educational and humanitarian legislation, and who is a great supporter of the school lunch program, that this $100 million does not flow into normal channels. Fifty-four percent of the money Congress appropriates for school lunches goes to middle-class children—children from families whose income ranges from $10,000 upward. In this particular instance all of the money goes to children in families with less than $3,000 and it is distributed according to the various States on the basis of the number of children in families with less than $3,000 a year compared to the total number in the country.

Mr. GROSS. But the money is being taken from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. PERKINS. The Department of Agriculture now has the money available, and in my judgment this will be of tremendous assistance to our farmers because we are continuing to get rid of the surplus commodities, which was the real purpose of our enacting section 32 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I am glad to yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. What the gentleman says is true, but the primary purpose of this legislation is to help needy children. Is that not correct?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct. The primary purpose here is to help needy children. And for no greater purpose could this money ever be expended, in my judgment, since we have this emergency in this country. And I feel that we would be derelict in our responsibility if we failed to do it.

I might observe that the Committee on Appropriations has utilized section 32 funds more this year than on previous occasions. However, what the Appropriations Committee did this year in H.R. 11612 was to take section 32 funds and substitute them for the direct appropriations that have been made in previous appropriation measures.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. If we pass this bill, as I hope we will today, we will provide authorization for the money which is derived from the section 32 program, to help needy children from families of less than $3,000 income who do not now have a sufficient diet.

Even with a use of $100 million for needy schoolchildren, there will still be enough section 32 funds available with which to acquire surplus commodities of all kinds from American farmers.

Mr. Speaker, one of the problems of the past has been that there have not been sufficient programs to utilize surplus foods after they have been acquired. This bill will make certain that we utilize the production from our farms by increasing the consumption of needy schoolchildren.

We also have an authorization, in case this is a problem to anyone, an authorization under the Agricultural Act of 1956, section 205, for $55 million. Therefore, if Department of Agriculture uses for other programs so much section 32 money that there is not enough to cover this $100 million authorization, or if they use this $100 million but do not have sufficient section 32 funds to acquire surplus commodities to fulfill USDA commitments.

So, Mr. Speaker, if anyone is concerned that there might not be enough section 32 funds to purchase commodities such as the citrus fruit, turkey, pork, or any other commodities, you can rest assured that the $500 million authorization which is law would permit a supplemental appropriation later on if needed. This bill will make certain that there will be an availability of an additional $100 million for the use of needy children in the school lunch program.

Mr. Speaker, the authorization that we attempted last year and which went through the House, was in the sum of $300 million. The authorization we are asking for this year is $100 million. Therefore, we feel it is in the amount that can well be used and should be used and that we need the authorization in addition to that which is in the school lunch program at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my of colleagues to vote for this legislation at this time.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I think we should point out here that the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota has worked many long hours and days in trying to improve the school lunch programs of this country. The gentleman deserves much credit.

Mr. Speaker, in the food assistance program, in the child feeding programs in the schools, we are presently proposing to spend $758,015,000 under the House bill that was passed, including the $120 million that was put in the bill by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE), chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, for the special milk program.

Mr. Speaker, since the other body has taken action on this and has approved an appropriation of $722,015,000, I think we should make it clear here in the course of this debate that the $100 million, if the House acts favorably and if this legislation is passed, that this $100 million is intended in addition to what the Appropriations Committee conferees agree on.

We intend that this $100 million extra will bring the total in the children's feeding program up to approximately $850 million. We further intend that this $100 million should be expended for the needy, the poorest, the most needy, where the demand is present and where we do not have school equipment in the estimated 7,000 or 8,000 schools in this country; am I correct in that statement?

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11651, another legislative milestone in our continuing program to bring the benefits of improved nutrition to our economically disadvantaged children.

Until our program has reached every

hungry child in America and given him, through proper nutrition, the opportunity to achieve his maximum potential in life, our task is incomplete. H.R. 11651, a 1-year emergency measure, would aid the needy children of our Nation who are not being reached by the programs authorized by the school lunch program and the Child Nutrition Act.

Nutrition-deficient children in schools, in day-care facilities, and in other organized activities in which children are concentrated away from their homes, are the intended beneficiaries of this emergency program. These children, between the ages of 3 and 17, would be provided meals free of charge or at a reduced price. These children must be given, through the utilization of our available national resources, the needed assistance to overcome the handicap of inadequate nutrition.

Our national resources in this instance consist of $100 million derived from customs receipts. The legislation before us would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to use that sum during the current fiscal year to carry out its purposes.

As we marvel at the dramatic achievement of the Apollo 11 mission and continue to offer our prayers for the safe return of its crew, it is not too remote to believe that some of the leaders of America's epic programs of the future, whether in space or on this earth, may well come from the ranks of the disadvantaged children H.R. 11651 is designed to aid. Irrespective of such possibility, however, by improving the nutrition of these needy children, America will have made an infinitely wise investment in its own future.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11651 deserves our unanimous vote.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have one concern, and I am asking these questions for the purpose of securing information.

Are section 32 funds available to the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of grain products?

For example, wheat, as the gentleman well knows, out in the Midwest we are hurting with the price support of $1.25 for wheat, and after transportation and storage charges it is down to $1.15.

Would taking $100 million away from section 32 funds destroy any opportunity for the Secretary of Agriculture to raise the price support on wheat for fiscal year 1970?

Mr. QUIE. No. This would not have anything to do with it. The Secretary of Agriculture would still be able to raise the price support on wheat in 1970 under the law.

Mr. DENNEY. That would be under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, or under what they call title II funds, I believe; is that where it comes in?

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is correct. In the past there has been very little of the money used for grains. This has been used mostly for the perishable commodities. For instance, $10 million was used in 1968 for grains of all kinds. Not just wheat, but all kinds of grain.

Mr. DENNEY. Out of the section 32 funds?

Mr. QUIE. Out of the section 32 funds.

Mr. DENNEY. But do I understand the gentleman to say that, taking the $100 million out of the school lunch fund would not affect the Secretary of Agriculture's right to raise the price support on wheat?

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DENNEY. Because there would be other funds available?

Mr. QUIE. That is right.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN).

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11651, which I consider to be paramount in importance to many of our Nation's children. H.R. 11651 authorizes the expenditure of section 32 funds for free or reduced priced meals to needy children.

Section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935—7 U.S.C. 612C—revenues are derived from imports of foreign agricultural products and are returned annually to the Treasury. Since 1959, approximately $1 billion has reverted to the Treasury from section 32 funds. The House of Representatives recognized the opportunity to utilize these funds in a meaningful fashion when we approved last year a measure quite similar to that which we are considering here today. Although no further action was taken on that measure by the Senate, enough support was engendered for the bill's provisions that $45 million was appropriated by Congress to meet the nutritional requirements of disadvantaged children.

The Committee on Education and Labor held extensive hearings on food service programs in an effort to cover thoroughly all aspects of food distribution, particularly the roles played by all levels of government in the administration of assistance programs for needy persons. During these hearings some startling facts were revealed with respect to the continuing lack of coverage by our food assistance programs. The committee report discloses the following facts:

First. More than 4½ million needy children, ages 5 through 17, are not receiving free or reduced price lunches.

Second. More than 6,600 schools in economically needy areas are without food services.

Third. Almost 3,000,000 economically deprived children, ages 5 through 17, in need of a school breakfast do not have access to such a program.

Fourth. As many as three-quarters of a million children coming from large families whose incomes are in excess of $3,000 per annum are estimated to need subsidized school food services.

Considerable attention has been given in recent months to the problems of malnutrition and some valuable recommendations have been proposed for effectively feeding the hungry. This discussion is most helpful toward establishing a meaningful nutritional assistance program for the economically deprived. However, it must be remembered that passage of H.R. 11651 by Congress will not obviate the need for a comprehensive and workable program for feeding the poor. The legislation we are considering today is desperately needed. It demands our unqualified support.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN).

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in wholehearted support of H.R. 11651, legislation which would provide an additional $100 million for free and reduced-price lunches for children from low-income families.

This is one of very few bills to come before the House which allocates fiscal resources to those who need them most. It is an irony that with millions of hungry children in America, we have hunger programs like the special milk program which allocates less than 7 percent of their funds to poor children and that attempts by myself and others to redirect such programs fall on deaf ears.

The Committee on Education and Labor under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) has demonstrated that a committee of Congress can grasp the urgency with which hunger and malnutrition must be faced in this country.

I can only hope that the Agriculture Committee can come to a similar comprehension of this sense of urgency and report out immediately the Senate passed bill to double fiscal 1970 funding for the food-stamp program without waiting for redundant hearings.

Unfortunately, as good as this legislation is, it does not begin to meet the problem of hunger and malnutrition.

If the entire $100 million went just to the city of New York, it would not be capable of taking care of the needs of the city's 4.24 million schoolchildren.

What is needed is a Federal payment of 100 percent of the cost of free lunches to the Nation's poor.

Nor are State governments like New York State making such a contribution. In my own State of New York, Rockefeller has demonstrated a dramatic lack of concern for the hungry schoolchildren not only by the cutting of funds for the school lunch program on the premise that welfare money was available to pay for the cost of poor children's lunch, but by then turning right around and cutting the welfare budget for food as well.

We cannot rely on the Rockefellers and Republican State legislators to do anything about child hunger, just like you cannot rely on this administration in Washington to do anything in this area.

You don't see the administration actively supporting the legislation before us today. The administration is more concerned about balancing the budget than about feeding poor starving kids. Where Johnson asked for $20 million increase in school nutrition funding for fiscal 1970, an amount which was barely adequate, Nixon cut back even that request $5 million.

Nixon only came out with his May statement to the Congress on hunger after public indignation became too much to bear, and the daily press accounts of the administration in fighting

XUM

on hunger became too embarrassing. Unfortunately, that statement turned out to be little more than rhetoric for it has not been translated into any action.

As I have pointed out in the past, there is much Nixon could have done to achieve the objectives he set down in his May speech to Congress on hunger with the resources and funding he had.

My attempts to prod the Nixon administration to spend the $30 million in food-stamp money it had available at end of fiscal 1969, and the $110 million in free food money were of no avail. About all either did was bring excuses from the administration on why it could not act and result in a political coverup with the Department of Agriculture hiding the $110 million in bookkeeping gymnastics to prevent the public from knowing what they had done.

As I said 2 months ago when I introduced the Food Stamp Reform Act, the only way that progress is going to be achieved in this field is for the Congress, together with the American people, to act, ignoring the administration. This bill is a good example of a committee doing exactly that.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD).

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have some hesitation in trying to comment on another committee's bills, and I very seldom do it.

But I do believe this is a bill that the Nation can afford. I believe the strength of our Nation's future lies in the children of today. The facts are incontrovertible that there is a need for these hot lunches in many parts of our Nation. The program will be in the hands of the local people. Certainly, if we can afford some of the expenditures we are affording, we can afford to feed needy and hungry children.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a good bill. I want to compliment the majority and the minority members of this committee for bringing this bill to the floor.

I trust that we will look at this in terms of adding to our national assets and that we will all support this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from California often speaks about the gross national product.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I noticed the other day that the gross national product is at the annual rate of $925 billion.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is pretty high.

Mr. GROSS. I am surprised that there are any so-called needy children in this country under the circumstances. How does the gentleman account for a $925 billion annual gross national product and needy children?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It is very simple. I would point out to the gentleman the fact that you and I get $42,500 a year and a lot of people in these United States do not get that.

This gross national product is not distributed as well as we should like to see it distributed. I think if it was distributed in some areas of our country, where these pockets of poverty exist, then we would not have the problem of hungry children before us today.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the gentleman knows, I think, that the yardstick for measurement of the economic well-being of this country does not repose in any gross national product figures. I maintain that the gross national product and the basis on which it is arrived at is as phoney as a $13 bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would be glad to take an hour someday to talk on that matter with the gentleman, but it is not under discussion so far as this bill is concerned so far as I know.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I would not want the remarks of the gentleman from New York to pass without some comment.

In the past, the Speaker of this House has joined with the majority of the Members of the Congress in well-intentioned programs to solve the problems of hunger and malnutrition.

Further, we have just heard some comments about the gross national product and the seeming wealth of the country, and at the same time admitting a need to take care of individuals who are not sharing in the wealth of the Nation.

I know that this administration is interested not in grandiose public-relation types of programs, but in programs which will yield results. We know that the effort has been made, and yet we also know that somehow the money that the Congress has appropriated through the years has not filtered to those people who really need it. We need a good, firm, effective plan, not just money, but a definite planned program to make sure that this money does get to the places where it is needed.

I assure the gentleman from New York that this administration is deeply concerned about solving this problem which has existed for too long in the United States.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I appreciate the sentiments expressed by the gentleman. But those are facts, and the facts remain that $140 million that the head of the Department of Agriculture had for free food programs and for food stamps was returned to the Treasury, despite the fact that there is this great need among those who need food, and the fact that I wrote to him on two occasions requesting that that money be distributed among the various States for the purpose of distributing food stamps and free food. Certainly intentions are governed by facts, and I have given you facts.

Mr. KYL. I will reiterate to the gentleman this obvious fact: We have appropriated money for years in this program. We have had money available. In my own State and in the gentleman's State, in spite of the good intentions of the Congress, this money has not gone where it should go. That fact is also obvious. We need not only money, but also a plan to get the money to where it should go.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I would like to say to the gentleman that, so far as turning money back to the Treasury is concerned, at the close of the fiscal year 1968 we saw $229,038,099 turned back to the Treasury. It is expected that there will be no money turned back to the Treasury for the fiscal year 1969. It is so close to the end of the fiscal year we cannot tell exactly, but it looks like there will be none returned, and it will be used for the purposes intended in 1969. Secretary Hardin is feeding needy people rather than turning money back to the Treasury.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON) for an observation.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the two gentlemen from Iowa, one asking why there should be hungry children if our gross national product is so high, and the other saying that it is very difficult to devise a program to feed hungry children.

I watched that moon shot last night. I saw Americans on the moon, and I saw television beamed from the moon to the earth. I also witnessed the President speaking on the telephone from earth to moon.

I think if we had the same sense of commitment to feed hungry children as we do to go to the moon, there would not be a starving person in the United States of America today.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER).

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest the remarks made by the able gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) that the gross national product was not the criterion of the social conditions of this country. I therefore presume to call attention to a bill which has been introduced in the other body by the able Senator from Minnesota, Mr. MONDALE, and I in this body, setting up a Council of Social Advisers in the executive department and providing for an annual social report by the President and a joint committee of the House and Senate upon such report, all analogous to the Full Employment Act of 1946, setting up a Council of Economic Advisers in the White House, a Presidential Economic Report, and a Joint Committee on the President's Economic Report in the Congress. Such legislation would inform the Congress and the country as to what the social conditions of our people are throughout the land.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so may revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

XUM

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 11651. In the midst of the affluence of this country it is a sobering fact that too many of our children are not adequately fed.

The purpose of this bill is to remedy that defect. Certainly in a time when so much of our resources are expended in matters that have no connection with human concerns it is appropriate that we should take this modest step to guarantee the present health of our children, and as a result greater national health for our country.

This bill will improve the nutrition of needy children in schools, day-care facilities, and other organized activities where children are brought together away from their homes. This program will reach children who are not now benefiting from Federal food service support.

This is a worthwhile objective and I hope that the House will support this legislation.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, before this bill goes to the other body I believe we should make it clear that in financing the school lunch programs for fiscal year 1970—H.R. 11612—the House did not make direct appropriations in all cases here and decided to finance a larger portion of the regular school lunch program as well as other child feeding programs out of section 32 funds.

I think that this is illustrated by examination of the following two tables. The first table reflects the increased use of section 32 as a source of funding for child feeding programs and the second table indicates that the total funds being made available to child feeding programs from direct appropriations and from section 32 transfers does not indicate an appreciable increase for a comparable period.

TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE FROM SECTION 32 FUNDS

Item	1968	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Appropriation or estimate	$578,911,603	$596,645,658	$665,000,000
Balance available from prior years	300,000,000	300,000,000	300,000,000
Recovery of prior years obligations	20,077		
Unobligated balance of research funds returned from Agricultural Research Service	317,305		
Transfers to—			
Child nutrition programs	−45,000,000	−64,325,000	−194,266,000
Special milk program	−104,000,000	−104,000,000	−120,000,000
Agricultural Research Service	−15,000,000	−15,000,000	−15,000,000
Foreign Agricultural Service	−3,117,000	−3,117,000	−3,117,000
Interior Department	−7,443,592	−7,412,775	−7,703,000
H.R. 11651			−100,000,000
Total available after transfers	704,688,393	702,790,883	524,914,000
Obligations	175,649,394	402,790,883	444,914,000
Unobligated balance	229,038,999		
Unobligated balance carried forward to subsequent year	300,000,000	300,000,000	80,000,000

FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS 1969 AND ESTIMATES FOR 1970

[In thousands]

	Fiscal year 1969, estimated	1970 revised budget	House bill	Senate committee
A. Child feeding programs:				
1. Cash grants to States:				
(a) School lunch (sec. 4)	$162,041	$168,041	$168,041	$168,041
(b) Special assistance (sec. 11)	10,000	44,800	44,800	44,800
(c) School breakfast	3,500	10,000	10,000	10,000
(d) Nonfood assistance	750	10,000	10,000	10,000
(e) State administrative	750	750	750	750
(f) Nonschool food program	5,700	10,000	10,000	
(g) Special milk	103,314		119,300	83,319
(h) Special sec. 32	43,941	89,000	89,000	89,000
Total, cash to States	330,046	332,591	451,891	415,910
2. Commodities to States:				
School lunch (sec. 6)	64,325	64,325	64,325	64,325
Sec. 32	80,500	90,411	90,411	90,411
Sec. 416	144,872	146,838	146,838	146,838
Total, commodities	289,697	301,574	301,574	301,574
3. Federal operating expenses:				
School lunch	2,161	3,100	3,100	3,100
Nonschool feeding	500	750	750	750
Special milk	681		700	681
Total, operating expenses	3,342	3,850	4,550	4,531
Total, child feeding	623,085	638,015	758,015	722,015

In fiscal year 1969, transfers from section 32 funds to child feeding programs amounted to approximately $194 million. This year, in the House passed H.R. 11612, they amounted to $340 million but the total funds being made available from both sources—section 32 and direct appropriations—increased by less than $15 million.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask the gentleman if he agrees with that statement.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute in order to say to the chairman of the committee that I agree with the figures, and that there was a shift from direct appropriations to the use of section 32 in the school lunch program and the special feeding program.

As I said earlier, we have plenty of authorization for additional appropriations if programs funded under section 32 go over the amount annually accumulated.

Also, in closing, I would say that when people on the other side of the aisle chastise this administration for not giving attention to the needs of hungry people, they are surely missing the boat, because the requests we have seen in the President's messages, sent to Congress, to both the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Education and Labor, are greater than we have ever seen before. This shows that this administration is not only committed to continue the space race which was begun some years ago but also it is committed to put its money where its mouth was on feeding needy people. President Nixon's request to double funds for needy people cannot be turned into some claim of callous attitude just for partisan purposes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 years we have witnessed the step-by-step awakening of the American people to a sobering set of circumstances prevailing in their country: the existence of hunger and widespread malnutrition. In 1967, the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy was in the vanguard of those who saw, and were profoundly dismayed by, the existence of hunger. In a land where many farmers are paid not to grow food, in a land which gives generously of its vast quantity of surplus food to less fortunate nations, the discovery of hunger and malnutrition seems at first an impossibility. Skepticism and doubt prevailed in the beginning but were gradually erased by periodic revelations of more and worse conditions of severe malnutrition and hunger. Thus, in June of 1967 a team of dedicated doctors reported to the Field Foundation and wrote in a shocked and angry tone about hunger among the children of Mississippi:

> We saw children who are hungry and who are sick—children for whom hunger is a daily fact of life and sickness, in many forms, an inevitability. We do not want to quibble over words, but "malnutrition" is not quite what we found; the boys and girls we saw were hungry—weak, in pain, sick; their lives are being shortened; they are, in fact, visibly and predictably losing their health, their energy, their spirits. They are suffering from hunger and disease and directly or indirectly they are dying from them—which is exactly what "starvation" means.

In the reports that followed in 1968, it was again always the children who seemed to suffer most from lack of enough of the right foods; it was also the children who understood least what was happening to them.

The report by the Citizens' Board of Inquiry Into Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States maintained that children in poverty areas were found to be shorter and smaller than the national norm, an observation supported by the preliminary results of the national nutrition survey currently being conducted by the U.S. Public Health Service. Whenever cases of the extreme protein and caloric deficiency diseases of kwashiorkor and marasmus are reported, children are always the victims. Perhaps worse than the bodily damage done to children by hunger and malnutrition is the harm that may be done to their minds. There is increasing evidence to show that a lack of protein in the diet of babies and young children may lead to irreversible brain damage. The Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs has this year heard disturbing testimony on this question as it has on so many other matters concerning hunger and malnutrition and American children.

Since 1946 the Federal Government has been attempting to assure American children of good nutrition, primarily through the school lunch program, but it is not enough. Last year we learned what many people had suspected for a long time: the school lunch program is not doing the job of feeding those children most in need of nutritious food, the children of poverty. A study was made of the program by five prestigious women's groups and their findings were published in a report, "Their Daily Bread":

> The most cherished myth about the National School Lunch Program is that no child who really needs a lunch is allowed to go hungry.
>
> We say flatly that this is not so. By conservative estimates, the odds are three to one against his getting a free lunch. There are six million school-age children in this country from families at the rock-bottom of poverty—whose parents earn less than $2,000 a year and/or are receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). But fewer than two million children receive free or reduced price lunches in the National School Lunch Program.

The authors of "Their Daily Bread" and the others who have written about this intolerable situation have all recommended the same remedy: increased funds to insure that needy children are fed. H.R. 11651—the legislation now before us—is a bill that will do just that. It amends the National School Lunch Act to authorize the use of $100 million in section 32 funds in fiscal 1970 to provide meals for children whose families earn less than $3,000 a year or are on AFDC.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the awakening of the American people is now complete and that the need for such legislation as H.R. 11651 is now abundantly evident. I personally have every faith in the generosity and the clearsightedness of my fellow citizens; I believe that once they are aware of the existence of wrongs, the American people want to right them if they possibly can. They—and we, as their Representatives in Congress—can right the grievous wrong being done to so many of America's children.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my support to the amendment to the National School Lunch Act.

In spite of our belief in an affluent America, there are still millions of needy schoolchildren who begin and end each day hungry, who suffer from constant malnutrition which will affect them the rest of their lives.

America enjoys a continuing and rapidly expanding technology. As we develop new means of producing goods, as our requirements for the goods themselves change, so do our labor requirements. It has become apparent that American workers increasingly require an adequate education in order to earn a decent living. Those who suffer most from rapid changes in technology are the children of the unskilled and the single skilled. When parents are thrown out of work or forced to take more menial jobs because they lack the requisite skills, the amount of food available in the home naturally dwindles.

As a result, in the North and in the South, children enter into the vicious cycle of hunger and ignorance. A child who is hungry cannot learn. And a child who grows up hungry has neither the strength nor the tools to provide for himself and become a productive citizen. And thus his children too enter into the vicious cycle.

A child's most crucial development years are his earliest. Malnutrition in his youngest years prevents physical development of his brain as well as his body. I am told that by the age of 3 years a child's brain achieves 80 percent of its adult weight. From the time of conception through the child's early years, failure of the brain to receive adequate and proper nutrition will result in drastic failure of brain growth which cannot be made up in later years. The result is permanent brain damage or, at best, congenital ignorance. And it is a simple fact of life, for which we need no expert testimony, that a child who has his mind on his belly will not be attentive to his lessons.

Failure to provide adequate nutrition to a child will result in a greater likelihood of chronic adult illness. In order to be productive a man must be healthy. If a child spends the first 15 years of his life with inadequate nutrition to develop his body and withstand disease it follows that as an adult his productivity will be lessened and continuously interrupted by sickness and disease.

This Nation cannot afford the loss of effectiveness or productivity of its children. The future of any nation is dependent on the physical and intellectual strength of its next generations. If today's children are hungry, tomorrow's America is the loser.

This Nation presently spends millions of dollars for the purpose of not growing crops. If we can afford to subsidize our farmers for not growing food, then we can certainly afford to make food available to hungry schoolchildren.

I realize that we presently have programs which are supposed to provide nutritional assistance to the hungry. It is apparent, however, that these programs are not reaching the people for which they were intended. I also understand that these programs are presently under study in an effort to make them more effective. In the meantime, it is necessary to fill in the gap between now and some future date when the present programs can be made more effective. I urge my colleagues to give their support to this emergency measure.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11651, a bill for temporary emergency assistance to provide nutritious meals to needy children.

The need for this type of legislation has long been recognized by the House. Last year we passed a similar measure, H.R. 17872, under suspension of the rules which requires a two-thirds majority vote. No further action was taken on that measure in the Senate although the bill stimulated the appropriation of $45 million to be distributed to meet the nutritional needs of children along the guidelines set forth in H.R. 17872.

The bill before us today would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to use, during the current fiscal year 1970, $100 million from section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935, to provide free or reduced price breakfasts or lunches to needy children.

Section 32 revenues are derived from imports of foreign agricultural products, and it is fitting that funds from this source be used to provide food for our needy children. The Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am a member, was informed that more than 4½ million needy children, ages 5 through 17, are not receiving free or reduced price lunches. More than 6,600 schools in economically needy areas are without food services. Equally startling, almost 3 million economically deprived children, ages 5 through 17, in need of a school breakfast do not have access to such a program.

In addition to helping these children, the bill would assist as many as three quarters of a million children from large families whose incomes are in excess of $3,000 but who are estimated to need subsidized school food services.

Overall, there are an estimated 32.5 million children who do not participate in the school lunch program. Less than 10 million of them could be expected to be able to afford a full price lunch at school. I would favor an appropriation to bring the program within reach of all children who need either free or subsidized lunches, but the cost of including all 32.5 million children would be approximately $1.3 billion.

If we merely provided an entirely free lunch for the 3,250,000 extremely needy children who are not participating in any school lunch program, the cost would be $225 million. I think that these figures show the magnitude of the task before us, and document the need for the $100 million we are requesting. Despite all of the government programs in this field, the amount we are seeking today will not meet the need.

The authority conferred by the bill is specifically to provide food services to children in addition to the support now provided under the School Lunch Act and the Child Nutritional Act. The major focus of the program would be to reach those children in schools and organized children's activities who are not now benefiting from Federal food service support for whatever reason.

It is intolerable for this affluent nation to continue neglecting the basic nutrition needs of millions of schoolchildren. There are insufficient funds available from section 32 duties on imported agricultural products to meet the entire

XUM

deficiency, but I urge approval of this measure to bring some relief and benefit to our hungry children.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, today our country—along with the entire world—basks in the sun of a scientific and technological achievement, until now only a dream for mankind. Two brave and talented human beings have landed on the surface of the moon, placed there by an astounding display of pure research and applied science management and teamwork. It is an achievement which has moral and social implications of equal importance.

While the drama focuses on the activities of the men in space, equally dramatic is the effort that put them there. The effort cost $24 billion, and, at its peak, top Apollo project directors coordinated and managed the work of 20,000 companies employing 420,000 people.

Just as I am deeply moved by this achievement, I am equally struck by the irony through which we find ourselves here today to consider legislation to provide 3 million needy children with breakfasts and lunches which they urgently need and currently do not have.

Why is it that we can make a national commitment to put a man on the moon and organize an effort to decipher the mysteries of the universe, while we have not as yet made a similar total commitment to eliminate hunger, disease, illiteracy, and poverty in America?

We have developed a metallic skin for the space capsule which enables it to move our astronauts in and out of varying earthly, space, and lunar environments in complete safety, resisting temperatures as high as 240 degrees above and below freezing, without damage to the space capsule or threat to the physical well-being of the extraordinary human beings who guide it.

Why is it we cannot devise the metals—the packaging materials for the foods and liquids we consume—which will commence a process of slow disintegration when exposed to the elements after being used. Today the streets of our cities are littered with soda bottles, beer cans, and plastic containers in ever-increasing volume. We have yet to develop the methodology for their removal; our cities are threatened with inundation from garbage beacuse we have ignored the problems of solid waste disposal.

We have solved the problem of disposing of the astronauts' waste products by recycling them into washing, and then drinking water, and of bringing our astronauts back from the moon without bringing bacteria which will contaminate the earth. Yet we continue to poison and pollute the earth's air, land, and water at rapid rates. We have yet to organize comparable crash programs to undertake the immense task of purifying our rivers, air, and land of the various kinds of human and industrial waste and pollutants which threaten to make our own planet unlivable.

The effort in space demonstrates what dedicated Americans can achieve when they establish priority objectives.

Why can we not establish our domestic goals here on planet earth and devote the same type of technological genius and development know-how to preserving the quality of life on earth, as we have done to establish the possibility of life beyond it.

The Apollo effort indicates far more than our demonstrated capacity to produce the ultimate in death-dealing weaponry. It demonstrates what we could do in the cause of peace and plenty. We can solve the problem of pollution and poverty and overpopulation if only we establish the kind of priorities for these urgent problems which we now give to our space program and to programs designed to increase our capacity for death and destruction.

As a barebones start, I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 11651.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I hope that this House will speedily and resoundingly approve this bill before us, H.R. 11651, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to use, during this fiscal year, $100 million to provide free or reduced breakfasts or lunches to needy children.

The specific intent of this bill is to provide essential nutritional services to extremely needy children who are not now benefiting from Federal food service support programs. It would seem obvious that the most effective and practical way of providing these services would be, as the bill directs, through activities in which children are concentrated away from their homes, such as a preschool program or a day-care facility. In other words, the administrative resources and units, through which these programs can be brought to the children, would be already in existence so that the program would be projected with a maximum of economic operation and efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, to the credit of this country and this Government, a great deal has already been accomplished toward overcoming the very serious problem of child malnutrition but the absolute necessity to take this further wholesome step is evidenced by the authoritative testimony disclosed in committee hearings that: More than 4½ million needy children, ages 5 through 17, are not receiving free or reduced price lunches; more than 6,600 schools in economically needy areas are without food services; almost 9 million economically disadvantaged children, ages 5 through 17, in need of a school breakfast do not have access to such a program; and as many as three-quarters of a million children coming from large families whose incomes are less than $3,000 per annum are estimated to need subsidized school food services.

Mr. Speaker, this is indeed impressive testimony to inspire our actions and I am sure all Members of this House would unite in agreeing there is no reason at all why any child, or indeed adult, should go hungry in this land of plenty. I am certain that all of us would further agree that a well-nourished child learns better, is healthier, has greater energy, is better dispositioned, and is bound to become a better mature citizen.

Mr. Speaker, over these past several months there has been a great deal of talk about and attention given to the subject of priorities in spending. It is difficult, indeed, to think of anything that would have a higher call upon such priority than a needy American child. Unquestionably, this bill represents a prudent priority investment in the future of America and I most earnestly urge my colleagues to promptly and overwhelmingly approve it in the national interest.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, H.R. 11651, concerned with providing adequate nutrition to needy children. The need for this legislation is obvious. Poor performance in school is known to be associated with the lack of a proper diet. Nutritional differences detract from a child's attitude, desire, and capability to learn. Despite the fact that we have a National School Lunch Act, better than 4.5 million of the needy children in America are not receiving free lunch.

This legislation is certainly one of top priority in the consideration of our national needs.

Even though the suburbs in the Eighth District of Maryland are among the most prosperous in the Nation, we have pockets of poverty and there is a real need among some of the schoolchildren. Last spring, in Montgomery County, I found that some of our needy children were not receiving free lunches.

The Montgomery County School Board has taken steps to remedy this condition, but I feel that it illustrates a very important point—if we are going to aid in diminishing this nutritonal gap through the school lunch program, we are not only going to need the necessary funds, but, in addition, we must have cooperation at all levels—Federal, State, and local.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge approval of the bill H.R. 11651 which would amend the National School Lunch Act by adding a new section to give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to use $100 million from section 32 of the Agriculture Act of August 24, 1935, to improve the nutrition of needy children. The program would be administered through schools, day-care facilities, and other organized centers and activities where children are concentrated away from their family residences. The authority prescribed in this bill is, according to the report of the Committee on Education and Labor, specifically "to provide food services to children in addition to the food service support now being provided under the provisions of the School Lunch Act and the Child Nutritional Act"—committee report on H.R. 11651, page 2.

The authority in this bill will enable the Department of Agriculture to reach more children who are in need of nutritional assistance but who are not now benefiting from other Federal food service programs. Unfortunately, the amount of $100 million will reach less than 50 percent of the 3.25 million children who need free lunches. Approximately 32.5 million children are not now participating in Federal school lunch programs. Of these 32.5 million children, approximately 3.25 million are estimated by the Department of Agriculture to need free lunches. In addition, over 19 million children are estimated to need reduced price lunches.

Despite the fact that millions of children in need of free or reduced price lunches are not receiving food support from the Federal Government, the appropriations contained in the fiscal year 1970 budget for Federal child feeding programs are only marginally greater than those for fiscal year 1969. President Johnson's budget requested $643,715,000 for fiscal year 1970 for food support programs for children, only a little over $20 million more than the $623,085,000 appropriated in fiscal year 1969. President Nixon's revised budget request reduces this small increase still further to $638,015,000.

Since the funds recommended for child feeding programs in fiscal year 1970 are only slightly greater than was expended in fiscal year 1969, it is clear that these programs will be unable to reach the 22.25 million children who need free or reduced price lunches but are not now receiving them. Therefore it is essential that additional funds be provided.

The $100 million authorized in H.R. 11651 will be drawn from section 32 funds of the Agriculture Act of August 24, 1935, from which, since 1959, approximately $1 billion has been returned to the Treasury. Hence the expenditure authorized by H.R. 11651 would not derive from funds appropriated by Congress for the regular operation of the School Lunch Act.

While it is important that the House approve the legislation before us today, we should not deceive ourselves that the funds authorized in H.R. 11651 are sufficient to provide for the nutritional needs of needy school-age children. According to the committee report on this bill, approximately $255.5 million would be necessary in order to assure a free lunch to the 3.25 million most needy children not now receiving Federal nutritional support. Thus, the $100 million authorization contained in this bill will not even meet the needs of half of the most needy children. The cost of feeding all school-age children who currently do not participate in Federal school lunch program, it is estimated, would be over $1 billion, or more than 10 times the amount authorized in H.R. 11651.

The House should not, then, be content merely to approve the bill before us today. For the $100 million in additional funds authorized in H.R. 11651 still falls far below the $255.5 million which the Committee on Education and Labor has estimated is required to provide free lunches for only the most needy 3.25 million children not now participating in other school lunch programs. Hence, there is also a need to increase appropriations for other child feeding programs from the levels recommended in the revised budget of the administration for fiscal year 1970.

Yesterday, the Nation witnessed the historic and dramatic landing of Apollo 11 on the moon. The technological achievement represented by that landing is indeed cause for immense national pride. But we would not forget that the achievements of the Apollo program were extremely costly—at least $24 billion. The appropriations which NASA received for that effort did not cover part of the costs of a moon landing; for both NASA and Congress recognized that partial appropriations would not get the job done.

With full support, the Apollo program is achieving, in spectacular fashion, the goals formulated for it. Congress must now recognize that if we are to achieve comparable results in solving the unmet domestic needs of our society, programs designed to meet those needs must also receive full support and attention. So long as Congress continues to appropriate only half the amount of money needed to solve urgent problems here at home, we will never achieve results comparable to the success in space.

For hundreds of years, men have dreamed of reaching the moon. That those dreams were fulfilled yesterday represents an enormous achievement for the United States. But the dream of abolishing hunger and malnutrition is far older than the dream of reaching the moon. The fact that we have as yet failed to achieve that dream is not, as Apollo 11 demonstrates, a failure of technical know-how. It is rather a failure of will. We have reached the moon. It is now time for Congress to make it clear that the abolition of hunger and malnutrition must take priority.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 11651.

The question was taken.

Mr. **PERKINS.** Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER.** Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 352, nays 5, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—352

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Albert
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Belcher
Bell, Calif.
Bennett
Betts
Bevill
Biaggi
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Caffery
Cahill
Carter
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chappell
Chisholm
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Clay
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Collins
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Coughlin
Cramer
Daddario
Daniel, Va.
Daniels, N.J.
Dawson
de la Garza
Dellenback
Denney
Dennis
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fish
Fisher
Flowers
Foley
Ford, William D.
Foreman
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Garmatz
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Hagan
Haley
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey
Hastings
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks
Hogan
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Keith
King
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Landgrebe
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
Lujan
McClory
McCloskey
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McKneally
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Mann
Marsh
Martin
Mathias
Matsunaga
Mayne
Meeds
Melcher
Meskill
Mikva
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Mize
Mizell
Mollohan
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Podell
Poff
Pollock
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Quie
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roybal
Ruth
Ryan
St. Onge
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Symington
Taft
Taylor
Thompson, Ga..
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Watts
Weicker
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Charles H.
Wold
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young
Zablocki
Zwach

NAYS—5

Davis, Wis.
Gross
Hall
Montgomery
Poage

NOT VOTING—75

Abbitt
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson, Tenn.
Ashbrook
Ashley
Beall, Md.
Berry
Brock
Camp
Carey
Casey
Cowger
Culver
Cunningham
Davis, Ga.
Delaney
Dent
Diggs
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Evins, Tenn.
Findley
Flood
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Gallagher
Gaydos
Goldwater
Green, Oreg.
Halpern
Hanley
Hébert
Henderson
Howard
Jacobs
Jonas
Kee
Kirwan
Lipscomb
Lukens
McCarthy
May
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Minshall
O'Konski
Pettis
Powell
Purcell
Quillen
Railsback
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Roudebush
Ruppe
St Germain
Sandman
Sebelius
Shipley
Sisk
Snyder

XUM

Stuckey
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tunney
Waldie
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Zion

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Delaney with Mrs. May.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Beall of Maryland.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Finley.
Mr. Flood with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Berry.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Sebelius.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Gaydos with Mr. Wampler.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Pettis with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Winn with Mr. Zion.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PRODUCT SAFETY EXTENSION

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 10987) to amend the National Commission on Product Safety Act in order to extend the life of the Commission so that it may complete its assigned tasks.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 10987

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2(c) of the National Commission on Product Safety Act (Public Law 90–146; 81 Stat. 466) is amended by striking out "two years from the date of approval of this Joint Resolution" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "June 30, 1970".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) is recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10987 extends the life of the National Commission on Product Safety from November 20, 1969, to June 30, 1970. This Commission was created by Public Law 90–146, a joint resolution approved November 20, 1967. It is a temporary commission and has a 2-year life which commenced on November 20, 1967.

Public Law 90–146 contained an authorization of funds to be appropriated of $2 million. Of this sum, $525,000 was actually appropriated in 1968 but by the time the Commissioners were actually sworn in and the Commission was funded, most of the first year of its 2-year life had passed.

H.R. 10987 will provide 7 additional months for the Commission to complete its work. No new authorization is sought.

H.R. 10987 has the unanimous support of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The extension is supported by the Commission itself, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and thus far I have heard of no opposition.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the National Commission on Product Safety was created by the 90th Congress to make an indepth study of strengths and shortcomings of Federal, State, and local efforts to protect citizens from the effects of hazardous substances. It was intended that the Commission would explore the state of the laws in effect at each level and the manner in which they were being implemented. It was also intended to discover where, if anywhere, there might exist barren spots in the coverage. The job was to take until November 1969 and then cease.

Due to circumstances which were by no stretch of the imagination any fault of the legislation, the appointment of the Commissioners was not accomplished until May 1968. Thereafter, the process of obtaining funds with which to carry out the assignment was not completed until October 1968. Consequently, one of the 2 years intended to complete the task was eaten up before it got off the ground.

Once in motion, the Commission got about its work diligently and effectively. In an interim report on children's toys it presented information which resulted in almost immediate action to improve the safeguards by amendment to the Hazardous Substances Act. That legislation is presently pending and should be before the House in the next week or two.

The committee listened to the Commissioners describe their activities and plans for completing the assignment. The effort seems to be well run and aimed at proper objectives. It is also clear, however, that a period of about 2 years is the required time in which to accomplish that which we decreed. To wind up the affairs of the Commission in November of this year would be wasteful of the effort already expended.

The purpose of this bill is merely to extend the life of the Commission for 7 additional months. That will end the project on June 30, 1970, which is still 3¼ months short of the original 2-year estimate for the work. The Commission feels, however, that it can render the kind of report we are looking for by that time. There is no need for additional appropriation authorizations.

I recommend the passage of H.R. 10987.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is with distinct pleasure and sense of duty to the Nation and to my constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania that I rise today to urge all my colleagues to vote for passage of H.R. 10987 and extend the life of the Commission on Product Safety so that it can complete its assigned tasks.

I have been quite impressed by the work that the Commission is doing in a variety of areas. Earlier this year, I sponsored H.R. 10012 which is identical to the bill we have before us today and H.R. 7509 which would amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to include additional categories of hazards which are found primarily in toys so that our children will not suffer the loss of life and limb because of the propensity of some manufacturers to make and market toys which are fashionable but not safe. The latter bill was drafted by the Commission and demonstrates in one small way its worth.

The work which the Commission has done in identifying hazards in toys and other types of products, which are designed to be used by the general consumer public, argues quite forcefully for the legislation now being considered. Certainly I do not think that any parent would want his daughter to play with a toy stove that heats up to 660°, hotter than a home oven, or a soldering kit which heats up to 800° and involves the use of molten lead. It is through identifying these products and letting the public know of their hazard that the Commission has done its greatest work. Public disclosure of hazards has more often than not been the catalyst for manufacturers to either take these products off the market permanently or at least recall them to eliminate the hazards which the Commission has found.

Recently, members of the Commission staff were of invaluable assistance to me in demonstrating to the people of Philadelphia the various types of hazardous toys on the market. I had the opportunity to appear on television in the Philadelphia area and discuss the subject and, through the assistance of the Commission, I had not only the hazardous toys to demonstrate but also the tremendous expertise of a Commission staff member to assist me in bringing home the message to our viewers. I need not tell you what the people of Philadelphia, who might otherwise have purchased these toys and had their children injured by them, think of the work being done by the Commission.

In late 1967, the Congress put itself on record as being extremely concerned about the massive toll of thousands of deaths and millions of injuries in American households and we recommended a new human right—the right of the consumer to be protected against the unreasonable risk of bodily harm from products purchased on the open market. The joint resolution which established the National Commission on Product Safety directed it to "conduct a comprehensive study and to file a report with the Congress and the President. Indications are that this report will not be completed before the fall of 1970. But the main issues have already been brought out into the open by the series of hearings which the Commission has held since last October in New York, Boston, Washington, and Chicago. Basically the issue is whether manufacturers will continue to have exclusive power to set standards that apply to a vast majority of products—floor furnaces with grills that burn toddlers, toys that cut them, wringer washers that mangle hands, electric steam vaporizers that scald infants, power lawn mowers that throw stones, football helmets that do not prevent brain concussions, and appliances, toys, hospital diagnostic equipment, and charcoal lighters that electrocute.

If voluntary standards are not adequate, the hearings which the Commission has conducted have certainly raised the question of what is to replace them. The question has also been raised as to whether it is desirable or even practical for every product to be subjected to Government premarketing clearance for safety, as medicines have been since 1938.

At this point it certainly appears that it is absolutely essential that some changes be made. The development of comprehensive safety standards is the key to the problem of product safety. Clearly, the system of voluntary controls has been put on trial by the Commission. They have made us all aware that protection against avoidable hazards is not adequately provided by old doctrines and comforting presumptions. Caveat emptor did not protect children who were scalded when they tipped over a vaporizer and were burned. Neither did the seals of approval showing compliance with the voluntary standards of the Underwriters Laboratories, the Good Housekeeping Institute or Parents magazine. There was no protection in claims in ads and the instruction booklet that the device was "tip-proof" "practically foolproof," and "safe." There also was no protection in the presumption that self-interest and brisk competition motivate manufacturers to produce safe products. We all know that stylishness and advertising commonly ring up more sales than safety.

Lawsuits—which can only compensate a victim, not prevent the marketing of unsafe products—are not an effective restraint. And, what about recall of products found to be defective?

We are all thankful when the Commission discloses that a product is unsafe and the manufacturer magnanimously agrees to pull it off the market and correct its faults. But, is this enough? I think it is not. While a lawsuit can bring relief in monetary terms to those of us who buy unsafe products and have accidents using them, this relief is only after the fact. Can anyone ever get a big enough cash settlement or judgment to make up, for example, for the loss of a child's leg or eye?

The cost of consulting an expert witness runs from about $500 to $2,000; deposition costs from $300 to $400; physicians from $200 or $300 a day and visual aids about $100. If the case is expected to go to trial, a lawyer must figure on recovering at least $10,000 to make the case worthwhile. This certainly is not consumer justice.

The mandate of the Commission authorizes it to explore the safety aspects of products which are used in the home. To fulfill this mandate, the Commission has to date conducted four sets of hearings, each designed to look into a special phase of products and safety standards. Important future hearings are planned. In addition, the Commission has conducted staff evaluations of standards codes and laws relating to product safety. It has planned special surveys in cooperation with insurance associations and received the approval of four medical groups to send questionnaires on product-related injuries to 85,000 physicians.

I believe that the Commission is certainly demonstrating its worth. It has been successful in creating a new awareness of the need for safety standards not only among consumers but also within industry. Throughout its hearings, attention has been focused on laxity as well as efficiency; on responsibility as well as irresponsibility. Its successes point up the welcome fact that many industries are often ready and eager to cooperate when the facts are revealed to them in public hearings. Perhaps through the work of the Commission in the future, industry will no longer need public hearings and disclosure of product defects before doing anything to correct these defects.

Some of the most notable results which public hearings held by the Commission have achieved to date are as follows: In January of this year, hearings were held by the Commission on the dangers of ordinary glass patio doors. Subsequently, the Federal Housing Administration announced its intention to make safety glass a requirement of its minimum property standards. In December, after hearings were held on hazardous toys, a manufacturer of a toy tunnel which was found to be highly flammable issued a call for the return of those still on the shelves of retail merchants. These tunnels will now be flameproofed.

Also, the American Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers voluntarily adopted a standard to require that doors of new freezers be designed to open from the inside as refrigerator doors have been required to do since 1958. The American Gas Association, as a result of evidence given at hearings conducted by the Commission in February of this year, has agreed to consider changes in standards for floor furnaces which are capable of inflicting serious burns, especially on children. Also, Underwriters Laboratories have upgraded a number of their standards and are exercising greater control over the use of the UL seal.

Mr. Speaker, as you and the Members of the House can readily see, the Commission is engaged in important work. It is work which perhaps many of us as consumers do not appreciate because all all we see are the unsafe products which are still produced because the Commission has neither the staff nor the funds to investigate them all as yet. I believe that the American consumer is getting a service of inestimable value from the work of the Commission. This work must be continued. To achieve this, we must act favorably on the legislation now being considered by the subcommittee, H.R. 10012 and H.R. 10987.

The consumer needs and deserves all the protection he can get. It is certainly not inconceivable that the Commission could save one life or perhaps prevent one debilitating injury for each dollar we spend to keep it operating. In these days when the value of the dollar appears to be shrinking considerably, the National Commission on Product Safety is the exception. It performs a valuable service to the Nation and serves as a powerful weapon in our arsenal of consumer protection. It should be continued.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10987, a bill to extend for 1 year the National Commission on Product Safety in order that the Commission may complete its assigned tasks.

I joined with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) in sponsoring H.R. 10334 which would have accomplished the same purpose as the bill we are considering today and I am happy that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has acted favorably on this legislation. The other body passed this legislation on May 8 of this year.

I applaud the work that Chairman Arnold B. Elkind, the Commissioners, and the staff have accomplished and I know that the Commission will continue to examine thousands of household products to determine if such products present an unreasonable hazard to the health and safety of the consuming public, to determine the extent and adequacy of industry self-regulation as well as local, State, and Federal laws to protect consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I was particularly pleased with the work the Commission did in looking into the defective design of children's cribs in light of the fact that some 200 infants a year strangle in their cribs. In the Miami, Fla., area alone in a period of 12 years, 11 infants died of strangulation in their cribs. Most of the deaths were attributable to a faulty design of the top of one type of crib, and in other instances two slats along the side which are too widely spaced thus permitting the body of the infant to slide through, but not the head.

I am also pleased that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has favorably reported H.R. 7621, to amend the Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards and I believe the House will con-

XUM

sider this measure within the next week or so.

The work of the Commission has been impressive and I look forward to receiving additional interim reports as well as the final report which will be forthcoming next June.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from West Virginia that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 10987.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. **STAGGERS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 15900) to amend the National Commission on Product Safety Act in order to extend the life of the Commission so that it may complete its assigned tasks, a bill identical to H.R. 10987, just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1590

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2(c) of the National Commission on Product Safety Act (Public Law 90–146; 81 Stat. 466) is amended by striking out "two years from the date of approval of this Joint Resolution" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "June 30, 1970".

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 10987) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. **STAGGERS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

ENDANGERED SPECIES

Mr. **DINGELL**. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11363) to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States; to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11363

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 2 through 5 of this Act, the term—

(1) "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior;

(2) "fish or wildlife" means any wild mammal, fish, wild bird, amphibian, reptile, mollusk, or crustacean, or any part or products or egg thereof;

(3) "United States" includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam; and

(4) "person" means any individual, firm, corporation. association, or partnership.

Sec. 2. Except as provided in section 3 of this Act, whoever imports, in violation of sections 2 through 5 of this Act, from any foreign country into the United States any species or subspecies of fish or wildlife which the Secretary has determined, in accordance with the provisions of such sections, to be threatened with worldwide extinction, shall be punished in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of this Act.

Sec..3. (a) A species or subspecies of fish or wildlife shall be deemed to be threatened with worldwide extinction whenever the Secretary determines, based on the best scientific and commercial data available to him and after consultation, in cooperation with the Secretary of State, with the foreign country or countries in which such fish or wildlife are normally found and, to the extent practicable, with interested persons and organizations and other interested Federal agencies, that the continued existence of such species or subspecies of fish or wildlife is, in the judgment of the Secretary, endangered due to any of the following factors: (1) the destruction, drastic modification, or severe curtailment, or the threatened destruction, drastic modification, or severe curtailment, of its habitat, or (2) its overutilization for commercial purposes, or (3) the effect on it of disease or predation, or (4) other natural or manmade factors affecting its continued existence. After making such determination, the Secretary shall promulgate and from time to time he may revise, by regulation, a list in the Federal Register of such fish or wildlife by scientific, common, and commercial name or names, together with his determination. The Secretary shall at least once every five years conduct a thorough review of any such list to determine what, if any, changes have occurred relative to the continued existence of the species or subspecies of fish or wildlife then on the list and to determine whether such fish or wildlife continue to be threatened with worldwide extinction. Upon completion of such review, he shall take appropriate action consistent with the purposes of this Act. The Secretary shall, upon the request of any interested person, also conduct such review of any particular listed species or subspecies at any other time if he finds and publishes his finding that such person has presented substantial evidence to warrant such a review.

(b) In order to minimize undue economic hardship to any person importing any species or subspecies of fish or wildlife which are determined to be threatened with worldwide extinction under this section, under any contract entered into prior to the date of publication of such determination in the Federal Register of such species or subspecies, the Secretary, upon such person filing the application with him and upon filing such information as the Secretary may require showing, to his satisfaction, such hardship, shall permit such person to import such species or subspecies in such quantities and for such periods, not to exceed one year, as he determines to be appropriate.

(c) The Secretary may permit, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, the importation of any species or subspecies of fish or wildlife listed in the Federal Register under this section for zoological, educational, and scientific purposes, and for the propagation of such fish or wildlife in captivity for preservation purposes, unless such importation is prohibited by any other Federal law or regulation.

(d) The provisions of section 553 of title 5 of the United States Code shall apply to any regulation issued under this section.

Sec. 4 (a) Any person who violates the provisions of sections 2 and 3 of the Act or any regulation or permit issued thereunder shall be assessed a civil penalty by the Secretary of not more than $5,000 for each such violation. No penalty shall be assessed unless such person shall be given notice and opportunity for a hearing on such charge. Each violation shall be a separate offense. Any such civil penalty may be compromised by the Secretary. Upon any failure to pay the penalty assessed under this section, the Secretary may request the Attorney General to institute a civil action in a district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business to collect the penalty and such court shall have jurisdiction to hear and decide any such action.

(b) Any person who willfully violates the provisions of sections 2 and 3 of this Act or any regulation or permit issued thereunder shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

(c) For the purposes of facilitating enforcement of sections 2 and 3 of this Act and reducing the costs thereof, the Secretary, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall, after notice and an opportunity for a public hearing, from time to time designate, by regulation, any port or ports in the United States for the importation of fish and wildlife, other than shellfish and fishery products imported for commercial purposes, into the United States. The importation of such fish or wildlife into any port in the United States, except those so designated, shall be prohibited after the effective date of such designations. Such regulations may provide exceptions to such prohibition if the Secretary deems it appropriate and consistent with the purposes of this subsection.

(d) The provisions of sections 2 through 5 of this Act and the regulations issued shall thereunder shall be enforced by either the Secretary or the Secretary of the Treasury, or both such Secretaries. Either Secretary may utilize by agreement the personnel, services, and facilities of any other Federal agency or any State agency. Any employee of the Department of the Interior or the Department of the Treasury authorized by the Secretary or the Secretary of the Treasury may, without a warrant, arrest any person who, within the employee's presence or view, violates the provisions of this Act or any regulation or permit issued thereunder, and may execute a warrant or other process issued by an officer or court of competent jurisdiction. An employee who has made an arrest under this Act may search the person arrested at the time of the arrest and seize any fish or wildlife or property of items taken, used, or possessed in violation of this Act or any regulation or permit issued thereunder. Any fish or wildlife or property or items seized shall be held by the employee or by a United States marshal pending disposition of the case by the court, commissioner, or magistrate, except that the Secretary may, in lieu thereof, permit such person to post a bond or other surety satisfactory to him. Upon conviction, any fish or wildlife seized shall be forfeited to the Secretary for disposal by him. Any other property or items seized may, in the discretion of the court, commissioner, or magistrate, be forfeited to the United States or otherwise disposed of.

(e) In carrying out the provisions of sections 2 through 5 of this Act, the Secretary may issue such regulations as may be appropriate.

Sec. 5. In carrying out the provisions of

XUM

sections 2 through 4 of this Act, the Secretary, through the Secretary of State, shall encourage foreign countries to provide protection to species and subspecies of fish and wildlife threatened with worldwide extinction, to take measures to prevent such fish or wildlife from becoming threatened with extinction, and shall cooperate with such countries in providing technical assistance in developing and carrying out programs to provide such protection, and shall, through the Secretary of State, encourage bilateral and multilateral agreements with such countries for the protection, conservation, and propagation of fish or wildlife. The Secretary shall also encourage persons, taking directly or indirectly fish or wildlife in foreign countries for importation into the United States for commercial or other purposes, to develop and carry out, with such assistance as he may provide under any authority available to him, conservation practices designed to enhance such fish or wildlife and their habitats. The Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary, shall take appropriate measures to encourage the development of adequate measures, including, if appropriate, international agreements, to prevent such fish or wildlife from becoming threatened with worldwide extinction.

Sec. 6. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary shall provide for appropriate coordination of the administration of this Act and amendments made by this Act, with the administration of the animal quarantine laws (21 U.S.C. 101 et seq., 21 U.S.C. 111, 21 U.S.C. 134 et seq.) and the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1306).

(b) Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed as superseding or limiting in any manner the functions of the Secretary of Agriculture under any other law relating to prohibited or restricted importations of animals and other articles and no proceeding or determination under this Act shall perclude any proceeding or be considered determinative of any issue of fact or law in any proceeding under any Act administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Sec. 7. Section 43 of title 18, United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 43. Transportation of Wildlife taken in violation of State, National, or foreign laws; receipt; making false records

"(a) Any person who—

"(1) delivers, carries, or transports or causes to be delivered, carried, transported, or shipped for commercial on noncommercial purposes or sells or causes to be sold any wildlife taken in any manner in violation of any Act of Congress or regulation issued thereunder, or

"(2) delivers, carries, or transports or causes to be delivered, carried, transported, or shipped for commercial or noncommercial purposes or sells or causes to be sold in interstate or foreign commerce any wildlife taken in any manner in violation of any law or regulation of any State or foreign country; and

"(b) Any person who—

"(1) sells or causes to be sold any products manufactured, made, or processed from any wildlife taken in any manner in violation of any Act of Congress or regulation issued thereunder, or

"(2) sells or causes to be sold in interstate or foreign commerce any products manufactured, made, or processed from any wildlife taken in any manner in violation of any law or regulation of a State or a foreign country, or

"(3) having purchased or received wildlife imported from any foreign country or shipped, transported, or carried in interstate commerce, makes or causes to be made any false record, account, label, or identification thereof, or

"(4) receives, acquires, or purchases for commercial or noncommercial purposes any wildlife—

"(A) taken in violation of any law or regulation of any State or foreign country and delivered, carried, transported, or shipped by any means or method in interstate or foreign commerce, or

"(B) taken in violation of any Act of Congress or regulation issued thereunder, or

"(5) imports from Mexico to any State, or exports from any State to Mexico, any game mammal, dead or alive, or part or product thereof, except under permit or other authorization of the Secretary or, in accordance with any regulations prescribed by him, having due regard to the requirements of the Migratory Bird Treaty with Mexico and the laws of the United States forbidding importation of certain live mammals injurious to agriculture and horticulture;

shall be subject to the penalties prescribed in subsections (c) and (d) of this section.

"(c) Any person who knowingly or has reason to know violates the provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of this section may be assessed a civil penalty by the Secretary of not more than $5,000 for each such violation. Each violation shall be a separate offense. No penalty shall be assessed unless such person shall be given notice and opportunity for a hearing on such charge. Any such civil penalty may be compromised by the Secretary. Upon any failure to pay the penalty assessed under this section, the Secretary may request the Attorney General to institute a civil action in a district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business to collect the penalty and such court shall have jurisdiction to hear and decide any such action.

"(d) Any person who knowingly and willfully violates the provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of this section shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

"(e) Any wildlife or products thereof seized in connection with any violation of this section shall be forfeited to the Secretary to be disposed of by him in such manner as he deems appropriate.

"(f) For the purpose of this section, the term—

"(1) 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior;

"(2) 'person' means any individual, firm, corporation, association. or partnership;

"(3) 'wildlife' means any wild mammal, wild bird, amphibian, reptile, mollusk, or crustacean, or any part or egg thereof, but does not include migratory birds for which protection is afforded under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, as amended;

"(4) 'State' means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam; and

"(5) 'taken' means captured, killed, collected, or otherwise possessed."

Sec. 8. Section 3054 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting "42," after "to enforce section" and by inserting a comma after "43".

Sec. 9. Section 3112 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting "42," after "to enforce sections" and by inserting a comma after "43".

Sec. 10. The first paragraph in section 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by deleting "wild animals or birds, or the dead bodies or parts thereof," and inserting "any wild mammal, wild bird, amphibian, or reptile, or any mollusk or crustacean, or the dead body or parts or eggs thereof."

(b) Section 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"In any case where the marking, labeling, or tagging of a package under this section indicating in any way the contents thereof would lead to the possibility of theft of the package or its contents, and affect the ability to insure the package and its contents, the Secretary of the Interior may, upon request of the owner thereof or his agent or by regulation, provide some other reasonable means of notifying appropriate authorities of the contents of such packages."

Sec. 11. (a) Section 2 of the Black Bass Act (44 Stat. 576), as amended (16 U.S.C. 852), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to deliver or receive for transportation, or to transport, by any means whatsoever, in interstate or foreign commerce, any black bass or other fish, if (1) such delivery or transportation is contrary to the law of the State, territory, or the District of Columbia or any foreign country from which such black bass or other fish is found or transported, or is contrary to other applicable law, or (2) such black bass or other fish has been either caught, killed, taken, sold, purchased, possessed, or transported, at any time, contrary to the law of the State, territory, or the District of Columbia, or foreign country, in which it was caught, killed, taken, sold, purchased, or possessed, or from which it was transported, or contrary to other applicable law; and no person shall knowingly purchase or receive any such black bass or other fish which has been transported in violation of the provisions of this Act; nor shall any person receiving any shipment of black bass or other fish transported in interstate or foreign commerce make any false record or render a false account of the contents of such shipment. For the purpose of this section, the provisions of section 10 of title 18, United States Code, shall apply to the term 'interstate or foreign commerce'."

(b) Section 3 of the Black Bass Act (46 Stat. 846), as amended (16 U.S.C. 852a), is amended by deleting the comma after "commerce" and inserting therein "or foreign commerce,".

(c) Section 6(a) of the Black Bass Act (46 Stat. 846), as amended (16 U.S.C. 852d (a)), is amended by adding a new sentence at the end thereof to read as follows: "The provisions of this section and any regulations issued thereunder shall be enforced by personnel of the Secretary of the Interior, and he may utilize by agreement, with or without reimbursement, personnel, services, and facilities of other Federal agencies."

Sec. 12. The second paragraph of section 4 of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 705), is hereby repealed.

Sec. 13. The provisions of sections 1 through 12 of this Act shall be effective one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 14. (a) Section 1 of the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 926; 16 U.S.C. 668aa), is amended by adding new subsection at the end thereof to read as follows:

"(d) For the purpose of sections 1 through 3 of this Act, the term 'fish and wildlife' means any wild mammal, fish, wild bird, amphibian, reptile, mollusk, or crustacean."

(b) The last sentence of section 2(c) of the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 926; 16 U.S.C. 668bb(c)), is amended by changing the "$750,000" to "$2,500,000".

(c) Section 2(d) of the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 926; 16 U.S.C. 668bb(d)), is amended by adding a new sentence at the end thereof to read as follows: "The Secretary is authorized to acquire by purchase, donation, exchange, or otherwise any privately owned land, water, or interests therein within the boundaries of any area administered by him, for the purpose of conserving, protecting, restoring, or propagating any selected species of native fish and wildlife that are threatened with extinction and each such acquisition shall be admin-

XUM

istered in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to such area, and there is authorized to be appropriated annually for fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972 not to exceed $1,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this sentence."

(d) The provisions of sections 1 through 5 of this Act and sections 1 through 3 of the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 926; 16 U.S.C. 668aa–668cc), as amended by this section, shall hereinafter be cited as the "Endangered Species Conservation Act of 1969."

(e) The second sentence of section 1(a) of the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 926; 16 U.S.C. 668aa(a)), is amended by changing the comma after the word "extinction" to a period and deleting the remainder of the sentence.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 11363 is threefold. First, in order to assist on an international level in the preservation of threatened species of fish and wildlife, the legislation would prohibit the importation into the United States of any species that has been determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be threatened with extinction on a worldwide basis.

Second, in order to assist the States in stopping or reducing illegal traffic in certain protected species of fish and wildlife, such as the alligator, the legislation would make it unlawful for anyone knowingly put into interstate commerce or foreign commerce, any such species taken contrary to a Federal, State, or foreign law.

Third, in order to assist in protecting endangered species of native fish or wildlife, the legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire privately owned lands within the boundaries of any area administered by him for the purpose of conserving and protecting such species.

Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the House will recall, essentially this same legislation in the form of H.R. 11618 was considered and passed by the House under suspension of the rules in February of last year, but failed to pass in the Senate. At that time, I pointed out the need for this legislation and called to the attention of the House Members that in 1966, the House considered what is known as the Endangered Species Act. The purpose of that act is to carry out a program with respect to native fish and wildlife that are found to be threatened with extinction.

During the passage of that act, it was brought out that in the United States and Puerto Rico alone, 24 birds and 12 mammals had become extinct, and many other species were on the verge of becoming extinct. A recent list of the world's rare and endangered species of wildlife compiled by an international conservation organization includes about 250 mammals and 300 birds. When a list has been compiled by the Secretary of the Interior on all species of fish and wildlife—including amphibians, reptiles, mollusks, and crustaceans—I am sure it will contain as many as 1,000 species. Unless some appropriate action is taken such as that envisioned by this legislation, that list will continue to grow and Mr. Speaker, we owe it to ourselves and to future generations to participate in a worldwide effort to preserve this priceless heritage.

Mr. Speaker, as indicated previously, the second purpose of this legislation is to assist in eliminating illegal traffic in certain species taken contrary to a Federal, State, or foreign law. Many species of mammals are becoming endangered because of their demand for wearing apparel or novelty uses. Poaching to supply these markets is a lucrative enterprise in Asia and Africa as well as here in the United States. Thus far, efforts on the part of these countries have not been successful in stopping this traffic. As indicated at the hearings on the legislation, there are about 1,000 poachers active in taking alligators in the southern part of Florida alone, and it is not uncommon for a poacher to make as much as $500 a week furnishing alligators to wearing apparel and luggage manufacturers. This legislation is designed to solve this problem by eliminating the market.

Briefly explained, section 1 of the bill would define certain terms used throughout the legislation.

Section 2 would provide for the punishment of those who import species in violation of the provisions of the import restrictions.

Section 3 would provide the criteria for the Secretary of the Interior to use when determining whether a species is threatened with worldwide extinction. In making this determination, the Secretary would be required to consult and work closely with the affected foreign country and other interested persons and organizations. When a species has been determined to be endangered, the Secretary would list its name in the Federal Register. At least once every 5 years the list would be reviewed by the Secretary with a view toward removing species which may not be endangered at that time. Also, this section would allow threatened species to be imported for zoological, educational, scientific, and propagation purposes, and in addition, would allow in hardship cases up to 1 year for importers of such species to dispose of their current supply before being in violation of the import prohibition.

Section 4 would authorize the Secretary to assess violators a civil penalty of prohibition a criminal penalty of not more than $5,000, and in case of violators willfully violating the import more than $10,000, or 1 year imprisonment, or both. The enforcement of the import prohibition would be carried out by either the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Treasury, or both. As a means toward facilitating enforcement and reducing the cost of the legislation, the importation of all fish and wildlife would be prohibited, except at ports designated as ports of entry by the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Section 5 would require the Secretary of the Interior, through the Secretary of State, to encourage foreign countries to take the necessary steps to prevent species from becoming endangered and through bilateral and multilateral agreements encourage such countries to take such measures as may be necessary to protect and even enhance fish or wildlife that may be threatened with worldwide extinction.

Section 6 would require the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate the administration of the act with the Secretary of Agriculture in his administration of the animal quarantine laws and the Tariff Act of 1930.

Present law makes it unlawful for anyone knowingly to put into interstate or foreign commerce any wild mammal or bird, or the dead body or part thereof, which has been taken, captured, killed, purchased, sold or transported contrary to a Federal, State, or foreign law.

Section 7 would rewrite this law to extend this protection to amphibians, reptiles, mollusks, and crustaceans, including any products manufactured or processed therefrom.

Section 7 would also provide that anyone who knowingly, or has reason to know, violates the provisions of this section shall be subject to a civil fine of not more than $5,000, and when the violation has been knowingly and willfully committed, a criminal penalty of not more than $10,000 or 1 year imprisonment, or both.

Section 42 of the Criminal Code governs the importation of injurious species of fish and wildlife. It contains no provision for arrest of persons committing violations of the law, execution of warrants, nor for search and seizure. This authority, however, does exist in connection with the enforcement of sections 43 and 44 of this same title.

Sections 8 and 9 of the bill would extend these greatly needed enforcement provisions to section 42 of the criminal code.

Present law makes it unlawful for anyone to put into interstate or foreign commerce any package containing wild animals or birds, or the dead body or parts thereof, without plainly marking, labeling or tagging such package.

Section 10 would extend this protection to amphibians, reptiles, mollusks, and crustaceans. Other reasonable means of identifying the contents of a package would be authorized in those cases where it is likely to cause theft or where it is likely insurance would be denied.

The Black Bass Act now makes it unlawful for anyone to deliver or knowingly receive for transportation or knowingly transport in interstate or foreign commerce or to or through a foreign country any black bass or other fish taken contrary to a Federal, State, or foreign law. That act does not now apply to imported fish.

Section 11 would assist in reducing this illegal traffic by making the prohibition of the Black Bass Act applicable to imported fish.

XUM

Section 12 would repeal a portion of section 4 of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act relating to shipment of wild game mammals or parts thereof to and from Mexico since this provision has been included in section 7 of the bill to become a part of section 43 of title 18, United States Code.

Section 13 would provide that provisions 1 through 12 of this act shall be effective 180 days after date of enactment.

Section 14 would extend the protection of the 1966 Endangered Species Act to include in addition to native fish and wildlife, any wild mammal, wild bird, amphibian, reptile, mollusk, or crustacean.

In addition, it would increase the amount of funds authorized to acquire lands in any one area under the 1966 act from $750,000 to $2,500,000, and also, it would enlarge the acquisition authority to authorize the Secretary to expend up to $1,000,000 per year for fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972, to acquire any privately owned lands and waters within the boundaries of any lands administered by him.

Mr. Speaker, the testimony at the hearings was overwhelmingly in support of the legislation. All Department reports were favorable and all amendments suggested by the Departments and all major amendments suggested by the witnesses testifying at the hearings were adopted by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and included in the clean bill now under consideration, H.R. 11363.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation was unanimously reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and I wholeheartedly endorse this measure and urge its prompt passage.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I was unable to hear the gentleman.

Well, first of all, on page 15 are these paragraphs or subparagraphs properly labeled? I note they are listed as (a), (d), (b), and (c)? I am referring to page 15 of the bill.

Mr. DINGELL. I assume the gentleman is referring to lines 10, 13, and 16; is that correct?

Mr. GROSS. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is referring to lines 10, 13, and 16?

Mr. GROSS. I am referring to lines 7 through 15.

Mr. DINGELL. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I am wondering if these paragraphs or subparagraphs are correctly and properly listed. They are arranged in the bill in this order: (a), (d), (b), and (c).

Mr. DINGELL. Yes; the paragraphs are listed correctly.

Subsections (a), (b), and (c) relate to section 14 of the bill and the "d" provision found on line 10 is the new language to be added to subsection (d) of the 1966 Endangered Species Act. It is just a matter of draftsmanship.

Mr. GROSS. On line 13, the changing of the figure of $750,000 to $2.5 million; would the gentleman again state what this means?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes. The original act, the act of October 15, 1966, is the Endangered Species Act. That act provided for a limitation of $750,000 that could be expended in any one area for the acquisition of endangered species habitat. There are some desirable lands now available for acquisition, particularly near Patuxent Wildlife Research Center and Mason Neck, Va., if this limitation is raised.

The $750,000 limitation has been found to be inadequate. The committee, upon the recommendation of the Department of the Interior, on several different occasions, early in February and then in March, and finally in May, has increased that figure to $2.5 million.

Mr. GROSS. Is this the first change made in the expansion of this program?

Mr. DINGELL. This is the first change that has been made in that regard.

Mr. GROSS. I understand this, but there is a total price tag of $1 million for each of the years 1970, 1971, and 1972; is that correct?

Mr. DINGELL. For the 3 years 1970, 1971, and 1972 there is a $1 million authorization, and the administrative cost is $145,000. These funds would be used to acquire in-holdings by the Secretary. For example, alligator in-holdings are now available for acquisition and they should be acquired before they are directed to other use.

Mr. GROSS. At $1 million for each of the 3 years?

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Does this bill provide any kind of commission or advisory board, or anything of that kind?

Mr. DINGELL. No; we do not set up any commission or advisory board, or anything of that kind, with this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. The $3 million would then go to the Department of the Interior for administration of this act?

Mr. DINGELL. No; the administration costs in connection with the control of imports is estimated to be $145,000 a year. The committee very carefully held the administrative costs low by prescribing the ports through which imports may be brought, and by utilizing as fully as possible the existing facilities of the Department of the Interior, the Department of the Treasury, and the Department of Agriculture, so as to utilize existing authorities and existing personnel as much as possible in the control of imports. We have actually limited the ports through which endangered species and through which different animals generally may be imported. By limiting ports of entry, we can control the expenses and the amount of animals that can come in.

Mr. GROSS. Where is the money being expended?

Mr. DINGELL. The $1 million to which the gentleman refers is for acquisition of real property within the boundaries of the areas administered by the Secretary of the Interior, where it is necessary to make this kind of expenditure for purposes of protection of endangered species of wildlife—and I mentioned the alligators to my good friend from Iowa earlier as an example.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield such time as he may consume to my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. LENNON) who has been so instrumental in the enactment of this bill, and who was its original author, and who is so interested in its passage.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to compliment the gentleman again for providing the leadership needed to bring this bill to the floor of the House.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL, in urging prompt passage of my bill, H.R. 11363.

As the Members of the House will remember, essentially the same legislation was considered and passed on the floor of the House last year but failed to receive favorable action in the Senate. Because of my continued interest in preserving and protecting endangered species, I introduced legislation early in this session of the Congress, H.R. 248. Subsequently, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries introduced the administration bill on this legislation, H.R. 4812. The bill under consideration today, H.R. 11363, is a clean bill I introduced along with 18 other members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. This bill incorporates the provisions of H.R. 248, H.R. 4812, all amendments suggested by the Departments and all major amendments suggested by witnesses testifying at the hearings on the legislation.

The legislation has the unanimous endorsement of the committee, all national conservation organizations and all Government agencies reporting on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly comment on several sections of the bill which I am particularly pleased to support. First, as all of us know, because of our great economic growth and affluence, we have been responsible for the disappearance of many species of fish and wildlife here in the United States. Altogether, some 24 birds and 12 mammals which were once native to the United States have become extinct. Fortunately in 1966, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries acted and reported legislation which ultimately was enacted into public law to assist in protecting our native species of fish and wildlife. The last section of this bill would broaden the authority contained in the act to allow the Secretary of the Interior to acquire privately owned lands within Federal areas administered by him. It was brought to the attention of the committee that there are several tracts of desirable lands available for acquisition at this time and it was for this reason that the committee unanimously agreed to include in the bill an authorization appropriation of up to $1 million per year for a period of 3 years in which to acquire these lands. It is most imperative that these lands which are so valuable for the preservation of endangered species be acquired before they are diverted to other uses.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the legislation should be of valuable assistance in eliminating the illegal traffic in alligator hides here in the United States. As was indicated by the Interior Department witness at the hearing on this legislation, there are approximately 1,000 poachers active in the State of Florida alone. I might add that in my State of North Carolina poaching is a problem but not as much so as in the State of Florida since there are few alligators left to poach.

After considering the evidence presented at the hearings, the committee concluded that the Lacey Act under which violators would be punished did not contain sufficient penalties. Therefore, the committee in its wisdom, decided to provide the Secretary of the Interior with authority to impose a civil penalty upon anyone who knowingly puts into interstate commerce any species of wild mammal, wild bird, amphibian, reptile, mollusk, or crustacean taken in violation of a Federal, State, or foreign law. In addition, anyone who knowingly and willfully violates the provisions of this section would be subject to a criminal penalty of not more than $10,000 or 1 year imprisonment, or both.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of this legislation, I think, will go far toward eliminating the market for species illegally taken and put into interstate commerce and also would provide valuable assistance in carrying out our Nation's goal of preserving species that are threatened with extinction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge prompt passage of H.R. 11363.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my good friend from North Carolina, and I now yield to my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for his interest in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11363, a bill to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish and wildlife into the United States; to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire inholdings located wholly within the boundaries of federally owned and managed lands.

This legislation is very similar to H.R. 11618 which passed the House in the 90th Congress and which was favorably reported by the Senate Commerce Committee but did not come before that body for a vote. I actively supported that bill, and had introduced similar legislation. Again this year I introduced legislation, and am a cosponsor of the bill before the House today.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is threefold:

First, to assist the several States in stopping or reducing illegal traffic in certain protected animals, this legislation would make it unlawful for anyone to knowingly put into interstate or foreign commerce any amphibian, reptile, mollusk, or crustacean, or parts thereof taken contrary to any Federal, State, or foreign laws or regulations. Present law extends this protection only to wild mammals or wild birds, or fish, or parts thereof.

Second, to eliminate known refuges for poachers, this legislation would permit the Secretary of the Interior to acquire by purchase, donation, exchange or otherwise any inholdings which have proven to be trouble spots in the effort to protect endangered species.

Third, to assist on an international level in the preservation of threatened species, this legislation would prohibit the importation of any species of wild mammal, fish, wild bird, amphibian, reptile, mollusk, or crustacean, or parts thereof that are threatened with extinction. The Secretary of the Interior could make exception for zoological, educational and scientific purposes, and for the purposes of breeding for preservation and propagation.

I am particularly interested in section 7 of the bill as reported because it is aimed at a problem with which I am most familiar; the threatened extinction of the American alligator.

Mr. Speaker, this majestic beast, a living fossil from the age of reptiles which flourished some 200 million years ago, is indigenous to the south central part of the State of Florida, the area which I have the privilege to represent in the Congress.

Today, human greed and vanity threaten the American alligator just as human greed and vanity threatened the American bison and the egret 100 years ago.

A finished alligator suitcase will sell for up to $1,000; men's alligator shoes retail at $70 or more. Prime alligator hides bring $8 per linear foot from dealers who do not question their origin, and it is estimated that the illegal market of skins in Miami, Fla., alone is in excess of $1 million per year.

This bill would provide a civil penalty of up to $5,000 against anyone who knowingly or has reason to know that he has delivered, carried, transported, or sold any wildlife or products thereof taken contrary to State, National, or foreign laws. A criminal penalty of up to $10,000, or not more than 1 year in prison, is imposed upon anyone who knowingly and willfully commits the same violations.

Under present law, if the poacher is not caught in the act of catching or slaughtering an alligator, and if he can get the carcass or skin to a dealer, there is little State or Federal officials can do. This legislation would close that loophole in the law.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation because I believe that man should not be callous and indifferent to the devastating exploitation of his natural resources, nor should man naively believe that other species will continue to exist on the face of the earth without his aid and protection.

I hope the House will pass this legislation today, and that the other body will act swiftly in order that the bill may become law.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida, and I now yield such time as he may consume to my good friend from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN), who is a member of the committee, and who has contributed much to the consideration of this legislation.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of H.R. 11363.

Mr. Speaker, we are considering legislation which recognizes and purports to remedy the threatened extinction of several species of fish and wildlife. H.R. 11363, of which I am a cosponsor, is the result of extensive hearings held during the 90th and 91st Congresses by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. As a member of this distinguished committee, which is so vitally concerned with the protection and preservation of endangered species, I urge my fellow Members to join in supporting this excellent bill.

H.R. 11363 recognizes the inadequacies of our present law in dealing with certain endangered species and as such, it contains three principal provisions. It prohibits, except for zoological, educational, scientific, and propagation purposes—the importation into the United States of any species or subspecies of wild mammal, fish, wild bird, amphibian, reptile, mollusk, or crustacean or any part or products thereof that are threatened with worldwide extinction. The bill also prohibits anyone knowingly to put into interstate or foreign commerce any such species taken contrary to Federal, State, or foreign laws or regulations. Present law protects only wild mammals or wild birds or parts thereof. The obvious objective of this bill is to expand such coverage to include certain species of fish and wildlife, increasing in demand because of their potential value as novelties or wearing apparel. As examples, one can look immediately to the alligator and the zebra, whose numbers have been dangerously reduced to satisfy a continually growing market.

To implement these provisions, H.R. 11363 provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall have the authority to determine that a species is threatened with extinction on a worldwide basis before listing it in the Federal Register as an endangered species. To make such a determination, the Secretary shall consult with the foreign countries affected, scientific and conservation organizations, fish and wildlife specialists, Federal agencies, and other interested parties. The Secretary, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, is also empowered to name the ports of entry into the United States for such commodities. Failure to comply with the bill's import or transportation prohibition provisions can bring a civil penalty of $5,000 for each violation and a criminal penalty of $10,000 or 1 year imprisonment or both, for each violation. The severity of the penalties is specifically aimed at reducing and eventually eliminating the illegal traffic in threatened species.

In order to assist in the preservation of species on an international level, one

XUM

section of H.R. 11363 calls on the United States to assume a central role in encouraging foreign countries to adopt similar protective measures. It is the intent of the committee that the Secretaries of Interior and State utilize every effort to achieve the "enactment and enforcement" of endangered species legislation as soon as possible. During the hearings it was revealed that the widely respected International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources had prepared an international convention with discussions currently underway for hopeful approval by a large number of nations in 1970.

It is evident from testimony before the committee that this legislation is urgently needed to preserve and protect those selected species in danger of extinction. H.R. 11363 is an amended version of a bill which passed the House last year. Among those amendments included in this new bill, I am pleased that my bill, H.R. 8853, is contained in section 14 of the legislation. Section 14 would in effect, authorize the expenditure of $1,750,000 by the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands adjacent to areas administered by him for endangered species purposes. This will accomplish the purposes of my bill, which is to authorize the necessary funding to acquire a desirable habitat adjacent to Mason Neck in Virginia. I have been advised by the Interior Department that the available lands would cost approximately $1.5 million and I urge the speedy enactment of this bill into public law as these lands should be acquired while available and at reasonable prices.

I will describe briefly the purposes of my bill, H.R. 8853. H.R. 8853 authorizes a particular expenditure for the acquisition of Mason Neck, a valuable tract of land along the Potomac River about 18 miles from Washington. The land is considered essential to the preservation and propagation of the bald eagle, our national emblem, since it serves as a valuable roosting and nesting area for a magnificent bird on the verge of extinction along the eastern seaboard. Valuable for recreational as well as conservation purposes, the area embraces about 4,000 acres of upland forest and woodland swamps and contains up to 20 roosting areas and two known nesting areas. As many as four pairs of eagles have nested on Mason Rock in recent years and the area is the natural habitat of many other animals, birds, trees, and flowers. Mason Neck would provide worthwhile recreational and educational opportunities for such activities as wildlife photography, nature walks, bird watching, and other natural history pursuits.

Other wildlife using the area include wild turkeys, pileated woodpeckers, and white-tailed deer. My colleagues will be interested to know, too, that according to the Interior Department, one reason for the decline of the bald eagle is the increase in human population in primary nesting areas. This has resulted in the disturbance of nesting birds, illegal shooting, loss of nest trees, and possible reduced reproduction as a result of pesticides ingested with foods by adult birds. We will be enabled now to protect these awesome creatures through acquisition of these needed lands in Mason Neck, Va.

The provisions of H.R. 11363, which have been subject to careful attention and scrutiny by the committee are vital to the preservation and protection of several species threatened with extinction. Many species of mammals and birds will be guaranteed continuation if this bill is enacted into law. Several species of the cat, rhinoceros, deer, pheasant, and fish families, to name a few, will be afforded necessary protection, in addition, of course, to the alligators and zebras. H.R. 11363 is most deserving of our enthusiastic support and I urge passage of the bill by the House.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DE LA GARZA).

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I would like to ask the gentleman one question with regard to section 7.

The gentleman has also referred to section 12, wherein the gentleman mentions the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and that is included also in section 7. So I would like to ask the gentleman whether this would prohibit the importation from Mexico of any wild animals, birds, and so forth, that have been killed contrary to a foreign law, and whether this would determine the laws of the Republic of Mexico?

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. My question is——

Mr. DINGELL. That is, by the way, a portion of the Lacey Act, not the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. It is quoted here as the Migratory Bird Treaty Act but, nonetheless, my question is, does this also give us the positive assumption that you can bring in anything you can legally kill in a foreign country?

Mr. DINGELL. There has never been any problem with regard to the importation of game taken in Mexico. The only requirement is that the person have a permit, and the Secretary has been issuing these on species that are not endangered, as a fairly routine matter.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Then the statement of the gentleman is that if you can kill 12 birds per day in Mexico, legally you could import them if you had the necessary permits, and so forth?

Mr. DINGELL. I would say, in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Texas, that you can providing that they are not an endangered species, and that it is not above and beyond the game limit, either on a per day or season basis in Mexico, and you obtain a permit from the Secretary of the Interior. This section applies to both legally and illegally taken species.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. They can be imported under those circumstances?

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I also want to commend the gentleman on his interests in the preservation of endangered species. In my area we have the white winged dove that is so famous, and that is in a state of almost extinction.

I think possibly, working with the gentleman later, that this act would be very beneficial in having the Secretary of the Interior interest himself in this matter to see if possibly some coverage or acreage could be secured in order that it might help to preserve this species.

Mr. DINGELL. I would be most happy to work with my good friend.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to insert in the RECORD a letter I received from Mr. Thomas J. Lloyd, president, and Mr. Patrick E. Gorman, secretary-treasurer, of the Amalgamated Meat & Butcher Workmen of North America. This union has been most cooperative in resolving the different views concerning the legislation, as introduced, and I want the RECORD to show that this fine organization now supports the legislation and the committee is most appreciative of their concerted efforts in behalf of conservation.

The letter follows:

AMALGAMATED MEAT CUTTERS AND
BUTCHER WORKMEN OF NORTH
AMERICA,
Chicago, Ill., July 18, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: The Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen (AFL–CIO) supports the endangered species legislation which the House of Representatives will consider on Monday. We believe the bill will bring about the necessary protection for various types of animals which are in danger of becoming extinct. We also believe that the bill provides the necessary protection for workers in the fur and leather industries against the loss of jobs due to any arbitrary banning of imports of skins.

We appreciate the leadership you have given on this legislation. You and your Subcommittee have drafted a bill which will achieve the goals of conservation without endangering employment in the fur and leather industries. We are delighted that our Union was able to play a part in helping to reconcile the differences which previously existed on this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. LLOYD,
President.
PATRICK E. GORMAN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I think the bill we are considering today is an extremely important one—not just to Americans—but to everyone in the world who appreciates nature and wants to preserve one of earth's most priceless resources—its animal kingdom.

Instead of stressing technicalities, it might help to state that, basically, this bill (H.R. 11363) is designed to prevent and discourage the repulsive and destructive practice of poaching. Poaching is a monstrous and criminal act against nature, and it should be stopped. Many animals around the world are endangered; they face complete extinction because greedy men hunt them and kill them for their furs, or their skins—or even because they are rare.

In the United States, the alligator is killed wantonly for its leather, without regard to State laws or the drastically reduced number of the species available. Other animals, in other lands, are in danger of being completely exterminated from the face of the earth, because selling their hides or heads or other portions is a lucrative business for unscrupulous hunters and trappers.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate to emphasize that many other nations share our concern; these nations also have laws prohibiting the taking of any species they consider endangered. But such laws do not stop the poaching, the illegal traffic in animals that provide a lucrative living to those who are willing to risk dealing in this illegal traffic.

What this bill does is seek to eliminate the market; if this is done, then it will no longer be profitable for the poacher to poach.

Mr. Speaker, there are other things this bill seeks to do and there are other reasons for supporting it, but I know that these have all been sufficiently explained today by many of my distinguished colleagues who have spoken in favor of this legislation.

I strongly urge passage of this legislation, and I hope subsequent enactment of the law will also be swift.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER).

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the able gentleman from Maryland, the chairman of the committee, and the able gentleman from Minnesota, the chairman of the subcommittee, and other members of the committee for bringing this legislation to the House.

As the report shows, I was one of those who introduced a kindred bill in the House.

This bill will be particularly meaningful to my State because unlawful poachers are threatening the alligator population in the Everglades National Park and in other parks in the State of Florida.

By prohibiting this and making it an offense against the Federal law to export out of Florida alligators in violation of State law, I hope this measure will do much to curb this unlawful and very dangerous practice.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I support the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) the chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation. H.R. 11363 will, I believe, prove to be one of the most important pieces of conservation legislation enacted by the Congress.

In 1966, the first endangered species bill was enacted. That legislation, Public Law 89–669, was concerned with the preservation of our native species of fish and wildlife, including migratory birds that are threatened with extinction. The endangered species law has been a valuable tool enabling the Secretary of the Interior to identify and take steps to preserve a large number of mammals, birds and fish which would otherwise soon disappear from the United States. The scope of the endangered species law is, however, unwisely restricted, and its enforcement and penalty provisions are inadequate.

A great many species of mammals, birds, reptiles and lesser creatures are now threatened with extinction on a worldwide scale. These include species of elephants, tigers, and many varieties of colorful birds and fish. The threat to these animals is two-fold. The ever-increasing population of the world constantly requires additional land for cultivation and settlement. In Africa and Asia particularly, the native habitat of many animals is being destroyed at an ever-increasing rate. There is perhaps little that we can do to insure the survival of these rare animals in the face of man's ever-increasing need for land.

That, however, is only one aspect of the problem. The other danger facing so many animals, birds, and other land creatures is man's vanity and desire for profit. The commercial exploitation of rare species has reached alarming proportions. The skins, the feathers, the tusks and other distinctive parts of these animals are demanded throughout the world. Although many countries are aware of the impending loss of these irreplaceable resources, they do not have the means to effectively prevent unlawful commercial hunting.

The United States, being the most affluent country in the world, is also the greatest market for these exotic species of wildlife. Unless the commercial market in the United States can be controlled, efforts of other countries to protect their native species will be largely in vain.

The first major provision of H.R. 11363, therefore, is to prohibit the importation into the United States of any species of wild mammal, bird, fish or lower form of animal life that is threatened with worldwide extinction.

This provision of the bill has been very carefully drawn to protect the legitimate interests of the scientific community, zoological institutions, and others who are interested in importing endangered species for the purpose of scientific research and efforts to propagate them in the United States. It also has been written in consultation with the responsible fur and animal importing industry to protect legitimate existing contractual rights and obligations.

The activities of the Secretary of the Interior in promulgating the list of threatened species will be coordinated with the commercial as well as the scientific community. This legislation is the result of close cooperation between all groups interested in the reasonable and legitimate use and preservation of these irreplaceable resources.

As I first indicated, the endangered species law of 1966 was directed to our United States only. Unfortunately, man's desire to exterminate the greatest number of valuable animals for commercial gain is not limited to other parts of the world. We have excellent examples of this tendency within our own borders. Perhaps the best publicized and, at the same time, the most important example of this senseless extermination involves the Florida alligator. If significant steps are not taken now to protect the alligator, it will disappear. The only way that these creatures and others in the United States can be protected from illegal commercial exploitation is to bring the full force of our Federal law enforcement efforts to bear. Only if the interstate market for these animals can be cut off will the alligator and other commercially desirable endangered species be saved. It accomplishes little for one State to prohibit the taking of an animal if a poacher can ship that animal with impunity from one State to another, or at the worst suffer the payment of a nominal fine if caught.

H.R. 11363 will therefore assist the States in stopping the illegal traffic in protected species of wildlife by making it unlawful for anyone to knowingly place such species in interstate or foreign commerce contrary to Federal, State, or foreign law. The bill provides civil penalties of up to $5,000 against anyone who knowingly violates the law and criminal penalties of up to $10,000 or 1 year imprisonment or both for willful violation. The criminal sanctions are intended to reach the large-scale commercial poachers or dealers in illegally-taken wildlife.

The original endangered species bill authorized the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands for the purpose of conserving the habitat of species threatened with extinction. The Secretary also is authorized to utilize funds from the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 for this purpose. He was limited, however, to the use of not more than $750,000 to acquire lands in any one area. This figure has proven to be much too low and has greatly restricted the full implementation of the endangered species law. Under present law, the Secretary also is authorized to acquire private tracts located within the boundaries of designated wildlife refuges. Various existing statutes however, limit the dollar amount which may be expended to acquire such inholdings.

H.R. 11363 will increase the maximum amount which the Secretary may expend to acquire any one area to $2½ million and will authorize him to expend up to $1 million annually for the acquisition of privately owned tracts within Federal preserves without regard to monetary limitations which may exist in other laws with respect to specific parks or refuges.

Mr. Speaker, similar legislation was passed last year, but unfortunately was not acted upon by the other body. It has been revised extensively in conjunction with all interested segments of industry and conservation groups and is supported by them. This legislation is vital for the preservation of rare species of wildlife for the benefit and enjoyment of future generations. I urge its unanimous passage.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am very

XUM

pleased that the House of Representatives is today considering legislation which I have long advocated and which is so important to the conservation of our Nation's resources—the endangered species bill.

Let me give you a graphic example of the senseless waste which the provisions of this bill would help prevent. Imagine if you will a dark and peaceful night in one of our great national parks. Suddenly the peace is broken by the noise of an airboat skimming across the sawgrass. A spotlight beams over the black water until it rests on the red reflection of an alligator's eyes.

Quickly two men flip the entranced creature onto the boat, and with a deadly blow from a sledge hammer they crush the alligator's skull. Next one of the men finishes the brutal business by implanting a hatchet in the reptile's brain and chopping through the spine in back of the head. Once the muscle spasms have terminated, they begin to skin the innocent creature.

This happened last night in Everglades National Park. It also happened the night before last, and the night before the night before last. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this grim scene is repeated many times every night. Florida's alligators are survivors from the age of reptiles, millions of years ago. But today the lure of profit from the sales of handbags, shoes, souvenirs, and fashion accessories threatens to do what time has not been able to. This was brought home dramatically to Secretary Walter Hickel when he recently assumed the role of a poacher in a night raid in the Everglades and escaped detection.

The endangered species bill would effectively bring a halt to the incentive for this carnage by providing penalties of fines and imprisonment for the interstate shipping of species protected by State law. The importation of endangered species into the United States would also be prohibited.

This measure would provide the Secretary of the Interior with the means to protect the more than 75 species which his Department has recently identified as being in danger of extinction.

The House of Representatives has long been aware of the critical problem of endangered species, and last year, recognizing the pressing need for the provisions of this bill, it was passed by this Chamber. Unfortunately late session amendments prevented its passage in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, we must act now, while there is still time to save the species of wildlife which face a cruel extinction without our help. I urge our colleagues to join in support of this important and merciful legislation.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I am in strong support of the bill before us, the endangered species bill. It will help to preserve on an international level some species of wildlife that are endangered. It will also prevent the illegal transportation of endangered species and the products thereof within the United States. Finally, it would allow the Secretary of Interior to acquire privately owned lands within any area administered by him for the conservation of rare wildlife. Each of these objectives is meritorious.

I particularly know of the need to prevent the transportation within the United States of the products of the Florida alligator. If this is not accomplished the alligator is indeed threatened with extinction. I also know of the need to allow the Secretary to acquire certain private lands within areas where an endangered species is present and which are administered by the Secretary. A typical case in point would seem to be the Key deer of southeastern Florida. Although at the moment they are being protected, it would seem that, without the acquisition of additional lands, there may well be a time in the near future when the land actually available may not be sufficient, because of developments.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support for H.R. 11363, a bill that would put new strength into the worldwide effort to protect species of wildlife threatened with extinction.

The need for this bill is clear and pressing.

Thousands of species of wildlife ranging from mountain gorillas to tropical fish are slowly disappearing because hunters want them as trophies, because zoos want them as displays, because collectors want them as curios, because clothing manufacturers want them as a source of skins and furs.

To supply these markets poachers are flouting conservation laws throughout the world, killing off millions of rare creatures each year.

Shall we allow the alligator to die out merely because women like durable handbags? Shall we countenance the extinction of the leopard merely to provides coats for the grande dames of society? Shall we sit back and watch the gorilla disappear from its native habitat merely to stock the cages of the zoos and circuses? Shall we tolerate the slaughter of the Ceylon elephant merely to provide ivory for trinkets and ornaments?

Thousands of creatures—running the zoological gamut from mammals, to fish, to birds, to amphibians, to reptiles, to mollusks, to crustaceans—face extinction unless the United States and other nations join forces now to protect them.

Over 40 species of wildlife were exterminated between 1910 and 1945 alone. Since 1945 the extinction rate has been accelerating rapidly—so rapidly that scientists, conservationists, and ordinary people the world over are expressing alarm.

H.R. 11363 would help knit together international efforts to protect endangered species. This bill would outlaw the importation into the United States of any creature put on an "endangered list" drawn up by the U.S. Interior Department in cooperation with foreign countries. The bill, moreover, would strengthen and broaden our domestic laws prohibiting interstate traffic in endangered species.

I want to make it clear that H.R. 11363 would not stop the importation or transportation of rare wildlife taken legally for zoological, scientific, or educational purposes.

A few statistics point out the magnitude of the problem that H.R. 11363 would help solve. At one New York City airport last year, during a 2-month period alone, 830,000 creatures were imported into this country. Among them were 20,000 birds, 790,000 fishes, 4,000 primates, 6,000 reptiles, and hundreds of large animals.

Many of the creatures in these shipments clearly fit into the category of "endangered species."

Dr. Theodore H. Reed, Director of the National Zoological Park, said in hearings before the Congress:

> The United States is the most lucrative market for birds, monkeys, furs, hides, and other animals and animal products. Too often our dollars are the reward sought by the poachers and smugglers. * * * It is unfortunately true that the temptation of dollars encourages lawbreaking and at times leads to the corruption of officials responsible for wildlife law enforcement.
>
> When such large rewards are available, it is profitable to evade the law, and smuggling becomes a major problem.
>
> The case of the orangutan is relevant. This gravely endangered species survives only in Sumatra and Borneo, where it is under full legal protection. The temptation to disregard these laws was great, however. A smuggler would buy illegally taken orangutans in Sumatra for as little as $5. They could be sold to zoos for $3,000 or more.
>
> Until a few years ago, most orangutans bought by zoos had illegal origins. Zoo buyers could close their eyes to this, because they bought from dealers who in turn bought from other dealers. Zoos did not know where the animals came from or how these animals began their journeys.
>
> In this case, zoos took the initiative in suppressing the illegal trade. Recognizing that zoo purchases could add to the danger of extinction, our American zoos, in 1962, resolved that we would no longer purchase orangutans without evidence of legal origins.

Stanley A. Cain, an Assistant Secretary of the Interior Department, pointed out in hearings that illegal traffic in domestic wildlife is also becoming a significant problem. Mr. Cain testified that a park ranger in the Florida Everglades estimated that 1,000 poachers are hunting alligators in southern Florida. Mr. Cain added:

> It is possible for a poacher to make as much as $100 in one night's foraging for these skins because raw skins are now bringing $6 a linear foot. Several of these poachers are said to make $400 and $500 a week when they are at this illegal business. The total market for these skins in Miami, the illegal market, is in excess of $1 million. I am quoting these data from this ranger.
>
> The protection service provided by the National Park and by the State game agents is entirely inadequate to significantly check this illegal traffic so that we are getting at the critical point where we are hurting them in the pocketbook.
>
> I think if we had more officials it would help to check this process, but the real problem I believe is the economic problem. If there are means of curbing the market for the sale of such products * * * you get at the profit. Until very recently, well, for centuries, people have lived in the Gulf States and alligators were never threatened. It is only recently when the alligator hides have been used for fashion purposes that the commerce has gone up, and it is the dollar profit that is threatening the species.

The Congress must act to strengthen the laws protecting wildlife now that rising profits are encouraging more and more poaching here and abroad.

I feel sure my colleagues in the House join me in urging passage of H.R. 11363.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I too, support this legislation to protect endangered species and to prevent the illegal shipment of wildlife.

The population explosion—with its accompanying requirements for feeding, transporting, and generally accommodating the millions of people who inhabit the earth—has been taking its toll on our wildlife and fish.

Consequently, we now have the problem of endangered species. And as President Nixon said last week in his statement on the population problem, plant and animal resources are also vital. A growing population will increase the demand for such resources. But in many cases the supply will not be increased and may even be endangered.

This bill would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate in an international effort to protect these endangered species, regardless of the country of origin. Under this legislation animals will now only be brought to the United States for scientific purposes or zoos. In addition, it provides for technical assistance to other countries seeking to protect such vanishing species.

The second section of this bill would aid the States in controlling the interstate shipment of animals caught illegally in this country. The language of this part specifically includes a ban on shipping any part of such animals, with special mention made of reptiles, amphibians, and black bass. This clause aims at reducing the flourishing traffic of poached goods, specifically reptile skins and animal hides.

As this country becomes more affluent, the demand grows for the beautiful goods which can be made from, say, leopard fur or alligator skin. But we must not allow our appreciation for these fine products to overcome our determination to protect the animals from which they come.

Further, the very scarcity of these animals makes their hides more valuable and the profit incentive to the poachers and illegal marketeers thus increases. We must do everything possible not only to protect wildlife, but to control this traffic in unlawfully procured animals now being shipped across State lines for commercial uses.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is further proof of our national concern for our natural resources. I am proud of the work the committee has done in this area and am glad to cosponsor this bill.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of legislation to protect endangered species, I urge the passage of this important measure.

In this increasingly commercialized and industrialized world, we must protect the original inhabitants, our fish and wildlife, from misuse and possible extinction. Legislation was passed by Congress in 1966 to protect our native American endangered species. As a member of the world community, we must now demonstrate that we are equally concerned about endangered species indigenous to other countries.

Fish and wildlife serve us in many ways, scientific, esthetic, recreational, and commercial. Not too long ago, regulation of the Alaskan fur seal and the sea otter prevented their virtual extinction and, therefore, saved their use for all of these purposes. By the turn of the century, the white-tailed deer was nonexistent in many northeastern States where it once thrived, and now does again because of effective and prompt action.

The regulation and control for which this legislation would provide are needed to protect the base for much industry and merchandising here in this country and abroad. But it will also assure us that our most valuable and enjoyed resources, our fish and wildlife, will not be indiscriminately and recklessly lost through misuse or abuse.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, hunted, trapped and killed, endangered species are facing a crisis of survival. The whooping crane, western bison, grizzly bear, bald eagle, alligator, jaguar, cheetah, leopard, and many other species may only be names in zoology books for the next generation, if my colleagues do not vote for the endangered species bill before the House today.

When I introduced this bill, it was with the knowledge that man has steadily encroached on these animals to the point of extinction. We cannot seem to let the beautiful things exist. We have to stuff them for the den, or skin them for fun furs, or trap them for exotic pets.

The endangered species legislation would prevent the interstate shipment or importation of endangered species. In this way, we would not only protect endangered species in the United States, but we would alleviate wanton destruction of such animals in other countries for sale in the United States.

The provision that the Secretary of the Interior designate the ports of entry, insures that there will be no illegal entry.

The bill also provides funding to the Department of the Interior for the establishment of sanctuaries for these animals.

Destroying our wildlife deserves strong penalties. I commend the committee for their prompt and crucial action on this bill. They have provided strong enforcement provisions and stiff penalties, appropriate to the crime against nature.

I am very encouraged by the committee's report. It indicates a deep realization of this critical issue. Thus, I am confident that the necessity for such legislation is evident, and that this necessary bill will pass the House today.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, as the sponsor of an almost identical bill, H.R. 10945, and having supported similar legislation passed by the House in the last Congress.

The legislation before us today not only preserves all species threatened by extinction, which in itself is significant, but the species of particular concern to my State of Florida, the alligator, is part of wondrous nature's means of preserving wildlife. The alligator holes in the Everglades are the principal means of preserving all types of wildlife—large, small, and even microscopic—in times of drought. Without the natural borings of the alligator, much of the wildlife in the Everglades and other places throughout the world would die and possibly become extinct. The alligator is therefore one of the means by which Mother Nature preserves wildlife and for this reason its preservation is of even greater significance than would appear on the surface.

I was privileged to join Secretary Walter J. Hickel on a recent on-site inspection of the alligator habitat in the Everglades and to make a survey of the Everglades National Park and surrounding areas, which is one of America's most precious natural resources of wildlife. At the rate poachers are killing off the alligator, it will not be too many years before it is extinct if this practice is not stopped. The most direct way to stop poaching is to make the transport and shipping of the alligator hide illegal. This bill accomplishes this.

The Department of Interior is to be congratulated also for beefing up the Park Ranger Service in the Everglades Park area to ferret out and fully prosecute alligator poachers.

The leadership of the Nixon administration in this effort, as evidenced by Secretary Hickel's activities and his personal visitation to Florida, is highly commendable, and I was happy to introduce H.R. 10945 to implement the administration's recommendations to effectively protect the alligator and other endangered species.

Secretary Hickel's testimony on this matter in part, highlighted the problem when he appeared before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee when he said, in recalling information provided by a national park ranger at the Everglades National Park:

> One of the park rangers who is the main enforcement officer in a critical area of the park says that his and other people's estimates are that there are about 1,000 poachers active in southern Florida. With drainage and the shrinking of wetlands the alligators are concentrated more and more, and are easier and easier to capture.
>
> It is possible for a poacher to make as much as $100 in one night's foraging for these skins because raw skins are now bringing $6 a linear foot. Several of these poachers are said to make $400 and $500 a week when they are at this illegal business. The total market for these skins in Miami, the illegal market is in excess of $1 million. I am quoting these data from this ranger.
>
> The protection service provided by the National Park and by the State game agents is entirely inadequate to significantly check this illegal traffic so that we are getting at the critical point when we are hurting them in the pocketbook.
>
> The Secretary further stated that more law-enforcement officials are needed but they could not alone entirely resolve this problem. He said:
>
> "I think if we had more officials it would help to check this process, but the real problem I believe is the economic problem. If there are means of curbing the market for the sale of such products * * * you get at the profit. Until very recently, well, for centuries, people have lived in the Gulf States and alligators were never threatened. It is only recently when the alligator hides have been used for fashion purposes that the commerce has gone up, and it is the dollar profit that is threatening the species."

This best illustrates the need for this legislation.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support for H.R. 11363. Cur-

XUM

rently, birds and wild animals are protected, under section 43 of the United States Code, from hunting and fishing practices that might lead to their extinction. The bill before us today would extend similar protection to reptiles, amphibians, mollusks, and crustaceans.

It would empower the Secretary of Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of State and officials of concerned foreign countries, to designate certain species as "endangered species." One year after designation, all importation of these species from a foreign country into the United States would be strictly prohibited. The only exception to this ban would be made for scientific and zoological purposes.

In addition, this bill makes illegal the transportation, delivery, carrying, and shipping for commercial or noncommercial purposes wildlife taken in violation of State, National, or foreign laws.

Today, one of the most endangered species is the alligator. Fashion trends have increased the demand for alligator handbags and alligator shoes. As a consequence of this demand, widespread poaching in Florida and other States has resulted.

This species in particular, and all species, in general, must be adequately protected. H.R. 11363, provides necessary protection, and I wholeheartedly support it.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation, but I do think there may be some delusion. The Committee on Appropriations of the House has not been going along with the purchase of any inholdings with or without conservation fund money and it is extremely doubtful that anybody is going to get the million dollars a year that is called for in this bill.

If the money is appropriated, and if priority is given to this prescribed purchase, the Members of this body should know that other previously authorized projects will be delayed further. The House should know we are about a half billion dollars behind in acquiring property, the acquisition of which has been authorized by the House.

I would also like to call to the attention of those who are interested in endangered species and wildlife in general to a potential problem that is developing.

There are about 324 fish and wildlife preservation areas in the United States, and under the law those have all been classified to see if they should fit into the wilderness system. The Bureau of Sports, Fishery, and Wildlife has now classified 90 of those areas or parts of the areas for inclusion in wilderness.

When we talk about endangered species, this becomes an especially pertinent subject. Because if land on a game preserve, no matter where it is, is placed in a wilderness, then the fish and wildlife service has obviated an opportunity to build a dam or to provide water or to build a canal or to drain lands and to alter in any respect the natural habitat which up to this time has been dedicated to the prime purpose of propagating our wildlife species.

I do want to take this opportunity to mention this matter to Members and particularly to the gentleman from Michigan who has such a strong interest in this total subject so that we do not let something happen here that should not happen.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, for bringing this matter to my attention.

This is a matter which has begun to trouble me considerably of late.

The distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and I have both communicated with the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to request that we be consulted with regard to any of these wilderness sites and the fish and wildlife resources involved therewith.

We have received a very friendly and helpful response and we are moving on this with great care and I hope my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa, will assist us in this matter in which he is interested.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I believe the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) has fully covered the provisions of this bill. I merely wish to add that it has the full bipartisan support of the other members of the committee, and I hope it will have the unanimous support of the House.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ).

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, any legislation which seeks to protect hundreds of species of fish and wildlife from being exterminated by human exploitation certainly seems worth supporting. This is especially true of H.R. 11363, which seeks to prevent man from obliterating, forever, certain species from the face of the earth.

This legislation proposes to regulate both national and international trade, which is decimating an enormous number of already endangered species.

The American alligator, which is a priceless national heritage, is an excellent example. It will soon disappear forever unless rapid action is taken. The same fate is imminent for other American species, as well as a host of exotic foreign animals, including the rhinoceros, mountain gorilla and many species of the cat family—such as the leopard and jaguar.

It is ironic, but true, that man is the most dangerous game. He is the most destructive predator, and the animals are the victims. This ruthless destruction of the world's wildlife must be stopped.

Basically, H.R. 11363 proposes to attack the problem in two ways: through eliminating the poaching of alligators or other species taken illegally and put in interstate commerce; and through cooperation with affected foreign countries. In both of these approaches the goal is to remove the market for these animals which are in demand for their furs, hides, and other portions used for wearing apparel or for novelty.

There is another section of H.R. 11363 which I consider to be extremely important. Under existing law, not more than $750,000 can be used to acquire land in any one area for an endangered species program. I had introduced a separate bill to raise that limit to $1½ million; later, I encouraged my committee to include an amendment increasing the maximum limit, and this was incorporated into the legislation we are discussing today.

I am convinced this limit should be raised. The Federal Government needs more land to aid its endangered species program and this land should be acquired now—while its cost and availability is within reason.

An excellent example of the need for more land can be found at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, in my own State of Maryland. This installation houses the only wildlife refuge of its kind in the world. Fifteen endangered species of birds and mammals are cared for at Patuxent, and considerable progress is being made in perpetuating valuable species once threatened with extinction. More land is needed at Patuxent, for the erection of breeding pens and for other installations essential to the efficient operation of the endangered species program. This land should be acquired now, while it is available.

A similar need for more land exists at Mason Neck, Va., where a sanctuary is maintained for the bald eagle. This magnificient bird, which is our national emblem, is threatened with extinction along the eastern seaboard. We need to move now to acquire more land to establish valuable roosting and nesting areas, before this land is lost forever to the relentless demands of industrial and commercial development.

There are other areas, in other parts of the country, where land acquisition is needed for our endangered species program. Mr. Speaker, this program and this legislation is designed to protect and preserve valuable species of the animal kingdom, so that they can be enjoyed and appreciated by future generations of people from all parts of the world. I hope that both houses of Congress will recognize this need, and give this legislation the support it needs and deserves.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 11363.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM H. NATCHER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM KENTUCKY

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

XUM

minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, the July 20, 1969, issue of the Washington Post carried an article written by Jack Eisen, one of the staff writers, entitled "Representative NATCHER: Policeman of District of Columbia's Freeways."

My friend, BILL NATCHER, one of the senior members of the Committee on Appropriations, is an outstanding Congressman, and fine citizen. On our committee which has 51 members, we have 13 subcommittee chairmen. Mr. NATCHER serves on three subcommittees—he is No. 2 on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations and he is No. 2 on the subcommittee that appropriates the money for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. He is chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia Budget.

BILL NATCHER is a good committee member and always takes an active part in hearings to develop the facts and in handling in all of the bills from his subcommittees. As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture I know that BILL NATCHER fully understands that agriculture is the principal source of new wealth. He further knows that it is the main provider of basic raw materials which support all segments of business and industry and is our largest industry. BILL NATCHER further knows that agriculture employs more workers than any other major industry and is one of the major markets for the products of labor and industry. He understands full well the importance to all our people of soil conservation, research, our extension service, consumer and marketing service, ASCS, REA, and rural telephone, and all of the other departments that make up the Department of Agriculture in this country. Mr. Speaker, we have served together on the Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture for 15 years. Always he has been an active member of our subcommittee. When we take our bill to the floor each year, Mr. Speaker, we can always depend on BILL NATCHER, because regardless of how much difficulty we experience in presenting our request he will take an active part and will stay there until the last bell sounds taking care of the consumer by providing for the production of food while protecting our national resources.

Mr. Speaker, BILL NATCHER is an active participant in all matters concerning the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. He is an outstanding member of the subcommittee that makes recommendations for these two departments of our Government. All down through the years WILLIAM H. "BILL" NATCHER has made an excellent member of the Subcommittee on District of Columbia Budget and now serves as chairman of this subcommittee. His hearings disclose his knowledge and his dedication to good government.

Mr. Speaker, I include the story entitled "Representative NATCHER: Policeman of District of Columbia's Freeways" in the RECORD:

REPRESENTATIVE NATCHER: POLICEMAN OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA'S FREEWAYS—BOWLING GREEN'S CONGRESSMAN KEEPS MANNING THE ROADBLOCKS

(By Jack Eisen)

Down in Bowling Green, briefly the Confederate capital of Kentucky and now a bustling city of 40,000 ringed by fields of tobacco and corn, easily the best-known local citizen is William Huston Natcher, 59, of 638 East Main St.

The window shades on Natcher's two-story brick Colonial home near the crest of Reservoir Hill are drawn, for he is in Washington attending the afternoon's session of the House of Representatives. You can depend on it. He hasn't missed a roll call since he first won election in 1953. The home folks know it and talk about it.

If you walk into the town square—a tree-shaded park dominated by a fountain decorated with baroque statues of cavorting angels and a flagpole modeled after the Eiffel Tower—anybody will tell you they know Bill Natcher. Known him all their lives. Why, when the favorite nephew won a 4-H prize, Bill even wrote him a letter. Yes, indeed.

Closer questioning discloses however, that in his home town, as in Washington, Bill Natcher is better known for what he does than who he is.

On visits home he will hold court in a store-front office across from the Warren County Courthouse—an office labeled "William H. Natcher, Attorney," although the law practice is dormant.

He also will walk down the street in a whirlwind of handshakes, saying "Hiya partner" to the few whose names he somehow cannot recall.

He is a commanding figure. About six feet tall, slender, with sharp features and piercing eyes, he parts his wavy, gray-streaked hair precisely down the middle. Always regarded as something of a spiffy dresser, he wears conservative suits and bar-type collar clasp.

"I was his laundry delivery boy when I was 16," recalls Deputy Sheriff Charles Forshee, an enthusiastic Natcher supporter. "All I remember is: Go heavy on the starch in the collar and the cuffs."

When home, Natcher will range widely, usually driving alone in his own car, across the rolling green hills of the Second Congressional District, past shanties and modest farm homes. Its 20 counties extend from the Tennessee border 20 miles south of Bowling Green to the banks of the Ohio River 75 miles to the north.

If there is an audience assembled, Natcher will talk to it. Off the political circuit, he shuns social gatherings. He is never seen at the country club. Sometimes he finds time to go fishing with a close friend.

In Washington, where his rise on the House seniority ladder has made him into one of the most powerful men—perhaps the most powerful of all—in municipal affairs, he is rarely seen off Capitol Hill. Since 1961 he has been chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, which passes upon the city budget for the Nation's Capital.

He works evenings, Saturdays, sometimes even Sundays, and never goes to cocktail parties or to other entertainments.

"About all that Bill is interested in is his work," says one Washingtonian who has known him for years.

A nonsmoker and a teetotaler from a district that grows some of the best tobacco and distills some of the most mellow bourbon whiskey in the land, Natcher is known to have but one addiction: peppermints.

Natcher's chief fame from his District Appropriations post stems from his refusal to approve funds for the city's long-sought subway system until the local freeway network, including the controversial Three Sisters Bridge, proceeds "beyond recall."

This has brought down upon him the wrath of those who see subways and freeways as an either/or proposition.

Some Washingtonians, including City Council members who oppose the roads, hope Natcher will relent. But those who know the man, who have watched him at work, insist he is not the kind to change his mind—especially since he has voiced his warning on the subway funds year by year since 1962.

Why has he done this? Some blame it on assumed links with the "highway lobby," the makers of automobiles, refiners of gasoline, manufacturers of cement and builders of roads. They suggest close connections, perhaps campaign contributions.

But Natcher, who routinely wins elections by margins of 2 to 1 (his last one was 3 to 2 in the face of a Nixon sweep of Kentucky and the election of a Republican governor), has reported no contributions received and nominal campaign expenses.

A check indicates no apparent ties with any outside group. He even voted against the Interstate Highway Act in 1955.

"In my opinion," said Circuit Judge Thomas W. Hines, a Republican, in an interview in Bowling Green, "you'll find him just as clean as any man in the U.S. Congress."

The answers more likely lie in Natcher's background and his personal style.

Born into a family of modest means in an isolated town then at the mercy of the politically powerful, Louisville & Nashville Railroad, Natcher grew up in the heyday of the Good Roads Movement.

The catchword was "Get the farmer out of the mud." Natcher's father and grandfather were farmers.

With good roads, Bowling Green blossomed. Interstate Rte. 65, recently opened to Louisville, has helped lure large industrial plants—Firestone, Chrysler Airtemp and Cutler-Hammer among them—to the city's outskirts.

But Bowling Green, which does not even have a local bus system, is not Washington, a point Natcher realizes. The real reasons for his actions on Washington transportation seem to be both political and personal.

The politics could involve old-fashioned log rolling: you do something for me and I'll return the favor.

Natcher wants (and has been amazingly successful in getting) dams, river navigation and flood control projects he believes will bring prosperity to his Second District.

These projects must be authorized by the House Public Works Committee.

It is no coincidence that the same committee has jurisdiction over highways and wants them built in Washington as elsewhere. The same committee originated the Highway Act of 1968, which ordered the city to build Three Sisters and move ahead on other road projects.

Natcher's personal reasons run more deeply.

Natcher, his friends say, has a deep reverence for Congress as an institution, an emotion stronger than whatever political philosophy he may espouse.

His attitude toward Congress is reflected by the detailed personal journal he continues to compile. Its bound volumes, consisting of pages dictated and typed daily without fail, line the shelves of his Capitol Hill office.

Put in the bluntest terms, Natcher is said to believe that once Congress has laid down a mandate to Washington, the city government has no choice but to carry it out.

In other areas of city financing, Natcher is privately regarded by local officialdom as tough-minded but fair, if at times narrow in viewpoint. When he rejects desired programs, he usually cites the need for a balanced budget. (He does have the power to recommend a higher Federal payment.)

Natcher's political ambitions began early in life. Mayor Robert D. Graham of Bowling Green, a Natcher crony who used to operate the Helm Hotel on the town square, recalls young Bill sitting in the lobby at the age of 16 telling hotel guests that someday he would go to Congress. At 17 he became a Democratic worker in the tough Hendricks Tobacco Barn Precinct.

Natcher attended local schools and Western Kentucky State College, which occupies a hilltop at the south end of town, then borrowed money and worked to put himself through the Ohio State University law school.

Returning home in 1934, he began to practice law. In his first year he earned a $10,000 fee—and nailed down a reputation—by successfully defending an accused murderer.

Returning to politics, he won statewide attention as president of the Young Democrats. In 1937—the year he married Virginia Reardon, a local beauty and daughter of an affluent physician—he was elected county attorney.

Natcher served as a Navy officer in World War II, meantime retaining his local office under a unique Kentucky law. In 1951 he moved up to commonwealth's attorney, or prosecutor, for a two-county circuit.

County Jailer Raymond McClard, who served as coroner under Natcher, recalls him as a stern but fair prosecutor. Some others are less charitable. One local observer contended that in arguing cases he played to the gallery, his eye always on his political future.

Natcher made his first move toward Congress in 1947 when Second District Rep. Earle C. Clements moved into the Governor's chair. Natcher was outflanked by John A. Whitaker.

After Whitaker died in office, Natcher was outflanked again by Garrett L. Withers, who died in 1953. Mayor Graham acknowledges that he went to Clements, then a U.S. Senator who was boss of the dominant wing of Kentucky's Democratic Party, to win clearance for Natcher. Natcher was nominated by a district convention and won election without Republican opposition.

"They never sent a Congressman from the Second District of Kentucky who wanted to come up here as bad as I did," Natcher told a correspondent for the Louisville Courier-Journal, who found him informal, talkative and frank.

As Natcher made his way into the inner circle of the House establishment by hard work, attention to detail and largely a party-line voting pattern, his superficial graciousnesss with newsmen remained intact.

But any tendency toward being talkative is now kept severely in check. He is thin-skinned, say some who know him, and he has not liked some of the things reporters and editorial writers have written about him. He declined to be interviewed for this article.

Perhaps his severest critic has been the Courier-Journal, a paper more liberal in tone than the back country of Kentucky in which it circulates widely.

An editor of that paper said Natcher, by his conservative fiscal views and votes in opposition to civil rights legislation, "does not represent Kentucky."

A random sampling of Bowling Green residents indicates, however, that he reflects his Southern-oriented district's views pretty well.

As an inside operative in Congress, Natcher has rarely been widely identified with major national legislation.

A dramatic and timely exception was in 1958 when Natcher, then chairman of a House space subcommittee, helped manage the bill that created the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. He predicted during debate that, given adequate financing, the program could put a man on the moon by 1966.

If Natcher faces any future political threat, it could come from the growth of rampant conservatism around Owensboro, the district's largest city, or the recent redrawing of his district's lines to push against the outskirts of Louisville.

Rarely if ever does Natcher send out mimeographed press releases or newsletters. But he peppers district newspapers, broadcasting stations and officials with telegrams describing the goodies he, by implication, has delivered or can provide.

And his letters of congratulations for awards, births and marriages, of condolences for deaths and illnesses are legend. Sometimes they find their way into adjacent districts. The political fallout is all in Natcher's favor.

"Sometimes folks criticize him for not getting up and fighting, for not making a lot of noise like some of the other Congressmen do," said a shirtsleeved workman slugging beer from a bottle in Simpson's Billiard Parlor. "As I look at it, he's a quiet cat and not a noisy cat. That's Bill Natcher."

GALLUP POLL SUGGESTS FEDERAL AID TO CHILD CENTERS

(Mr. DELLENBACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, the task force on education and training established by the House Republican research committee recognizes the growing national awareness that adequate day-care facilities and programs are needed. The extent of this nationwide concern is reflected in a recent Gallup poll, published in the New York Times on July 13, 1969. It indicates that two out of every three adults in this country favor the use of Federal funds to establish day-care centers across the Nation.

During the coming months, a large portion of the task force's energies will be devoted to investigating not only the day-care problems but also the larger concern of early childhood education. Psychologists and educators tell us that the earliest years of a child's life may well be the most important in determining his future accomplishments. Early childhood education is a concern that cuts across the total fabric of our society, but it is of deepest concern to the economically and culturally deprived who cannot take for granted that their children will receive either the relevant educational experiences or the proper physical attention needed to realize their potential.

The article follows:

Poll Suggests Aid to Child Centers—Gallup Says 64 Percent Back Use of Government Funds

Princeton, N.J., July 12.—Almost two out of every three adults favor the use of Federal funds to set up day-care centers for children in communities across the nation, according to the latest Gallup Poll.

"I'm all in favor of day-care centers for children, a 25-year-old social worker from Brooklyn said.

"Mothers complain to me that they can't take a job because there's no place to leave their children. And they don't want to leave them with neighbors because they can't be sure what will happen to them during the day."

"Furthermore," he added, "kids gain from these centers—they get away from what goes on in underprivileged areas and they receive training that will help them later."

JOBS FOR MOTHERS

The centers would give mothers a chance to get jobs or job training and would provide greater educational opportunities for younger children.

Now almost all day-care centers in the nation are privately run and are operated by corporations or by trade and community groups, both on a profit and nonprofit basis. There is little Federal funding of daycare centers, except for a few experimental projects.

Negroes interviewed in the survey were enthusiastic about the proposal. A 23-year-old Los Angeles Negro, whose yearly income is $5,000 and who has a wife and seven children, commented about the centers:

"They couldn't help but be beneficial to both the mother and children. They would permit the mother to work and give young children a chance to get some education."

In the survey, 1,551 persons were interviewed between June 20 and 23. They were given the following explanation and question:

"Day care centers for very young children are being set up so that mothers living in poor areas can take jobs and so that the children can get early educational training. How do you feel about this—would you favor or oppose having the Federal Government provide funds to set up these centers in most communities?"

Negroes and persons living in the largest cities were most in favor of the proposal. Those who opposed the proposal often did so on the grounds that it would add to the taxpayer's burden.

The national results and results of the poll by key groups follow:

	Favor (percent)	Oppose (percent)	No opinion (percent)
National	64	30	6
Men	59	34	6
Women	68	27	5
Whites	63	32	5
Negroes [1]	83	11	6
21 to 28 years	77	21	2
30 to 49 years	63	32	5
50 and over	60	32	8
Community Size			
500,000 and over	70	23	7
50,000 to 500,000	67	29	4
2,500 to 50,000	58	38	4
Under 2,500	58	34	7

[1] Based on the 9 percent of Negro adults included in the sample.

MOON MISSION ACCOMPLISHED—PROBLEMS ON EARTH REMAIN

(Mr. FULTON of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, two American astronauts set foot on the surface of the moon last night as the representatives of all mankind. They are a living example of the capability of human technological resources to do the seemingly impossible. It is also apparent that without the greatest resource of all, the drive and determination of the human spirit, none of this could have been accomplished.

With the incredible success the space program has attained and with the belief that it will continue this success, we must now turn our faces downward to the solving of the problems on earth. Can we not transfer our desire for exploration of space to the troubles we have at home? They are, in comparison, very simple. We do not have to contend with a foreign environment or unknown dangers. We have simply to house and feed the poor, clean the air and water, control a booming population, and end armed hostilities. Cannot we apply a perfectly executed program like the Apollo mission to saving our cities and curing deadly diseases. We have the objectives and the programs, we need a concentrated effort. It is now time for a revitalization of programs and rededication of action to achieve our goals. When we know that it is possible to explore outer space and the moon and open a new world for posterity, certainly we can improve the old world.

The kind of cooperative effort that a space program demands must be applied to domestic and international actions for the improvement of the peoples and environment of this earth.

In the words of John Ruskin, a 19th-century writer:

> The highest reward for man's toil is not what he gets for it, but what he becomes by it.

The landing on the moon of an American space vehicle was a universal triumph which reflects upon each human being. By our "toil" we must now become a nation and world dedicated to assuring the well-being of all mankind.

AEC AND ITS CONTRACTORS PLAY EXPANDING ROLE IN MANNED SPACE MISSIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. Hosmer) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, because of the unique capabilities developed in connection with nuclear energy, the Atomic Energy Commission and its contractors throughout the United States are being called upon to play an expanding role in manned space missions.

A heater system, using radioactive plutonium-238 produced at the Atomic Energy Commission's Savannah River plant, in South Carolina, is built into a seismometer which Apollo 11 astronauts will leave upon the moon. The two heaters, fabricated by the Atomic Energy Commission's Mound Laboratory, Miamisburg, Ohio, will protect the moonquake recorder during the long frigid lunar nights. Radiation from the plutonium-238 produces the heat for the device.

When the Apollo 11 astronauts obtain the first lunar surface samples, they will be dug with a scoop designed and fabricated by the Atomic Energy Commission's Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The lunar samples will be placed in two vacuum-tight containers called moon boxes, which were designed and fabricated at the Commission's Oak Ridge Y-12 plant.

And later, the lunar materials will undergo extensive physical and biological testing at an underground laboratory at NASA's Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Tex. The low-level radiation-counting laboratory at the Center is based upon an environmental control system designed, built, and tested by Y-12. For some of the tests, a special spectrometer developed by the Oak Ridge National Laboratory will be used.

When scientists examine the first "dust" brought back from the moon, one of the tests will be to determine whether any form of life is present. An expert in the special technique to be used in testing for biological content, Dr. M. G. Hann, Jr., an experimental pathologist at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory and a consultant to NASA, will oversee use of germ-free mice for this experiment.

Lunar samples will also be analyzed at the following AEC installations: Argonne National Laboratory, near Chicago; Battelle's Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Hanford, Wash.; the University of California's Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Livermore and Berkeley; and the Idaho Nuclear Corp., Idaho Falls. Dr. Luis Alvarez of the University of California will study some of the samples in his investigations of the moon's magnetic fields.

The AEC's Idaho Operations Office has been supporting both manned and unmanned lunar and planetary programs under contract with NASA, dating back to May 1966. The work, assigned to Idaho Nuclear Corp., has involved setting up at NASA's Houston Lunar Receiving Laboratory highly sophisticated techniques utilizing gamma ray spectrometry for measuring and analyzing moon dust samples.

Supervising the work under two AEC-NASA contracts is Idaho Nuclear's Russell Heath, international authority on the spectrometry of radioisotopes and nuclide decay schemes.

The AEC's Atomics International facility in the Santa Susana hills of California played a key role in quality control and acceptance testing and neutron radiography of more than 500 ordnance items in the Apollo command service module. AI developed and supplied the cold plates which remove heat from the batteries, generators, and transformers aboard the Apollo spacecraft. The cold plates are based upon reactor fuel technology developed by the Atomic Energy Commission. Atomics International also supplied the counterweights of depleted uranium for the Apollo launch escape system.

Recently the Oak Ridge Gaseous Diffusion Plant designed and fabricated a "space wrench"—an open end flat ratchet wrench currently being evaluated for possible use by astronauts in space.

The first lunar excursion module docking device, a one-third scale working model, was fabricated at this same gaseous diffusion plant, and was used by NASA in testing prior to construction of the full-scale operational device.

Looking into the future, when the Apollo 12 astronauts make the second manned lunar landing, they will place an AEC-developed atomic-fueled generator—known as SNAP-27—on the lunar surface where it will become the first long-life day and night power station on the moon. Its electrical output will be used to run a series of several automated scientific experiments which will operate for at least a year, and to power the radio transmitter used to beam results of the experiments back to earth.

The fuel in the generator will be plutonium-238, also from the Savannah River plant, operated for the Atomic Energy Commission by the Du Pont Co.

The broad spectrum of capabilities of the AEC and its contractors proves of service to the Nation's space program and in achieving many other national goals. As a nation we are fortunate from the foresight of those who developed these great multidisciplinary national institutions.

GOV. LESTER MADDOX OF GEORGIA ON FREEDOM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Rarick) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in times of crisis, a leader has always appeared to guide the people.

Today unelected bureaucrats swarm over our land, disrupting society, creating tensions and provoking hostilities.

The narrow-minded egomaniacs would destroy every freedom which interferes with their ideas of what is good for us.

No more important freedom could exist than the God-given right of a parent to defend and protect his child and to see that he is educated and grows up according to the ideals and principles of his parents. Even the Supreme Court upheld this view in disallowing school prayer for the benefit of an atheist's child.

Today, all over our country, but most especially in the South, parents are being denied the right to have any voice in the selection of a school for their children. This tragic educational totalitarianism has been forced upon our people by a Federal court bureaucracy which would defy humanity, reason, laws, and even the Constitution itself, by holding freedom to be illegal unless the people use that freedom to establish a social order which the people do not want but the bureaucrats do. Parents are told that they are perfectly free to do as they are told.

The leadership in the battle to regain individual liberty under our Constitution and God, and to preserve education, has now been thrust upon Gov. Lester Maddox of Georgia. He has accepted his role with a fervent dedication to do whatever is necessary to dramatize the lack of public confidence and support in the ever-expanding bureaucratic dictatorship which seeks to engulf us all.

I join with millions of my fellow countrymen in recognizing Governor Maddox's struggle for right and include a copy of his letter of July 11 to the President of the United States, his reply to the HEW ultimatum, and his position on the consolidation and closing of schools and busing of schoolchildren in the Record, as follows:

Executive Department,
Atlanta, July 11, 1969.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Along with countless other Americans, I appreciate your efforts to end the war in Vietnam, restore peace on our college campuses, make safe the

XUM

streets of American cities, snuff out the flame of inflation and stem the flow of obscene materials in our mails. These are goals which should receive the total support of every patriotic citizen of the United States.

However, it is my judgment that these goals cannot be reached until Federal control of education is relinquished and the control of public education is returned to local citizens and their local governments and local systems of education.

Federal participation in education, once hailed as a progressive step, has evolved into a Federal dictatorship over our public systems of education, and the rights of the several states and their local citizens to control the institutions which they have set up to educate their children have been unconstitutionally denied.

The obvious, and generally acknowledged, result of Federal interference in public education is choas, confusion, disruption and an overall lowering of the standard of education, available to all children, both white and nonwhite. The philosophy which currently prevails with most Federal officials who are charged with determining educational policies is one which places social reform far ahead of the safety, welfare, health and economic security of our children, their teachers, their parents and their communities.

Innocent and helpless children, without regard to race, are to suffer. Hundreds of communities are left without schools and without industrial and economic development opportunities, and the investments of teachers, parents and others in their schools, homes and businesses, in many instances, are all but destroyed.

American citizens are being denied the "freedom of choice" which is the nucleus of of the freedoms for which Americans have fought and died, and for which, even today, our young men in uniform are giving their all.

I am sure that you, yourself, have observed that, as Federal control of education has increased, there has been a corresponding increase in crime, disorder, violence, attacks on teachers and students (both in and out of school), disrespect for the U.S. government and for its flag, disrespect for law and order and for the rights of our citizens.

In order to counter this grave threat to the very survival of the United States as "one nation, under God," it is necessary to immediately relinquish the Federal stranglehold on public education in the United States and return this control to the proper local governments, local institutions and to the local citizens.

In 1968, you stated:

"Federal aid to education has been necessary, and I have supported it. But, I draw the line on one point. If we're going to have Federal aid to education, it is the responsibility of those at the national level, and particularly the President of the United States, to see that Federal control does not follow. We want federal aid and local control."

Mr. President, in the name of what is right and what is American, I beg of you to follow through on your promises, both implicit and explicit, to the American people that you would remove public education from the death grip of unknowledgeable and unfeeling Federal bureaucracies.

In my judgment, success in this most worthy endeavor would represent an accomplishment the significance of which has never been surpassed by any other President of the United States in the history of this great nation.

I pray that you will give this matter the full consideration which the vast majority of your constituents would insist that it deserves.

Respectfully,

LESTER MADDOX,
Governor.

RESPONSE BY GOVERNOR LESTER MADDOX TO THE HEW ULTIMATUM ISSUED TO THE GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, JULY 10, 1969

It is a sad and tragic time for Georgia and her children and for the parents and children throughout this great land. It is not a question of "segregation" and "integration;" it is a question of education and what must be done to turn back a very real threat to the safety and welfare and liberty of our children, their parents, their teachers and their communities.

Those in our federal government who brought about the issuance of this ultimatum, either knowingly or unwittingly, are carrying out the plans outlined by the Communist Party U.S.A. some forty years ago, and demanded even now by the communist enemies of America. Those in our federal government who know of the communist demands and then support or do not oppose such an ultimatum do not deserve to be in public office in this country, and those who insisted upon this ultimatum who are not knowledgeable of the communist involvement also should be removed from public office.

HEW has demonstrated time and time again that they have no interest whatsoever in the education of this nation's children; they care no more about our children, black or white, than they care about the rubble in the streets. Their one and only aim is to promote social reform, regardless of the costs in human suffering.

I predicted back in the Mid-fifties, and it is a matter of public record, that if the federal government continued to wrest control of education from local citizens and their local officials, we would have a lowering of the level of education in this country, that our children and their teachers would be subjected to attacks, that we would have to put armed policemen in school hallways and classrooms to keep the peace, that property would be wrecked and destroyed and that there would be crime, disorder and violence in our schools such as we had never before witnessed in the United States of America.

Regretfully, each and every one of these predictions have come true, and, now, not satisfied with the chaos, confusion and heartache which they have already caused, HEW officials, with the implied consent of the President, the Congress and the U.S. Supreme Court, are attempting to bring about their destruction of education in America in a wholesale, rather than piecemeal, fashion.

I say that those leaders in the White House, in Congress, in the Supreme Court and in state and local offices throughout this nation who know (and all able and patriotic officeholders should know) of the plans of the communists to wreck and ruin public education through federal control of education and thus overthrow our republic, and yet allow the heel of the federal tyrant to be crushed into the faces of our children, then, in my judgment, they are dishonorable cowards who are not deserving of the great trust placed in them by their constituents.

HEW is allowed to issue an ultimatum to the free citizens of Georgia and other sister states, demanding that we surrender our children and our basic human and American right to freedom of choice, but top officials in our national government do not have the guts, courage and love for country required to issue an ultimatum to the enemies of this country in North Vietnam where even now we have lost some forty thousand young Americans and injured, crippled and blinded more than two hundred thousand of our finest young men fighting a war the way our communist enemies demand that it be fought.

They would not dare to issue an ultimatum cutting off "anti-poverty" and other federal funds that are used to employ, encourage and finance the anarchists, criminals, communists, bums and parasites who wreck, burn and loot our cities, shoot down law enforcement officers and law-abiding merchants and other peaceful citizens, and disrupt and destroy our college campuses throughout much of this country. They just simply are not American enough to cut off these who are following the dictates of those in Russia and Red China who have sworn to destroy and take over the United States of America.

These same officials who say surrender your children (non-white and white) and their education to us, or we will cut off funds needed for books, schoolrooms, teachers and food, do not have the courage and patriotism required to call a halt to federal dollars being used to feed, house, clothe, and finance those who spread communism, both in this country and abroad.

Of all the billions of dollars ever to flow into Washington and those billions that will flow there later, their value is nothing compared to the value of our children, their education, their safety and welfare and the liberty of us all. Regardless of the cowardice of our leaders in Washington and the demands of the communists, our position of placing our children ahead of dollars, votes, politics and communism will be upheld.

I don't have too much of a life left; I have lived almost 54 years of it, so the future of Lester Maddox is not important. But there are children in this State and in this country who have their whole lives ahead of them, and I intend to do all within my power, whatever the cost, to see that they have a chance to live in a free nation. To do less would require that I join with the cowards who would rather be elected than be right.

This threat to one of the most basic freedoms of our people, that of "freedom of choice", must be turned back, and whether I have fifteen more minutes or fifteen more years to live, I will spend every minute of that time in an effort to restore to our people their right to determine educational policies at the local level and, in so doing, help to preserve America as a free republic.

I have no direct authority in this matter; nevertheless, I am recommending that the State Board of Education proceed as it has in the past by providing our people, both black and white, freedom of choice. I, for one, will not stand by and fail to fight with all that is within me those who demand that our children, their teachers and our communities be subjected to the illegal dictates of federal bureaucracies which neither know, nor care, about the educational needs of Georgia's citizens. I consider forced integration and forced segregation to be equally illegal and unconstitutional. The God-given right of freedom of choice for every parent, every teacher and every child must be restored.

We law-abiding citizens and our children are asking for no more than our federal government now extends to our communist enemies, both within and without this nation. Surely our national government will not continue to deny to us what it so freely affords our enemies.

We are asking for no more than Mr. Nixon assured us would be ours when he said, "If we're going to have federal aid to education, it is the responsibility of those at the national level, and particularly the President of the United States, to see that federal control does not follow. We want federal aid and local control."

We are asking for the federal aid and local control as Mr. Nixon said the President of the United States should provide. It is the American way and, without it, America will fall.

Regardless of what course others may take, I have stated my position and will not forsake it, even if I am the first to go to jail or if my life is required of me.

Our schools need every dollar they can get, but if the federal government insists

XUM

upon its position that we decide between millions of federal dollars and our children, their education and their liberty, then my choice will be Georgia's children.

Position on Consolidation and Closing of Schools and Busing of Schoolchildren

(By Lester Maddox, Governor of Georgia)

To: *Officials of State and Local Boards of Education, Educators and Georgia Parents:*

In the sincere belief that many of the ever-increasing problems in local systems of education have resulted from the forced implementation of cruel, unreasonable, unconstitutional and patently illegal guidelines and demands by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and believing, further, that rather than benefitting any particular person, group or community, as these guidelines are alleged to do, that they, instead, have brought, and will continue to bring, irreparable harm to our local systems of education, to our teachers, to our parents, to our communities, and, most regrettably, to the children of this State who have no choice but to accept whatever we provide for them, whether it is good or bad.

I feel that the seriousness of the situation which confronts us demands that I make known my opinions, although I am well aware that my position as Governor does not grant me any special authority in matters dealing with policies of education either at the State or local level.

However, it is my judgment that schools and grade levels, which are not able to enroll what has been determined to be a minimum number of students, should not be closed, nor the students be transferred to other districts or to other cities, if the schools and grade levels can be demonstrated to be growing, or at least not losing students. To close such schools and to transfer these students represents a total disregard for the best interests of the students, their parents, the teachers and the communities.

To bring about the closing of schools in order to comply with the socialistic philosophies of those in H.E.W., in Moscow, and elsewhere, thus sacrificing an entire generation of our children, their education and their communities is, in my opinion, a criminal and unconstitutional act by government and by the educators responsible for such actions.

It has been observed that, through the inaction of education officials, some schools have been allowed to deteriorate to an intolerable degree and, then, the dilapidated condition of these schools has been used by these same officials to justify the closing of the schools.

The closing of a school through such devious means or under the pretext that reduced enrollments demand such action, when, in fact, such reductions have been deliberately caused by the busing of children out of their own school district to attend schools in other districts, represents cruel and unjust treatment of all the children, parents, teachers and other members of the communities thus discriminated against.

In the same light, to bus children of several grades out of their home communities to schools in a foreign community or even in another city, solely for the purpose of promoting social reform, with total disregard for the education and well-being of our children of every race and color, is, also, in my judgment, a criminal and unconstitutional act.

The closing and destroying of schools to promote racial integration disrupts, and sometimes even destroys, communities and places such integration ahead of the education and well-being of both black and white students.

It is criminal and unconstitutional to deny black and white teachers and students "freedom of choice" in determining where they will teach or attend school. Federal and States laws permit citizens "freedom of choice" in training and protecting their pets and animals, and officials at any level of government or education who deny "freedom of choice" to parents in determining how best to train and protect their children are knowingly, or unwittingly, committing a criminal and unconstitutional act against these parents and their children.

It is my position that any actions detrimental to the health, education and welfare of Georgia's children, especially as outlined in this paper, must be halted, even if such action results in the loss of millions of dollars in federal aid. Georgia's children, both black and white, and their education, safety and well-being are worth more than all the federal dollars this State has ever received, or will ever receive.

It is an obvious fact that we need all the money we can get for the education of our children, but if we are required to sacrifice our children as helpless and innocent pawns of the socialists in order to obtain federal dollars, then we should forget the dollars and place our children's education and welfare ahead of all else.

In addition to the harm brought to our children by unnecessary busing of students and the unnecessary closing and consolidation of schools, there are also important economic considerations which are worthy of your attention.

Such actions destroy the industrial potential and economic well-being of a community. Industry will not go into a community where a school has been closed or where unfavorable conditions of education have developed in a community as a result of school consolidation.

It is no less than stealing from the taxpayers when the schools they have bought (or are buying) are closed to please the socialists and communists.

To close such schools without educational justification, when citizens have moved into communities and made investments in their homes, businesses, churches, and other properties, is also stealing from our fellow citizens.

While we are all fully aware that the Governor of Georgia has no authority in matters relating to policy and regulations governing the operation of Georgia schools, I do feel that it is incumbent upon me as an elected official and as a citizen of this State, to call upon the educators at State and local levels of govenment to place our children ahead of the socialists' demands to bus Georgia children and close Georgia schools for the sole purpose of promoting social reform. To ignore this problem, and to continue to disregard the cries for help from Georgia parents and children of all races, would be to forsake our duty and responsibility as citizens, as educators and as public officials.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION AND LIBRARIES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, last Friday on behalf of myself and 68 other Members of Congress, I called for the restoration of the large cuts in Federal aid to education and libraries, recommended by the Nixon administration.

The recommendation came in the form of a letter to the chairman of the Health, Education, and Welfare-Labor Appropriations Subcommittee, Hon. DANIEL FLOOD. In that letter we declared that a failure to restore the Nixon cuts would result in a 66-percent cut in Federal aid to libraries—from $135 million to $46 million—and a 25-percent cut in the budget of the Office of Education—from $4 billion to $3.3 billion—from fiscal 1968 levels.

The administration recommended the elimination of any money for the elementary and secondary school libraries program—title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—which provides money for the purchase of books for children in public and private schools. It calls for the 50-percent cut of funds for grants for public libraries under title I of the Library Services and Construction Act. And it calls for a 33-percent reduction in funds for programs to make education more relevant and individualized through programs of supplemental services under title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Since this question will be before the Democratic caucus on Wednesday, and before the floor next Monday, I am inserting, following my statement, a comparison of fiscal 1968 appropriations for selected education and library programs with the amounts recommended by the Nixon administration for fiscal 1970.

There is something basically hypocritical about an administration which preaches self-help and then grabs away the books and educational programs which would allow those who want to, to better themselves.

If the funds are not restored, the effect of these cuts on the education and library programs of this country will be devastating. The impact on New York City offers a good example. It would mean that hours and staffing at many local libraries would have to be cut. It would end programs of service to low-income communities which provide preschool Headstart type, dropout, and adult reading and education programs to over 1.2 million in the south Bronx and north Manhattan areas. It would prevent the establishment of a third program of educational and library services to low-income communities contemplated for the Lower East Side.

The letter and comparison of education and library appropriations follow:

JULY 18, 1969.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare, Appropriations Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: We are writing to urge you to recommend that the Appropriations Committee restore the huge cuts in Federal aid to education and aid to libraries recommended by the Nixon Administration. At the very least, they should be restored to their fiscal 1968 level. If they are not, the budget of the Office of Education will be 25% below its 1968 level, and library allocations will be down 66% from the same year.

There is something inherently wrong with a sense of national priorities which can allocate over $80 billion to defend a society in which less than $3.3 billion in Federal money is being spent for the education of all its 60 million school children and the many millions more who seek to up-lift themselves.

If these cuts are approved, it will impoverish our school libraries, our college libraries, and our public libraries, and choke off other education programs on all levels.

Our elementary and secondary school libraries, with their open range of books, films, and mini-laboratories, are getting our kids excited about learning more than the old regimented methods ever did. There are still 40,000 schools without their own libraries,

XUM

and teachers in these schools have been pleading for them. Yet the new budget cuts them off without a penny, providing for absolutely no funding for Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The proposal will knock the wind out of the new missionary libraries—little collections of books that have been going to the people where they live, in urban slums and rural wildernesses. These missionary libraries help preschool children from illiterate homes, and migrant workers and people on welfare who would like to get themselves a decent job. It would cut in half the fiscal 1969 allocation for Title I of the Library Services and Construction Act.

And finally, the recommended cuts will seriously hamper programs to make education both more relevant and individualized by cutting by one-third the funds for supplemental services under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

By reducing library allocations from fiscal 1968's level of $135 million to $46 million, the proposed cuts would trim the Federal budget by 1/20 of one percent. Meanwhile, in spite of this achievement, the Federal budget would still be up $8 billion over last year.

The proposal then is as futile in saving money as it is destructive to social progress and human lives. We call upon the committee to squarely face the challenges of America's future and to restore the educational and library budgets.

Sincerely yours,

SIGNATORIES TO LETTER TO CONGRESSMAN FLOOD

Leonard Farbstein, Democrat of New York.
Joseph Addabbo, Democrat of New York.
Glenn M. Anderson, Democrat of California.
Mario Biaggi, Democrat of New York.
Jonathan B. Bingham, Democrat of New York.
John Brademas, Democrat of Indiana.
George E. Brown, Jr., Democrat of Colorado.
Daniel E. Button, Democrat of New York.
Hugh L. Carey, Democrat of New York.
Tim Lee Carter, Republican of Kentucky.
Shirley Chisholm, Democrat of New York.
William Clay, Democrat of Missouri.
Jeffery Cohelan, Democrat of California.
John Conyers, Jr., Democrat of Michigan.
James C. Corman, Democrat of Califorinia.
John Culver, Democrat of Iowa.
Emilio Q. Daddario, Democrat of Connecticut.
Dominick V. Daniels, Democrat of New Jersey.
John D. Dingell, Democrat of Michigan.
Harold D. Donohue, Democrat of Massachusetts.
Don Edwards, Democrat of California.
Joshua Eilberg, Democrat of Pennsylvania.
Michael A. Feighan, Democrat of Ohio.
Hamilton Fish, Jr., Republican of New York.
Donald M. Fraser, Democrat of Minnesota.
Samuel N. Friedel, Democrat of Maryland.
James G. Fulton, Republican of Pennsylvania.
Richard Fulton, Democrat of Tennessee.
Nick Galifianakis, Democrat of North Carolina.
Edward A. Garmatz, Democrat of Maryland.
Joseph M. Gaydos, Democrat of Pennsylvania.
Henry B. Gonzalez, Democrat of Texas.
Lee H. Hamilton, Democrat of Indiana.
Ken Hechler, Democrat of West Virginia.
Henry Helstoski, Democrat of New Jersey.
Frank Horton, Republican of New York.
William L. Hungate, Democrat of Missouri.
Harold T. Johnson, Democrat of California.
Edward I. Koch, Democrat of New York.
Peter N. Kyros, Democrat of Maine.
Allard K. Lowenstein, Democrat of New York.
Spark M. Matsunaga, Democrat of Hawaii.
Martin B. McKneally, Republican of New York.
Lloyd Meeds, Democrat of Washington.
John Melcher, Democrat of Montana.
Abner J. Mikva, Democrat of Illinois.
Joseph G. Minish, Democrat of New Jersey.
Robert H. Mollohan, Democrat of West Virginia.
F. Bradford Morse, Republican of Massachusetts.
John E. Moss, Democrat of California.
William T. Murphy, Democrat of Illinois.
Robert N. C. Nix, Democrat of Pennsylvania.
Arnold Olsen, Democrat of Montana.
Claude Pepper, Democrat of Florida.
Bertram L. Podell, Democrat of New York.
Thomas M. Rees, Democrat of California.
Ogden R. Reid, Republican of New York.
Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Democrat of New Jersey.
Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Democrat of New York.
Edward R. Roybal, Democrat of California.
William F. Ryan, Democrat of New York.
William L. St. Onge, Democrat of Connecticut.
James H. Scheuer, Democrat of New York.
Louis Stokes, Democrat of Ohio.
James Symington, Democrat of Missouri.
Frank Thompson, Jr., Democrat of New Jersey.
John V. Tunney, Democrat of California.
Lester L. Wolff, Democrat of New York.
Gus Yatron, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—HISTORY OF 1970 BUDGET, OFFICE OF EDUCATION

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 1970 HISTORY, I

	Fiscal year 1968 appropriation	Fiscal year 1969		Fiscal year 1970				
		Authorization [1]	Appropriation [2] [3]	Authorization [1]	Estimate to Department	Department estimate to Budget Bureau	Johnson budget	Nixon amendments
Elementary and secondary education	$1,667,213,000	$3,249,059,274	$1,475,993,000	$3,612,054,470	$1,553,855,000	$1,558,327,000	$1,525,876,000	$1,415,393,000
School assistance in federally affected areas	529,602,000	640,112,000	521,253,000	701,593,000	458,502,000	315,167,000	315,167,000	202,167,000
Education professions development	0	352,500,000	95,000,000	445,000,000	146,500,000	116,500,000	105,000,000	95,000,000
Teacher Corps	13,500,000	46,000,000	20,900,000	56,000,000	31,100,000	31,100,000	31,100,000	31,100,000
Higher education	1,155,682,000	1,689,428,706	815,444,000	1,981,700,000	1,204,372,000	1,071,188,000	897,259,000	780,839,000
Vocational education	262,900,000	482,100,000	248,216,000	766,650,000	444,570,000	350,216,000	279,216,000	279,216,000
Libraries and community services	156,500,000	275,300,000	147,144,000	425,100,000	179,675,000	168,375,000	155,625,000	107,709,000
Education for the handicapped	53,400,000	243,125,000	79,795,000	321,500,000	111,500,000	100,000,000	85,850,000	85,850,000
Research and training	90,967,000	35,000,000	87,452,000	56,000,000	161,755,000	113,200,000	90,000,000	115,000,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs	15,700,000	56,050,000	18,165,000	120,000,000	29,500,000	24,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
Research and training (special foreign currency)	0	Indefinite	1,000,000	Indefinite	7,500,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	1,000,000
Salaries and expenses	37,520,000	Indefinite	40,804,512	Indefinite	58,412,000	46,725,000	43,375,000	43,375,000
Civil rights education	10,000,000	Indefinite	10,797,000	Indefinite	16,500,000	13,800,000	13,750,000	20,000,000
College for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts	2,550,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,650,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
Promotion of Vocational Education Act, Feb. 23, 1917	1,161,000	7,161,455	7,161,455	7,161,455	7,161,455	7,161,455	7,161,455	7,161,455
Student loan insurance fund	0	Indefinite	0	Indefinite	10,826,000	10,826,000	10,826,000	10,826,000
Higher education facilities loan fund	0	400,000,000	104,875,000	400,000,000	154,800,000	54,509,000	4,509,000	4,509,000
Total	4,006,418,000	7,479,682,435	3,676,599,967	8,895,358,925	4,579,178,455	3,987,694,455	3,591,314,455	3,221,745,455

[1] Includes indefinite authorizations.
[2] 1969 appropriation adjusted for comparability with 1970 appropriation structure.
[3] Includes proposed supplementals.

Source: Budget and Manpower Division, Apr. 9, 1969.

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 1970, II—SELECTED FIGURES

Appropriation/activity	Fiscal 1969 appropriation	Fiscal year 1969		Fiscal year 1970				
		Authorization	Appropriation	Authorization	Estimate to Department	Department estimate to Budget Bureau	Johnson budget	Nixon amendments
Elementary and secondary education:								
Educationally deprived children (ESEA–I)	$1,186,873,000	$2,184,436,274	$1,123,127,000	$2,359,554,470	$1,171,500,000	$1,226,127,000	$1,226,000,000	$1,226,000,000
Local educational agencies (ESEA–I)		(2,072,075,264)	(1,020,438,980)	(2,238,402,205)	(1,061,414,905)	(1,115,347,932)	(1,115,222,202)	(1,115,222,202)
Handicapped children (ESEA–I)		(29,781,258)	(29,781,258)	(32,128,027)	(32,128,027)	(32,128,027)	(32,128,027)	(32,128,027)
Juvenile delinquents in institutions (ESEA–I)		(12,459,014)	(12,459,014)	(13,518,269)	(13,518,269)	(13,518,269)	(13,518,269)	(13,518,269)
Dependent and neglected children in institutions (ESEA–I)		(1,487,086)	(1,487,086)	(1,564,245)	(1,564,245)	(1,564,245)	(1,564,245)	(1,564,245)
Migratory children (ESEA–I)		(45,556,074)	(45,556,074)	(49,214,654)	(49,214,654)	(49,214,654)	(49,214,654)	(49,214,654)
State administration (ESEA–I)		(23,077,578)	(13,404,588)	(24,727,070)	(13,659,900)	(14,353,873)	(14,352,603)	(14,352,603)
Dropout prevention (ESEA–VIII)	0	30,000,000	5,000,000	30,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	24,000,000	24,000,000
Bilingual education (ESEA–VII)	0	30,000,000	7,500,000	40,000,000	15,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Supplementary educational centers (ESEA–III)	182,810,000	527,875,000	164,876,000	566,500,000	214,000,000	172,000,000	172,876,000	116,393,000
Library resources (ESEA–II)	99,085,000	167,375,000	50,000,000	206,000,000	41,400,000	46,000,000	42,000,000	0

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 1970, II—SELECTED FIGURES—Continued

Appropriation/activity	Fiscal 1969 appropriation	Fiscal year 1969		Fiscal year 1970				
		Authorization	Appropriation	Authorization	Estimate to Department	Department estimate to Budget Bureau	Johnson budget	Nixon amendments
Elementary and secondary education—Continued								
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V–A)	$24,460,000	$25,000,000	$17,000,000	$40,000,000	$19,800,000	$18,000,000	$12,000,000	0
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA–III)	77,883,000	204,373,000	78,740,000	290,000,000	16,155,000	17,950,000	0	0
Grants to States		(96,800,000)	(75,740,000)	(105,600,000)	(13,155,000)	0	0	0
Loans to nonprofit private schools		(13,200,000)	(1,000,000)	(14,400,000)	(1,000,000)	0	0	0
State administration		[1](10,000,000)	(2,000,000)	[1](10,000,000)	(2,000,000)	0	0	0
Grants to local educational agencies		(84,373,000)	0	(160,000,000)	0	(17,950,000)	0	0
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA–V)	29,457,000	80,000,000	29,750,000	80,000,000	35,000,000	32,000,000	29,750,000	$29,750,000
Grants to States		(76,000,000)	(28,262,500)	(76,000,000)	(33,250,000)	(30,400,000)	(28,262,500)	(28,262,500)
Grants for special projects		(4,000,000)	(1,487,500)	(4,000,000)	(1,750,000)	(1,600,000)	(1,487,500)	(1,487,500)
Planning and evaluation (ESEA Amendments of 1967—IV)	0	Indefinite	0	Indefinite	14,000,000	9,250,000	9,250,000	9,250,000
Total	1,668,213,000	3,249,059,274	1,475,993,000	3,612,054,470	1,553,855,000	1,558,327,000	1,525,876,000	1,415,393,000
Libraries and community services:								
Library services	40,073,000	80,000,000	40,709,000	96,000,000	44,000,000	42,000,000	40,709,000	23,209,000
Grants for public libraries (LSCA I)		(55,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(65,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(17,500,000)
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)		(10,000,000)	(2,281,000)	(12,500,000)	(3,500,000)	(2,500,000)	(2,281,000)	(2,281,000)
State institutional library services (LSCA IV–A)		(10,000,000)	(2,094,000)	(12,500,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(2,094,000)	(2,094,000)
Library services to physically handicapped (LSCA IV–B)	26,997,000	(5,000,000)	(1,334,000)	(6,000,000)	(2,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,334,000)	(1,334,000)
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)		60,000,000	9,185,000	70,000,000	15,800,000	15,800,000	9,185,000	0
College library resources (HEA II–A)	24,509,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	75,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	12,500,000
Acquisition and cataloging by Library of Congress (HEA II–C)	5,478,000	6,000,000	5,500,000	11,100,000	5,500,000	8,500,000	7,356,000	4,500,000
Librarian training (HEA II–B)	8,016,000	[2]11,800,000	8,250,000	[2]28,000,000	8,250,000	8,250,000	8,250,000	4,000,000
University community services (HEA–I)	9,755,000	10,000,000	9,500,000	50,000,000	14,000,000	10,000,000	9,500,000	9,500,000
Adult basic education	38,634,000	70,000,000	45,000,000	80,000,000	53,500,000	50,200,000	50,000,000	50,000,000
Grants to States (Adult Education Act)			(36,000,000)		(42,800,000)	(40,160,000)	(40,000,000)	(40,000,000)
Special projects (Adult Education Act)			(7,000,000)		(8,200,000)	(8,040,000)	(8,000,000)	(8,000,000)
Teacher education (Adult Education Act)			(2,000,000)		(2,500,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)
Educational broadcasting facilities—grants for facilities (Title III, Communications Act of 1934)	0	12,500,000	4,000,000	15,000,000	13,625,000	8,625,000	5,625,000	4,000,000
Total	153,462,000	275,300,000	147,144,000	425,100,000	179,675,000	168,375,000	155,625,000	107,709,000

[1] Includes supervision which is funded under title V, ESEA.

[2] Includes library research which is shown under "Research and training."

A NEW WORLD

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, man has ever sought to extend the dimensions of his world, to know more of his universe, perhaps so that he could better know himself.

Man walked to the edges of the world as he knew it, and then risked all to learn what lay across the perilous ocean depths. And having sailed the ocean and found a new world, man knew that there was yet another world beneath the sea.

Yesterday, man voyaged to the very surface of the moon, there to see and touch a barren, forbidding new world. At the same time, man drifted through the ocean depths, exploring the mysteries of a marine world equally as dangerous, equally as unknown, equally as challenging as the moon.

All of this is part of the eternal quest to learn, and perhaps to know the secrets of the universe.

Man has now again, as in the days of David, lived to know the truth of the Psalm:

> Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil.

I praise the courage of the astronauts, and all who venture to the edges of our world and universe, and I pray for their safe return. May their journey mark the beginning of a search not only for a new world, but begin for all mankind a search for peace on earth.

VIETNAM

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it is abundantly clear that President Nixon seeks by every honorable means to bring an end to the war in Vietnam. In his speech of May 14 he set forth specific proposals by which this war could be ended. Since then Saigon has offered the National Liberation Front the opportunity to participate in elections in which all the people of South Vietnam would have a voice. Symbolic of our good faith the President has withdrawn some of our combat troops.

There is no mistaking the willingness of the United States to make every reasonable concession that there may be meaningful negotiations for an honorable settlement of the war.

In these efforts the great majority of the American people support the President. But there should be no misunderstanding on the part of Hanoi that however earnestly the American people desire peace, they do not desire peace at any price. The cause of freedom means more to the American people than life itself. Hanoi must know that there is no intention on the part of this administration, nor is there any desire on the part of the American people, that we summarily surrender. To do so would mean that all our sacrifices have been in vain.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the United States and the Republic of Vietnam have long sought ways and means to arrive at a resolution of the conflict in that tormented country. There have been a number of major initiatives on the tortuous road to peace. One was the partial bombing halt over North Vietnam on March 31, 1968; another was the opening of discussion in Paris between the United States and North Vietnam in May of last year; a third was the total bombing halt of November 1, 1968, and the concurrent agreement on the expansion of the Paris meetings to include the Republic of Vietnam and the National Liberation Front. More recently, we have seen President Thieu's forthcoming offer to engage in private discussions, without preconditions, with the National Liberation Front. Subsequently, there was President Nixon's speech of May 14, in which he advanced serious and sweeping proposals for a settlement, and then his announcement that 25,000 U.S. troops would be replaced, not later than the end of August, by South Vietnamese.

Now, in Saigon on July 11, President Thieu has added to the basis for a reasonable settlement by proposing elections, in which the National Liberation Front would be allowed to participate; the creation of an electoral commission, on which the National Liberation Front would likewise be represented, to work out the timetable and the modalities; and the establishment of an international body to oversee the conduct of those elections. Most important of all, he has committed the Republic of Vietnam to abide by the outcome of those elections, whatever the outcome may be. And he has challenged the Vietnamese Communists to do likewise.

What have the Communists said and done in response? They have rejected President Thieu's offer and called it "deceitful." Why? We cannot know precisely, but we can guess that the Communists are afraid to put their political strength on the line, even when they would have a voice in organizing the electoral contest. What have they offered? Nothing more than the 10 points they tabled last May, in which they called for the establishment of a "provisional coalition government" in which, as their own description of it implies, they would have dominant influence without having to submit to any electoral process, and by means of which they would hope to set aside the present Government of Vietnam.

The time has come for the Vietnamese Communists to live up to the high-sounding phrases they have been uttering for years and years. If they really wish to see the people of South Vietnam determine their future free from outside interference, let the southerners among them sit down with representatives of the Republic of Vietnam at Paris and work out the details of the elections President Thieu has proposed. Let them abandon the tactics of violence, of terrorism, that have cost the lives of so many of their countrymen and engage instead in peaceful, electoral competition. Let their northern colleagues withdraw their troops from South Vietnam, as the United States has already begun to do, so that those elections can be carried out in a proper atmosphere.

Meanwhile, let us recognize the political courage of President Thieu, his government, and his people. Let us appreciate his statesmanlike and forthcoming proposals, which have demonstrated the good will of the Republic of Vietnam and which call for serious and considered response—not contemptuous dismissal—by the other side.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on Vietnam.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

AS A SEEKER OF PEACE FOR ALL MANKIND

(Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the message which the astronauts took with them to the moon is a simple and powerful one: "We came in peace for all mankind." So the message of the President's forthcoming trip is also simple and powerful. He comes as a seeker of peace for all mankind.

Every one of the Asian capitals which President Nixon is visiting this month was on his itinerary 2 years ago when he traveled as a private citizen. Some of them he has visited as many as four or five times. He also visited Rumania when he was out of office. He returns, therefore, as an old friend and well-informed student of all the countries he is visiting. His knowledge of these nations and his personal relationship with their leaders is an important personal resource for him and a tremendous national resource for all of us.

While the President is visiting the Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand, India, and Pakistan, the Secretary of State will also go to the Philippines and Indonesia—and will then go on his own to Japan, Korea, the Republic of China, Australia, and New Zealand. So between them, our two leaders will visit 10 different Asian governments—seeking their views on important problems and emphasizing the commitment of this country to peace and progress for all people in the world.

Certainly Asia is a critical part of the world as far as this Nation is concerned. Most of our economic aid, our technical assistance, and our military aid programs have been directed there. Here American men have fought and died in three wars in the last three decades. Here live over one-half of the world's people. Here is where the potential for Communist growth seems to present the greatest danger.

In October of 1967, President Nixon wrote an article in Foreign Affairs magazine entitled "Asia After Vietnam." It was a thoughtful analysis of the need for Asians to find Asian solutions to their economic and political problems, to achieve their goals and defend their peoples through regional cooperation of a sort which would not require the direct kind of American involvement we have seen in the past. When he wrote this article, President Nixon was a private citizen, one who had traveled widely and thought deeply, but one who still could deal only in words and in suggestions.

Now as President of the United States, he is in a position to act on those thoughtful suggestions and to deal in deeds as well as in words. This trip to Asia represents one way in which he can advance that process.

I know he has the good wishes and the support of all Americans as he embarks on this important trip.

REFINING AMERICA—THROUGH THE FOREIGN TAX CREDIT—BY OUR OIL INDUSTRY

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, much publicity has been given to foreign and domestic depletion allowances enjoyed by the oil industry at expense of America's taxpaying public. For a certainty, they are a gaping pair of tax loopholes. Yet there is another method of tax evasion utilized by this industry which has escaped glaring public scrutiny. I refer to the foreign tax credit, by which American oil companies receive a dollar-per-dollar domestic tax writeoff and exemption for every dollar they pay in taxes or royalties abroad.

I submit that such tax credits should forthwith be terminated, on the grounds that they are enabling American oil companies to evade paying Federal tax on upward of $2 billion annually in this manner. No better tax reform could be initiated. I have just introduced a bill which would have the effect desired in this case.

It is understood among those conversant with the oil industry that a minimum of 80 to 85 percent of funds they list with the SEC as foreign and some States' taxes are paid out abroad. Some of these moneys are utilized in highly questionable ways, which I shall delve into at length in the future. I have communicated my information and results of my research to the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of this body. The text of the letter and results of the research are as follows:

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Knowing how intensively you and your committee are working on tax reform, I wish to bring to your attention another aspect of a massive escape of payment of taxes on the part of an entire industry. I refer, of course, to our oil industry. In this case I have specific reference to the foreign tax credit.

In 1968, as verified by the SEC, our oil industry paid $1,981,126,000 in foreign and some state taxes. It is conservatively estimated that 80% of this sum is paid out as taxes to foreign governments. Thirteen of the largest corporations accounted for $1,817,604,000 of this amount. Under existing law, this sum is treated as a foreign tax credit, and is immune from Federal tax laws. The oil companies receive a dollar-per-dollar tax credit for such foreign taxes.

It is my intention to introduce a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that credit for foreign taxes shall not be allowed in the case of taxes paid in any form to a foreign country in connection with production of oil and gas. I sincerely hope, Mr. Chairman, that you will see fit to consider this as an integral element of tax reform regarding the oil industry.

I see no reason why American oil and gas companies producing oil abroad should receive a dollar-per-dollar credit against their Federal income taxes, which is allowed them now. This is simply subsidization by our taxpayers of foreign investment, the tax benefits from which accrue to foreign countries.

My measure simply removes oil and gas companies from eligibility to receive foreign tax credits. While the present code does not specifically give them this tax privilege, they are clearly eligible.

I see no reason why American oil companies should be able to take a very profitable barrel of oil out of the ground overseas, and receive a tax write-off for that amount at expense of our taxpaying public. This is tax evasion with a vengeance. What the oil companies decide to pay slaveowning sheiks of the Middle East in royalties is their business. I do not think, however, we should continue to be forced to pay for it.

Mr. Chairman, the list of oil industry privileges seems as endless as it is intolerable. We must add this loophole to their domestic and foreign depletion allowances, which are the highest for any extractive industry. I pray that we shall see an end to their outrages upon the public. I hope that in your eminently fair consideration of tax reform you will give serious consideration to eliminating this particular tax privilege. Thank you.

Sincerely,

BERTRAM L. PODELL,
Member of Congress.

XUM

TAXES PAID BY A SELECTED GROUP OF THE NATION'S LARGEST REFINING COMPANIES, 1968

[In thousands of dollars]

	Net income before tax	Federal tax	Percent	Foreign, some states' tax	Percent	Profit after tax
Standard Oil (New Jersey)	2,303,587	223,999	9.7	802,907	34.8	1,276,681
Gulf	977,321	8,005	.81	342,997	35.1	626,319
Texaco	1,019,930	23,800	2.4	160,600	15.8	835,530
Mobil	673,739	22,000	3.3	223,500	33.2	428,239
Standard Oil (California)	569,431	16,700	2.9	100,900	17.7	451,813
Standard Oil (Indiana)	395,064	74,678	18.8	10,892	2.7	309,494
Shell	387,767	63,378	16.3	12,298	3.2	312,091
Cities Service	138,613	12,683	9.2	4,594	3.3	121,336
Union	164,232	5,955	3.6	7,045	4.3	151,232
Sun	227,790	44,290	19.4	19,070	8.4	164,430
Atlantic-Richfield	240,272	2,999	1.2	37,713	15.7	199,560
Marathon	155,335	4,350	2.8	67,659	43.6	83,326
Sinclair	101,265	−2,747	.0	27,429	27.0	76,583
Conoco	290,357	9,721	3.3	130,594	45.0	150,042
Phillips	184,560	32,584	17.7	15,174	8.2	136,802
Standard Oil (Ohio)	113,571	38,100	33.5	5,394	4.7	70,077
Getty	112,798	6,712	6.0	7,836	6.9	98,250
Ashland	79,115	26,251	33.2	4,524	5.7	48,340
Total	8,134,717	613,458	7.7	1,980,586	24.3	5,540,163

TVA DOING OUTSTANDING JOB

(Mr. BEVILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, watermilfoil has become a serious problem in some of the main stream reservoirs of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Guntersville Lake, in my congressional district, has been severely hit by the rampant growth of this watermilfoil.

The people of Guntersville and the surrounding area realize the importance of Lake Guntersville to their economy. The Guntersville Chamber of Commerce has sent to me a resolution of appreciation for the outstanding job done by the Tennessee Valley Authority toward controlling this pest weed.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the resolution in the RECORD at this time:

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GUNTERSVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN APPRECIATION OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Whereas, the people of Guntersville recognize the importance of Lake Guntersville as it pertains to our economy; and,

Whereas, the people of Guntersville abhorred the hazards to navigation in the surrounding waters imposed by the milfoil infestation; and,

Whereas, the destruction of the most beautiful recreational area in the south was assured by said infestation; and,

Whereas, the safety of the visitors to this area was being jeopardized;

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved by the people of Guntersville, Alabama on this 15th day of July, 1969, that our everlasting appreciation to the Tennessee Valley Authority for the outstanding job done towards controlling the infestation described herein, be conveyed, and that this resolution be made a public record by introducing it into the congressional records in our nation's capitol.

JOHN WILLIS,
President.
RICHARD FLEMING,
Executive Secretary.

HIGHWAY TO BE NAMED FOR CONGRESSMAN NICHOLS

(Mr. BEVILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and distinguished colleague, the Honorable BILL NICHOLS, is being honored for his outstanding work in the Alabama State Legislature by having a highway named for him. Congressman NICHOLS established a lasting record of achievement in Alabama by his diligent work for better highways to serve the people of our State, and is certainly deserving of this recognition.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD at this time an editorial which appeared recently in the Talladega Daily Home regarding the Bill Nichols Scenic Highway.

The editorial follows:

HIGHWAY TO BE NAMED FOR CONGRESSMAN NICHOLS

SYLACAUGA.—Congressman Bill Nichols may not consider himself scenic but he has a highway named after him.

Legislation was officially completed in Montgomery Wednesday that would name Alabama 143, between Sylacauga and Millerville the "Bill Nichols Scenic Highway."

Representative Lyndol Bolton said members of the Legislative Delegation felt Nichols deserved to have the highway named for him.

"He worked long and hard for the highway. We felt it only appropriate that the highway should carry his name," Bolton said.

Eventually the southern tip of the long talked about, Skyline Drive, will connect with the highway.

PROPOSED DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last week we received the administration's proposed District of Columbia Court Reorganization Act of 1969. I support the general purpose and thrust of this legislation and have cosponsored the measures in the House. Because certain Members may have received false impressions of the legislation as a result of the prematurely public statements of the District of Columbia government on some of its provisions, I request permission to rebut those statements here.

According to newspaper accounts, on Wednesday, July 9, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, generally known as the Mayor, sent to the Bureau of the Budget his comments on the District of Columbia Court Reorganization Act. The Commissioner's comments take the form of opposition to certain parts of the act on the ground that they are contradictory to, or in derogation of, the principle of home rule. The Commissioner wants to be able to appoint the judges, to run the prosecutor's office, to tamper with the court system budget, and to run the probation and social-work services of the courts. If anyone else does these things, he says, it is not home rule.

I would say that the Commissioner's failure to understand the true thrust of the act, and his misinterpretation of some of its provisions, are the best evidence I have seen that the District's infant government must learn to walk before it tries to run. The Commissioner apparently does not understand that principle.

Examine, for a moment, the matter of the court system's budget. Budget matters are generally dull and beyond most men's comprehension, but this particular matter is rather simple. The Commissioner opposes the provision in the act which would allow the District government to comment upon the court system's budget when it is submitted to the Congress, but not to alter it. He says that is contrary to home rule principles. He does not notice that the act places the same limitations on the Bureau of the Budget with respect to the District of Columbia court system budget estimates and requests.

In effect, the act would put the District's courts on the same footing as the Federal courts for budget purposes, by freeing their requests to the legislative branch from any tampering by the executive branch, local or Federal. The basic principle here is the independence of the judiciary in our system of government. If the Commissioner thinks that principle is contrary to home rule, he is welcome to his opinion, but I do not think it is a very well informed one.

Let us examine the other points made by the Commissioner in his letter.

He opposes the act's provision for appointment of District of Columbia court judges by the President. He says this should be done by himself, or by the President only on his recommendation. I know of no city in the country where the mayor appoints judges of a court of general, unlimited jurisdiction. I know of no State where the Governor makes such appointments only on the recommendation of a mayor. I certainly know of no State where the power to appoint judges is exercised by an appointed official, such as the Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

Next, he objects to the fact that the act would continue the present system of prosecuting offenses in the District of Columbia, in which the U.S. attorney bears the brunt of the load, and the Corporation Counsel prosecutes minor statutory offenses and ordinance violations and acts as prosecutor in the juvenile court. He says this is contrary to home rule. Well, in most major cities of the country, the city's corporation counsel has the same, or even less, prosecutorial authority. and major criminal cases are prosecuted by someone else. Usually it is a district attorney, a State's attorney or commonwealth attorney, or the State attorney general. The head prosecutor is either appointed by the Governor of the State or elected. He is separate from the local, municipal administration, because one of his functions is watching that local administration for corruption. You do not want the cat in bed with the mice. That is the basic principle. I think that, like judicial independence, it is a more important principle than home rule.

Parenthetically, I think that perhaps, in the not too distant future, this city may have an independent district attorney. If so, he should be appointed by the President.

Such a district attorney would take over the prosecutorial duties of the Corporation Counsel, as well as the local law-enforcement functions of the U.S. attorney. With the new court system put forward by this Court Reorganization Act, the assistant U.S. attorney in charge of the U.S. attorney's office will become a very important figure, and that division of the office may become so large, and so separate from the rest of the office, that it will make more sense to make it a completely separate office. That may be the case. I am not predicting, just speculating. If it happens, perhaps we ought to have a separate district attorney's office for the city of Washington. But the first step in that direction should be to beef up the U.S. attorney's operation in the superior court, not to give greater authority to the Corporation Counsel.

Indeed, I question whether the act goes far enough in that regard. Perhaps the Corporation Counsel ought to get out of the law-enforcement business entirely, and serve, like other city corporation counsels, solely as the civil attorney for the city. It certainly does not make great sense for one prosecutor to handle a case before the juvenile court, and for another to take it over if the juvenile court waives jurisdiction, as it is today. I understand the draftsmen of this act considered doing something like putting all prosecutions except violations of municipal ordinances in the hands of the U.S. attorney, but felt that it was inconsistent with home rule. As a single, immediate step, it might be inconsistent, but as a step toward the creation of a district attorney it would not. It would be taking one step sideways to take two steps forward.

But that is an issue for another day. I mention it only to refute the Commissioner's suggestion that the Corporation Counsel should prosecute all local offenses. The basic failing of that suggestion is that the Corporation Counsel is not ready to do it. He does not have any experienced assistants who are qualified to handle serious criminal cases. It is not that he does not have many good lawyers on his staff, but few of them are experienced in the trial of criminal cases, and those few are, generally, not out of the top drawer. He does not attract the same caliber of young lawyers as the U.S. attorney.

The Commissioner also questions a provision of this act which would make the witness fees in the new District of Columbia Superior Court the same as those across the street in the U.S. district court. This also, he says, is contrary to home rule. It may be contrary to home rule, but it strikes me as nothing more than simple justice. Both sets of courts are created by Congress, and Congress should set the same fees for witnesses and jurors on both sides of the street. If anyone is to have the power to change those fees, other than the Congress, it should be the courts themselves, not the City Council as he suggests.

Again, this relates to the independence of the judiciary, which the Commissioner does not seem to understand. In the same vein is his criticism of the act's provision for expanding the local court system's social service operations and unifying those activities under a director of social services. The Commissioner feels that this office will duplicate the functions of the Department of Welfare, and that its operations should be placed under his office, with the power to appoint the director in his hands, rather than those of the courts and their executive officer. One may speculate whether the Commissioner's real objection is not to duplication of functions, but to the performance of those functions by persons not directly responsible to him.

In particular, he appears to have missed that provision of the act which requires the superior court's director of social services, "whenever possible" to "coordinate with and utilize the services of appropriate public and private agencies within the District of Columbia." The act explicitly tells the director to avoid the very duplication of effort which the Commissioner says it will create. One almost has to wonder whether he has read the act he is criticizing.

There are other comments in the Commissioner's letter which do not bear repetition here. I think it is fair to say that they are all in the same vein. This, or that, is inconsistent with home rule.

The Commissioner may be an able man in many respects, but in this instance he cannot see the forest for the trees. This act, in its broad general outlines, overall structure, purpose and thrust, increases the power of the District in its judicial branch to handle its own affairs.

I expect that many opponents and proponents of home rule will support this act. You need not be for or against home rule to support improving the administration of justice in the District of Columbia, which is the major purpose of this act. It accomplishes that purpose by upgrading and consolidating the local courts, and by giving to the local courts, for the first time, full jurisdiction over the trial of local matters. Not to do this would be enormously inconsistent with home rule, although this can, and should, be done without home rule, or without regard to whether we are to have home rule, or how much we are to have.

Commissioner Washington wants us to decide that question first, and to make the local courts of the District subservient to the executive and legislative branches of the local government. The Commissioner is putting the cart before the horse. We need not now resolve the thorny problem of how to balance the local and Federal interest in the Nation's Capital. But we should, in both interests, in everyone's interest, pass this legislation for a unified, simplified court system for the Nation's Capital.

The most surprising thing of all, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that this man criticized publicly a proposal of the President of the United States even before it had been formally presented to the Congress. He was reappointed by the President to ostensibly cooperate with the new administration in carrying out its proposals and programs for the Nation's Capital. By accepting the reappointment he agreed to be a member of the President's team. I believe it is almost without precedent for anyone appointed by the President of the United States to publicly criticize his proposals and remain on the job. Yet this practice in recent days by appointees to the District government has become the rule rather than the exception. His appointees to the City Council opposed his very first anticrime proposal, that of increasing the size of the Metropolitan Police Department.

This situation has become extremely serious, Mr. Speaker. Unless the President of the United States can get more loyalty and support from those he appoints to the District government in the future, the record of this administration insofar as the District is concerned can only be a miserable failure.

VIETNAM

(Mr. BUSH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, we all know the importance of U.S. public opinion in the calculations of Hanoi.

There can be no doubt of the desire of the American people for peace; the record of our Government's steps to deescalate the war, make every reasonable concession, and get on to real negotiations for peace is clear.

Communist political instructions often refer to U.S. public opinion as the "battlefront right in the United States" and they make no bones about their hopes for achieving a breakthrough on that front and thus increasing pressures on the administration. This creates a difficult predicament for honest critics of the war, because they know that their words might be used by Hanoi propaganda and thus could complicate the negotiating position of our own government.

What Hanoi must understand is that there are limits beyond which responsible critics in this country will not go.

When they see the administration put forward a comprehensive and generous series of proposals, as President Nixon did on May 14; when they see President Thieu offering to have secret talks with the NLF, as he did on March 25, and now offering the NLF a chance to compete as a group in elections and have a voice in deciding electoral procedures, as he did on July 11; and when we see the first combat troops actually coming home as a part of a general replacement process—then we ask what is the other side doing for peace?

When we see Hanoi and the NLF in

XUM

Paris constantly saying "No" to our proposals while they plan new attacks on the battlefields of South Vietnam, then we ask why does Hanoi still count on American public opinion to be critical of the Administration rather than critical of Hanoi?

It is time Hanoi understood that this country, in its great majority, supports the policies of the President and is losing patience with the short-sightedness of Hanoi.

Let all know that the United States earnestly desires peace, and that we will take every reasonable step to achieve it. But all should also know that this does not mean faintheartedness of fundamentals of freedom. In the performance of duty and in the cause of freedom, Americans are not driven from the field by fatigue or frustration, or demands to sacrifice.

This is the implicit message which members of this body and the public are now sending Hanoi, and it is a message which should be taken very seriously by the leaders of the Politbureau of North Vietnam.

It takes two to negotiate. We in this country are ready. Hanoi should now show it is also ready.

APOLLO AND WORLD PEACE

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the events of yesterday defy human imagination. To walk on the surface of the moon is an accomplishment which is truly "one giant leap for mankind."

Space exploration is a necessary element of national leadership which can become a powerful force for international friendship and cooperation. History teaches that those nations which selfishly turn their energies inward will become second-rate powers. Let us never forget this fact as we talk about the need for reassessing national priorities. Space is the new frontier which challenges the United States to seize and extend its technological leadership.

It is very true that space activities can act as a substitute for aggression, and observation satellites can also become major tools in arms control, disarmament, and inspection to insure that international agreements are honored.

When President John F. Kennedy came before this Congress on May 25, 1961, and boldly proclaimed the national goal of a manned lunar landing within this decade, his address was made against the backdrop of the serious competitive challenge posed by the Soviet Union. The orbiting of sputnik in 1957, followed by the manned orbital flight of Yuri Gagarin in 1961, spurred the United States to frenzied activity in what we all thought of as "the space race." It might now be possible to turn this competition into the kind of cooperative space endeavor which would be an important building block in the structure of international understanding.

THREATS AND INTIMIDATION BY UMW LEADERSHIP

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the threats, intimidation, and violations of both law and simple decency and fairness by the top leadership of the United Mine Workers of America continues and is compounded daily. On July 15, 1969, at page 19636 there was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a letter to Secretary of Labor Shultz, dated July 9, 1969, detailing a number of apparent violations of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act—The Landrum-Griffin Act—perpetrated by the top leadership of the United Mine Workers of America.

Now there are even more acts by the same UMW leadership which apparently fears so much for its future that the top officers are afraid to allow the rank and file members of the United Mine Workers of America to vote as they please. These threats, these beatings, this intimidation, these goon-squad tactics to break up meetings, these uses of union dues to buy an election, these frenzied attempts to buy support for Mr. Boyle and his henchmen do not merely march up to the fringes of law violations—they seem to constitute direct thwarting of the law.

On two occasions, Mr. Boyle has already been found on the judicial record to be in violation of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act with respect to Mr. Boyle's attempts to block legitimate campaign efforts of Mr. Joseph A. Yablonski, candidate for president of the United Mine Workers of America.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to additional evidences of what appear to be law violators, as detailed in a letter dated July 18, 1969, dispatched to Secretary of Labor Shultz by Joseph L. Rauh, Jr.:

RAUH AND SILARD,
Washington, D.C., July 18, 1969.

Hon. GEORGE P. SHULTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On July 9, 1969, Joseph A. Yablonski, candidate for President of the United Mine Workers of America, and H. Elmer Brown, candidate for Vice President thereof, requested an immediate and continuing investigation of the illegal activities of the incumbent UMWA officers who are seeking to prevent the nomination of Mr. Yablonski and Mr. Brown for those offices. I am writing on behalf of Mr. Yablonski and Mr. Brown once again to set forth additional pieces of information supporting our earlier request for an investigation. It can truthfully be said that there has never been the equal in massive violations of federal law to what the officers of the UMWA are now doing.

Initially, it should be pointed out that a copy of the July 9th letter was served the same day upon W. A. ("Tony") Boyle, President, George J. Titler, Vice President, and John Owens, Secretary-Treasurer, with a request that the union or its governing Board or officers bring suit to remedy the breaches of trust by the incumbent UMWA officers and those working with them as enumerated in the July 9th letter to you. That request was, in effect, rejected in a letter from Mr. Edward Carey, General Counsel of the UMWA, dated July 14, 1969, a copy of which was sent to you. But the significant thing about Mr. Carey's letter was not his rejection of our request; rather it was his calculated failure to deny practically every assertion in our letter to you, a denial which would have carried the penalties of 18 U.S.C. 1001.

Incidentally, in the two instances where Mr. Carey did make statements of fact, they are without foundation. The suggestion in Mr. Carey's letter that Mr. Yablonski was somehow involved in the change of the UMWA Constitution in 1964 to require 50 nominations from local unions rather than 5 has no support in any record of the UMWA and is incorrect. The statement of fact—Mr. Carey's denial that "an attorney for the UMWA deliberately sought to sabotage the mailing"—fails in the face of the actual facts. After Judge Corcoran issued his preliminary injunction on June 20, 1969, directing the UMWA to send out Mr. Yablonski's campaign literature, lawyers for the UMWA and Mr. Yablonski worked out an arrangement under which a non-profit bulk mailing permit was obtained by the UMWA from the Silver Spring, Maryland, Post Office (Permit No. 542). It was understood that this permit was acquired for the purpose of distributing Mr. Yablonski's campaign literature pursuant to Judge Corcoran's Order. While Mr. Yablonski's literature, under the label "Miners for Yablonski," was on the printing press and after the postal authorities had approved use of said permit by Mr. Yablonski, Mr. Willard Owens, a lawyer for the UMWA and son of Secretary-Treasurer John Owens, called Mr. Harold E. McKnight, the relevant officials of the Post Office Department, and informed him that an organization of private individuals, i.e., "Miners for Yablonski," was attempting to use the UMWA non-profit bulk mailing permit. Mr. Owens further told Mr. McKnight that "Miners for Yablonski" was not the same entity as UMWA and that therefore he thought they should not be allowed to use the UMWA bulk mailing permit. He did not mention the fact that the UMWA were under federal injunction to mail out Mr. Yablonski's literature under their aegis nor that UMWA had obtained the non-profit bulk mailing permit for the express purpose of this very mailing. Only after this deception was uncovered by Mr. Yablonski's counsel was the matter rectified at the Post Office and the mailing consummated.

Mr. Carey's calculated failure to deal with the factual allegations in our letter of July 9, 1969, adds urgency to our request to the Labor Department for immediate action.

We desire, in addition, to submit certain further information corroborating the UMWA's course of illegal conduct, which has come to our attention since delivery of the earlier letter to you:

1. Referring to paragraph 2 of our July 9th letter, we can now report that Judge Corcoran again ruled for Mr. Yablonski on July 15, 1969 (Civil Action No. 1799–69), holding Mr. Boyle's removal of Mr. Yablonski from his office as acting director of Labor's Non-Partisan League to be an illegal reprisal against him for exercising rights under LMRDA and directing Mr. Yablonski's reinstatement. In other words, Mr. Boyle has now been found, on the judicial record, twice to have been in flagrant violation of LMRDA.

2. With respect to paragraph 3 of our earlier letter, Mr. Yablonski has not yet fully recovered from the blow knocking him unconscious at the campaign meeting on June 28, 1969. We understand that the Department of Justice is still investigating this violence against Mr. Yablonski.

3. With respect to paragraph 5 of the earlier letter, those working for Mr. Boyle have continued to approach and to direct supporters of Mr. Yablonski to switch to Mr. Boyle and have threatened later reprisal if they do not do so. Among those so approached, in addition to others already men-

tioned, are Charles Shawkey, a local union president at Boomer, West Virginia.

4. With respect to paragraphs 8 and 9 dealings with the discriminatory dechartering of local unions to avoid Yablonski-Brown nominations, that process continues unabated, UMWA Local 7488, Oakwood, Virginia, and its President, Tom Owens, strongly support Mr. Yablonski. In order to avoid a nomination of Mr. Yablonski, a paid official of trusted UMWA District 28 tried to force Local 7488 into a merger with a larger nearby local and, failing in that, literally snatched the official seal of the local and escaped therewith with local union members in hot pursuit. Although the official seal was recovered on a writ of replevin, the threat of discriminatory dechartering still looms.

5. With respect to paragraphs 10, 11, and 12 of the earlier letter, the pattern of surprise meetings and surprise nominations continues. On July 5, 1969, without any prior notice and even before the nominating period had officially commenced, the same violation of law occurred as in UMWA Local 7113. This time it was Local Union 9603, Ragland, West Virginia. Only approximately a dozen of the more than two hundred local union members were present at this July 5th meeting, no notice of nominations having been given. One "Rusty' Runyon, a recently appointed paid employee of trusteed UMWA District 17, succesfully sprung a surprise nomination for the Boyle team upon the local union meeting.

6. Next, on July 14, 1969, the same type of surprise nomination was perpetrated upon UMWA Local 5582, Frackville, Pennsylvania. There, again, and as in all these instances in violation of the UMWA Constitution, no notices were posted or appeared in local newspapers informing the local union members that nominations were to be held at this regularly scheduled local union meeting.

7. Next, on July 16, 1969, about thirty members attended the regularly scheduled meeting of UMWA Local Union 1686, St. Clair, Pennsylvania. Again no notice had been given that nominations would be conducted at this meeting; and again a surprise nomination for the Boyle ticket was sprung, this time by one William Martin, brother-in-law of John Reddington, a UMWA trusteed District 25 Executive Board member, who was also present. Despite the surprise, the opposition to Mr. Boyle became obvious. An attempt to close nominations immediately after the nomination of the Boyle ticket failed. Thereupon, James DeAngelo nominated Mr. Yablonski. In view of the threatening presence of paid District officials working for Mr. Boyle, Mr. DeAngelo demanded that the vote on nominations be by secret ballot. Reddington, in effect taking over the meeting, prevented the secret ballot; instead a voice vote was announced in favor of the Boyle ticket though no count whatever was taken.

8. An equal, if not more flagrant, violation of LMRDA occurred the same day at the regularly scheduled meeting of UMWA Local Union 807, Shenandoah, Pennsylvania. The president of that local, one John Karlavage, is also a paid official of UMWA trusteed District 25 and was the leading instigator of the disruption of the campaign rally in Shenandoah referred to in paragraph 4 of our earlier letter. No notice was given that this regularly scheduled meeting would consider nominations. Compounding the absence of notice of nominations, Mr. Karlavage got a few people together in the meeting room and nominated the Boyle team even before the time of the regularly scheduled meeting and after a number of members, who had come in to pay their dues, left before the meeting opened because they were not informed that nominations would occur.

9. Mr. Karlavage was equally active the day before, i.e., on July 15, 1969, at UMWA Local 1516, Shenandoah, Pennsylvania. There, the only notices posted were at remote job sites long since abandoned by the mining industry. Approximately twelve members attended this meeting, which nevertheless unanimously nominated Mr. Yablonski. However, Mr. Karlavage, the paid official of UMWA District 25 referred to in the previous paragraph; and other District officials, lingered behind after the meeting of Local 1516 and attempted to prevent the nomination going forward in due course.

10. With respect to paragraph 13 of the earlier letter, UMWA funds are continuing to be expended to prevent Yablonski-Brown nominations at an ever-accelerating pace. On July 13, 1969, incumbent UMWA officers Boyle, Titler, and Owens and their associates staged a "health and safety" rally at Welch, West Virginia. This rally, run at UMWA expense, was not the usual "health and safety" meeting; It was an out-and-out Boyle team election rally. Chartered buses, providing free transportation to the meeting, displayed large signs and placards (some professionally made) urging support of the Boyle ticket. Justin McCarthy, editor of the United Mine Workers Journal, utilized his office to arrange local radio and other advertising for the rally. Campaign literature urging reelection of the Boyle team was widely distributed at the rally. Eight of the rally's eleven organizers were appointed officials of trusteed UMWA District 29.

11. With respect to paragraph 14 of the earlier letter, the anonymous and libelous sheet about Mr. Yablonski, prepared by Mr. McCarthy, has continued to be circulated by those working with Mr. Boyle. It is highly significant that Mr. McCarthy has not, under oath or otherwise, denied the charge made to the Secretary of Labor in the earlier letter that, in direct breach of trust, he wrote this anonymous and libelous sheet.

12. With respect to paragraph 15 of the earlier letter, the United Mine Workers Journal of July 15, 1969, is a most obvious campaign document for Mr. Boyle. His name appears favorably 34 times in 24 pages; statements such as these stand out:

"It would not be too much of an exaggeration to say that Lewis and his union saved the coal industry as we know it today. Only the solid rock of the joint wage agreement kept the price structure from being totally wrecked by cut-throat operators and for years on end it was the only stable element in a strife-torn business . . .

"In his last days, men challenging the present leadership of the union called upon him to 'save' it. There is no evidence that he ever deigned to acknowledge such a demand from crusader Ralph Nader, which will come as no surprise to those who know that Lewis groomed *Tony Boyle* as his eventual successor and heir" (p. 13).

Also:

"Ghizzoni [International Executive Board Member] warned his audience to beware of certain 'crackpots' who would destroy the effective leadership of the United Mine Workers of America. He drew a warm round of applause when he said the miners' slogan was "Stick and Stay With Tony Boyle all the way.'"

Still no single mention of Mr. Yablonski.

13. With respect to paragraph 16 of the earlier letter, it is understood that the FBI has already received statements from several UMWA employees who were forced to assist in the conversion of union funds into Mr. Boyle's election campaign chest.

14. With respect to paragraph 17 of the earlier letter, the Boyle team continues to utilize the list of officers of local unions and continues to refuse to turn over the same list to Mr. Yablonski for like utilization.

15. But even all this is not the end. Local union presidents of pensioner locals in Southern Illinois are being offered $150–$200 each to coerce their locals into nominating incumbent Boyle and to block nominations for the Yablonski-Brown ticket.

16. The direct purchase of votes is also a Boyle team tactic. One James Manfredi, working for Mr. Boyle, offered to pay $5 a vote for Boyle at a nomination election of Local Union, 688 Fredericktown, Pennsylvania.

17. Paid officials of trusteed UMWA District 17 were present at campaign rallies of Mr. Yablonski and Mr. Brown held in Matewan and Beckley, West Virginia, on Sunday, July 13, 1969. These officials, armed with tape recorders, compiled lists of Yablonski-Brown supporters attending the rallies, informed certain of them that the fact of their presence at the Yablonski-Brown rally was known and would be taken into consideration by District and International officials, and otherwise made clear that reprisal and intimidation would be meted out to persons attending Yablonski-Brown functions.

The case made against the incumbent officers of the United Mine Workers is so overwhelming that it seems hard to believe that there can be any question about the Department of Labor making the investigation for which Mr. Yablonski and Mr. Brown are asking. Now, nine days into the 30-day nominating period, we repeat that request even more urgently than in our earlier letter.

We make one additional request about which there also should be no question. We ask you to send our letter of July 9, 1969, and this letter to Mr Boyle and request an official response to the charges made therein. The UMWA officials have been very careful not to deny to the Department of Labor the charges made in our original letter; rather Mr. Carey has merely sent you a copy of his letter to the undersigned which avoids answering the charges. We do not believe the Boyle team will submit a direct answer to the Department either under oath or under the penalties of 18 U.S.C. 1001.

The Department has two ways to test out our allegations—by its own investigation and by its demand for a responsive statement from the UMWA. To make the LMRDA a reality rather than a formality we ask the Secretary to do both—now.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH L. RAUH, Jr.,

Attorney for: Joseph A. Yablonski, H. Elmer Brown.

ONE GIANT LEAP FOR MANKIND

(Mr. BOLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the words that Astronaut Neil Armstrong spoke as he set foot on the moon last night will be remembered as long as man survives:

> One small step for man; one giant leap for mankind.

Yesterday's moon landing ranks as the greatest scientific achievement—and the greatest adventure—in the history of mankind. Just after 4:14 p.m., yesterday, the unwieldy-looking lunar excursion module fluttered down to the surface of the moon, realizing a goal that took a near decade of work and all the technological resources of this Nation. The touchdown, an event that would have been considered the most bizarre science fiction in my youth, stirred literally hundreds of millions of people in just about every part of the globe. It is not much of an exaggeration to say that the whole world was watching when Astronaut Armstrong, his body ensheathed in a spacesuit that looked as if it had come straight out of a Buck Rogers comic strip, lumbered down the Lem's descent ladder and placed his foot on the moon.

What amounts to a fantastic dream—a dream that has diverted men for thousands of years—was realized at that mo-

XUM

ment. It is still hard to believe that last night we watched Armstrong and "Buzz" Aldrin striding about in their ungainly spacesuits on the moon's surface, alternating the most sober scientific work with playful gamboling before the TV camera. The courage of these two men—and what the younger generations would call their "cool"—cannot be overemphasized.

Their achievement's lasting significance for mankind, of course, will be left to future historians. But I think a few tentative judgments can be offered now. The lunar exploration, for one thing, signals the true opening of the space age. It opens up entire new frontiers—frontiers in science, in exploration, in technology, in man's continuing quest to understand himself and his universe. Just the few handfuls of rock that Apollo 11 will return to the earth may tell us more about the evolution of the solar system than any other clues that science has uncovered to date.

Still another immediate benefit stems from the lunar mission—a benefit that may be remembered as the most significant of all. Apollo 11 demonstrates what astonishing feats man is capable of once he sets a goal and works arduously to achieve it. It demonstrates that this country's most nettlesome problems—racial strife, urban decay, crime, injustice—can be solved.

President Nixon, in his telephone message to the astronauts last night, expressed hope that the lunar landing will inspire us to come up with solutions to the problems I have just cited. The text of the President's message follows:

> Hello Neil and Buzz. I'm talking to you by telephone from the oval room at the White House. And this certainly has to be the most historic telephone call ever made.
>
> I just can't tell you how proud we all are of what you have done. For every American, this has to be the proudest day of our lives and for people all over the world I am sure they too join with Americans in recognizing what an immense feat this is.
>
> Because of what you have done the heavens have become a part of man's world. And as you talk to us from the Sea of Tranquility it inspires us to redouble our efforts to bring peace and tranquility to earth. For one priceless moment in the whole history of man all the people on this earth are truly one. One in their pride in what you have done and one in our prayers that you will return safely to earth.

The moon program, starting from scratch just 8 years ago, overcame technical barriers science once considered insuperable. It took the work of literally hundreds of thousands of people in Government, in colleges and universities, in private institutions, in industry. As a ranking member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Development and Independent Offices—the legislative body that handles the NASA budget—I am proud to have had a role in helping achieve the goals of the space program. After President Kennedy announced the national goal of putting a man on the moon by the end of the decade, I helped lead the struggle to fund the space program adequately. I will continue to do so. One of the greatest honors of my life is NASA's decision to inscribe my name, along with the names of certain other Congressmen and world leaders, on a silicon disc the Apollo 11 astronauts placed on the moon.

I am sure my colleagues join me, Mr. Speaker, in wishing Neil Armstrong, "Buzz" Aldrin, and Michael Collins a safe journey back to earth.

Our prayers are with them.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. Addabbo (at the request of Mr. Joelson), for Monday, July 21, 1969, on account of official business.

Mr. Kee (at the request of Mr. Mollohan), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Pettis (at the request of Mr. Arends), for today, on account of influenza illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Hosmer (at the request of Mr. Dennis), for 10 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Jones of Tennessee), to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Rarick, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Farbstein, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. Gonzalez, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Fascell to extend his remarks during debate on H.R. 11363.

Mr. Bennett to extend his remarks during debate on H.R. 11363.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Dennis), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Conte in two instances.
Mr. Bush.
Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania in five instances.
Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Keith in three instances.
Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Foreman in two instances.
Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Mizell.
Mr. Hunt.
Mr. Wyman in three instances.
Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Derwinski in three instances.
Mr. Poff.
Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Robison.
Mr. Gude.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Jones of Tennessee) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Charles H. Wilson in two instances.
Mr. Long of Maryland.
Mr. Dingell in four instances.
Mr. Boland in three instances.
Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee in two instances.
Mr. Rarick in three instances.
Mr. Friedel in two instances.
Mr. Rivers in two instances.
Mr. Anderson of California in two instances.
Mr. Baring.
Mr. Rodino.
Mr. Mikva in two instances.
Mr. Vigorito.
Mr. Gonzalez in four instances.
Mr. Dulski in three instances.
Mr. Nichols.
Mr. Celler in two instances.
Mr. Fraser.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 22, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

979. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the administration and effectiveness of the work experience and training project in Carroll, Chariton, Lafayette, and Saline Counties, Mo., under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

980. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a report on the settlement of claims of civilian personnel during fiscal year 1969, pursuant to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 241; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of July 17, 1969, the following bills were reported on July 18 and 19, 1969:

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 11363. A bill to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States; to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–382). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 12549. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–378, pt. II). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted July 21, 1969*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 12829. A bill to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–383). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROONEY of New York: Committee on Appropriations, H.R. 12964. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State,

XUM

Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 12964. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO (for himself, Mr. Adams, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Dingell, Mr. Garmatz, Mr. Hanley, Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania, Mr. Matsunaga, Mr. Murphy of New York, Mr. Murphy of Illinois, Mr. Railsback, Mr. Roybal, Mr. Sisk, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin, Mr. Waldie, and Mr. Yates):

H.R. 12965. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to make crime protection insurance available to small business concerns; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 12966. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12967. A bill to amend section 101(a) (27) (D) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12968. A bill to provide for orderly trade in footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLACKBURN (for himself, Mr. Carter, Mr. Cowger, Mr. McKneally, Mr. Coughlin, and Mr. Keith):

H.R. 12969. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing job training programs, and to provide training and employment opportunities for those individuals whose lack of skills and education acts as a barrier to their employment at or above the Federal minimum wage, by means of subsidies to employers engaged in small business on a decreasing scale in order to compensate such employers for the risk of hiring the poor and unskilled in their local communities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 12970. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include prescribed drugs among the items and services covered under the supplementary medical insurance program for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 12971. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12972. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12973. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to provide funds and authorities to the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of providing free or reduced-price meals to needy children not now being reached; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12974. A bill to redesignate the Department of the Interior as the Department of Resources, Environment, and Population, and to transfer to such Department certain programs and functions currently being carried out by other Federal departments and agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 12975. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 12976. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide extra compensation for officially ordered or approved time worked by postal field service employees, on any day designated by Executive order as a national day of mourning, holiday, or day of participation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 12977. A bill to protect collectors of antique glassware against the manufacture in the United States or the importation of imitations of such glassware; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALEY (for himself, Mr. Fascell, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Rogers of Florida, Mr. Fuqua, Mr. Chappell, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Sikes, and Mr. Gibbons):

H.R. 12978. A bill to amend the act fixing the boundary of Everglades National Park, Fla., and authorizing the acquisition of land therein, in order to authorize an additional amount for the acquisition of certain lands for such park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON (for himself, Mr. Nix, Mr. White, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Brasco, Mr. Gross, Mr. Derwinski, and Mr. Lukens):

H.R. 12979. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to revise, clarify, and extend the provisions relating to court leave for employees of the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 12980. A bill to provide a code of ethics for Federal judges, including Supreme Court Justices, by amending chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 12981. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of second- and third-class mailing permits of mail users who have used these permits systematically in the mailing of obscene, sadistic, lewd, or pandering mail matter, to prescribe criminal penalties for such systematic use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 12982. A bill to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 12983. A bill to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H.R. 12984. A bill to authorize appropriations to be used for the elimination of certain rail-highway grade crossings in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 12985. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the assignment of a member of an armed force to combat area duty if any of certain relatives of such member dies, is captured, is missing in action, or is totally disabled as a result of service in the Armed Forces in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. Springer):

H.R. 12986. A bill to regulate interstate commerce by strengthening and improving consumer protection under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to fish and fishery products, including provision for assistance to, and cooperation with the States in the administration of their related programs and assistance by them in the carrying out of the Federal program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 12987. A bill to provide for orderly trade in footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 12988. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery within the boundaries of Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif., to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.J. Res. 824. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim "Moon Day" and providing for the striking of medals and for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Apollo 11; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.J. Res. 825. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.J. Res. 826. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.J. Res. 827. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a national holiday commemorating man's landing on the moon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. Teague of Texas, and Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 487. Resolution expressing the commendation and gratitude of the House to the men and women of the national space program on the occasion of the Apollo 11 mission; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

244. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to revising the Selective Service System; to the Committee on Armed Services.

245. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to research into the habits of fish and the effects of a changing environment on fish; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 12989. A bill for the relief of Joseph P. Mahady; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 12990. A bill for the relief of Maria de Conceicao Botelho Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 12991. A bill for the relief of the estate of Junichi Taketa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12992. A bill for the relief of Aurelio Micco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

181. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Allan Feinblum, New York, N.Y., relative to na-

XUM

tional defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

182. Also, petition of the National Conference of Lieutenant Governors, Atlanta, Ga., relative to Federal revenue sharing, and so forth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FOOTPRINTS ON THE MOON

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, if it is proving difficult for most of us to "come down to earth" today, there is good reason—for we have just witnessed one of the most fantastic technical and scientific accomplishments of mankind's long history.

Fantastic, amazing, unbelievable—yes, all such adjectives and more of wonder, admiration, and common pride in man's indomitable spirit apply on this "day of participation" which, though formally declared only for Americans, is undoubtedly being experienced by all the people of this globe whose rulers have permitted them to know of Neil Armstrong's "small step" to the surface of the moon.

As we now wait for the safe return to earth of the first men on the moon, each of us is attempting after his own fashion to assess and understand the meaning of this tremendous adventure. Should we have attempted it? Was it worth it? Where, in space, should we go from here?

It does little good now, really, to ask if we should have attempted it—for we did, the money has been spent and, thus far, well spent if success be the yardstick.

Was it worth it? Well, who can really say?

Our Puritan heritage demands "good reason" for nearly everything we do—especially when public moneys are involved. Was this "giant leap for mankind" necessary from the standpoint of national prestige? Probably not, but yet surely our Nation's prestige is higher this day in nearly every corner of the earth than it has been. And that is good; good in terms of international good will, no matter how fleeting that change of mood toward us on the part of other people may be. Especially good for us, too, for our own confidence in ourselves has been badly shaken for many months, now. As Life magazine sought, editorially, to put all this in perspective some weeks back:

> It is jarring to consider what might be our national mood today if Russia were on the moon and our international contribution were the war in Vietnam.

So there is that.

But was the trip necessary to beat the Russians to the moon? Again, probably not, though the fact remains that we did. And there is a sort of lift to our national spirit from that fact. Besides which there is a more important consideration in all this—in the possibility that international competition of this sort—as in economic, athletic, or cultural contests—provide the challenge that is inherent in feelings of nationalism with an outlet that, all too often heretofore, only war has seemed to offer.

And so there has been that.

Was Apollo 11's trip necessary in order to help resolve the mysteries of the cosmos? Well, such a question provokes all kinds of answers. As Life also noted, man's curiosity and adventurous spirit has always seemed insatiable, adding:

> Americans in particular have needed a quest, across the mountains or the continent, into the sky and sea, to the poles or inside the atom.

So it was probably inevitable that we would, some day, toss our hat over the "space wall," as the last President Kennedy said so we could "then explore the wonders on the other side."

From the material standpoint, it is questionable what we will find of value on the moon, or farther out in mysterious space. Perhaps, at best, we will find some keys to help us unlock some of the remaining secrets of our universe—how it was formed, if not why—and even though we may find no new sources of taxation, one supposes that just pushing back the boundaries of knowledge is something that bears no price tag.

So, again, there is that.

To which, Mr. Speaker, there already have been a whole host of valuable technical "spin-offs" with domestic applications from the space effort—and surely will be more of the same yet to come; a more practical justification for what we have done if neither knowledge nor the sheer exhilaration of high adventure is enough.

Of course, there are those who say that our own problems here on earth—and here at home—are such, and of such urgency, that we might better have concentrated thereon instead. This is a difficult argument to counter, even though Life once again remarked on the "acute human misery" prevailing in Spain when Columbus used the Queen's money for his historic voyage, saying further:

> It is possibly one of the greatest tragedies of our time that the eradication of ghettos and the cleansing of the air and the water or the cure for cancer do not offer quite the same stimulation (as space exploration).

And that is something we might well ponder, today, in the hope—that I, for one, would consider a promising one—that out of this lift in national spirit we all now have experienced, and out of our revived sense of community, could come both a new confidence and a new sense of resolution toward our more mundane, earthbound problems.

If, Mr. Speaker, this should prove to be possible, the cost of Apollo 11 would have been well worthwhile.

Thus there is possibly that.

But as I review my own thoughts while watching Neil Armstrong and "Buzz" Aldrin—wonder of wonders—making those historic footprints on the moon's surface, footprints that will stay there for centuries in the Sea of Tranquility alongside an American flag that can no more feel or know the gales of earth than it can the invisible solar wind, it seems to me that the greatest of all possible dividends the Apollo 11 investment could pay would be in terms of an enhanced sense of world brotherhood.

For despite the flag and all the overtones of national glory and prestige, this was an adventure in which all mankind participated. The reactions from nearly everywhere abroad today prove that—giving emphasis once more to the human need to recognize the fact that we are, after all is said and done, truly "riders on the earth together."

Among the variety of messages left in that tiny silicon disk on the lunar surface by our astronauts was this one from President Tito, of Yugoslavia:

> May this majestic fulfillment of the ancient dream of the human race . . . bring closer the realization of humanity's age-long vision to live in peace, brotherhood and joint endeavor.

And perhaps that—or something like it—is Apollo 11's real message.

If it is—and as we begin to decide where next to go in space—let us also remember that America's ability to help move this world of ours toward peace and brotherhood depends on more than power and prestige. If, as President Kennedy said, we cannot afford to be second best in space," neither can we afford to be second best in the effort to move that world from "an era of confrontation to an era of negotiation." Nor second best in the endeavor to improve the quality of our own civilization, on the basis of which rather than on feats in outer space we will be judged. Nor second best in our ideals—and our guiding philosophy—on which matters, too, and our devotion thereto, we shall also be judged.

Therefore, even as this is a day for self-congratulation, so is it, too, a day for re-dedication—for the full American dream has yet to be realized.

ROUTE TO MOON LIES THROUGH TENNESSEE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as the scheduled launching of the Apollo 11 moon mission nears, it is appropriate to point out that the testing for the huge Saturn rocket motors was carried out at Arnold Engineering Development Center at Tullahoma, Tenn., in the Fourth Congressional District which I am honored to represent in the Congress.

In this connection I place in the RECORD herewith my recent newsletter Capitol Comments, because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this important scientific project.

The newsletter follows:

HISTORIC APOLLO MOON MISSION UNDERLINES VITAL ROLE OF RESEARCH ACTIVITIES IN FOURTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

(By JOE L. EVINS)

The scheduled historic Apollo 11 moon mission underlines the vital importance of research activities in the Fourth Congressional District. Research in space exploration and other important areas is underway at the Arnold Engineering Development Center and Tennessee Space Institute at Tullahoma, the Atomic Energy Commission at Oak Ridge, and Tennessee Technological University at Cookeville.

The giant Saturn rocket which is scheduled to power the three astronauts to the moon for the dramatic lunar landing was tested at the giant testing facilities at Arnold Engineering Development Center at Tullahoma. The third stage of this giant rocket was tested more than 80 times in one of the huge test cells at this facility in our District. Complementing the work at AEDC is the University of Tennessee's Space Institute research in related fields—aerodynamics, propulsion, supersonic combustion, electrical engineering as well as plans for research in space medicine and space biology.

In Oak Ridge the Atomic Energy Commission and Oak Ridge National Laboratory are engaged in a broad range of defense and peacetime research projects in life sciences, physical sciences and all aspects of reactor development. An outstanding development is the harnessing of the atom for production of electric power for peacetime uses. Tremendous research is being performed in the biomedical area in Oak Ridge. Oak Ridge is also developing as a center for research into the problems of our cities, large and small.

At Tennessee Tech University research is in progress in many areas—including engineering, biology, education, economics, highway safety and science. The Engineering Department for three years has been working with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in the development of materials for space travel resistant to high velocity pellets to protect space travelers from small meteorites. Designs have also been developed and recommended to NASA for spacecraft shields. Tennessee Tech and its Upper Cumberland Economic and Resources Development Center are engaged in a practical program of providing research and technical assistance to communities and businessmen in the Upper Cumberland area.

From Coffee County to Anderson County—from the southern fringe of our District to the eastern edge—research is assuming greater and greater importance in shaping the future of Tennessee and the Nation.

APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues that a program for increasing minority-group enrollment in apprenticeship training programs has been organized by the Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO. The purpose of the program is to seek out Negroes, Spanish-speaking Americans and Indians to prepare them for entry as apprentices in the construction trades. This is an excellent example of the type of compensatory training and opportunity that needs to be provided for those who have suffered for the lack of opportunity in the past.

An article in the building and construction Trades Bulletin, volume XXII, No. 6, dated June 1969, which follows, describes the success of this effort:

> The drive of the Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO, to open the way to apprenticeship training for minority workers continues to show good results, and more and more, is attracting favorable comments.
>
> In an extensive analysis of the Apprenticeship Outreach Program, vigorously supported by the Department, as well as other sections of organized labor, the federal government and some civil rights groups, the official magazine of the U.S. Labor Department's Manpower Administration notes:
>
> "*That* the program in 48 major cities had placed 2,325 minority group members in building trades apprenticeships by the end of 1968, after less than two years' operation. (The program now has been extended to 53 centers.)
>
> "*That* the number of registered apprentices rose from 207,500 in January, 1967, to 240,000 in January, 1969. The number of minority apprentices during the same period rose from 9,300 to 15,600. The increase in minority participation was 68 percent.
>
> "*That* the increase in the number of apprentices for Negroes during the two years was even greater, rising from 4,100 to 9,400, a jump of 120 percent."

The apprenticeship Outreach program seeks out Negroes, Spanish-speaking Americans and Indians and prepares them for apprenticeship entry in the construction trades. The thrust of the effort to bring more minority workers into jobs is not to lower journeyman standards but to help youngsters start out with better backgrounds and a better chance to make the grade.

QUOTAS LOOM: TEXTILE IMPORTS CHALLENGE NIXON

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in revising and extending my remarks, I include a very thoughtful, timely article by the able financial writer of the celebrated Boston Globe, Mr. Joseph R. Slevin, entitled "Quotas Loom: Textile Imports Challenge Nixon."

This article points out the difficulties of getting relief from cutthroat foreign competition for American industries and their employees being hurt by the growing flood of cheap imports, not only in textiles and shoes, but many other kinds of products, that are currently flooding the Nation, and threatening the stability and prosperity of our economic system.

I hope that the President will listen to the appeals of those industries and workers who are being seriously injured by these steadily increasing imports from many foreign countries.

It is clear that little headway has been made by the Government in coming to an agreement on proposed quotas to keep imports at reasonable levels. This country wants constructive trade with other nations, where that is possible and feasible without adversely affecting our own industries and their workers.

It is also very clear that, if we do not get relief by way of quota agreements, the only way we can get relief is by amending the trade bill to stop effectively currently escalating destructive imports from low-standard, foreign, competitive sources.

The article referred to follows:

QUOTAS LOOM: TEXTILE IMPORTS CHALLENGE NIXON

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon is finding it hard to carry out his campaign promise to protect U.S. textile manufacturers against foreign competition.

Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans has returned battered, bruised, and empty-handed from consecutive swings through Europe and the Far East. The key textile producing countries flatly rejected the White House emissary's demands that they curb their exports to this country and they are now waiting for Nixon to make the next move.

Hong Kong, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan are the prime U.S. targets. Administration strategy calls for initiating a quota agreement in the Far East and then persuading the Europeans to go along but the Asian countries have bluntly rejected all of Stans' overtures.

Stans wants the President to throw his full weight behind a high-pressure drive to force the textile producing countries to accept the export restrictions that the United States has vainly been trying to impose. He has urged Nixon to use all of the financial and trade leverage that the United States can bring to bear.

The Secretary needs an answer before he leaves next Saturday for an annual round of talks between ranking U.S. and Japanese Cabinet members. The President's decision will profoundly influence the future course of U.S. trade policy. As this was written, the question still was on Nixon's desk.

Stans has been waging a solitary battle. He has had the unyielding opposition of the State and Treasury Departments and of the President's own Trade Negotiations Office.

If Nixon insists on pressing for the multilateral quotas that Stans has been seeking, it will be a clearcut victory for the quiet, conservative cabinet officer who was his chief fund raiser before the Republican convention.

If Nixon moves toward a more selective, less protectionist position, it will be an equally decisive defeat for the Commerce Secretary.

Stans urged a tough line in a memorandum that he gave the President earlier this summer, after his return from the Far East. It is a memorandum from Stans and only from Stans because none of the other agencies would indorse Stans' rigidly protectionist approach.

Nixon's costly campaign pledge was given to the makers of synthetic and woolen textiles. Cotton textile producers are covered by an international quota agreement that the United States negotiated in 1962.

Stans' goal is a quota agreement that will limit the sale of all foreign synthetics and woolens to American consumers. He wants the producing countries to negotiate the arrangement "voluntarily" at Geneva and that is what they unequivocally have refused to do.

The angry European response is that across-the-board quotas will open the gates to a flood of restrictionist trade curbs and that the result will be the destruction of the post-World War II drive toward freer trade.

"The Europeans say we don't know where we are going and they are perfectly right," a veteran official says bitterly. "We don't know where we are going."

Mounting quantities of attractive, competitively priced foreign shoes now are pouring into American shops. European negotiators have told Stans that they are unhappily certain that the United States next will demand quotas on shoes if it gets quotas on synthetics and woolens.

The less developed countries such as Taiwan and South Korea raise an equally fundamental argument. They point out that the wealthy United States cannot hope to encourage the poorer nations to become self-sufficient, industrialized countries if it bars their products from the American market as soon as their manufacturers begin exporting large quantities of textiles, or shoes, or transistor radios.

LUNAR LANDING DAY, A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we witnessed one of the greatest moments in man's history. To the list of names that includes mankind's greatest explorers, Marco Polo, Columbus, Magellan, Lewis and Clark, Peary and Byrd, must be added Armstrong, Aldrin and Collins. The feat that they have performed has uplifted the spirit of all mankind and opened new vistas of infinite beauty and challenge to the human race.

Accolades shall befall these intrepid mariners for the remainder of their days. Youngsters will grow up having played Apollo lunar landing games instead of cowboys and Indians. Future astronauts can now realistically envision manned excursions to Mars, Venus, and the other planets of our solar system. I, therefore, think it appropriate, at this time, to introduce the following resolution which attempts to signify, in a small way, our recognition of the visible as well as the as yet unknown ramifications of this monumental achievement. A national holiday is called for since the flight and landing was a national effort and evoked a national sense of pride and satisfaction. My resolution follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION

Whereas mankind has thrown off the shackles that have limited its existence to its native terrestial orb and opened up the far reaches of this solar system to human exploration and investigation; and

Whereas the achievements of Astronauts Neil A. Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin and Michael Collins reflect the combined efforts of hundreds of thousands of American citizens; and

Whereas the people of the United States of America have shared the hopes and aspirations of the Apollo Mission crew and participated in this experience through the use of the television and radio communication media; and

Whereas, the magnitude of the accomplishment is unprecedented in the entire history of mankind: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress of the United States do hereby designate that the twentieth day in the month of July shall be a national holiday to commemorate the landing upon the surface of the Moon of the first representatives of mankind, Neil A. Armstrong and Edwin Aldrin; and be it further

Resolved, That the twentieth day of July shall be known forthwith as Lunar Landing Day.

CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM OF RADIO FREE EUROPE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, at a time when there is growing interest in the obvious defects in the Voice of America, it is equally frustrating to note the current ineffectiveness of Radio Free Europe.

In an article commenting on RFE, Dumitru Danielopol, writing in the June 28 San Diego Union, provides a very needed constructive criticism of the organization.

The article follows:

RADIO FREE EUROPE IS HURTING AMERICA

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

MUNICH.—Criticism of Radio Free Europe is growing on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

East Europeans scoff at RFE as a weapon against Soviet repression in Eastern Europe. The "détente" years of Kennedy-Johnson took out the RFE stuffing and left a bland, ineffective operation.

Critics say RFE fare is so innocuous that the Reds don't even bother to jam the broadcasts anymore. Some claim that the station took a turn to the political left early in 1960 and that now, far from combatting communism, many Free Europe broadcasts actually support some of the Red regimes and officials.

Some desks are accused of attacking De Gaulle and supporting Daniel Cohn Bendit (Red Danny) during last year's French crisis.

They also are charged with attacking nationalist trends behind the Iron Curtain, trends that could weaken the Soviet stranglehold.

The RFE has actually hired as broadcasters and writers Communists who fled in recent years from behind the Iron Curtain.

Visitors coming to the West, tell how people in the satellite countries are shocked to hear on an American radio station the voices of many Communists who for years have blasted the United States from their own Red stations.

The criticism of Free Europe's "soft line" is sharpest in exile newspapers. Editors of these little papers, struggling to keep sparks of resistance alive after 25 years, are obviously angry about Radio Free Europe. Some are printing the names and background of former Reds now working for RFE.

On the Romanian desk, for instance, is Jacob Popper, a notorious Communist police stooge in Jassy before going to Israel and hence to RFE.

He was a professional writer who advocated the burning of "bourgeois libraries" in Romania in the late 1940s. He was notoriously anti-Western and anti-American.

Another man on the Romanian desk is Edgar Rafael who has been publicly accused of being a former agent of the Communist security police. Exiles claim he is abroad because he fears reprisals after the changes of policy in Bucharest.

As a member of the RFE he applied for American citizenship but was rejected by the Justice Department for his Communist affiliations.

The damage to the image and prestige of the United States is considerable.

Although RFE calls itself a private organization supported by contributions, it draws most of its money from official U.S. sources and its policy is dominated—if not dictated—by a small group of men in the State Department.

Perhaps the time has come to drop the masquerade. Perhaps Congress should conduct a public investigation of U.S. propaganda "efforts."

LONG-TERM FARM LEGISLATION SHOULD LIMIT ANNUAL COTTON, WHEAT, AND FEED GRAIN PAYMENTS TO A SINGLE PRODUCER TO $5,000

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr Speaker, when my amendment placing a $20,000 ceiling of total farm payments passed this House by a vote of 224 to 142 on May 27, 1969, critics of my proposal argued that an appropriations bill was not the proper vehicle to effect this change.

I disagreed then and I disagree now, since I must confess to a lack of faith in the House Agriculture Committee's willingness to embrace or even seriously consider such proposals.

Nevertheless, while I remain skeptical about that committee's responsiveness, I have today presented my views on the need for a payments limitation before that committee, chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Because this proposal would not be tied to an appropriations bill, I was able to suggest more extensive changes than were possible earlier.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues I now insert in the RECORD a copy of my statement before the House Agriculture Committee:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE SILVIO O. CONTE BEFORE THE HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE ON JULY 21, 1969

Mr. Chairman, although I am a co-sponsor of H.R. 12222, the Administration bill to expand our current food stamp program, I appreciate this opportunity to testify today in support of a proposal to place a ceiling on farm subsidy payments as part of any long-term farm legislation.

I don't believe there is much that needs to be added to the excellent presentation made by Secretary Hardin last week in support of the Administration food stamp bill. I am sure that improvements can be made on this bill and I strongly urge this Committee to report the strongest possible bill to eradicate the scandal of hunger and malnutrition in this land of plenty. But, on the whole, it must be said that the Administration bill represents an excellent beginning and a genuine commitment.

I do want to make one further comment on the food stamp legislation before turning to the subject of a farm payment ceiling. It is essential that the food stamp bill be given immediate attention. Under no circumstances should this vital legislation be delayed pending what is likely to be a much lengthier process of putting together a new farm bill.

Mr. Chairman, as this Committee knows, our present farm program is scheduled to continue through 1970. Despite the inadequacies of that program, there is no need for haste in devising a new and more sound farm program.

In contrast, all of us surely must realize now the great urgency of acting quickly and decisively to eliminate the conditions under which some ten to fifteen million Americans are today suffering from hunger and malnutrition.

XUM

It would be absolutely intolerable to hold this food stamp bill hostage until the passage of a new farm bill. I trust no one on this Committee would permit this needed food stamp legislation to be used as a device to perpetuate our present inadequate farm program.

My main purpose here today, however, is to speak to the matter of long-range farm legislation.

Gentlemen, I make no pretense, particularly before this distinguished Committee, to being an authority on the overall subject of farm legislation.

I have, however, spent a good deal of time considering one major aspect of that program. I refer to the matter of farm subsidy payments. I am convinced that there is no justification for the continuation of excessively large payments to a handful of corporate farming giants.

Last May 27, our colleagues in the House supported my amendment placing a $20,000 ceiling on total farm payments for the second year in a row. This year they did so by the even greater margin of 224 to 142.

Although the other body has once again failed to go along with that proposal, I am sure I speak for a majority of this House in urging our conferees to insist on the House amendment with all possible vigor.

But, whether or not that amendment prevails this year, we must still address ourselves to the long-range need for reform in this area. In more recent studies of the problem I have become convinced that there is a better proposal—one easier to administer and, more importantly, capable of saving twice as much as my previous proposal.

Mr. Chairman, when I proposed a $20,000 ceiling in the House, Secretary Hardin's analysis and report on 1968 farm program payments were not available.

Since then, these materials have been made available through the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture.

In recent testimony before that body, Secretary Hardin estimated that a billion dollars, or more than a third of the $2.9 billion paid to cotton, wheat and feed grain producers in 1968, were income supplements, in no way related to supply-adjustment needs. They were payments over and above the amounts needed as economic incentives for acreage diversion and other supply-adjustment practices.

These income supplement payments—$508 million to cotton producers, $368 million to wheat producers and $148 mililon to feed grain producers—were in addition to the $1.9 billion total paid to these three groups for supply-adjustment purposes. They were net additions to the producers' income from farm product sales. It is probable that these supplemental income payments will be even higher in 1969 and 1970, especially for cotton producers.

Mr. Chairman, a limitation on the amount of these supplemental income payments will not defeat the supply-adjustment features of the programs.

On the basis of the facts made available to the Holland Subcommittee by Secretary Hardin, I now urge this Committee to include a limitation on the annual payments made to individual cotton, wheat and feed grain producers to $5000 per crop. With appropriate adjustments in these programs the effect of this ceiling can be limited solely to the income supplement part of the payments.

I am aware, of course, of the low levels of income earned by most farmers. I believe they need the help that an intelligently designed supply and price stabilization program provides. But there is no legitimate reason for continuing the excessively large government payments which have been a prominent feature of these programs in recent years.

Mr. Chairman, the excessively large farm program payments to the large corporations and individual land owners have not only wasted government funds badly needed for other domestic programs; they have worsened the position of the average-sized family farmer. Giant corporations and other large farmers have used these excessive government payments to further add to their land holdings and bid up land prices. These huge payments have tightened the squeeze still further on the family farm.

Every survey I have seen indicates that a majority of farmers favor a reasonable limitation on farm program payments. A Doane Agricultural Service Survey showed last year, for example, that some 85 per cent of farmers themselves want to limit the size of farm program payments.

Studies in the Department of Agriculture in the last months of the previous administration, and additional studies made in the last few months, led Secretary Hardin to advise the House during the debate on the 1970 agricultural appropriations that, "The Department of Agriculture believes it is possible to design a sound farm program that limits the number of dollars that can be paid to any one farmer for programs following the 1970 crop year."

Mr. Chairman, had a $5,000 limitation on payments to individual cotton, wheat and feed grain producers been in effect for the 1968 programs, 84,728 producers would have had their payments limited. These 84,728 producers received $917 million in 1968, almost one-third of the total payments under these three programs. A $5000 limitation would have reduced their payments by $493 million.

At my request the Department of Agriculture has prepared a table reflecting the distribution of these producers by state and the strikingly low percentage of such producers when compared with the total number of producers receiving payments. I have attached this table at the close of my statement.

I know of no better way to reduce government expenditure on farm programs up to $500,000,000 than to place a $5,000 limit on individual producers' payments. A limitation as low as $5,000 would affect approximately 85,000 producers out of a total of 2,372,000 who received payments in 1968—only three to four percent of the total. Those affected are the corporations, the wealthy landowners and the large operators, most of whom have high incomes by any reasonable standard. We would need a fifteen percent reduction in average payments to *all* producers of these crops to achieve the reduction in government expenditures that could be achieved by a $5,000 payment limitation.

A $5,000 payment limitation would affect about 8 percent of the cotton producers, 3 percent of the wheat producers and 2 percent of the feed grain producers. Approximately two-thirds of the cotton is produced by the producers who would be affected by a $5,000 limitation, one-fourth of the wheat and a fifth of the feed grains.

If the cotton producers affected by a payment limitation are permitted to increase their acreage and the minimum diversion requirements for wheat and feed grain producers are reduced in proportion to their payment reduction, a $5,000 limitation on payments to an individual producer would be more than equitable and do no damage to the voluntary supply adjustment programs.

The changes in the cotton program would encourage acreage reductions on the part of those producers now growing cotton primarily to collect the government payments, which will fully offset the increased planting on the part of those affected by payment limitations. And a 5 to 10 percent increase in the voluntary acreage diversion goals of the wheat and feed grains programs would compensate for the reduced diversion from those crops by large producers whose payments were limited.

Agricultural specialists fully familiar with the administration of these programs advise me that the Secretary of Agriculture can easily adjust the diversion goals for the voluntary programs to compensate for the effects of a reasonable annual payment limitation for each program.

With respect to cotton, even the analysts in the Department of Agriculture's own Economic Research Service have predicted there would be no appreciable increase in total production with this change. The distinguished former Under Secretary of Agriculture, Dr. John A. Schnittker, who also supports this $5,000 per program ceiling, has confirmed this view.

In a paper delivered at a Symposium on Public Problems and Policies at Iowa State University on May 27, 1969, Dr. Schnittker stated:

"It will be objected that such a limitation would make the voluntary payment-based production control programs inoperative. That claim is false. So little grain (especially feed grains but also wheat) is grown on really large farms that the effect of greater production from payment limits as low as $5,000 per program can be ignored. Large cotton payments, on the other hand, have been justified, not to reduce output but to increase it. No one will argue that limiting payments will lead to a cotton surplus. No one needs to take seriously the claim that a payment limit will lead to new grain surpluses."

Still on the subject of cotton, I should mention briefly one additional major change that is needed. This is the repeal of the so-called "snapback provision," section 103(d)(12) of the 1965 Act. This device was inserted into that bill because large cotton interests had foreseen the inevitable success of some form of payments ceiling and acted to prevent its application to cotton by a provision automatically reinstating the old and obsolete price support system. No rational program for a payments ceiling can permit this provision to stand. It would defeat the clear intent of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I should briefly explain why I now advocate for long-term farm legislation a limitation on each separate program instead of a ceiling on total payments which the House has voted to apply to Fiscal Year 1970. I do so because farm program administrators at the Department of Agriculture have concluded that this approach would greatly simplify its administration. Moreover, it would simplify planning for those farmers who plant more than one of these three crops.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I cannot overemphasize the importance of incorporating a payments ceiling in any future farm program. The American taxpayer who faces another burdensome year of the surtax is rightly demanding that economies be made where they can. And Congress has now heard from no less an authority than Secretary Hardin himself that more than one-third of all farm payments are, in effect, income supplements. They are *not* needed as part of any supply-adjustment program.

Perhaps it is not altogether inappropriate that the farm subsidy program is being considered as we also consider pending food stamp legislation. It is ironic that our farm program is virtually unique in possessing an open-ended "backdoor financing" feature under which the Department of Agriculture borrows whatever funds are required from the Treasury and is reimbursed through appropriations in a later fiscal year.

Surely, as others have noted, it would be far more justifiable to have this sort of financing to provide food for hungry families and underfed children.

There has been a great deal of talk in recent years, Mr. Chairman, to the effect that our government all too often has its priorities out of order. I know of no clearer example of this than the disturbing contrast of providing largesse to corporate farmers while we have food distribution programs for the needy that do not begin to satisfy their needs.

I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that my proposal is an equitable way to reduce farm program expenditures by the substantial amount of $500 million. A limitation on payments at any level creates administrative problems but they would be no greater in administering a $5,000 than in administering a $10,000 or a $25,000 payment limitation.

I respectfully urge that you include a $5,000 payment limitation to producers of cotton, wheat and feed grains in any bill finally approved by this distinguished Committee to extend the Agricultural Act of 1965.

Thank you again, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to appear before you.

PRODUCERS RECEIVING $5,000 OR MORE FROM SPECIFIED PROGRAMS AND TOTAL NUMBER OF PRODUCERS, BY STATES, 1968

State	Producers receiving $5,000 or more from—				Total producers, 3 programs	
	Cotton program	Feed grain program	Wheat program	Total	Number	Percentage receiving $5,000 or more
Alabama	1,698	117	3	1,818	75,410	2.4
Arizona	1,073	83	36	1,192	2,017	59.1
Arkansas	3,242	4	16	3,262	35,465	9.2
California	2,567	80	244	2,891	8,802	32.8
Colorado	1	455	1,352	1,808	19,452	9.3
Connecticut					323	
Delaware		29		29	1,449	2.0
Florida	30	105		135	7,967	1.7
Georgia	1,457	517	8	1,982	50,651	3.9
Idaho		2	1,131	1,133	19,416	5.8
Illinois	9	3,111	47	3,167	111,882	2.8
Indiana		1,952	19	1,971	90,520	2.2
Iowa		5,531	3	5,534	138,352	4.0
Kansas		1,126	4,217	5,343	131,758	4.0
Kentucky	23	226	5	254	64,270	.4
Louisiana	1,358	9	9	1,376	24,935	5.5
Maine					249	
Maryland		52	5	57	6,470	.9
Massachusetts					159	
Michigan		302	19	321	65,489	.5
Minnesota		1,780	149	1,929	98,665	2.0
Mississippi	3,732	39	14	3,785	70,506	5.4
Missouri	889	1,698	51	2,638	101,883	2.6
Montana		12	3,296	3,308	22,794	14.5
Nebraska		3,362	566	3,928	92,552	4.2
Nevada	15		10	25	160	15.6
New Hampshire					105	
New Jersey		40	4	44	3,514	1.2
New Mexico	639	573	267	1,479	6,784	21.8
New York		35	20	55	20,887	.3
North Carolina	469	288	1	758	93,231	.8
North Dakota		37	2,857	2,894	68,855	4.2
Ohio	1	710	29	724	92,551	.8
Oklahoma	667	108	1,906	2,681	61,551	4.4
Oregon		3	832	835	8,415	9.9
Pennsylvania		42	7	49	30,195	.2
Rhode Island					8	
South Carolina	1,247	106	4	1,357	43,788	3.1
South Dakota	1	580	576	1,157	51,953	2.2
Tennessee	1,038	102	3	1,143	76,167	1.5
Texas	13,862	4,352	1,946	20,160	145,355	13.9
Utah		1	121	122	4,836	2.5
Vermont					408	
Virginia	10	81	4	95	27,960	.3
Washington		17	2,766	2,783	13,024	21.4
West Virginia		5		5	5,852	.1
Wisconsin		372	1	373	50,839	.7
Wyoming		3	109	112	2,473	4.5
Total	34,028	28,047	22,653	84,728	2,050,347	4.1

TAX DEDUCTION FOR FARM OPERATORS

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, in response to my recent newsletter and questionnaire about one out of four have enclosed a letter expressing their further views. I suggest to my city cousins in Congress that they read the views expressed in the following letter. A copy of this letter has already been submitted to the appropriate committee:

JULY 1, 1969.

Congressman JOE SKUBITZ,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Since farm parity at present time is near 72, why not allow all bonafide farm operators to deduct 28% of income tax off tax due at date of payment? For a majority of farm operators this deduction would match dollars received by those who cooperate. Do away with farm subsidy programs. Also show a breakdown of money paid for compliance. Also all balance paid to other programs charged to farm programs. Urban citizens read "6 million farm subsidy." You and I know about 30% goes to those who comply with A.S.C. programs. A breakdown on the balance of 6 billion is just as important as the new law on truth and amount of interest and carrying charges.

Yours truly,

——— ———.

AMERICAN LIVES LOST IN VIETNAM

HON. JOSEPH P. VIGORITO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, on June 26 I entered into the Extensions of Remarks of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of those young men from the 24th Congressional District of Pennsylvania who had valiantly lost their lives in Vietnam in the cause of peace.

It has been brought to my attention that two names were inadvertently left off the list.

These two men, like the 79 others from Erie, Crawford, and Mercer Counties, went to Vietnam and gave their lives bravely. They, too, deserve our recognition for their sacrifice. I extend to their families my hope that their sacrifice will soon lead to peace in Southeast Asia and throughout the world.

The two, to whom I would like to pay tribute, are:

Cpl. Anthony DeGerolamo, Jr., of Wheatland, Pa., killed in Vietnam, February 5, 1968, and

A1c. Donald I. Bowers of Meadville, Pa., killed in Vietnam, June 16, 1966.

GULF THREAT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor of July 14, 1969, carried an editorial entitled, "Gulf Threat" in which hazards posed by excessive use of DDT, dieldrin, and similar pesticides are discussed. So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read these fine comments, I include the text of the editorial at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

GULF THREAT

Ornithologist Roger Tory Peterson tells of the decline of the osprey, or "fish hawk," in the latest National Geographic. In the Connecticut River nesting area alone, reproduction is down to but a seventh or eighth of what it was only a dozen years ago.

The low reproduction rates, of course, are known to be caused by man-made pollutants. Chiefly in the form of pesticides, these are passed on through the insect-fish-bird life cycle. The result is sterile eggs, or eggs whose shells are too fragile to support the nesting parent.

It was sadly ironic that Mr. Peterson singled out the Florida Everglades ospery population as one that seemed to be holding its own against decline. For on the same day that his article appeared in the National Geographic, reports of a threat to natural life from the other shore of the Gulf of Mexico surfaced. The Department of Agriculture, it became known, was weighing the saturation of an Air Force base near San Antonio with dieldrin—supposedly two to 15 times as deadly as its sister slow-to-break down pesticide, DDT. The purpose of the saturation was allegedly to subdue exotic insects that may be imported from Vietnam and elsewhere on aircraft using the field.

Many experts are aghast at the project. They point out that the base is near the San Antonio River, which empties into the Gulf of Mexico. As one Texas ecologist said, "That amount of dieldrin, if it got away, would be enough to sterilize the bays all along the Gulf Coast."

Thus the Florida ospreys, too, are threatened.

The San Antonio disclosure has had at least one positive result. The Department of Agriculture has responded to protests with a 30-day ban on the use of dieldrin, DDT, and seven other persistent pesticides while it reviews their side effects.

There is something profoundly disturbing about an egg that will not hatch. One needn't be a particular poetic person to be moved by its symbol of sterility, hopelessness. And the thought that man should be deprived of the glorious soaring and plunging which ospreys have long enacted over the gulf waters is a hard one indeed.

Clearly, as the ospreys and other indicators of the general environment deadening show us, the use of pesticides and other pollutants must be cut back at once.

CAPT. GEORGE I. A. WAIDNER

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the honor of attending the Naval Reserve change of command ceremonies in Baltimore, Md., where Capt. George I. A. Waidner retired after serving from August 1926 through July 1969. Captain Waidner has been an outstanding officer in the Reserves and a credit to his country. Under his command, the Naval Reserve units in Baltimore received two national and 22 commandants' performance awards. He has provided outstanding leadership to the 24 Naval Reserve drilling units in Baltimore, and for his untiring efforts was awarded the Navy Commendation Medal. I should like to honor this exceptional officer and exemplary man by sharing the following citation with my colleagues:

> The Secretary of the Navy takes pleasures in presenting the Navy Commendation Medal to Capt. George I. A. Waidner, U.S. Naval Reserve, for service as set forth in the following:
>
> Citation: For meritorious service from August 1926 through July 1969 while serving in various units of the Naval Reserve Program in Baltimore, Maryland. Captain Waidner exercised exceptional leadership and masterful ability in the organization, management and administration of the Naval Reserve Program in the Baltimore area. By his superior knowledge of Reserve matters, and his sound judgment in utilizing his knowledge to best advantage in the organization and management of the twenty-four Naval Reserve drilling units, he has made a significant contribution to their increased mobilization readiness. The untiring efforts of Captain Waidner throughout his years of Naval Reserve participation contributed to two national and twenty-two Commandants' performance awards received by Baltimore units. The national honors were the Admiral C. W. Nimitz Trophy for the best national Naval Reserve Submarine Division, and the Admiral D. C. Lyndon Trophy for best national Naval Reserve Crew. The Commandants' awards for outstanding performance were awarded to Naval Reserve units of the Surface, Submarine, Security Group, Mobilization Team, Construction Battalion, Military Sea Transportation Service and Advance Base Programs. By his exemplary performance of duty throughout his naval career, Captain Waidner upheld the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service.
>
> For the Secretary.
>
> T. H. MOORER,
> *Admiral, U.S. Navy, Chief of Naval Operations.*

BADGER BOYS' STATE GOVERNOR JUNGBACKER

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the best practical training laboratories for young people in government and politics is the American Legion's Badger Boys' State program conducted each year on the campus of Ripon College in Ripon, Wis. At these week-long conferences, 1,000 high school juniors from all over the State organize their government and elect city, county, and State officials.

This year, John P. "Pete" Jungbacker, a junior at Oshkosh High School was elected governor of Badger Boys' State. "Governor" Jungbacker wrote his impressions of the week at Boys' State and they were published in The Paper, Oshkosh. This report is the work of an outstanding young man interested in working in the American political tradition. I am proud of the work of "Pete" Jungbacker and accordingly recommend this report to the attention of my colleagues:

BOYS' STATE GOVERNOR DISCUSSES HIS EXPERIENCES

(By John P. Jungbacker)

Badger Boy's State is an intensive, one week study in government at state, county, and city levels run by Badger Boy's State Inc., an affiliate of the American Legion.

This year Oshkosh High School sent seven delegates to Ripon. They were chosen as juniors by the OHS faculty.

When I first arrived at B.B.S. confusion seemed to be the word of the day. The 1061 delegates were given physical exams, instructions on various aspects of camp function, Badger Boy's tee shirts and caps, and finally the citizen manuals which contained a vast array of material.

We were then sent to our dorms which would be home for a week. I met my city counselor and then went to my room where my personal contact began with other members of the camp. I had been told earlier that there would be leaders, scholars and athletes from all over Wisconsin at Ripon, but was amazed at the diversity of individuals I found. All the boys were different, yet all had something in common—they were residents of the state of Wisconsin. They represented presidents of their classes and student councils, editors of papers, athletes and scholars.

Upon my arrival to Ripon I had considered running for some state office. At the first state party caucus meeting the idea of running for governor seemed a possibility.

The Federalist state convention was to be held on Tuesday night and my decision to run for governor came on Sunday afternoon. Thus I had two days to make myself known to the 530 Federalists that would vote in the state primary. I soon found that the most effective place to campaign was the snack bar located in the Brooks Memorial Union. Here it was possible to talk in depth with the other delegates of Badger Boy's State on both the proposed party platform and the expanded ones of the other gubernatorial candidates.

The state primary election was held Tuesday night in the Ripon College commons. The first order of business was the adoption of the party platform, drawn up by the resolutions committee of which I was a member. The preamble of the platform said we should "concern ourselves with topics not only relevant to Badger Boy's State, but also with topics relevant and vital to the state of Wisconsin," and that the programs of Badger Boy's State be expanded to include not only the mechanical functions of government, but the issues of concern within government as well. This is what I based my platform upon; the establishment of a Wisconsin Issue school similar to the other five schools run during the encampment. With this school we would accomplish the objectives of our party platform.

The party platform was accepted without too much difficulty so that by nine o'clock the candidates began to give their speeches before the assembled Federalist party. There were seven candidates running for the office of governor in the party primary. I was fortunate enough to become the Federalist candidate for governor. The victors of each party immediately went to their respective party headquarters for instructions. The general state assembly was to be held Wednesday night and additional campaign material had to be produced and distributed for each candidate. The fine work done by the party members in distributing posters did much to influence the vote.

The assembly was held at eight o'clock Wednesday night and was one of the most moving and thrilling moments of my life. Supporters on both sides yelled for their candidates. All the men aspiring for state positions spoke before their constituents. Because I ran for governor and was a Federalist, my speech was the last one to be given. This is what I had hoped for. My opponent would give his speech first and would place pressure on me to give a better one, and time would not be a factor. The floor demonstration could be long, and hopefully sway votes to the Federalist side. With the conclusion of the program there was nothing left to do but wait until the voting and tabulation of the votes began at 11:30 the next morning. At four o'clock the official election returns were posted at election headquarters—I had won with 532 votes to 487 for the opposition candidate Jim Ketterhagen of Elm Grove. The campaign had ended, the inauguration lay ahead with the duties of the governorship awaiting me.

The candidates were sworn in in an inspiring ceremony by Justice Bielfuss of the Wisconsin Supreme Court and the assembly was addressed by Governor Knowles.

My week at B.B.S. was one which I shall remember always, not only for the honors given me, but also for the opportunity of getting to know many fine young men from the state of Wisconsin.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, throughout this week, July 13–19, Americans will join in a great undertaking—observance of Captive Nations Week. I am happy to join with my colleagues in Congress in commemorating this important occasion.

Since its establishment in 1959, Captive Nations Week has become a signifi-

XUM

cant part of American national life. Each year, during the third week of July, Americans everywhere hold appropriate ceremonies, television and radio programs, and public discussion forums in remembrance of their fellow human beings trapped behind the Iron Curtain. In my own city of Chicago, Captive Nations Week is traditionally observed with enthusiasm and dedication, and this year promises to be one of the most meaningful of these occasions.

The people of the Third District of Illinois, as well as citizens throughout the country, are aware of the indivisibility of freedom. They know that wherever any human being is oppressed, wherever any fellow human being is denied the most basic right of human liberty, then their own liberty is diminished.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to join in solemn commemoration of this great time of rededication to the ideal of freedom and justice for all.

GOVERNMENT WIRETAPPING GONE WILD?

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, last year's omnibus crime bill and recent disclosures have revealed just how important it has become to clear up the confusion concerning wiretapping and electronic surveillance. While we are all committed to effective crime control, there can be no compromising the clear constitutional protection against illegal search and seizure.

Because of the confusion surrounding the question, the Congress wisely established a National Commission for the Review of Federal and State laws Relating to Wiretapping and Electronic Surveillance. Unfortunately, this commission is not scheduled to begin its business until 1974; despite the fact that some of the members have been duly appointed. To rectify the problem and to begin the important study as soon as possible, I have introduced H.R. 12808 to activate the commission immediately.

In order to share with my colleagues the concern for immediate action, I wish to insert into the Record a July 10 editorial from the Chicago Tribune. The Tribune's clear delineation of the problem makes its editorial a worthwhile reminder of the dangers inherent in unrestricted Government wiretapping:

Wiretapping Gone Wild

Recent days have brought a dismaying succession of new examples of wiretapping or other electronic eavesdropping by the government. The victims range from Cassius Clay to Mrs. Claire Chennault, and from the late Dr. Martin Luther King to the Mafia. There are constant new revelations about the extent to which the late Robert F. Kennedy, as attorney general, went in getting evidence against Jimmy Hoffa of the teamsters' union.

Some of this eavesdropping seems to have gone on for years on end, and for purposes which are obscure at best. The average citizen, guaranteed against invasion of his privacy and illegal search and seizure by the Constitution, may reasonably wonder where all this is going to end. Is there no escape from Big Brother's omnipresent ear? It sometimes seems as if the late Justice Brandeis, a leading liberal of the 1920s, was right when he said that other police actions "are puny instruments of tyranny and oppression when compared with wiretapping."

The fact is, however, that every one of these instances took place more than a year ago, at a time when wiretapping was illegal under a statute passed by Congress in 1934. They were condoned because the courts, including the Supreme Court, failed to take a clear stand on what was wiretapping and what was legal.

Is it legal if the wiretapping is done off of the victim's property? For years, the Supreme Court said it is; then, in 1967, it said it isn't. Is wiretapping a form of search and seizure as defined in the 4th amendment? At first the court said no; more recently it said yes. But in saying yes, it suggested that wiretapping would be legal if conducted with a court warrant, as in the person of a person's property.

Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy urged that the matter be faced honestly and that wiretapping be permitted under specified conditions. Mr. Johnson professed to deplore wiretapping, yet it was under his administration that Mrs. Chennault's calls were monitored because she opposed the cessation of bombing Viet Nam.

Despite Mr. Johnson's objection, Congress last year passed an omnibus crime control bill authorizing wiretapping in instances involving national security or major crime when a warrant has been obtained specifying clearly what is being sought. Both Mr. Nixon and his attorney general, Mr. Mitchell, have indorsed the use of wiretapping against crime.

There is no evidence thus far of abuses under the Nixon administration. But in view of past experience, and the new law, we are entitled to an explicit statement on what the government's policy is. The people are entitled to know under what conditions they may be subject to wiretapping. There may be cases in which it is justified, but Justice Brandeis' warning was not an empty one. Wiretapping is a dangerous habit for the government to get into; and if it is tolerated at all, it must be under clear and strict limits.

THE SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two bills to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes area is one of the few remaining dune areas on Lake Michigan that has not as yet been commercially developed. However, if this valuable natural resource is to be preserved, early legislative action is essential.

For this reason, I have introduced two separate bills to create the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore. I feel that both bills have great merit and it is my sincere hope that one of the two bills, or a revised version including provisions from both bills, will be the subject of early hearings before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and that the House will be afforded an opportunity to vote on the legislation before the end of the first session.

SENATOR GRUENING'S REMARKS BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, in the past few years Congress has become a vigorous advocate of foreign aid for family planning. It has only been through the earmarking of funds by Congress for an AID population program that something more than just a minimal program has finally been undertaken by the agency.

The House Republican Research Committee Task Force on Earth Resources and Population has been working for some weeks to develop more effective use of Government funds and efforts in the field of population planning. New suggestions in this area were recently presented in testimony on July 11 before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, by former Senator Ernest Gruening, a pioneer in the field when he served as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures. Senator Gruening's remarks are worthy of review by all of us who are charged with determining priorities of Federal expenditures, particularly in view of the emphasis President Nixon has attached to population planning in his message to the Congress last week. I therefore am glad to offer Senator Gruening's remarks for inculsion in the Record at this point.

Testimony of Ernest Gruening Before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, July 11, 1969

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to testify before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Foreign Assistance Authorization for fiscal year 1970.

As one who has long been concerned with the perils to mankind of the population increase, it is a source of deep immediate concern to me, as I suspect it may be also to members of this Committee, that top officials in AID have not yet given genuine support and force to population programs.

As this Committee well knows, funds for the AID population program were first earmarked by the Congress, with the leadership taken by this Committee, in 1967. This earmarking was accomplished over the objections of AID bureaucrats and $35 million was provided and obligated in fiscal year 1968. In fiscal 1969, again over the objections of AID bureaucrats, $50 million was earmarked for population and very close to that amount was obligated. Now again in fiscal 1970, the AID agency has declined to ask for any increases in population funding and a number of witnesses before this Committee have specifically urged that the earmarking be eliminated. Before the Congress took the lead in this field, there was no program worthy of the name. Now the level of funding is $50 million, but I think we can be sure from past experience that unless the earmarking is retained, the level of funding not only will not increase, it will probably decline.

In fiscal 1970, I believe that a vigorous imaginative effort, with adequate staff in the field to help develop necessary programs should appropriately be at not less than the $100 million level. Nearly four years ago a White House Conference committee recommended an annual AID population budget of $100 million. Every year about 70 million people are added to the world's population, but AID continues to argue against increased population control programs.

Additional funds are needed to support United Nations programs at an expanded level. The recent report of the United Nations Association of the United States called for a UN Commissioner of Population and eventual expenditures by the UN system of $100 million per annum. Other nations will join in supporting such a truly multilateral effort, but the United States will need to make a substantial commitment.

Research in contraceptive development is also urgently needed. A once-a-month pill, a long acting injection or a successful subcutaneous implant would be tremendously helpful in a country like India. This research should be supported not only by NIH in the U.S., but also by AID here and overseas where it can have greatest impact on family planning programs in the developing countries.

From my own travels and investigations and the hearings I conducted as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the Senate Committee on Government Operations. I am convinced that $100 million could be usefully expended today to support programs of government, and private organizations, and to provide necessary commodities such as vehicles, medical equipment, contraceptives and audiovisual supplies, and to encourage education and information activities.

The worldwide need and demand for more and better family planning is great. Those who argue that $100 million is too much for AID to spend on the population problem should be reminded that unless population growth is checked, the rest of our AID program will be wasted. What is the value, moral or practical, of providing more food or more schools if the result is only going to be an even larger number of hungry people, of adult illiterates, of children out of school? It is not only U.S. assistance that is wasted under such circumstances, but also the determined and self-sacrificing efforts of the developing countries which see their own much needed capital devoured by each new generation.

There has been much self-righteous talk on the part of AID officials about not forcing aid-recipients to undertake population programs, and not conditioning U.S. aid on self-help in the population field. The time has come, I respectfully submit, when we should very seriously consider the need to condition U.S. assistance on a realistic recognition by aid-recipients of how headlong population growth really defeats both their own and our basic objectives. Neither the U.S. nor the developing countries have resources to waste. Those nations which directly or indirectly deny their citizens access to competent and sympathetic methods to prevent unwanted children should not look to the United States to pay the bill for indifference and disregard toward what the United Nations has already termed "a basic human right".

I would like to suggest to the committee that you seriously consider adding to the existing language in support of population and family planning a provision requiring that not less than 5% of the total dollar funds provided in any country programs be available only for population and family planning programs. Funds not obligated under this provision could be reallocated to international or regional programs in the same fiscal year. In other words, a country would only get 95% of the projected assistance if it failed to utilize any aid for family planning.

This approach would not force any government to undertake a family planning program. However, it would ensure that funds for such a program would be available and would not, for instance, be deflected to build a prestigious-looking steel mill. It would in effect show aid recipients that the U.S. believes any economic development program which neglects the population problem will not be 100% effective and therefore will not get as much support from the U.S. I believe this is a reasonable exercise of discretion in the use of U.S. funds and would have broad support from the citizens of this country. Those countries not willing to accept U.S. dollars for family planning programs would recognize that these funds—5% of their total U.S. assistance—could then be transferred to international or regional programs, including United Nations agencies.

To carry out such a program will require more than mere lip service and speechmaking by AID officials. It will require, in addition to the earmarked funds, sufficient personnel to stimulate and encourage new projects and to provide follow-through and support for existing programs that may run into difficulties. Out of a total AID appropriation of $1.7 billion last year, just under $50 million or about 3% was allocated for population; yet out of total AID personnel of over 7,000, only 60, or less than 1% were allocated for population. A $100 million program should realistically have staff support of 300–400 people, including at least one full-time population officer in every AID mission and interdisciplinary teams in many countries, as well as increased staff in Washington.

The director of the population program should be at the level of Assistant Administrator for Population and should be able to speak with authority for population activities throughout the agency. If the program is not at this level, it will be downgraded by others in the agency.

As in the case of the funding and the personnel problem, an Assistant Administrator for Population could, of course, be designated by the agency without legislation, but it is a measure of the lack of real priority that AID gives to the population program, that in fact, funds have not been allocated, except as Congress required. Personnel in sufficient number and rank have not yet been provided because the Congress has not yet made such requirements statutory. In my view, the time for such action has clearly come.

Mr. Chairman, five Presidents of the United States have supported this cause—President Truman and President Eisenhower, who served as honorary chairmen of Planned Parenthood; President Kennedy, who altered U.S. policy to provide assistance in population; President Johnson, who spoke some 44 times about the urgency of the population problem and the need for action; and most recently President Nixon who in his foreign aid message urged AID to build on past successes in family planning.

Yet, the fact remains that without the leadership and initiative of the Congress and most particularly of this Committee, there would probably be no program to this day. I strongly and respectfully urge that this Committee not only retain the earmarking provisions and increase the sum of to not less than $100,000,000, but also that it require AID to provide sufficient staff and support at a level within the agency commensurate with the importance of the problem and that you seriously consider a further requirement that 5% of each national program be allocated to population control measures.

I would like to say, parenthetically, that while I supported foreign aid in my first years in the Senate, I did seek to rectify some of its abuses and shortcomings by amendments, some of which were accepted. I could not see the justification, for instance, for making loans to self-liquidating projects with no repayment of principal for 10 years and with a ridiculous interest rate of ¾ths of 1 per cent.

I consistently opposed, and would oppose again were I in the Senate the military appropriations for Latin American countries which experience has repeatedly shown are used by military men to upset civilian regimes and constitute a tragic waste of our funds and a policy which is counterproductive. But as of today I feel that while the foreign aid program has done some good in the past in a few countries, it has never been well administered and on the whole it has been, in my view, a costly failure. It is pertinent that I made while in the Senate two searching investigations of our foreign aid program—one for ten countries in the Middle East and one for Latin America, both of which were published as Senate documents. If any one wants to appreciate the extent of the mishandling of our foreign aid I would refer them to these reports. One report is entitled "A Report of a Study of United States Foreign Aid in 10 Middle Eastern and African Countries," 88th Congress, 1st Session, and the other "United States Foreign Aid In Action: A Case Study," 89th Congress, 2d Session.

It also seems to me difficult at this time to justify our pouring vast sums into foreign countries for schools, health, resource development and much else when we deny funds for similarly needed projects to our own people. In my State of Alaska some vital authorized projects are not being financed as part of the Administration's drastic cuts, and this is going on everywhere in the United States. I take the old fashioned view that the interests of the American people should have priority. But to return to the subject of population control the one thing that, in my view, would justify support of the foreign aid legislation in this Congress would be its provisions to help every country which is the recipient of our aid to introduce birth control measures and limit the population as far as possible. Unless this is done, the whole foreign aid program will continue to be a disaster and increasingly so.

It is far later than we think. We are on a collision course with world chaos and unless we act *now* vigorously, forthrightly, unqualifiedly, determinedly, we shall inherit that chaos. It may even be too late but the time to act is now, and I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the Members of Congress who have had the understanding of the gravity of this problem and are taking the appropriate steps to try and avert irremediable disaster.

In conclusion, I would like to spell out what I think specifically should be the kind of amendment to the existing legislation that will achieve the desired result.

POPULATION AMENDMENT TO H.R. 11792

What the proposed Population Amendment to the Foreign Aid bill would do:

1. It would place AID population programs in a secure position of priority and funding within the foreign aid effort.

2. It would retain in force the population earmarking provisions enacted into law in 1967 on the initiative of the Congress, which AID has repeatedly sought to eliminate or nullify.

3. It would increase the sum of money earmarked from $50 million in fiscal year 1969 to $100 million in fiscal year 1970. In FY 1968,$35 million was earmarked by the Congress over AID objections and since that time AID has repeatedly refused to seek annual increases in population program funding.

4. It would guarantee personnel proportional to the dollar size of the population assistance program in order to ensure efficiency, imaginative program development and appropriate surveillance.

5. It would make available to each country at least 5% of the total dollar assistance only for population programs. This provision does not coerce or pressure any foreign government to undertake population programs if it does not wish to do so, but this language guarantees a minimum level of AID support for such programs if undertaken. If any government does not choose to undertake such

a program or to utilize AID assistance for it, the available dollar funds could be used instead to support regional or international population programs, public or private.

6. It would raise the level of AID responsibility and authority in administering population programs sufficiently to emphasize the high priority of the population issue and the concern of the Congress in encouraging vigorous and innovative activities.

I wish to thank the Committee for the opportunity to be heard on perhaps the most crucial problem facing mankind.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 11792

To promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world to achieve economic development within a framework of democratic economic, social, and political institutions, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 1. Section 208 of H.R. 11792 is hereby amended by deleting line 24, page 18, beginning with the words "The President" through line 4, page 19, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 209. (a). Of the total funds provided to carry out the provisions of part I of this Act for any fiscal year, not less than $100,000,000 shall be available only to carry out the purposes of this title and, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, funds used for such purposes may be used on a grant or loan basis.

"(b) Of the total U.S. personnel assigned to carry out the provisions of part I of this Act in any fiscal year, in Washington and overseas, the proportion assigned to carry out the provisions of section 208 and section 209 shall be the same as the ratio of the funds authorized in section 209(a) to the total funds available under part I of this Act. At least one full-time population officer shall be assigned to each overseas AID mission.

"(c) Of the total dollar funds allocated to any country program, in any fiscal year, not less than 5 per centum shall be available only to carry out the purposes of sections 208 and 209. Funds not obligated under this provision for any one country may be reallocated within the same fiscal year to regional, interregional, or international population and family planning programs."

SEC. 2. Subsection 624(a) of chapter 2 or Part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is hereby further amended by inserting after the comma following the words, "part I" the following "one of whom shall be designated Assistant Administrator for Population."

SOLACE FOR THE CAREY FAMILY

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a dreadful tragedy has befallen our respected colleague, HUGH L. CAREY, of New York, his dear wife, and family. Their sons, Hugh, Jr. and Peter met their death in an automobile accident while in the flower of their youth. They were the pride of their parents and beloved by their many friends. No words can assuage the grief of those who loved them. Only time can bring balm to the wounds.

The parents recall with glowing pride the days they watched their sons grow. The child bloomed into brilliant youth and gave great promise for the future. Now all that is erased and only fond recollections remain. But to live in the hearts of those we leave behind us is not to die.

The good Lord has placed His finger upon them and they sleep the sleep of the blessed.

At this time, I think of the lines in the 23d Psalm:

> Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me.

My condolences go out to HUGH, his wife, and their dear ones.

TO BUILD A STABLE ASIA

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, Alexander Hamilton once said, "Learn to think continentally"; today we should reword that to say, "We must learn to think intercontinentally."

There is no question that progress on domestic issues is vital to our future, but their relationship to our foreign interests is not an either/or matter. There is a strong interrelationship, an interwoven pattern that links both foreign and domestic affairs.

It is true that our success in meeting urban and human problems in our society will have a great deal to do with our strength in facing the rest of the world and in the free world's acceptance of our leadership. It is also true that we will not be able to shift a substantial proportion of our resources from defense to domestic needs until we can help build a world of compatible nations.

To think intercontinentally in this effort to secure an ordered world, means that we must give high priority to Asia. Asia is on the verge of national and industrial changes that confronted Europe from the 15th to the 19th century. As Asia tries to absorb these changes, it must be remembered—that half the people of the world live there—that three potential nuclear powers are there—that four of the six most populous nations are there with problems of food shortage and the mobilization of industrial potential.

That is why the President has wisely chosen to take a trip to these Asian nations. The President has made this forward and constructive decision because he knows that in order to bring peace to the world, it must be brought to Asia. By the visits with these Asian leaders of government he can understand at firsthand the aspirations of Asians and the problems blocking those aspirations. He can communicate the fact that he shares their aspirations and their hopes for development of a community of thriving, self-sufficient, and independent nations in Asia.

Out of the President's trip can come new understanding between nations to help shape the plans to build a stable Asia in the wake of the Vietnam war.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1969

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, in 1959, a man who gave his entire life to the defense of liberty, both as a soldier and as a civilian, declared the first Captive Nations Week. The purpose was to demonstrate American sympathy for the populace of Eastern Europe which had been enslaved in the years immediately following World War II.

Another 11 years have now passed since President Eisenhower first announced that the third week of July was to be a time of solemn remembrance of those whose freedom of thought, religion, and action have been swallowed up by a monolithic structure which neither acknowledges human worth nor permits dissent.

While it is true that time changes much, we cannot deceive ourselves that freedom returns as regularly as the evening tide nor that the tyrant will mellow and then wither away with the passage of time.

> In the long stretches of peace—

Writes Hilaire Pelloc—

> we are not afraid. But . . . we are watched by large and awful faces from beyond and on these faces there is no smile.

At long intervals we have indeed been confronted by these unsmiling faces and each time we start in surprise.

We see the tanks rumble through the streets of Budapest in 1956;

We watch a wall go up in Berlin in 1961;

We observe the troops in the city of Prague in 1968.

The forces of oppression themselves remind us periodically that time has not effaced the harsh realities which are the lot of Eastern Europe and that subject nations are not a phenomenon which vanished with the dawning of the democratic age. For the people behind the Iron Curtain, however, the reminders do not come at intervals.

Imperialism, a force associated with the 19th century, has survived and is with us yet: an anachronism to be sure, yet no empty form. The denial of self-determination and national sovereignty runs counter to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations in 1948 as empires were being liquidated all about the globe, but for half of Europe it is as if the birth of the 20th century were yet to be.

The concept of a free society has evolved at immeasurable cost over uncountable years, yet for half of Europe it has no reality. The world yearns for a permanent, happy adjustment of the relations between men; half of Europe has a society at once artificial, unhappy, and inflexible.

America's position is clear. President Nixon, in his inaugural address, stated:

> We seek an open world—open to ideas, open to exchanges of goods and people, a world in which no people, great or small will live in angry isolation.

This goes beyond mere national policy; it is a quest for a system which will, in Erich Fromm's words, enable man to prevail. For so long as a large power bloc continues to promulgate the doctrine of "spheres of influence" however, this will never be possible.

In Lithuania, a law was passed on June 29, 1968, which provided that children may be taken from parents who do not bring their children up according to the Communist moral code. Moreover, should the parents have the temerity to provide their children with a religious education, the parents are liable for a prison term of up to 3 years. It is small wonder that in all save one of the captive nations, the population has declined in proportion to that of the world in the years since World War II. We may be forgiven if we assume that this is not the result of brilliant policies of population control.

Physical atrocities such as the slaughter of the kulaks in the 1930's or the mass murders in the Katyn Forest in the 1940's are but a facet of a system which has driven millions to desert their homelands for the West. Equally significant is the effect which captivity has on the spiritual growth of every citizen of the hostage nations. Just as physical growth is stunted and contorted by a lack of light, so is spiritual growth affected by want of liberty. As Americans we rededicate ourselves this week to the right of every man and of every nation to develop, to grow, and to attain that full measure of prosperity and beauty which only freedom can assure.

THE U.S. CAPITOL GUIDE FORCE

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Joseph McCaffrey, who is recognized and widely respected as one of the most knowledgeable and perceptive commentators on the activities of the Congress has once again called our attention to the sorry plight of the members of the U.S. Capitol guide force.

In his July 12 broadcast over WMAL-TV channel 7 here in Washington, D.C., Mr. McCaffrey directed his comments to the two main points which I made when I introduced my bill, H.R. 6965 to establish the Capitol Guide Service.

At that time I pointed out that many Members of Congress feel that tours of our Capitol should be provided without charge to our fellow citizens, who already pay for its maintenance through their taxes and that as a gesture of good will the same courtesy should be extended to our foreign visitors. I also called attention to the financial plight of the Capitol guides under the present system.

I am pleased that Mr. McCaffrey has taken an interest in this very real problem and I commend his remarks to my colleagues. The full text of Mr. McCaffrey's commentary follows:

> COMMENTARY OF JOSEPH MCCAFFREY
>
> Caught in a seemingly endless squeeze are the members of the United States Capitol guide force.
>
> The guides who show visitors around the Capitol Building are not, technically, employees of the United States Government. They are free lance workers selected by Congressional leadership, who depend on the 25 cents a head collected from each tourist to pay their salary. The guides work co-operatively with the money being pro-rated among them. They have no pension fund, no sick leave, no benefits of any kind—unlike Congressional employees.
>
> For years the guides have tried to get on the Congressional payroll where they would be adequately taken care of. In turn, they have pointed out, the chinzey demand that every American taxpayer pay 25 cents to be shown around his own Capitol could be done away with. But red tape, which is manufactured somewhere in the bowels of the Capitol by shifts of nameless men and women working around the clock, has successfully blocked this.
>
> Since 1956, 13 years ago, this is what has happened to a few guides who had to quit work because of old age and illness. One died in the poorhouse at Manassas, Virginia, another, (one of the most colorful guides to ever show tourists around the Capitol) had to be taken care of by a daughter until he died, impoverished. Another is in a nursing home but her social security pension is not enough to continue her there, and because she was not a Capitol employee she has no other income.
>
> The Capitol guides are the only representatives of the United States Congress most people meet in their visits to Washington.
>
> The Capitol guides should be treated for what they are, human beings needing consideration and fair treatment. They have a compelling case, if only those who are responsible would pause long enough to listen.

CAPTIVE NATIONS AND THE MOON WALK

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep significance to me that the venture of Apollo 11 into space should coincide with the 10th annual observance of Captive Nations Week.

The impact of this truly historic and brilliant feat on the minds of men everywhere will perhaps not be fully realized for years to come; but there is nothing else in the history of mankind that has so engulfed the spirit and awe of the human mind and humbles even the bravest of men. Astronaut Neil Armstrong captured the imagination and respect of a worldwide audience when on man's first step onto the moon he declared:

> That's one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind.

It is reported in the morning papers of this date that with the exception of China, communications of the event were beamed and dispatched to every corner of the globe. Hundreds of millions of people around the world watched the live telecast as history unfolded before them.

President Nixon, speaking directly to the astronauts on the moon said:

> Because of what you have done, the heavens have become a part of man and as you talk to us from the Sea of Tranquility, it inspires us to redouble our efforts to bring peace and tranquility to earth. For one priceless moment in the whole history of man, all the people on this earth are truly one.

If ever there was an occasion, Mr. Speaker, to bond the ties of free men everywhere, dedicated to the common purpose of freedom and liberty for all, this must be it. Captive Nations Week is an irony in the shadow of this accomplishment of man's milestone victory over the mystifying and hostile environment of outer space. But the hostility of outer space is one of physical elements whose character is without emotion, while the hostility on earth broods in the minds of men. While rededicating ourselves to "peace and tranquility" on earth, and recognizing that the spirit of freedom still persists despite the decades of repression of the people of the captive nations, let us hope and pray that the inspiration gained from man's conquests in outer space will serve as a calalyst to breech human frailties in pursuit of freedom, individual liberty, and self-determination for the captive millions.

CAPTIVE NATIONS

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this is the 10th year since the late President Eisenhower issued the first proclamation declaring the third week in July to be Captive Nations Week. For the 10th time we pause to reflect on the repression of millions of freedom-loving peoples by the Soviet Union. For the 10th year we stand to declare our abhorrence of the enslavement of a hundred million people who, were it not for the guns, the slave labor camps, and the terror imposed upon them, would enjoy their rightful blessings of justice and liberty.

We are, this 10th anniversary, especially horrified. Less than a year ago we were witness to the Soviet rape of Czechoslovakia. For months prior to the Soviet invasion we anxiously watched while Czech leaders sought to assert their independence, to develop their own national life free from foreign dictates, to live free from terror and repression, and to secure the blessings of freedom.

The Czech people embraced the plans and shared the dreams of their liberal leaders. The Soviet response was vicious and horrifying. In a few short weeks a courageous people who wished only to live in freedom and in peace with the world saw their dreams smashed by the might of Soviet tanks and guns. Armed men and secret police secured the repression dictated by Moscow's fear that the seeds of Czech freedom might spread to other lands held captive.

In the face of this horror and less than a year later, we read that Soviet Minister Gromyko has declared a period of

XUM

"mir i druzhba," peace and friendship toward America and the world. Soviet actions toward its neighbors seem gravely inconsistent with his declaration to the world.

For over two decades the people of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania, as well as the other captive nations have been denied the freedoms and independence promised them at the close of World War II. The regimes of these Soviet colonies have consistently refused to grant free and open elections. All attempts to bring about a free society are met with the most vicious repression.

But in spite of the most recent Czech outrage and in spite of over two decades of Soviet domination over the peoples of Eastern and Central Europe, I do not believe that the oppression can endure. Man was born to be free. It is as if there is something in his soul that ever moves him toward liberty, something in his will that leaves him no rest until he is truly free. Sons inherit it from fathers and so it grows. The greater the oppression the greater is the desire for liberty. And there is no force on earth that can contain it.

As we are anxious for the present condition of the Eastern and Central European peoples, we are also optimistic that their oppression will not endure. We pray and we believe that the shackles which bind them will be broken and they will rise up a free people.

RISING HEALTH CARE COSTS MUST BE CUT AND SERVICES IMPROVED

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the matter of steadily increasing and inflated medical and hospital costs pose a critical problem in health care.

In this connection I place in the RECORD herewith my recent newsletter, Capitol Comments, because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most vital and important problem.

The newsletter follows:

CAPITOL COMMENTS: RISING MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL COST MUST BE REDUCED TO AVERT CRISIS IN HEALTH CARE

(By Joe L. Evins, Fourth District, Tennessee)

As the public is faced with rapidly increasing medical and hospital costs, the Congress and the Administration are taking a long, hard look at health care services throughout the country. While Congressional committees study and investigate the reasons for increased costs in Medicare, Medicaid and general health services, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in a hard-hitting report declared that the Nation is in danger of a breakdown in its health care program.

In this report, Secretary Robert Finch and Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, the recently appointed Assistant Secretary for Health, of HEW, said that medical costs are increasing at a rate twice as fast as the increase in the cost of living. The cost of a day in a hospital, excluding doctor bills, has risen from $44 in 1965 to $70 today and could reach $100 a day by 1970 unless action is taken to counter this inflationary increase. The President said in a recent statement that the Nation faces a "massive crisis" unless a "revolution" in health care is brought about by the private sector in cooperation with the Federal Government.

The basic problem is that the exploding population coupled with programs making high cost health care available to millions of additional citizens are over-taxing present facilities and methods. Officials say new approaches, new thinking, new methods keyed to lower-cost alternatives are regarded as essential if this problem is to be solved.

The HEW report said, in part:

"Our overtaxed health resources are being wastefully utilized and we are not adding to them fast enough to keep pace with rising demand. Our health priorities are critically out of balance. Our incentive systems all lead to overuse of high cost, acute-care facilities, while the need increasingly is for lower-cost alternatives."

The report emphasizes the need for a better system of training doctors and nurses to assure that sufficient medical personnel will be available to our people. Emphasis on hospital improvement should include expansion of facilities for out-patient treatment and other facilities to ease the pressure on hospitals, the report continued. The Administration is placing curbs and closer controls on the amount of payments for various Federal medical aid programs and the Public Health Service is preparing recommendations on improvements needed in our health care system.

Certainly the health insurance companies, physicians, hospitals, medical schools, business, and the Federal, state and local governments should join together in solving this acute problem of health care for those who need and require it. Costs must be cut and services must be improved.

SAVE OUR PARKS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress what one thoughtful man has proposed as a solution to counter those forces seeking to eliminate our public parks, the one last remaining refuge of beauty in some of our crowded cities.

Beverly Hills Assemblyman Alan Sieroty has a bill before the California Legislature that will put a stop to the park-wrecking, or at least slow it down. His bill would require any governmental agency or public utility that destroys a park to replace it with another equal park in the same area for the same users.

If Assemblyman Sieroty's bill becomes law, a valuable model and precedent for other cities across the entire United States may be established.

Radio Station KFWB of Los Angeles, under the direction of Gordon Davis, vice president and general manager, and Gene Fuson, editorial director, recently presented an editorial, which follows, concerning Assemblyman Alan Sieroty's bill to save our parks:

AB 1918: WHO WRECKS ONE, BUILDS ONE

(By Gordon Davis)

Just one month ago, we described the sickening sight of state construction crews as they chopped down huge old shade trees and ripped up lawns to turn a downtown Los Angeles park into a blacktop parking lot.

It was done in the name of "progress." It was all perfectly legal. We found it repugnant.

Beverly Hills Assemblyman Alan Sieroty has a bill in the legislature that will put a stop to the park-wreckers, or at least slow them down.

Sieroty's bill is AB 1918. It would require any governmental agency or public utility that destroys a park to replace it with another equal park in the same area for the same users.

As you might expect, the bill's major opposition has been coming from the State Department of Public Works and the State Division of Highways. Those are the two agencies that have traditionally ripped up public parks because they are an easy victim. The Los Angeles park was a perfect example.

Sieroty's AB 1918 already has the approval of the Natural Resources Committee, and now comes up a week from today before Assemblyman Frank Lanterman's Way and Means Committee.

If AB 1918 becomes law, it will be the first major step ever taken to protect our local parks from destruction by their worst enemy—our own government.

K. STEFAN POMIERSKI—AN EXCITING LEADER

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was very deeply saddened by the recent passing of my dearly beloved friend, Mr. K. Stefan Pomierski, which recently occurred in Riverhead, Long Island, N.Y.

Born in Poland of a noble family, and with the title of Count, Mr. Pomierski came to this country years ago when conditions in Poland and Europe were deteriorating as a result of war and the activities of the twin totalitarian systems of communism and Hitlerism.

He was highly gifted and had attended the University of Leipzig, the University of Heidelberg, Oxford University in England, Cracow Technical University, and other famous Polish institutions of learning.

Possessed of extraordinary linguistic talents, he actually spoke fluently in 11 languages, and had a working knowledge of many language systems in the world.

He was a dedicated student of religious and general philosophy and political science, particularly that of the United States and the free world.

Mr. Pomierski was passionately devoted to the cause of Polish freedom, and the liberation of the Polish people from the repressive system imposed upon them by the Soviet Marxist, satellite regime.

He spent a great deal of his time and personal funds in support of this cause, and organized various, effective organizations to work for its objectives, and for the resettlement in this country of Polish refugees.

XUM

In his early life he became an American citizen, and no one could be more zealous, loyal, devoted, and committed to our country with greater fervor, depth of feeling and total fidelity than this learned, Polish nobleman, K. Stefan Pomierski.

In fact, I regarded him as one of the most patriotic Americans I have ever known. He was particularly eloquent of speech in a number of languages, and this facility made him most sought after as an after-dinner speaker, leader, and presiding officer of a number of organizations.

Some of the speeches I have heard him make about the great significance, and invaluable worth of American citizenship, and the benefits and blessing of our great country, were among the most stirring and impressive talks that I have ever heard.

He spoke with force and conviction, at times with fiery expression and sensitivity, yet always in the measured language and rational pattern of the intellectual and the highly cultivated individual.

Mr. Pomierski devoted much of his life to writing and working for the causes, political aims, and moral principles to which he was irrevocably pledged, and other activities, in which he was successful, were frequently subordinated to the greater demands of questions of freedom, personal liberty, free enterprise, justice for all that were such a definitive part of the philosophy and makeup of this gifted leader.

He won the confidence of many people by his strong, effective expression in many languages, his eloquent tongue, and his resolute adherence, particularly to the ideas and principles of human freedom, individual liberty, and the rights of mankind, in which he so profoundly believed.

Count Pomierski was an idealist in many ways, but he was also very much a realist, who could not be swayed or diverted from his high goals by the honeyed promises, the false, rosy preachments, or the insincere professions and pressures, of radical, political reformers.

This proud son of Poland and loyal American saw very clearly the need for a progressive, political community and national atmosphere, where free discussion could exist, equality of treatment for all was assured, and where institutions could be changed by the people whenever it was necessary to serve the public interest.

I knew Count Pomierski very well. I had great admiration and affection for him. I also had great respect for his learning, his intellectual attainments, his linguistic mastery, and his allegiance to the doctrines of human freedom, and the perpetuation of liberty, democracy and justice in this great Republic of ours, and in the world, to which he devoted a large part of his life.

He was a Polish freedom fighter in the best sense, but he was also a courageous and gallant worker and fighter for the American Constitution, the American way of life, and the realization of the American dream.

He lived a long, active life, devoted to standing up boldly, and fighting unceasingly for the things in which he believed—his ideals and his loyalties.

He has left us a rich heritage—the strong, fearless advocacy of truth and principle in a world that seems to be putting less and less value upon these essential universals so basic to the free way of life.

He fought the good fight, and he never gave up his principles and his convictions, which he carried with him to his last resting place.

Such a man must be admired for his talents, praised for his courage, honored for his loyalties and loved for his resolute allegiance and the truths he fought for and passed on to the friends he loved.

Mr. Pomierski was endowed with rare personal qualities and the capacity of making friends. Warmhearted by nature, generous of spirit, interested in people and in a wide range of human events, he was truly a citizen of the world, courtly, well-mannered, urbane, a devotee of music and the performing arts, whose exceptional linguistic powers enabled him to sing and recite in several different languages.

He possessed an exceptional sense of humor and always was an extraordinary conversationalist of magnetic presence welcomed in every gathering. Trained in the best classical traditions, he would often conclude his musical renditions with the famous student song—Gaudeamus Igitur.

He is survived by a wonderful family—his lovely wife, Anna, a native of Riverhead, Long Island, N.Y., an American-Polish girl of beauty, understanding, and devotion to him, two brothers, sons, grandchildren, nephews and nieces, who were surely the apple of his eye, and who will miss him in death as they loved him in life.

I join them in mourning his sorrowful passing, and the irreparable loss which they, and all of us who knew and loved him, have sustained. Stefan Pomierski fought the good fight for God and country all his life, and now in death I know he will be rewarded and blessed by his Maker in his eternal, heavenly rest.

He was a man of distinction, color, and many interests, a citizen of the world, an exciting cosmopolitan, an intriguing companion and friend, who saw clearly the dangers on our course and gave freely of himself to preserve individual liberty and freedom in the Nation and world. May the good Lord grant him peace rest.

Mr. Speaker, I insert as part of my remarks certain newspaper articles concerning Mr. Pomierski's passing:

[From the Glen Cove (N.Y.) Record-Pilot, July 3, 1969]

POMIERSKI, LONG HERE, DIES AT 75

Konstanty Stefan Pomierski, 75, who had lived in Glen Cove for 31 years, died at his home in Aquebogue, L.I., on June 25 after a long illness.

Mr. Pomierski, who had been born a member of an ancient Polish noble family in Pomorze, Poland, was educated in Germany. After graduation from a classical college, he did post-graduate work in Germany, London and New York.

He came to the United States during World War I and served as a junior finance officer with the Merchant Marine.

In 1935, he moved to Glen Cove and established himself as a real estate broker and general insurance executive. From 1935 to 1940 he was the Senior Area Supervisor of the National Youth Administration on Long Island.

At the outbreak of World War II, he worked in an administrative position with the United States War Manpower Commission and initiated the establishment of the first two training centers on the island for the War Industries. He also served as a liaison officer between the War Manpower Commission and foreign groups, and as a member of the board of the Office of Price Administration, City War Council, and the War Bonds Committee.

During the Korean War, Mr. Pomierski was the acting civil defense Director for Glen Cove. In recognition of his war services he received a Presidential Citation, a Certificate of Award from the Governor of New York, the Commander's Cross of Polonia Restituta, the Gold Cross of Merit by the Government of Poland, official decorations from Greece, France and Serbia and the Papal Blessing for his stand against communism.

Following the wars, Mr. Pomierski assumed many civic responsibilities, including membership on the Neighborhood Association Board of Directors, the Community Chest, the Polish National Home, and the USO. He was named President Emeritus of the American Order of General Pulaski; was commissioned a colonel by the Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; and was a member of the City Library Board of Trustees.

Mr. Pomierski is survived by his widow, Anna A. Celic; a son, Joseph; and two grandchildren.

A solemn mass of requiem was offered at St. Isidore's Church, Riverhead, and interment was at St. Isidore's Cemetery.

[From the New York Times, June 27, 1969]

K. STEFAN POMIERSKI, 75, EX-INSURANCE MAN, IS DEAD

RIVERHEAD, L.I., June 26.—K. Stefan Pomierski, a retired realtor and insurance man, and a leading in Polish-American activities, died yesterday at his home at Broad Avenue, Aquebogue. He was 75 years old.

Mr. Pomierski was president emeritus of the American Order of General Pulaski.

He was born in Poland and came to the United States during World War I, when he served with the United States Shipping Board. In World War II he served with the War Manpower Commission.

From 1935 to 1940 he was a Long Island supervisor for the Youth Administration. During the Korean War, he was acting civil defense director of Glen Cove.

Surviving are his widow, the former Anna A. Celic; a son, Joseph; a brother, and two grandchildren.

K. S. POMIERSKI, POLISH LEADER, DIES

AQUEBOGUE.—K. Stefan Pomierski of Broad Avenue, an active leader of Polish Americans and a president emeritus of the American Order of General Pulaski, died Wednesday of a heart attack. He was 75.

Born of a Polish noble family in Pomorze, he emigrated to the United States in 1914. During World War I, he served in the U.S. Merchant Marine and had an administrative position with the U.S. Manpower Commission during World War II. For services rendered during the two world wars, he was decorated by the governments of Greece, France and Serbia, and he received a U.S. Presidential citation. During the Korean War, he was acting civil defense director for the city of Glen Cove, where he lived for 31 years.

A self-employed general insurance agent and realtor, he was active in civic organiza-

XUM

tions for more than 30 years. He had served as a senior area supervisor with the National Youth Administration, was a member of the Glen Cove library board and a founder of the "I am an American" Day.

But his special interest was in aiding Polish emigres and victims of prisoner of war camps. In 1950, he received a Papal blessing from the Vatican for his services.

He is survived by his widow, Anna, of Broad Avenue; a son Joseph, of Aquebogue; a brother John, of Glen Cove; and two grandchildren.

The rosary will be recited for him tonight at 8 in the Danowski funeral home, on Marcy Avenue, Riverhead. A solemn High Requiem mass will be sung Saturday at 9:30 a.m. in St. Isidore's R.C. Church, Riverhead, Interment will take place in St. Isidore's R.C. Cemetery.

[From Newsday, June 27, 1969]

K. POMIERSKI: RITES SET

Riverhead—Services will be held tomorrow for Konstanty Stefan Pomierski, 75, who died Wednesday at his home in Aquebogue.

Pomierski, a retired real estate agent and general insurance executive, was a Glen Cove resident from 1935 to 1966. The book, "Long Island: A History of Two Great Counties, Nassau and Suffolk," describes him as "one of the outstanding citizens of Polish extraction in the Nassau County section." It said that he "devoted his activities extensively to various efforts during World War II, including his important service as Nassau supervisor of the National Youth Administration."

The book lists among Pomierski's "outstanding services" his participation on the Glen Cove board of the Office of Price Administration and on the War Council of Glen Cove during World War II. During the Korean war, Pomierski was acting civil defense director of the City of Glen Cove. In recognition of his war services, he received a presidential citation, a Gold Cross of Merit. He had also received citations from Poland, Greece, France, Yugoslavia.

Pomierski was also president emeritus of the American Order of General Pulaski. He was a former member of the board of directors of the Glen Cove Neighborhood Association and the board of trustees of the Glen Cove Library. He is survived by his wife, Anna; a son, Joseph; two brothers, Jan and Roman, and two grandchildren, Patricia and Joseph. Services will be at St. Isidore's Catholic Church at 9:30 AM, followed by burial in St. Isidore's Catholic Cemetery.

FRATERNITIES ON CAMPUS DISORDERS

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues will be interested to learn the attitude concerning campus disorders held by a large representative group of college students.

At its national convention in August 1968, the Pi Kappa Phi fraternity passed a resolution on this subject.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I quote the text of that resolution in full:

PI KAPPA PHI FRATERNITY RESOLUTION

Whereas, Pi Kappa Phi Fraternity is deeply concerned about the serious disorders occurring on American and foreign college and university campuses; and

Whereas, such disorders disrupt the progress of the vast majority of students who seriously seek an education; and

Whereas, such activity on the part of a few students reflects unfavorably on the majority who come to learn and not to burn; and

Whereas, such activity not only endangers our educational system, but also our economic and governmental systems; and

Whereas, Pi Kappa Phi Fraternity supports the right of dissent and demonstrations within proper and reasonable limits;

Be it therefore resolved, that Pi Kappa Phi Fraternity urges other Greek organizations to join our Brotherhood in a concerted effort to provide constructive leadership on our college and university campuses toward the goal that student controversies may be presented within the bounds of established school procedures and with due regard for the rights of fellow students; and

Be it further resolved, that when student pleas and complaints are properly presented, Pi Kappa Phi Fraternity will support and defend the right of students to have fair hearings and equitable consideration by appropriate school officials.

TOWN OF EAST LONGMEADOW

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the beautiful town of East Longmeadow in southwestern Massachusetts has just celebrated its 75th anniversary. This gala 8-day occasion recalled the proud history of a residential and industrial New England town which borders a large metropolitan city, an affluent suburb, and the State of Connecticut.

Settled in 1740, East Longmeadow was an integral part of the town of Longmeadow until July 1, 1894, when it was incorporated as a separate town. Although the question of the division of Longmeadow into two parts was brought into public view as early as 1865, it was not until after 30 years of debate that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts established East Longmeadow by an act signed on May 19, 1894, to take effect July 1, 1894.

The town's early economy both before and after the division was sustained by the brownstone quarry industry. In its heyday of quarrying, East Longmeadow had more than 50 sandstone quarries employing several hundred persons. With the turn of the century the women of East Longmeadow, perhaps more than in any other section of western Massachusetts, moved to the forefront in the battle for women's suffrage. This fine civic spirit is illustrated further by the fact that 75 years after its incorporation East Longmeadow still maintains its original town meeting form of government.

In the more recent history of the town, East Longmeadow has continually progressed forward to keep pace with the 20th century. During the preceding decade from 1950 to 1960 the population increased 110 percent from 4,900 to 10,300. In addition the growth rate during that period was the second highest of any community in the State. The present population, according to the 1965 census, is 11,988.

It is not surprising to note that the industrial economy has kept pace with the population boom. While East Longmeadow is primarily a residential town, it is well balanced with large industries, beginning with the Package Machinery Co., the American Saw & Manufacturing Co., and the newest surging industry—the Milton Bradley Co.

In the field of education East Longmeadow boasts a commendable record of achievement. The opening of the new high school in 1960 was a major event in the history of the town. The site includes a football stadium with track, baseball diamond, soccer and hockey fields, tennis courts, and hockey rink. One of the two towns in the western part of the State to have a metropolitan council for educational opportunity program, East Longmeadow has enrolled 18 nonwhite pupils from Springfield in grades 1 through 4. These pupils will be given the opportunity to continue through to high school graduation. Each of these pupils has a host family in town, on hand to help in any situation.

Proud of their prosperous and progressive town the citizens of East Longmeadow paid tribute to their achievements in their recent 8-day 75th anniversary celebration. Events ranged from a swim meet, an art exhibit, fireworks, a band concert, a carnival, and concluded with an exciting gay nineties anniversary ball.

Mr. Speaker, I include the program for the 75th anniversary celebration of East Longmeadow in the RECORD:

PROGRAM

SATURDAY, JUNE 28

10:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M.: "Swim Meet" at the High School Pool, no charge, open to all. Trophies and ribbons awarded. Sponsored by local Y.M.C.A. George LaBroad, *Chairman;* Peg LaBroad, Bob Gibson, *Assistant*.

10:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.: "Outdoor Art Exhibit," show and sale at the Livery, Shaker Road. Registration forms available from Raymond Ellison, recreation director. Sponsored by the Council for the Aging and Teen-Age Group.

12:00 P.M.: Boy Scout Troop #275 Camping at Center Field. Scouting skills. Charles Spaulding, Scoutmaster, in charge. Visitors welcome. (Until 2:00 P.M. Sunday)

1:00 P.M. to 5:00 P.M.: Y.M.C.A. Young Adults Concert, High school athletic field, bands. "Egg," "Temple", "Cin", "Incredibly High" plus folk singers. No charge. Sponsored by East Longmeadow Y.M.C.A. Dr. Raymond Racicot, *Chairman*.

5:00 P.M. to 7:00 P.M.: Y.M.C.A. "Chicken Barbecue" H.S. Athletic Field. Sponsored by East Longmeadow Y.M.C.A. W. Lynn Gage, *Chairman*.

6:00 P.M.: "Fire Engine Parade." More than 30 pieces of fire apparatus, antique models, bands, marching units. Parade route: Birchland Park School to High School via Elm, Mapleshade, North Main to Center, Maple Street. Sponsored by local firefighters.

8:00 P.M. to 11:00 P.M.: Y.M.C.A. "Up With People Show" sing out Springfield. High School singing groups. A show for the entire family. Larry Carnes, *Director;* Frederic Stevens, Dr. Earl Tompkins, Marshall Hanson, assisted by East Longmeadow Y.M.C.A. Jr. Leaders Club. Pete Sibley and Lynda Cassidy, *Advisors*. Sponsored by East Longmeadow Y.M.C.A. *Admission 50¢*.

XUM

SUNDAY, JUNE 29

10:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.: "Outdoor Art Exhibit", show and sale. (see details, Saturday, June 28.)

12:30 P.M.: "East Longmeadow Dog Obedience Match", St. Mark's Church grounds, corner Porter Road and Mapleshade Ave. Open to purebred and non-purebred. Entry time: 12:30 to 2:00 P.M. Entry fee: $1.00 per class. Judging begins at 2:00 P.M. Margaret McClenaghan, East Longmeadow; Margaret McClintock, Longmeadow; *AKC Obedience Judges*. No admission, refreshments. For information, contact: A. Scott Phillips 525–3597, Susan Newkirk 734–2320.

1:00 P.M.: "Sidewalk Coloring Contest" in center area. Age groups judged as follows:

Ages 4 thru 6.
Ages 7 thru 9.
Ages 10 thru 12.
Ages 13 thru 15.

Sign up at The Livery, Shaker Rd., Cash Prizes. Sponsored by Recreation Commission.

1:00 P.M. to 5:00 P.M.: "Chicken Barbecue and Carnival," Knights of Columbus, K. of C. Grounds, Baldwin St. off Maple St. Adults: $2.00 Children (12 and under): $1.00 No reservations.

2:30 P.M.: "5½ Mile Road Race", AAU sanctioned Marathon. Route: From Center, Maple St. to Chestnut St., Chestnut St. to Shaker Rd., back to Center; twice around. Prizes and medals. Entry blanks available from Raymond Ellison, Recreation Director, The Livery, East Longmeadow. Sponsored by the Recreation Commission. Runners report to the Livery, Shaker Road, East Longmeadow.

4:30 p.m.: "Ecumenical Vesper Service", First Congregational Church lawn. Music for hymns, brief church history. Cooperating churches: Congregational, Lutheran, Catholic, Methodist, Episcopal. Bring your lawn chairs and blankets.

6:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.: "Western-style Square Dance", First Bank Parking Lot, Maple St. Refreshments. Sponsored by Gunther-Rowley Post 293, American Legion. For tickets, contact: Robert Earnshaw, tel: 525–3509—Arthur Mackintire, tel: 525–6065. Admission: $3.00 per couple.

MONDAY, JUNE 30

5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.: "Y.M.C.A. Indian Guides" at Center Playground. Indian-type carnival of crafts, games and displays. Teepees, over 30 tribes represented. Refreshments. Closing ceremony at dusk. No admission.

8:30 p.m. or dark: Movie: "Spencer's Mountain" (color) at Little League Field, Center Playground. No admission. Sponsored by Recreation Commission.

TUESDAY, JULY 1

5:30 p.m.: "Swedish Meatball Supper". St. Paul's Lutheran Church, corner Elm St. and Mapleshale Ave. Tickets: $2.50. For reservations contact: Miss Hulda Anderson, tel: 733–4483—Mrs. Dottie Sandin, tel: 525–3417.

7:00 p.m. to 11.00 p.m.: "Happens-Dance", St. Mark's Church parking lot (corner Mapleshade Ave. and Porter Road). An evening of music, singing and dancing for young people—all outdoors. Sponsored by St. Mark's Church and local Y.M.C.A Admission: 50¢ "in the barrel"—Refreshments.

7:30 P.M. to 9:00 P.M.: "Dog Obedience and Drill Team Demonstration", high school athletic field and bleachers. Sponsored by East Longmeadow Dog Obedience Training Club. No admission.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 2

10:00 A.M. to 3:00 P.M.: "Golden Agers' Food Sale". The Livery, Shaker Road.

5:00 P.M. and 6:00 P.M.: "Grange Smorgasboard Supper", Grange Hall, Somers Road. Tickets: $2.00. Two sittings, reservations please. Call: Mrs. Doris Hibbard: 567-5658.

7:00 P.M. to 9:00 P.M.: "Band Program", center playground, East Longmeadow High School Band. Bring your lawn chairs and blankets.

8:00 P.M. to 11:30 P.M.: "Battle of the Bands", high school gym. Sponsored by the Recreation Commission. Admission: $1.25.

THURSDAY, JULY 3

12:00 P.M. to 3:00 P.M.: "This 'n That Sale" and "Fudge and Bake Sale", The Livery, Shaker Rd. Sponsored by the Council for the Aging.

5:00 to Sellout: "Jaycee's Beef Barbecue", high school hockey rink. Price: 75¢. For tickets, contact: Bob Bean tel: 525-4070.

6:00 P.M. to 12:00 P.M.: "Bavarian Stein Fest", Baldwin St. (across from K. of C.). Music. Refreshments. Commemorative Steins, $2.00 (white-glazed ceramic; anniversary seal in blue). Sponsored by the Craftsmen's Club. Contact: George Chmael, 390 Somers Road, East Longmeadow. Also on Friday and Saturday.

8:00 to fireworks: "Jaycee's Young People's Dance", High School Tennis Courts. Live band—No admission.

10:00 p.m.: "Fireworks Display", high school.

10:00 P.M. to 12:00 P.M.: Continuation of Jaycee's Young People's Dance.

FRIDAY, JULY 4

9:00 A.M. to 11:30 A.M.: "Coffee and Donuts", The Livery, Shaker Road. Sponsored by the Council for the Aging.

10:00 A.M.: "Fourth of July Parade", the biggest event of the 75th celebration. Floats, bands, marching units.

10:00 A.M.: "Box Lunches", First Congregational Church lawn, Center Square. Adults: 75c. Children: 50c. Drinks available. Also available at high school parking lot during and after parade. Sponsored by Women's Fellowship, First Congregational Church.

10:00 A.M.: "Food Booth", United Methodist Church, 58 Maple Street (near RR). Hot dogs, cold drinks, souvenir hats, balloons, etc. Also refreshment stand, Center Square, at Gulf Station.

"Beard Contest Judging", high school parking area. At conclusion of the parade.

12:00 Noon to 12 P.M.: "Bavarian Stein Fest" (see Thursday for details).

6:00 P.M.: "Drum Corps Competition", high school athletic field and bleachers. Admission: $1.50.

SATURDAY, JULY 5

12:00 Noon to 12:00 P.M.: "Bavarian Stein Fest" (see Thursday for details).

1:00 P.M. to 3:00 P.M.: "Fashion Show", The Livery Shaker Road. For teen girls and mothers. Sponsored by the Recreation Commission and "The Wicked Witch". No Admission.

2:00 P.M.: "Band Concert" by the American Legion Band, Center playground. Sponsored by Shaker Bowl. Bring your lawn chairs and blankets.

8:30 P.M. to 12:00 P.M.: "Gay 90's Anniversary Ball", Willow Glen, Castilian Room. Hot and cold hors d'oeuvres—Music by "Cookie" Bates—Grand March—Costume Prizes. Tickets: $2.50 per person.

For tickets call: Mrs. Joseph Accorsi, tel: 525–2532, Mrs. Donald Bremmer, 525–2425, and Mr. Gordon Davidson, 525–3088.

Sponsored by the Lions' Club and Women's Community Club.

Final event of the celebration: "Anniversary Store", located at the East Longmeadow Grange Hall, Somers Road, 12:00 P.M. to 2:00 P.M., Friday, June 27th, Saturday, June 28th, Monday, June 30th thru Saturday, July 5th, Anniversary items on display for sale or order.

"Country Store", Maple Street, corner Baldwin Street near R.R., Open at 11:00 A.M. Daily through July 5th, St. Michael's Catholic Women's Club. Red-striped vests. Adults: $1.50. Children: 75¢. Aprons, converted to bonnets; Bazaar items, white elephants; penny candy, ceramics, many other items.

"Food Booth", 58 Maple Street (near R.R.), United Methodist Church Group. Hot dogs, cold drinks, souvenir hats, ballons, etc. Open at 11:00 A.M. Daily through July 5th.

THE FEELINGS OF THE AVERAGE MIDDLE-INCOME TAXPAYER

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned with high taxes, inflation, unnecessary spending and waste, foreign aid, Vietnam costs, and many other ways to get rid of the taxpayers dollars. I was one of those who voted to impose a 10-percent surtax in 1968 because everyone who should know said it would halt inflation. Hindsight is better than foresight. It has not. Therefore, I voted against the surtax extension. President Nixon campaigned in my district in Marion, Ill., just before the election and promised my people that he would be for the elimination of the surtax.

Mr. Speaker, under previous order granted me, I want to insert in the RECORD a letter I have received from a friend and constituent, Mr. R. P. Hibbs, of DuQuoin, Ill., pointing out the feelings of the average middle-income taxpayer. They are mad. We had better listen.

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY,
Carbondale, Ill., July 14, 1969.

Hon. KENNETH J. GRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GRAY: Many of us were encouraged to hear the pre-election pledges by our new administration of domestic and international changes for the better; we are disenchanted to find that we have just what we had before—only more of it.

Of immediate concern are runaway inflation and the surtax; the latter, at least by implication, the elected administration promised to eliminate. In a way, I guess it did: it will eliminate the confiscatory 7½ per cent 1968 tax under President Johnson and replace it with 10 percent for 1969 under President Nixon.

Has there ever been a "temporary" tax—which is the pap we are fed to make a new tax swallowable? Will the surtax be 12 per cent next year, 15 the following, mounting in perpetuity?

Nearly one-third of my very modest *gross* income in 1968 went to the Federal government in income taxes alone. Add to this the plethora of other taxes, steadily mounting, the new Illinois income taxes and increases in its other taxes, I must work nearly every other day for government, not counting the governmental record-keeping I must do on the day I work for myself. I am tired of supporting increasing numbers of persons who live off my labor, in many cases in greater luxury than I, weary of profligacy, of government as determiner and provider of everything for everybody everywhere.

One does not need by a Keynesian economist to know that our present namby-pamby efforts of coping with inflation are like fighting fire with gasoline; they accelerate inflation, not inhibit it.

The chief inflater is government itself, with its gorged budgets, deficit spending, its raising of the interest rates on its obligations, its enlarging of salaries. How can these fight inflation? Am I expected to believe that if I spend my money, inflation

XUM

will be compounded but if the *government* spends it, inflation will be curbed?

That the surtax will brake inflation is wishful thinking indeed. Has it done so? Will it do so? How can it? Already, in anticipation of its reenactment, have come tremendous wage hikes for all kinds of labor (see July 11 Time), and rises in prices for products and services as cushions against the surtax.

Pray tell me, sir, what makes wage and price control inviolable? Indeed, that is what the surtax purports to do, indirectly and ineffectually, aggravating the malady it purports to cure. True, it does debilitate the spending power of those like me, who have no powerful union or lobby to raise our wages against the new bite and who, unlike our legislators, cannot vote ourselves unconscionable increases in salary.

Governmental "guidelines" for price and wage controls have been forcical, ignored, stultified by the government itself. I am aware of the implications and complications of definitive, enforceable wage and price controls; but our present gauche dabbling is complicated, too—and worse than ineffectual. Price and wage controls did stabilize prices and wages during our wars. There will come a place where we shall have to take this reluctant step anyway; let us do so before the disease is so desperate that even more heroic remedies will not cure it.

This letter sounds like embitterment; indeed, sir, it is.

Respectfully yours,

R. P. HIBBS.

GEN. JOHN P. McCONNELL

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to attend ceremonies last Thursday at the White House honoring a dear friend, Gen. John P. McConnell. The able Air Force Chief of Staff is retiring July 31.

President Nixon said of General McConnell:

> His performance in both war and peace reflects the true spirit of the American armed forces.

I have known General McConnell in war and peace, professionally and personally. I have talked with him at length on matters relating to the defense of our Nation; and I have enjoyed his company in a more leisure setting as he visited in my district in Texas, and throughout the country.

As leader of the mightiest air power in the world, General McConnell has been tailor made for the job. He is a stern taskmaster. When he gives an order, there is not the slightest question that it will be obeyed, immediately and accurately. His professional approach has won him respect from the officers and men of the Air Force, the highest respect. He has also won their personal admiration with his warm personality.

As a native of Arkansas, General McConnell is well known throughout my district. We are all appreciative of his contributions in our area. In Texas, we call him one of our own.

During his career, the Air Force has advanced from a group of dedicated pilots who flew by the seats of their pants, to a highly sophisticated computerized airborne armada.

It is a vastly different Air Force since the day that the young John McConnell signed on. His contributions did much to make the transition orderly. His enthusiasm was infectious. His men have kept this Nation leader of the free world.

Permit me, also, Mr. Speaker, to vouch for his tremendous dedication to his country. There never has lived a more intensely dedicated man. He was commander in chief of the Air Force, and as such, the men and officers gave him total response. In turn, General McConnell was fiercely loyal to his Commander in Chief, President Lyndon Johnson, to whom he gave complete dedication. Those of us who knew of this loyalty will always remember with affection and respect the services of the General McConnell who led the U.S. Air Forces in its greatest hours. In our hall of fame the name of John McConnell should be near the top for that is where he belonged, by nature, experience, and service.

WATER POLLUTION

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor of July 11, 1969, carried an item on water pollution in the Cuyahoga River. I believe the first two sentences of this news item to be most revealing, and I quote:

> It finally happened. The Cuyahoga River caught on fire last month.

I have written Secretary of the Interior Hickel to request a full report on the specific incident described in the news item and for information on the allegation in the news item that various water pollution control statutes are not being enforced with regard to the Cuyahoga.

So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to see the Christian Science Monitor's news item, I include the text of the article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

> It finally happened. The Cuyahoga River caught on fire last month, just as Cleveland Mayor Carl B. Stokes and a host of other antipollutionists warned it would.
>
> The lower reaches of the Cuyahoga, a meandering stream which flows into Lake Erie, are supersaturated with pollutants—mainly unreclaimed oils and other gooey wastes from the big steel mills and other industries lining the river's banks.
>
> Spot fires from oil slicks and other flammable junk floating in the river are usually put out quickly by patrolling fireboats.
>
> But this time the situation got out of hand, owing to an enormous accumulation of oil that apparently was dumped into the river in the vicinity of the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation.
>
> The slick ignited. Shooting flames upward to 200 feet, it floated downstream under two railroad trestles. The wooden trestles caught fire. Both tracks, curled by the heat, had to be closed. Fire officials estimated the damage at $50,000.
>
> Both state and local laws prohibit dumping of industrial wastes into the Cuyahoga. But the laws are rarely if ever invoked. And the state grants permits to industries to jettison their effluence into the stream.
>
> Mayor Stokes is now threatening to bring legal action against the State of Ohio to prevent it from renewing these permits.
>
> Meanwhile, antipollutionists hope this latest episode will trigger a public outcry for stiffer laws and tougher enforcement.

A PRIVATE CORPORATION'S MEAT COULD BE A PUBLIC UTILITY'S POISON

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the wise shopper has long since learned to examine all of the goods in the marketplace before deciding upon a selection. Those of us who serve on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee can be likened to comparative shoppers in that we are actively seeking new and better methods through which to run this immense and troubled public service. The Nixon administration's current offering in the marketplace of postal ideas is a public corporation financed through public and private investments. The corporation plan was conceived by a Presidential Commission headed by Frederick R. Kappel of American Telephone & Telegraph.

It cannot be denied that the Kappel Commission approached their task with a determination to do what is best for this country's mail users, nor can it be denied that they are sincerely convinced of the soundness of this proposal; nevertheless, in attempting to acquaint Members of this distinguished body with the merits of the plan, its backers, headed by Mr. Kappel, are offering some rather weak and uncertain comparisons as evidence.

The theory is being put forward that because the A.T. & T. Corp. is a successful, going concern whose stock is both healthy and attractive, a postal corporation along similar lines will be a golden bonanza for the ailing Post Office Department. Although the proponents of this theory are by no means attempting to dupe or hoodwink the public, they are, by an act of omission rather than commission, failing to point out certain fundamental differences which exist between the present A.T. & T. Corp. and the suggested postal corporation.

First, as far as an economically healthy operation is concerned, let me mention the fact that A.T. & T. is guaranteed a 6 percent profit; this is not a bad deal for any corporation, public or private. No such guarantee is anticipated for the postal corporation, which would have a tough enough time merely breaking even, let alone profiting. Second, the Post Office Department is a public utility which must service everyone, everywhere within our borders, whether it is pleasant, profitable, prudent, and prestigious or not. Such oppressive dregs are not part of the phone company's plan. Areas which are deemed undesirable for various reasons—including profit margins—find themselves outside the wonderful world of A.T. & T.—no princess phones for them. Third, a short note to cousin Mary Jane in Sea Girt, N.J. costs the same as a long letter to Aunt Dorothy in Imperial Beach, Calif. Public spirited bargains such as this are not to be found on the telephone, for which charges are based according to minutes and distance. Indeed, the last reduction in telephone rates, heavily ballyhooed in newspaper and magazine ads, was actually a direct result of a Government order. This hardly corresponds with the proposed postal corporation's strictly nonprofit, nondiscriminatory, public service nature. Finally, perhaps "neither snow nor rain nor sleet nor gloom of night shall stay the couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds," but it certainly cannot be said that those elements, at one time or another, have never "stayed" the telephone from its intended function. While people have learned to accept occasional substandard telephone service for various reasons—faulty equipment, overloaded circuits, downed power lines, et cetera—few of us will readily tolerate a letter never delivered or a mail route market "out of order." In short, it is just not the same.

I do not mean to argue that the postal corporation scheme is a thoroughly bad idea or that I am dead set against it; the point I want to underscore is simply that the big business, corporate-oriented community, with Mr. Kappel as its chief spokesman, should not presume to be holding the key to a miraculous corporate panacea for our postal ills when direct, comparative examination reveals inept analogies and faulty reasoning in the attempts to match existing corporate structures to the needs of our postal service.

Additionally, I do not deny that we must move decisively toward postal reform. I am a firm advocate of this course—but after, not before, a thorough examination of all of the solutions available for the Department's difficulties, unbeclouded by the rhetoric of big business salesmanship. It is misdirected altruism at best and overbearing hypocrisy at worst which manifests itself in postal corporation sales pitches from corporate leaders who have no need or history of being totally responsive or totally responsible to the public interest, as a proper postal service must be. What we need is a chance for cautious shopping in the absence of high pressure salesmen. What is good for A.T. & T. is good for the Post Office? To quote an old but applicable expression, "it aint necessarily so."

MEN ON THE MOON

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I have just heard that our astronauts, Armstrong and Aldrin, have successfully lifted off the moon, and are now in orbit steering for rendezvous with Michael Collins in the Columbia. It is, needless to say, a major relief to know that they have begun their journey homeward, and I guess that it will now be easier to talk about their feats of yesterday.

How magnificient it was to see them last night touch the moon's surface and perform their historic tasks. This entire undertaking brings out all the superlatives in one's vocabulary, and makes speech itself seem little and unimportant.

All I can say is that our hearts and prayers are with the astronauts and their families, and that the Nation is proud and happy about their historic mission.

DALLAS LEADS TEXAS; SEVEN OF TOP 10 COMPANIES

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's New York Times has an interesting article which was headlined "Dallas First as Texas Business Hub." This particular article in the New York Times stresses the point that seven of the largest 10 companies in Texas are domiciled in Dallas.

We are proud of the growth of Dallas because it measures the enthusiastic spirit of our great business leaders. These businessmen have built companies that provide job opportunities in fields ranging from banking and insurance to electronics and baking goods.

Dallas takes pride in its present achievement, but the greatest thrill is to look to the dynamic future.

The following is the article in the New York Times, July 20, 1969:

> Dallas established itself as the center of Texas business this week with the release of a list of the top 100 companies in Texas, showing Dallas with seven of the top 10.
>
> The list, compiled by the Texas Parade magazine, also showed Dallas with 38 of the top 100. Houston was second with 31 and the remaining 31 were scattered throughout the state.
>
> Top ranked among the corporate giants is Ling-Temco-Vought of Dallas, with $2.7-billion in 1968 sales. The top 100 Texas corporations are ranked by sales in 1968 or fiscal 1968, by net, and by employes. Assets are also reported.
>
> Second is Houston's Tenneco, which had 1968 sales of just over $2 billion. It ranked first in assets and net income and second in employes. L-T-V was second in assets, fourth in net and first in employes.
>
> Third largest of the top 100 was Halliburton of Dallas. After Halliburton, the companies in the top 10 ranks as follows: Texas Instruments of Dallas; Pennzoil United of Houston; Dresser Industries of Dallas; Southland Corporation of Dallas; Anderson, Clayton & Co. of Houston; Collins Radio of Dallas, and Campbell Taggart Bakeries of Dallas.
>
> In the collateral lists, Dallas and Houston split the four biggest banks, all of which have resources of $1-billion or more (including the Republic National Bank of Dallas with more than $2-billion). Houston outranks Dallas in the top-30-banks list, six to five.
>
> In the list of the top 40 life insurance companies, Dallas leads with 22, and Fort Worth and Houston each have seven. The biggest company in the state, American National, is based in Galveston.
>
> Statistically, the economy of Texas seems to be about one third based in Dallas, one third in Houston and the remaining third in the rest of the state.

BASEBALL ANNIVERSARY OBSERVANCE

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, we are today nearing the high point of the 100th anniversary observance of organized baseball. Tonight the centennial banquet will be held at Washington's Sheraton-Park Hotel at which the all-time baseball team will be announced as well as the greatest player ever. Honored guests at the dinner will include the living members of the greatest team, members of the baseball Hall of Fame, heroes of past All-Star games, and the entire 1969 All-Star cast.

Tomorrow, President Nixon will have about 400 of these guests over to the White House for a reception. In the evening the All-Star game will be held at R.F.K. Stadium with the President in attendance.

This all began 100 years ago when a group of Cincinnati businessmen organized a professional baseball club called the Red Stockings. By openly offering attractive salaries, they recruited the best players from the amateur and semipro ranks, including the first famous Wright brothers, playing-manager Harry and star shortstop George. This team, headed by Cincinnati attorney A. B. Champion, then toured the eastern States in the early summer of 1869, taking on the top teams in each city.

On June 25 they came to Washington and defeated the Nationals 24 to 8 on the field then at 15th and S Streets NW. A large crowd of about 7,000 came out in holiday atmosphere to view the touring professionals. The Red Stockings were well received locally and the next morning they were given a tour of the city by the Washington club. President Grant received them at the White House, where he shook hands with them and complimented them on their play. He promised to witness their next game if his official duties permitted him. On June 28 the Red Stockings beat the Washington Olympics 16 to 5 before another large crowd which presumably included the President. At least his carriage was parked on the outfield grass.

This gave the Red Stockings 20 consecutive victories and they returned to Cincinnati on July 1 for an enthusiastic reception and to prepare for their western tour. At the civic banquet in their honor, Club President A. B. Champion rose to his feet and said:

> Someone asked me today whom I would rather be, President Ulysses S. Grant or President Champion of the Cincinnati Baseball Club. I immediately answered him that I would by far rather be the president of the baseball club.

The team then toured to the west coast and back playing the leading teams in the country. They won all 65 games in their spectacular 1869 season and succeeded in stimulating a great interest in what was soon to become our national game.

It is interesting to note that President Nixon is emulating President Grant's gesture of a century ago by inviting baseball's greatest players to the White House. We are also pleased to note in this centennial year that the President has sparked interest in the national game by attending several Washington Senator contests. He has already attended five regular season games here. No President has shown that much interest in baseball in many years. Too often the only time a Chief Executive attended a major league game was to throw out the first ball on opening day, and sometimes that task has been turned over to the Vice President or some other top official. In fact, Mr. Nixon has been the only person to perform this duty as a Vice President, in 1959, and as President in 1969.

The only other Presidents to show such interest in major league baseball were Woodrow Wilson and William Howard Taft. In his first year in office in 1913, President Wilson attended seven games in Washington, where Walter Johnson was then the chief attraction. As the President left the park on one of his first outings, the fans hollered "Come again Woody," and he did, three times in 1 week. His attendance dropped off sharply after the 1913 season, because of the press of duties during World War I, and because of illness which restricted his activities.

President Taft, who initiated the practice of throwing out the first ball on opening day in 1910, saw a total of six games that year. Three were in Washington and three were on the road where he could take in National League games.

In the course of his 4-year Presidency, he saw a total of 14 major league games, including one game in Chicago, one in his hometown of Cincinnati, two in Pittsburgh, and three in St. Louis. On May 4, 1910, in St. Louis, he went to the extreme of going to the National League park to see the Cardinals play the Reds, only to leave midway in the contest to attend the game at American League park between the St. Louis Browns and the Cleveland Indians.

We are grateful for the attention President Nixon has paid to baseball in this anniversary year and we invite him to attend one of the games in Cincinnati before this season is over. He would see the hittingest team in many a year and it would be a fitting tribute to the city which sent out the first professional team 100 years ago.

OIL IMPORT PROGRAM

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, 1969, I spoke on the floor of the House about the need to overhaul the present oil import program.

One month later, I introduced three bills—H.R. 10799, H.R. 10800, and H.R. 10801—that would phase out this program over a 10-year period. I was joined in this effort by 53 of my colleagues in the House from both sides of the aisle and from many areas of the country.

Since I introduced my bill, I have come across several interesting articles about the oil import program. I placed one of these in the RECORD on June 16 at page 16012, which I still think would be very good reading for my colleagues.

On July 18, the New York Times had an excellent editorial on the import program and specifically on the effect it has had on New England consumers. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

SERVICE FOR WHOM?

In an oblique attack on proposals to build an oil complex in Maine that would utilize imported petroleum at lower prices than currently available, Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel told the National Petroleum Council the other day that the present import quota system for oil had "served well until we began to develop many exceptions."

There is no question that import restrictions have well served those who profit handsomely from protected, high-cost domestic oil production. But for the many New Englanders who are compelled to purchase petroleum products, oil quotas have meant hundreds of millions of dollars a year in excessive prices. Professor Joel B. Dirlam of the University of Rhode Island estimated before a Senate subcommittee last spring that the proposed Maine refinery alone could result in savings for New England of as much as $158 million annually.

It is the responsibility of the Interior Secretary, who is a member of the Presidential task force studying the Maine proposal, to serve a broader public interest than that of domestic oil producers.

POLITICS OF THE POPULATION EXPLOSION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in his message to Congress last week, the President recommended certain steps to bring the current population explosion under control. The reaction, pro and con, to the recommendations gives an interesting insight into the politics of our runaway population.

It is said that politics make strange bedfellows. The wire service story in the Evening Star for July 19 attributes the following remarks to individuals and spokesmen for the groups indicated. The religious view, the NAACP professional's view, and the Indianapolis mother's view are those expected. The SIECUS approval of Federal money in its field, however, leads to a nasty suspicion that its endeavors with our children are not entirely unselfish when there is a dollar to be made.

Excerpts from the news story follow:

NIXON POPULATION PLAN STIRS BOTH PRAISE, DOUBT

"There is an implicit pressure in receiving from the same hand both a welfare check and advice on what to do to keep the family down," said Msgr. Hugh Curran, director of the Roman Catholic archdiocesan Family Life bureau in New York.

"The real question is one of freedom, not of contraception," Msgr. Curran said, adding that he did not think it was "the proper role of the government to embark on a contraceptive program."

* * * * *

Dr. Mary Calderone, executive director of the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS), called the message "a tremendous step forward toward peace—peace because population pressures engender hostility, locally and nationally."

* * * * *

Marvin Davies, Florida field secretary for the NAACP, speaking for himself said, "I do not think the President's plan is in the best interest of the black people. Our women need to produce more babies, not less. Our problems are mainly economic ones, and until we comprise 30 to 35 percent of the population, we won't be able to really affect the power structure in this country."

* * * * *

An Indianapolis woman, 36, with eight children and a husband making $36-a-week take-home pay, said: "I wish somebody had told me about birth control before now. It's too late to do me much good but it will help my daughters."

FOREIGN AID BENEFITS CALIFORNIA ECONOMY

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, a program that both benefits our own country and benefits many other countries throughout the world exemplifies a high form of statesmanship. One program that meets these criteria is the U.S. foreign aid program.

Many people think of foreign aid as a generous means of helping less developed countries along the road to self-sustaining economic growth. Others point to its role as an instrument of U.S. foreign policy. What is often overlooked is the contribution the foreign aid program makes to our own economy. It contributes in a number of ways. By helping countries to modernize, aid builds new trade partners and markets for the United States. This is particularly important for the States on the shores of the Pacific highway to the developing countries of Asia. Foreign aid also makes a direct contribution to our economy; 98 percent of foreign aid purchases are made in the United States.

Among the States which benefit most importantly from foreign aid purchases is California. In the first half of fiscal year 1969 California manufacturers received AID-financed orders totaling over $27 million. In addition, as of December 31, 1968, California institutions and individuals held technical service contracts totaling almost $25 million.

XUM

In Orange County, in the first half of fiscal year 1969, 16 manufacturing firms held contracts totaling over $400,000. This includes manufacturers in Anaheim, Costa Mesa, Fullerton, Newport Beach, Orange, and Santa Ana.

The dual nature of foreign aid becomes clear when we note that each of the $62 million worth of AID contracts in California represents jobs and profits for the people of the State. At the same time, the products and services that are purchased will make a real contribution to world economic development.

PRESIDENT NGUYEN VAN THIEU'S STATEMENT OFFERING FREE ELECTIONS AS A MEANS TO END THE WAR IN VIETNAM

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on July 11, 1969, South Vietnam's President Nguyen Van Thieu delivered a speech to his nation in which he reviewed the series of concessions made by himself and his government to bring about meaningful discussions for peace.

In this speech, President Thieu also made what I believe to be the most significant offer for resolving the war in Vietnam through elections in which all political parties in South Vietnam, including the Communists themselves, could participate if they renounced violence and pledged themselves to accept the results of such elections.

President Thieu unequivocally pledged to abide by the results of the election whatever the results may be.

I am placing in the RECORD today President Thieu's entire speech and I challenge those of my colleagues who have up to now criticized President Thieu and his honest efforts at peace to show me and the Congress of these United States, as well as the people of America, any efforts made by the Communists and any similar concessions to bring about peace in Vietnam.

I believe President Thieu has made an honest offer to help resolve this conflict.

The Communists' response has been as was expected—a tirade of invectives and abuses against the Thieu administration and against the honesty and integrity of President Nixon.

It is my hope that President Thieu's speech would get the highest distribution in this country so our American citizens can see the degree of concessions that the South Vietnamese Government has made in a sincere effort to find peace in South Vietnam.

I hope those of my colleagues who have been so critical of President Thieu's efforts will carefully read this speech and then join with me in rallying world opinion against the Communists for refusing this very generous offer.

Mrs. Binh, the chief Communist negotiator in Paris, recently stated that the North Vietnamese Communists are capable of continuing this war for as long as necessary, perhaps 5, 10, or 20 years if need be.

The Communists, in rejecting President Thieu's proposal, make it quite clear that they do not intend to negotiate any kind of an agreement which would deny them ultimate control over South Vietnam.

I hope that those who have been so quick in denouncing our efforts to preserve the sovereignty of South Vietnam will carefully read President Thieu's speech. It would be my hope that we can, in the light of his truly generous offer and in the light of the Communists' arrogant rejection of this proposal, now unite the American people behind a sound program to win the war in Vietnam and restore peace to that very beleaguered nation.

No one can fault President Thieu for his latest proposal and it should now be patently clear that it is the Communists who do not want peace in Southeast Asia.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT THIEU

President Thieu's speech follows:

When I took office as President of the Republic, I pledged before the nation that I would devote my efforts to the restoration of peace.

The Vietnamese people from North to South long for peace after so many years of war and destruction.

All of Viet-Nam has not known real peace for over two decades.

A quarter of a century after the end of World War II and fifteen years after the Geneva Armistice, Viet-Nam is still at war.

War is unnecessary and cannot solve any problem in today's world.

The people and Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam stand for peace, independence, freedom, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity. The authorities of North Viet-Nam profess that they are pursuing these same goals.

The major question is how best to achieve these goals.

We do not believe that any difference should be solved by means of aggression. After so many years of hostilities, North Viet-Nam should realize that it cannot impose its rule by force. On the contrary, North Viet-Nam's attempts to impose its domination by the use of force have brought destruction and suffering to the people in both parts of Viet-Nam, and nobody can predict the turn of events if this aggression continues much longer.

Our country is very richly endowed by nature. Our people are dynamic, courageous, and hard-working. The brightest future awaits the whole Vietnamese nation if only this fratricidal war could be brought to an end.

In the context of the balance of power in the world today, the basic objectives of peace, independence, sovereignty, unity, and territorial integrity which North Viet-Nam professes to pursue can be fully attained only if, first, peace can be achieved among the Vietnamese.

Toward that end, as President of the Republic of Viet-Nam, I have made relentless efforts and repeated acts of goodwill.

I can reveal now that, even before the beginning of the preliminary Paris conversations, I had requested the good offices of important international personalities and governments not involved in this conflict to bring about peace negotiations between North Viet-Nam and South Viet-Nam. These efforts did not bring concrete results because of the negative attitude of Hanoi.

Subsequently, on March 31, 1968, we agreed with the United States Government on the cessation of bombing covering most parts of North Viet-Nam, in order to bring about the preliminary Paris conversations.

Later, in November 1968, we concurred with the United States Government on the total cessation of bombing over North Viet-Nam with the understanding that North Viet-Nam would begin serious talks with the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam. At that time, it was made clear that such talks could not be productive in an atmosphere where the cities were being shelled and the DMZ was being abused.

The acceptance by the Government of Viet-Nam of Hanoi having the "NLF" on its side at the Paris talks is another important gesture of goodwill on the part of the Government of Viet-Nam.

Later, the continued participation of the Government of Viet-Nam in the Paris talks despite the violations by Hanoi of the understandings relating to the total cessation of bombing of North Viet-Nam, constitutes another indication of our goodwill and sincere desire for peace.

Our acceptance of the formula of simultaneous withdrawal of Communist aggressors and allied troops is another manifestation of our good will for peace.

On March 25 this year, I made the offer to the "NLF" for private talks, without preconditions, toward the solution of the internal political problems of South Viet-Nam in a brotherly spirit. The offer still stands.

On April 7, I presented the Republic of Viet-Nam's six-point program for peace which is comprehensive enough to constitute a sound basis for discussions toward a peace settlement.

At Midway on June 8, with President Nixon, I expressed the intention to seek a just settlement to this conflict in a spirit of patience and goodwill.

President Nixon and I also agreed on the reduction of US troops in Viet-Nam. Further replacements of American troops will be considered at regular intervals.

Communist propaganda has distorted the facts, and reversed the roles in portraying the allied countries in Viet-Nam as aggressors, while they picture themselves as "liberators." The fact for all to see is just the reverse: Communist aggression had started many years before the allied nations began to participate actively in the common defense of freedom.

A few days ago, allied troops have begun to be reduced. Allied troops came to Viet-Nam after Communist aggression had started, and are being reduced before the Communist aggressors accept to leave the scene. These are facts, and show clearly who, in this conflict, are genuinely for peace.

In contrast to our repeated acts of goodwill for peace, the Communist aggressors have continued to infiltrate troops and war materials into South Viet-Nam and to violate the DMZ, and the neutrality and territorial integrity of Laos and Cambodia. They continue their indiscriminate shellings against the civilian population, and their acts of terrorism. Recently, the Communists' desperate and futile attacks against Tay Ninh and Benhet, their attacks against Muong Suoi in Laos, and their repeated violations of Cambodian territory amply demonstrate the continuation of their aggression, and their desire to seek military victory instead of a peace settlement.

The Communists also persist in refusing to hold serious talks in Paris and in maintaining their absurd demands for the overthrow of the legal Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam, and for the unconditional unilateral withdrawal of allied troops.

However, this war cannot be permitted to last indefinitely. It should be ended one way or another. We, the peace-loving people, would like to solve this war by way of reconciliation.

To move the negotiations forward, I feel that a major initiative is needed. To that

XUM

effect, we are willing to make, as another act of goodwill, a comprehensive offer for the political settlement of this conflict.

Both sides in this struggle have said that the internal affairs of South Viet-Nam should be decided by the South Vietnamese themselves, in a free and democratic fashion.

The only way for the people of South Viet-Nam to exercise their right of self-determination, to participate in public affairs, and to determine the future of the country, is through elections in which they can genuinely express their choice, free from fear and coercion.

In this spirit, free elections can be based on the following principles:

(1) All political parties and groups, including the "NLF" which is now bearing arms against us, can participate in the elections if they renounce violence and pledge themselves to accept the results of the elections.

(2) To make sure that the elections would be conducted in all fairness, an electoral commission could be set up, in which all political parties and groups, including the "NLF" now fighting against us, could be represented.

The electoral commission will assure equal opportunities in the campaigning to all candidates.

It will also enable all political parties and groups to participate in watching the polls to see that people vote absolutely freely, and in watching the counting of the ballots to see that they are honestly counted.

(3) An international body is to be established to supervise the elections, and to make sure that the elections are held under conditions fair to all.

(4) We are prepared to discuss with the other side the timetable and the modalities under which the elections will be held.

(5) There will be no reprisals or discrimination after the elections.

(6) The Government of Viet-Nam declares that it will abide by the results of the elections, whatever these results may be. We challenge the other side to declare the same.

The other side claims that it controls 30 percent of the population of South Viet-Nam. We say that they dominate by force only a small portion of the population. Let these claims be put to the test of elections. If the other side really believes its own claims, and really stands for the right of self-determination of the Vietnamese people, there can be no reason for it not to accept our offer of genuinely free elections, in which they can participate without discrimination, not only in the voting but also in the control of the counting of the votes, with international supervision.

To be meaningful, elections should be conducted under conditions under which the South Vietnamese people can exercise their choice, free from fear and coercion.

Thus, there is an obvious connection between free elections, supervised withdrawal of non-South Vietnamese forces, and an end to violence and terrorism.

Today I renew the offer of private talks with the "NLF", without preconditions, to discuss the above and any other questions, toward the restoration of peace and national reconciliation.

The other side should not misconstrue our desire for peace as a sign of weakness. It should not be induced by our repeated acts of goodwill into believing that it has only to remain adamantly negative for us to accept eventual surrender.

We are fighting for a just cause and in self-defense, and we are becoming every day stronger. We shall not grow tired in this struggle. In fact there is a point beyond which we shall get tired of making unilateral acts of goodwill. Hanoi will then have to bear all the consequences of the protracted war, and it has to assume full responsibilities for the sufferings that it imposes on the people in both parts of Viet-Nam.

Dear Fellow Countrymen, the fact that today we make another initiative of peace, after many initiatives of peace in the past, clearly demonstrates to public opinion everywhere that the Republic of Viet-Nam once more has maximum goodwill for peace, in contrast to the negative attitude of Hanoi and its auxiliaries. It shows that we never neglect any opportunity to take positive actions for peace.

These are correct actions, and it is our duty, as peace-loving people, to undertake them even when we are the victims of aggression and are determined to struggle until aggression is ended.

Besides, initiatives of peace indicate also our real strength. Today, everybody has seen that militarily the Communists cannot defeat us because they have become weaker and more disorganized, while in contrast we become stronger every day and can assume an increasingly larger share in the defense of our country. Politically, we can challenge those who are fighting against us to accept the test of the free choice of the people through elections.

We can do so because we have self-confidence, and because we are convinced that, when the Vietnamese poeple are given a free choice, they always choose freedom.

For a long time, we the peace-loving people have put forward the policy of national reconciliation, suppression of hatred, and national union. We have sincerely carried out that policy. Today, we continue that policy. Therefore, we do not require those who are fighting against us to surrender. On the contrary, if they renounce violence and terrorism, and sincerely accept the democratic procedures, we shall be most glad to have them cooperate with us in the reconstruction and development of this country, with all the rights and obligations of regular citizens.

As far as I am personally concerned, with the responsibility and conscience of a leader in the face of a war which has been ravaging this country for so many years, which has caused the death of so many brave soldiers, cadres and innocent civilians, which has seen women and children daily killed by the Communists and the destruction suffered by our countrymen, although we have no other choice than to fight to defend our independence and our freedom, I have constantly, every day, searched for possibilities to restore a just peace which can spare the lives of the population, end the sufferings and mournings, and preserve this beloved land from Communist domination.

The country needs peace. We have to rebuild South Viet-Nam to make it strong and prosperous, and prepare for the day when the entire country can be reunified. I cannot go against these national aspirations, which are the aspirations for peace. Therefore, I have constantly devoted all my thoughts and efforts to serve these aspirations of the whole population.

The Communists always pretend that they stand for peace, but have never demonstrated goodwill and are always adamantly negative. They have only one objective, that is, the conquest and enslavement of South Viet-Nam under Communist rule. Therefore, they obstinately pursue this goal by every means, direct or indirect, immediate or long-range actions.

The Communists, in their propaganda, clamored for a so-called "peace government" in South Viet-Nam to negotiate with them. I have declared, and I repeat today, that the present Government under my leadership, which represents the peace-loving people of South Viet-Nam, is a peace government. This I have many times proven not only by words but also by deeds, through many acts of goodwill and positive initiatives of peace, and the repeated request which we have made to the other side to negotiate seriously toward the speedy restoration of peace.

Today, I make another initiative of peace because I feel that it is my duty toward the people to do so, and because I place the interests of the Fatherland and the aspirations of the people above everything else.

My personal position and interests do not count in the face of the supreme interests of the Fatherland and the aspirations of the people.

Therefore I trust that the initiative of peace which I make today will be approved and supported by all the strata of the population, all the members of the Armed Forces and cadres. It provides a peaceful and rational solution to terminate this war.

I am also confident that, at any time when the circumstances materialize for the people to exercise the right of self-determination through free and democratic elections for the restoration of a just and guaranteed peace in our beloved country, this will have your approval and support.

I am strongly convinced that all the Vietnamese who love freedom and democracy will triumph when they exercise their right of self-determination and free choice. I am sure that all of the 17 million of our countrymen will choose freedom and democracy.

Because of our patriotism, our pride, our self-reliance and our determination not to bow to brutal force, our just cause will prevail and we shall overcome Communism.

Then, I shall consider that I shall have fulfilled my personal aspirations as well as the aspirations of all of you for the establishment of just peace in our beloved country.

ABRAHAM BEAME SPEAKS OUT AGAINST TIGHT MONEY AND PROHIBITIVE INTEREST RATES

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, former comptroller of the city of New York, Abraham D. Beame, is one of the most respected voices in fiscal administration of major jurisdictions in the country today. Consistently he has labored on behalf of providing necessary service to growing urban populations with careful consideration given to urban fiscal responsibility. Sunday he made a major statement in regard to tight money policy on the part of the Federal Reserve Board. He also struck out at the recent hikes in the prime interest rate, remarks which I think were very well taken. I feel that his comments are worthy of inclusion in the RECORD for the enlightenment of the House.

The text of his comments follows:

STATEMENT OF ABRAHAM D. BEAME

Abraham D. Beame, Democratic Candidate for Comptroller, today took sharp issue with the decision of the Federal Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve Board to continue its tight money policy as disclosed in reports yesterday from Washington.

"The tight money policy being followed by the Nixon Administration is increasing inflationary pressures," Mr. Beame said in a statement addressed to the New York Democratic Congressional Delegation, in which he urged the Delegation to use all its influence to combat the present tight money policy of the administration.

"The policy of full employment, pursued as a national policy by past Democratic Administrations, is being abandoned by the present administration. According to the Washington report, some of the money managers are beginning to worry about the problem of preventing the expected decline from turning into a sharp recession that would send unemployment skyrocketing. This can

XUM

have dire consequences. The first to feel the pinch of unemployment will be the poor, the uneducated, the blue collar worker.

"The prime rate has been increased five times since last December, when it stood at 6½% as contrasted with today's rate of 8½%. This high rate has not halted or slowed down inflation. In many ways, it is adding to it. For example, it has driven mortgage money to the highest point in history, with a consequent slow down in new housing startups.

"The high cost of money, let's not fool ourselves, is being passed ultimately to the consumer in higher prices, thus adding to the very inflation it is supposed to check.

"Full employment, full production of consumer needs are our objectives.

"For these reasons, I ask that you do all in your power to combat the tight money policy of the present administration," Mr. Beame told the Democratic Delegation. In closing he said, "as reaching the moon was the goal of this decade, the aim of the next decade must be to give first priority to maximum economic growth and full employment for all. In other words, more jobs not fewer."

Text of telegram sent by Abraham D. Beame, Democratic Candidate for Comptroller, City of New York to: Hon. Wright Patman, Chairman, House Banking Committee; Hon. Emanuel Celler; Hon. Seymour Halpern; Hon. Joseph P. Addabbo; Hon. Benjamin S. Rosenthal; Hon. James J. Delaney; Hon. Frank J. Brasco; Hon. Shirley Chisholm; Hon. Bertram L. Podell; Hon. John J. Rooney; Hon. Hugh L. Carey; Hon. John M. Murphy; Hon. Edward I. Koch; Hon. Adam C. Powell; Hon. Leonard Farbstein; Hon. William F. Ryan; Hon. James H. Scheuer; Hon. Jacob H. Gilbert; Hon. Jonathan B. Bingham; and Hon. Mario Biaggi.

"The tight money policy being followed by the Nixon Administration is increasing inflationary pressures.

"The policy of full employment, pursued as a national policy by past Democratic Administrations, is being abandoned by the present administration. This can have dire consequences. The first to feel the pinch of unemployment will be the poor, the uneducated, the blue collar worker.

"The prime rate has been increased five times since last December, when it stood at 6½% as contrasted with today's rate of 8½%. This high rate has not halted or slowed down inflation. In many ways, it is adding to it. For example, it has driven mortgage money to the highest point in history, with a consequent slow down in new housing start-ups.

"The high cost of money is being passed ultimately to the consumer in higher prices, thus adding to the very inflation it is supposed to check.

"Full employment, full production of consumer needs are our objectives.

"As reaching the moon was the goal of this decade, the aim of the next decade must be to give first priority to maximum economic growth and full employment for all. In other words, more jobs not fewer. For these reasons, I ask that you do all in your power to combat the tight money policy of the present administration."

ABRAHAM D. BEAME,
Democratic Candidate, Comptroller, City of New York.

TRIBUTE TO VOLUNTEERS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Oak Forest-Tinley Park Times is a weekly publication serving the southwest suburban area of Cook County. An editorial Wednesday, July 9, carried a very timely tribute to volunteer groups who provide wonderful grassroot spirit that is one of the greatest assets of our country.

The editorial follows:

A TRIBUTE TO VOLUNTEERS

Volunteers are unsung heroes and heroines who devote their time and talents to aid suffering humanity in hospitals and institutions, promote programs for and work with young people; or perhaps it is a neighbor who can always be relied upon to offer assistance in times of emergency.

One never ceases to wonder why these people devote so much of their time to worthy causes. Their only reward is one of personal satisfaction.

They are the men and women who are always first to volunteer when help is needed.

Especially rewarding is working with young people in organizations such as the 4-H clubs, scouts, church and other young people groups.

Many a boy without a father has grown and developed into a fine responsible adult with a man who has become a father image; one whom he can pattern his life through association. He may be a coach, scout leader, or a Sunday School teacher.

It seems fitting that we publicly thank and bless all adults so involved. After all, is that not what Life is all about—giving and sharing so that life may be a little more joyful for those less fortunate, and helping to shape young lives to prepare them for the time when they will take their place and do their share.

REFLECTIONS ON THE APOLLO 11 MISSION

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, for a moment let us reflect on the events of the last few hours. Last night and early this morning we watched two men walk on the surface of the moon. This afternoon we watched the liftoff of the lunar module and the successful docking of the Columbia and the Eagle.

This is a great day for America, and a great day for all mankind. The President of the United States has declared this National Participation Day. I know that each of us in Congress feels a keen sense of participation. We have considered and authorized the program and appropriated the money. We continue to debate the merits of our space effort and we try to fit it into the scheme of other problems and priorities we face on our agenda for the Nation.

President Kennedy set the goal of reaching the moon by 1970. With the support of Congress, the work of our magnificent space team and the enthusiasm of our fellow countrymen that goal is accomplished and the world has seen it happen.

I am not one who believes that the exploration of space supersedes the search for solutions to the problems of man on the scale of national priorities. I am one who believes, however, that a solid continuing space program will render concrete benefits to all mankind.

With the walk on the lunar surface we have proven that man can set the most unbelievable goal—and then accomplish it. Can we now focus this energy, technology, and ability on solutions to the problems of poverty, pollution, and peace? This is a part of the challenge of man's first walk on the moon.

Fantastic as it would have seemed a few short years ago, the systems analysis approach utilized in the space program may well be brought to bear on environmental and social problems like pollution in our lakes and streams and poverty in the city and the countryside.

What does man's walk on the Moon have to do with peace? We claimed the Moon not for America—as the traditions of nations in exploration might have dictated. We claimed the Moon for all mankind and signaled our desire that the conflicts of man will never be taken beyond the confines of the earth. For a few dramatic moments last night and this morning most of mankind was uniquely united in the fervent wish for the success of the mission. Perhaps we sensed that we are, indeed, riders together on a very small sphere in a vast universe. Let us hope that the bond between men of different nations and races and creeds that was established last night can be expanded into the common dream for the establishment of peace and harmony between all men.

Who knows what we have begun with Apollo 11? In the House of Representatives I represent Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., which is located at the intersection of Lake Huron and Lake Superior. I understand that in the mid-1800's there was a debate in Congress over the feasibility of a lock between the two lakes at Sault Ste. Marie. Henry Clay reportedly scoffed at the idea with the comment that Sault Ste. Marie was the remotest place this side of the Moon. Our former colleague, Mr. Clay, would have marveled at the ultramodern $40 million lock we dedicated there last month as we would marvel if only we knew what we have begun with Apollo 11. Perhaps man will learn to live together and expand his horizons farther out into space beyond the stars and as centuries pass, will people planets yet unknown. None of us know what we have begun any more than Henry Clay understood the advisability of a lock at Sault Ste. Marie. But we know we have begun something that people scoffed at only a few short years ago. We also know that man must learn to live together in peace, and to find solutions to his problems here on earth if the ultimate dream of Apollo 11 is ever to become a reality.

WERNHER VON BRAUN: "SPACE AN ALTERNATIVE TO WAR"

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, our brave astronauts, Armstrong, Collins, and Aldrin, are well on their way returning from the Moon. As

XUM

they continue successfully to complete this remarkable flight, it seems important to reflect on the importance and significance of our national space program.

Dr. Wernher von Braun in the August 1969 Pace magazine offers a thoughtful commentary. Dr. von Braun points to the value of our space program as an alternative to war. When Congress considers the authorization and appropriation of funds, this is certainly a significant aspect in the determination of congressional support. I commend this thoughtful discussion to your reading:

FORESEEING AN ALTERNATIVE TO WAR

(By Wernher von Braun)

Suddenly the eyes of the powerful man across the table lose their humor. "How sad," he reflects, "that scientific progress has been fastest when nations were fighting. Now the space program is doing what war used to do. For the first time in history a nonmilitary program is making enough demands on human ingenuity."

The authoritative, guttural voice is that of Dr. Wernher von Braun, master of both war and space. His V-2 weapons of World War II came close to changing history, and he masterminded the giant Saturn V rocket which thrust man to the moon.

"At last man has an outlet for his aggressive nature," he explains. "Unless you give a small boy an outlet to vent his energy and his sense of contest he'll come home with black eyes. Then you can either chew him out and make a sissy of him or channel his energy into sport or skills. That's the way it is with space."

Wernher von Braun was eight years old when he first dreamed of playing with stardust. He was practicing the violin in the nursery of Wirsitz Castle in Prussia when his mother, the Baroness Emmy von Quistorp, an amateur astronomer, returned from the market with a small telescope. The boy ran outside into the frosty night and looked at the moon. "How near it is!" he shouted. "One day I'm going up there."

Two decades and a world war later Dr. von Braun arrived in America as the world's first expert on rocketry. Today his castle is a steel-and-glass one rising above the cotton crops and dairy herds on verdant hills near Huntsville, Ala. Here he conceived and developed Saturn V.

Since his first telescopic look at the moon, Von Braun has kept telling himself, "How near it is—how near!" Now he reflects, "When we wheel out one of the rockets to the launch pad I find myself thinking of all those thousands of parts—and all built by the lowest bidder—and I pray that everyone has done his homework."

At 56, Von Braun is athletically fit. It has been said that when he sucks in a breath he creates a vacuum around him—one of many legends about a man who is a pilot, skier, skin diver, mountaineer, pianist, philosopher, writer and theologian.

"The most fateful question of our time? I would say that it is simply how people are going to use their knowledge."

The blue eyes move to the ceiling. "Let's understand that science itself has no ethical standards. Take drugs. They are neither good nor bad. It's the same with nuclear power—it can blast cities into cosmic dust or create a new Renaissance. Space technology can bring the best out of men or hold terror over their lives and homes."

Von Braun compares the exploration of space and NASA's role with the Renaissance "which was also a time when the mental and spiritual blocks of mankind were blasted away. As old concepts came under scrutiny and as the spiderwebs were pulled away, the church had its problems. But in the end of the church and the spirit of man benefited. The same thing is happening now.

"What I'm saying is that the space program is the cutting edge for science and technology. Man needs a cutting edge as he hunts for truth."

He is convinced that space will bring nations closer together. "Space people have a tremendous respect for each other," he says. "The world knows we're not going to the moon to put up a sign, 'Uncle Sam was here.' Nor is it just to bring back samples of moon sand. Our purpose is to extend human knowledge."

After the moon Von Braun and his technicians will be looking at Mars—"and probably going there in 15 years. We must evaluate the options available to us in the continued exploration of the universe. We need a timetable."

This is the year of the moon—the year dreamed about by a small boy, who lived in a faraway castle, who looked through a telescope and said, "One day I'm going up there."

His Parthian shot: "I still plan to."

CRISIS IN THE SKIES

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, like every American, I am ecstatic over the safe and successful landing of American astronauts on the Moon. But I am profoundly concerned about the impending crisis in the skies closer to the Earth. A complete breakdown in U.S. air travel is threatened. And I, for one, place the blame squarely at the doors of the Federal Aviation Administration and the airlines of this Nation. Instead of dealing with the fundamental failures of the present air traffic system they are reacting badly to the symptoms of those failures.

The facts are that the present air control system in this country is hopelessly inadequate and outmoded. It needs to be scraped and a totally new system substituted in its place. The present two-dimensional radar air traffic control system must be replaced with a three-dimensional system similar to the radar system for the proposed ABM.

The conclusion that the present system is inadequate and extremely dangerous is inescapable. Last week the FAA released a study that shows that there were probably some 4,000 near-collisions in U.S. skies last year.

Most present jet airports, as every air traveler knows, are frightfully inadequate. New airports are needed and existing ones must be expanded and modernized. The air traveler must help pay for these improvements for his own safety.

Ground crew practices are antiquated and have failed in numerous instances to transform crash landings into survivable accidents.

Instead of dealing with life and death issues the airlines vie with one another to develop new, more colórful and shorter miniskirts for their hostesses and more tasty, cooked-in-the-air meals.

The FAA, instead of dealing with the genuine physical and psychological exhaustion of its air controllers, has announced it will discipline the controllers whose protest of concern over the present outmoded system slowed air travel last month.

Even before FAA Administrator John H. Shaffer announced this decision, the 7,000-member professional Air Traffic Controllers Association announced that if the disciplinary action was not dropped, there would be mass resignations of controllers this week. Compounding an extremely bad situation, the FAA also announced it would end a dues checkoff plan for the air traffic controllers organization.

Spokesmen for the controllers said the resignations will occur after the successful splashdown of Apollo 11.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it is an exaggeration to say that a crisis impends. I believe the Congress must act promptly and I have today requested Chairman HARLEY STAGGERS of the House Commerce Committee which has oversight jurisdiction over FAA activities to promptly schedule hearings on the impending crisis and develop an effective legislative program to correct the fundamental failures in the present system. I plan to continue to address myself to this situation in the days ahead.

CLARENCE MITCHELL

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, Clarence Mitchell has been and continues to be one of the most constructive proponents and effective activists for civil rights. His continuous dedication to the goal of equality for all and his contributions to the rights of his fellow Americans were recognized last week as the NAACP honored him with its Spingarn Medal for outstanding achievement. I would like to add my sincere congratulations for this much-deserved award and my personal appreciation for the task which he has undertaken in behalf of his country.

As lobbyist for the NAACP since 1950, Mr. Mitchell has been working with laws as his part in the civil rights movement—creating new ones, changing the old, insuring enforcement of all laws so that every citizen may enjoy equal opportunity. Law, he believes, is "the only true guarantor of equal rights." From this philosophy comes the importance he attributes to voter registration drives and to black candidates for public office. From this belief also springs his total commitment to influencing the lawmakers and the policymakers concerning the necessity of civil rights legislation.

Clarence Mitchell does not create a spectacle as he quietly moves among the diverse political circles on Capitol Hill, talking and persuading, yet the results he achieves are spectacular. Among his most outstanding achievements in the field of civil rights are the roles he played in the 1964 civil rights bill and the 1968 open housing legislation. The no-compromise sections in the 1964 act and even the passage of the 1968 bill can be credited to his behind-the-scenes involvement. He is presently battling the administration's so-called voting rights proposals and is working for extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Speaking as a member of the Judiciary Committee where much civil rights legislation is developed, I know that this committee listens very carefully to his testimony and keeps his position in mind throughout its deliberations.

There is no more deserving recipient of the NAACP's Spingarn award than Clarence Mitchell in recognition of his optimism, his courage, and his dedication to a dream of a "color-free society."

AREA FIRMS TIED TO APOLLO HAIL LANDING ON MOON

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, along with Americans everywhere and people throughout the world, I salute the Apollo 11 team.

As they hurtled toward the moon, they carried with them the prayers and hopes of all Buffalonians, and our prayers and best wishes are with them on their return journey.

Not only are we immensely proud of their feat, but we are also proud of the significant part that Buffalo area industry played in mankind's first landing on another celestial body.

Among the local firms which made outstanding contributions to the Apollo 11 mission are: Cornell Aeronautical Lab; Bell Aerosystems; Linde Division of Union Carbide, Houdaille Industries; Aro of Buffalo, Inc.; Taylor Devices; Carleton Controls; Newbrook Machine; Kistler Instrument; Moog, Inc.; Taber Instruments; Scott Aviation; and FMC Corp.

As usual, the ingenuity and capability of our Buffalo area's industrial might was not found wanting.

And to our astronauts—Godspeed.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., July 21, 1969:

AREA FIRMS TIED TO APOLLO HAIL LANDING ON MOON

Following the successful Apollo 11 lunar landing and the astronauts' moon walking Sunday, the expressions of "terrific . . . fantastic . . . a wonderful success" were among observations of Buffalo area firms which had contributed to the historic project.

Peter Sorce, director of engineering and general manager of Aro of Buffalo, Inc., Cheektowaga, which produced hand-held ventilators for the astronauts, said his firm was "very pleased and proud to be involved in the program," noting that there "were really no adequate words to fully describe the feat."

SORCE PROUD

Sorce echoed millions of other Americans when he said:

"It's hard not to be a little proud at a time like this—you just get choked up."

The ventilators made by Aro were carried by the astronauts as they left the ready-room just prior to Apollo 11's blastoff last Wednesday.

Richard D. O'Connor, manager of advertising and public relations at Scott Aviation Division here, said:

"We are proud of the small part we played and although our products will not be on the moon, we have the greatest pride that our products were chosen as back-up life-support systems for the astronauts on the moon."

RESCUE TEAMS

Scott provided self-contained breathing apparatus for the rescue teams for Apollo 11, and fuel cell regulators which provide power to the service module from the orbiting command module.

Wayne Hawk, vice president and general manager of the Aerospace Division at Moog Inc., noted the moon walk was "a complete success" and voiced the hope that it would encourage the government to go forward with additional space programs. Calling Apollo 11 "the most complex vehicle ever launched," Hawk said he was proud of Moog's involvement.

An East Aurora firm, Moog built the servo-actuators that enabled the astronauts to steer the vehicle on their way to the moon.

JUST BEGINNING

"I think it's just the beginning and I'm sure, as we all are, that it will continue to be a success," said John Schneider, marketing manager at Carlton Controls of Elma.

When the two astronauts walked on the moon, they wore life-support back packs made by Carleton. On their way back from the moon, they will use main oxygen supply regulators, also manufactured by Carleton.

Ted Smist, manager of safety and public relations at the Tonawanda Linde Division of Union Carbide, was "extremely pleased and happy" with the entire project. Linde provided the four million pounds of liquid oxygen—70 percent of the rocket's total weight at the time of blastoff—necessary to boost the rocket into space.

PLANNED NAP

Smist said he and his family had planned to take a nap before it was announced that the astronauts would step out earlier than planned. "A lot more people have been able to see it because of the time change, and we're very proud," he said.

A spokesman for Bell Aerospace in Wheatfield, the largest contributor to the Apollo moon flight, had this to say:

"This is an epic-making achievement for the United States and for all mankind. The management at Bell and all our employes are particularly proud of this unique accomplishment because of our outstanding association with the nation's manned-space program.

"Now that the objective set forth by the late President John F. Kennedy has been achieved," he continued, "we pray for the safe return to earth of astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin and Collins."

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, as the end of the last war was in sight, one could see its wreckage everywhere. We were awestruck by the loss of wealth worth billions of dollars, and the human losses running to tens of millions. But it seems that the war-sick world, especially the free world, was to witness another catastrophe which has proved as shocking and heartrending, involving the fate of more than 100,000,000 helpless souls in Europe alone. And the sad aspect of this problem is that to date the leaders of the free world have not been able to resolve it in any satisfactory manner.

The tragedy of the captive nations stems directly from the aggressive policy of the Soviet Union. Seeing that democratic forces in Europe were weakened by the war, and anxious to spread communism in as many countries as they could, Soviet authorities installed Communist governments in all East European countries and then isolated these countries from the free world by raising the Iron Curtain between East and West. Thus while the free world was busy in the huge salvage work from the war's wreckage, the Soviet Government built up its East European hegemony, enslaving all peoples in lands extending from the Bay of Finland to the Black Sea. Faced with such a sad and shocking situation, and understandably resolved not to start another war in behalf of these 100,000,000 innocent souls, the leaders of the free world have done their utmost to better the unenviable lot of these peoples. They are still trying to do this.

We on our part have always felt keenly about the fate of these nations. Ten years ago Congress enacted a joint resolution providing for the establishment of Captive Nations Week. By Presidential proclamation the third week of July was designated as Captive Nations Week, to be observed annually until the liberation of these nations from Communist totalitarian tyranny. I am indeed glad to participate in the observance of this annual event.

SHOWING THE FLAG—COMMUNIST STYLE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, overshadowed by the historic events of the weekend, two side-by-side items in the news should be called to the attention of all Americans.

The Soviet warship visit to Cuba put a guided missile cruiser, frigate, and destroyer, with launchers for missiles assumed to be capable of carrying nuclear warheads, in the Gulf of Mexico. Those of us who represent Americans from the States bordering the Gulf of Mexico are disturbed over the showing of the Communist flag at our doorstep.

At the same time, we are said to have received informal notice that the Communists will soon agree to the formal opening of strategic arms limitation talks.

Elementary logic indicates that this Soviet move is either in good faith or it is fraudulent. If it is fraudulent no more need be said of its value. If it is in good faith must we not assume that the Soviet leaders feel that they have achieved

XUM

a naval parity, or superiority over the free world, which it desires to guarantee with American arms just as it did the security of Communist Cuba.

Although I can see no useful purpose to be served by any such talks, perhaps it would be appropriate for our Secretary of State, who has already proposed that they open on July 31, to suggest that they be conducted aboard the Communist missile cruiser, *Kynda*, anchored in the Gulf of Mexico, 90 miles offshore from the coast of my State of Louisiana. Americans would be less easily deceived under such circumstances. It might remind some Americans above the age of 30 that a very effective arms limitation agreement was signed aboard the U.S.S. *Missouri* anchored in Tokyo Bay.

I include the two indicated news articles from the Evening Star of July 18, 1969:

Soviet Navy Shows Power

(By Henry S. Bradsher)

The squadron of Soviet warships scheduled to sail into Havana harbor Sunday closes a circle in the development of Moscow's military might.

After seven years on route, the Soviet Navy is finally getting to Cuba, the place where—in a sense—modern long-range Soviet sea power began.

The Cuban missile crisis of October 1962 demonstrated painfully to Kremlin leaders their inability to exert any conventional military force as far from their borders as the Caribbean.

They had nothing to fill the big military—and political—gap between the unarmed freighters hauling missiles to Cuba and intercontinental missiles with nuclear warheads. Supremely powerful on the ground so far as their tanks could roll, the Russians were too muscle-bound to reach far beyond their borders with any force useable in less than all-out war.

NEW FLEXIBILITY

The squadron that is about to visit Cuba for a week represents a new flexibility in Kremlin military policy, a new ability to exert influence in distant places.

The days of gunboat diplomacy are long ended. But the mutual deterrence of nuclear weapons has heightened the continued importance of conventional weaponry.

Warships lying off a coast can still have psychological significance in a world of turmoil.

The Soviet Union realized this in the Cuban missile crisis. They were convinced that they had to get their navy out of home waters.

A Soviet naval task force cruising off Cuba in October 1962 might not have changed the result of that crisis. President John F. Kennedy was too determined to get the Russian missiles withdrawn, the U.S. Navy was too strong.

But a red flag fleet at hand might have given then-Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev a wider range of maneuver in the crisis. Kremlin leaders realized they needed a long-range navy.

"Cuba was the catalyst," a U.S. Navy captain observed.

Experts on Soviet military policy point to a speech on Army-Navy Day in Moscow, Feb. 22, 1963, four months after the missile crisis. It was made by Adm. Sergei G. Gorshkov, commander of the Soviet fleet.

NAVAL ACCENT

The navy must take to the high seas, he said. It must learn to operate there in all seasons and under all conditions. It must demonstrate that the oceans of the world are no longer dominated by the United States.

Although the warship construction program that would make this possible had already gotten under way before 1962, Gorshkov's speech was a radical reversal of direction for Soviet naval thinking. The Russians, both tsarist and Communist, had always had a navy that stayed close to port, defending the homeland rather than roaming the seas as an offensive military-political tool.

Less than two years after the Cuban crisis, the U.S. Navy began to see Soviet warships venturing into the Mediterranean with a new technique. For the first time, they were resupplied at sea—an essential practice for long-range operations, but one the Soviets had never previously bothered to develop.

Soviet naval operations in the Mediterranean increased rapidly. From 1,800 ship-days in 1964 the total rose to 12,000 ship-days in 1968, the average fleet cruising there reaching 35 ships.

A POLITICAL CRUISE

Naval maneuvers reached into the South Atlantic for the first time in 1967. Then last year the Soviet navy drew worried attention from the West by its first big political cruise.

A cruiser, a guided missile frigate and a guided missile destroyer visited 10 ports in eight nations on the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf. It was the first time the Communist naval ensign had been shown in that part of the world.

Most worrisome, it came as the British were cutting back to almost nothing their military presence in the area.

The large and rapidly expanding Soviet merchant fleet often operates as part of the navy. The squadron visiting Cuba is accompanied by a civil tanker, the Karl Marx. Such help makes long-range warship operations possible.

MISSILE CRUISER

The visitors to Cuba are led by a 4,300-ton guided missile cruiser of the new Kynda class. It carries eight launchers for Shaddock surface-to-surface missiles, which are assumed to be capable of carrying their nuclear or conventional warheads.

The cruiser and two accompanying missile warships, a frigate and a destroyer, plus two diesel-powered submarines sailed to within 400 miles of New Orleans. The Shaddock has a range of 450 miles.

Two years ago Admiral Gorshkov complained about U.S. 7th Fleet vessels in the Sea of Japan close to the Soviet Far East. "How would the Americans like it," he asked publicly, "if rocket-launching Russian ships maneuvered in the Gulf of Mexico 80 miles off New Orleans?"

Now the Cuban visit has brought them close to that. The U.S. Navy does not like it.

The U.S. Navy remains overwhelmingly more powerful than the Soviet navy. But the new ability of the Soviets to put warships into any international waters raises potential problems.

Many American diplomatic thinkers have assumed in the last few years that the Soviet task force in the Mediterranean has limited U.S. capabilities there. For instance, they say, the United States might not be able to land the Marines again the way it did in the Lebanon in 1958 because the Soviets might sail into the way.

Some U.S. Navy sources doubt this, saying "vertical envelopment" by helicopter landings still would be possible. But it could be more difficult, perhaps awkward.

Some diplomatic thinkers wonder if the Cuban visit could portend a capability of operating in the Caribbean. They go on to ask, would the Soviet navy maybe be in the way of any future Dominican Republic-type operation?

The Soviets have not so far shown the capability of carrying their black beret marines on distant cruises. So the question has now arisen of Moscow's responding to calls for help from Communists or just simply desperate leftist factions in unstable countries.

But the capability is developing behind the new long-range naval operations.

And it comes back to a Kremlin view of the world that developed out of the Cuban missile crisis. The Soviet squadron putting into Havana harbor on Sunday is coming home to its conceptual birthplace.

Soviets Hint Readiness To Set Arms Talk Date

The U.S. government has received informal notification from Moscow that the Soviet Union will shortly agree formally to the opening of strategic arms limitation talks, sources said today.

The word passed by Soviet contacts was that July 31 would be too soon but the talks could open within several weeks after that.

Secretary of State William P. Rogers proposed to Soviet Ambassador Anatoly F. Dobrynin in June that the talks open July 31. Rogers told the House Foreign Affairs Committee yesterday that there still had not been any formal response.

A favorable reply was foreshadowed by the Moscow speech of Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko on July 10.

Stressing the importance of arms control in the field of strategic weapons, Gromyko noted that the United States had said "it is getting ready for an exchange of opinion" on the subject.

"The Soviet government is also ready for it," he said. "One would hope that both sides will approach this problem with full understanding of its great importance."

Sources here said the United States still has not received any indication what the Soviet position will be in the talks. Both Soviet officials and the Moscow press have been silent on the subject.

The U.S. position is still under consideration, with a third meeting of the National Security Council on the subject being planned. The talks will deal with both missiles and anti-missile defenses.

VOYAGE TO THE MOON

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I am not alone in finding myself speechless today. The monumental journey of man to the moon represents a turning point in the history of civilization on this planet. With this fantastic journey behind us, the possibilities for the future become infinite.

But I find the words of one of my distinguished constituents, Archibald MacLeish, fitting for the greatness of this occasion. In a poem entitled "Voyage to the Moon" that appeared on the front page of the New York Times for July 21, 1969, Mr. MacLeish eloquently portrayed this most momentous of all events.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. MacLeish's poem in the RECORD at this time:

Voyage to the Moon

(By Archibald MacLeish)

Presence among us, wanderer in our skies,
Dazzle of silver in our leaves and on our waters silver,
O silver evasion in our farthest thought—"the visiting moon" . . . "the glimpses of the moon" . . . and we have touched you!
From the first of time, before the first of time, before the first men tasted time, we thought of you.

You were a wonder to us, unattainable, a longing past the reach of longing, a light beyond our light, our lives—perhaps a meaning to us . . .
Now our hands have touched you in your depth of night.
Three days and three nights we journeyed, steered by farthest stars, climbed outward,
Crossed the invisible tide-rip where the floating dust falls one way or the other in the void between,
Followed that other down, encountered cold, faced death—unfathomable emptiness . . .
Then, the fourth day evening, we descended,
Made fast, set foot at dawn upon your beaches,
Sifted between our fingers your cold sand.
We stand here in the dusk, the cold, the silence . . . And here, as at the first of time, we lift our heads.
Over us, more beautiful than the moon, a moon, a wonder to us, unattainable,
A longing past the reach of longing,
A light beyond our light, our lives—perhaps a meaning to us . . .
O, a meaning!
Over us on these silent beaches the bright earth, presence among us.

A THREAT TO MAN

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the July 11, 1969 issue of Life magazine entitled "Evolution on a Bad Trip" or "'Can Man Survive?' at the American."

Perhaps this warning will help to alert Americans to the vile and evil things they are doing to their environment.

The article follows:

EVOLUTION ON A BAD TRIP—"CAN MAN SURVIVE?" AT THE AMERICAN

(By Wilfrid Sheed, a theater, film and book critic and author of four novels)

One of the gentler memories of any New Yorker's childhood is the Sunday visit to the American Museum of Natural History. There, in a drowsy Rittenhouse Square atmosphere, you could see how evolution had finally worked out: rickety, loose-knit dinosaurs, stuffed grizzlies and You, the Lord of Creation. One departed with the feeling that Nature's fangs were permanently under glass and Mankind was sitting pretty.

Recently, though, the museum has changed its tune. The message of its centennial exhibit, *Can Man Survive?*, is that the way things are going, there may not even *be* any natural history much longer. When the old museum worries, it is probably time for everyone to worry. So crowds of up to 2,000 a day are piling in to see what the problem is.

You can tell something is wrong the moment you walk in. A harsh, raised structure, appropriately called a truss, has been plunked down in the middle of sedate Roosevelt Memorial Hall. Inside the truss, walls jab at you, electronic music jangles you, ramps rise and ceilings dip—more like a fun-house than a biological cathedral.

The first enclave is calm enough. On a split screen, nature goes through its old dreamy paces. The animals eat each other, but "that's the way it goes," as a Negro girl sitting on the floor said. On the walls leading out of that, we get a hasty briefing on agricultural history, early tools, man's ever-lengthening forehead; no museum show would be complete without this rundown, but *Survive* has the grace to make it brief.

Now the sound changes from bird song to a goofy industrial cacophony. Progress as Fun is the next theme. Rocket-launchings, a bottling plant and a mysterious monkey on ice skates are flashed on the screen. Survive? Man will probably die laughing. But this does not fool the museum for one minute. The noise in the corridor changes again, becoming more strident. Voices shout, machines clatter meaninglessly. That throbbing technology is beginning to gibber. And we are ready for our lesson.

It is not, God knows, an original one—only, the suggestion is, a matter of life and death. Overpopulation, pollution, starvation. On one wall, the screen shows sick babies being saved by Science, to lead hungry desolate lives. Across the way, we see fishes dying in poisoned water, cities dying in swirls of manmade gook. On blocks, built to look like the rocks on a tomb, messages of doom pile up. The earth is worn out from the pounding Man has given it. And the pounding gets worse.

There is no great finesse about this display. The museum has 20 minutes to ram its thought home to a largely high school audience, or face its own crowding problem. But if the medium is sledgehammer repetition, the message itself seems to play fair. According to Dr. Harry L. Shapiro, the museum's curator emeritus of physicial anthropology, the estimates of disaster are about the most conservative possible. "Let one expert say that we're crazy and we're ruined," he said.

The final scene is Armaggeddon itself. Thrusting from the wall like stalactites are pictures of the ultimate traffic jam, of a junkyard that never ends and a rush hour that girdles the globe. The noise is splintering, but over it can still be heard the whinny of platitudes: optimistic and hard-nosed pieties about life on the moon and the imperatives of free enterprise.

Visitors fresh from the desert may be shaken by all this. But for most of us, this is not the future but the present. The museum has once again understated its case and our burned-out nerves barely manage a twitch. Some young boys came kibitzing through obliviously at this point—making one despair of man's ability to learn and at the same time rejoice, perversely, at his refusal to be snowed. But in the next room, some other boys sat on the floor watching the film about the undernourished babies again and again, jaws slightly open, faces frozen in shock. "We had planned to make the show more analytical," said Dr. Shapiro; but shortage of space in the truss has reduced it to a sharp little belt in the mouth.

The stone steps leading out of the museum were strewn, on a fine Sunday evening, with thousands of candy wrappers, crushed cola cans and cigarette butts. These constituted the final items in the exhibit.

SENATE—*Tuesday, July 22, 1969*

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by Hon. MIKE GRAVEL, a Senator from the State of Alaska.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art above and beyond but ever near, we stand in Thy presence this day to thank Thee for man, for the majesty and mystery of his person, for the brilliance and ingenuity of his mind. We rejoice that "when the morning stars sang together" at the dawn of time, Thou didst crown all creation by making man in Thine own image, and breathing Thy creative spirit into him.

Eternal Father, we thank Thee now for the new dimensionless and unfathomable vistas opened to all mankind, as by his wisdom and in Thy good providence man has slipped the bonds of earth and soared to lunar lands and spaces. Give Thy servants journeying mercies on the return voyage to the haven of home amongst us on this planet.

As we offer our thanks and praise for the wonder of the realms beyond, we enlist anew in the service of Thy higher kingdom to abolish poverty, to eliminate injustice, to banish hate and war that the sins of earth may not be exported because Thy kingdom of righteousness has first been fulfilled here. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., July 22, 1969.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. MIKE GRAVEL, a Senator from the State of Alaska, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. GRAVEL thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 18, 1969, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 38. An act to consent to the upper Niobrara River compact between the States of Wyoming and Nebraska; and

S. 1590. An act to amend the National Commission on Product Safety Act in order to extend the life of the Commission so that it may complete its assigned tasks.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 7517. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code to provide cost-of-living adjustments in cash relief payments to certain former employees of the Canal Zone Government, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11363. An act to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States; to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law; and for other purposes;

H.R. 11609. An act to amend the act of September 9, 1963, authorizing the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11651. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to provide funds and authorities to the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of providing free or reduced-price meals to needy children not now being reached.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 7517. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code to provide cost-of-living adjustments in cash relief payments to certain former employees of the Canal Zone Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 11363. An act to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States; to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 11609. An act to amend the act of September 9, 1963, authorizing the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 11651. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to provide funds and authorities to the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of providing free or reduced-price meals to needy children not now being reached; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PACKWOOD, SENATOR GOLDWATER, AND SENATOR PERCY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the speech of the distinguished Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD) be recognized for not to exceed 20 minutes, to be followed by the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), for not to exceed 30 minutes, to be followed by the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), for not to exceed 30 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with "New Reports."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated, beginning with "New Reports."

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Justice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

AMBASSADORS

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of ambassadors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

The assistant leislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph A. Greenwald, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of those nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the concurrence of the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), and with no loss of time to him, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures of the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 313 and the succeeding measures in sequence.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MR. AND MRS. WONG YUI

The bill (S. 92) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Wong Yui was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 92

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mr. and Mrs. Wong Yui shall be held and considered to have been born in China.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 322), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to deem Mr. and Mrs. Wong Yui to have been born in China.

SFC. PATRICK MARRATTO (RETIRED)

The bill (H.R. 3379) for the relief of Sfc. Patrick Marratto, U.S. Army (retired), was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 323), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve Sfc. Patrick Marratto, U.S. Army (retired), of Springfield, Mass., of liability to the United States in the amount of $786.20, the amount of an overpayment of compensation as a member of the U.S. Army in the period beginning June 1, 1950, and ending January 31, 1967, because of an administrative error. The bill would also authorize the refund of any amounts withheld or repaid by reason of the liability.

MR. AND MRS. A. F. ELGIN

The bill (H.R. 6585) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. F. Elgin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–324), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay $317.40 to Mr. and Mrs. A. F. Elgin, of Spokane, Wash., in full settlement of their claim against the United States for reimbursement for the cost of transporting the

XUM

automobile of their son after they had received official notification that the son was killed in action in Vietnam.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for his graciousness.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) for an hour and a half.

SAFEGUARD: STRATEGIC NECESSITY AND PATHWAY TO FUTURE DISARMAMENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the appropriations bill for military procurement, as reported by the committee, and against the amendments to delete funds for production and deployment of the Safeguard system.

During the debate that has preceded, Senators have presented carefully reasoned arguments both for and against deployment. Extensive hearings have been held before both the Foreign Relations and Defense Appropriations Committees, on which I am privileged to serve. In addition, we have had much evidence provided to us by our Central Intelligence Agency as it regularly appears before the oversight group headed by the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), on which I also serve. We have listened to many expert witnesses in these hearings. From these lengthy deliberations in three different committees, as well as the Senate debate on this item, I cannot but conclude that it would be dangerous to delay action on Safeguard as is proposed by amendments now before the Senate.

This judgment arises from two factors basic to the future security of the United States. First of all, we must keep the Soviets and any other adversary convinced that no combination of their offensive and defensive weapons could be used against the United States without incurring swift and devastating retaliation. That is what the militarists refer to as deterrent.

Past history clearly demonstrates how easy miscalculation on the part of the enemy can lead it to make an attack which has resulted in our entry into war. As long as an adversary thinks the weapons deployed on both sides are in balance or that advantage is enjoyed by the United States, it would not start an attack. This is the premise. I shall develop the arguments bearing on this concern later in my remarks, but before doing so I wish to comment on the second factor which may be overlooked by the opposition to my point of view.

The objective of all good and sane men on this earth is to reduce and ultimately eliminate the risk of a military nuclear exchange between massively armed powers. I am certain that it is this threat that has opinion so vigorously divided on the issue before us. To many Senators opposed to Safeguard, there is the view that this system if deployed will be a further expansion of the arms race. They argue that as defensive weapons improve, it only triggers greater escalation of counterimproved offensive weapons. One begets the other. And there is some merit to what they say. After all, what has been happening these last 20 years?

LIMITS TO OUR RESOURCES

As a Senator representing a constituency underdeveloped in terms of resources available, for many years I have grappled with the ever-mounting burden of military expenditures. So in serving on both the Subcommittee on the Department of Defense of the Appropriations Committee and on the Foreign Relations Committee, I am concerned when resources are depleted at the expense of urgent necessities to develop our country in agrarian and urban areas—not for ourselves alone, but for the crying needs of the world as well. Practical and credible disarmament would unleash funds to promote the humane objectives upon which this Nation was founded.

So here we are. The dilemma seems to extend endlessly to the future. The threat to national security must be countered. To do so requires larger and larger appropriations and less and less return from the revenues collected. The temptation is strong to cash it all in and hope that the Russians, seeing our good intentions and faced with the same problems, will follow suit.

CHINESE MISSILE THREAT

However, a new problem intrudes. Hardly a week has passed in recent months that the press fails to report a fresh border incident between China and the Soviet Union. These accounts are vague, but some of these incidents have been pretty large scale. And the Chinese have demonstrated under test conditions that they can build thermonuclear warheads. Speculation is frequently voiced that they will begin deploying missiles with nuclear warheads by 1972. Some disagree about the day, month, or year, but no one has said that they are not going to do it sometime in the reasonably early future. Thus, the Russians must be intimidated by the bellicose attitude of the Chinese growing more and more belligerent as an arsenal of nuclear missiles in China draws nearer.

Under these circumstances, it would be foolhardy for either the United States or the Soviet Union to scrap all of its missiles. Some must be kept to preserve the balance against China if not against each other. China must remain convinced that it cannot launch a successful surprise attack. So some minimum level of missiles must be kept by all sides to deter another's possible aggression.

SAFEGUARD AND DISARMAMENT

All right, then, that is the base line toward which we must negotiate. How do we get rid of the rest of the missiles, and stop the submarine and bomber production races? I contend that the salvation is the development of a defensive system such as Safeguard in which both sides, that is the U.S.S.R. and the United States, share the conviction that their defensive missiles are adequate to offset any threat which could be posed by reduced numbers of offensive missiles. That, to me, is the critical but perhaps realizable objective of future negotiations.

There was support for this opinion expressed early in the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE) made the full text of the statement available to Senators, who can find it on pages 8234–8236 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 1, 1969. The witness was Dr. Donald G. Brennan, recognized as an outstanding mathematician and a highly regarded scientist in the field of arms control. Quoting briefly from his statement, here is what he said:

> We might begin at once with a Soviet-American understanding about a ceiling on offensive forces, expressed in inspectable terms such as gross weight, and an understanding that we might both build up defenses. Such an agreement is clearly in the common interest of both the United States and the Soviet Union and should prove realizable. By the mid-1970's, if the defenses are in place and appear to have the capabilities now expected of them, there should be enough confidence in them to begin some gradual reductions of the offensive forces on both sides, reductions which would require only modest inspection because the defenses would (if suitably deployed) sharply diminish the effectiveness of clandestine missiles. The defense would then become even more effective against the then-reduced offensive-force threat, which would facilitate further reductions in offensive forces. Just how far this process might go would depend on the technological and political circumstances then prevailing, but I should not be surprised to find that by 1980 one might reduce the risk of Soviet-American strategic nuclear war to negligible proportions. The defensive forces themselves might, of course, be reduced along the route, but not eliminated. It should be clear that there would be some effective "disarmament" of the offensive-force potentials as soon as the defenses were working, even before direct reductions of the offensive forces.

It is this prospect persuasively argued by Dr. Brennan that is our avenue toward successful disarmament, through Safeguard which I hope those now disposed to the contrary will seriously consider. I think it is vital that we look at the pitfalls that could ensue if we remove this option from any future negotiating table.

RISK OF SOVIET MISJUDGMENT

Returning to the first point, that is, insuring that the Soviet leadership remains convinced of our ability to impose unacceptable counterdamage to their territory and populace if Russia attacks the United States, I should like to bring up some additional points. There are two considerations: intentions and capabilities. The former is difficult to weigh; the latter perhaps not as much so. I am concerned with what these capabilities are, but equally important, what they are believed to be in the mind's eye of Soviet leadership. Here, I cannot help but recall an old Indian saying:

> Great father keep me from judgment until I have walked a mile in the other brave's moccasins.

We must very definitely dwell on what the Russians are thinking. They look at our annual "Posture Statement." That is the document that is released each year by the Department of Defense when the Secretary presents the President's proposed military program for the following fiscal year. I am sure Senators are familiar with it. The Russians do not accommodate us quite as well. However, to get the word out to all the officers and in turn the troops from border to border, they do have something somewhat like ours. It is now in its third edition. This very interesting document is entitled "Military Strategy" and is edited by Marshal V. D. Sokolovsky. The extracts which I will be quoting are from the third edition published in Moscow in 1968. The English translation is not available yet in published form but a copy of the translator's transcript has been made available to me.

In reading the second edition, published in 1964, and the third, published in 1968, the changing attitude among the military leadership of the Soviet Union is very pertinent to the decision the Senate will make on Safeguard.

In my reading of this document, the following quotations are new to the earlier version, portending a greater confidence, false or well-founded, to mount a successful strategic conflict against the West. The document says:

> The success of world socialism, which is becoming the decisive factor in the development of human society, the bankruptcy of the colonial system, the unsolvable contradictions of the capitalistic camp, and the desire of the peoples of the world for peace, clearly show the legality of the historically unavoidable downfall of the obsolete world system of imperialism. This strongly motivates the imperialists, primarily those of the USA, to forestall the imminent destruction of their dying system and, by means of war, change the development of world events so unfavorable to them. It is for this reason that modern imperialism threatens the peace and security of nations.
>
> In describing the essence of war, Marxism-Leninism uses as its point of departure the position that war is not an aim in itself, but rather a tool of politics.
>
> Politics prepares war and creates, for the benefit of strategy, favorable conditions in the economic and ideological respects.
>
> The acceptance of war as a tool of politics determines the relation of military strategy and politics, based completely on the dependence of the former on the latter.
>
> The main attention of military strategy is directed to studying the conditions under which a future war may arise, a detailed study of the peculiarities of the strategic deployment of the armed forces, the methods of delivering the first strike and conducting the first operations, as well as the method of strategic utilization of the different services of the armed forces.
>
> The preparation of foreign policy for war includes such measures as the signing of treaties, the formation of coalitions, the safeguarding of the neutrality of neighboring countries, and others.
>
> It is important for military strategy to assure neutrality of a number of countries or of individual countries; this task is also assigned to diplomacy.
>
> The wars between States with different social systems, the highest form of class struggle, are particularly decisive. In wars between States with the same social system, when there are no social contradictions between the antagonists, the political and strategic aims, the experience of imperalist wars show, are usually limited. In such wars, long before economic and military exhaustion of the belligerent states is reached, compromises of various types are possible.
>
> The nature of military strategy is often influenced by such factors as the general historical, national, and political traditions of a country. For instance, Britain in its foreign policy always adhered to a clearly pronounced policy of watchful waiting, over-safeguarding, having someone else do their dirty work for them. This influenced their military strategy, which avoided decisive engagements, refused to take even reasonable risks, and always looked for devious, indirect roads to victory.
>
> It is apparent that when the very outcome of the war depends largely on the number and the effectiveness of the strikes at the very beginning of the war, it is hardly reasonable to count on the potential capabilities of a country and to reserve a large part of the manpower for military operations during later periods of war. An overwhelming majority of military theoreticians in the highly developed countries of the world is coming to these conclusions.
>
> Diplomatic and economic struggle does not stop in wartime, but these forms of political struggle are entirely dependent on the decisive form, that of armed conflict.
>
> Under conditions of nuclear rocket war, the resolution of the main aims and problems of war will be accomplished by strategic rocket troops, by delivery of massed nuclear rocket strikes.

Mr. President, I interpolate here, for the benefit of those opposed to the ABM deployment, to suggest that they read this statement with care, direct from the top military strategists of Moscow, made just 12 months ago when they say, "by delivery of massed nuclear rocket strikes."

Mr. President, that is what this debate is all about.

Are we going to stand here and accept with no effective defense against it that kind of massed nuclear rocket strikes which the Russians have told us less than a year ago they expect to deploy against us if war comes?

Surely, Mr. President, Senators should have learned something from reading "Mein Kampf," in which Hitler told the free world in advance what he was going to do, and then did it.

Here we have it in black and white, in the Russian language, translated from their military papers.

They tell us now that if war comes, they expect to deliver massed nuclear rocket strikes against us.

I ask those in this body with little faith in our Defense Establishment, or in the capacity of the great, inventive genius of America—which just last Sunday placed men on the moon for the first time in the history of mankind—to build the comparatively simple devices required in the ABM in order to protect us against the very massed nuclear rocket strikes the Communists, in cold print, have told Americans they will launch against us if war comes, to read their statements very carefully.

Mr. President, that is the nubbin of this debate.

The burden of argument shifts to those who say: "Do nothing, or delay doing something, or engage alone in research and development, but do not deploy the weapon you have built."

What are those Senators going to say to their constituents when those constituents question them as to what they have done to protect America and its people against the announced intention of the Russians to strike us with massed nuclear rocket strikes?

Now, Mr. President, reverting to reading from this very interesting Russian document, I continue:

> Ground troops with the aid of aviation will perform important strategic functions in a modern war; by rapid offensive movements they will completely annihilate the remaining enemy formations, occupy enemy territory, and prevent the enemy from invading one's own territory.
>
> Consequently, over-all victory in war is no longer the culmination, nor the sum of individual successes, but the result of a one-time application of the entire might of a state accumulated before the war.

Mr. President, let me interpolate again: Let those Senators among us who question the intention, or desire, or capability of the Russians to launch a first strike attack against us, let those Senators who do their homework, read what the Russians have said to their own troops in their military papers in their own language. They put it very clearly. The debate between those Senators who shrug it off and say, "They are not going to try anything very devastating such as an overwhelming first strike. We do not have to be much concerned about that," and get all involved in the forensics and the semantics of what a first strike means, let them read what the Russians have actually said from the top down to their own generals and their troops.

Let me read it again because it is cruelly cold when we see it in print in black and white, as translated from the Russian language. Here it is:

> Consequently, overall victory in war is no longer the culmination, nor the sum of individual successes, but the result of a one-time application of the entire might of a state accumulated before the war.

We better be sure we are ready for whatever the Russians mean by "a one-time application of the entire might of a state accumulated before the war." Remember, Senators, the Russians said that we did not. I continue to read from what I believe to be one of the most revealing and significant documents thus far made available to Senators in the course of this debate:

> Once the military operations on land and on sea have been started, they are no longer subject to the desires and plans of diplomacy, but rather to their own laws, which cannot be violated without endangering the entire undertaking.

In response to the statement made by the English military theoretician, Kingston-McCloughry—"In the event of such a war, nuclear war, all politics would come to an end and universal mutual annihilation would begin"—Marshal Sokolovsky remarked:

> It is quite evident that such views are a consequence of a metaphysical and antiscientific approach to a social phenomenon such as war, and are a result of idealization of the new weapons. It is well known that the essence of war as a continuation of politics does not change with changing technology and armament.

My reading of Marshal Sokolovsky's "Military Strategy" draws me inevitably to the conclusion that the Soviet military mind, at a minimum, grows ever more strident as their confidence in the proficiency of their weapons has increased. Summarizing my reaction to this document from the study and analysis of this rather amazing and highly illuminating

XUM

Russian document, the following comments seem valid:

First. The Soviet military-political complex is concerned with the attitude of the Soviet citizen toward the United States. It is using the current Vietnam war to advantage to explain why "modern imperialism threatens the peace and security of nations."

Second. The Soviets have not changed the doctrine that war is a tool of politics.

Third. In preparation for war, the Soviets continue to adhere to the practice of using diplomacy for signing treaties, forming coalitions, and safeguarding the neutrality of neighboring countries.

Fourth. Under conditions of nuclear war, Soviet military strategy dictates the delivery of a massive number of nuclear rocket strikes and the on-time application of its entire might at the very beginning of the war.

Fifth. When military operations begin, contrary to what they espouse for us, Soviets will not rely on diplomacy because such action could endanger the entire undertaking.

Sixth. The statement, "It is well known that the essence of war as a continuation of politics does not change with changing technology and armament," is very significant. In short, it appears that the Soviets find nuclear war acceptable if it can serve their political objectives.

Other documents are available which are important to our consideration. In "Soviet Rocket Troops," edited by Col. Gen. V. P. Tolubko and published in 1969, the statement is made:

> The Armed Forces have now received rockets which operate on new, highly effective fuel including solid fuel. The new propellant has made the operation of rockets extremely reliable and simple. In addition, the new propellant has made it possible to store rockets for lengthy periods and to maintain them in a high degree of readiness for launching. With regard to the Rocket Troops, the author stated that they can perform underground launchings not just of single rockets, but also salvo launchings.

In a broadcast Moscow Radio reported on April 20, 1968, that Soviet ICBM's have highly maneuverable launchers that constantly change their launching position and are always ready for immediate action.

SOVIET ABM EFFECTIVENESS

Turning from the broad scope of Soviet strategic beliefs, I should now like to discuss the Soviets' attitude toward their own ABM. In "Commanders of Fiery Arrows," published in 1964. Marshal Malinovsky is quoted as saying to the 22d Congress of the Communist Party that Soviet scientists and engineers had successfully solved the problem of destroying missiles in flight.

In a book written by T. W. Wolfe, entitled "Soviet Military Policy Trends Under the Brezhnev-Kosygin Regime", Soviet Colonel Rybkin is quoted. He declared that the damages of a nuclear war could be limited by, first, achieving a quick military victory over the enemy, and second, using ABM systems to counter the enemy's missiles forces. With regard to the position that nuclear war should be avoided, Rybkin stated that such a position was theoretically false and politically dangerous.

Mr. President, this might be a little statement that our disarmament representatives, soon to be sent somewhere to meet with the Russians, should tuck away in their hatbands when they sit down for their conferences, with Russian theoreticians on record with that statement with regard to the position that nuclear war should be avoided. Rybkin stated that such a position was theoretically false and politically dangerous. If nothing else, this thinking on their part should suggest that when, as, and if we negotiate, wherever we meet with them, wherever they meet with us, we negotiate at arm's length and insist, as we always have, and as I hope we always shall, on unchallenged and unchallengable mutual inspection as a basic point in any disarmaments which are agreed upon.

It is significant that Lt. Col. E. Rybkin also stated that the damages of a nuclear war could be limited by achieving a quick military victory over the enemy and using ABM systems to counter the enemy's missile forces. In other words, nuclear war is practical if you hit the enemy sufficiently hard in your first strike. The deployment of a Soviet ABM system indicates that the Brezhnev-Kosygin regime subscribes to the same theory. It should also be assumed that the Soviet ABM system conforms with Soviet political objectives in the manner outlined by Marshal Sokolvsky in "Military Strategy."

Extracts from still another document, "Soviet Rocket Forces," authored by P. T. Astoshenov and published in 1967, are even more chilling:

> The USSR far outstripped the United States not only in creation of intercontinental and other rockets, but also in the area of antimissile defense. All of us with a sense of patriotic pride grasped the report of the Minister of Defense of the USSR about the fact that in our country we have successfully solved the problem of destruction of rockets in flight.

Mr. President, I think I should read that again, for the benefit of Senators who may not have heard it on the floor, but who will get it from reading the RECORD, Senators who are still on the fence or who may have made a hasty decision, on the basis of inadequate evidence, to oppose the ABM because it cannot work, or because, for some curious reason, a Senator sitting under the dome of the Capitol has decided that an ABM around Moscow is unworkable and, on that basis, he has made his decision. I think he would have a hard time discussing with his colleagues, on the basis of what Mr. Astoshenov says, the author of "Soviet Rocket Forces," written in Russian for the Russians, not in English for Americans, but translated for us so we now know what he says, in which he says very definitely:

> All of us with a sense of patriotic pride grasped the report of the Minister of Defense of the USSR about the fact that in our country we have successfully solved the problem of destruction of rockets in flight.

Mr. President, that stands as clearly as the path to this country's schoolhouse. We may have beaten the Russians to the moon—we know we have—but they have beaten America to the creation of a defense system for the people against ICBM's—and we know that also. I hope we will not let false pride in an achievement as great as putting a man on the moon cause us to be reckless about our own defenses, on the assumption that the Russians are unable, because they did not get there first in their effort to get a man on the moon, to have established an ABM system in which they have confidence and in which, they tell their people in their language, they take great pride in having developed.

Continuing to quote from this highly revealing and somewhat disturbing and chilling document of P. T. Astoshenov:

> One of our antimissile complexes included long-range pilotless interceptors. During training firing, with the aid of such antimissile missiles, we clearly intercepted the warhead of a ballistic missile flying at cosmic velocity ((orbital velocity)) . . . Still more effective is another Soviet antimissile missile. It is able to destroy the warhead of ballistic missiles at a great distance from the protected objects.

My reason for dwelling on the subject of Soviet attitudes toward nuclear war, strategic missiles, and the interaction of offensive and defensive weaponry is to forestall misimpressions and possible delusions concerning the latitude of choice which they believe they enjoy.

COST OF SOVIET ARMAMENTS

Senators will remember that in the Export-Import Bank debate, having to do with the question of lending U.S. money to the Soviet Union for a Fiat plant—built by Italians, financed by Americans, located in Russia, to make implements of war.

I developed the evidence that the Soviets since 1963 had stripped the domestic sector of their economy to increase the military industrial base. Increases at that time in the Soviet military budget amounted to a staggering 12 percent annually. Studies prepared by the Joint Economic Committee indicate that by 1968 the Soviet military industrial base had surpassed that of the United States. For years now the Soviets have doubled U.S. expenditures for strategic forces. Fortunately the Senate stopped the Fiat deal.

The toll of these investments is high. For, as is known, Soviet total production is less than half of ours. The agriculture and consumer-goods sectors have been shoved aside, so much so that productivity in these industries is less than that realized during the Czarist regimes, taking into account population growth.

So what does this tell us? From 1963 to now, we have consistently reduced our strategic weapon plans, both deployed and for replacements. We have scrapped thousands of bombers; we have limited our interceptor forces; we have stalled and slowed down production of Polaris submarines. And what has the Soviet done? The gesture seems wasted. They have ignored the evidence. Instead, they have redoubled efforts to surpass the strategic posture of the United States.

PROJECTED SOVIET CAPABILITIES

These commentaries from Soviet policy document, written in Russian and now available to us in translation, do not suggest to me that their intentions are growing more peaceful. As I mentioned before, intentions are part of it.

XUM

The second part of this concern with respect to the Soviet strategic posture concerns the present and projected Soviet capabilities. Of course, very specific information is highly classified. Some of it we have received in our secret session of the Senate. Senators sitting on the appropriate committees have of course learned it long ago.

The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has made available to Senators a letter which was recently addressed to him in response to his request by Mr. Melvin Laird, our Secretary of Defense. In this letter, the full text of which can be found on page 19059 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 10, 1969, the Secretary recounts the great growth in Soviet capabilities as a consequence of the heavy investments. The heart of this assessment, in which CIA Director Richard Helms concurs, is told in the concluding paragraphs from which I will now quote:

> 1. The Soviet Union could acquire a capability to destroy virtually all of our Minuteman missiles. To be able to do so, in the present context they would need: (a) at least 420 SS–9s with three independently-targeted re-entry vehicles which have a capability of separating from one another by some relatively small number of miles; (b) each of these re-entry vehicles would have to have a warhead of approximately 5 megatons and a reasonably good accuracy; (c) the SS–9s would have to be retargetable; and (d) the range would have to be sufficient to reach all of the Minuteman silos.
>
> 2. The Soviet Union could acquire a capability to threaten severely the survival of our alert bombers. To do so in the present context they would need; (a) a force of about 15 Y-class (Polaris-type) submarines on station off our shores; and (b) the ability to launch the missiles on a depressed trajectory.
>
> 3. Although we confidently expect our Polaris/Poseidon submarines to remain highly survivable through the early to mid-1970s, we cannot preclude the possibility that the Soviet Union in the next few years may devise some weapon techniques or tactic which could critically increase the vulnerability of those submarines. Nor can we preclude the possibility that the Soviet Union might deploy a more extensive and effective ABM defense which could intercept a significant portion of the residual warheads. In any event, I believe it would be far too risky to rely upon only one of the three major elements of our strategic retaliatory forces for our deterrent.
>
> In summary, Mr. Chairman, it is entirely possible that the Soviet Union could achieve by the mid-1970s a capability to reduce, in a surprise attack, our surviving strategic offensive forces below the minimum level required for "Assured Destruction," and thus gravely weaken our deterrent. In my judgment the overall strategic balance between the United States and the Soviet Union is much too close to run that risk. Therefore, something more must be done now to ensure a favorable strategic balance in the mid-1970s and beyond.
>
> Short of achieving a workable agreement with the Soviet Union on the limitation of strategic armaments, which will take some time, we are convinced that the approval of Phase I of Safeguard would be the most prudent and economical course we could pursue at this particular juncture. This action would place us in a position to move forward promptly not only with the defense of our Minuteman and bomber forces should the Soviet threat develop as I have described, but also with the defense of our population against the Chinese ICBM threat should that emerge during the next few years.
>
> In your letter of July 3rd, you also asked whether the Director of Central Intelligence, Richard Helms, concurs in my formulation of the threat. I have furnished a copy of this letter to Director Helms and he assures me that he has no disagreement with the statements concerning the potential Soviet and Chinese Communist strategic capabilities as seen from the intelligence point of view.

The Senate has debated ABM and delayed development and deployment for 5 years now since the Soviets began deployment of their system. The Soviets, from the information I have related previously in my remarks, properly see this to their advantage. The country-to-country comparisons are going down, down, and down on our side and up, up, and up on theirs.

As I have said before, we must have nuclear disarmament. I share the opinion of others that the world's needs cry for a stop to this folly of continuing nuclear stockpiling of arms, one country as against the other.

I look forward to promising results when the President's proposed arms limitations talks begin. But I am a realist. Having made this huge investment, at great sacrifice to their economy, what do you think the Soviets are going to say when we propose, "You break up your antimissile system and we'll tear up our blueprints?" Why, of course, they will laugh at us; the terms are not equitable; they would never enter into such a one-sided concession, and they should not be expected to do so.

Beyond this, returning to the point previously made concerning the legitimate apprehension that both the United States and the Soviet Union must share toward the day Chinese nuclear missiles appear on the launching pad, I firmly believe the avenue for successful disarmament is toward the direction of "light offense—heavy defense." Technology and the pace of earlier developments leave too little promise for other alternatives.

As Senators, by our oath of office to support the Constitution, we are pledged to provide for the common defense. Greatly expanded quantities of Soviet nuclear weapons and higher confidence in them held by the Soviets if not offset by matching United States defense will, in my opinion, leave us short on that oath. The time to ante up is here; though the cost be high, we cannot shortchange our Defense Department experts who say we must increase the deterrent of the United States.

To my knowledge, no other weapon system has been subjected to such intensive and protracted research as the Safeguard. Dr. John Foster, who, before committees of the Senate, has established a record for avoiding premature commitments, states that an ABM system is now ready for production. He had expressed reservations in years before. In 1966, 1967, and 1968, he said there was more testing to be done, more experiments required. Now, he says, we can have confidence. He is the Government's No. 1 expert in these matters; we are not. I abide by his counsel. If we are ready and the requirement is clearly there, and I believe it is, let us get on with it, thankful that through Providence we are prepared to fulfill our obligations to our fellow countrymen and support the President.

ABM IS AMERICA'S BEST INSURANCE PURCHASE

Mr. President, it is now very apparent that even among those Senators who oppose President Nixon's Safeguard ABM package, some are having serious "second thoughts" about the wisdom and defensibility of their all-out opposition, including some who curiously enough voted to support the ABM program sent us by President Johnson a year ago, although that was a far more extensive and expensive program, but who now with a Republican President have announced opposition to the far less expensive and more effective ABM program sent us by President Nixon. Some of those who have consistently opposed this defensive installation whether proposed by a Democratic or a Republican President are also backing down a bit from their earlier all-out opposition to ABM.

We have before us a variety of amendments which while different in detail, all propose that we continue the research and development expenditures for ABM but that by one device or another we delay and deny the deployment without which, of course, the R. & D. expenditures lose their reality of purpose. Certainly, if we do not intend to install and deploy the results of the research and development, it occurs to this Senator we had better spend our money on some other weapons systems designed to protect our lives and security rather than to go on the record for spending vast sums of money for research and development of an ABM system we decline to test out in the laboratory of life through early deployment.

Still, many Senators who just do not quite trust the early judgments they have made to curtail this ABM development which our military leaders and experts tell us is so important to the protection of our peace and our people, now urge us to adopt an amendment which would still provide all of the research and development dollars required but then deny our country the benefits and the protection which can come only from actual deployment on the sites selected as essential to our national defense. To me, Mr. President, this is an inconsistent position for any Senator to take on an issue of this magnitude.

It seems to me it is inconsistent to attempt to straddle the fence by financing the expensive blueprints but denying the dollars required to complete the construction and installations required for the blueprints, or the research findings if you prefer, to be put to effective use.

And how much, Mr. President, is involved in that part of this appropriation required for the deployment phases of ABM? I asked that question of Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird when he was a witness recently before our Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. That was a closed session, but subsequently portions of the testimony were released. The part I am about to read is part of that which was subsequently made available to all Senators.

Mr. President, here are the facts as

recorded in those hearings and I quote, now beginning on page 41 of our committee report date June 23, 1969:

> Senator Mundt. Mr. Secretary, can you give us the exact difference in terms of dollars between research and development on ABM which everybody seems to favor, and the controversial phase of deployment?
>
> Secretary Laird. As far as this year's budget is concerned, Senator, the total amount involved we have asked this Congress for is——
>
> The Chairman. That is 1970.
>
> Secretary Laird. 1970.
>
> The Chairman. Fiscal?
>
> Secretary Laird. $800 million in fiscal year 1970. President Johnson and Secretary Clifford asked the Congress in their original fiscal year 1970 budget for $1,800 million in NOA. (New obligational authority). This has been reduced by President Nixon's request to $800 million for procurement, R. & D.—the total program as far as Safeguard is concerned—for fiscal 1970.
>
> Senator Mundt. I have seen Secretary Packard quoted on the difference in cost if we did what everybody wants to do, which is research and development, and if we started the deployment preparation for this next fiscal year, which would be $400 million.
>
> Secretary Laird. That is approximately correct because of the total amount in this budget about $400 million is in the research and development area.
>
> Senator Mundt. What we are really arguing about then, to make it clear, is whether or not to put $400 million in this budget for deployment.
>
> Secretary Laird. That is approximately correct. That figure is not exactly $400 million. I will supply the exact figure for the record. (The following note was later added by the Defense Department: the revised fiscal year 1970 budget includes about $393 million in NOA (new obligational authority) for deployment.)

I think it is about time in this debate, Mr. President, that we get down to specifics and to precise cost figures about the controversial question "to deploy or not to deploy?" The fruits of the research and development program which virtually all Senators now appear to favor.

How much is a billion dollars? With a total American population of slightly over 200 million people, Mr. President, a billion dollars is almost exactly five dollars per man, woman, and child in the United States. With this in mind, any school boy can use his competence in division and determine that the $393 million involved in the deployment costs and aspects of this debate on ABM come to substantially less than half a billion dollars—less than $2 per man, woman, and child in America, in that portion of this appropriations bill required for the current fiscal year.

In other words, Mr. President, we can buy the protection provided by the full Nixon Safeguard ABM program by adding the cost of less than $2 per individual American more than what even the most determined opponents of ABM appear willing to spend for research and development of the same weapons system.

For $2 per American, we can buy this important insurance against national catastrophe for an entire fiscal year. Next year and for the next several years—if Russia remains adamant and refuses to join with us in some nuclear arms limitation formula—we would continue to pay approximately $2 for each of us to keep this insurance policy in force against the potentiality of an atomic attack.

Mr. President, verily, I believe the Safeguard ABM system is indeed America's best insurance purchase. Many people spend more than $2 for trip insurance on a single vacation trip by air. Others thoughtlessly buy a $2 ticket at a race track and think nothing of it. In New York City, for example, one "night on the town"—one visit to a theater, a night spot, or a first-class restaurant would cost the customer much more than his entire share of the Safeguard system for the next 10 years—once you separate out the deployment costs from the total ABM package, and I repeat again, even many of the opponents of ABM—perhaps most of them at this time in the debate—have now come around to recognizing the merit of this system by demonstrating a willingness to finance the research and development required. They object only to the $2 per year per individual in this country which is the additional cost involved in providing the essential deployment required to make certain that what has been designed as a protective weapon will function effectively as such.

Mr. President, while I totally disagree with the position, I can understand a Senator's motivation when he denounces the entire ABM concept and votes to deny, unilaterally, to the United States the means to defend itself. While I think a Senator is terribly and dangerously in error when he votes to kill entirely the ABM defensive weapons system to protect the United States on the basis "we might better use the money for educational purposes, for pollution control, or to enrich life in our urban centers," I can also understand the motivation causing him to make this unthinking and unreasoned mistake in his choice of spending priorities. But what I cannot understand, is either the logic or the motives of a Senator who says he is willing to vote what the Defense Department requests for research and development of an operative and effective ABM complex and then also votes to deny his Government the right to test it for workability and to deploy it at its operational sites so that we can learn from the laboratory of life whether we have come up with the optimum answer to our self-defense or whether still additional research is required to eliminate any possible deficiencies in the system.

A SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENTS INVOLVED

Mr. President, after the lengthy and significant debate in the U.S. Senate, it seems to me that the arguments pro and con with regard to this ABM decision boil themselves down to five significant areas of disagreement. It would seem that any Senator evaluating this debate who decides for himself that on as many as three out of five of the controversial issues the weight of the argument is with one side or the other, that Senator would want to vote "Yes" or "No" depending upon where his judgment leads him in deciding these basic issues. In fact, since the security and survival of our country are involved, I would think that if on any one of these five basic issues a Senator is driven by judgment or conscience to accept the affirmative side, he should vote "Yes" and support the President's ABM position.

I would now like to summarize what I believe to be the pertinent points in controversy.

First, there appears to be dispute among us as to the "Do we need to make a maximum effort to safeguard our country against a possible attack from Russia or China?" argument.

On this point, Mr. President, I sincerely believe the weight of evidence overwhelmingly supports the thesis that the United States of America must never permit itself to lag behind the military strength of its potential enemies if our lives and our freedom are to remain secure. The surest path to war insofar as the United States is concerned is to permit our defenses to become outmoded or inadequate to the point where some foreign power or creed is led to believe that it can blackmail us into capitulation or, failing in that, that it has the military power to impose its will upon us. Thus, I firmly believe that to remain free, we must remain strong, and that to enjoy peace, we must endure the costs of a totally adequate and sufficient defense system.

Second, is the "Will it work effectively?" argument as related to the proposed Safeguard-ABM defense proposal.

It appears to be on this issue that a large part of the controversy has developed. Equally competent nuclear scientists are divided on this issue, although the predominant expert military opinion believes the ABM to be both an effective and a necessary development if we are to come up with the capacity to take a possible first strike from a foreign foe and have the retaliatory power not only to strike back but—and this is most important—to demonstrate to such a foe that a surprise attack launched against us would be suicidal from the standpoint of the attacker. Once a potential enemy comes to believe that we can recover from a surprise attack and return against that enemy a thoroughly devastating strike against him, there is little likelihood that he will engage in such a self-defeating act of war.

However, Mr. President, debate will never determine an accurate answer to the question, "Will it work?" The only way to be sure on that point is to research, develop, design, and deploy an ABM system which can be tested on its operative site. Additionally, I should add that if those of us who believe it will work are wrong and should win the vote, all we shall have lost is the money expenditure involved, but if those who oppose the ABM and believe it will not work are wrong and should win the vote, we may, indeed, have lost everything dear to all good Americans—including a second chance to try to rectify this tragic error in judgment.

Mr. President, I submit it is far better to have the ABM system developed and not need it than it is to need it and not have it available.

Third comes the "Can we afford it?" argument as related to the ABM.

Earlier in this presentation, I have pointed out that there is, indeed, a very small dollar involvement in this debate between those who would proceed with research and development and deny deployment and those of us who would spend the added $2 per year per American individual required to add the needed deployment to the costs of research and development.

I just cannot see the wisdom in spending vast sums for the research and development of a weapons system and then enacting a legislative prohibition against utilizing the fruits of these efforts through testing them thoroughly by deployment on their sites of proposed operation. On this point, Mr. President, I believe more Americans are concerned about the question, "can we afford longer to delay this necessary addition to our defense system?" than are concerned about the question, "can we afford the $2 per year per individual required to make sure we are able to defend ourselves and our military deterrent to the maximum required?"

Fourth, we have heard much in this debate about the "will it help or harm our efforts to enter meaningful negotiations with the Russians on nuclear disarmament?" argument.

Mr. President, Russia, as we all now know, already has an ABM system installed around Moscow and is testing and developing additional antiballistic missiles. We have none. I completely favor pressing forward with nuclear disarmament talks with the Russians because, in the end, I firmly believe the only complete protection against possible mutual annihilation through a nuclear war is to set up a system of complete nuclear disarmament accompanied by unchallenged and unchallengeable mutual inspection rights on both sides.

To bring this about, however, we must mutually disarm and both sides must cut back and destroy their nuclear armaments to a degree that neither side has any advantage over the other and neither has the capacity to make an effective attack against the other—whether by surprise or following some demanding ultimatum.

On this point it seems to me every realist in the Senate must recognize that for the United States to have any chance of inducing the Russians to join us in such a mutual disarmament of our nuclear weapons, it is imperative that we do not permit the U.S.S.R. to out-strip us or to out-arm us in any important aspect of nuclear armament. And, make no mistake about it, Mr. President, the monopolized capacity—or the believed capacity—to ward off any atomic attack through use of antiballistic missiles is too great an advantage to give to any potential foe of the United States.

Certainly, should the Senate deny our Government the right to proceed with an ABM system we would be sending our negotiators with the Russians to the conference table devoid of any "trading stock" in this area of discussion.

Does any Senator really believe that any American negotiator could go to such a conference and successfully say to the Russians, "We propose as an important step in disarmament that you tear down and demolish your ABM installations on which you have spent many billions of dollars, and in return we shall promptly tear up our blueprints and shut down our research laboratories." To assume that, Mr. President, is to attribute to the Russian Communists a naivete and a stupidity which they simply do not have.

Fifth, the final major point in controversy is the argument involving the "should we concentrate on producing offensive nuclear weapons of greater and greater sophistication and destructive power or should we balance our military posture by including an effective defense against the other fellow's striking power?"

On this point we should remember that this is the United States that we are arguing about. Were we a totalitarian power, bent on aggression, and subject to the whims of a single individual, quite an argument might be made in favor of developing a striking power so fearsome and so destructive that we could rely upon our will and capacity to kill or to frighten any potential foe from ever making an attack against us. However, we want neither war nor domination, nor imperialistic acquisition. We want peace in these United States.

We will never launch a surprise nuclear attack against any foe. All Americans know that. More important, Mr. President, all foreigners also know that. Therefore, unless we maintain a safe balance of our defenses against our offensive striking power we sharply lessen the deterrent to war represented by our nuclear might.

I should also like to emphasize with regard to this issue, the very practical and perceptive point made the other day in the highly persuasive and effective speech made by Senator WIN PROUTY, of Vermont, when he was outlining his reasons for supporting the ABM. Once we have developed an effective defense against the other fellow's intercontinental missiles, we shall have evolved a procedure whereby we need not rely solely upon launching our own missiles on a murderous trip through the skies to kill hundreds of millions of people in other lands. Once we have the capacity to intercept and destroy incoming missiles, we will have "bought ourselves some highly valuable time" to first ascertain the source of an attack upon us, and to determine whether by accident or by design, before being compelled to launch against an enemy our highly destructive nuclear missiles.

A protective screen capable of warding off an atomic attack against us and capable of providing protection for our retaliatory striking power—and perhaps, eventually, for many of our centers of population and production—gives us a "second choice" before committing our country to the callous business of exterminating an entire nation as our sole and only available defense against an attack against us which conceivably might emanate from the impetuous action of a single madman or even come as the result of accident rather than intention.

Mr. President, on balance, it appears to me that there is only one sound, prudent, and responsible decision we can make when it comes time to vote on the President's request to move forward with his proposed Safeguard ABM system. We should comply with that request.

We should vote to approve the modest request for funds and the meaningful request for authority to assure our fellow countrymen that our country will never fall prey to any foreign power seeking to impose its way of life and its domination over us. To do that safely and surely in this modern era, we must research, develop, and deploy the best available offensive and defensive weapons system that the state of the art provides. In the instant case, Mr. President, that means we should approve the committee's report in support of ABM.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR ALLEN

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the address by the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), the distinguished and very able junior Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) be recognized for not to exceed 20 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order previously entered the Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE STATEMENT

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the most crucial decision facing this first session of the 91st Congress, and perhaps this and a number of subsequent Congresses, is the decision now before us on deployment of the antiballistic system known as Safeguard.

This decision has been much debated. It has been the subject of much controversy in our Nation's press and our Nation's colleges. It has been the subject of extensive hearings and debate in our Armed Services Committee and here on the floor of the Senate. It has been debated throughout the life of this Congress and this administration and was debated in preceding Congresses. Despite this lengthy and full examination of the Safeguard system it continues to divide men of good intention, of deep concern and commitment to the welfare and security of this Nation.

The debate divides our experts as it divides our citizens and the Members of this body. This division is no less real among those of us on the Armed Services Committee who have heard all the secret testimony than among the Members of the Senate as a whole, who have now also heard a summary of that testimony. And as a measure of the profoundness of this issue we see a public equally polarized.

XUM

The division is not a partisan one albeit a larger percentage of the President's party supports his proposal than is true of the opposition. But the division is real, and the decision we are about to make is of critical importance to the future of this Nation and the peace of the world.

A number of issues have been raised about this system's deployment which casts doubt as to its cost, it workability, its justification, and which question its potential effect upon our security, upon our adversaries' decisions, and upon the very future of civilization.

While the decision we are about to make is a most crucial one I would suggest its true significance is not based on the question of technical feasibility, although serious doubts are justified. The inability to test this system operationally will always limit our knowledge of its reliability. We are being asked to approve a system indescribably complex. We are being asked to authorize deployment of a system for which some components are still undeveloped and untried.

I do not question our ability to develop a system which will destroy some incoming nuclear warheads in flight. But whether the ratio destroyed is one in four or three in four will not alter my opposition. Even if we accept the estimates that our ABM could destroy more than 70 percent of incoming nuclear warheads those which will not be stopped will make the halting of others a matter of small moment.

The degree of its perfectibility is not the crucial issue, however. How many strikes, fifty or more times as powerful as the bomb at Hiroshima or Nagasaki, are we willing to consider acceptable? I refuse to support a national policy which envisions such destruction as acceptable.

Neither is the decision we are about to make of such significance because of its cost. This is true whether we calculate that cost to be merely the $759,100,000 in this authorization bill, or $7.9 billion, $12 billion, $40 billion, or even an eventual several hundred billion dollars, as has been estimated by some. Demands on our resources have never been greater, nor our unmet needs more obvious or more pressing, but savings alone do not justify my opposition.

Yes, we have good reason to question the allocation of our resources when this Government requests $44 for the education of each American boy and girl while requesting $20,400 for ammunition for each North Vietnamese, and Vietcong regular or guerrilla estimated to be in South Vietnam.

We have good cause to be concerned when we find an administration so short for funds at home that it will slash $25,000 from our tuberculosis program in Hawaii while going forward with the development of an F-14 fighter plane which will have a price in excess of 100 times that for each plane.

We have good cause to question our system of national priorities when we cannot find funds to feed poor children or save our cities, while the billions spent in the name of national security go largely unquestioned and unchecked. But cost is not the primary reason for my concern.

Nor is my concern primarily a response to the changing rationale being put forth in defense of the deployment of an ABM system although we have good reason to question its shifting rationale. A system is suspect which is sold first as the answer to a possible attack by the Chinese on our cities only to be repackaged—after objection by those to be saved from such an attack—with but slight modification. It is now sold as the ideal weapon to protect our missile silos from a Russian first strike and our cities from accidental attack. We have good reason to question a defense system designed against an assumed threat which the Secretary of Defense and the Director of our CIA cannot agree as being a goal of the Soviet high command. But my deepest concern is not primarily because this is indeed a "missile in search of a mission."

Nor is my concern so great because of the inconsistencies of those who advocate deployment, although this too causes me some uneasiness. We find the President defending a two-site system while his Secretary of Defense refuses to endorse a proposed compromise because it fails to provide authorization for the acquisition of 12 sites.

While I am concerned with the testimony which demonstrates that our Safeguard system can be overwhelmed by the enemy through only a relatively small increase in his offensive capacity neither is this the reason for my ultimate objection. Rather, that objection is based on my firm belief that we are now at one of those watersheds in our Nation's history when we must decide our course for administrations and generations yet to come.

I believe we must make a decision now as to whether our security and our future lies in the direction of ever increasing levels of armed might and another great step in the arms race, or whether we will finally also take some risks in the name of peace. For let there be no question about it—an additional giant step in this arms race—even with a so-called defensive weapon—will only heighten the level of terror. To deploy Safeguard is not to embark on a course without risk. It is not a harmless American "security blanket."

We Americans have spent a thousand billion dollars in defense against a possible Russian attack since World War II. Many billions of these have been wasted as we now know. This is not to say that the threat was not real but rather that our mutual response has provided no real security but only an increase in the level of terror.

In his June 4 Air Force Academy address, President Nixon stated:

> The adversaries in the world today are not in conflict because they are armed. They are armed because they are in conflict and have not yet learned peaceful ways to resolve their conflicting national interest.

I believe that such a view of the world is unreal and unrealistic. The level of arms is not alone the result of conflict but also increases the level of conflict. Our response in the Cuban missile crisis was not a response to a new level of conflict but a response to the introduction of a new level of armed threat. We developed MIRV in response to Galosh, not because Galosh represented a new level of conflict; but, rather, because it might make inoperative some of our retaliatory power.

Today we are at long last moving toward negotiations with the Soviet Union over our mutual level of armaments. For us, at this time, to upset the delicate parity which presently describes our relationship is to destine those negotiations to failure.

I say this not because I believe the Soviets will automatically respond favorably to a unilateral reduction in our military capability, for I do not believe they will. Nor do I take this position because I believe the Russians will respond to a sign of weakness on our part with restraint on theirs. They will not.

I oppose present deployment of the ABM Safeguard system because it will in fact frustrate our efforts at achieving a higher level of security. Security can only be achieved through a mutually agreed upon limit on the level of our armaments. The Russians will never agree to negotiate meaningful reductions from a position of announced inferiority. If we seek to negotiate with a new weapon system as one more high card in our deck, then they will refuse until they likewise have acquired an added increment of power—and so the cycle continues while our cities smoulder, our poor remain underfed, our air grows ever more polluted, and our dreams for a better future are daily tarnished and frustrated by the demands of today's escalating arms race.

We must, therefore, move forward to the pending negotiations while in a period of delicate balance—as equal participants—seeking a mutual victory over the forces of conflict which have so dominated our thoughts and our lives. If we have learned a single lesson from these past 25 years of negotiation and competition with the Soviet Union, it is that every stimulus we provide engenders their response. The atomic age and the age of intercontinental ballistic missilery has brought us to that stage where there can be no hope for peace nor for victory over a like armed adversary through increased power. The only possible victory is a mutual victory over the continuing upward spiral in the level of armaments. This, then, must be our search.

Our deterrent capacity remains. Such deterrence is based not alone on our land-based ICBM's but includes our Polaris fleet, our strategic bombers, and the additional nuclear striking power we have in our arsenal at sea and abroad.

I urge, therefore, my colleagues in the Senate to join with me in opposition to this so-called Safeguard system. We are at an important juncture in our Nation's history, and indeed in the history of man. The choice is clear. The time is now.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

XUM

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair would advise the Senator from Arizona that the Senator from Oregon, who was to speak next, is not in the Chamber and, therefore, under the previous order, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) is recognized.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I will be very happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon when he comes into the Chamber, with the understanding that——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would suggest to the Senator from Arizona that he should proceed now with his entire statement.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Chair.

ABM DEBATE—GENESIS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services and as a concerned American citizen, I wish to address my colleagues at this time on the military procurement bill with special emphasis on that part of it which deals with the administration's request for the Safeguard ABM system.

As my colleagues are aware, I returned to the Senate this past January after a 4-year absence. And because of this, I have taken the trouble recently to go back and trace the genesis of the argument for a missile defense in this country to counter, in part, the vast, three-stage Galosh system which the Soviet Union has been deploying over the past 5 years.

Mr. President, I think that we have heard so many arguments pro and con and listened to so many different kinds of scientific experts and military strategists that we may have obscured the most simple, fundamental reason why this Congress must approve an ABM.

That reason is that President Nixon, acting in his capacity as Commander in Chief of the armed services, has recommended the Safeguard system as an essential requirement for the defense of the American people. Since this dispute arose some years back, two Presidents, three Secretaries of Defense and succeeding members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have all argued the necessity of erecting a missile defense in this country.

It is imperative, I believe, for us to understand that the officials with the very best information about this Nation's defenses and this Nation's vulnerabilities are in agreement on the need for an ABM. Against this, we have the very active and vocal opposition of many members of this Senate and of the intellectual and scientific communities.

Let me make it abundantly clear that I mean no disrespect to my colleagues, nor for the distinguished professors and scientists who oppose ABM, when I state that the safety of the American people is far too important to be left to the judgment of nonexperts.

The American people elected President Johnson as their Commander in Chief in 1964, and he recommended an ABM system for their protection. He was supported in this decision by former Defense Secretaries Robert McNamara and Clark Clifford. By the same token, the American people elected Richard Nixon as their Commander in Chief in 1968, and he recommended an ABM system for their protection. In this he was supported 100 percent by the present Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird.

I believe it makes a great deal of difference—much more difference than it has been accorded during these days of debate—to understand that it is one thing to stand outside the arena of direct responsibility and oppose a system for the defense of 200 million Americans, and it is quite another thing to act as President or Secretary of Defense and carry on your shoulders the very heavy and very direct burden of responsibility for the safety of our people.

It is easy enough for a member or even all the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to decide a matter of military importance and argue the point on the Senate floor in connection with this military procurement bill. It is even something different for members of the Armed Services Committee—who come closer to that arena of responsibility of which I spoke—to stand in opposition to our Commander in Chief, to our Secretary of Defense, and to our military Chiefs of Staff.

But I wonder how many of the opponents, if they were to find themselves tomorrow sitting in the oval office of the President and feeling the awesome weight of official responsibility, could reject the advice of his military advisers and forgo the deployment of a missile defense system designed to protect the people he has been elected to lead.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has just raised a question of the propriety of acting contrary to the recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff with respect to the deployment of an ABM or other methods to protect the people. Is that correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I would not say that was correct in my interpretation. I can understand how the Senator could understand it that way. I said previously that I made no criticism, nor would I deny any Member the right to act as he feels. I merely say that I do think deference should be paid to people who have been trained throughout their lives in strategic and tactical problems and weaponry. That is my position.

Mr. GORE. I thought I heard the Senator correctly. Would the Senator mind reading the last sentence he read just before I asked him to yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wonder how many of the opponents, if they were to find themselves tomorrow sitting in the oval office of the President and feeling the awesome weight of official responsibility, could reject the advice of his military advisers and forgo the deployment of a missile defense system designed to protect the people he had been elected to lead.

Mr. GORE. Now will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. GORE. The reason why I asked the Senator to yield at that point was that it was the Sentinel model of the ABM system that was designed to protect the people of our cities. The Joint Chiefs of Staff urgently recommended that; urgently recommended the deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system around our principal cities. Indeed, they said it was necessary for our national security that the people of our principal cities be protected by the deployment of an ABM system.

It would be interesting to know the precise date when the Joint Chiefs of Staff changed that recommendation. This is one secret that we have not learned. So far as the record shows, the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended the deployment of the Sentinel model of the ABM until, after a little political commotion in Boston and Seattle and Chicago, there was a political recommendation that the deployment of ABM be changed from about the cities to around two missile complex sites in Montana and North Dakota. These facts make the sentence which the Senator just covered quite interesting, indeed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Of course, the Senator realizes that I was not here when the system he is referring to was voted by the Senate. I returned either shortly before or shortly after the decision on Safeguard was made. So I do not think I can say any more than what I have said in the sentence the Senator asked me to reread. I do not think I would change it unless I were privy to what went on here when the so-called thin system was voted on.

Mr. GORE. What I wished to suggest to the Senator was that the present ABM deployment is not, in fact, designed to protect the lives of the people. Instead, it is proposed to protect certain missile silos. So when I heard the Senator make the statement, I rose to suggest to him that he might wish to revise the sentence.

Mr. GOLDWATER. No; I would not wish to. Because of the Senator's reference to people, I think that the defense of any weapon system is a defense of the people. It may be a roundabout way, but to put all our eggs in the defense of the cities, I think even the proponents, as well as the opponents, of the ABM will admit would be a very difficult task. We developed a weapons system that was designed to protect this country by its being a threat. If we do not protect it and it is not a constant threat, it offers no retaliatory possibilities at all. I look upon this deployment as a people saver, even though it is indirect, a defense of weapons.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In the context of nuclear war technology, and in view of the enormous stockpiles of offensive nuclear weapons possessed by both the United States and the Soviet Union, it appears to the senior Senator from Tennessee that the only measure of protection of American lives, the only measure of security for either country is the avoidance of nuclear war. And in that context,

XUM

it is difficult indeed for me to see how the proposed ABM system provides any protection, whatsoever, to the American people. Indeed, after months of study, it is my conclusion that it would render the people less secure, not more secure.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Well, of course, I think that is one of the bases on which the opponents and proponents disagree in this matter. I see in this ABM system a system that will protect our weaponry, and, therefore, a system that can add to our retaliatory capability.

I will join the Senator from Tennessee in hoping and praying that we can have a meaningful discussion with the Soviets on disarmament. I would be the chief advocate for it. But I have not seen anything in my years that would lead me to believe that such a discussion either is imminent or that it would be productive. I hope I am as wrong as I can be. I have no more choosing for this type of weapon than does the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, I continue with my statement.

I would ask each and every Member of this body to try and place himself behind that Presidential desk flanked by the American flag and decide once and for all that he could afford to rest the safety and the security of all peace-loving Americans on the assumption that our potential adversaries will conclude an honorable agreement for arms limitations.

Sitting in such a seat of responsibility, can any of us here today state definitely that the construction of a purely defensive system comparable to the one that already exists around the major Russian cities would set off another round in the so-called arms race?

Could any of us, sitting in that seat of responsibility, decide that domestic problems were far more important than the possible safety of the people involved in those problems? Could we convince ourselves that the rebuilding of our inner cities and the construction of badly needed urban renewal projects would lessen the danger of a possible enemy attack?

Could any of us sit at that desk and say to ourselves, because some scientist believed that the Safeguard will not work, we should not attempt it at all? In fact, I might say, Mr. President, that after what happened this past weekend, I cannot believe that any scientist, or any American, can say about any idea, "It will not work." What we did in reaching and walking on the moon called for much more precise computerization and activity than would be required with the weapons system we are talking about.

Do we not remember that other Presidents were told that the A-bomb would never work and that development of an H-bomb was not feasible?

Are we not eternally grateful to the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt for moving ahead with the Manhattan project and obtaining what was then considered the ultimate weapon before it fell into the hands of the madman, Adolf Hitler? Are we not grateful to former President Harry Truman for his courage and foresight in overriding the opposition of the left-wing scientific community and developing the H-bomb in concert with a similar Communist development behind the Urals in the Soviet Union?

I emphasize that what we are discussing here today is a system designed not to kill people but to keep them alive. We are not discussing a weapon of terror or a weapon of destruction. We are discussing a very rudimentary system of conservation and protection. We are not even discussing an elaborate, all-out defensive system such as the one the Soviet Union has deployed around its major cities. We are not even discussing a "thin" Sentinel system to protect our civilian population from a possible Chinese attack, a Sentinel system for which many Senators here today voted.

No, we are here discussing a system which is very little more than a program of intensified research and development calling for only partial deployment. For those who talk compromise, let me say I think this is a compromise. It is certainly a much different program than the Sentinel project, which President Johnson told us in March of 1968 was of the highest national priority.

The Safeguard system is designed to protect our nuclear deterrent. And certainly if we had the international moral right to construct such a deterrent, we have the right to protect it. Our deterrent system was built to serve our national strategic interests, protect our population and serve the cause of freedom elsewhere in the world. Why, all of a sudden, there should be such an unreasonable outcry against any effort to protect that deterrent, is one of the great mysteries surrounding this present debate.

In tracing the background of this controversy, I find that Secretary McNamara first unveiled his recommendation for the Sentinel ABM in September of 1967. In November of that year the Department of Defense announced that the Sentinel would be a thin configuration of the Nike X system and identified 10 areas to be surveyed as possible site locations.

As I recall it, there was interest, but very little protest, aroused by the successive actions of a Democratic administration. In the following year, things moved on rapidly. As I pointed out, President Johnson in March gave his ABM proposal the "highest national priority." In April, the Senate rejected by a vote of 31 to 28 an amendment to the defense appropriation bill which would have delayed the deployment of the Sentinel until it was certified as practicable by the Secretary of Defense. In June of 1968, the Senate voted down 52 to 34 an amendment which would have delayed ABM construction funds for 1 year.

In June, too, the House of Representatives beat down, 106 to 37, an amendment to the Defense Appropriations Act which would have deleted acquisitions of property and the construction of related ABM facilities.

The Senate in August of 1963 rejected 46 to 27 an amendment which would have deleted all funds for the ABM construction. In October, the Senate defeated 45 to 25 a proposal to delay the construction of the Sentinel system for 1 year.

All these actions were certainly implied if not direct votes of support for the Sentinel ABM system recommended by President Johnson and Secretary McNamara and Secretary Clifford. One is bound to wonder at the lack of opposition to a system far more complex, far more expensive and far more likely to upset our possible adversary than the watered-down version of ABM which President Nixon and Secretary Laird has proposed.

Mr. President, I realize it is not popular and probably not entirely accurate to describe the current controversy over the ABM as a purely partisan matter. I am fully aware that many Senators, who are members of my own political party, are opposed to the Safeguard system for reasons which they feel to be good and sufficient and have nothing to do with the whole business of Republicans versus Democrats.

However, I believe that it must be noted that the great outcry against the development of an ABM system coincided with an all-out attack on the so-called military-industrial complex and almost every proposed expenditure recommended by the Secretary of Defense. And I believe that it is important for us to note that this opposition to the ABM did not reach anything like its present crescendo when the program was called Sentinel and was being propelled by a Democratic administration and a liberal-oriented Secretary of Defense.

I have already enumerated the number of times that this body of the Congress has gone on record in favor of the Johnson-McNamara ABM. I want to underscore also the fact that the great attack on the so-called military-industrial complex was not mounted while either Secretary McNamara or former Defense Secretary Clifford were calling the shots in the Pentagon with the help of the computer "whiz kids."

To read the reports of the Senate Subcommittee on Government Economy, one would begin to suspect that all the waste and inefficiency and cost overruns in our defense procurement system were products of the present administration. I am not about to deny that my colleague from Wisconsin, Subcommittee Chairman WILLIAM PROXMIRE, has performed an extremely valuable service to the Congress and to the country with his investigations of waste and inefficiency in the Defense Establishment. However, I believe the whole thing would be more enlightening if it were pointed out more often that these abuses and wastages of the taxpayers' dollars took place during the McNamara Pentagon regime which was supposedly dedicated to a revolutionary type of "cost effectiveness." I am well aware that Mr. McNamara had what amounts to one of the greatest public relations programs ever to surround a single Government official. But I think we all can realize now that his regime actually will go down in history for setting new records in the area of cost-defectiveness and waste.

There was no mystery about irregularities in the Department of Defense during 8 years of the Kennedy-Johnson administration.

XUM

But I certainly do not recall any concerted and orchestrated attack on the Defense Establishment nor on its connection with private industry suppliers of military hardware.

I wish to point out, Mr. President, that the phrase "military-industrial complex" was not invented after the presidential election last November. These words have been lifted out of context from a farewell radio-TV speech delivered by former President Eisenhower 8 years ago. In other words, the MIC apparently was not the great threat which its critics would have us believe it is today while it was being run by Secretaries McNamara and Clifford.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I want to say that I believe that a great deal of the criticism of the proposal to deploy the Safeguard system is rooted in an overall attack on our Nation's defense system. This makes it more than ever important that we adopt it by a comfortable margin.

We must, in approving Safeguard, serve notice on the Nation and the world that we intend to keep our Nation strong and to protect its 200 million citizens to the best of our ability.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR RIBICOFF

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the address by the junior Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) be recognized for not to exceed 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR JAVITS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, upon the completion of the remarks of other Senators for whom time has been authorized by unanimous consent, the last of which I understand will be the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), I may address the Senate for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed notwithstanding the unanimous-consent order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ABM

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, national security can be threatened at home as well as abroad. And the most urgently needed development in our defense efforts would be a reduction rather than continued escalation of the arms race.

Our problems here at home are critical, especially in our cities. We are about to embark upon strategic arms limitation talks that we all hope will be fruitful. It is therefore incumbent upon the Senate to scrutinize closely any proposed increase in our defensive armaments.

When considering the deployment of the ABM, we must look closely at the nature of the threat we are supposedly meeting, the capability of the system that is offered to counteract this threat, the impact such a weapons system will have on the arms talks, and the results of diverting more of our national resources to this new system.

There are those who argue that this is irrelevant. We are told that the President wants the Safeguard ABM system and that this is sufficient.

I could not disagree more. Certainly it is relevant to know that the administration and the President desire the deployment of the ABM. Certainly we should weigh that desire in our consideration. But, even if the President opposed this system, it would be our responsibility to evaluate it independently to decide whether it was needed.

I do support our efforts to develop the most effective defense system necessary and possible. I do support those who place the highest importance upon national security.

Too often in the past, however, the Senate has abdicated its responsibility to the country and itself and yielded without question to the desires of a given administration. The Fulbright resolution we overwhelmingly passed recently demonstrated our recognition of the need for independent evaluation.

Our experience in Vietnam has shown us that Members of the Senate may see far more clearly, than the administration, the error of a given policy and the need for new approaches. The moves for peace first originated here and the country owes its gratitude to those who originally raised this issue.

The recent disclosures of widespread waste in the development of our weapons systems demonstrate that the executive branch has no monopoly on expertise. If we underestimate by billions the costs to build various defense items, mistakes can be made in other areas as well.

It is illuminating to remember that the desire for a Safeguard is not a new phenomenon. The Army sought it as early as 1959, only then it was called the Nike-Zeus. The administration had the foresight to see that it had too many flaws. By 1963, it became common knowledge that, had we deployed Nike-Zeus, we would have purchased an obsolete weapon at a cost of almost $14 billion.

Let us first analyze the nature of the threat against which we are being asked to deploy the ABM. This is not an easy question, especially since the administration has continually changed that threat.

Originally we were going to protect our cities against an all-out attack. Then we were asked to worry about an accidental Russian missile or the dangers of political blackmail from the Chinese who might threaten to send a handful of missiles against our major cities. Then we were advised that the ABM was needed to defend our nuclear deterrent. Now we are confronted with a Soviet oriented "mini" Safeguard system slated to protect only two missile sites in North Dakota and Montana.

I don't know what happened to the earlier threats we were asked to consider. Have they disappeared of their own volition? Have we made some secret breakthrough that rendered them meaningless? Or will they simply emerge again at some later date when they are needed to justify some new system being presented to the Congress and the people of this country?

In any event, the threat we are now told to focus upon is the potential first strike capability being developed by the Soviet Union. It is generally conceded that this threat does not presently exist. There are few facts even supporting any movement on the part of the Russians to create such a threat.

The Soviet Union does appear to be increasing the number of missiles and warheads in its stockpile, but they are still hundreds of missiles and thousands of warheads from equaling our own present supplies. And no one has yet proposed that we, even with our superiority, have anything like a first-strike capability.

Equally important is the serious question whether the Russians have the economic capability necessary to develop a first-strike capability. This is highlighted by the enormous difficulty of neutralizing our Polaris submarines. This may be accomplished someday, but that day certainly is not upon us.

Finally, our national security in the atomic age has always rested upon our ability to retaliate against any attack. This ability to retaliate does not depend on the Safeguard system. Even should the Soviets develop the weapons necessary to hit all parts of our deterrent, there is no known way they can attack and destroy this capability before it is loosed against them.

Any attack on our missiles can be detected 20 minutes prior to impact. We would still have enough time to check our radar signals and launch our Minutemen before they could be destroyed by Soviet weapons. No matter how many missiles the Russians fired at our Minutemen, they would hit only empty silos. The Russians will always know this, and the credibility of our deterrent will be retained.

Equally important, we should remember the overwhelming strength of our present nuclear weapons systems. With our 645 strategic bombers, our 41 Polaris submarines with 656 missiles, and our 1,054 land-based ICBM's, we have the capability of destroying the Soviet Union many times over. Each of these systems is also capable of responding independently against a Russian attack.

The United States now has a total of 4,200 deliverable nuclear weapons compared to the Soviet's weapons which are estimated to be approximately 1,200. Even if the Soviets increase their SS 9's to 500 by 1975, as Secretary Laird predicts they will, we will by then have also increased our deliverable nuclear weapons to 10,000.

Given the hypothetical nature of the threat against which we are being asked to respond, we should pay particular attention to the great controversy surrounding the ability of the ABM system to meet that threat.

Numerous scientists maintain that, even should the complicated three-part ABM system function in a coordinated fashion, it could easily be overcome by the Soviet Union's present capability. For one thing, the ABM system can be easily penetrated by the enemy. Its radars can be blacked out. Its missiles can be exhausted by enemy decoys. Its computers are designed to meet a specific calculated threat. If the Soviets develop their SS–9 missiles only 10 percent beyond Defense Department projections, the system becomes entirely worthless.

What we see is the spectre of a vaguely possible threat in the future being met by a system that will cost us untold billions and probably will not work. But the administration continues to raise new justifications for the ABM.

We are now told that we should vote for the deployment of this system to strengthen our bargaining position at the forthcoming strategic arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union. Somehow, the irony of coming to the bargaining table to discuss weapons limitations when we have just voted to deploy a new weapons system has escaped the advocates of ABM.

I have no doubt that this administration wants the arms talks to be successful. It seems to me, however, that our chances for success are increased substantially if we approach the negotiations from a position of strength presenting a firm hand seeking peace rather than a quivering hand rattling our newest weapons system.

I believe that, if we deploy the ABM, we will succeed only in heightening world tensions and escalating the arms race. We are told that this cannot happen because the ABM is only a defensive system. But I would remind you that this system originally was designed to surround our cities. So far as the Soviet Union is concerned, there is nothing to stop us from developing the ABM and engaging in just such deployment. This would go to the heart of their retaliatory capacity. They in turn would have no choice but to respond with even more and newer atomic weapons.

It will be recalled that this is precisely how we reacted on numerous occasions. In the late 1950's we devoted billions of dollars to the development of an early warning system against a Russian bomber threat that everyone agreed did not then exist. It was only the threat of its existence that set off this multibillion-dollar project.

We must assume that the Soviets are equally concerned with national security. Any moves on our part that they believe jeopardize their retaliatory ability will be met with increasing Soviet expenditures. This will, of course, inevitably lead us to respond. Escalation in the arms race will be rampant without any increase in security.

I have therefore concluded that we should refuse to authorize any funds for the deployment of the Safeguard ABM at this time. I am willing to see us continue to expend moneys necessary for the research and testing presently provided. Then, if a real threat does arise, we will be able to meet it with a weapons system that has some chance of working.

For now, the $350 million proposed for the deployment of the ABM this year can be used to meet far more urgent needs. The total $10 billion saved from nondeployment of the ABM over the next few years will only begin to attack our pressing urban problems. The huge sums of money needed to deploy an ABM system would be better spent on the health, education, and welfare of our people.

With our waters becoming increasingly foul, we spend only 20 percent of the Federal funds we have authorized—let alone need—to fight water pollution.

With the increasing need for better educated citizens, we still appropriate less than 50 percent of the funds authorized for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

While our cities are clogged with traffic and rapidly becoming covered from end to end with concrete, the Federal government spends only 4 percent of the amount spent for highways on mass transit support and development.

With millions suffering from malnutrition—hundreds of thousands going without proper health care—and thousands willing but unable to find work, we say come back later, next year, after we have studied the problem. Perhaps then we will be able to help. Perhaps then we will provide the funds necessary to meet your problems.

A nation that spends five times as much on defense as it does directly attacking deteriorating conditions in its urban areas may find that its elaborate defense structure is only protecting a pile of rubble.

I am in favor of protection against our enemies. It is obvious that without an adequate defense system, the rest of our efforts may be in vain. But I oppose the spending of billions of dollars to defend against ghosts and hypothetical dangers, especially when the ability of the proposed defensive system to meet these hypothetical threats is uncertain.

The threat I see that faces us—the threat I see as real and that must be avoided—is the destruction of our internal security right here at home.

This is the threat we should meet now.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MISSILE TEST FACILITIES AT KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE, AND RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTH

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two hours having expired, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2546) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without regard to the previous order, I be allowed to proceed at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATORS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) has completed his remarks, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD) may be recognized for 20 minutes; the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) may be recognized for 30 minutes; and I may be recognized for 20 minutes.

I make this request because apparently one Senator spoke out of turn and that affected all of the other unanimous-consent requests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF HEW PLANS IN MOBILE, ALA.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I speak today for the people of Mobile and for the people of Alabama. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, through its actions in Mobile, Ala., is violating laws of Congress, and we demand that the executive branch of the Federal Government, and every department in it, be compelled to obey the law.

I have just returned from a visit to Mobile, where I opened a fourth office in

XUM

Alabama; the purpose of these offices being to serve more effectively the people of Alabama and to keep informed of issues uppermost in the minds of the people.

Mobile is a thriving port city with a metropolitan area population of about 300,000 people. While in Mobile, I had the honor and pleasure of addressing the Alabama Bar Association at its annual meeting in Mobile. Accordingly, I had the opportunity to talk with hundreds of Alabama citizens and responsible leadership of the city of Mobile and of the State of Alabama.

Mr. President, the people of Mobile and of the State of Alabama are outraged by actions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Mobile which are in clear violation of the law and which defy the expressed will of Congress. We have a right to be outraged. The public schools and public education are at stake. The welfare of their children is at stake. We have a right to demand action by Congress.

Mr. President, storm clouds are on the horizon—a storm is brewing in this country. The eye of that storm may turn out to be Mobile, Ala., where the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has submitted detailed school plans which call for closing of some schools, for building others, for mass conversion of schools for purposes other than those they were constructed to serve—such as changing elementary schools into junior and senior high schools and vice versa, necessitating expensive renovations. These plans require gerrymandering of attendance zones in order to achieve racial balance at the expense of sound educational and practical considerations. The plan calls for busing at least 15,000 more students than are presently bused in the public school system in Mobile County, Ala. In addition, the plan calls for assignment of faculty and administrative personnel on the basis of race and an implied threat of dismissal of teachers who refuse such assignment.

Mr. President, not less than three provisions of the statutes under which the Department operates have been utterly disregarded in the formulation and implementation of an unprecedented 126-page plan for Federal takeover of public schools of Mobile County, Ala., by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Consider these provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964:

> Nothing herein shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another or one school district to another in order to achieve such racial balance.
>
> Nothing contained in this Title shall be construed to authorize action under this Title by any department or agency with respect to any employment practice of any employer . . . except when a primary objective of the federal financial assistance is to provide employment.

In addition, Mr. President, the 1968 appropritions bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare specifically provides:

> No part of the funds contained in this Act may be used to force busing of students, abolishment of any school, or to force any student attending any elementary or secondary school to attend a particular school against the choice of his or her parents or parent in order to overcome racial imbalance.

Mr. President, is it any wonder that the highly respected Mobile Register should have editorially declared in this connection:

> HEW's "plan" for the public school system of Mobile County is in reality a formula for the destruction of the system of public education in this county. It is a brutal bureaucratic atrocity of which no responsible agency of government would be guilty.
>
> For the first time in American history, an instrumentality of government in Washington, D.C., has gone so stark wild that it openly calls for violation of federal law to destroy a public school system.
>
> Its ruthless, reckless, destructive, law-defying scheme would virtually reduce the system of public education in this county to a daily clutter of pupil-hauling buses operated as one segment of the bankruptcy-producing expenditures to which the school system would be subjected as an inevitable necessity to compliance.
>
> What travesty, what mockery, what hypocrisy, what outrage perpetrated against the public intelligence . . . (by the action of) HEW.

Mr. President, I concur in these sentiments. The vast majority of the people of Mobile and of the State of Alabama concur in them, and they are convinced that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, if not checked, will destroy the public school system of Alabama. This conviction is not without substance.

Imagine, if you will, Mr. President, a Federal agency issuing 126 pages of rules and regulations governing the administration of local public schools of a county. This despite the 1968 declaration by Congress that the Department should not use funds appropriated by Congress to force busing of students, to abolish any schools, or to force any student attending an elementary or secondary school to attend another school against the choice of his parents in order to overcome racial imbalance. Is the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare bound by this law or is it not?

And what about the law that says that no department or agency of government shall be authorized to interfere with employment practices unless the primary objective of Federal assistance is to provide employment? Is the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare bound by this law or is it not?

Another truly shocking aspect of this and other arrogant and defiant HEW school plans is the absence of education standards. There is not a word, not a line, not a thought given to educational criteria.

There is not a word, not a line, not a thought given to a consideration of convenience and safety of schoolchildren affected.

There is not a word, not a line, not a thought given to the wishes and best judgment of pupils, parents, teachers, and local education authorities in Mobile County. All valid considerations of this nature are subordinated or utterly disregarded to the overriding consideration of compulsory race mixing to the detriment of all children and the education system which serves all children.

But, Mr. President, the plans were not silent on one point. Where are the people to get the money to build new schools, to remodel and alter others, and to pay the increased cost of busing 15,000 additional children?

In this regard, the Department has the audacity to suggest that local public officials levy additional taxes. This part of the HEW plan reveals the cold-blooded, calculating potential for tyranny that constantly lurks in bureaucratic administration of power. For how can the Department require the levy of taxes? The answer is that it threatens to withhold funds and services provided by Congress for the benefit of schoolchildren. The Department uses food, money, necessities of life as a weapon for enforcement of its regulations. Or else it can resort to Federal courts which continue to threaten elected public officials with confiscatory fines and imprisonment without benefit of trial by jury as a means of effecting obedience to dictatorial social reforms. Will the people of this Nation submit to such tyranny?

Mr. President, when an agency of the Federal Government willfully violates the law of the land and the expressed will of Congress, there must be an extraordinary reason for it. When public officials flip and flop in their public statements, and when their actions contradict their words—there must be a reason for it.

Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the statement made by Richard M. Nixon while a candidate for President. Mr. Nixon stated in a television broadcast, and I quote:

> I believe that the Supreme Court decision was a correct decision, Brown versus the Board of Education. But, on the other hand, while that decision dealt with segregation and said that we would not have segregation, when you go beyond that and say that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government and the Federal Courts to, in effect, act as local school districts in determining how we carry that out, and then to use the power of the Federal Treasury to withhold funds or give funds in order to carry it out, then I think we are going too far.

Mr. President, there is good reason to believe the people of this Nation agreed with candidate Nixon. They had a right to believe him. They have a right to believe public statements of candidates and the right to believe the statements of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Robert H. Finch, who said at his confirmation hearing, as reported by the Washington Post, that publication of renowned truth and veracity:

> Mr. Finch said that he did not agree with withholding federal funds, the weapon used by the Johnson Administration.

Mr. President, the people believed that statement. They had a right to believe it. It seemed to be consistent with the statement of candidate Nixon that he did not believe that Federal courts and Federal agencies of Government should act as local school districts or withhold Federal funds.

Yet, Mr. President, one of the first official acts of Mr. Finch upon assuming the office of Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was to

XUM

order withholding funds, benefits and services from innocent schoolchildren. Since then, the Department has continued to use the "weapon" of withholding funds—funds provided by Congress for the benefit of schoolchildren and not for the benefit of school board members and public school administrators.

And, Mr. President, these funds and services and other benefits have been withheld without due process of law, without an opportunity for parents to be heard or to object or to plead not to be deprived through no fault of their own.

It is my judgment that several of the major political issues of the next congressional and presidential election are being shaped in the context of Federal education policy.

The people want to know whether or not the Constitution will continue to be the law that governs government;

Whether or not the executive branch of the Federal Government will be compelled to obey the law;

Whether or not the Federal courts will be made to obey the law;

Whether or not political actions shall be subordinated to morality, ethics, and humanitarian principles in this Nation;

Whether or not innocent persons shall be deprived of food and benefits as a political weapon to effect social reforms.

Mr. President, these issues as they relate to public education involve considerations of the health, safety, moral welfare of children, and the right of a free people to self-government in matters affecting the vital interests of their children.

These are issues that must be decided. There is no way for any elected public official to avoid a stand on the moral and ethical issues raised in Mobile County, Ala.

Yes, Mr. President, the people of Mobile, the people of Alabama, the people of the South, and the people of this Nation have a right to be outraged.

Mr. President, let us put this problem in perspective. We are not dealing with an isolated action by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The lawless action of the Department is not limited to the public school system of Mobile County, Ala. The hideous plans given birth by unlawful actions of the Department extend to over 25 separate school systems in Alabama. Nor will such lawlessness stop in Alabama, nor will it stop in the South, they will eventually be extended to cover every public school system in the United States—and do not discount that as the intention of the Department. For the forces of rule or ruin in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare who now exercise life or death powers over the public schools of the South are already reaching out to impose that power over the public schools in other regions of the Nation. This lawlessness must be stopped. It must be stopped now.

Mr. President, how do we explain the actions of public officials who say one thing and do another, and departments of Federal Government which violate laws of Congress with impunity?

The people of this Nation are getting fed up with this business of playing politics with their children and their schools. They are not going to let arrogant and callous politicians endanger the health, safety, and morals of their children and destroy their public school in pursuit of self-centered political ambitions.

The people are fed up with power politics devoid of moral, humanitarian, and ethical considerations, and with politicians who can justify withholding funds, services and benefits from innocent schoolchildren, as a "weapon" to be used for political gain. I say as sincerely and solemnly as I know how that ruthless politicians had better stop playing politics with our children.

The people are downright revolted by pious pretentions about democracy and constitutional law by those who deprive the innocent and also deliberately flout the laws of Congress. They are fed up with deceptions, double talk, and double standards.

But politics is one thing and obeying the law is another. Mr. Finch in Mobile County is executing the will of Congress or he is not. He is, or he is not above the law. The Supreme Court has not declared any of these statutes invalid. They are binding upon every public official, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and Federal judges. Yet, Mr. President, these laws are violated by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The people demand that something be done about it. They have a right to demand redress. They will have redress in one way or the other. I say as sincerely as I know how that the people are mad. They have a right to be. A storm is brewing. Something is going to give. Something has to give, and I do not believe it is going to be the will of the people of Alabama and the will of the people of our Nation to resist usurpation of powers and tyrannical use of powers by the Federal executive as so glaringly manifest in HEW actions in Mobile County public schools.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1969—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 91–141)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Interstate Commerce Commission, oldest of the Federal regulatory agencies, has jurisdiction over 17,000 carriers—rail and motor, water and pipeline, express companies and freight forwarders. Its decisions help shape the scope and character of the Nation's transportation system.

But, as important as the Commission is, as extensive as its jurisdiction is, it is hampered by:

1. *Lack of continuity:* The Chairman of the Commission serves only a year, selected by annual rotation from among the eleven Commissioners. In no other major Federal regulatory agency is the President without the power to designate the Chairman.

2. *Lack of leadership:* The Chairman does not have vested in him by law the executive and administrative functions of the Commission. As a result there is no firm and clear legal responsibility for the management of the Commission's day-to-day affairs.

To change this situation, I am sending to the Congress today Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1969, prepared in accordance with chapter 9 of title 5 of the United States Code.

1. CONTINUITY

The Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission is the Commission's spokesman, its key link to other agencies and the industry, the supervisor of its staff, and director of its internal operations. Yet today, despite the need for sustained leadership, the Chairman of this agency serves only one year. I know of no modern business that would tolerate the practice of annually rotating its chief executive.

To provide the necessary continuity of leadership in the conduct of the Commission's administrative affairs, *I propose that the President be authorized to designate the Chairman of the Commission from among its members*. This principle of good management has already been taken with respect to most other major Federal regulatory agencies. The time has come to apply it to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

2. LEADERSHIP

The administrative powers of the Chairman must be strengthened.

In 1961, the Commission delegated its administrative powers to its Chairman. However, unless and until the administrative powers are vested in the Chairman by law, statutory authority will remain dispersed among the Commissioners.

Almost 20 years ago the Hoover Commission emphasized that "Administration by a plural executive is universally regarded as inefficient." It then recommended that all administrative responsibility be assigned the chairmen of these regulatory agencies.

That recommendation is as sound today as it was then. It has already been applied to almost every other major Federal regulatory agency. *I propose that administrative authority be vested in the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission.*

In sum, the reorganization plan provides continuity of leadership and vests responsibility for internal administrative functions in a chairman designated by the President, with safeguards to ensure that the Commission retains full control over policy and the direction of its regulatory programs. This does not affect the statutory provisions governing the exercise of quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial powers by the Commission and its employees to whom it has delegated the responsibility of hearing and deciding cases.

Each reorganization included in the

plan is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 901(a) of title 5 of the United States Code. In particular, the plan is responsive to section 901(a)(1), "to promote the better execution of the laws, the more effective management of the executive branch and of its agencies and functions, and the expeditious administration of the public business;" and section 901(a)(3), "to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable." This plan will help achieve those ends.

This plan should result in more efficient operation of the Commission. To itemize or aggregate resulting expenditure reductions under the plan is not practicable. I shall continue to explore other ways to make the Commission structure more effective.

I strongly recommend that the Congress permit this necessary reorganization plan to become effective.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 22, 1969*.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

THE PROPOSED SURTAX AND INFLATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD) is now recognized.

Mr. PACKWOOD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I should like to make a few comments this afternoon about the proposed surtax the Senate is now considering.

A couple of hundred years ago, when Edmund Burke, the famous British conservative, was dining with Prime Minister Pitt at 10 Downing Street, he strove to make Pitt understand how critical England's economic situation was.

Pitt made light of the danger saying: "This country and this constitution are safe to the day of judgment."

"Yes," replied Burke, "but 'tis the day of no judgment that I am afraid of."

So today we should be afraid if the Senate exercises no judgment on monetary policy.

The true test of a nation is whether it is capable of meeting the challenges of the times. Those nations that do, strengthen the structure of their institutions and enrich the lives of their people. Those that fail, bear the indelible scars of their mistakes through successive generations.

The challenges we face today are numerous and complex, they extend across the entire spectrum of our activities in the pursuit of national goals. But each of these problems is capable of sound solution. What is required is a commitment of purpose, a priority of action, and a determination to succeed.

Of the many serious problems we face today, none is more critical than the problem of inflation. Inflation is the one disease that is capable of undermining our national efforts in every domestic endeavor.

It is the most regressive of taxes. No one can escape it. It treats rich and poor alike. Working men pay it. Young people pay it. The elderly on pensions pay it.

To put it tersely, as long as inflation runs wild, everything is on the rise. Unless the Senate acts to stop this inflationary roller coaster—without delay—it will become a wholly uncontrollable problem.

This tragic situation affects everyone: First, the family financing a home; second, the business and corporation financing the purchases of new equipment or expansion or productive capacities; and third, even the U.S. Treasury, which only 2 weeks ago paid over 7 percent for money to refinance a portion of the public debt—the highest it has ever paid in the history of our Nation.

It has been projected that if inflation continues at the present pace, by the year 2000: a $75 a day, semiprivate hospital room will cost $630; a $2 haircut will cost $10; food for a family of four costing $40 per week will run $112; a $4,000 car will cost $10,000; and a $40,000 house will cost a whopping $86,000.

If there is one thing upon which all Americans are today united, it is the conviction that inflation must be brought to a screeching halt.

These are unpleasant facts—unpleasant to recite—unpleasant to face. But face them we must. For as Winston Churchill told the British House of Commons in an age of similar peril:

> We shall not escape our dangers by recoiling from them.

The American people are concerned about the purchasing power of their hard-earned money; about the future buying power of their savings; about the growth of their investments. They want some assurance from their government that it will do everything that is humanly possible to strengthen, not weaken, the value of the dollar; to encourage, not destroy, the concept of systematic savings; and to enlarge, not diminish, investment in our country's future economic growth.

Before his election, President Nixon promised the American people that he would use the powers of the Presidency to harness the inflationary pressures that had assaulted our economy during the past several years.

Since January, the administration has moved toward accomplishing this objective by the wise use of administrative, fiscal, and monetary policies. In order to divert billions of dollars from the swollen stream of spending, the President requested all Federal agencies to immediately place in effect a policy of expenditure restraint. This was followed by recent actions of the Federal Reserve Board, which were designed to appreciably contain the rate of monetary growth by limiting the volume of reserves available to banks and by raising the discount rate.

The administration's surtax bill presently before the Senate contains a sound and sensible package of fiscal steps necessary to restrain present inflationary pressures and dampen future inflationary activity. It complements existing administrative and monetary policy designed to achieve the same desirable and necessary objectives.

This bill is one of the most important pieces of legislation the Senate will consider this year. It is a powerful offensive weapon against the inflationary pressures that are crippling every national program to which we are committed as a people and as a Nation. This bill, in addition, contains elements of tax reform. It accomplishes five important things:

First, it extends the present surcharge on income taxes at 10 percent through December 30, 1969, and at 5 percent until June 30, 1970;

Second, it extends the 10-percent excise tax on telephone services and the 7-percent sales tax on new passenger cars for 1 year;

Third, it repeals, effective midnight April 18, 1969, the tax credit given businesses on the costs of their investment in machinery and equipment;

Fourth, with certain restrictions, it provides a special 5-year rapid writeoff, for tax purposes, of the cost of equipment aimed at abating air and water pollution;

Fifth, it provides special tax relief for low-income families, as recommended by the President in his tax reform program. An estimated 2 million families, officially defined as poor, would be removed from Federal tax rolls, while an additional 8 million other taxpayers, whose incomes are slightly above the poverty line, would have their taxes reduced.

This tax measure will bring over $9.1 million into the Treasury during fiscal year 1970. This compares favorably with President Nixon's original proposal.

Extension of the surtax will enable the Government to show a 1970 budgetary surplus of $6 billion—a goal that has been sought for years. We now have it within our grasp—if we act favorably and promptly on the tax bill before us.

We can ill afford to gamble with the happiness of the American people or with the security of our Nation. This we do if we delay passage of this measure or dilute its strength.

We cannot add $9 billion to the purchasing power of individuals and corporations at a time when our economy is experiencing full employment, steadily rising prices, high interest rates, and excessive inflationary spiral. To suddenly dump $9 billion into the already swollen stream of spending would preclude, for years to come, future efforts to achieve economic stability and the stability of the American dollar as a medium of international exchange.

Although all Americans suffer from continued inflation and during periods characterized by abnormally high interest rates and restricted credit, some segments of our economy take a devastating blow. Such a segment is the homebuilding and lumber industry—which, incidentally, is the mainstay of Oregon's economy.

The homebuilding and lumber industries are vital cornerstones of the American economy. Whenever anything impedes the building of homes, shockwaves are sent through our society.

The devastating results are felt directly by those employed in the housing industry. They are also experienced by those engaged in the lumber industry, in the production and manufacturing of housing material and household appliances, and by those Americans who are deprived of the new home for which they have dreamed and saved and planned for so long.

A slump in the housing industry furthers the countless thousands of Americans who want to move out of our blighted urban areas—if only they could find housing elsewhere.

No sector of our economy has been hurt as severely in the past by inflation as the home industry with all its complex and diversified components. In the summer and fall of 1966, and again in 1968, the homebuilding industry suffered severely when inflation went unchecked, when money and credit became equally scarce. The same characteristics of our economy that especially hurt the housing industry in those times are present today: High interest rates, money markets incapable of fulfilling demands, restriction of credit essential for real growth, and unchecked inflation.

There is a great imbalance in our country between our needs and our national priorities. Nowhere is this more apparent then in the homebuilding industry where our national needs are the greatest and the priority assigned to meeting the challenges in this vital area consistently downgraded.

We will need 26 million new and rehabilitated housing units in the next 10 years—roughly 2.6 million a year. But, though we are the most prolific builders in the history of mankind, we will build less than 1.6 million housing units this year—and we still tolerate 11 million substandard living units.

In the last 20 years, we have demolished more than 31 million homes and apartments with Federal aided construction projects. We have torn down more housing than we have built with all our federally aided housing programs.

Instead of moving ahead, we are losing ground. Instead of solving the challenges we face in this area, we are continuing the past expedient policies of procrastination to the detriment of millions of Americans—those who depend upon the homebuilding industry for a livelihood and those who look forward to the day when they too can share in this Nation's lofty standard of living.

Housing starts since February of this year have dropped each month. The trend is well established. Home building economists predict that there will be a 40-percent drop by the end of this year or early 1970—a 40-percent drop over last year, which was below the standard we wanted to hit. Investment funds for apartment buildings have almost disappeared. Even if they were available, consumers would be unable to pay the higher rents caused by the inflated costs of materials and money. This is an intolerable situation.

Intolerable too is the recession the lumber industry is now in, a recession characterized by layoffs, unemployment, shutdown of mills, and depressed prices for lumber and plywood.

Mr. President, this was brought graphically home to me when I was making arrangements to spend 2 days in Oregon this coming weekend. I was going to central Oregon, which is a pine-producing, pine mill area, and I asked the person in charge of my tour to arrange some plant tours so that I could go to talk with the workers, to meet with them at coffee breaks and lunch hours, so that I could explain my views on what is going on in Washington, and ask their opinions.

I was told that today there is not a lumber mill operating within 50 miles of Bend, Oreg., on a Saturday. Mills that a year ago were operating two shifts 6 days a week are today lucky to be operating one shift 5 days a week.

The tragedy of the homebuilding industry is of great magnitude in itself, but as far as I am concerned, even greater is the tragedy that, while those in the income brackets of $10,000, $20,000, or $40,000 a year can pay the 8.5-percent interest rate and perhaps build or buy homes, millions of Americans in low-income brackets are being squeezed out of any possibility of homeownership; and we at the Federal level have been underfunding the promises that we have made in bills passed in past Congresses. Those who need the greatest help and assistance are the ones to whom we give the greatest promises and the least results.

If we are to meet the housing challenges in this country and satisfy the housing necessities of our citizens, then we must assure the American people that the housing and homebuilding industry will not be subjected to periodic pressures of uncontrolled inflation, tight money, and abnormally high interest rates.

That brings us back to the surtax, with which we are now so vitally concerned.

The proposed administration tax program of a temporary 10-percent surcharge on corporation and individual income taxes, the elimination of the investment tax credit on plant equipment and machinery, and the continuation of existing excise taxes on telephones and automobiles will not by itself accomplish all that is necessary to meet the fiscal challenges we face. Other and additional restraints are necessary. But without this surtax bill, the total and additional restraints will be of no use, and we might as well not attempt them.

The enactment of the surtax, however, will enable us to withdraw from the inflationary stream of spending more than $9 billion. No other single action would be more instrumental in dampening the inflationary fires in our economy and revitalizing our homebuilding industry.

Many tax measures have come before the Senate in the past decade. History records that in many instances, we have deliberated and delayed, while conditions which the measures were designed to alleviate became more deplorable.

Let us not now compound the complexity of the problem we face by postponing a favorable decision on this tax measure.

This we do, whether willingly or not, when we attempt to prevent its passage by offering amendments unrelated to the intent of the bill.

Mr. President, when we started talking about tax reform 2 or 3 months ago, I was one of those who had some misgivings about passing a surtax bill without attaching tax reform amendments to it, because I feared that without the impetus of the surtax, the desire for tax reform would be sufficiently diluted that we would get no tax reform at all.

I had occasion to meet last Wednesday at the White House with President Nixon, and to pose to him specifically a question as to how sincere, how demanding was the administration about tax reform and how far was the President personally willing to push.

He assured me in terms that could not be mistaken that he is committed to a tax reform bill—a meaningful tax reform bill—this year. He has the assurances of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives that a tax reform bill will be through the other body before we recess in August, and he apparently has the assurances of the leadership at least of the tax writing committee in this body that a meaningful tax reform bill will be brought to the floor of the Senate.

I cannot guarantee that such a bill will pass, nor can any other Senator. But none of us can now claim that we will not have a chance to vote on it if the surtax is passed. We will.

Consequently, I am asking Senators to refrain from attempting to cripple or delay the passage of the surtax bill by offering and attaching amendments of an extraneous and irrelevant nature, which might have the effect of so long delaying the passage, or—hopefully not—defeating the surtax bill, so that we will see again this year a 6-, 7- or 8-percent inflation.

I am referring specifically to complete tax reform, which is something else that the American people want, deserve to have, and shall have. For tax reform is one of the principal objectives of the President, the Republican Party, and the Democratic Party; we are all committed to an expeditious passage of a complete tax-reform package.

The extension of the surtax, Mr. President, is a nonpartisan bill. It reflects the President's conviction that America's poor should not have to pay taxes. It also reflects the desire of the Democratic Party, for in their 1968 party platform, it was emphasized that "no person or family below the poverty level should be required to pay Federal income taxes." The passage of this bill simultaneously carries out the wishes of both the President and the Democratic Party in giving to the poor of this Nation much-needed relief from Federal income taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time allotted to the Senator has expired.

Mr. PACKWOOD. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there

XUM

objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. PACKWOOD. There are some who are not particularly pleased with the surtax bill in its present form. They would like to incorporate within the bill more tax reforms. This is neither desirable nor necessary. For I have the President's personal assurance that the administration's comprehensive tax reform will soon be readied for our consideration. Then, and only then, should we concern ourselves with the complexities inherent in reshaping this Nation's tax laws.

What is important now is the quick passage of the surtax bill in its present form so that we can accomplish the mutually desirable goals of strengthening our economy by relieving inflationary pressures and providing humanitarian relief to our country's poor. After the surtax bill is passed, we can then take the time to enlarge tax reform by eliminating the inequities in our tax laws.

In the pursuit of our national goals, priority must be given to those efforts that are directed toward maintaining the health of our economy and insuring sound economic growth. To delay passage of this important bill is to weaken our national efforts in this pursuit.

The real question now is whether every one of us is willing to face the facts, to bear the burdens, to meet this challenge, and pass the bill.

Will we be like the congressional war hawks prior to the War of 1812, who responded to the arrogant treatment our sailors were receiving with tough talk and a hard line—but who failed to provide our Nation with the frigates needed to keep the peace? Or will we say, as did Teddy Roosevelt:

> If we are to be a really great people, we cannot *avoid* meeting great issues. All that we can determine is whether we shall meet them well or ill.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to compliment my colleague from Oregon on a very eloquent and persuasive maiden speech, in which he concerned himself with probably the most important of our domestic issues—inflation, housing, and their related matters.

I believe that anyone who has known my colleague over a number of years, as I have known him, can appreciate fully the fact that he is one who does his homework. He is a man who puts his facts together and makes his decision based upon the data, and the most current and authentic information available at the time. I associate myself with my colleague in his concern, as he expressed it, for the housing problem of this country, and the lumber problem as we face it in Oregon.

It is impossible to exaggerate the crisis that we face, as he has very carefully stated, not only because we are over a million units under our commitment of 2.6 million units per year, but also I would suggest because we are far behind solving our race relations problems, our general urban problems, and many other problems with which housing is related intimately.

I remember that the mayor of San Francisco, Mayor Alioto, just a few weeks ago observed that in the year 1968 there were 112 new housing units constructed in the city of San Francisco, but there were 111 torn down and removed; so the net gain was only one for the year 1968.

This supports the data which my colleague used to illustrate the situation we face today that we are in as we are getting further and further behind in achieving our housing goals.

Again I wish to state that my colleague has set forth very adequately and appropriately the problem—not only as it confronts us in Oregon, for it is not purely a local problem or a regional issue but as a national problem of inadequate housing that we face today. I am very happy to associate myself with these concerns. I may hold a different viewpoint on some of the other matters in his presentation, but I am most proud to say that he has delivered, I think, an outstanding and superior maiden speech on the floor of the Senate today.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN in the chair). Under the previous order, the Chair at this time recognizes the Senator from Illinois for 30 minutes.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the pending unanimous-consent orders have been complied with, I be recognized for 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Arkansas will be recognized for 20 minutes after the Senator from Illinois has been recognized for 30 minutes and the Senator from New York for 20 minutes.

VIETNAM

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, President Nixon, when addressing his remarks to the astronauts shortly after their remarkable landing on the moon, talked about the Sea of Tranquillity on the moon and discussed also the tranquillity which he hoped could be brought to mankind here on earth. That tranquillity depends to a great extent on what happens in Vietnam, and what happens in Vietnam depends to a great extent on what happens in the negotiations now going on in Paris.

Thinking Americans have long favored settling the conflict in Vietnam on reasonable and moderate terms fair to all parties. I believe that the President's eight-point program of May 14, the most recent proposals of the Saigon government, and the President's statement of July 11 provide a basis for a serious negotiation in the interest of all.

We in the U.S. Senate understand that President Nixon does not intend a unilateral American withdrawal from Vietnam, and Hanoi and the National Liberation Front must certainly be aware that a majority of the American people support this position.

It behooves the Hanoi Government and the National Liberation Front to negotiate in the spirit of reasonableness, flexibility, and moderation, just as most Americans support our own Government taking this same approach, so that the conflict can be brought to an end. There is nothing to be gained from prolonging the conflict.

Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN), the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it is safe to say that most Members of the U.S. Senate have long favored settling the conflict in Vietnam on reasonable and moderate terms fair to all parties.

Most of us believe that President Nixon's eight-point peace program of May 14, President Thieu's proposal of July 11 for internationally supervised elections, and President Nixon's statement of the same date supporting the Saigon Government's offer, together provide a basis for serious negotiations in the interest of all.

American withdrawal from South Vietnam cannot be expected without a corresponding response. We expect cooperation from North Vietnam and the NLF.

Without cooperation it will be apparent to Americans and the world at large that the leaders of both these belligerents want to continue the war.

Without some indication that the Hanoi regime and the NLF are actually desirous of peace, the President will have little choice except to continue our participation in this war and the efforts of millions of peace loving people in the United States will have been in vain.

Therefore, I am glad to join the distinguished Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) and others in urging that the Hanoi regime and the NLF state frankly whether they actually desire peace and will cooperate with us so that our future policy may be guided accordingly. If they have no desire to restore peace in Southeast Asia, then we should know that now, too.

We have full sympathy for those people who have suffered the horrors of war but we must know whether their governments are willing to join with us in ending the war and will cooperate with us in developing a better life for all.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for yielding to me, and I commend him for his statement.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Vermont has reflected not only the deep feelings of a good many of the Members of Congress, and particularly those in the Senate, but also the deep feelings of millions of Americans. I refer to Americans on college campuses, in our urban areas, and in rural communities.

The Senator has a deep understanding of the sensitivity of Americans on that subject. I know of no other Senator who is closer to his own constituents and his own people.

The Senator has properly reflected what he feels should be American policy. He is earnestly seeking to find a way to end this tragic war. The Senator's sentiments would be a fine guide for any government to follow in seeking an end to the war that the whole world wishes to see ended at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I associate myself with the comments and observations made by the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois and the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont.

Some part of the public opinion of this Nation reflects—and the same attitude has been manifested to some extent in the press—that President Nixon is not indeed changing the course and direction of the Johnson administration on Vietnam policy.

This is true only to the extent that the present administration has sought to carry out that quick and rather abrupt change in diplomatic course indicated by the former President of the United States when he stepped down and stopped the bombing of the north and called for talks in Paris.

I think that President Nixon, in his May 14 speech and in his withdrawal of troops from Vietnam, has indeed taken daring and new steps and risks in the hope of peace.

A strong nation can be measured, not by its flexing of muscles, but by its flexibility, its willingness to yield on problems, and its compassion.

I think these manifestations of restraint have been shown by President Nixon. However, I note that in each case Hanoi and also the NLF have responded to every overture of word or deed with negative and even abrasive comment.

We do not understand Southeast Asia or Vietnam. I suggest that if those leaders in Vietnam and those who support them have misread the character and the spirit and the will of the American people, they in like manner do not really understand the nature of this land and its people.

There is great pressure to end the war. However, if I judge the temper of this land—and whatever reasons we are in Vietnam are beside the point—we expect negotiations, we expect honest and sincere efforts to end the war, and we expect reciprocal action on the part of Hanoi and the National Liberation Front.

I think they greatly misjudge us if they believe we will accept the absolute surrender of all of our principles and our goals which have been announced.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas very much.

I support that Hanoi has been reading about and studying our college campus demonstrations. They probably watch them closely and try to read into the demonstrations a protest against our presence in Vietnam and everything else they want to read into them.

I have just recently completed a tour of 10 campuses in the State of Illinois alone. I have been to every major State university. On every one of these campuses I took a poll by a show of hands. Some of the audiences consisted of as many as 4,000 and 5,000 students.

I asked the questions, "Do you want to accelerate the war and win a military victory? Do you want to withdraw unilaterally, or would you like to follow the policy of the President in gradually drawing down our forces, but depend upon negotiations in Paris to find a political solution to an essentially political problem?"

The pattern was the same no matter where I went in my own State. Very few students felt that we should seek a military victory or desired it. An equally small number of students wanted to unilaterally and precipitately pull out. Overwhelmingly, the students supported the position of the administration in gradually drawing down our forces there, but depending upon negotiations, and assuming that we, Hanoi, the NLF, and South Vietnam were in Paris for the purpose of negotiating a settlement.

Did that observation on my part concur with the observations of the distinguished Senator from Kansas in his own State?

Mr. PEARSON. I respond by saying to the Senator that I concur.

I suppose in any open society, that which represents news will be played up. They measure our temperament just as we measure theirs, to some extent.

I think the purpose of this colloquy today is actually to serve notice that there is an extreme fraction of the people of this country who want to get out at any cost. I think it is only honest to note that there is an extreme percentage of people who want to get in at any cost and to the fullest extent. But the wide body of American opinion seeks negotiation. I believe Congress seeks and wants negotiations. But there is no temperament here, in my judgment, or among the people, simply to cut and run. This needs to be understood.

Mr. PERCY. I ask this question: If negotiations fail, if no progress is made in Paris, would this tend to strengthen the hands of those who have said, "We can only seek a military victory; get in and win"?

Mr. PEARSON. I do not think there is any doubt about it, and I think they are playing an extremely dangerous game when they accept that interpretation.

Mr. PERCY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on May 14, the President, speaking to the Nation and the world, outlined the policy of his administration on the question of Vietnam. It was a speech, wide in scope, which offered every opportunity for North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front to engage in serious and substantive negotiations.

Since that time he has given evidence of the seriousness of his purpose to move toward a reduction of the fighting and negotiations for peace in Vietnam by his decision to withdraw 25,000 of U.S. forces from South Vietnam. His purpose continues and undoubtedly will be expressed again in concrete proposals and action. The President is uniquely able to move freely, for he is not bound by past decisions or engagements with official personalities of South Vietnam, made during the long history of the United States involvement in Vietnam. He desires, as he has said so often, only that all the people of South Vietnam, of whatever political persuasion or ideology, shall have the opportunity to freely express their will concerning the future of South Vietnam and the unification of Vietnam.

I was one of those in the Senate who urged a cessation of the bombing of Vietnam and in fact argued against its commencement in early 1965. I urged this course as a way to open negotiations, as had been promised in North Vietnam. Negotiations were formally opened but thus far they have not been substantive.

The President has offered to consider all proposals—Hanoi's four points and NFL's 10 points.

As one who argued for the cessation of bombing and negotiations, I urge that it is necessary for North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front to recognize the serious purpose of President Nixon and to enter substantive negotiations on all proposals, to the end that the war may be brought to a close and the future of Vietnam may be decided by rational agreements.

Mr. PERCY. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and has had a lifetime of experience in the political and displomatic fields as well as in the judicial field. I ask him whether he feels that the proposals made by the President on May 14 and July 11 and the recent statements made by the Saigon government do not constitute a basis, a beginning, for reasonable, flexible, and sensible negotiations, a basis for beginning serious discussions.

Mr. COOPER. I do, without question.

I have just stated that the President, in his speech outlined the policy of his administration, made it clear that he was ready in negotiations to consider the proposals that had been made both by North Vietnam and the NLF concurrently with the proposals that he made in that very good speech.

Mr. PERCY. Of course, it would be impossible for any of us in this country to speak for other governments. The Senator has had a service in India, a developing nation. I wonder whether he feels that that third of the world, which is concentrating essentially on its own development, is yearning for an answer to the problems that engage so much of our wealth, our resources, our finances, our livelihood, and our lives; and whether that third of the world would find the ending of this tragic war and the concentration of resources to confront the real enemies of mankind—poverty, ignorance, and disease—to be one of the greatest things that could come about, and whether a government which would take the steps necessary to find the answer to this tragic war would be acclaimed.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct.

From such short experience as I had some time ago in South Asia, I know that it was the earnest hope and desire of the country to which I was named—India—and other countries in that area,

XUM

with whose leaders I have had a chance to talk, that this war may be ended in a reasonable and a peaceful way. It was the purpose and hope of those countries, as the Senator has said, to use their resources—very limited for many—in the development of their own country.

I am sure they believe that a war in that area also has the possibility of spilling over, and they have some fear of that. But, chiefly, I believe that they are disturbed about the continuance of war, which offers no hope to the peoples of the area and which could possibly spill over into their countries if it should continue.

Mr. PERCY. I thank the Senator.

I yield to another member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from the great State of Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Illinois and congratulate him on the thrust and the gist of his speech.

I think it most important that those of us who for several years have been for deescalating the war in Vietnam should emphasize at this time that the best situs for discussing the deescalation is in Paris.

I note with regret that public attention has been removed from Paris. I note with some distress that General Ky made some derogatory remarks about the negotiating process in Paris.

I emphasize that at this time the Senator from Illinois is rendering a great service by emphasizing that, when it comes to the resolution of the unhappy war in Vietnam, the main field of discussion is in Paris, and that what the American people wish and what they will really insist upon is that some form of agreement, whether implicit or specific, will be arrived at there.

I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding.

Mr. PERCY. I thank my distinguished colleague for his comments.

I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York, who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think it is appropriate that people like the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER) and I should speak to this issue because Hanoi is only pretending to misunderstand. It does not really misunderstand at all, in my judgment. However, even what it pretends should be rebutted, in view of the President's Asian trip.

No American that I know of is thinking in terms of defeat in this matter, or of "abandoning" Vietnam. What we are concerned with—people like myself and others who speak—is freedom of action. We want freedom of action for ourselves, just as we believe the South Vietnamese should have freedom of action for themselves. I have tried to make clear that we will not give the government of South Vietnam a veto with respect to when and whether we withdraw forces or even withdraw from the whole combat responsibility.

I see our operation as being phased out of Vietnam only to the extent that we are satisfied—and not the government in Saigon, but that we are satisfied—that there is not going to be a sudden cave-in of the situation in South Vietnam, and that the South Vietnamese should have every opportunity to put themselves—with our help—in a position to carry the major combat responsibility.

Mr. President, I am confident Hanoi understands this. The statements of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN), and other Senators, should make it clear that the American people are strong and resolute. This is a great country and great countries are not fainthearted and do not run away from unfinished tasks.

The resoluteness of the United States that we are going to move our troops out as we are satisfied there is not a vacuum, and the determination of the United States to give logistic support, which would include air support and financial support, should be unquestioned. We will proceed with the dignity and deliberateness which befits a great country like our own.

I am sure Hanoi does not misunderstand but if it does I think people who feel as I do should make it clear. We are not going to pressure the Nixon administration to "pull-out" precipitously and accept any terms for a settlement which Hanoi and the NLF dictate.

Mr. PERCY. I thank the distinguished Senator from the great State of New York. Certainly, as we look at the country, people think differently in different parts of the country. It is generally assumed that the east coast has a lesser resolve on this question and is anxious to get out of the war hastily. I think the comments which have been made by our distinguished colleagues make it clear that in this resolve it does not make any difference if they live in the Midwest, on the east coast, or on the west coast—they want to see honest negotiation carried on. They think we are in Paris for a reason. Hanoi is there to seek a political settlement and that is what we are there for. It is about time we were underway with the job. Men are being killed every day. While men are there talking, it is not in terms which would lead to a successful conclusion. In that time the killing and waste could be ended and we could set about the job of building for mankind.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. There is no question about the hypocrisy of the Government in Hanoi. The best thing for the people of Vietnam is peace. The United States is still prepared, in my opinion, as President Johnson promised, to lend its enormous aid to reconstruct the entire area—including North Vietnam—if an acceptable settlement can be negotiated. Every legitimate objective of North Vietnam could be obtained in negotiation.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PERCY. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am sorry I was not here to hear the entire colloquy. I, too, would like to congratulate the Senator from Illinois for raising this subject and for pointing out the importance of making absolutely crystal clear to the government in Hanoi the feelings of the people of the United States.

No one likes this war. There is no one who would not like to have a sound, honorable, and practical way out of it.

As I have said many times in this Chamber, unfortunately some statements made in this Chamber and in other areas of Government have been used for the purpose of propaganda by the Communist North Vietnamese Government. I think one of the most helpful things that could possibly happen would be to find a way to really convey our exact feelings. I do not think there is much difference in the feelings of people across this great country. I think the boys over there fighting and dying come from all sections of the country. Once they get over there one cannot be distinguished from another.

I think it is probably one of the most important things that could be done at this time in advance of the President's trip to let the world know how this Nation feels. I think there have been terrible mistakes made, and I would recommend to the Senator that he read the records of the negotiations in Korea. Exactly the same treatment occurred. Some of us who have been students of Communist procedures over the years expected very little in Paris, where they sit and argue for months about the size and shape of the table while boys are dying.

I wish to thank the Senator for providing this opportunity for some of us to express our feelings in order to let the world know that the courage and determination of the American people has not changed and that we want to find an honorable solution as quickly as possible, but that we are not going to settle for anything less.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. PERCY. I thank the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. President, I yield to the junior Senator from New York, who has been very closely in touch with the people of that great State.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for yielding. I commend him for taking the leadership in this effort, as the President is about to embark on a trip across Asia and into Eastern Europe.

I think it is critically important that the North Vietnamese not misunderstand those of us who at various times have been critical of our policy in South Vietnam. There are very few people in the United States who would advocate that we just put our tails between our legs and abandon the commitment, of any nature, in Southeast Asia. We who are critical at times of the inflexibility of our policy are advocating that our Government take the lead in various approaches that can lead to a meaningful peace in Southeast Asia.

I think it is also important to emphasize for the benefit of the North Vietnamese that actions speak louder than words. We can understand, perhaps, delay in the Paris peace talks. However, I think we would all be greatly reassured and I think it would make a major contribution to peace in Southeast Asia if North Vietnam would carry through with what is an apparent policy of deescalating the actual fighting and the hostilities. There are grave questions here as to the future of North Vietnamese policy in terms of war. It is true that they have cut back on their supply routes. It is true that there has been a diminution of the actual fighting. But, it is also true that the North Vietnamese retain a military potential to concentrate in specific areas and to escalate the war significantly in those areas.

As the North Vietnamese carry forward with a policy of de facto peace in South Vietnam, I think it will immeasurably assist the United States and the world in finding an ultimate permanent peace in Southeast Asia.

I think it will provoke, without question, the Paris peace talks.

I commend the Senator from Illinois for his contribution. All of us who have joined in this colloquy this afternoon want no mistaken impression left in the minds of the Vietnamese leadership that this country lacks resolve or lacks unity in the present situation.

We will stand behind our President in all reasonable measures to encourage a fair and and permanent peace in Southeast Asia.

But, there is a limit to the patience of our people. The North Vietnamese will gain nothing from an extension of the war. Hopefully, they will see the light of hope for a resolution that can bring peace once again to South Vietnam and North Vietnam.

Mr. PERCY. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in connection with this important discussion on the current negotiations in Paris, I would like to take this opportunity to reiterate what I said on the floor last week.

President Thieu's latest speech could represent an important new move in negotiations in which the world has placed so much hope. What he has offered is to open up political competition to the process of elections in the south in which the NLF could take part as an organized group; and in which they would have a voice as to the organization of the elections.

There is no point in debating whether Thieu might have offered more at this juncture or whether in certain respects his proposal lacks precision. What is important now is that the other side take this latest speech as the serious document we hope it is.

There are many possibilities which this proposal opens up. The language is framed in general terms. For example, there is no specific mention of the constitution. If the other side is interested in negotiating, this offer gives them a reasonable basis on which to do so. President Thieu has made his move. It is now up to the other side to make its move and to do so quickly and seriously.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, under unanimous consent, I have the floor now. I ask unanimous consent that the order of precedence be reversed, that the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McClellan) may precede me now for his allotted time and that I may follow him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arkansas, after which the Chair recognizes the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Chair.

S. 2677—INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDENT DISTURBANCES ACT OF 1969

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this exercise in rearranging of the time is satisfactory to me. I very much appreciate the opportunity to proceed at this time.

Mr. President, the rights of peaceful dissent and protest are fundamental to our liberties and democratic society. Most Americans would vigorously oppose governmental interference with those rights by any person or group so long as dissent and protest were peacefully conducted with the rights of others duly respected. Today, however, we face a new challenge. Nathan Glazer, a respected member of the academic community, who taught at Berkeley in the early 1960's, and who now teaches at Harvard, writing in this month's Atlantic, rightly observed:

> Anyone who has experienced the concrete situation in American universities knows that the threat to free speech, free teaching, and free research, comes from radical white students, from militant black students and from their faculty defenders.

Professor Glazer's observations parallel those of President K. S. Pitzer of Stanford University in his testimony before the Subcommittee on Investigations:

> But as acts of disruption have grown, both in frequency and severity, the academic community across the country increasingly has recognized them for what they are—namely, a threat to free inquiry, to the free expression of ideas, and to the very civil liberties long regarded as vital to the campus community.

It is this challenge that the Congress must now face.

I

Mr. President, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations has been authorized and directed by this body to investigate riots and civil disorders wherever they occur—to ascertain if there are groups or individuals who have instigated or fomented the violence, and, if possible, to discover their objectives and purposes. In this connection, the subcommittee was authorized on May 1, 1969, by unanimous recorded vote of the Committee on Government Operations, to investigate and hold public hearings or executive sessions on the riots and disorders that have disrupted college campuses, and we have, since that time, held a series of hearings concerned with the activities of organized groups who have created unrest and disturbances and who have participated in rioting in our cities and on college campuses. It is clear, too, that some of the same individuals and organizations which have been involved in agitation in the cities are spearheading the disturbances and disruptions at our colleges and universities.

Initially, we heard witnesses who described in detail the backgrounds, structures, and activities of our militant organizations whose members are known to have been involved in widespread agitation and incitement to violence in cities that have suffered serious riots. Three of the groups and their members also have been notoriously active in campus turmoil and violence. The groups we examined were: The Black Panther Party, Student for a Democratic Society, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and a comparatively new organization called the Republic of New Africa, which has not, however, been identified as being involved in campus disruptions.

These militant organizations have been examined in relation to their national impact and influence and the dangers they pose to the internal security of our society. We have included in the record the results of staff investigations and analyses which have been underway for more than a year. We have had the benefit of carefully prepared charts of the organizations' structures, which show the key members. Testimony has disclosed that these groups use threats and violence as a means of attaining their goals and that they are dedicated to callous and cynical exploitation of issues and grievances on campuses and in urban areas.

Our staff has worked closely with municipal, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies from coast to coast during our extensive inquiry. Representatives of these agencies, knowledgeable about the activities of militant groups within their jurisdictions, have substantiated in our hearings the information disclosed by the charts and the testimony of our staff. They have also furnished much additional information of value about specific instances of agitation, incitement to riot, and participation in violence by leaders and members of the groups I have named.

The subcommittee has heard testimony from officials representing agencies in New York City, New Jersey, Los Angeles, Oakland, the State of Michigan, Detroit, Chicago, and other areas. When other testimony is completed and in the record, we will have a very clear picture and understanding of the challenge that faces us.

Our investigations, however, have progressed sufficiently for us to begin a consideration of possible remedial legislation, and the bill which I am introducing today, the Student Disturbances Act of 1969, can be a beginning.

I may add, Mr. President, that there are already cosponsors of the bill. I am glad to welcome the additional cosponsorship of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Byrd), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Mundt), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Thurmond), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Eastland), and I ask unanimous consent that their names be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I assume that this bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and then to the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, in which case, as chair-

XUM

man of that subcommittee, I would expect to schedule early hearings. The record of the Investigations Subcommittee's hearings can be adopted as an exhibit for reference in those hearings on the bill, in order to expedite processing and consideration of the bill.

I think that the testimony, at least a substantial part of it, would be pertinent to and worthy of consideration in connection with the proposed legislation.

II

Mr. President, the use of force to occupy college buildings, to destroy personal or community property, and to make physical attacks upon faculty members and students, cannot, in my judgment, by any standards be considered a legitimate form of protest or dissent. From my viewpoint, such acts are criminal and intolerable.

Indeed, in addition to acts of violence and destruction that young vandals have committed in the name of protest and dissent, they have been guilty in many instances of denying to others the very rights that they so loudly profess to exercise for themselves.

They demand free speech, but shout down attempts to speak by persons who hold views different from theirs. They demand amnesty for their actions, but then insist that faculty members or administrators displeasing to them be fired. They claim that college administrations have declined to negotiate with them, and then they present lists of demands which they call nonnegotiable. They accuse law-enforcement agencies of brutality, and then they threaten fellow students with physical violence if such students do not support their cause. They shout for educational and academic freedom, and then prevent other students from attending classes and faculty members from teaching. By such acts, they are vigorously attempting to destroy the very freedom that they falsely claim to be defending.

Many students desire to train during college days as Reserve officers, yet the militants attempt to prevent them from doing so by attacking and removing ROTC programs from the campus. Other students wish to enlist in the Armed Forces in order to fulfill their military obligations upon graduation, but militants attempt to drive recruiting officers from the campuses. Officials of commercial corporations visit colleges to recruit graduates for positions in their firms, but frequently they are so abused and vilified that they abandon their efforts at certain institutions. Students are thus denied an opportunity to secure employment with firms of their own choice.

Mr. President, the academic world undoubtedly needs improvement and modernization, like many other areas of our developing and complex modern society. Indeed, I commend to college administrators everywhere the wise words of Edmund Burke to the House of Commons in 1780:

> Consider the wisdom of a timely reform. Early reformations are amicable arrangements with a friend in power; late reformations are terms imposed upon a conquered enemy; early reformations are made in cool blood; late reformations are made under a state of inflammation. In that state of things the people behold in government nothing that is respectable. They see the abuse, and they will see nothing else. They fall into the temper of a furious populace provoked at the disorder of a house of ill fame; they never attempt to correct or regulate; they go to work by the shortest way; they abate the nuisance, they pull down the house.

The needed changes in our educational institutions should be the result of reasoned and informed discussion and negotiation among college administrative officials, faculty members, and responsible representatives of the student body—not the product of a cowed administrator's hasty decision extorted by the sight of firearms and bandoleers.

Our hearings on campus disorders have had and will have as witnesses a number of university administrators and other officials from institutions where disruption has occurred. We are endeavoring to ascertain from them how much of the so-called student unrest is based upon valid and legitimate dissatisfaction with certain aspects of our system of higher education, and how much is the product of deliberate attempts by organized groups to cause turmoil and create chaos. We are trying to determine from the officials whether the schools themselves can impose and enforce the discipline and restraint necessary to prevent disorders and lawlessness and to maintain order on the campuses. Nevertheless, we are mindful that the President's Commission on Violence has already concluded:

> [T]he university is ill-equipped to control violent and obstructive conduct on its own. Most institutions have few campus police; most of these are not deputized and thus do not possess true police power. Few schools have explicit rules either defining the boundaries of permissible protest or stating the consequences if the boundaries are crossed. Some have very loose rules for disciplinary proceedings; others have diffused disciplinary power so widely among students, faculty and administration that effective discipline is difficult to impose; and is seldom imposed quickly enough to meet an emergency. And in most institutions the ultimate internal disciplinary sanction of suspension or expulsion lies unused because the campus community shrinks from its probable consequence—exposure of dismissed students to the draft and what students call the "death sentence" of Vietnam.

We are also asking these officials what measures they intend to take to resolve their problems and what kind of aid and support they might need from outside agencies, including the Federal Government.

III

From our studies so far, however, it seems clear that the protestors who have generated much of the violence on American campuses represent only a minute percentage of the national collegiate student body of approximately 7,500,000. It is our information that in a large university of say 15,000 students, the hard core of militants who advocate physical disruption may number only 50 to 100 persons, some of whom are actually outsiders not registered in the institution and have no legitimate purpose for being on the campus.

Likewise, we are informed, for example, that the leaders of Students for a Democratic Society claim to have 40,000 members across the Nation. Yet our investigation has shown that there are only about 8,000 so-called hard-core members, while there may be 25,000 to 30,000 supporters of the organization and its objectives. Nevertheless, the impact of these small groups, who are primarily responsible for many of the outbreaks of violence on American campuses, has been very significant and deserves the close attention of all concerned citizens. The skilled use of what they call "provocatory tactics" is an important factor in their success in creating turmoil and disrupting great universities even though their numbers are relatively few.

As I understand this technique, it is to instigate a major incident or disruption through four separate stages, each of which in turn increases the unrest which may already exist on the campus.

Their first step is to seize for exploitation already existing issues relating to college activities, or to create them if none are readily available. A propaganda campaign about the issues is part of the initial stage, which may include demonstrations, rallies, street corner speeches, and inflamatory printed material.

Second, as support for their position is manifested by other students, they attempt to provoke reactions from the college authorities by occupying buildings, shutting down classes, and other physical tactics, including abuse of administrators and faculty members. At this stage they usually issue a list of "nonnegotiable" demands, most of which the college administration cannot possibly accept.

Then the tempo of the disturbance is increased as much as possible, and if the college authorities react by the use of police or other force, in order to restore order to the campus, the militants seek a violent physical confrontation by rock-throwing, name-calling, marching into police lines and fighting police, resisting eviction, and other tactics.

Ultimately, when the police or other authorities carry out their duty to quell the disturbance, evict persons from unlawful occupation of buildings, and restore order to the campus, using force if necessary, the militants cry "police brutality" and "repression by the administration" and thus they manage to arouse segments of the student body to rally to their cause. The authorities have become the villains, charges of brutality have obscured the original issues, the militants and their close supporters have become the heroes, and the university or college is usually in serious difficulty.

Professor Glazer, in his instructive Atlantic article, described the purpose and result of this process in these words:

> There is only one result of a radical action that means success for the radicals—making new radicals. In this sense, the Harvard action has been an enormous success. Those who know something of the history of Marxism and Leninism will be surprised to see this rather esoteric definition of success for true radical movements now emerging full-blown in the midst of the SDS, which began so proudly only a few years ago by breaking with all previous ideology and dogma. "Build the cadres" was the old slogan: "build the cadres," because any *reform* will only make the peasants and workers happier or more

XUM

> content with their lot, and will thus delay the final and inevitable revolution.
>
> The aim of action, therefor, is never its ostensible end—the slogan is only a tactic—but further radicalization, "building the cardes," now "the movement." The terrible effect of such an approach is to introduce corruption into the heart of the movement, and into the hearts of those who work for it, because the "insiders" know that the *ostensible* slogans are only tactical, that one can demand anything no matter how nonsensical, self-contradictory, and destructive, because the aim is not the fulfillment of demands, but the creation of new radicals who result from the process that follows the putting forward of such demands: violence by the revolutionaries, counterviolence by the authorities, radicalization therefore of the bystanders and the further "building of the movement."

Mr. Charles A. Anderson, president of the Stanford Research Institute, Menlo Park, Calif., expressed a similar thought in his testimony before the Subcommittee on Investigations:

> As for the hard-core radical student—the SDS type—I have found that they do not really want the so-called rational dialogue they speak of. It is only a phrase they use in trying to set up confrontation. They are bent on destroying the "establishment" and reducing our institutions to chaos.

He also added:

> With them we must be absolutely firm and make it clear that lawlessness and violence are unacceptable tactics in our society under any circumstances. We must make it clear that we will insist upon and protect our rights.

Mr. President, the challenge that this is presented to us by this sort of "movement" has been ably articulated by 22 of our colleagues in the House in the Brock report. They observed:

> It is clear that if violence on our campuses does not end, and if the reaction to it is on the one extreme too lax, or on the other extreme too harsh and indiscriminate, the vast moderate student majority may be forced into the arms of the revolutionaries, and those few who seek to destroy the fabric of higher education will have succeeded.

It was with this danger in mind, therefore, that the Student Disturbances Act of 1969 was drafted. Hopefully, it is neither "too harsh" nor "too lax." Instead, without going "too far" or "not far enough," it is designed to give those involved in the university community the legal tools necessary to help them help themselves restore order and work out in a peaceful manner the reform of their internal affairs.

I expect, of course, that there are those who will feel that even this sort of legislation is unnecessary or ill advised. The President's Commission on Violence described: "the belief of many that the civil law should not apply to internal campus affairs. They feel that the academy is an enclave sheltered from the law, that the forces of civil authority may not enter the campus save by invitation."

It then added:

> This is a serious misconception—a residue of the time when the academy served in loco parentis. . . . Now that students themselves have firmly discarded school authority over their personal lives, they must logically accept civil authority. They cannot argue that of all Americans they are uniquely beyond the reach of the law.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, the Congress—leaving to one side for a moment all other considerations—has a substantial financial investment in student aid—$490 million annually is the current amount in appropriated funds. It has an enormous financial stake, too, in academic research. In 1970, total Fderal obligations for research grants and contracts in colleges and universities will be $1.56 billion, an increase of $152 million over 1969. This investment of the Federal Government provides approximately two-thirds of all research funds spent by academic institutions throughout the country. This financial stake alone warrants our interest and concern in the future of higher education.

Mr. President, I should now like briefly to highlight the major provisions of the proposed statute to show the response that it makes to the challenge of student disturbances.

The bill begins with a statement of findings and purpose, which explicitly recognizes that the primary responsibility for the maintenance of academic freedom and the orderly administration of colleges and universities rests on the academic community itself.

Section 2 of the bill then sets out a series of definitions of the key terms which set the limits for the operation of the proposed act. Although its scope is comprehensive, I note that there is no intent to preempt parallel State law. The authority of the Congress to act is premised on the existence of a "Federal assisted institution of higher education." Such institutions are then to be protected from "acts of disruption" that "unreasonably interrupt" or "unreasonably obstruct" the operation of the schools' programs. See *Cameron* v. *Johnson*, 390 U.S. 611, 616 (1968); *Cole* v. *Arkansas*, 338 U.S. 345, 353–54 (1949). "Casualties" under the proposed act are defined to include bodily injury or death or loss of property, including benefit of tuition or other school fees, as well as loss of wages or profits. Finally, "persons" is defined to include individuals as well as legal or factual groups. See *United Mine Workers* v. *Colorado Coal Co.*, 259 U.S. 344 (1922).

Next, in section 3 of the proposed act, a threefold prohibition is set out, which centers around the orderly administration or operation of any federally assisted institution of higher education. Such institutions are protected against: First, the appropriation of property; second, the disruption of programs, and third, the obstruction of the restoration of order during disturbances.

No one has a constitutional right, I suggest, under the guise of free speech or dissent to bring about or to conspire to bring about a civil disturbance on the street or elsewhere. See *Lynch* v. *State*, 236 A. 2d 45 (Md. 1967); *People* v. *Epton*, 19 N.Y. 2d 496, 227 NE. 2d 829, 281 N.Y.S. 2d (1967), *cert. denied*, 88 S. Ct. 824 (1968). Section 3, therefore, is but a codification of the commonsense of the matter.

The good faith acts of duly authorized individuals, such as firemen, are excluded from these prohibitions. See *Sterling* v. *Constantin*, 287 U.S. 378 (1932); *Commonwealth ex rel Wadsworth* v. *Shortall*, 206 Pa. 165, 173, 55 A. 952, 955 (1903); *United States* v. *Bevans*, 24 F. Cas. 1138 (No. 14, 589) (D. Mass. 1816). And, as it has been recommended, they are also given, under section 3, the protection of Federal law. See "Report on the National Guard Capability," House Committee on Armed Services, 90th Congress, first session 5665, 1967.

Following these prohibitions, section 4 sets out a series of graded criminal penalties to enforce these prohibitions. Agreeing to engage in, endeavoring to engage in, or engaging in conduct in violation of the threefold prohibition, noted above, is made, for the first offense, a "petty offense" punishable by a $500 fine, or 90 days in jail. See *District of Columbia* v. *Clawans*, 300 U.S. 617 (1937). Probation, however, is authorized for a period of up to 3 years. See *Frank* v. *United States*, No. 200 Oct Term 1968, decided May 19, 1969; compare 18 United States Code, section 3651. Nevertheless, a violation of the probation may not result in incarceration in excess of 120 days. Compare 18 United States Code, section 3653. Where bodily injury or death results from a violation, and it is so charged and proven, the penalty is appropriately increased to $1,000 or not more than 1 year for bodily injury, and $10,000 or for any term exceeding 10 years or life if death results. Second offenders are appropriately treated in a more severe manner by raising the petty offense to a misdemeanor.

Trials of petty offenses, without regard to the election of the defendant, are to be before the appropriate U.S. magistrate. Compare 180 United States Code, section 3401.

Since it would be only a "petty offense," absent bodily injury or death, a violation of section 4 would not be a "serious crime" under the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1968, Public Law 90–575, 82 Stat. 1014, 20 United States Code, section 1060(a) (1968), and it could not serve as a basis for the cutoff of Federal educational assistance.

Mr. President, these provisions should adequately handle the vast majority of those who unwittingly allow themselves to be caught up in the current campus cause without full awareness of the implication of their actions. There is no purpose here to treat these young men and women as common criminals. Nonetheless, there is a need to impress upon them that this sort of conduct is beyond the pale of what a free society may tolerate under the misappropriate aegis of dissent or protest.

The proposed statute next turns to the outside agitator. Anyone not a member of the faculty or the student body in the university or college, who uses any facility of interstate commerce and thereafter engages in or endeavors to engage in any conduct in violation of the threefold prohibition, noted above, may be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years. See 18 United States Code, section 1952. Where bodily injury results, the fine and imprisonment is raised to $10,000, or up

XUM

to 10 years. Where death results the fine and imprisonment are $10,000 or any term exceeding 10 years, or both.

Mr. President, I do not suggest for a moment that all of the disturbances that our colleges have experienced have been the product of planning or conspiracy. Nor can it be maintained, I think, that none of these disturbances have been the outgrowth of a scheme or design. Seeing these disturbances solely in terms of these two alternatives is little more than a false dichotomy. Crane Brinton, in his instructive "The Anatomy of Revolution," sums up this sort of attitude as follows:

> The school of circumstances regards revolutions as a wild and natural growth, its seeds sown among tyranny and corruption, its development wholly determined by forces outside itself or at any rate outside human planning; the school of plot regards revolutions as a forced and artificial growth, its seeds carefully planted in soil worked over and fertilized by the gardener-revolutionists, mysteriously brought to maturity by these same gardeners against the forces of nature. Actually, we must reject both extremes, for they are nonsense, and hold that revolutions do grow from seeds sown by men who want change, and that these men do do a lot of skillful gardening; but that the gardeners are not working against Nature, but rather in soil and in a climate propitious to their work; and that the final fruits represent a collaboration between men and Nature.

In concentrating on the legitimate grievances of some with our society and its institutions, we must not, therefore, close our eyes to the irresponsible acts of the unreconciled and unreconcilable radicals who desire not reformation, but reconstruction. We must not forget that the ubiquitous Tom Hayden was present both at Moses Hall at Berkeley and at the mathematics building at Columbia. This provision, modeled after the Anti-Racketeer Act, should put our Nation's future Tom Haydens in the place every free and sane society reserves for those who would violently destroy its very foundations.

Mr. President, if the criminal law has a role, however limited and however discriminating, to play in this area, it is true, too, that civil sanctions must be assigned their tasks to perform. Section 5 of the proposed act thus authorizes the U.S. district court to prevent and restrain violation of the threefold prohibition, noted above. The courts are, under appropriate circumstances, specifically authorized to regulate the size, place, and time of proposed demonstrations to protect the personal security and property of others. See *City of Chicago* v. *King*, 86 Ill. App. 2d 340, 353–54, 230 N.E. 2d 41, 47–48 (1967); compare *Walker* v. *City of Birmingham*, 380 U.S. 307, 309, 315 (1967), *Carrol* v. *Princess Anne Commissioners*, 393 U.S. 175 (1968). Such injunctive proceedings, however, may be brought only by those immediately concerned with their consequences—administrators, faculty members, and students. Special penal limits, paralleling those applicable to the petty offenses, noted above, are placed on contempt actions under such injunctions.

Mr. President, I have noted that most of those who get caught up in these disturbances are but immature adolescents, playing at being revolutionaries, without fully understanding the consequences of their acts. I say this not to excuse or condone their actions, but to recognize them for what they are. It is important, then, not to brand them unnecessarily with a criminal record that will haunt them throughout their adult lives. For this reason, section 6 of the proposed act accords to each offender who was, at the time of the offense, a minor—under 21 years of age—upon the successful completion of probation, the right to secure the expunging of his record. It also permits him lawfully to ignore any future inquiry concerning such record in any employment or other situation.

Mr. President, all too many of our young radicals seem to think that in attacking what they call the "power structure," somehow only that "power structure" suffers. Little or no consideration is given to the direct financial and other injury they may be doing to their fellow students, faculty members, or the schools themselves. Section 7 of the act, therefore, appropriately creates a Federal civil cause of action making anyone who incites or engages in conduct in violation of the threefold prohibition of section 3 civilly liable for the consequences of his actions. For example, many of our private universities have tuition fees running as high as $2,500 per year. A disrupted semester may mean for an individual the loss of the benefit of all or a part of that fee.

Similarly, at Howard University, according to testimony before the Permanent Investigations Subcommittees by its former president, James M. Nabrit, the damage done to buildings, during student disturbances there, amounted to $136,397, of which only $53,824 was covered by insurance. It is time, I suggest, that the cost of these irresponsible acts of vandalism be brought home to these young men and women. As the Court in *Calcutt* v. *Gerig*, 271 F. 220, 223 (6th Cir. 1921), aptly put it:

> It would seem almost unnecessary to say that persons responsible for mob violence cannot escape liability for the necessary and natural consequences thereof. It would be just as reasonable to say that a man might start a fire and then by retiring to some distant spot avoid responsibility for destruction wrought by the conflagration he initiated.

If they would call the tune, they should be willing to pay the piper.

Civil suits may be brought in U.S. district courts without regard to the amount in controversy and in any of several appropriate forums. Recovery under section 7, moreover, is not limited to compensatory damages or punitive damages. Reasonable attorney fees, and litigation costs are provided. We must recognize, too, that many of those who might seek to recover their losses would be unable financially to bear the cost of suit. Nevertheless, recovery, other than for bodily injury or death, shall not exceed $5,000 in the case of each defendant. There is no need to visit on any one individual a judgment in excess of his probable ability to pay.

The doctrine of charitable immunity shall not be asserted as a defense to liability. Compare *Miller* v. *Concordia Teachers College*, 296 F. 2d 100 (8th Cir. 1961), with *Gamble* v. *Vanderbilt University*, 200 S.W. 510 (Tenn. 1918); see *President and Directors of Georgetown College* v. *Hughes*, 130 F. 2d 810 (D.C. Cir. 1942).

Section 8 of the bill authorizes under appropriate safeguards modeled after legislation recommended by the National Commission on the Reform of Federal Criminal Law, the granting of immunity from self-incrimination in civil and criminal suits brought under the proposed act. See S. 2122, 91st Congress, first session 1969. Since the civil provisions so closely parallel the criminal provisions, their effectiveness without such a provision would be sharply curtailed.

Section 9 of the bill sets out provisions for broad venue and process, similar to that set out in our antitrust laws.

Section 10 of the bill provides that it shall be liberally construed to effectuate its remedial purposes.

Section 11 contains a separability provision.

Mr. President, I am not irrevocably committed to the present language or the specific provisions of this bill. I am sure that the bill can be strengthened and improved by the hearing and committee process. Nevertheless, I am committed to the objectives of this legislation. We must support, protect, and preserve our system of higher education. We cannot let it be destroyed by the deliberate and willful actions of a few or by the unthinking and irresponsible actions of many. We must uphold our traditional standards of personal responsibility—both criminal and civil. Demonstrations and dissent must be protected; yet when such actions transgress the legitimate rights of others, effective redress must be afforded to those who are injured. Justice requires no less.

VI

The President, in his news conference of June 19, 1969, indicated:

> [W]e do not want the Federal Government interfering in and responsible for discipline in every college and university in this country. . . . [T]he responsibility for discipline in colleges and universities should be on the college administrators.
>
> That's why I've asked the Attorney General to develop, if he can, new legal remedies that might be available to college administrators, to use where violence or lawlessness does occur on the campus. The responsibility should be theirs. The Government's role should be to help them meet that responsibility.

I am in accord with the views of the President of the United States, and this legislation meets those objectives. It gives to those involved—the administrators, the faculty members, and the students themselves—what they need to help themselves work out their own problems. I hope, too, that it will soon meet with the approval of this body.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill, which I now introduce, printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2677) to prohibit the dis-

ruption of federally assisted institutions of higher education, to provide for the enforcement of such prohibition, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McClellan (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2677

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of American in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Student Disturbances Act of 1969."

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

(a) The Congress hereby finds that the primary responsibility for maintaining freedom of expression, public order, and the effective functioning of the educational processes at American institutions of higher education rests with the trustees, administrators, and other duly-appointed collegiate officials, faculty, and student body.

(b) In light of the finding set forth in subsection (a), it is the purpose of this Act—

(1) to maintain within the scholarly community the basic American concepts of freedom of thought, inquiry, expression, and orderly assembly,

(2) to assist those who wish to pursue their education in a campus atmosphere free of acts of disruption and violence,

(3) to afford encouragement and opportunity to administrators, faculty and students in working for orderly progress,

(4) to assist the academic community in maintaining institutions of higher education as centers for the free interchange of ideas, and

(5) to assure reasonable protection of the Federal investment in higher educational programs.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 2. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "federally assisted institution of higher education" means any such institution as defined by section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (A) which during the current calendar year has received or will receive, directly or indirectly, from any department or agency of the United States any compensation, education or research grant of money or property, educational loan, or educational loan guaranty, or (B) at which any student is in attendance, who during the current calendar year has received or will receive, directly or indirectly, from any department or agency of the United States any compensation, educational or research grant of money or property, educational loan, or educational loan guaranty.

(2) The term "act of disruption" means (A) any act of trespass upon, or unlawful or unauthorized occupation of, any classroom, office, or other facility or any federally assisted institution of higher education which results in the suspension, unreasonable curtailment, or unreasonable interruption of any class, program, or activity conducted or provided by such institution or authorized by appropriate administrative authority of such institution to be conducted in, around, or upon any campus of such institution, or (B) any unreasonable obstruction of access to, egress from, or the use of any part of any campus or property of such institution or any structure or facility situated thereon by any person who is lawfully entitled to access to, egress from, or the use of such campus, structure, or facility or property.

(3) The term "civil disturbance" includes any riot, demonstration, strike, or seizure of property occurring in, around or upon the campus of a federally assisted institution of higher education involving an assemblage of three or more persons in which one or more acts of disruption occur.

(4) The term "casualty" includes (A) the bodily injury or death of an individual, (B) damage to, destruction or loss of, or loss of use of, real or personal property including, but not limited to, loss of benefit of all or part of tuition, fees or other costs incident to attendance at an institution of higher education, loss of wages or salary by an individual, or loss of earnings or profits by a person engaged in a business or profession.

(5) The term "person" includes any individual, corporation, trust, partnership, unincorporated association, or any other group composed of two or more individuals associated in fact although not a legal entity.

(6) The term "interstate commerce" means commerce between one State, Territory, Possession, or the District of Columbia and another State, Territory, Possession or the District of Columbia.

(7) The term "foreign commerce" means commerce with a foreign country.

PROHIBITION

Sec. 3. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to prevent, obstruct, or interfere with the orderly administration or operation of any federally assisted institution of higher education, by

(1) appropriating, occupying, damaging or destroying during a civil disturbance any real or personal property, which is the property of such institution, which is situated in, around or upon the campus of such institution, or which is situated within any structure of such institution;

(2) denying or abridging by force, threat of force, or any act of disruption during a civil disturbance the opportunity of any person to participate in or enjoy the benefits of any class, facility, program, or activity conducted or provided by such institution, or authorized by appropriate administrative authority of such institution to be conducted in, around or upon any campus of such institution; or

(3) obstructing, assaulting, or otherwise physically opposing any duly authorized person engaged in the good faith restoration of peace, safety and good order during a civil disturbance occurring in, around or upon the campus of such institution.

(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to acts or omissions on the part of law enforcement personnel, firemen or other duly authorized persons, members of the National Guard, as defined in section 101(9) of title 10, United States Code, members of the organized militia of any State or the District of Columbia, not covered by such section 101(9), or members of the Armed Forces of the United States, who are engaged in the good faith restoration of peace, safety and good order during such civil disturbance.

CRIMINAL PENALTIES

Sec. 4. (a) Whoever agrees to engage in, or endeavors to engage in, or engages in conduct in violation of the provisions of section 3 of this Act shall for the first offense be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned not more than ninety days, or both. Such person may be placed on probation for a period not to exceed three years. No person who violates a condition of such probation shall be imprisoned for a period in excess of one hundred and twenty days. If bodily injury to any person results from such first offense, such person, if so charged and convicted, shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both. If the death of any person results from such first offense, such person, if so charged and convicted, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned for any term of years exceeding 10 years or for life, or both. In the case of a second offense, and for such subsequent offense, such person, if so charged and convicted, shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both. If bodily injury results from such offense, such person, if so charged and convicted, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both. If the death of any person results from such offense, such person, if so charged and convicted, shall be fined $10,000, or be imprisoned for any term of years exceeding ten years or for life, or both.

(b) The trial of petty offenses under this section, without regard to the election of the defendant, shall be before the appropriate United States magistrate.

(c) Whoever, not being a member of the faculty in good standing of such institution or a student in good standing in such institution, travels in interstate or foreign commerce or uses any facility in interstate or foreign commerce, including the mails, with intent to engage in conduct in violation of section 3 of this Act and thereafter engages in, or endeavors to engage in, any conduct in violation of section 3 of this Act in, around or upon the campus of a federally assisted institution of higher education, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both. If bodily injury to any person results from such offense, such person, if so charged and convicted, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both. If the death of any person results from such offense, such person, if so charged and convicted, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned for any term of years exceeding 10 years or for life, or both.

INJUNCTIONS

Sec. 5. (a) The United States District Courts shall have jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violations of section 3 of this Act by issuing appropriate orders, including, but not limited to: regulating the size, place, and time of proposed demonstrations to protect the personal security and property of others.

(b) A trustee, the president, chancellor, or other duly appointed head administrative officer of any federally assisted institution of higher education, any member of the faculty in good standing of any such institution, or any student in good standing in any such institution, may institute proceedings, without regard to the amount in controversy, to prevent and restrain such violations. In any action brought under this section, the courts shall proceed as soon as may be practicable to the hearing and determination thereof. Pending final determination, the court may at any time enter such restraining orders or prohibitions, or take such other actions, including, but not limited to, the acceptance of satisfactory performance bonds, as the court shall determine to be appropriate.

(c) No person adjudged in contempt in a violation of an injunction or restraining order issued under this section shall be fined more than $500 or imprisoned for a period in excess of 90 days or placed on probation for a period in excess of 3 years. No person who violates a condition of probation imposed under this section shall be imprisoned for a period in excess of 120 days.

EXPUNGING OF RECORD

Sec. 6. Upon the expiration of a sentence, including a term of probation, imposed upon any person under this Act, such person, who at the time of the offense was 21 years of age or younger, may apply to the court for an order to expunge from all official records all recordation of his arrest, trial and conviction pursuant to this section. If the court determines, after hearing, that such person during the period of such probation has not been guilty of any serious or repeated violation of the conditions of such probation, it shall enter such order. The effect of such order shall be to restore such person, in the contemplation of the law, to the status he occupied prior to such arrest, trial and conviction. No person as to whom such order has been entered shall be held thereafter under any provision of any law to be guilty of perjury or otherwise giving a false statement by reason of his failures to recite or acknowledge such arrest, trial or conviction in response to any inquiry made of him for any purpose.

RECOVERY OF DAMAGES

Sec. 7. (a) Whenever any civil disturbance occurs in or around or upon any campus of a federally assisted institution of higher education, and any conduct in violation of section 3 of this Act is engaged in the course of such disturbance, all persons who have intentionally incited or have knowingly participated in such conduct shall be jointly and severally liable for all losses sustained on account of any casualty resulting from any such conduct engaged in the course of such disturbance or any act committed as a part of the good faith restoration of peace, safety, and good order during such civil disturbance.

(b) the district court of the United States shall have jurisdiction, without regard to the amount in controversy, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any action brought under this section for the recovery of damages for any such loss. In any action brought under this section, a successful plaintiff shall be entitled to recover, in addition to the amount of compensatory damages entered in his favor, punitive damages and litigation costs, including a reasonable attorney's fee, taxable costs, and reimbursement for all other expenses reasonably incurred for the preparation and prosecution of such action as determined by the court.

(c) The doctrine of charitable immunity shall not be asserted to avoid liability under this section.

(d) Recovery of compensatory or punitive damages or litigation costs under this section, other than for bodily injury or the death of an individual, shall not exceed $5,000 in the case of each natural defendant for each such disturbance occurring in, around or upon a campus of a federally assisted institution of higher education.

IMMUNITY

Sec. 8. (a) Whenever a witness refuses, on the basis of his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or to produce other evidence in an action or other proceeding under this Act in and before or ancillary to a district court of the United States and the court orders the witness upon request made pursuant to this section to give testimony or to produce other evidence, the witnesses may not refuse to comply with the order upon the basis of his privilege against self-incrimination. No testimony given or other evidence produced in compliance with the order or any information come at by the exploitation of such testimony or other evidence may be used against the witness in any criminal case, except a prosecution for perjury, giving a false statement, or otherwise failing to comply with the order.

(b) In the case of any individual who has been or may be called to testify or provide other information in any action or proceeding under this Act, the United States district court for the judicial district in which such action or proceeding is pending, shall issue, upon the written approval of the United States attorney for such district, an order requiring such individual to give any testimony or produce any other evidence which he refuses to give or produce on the basis of his privilege against self-incrimination.

(c) (1) A United States attorney may, with the approval of the Attorney General (or the Deputy Attorney General, or any Assistant Attorney General designated by the Attorney General), request an order under this section in any action brought under this Act when in his judgment—

(A) the disclosure of the testimony or other evidence sought from such individual may be necessary to the public interest; and

(B) such individual has refused or is likely to refuse to testify or produce other evidence on the basis of his privilege against self-incrimination.

(2) Upon the written approval of the United States attorney for the district in which an action or proceeding under this Act is brought, the plaintiff or the defendant in such action or proceeding may request an order under this section with respect to any individual who has been or may be called to testify or to produce other evidence in such action or proceeding when such individual has refused or is likely to refuse to testify or produce other evidence on the basis of his privilege against self-incrimination.

VENUE AND PROCESS

Sec. 9. (a) Any civil action or proceeding under this Act may be brought in the district court of the United States for any district wherein any action or transaction constituting a violation of section 3 of this Act occurred or in the district wherein any person against whom any such action or proceeding is brought is found or is an inhabitant.

(b) In any action under this Act in any district court of the United States in which it is shown that the ends of justice require that other parties residing in any other district be brought before the court, the court may cause such parties to be summoned, and process for that purpose may be served in any judicial district of the United States by the marshal thereof.

(c) In any action or proceeding brought under this Act in the district court of the United States for any judicial district, subpenas issued by such court to compel the attendance of witnesses may be served in any other judicial district, except that in any civil action or proceeding no such subpena shall be issued for service upon any individual who resides in another district at a place more than one hundred miles from the place at which such court is held without approval given by a judge of such court upon a showing of good cause.

Sec. 10. The provisions of this Act shall be liberally construed so as to effectuate its remedial purposes.

Sec. 11. If the provisions of any part of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances be held invalid, the provisions of the other parts and their application to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am prepared to yield the floor, or to yield for comments or questions.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to read the bill or to study it. I do wish to take this opportunity, though, to observe that I have the highest regard and respect for the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas. I have observed him since long before I came to the Senate, and since then I have watched him very closely. I know he is a man who has been trained in the law. He served in various legal capacities before he came to Congress. He is diligent and perceptive. He is fair and unrelenting in his efforts to ferret out the facts. I know that he has worked long and tirelessly in delving into the records of the disturbances on campuses, as he has with respect to those of the disturbances in the cities of America; and I feel certain that as to many of the important facts that have been developed insofar as those disturbances are concerned, and the forces that have generated them, he has made a significant contribution to our knowledge.

I certainly intend to study the bill. I am inclined to think it meets the test that the President has spelled out for legislation in this area.

I feel that the universities have a prime responsibility to the people of the country. I think it is their job to see that order is maintained on campus. In my opinion, some administrators have been derelict in not meeting the challenge that was posed for them by these disruptive influences on campus.

It is one thing to want to speak out, to propose a particular policy, or to object to a particular policy, of the university or of the Nation. It is another thing to deny others the right, similarly, to be heard. It occurs to me that, in most instances, this is precisely why trouble has erupted. There are those on the campuses who are not content simply to speak their own thoughts. They want, by means of violence and physical assault to deny others the right to speak out, to deny faculty members the ability to meet with their classes, and to deny college administrators the right to perform their tasks.

So at this point I think it is important that Congress consider what steps the Federal Government may take in order to assure that there shall be no question, on the part of the various school, college, and university administrators the country over, as to their freedom to do their job well.

I served for 17 years as a member of the board of trustees of the University of Wyoming. The last 7 of those years I was president of that board. Then I served also, for the next 4 years, while Governor, as an ex officio member of the university's board of trustees. I found no evidence, in my experience, of any university governing board that would seek to strifle free expression, or to deny anyone the right to express an opinion.

But I certainly think the taxpayers, the people of the country, and the students of the colleges and universities deserve better than they have been able to get for the last several years.

And I may say that my high regard for the distinguished Senator from Arkansas was not diminished by his continued and persistent efforts to do something about the TFX. A long time ago, he became convinced that the system that was being proposed by a previous administration was not sound. I recall how he stood almost alone in objecting to the development of a plane that was supposed to serve two major, yet very distinct and separate functions. I shared the great pleasure and satisfaction of many Senators when finally the various services concerned with that plane announced that its further development would be dropped.

I compliment the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for his scholarly approach to this problem, for his objective appraisal of all of the factors, for his fairness in listening to all points of view, and for the contribution I am certain he now makes in presenting, for consideration by Congress, legislation which will help to implement the objectives the President has called for in order better to support those charged with the administration of the colleges and universities of the country.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend from Wyoming. I appreciate his expressions of confidence and his desire to work with all Senators in an effort to find out what remedies will be needed and can be applied under the very difficult conditions that prevail today.

I may say to the distinguished Senator that the hearings have not been concluded. So far, we have examined, as I recall, 10 different colleges and universities. We have heard officials of those institutions. We have heard a number of police officers who had information about and were familiar with the disturbances, and particularly information about what I term the "hard-core group of militants," who are not concerned about education in our land, but whose only interest is to disrupt and to destroy—and that view—that their aim is to destroy—is shared by some college administrators.

A witness from New York testified this morning and explicitly emphasized that the goal of a number of these organizations—and he named the organizations and their leaders, and stated the general objectives of the organizations—was to do exactly what I have said. They were not interested in reform or improvement, but solely in destruction, not only of education in the universities, but of education generally, and of the country itself.

This bill is not perfect. It may need modifications. But it is a vehicle to go to the appropriate legislative committee of the Senate, which can, in its deliberations and in its wisdom, at the proper time begin hearings. Moreover, I think that the massive record that is being built in our investigating hearing can serve as an appropriate exhibit for the information of that legislative committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the bill may need some modifications. A study of it will, I am sure, indicate that. I am no completely wedded to it, but it is an approach. As a whole, the bill is designed to enable the administrators of colleges and others who have responsibility to fulfill that responsibility. It gives them the tools with which to do it. It may be said that they already have tools in the form of State laws. That may be true, and if so they should use them. Nevertheless, this bill recognizes the responsibility and seeks to help them.

If an institution is supported by Federal aid, the Federal Government has the duty to make certain that the institution can be administered to protect the students who attend and who also have civil rights. They have a right to a peaceful education and to protection from the violence which interferes with their education.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HANSEN. Is it not true that there has been just as great an abrogation of the rights of the peaceful students who have been denied the right to attend classes as there can be charged an abrogation of the rights of militants on campus?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not think the rights of militant students have been abrogated. Rather, I think they have been taking to themselves a license to commit violence to accomplish their own purposes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the first requisite for the solution of a problem is an understanding of the problem. It is difficult for one of our generation, I daresay, to understand the causes which the present generation of college students would regard as sufficient to cause them to resort to acts of violence such as we have seen.

I wish to suggest one additional factor that perhaps should be a part of the consideration of this problem. Mrs. Gore and I attended the graduation of our son. At that graduation, only a handful of students walked out. I must say that by far the great majority, in their caps and gowns, received their degrees, their honors, and their awards. About the only thing I saw on television or read in the press about that graduation exercise, which was at one of the Nation's large universities, was the antics of that handful of dissidents.

It seems to me that we pay too much attention to the communication media and pay too much attention to the action of an obstreperous view. I accept that as only one grain of thought to be considered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator.

I think that is probably a matter over which Congress cannot legislate. The communications media has the freedom of the press. They may make these selections even though they sometimes do the country a disservice.

But as the Senator has pointed out, 98 percent of the students not participating in the demonstrations are dedicated to getting an education. They resent the fact that they have to be subjected to this kind of an insult or this sort of treatment on a day that is most important to them.

It is against the activities and the objectives of that small militant group that the Congress has a duty to take some action of the present laws—Federal, State, and local—are not adequate.

The student that is there to get an education and the faculty that is there to teach him and give him the best education they can are today being injured and interfered with by reason of these unlawful acts.

It is this element that we are trying to deal with—and are now dealing with unsuccessfully in my judgment.

Mr. GORE. The protection needed, it would seem to me, is the protection of the institution, of the educational process, of the processes of freedom, law, and order, and of the well-meaning students.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator. I appreciate these sentiments coming from him.

No one proposes to defend our institutions as being perfect. I am sure that there are occasions on which the students should have their reasonable complaints and grievances listened to. The institutions should on occasion react to them more favorably. However, the fact that they have not done so does not justify a resort to lawlessness.

Mr. President, I shall be away from the Chamber for awhile. The Senator from New York will now have an opportunity to reply to my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McClellan), the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations and its Investigation Subcommittee, both of which I am a member, has with his characteristic courtesy, furnished me with a copy of the remarks he was going to make and with a copy of his bill.

The Senator invited me to join with him in introducing the bill. I did not do this, for reasons which I will make evident.

The Senator from Arkansas, again with characteristic fairness, agreed that we are at sort of a midpoint in our investigation.

The Senator from Arkansas, under his authority as chairman of the committee and by his own distinction, has introduced the first really wide-ranging measure introduced in the Senate since the more recent wave of dissent and disruption hit America's colleges and universities. This gives an opportunity to the Senate and to the country to appreciate the work of our committee.

I would say at this point that we are, as an approximation, at the midpoint of our investigation.

The fundamental difference between us as I now see it is whether or not we are ready to legislate.

The Senator from Arkansas knows that we are not ready. However, he feels that the time has come to crystallize a legislative proposal. I do not go that far.

As a lawyer, may I immediately state my point in speaking. It is that question—whether the time has come to crystallize a legislative proposal—to which I would like to address myself. In the light of the progress we have made, there is no question about our agreement on one point. That concerns our duty to protect and support our system of higher education. The Senator from Arkansas is pledged to perform that duty. So am I.

The question is how we go about it. At the point we have reached in our subcommittee's deliberations, we have reviewed about half of the case. That con-

XUM

cerns the activities of small, militant groups and how they have stirred up the college campuses and destroyed the opportunity for reasoned dialog and the opportunities for study.

What I think has not yet been covered in our subcommittee hearings is what the reasons for these disruptive activities have been and why they have had more attention than they deserved.

What is there that exists on the college and university campuses and in higher education and in the lives of our young people which has introduced these revolutionary ideas in American college and university lives? Students have been ebullient and full of this kind of derring-do before. They generally vented it in panty raids, not in the occupation of buildings nor, as in one case in New York, with guns and in the destruction of property and in the assaults upon deans as well as each other.

Now, Mr. President, to give an idea of how real this question is, may I point out that our witness this morning, a very distinguished man, the president of the City College of the city of New York, whom I had the honor of introducing to the committee, testified that there are 20,000 students at CCNY, that 12,000 of them are full-time students, and that there are 600 faculty members. Yet, his estimate of the membership of the groups that fomented and planned the unrest and disorder at CCNY, which was very real and very dangerous and very demanding, constituted some 205, divided, to be exact, into five extremist organizations.

What I think people such as myself, on the Investigations Subcommittee, would like to do is to dig beyond the present stage of the hearings in order to try to find out what the basis for this college disruption movement is and what we can do about it in a broader way than would be indicated by this bill.

I believe the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN) has done us all a service in beginning to crystalize the issue. As we know, the public media are interested in debate. I hope that Senator McCLELLAN will forgive me if, on the very day that he introduces his bill, I join the issue, because it is the only way to make it vivid and useful to all of us. His dedication and his devotion to freedom of speech are such that I know he enjoys and would welcome another point of view, which is one I am going to state now.

So far, the subcommittee witnesses have, in the main, been police officials and subcommittee staff members who have investigated the various militant groups. We have begun to hear some college presidents. I gave an instance of it today. We have not heard, however, a great many of them, in some instances for good reason.

For example, Dr. Pusey was in the hearing room when a Harvard student testified all day long. Because the student's testimony took much longer than the chairman anticipated, Dr. Pusey could not be heard. I am confident, however, he will be heard.

The president of Cornell, an instance where the guns were brought into an occupied building, is yet to be heard. Again, he will be heard; but he has not been reached as yet.

To get the full picture, therefore, we must hear from many more people, not only from college presidents such as those who have already testified and those who will testify, but also, in my judgment, from a broad and representative range of students who attend colleges; also, from the members and staff of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, of which Dr. Milton Eisenhower is chairman; from students of the humanities and the social studies; from sociologists and psychologists; from our colleagues in the House of Representatives who have toured the campuses—to which Senator McCLELLAN has also referred; and from major student and faculty organizations, who represent the bulk of the students in the Nation's colleges and universities. We must even hear from representatives of such institutional sources which often have been the cause or the imminent, sparking cause for college disruption, such as the ROTC and defense-related corporations. Institutions such as these often have been the subject of student attack.

Until the hearing record is more complete—and it is not complete at this point—I do not think that, to quote our chairman, "our investigations have progressed sufficiently for us to begin consideration of possible remedial legislation."

May I point out that there are more grounds of agreement than difference between us, of course. I agree—and I believe every member of the committee agrees and every Member of Congress agrees—that the use or threat of force and violence, the staging of immobilizing sit-ins, the breaking up or prevention of meetings, the insults hurled upon speakers—indeed, I myself was the object of such violent insult at one affair—are not legitimate forms of dissent. I do not believe that any of us would condone such activities. Nor should such students, who like to consider themselves only dissenters, but who are obviously far more than that, be permitted to restrict the freedom and opportunity of those who do not share their views.

However, I strongly restate my conviction that neither is a primary reliance on punitive Federal legislation the effective nor the equitable manner in which to deal with this problem. I do believe—and this is the central point to me, and I am delighted that Senator McCLELLAN is present—that because the authors of reforms are themselves violent and elicit such distaste and revulsion from all of us, it means that we should not listen to what they are saying; or, if it is in the interest of our whole system of higher education and the bulk of the student bodies, that we should not do anything about it. This is not a matter of getting even or of resentment. This is a matter of men of great authority, such as ourselves, doing what needs to be done in order to handle one of the most trying, radical movements this country has ever seen.

It is my judgment that the colleges and universities themselves have the ultimate remedies for dealing successfully with serious disruptions; namely, the power of suspension and expulsion, as well as the opportunity, if they wish, to call on the courts for injunctions and the civil authorities for police assistance. Increasingly, university administrators are showing that they are beginning to have the will as well as the means to control serious disorders and to regain the initiative from the extremist members of their own communities. Most universities today are developing and revealing plans for dealing with campus disorders, drawing from a broad consensus of students, faculty, administration, and civil leaders. College officials are making these plans known to the college community and are emphasizing the fact that they intend to deal firmly with those who abuse the institution.

Much reform is resulting. Even at the City College of New York, at Columbia University, and at Cornell, where there have been the most serious disruptions, there has been the beginning of very serious and very deep reform in terms of student and faculty participation in all aspects of the higher educational process.

Mr. President, problems differ from campus to campus; the causes of disorder are not always the same, nor the resources with which to meet them. Thus, in my judgment, it is crucial that the universities and colleges be allowed to work out this matter in the way which is best suited to their particular situation. Federal legislation aimed alone at the maintenance of order on college campuses could be counterproductive and most unwise. Punitive legislation could well play into the hands of the very extremist disrupters who often are seeking exactly that in order to lend aid to their cause. These disrupters seek, through the "politics of confrontation," as they call it, to bring about a radicalization of American society and politics. We certainly cannot permit this to happen. We cannot play into their hands by reacting in the punitive and injudicious way they invite and for which they are hoping.

Indeed the subcommittee heard Prof. William Rambo, of Stanford University, who, himself, confessed to a basic bias against the student disorders, remark:

> Would the application of external pressures hasten the development of that support so badly needed—pressure, for example, through Federal legislation such as is embodied in the so-called "anti-riot" amendments? I think not. I think in fact that the University would be diverted from this effort to control internal disruption by an instinct, one natural to an academic community, to deal with what many would consider an equally threatening external interference in its business.
>
> I believe the majority of our campus community would agree that it is surely within the purview of the Congress to examine the disposition and use of federal funds in universities. I know that majority would hope that the conclusion of such an examination would be a recommendation against the future imposition of such measures as the "anti-riot" amendments. These measures would seem to arm our University adminis-

> tration with weapons most narrowly aimed. They add nothing to an authority already in existence in the University; their application would substantially undermine that essential support of our university community for the President and the Administration, and hence reduce their practical power to exercise that authority in affected matters. The positive, direct effect can only be small; the negative effect, though indirect, can be enormous.

In recent statements, many university administrators have urged Congress and State legislatures not to act punitively, not, in effect, to prejudice the institutions themselves in the power and flexibility to meet this crisis.

May I refer, for example, to the testimony of Roger W. Heyns, chancellor of the University of California at Berkeley, probably one of the toughest campuses in the United States from the point of view of this kind of problem. This is from his examination by the subcommittee on July 15, 1969:

> The Chairman. Let me ask you one other question. Is there anything, any legislation, or any action, other than appropriating money, that you think Congress can do to be helpful to administrative officials of the universities and colleges to help some of this problem?
>
> Dr. Heyns. Senator, I thought about this in connection with the same kind of question addressed to me by legislators in the State of California.
>
> I will give you the same answer that I gave them. In the State of California there was some help with respect to the trespass law that we needed and we got, but I don't believe that there is anything in the way of legislation that is needed.
>
> Mr. Chairman, I would say that if we at Berkeley fail to bring about a community that is capable of resolving its controversies without resort to violence and coercion, it will not be because of lack of laws or legislation.
>
> If I do as I am doing, devoting my professional career to the achievement of that objective and I fail, I could not claim it was because of an absence of adequate legislation.

Nathan Pusey, president of Harvard, in testimony prepared for delivery before the subcommittee:

> Nor do many of us within the universities feel, as a number of us have testified, that the problems of order with which we are confronted can be helped by legislative enactments of civil authorities . . . we are convinced that legislative enactments will not help with the larger problem. Indeed, we feel such action can only make our task more difficult by lending credence to the charge of the revolutionaries that all one can expect from existing authority is repression.

James M. Nabrit, former president of Howard University before the subcommittee:

> We have no information which should lead us to believe that outside forces or organizations or political entities are playing any role in the disturbances at Howard. I would hope universities would have an opportunity to solve these problems within the universities themselves.

President K. S. Pitzer, Stanford University before the subcommittee:

> Freedom is the essence of the university. As all of us know, it also is the heart of the democratic process. Its historic importance to the academic community accounts for the reluctance of many persons on campus to impose or support harsh penalties on those found guilty of all but the most seriously disruptive acts.

After describing voluntary steps Stanford's students and faculty have taken:

> These voluntary activities, together with the many official actions listed earlier, all point in the same direction—toward a growing sentiment on campus against disruptive acts. Obviously, these measures can provide no guarantee that such acts will not occur again. But they do provide some assurance that support for disruptive acts can be limited and that internal mechanisms can work.
>
> We have devoted much time, energy and effort to developing our own internal judicial and governance procedures in ways which will attract the widest possible support. Having made this effort, we so far have been able to seek assistance when necessary from the courts and civil authorities without destroying the same consensus. We seek to build a university community which honors ideals and rejects coercion. . . . The modern university best serves society when it functions as a center for the free discussion of ideas. It cannot long endure any repression of free thought, whether imposed from within or from without. Nor can it function as an armed camp amid warring social factions.

Most importantly, in a well-publicized report to President Nixon, a group of 22 Republican Congressmen, led by Congressman Bill Brock, of Tennessee, noted the following:

> It is clear that if violence on our campuses does not end, and if the reaction to it is on the one extreme too lax or on the other extreme too harsh and indiscriminate, the vast moderate student majority may be forced into the arms of the revolutionaries, and those few who seek to destroy the fabric of higher education will have succeeded.

In their recommendations, the Congressmen called for "no repressive legislation" and stated:

> In our opinion, the fundamental responsibility for order and conduct on the campus lies with the university community.

If there is to be any kind of Federal legislation it should have two objectives: first, it should be concerned not only with the symptoms but also with the causes of campus disorder; and, second, it should seek to stimulate the universities and colleges themselves to take the desired action suited to their particular problems and resources, rather than impose standards and remedies upon them which only have a threatening effect. And lest there be confusion, I mean by "desired action," not only to provide for the maintenance of order, but also to undertake to reform themselves. For, the most effective way to deal with this problem is by mobilizing the majority of the faculties and student bodies in each of these university communities to support the democratic processes of peaceful and nonviolent change.

If legislation be needed at all it should require universities and colleges to provide for change as well as for order and should preserve that autonomy and individuality of each academic institution which is crucial to the academic freedom which we so cherish.

With existing State laws on civil disturbances and criminal trespass; with the injunctive relief available and, in many cases, already exercised by universities; with a full range of laws already applicable to riots, building seizures and related conduct, new Federal statutes would add little to our capacity to deter and control campus disorders were we to provide additional Federal criminal penalties.

As the Republican Congressmen noted, this problem is "far deeper and far more urgent than most realize." However, it must be emphasized, as Senator McClellan has himself done, that 98 percent of the students are thoughtful, highly motivated, and idealistic young men and women who seek to move and change things peaceably. But, often, they are frustrated by the institutions' unwillingness to listen and to discuss problems, by the lack of communication in many, if not most, universities and colleges.

> There is on the campus today—

Said the Congressman—

> a new awareness of potential student power and the emergence of a large group, probably the vast majority of student leaders and a substantial number of intelligent, concerned and perplexed young people, which has genuine concern over what it feels is the difference between the promise and performance of America.

Despite the great affluence of our society, cynicism and frustration characterize much of the present student generation, including its most intelligent, responsible and sensitive elements—frustration over the Vietnam war and the inequities of the present draft system, frustration over the crisis of our cities, racial injustice and the lack of relevance of their own lives and the lives of the universities they attend to the problems of the communities that surround the campuses. In this situation, the fury of a revolutionary student vanguard who question American society has evoked some sympathy among the less militant, but not less concerned, students.

To quote the eloquent and distressing resignation statement of Dr. Buell Gallagher, the distinguished former president of the City College of New York:

> The frustrations spawned by a society which has inverted its values and reversed its priorities, putting war ahead of human wellbeing and preferring privilege to justice—these frustrations pushed the on-coming college generation into an activism which overreaches immediately attainable goals. The resulting strains on the academic community are evident . . ."

Like my colleague from Arkansas, I do not want any part of the 98 percent of the students to whom I referred to fall into the arms of the militants and extremists, who comprise the other 2 percent. Those of us who have had experience with these disruptions on the campuses—and they have occurred in my State as frequently and as intensely as anywhere with the possible exception of Berkeley—know that this could happen. We have found that where there is a "bust," as the kids call it—that is, when the police move into the campus to clear a building or take other action that I admit may be necessary when no other way is possible—it can have the effect of rallying much greater numbers of the students to the side of the disrupters than before. That is the kind of confron-

XUM

tation they seek, but that does not mean we should not follow that course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PACKWOOD in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think punitive legislation on the Federal level can very well have the same effect on students as the "bust" to which I referred. This is not to say the measure which the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. MCCLELLAN) proposed will or will not have this effect, but it will certainly give us the opportunity to appraise the situation. I do not believe a case has been made for Federal legislation.

In this situation now confronting our campuses we in the Congress can take action. We can and must address ourselves to the major problems of our society with a sense of urgency and immediacy. We must bring the war in Vietnam to a conclusion and begin the process of reallocating some national resources away primarily from military uses to correcting hunger, poverty and other social inequities, and to providing education and health.

As the hearings of the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee continues, we should keep before us the possibility that no Federal legislation is desirable. This has been the conclusion of our colleagues on the House Committee on Education and Labor.

On the other hand, we should also bear in mind that these hearings could result, for example, in legislation which would require colleges and universities to file information concerning their policies and procedures, not only for the maintenance of order, but also for the preservation of academic freedom, the stimulation of innovation, the improvement of communication, and the participation of students and faculty in the university's governance and mission.

Other reforms which we should consider include the enactment of new programs for strengthening the capacity of colleges and universities to enlarge contact with and involvement in the communities around them. This includes assuring all disadvantaged youth a higher education opportunity, establishing meaningful youth advisory procedures throughout our society and institutions of government, and, of course, lowering the voting age to 18.

The problem of student unrest and disorder requires firmness and, at times, punitive action. Our colleges and universities need order if they are to carry out their mission and if academic freedoms are to be preserved. But firmness and order, by themselves, are not enough. They will bring neither peace nor progress to our campuses or to our society. They must be combined with new opportunities for participation of students and of change and innovation. There must be new institutions and arrangements which will build into our colleges and universities the opportunity for a continual process of reform and responsiveness to all the members of the academic community, including students.

That is the response which is demanded of us. Until we are prepared to act in such a balanced and judicious manner, we had best not act at all.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator to refer to some witnesses?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have no doubt that the chairman will be more than reasonable in connection with any witnesses we might want.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It was not a matter of reason. I wanted to explain that I wrote to each member of the committee some time ago when we were hearing the matter of riots generally and asked for suggested witnesses, whose attendance we might procure, psychologists, and so forth.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as I recall, the Senator gave us two names, one of which was Mayor Lindsay and the other was Dr. Clarke. I wish to advise the Senator that they were both invited at that time. Dr. Clarke first accepted but then said that he could not come. Mayor Lindsay said he was involved in a campaign at that time, and it was not convenient for him to come. The committee will still hear either of them at any time that it can be arranged. I am not trying not to hear any of them.

Mr. JAVITS. I think it would scale down the level of this discussion if I engaged in any colloquy with the chairman which indicated any doubt in my mind that he did call witnesses.

I might point out to the chairman, in fairness to myself, that it was suggested we call Milton Eisenhower, the Executive Director of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence to deal with this question of violence. At that time the Chair felt—he is running the hearings and I have no quarrel with that—he would rather hear the testimony of the police officials, the committee staffs, and at least some of the college presidents, before hearing other witnesses.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does not the Senator agree with me that if we are going to have those officials heard, we should first make the record? I think that this would be the logical way to do it. But I have no objection to bringing them in out of order, if the Senator wants to do that, but we should, I think, get in all the facts before we hear opinions as to how to deal with those facts. The Senator says the bill is premature. I think opinion witnesses now would be premature.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not agree, but the Senator is running the hearings.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not think I agree with that. I am running the hearings, of course, in a sense. But that term might imply——

Mr. JAVITS. No, no.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am the chairman, but I try to consult with my committee members.

Mr. JAVITS. I respect that. I respect the fact that the Chair is presenting his case in a certain way in which he feels it is best presented. I personally would have opposed it. I had hoped that we could have called the members of this Commission to testify much sooner than we now apparently will be. I made that clear to the Chair, but as I said a minute ago, I hope we may continue to discuss this issue of campus disorder on a high level. I would ask the chairman, under the circumstances, to consider calling these officials of the Commission once more, I think it will really help the hearings.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I believe we have called some. How many have we heard? Does the Senator from Illinois recall? I do recall we called one that the Senator from Illinois was interested in. I believe he was a doctor of psychology.

Mr. PERCY. I do not recall that one.

Mr. JAVITS. I would hope that at an early date we could call both the national commission, Congressman BILL BROCK, and some other Representatives who actually investigated the college campuses.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT 11 A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR CRANSTON TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, immediately following the prayer and the disposition of the Journal tomorrow morning, the distinguished junior Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) be recognized for 1 hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MURPHY TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) be recognized for 30 minutes tomorrow following the remarks of the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2677—INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDENT DISTURBANCES ACT OF 1969

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have only one or two other comments and I will be ready to yield. I just want to assure the Senators how present on this committee that its chairman will consider the calling and will call any witness that any member of the committee wants.

I say this with only one limitation. I reserve the right not to call witnesses if I believe we would only be calling in militants solely to give them a forum to

XUM

debase the Nation. I will not participate in that sort of hearing. Any witness who can make a contribution to the hearings I will be more than happy to call.

As I said to my good friend from Illinois a moment ago when we were in conversation, when you are the chairman of a committee you realizes what the problems are. Others perhaps do not fully appreciate these problems. I do as much as I can to accommodate all of the membership. For example, as soon as I could get the bill finalized I submitted copies of it to the membership of the Criminal Laws and the Investigations Subcommittees so that they could have an opportunity to look it over. I did not generally circulate it. What I did is a courtesy that is always required. So far as I am concerned, I have always tried to work harmoniously and considerately with everyone. I always try to do that.

With respect to what the Senator terms our differences, although we have the same desire to control these disturbances, I again direct my attention to the small number of militants, Dr. Copeland of the College of the City of New York, I believe, this morning indicated only about 200 of these hard-core militants had succeeded more than once in disrupting that institution, taking over half of it at one time.

And I add that whatever are the causes, whatever are the conditions that prevail in America today, I do not think that this sort of activity is justified, and I do not think it should be tolerated, in fairness to the overwhelmingly large number of students who want to get an education.

If—I do not say it is—I may have opinions about it—but if additional laws are needed or any new legislation can be passed by Congress that will strengthen the hands of the college administrators who have the primary responsibility, I want to see to it that such legislation is enacted.

Finally, let me say with respect to the ultimate causes, if poverty is such a cause—and for the moment, let us assume that it is—if we have to tolerate militants, disruptors, and destroyers, from now until the time that poverty is eliminated from this great land of ours, then only God knows for how many years this country is in for turmoil and revolution.

Mr. JAVITS. It is a question of how best to deal with it. It is my judgment that we are not dealing with a simplistic equation of 205 militants against 20,000 students. Militants attract to them a constituency, too. I want to get at the basis of this issue as well as the Senator does. It does not mean that we have to wait until poverty is eliminated. It does mean that there are reforms of institutions on the campuses of this land which are being made. The answer is, they are being made. They were made at Columbia, and the most of the difficulties have stopped there. The same goes for CCNY—the very university that Dr. Copeland testified about. They are being made elsewhere, at Berkeley, Stanford, and other places.

The question is: Shall we allow them to be made, or shall we leave it to the discretion of the militants to initiate actions because we have too simple a view of the situation at the Federal level? It is not a question of enforcing the law, but enforcing the law intelligently. We will never have enough policemen, or Army, Navy, and Air Force to merely enforce the law if enough people are against it. Therefore, I want the biggest constituency behind me when I try to enforce a law intelligently. I do not want to concede it to the militants.

Mr. PERCY. While the chairman is still in the Chamber, I would like to express a sympathetic view toward his desire not to have the dignity of the Senate hearings abused by someone who, obviously by his own record of past actions and words, designs to do only one thing; namely, to destroy in every way he conceivably can this form of government and the institutions which have made this country great. We do not want the great forum of a Senate hearing to be used for that purpose.

However, let me comment that I was pleased to hear the chairman say he would like to have any witnesses called who can make an intelligent analysis for us of the situation as to what is transpiring and going on. For these reasons, I have urged and am pleased the chairman has accepted the suggestion to hear Representative Brock and the group that he would select from the other body who have visited 50 campuses recently and who spent an hour and a half with the President of the United States and who made their special report to him and who, I think, have a unique opportunity to provide intelligence to us because they see the problem as lawmakers. They have talked with administrators and they have talked with the students, and before I could pass judgment on any piece of legislation, I would need to have the intelligence that I could get from that group of highly responsible men who are deeply concerned about the direction the country is taking, and who are also deeply concerned about the responsibilities that Congress has.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PERCY. May I make one further suggestion? Then I shall be very happy to yield. I would suggest, thinking about who in the country have not been called who could give us guidance, that we could call Dr. Ed Levy, of the University of Chicago, to come. Recently a news magazine cited his having handled the riots and demonstrations at the University of Chicago in such a way as to call for the commendation of academicians across the country, as well as observers of this type of disturbers.

He had to deal with hard-core militants. He had to deal with those from the outside who were seeking to destroy the university and who were desirous of seeking to contribute to the destruction of American society. He was also faced with the great problem of keeping separate that group from the hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of students who were perhaps disillusioned and disappointed at the response of the so-called establishment. It was his job to handle that situation in such a way that he did not thrust these moderate, but constructive, discontents into the hands of the very militants whose intent and purpose he was certainly aware of. He handled that problem with great skill and patience. I think he would make a fine witness to appear before the committee.

Mr. JAVITS. So would Morris Abrams, of Brandeis University, who had exactly the same experience.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from New York is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have no objection to these suggestions. Nevertheless I repeat that it is not always possible to schedule each of these hearings and still carry on our other duties. But I have been present at all of the hearings. Other Senators engaged in this colloquy have not been able to attend much of the time, in spite of the fact that we scheduled them and worked them out as best we could. I can understand that, but I have to be practical. I recognize that my colleagues are trying to be helpful in making these suggestions, and I will cooperate with them. I always have.

I understand that the Senator thinks this bill is premature, and perhaps it is. But I do not think so. I think Congress ought to have something before it. I have letters—so do other Senators—asking, "What are you going to do about these disturbances?" I do not know what we are going to do about them, but I, for one, am going to hold hearings on this suggested legislation that I have introduced with the idea of revising the proposed legislation as testimony indicates it should be revised. And I am going to take some action, as I have sought to take action in this proposed legislation. I hope other Senators will introduce other legislation to carry out their ideas as to what should be done, or will join me in helping to improve mine. Let us act in this field and make a judgment where legislation is needed. If our judgment that legislation is needed is wrong, then Congress can reject it.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I know the chairman will consider recommendations from any member of the committee, and that includes specifically the minority members. I have had a longstanding understanding with the chairman that the minority would always have the full right to call witnesses before the committee as we so indicate. I am sure that understanding will be carried out. It has never been violated in the past.

While understandably one captain of the team has to schedule the order of witnesses, we can urge him, if we think it advisable, to move the scheduling of one witness forward a little or back a little. As far as calling our witnesses is concerned, we will have no trouble in that, I will assure the Senator. I have served with the chairman of the subcommittee much longer than have the two Senators who have come on the com-

XUM

mittee more recently. I do not think they have had any adverse experience in that period of service on the committee in that regard. I have not had, prior to that or since. I can assure the Senators that that kind of procedure will be followed.

May I say, regarding the question of whether the legislation is premature or not, I do not think it is premature because I think it is well to have a legislative purpose for a committee investigation hearing whenever we can. I joined the chairman in support of the bill, not because I favor every single passage, not because I think it covers every item which should be covered, but because I think it would be highly constructive to have a legislative proposal in order to hear people like Dr. Levy and Dr. Abrams, and the others mentioned, make their suggestions for addenda or deletions. Certainly, the bill can be expanded or changed.

I would certainly agree with the Senator from New York if he says it is premature for us to enact legislation. This is not the final advice of the committee in that regard. It is a start. It recognizes that the Federal Government has an obligation in this area. It is definitely not premature to have placed before the committee and before the Senate some specific proposals in bill form on which we can take testimony and seek counsel.

Some of the testimony indicates that some of the disturbances were perpetrated by people on the Federal payroll, in the OEO, and elsewhere. Whatever the situation is, it seems to me the Federal Government cannot, like Pontius Pilate, wash its hands and say we have no responsibility at all.

I am not sure the suggestions incorporated in the bill, in which I have joined as a cosponsor, will at the end be what Congress decides or what our committee decides should be done; but I think it is good to have some expressions of opinion from the kind of witnesses that have been suggested, so they can give us their opinions as to whether they feel this legislation is appropriate and what changes should be made in that connection.

In the end, I think Congress is likely to enact some legislation. We saw what happened on the other side of the Capitol. For awhile, it looked like the other body was going to rush into legislation which, in my judgment, was ill-advised, because it sought to punish the innocent as well as the guilty. It now seems to be in a state of hiatus, but from what my colleagues there tell me, the desire to have some legislation is rampant in the Congress, and it certainly is present in the House. We also see many indications of it in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 additional minutes of the Senator from New York have expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Unless we and the committee take some action in saying, "We think this is acceptable" or "This is undesirable. Here is something we are pondering, Mr. University President. What do you think about it?" we are likely to be plagued with a plethora of suggestions, as they were on the other side of the Capitol, many of which will not have had the benefit of hearings.

I am sure the Senator from New York is desirous of our having some legislative purpose in our hearings, when we can. It does not mean that this proposed legislation is the final answer, take it or leave it; but here are some suggestions, which are pretty moderate, which carefully and clearly avoid the temptation to try to punish the institution or the innocent members of the student body for the errors of the guilty. This legislation is directed specifically against those who are the disrupting influence.

So I think, with a little patience and with a little persistence, we are going to continue to work toward a constructive goal.

I believe the suggestions which have been made by our esteemed colleagues from New York and Illinois will be helpful in this connection.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. He has certainly tried to be most fair, as the ranking minority member.

I would like to conclude by saying that, just as the issue was raised in the other body between those who thought legislation was desirable and those who did not, I thought the issue should be joined here. That is what I have tried to do, in terms of legislative determination. It is also a legislative determination to say that any Federal legislation is unwise.

So far, I think that is where the burden of the evidence lies. I think it is very useful that the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) have done what they think is right, and I have done what I think is right. I think that will help the hearings, and be more meaningful to the country.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am pleased to be a sponsor of the proposed legislation and I would like to associate myself with the remarks just made by the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, which has long been studying riots, civil and criminal disturbances and disruptions on college campuses.

In fact, the U.S. Senate recognized the grave national crisis created by the urban rioting in voting unanimously on August 11, 1967, to examine these matters thoroughly, including their immediate and longstanding causes. This task was given to the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, the inquiry was undertaken immediately, and the hearings began on November 1, 1967.

The initial undertaking included study of the disturbances which erupted in the cities of Nashville, Tenn., and Houston, Tex., in 1967. The subcommittee made a detailed investigation into the activities of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—SNCC—at both Fisk University and Tennessee A. & I., in Nashville, and at Texas Southern University—TSU—in Houston. We did not realize then that our inquiry would be a forerunner to our current investigation of disturbances on college and university campuses that have occurred so frequently in 1968–69.

In our earlier hearings, the subcommittee learned that there were 166 riots and major civil disturbances that occurred in our Nation's cities from 1965 through the middle of 1968. A recent subcommittee staff study, which has become a part of the record of our hearings, indicates that there were 471 disturbances at 211 universities and colleges throughout the country during a period from October of 1967 through May of 1969. A simple comparison of these figures alone should indicate to the unsuspecting, or to the uninformed, that we have a very serious matter before us in considering the import and effects of the relatively recent unrest and disorder that has come to our Nation's great universities and colleges.

It is not my purpose to cry alarm unnecessarily, but I feel that the record of the hearings, with particular emphasis on that portion pertaining to our schools of higher learning, contains startling disclosures about militant organizations throughout the country which are dedicated to the use of violence in gaining their goals and objectives. In using the word, "militant," I am referring to those individuals, or groups, who, by their own proclamations and avowals state that they intend to attain their ends "by the use of any means necessary."

These organizations loudly proclaim their dedication to revolution in the United States, the destruction of our system of government, and the replacement of the ideals and principles of our republic with the philosophy and methods that characterize and dominate the societies of Red China, Cuba, and the Soviet Union and its satellites. They make no attempt to disguise or cover up their intentions. The testimony of our hearings, largely based upon documentary evidence which comes directly from the public speeches, newspapers, magazines and other propaganda devices of these organizations, is replete with such disclosures. Whatever factional loyalties they hold, they seem to have one theme in common—their dedication to the overthrow of what they call "the capitalist and imperialist" Government of the United States. I am using their words which flow from their printing presses in great abundance. The printed material states their intentions over and over again, and the record of our hearings so indicates.

The organizations that I refer to are the Students for a Democratic Society—SDS—the Black Panther Party—BPP—with its affiliates under many names such as the Black Student Union—BSU—and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—SNCC. Scarcely an institution which has had a campus disturbance has not been affected by one or more of these organizations.

All of them have limited hard-core memberships; for example, SDS has a

basic national membership between 6,000 and 8,000—not all of whom are students, I might add. The same is true of the Black Panthers, who are estimated to number about 4,000 nationally. However, both organizations, through adroit exploitation of issues, have managed to attract many times their number in "sympathetic understanding" to participate in campus disturbances.

Examination of chronological events bears out this conclusion. For instance, these organizations were very successful in creating disorder in a relatively few scattered demonstrations in 1967. However, they quickly discovered that their tactics of exploiting issues without serious intent to resolve them frequently led to violence, complete disruption of the orderly processes of the institution involved and, more importantly and more often than not, to capitulation by the college administrators. Under these circumstances, initial successes led them to more intensified efforts and to the spread of their influence and support on hundreds of college campuses, until, during the 1968–69 academic year, there were almost daily outbreaks of rioting and violence on campuses all across the Nation.

It is clear from testimony in our hearings that they owed much of their success initially to several factors other than the direct results of their own aggressiveness, use of force, and skill in provocation. Their efforts generally were assisted and strengthened in impact by: First, the failure of college administrators to take swift and certain action against criminal tactics and strategies; second, the intimidation of college faculties and administrations as a result of threats and actual physical violence, vandalism, and destruction; third, the capitulation of persons in authority to outrageous demands made under conditions of existing violence, and fourth, the failure of administrators and faculties to impose justified penalties:

I realize that there is every indication that these destructive activities are carried out by only 2 percent of the student body of our colleges and universities. However, 2 percent of an estimated 7.5 million students does amount to some 187,500 persons, and if this represents the number of "rebels," as Adm. Hyman Rickover called them while testifying before a Special House Subcommittee on Education recently, then this becomes a significant statistic. And I also recall the words of Al Capp, noted American cartoonist, who told our subcommittee:

> From my observations, not more than two percent of the student body on even our most turbulent campuses have been infected by such men, but a two percent infection of any body can eventually destroy it all, if it isn't checked.

I think it should also be noted that these radicals have hoodwinked countless numbers of mature, respectable and law-abiding citizens—some at high levels in the professions, communications media, and government—into apologizing for them and condoning their violence in the erroneous belief that the revolutionaries are fighting for individual freedom and the right to self-determination.

Our hearing record shows that when students seize college buildings with force of arms, physically mistreat faculty members and other students, fight with police, destroy property and commit other types of vandalism, their apologists often condone and justify the criminal actions. Their defenders ignore the frequent proclamations that the overthrow of this society and its institutions is the ultimate goal of the disrupters; instead, they advocate capitulation to unreasonable and destructive demands which are arrogantly termed "nonnegotiable," they call for permissiveness in college administrative policies, and promote amnesty for ringleaders of violence and crime.

The faculty is not always without fault. Our hearings have shown that faculty activities at the time of a campus disturbance have ranged from silent acquiescence, through participation as sympathizers, to actual leadership in some of the disorders. Many college instructors, of course, have been very much opposed to campus disruptions of any kind, but unfortunately too few of them have spoken up when the campus has been taken over. Herbert Ellingwood, legal affairs secretary to the Governor of California, in his appearance before the subcommittee explained it this way:

> What is the role of the faculty in all of that? It is becoming increasingly apparent that the University is not just a victim of student militancy.
>
> Overt faculty involvement in the organization of student radicals evidences faculty complicity rather than faculty permissiveness.
>
> Although academic achievement is of paramount importance, high moral character must be of equal concern. The young learn not only by exposure to fact and interpretation but also in great part by good example. Academic freedom cannot become a disguise for unprofessional conduct, and tenure cannot be tolerated as a device for the unqualified or irresponsible professor.

What has been the result of these campus disorders to date? What has it all gained? What are the losses?

Dr. Dwight L. Dumond, professor emeritus of history at the University of Michigan and a noted liberal pioneer in the struggle for freedom of the blacks in America, asked these identical questions in a lengthy article in the Sunday Star of May 4, 1969. Dr. Dumond concluded as follows:

> The militants are not progressives, not liberals. They are reactionaries of the most extreme sort. They seek to destroy, not to build, and they are achieving little except chaos and retardation.

Dr. Dumond indicates that the following conditions have resulted and I feel, for the most part, that I must agree with him. Dr. Dumond says:

> Those responsible have:
>
> (1) Destroyed academic freedom.
>
> (2) Betrayed the educational process by seeking objectives through ultimatums, threats of force, and destruction of property.
>
> (3) Infringed upon the rights of others to improve their talents and skills.
>
> (4) Greatly retarded understanding and peace between people of different colors by demanding separation instead of integration.
>
> (5) Fostered in their own minds and others a false idea of achievement, inculcating the idea that the road to progress is obstruction, destruction, threats of fear.
>
> (6) Allowed themselves to resort to mob action, planned and well coordinated, until no one knows whether the upheaval, with its overtones of racism, portends social revolution or war; or whether the disorders are evidence of smoldering emotions or first steps in a specific program of world-wide revolution.
>
> (7) Insured a level of mediocrity in the education of blacks and whites alike by demands for adoption of "pass-fail," abolition of requirements for admission and graduating, and appointment of professors on other bases than quality.
>
> (8) Turned distinguished scholars and administrators away in disgust.

What are the probabilities that we have seen the end of these campus disruptions? Unfortunately, the testimony and the documentary evidence in the record give us no basis for optimistic predictions that the worst is over, that violence in our institutions of higher education has been checked, and that those responsible for disruptions will be generally deterred from renewing and accelerating them when schools open in the fall. I hope I am wrong. However, I quote the testimony of Al Capp:

> After my (campus) lectures, I am usually visited in my living quarters by small delegations of activists, and militants. They have better manners, in small groups in motel sitting rooms, than when they form mobs in auditoriums, and I don't mind their visits much except that after they leave, I need air.
>
> At these sessions, they tell me, with childish frankness, of their plans for the future.
>
> They learned that their greatest asset is the publicity given them by TV and their sympathetic treatment by TV commentators. They learned a lot—and they are learning a lot today—from the television handling of their takeover of the "People's Park" at Berkeley.
>
> They appropriated a million dollars of the university's property, and when they were handled as firmly by the police as another mob of bandits who stole a million—the Brink's gang—the slobbering over them by TV softened much of the more soft-headed public into slobbering over them, too.
>
> When the Brink's bunch stole a million, they were called bandits, when this bunch stole a million in property, they are called idealists.
>
> The lesson wasn't lost on them. They know the value of TV. And so come this fall, they are going to try to take it over. New objective, but same methods.
>
> They have already had one moderately successful dress rehearsal; namely, the takeover—for an hour or so—of Channel 13 in New York last year. They rushed the studio, roughed up the staff, demolished the equipment, and screamed filth into the transmitters.
>
> They feel that they have even a more persuasive case for their right to take over TV than universities and parks. They know that TV is the people's property, returnable to the people, at the demand of the people, and they are the people who are going to demand it, in the robut style that TV has so often sympathized with—new objective, but same methods—when they demanded it from other institutions.

If Mr. Capp is correct, that the revolutionaries are going to attempt to take over the television medium, then God help our universities and colleges which so obviously fit into their disruptive and destructive programs.

What can be done about it? I think that the bill proposed by our distinguished subcommittee chairman, Senator

XUM

John L. McClellan, is a step in the right direction. Senator McClellan has explained the provisions of the bill in some detail and so I will not attempt to duplicate his efforts here. However, there are some parts of this proposed legislation which seem extremely important and I will run through them briefly.

First. Federally assisted institutions of higher learning would be protected against the threefold prohibitions of, first, appropriations of property; second, disruption of programs, and third, obstruction of the restoration of order during disturbances.

Second. The criminal penalties for the unaggravated violation of any of the above provisions, which are directed primarily at students and cooperative faculty members, upon being charged and convicted, would range from those applied generally for "petty offenses" to those applied for misdemeanors, with the right of a person under 21 years of age at the time of the offense to have the violations expunged from his record to protect his civil rights more fully. Of course, if a person was involved in a situation in which bodily injury, or death, resulted, then such person, if so charged and so convicted, would incur a substantially more severe sentence.

Third. Any person, not a member of the faculty or of the student body of the particular school then being disrupted, but who used any facility of interstate commerce and thereafter engages in, or endeavors to engage in, any conduct in violation of the threefold prohibition, upon being so charged and convicted, could be fined $5,000 or imprisoned for a maximum period of 5 years. Similarly, if bodily injury or death has resulted from the incident, the resulting sentence would be considerably more severe.

Fourth. For civil remedies that would be available under this proposed statute, the appropriate U.S. district court could be utilized for the restraint or prevention of a violation of the threefold prohibition through the use of the injunctive process, if requested by the particular school's administrators, faculty members, or students.

Fifth. A Federal civil cause of action, to the maximum extent of $5,000 for each individual, could result against any person charged and convicted of the violation of any of the threefold prohibitions.

There is no mention in this bill of cutting off Federal funds from students who create campus disturbances or from particular schools involved. I am willing to accept the lack of such a proposal at this time. However, I have a deep concern over the use of Federal funds by an institution of higher learning which allows its rampaging students to become a disruptive influence to that institution. This is always at the expense of other students who are interested in attending that school to get an education. I am particularly disturbed if the disruptive students are recipients of Federal grants allowed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Defense, or the National Science Foundation. I will reserve further judgment for the moment, but I feel that the American taxpayer has every right to know, and expects to know, whether his hard-earned dollars are being siphoned in that fashion. I believe the situation would be intolerable if those students are active members of the Students for a Democratic Society, the Black Panther Party, or their affiliates, whose avowed common purpose is the overthrow of our present form of government.

Mr. President, I recognize that there is substance to the cries of our youthful students that some changes must be made. Colleges and universities may have become too impersonal, or their curriculums may be outmoded. New fields of study may be necessary; new approaches to traditional academic disciplines may be desirable, and certainly new or amended policies of administration and supervision should be considered. However, I again refer to the word of Dr. Dwight L. Dumond:

> Those things which militants among the students want are not within the province of anyone to give. The structure of a university cannot be changed overnight, in all probability should not be changed at all.
>
> Teaching methods, the content of admission requirements, the intellectual attainments which justify conferring degrees—all of these elements in the educational process are constantly under scrutiny and revision by college faculties. *There is always intellectual ferment, though not always change, because change does not always denote progress.*

Dr. Dumond made another very provocative statement when he concluded his article:

> It takes 100 years to build a university faculty of distinguished scholars, even longer to establish for it a reputation which merits the full support and affection of the people.
>
> Schools like Harvard and Michigan and California belong to the world. They are the most precious institutions of a people's culture, reaching far into the distant past and on into an endless future. *They can be destroyed in a day, and I wonder how close it is.* . . .

Mr. President, I have warm feelings of affection and admiration for the great universities and colleges of our country. They provide the finest system of higher education the world has ever known. I also respect, admire and cherish the youth of our Nation. All my colleagues, I am sure, share my sentiments. Because of my feelings, I am deeply concerned about the future of these great institutions and about the welfare of the young people who attend them. For these reasons, I have added my name as a sponsor of the measure under discussion, and I strongly urge the Congress to give it close and careful attention.

CURRENT VIETNAM STATISTICS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in view of the many statistics that have been released, I have asked the Department of Defense to provide me with statistics regarding the number of U.S. soldiers, sailors, marines, and Air Force personnel who have been sent to Vietnam since the Midway Conference.

The figures supplied to me are as follows:

The Army has sent, from June 8 to July 10, 37,658.

The Navy, from June 8 to July 14, has sent 2,888.

The Air Force, from June 9 to July 10, has sent 3,489.

The Marines, from June 9 to July 12, have sent 7,672.

That represents a total for the various forces, with regard to the stated dates, of 51,707.

I have also asked the Department of Defense to supply me figures with respect to casualties. These statistics now show that we have suffered more than 50,000 casualties since the inauguration of President Nixon.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION ANNOUNCES NEW POLICY FOR LICENSING COMMERCIAL ATOMIC POWERPLANTS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on a very important announcement being released today by the Atomic Energy Commission.

It may not be generally known that every one of the commercial atomic electric powerplants licensed in the United States to date has been licensed under section 104(b) of the Atomic Energy Act, which means that they are licensed under the medical therapy and research provisions of the law.

This has had the effect of keeping them out from under the antitrust laws. It has also had the effect of causing every municipal system, every cooperative system, and a great many small private power systems to fear that, with these giant generating plants being owned by a few companies, the time will come when they will be discriminated against as to price, or have their power shut off, and, in effect, be put out of business.

This announcement today, to the effect that by June 30, 1970, the Atomic Energy Commission intends to initiate public rulemaking proceedings, means that they will license these plants under that provision of the law, which will have the effect of putting them under the antitrust laws, and will prevent unfair discrimination against public and cooperative distribution systems.

I read one paragraph of the release:

> The Atomic Energy Act provides that whenever the Commission has made a finding that any type of reactor has been sufficiently developed to be of practical value for industrial or commercial purposes, the Commission may thereafter issue licenses for facilities of such type under Section 103 of the Act. Licenses for nuclear power reactors built to date have been issued under Section 104b., which authorizes the licensing of nuclear facilities involved in the conduct of research and development activities leading to the demonstration of the practical value of such facilities for industrial or commercial purposes.

As I have just stated, licensing under this section has the effect of keeping the giant powerplants out from under the antitrust laws, provided things have gone as they hoped.

I read further as to what this new rulemaking proceeding will provide:

> A finding of practical value, in addition to requiring that only Section 103 licenses

XUM

be issued thereafter for the reactor type or types covered, would have the following principal legal consequences:

1. The proposed issuance of a Section 103 license must be reported to the Attorney General for an advisory opinion on antitrust aspects.

2. Preference must be given to applications for power reactors which will be located in high cost power areas in the United States if there are conflicting applications for a limited opportunity for such licenses. Where there are such conflicting applications, those submitted by public or cooperative bodies must be given preferred consideration.

3. Notice of application must be published for four consecutive weeks in the Federal Register and notice must be given to various regulatory agencies, and others.

4. Charges for use of source and special nuclear material may not be waived by the Commission for a Section 103 licensee and charges must be made for consumption of nuclear fuel.

This means they not only cannot be licensed in such a way as in the past, so as to keep them out from under the antitrust laws, but that the Government will be prohibited from furnishing them free fuel with which to produce the energy.

Mr. President, some of us have been trying for some time, with emphasis on the last 2 or 3 years, to get the law changed so as to provide for licensing these plants in the manner in which the Atomic Energy Commission now says it intends to do it. But I say that, much as we are pleased with the announcement by the Atomic Energy Commission, I, for one, do not regard it as taking the place of legislation on the books. This year a bill has been introduced by the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), of which I am a cosponsor, which would write this proposal into the law itself, where it properly belongs. I understand that the bill now has priority before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and that it will be considered in the not-too-distant future. It is my earnest hope that, in spite of the gratitude we may have for the Atomic Energy Commission's decision to properly license these great commercial atomic powerplants under a rule, promulgated by the Commission, they should also be required to license them under the law; and therefore, I hope that the bill sponsored by the Senator from New Mexico and myself may be considered and passed by Congress at an early date, so that there will be no future complaint as to the handling of this licensing of atomic power plants.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the entire news release of the Atomic Energy Commission and the bill (S. 212) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AEC Plans Public Rulemaking Consideration on Finding of Practical Value for Certain Types of Power Reactors

The Atomic Energy Commission announced today that it intends to initiate a public rule making proceeding by June 30, 1970, to consider whether a finding of practical value, within the meaning of Section 102 of the Atomic Energy Act, should be made for some type or types of light water nuclear power reactors.

The Commission's intention to initiate a practical value rule making proceeding during 1970 was stated by Government counsel to the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit on June 26, 1969, in the course of oral argument on appeals from AEC licensing actions granting provisional construction permits to the Duke Power Company, the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation and the Philadelphia Electric Company. The announcement today makes more specific the timing for Commission commencement of the of the rule making proceeding.

The Atomic Energy Act provides that whenever the Commission has made a finding that any type of reactor has been sufficiently developed to be of practical value for industrial or commercial purposes, the Commission may thereafter issue licenses for facilities of such type under Section 103 of the Act. Licenses for nuclear power reactors built to date have been issued under Section 104b., which authorizes the licensing of nuclear facilities involved in the conduct of research and development activities leading to the demonstration of the practical value of such facilities for industrial or commercial purposes.

The Commission has considered whether a finding of practical value should be made on two previous occasions. In a public rule making proceeding which culminated in a Determination dated December 29, 1965, the Commission concluded that such a finding could not be made on the basis of cost information limited to the prototype and noncompetitive nuclear power reactors then in operation. The Commission's position is summarized in the following quotation from that Determination:

"While certain economic evaluations governing the award of contracts for scaled-up plants not involving Government assistance provide strong indications that economic competitiveness will be achieved, we have decided to exercise our discretion to await a reliable estimate of the economics based upon a demonstration of the technology and plant performance. Pending the completion of scaled-up plants, and the information to be obtained from their operation. and in light of the legislative history, the Commission has determined that there has not yet been sufficient demonstration of the cost of construction and operation of light water, nuclear electric plants to warrant making a statutory finding that any types of such facilities have been sufficiently developed to be of practical value within the meaning of section 102 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended."

The 1965 Determination and its bases were reaffirmed by the Commission on December 21, 1966, in a denial of a petition for rule making filed by the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., the National Coal Association and the United Mine Workers of America.

The Commission's intention to initiate rule making reconsideration of the practical value question before the end of the first half of 1970 is based on its expectation that sufficient information as to the cost of construction and operation of certain types of larger sized light water reactors will then be available to provide a sound basis, with reasonable extrapolation, for a determination as to whether such types of reactors are sufficiently developed to be of practical value within the meaning of Section 102 of the Act.

The Commission has previously stated that it also intends to consider, in a further rule making proceeding, whether to change its present regulations (10 CFR §§ 50.24 and 50.56) so that any operating license for a facility of the type for which a finding of practical value has been made would be issued under Section 103 of the Act, even though the construction permit for the facility may have been issued under Section 104 b. A public rule making proceeding to consider such a change will also be initiated by June 30, 1970.

A finding of practical value, in addition to requiring that only Section 103 licenses be issued thereafter for the reactor type or types covered, would have the following principal legal consequences:

1. The proposed issuance of a Section 103 license *must be reported* to the Attorney General for an advisory opinion on antitrust aspects.

2. Preference must be given to applications for power reactors which will be located in high cost power areas in the United States if there are conflicting applications for a limited opportunity for such licenses. Where there are such conflicting applications, *those submitted by public or cooperative bodies must be given preferred consideration*.

3. Notice of application must be published for four consecutive weeks in the Federal Register and notice must be given to various regulatory agencies, and others.

4. Charges for use of source and special nuclear material may not be waived by the Commission for a Section 103 licensee and charges must be made for consumption of nuclear fuel.

The Atomic Energy Act's requirement for a finding of practical value and the statutory differences in treatment between facilities licensed under Section 104 b. and facilities licensed under Section 103 were based principally upon an anticipated scarcity of nuclear materials and the desire for a mechanism which would serve to designate the point at which a facility type should not be eligible for further Governmental assistance. The reasons for the licensing distinction have either receded in importance or been shown to have less significance than was previously attributed to them, and the Commission is supporting legislative proposals, now pending before the Congress, designed to eliminate the practical value distinction between Section 103 and Section 104 b. licensing. Enactment of such legislation would remove the basis and need for Section 102 rule making by the Commission.

S. 212

A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection 2 e. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"e. Source and special nuclear material, production facilities, and utilization facilities are affected with the public interest, and regulation by the United States of the production and utilization of atomic energy and of the facilities used in connection therewith is necessary in the national interest to assure the common defense and security, to protect the health and safety of the public, and to control the thermal effects of the release of liquid effluents to the environment."

SEC. 2. Subsection 3 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"d. a program to encourage widespread participation in the development and utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes to the maximum extent consistent with the common defense and security, the health and safety of the public, and the control of the thermal effects of the release of liquid effluents to the environment."

SEC. 3. Paragraph (4) of subsection 31 a. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(4) utilization of special nuclear material, atomic energy, and radioactive materi-

XUM

al and processes entailed in the utilization or production of atomic energy or such material for all other purposes, including industrial or commercial uses, the generation of usable energy, and the demonstration of advances in the commercial or industrial application of atomic energy; and".

Sec. 4. Section 102 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 102. Determination of Substantial Research Activities.—Any license for a utilization facility to produce electric energy for ultimate sale to the public or for a production facility shall be issued pursuant to section 103 unless the license applicant demonstrates, and the Commission determines in writing, that the principal purpose of the facility is the performance of substantial research and development activities for the demonstration of significant advances in the commercial or industrial application of atomic energy, in which case such license shall be issued pursuant to section 104."

Sec. 5. The first sentence of subsection 103 a. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "The Commission is authorized to issue licenses to persons applying therefor to transfer or receive in interstate commerce, manufacture, produce, transfer, acquire, possess, use, import, or export under the terms of an agreement for cooperation arranged pursuant to section 123, utilization or production facilities."

Sec. 6. Subsection 104 b. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"b. Subsequent to a determination by the Commission as authorized in section 102, the Commission may issue to any person applying therefor a license for a utilization facility to produce electric energy for ultimate sale to the public or a production facility the principal purpose of which is the performance of substantial research and development activities for the demonstration of significant advances in the commercial or industrial application of atomic energy. In issuing licenses under this subsection, the Commission shall impose the minimum amount of such regulations and terms of license as will permit the Commission to fulfill its obligations under this Act to promote the common defense and security and to protect the health and safety of the public."

Sec. 7. Subsection 105 c. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"c. The Commission, promptly after receiving any application for a license under section 103, shall transmit a copy thereof to the Attorney General who, in the case of an application to construct a utilization or production facility shall, or in the case of an application to operate such a facility may, within a reasonable time, in no event to exceed 180 days after receiving a copy of the application, advise the Commission whether, insofar as he can determine, the issuance of such license or the activities for which the license is sought would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws, and such advice shall be published in the Federal Register. The Commission shall give due consideration to the advice received from the Attorney General and, where the Commission finds that activities under any license would tend to create a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws, is authorized and directed to refuse to issue such license or establish such conditions to prevent such result as the Commission may determine necessary and appropriate. Upon the request of the Attorney General, the Commission shall furnish or cause to be furnished such information, including, but not limited to, contracts between the applicant and other parties relating to activities for which the license is sought, as the Attorney General determines to be appropriate or necessary to enable him to give the advice called for by this subsection. Where the advice furnished by the Attorney General states in substance that he does not favor issuance of such license or requests the Commission to impose thereon conditions requiring such applicant to alter or enter into any contracts or other arrangements with other parties relating to activities for which the license is sought, the Attorney General or his designee shall participate as a party in any proceedings that may thereafter be held on such license application. The Commission, with the approval of the Attorney General, may except from the requirements of this subsection such classes or types of licenses as the Commission may determine would not significantly affect the applicant's activities under the antitrust laws as specified in subsection 105 a."

Sec. 8. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding thereto the following new section:

"Sec. 111. Control of Thermal Effects.—

"a. In addition to any other requirements of this Act, the Commission shall not issue any license under section 103 or section 104 b. for a facility except to those persons who are equipped to observe and who agree to observe applicable and nondiscriminatory Federal and State standards for the control of the thermal effects of the release of liquid effluents from such facilities to the environment.

"b. The Commission, promptly after receiving any application for a license under section 103 or section 104 b., shall transmit a copy thereof to the Secretary of the Interior who, in the case of an application to construct a utilization or production facility shall, or in the case of an application to operate such a facility may, within a reasonable time, in no event to exceed 90 days after receiving a copy of the application, advise the Commission whether the license applicant appears equipped to observe applicable and nondiscriminatory Federal and State standards for the control of the thermal effects of the release of liquid effluents from such facility to the environment. The Commission shall give due consideration to the advice received from the Secretary and is authorized and directed to refuse to issue such license or establish such conditions as the Commission may determine necessary and appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this section. Upon the request of the Secretary, the Commission shall furnish or cause to be furnished such information as the Secretary determines to be appropriate or necessary to enable him to give the advice called for by this section. The Commission, with the approval of the Secretary, may except from the requirements of this section such classes or types of license applications as the Commission may specify."

Sec. 9. Subsection 161 i. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"i. prescribe such regulations or orders as it may determine necessary (1) to protect Restricted Data received by any person in connection with any activity authorized pursuant to this Act, (2) to guard against the loss or diversion of any special nuclear material acquired by any person pursuant to section 53 or produced by any person in connection with any activity authorized pursuant to this Act, and to prevent any use or disposition thereof which the Commission may determine to be inimical to the common defense and security, and (3) to govern any activity authorized pursuant to this Act, including standards and restrictions governing the design, location, and operation of facilities used in the conduct of such activity, in order to protect health, minimize danger to life or property, and, with respect to facilities within the purview of section 111, control the thermal effects of the release of liquid effluents to the environment."

Sec. 10. Subsection 161 n. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "finding of practical value" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "determination of substantial research activities".

Sec. 11. Subsection 161 o. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by striking out "section 105" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 105 and 111".

Sec. 12. The second sentence of subsection 182 a. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "In connection with applications for licenses to operate production or utilization facilities, the applicant shall state such technical specifications, including information of the amount, kind, and source of special nuclear material required, the place of the use, the specific characteristics of the facility, and such other information as the Commission may, by rule or regulation, deem necessary in order to enable it to find that the utilization of production of special nuclear material will be in accord with the common defense and security and will provide adequate protection to the health and safety of the public, and that, with respect to facilities within the purview of section 111, the applicant is equipped to observe and agrees to observe applicable and nondiscriminatory Federal and State standards for the control of the thermal effects of the release of liquid effluents to the environment."

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the transaction of routine morning business.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Under the previous order, are speeches during the transaction of routine morning business to be limited to 3 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the time limitation, I be permitted to speak for 7 minutes for the purpose of introducing a bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2676—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROHIBIT THE SALE TO MINORS OF CERTAIN OBSCENE MATERIALS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, today on behalf of myself and Senator ANDERSON, Senator BIBLE, Senator BURDICK, Senator CANNON, Senator EASTLAND, Senator FANNIN, Senator FONG, Senator GORE, Senator GURNEY, Senator HARRIS, Senator HART, Senator HARTKE, Senator HOLLINGS, Senator MAGNUSON, Senator MANSFIELD, Senator METCALF, Senator RANDOLPH, Senator STEVENS, and Senator THURMOND, I am introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill to prohibit the sale to minors of obscene materials that have been transported by interstate commerce or by the U.S. mails.

In 1963, Ralph Ginzburg, a New York publisher, was convicted and sentenced to 5 years' imprisonment for sending an obscene edition of his magazine, Eros, through the mail. In 1966, following the Supreme Court's affirmation of his conviction,[1] Ginzburg posed the following question:

> What is obscenity anyway, it's not definable, not measurable, a bag of smoke, it's like witchery, there's no such thing?

I disagree with Mr. Ginzburg. There is such a thing as obscenity. You may have some trouble defining it, but you know it when you see it. You know that it is not James Joyce's "Ulysses." It is not the poems of Ovid. It is not the Book of Ruth. Great literature and poetry may deal with sexual matters, but they are still art, not pornography. These are, of course, many borderline cases, with which the courts struggled for many years. As to such material, individuals may perhaps differ from each other. Let us admit also that standards have changed over the years and that today we have difficulty understanding the uproar that accompanied the use of the word "damn" in "Gone With the Wind."

But consider the trash books with titles on the order of "Wicked Wanton" and "Sex Siren" that are becoming increasingly prevalent on the less reputable bookstands. These high-priced formula pulps are turned out by the score, virtually overnight. They are cheaply bound and printed. They have no beginning and no end. They have little plot and no characters worth remembering. In sum they have no literary merit whatsoever. They do, however, describe in vivid terms the most lurid sexual aberrations known to man. Are they obscene, Mr. Ginsburg? I think so. Worse even, let us consider the so-called French postcards, and playing cards, and stag films that in still and motion pictures show heterosexual and homosexual relations of every nature and kind. We do not have to agree with Anthony Comstock or even to be old fashioned to label these items obscene.

Does anyone doubt that this material panders to prurient interests, violates contemporary community standards, and is utterly and completely devoid of redeeming social value? Clearly, it constitutes hard-core pornography. Clearly, it represents speech that is not and should not be subject to the protection of the first amendment to the Constitution.

Frankly, I am not overly concerned about what adults buy or read or see. Mature adults are usually quite capable of selecting their own reading matter and coping responsibly with its content. I am very concerned, however, that as much as 75 percent of the pornographic material circulated in this country eventually falls into the hands of minors. I am concerned that much of this material reaches the unformed minds and emotions of young boys and girls.

I cannot prove that a particular child read a particular manuscript and as a result committed a crime or suffered emotional problems. I do not need such proof and neither does any other parent. I am satisfied with the accuracy of the findings of the New York Academy of Medicine that such reading "interferes with the development of a healthy attitude and respect for the opposite sex." Such interference would seem to be a natural result of the sick and distorted manner in which pornography portrays sex. No one would suggest that all or even most youngsters would be detrimentally affected by exposure to pornography. But some might. I am convinced by the expressed views of noted psychiatrists that by exposing healthy boys and girls to abnormalities you might do permanent character damage.

At the very least I am convinced and satisfied by such authoritative opinions to the extent that I do not wish to test the findings, not with my children nor with anyone else's.

Parents, of course, are responsible for raising, caring for, and nurturing their own sons and daughters. And we welcome these chores. Nevertheless we do not wish and cannot be expected to monitor their every activity, examine every piece of mail that they receive, and constantly search their rooms for hidden contraband. In order to be a match for those who pander filth for the dollar's sake, we must have the support of laws designed to aid us in the discharge of our responsibilities.

Pornography is big business with an immense profit margin. Estimates as to the annual take of the smut industry have ranged as high as a $2 billion per year. With so much money at stake, it is no wonder that the pornographers ply their trade so diligently. To subdue this massive operation, we must depend to a great extent on vigilant, vigorous enforcement of laws that are designed to convince the peddlers of pornography that the risks of their activities outweigh the potential monetary rewards. To be certain there are already numerous laws on the books. Many of them, however, are excessively vague or are otherwise subject to constitutional attack. When trained law enforcement officers cannot be certain of the applicability of a statute, and when prosecutors and judges have doubts as to the validity of convictions obtained under it, we cannot expect it to be an effective weapon in the war against obscenity.

Many of the existing laws are also not as effective as they might be because they apply the same standards to children as they do to adults. These statutes fail to take advantage of recent court decisions that would allow a broader attack on the material peddled to children than on that purchased by adults. I am pleased to see that a number of thoughtful legislative proposals introduced this year are designed to take advantage of these court decisions. We simply cannot afford to waste any ammunition that we have at our disposal.

In drafting the legislation that I am introducing today, I have attempted to utilize all available ammunition while adhering closely to the guidelines established by the courts. I began with the proposition that obscenity is not entitled to the protection of the freedoms of speech and press and may be regulated by a properly drafted and administered statute. The Supreme Court has specifically affirmed that proposition in Roth against United States.[2] In Roth, the Court also established for the first time the constitutional test for obscenity. That test, as subsequently amplified in Jacobellis against Ohio[3] and the Fanny Hill case[4] has three elements, all of which must coalesce. In order for material to be considered obscene and not subject to the strictures of the first amendment, it must be established that:

First, the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to a prurient interest in sex;

Second, the material is patently offensive because it affronts contemporary community standards relating to the description or representation of sexual matters, and

Third, the material is utterly without redeeming social value.

Of course, in Ralph Ginzberg's own case, the Court held that the manner in which the material was presented to the public is evidence that can be considered in determining if it fits the definition of obscenity.

In my opinion, however, the most significant case since Roth involves another Ginsberg, Sam Ginsberg, the owner of Sam's Stationery and Luncheonette in Bellmore, Long Island. Samuel Ginsberg was tried and convicted under a New York criminal obscenity statute that prohibits the sale to minors under 17 years of age of material defined as obscene not on the basis of its effect on adults but rather on the basis of its prurient appeal, offensiveness and social importance to such minors. Ginsberg attacked the law in its face, but the Supreme Court rejected his position.[5] Justice Brennan wrote the opinion for the Court. The Court said, in sum, that obscenity is not within the area of protected speech or press; that the power of the State to control the conduct of children reaches beyond the scope of its authority over adults; and that the Court cannot validly take the position that defining the obscenity of material on the basis of its appeal to minors has no relation to the objective of protecting such minors from harm. The Court also found that the statute was not unconstitutionally vague and had the necessary requirement of scienter implied within its strictures. These latter findings deal, of course, with familiar problems of procedural due process.

The legislation that I am introducing today is patterned after the provisions of the New York statute[6] upheld in Ginsberg.

It is a criminal statute, not one involving prior restraint, and will provide those accused of violating it with all the due process safeguards surrounding a criminal trial. The bill would make illegal

---

[1] *Ginzburg* v. *United States*, 393 U.S. 463 (1966).

[2] 354 U.S. 476 (1957) *reh. den.* 355 U.S. 852.

[3] 378 U.S. 184 (1964).

[4] *A book named "John Cleland's Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure"* v. *The Attorney General of Massachusetts*, 383 U.S. 413 (1966).

[5] *Ginsberg* v. *State of New York*, 390 US 629 (1968), *reh. den.* 391 US 971.

[6] I believe that the modifications that I have made represent improvements. *Foolish Figleaves*, a thoughtful book by Richard H. Kuh was particularly helpful.

XUM

the sale or exhibition to children under 16 years of age of books, photographs, drawings and movies that pornographically depict or describe sexual conduct and sexual excitement, including sadomasochistic abuse. Pornographic is defined in terms of effect on minors and, therefore, reaches beyond the limits proscribed for the regulation of material sold to adults. The legislation sanctions only knowing intentional behavior.

Furthermore, the bill is designed carefully so as not to interfere with any parent's guidance and supervision of his own child. Immunity is also provided for schools, museums, and libraries.

No one law, even if vigorously enforced, could in itself put the purveyors of filth out of business. The legislation that I am proposing, however, will, I believe, be a powerful, dependable weapon in the arsenal of our law enforcement officials. Hopefully, it will be utilized to do heavy damage to those whose trade endangers the impressionable minds of our children.

No doubt, despite the safeguards incorporated in it, this legislation will be criticized by those who fear any regulation of the written or spoken word. To these critics let me say that I respect their views and understand and share their concern for the defense of our basic freedoms. Nevertheless, I do not believe that a narrow, carefully drafted law designed to protect young children from the tensions and distortions that are inherent in pornography encroaches in any manner on our rights of free speech and free press. I must agree with the words of Norman Thomas, a man who had a deep and abiding belief in the need to maintain the viability of the Bill of Rights:

> I do not believe that in order to protect the fundamental liberties of the press we have to turn our children . . . over to the kind of visual exploitation of base emotion, and the arousal of base emotion to which of course this literature, this pornographic literature, these films and cards and all the rest are directed . . .
>
> * * * * *
>
> I think in these times with this terrible increase in juvenile delinquency, with this immensely profitable flood of pornography using techniques never before available to the seducers of the innocent, *I think it is nonsense to say that we are so bound by a very extreme interpretation of the freedom of the press that we cannot act.*[7]

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2676) to prohibit the sale to minors of certain obscene materials transported in interstate commerce or by the U.S. mails, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Tydings (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2676

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 71 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended:

(1) By adding a new section 1466 as follows:

"§ 1466. Sale of matter harmful to minors

"(a) Definitions. As used in this section:

"(i) 'Minor' means any person less than sixteen years old.

"(ii) 'Adult' means any person sixteen years old or older.

"(iii) 'Sexual conduct' means human masturbation, sexual intercourse, or any touching of the genitals, pubic areas, or buttocks of the human male or female, or the breast of the female, whether alone or between members of the same or opposite sex or between humans and animals in an act of apparent sexual stimulation or gratification.

"(iv) 'Sexual excitement' means the condition of human male or female genitals when in a state of sexual stimulation, or the sensual experiences of humans engaging in or witnessing sexual conduct.

"(v) 'Sado-masochistic abuse' means flagellation or torture by or upon a person clad in undergarments, a mask or bizarre costume, or the condition of being fettered, bound or otherwise physically restrained on the part of one so clothed.

"(vi) 'Harmful to minors' means that quality of any description or representation, in whatever form, of sexual conduct, sexual excitement, or sado-masochistic abuse, when it:

"(A) predominately appeals to the prurient interest of minors; and

"(B) is patently offensive to prevailing standards in the adult community as a whole with respect to what is suitable material for minors, and

"(C) is utterly without redeeming social importance for minors.

"(vii) 'knowing' means having general knowledge of or reason to know, or a belief or ground for belief which warrants further inspection or inquiry of both of the following:

"(A) the general nature and content of any material described herein which is reasonably susceptible to examination by the defendant, hereafter referred to as the 'content' of the materials, and

"(B) the fact that the materials have been or will be shipped in interstate commerce or by the U.S. mails, hereafter referred to as the 'character' of the materials.

"(b) Selling obscene material to minors

"(i) A person is guilty of selling obscene material to minors when knowing its character and content, he sells or loans to a minor for monetary consideration.

"(A) any picture, photograph, drawing, sculpture, motion picture film, or similar visual representation or image of a person or portion of the human body that depicts sexual conduct, sexual excitement or sado-masochistic abuse, that is harmful to minors, and that has been or will be shipped in interstate commerce. or by the U.S. mails; or

"(B) any book, paperback, pamphlet, magazine, or other written or printed matter however reproduced, or sound recording which contains any matter enumerated in paragraph (A) hereof, or explicit and detailed verbal descriptions or narrative accounts of sexual excitement, sexual conduct or sado-masochistic abuse, that, taken as a whole, is harmful to minors and that has been or will be shipped in interstate commerce or by the U.S. mails;

"(ii) A person is guilty of selling obscene materials to minors when knowing the character and content of a motion picture, show or other presentation that, in whole or in part, depicts sexual conduct, sexual excitement, or sado-masochistic abuse, that is harmful to minors, and that has been or will be shipped in interstate commerce or by the U.S. mails, he:

"(A) exhibits such motion picture, show or other presentation to a minor for a monetary consideration; or

"(B) sells to a minor an admission ticket or pass to premises whereon there is exhibited or to be exhibited such motion picture, show or presentation; or

"(C) admits a minor for monetary consideration to premises whereon there is exhibited or to be exhibited such motion picture, show or other presentation.

"(iii) An employer actively participating in the operation of a business may be held criminally responsible for the acts of those employees in such business that are in violation of this section when those acts are performed within the scope of the employee's employment.

"(iv) A person found guilty of selling obscene material to minors shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 and/or imprisonment for not more than five years for the first offense and a fine of not more than $10,000 and/or imprisonment for not more than ten years for each additional offense.

"(v) Selling obscene materials to minors shall not be a violation of this section when:

"(A) the minor is accompanied by his parent or legal guardian, or when the minor is accompanied by an adult, and the defendant has no reason to suspect that the adult accompanying the minor is not the minor's parent or guardian; or

"(B) the defendant is charged with the sale of materials the obscene portion of which form merely a minor and incidental part of an otherwise non-offending whole and which serve some purpose therein other than titillation.

"(vi) Nothing in this section shall be construed to render illegal the selling, lending, giving, or exhibiting to minors of the materials proscribed herein when:

"(A) the defendant is in a parental or guardianship relationship with the minor; or

"(B) the defendant is a bona fide school, museum, or public library, or is acting in the capacity of an employee of such organization or of a retail outlet affiliated with and serving the educational purposes of such organization; or

"(C) the defendant is distributing, selling, or otherwise commercially marketing or renting a book, magazine, pamphlet, paperback, or other written or printed matter that is a serious and bona fide treatise or handbook on sexual functioning, guidance, hygiene, or problems, and is advertised and marketed as such; or is officially involved with legitimate research in these areas.

"(c) Presumptions—The following rebuttable presumptions are applicable to this section:

"(i) Any person owning, operating, or employed in the business of selling, offering for sale, renting, or exhibiting any of the materials proscribed for minors by this subsection shall be presumed to have knowledge of which materials in the establishment have been transported by interstate commerce or by the United States mails.

"(ii) An employee who sells obscene materials to minors in or about his place of employment is presumed to have acted within the scope of his employment.

"(d) Defenses:

"(i) In any prosecution for selling obscene material to minors, it is an affirmative defense that:

"(A) the defendant or his employee had reasonable cause to believe and did honestly believe that the minor involved was sixteen years old or older; and

"(B) such minor exhibited to the defendant a draft card, drivers license, birth certificate or other official or apparently official document purporting to establish that such minor was sixteen years old or older.

---

[7] Hearing on juvenile delinquency (obscene and pornographic materials) before Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 84th Cong., 1st sess., 217–21 (1955).

"(ii) It shall be an affirmative defense to a charge of violating this section by filling a minor's mail order request for obscene material that the defendant made reasonable efforts to determine that the purchaser of the material was sixteen years old or older: *Provided that* reasonable efforts shall not solely consist of the asking the minor to state he is sixteen years old or older."

(2) By adding to the analysis of chapter 71 of title 18, United States Code, the following new item:

"1466. Sale of matter harmful to minors."

Mr. HART. Mr. President, if tax fairness is the No. 1 complaint of many constituents, a close second is concern over the mushrooming availability of obscene materials—obscene by any definition.

The problem is not only that such material, however broadly or narrowly defined, is available for purchase or viewing, but also that increasing amounts of such material are being sent through the mail unsolicited.

Even more disturbing is the estimate that 75 percent of such material ends up in the hands of minors.

Rational men of good will can and do differ on what is pornographic.

Rational men of good will can and do differ on what authority the State has in a free society to regulate the availability of obscene material for adult consumption.

There is disagreement on the need of censoring such material for adults.

But despite this disagreement on controlling what material adults may choose to read and to watch—I believe that most of us can agree that there is a strong case for greater control of the material available to minors.

Indeed, the trust of most complaints in this area is concern over efforts made to sell such material to minors.

As a parent of eight children, I share that concern.

Because of that concern, I today cosponsor S. 2676, a bill, introduced by the senior Senator from Maryland, to prohibit the sale to minors of certain obscene material transported in interstate commerce or by the U.S. mails.

There is every reason to believe that this bill is constitutional and will be effective.

The bill is based on four propositions set out in a series of U.S. Supreme Court decisions, most recently the 1968 ruling in Ginsberg versus New York:

First. Obscenity is not protected by constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and of the press.

Second. Obscene material can be defined.

Third. The State has broader authority to control the conduct of minors than of adults.

Fourth. The State is not prohibited from defining obscene material in terms of its effect on minors.

In Ginsberg against New York, the Supreme Court upheld a State law prohibiting the sale to minors of material defined as obscene in terms of its effects on minors rather than on adults.

The bill I cosponsor today is patterned on that law.

In short, the bill defines pornography in terms of its effect on minors; sets criminal penalties for selling or exhibiting obscene material to minors; protects the rights of the accused by requiring a criminal jury trial; and, permits the sale of such material to minors accompanied by a parent or legal guardian and to schools, museums, and libraries.

Mr. President, short of outright and total censorship of all publications, I know of no law which will force all material considered pornographic out of circulation.

I know of no law which will totally insure that such materials, no matter how defined, will not reach minors.

In the final analysis, the primary responsibility in this area must rest with parents, churches and schools.

For example, effective public boycott of a movie or television show will do more in determining acceptable standards than any legislation or office of censorship.

However, having said that, I do not mean to imply that the State has no authority to help parents who seek to provide guidance in developing their children's taste and intellect.

That is a clear responsibility of parents and should not be undercut by persons seeking profit from playing to the prurient interest of minors.

To argue that such authority is not needed because we have no proof that exposure to obscene material is harmful to minors is to argue that society and parents do not have an interest in seeking to develop in the young a knowledge of sex, literature, and the arts that is both healthy and wholesome.

As a parent I believe I do have that responsibility.

The bill I cosponsor today is designed to assist parents to meet that responsibility, and in no way interferes with the parent who decides what some may consider pornographic is suitable material for his children.

I recognize and sympathize with those persons concerned about any censoring of the written and spoken word.

That concern is, of course, at the heart of the question of controlling the availability of obscene material to adults.

In a free society, it is extremely difficult if not impossible to determine a broad definition of what adults consider pornographic. Tastes vary, even within communities.

Nevertheless, a carefully drawn bill to help parents guide their children toward material which the parents, as individuals, feel is proper does not infringe on the basic freedoms so often thought to be endangered by bills in this area.

This bill both protects the rights of individuals and attacks the efforts of those who seek profits from playing to the prurient interest of minors.

I join the able Senator from Maryland in the introduction of this bill; I will join him in efforts to schedule prompt hearings.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE SURTAX

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss one adverse effect of deferring enactment of H.R. 12290 which as yet has not been mentioned.

In previous statements I have already called attention to the problem created in the financial communities as the result of the continued uncertainty as to whether Congress will or will not extend the surcharge and if so, at what rates, and whether Congress will or will not repeal the investment credit and if so, its effective date.

Businessmen need to know the rules under which they are expected to operate, and a continuation of this uncertainty is having and will continue to have an adverse effect on our economy.

But there is an additional argument for prompt action on H.R. 12290 which has not been mentioned, and that is the point I wish to discuss today.

The argument is made, "It will not make any difference if we enact month-to-month extensions of withholding and pass the surcharge extension any time." On the contrary it does make a tremendous difference.

By merely extending the withholding rates on the wage earners the corporations and the large taxpayers who file estimated returns have a definite advantage in that they can legally reduce their estimates on the assumption that the 10-percent surcharge is no longer the law; it has not been extended. All that Congress is doing is extending the withholding rates.

I have asked the Treasury Department to compile an estimate—the table to be incorporated at the end of my remarks—of the additional deferral of individual and corporate income taxes due that could result from successive month-to-month extensions of withholding as a substitute for passing the surcharge extension.

According to this table prepared by the Treasury Department the August revenue will be about $50 million lower if we rely on month-to-month extensions than it would be if we passed the surcharge extension now. The cumulative loss will be $685 million if we are still relying on month-to-month extensions through September, and by December if month-to-month extensions are still being used the cumulative revenue loss and the increase in the Federal debt will be $1.355 billion.

Senators should understand what these figures mean. We are proceeding on the premise that ultimately the surcharge will be passed. We are telling the wage and salary earners of America that we are going to withhold taxes on their income as if we had passed the surcharge. This is what the withholding extension does.

Most of the wealthy taxpayers, however, and the corporations pay a large amount of estimated tax. We cannot require these taxpayers to increase their estimated tax payments until we increase the legal liability for 1969—that is, until we pass the surcharge extension. When we defer passage of the surcharge extension and enact monthly withholding extensions, we are collecting more money from wage and salary earners but not from the wealthy people and the corporations that pay estimated tax. We are telling them that they can reduce their estimated tax proportionately and pay us later.

What we are doing is providing interest-free loans to wealthy taxpayers and corporations at a time when the prime interest rate is 8½ percent nominally and over 10 percent in effect due to compensating balance requirements. On the other hand, the Federal Treasury will have to pay additional interest at close to 7 percent per annum on the borrowing necessary to make up these interest-free loans.

There is another aspect that arises from the mere extension of the withholding rates. Many corporations report their income tax liabilities on a fiscal year rather than a calendar year basis.

H.R. 12290 proposes to repeal the investment credit as of April 18, 1969; however, a company whose fiscal year ends between April and whatever date Congress enacts this bill gains an additional benefit. For example, suppose this company between those dates purchases equipment which under existing law is eligible for the 7-percent investment credit. That company in filing its tax return must comply with the law as of the date it files its tax return. That means it would automatically deduct the 7-percent investment credit from its fiscal year tax obligation for equipment purchased after the April date.

It is true that later, should Congress repeal the investment credit retroactively the company would be required to file an amended return and refund this investment credit to the Government. In the meantime, however, the company would have had the use of the money and conceivably could have invested it in Treasury bills bearing 6 percent until such time as Congress decided to enact the law. The Government would not recover this interest because Congress in retroactively enacting a tax cannot place a penalty upon a taxpayer for not having paid the tax before the law was passed.

I have pointed out the decided advantages that can accrue to the corporations and large taxpayers as the result of congressional delays in acting on this surtax bill. Now I shall point out the disadvantages to the wage earners whose taxes would be withheld under a series of withholding extensions.

Suppose, in the final analysis, Congress did not extend the surtax. When the wage earners file their tax returns next April they would get a refund of the additional withholdings, but they would not get any interest on this overwithholding.

The Government would have had the use of their money, interest free, from 6 to 8 months.

Mr. President, there is only one responsible and equitable manner in which this issue can be settled, and that is by prompt consideration by the Senate of H.R. 12290. There is no reason why action cannot be taken promptly. It would be a near catastrophe to wait for the tax reform now being considered by the House. Tax reform is needed, and there is no question but that it will be on the agenda of the Senate before this session of Congress ends; but its proper consideration will take time—and time is running out in our fight against inflation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point a table prepared by the Treasury Department showing the results of monthly extensions of withholding rates and the potential windfalls that will develop for the wealthy taxpayers and corporations should action on the surtax extension be unduly delayed.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX POSTPONEMENT GRANTED BY SUCCESSIVE MONTHLY EXTENSIONS OF THE CURRENT WITHHOLDING RATES WITHOUT ENACTMENT OF THE SURCHARGE

[In millions]

Month-to-month extension through—	Additional deferral of estimated tax due to—			Total	Cumulative deferral
	Corporate income	Investment credit	Individual income		
August	$30	$10	$10	$50	$50
September	450	110	75	635	685
October	30	10	10	50	735
November	30	10	10	50	785
December	450	110	10	570	1,355

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO REQUESTS FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION ACADEMY AT QUANTICO, VA. (S. Doc. No. 29)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed amendment to the requests for appropriations transmitted in the budget for fiscal year 1970, in the amount of $7.4 million, for completion of the Federal Bureau of Investigation Academy in Quantico, Va. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED 2-YEAR EXTENSION OF RURAL HOUSING AUTHORIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide for a 2-year extension of rural housing authorizations, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting pursuant to law, a report on the effectiveness and administration of the community action program under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Phoenix, Ariz., Office of Economic Opportunity (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROSPECTUSES FOR PROPOSED LEASES

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, prospectuses, which propose acquisition of space under a lease arrangement (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

H.R. 11249. An act to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize additional funds for such Center (Rept. No. 91-327).

HYDROELECTRIC POWER DEVELOPMENT AT THE TOCKS ISLAND DAM—DELAWARE RIVER BASIN—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—(S. REPT. NO. 91-328)

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works, I report favorably an original bill (S. 2678) to amend section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 to provide for optimum development at Tocks Island Dam and Reservoir project, and I submit a report thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia subsequently said: Mr. President, on behalf of my senior colleague from West Virginia, Senator RANDOLPH, I ask unanimous consent that the report filed earlier today from the Committee on Public Works, on an original bill (S. 2678) to amend the Flood Control Act of 1966, be printed, together with the individual views of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session, the following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Roderic L. O'Connor, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

Spurgeon M. Keeny, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 2669. A bill to provide for the free entry of certain scientific instruments for the use of certain universities; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2670. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Di Nardo;

S. 2671. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Mangano; and

S. 2672. A bill designating July 20 of each year as a legal public holiday to be known as "Moon Landing Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2673. A bill to permit a Federal employee to transfer his enrollment from a Federal health benefits plan to another plan under certain additional circumstances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(The remarks of Mr. Ribicoff when he introduced S. 2672 appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 2674. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the procurement and retention of judge advocates and law specialist officers for the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The remarks of Mr. Inouye when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2675. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS (for himself, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bible, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gore, Mr. Gurney, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hollings, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Stevens, and Mr. Thurmond):

S. 2676. A bill to prohibit the sale to minors of certain obscene materials transported in interstate commerce or by the U.S. mails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. Tydings when he introduced the bill appear earlier in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Mundt, and Mr. Thurmond):

S. 2677. A bill to prohibit the disruption of federally assisted institutions of higher education, to provide for the enforcement of such prohibition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. McClellan when he introduced the bill appear earlier in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 2678. A bill to amend section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 to provide for optimum development at Tocks Island Dam and Reservoir project; placed on the calendar.

(The remarks of Mr. Randolph when he reported the bill appear earlier in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

S. 2679. A bill designating July 20 of each year as a legal public holiday to be known as Manned Lunar Landing Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. Byrd of West Virginia when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S.J. Res. 138. Joint resolution to designate the 20th day of July in each year as "National Man in Space Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. Goldwater when he introduced the joint resolution appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

S. 2672—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH JULY 20 OF EACH YEAR AS "MOON LANDING DAY"

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, men have dreamed about going to the moon for thousands of years. Now we have done it.

An annual holiday in commemoration of this historic event would remind us each year of the great success we have achieved—and provide inspiration for us to pursue new and even more challenging goals, both on earth and in space.

In the lunar landing, the world has witnessed the most spectacular technological accomplishment of all time.

The door has been opened to a whole new world of exploration and knowledge. As Neil Armstrong said walking on the moon for the first time:

> That's one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind.

We have seen a triumph of wit, daring, and vision—and all mankind can take pride in this achievement.

Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins—like Columbus—have made history and, in so doing, have enriched and broadened the course of human destiny.

The plaque that rests on the lunar surface says, "We came in peace for all mankind." I hope that all mankind will benefit from this mission and those that follow.

For if men can visit the moon—and now we know they can—then there is no limit to what else we can do. Perhaps that is the real meaning of Apollo 11.

It is a lesson that each generation of Americans should know—one that should be remembered for as long as we are a nation.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish July 20 each year as a national holiday to be known as "Moon Landing Day."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2672) designating July 20 of each year as a legal public holiday to be known as "Moon Landing Day," introduced by Mr. Ribicoff, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2674—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL PROVIDING FOR THE PROCUREMENT AND RETENTION OF JUDGE ADVOCATES AND LAW SPECIALISTS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the procurement and retention of judge advocates and law specialist officers for the Armed Forces. My bill seeks to alleviate a chronic, critical problem of retention of military lawyers by providing special incentives for continuation in the service after the initial 4 years' active duty in the Judge Advocate General's Corps and professional pay for a skill that is in desperately short supply.

Specifically, my bill provides special pay to judge advocates of $50 per month for grade O–1 through O–3; $150 per month for grades O–4 and O–5; and $200 per month for grades O–6 and above. This allowance corrects what appears to me to be an unjust discrimination against lawyers. Dentists, physicians, and veterinarians currently receive special pay of $100 to $350 per month. Enlisted personnel in some 484 designated skills and specialties receive special pay ranging from $30 to $150 per month per recipient. Of the professionals requiring advanced graduate education, only the lawyer receives no recognition for the years spent in school. My bill will accomplish two things; it will make service in the Armed Forces as a career military lawyer more financially attractive and it will confer upon the lawyer recognition as a respected professional with urgently required skills.

The second portion of my bill will provide for a continuation bonus for military lawyers who extend their service on active duty for at least 3 years but not more than 6 years, at the rate of 2 months' pay for each additional year. The bonus would be paid upon the completion of the 4 years' required duty.

Figures released over the last year indicate the seriousness of the military lawyer retention problem. It has been estimated that there is an existing shortage of some 737 lawyers: 323 in the Army; 170 in the Navy; 112 in the Marine Corps; and 132 in the Air Force. This problem will be aggravated when the Military Justice Act of 1968 becomes fully effective. The act is estimated to require more than 800 new attorneys.

The retention rate of lawyers is shockingly low. Of the required rate of 25 percent in the Army, only 17 percent are retained; the Navy retains 8 of 30 percent; the Air Force 14.5 of 45 percent; and the Marine Corps 3.6 of 25 percent. The result of the failure to retain an adequate number of experienced lawyers could result in the decline of the quality of counsel since newer lawyers may be unfamiliar with military routine and lack the experience that comes only with years of practice.

Hitherto there has been little difficulty in obtaining junior lawyers because draft pressures have led a sufficient number of well-trained graduates to join the Judge Advocate General's Corps. However competent they may be, a junior lawyer lacks the expertise of someone who has spent a career as a military attorney.

The Department of Defense has recognized the critical nature of the shortage. A study by a Department of Defense working group on military lawyer procurement, utilization, and retention was completed last October and arrived at many of the dismaying figures I have given today. My measure embodies many of the suggestions of the study and conforms to Department of Defense recommendations.

Estimated cost of the legislation is $7 million annually, with subsequent costs of no more than that amount. More expensive programs have been proposed, but I believe that my bill is sufficient to mitigate the problem at a lesser cost. The Judge Advocate Association has endorsed the concept of the bill, as has the Federal Bar Association. After years of hesitation, the Department of Defense has finally given lawyers' compensation its endorsement and has conceded that there is no present remedy to relieve the shortage. I believe that the proposals contained in my bill are overdue and that, having been ignored for so long, the lawyers serving in the armed services deserve this recognition.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing these figures be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the table will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2674) to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the procurement and retention of judge advocates and law specialist officers for the Armed Forces, introduced by Mr. INOUYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The table presented by Mr. INOUYE is as follows:

MILITARY LAWYER RETENTION RATE DECLINING

	Required rate per year (percent)	Actual rate per year (percent)	Numerical shortage in career force
Army	25	17	−323
Navy	30	8	−170
Air Force	45	14.5	−132
Marine Corps	25	3.6	−112

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 138—INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION DESIGNATING THE 20TH DAY OF JULY IN EACH YEAR AS "NATIONAL MAN IN SPACE DAY"

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the success of Apollo 11 is an incredible triumph of man. The extraordinary achievements of the crew of Apollo 11—which are still unfolding—will go down in history unlike anything before.

The most remarkable fact about this flight may be that it marks the first voyage of humans to the surface of another celestial body. But, other firsts which result from this mission will continue to unravel for months to come. Any list of these firsts will surely include the following:

The first landing of a manned spacecraft on the surface of the moon.

The first step taken by man on extraterrestrial soil.

The first words spoken on the moon.

The first on-the-spot television pictures transmitted by and about men on the moon.

The first successful demonstration that men can function on the moon.

The first scientific exploration and experimentation to be conducted by humans on the moon.

The first samples of lunar materials to be returned from the surface of the moon to the earth.

The first successful liftoff and return of any craft, manned and unmanned, from the lunar surface.

Mr. President, I believe that the essence of what all this means is well expressed in the first words which were spoken on the moon. At the fateful moment last Sunday when Neil Armstrong took his first step onto lunar soil, he reported:

> That's one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind.

Mr. President, in my opinion, these words must be among the most profound and prophetic in the entire history of man. This step was indeed a small one insofar as it carried this one man; but with this same step mankind took a great leap forward into a new, bold era utterly removed from any other in the entire history of the human race. Man has for the first time proven that he is able and willing to adapt to environments beyond this planet. Thus, an era is begun when man, sooner or later, will colonize the moon, move toward the planets, and perhaps, even reach for the stars.

Mr. President, there is another special quality of the journey of Apollo 11 that sets it far above any previous events. It should be noted that never before has any landmark of human times been shared and witnessed by such a great portion of mankind. It is not alone by reason of the technical miracles of the age that we were able to enjoy the privilege of bearing witness to this incredible venture. A real debt of tribute must be paid to the open quality of American society—an America courageous enough to permit the peoples of the world to view and listen to the journey of Apollo 11 each step of the way and thereby to experience history as it was being made.

Mr. President, I cannot fully describe the impact Apollo 11 will have on man's future. I have touched upon the significant beginning that has been made to put man into environments outside this planet. And, to that, I can add the great boost which this flight will have in rekindling man's dreams and hopes by proving what dedicated men, and a dedicated people, can do in the face of seemingly insurmountable problems. But the final answer lies within us all because the complete results of this memorable flight will depend upon the ultimate capabilities of man and what he chooses to do with them.

Mr. President, there is much cheer in this for America. Two Americans have been on the moon. American will and American know-how was able to pull off a staggering technical and physical feat. This country can be pleased that it is the American flag which is the first to be planted on the soil of any body outside this planet. And, we can rightly be proud of the decision by our space experts to stick to manned flights for the major lunar mission. The wisdom of this decision was clearly proven Sunday when the automatic guidance system on Eagle nearly put the craft into a deep, rock-filled crater. It was only the skill of the astronauts on board who were able to override the automatic system by manual steering, that saved their ship from what might have been a fatal landing.

Mr. President, there will be many honors and celebrations awaiting the brave astronauts soon after their safe mission home is completed; and they are fully deserving of all the tributes we can bestow upon them.

But, once these ceremonies have ended, we must search for something more lasting. We must provide a means for Americans of all future generations to recall, rejoice in, and be inspired by the great deeds and achievements which these three men have made a part of America's heritage.

Therefore, Mr. President, I propose to set aside a day in each year when citizens of the United States from all walks of life may participate in ceremonies and activities held in honor of Apollo 11. This day should be marked by remembrances of the great story of the flight of Apollo 11 and by a continuous updating of its meaning to Americans.

Also, it might serve well as the one day when all of man's great ventures in space will be recalled and used to refresh the human spirit.

Since the most dramatic single events of the 9-day Apollo 11 mission will have to be those which occurred on the day when man first touched down on the moon, I have chosen this date—July 20 of each year—as the symbolic occasion for holding this national day of participation. And, I can imagine no more fitting name to give to this day, so that it will remain relevant to changing times, than "National Man in Space Day."

In this manner, Mr. President, the noble flight of Apollo 11 and the great moments of other space endeavors may serve to lift the human spirit and reawaken the pride of achievement in man that will move the human race forward for the betterment of all.

Mr. President, at this time I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to carry out the proposal, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 138), to designate the 20th day of July in each year as "National Man in Space Day," introduced by Mr. GOLDWATER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 138

Whereas on Wednesday, July 16th, 1969, Neil A. Armstrong, Edwin (Buzz) Aldrin, Junior, and Michael Collins rocketed on the memorable start of the epic nine-day flight of Apollo 11; and

Whereas on Sunday, July 20th, 1969, at 4:17 p.m. (EDT), with the lunar module, Eagle, separated from the command ship, Columbia, Neil A. Armstrong and Edwin (Buzz) Aldrin, Junior, touched down safely in the Sea of Tranquility on the first landing of a manned spacecraft on the surface of the moon; and

Whereas with the message "Houston, Tranquility Base here. The Eagle has landed.", the whole world was informed of this landmark in human history; and

Whereas at 10:56 p.m. (EDT) on July 20th, less than seven hours after the first lunar landing, Neil A. Armstrong became the first man to set foot upon the moon; and

Whereas a few minutes later, Edwin (Buzz) Aldrin, Junior, became the second man to stand on extra-terrestrial soil; and

Whereas these two space pioneers success-

XUM

fully performed a lengthy and gruelling set of scientific activities on the lunar surface, demonstrating to the world that man can function on the moon; and

Whereas it was stated by the President of the United States that this momentous achievement stands as the breakthrough by which "the heavens have become a part of man"; and

Whereas the first words spoken on the moon, "That's a one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind," are deeply profound and prophetic because the flight of Apollo 11 is more than the first voyage of humans to another celestial body—it is also the beginning of a whole new era in which mankind has taken the first great step in adapting to an environment beyond this planet; and

Whereas the successful lunar landing, moon walk, and lift-off from the lunar surface are the only landmark events in the whole history of man which were experienced and witnessed as they occurred by a large portion of mankind; and

Whereas the moment on which the American flag was planted in the soil of the moon is a dramatic event destined to be a lasting part of the heritage of this nation; and

Whereas the successes of Apollo 11 and other great space ventures will surely serve to rekindle man's dreams and hopes, and reawaken his confidence in what dedicated men, and a dedicated people, can do in the face of seemingly insurmountable problems; and

Whereas it is therefore fitting and proper that the extraordinary achievements of the brave men of Apollo 11 and great moments of other American space endeavors be recalled and rejoiced in by annual, national observances held throughout the United States:

Now, therefore, be it *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the 20th day of July in each year is hereby designated as "National Man in Space Day."

SEC. 2. The President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue proclamations annually (1) officially designating July 20th in each year as "National Man in Space Day," (2) calling upon the people of the United States to participate in ceremonies and activities in remembrance of the epic achievements of the flight of Apollo 11 and other historic American space ventures to the end that all our people may have a better understanding of the meaning of these great events in relation to current times, and (3) inviting the Governors and Mayors of State and local governments in the United States to issue similar proclamations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

S. 961

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT) be added as a cosponsor of S. 961, to improve the judicial machinery by providing for Federal jurisdiction and a body of uniform Federal law for cases arising out of aviation and space activities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 1980

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) be added as a cosponsor of S. 1980, to improve judicial machinery by providing Federal jurisdiction for certain types of class actions, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2306

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON) be added as cosponsors of S. 2306 to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2518

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE) I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) be added to S. 2518 to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder.

In the case of the Senator from Maine, he was one of those who originally indicated his desire to cosponsor this legislation, but, through an inadvertence, his name was omitted from the list that went to the bill clerk. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected to show Mr. MUSKIE's name among the list of cosponsors as of June 30, 1969.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2636

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BOGGS) I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) be added as cosponsors of S. 2636, to make the provisions of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 applicable to individuals preparing to be volunteer firemen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE RESOLUTION 221—RESOLUTION TO INTERNATIONALIZE THE U.S. SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. GRAVEL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 221); which was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

S. RES. 221

Whereas the exploits of the United States astronauts who have left indelible footprints on the moon is a ringing salute to man's courage and enterprise;

Whereas the United States of America has performed a singular achievement in extending man's perspective beyond his own environment;

Whereas we remain confident that this has been only the first of many successful ventures into space by man;

Whereas our nation's resources can and should be shared with mankind, and

Whereas the United States has twice cooperated with Canada in international extension of our space exploits, first in the area of science, and second in the area of applicational communications, and

Whereas the United States has cooperated fully with nations in Europe, in the Americas, in the Far East and in Africa, and with groups of nations operating within singular organizations such as the European Space Research Organization,

Resolved, that it is the desire of the United States Senate to fully share the technology and pride of our space achievements with all nations. Toward that end the Senate urges The National Aeronautics and Space Administration to select candidates from Canada and Mexico to participate in the space program as astronauts and ground specialists. And that the inclusion of those from our contiguous neighboring states be considered a first step toward expansion of the program to include all nations.

The United States Senate believes that internationalizing our space program will truly identify it as a program of science and peace and one shared by all men everywhere.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 1980

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I announce hearings on S. 1980, a bill to improve judicial machinery by providing Federal jurisdiction for certain types of class actions, and for other purposes. The hearings will be held at 10 a.m. on July 28 and 29, 1969, in room 6226, New Senate Office Building.

Any person who wishes to testify or submit a statement for inclusion in the record should communicate as soon as possible with the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, room 6306, New Senate Office Building.

RURAL HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs, of which I am chairman, is conducting hearings this week on 1969 legislation. The subject matter of the hearings is of a general nature, mostly concerned with reviewing existing programs and extending them beyond current expiration dates. After the great Housing Act of 1968, we believe that we have enough new programs on the books to last us for a few years.

One of the programs up for review and extension is the rural housing program under the Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture. I take great pride in this program because I authored it originally as part of the Housing Act of 1949. At that time, it was called the farm housing program. Later, it was extended to small towns—up to 5,500 population—and to nonfarm residents in rural areas.

The testimony submitted to the subcommittee on Monday by Mr. James V. Smith, Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, gives a brief explanation of the program and I believe is one of the best statements on the housing problem in rural areas and how the Farmers Home Administration is helping to solve it.

Mr. President, sometimes we forget how the people live in rural areas and the kind of poor housing occupied by so many of them. Mr. Smith, in his statement, points out that about 30 percent of the Nation's population lives in rural areas, and about one-half of the Nation's substandard housing is found there.

The rural housing program, I believe, has all the elements needed to solve the housing problem in rural areas if it is properly implemented and given adequate authority by the administration.

At the current time, "tight money" has slowed the program down, but Mr. Smith has made suggestions which I believe are very reasonable for speeding up this very fine program.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Smith's statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY FOR ADMINISTRATOR JAMES V. SMITH, FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION, BEFORE SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, JULY 21, 1969

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you to recommend a two-year extension of Title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended—the so-called rural housing section. This extension is of utmost importance if we are to fulfill the commitment to replace or repair the some 4 million substandard homes in rural America, and to provide new housing in the countryside for a substantial part of our growing population.

In support of this amendment I will briefly describe how the rural housing program works, and how it is administered by the Department of Agriculture.

The Farmers Home Administration got into the business of making rural housing loans by Congressional action in 1949. But our loan authorization was restricted to farm families only. As such, the program was limited in scope but it did give our county supervisors in the field valuable experience in dealing with rural housing problems.

In 1961, Congress greatly broadened the rural housing program. This legislation authorized us to make rural housing loans to nonfarm people as well as farmers in rural areas. Special provisions were made for housing loans to senior citizens and for farm workers.

Our rural housing loans increased from $40 million in 1960 to more than $95 million in 1962 and to $185 million in fiscal 1963.

By 1965, there was a growing public awareness that the rural housing problem matched that of the city and urban areas not only in size but in urgency. Congress responded to this by incorporating in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 authority to broaden the rural housing program.

The 1965 Act was particularly significant because it authorized a change in the method of financing the program to make it possible for private investors to buy housing insured noted. This shifted the funding of the program from appropriated funds to private funds. This change established a solid base for a rapid expansion of the rural housing program. In addition the Act authorized us to make loans in rural communities of up to 5,500 population. An estimated 30 percent of our nation's population live in rural America and about half of the nation's substandard housing is to be found there.

In the first full year under this insured loan program our rural housing loans rose to more than $400 million. By fiscal 1968 our rural housing loans totaled $494 million.

In 1968, the Housing and Urban Development Act further expanded the program, making it possible for us to help more hard-to-reach low income rural people who are the ones most desperately in need of adequate housing. The interest supplement payment provision of this act enables us to reduce interest rates to as low as one percent for low-income families thus putting the monthly payments within reach of rural people who heretofore could not repay a rural housing loan.

The interest supplement provision is administered in two ways. First, under an agreement with HUD, the Farmers Home Administration acts as the authorized representative of the Federal Housing Administration, Section 235 program in rural areas.

Second, in cases where the applicant is unable to obtain a loan insured by Federal Housing Administration the Farmers Home Administration is able to make an interest supplement loan under the Section 502 program.

I would like also to take note of our self-help housing program which is another excellent program to help very low income rural families to acquire decent housing. The "sweat equity" these people put into their homes reduces the construction cost from 20 to 25 percent. During fiscal 1969 we made more than 650 self-help housing loans. This is a small but a most important program.

These loans require more than normal technical assistance and with the limited personnel the program must remain small. The funds in the amount of $3 million which are being requested in fiscal 1970 would be granted to private nonprofit groups who would provide the supervision required by this program. Such an approach would make it possible to expand this program without increasing the number of government employees and yet bringing the programs to a great many more low income rural families.

Overall, during fiscal 1969 through May 31, some 52,000 loans totaling approximately $480 million were made to help rural families improve the condition of their housing. In addition, we still had a backlog of 67,000 applications that could not be processed because of lack of funds. For the current fiscal year, 1970, we have asked for $1.2 billion. This is about two-and-one-half times more than we had in 1969.

While this represents a substantial increase in loan funds, it still falls short of the level of rural housing lending we should have if we are to meet the goal of building 3 million publicly assisted rural housing units over the next decade. To meet this goal we should provide loan assistance to build or rehabilitate 300,000 units a year. The $1.2 billion authorization will enable us to serve the housing needs of only 154,000 families in fiscal 1970.

In this business of attacking the rural housing problem, we must recognize that poor housing is a fact of life to millions of rural people and unless there are public assistance programs such as our rural housing program, these people are never going to get decent housing.

There are a number of reasons for this:

1. There is a well defined credit gap in rural areas. Consequently, the flow of housing credit to the countryside is often inadequate, sporadic and sometimes non-existent. Small town bankers and other lenders are just unable to tie up their limited lending resources in long-term housing credit. Furthermore, rural facilities for tapping the credit resources of larger institutions in big cities are inadequate.

2. Over the years, federally-sponsored housing programs have been designed for urban areas. Vast urban renewal projects, city slum clearance programs and towering housing developments in our cities provide ready evidence of federally-financed urban-oriented housing programs. Only in the last two decades have rural housing problems begun to share any attention in the federal spotlight.

3. Rural houses are scattered and dispersed over 98 percent of the nation's land area. This makes rural housing construction and development less attractive to builders and lenders. Mass housing development in the countryside for rural families is not a practical solution. Rural families want individual homes, for the most part. Highrise apartments are not well adapted to the needs of rural people.

4. Efforts of the Federal Housing Administration have been much more effective in urban areas than rural areas largely because that agency's program depends on private originating lenders and large-scale builders. Both are scarce in rural areas. Furthermore that agency does not have the local offices and personnel to serve the scattered rural population.

5. Rural areas with 30-percent of the population have 40 percent of the nation's poverty-level people. This limits the ability of many rural people to improve their homes or to secure the credit to build a new one.

6. Communications and the lack of public and private institutions and organizations to tell rural people about available housing assistance has also been a factor in contributing to the housing lag.

We feel we are uniquely qualified to serve rural people in this area of public assistance.

The Farmers Home Administration has established an outstanding repayment record on housing loans. Losses, Mr. Chairman, are less than two hundredths of one percent of the amount loaned. The delinquency rate is less than 9 percent. Repayments by active borrowers are 104 percent of the amount loaned. This in our judgment is a most creditable record.

One of the prime factors of our record lies in the fact that 90 percent of our staff and personnel live out in the rural areas with the people they serve. We have 1,700 local county offices. Our county supervisors, our assistant supervisors, our clerks intimately know the community. They know the people who come for credit assistance. They know their abilities, their personal integrity. The personal relationship and rapport our people have with those they serve, enables us to carry on a program of effective supervision and counsel—a factor, we believe, that is as important as the credit assistance itself.

Furthermore, our people—both at the national and local level—now have a combined record of 20 years experience in the rural housing program.

Over our years of experience we have devised effective procedures to carry out the program.

The following five characteristics distinguish the rural housing loan program:

1. Loans are made only to families who cannot obtain credit from other sources at terms they can reasonably be expected to pay. The function of the agency is to supplement other credit sources and not to compete with them.

2. The Farmers Home Administration works directly with individual families. They frequently need more than just credit. They need advice in house planning and design, obtaining cost estimates, contract negotiations, inspection of construction and, often most important of all, advice in budgeting so that their housing debt will fit their pocketbook.

3. When the Farmers Home Administration makes a loan to a family, it is a combined construction and permanent financing loan. For example, if an applicant applies for a loan to build a house, the loan is closed before construction starts and loan funds are deposited in the joint bank account of the borrower and the Farmers Home Administration. Funds are disbursed as construction work progresses. After construction is completed, the same loan continues on a long-term basis.

4. Loans are made out of the Rural Housing Insurance fund. After the loans are made, the notes are sold to private investors. The loans are insured at the time of sale. Proceeds from the sales are used to replenish the revolving fund.

5. Loans are made, serviced, and insured by the Farmers Home Administration. When insured loans are sold to a private investor, he buys only the note and receives payments

once a year. The Farmers Home Administration makes collections and services the loan at no cost to the investor or the borrower.

In this regard, I think it is important that I bring to the attention of the Committee the difficulties we are experiencing in funding the rural housing program as well as other programs in which we insure the funds extended by private investors.

Funds for rural housing loans come from the private sector through the mechanism of our rural housing revolving fund. We make our loans to the home owner out of the housing fund and replenish the fund by selling the home owner's note to private investors.

This method of funding worked remarkably well up until about the first of the current calendar year, when the money market began to tighten up and interest rates began to climb. Sales of FHA paper fell off sharply. Even after two increases in interest rates the volume of sales is well below the level needed to operate the program.

The Treasury Department helped us get through the last half of fiscal year 1969 by offsetting the shortfall in our sales against the accounts of other Government agencies that were in surplus. The Treasury Department determines policy on the sale of securities by Government agencies. They know our problem and have been working with us. As yet we have not been able to evolve a solution using the authorities available to us in existing legislation. We will continue to work with Treasury and we will keep the Committee informed on the progress we make.

In addition we are now working on a proposal now being cleared for submission to the Committee that will recommend that the ceiling on the amount of new notes we can hold in the fund be raised from $100 million to $350 million. We need a higher ceiling so that we can do an orderly job of assembling and marketing the larger volume of housing loans flowing through the fund as a result of the sharp increase in program volume scheduled for the 1970 fiscal year.

SUMMARY

Mr. Chairman, poor housing is a serious problem in rural America.

There are as many substandard homes in the countryside and in our small towns and villages as there are in all our cities.

The rural housing problem merits the same comparable deliberation and support as given to the housing problems of the metropolitan areas.

The "credit gap" in rural America further aggravates the situation. The flow of credit for rural housing historically—either from private or public sources—just has not been adequate to meet the need.

Title V of this Act represents a breakthrough on this problem. The program combines the muscle of private credit with public assistance, personal supervision and capable technical know-how which Farmers Home Administration furnishes through its 1,700 local county offices.

With private investors providing nearly all of the funds for this program, Title V makes relatively minor demands on the Federal budget and the taxpayer.

Our rural people need the assurance that this program will be continued and we urge the two-year extension of Title V of this Act.

ARKANSAS YOUNG DEMOCRATS PLATFORM SECTIONS ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND ABM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Arkansas Young Democrats recently adopted a platform for 1969 which sets forth their position on a number of issues of current importance. Although most of the platform pertains primarily to Arkansas matters, there are two sections—on foreign affairs and the anti-ballistic-missile system—ABM—which are of much broader interest.

I call these sections of the Arkansas Young Democrats platform to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the sections were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

We believe that we should re-examine our nation's foreign policy in the light of present realities and cast aside old myths which have no relevance in today's world.

Our Nation, born in revolution, should support the revolutionary aspirations of peoples striving to set up political and economic institutions which they, the people feel to be in their best interest. We feel that the United States should not dictate to other people the courses that their revolutions should take. In aligning ourselves with those who are in opposition to revolution we incur the enmity of those engaged in the revolutionary struggle and thwart the aspirations of developing nations.

Today we find ourselves involved in a revolutionary struggle in South East Asia on the side of the status quo. In Viet Nam we believe that our initial commitment was an error and that the main problem facing this nation now is how to extricate ourselves with the greatest possible speed.

We find, 90 miles south of our border a revolutionary government which is hostile to the United States. In Cuba, we feel that we must as a nation recognize that the Cuban revolution is established. We call for the resumption of diplomatic relations with Cuba.

We find that our nation stands deserted by many of our oldest allies in our stance towards the world's most populous nation. We find that our nation's policy toward Red China has tended to isolate and induce a paranoid response by the Chinese toward us. Mankind cannot hope to survive with the world's most populous nation remaining outside the family of nations. We call for the establishment of diplomatic relations with Red China and the admission of Red China to the United Nations. We do not believe that the twelve million or so people of Formosa should lose their seat in the United Nations.

We wish to emphasize that we are not in favor of an isolationist foreign policy. We believe that the United Nations is the world's best hope for peace in this time and should be thoroughly supported.

ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

We are opposed to the construction of the Safeguard Anti-Ballistic Missile System. It is technologically unproven and easily circumventable. Our nation's domestic problems urgently need the funds which would be justifiable only if there were evidence that the construction of this system would advance the cause of world peace. The very opposite appears to be the case. The construction of this system appears to be another step in the expensive arms race, the only result of which could be to bring nuclear annihilation but one step closer.

We commend the Democratic Senate leaders who have opposed the deployment of the Safeguard ABM system.

TAX-EXEMPT STATUS OF MUNICIPAL BONDS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I have already spoken before this body on the attempt being made to eliminate the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds. I believe that there are many uninformed Americans who might tend to support a proposal to tax municipal bondholders in the name of tax reform. However, when the issue is presented in a clear manner, strong support for the maintenance of this tax-exempt status is overwhelmingly the case. I will now repeat what I have been saying since this issue came up, and that is that the present tax-exempt status on municipal bonds enables an already deteriorating system of local government to survive and remain viable in our Federal-State-local governmental framework.

In an article published in the Texas Town and City, Mr. W. E. Tinsley, the executive director of the municipal advisory council of Texas, argues the position which I have taken in a most forthright and revealing manner. Among the many points Mr. Tinsley states is the fact that it is not the minute number of municipal bondholders who gain the most out of this tax-exempt status, but, rather, it is the American populace who benefit through the public services afforded them by municipal and local governments. Furthermore the author refers to statistics which show that only 18 percent of those corporations, banks, and so forth gain more than 10 percent of their income from municipal bonds.

The American system provides for a viable federalized system of government. By eliminating the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds we will move further away from such a federalized system of government. Nor can we accept the proposal to federally subsidize municipalities. Such a setup will further enhance the local government's dependency on Washington. Entangling the Federal Government in the collection of taxes on municipal bondholdings and replacing the present tax-exempt status with some type of Federal subsidy will infringe on the rights of local institutions to govern themselves effectively without excessive bureaucratic interference.

At this time in our country's history students of political science and government are attempting to find ways in which to rebuild our State and local government structures so that they can compete with the Federal Government with regards to services rendered to the public. In order to restore this balance between Federal and local governments, I feel that it would be disastrous to change the present tax-exempt status of municipal bonds. Since the above-mentioned article puts this controversy in such an enlightening frame of reference, I ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TRANSFER OF POWER FROM CITY HALL SEVERELY THREATENED—WHO REALLY BENEFITS FROM TAX EXEMPTION OF INTEREST ON MUNICIPAL BONDS?

(By W. E. Tinsley)

A surprising number of people across the land are completely unaware of the fact that the owner of a bond issued by a state or unit of local government is not required to pay income taxes on the interest which the bond earns. At least that has been the situation; the number of such people grows smaller every day. One can hardly pick up a newspaper these days or listen to a newscast without there being brought to his attention some story of the gross inequities in our sys-

XUM

tem of federal income taxes under which bloated plutocrats realize incomes running into the millions but pay no income taxes whatever. More often than not, it is mentioned that the tax dodge or loophole employed by these parasites of society is that of the municipal bond, the interest income from which is tax exempt.

The average American is an easy mark for this sort of propaganda. He has an inherent sense of fairness, he is generally unhappy with the amount withheld from his pay check, and he has the uneasy suspicion that he is not getting his money's worth of government for the taxes he pays. He is outraged by the image which has been created of the owner of municipal bonds, this fat cat lying on the warm sands of Miami Beach with a martini in one hand and a buxom blonde in the other, and paying no income taxes. There ought to be a law against it! Everyone ought to be forced to pay some income taxes!

Here we see one of the most cleverly contrived images (of a character who does not exist, incidentally) which has been foisted on the American public in many a day. What are the facts? When and how did such a system ever come into being in the first place? Why doesn't Congress put a stop to it?

The exemption of interest income on municipal bonds is as old as the federal income tax law. Eminent legal authorities maintain that its principle is solidly founded in the United States Constitution under those provisions which establish reciprocity between the states and the central government under our federal system. But this is not a legal dissertation; the purpose of this discussion is to examine some of the practicalities of the matter and to determine just who the real beneficiary is of this arrangement which exempts municipal bond interest from federal income taxes.

WHO REALLY BENEFITS?

Our thesis is this: the real beneficiary is not the holder of the municipal bond—the investor who loaned the money to the state or local governmental unit to finance some public facility—but the real beneficiary is any one of the 200 million Americans who may at any time during the routine of his day-to-day existence—

Draw a glass of water to quench his thirst, open the faucets of his shower, wash the family automobile or sprinkle his lawn;

Flush a toilet, open the drain in the lavatory of his bathroom, or drop table scraps into the disposal unit of his kitchen sink;

Pay a premium on a fire insurance policy covering his home or place of business which is protected by the fire plug at the corner and the fire station in the neighborhood;

Drive his automobile on a paved street or county road, across a bridge which spans a stream, or halt it at the traffic light at a busy intersection;

Have a child enrolled in a public school or a state supported institution of higher learning;

Feel any satisfaction as a citizen of his community in the knowledge that the criminal is safely behind bars, the insane are being ministered to, and the indigent are housed;

Romp with his children in a public park or give them a swimming lesson in the park pool;

Take off or land as a passenger of any scheduled and licensed airline or ship, or receive merchandise sent by air;

Or, participate in any one of literally dozens of other activities or realize the benefits and conveniences of any of the countless publicly-owned facilities which are financed through the issuance and sale of bonds of the state and its local governmental units.

This is the real beneficiary of tax exemption of municipal bond interest. Why? Because it saves him billions of dollars a year in interest charges on money borrowed through the medium of municipal bonds to provide all of these conveniences, interest he pays for in the form of locally levied taxes or user charges.

INTEREST—RATES AND DOLLARS

There are about $125 billion in state and local government bonds which are outstanding in this country today. A good guess as to the average rate of interest on all of these bonds would fall in the neighborhood of 4%. Now that produces a gross interest cost of about $5 billion annually.

The difference between the rate of interest on tax free municipal bonds and taxable bonds, such as those of the U.S. Government and private corporations, usually amounts to about 40%. Or, to express it somewhat differently, under conditions of comparable security or certainty of repayment, investors are willing to lend money to states and local governmental units at an interest rate which is usually about 70% of that which they demand of private borrowers.

On the basis of these figures, we compute by simple arithmetic that the $5 billion annual interest charge on tax-free municipal bonds becomes $7 billion if the right of income tax exemption is ever lost by local government.

But this tells only part of the story as regards the true value of tax exempt bonds to the local governmental unit. Take the case of the school district that needs a $1 million school building or the city that needs a $1 million hospital expansion. Now, if this school district or this city can issue bonds at 5% (which is unlikely under bond market conditions existing at this writing), it is necessary to find only $65,050 a year in the annual budget to finance the million dollar project. In other words, $65,050 will amortize a million dollars over a 30-year term assuming that the bonds can be sold at a 5% interest rate.

Remove tax exemption of municipal bonds, though, and the 5% assumed rate immediately becomes about 7¼% and look how the picture changes: interest alone on a million dollar bond issue amounts to $72,500, and if $65,050 is the extent of leeway in the local budget, then the project must be forgotten or cut back to unworkable proportions.

This is the value of tax exemption of municipal bonds to states and local governments, and it is the local taxpayer who is the true beneficiary of the arrangement; not the investor who buys the bonds.

FICTITIOUS FAT CAT

But what about this fellow—this fat cat—this parasite who lives off the fat of the land, and who pays no income taxes? We are still more than a little wrought up about him. The mere thought of him outrages our sense of fairness. There has been more than one barn burned down just to get rid of the rats, but in this instance, perhaps we should first try to take a rat census. Just how many rats are there in this picture? Do we know? The answer is, yes.

We start with an examination of those who own all of these $125 billion state and municipal bonds. Who is the recipient of this tax free interest income? Here are the latest figures available on the subject.

[Percent owned of total outstanding]

Class of bondholder:	
Commercial banks	38
Individuals and personal trusts	32
Insurance companies (life, casualty, etc.)	17
Pension funds, sinking funds and all other	13

Latest available U.S. Treasury data reflect the fact that there were 155 tax returns filed by individuals in the year 1967 with incomes over $200,000 on which no income taxes were paid. Of these, there were 21 returns covering incomes over $1,000,000, but there is no information as to the amount of these incomes which arose from municipal bond interest. Data gathered by the Michigan Survey Research Center[1] indicates that, of persons surveyed in income tax brackets of $315,000 and more, 65% held *some* municipal bonds, but only 18% derived as much as 10% of their income from that source and only 6% derived as much as 25% from that source. So it begins to appear that there may not be so very many rats in the barn after all.

But what about these banks and insurance companies which evade income taxes at least on that portion of their income which arises from municipal bond ownership? Go ahead and tax them if you will: it really makes little difference to this type of investor; he merely places a new floor under the investment yield which is acceptable, and he switches to corporate bonds yielding 7½% or he demands municipals which yield that figure.

Who profits from all of this? It is hard to say. Some fast figure artists with the aid of mirrors and formulae which no one can understand have come forth with the very positive assertion that in the tax exempt bond principle there is a loss to the U.S. Treasury in income taxes of 42% while the states and local government units which issue such bonds realize a benefit of only 25%, thus "proving" a loss to the public in general of 17%.

In the first place, the criteria and procedures which lead to this conclusion are highly questionable; but even if their adsolute validity and accuracy could be established, the cold, stark fact remains that when local government loses its right to issue tax exempt bonds, it loses more than dollars. Take away tax exemption, and the entire system of local governmental capital financing in this country will have to be re-structured, and the only immediate solution lies in a federal subsidy of some sort.

This, of course, is exactly what the opponents of tax exemption of municipal bonds know, and this is the way it has all been patiently planned. Centralism versus local self-government, this is the real issue in all those propaganda barrage to which the American public is being subjected.

Who is the real beneficiary of the exemption of municipal bond interest from federal income taxes? Every American citizen who pays local taxes or locally imposed user charges for a publicly owned facility. Every American citizen who prizes the right of local self-government and every American citizen who believes in efficiency in government as opposed to suffocation under a heap of red tape. This is the real beneficiary of tax-exemption of municipal bonds.

NEW JERSEY CONGRATULATES ASTRONAUT EDWARD ALDRIN, JR.—MONTCLAIR'S MOON MAN

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we have become a marvel for all the world to witness. Americans have explored space and encircled the moon and the earth, and now we have set foot on the moon. I share with all Americans the mutual esteem generated by this momentous occasion.

It is a time of national achievement and international promise. The moon landing demonstrates the necessity of international and world order, peace, and cooperation. It reminds us that we must live in a community of nations to survive in a universe of communities.

---

[1] *Income Distribution and The Federal Income Tax*, Michigan Governmental Studies No. 47, Institute of Public Administration, University of Michigan, 1966, Appendix A.

Col. Edwin "Buzz" Aldrin, Jr., from Montclair, N.J., was there when it happened. As pilot of the lunar module, he was the second man to set foot on the moon. This is not a time for provincial vanity, but I cannot conceal my pride in this personal achievement for one of our hometown boys.

"Buzz" Aldrin is a composite of America. He is the athlete, the military hero, the scientist, the engineer, the family man, and the humorist. The perseverance demonstrated by "Buzz" throughout his life and his drive for perfection and accomplishment resembles the stories of many of our American heroes.

Mr. President, in tribute to this great American and his recent celestial achievement. I ask unanimous consent that an article which describes Col. Aldrin, his life, and aspirations, published in the Elizabeth Daily Journal, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"MOON MAN" ALDRIN, MONTCLAIR NATIVE, RECALLED AS BRILLIANT, AMBITIOUS

(By Paul Recer)

SPACE CENTER, HOUSTON.—Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr., looks like an athlete, talks like a scientist and has the humility of a church elder.

The 39-year-old astronaut is actually all three.

Aldrin, an Air Force Colonel, is lunar module pilot on Apollo 11. He'll follow Apollo 11 commander Neil A. Armstrong out onto the moon's surface early on July 21.

The prospect of becoming one of history's great explorers is humbling, says Aldrin.

"You feel a bit more humble in the fact that you've been very blessed in receiving things that maybe you personally wanted," he says. "I think you have to look at this as an obligation, not only to this particular job, but as an obligation . . . to repay for the opportunity by service to other people."

Aldrin, a blue-eyed man with receding blond hair, is a muscular, agile ex-football player who works almost as hard to stay in shape now as he did when he played center on the 1947 New Jersey high school championship team.

He has a high bar in the back yard of his home near the Manned Spacecraft Center and frequently goes through gymnastic routine. He also pole vaults, a skill he first learned in high school.

Aldrin could stick a "doctor" in front of his name, but never does. He earned a doctorate in orbital mechanics from Massachusetts Institute of Technology, but he's not particularly impressed with it.

HAS OPEN MIND

"People can go to school all their lives and not be sharper than people who haven't," he says. "I think that the education I've been exposed to has served to give me an open mind rather than fill me with a particular type of knowledge."

The astronaut was born in Montclair, N.J. and lived there until college. People who knew him there as a boy speak of his brilliance and ambition.

"He had a 150 IQ and was always in the upper half of the top five per cent of his class," recalls his grade school principal, Al Hartman.

Aldrin started first grade a year early and "just bent over backwards to prove that he could stay," recalls Rita Hogan, a retired elementary teacher who had him as a pupil.

"He had what I call a creativity in most all of his activities," says Hartman. "At 8, he could comprehend at a junior high level. He had the ability at 12 to do what a child usually does in algebra at 15."

Aldrin was the lone son of an early day aviator and, appropriately, the maiden name of his late mother was Marion Moon.

Aldrin's father earned his pilot's license in 1919 and today, at 73, is still qualified to fly.

MECHANICAL MAN

His parents gave him the nickname "Buzz" which has stuck on since.

"My name was the same as my father's," explains the astronaut, "so I guess they felt they needed something else for me."

Even at a young age, Aldrin seemed to develop a reserve that haunts him yet. He's been called "the mechanical man" by some who know him.

"Buzz was one of those kids who had a mind that was really fantastic," says Hartman. "But he would sometimes shrink into his shell."

The astronauts' father remembers him as a "football nut" from an early age and Aldrin was eager, but not outstandingly skilled, when he went out for football in high school.

He was a second-string back for two years and then Clary Anderson, a legend in New Jersey high school football, became coach at Aldrin's school.

"I needed a center," recalls Anderson. "Buzz was a blond, curly haired 160-pounder, so I said 'you're the center'."

Aldrin developed an unusual one-handed snap and is remembered as a "ferocious" tackler.

"He didn't have a lot of natural athletic ability," says Line Coach Anthony J. "Butch" Fortinato, "but he had determination. He was varsity over players that actually had better ability."

But the coaches also remember his reserve.

"The girls thought he was snooty because he was always so busy," says Anderson. "He was friendly, all right, and one of the guys. But when there was horseplay, he would be the last to take part. He was too busy."

TOP STUDENT

Aldrin graduated with a scholastic record of A's and B's, finishing in the top 10 per cent of his class, and received both a scholarship offer from MIT and an appointment to the U.S. Military Academy.

His father said he picked West Point because it offered more athletics.

Buzz made a "hell of a good cadet" recalls W. F. Lewis, academy physical training teacher.

Aldrin was first in his plebe class scholastically and showed a well-remembered dedication in athletics.

"He wasn't frivolous. He wasn't any playboy," says Lewis. He said Aldrin would come in for calisthenics even in the off season.

"Everything was feared and aimed at perfection," says Carlton R. Leton, the academy track coach, of Aldrin as a cadet. "Aldrin was very methodical and business like. He'd come down and do his work and leave."

Aldrin was a pole vaulter at the academy. He scaled up to 13 feet, 8 inches in the days before the flexible glass vaulting poles starting springing vaulters ever higher.

The astronaut graduated third out of 475 cadets in the class of 1951. He took his commission in the Air Force and received his pilot's wings at Bryan, Tex. The Korean War was drawing to a close, but the new Air Forces lieutenant went there for the final months.

DOWNED TWO JETS

He flew 66 combat missions and downed two enemy jets and crippled another.

The war, he recalls, "was all chasing and not being chased."

He married Joan Archer of Hohokus, N.J., after returning from Korea. The Air Force assigned him to three posts in the United States and then sent him to Bitburg, Germany as flight commander of a tactical fighter wing.

Despite his love of flying, he says, he realized toward the end of his three-year tour there that he had also better learn other skills.

"The future of fighters at that time looked pretty bleak," Aldrin recalls. "I decided it was about time to go back and get some more schooling. MIT looked like the best place."

The pilot entered a two-year Air Force program at MIT, but got an extension after a year there to work on his doctorate.

In 1963, Aldrin earned his degree after writing a thesis on orbital rendezvous. A system he suggested for this critical space maneuver was later adopted in part by the Gemini and Apollo programs.

He put his theories to work three years later.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration picked him as an astronaut and later named him to the Gemini 12 mission commanded by Navy Capt. James A. Lovell Jr.

The mission included a rendezvous using a radar and an onboard computer. The Gemini spacecraft was to link up in space with a previously launched Agena target vehicle.

But the radar failed, and Aldrin and Lovell completed the rendezvous with computations of their own.

Aldrin later opened the spacecraft hatch and spent more than five hours "walking in space." By promptly pacing himself, he overcame the problems of exhaustion which cut short earlier space walks. His space walk record still stands.

Aldrin was named to the Apollo 11 crew in January. He admits he would have been "pretty disappointed" if he hadn't made the crew.

But he also has mixed feelings about the fame that's sure to follow.

"I think there are enjoyable parts of it," he says. "There are frustrating parts of it, also. Your life is not the same. You certainly lose privacy."

The astronaut's wife holds a master's degree in dramatic arts and is active is local theater groups, but Aldrin makes little effort to fit in with the theater crowd.

His reserve often strikes people as a coldness, says a friend of Aldrin's wife.

"If you didn't know what he did you wouldn't be at all interested in him," says an actress friend. "He's a very forgettable man, but he's a nice man."

Fellow astronauts say Aldrin has a rich sense of humor, but seldom flashes it. Dedication to his job, they say, often masks it and he often appears pompous when he's concentrating on his work.

"He's a brilliant engineer and a crackerjack pilot," says a technician who has worked with Aldrin for months, "but a totally gray personality."

Aldrin and his wife have three children, Michael, 13; Janice, who'll be 12 in August, and Andrew, 11.

The astronaut said they're not at all impressed that he's going to the moon.

"I feel that they must somehow think that, you know, this thing happens all the time," says Aldrin.

His job takes him away from home for weeks on end, says Aldrin, but he adds "We do try to have family get-togethers whenever we can."

And the second man to walk on the moon has the same problems of parents everywhere.

"We find that just to be able to locate them (the children) is an event around the house," he says. "And we usually do that just before they go to bed. They're extremely independent."

XUM

A BRILLIANT STROKE OF DIPLOMACY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, for the last several years, the most astute observers of the Communist world have noted with great interest the forces of polycentrism at work, the crumbling of what was once the monolith of Joseph Stalin. There is a deep schism in the Communist world between the Soviet Union and China; lesser Communist heresies now proliferate throughout Eastern Europe.

One nation that speaks with an independent voice in foreign policy, that has refused to toe the line drawn by the Soviet leadership, is Rumania.

The President of the United States, recognizing this yearning among the Communist states to carve out their own national foreign policies, has accepted an invitation to visit Bucharest. As the Miami Herald has noted, it is a "bold and imaginative" stroke of American foreign policy:

> It will thrust him onto a world stage which so long has been bare of American Presidential presence.

The Atlanta Journal has written:

> It is good to have a President who is not content to sit back in Washington . . . and let his aides do all the contact work.

I am in firm agreement. President Nixon's visit to Rumania is a brilliant and bold stroke of American diplomacy.

We have a President who is not willing to concede to the Soviet leadership that the ancient states of Eastern Europe are colonies of Mother Russia—a permanent sphere of absolute Russian influence, off limits to American presence. We finally have an independent and imaginative foreign policy that recognizes clearly the vast gulfs between the Soviets and the states of Eastern Europe and deals with the world as it is. The Soviet veto over American foreign policy toward Eastern Europe will no longer be recognized.

Those who term this a provocation of the Soviet Union are asking in effect that we allow the Soviets to dictate our policy toward the Communist part of the world, while the Soviets conduct their own policy in the non-Communist regions of the world. I have yet to hear of Soviet leadership asking American permission to visit the NATO nations; I did not hear of a Soviet request for permission before they moved diplomatically to establish closer ties with the CENTO nations of Turkey, Pakistan, and Iran.

For years we have been told that we must recognize the Soviet bloc is no longer a monolith. Our President has recognized that historical event; he seeks to deal with it to the advantage of the peoples of Eastern Europe and the people of the United States, and in the interests of peace. Now he is faulted for not asking the Russians' permission to make this move. I say, good luck, Mr. President, and Godspeed. Congress is behind you.

THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch recently published an excellent series of articles written by Richard Dudman on the political situation in South Vietnam. Mr. Dudman is one of the most industrious and perceptive reporters on the Washington scene. This series is a thorough exposition of the repressive political environment in Saigon, created by the government on which the United States has placed its chips.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAIGON REGIME'S CHANCE AGAINST REDS AT POLLS RATED SLIM

(By Richard Dudman)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, July 5.—As the Vietnam war slowly begins to run down, the emerging main test of success or failure of Allied policy and strategy is whether any South Vietnamese government can compete effectively against the Viet Cong.

Can the 2-year-old republic, with its American-style constitution proclaiming government "of the people, by the people and for the people," survive the change from shooting war to political contest?

Findings in a month-long inquiry by the Post-Dispatch suggest that the prospects of the non-Communist forces in the approaching political contest must be rated as poor and probably worsening.

It appears, moreover, that the political contest has begun and that the government headed by President Nguyen Van Thieu may be losing and the Viet Cong winning.

KEEPS NARROW BASE

The trouble is that Thieu is clinging to his narrow political base, largely military and Roman Catholic. He is using his extraordinary wartime police powers to block efforts to form a broader, non-Communist "third force."

Paradoxically, the showings on all the secondary tests have turned generally favorable in recent months.

The actual fighting is going well for the government for a change. Enemy body counts are up. Although American fatalities are holding steady at more than 200 a week, the enemy-to-friendly "kill ratio" shows that the other side is being hurt more. It may well be true, at last, that the enemy can no longer mount a major offensive.

Pacification, as measured by the computerized hamlet evaluation survey, shows steady progress. Each month, a higher percentage of the population is rated as living in relative security.

Pacification, which means different things to different people, is the term used to cover a broad range of activities aimed at improving life and freedom for South Vietnamese, and destroying the Viet Cong's popular support. Saigon thinks the program is designed to create positive allegiance to the present government. Washington regards it as an effort to bring about widespread popular support for any government the South Vietnamese people may choose.

Cash rewards bring in more and more enemy defectors, intelligence reports, and tips on where to find enemy caches of weapons and food. Other cash payments persuade more and more "friendly" Vietnamese to build new houses, repair bridges and canals and restore abandoned rice paddies.

Operation Phoenix, the heart of the pacification effort, has an impressive record in its task of wiping out the Viet Cong's shadow government that still collects taxes, recruits new troops and even runs its own mail service over much of South Vietnam. Monthly reports usually show that a thousand or two of these underground officials have been captured, killed or persuaded to defect.

But what will happen when the fighting tapers off, when the long-sought cease-fire comes at last?

FEW COMMITTED

After all the years of fighting and propaganda and cash handouts, a reasonable estimate of the present state of South Vietnamese allegiance puts the number uncommitted to either side at 70 to 80 per cent. Only 20 to 30 per cent are lined up solidly with either the government or the Viet Cong.

A widely respected former minister of information in the Thieu government, Ton That Thien, now a professor at Van Hanh University, offers that estimate. What is more, he says the government is lucky that the number uncommitted remains as high as it is and that so few have swung over to the Communists.

When the time comes to vote, the choice will not be the simple ideological one of capitalism versus Communism or the still simpler one of freedom versus slavery. Instead, it will be Ho Chi Minh (or rather his ally in the South) against Thieu or whichever other non-Communist leader emerges in the meantime.

A main issue is likely to be peace versus more war. Peace sentiment runs strong. Vietnamese are sick of bombing, sick of artillery barrages, sick of being drafted, sick of being taxed, sick of the constant trouble and danger that comes with the war.

Another is likely to be Vietnamese nationalism. On the communist side will be leaders who have established a legitimacy by fighting against foreign intruders no matter who they are—the Japanese, the French and now the Americans. On the government side, the leaders, until now at least, are those who sided with the French and now side with the Americans.

Looking toward peace, many South Vietnamese students and intellectuals have begun to hedge against the future by moving toward their personal accommodations with the Viet Cong. Being civil to a Viet Cong agent might keep one off the Viet Cong blacklist if it turned out that the communists came to power outright or became an important force in a ruling compromise coalition.

The Viet Cong's recent proclamation of a provisional revolutionary government of South Vietnam stepped up the political warfare. Although American officials scoff that the leaders of the new "government" are the same old faces from the Viet Cong and the transitional Alliance of Peace, Nationalist and Democratic Forces, many South Vietnamese consider the move an important one.

FIRST ALTERNATIVE

For the first time, there is an alternative to the Saigon regime. If the enemy now should ask for a cease-fire, the United States and Saigon could hardly refuse. The next step would be a regrouping of forces into assigned areas, the Viet Cong into a generally recognized "liberated zone." The result would be de facto partition, with two capitals and two governments.

The present situation has been long in the making, and the obvious remedy has long been discussed. What was needed, it was said, was for the Saigon government to broaden its base, bring in all the non-communists, and develop a popular regime.

Whatever Thieu's other achievements, his response to these suggestions has been to narrow his political base rather than to broaden it.

He has closed newspapers that have said too much about peace or coalition with the Communists. He has used the draft and imprisonment to put his non-Communist political rivals out of action. Many potential leaders of a broadened regime have been jailed, drafted into the army or sent into exile.

When Thieu announced the formation of a

XUM

political front this spring, it included only the groups he could trust. Even the opposition front, in Saigon, put forward as the start of a loyal opposition in an eventual two-party system, was hand-picked on an invitation-only basis.

This opposition front has become something of a joke, inasmuch as the head of one of the component parties has been telling friends that Thieu personally asked him to take part in the opposition bloc.

A somewhat more independent group, some lawyers, professors and one member of the lower house of the National Assembly, is headed by Tran Ngoc Lieng, a Saigon lawyer, it has been walking the narrow edge of what is permitted. The group carefully avoids the forbidden terms "neutralism" and "coalition" in its program calling for a "government of national reconciliation."

Lieng was summoned to national police headquarters for questioning. He says he expects continued harassment but hopes to avoid arrest.

EXAMPLES GIVEN

Those who have dared to go further have been put out of action entirely. Some examples:

Duong Van Minh, one of the generals who led in overthrowing the dictatorship of Ngo Dinh Diem, was kept in exile and prevented from running in the 1967 presidential election. He now has been permitted to return but remains on the sidelines.

Au Truong Thanh, former minister of economics in the Nguyen Cao Ky government and regarded as one of the most promising potential leaders of a non-Communist or coalition regime, is in exile in France. He was thrown off the ballot shortly before the 1967 election on the ground that his peace candidacy was neutralist and pro-Communist. He later was arrested, ostensibly for his own protection. Eventually, after intercession by the U.S. mission, he was released from prison and permitted to go with his family to France, where he teaches in a university at Tours.

Gen. Nguyen Chang Thi, former commander of the northern First Corps, one of the few national leaders who had the respect of the militant Buddhists, is in exile in Washington, where Ky banished him with the help of Gen. William C. Westmoreland.

BUDDHIST DRAFTED

Tran Quang Truong, a widely respected Buddhist layman and university professor who walked out of the constitutional assembly in 1966 because of the government's suppression of the Buddhist struggle movement, was ordered back into the army for additional duty, although he had long since completed his military service. He has no prospect of returning to politics.

Vinh Kha, who was president of the student body of the University of Hue and took a leading part in the struggle movement, was drafted as a sergeant although he was a fourth-year medical student. He is in prison, convicted of desertion.

UNDER HOUSE ARREST

Hoang Van Giau, another leader of the struggle movement, was drafted, went into hiding and was caught and sent to prison.

Thich Tri Quang, the able if troublesome and charismatic leader of the militant Buddhists, as anti-Communist as he is anti-Thieu, is under virtual house arrest at the An Quang pagoda, effectively out of action for the present.

In its systematic suppression of the struggle movement, the government followed a pattern of drafting hundreds of the student activists as privates, although Vietnamese university students entering the army are almost invariably commissioned as officers. Many either evaded the draft or deserted after induction and wound up in prison or, in some cases, with the Viet Cong.

Whatever the merits of the cases against Thich Thien Minh, director of the Buddhist youth center, Truong Dinh Dzu, runner-up peace candidate in the 1967 election, and Nguyen Lau, editor of the Saigon Daily News, their continued imprisonment is a constant warning to Thieu's non-Communist opposition to lie low or take the consequences.

SAIGON FLOUTS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

(By Richard Dudman)

SAIGON, July 7.—An American Citizens' committee touched a raw nerve when it came to Saigon recently to investigate the status of political and religious freedom in South Vietnam.

American and Vietnamese officials barely concealed their annoyance over the visit, although they decided that they could not avoid co-operating, especially because one member of the group was a congressman.

An official of the United States mission said afterward that the "study" was "an unconscionable smear on a sovereign ally in time of war." He said that it was cowardly of the group to question such practices in South Vietnam when China stood threateningly nearby and positively "Phariseeical" to cast the first stone, considering the many abuses of civil liberties in the United States.

On the Vietnamese side, hard-line supporters of President Nguyen Van Thieu in the National Assembly gave a luncheon for the American study team and then in very un-Vietnamese fashion denounced their guests to their faces. Disagreement here is characteristically oblique, but these Vietnamese legislators asked bluntly who had appointed the American committee, who was paying its expenses, and why it did not also investigate the status of civil liberties in Hanoi and why it did not inspect the mass graves at Hue where the Viet Cong murdered hundreds of citizens in the Tet offensive last year.

But there were many anti-Communists who heralded the American committee as a prospect of relief from what they contend is an oppressive regime seeking above all else to maintain itself in power.

A four-week inquiry into the situation by the Post-Dispatch has produced a mass of evidence that President Thieu is operating a semipolice state. There is not much dispute about this, but there is wide disagreement as to whether it is necessary.

Some of the bitterest comments encountered came from a Vietnamese lawyer to whom high American embassy officials had repeatedly referred the reporter as a reliable source.

The attorney supplied details of several cases of false arrest and torture. He said the fingers of one of his clients had been broken in the course of third-degree interrogation the previous day. He denounced the arrest and imprisonment of Thich Thien Minh, a prominent Buddhist monk, and Nguyen Lau, publisher of the Saigon Daily News.

"We have authoritarian rule in South Vietnam," the lawyer said. "According to the constitution, we have freedom. Actually we have none. We have an unofficial police state."

Somewhere between 15,000 and 35,000 South Vietnamese citizens are now in prison for alleged political crimes ranging from active participation in the Viet Cong to merely advocating coalition with the Viet Cong, or a neutral Vietnam.

Other thousands are being detained indefinitely on mere suspicion of being Viet Cong sympathizers or supporters, for investigation, or through crude extortion rackets, maliciously false accusations or official red tape.

Many of these prisoners were picked up in wholesale lots in the course of military sweeps of contested areas. These detainees are classed as "Viet Cong suspects" and theoretically are quickly screened to hold only those against whom there is substantial evidence. Actually, many are held for months or even years without being brought to trial.

Others have been caught in a year-old program known as Operation Phoenix, aimed at beating the Viet Cong at its own game by rooting out the "Viet Cong infrastructure," the shadow government whose network extends through most of South Vietnam.

Still other prisoners have been picked up under a broad interpretation of Article 4 of the Vietnamese constitution, which prohibits "every activity designed to publicize or carry out Communism." Such arrests, often for advocating "neutralism" or calling for a political compromise to end the war, have led to many of the most publicized cases of political imprisonment.

Finally, there are those who are arrested clearly for political reasons but technically on such grounds as draft evasion, desertion from the armed forces, or conducting a meeting or press conference without the required government permission.

South Vietnam's American-style constitution bears little resemblance to what actually goes on under the Thieu regime.

The constitution prohibits arrest without a warrant, yet suspects are rounded up every day on the basis of unsupported accusation.

Torture is outlawed, yet broken fingers, electrical burns and bruises from systematic beatings of arms, legs and backs attest to the continued use of torture as a tool of interrogation.

A Saigon lawyer today recognizes the same police bullies who used to give the third-degree under the French.

The constitution says that "a defendant is entitled to a speedy and public trial," yet thousands of political prisoners are held in prison two years or sometimes far longer without any hearing at all or on the decision of a mere provincial security committee that looks only at a dossier.

A defendant is guaranteed the right to a defense lawyer for counsel at every phase of the interrogation, including the preliminary investigation."

Yet only a few of several hundred convicts serving sentences of five years or more on the prison island of Con Son, questioned by the Post-Dispatch, said they had been represented by counsel, even court-appointed counsel.

Minister of the Interior Tran Thien Khiem insists that lawyers may be present and communicate with their clients during investigations and may look at the dossiers to plan their defense.

But when a tour of the central interrogation center in Saigon, disclosed a young woman detainee who said she had no lawyer, Col. Nguyen Mau, chief of the national police special branch, a rough equivalent of the American FBI, said flatly that no lawyer was ever permitted inside the center. Detainees may retain counsel only if transferred to prison to await trial, he said.

American and Vietnamese officials, when asked about these discrepancies, pointed out that South Vietnam is a poor and backward country doing the best it can in the midst of an all-out war against a ruthless underground insurgency.

Several of these officials recalled that the United States had uprooted Japanese-Americans on the West Coast at the start of World War II and put them into inland detention camps on the notion that some of them might be disloyal. They pointed out that South Vietnam is only two years old as a republic and asked whether the state of civil liberties was any better in the United States in, say, 1791.

A former minister of information, Ton That Thien, who gained a reputation for toughness in suspending newspapers that offended President Thieu or Prime Minister Tran Van Huong, now has turned to teaching and can afford to be philosophical about such matters.

He says that he is not surprised that the government does not abide by its own constitution, because the document is "a Jeffersonian-Lockeian head on a Confucian body." (John Locke was a Seventeenth Century English philosopher.)

His implication is that government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," as the preamble describes it, is a charade being played by Vietnamese actors with an American script for an American audience.

SAIGON PRODDED BY UNITED STATES TO SETTLE PRISONER CASES

(By Richard Dudman)

SAIGON, July 8.—Under the careful direction of Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, American officials are using quiet persuasion in hopes that the South Vietnamese government will settle several cases of political imprisonment that have stirred world criticism and concern.

Pressure would be too strong a word, because Bunker hews close to the line that South Vietnam is a sovereign nation. He also preaches gentleness toward what he regards as a young but promising government struggling to gain strength against heavy odds.

These efforts appear to be based partly on considerations of public relations as well as principle. Settlement would mollify American public opinion and remove one embarrassment to the Saigon regime and the United States policy of supporting it.

Among these cases, the best known is that of Truong Dinh Dzu, a peace candidate who was runner-up in the 1967 presidential election and since has been sentenced to five years in prison for advocating coalition with the National Liberation Front.

Foreign demands for Dzu's release have built his case into a major controversy, but few Vietnamese or Americans in South Vietnam has a good word to say for him. A frequent comment is that "he belongs in prison, but he's there for the wrong reason."

Dzu is a vigorous, engaging man. In his campaign, he attacked President Nguyen Van Thieu savagely and called for a political settlement of the war. Many of his votes, however, are attributed to the fact that his symbol, the dove, stands in Vietnam for a good harvest. Many peasants are said to have voted for him for good luck.

But elsewhere in the world his peace platform, plus a continuing campaign by his articulate and attractive son and daughter in the United States and similar appeals here by a younger daughter and his handsome wife, who tearfully begs visitors to intercede for her husband, have stirred much sympathy and have kept the case in the headlines.

The reason that few Americans or Vietnamese here in South Vietnam have rallied to Dzu's support is that he is generally regarded as a crook.

His style of life requires more money than most lawyers can earn here. He has eight housemaids, three chauffeurs, three automobiles and two concubines, each of which is reputed to get $400 a month for expenses.

Dzu is said to have built his lucrative law practice mainly through high-level influence in recent years, including a connection with a relative of Madame Ngo Dinh Nhu who steered business to him under the Diem regime.

More recently, he has been arrested several times, but never prosecuted, on charges of check kiting, embezzlement and swindling widows and orphans. The Lawyers' Council of Saigon has disbarred him because of his unsavory reputation.

Foreign interest in Dzu's case got a new push recently when Dzu announced that he had lost 10 pounds and had suffered a heart attack when imprisoned on Con Son Island, off the southeast coast. Although he had been overweight and had had no history of heart trouble, and although few Vietnamese believed his story, President Nguyen Van Thieu took the occasion to transfer him to a more comfortable detention center in Saigon.

Thieu has given no indication, however, that he is prepared to bow to world opinion and release Dzu. When members of an American citizens' committee asked him recently to consider releasing the prisoner, Thieu told them:

"Dzu is talking not only for peace; he says we should have coalition government. This is anticonstitutional. Under Article 4, we never can have coalition government unless the constitution is changed."

Article 4 prohibits "every activity designed to publicize or carry out Communism."

Thieu made no bones about calling Dzu a "political prisoner," but he seemed to be following common Vietnamese usage of so classifying all who give aid and comfort to the Viet Cong, as distinguished from prisoners of war.

"When he attacked us, nobody protested," Thieu said. "He had a right to talk about peace, but he had no right to promote coalition."

The case of Nguyen Lau, publisher and owner of the English-language Saigon Daily News, is more complicated. He was arrested last spring and is being held incommunicado during a prolonged investigation. The government has since closed down his newspaper indefinitely for publishing an editorial blaming Prime Minister Tran Van Huong for a current surge of inflation.

Last week a military tribunal sentenced him to five years in prison on charges of "actions detrimental to the national order," but acquitted him on a charge of rebellion.

American officials consider Lau guilty of treason, although there is only one witness to his alleged crime instead of the two that would be required under U.S. law. They concede, however, that the South Vietnamese government has bungled the case and let Lau obtain the advantage in public opinion.

In the American view, Lau clearly was supplying intelligence information regularly to the enemy, although examples cited thus far consist only of passing along his thoughts as to President Richard M. Nixon's Vietnam policies and the like.

The undisputed facts of the case are that Lau had been meeting with an enemy political agent for discussions of current news developments. The agent was caught, and he implicated Lau. The government presented both men at a press conference last April, together with two other Viet Cong agents and 25 other intellectuals and professional persons who had been arrested on charges of having been in contact with the agents.

Lau and the agent who implicated him, Tran Ngoc Hien, had been childhood friends. Hien had gone to North Vietnam when the country was partitioned. He had come South again in 1964, he said, under instructions to establish close relations with non-Communist dissidents and gather political information from them.

In the press conference, Lau won the sympathy of most observers by acknowledging that the law required him to denounce a man he knew to be a Viet Cong agent but explaining that he had hesitated to turn against a boyhood friend.

More recently, the government sought to strengthen its case by reporting that a captured letter from Hanoi officials mentioned Lau's name (It was not clear whether it named him as an agent or merely as a possible source of information) and producing a South Vietnamese press card that it said Lau had issued to Hien to facilitate his movements while in the South.

A photographic copy of the Press card examined by the Post-Dispatch bore Lau's signature and identified as a representative of the Saigon Daily News one Ton That Dong, said by police to be a false name given Hien by his intelligence agency in Hanoi.

Lau's friends contend that the letter would have referred to Lau by a pseudonym if he had been, in fact, a Viet Cong agent. They explained the issuance of the presscard as a loose practice widely used in Saigon to give a friend something to show the police at the numerous check points and to serve as a pass after the midnight curfew.

A different view came from Ton That Thien, a widely respected former minister of information, now a professor at Ban Hanh university.

"Lau is a weak man," Thien told the Post-Dispatch. "He had been trying for two years to get out of the country, to escape the squeeze between the Viet Cong and the government. He had applied for a passport shortly before he was arrested. He should not have let a Viet Cong agent come to his house, even if the man was a childhood friend. The proper answer would have been, 'Go away.'"

Neither Lau's wife nor his lawyer were permitted to talk with him after the arrest. The official justification for this was that the investigation was still in progress.

A third major case is that of Le Doan Kim, a longtime promoter of the idea of a neutral Indochina.

Kim had represented the South Vietnamese neutralist movement at a meeting organized in 1965 by Prince Norodom Sihanouk of Cambodia in Phnom Penh. Since then, he has been well enough regarded by the Saigon government to have been sent to Phnom Penh and Paris on missions for the national police directorate and the Vietnamese Confederation of Labor.

When the Paris peace talks turned to the subject of neutralism early this year, Kim called a press conference and, in preparation, sent out copies of his 1965 speech on neutralism. He was arrested on the eve of the scheduled press conference and first was charged with engaging in "subversive activities against the security of the state." The evidence was the four-year-old speech.

Later he was tried on the reduced charge of attempting to hold an illegal press conference, a violation of a 1968 law that requires a police permit for any meeting of more than five persons. He was sentenced to a year in prison.

In part, these arrests are part of Thieu's tough public stance intended to discourage Hanoi from thinking that as long as it continues to fight the Saigon regime will gradually crumble and give ground.

But critics cite these and similar cases as evidence that Thieu is using the power of arrest to suppress any possible opposition and maintain his narrow-based regime in power.

And, rightly or wrongly, Thieu's policy stands in the way of any accommodation with Hanoi and the new provisional revolutionary government of South Vietnam, successor to the National Liberation Front, if that offers a way to end the fighting.

BUDDHISTS SAID TO REGARD MINH EVIDENCE AS FABRICATED

(By Richard Dudman)

SAIGON, July 9.—Of all the political arrests made by the strange mixture of dictatorship and democracy that rules South Vietnam, that of Thich Thien Minh promises to have the most profound repercussions.

When the high ranking Buddhist monk was sentenced last March to 10 years at hard labor, the case recalled all the bitterness of the anti-Buddhist policy that led to the overthrow and assassination of President Ngo Dinh Diem in 1963, the bloody suppression of the Buddhist struggle movement in 1966 and the almost successful attempt to assassinate Thien Minh with a grenade later that year.

Many Buddhists of the powerful militant

XUM

faction affiliated with the An Quang pagoda have disregarded entirely the serious charges against him, assuming that they must have been fabricated. They have seen the incident as one more round of persecution, once more with the approval of the Americans.

President Nguyen Van Thieu welcomed the chance to put the powerful monk out of action. He told a group of visiting Americans inquiring into political and religious freedom in South Vietnam that he had been annoyed a long time over "insulting" nightly attacks on him and his regime over a loudspeaker in the sanctuary of the pagoda. But he said he dared not move against the monk on that ground for fear of being accused of suppressing freedom of speech and religion.

High-ranking members of the United States mission believe Thien Minh fully deserved the sentence, although they seemed to approve when Thieu bowed to world opinion and took the monk off hard labor and cut his sentence from 10 years to three years, as "a goodwill measure" on the occasion of Buddha's birthday.

Saigon Chief of Police Trang Si Tan recently gave a long account of the investigation and arrest. He used charts and photographs in an effort to convince skeptics that Thien Minh was guilty as charged.

In a chain of arrests, Tan said, police had picked up an admitted Viet Cong agent at a house in central Saigon last Feb. 22. The guerrilla, named Cao Duy Tuan, gave his residence as the Buddhist Youth Center and said he had Chinese weapons and ammunition in his room there.

The next day, led by Tuan, police raided the youth center and found in the agent's room a Chinese pistol and two pounds of C-4 explosive, useful in sabotage and terror operations.

Some U.S. officials believe incorrectly that Thien Minh just happened to be present and that the police had not expected to seize him in the raid. Actually, the monk was the director of the youth center, lived there regularly, and accompanied police as they searched the place with a warrant.

In other rooms, said Tan, officers found 20 pounds of Communist documents including printed Tet holiday greetings from Ho Chi Minh, apparently for distribution in South Vietnam.

The police chief showed photographs of a closet with a false back that concealed the entrance to a small secret room. Inside, he said, were a bed, a chair and a stack of bricks covering a blue nylon bag containing Viet Cong documents including a mobilization order, instructions to attack Saigon and a letter from the Viet Cong Central Committee asking the youth of Saigon to rise up and join the insurrection. There also were more Chinese weapons and explosives and fake safe conduct passes.

"This showed that a high-ranking Viet Cong cadre lived there, receiving direct orders from the Viet Cong Central Committee," the police chief said.

Eventually the search party came to Thien Minh's room, Tan reported. The door was locked, and the monk said he had lost the key. After some discussion, in which the monk agreed to let the police shoot out the lock, a Chinese locksmith was brought in and the door was opened.

Inside, said Tan, were eight youths—two Viet Cong agents, four draft dodgers and two deserters from the armed forces.

As a result, the specific charges against the monk were harboring traitors, assisting draft dodgers and deserters, and illegal possession of firearms and ammunition. The government also seized control of the youth center, although it was turned back to the Buddhists when Thien Minh's sentence was shortened.

Certain other facts round out the story as told by the police chief. Cao Duy Tuan, the Viet Cong informant who guided the police in the raid, has been arrested several months earlier, held for a time and released.

It developed, moreover, that Tuan had obtained lodging at the youth center not from Thien Minh but from one of his subordinates. The monk's defense was that he did not know that Tuan and the illegal weapons were in the institution.

These circumstances have led many Vietnamese, who tend to think in terms of plots and counter-plots, to conclude that Tuan was a police spy who planted the evidence on behalf of the police.

Suspicions are fed in most such cases here by the fact that lawyers generally are given only a few hours to prepare for trial and have little or no chance to talk with the defendants or study the charges and evidence.

An alternative explanation believed by some is that the Viet Cong and the other law breakers took advantage of Buddhist religious compassion, which requires a pagoda to feed and shelter all who seek aid, without asking any questions.

Regardless of the facts of this case, it is clear that President Nguyen Cao Ky and more recently President Thieu have regarded the An Quang Buddhists as a hostile political force that had to be put out of action and kept out of action.

Thich Tri Quang, the most prominent leader of the faction through the turmoil of 1966, is under heavy surveillance that amounts to virtual house arrest. He avoids publicity and concentrates for the time being on remodeling his living quarters and installing an air conditioner at the pagoda.

Many leaders of the struggle movement are still in prison or have been drafted into the army. Those who have been released from prison generally avoid politics for fear of getting into new trouble with the government.

At Hue, where Buddhist students burned the American library and the American consulate in 1966 and Buddhist troops refused to obey orders to halt the demonstrations, attitudes have changed remarkably. At first, the great bitterness over the heavy-handed methods that Ky used to crush the Buddhist uprising developed into strong sentiment for coalition with the Communists and some outright sympathy with the Viet Cong.

Some of the bitterness remains, but any thought of making a deal with the Viet Cong vanished when the enemy held the city for 24 days in the Tet offensive last year and murdered hundreds of plain citizens as well as government functionaries. More than 800 bodies have been found in mass graves, and more than 1000 persons are still missing.

From a stronghold of Tri Quang's militant Buddhists, Hue has become the most strongly anti-Communist city in the country.

Ironically, the Buddhist militants began their struggle movement as a demand for early elections and the drafting of a constitution. They hoped to elect a successor to the Thieu-Ky regime, one that would negotiate an early peace and get rid of all foreign troops, American as well as North Vietnamese.

That bit of history is sometimes forgotten, now that Thieu and Ky have conducted the elections, won control under the new constitution and now seem bent on continuing the war in quest of victory.

No hard evidence has ever been produced to show that the struggle movement itself or Thich Thien Minh or Thich Tri Quang were deliberately helping the Viet Cong. Leaders of the movement did, however, lose control of it so that its actions could sometimes be influenced by Viet Cong agents on the one hand and perhaps by government provocateurs on the other.

The American role in the crushing of the movement—U.S. Navy planes carried the South Vietnamese troops to Hue and Da Nang for a campaign of suppression in which several hundred persons were killed has led some respected South Vietnamese intellectuals to believe that the United States always has opposed the Buddhists, even when it encouraged the overthrow of President Diem. The real reason for the American green light for that coup, so the argument goes, was not Diem's mistreatment of the Buddhists but the fact that he was preparing to end the war by negotiating a settlement with Hanoi.

Whatever the rights and wrongs of the Thien Minh case and the whole struggle movement episode, the fact remains that the movement was once probably the second most powerful political organization in South Vietnam. The most powerful was the Viet Cong, not the Saigon government except for the support of American troops.

The Buddhist militants were at one time and may still be the most promising counterforce to oppose the National Liberation Front if war eventually gives way to political contest. But their movement now has been paralyzed and perhaps permanently crippled.

POLITICAL LIBERTY A DISPENSABLE SAIGON LUXURY

(By Richard Dudman)

SAIGON, July 10.—A long time Western observer of Southeast Asia, one whose judgments have been proved right time after time, quotes Talleyrand in appraising President Nguyen Van Thieu's policy of political arrest and imprisonment: "It is worse than a crime—it is a blunder."

By Asian standards, the semipolice state that Thieu and former Premier Nguyen Cao Ky have been operating for four years with American backing is not particularly brutal or even very efficient.

Considerable criticism of the government is permitted, press censorship is only spotty, and torture is applied only occasionally. The National Assembly, whose members enjoy immunity from government reprisal, rivals the United States Congress as an independent center of power and dissent.

If Thieu has used the police power to neutralize political leaders who threaten his position and policies, it must be said also that political assassination is not the fashion here as it is in some countries.

But critics ask whether this is one situation where normal standards won't do.

South Vietnam's situation is a special case, far different from the problems faced by the government of Thailand, the Philippines, South Korea, Formosa, India and Pakistan, where the practice of throwing political enemies in jail is also well established.

Two sets of circumstances set South Vietnam apart from the rest:

First, the government is beset by a well-organized and deeply rooted revolutionary conspiracy. Operating in secret the Viet Cong have set up a shadow government through most of the country, with functionaries to match all the principal officials of Thieu's government.

Second, as the United States begins to withdraw its forces, Thieu's government begins to approach the moment of truth when the Viet Cong insurgency will turn from war and terror to political competition. Both sides will have to begin trying to win through politics what they could not win through fighting, and that means competing for the voluntary allegiance of the South Vietnamese people.

Thieu has been concentrating on the first at the expense of the second. What is more, his emphasis has the encouragement of the U.S. mission, if not as a matter of American policy at least as the cumulative impact of the thousands of American advisers. In their eagerness to track down and liquidate members of the shadow government, Thieu and

XUM

Vice President Ky generally see political liberty as a dispensable luxury.

More specifically, they argue that the Saigon government must not be bound by ordinary rules of evidence and due process of law. After all, they often say, the government cannot afford to take a chance when a politician who advocates a neutralist or coalition policy may actually be a disciplined agent of the Viet Cong.

Leniency toward such talk, moreover, could serve to stiffen the determination of Hanoi and the Viet Cong to continue to fight in the hope of more and more political concessions, it is contended.

At the heart of the pacification effort is Operation Phoenix, an effort to identify, ferret out and dispose of the key members of the Viet Cong "infrastructure."

Phoenix is a largely secret enterprise, operated by the Vietnamese although it was organized by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency and is guided by American "Phoenix advisers" in the 44 provinces and most of the 242 districts as well as major cities.

All intelligence resources are used to build a blacklist of the supposed key figures in the shadow government and find their whereabouts. When one is found, the final step is to send a military, paramilitary of police detachment to persuade the identified Viet Cong official to defect, to arrest him, or, if necessary, to kill him.

In one of the few public accounts of Operation Phoenix, the U.S. mission reported last winter that 8600 blacklisted suspects had been "captured, killed or welcomed as defectors" in the first nine months of last year. The report said the "bag" was 1459 for October and 2338 for November. The November "bag" included 1563 captured, 409 killed resisting arrest and 366 who defected to the government's side.

Critics say the Phoenix system often is abused. Huong Ho, a member of the National Assembly from Kien Phong Province, says police often pick up someone on the street, order him to denounce a wealthy citizen as a Viet Cong agent, arrest the rich man, and then release him on payment of 25,000 or 50,000 piasters in ransom.

Ngo Cong Duc, a deputy from Vinh Binh Province in the Mekong Delta, says that malicious informants and sometimes actual Viet Cong agents supply names to the Phoenix blacklist, getting around the Phoenix system of cross-checks by reporting a person through several different agencies.

U.S. officials contend that necessary flexibility makes some abuses inevitable. The mission's report says that a person arrested is taken before a military field court "if the evidence and the testimony add up to a legal case." But it notes that "such legally admissible evidence may be impossible to obtain if most of the witnesses and the evidence are beyond the court's reach in enemy territory."

"If the case against the suspect is nevertheless conclusive, he is detained," says the report. "Under Vietnamese law, such a man may be detained without judicial charge up to two years, and that detention period may be extended if the detainee's freedom would constitute a threat to the security of the nation.

American officials consider the present system a great improvement over Gen. William C. Westmoreland's old "county fair" operation, in which a village was cordoned off, all the villagers screened, perhaps hundreds held for investigation and the great majority eventually freed as innocent bystanders.

The Phoenix blacklist was refined three months ago to eliminate mere rank and file and leave only the Viet Cong leaders—members of the newly elected village and hamlet "liberation committees" and such officials as political, finance and security chiefs in the shadow government.

This substitution of "a rifle shot for a shotgun blast" has reduced the blacklist from more than 90,000 to about 70,000 and doubtless has lessened the number of innocent persons carried on the list. But in some districts the Vietnamese blacklist remains twice or three times the size of the U.S. blacklist, leaving the way open for continued wholesale arrests.

Whether a person is arrested in the Phoenix program or picked up in a military sweep, his case eventually goes before a provincial security council, comprising top law enforcement officials with the recent addition of a judge and the president of the elected provincial council.

Proceeding much as a local draft board in the United States, the security council meets once or twice a week and considers perhaps 20 or 30 cases at each sitting.

It rarely sees the suspect or hears witnesses, acting usually on the basis of a written record of the investigation. The suspect is not permitted to have a lawyer and often may not see his relatives until the investigation is over and the security council has acted.

As a random example, the records of a recent security council meeting for Thua Thien Province showed that, of 30 cases considered, seven suspects were released, 22 were sentenced to two years or less in prison, and one was ordered transferred to Da Nang for trial by a military court. Two years is the longest sentence that may be imposed without trial.

Harsh as this may seem—to be subject to imprisonment for two years without having a lawyer or a trial—attorneys say still worse things happen. They cite numerous cases in which defendants are held for months after acquittal by one of the military courts.

Sometimes the results seem to justify police-state methods. Several cases examined by the Post-Dispatch sounded at first like flagrant use of the police power to settle grudges or extort money from prominent citizens. The victims were pillars of their communities, reputable physicians and merchants, and their families and friends were terrified and outraged. In each case, the police followed the usual practice of holding the "suspect" incommunicado during lengthy investigation.

What the families and friends did not know, however, and do not know even yet, is that police had obtained detailed confessions in which the suspects admitted that they were key officials of the Viet Cong's shadow government. While living ostensibly normal and upright lives in their cities and towns, they said, they had secretly been serving in such capacities as paymaster, supply agent and intelligence co-ordinator in this Viet Cong "infrastructure."

Each of the conspiractors told of having served in Ho Chi Minh's guerrilla army against the French and having settled in the South after the country was partitioned in 1954. In each case, a Viet Cong agent, an associate from the old Viet Minh days, eventually appeared. Through threats and peruasion, the solid citizen was drawn into the underground organization. Once there, he was held in constant fear of being exposed if he did not continue to co-operate.

Dossiers of the cases show that when a Vietnamese confesses he really tells all. Some of the confessions list as many as 100 names of others said to have attended meetings and done the work of the Viet Cong conspiracy.

Officials argue that if a suspect had seen his family or lawyer during the investigation, word of his confession could have leaked out. Any secret Viet Cong agent associated with the informant could have gone into hiding before police could act on the information.

A contrary case was a scandal that broke into the open last May in Vinh Binh province when Congressman Duc began receiving complaints from home about widespread arbitrary arrests.

A full congressional investigation determined that there had been several hundred unjustified arrests and that many of the victims had been held for months merely on suspicion that they might have a Viet Cong connection. The minister of the interior blamed low-level officials and ordered rapid processing of the prisoners to release the innocent.

Duc told the Post-Dispatch that most of the victims had been rounded up as part of a province-wide extortion racket in which payoffs for release from detention went all the way to the province chief. He said a crooked province police chief shared in the pay-offs.

Some of the arrests, Duc said, where because of local grudges. One wealthy man was picked up because his daughter had scorned the advances of a province official. In some cases, he said, Viet Cong agents had given information to the police to punish persons who had refused to co-operate with their underground organization.

At Phu Vinh, the province capital, American military and civilian advisers said they resented the bad publicity and contended that conditions there were no worse than in most other provinces. Most jails are overcrowded, disposition of cases goes slowly, and complaints of crooked police chiefs are common all over South Vietnam, they said.

There were obvious political motives in Duc's charges—he was feuding with the province chief. There were rumors, moreover, that Duc was working for the Viet Cong. An American officer said he found partial confirmation of the rumors in a remark Duc had made after several drinks at a reception in the Tet holidays last winter. This treasonous remark turned out to have been an observation that the Americans had not succeeded very well in Vietnam.

But a U.S. political specialist looked into Duc's charges and found them fully justified. Citizens had, indeed, been rounded up and held merely because they happened to be found in the area of a military operation. Police ignored the advice of the newly elected village chiefs, who vouched for the suspects.

A jail built for 270 inmates held more than 700, some of them there as long as nine months for investigation. Processing of the prisoners was accelerated from five a month to 50 a month only after the congressional investigation.

One result of the police-state methods and Thieu's exclusive emphasis on destroying the Viet Cong is that many of the most promising non-Communist political leaders have been imprisoned, driven into exile, thrown into the army or otherwise put out of action.

Another is the technical point that widespread detention without legal counsel or trial actually interferes with successful police work. Lawyers protect their clients, but they also protect the government against the mistakes and self-delusions that grow out of false accusations, false information and false confessions extorted by third-degree methods.

Most important of all, the South Vietnamese government is hurting its own credibility by employing the methods of a police state. When the authorities do catch a bona fide Viet Cong agent, public doubts arise because of the secrecy that surrounds the investigation and prosecution.

Many Vietnamese and Americans fear that, when a ceasefire eventually comes, the Viet Cong will remain a powerful political force, whereas Thieu will have knocked off any important non-Communist opposition and will have to face the Communists alone.

The prospect is that the South Vietnamese people will continue to regard the Saigon government as an oppressive force seeking only to collect taxes and draft men into the army instead of being a source of support and assistance and protection.

If that happens, self-determination will offer only a poor choice.

XUM

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURPHY AT NORTH ISLAND NAVAL AIR STATION, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, my friend, the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), delivered a speech last Saturday at the North Island Naval Air Station, San Diego, Calif. I believe it is extremely thoughtful, and at his request I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR GEORGE MURPHY AT NORTH ISLAND NAVAL AIR STATION, SAN DIEGO, CALIF., JULY 19, 1969

In a matter of hours, an American civilian will stand on the moon. He will be piloted to his final destination and guarded by American Air Force officers. He will have been placed there by the combined efforts of the American citizens, American industry, the United States Government, and the teams of scientific, investigative research from American universities. One of his first acts will be to plant the American Flag on the surface of the moon. This act, and that flag, will be visible to all of the people of the world. On his return, he will be brought home by the United States Navy on a ship bearing aircraft serviced at this installation.

Today we commemorate, on the eve of this great accomplishment, the 50th anniversary of this facility. The timing could not be more significant. Just a few short years before North Island was dedicated to the service of American Naval Aviation, Orville and Wilbur Wright's flimsy aircraft had sputtered into the sky, linked to its power by a bicycle chain. In its infancy, Billy Mitchell was court-martialed for his outspoken advocacy of air power as an indispensible weapon in our military arsenal. Less than ten years after its founding, adjacent to this base, a local engineer, Claude Ryan, and his associates were readying the aircraft which would drop out of the mist over Ireland, and among other things, prove General Mitchell to be correct.

For fifty years, at this base and in this city, the combined efforts of American civilians and American military men and women have been recognized in the development of the tools of peace and the preservation of American independence and personal liberty. Here we also witnessed our triumphs and our failures. It is to this Port the first casualties of Pearl Harbor, Guadalcanal, Tarawa, and all of the points enroute to peace in World War II returned, and it is here the victors were welcomed home. From here, too, Americans embarked on their way to Korea and Vietnam. It was here a few short months ago, the men of the Pueblo landed. It is therefore fitting and proper that as we look back, we examine the present and consider the future.

Before the founding of the Republic, Patrick Henry observed:

"I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience. I know no way of judging of the future but by the past."

As we look back, we should be conscious of the fact that in every instance our purpose was not conquest, but peace.

When this base was founded, however, our defense policy could be embodied in a simple sentence—a historic declaration of an embattled American Ambassador—"millions for defense but not one cent for tribute." Those words were spoken in 1797 by Charles Pinckney, Minister of France when he was told attacks on American shipping would be halted only if this country paid a bribe and made a large loan. However, the world has become more complex. In 1940 President Roosevelt observed:

"The Soviet Union, as everybody who has the courage to face the fact knows, is run by a dictatorship as absolute as any other dictatorship in the world." (Address to American Youth Congress, February 10, 1940.)

Bear in mind that these words were spoken at a time when Adolf Hitler was at the height of his power in Nazi Germany.

By 1946 Winston Churchill observed:

". . . An Iron Curtain has descended across the Continent. Behind that line lie all the capitals of the ancient states of Central and Eastern Europe."

By 1952 an unbroken chain of broken treaties brought us to an Administration that proceeded on a basic premise, that for eight years kept us at peace. At the conclusion of his term of office, Dwight David Eisenhower restated that premise:

"A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be temped to risk his own destruction."

During the succeeding eight years, Americans watched again as treaties were broken in Laos, in Korea, in Czechoslovakia, and in Berlin. And once again, a Republican President is faced with the problem of extricating American boys from a war nobody wants but the communists.

Yet the voice of the critic of a strong defense is heard at home. The same educational structure that created the brainpower to send a man to the moon is under siege from anarchists who want to tear it down. They say openly that they want to destroy the establishment, and seldom do they say anything about rebuilding it.

The path to peace has always been difficult. In the complex world of intercontinental ballistic missiles and thermonuclear bombs, it is tortuous. No sane person wants war. There can be no doubt that the President of the United States wants peace. He is trying to find it at the conference table, in the diplomatic halls, at the highest levels of world government. In my meetings with the President, he has spoken of his anguish over this perplexing problem. He is literally about to tour the ends of the earth in an effort to find its solution.

There is, however, no simple solution. The carpers use easy slogans as a substitute for difficult thinking. You've all heard them.

"Ban the bomb."

"Make love not war."

The first statement is dangerous in the simple form in which it is stated. The second statement has some interest for most of us—but then it really isn't the answer.

In five years in the United States Senate, I have gained some personal experience with the real problem. I was in Vietnam on a Presidential commission to observe the free elections of Vietnam. I can report firsthand of the efforts of the United States to insure the freedom of that election and of the communists' to prevent it. If I had stayed on my original schedule in visiting polling places, I would not have been here today. The communists exploded a bomb only a few minutes before the United States Inspection Team, of which I was a member, arrived at one hamlet. It was intended to assassinate us. It failed and we stayed. Our purpose in Vietnam is in keeping with the American tradition—the attainment of peace and individual liberty—in this case, for the Vietnamese as well as for our own citizens. The communists' purpose is to use terror and guerrilla warfare to destroy freedom. And to those who, despite the lessons of the past, would have us withdraw our troops and trust Ho Chi Minh, I would repeat the warning of another Irishman—"trust everybody, but cut the cards."

Through this base have passed in the last year over 600 aircraft, more than 2,000 jet engines, and more than 124,000 aeronautical components. It is the second largest industrial activity in San Diego County and employs over 7,600 persons with an annual payroll in excess of $76 million. It is a part of the great combination of private citizens, members of the armed services, American industry, government, and scientific research which provides the front line of American defense.

Which brings me to another easy catchword used by those who would destroy what they call the "establishment". They take a phrase out of context from the words of President Eisenhower in a speech to which a few moments ago I made reference. That phrase is the "military-industrial complex," an institution they denounce. I knew and worked with President Eisenhower. I have read his full statement. I suggest you do the same. What you will find is a sensible and reasonable appraisal of the role of the military and the industrial forces in our society.

You will remember he began with the premise I have previously quoted and which I think bears repeating.

"A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction."

Then he noted the same span of years we have observed in the history of this base.

"Today the solitary inventor, tinkering in his shop, has been overshadowed by task forces of scientists in laboratories and testing fields. In the same fashion the free university, historically the fountainhead of free ideas in scientific discovery, has experienced a revolution in the conduct of research. Partly because of the huge costs involved, a government contract becomes virtually a substitute for intellectual curiosity. For every old blackboard there are now hundreds of new electronic computers. The prospect of domination of the nation's scholars by federal employment, project allocation, and the power of money is ever present and is gravely to be regarded."

From this phrase the radicals would move to destroy the American university, to remove all governmental research, to shut down the ROTC, to prevent private defense industry from recruiting on the college campus, and to deny the opportunity for young men to interview representatives of the armed services to select their role as volunteer officers in the defense of their country. If it were not so tragic, this attack would be a joke. I haven't noticed any government silencing the battery of college professors employed by the opponents of the ABM. And yet three men in space owe their lives to government-sponsored research in the laboratories of American universities.

The President also in that same speech said:

"This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence—economic, political, even spiritual—is felt in every city, every statehouse, every office of the Federal Government. We recognize the imperative need for this development."

Let me repeat that sentence.

"We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implication. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society."

Now let's stop here and take a careful look at what President Eisenhower said:

1. A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment.

2. There is an imperative need for the conjunction of the military establishment and the arms industry.

3. It does, however, embody certain dangers. What are these dangers? President Eisenhower told us. "In the council of gov-

XUM

ernment we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the"—and here comes that phrase—"military-industrial complex. The potential"—note he said the potential—"for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist."

Let me repeat again, the President did not say that unwarranted influence existed then. He was concerned that we guard against the potential.

Let me say right now, I am prepared to guard against that type of influence today, tomorrow, and as long as I am in the United States Senate. You will recall in 1964, when I first campaigned for the Senate, I warned that defense contracts were being taken from California for purely political reasons.

There can be no question that we must all remain vigilant against any collusion between government and private individuals for personal or political purposes. It would, however, be pure folly to resort to government-owned industry. That's what Nazi Germany did, that's what Communist Russia and Communist China are doing, and that type of operation has no place in the American system. But clearly there is nothing in the language of President Eisenhower which I have quoted to counsel the destruction of either the military or industrial complex which has kept Americans secure and free. What he did counsel is that:

"Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals so that security and liberty may prosper together."

Now you all know how an alert and knowledgeable citizenry protects itself. It writes to, votes for, elects and/or rejects its Senators and Congressmen. If you believe somebody is getting rich at the expense of the United States Government; if you know of any collusion between private industry and the Pentagon at the expense of the American taxpayer or American liberty; then it is your obligation—your duty—to tell your elected representatives about it. I keep asking some of my colleagues in the Senate for examples of collusion. I haven't heard any yet.

The critics of our defense policy are also using another catchword in their attack upon the President's proposal for the Safeguard Program. This one is an old trick. They call it "compromise". Now you all know that two years ago the Russians put up a ring of antiballistic missiles around Moscow. What did this mean? This meant that they were trying to protect their government from retaliation in the event they attacked the United States with intercontinental ballistic missiles. Now I don't know about you, but I get a little scared when I think the man who can push the button to end the world believes, however wrong he may be, that he will survive. Let me repeat for the third time Ike Eisenhower's words:

"Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction."

This Fall the President proposes to talk to the Russian leaders. His hope is to persuade them to start disarmament. Now remember, the Russians put up the antiballistic missiles. We didn't, and we haven't yet and will not have at that time. All the President has proposed is that we spend the money and commit the establishment of these missiles in two locations. His proposal provides for a review of the installation of Safeguard Missiles by the United States in one year. To me, that makes sense. Eight years of the Eisenhower Administration taught us that the only thing the Russians understand is action.

They started to move in Lebanon, you will remember in 1958. President Eisenhower did not say, "I'll hold my troops back if you withdraw." He acted, and they withdrew. The only thing that kept Russian missiles out of Cuba was the fact that the United States actually had warships on the high seas with orders to shoot if necessary. Now many of the same people who believe we should withdraw our troops from Vietnam and trust Ho Chi Minh to do the same are advocating that we compromise. We simply tell the Russians we are going to build an antiballistic missile and hope they believe us. They would have us spend the money on research and development but not put the defense missiles in place. That's not compromise. That's capitulation.

Despite the cries of protest you hear, my friends, about the combination of private citizens, private industry, American universities, and the United States Government in our defense system, bear this simple truth in mind—the United States will not fire the opening shot of the third World War, if it is fired. And we pray to God that it isn't. But we must be capable of answering an attack from any source. As long as any potential aggressor recognizes this, we will be safe—and guarded. That's what Safeguard is all about, and that's what America's defense policy is all about.

We must allow honest dissent. That is an essential part of our democracy. But we must establish the lines between truth and non-truth. The military services and the industrial might of this nation have kept us free and will continue to do so.

The *truth is* we are closer to peace today than we were six months ago. Because our President stands resolute, last week the Supreme Soviet gave dramatic evidence that it wanted to move toward an accommodation with our country.

The truth is that because we are first in space, our astronaut, Col. Frank Borman, was greeted openly in Moscow, and for the first time, an American military officer visited the onsite Russian rocket installations. You may recall that the requirement of inspection of Russian rocket installations has been a major deterrent to world disarmament.

The truth is that because the Russians know our President is prepared to meet the threat of their antiballistic missiles, they have indicated a new willingness to talk about strategic arms limitations.

When the whole world watches Neil Armstrong place the American Flag on the surface of the moon, it will know the truth. His act is the result of the combined efforts of free men acting in the interest of progress and peace.

These are again the times that try men's souls. More than that, they are times of complex problems no simple slogans can solve. Childish tantrums against the traditions of our democracy do not lead to the path of peace. Resolution, patience, and understanding are required.

A strong nation will be respected. A free nation can only be a peaceful nation for a very simple reason. No one will knowingly vote for war. I believe Premier Kosygin knows this. When he meets with President Nixon this fall, I hope he will also know that the United States is moving as resolutely in the maintenance of its defense as in the search for peace.

BROTHERHOOD IN ACTION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in a day when the word "brotherhood" is so often used that its meaning is nearly forgotten, it is encouraging to find an organization whose very existence is based on brotherhood.

It is heartening to realize that, to some, brotherhood is not a word, but a mode of action.

It is a fine example to all America to see an organization composed of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews united in one cooperative effort to improve our society.

"Brotherhood in Action," uniting members of the Masonic fraternity, the Knights of Columbia, and B'nai B'rith in Connecticut is just such an organization.

The chairman of Brotherhood in Action, Mr. Gene Valentino, of Watertown, Conn., has recently forwarded a proclamation of this group to me.

This document attests to a sincere belief that the dominant force in America is, and will be, good.

I congratulate Mr. Valentino and all members of Brotherhood in Action upon this fine statement, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRATERNAL BROTHERHOOD IN ACTION

The constant attacks being made today on the moral standards of America, call for the enlistment of the high-minded strength of the fraternal organizations of this nation to combat and overcome the forces whose degenerative influence is becoming a crippling menace to the American way of life.

In view of the increasingly close ties of mutual understanding and support today between all the fraternal organizations, it is important that we associate ourselves in a manner suited to our responsibilities towards our God, our country, and our civil duties.

To reach this goal, organizations must educate their members to understand and to act according to their individual ability in the fields of moral, civil and patriotic responsibility.

It is the purpose of our future programming to coordinate and promote activities of our organizations which will help our communities with the complex problems of today, but this development cannot occur unless individual men and their associations cultivate in themselves the moral and social virtues and promote them in society.

This joint effort in Connecticut is our answer to the advocates of non-patriotism, loose morals, obscene literature, pornography and all those who through their actions, have proven that they seek the moral decay of our great country.

The participating organizations will look upon this effort as a crusade believing confidently that the forces of good will overcome those of evil.

On our side we have the 46,000 members of Freemasonry, the 10,000 members of the B'nai-B'rith, the 40,000 members of the Knights of Columbus and the membership of all other God-fearing and patriotic organizations who care to participate in this program which has as its basis the moral purposes of our American way of life and the object of our loving one another, our God, and our country.

Fraternal organizations today face some hard decisions and failure to make these decisions means sure obsolescence. We must not merely state our position in the Lodge rooms for all our members to hear—we must state them in public together and by every means of communication so that everyone will hear that our respective orders have shown steadfast devotion to American principles and American ideals and oppose atheistic communistic doctrines which would destroy religion and undermine the ideals upon which our democratic form of government is founded.

In our proposed radio and TV programs, we as fraternal organizations, will demonstrate that we are not going to drift with the tide and be carried away with the current but that we will try to anticipate the needs of our respective religions, our country, our

XUM

youth and our fellowman and create a united fraternal crusade which will show that patriotism, decency, moral responsibility, parental guidance and teacher responsibility can live, and must live, to combat the popular unconcern regarding morals and patriotism that exists today in our modern society.

MILTON N. KADISH.
JOHN J. BEDELL.
WILLIAM CAMPBELL.

THE EAST DALLAS DEMOCRATIC CLUB SUPPORTS S. 4, THE BIG THICKET NATIONAL PARK BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, public support for the preservation of a portion of the Big Thicket area in southeast Texas has been growing steadily since I introduced the first Big Thicket bill in Congress in 1966. Many persons, groups, and organizations have endorsed my bill, S. 4, which calls for the establishment of a Big Thicket National Park of not less than 100,000 acres. They have recognized the value of this beautiful and unique land, and are working diligently to preserve the remaining forest lands, river bottoms, and wildlife habitat areas.

Today it is my privilege to add to the growing list of organizations which support and endorse the Big Thicket, the East Dallas Democratic Club.

I have received from this organization a resolution indicating its full support of the preservation of the Big Thicket. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF EAST DALLAS DEMOCRATIC CLUB ON THE BIG THICKET NATIONAL AREA

The East Dallas Democratic Club does hereby adopt the Policy Statement on The Big Thicket National Area, a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes, and urges the President of the United States, the Congress, the Department of the Interior, the U.S. Corps of Engineers (as to Dam B), and the appropriate state agencies (as to supplemental state and historic parks) to take appropriate action to implement this policy as soon as possible.

IORRIS K. BYRD,
President.

POLICY STATEMENT ON BIG THICKET NATIONAL AREA

We favor a Big Thicket National Park or area which would include a minimum of the 35,500 acres proposed in the Preliminary Report by the National Park Service study team, with the following modifications and additions:

1. Extend the Pine Island Bayou section southward and eastward down both sides of Pine Island Bayou to its confluence with the Neches River.

2. Extend the Neches Bottom Unit to cover a strip, a maximum of three miles, but not less than four hundred feet, wide on both sides of the Neches River from Highway 1746, just below Dam B, down to the confluence of Pine Island Bayou.

3. Extend the Beaumont Unit northward to include all the area between the LNVA Canal and the Neches.

4. Incorporate a Village Creek Unit, comprising a strip up to one mile wide where feasible, and no less than 400 feet wide on each side of Big Sandy-Village Creek from the proposed Profile Unit down to the Neches confluence. Wherever residences have already been constructed, an effort should be made to reach agreement with the owners for scenic easements, limiting further development on such tracts and preserving the natural environment. Pioneer architecture within these areas should also be preserved.

5. Incorporate a squarish area of at least 20,000 acres so that larger species such as black bear, puma and red wolf may survive there. An ideal area for this purpose would be the area southeast of Saratoga, surrounded by Highways 770, 326 and 105.

Although there are pipeline crossings in this area, they do not destroy the ecosystem; therefore the National Park Service should revise its standards pertaining to such incumbrances, in this case, leaving them under scenic easement rules instead of acquiring them.

6. Connect the major units with corridors at least one-half mile wide, with a hiking trail along each corridor but without new public roads cutting any forest. A portion of Menard Creek would be good for one such corridor.

The entire watershed of Rush Creek would be excellent for another.

Such additions would form a connected two-looped green belt of about 100,000 acres (there are more than 3 million acres in the overall Big Thicket area) through which wildlife and people could move along a continuous circle of more than 100 miles.

We recommend that the headwaters be in or near the line of the Profile Unit.

We are absolutely opposed to any trading or cession of any National Forest areas in the formation of the Big Thicket National Park or Monument.

In addition, but not as a part of the Big Thicket National Monument, we recommend: (a) the establishment of a National Wildlife Refuge comprising the lands of the U.S. Corps of Engineers around Dam B, (b) a state historical area encompassing communities of typical pioneer dwellings, farms, etc., such as that between Beech and Theuvenins Creeks off Road 1943 in Tyler County, and (c) other state parks to supplement the national reserve.

THE SURTAX EXTENSION

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, in an editorial published on July 19 the Washington Post called for the prompt passage of the surtax bill before the withholding extension expires on July 31.

As we all know, this measure has now been reported favorably from the Committee on Finance and has been placed on the Senate calendar. Thus far the majority party leadership has indicated that it will not call up this bill prior to the reporting of a broader tax reform measure by the Committee on Finance. The Washington Post editorial states that there is no reason for withholding the passage of the urgently needed surtax bill merely for the sake of having the less urgent although vitally important reform bill follow it on the legislative agenda. I share the views expressed in the Post editorial and for this reason ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX COUP IN THE SENATE

It was questionable judgment for the Senate Finance Committee to report out the surtax renewal bill without hearings and in defiance of the wishes of its chairman and the Senate Majority Leader. The measure would probably have gone to the floor with substantially more support if Chairman Long had been permitted to carry out his plan of holding brief hearings on some additional reforms and of giving the House-passed bill a Senatorial flavor. What the Committee has done, however, is a *fait accompli*. The Senate has now to decide its course in the light of that situation.

Presumably the Finance Committee will proceed with its hearings with the object of passing a comprehensive tax reform bill later in the session. That in itself is a major undertaking. It should be pressed with vigor regardless of when the surtax bill is passed. No doubt it will be a disappointment to many Senators not to have Committee consideration of their proposed reforms for attachment to the surtax bill, and many of these may be offered as amendments to the latter bill on the floor. But action on the floor without adequate Committee study of these complex issues is a very poor way to write a tax law. The cause of sound tax legislation argues strongly for all the reforms not incorporated in the House bill to be saved for the special reform measure.

Apparently Majority Leader Mansfield and some other Democratic leaders are not reconciled to this procedure. In line with the views of the Democratic Policy Committee, Senator Mansfield wants to postpone all tax legislation until after the August recess. The difficulty with this position is that it leaves the continuation of the surtax in a state of uncertainty and that it will force Congress to vote another stop-gap measure to continue the withholding of the surtax beyond July 31. Now that the surtax bill is before the Senate, it would be much easier to enact it in the form the House gave it than to fuss with another withholding authorization, which would have to pass both houses.

It is well to remember that Mr. Mansfield is not insisting that the two tax bills be merged into one, as are some other legislators. He merely wants to hold the surtax bill as hostage until the broader reform measure emerges from the Finance Committee. But this might be October or even later. Many highly complex and controversial items which ought to go into the reform measure have not yet taken definite shape. We can see no excuse for holding the urgent surtax bill merely for the sake of having the less urgent but enormously important reform bill follow it in the legislative channel.

Good management seems to call for passage of the surtax bill before the withholding extension expires on July 31. Senators can reasonably be asked, as a public service, to save their reform proposals for the special reform bill. And if the pledges from tax leaders and the Committees at both ends of the Capitol that meaningful reform legislation will be passed before the end of the year are not considered enough assurance of good faith in this matter, the Senate could accept Senator Javits' proposal for a "sense-of-Congress" resolution committing both houses to act. It would be most unfortunate if consideration of face-saving or politics should obstruct the enactment of either of these essential measures.

THE PESTICIDE PERIL—XXIX

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the question of whether or not to ban the use of DDT is currently being debated before many of our State legislatures. Michigan and Arizona have already resolved the question by declaring a ban on the use and sale of that persistent, toxic pesticide in their States, and Wisconsin—after extensive public hearings last winter—is expected to make a decision soon. Of particular interest is the status of the controversy in California, the Nation's leading agricultural State.

XUM

Generally, agricultural spokesmen have argued against the ban because they feel that DDT is vital for the protection of the State's crops against pests. Conservationists, including officials in the California Department of Fish and Game, disagree. Since its first use against insects in 1939, DDT has accumulated in the environment to the point where the ecological balance is imperiled. According to George T. Stewart, of the Davis campus of the University of California:

> Pesticides are but one threat to wildlife and the so-called "balance" of nature as man's continuing manipulation of the environment, in general, is fast endangering man himself.

In addition, DDT will soon no longer be effective against many insects because over the years of heavy exposure they have developed an immunity to the pesticide. Alternative means of pest control are now being developed that have proven to be both economical as well as effective.

I ask unanimous consent that an article describing the DDT controversy in California, published in Sunday's Washington Post, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOT BATTLE OVER DDT LOOMS IN CALIFORNIA—CONSERVATIONISTS, FARMERS SET FOR SHOWDOWN

(By John Berthelsen)

SACRAMENTO.—Another of those crisis bills, vastly overshadowed by the tardy passage of California's $6.2-billion budget, is creeping through the State Legislature here.

This one concerns DDT, the pesticide which has caused a world revolution since it was first used against insects in 1939 and, in 1948, won the Nobel Prize for Swiss chemist Paul H. Mueller, who discovered its insect-killing properties.

Late last week, two San Francisco Bay area Republicans, unmindful of that revolution, pushed their bill out of the Senate Agriculture Committee. If passed by the Legislature, it will prohibit the use of DDT in California after Dec. 31, 1971.

This would force California's giant agriculture community to come up with an alternative to what is the only pesticide guaranteed to protect 17 of the State's crops against pests.

The issue has evolved into a toe-to-toe brouhaha between such conservationist groups as the Sierra Club and farmers, who annually spray between 1½-million and 3-million acres with DDT.

It also has started a minor feud between the Department of Fish and Game, which regulates the State's wildlife, and the mammoth Department of Agriculture, which regulates and protects California's biggest industry. The wildlife people say DDT must be dropped. Agriculture says the farmers cannot be without it.

In a way, the dispute is ironic, because DDT probably will only be in use in California for a half-dozen more years. It will no longer be effective. Like most pesticides, it is creating strains of bugs which are impervious to its effects.

It already has been abandoned in public health, says Eldrige P. Hunt, research biologist for the Department of Fish and Game, because mosquitoes and flies have built up a resistance to it.

"It can still be used against body lice," he adds, "but body lice don't occur in large numbers in California. At least, we hope they don't."

Biologists and chemists say the same thing will happen soon to such pests as the cotton bollworm. After the pesticide has killed all of the DDT-susceptible bollworms, the farmers will be left with a super-insect and new pesticides, resistant plant strains or other measures will have to be developed.

But at the moment there seems to be nothing to take the place of DDT.

"You need five to eight years to develop an alternative," says State Sen. Fred Marler Jr., a Northern California opponent of the bill.

"If an alternative hasn't been developed by 1971, you would have to pass a bill to extend the use of DDT and a bill like that would be very hard to pass indeed."

Marler says that such highly touted methods of insect control as sterilization are not practical. "With bugs which breed more than once," he says, "you need something like 50 times the normal insect population, so the fertile ones can be sure of breeding with sterile insects throughout their lifetimes. This isn't practical in many insect populations—it is impossible."

He adds that the removal of DDT from the market, and the lack of such other control methods, will pave the way for the use of poorly tested substitutes which could do much greater damage to the State's ecological balance.

The farmers, moreover, feel that dropping DDT from the market would be tantamount to disaster. The State is third overall in the Nation in cotton production, first in agriculture. Most farmers feel this is due to the chemical revolution.

"Parathion, if you will, has produced more foods than any chemical but DDT," says David Zollinger, general manager of a central California growers' association. He is not interested in seeing the revolution slowed.

But, say ecologists such as George F. Stewart of the Davis Campus of the University of California, the revolution has to slow because the State's ecology cannot take it.

"Pesticides are but one threat to wildlife and the so-called 'balance' of nature as man's continuing manipulation of the environment, in general, is fast endangering man himself," Stewart wrote in a report on DDT.

"The resulting pollution of this unchecked manipulation has already resulted in the claimed mounting extinction of numerous species of birds and mammals native to the United States as well as numbers of reptiles, fish and amphibians."

The trouble with DDT, says Stewart, is that it is persistent and omnipresent.

Evidence of DDT is being found on every continent in the world, including Antarctica, and the substance is not breaking down. Chlorinated hydrocarbons diminish by half only every ten years, ecologists say. It is not because the other half breaks down into nontoxic elements, they feel, but because it soaks into the soil and is eventually carried out to sea, where it is found in increasing amounts in fish and other marine life.

Or, say authorities like Dr. Thomas H. Jukes of the Berkeley Campus of UC, it is ingested on berries or insects by birds, causing disastrous effects.

Stewart, in his UC–Davis report, writes:

"Scientists have found that DDT entering the food chain of aquatic animal forms undergoes magnification which is affecting certain marine birds' reproductive ability."

He also says eggs from birds which have swallowed DDT are calcium-deficient and fail to hatch. Other scientists, he says, have discovered that DDT "is extremely toxic to many" acquatic invertebrates, such as crabs and oysters, and is posing a serious threat to the shellfish industry in certain parts of the world.

Stewart cites an attempt to save Dutch elm trees from a disease carried by bark beetles as one "classic and celebrated example" of chemical misapplication.

Important urban shade trees, the Dutch elms were planted too close together, Stewart says, which allowed the bark beetles to pass from tree to tree, making the spread of the disease easy.

Then, he said, city maintenance crews sprayed too much DDT on the trees in attempts to save them. Third, he says, residues of DDT accumulated in the soils under the trees. These passed into the food chain.

Then birds began to die when they ate earthworms under the trees.

Why has DDT affected birds this way, while man remains healthy? Stewart feels it is because birds eat 100 times their weight each year, mainly insects—which now are dusted with DDT.

Man eats only eight times his own weight in the same period—so his ingestion rate of DDT is much slower. Will man eventually begin to wither from the effects of DDT? Stewart does not know.

Republican State Sen. John R. Nejedly, the co-author of the Senate bill, is more positive—or negative:

"Man may be in danger," he says, "for who can predict the final effect of a human who sits down to a seafood dinner?" Nejedly claims water drained from the San Joaquin Valley into the bay may be to blame for recent declines in crab catches, and he quotes a Department of Fish and Game report which concludes that crab exposed to insecticides because of their susceptibility and the possibility of "disastrous results."

Will his bill pass? Co-author Lewis F. Sherman answers that it has a "good chance of getting through the Legislature."

This is contingent on California politics, however. After passing through the State Senate it must go to the Assembly.

There, new House Speaker Robert A. Monagan, who replaced Jess Unruh last November, has the choice of sending it to the Assembly Agricultural Committee or to a Wildlife Committee.

If it is directed to the Agriculture Committee, its chances of ever being reported out are slim, says an observer. If it goes to the Wildlife Committee, it will sail on through.

After that, it must come back to the Assembly floor and finally will go to Gov. Ronald Reagan's desk.

It is not known if the Governor will sign it. He normally has been aligned with the agricultural interests, observers also point out that the chief opponent of the bill during hearings is California Director of Agriculture Jerry W. Fielder—a Reagan appointee.

In the meantime, the controversy goes on. Despite the publicity, no one can really say DDT is a threat to human beings.

Its advocates point out that DDT prevented a typhus epidemic during World War II, thus, they say, winning the war for the allies. Its detractors point out fish and wildlife are disastrously affected, and that DDT residues even fall from the sky in rain and snow. What its future effects will be, they add, no one knows.

APOLLO, PA.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the citizens of Apollo, in Armstrong County, feel a special kinship to the astronauts of the Apollo space program, and have made the men of Apollo 11 honorary citizens of Apollo, Pa.

The following resolution was sent to President Nixon:

> Whereas Apollo 11 set forth from the Planet Earth on the sixteenth day of July 1969 on the most historical event ever to be envisioned by man and dedicated to the science and knowledge of the world; and whereas on the twenty-first day of July 1969 the brave and dedicated crew of the Apollo 11 set foot on the Earth satellite Moon, accomplishing the greatest single feat in the re-

corded history of mankind; and whereas his excellency President Richard M. Nixon has declared Monday, twenty-first day of July, in the Earth year one thousand nine hundred and sixty nine to be a day of national participation to honor the flight of Apollo 11; and whereas Apollo, Armstrong County, Pennsylvania has diligently followed the Apollo space program from the beginning and honored all Apollo astronauts as Honorary Citizens of Apollo Pennsylvania; therefore I, Duane S. Guthrie, Mayor of Apollo do hereby declare the astronauts of Apollo 11, Mr. Neil A. Armstrong, Col. Edwin E. Aldrin, Lt. Col. Michael Collins to be henceforth and forever Honorary Citizens of Apollo, Armstrong County, Pennsylvania; and be it further resolved that the Boro of Apollo, Pennsylvania forever hold this date in remembrance of this occasion.

DUANE E. GUTHRIE,
Mayor, Apollo, Armstrong Co., Pa.
EVERETT A. BECK,
President, Apollo Boro Council.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, at this time, recalling Captive Nations Week is singularly appropriate. For if we forget, we forget ourselves.

On Wednesday, July 16, it was my privilege to attend the dinner in Washington, D.C., commemorating the 10th anniversary of the proclamation of Captive Nations Week. The dinner was organized under the auspices of the National Captive Nations Week Committee, the head of which from its inception has been Prof. Lev. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University. Professor Dobriansky is the man who was originally responsible for the concept of Captive Nations Week. The overwhelming merit of the proposal was so persuasive that the resolution was unanimously endorsed by both the Senate and the House.

The 10th anniversary dinner was a distinguished and dignified affair, which reflects the highest credit on Professor Dobriansky and the dedicated group of volunteers who worked with him in organizing the affairs.

Professor Dobriansky opened the proceedings by reading the proclamation issued by President Nixon designating the week beginning July 13, 1969, as Captive Nations Week. In this proclamation the President urged the American people "to renew their devotion to the high ideals on which our Nation was founded and has prospered and to sustain with understanding and sympathy the just aspirations of the peoples of all nations for independence and human freedom."

Professor Dobriansky also pointed out that parallel proclamations had been issued by the Governors of most of our States and by the mayors of numerous cities across the country. Mr. Philip J. Rutledge, representing Mayor Walter E. Washington, read the proclamation which Mayor Washington issued locally.

The Eisenhower Award of the National Captive Nations Week Committee was presented to Mr. Ku Cheng-kang of the Republic of China, in recognition of the great contribution he has made as chairman of the World Anti-Communist League.

Secretary of Transportation Volpe, who was the main speaker of the evening, reminded the audience of President Eisenhower's eloquent statement, committing the United States to work unremittingly for the liberation of the captive nations by every peaceful means.

House minority leader, GERALD R. FORD, who was introduced by Representative ED DERWINSKI, also made an eloquent and forceful address. He expressed his confidence that Communist tyranny would ultimately crumble and that the peoples of the captive nations would again know the blessings of personal liberty and national independence.

And it was on this note that the 10th anniversary captive nations dinner ended.

STUDENT DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, a letter printed in the Sacramento Bee from a graduate of San Francisco State College, where, as Senators know, there have been serious student demonstrations and disruptions, has been called to my attention. Specialist Fourth Class Elliott discusses both the war in Vietnam and the trouble on our campuses. Because of the importance of both of these issues, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM VIETNAM: "YOUNG MEN OVER HERE ARE TRYING TO END THE WAR"

(NOTE.—Spc.4 Michael R. Elliott, a graduate of San Francisco State College, wrote this letter to the Bee from Vietnam.)

I am now in my fourth month in Vietnam and I find my greatest concern is with two subjects: Peace at home and war abroad. Or is it war at home and peace abroad?

Try as I may, I cannot see what the young men and women on our campuses and in our schools are trying to prove or hoping to achieve. If it is their desire to prove they have no respect for the republic in which they live, they are doing an excellent job. Freedom of speech is clearly guaranteed on the face of our Constitution in the Bill of Rights, but that freedom is relative, relative to a society founded on a respect for order.

We in Vietnam read daily of the youth of our nation, the hope of America's future, protesting for "better" educational institutions, demanding schools conform to standards which they establish. Our nation has never respected such demands, nor shall it do so now. Dr. S. I. Hayakawa, for one, has voiced that opinion most straightforwardly and decisively.

I sympathize with student desire to take part in administrative problems but cannot convince myself their means are correct. Change for the better is one of the most trying and difficult accomplishments which has ever confronted mankind. And there is a tested method for achieving such change.

In civilian life, more so than in military, there is a chain of command, the following of which is mandatory for effective change. The outline of this chain is far more difficult to see than that of the military but is just the same very much present and necessary.

If today's students are sincerely interested in change for the better, they must start at the beginning. They must start, not with demands, but with requests submitted in an orderly manner to the personnel charged with the responsibility of our schools: The administration, the legislature, the courts and any other orderly means open to them. A slow, tiresome and sometimes fruitless road? Yes, it is, but it is the method which has been proved to work and work best.

Before graduating from San Francisco State College, I was involved in the initiation of an innovation in college administration. Students were invited to meet and elect representatives from the various departments to take part in the formulation of administrative policy with a voice, a vote the same as the professors within the departments.

The students were so eager to take their place in the administration they did not even take enough initiative to meet and elect representatives. They sluffed off a real beginning by saying "nothing would come of it anyway." And now those same students, perhaps with different faces, want to run the whole show. As we say in Vietnam, "there ain't no way."

A college president once said the colleges should be a moulding place for ideas, not a cementing place. We are now confronted with the reverse of his philosophy and the result is not a pleasant one.

The reaction to the war in Vietnam is the other issue which perplexes me. I see young men I have called friend die here, and then read in the papers where our "knowledgeable" young students in America demand a stop be put to American aggression in Vietnam, and I am very angered. They know so little to be speaking so authoritatively, and their demands are met properly with stringent disgust.

The young men over here are doing everything within their power to bring this war to a close. There is not a man over here who enjoys fighting this war, but they all realize the issues are real and complex and cannot be solved by demands, most of all demands from an unknowing group of students.

I say thanks that men in Vietnam must mature rapidly, for they soon become equipped to deal with the rather confusing cries of their counterparts back home. They are capable of laughing off the war protester's cries for they know the idiocy of a person who would sit serenely on the hillside far away from the madding guns of death and dare to end the dying by jumping up and down and waving his hands.

The place for those who want to stop the war is here in Vietnam, (I invite all of you), not sitting in the classroom studying cognitive dissonance or the problems with interpersonal relationships.

If our concerned young students have the guts, here is where they can help, but I doubt they would want to help. They would probably refuse to fight with Charlie even if he were overrunning their position unless they could run the operation their way.

I am truly tired of hearing the pitiful cries of little boys and girls playing the game of life without having to pay the price. May I soon see you in Vietnam?

Sp4c. MICHAEL R. ELLIOTT.
APO SAN FRANCISCO.

BOYS' NATION BUILDS YOUNG, PRODUCTIVE CITIZENS; TWO OUTSTANDING YOUNG TEXANS ELECTED

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on July 18, 1969, two young men from each of the 50 States arrived in Washington, D.C., to participate in the American Legion's Boys' Nation. I am pleased to recognize the two delegates from Texas, Mr. Edwin Collins, of Austin, and Mr. Lynn Cauley, of Big Spring. They earned the privilege to come by being elected governor and party chairman, respectively, of the Texas Boys' State this June.

These two fine young Texans will participate in a multitude of activities ranging from lectures, forums, and tours of our national shrines to organizing their own senate and conducting a session complete with bills, committees, and, no doubt, difference of view. They will not only see how our Federal Government operates, but will have the opportunity to appreciate the efficacy of our democratic system by participating in the actual mechanics of government. I am sure that after their short but very productive 1 week in Boys' Nation, they will return to Texas with an enthusiastic, practical, and realistic view of American Government.

I commend them on the initiative and diligence they have shown by being chosen for the honor of participating in this experiment in government, and I congratulate the American Legion for the success it has enjoyed in this most worthwhile and salutary undertaking.

PARTICIPATION BY OTHER NATIONS IN U.S. SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, all Americans share a great pride in the magnificent achievement of the Apollo 11 flight crew. No greater frontier has ever been crossed. In a century of phenomenal technological expansion the moon landing stands out as the highest adventure, the furthest reach of man's indomitable genius and spirit. It was American technology that put Neil Armstrong on the moon. But it was human aspiration to see the unknown that drove the dedicated men at Houston and Cape Kennedy and in laboratories and stations around the world to put together a precise technology, a faultless venture. We Americans are justifiably proud of an American achievement, but we must not forget the universal nature of this mission. On a planet so rife with struggle and war as ours, the Congress should do all in its power to emphasize the universal human aspirations, the spirit that brings men together into creative labor rather than those which rip them apart.

Therefore, I offer today for the consideration by the Senate a resolution which will encourage the participation of other nations in our space program. The fact that not all men are Americans does not mean that all men do not have a great lust for discovery. Americans can be leaders in the space effort without declaring a self-imposed monopoly on the drive for adventure and creative labor. There are talented, intelligent men and women throughout our planet which have much to give to any space program. Let them lend their hand to the great progress Americans have already made. Let us bring men a little closer by a common effort in this, the highest adventure of any age. Space exploration is at heart nonpolitical; the political quarreling and warring so prevalent today need not prevent men of all nations from working together on a project which commands the energies and contributions of all mankind. It is time to find more things on which men can work together. I urge the Senate to take the first step toward permitting citizens of other nations to participate in our astronaut program. I propose that we begin specifically with citizens of Mexico and Canada, our contiguous neighbors. Let us make the sense of the Senate clear on this, and make the first courageous move toward an international space effort.

THE PRESIDENT'S TRIP—FOR A BETTER PERSPECTIVE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, President Nixon's trip to the Pacific, to South Asia, and to Eastern Europe next week will mark the second time this month that Americans can share through the miracle of communications in a great and historic journey.

On the Asian leg of his trip, the President will visit five countries, bringing to the people of that continent the warm greetings and best wishes of our people. As an American, I am proud and happy that he is giving this attention to Asia. For, after all, there are almost two billion people in Asia—more than one-half of the world's population. As many people are living in Asia today as there were in the whole world in the 1920's. Four of the six most populous nations in the world are in Asia. It is extremely important that our country understand this part of the world better than we do at present and that we develop bonds of friendship which will produce a lasting peace.

From his last Asian stop in Pakistan, the President will go on to Bucharest for a very important visit. This will be the President's second trip to Romania, I might note, and the first visit to any Communist country by an American Chief of State since the immediate aftermath of the Second World War. The trip symbolizes, I believe, the changes which have occurred in international relations in the last two decades. It demonstrates that while people may have different systems of government and different philosophies about many matters, they can still live at peace with one another and can work together on matters of mutual self-interest. By demonstrating that truth, the President's trip to Romania helps to make our world a safer place to live and hastens the day when our planet will know the lasting peace we all long for.

One of the important features of this trip will lie in the message which the President brings to the leaders he meets and to their peoples; a message of peace and friendship and good will. But another value will lie in the listening which he does as he stops in each city. He will have an opportunity, first of all, to listen to the views of allied governments, nations which have been closely alined with our position for many years and are even now fighting beside us in Vietnam. Second, he will also have an opportunity to talk with nonalined nations, countries which have steered clear of affiliations with either the East or the West. Finally, he will have a chance to listen to the views of a Communist government in the country of Romania, to find out how the world situation looks from their distinctive point of view. Certainly, all of these conversations will provide valuable perspectives for the President and for all of us. Certainly American foreign policy will be better informed as a result of this trip, and certainly it will be better understood by other nations.

The President told the astronauts last week that all men were with them on their trip, sharing their adventure and supporting them with prayers. I am sure that all Americans feel the very same way about this important trip around the world by their President.

OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the Gadsden Times is a highly respected and influential daily newspaper in Alabama. It enjoys a much deserved reputation for the fairness and general excellence of its editorial opinions.

On Saturday, July 5, 1969, the Gadsden Times published an editorial on questions relating to the oil depletion allowance. In characteristic fashion the editorial fairly and objectively presents "The Other Side of the Story" in a manner which commends itself to the thoughtful consideration of all who earnestly seek answers which, in the words of the editorial, will be "the greatest benefit over the longest range for the Nation." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL INDUSTRY REVEALS OTHER SIDE OF STORY

It seems to be open season for giant-killing in Congress. But satisfying as it may be to see the hitherto inviolable Defense Department on the carpet or the powerful oil industry being threatened with the loss of some of its tax privileges and other protection, in both cases the situation is one of perplexity for the average citizen—and probably for many congressmen themselves.

The person who tries to keep an open mind is buffeted on both sides by opposing experts. Some tell him that the proposed Safeguard antiballistic missile system is absolutely vital for the nation's defense. Others, equally distinguished, warn that it is a vast boondoggle which could actually increase the likelihood of war.

In the matter of oil, it is charged that the 27½ per cent depletion allowance which gives oil producers (and mineral producers also) tax compensation for the natural depletion of the resources they take out of the ground, costs the government $1 billion in lost taxes a year. Sen. Edward Kennedy recently claimed that controls on the import of foreign oil were costing consumers between $4 billion and $7 billion a year.

The oil industry marshals its own figures to show that it pays its fair share of taxes and that both depletion and import controls have helped maintain a strong domestic industry, which is as vital to the nation's security as a strong military establishment.

The public sees a few highly visible oil millionaires; it does not see the many others who have lost their shirts in the game. Of 8,879 exploratory wells drilled last year, 84 per cent were dry holes. Some 1,600 fewer wells were completed in 1968 than in 1967. The total figure of 30,599 wells was 46 per cent below the number completed in 1956.

In 1958, the United States had enough proved oil reserves to last for 13 years, based on production in that year. Today, because of increased consumption and lagging exploration, the figure is down to 10 years.

Since depletion allowance was enacted in

1926, the retail price of regular-grade gasoline (excluding taxes) has increased only about three cents a gallon. Since import controls were imposed by President Eisenhower in 1959, gasoline prices have increased about 14 per cent, but retail prices generally have jumped 24 per cent.

The wisdom of the import system, which holds imports to 21 per cent of domestic production, was dramatically illustrated during the Arab-Israeli war in 1967 when oil shipments from the Middle East to the United States and much of Europe were abruptly halted.

Foreign oil is presently cheaper than domestic oil, especially with the advent of supertankers which have impressively cut shipping costs. But it would be foolish, the industry argues, to make ourselves too dependent upon oil supplies by foreign powers in order to lower prices or to conserve our own resources. Oil production facilities and highly trained personnel are not things that can be moth-balled for use at a later date.

Each side accuses the other of taking extreme positions, yet it is only between extremes that a sensible middle ground can be staked out.

Likeliest prospect is that the depletion allowance can be modified somewhat, perhaps by limiting it to fixed periods rather than over the entire lifetime of a well, but not eliminating it entirely or reducing it so drastically as to discourage continued exploration. And a modest easing of import quotas may not be incompatible with a strong domestic industry and national security.

In oil, as in ABMs, the determining factor must be what promises the greatest benefit over the longest range for the nation.

The rule is easy to state, of course, but exceedingly difficult to put into practice.

ANTI-DDT VICTORY IN WISCONSIN

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, on Friday the Wisconsin State Assembly passed unanimously a bill to ban the sale and distribution of the pesticide DDT in Wisconsin. The bill will now be considered by the State senate.

The action of the Wisconsin Assembly is one of the final steps to victory for the scientists, conservationists, and concerned public who have contested the use of DDT in our State. Many of them recently testified during public hearings before the State department of natural resources on a citizens petition also to ban DDT. The Wisconsin hearings stimulated the first major confrontation between the pesticide industry and concerned citizens and scientists and focused both national and international attention on the dangers of DDT to our environment and to man.

I ask unanimous consent that an article reporting on the assembly's action, published in The Capital Times, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A 99-0 Assembly Vote OK's Bill Banning Sale of DDT in State

(By John Patrick Hunter)

The State Assembly today, by a 99 to nothing vote, passed and sent to the Senate a bill that would ban the sale and distribution of the pesticide DDT in Wisconsin.

Before taking final action, the Assembly amended the measure to permit a "DDT emergency board" to authorize use of the chemical in cases where "a significant portion" of a crop is affected by epidemic plant diseases.

The emergency board would also be authorized to permit the use of the pesticide in the case of an epidemic disease of humans or animals.

Today's Assembly action represents a victory for Assemblyman Norman C. Anderson (D-Madison), whose stronger substitute was adopted in place of milder version supported by the Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation.

An attempt by opponents of the DDT control bill to lay the measure aside, in hopes that it would get lost during the maneuvers over adoption of a state budget, failed.

The Assembly refused to table the bill by a substantial 60 to 37 margin.

Under Anderson's substitute, the three-man emergency board would consist of the secretary of agriculture, the state health officer, and the secretary of natural resources.

The bill would take effect Dec. 31, 1969.

Assemblyman Norbert Nuttelman (R-West Salem) spoke in opposition to Anderson's substitute.

So did Assemblyman Joseph Tregoning (R-Shullsburg). Tregoning pleaded with the Assembly to "give us a little leeway. We need some leeway time to work out more details."

Anderson, who described DDT as "a deeply dangerous compound," added that the state has "a unique opportunity to say once and for all, at least in this state, we realize the danger of this compound."

Assemblyman Russel Weisensel (R-Sun Prairie) managed to amend Anderson's bill to allow the emergency board to permit use of the pesticide when a local crop was threatened.

Supporters of the bill charge the Weisensel amendment "weakened" the measure, but Anderson accepted the amendment because he said the emergency board would not indiscriminately permit the use of the compound.

PHILADELPHIA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION ENDORSES THE COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACT OF 1969

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Philadelphia, Pa., Commission on Higher Education has announced its support for the Comprehensive Community College Act of 1969. This endorsement is significant because it is the first support the bill has received from an institution which represents all levels of higher education. The Philadelphia commission recognizes this bill for what it is—not a bill of competition with 4-year institutions, but an effort to strengthen the growth of community-junior colleges in this country. This endorsement goes a long way in breaking down the arbitrary walls separating institutions of higher learning and it is certainly welcomed as we gear up for consideration of this important legislation. I commend the commission on their leadership.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the details and statement of the announcement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Commission on Higher Education Supports Comprehensive Community College Bill

Charles G. Simpson, Chairman of the Philadelphia Commission on Higher Education today announced the Commission's decision to support the federally proposed Comprehensive Community College bill. The measure, introduced by Senator Harrison Williams, Jr. of New Jersey, has gained bipartisan endorsement in the Senate.

According to Mr. Simpson, the bill is designed to assist the states in providing expanded post-secondary educational opportunities to all persons through a program of Federal grants. These grants would enable the states to strengthen, improve, and develop comprehensive community colleges. They would also ensure that the education provided by such colleges is suited to the needs, interests, and benefits of the total community. The grants would further assist colleges in providing educational programs especially suited to the needs of educationally and/or economically disadvantaged persons.

The states would submit a master plan for post-secondary education to the United States Commissioner of Education. This plan would be developed jointly at the state level with all post-secondary education agencies within that state. Although "Individualized" to fit the needs of the particular state, the plans would be required to meet certain national criteria. Institutions would be obligated to establish comprehensive curriculum plans, including occupational-technical programs, adult continuing education, community service programs, remedial education, counseling-guidance services, and lower division university parallel courses. Plans would also be drawn up to move the institutions toward a tuition-free policy, or evidence would be given that adequate scholarship and grant-in-aid assistance was available to provide educational opportunity to those who need it. In addition, teacher-training and personnel development programs would be designed as a component of the master plan.

The Williams' bill provides for a one year $10 million preliminary planning phase to be followed by a three-year program of Federal assistance. Funds would be made available, through the state coordinating agency, for improvement of existing schools, construction and development of new institutions, and expansion and modernization of instructional and counseling techniques and facilities. The three year appropriation would total six billion dollars.

In speaking of support for this legislation, Mr. Simpson said that a new community college program is needed to give to two-year schools a more equitable share of Federal assistance for post-secondary education. He noted that out of 24 current Federal assistance programs for higher education, two-year colleges take part in only six. Even more significant, he added, is the low percentage of junior-college students who take part in individual-assistance programs. Community college students have access to only 4% of the National Student Defense Loans, 6% of Educational Opportunity Grants, and 15% of Work-Study Funds.

Concluding, Mr. Simpson indicated that he expected that support for this measure would be generated by Senatorial and Congressional representatives from the Philadelphia area and by the presidents of the colleges and universities which comprise the Commission's constituency.

J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, no man in our country has rendered a longer or more dedicated service to this Nation than that of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, who has completed 45 years of outstanding service to the United States.

The California Peace Officers' Association on May 28, 1969, passed a resolution extending their gratitude to Mr. Hoover and wishing him the best for the future.

XUM

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas J. Edgar Hoover has completed 45 years of unselfish and dedicated service to law enforcement and its goals as Director of the F.B.I., and

Whereas J. Edgar Hoover and the F.B.I. has been the bulwark of defense against those forces which try to undermine and subvert cherished American principles, and

Whereas J. Edgar Hoover has always been the guiding force in raising law enforcement to the high professional standards it has attained; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the California Peace Officers' Association at their 49th Annual Conference assembled at Stockton, California, on May 25 through May 28, 1969, extend their gratitude to J. Edgar Hoover and extend their best wishes for continued tenure as Director of the F.B.I., and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, the two California Senators, and J. Edgar Hoover so that they may be apprised of the sentiments of this Association.

RATIFICATION OF THE GENEVA PROTOCOL OF 1925 NECESSARY TO CONTROL CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, during the last two sessions of Congress, I have daily taken the floor to urge the Senate to ratify the international Conventions on Forced Labor, the Political Rights of Women, and Genocide. Today, rather than speaking of these, I would like to deal with a matter of equal if not greater importance to the future of world peace.

In 1925, in the wake of a war that saw thousands of men maimed or killed in gas attacks by both sides, an arms limitation conference created an international agreement—the Geneva Protocol of 1925—banning the aggressive use of chemical and biological weapons. Though the United States initiated this action and signed the protocol, and though our policy in this area has since run directly parallel to it, the U.S. Senate has never ratified the protocol. After languishing in this body for over 20 years, the protocol was removed from Senate consideration by the Truman administration.

It is precisely this contradiction, Mr. President that warrants grouping the Geneva protocol with the three human rights conventions. The protocol deals—as do the conventions—with longstanding and important policies of our Government, policies that are inevitably compromised by our failure to affirm them internationally.

I need not labor the point that chemical and biological weapons must be controlled if we are to attain any semblance of world peace. The unspeakable horrors of their use have been cataloged often enough. We stand on the brink of a headlong proliferation of these weapons that will only aggravate the already tense and chaotic arms race and make vast destruction infinitely more difficult to prevent.

Equally true is the fact that our ratification of the Geneva protocol would be a major step toward controlling chemical and biological weaponry. The protocol does not require that we give up research and sacrifice these weapons as retaliatory deterrents. It only prohibits their use as first strike weapons. But in so doing it contributes greatly to their control. If all nations specifically state that they will not use these weapons first, their agreement achieves the legitimacy and force of international law. Though a first strike with these weapons is impossible to prevent entirely, the perceived likelihood of attack will decrease greatly under such an agreement, and nations will feel less need to expand their defensive CBW capabilities. And if the major nations can thus limit the development of these weapons, the likelihood of their rapid spread to smaller nations will also decline sharply.

Such weapons are, moreover, not substitutes for nuclear weapons, since they destroy only enemy lives and not enemy military hardware. Thus, their nearly prohibitive costs must be added to those of nuclear systems, and any method of limiting their development can only save vast quantities of time and resources.

I intend to deal with these and other arguments in more detail later, but they lose none of their force by being stated simply. The United States has no rational strategic interest—much less the intention—of using chemical and biological devices as first-strike weapons. Yet it has every conceivable interest in limiting their development and use for this purpose by other nations. I urge the administration therefore, to refer the Geneva Protocol of 1925 to the Senate for its ratification, not only as a long-overdue affirmation of a basic tenet of our foreign policy, but as a major step toward control of the arms race and achievement of world peace.

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY COLLEGES IS FORMED AND READY TO SERVE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the emergence of the 2-year college is rapidly becoming one of the most important developments in American education. Unfortunately, Federal support for these community junior colleges has not kept pace with the increasing demand for services and personnel. This point was documented on February 17, 1969, when the Comprehensive Community College Act of 1969 was introduced. With more than a third of the support of the Senate, this legislation is designed to provide accelerated Federal participation in this new level of education.

On July 16, I announced the formation of a national advisory committee on community colleges. This ad hoc committee is made up of private and public community college presidents, executive officers of private and State community college systems and associations, university experts in postsecondary education, research and teaching specialists, and others who are closely associated with community colleges. The committee is broad-based and national in scope, reflecting all facets and points of view. These men offer tremendous insight and profound knowledge of the affairs of community colleges. As nationally known educators, they bring incisive comment and productive suggestions to our discussions on the community college program.

I am proud that they have accepted my invitation to serve on this committee. Their willingness to participate in this fashion is yet another indication of the importance educators are placing on the 2-year schools—and it points up the widespread support for community colleges which has developed throughout the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the members of the ad hoc Committee on Community Colleges be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Milton Bassin, President, New York City Community College, Brooklyn, New York (212–643–8612).

Louis W. Bender, Associate Commissioner, Department of Public Instruction, Bureau of Community Colleges, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126 (717–787–4368).

James Borman, Executive Director, Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Chicago, Illinois 60606 (312–372–0544).

James A. Colston, President, Bronx Community College, Bronx, New York (212–WE3–7000).

Joseph Cosand, President, Junior College, District of St. Louis, Clayton, Missouri (314–726–4686).

Patrick J. Distasio, Director, Center for Community Development, Miami-Dade Junior College, Miami, Florida 33156 (305–238–4632).

Paul A. Elsner, Director, Division of Community Colleges, Denver, Colorado 80203 (303–892–3061).

Ed K. Erickson, President, Seattle Community College, Seattle, Washington 98122 (206–EA4–3500).

William F. Flanagan, President, Rhode Island Junior College, Providence, Rhode Island 02908 (401–831–6600).

Richard Gott, Director of OEO Demonstration Projects AAJC, Washington, D.C. (AC 415–845–1015) (Ofc 202–462–4031).

Richard K. Greenfield, President, Mercer County Community College, Trenton, New Jersey 08608 (609–396–9241).

Ervin L. Harlacher, President, Brookdale Community College, Lincroft, New Jersey 07738 (201–842–1811).

Norman C. Harris, Professor of Vocational Education, Department of Higher Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan (303–764–9472).

Ellis F. Hartford, Dean, Community College System, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky 40506 (606–258-9000).

Carl L. Heinrich, Director, College Accreditation, Kansas State Department of Education, Topeka, Kansas 66612 (913–296–3047).

B. Lamar Johnson, Professor of Higher Education, Department of Education, University of California, Los Angeles, California 90024 (213–825–3101).

Francis Keppel, President and Chairman of the Board of Directors, General Learning Corporation, New York, New York 10022 (212–421–9850).

S. V. Martorana, Vice Chancellor, State University of New York, Thurlow Terrace, Albany, New York 12201 (518–457–3300).

Lloyd E. Messersmith, Executive Director, California Junior College Association, Sacramento, California 95814 (916–444–8641).

Harry Miller, President, Keystone College, LaPlume, Pennsylvania (717-945-5141).

Bill J. Priest, Chancellor, Dallas County Junior College District, Texas Building, Dallas, Texas 75202 (214-RI2-1411).

Peter Scarth, President, Education Systems Corporation, 1211 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (202-332-5292).

Oscar E. Shabat, Chancellor, Chicago City College, Chicago, Illinois 60601 (312-782-6288).

Walter Sindlinger, Department of Adult and Higher Education, Columbia University Teachers' College, New York, New York (212-870-4891).

Dale Tillery, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, California (415-642-7500).

James L. Wattenbarger, Director, Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32601 (904-392-3261).

Everett M. Woodman, President, Colby Junior College, New London, New Hampshire 03257 (603-526-2010).

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the ad hoc committee has been formed, and is ready to serve. I invite those Senators who have joined me in sponsoring the Comprehensive Community College Act of 1969, and any other Senators who are interested in our objective, to make use of these experts in their work on this bill and other related issues.

AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, one of the great problems confronting us as a country is pollution, both air and water.

Only recently the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare granted to the State of California a waiver from the Federal preemption provision with respect to the establishment and enforcement of automobile emission standards. This means that California may set standards higher than the rest of the Nation. Naturally, as the author of this amendment, I am very much pleased with this favorable decision. As a result, California has been able to implement its Pure Air Act of 1968. Recently, the Oakland Tribune carried a series of articles once again underscoring the seriousness of the pollution problem and because of its importance, not only to the State of California, but to the Nation as well, I ask unanimous consent that these excellent articles, written by Mr. Ernie Cox, the Oakland Tribune staff writer, be printed in the RECORD.

The battle against pollution must be won, and I for one am determined to do everything that I can to see to it that the people of the Nation have the air quality that they rightfully demand and deserve.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, June 29, 1969]

BAY'S AIR POLLUTION UNABATED—SMOG STAYS DESPITE REGULATIONS

(By Ernie Cox)

When President Nixon on May 29 announced creation of a cabinet-level council on environmental quality, he said: "We have become victims of our technological genius."

The President's move, with air pollution as one of its primary targets, is only the latest in a series of governmental actions at various levels to do something about the air we breathe.

For the past two decades the State of California has had what it euphemistically calls "a program for air resources management." In the battle against smog, Los Angeles and the San Francisco Bay Area are far ahead of most of the nation. It was—and is—a matter of survival.

To the average eye-smarting Californian it is small comfort to know that the problem existed as far back as the year 1215. In that year of the Magna Carta King John of England decreed a ban against foul smelling wood-burning carts that local food vendors pushed through London's murky streets. It was the world's first known air pollution control regulation.

The word smog was coined by a London physician in 1905 to describe a combination of smoke and fog.

To the Los Angeles area went the dubious honor of introducing to the world a new-type pollutant—called photo-chemical smog. The major source: the gasoline-burning motor vehicle.

This brownish haze is the result of nitrogen oxides and hydrocarbons reacting with sunlight to form new compounds which reduce visibility; irritate the eyes, nose and throat; damage plants, craze rubber products, peel paint from buildings, aggravate asthma and possibly is linked with cancer.

In virtually all California cities of 50,000 population or more, an air pollution problem exists. More than half the state's 58 counties have experienced plant damage.

The U.S. Public Health Service says Americans pour 142 million tons of waste into the air every year—more than 1,400 pounds for every man, woman and child.

In the Bay area a total of 9,473 tons of pollutants per day were emitted into the air last year, according to local air pollution officials, who claim their "tonnage" figures are 85 per cent accurate.

Last year's pollutant figure represents a decrease of 2.7 per cent in total pollution in the Bay Area over 1967 despite a big increase in the number of automobiles.

The Bay Area Air Pollution Control District has been in operation 13 years and has put into force a series of stiff regulations, with more to come.

Despite these efforts, the district's own figures show that stationary sources such as factories and backyard burning still account for 29 per cent of the Bay Area's air pollution. Stationary sources are under jurisdiction of the local district.

The six county Bay Area's 2.3 million automobiles account for 71 per cent of the total pollution problem. Automobile pollution is controlled by the state, not by the local district.

Local air pollution officials state unequivocally that if the Bay Area had 4.4 million automobiles and 8 million people—as in Los Angeles—we would have as serious a smog problem as Los Angeles.

The local district has regulations controlling open industrial or agricultural burning, industrial smoke such as that from factories and ships, and the organic gases given off by inks and paints and by gasoline in uses other than car fuel.

A brand new regulation which goes into effect next January 1 will regulate backyard burning in one and two-family dwellings, considered one of the major sources of smoke and haze.

District officials are satisfied with the regulations as far as they go, but they also know population growth will call for more stringent controls. These are under constant study.

By the year 2000, according to Milton Feldstein, director of technical services for the Bay Area district, this part of California from Sacramento to Santa Cruz will be one vast megalopolis with additional millions of population and at least two cars in every garage.

The state has new control standards on evaporative losses for 1970 model cars; control of oxides of nitrogen will not begin until the 1971 cars are produced. Both controls will be limited to new cars.

Many experts agree that current regulations, state and local, are only buying a little more time—time for something dramatic to happen in the auto industry, probably an alternative to the internal combustion engine; time for the public to become truly concerned; for the planting of more green belts to help purify the air; to develop mass transit facilities, better planning and zoning.

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, June 30, 1969]

A STRATEGY UNFOLDS TO CUT SMOG LEVEL IN BAY REGION

(By Ernie Cox)

On a clear day you can see—not forever—but at least 50 beautiful miles around the Bay Area.

On other days—and they are coming more often—the haze is so heavy you can barely make out the Eastbay end of the Bay Bridge from downtown Oakland.

The average man in the street, if he bothers to look up at all, shrugs and tells himself it's just another one of those gray days. Wedded to the unfetter use of his private automobile, he figures air pollution is somebody else's problem.

Overcoming that attitude is one of the biggest problems of air pollution officialdom. Lending a hand in a public awareness effort is a newly formed group of concerned scientists and laymen calling themselves the Northern California Committee for Environmental Information.

This Berkeley-based group formed just six months ago, has just completed a draft of its first report. It has not been released, but The Tribune obtained an advance copy of the 20-page document for this series.

The group is an affiliate of the Scientists Institute for Public Information in New York. Its report was prepared by a subcommittee on air pollution headed by Jim Huntziker, a research physicist at University of California, Berkeley. Others on the subcommittee included Cruz Venstrom of Berkeley, a retired agricultural economist; and Laurence Caretto, assistant professor of mechanical engineering, U.C., Berkeley.

Some of the major points made in the report include the following:

1. Electrical, steam or gas turbine powered automobiles are possible alternatives to the internal combustion engine.

2. Inspection of private autos is needed in order to insure that pollution devices, once installed, remain effective.

3. Coordination of both planning and funds for highways and rapid transit would help reduce congestion and pollution.

4. Fast train transportation for short runs—with airplane competition prohibited on such—would help reduce auto usage.

5. Progressively higher registration fees, based on pollution emissions, could be used to phase out uncontrolled cars.

6. Two lanes on the Golden Gate and Bay Bridges could be assigned to buses only to encourage more public use.

7. Differential bridge tolls at peak traffic hours and higher tolls for singly occupied cars would encourage mass transit.

8. Maximum piggybacking of trucks by railroads would reduce air pollution, traffic congestion, and highway construction and maintenance costs.

9. As the population in the "poorly ventilated" Central Valley increases, a forward-looking rapid rail transit system could encourage both land and air conservation. Such plans should be begun soon.

"Effective citizen action to help clean our air involves a personal action in two ways," says the report. These are:

Less frequent and more efficient use of personal cars.

Encouragement of effective legislation and controls.

"The population of the United States is still increasing," states the committee, "but even when it stabilizes there would still be the probability of continued migration to the Bay Area—a highly desirable place in which to live. More people imply more cars and consequently more sources of pollution."

The report points out that present laws applying to automobile emissions will have their maximum effect about 1985 but it adds, "there is also room for further reductions in industrial emissions in the Bay District."

The committee cites figures issued in 1968 by the California Air Resources Board predicting impressive reductions in emissions for the Bay Area up to 1985, and adds this comment:

"This would be better air than we now see and breathe. But there are some big 'ifs' which are recognized in the report. One is that the research has not yet been done to design a production car to meet California 1974 emission standards.

"A bigger question is that the initial effectiveness of control devices decreases with age and there is currently no check on the operation of a control device once the car is sold."

What happens when the cool off-shore breeze comes in through the Golden Gate on a typical summer day? The air splits against the Berkeley hills, with one portion flowing east over Carquinez Strait to the Central Valley. The other portion is deflected southeastward to Dublin, Livermore and the San Jose area.

Pollutants from the Richmond area normally move east through Contra Costa County with some southward drift into the Livermore area. However, in the course of a season there will be all kinds of variations from the typical pattern.

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune,
July 1, 1969]

MASSIVE STATE SMOG STUDY

(By Ernie Cox)

There's a rabbit in a cage out in Berkeley undergoing tests that would take your breath away.

They're pumping smog into his cage to test its effects on his tissues and organs.

Doctors already know a great deal about the poisonous effects of smog on the senses and the human lungs. But the rabbit is part of the State Health Department's continuous search for more knowledge about this public enemy of our environment.

Says Dr. Louis F. Saylor, director of the State Health Department, "Health is no longer narrowly defined as only the absence of disease. Our goal in public health is to provide the means to robust good living."

Dr. Saylor adds that this ideal is modified by the quality of our environment.

The department's Bureau of Air Sanitation was established in 1955 to bring the resources of state government to bear on the growing problems of air pollution. Under contract with the State Air Resources Board, the department is conducting a massive inventory of pollutant emission sources in each of California's 11 air basins.

Dr. John R. Goldsmith, head of the department's Environmental Epidemiology Unit, says four separate annual surveys in California showed that 3 out of 4 persons are bothered by air pollution and 90 per cent of these had eye irritation. One out of 16 in Los Angeles and Orange counties reported air pollution affected his breathing. Dr. Goldsmith also said many local physicians have reported that asthma is aggravated by smog.

The department's own surveys, according to Dr. Goldsmith, found that next to eye irritations, asthma was the most frequently reported chronic condition made worse by air pollution. He added, "The evidence for lung cancer so far is negative."

However, Dr. John Rosen, an Oakland physician, recently told a news conference in Sacramento he considers smog as dangerous to health as cigarette smoking. Rosen was in Sacramento to support a bill by Sen. Nicholas C. Petris, D-Oakland, to phase out gasoline-powered autos in California.

"There is a definite correlation," said Rosen, "between smog and lung cancer . . . a very high correlation."

Dr. Peter K. Mueller, chief of the Air and Industrial Hygiene Laboratory, State Health Department, is convinced smog causes impairment of pulmonary functions in humans and increases susceptibility to respiratory infection.

In a paper presented at the 62nd annual meeting of the Air Pollution Control Association in New York City last week, Mueller notes that laboratory experiments with animals causes him to suspect the aging process may be accelerated by repeated exposure to smog. He also says long-term exposure to smog irritants can produce emphysema-type conditions in the lungs of rats and mice.

"Both ozone and oxides of nitrogen (smog ingredients) are deep lung irritants," says Mueller. "They exert an inflammatory reaction mainly in the lower region of the respiratory tract."

He added that a number of experimental studies in animals have demonstrated "the capacity of photochemical pollution to produce changes in lung tissue and lung function at oxidant concentrations compatible with those found in Los Angeles."

At a conference on "Man and His Environment" held May 28-29 at San Jose State College, Dr. H. V. Thomas, a research specialist under Dr. Mueller, noted a national increase of 400 per cent in chronic respiratory disease over the last decade.

"The trends for deaths from chronic respiratory diseases observed during the past two decades," he said, "constitute a chronic disease epidemic."

While there is still no concrete evidence to prove the point, Dr. Thomas said "one can only wonder" whether the upward trend in respiratory disease is caused by a weakening of the lung's defense mechanism from breathing smog.

"Might it not be prudent," he asked, "to try to live in harmony with our environment than to adopt an attitude of hostility towards it?"

Independent studies made in recent years in Great Britain, Nashville, Tenn., and Buffalo, N.Y. showed a strong association between the rate of deaths from stomach cancer and the existence of air pollution. The Buffalo study found the death rate among white men and women, 50 to 69 years of age, was almost twice as high in areas of high pollution as in those of low smog levels.

Another study, looking for the prevalence of emphysema, compared heavily industrialized St. Louis, Mo., and Winnipeg, Canada, a prairie-agricultural city, in neither city were causes of severe emphysema observed in non-smokers. But the incidence of severe emphysema in comparable groups of cigarette smokers was four times higher in smoggy St. Louis than in Winnipeg.

The never-ending research goes on at a relentless pace—not only in California, but throughout the nation—indeed, throughout the world.

At least the scientists and doctors—if not the general public and most politicians—know man must find a way soon to avoid befouling the only planet we have.

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune,
July 2, 1969]

POLLUTION CONTROL "A HOLDING ACTION"

(By Ernie Cox)

Industrial smokestacks, open burning of garbage dumps, agricultural burning, ships in port and fumes from paints and other solvents—all are controlled in six Bay Area counties.

Starting next Jan. 1, burning of rubbish in backyards of one and two-family dwellings will also be regulated.

It is all the work of the 13-year-old Bay Area Air Pollution Control District.

The regulations have made substantial inroads against many types of air pollution but the overall Bay Area effort is a losing battle—or at best a holding action—against automobiles and trucks, over which the local district has no jurisdiction.

The district operates from its new six-story office building at 939 Ellis St., San Francisco. What goes on inside its walls more closely touches the man in the street than do many other better-known agencies of government.

Ninety district employes will be operating in the upcoming fiscal year under a $1.8 million budget financed mainly from property taxes in the counties of San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara.

The budget provides for the operation of the district's 10 air monitoring stations and another soon to be opened in the smog-plagued Livermore Valley.

The 1955 legislation setting up the district also contemplated the inclusion of Napa, Sonoma and Solano counties but it contained a loophole requiring affirmative action of each board of supervisors before the counties to the north could be included in the district.

After 13 long years the three counties are still holdouts and it is becoming increasingly an irritant to the local district—almost as smarting as smog itself.

D. J. Callaghan, the district's $27,500-a-year chief administrative officer, says the three north bay counties are producing 1,800 tons of pollutants per day, some of which is carried down into the air of the six counties where residents are taxing themselves to fight smog.

The district is governed by a 12-man board of directors composed of a city councilman and supervisor from each of the six counties. A 20-man advisory council, appointed from a cross section of industry, commerce and business, recommends policy decisions to the board.

A three-man hearing board sits as a quasi-judicial body to consider individual cases. On the hearing board are J. Joseph Sullivan, San Francisco attorney; E. Spencer Bodine of Marin County, a retired engineer for Shell Oil Co., and Joseph G. Hunter of San Francisco, a retired chemical engineer.

Severest criticism of the district setup has come from a four-year-old San Jose-based group called Citizens Against Air Pollution, Inc. It is headed by Peter B. Venuto, assistant professor in the School of Business, San Jose State College. Others on the board of directors are A. Bepristis, a San Jose chemist; attorney Walter V. Hays of San Jose, and John H. Bloomer, a Palo Alto engineer.

Venuto said his main criticism of the district is that Callaghan is an administrator and not a technician in air pollution, and that Callaghan is appointed by a "politically oriented" board of directors rather than being elected by the voters of the district.

"Air pollution is a technical problem," said Venuto, "and our smog chief should be technically qualified. There also are no

XUM

checks and balances under the present setup. The voters have no say as to which councilman or supervisor is to serve on the pollution district board.

"We do not need a board of directors. The smog chief should be directly elected by the district and given full responsibility and authority."

Venuto said he also feels the advisory council is "loaded in favor of industry" and that certain members have a direct conflict of interest because their employers are some of the major air polluters in the area. The advisory council and hearing board are both appointed by the district directors.

Venuto charged also that district officials have refused to make public the names of major polluters, and won't identify the pollutants coming from individual sources.

"There are so many loopholes in the present law," he said, "that the district is able to grant repeated continuances and variances which actually allow an industry to pollute the air legally."

District officials say what Venuto has asked for is the name and address of the "25 biggest polluters" even though the industries may be meeting all current legal requirements of the district. They say also that pollution would have to be defined in order to pinpoint individual sources, because pollution is made up of numerous ingredients and the ingredients vary widely from one industry to another.

The district also refuses to divulge the component breakdown of emissions from individual industries. This information is supplied by the industries and, said a district spokesman, it is "privileged" information because it might be used by a competitive industry to learn of a plant's processes.

Out in Martinez, 88 residents became so impatient with their own board of supervisors and the pollution district they filed a suit in U.S. District Court in San Francisco seeking an injunction and $13.2 million from Shell Oil Co. which operates a new $80 million refinery in the Contra Costa County seat. The suit was filed last August and is still pending.

Thomas Fuller of Martinez, a retired teacher and long time spokesman for the citizens group, said the court action finally came after months of hearings before the Contra Costa County supervisors and the smog district board.

Fuller said as far as he is concerned the Shell refinery in Martinez has still not improved its operation to any great extent.

"My personal feeling," he stated, "is that the smog board has got too many political strings attached to it."

District officials disagree sharply. They say Shell is tearing down its 12 plants within the refinery "brick by brick" to get to the cause of breakdowns which produce smoke and smog.

The refinery still has an "occasional breakdown", said a spokesman, but he contended the Shell operation has improved greatly in the past year. The district advisory council currently is looking into the possibility of strengthening the "breakdown" provisions of the present regulations, he said.

Another citizens group, called Clean Air Now, was founded by Mrs. Sarah Feldner, a Palo Alto housewife.

She said 120 Bay Area families belong to the group which has lobbied for legislation in Sacramento and frequently compares notes with citizen groups in Los Angeles.

Mrs. Feldner, who regularly attends smog district meetings, said the meetings are poorly attended by the public and added, "it is hard for the directors to get much feedback from the public when the public doesn't attend any of the board meetings."

Air pollution, she said, has been thought of as the "concern of the middle class" but she added, "this must change. Air pollution is everybody's business."

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, July 3, 1969]

CALIFORNIA PASSED FIRST SMOG LAWS

(By Ernie Cox)

The first laws in this nation requiring smog controls on cars were passed in California.

The old Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board, a state agency in operation about two decades, was the first of its kind in the United States.

California's regulations were so far ahead of the rest of the states, the Federal Government adapted many of them in the Federal Air Quality Act of 1967.

The Legislature passed the Mulford-Carrell Air Resources Act of 1967 which revamped the statewide smog control setup. The state's Pure Air Act of 1968 set new and more stringent standards for cars.

Despite all the laws and controls to date, there has been no significant reduction in total air pollution shrouding California cities each day.

As more people move into the state, as they buy and use more cars, the increase in smog is running ahead of the controls.

More stringent controls are planned for the future but many scientists and others are not optimistic that the problem is anywhere near to being solved.

The battle is being carried on statewide by the Air Resources Board, which was created in 1967 to replace the old Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board. The new board, headquartered in Sacramento, has been given broad powers over non-vehicular pollution as well as that from cars.

The board is presently considering air quality standards for the entire state, which has been divided into 11 so-called air basins. The standards, if adopted, will be higher in many cases than those now followed by the Bay Area Air Pollution Control District under its own six-county regulations.

California's Pure Air Act of 1968 went into effect last November and test procedures were adopted by the Air Resources Board on November 20. The standards spell out a five-year program of increasing stringent standards for 1970 to 1974 model cars.

The act will prohibit the sale in California of new vehicles which cannot meet the state requirements.

Scientists and public health officials agree the automobile is the main culprit in the smog problem.

They do not all agree with some of the state's own rather optimistic predictions for the future.

In its 1968 annual report the board says regarding new cars, "control of evaporative losses will not begin until 1970 . . . control of oxides of nitrogen will not begin until the 1971 models . . . strictest standards for exhaust hydrocarbons do not go into effect until 1972 . . . those for oxides of nitrogen, not until 1974."

The board says this "timetable . . . will progressively reduce the emissions of all three pollutants to a minimum point by about 1985."

At least one group, the Berkeley-based Northern California Committee for Environmental Information, does not share the optimism of the State Resources Board. The committee, which includes scientists and engineers, says the state board's predictions for 1985 "rest on potentials in law, but not in fact; on administrative problems of inspection and joint jurisdictions, and on a combustion technology not yet available."

In simpler terms, the Berkeley committee says "research has not yet been done to design a production car to meet California 1974 emission standards."

The state board is well aware of that fact. It acknowledges its predictions for Los Angeles and San Francisco cleaner air by 1985 are "based on the projected growth in these areas, together with the assumptions that vehicle emissions will comply with the standards . . ." It adds that "research and development will be required of the automobile industry and others to produce vehicles that will meet these standards."

Chairman of the Air Resources Board is Dr. A. J. Haagen-Smit, professor of bio-chemistry at California Institute of Technology, Pasadena. The board operated in fiscal 1968–69 with a $2,470,000 state budget and Federal grants totaling $533,800. These funds support a staff of 56 technical and administrative personnel and a $968,500 contract with the State Department of Public Health for technical services.

A statewide air monitoring network of 50 sampling stations is concentrated mainly in Los Angeles and the Bay Area. Little is known of the pollution concentrations in the state's huge agricultural areas. Federal grants over the next three years are expected to help establish more monitoring stations.

The board works closely with the National Air Pollution Control Administration, a Federal agency with officies in San Francisco, and with local control districts such as the Bay Area Air Pollution Control District.

Twenty-four of the state's 58 counties are now in local control districts. This embraces only 50 per cent of the land area but about 90 per cent of the population. The state hopes to encourage the formation of more districts.

A number of the new districts are small and confined to single counties, although smog is no respecter of political boundaries. Problems are expected in these cases in achieving a coordinated air pollution program and in finding trained technical personnel.

The new federal law provides that a state may enforce its own controls on new auto emissions—provided it first obtains a waiver from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The procedure is complicated and time consuming. Unless the federal government simplifies the procedure, said the State Board, California will "continually be in the process of seeking these waivers."

SMOG WARNING PROGRAM FOR LOS ANGELES SCHOOLCHIIDREN

LOS ANGELES.—When air pollution reaches a certain level, Los Angeles school children will not be required to run, jump, or play football, baseketball or baseball.

The new school smog warning program was announced yesterday by the Air Pollution Control District.

Students will be warned against taking strenuous exercise when the forecast is for a count of .35 or more parts of ozone per million parts of air.

The warning system was approved by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors in April after the County Medical Association recommended the program in a resolution that warned "smog is an increasing health hazard which may seriously affect the lungs of young people."

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, July 4, 1969]

UNCERTAIN EFFECTS IN SMOG CONTROLS

(By Ernie Cox)

A spokesman for Bay Area industrialists says indusrty has spent $100 million on air pollution control equipment since industry controls were adopted in 1960.

An official of the Bay Area Air Pollution Control District placed the industry cost at between $30 million and $50 million.

Whatever the actual figure, it is evident that most Bay Area industries have gone a long way toward eliminating many objectionable features of their plants. Total elimination of industrial air pollution probably is a Utopian goal which never will be achieved.

XUM

Critics of the local air pollution control district say current regulations contain too many loopholes for variances and continuances for violators.

Industry spokesmen, however, contend that pollution control regulations must take into account both the technological and economic feasibility of control devices—and these factors may vary widely from one industry to another.

Principal spokesman for Bay Area industry is Eveleth E. Hayden, executive vice president of the Bay Area League of Industrial Associations, Inc., with offices at 3124 E. 14th St., Oakland.

To put the problem of industrial air pollution into perspective, one must keep in mind figures released recently by the Bay Area Air Pollution Control District. These showed that automobiles and trucks contribute 71 per cent of the Bay Area's air pollution; back yard burning, 11 per cent, and industries the remaining 18 per cent.

Hayden says local industry leaders originally supported the formation of the Bay Area control district, formed in 1955, for several reasons.

They wanted to avoid a critical problem which they could see developing; they wanted to avoid some of the problems of the Los Angeles Air Pollution Control District, and they preferred a locally controlled district rather than a state agency.

The League and its forerunner organization, the Alameda County Industries, Inc., has been closely associated with the writing of Bay Area air pollution regulations No. 2, which controls industrial smoke, and regulation No. 3, controlling fumes and other pollutants from solvents, inks and paints.

Its lobbying efforts with the smog control board and its 20-man advisory council have been both vigorous and effective when the industrialists felt proposed regulations would be too expensive or impractical.

Hayden says Bay Area industry favors, for instance, the broad "performance standards" used by the local district instead of so-called "specification standards" applied to industry in Los Angeles. The difference is important to industry.

The Bay Area pollution board simply sets a standard of performance required of industry and says in effect, "This is what is expected of you—how you accomplish it is your problem."

The Los Angeles district, on the other hand, sets up much more detailed specifications for individual industries, allowing for little flexibility or adaptation. Hayden says the latter method causes unnecessary technical problems, while adding nothing to the final result.

Bay Area industry was instrumental in writing the original formation law as well as subsequent regulations.

In the key provision for enforcement the Los Angeles and Bay Area districts are poles apart.

In Los Angeles, a suspected violating industry is given a misdemeanor citation, hailed into court and required to defend itself against possible fines.

The Bay Area district follows an "injunctive procedure" whereby suspected violators may either correct the conditions or apply to the district's three-man hearing board for a variance. Repeated violations can result in court injunctions or fines, but the process is a slow one.

Hayden and local pollution district officials both say they prefer the local setup because, while it is slower, it has resulted in far greater voluntary cooperation from industry—which they consider one of the keys to an effective control program.

In justifying industry's prominent role in writing regulations applicable to itself, Hayden explains, "We feel we have been helpful to the nontechnical members of the (Bay district) advisory council. Air quality is a technical matter—not a political problem."

He added somewhat ruefully, "There is a tendency on the part of uninformed members of the public to brand industry as the bad guys. We are the guys with the black hats."

In Contra Costa County oil refineries have been one of the biggest problems. One of them, Shell at Martinez, is still embroiled in controversy with neighbors who have filed a federal court action for damages.

Bob Crothers, whose title was recently changed from air sanitation director to industrial health director in the Contra Costa County Health Department, says he receives more complaints against sulphur compounds than any other. These are caused by refineries or related industries making sulphuric acid.

"The public is demanding increased controls," said Crothers. "A few years ago they might have put up with something objectionable. Now they demand it be eliminated. This creates a never-ending task for industry."

Crothers called the Antioch plant of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. the "best setup in the country." The plant, he pointed out is surrounded by farm land owned and controlled by du Pont; the plant is at least one-half mile from its nearest neighbor.

While such an ideal setup is not always possible, it seems clear that industry's annoyances will no longer be tolerated by the public as a necessary evil.

The California Air Resources Board currently has under study a set of new and stiffer air quality standards recommended by the State Department of Public Health.

These standards, if adopted, would be higher in many cases than standards currently in effect for the Bay Area. The state standards would have to be met in the local district.

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, July 5, 1969]

Hopes Dim for Clean Air

(By Ernie Cox)

Can residents of the Bay Area ever expect to breathe really clean air again?

Probably not—if you're thinking of our pre-World War II environment.

Air pollution officials are sorry about that, because it's their job to clean up the air.

A simple fact of life is this: people cause pollution. More people cause more pollution. As certain as night follows day the Bay Area can expect thousands, perhaps millions, more people in the years ahead.

They will drive more cars, work in more factories, burn more private rubbish, light more furnaces and fireplaces, operate more diesel trucks, fly more jet airplanes.

A genuine concern for the future came recently from A. E. Schuck, professor at the Air Pollution Research Center, University of California at Riverside, where research is being done on the effects of air pollution on plants.

Professor Schuck believes man's use of fossil fuels such as gasoline and diesel fuel will result in the creation of 25 per cent more carbon dioxide in the earth's atmosphere in the next 30 years. This, he says, will cause a greenhouse effect, resulting in a rise in world temperatures, warming the oceans and melting the polar ice cap. The combined effect, he says, could raise the levels of the oceans by 400 feet. High on his list for smog reduction is the replacement of the internal combustion engine.

The State Air Resources Board has adopted standards calling for successively tougher controls of auto emissions to 1974. But the attainment of such goals may not be technically or economically feasible. The auto industry has not yet indicated it will be able to meet the 1972 standards, much less those for 1974.

There is strong feeling on the part of some experts that the internal combustion engine has been made about as "clean" as is technically and economically feasible and that some radical new breakthrough is needed.

Alternatives suggested have included the steam engine, battery powered cars, and even the use of compressed natural gas. The state is currently involved officially in programs to test all three types of vehicles. Successful tests could have far-reaching effects on the future of motor transportation.

One of the first to go—assuming impressive test results—may be the diesel driven urban bus. If you've ever been caught behind one of these belching behemoths, trailing its black and stinking cloud, the news will be welcome.

There are about 57,000 diesel-powered vehicles in California. Ninety per cent are trucks and 10 per cent are buses. The Air Resources Board says the California Highway Patrol has authority to issue citations to any vehicle smoking excessively—and that in 1968 the CHP issued 8,686 citations and made 7,846 arrests.

Smoke from jet aircraft, increasing significant as more and more planes come into use, is not now regulated by the Air Resources Board, nor does the Federal Aviation Agency have any regulation governing emission into the atmosphere. The National Air Pollution Control Administration has been directed by the Congress to study the problem and report its findings.

The United States Public Health Service has estimated that the annual cost of air pollution is about $65 per person. In the Bay Area the cost of pollution control equipment to industry, alone, is estimated at upwards of $100 million, plus incalculable additional costs of maintenance and operation.

In addition, Bay Area motorists have spent an estimated $12 million for exhaust controls on their cars and another $15 million for crankcase devices required by tough new laws.

In the Bay Area there are 2,250,000 automobiles and about 10,000 industrial operations—all potential air polluters—such as auto body shops, refineries, foundries, paint shops, food processing plants, metal grinders, rock crushers, cement plants, chemical products, house painters—the list is almost endless.

A great deal is being done to abate air pollution but some local officials feel we are only "buying a little more time" with all the regulations. They expect the air pollution to reach a plateau, level off for a few years, then begin to climb again—unless something dramatic happens to eliminate the overwhelming pall of smog from the automobile.

While you cough and sneeze, wipe your eyes and worry and wait for "progress," there are several things the experts suggest you might do:

—Learn as much as possible about smog, its sources, effects and control.

—Keep you own car properly maintained and serviced through regular checkups of smog control equipment, ignition and carburetor.

—Be prepared to foot the bill and support legislation for better smog control.

—Make up your mind that everyone is a potential air polluter and decide to do what you can to lessen the problem.

The results could be like a breath of fresh air.

A LAWYER VIEWS THE GATHERING STORM

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on June 14, 1969, the Cleveland-Marshall Law School, of Cleveland, Ohio, awarded the degree of doctor of laws to a distinguished member of the District of Columbia bar, the Honorable Frederick Bernays Wiener, who delivered the commencement address on that occasion. The

XUM

commencement address, which bears the title "A Lawyer Views the Gathering Storm," contains many trenchant remarks of permanent value and merits wide dissemination. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A Lawyer Views the Gathering Storm

(By Frederick Bernays Wiener)

In the first volume of his history of The Second World War, Sir Winston Churchill related the sorry account of the foolishness and the fearfulness of the English leaders in the seven-year period preceding that tragic conflict. Step by step they yielded to the threat of force, step by step they weakened their ability to resist, step by step they sought to buy peace by throwing smaller nations to the wolves. To no avail. They lacked alike the wisdom and the courage to understand either that permissiveness is no counter to wickedness, or that appeasement in the face of promised violence simply feeds the appetite for plunder and dominion. The men of Munich, seeking "peace in our time," found that, instead, their actions only guaranteed the holocaust that came so very near to ending civilization.

Churchill entitled that first volume "The Gathering Storm."

Today, a generation later, it is not Britain but the United States that faces the gathering storm, and today in this country we are not threatened nearly as much by the barbarians outside our borders as by the savages within them.

Everywhere around us we see starkly the signs of erosion, of the tearing apart of institutions, of the loosening of what may be comprehensively called the obligations of society, of the weakening and indeed the rending of the social fabric. These are not future visions vouchsafed to prophets of doom, they are actual events recorded daily before our eyes. And, tragically, the decay and dissolution have been most manifest in our universities, in the very centers where one would have supposed the collective wisdom of the nation had been assembled and nurtured.

Our campuses have been invaded by violence, our colleges have been subjected to the dictates of armed barbarians with bandoliers. With all too few exceptions, faculties and administrators have supinely surrendered, accepting demands backed by duress, and, where outside assistance has been invoked, lamely apologizing for having done so. For the most part it has been a step by step surrender, recalling all too accurately the pusillanimous pilgrimage to Munich that was so tragically led by the cowardly Chamberlain.

It is said that such a view reflects a generation gap on the part of one presenting it. But the current strident revolt is rather an intelligence gap—and that this is not an epithet is amply proved by the illiteracy of the rebels. If Charlie Brown and his Peanuts companions were to misspell "Suport Boycot" it would be found amusing; but college students actually doing so all too starkly proclaim their lack of even elementary education. Yet these are the people who would "restructure" the universities—and with whom some administrators and many professors are willing to talk, even at the point of a gun.

If we disregard labels and concentrate on realities, it becomes crystal clear that the student rebels do not seek democracy, but instead despise it; for democracy is inescapably the rule of the majority, while these rebels insist that their minority views prevail.

They do not seek free speech; to the contrary, they will not listen to any speakers not in agreement with them, and they regularly disrupt meetings where such speakers seek to appear. They grant no right to anyone to dissent from their views, not even a right of rebuttal. They are wholly insensitive to the force of argument, preferring to rely entirely upon the argument of force. By insisting that they will obey only the laws that are pleasing to them and disobey all others, they plainly demonstrate that they are, in the dictionary sense, anarchists.

Interestingly enough, a recurrent feature of almost all the campus disruptions has been the insistent demand of the disturbers that they be granted amnesty, that they go unpunished for the excesses that they have committed, and that the universities refrain from taking either academic or criminal action against them for the harm that they have done. Plainly, this is another aspect of that selective law observance which is the essence of anarchy.

But whereas earlier anarchists welcomed martyrdom with ecstatic elation, today's seek only to be martyrs without suffering. Yet, shamefully if predictably, it is amnesty that many institutions have given them.

What can the community thing of educators who so plainly encourage irresponsibility, who thus underwrite the commission of crimes immune from punishment.

It is all too obvious that the objectives of the student rebels are purely emotional, and that, far from weighing their desires in the light of human experience, even of recent experience, they apply to any attempt to question the validity of their demands their ultimate term of denunciation, the word "irrelevant." Their spiritual companions are thus the elder Henry Ford, who once proclaimed that "History is bunk," plus the everpresent man of positive views, who brushes away all facts once he has made up his mind, and so falls within the Ambrose Bierce definition of "positive" as "wrong in a loud tone of voice."

Why have our universities been so ineffective, so fearful, indeed so craven, in dealing with their student rebels? Surely the students do not know as much as their teachers, else why should they bother to attend? Surely the teachers are aware of the manifold lessons of the past, all of which show the students to be wrong.

In all conscience, it must be admitted that the prerequisite for membership in academe, the possession of a Ph.D. degree, is but poor preparation for defensive operations at the barricades. But there is no reason why the professors must themselves repel the savages on the pattern of the pioneer wives who helped defend their homes against the Indians.

For well nigh two centuries it has not been necessary for individuals to go armed in self-defense. That function has long since been delegated to an organization maintained by the community for just that purpose, so that if a man's own home is about to be invaded by ruffians, he calls the police, and relies on them to do the necessary.

Surely an institution has the same right of self-defense as any individual, with the same right to the use of whatever force is necessary to repel unlawful force. Yet some universities have refused to call the police when their buildings were invaded and their operations halted, and in others belated invocation of police assistance has been loudly criticized because, in current libertarian jargon, it "polarized the moderates."

In his recent Law Day address, Assistant Attorney General William H. Rehnquist put an unerring finger on the fallacy of such silly semantics, recalling the beginning of our Civil War. After seven States had been permitted quietly to secede, the hotheads in one of them fired on Fort Sumter. President Lincoln was asked to sit supinely by, lest by taking affirmative action in self-defense he "polarize the moderates." Well, he called for troops—and, sure enough, four more States seceded.

Should he have refrained from seeking to put down what in the Official Records is still called "The War of the Rebellion"? If he had, we should now be two nations instead of one, and, more significantly, the institution of chattel slavery would surely have endured for decades more—and might indeed still exist.

One cannot expect schoolboys, lacking background, inflated with rhetoric and mouthing platitudes, to know of this. But is it unreasonable to ask that mature, educated and indeed learned men brush aside such an obvious lesson of indigenous history in order to rationalize and actually justify the destruction of a university by unkempt thugs? Yet when the President recently exhorted educators to show some backbone, when the Attorney General and his assistants called for an end to campus violence, the American Association of University Professors labeled such an attitude to a threat to academic freedom. It somehow never occurred to them that academic freedom had already been stifled by the actual shutting down of so many universities, and that it was the proposal to preclude such interference in the future that would restore academic freedom.

As one reviews the turmoil on American campuses over the last several years, as one reads the incredible nonsense spewed forth by doctrinaire libertarians, as one contemplates the recent public confession of articulated cowardice by a law professor at the one institution that most obviously yielded to force with a kind of masochistic satisfaction, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that, with the shining exceptions of Father Hesburgh and Dr. Hayakawa, too many American educators have failed their universities—and betrayed their country.

It was Talleyrand rather than Clemenceau who remarked that war was far too important to be left to the generals. But unless presidents and professors begin very soon to demonstrate in the future more wisdom and far more fortitude than they have displayed recently, we shall have to paraphrase the French remark with the observation that our universities are far too vital to the nation to be entrusted to their faculties.

But before we move off campus, it seems appropriate to say a few words about the Reserve Officers Training Corps—the ROTC—which currently has become the favorite target of the student militants and of their faculty sympathizers.

Again, I expect no rationality from ignorant nihilists. I also recognize that, over recent centuries, pacifism has been the intellectuals' Achilles heels—so much so that, after Munich and just four months before the outbreak of World War II, the Labour Party in Parliament voted solidly against conscription. But, once more, I submit that mature teachers at the highest academic level should be sufficiently awake to the facts of recent history to be able to place ROTC in its setting.

No one except utter idiots would seriously contend that the United States disarm completely and stay unprepared. The Axis has been laid, but the second invasion of Czechoslovakia last summer, just thirty years after the first, should serve to convince the unaligned that aggression still stalks the world. Truly, as the philosopher Santayana wrote, those who ignore history are condemned to repeat it.

So the question is no whether the United States shall maintain armed forces but rather what kind of forces. And up to now the American answer has been that the country will keep a core of full-time professionals, to be fleshed out by citizen soldiers in time of need, and that the United States does not propose to follow down the path of na-

XUM

tional dissolution the Roman example of hired mercenaries and Praetorian guards.

And if we are to provide a citizen army, we need citizen leaders, persons who are properly educated and who are imbued with our civilian traditions. There, essentially, is the justification for ROTC.

It would be easy to expand and document the foregoing. But perhaps it will suffice on this occasion simply to add the ultimate contention for the retention of the ROTC, the argument of survival: Let us keep it so that in at least one department on a college campus there will still be taught and practiced discipline—and courage.

The philosopher Erasmus described the lawyers of Henry the Eighth's day as an exceedingly learned group of extremely ignorant men. The same characterization is surely applicable to many, far too many, of today's professors. They lash out in a unison of emotional frenzy at "the military-industrial complex," a phrase coined by one of theirs and accepted by the amiable Eisenhower. They fail utterly to realize that this is simply a derogatory synonym for what a far abler and a far more perceptive President, Franklin Roosevelt, called rather "the arsenal of democracy." Ironically enough, tragically enough, the loudest and most articulate of today's faculty anti-militarists are precisely those who would themselves have been the first victims of Nazi terror if America's arsenal of democracy had not succeeded in first stemming and then conquering the Axis tyranny.

The shame and folly of Munich took place thirty-one years ago, and to read of it in detail even today evokes a mounting sense of nausea. So when the cream of our intellectuals today so far take leave of their intellects that they urge us down an identical path to disaster, one is forced to conclude that, unless somehow this national lunacy can be arrested, the word "professor" may well become a name of obloquy along with boycott and with quisling.

A second frightening aspect of today's increasing social disintegration is the rise of crime and the visibly accelerating decline in law enforcement. In Washington, during a recent span of less than 70 days, there were 799 recorded holdups. It is common in libertarian circles to attribute such a jungle-like condition to poverty and to discrimination. But in Washington, as I know of my own knowledge, the facts belie the attribution.

Back in 1933, when I first came there, the Nation's capital was still deep in the depths of the depression; and it was so rigidly segregated that when Secretary Ickes directed that the Interior's Negro employees could sit anywhere in the Department's cafeteria instead of being limited to their traditional corner table, his order was hailed as a great step forward. Yet in 1933 the streets of Washington were safe. Today its per capita income is close to the highest of any American city's, and the fullest integration prevails. But today the streets of Washington even in daylight are far from safe, and at night they are affirmatively dangerous; for months now, bus drivers have carried no cash, only paper scrip. None the less, the Mayor's recent call for extra Washington police was opposed by the libertarians, who, after howling down last year all who called for law and order, are now labeling efforts at improved law enforcement with a designedly nasty word: "repression."

Law graduates today must help restore sanity and proportion to public thinking. They will need to do so as individuals, drawing on the rules and outlook they have learned and on the powers of analysis they have acquired to urge a return to reason upon friends and acquaintances.

Today's law graduates will not find many allies in that task in the media of communication; television is, inescapably, show business and not journalism, while many publications have become infected by the same disease that has already so seriously weakened the universities.

Nor will today's law graduates find aid or comfort in the organized bar. It is true that the organized bar has never been actively antisocial, as indeed organized medicine was in its long and virulent campaign against medicare. But after forty years' close observation of many bar associations, I must in all candor say to you that you cannot fairly or usefully rely upon them to do anything worthwhile. The bar in its collective capacity is too timorous to stand against the tide, and most of its indorsements simply add a "me-too" to what would have been adopted without such approval. Characteristically, when the recent judicial scandal came to public notice, the President of the American Bar Association shrank from comment, saying it was not the business of the bar to discipline the bench. And, equally in character, five days after the individual concerned had resigned under fire, the Association's committee on ethics adjudged his conduct to have been unethical. Assuredly, it takes a unique variety of courage to kick a corpse.

Inescapably, therefore, as we view the legal scene, we are bound to return to what Charles Evans Hughes said in 1907: "We are under a Constitution, but the Constitution is what the judges say it is, and the judiciary is the safeguard of our liberty and of our property under the Constitution." Passing the obvious question of the ancients, *Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?*—who shall guard the guardians themselves?—we must first ask ourselves what kind of Constitution we want—and need.

Should it follow the admonition of the Old Testament: "Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have not"? Should it exemplify the observation of Maitland, that "every age should be the mistress of its own law"? Or should it rather pursue a middle course, reflecting the classic paradox posed by Roscoe Pound, that "Law must be stable and yet it cannot stand still"?

Surely, as Holdsworth pointed out a generation ago, the greatest judges of all ages have been those who have summed up the law, restated it, adapted it, and passed it on, making it serve the demands of the present, yet preserving its continuity with the past and its capacity for growth in the future. Such a process must necessarily be gradual, one that will always pour the new wine into the old flagons. On that footing, American constitutional law in the last few years has been far too unstable. Indeed, there have been so many overrulings in the immediate past as to require a calculus of retroactivity, to determine which of the novel decisions may cast their newly revealed light backward as well as forward.

In a democracy constant deflection of the fundamental law by a body wholly insulated from popular control cannot be healthy. After all, the very concept of law implies a set of fixed and hence predictable rules. Those of us who recall the constitutional struggle of the 1930's see once again around us the same essential factors that evoked the earlier contest. Indeed, its recurrence was predictable. As Mr. Justice Jackson wrote, half-way between the dissatisfaction of the 1930's and the dissatisfactions that are becoming ever more voluble today, "not one of the basic power conflicts which precipitated the Roosevelt conflict against the judiciary has been eliminated or settled, and the old conflict between the branches of the Government remains, ready to break out again whenever the provocation becomes sufficient."

Even the tones of the dissents are keyed to the same tune. Let me just quote two passages, one written a few months ago, the other taken from an opinion of the 1930's, and ask you whether from their tenor you can allocate them accurately as to time.

"The power of courts to declare a statute unconstitutional is subject to two guiding principles of decision which ought never to be absent from judicial consciousness. One is that courts are concerned only with the power to enact statutes, not with their wisdom. The other is that while unconstitutional exercise of power by the executive and legislative branches of the government is subject to judicial restraint, the only check upon our own exercise of power is our own sense of self-restraint. For the removal of unwise laws from the statute books appeal lies not to the courts but to the ballot and to the processes of democratic government."

"Today's decision, it seems to me, reflects to an unusual degree the current notion that this Court possesses a peculiar wisdom all its own whose capacity to lead this Nation out of its present troubles is contained only by the limits of judicial ingenuity in contriving new constitutional principles to meet each problem as it arises. For anyone who, like myself, believes that it is an essential function of this Court to maintain the constitutional divisions between state and federal authority and among the three branches of the Federal Government, today's decision is a step in the wrong direction."

Many recent decisions, of course, do not evoke extended popular outcry; they outrage only the dissenters, plus other minority groups such as lawyer students of the judicial process.

But the seeds of the conflict that Justice Jackson presciently envisaged may today lie in the recent line of Supreme Court decisions that have enlarged, step by step, the rights available to persons accused of crime. It is fashionable in liberatarian circles to speak comprehensively of "the constitutional rights of an accused." But that formulation really begs the question, for at least two reasons.

First, those recent decisions did not spring from any inescapable or inexorable constitutional command; if they had, discovery of what the Founders had so plainly ordained could hardly have been delayed for 170 years and more. Indeed, to revert to the language of patent law, one can pinpoint in these newly formulated constitutional imperatives the very moment of invention.

And, second, the purpose of the criminal law is not to insure the liberty of the accused criminal, it is to enforce the sanctions that society has decreed through the orderly processes of representative government. Consequently, when one examines the recent decisions, it is necessary to ask whether they assist the innocent person wrongfully accused to estabilsh his innocence, whether they add appreciably to the fact-finders' ability to distinguish between guilt or innocence, or whether they simply make it more difficult to persecute the plainly guilty. I have not undertaken such a study in detail, nor could I now discuss my results with you if I had. Still, to recall Justice Holmes' ultimate test of faith, I should be willing to make a substantial bet that the sum total of what has been called the criminal law revolution perceptibly weights the scale against the prosecutor without much countervailing help to the truly innocent or, except in the right-to-counsel cases, without perceptible improvement in the fact-finding process.

Let me call to mind another prophetic remark of Justice Jackson, taken from a dissenting opinion that he wrote just twenty years ago:

"This Court has gone far toward accepting the doctrine that civil liberty means the removal of all restraints from these crowds and that all local attempts to maintain order are impairments of the liberty of the citizen. The choice is not between order and liberty. It is between liberty with order

XUM

and anarchy without either. There is danger that, if the Court does not temper its doctrinaire logic with a little practical wisdom, it will convert the constitutional Bill of Rights into a suicide pact."

That this view was more than the conjuring up of imaginary horribles that is occasionally to be found in dissenting opinions was dramatically and even frighteningly underscored by some recent preliminary proceedings in the courts of the District of Columbia.

There a Park Service regulation had limited to 200 persons the size of demonstrations taking place on the sidewalk in front of the White House. A United States District Judge held that regulation unconstitutional and enjoined its enforcement; a divided Court of Appeals denied a stay; and it took action by the Circuit Justice, who for the District of Columbia Circuit is the Chief Justice of the United States, to maintain in force during the pendency of the litigation a regulation so obviously designed to protect not only the rights of pedestrians to free passage, but, more importantly, the right of the President of the United States to be physically protected from a potential mob.

Fortunately, however, just as the heroine of the traditional melodrama is at the last moment rescued from the proliferation of perils seen to be bearing down upon her, so that good fortune which protects little children—among others—has not passed by the United States. The new President has just been blessed with two Supreme Court vacancies, one of which he has already filled with a judge of character and of sturdy good sense. I say "good fortune," because it is entirely conceivable that, if President Franklin Roosevelt had similarly been able to fill two vacancies on the Supreme Court in his first Term, the decisions that gave rise to his 1937 Court Plan, decisions that surely were not required by anything in the Constitution or in the lines of its growth, would never have been handed down—and then there would have been no need even to formulate a court plan.

It was, as we know, rejected, and although Franklin Roosevelt lost all the battles, he won the war when the new Court, decision by decision, overruled the old stumbling blocks, and, one by one, enacted into law the dissents of Justices Holmes, Brandeis, and Stone, that were so greatly admired—and that articulated sounder constitutional doctrine.

More recently, we have seen the dissents of the 1940's and 1950's written by Justices Black and Douglas become law; and, in the years ahead, insofar as it is possible to predict the course of constitutional adjudication, I venture the observation that today's law graduates will be seeing the current dissents of Justices Harlan and Stewart similarly transformed into opinions of a future Court.

Let me close with an anecdote, even at the risk of being thought to have reached my anecdotage.

In my last year at law school, I was writing for Professor Felix Frankfurter's seminar in Federal Jurisdiction a biography of Mr. Justice Moody. I had selected that subject because of what I deemed two very cogent reasons. First, he was one of the instructor's judicial heroes, so that anything I might write would be well received. Second, and perhaps more importantly, Justice Moody had served on the Court for only three terms, which meant that he had not written many opinions that needed to be read.

In the course of working on the paper, I called on one who had been a college classmate of Justice Moody, Professor Eugene Wambaugh, who was then retired after many years of teaching constitutional law. Mr. Wambaugh gave me many illuminating sidelights, and then I put a question to him.

Examination of the newspapers and periodicals at the time of Justice Moody's appointment, in 1906 when he had been Attorney General of the United States, disclosed considerable criticism over the translation of the country's highest law officer to the country's highest court. So I asked Mr. Wambaugh what he thought of the charge that President Roosevelt had packed the Court by doing so.

To put my inquiry into context, I must point out that this conversation took place in the spring of 1930, when the only President Roosevelt was Theodore; that Franklin Roosevelt was then in his first term as Governor of New York; and that if anyone, anywhere, had talked out loud about a court plan such as was later proposed in 1937, he would have been immediately committed for psychiatric examination.

So I will ask you, at the risk of repetition, to bear the date of the colloquy forcefully in mind: It was early in 1930 that I requested Mr. Wambaugh to comment on the remark that President Theodore Roosevelt had packed the Supreme Court by placing his Attorney General on it.

Here was Mr. Wambaugh's reply:

"All Presidents have packed the Supreme Court. Only some have packed it with able men—and others with men not so able."

THE CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS MENACE

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, the controversy concerning chemical and biological weapons gained a new dimension with the disclosure of an accidental release of deadly nerve gas at the U.S. base on Okinawa. Fortunately, injuries were minor, but the ramifications of this incident are likely to loom large in our present concern over CBW and United States-Japan relations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article dealing with repercussions from this accident and published in the New York Times of July 20, 1969.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OKINAWA REPORT ON GAS PROVIDES WINDFALL FOR OPPOSITION IN JAPAN

(By Takashi Oka)

TOKYO, July 19.—Opposition parties in Japan are reaping an unexpected windfall from the disclosure that 24 Americans on Okinawa were briefly hospitalized because of a mishap that apparently involved nerve gas.

The conservative pro-American Government of Premier Eisaku Sato has been severely embarrassed by the incident, a source close to the Premier admitted. "It's a nasty problem," the official said, "and the Government is agonizing over the possibility that it will be used to fan anti-base feeling anti-American feeling."

Mr. Sato himself was said to be deeply concerned over the affair.

INVESTIGATION DEMANDED

Spokesmen for the opposition parties—the Socialists, the Communists, the Democratic Socialists and the Buddhist-affiliated Komeito—which have been in a bitter parliamentary dispute over domestic legislation with the governing Liberal-Democratic party, have issued statements condemning the reported stockpiling of poison gas on Okinawa. They have demanded an investigation and the immediate removal of the gas if its presence is proved.

Some members of the Liberal-Democratic party, which enjoys a majority of close to two-thirds in the Parliament, seem to be moving toward making common cause with the opposition on this issue. Susumu Nikaido, deputy secretary general of the Liberal-Democrats, said today that the reported incident posed an issue affecting human welfare. He called on the Government to disclose the truth to the people.

Foreign Ministry officials met today to investigate the possibility of making poison gas a subject of prior consultations between the United States and Japan under the two nation's security treaty. Such a demand, if accepted, would mean the United States could not introduce poison gas into Japan without Tokyo's consent. Okinawa would come under the same restrictions, once it returned to Japanese rule. At present only nuclear warheads and intermediate and long-range missiles are subject to Japan's veto.

"We used to say, 'No nukes on Okinawa,'" a source close to Premier Sato said wryly. "Now we will have to say, 'No nukes and no gas.' It's going to become a national demand."

So far, the Pentagon has refused to say whether the accident July 8 had anything to do with a gas leak but informed sources say that originally the Defense Department's prepared statement on the incident included the phrase "toxic chemical munitions."

American officials here are relieved that no Okinawans were directly affected by the incident and that no lives were lost. But they and Japanese officials agree that the long-term effects of this affair are incalculable.

The Government is handling the situation gingerly, lest by some misstep it provoke the very reaction it fears. Its first test will come when the Parliament resumes early next week. Opposition parties intend to press the Government with questions about the incident and about the possible presence of poison gas in Japan itself.

The Sato Government's official position is that it has asked the United States for an explanation of the incident and hoped that Washington would not cause "uneasiness" to the one million inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands, who consider themselves Japanese by language, ethnic origin and culture. Okinawa, the main island of the American-ruled Ryukyus, is the site of the chief American base in the Far East.

PUBLIC OUTCRY INTENSIFIES

NAHA, OKINAWA, July 19.—A public outcry about the nerve gas incident intensified here today as the Okinawans learned more about the deadly agent and realized once again their powerlessness in the military affairs on the United States-ruled island.

The local newspapers devoted a major part of their front pages to reporting the accident and to chemical and biological warfare weapons. Details of the accident could not be learned.

United States military officials would not comment on either the accident or chemical and biological weapons.

Reports by witnesses, however, indicate that there are two chemical and biological warfare installations here: the 137th Special Ordnance Company in northern Okinawa and the 267th Chemical Company in central Okinawa. Both are under the Army's Second Logistical Command.

According to Okinawan construction contractors, who have been building ammunition storage facilities for the United States forces on the island, there are several hundred sod-covered, concrete "igloos" at the 267th Chemical Company. These igloo complexes, situated in a pine forest one or two miles from the nearest village and Kadena Air Base are surrounded by three fences, probably electrified, sources said.

The contractors also report having seen some goats near the igloos. Rabbits, goats and some other animals have been used in the United States for testing chemical and biological weapons, and biological agents are usually stored in igloos.

Near the 267th Chemical Company are the

XUM

Misato ammunition depot and a sentry dog platoon. Some pine trees in the area are blighted, but the cause is not known. The 137th Special Ordnance Company is situated near the northeastern coast of the island. It, too, has igloos enclosed by fences, but there have been no reports of goats or rabbits there. About 200 Okinawan children suffered skin burns in July last year while swimming at a beach about 12 miles south of the 137th Ordnance Company and many Okinawans suspect some connection between the burns and the American installation.

FLORIDA CURED HAM TO BE SERVED SENATORS ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 23

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, claims have been made heretofore by the distinguished Senators from Tennessee, Virginia, and Kentucky as to the unsurpassed excellence of the hams produced in their respective States.

Undaunted by these extravagant claims, my colleague from Florida (Mr. GURNEY) and I have arranged for Senators, in the several Senate dining rooms, to partake of Florida cured ham tomorrow, Wednesday, July 23, and thus prove beyond doubt the superior quality of Sunshine State pork products.

To insure against any untoward event, including "Ham-napping," Mr. Cliff B. Gosney, Jr., Daytona Beach attorney, and Mrs. Gosney have personally cured and cooked the hams and are accompanying them to Washington to provide this tastiest treat, for all Senators and their guests to enjoy.

Senator GURNEY and I extend a cordial invitation to all our colleagues to sample some Gosney-produced Florida cured ham. We will delight in observing the looks on the diners' faces, as we know their pleased expressions will attest to the superior quality of Florida cured ham.

A MEMORIAL DAY ESSAY

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, many persons have contended that American policies, both foreign and domestic, are not consistent with American principles as put forth in our great national documents. Proponents of this idea have further asserted that our society is highly materialistic and not concerned with human suffering. Such viewpoints are often highly exaggerated but they should serve as cause for deep thought. "The Day to Remember," an essay written by Bruno Andrews, is an eloquent plea for humanity. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DAY TO REMEMBER

(By Bruno Andrews)

Memorial day is all the more poignant in time of war. It is not a day to celebrate or glamorize man's immoral mass slaughter of humanity, but a day to remember. In all the wars that involved our great nation, Americans have fought and died for independence, for freedom, for ideals.

In the countless cemeteries and unseen ocean graves repose the remains of men whose supreme sacrifice was made to the drum beat of high platitudes of morality. Yet Political leaders of nations agree to respect the laws of the Geneva Convention governing the conduct of warfare, but fail to outlaw war. Who will answer?

A deafening silence of sacrilege presides over our national legislature while sixty one congressmen report a financial interest in companies ranked among the top defense contractors. Three house members on the joint committee on defense expenditures own stock in nine corporations awarded contracts to build major components of Sentinel anti ballistic system. Seven who serve on committees with possible defense responsibilities own stock in the parent company of the prime contractor for the ABM program. Who will answer?

Who, has conferred upon mortal man the power of the frozen finger of god, to decree who shall kill and who shall be killed? The military directs men to ascend the bloody slopes of Hamburger Hill, while the garbage pails of affluent America overflow with undevoured steaks, the world's millions go undernourished and dying from lack of food. Who will answer?

What kind of morality grants the license to place a higher value on material things than on the value of human life.

With all our vast accumulation of intellect, knowledge and advanced technology we have spawned a world where nations have in reserve thirty thousand pounds of T.N.T. for every man, woman and child in the world.

Violence simmers and flares in the Ghetto where people have felt its curse for years and now pay it back in kind. It mows down our men and theirs in Vietnam, it erupts on the Campus of the nation, where some of our young people have turned against their own proclaimed abhorrence of violence and have disfigured not just their universities but their own lives. It stalks our cities and subways. Who will answer? There is no point in restoring sanity and balance to life in America if the human race is going to be incinerated in a flash of nuclear violence.

It rams its way into our homes on the T.V. screen that brings instant brutality and savagery, instructing children in the ease with which life can be tormented and twisted until the need to respect the preciousness of life is blotted out, by this tube feeding of children. Who will answer?

We can no longer make rigid distinctions between the degeneration of law and order in the nation and the break down of law and order in the world. Violence among nations cannot be separated from violence within nations. Who will answer? When will the tragic cost in human wreckage and misery shake the foundations of morality as the tax and financial cost has shaken the stability and financial soundness of nations?

While men die in battle and the worlds millions starve, 381 incomes over $100,000 and 21 incomes over one million dollars went completely tax free. They paid no tax in support of the government or the war. Other huge incomes paid minimal levies, the low and middle income burden became heavier and more impoverished each day. Who will answer?

It's time we understood that war simply defined is a continuation of politics in a more forceful or military manner. It's time to recognize that peace has a mind of its own and does not automatically follow the cessation of hostilities.

The mortal words, "No man is an island unto himself, any mans death diminishes me for I am involved in mankind", is a constant reminder, we cannot live alone, in peace. Our well being is dependent upon other nations and all humanity.

When will we learn to become citizens of the world, and member of the human community? When will we learn as a nation to live as men of dignity and not as ostriches nor as dogs in the manger?

There can be no lasting peace if we approach it with suspicion, mistrust and fear. A lasting peace can be gained only by proceeding with understanding, confidence and courage that flows from conviction.

Our hand must become steadier for the work that must be done, we should move more firmly into the task, knowing that the millions of teaming humanity—are joined with us in the resolve to make the work endure.

The work is peace, more than an end to this war—an end to the beginning of all wars, and end forever, to the impractical, unrealistic, settlement of differences between governments by the mass killing and maiming of people.

It's time to move against the terrible scourge of war, and go forward to the greatest contribution this generation of human endeavor can make in the world—a lasting universal peace, based on social justice and brotherhood. Who will answer?

Dangers lie ahead—a new war need not happen, nor will ever happen, if we use the powers given to us for life not for deaths. The destroyer must never have another chance. The Four Horsemen will not ride out again, if we have a wider comradeship with the people of other nations—stricken like ourselves, bewildered like ourselves, searching like ourselves for a way of escape out of this ruin. There is no need to see great cities smashed by high explosives, or to smell the pungent odor of burnt and rotting human flesh, if the best intelligence among us will give a lead to the world. Who will answer?

We must love life and laughter and tolerance and good fellowship. Let us hate cruelty. Let us dedicate ourselves to the children of the world, so that they may get a decent chance of happiness. Let us have courage above all to face this life, this strange adventure whether it brings hardship or peril.

Throughout all the struggles and strivings of the human race, all its blunderings and conflicts, all its stupidities and failures, those ideals lived in many simple and noble minds—before and after Socrates and Plato—and that faith helped them through. Only by faith reawakening and strengthened by new knowledge, reaching out across the world, controlling the machines and instruments of power, distributing more fairly the fruits of toil, working for peace, and raising the standard of charity—will we go forward to meet the future unafraid.

When we look back in the process of history, when we survey the genesis of America, we see written on every page; that nations are renewed from the bottom, not from the top; that the genius which springs up from the ranks of unknown men is the genius which renews the youth and energies of the people. Everything we know about history, every bit of experience and observation that has contributed to our thought, confirms to us the conviction that the real wisdom of human life is compounded out of the experience of ordinary men.

The utility, the vitality, the fruitage of life does not flow from the top to the bottom; it comes like the natural growth of a great tree, from the soil, up through the trunk into the branches of the foliage and the fruit. The great struggling masses of men who are the base of everything are the dynamic force that lifts the level of society. A nation is as great and only as great as its people.

The hope of America is the same as it has always been; the hope and the confidence that out of unknown homes, will come men who will constitute themselves the masters of industry and politics.

It behooves us to remember that a people will be saved by the power that slumbers deep in our nation's bosom, or by none, will be renewed in hope, in conscience, in strength, by waters welling up from its own sweet perennial springs. Not from above; nor by patronage of its aristocrats.

XUM

The flower does not bear the root, but the root the flower. Everything that blooms in beauty draws its fairness, its vigor, from its roots. Nothing living can blossom into fruitage unless through nourishing stalks deep-planted in the common soil.

The rose is merely evidence of the vitality of the root; the real source of its beauty, the very blush it wears upon its tender cheek, comes from the silent sources of life that lie hidden in the chemistry of the soil.

Up from the soil, up from the silent bosom of the earth, rise the currents of life and energy. Up from the common soil, up from the quiet heart of the people rise today's streams of hope and determination, bound to renew the hope of humanity in its labor for peace.

We know from experience no bureaucratic government monopoly, no unitarian social institution can reform itself. Reform comes only from competitive outsiders who force efficient adjustment to changing situations.

What can we do? We can strike the lost chord in modern men and women. We can construct a widespread web of communications, to political leaders, legislators, educators, the clergy and most important, the people. Imagine the impact of writing 200 million letters each week to people all over the world, getting to know and understand each other a little better.

We can organize a kaleidoscope of human action, it can take a thousand forms and work in a million ways. We can weld the public into an island of strength in a sea of moral chaos, hypocracy and corruption.

The hallowed dead, who a short time ago lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow, must not have died in vain. We the doers and dreamers can stir the social conscience. We will live for the ideals they died for. We will give substance to a new dream for humanity.

We will keep faith with those who died, nothing less is at stake than the ultimate survival of world civilization. The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. This is the day to remember, the greatest power of all for good is the power of the people, no force can stand against it. Let us move forward with a strong and active faith. Who will answer?

THE NEW WORLD OF SPACE EXPLORED

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the voyage of Astronauts Neil Armstrong, Edwin "Buzz" Aldrin, and Michael Collins was no mere adventure. It was no mere lark. It was no mere stunt, such as going over Niagara Falls in a barrel, or walking over it on a tightrope, or making a parachute jump from a high flying plane into the water. This was a scientific journey of exploration to expand the borders of human achievement and human knowledge. The tens of thousands of people who worked on this project all had a hand in it. A failure at any point from the newest apprentice workman to the most experienced scientist would have doomed the expedition to failure. As chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I am proud of the high educational achievements and the high labor standards that made this exploration possible.

For thousands of years, man has looked at the moon, dreamed of the moon, wondered if he could go there, wanted to go there, hoped to go there; now man has gone.

This voyage has answered the yearning of the human spirit for the unknown, for "that other island." Now these three brave, perfectly self-disciplined, able, extremely well balanced, mentally self-possessed young Americans have landed on that distant shore. They have touched the rim of our earthly universe; they have walked among the stars. Their achievement is the epitome to this point in man's experience in the world—of man's total experience. We honor them for journeying into the unknown and for bringing back to us some of the experiences of man's feeling when he walks on another planet.

On July 15, 1969, I placed in the Congressional Record at page 19565 a petition from my constituents in Texas asking that the day man walked on the moon be declared a holiday. On July 16, President Nixon declared Monday, July 21, 1969, a day of participation for all the people of this Nation, in man's first landing on another celestial body. Not only did this Nation participate; virtually all of mankind with access to broadcast news media participated. Never in the history of mankind have so many people of so many different nations participated with such elation at one event in the history of man.

The victory of Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins was no military victory; it was no conquering of people; it was no laudation of man over his fellow beings. It was an exploration in space for all mankind, a conquering of space, a conquering of the realm of the unknown, in the hope that man might find there benefits to humanity.

Some writers say that man seeks another Eden. I think that he seeks whatever is unknown. It is the intellectual curiosity of man to unlock the secrets of nature and the secrets of the universe and to apply those secrets, not selfishly to his own use, but unselfishly for the progress of the human race. It is in this spirit that I commend Neil Armstrong, Edwin "Buzz" Aldrin, and Michael Collins, and congratulate NASA and all those who participated, for this great achievement in the history of the human race.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MISSILE TEST FACILITIES AT KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE, AND RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTH

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2546) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. BYRD of West Vrginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of a short quorum call, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

ABM, DEFENSE AND SECURITY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the destructiveness of nuclear war today makes the avoidance of war between the nuclear powers the only measure of their mutual security.

Never before have two great nations had such a mutuality of interest as now exists between the United States and the Soviet Union. It is the mutuality of self-preservation—the first law of nature and man.

This places a very high value on deterrents—deterrents to the initiation of nuclear war. This equation of deterrence has particular application today between the United States and the Soviet Union.

When the proposed deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile weapon system is considered in its broad context, it is my opinion that it would endanger rather than enhance our security. It would likely make an armaments limitation agreement more difficult, if not impossible, to attain, and thus ultimately could degrade our deterrence.

We foresaw years ago that our strategic bombers were becoming vulnerable. We decided to build the Minuteman.

We foresaw the possible vulnerability of the Minuteman, so despite the great cost, we built a fleet of nuclear missile submarines. Rightly or wrongly, our offensive capability in this regard is now being augmented by replacing the Polaris missile with Poseidon missiles.

Now, in spite of the fact that each of our 41 nuclear submarines may soon have the capability of destroying 150 cities, an addition to all other destructive power, it is urged that we must now deploy an anti-ballistic-missile system around two missile sites in Montana and North Dakota.

This ABM system is a weapons system in search of a mission. We have heard every possible kind of argument for it, and many of these are contradictory. We were told at first that we had to have an ABM because of the Chinese threat. The Chinese do not even have an ICBM.

Next it was said that we had to have an ABM because the Russians had an ABM of their own around Moscow. But now it is clear that this system is mostly of the kind that we considered obsolete years ago, and that it has only 64 interceptors to stop our thousands of warheads, in the event they were used.

We were told next that we must have

XUM

an ABM system because the Russians were building a missile defense throughout Russia. But now it is clear that this Tallinn system has no significant capability against missiles.

Until a few months ago, were told by the Joint Chiefs of Staff that our security required deployment of ABMs around 25 or 50 cities to protect our people. Then all of a sudden we were told that defense of the people in our cities is impractical and impossible. Apparently because of a commotion in Boston and Seattle, it is no longer necessary to the security of this country that we protect the people of our cities.

We are told that we must begin to deploy the ABM so that we can test its operational capability, something that can better be done at Kwajalein, where our test facilities are located.

Finally, we are told that we have to protect our deterrents. Even if this were necessary, the proposal would at the very best, or very most, involve only a small fraction of our nuclear weapons and, according to many experts, ill-suited to the purpose.

So, this weapons system, though eagerly searching for a mission, surely has not yet found it.

Former Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford, in a recent speech, said:

> The hard fact is that we may never again expect to be in as favorable a position as we now enjoy for entry into talks about a freeze in strategic nuclear armaments. Technological developments may well make any arms limitation agreement more difficult to develop and enforce a year from now, or 6 months from now, than it is today.

The Senate has ratified a treaty, the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, which obligates us to enter into good faith negotiations for a limitation of the nuclear armaments race. The conference, we hope, is soon to begin. The 18-nation Disarmament Conference is underway in Geneva. Yet another escalation in the nuclear armaments race is now proposed.

Our real security rests in stopping the nuclear armaments race, not in promoting it.

The Constitution assigns to the President the responsibility of being Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. But it assigns to the Congress the broad responsibility to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States" and the specific powers "to raise and support armies" and "to provide and maintain a navy."

The responsibility of the Congress to provide, through legislation, for the common defense is not optional but obligatory and carries with it, pursuant to the principle of the separation of powers, the duty to reach independent judgments. The powers of the national government were deliberately divided because, as Madison wrote in the Federalist:

> The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands, whether of one, a few, or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny.

There are other definitions of tyranny—and other forms. The strong can be tyrannical—but so can the weak. Pride often tyrannizes—and so does fear.

William Pitt once said:

> Necessity is the argument of tyrants, it is the creed of slaves.

Tyranny has been called the antithesis of law; it might also be called the enemy of choice.

We in the Congress are now facing a choice. We must choose wisely and not under the compulsion of pride or fear.

The Congress is now in the process of discharging its responsibility through its annual review of the request of the President for authority and funds to be allocated to the Department of Defense.

The use of nuclear weapons at Hiroshima and Nagasaki—the only times they have ever been used in warfare—ushered in a new age in the development of arms and armaments. But compared to the destructive power of the nuclear weapons now in the arsenals of the United States and the Soviet Union, the atomic bombs of Hiroshima vintage are as but mere toys. The awesome destructive power of modern weapons employing the principles of hydrogen explosion, and the capacity of both ourselves and the Soviets to produce and deliver them has led to the kind of arms stalemate that has aptly been called "a balance of terror." The sophisticated nuclear devices deployed today in silos and in submarines, as well as in long-range bombers, are perhaps the first weapons of which it might accurately be said that they were produced, not for use in war, but as a means of avoiding war. Rational men of whatever persuasion are bound to understand that there can be no winner in a nuclear exchange. Surely the leaders in the Kremlin, our major nuclear adversaries, understand this, and I daresay that the leaders in Peking will understand it as their nuclear capability becomes more sophisticated and as they join the still limited club composed of major nuclear powers.

All this is but another way of saying that we do not produce and deploy nuclear weapons to further any desire on our part to destroy the Soviet Union, or anyone else. We produce and deploy nuclear weapons primarily for the purpose of convincing any potential enemy that a nuclear attack upon the United States will bring sure and sudden destruction upon the attacker.

Today both the United States and the Soviets have what can properly be called a credible deterrent. We have the capacity, even though struck a mighty first blow, to retaliate sufficiently to destroy any attacker—and our leaders would have, I believe, the will to retaliate. On the other hand, the Soviets could likewise inflict upon us so much damage in the way of lives and destruction as to make meaningless any discussion of who might be the winner of a nuclear conflict.

Thus, the basic underlying issue in the debate on the Safeguard ABM system is whether deployment of this system, as proposed by the President and the Department of Defense, would enhance or damage our chances of avoiding nuclear war and the devastation that nuclear war would bring. This was the theme that underlay the arguments for and against the system as presented to the Disarmament Subcommittee, and this is why I stated to Secretary Laird when he appeared before the subcommittee that I wished to "join issue" with him on this, his principal argument.

Although proponents of ABM deployment still from time to time pay lip service to the mission of defending against a Chinese attack in the 1970 time period and to defense against accidental launches, neither of these alleged missions for Safeguard is seriously advanced as justification for deployment. Militarily, proponents rely almost entirely upon the mission of defending Minuteman missiles from possible attack by the Soviet Union as justification for ABM deployment.

And so, Mr. President, let us examine this proposal in the light of the only true measure of whether it will enhance the security of the people of the United States—will the proposed ABM deployment aid our efforts to avoid the outbreak of nuclear war? Will Safeguard make more credible our capacity and our will to retaliate and thus deter a would-be attacker from launching an attack he might otherwise launch?

It is my considered opinion that an ABM system is not needed to establish or preserve a credible nuclear deterrent and that it would not effectively contribute to our deterrent if a need could be established. Further, it is my view that deployment of Safeguard at this time would intensify the arms race, make more difficult if not impossible the attainment of an arms limitation agreement, and thus imperil, rather than enhance, the security of the people of the United States.

The characteristics of a credible deterrent include both the capacity to retaliate and the will to do so. It is not sufficient that we possess the capability and the will to use it—it is also necessary that potential adversaries know that we have the capability and that they believe we would employ it. Thus, in order to analyze the effect of Safeguard deployment it is necessary that we consider not only what it is and what it might be capable of doing, but also how it might be regarded by the Soviets and what would be their reaction to it.

In fact, granted all the assumptions of ABM proponents concerning the threat, a strong case can be made that deployment of any kind of defensive missile system would actually degrade the credibility of our deterrents. As I pointed out earlier, the effectiveness of our deterrents is a function of both our capability and our will. No matter how many weapons might survive an attack, their existence will not effectively deter a would-be aggressor unless he believes we would use them to retaliate. If we possess only offensive missiles, then the only means we would have with which to respond to an attack would be the counterattack. If an aggressor should conclude that we might delay launching missiles at him until we learned the results of our efforts to shoot down the missiles he had launched at us, he might more readily

XUM

conclude that he could attack without unacceptable risk of damage to himself. Many military tacticians have relied on the adage that "the best defense is a good offense," and, until recently, this has been the approved concept of our nuclear defense posture. Now, apparently, the administration professes to believe we can no longer rely on this concept because it presumably believes that our offense is not good enough. I do not agree. If any aggressor knows that the only way we can react is to send death and destruction his way, he is more likely to use restraint than if he is permitted to think we may have a choice between defense and offense.

Mr. President, it seems clear to me on the basis of the facts as they appear from evidence submitted to the Disarmament Subcommittee that this Nation does not need the Safeguard system to preserve the credibility of our retaliatory capability; that the proposed plan would, at best, be only marginally effective and quite expensive; and that its deployment well might degrade credibility of our determination to retaliate. On this basis, some might argue that we should go ahead because we just might be wrong about our nuclear strength vis-a-vis the Soviets and that no harm could come from adding defensive capability to our offensive capability.

But much more than just the expenditure of enormous sums of money is involved. Continued escalation of the nuclear arms race constitutes inherent danger of the greatest magnitude. The action-reaction phenomenon that has characterized the arms race for the past two decades has already resulted in the production and deployment by both ourselves and the Soviets of sufficient weapons to destroy each other many times over.

If this madness continues, it may well be, as Dr. Herbert York puts it, that we shall have to rely upon machines to determine whether doomsday has arrived.

The Disarmament Subcommittee, which I have the honor to chair, held a series of hearings on how to protect and defend the United States, at which arguments for and against the Safeguard system were heard. Secretary of Defense Laird, Deputy Secretary of Defense Packard, and Gerard Smith, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and others presented the administration's case before the subcommittee. Secretary of State Rogers did so before the full Foreign Relations Committee. And Secretary Laird and CIA Director Richard Helms discussed various questions relating to the ABM before the full committee in a classified executive hearing, a sanitized transcript of which is on each Senator's desk. The outside experts who testified before the subcommittee, in the order of their appearance, were:

Dr. Hans Bethe of Cornell University, former director of the Theoretical Physics Division at Los Alamos, member of President Eisenhower's Science Advisory Committee, winner of the Nobel Prize for physics in 1967.

Dr. Donald G. Brennan, of the Hudson Institute, a past president of the institute.

Dr. Daniel J. Fink, of General Electric, former Deputy Director of Defense Research and Engineering in the Department of Defense.

Dr. Carl Kaysen, director of the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton University, Deputy Special Assistant to President Kennedy for National Security Affairs.

Dr. James R. Killian, chairman of the board of MIT, Special Assistant to President Eisenhower for Science and Technology.

Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, of Harvard University, President Eisenhower's Special Assistant for Science and Technology and member of the President's Science Advisory Committee in both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations.

Dr. Wolfgang Panofsky, director, Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford University, member of President Kennedy's Science Advisory Committee.

Dr. George W. J. Rathjens of MIT, Director of Weapons Systems Evaluation Division of the Institute for Defense Analyses, former Chief Scientist for the Advanced Research Projects Agency, Department of Defense and also former Special Assistant to the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Dr. J. P. Ruina of MIT, former Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency and former president of the Institute for Defense Analyses.

Dr. Marshall D. Shulman, director of the Russian Institute, Columbia University.

Dr. Allen S. Whiting, Center for Chinese Studies, University of Michigan.

Dr. Herbert York, of the University of California at San Diego, former Director of Defense Research and Engineering in the Department of Defense and member of President Eisenhower's Scientific Advisory Committee.

Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, provost of MIT, Special Assistant to President Kennedy for Science and Technology.

Dr. Edward Teller, associate director of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, University of California and former director of the Livermore Laboratory.

Dr. Donald F. Hornig, vice president, Eastman Kodak Co., Special Assistant to President Johnson for Science and Technology and presently a consultant at large to the President's Science Advisory Committee.

Dr. Gordon J. F. MacDonald, vice chancellor, University of California, Santa Barbara, former executive vice president of the Institute for Defense Analyses and a member of the President's Science Advisory Committee.

Dr. Eugene P. Wigner, professor of mathematical physics, Princeton University, recipient of the Nobel Prize for Physics in 1963.

Collectively, these men represent great wisdom and experience in scientific and foreign policy matters. All of them have held high government positions. All are recognized and acknowledged leaders in their fields. Not all of them were opposed to the deployment of the Safeguard system but most of them were, as will be clear from my remarks today, and among those opposed were all four former Presidential Science Advisers—Drs. Kistiakowsky, Killian, Wiesner, and Hornig.

In his testimony before the subcommittee on March 21, the Secretary of Defense listed five objectives of the so-called Safeguard system. For the sake of orderly examination, I will discuss them in the order in which he listed them, not in the order of their importance.

The first objective was described by Secretary Laird as follows: He told the subcommittee.

> It clearly rejects a provocative expansion into a heavy defense of our cities against a Soviet attack.

Secretary Laird then went on to observe that, first, the original Sentinel system could have been construed as a provocative deployment because it would have been deployed around cities. The Soviets could thus have concluded that it was aimed at making it possible for us to strike first because we would be able to defend against a retaliatory attack. The Safeguard system, on the other hand, cannot be construed as provocative because it protects missile sites which shows that we are interested only in insuring that a Soviet first strike could not destroy our capacity to retaliate; and second, thus, the Safeguard system's "direction is away from arms escalation" because it will "require no reaction at all from the Soviet Union—provided the Soviet Union has a responsible deterrent nuclear war policy, as we do here in the United States."

The subcommittee hearings brought out the following points regarding this first objective listed by the Secretary of Defense.

While the Department of Defense has declared that the decision to deploy Safeguard "rejects a provocative expansion into a heavy defense of our cities," merely declaring that a decision is not provocative obviously does not insure that others will agree with that declaratory judgment. Despite the fact that we are ahead of the Soviet Union in the number of nuclear warheads we can deliver, and the further fact that we have more than enough nuclear warheads to destroy the 50 largest cities in the Soviet Union many times over, we regard their ability to deploy about the same number of ICBM's as we have deployed, and their construction of a primitive and ineffective ABM system around one of their cities, as provocative. At least, the administration has been provoked into recommending the deployment of an ABM system, justifying it on many grounds, as will be clear in my remarks, but principally on the ground that the Soviets are deploying a number of missiles with large megaton warheads similar, it should be noted, to the Titan II missiles that we decided years ago were not as effective as Minuteman missiles with smaller warheads. We have a tendency to regard the deployment of almost any Soviet weapon or weapons system as provocative. Why should they not regard as provocative our deployment of an ABM system which is more effective than theirs and will have many times more interceptors?

XUM

Was the Sentinel system rejected, or to put it more accurately, amended, because the Soviets considered it provocative—or because the Americans it was designed to protect considered it provocative? The Secretary of Defense told the subcommittee that the fact the decision to amend the Sentinel system was announced soon after public protests against the construction of certain sites was "coincidental" as far as he was concerned. The coincidence, I must admit, strains my credulity.

I also find it difficult to understand why the Soviets should agree with Secretary Laird that we have a "responsible" deterrent policy and that therefore deployment of the Safeguard system will not "require" them to react. As a number of eminent witnesses before the committee pointed out, we first developed multiple reentry vehicles, or nuclear warheads, and then multiple independently-targeted reentry vehicles, or MIRV's, as well as Poseidon missiles on our submarines in response to their development of an ABM system. Secretary Laird was the sole witness to deny that our MIRV was a response to their ABM. He claimed that MIRV was "not related to Galosh"—the ABM system partially deployed around Moscow—"because we started appropriating funds for the development of this program prior to the time we knew Galosh was in being." But his own deputy, Mr. Packard, does not agree, for when talking about the Soviet installation of "an ABM system around Moscow" he commented that "we had a proper counter to the Soviet moves and possible intentions for we were developing multiple guided warheads that could be installed on strategic missiles," and he made it plain that in his mind there was "no question that the appropriate response to the ABM defense of cities is a large number of small multiple warheads." Dr. Kistiakowsky said flatly that the development of MIRV's was undertaken "upon learning of the start of the deployment of the Soviet ABM." And both General Wheeler and Secretary of the Navy Chafee, in their testimony before the Armed Services Committee, said that the development of Poseidon was necessary because of the Soviet ABM system. I quote General Wheeler's statement:

> Poseidon is necessary to assure the continued effectiveness of our fleet ballistic missile system against Soviet targets as they become defended by anti-ballistic missiles.

I now quote Secretary Chafee:

> Therefore, we must continue our efforts to insure that we anticipate Soviet technological advances and avoid the loss of our deterrent effectiveness. Such a development is the Navy's Poseidon missile, designed to maintain the effectiveness of our sea-based strategic weapons despite the introduction of Soviet anti-ballistic missile systems. The Poseidon weapon system will be ready to meet this threat and to continue the sea-based deterrent strength that has been so important to our security in the sixties.

Thus, anticipating an effective Soviet missile defense—anticipating a fact that is not yet a fact—we began to deploy weapons to neutralize that defense. Faced with part of an ABM system around only one Soviet city, Moscow—the so-called Galosh system of 64 defensive missiles, to use the figure provided by Secretary Laird, which would be ineffective against an American missile attack of more than 64 missiles or a smaller number of American missiles using sophisticated penetration aids—we began the steps which could increase the number of our targetable missile warheads by fitting land- and sea-based missiles with between three and 10 or more multiple independently targeted warheads. And now, anticipating a future Soviet threat to our land-based missiles—again anticipating a fact that is not yet a fact—we propose to deploy Safeguard to defend against that unrealized capability. Given our reaction to anticipated Soviet developments in the weapons field, how can we expect them not to react in anticipation of the continued growth of ours?

Dr. Herbert York told the subcommittee:

> No one today can outline in detail what kind of a chain reaction a Sentinel or a hard-point defense deployment would lead to.

Dr. York termed the view that the deployment of the Safeguard system would mark the end of the chain reaction the "fallacy of the last move"—the assumption that we could make a move in the nuclear weapons field and expect that our nuclear adversary would not react. And proceeding with phase I of the Safeguard system—the deployment of defensive missiles around two complexes of offensive missile sites—is, of course, not one last move but two, for there is little reason for the Soviets to assume that we will not proceed to phase II and the deployment of defensive missiles in 12 sites throughout the country and around the Nation's Capital.

In explaining the "option" to move to a second phase, Mr. Packard showed the subcommittee a chart which called for constructing the full number of 12 sites if there were a "greater" Soviet submarine threat to the SAC bomber force or if the "Chinese ICBM threat continues to increase." Surely we cannot expect the Soviet Union to stop their production of Polaris-type submarines when they have only eight and we have 41 and when we are in the process of replacing Polaris with Poseidon, which will multiply the number of our submarine-launched missiles by a factor of 10 or more. And as the Chinese are still testing missiles, but do not yet have an ICBM, it seems likely that the "Chinese ICBM threat" will continue to increase. Thus, if the "option" to complete the 12-site system is conditioned on either a Soviet attempt to narrow the gap between their nuclear missile submarine capability and ours, or on a Chinese attempt to deploy ICBM's, there is no "option" at all, as far as moving to phase II is concerned. That "option" is, rather, a foregone conclusion.

Expecting the Soviets not to react to our deployment of an ABM system, implies—it seems to me—a faith in Soviet restraint completely at variance with the administration's view of other aspects of Soviet behavior. I will discuss at a further point Secretary Laird's comments on the increasing Soviet military threat, a development that he considers to be the very denial of restraint. How can the administration expect the Soviets to be so restrained as not to react to our deployment of the Safeguard system when the administration rests its case for Safeguard deployment on the lack of Soviet restraint in military spending and in the development and deployment of nuclear missiles? Is this selective restraint a verifiable and predictable characteristic of Soviet behavior and, if so, how has it been verified and on what assurance can it be predicted? Or is it a combination of wishful thinking, self-deception, and artful—but fallacious—argumentation? Which is it? It cannot be both.

So much for Secretary Laird's first stated objective. I turn now to the second objective which is the principal ground on which the administration's argument for Safeguard rests. Secretary Laird said about the Safeguard:

> It offers more protection, as needed, to our deterrent forces.

In his statement before the committee he restated this objective by saying that the chief value of the Safeguard system was that it "protected the credibility of our deterrent." The Secretary and the Deputy Secretary explained that:

First. The credibility of our deterrent depends on how many of our offensive Minuteman missiles can survive a first-strike nuclear attack, for in order to deter a potential attacker that attacker must be positive that enough missiles or bombers will survive to destroy him.

Second. The Soviet Union has decided to develop a first-strike capability. There is no other explanation for the recent increase above 200 in the number of Soviet SS–9 missiles, a missile able to carry up to a 25-megaton warhead, which is a larger megatonnage than that required to destroy cities but is of the size required to destroy hardened missile sites. There had been a "feeling," as Mr. Packard put it:

> The (number of) SS–9 was going to level off at a number somewhere below 200.

Furthermore, the Soviets are testing multiple warheads on the SS–9. To quote the Secretary directly:

> With the large tonnage the Soviets have they are going for our missiles and they are going for a first-strike capability. There is no question about that.

Third. Our Polaris submarines by themselves will not be a "sufficient and credible deterrent" from 1972 on.

Fourth. Our bombers are vulnerable to missile attack on the ground unless they receive sufficient advance warning. The long-range perimeter acquisition radars, which are part of the Safeguard system, would give our bombers "greater warning time" against long-range missile attacks. Furthermore, the Soviets have launched eight or nine nuclear missile submarines and can now build "one a month," as the Secretary of Defense told the subcommittee on March 21, or eight per year, as he told the House Appropriations Subcommittee on May 22. If large numbers of Soviet submarines carrying missiles are stationed close to our shores, the short flight time of these missiles to our bomber bases would reduce the takeoff time available to our

XUM

bombers. These missile-carrying submarines thus limit the potential effectiveness of our bomber force. The Soviets are outspending us in both strategic offensive and defensive forces by a ratio of 2 to 1—4 to 1 in proportion to GNP—and, as of today, "have in being and under construction more ICBM launchers than the 1,054 possessed by the United States."

Fifth. If we do not deploy an ABM system, but merely continue research and development, we would be left, in the words of Secretary Laird, "with no option to provide defense for our deterrent on the schedule that might be required by the Soviet threat if we do not reach an agreement with the Soviets on limiting strategic forces." If we build only a prototype ABM installation at this point, and hold up deployment until the prototype had been tested, we would delay any kind of an ABM system by "3 or more years," to quote Secretary Laird.

Sixth. For all of the above reasons, the decision to deploy cannot be delayed beyond the budget for fiscal year 1970.

Testimony before the committee revealed that:

First. The Safeguard system will, in phase I, protect, as Secretary Laird stated the case, "30 percent of our Minutemen." But even assuming that this statement is correct—which I assume only for purposes of argument—why is it so important to protect 30 percent of our Minutemen? The implication is that the Soviets could destroy the remaining 70 percent of our 1,000 Minutemen; our 41 Polaris submarines each of which now carries 16 missiles but which will, in the near future, carry at least 160 warheads; and our 650 intercontinental bombers.

Second. But are we protecting even 30 percent of our Minutemen? Testifying before the Armed Services Committee, Dr. Panofsky pointed out that the protection offered by the Safeguard system in phase I could be offset by an increase in Soviet offensive forces of only a small percentage. Even in phase II, according to Dr. Panofsky, given the limited number of Spartan and Sprint defensive missiles in the Safeguard system, our Safeguard could be offset by a Soviet offensive increase "on the order of 10 percent."

Third. The administration contends, and I agree, that the credibility of our deterrent depends on a potential adversary's sure knowledge that a sufficient number of our deliverable nuclear weapons will survive an attack to be able to inflict unacceptable damage on the attacking country. That being so, it is obvious that a nuclear attack on the United States would have to be massive and synchronized for it to succeed in destroying our deterrent whether or not we have an ABM defense system. Most, if not all, of our Minuteman missiles, Polaris submarines on station, and strategic bombers would have to be destroyed—enough of them destroyed at any rate, to render retaliation ineffective.

Dr. Panofsky expressed "considerable skepticism" to the subcommittee that "an attack of the kind envisaged by the Department of Defense witnesses could be mounted by the Soviets with any confidence of success." Testifying before the Armed Services Committee, he went further. He called a first strike threat an "extremely implausible projection of our available intelligence, including that concerning the SS-9," said that he knew of "no technical prospects or of any current intelligence" indicating a threat to Polaris and argued that destruction of both bombers and land-based missiles together was itself "extremely implausible." Dr. Wiesner pointed out that the Soviets would also need "large numbers of high-accuracy multitude warheads, a much better air defense system, an effective ASW capability and a truly effective nationwide ABM system." He added:

> Clearly the Soviet Union is far from having these combined capabilities now, and there is essentially no reason to believe that they will move into such a position by 1975 or even later.

Finally, there is the question of whether the Safeguard system would work at all, given the highly complicated technology involved in what Dr. Wiesner has called the most sophisticated and intricate system that man has attempted to build. Now I do not make any pretense at being a physicist, a mathematician, or an engineer. Yet at the same time I am going to be faced with the responsibility of having to vote on the question of providing funds for a system which I have no way of knowing personally will or will not work. It would certainly seem to me that I would be acting irresponsibly if I were to ignore expert scientific opinion. Yet a number of scientists—among the most eminent in our country—told the subcommittee that they had grave doubts about the system from a purely technical point of view. Dr. York, a former Director of Defense Research and Engineering, spoke of the possibility of a "catastrophic failure" in which no interceptors at all might fire. Dr. Kistiakowsky, a former Presidential science adviser, agreed with Dr. York that—

> Massive failure cannot be excluded for a system that must function the very first time it is tried out as a whole.

Some scientists who appeared before the subcommittee argued that further research and development was necessary to develop a more efficient system. Dr. Panofsky called the Safeguard a poor engineering decision because it took the components from the Sentinel system. which had been designed to defend cities, which are soft targets, and used them for the different purpose of a hard point defense system. While it is necessary to intercept at high altitudes to protect cities, he pointed out, missiles attacking hard point targets can be intercepted at low altitudes, which means that the system designed for hard point defense—including the radar components—can be simpler and less expensive than the system designed to defend cities or soft targets. Summing up his argument, he said that "did not make sense" to take a city defense system and give it a dual capability of hard point defense and bomber defense, and that if we needed a hard point defense system, one should be specifically designed for that purpose.

Dr. Hornig remarked:

> But the uneasy feeling persists in my mind that, although Presidents may change, Secretaries of Defense may come and go, and the philosophies enunciated by our political leaders may change, the design of our ABM system hardly changes at all. It includes the same radars, the same rockets and largely the same deployment which was contemplated for the "heavy" defense.
>
> Safeguard continues to look like a first step toward a much bigger, much more expensive and still ineffective system.

A number of witnesses commented on one particularly ill-designed component of the Safeguard, ill-designed given the declared objective of the system: the missile site radar. It was pointed out that the radar was badly matched to a defense of missile silos because it was far more vulnerable than the silos themselves. It cannot be hardened; it has far less resistance to shock wave or nuclear blast than a missile; and there is only one per Safeguard site. Thus, it would be a prime target for the attacker because if the radars were destroyed the whole system would collapse. The radars are thus a useful target for the smaller Soviet SS-11 missiles, and there are far more SS-11 missiles than SS-9 missiles in the Soviet inventory. Hence, the SS-11's could knock out the Safeguard system by blinding it so that Safeguard would not be able to neutralize a single SS-9 missile.

It was also pointed out that the system will go into production before the components have even been assembled and before some have even been built—the Par radar being a case in point—that there are no working examples of computer programs of the scale required by the Safeguard system, and that furthermore the computer will never be able to be tested in its operational environment because of the impossibility of simulating nuclear attack. Even Dr. Teller, an advocate of deployment, explained that he favored deployment because of the value of the experience that a "pilot operation" would provide. Admitting that "we do not know whether defense or additional offensive force will be cheaper and more effective," he concluded that "we shall never find out unless we make an actual attempt" by deploying. Dr. Teller subsequently defined the difference between his position and that of Dr. Wiesner in two sentences:

> He says research and development. I say pilot operation.

To which Dr. Wiesner replied that testing could be done more effectively at Kwajalein.

I will turn now to the assertion that I have said I regard as the principal ground on which the administration's case must stand or fall: the statement by the Secretary of Defense:

> With the large tonnage the Soviets have they are going for our missiles and they are going for a first-strike capability. There is no question about that.

The Secretary is quite wrong in at least one respect, for there is a question about whether the Soviets are going for a first-strike capability. That judgment is not supported by intelligence authorities, for example. The U.S. Intelligence Board, our top intelligence body, has never so found. Nor is that statement supported by the Secretary of State. Only some 2 weeks after Secretary Laird's statement, the Secretary of State said in a press conference:

> I have difficulty in believing that the Soviet Union could initiate a first strike . . . Certainly it is difficult to understand why the Soviet Union is deploying SS–9s . . . And I think when we enter the SALT (Strategic Arms Limitation) talks, one of the first questions we want to raise with them is why. Why would you have a 25-megaton missile? But insofar as whether they are doing it with the intention of actually having a first strike, I don't believe that.

If there were "no question" about the Soviets "going for a first-strike capability," the Secretary of State would hardly have spoken as he did. And if there is a question in his mind, is there any reason why the rest of us should not wonder?

But there are questions not only in the executive branch, but also in the mind of the Secretary of Defense. In a closed meeting of the full Committee on Foreign Relations on June 23, Secretary Laird suddenly changed his definition of first strike—changed it from the generally understood concept of a knockout blow to the more limited meaning of ability to attack our hardened missile sites. In my opinion, he thereby destroyed his own principal justification for requesting immediate deployment of the Safeguard system.

Fourth. The third argument of Secretary Laird's with respect to the need to protect our deterrent by protecting our missile sites was that our Polaris submarines would not be "sufficient and credible deterrent from 1972 on." The Secretary made it plain that he was referring to a growing Soviet capability to locate and destroy our nuclear submarines while on station but he offered no explanation of how this might be accomplished.

The Secretary's assertion would be disquieting if true but can we accept it with confidence? Only a year ago, in hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, was asked:

> Admiral, we have put a great many of our chips on the invulnerability of the Polaris submarines. Do you have a high degree of confidence that this invulnerability will be maintained, and what operations do you foresee in the event of a technological breakthrough on the part of the Soviets that would reduce or eliminate the invulnerability.

Admiral Moorer replied:

> I have a very high confidence that this will be maintained for several reasons.

Present for a brief time at our subcommittee hearings was Representative ANDERSON of Tennessee, formerly captain, U.S. Navy, who commanded the first nuclear submarine to transit the Polar Cap. I asked him at the hearing what he though about the Polaris submarines as a deterrent force. He replied, and his statement appears in the hearing record:

> There have been statements made recently, leaving the implication that when we get to 1972, 1973, 1974, some of the technology that the Soviets are working on will be adequate to neutralize our Polaris submarines. I checked around some and I find no evidence whatsoever to support such a statement.

Finally, to clear up any possible uncertainty on this point, I wrote Secretary of the Navy Chafee, on May 28, and asked him for a specific statement "on the vulnerability of Polaris submarines in the period 1970 through 1980." The Secretary replied in a letter dated June 12, which I had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and which also appears on page 604 of the subcommittee hearings, and said that his views were in accord with those Mr. Packard had expressed before the House Armed Services Committee on April 14 at which time Mr. Packard had said:

> We expect the Polaris to remain highly survivable until at least the late 1970's.

Secretary Chafee added, incidentally:

> I have strong confidence in the continued effectiveness of Polaris-Poseidon submarines. To the best of our knowledge the Soviets have not been able to detect or track any of these submarines while on station. This is the principal reason for my confidence.

Fifth. The next point made by Secretary Laird and Mr. Packard related to the vulnerability of our strategic bombers to attack from land or submarine-launched missiles, the greater warning time the Safeguard system would provide and the relatively greater importance that must be attached to Minuteman as a second-strike weapon because of the vulnerability of bombers to submarine launched missiles.

I would like to make several observations on this point. First, Dr. Panofsky pointed out to the subcommittee that there would be sufficient time in the case of an ICBM attack on missile sites to get bombers in the air—and sufficient time in the case of a submarine attack on bombers to launch missiles. The extra warning time of a few minutes provided by the Safeguard long-range radar was thus not necessary, in his view. Second, the vulnerability of bombers on airfields can be countered by dispersing bomber bases—especially by moving them inland—and by keeping a number of bombers in the air on alert, as Dr. Wiesner, and several other witnesses suggested. Third, it has occurred to me that since our strategic bombers are stationed not only in the United States but on airfields abroad as well, a Soviet first strike would not only have to knock out all missile sites and airbases in the United States, and all of our Polaris submarines on station, but a considerable number of airfields in other countries as well. Finally, while Secretary Laird regards the growing Polaris-type Soviet submarine fleet as a potential threat to our bombers, our Poseidon submarine missile fleet is "designed to maintain the effectiveness of our sea based strategic weapons despite the introduction of Soviet anti-ballistic-missile systems," to quote again Secretary of the Navy Chafee's statement to the Armed Services Committee. How can it be that we and the Soviets have such different objectives for the same weapons system?

Sixth. Regarding Mr. Laird's statement that the Soviets are outspending us in offensive and defensive forces and have more ICBM launchers in being or under construction than we do, I must say that it would surprise me if the Soviets were not spending proportionately more than we are. The fact is, though, that while they may be devoting a greater percentage of their GNP to defense, our defense budget is running at about a third higher than theirs, and their spending on offensive and defensive weapons has remained relatively constant for the past decade. And while the Soviets have a few more ICBM launchers deployed and under construction than we do, they still have fewer land-based ICBM's, around 1,000 compared to 1,054; fewer long-range strategic bombers, 150 compared to 650; and fewer nuclear ballistic missile submarines, eight or so compared to 41.

The further fact is that we are phasing out older missiles and replacing them at a more rapid rate than they are and that we are far nearer to having a MIRV capability than are they.

We have already had the experience of living through an illusory missile gap. I hope that we are not going to be presented now with a prospective delusory missile gap, the product of presenting only some of the relevant information; that relating to the number of ICBM launchers, in this case; without presenting all of the relevant information; that relating to strategic bombers and submarine launched ballistic missiles; and presenting, too, theoretical extrapolations of Soviet weapons development as though they were confident predictions.

Of course, there is a point beyond which offensive capability becomes unnecessary overkill. The United States presently has enough nuclear weapons to attack about 2,400 different targets in the Soviet Union; the Soviet can now attack about 1,100 different targets in the United States. Assuming that 250 warheads could devastate the 50 largest cities in either country, and that the capability of destroying the 50 largest cities in either country constitutes a credible deterrent, the United States has 2,100 more nuclear warheads than it needs to destroy these 50 cities and the Soviet Union has 845 more nuclear warheads than it needs to destroy the 50 largest cities in America.

This is one way of measuring overkill. A second way of measuring is to compare the number of separately targetable strategic warheads per city for the 50 largest cities in the United States and the Soviet Union. Dividing the number of warheads possessed by each country by 50, the United States has about 48 warheads per city and the Soviet Union 22. Yet one hit is sufficient for the awful task.

I am, therefore, not alarmed by Soviet defense spending and the prospect of parity with the Soviet Union in the number of land-based intercontinental missiles. We are still far ahead of the Soviets in the number of nuclear warheads. Both we and the Soviets have more than enough warheads to destroy each other. I am alarmed only at the senseless drive in both countries for more weapons when these additional weapons are not necessary. I am dispirited only at the lack of interest in taking advantage of a situation in which the Soviets are approaching parity in land-based intercontinental missiles to negotiate mutual controls instead of regarding the situation as requiring new weapons systems which not only do not add to our security but threaten to begin a new cycle of action and reaction in this expensive and dangerous area.

Seventh. A number of witnesses before the subcommittee disagreed flatly with the assertion made by Secretary Laird and Mr. Packard that if we do not set in motion immediately steps to deploy an ABM system, but merely continue research and development, we will be left without the option of a ballistic missile defense for our deterrent by the time such a defense will be necessary. Most expressed the view that we could afford to wait for up to a year to see whether negotiations with the Soviet Union would be fruitful.

Furthermore, if we must have an "option" to defend against a threat of a Soviet first-strike capability, there are other methods of defending our deterrent which are more reliable, less expensive and involve shorter lead time. Putting more concrete around missile sites—superhardening—is one way. Building more nuclear missile submarines and more intercontinental missiles is another. But instead of considering these steps we have chosen a method which is extremely costly, which is of questionable reliability and which requires the longest leadtime of all.

The third objective stated by Secretary Laird was his claim that the Safeguard system "offers protection, as needed, of the entire country from a small attack, such as the kind of attack that could possibly be delivered by the Chinese Communists during the decade of the 1970's or from an accidental launch." Let me first discuss the Safeguard as protection from a Chinese attack.

As we all know, the Chinese do not now have ICBM's, and Mr. Packard told the subcommittee that the Chinese were "no further along" in developing a missile than they were 3 years ago. But the Cultural Revolution and other political disruptions notwithstanding, we must obviously assume that there may be Chinese missiles operational in the 1970's. Secretary Laird estimates that this will be in the "1972–73 time period" and "in the time period of 1975 and beyond that the Red Chinese could have the capacity and the capability to have 15 or more missiles," a statement he amended before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on May 22 to "10 to 25 operational ICBM's" assuming an initial operational capability in late 1972 which the Secretary implied he did not think would be achieved but was more likely to be delayed "perhaps as much as 2 or 3 years later." Nevertheless, to be prudent we must assume not only that the Chinese will have an ICBM capability in the mid-1970's but that this capability will grow and that the Chinese will also develop a full range of sophisticated accessories, such as decoys and other penetration aids. We must thus consider a theoretical system of defense against a Chinese nuclear missile attack in two stages: when China's ICBM capability is very limited, and when that capability is far greater.

When the Chinese missile force is small, we would not need a defense system which would preserve a percentage of our offensive missiles. A small Chinese force would, by definition, not be large enough to destroy more than a minute percentage of our missile force. What is needed when China's missile force is small, then, is not a system which would defend a few missile sites but a system which would provide "some protection over the entire country," as Dr. Fink pointed out to the subcommittee.

In phase I of the Safeguard system, of course, there will be protection of only a "footprint" area around the two defense missile sites. The rest of the country will be unprotected. Furthermore, the Par radars in Phase I "will have faces only to the north because that is the direction from which the Soviet threat would be expected," to quote Mr. Packard. Thus, protection against a Chinese attack requires going to phase II.

The Safeguard system, when fully deployed in phase II, will, its supporters claim, provide some protection for the entire country, but only some protection. Full effectiveness is not claimed. Some Chinese missiles would get through, especially if equipped with penetration aids. Dr. Bethe told the subcommittee that it was "entirely logical that the Chinese might develop such aids "at the same time" as they develop the ICBM itself. The result would be some destruction in the United States, but in China the result of our retaliatory strike would be massive destruction ranging all the way to the verge of total annihilation. The sole effect of Safeguard, and this would be true only of the fully developed system, would be perhaps to reduce somewhat the destruction in the United States. Safeguard would not affect the credibility of our deterrent as far as the Chinese are concerned for it is thoroughly credible now, and will continue to be thoroughly credible, in the face of the projected limited Chinese ICBM capability.

When we talk about a Chinese attack during the period when China has only a limited ICBM capability we are talking about the possibility of an "irrational" Chinese action, for a limited Chinese attack which would surely result in a devastating attack on China could only be irrational. In his testimony before the subcommittee, Secretary Laird implied that the Chinese were "different" from the Soviets, as far as the area of rational action is concerned. Yet what arguments can be cited for assuming that the Chinese will act irrationally to the point of suicide? We have never argued that the Soviets might act irrationally in the matter of a nuclear attack. The Chinese have not acted irrationally as far as their foreign policy is concerned. Their words have been irrational but their actions have not been. Dr. Alan Whiting told the subcommittee:

> I see no basis in fact or theory for attributing a significantly higher likelihood of irrationality to Chinese as compared with Russian decision makers.

Before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on May 22, Secretary Laird raised the specter of Chinese "nuclear blackmail" as an argument for Safeguard deployment. But it would be the height of madness for a country with a miniscule missile force to threaten to blackmail a country with the nuclear weapons we have at our command, for the obvious answer to such a threat is a preemptive nuclear strike. This argument, too, assumes a strong suicidal urge on the part of the Chinese, an assumption with no basis in logic or in history, an argument which, in sum, clutches at straws or what we often call weak reeds.

How long will it be before China will have not a few missiles but hundreds with sophisticated penetration aids as well as nuclear missile-carrying submarines and ship-launched ballistic missiles? All of these "may be in the Chinese inventory in the next decade," Dr. Jack Ruina told the subcommittee. When this happens, of course, the situation will be exactly as it is now with respect to the Soviet Union. The same arguments will apply for and against a hard point defense system and for and against a defense of our cities. But there will be a double twist. For if the Soviet Union now regards a city defense as "provocative," a position with which Secretary Laird agrees as evidenced by his statement that the first objective of the Safeguard system is that "it clearly rejects a provocative expansion into a heavy city defense," presumably it will hold the same view in the future.

As Dr. York pointed out to the subcommittee, "to protect against China we will eventually have to build up an ABM to the point where it will be provocative to the Soviet Union." Thus, if we decide to attempt some defense against Chinese attack, we will be hoist by our own petard to a higher level of defense which we ourselves have admitted is provocative.

As for protecting against an accidental launch, I would certainly favor any system that could afford this protection. But there are those who should know who say that while with further research and development a system could be designed to attempt to achieve this objective, the Safeguard system—with its particualr combination of raders, Sprint missiles and Spartan missiles—is not designed to meet this need. It should be realized that in phase I, the Safeguard system will protect against an accidentally launched missile only if that missile is headed toward the two sites at which Spartan and Sprint missiles will be deployed. Protection of the whole country against an accidentally launched missile is thus not even a theoretical possibility unless defensive missiles are deployed in all 12 sites. But even then, is there protection against an accidental launch? Dr. Panofsky has said that if an accidental launch included decoys or multiple warheads, the modified Sentinel system could be "penetrated." Even if only a single missile without decoys were involved, and assuming perfect reliability of the Safeguard system, this single missile could be stopped only if the "state of alertness of the system in peacetime can be kept at a high enough level."

Now the question of the state of alertness is a complicated matter. The chances are that a deliberate missile attack, even a so-called surprise attack, would probably be preceded by at least a noticeable change in the political atmosphere, if not a period of tension. An ABM system, like the rest of the Nation's defense Establishment, would be placed in a state of alert. But there would be no such warning signs before an accidental launch. On the contrary, such an accident could occur at any time including a time of least tension. Thus, in thinking about protection against an accidental launch, it is well to recall Dr. York's comments to the subcommittee on the conflicting requirements of a "stiff trigger," to prevent the accidental firing of a defensive missile, and a "hair trigger," to provide a sufficiently rapid intentional firing of a defensive missile in the case of surprise attack. Both intentional and accidental launches are possible in any missile system—offensive or defensive.

But the chances of an accidental launch are, in fact, greater in the case of a defensive system. This is so because the time in which the decision to launch must be made is so short—10 minutes at the maximum, according to Mr. Packard—that it is inevitable that the responsibility for launching would necessarily be delegated to lower command echelons and eventually, as weapons improve and machines become more complex, to computers. Mr. Packard told the subcommittee that there would be "adequate time to assume command and control by the President," but 10 minutes does not strike me as long enough to insure presidential action, given the communications problems involved. Thus, the more effective a system is for intercepting accidental launches, because the finer its "hair trigger," the greater the chances the system will itself err and launch a missile accidentally, because the looser its "stiff trigger" will be.

The accidental launch of a defensive missile would not be a cause for great concern if it could definitely be detonated or intercepted at a sufficiently high altitude so that no damage would be caused. But the accident that launched the defensive missile might cause other related accidents as well. Having launched a defensive missile in error, a computer might also erroneously instruct it to explode at a low level. Or the missile might, again accidentally, trigger an automatic Soviet reaction and bring a retaliatory attack. Thus, in developing a system to protect us from accidents, we may well increase the likelihood of accidents so that the rise in the level of risk will be far higher than the rise in the level of protection.

Furthermore, if we are entitled to a system which we allege will, among other things, protect us from accidental launches, surely the Soviets and the Chinese will make a similar claim. But since protection against accidental launches requires a general area defense system, and not a system which can protect only hardened missile sites, this justification, like the others used, inevitably forecasts an escalation of the arms race with proliferating finely tuned defensive systems and new offensive systems to neutralize them. But this subject belongs more properly in my discussion of Secretary Laird's fourth and fifth objectives.

Secretary Laird described the fourth objective of the Safeguard system in the following way:

> It offers the Soviet Union an added incentive for productive arms control talks.

In the course of testimony before the subcommittee, Mr. Packard and Mr. Smith, and Mr. Rogers in his appearance before the full committee, also said that:

First. As even the first two Safeguard system installations will not be operational before 1973, there is ample time to negotiate agreements with the Soviet Union, so that Safeguard "opens the door wider to mutual arms control." Furthermore, "it should not take us years but months to determine if the Soviet Union is seriously interested in entering into arms control arrangements," to quote Mr. Smith, and if they are, deployment of the Safeguard system, which will be subject to annual review and appraisal, can be stopped. On the other hand, Secretary Laird told the subcommittee that "if the Soviets should slam the door on an agreement, the modified ABM would permit us to continue steps toward protection of our retaliatory forces" which would be important because "a Soviet rejection of meaningful negotiations would demonstrate a Soviet determination to continue to build toward a low-risk, first-strike force."

Second. The Safeguard system "requires" no military response from the Soviet Union, as would be the case if we were increasing the number of our offensive missiles and bombers. "It shows them that any effort on their part to achieve a successful first strike is fruitless" to quote Mr. Packard, but does so "without threatening their second strike deterrence."

Third. As a result of our announced intention in 1967 to deploy the Sentinel system, it is likely that any Soviet military reaction is already in train and would not be further affected by the deployment of the Safeguard system. Nor will the prospects for negotiations be affacted because the Soviets had first indicated their willingness to negotiate after the decision to deploy Sentinel was announced and have reaffirmed their willingness to talk on several occasions since in public and in private talks with American officials.

Fourth. As the Soviets deployed their own ABM system first, they can hardly criticize us for deciding to do likewise or argue that our decision prejudices arms talks particularly since their system is already in place and ours is not.

Fifth. Quoting Secretary Rogers' statement to the Foreign Relations Committee on March 27:

> We cannot predicate our security decisions, that we have to make now, on the potential success of future endeavors in the disarmament field.

Sixth. The Safeguard system will be a "further incentive" for discussions on the limitation of both offensive and defensive weapons.

Proceeding first to the point that there is time to negotiate agreements before the first Safeguard sites become operational and time—anywhere along the line—to stop the process of deploying the Safeguard system if the negotiations are successful, it seems to me that this argument assumes that we can make time work only one way—for us but not against us. Faced with the prospect of an ABM system that will be operational in 1973, either the Soviets will enter into an agreement with us before that date, which will make it unnecessary for us to go ahead, or, if no agreement has been reached, deployment will begin and the objectives Secretary Laird claims for the system will be achieved. Heads, we win; tails, they lose.

But will they lose or will we? If the Safeguard system is as ineffective as many contend, and the Soviets are willing to ignore it, it will not affect the negotiations and will not have resulted in a Soviet reaction. But we will have spent billions of dollars for a system that does not protect us and that has not given us a negotiating advantage. The assumption that the Soviets will be willing to ignore it as either ineffective or harmless—to conclude, as stated in the second point above, that Safeguard "requires" no Soviet military response—would, again, call for considerable restraint on their part. In fact, as I have pointed out before, it would require more restraint than we ourselves have shown in response to their Galosh ABM system. Not only have we developed MIRV's and Poseidon missiles in response, but the administration's arguments imply that Galosh is another reason which justifies our deploying Safeguard. In how many ways must we react to new Soviet weapons systems? And in how many ways do we expect them not to react to new weapons systems of ours?

Of course, if the Safeguard system is effective, the Soviets will surely react. Even though the system is to be deployed around missile sites and thus does not affect Soviet second-strike capabilities, how can they be sure that, once developed and deployed, it will not be turned into a "thick" system which would affect their second-strike capability despite Secretary Laird's assertion that Safeguard "cannot develop into the thick system surrounding our cities that the other proposed Sentinel system could have developed into." If "we cannot predicate our security decisions, that we have to make now, on the potential success of future endeavors in the disarmament field," to quote Secretary Rogers again, surely neither can they.

Time will work in another way as well. Once begun, weapons systems are difficult if not impossible to stop. The best time to stop them is before they are started, before rationales and justifications can shift, as has already been true in the case of our ABM, and before programs develop large and powerful constituencies.

As for the argument made by Safeguard proponents that the Soviets' military reaction to a Sentinel-type deployment was probably already in train and would not be affected by any deployment on our part, Dr. Marshall Shulman told the subcommittee:

> I don't see how we can know that they have discounted it. As a matter of fact, you could probably make as strong a case for the opposite view.

Whether or not the Soviets have "discounted" the deployment of Safeguard, the point is that while the Soviets have continued to be willing to enter into arms limitation talks—and initially indicated their willingness after the decision to deploy the thick and "provocative" Sentinel system was announced—they are, at the same time, adding to their arsenal of nuclear weapons. The arms race is still escalating, literally before our eyes.

There is one final comment that I would like to make on the subject of the "incentive" this decision is said to offer the Soviet Union for arms control talks. The use of the word "incentive" means, to me, that somehow we regard the prospective deployment of Safeguard, especially because it is to be deployed in phases, as some sort of a bargaining card in arms control talks with the Soviets.

I quote again from Dr. Shulman's statement to the subcommittee:

> It would not be wise to deploy an ABM system in the belief that it would improve our bargaining position in relation to the missile talks. To do so would be more likely, in my opinion, to strengthen the position of those on the Soviet side who are only too ready to argue that the United States is too committed by its system or its pressure groups to an arms race to be seriously interested in its abatement.

I also quote the statement to the subcommittee of Dr. Carl Kaysen:

> The future capacity to deploy, and perhaps to deploy a better conceived and designed system, is all the bargaining card we need. Actual deployment, by revealing what we are doing, diminishes rather than increases the effectiveness of our bargaining position.

Finally, I quote Secretary of State Rogers before the Committee on Foreign Relations on March 27:

> In none of my talks with the Soviets has any Soviet representative suggested that the decision [on an ABM system] would affect the initiation of talks *or their outcome.* (emphasis added)

Can the Safeguard decision not affect the outcome of arms control talks but yet be a bargaining weapon?

Secretary Laird's fifth objective is really a summation of the other four. It is that the Safeguard system "provides the protection needed for the safety and security of our country—but only the protection that is needed." He explains that the Safeguard plan "permits us to respond to the Soviet threat, not as we project it, but as it develops in the months and years ahead. We neither add to our weapons inventory nor do we incur the costs for a threat that possibly will not materialize."

I would disagree with the Secretary, and so would most of the witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee, on his fundamental premises which are that deployment of the Safeguard system at this time would provide us with protection and thus enhance our security. I have already stated the relevant arguments: that our nuclear weapons arsenal is so vast that it could not be destroyed by any Soviet force that can be foreseen at this time; that the Safeguard system is of doubtful effectiveness and requires more research and development before it is deployed; that its deployment seems bound to cause a new cycle of action and reaction which will escalate the arms race at tremendous cost without providing greater security; that an irrational Chinese attack seems no more likely than an irrational Soviet attack; and that Safeguard not only will not protect against an accidental launch but, in attempting to do so, may actually increase the risk of accidental nuclear explosion. In brief, the dangers inherent in the Safeguard system seem to me—to many of my colleagues, to many distinguished physical and social scientists and to many, many Americans—to outweigh by far the benefits of Safeguard, if indeed there are any benefits at all.

The Safeguard decision is not just another political or military decision. It is a decision which affects all Americans in fundamental and important ways. It will use large amounts of their tax moneys directly and even larger amounts indirectly because of the weapons developments it will spawn—moneys that could be used for problems pressing in on us at home. Thus, it will affect what we have come to call the quality of life in our country. It will, in my opinion, and in the opinion of many others, also affect the quality of international life for it will set off a new round in the armaments race, with all the dangers and tensions that it involves, as the Soviet strive for at least parity with us in nuclear weapons systems and as we strive to maintain "sufficiency."

In fact that next step in the race is almost upon us—the deployment of MIRV's, the weapon response to ABM. We are ready to deploy these weapons "not in the too distant future," according to the Secretary of Defense. The submarine version of MIRV's, the Poseidon, will be deployed "unless we conclude some agreements that would dictate otherwise," according to Mr. Packard.

The important issue involved in MIRV deployment is, simply, that while we can detect Soviet MIRV tests, and they can detect ours, there is no way of detecting deployment. After MIRV's have been tested to the point where they can be deployed, and we have almost reached that point, there is no way of knowing whether the number of warheads has been multiplied by two or three or five or more. The Soviets will not know how many warheads we will have—although it has been reported that we can multiply our submarine-launched missiles by about 10 and our land-launched missiles by three—and we will not know how many they have. Not knowing how many warheads are deployed by another state, each country will assume the worst. New systems of defense and offense, and thousands of new nuclear warheads, will be produced. Land-based missiles in fixed sites, like Minuteman, may well become obsolete, making Safeguard or any ABM system defending ICBM's unnecessary, and be replaced by other less vulnerable but even more lethal nuclear weapons systems. Control agreements will be beyond reach because verification will be impossible.

Hence, we are suddenly close to meeting, we and the Soviets, on the same plateau, barren and rocky though it is. It is the plateau of nuclear equality. It is not equality in weapons, for we have far greater numbers of weapons, but equality in other ways. We are equal, in a sense, because we can destroy one another and a large part of the world as well. We are equal, too, because we will both soon be able to deploy a weapon—MIRV's—which will make verifiable agreements impossible. We are equal because we are both spending more on weapons than we should. We are equal because we do not trust one another, and see little reason to trust one another.

This plateau of nuclear equality, on which we and the Soviets stand momentarily poised, could prove to be the highest point reached in the nuclear arms race. Or it could be the point of departure for the next stage in that race which will lead us both to be better armed but less secure. The question before the Senate is clear: Who will take the first step—and in what direction?

URGENT NEED FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL MINERALS POLICY

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on July 9, the Mineral Materials and Fuels Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee conducted hearings on S. 719, a bill to establish a national minerals policy. This is a bill which I have introduced in previous sessions of Congress and believe should have been enacted into law before now.

At the hearing, a most impressive group of the key executives of the industries which are closest to the necessity in such a policy, testified on behalf of this legislation. Most of these witnesses who were assembled, took time out of their busy schedules to be there. The members of the American Mining Congress, of which Mr. Cris Dobbins is the president, testified in full. Mr. Dobbins' excellent introductory and closing statements, I know, were founded upon his vast, keen personal acquaintance with the broad spectrum of our national minerals, from extraction to actual employment, past, present, and future. By reading it, all of the Members of Congress will be better acquainted with the need for a law establishing a national minerals policy.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the statements of Mr. Dobbins be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF CRIS DOBBINS

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I am Cris Dobbins, Chairman and President of Ideal Basic Industries, Inc.

I am President also of the American Mining Congress, a trade association of U.S. companies that produce most of the nation's metals, coal, and industrial and agricultural minerals. Its membership also includes more than 200 corporations that manufacture mining and mineral processing equipment and supplies, as well as financial institutions with a business interest in the mining industry.

My colleagues and I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you to support the development of a national mining and minerals policy.

Through our several witnesses we hope to demonstrate the need for such a policy.

First, however, let me indicate how we interpret the concept, "Policy," and how we believe it might function to produce the desired result.

In a sense, almost every enactment by the Congress of a law relating to minerals is an expression of national minerals "policy." In this sense, the considerable number of existing laws pertaining directly to mining and minerals—the organic acts of the Geological Survey, the public land laws the stockpiling legislation, all define the national "policy." In addition, the vast accumulation of existing laws having an impact on mining and minerals—laws on internal revenue, environmental quality, aid to education, and so on, interact importantly with the minerals "policy."

But each of these legislative enactments is passed to meet a particular problem or purpose; seldom are they viewed altogether as an integrated expression of overall policy. As a result, they are not coordinated, there are contradictions one against another, and their relative priority is not determinable.

The executive branch of the government, charged with the responsibility of implementing all the laws, consequently lacks the clear direction which it needs effectively to achieve the intention of the Congress.

The articulation of a broad "Policy," such as the proposed mining and minerals policy, will, we believe, be of great value to the executive branch and to the nation, both in the implementation of existing legislation and in the development of future legislation.

It will serve as a statement of fundamental principles or objectives, an indication of Congressional priority, a "bench mark," if you will, against which the executive branch can measure proposed action and the Congress can measure proposed new legislation.

Moreover, by charging the Secretary of the Interior with overall responsibility for effectuation of the policy, the Congress assures itself of a fully responsible source of advice and counsel as to whether the Congress' objectives are being achieved and of recommendations as to further Congressional action which might from time to time be necessary.

The testimony you will hear from my colleagues is based upon this understanding of the concept of the term "Policy" as it is used in S. 719.

Our first witness is Mr. Andrew Fletcher, Honorary Chairman of St. Joseph Lead Company, who will provide you an over-view of the problems and opportunities facing the United States in regard to mining and minerals. He will be followed by Mr. James Boyd, President of Copper Range Company, who will discuss implications of the proposed policy on development and manpower in mining and minerals; Mr. David Swan, Vice President—Technology of Kennecott Copper Corporation, who will discuss environmental quality; Mr. Charles F. Barber, President of American Smelting and Refining Company, who will discuss the use of public lands; Mr. Lindsay F. Johnson, President of the New Jersey Zinc Company, who will discuss stockpiling; Mr. Fred W. Peel, of Miller and Chevalier, who will discuss tax policy and mine finance; and Mr. Donald J. Donahue, President of American Metal Climax, Inc., who will discuss foreign trade.

Following Mr. Donahue's statement we will all be pleased to respond to any questions you may have for us.

(Remarks of other American Mining Congress witnesses were made at this point in proceedings.)

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I hope that in these several presentations we have been able to demonstrate the broad scope and nature of the problems and opportunities facing our nation in regard to mining and minerals, and the importance of a Congressional declaration of National Policy on this vital subject.

It is clear, we believe, that such a Policy has implications to research, development and manpower, to environmental quality, to the use of public lands, to the subject of stockpiling, to tax policy and mine finance, and to foreign trade. Overall it has the most profound implications to the economic future of the United States which is based so heavily on a continuing supply of raw materials—both domestic and foreign.

The mining industry of the United States, which we represent here today, is dedicated to meeting the raw material requirements of our nation. The support and encouragement of a National Mining and Minerals Policy will help greatly in continuing to achieve that objective.

We thank you for this opportunity to present our views and we would be pleased to respond to any question you may have for us.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S MESSAGE ON THE POPULATION EXPLOSION

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I want to speak for a few moments this evening with respect to the growth of hunger and population in the world.

I am reminded of the Biblical passage from Isaiah 8: 21 which reads as follows:

> And it shall come to pass that when they shall be hungry, they shall . . . curse their King and their God.

The word "crisis" hangs in the air over discussions of food and population as the realities of life, ordered by a harsh and stern Nature, catch up with mankind in the last third of the 20th century.

Today many of us cling to an optimistic faith in the inevitability of progress, to the assumption that the fate of man on earth is destined to improve as time goes on.

Yet in his message to Congress last Thursday, President Nixon notes that if present rates of population growth continue, it is likely that the earth will contain 7 billion human beings by the end of this century.

> It is in the developing nations of the world—

Said the President—

> that population is growing more rapidly today. In these areas we often find rates of natural increase higher than any which have been experienced in all of human history. With their birth rates remaining high and with death rates dropping sharply, many countries of Latin America, Asia and Africa now grow ten times as fast as they did a century ago. At present rates, many will double and some may even triple their present populations before the year 2000.

And what of the quality of life? As the President said last week:

> Despite considerable improvements in agricultural technology and some dramatic increases in grain production, it is still difficult to feed these added people at adequate levels of nutrition.
>
> Protein malnutrition is widespread. It is estimated that every day some 10,000 people—most of them children—are dying from diseases of which malnutrition has been at least a partial cause.

The question, then, can be simply stated: Has the less-developed world lost the capacity to feed itself?

Today, there exists no shortage of experts willing to provide an answer.

The world will face the greatest famine in history by about 1980, says Rene Dumont, the French agronomist now director of research at the National Agricultural Institute in Paris. World population, he notes, is year by year outstripping food production.

Dumont wrote in late 1967:

> Throughout the Third World, since 1959, population increase has been 26 per 1,000 per year and food production has increased for only 15 to 20 people per 1,000 per year.
>
> There are others—

Dumont adds—

> who go further than I do and say that it's already too late to avoid the terrible catastrophe and that it could come as soon as 1975.[1]

Terrible catastrophe? The greatest famine in history? It does sound a bit extreme, until one does some arithmetic.

Tonight in the world, 170,000 deaths; twice as many births. It has been that way for years.

The result? Prior to World War II today's hungry nations were exporters of grain. By the 1960's they had become importers. In the 1930's Latin America exported more grain than the United States and Canada combined but by 1950, Latin America had become a grain importer.

The Netherlands Indies was a major prewar supplier of copra on the world market before World War II. Today's Indonesia, in contrast, exported in 1964 only one-half of the amount of 1938, although the total amount grown was greater than the crop of 1938.[2]

Add similar examples of corn in Nicaragua, wheat in India, soybeans in China, beans in Chile and the somersault within the former exporting nations becomes more graphic. Swollen populations have consumed the surplus formerly exported and they must now import increasing amounts of food each year.

Grain exports-imports are an example:

Net import (−), export (+) of grain for *Asia* (not including Japan), *Africa* (not including South Africa), and *Latin America* (not including Argentina): [3]

[In millions of metric tons]

Period:	
1934–38	+3
1948–52	−6
1957–59	−12
1961–63	−22
1964–65	−26
1965–66	−28
1966–67	−34
1967–68	−29

It is not just the dimension of this change that has caught the world off guard, it is the speed at which it has taken place.

---

[1] The (London, England) Observer, December 10, 1967.

[2] Kenneth D. Thomas and J. Panglaykim, *Indonesian Exports; Performance & Prospects 1950–1970*, Universitaire Pers Rotterdam, 1967, p. 32.

[3] Quentin M. West, *World Food Needs*, Foreign Regional Analyst Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, February 10, 1966, p. 10.

> It is a simple but indisputable fact—

Says George Aiken, ranking Republican on the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee—

> that world food supplies are running second to world population. We need an agricultural production to match the population requirements. Despite the great progress that has been made in production yields, we cannot take the outcome of this crucial race for granted.

Says Senator Milton Young:

> Concerning food needs in this country we have the capacity to produce all of our nation's needs for at least the next half century and perhaps far beyond. The farmers of this nation continue to produce more per unit each year with no end in sight. They are now producing enough to meet our domestic food demands plus up to $6 billion worth of farm commodities for export annually. This is done at a time when we have a government program to keep idle more than 35 million acres of American cropland!
>
> We must be concerned, however, about the population explosion around the world. The major problem involved here is one of finding a way to make our food available to these people other than through highly subsidized or donation programs.

Dr. Raymond Ewell believes—

> The world is on the threshold of the biggest famine in history. If present trends continue, it seems likely that famine will reach serious proportions in India, Pakistan and China in the early 1970's . . . . Such a famine will be of massive proportions affecting hundreds of millions.[4]

Swedish economist Gunnar Myrdal sees a "world calamity" in "5 or 10 years."[5]

W. Arthur Lewis writes:

> We cannot be confident that world food production will increase during the next two or three decades at the desired rates.[6]

At the December 1967 OECD Ministers' Meeting a report on the food problem of the developing countries was presented by the Secretary General of OECD Thorkil Kristensen. Notable points:

> It is a matter of concern that in the first seven years of the 1960's the following phenomena have coincided:
>
> Food production in the developing countries has grown more slowly than demand;
>
> The area of good new land that could easily be brought under cultivation in developing countries has been sharply reduced;
>
> The population of developing countries has been growing at an increasing rate;
>
> Surplus stocks of grain in North America have roughly speaking been exhausted through shipments to less-developed areas;
>
> Development aid from the richer countries has on the whole stagnated;
>
> The debt burden of many developing countries has been rising fast.[7]

WHAT OF NEW SCIENTIFIC DEVELOPMENTS?

In May 1969, Addeke H. Boerma, Director-General of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, said:

> For one thing, the varieties that have so far been produced are not suited to some climatic conditions, so that there will be a need to test the behavior of existing varieties in many countries and to promote research in others in order to create varieties there which are locally suitable. Again, the new varieties will not yield their full capacity without the assistance of many other elements. These include primarily large quantities of fertilizers, plant protection chemicals and a regular water supply—which in itself calls for investment in better methods of irrigation, drainage and flood protection. Farmers will have to be persuaded—and this is certainly not the least difficult task—to change their traditional methods of cultivation.

Time and again cold water is dashed on hopes for meeting the food crisis, only to find optimistic faith in the inevitability of progress doggedly raising its head. The Economist held out hope in an October 28, 1967, article entitled "Plenty of Wheat for Those Who Can Pay," yet Newsweek was to report barely 2 weeks later, on November 13, 1967, that the worst drought in history had gripped Australia in a dusty nightmare:

> The country's widely exported wheat crop for this season will be slashed nearly in half—from 462 million to 260 million bushels.

In January of 1968 the Australian Wheat Committee in London reported their marketable crop was down to 238 million bushels, and butchers from New Zealand had been flown in to help handle the mass slaughter of beef cattle, rushed prematurely to market at a loss of $40 a head.

Looking beyond weather variables, Paddock and Paddock write:

> The present downward trends cannot be reversed, nor can they be dusted under the carpet. Those who say there are too many variables in the future to forecast food deficits ignore the present trends . . . The famines which are now approaching will not . . . be caused by weather variations and therefore will not be ended in a year or so by the return of normal rainfall. They will last for years, perhaps several decades, and they are, for a surety, inevitable.[8]

WHAT IS FAMINE?

The borderline between food shortage and famine is uncertain, yet the need for a working definition is self-evident. Food shortages which are general but not extreme, as in Kenya and Tanganyika in 1961–62 when large portions of these countries needed relief but no one actually died of starvation, would probably be excluded from the category of famine. Objective tests are equally difficult to apply. Even the nutritionists cannot really draw a clean-cut line between malnutrition and starvation.

Biafra, in this summer of 1969, becomes the case in point.

Thus FAO, while not purporting to give a dictionary definition, proposed the following:

> It is a food situation in which there are clear indications, based on careful and impartial study, that serious catastrophe and extensive suffering will occur if international assistance is not rendered.[9]

This particular definition adds a rather menacing dimension to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's so-called world food budget, which shows who fits the definition.

> The share of the population—

Reports the USDA—

> living in countries with average energy (calorie) supply levels below the minimum recommended was 92% for Asia, 38% for Africa and 29% for Latin America.

This, incidentally, amounts to approximately 79 percent of the population in the underdeveloped regions or 56 percent of the entire world.[10]

Worse, even the minimum recommended calorie supply levels are suspect as a result of today's research.

The Paddocks said:

> Until now it has been the standard practice to state that people need less food in the tropics than in the temperate zones.
>
> Thus, FAO in its calculations recommends a 5 percent decrease in food requirements for every 10-degree increase in environmental temperatures. However, tests by the U.S. Army Medical Research and Nutrition Laboratory at Denver have shown that just the opposite appears to be true. This means, then, that the hotter the weather the more food the individual needs to perform his work. Since the hungry nations are nearly all in the tropics, it would appear as if the FAO figures should be increased by another 50 million people suffering from malnutrition—give or take a dozen million people.[11]

SOME BASICS OF FOOD

In the simplest of terms, a few inches of living topsoil underlies all life on earth. Man must cling to the soil because life depends on plants, and they depend on topsoil.

Life is organized energy and energy on earth comes from the sun, but normally only plants can organize the sun's energy directly.

Man and other animals do not have the plants' vital power of directly storing up the sun's energy in new materials. And of the plants, only some are foodstuffs for man who can digest only the simpler compounds, the sugars and the starches. But animals can convert even grass into meat; for indeed, as the Bible says, "All flesh is grass."

Even fish depend on energy from the sun, for marine plants trap solar energy to begin the long food chains of the oceans culminating in fish that eat each other. And man eats fish. All these chains of life depend on, and are powered by, the energy of the sun captured by the earth's plants; a fact to keep in mind when we read of high hopes for new forms of food.

Today and for the greater part of history, over most of the earth, people live on grass seed. Half mankind lives on rice, the staple of Asia.[12] Rice, wheat, corn, the starch-packed seeds of grasses, are the world's staple belly fillers. Roots, fruits, and vegetables provide calories, yet a calorie is nothing but a unit of energy, and food that supplies calories may not supply the bodybuilding materials that man needs as well as energy.

---

[4] Raymond Ewell, "Famine and Fertilizer," *Chemical and Engineering News*, December 14, 1964, pp. 106–117.

[5] *Look*, March 7, 1967, pp. 86–88.

[6] W. Arthur Lewis, *The Theory of Economic Growth*, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London, 1955, p. 355.

[7] The OECD Observer, December, 1967, p. 5.

[8] William & Paul Paddock, Famine—1975, Boston, Little, Brown & Co., 1967, p. 45.

[9] FAO Commodity Policy Studies No. 10, *Functions of a World Food Reserve—Scope and Limitations*, Rome, 1956.

[10] Lester R. Brown, "Man, Land and Food," U.S. Department of Agriculture, FAE Report No. 11, November 1963, p. 76.

[11] Paddocks, op. cit., p. 51.

[12] Stanley Baron, "Rice: Staff of Life for One-Third of the World," *Newsweek*, August 28, 1967.

XUM

The world in general has a calorie problem; as we have seen half the people do not get enough of them. Some countries have a calorie surplus. Canada grows more wheat than she can eat herself. The rest has gone for export, primarily to fill Russia's recent food deficits.

So foodstuffs are made up of many units, all linked together into long chains of starch or cellulose. By breaking the various linkages, an animal's digestion gets back the energy of the long chain linkages. Most animal products, such as milk and meat, are also long chains; proteins—various linkages of 20 or so simple amino acids. Man must take in eight of these 20 in the form of food from plants or from animal products, or he dies of malnutrition no matter what else he eats. So much for food itself. How does man get it?

SEVERAL WAYS HAVE BEEN TRIED

Gathering wild food was man's only way of getting food up to about 10,000 years ago. It limited the population of the earth to about 10 million people. Fishing is the only primitive food-getting method widely used today.

Conventional commercial fishing is limited by shortages in the sea. Despite all our progress, and all the scientific expertise of the United States, since the end of World War II, the total aquatic catch of the United States has dropped by 550 million pounds a year.

The United States—with only 5 percent of the world's population— has become the world's largest importer of fish, 1,200 million pounds per year. And the United States is now far more dependent upon the sea than is usually recognized. While certain fish imports are indeed for human consumption—shrimp is imported from more than 40 countries, including several undernourished lands such as India and Ecuador—most fishmeal and fish solubles go into manufacturing of poultry feed. The FAO, in "Fisheries in the Food Economy," says:

> The principal product of the reduction industry, fishmeal, is today used primarily in the farming operations of industrialized countries. A large part of supplies has been imported in recent years from developing countries where the animal protein content of diets is still quite inadequate. . . . Japan was at one time a net exporter of fishmeal; in recent years, it has had to cover a part of its own growing supply needs through imports, mostly from Peru and South Africa.[13]

Almost half of the total U.S. fish catch goes to making fishmeal, yet it is not enough to feed America's own growing population. Therefore the United States is second only to all the countries of Western Europe combined as the largest buyer in the world of this high-rate feed protein. All this to feed but 5 percent of the world's people.

In the 1968 FAO document, "The State of World Fisheries," this summary of the future of food from the sea is offered:

> Over the past 20 years the annual world fisheries catch has almost trebled, to nearly 57 million tons in 1966. But while the gross catch has increased dramatically, the effort needed to catch every ton of fish has increased much more steeply and many important marine resources are already yielding maximum catches or are even overfished. . . .
>
> In 1949 . . . the only overfished stocks were those of a limited number of high-priced species, mainly in the north Atlantic and north Pacific, for example plaice in the North Sea, halibut and salmon in the northeast Pacific, and . . . some 30 stocks were then believed to be underfished. Of these stocks about half are now in need of proper management, including cod, redfish and herring in the north Atlantic, and at least some species of tuna in most of the oceans. . . .
>
> The classical response of the fishing industry to overfishing in one stock has been to move to other usually more distant stocks, but it is clear that this process cannot continue much longer. . . . At the present rate of development few substantial unexploited stocks of fish accessible to today's types of gear will remain in another 20 years. The problem of international management is becoming increasingly urgent. . . .

Concluded the study:

> A hundred years ago most people, including leading scientists, believed that the living resources of the sea were essentially inexhaustible—"There are more good fish in the sea than ever came out of it." This assumption, which was justified at the time it was made having regard to the fishing fleets then contemplated, has been invalidated by the subsequent intensive exploitation of many of the world's most valuable and vulnerable species. Convincing proof that this decline, and the decline in stocks of other valuable species, was due to fishing was provided by the severe restrictions on fishing during the two world wars. Immediately after each war the catches of individual trawlers were often several times the prewar averages. . . . Despite the vast expanse of the open ocean in relation to the areas at present exploited, the number of unexploited but practicably exploitable stocks of fish is not believed to be large. Unless there is a technical breakthrough which would make the harvesting of new types of resources economically feasible . . . *the present rate of expansion of world fish production cannot be maintained indefinitely, possibly for not more than 10 or 15 years.*[14]

Breeding fish? The idea has been around for years but truly large scale application is not yet economic. Efforts are being made, as in the U.S.S.R., Europe, and Japan to cultivate fish yet even the largest program is small in comparison to world need.

Despite our hopes, fishing remains good only where nutrients exist. Just as a crop of corn requires nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium, a crop of plankton—the basic food of fish—needs the same chemicals. Few waters have these nutrients in abundance. And when the fish are gone, as California and Norwegian fishermen have learned in the last 10 years, they are gone for good.

FARMING

Since man's invention of agriculture about 10,000 years ago, civilization has, in part, meant clearing the bush, and replacing wild plants with man's domesticated crops.

Land under simple agriculture is capable of supporting about 10 times as many people to the square mile as land under hunting. Today several countries still rely chiefly on the agricultural stage of farming. And even the most advanced countries still get part of their food by the methods of simple agriculture.

But the most intensive use of land is the last stage—industrial farming. One industrial farmer now feeds up to 45 people, but it may take half a dozen technicians in the background to help him do it. You do not need many people, just a relatively few skilled ones practicing industrial techniques.

An early example of industrial farming involved livestock feeding. Since it takes 7 pounds of feed to put on 1 pound of live beef, machinery was developed to grind up all the corn plant—leaves, cob, stalk and all—to become silage.

Thus, most modern food raising is a combination of the last two stages: industrial and agricultural. And, where used, it reaps larger harvests of fish, plants, and animals.

HOW MUCH FOOD DO WE NEED?

The question of how much food will be required in, say, 1979—10 years from now—is difficult to determine. This is due in no small measure to the imprecise data available even today, almost 10 years after the launching of FAO's "Freedom From Hunger Campaign." Nor are experts specific to any great degree about the statistical foundations for their alarm.

FOOD FOR MAN AND ANIMALS

Georg Borgstrom, in "The Hungry Planet," adopts a protein aggregate table as his approach to creating a supply-demand curve for world food needs. He includes food needs for livestock saying:

> In order to fill the nutritional needs of (3.3 billion) people, and in order to produce their food, a livestock population is maintained which is equivalent to almost (15 billion) human beings . . . In summary, our earth carries in total a feeding burden exceeding that of 18 billion human beings.[15]

Borgstrom adds:

> In spite of mechanization, horses still amount to about 609 million (human protein consumption) population equivalents. Cattle . . . correspond to 8.4 billion, i.e., nearly three times the world population: thus they account for almost two-thirds of the total livestock biomass. The total protein consumption of the hogs in the world household is equivalent to 1.8 billion population equivalents and surpasses as such the total human biosphere of both the U.S.S.R. and the United States, taken separately. Sheep add up to 900 million. [16]

Borgstrom's is one of the few works on the subject of the world's food needs that is not confined to calculating man's total calorie requirements and the capability of the soil and sea to meet these demands. If one combines Borgstrom's data with the more specific calorie requirement projections of the UN, the conclusions may be checked against results of the 1970 world census; verification, or lack of it, with regard to both population growth and trade data on food imports and exports will thus be available within 2 to 3 years.

---

[13] FAO Freedom From Hunger Campaign Basic Studies No. 19, "Fisheries in the Food Economy." Rome, 1968, pp. 33, 75.

[14] FAO, *The State of World Fisheries*, Rome, 1968. pp. v. 1–10.

[15] Georg Borgstrom, *The Hungry Planet: The Modern World at the Edge of Famine*, London, Collier-Macmillan Ltd., 1967, p. 17.

[16] Ibid. p. 17.

XUM

For the moment, however, an alternative approach might be to verify the failure of agriculture to produce food in pace with the expanding population of here and now.

YIELDS PER ACRE

The Paddocks wrote in "Famine 1975":

> No only is agricultural production in the hungry nations falling on a per capita basis; in some it is falling on a per acre basis.[17]

Which is true. The Department of Agriculture's Agriculture Statistics Yearbook 1966 shows corn yields per acre in Colombia, Venezuela, and Ecuador were higher in 1955–59 than in 1961–63. In Brazil both wheat and corn per acre yields were higher in 1935–39 than in 1955–60. Guatemala had the greatest drop, with yields falling from 15.7 bushels to the acre in 1939 to less than 12 in 1962.

The Paddocks said:

> Land has been put into production which simply lacks the qualities needed to maintain production.
>
> The rising cost of food combined with the population pressures on the land have pushed farmers farther and farther up the hillsides and farther and farther out into the jungle. *They are now tilling land which should never have been farmed.* This land may be able to raise a few crops successfully, but then the yields fall off because its low quality will not permit sustained production.[18]

The OECD agrees:

> In contrast to the last few decades when the amount of land under cultivation in the developing regions increased fairly rapidly (accounting for more than half of the increase in production in Latin America, the Near East and Africa and for more than 40 percent in the Far East), there will in future be little possibility for further increases in the area under cultivation, especially in the Far East. Thus the amount of agricultural land per capita will decline. It is likely that by the year 2000 each person in the farm population of the developed countries will have about twenty times as much land as the average person in the farm population of the developing countries. Compared with the Far East alone it would be 50 times as much.[19]

So does Lester Brown of the Department of Agriculture agree:

> Until quite recently, most of the less-developed world was still expanding the area under cultivation to feed its rapidly-growing population. In recent years, however, country after country has furrowed the last of the "new" land readily cultivatable. During the Fourth Plan Period ending in 1971, India plans to expand the net area sown by less than 1 percent, though the nation's population is expected to increase by 14 percent. Clearly, most of its additional food needs must be met by raising productivity per acre. *Nearly all of Asia, the Middle East and North Africa share this land hunger.*[20]

VANISHING FOOD LAND

We might add this problem is not unique to developing nations. In the United States, about 2 million acres of rural land are lost to nonagricultural development each year; that is, to houses, highways, and commerce. Once lost, such land is virtually impossible to regain.

Easily forgotten is the fact that good soil is a very rare and precious item on this earth. Even more rare: a mix of good soil and good rainfall. For this reason, slightly less than 8 percent of the land surface of our planet is cultivated.

The United States and Canada have 22.7 percent of all the world's cultivated land. Latin America, in contrast, with just as many people to feed, has only 6.5 percent. This is no one's fault. This is just a hard fact of geography.[21]

R. Dudal, in his "Dark Clay Soils of Tropical and Subtropical Regions," speaks of much of the land on earth when he describes:

> Clay soils having marked tendencies to shrink and swell with changes in moisture content are widespread in many parts of the world, especially in tropical and subtropical regions. Owing to their high clay activity, these soils are difficult to cultivate, especially with simple implements, and as a result, large areas have remained unused or have not been used efficiently.[22]

Nor will they be used efficiently without massive infusions of capital and technology; infusions difficult to obtain in most developing countries with their scarce resource.

THE CASE OF UGANDA

Uganda provides an interesting example in this respect. Described by a sociologist as, "potentially a land of milk and honey," possessing "rich soil for expansion and vast underground water supplies," Uganda was said to possess sufficient new lands to provide food for foreseeable population increases.

Why, then, these rather startling statistics on Uganda's retained food imports? (Net food imports minus re-exports, not including beverages and tobacco):[23]

[Uganda pounds sterling]

Year:	
1960	851,000
1961	949,000
1962	1,249,000
1963	1,101,000
1964	1,227,000
1965	1,846,000
1966	2,567,000
1967	2,259,000

Clearly Uganda is spending more scarce foreign currency on food—not fertilizer, or other inputs—every year and spending it at a sharply increasing rate.

A clue to the discrepancy between the sociologist's optimism and the gloomy food import statistics is found in a paragraph from Uganda's Second 5-Year Plan, 1966–71:

> Hitherto increases in output have nearly always been achieved through an expansion in the acreages under cultivation. There is not yet an overall shortage of land in Uganda, *though in some of the most fertile areas a shortage of good land is beginning to appear* (emphasis added). However, with population growth at least 2.5 percent per annum land shortage is likely to emerge in many areas of the country in coming years. Because of this, increases in output in the future must be sought from increasing yields as well as from increases in acreages.[24]

The "rich soil" the sociologist found may exist, but "expansion" is difficult, for to irrigate a desert is costly—United States has spent $6.9 billion to irrigate 10 million acres—and the manufacture and proper use of fertilizer is both costly and complex. The variety and extent of what a farmer must buy to make two blades of grass grow where one grew before is not fully appreciated.

INPUTS

In the United States, for instance, farmers in 1965 spent $21.5 billion on inputs. Of this, $9 billion was bought from other farmers in the form of livestock, feed, and so forth. The other $12.5 billion was purchased input from off-farm sources such as fertilizers, lime, petroleum products, machinery, equipment, and spare parts, and so forth. For each of the 300 million acres American farmers cultivated, they spent $42 annually on production requisites supplied by the nonfarm sector.

This $42 per acre is for already productive land and includes no cost for clearing, leveling, draining, and irrigating required to transform deserts. Compare this input with Uganda's per capita income, which is $93 a year.

GRAIN OUTPUT

Another method of verification is that of Lester R. Brown in his "Man, Land and Food," considering grain production as representative of total agricultural production. The direct consumption of grains provides 53 percent of man's calorie supply, and indirect consumption, in the form of meat, milk, eggs, and other livestock products, accounts for a large part of the remaining calorie intake.

> The per capita availability of grain—

Says Brown—

> largely determines the quality of diet. If availabilities are low, virtually all grains must be consumed directly to satisfy man's minimal energy requirements. But if they are high, a substantial portion may be fed to livestock and converted into meat, milk and eggs (recall Borgstrom's 18 billion human equivalents) so essential to a nutritionally adequate diet.
>
> The per capita availability of grain, then, is a useful indicator of the nutritional quality of diets. It is also a very useful analytical tool for it is now possible to make valid comparisons betwen regions and, perhaps more importantly, within any given region over a long period of time.[25]

Brown adds:

> Relatively reliable data are available for area in grain for every country of significant size. Area planted to grain is conceptually much more uniform and therefore much more useful in examining long-term trends.

Using this simplified food-output indicator with world grain output viewed in terms of the two dominant economic regions—developed and less developed—

---

[17] Paddocks, op. cit., p. 45.

[18] Ibid., p. 46.

[19] The OECD Observer, December 1967, p. 5.

[20] The Congressional Record, January 17, 1967, Lester R. Brown, "The Stork Outruns the Plow."

[21] William and Paul Paddock, Hungary Nations, Boston, Little, Brown & Co., 1964, p. 22.

[22] R. Dudal, *Dark Clay Soils of Tropical and Subtropical Regions*, FAO, Rome, 1965, p. 1.

[23] *Uganda Government 1966 Statistical Abstract*, Statistics Division, Ministry of Planning and Economic Development, Government Printer, Entebee (GPUG 3181 1050–5–67).

[24] *Work for Progress: Uganda's Second Five Year Plan, 1966–1971*, Government Printer, Entebbe, Uganda.

[25] *Brown, Man, Land & Food*, op. cit., p. 48.

XUM

the trends in aggregate output are actually quite similar.

Output in the developed regions increased 51 percent from the average of the years 1934–38 to the actual crop year 1960–61, while that in the less developed regions was only somewhat less at 42 percent. Aggregate output in the developed regions amounted to 334 million metric tons in 1934–38, compared with 317 million tons in the less developed regions. By 1960–61, the margin had increased slightly as output reached 506 and 450 million tons respectively in the two regions.

Two points may be made about the aggregate comparisons just cited. First, food production increases in areas of high population growth must exceed, not merely attempt to keep up with, increases in areas of more stable population levels and, second, even this apparently "matching" rate of increase in food production is illusory.

The reason is this: Fairly accurate projections of population growth were available by the late 1950's, and assumptions could be made concerning expected rates of increase in per capita income, the other principal factor influencing demand for food. Thus demand projections were reasonably simple and straightforward. But on the supply side, much less was available in the way of projections, and much less was known about supply projection techniques.

Reports the USDA's "Increasing World Food Output":

> Lacking anything better many projections of output were made simply by extrapolating the food output trends existing from the late 1940's to the late 1950's or alternatively from the early 1950's to the late 1950's or early 1960's. *Overlooked was the fact that increases during this period often consisted in large part of recovery from the destruction and disruption of World War II.*
>
> Near the end of the 1950's per capita output levels in the less-developed regions began to approach the levels existing before the war. But the gains made during the 1950's were in a sense illusory. Once recovery was complete, the rate of gain began to slow down—making the supply projections unduly optimistic. And in some cases this unwarranted optimism contributed to a shift of emphasis from agriculture to industry. Only now are the effects of this shift becoming evident as many less-developed countries are plagued with growing shortages of food.[26]

THE POSITION TODAY

To summarize, 30 years ago the less-developed regions of Asia, Africa, and Latin America were all grain exporters. Collectively, they sent some 11 million tons of grain yearly to the developed regions. During the war decade of the 1940's, this flow was reversed and the less-developed world became a net importer of grain, losing a valuable source of foreign exchange earnings.

Net imports of grain reached 4 million tons in 1950, and 13 million tons by 1959. As population growth in the developing countries accelerated further during the 1960's, this net inflow increased sharply, reaching an estimated 31 million tons in 1966.

ARE THEY?

On February 18, 1969, the Outlook and Situation Board of the USDA reported on the year 1968 as follows:

> Both agricultural production and total population increased 2 to 3 percent from 1967 to 1968, leaving output per person in the world practically unchanged. Production per capita in the less developed regions was the same as in 1967 and not significantly different from the level prevailing from 1958 to 1965. In the developed regions, on the other hand, agricultural production per person reached a new high, continuing the rising trend of the past decade.

TOMORROW

Conventional wisdom is a powerful factor in directing governments and peoples. It has now become a part of the conventional wisdom of "the West" that agriculture plays a central role in the development of the Third World, but that it is the most difficult sector of the economy to develop.

> Agrarian backwardness—

Writes Dumont—

> always inhibits and sometimes prevents entirely any possibility of rapid economic expansion. . . . Progress in agriculture should not be considered as a preliminary to industrialization, but an indispensable corollary.[27]

Or, from W. Arthur Lewis:

> The crux of the (economic progress) problem is usually a backward system of agriculture.[28]

Or, from Gerald M. Meier:

> Experience . . . has shown the limitations of an overemphasis on industrialization, and it is increasingly recognized that agricultural progress is a strategic element in the development process.[29]

Or, from Christoph Beringer in the February 1968 OECD Observer:

> It is now much more fully understood that the agricultural sector has a crucial role to play in the process of economic development.

Concern for agriculture, for that matter, passes beyond the borders of development economics into sociology. Witness Lucy Mair's concern:

> To persons responsible for the policies of governments the most distressing aspect of this situation is that agricultural resources are either not being developed or—more often—are being ruined by inefficient farming. Agricultural Departments train demonstrators to teach farming methods which would at least preserve the soil from the complete loss of its fertility and possibly make it more productive. But at any given time most of the energetic and intelligent potential farmers to whom their teaching should be addressed are away pursuing other avocations, and hardly anyone belonging to this section of the population expects to spend more time as a farmer than as a wage-earner.[30]

Development economist H. Myint says:

> Industrialization is popularly regarded as synonymous with economic development by the people of the developing countries. They feel that agriculture is an inherently less productive occupation than manufacturing industry, and that the present economic structure of their countries, characterized by a large proportion of the total working force in primary production, is somehow lop-sided and unbalanced and should be cured by an all-out drive for manufacturing industry.[31]

Yet Celso Furtado is able, in Development and Underdevelopment, University of California, 1968, to put together 171 pages of economic analysis with only the slightest nod of his head to the role of agriculture in economic growth.[32]

And Richard T. Gill, on the same wrong path, adds:

> An underdeveloped country has only limited resources to give to investment and growth . . . it must choose those areas which promise the greatest development . . . Clearly not agriculture, but industry. Indeed, modern growth and industrialization are really synonymous phenomena.[33]

No, the "conventional wisdom" has yet to agree on agriculture's role in development, and the other quick, facile statements on the future of food production are equally wide of the mark.

FERTILIZERS—A SCARCE CURE-ALL

Current hopes for vastly increased use of fertilizers, for instance, seem to overlook the finite quantities of raw materials available to us.

> Owing to the increasing urgency of fertilizer production in the various countries of the region—

Says the U.N.'s Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East—

> at a time when currently exploited mineral raw materials deposits for fertilizer production are nearing exhaustion and shortages are beginning to be experienced in practically every stage of raw material production, a time is fast approaching when utilization of low grade ores will have to be considered.[34]

And since the developing regions today produce just under half of the very small quantity—in comparison with developed countries—of commercial chemical fertilizers they consume, the rest must be imported.[35] Thus the skepticism of the Paddocks' is understandable:

> Now, suddenly, fertilizer is the fashion. It is a short-term, mechanical process that fits in with the traditional development philosophy of crisis, impact projects. Build

---

[26] *Increasing World Food Output, Problems and Prospects,* Foreign Agricultural Economic Agricultural Economic Report No. 25, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, Foreign Regional Analysis Division, April 1965.

[27] Rene Dumont, *False Start in Africa,* Andre Deutsch, London, 1966, p. 31.

[28] W. Arthur Lewis, *The Principles of Economic Planning,* George Allen & Unwin Ltd. London, 1952, pp. 122–3.

[29] Gerald M. Meier, *Leading Issues in Development Economics,* Oxford University Press, 1964, p. 285.

[30] Lucy Mair, *New Nations,* Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1963, p. 38.

[31] H. Myint, *The Economics of the Developing Countries,* Hutchinson University Library, London, 1967, p. 129.

[32] Celso Furtado, *Development and Underdevelopment; A Structural View of the Problems of Developed & Underdeveloped Countries,* Berkeley, University of California Press, 1967.

[33] Quoted in Y. S. Brenner, *Theories of Economic Development and Growth* (from Gill's Economic Development Past and Present, 1963), London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1966, p. 274.

[34] *Mineral Raw Material Resources for the Fertilizer Industry in Asia and the Far East,* U.N. Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, Mineral Resources Development Series No. 28, Hong Kong/New York, 1967, p. 73.

[35] FAO, *Agriculture and Industrialization,* Basic Study No. 17, Rome, 1967, p. 106.

XUM

> fertilizer plants everywhere. Ship more and more fertilizer everywhere. . . .
>
> Recently I examined some fertilizer trials on the grasslands in the state of Amapa, north of the mouth of the Amazon. The resulting growth was striking and I was impressed. I asked the young agronomist there, "Where did you get your fertilizer?"
>
> "Some of it was shipped in directly from Europe, but we received our lime from Sao Paulo." That is over 2,500 miles away. How will it ever be possible to raise a crop that can pay for such transportation costs?
>
> One more hardship for the undeveloped world is that phosphate and potassium-bearing strata as well as limestone are scarce in the tropics. A fertilizer plant can manufacture nitrogen from the air, but the other mineral components must be dug from the ground and, if not found locally, often must be shipped in from extraordinary distances. Transportation cost is important because fertilizers usually are applied in the form of salts and large quantities are required per acre.[36]

The OECD report:

> By 1980 something of the order of $5 billion a year will be needed by the developing countries in foreign exchange for fertilizers alone to prevent the food gap from widening.
>
> This figure, which is based on several very specific assumptions (1), represents around half of the total financial resources currently flowing from OECD Member countries and multilateral agencies to the less-developed world. It could amount to 8 to 10 percent of the export earnings of the developing countries even if the latter continued to grow, as they have in recent years, at a rate of 5 percent a year. Thus the problem of providing fertilizers for development is one that will assume major dimensions in the next decade.[37]

Brown puts it rather more simply:

> If fertilizer application rates in India, for example, were to reach those of Japan, India's requirements would far exceed present total world output.[38]

FOREIGN AID

Little and Clifford say:

> Within the category of capital-project financing, the very small proportion devoted to agriculture, forestry, and fishing, is worth noting. It is mere 11–12 percent of the total, despite the fact that agriculture accounts directly for somewhere around half the output of the underdeveloped world.[39]

The question of reconciling this statistic with the heavy publicity given to present and future food requirements cannot be dealt with here. I can only note, again, the questionable validity of the assertion that agriculture's role is now part of "the conventional wisdom."

Further, the effectiveness of agriculture-oriented aid is subject to question. Much of the small quantity of foreign aid directed to increasing food production, continue Little and Clifford,

> has been for irrigation, which is itself more of an economic overhead than a directly productive investment. It is unfortunately notorious that much of the capital for irrigation has been wasted, and has had little effect on output. Either land-tenure has been unsuitable for irrigated farming, or the farmers have been unwilling to change, or have received insufficient help to enable them to make the radical changes in methods which are required. Sometimes too, canals have leaked, or there was inadequate drainage, with resultant loss of land through salinity.

NONPRODUCTIVE FOREIGN AID

Considering the dimensions of need, therefore, it is somewhat discomfiting to read:

> The aid given to India would be the more effective if a high proportion of it were not going to military expenditure and expropriation indemnities—such as the million dollars annually paid to the Nizam of Hyderabad.[40]

Nor is India unique. Brazil, Peru, Chile, and Argentina have all used scarce currency to buy new war planes from abroad.

The fact that neither Brazil, Peru, Argentina, or Chile has fought a war in modern memory, or been threatened with invasion, or the knowledge that the region is spending resources desperately needed for economic and social progress, clearly is not decisive. Jose Nun writes Chile spends 18 percent of its budget on the military, Peru 18 percent, Haiti 23 percent, Dominican Republic 26 percent, compared to more advanced Latin American governments; Uruguay 1 percent, Mexico 1 percent, Costa Rica 1 percent.[41]

NEW AID FOR OLD DEBTS

Nor is this the only problem. It was estimated in 1968 that two-thirds of official aid that developing countries got was being used to repay debts, including payments due to colonial civil servants who retired following transfer of power. Compensation paid to individuals and companies who had claims to money, property, or land—like British farmers in Kenya—were also part of the aid program. The pragmatic British take comfort in the fact that for every 100 pounds England spends on aid, 130 pounds will be returned to England in goods or services.[42]

And what is the temper of the world's largest aid giver? Action in the U.S. Senate on Foreign Assistance authorization requests for the last 4 fiscal years is indicative. Presidents have requested total authorizations during that period of $13.066 billion. The Senate has authorized instead a total of $9.874 billion.

The bills have been supported in large part because of these reductions, or opposed because the reductions weren't deep enough. "Reduction" has become the key word, perhaps reflecting American uneasiness, skepticism as to the effect of our aid, and great concern for domestic needs.

And how does this look from abroad? Costa Rica's ex-president, Don Jose Figueres, said:

> The United States is steadily moving further away from the underdeveloped world economically and psychologically. It is becoming more and more difficult for the United States as a nation to communicate with the rest of the world.[43]

Each view has a part of the answer, for 30 million Americans do indeed live on poverty-level incomes—$3,000 a year or less for a family. The aged, the nonwhite and the small farmworker are particularly hard hit.

> In some Negro ghettos—

Reported Time, November 10, 1967—

> 28 percent are unemployed—a higher rate than the U.S. as a whole experienced in the depths of the Depression. In addition, problems of air and water pollution, classroom shortages, inadequate mass transportation and urban decay plague the nation.

Tomorrow's food production and the aid so vital to its increase are today no more than a question mark. Are the land and water resources of the United States, as President Nixon asks, and indeed of the world, if properly used, capable of providing an adequate level of nutrition to the population which is already foreseeable?

A fairly realistic answer is Walter H. Pawley's, located at the very end of his study, "Possibilities of Increasing World Food Production":

> In the Near East, an increase in production in excess of threefold would push utilization of resources much closer to the limits set by present technical knowledge than would be the case in either Latin America or Africa. Quite apart from the political, administrative and institutional problems involved, it is an area in which there may be cause for some disquiet from the point of view of the natural resources. Water is strictly the limiting factor, and the two main river systems, the Nile and the Tigris-Euphrates, are already fairly fully drawn upon.
>
> Of course, all this might be changed by the desalinization of sea water at costs which would be economic for irrigation, though transportation costs to areas far removed from the coast could still remain a problem.
>
> The need for a more than fourfold increase in food production in the Far East definitely raises the question of the adequacy of the basic physical resources. In a study of the Lower Ganges-Brahmaputra basin, a careful examination of resource potentialities led to the tentative conclusion the production could be increased about fourfold in this area. . . . There is reason to believe, then, that in the Far East the balance between future food needs and known potentialities for production may well prove to be delicate. . . . In Latin America and Africa, the physical resources are unquestionably ample, without approaching their full utilization, to meet the estimated increases required.[44]

So much for finite limits: Tight in Asia, but sufficient for the foreseeable future in the rest of the world.

American farmers can, as they have for nearly three decades in war and peace, help. There is danger, however, in overreacting.

America's farmers are still suffering from overreaction during the crisis of 3 years ago when the administration upped our production on a one-shot

---

[36] Paddock & Paddock, *Famine*, 1975, op. cit., p. 80.

[37] The OECD Observer, No. 28, June 1967, p. 13.

[38] Lester R. Brown, *Man, Land and Food*, op. cit., p. 106.

[39] I. M. D. Little and J. M. Clifford, *International Aid*, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1965, p. 71.

[40] Rene Dumont, *Lands Alive*, Merlin Press Limited, London, 1965, p. 238.

[41] Jose Nun, "The Middle-Class Military Coup" in *The Politics of Conformity in Latin America*, edited by Claudio Veliz, Oxford University Press, London, 1967.

[42] Daily Express (London, England), February 21, 1968.

[43] *Latin America: Today's Challenge*, Association for International Development, New Jersey, 1967, p. 3.

[44] Walter H. Pawley, *Possibilities of Increasing World Food Production*, FAO, Rome, 1963, p. 222.

XUM

basis. The price of wheat has still not recouped.

The ultimate answer, obviously, does not rest solely or even in large part with American farmers but within the developing lands themselves.

When the final hectare of land in India or Pakistan is planted in Mexican wheat seed and Philippine rice seed, the grain supply limit will have been reached. Meanwhile, population increases continue merrily on their way. Abated, perhaps, but continuing nevertheless.

Whether aid from OECD will continue to decline, whether aid from America will increase to its former levels, whether birth control programs cannot only halt but reverse present population trends, all depend on people.

Perhaps the most encouraging sign is that the problem of food and population is recognized today at the Presidential level.

President Nixon has proposed the creation by Congress of a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. Meeting world food needs, is, admittedly, but one facet of the grim equation.

Yet, without it there is—literally—no answer.

S. 2679—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL DESIGNATING JULY 20 OF EACH YEAR AS "MANNED LUNAR LANDING DAY"

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the world at this moment is witnessing the final stages of perhaps the greatest, most daring adventure in the history of man.

Three American astronauts are blazing a trail of glory back to earth. They are completing the final phase of not only a singular space exploration, but also the final phase of a national commitment. Eight years ago, this country under the late President John F. Kennedy, pledged itself to land a man on the moon and return him safely to earth by 1970. We are in the process today of keeping that commitment.

In order that we may write a fitting postscript to this monumental space voyage and to the commitment of 8 years ago, I am today introducing a bill to designate July 20 as a national holiday to be called "Manned Lunar Landing Day."

President Nixon proclaimed a National Day of Participation in connection with the Apollo 11 flight, and, as the flight nears its finish, I feel that Congress should take action to officially commemorate the event annually.

There is no doubt that July 20 will be written in every forthcoming history book. There is also no doubt that the date of the lunar landing will take its place alongside other great moments in history and other brave adventures long past but forever honored by commemorative national holidays.

The moon landing truly merits enshrinement in American memory as the most epical, most meaningful, and most spectacular achievement in the history of scientific and technological evolution.

Its anniversary deserves a special and lasting recognition as a national holiday which would be a deserved tribute to the ability of the American people to meet and conquer extraordinary challenges with skillful planning, courage, tenaciousness, and, ultimately, with flawless performance.

The marking of this monumental occurrence should serve as an annual point for a renewal of faith and purpose in greater personal and national goals.

Let us mark this milestone in the glorious history of our country for remembrance and for inspiration to yet greater deeds.

Mr. President, I think it fitting to recall the lines written by one of my favorite poets, Edwin Markham:

Man comes, a pilgrim of the universe,
Out of the mystery that was before the world,
Out of the wonder of old stars.
Far roads have touched his feet;
Forgotten wells have glassed his beauty, bending down to drink.
At altar fires, anterior to earth, his soul was lighted
And it will burn on after the suns have wasted on the void.
His feet have felt the pressure of old worlds
And are to tread on others yet unknown.
Worlds sleeping yet in some new dream of God.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2679) designating July 20 of each year as a legal public holiday to be known as "Manned Lunar Landing Day," introduced by Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I gather that the Senator was speaking about the tremendous lift and excitement of our country and of the world with respect to Messrs. Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins and their tremendous achievement.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator has recited a poem. I think that is about the only way to describe it.

I should like to join, without seeming officious, in the exultation of all mankind at this breakthrough and the prayer that it will bring all men to their senses for an era of real peace in which all this can be enjoyed for ourselves and our children. I think that would probably be the greatest memorial we could make to these unbelievably exciting and wonderful men.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the able Senator.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 23, 1969, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, July 22, 1969:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Taylor G. Belcher, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Peru.

Walter L. Rice, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Thomas Hal Clarke, of Georgia, to be a Member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the term expiring June 30, 1973, vice Michael Greenebaum, term expired.

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

George M. Moore, of Maryland, to be a Member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 16, 1973, vice Stanley D. Metzger, resigned.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Frank H. McFadden, of Alabama, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Alabama, vice Harlan H. Grooms, retired.

George H. Barlow of New Jersey to be U.S. district judge for the district of New Jersey, vice Arthur S. Lane, resigned.

Leonard I. Garth, of New Jersey, to be U.S. district judge for the district of New Jersey, vice Thomas M. Madden, retired.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Peter Mills, of Maine, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Maine for the term of 4 years, vice Lloyd P. LaFountain.

Robert G. Renner, of Minnesota, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Minnesota for the term of 4 years, vice Patrick J. Foley, resigned.

David A. Brock, of New Hampshire, to be U.S. attorney for the district of New Hampshire for the term of 4 years, vice Louis M. Janelle.

U.S. MARSHAL

John H. deWinter, of Maine, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Maine for the term of 4 years, vice Adam J. Walsh.

Leonard E. Alderson, of Wisconsin to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years, vice Keith C. Hardie.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert P. Keller
Alan J. Armstrong
George C. Axtell
Foster C. La Hue
Charles F. Widdecke
Louis H. Wilson, Jr.
John N. McLaughlin
Robert R. Fairburn

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 22, 1969:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Joseph O. Rogers, Jr., of South Carolina, to be U.S. attorney for the district of South Carolina for the term of 4 years.

William L. Martin, Jr., of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Georgia for the term of 4 years.

AMBASSADORS

Eileen R. Donovan, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Barbados.

Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Philippines.

J. Raymond Ylitalo, of South Dakota, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Paraguay.

Leonard C. Meeker, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Romania.

ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Joseph A. Greenwald, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be the representative of the United States of America to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, July 22, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Because Thou art my God, Thy gentle spirit shall lead me into the way of life.—Psalm 143: 10.

Almighty God, may this day be radiant with the reality of Thy presence as we address ourselves to the tasks before us. Bless Thou our President, our Speaker, all Members of Congress, and all who work with them that they may set themselves to meet the challenges of this hour with confidence and courage.

We do not pray to escape responsibilities, but to be made equal to them; not for removal of tasks, but to be made ready for them; not for burdens to be lifted from our hands, but to be lightened by the strength of Thy spirit.

We pray for our country. May this beloved land of ours be the channel through which the blessings of freedom may come to the oppressed, light may shine upon those who sit in darkness, strength may come to the weak, weights be lifted from the weary, and the joy of liberty dwell in every heart.

In the Master's name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2785. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Tennessee certain lands within Great Smoky Mountains National Park and certain lands comprising the Gatlinburg Spur of the Foothills Parkway, and for other purposes.

H. Con. Res. 300. Concurrent resolution extending the congratulations of the Congress of the United States to organized baseball upon the occasion of its centennial year.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1072) entitled "An act to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, and titles I, III, IV, and V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended," agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. SPONG, Mr. BAKER, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. PACKWOOD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

JULY 14, 1969.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 and the Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriation Act, 1969, the House Committee on Public Works approved a resolution amending the project previously approved by our Committee on April 14, 1964, for the renovation of a Post Office and Courthouse in Butte, Montana on June 24, 1969, and a prospectus for the proposed lease of a building for the Internal Revenue Service Automatic Data Processing Center in the metropolitan area, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania on June 26, 1969.

A copy of the resolution for the Butte, Montana project is attached hereto.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE H. FALLON,
Chairman.

Resolved by the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, United States, That the prospectus approved April 14, 1964, for the alteration of the Post Office and Courthouse at Butte, Montana, is amended to increase the total estimated maximum cost from $707,000 to $850,000.

Adopted June 24, 1969.

Attest:

GEORGE H. FALLON.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, I was unavoidably absent from the floor of the House attending to some constituent business, and was not present when the House considered H.R. 11651, a bill amending the national school lunch program. I have been a stanch supporter of the school lunch program, Mr. Speaker, and will continue to be one in the future. Had it been possible for me to be on the floor when the final vote was taken, I would have joined my 352 colleagues in voting for the passage of the bill.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PERMISSION FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY AND TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Small Business may be permitted to sit during general debate on today, July 22, and tomorrow, July 23.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 114]

Ashley
Boggs
Carey
Celler
Chisholm
Clark
Cramer
Culver
Davis, Ga.
Diggs
Dwyer
Esch
Gallagher
Giaimo
Gray
Gubser
Halpern
Harsha
Hawkins
Hébert
Howard
Kee
Kirwan
Leggett
Lipscomb
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
Miller, Calif.
Morse
O'Konski
O'Neill, Mass.
Powell
Purcell
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Scheuer
Stratton
Teague, Calif.
Tunney

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 393 members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1970, UNTIL MIDNIGHT THURSDAY, JULY 24, 1969

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight Thursday, July 24, to file a privileged report on the appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

XUM

Mr. MICHEL reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12781) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. Reifel) and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 12781 with Mr. Price of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. Hansen) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. Reifel) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair now recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I would like to take this opportunity to express my deepest appreciation to the hardworking and knowledgeable members of our subcommittee. Without their extensive knowledge of all areas of our Nation, and their contribution of this knowledge to the committee's evaluation of budget estimates, this bill would not be possible.

I particularly wish to express my sadness today that our beloved colleague and my distinguished predecessor, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Kirwan), is not here today. He has been of such tremendous help to all these programs, and the committee sends him our gratitude for his services and our best wishes for his speedy recovery.

At this time I would also like to pay a tribute to one of the very distinguished members of our subcommittee who is leaving the Congress of the United States, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Joelson). It has been my pleasure to serve with this very able, conscientious, and intelligent Member since 1961 when we were both on the Education and Labor Committee, then moved simultaneously to Appropriations. This Congress will miss Mr. Joelson for his humor and intelligently reasonable approach to matters far beyond the scope of routine legislation. He has had a keen insight into the needs and well being of humanity, the responsibilities of a free Nation operating to preserve its freedom and maintain the dignity of its people. My deepest appreciation to the distinguished gentleman, my good wishes, and I am sure that I speak for the committee when I add their good wishes, also. New Jersey is indeed fortunate to have the distinguished gentleman in its judiciary.

I would also like to express my particular appreciation and salute to the ranking Republican member of this subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. Reifel) who, unfortunately, has announced that this will be his final term in the U.S. House of Representatives. Fortunately, we will have him with us next year. Like the able gentleman from New Jersey, this distinguished gentleman from South Dakota has served humanity well and untiringly. His particular interest and assistance to the American Indians, to the preservation, conservation, and development of our natural resources have been outstanding. In other fields—the arts and humanities, historic preservation, the ever-increasing activities of that most distinguished Institution, the Smithsonian—his efforts have been equally outstanding.

I am also grateful to every Member of this House who took the time and effort to appear before the committee for hearings and who wrote or talked with me and with members of the committee about funding for the bill and the impact of that funding on our total economy.

May I recommend to each and every Member of the House of Representatives that he or she read our three volumes of hearings where there is a careful analysis and innumerable details relative to operations of each department and bureau. As I reminded you last year, they can become for you and the people you represent a factual summary of your management of the American land for which you and I are trustees.

Mr. Chairman, today the House Appropriations Committee presents for the consideration of this House the 1970 appropriation bill to fund the Department of the Interior—except Bonneville Power Administration, Bureau of Reclamation, Alaska Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration—and for other related agencies which include the U.S. Forest Service, Indian health activities, Smithsonian Institution, National Gallery of Art, and others.

The compilation of an appropriation bill is a matter of deep thought and concern. Those responsible for the appropriation process have an obligation to the taxpayers of our Nation to keep Federal expenditures at a practicable minimum, and to the greatest extent possible insure that a dollar's worth of product or services is received for each dollar of Federal funds expended.

Conversely, the appropriation process is the lifeblood of various Federal agencies performing necessary services for the benefit and welfare of our Nation and its people. Nothing is accomplished without money and there is never a surplus of this to do everything which should be done. It is also seldom that those interested agree on all allocations or their desirability. Decisions must be made and priorities drawn. This summation is the bill before you.

Activities funded here primarily relate to the conservation and development of our natural resources and to the well-being of people for whom we have been delegated the responsibility by statute, treaty, or international agreement.

The committee considered total budget estimates of $1,568,694,500. This amount includes both new budget—obligational—authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authorizations. We have recommended appropriations totaling $1,540,332,000, a reduction of $28,362,500 below the budget estimate and an increase of $10,165,865 over fiscal year 1969.

To those who question the increased funding over the 1969 fiscal year, I would point out that you cannot have annual pay increases and accelerate the activities of various agencies without the total cost of operations increasing from year to year.

We have economized in other years and those economies have cost us bitterly. I said in February of this year before the House that the U.S. Forest Service reports that we are importing 13 percent of the lumber we use domestically. Future prospects look even bleaker, for tree planting and forest management practices are limited by budget restrictions. In order to have adequate lumber by the year 2000 trees must be in the ground now.

A great deal of the lumber shortages in America today can be linked directly to lack of funds which has prevented imaginative and progressive forest management and planning.

Savings based on the destruction of our natural resources are false economy and can in the end do more to destroy this Nation than all the armadas of any mighty alien empire.

For example, if we do not attempt to solve the problem of water supply and pollution—plain drinking water if you please—we can build cities, develop space centers, and change all the housing and poverty conditions on earth without possessing that single most important requisite for a human being's existence—water.

Less than a mile from us, the Potomac is threatened by drought conditions. Its supply for Washington and Washington suburbs diminishes year by year and yet the city continues to grow. What answers do we make? Do we cut research and water resources development; do we cut the geological survey which will enable us to fully explore underground water resources; or say "Build and go thirsty"?

Frankly, I do not think we are that stupid.

Also, may I call your attention to page 5 of our report where we pointed out that in 20 short years we have lost our position of dominance as a mineral resources consumer and producer.

> We are now producing between 25 and 30 percent of the world's requirements. Translated into dollars, this means we are producing about $25 billion worth. By the end of the century, it is predicted we will be consuming about $90 billion worth annually and producing something in the range of $45 billion worth annually. In other words, the present deficit of $6 or $6.5 billion would increase to $45 billion by the end of the century. To summarize, our deficit was only about 9 percent of our consumption requirements in 1950; our deficit now is in the range of 25 percent of our consumption requirements; and it is predicted by the end of the century our deficit will be in the range of 50 percent of our consumption requirements.

This past year constant timber shortages, causing a tight lumber market and exorbitant prices throughout the country, and related to one of America's greatest problems—housing—presented such irrefutable facts and figures that the committee has recommended additional funds to increase the production of timber in years to come, as well as recognized the necessity to develop the watersheds of this Nation for our expanding population and to provide other multiple-purpose uses of the forests.

Similarly, funds included in this bill for mine health and safety are $2,448,000 above the $12,334,000 available in fiscal 1969. In view of recent mine disasters, the committee would be remiss if it did not provide the additional funds necessary to improve the health and safety conditions of this Nation's mines. These are only a very few reasons why it is impractical to limit funding in this bill to the appropriation level of fiscal year 1969.

A summary by activity of major increases and decreases in funding for the 1970 fiscal year, compared to fiscal year 1969 is as follows:

Summary of increases and decreases

MAJOR INCREASES	
Education and welfare services and other assistance to American Indians	$35,395,000
Construction of roads	16,070,000
Administration of territories	11,615,000
Management, protection, and maintenance of national parks	11,528,000
Conservation and development of natural resources	4,759,000
Geological surveys, investigations, and research	4,711,000
Smithsonian Institution and related activities	2,586,000
Mine health and safety	2,448,000
Arts and humanities	1,500,000
Subtotal, major increases	90,612,000
MAJOR DECREASES	
Acquisition of land under the land and water conservation fund (1969 base included $65,000,000 for liquidation of contract authorization for Redwood National Park)	40,500,000
Forest firefighting costs	20,118,000
Construction of facilities	5,858,000
Helium fund	5,200,000
Construction of fishing vessels	3,000,000
Migratory bird conservation fund	2,500,000
Solid waste disposal	$1,067,000
Prototype desalting plant	1,000,000
Subtotal, major decreases	79,243,000
Other increases and decreases (net)	−1,203,135
Net total increase over fiscal year 1969	10,165,865

The committee also influenced by income generated by activities funded in this bill. Unlike many appropriations bills which will be before you, this bill is responsible for sizable U.S. revenue. The following table indicates a comparison of appropriations and total receipts for fiscal years 1968, 1969, and 1970. The data for 1968 is actual and the amounts for fiscal years 1969 and 1970 are based on the latest estimates.

Item	Fiscal year 1968	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970
Appropriations	$1,485,712,350	$1,530,166,135	$1,540,332,000
Receipts:			
Department of the Interior	1,343,372,205	805,580,636	1,013,719,096
Forest Service	218,323,000	262,170,000	341,625,000
Total receipts	1,561,695,205	1,067,750,636	1,355,344,096

A further fiscal consideration is the massive income tax generated for use by the total U.S. Government by forests, parks, mines, grazing, fishing, water development, and other resources uses.

You will note the following list of selective items indicate the extent of activities of some of the programs funded in this bill:

Management of public lands (acres):	
Bureau of Land Management	453,075,091
U.S. Forest Service	186,921,196
Bureau of Indian Affairs	55,426,645
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	29,217,587
National Park Service	27,940,849
Total acres	752,581,368

	Current inventory	1970 construction
Road construction (miles):		
Bureau of Land Management	52,000	385
Bureau of Indian Affairs	18,054	427
National Park Service	9,979	15
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	6,015	
U. S. Forest Service	202,794	8,758
Total miles	288,842	9,585

	1968 actual	1970 estimate
Recreation visitations (millions):		
National Park Service	145	171
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	18	23
Bureau of Land Management	57	82
U.S. Forest Service	156	171
Total visitations	376	447

TIMBER PRODUCTION

Forest Service: An estimated harvest of 13 billion board feet is anticipated for 1970, with receipts from sales of approximately $327 million. The timber harvest provides the raw material base for over 1 million jobs, $11.5 billion in gross national product, and $2.4 billion in returns to the Treasury under the present tax rates. This volume represents about one-fourth of the total timber and 40 percent of the softwood timber cut for industrial purposes annually, and is equivalent to the construction of about 1.6 million average-sized homes.

Bureau of Land Management: Administers the sale of over 1.5 billion board feet of timber annually.

GRAZING

Bureau of Land Management: Administers grazing of more than 10 million head of livestock and 2.7 million big game animals.

Forest Service: Administers the grazing of 7.2 million head of livestock. This provides a continued and necessary source of grazing required by 20,000 family-size ranch units.

INDIAN EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Indian children in Federal day and boarding schools, 55,000; Indian children in public schools, 75,000; Indians provided with welfare guidance services, 39,000; operation and maintenance of 300 Indian irrigation systems.

MINERAL RESOURCES

Bureau of Land Management: Administers mining and mineral leasing on approximately 760 million acres of land in the continental United States and more than 250 million acres of submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf with estimated receipts of $944,300,000 in 1970.

Geological Survey—Provides the basic scientific and engineering data concerning water, land, and mineral resources; and supervises the development and production of minerals and mineral fuels on leased Federal, Indian, and Outer Continental Shelf lands. The annual value of production on Federal, Indian, and Outer Continental Shelf mineral leases is $2.8 billion, with royalties accruing to the Government of $360 million. Bonuses from lease sales this fiscal year will approximate $200 million.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

A total of $400,459,000, or 26 percent of the total funds provided in this bill, directly benefits the American Indians. In addition, an estimated $119 million will be available from Federal programs operated by other agencies not included in this bill.

I wish it were easy to offer you today, as many may attempt to do, quick and easy solutions for our "Indian problem." We readily admit shortcomings in the field of accomplishment for the Indian people. Yet, I think we should recognize some of our great achievements at the same time that we note our failures—or perhaps that is no longer an American custom.

I am sure that many of you may not realize that the system of education for our Indians is relatively of short duration. It was not until after World War II, for example, that the Navajo Reservation even had education. It is also interesting to note that during World War

XUM

II Navajo boys distinguished themselves in the service of our country, particularly in the South Pacific, where their language was the single code unbreakable by the Japanese.

We have been a long time in the business of attempting to manage Indian affairs, but we have been a relatively short time in the progressive and intelligent approach to Indian education and we must not count all our steps as failures.

I had the privilege this year of visiting the Navajo Reservation and talking with hundreds of young people who said to me: "Mrs. Hansen, we are not burning the country down." These same young people, when asked about the thing they enjoyed most about their boarding schools, replied: "The faculty. They give us so much."

I met groups of young students preparing themselves for college, taking advantage of the Indian scholarship program. I met other groups actively interested in planning and discussing better recreation facilities, the preservation of their culture, the landscaping of their schools. At the Santa Fe Institute of Indian Art I saw some of the loveliest work in the arts I have ever seen. These are the Indian young people of today and to those of us who serve on the committee, they are a great source of pride and an inspiration which says to us unmistakably, "Do better. This is a quickennig century and we must move faster and faster."

It is in this spirit that the committee has tried to respond. We have no apologies for the recent funding of our Indian activities and money has not always been the problem with Indian development. There have been management mistakes that can be avoided and I would like to take this opportunity and a moment to point out some of these. In the meantime, during fiscal year 1960, appropriations were $166,444,000. In 10 years appropriations for the American Indian have more than doubled.

As I noted earlier, I do not even presume to attempt any immediate utopian solutions for Indian programs, nor does the committee, but we do repeat that we have serious concerns about certain facets of administration. The committee is seriously concerned that to date no Commissioner of Indian Affairs has been appointed, yet this is the single largest agency within Interior dealing with people.

We did not fund, as you will note, the National Council on Indian Opportunity. Why? Because since January they have never held a formal meeting, and yet this could have been an outstanding activity.

To the immediate present, I would think that the first and most urgent demand in the Department of Interior is the appointment of an able, energetic administrator of the same ability as that great Indian, Bob Bennett, who has just had his service terminated. In passing, may I note that Mr. Bennett was the second Indian in the history of the United States to serve as Commissioner.

I want to say, however, to the next Commissioner, whoever he may be, will have the firm support of this committee to make sure the funds appropriated for the welfare and benefit of American Indians will actually be used for that purpose rather than adding more bureaucrats to a bureaucracy already top-heavy.

For example, I am advised that last year, when the proposed kindergarten program was cut in half, the scheduled personnel of administration was left as programed and was not cut in half; this, in spite of the fact that personnel ceilings were in effect, that money was tight for expenditures, and that needs were massive in the Indian education field. This is unconscionable. Indians need the money, not bureaucracy.

The committee wishes the next Commissioner well, and we also would like to point out he faces many challenges—exciting challenges, if you please—for these are people. In fact, the Bureau of Indian Affairs administers and works with the activities of 452,000 Indians of whom 55,400 are Alaska natives and Aleuts. There are also 650 Pribilof Islanders.

Relative to Indian education, where you will find a total of $110,600,000 in this bill for Indian education, the committee would like to recommend again—and we have done it repeatedly—a straight line educational reorganization within the Bureau comparable to any good State Department of Education under which educational policies promulgated in the Washington office can be administered throughout the Nation. To date this has not been accomplished. There is fragmentation, interference, and overlapping jurisdiction by officers who themselves are perhaps not educators.

It seems to me that the time has come for the educational direction of the BIA to be excellent, competent, imaginative, and progressive; to make sure that: First, there are good textbooks, useful and available for the children which will reflect a rapport with their lives; second, that we increase sizably the number of Indian aides in our school rooms, particularly in those lower grades with language difficulties; third, that we present a program of home economics which will teach young Indian girls to be good homemakers in order that they may not in the future contribute to the lack of nutrition of this Nation because of inabilities to understand how to buy, and cook foods for their families or budget their incomes; and fourth, that we step up vocational training for useable job skills.

Again, may I repeat, Federal Indian schools must be administered efficiently and there are many who contend that the Federal boarding schools are no longer necessary. The committee agrees that Federal boarding schools are not the most desirable way of education. On the other hand, the instant abolition of these schools would jeopardize the health, safety, nutrition, and opportunities of many thousands of young people. It is urgent that money be well spent in these schools until that day when boarding facilities are no longer necessary due to improved road conditions, reliability of water sources, and firm establishment of village population centers. This program is only a prelude to full participation in the American public school system toward which hopefully, our Indian people are rapidly moving.

The BIA and the State of Alaska are to be congratulated. Instead of rebuilding Mount Edgecombe as a boarding school, funds will be provided for dormitory facilities in that travel-difficult State, but these dormitories will only be for housing young people who will attend the public schools in various communities of Alaska. This is genuine progress, and I commend the people of Alaska who have worked so diligently on this.

I also would like to commend the people in the district of the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON) for their diligence and work on behalf of the Eufaula School. There are other schools in Arizona and in New Mexico which are participating even more fully in the public school system.

We have urged in our report that to the fullest possible extent young Indian people be given the opportunity to attend public schools, and we have urged the BIA to accelerate their efforts in this direction.

As a further means of improving the educational system, the Bureau should make increased efforts to develop Indian Tribal Advisory Boards and to train school board members to participate in the operation of all Indian schools. The BIA should exert every possible effort in promoting genuine family relationships between pupils, schools, and parents.

Concerted action should be taken to program schedules to increase the frequency and length of visits of parents with children in the boarding schools. It may even be possible to contract certain of these necessary related services with the tribes.

We have some other comments to make. The committee regrets that approximately $1 million was spent for a deluxe accounting system which, to my knowledge, is not in full operation, yet when committee members visited Indian schools we found that teachers had to use their own personal money to buy fundamental and essential schoolroom supplies.

We also found that in spite of a top-heavy administrative bureaucracy personnel, there were situations in Indian boarding schools where there was only one counselor for more than 100 subteenage students during night hours. I remind you—one counselor to cope with the panic and dangers of catastrophes such as fire; to deal with the emotional frustrations of 7-year-old students transplanted from a hogan to a boarding school and a life with which he is unfamiliar; one counselor to discuss the problems of 12-year-olds who may have been taken to Gallup and have seen the bars wide open with everybody drinking and have raised the usual youthful questions.

We must have more counselors and we have provided in our funding this year, the request that there be one model school with total model counseling and adequate guidance service, so that this may be evaluated and noted.

XUM

We have also provided money for supplies. We have provided money for summer programs on Indian reservations and these, I may say, will help overcome the language gap faster than anything else.

We have provided $4 million for the construction of 59 kindergarten classrooms and employee quarters in Bureau schools. Again, this is a step to overcome language and cultural problems of young Indian students.

We regret we could not finance kindergartens for all our non-Federal schools, but we are convinced that the States which have this responsibility can participate and can furnish to the BIA in time for the next fiscal year's planning accurate figures of amounts and classrooms needed. The cooperative program can then be established between our public schools and the BIA with economy and understanding.

In my own State we are proud that we have a kindergarten-to-college program and we are proud we spare no effort for these youngsters. We want an inventory from the States, through the BIA, of the exact necessities and I can assure you that the committee next year will proceed with this program.

Also, relative to schools, the committee has a feeling that before any more schools are constructed at the Federal boarding school level:

First. A complete and comprehensive survey be done for their actual need making sure that public school facilities are not available before there is further large-scale planning of large-scale schools.

America is proud of her public education system and the American Indian should participate to the fullest in this. It is his heritage too.

The second step after this evaluation of our schools' physical needs which should also reflect maintenance status and repair needs should then be design and planning with an adequate opportunity to review the adequacy and utility of plans developed.

Let me give you an example of what I mean. I saw in several boarding schools elegant reception rooms which were underused and yet according to students in a dialog between us—of which there needs to be more, may I add—"We would like a place that is informal and ours where we can talk, visit and have some recreation".

Also, there needs to be a look at planning in the creation context. It will be necessary, I am convinced, that we move into a recognition that swimming is not a "frill" and that swimming pools, which are not luxuries in the Air Force, Army, or Navy, are not luxuries for Indian children either.

The same is true of tennis courts and other active outdoor exercise opportunities which should be made available for total physical and emotional fitness. It is well to remember that these Federal schools do not have substantial opportunities to enlist Rotarians, chambers of commerce, and other businessmen who participate in team and game advancement in the usual American school.

The third step then should be actual funding of construction. At the present time, planning and design as well as construction, are all funded at once and there are always immense carryovers. In no other phase of our construction within this bill is this procedure followed.

For the information of those Members of Congress who hear nothing but criticism of the Federal schools and suggest they be abolished immediately, may I say that they are doing a better-than-average job of education. Young people are going on to school, and there are reasons, compelling and overwhelming, against total instant abolition. Among these are—

First. The provision of food, for we have thousands of young people who, if dependent upon their present home conditions and because of poverty depths on the Indian reservations, would have no chance to have breakfast, lunch, or dinner. This is not necessarily a criticism of parental conditions. It is simply one of the realistic facts of life about poverty, working parents, and school bus travel. Youngsters in a hurry to catch a bus do not bother to sit down and eat a breakfast, nor do they prepare a lunch, and working parents may never arrive home in time to cook a dinner.

In one of the pueblos south of Santa Fe we heard of innumerable problems within the families where working mothers did not arrive home until 9 o'clock at night. Before the children left this day school for home, they were given a glass of milk and crackers. I would suggest that this program be stepped up to include something warm for it well may be the only meal they receive until the next morning. Frankly, I would rather spend money on boarding or day school food to feed these young Americans than I would to think that in a land of two-car affluence we allow our young Indians to go without food.

Second. As I drove on a bleak wintry day with a blizzard coming out of the north along the road to Gallup, I saw two little Indian youngsters descending from a school bus. I asked how far these children would have to walk to their hogan. Approximately 2½ miles, I was told. Dusk was falling. If the blizzard had worsened, it would well have been that those children would never have been seen again, alive.

Therefore, the committee recognizes some of the difficulties—roads to build, water sources to secure, village developments, the general economy of many tribes to overcome—before we casually and with "political" promises blithely write off our Federal school facilities until they are replaced with something better.

I would rather face the realities of these facts than worry about the security of my seat in Congress.

In the meantime, we must do the very finest job we can at our Federal schools. However, I think the committee wants to say to the BIA, "We have had enough of moving young Indians from Alaska to Oregon and from Oregon to Oklahoma. They are all better nearer their homes rather than being shipped away for a year at a time."

There are plenty of Northwest youngsters who desperately need schools in the Northwest; there are plenty of Alaskans who need schools in Alaska; there are plenty of Oklahoma Indians who need schools there. Let us rearrange our bureaucracy to recognize that children are human beings and that it is not nearly so important to insure the security of a bureaucrat as it is the well-being of a child. There is one thing which I can assure you, we are not going to run out of Indian young people for many years to come.

I do want to point out one additional project with which I was deeply impressed on the Navajo Reservation, and that is the Navajo Community College. The committee supports its goals and if the authorizing legislation had been passed or if we had been completely sure that within the BIA itself there was enough authorization for the construction of college buildings, we would have provided funds for planning and design. However, I do wish to announce at this time that through the Economic Development Administration, a $2 million low-interest loan has been approved for dormitory construction at the Navajo Community College.

Also, they have received $200,000 from adult basic education at HEW.

I may point out that this is not a segregated college. It is a college open to any student in the United States, and with this institution and others, I urge that the BIA take advantage of every possible opportunity to provide more vocational education and more academic higher educational opportunities, for we are in great need of Indian teachers, doctors, lawyers, nurses, supervisors, and skilled workers. To those who sit around and criticize all young people, I want to salute with great pride the Indian students of America. It is a joy to serve them.

Also, while I am saluting them, I want to salute as well the young people of Micronesia who are at our nursing schools and our institutions of higher learning; the young people of Samoa, and the young people of Guam who are receiving academic training.

Once in a while I think we should be proud of people who accomplish something. They may not be on their way to the moon, but they have risen, perhaps against greater handicaps, and when these young people receive their diplomas, I am sure every American can take pride in our scholarship programs.

In the field of other Indian programs, we have given a total for relocation and adult vocational training of $36,881,000; welfare and guidance services will receive $23,778,000; and for maintenance of law and order—dear to the hearts of Americans—there is $4,741,000.

Congress is often accused of having no imagination and no initiative. I am proud to report that one of the most successful Indian programs we have had is that of "work and learn" where young teenagers plan and manage community cleanups and village development and where they earn their spending money during their own sparetime work. This was inaugurated by the Interior Subcommittee of Appropriations.

The committee recommends an increase of $2 million over the budget esti-

XUM

mate to accelerate progress on the Navajo Irrigation Project. There have been many Presidential speeches about help for the Indian people, but I notice that the Bureau of the Budget, a creature, I am reminded constantly, of the President, has never yet seen fit to fully recommend construction programs for which there is capability. Yet it is upon completion of these irrigation systems in the dry Navajo land that the future of Agriculture and the decrease of poverty is based.

Therefore, we have departed from Presidential rhetoric and moved to fiscal action. It is my hope we can increase year by year this Navajo irrigation program so that it can be completed long before the end of the century.

I am proud also to commend the new program of Indian Resources Management to the BIA budget. I sincerely trust new industries emerging from Indian forests, Indian reservoirs, rivers and waterways can improve the income level of our Indian people.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

Another activity of national interest funded in this bill is the land and water conservation fund. The following table reflects the action taken by the committee in this connection:

Activity	Budget estimate	Committee bill, 1970	Change
1. Assistance to States	$77,000,000	$75,000,000	−$2,000,000
2. Federal land acquisition program:			
National Park Service:			
Assateague Island National Seashore	1,789,718	1,789,718	
Biscayne National Monument	1,000,000	1,650,000	+650,000
Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area		2,000,000	+2,000,000
Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore	1,500,000	2,000,000	+500,000
North Cascades National Park	250,000	250,000	
Ozark National Scenic Riverway	558,100	558,100	
Inholdings	674,182	674,182	
Grand Teton National Park	1,050,000	1,050,000	
Padre Island National Seashore (court award)	7,800,000	7,800,000	
Wild and scenic rivers	100,000		−100,000
National trails system	50,000		−50,000
Subtotal	14,772,000	17,772,000	+3,000,000
Liquidation of contract authority:			
Assateague Island National Seashore	3,500,000	3,500,000	
Biscayne National Monument	2,500,000	2,500,000	
Carl Sandburg Home National Historic Site	203,000	203,000	
Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area	2,561,000	2,561,000	
Guadalupe Mountains National Park	1,015,000	1,015,000	
Herbert Hoover National Historic Site	150,000	150,000	
Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore	4,000,000	4,000,000	
Ozark National Scenic Riverway	500,000	500,000	
Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore	420,000	420,000	
San Juan Island National Historic Park	33,000	33,000	
Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site	47,500	47,500	
2. Federal land acquisition program—Continued			
Liquidation of contract authority—Continued			
Whiskeytown National Recreation Area	$239,000	$239,000	
Inholdings	359,500	359,500	
Total, liquidation of contract authority	15,528,000	15,528,000	
Total, National Park Service	30,300,000	33,300,000	+$3,000,000
Forest Service:			
Wilderness areas	330,000	330,000	
Other recreation areas	11,170,000	11,170,000	
Total, Forest Service	11,500,000	11,400,000	
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife:			
Endangered species:			
Mason Neck Wildlife Refuge	375,000	375,000	
Patuxent Wildlife Research Center	375,000	375,000	
Total, endangered species	750,000	750,000	
McNary National Wildlife Refuge	50,000	50,000	
Tennessee National Wildlife Refuge	200,000	200,000	
Total, national refuge and hatchery systems	250,000	250,000	
Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	1,000,000	1,000,000	
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation: Emergency planning and acquisition	1,000,000		−1,000,000
Administrative expenses	3,200,000	3,200,000	
Total, Federal program	47,000,000	49,000,000	+2,000,000
Total, 1970	124,000,000	124,000,000	

THE 1970 CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION

Contract authorization for fiscal year 1970 is approved for the following land acquisition:

National Park Service:	
Assateague Island National Seashore	$1,000,000
Biscayne National Monument	4,000,000
Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area	2,550,000
Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore	8,500,000
North Cascades National Park	250,000
Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore	1,000,000
Wild and scenic rivers	500,000
Inholdings	5,000,000
Total, National Park Service	22,800,000
Forest Service:	
Arkansas:	
Ouachita National Forest	6,400
Ozark National Forest	30,794
Colorado:	
Pike National Forest	15,000
Roosevelt National Forest	173,000
Georgia: Chattahoochee National Forest	314,508
Idaho:	
Clearwater National Forest	100,000
Salmon National Forest	150,000
Sawtooth National Forest	102,000
Illinois: Shawnee National Forest	150,000
Forest Service—Continued	
Indiana: Hoosier National Forest	$200,000
Kentucky:	
Daniel Boone National Forest	479,000
Jefferson National Forest	86,275
Michigan:	
Hiawatha National Forest	40,000
Manistee National Forest	200,000
Minnesota: Chippewa National Forest	50,000
Missouri:	
Clark National Forest	400,000
Mark Twain National Forest	439,000
Nebraska: Nebraska National Forest	121,000
Nevada: Toiyabe National Forest	2,200,000
North Carolina:	
Nantahala National Forest	34,000
Pisgah National Forest	150,450
Ohio: Wayne National Forest	110,000
Oklahoma: Ouachita National Forest	92,245
Oregon: Siskiyou National Forest	350,000
South Carolina:	
Francis Marion National Forest	250,000
Sumter National Forest	47,000
Utah: Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area	400,000
Virginia:	
George Washington National Forest	30,128
Jefferson National Forest	379,200
Forest Service—Continued	
Wisconsin: Chequamegon National Forest	$100,000
Total, Forest Service	7,200,000
Total contract authorization	30,000,000

BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

In the committee report, we have instructed the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to give particular consideration to the needs of those States which have found that the 1968 directives urging rigid guidelines of one-third for development and two-thirds for land acquisition have resulted in hardship due to conditions peculiar to the States where ample recreational land was available but a facilities deficiency existed.

In providing adequate facilities to alleviate these situations, the committee directs the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to give particular consideration to these situations and exercise careful, thoughtful flexibility in interpreting proposed guidelines for individual circumstances that merit such actions.

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

We have appropriated the full amount requested by the administration of $41,612,000 for the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands.

The committee would again like to comment that the primary thrust of this program continues to be directed toward the accomplishment of practical projects which will provide immediate and necessary improvements of education, public health and sanitation facilities, and economic development opportunities.

We have had too many years of bureaucracy in the context of the British Indian civil service. We have a mass of studies, huge visionary plans and yet public dispensaries are dilapidated, many schools need activity, and there is a plain, down-to-earth, commonsense need for adequate water in the villages. Let there be less publicity and more action; less departmental movies and more motion.

The problems are many and time is not on our side.

For those of you who may wonder how many people are supported by the Department of the Interior there are 96,700 in the Trust Territories of the Pacific; 28,200 in America Samoa; 63,000 in the Virgin Islands; and 100,000 in Guam.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

The bill provides a total of $123,017,000 for the National Park Service. This is an increase of $18,157,000 over funds available in fiscal 1969, and a reduction of $3,646,000 below estimate.

From today's world of ever-increasing leisure time, tensions derived from urban living, and the desire toward a world with which this generation did not have the privilege of growing up—serenity of life within a forest or on an empty desert—there have come ever-increasing pressures to the national park facilities. As I noted much earlier, visitor numbers have increased both during summer and winter months, especially where winter activities have become popular.

Park visitation, 1957–69

Fiscal year:	
1957	59,285,000
1958	65,660,000
1959	70,287,000
1960	73,620,300
1961	84,008,500
1962	92,160,300
1963	100,876,500
1964	107,446,700
1965	113,703,200
1966	127,440,300
1967	135,325,600
1968	145,342,200
1969 (estimated)	158,310,800

SUMMER IN THE PARKS

There can be another change during these years, that of off-season vacations due to adoption of a 12-month system of public schools where vacation periods are shifted. Readiness to reflect these necessities is mandatory.

Again I would like to call to the attention of this Congress a program originally inspired by the Interior Subcommittee's interest, that of "summer in the parks." Why this program? Because the committee firmly believes that those who grow up knowing what their land is all about and what their heritage is will have less inclination to destroy it. Therefore, in the inner cities where there are park lands we are working to make sure that children and people who have never before had the opportunity to understand their heritage know its depth and meaning.

In Washington, D.C., alone, a quarter of a million people participated last summer and I may remind this House that there were no riots during the period of this playtime.

Perhaps I do not speak for all the committee, but to me life need not always be only a thing of grim, hard toil, and despair, but of joy, fulfillment, and an ever-increasing love of my land.

Due in large part to personnel restrictions and various fund limitations, the Department of Interior decided to close many park facilities for 1 or 2 days a week during the past several months. Public reaction was critical. When an individual drives several hundred miles to see a particular attraction, only to find the facility closed, he is not pleased.

Therefore, the bill provides $8,443,000 over the amount available in 1969 to furnish adequate services for increased visitations to the national parks; provide acceptable standards of maintenance for them; and to keep parks open on a 7-day-per-week basis.

To those who question the appropriation of funds of this magnitude for so-called recreational purposes at a time when we are faced with a surtax and many urgent requirements for Federal funds, I would cite a recent study which was made on the impact of national park system travel on the national economy. The following is a summary of that report which indicates the contribution travel in our national parks can make to our national economy:

The value of the national park system to Americans is not measurable in strictly monetary terms. But it can be shown that travel to the national parks, monuments, and other areas of the system contributes far more to the economy dollarwise than generally has been supposed.

The park system is of such significance both qualitatively and quantitatively as to occupy a major role in the daily life of a nation undergoing marked social and economic changes. Trips to the national park system in 1967 benefited the national economy to the following extent: $6.35 billion in travel expenditures which resulted in $4.76 billion in personal income, $5.71 billion added to the gross national product, $952 million in Federal taxes.

The $4.76 billion in personal income represents more than $23 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. This figure is quite sizable as a matter of gain to the Nation from assets being preserved for posterity. Unlike the mining and the oil industries, for example, which give up nonrenewable resources, the national park system yields its contribution with little or no diminution of its resources values. Wilderness resources are even increasing in value, materially as well as in less tangible ways.

LITTER

For those taxpayers who want to make a direct contribution to their Nation's money-saving efforts, may I suggest they concern themselves with the individual's contribution to the cleanup of litter. During our hearings, the cost to our government of litter and its removal was fantastic. In the Department of Interior—Parks, BLM, and BIA—during the past year, $2,170,000 was expended. For the Forest Service which included designated camping areas, hunters, fishermen, and areas not designated as official camping spots, $17,057,000 was spent. Thus, here is a total of $19,257,000 directly attributable to the carelessness of recreation users—or we could call it the cost of messy Americans?

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The bill provides $95,628,000, the budget estimate, and an increase of $4,711,000 over 1969 for Geological Survey.

The funds will enable this agency to continue its very important work in the fields of mapping, mineral resources, surveys, water resources, investigations, and related activities.

Included is $3,800,000 for the earth resource observation satellite—EROS—to be operated in coordination with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This mapping technique research project is expected to yield more accurate, up-to-date maps at greatly reduced costs. It would also appear there is an excellent possibility that EROS will enhance capability for locating additional water resources and assist in quicker recognition of developing detrimental environmental situations.

U.S. FOREST SERVICE

TIMBER

Earlier I mentioned those circumstances relative to the production of timber which are relevant to lumber prices and housing. At this time I would like to amplify those statements in the context of our needed timber supplies, the problems of log exports, the necessity for providing adequate management techniques and road construction for the future.

Strong recommendations are made by some to increase the timber cut in our National forests regardless of sustained yield limitations. Others, interested in the wilderness aspects of our National Forests, recreation, pollution and the protective watershed role of American forests, demand that there be an appreciation and integration of these facilities wtih commercial cutting activities. The committee, recognizing these diverse viewpoints and reiterating the multiple-use forest concept, has designed the bill to reflect the total public need and interest.

The U.S. Forest Service estimates a harvest of 13 billion board feet in fiscal year 1970. This volume represents about one-fourth of the total timber produced in this Nation, and 40 percent of the softwood timber cut for industrial purposes annually.

The Bureau of Land Management administers the sale of over 1.5 billion board feet of timber annually, produced on 39 million acres of commercial forest land administered by that agency.

In its consideration of the budget estimate submitted by the U.S. Forest Service, the committee approved all the funds requested and provided an additional $6,961,000, a large portion of which represented restoration of reductions made in the amended budget estimate.

Although the committee recommended a reduction of $7,000,000 in the forest roads and trails program—appropriation to liquidate contract authorization—this will not restrict the budgeted program for fiscal year 1970, inasmuch as increased receipts over the original estimate will provide at least an additional $7,000,000 for this activity.

An important factor in committee consideration was the discussion in the hearings held with the Chief of the Forest Service. He testified that there are now 4¾ million acres of national forest land which is nonproductive, or at a very low state of productivity. In addition, he stated there are 13 million acres of young timber in need of salvage and thinning to accelerate growth. The potential of these acres is an annual increase in production level of about 5 billion board feet, more than is now being produced, or nearly 40 percent above present harvest rates.

The estimated cost for achieving this increased production is about $866,000,000, and at the 1968 stumpage price level, the increased production could return more than than $100,000,000 a year.

It was pointed out that a feasible acceleration over a 5-year period would be a graduated increase to $30,000,000 by the fifth year. The additional production, obviously, could not be obtained immediately but would have to be programed over a period of time.

It was also stated that a $35,000,000 program increase per year for 4 or 5 years would be needed for additional investments in roads to maintain the present level of production.

According to Forest Service statistics, for each $1 million of increased investment in planting and timber culture on the national forests, almost 11 million board feet of annual production $215,000 at 1968 prices would be available, and would continue for a number of years in the future.

Testimony developed during the hearings further revealed that the allowable cut for the U.S. Forest Service could be increased by one-third without violating sound conservation principles under present levels of management. This could be achieved if sufficient funds were available for timber stand improvements, reforestation, more intensive management, and more intensive utilization. Until this is done, allowable cuts cannot be increased significantly.

An additional $2,000,000 is recommended for forest fire control under State and private forestry cooperation. With this increase, the bill provides $16,396,000 of Federal funds to provide more adequate fire protection for 517,000,000 acres of State and privately owned forest land in the Nation.

The committee also recommended the full amounts it deemed practical for forest activity in the administration of the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Indian Affairs forest lands. The slight reduction recommended by the committee for forest management in the Bureau of Land Management appropriation will be more than offset by additional receipts from the sale of timber, ONC lands.

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

The bill also provides $41,816,000 for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. The committee continues to be concerned over the status of our commercial fishing industry, especially since we are now importing 75 percent of the fish products we consume domestically. Our imports were only 25 percent in 1950 and the upward trend is alarming.

Fishing is an important part of our economy. We hope that more serious attention will be given to improving our status among the fishing nations of the world.

The committee's concern is reflected by an increase in the appropriation of $563,000 over the budget estimate for additional research on pollock fishing off the northeast coast of the United States where haddock fishing has been a primary source of income but, for various reasons, that haddock supply has materially declined.

For those interested in dollar amounts now available in the various commercial fishery areas, there is provided $250,000 for general research to partially restore funds reduced in fiscal year 1970; $42,000 for jellyfish is added, a total of $750,000; $152,000 has been added for catfish, thus making a total of $301,000. Of major importance also are items as follows: Designing fish protective devices, $20,000; research of fish migration over dams, $200,000; Columbia River fishery development, $180,000—which will provide production of fingerlings at hatcheries.

The committee has recommended in the construction area: $1,625,000 for the third and final phase of Willamette Falls fishway, and $400,000 with the use of any other available funds for the construction of a fish protein concept.

Summarizing our activities on commercial fisheries, I would like to point out to the Congress that competition with Communist countries of the world is not only by armaments; it is also by development, protection, and knowledge of our natural resources. What profit this Nation if we have developed missile systems only to have some other nation say, "Because of our sophisticated research and development in the world of fish resources and our ability to outfish you, America, You will eat only what we allow."

NATIONAL FOUNDATION OF THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

The committee recommends a $16 million expenditure for the arts and humanities.

There are millions of dollars in this bill providing outdoor recreation of various kinds to Americans. Conversely, there are millions of Americans who will never set foot in a forest or hold a fish pole. These people live in cities and towns. Some are handicapped and some do not have the means to supply themselves with expensive guns and sports equipment. Use of the mind, however, is free. Museums, art galleries, outdoor concerts can be enjoyed by those who have no transportation.

The report of the Commission on the Humanities which preceded the congressional report of the establishment of the Humanities Endowment said:

> The Commission conceives of the humanities, not merely as academic disciplines confined to schools and colleges, but as functioning components of society which affect the lives and well-being of all the population . . . The humanities are the study of that which is most human. Throughout man's conscious past they have played a central role in forming, preserving, and transforming the social, moral, and aesthetic values of every man and every age.
>
> Throughout the centuries art, music, sculpture and literature have made man what he is, or the lack of them, perhaps, made him what he isn't.

On Saturday, July 12, the Seattle Post-Intelligencer said:

> Look back over the centuries. What do we remember best of ancient Athens? Poets like Pindar; playwrights like Aeschylus, Sophocles. Euripides and Aristophanes; sculptors like Praxiteles. Who was the weathiest grain merchant in Periclean, Athens? Esoteric scholars might know. The only reason most of us know Maecenas was one of the wealthiest men in Rome is that Horace wrote poems about him.
>
> More people know more about Shakespeare than they do about Elizabeth I. Tourists visit tombs in Italy not for those buried there but to gape at statuary by Michelangelo. The arts are the culmination—if you will, the apex—of a civilization.
>
> But the arts are more than mere monuments. There is in each of us a creative instinct, a yearning to—in the ancient Greek sense—make something. Few of us have the talent; even fewer the genius.
>
> The theater, for example, music, too, gives us that. And we haven't even mentioned the need for beauty, or that artists usually anticipate the future. They speak to us not only of our time, with sensitivity, but of the human condition in general. They do this with a candor and an honesty, with a set of standards that are rare anywhere.
>
> We face in this country a crisis, and we aren't even aware of it yet. In the next several decades technological advances will increase leisure time for Americans. What will they do with it? Under population pressures present facilities will be utterly inadequate. Where are the appropriations to enlarge them?

The same columnist, Mr. Stromberg, goes on to say:

> The undeclared war in Vietnam costs $2.3 million an hour.

The total appropriation of $16 million for the Arts and Humanities is less than 8 hours of this war cost.

The humanities are bringing us face to face with some of our national problems viewed through the eyes of history. We search now in history for insight into the grim beginning where some of our present problems started as well as for insight and guidance from those deeds which have added great luster.

Finally, I quote the words that are engraved above one of the Smithsonian Institution's buildings. These words were spoken by John Quincy Adams, the sixth President of the United States:

> Whoever increases knowledge multiplies the uses to which he is able to turn the gift of his creator.

XUM

AMCHITKA

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to review the major items in the bill before us. However, it is impossible to touch all subjects of public interest today and which the committee has taken cognizance of through its hearings. If I were to take the time, my report would not be completed within the debate allowed. I may comment that I am not sure Congress is always wise in presenting in such a short time the total facets of such a tremendous area of public interest and governmental management as this bill encompasses.

However, among fields of concern today are two I would like to mention briefly. The committee is completely aware of the atomic testing and its related problems at Amchitka in the Aleutian Islands. I have been increasingly disturbed by the potential of this testing in the areas of wildlife, fish resources, and damage to the earth's crust. Throughout our hearings I have urged that all departments, particularly the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and Geological Survey, continue an eagle-eyed surveillance upon Amchitkan activities or we may find ourselves face to face with something far worse and far more explosive—if you pardon the pun—than the Santa Barbara oil spill.

PRIBILOF

In another field related to the management of our resources, the committee has taken note of the situation relative to seal killing and has asked the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to bring us a full report on new and more humane methods of conducting their operations in the Pribilofs.

Further brief summaries of other activities covered by this bill in the report are as follows:

OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH

Appropriation, 1969	$13,700,000
Estimate, 1970	13,300,000
Recommended, 1970	13,300,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1969	−400,000
Estimate, 1970	----------

While the Committee has recommended an appropriation of $13,300,000, the budget request for this activity, it has provided $10,000,000 for "Project Gasoline", a reduction of $652,000, and has approved the appropriation of $652,000 for the continuance of the contract with the Pittsburgh and Midway Coal Mining Company to demonstrate the technical feasibility of producing a very low-ash low-sulphur fuel from a wide range of coals at low cost.

CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS

Appropriation, 1969	$6,000,000
Estimate, 1970	6,000,000
Recommended, 1970	3,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1969	−3,000,000
Estimate, 1970	−3,000,000

Funds recommended under this appropriation item are required to carry out the provisions of Public Law 88–498, approved August 30, 1964, which amended and extended the act of June 12, 1960, authorizing the payment of construction differential subsidies for fishing vessels constructed under certain restrictive conditions.

Current existing legislation provides for the acceptance of applications received by June 30, 1969. In the absence of new legislation extending the time for the acceptance of new applications, the Committee is recommending an appropriation of $3,000,000, a reduction of $3,000,000 below the budget estimate, for the processing of applications already on hand.

FISHERMEN'S PROTECTIVE FUND

Appropriation, 1969	$60,000
Estimate, 1970	60,000
Recommended, 1970	60,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1969	-------
Estimate, 1970	-------

The committee recommends an appropriation of $60,000, the budget estimate, to implement the Fishermen's Protective Act—Public Law 90–482. This legislation authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreements to indemnify the owners and crews of American fishing vessels seized or detained by a foreign country under certain conditions.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

Management and investigations of resources

Appropriation, 1969	$47,246,000
Estimate, 1970	47,923,000
Recommended, 1970	48,503,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1969	+1,257,000
Estimate, 1970	+580,000

The amount recomended by the Committee compared with the 1970 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1970	Bill compared with estimate, 1970
Fish hatcheries	$9,686,000	+$600,000
Wildlife refuges	14,675,000	−50,000
Soil and moisture conservation	728,000	....
Management and enforcement	4,105,000	....
Fishery research	4,040,000	+30,000
Wildlife research	7,981,000	....
Fishery services	1,984,000	....
Wildlife services	3,487,000	....
River basin studies	1,419,000	....
Pesticides review	398,000	....
Total, management and investigations of resources	48,503,000	+580,000

The net increase of $580,000 above the budget estimate consists of a decrease of $50,000, and increases of $630,000 as follows:

Wildlife refuges, −$50,000: National interpretive planning capability.

Fishery research, +$30,000: Equipment for the fisheries research laboratory at Cortland, New York.

Fish hatcheries, +$600,000: Operational research and exhibit design for the National Fishery Center and Aquarium.

Construction

Appropriation, 1969	$1,891,000
Estimate, 1970	1,082,000
Recommended, 1970	1,686,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1969	—205,000
Estimate, 1970	+604,000

This appropriation finances the construction of fish hatchery and wildlife refuge facilities and fishery and wildlife research facilities.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,686,000, an increase of $604,000 over the budget estimate. Additional funding is provided for the following projects:

$150,000—Wildlife Refuge, Wichita Mountains, Oklahoma.

$136,000—Wolf Creek Hatchery, Kentucky.

$133,000—Quinault Hatchery, Washington.

$100,000—San Marcos Hatchery (Planning), Texas.

$50,000—Fishery Research Facilities, Port Aransas, Texas.

$35,000—Allegheny Hatchery, Pennsylvania.

PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

Appropriation, 1969	$604,000
Estimate, 1970	1,604,000
Recommended, 1970	1,600,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1969	+996,000
Estimate, 1970	−4,000

Funds provided in this appropriation are required to carry out the provisions of Public Law 89–665, approved October 15, 1966. This legislation was enacted to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the nation.

The total amount provided includes: $969,000 for matching grants-in-aid; ¢153,900 for maintenance of the National Register and administration of the grants-in-aid program; $75,100 for the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Support; $173,800 for the Historic Sites Survey; $170,800 for Historic American Buildings Survey; and $57,400 for administrative and technical support.

OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

Salaries and expenses

Appropriation, 1969	$11,181,000
Estimate, 1970	11,229,000
Recommended, 1970	11,229,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1969	+48,000
Estimate, 1970	----------

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $11,229,000, the budget estimate, for administration of the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (Public Law 88–379), as amended. This will provide:

$5,100,000 for assistance to States.

$3,000,000 for matching grants to Institutes.

$2,000,000 for water resources research to be performed by any qualified entity or individual as provided under Title II of the Act.

$1,129,000 for administrative expenses.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses

Appropriation, 1969	--------
Estimate, 1970	$225,000
Recommended, 1970	175,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1969	+175,000
Estimate, 1970	−50,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $175,000, a reduction of $50,000 below the budget estimate for the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.

This Commission was authorized by Public Law 89–491, July 4, 1966, to plan, encourage, develop, and coordinate the commemoration of the American Revolution Bicentennial. The celebration of this Bicentennial should be a momentous occasion. In order that this be achieved, a great deal of effective planning and coordination must be accomplished in the immediate future.

The Committee is not content with the progress to date, and views with serious concern the long delay in appointing the full membership of the Commission. It is hoped that indecision in the operation of this Commission will not detract from this Nation's celebration of its founding 200 years ago.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON INDIAN OPPORTUNITY

Salaries and expenses

Appropriation, 1969	$100,000
Estimate, 1970	300,000
Recommended, 1970	--------
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1969	−100,000
Estimate, 1970	−300,000

The National Council on Indian Opportunity was created by Executive Order 11399 on March 6, 1968. The purpose of the Council as stated in the Order was to encourage full use of Federal programs to benefit the Indian population; encourage interagency

> coordination and cooperation in carrying out Federal programs as they relate to Indians; appraise the impact and progress of Federal programs for Indians; and suggest ways to improve such programs.
>
> While the Committee on numerous occasions has indicated its interest in improving the welfare of the American Indians, at the same time it feels maximum results must be obtained from the expenditure of Federal funds. Based on information the Committee has received, it has serious doubts as to the actual need for the continuance of the Council. Many of the objectives of the Council as described in the Executive Order, are also the well-defined responsibilities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Committee understands that a formal meeting of the Council has not been held since January 1969.
>
> In view of the foregoing, the Committee has not approved any funds for the operation of the Council in fiscal year 1970.

Mr. Chairman, later this afternoon I am sure there will be a discussion on other problems related to spending. May I ask that when these amendments are presented the entire committee bear in mind certain facts about the Department of the Interior and other related agencies:

First. The only students funded in the Department of the Interior are our Indians, Micronesians, Guamanians, and Samoans;

Second. Departments and bureaus work with States and universities on a cooperative basis for research and research alone. Departments such as Forestry, Bureau of Sport Fisheries, Geological Survey, Commercial Fisheries, and Water Resources, purchase from the universities space for research and a knowledge developed by research within specified programs.

As I watched the magnificent triumph of knowledge and the application of knowledge throughout these past several days when courageous men went to the moon, and as I saw the precision with which knowledge has been applied for mankind's benefit and triumph, I cannot help but say that I am deeply concerned that the kind of research done by the Interior, U.S. Forest Service, and so forth, should also have the opportunity without crippling activities to develop techniques and know-hows valuable to man's very survival.

Geological Survey has been deeply involved in the moon program. The Forest Service and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife are deeply involved in laboratory work that will find the answer to the complex problem of pesticides. Technicians at work on saline water and water resources may well supply man with a greater future than even that which the moon has provided.

Disruption of laboratory operations for saline water, for example, or other research projects; can be likened to deliberately removing some one of the bolts or parts of the rocket that went to the moon.

It is in this spirit that I ask research be allowed to proceed with as few dilatory objectives as possible.

As we discuss this bill today and expenditure relativity, some significant comparisons may be of interest. To date approximately $24 billion has been spent on the space program which has sent the first man in the history of mankind to the moon. This event generated pride in the Nation and man himself.

This $24 billion is $4 billion less than 1 year of the Vietnamese conflict.

This bill, $1.54 billion expenditure, is approximately one-sixth of U.S. citizen expenditure for tobacco in the year 1965, and approximately one-tenth of our alcoholic beverage expenditure in the same year—both figures, I may add, have escalated.

Thomas Huxley, the English zoologist and lecturer, who when visiting the United States during the 19th century, said to this country:

> I cannot say I am the slightest degree impressed by the bigness, or your natural resources as such . . . Size is not grandeur, and territory does not make a nation. The great issue . . . is what are you going to do with *all these* things?

Today, Mr. Chairman, as we vote on this bill, let us make our reply to Mr. Huxley's challenge with a firm statement of our national objectives, resources, and goals; the expenditure of money for this Nation's life, and, in some instances, its very survival.

Mr. Chairman, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a tabular statement of the funding of the various activities of the bill:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1969 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1970

[NOTE.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority enacted to date, fiscal year 1969	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill	Bill compared with— New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969	Bill compared with— Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT					
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT					
Management of lands and resources	$62,964,000	$53,640,000	$52,600,000	−$10,364,000	−$1,040,000
Construction and maintenance	3,081,000	2,936,000	2,925,000	−156,000	−11,000
Public lands development roads and trails (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization)	*(3,500,000)*	*(3,500,000)*	*(3,500,000)*		
Oregon and California grant lands (indefinite, appropriation of receipts)	12,750,000	13,750,000	13,750,000	+1,000,000	
Range improvements (indefinite, appropriation of receipts)	1,460,000	1,788,000	1,788,000	+328,000	
Total, Bureau of Land Management	80,255,000	72,114,000	71,063,000	−9,192,000	−1,051,000
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS					
Education and welfare services	146,476,000	182,945,000	174,500,000	+28,024,000	−8,445,000
Education and welfare services (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization)	*(1,293,000)*	*(1,500,000)*	*(1,500,000)*	*(+207,000)*	
Resources management	52,940,000	55,692,000	55,692,000	+2,752,000	
Construction	25,471,000	23,373,000	25,373,000	−98,000	+2,000,000
Road construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization)	*(18,000,000)*	*(20,000,000)*	*(20,000,000)*	*(+2,000,000)*	
Revolving fund for loans	450,000			−450,000	
General administrative expenses	5,013,000	5,113,000	5,013,000		−100,000
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of tribal funds	230,350,000	267,123,000	260,578,000	+30,228,000	−6,545,000
Tribal funds (*limitations on use of trust funds*)	*(3,000,000)*	*(3,000,000)*	*(3,000,000)*		
BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION					
Salaries and expenses	4,315,000	4,290,000	3,500,000	−815,000	−790,000
Land and water conservation:					
Appropriation (*repayable advance to the fund*)	*(53,000,000)*			*(−53,000,000)*	
Appropriation of receipts (indefinite)	92,500,000	108,472,000	108,472,000	+15,972,000	
Appropriation out of the fund (not including liquidation cash)	7,000,000			−7,000,000	
Appropriation out of the fund to liquidate contract authorization	*(65,000,000)*	*(15,528,000)*	*(15,528,000)*	*(−49,472,000)*	
Total, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation	103,815,000	112,762,000	111,972,000	+8,157,000	−790,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1969 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1970—Continued

[NOTE.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority enacted to date, fiscal year 1969	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued					
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT—Continued					
OFFICE OF TERRITORIES					
Administration of territories	$14,697,000	$14,921,400	$14,700,000	+$3,000	−$221,400
Permanent appropriation (special fund)	*(162,200)*	*(239,400)*	*(239,400)*	*(+77,200)*	
Transferred from other acccounts (special fund)	*(240,000)*	*(292,700)*	*(292,700)*	*(+52,700)*	
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	30,000,000	41,612,000	41,612,000	+11,612,000	
Total, Office of Territories	44,697,000	56,533,400	56,312,000	+11,615,000	−221,400
Total, Public Land Management	459,117,000	508,532,400	499,925,000	+40,808,000	−8,607,400
MINERAL RESOURCES					
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY					
Surveys, investigations, and research	90,917,000	95,628,000	95,628,000	+4,711,000	
BUREAU OF MINES					
Conservation and development of mineral resources	38,001,000	39,683,000	39,000,000	+999,000	−683,000
Health and safety	12,334,000	14,782,000	14,782,000	+2,448,000	
Solid waste disposal	1,067,000			−1,067,000	
General administrative expenses	1,647,000	1,647,000	1,647,000		
Helium fund (authorization to spend from public debt receipts)	26,200,000	26,200,000	21,000,000	−5,200,000	−5,200,000
Total, Bureau of Mines	79,249,000	82,312,000	76,429,000	−2,820,000	−5,883,000
OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH					
Salaries and expenses	13,700,000	13,300,000	13,300,000	−400,000	
OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS					
Salaries and expenses	866,900	1,081,900	994,000	+127,100	−87,900
Total, Mineral Resources	184,732,900	192,321,900	186,351,000	+1,618,100	−5,970,900
FISH AND WILDLIFE, PARKS, AND MARINE RESOURCES					
BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES					
Management and investigations of resources	25,225,000	25,543,000	26,400,000	+1,175,000	+857,000
Management and investigations of resources (special foreign currency program)	15,000	15,000	15,000		
Construction		1,625,000	2,025,000	+2,025,000	+400,000
Construction of fishing vessels	6,000,000	6,000,000	3,000,000	−3,000,000	−3,000,000
Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and development	4,327,000	4,027,000	4,590,000	+263,000	+563,000
Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation	2,307,000	2,307,000	2,307,000		
Administration of Pribilof Islands (indefinite, appropriation of receipts)	2,653,400	2,654,000	2,654,000	+600	
Fishermen's protective fund	60,000	60,000	60,000		
General administrative expenses	765,000	165,0000	765,000		
Limitation on administrative expenses, Fisheries loan fund	*(300,200)*	*(300,000)*	*(300,000)*	*(−200)*	
Total, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries	41,352,400	42,996,000	41,816,000	+463,600	−1,180,000
BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE					
Management and investigations of resources	47,246,000	47,923,000	48,503,000	+1,257,000	+580,000
Construction	1,891,000	1,082,000	1,686,000	−205,000	+604,000
Migratory bird conservation account (definite, repayable advance)	7,500,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	−2,500,000	
Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation	2,294,000	2,294,000	2,294,000		
General administrative expenses	1,699,000	1,699,000	1,699,000		
Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	60,630,000	57,998,000	59,182,000	−1,448,000	+1,184,000
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE					
Management and protection	45,740,000	49,475,000	49,000,000	+3,260,000	−475,000
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities	32,918,000	40,152,000	40,000,000	+7,082,000	−152,000
Construction	5,471,000	7,805,000	7,600,000	+2,129,000	−205,000
Parkway and road construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization)	*(17,000,000)*	*(24,500,000)*	*(21,500,000)*	*(+4,500,000)*	*(−3,000,000)*
Preservation of historic properties	604,000	1,604,000	1,600,000	+996,000	−4,000
General administrative expenses	3,127,000	3,127,000	3,317,000	+190,000	+190,000
Total, National Park Service	87,860,000	102,163,000	101,517,000	+13,657,000	−646,000
Total, Fish and Wildlife, Parks, and Marine Resources	189,842,400	203,157,000	202,515,000	+12,672,600	−642,000
OFFICE OF SALINE WATER					
Saline water conversion	24,642,835	26,000,000	25,000,000	+357,165	−1,000,000
Prototype desalting plant	1,000,000			−1,000,000	
Total, Office of Saline Water	25,642,835	26,000,000	25,000,000	−642,835	−1,000,000
OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH					
Salaries and expenses	11,181,000	11,229,000	11,229,000	+48,000	
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR					
Salaries and expenses	5,683,000	5,625,800	5,530,000	−153,000	−95,800

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1969 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1970—Continued

[NOTE.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated]

				Bill compared with—	
Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority enacted to date, fiscal year 1969	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
TITLE I—DEPARAMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued					
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
Salaries and expenses	$8,755,000	$10,187,400	$9,887,000	+$1,132,000	−$300,400
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)		25,000	25,000	+25,000	
Total, Office of the Secretary	8,755,000	10,212,400	9,912,000	+1,157,000	−300,400
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, Department of the Interior	884,954,135	957,078,500	940,462,000	+55,507,865	−16,616,500
Consisting of—					
Appropriations	858,754,135	930,878,500	919,462,000	+60,707,865	−11,416,500
Definite appropriations	(749,390,735)	(804,214,500)	(792,798,000)	(+43,407,265)	(−11,416,500)
Indefinite appropriations	(109,363,400)	(126,664,000)	(126,664,000)	(+17,300,600)	
Authorization to spend from public debt receipts	26,200,000	26,200,000	21,000,000	−5,200,000	−5,200,000
Memoranda—					
Appropriations to liquidate contract authorization	(104,793,000)	(65,028,000)	(62,028,000)	(−42,765,000)	(−3,000,000)
Total, new budget (obligational) authority *and* appropriations to liquidate contract authorization	(989,747,135)	(1,022,106,500)	(1,002,490,000)	(+12,742,865)	(−19,616,500)
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
FOREST SERVICE					
Forest protection and utilization:					
Forest land management	208,818,000	190,978,000	195,042,000	−13,776,000	+4,064,000
Forest research	40,430,000	40,983,000	41,880,000	+1,450,000	+897,000
State and private forestry cooperation	19,957,000	20,529,000	22,529,000	+2,572,000	+2,000,000
Total, forest protection and utilization	269,205,000	252,490,000	259,451,000	−9,754,000	+6,961,000
Forest roads and trails (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization)	*(91,000,000)*	*(107,570,000)*	*(100,570,000)*	*(+9,570,000)*	*(−7,000,000)*
Acquisition of lands for national forests:					
Special acts (special fund, indefinite)	80,000	80,000	80,000		
Cooperative range improvements (special fund, indefinite)	700,000	700,000	700,000		
Assistance to States for tree planting	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000		
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, Forest Service	270,985,000	254,270,000	261,231,000	−9,754,000	+6,961,000
FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW					
Salaries and expenses	157,000	148,000	148,000	−9,000	
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS					
Salaries and expenses	115,000	115,000	115,000		
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION					
Indian health services	94,350,000	99,581,000	98,581,000	+4,231,000	−1,000,000
Indian health facilities	18,156,000	20,000,000	19,000,000	+844,000	−1,000,000
Total, Health Services and Mental Health Administration	112,506,000	119,581,000	117,581,000	+5,075,000	−2,000,000
INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	619,000	800,000	800,000	+181,000	
NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	1,047,000	1,248,000	1,070,000	+23,000	−178,000
NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES					
Salaries and expenses	1,400,000	1,744,000	1,500,000	+100,000	−244,000
Endowment for the arts	7,400,000	7,500,000	7,250,000	−150,000	−250,000
Endowment for the humanities	5,700,000	7,500,000	7,250,000	+1,550,000	−250,000
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities	14,500,000	16,744,000	16,000,000	+1,500,000	−744,000
PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	944,000	922,000	922,000	−22,000	
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION					
Salaries and expenses	26,443,000	28,955,000	28,200,000	+1,757,000	−755,000
Museum programs and related research (special foreign currency program)	2,316,000	4,500,000	3,000,000	+684,000	−1,500,000
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park	300,000	600,000	600,000	+300,000	
Restoration and renovation of buildings	400,000	755,000	425,000	+25,000	−330,000
Construction	2,000,000	200,000	200,000	−1,800,000	
Construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization)		*(6,000,000)*	*(3,300,000)*	*(+3,300,000)*	*(−2,700,000)*
Construction (new contract authorization)	12,197,000			−12,197,000	
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art	3,230,000	3,410,000	3,350,000	+120,000	−60,000
Total, Smithsonian Institution	46,886,000	38,420,000	35,775,000	−11,111,000	−2,645,000
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT					
Salaries and expenses, National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources	1,300,000			−1,300,000	
FEDERAL FIELD COMMITTEE FOR DEVELOPMENT PLANNING IN ALASKA					
Salaries and expenses	235,000	235,000	150,000	−85,000	−85,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1969 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1970—Continued

[NOTE.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority enacted to date, fiscal year 1969	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill	Bill compared with— New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969	Bill compared with— Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES—Continued					
HISTORICAL AND MEMORIAL COMMISSIONS LEWIS AND CLARK TRAIL COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	$25,000	$10,000	$5,000	−$20,000	−$5,000
AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses		225,000	175,000	+175,000	−50,000
NATIONAL COUNCIL ON INDIAN OPPORTUNITY					
Salaries and expenses	100,000	300,000		−100,000	−300,000
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, related agencies	449,419,000	433,018,000	433,972,000	−15,447,000	+954,000
Consisting of—					
Appropriations	437,222,000	433,018,000	433,972,000	−3,250,000	+954,000
Definite appropriations	(436,442,000)	(432,238,000)	(433,192,000)	(−3,250,000)	(+954,000)
Indefinite appropriations	(780,000)	(780,000)	(780,000)		
New contract authorization	12,197,000			−12,197,000	
Memoranda—					
Appropriations to liquidate contract authorization	(91,000,000)	(113,570,000)	(103,870,000)	(+12,870,000)	(−9,700,000)
Total, new budget (obligational) authority *and* appropriations to liquidate contract authorization	(540,419,000)	(546,588,000)	(537,842,000)	(−2,577,000)	(−8,746,000)
RECAPITULATION					
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority, all titles	1,334,373,135	1,390,096,500	1,374,434,000	+40,060,865	−15,662,500
Consisting of—					
1. Appropriations	1,295,976,135	1,363,896,500	1,353,434,000	+57,457,865	−10,462,500
Definite appropriations	(1,185,832,735)	(1,236,452,500)	(1,225,990,000)	(+40,157,265)	(−10,462,500)
Indefinite appropriations	(110,143,400)	(127,444,000)	(127,444,000)	(+17,300,600)	
2. Authorization to spend from public debt receipts	26,200,000	26,200,000	21,000,000	−5,200,000	−5,200,000
3. New contract authorization	12,197,000			−12,197,000	
Appropriations to liquidate contract authorization	(195,793,000)	(178,598,000)	(165,898,000)	(−29,895,000)	(−12,700,000)
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority *and* appropriations to liquidate contract authorization	(1,530,166,135)	(1,568,694,500)	(1,540,332,000)	(+10,165,865)	(−28,362,500)

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentlewoman and her subcommittee for inclusion within the construction funds of Indian facilities in the amount of $2 million that she has put in the bill on the Navaho irrigration project.

This is a project that is way behind time. It should have been practically completed by now. From the testimony that I have received, only 16 percent of this project has been completed. It is something that will contribute greatly to the economic benefit of the Navaho Indian people.

I again want to compliment the gentlewoman for including this in the bill and it is an area in which I think probably this money can be as well spent as any money that we spend in the Federal budget.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida. We had the pleasure this year of visiting the Navaho lands, and we discussed this particular project. It is regrettable that we cannot put more money into the project at this time. I would urge the Bureau of Indian Affairs to continue to step up this project, because this project will provide a better base for their agricultural needs. I do thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the chairman for yielding. I wish to join my colleague, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, in commending the committee for a good bill, and particularly for a good bill in the field of Indian affairs, with which we have considerable concern and some responsibility as an authorizing subcommittee.

The gentlewoman, as always, has made a fine explanation of the bill and of the matters that are covered in it. I am highly pleased by the comments that appear in the report on the subject of educational policy and the need to do more and to do more effectively in this field, and the remarks which appear on pages 8 and 9 of the committee report are of special interest to me.

The gentlewoman is aware of the long concern that I have had in a number of appearances before the Committee on Appropriations in connection with the school at Eufaula, Okla., which burned down a number of years ago—at least a major dormitory facility burned down there a number of years ago—and which Chief McIntosh of the Creek Indians has been seeking to get reconstructed for a number of years.

The committee had provided funds, last year, for reconstruction of this facility, but the report indicates that an award of a contract for construction is still pending. I am deeply concerned, and I know the gentlewoman shares my concern about the failure of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to carry through reconstruction of this dormitory facility to enable both the Creek Indian boys as well as girls to be served at this facility, and to be served in an institution which provides boarding care for the children while they attend public schools of the city of Eufaula. We have some fine institutional schools that have both the educational institution and the boarding facilities on campus, and I am not quarreling with them. They do a good and necessary job. But this is one of the rare instances—the only instance in the district that I serve—in which a Bureau of Indian Affairs facility provides boarding care for Indian children while they go to the public schools, and the long delay in reconstruction of that facility and the provision of this opportunity to the Indian boys of this area is to me very, very deplorable, almost inexcusable.

I would like the gentlewoman to tell me what the committee plans to do about this, if she can.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. As I have previously stated, we believe that the BIA should step up all of its efforts in planning, building, and constructing those school facilities which may be consolidated with the public schools. Your school at Eufaula is similar to the schools in the State of Alaska, where the BIA will participate in construction and maintenance. The BIA will furnish dormitory facilities for the children of Alaska, who will attend the public schools of Alaska. This is a forward, progressive step, and I will urge, as I believe all members of the committee should urge, that construction money be made available as rapidly as possible to complete the dormitory facilities at Eufaula so that they may meet the needs of the youngsters attending the public schools there.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to hear the gentlewoman say that. What has been happening is that the boys who need this kind of institutional help have been sent out to other schools, often a great distance away, where they go to school on campus, instead of having an opportunity to go to the Eufaula public schools while living in the boarding home with their sisters. It simply has not made any sense to me to have this unfair situation prolonged as long as it has been.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. In the first place, I think there is unconscionable footdragging in the Department of Interior and in the BIA itself. To date there is no Commissioner of Indian Affairs. To date there has been little recognition of the need to develop a straight line educational system in the same context that the majority of State educational programs have.

In my prepared statement I have emphasized that we think the entire school construction program for Indians needs the following:

First. The straight line educational system; and

Second. Before any more Federal schools are built, there should be a complete and comprehensive survey of all public schools and Federal schools and the facilities for the youngsters to attend the public schools. If there is the opportunity to attend the public school facilities, we do not believe there is a possible excuse to place an Indian school there.

I may say very frankly to the gentleman from Oklahoma, I do not believe we should be transporting Alaskan youngsters to Oregon or to Oklahoma. We should provide the schools in Alaska and give the children the opportunity to attend the schools there. We should provide schools in Oklahoma and give the children a chance to attend schools there. We should do this wherever possible.

With regard to the construction program, design and planning should be done prior to the appropriation of construction money, so there is a chance to review the adequacy of these plans.

I say this from looking at the Federal schools I have visited. We have found a large reception room was provided for the young Indians in the dormitory. They were not using it. But what did they all say? They said they would love to have an opportunity to have a recreation area where they might go and work and play and meet with friends.

The need is to have somebody recognize that swimming pools are not frills. They are not frills for the Army or the Navy or the Air Force, or for these young Indian people, who must develop both physically and emotionally. We have to recognize that we must provide these facilities.

Then the following year, as we have done with every other construction item in this bill, the committee would provide the construction funds. I think then we would get a proper sequence for the efficient use of funds and the provision of required facilities.

May I say to the gentleman from Oklahoma, I am not criticizing boarding schools in general. There are some lamentable conditions, and these conditions we hope to correct by some of our funding. For example, the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota and I saw dormitories where there were more than 100 youngsters with only one night counselor. We are asking that some of these situations be corrected.

We also saw Indian schools where the teachers had to provide supplies while a fancy computer system was installed at Albuquerque. I do not know how well it is working.

These are the things we ask, that the BIA establish priorities to do a good job; that they abolish some of the conditions which have existed because of personnel ceilings and bureaucratic overhead.

We could not sensibly abolish every Federal boarding school at once, I will state why. This Nation is deeply concerned about nutrition.

We are feeding in one area alone more than 20,000 youngsters in these Federal boarding schools. If these youngsters have to travel on school buses perhaps 30 to 60 miles, then they would have no breakfast, only lunch.

These are the things that have concerned the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota and myself, as we visited the boarding schools.

The youngsters we visited with at boarding schools said to me, "We are not burning our schools down. We are going on to higher educational institutions." They are availing themselves of scholarships. They are begging for the opportunity to learn, to know, and to do.

I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, I believe we can take tremendous pride for what has been done in the past several years with the money appropriated by this Congress, and what it has meant to the American Indians.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentlewoman for the explanation she has made, and I thank her, the gentleman from South Dakota, and the other members of the subcommittee for the study in depth they have made of this problem.

I certainly was one of those disappointed by the publicity about a school in Oklahoma, the Chilocco School, which got a lot of bad publicity, I think unfairly, and as to which a subsequent investigation demonstrated its black eyes in the press were not justified at all. I believe the later inquiries at the Chilocco School indicated that the great majority of the students were very pleased with the operation of that school and felt it had been unfairly reported with respect to the complaints of a few.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. One significant remark made to the gentleman from South Dakota and to me, as we sat and talked, just people to people, and asked the young people what was one thing they thought was best about the schools, they said, "The faculty; they bring us so much."

I should like the gentleman to know that I did not see in these Indian schools any feeling of hate, of insolence or of defiance. There was a feeling of joy at the opportunity to receive an education.

I would say one thing further to the distinguished gentleman. This bill provides for more kindergartens in our Federal schools. These we saw in operation. To me they were one of the outstanding examples of progress that the Appropriations Committee of this Congress has made.

If we can somehow break that barrier of language and culture, we will have begun to do the job that must be done in this area.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentlewoman and thank her for the time which she has yielded to me.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to my previous discussion with the gentlewoman and other members of the committee, such as the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. REIFEL), I would like to express my appreciation to her for her foresightedness in the additional appropriation with respect to the Navajo irrigation project. As the gentlewoman and the members of the committee know, without this appropriation we would have had completely to shut this project down, a project which was to have been completed in 1970 and now, with this additional funding, has been projected into around 1990.

What we are doing by this—and the gentlewoman knows this at least as well as I do, if not better, because of her visits to us there, which we have very much enjoyed—is helping people to help themselves there to get off the welfare rolls and back on the tax rolls by bringing in this water, which is so necessary, and making these acres irrigable so that we may help them to help themselves.

Mr. Chairman, there is one question I would like to ask the gentlewoman, which we discussed this morning in the committee room. What kind of a suggestion does the gentlewoman or the committee have for us with respect to the problem we face at Navajo, N. Mex., in an area where we have had a large influx of Indian families who have moved in with the development of a new sawmill industry there. We have a lot of students there now who need education. The school system there does not have a sufficient tax base to provide for them. The gentlewoman talked about some students having to ride 30 or 40 or 50 miles. In this instance, if these children were brought in to Gallup, it would be a daily busing of 160 to 170 miles per day or a 4-hour bus ride in order to accommodate them.

XUM

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman for asking that particular question. The normal community developing on the Navaho reservation, is facing the same sort of problem that is happening throughout the Indian world to a large extent. They are coming into areas where there is an industry. The result, of course, is that there is an inability of the district schools, because of the large amount of Federal land involved and the low assessed valuation of the land, to maintain those schools as needed for the suddenly increased population. Usually the first step is for the school district to work with the Bureau of Indian Affairs in developing a formula with regard to provisions for investment in building facilities and payment on the basis of a per pupil day and then getting authorization for design and construction of such buildings. I would urge that this should take place as quickly as possible. In fact, since the other body has not yet taken action on the Interior bill, it might be well to work with them and decide if planning and designing funds should be made available based on all the facts that the Bureau of Indian Affairs may have at hand at this time. We had no testimony on this and no discussion of it, because, as you are well aware, these villages evolve rather quickly, as you have mentioned, particularly with a rapid growth of industry.

The joint operation of public schools with the Bureau of Indian Affairs is going to produce a better educational program for young Indian people in this country.

Mr. FOREMAN. I certainly appreciate the understanding and the suggestions of the gentlewoman.

If I may point out and better amplify the problem which we face, particularly in McKinley County, N. Mex., where the big concentration of this school population is, I would like to include a short report here from the school superintendent, Dr. Fitzsimmons, whom I believe the gentlewoman met with.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. When we return to the House it will be possible to place this in the RECORD.

Mr. FOREMAN. I would like to include that information so that everyone may better understand the problems which we face there.

For instance, just 12 years ago the school system in McKinley County was approximately 1,000 Indian children. And, the current enrollment stands at a 12,000 increase. This increase represents the type of problem which we are experiencing. For instance, we have bus routes that have increased from 14 to 46 and we just do not have the tax base to support the kind of investment with which to deal with the problem we have at the present time.

I certainly appreciate the understanding of the distinguished gentlewoman in helping resolve this problem. We will be meeting with the Members on the other side after this bill is passed and it is my hope that we can put forth proposals for additional funds with which to establish facilities for these operations.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, as we consider the overall appropriations for the Department of the Interior, I wish to draw my colleagues' attention to the immediate need for a secondary school at Navajo, N. Mex., to accommodate Navajo children now being bused across the State line to Arizona for schooling.

These children, who live in the Gallup-McKinley County School District in New Mexico, are being carried to Arizona by bus, where they are attending school in the Window Rock School District at a cost to the Gallup-McKinley County District of $810 per child. There are 184 students now making this 25-mile trip.

It is impossible to absorb these 184 students into the Gallup-McKinley County District schools. Population increases in this area have already forced the absorption of 6,000 students into these schools over the past 12 years—from 1,000 students to 7,000. School bus routes over the same period expanded from 14 to 46 routes.

These are Navajo children, and the people of the Gallup-McKinley County District should not be expected by the Federal Government to bankrupt themselves carrying a load that rightfully belongs to the Government.

I strongly urge consideration of the inclusion of $2.5 million in this budget for construction of a secondary school at Navajo, N. Mex., to accommodate these children and to grant some relief to the Gallup schools.

Mr. Chairman, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has recommended a much needed increase of $2 million over the budget estimate to accelerate the Navajo irrigation project, thus bringing the 1970 available funds for this project to $5.5 million. This project is of tremendous importance not only to the Navajo Nation but to the industrial development of the entire Southwest. I most sincerely urge my colleagues to augment this economic development with an additional $2.5 million for this most urgently needed school, thus assuring that educational development will keep pace with the industrial growth of this area, and providing the means for these children to attend school in their home district rather than in the neighboring State.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I shall be delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. I should like to commend the gentlewoman for bringing this worthwhile bill to the floor of the House for consideration of appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies.

One area of concern to me and which I should like to point out to the gentlewoman, with the hope that something can be done to eliminate my concern, is the question of the summer theater program which the Smithsonian Institution is conducting, on the Mall.

They have a tent there which can hold up to 900 people. They charge anywhere from $2 to $3 for admission to these activities. In addition to a children's, theater with which I have no objection, I am told that they also are conducting regular theater such as productions of "Guys and Dolls" and "Annie Get Your Gun." This, in my opinion, represents direct competition with the private theaters, both profit and nonprofit. Yet at the same time they are not paying the prevailing wages and rates to the actors involved and to the stage managers, and others who are involved in the production. The result of this is that we find ourselves in a situation where a governmentally financed agency such as the Smithsonian is violating the thrust of our Federal legislation which was established in the Arts Foundation Act, which says that when the Government gets involved in activities of this type that it should pay the prevailing rates of pay to the artists and others involved in the activities.

The result of this is that what we are really doing is putting on subsidized performances for the benefit of the public by charging some admission, and in fact also compelling the artists to pay for these subsidized performances by paying the artists less than prevailing wages.

This is a program whereby if we allow this to prevail we will be doing the same indiscriminately throughout the country. This would involve all those artists engaged in the arts.

However, it has been the purpose of the Government and the intent of the Congress not to subsidize art at the cost and expense of the artists involved. It is my opinion that the Smithsonian should recognize this and should work out a solution to this problem, an equitable and fair solution to it.

I wonder if the distinguished gentlewoman could enlighten us further with reference to this?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I have discussed this at some length with administrators of the Smithsonian Institution. The tent was originally erected for the National Intercollegiate Drama Festival, which has proved to be one of the truly exciting festivals in this country. Since the tent was already there, and a great amount of private funds available, it was decided to make good use of it. They have assured me they would like very much to work out with the Actors' Equity some kind of an agreement. I think that should be their goal.

I may remind the gentleman from Connecticut that the tent was also used for the Folk Festival, and it is being used in the puppet shows and in the other children's shows which are provided as part of the total recreational program for the summer. But I agree with the gentleman from Connecticut that there should be a complete discussion, with the Actors Equity so that fair wages are established.

Mr. GIAIMO. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. If the gentleman from Connecticut is interested, I have in my folder at the table a letter outlining some of the steps.

Mr. GIAIMO. I would state to the gentlewoman from Washington that I think I am familiar with some of the steps which they suggest that they have

XUM

taken, but the fact is they are already in the theater season for this summer, and no steps have been taken, and they are not paying the prevailing wages, at least this year.

So I would hope that there would be a clear enunciation of policy by the Smithsonian people as to their policy certainly as to next year.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. There is another fact I would like to mention for the record. These people who are participating are students of drama from various colleges, who are going to be teachers of drama. After the discussion we heard yesterday on student riots, I am sure we would want them to do this. That is part of what the purpose of this program is.

I think that in time they can work out their problems with Actors' Equity.

Mr. GIAIMO. I thank the gentlewoman from Washington.

I would just like to comment further about what the gentlewoman has said, and this is correct, that some of them may be students, but the fact is this theater does not qualify as a teaching theater, or as a special theater in the sense that it is putting on unusual productions which are not normally put on by the regular theaters. They are putting on regular shows and regular productions, and in this sense are very clearly competing with private theater people, and are not paying the prevailing wages which the law concerning the Arts and Foundations Act clearly prohibits the Government from doing.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and its members for their arduous work on their enormous task. A few months ago I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer describing the grave financial difficulties faced by the Cleveland orchestra. Considered one of the world's finest, the Cleveland orchestra has been forced to depend partially on its gradually depleting endowment simply to meet its operating costs.

Our society has placed more and more value on the cultural benefits to be derived from the arts. The exciting and imaginative productions, exhibitions, and concerts once reserved to those who could afford the price of an admission ticket, are increasingly being brought to the economically disadvantaged through special programs funded in part by Federal and State governments and private contributions. The advantages to be gained by opening the eyes of the young and old alike to the excitement of an artistic experience is immeasurable. Just when we have begun to recognize the tremendous value and appeal of the arts to all segments of society, however, some of the most beneficial programs are in danger of drastic reduction. Our budgetary recommendation for the National Foundation on the Arts in this legislation is only $7,250,000. I am only too aware of the heavy demands on our budget, but I think before it is too late, we must acknowledge and respond to the contribution of the arts in our society or we will be forced to witness a dramatic national decline in our fine arts programs. More than the Cleveland orchestra will suffer—every element of the arts will suffer—but most importantly, the American people will be the ultimate losers.

Mr. COHELAN. Madame Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I will yield briefly to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Madame Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I wonder if the gentlewoman, who has worked so hard on this bill, could answer some questions in connection with the land and water conservation fund, which have troubled some of us.

First of all, Madame Chairman, I would like to know if it is true that the bill recommends, as I understand it, an expenditure of $124 million from the land and water conservation fund. Is that correct?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The gentleman is correct, it is $124 million.

We have already spent $72 million for the Redwood National Park. The Land and Water Conservation Act authorizes $200 million per year for the total land and water conservation program. However, the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior came up with these sizable shifts between the 1969 contract authorization, the 1970 cash, the 1970 contract liquidation funds. I would point out that there is $76 million that can still be appropriated this fiscal year. But on the other hand there is an unobligated balance of $51.5 million. There was $46 million put in reserve by the Bureau of the Budget, an action with which this House is very familiar.

We followed the administration's guidelines as contained in the revised budget estimate.

I am going to be very frank and say that we would be happy to appropriate the full $200 million if we receive proper guidelines on how and where it is to be expended in a practical manner. I do not believe that just for the sake of spending money we should contribute to the mainstream of inflation without proper steps being taken to safeguard this country from what could become a major land scandal.

Just because the authority is available, does not excuse the administration from coming to us with an orderly procedure for the expenditure of this money, using as their criteria the land where the need is greatest and where the escalation will be the most severe.

Those are the things that the committee is very concerned about. May I say to the gentleman, with regard to Point Reyes, when the authorization is approved for additional expenditure, additional appropriations will undoubtedly follow.

It may interest the gentleman from California that our old friends, the Bureau of the Budget, do not seem inclined to approve increased authorization for Point Reyes.

Mr. COHELAN. The reason for my asking the question, as the gentlewoman well knows, is my intense interest in all conservation matters. There is a great concern over what we consider to be underfunding, as the budget request was only for $124 million, out of a possible $200 million.

As the gentlewoman emphasized to me repeatedly, the committee has fully funded the budget request. You have already explained the difference, but in order that I may understand it perfectly, the gentlewoman has said to me that if the administration submitted a request with appropriate guidelines for the full $200 million that your committee would respond favorably.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. We would respond in a favorable manner.

Mr. COHELAN. I want to commend the gentlewoman for the fine work she is doing. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. If I may first conclude my statement, then I will be glad to yield to my colleagues.

May I say in conclusion, before I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that I hope you will support this bill because this will be support for the needs of the people of this Nation and its well-being and perhaps for its survival.

Now I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for yielding to me at this particular time following the colloquy she has had with the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN).

What is involved here is a ceiling of $200 million for a 5-year period—or $1 billion.

What the gentlewoman has said is that there has been no guideline sent up to her committee and to the main Committee on Appropriations by which this money can be spent efficiently, effectively, and wisely; is that correct?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. That is correct. The gentleman from Colorado, the very distinguished chairman of the authorization Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is entirely correct. It would be erroneous on our part to spend this money without adequate guidelines. When they come up with a proper request, as the gentleman so well knows, we will be glad to give it our serious consideration.

Mr. ASPINALL. While money in the neighborhood of $300 million to $400 million authorization exists at the present time, still there is no structural format by which the gentlewoman and her committee can work effectively; is that correct?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alaska.

XUM

Mr. POLLOCK. Thank you very much, Madam Chairman.

I would like to compliment the gentlewoman from the State of Washington for the expertise with which she has responded to all the queries today. Her answers have been very outstanding.

I would like to indicate my concern, which you well understand, about the cut which has been made in the Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska. I believe it appears on page 37 of the report. My concern, of course, is that the appropriation was cut from $235,000 to $150,000, which is a cut of $85,000. I am concerned with the explanation that this cut was made in anticipation of the liquidation of the program, and yet it will run for a full calendar year. I wonder if the gentlewoman would comment on that.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Some of the phases of this program are diminished in the extent to which they have to be funded. The need now is for administrative tidying up of details in the phasing-out process. It could well be possible that, as Alaska develops, more funds will be necessary in another context, in another place.

I can assure the gentleman that the Appropriations Subcommittee is deeply interested in the resources of Alaska, and will be of major assistance whenever the need arises.

Mr. POLLOCK. If the gentlewoman will yield further, I point out that this cut comes, of course, at a critical time in the history of our development. I have introduced H.R. 11340, which is a bill to provide for the transfer of the Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska into a Regional Development Commission such as we have in other parts of the country under title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. It is my understanding that the other body has taken into the bill the transfer of the Federal Field Committee, and I would hope that while I have offered no amendment or intend to offer none on the floor of the House, as I did not discuss it with the committee, requesting an amendment, I would hope that some serious consideration would be given in conference to the House adopting that portion of the Senate bill.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. REIFEL).

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want, first, to express my appreciation for the kind remarks about me and other members of our committee by our distinguished chairman of our subcommittee. I do wish to join her in expressing regret that our distinguished colleague from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON) is going to be leaving us at the end of this term. He has been very understanding of the problems of the West and the Midwest, even through he comes from a part of the country that might produce individuals otherwise inclined, and we have appreciated his services and his assistance.

As the ranking minority member of this Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, I should like to express for all of us our appreciation of the great leadership that has been provided by the great, distinguished and beloved Member of the House who has chaired this committee in previous years and now is chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works, and by name, our great friend MIKE KIRWAN. I think that we could well preface the remarks that might be made in connection with anything having to do with resource development by the words that appear over the Speaker's chair.

I choose to read them at this point so that those who may read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in all parts of the land may know that that inscription is up there on the wall back of the Speaker's chair.

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

That is a quotation from Daniel Webster.

Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN, often referred to this particular appropriation bill as the all-American bill. Truly it is that. It is understandable that each of us, on whatever committee we may serve or whatever subcommittee—and it should be this way—consider it the most important committee in the Congress. So, too, those of us who serve on this subcommittee have this attitude, because this committee does deal with the resources of our land.

While our distinguished chairman, the gentlewoman from Washington, has already referred to the importance of our natural resources, with which this appropriation bill concerns itself, I should like to refer all Members to page 5 of our report, and I shall read a part of it for the RECORD, because I think it is important to all America that we do give the necessary attention and time to the development of our resources, to the rational exploitation of not only our renewable but also our nonrenewable resources, with which the major part of this bill is concerned:

> Testimony developed during the hearing with regard to our mineral resources indicated that in 1950 this country produced and consumed well over half of all the mineral commodities that were being produced and consumed in the world. In the short span of twenty years, we have lost our position of dominance as a mineral resources producer and consumer. We are now producing between 25 and 30 percent of the world's requirements and consuming slightly less than 30 percent of the world's requirements. Translated into dollars, this means we are producing about $25 billion worth of mineral resources and consuming about $31 billion worth. By the end of the century, it is predicted we will be consuming about $90 billion worth annually and producing something in the range of $45 billion worth annually. In other words—

And here I should like to quote our dear friend, DAN FLOOD, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, when he says—

> The present deficit of $6 or $6.5 billion would increase to $45 billion by the end of the century. To summarize, our deficit was only about 9 percent of our consumption requirements in 1950; our deficit now is in the range of 25 percent of our consumption requirements; and it is predicted by the end of the century our deficit will be in the range of 50 percent of our consumption requirements.
>
> These are some of the considerations that cause the committee to be concerned with the future of our country's natural resources. It is the earnest hope of the committee that those in the executive department responsible for our natural resources will seriously analyze our position now and what it might be within the next 20 years and do everything possible in the development of our renewable resources and the conservation of our depletable resources.

I want here to pay tribute to a corollary committee—and I guess we are the corollary of the main committee—and that is the authorizing committee, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I am glad the distinguished chairman of the great committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL), is here with us on the floor this afternoon, despite his recent sadness. He is here with us now.

The gentleman has authorized, through his committee and with the help of the members of that committee and of the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR), programs which we are privileged to fund, which will make it possible for us to keep up, hopefully, with the demands on our natural resources, so that we may continue, as was so dramatically demonstrated in the past 48 hours by our astronauts, to show that when we put our mind and our will and our commitment to something we can do it.

But we will not be able to do it for long unless we take care of the resources which the Lord has put into our care in this body.

I should like to quote, in connection with what I have read from our report, some comments on the very minimum that we are putting in with respect to our extractive minerals. I shall quote from the very able Director of the Bureau of Mines, Mr. O'Leary. In our hearings, as shown on page 416, I commended him on pointing out to us how time is running out. He was indicating that in respect to certain important minerals we will soon be running in real deficits in one or two decades.

I asked him what we could do, and he said that if we did what we ought to do—and this was most encouraging and reassuring—we would not have to worry too much for the next 200 years. I thanked him for that observation. Then he went on to say:

> Let me give you one more measure of this. The agricultural economy is, from the standpoint we are discussing I believe, quite successful, vis-a-vis the mineral resources economy.

To the great Committee on Agriculture and to the subcommittee which funds the agricultural programs and those having to do with research, go our compliments and our gratitude.

XUM

He went on to say:

> The Federal expenditures for research and information services in that field are about 3.8 percent of the product. The Federal expenditure in mineral resources is about 0.16. Note the point. 3.8, 0.16 percent, about 1/20th.

We are putting about one-twentieth of the value of the product in minerals, as against that for agriculture.

We know where we stand with respect to agriculture in the world. We produce more food with fewer people than any other nation in the world.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REIFEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, my distinguished friend (Mr. KYL).

Mr. KYL. I am very pleased the gentleman from South Dakota has made the comments which he has just completed. No one questions his credentials as a conservationist or preservationist. The kinds of things he has been saying normally are said by those who have a direct interest and because those people make the comments they are somehow considered to be robber barons or despoilers of our resources.

The gentleman from South Dakota knows very well the kind of conflict we have today which prevents our development of our best use of many of our resources. I speak here of the strong tendency to make a flat declaration that all of the public lands of the 50 States should be devoted to recreation or esthetic interests to be preserved rather than to be developed as resource lands.

I say again that I am most pleased to have the gentleman bring this to the attention of the House, because while we all want to conserve and while we all want to preserve vast areas of the country, we cannot lock up all our resources for specific recreational and esthetic needs and still do the kinds of things that we have to do for the welfare of the country.

I want to thank my distinguished friend from South Dakota.

Mr. REIFEL. I thank the gentleman for his very appropriate comments.

As I said at the outset, Mr. Chairman, we must be concerned with a rational exploitation of our resources. I think the authorizing Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in every instance of which I am aware has set out rational guidelines by which we are enabled to do this. The appropriation bill which this committee is bringing out in this Congress deals, as I said, primarily with the renewable and nonrenewable resources and the rational exploitation, preservation, and development of them.

There is still another important aspect of this which has to do with human beings directly, the majority of them being Indian Americans. Along with these Indian Americans are the American Samoans, the Guamanians, and also we have accepted the mandate from the United Nations to do the best we can for the Micronesians. In this part of our appropriation bill I am pleased and I think that the Congress and the people of America can be pleased and appreciative of the leadership that has been provided by our chairwoman, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN). She is a compassionate individual who is vitally interested in the education not only of these minorities I have just mentioned but of all of our younger people as well as the older people of our Nation who are in need of the right kind of education and a proper environment in which that might be accomplished.

I hope that I will be permitted to make some personal references with regard to the education of the American Indians, the Micronesians, the Guamanians, and the American Samoans who are not too unlike each other with regard to their problems in the field of education as well as in the adjustment to our economic, social, political, and cultural system.

I must state unequivocally that the Bureau of Indian Affairs, with which I served for some 25 years before I came to the Congress, is staffed by people the majority of whom are dedicated to bringing the best kind of service to the people with whom they work. This has been my experience with these people who work with minorities, whether it be in the trust territories or in American Samoa or in other isolated areas, the Navajo Reservation or Alaska. If they were not this kind of committed and dedicated individuals, they just would not stay, because without that kind of background and ability they would feel their calling to be elsewhere where they could be even better paid.

The leadership in the Bureau of Indian Affairs in recent years has been of the best. Programs have been started that bring the Indian into participation in the solution of his problems. And, as a product of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, because I was born and reared on an Indian reservation which I did not leave until I was 19 years of age to go to high school some 400 miles from home, I want to say that the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL) and his authorizing committee, and in the wisdom of that committee back in 1928 provided educational loans for Indians, free of interest, to be paid back when you got a job.

They anticipated in the Bureau of Indian Affairs and in that committee many of the things that people are saying now that they just seem to have discovered in health, education, and welfare and in some of these other programs.

Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, together with the guidance of this appropriations subcommittee and the authorizing committee, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, worked long and hard and has drafted and made viable many programs that have proved their worth. The Health, Education, Welfare and Labor Department and other places in our Government, could well take a leaf out of the book of the experience of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in dealing with similar problems in the general population.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, would my friend, the gentleman from South Dakota yield to me at this point?

Mr. REIFEL. I am very happy to yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

Mr. ASPINALL. I am sure it is not necessary for me to say anything at this time which would add to the very eloquent statement which my distinguished friend, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. REIFEL) has made. However, I would like to direct the gentleman's attention to what he has said about the offshore areas and the various programs conducted there. The control would be equally important with reference to the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Guam, and so forth; is that not correct?

Mr. REIFEL. That is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. And I am sure the gentleman's interest remains just as fervent with reference to those areas today as it does in the interest of the others and that the tax structure makes it unnecessary to use this formula that the gentleman has presented?

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that that additional observation and remark was made by the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REIFEL. I am happy to yield to the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity, first, to commend our colleague from South Dakota for his participation in this field and also as a member of the Committee on Appropriations on this very important bill which we now have pending before us.

Let me say that speaking for myself and many people on our side of the aisle, we heard with regret the announcement of the gentleman that he was not going to seek reelection. I say this because the gentleman has rendered a tremendous service not only to the Members of the House of which we are all a part, but the gentleman has rendered a tremendous service to the country and its people in the great work that he has done as a member of the Committee on Appropirations.

Since the gentleman has talked about fragmentation in certain respects, I would like to ask, as I have done almost every year because some people still do not understand, why we would consider a bill which is entitled, "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes," when we find absolutely no reference to some of the most important bureaus in the Department of the Interior; namely, the Bureau of Reclamation, nothing whatsoever with regard to the Southwestern Power Administration and the other power administrations which are under the Department of the Interior, and absolutely nothing for the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration which was transferred last year by Executive order to the Department of the Interior.

Can our good colleague tell us why this important committee that has done such a tremendous job on the other facets has not touched on these important agencies of the Bureau of Reclamation?

Mr. REIFEL. I can only say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that in the wisdom of either this body or whoever it is in authority who decides where these agencies will be funded, that the decision rests there. Interestingly enough, and appropriately enough, our committee funds the Forest Service that is under the Department of Agriculture. So there must be somewhere a decision made as to where these agencies should fall for their funding.

I am in no position from the information I have to give the gentleman an answer which I am sure would be satisfactory to the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. If the gentleman will yield further, it is my recollection that a former Member of this body, Mr. Cannon, rather arbitrarily on one occasion decided to force this subcommittee to accept this limitation and since the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration was under HEW, apparently the present chairman has not seen fit to reallocate it to your subcommittee. I think that those Members who serve on this subcommittee, and who do such a tremendous job, would be rendering a real service if they could take a look at the entire picture of the Department of the Interior and if these three agencies were included, then the Congress and the country would get a better picture of the tremendous responsibilities of this committee, and the Department of the Interior.

Mr. REIFEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. REIFEL. I am delighted to yield to my colleague who is a member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE).

Mr. McDADE. Mr Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to commend the gentleman from South Dakota for the statement that he has made, and he has been, as usual, in his customary practice, most informed and most intelligent, and I think most useful for all of us as Members of this body when we try to discern exactly what we are doing in this bill.

For me personally, the gentleman from South Dakota has been a real inspiration when I try to work on this bill, because the gentleman knows so much about it, both from the direct people programs, and also those having to do with our natural resources. The statement the gentleman made about natural resources was most articulate, and one I hope will be heard by all of us because the points he raises are extremely important not only to this Nation and for its future, but for the future of the whole world as well.

Mr. Chairman, I want the gentleman in the well to know that his opinion is valued most highly by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and by all members of the subcommittee and, indeed, by the Members of this House. It is a great real pleasure to serve with the the gentleman.

Mr. REIFEL. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude by expressing the appreciation of our subcommittee, and I am sure all members of this committee and Congress itself, for the dedicated service of our Federal employees. This past year has been a very difficult one for the administrators of the programs, particularly in those areas in which we fund these smaller agencies which in turn house small operating units in isolated areas where there may be only one employee on the job.

In the Park Service, for example, where you may have a national monument to be visited by thousands of people, and some of these people may come late in the evening, but the park employee knows that they have come from a great distance, and that they want to see a part of their country, and so he stays on even though it is beyond the hours in which he should be at work.

This is true of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in an isolated Indian school where teachers are cut back under the program of last year so that one teacher may have to take over the load of two teachers and in some instances of three teachers.

But apropos of this situation, I would like to read this from the record of the hearings at page 1176 where we elicited from Mr. Hartzog this information:

> Your total personnel was just under 6,300, I believe, in July of last year. And they contributed, will have contributed about a million and a half dollars of overtime for which they were not paid. This amounts to about $250 per employee. I think this needs to stand out in the record.
>
> While you did go over this adequately, I think it ought to be nailed down that it is $250 per employee in the Park Service, that they made this contribution to the preservation of our resources.

I think this can be said too of the employees of the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and the Bureau of Land Management and all the other agencies that are a part of the Department of the Interior and its related agencies that are funded by this.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REIFEL. I am glad to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell us how much there is in this bill to cover the pay increase costs?

I know that the total figure governmentwide that is mentioned in the report is $2,800,000,000. But I wonder what is provided for the personnel covered in this bill?

Mr. REIFEL. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), the chairman of the subcommittee, as she may have that information at hand.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. There is nothing in this bill to cover upcoming pay increases.

Mr. GROSS. Upcoming pay increases?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. You mean the pay increases which became effective on July 1?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. That is right, July 1.

Mr. GROSS. There is nothing in this bill?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. No.

Mr. GROSS. Where will that be taken care of?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Customarily, that is taken care of in the supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentlewoman about this American Revolution Bicentennial Commission? Is there authorization in law for the continuation of the appropriation that is here scheduled for the Bicentennial Commission?

Mr. REIFEL. I believe there is an authorization for the Bicentennial Commission. But I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) to reply.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The authorization bill extending the period for this activity is not yet enacted. If the gentleman wishes to raise a point of order, it would be valid. The authorization passed the Senate July 14, 1969, but has not been acted on by the House.

Mr. GROSS. If I may address a question to the gentlewoman, Does the gentlewoman know that the chairman of this American Revolution Commission is a native-born Canadian?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I have not been inquiring into who has been appointed in the various agencies and asking where they were born. But there are many native-born Canadians who have, I think, become American citizens.

Mr. GROSS. Would not the gentlewoman think it somewhat strange that a native-born Canadian would be the Chairman of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I do not make the appointments and without impelling reason to do so, I do not think I should comment on the background of appointees.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT).

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, I would like first to commend the gentlewoman from Washington, the chairman of this committee, for an outstanding job done in the day-to-day work of this committee. As a new member of this committee and sitting for the first time this year, it has been a real education for me to serve under the chairmanship of the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) and our ranking member, Mr. BEN REIFEL. Their knowledge and their dedication to their job has been a real experience for me, and I believe it has made it possible for me to make a greater contribution by far than would have been possible otherwise.

During my brief tenure in Congress, I have been greatly disturbed by the appropriation process in connection with our natural resources, our renewable natural resources. Two good examples are our timber resources and our fishery assets. The timber that is harvested by the Federal Government returns several times the amount that it costs to manage it and to cut it. The total added to the gross national product in the fisheries area is many times the relatively small amount appropriated, and these are renewable natural resources. These are resources that belong to every person in this country, and yet in this unique area of renewable natural resources, the

XUM

appropriations have historically been handled in exactly the same manner as have all other Federal appropriations.

The dollars for these productive programs have had to compete with dollars for totally unproductive programs, unproductive in terms of generating actual Federal income. No private business would operate in this manner. Efficient management would soon see that the maximum amount would be invested to produce the maximum return to the Treasury. Simple ordinary prudence would dictate that this be done.

Fortunately, this year, with the vision and the courage of the chairman and the ranking member of this committee, the impact of applying the same procedure to the management of our renewable resources has been minimized. So far as I know, the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service have been given all the money they have requested. This is important because of the growing crisis in the wood fiber supply, if we are to meet this Nation's housing goals as adopted by this Congress and recommended by the Executive. This is important if we mean what we say about providing adequate housing for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Research in this area is of enormous importance and returns many times over what is invested. The financing of phase two of the Forest Sciences Laboratory at Oregon State University is a very good example of a farsighted investment which will return many times the dollars invested.

In our fishery resource, the subcommittee has provided much needed management and research money, without which this great resource would disappear.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

The SPEAKER assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following date the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On July 11, 1969:

H.R. 11069. An act to authorize the appropriation of funds for Padre Island National Seashore in the State of Texas, and for other purposes.

H.R. 12167. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose informally to receive the message, the gentleman from Oregon had the floor. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining, and will proceed.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, the fact that we have done well this year, and we continue to do well in the next few visible years ahead, does not alter the fact that a better way should be devised for handling appropriations dealing with the great renewable natural resources of this country. This is something which I will devote particular attention to.

Again I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for the very excellent education they have provided me during the past year.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE).

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, the bill which the subcommittee has brought before the House, to provide the appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies, is a most significant one. It concerns itself with a vast area of responsibilities which are particularly significant in American life today.

It is difficult to pick up a newspaper or a magazine without reading a plea to conserve the natural beauty of our forest lands for ourselves and for our children. Through the appropriations here for the National Park Service, we are doing just that.

There is a growing concern, not only in the press, but among all Americans over the conservation of our fish and wildlife. Again, through the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, this bill will be a significant step in getting on with that job.

We find ourselves, as we look to the future, more and more concerned over the problem of clean water. Through the Office of Saline Water and the Office of Water Resources Research, this bill may open the door to new and imaginative steps forward in the conservation of fresh water for our future, and in the conversion of salt water into fresh water.

We are vitally concerned over the quality of American life in our own lives and in the lives of our children. Through the Commission on Fine Arts and the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, this bill will work to raise the quality of all of our lives.

It is indeed difficult to touch upon the countless aspects of American life which the appropriations we approve this afternoon will affect. I would single out, however, its enormous significance in my own congressional district in just a few areas.

We have been conducting in the anthracite coal region of the 10th Congressional District a vigorous fight against mine subsidence. We have worked ceaselessly to stabilize the surface of the land located above deserted mine shafts. This is a vital program to protect the homes and the lives of the people who may find themselves gravely endangered by subsidence. This bill will assist our able Bureau of Mines in a continuation of that surface stabilization program, which is so essential not only in my own district, but in every district where there has been substantial mining below the surface in the past.

We have begun an equally vital battle against the burning coal refuse banks in northeastern Pennsylvania. As the members of this subcommittee are well aware, and as some of my colleagues may also know, we have been faced in the anthracite region in Pennsylvania with the problem of nearly a billion cubic yards of burning coal refuse. This burning refuse represents a serious and dangerous problem in air pollution through the production of noxious gases and the slow burning process of anthracite, and guarantees that these burning banks would continue to smolder for many, many years to come—just as they have burned many, many years in the past. Through this appropriations bill, we can continue the fight against burning culm banks, not only to extinguish them, but to reclaim the land for industrial and residential usage.

I could not conclude these remarks without thanking the distinguished chairman and the other members of the subcommittee for supporting my request for an additional $2 million to be used in the Tocks Island project, where we are creating the Delaware National Park. I am vitally concerned in the wise and orderly progress of this project, and this additional money represents a prudent investment in the future development of this whole area.

In short, Mr. Chairman, the very name of this bill is a picture for what it represents. It is concerned with the interior of this Nation encompassed by our national boundaries, a countless number of areas vital to all of us, but even more vital in the preservation of this great Nation for our children.

I am sure the Members of this House will give their enthusiastic support to this legislation which was prepared over long and careful hours of study by the chairman of the subcommittee and by her colleagues. It is a bill worthy of the support of all of us.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN).

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation bill under consideration today has my full support.

During this time of inflationary trends in the economy, it is always difficult to fulfill all of the requests for funds. I want to thank the chairman, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) and the members of the committee for the time and consideration given to my requests at the time of the hearings and during conversations.

The redwood research headquarters to be located at Arcata, Calif., will be a great adjunct to the excellent Forestry Department at Humboldt State College and will serve to provide the necessary information as we seek to protect the redwood giants located in the Redwood National Park as well as advance the research data to public and private land management personnel concerned with watershed protection and management.

This will take on increasing importance, as time passes, particularly, as we seek expanded production in the second-growth redwood lands and stabilized watersheds contiguous to land-management units.

There is an additional matter I should like to bring to the attention of the Members. This relates to the Point Reyes National Seashore and the completion of the land acquisition. The authorizing Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has held the initial public hearings and developed the record for, hopefully, the required authorization and acceptance by the committee and the Congress.

Obviously, we cannot expect the Appropriations Committee to include funds unless and until action is concluded on the authorization legislation.

However, I do want to again bring to the attention of my colleagues the need to finalize the acquisition of these lands in order to relieve the affected landowners of this continuing uncertainty.

As the years pass on, the personal financial conditions of many of the landowners has changed dramatically. Deaths have occurred in some of the families, thereby creating severe estate tax problems. Also, local appraisal rates have increased, thus adding to their overall tax burden.

While I fully realize the remarks I make today may appear to be irrelevant, I simply am taking every opportunity to remind you, my colleagues, about the unfinished business we have with respect to the Point Reyes National Seashore. I shall maintain eternal vigilance until the project is completed.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado, the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (Mr. Aspinall).

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the 5 minutes, although I appreciate very much the yielding of that amount of time to me.

First, I wish to commend the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. Hansen), the chairman of the subcommittee, and her counterpart, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. Reifel), and the other members of the committee for what I consider to be an outstanding contribution as far as the appropriation process is concerned for this important responsibility of our Federal Government, the activities coming under this appropriation bill. I think if all of us would read the first five pages of this report, we would find there a pretty good format of just what is involved.

I listened very closely to the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Wyatt). He is so right in what he said and the thought he conveyed. The United States has not been too good a husbandman in the property which belongs to the United States. We have not taken care of our property as we should have taken care of it. This is not the fault of the Congress nor is it the fault of the administrative branch of the Government singly. It is the fault of all of us put together. We have one-third of the land area of the United States which belongs to the people of the United States. In this great land area wrapped up are the natural resources concerning which this bill treats. If we would be just a little bit more attentive to protecting such resources as they are or are not being used our country certainly would be far better off.

As far as the human resources to which the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. Reifel) so eloquently referred, he is correct. There is not any question about it. However, here again with all of the fine people we have working in this area in the United States proper and in the territorial areas, we, too, have been a little bit negligent in the work we have tried to do throughout the years.

So in my commendation to this Committee at this time, I wish to commend them on the way that they have brought this legislation to the House for consideration, for their understanding, for their cooperation with the authorizing legislation, and for their continued endeavor that there may be closer cooperation between the executive department and the Congress of the United States.

There may be some deficiencies in this bill. It may not please everyone. It never will please everyone, as far as that is concerned. I could ask some questions about certain parts of this bill if I were of a mind to, but by and large and generally, this bill is well put together. I would say to my colleagues, let us be careful in any attempt to amend this bill at the present time. This is the product of months of work. It is not final, it is not conclusive at the present time. It must go to the other body, and it must come out of conference. But if any Member can find any money being misspent in this bill, I am willing to talk further to that Member.

My only criticism—and it is not meant as criticism, but only as friendly suggestion—would be that we are not spending enough in this bill to take care of the resources upon which the people of the United States depend so much. It is all right to talk about all the good things, such as the Great Society or environmental control or a great many other of the good things we want to do, but if we spoil the base which makes our economy possible, then the good things of life which we talk so much about just are not going to be ours.

So in my commendation to those responsible for this legislature, the Members of this Committee of the Whole, let us be careful before we try to amend any part of this particular bill.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Saylor), a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, it is not very often that I disagree with the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but there are several items in this bill which I believe are worthy of correction, and at the appropriate time I will offer three amendments.

The first is an amendment which I hope will be accepted; that is, to reduce the expenditure by $77,300. It seems that back in 1964 President Johnson appointed a temporary Commission for Pennsylvania Avenue. There is absolutely no legislation whatsoever authorizing this Commission. There is absolutely no authority whatsoever for any appropriation for it. It has been funded over the years out of the President's own budget. Mr. Owings appeared before the committee and was asked whether or not there was any legislation. He said there was not. For some unknown reason the committee gave him $77,300 to take care of Pennsylvania Avenue between the Capitol Grounds and 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, a place known as the White House.

If any Member can understand why they need $7,800 for travel, he is better than I am; but it is in there. That is part of the authorization, $7,800 for travel from here down to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. This is an item that should be taken out of the bill.

I will offer another amendment with regard to the contract authorization. On page 25 the committee has seen fit to say:

> *Provided*, That none of the funds herein provided shall be expended for planning or construction on the following: Fort Washington and Greenbelt Park, Maryland, and Great Falls Park, Virginia, except minor roads and trails; and Daingerfield Island Marina, Virginia, and extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from vicinity of Brickyard Road to Great Falls, Maryland, or in Prince Georges County, Maryland.

I do not know why these five areas have been selected by the committee, but if they are going to do it then let us go the whole way. Since we have not approved the overall plan for Assateague Island I am going to offer an amendment to say that no funds shall be used for construction of a road over the Assateague National Seashore.

Then I have an amendment which will cost a little money. It seems there have been considerable funds in this bill, $48,503,000, for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife Management. At one time one of the largest hatcheries owned by the Federal Government in the entire system was the Lamar Fish Hatchery in Pennsylvania.

The present field station is responsible for fishery management on all Federal waters in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and parts of New York and Maryland comprising 21,073 acres of lakes, reservoirs, and ponds, and 778 miles of streams.

The Lamar Field Station is budgeted for only $14,000 as a one-man operation but in conjunction with the completion of the new Kinzua Dam project and the needs of the Allegheny National Forest, a suggested budget of approximately $65,000 per year is modest compared to the budgets of other field stations.

Why the Bureau requested such a small amount I do not know, but I expect to offer an amendment to increase that appropriation by $65,000.

With these three changes—none of which involves anything in my district, but all of which I believe are vital to a better bill—I hope that the bill will be accepted by the members of the Committee and passed.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Marsh).

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank

the gentleman from South Dakota for yielding this time to me.

It is a pleasure for me to take the well and speak in support of this bill as well as pay tribute not only to the leadership of the chairwoman of the committee but also the leadership of the gentleman from South Dakota.

As many others have mentioned before today, I, too, share their concern and regret at the announcement that he will not seek reelection to the 92d Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, for those of us who consider this bill, which is one of the smaller bills brought out by the various subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations. I think it should be pointed out very clearly and should be understood by everyone that the Department of the Interior is the only major agency of the Federal Government that generates more receipts in the way of Federal revenues than it spends. On page 2 of the report this year it is pointed out that the estimated receipts for the Department for fiscal year 1970 are $1,355,000,000 plus. So we are actually dealing here with a Federal agency which is returning to the U.S. Treasury huge sums of Federal revenues.

This is also an agency that deals with a broad scope of America's resources which have so ably been described by other members of the subcommittee. They range from the Nation's national parks and national forests and public lands to the resources of the sea. For those who come from districts which are oriented toward marine activities, they know that one of the critical areas of concern nationally is the American fisheries industries. For those of us who have listened to the testimony before this committee, we can confirm that this Nation is lagging in its development of the resources of the sea and that the American fishing industry is indeed in trouble.

However, for those of us who are still not convinced—although I really believe all of the Members are convinced—as to the great economic impact coming from this particular bill, let me say that in the 90th Congress the committee directed questions to the National Park Service to see if they could give the committee, the Congress, and the people of the United States some idea of the economic impact and the cost-benefit ratio of the National Park Service with relation to our Federal economy. The National Park Service commissioned a study conducted by Dr. Ernst W. Swanson at North Carolina State University. Dr. Swanson is a noted economist. For those of you who are interested in pursuing this matter I direct your attention to page 23, volume 1 of the committee hearings wherein there is a summary of the economic report of Dr. Swanson. I would like to point out this excerpt from Dr. Swanson's report with reference to the economic benefits of the National Park Service. Please remember that this is a very limited area of the total jurisdiction nationally of the Department of the Interior. I note from Dr. Swanson's report:

> Trips in the national park system in 1967 benefited the national economy to the following extent: $6.35 billion in travel expenditures which resulted in $4.76 billion in personal income. $5.71 billion added to the gross national product—$952 million in Federal taxes.

So you can see that this one agency of the Department of the Interior, the National Park Service, was able to make an economic contribution through visitations by the American people to the national parks of revenues that amounted to $952 million.

Looking at the $4.76 billion personal income mentioned above and the $102 million appropriation to the National Park Service, Mr. Chairman, Dr. Swanson points out that actually based upon a ratio of investment to economic impact, with reference to the national parks, that for $1 invested in appropriations we have received a $46 return in economic impact. A 46-to-1 ratio.

Let us remember this when we vote on this bill today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. THOMSON).

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from South Dakota yielding this time to me because I simply want to call the attention of the Committee and to those who may be members of the conference with reference to an urgent need in Wisconsin to relocate the fish control laboratory at LaCrosse, Wis. They are presently located in a little building which was constructed in 1924 in the middle of a city park. Every spring when the Mississippi River floods, they lose the use of that building for about a 1-month period of time. They have to remove the equipment and when the flood is over, they have to replace it back in the building.

Mr. Chairman, the Bureau did not arrive at a figure for studies with respect to this relocation until too late to bring it to the attention of this committee. We hope it will be in the Senate bill and that when it comes to conference you will give your favorable attention to this very urgently needed improvement.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I would like at this point to yield to our distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), if she would like to respond to the observation just made by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. THOMSON).

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Dakota for yielding to me. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin that this matter did not, as the gentleman commented, come up before the committee during the course of its hearings. Certainly I realize that when a fish hatchery has been constructed and has been in service for a long period of time, funds eventually are required for rehabilitation or replacement.

This committee is usually very happy to assist in this kind of activity when it is properly presented.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER).

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I thank the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to note the concern for the health and safety of coal miners in the work of the subcommittee which is revealed not only in the testimony but in the action of the subcommittee in granting the full request of the Bureau of Mines for an additional $2,448,000. I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee and the members of the subcommittee for this action.

Mr. Chairman, I am very concerned that sufficient leadership is exercised in these vital areas of health and safety in the coal mines. For many years the Bureau of Mines has been "operator oriented," or, perhaps, a better term would be "production oriented" in its approach to the problem of health and safety. The Bureau unfortunately has done very little in taking the initiative in order to protect the health and safety of coal miners. Rather, the Bureau has been too much concerned with increasing the production of coal and not enough with the protection of those human beings who mine the coal.

I would like to ask the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington what her reaction would be to writing into the law some form of early retirement for these inspectors in the Bureau of Mines, many of whom have hung on for years and years and are imbued with the older philosophy of production rather than protection.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I gladly yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. In reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that if he were to ask me to write an amendment to the civil service system on the floor of the House it would take more than this afternoon. Problems are not confined to older employees; young employees can be slothful also. Some place along the line we are failing to inspire these people to realize that the better job they do, the better their Government and our land will be. But, to be perfectly frank, I do not believe you can abolish or change the whole thing this afternoon.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I thank the gentlewoman from Washington.

I believe that the mine health and safety legislation now being developed by the Committee on Education and Labor might recommend such a proposal, and I believe it would be a very healthy development which would beef up the Bureau of Mines and its approach to modern problems.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the fact that so much money for health research will be administered by the Bureau of Mines, because the Bureau of Mines has for so long ignored the rising and critical problem of pneumoconiosis among the Nation's coal miners. I would like to ask the gentlewoman from Washington, the chairman of the subcommittee, what her feeling would be on putting a little more emphasis in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on health research, rather than putting all these funds into the Bureau of Mines.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I gladly yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The Health, Education, and Welfare bill is not before us at the present time, and neither am I the chairman who handles that bill. We are handed the responsibility of funding for adequate mine safety, and for the programs which the Bureau of Mines develops and sends to us under the authority of the Department of the Interior, and we have endeavored to fund them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Taft).

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to call to the attention of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Washingon, the justification by the Geographical Survey to be found on pages 902 through 909 of the hearings.

Specifically, I have had complaints from various engineering, surveying, and mapping firms that there has been a tendency by the Geological Survey to move over into areas in which private enterprise and the skills of private professional personnel are available. Yet I note in this bill, and perhaps in some relation to the complaints that I have had, that there is an application in this so-called justification for 66 additional positions, and an additional $2.6 million although I do not know that all of these items are superfluous. The gentlewoman from Washington herself later on in the hearings I note asked whether they could not get along with their same personnel of approximately 1,500 people, but no response was given as to that—just a statement that it would be hard to do so.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that when we are trying to economize it might be well to reexamine this situation. The reason I make this point, if an amendment is not offered here today, is that the Senate committee, or perhaps the conference committee, might take a look at this item to determine whether the work which is involved is necessary. Indeed there is some talk in the transcript of a reduction in some of the work as to the requirements of some of the map revisions, requirements that have been observed in the past, to find out if we could not perhaps economize somewhat and cut back on this and leave some of it to the private professional resources.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will state to the gentleman that we had a thorough discussion of items in this bill, and if the gentleman from Ohio will pardon me for saying so, there are maps involved here that are related to many fields beyond those where private industry participates.

This is not in any way to say anything derogatory with regard to map work performed by private industry. It is simply felt that these maps are needed in many of the governmental activities. I think I need not go any further.

Mr. TAFT. I would just like to say to the gentlewoman, although it may not be true of some of the areas covered in the justification, but there are other programs with reference to mapping 25 large cities topographically.

I know from my experience as a practicing attorney there have been many instances where that has been done well by private professional people.

Is the gentlewoman aware of that and does she claim there is no such mapping involved in the justification and the expansion listed by it?

Why are there 60 additional personnel needed when they have 1,500 personnel already? Could they not get along with what they have?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. We have received quite an extensive analysis from the U.S. Geological Survey in this connection justifying their budget request. I will supply this information for his review.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time and yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. Hansen), if she should need the time to close debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. Hansen) is recognized.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, as usual I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my very distinguished colleague, the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. Reifel).

(Mr. GIAIMO, at the request of Mrs. Hansen of Washington, was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I have never once hesitated to support appropriations for the National Endowment for the Arts, and I have never once hesitated to encourage additional authorizations for this excellent agency that is literally starved for funds. As man conquers the moon and space the kind of things with which this tiny agency concerns itself makes life on earth bearable and civilized. I am constantly shocked by the disproportionate amount we spend to develop the technical side of man's abilities compared to the pittance we offer his spiritual and cultural talents. And so, Mr. Chairman, I embrace these programs for the arts and the humanities.

But in this area as in all others, I deplore waste. I deplore the kind of waste that comes from well-intentioned programs that are so badly conceived, and so poorly managed, that they actually work against their own stated goals. These are the expensive little Frankenstein monsters that we give life to in Government and they always come back to haunt us.

I hasten to explain that I am not now characterizing the programs of the arts endowment which in general I believe have been brilliantly administered by Mr. Roger Stevens. I am referring to the mushrooming activities of the Smithsonian Institution which has recently blossomed forth with a Department of the Performing Arts. It seems that Mr. Stevens' success has gone to the Smithsonian's head and it is now seeking to share the arts' endowments mission.

The Smithsonian has blessed us with its own concept of how the theater is to be encouraged. In practice it is a curious program.

Taking advantage of its excellent location on the Mall and a 900-seat tent theater constructed by the Pepsi-Cola Co., the Smithsonian has gone into the theater business. This summer it offers the Washington tourist trade three musical comedies: "Annie Get Your Gun," "Of Thee I Sing," and "Guys and Dolls." Admission is $2 and $3. The Smithsonian is able to do this because, first, we appropriate money for it, and, second, the Institution pays wages that are considered substandard by the Secretary of Labor and by practically every major professional theater organization in the country.

With all of this going for it, the Smithsonian can afford to make a singular contribution to the Washington advertising business by placing large, expensive ads in the major media to draw tourists and citizens alike to the Mall and away from privately sponsored theater programs.

I believe this is a serious matter. On the one hand we appropriate funds to put some needed economic backbone into the theater and other art forms but with the other we support the Smithsonian's curious effort to engage in competition with privately operated theaters. On the one hand we try to assist the American artist to find opportunities that will pay him a fair wage so that he may pursue his art and develop within his profession and with our other hand we appropriate funds to a government operation that competes in theater on the basis of paying substandard wages to its artists.

It seems that our Smithsonian Institution, in its eagerness to assume new responsibilities has scrambled some valid priorities with regard to the Government-art relationship. Perhaps we should advise the Smithsonian and all other agencies of the Government that might seek to branch out into the theater that consideration must be given to the artist and his welfare and that a great deal of thought should be given the extent to which Government-administered programs might compete with private efforts to provide entertainment and cultural activities.

With regard to the artist, I think this body has already written some sound guidelines into Public Law 89–209 which can serve other programs as well. In that act we stated that grantees of the National Endowment for the Arts could not employ wage-earning performers for less than the standard minimum wage as determined by the Secretary of Labor. Surely, an agency of the Federal Government should not be permitted to do directly what the Arts Endowment is

XUM

prohibited from doing indirectly through its grants programs. And yet, this is what the Smithsonian has done. It has employed people at less than the standard minimum wage set for actors and actresses and it has employed them directly in its own service.

Concerning Government's position vis-a-vis privately administered theater activities, I think all Government agencies should be careful that they stimulate, encourage, and supplement that which is offered by private organizations rather than supplant such privately sponsored programs. I believe that the first priority for all Government endeavors in the arts should be to assist and thereby encourage a great variety of privately administered programs through the use of grants or contracts.

With this in mind, I consider it proper for Government to engage directly in productions of the performing arts only when it is necessary to provide a service to the public that cannot be provided under private commercial or nonprofit auspices even with Government assistance. Special presentations of rarely performed but culturally significant works or free events that are offered to all of the public without consideration of ability to pay are some of the activities which come to mind that might justify direct Government involvement.

The Smithsonian is asking $2 and $3 in a location where tourists, not our economically deprived citizens, abound. It is offering standard commercial theater musicals that are still widely presented by the privately operated theaters of our land. In sum, the Smithsonian's Theater on the Mall operation offers no special service to the community which justifies the involvement of this Government agency to the extent it has become involved as producer and manager. Indeed, as a producer and manager of a theater offering substandard wages and working conditions to its artists, it does us all a great disservice.

I suggest that the Smithsonian reevaluate its program in terms of its contribution to the performing arts professions and in terms of its responsibility to privately operated theaters in this city. I am deeply concerned with this matter and I hope it will not be necessary for me to ask this body for legislation that would require the Smithsonian to meet its obligations as a representative of this Government's policies in the arts.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I have asked for this time simply to propose this inquiry.

I am very much concerned that the budget estimate for the National Council of Marine Resources and Engineering Development was not included. I understand from reading the report that it did not reach the committee in time. I am sure the committee does consider this a very vital agency and that its function is very vital. I wonder how the funding would occur?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. That is quite true. We had no presentation of this before the committee and we did not have the material before our hearings were completed. It was not before us when we marked up the bill.

It may be considered by the other body because we are deeply concerned and interested in this activity.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, we have had a variety of very excellent debate and excellent questions here today.

I would like to express my appreciation to Members who have participated in it so fully and who have asked these questions.

Mr. Chairman, in closing this debate I would like to say one thing, because sometimes we measure the width and the greatness of our land purely in terms of money. I think it is well to look at this bill in the context of many things and measure our expenditures accordingly. I think some significant comparisons may be of interest.

Mr. Chairman, I am informed that to date approximately $24 billion has been spent on the space program which has sent the first man in the history of mankind to the moon. This event generated pride in the Nation and man himself.

This $24 billion is $4 billion less than 1 year of the Vietnamese conflict.

This bill, $1.54 billion, is approximately one-sixth of what U.S. citizens expended for tobacco in 1965, and approximately one-tenth of our alcoholic-beverage expenditure in the same year. Both figures, I may add, have escalated.

Thomas Huxley, the English zoologist and lecturer, who when visiting the United States during the 19th century, said to this country:

> I cannot say I am the slightest degree impressed by the bigness, or your natural resources as such. . . . Size is not grandeur, and territory does not make a nation. The great issue . . . is what are you going to do with all these things?

Today, Mr. Chairman, as we vote on this bill and as we debate it, let us make our reply to Mr. Huxley's challenge with a firm statement of our national objectives, resources, and goals. The expenditure of money in this bill is for this Nation's life, and, in some instances, its very survival. I urge your support.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, I must point out that the Interior and related agencies bill my colleagues and I are considering today for passage does not contain what I feel to be a proper amount of funding for an extremely important facet of services for our American Indians. Under the health services for Indians section the bill, $1 million has been unjustifiably cut out which will impair the vital assistance necessary for the continued good health of Indian families.

If I may cite at least one example in my State of Nevada, and, I am sure, other Members of the House have similar situations regarding this same subject. The Indians at the Nevada Duck Valley Indian Reservation at Owyhee, Nev., the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes, alerted me earlier this year to the individual hardship their tribe sustains without sufficient dental care.

The one dental unit now authorized at the Duck Valley Reservation is not capable of handling the needs of the Indians. It has been my understanding that a second dental unit was to have been installed this year but this was not accomplished, despite urging from Shoshone-Paiute Tribe at Owyhee to the Division of Indian Health offices at the Phoenix area office. The funds for this second dental unit were to have come from the Indian Health Services section of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under this bill, H.R. 12781, before the House of Representatives today.

But, Mr. Chairman, the $1 million cut in Indian health services will completely eliminate any chance for the establishment of the second dental unit I have spoken of.

The Shoshone-Paiute Indians at the Duck Valley Indian Reservation at Owyhee, Nev., are faced with the continued problem of only one dentist available from July 1 to December 31. One chair with one dentist simply is not satisfactory service to handle the dental needs of our Indian brothers at Owyhee, and I urge other Members to join with me today to support this grievance and state similar cases I know must be prevalent in their own States and districts, in hopes the $1 million will be restored.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to add that I find it regretful the bill eliminates the salaries and expenses for the National Council on Indian Opportunity. I feel that the important service of this Council would be manifold in helping coordinate the Federal Government's role with respect to the individual Indian needs across the country and those programs designed to assist the reservations and tribes.

I urge the $1 million cut in Indian health services be restored today and that the funds for the council be added to the bill.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee and particularly the Subcommittee on the Department of the Interior and its able chairman, the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), are to be commended for the farsighted approach embodied in the bill before us today. After thorough consideration of the Department's requests, the committee acted in favor of long-term economy—making funds available now which will, as each year passes, mean a great savings to the Federal Government and all taxpayers, and a greater enjoyment to the millions who yearly visit our national park system.

A major problem in the orderly expansion of our national park system has always been the timelag between authorization of new park lands, and the actual appropriation making purchase possible. Early last year the Department of the Interior noted:

> If acquiring agencies were authorized to enter into land purchase contracts at such areas [parks] immediately after authorization instead of having to wait an average of about 9 months for the appropriation of funds, as is now the case, substantial money would be saved. These savings would be accomplished by acquiring prime tracts before most price escalation could occur.

Acting in direct response to this problem, the Department of the Interior, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, recommended authorization of the Biscayne National Monument in south Florida, and acquisition of the privately owned lands, valued at approximately $25 million, within a 5-year period.

In farsighted action and wisdom, the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of the Interior has added its approval to this new funding method, and recommended approval of a $4.15 million expenditure from the land and water conservation fund for actual purchase of private lands in the Biscayne National Monument during fiscal year 1970, and an additional $4 million in advance contract authority to enable the National Park Service to contract for lands at the current market value. Not only will this procedure result in a considerable savings to the Government, but it will also eliminate the long period of uncertainty previously forced upon private landowners. Because of the committee's action, property owners can now be more assured of the Government's very real intention of acquiring all privately owned lands within a reasonable time period.

I am sure the Appropriations Committee has long realized the need for an orderly, money-saving procedure of this nature, and am pleased that, with the cooperation of the Interior Department and the Bureau of the Budget, this has finally been accomplished.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, in its report on H.R. 12781, the Committee on Appropriations recommended that the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission be funded in the amount of $175,000 for fiscal year 1970, which is $50,000 less than the Commission had requested.

The committee also voiced criticism of the Commission for not having made greater progress since it was chartered on July 4, 1966.

I would like to echo my concern. The 200th anniversary of this Nation—and, incidentally, the 100th anniversary of the great State of Colorado—is a bit more than 6 years away, and very few of the basic decisions—such as the site of an international exhibition—have been made.

Six years is virtually tomorrow in the context of planning an event of the scope of the Nation's bicentennial. A "crash" program will be necessary to make up for lost time.

I would add that the lack of progress is not solely the fault of the Commission itself. Rather, lack of funding in its early months and delays in reconstituting the Commission in 1969 were responsible in part.

Thus, both the Congress and the administration contributed to the delays, and accordingly I would hope that both branches of the Federal Government will encourage the Commission to get on with the job.

At best, the bicentennial events will give the United States an opportunity to point with pride to its beginnings and also give the world the message that we have barely begun to realize our potential as a nation.

At worst, it will be an overcommercialized, underplanned collection of uncoordinated events which will damage our Nation's prestige.

The Commission—with the help of the Congress and the administration—can make certain that we display our past, present, and future fittingly.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I urge approval of this bill to insure the orderly development and management of the Nation's natural resources. Members of the House Appropriations Committee and its Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies are to be congratulated in presenting a bill for our approval that will accomplish this important aim.

I note with particular satisfaction that the version before us supports an expanded program for the intensified management of our national forest lands. As I stated in testimony before the subcommittee last March, better management will provide opportunities to meet successfully the growing and varied demands made on our timber resources. We can move closer to two desirable and compatible goals: more efficient harvest of our national forests, and more effective use of Forest Service lands for recreation purposes.

I am pleased, too, that the bill encourages continuation of such crucial forest programs as are now conducted by the U.S. Forestry Sciences Laboratory at Corvallis, Oreg., and by the Range and Wildlife Habitat Laboratory at LaGrande, Oreg. Their work, and the work of other research units across this Nation included in this measure, is essential if we are to make headway in forest insect and disease control, forest tree genetics, and evaluating the effects of pesticides on forest soils and water.

THE NATIONAL PARKS—A SOLID INVESTMENT

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, earlier today, during the consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union of the bill (H.R. 12781) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, I took occasion to direct attention to the fact that the National Park Service is notable for its impressive ratio of dollars earned to dollars received in appropriations.

A credible estimate places this ratio at 46 to 1 return in economic benefits of approximately $46 for each $1 invested in appropriations.

As I mentioned in my earlier remarks, a study commissioned by the National Park Service pursuant to a request of the committee made in connection with appropriation hearings in the 90th Congress indicated that, in 1967, for example, $6.35 billion in travel expenditure resulted in $4.76 billion in personal income and $5.71 billion added to the gross national product. Visitation in the national park system produced $952 million in Federal taxes in that year.

Because I believe the House will find impressive this identification of substantial economic productivity in a Federal agency, I take the liberty at this time, Mr. Chairman, of including a summary of the study referred to, which was conducted by Dr. Ernst W. Swanson, professor emeritus of economics at the North Carolina State University at Raleigh, as follows:

SUMMARY OF A STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM TRAVEL ON THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

(By Dr. Ernst W. Swanson, Professor Emeritus of Economics, North Carolina State University at Raleigh)

The value of the National Park System to Americans is not measurable in strictly monetary terms. But it can be shown that travel to the national parks, monuments, and other areas of the system contributes far more to the economy dollarwise than generally has been supposed.

The park system is of such significance both qualitatively and quantitatively as to occupy a major role in the daily life of a nation undergoing marked social and economic changes. Trips to the National Park System in 1967 benefited the national economy to the following extent: $6.35 billion in travel expenditures which resulted in: $4.76 billion in personal income, $5.71 billion added to the gross national product, $952 million in Federal taxes.

The $4.76 billion in personal income represents more than $23 for every man, woman and child in the United States. This figure is quite sizeable as a matter of gain to the nation from assets being preserved for posterity. Unlike the mining and the oil industries, for example, which give up nonrenewable resources, the National Park System yields its contribution with little or no diminution of its resource values. Wilderness resources are even increasing in value, materially as well as in less tangible ways.

To calculate the economic impact of park system visitors we take these steps:

1. Determine the number of visitors who make major expenditures by staying overnight at or near a park system area. One-day visitors are omitted because we can't make any valid assumption as to their spending behavior. Under presumptions based on studies at major national parks, and a review this past summer by this writer of dozens of park and regional spending patterns, a reasonable "average" figure can be derived. To adjust for day visitors we reduce the total visitations by 25 percent. Thus, transients and double counting may be largely omitted. The truly income-generating park visitors are those who stay overnight and who travel a substantial distance to reach the park. At Yosemite, Sequoia and Kings Canyon national parks, the income-generating visitors may be no more than 55 percent of the total. At Grand Canyon, Rocky Mountain, Grand Teton, Zion, Glacier and other parks 95 percent may be income-generating, based on park studies, park statistics and my review in the summer of 1968.

2. Establish expenditures per person for visitors staying more than a day in the state in which the park is located. From visitor expenditure figures taken in varying years in two states, five national parks and one national seashore, and adjusting them for differences in price levels, we found this average visitor spent about $15.12 per day. From several recent studies, data from the Fred Harvey Company and my own interviews with travel group members, we concluded that 4.0 days is the average length of stay.

3. Thus 75 percent of the total 1967 park system visitation of 140 million gives us 105 million income-generating visitors who spent $15.12 each per day for four days, or a total of $6.35 billion.

4. This figure, however, is total outlay whereas the best measure of the economic impact of visitations is personal income. The $6.35 billion includes most excise and sales taxes, business savings, undistributed profit and expenditures for goods brought into the area. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, direct personal income runs about 30 percent of gross outlay. Thus, we find $1.905 billion in direct personal income resulting from park travel. This is the income of merchants, retailers, service station operators, restaurant owners and the employees of all the travel-related businesses.

5. There is indirect personal income as well, however, resulting from the park travelers' outlay. Indirect income is that income resulting from the effects of the spending of the direct income receivers. The service station owner's wife buys an overcoat, for example. The clothier pays his clerks who, in turn, buy groceries. The chain reaction of spending naturally will be greater in a diversified economy such as the Northeast than in a highly specialized area as, say, around Glacier National Park. Economists measure this effect by tracing the use of a dollar over and over. The first spending contributes $1.00 to the money flow but if a family is saving 30 percent, then the amount returned to the flow is $.70. The next time around, assuming the same withholding of 30 percent, 70 perment of the $.70 is returned, or $.49. Next time it's 70 percent of 49 cents or 34.3 cents and so on until nothing is returned to the money flow.

Now, to get some measure of this indirect income, we resort to a variation of the investment multiplier technique used to measure the probable effects of investment. If there is a withholding of 30 percent from the initial dollar spent, we compute a multiplier effect of 3.333 (.30 into 1.0). But evidence from a variety of research studies shows this figure much too high and the rate of withholding as applied to travel-derived income is really about 40 cents on the dollar which produces a multiplier of 2.5.

Studies show that the multiplier varies from as low as 1.12 to 3 or more, depending on the economic complexity and size of the region being studied. The 2.5 figure also is an "in-between" value, based on the findings of the Robert R. Nathan Associates, research groups of the universities of Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming and of Memphis State and Colorado State universities. This figure is an approximation which reflects a balancing out of the highly developed, populous areas with the poorly developed and sparsely populated areas.

In a strict sense, 2.5 is not an average but a judgment based on knowledge of the economic conditions of the National Park System locales. Had we selected a multiplier of 3.0, a figure supported by some writers, we would have obtained a figure of $5.7 billion as the total contribution to direct and indirect personal income of National Park System travelers. Our more realistic multiplier of 2.5, deemed more representative of the nation as a whole, gives us a personal income figure of $4.76 billion contributed by National Park System travel.

If we study the nature of formation of the Gross National Product (the best measure we have of national well-being) we find that GNP runs approximately 1.2 times the national personal income. Thus, the income contribution of National Park System travel gives a figure of $5.71 billion as the amount of GNP generated by National Park System travel.

Another remarkable contribution of the National Park System to the national economy lies in the Federal taxes accruing from park visits. The Treasury Department makes a rough estimate that 20 percent of total personal income goes into Federal taxes. At this rate, travel to the National Park System resulted in $952 million in taxes for the Federal Government in 1967.

Still another graphic indication of the National Park System's economic impact is its 46-to-1 return per dollar of annual appropriation. The total personal income of $4.76 billion from Park System travels is realized on appropriations of only $102 million, a figure far inadequate for the country's needs.

Although the National Park System cannot be evaluated adequately in dollars and cents, we can compute a business-type capitalization based on the personal income contribution from Park System travel. To derive a "market value" of the Service's assets, we multiply the personal income contribution by some factor that reflects the going market rate of interest. We select a 4 percent rate; business firms, facing higher risk conditions, would use a higher rate. On the assumption that the annual income here is a perpetual annuity, we divide 100 by 4 then multiply this factor of 25 by the total personal income contribution. On this basis the value of the National Park System assets may be said to be $119 billion.

Until one has traveled to the majority of the national parks, it is difficult to realize how much money is spent by the traveling public. Californians spend about $2 billion a year on vacations; visitors to the state spent $900 million in 1967.

To go by car to Grand Canyon National Park from Washington, D.C., with reasonably priced lodging and meals and as much as 40 cents or more for a gallon of gas, will cost two people $30 a day or more. With a week or so at the park, the vacation will cost two people at least $600. Rental of campers and travel coaches may be as expensive as lodging at a high-class motor inn at $10 per person.

Residents of some areas derive much of their livelihood from park travel; for those in the Jackson Hole country at Grand Teton National Park, the park is the source of half their living.

The biggest business in Cortez, Colorado, and surrounding Montezuma County is the servicing of travelers to Mesa Verde National Park, Hovenweep National Monument, and Aztec Ruins National Monument. There are 342 motel units, plus a hotel of 50 units—a 25 percent increase in the last five years. Yet, more accommodations are needed. Some 130 to 150 travel parties have been turned away each night during the peak season. About 1,100 travelers are given lodging, leaving some 435 to 525 without accommodations. The daily income from travelers runs as high as $15,000 during the peak season, less than half that in the off season.

The demand for recreation has reached heights which a decade ago could only be sketchily foretold. Can we afford a burden of visitations so immense as to threaten the very existence of our parks and landmarks? To this question there is an answer: Our National Park System is such a powerful generator of a sizeable amount of national income, that there is no convincing reason why Congress should not provide whatever funds are necessary to guard against such a threat and to maintain, operate and perpetuate these valuable lands and waters.

These are, indeed, irreplacable assets that serve us in the understanding of nature, our cultural background, and the beginnings of this nation and of the continent. They are the sources and stores of history, anthropology, archaeology, zoology, climatology and geology. Dollar signs cannot be attached to knowledge so significant that it can never be found again in another place or time.

Dollar signs can be placed, however, on the economic activities arising from their presence, the values to the nation of the travel outlays and expenditures arising from visits to these assets, even though such figures pale in significance in comparison to the knowledge gained, recreation enjoyed and psychological and spiritual enrichment realized.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of June 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 212), as amended by the Act of August 30, 1964 (78 Stat. 614), to assist in the construction of fishing vessels, $3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this bill is something like an iceberg. Not all of it shows on the surface or above the surface. We know that this bill is at least $10 million above last year's appropriation for the same general purposes. That is the word of the chairman of the subcommittee, but what is not seen are the millions of additional dollars that the Department of the Interior is obligated to pay out and which ought to be provided in this bill. That is the part of the iceberg that is unseen.

A little while ago I asked whether there was any money in this bill for the pay increases that became effective last July 1. I was advised there is no money for such purpose in the bill. The Department of Interior is not the smallest Department in the Federal Government. It has thousands of employees. We know the pay increase for all agencies of the Government, which was effective July 1, will amount to nearly $3 billion. So there are millions upon millions of dollars that belong in this bill but which will be provided later in a supplemental appropriation.

What I am trying to say here this afternoon is simply this: If we are going to bring any order out of chaos in the fiscal affairs of this country, somewhere we are going to have to start cutting appropriations. It has not been done in other legislation and it is not being done in this bill. This bill, calling for the spending of $1.5 billion in this fiscal year, is $10 million more than the appropriation for last year, minus the very substantial amount of money that will be provided later to pay for the salary increases. So we are seeing only a part of the iceberg. Make no mistake about it—you will not be cutting expenditures if you vote for this bill. You will be voting for an increase.

I am intrigued, I am always intrigued by money that is expended through this bill for such items as commercial fisheries and the construction of fishing vessels. I do not know why we build fishing vessels in this country if we are going to permit them to be shot up and confiscated by foreign governments, and if we have to pay from another pocket money to get the vessels, cargoes, and the crews back.

That is another of the incredible con-traditions in the operation of this Government.

And we have the good old arts and humanities in this bill to the tune of $16 million. Why should there be another dollar of increase for that purpose? This is one fund that ought to be cut out entirely in the interest of fiscal sanity. Around the country, cultural centers are busted and closing. The new $13 million center in Atlanta, Ga., opened recently and three of the theaters in that center are to be closed this fall, according to the testimony before this committee, because they are not supported. But we in this Congress go blindly on voting to put up more and more money for the arts and humanities.

I hope there will be an amendment—and I understand there will be one—to at least cut the appropriation back to the figure for last year. It ought to be cut out completely and the money devoted to something worthwhile.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa referred to the funds that are in this bill for the construction of fishing vessels and for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. Also the gentleman indicated that he certainly did not approve of appropriating money for construction of vessels that would be seized by other nations and for which this Nation would pay fines, and so on.

I think I should comment at this time and say that I am very hopeful these seizures will cease. On July 29 a meeting is scheduled in Latin America in which four nations will participate in discussions. I am hopeful there will be an end to the fining of our fishing vessels that fish on the high seas and which for the last 15 years the United States has seemed unwilling to protect.

However, I should like to call attention to the fact that in this bill funds for construction subsidy of fishing vessels are reduced.

In the early days of the founding of this Republic it was determined that in order to develop our shipbuilding industry we should require that fishing vessels must be built in this country, and therefore the fisherman is compelled to pay higher prices than he would otherwise to have his fishing vessel built abroad.

We have had a program since 1964 under which we have attempted to upgrade our fishing fleet. It has been a miserable failure. We have spent millions of dollars and have succeeded only in building 31 new fishing vessels. When one considers we have some 13,000 fishing vessels, mostly overage, of 5 tons or more, one can see it has not succeeded in its purpose of upgrading the fleet. As a matter of fact, most of these 31 vessels went to concerns that were never in the fishing business before, so what we have succeeded in doing is giving the existing fishing industry competition it never had before.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am not worried so much about the subsidization of the American fishing industry as I am that we build fishing vessels and then see them taken over on the high seas by foreign governments.

Mr. PELLY. I have appreciated the fact that the gentleman from Iowa has supported my efforts in order to try to stop this practice, and I believe, thanks to his help and the action of this House, we finally are going to come to some agreement with these countries. I appreciate the gentleman's help.

Mr. GROSS. There is to be a meeting in Washington in October, a so-called low-level meeting, and then in December down in Venezuela there is scheduled a so-called high-level meeting, but I cannot be very optimistic, from what I hear, that the gentleman is going to see the results he hopes for. I do commend the gentleman from Washington for the vigorous fight he has made to put a stop to the seizure of our fishing vessels.

Mr. PELLY. I have followed the situation very closely, and I am personally encouraged. A four-nation meeting is scheduled to meet in Buenos Aires the end of July with representatives from Peru, Chile, and Ecuador.

I want to say I am hopeful. I believe meanwhile it is quite essential to enact a new fishing vessel construction program.

The consumption of fish in this country has gone up, but it has been the consumption of imported foreign fish which has gone up since 1954 by more than 100 percent. Meanwhile, during the same period the consumption of our own domestically caught fish has gone down. We must do something to upgrade our old obsolete fishing fleet.

As I say, the funds in this bill have been reduced from the $6 million appropriation of last year to $3 million.

Meanwhile, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House has developed a bill which I believe will give broader support for the upgrading of our fishing vessels, and will allow this subsidy to go for reconstruction and remodeling of the older vessels as well as new construction so that the money available will go further. We should help more of our people in the fishing industry, instead of giving them competition they have never had before.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon, who has done a great deal in the way of trying to help our fisheries.

Mr. WYATT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman, who has been a real leader in fisheries matters, and I should also like to point out, as he has said, during the time that the total poundage of fish consumed in this country has grown enormously the percentage of fish caught by domestic American fishermen of that total has gone down dramatically. If we want to completely abolish the domestic fisheries, then we should eliminate the relatively small amount of money contained in this bill. I urge the money be retained in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Pelly was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. WYATT. I urge that this money be retained. I believe we should be doing much more for our commercial fishermen than we have been doing.

I also point out the effect of dropping this appropriation on the balance of trade and the balance of payments.

Mr. PELLY. I might just sum up, Mr. Chairman, by saying that a new $20 million authorization bill for a fishing vessel construction subsidy will, I hope, be given a rule shortly and will be considered on the floor of this House. Then I am sure I will have some support from the House on it. I know if that is the case, the gentlewoman from Washington and the other members of the committee will try to provide adequate funds. Incidentally if funds are added in the Senate after the authorization is passed, then I am sure the Committee will recognize that $3 million will not be enough.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PELLY. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I assure the gentleman, I am greatly interested in funds for all commercial fishing activities because I think it is mandatory for us to support this important phase of our economy.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentlewoman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, except whales, seals, and sea lions, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources; operation of the industrial properties within the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770); and maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge; $48,503,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAYLOR

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Saylor: On page 21, line 24, strike out "$48,503,000." and insert in lieu thereof "$48,554,000, of which $65,000 is for operation and maintenance of the Lamar Field Station in Pennsylvania."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I realize that this is an increase in the appropriation for sport fisheries. However, from information which has been furnished to me by the Department of the Interior and information which has been furnished to me by people in Pennsylvania, I recognize that the amount of money which has been requested for the Lamar fish hatchery in this budget will not be sufficient to continue its operation during fiscal year 1970. For the information of the members of the committee, the Lamar fish hatchery is responsible for furnishing the sport fish furnished by the Federal Government for the entire northeastern part of the United States. This is the one fish hatchery that has the largest responsibility of any of our hatcheries throughout the United States. I would sincerely hope, therefore, that the amount of $65,000 which is needed for its operation and maintenance would be given at this time. Failure to do so will mean many of the Members of Congress who come from the northeastern part of the United States and who have organized sportsmen requesting that fish be sent into their States, as well as various State organizations who are requesting that their streams and lakes be stocked, will find that they will be unable to comply with these requests.

This is a small amount, and I sincerely hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this item is for maintenance, and it seems strange that the Department did not see fit to request additional funds for this particular item. It is with great reluctance that I oppose additional funds for any kind of an installation in any one of the States. As you know, we have had a great many problems. We have to allocate the funds cautiously and carefully. We try to do it on a stage-by-stage basis.

For the information of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, it is rather strange that the Department did not make a stronger case for this item.

Mr. Chairman, there are 435 Members of this House and I have no illusion but that each of these 435 Members has a project in his respective district that would cost $50,000 which he could add to the cost of this bill in 1 minute just by being given the paper and pencil with which to write the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have to draw rather sharp lines in the presentation of this bill because we have stringent fiscal limits. However, we have not tried to superimpose frugality at the expense of our natural resources in this bill. We have tried to do a good job. However, I just do not think that at the 11th hour there should be an increase in these funds. If we did so I might say that we would have a sizable amount of such items added, and with very good reason. But I do say that I would hesitate to add this item to the House bill, and I do oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in title 23, United States Code, section 203, $21,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds herein provided shall be expended for planning or construction on the following: Fort Washington and Greenbelt Park, Maryland, and Great Falls Park, Virginia, except minor roads and trails; and Dangerfield Island Marina, Virginia, and extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from vicinity of Brickyard Road to Great Falls, Maryland, or in Prince Georges County, Maryland.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAYLOR

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: On page 25, immediately after line 10, insert "construction of any road over Assateague National Seashore;".

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I did not expect my first amendment to be accepted because it would involve an expenditure. But I certainly hope I have a little better success with this amendment because it represents a reduction in expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, it so happens that at the time the Assateague National Seashore was authorized, there was a great deal of debate as to whether or not a road should be built through the wildlife refuge which is immediately south of the seashore. That matter has not been resolved as yet between the States of Virginia and Maryland and the National Park Service.

Mr. Chairman, the only purpose of this amendment is to see to it that none of the funds are expended until after that item is resolved. I sincerely hope, since I feel this is in the interest of economy and in the interest of looking toward the resolution of this problem, that this amendment might be accepted. The amendment, if adopted, would prohibit the use of any funds for the construction of a road until an overall plan is presented to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and has been approved.

That road program has not been submitted to our committee, and I would hope that no funds would be expended up until that time takes place.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I will be happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may I point out that construction of this road is directed by the authorizing legislation. We do not provide funds for construction of the road in this bill. However, no restrictive action was taken by the Committee so that the National Park Service and the people involved could discuss it and come to a conclusion. So there are no funds in this bill for the Assateague Road. We told the National Park Service that until they came to some kind of a mutual decision on the practicability of a road in the area, funding for construction would be delayed.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I might say to the gentlewoman from Washington that the only reason I have offered the amendment is because the committee placed a limitation, a proviso, that they have presently included in lines 9 to 16 on page 25 of the bill, because none of those items are included in this $21.5 million here, and for that reason I have just added one more.

That is the reason I have offered the amendment. There is no money appropriated for any of these.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Virginia.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would state to the gentleman that the reason that the construction of the proposed road on Assateague Island has not commenced—and I know that the gentleman in the well has followed this very closely, and is certainly well aware of the situation that exists there—is that in the authorizing legislation in section 9 (a) and (b), the Secretary of the Interior was authorized and directed to construct a road that would run the length of the island, and as the gentleman knows, currently in the State of Maryland, from the Maryland State line north to the Maryland access road there is a public highway. Second, in the State of Virginia, in the wildlife refuge there has been constructed a road tied in with the refuge portion. It was the feeling of the committee that to spell out in the law that no funds can be used for that would actually go in the face of what Congress had already directed to be done by statute.

Mr. SAYLOR. I might say to my colleague that Congress has already authorized building and the acquisition of a park entrance in Prince Georges County, Md. Congress has approved that, in the vicinity of Brickyard Road to Great Falls, Md. We have approved the Dangerfield Island marina in Virginia. We have approved the Greenbelt Park in Maryland, and the George Washington Memorial Parkway in Washington and Maryland, and we are talking about funding, but particularly limiting the expenditure of these funds, and I think it is appropriate that since there is no money provided that we limit the Assateague Island Road. That is the one thing that has caused some real problems so far as the Assateague National Seashore is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the amendment would be adopted.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I would like to say that in the early stages of the development of the Assateague Seashore the group from Maryland and the group from Virginia got together and it was my understanding that in return for our support for this wonderful national project they were going to put a road in. Now, I know I would have never voted for this project, and never have supported it unless I was assured that a road was going to go through that island. I believe that there are many in Maryland and many in Virginia who are laboring under that understanding that there will be a road. Therefore I would hope that the House will vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

XUM

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $148,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECHLER OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia: On page 35, line 8, strike out lines 8 through 12.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, there are five reasons why this useless appendage and administrative monstrosity known as and misnamed the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review should be abolished.

First. This Board is completely outside of the Bureau of Mines. It is an independent agency. It is dominated by coal operators. It has the right to review on appeal and nullify the efforts of the inspectors in the Bureau of Mines who are trying to do their job to protect the safety of the miners.

Second. You would not superimpose on the Federal Power Commission a board of review which consists of electric utilities. You would not superimpose on the Department of Agriculture a board of review consisting of representatives of large meatpackers to review meat inspection.

Administratively I think this is a terrible idea.

Third. We already have an adequate process of judicial review of all of the activities and orders of the Bureau of Mines and its inspection service written into the law.

Fourth. The other body's Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has stricken this Board out of its recommendations.

Fifth. It has been recognized that this Board does very little except to review on appeal by the operator some of the very good and constructive work that inspectors in the Bureau of Mines do.

I would like to point out to you on page 26, part 3 of the hearings where the very able chairman of the subcommittee asked whether a miner could appeal to this Board of Review.

The answer by Robert Freehling, general counsel of the Board was:

> No; the miners have no right of appeal. It would only be the operator who could dispute the order and appeal to the Board.

So what is this so-called Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review?

In the first place, it consists largely of operators. Second, the miner cannot appeal to it; only the operator can appeal to it. If we have any faith or confidence in the Bureau of Mines and its adherence and dedication to the public interest, we should give them the authority to protect the safety of the miners and not set up a nongovernmental, independent board in order to complicate this entire procedure.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committee will support this amendment, and I hope I can get the support of the gentleman from Missouri, the gentleman from Iowa, and other economy-minded Members. We can save $148,000 at this point. I do not believe the gentleman from California would like to have the Federal Power Commission's rulings reviewed by an independent board outside of the Commission which consists of electric utilities or have the rulings of any other agency of the Government reviewed by some outside board of review. It is a special-interest type of board.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I wish to say that I am in complete accord with the statement of the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I appreciate the gentleman's support.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I was not here for the opening remarks on the amendment. Who appoints this Board?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. This is a presidentially appointed Board.

Mr. JOELSON. But it consists of, you say, representatives of the mining industry?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. The current composition of the Board includes three out of the five from the coal mining industry. It so happens that one member represents the United Mine Workers of America, and he is not very active. I do not know why he is not, and although he is outvoted, he does not seem to object very much to the actions of the coal operators. The other members are primarily representatives of the coal operators, large and small. The chairman is supposed to be an engineer, experienced in the coal mining industry, but he usually turns out to be a man who speaks for the coal operators.

Mr. JOELSON. I assume that there is a public statute under which this body is set up?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. JOELSON. Perhaps it should be repealed.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I hope it will be. I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey, when the coal mine health and the safety legislation comes in as recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor, I hope that will be done.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I have asked the gentleman to yield because I dislike to leave the question unanswered. When you say that there is one member from the United Mine Workers and he is not working at the present time, I would ask you if that is Mr. Widman. Is that Mr. Widman?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. No, that is Mr. Lewis E. Evans.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to take part in the debate on this amendment until the gentleman who offered it discredited my constituent and a representative of the United Mine Workers of America, Mr. Lewis E. Evans.

It just so happens that I have known Lew Evans for a long period of time. He received training in the Pennsylvania coalfields after his formal education, and has been a knowledgeable and an experienced miner. The late Gov. David Lawrence, of Pennsylvania, recognized his capabilities and appointed him secretary of mines for our State and his record for safety is unsurpassed in his lifetime fight for the men who toil in the mines.

Despite the temper of statements that have been made, I can tell you that Lewis Evans has been an exceptionally qualified member of this Board. He has fought diligently and fairly for changes in regulations in which his experience and training command. For those beliefs you cannot fault any man. I sincerely hope that this amendment will be defeated.

If you decide to abolish this Board, that is perfectly within your right to do so, but you do it by the proper legislative route. You simply do not use this approach and divest an appropriation from an authorized board.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I will apologize to the gentleman if I seemed to reflect on Mr. Evans. What I merely meant to convey was that the other members of the Board had consistently outvoted Mr. Evans.

I did not mean to impugn the integrity of any member, but merely to define the composition and the way in which they voted.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is perfectly all right. One man cannot dominate a board consisting of five members, but certainly a man with the record of Lewis Evans does not deserve to be impugned because of his not being able to successfully have his way on all votes on this Board.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is defeated.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Very briefly—and I am not holding any brief for or against personalities on the Board—I am going to say this: This Board was established by statute. It should be eliminated by statute. The distinguished gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER) did not appear at the hearings and ask that this money be cut. We did not have a communication from him asking that the money be cut and that in effect this agency be abolished. Until it is terminated by statute, I think we can provide this small amount of money which serves in the intrarelationship between the State plans, and Federal operations. I do recommend that it go to the authorizing committee for action rather than to have us take action here.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I have known of this agency for some time. This is the first time I have ever heard of any complaint brought against the Board as such. I think whatever authorizing committee has jurisdiction over this matter, this should be brought to that committee, and it should be brought into the picture, rather than have us trying to kill a board, already authorized and already a part of the official family of the United States, by cutting off the funds. That just does not make sense to me.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest to the Members of this House, they read part 3 of the hearings, and on page 13 a distinguished Member of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. KEE), the son of a former distinguished Member, came and introduced a member of the Board who appeared before us. Obviously a member of the committee does not question another Member of the Congress when a person introduced by him appears before the committee. Very frankly, I think this is a matter for the authorizing committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by the National Capital Planning Act of 1952 (40 U.S.C. 71–711), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and uniforms or allowances therefore, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902); $1,070,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided herein shall be used for foreign travel.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAYLOR

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: On page 38, line 7, strike out "$1,070,000: *Provided*," and insert in lieu thereof "$922,700: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided herein shall be used for the Temporary Pennsylvania Avenue Commission: *Provided further*,".

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, if this section would have divided the moneys for the National Capital Planning Commission and for the Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue, I would have been able to make a point of order against the funds for the Temporary Pennsylvania Avenue Commission, because it has not been authorized by law. If the Members will refer to page 956, part 3 of the hearings, which are available to Members, they will see under "Current status" the following:

> As mentioned above, Joint Resolutions were introduced in both Houses of Congress in the second session of the 89th Congress. The Senate passed the Resolution and it was reported favorably out of the House Interior Committee, but it did not reach the House floor. New legislation was introduced in the first session of the 90th Congress and passed the Senate. Thus far, the House Interior Committee has not reported out the Resolution, and it will most probably need to be reintroduced in the 91st Congress.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I have no particular feelings on this one way or another. I am willing to accept this amendment as offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL FOUNDATIONS ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, $14,000,000, of which $4,250,000 shall be available until expended to the National Endowment for the Arts for the support of projects and productions in the arts through assistance to groups and individuals pursuant to section 5(c) of the Act and for support of the functions of the National Council on the Arts set forth in Public Law 88–579; $2,000,000 shall be available until expended to the National Endowment for the Arts for assistance pursuant to Section 5(h) of the Act; $6,250,000 shall be available until expended to the National Endowment for the Humanities for support of activities in the humanities pursuant to section 7(c) of the Act; and $1,500,000 shall be available for administering the provisions of the Act: *Provided*, That in addition, there is appropriated in accordance with the authorization contained in section 11(b) of the Act, to remain available until expended, amounts equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property received by each Endowment during the current and preceding fiscal years, under the provisions of section 10(a)(2) of the Act, for which equal amounts have not previously been appropriated, but not to exceed a total of $2,000,000: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 3 percent of the funds appropriated to the National Endowment for the Arts for the purposes of sections 5(c), 5(h) and functions under Public Law 88–579 and not to exceed 3 percent of the funds appropriated to the National Endowment for the Humanities for the purposes of section 7(c) shall be available for program development and evaluation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHERLE

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHERLE: On page 38, line 14, strike out "$14,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,600,000."

On page 38, line 14, strike out "$4,250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,400,000."

On page 38, line 22, strike out "$6,250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,700,000."

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, before I speak on my amendment, I wish to say that I am surprised that there is any money at all in this bill.

On page 1041, part 3 of the hearings, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentlelady from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), says:

> I may state there will be no funding until there is an appointment of the Chairmanship of the National Endowment for the Arts and the Committee is informed of program policy for fiscal year 1970.

Yet, despite the fact that the new arts chairman has not been appointed, the committee is asking for an increase for the Arts Council of $850,000 over what it spent last year and the Humanities Council is to be given a $2,550,000 increase.

It is incredible that the Foundation on the Arts would receive a 20-percent increase in spending and the Foundation for the Humanities a 70-percent increase. When is this Congress going to cut spending? It shelled out an additional $12.5 million for the Kennedy National Cultural Center which originally was not supposed to cost the taxpayer one single penny. The arts and humanities should be able to function adequately at their present funding level.

I hope every Member of Congress takes the time to read the hearings, particularly part 3 concerning the interlocking cultural setup that is building in our Nation today. Clearly the Smithsonian Institution and the Foundation have overlapping, duplicating, and competing jurisdictions. There is under the Smithsonian program a Performing Arts Division, the National Collection of Fine Arts and National Portrait Gallery, and the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, which is headed by Prof. Hubert H. Humphrey. All of these bureaus perform similar functions to those of the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities.

A foremost example of the overlapping and competing Government agency projects is the plan to celebrate the American Revolutionary Bicentennial. The Smithsonian Institution has already spent $100,000 on this project and intends to spend another $50,000 this year. Not to be outdone, the National Endowment for the Humanities intends to spend $200,000 on the event celebrating the 200th birthday of our Nation. But on top of all this, Members can turn to page 44 of this bill and see that this committee has approved $175,000 to set up another, or third American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.

In reading this legislation, one quickly realizes that many of the grants made by the Foundation show little element of urgency. For example, the Congress is being asked to fund as a priority project a sixth version of "The Scarlet Letter." Justification for this project is based on the attempt that they are trying to obtain a final corrected version of a classical fictional novel. Of course there is no assurance that this sixth version will achieve the ultimate truth in this fiction.

The sense of priority among the arts baffles me. Congress is asked to drastically increase funds for the Foundation while it is unwilling to grant a $54,000 request to the National Gallery of Arts to stay open during the evening hours. During April 1 through Labor Day, over 100,000 visitors, both tourists and Washington-area residents, would take advantage of the evening hours to visit the National Galley of Arts; however, this is not possible. This is another example of the "cultural conglomerate" catering to the privileged few rather than to the general public.

Everyone who is familiar with the arts and humanities program would have to agree that the most spectacular project undertaken is the Westbeth artists housing program. This can be described as a resident artist playhouse which contains 384 apartments ranging from a single studio apartment to a three-bedroom suite with a large living room. Uncle Sam put up half the money to form the corporation which built this plush playhouse. The FHA loaned this New York City corporation $9.5 million for construction. The artists will be allowed to reside there at a rent which is two-thirds subsidized by the Federal taxpayers. It is anticipated that artist compounds such as this eventually will be built in every State. There is plenty of studio working space so that the artist cannot be frustrated by commuter problems facing most other Americans today. In addition, a sculpture garden, a theater for rehearsal, and, in the basement, a soundproof studio because as the sponsors of the project said:

> Composers aren't exactly a help to their neighbors if they are playing the piano.

Mr. Chairman, apparently the American taxpayer has been shoved into a soundproof room because no one has paid any attention to his clamoring to end the ever-increasing cost of nonessential projects such as this. With the 10-percent surtax a virtual certainty and with many other projects which will require additional Federal financing this year, it is imperative that this body begin to make meaningful spending cuts. This bill would be a good place to start, here and now. I urge the adoption of my amendment which will merely require the Foundations for Arts and Humanities to spend at the same level as it did last year and save the taxpayers $3.4 million.

Mr. Chairman, I have no objection whatsoever as far as this bill is concerned with respect to the Interior appropriations. My only objection is to the related agencies appropriations. I think the Members of Congress would do well to save the taxpayers of this country, as a beginning, $3.4 million to which I think they are fairly and certainly entitled.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the real effect of this amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE) would be to reduce the Arts and Humanities moneys to the level of the expenditures of last year. This matter has been given careful consideration by the subcommittee under its distinguished chairman, after thorough justification was made to the chairman and to her subcommittee members, and after consideration by the full committee.

I might point out to the gentleman from Iowa that notwithstanding the quotation with respect to the appointment of a new Arts Chairman, it is a matter of great national interest and it has been a matter of interest to the President during his 6 months of incumbency to support the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities and, indeed, to support the Kennedy Center. I say this because while he was a Member of the other body and during the time that he was the Vice President, President Nixon enthusiastically supported these and a number of other similar cultural projects.

Now Mr. Chairman, with reference to the expense which has been suggested by the gentleman from Iowa, if this amendment were unfortunately to be adopted, it would be virtually impossible for the President to find the type, the quality, and the experienced person such as he has been looking for to succeed Roger Stevens, who did such an outstanding job in the infancy of this program. A number of extremely distinguished names have been mentioned, without regard to politics, but with regard to their quality, ability, and willingness to make the enormous sacrifice that is necessarily involved in this program. Mr. Stevens made such a great personal sacrifice as Chairman of the Arts Foundation.

The Chairman of the respective Foundations, to say the very, very least—and I shall not name the persons involved—have been absolutely spectacular in administering these programs, notwithstanding criticisms of specific projects.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from New Jersey mentioned the name of Roger Stevens. Is this the same Roger Stevens who said when this Cultural Center was started here that he would raise the money from private sources or resign his job?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I did not see the quote, but I will give the gentleman from Iowa credit for the accuracy of his statement and then I will put it in its proper context.

At the time Mr. Stevens is alleged to have said that, the bill before the House was the original National Cultural Center legislation of which I was the author. At that time I said, and Mr. Stevens and others said, that the Government would not be called upon to provide funds for this Center.

The gentleman's colleague from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE) has alluded to this also.

Following the assassination of President Kennedy, the House of Representatives and the other body changed the name, changed indeed the basic legislation, to name the National Cultural Center the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, at which time, without any special promises, and certainly without any deception, but perfectly candidly, we asked that the Government match on a 50–50 basis funds which were raised from private sources, which is being done. We went through this several days ago during debate on another bill.

At the time which the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) has mentioned, which was before there was a changed concept, Mr. Stevens may have said that. Certainly I expected, as the author of the legislation, that the Government would not be called upon. But as the coauthor of the changed legislation I said in this well that I would ask that the Government contribute its 50 percent.

Mr. GROSS. And changing the name only resulted in a bigger take from the taxpayers; is that correct?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I do not question that it is a bigger take from the taxpayers, but how in the name of heaven, with an expenditure so small as involved in the construction of the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts can we say that a nation of 200 million people is taking from the taxpayers an unwarranted amount? It is a case where the people of the country have absolutely expressed their willingness to help with this project.

I notice that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE) talks about how terrible it is to give a pianist a soundproof room in which to perform. I do not hear the gentleman saying it is a terrible thing to quarantine a couple of dozen people in order that we have full knowledge of the scientific results of our astronauts' walk on the moon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I do not hear a question about quarantine facilities on ship or on shore or at the space centers. He approved of these things, but do you know an artist needs some quarantine in carrying out an opportunity to perform?

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I will first yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As far as quarantine is concerned, I would certainly think we need one, but I think they should provide it, just like the other means or provisions are made.

Second——

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. What other provisions is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. SCHERLE. Let me continue. You have got——

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield unless the gentleman tells me what other provisions he is talking about.

The gentleman from Iowa refers to some other provisions. What other provisions does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. SCHERLE. Quarantine, as the gentleman mentioned.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes, I understand the meaning of that word.

Mr. SCHERLE. All right. Who makes these provisions?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. In one case, NASA can quarantine the astronauts, and those who are going to go after them when they land. And in the other case, in the——

XUM

Mr. SCHERLE. I think what we are trying to do, I think we are trying to compare apples and oranges. I do not think——

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman from Iowa is the one who mixed the apples and the oranges. I am not trying to mix them.

Mr. SCHERLE. As far as the Cultural Center is concerned, they are now putting up in Niagara Falls, N.Y., a cultural center there for Bobby Kennedy for $24 million in public donations.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman from New Jersey declines to yield any further on the ground that this is unknown to him, and because it is not relevant to our discussion. We are not talking about the Kennedy Center or Niagara Falls in this appropriation bill. We are talking about the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. If the gentleman would understand better the legislation we could discuss it.

Mr. SCHERLE. I do not consider that that is so. I think I understand it very well.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. If the gentleman understands it very well, I concede that to him, but I must admit that we must be talking in a different language because I do not understand his language.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to say that in view of some of the remarks I have heard from the other side I would think soundproof facilities might be very well considered for some political figures.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I can only say this: by no standard on earth can it be considered an exorbitant expenditure to give the modest amounts of money called for in this legislation for all of the arts and all of the humanities, and the other Federal involvements in this project. I will concede that there is duplication, and I shall make reference later to a Smithsonian Performing Arts project of which I am critical, and about which some others are critical. Notwithstanding, if the gentleman would take as much time to look at duplications in the physical sciences and in the medical sciences, and in other areas, I am sure that we could agree that there could be vast savings.

Mr. Chairman, my reference to the Smithsonian Institution relates to its Performing Arts Division which is presenting three productions of American musical theater in a tent on the Mall. These productions cover the period from July 15 to September 2. Unfortunately, the formula contained in the Public Law 89–209, of which I was the author, does not apply to the Smithsonian. Briefly, this requires that artists shall work for a salary no less than the standard minimum pay determined by the Secretary of Labor.

The following correspondence addressed to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) and to myself explains the position of the Smithsonian and that of the Musicians Union and Actors Equity Association. It is my intention to insure that if the Smithsonian's splendid project is repeated next year, it be done in accordance with the type provision set forth in Public Law 82–209. In a word, we want to continue opportunities for students and at the same time guarantee professional standards.

The correspondence follows:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,
Washington, D.C., July 18, 1969.

Hon. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on the Department of Interior and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your inquiry concerning the non-use of members of Actors Equity Association in our Mall Theatre productions.

As part of a developing program to enliven the Mall and to present culturally stimulating programs to our visitors, the Smithsonian is presenting three productions of representative American Musical Theatre for seven weeks, from July 15 to September 2. This theatre form has been widely recognized as one of our country's major cultural contributions and the plays chosen are outstanding examples of the development of this form.

Every effort is made to present all Smithsonian productions with the highest performance quality and to demonstrate worthy esthetic standards. Towards this end, we anticipated the use of an experienced professional company to be employed in these productions. At the same time, we are vitally concerned that any presentations offered by this Institution are available to all our visitors and that no ticket price be established which would prohibit any citizen from attending one of our programs. We found that the cost of an Equity Company was not compatible with a popular-price ticket particularly in view of our limited funds. As you know, the cost of these productions is borne almost entirely by private funds and tickets are available for $2.00 or $3.00, a price believed to be within the reach of a great majority of our visitors.

When the cost of a full Equity contract proved to be prohibitive, the Institution approached the Association with a request for a partial Equity contract similar to the special arrangement negotiated by the union with the Summer Shakespeare Festival for performances at the Sylvan Theatre. (This contract allows a minimum of ten Equity performers to work in a company with an unlimited number of unpaid non-Equity actors.) This request was denied. Subsequently a decision was reached to proceed with the presentation using a non-professional company. Although less than a week before rehearsals were to begin Mr. Carl York, business agent of Actors Equity, visited Washington and contacted Mr. James R. Morris, Director of the Smithsonian's Division of Performing Arts, to explore the possibilities of an acceptable contract. Every effort was made to seek an arrangement with Actors Equity and still maintain the low ticket price which we felt essential. Equity representatives were given permission to speak to the non-Equity company concerning union membership but did not appear, and Mr. Morris warned the cast at the initial rehearsal that any union members should not continue with the performances.

The performers appearing in these productions are for the most part students at area colleges and universities. These young people are not members of the union but are nevertheless very talented and their affiliation is similar to that of other student interns working in various departments of the Institution during the summer. These opportunities provide the student with experience and are related as closely as possible to their individual course of study and interests. The salaries of the performers and other production expenses are dependent upon boxoffice receipts. Less than $10,000 in appropriated funds has been used in support of this program by providing buildings management services and equipment, administrative, and technical direction.

In the future, if public response calls for the continuation of these programs, it is our intention to employ union personnel. This will require extensive efforts for fund raising to make possible the substantial increase in costs.

In the meantime, we hope that we may continue our earnest endeavors to provide these musical performances for the public and to avoid the distress to the young people particularly that would result from the cancellation of the program.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES BRADLEY,
Acting Secretary.

ACTORS' EQUITY ASSOCIATION,
New York, N.Y., July 22, 1969.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I greatly appreciate your interest in the theater events being sponsored by the Smithsonian Institution on the Washington Mall this summer since this activity is of some concern to me and to the Actors' Equity Association. The situation involves several matters of policy with regard to the evolving relationship between government and the arts that I hope you can help clarify.

First there is the matter of the government's treatment of the artist. I know I do not have to tell you about the economics of the actor's profession. The records of the Committees you have chaired are full of statistics and testimony verifying the fact that unemployment, low pay and poor working conditions typify the economic situation facing all the performing arts professions in our country. Numerous authorities have noted that this situation has been very harmful to the quality of the arts in America. Faced with economic uncertainty and constantly required to make financial sacrifices, the performing artist is forced to divide his time between his art and work that would provide him with a decent living. Many of our country's finest talents find it impossible to earn a living in America and they either leave to perform in other countries or they abandon their profession altogether. Surely, if the government is to undertake the production of performing arts events it must do nothing that would encourage this sort of treatment of America's artists.

I am confident that the Congress does not intend that such exploitation take place. I believe that for this reason P.L. 89–209 specifies that grantees of the National Endowment for the Arts must insure that their employees receive no less than the standard minimum compensation for performing arts as determined by the Secretary of Labor and that working conditions shall meet basic standards of safety and health. Having stated this for the guidance of private individuals and organizations receiving grants from the Endowment, surely the Congress could not permit a government agency to abide by lower standards.

And yet this is what the Smithsonian Institution seeks to do. For its presentations of musical comedy on the Mall, the Institution has employed its artists at salaries far below that which the Secretary of Labor has found

XUM

to be minimal for the theater. It is my understanding that the compensation this agency offered its performers during the rehearsal period preceding the "opening night" was even below minimum wage standards. I am also informed that backstage conditions are far below par for the profession. Commonly accepted practices designed to protect the performers from injury and to safeguard their health have been ignored.

Despite our efforts to bring these matters to the attention of Mr. James Morris, Director of the Performing Arts Division of the Smithsonian, he declined to participate in anything more than the most perfunctory discussions claiming, in part, that because of the nature of the activity in which the Institution is engaged, it is entitled to special dispensations freeing it from the standards to which I refer.

Equity acknowledges that there are situations in the theater when the actor can properly be asked to sacrifice, i.e., when it is necessary for the welfare of the profession or when it is vital to the quality of our society's cultural experiences. For this reason special consideration is given to bona fide drama schools seeking experienced performers to work with and thus help educate their students. Equity believes the professional artist has an obligation to help the next generation of stage performers. To stimulate training in a professional atmosphere Equity and the managements of many theaters have established apprenticeship and journeymen programs for young people. And in these cases too, allowances are made because of the importance of these programs to the profession.

This Association also has recognized that valid arguments can be made for special consideration when a theater activity is making a unique and significant contribution to the cultural life of a community. Special presentations of rarely performed but important works at times qualify for this consideration. However, the productions being offered by the Smithsonian ("Annie Get Your Gun," "Guys and Dolls," "Of Thee I Sing") are the kind of fare that is regularly offered by countless commercial and private nonprofit theaters across the land. Although it may be pointed out that the Smithsonian is providing this service for the Washington tourist trade at a price that is less than that which is asked at other theaters, surely this cannot be considered a unique contribution.

I believe that any theater having government sponsorship and paying substandard wages could undercut with lower admission prices private efforts that maintain standards and have no government backing. This, I fear, is exactly what the Smithsonian's program threatens to do.

For these reasons, I believe the Smithsonian's theater on the Mall as presently constituted is ill advised. I hope you will use your good offices to correct the situation so that the American artist, his profession, and the general public will be able to benefit from a healthy, constructive relationship between its government and the theater.

Sincerely,

ANGUS DUNCAN,
Executive Secretary.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF MUSICIANS,
Washington, D.C., July 15, 1969.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: The Smithsonian Institution's production of musical comedy on the Washington Mall raises a question which is of great concern to Local 161–710 of the American Federation of Musicians. The question is: What is the obligation of the Federal government to the artist when it undertakes to provide entertainment and cultural events that may or may not be in competition with private commercial or non-profit efforts.

I firmly believe that government must not become a party to the universally-deplored practice of presenting artistic events at the expense of the artist. The basis of all art is the artist, whether he be a painter, writer, actor or musician. Government, above all, has an obligation to acknowledge this truth and consider the artist's needs before all others when budgeting for cultural or entertainment activities. When government sponsors cultural programs and provides the artist with just compensation, it makes a twofold contribution: It presents an event for the enjoyment of the public and it helps the artist to achieve a degree of economic stability so that he may continue and grow in his profession. But when government promotes events that depend for their financial solvency upon the willingness of artists to sacrifice decent pay, standard fringe benefits and proper working conditions, then it is the artist, not the government, who is subsidizing the event.

Happily, the Congress has devised a formula to prevent such abuses. In Public Law 89–209, which you authored, there are provisions requiring that recipients of government grants from the National Endowment for the Arts offer artists who work for a salary no less than the standard mimimum pay determined by the Secretary of Labor. Also, the Act requires that such grantees provide safe and sanitary conditions in which the artists can work. It seems to me that having enacted such a provision as part of the National Foundation on the Arts & Humanities Act, Congress has endorsed a sound policy. I cannot believe that Congress would permit any government agency to do directly what it prohibits the Arts Endowment grants program from doing indirectly.

And yet, we know what the Smithsonian, through its performing arts program, is offering salaries and conditions below those which has been established as minimal for the theatre by the Secretary of Labor.

Although members of my local are employed by the Smithsonian for its current presentation on the Mall and are guaranteed fair compensation, it is my understanding that the stage artists and theatre craftsmen are employed on a sub-standard basis. If this is true, I hope you can help end this practice. Our members would reap no immediate gain if you were successful in doing this, but I do believe the relationship between government and the arts in our city would be improved in a manner that would benefit the public, the arts and all artists in the future.

Sincerely yours,

J. MARTIN EMERSON, *Secretary.*

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the issue before the House today is a relatively simple one: whether we are going to provide significant, continuing, and major support for the arts and humanties in the United States. Basically, as every Member knows, we spend less at the national level than virtually any other civilized nation on the globe.

Notably, we spend less than the United Kingdom, France, Italy, and Austria. We spend only 3 cents per person for the arts; England spends six times that amount; France spends 20 cents per person; Italy 17 cents; and Austria spends $5.50.

I think most Members are familiar with the fact that today in the United States virtually every major symphony, opera, dance, and ballet company is running at a deficit. Theaters large and small—on Broadway and in cities around the country—have to face annual cost increases that threaten their continued operation.

Overall, in the performing arts, there is a deficit of about 30 percent; of perhaps 60 percent in the ballet; and perhaps 40 percent in symphonies. Of our major symphony orchestras, only about 12 have a reasonable hope of remaining alive financially. Similarly, there are only five or six major opera companies in the country today, and about an equal number of significant dance groups. Of all the existing performing arts groups, it is quite clear that only a handful can take their survival for granted.

Most of the members of these professions, be they artists, dancers, or singers, or on the stage also are living with very, very modest financial returns—many of them below the poverty level.

In terms of salaries, of the 12,000 members of Actor's Equity in New York, only about 100 are able to make a living from their work on Broadway. The situation is much the same for the members of the American Guild of Musical Artists—only about 300 of these dancers can make a living from their professional work.

It strikes me, that with the passage of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, we have made in this country a national commitment to support meaningfully the arts and to give national recognition to the arts.

I might point out that in the 12 months between June 30, 1967, and June 30, 1968, the National Endowment for the Arts awarded grants to some 187 individuals and 276 organizations, for a Federal investment of $8.6 million. But this $8.6 million generated $27 million from other sources.

Further, I will point out that with regard to the humanities, and figures vary, we are spending only $5 million, as compared to $15 billion in the sciences on an annual basis.

I think the humanities can help to point the way to the future and underline shared values that are essential to dealing with the great questions of war and peace and the banishment of poverty here at home.

I think, moreover, the question of our continued support for the arts will relate to the quality and to the character of our civilization in America.

I think if we are going to have grace and beauty and if we are going to mean something in terms of a basic national commitment to the arts, we must clearly continue to support them and, indeed, to increase our support significantly. At a time when we have had a major technological advance in landing men on the moon, and hopefully bringing them back safely, I think to cut back aid to the arts and humanities would reflect very unfortunately on the quality and the character of our society and our commitment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment and support funding for the arts and humanities at the level recommended by the Committee; namely, $16 million.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and do so for the purpose of associating myself in the warmest way with the eloquent and meaningful sentiments uttered by the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. Reid).

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly disagree with my very delightful friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Scherle).

Mr. Chairman, I do not suppose there is a Member in this House who has had as little opportunity to know about the arts and the humanities as the gentleman from South Dakota now addressing you.

I grew up on an Indian Reservation where I knew nothing about these things—and not anything did I know about them until I was nearly 21 years of age.

As I go back home in South Dakota, a State that is extremely conservative in many of its interests, and a State that has appropriated money for the arts—and we do have a State arts council—and there are little rural communities where people are hungry for the kind of thing that is being promoted by the endowment of the arts and the endowment of the humanities—and when so little is called for out of our great resources—and as pointed out by the gentleman from New York—when we here are asking for a paltry $16 million and while we spend nearly that many billions of dollars—and naturally I support this in the sciences—why cannot we spend this little for the humanities and the arts so that we can better understand each other.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be soundly turned down.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Scherle amendment to cut $3¼ million out of the $16 million for the arts and humanities.

And the money that would be left in the bill would be far better spent on Indians and their reservations throughout the country than on so-called cultural deals.

I understand that this appropriations subcommittee increased expenditures for the National Park Service, especially for the policing of the national parks.

There has been a 67-percent increase in crime, according to the hearings conducted by the committee, in the national park areas in the city of Washington alone. While perhaps this percentage is somewhat less elsewhere in the country, this money would be better spent on policing the national parks and helping restore law and order instead of spending it on this nebulous business operating under the label of arts and humanities.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I shall be brief.

The committee supported this appropriation, only wishing that we could have provided more. I would remind the Members of the House that there are millions of dollars in this bill providing outdoor recreation of various kinds for Americans. Conversely, there are millions of Americans who will never set foot in a forest or hold a fishing pole. These people live in the cities and towns. Some of them are handicapped and some do not have the means to supply themselves with expensive guns and sports equipment. Use of the mind, however, is free. Museums, art galleries, outdoor concerts can be enjoyed by those who have no transportation.

It is in this context that this committee is supporting the effort to make some small but lasting contribution to the quality of the spirit in America.

I close my remarks with this quotation, which is inscribed on one of the buildings of the Smithsonian Institution:

> Whoever increases knowledge multiplies the uses to which he is able to turn the gift of his Creator.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this subcommittee will be losing two members, and my remarks now have been sparked by the very stirring remarks of the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. Reifel). It will be losing the services of the present speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey, and I think we will stagger along without my services, and that I might be expendable. But we will also be losing the services of the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. Reifel), and that will truly be a blow and a loss.

I have worked with him. I have been amazed by the breadth of his views. He represents his district, but he has an abiding faith in the direction and the purpose of this Nation. I want to say it has been a pleasure knowing him, and I wish him well in all his future endeavors.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Scherle).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

American Revolution Bicentennial Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of July 4, 1966 (Public Law 89–491), as amended, establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, $175,000.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the National Council on Indian Opportunity. The Council, which is chaired by the Vice President and composed of Cabinet officers responsible for programs affecting Indians and Indian leaders, was established by Executive order in 1968. It has a unique role to play in Indian affairs.

The National Council on Indian Opportunity is the only group which can coordinate effectively the Indian programs that now exist in seven different governmental departments. It is the only Federal body that has focused on the special problems of America's 240,000 or more urban Indians who are not covered by Bureau of Indian Affairs programs.

Perhaps most importantly, the Council provides the only opportunity for Indian leaders to sit down with high Government officials on an equal basis to negotiate and exercise some control over the programs that so vitally affect the lives of Indian citizens.

Unfortunately, the Appropriations Committee has eliminated all funding for the National Council on Indian Affairs for fiscal 1970. This decision is regrettable. I hope that the Congress will see fit to restore these funds because the job of the Council is a crucial one.

(Mr. FRASER (at the request of Mr. Edwards of California) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate my deep concern about the Appropriation Committee's recommendation to deny funds for the new Indian kindergarten program. The administration had requested $2.3 million for this program, which would be used to establish kindergartens in public schools which serve Indian children.

In my State of Minnesota and in many other areas, all Indian children attend public schools. But the school districts in Indian areas often have extremely limited sources of local revenue and must rely in large part on State and Federal funding. In many districts funds are so scarce that the district cannot afford to operate kindergartens. This situation is documented by the fact that less than 10 percent of all Indian children age 5 attend kindergarten. The same figure for all non-Indian children is 78 percent.

Now, when we are placing so much emphasis on early childhood education through Headstart and other new efforts, I do not see how we can deny Indian children the same early educational opportunities available to other youngsters as a matter of course. I hope that the Senate will see fit to restore funds for Indian kindergartens when H.R. 12781 is considered by that body.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

Sec. 302. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to finance interdepartmental boards, commissions, councils, committees, or similar groups under section 214 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1946 (31 U.S.C. 691) which do not have prior and specific congressional approval of such method of financial support.

Sec. 303. No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to pay the salary of any Federal employee who is convicted in any Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction, of inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot, or any group activity resulting in material damage to property or injury to persons, found to be in violation of Federal, State, or local laws designed to protect persons or property in the community concerned.

XUM

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANDGREBE

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Landgrebe: On page 45, following line 2, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 304. No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to enter into contracts to extend the boundaries of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore beyond the boundaries set forth in H.R. 11084 of the 91st Congress."

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been introduced and is aimed primarily at the line item on page 14, the 1970 contract authorization dealing with the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore in the amount of $8,500,000.

The intent of this amendment is to confine the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore part to the undeveloped areas in Porter County, which, incidentally, has been my home for approximately 53 years. The underdeveloped areas equal over 2,000 acres, saving over 2 miles of shoreline of Lake Michigan, which is part of a bill I have introduced. It does retain the undeveloped areas in this part of the Nation for a national park.

The intent of my bill and the intent of this amendment is to exempt from the proposed national lakeshore part the developed areas that comprise over 500 homes and businesses. They are included in the exempt area, in the area I would like to exempt from consideration, including Baileytown, Beverly Shores, Furnessville, and Tremont. Also this amendment would exempt the shorelines in front of the towns of Dunes Acres and Ogden Dunes. These are two of our Nation's finest exclusive residential communities, and these areas would be seriously devaluated and impaired should there not be some restriction placed on the present plan.

This amendment would serve to save the tax base so badly needed in our fast-growing community for educational purposes and for police and highways and other badly needed local services.

Last, but certainly not least, it will save—and this is my own estimate, but I think it is conservative, based on what the Government has paid for land in the area—approximately $50 million of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDGREBE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the gentleman offers this as a limitation upon the appropriation process? Is that the reason it is offered here?

Mr. LANDGREBE. This amendment is very simple and understandable. It would place a restriction on the expenditure of funds for contractual purposes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is the gentleman in any way endeavoring to change the authorizing legislation which created the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore?

Mr. LANDGREBE. This amendment would simply for 1970 restrict the use of funds for contracting for real estate in our community outside of certain areas.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, my question has not been answered. I want to know whether in any way it is the intention of the gentleman from Indiana to change the authorizing legislation.

Mr. LANDGREBE. The intention of this amendment is to restrict the use of funds for contracting for land in the north part of our county for 1970.

Mr. ASPINALL. I ask my colleague once more, and he has not answered my question, if he wants to change the authorization. If he wants to change the authorization, then he should come before the committee, which I have the honor to chair, rather than try to cut down on a program which is already authorized.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, I am going to answer the gentleman again and simply say I believe it is the right and obligation and duty of all Members of this Congress to put restrictions on expenditures of funds, and that is the purpose of this amendment, to put a restriction on the use of funds for contracting for real estate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Landgrebe was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, I want to complete a couple of comments here, and then I will yield.

I am not opposed to conservation or recreation in any part of the country.

I am opposed to the unwarranted destruction of 500 homes and the devaluation of hundreds more.

I am opposed to the destruction of small business or large in the name of conservation.

I am in favor of reducing the waste of Federal moneys, particularly while this Nation is at war, a war which continues to take a toll of lives of our young men and continues to increase our national debt, a debt which this year is going to cost $17.3 billion in interest.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDGREBE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

The gentleman consulted with me about his amendment beforehand. I ask him to yield only in the spirit of helpfulness.

Is it not true that the only limitation on funds the gentleman intends by his amendment is to prevent the further acquisition of land over and above the existing borders of the Indiana Dunes State National Park, which is now authorized by law?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I should like to be helpful, also.

Mr. LANDGREBE. I should like to explain to my colleague from Missouri that in discussions with him on the amendment we talked about certain things, but I found out later on good authority that the amendment I was offering was not subject to a point of order. It is a legitimate and right and proper amendment. I ask only that consideration be given to this amendment.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield for one further question, it is not his intention to change the existing law by the limitation herein, but to prevent further acquisition of land outside the existing park; is that not correct?

Mr. LANDGREBE. That is exactly right.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I thought that the Indiana National Dunes Park area was settled some time ago by this Congress.

Over all these years, at practically every session, the National Dunes Park legislation was presented; and finally, thanks to the last Congress, the Indiana National Dunes Park legislation was enacted into law.

My good friend from Indiana, Congressman Landgrebe, states that there should be some further land eliminated from what the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Congress has already enacted, and he is trying to do it through this amendment. Let me say that for 25 years the sponsors of the National Dunes Park had proscribed thousands of acres more than is contained in the present park area. Over the years, piece by piece, there have been thousands of acres of land eliminated from the National Dunes Park. I will call attention to some.

Beverly Shores, a residential area, originally supposed to be in the Dunes Park, was eliminated.

Dunes Acres, another residential area, has been eliminated.

Ogden Dunes, another residential area, has been eliminated. Several other smaller acreage areas have been eliminated from present park confines.

The Inland Steel property has been eliminated. That property consists of about 400 acres. Even the former retired president of Inland Steel told me personally that Inland Steel purchased this land over 50 years ago hoping some day to erect a steel mill. The steel officials gave up the project on account of the storms coming down Lake Michigan. This north-south sweep of about 600 miles over the centuries created the Indiana Dunes.

These storms destroyed the Michigan City Indiana Harbor project which was launched over 135 years ago. The government was called up to clean the port from land blockades every 2 years. This is the reason that big industry gave up the plan to make the south shore of Lake Michigan a large port shipping project.

The storms from the north of the State built the dunes. My friends, this dune park area will accommodate a public park for the enjoyment of millions of people who are living in northern Indiana and southern Michigan. It will accommodate about 9 million people living in the Chicago area and those living in the whole Midwest. There are millions of folks in this area who cannot go to Bar Harbor, Maine, or to Canada, northern Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. They must enjoy their vacations within a few hours' driving distance of their homes.

Mr. Chairman, at this late hour, after the Nixon administration has already cooperated by setting aside $1.5 million in cash and $8½ million in contract finances to erect this park which we have been fighting for, for the last 50 years, at this late hour to have an amendment offered here to cut off another scattering of acreage for an area that millions of people would like to have as a recreational park is something I just cannot understand.

I want to close by saying that even the people who were originally opposed to the park and the industries in that area of Indiana are for the park now. In fact, Inland Steel has already given up its land for the park. Organized labor is for the park. Chambers of commerce, every wildlife organization, such as the Izaak Walton League and just about everybody in northern Indiana are for this park.

Some Indianapolis real estate operators have a lot of options on land in this park area that they bought 20 years ago. They are the prime opponents who are still fighting against the park. They are trying to save some land speculations so that they can close in on their options. They speculate that there will some day be a great industrial area that will be erected among those sand dunes.

Mr. Chairman, I close now by stating that I hope we vote down this amendment.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I will not go into any great detail. This is an attempt to change the scope of the authorization bill on an appropriation matter. It is clearly, aside from its technical language, something that does not belong in this bill.

The second thing I wish to point out is that the bill before you today contains no funds for liquidation of the 1970 contract authorization. If it is desired to change the context of the authorizing legislation, it should be done through the authorizing Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of which the very distinguished gentleman from Colorado is chairman.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I am delighted to have the opposition of the chairman of this committee, because the only thing that can happen if this amendment is adopted is that the price of the land, which has already escalated in the area defined as a park will continue to escalate and instead of being a tax savings it will be a burden.

I hope the amendment is soundly defeated.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MIKVA. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman and point out that the total area cut out of the dunes park by the bill incorporated by reference here will be over 90 percent of the area which was originally authorized by this Congress. Certainly that major surgery on a national park ought to be done through a bill which goes through the regular authorizing committee rather than through the back door in an appropriation.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I wish also to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Washington and observe that it is my own understanding that never in the history of the National Park Service have lands authorized for national parks and purchased under such an authorization been subsequently removed from public use.

I do not believe that the Members of this House or the Secretary of the Department of the Interior would enjoy the distinction of supporting a measure which for the first time in conservation history would strip land purchased by the American taxpayers from inclusion in a national park.

Mr. Chairman, back in my part of the State of Indiana we call this the "land grab assault."

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment ought to be defeated.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman from Washington yield to me at this point?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I take no particular position in this matter. I come from the State of Indiana but from another area entirely. I have my views on it but I am not sure as to exactly what is involved. However, I would like to say in connection with the remark which was made by my distinguished friend from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) that I happen to know the author of this amendment and whether he is right or wrong on this amendment, there is no more sincere gentleman in this House. Therefore, I feel the "play" made on his last name by my colleague from Indiana was in poor taste.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am terribly sorry that my good friend from Indiana is so sensitive about my words, but I believe that the way in which the amendment offered by my friend from the Second District has been described by him touches on a point that goes to the heart of the legislative process.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my friend from the Second District of Indiana, Mr. LANDGREBE, would have us believe that his amendment represents a simple restriction on an appropriations bill, would he not? He has pointed out that his amendment simply embodies the bill affecting the Indiana Dunes Lakeshore which he has earlier introduced. But he did not tell us what was in that bill, did he? However, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA), told us what was in that bill; for that bill would have, in effect, affected, some persons estimate, up to 90 percent of the park.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. No, not at this time. That bill would have affected, some persons advise me, up to 90 percent of the land authorized for this park.

I do not believe it altogether unreasonable to suggest that the language used by the gentleman from the Third District is, indeed, appropriate, and that the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from the Second District is not at all appropriate in that he somehow neglected to point out to his colleagues in this committee the full impact of his amendment.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that everyone in this body understands the point I am making. I think it fair that as legislators we put all the facts on the table, make very clear the substance on which we are asking Members to vote, and then let the Members vote either "yes" or "no."

Mr. Chairman, let me spell out a little more fully why this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I have long supported the proposal to establish the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore as an 8,000-acre national park located on the southern shores of Lake Michigan. Recently, however, my colleague from the Second Congressional District of Indiana, Mr. LANDGREBE, introduced a bill "to define more clearly the boundaries of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore." This legislation would not define the boundaries of this national park, but would more properly reduce the size of the lakeshore by over three-fourths of its presently authorized size.

Today, Mr. LANDGREBE has introduced an amendment to H.R. 12781, a bill which in part would appropriate moneys for land acquisition in the Indiana Dunes Lakeshore. This amendment, if approved, would accomplish the same purposes as his original bill: It would effectively decrease the park lands authorized for acquisition.

Mr. Chairman, I stand firmly against these proposals. I consider them a land-grab assault on the national park which Congress in its wisdom authorized in 1966 after more than a decade of study to determine the recreation needs of the urban-industrial complex stretching from north of Chicago to Benton Harbor, Mich.

Before raising my specific objections to Mr. LANDGREBE's proposals, however, I should like to first review the history of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

WHAT ARE THE DUNES?

The Indiana Dunes, located in Porter and La Porte Counties, Ind., on the southern shore of Lake Michigan, are known across the Nation as one of the true national wonders of America. Alive with self-renewing beaches and sand dunes which change shape at the command of the north winds, rolling meads, and ponds and bogs interspersed in the surrounding topography, the dunes are ideally suited to the recreation facilities desperately needed by the heavily populated industrial regions of Chicago, northwest Indiana, and southwestern Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, the area of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore also offers numerous unique conservation features. Cowles and Pinhook Bogs are registered natural landmarks, where Prof. Henry Cowles of the University of Chicago early in this century conducted extensive research into the subject of ecology. It is here that the science of ecology originated, and is known to many conservationists as the "cradle of ecology." The beaches feature "singing sand," which when dry, hums when walked upon. The dunes area is one of two places east of the American Southwest where cactus grows, and the only place south of the Arctic Circle where certain kinds of pine trees grow. The "live" dunes often cover parts of forests, only to uncover them hundreds of years later as "tree graveyards."

Further, the area incorporated in the Dunes National Lakeshore includes one of the most significant landmarks in the history of the development of the Northwest Territory, the Bailey Homestead. It was here that the first settlers in this part of what is now Indiana, built their home. This first pioneer, Joseph Bailey—the Daniel Boone of his time—established a trading post and an inn which became a popular stopping place for travelers who passed over the old post road between Detroit and Chicago.

HISTORY OF THE DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. Chairman, as far back as 1916, the need to preserve the dunes as a recreation facility in the rapidly expanding metropolitan area of northern Indiana was recognized by the first director of the National Park Service, Stephen Mathen, who attempted to establish the dunes west of Gary, Ind., as a national park. Fifty years later—Congress authorized a bill to establish the Dunes National Lakeshore, an 8,300-acre recreation facility in Porter and La Porte Counties, Ind.

The many years of heroic effort by two of the great conservation-minded men ever to serve in Congress—Senator Paul Douglas and Congressman Ed Roush—as well as the Save-the-Dunes-Council were brought to fruition in 1966 when Congress passed legislation authorizing the Dunes National Lakeshore. The decade preceding final passage was marked by intensive deliberation by Congress to strike a balance between the need to preserve adequate recreation facilities and continued economical and industrial growth in northwest Indiana. Much credit should be given to Senator BAYH for his splendid work in offering a plan acceptable to both industrial and conservation interests, which resulted in authorization of this national park 3 years ago.

In reaching this compromise, Mr. Chairman, Congress excluded the heavily developed residential areas of Ogden Dunes, Dune Acres, and Beverly Shores from the national park area. Land to accommodate two steel mills and an international deepwater port was also deleted from the park proposal. An additional 75 acres of land were excluded to accommodate a power station of the Northern Indiana Public Service Co.

The recreation facility envisioned by Congress in 1966 was a national park of approximately 8,300 acres, 2,200 acres of which constitute the Indiana Dunes State Park. A budget of $27 million was authorized by Congress for land acquisition.

THE CURRENT SITUATION

Mr. Chairman, a total of $12½ million has already been spent by the National Park Service for purchase of 1,344 acres of land throughout the area authorized by Congress as the Dunes National Lakeshore. According to the National Park Service most of the funds expended to date have been in the most costly areas of the park. Subsequent appropriations will provide for larger increments of land to be acquired.

Since 1966, private industry has been moving to preserve the recreation and conservation acreage authorized by Congress. For example, the Chicago South Shore & South Bend Railroad, has reached agreement with the Bethlehem Steel Corp., to place a marshaling yard on the Bethlehem property adjacent to the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore rather than on 27 acres of park land on the railroad's right-of-way within the confines of the park.

Public support for the Dunes National Lakeshore has been widespread. Numerous Members of Congress, union leadership, conservation groups such as the Izaak Walton League, and local Indiana officials have all voiced their approval of the authorized park. In the latter category, the mayors of Whiting, Hammond, East Chicago, Gary—the second largest city in Indiana—Michigan City, and Fort Wayne—Indiana's third largest city—as well as the town boards of Ogden Dunes, Dune Acres, and Beverly Shores, have all gone on record in favor of this national recreational facility for northwest Indiana.

Significantly, the majority of the Indiana General Assembly has never resolved against the Dunes National Lakeshore authorized by Congress, although such legislation has been introduced in that legislative body. It would appear, Mr. Chairman, that a majority of people in my State, speaking through their elected representatives, favor the national park envisioned by Congress after many long years of consideration.

H.R 11084—A LANDGRAB OF PUBLIC ACREAGE

Mr. Chairman, I should now like to turn to the bill which Mr. LANDGREBE introduced earlier this year, H.R. 11084, which shows an utter disregard for the intelligence of the American public as well as a complete lack of understanding for the monumental problems passage of his bill would create, but for which he offers no solution.

First, as my colleague, Mr. MIKVA has so ably pointed out, H.R. 11084 does not seek to define the boundaries of the Dunes National Lakeshore, as Mr. LANDGREBE would like us to believe, but rather seeks to reduce by 6,000 acres the total size of the park. Removal of this land would open the way for further industrial development in Porter County at the expense of the many years and long years of deliberation Congress devoted to finding a proposal agreeable to industrial and conservation interests in northwest Indiana. This issue was settled 3 years ago, after a decade of study and, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that nothing can be gained from reopening this controversy.

Second, Mr. LANDGREBE claims that his bill encompasses "those undeveloped areas remaining in the community which have historic value." Clearly, Mr. Chairman, either my colleague was trying to deliberately mislead the American public or he is unaware of the history of folklore of that portion of northwest Indiana which he represents.

The Bailey Homestead, a site of great historic significance, which I have already mentioned, is excluded from the Dunes National Lakeshore by the Landgrebe proposal. Not only was the homestead a stopping off place for weary travelers bound for either Detroit or Fort Dearborn, but its location on a principal Indian trail made it a trading post that became a favorite rendezvous of Indians and trappers. Ottowa Indians came from what is now Michigan to trade here, and the place was also a favorite haunt of the Potowatomi. Both tribes often camped for months at a time in the vicinity of the post, and frequently left their personal property in the care of the Baileys when they went on prolonged hunts. It was in his home that Bailey translated the entire New Testament into Potowatomi.

Mr. Chairman, surely the Bailey Homestead, the first permanent settlement in the Calumet region area of northwest Indiana, has historic value and rightfully deserves to be included in the Dunes National Lakeshore authorized by Congress.

Third, Mr. LANDGREBE does not take into account the $4.5 million already spent in the acquisition of 523.97 acres of land in the authorized area of the Dunes National Lakeshore which he proposes to delete from this national park. This land now belongs to the American public. Does he suggest that Members of Congress vote to take land, paid for by American taxpayers, out of their hands?

Mr. LANDGREBE's bill poses a unique situation, Mr. Chairman. Never in the history of the National Park Service have lands authorized for a national park and purchased under such authorization been subsequently removed from any park. I should like to speculate that neither the distinguished Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Walter Hickel, or the President himself, would like to make conservation history by supporting a measure which for the first time in our history would strip purchased land from inclusion in an authorized national park.

Fourth, Mr. Chairman, the Landgrebe proposal would place the Federal Government in the land business at the ex-

XUM

pense of those who have already sold their property to the National Park Service for inclusion in the Dunes National Lakeshore. Mr. Landgrebe's bill makes no provision for disposal of land already purchased. Under present law the land would be sold by the GSA.

Mr. Chairman, we all know that land costs are continually spiraling upward. The National Park Service has purchased land in the Dunes National Lakeshore Area under authority of the Federal Government with the reserved right to condemn land for public use. Those landowners who have sold their property to the National Park Service will have sold their holdings at a loss, since the value of their former property would have increased by the time the Government placed the land on the open market.

This raises a serious question of public policy, for the effect of the Landgrebe bill is to place the Federal Government, with the power to condemn land, into the land speculation business with a real profit gain. This is a dangerous precedent, Mr. Chairman, which I do not believe the Congress can condone. Such a practice would be grossly unfair to those who have already sold their land to the Federal Government and raise grave questions concerning exercise of the power of the Federal Government.

NEED FOR THE DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

I should like to conclude, Mr. Chairman, with the one overriding argument which militates against both Mr. Landgrebe's earlier proposed bill and the amendment which he has offered today: the Dunes National Lakeshore will provide the 11 million people who live within a 100-mile radius of this recreation facility with the only national park within 600 miles of northwest Indiana.

The pains of urban growth which America has experienced over the past several years demonstrate our past failure to include adequate recreation facilities in our attempts to relieve the pressures on our cities. In authorizing the Dunes National Lakeshore, Congress recognized the desperate need of the urban complex of cities along the southern half of Lake Michigan for public recreation areas.

At present, only about 10 percent of the 40-mile Lake Michigan shoreline in Indiana is available for public use. When the beach portions of the park have been purchased, nearly one-quarter of the shoreline will be available for public use, not nearly enough to accommodate the 14 million people who will reside within a 100-mile radius of the Dunes National Lakeshore in the next decade. Nor do the Landgrebe proposals provide for the future day when, as Dr. Philip Hauser of the University of Chicago has suggested, a megolopolis stretches out from Chicago and reaches across to Detroit.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this Committee to join with me in opposing Mr. Landgrebe's amendment which would deny the American public recreation lands they already own, and to give favorable consideration to H.R. 12781 which would appropriate land acquisition and contract authority funds for the Dunes National Lakeshore in fiscal year 1970.

The appropriation of these funds will be a giant step forward in completing the national park authorized by Congress in 1966 and providing recreation facilities needed by the 11 million people who live in the urban-industrial complex stretching from Chicago to Benton Harbor, Mich.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Landgrebe).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time to make a brief statement about the National Council on Indian Opportunity, a new agency established by Executive order last year. The Council's basic function is to coordinate the numerous Federal programs affecting Indians, make policy recommendations and insure that new programs reflect the needs and wishes of the Indian people.

I feel that the Council is particularly significant because it gives the Indians a direct voice in policymaking. Six Indian leaders sit as full voting members along with the cabinet members whose departments are responsible for Indian programs.

I became particularly interested in the Council because of its concern for the problems of urban Indians, an area that has been virtually ignored by all other agencies. The Council has been holding hearings on urban Indian problems in a number of cities including my district, Minneapolis. The Council is hoping to publish these hearings along with some recommendations for ways of dealing with problems in this area.

The proposed budget for the National Council of $300,000 was not supported by the Appropriations Committee. I would like to ask the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. Hansen), if I may, about the fact that money for the Council was not included in this bill.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The fact that the bill does not provide funds for this activity is because there has not been a formal meeting of the National Council on Indian Opportunity since January and now it is mid-July. There is not even a Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

The National Council on Indian Opportunity could be most useful. However, I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota that the Bureau of Indian Affairs, in its administrative budget, has sufficient funding to finance travel costs of Indians participating in these activities.

There was discussion on whether the Council on Indian Opportunity should not be largely a council of Indian tribal leaders, and then let them employ the technicians and the people to achieve the objectives. I reiterate to the gentleman from Minnesota, that when this matter was considered in committee, there was no desire to curtail these activities. I simply say to the department, "Find yourselves somebody for a Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and do the job and get on with it, and do the job for the Indian people that should be done."

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for her statement, and I do know of her deep interest in this problem and her dedication in seeing to the many problems of the Indians. I would hope that funds could be found to continue the Council. Terminating the agency at this point would only contribute to further fragmentation of Indian programs and would deny the Indian people an important role in shaping the programs that affect them so directly.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Udall).

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I just want to say to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. Hansen) that there has been no better friend to the American Indians than the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mr. Chairman, I too have been concerned about this council, but I do recognize that there is a problem and that this is an area where an appropriation was not made. I would hope that consideration will be given in the other body that will be a convincing approach to this situation, and that the gentlewoman from Washington and her subcommittee might look with favor upon that, and that perhaps something might be done.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would be delighted to review the situation and give further consideration to it.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, pursuant to my earlier discussion with the chairwoman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Interior, Mrs. Hansen, here on the floor and our additional office and committee discussions concerning the vitally important need for adequate funding of the Navajo Indian irrigation project, road programs, health facilities, and all Indian education, I am pleased to include additional background materials on these necessary programs for review by the Members of Congress.

I can understand, but I sincerely regret that the chairman and committee members recommended that rather than amend this bill for inclusion of necessary funds for the Navajo Elementary School in McKinley County, N. Mex., we urge the other body to include the planning, design and construction funds in their markup of the bill. I will appreciate their support toward this effort and their agreement to approve such additional funds in conference.

First, I submit a resolution delivered to me last Friday by the Gallup-McKinley County Board of Education which clearly recaps the problem:

RESOLUTION BY GALLUP-MCKINLEY COUNTY SCHOOLS, GALLUP, N. MEX.

Whereas, the Board of Education of Gallup-McKinley County School District No. 1, Gallup, New Mexico, realizing its responsibilities to the Indian children of the townsite of Navajo, New Mexico and surrounding area, desires to further the educational opportunities of these children, and

Whereas, the school children in this area were housed in barracks and quonset huts, then bused 75 miles to Gallup to school, then later transported to a high school in Arizona on a tuition basis, in an attempt to provide a worthy education, and

Whereas, the Chief of Public School Finance, New Mexico Department of Finance and Administration has stated their department would no longer pay the tuition for the education of these children of Navajo in an out-of-state school beyond September, 1970, and

Whereas, Public Law 815 funds for the construction of schools have not been available for the Gallup-McKinley County School District for the past three years, which funds could have provided a secondary school for the education of the children of Navajo, New Mexico,

Now, therefore, be it resolved: The Gallup-McKinley County Board of Education requests direct funding in the amount of two and one-half million dollars for the construction of a secondary school in Navajo, New Mexico, to provide the proper housing and educational opportunities for the Indian children in Navajo and the surrounding area.

JOHN A. SCHUELKE,
President.

Attest:

EARNEST BECENTI,
Secretary.

Passed unanimously July 14, 1969.

Second, I submit an excellent explanatory report by Dr. W. B. FitzSimmons, superintendent of schools, Gallup-McKinley County School District, Gallup, N. Mex., regarding the important need for the funding of an elementary school at Navajo, N. Mex.

FITZSIMMONS REPORT

To Members of Congress:

The Gallup-McKinley County Board of Education in prior correspondence has furnished The New Mexico Congressional Members considerable information in regard to federal aid to education, primarily Public Law 815, Public Law 874, and Johnson-O'Malley evaluations and how they adapt to Indian education, together with recommendations and suggestions for changes in the laws to better accommodate the needs of Indian children.

At this writing, it is our understanding that no one knows the fate of the above laws or what the future role of the federal government may be. If Congress does not act favorably, and the existing laws are curtailed to a point of being inadequate, the Gallup-McKinley County School System will be in a precarious position and will have to relinquish its obligation of Indian education to the federal government. This action is not the desire of the Gallup-McKinley County Board of Education, but it would be their only recourse.

It is our observation and appraisal that Congress may not resolve the appropriations for P.L. 815 until the latter part of the year, and then the appropriations may be severely curtailed. Therefore, the following projects which were submitted with the 1966–69 P.L. 815 application, are in jeopardy.

Addition to Navajo Elementary	$856,341.00
Addition to Thoreau Elementary	1,151,393.00
Addition to Tohatchi High School	2,328,500.00
Addition to Towa Yallane Elementary	113,500.00
Zuni High Vocational Addition	128,000.00
Addition to Tse Bonito Elementary	706,002.00
Start of Secondary School at Navajo	2,133,137.00
Zuni Jr. High School	1,710,000.00
Addition to Thoreau High School	2,339,652.00
Addition to Crownpoint High School	2,328,500.00
Total	13,795,025.00

The building cost of the above projects has increased at least 10 percent since the time of their submittal. The priorities of these projects have all changed with the time delay, and, as of now, all the projects have a number one priority as far as the school district is concerned. The enrollment data which follows will clearly substantiate this statement.

GALLUP-McKINLEY COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT, GALLUP, N. MEX.

	Capacity of present building	Enrollment as of June 1969	Projected enrollment 1969–70	Unhoused children, September 1969	Projected enrollment 1970–71	Unhoused children, September 1970
Navajo Elementary grade K-6[1]	300	290	349	49	400	100
Navajo grade 7–12 (attending Fort Defiance, Arizona—tuition basis)		136	184	184	300	300
Crownpoint Elementary grade K-6[2]	690	637	750	60	825	135
Crownpoint High grade 7–11	250	259	[3] 453	203	475	225
Church Rock grade K-6[2]	360	413	429	69	460	100
Tohatchi Elementary grade K-6[1]	540	585	647	107	700	160
Tohatchi High grade 7–10	250	199	[4] 296	46	[3] 350	100
Thoreau Elementary grade K-6[2]	390	552	644	254	725	335
Thoreau High grade 7–12	150	347	411	261	465	315
Towa Yallane grade K-6[1]	300	382	406	106	430	130
Zuni Elementary grade K-6	540	528	547	7	575	35
Zuni High grade 7–12	600	550	711	111	725	125
Tse Bonito grade K-6[2]	120	170	184	64	200	80
Total	4,490	5,048	6,011	1,521	6,630	2,140

[1] Indian reservation.
[2] Checkerboard area.
[3] Grade 7 to 12.
[4] Grade 7 to 11.

School officials feel this data speaks for itself and clearly shows that the school district is in dire need of funds for school facilities to alleviate present and future classroom needs.

Even though the above data indicates our needs are critical in all the areas listed, the Gallup-McKinley County Board of Education at this time wishes to point out the greatest need is for a secondary school (Grades 7–12) in the townsite of Navajo, New Mexico. This is the only area in the Gallup-McKinley County School District without secondary school facilities.

Therefore, the Board of Education of Gallup-McKinley County Schools is requesting direct funds of two and one-half million dollars to be appropriated immediately for this project. This request is urgent in that it will take 250–280 days for construction to be completed by September, 1970.

The children from the Navajo, New Mexico area have been transported to the Gallup secondary schools in the past. This plan had to be discontinued because the children were traveling 160–170 miles per day, which entailed a four-hour bus ride. This subjected the children to an undue hardship. The following year, the Board of Education tried to start a secondary school at Navajo, using old surplus barracks and quonset huts, however, these facilities were inadequate. The Director of Instructional Services, Mr. Calloway Taulbee, New Mexico State Department of Education, during an evaluation study of the school district, recommended the children be transported to Fort Defiance, Arizona, and enrolled in the Window Rock Public School District on a tuition basis. In his letter of February 5, 1968, he stated:

"During our recent evaluation visit to your school district it became obvious to us that the children in grades 7–9 at Navajo would obtain better educational opportunities at nearby Window Rock, where you are already sending grades 10–12. While the question of out-of-state tuition has to be considered, we are in agreement that it should not dissuade you from seeking improved opportunities for the children involved.

"It is our recommendation, therefore, that you strive to make the necessary plan to send all of the secondary school children from Navajo (grades 7–12) to Window Rock next school year (1968–69)."

The trip to the Window Rock school district required only a 25 mile bus ride. This recommendation was deemed satisfactory by the Board of Education and was enacted immediately, even though the Board felt the tuition charged by Arizona, in comparison to the cost in New Mexico, was high. The number of Navajo, New Mexico children educated in Arizona this past school year reached 136 and the estimate for the next school year is 184 children. Mr. Harry Wugalter, Chief, Public School Finance, New Mexico State Department of Finance and Administration, met with officials of the Arizona State Department of Education and the governor of Arizona in an attempt to lower the tuition rate, but to no avail.

During the annual budget hearing for the Gallup-McKinley County school district, held in May, 1969, Mr. Wugalter, after a lengthy discussion, stated he would not approve payment of the Arizona tuition of $810 per child beyond September, 1970, and he instructed the Board of Education to find revenues to construct a secondary school at Navajo. In his letter of July 7, 1969, he stated:

"This letter is a follow-up to our lengthy discussion during the budget hearing about the situation at Navajo.

"As we indicated, the tuition payment for resident New Mexico pupils to the Arizona School District was meant to be a temporary arrangement. It appears that the enrollment projection for next year, and further projections, point to the need for a pupil attendance center.

"This office granted approval of the out-of-state tuition payment with the proviso that the board would do all possible to seek a solution for our secondary pupils. If there is an opportunity for the board to receive

XUM

federal assistance with which to construct a junior-senior high school, then this office would certainly endorse this move. The State of New Mexico will meet its obligation to the school district and assure the district of operating expenses via the state-aid formula as long as these resident children attend a public school in this area.

"If this office can be of any assistance at any time in connection with this matter, please do not hesitate to call."

In 1965 the Gallup-McKinley County Board of Education constructed the elementary school at Navajo with district bond monies because Public Law 815 funds were not available at that time. Mr. Sweeny, Field Representative for P.L. 815, could not be convinced that this community would be large enough to warrant an elementary school. However, the Gallup-McKinley County Board of Education had the foresight to see the need, and in cooperation with the Navajo Forest Products Industries and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, allowed bond money to be used for an elementary school at Navajo. The Navajo Forest Products Industries officials and the Bureau of Indian Affairs planned the sawmill as an industry together with a community development plan. The entire project was to be a model community and an example to the rest of the reservation to follow. The plan has made tremendous progress. The sawmill is one of the most modern in the United States (see attached brochure). The community is growing by leaps and bounds, and has the most modern housing on the reservation. The economy in the area is above average and stable. This project is a perfect example of what can be done on the Navajo Reservation with the Indian workers. It is conclusive evidence that once an Indian has a skill and a job, his social progress and educational philosophies for his children change to conform with our society.

Due to this progress and the demands of the people, the Board of Education feels very strongly that the Navajo community deserves school facilities to house children in grades kindergarten through twelve.

The plans for a new high school include six general classrooms, music, art, industrial, woodworking, science, business administration and home materials center, with staff offices, toilet rooms, and storage and custodial spaces for a total of 21 teaching spaces, all in a steel frame, one-story building. The teacherages are to have ten 3-bedroom units and ten 2-bedroom units in the townsite proper on sites assigned by the town from the existing plat.

The proposed facilities should provide for teaching stations in the basic areas of English, mathematics, science, social studies, health and physical education, business education, fine arts, foreign languages, home economics, arts and crafts, driver education, and industrial arts. In addition, vocational education facilities should be provided in the areas of building trades, office occupations, distributive education, and consumer and homemaking education.

With an anticipated initial enrollment of 300 secondary students, staffing requirements would include eighteen teachers, one counselor and one principal.

The curriculum recommendations stated above would provide an adequate instructional program to meet the educational needs of the secondary students in the Navajo area. This program cannot be implemented until adequate facilities are provided.

The reason the construction fell behind in our rural school area was because P.L. 815 funds were frozen for the past three years, and our school district has not received any funds even though it was eligible. During this same period, the school district has had an increased enrollment of approximately 1,500 federal impacted children, all of whom are primarily of Indian descent. This lag in federal funding has set back the school district construction program four years and forced the school district to house children in old surplus barracks and quonset huts. These buildings present a fire hazard and poor atmosphere for education. The Board of Education cannot help but feel that the federal government is not fulfilling its obligation to the Indian people. School officials of McKinley County have a strong feeling that Public Laws 815 and 874 were not designed for Indian education; nevertheless, if our school district had been funded in the past three years as it was from 1960 to 1965, the deplorable classroom conditions would not exist. As one can readily see from the previous enrollment chart, the school district will have 1,521 unhoused children as of September, 1969, and this will increase to 2,140 by September of 1970. All of the unhoused children will be assigned to obsolete classrooms.

The education of the American Indian has been one of the most controversial topics in America. Most Indian children enter school with a language handicap. They are made to compete in a society that is foreign to them in their cultural and language patterns. If the school curriculum is not developed with the above elements in mind, it may hamper the Indian child through his life span. This makes the education of the Indian child a complicated problem, and we feel it is the greatest challenge in education today.

In order to cope with this problem, all personnel concerned must have the knowledge, enthusiasm, and dedication to do a good job. It is of the utmost importance to have a Board of Education that is willing to take on the responsibility of this challenge. It could be said, without reservation, that the members of all of the boards of education who served the Gallup-McKinley County school district have not only accepted this responsibility, but have, in a genuine manner, touched the problem and made educational strides second to none.

The absorption of Indian children into the public schools of McKinley County in the past 12 years proves this point without a shadow of a doubt. Twelve years ago the school system was educating approximately 1,000 Indian children. The current enrollment stands at 12,000 with 7,000 Indian children. Bus routes have been expanded from 14 to 46 over the same period of time. All of these children reside at home and attend school on a day basis, with the exception of approximately 600 children in the Gallup and Ramah dormitories. This educational feat could be accomplished only with the full cooperation of the Indian people, the Navajo Tribal Government, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Another important aspect, if not the most important, is the part played by the federal government in providing necessary funds under P.L. 815, P.L. 874, and the Johnson-O'Malley law. P.L. 874 provides funds in lieu of local taxes for the operating and maintenance purposes of the plant; P.L. 815 provides funds for construction; and Johnson-O'Malley law provides funds for special education needs. It is very obvious that this financial support is necessary due to the nontaxable lands involved in the Gallup-McKinley County area. This support will be necessary until such time that resources of these areas are industrialized and the economy stabilized to support itself through the normal taxation process.

For your further information, we are also enclosing statistical data on projected enrollments for the entire Gallup-McKinley County School District for the years 1969–70 and 1970–71.

We trust the information provided in this report will justify the immediate funding of a secondary school at Navajo, New Mexico.

W. B. FitzSimmons.

Mr. Chairman, the problem outlined here is very similar to an Indian education problem we have in the adjoining Valencia County which also has an urgent school need which I will very shortly outline and present to the Members of Congress. In fact, I have just today reviewed this matter with Mr. M. B. McBride, superintendent of schools, Grants, N. Mex., and members of his board of education. It is my hope that preliminary plans on this project can also be presented in time for consideration by the other body during their markup of this bill. No other domestic need today surpasses education. I submit herewith a resolution of the Ramah Navajo Chapter presented to me today by a distinguished Navajo Councilman, my good friend, Mr. Chavez Coho:

Resolution of the Ramah Navajo Chapter Requesting the Establishment of a Peripheral Dormitory in the Ramah Navajo Area, N. Mex.

Whereas:

1. The parents of the Navajo children who will attend the new Ramah Navajo School to be built by Grants Municipal School System, in the Ramah Navajo Area, Valencia County, for the purpose of consolidation, through the office of Chapter President requests the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Albuquerque Area Office to establish a peripheral dormitory near this new school.

2. Navajo students from areas such as Los Norias, Corrizzo, and Ramah are attending public school at Ramah or Fence Lake and are living in an overcrowded dormitory at Ramah, and

3. Other Navajo students are bused over very rough dirt roads to attend these public schools, and such busing is extremely difficult and dangerous particularly in the winter season, and

4. The Grants Valencia County Municipal School Superintendent has, at a meeting on June 17, 1969, promised his, as well as the Grants Valencia County School Board, full support in getting a new school in the Ramah Navajo Area.

Now therefore be it resolved that:

1. The Ramah Navajo Band hereby respectfully requests the Bureau of Indian Affairs to establish a peripheral dormitory in the Ramah Navajo Area for the use of Navajo students attending school in that area.

2. The Albuquerque Area Director is hereby authorized to take such steps as are necessary and appropriate to place this resolution into effect.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was duly considered by the Ramah Navajo Band at a duly called meeting at the Ramah Chapter House at which a quorum was present and that same was passed by a vote of 59 in favor and 0 opposed, this 20th day of June, 1969.

Chavez Coho,
Councilman.
Juan Martine,
Ramah Chapter President.
Dorothy Antonio,
Vice President.
Martha Henio,
Secretary.

Next, Mr. Chairman, I include a statement by Mr. Steve Reynolds, New Mexico State engineer and secretary to the New Mexico Interstate Stream Commission, submitted last week in support of S. 203, introduced by Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, with respect to the Navajo Indian irrigation project. Today, I have introduced a companion bill here in the House of Representatives. The bill, as submitted, and Mr. Reynolds' testimony follows:

H.R. 13001

A bill to amend the act of June 13, 1962 (76 Stat. 96), with respect to the Navajo Indian irrigation project

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of June 13, 1962 (76 Stat. 96), is amended as follows:

(a) By deleting "and" in the first sentence of section 3(a) immediately preceding "townships 27" and by inserting immediately preceding "New Mexico principal meridian", the following: "townships 26 and 27 north, range 11 west, and townships 24, 25, and 26 north, ranges 12 and 13 west,";

(b) By deleting "$135,000,000 (June 1961 prices)" in the first sentence of section 7 and substituting in lieu therefor "$175,000,000 (January 1966 prices)"; and

(c) By adding the following subsection to section 3:

"(d) The Secretary of the Interior shall compensate the persons whose grazing permits, licenses, or leases covering lands declared to be held in trust for the Navajo Tribe pursuant to section 3(a) of this Act are canceled after the date this subsection becomes effective. Such compensation shall be determined in accordance with the standards prescribed in the Act of July 9, 1942, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315q), and shall be paid from the moneys received by the United States from the Navajo Tribe for the full appraised value of such lands under the provisions of section 3(a)."

STATEMENT ON S. 203, A BILL TO AMEND THE ACT OF JUNE 13, 1962 (76 STAT. 96) WITH RESPECT TO THE NAVAJO INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT

(Presented to the Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by S. E. Reynolds, Secretary, New Mexico Interstate Stream Commission, July 1969)

The 1868 Treaty between the United States of America and the Navajo Tribe of Indians provides that any Navajo being the head of a family and desiring to commence farming shall have the privilege to select 160 acres in the Navajo Reservation to be held in the exclusive possession of the person selecting it and of his family so long as he or they may continue to cultivate it. The Treaty also provides that any person over 18 years of age not being the head of a family may in a like manner select and hold 80 acres within the reservation for purposes of cultivation. The Treaty further provides that the Navajo head of family is entitled to receive seeds and agricultural implements to help him get started in his farm enterprise. Even a casual examination of precipitation records shows that irrigation is essential if these Treaty provisions are to be given effect of much significance.

Of the 16 million acres on the Navajo Reservation, about 21,000 acres can be hazardously dry farmed; about 37,000 acres are irrigated as water supply permits. Much of this irrigated land does not have an assured water supply and must depend on sporadic runoff from summer showers.

In the negotiation of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact of 1948, the New Mexico representatives contended for a share of the Upper Basin waters adequate to serve a major irrigation project for the Navajo Indians along with other potential uses in New Mexico. New Mexico was awarded 11¼% of the consumptive use of water apportioned to the Upper Basin by the Colorado River Compact of 1922, and the 1948 compact provided that the consumptive use of Colorado River system water in New Mexico by the Indians is to be charged against the New Mexico allocation.

New Mexico's Upper Basin allocation is currently estimated at 770,000 acre feet of consumptive use annually. The estimated diversion requirement for the authorized 110,630 acre Navajo Irrigation Project is 508,000 acre feet annually. The consumptive use estimated to result from this diversion is 254,000 acre feet annually, or about one-third of the New Mexico allocation.

Hydrologic studies show that the New Mexico allocation is sufficient for all existing uses from the San Juan River system in New Mexico and for the commitments made to the Navajo Project and the authorized San Juan-Chama and Animas-LaPlata reclamation projects, with a residual of 100,000 acre feet for potential municipal and industrial or other uses. New Mexico fully supports the use of a portion of its Upper Basin allocation for the 110,630 acre Navajo Indian Irrigation Project and has assigned to the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with New Mexico statutes the water rights needed for the project.

The Colorado River Storage Project Act of 1956 (Public Law 84–485) provided that in the event the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project is authorized the project costs allocated to irrigation and beyond the capability of the lands to repay shall be nonreimburseable in recognition of the fact that assistance to the Navajo Indians is the responsibility of the entire nation.

In 1958, the Governor of the State of New Mexico told this subcommittee:

"The plight of the Navajo Indians and their pressing need for relief from the severe and chronic distress need not be belabored before this subcommittee. . . . The Navajos are a proud people, independent, intelligent and industrious. Lack of opportunity alone has kept them from becoming self-sufficient. The Navajo Project is the vehicle upon which they pin much of their economic hopes."

This statement is still valid and it is of great importance that the nation's responsibility acknowledged in the 1956 Act be met fully at the earliest possible time. The Navajo population is growing 1.6 times faster than the national population and 3,000 young Navajos are entering the labor market each year. The population of the Navajo Tribe is now 118,900. Of the total labor force of 31,300 persons, only 8,000 are fully employed; 7,300 are under-employed and 16,000, or 51%, are unemployed. The 1968 per capita income for the Navajo people is estimated at $300 as compared to the national per capita income of $3,412.

Economic studies show that full development of the Navajo Irrigation Project could create 6,626 employment opportunities for Navajo people—almost as many as are now fully employed.

The State of New Mexico vigorously supported the authorization of the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project and is most grateful to this distinguished subcommittee and the Congress for the authorization given in 1962. The State still supports full development of the project and sees this development as the best possible use of water for the benefit of its Navajo citizens. This view is supported by the "Reevaluation Report, Navajo Indian Irrigation Project, New Mexico" dated July 1966. This report was prepared by a field task force appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. The task force considered and reported on the complete range of reasonably foreseeable potential water uses in the San Juan River Basin in New Mexico.

The enactment of S. 203 is essential to the full development of the 110,630 acre project authorized in 1962. In the course of preconstruction planning, the Bureau of Reclamation found that about 15,000 acres of the land to be irrigated west of Chaco Canyon—which is near the western limit of the project area—are not suitable for sustained irrigation. Re-construction planning also reveals that the project could be constructed at a lower cost by forgoing the irrigation of all lands west of Chaco Canyon in favor of lands to the east of the originally contemplated project area. This rearrangement would obviate a costly 19 mile siphon crossing Chaco Canyon. It would cost $197.6 million to develop a 110,630 acre project on lands east and west of Chaco Canyon while the project substituting lands east of the originally contemplated project area for lands west of the Chaco Canyon could be developed for $175 million.

Thus, full development of the most economic project of 110,630 acres requires both the raising of the authorized ceiling to $175 million at January 1966 prices and the authorization to acquire lands for the project in eight townships to the east of the originally contemplated project area. Accordingly, the State of New Mexico urges your favorable consideration of S. 203.

In conclusion, I want to express on behalf of the State of New Mexico appreciation of the opportunity to appear before this distinguished subcommittee to express the views of the State on S. 203.

Further, in review of this important project that will help people to become self-supporting, independent citizens, I submit an additional review and report on the Navaho Indian irrigation project presented to me last week by a distinguished member of the Navaho Tribal Council, Mr. Carl Todacheene of Shiprock, N. Mex.:

COUNCIL REPORT—FUNDING FOR CONSTRUCTION

Public Law 87–483 specifically required that the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project will be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation under Indian law. This provision necessitates a close cooperative effort between the Bureaus of Indian Affairs and Reclamation. The law further provides that the development of the land will be a function of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

In December 1962 a memorandum of agreement clarifying the responsibilities of the two Bureaus in the construction of the Project was approved.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs, using construction planning information furnished by the Bureau of Reclamation, is responsible for the acquisition of construction funds from the Congress. These funds are then utilized by the Bureau of Reclamation to design and construct the major project works down to the field delivery points.

Since the Bureau of Indian Affairs is responsible for the development of the Project lands, the Bureau of Indian Affairs Navajo Indian Irrigation Project technicians determine the location of the field deliveries and their capacities.

AVAILABLE FUNDS

Fiscal year	Programed	Appropriated
1964	$1,800,000	$1,800,000
1965	9,000,000	4,700,000
1966	12,000,000	6,500,000
1967	13,000,000	6,500,000
1968	18,000,000	5,300,000
1969	20,000,000	3,500,000
Total	73,800,000	28,300,000

The President's budget message for Fiscal Year 1970 contained a request for $3,500,000.

Based on the ratio of funds expended for project cost, the Project is 16% complete.

Should the funding level approach the programming level it is possible to deliver water to the first irrigable unit of approximately 10,000 acres in 1977 and complete the Project about 1987.

Construction is essentially complete over the first 13 mile reach below Navajo Dam. This includes two tunnels—2 miles and 5 miles long; three siphons—0.25 miles, 0.40 miles and 1.55 miles long and approximately 3.4 miles of canal. Cutter Reservoir 0.8 miles long to be formed by an earth-filled dam has not been constructed.

PLANS FOR DEVELOPMENT

All lands encompassed by the Project will be Navajo Tribal lands. There will be no lands in private ownership within the Project, either Indian or non-Indian. The planning for the development of the Project has commenced as a joint effort of the Navajo Tribe and the Bureau of Indian Affairs taking into consideration the interest of other groups and individuals. The impact of the Project will be far-flung in the Four-Corners area and will have a bearing on many groups other than the Navajo people.

In July 1967 the Bureau of Indian Affairs established a project office in Farmington, New Mexico. It is now staffed with three planning technicians and a secretary. The principal purpose of this office is to develop proposals for the total development of the Project. These plans are developed in cooperation with the Navajo Tribal officials. Every effort is made to insure that the plans include the desires and requirements of the Navajo people. The development of the physical features of the Project are being considered, along with following components: Land acquisition, cropping systems, marketing needs, produce processing, community development and training. In an area some 40 miles square, such as will encompass the irrigation project, and in which large numbers of people will be employed, it seems reasonable to assume that the necessity for at least one or more new communities exists. Numbers and kinds of service operations needed by the community will be determined, as will locations of the processing plants either in the new local community, or on the periphery of the Project in an established town. Plans must be made leading to timely construction of utility systems, housing and roads systems including farm-to-market and farm operational roads throughout the Project.

The most important element is human development. For the present young generation of Navajo people and the future Navajos that will be involved on the Project, training in agriculture and its related fields is of paramount importance. Skills needed on the Project must be determined and compared with existing skills so that appropriate training programs can be initiated. This planning is being coordinated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Navajo Tribe with that of the Navaho Community College, New Mexico State University, and other institutions.

The emphasis on agriculture in the San Juan Basin in general, and on the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project in particular, led to a concentrated effort to establish a Branch Experiment Station in the Farmington, New Mexico area. A request for such a Branch Agricultural Experiment Station was supplemented by petitions signed by more than 3,000 people throughout the area in and surrounding the Project. The proposal was the joint undertaking of a steering committee of leading citizens representing all phases of agriculture in San Juan County, New Mexico and the Navajo Tribe.

The Branch Agricultural Experiment Station in San Juan County will provide the research and education to aid the people in San Juan County in the techniques of irrigated farming. The station will give the answers to the problems that will face farmers as the area goes into higher production through irrigation. The State of New Mexico concurred in the belief that an experiment station was essential to the well being of the area as did the Navajo Tribe. Consequently, funds in the amount of some $280,000 were forthcoming from the State of New Mexico for the establishment of the station, and land was provided by the Navajo Tribe for a period of 65 years for use by the San Juan Branch Agricultural Experiment Station. These 253.75 acres are located approximately seven miles southwest of Farmington on the Navajo Reservation and are included within the gravity lands of the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project. The experiment station plant has been constructed and staffed. Sufficient land has been subjugated to accommodate available water supply.

Plantings of various fruit trees and grapevines have been made. Water to the experiment station site is temporarily being pumped through a six-inch pipeline from the Fruitland Canal into a reservoir. This limits irrigation activities at the station to some 40 acres, pending delivery of water to this unit of land through the main distribution system of the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project.

When all irrigation projects within the San Juan Basin are fully developed, San Juan County will contain the largest irrigated acreage in the State of New Mexico, and will rank among the top 30 counties in the Nation in irrigated acreage. The 215,000 irrigated acres in the Basin, of which 110,630 comprise the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project, will be one-fifth of the irrigated acreage in the State, and County will contain over five times its present amount of irrigated land. The present irrigated acreage in the San Juan Basin is some 38,800 acres. The full development of the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project will generate some 8,841 jobs of which 6,626 can be Navajo. The total annual payroll associated with all phases of agriculture is estimated at approximately $42,000,000 of which about $33,000,000 can accrue to Navajo people. The 6,626 jobs that can be filled by Navajos will provide improved living conditions for some 30,000 Navajo people. The Navajo Indian Irrigation Project will increase the annual value of crops within the San Juan Basin from the present $7,000,000 to an estimated $28,000,000. It is expected that the result of agricultural research will increase crop values to $35,000,000 annually. The expanded agricultural industry will effect the economy of the area by producing a livelihood from agriculture for 22,000 persons, and will produce over 13,000 non-agricultural jobs, with an annual payroll of some $19,000,000. This expansion will include some 175 new retail stores, over 500 new professional men and retail sales of approximately $23,000,000. When all industries affected by the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project are included, the Basin economy should be increased by approximately $86,000,000 per year.

We believe that there will be employment opportunities for all interested Navajo people within the farming—processing complex. We further believe that there will be an opportunity for practically any and all skills and professions to be applied.

It is not too early for Navajo students to set their educational goals toward careers on the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project. Qualified individuals should experience no difficulty in securing employment following completion of their education prior to the operational phase of the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project. Experience thus gained will make them more valuable to the Project operation.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, although the Navajo irrigation project was authorized in 1962, with construction scheduled to be completed in 1969, it is now only 16 percent completed. At the rate of funding included in the 1970 budget estimate, completion of the project will not be achieved until 1995. Completion of this project will greatly enhance the economic resources of the Navajos. We must set this as a top priority item to be properly and promptly funded and constructed. I thank the Members for their attention, consideration, and support of these vitally important programs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12781) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House, with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 399, nays 6, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

YEAS—399

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Beall, Md.
Belcher
Bell, Calif.
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Caffery
Cahill
Camp
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Chisholm
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Collins
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Coughlin
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniel, Va.
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dennis
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Foreman
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Garmatz
Gaydos
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Hagan
Haley
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
King
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Koch
Kyl
Kyros
Landgrebe
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
Lujan
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McCloskey
McClure
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McKneally
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Mann
Marsh
Martin
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Melcher
Meskill
Michel
Mikva
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Mizell
Mollohan
Monagan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morgan
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Podell
Poff
Pollock
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roybal
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weicker
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wold
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—6

Ashbrook
Biaggi
Gross
Hall
Hastings
Hogan

NOT VOTING—27

Ashley
Boggs
Broyhill, Va.
Carey
Celler
Clay
Culver
Davis, Ga.
Diggs
Dorn
Gallagher
Halpern
Hawkins
Hébert
Howard
Karth
Kirwan
Kuykendall
Lipscomb
McCulloch
Miller, Calif.
Morse
O'Konski
Powell
Rosenthal
Stratton
Tunney

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Celler with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Davis of Georgia.
Mr. Clay with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Karth.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Stratton.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. **HANSEN** of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill just passed.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. 91-141)

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Interstate Commerce Commission, oldest of the Federal regulatory agencies, has jurisdiction over 17,000 carriers—rail and motor, water and pipeline, express companies and freight forwarders. Its decisions help shape the scope and character of the Nation's transportation system.

But, as important as the Commission is, as extensive as its jurisdiction is, it is hampered by:

1. *Lack of continuity:* The Chairman of the Commission serves only a year, selected by annual rotation from among the eleven Commissioners. In no other major Federal regulatory agency is the President without the power to designate the Chairman.

2. *Lack of leadership:* The Chairman does not have vested in him by law the executive and administrative functions of the Commission. As a result there is no firm and clear legal responsibility for the management of the Commission's day-to-day affairs.

To change this situation, I am sending to the Congress today Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1969, prepared in accordance with chapter 9 of title 5 of the United States Code.

1. CONTINUITY

The Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission is the Commission's spokesman, its key link to other agencies and the industry, the supervisor of its staff, and director of its internal operations. Yet today, despite the need for sustained leadership, the Chairman of this agency serves only one year. I know of no modern business that would tolerate the practice of annually rotating its chief executive.

To provide the necessary continuity of leadership in the conduct of the Commission's administrative affairs, *I propose that the President be authorized to designate the Chairman of the Commission from among its members.* This principle of good management has already been taken with respect to most other major Federal regulatory agencies. The time has come to apply it to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

2. LEADERSHIP

The administrative powers of the Chairman must be strengthened.

In 1961, the Commission delegated its administrative powers to its Chairman. However, unless and until the administrative powers are vested in the Chairman by law, statutory authority will remain dispersed among the Commissioners.

Almost 20 years ago the Hoover Commission emphasized that "Administration by a plural executive is universally regarded as inefficient." It then recommended that all administrative responsibility be assigned the chairman of these regulatory agencies.

That recommendation is as sound today as it was then. It has already been applied to almost every other major Federal regulatory agency. *I propose that administrative authority be vested in the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission.*

In sum, the reorganization plan provides continuity of leadership and vests responsibility for internal administrative functions in a chairman designated by the President, with safeguards to ensure that the Commission retains full control over policy and the direction of its regulatory programs. This does not affect the statutory provisions governing the exercise of quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial powers by the Commission and its employees to whom it has delegated the responsibility of hearing and deciding cases.

Each reorganization included in the plan is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 901(a) of title 5 of the United States Code. In particular, the plan is responsive to section 901(a)(1), "to promote the better execution of the laws, the more effective management of the executive branch and of its agencies and functions, and the expeditious administration of the public business;" and section 901(a)(3), "to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable." This plan will help achieve those ends.

This plan should result in more efficient operation of the Commission. To itemize or aggregate resulting expenditure reductions under the plan is not practicable. I shall continue to explore other ways to make the Commission structure more effective.

I strongly recommend that the Congress permit this necessary reorganization plan to become effective.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 22, 1969.*

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL TO HAVE POWER TO DESIGNATE CHAIRMAN OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's proposal that he has the power to designate the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission is one that makes good sense.

Every Member of Congress and every staff member with intimate knowledge of the workings of the ICC will adhere to the view that the Commission should have a strong Chairman. There should be a strong hand at the helm, and under the present system of a rotating chairmanship we cannot be assured of this.

The weight of logic also supports the President's proposal to strengthen the administrative powers of the ICC Chairman. At present the ICC has no administrative cohesion. This is a situation that must be remedied.

Mr. Speaker, it is my expectation that the House Government Operations Committee will have no cause to object to President Nixon's Reorganization Plan No. 1.

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE TAX RELIEF

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, today Congressman ST GERMAIN and I have introduced on behalf of ourselves and 100 Members of Congress a bill which will provide tax relief to millions of working men and women of our country.

Our bill would benefit all persons who earn more than $1,200 by providing them an additional tax exemption of $600 over and above what is now available.

Over a third of the membership of this House have sponsored bills to increase the personal exemptions across the board for all persons including dependents. The majority of these bills increase the exemptions to $1,200 for each person, the taxpayer and each of his dependents.

While there is absolutely no doubt that this increase for all dependents is highly justified because of the high cost of living, still I believe that there is little chance such a bill can be expected to be acted upon by this House because of its high cost in terms of loss of revenues.

Thus, I believe that unless we are willing to lower our objectives to that which is immediately attainable we shall miss this opportunity to provide the average working family the tax relief that it so desperately wants and needs.

With the passage of the 10-percent surtax by the House and the possibility of some action to close loopholes, unless we move with equal determination I believe we shall forfeit this chance to include in this tax package some tax relief for those who are hardest hit by higher taxes and higher prices. This is not in any way to reduce our drive for significant tax reform which we hope will bring additional needed dollars into the Treasury. But we do believe that there is a vast difference between tax reform and tax relief and it is this latter purpose which we seek to accomplish with our bill today.

In discussing our bill with staff in the Internal Revenue Service I am advised that its cost is estimated at $4 billion, far less than if we sought an across-the-board increase for all including dependents.

This bill has the advantage of providing instant tax reduction for millions of working men and women, single as well as married. If both husband and wife work, both would have the benefit of a double exemption or $2,400 for both. Each dependent child would still receive the present $600 exemption. Thus if such a family had 3 children the basic tax exempt income would be $4,200 per year. In addition the family could claim the standard or itemized deductions. Most families to be helped by this bill would have purchased homes and would likely use the long form and itemize their deductions. For families who use the short form, the recently House-passed surtax bill providing for the low income allowance of $1,100 standard deduction for each family unit, would raise the tax exempt earnings for this family for two working parents and three children to $5,300. The current law only provides $3,700 tax-exempt income for the family who files a short form. The House-passed surtax bill would allow only $4,100.

The increased tax relief of our bill is obvious and its real virtue is that it helps those who seek to help themselves by work.

I believe that this bill has great merit and I urge all of our colleagues of this House to join us in cosponsoring this bill. The taxpayers of this country will be indebted to you for your support of their cause.

AIR TRAVEL GROWTH RATE SLOWED

(Mr. FRIEDEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the financial pages of the newspapers recently have forecast nothing but gloom for the scheduled airline industry of the United States. This is not only true in the already heavily overcrowded international field but among our domestic carriers as well.

We were all shocked and surprised one day last week when Pan American World Airways did not pay stockholders dividends for the first time since 1941. Yet, when we consider all the competition Pan American has on top of it and not only from foreign-flag lines we might wonder why the dividend payments were not halted earlier.

I hope, but I sincerely doubt, that our other air carriers, experiencing higher operating costs than could ever be imagined and excessive competition, will not be forced to withhold dividend payments, and even worse, commence employee layoffs.

We of the Transportation and Aeronautics Subcommittee of the Commerce Committee are watching very closely the continuing developments in the air transport industry and we are worried. We hope that the CAB is watching also and is likewise concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD an article, "Air Travel Growth Rate Slowed in June and May Continue To Taper, Airlines Say," as published in a recent edition of the Wall Street Journal.

The article follows:

AIR TRAVEL GROWTH RATE SLOWED IN JUNE AND MAY CONTINUE TO TAPER, AIRLINES SAY

While three Astronauts hurtle through space to the moon, Americans left back on earth are seemingly becoming less eager to fly.

Preliminary reports from the nation's domestic trunk airlines indicate the growth in passenger traffic volume slowed considerably in June from the pace of earlier this year.

The year 1969, observes a spokesman for Trans World Airlines in New York, "appears to be (the period) in which encouraging growth rates experienced by the domestic industry between 1962 and 1967 are tapering significantly."

And the rate may continue to shrink. "The conservative economic forecast for 1970 would suggest that we may have attained a period of tapered growth," TWA declares.

To TWA, "The high rates of inflation, plus the incipient economic slowdown, appear to be discouraging to both business and pleasure travel." Eastern Air Lines, also of New York, agrees "people haven't been spending so freely and traveling as often." Other reasons cited by domestic carriers are labor difficulties, increased competition and traffic congestion at major airports.

In all, six of the nation's 11 domestic trunk airlines have reported so far that their domestic passenger gains narrowed in June from earlier in the year. Besides Eastern and TWA, these are the Braniff Airways division of Ling-Temco-Vought Inc., Continental Airlines, United Air Lines and Western Air Lines.

National Airlines said its rate of increase expanded slightly. Delta Air Lines said it experienced no slowdown in June. American Airlines posted a sharp improvement last month, but it had been crippled by a strike for 21 days during the first quarter.

Northeast Airlines and Northwest Airlines have yet to report.

The gains of earlier this year were substantial. According to the Air Transport Association, a Washington-based trade group, the 11 trunk carriers had lifted passenger traffic 11% in the first five months of 1969 from the 1968 level. That traffic through May totaled 34.48 billion revenue passenger miles, representing the number of paying passengers carried times the number of miles flown. May's gain alone was 14.6%.

The association is expected to report its June totals within a week.

For the airlines hit by the smaller traffic gains, the shriveling growth rate is a double blow. Even during the sharper passenger rises of earlier this year, most domestic air carriers were adding new equipment faster than they were booking passengers to fill the seats.

In May, according to the Air Transport Association, paying passengers filled only 47.8% of all seats on the 11 domestic trunk carriers, off sharply from the 53% average of all last year.

What's more, according to some airlines, a significant percentage of those seats are being filled by passengers paying promotional cutrate fares, a pricing policy that leads to lower yields for each passenger carried.

United, the nation's biggest air carrier, cited such promotional fares Monday to explain why the line's average revenue per passenger mile declined 1.2% in the first half from the 1968 level to 5.13 cents, despite a 3.8% average fare increase in late February.

United did better than some in the June slowdown. Its revenue passenger mile gain narrowed to 7% in June from the 20% rise posted during the full first half, the company said in Chicago.

Braniff's domestic traffic gain shrank to 3% in June, compared with 14.6% gain in the half, because of general business conditions and new competition on flights to the Northwest, the company explained in Dallas.

TWA's increase in domestic revenue passenger miles declined to 3.5%, far slimmer than the 14.1% gain of the full half. At Eastern, the gain narrowed to 9.7% from 12% due in part to "fewer draftees moving between military camps in the East." Then, too, the line added, air congestion in the Northeast may have frightened some travelers away from air travel.

Two carriers based in Los Angeles managed to hold onto most of their earlier gains. Continental said its June volume gain eased to 23.5%; its first half gain was 27.9%. Western's rise eased to 11.1% in June. For the half it was 13.9%. "The airline industry as a whole," explained a Western spokesman, "is finding that air travel isn't growing as fast as in previous years, but we have no specific reasons for it other than capability has outstripped demand."

National said in Miami it improved its performance in June, posted a 6% gain from the year-before month while volume for the full half was up only 5%. But National's operations were cut about 25% for several days in January because of a labor dispute.

At American, June traffic was up 7.1%, contrasted with a 2.8% decline for the full first half; but, again, a strike from Feb. 27 to March 19 was held accountable.

American, reporting its first half earnings said the strike crippled operations in the first quarter and "due to the pattern of advance bookings in the airline industry," the walkout continued to depress traffic in the second quarter.

As a result American's earnings fell in the second quarter to $13.1 million, or 64 cents a common share, for almost 14.5 million, or 72 cents a share, a year before. First half earnings sank to $688,000, or 3 cents a share, from almost $17 million, or 84 cents a share, a year before.

Delta, for its part, said it doesn't see any sign of a leveling-off in traffic volume. "The Government is certainly trying to slow down the economy, and if it does we would be affected like everybody else, but so far it hasn't been able to do it," a spokesman in Atlanta said.

International carriers haven't avoided the passenger slowdown. Pan American World Airways, which handles only foreign traffic, said its revenue passenger mileage eased .2% in June while volume in the full half was up 5.9%.

A Pan American spokesman contended, though, that a "good portion of our traffic" was diverted to other carriers because of contract negotiations with pilots, stewardesses and mechanics. "Many people and travel agents got jittery there would be a strike," he said. The airline, further, has had to face increased competition on Caribbean runs, the Pan Am spokesman said.

GROUP CHARTER PRIVILEGE ABUSED

(Mr. HAYS. asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks to the House on July 9, 1969, regarding mistreatment by Overseas National Airways, I referred to two articles from the Wall Street Journal. Under unanimous consent I make these articles a part of the Record.

Flight Turbulence: Group Charters Boom, but Some Critics Claim the Privilege Is Abused—Airlines and the CAB Charge Groups Include Outsiders on Cheap Trips to Europe—Do the Little Old Ladies Ski?

(By Norman Sklarewitz)

San Francisco.—Holly Noble is an avid tennis player, but when it comes to soccer she doesn't know a corner kick from a trap. Nevertheless, last winter she joined the Scots Soccer Club of San Francisco, and last month she accompanied the group on a charter flight to England.

The round-trip, charter flight on a jet cost Mrs. Noble only $245—and that's why she joined the soccer club. The fare on a regularly scheduled airline would have been $1,090 first class and $590 tourist class.

The bargain pleased Mrs. Noble, just as it will please most of the 800,000 to 900,000 other Americans who will be taking low-cost charter flights to Europe this vacation season. But it doesn't make the regularly scheduled airlines happy, and they're kicking up a fuss. As a result, Government authorities are cracking down on some flying groups that regulators say lack "affinity"—dental associations whose members aren't dentists, for instance. The Government has forced last-minute cancelation of some flights.

Only groups with affinity are legally entitled to take advantage of low-cost charter flights, and officials of regular airlines claim they have no complaints about this legitimate use. But they maintain, and the Civil Aeronautics Board agrees, that some people—especially travel agents who put together groups—are increasingly abusing the privileges.

THE LITTLE OLD LADIES

"You see too many little old ladies getting abroad on the trips offered by the Far West Ski Association," complains one airline executive. (An official of the 30,000-member ski group concedes not all members are skiers. "All you have to do is be a person and pay your dues," she says. She adds, "We have a lot of European-born members" who joined just for the flights.)

Executives at the charter airlines say they don't know if those little old ladies are really skiers, and they say it isn't their business to investigate every passenger. All they have to do, they say, is make sure the club they carry wasn't formed merely to take advantage of charter rates. Even that, says a charter airline president, "is an administrative nightmare." Other executives say that all they know is that they offer good prices and that business is better than ever.

Indeed they do, and indeed it is. A New York-to-London-and-back ticket on a charter flight costs as little as $130, compared with a minimum of $300 for an economy ticket on a regularly scheduled line. The 800,000-plus people who will take charter flights to Europe this vacation season compare with about 700,000 in the April-through-September season of 1968 and about 550,000 the year before that. The biggest of the 13 U.S. charter carriers, California-based World Airways, has a 15-jet fleet that is larger than the jet fleets of such major foreign carriers as Swissair, Iberia and Sabena.

WHAT IS AFFINITY?

But business won't be quite as good this year as some airlines had anticipated. In March, the CAB canceled 20 European charter flights scheduled by one group on the ground that it sold tickets to the general public. Late last week, 20 flights scheduled by a California group were canceled for the same reason. Within the next few weeks, the agency plans to conduct closed hearings in Los Angeles into indications of numerous charter-group violations in Southern California. The hearings will be aimed primarily at travel clubs that may have been formed only for the purpose of selling air-charter tickets to the general public, CA officials say.

The cancelations upset ticket buyers, who suddenly have their vacations ruined, and sometimes are embarrassing to the airline. A case in point: Trans International Airlines, a seven-jet carrier based in Oakland, recently had to cancel three charter flights because the CA ruled that the groups to be carried had no affinity. The grounded passengers were all shareholders of Transamerica Corp., the airline's parent.

Just what constitutes affinity is difficult to say. The Government says that being Presbyterians isn't enough to qualify a group for charter air rates, but being members of a Greek Orthodox lay group or of a specific Roman Catholic diocese is enough to constitute affinity, the CAB has held.

XUM

The way to end this confusion, says Glenn A. Cramer, president of Trans International, is to let anyone fly on a charter flight without belonging to any special club. Not surprisingly, the Air Transport Association, a trade group comprising regularly scheduled lines, disagrees. A spokesman says the move advocated by Mr. Cramer would result in "virtually scheduled" cut-rate service.

SOME STATISTICS

The people at the charter lines and the men at the scheduled lines don't waste kind words on each other. One airline official calls the charter lines "pirates." The scheduled lines say their rivals have the advantage of being assured of profitable operations because the sponsoring group guarantees it will pay for every seat on the plane. In contrast, some scheduled jetliners make the Atlantic crossing with a handful of passengers.

For their part, the supplemental carriers say they don't know why the scheduled lines are complaining. They say they don't pirate passengers but rather take people who otherwise couldn't afford to make the trip. They say that the scheduled lines have 80% of the transatlantic business and that the supplemental lines' share is not increasing (though the supplemental lines have an amazing 70% share of the West Coast-to-Europe business). The charter lines also maintain that the scheduled lines are free to compete by offering low-cost charter themselves.

This last point is subject to qualification, however. A scheduled airline can't sell a charter to any group that has more than 20,000 members, nor can it combine two or more groups on a single flight. (Charter lines can take up to three groups one one plane.) The regular carriers also are limited in the total number of charters each can fly. The scheduled lines hope to persuade the Government to ease these restrictions.

And when they do make charter trips, the regularly scheduled airlines usually can't match the rates of the supplementary carriers. Most rates run $50 to $100 more than those of the chartered lines because the charter lines cram more people into their planes and have less overhead at the airport and the office.

But some travelers say the extra $50 or $100 is worth it. One charter passenger recently back from a trip to Europe says the food was terrible—"dried-out chicken" and "sandwiches that tasted three weeks old"—and another traveler says that "the line-up at the bathrooms gets pretty long at times." It's easy to see why. On big jets, the charter flights carry 250 to 260 passengers, compared with 214 in an all-tourist-class jet run by a scheduled airline.

Other persons say they wouldn't take another charter flight whether on a scheduled or nonscheduled airline. Earlier this year, one group was delayed 12 hours in taking off from Frankfurt, Germany, after being told there would be a "slight delay." In such situations, a charter passenger can't switch to another carrier, as passengers on scheduled flights often can. What's more, if a charter passenger misses this plane, he generally loses the fare.

Some travelers swear by the charter flights, however. They say the flights are often just a high-altitude party. Drinks are sold and passengers often wander through the plane during the flight making friends. "It's hard to keep people in their seats," says a stewardess.

Other passengers maintain the food is better than that served on scheduled carriers' tourist flights, and they say that most charters let them carry 50 to 55 pounds of baggage, in contrast to the strict 44-pound limit imposed by scheduled airlines. A group of 125 Michigan undertakers who traveled to Curacao on Overseas National Airways praise that line for letting it bring back some oversized souvenirs—caskets.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 9, 1969]

CAB IS CRACKING DOWN ON CHARTER GROUPS IT SAYS TRY TO EVADE BOARD'S RESTRICTIONS

WASHINGTON.—The Civil Aeronautics Board is cracking down on groups it says are trying to evade the board's restrictions on chartering airplanes.

The result could be some last-minute cancelations for certain air-charter passengers.

In its latest action, the CAB denied authority for two charter airlines to operate 20 transatlantic flights for the International Student Affairs Club, a California group. Among other things, the group apparently sold charter tickets to nonmembers, the CAB said. The board has canceled several charter flights in recent months for similar reasons.

Within the next few weeks, the CAB plans to conduct closed hearings in Los Angeles into indications of numerous charter-group violations in Southern California. The hearings will be aimed primarily at certain travel clubs that may have been formed only for the purpose of selling air-charter tickets to the general public CAB officials say.

They add that air-charter abuses by such groups involve only a small percentage of the air-charter business, but that it isn't known yet precisely how widespread such abuses may be.

Under CAB regulations charter flights are available only to legitimate groups such as social, religious, fraternal or business organizations. These groups basically can reserve an entire plane and split the cost among their members. As a result, individual charter fares can be 40% or more less than regular fares for the same trip. Individuals, or groups formed only to obtain their lower fares, aren't eligible for charter flights.

The CAB said it was told by the two charter airlines involved in the latest case—American Flyers Airline and Trans International Airlines, a subsidiary of Transamerica Corp.—that the proposed charter flights for the International Student Affairs Club were illegal under existing regulations. The carriers, the CAB said, reported that the student group apparently advertised and sold charter tickets to the general public and that the proposed flights might include nonmembers.

The two charter carriers, however, requested that the proposed flights to Europe from Los Angeles be granted an exemption from the rules. They noted, in pleas filed last Tuesday and Wednesday, that the first flight was scheduled to depart next Friday. The CAB responded that the airlines should have warned passsengers of possible cancelations before the airlines' "11th-hour requests for exemptions."

CAB Vice Chairman Robert Murphy dissented from the board's three-to-one decision. He also recommended a review of current charter regulations "with a view toward facilitating the proper availability of such low-cost services to the public . . . with less confusion, doubt and last-minute disappointments."

It was the second time this year that the CAB has canceled 20 European charter flights by one group. In March, a club named Goodwill Ambassadors had that many flights grounded because the CAB contended that the group sold tickets to the general public.

The board in recent months also has canceled several European flights proposed by Air India, and three of five European flights requested by Trans International for stockholders of Transamerica, its own parent company.

In the latter case, the CAB ruled that Transamerica shareholders lack the proper "affinity" to qualifiy as a charterworthy group. The board hasn't ruled on a complaint by Pan American World Airways, challenging the legality of a proposed charter flight by Overseas National Airways for a group called the International Order of Old Bastards.

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR THE 1970'S: TOWARD A STRATEGY OF INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am today filing a report on "New Directions for the 1970's: Toward a Strategy of Inter-American Development."

The report has been issued by the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs which I have the honor to chair.

It culminates nearly 5 months of intensive work by the subcommittee—hearings, executive briefings, and other studies—reviewing the record of the Alliance for Progress and its prospects.

The body of those hearings, published in a separate volume, are also being released this week.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to my distinguished colleague from California, the Honorable WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, ranking minority member of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee, and to all the members of the subcommittee, for their tremendous dedication to the task which we began last February.

In its bipartisan summation, outlined in the report, the subcommittee concludes that significant, far-reaching changes in the techniques and emphasis of our aid program, and in the self-help efforts of the Latin American countries, will have to transpire if the goals of the Charter of Punta del Este are to be realized.

Mr. Speaker, our report is very brief. It can be read in less than 15 minutes. But the issues with which it deals are of paramount importance to the future of freedom and progress in our hemisphere.

For this reason, we have departed from our usual procedure and delivered a copy of our findings and recommendations to each Member's office. I would hope that my colleagues, as busy as all of us are, will find time to review them.

At this point, I would like to include the recommendations of our report in the RECORD:

RECOMMENDATIONS OF REPORT

It seems clear from the facts summarized in the foregoing section of this report that after 8 years of experience with the problems of development in this hemisphere, the United States stands at the crossroads with respect to its policy toward Latin America:

We can renew our commitment to the Alliance for Progress and provide timely effective support to the forces of peaceful, progressive change operating on the Latin American continent; or we can stand aside and prepare for a crescendo of wasteful, disruptive violence welling up from the deepening disillusionment of the Latin American masses.

Concern for our national self-interest compels us to opt for the first course.

Latin America occupies a unique place in our Nation's history. We share a common culture, two centuries of independent national development, economic interdependence, and a sense of separateness from both the East and the West. These can become elements of our joint strength, determinants of our role in world affairs. For it may well be that the patterns of international cooperation, devised and applied in this hemisphere, will one day provide an example to other regions and become the building blocks of world peace and security.

In order for this to happen, however, the United States cannot be insensitive to the widening gap which divides our hemisphere. We cannot ignore the fact that 250 million Latin Americans get their livelihood from a gross national product which amounts to a bare 12 percent of our own national GNP. We must, instead, help them to advance their development objectives.

The subcommittee is aware that the tasks which confront our sister republics are enormous; that, basically, they must be discharged by the Latin Americans themselves; and that, even with the best of effort, many of them will not be accomplished in the next decade.

These facts do not deter us from saying what has to be said.

The subcommittee recommends that the United States reaffirm its commitment to support the forces of change which are working to ameliorate the human condition in our hemisphere and undertake to fashion, in concert with the Latin American countries, long-range, viable, and dependable programs of inter-American cooperation—in trade, assistance, finance, technology and other fields—which will provide more effective support and sustenance for Latin America's development undertakings.

We want to note, however, that cooperation is a two-way street. The flow cannot come from just one direction. Our readiness to fashion new patterns of inter-American cooperation has to be matched by increased self-help and internal reform, by willingness to establish fair and stable rules which will attract private capital and reduce dependence on Government aid, and by other steps which will reinforce our mutual efforts and sacrifices.

In arriving at new policies and programs, the United States should carefully reconsider the form, the method and the thrust of our assistance to the Alliance for Progress.

Specifically, the subcommittee recommends that the United States—

1. Substantially reduce the many onerous, at times self-serving and counter-productive conditions attached to development assistance, including wholesale "tying" of aid to U.S. procurement;

2. Place increased emphasis on long-term technical assistance and support for education, agriculture, family planning, and the development of local institutions necessary to assure broader participation of the Latin American people in their developmental processes;

3. Promote the sharing and development of technology required to buttress Latin America's economic levelopment efforts;

4. Insulate assistance aimed at long-term social, civic, and technological development from direct dependence on short-term political fluctuations;

5. Channel resources for capital infrastructure projects to the extent feasible through multinational consortia and appropriate international organizations;

6. Endeavor to establish mutually reinforcing relationships between development assistance and promotion of private investment to the end that both may better serve Latin America's basic development objectives;

7. In cooperation with American labor and industry, work out new approaches which would assist Latin America to advance the twin goals of diversification and increased trade;

8. Attempt to harmonize U.S. aid and trade policies toward Latin America so that they will not work at cross-purposes;

9. Devise imaginative new ways for engaging the broad spectrum of our society in the advancement of human progress in our hemisphere. The complexity of development tasks confronting Latin America provides both a challenge and an opportunity for our pluralistic society. We should shirk neither.

10. Undertake a thorough review of our military assistance programs in the Western Hemisphere.

It seems self-evident that no sovereign country will abolish its military forces, or see its military equipment become totally obsolete, because of lack of U.S. aid. When in need, any such country will turn to alternate sources of supply, including those hostile to the United States. It seems equally clear that for the forseeable future, the Latin American military will continue to play an important role in the processes of change transforming their societies. It would be extremely shortsighted on our part, therefore, to willfully abandon all communication with them and to terminate even limited support for the legitimate functions which they perform in their own countries.

At the same time, we are deeply concerned that our military assistance not be misused to repress the proponents of necessary and desirable change. It is a difficult and complex task to prevent abuse of military power—and aid. For those reasons, we recommend a thoughtful review of the military assistance program in Latin America.

The subcommittee believes that the course outlined above is both timely and vital. The first decade of the Alliance is nearing an end and the Latin Americans are beginning to formulate a new strategy of development for the 1970's. There is every reason for the United States to become a participant in that undertaking. The subcommittee believes that it is incumbent upon the President to take the lead in articulating the U.S. commitment to Latin America and in launching studies, discussions, and negotiations required for the formulation of sound and effective programs of inter-American cooperation in the coming decade. The subcommittee's recommendations can be the starting point for such discussions.

Those recommendations do not entail any substantial increase in the levels of U.S. "foreign aid" proposed for Latin America by successive U.S. Presidents. They do, however, call for some basic changes in the method and thrust of our approach. We propose that the time has come to start moving in those new directions.

CITIES ARE MEANT TO LIVE IN

(Mr. WEICKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, cities are meant to live in. And yet since the end of World War II, living has become a stepchild to structural esthetics, commercial convenience, and industrial efficiency. For a minute today, I would like to avoid the generalities of philosophical clamoring for better housing and tell it as it is in my own Fourth District of Connecticut.

Where there existed slums, there are now shopping centers. Where there existed substandard multifamily tenements, there exist office-research complexes. Truly it can be said that a drive down the Connecticut turnpike is more eye pleasing today than it was 20 years ago. Truly it can be said that the tax base of the cities of Connecticut rests more comfortably on the affluence of commerce than on the risks of homes. And truly it can be said that escape from city to suburb has become an illusory panacea for both the creator of the homeless community and the desperate homeless. The legislation that I am introducing today amends title I of the Housing Act of 1949 and very simply does the following:

The present law only requires a percentage of low- and moderate-income housing where housing is called for in the plan of renewal. It is important to note that there is no requirement that any housing be constructed at all. It is my proposition that where substandard housing is torn down in the process of urban renewal, that it be replaced with at least an equivalent amount of decent housing.

You see, to me, the present principle of relocation is only an excuse for failing to make the investment in decent living within the cities themselves. The emphasis must be on quality of environment for the people of our cities. Good housing, good education, good recreation, good health facilities—these must be built on location, and they cannot be shuffled from Stamford to Greenwich, or Bridgeport to Fairfield, or New York to Connecticut or from the South to the North.

We talk about the American home being the foundation of our Nation's strength. To many Americans, the first question is still unanswered: What home?

A RUNNING START ON TAX REFORM

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee has recommended a series of tax reforms affecting our oil industry. They are long overdue. The very distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. MILLS, and his colleagues, are to be congratulated on keeping the promise they made. While I am not going to wax enthusiastic about the proposals, they are precedent-setting beginnings. A breakthrough has been made, and a large crack appears in the towering monolith of oil industry tax privileges. More will inevitably follow.

One recommendation is reduction of the existing 27½-percent oil and gas depletion allowance to 20 percent. While this may be a too generous sop to the oil industry, it is significant that a first slice has been taken. Another recommendation is made for total abolition of the foreign oil and gas depletion allowance. This is an excellent reform, and one the oil and

XUM

gas industry can easily bear through existing unused foreign tax credits. The other recommendations are minimal in substance but substantial as foundations for future reference, and most assuredly, there shall be significant future attention to each and every one of them.

It will be extraordinarily difficult for this hitherto privileged industry to swallow with any sort of equanimity its first defeat after an unbroken history of tax preference and congressional victories. Yet they know better than any how extensive, profitable, and unfair those privileges are, and how necessary reform is for our entire tax system. I passionately believe in legitimate profitable enterprise. Nor do I enjoy seeing it harmed unnecessarily. What I do oppose is grossly unfair privilege at expense of an increasingly overtaxed public. This is the obvious case here.

A wise and farsighted oil industry would do well to study these recommendations closely. So far, they are exceedingly fortunate. Drilling expenses, foreign tax credits, and the oil imports quota system remain untouched—for the present. I find this distasteful, but temporarily palatable if the present recommendations are made a part of our tax system. If the oil industry seeks to preserve its unfair tax privileges, then the full force of national demand for reform can, should, and will fall with crushing force upon them.

Chairman **Mills** is due full credit for steadfastly leading the effort to attain tax reform and tax justice. He has given fair consideration to a plethora of demands in many forms. I believe he and his committee have labored effectively and in the interests of taxpayers who have asked for reform. The chairman made a promise, and he is one who keeps them once made.

HE IS REPRESENTING ALL OF US

(Mr. WAGGONNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon already gives every sign that he will be one of our best traveled Presidents while he is in office, even as he was the most traveled man ever to seek and win the Presidency. And that is as it should be in this day and age. For many of our world problems, I believe, arise because of simple misunderstandings, and misunderstanding, in turn, is often the product of narrow perspectives and poor communications. At a time when men are able to travel to the moon and walk on its surface, then certainly the leaders of nations back here on earth ought to be traveling over its surface so that they can understand one another better than they have done in the past.

Today the human race is able to reach out beyond the skies in pursuit of new adventures. Certainly we should also be able to rise above our divisions on this planet. Trips such as that which the President is making this week can do much and I congratulate the President on his decision to make it.

There may be some who say, “Should not the President be minding the store here at home? Should not he be paying more attention to domestic problems?” But those people forget two important things. First, there is little if anything more important than bringing peace to Asia and to the world. This trip is important first because it is made to advance the cause of peace.

Second, no clear line can be drawn between foreign and domestic affairs. The two are constantly intermingled. Our ability to deal effectively with issues at home depends on the degree of energy and wealth which we must use to meet our responsibilities abroad. Similarly, our achievements at home provide the moral and physical strength which we utilize internationally. So this is not simply a foreign policy trip during which the President takes leave of domestic considerations. Rather it is a trip by the President of the United States on behalf of his people, one on which the President will continue to be concerned about and think about and talk about all of our problems both at home and abroad. And hopefully, the trip will help contribute to the solution of each kind of problem.

The President will visit five Asian nations and one Eastern European nation on this journey. He has been in each of these countries before and has visited several times in many of them. He is, as Emerson has put it, at home wherever he travels.

When Mr. Nixon was last in most of the countries, he was traveling alone as a private citizen. This month he journeys with a party of aides and journalists. An even more important difference between his private trips and this one, however, is that this time all of us are—in a sense—going with him. For he travels on our behalf, as our representative. And all Americans, therefore, have a stake in the success of this venture. Our very best wishes for a most useful journey and a safe return go with the President.

APOLLO 11

(Mr. POFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, in today’s issue of the Washington Post, I found a piece of literary excellence which should not go unrecognized.

I refer to the article on the front page under the byline of William Greider. The article reflects an unusual insight into the human factors involved in the Apollo 11 equation. The author penetrates to the essence. The syntax and style of his sentences and the words themselves are truly lyrical, poetic. They rank in my judgment with those written by Archibald MacLeish following the flight of Apollo 10. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I quote the contents of that article:

A Vision Invaded Our Dreams

(By William Greider)

Houston, July 21.—The television screen stuttered at first between negative and positive images of him. So do we all.

He is gone from view now, but the ghostly presence still flickers black on-white, white-on-black in the mind. He floats elusively between the room filled with real memories and the corner reserved for brilliant fantasy.

Like a Biblical vision, a picture of the ponderous figure—who looked something like ourselves—flashed across the void and invaded our dreams. Abraham never saw him, nor Moses, nor Jesus of Nazareth. But this time, every man went to the mountain top and together we tried to glimpse beyond.

So today we were all prophets at the breakfast table, a dizzy feeling.

Certainly, most things are to go on as before. Men will keep doing the things they must do and worry about what they cannot find in life. And inexplicably, men on occasion will continue to conspire against themselves, losing everything to a fitful impulse, a moment of fate. That is the human condition and anyone who proclaims that it has been altered by these events should not be taken seriously.

Yet here he is, this new man in the life of our dreams, bouncing airly across the terrain in strides which seem too graceful for his bulky shape. There is something disconcerting in his voice, too, and even-handed quality of self-confidence that denies everything else we understand about the hazards of his adventure. His life there is so short and the scientific purposes behind what he is doing are so obscure.

Is that us? Our sons? Or their sons? Or the men of the next eon? The thought spins forward in the imagination, then is lost, too awesome and troubling to pursue to a firm conclusion.

For in the crisp commentary of the explorers, there is a chilling message for the people who do not live in the world of numbers, who do not understand the numbers and do not want to understand them. A few minutes before the two men were to land on the moon, one of them radioed this message back to earth:

Roger, AGS residuals: Minus zero decimal one, minus zero decimal one two, minus zero decimal seven, and we used the PGNS noun 86 for delta-VZ which was niner decimal five, which is yours which is nine decimal one, and I believe that may explain the difference. Apogee five seven decimal two, perilune nine decimal one, sun check, the 3 mark noun two zero minus noun two two, plus zero minus one niner plus zero decimal one six plus zero decimal one one. Over.”

Extraordinary words that seem to say how obsolete the non-numbered people are to become, that they cannot possibly survive. Perhaps they are already obsolete.

The garbles and beeps and the voices continued with their torrent of data. If there was a surge of fear or joy or wonder, they concealed it in the secret language of the numbers. Before the necessities of navigation the romance of the adventure receded and, suddenly, there was this empty feeling, a sense of being cheated.

This was not how it was supposed to be. The centuries of dreams and poetry hadn't prepared the unnumbered people for the reality of “verb four seven” and “gimbal AC.”

But, of course, that was unfair. The technocrats hadn't promised any poetry. All they said was that they would do it. That suggestion alone had boggled the minds of the unnumbered people who could not begin to grasp how it might be possible.

Now this world of the technocrats was opening before them all at once. Its complexity staggered them; they fell back in panic before the enormity of all they didn't know. Of course, the engineers and scientists were right. This had to be the only way.

Look, here they are doing it.

So the numbers were accepted, even if not understood. The voice, remember, belonged to a man with blue eyes and blond hair and a boyish face who had learned somehow to do all these things without choking on the excitement.

The numbers then could assume a drama of their own:

"35 degrees. 35 degrees.

"Three-five degrees. 750, coming down at 23. 700 feet, 21 down. 33 degrees. 600 feet, down at 19. 8 forward. 350, down at 4. 330, 3½ down."

The transmission garbled, but the world thought it heard, "We copy you down, Eagle."

"THE EAGLE HAS LANDED"

"Houston, Tranquility Base here. The Eagle has landed," the voice replied as evenly as ever. The surge of feeling was not recorded on the transcript of the mission commentary, but it was reassuring to learn from the doctors later that the man's heartbeat leaped upward, just as yours did.

Then the two shadowy forms appeared to do their work, tasks performed so routinely because they had practiced them many times before on earth. And the sense of remoteness returned.

No one could share the feathery feeling as they walked or the jumbled reflexes of one trying to put something in a pants pocket he could not see. The sequence of experiments and maneuvers was baffling, even a little boring, after the initial shock of the gray images subsided.

But something unscheduled happened. One of the figures was going back to close the door of their spacecraft when he paused with perfect timing to make a droll aside.

"Making sure not to lock it on my way out," he quipped.

SMILE BENEATH THE BUBBLE

There was no laughter recorded on the moon, but his partner must have smiled beneath his bubble. He had told a joke. The human frailty inside the gray shape was disclosed. The remark was completely unnecessary to closing the hatch—yet it must have been needed by the man.

Perhaps that establishes a small measure of immortality for the unnumbered people, a certain solace. On the mountain top, they glimpsed a world so different from their own, one that will not much care what people thought and felt on the day men first set forth.

Yet even that distant race of men may be influenced by forces that cannot be measured—the chance remark that evokes a smile, the unseen power that quickens the heartbeat, and above all, that rare strength that lets some men be courageous.

THE APOLLO XI MISSION

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was in Grand Rapids, Mich., and was unable to join my colleagues in the House in expressing the jubilation we all felt over America's mighty achievement—manned exploration of the moon.

In the exhilaration we experienced during the lunar landing and moon walk, many Americans perhaps forgot that the Apollo project cost far more than the estimated $24 billion expended on sending a man to the moon. It also took the lives of three fine Americans—Roger Chaffee, Ed White, and Gus Grissom—in a flash fire that swept through their Apollo spacecraft January 27, 1967, while it sat on a Cape Kennedy launch pad. Roger Chaffee was from my hometown of Grand Rapids. An outstanding product of our community and its school system.

Mr. Speaker, the flight of Apollo 11 was such a scintillating success that it almost seemed easy.

I would venture to guess that one reason the flight was so flawless was because the National Aeronautics and Space Administration ordered a full-scale rebuilding of the Apollo spacecraft after the tragic fire in 1967. Safety precautions were tightened up, overall.

Mr. Speaker, let us all salute Neil Armstrong, Ed Aldrin, and Mike Collins, and pray for a safe splashdown in the Pacific on Thursday. But let us also say a prayer for Roger Chaffee, Gus Grissom, and Ed White, and pay tribute to them for the heroic contribution they made so that Eagle might land on the moon and return to planet earth.

Mr. Speaker, with the successful flight of Apollo 11 the United States has opened up the universe for all the peoples of the earth.

I believe our moon journey has kindled a new feeling of pride in country in all our citizens—a new and much-needed patriotism, if you will.

This welling up of national pride is most natural. I am sure the other peoples of the world flash an understanding smile as we throw out our chests and crow just a little.

CONGRESSMAN PICKLE RECEIVES TEXAS VFW'S HIGHEST AWARD

(Mr. ROBERTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, last month my colleague from Texas, J. J. PICKLE, received the highest honor the Veterans of Foreign Wars can present at the State level. JAKE PICKLE was named recipient of the 1969 VFW silver citizenship medal and citation from the Department of Texas. The award was presented at the June 27–29 annual convention by Comdr. Cleo G. Clayton, Jr.

JAKE PICKLE was honored because of his outstanding efforts in behalf of his comrades-in-arms, the members of the VFW. JAKE is an active member of Post 8787 in Austin. Just one example of his concern for veterans can be illustrated by his success in getting citizenship awarded posthumously to Pfc. Joseph Snitko, who was killed in Vietnam action before he could take the final oath. The bill officially declaring Snitko a U.S. citizen passed the Senate only last week.

In accepting the citation and silver medal, my colleague made some rather pointed remarks about the defense of this Nation. I would like to enter excerpts of his speech at this time:

IN DEFENSE OF OUR COUNTRY

(Remarks by U.S. Representative J. J. Pickle, upon accepting VFW silver medal and citizenship citation, June 29th, Galveston, Tex.)

It is time for the majority to protest.

We must ask our law-breakers, the misdirected voices of social protest, if they want to reside within society or without. We must stop giving them the protection and benefit of living within society—and still grant them the privilege of waging war with the United States.

It is time for our people to show more patriotism.

Something is wrong when we think the country should forget or neglect the defense of the nation just to spend more on domestic programs.

Something is wrong when we are asked to abandon our leadership in the free world because the sacrifice is heavy.

It is time to recognize again our responsibilities and to speak out for our country. We must speak of what is right, and we must speak without fear. Too often, we are placed on the defensive. We have been on the defensive so long that we are apologetic for what must be done to protect the free world.

I don't apologize for one minute our efforts to save democracy during World War I, during World War II, in Korea . . . and I don't apologize for keeping our commitments in the Republic of South Vietnam.

I am convinced to the depth of my being that if the world allows aggression and violence to go unchecked, then it will only be a matter of time until our own democracy is threatened. In this day of nuclear age, there is no such thing as preparedness after the fact.

Consequently, I don't see how this country can afford not to develop an ABM system. The alternatives are slim or none. We can gain valuable time in technology and research in a vital defense system that is rife with continuous scientific advances. The ultimate defense of the ABM system is that it will save American lives should deployment become necessary. Is there any better reason?

The members of the VFW know what it means to fight for their country. You have been on the front lines and like all service veterans organizations know that as a free people, we must fight to protect freedom. That is the contribution and responsibility of nearly every generation of our people, and I am proud that today a vast majority of our young citizens are carrying forward the torch for freedom.

In times of peace the veterans watch on the ramparts. It is your organization that sees to it that veterans are given the benefits they are due, and it is veterans who participate in community affairs by promoting progress and development and growth so that the world can go forward in peace.

I thank the Lord that we have organizations such as you which will not let us forget and not let us become lax.

RED ROLFE

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on this day of the all-star game it is appropriate for us to pause for a moment to pay tribute to one of the great baseball players of all time who died 9 weeks ago in his native New Hampshire. His name was Robert Abial Rolfe, known as "Red" to his contemporaries at Dartmouth of which I was one and later to the baseball fans of the country.

He was unobtrusive and he was quiet, but on a team which included Ruth, Gehrig, and DiMaggio, he held his own and must be called one of the few great third basemen of all time.

Amusingly enough, Jeff Tesreau, the Green coach, played Rolfe at shortstop, because his throwing arm was not considered strong enough to put him at third and yet he played at this key spot for the Yankees for some 10 years. A great fielder, a flawless batter, and a great hitter of doubles, Rolfe's greatest forte probably was the drag bunt at which no one will ever excel.

On this day it is interesting to remember that in the 1937 all-star game it was Rolfe's triple off Carl Hubbell that put the game on ice for the American League.

Red went on to coach the Tigers and worked at Yale and finally became the director of athletics at our alma mater. His mode of living was similar to his style on the diamond. Here, too, he was quiet, clean cut, loyal, friendly, and wholly admirable. Arthur Daley, the columnist for the New York Times, paid a warm and knowledgeable tribute to Red Rolfe in his column of July 18 and as an additional tribute to my friend I append Mr. Daley's column to these remarks of mine:

YANKEE PERFECTIONIST

(By Arthur Daley)

With the death of Red Rolfe last week, the Yankees lost another link with their storied past. It would be unthinkable, almost sinful, not to offer an appraisal of one who came closer than most to being the beau ideal of the Yankees. He had all the finer qualities, both as ballplayer and as man. They could always point to him with pride and that pride was justifiable.

No headline grabber was Robert Abial Rolfe, the unobtrusively competent third baseman. He left the headlines to the flamboyant Babe Ruth, the thunderous Lou Gehrig and the exquisitely efficient Joe DiMaggio, all teammates at one time or another. But Red was a steady, dependable workman day after day, marvel at his job.

It was in retrospect that his stature really grew. When the Bombers took a recent poll to determine what they described as their "all-time" team, Red was an overwhelming choice for third base. After a wider poll of all the teams in both leagues, the realization grew that the Dartmouth alumnus may have been outranked at his position only by the legendary Pie Traynor of the Pirates. I remember one day at the stadium when a fellow writer paid Red an unconscious tribute.

"I don't know how he does it," said the amazed press-box tenant, "but Rolfe can drive in more runs and make more great fielding plays without being noticed than anyone in baseball."

STILL UNNOTICED

In the 1937 All-Star Game, for instance, the acclaim went to Lefty Gomez for his brilliant pitching and to Gehrig for his massive two-run homer. Overlooked for the most part was the key triple with two men on by the Redhead. It was struck off Carl Hubbell of the Giants, then the best pitcher in the sport. And it made the American leaguers safe from pursuit.

Red's strength as a player was that he was a Yankee perfectionist. But that same quality was to prove his undoing as a manager when he took over the Detroit Tigers. He immediately became appalled by the complacency of his hired hands and they grew to resent his driving for the same perfection he had taken virtually for granted when he was with the Bombers. They also resented his comment when he grabbed up his former teammate, Charlie Keller.

"I signed Keller," snapped Rolfe, "in order to give my ball club some class, Yankee class."

Yet Red came close to performing a miracle in 1950 when he needled his Tigers into making a great stretch run that just missed overhauling the Yankees for the pennant. For this he was named manager of the year. I remember being so impressed that I sounded him out the next spring on an idea I had been mulling over in my mind.

"Red," I said, "I'm tempted to pick the Tigers over the Yankees this year."

"Don't do it," he said. "I'm speaking to you now as an old friend and not as the Detroit manager. Everyone on our ball club played over his head last year. Everyone had the best season of his life. I hate to admit it, but I can't see us in serious contention When the Tigers go down, I'll go with them."

With gold-plated advice like that, I picked the Yankees. I was right. So was Red. The Tigers faded to fifth. When they were last in midseason of 1952, Rolfe's long-range prediction finally came through. He was ousted as Detroit manager.

INSIDIOUS BUG

The managerial bug is like the malaria bug. It gets into the bloodstream and obstinately refuses to leave. Red kept waiting for another chance. But it never came. So he finally returned to the peace and contentment of the Hanover hills as director of athletics at his alma mater, Dartmouth. He had come full cycle.

It was as a Dartmouth shortstop that he had caught Yankee eyes and a brief minor league apprenticeship made him ready for the big time. A left-handed hitter with marvelous bat control, he was an artist in bunting, lining shots to the opposite field, protecting the runner and handling his job with unspectacular perfection. And he was just as strong in the field.

His only manager was Joe McCarthy and managers pray for players like Rolfe. A model gentleman of exemplary behavior, Red also was a fierce competitor, a clutch performer and a precise kind of intelligent, articulate and personable young man that a manager delights to have.

Red had it all. If he was not the beau ideal of the Yankees, he is entitled to that designation until a better man comes along—if one ever does.

CHALLENGE TO THE LAW

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, 11 days ago the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare issued a direct challenge to specific language of title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

That title prohibits any order requiring the transportation of school pupils from one school to another, or one school district to another, for the purpose of achieving a redistribution of racial groupings in schools.

Yet the July 10 proposal of HEW concerning the schools of Mobile County, Ala., does exactly that. It proposes a massive reorganization of the system requiring the busing of more than 2,105 pupils across the city and across the county for the purpose of achieving what it calls a racial balance.

Presumably the issue will be settled finally in the courts. The HEW plan itself makes reference to the legal question involved.

What we have, then, is a clear and deliberate challenge to the law and to the Congress which wrote the law. We are being challenged either to defend the law as it stands or be prepared to change it.

That is the only interpretation I can make of this issue, if the law as it is written is to mean anything at all.

Mr. Speaker, it is estimated according to my best information, that if the HEW order in Mobile County were to be fully implemented the cost would be somewhere around $13 million.

The reason the estimated cost is so high is that the plan goes far beyond the question of transportation of pupils. It also requires the county to close some schools and to build new ones. It also calls for the conversion of some elementary schools to junior and senior high schools, and vice versa.

It seems a legitimate question to ask where the money is to come from. Are the taxpayers of the county to provide the cost by themselves? If the money cannot be raised, what then?

If pupils to be bused across town don't want to cooperate, then are they to be forced out of their homes and into the buses? Are elementary schoolchildren to be held in contempt of HEW if they refuse to attend a school far from their residence?

These and other serious questions are raised by the HEW proposal. They cry out for answers. The new school term opens in barely 6 weeks.

For these reasons I call upon the Education and Labor Committee of the House to conduct a full study of the situation. The committee should determine, if possible, if any new legislative action seems in order relating to title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

If the Congress believes in what was written into the Civil Rights Act prohibiting the forced busing of students, then we should reaffirm it now.

At this point in my remarks I insert an editorial of the Mobile Press newspaper of July 14:

HEW IGNORES LAW BY REQUIRING BUSING HERE TO MIX STUDENTS

It is little wonder that Mobile County school authorities and citizens are shocked in the wake of Thursday's action by HEW in asking that the court order massive new racial mixing in local public schools.

Under the federal agency's plans for busing students across town, which is in violation of the congressional Act of 1964, some pupils may spend as much as two hours a day going to and from schools.

Yet the Health, Education and Welfare Department goes ahead to completely ignore what Congress said in the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which follows:

"Nothing herein shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another or one district to another in order to achieve such racial balance."

Even HEW itself in its plan filed with the district court here Thursday conceded it was raising a legal question which "we can only leave to the parties and the court."

The speed with which government officials acted to force a new system that requires the closing of some schools and construction of new ones as well as gerrymandering of districts—much to be put in effect by the time schools open a few weeks from now—was apalling and somewhat ruthless. This could have no constructive effect on education here and completely ignores the heavy expense involved in making the required changes.

Understandably, the school board will battle this unreasonable federal intrusion into its management of local education, for HEW is demanding accomplishment of the impossible in so short a time as between now and opening of the next term, the first week in September.

In the past few years, Mobile school authorities have been kept in a state of confusion each summer, not knowing when its carefully laid plans for new sessions would be upset by a new order from the courts or new interpretation of bureaucratic guidelines.

For the most part, racial integration has proceeded in orderly fashion in Mobile schools, but if the district court here and the Fifth District Court of Appeals uphold HEW's latest plan it could have such disruptive effect in the new session as to deny children of both races the educational training they deserve.

FEDERALLY INSURED STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

(Mr. PICKLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the special Subcommittee on Education of this House, chaired by the gracious and capable lady from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN), will begin hearings on problems facing the Nation in the area of student financial aid. These hearings concern themselves with a problem area with which we in Congress and members of the educational community have long been aware. However, the hearings have—I understand—been much delayed due to the failure of the administration to develop a position with which all its members could agree. Apparently this stumbling block has now been overcome. I hope the administration can present to the subcommittee tomorrow a meaningful program which will strengthen and broaden the resources available to students who are seeking to better themselves through further education. The previous administration made considerable progress toward this goal in its last recommendations to this Congress. After I have had an opportunity to evaluate the proposals, if any, put forward by the Nixon administration before Mrs. GREEN's committee, I hope that I can again address this House and support them as adequate to meet the challenge.

Mr. Speaker, there is considerable variety in the types of student financial aid provided by, or underwritten by the Federal Government. Most of these programs work reasonably well. Their effectiveness is currently limited—in major part—by the critical lack of appropriated funds. This problem is one that cannot be solved completely until the dual crisis facing the American economy—inflation and the national defense effort in Vietnam—is settled or considerably abated. However, there is one student financial aid program now on the books which has not, and cannot, begin to meet its potential because of serious flaws in its authorizing legislation. I am speaking of the federally insured student loan program established by title IV, part B of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

This program, as it is presently constituted, operates as follows:

Title IV, part B of the Higher Education Act of 1965 authorizes programs of federally insured student loans. These programs provide for students to apply for loans from participating lending institutions to help pay their educational costs while attending schools ranging from vocational or technical to degree-granting institutions.

These loans are insured by the Federal Government and in the event of a student's failure to pay, the lender will be reimbursed 100 percent of the unpaid principal balance of the loan. In the case of the student's death or total and permanent disability, the Federal Government will pay the entire amount owed by the student.

During the student's in-school period, prior to commencement of repayment, and during periods of authorized deferment, the Federal Government pays the total interest up to the maximum 7 percent per annum for those students whose adjusted family income is less than $15,000 per year. During the loan repayment period, the student will assume the total interest charges. Students who do not qualify for Federal interest benefits may borrow, but they must pay all of the interest on the loan.

WHO MAY BORROW?

Regardless of family income, any student desiring to pursue a postsecondary education is eligible to apply for a loan provided he or she:

First, is enrolled and in good standing or has been accepted for enrollment at an eligible school;

Second, is carrying at least one-half of the normal full-time workload as determined by the school; and

Third, is a citizen or national of the United States or is in the United States for other than a temporary purpose.

MAXIMUM LOAN AMOUNT

A maximum of $1,500 per academic year may be applied for if the educational costs require borrowing to this extent. The total outstanding principal balance may not exceed $7,500 at any time.

INSURANCE PREMIUM

The Office of Education charges the lender an insurance premium of one-fourth of 1 percent per year on the amount disbursed for the term of the in-school note. This is computed from the month following disbursement to anticipated month of graduation plus 12 months. The premium is charged only once for the term of each loan. There will be no refunds or adjustments. The lender, at his option, may collect the premium from the borrower or deduct it from the proceeds of the loan. Premiums should be held by the lender until they are requested by the Office of Education.

BILLING OF INTEREST BENEFITS

Lenders will compute and bill the Office of Education for interest benefits on forms provided for this purpose—OE 1166. Lenders have the option of billing on a quarterly, semiannual or annual basis.

LOAN APPLICATION PROCEDURE

The student obtains a Federal application OE 1154—from a lender or school. After completing part A, the student submits the application to the school which verifies enrollment, completes part B, and returns the form to the student. After completing part C, the application is submitted to a lender for approval.

The lender reviews the application for completeness and approves or declines the loan. If approved, the lender completes and signs part D, then submits the original and duplicates to the appropriate regional office of the Office of Education for an insurance commitment. The original application will be returned to the lender bearing the loan insurance commitment in the upper right hand corner. The student executes the Federal note—OE 1164—and the lender disburses the funds. The lender reports disbursements to the Office of Education on a manifest—form OE 1151.

REPAYMENT

Repayment of the loan is over a period of not less than five nor more than 10 years beginning not earlier than nine nor more than 12 months following the date on which a student ceases to be enrolled on at least a half-time basis at an eligible institution. However, as the act requires the student to repay at a rate not less than $360 a year, the actual repayment terms will depend on the student's total indebtedness. Principal payments need not be made by the borrower while he is a member of Armed Forces, a volunteer in the Peace Corps or VISTA, or for any period during which he is pursuing a full-time course of study at an eligible school. The borrower is encouraged to make at least partial payments during such periods of deferment in order to reduce the principal amount of the loan. Full interest subsidy will continue or resume during such periods of deferment, whether or not principal is in fact being paid.

In its concept this program is most worthy; it provides no gift, merely the opportunity for a student to arrange on realistic terms to borrow such funds as he may need to obtain a college or university education. While I certainly acknowledge that this program cannot meet the needs of many desperately disadvantaged young people who also seek a higher education, full utilization of this program by children of middle and lower income families would relieve the stifling demands now put upon such programs as work-study and educational opportunity grants.

Unfortunately, in my district and across this Nation the lending institu-

XUM

tions have found this program so unattractive that they have not been able—out of consideration to their role as guardians of the assets entrusted to them by stockholders and depositors—to participate in the guaranteed student loan program to any meaningful degree.

In one major city in my district, only two of 10 banks now make any loans under the program, and these banks can only handle a very few loans per year. Several banks have their own educational loan programs, but of course these do not have the interest subsidy and payment deferral provisions of the federally insured program. In another major city in our State in which is located a large university and a substantial population of students needing all manner of student financial aid, not one lending institution in town offers the federally insured loan program.

The results of this situation are often tragic. The following are three actual case histories of good students who were forced to withdraw from a university in my district due to the fact that the institutions' resources for financial aid were depleted and the students—because of their impecunious family backgrounds were unable to borrow any money from commercial lending sources.

CASE STUDY

Doyle H., a senior English major whose expected graduation date was May 1969, was forced to withdraw from the university during the final semester of his senior year for financial reasons. He had a solid "C" average at the time of his withdrawal, and there is no evidence that other factors played a part in his decision.

Doyle's father is permanently disabled with a heart condition. The family income is reported at $3,900 per year. Doyle attended a junior college in his hometown for 2 years before transferring to the university. When he applied for aid preceding his transfer in 1967, he was told that no funds were available for initial-year educational opportunity grants, since freshmen had priority on receiving these grants. He was, however, awarded a loan for the 1967–68 school year. He applied again for aid in the 1968–69 school year, but, because there was some delay in submitting a parents' confidential statement, his file did not become complete until after all national defense loans had been awarded. He received no aid at all during his last year in school except that which he earned by working.

With more flexibility in the regulations to provide for the enormous number of transfer students entering the university each fall, Doyle might have received grant and loan funds—or work-study job—sufficient to allow him to graduate.

CASE STUDY

Gwendolyn W., age 19, withdrew from the university both in the fall 1968, and in the spring 1969, for financial reasons. A sophomore science major, Gwendolyn's grades were slightly above average.

She had applied for financial aid, but because her parents' combined income was above $11,000, she was ineligible for any assistance except for the federally insured student loan program. Her application was supported by a letter from her father, stating that, with two other children and with unexpected business expenses, he would be unable to assist Gwendolyn during the 1968–69 school year. He also indicated that his bank did not participate in the federally insured student loan program.

There was no aid available to fit this sort of situation, since Gwendolyn's grades were slightly short of the requirement for academic scholarship.

CASE STUDY

Robert N., 22, withdrew from the university during the spring of his junior year, for financial reasons. He was a "B" student, majoring in German and planning to teach after graduation.

His father is a laundry delivery man whose income has fluctuated in the past 2 years because of illness and because his mother has been laid off her job. During the 1967–68 school year, Robert qualified for and received a national defense loan and a small educational opportunity grant. For 1968–69, however, his parents' contribution was estimated by college scholarship service at $610, rendering him ineligible for a grant. Robert showed by his estimated expenses that he was accustomed to living well below the estimated budget for a single student at the university, but he also indicated on his application that his parents were unable to contribute to his education this year.

Present program regulations were too restrictive to award Robert sufficient aid to keep him in school, although a glance at the parents' statement is sufficient to show that it would be very difficult for a family of so little financial strength to obtain a bank loan.

Members of this Congress cannot stand by and wait for an end to inflation, an end to the Vietnam conflict, and a decision by the administration, to take action on this tragic situation. When a B student cannot borrow money to finish his senior year in college relief must be afforded.

In conversations with university officials and members of the banking community, I have learned that there are two impediments to its utilization. First is the limitation placed on interest payable on loans insured under the program. Second is the fact that, should a loan be declared in default, the lending institution can only recover the principal amount of the loan.

In recognition of these shortcomings in the present legislation, and in an effort to offer the fastest feasible means of increasing student financial aid resources available to students entering colleges and universities this fall; I am today introducing legislation which will authorize the Commissioner of Education to first, issue certificates of insurance on loans made under this program so long as the interest provided for therein does not exceed one-half of 1-percent per annum more than the "prime rate"; and second, include in the insurable amount accrued interest.

In my opinion the maximum interest provided for in my bill will permit lending institutions to make a fair return on their assets which are tied up in student loans.

The additional one-half of 1 percent is justified, in my opinion, because of the extensive additional recordkeeping and reporting which banks must perform to comply with the regulations governing this program.

Admittedly, they might be able to realize more income from various types of consumer credit. However, my conversations with the banking community in my district indicates that they would be willing to forgo this additional income on a small part of their total loan portfolio. In addition, it must be borne in mind that these loans will be fully guaranteed by the Federal Government.

Furthermore, this guarantee will be a meaningful provision, rather than the halfhearted guarantee now provided to lending institutions. Section 2 of my bill would eliminate the existing provision of law which provides that Federal insurance cannot be extended to cover interest earned on the defaulted loan. Thus, lending institutions will be able to recover a fair return on student loans even though such loans may at some future date be turned over to the Federal Government for collection. This is only right. We are asking the lending institutions of the Nation to assume a major role in providing a service to society, they should not be expected to do so at a loss to themselves, their depositors, and their stockholders.

I am confident that if my bill can become law soon, the financial community of this Nation will cooperate fully to make available to the class of 1973, and students already in college, a meaningful opportunity to participate in the federally insured student loan program.

VIETNAM ROLL OF HONOR

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, with these remarks I place in the RECORD the names of Americans killed by hostile action in Vietnam since President Nixon took office. Together with the names inserted earlier, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 25 and April 3, they constitute the Vietnam roll of honor. This list includes nearly 3,000 names.

Published at a moment of great exhilaration and rejoicing over the success and safety of the moon landing, the listing is a sober reminder of the grim momentum of war back on earth. With Neil Armstrong's walk on the moon's surface we have reached a goal set 7 years ago—the achievement of which unfortunately involved the death of three of our astronauts. Yet we need to be constantly reminded that during a parallel period of commitment in Vietnam, we have lost more than 36,000 American men in battle.

The roll of honor has special meaning and justification in terms of both living and dead at this time when the first 6

XUM

months of the Nixon administration are being assessed.

It explains in the most personal, explicit, and convincing terms possible why the President has begun disengagement of our forces in Vietnam and why this must go forward promptly and completely.

Publication of the roll of honor also serves an important purpose to the extent that it will counterbalance pressures aimed at persuading the President to reverse his decision and turn back. These pressures inevitably and naturally will be brought to bear at the White House from varied and powerful sources.

For example, like many other citizens, the Joint Chiefs of Staff are deeply committed to preserving our Nation's cherished military tradition of never losing a war and may therefore argue against withdrawal. They have ready access to the President and are skilled in using the vast resources of the Department of Defense to sell their viewpoint. The terms "commitment, national honor, Communist containment" will be repeated over and over again by these officers and other prominent spokesmen. These terms readily and properly touch public nerve centers and often evoke an emotional response rather than a reasoned analysis of the hard facts.

A rumor in Paris, a lull in the fighting, a sharp drop in casualties, or other favorable news will prompt those who see Communist forces weakening to plead, as they have in the past, for a little more time to test some new military or diplomatic tactic. Such forces doubtless already are being felt at the White House and will persist in the days ahead. They make absolutely essential the development of effective measures to reinforce the President's decision to disengage and to broaden public support for it.

Most of the well-publicized statements calling for disengagement quote Democrats who held prominent positions in the Johnson administration—Clark Clifford, Cyrus Vance, Averell Harriman, Edwin Reischauer, as well as Senators and Representatives who are Democrats. Human nature being as it is, the partisan character of this chorus might be expected to stir reverse tendencies in a Republican administration.

The general silence of Republicans in Congress should be taken as tacit support for the President's recent decisions regarding the Southeast Asia conflict Realizing the enormity of the problem President Nixon confronted when he assumed office on January 20, we wanted him to have ample time to set a solid new course for his administration. The whole area of foreign policy is so delicate and critically important that it seemed best to await clear signals from the White House as to the direction the President would take in Vietnam.

I feel that the signals are now clear.

Mr. Nixon has already acted in momentous form, reversing the troop buildup which had been carried forward in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. On Presidential orders, 25,000 troops are now being withdrawn from Vietnam. August has been given as the time when further cutbacks will be decided. Mr. Nixon has publicly expressed the hope that all ground combat forces can be withdrawn before 1971. Although he has listed factors which will be considered in determining the pace of disengagement—that is, developments at Paris, the enemy's response, the ability of the South Vietnamese to take over the fighting—an examination of his statements shows that he has carefully avoided fixing these or any other factors as absolute conditions to further troop reductions.

Given the deep division among Americans over what policy should be pursued—my constituents are evenly split between "pouring it on" and "pulling out"—the President's delineation of his plans is as explicit as reasonably can be expected at this juncture.

What the President needs, even more than a response from Hanoi, is a response from the American body politic and especially from Republicans in Congress. With strong vocal bipartisan support, the President can proceed forthrightly and confidently with disengagement.

Without it, he may decide that a greatly protracted withdrawal and fundamental review is required. On a policy question of such critical importance, the President risks the loss of his ability to lead the Nation if he appears to depart sharply from public sentiment. In this regard, public support from his own party is especially important.

Republican silence denies Mr. Nixon the active bipartisan support that is absolutely essential if he is to carry out disengagement with a minimum of domestic trauma.

I therefore urge my colleagues in Congress, and especially those of the Republican Party, to speak up clearly in support of the President's recent actions and in support of disengagement. I urge this be done now. Each of us must assume a special personal responsibility, as well as our constitutionally delegated responsibility in the field of foreign affairs.

By this means we will be acting to halt the further extension of this roll of honor, action which I consider to be the most honorable way we can possibly commemorate those who have died.

Of course, this list of names is not news to President Nixon. With the exception of the immediate families of these brave men, surely no other person feels the same anguish experienced by the Commander in Chief as daily casualty reports come to his desk.

The frustration of that anguish must be all the more intense now that President Nixon so clearly has made the long-awaited fundamental decision to terminate our combat operations in Vietnam and withdraw our military forces at the earliest possible date.

With that decision made, every man who is injured, every one who is killed in this interim period while withdrawal is actually taking place, must constitute a heavy burden indeed for the President—as for all other concerned citizens.

The American people will support the President in promptly carrying out disengagement to the extent that they comprehend the cost of further delay. I know of no way to describe it more adequately or appropriately than by listing the name and address of each man killed in recent months.

Weekly casualty reports are cold, impersonal. They are read like stock market quotations—up one week, down the next. We occasionally slip into the use of callous terms like "kill ratio." If it shows a marked increase in enemy losses contrasted with our own, this supposedly indicates that the war is going in our favor. If the American toll is down compared with that of the previous week, faces brighten. But statistics obscure the personalities and humanity involved. Even one death in a mistaken, hopeless cause is too high a price. The young Americans recorded here are irreplaceable to their families, communities, and mankind. Most of those who died were under 23 years of age, and of course no one will ever know what contributions to human advancement they might have made during a normal life span.

Since President Nixon announced the withdrawal of 25,000 troops and expressed the hope that the remainder of all ground combat forces will be removed prior to 1970, critics have questioned the timing and bemoaned the effects of his statements.

Some have said the President thus killed all hope for progress at the Paris peace talks, arguing that the Vietcong and Hanoi now know they need make no concessions to get what they want. They contend that all Hanoi needs to do is wait for the completion of the withdrawal the President has started.

Such reasoning must stand or fall on the likelihood of fruitful negotiations at Paris. Clearly the President has come to the conclusion that Paris offers no hope for satisfactory settlement of our military involvement in Vietnam. Secretary Rogers has testified that the United States is not putting all its eggs in the Paris "basket." The President's recent statements could therefore hardly kill something already as dead as Marley's ghost. Obviously the President has decided the waiting game at Paris cannot justify more names on the Roll of Honor. Critics have also forecast that U.S. withdrawal will have a disastrous effect on the stability of the South Vietnamese government. In my judgment, the President's action will lead to a greater, more permanent stability in the political development of South Vietnam.

By beginning disengagement, he thereby immediately set in motion powerful new local forces. The Thieu-Ky regime can survive U.S. disengagement only by broadening its base of local support. The regime must now find popularity at home instead of Washington, or be replaced. Admittedly the political structure will have to accommodate local insurgent forces. President Thieu has been holding talks with political leaders of all factions during the last few weeks, and there is every indication that political accommodation is already beginning to take place.

Our presence in Vietnam is an unnatural but powerful political influence which serves to delay the development of a local Vietnamese political order in tune with the realities of Vietnamese political, social, and economic life.

I am convinced the President has added up to the Vietnam balance sheet in terms of national interests and found it favors withdrawal. If, as some argue, our military policies sustain our prestige in some quarters, the very same policies sharply diminish it in others. While it is true that our Nation has never lost a war, it is also true that our Nation has never before made so grievous a military mistake.

Although commitments to Vietnam have been made by previous Presidents, the mark of greatness in a nation, as in a person, is the wisdom to recognize error and the courage to take corrective action promptly. No nation likes to lose a war, but a nation which attempts to fill the role of world policeman must have the wisdom and courage to retire from positions that are unproductive and unpromising.

In making his statements the President acted with compassion for Americans who are living, especially those whose lives might otherwise be wasted buying time for a purposeless extension of an empty ritual. The President also honors those who have died by his determination that others need not follow them to an untimely grave.

The roll of honor provides recognition of heroes who deserve to be remembered. The courage and conviction, determination and devotion that they displayed under great handicaps—psychological as well as physical—in a strange, distant war must place them in the very front ranks of all heroes in our history.

The roll of honor and a tabulation follow:

DEATHS RESULTING FROM HOSTILE ACTION IN VIETNAM IN MARCH 1969 NOT PREVIOUSLY RECORDED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

ALABAMA

Army

Barnett, Donald Eugene, Anniston.
Brown, Walter Evans, Jr., Bessemer.
Caldwell, Henry, Jr., Birmingham.
Daniel, Robert G., Bridgeport.
Dixon, Louis Krimmit, Mobile.
Dobynes, Joseph James, Marion.
Freeman, Jimmy Grant, Talladega.
Golden, George Kenneth, Eva.
Hocutt, Larry Keith, Mobile.
Hughes, Errol Arthur, Oxford.
Motley, John Larry, Jr., Birmingham.
Presley, Andrew Lee, Jr., Mobile.
Sturma, Charles Frank, Silver Hill.
Thomas, Howard Ray, Jr., Oxford.
Walker, Charles Clarence, Eufaula.

Marine Corps

Franklin, Ira Melton, Jr., Birmingham.
Keefe, Floyd Milton, Montgomery.
Lane, Gerald Bruce, Hartselle.
Martin, Charles Edward, East Gadsden.
Northington, William Clyde, Prattville.
Sargent, George Thomas, Jr., Auburn.
Tolsma, Raymond Earl, Prichard.

Navy

Dees, Edgar Allen, Jr., Mobile.
Hamner, Theodore S., III, Tuscaloosa.
Sellers, Melvin Louis, Phenix City.

ARIZONA

Army

Bailey, Larry Eugene, Phoenix.
Lee, Bill Gregory, Tucson.

Marine Corps

Carter, Jack David, Scottsdale.
Moreno, Alfred, Jr., Phoenix.

ARKANSAS

Army

Grant, Robert Earl, Blytheville.
Grissom, Johnny Paul, Little Rock.
Harvey, Randall Lloyd, Paragould.
Sauls, Elbert James, Fort Smith.
West, Mounce Edward, Paragould.
Womack, Roy Arnold, Fort Smith.

Marine Corps

Crowder, Harold Edward, North Little Rock.
Hill, Carl Wayne, Benton.
Pugh, Robert Earl, Little Rock.

CALIFORNIA

Army

Adcock, Richard Lynn, Hinkley.
Barnholdt, Terry Joe, Garden Grove.
Baxter, Jerry, Susanville.
Brown, Richard Allen, Lakewood.
Campbell, Robert John, Burbank.
Canavan, Martin Joseph, Jr., Barstow.
Cole, Robert Owen, Sacramento.
Daniels, Bruce William, Fresno.
Davis, Robert Scott, Gardena.
Doran, Sean Timothy, Lennox.
Duperry, Peter Alfred, Whittier.
Eade, Raymond Fredrick, King City.
Estes, Brian Robert, Whittier.
Flores, Edwardo, San Jose.
Garcia, Antonio Mendez, Needles.
Gorvad, Peter Lawrence, Oakland.
Greer, Dennis Dale, Los Gatos.
Hall, Leonard John, Menlo Park.
Hatley, Eddie Lee, Stockton.
Heinmiller, Robert Lynn, Fresno.
Helgeson, Dale George, Lawndale.
Higginbotham, Larry Gene, Porterville.
Kinnard, James Edward, Vista.
Lawson, Daniel W., North Highlands.
Lucas, Clyde Austin, Mendocino.
Mischeaux, Rene Clarence, San Francisco.
Morgan, David Robert, Altadena.
Mortenson, Allan David, El Cajon.
Ortegon, Richard Joseph, Fremont.
Paerke, Duane Carl, Jr., Salt.
Peterson, David Bruce, Bellflower.
Radtke, Carl Leonard, New Hall.
Rains, Clyde Edward, Covelo.
Robbins, Jerry Clayton, Martinez.
Robinson, Kenneth James, Fontana.
Rowe, William Edwin, Costa Mesa.
Russell, Ronald Patrick, El Cajon.
Santos, Layne Michael, Los Angeles.
Segura, Steven Rey, San Francisco.
Sheridan, Robert Edward, Placentia.
Sloan, Robert Leland, North Hollywood.
Sparks, Glenn Louis, Buena Park.
Tapia Moises, Los Angeles.
Thompson, Bruce Wayne, Glendale.
Thompson, Robert Eugene, Fullerton.
Thompson, Thomas Donald, Jr., Los Angeles.
Waller, John Bussey, Berkeley.
West, James Clifford, Jr., North Hollywood.
White, Richard Allen, Monterey.
Williams, Craig Emery, Lakewood.
Worl, Leslie Wayne, Long Beach.
Ziegler, Stanley Bruce, Cedarpines Park.
Zufelt, Roy Glenn, Palmdale.

Air Force

Di Figlia, Frank Anthony, Burbank.

Marine Corps

Angel, Michael Eugene, Hayward.
Blosky, Gene Orville, Los Angeles.
Burris, Victor Antonied, Los Angeles.
Christianson, Ronald F., Redding.
Conner, Melvin Hubbard, Jr., Riverside.
Curci, Anthony Boy, Riverside.
Delgado, Raymond Rodriguez, Watsonville.
Glass, Donald Robert, Citrus Heights.
Gould William Andrew, Oxnard.
Guillen, Davis Lawrence, Gardena.
Hunt, Philip Michael, Chula Vista.
Jay, Robert Vern, Alturas.
Labowski, Leonard William, San Francisco.
Liss, Larry William, Oroville.
Marshall, Michael Allen, Los Angeles.
Mulholland Robert Alton, Studio City.
Nibbelink, Lea Everett, Los Alamitos.
Nottingham, Richard Lance, La Puente.
Pastores, Gevin Pescozo, Oakland.
Regnolds, James Randolph, Los Altos.
Shields, Richard Dale, Bellflower.
Stitt, Richard Wesley, Paramount.
Swisher, Clifford Lee, Cypress.
Torres, Michael Angel, Gardena.

Navy

Bruckart, Donald Lee, Redlands.
Shapiro, Milton, Palmdale.

COLORADO

Army

Blake, Armin Jochaim, Denver.
Gabbin, Fred Lee, Colorado Springs.
Garcia, Edward Lee, Cortez.
Pollock, Douglas Ray, Brush.

Air Force

Anselmo, William Frank, Denver.
Seiler, Clyde, Aurora.

Marine Corps

Katz, Ronald Christopher, Pueblo.

Navy

Menard, Douglas Fred, Denver.

CONNECTICUT

Army

Bowe, Thomas John, Stratford.
Crosby, Arthur Allen, Jr., Guilford.
De Forge, David Henry, Bloomfield.
Fenton, William Charles, Jr., Wallingford.
Krajewski, Donald Joseph, Manchester.
Lamoreux, Edward Donald, Plainfield.
Tripp, Peter Leadbetter, Greenwich.
Tyrell, Edward Judd, Danbury.

Air Force

Alho, Antonio Lopez, New Haven.

Marine Corps

Dupuis, Clement Arthur, Southington.

DELAWARE

Marine Corps

Hill, Arthur Stanley, Jr., Wilmington.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Army

Cofield, Edward Charles, Jr., Washington.

Marine Corps

Avery, James Linwood, Washington.
Jones, Ronald, Washington.
Wilson, Carl Richard, Jr., Washington.

FLORIDA

Army

Ash, Frederic Nathaniel, Tallahassee.
Brown, Willie Lee, Jr., Archer.
Calloway, Hardy Eugene, Pensacola.
Cook, Jimmie Dee, West Palm Beach.
Fields, Charlie, Winter Garden.
Gibson, John Brown, Jr., Sarasota.
Graham, Terry Durand, Gainesville.
Green, Willie Frank, Riverview.
Haga, Joseph Clayton, Miami.
Harter, Robert Louis, Palm Bay.
Heinselman, Theodore E., Jacksonville.
Heizer, Gary Paul, Orlando.
Johnson, Carlton Jerry, Tallahassee.
Lieser, Robert Daryl, Carol City.
McIntosh, Robert A., Clearwater.
McKinley, James Marion, McDavid.
Murray, Gordon Chester, Greenacres City.
Nelson, Lawson Dwight, Ocala.
Nurman, Calvin, Jr., Tampa.
Outlaw, Charles Reuben, Jr., West Palm Beach.
Palmer, Johnny Lee, Opa Locka.
Vickrey, Charles Craig, Homestead.

Air Force

Fields, Robert Wayne, DeLand.

Marine Corps

Byars, Steve Eugene, Lorida.
Folden, Thomas, Belle Glade.
Ganzy, Clyde Wayne, Jacksonville.
Jenkins, Robert Henry, Jr., Interlachen.
Miller, Wilbur James, Jr., Jacksonville.
Strouse, Paul Edwin, Crestview.
Thompson, Leslie Dale, Tampa.
White, George Preston, Orlando.
Witham, Kenneth Leroy, Winter Park.

GEORGIA

Army

Bender, Gernot, Columbus.
Bradley, Stanley Thomas, Cartersville.
Cuker, Dennis Sanders, Monroe.
England, Michael, Athen.
Faircloth, Henry Floyd, Lyons.
Ferguson, Earl, Savannah.
Garroll, Larry David, Hartsfield.
Goodale, Joseph Daniel, Jr., Grovetown.
Green, Jewell Robert, Blue Ridge.
Guthrie, Charles Larry, Kensington.
Harper, Allan G., Villa Rica.
Howard Roy Lee, Monticello.
Johnson, Jerry, Covington.
Johnson, Russell Lee, Dixie.
Macken, Charles Davis, Albany.
Pattillo, Minor Wesley, Griffin.
Pullum, Henry, Jr., Americus.
Sauls, Robert Ned, Atlanta.
Sharpe, Mack Donald, Brunswick.
Stinson, William Clyde, Jr., Dublin.
Stone, David, Scottdale.
Webb, Oliver Kenneth, Valdosta.

Marine Corps

Herring, Elijah, Jr., Leslie.
McGill, Robert Andrew, Columbus.
Moss Charles Nathan, Atlanta.

Navy

Belcher, Herbert Eugene, Douglas.

HAWAII

Army

Kawamura, Terry Teruo, Wahiawa.
Otake, John Sadad, Honolulu.
Shibata, Glenn Teugio, Kealakekua.
Silveri, Dennis Michael, Honolulu.

IDAHO

Army

Claybaugh, James Bradley, Caldwell.

ILLINOIS

Army

Avgerinos, George Richard, South Holland.
Brown, Raymond, Chicago.
Chappell, Edward Lewis, Chicago.
Cody, William De Brece, Robinson.
Frendling, Edward Joseph, South Holland.
Gregg, Robert Stanley, Shelbyville.
Herschbach, David Edward, East St. Louis.
Horchem, Nelson Leport, Jr., Kankakee.
Iyua, Archie Hubert, Jr., Chicago.
Janka, James Edward, Westmont.
Lama, Edward Bartholomew, Mundelein.
Lauber, Robert Dean, Monica.
Lovellette, George Ronald, Urbana.
Matheny, Larry Dale, Chicago.
Meierotto, Edward Ralph, Chicago.
Merker, Rand Russell, Northbrook.
Mills, Greg Wendell, Mendota.
Moehring, Dean Ward, Naperville.
Moore, Terry Dwight, Washington.
Newman, Bobby Joe, Chicago.
Perez, Raul Victor, Chicago.
Ryan, William Dean, Walnut Hill.
Schwichow, Richard Joseph, Chicago.
Spearman, William T., III, Chicago.
Spiegel, Robert Eugene, La Harpe.
Thompkins, Glenn Alan, Rock Falls.
Vavrosky, Paul Peter, Milan.
Willis, Donnis Glen, Winthrop Harbor.
Wilson, James Harold, Chicago.
Wisniewski, Dennis Euguene, Chicago.

Air Force

Cofer, Arthur William, Springfield.

Marine Corps

Beck, Norman Elmer, Rockford.
Gough, William Lyle, Atwood.
Hart, Samuel Nicholas, Villa Park.
Jennings, Bobby Dale, Granite City.
King, James Micheal, Rock Island.
Knoeferl, Kenneth Joseph, Rock Island.
Pote, Freddie Charles, Jr., Hometown.
Sanders, Henry Clyde, Rockford.
Thaxton, David Edward, Waukegan.
Washington, Maurice Joe, Chicago.

Navy

Burton, Bert Ellis, Greenfield.
Overright, Daniel Lee, Bradley.

INDIANA

Army

Anderson, Ral Jefro, Jr., Gary.
Bernoska, Wayne Gary, Gary.
Culp, Everett T., Columbia City.
Grabbe, John Albert, Freelandville.
Ivy, Leonard Clarence, Jr., Terre Haute.
Lezma, Jose, Jr., Gary.
Lynch, Philip Edmond, Williams.
McAllister, William Denni, Vincennes.
Meszar, Frank III, East Chicago.
Pace, Gary Lynn, Hope.
Walters, Bobby Joe, Petersburg.
Walters, Tim Leroy, South Bend.
Wysong, Joseph Walter, Richmond.

Air Force

Buhr, Thomas Frederick, Ft. Wayne.

Marine Corps

Baer, Max Irwin, Goshen.
Bell, Steven Allen, Petersburgh.
Bruce, Daniel Dean, Beverly Shores.
Hiday, Thomas Michael, Alexandria.
Meyer, John Joseph, Indianapolis.
Musselman, Harold Earl, Centerville.
Thomas, Charles Wayne, Gary.
Vroom, James Lee, Ft. Wayne.
Whitten, Robert Franklin, Indianapolis.

IOWA

Army

Baker, Philip Lou, Correctionville.
Lovitt, David Glen, Bedford.
O'Shea, James Charles, Council Bluffs.
Potter, William Don, Manchester.
Rupe, Donald Lee, Cedar Rapids.

Air Force

Rex, Robert F., Odebolt.

Marine Corps

Duntz, Ronald De Vere, Des Moines.

KANSAS

Army

Brenner, Kenneth James, Hope.
Eisenrath, John Joe, Wichita.
Hurst, Quentin Foxx, Valley Falls.
Rolfe, Gary Fay, Wichita.
Schoth, William Wesley, II, Mission.

Navy

Adams, Thomas Edward, Topeka.

KENTUCKY

Army

Alvey, Alfred Eli, Jr., Morganfield.
Beard, Leon, Marion.
Blankenship, Jewell C., Hopkinsville.
Colson, Ronald Sanders, Murray.
Emrath, John Phillip, Lexington.
Haydon, Paul Dearing, Louisville.
Hornsby, John R., Paducah.
Lindsey, Arthur Dale, Paducah.
Stewart, James Lloyd, Inez.
Thompson, William P., Jr., Shelbyville.
Walters, William Owen, Melber.
Wilkins, Ben Henry, Jr., Louisville.

Air Force

Bowman, Jesse Carl, Lexington.

Marine Corps

Ball, Michael Roger, Davenport.
Brake, Boyd Lawerence, Adairville.
Hardy, Buford, Richmond.
Thompson, Philip Bruce, Monticello.

LOUISIANA

Army

Brannan, James Curtis, Slidell.
Cain, Carl Dennis, Denham Springs.
Clause, Michael Allen, Labadieville.
Cooke, Paul Donald, La Place.
Denny, Roger Edward, Mayna.
Gordon, Jimmie Lee, Tallulah.
Miller, Leonard Charles, Ponchatoula.
Roberts, Marvin James, Baton Rouge.
West, Paul Bradley, Ville Platte.
Wilhelm, Lawrence M., Jr., Lake Charles.
Williams, Huey, Shreveport.

Coast Guard

Beeson, Morris Sampson, Pitkins.

Marine Corps

Floyd, David Allen, Minden.
Owens, Claude James, Lake Charles.

Navy

Bush, Cecil Floyd, Bogalusa.

MAINE

Army

Bechard, Raymond Joseph, Augusta.
Davan, Benedict Maher, Westbrook.
Davenport, Bard Elton, Wilton.
Mckechnie, James Allen, West Farmington.

Air Force

Levesque, J. B. L., Van Buren.

Marine Corps

Goding, Robert Earle, Ashland.

MARYLAND

Army

Abshear, William Wallace, Hillcrest Heights.
Colt, Leon, Baltimore.
Crew, Carl Joseph, Betterton.
Fraley, Clayton Eugene, Gaithersburg.
Nohe, Joseph Edward Jr., Baltimore.
Pulliam, Eric Vincent, Baltimore.
Rawlings, Benjamin Joseph, Naylor.
Schaaf, William John, Baltimore.
Taylor, James Randel, Suitland.
Turner, Thomas Gaines, Bethesda.
Wimmer, Willard Alvon, Baltimore.

Marine Corps

Best, Billy Howard, Baltimore.
Childress, Calvin Jeffery, Baltimore.
Wilson, Lorne John, Rockville.

Navy

Fisher, Donald Jay, Baltimore.

MASSACHUSETTS

Army

Bois, Richard Joseph, Peabody.
Crocco, Walter Vincent, Somerville.
Dumont, Roger Joseph, Chicopee.
Dunn, Michael, Roy, North Andover.
Erbentraut, Steven Charles, Springfield.
Fetterman, Glenn Leroy, Charlotte.
Gordon, Glenn Raymond, Abington.
Gould, William C., Jr., Boston.
Lameiras, Richard Arthur, Cambridge.
McNamara, William James, Boston.
Michael, Thomas, Dover.
Miller, Kenneth Edward, New Boston.

Marine Corps

Costa, Robert Joseph, Somerville.
Kostanski, Stephen Francis, Springfield.
Malone, Philip Newman, Alexandria City.
Nee, Peter Mary, Cambridge.
Pratt, John Lionel, Pittsfield.
Taylor, Philip Joseph, Holden.

Navy

Petschke, Robert Elton, Jr., Springfield.
Sorrenti, John Anthony, Boston.

XUM

MICHIGAN

Army

Atkinson, Robert Louis, Jr., Clarkston.
Bryant, William Maud, Detroit.
Buczolich, Paul Joseph, River Rouge.
Cameron, James Luther, Muskegon.
Cook, Charles Francis, East Detroit.
Craig, William Thomas, Jr., Battle Creek.
Curran, Daniel Joseph, Jackson.
Diaz, Benito, Jr., Saginaw.
Dunneback, Michael Arthur, Grand Rapids.
Eastern, Joe Butler, Detroit.
Flannery, David Elwood, Muskegon.
Garrick, Jerry Arthur, Trout Creek.
Grow, Gary Warren, Jackson.
Guyton, Melvin, Hamtramck.
Jacobs, David Paul, Port Huron.
Keck, Frank Leslie, Kalkaska.
Lamey, Lavern Michael, Milan.
Martin, Kenneth, Kalamazoo.
Nowakowski, John Alexander, Rochester.
Polasek, Joseph James, Jr., Kalamazoo.
Ramsby, James Edward, Milford.
Ray, Dewey Junior, Detroit.
Reel, J. C., Troy.
Roach, Thomas Joseph, Jr., Royal Oak.
Robinson, Thomas Leon, Muskegon.
Scott, Martin T., II, Davison.
Snyder, Charles David, Saint Clair Shores.
Strucel, Joseph John, Detroit.
~~Vanden~~ Berg, Ronald Jay, Wyoming.
~~Verrett,~~ Kenneth Emery, Sault Sainte Marie.
Weiher, Robert Lester, Battle Creek.

Air Force

Lepard, Donald George, Flint.

Marine Corps

De Wilde, Peter F., Jr., Lansing.
Dusseau, Richard Frank, La Salle.
Heckman, Clarence Alvin, Lansing.
Heiser, John Louis, Detroit.
Jones, Richard Stephen, Reimanville.
McDaniel, Frankie B., Battle Creek.
Merryman, Dennis Gary, Sparta.
Ovist, David Emanuel, Pelkie.
Shier, Ronald James, Cadillac.

Navy

Rudd, Donald Lee, Tecumseh.

MINNESOTA

Army

Anderson, Darrell Eugene, Minneapolis.
Enz, Harvey Gordon, St. Peter.
Nelson, Paul Arthur, New Brighton.
Norman, James Michael, Duluth.
Smith, Harold John, Stillwater.
Songle Clayton Andrew, Minneapolis.
Taylor, Phillip Edward, Minneapolis.
Thompson, Lyle John, St. Paul.
Weber, David Allan, Rochester.

Marine Corps

Pederson, Kenneth Allen, Minneapolis.
Schaefer, Thomas Koenig, Hopkins.

MISSISSIPPI

Army

Gilliard, Edward Lee, Heidelberg.
Hill, Charlie, III, Pelahatchie.
Johnson, Victor, Jr., Belen.
Spiers, Frank, Columbia.
Wilder, Frank, Carthage.

Marine Corps

Bolton, Willie Edward, Richton.
Burks, James Carl, Raymond.

MISSOURI

Army

Boyd, Roy Bradley, Windsor.
Bright, Thomas, Jr., Warrensburg.
Forck, Michael Richard, Jefferson City.
Gaylord, Douglas Drue, St. Peters.
Goodwin, William Franklin, Springfield.
Hobbs, Charles Michael, Independence.
Jackson, Robert, Jr., St. Louis
Mayberry, Donald Richard, Dexter.
Nixon, Donald Lee, Pine Lawn.
Schmich, Joseph, Jr., St. Louis.
Thompkins, Ronald Winston, Jefferson City.
Veale, Ralph Dean, King City.
Walker, Charles, St. Louis.

Marine Corps

James, Gerald Lynn, Hornersville.
Menninger, Robert Patrick, Gladstone.
Prose, William Thomas, St. Louis.

Navy

Hutton, William James, Columbia.
Suhr, Alfred Henry, Mexico.

MONTANA

Army

Caton, Leonard Roger, Laurel.
Harness, Anthony Gene, Kila.
Jodrey, William Michael. Shelby.
Petrie, John James, Cut Bank.
Yarger, John Robert, Miles City.

Navy

Flanagan, Russell David, Great Falls.
Harris, Lewis Craig, Deer Lodge.

NEBRASKA

Army

Benze, Patrick Henry, O'Neill.
Clements, Milo Dean, Blair.
Sayer, Terry Lynn, Holbrook.
Wiese, Thomas Arthur, Mullen.

Marine Corps

Coker, Ronald Leroy, Alliance.

NEVADA

Army

Brown, Larry Donald, Caliente.
Hodge, Charles Lynn, Reno
Rucker, Carlos Wilson, Las Vegas.

Marine Corps

Aleck, John Ira, Reno.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Army

Pelletier, Richard William, Greenville.

Marine Corps

Shaw, Robert Ernest, North Hampton.

NEW JERSEY

Army

Bell, William Brent, Essex Fells.
Biddle, Joseph Lenord, Berlin.
Callan, George Allan, Pennsville.
Coll, Dennis Joseph, Springfield.
D'Adamo, Albert L., Jr., Wanamassa.
Danchetz, Lester, Rahway.
Joseph, Guy Frederick, Chatham.
Joynes, Frank Dennis, Jr., Newark.
Markovich, Douglas Joseph, Madison.
McCallum, Peter John, Jr., Passaic.
Moon, Theodore Edward, Jr., South Orange.
Moran, Vincent, Iselin.
Nofford, Clarence, Newark.
O'Shaughnessy, James John, Closter.
Spence, Roger James, Roselle Park.
Tully, Walter Busill, Jr., Madison.
Warnett, Ronald Leonard, Linden.
West, John Hayden, North Bergen.

Air Force

Alexander, Calvin Eugene, Newark.
Dinan, David Thomas, III, Nutley.
Rios, Noel Luis, Newark.

Marine Corps

Burke, William Gregory, Saddle River.
Grassia, Joseph, Jr., Paterson.
Presley, Avey, Elizabeth.
Sargent, Gordon Leroy, Jr., Newark.
Sellitto, Michael Joseph, Towaco.

NEW MEXICO

Army

Griego, Richard Edward, Santa Fe.
Sandfer, Willie J., Jr., Tinnie.

NEW YORK

Army

Arniotis, Dimitrios G., Jamaica.
Bethea, Henry, Montrose.
Bonapart, Paul, New York.
Browne, Earl Frederick, New York.
Carapezza, Richard Allan, Rochester.
Carpenter, Walter Andrew, Binghamton.
Conklin, Larry James, Endicott.
Doane, Stephen Helden, Walton.
Durpe, Charles Vaughn, Olean.
Elder, Eugene, New York.
Ellis, Frank Joseph G., Jr., Syracuse.
Force, Rodger Dennis, Millport.
Forest, Donald Steven, Rochester.
Freeman, Furnace, Jr., New York.
Gentile, James Raymond, Watertown.
George-Pizarrd Arthur, New York.
Goss, Jeffrey Kenneth, New York.
Hamilton, John David, Jr., Rochester.
Hordern, David James, New York.
Johnson, William Lovett, New York.
Kangro, Lauri, New York.
Kent, Kenneth Ross, Dundee.
Kulpa, Richard Walter, Utica.
Lallave, Alfred, New York.
Lund, Willard Spencer, Bayport.
Lynch, Michael, Amsterdam.
Malin, Michael Lee, Angola.
Mazal, Roger James, Valatie.
Miller Allen Robert, Edmeston.
O'Connor, Michael Patrick, Troy.
Phillips, David Jeffrey, Buffalo.
Pignataro, Julius Philip, Ozone Park.
Poggi, Michael Louis, Peekskill.
Prchal, Charles Robert, Sound Beach.
Ricciardo, Ronald Francis, Deer Park.
Rivera, Miguel Angel, New York.
Rudolph, Walter William, Manhasset.
Russo, Joseph Charles, New York.
Slaven, Richard E., Elmira.
Somma, Ryuzo, Medford.
Stone, Lester Ray, Jr., Harpursville.
Sullivan, James Michael, Glendale.
Torpie, William James, Hawthorne.
Whitford, Lynn Cecil, Crown Point.

Marine Corps

Baker, Paul Joseph, Troy.
Bey Nelson, New York.
Carey, William James, Astoria.
Christie, Larry Edward, Waddington.
Evangelista, Frank Paul, Flushing.
Giretti, Anthony Alfred, Baldwin.
Gyore, Allan Ronald, Lowville.
Leahy, Richard James, Albany.
Malabe, Julio, New York.
Miles, Larry Allen, Buffalo.
Orbino, Dennis Michael, Syracuse.
Rogers, William James, IV, Buffalo.
Rubin, Roy Garland, New York.
Stahl, John Joseph, Floral Park.

Navy

Gebbie, Ronald Jackson, Rochester.
Swagler, Craig Everett, Endwell.

NORTH CAROLINA

Army

Baumgarner, Raymond Ervin, Kannapolis.
Beacham, Warren Lee, Washington.
Britt, Dan Michael, Fairmont.
Dent, William Lorance, Hillsboro.
Douglas, Carl Scott, Sanford.
Fleming, Phillip Harry, Raleigh.
Goebel, Rupert Watson, Jr., Gastonia.
Graves, Carter Lee, Reidsville.
Greene, John Marvin, Charlotte.
Hayes, Earl Marshall, Spindale.
Lee, Kenneth Mac, Dunn.
Lowery, Steve Edwin, Forest City.
Maske, William James, Albemarle.
Partee, John Leroy, Concord.
Perkins, Danny Franklin, Mount Holly.
Roberson, Samuel Albert, Wilson.
Smith, Jimmy Van, Marble.
Tisdale, Leon, Greensboro.
Wall, James Howell, Cullowhee.

Marine Corps

Arnold, Donald Ray, Greenville.
Casey, Danny Vann, Wilson.
Elders, Ernest Franklin, Shelby.
Ervin, Donald Frank, Greensboro.
King, Joseph Robert, Jr., Raleigh.

Navy

McCormick, William L., Greensboro.

NORTH DAKOTA

Army

Hanson, Danny Leroy, Stirum.

OHIO

Army

Brown, Fred Edward, Hamilton.
Cunningham, Charles Robert, Cincinnati.
Dodson, Leonard, Manhattan.
Evans, Larry Edgar, Van Wert.
Glanton, Albert Thomas, Canton.
Groves, Lowell Roger, Athens.
Hawley, Roger Lee, Gallipolis.
Hinkel, Daniel Kenneth, Dover.
Hoxworth, Walter Bruce, Struthers.
Nall, Carl David, New Carlisle.
Petric, John Anthony, Cleveland.
Richards, Dennis R., Marion.
Riplie, George Henry, Toledo.
Scheeler, Victor Ray, Piqua.
Shrack, Robert Venard Jr., New Burlington.
Siegler, Willie James, Cleveland.
Smith, Nelson Lee, Sandusky.
Stair, Glenn Robert, Akron.
Weant, Terrance Lee, Cortland.

Marine Corps

Bauer, Daryl Charles, Cincinnati.
Decker, Joseph Nicholas, Springfield.
Dishman, Jerry, Akron.
Ferguson, David Charles, Wadsworth.
Johnson, Dennis George, Cincinnati.
Johnston, David Allen, Canal Winchester.
McCormick, Michael P., Wellston.
Petal, John Darryl, Cleveland.
Porter, Lawrence William, Steubenville.
Ramsey, Samuel Virgil, Jr., Canton.
Shartz, Frank, Jr., Wickliffe.
Shaum, Ray Thomas, Jr., Mansfield.
Taylor, Earl Eugene, Maplewood.
Wingenbach, Glenn S., Jr., Mansfield.

Navy

Avery, Marvin Douglas, Warren.
Davis, Kenneth, Zanesville.
Thum, Richard Cobb, Cleveland Heights.

OKLAHOMA

Army

Brannon, Gary Michael, McAlester.
Emerson, Tom, Oklahoma City.
Hyatt, Michael Dale, Tulsa.
King, Francis, Jr., Oklahoma City.
Koehn, Arlin Wayne, Helena.
Locke, James Lee, Altus.
Parker, Johnny Ray, Idabel.
Wheeler, Clinton Lee, Oklahoma City.

Marine Corps

Lynn, Roy Eugene, Shawnee.
Smith, Charles Leslie, Oklahoma City.
Upchurch, James Glen, Ada.

Navy

Morgan, Jackie Ray, Oklahoma City.

OREGON

Army

Applebury, Melvin Lynn, Eugene.
Gibson Thomas Michael, Portland.
Henjyoji Grant Hiroaki, Portland.
Leamen, Robert Edward, Redmond.
Onchi, Curtis, Portland.
Smith, Ferrol Shane, Grants Pass.
Styles, David Ira, Philomath.
Wagner, Clifton Fred, St. Helens.

Marine Corps

Lane, Austin Clifford, Rogue River.

PENNSYLVANIA

Army

Barr, Elmer Edward, Clymer.
Becker, Thomas Alexander, Bethlehem.
Dellapina, Christhopher L, Pittsburgh.
Diehl, Robert Ernest, Prospect Park.
Diemler, Richard Lee, Hummelstown.
Fry, Richard Leroy, Beaver Springs.
Gilpin, Jay Barry, Palton.
Grimenstein, John Paul Jr., Oakmont.
Hickey, Edward Robert, Philadelphia.
Himes, Earl W., Spring City.
Isom, Dennis Ross Paul, Drexel Hill.
Johnson, Oscar Gibson, Jr., Philadelphia.
Kolenc, William Joseph, Smithton.
Moore, James Harrison, Latrobe.
Reyes, Angel, Philadelphia.
Schiffhauer, John Charles, Harrisburg.
Schimpf, Joseph Francis, Philadelphia.
Seedes, Harry Baton, III, Philadelphia.
Smith, Leo Brian, Philadelphia.
Thomas, Lee Daniel, Elizabeth.
Valunas, Michael, Philadelphia.

Marine Corps

Brenneman, Richard Eugene, Dover.
Coyle, Richard Dennis, Lyndora.
Maher, Harold William, Altoona.
Mangold, Leo Joseph, Philadelphia.
Myers, George Nervin, Lancaster.
Rodgers, Larry Morgan, Shavertown.
Zierden, Roland Steven, Cecil.

Navy

Burinda, Joseph Frank, Jr., Central City.
Hawryshko, David William, Bristol.
Horton, Donald Mullaly, Athens.
Moore, Earl Thomas, Jr., Renovo.
Peruso, Lawrence David, Conemaugh.
Romanelli, Louis Vincent, West Hazelton.
Singler, Delbert Leo, Jr., Irwin.

RHODE ISLAND

Army

Johnson, Max Arden, North Kingston.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Army

Black, David Forrest, Pickens.
Butler, Linnell, Wagener.
Dozier, Willie Clay, Orangeburg.
Driggers, Jerry Truman, Summerville.
Edwards, Austin Ivan, Walhalla.
Flaherty, Steve, Columbia.
Gleaton, Homer Layne, Orangeburg.
Goodson, Joseph Alan, Ulmers.
Green, Edward, Jr., Hardeeville.
Locklair, Allison Wayne, St. Stephen.
Louallen, Jack Neece, Jefferson.
Madden, Willie Erskine, Laurens.
Massey, John William, Jr., Greenville.
Nunnery, Clarence E., Jr., Sumter.
Scott, Vernon Elbert, Columbia.
Smith, David Gerald Liberty.

Marine Corps

Brantley, Leroy, Charleston.
Freeman, Joseph Lloyd, Jr., Greenville.
Wine, Harrison, Jr., Johns Island.

Navy

Todd, Carl Edward, Conway.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Army

Gruenwald, Michael Jerome, Redfield.
Noeldner, Daniel Morris, South Shore.

Marine Corps

Flowers, Edgar Allen, Sioux Falls.

TENNESSEE

Army

Armstrong, James Harold, Old Hickory.
Bryant, Walter Tarver, Knoxville.
Gilbert, James Caroll, Butler.
Grindstaff, Thomas Jackson, Maryville.
Gunter, Alvin Flynn, Rockwood.
Harris, William Thomas, Clarksville.
Hart, William Edmond Lee, Tiptonville.
Lynn, Johnny, Ralph, Hillsboro.
Moore, Fulton Beverly, III, Johnson City.
Murdock, Larry, Millington.
Seiber, David Andrew, Waynesboro.
Smith, Walter Daniel, Tullahoma.
Tillman, Cecil Wayne, Memphis.

Marine Corps

Duffer, Eric Thomas, Gallatin.
Landry, John Patrick, Memphis.
Merriweather, Gene Operle, Clarksville.

TEXAS

Army

Alvarado, Raul, Jr., El Paso.
Bean, Jimmy Dale, Amarillo.
Black, William Ray, Newbern.
Buller, Rene Aldo, Houston.
Delcambre, Terry Lee, Amarillo.
Gonzalez, Ramiro Medina, San Antonio.
Griffith, Robert Elwin, Big Spring.
Jones, Sanderfierd Allen, Hutchins.
Lindley, Bobby Pat, Houston.
Martinez, Sixto R., Jr., Galveston.
McClain, Wildfard A., II, El Paso.
Meeks, Dustan William, Dallas.
Mendias, Mario Juan, Marfa.
Menninger, George Edward, Abilene.
Pace, Ronald Gene, Sherman.
Riggins, Robert Lucian, Jr., Dallas.
Shirley, Donald Lee, Ridgely.
Smelser, Roger Wayne, Baytown.
Smoots, Norman Carter, Plainview.
Wells, Robert Oliver, Killeen.

Air Force

Keeler, Harper Brown, Galveston.

Marine Corps

Cauble, Arturo Alvarado, Fort David.
Colunga, George, Houston.
McCartney, Joseph Byron, Houston.
Rodrigues, Joe G., Jr., Dallas.
Ruiz, Antonio Elizondo, Houston.
Sledge, Douglas Roy, Fort Worth.
Stelter, Nyman William, Jr., Galveston.
Wilson, Alfred Mac, Odessa.

Navy

Buckelew, Earnest Jack, Arlington.
Overstreet, David Dewayne, San Angelo.

UTAH

Army

Crandall, Bret Fletcher, Salt Lake City.
Fitzgerald, Howard Kim, Draper.
Larsen, Jimmy Lee, Salt Lake City.
Pollock, Gary Joe, Sigurd.
Stevenson, Jesse Brent, Layton.

Marine Corps

Mermejo, Joseph Michael, Stockton.

VIRGINIA

Army

Briggs, Everett Wayne, Madison Heights.
Brown, George Lawrence, Norfolk.
Burton, Fred Douglas, Chase City.
Clarke, Kenneth George, Jr., Richmond.
Collins, Ross Willard, Jr., Alexandria.
Edmunds, Calvin, Halifax.
Hudson, Willie Junior, Lovingston.
Layne, David Daniel, Chatham.
McDonald, Robert F., II, Lorton.
Monroe, Carlton Lee, Portsmouth.
Oberson, Francis Sherman, Salem.
Rector, William Thomas, Jr., Front Royal.
Shrewsbury, Paul Wayne, Newport News.
Summerlin, John Wright, Norfolk.
Toombs, Alvin Carnall, Jr., Newport News.
Whitten, Thomas William, Abingdon.
Wimmer, Roy Dean, Whitewood.

Marine Corps

Barrett, Drew James, III, Springfield.
Durham, Thomas Wyatt, Richmond.
Looney, Douglas Oscar, Roanoke.

Navy

Ninow, William Charles, Falls Church.
Robertson, Donald Reed, Roanoke.

WASHINGTON

Army

Anderson, Lynn Dennis, Wishram.
Forester, Richard Thomas, Pasco.
Ilsley, Robert Patrick, Seattle.
Laan, Jacob Clark, Stanwood.
Marvin, Gregory Allen, Seattle.
McAferty, Robert Eugene, Olympia.
Meyer, Ronald Ray, Seattle.
Salazar, Richard Frank, Kingston.
Visintin, Kenneth Henry, Seattle.

Marine Corps

Hall, Timothy John, Spokane.
Lewis, Earl Lloyd, Gig Harbor.
Lowery, Alvin Leroy, Yacolt.
Playford, Ronald Edgar, Yelm.

Navy

Zacher, Lyle David, Spokane.

XUM

WEST VIRGINIA

Army

Anglin, Robert Lee, Arista.
Aston, Lyle Glenn, Glen Easton.
Ball, Roscoe Willet, Jr., Charleston.
Board, Stephen Douglas, Belle.
Browning, George Edward, Harts.
Carper, Eddie Dean, Bluefield.
Duty, Edward, Roderfield.
Horton, James Harrison, Holden.
Nelson, Dana Edward, Costa.
Spurlock, Lon Arnold, II, Midkiff.
Thomas, Billy Dean, Bens Run.
White, Charles Franklin, Vendunville.
Young, Roger Duane, Webster Springs.

Marine Corps

Garrett, Michael Steven, Charleston.

WISCONSIN

Army

Behnke, Richard Carl, Jefferson.
Benedict, Robert John, Little Saumico.
Cottrell, Thomas Lewis, Milwaukee.
DeGalley, Jerome Anthony, Milwaukee.
DeLange, Jack Peter, Elkhorn.
Guex, Bruce John, Shawano.
Lacaeyse, Larry Gene, Reeseville.
Mendoza, Albert Manuel, Superior.
Mueller, Randy Roy, Milwaukee.
Richter, Donald Joseph, Sheboygan.
Schiesl, Gerald Raymond, Manitowoc.
Stedl, William John, Greenleaf.
Strittmater, Kenneth Leroy, La Crosse.
Thiex, Ronald Charles, Bowler.
Van den Heuval, David F., West de Pere.

Air Force

Booth, Walter Clay, Waukesha.

Marine Corps

Brannon, James Edward, Milwaukee.
Harvey, Michael Anthony, Milwaukee.
Leicht, Roman Henry, Sheboygan.
Leon, Mario Robert, Milwaukee.
Malueg, Michael Paul, Antigo.
Vandehei, Joseph Robert, Green Bay.

WYOMING

Army

Kobelin, John William, II, Cheyenne.

GUAM

Army

Castro, Juan Pascual R., Mongmong.
Guerrero, Vincent Feja, Sinajana.

Marine Corps

Espinosa, Vicente T., Merizo.

PUERTO RICO

Army

Ayala-Mercado, Juan Bayamon.
Maldonado-Torres, Lionel, Juana Diaz.
Overman-Rodriguez, Jose R., Santurce.

DEATHS RESULTING FROM HOSTILE ACTION IN VIETNAM IN APRIL 1969

ALABAMA

Army

Bishop, James Arthur, Gallion.
Bradberry, Arthur Milton, Gadsden.
Cardwell, Henry Waters, Bessemer.
Cline, Donald Leo, Huntsville.
Combs, John Beechly, Mobile.
De Priest, John Thomas, Mobile.
Duke, Billy Wayne, Albertville.
Gulley, Percy Lee, Jr., Plateau.
Polk, Kenneth Erbie, Pleasant Grove.
Ratcliff, Jackie Lee, Birmingham.
Smith, William Hoyt, Heflin.
Steel, Townser, Jr., Selma.
Stephens, Gerald Wayne, Ft. Payne.
Truelove, James Melvin, Sulligent.
Wiggins, David Roger, Monroeville.

Marine Corps

Gill, Robert Earl, Mobile.
Patrick, Danny Leon, Mobile.
Patterson, Booker T., Jr., Jacksonville.
Smith, Clinton Daniel, Yellow Pine.

Navy

Boone, William Edward, IV, Tuskegee.

ARIZONA

Army

Austin, Albert Delgado, Jr., Mesa.
Deal, Floyd Andrew, Globe.
Robinson, Charles David, Phoenix.
Shaver, Clinton, William, Jr., Tucson.

Marine Corps

Blackwell, Kenneth G., Tucson.
Courtright, Michael Eugene, Phoenix.
Hawk, Randall Lee, Phoenix.
Ochoa, Ralph Richard, Tucson.

ARKANSAS

Army

Brown, Louis, West Memphis.
Harper, Larry Neil, Paris.
Johnson, Robert Thomas, Little Rock.
Kelley, Larry Milton, Blytheville.
Lucas, Larry Jack, Sheridan.
Turner, Larry Thomas, Augusta.

Marine Corps

Huie, Robert Dotson, Jr., Arkadelphia.

Navy

Furr, Frederick Edward, Ft. Smith.

CALIFORNIA

Army

Atuatasi, Sa, Jr., Wilmington.
Bangs, Christopher Delbert, Carmichael.
Bird, Kenneth Robert, Monrovia.
Brown, Gale Lee, Lakewood.
Bugarin, Benjamin, Sepulveda.
Burnett, David Leigh, Lone Pine.
Burns, James David, Oakland.
Calderon, Felix Antonio, Burbank.
Campbell, Jack Donald, San Pablo.
Castro, Louis, Union.
Collins, Jonathan, III, Los Angeles.
Cooke, Larry Houston, Castro Valley.
Cooper, Donald Ray, Carmichael.
Creal, Carl Martin, Palos Verdes Estat.
Curtis, Roger Dale, Winters.
Dedman, Julian Dean, Norwalk.
Fanfa, Anthony John, Oakland.
Fox, James Carl, Arcadia.
Garcia, Nickolas Gastelum, Five Points.
Gavia, Joseph Jess, Oxnard.
Girard, Charles Pierre, Pasadena.
Goody, Peter Jr., Los Angeles.
Hanbury, David Delany, Whittier.
Hansen, Mark John, Reseda.
Harvey, Jeffery Arnold, Burlingame.
Haug, Fred Gunder, Merced.
Huckaba, Thomas James, Sacramento.
Israel, Ralph Waldo, Jr., Chula Vista.
Jacques, Felix, Fresno.
Jensen, Kenneth Vern, Sacramento.
Jones, Terry Edward, Whittier.
Kellison, David Glenn, Cucamonga.
Kubler, Garry Lee, Lodi.
Lewis, Stephen Mix, Torrance.
Lizarraga, Michael Wayne, Richmond.
McAtee, Don Jay, Castro Valley.
Mohvike, Phillip Sherman, Visalia.
Montapert, Ronald M., Los Angeles.
Morgan, John Louis Jr., Pacoima.
Palacios, Tony, Moorpark.
Parker, Roy Eugene, Shell Beach.
Pedersen, Kenneth Ralph, Brentwood.
Peters, Lauvi Paul Philip, Garden Grove.
Porte, Robert Andrew, Reedley.
Porter, Michael Grant, Anaheim.
Powell, Leslie Allen, Norwalk.
Proctor, Rickey Allen, Redding.
Riley, Ronald Howard, Sanger.
Sand, Ralph Thomas, La Habra.
Short, Charles Dudley, Ontario.
Simpson, Larry Douglas, Sloat.
Smith, Charles Clarence, Jr., Saugus.
Sours, Bruce Michael, Concord.
Spear, John Randall, Anaheim.
Stephens, Hays Charles, Los Angeles.
Stork, Robert John Jr., Oakland.
Thiery, John, Fairfield.
Tiderencl, John Werner, Broderick.
Tipton, Timothy Taylor, Dixon.
Valdv, James Damion, Downey.
Vande-Vegte, Douglas Lee, Lakewood.
Wilson, Ronald Kelley, Mountain View.

Marine Corps

Allman, Jonathan Wayne, La Habra.
Bosbery, Donald Charles, Daly City.
Davis, Duane Ross, Fortuna.
Earley, John Richard, Eureka.
Friel, Bruce Gary, San Jose.
Fry Stephen Michael, Citrus Heights.
Gallion, Gaylen Ray, Sylmar.
Gardenhire, Jimmy Maryland, Garden Grove.
Gendron, Robert Michael, Costa Mesa.
Henderson, Arthur Franklin, Los Angeles.
Huff, Richard Elliott, Chester.
Kuebel, Andrew Michael, Glendora.
Liptak, Charles Lewis, Glendora.
Lira, Robert Chagoya, Indio.
Meeks, Charles Henry, Jr., Los Angeles.
Metoyer, Michael Espy, Los Angeles.
Morris, Harry Leo, Jr., Long Beach.
Peters, Edward Theodore, Jr., Castro Valley.
Saldana, Fernando Saenz, Los Angeles.
Smith, Matthew Edward, San Jose.
Toreson, Robert Wayne, Sacramento.
Vesey, Charles Hansen, Napa.
Woolsey, William Jay, Lancaster.

Navy

Angelley, Gerald Dwain, Los Angeles.
Babcock, John Richards, Newport.
Keller, Richard Leon, Lomita.
Worthington, Robert Leroy, Redondo Beach.

COLORADO

Army

Giddings, Clyde Arthur, Denver.
Reynolds, Martin Daniel, Denver.

Air Force

Pierce, Leon Joseph, Englewood.

Marine Corps

Carroll, Frank Jerome, Denver.
Layton, Ronald Dean, Golden.

Navy

Brown, Thomas Louis, Gunnison.

CONNECTICUT

Army

Dixon, Mark Hannay, West Hartford.
Richard, Roland Armand, Meriden.

Marine Corps

Chialastri, Thomas Anthony, New Haven.
Gregory, Francisco, New Britain.
Scheidel, Robert L., Jr., Canton.

Navy

Bailey, Arthur William, Jr., New Haven.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Army

Neely, Paul Jameson, Washington.
Racca, William, Washington.

Marine Corps

Cunningham, Larry Alfonso, Washington.
Worthington, James Author, Washington.

FLORIDA

Army

Allen, William, Jr., Cantonment.
Ball, Luther Edward, Jr., Kissimmee.
Barfield, Larry Bruce, Sarasota.
Cochran, Robert McLain, Jr., Sarasota.
Crosby, Charles David, Orlando.
Dickerson, Charles C., Jr., Jacksonville.
Gillis, Gary Wayne, Okeechobee.
Harbot, Frederic Richard, Altamonte Springs.
James, Kenneth Bradley, West Palm Beach.
Johns, Lamarr Lee, Tampa.
May, Richard George, Hialeah.
McDonald, David Harold, Hialeah.
McGill, David Loren, Lakeland.
Murphy, Barry Daniel, Cutler Ridge.
Rehberg, James Herbert, Lake City.
Rothar, Phillip Edward, Jr., Leisure City.

Ruggs, Randall, Tampa.
Searcy, Elton Lloyd, Chipley.
Smith, Arthur Whorlow, Daytona Beach.
Stephens, Johnnie Perry, Jr., Tallahassee.
Strahan, Walter Sperring, Jacksonville.
Williams, Phillip W., Highland City.

Marine Corps

Adams, Boyed Timothy, Zolfo Springs.
Arroyo-Brenes, Gilbert D., Miami.
Gierman, Walter Edward II, Lake Worth.
Smith, George Henry, Tampa.
Triplett, James Michael, Orlando.
Williams, Frank Curtis, Jacksonville.

GEORGIA

Army

Brock, James Albert, Kingston.
Brown, James Anderson II, Atlanta.
Carroll, Roy Arnold, Thomaston.
Conaway, London, Valdosta.
Davis, Billy Charles, Atlanta.
Heaton, Tommy Calvin, Toccoa.
Jacobs, Willie Brewster, Augusta.
Lee, Travis Bertrand, Jr., Marietta.
McDonald, John Ethridge, Hahira.
Pullins, Rogers, Jr., Harlem.
Sirmans, Rufus, Valdosta.
Stewart, Wayne Yearwood, Warner Robins.
Tidwell, Robert Paul, Douglasville.
Tuten, Richard Bailey, Savannah.
Woodruff, Alton Darnell, LaGrange.

Marine Corps

Hayes, Ivey Jackson, Jesup.
Oliver, Dennis Jerrod, Manassas.
Segars, Tommy Quinn, Jr., Rome.
Wilson, Leon, Jeffersonville.

HAWAII

Army

Fukunaga, Rodney Tamotsu, Hilo.
Leopoldino, Larry Gene, Hilo.
Leslie, Wendell Wayne, Honolulu.
Loo, Edward Lukana, Jr., Kamuela.

IDAHO

Army

Drown, Lyle Eugene, Kimberly.
Koefod, Rodger Magnus, Moscow.
Peterson, Jon Dale, Shelley.
Williams, Daniel Eugene, Hamer.

Marine Corps

Gordon, Robert Jerry, Hayden Lake.

ILLINOIS

Army

Bessent, Samuel Alonzo, Chicago.
Biedron, Andrew Albert, Jr., Chicago.
Bottoms, Harold Gene, Springfield.
Brinker, Kenneth Ray, Bartonville.
Brown, William Henry, Jr., Chicago.
Chenoweth, Irving S., III, Bloomington.
Conde-Falcon, Felix M., Chicago.
Erickson, Howard W., Jr., Addison.
Figueroa, Angelo, Chicago.
Flannigan, Phillip Wayne, Hazel Crest.
Flood, Michael Harold, Todelo.
Giunta, Michael Anthony, South Chicago Heights.
Gregory, Glenard Jay, Shipman.
Keller, Lawrence Oswald, Jr., Chicago.
Kleinau, Carl Edward, Geneseo.
Long, Thomas Kendrick, McLean.
Mifflin, John Ray, Murphysboro.
Murry, Willie James, Chicago.
Ormond, Dennis Alan,, Downers Grove.
Owen, William Lee, Jr., Chicago.
Paez, Joseph Flavio, Chicago.
Pilkington, Carl Edward, Sr., Mt. Vernon.
Potts, Clifton Dennis, Raleigh.
Proietti, Anthony Alphonse, Chicago.
Rasmussen, Robert Michael, Chicago.
Richards, Douglas Wayne, Granite City.
Robertson, Thomas Harry, Blue Island.
Shianna, Louie John, Freeport.
Sink, Charles Robert, Ingleside.
Stadel, Chuck Michael, Aurora.
Turley, Richard Lynn, Chicago.
Walden, Darrell Edward, Girard.
Watson, Sullivan Wall, Chicago.
Welsh, Daniel, Worth.
White, Gene Lewis, Lansing.

Air Force

Baker, Jack Leslie, St. Augustine.

Marine Corps

Banister, John Edward, Peoria.
Brown, Terrance Lee, Peoria.
Cunningham, Robert Maurice, Chicago.
Freise, Melvin John, Venice.
Hartman, Fred Andrew, Jr., Palos Heights.
Miranda, Michael, Chicago.
Olson, Meadow John, Mt. Olive.
Ranson, David William, Rock Island.
Slawek, Joseph Dennis, Jr., Chicago.
Vosylius, Vincent, East St. Louis.

Navy

Meyer, Gary Jon, Evanston.

INDIANA

Army

Berry, Michael Lewis, Ashley.
Bingham, Chester Elmearl, Ft. Wayne.
Farmer, Neil Philip, Guilford.
Fulkerson, Robert Alan, Hammond.
Koehler, John Francis, Indianapolis.
Leap, Thomas Edward, Jr., Kokomo.
Lennon, Mark Steven, South Bend.
Park, Robert Lee, Indianapolis.
Perry, Thomas David, Warren.
Peterson, Jerry Lee, La Porte.
Phillips, Boyce Dean, Geneva.
Smith, Robert T., Indianapolis.
Staten, Tyrone Joseph, Gary.
Ward, Roger Lee, Brookston.

Air Force

Burkett, William Omer, Dillsboro.
Ackerman, Rex William, Kendallville.
Blanton, Richard Patrick, Greenwood.
Cummings, Roger Wayne, Bloomington.
Glasscock, Terry Lee, Zionsville.
Hall, Stephen Thomas, Mount Vernon.
Hofer, Thomas Edward, Richmond.
Leavell, Richard Tyrone, Jeffersonville.
Lowery, Daryl Lee, Warren.
Nickerson, Michael Kent, Indianapolis.

Navy

Holloway, Thomas Eugene, New Castle.

IOWA

Army

Batt, Caryle Wayne, Burt.
Bleything, Larry Dean, Ottuma.
Bousquet, James Estrem, Cedar Rapids.
Brinkman, Robert Jay, Sheldon.
Hilkin, Lawrence Archie, Dubuque.
Jensen, Harold Norgaard, Council Bluffs.
Jones, Lloyd Wesley, Mystic.
Nutt, Walter Lee III, Des Moines.
Smith, Larry Eugene, Washington.
Tindall, Corbin Clark, Le Mars.

KANSAS

Army

Bauer, Lawrence Edward, Louisburg.
Baughman, John Oliver, Junction City.
Bunch, James George, Jr., Topeka.
Higley, Lynnford Harlow, Lawrence.
Milbradt, Dale La Verne, Topeka.
Schmelzle, John Joseph, Edwardsville.
Wood, Lloyd Joseph, Sr., Independence.

Marine Corps

Kitchen, David Lee, Wamego.

KENTUCKY

Army

Adams, James Henry, Whitehouse.
Jenkins, J. Clifford, Corbin.
Johnson, Jimmy Donald, Ashland.
Mills, Victor Lane, Harlan.
Moore, James William, Jr., Frankfort.
O'Banion, James Russell, Florence.
Overstreet, William Lurther, Elk Horn.
Schulte, Alvin Clayton, Louisville.
Siegel, Theodore Frank, Louisville.

Marine Corps

Ausbrooks, Richard David, Bowling Green.
Blagg, Patrick Earl, Newport.
Kinney, Donald Mack, Louisville.
Lowe, Willie Lee, Louisville.

LOUISIANA

Army

Brown, Kenneth Earl, Chalmette.
Browne, Richard Allan, Gretna.
Evans, Lonnie Dale, Monroe.
Graham, Johnnie Lee, Jr., Shreveport.
Granger, Floyd Ira, Jr., De Quincy.
Lavite, Anthony, III, New Orleans.
Morrison, Carl Phillip, Bonita.
Tregre, Larry Peter, Hahnville.

Marine Corps

Carbajal, Adrian David, New Orleans.
Tatney, Ernest, Jr., Plaquemine.

MAINE

Army

Baka, James Alexander, South Portland.
Cleary, James William, South Berwick.

MARYLAND

Army

Bittinger, Robert Lee, Jr., Cumberland.
Daubert, William John, Eden.
Dorsey, James R., Jr., Clements.
Knight, Orville Lee, Keedysville.
McCreary, Stanley Eugene, Havre de Grace.
Oreto, Joseph Anthony, Westminster.
Pumphrey, Edwin Holland, Silver Spring.
Regan, Philip Thomas, Jr., Adelphi.
Roehmer, Robert Paul, Kingsville.
Savanuck, Paul David, Baltimore.

Marine Corps

Belcher, Stephen Edwin, Avondale.
Gordy, Michael Edward, Snow Hill.

Navy

Jones, Lloyd Edward, Baltimore.

Army

Chase, Freddie Nicklys, Newburyport.
Chase, Walter William, Palmer.
Curry, James Joseph, East Boston.
Gorrill, Thomas Roy, Hanover.
Hitchcock, William F., Middleboro.
Johnson, James Edward, Jr., Roslindale.
Lyon, John Paul, Cohasset.
Morrill, Edward Francis, Medford.

Air Force

Christianson, Peter Bugbee, Abington.

Marine Corps

Andrews, Lawrence Theodore, Taunton.
Conry, Dennis, Brookline.
Donaldson, Steven Ellis, Peabody.
Falco, Antonio, Canton.
Kupka, Anthony Edward, Falmouth.
Roy, David Paul, Worcester.

MICHIGAN

Army

Cutler, Ralph Louis, Midland.
Davis, Thomas Arthur, Manistee.
Flanigan, Robert Morris, Detroit.
Goral, Gerald Eugene, Roseville.
Keski, Keith, Michigamme.
Killing, Ronald James, Troy.
Kiracofe, Burley Darrel, Kalamazoo.
Kloo, James Edward, Lansing.
Ladd, Albert Allen, Detroit.
Light, William Marvin, Pinckney.
Lobker, Dann Joseph, Coral.
McNees, Dwight Allen, Battle Creek.
Parr, Larry Douglas, Onondaga.
Respecki, Donald George, Gaylord.
Sipperley, Lorne Jay, Grand Rapids.
Smith, Michael LaVern, Sumner.
St. Onge, Thomas Gordon, Hermansville.
Tank, Charles Louis, Ecorse.
Van Dusen, Robert Edward, Bay City.
Vore, Rodney Allen, Monroe.
Warfield, Dennis Gordon, Pontiac.
Wofford, William Phillip, Battle Creek.

Air Force

Lynch, James Oliver, Flint.

Marine Corps

Bryant, Charlie Paul, Jr., Detroit.
Cook, Curtis Keith, Jr., Augusta.

Keith, Daniel Scott, Livonia.
Kelly, Michael John, Detroit.
Malkut, Stefan, Detroit.
Porta, Gerard Paul, Wayne.
Schrecongost, Frederic Lee, East Grand Rapids.
Staples, James Arthur, Detroit.
Van Tongeren, Timothy Ray, Grandville.
Wilson, Delvin Keith, Pontiac.

MINNESOTA

Army

Anderson, David Bruce, St. Paul.
Harder, Erwin John, Lake Cottonwood.
Harrigan, Gregory Michael, Minneapolis.
Hubert, Steven James, Lamberton.
Johnson, Bruce Ervin, Wells.
Johnson, Dean Raymond, Wheaton.
Kindle, William Henry, St. Paul.
Maas, Roy Francis, Lyle.
Manderfeld, Thomas George, Mankato.
Quinn, Thomas Wayne, Minneapolis.
Schoeben, Scott Douglas, Minneapolis.
Webb, Alfred, Jr., Hinckley.

Marine Corps

Anderson, Johnnie Lee, St. Paul.
Hering, William Arthur, Northfield.
Lisle, Terrill Michael, Osseo.
Nelson, David Thomas, Hopkins.
Nickelson, Martin John, Minneapols.
Terhorst, Bernard Reinhold, St. Paul.
Wettergren, Steven Edward, St. Peter.

MISSISSIPPI

Army

Breland, Leo Meyers, Long Beach.
Danield, Ollie James, West Point.
Gray, John Terry, Ellisville.
Hathorn, Charles Lee, Jr., Laurel.
Hollingsworth, Joseph K., Gloster.
Malone, Herbert Lee, Carthage.
Pearson, Francis Lavry, Ocean Springs.
Roads, Dennis Lee, Hattiesburg.

Marine Corps

Batchelor, John Elsey, Jr., Vicksburg.
Forrest, Jimmie Lee, Winona.
Johnson, James Carl, Jackson.
Tannehill, Charles Deveaux, Jackson.

Navy

Thompson, Terry Neil, Gulfport.

MISSOURI

Army

Agnew, James William, New Franklin.
Budzinski, Lawrence Joseph, St. Ann.
Cain, Glennie Wayne, Caruthersville.
Chandler, Charles William, Jefferson City.
Collins, Arlie Ray, Willow Springs.
Cross, Gary Lee, Hopkins.
Dittmer, David Allen, Marshall.
Gearheart, Mike Duane, Sedalia.
Goedde, Robert Joseph, Maplewood.
Harris, Robert John, Jefferson City.
Holmes, Michael Douglas, St. Louis.
Houser, Carl Ray, Hallsville.
Howell, Larry L., Versailles.
Hughes, Jerry Daniel, Willard.
Jines, Robert Allan, Risco.
Koenig, Daren Lee, Hannibal.
Lester, Jimmy Don, Eldon.
Mosley, Wallace Jerome, St. Louis.
Rodgers, Robert Louis, Kirkwood.
Skinner, Courtney A., St. Louis.
Smith, Thomas Montgomery, Hannibal.
Spinnicchia, Joseph Frank, St. Louis.
Tate, Jackie Lee, Branson.
Tomek, Glen Dale, Hawk Point.
Tyron, William David, Kansas City.
Wilson, David Olsen, Tuscumbia.
Wood, Loren Edwin, Jr., Sterling.

Marine Corps

Cartier, Victor John, Webster Groves.
Kitchen, Russell Harold, Jr., Moberly.
McSwine, John Henry, St. Louis.
Rankin, Andrew Bryan, St. Peters.
Wilson, Charles Jackson, St. Ann.

Navy

Droz, Donald Glenn, Rich Hill.
Jones, Curran M., Kirkwood.

MONTANA

Army

Ferguson, Ronald Bruce, Great Falls.
Habets, Gregory Lee, Valier.
Hood, Roger William, Choteau.
O'Neill, Daniel John, Butte.

NEBRASKA

Army

Andersen, Buel Edward, Superior.
Bull, Kenneth R., Omaha.
Cunningham, Richard Ira, Omaha.
Davis, John Clinton, Omaha.
Hornelas, Ismael Fernando, North Platte.
Rieken, Larry Riek, Sterling.

Air Force

Stewart, Francis Ernest, Sterling.

Marine Corps

Bazar, Paul Thomas, Omaha.

NEVADA

Army

Morgan, Robert Leroy, Jr., Reno.

Marine Corps

Christian, Robert M., Jr., Boulder City.
Sam Wilfred Gerald, Elko.
Walker, Richard Howard, Sparks.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Army

Hildreth, David Wayne, Warren.
Knight, Robert Louis, Jr., Bennington.
Labonte, Roland Charles, Nashua.
Leahy, Daniel Michael, Manchester.
Smith, Gary Roy, Laconia.
Stover, Douglas Earl, Concord.

Marine Corps

Finan, Robert Edward, Claremont.
Le Houllier, Paul Raymond, Somersworth.

Navy

Gaudet, Thomas Wilfred, Salem.

NEW YORK

Army

Brenner, Richard Irving, Teaneck.
Cama, Dennis Rocco, Hazlet.
Derbyshire, James Wilbert, Bridgeton.
Mahurter, Lawrence William, Fair Lawn.
Morgan, Jerry Jr., Long Branch.
Palma, Gerard Vincent, Hammonton.
Rasmussen, Peter Terence, Paramus.
Romero, Ricardo Ibrahin, Jersey City.
Van Houten, Nelson Omar, Paterson.

Marine Corps

Burr, Steward Samuel, Passaic.
Byrne, John Patrick, Sayreville.
Christiansen, Bernhard M., Willingboro.
Crane, Dennis, Spotswood.
Giordano, Daniel J., III, Hi Nella.
Jarmolinski, Chester, Jr., Jersey City.
Melnyk, Mikolaw, Linden.
Quarles, Wayne Robert, Camden.
Romaine, Thomas Gilbert, Saddle Brook.
Tulp, Guyler Neil, Clifton.
Williams, Fred Thomas, Paterson.

Navy

Gillies, Robert Knell, Mantua.

NEW MEXICO

Army

Garcia, Francisco M., Jr., Tucumcari.
Johnson, Larry Dean, Albuquerque.
Martinez, Willie Danien, Santa Fe.
Thompson, Jerry Elmer, Artesia.
Velasquez, Julian Victor, Willard.

NEW YORK

Army

Ambrosio, Frank Carl, Deer Park.
Best, Thomas Emanuel, New York.
Brown, James Arthur, New York.
Brush, Richard Bernard, Nanuet.
Chandler, Charles, Albany.
Dacey Bertrand Jahn, New York.
DeLuca, Thomas Steven, Jr., Mineola.
Derda, James Michael, Albuquerque.
Dobash, John Ernest, Syracuse.
Fisher, Richard James, West Monroe.
Gamboa, David Hercliff, Jr., Yonkers.
Garbys, Stephen Michael, Bellerose.
Glassey, John Girard, East Meadow.
Hill, Hugh Filbert, Jr., New York.
Karaman, Fred, Endicott.
Kelly, Michael Joseph, Jr., Syracuse.
LaPolla, John Anthony, Frankfort.
Lamby, Charles Michael, Derby.
Plotkin, Stephen Lewis, New York.
Prete, Robert Nicholas, Piffard.
Reiter, Lesley Steven, New York.
Rivera-Delvalle, Manuel A., New York.
Shavel, Frederick Stanley, Richmond Hill.
Sherlock, Stephen Andrew, Kingston.
Sidelko, George, New Hartford.
Taylor, Vincent Andrew, Jamaica.
Timian, Frank Edward, Lockport.
Urrutia, Anthony John, New York.
Walsh, John Michael, Valley Stream.
Weigle, Thomas Herman, South Farmingdale.
Wier, Michael Broderick, Buffalo.
Winters, Michael John, Saugerties.

Marine Corps

Boryszewski, Stephen J., Buffalo.
Boule, Thomas Michael, Syracuse.
Ficara, Joseph, White Plains.
Labombard, Clifford George, Albany.
Lynch, James Joseph III, Pine Plains.
Moore, James Charles Jr., Spencer.
Oliver, Bernard George Jr., Willsboro.
Ornelas, Jack Michael, Whitestone.
Ozger, Islam, New York.
Paquin, Howard Robert, Gabriels.
Parker, George Joseph Jr., Rochester.
Quillen, Lloyd Daniel, New York.
Rossini, Ronald Stephen, Sidney.
Scolnick, David, Brentwood.
Senese, Christopher Leigh, Rochester.
Stoddard, Marcus William, Mineville.
Swan, Wayne Robert, Arkport.
Thornlow, Gary William, East Rockaway.

Navy

Clerkin, Joseph, Central Islip.
Peterson, Carl Jerrold, New York.
Reardon, Richard John, Huntington.

NORTH CAROLINA

Army

Anderson, Julian Raye, Currie.
Burgess, John, Cherokee.
Downing, Lester Earl, Roper.
Gilmore, Michael Douglas, Wilmington.
Jennings, Charles Wendell, Cullowhee.
Lovette, Samuel D., North Wilkesboro.
Mauney, Ricky David, Dallas.
McKinney, Dallas E., Jr., Magnolia.
Osborne, John Woodrow, Traphill.
Panarese, Roland John, Jacksonville.
Smith, Melton Edward, Grifton.
Taylor, James Wade, Wilbar.
Wall, Jerry Lee, Greensboro.
Ware, Beverly Costner, Mount Holly.
Westmoreland, Jimmy Roger, Kernersville.

Marine Corps

Hall, James Luther, Bunnlevel.
Sawyer, Donald Sherwood, Scranton.
Taylor, John Francis, Windsor.
Till, Willard Harold, Jr., Raleigh.

NORTH DAKOTA

Army

Coulthart, Gerard Frank, Hamilton.
Decker, Gerald Anthony, Sentinel Butte.
Ottmar, Stanley John, Burt.
Waldera, David Arlen, Fargo.

Marine Corps

Joyce, John Morris, Minor.

OHIO

Army

Asher, Denny Lynn, Cincinnati.
Boyd, Hurley Millard, Baltimore.
Brouse, Paul Andrew, Barberton.
Davis, Albert J., Belmore.
Detrick, Gary Gene, Wapakoneta.
Dye, Timothy Elden, Marion.
Erhart, Michael David, Mansfield.

Feck, Daniel Edward, Fairfax.
Fitzpatrick, Thomas M., Euclid.
Flonnoy, Frank Warren, Jr., Shaker Heights.
Funk, Emmons Edward, Jr., Willard.
Gray, Raymond Anthony, Cleveland.
Hacker, Ronald Vention, Massillon.
Hale, John, Jr., Lafayette.
Heim, James Phillip, Canton.
Hoover, Thomas Eugene, Dayton.
Huffman, Gerald, Cleveland.
Keene, Daniel Arthur, Fairview Park.
Kijowski, Robert George, Dayton.
King, Robert Larry, Ravenna.
Knoch, Dennis Richard, Carrollton.
Lacey, David Michael, Auburn.
Lemmon, Richard Keith, Youngstown.
Martin, Larry Charles, Smithville.
Montgomery, John Thomas, Newton Falls.
Patterson, James W., Jr., Cleveland.
Rickey, Lawrence David, Anna.
Ruggles, Larry Dean, Springfield.
Shafer, Thomas James, Peninsula.
Smith, John Lewis, Canton.
Vasil, Thomas Joseph, Parma.
Yost, Howard Edgar, Jr., Newark.

Air Force

Lamp, Arnold William, Jr., Hebron.

Marine Corps

Barnes, Laurie Eugene, McArthur.
Bohannon, Ronald, Kirtland.
Isaacs, Wayne Lee, Hamilton.
Orlando, Richard Duane, Lorain.
Porter, Richard Lee, Stow.
Sekne, Sylvester Victor, Cleveland.

OKLAHOMA

Army

Brock, Larry Dee, Oklahoma City.
Chambers, Billy Clayton, Maysville.
Dasher, Gary John, Tulsa.
Davenport, John Sanford, Cashion.
Durham, Dwight Montgomery, Tulsa.
Howard, Michael David, Oklahoma City.
Kelsey, D. J., Lawton.
McDonough, George Watson, Oklahoma City.
Scott, Perry Jay, Oklahoma City.
Sehested, Ronald Allen, Marlow.

Marine Corps

Barr, Allan Vaughn, Freedom.
Robertson, Don Mark, Oklahoma City.

Navy

Carpenter, Ramey Leo, Norman.
Junger, Walter Joseph, Jr., Tulsa.

OREGON

Army

Green, Carl John, Jr., Seaside.
Gump, Terry Lewis, St. Helens.
Lochner, Verne Eldon, Portland.
Morrow, Joseph Edward, Jr., Portland.
Wallace, John Edward, Portland.
Wilkins, Michael Lee, Portland.

Marine Corps

Simonsen, Richard Harold, Portland.

Navy

Sperb, William Lyle, Gresham.

PENNSYLVANIA

Army

Ahlum, William John, Hatboro.
Alaimo, John Charles, Johnstown.
Baggs, William F., Jr., Glenolden.
Bladek, John Emery, Johnstown.
Boucher, Robert Charles, Oreland.
Burton, Theodore Hughes, Springfield.
Dunlap, Francis Edward Jr., Bellefonte.
Eaton, George Elwood, Blanchard.
Eckert, Harold Lee Jr., Hershey.
Ehrhart, Melvin Grayson, Chambersburg.
Griffis, Michael Daniel, Philadelphia.
Hedglin, Miles Bradley, Mercer.
Herman, Robert Curtis, York.
Kachman, Edward Michael, North Braddock.
Krupinski, Raymond John, Erie.
Lee, David, Plymouth.
Long, James Robert, McKeesport.
Martz, William Henry Jr., Tarentum.
Mitchell, Thomas Victor, Pittsburgh.
Musser, Richard Laverne, Middleburg.
Neiman, Gary Preston, York.
Nevel, Robert Joseph, Stowe.
Pardobek, Silas William, Albion.
Poley, David Allen, Philadelphia.
Reece, Peter Edward, Easton.
Rocco, William Frank, Lewistown.
Sotak, Tibor, McKeesport.
Wertman, Michael Lee, Roaring Springs.
Wescott, Robert Hyatt Jr., Philadelphia.
Witts, John Joseph Jr., Philadelphia.
Woujtyna, Robert Anthony, Pittsburgh.

Air Force

Smiley, Francis Edward, Upper Darby.

Marine Corps

Allard, Paul Edward, Folcroft.
Beech, Harry David Jr., Harrisburg.
Bem, Walter Paul, Indiana.
Conley, Ronald Clarence, Etters.
Comer, Glenn Wilson, Daves Hill.
Geary, William Stanley, Roslyn.
Kovacs, Francis Steven, Philadelphia.
Vitale, Michael Nicholas, Philadelphia.

Navy

White, Danforth Ellithorpe, State College.

RHODE ISLAND

Army

Pritchard, Walter Leo, Jr., Pawtucket.

Marine Corps

Dean, James William, Pawtucket.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Army

Creamer, Albert Eugene, West Pelzer.
Dennis, Delmar Claude, Salem.
Hannon, Richard Lamar, Rock Hill.
King, Robert Carl, Alcolu.
Lee, Melvin, Pacolet.
Lipscomb, Roy Lollis, Travelers Rest.
Spencer, James Albert, Jr., Gaffney.
Touchberry, Miles D., Jr., Sumter.

Marine Corps

Skipper, Michael Ray, Conway.

Navy

Hart, Joseph Felder, Columbia.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Army

Kahler, Le Lund Morris, Belle Fourche.

TENNESSEE

Army

Abbott, James Michael, Memphis.
Alston, Billy Clyde, Brighton.
Beers, Jack Blaine, Clarksville.
Clark, John Joseph, Manchester.
Davidson, Verbin Eugene, Dickson.
Hardison, Robert Smith, Nashville.
Harr, Michael Edwin, Blountville.
Maples, Paul Edward, Knoxville.
McMurtry, Ralph David, Gallatin.
McVeal, Richard, Arlington.
Moore, Percy, Memphis.
Nesbitt, Joseph, Memphis.
Renshaw, Anderson N., III, Memphis.
Smith, Gerral Aubrey, Eads.
Steed, William Owen, Erie.
Taylor, Walter Minor, Clarksville.
Trisdale, Robert Lee, Gallatin.
Tuttle, James Walter, Arthur.

Marine Corps

Bolton, Dan Arthur, Jr., Nashville.
Henderson, Bruce Dale, Nashville.
Molley, Chester Andrew, Morristown.
Rush, Charles Glynn, Jr., Jackson.

TEXAS

Army

Abraham, Paul Harold, Irving.
Alexander, Stamatios G., Jr., Duncanville.
Arredondo, Jessie, Arlington.
Autrey, James Harold, Dallas.
Barnes, Sheldon Ora, Dallas.
Beck, Jerry Don, Dallas.
Bray, Arnold Rex, Paris.
Burnette, Michael Robert, Houston.
Denton, Bobby Lee, Houston.
Diaz, Jose Renteria, Barstow.
Dorman, Michael Rodney, Kyle.
Dudley, Lawrence Wesley, Jr., Houston.
Esparza, Nicholas, Jr., Waxahachie.
Fernand, Santana S., Jr., San Antonio.
Flores, Guadalupe, Bexar.
Gibson, Johnny Allison, Bloomburg.
Hernandez, Manuel, Jr., Corpus Christi.
Humphrey, Robert Loy, Kosse.
Jenkins, Bert McCree, Dallas.
King, Bruce Thomas, Dallas.
Largent, Loel Floyd, Rusk.
Lechuga, Martin, San Antonio.
Loftin, Teddy Carl, Dallas.
Longoria, Joe Gilbert, San Antonio.
McDonald, Charlie Ray, Jacksonville.
Melonson, Joseph Dudley, Jr., Beaumont.
Moon, Robert Wayne, Denver City.
Morris, Jesse Don, Jr., Amarillo.
Nolley, Lee Roy, Jacksonville.
Oman, Richard Arlen, Georgetown.
Pongratz, Ronald Eugene, Houston.
Pritchard, Victor Heenan, Cleburne.
Pyle, Larry Gene, Fort Worth.
Randolph, Seth Earl, Houston.
Reynolds, Oliver Eugene, Jr., Tulia.
Sapp, Jeffrey Truett, Houston.
Schroller, Leo Joe, Jr., Kenedy.
Simmons, Richard Charles, Fort Worth.
Smart, Robert Hall, Dallas.
Spivey, Elmer Lynn, Port Neches.
Stark, Alfred, Houston.
Tilghman, Jimmie Mack, Denver City.
Vann, Ronald Bryson, Waco.
Villasenor, Gonzalo H., Forth Worth.
Watson, David Warren, Lubbock.
White, Lenwood, Jr., Fort Worth.
Williams, David Edward, Brownsville.

Air Force

Van Cleave, Walter Shelby, Dallas.

Marine Corps

Adams, Bert Morris, III, Houston.
Cortez, Alberto Gutterrez, Kingsville.
Culp, Karl Howard, Fort Worth.
Daniel, Stephen Arthur, Waco.
Deleon, Rafael, Jr., Donna.
Jackson, Maxie, Jr., Tyler.
Johnson, Charles Ray, Houston.
Lenz, Thomas Wayne, Moulton.
Licon, Francisco, El Paso.
Perez, Espiridion, Corpus Christi.
Quinn, John Francis, El Paso.
Reynolds, Larry Allen, South Houston.
Rodriguez, Francisco, Jr., San Antonio.
Rodriquez, Toby S., Jr., Austin.
Villalobos, Eliseo Morales, San Antonio.

Navy

Schafernocker, Michael E., Arlington.

UTAH

Army

Crowley, Leland Stephen, Jr., Ogden.
Gay, Alvin Leon, Springville.
Jensen, James Paul, Tremontton.
Johnson, Richard Craig, Grantsville.
Martin, Jerry Wayne, Salt Lake City.
Robbins, Larry Oliver, Santaquin.
Snyder, Robert William, Springville.

VERMONT

Army

Byrne, Wayne Eugene, Johnson.
Randall, Wayne Michael, Passumpsic.

Marine Corps

Ritchie, Bernard Fredericy, Burlington.

VIRGINIA

Army

Cantrell, Gerald Wayne, Pilgrim Knob.
Daugherty, James Oliver, Jr., Charles City.
Dunn, James Harlow, III, Norfolk.
Girard, Christian George, Oceana.
Henderson, William Wayne, Lyndhurst.
Hoy, Robert Elvin, Arlington.
Jenkins, Claude Thomas, Chesapeake.
Oquinn, Arvin Lee, Clifield.
Reid, Aubrey, Archie, Jr., Roanoke.

Remeikas, Joseph John, Jr., Arlington.
Spinner, Alfred William, Lynchburg.
Tatem, Harold Paul, Virginia Beach.

Air Force

Bach, John Joseph, III, Petersburg.
Bowles, Dwight Pollard, Staunton.
Scott, Vincent Calvin, Jr., Richmond.

Marine Corps

Bazemore, William Hodges, Norfolk.
Lawrence, John Franklin, Norfolk.
Leonard, John Charles, Ethlan.
Payne, Darnell Milton, Falls Church.
Perdue, Richard Wayne, Rocky Mount.
Toward. Ronald Joseph, Falls Church.

Navy

Castle, Hal Cushman, Jr., Norfolk.

WASHINGTON

Army

Bradley, Robert Richard, Moses Lake.
Carter, Stanley Alan, Moses Lake.
Hopkins, Edward Arthur, Edmons.
Hyatt, George Jackson, Tacoma.
Jarvis, Danny Wayne, Mesa.
Meidinger, Daryl Gene, Moses Lake.

Air Force

Gordon, Glenn Allyn, Seattle.

Marine Corps

Barnhart, Beverly Lee, Wenatchee.
Blankenship, Leroy Irvin, Renton.
Bragg, Roger Dale, Bellingham.
McCall, William Arthur, Jr., Seattle.
Misner, Kenneth Gene, Olympia.
Rolstad, Theodore S., Seattle.

Navy

Stith, Peter Lewis, Bainbridge Island.

WEST VIRGINIA

Army

Crose, James Charles, Ashford.
Greever, Harold Lee, Hinton.
Lauzon, Lawrence John, Huntington.
Long, Ronald James, Farmington.
Maynard, Ralph, Wilsondale.
Redd, Charles Edward, Beckley.
Ross, Donald Edward, Parkersburg.
States, William Codar, Walker.
Strahin, Arthur Ronald, Elizabeth.

WISCONSIN

Army

Blavat, James Norbert, Green Bay.
Butler, Lawrence Joseph, Hayward.
Dahlman, George Clarence, Milwaukee.
Eiden, Edward Valentine, Jr., Winneconne.
Houle, Danny William, Hiles.
Markevitch, Anthony G., Jr., Onalaska.
Michalski, Steven, Marinette.
Miller, Keith Norman, Racine.
Milling, Larry Dean, Boyd.
Noel, Donald William, La Crosse.
Orlowski, Charles Francis, Milwaukee.
Shellum, John Charles, Superior.
Smith, Fred D., Wittenberg.
Smith, Larry Alan, Fort Atkinson.
Stein, Philip Clarence, Milwaukee.

Marine Corps

Hickey, John Joseph, Green Bay.
Woods, Curtis Steven, La Crosse.

Navy

Smith, Steven James, Viroqua.

WYOMING

Air Force

Jensen, Bruce Allan, Green River.

Marine Corps

Barton, James Lee, Greybull.

DEATHS RESULTING FROM HOSTILE ACTION IN VIETNAM IN MAY 1969

ALABAMA

Army

Bishop, Woodrow Wilson, Jr., Northport.
Boles, Fletcher W., II, Tuscaloosa.
Chapman, Willie James, Jackson.
Collins, Jerome Liston, Magnolia Springs.
Creaghead, Clarence, Bessemer.
Crump, Jack Vann, Sulligent.
Fields, James Ronald, Millport.
Fields, William Michael, Evergreen.
Forrester, Joel Wayne, Florence.
Frowner, Edward, Manila.
Gohagin, James Rayford, Atmore.
Goodwin, Paul Venon, Anniston.
Gordon, Ernest Lee, Birmingham.
Isaac, James Edward, Jr., Daleville.
June, Jeremia, Birmingham.
Kelly, Donald Lynn, Hartford.
Oliver, Roger Lee, Sylacauga.
Overton, William Hilliard, Decatur.
Patterson, Samuel Lee, Hueytown.
Penn, Rcosevelt Franklin, Fulton.
Pettis, Billy Wayne, Castleberry.
Taylor, Clarence, Greenville.
Waddle, Sammie Wayne, Bremen.

Air Force

Evans, Douglas McArthur, Ramer.

Marine Corps

Bice, Jimmie Ray, Birmingham.

Navy

Greene, James Etheridge, Jr., Auburn.

ALASKA

Army

Barr, Thomas M., Anchorage.

Navy

Rice, Andrew William, Jr., Fort Richardson.

ARIZONA

Army

Arnold, Roy Lee, Phoenix.
Becker, James Francis, Phoenix.
Drane, John Wilbur, Phoenix.
Hickson, Leonard Martin, Ft. Defiance.
Moreno, Miguel Ortega, Phoenix.
Norvell, Raymond Frank, Phoenix.
Randall, John Michael, Phoenix.
Stowe, Jeffrey Charles, Winslow.
Turner, John Michael, Casa Grande.
Zody, Richard Lee, Phoenix.

Marine Corps

Albright, Buck Edward, Tempe.
Jackson, Ralford John, Tuba City.
Medeguari, Rene, Douglas.

Navy

Lukenbach, Max Duane, Tucson.

ARKANSAS

Army

Beasley, Odell Daniel, Texarkana.
Boudra, Kilbern Dean, Pine Bluff.
Griffith, Edward Wilson, Jacksonville.
Hale, William Robert, Russellville.
Hildebrand, Herbert S., Hot Springs.
Pearce, Charles Hubert, Jr., Pocahontas.
Young, Robert Allen, Jr., Little Rock.

Marine Corps

Forte, Gerald Wayne, Conway.
Sanders, James Albert, Pine Bluff.
Warren, Sammie Lee, Wynne.

CALIFORNIA

Army

Allred, Rex Charles, Ventura.
Almeida, Joe, Jr., Los Angeles.
Banks, Robert Alan, Shafter.
Barth, Thomas Fredrick, Lakewood.
Beall, Tyson Vance, Napa.
Bock, Jimmie Van, Vacaville.
Boles, Joey Lee, Wasco.
Bowden, Byron Bill, Arcata.
Bowen, Duane Curtis, Ramona.
Boydston, Oscar Dan, San Francisco.
Brown, Ronald A., Huntington Park.
Baumgarner, Thomas Edward, West Sacramento.
Bundy, Lincoln E., Redding.
Burke, William James, Jr., Menlo Park.
Byrd, James Carmen, Norwalk.
Carrasco, Daniel, Cucamonga.
Clark, Ernest Lee, San Marcos.
Clirehigh, Robert W., Jr., San Francisco.
Clutter, Carl Norman, Wilmington.
Colomber, James Stephen, McCloud.
Compton, Robert William, Pacifica.
Corrie, Gary Allen, Oakland.
Cramblet, Howard Earl, Santa Clara.
Creason, W. K. Utah, Quincy.
Cruise, Kenneth T., Jr., San Francisco.
Cruz, Johnny Manuel, Sacramento.
Cummins, Thomas Wayne, Marysville.
Daniels, William, Jr., Calexico.
De Aro, Stephen Wayne, Los Angeles.
Dixon, Michael Kenneth L., Torrance.
Dulley, Kenneth Lawrence, Brea.
Dwyer, Patrick William, Hollywood.
Ewing, Jerry Lew, Madera.
Ferouge, Ronald Walter, San Leandro.
Francis, James Patrick, Napa.
Garcia, Richard Claude, Morgan Hill.
Gastelum, Eugene, San Diego.
Graff, Allen Michael, Manhattan Beach.
Graham, Roy Wayne, Sacramento.
Grubbs, Garey Lee, Torrance.
Hatzell, Michael Maxwell, San Jose.
Hernandez, Phillip, Guadalupe.
Hight, Charles Benny, Visalia.
Huntley Michael Alan, San Diego.
Hwang Gerald Richard, Palo Alto.
Jacques Kennedy, Anaheim.
Jerse William Edward, El Cajon.
Jones, Charles Alexander, Tulare.
Kennedy, Edward Henry, Oceanside.
Lawrence, Bobby Gene, Sacramento.
Leonard, James Michael, Edmond.
Lohmeyer, Douglas Edward, Sacramento.
Love, John Jr., Hollywood.
Lukins, Paul Roger, Riverside.
MacLeod, Phillip Lesley, Glendale.
Madrid Adano Hernendez, Los Angeles.
Mansergh, William A., Jr., San Jose.
Martin, John Anthony, III, Los Angeles.
Martinez, Chris Ronald, Alameda.
Martinez, Paul Dinnes, Jr., San Francisco.
McCarthy, Joseph F., Jr., Los Angeles.
McCarthy, Terry, Alan, San Diego.
McCorkle, Leslie Leroy, Yuba City.
McElroy, Dennis Arthur, Modesto.
McLellan, Jimmy Lee, Huntington Beach.
Mearns, Glenn Rodney, Hacienda Heights.
Morgan, Ronald Edward, San Diego.
Negrini, William Lodi, West Covina.
Nix, Warren, Paul, Los Angeles.
Owen, Steven Craig, Long Beach.
Paco, Richard Manuel, Pacoima.
Parker, Ronnie Earl, Fullerton.
Pettigrew, Kenneth Dale, Redding.
Posten, Gerald Wayne, Placerville.
Ramirez, Ralph Albert Jr., San Pablo.
Ross, Douglas Alan, Temple City.
Ross, Roger Dale, Hayward.
Ruiz, Salvadore Iniguez, Scramento.
Sadler, Thomas Wayne, Oakland.
Scurr, Kenneth Wesley, Grass Valley.
Shepard, Lawrence Robert, Napa.
Shugart, Lynn Doyle, Banning.
Smith, Larry Wayne, Bakersfield.
Souza, Francis Louis, Orange.
Taylor, Wayne Oliver, Anaheim.
Tiffany, David L., Riverside.
Titmas, James III, Panorama City.
Toth, Bertalan James, San Francisco.
Villanueva, Francisco Jr., McFarland.
Volheim, Michael Cory, Hayward.
Word, William Keneith, Sunnyvale.
Yanez, Victor Manuel, San Francisco.

Air Force

Hayden, Neil William, Redding.

Marine Corps

Bell, Samuel Wayne, San Francisco.
Cowan, Paul Allen, Arleta.
Gracia, Henry, Jr., National City.
Graff, Paul Arnold, Sunnydale.
Green, Michael Wayne, Hayward.
Jakobsen, Peter Laust, Northride.
Lind, Morten Arvid, Jr., Placerville.
Mullen, Larry Donald, Ojai.
Nelson, Albert Oscar, Jr., Oceanside.
Orr, Thomas Joseph, Garden Grove.
Parker, Kenneth, San Francisco.
Phipps, Jimmy Wayne, Culver City.
Pinamonti, Ernest Anthony, Inglewood.

Sarakov, Harry Daniel, Chico.
Urnes, James Lee, Pacific Grove.
Vanderventer, James Charles, Lancaster.
Villalobos, Arthur Garcia, Compton.
Vivilacqua, Theodore R., Long Beach.
Woods, Arthur Lee, Los Angeles.
Wright, Dennis Harold, Ean Jose.

Navy

Pace, Ronald Earl, Los Angeles.
Thompson, Robert Alan, Downey.

COLORADO

Army

Bensberg, Robert Trame, Colorado Springs.
Machata, Rudolph George, Littleton.
Seward, Kennith Marion, Greenley.
Staab, Richard Eugene, La Junta.

Marine Corps

Girardo, David Laverne, Arvada.
McMacken, Leslie T., Jr., Frisco.
Rauschkolb, Jan, Denver.

CONNECTICUT

Army

Davis, Willie Cecil, Stanford.
Dubiel, Peter Philip, Bristol.
Flynn, James Gerald, Danbury.
Kiewlen, Frank Joseph, Jr., Meriden.
Layman, Robert Emmett, Jr., Poquonock.
Marcy, William Lincoln, Norwich.
Massey, Harry, Bridgeport.
Newsome, Roy C., Somers.
Perry, Stephen Tucker, Wilton.
Read, Robert Berton, Hamden.
Rosenstreich, Aaron Lieb, Norwich.
Shea, Daniel John, East Norwalk.

Marine Corps

Fratto, Michael John, New Fairfield.
Kirk, David Michael, Hartford.
Packard, Carl Edward, Jr., Shelton.
Pyle, Wilton Stroud, Morris.
Sapp, Isaac, Stamford.
Taylor, John Stewart, Granby.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Army

Conners, Ralph Wilson, Jr., Washington.
Ide, Donald William, Washington.

FLORIDA

Army

Abney, Daniel Thomas, Jr., Tampa.
Anthony, Charlie C., Naples.
Arnold, Daniel Raymond, Frostproof.
Bell, Malcolm Frank, Milligan.
Birdsell, Gordon Douglas, Indian Harbour Bea.
Boston, James, Jr., Gainesville.
Carnley, Rudy Avon, Lake Wales.
Davis, Emmett Larue, Lakeland.
Ellis, Alton Starling, Fort Lauderdale.
Freeman, Moulton Lamar, Port Saint Joe.
Hamilton, Virgil Vern, Brooksville.
Hathaway, Walter Samuel, New Smyrna Beach.
Heath, Michael Frederick, Miami.
Hilerio, Albert Jr., Miami.
Hohman, John Michael, Lakeland.
Johnson, James Bruce, Sr., Wildwood.
Kirkland, Willie Lee, Avon Park.
Merricks, Alvin, Orlando.
Paddleford, Fred Harold, Jacksonville.
Price, Joseph Michael, Graceville.
Randall, Robert John, Jr., Miami.
Schaltenbrand, Wayne Keith, Hialeah.
Solis, Ismael, Lake Worth.
Turner, Earl Ralph, Jr., Orlando.
Vitch, Ralph Allan, Tampa.
Vollmerhausen, John M., Jr., Wilton Manors.
Woodard, Joseph, Winter Park.

Air Force

Roberts, Kermit Brjce, Key West.

Marine Corps

Bowe, Robert William, Lantana.
Gibson, Peter, Orlando.
Jones, Anthony Bernard, Miami.

GEORGIA

Army

Atkins, Don Larry, Cedartown.
Bass, Jackie Dennis, Cochran.
Boling, Charles George, Canton.
Bolton, Melvin, Tignall.
Brown, Tommy Lee, Pinehurst.
Browning, Cleveland, Waycross.
Conkle, Joe Thomas, Hampton.
Corbett, Donald June, Adel.
Crisp, John Harold, Marietta.
Evans, Russell, Sylvania.
Frazier, Willie James, Quitman.
Garrett, Donald Wayne, Conyers.
Haire, Benjamin Wayne, Jonesboro.
Harper, James Cecil, Jr., Nicholls.
Harris, James Larry, Fitzgerald.
Holmes, Larry Lamar, Port Wentworth.
Idlett, James, Albany.
Jinks, Raymond Arthur, Pulaski.
Johnson, Melvin, Douglasville.
Johnson, Milton, Savannah.
Johnson, Walter Billy M., Union Point.
Kelly, Joel Ray, Columbus.
Kendrick, Homer Phillip, Columbus.
McKenzie, Jackie Ray, Gainesville.
McMurray, Odie C., Buena Vista.
Morgan, Luther, Jr., Atlanta.
Neal, Charlie Thomas, Atlanta.
Odea, Thomas Patrick, Decatur.
Sanford, James Ira, Vidalia.
Scott, Arthur Edward, Hull.
Simmons, Nathan Bedford, Douglas.
Smith, Forrest Lloyd, Columbus.
Solivan, Louis, Columbus.
Tabor, Clifford, Jr., Ft. Valley.
Taylor, Landus S., Jr., Madison.
Thomas, James Richard, Jesup.
Tribble, Preston, Jr., Atlanta.
Turner, Stanley, Atlanta.
Walters, Fredrick Stephen, Columbus.
Watson, Thomas Arthur, Chickamauga.
Wilson, Gerald Lee, Albany.

Air Force

Bush, Milton Jackson, Barnesville.
Hartenhoff, Duane Leland, Savannah.

Marine Corps

Dobyns, Russell Martin, Jr., Atlanta.
Fann, Danny Wayne, Marietta.
Powell, Michael Anthony, Atlanta.
Strickland, Randy Albert, Atlanta.
Williams, James Bernard, Jr., Albany.

HAWAII

Army

Bongo, Anthony, Honolulu.
Castillo, Leonard Baldomir, Honolulu.
Nakashima, Michael Seiji, Hilo.
Perreira, Errol Wayne, Hilo.
Taira, Clifford Kazumi, Honolulu.

Marine Corps

Foster, Timothy K., Honolulu.
Paro, Randy Charley, Kohala.

IDAHO

Army

Bronson, Randy K., Meridian.
Olsen, William Whitby, Pocatello.
Willey, Robert Leon, Grangeville.

Marine Corps

Hansen, Robert Warren, Naples.

ILLINOIS

Army

Behar, Daniel Simon, Chicago.
Beisly, Steven Dale, Met Amora.
Benson, Allan Cameron, Kewanee.
Bock, Jerry Charles, Markham.
Clennon, Edward Francis, Joliet.
Craig, Odell, Decatur.
Crites, Raymond, Chicago.
Dixon, Patrick Martin, Dixon.
Fultz, Michael Kent, Earlville.
Gillen, John Aloysius, Chicago.
Gray, Ronald Leonard, Manteno.
Harker, Robert Dale, Sigel.
Harris, Prentiss, Jr., Champaign.
Hill, Ronald Allen, Grayslake.
Jerde, Gerald Dean, Ottawa.
Jordan, Orval Clyde, III, Hickory Hills.
Kerkstra, Harry William, Chicago.
Krell, Robert Gazl, Springfield.
Larsen, Terry Lee, Rockford.
Lyden, Michael P., Chicago.
Malecki, Robert Richard, Chicago.
Mann, David Roy, Earlville.
Mills, Hans Lothar, Sterling.
Montgomery, Eddie, Jr., Chicago.
Montoya, Guadalupe Esparza, Argo.
Mortensen, Terrence John, Champaign.
Nichols, Philip Gwyn, Rockford.
Palm, Dennis Du Wayne, Varna.
Patterson, Wallis Gilbert, Rockford.
Peterson, Howard Mathis, Chicago.
Rosen, Daniel Elmer, Breese.
Sabo, Andrew Robert, Lansing.
Schaefer, William Eric, Deerfield.
Shelby, James Benjamin, Peoria.
Sly, Richard Stephen, Macomb.
Smith, Dale Gene, Pearl.
Stigen, Wayne Douglas, Chicago.
White, Kenneth Leroy, Rockford.
Woehrl, Michael John, Chicago.

Marine Corps

Adkins, Terry Lee, Dupo.
Anderson, Mark Steven, Palos Heights.
Baldwin, Roy Lee, Donnellson.
Bateman, James Austin, Mundelein.
Forbes, Arthur Kirks, Chicago.
Heise, Thomas Howard, Melrose Park.
Henry, Gerald Edward, Edwardsville.
Jones, Clarence, Jr., Chicago.
Keller, Ronald Dale, Edwardsville.
Kitchen, Michael Roosevelt, Chicago.
O'Donovan, Edward Thomas, Chicago.
O'Reilly, Timothy Rourke, Chicago.
Ramos, Samuel, Chicago.

Navy

Vaughan, Douglas Dean, Arlington, Heights.

INDIANA

Army

Connell, Thomas Michael, Ft. Wayne.
Cox, Gary Wayne, East Gary.
Fenner, Mark William, Indianapolis.
Fleck, Gregory Lamar, Andrews.
Gourlay, Bruce Andrew, Gary.
Harley, Donnie Ray, Walkerton,
Keesling, John Arthur, New Castle.
Klapak, John Robert, Jr., Whiting.
Lewis, Robert Dean, Jeffersonville.
McAndrews, John Joseph Indianapolis.
Morris, Walter Joseph, De Motte.
Movchan, David Edward, Gary.
Murray, Steven Edward, Indianapolis.
Pedue, Roger William, La Porte.
Ralph, James Troy, Hobart.
Rozow, John, South Bend.
Thomas, Jerry Denver, Syracuse.
Weeden, Larry Lee, Mill Creek.

Marine Corps

Abbott, John William, Hammond.
Alert, Ropert Joseph, Jr., Elkhart.
Croy, John Lee, Elwood.
Johnson, Jack Lee, Elkhart.
Larkins, Virgil Lee, Indianapolis.
McKee, David Leroy, Gary.
McKillop, Leslie Wayne, Terre Haute.

IOWA

Army

Adams, William James, Iowa City.
Brookhart, Gary Lee, Muscatine.
Budde, Larry, John, Preston.
Case, Charles Cecil, Des Moines.
Fowler, Joe Lynn, Vinton.
Gilbert, James Michael, Waterloo.
Johnson, Eric Bernard, Laurens.
Lefler, David Allen, Sioux City.
Miller, Terry Vernon, Ottumwa.
Milner, Michael Wayne, Council Bluffs.
Munch, Michael Raymond, Council Bluffs.
Neavor, Gary Arnold, Bettendorf.
Nebel, Thomas Allen, Keota.
Park, Marvin Edward, Bedford.
Pickart, Dwayne Robert, Norway.
Platt, John Herbert, Early.
Rogers, Cordell Bruce, Remsen.

Schroeder, Michael Allen, Mason City.
Speer, James Walter, Bloomfield.
Yashack, Ronald Allen, Diagonal.

Marine Corps

Kahlsterf, Keith Alan, Britt.
Sanderson, Gail Gene, Anthon.
Walters, Jim James, Sioux City.

KANSAS

Army

Boese, Robert Lee, Marion.
Brull, Michael Joseph, Atchison.
Crawshaw, Steeve Alexander, Williamstown.
Dotter, Edwin Earl, Wichita.
Fry, Rolland Keith, Hutchinson.
Gerber, Michael Eugene, Conway Springs.
Goodner, Robert Eugene, Iola.
Handshumaker, Lloyd E. Jr., Coffeyville.
Love, John Arthur, Liberal.
Martin, Steven Louis, Wichita.
Nevins, Floyd Charles, Valley Falls.
Paxson, Steven Duane, Topeka.
Shannon, Richard Dean, Jr., Piper.
Stultz, Charles Gilbert, Quenemo.
Turner, Robert Eldon, McPherson.
Ward, Ronald Ray, Haysville.

Marine Corps

Trower, Gary Ray, Chapman.

KENTUCKY

Army

Barlow, Edward Arnold, Hebron.
Bowman, Robert Earl, Louisville.
Bragg, Joe Eddy, Lawrenceburg.
Cornett, Gregory Douglas, Putney.
Fleek, Charles Clinton, Petersburg.
Hampton, Orville, Catlettsburg.
Hilbert, Charles Allen, Parksville.
Newby, Bobby Gene, Winchester.
Noe, George Hobert, Cawood.
Powers, Edward Claus, Fort Knox.
Sizemore, Clarence, Manchester.
Sturgeon, Ira Jackie, Freeburn.
Tackett, George Edward, Olive Hill.
Wallace, Gary Anthony, Louisville.

Marine Corps

Ford, Charles Wayne, Louisville.
Hisle, Gary Lee, Covington.
Jackson, Michele Lee, Bowling Green.
Parks, Floyd Junior, Owensboro.
Powell, Marion David, Vine Grove.
Smith, James Bryan, Louisville.
Wartman, Chester James, Fort Mitchell.
Whaley, William Eldred, III, Louisville.

LOUISIANA

Army

Brumfield, Richard Lynn, Denham Springs.
Culpepper, Allen Ross, Minden.
Fenceroy, Louis Earl, Bastrop.
Grayson, Herman Lee, Baton Rouge.
Greco, Eric Joseph, New Orleans.
Grimes, Alvin, Baton Rouge.
Huber, Leo John, III, New Orleans.
Jett, Russell Lane, Hornbeck.
Karr, John Preston, Kenner.
Nations, Roy Lee, Bastrop.
Pitre, Jory Joseph, Cut Off.
Prejean, Kenneth Andrew, Metairie.
Sonnier, Foster Lee, Opelousas.
Thomas, Charles, Jr., New Orleans.
Vice, Farrell James, Abbeville.
Washington, James Leroy, Sr., New Orleans.
Zeringle, Ralph Henry, Raceland.

Air Force

Stewart, Virgil Grant, Baton Rouge.

Marine Corps

Broussard, Gerald Gene, Duson.
Cook, Donald James, Baton Rouge.
Dubois, Richard Francis, New Orleans.
Hebert, James III, New Orleans.
Nelson, Daniel Carter, Shreveport.

MAINE

Army

Collier, Raymond Lyn, South Berwick.
Luttrell, Bruce Irving, Auburn.
Sowers, James Rodney, Presque Isle.
Strout, Philip William, Portland.
Theriault, Harry Everett, Rumford.

MARYLAND

Army

Barnhart, Otto Philip, Hancock.
Case, James Gilbert, Cumberland.
Godman, Earl Arthur, Baltimore.
Hicks, Silas Lucas, Jr., Hyattsville.
Higginbotham, Robert M., Rockville.
Hughes, Ernest Joseph, Baltimore.
McGowan, William Lewis, Silver Spring.
Spriggs, Otha Thomas, Jr., Baltimore.
Stonesifer, Harry Nelson, Pasadena.
Thornhill, William John, Baltimore.
Tine, John Richard, Silver Spring.
Warnick, Jerone James, Princess Anne.

Marine Corps

Call, Gerald Lee, Aberdeen.
Linn, John Holmes, Seabrook.
Stevens, Wayne Alan, College Park.
Wark, Carlisle Ogden, Jr., Annapolis.

MASSACHUSETTS

Army

Andresen, Scott Frederick, Melrose.
Bellino, Paul George, Worcester.
Chevalier, Henry Anthony, Fairhaven.
Daley, Richard John, New Bedford.
Dick, Bruce David, Peabody.
Frongillo, John Ralph, Woburn.
Gamble, Philip Lyle, Jr., Amherst.
Gliniewicz, Richard F., Abington.
Kelley, Richard Robert, Weymouth.
Laskowski, John Joseph, Willimansett.
Matta, Bruce Joseph, Canton.
Mattarocchia, John F., Jr., Ipswich.
Moore, Douglas Fillebrown, Ayer.
Putney, Edward Allen, Reading.
Roderigues, Paul Irving, New Bedford.
Simone, Craig Michael, Cohasset.

Marine Corps

Adams, Peter Robert, Dorchester.
Cheney, Richard Daniel, Dorchester.
Foley, Martin Francis, Dorchester.
Guest, Gary Richard, Stoughton.
Hickey, James Philip, Quincy.
Parent, Jeffery Mark, Westfield.
Passerello, Anthony Joseph, Needham.
Rose, Carlos James, Onset.

MICHIGAN

Army

Acton, Gerald Richard, Saginaw.
Alexander, William Lee, Flint.
Arbogast, Carl Francis, Jr., Marquette.
Ballinger, Timothy J., Springport.
Beske, William Henry, Jr., Lathrup Village.
Brinkley, Larry Howard, Troy.
Brinks, Kenneth Lee, Cadillac.
Caldwell, Hugh Pinson, Jr., Detroit.
Chisholm, Joseph Charles, Union Lake.
Clancy, Terrance Burton, Port Austin.
Clay, James Wilford, Waterford.
Clouse, Duane Leon, Eaton Rapids.
Crowley, Ralph Heman, Remus.
Crutts, Ralph Joel, Owosso.
Darden, William Henry, Detroit.
Dwornik, Valentine Marion, Detroit.
Eads, Russell Wade, Detroit.
Eland, John Frederick, St. Clair Shores.
Ewing, David James, Bloomfield Hills.
Freeman, Robert Lee, Ypsilanti.
Gentinne, Thomas Henry, Dearborn.
Gibson, Keith Edward, Grand Rapids.
Gray, Asa Parker, Jr., East Lansing.
Gray, Thomas Edward, Temperance.
Guilmette, Dennis Michael, Flint.
Harter, James Wilson, Dexter.
Hastings, Thomas William, Battle Creek.
Hilliard, James Francis, Kalamazoo.
Hohn, Rodney Allen, Flint.
Logan, Joseph Lawrence, Jr., Detroit.
Lukas, Jerome Kristin, Caledonia.
Matheson, Douglas Roy, Columbiaville.
May, Michael Frederick, Vassar.
McNew, Brian Richard, Southgate.
Melvin, Joseph Ernest, Wurtsmith AFB.
Miller, Richard David, Charlotte.
Nelson, Rex Franklin, Jr., Coldwater.
Nichols, Gary Bruce, Melvindale.
Plante, Gary William, Midland.
Ratta, Felice Nichols, Detroit.
Roossien, Robert Allen, Wyoming.
Scarmeas, James Sam, Jr., Hazel Park.
Schmidt, Denis Gordon, Detroit.
Schnake, Richard Martin, South Haven.
Seburg, Donald Paul, Jr., Jackson.
Shineldecker, Raymond Mack, Muskegon.
Shoaps, Kenneth Duane, Grosse Pointe Wood.
Smith, Gary Kent, Detroit.
Smith, Kenneth William, Detroit.
Somes, Ronald Ree, Sault Sainte Marie.
Stevenson, Rufus Newton, Jr., Flint.
Stewart, John Wallace, Union Lake.
Strickland, Thomas Neil, Hillman.
Sturgill, Michael James, Jackson.
Taylor, Donald Thomas, Newberry.
Tucker, Michael Raymond, Detroit.
Tungate, Norman Lee, Kalamazoo.
Weil, Larry Steven, Birmingham.
Wender, Terry Arthur, Iron Mountain.
Whitby, Thomas Alvin, Kalamazoo.
Willis, Joseph F., Westland.
Wise, James Joseph, Detroit.
Wooster, Roger Edson, Munith.
Yates, Craig Edward, Sparta.

Marine Corps

Mannerow, Paul David, Harper Woods.
Modderman, Philip John, Grand Rapids.
Moe, Charles Mervin, Jr., Lake Odessa.
Mrosewske, Roy James, Mt. Clemens.
Outman, Charles Edgar, Battle Creek.
Paul, Gary Michael, Norway.
Schultz, John La Vern, Birch Run.
Van Horn, Albert James, Daggett.

Navy

Decker, Dewey Russell, Ionia.

MINNESOTA

Army

Christiansen, Thomas Lee, Minneapolis.
Dufresne, Willard J., Jr., Hutchinson.
Halgrimson, Marloye Keith, Ada.
Jorgenson, Jerome David, Fairmont.
Martin, Carl Raymond, Minneapolis.
Nyblom, Duane Willard, Fridley.
Peterson, David Martin, Edina.
Potthoff, Thomas Albert, Circle Pines.
Stevens, Wesley Warren, Peterson.
Stiyer, David Alan, Ogema.
Swanson, Lynn Curtis, Argyle.
Sweet, Richard Donald, Crystal.
Westman, Myles Dalen, Thief River Falls.
White, Richard Neal, Golden Valley.

Marine Corps

Mathison, Michael Alfred, Princeton.
McKnight, Joseph Patrick, St. Paul.
Perkins, George Peter, Shakopee.
Skaggs, William Frank, St. Paul.
Stenberg, John Marvin, International Falls.

Navy

Cox, Richard Leigh, Shakopee.

MISSISSIPPI

Army

Bell, Arthur Frederick, Greenville.
Carter, L. C., State College.
Chapman, David Thomas, Dumas.
Dodds, Larry Floyd, Booneville.
Hassell, Ulysses C., Hernando.
Holliday, Cris, Meridian.
Jones, Charles Ray, Calhoun City.
May, Richard Earl, Collinsville.
Myers, R. C., Jackson.
Smith, Kenneth Lavelle, Poplarville.
Smith, William Walter, King City.
Stevenson, James Ralph, Tupelo.
Terrell, Lemjel Ebb, Purvis.
Wilson, Charles E., Jr., Greenwood.

Marine Corps

Rhodes, Joseph Lee, Greenwood.
Smith, Ronny, Lena.

MISSOURI

Army

Baxter, Larry Lee, Pierce City.
Bliss, Benjamin Charles, Crane.

Brooks, Edward Allen, Springfield.
Brown, Galen Charles, Cassville.
Daniels, Curtis Ray, Kansas City.
Doebert, Phillip Ray, De Soto.
Drew, James Lee, Kansas City.
Foster, Thomas Eugene, Ballwin.
Grays, Demetrius Jerome, St. Louis.
Hall, George Thomas, Crystal City.
Hayes, Garry Lee, St. Louis.
Henn, Norville Martin, Jr., St. Louis.
Joanis, Kenneth Joseph, Affton.
Johnson, Louis, St. Louis.
Julian, James Julius, Jr., Kansas City.
Kigar, Larry Eugene, Baring.
Le Clair, Timothy Kim, Webster Groves.
Lowe, Aaron Harvey, Cassville.
Mallinckrodt, Arthur T., Jr., New Franklin.
Price, Derrill Le Roy, Jr., El Dorado Springs.
Ray, John Edward, Wasola.
Ruhlmann, Heinrich, Richmond Heights.
Scheulen, Gary Jerome J., Westphalia.
Schmidt, Joseph Vincent, St. Thomas.
Thompson, James Michael, Independence.
Thomure, Larry Lee, Ste. Genevieve.

Marine Corps

Combs, Phillip Eugene, Grandview.
Emrick, Ervin Junior, St. Louis.
O'Neill, Timothy Michael, St. Louis.
Prentice, Alan Neil, Rolla.
Weese, Ronnie Gene, Amity.
Wright, Tommy Dee, Centralia.

MONTANA

Army

Dunbar, Doyle Daniel, Hamilton.
Greiner, Gary James, Polson.
Griffin, Gary O'Neal, Billings.
McCarvel, Stephen Lewis, Great Falls.
Thomas, Roy Stephen, Trout Creek.

Marine Corps

Barton, Jim Albert, Great Falls.
Pickett, Richard Dale, Laurel.
Summers, Jon Ray, Helena.

Navy

Westervelt, Johnnie Bowen, Big Timber.

NEBRASKA

Army

Dagley, Gary Gene, Lincoln.
Hargens, David Allen, Nickerson.
Harvey, Lawrence Daniel, Greeley.
Kosanda, Jerry Joseph, II, Omaha.
Napier, Lee Allan, Orchard.
Van Andel, Claude Richard, Norfolk.
Wieser, Lynn Jay, Gothenburg.

Marine Corps

Bailey, Byrle Bennett, Omaha.
Wright, Delbert Pat, Hastings.

NEVADA

Army

Blea, Michael Delano, Fallon.
Clark, James Woodford, Reno.

Marine Corps

Burgess, Stanley Wayne, Las Vegas.

Navy

Andrews, Robert Warren, Jr., Reno.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Army

Scibilia, Robert Peter, Nashua.
Towle, Gary Chester, Concord.

Marine Corps

Girouard, Yvon Eldmond, Littleton.

NEW JERSEY

Army

Atkinson, Franklin G., Jr., Hurffville.
Barnes, Alfred, Montclair.
Cerrato, Nicholas Frank, Paterson.
Dettman, Edward, Clifton.
Eggenberger, William Gary, Lyndhurst.
Folger, John Vincent, Bayonne.
Ganun, Paul Huntington, Asbury Park.
Hinson, Alvin Crawford, Westville.
Klaniecki, Edward Matthew, Fanwood.
Lawson, Birden Jerome, Newark.
McCants, Joseph, Jr., Trenton.
Myers, Thomas Wayne, Middlesex.
Nelson, Paul Vincent, Belleville.
Walters, Michael Arthur, Gloucester City.

Marine Corps

Blevins, Thomas Lee, Jr., Middletown.
De Lorenzo, Ronald, Trenton.
Hoffmann, Thomas Martin, Palmyra.
Newton, Barrie Myron, Cherry Hill.
Ryan, William Cornelius, Jr., Bogota.
Winters, John, Clark.

Navy

Menter, Jerome, Englewood.
Russell, Peter Fransson, Wharton.

NEW MEXICO

Army

Black, Rodney Joe, Roswell.
Eggert, Sam, Tucumcari.
Madrid, Gabriel Hernandez, Las Cruces.
May, Clovis Lee, Deming.
McCorvey, Gerald, Tucumcari.
Quintana, Santiago, V. E., Santa Fe.
Sisneros, Arturo Sylvester, Dexter.

Air Force

Adams, Michael Thomas, Albuquerque.

Marine Corps

Garley, Frank Elroy, Albuquerque.
Martin, Emerson, Churchrock.

Navy

Pyle, Chris Monroe, Albuquerque.

NEW YORK

Army

Anderson, Robert Lee, Middletown.
Asher, Alan, New York.
Barbiere, Charles Louis, New York.
Bauer, William Henry, New York.
Bausch, Barry Ralph, Elmont.
Best, Oliver Adrian, Jr., New York.
Bouttry, Charles Edward, New York.
Briales, Miguel Eugenio, New York.
Buckley, Robert Walter, Uniondale.
Bukowski, David Frederick, West Islip.
Calhoun, Steven Brian, New York.
Carbone, Richard, Huntington Station.
Crocker, David Rockwell, Jr., Schenectady.
Cruz, Luis Phillip, New York.
Dalke, Burton Ward, Tonawanda.
De Marinis, Thomas Joseph, New York.
De Meola, Raymond Warren, Blauvelt.
Dominkowitz, Michael John, New York.
Elam, Walter Alan, New York.
Fassel, Gary Carl, Buffalo.
Fiume, James Rocco, Jackson Heights.
Gearing, William Carl, Jr., Rochester.
Glynn, John Joseph, Jr., New York.
Glynn, Peter John, New York.
Godley, Louis Henry, New York.
Gruhn, Robert Ayers, Rochester.
Hogan, Edward Joseph, New York.
Huestis, John Edward, Goshen.
Hynes, Robert John, Long Island City.
Jackson, Thomas Peter, Jr., Westbury.
Jules, George Henry, New York.
Kronthaler, Paul John, Buffalo.
Kupchinskas, Paul Norman, New York.
Lawyer, Alfred Lewis, New York.
Luckenbach, Richard Mate, Sodus.
Manino, Salvatore Patrick, New York.
Margro, James Anthony, New York.
Markunas, Thomas William, New York.
Masinski, John George, New York.
McCarthy, John Neal, Glen Cove.
Minotti, Anthony John, Alden.
Mitchell, Michael John, New York.
Mongelli, Alexander A., New York.
Morales, Victor David, New York.
Murphy, Joseph Thomas, Jr., Glens Falls.
Nelson, David Charles, Hollis.
Nurzynski, Joseph Anthony, Buffalo.
O'Donnell, John Michael, Long Island City.
O'Neill, Anthony, Joseph, New York.
Olsen, John Andrew, St. James.
Oquendo, Fruto James, New York.
Ortiz-Ramirez Juan, New York.
Palmer, Walter, New York.
Pape, John Charles, West Babylon.
Pavan, Kenneth Alan, Niagara Falls.
Peteroy, Bruce Edward, New York.
Pickel, George William, Astoria.
Quinn, William Caniel, III, East Northport.
Ross, David Seth, Astoria.
Rossi, Rudolph, Howard Beach.
Santinello, Ralph Michael, New York.
Saunders, Bruce, New York.
Soto-Concepcion, Jose, New York.
Swane, Brian Edward, Massapequa.
Swanstrom, Douglas Gaylord, Ellington.
Torre, Pasquale, New York.
Turzilli, Stephen Edward, New York.
Vallen, Donald William, Jr., New Hyde Park.
Walls, Albert Calvin, Jr., White Plains.
Walters, James Reese, Riverhead.
Williams, Joseph Jeremiah, Holcomb.
Winters, William John, Boonville.

Marine Corps

Baurle, Matthew John, Gloversville.
Beeching, Earl Peter, Norwich.
Cockerl, James Calvin, Lynbrook.
Epps, James, New York.
Hughes, Graham, Rochester.
Labianca, Michael, Jackson Heights.
McDowell, Robert J., Jr., Binghamton.
Parker, Stephen Vance, New York.
Pierce Ronald Shafer, Kenmore.
Schmidt, Robert Gustave, Levittown.
Simonds, Harold Riley, Gloversville.
Thomas, Daniel Patrick, Jr., Niagara Falls.
Tirado, Daniel, New York.
Wood, Raymond Charles, Napanoch.

Navy

Meyer, Lowell Wayne, Riverhead.
Wiltsie, Joseph Carl, Cazenovia.

NORTH CAROLINA

Army

Beach, Harold Dean, Boone.
Breedlove, Curtis, Bryson City.
Carter, Robert Henry, Jr., Morganton.
Chavis, Alphonzo Linwoodel, Sanford.
Clark, Terry Desmond, Wilmington.
Clodfelter, Gary Reid, Thomasville.
Coble, James Thomas, Asheboro.
Cooper, Robert Lee, Fayetteville.
Davis, Thomas Warren, Garner.
Eyer, Kenneth Jones, Jr., Elizabeth City.
Fogleman, James Olin, Graham.
Freeman, Earnest Taylor, Morganton.
Gentry, Leroy James, Asheville.
Gerald, Raeford James, Jr., Rowland.
Green, Melvin, Jr., Oxford.
Harris, Curtis Ray, Albemarle.
Lee, Jerry Tyrus, Rocky Mount.
Lutz, William Lee, Whitnel.
McArthur, Henry Lee, Fuquary Varina.
McCollough, Gary, Charlotte.
McCray, Gary Dean, Claremont.
Penley, Charles Martin, Jr., Asheville.
Pratt, John Monroe, Reaford.
Pullen, Claude Douglas, Statesville.
Schachner, David Brennan, Charlotte.
Sprinkle, Steven Kenneth, Winston-Salem.
Starnes, Keith Newton, Jr., Charlotte.
Sykes, Cana, Michael, Winston-Salem.
Tilley, Hubert Samuel, Jr., Winston-Salem.
Wade, Lindberg, Red Springs.
Watkins, Larry Wayne, Kannapolis.

Air Force

Nunn, Rodolph Lee, Jr., Kinston.

Marine Corps

Cherry, David Earl, Jr., Woodland.
Jenkins, James Alex, Marion.
Scorsone, Donald Floyd, Asheville.
Sickles, Richard Lee, Albemarle.

Navy

Alcock, Ronnie Gilman, Greenville.
Vanhoy, Kenneth Edward, Goldsboro.

NORTH DAKOTA

Army

Briss, Marvin Clarence, Binford.
Cox, Leon David, Jamestown.
Kopseng, James Claire, Harvey.

Kuhn, David James, Richardton.
Laber, Merlin James, Sykeston.

Marine Corps

Finley, Valarian Lawrence, Mandaree.
Gietzen, Gene Thomas, Glen Ullin.

OHIO

Army

Anderson, Millard Ray, Wooster.
Barber, Floyd Edward, Franklin.
Byous, Marcus Randolph, Akron.
Carter, Ronald James, Parma.
Diehl, Patrick Regan, Chagrin Falls.
Duffy, James Patrick, Jr., Brunswick.
Dye, James Herbert, Marietta.
Freeman, Joseph Warren, Jr., Cincinnati.
Garven, Wayne Eric, Mt. Vernon.
Giron, Mark Joseph, Barberton.
Goonan, Paul Edward, Jr., Franklin.
Hausman, Henry Richard, Jr., Hilliard.
Hopkins, Richard Lee, Ottawa.
Householder, Richard Wayne, Somerset.
Irvin, Cphrey Austin, Chillicothe.
Knaus, William Campbell, Cincinnati.
Krukemyer, Kenneth Warren, Pemberville.
Laubacher, Robert Francis, Minerva.
Luckett, James Sawyer, II, Columbus.
Maher, Martin Joseph, Cincinnati.
Malicek, Donald Joseph, Twinsburg.
Masten, Armand Dominic, Cleveland.
McMillion, Charles Eugene, Jefferson.
Moore, Wavery, Toledo.
Murray, Arthur Joseph, Jr., Cincinnati.
Neff, David Russell, Dayton.
Painter, Marvin Reed, Cleveland.
Ptacek, Timothy Richard, Bay Village.
Richard, John Wayne, Versailles.
Ryan, Samuel Franklin, Utica.
Sanders, Donald Robert, Jr., Cayton.
Springfield, William Val, Elyria.
Strayer, Lawrence Edward, Dublin.
Tamer, Richard Edward, Parma.
Thompson, Jim Allen, Lima.
Trammell, Harry Michael, Brunswick.
Uplinger, Garry Lynn, Cambridge.
Ward, Theodore Davison, Huron.
West, Darrell Charles, Barberton.
Wolfrum, Larry Virgil, Sherwood.

Marine Corps

Church, Jimmy Kermit, Columbus.
Dombroski, Darryl Tod, Youngstown.
Freeland, Charles Jeffery, Worthington.
Hall, Samuel Christian, East Liverpool.
Hatfield, John Frederick, Springfield.
Heskett, Jerry Wayne, Coshocton.
Horn, Edward Andrew, Jr., Poland.
Justice, Donald Lee, New Boston.
Laverock, Paul Stuart, Perrysburg.
Protain, David Alan, Youngstown.
Spaulding, Larry Eugene, Athens.
Speaks, Paul Edward, Newark.
Tolley, Edward Robert, Lorain.
Weisbrod, John, Canton.

Navy

Baumberger, Richard L. Jr, Mansfield.
Grieser, Philip Lee, St. Paris.

OKLAHOMA

Army

Bruner, David, Sapulpa.
Cobb, Milford Eudene, Shawnee.
Cowan, Robert Le Rhea III, Tulsa.
Davis, Walter Emerson, Grace Monte.
Deevers, Donald James, Hinton.
Demings, David Eugene, Wewoka.
Fields, Elmer Eugene, Fairfax.
Gardner, Marion Lora, Tulsa.
Hays, Thomas Earl, Oklahoma City.
Ledford, Alvie Junior, Jr., Afton.
Maready, Terry Kay, Okemah.
McFarland, Arthur Ray, Oklahoma City.
Noe, Marvin Lewis, Lawton.
Pratt, Guy Leon, Jr., Oklahoma City.
Sanders, Phillip Duane, Coweta.
Seigle, William Arthur, Tulsa.
Singer, Norman Paul, Oklahoma City.
Thomas, Billy Lee, Oklahoma City.
Wable, Samuel Lee, Altus.

Marine Corps

Ervin, Charles Dwayne, Lamont.
Jones, Harold Leslie, Del City.
Lisenby, Max, Lawton.

Navy

Padberg, Larry Gene, Ada.

OREGON

Army

Bowman, John Otto, Salem.
Cochran, Scott Edward, Eugene.
Dalton, Donald Everett, Cove.
Dimick, Harley Daniel, Sweet Home.
Hornback, Richard Jerry, Bend.
O'Brien, Michael Steven, Portland.
Patrick, Reese Michael, Riddle.
Rose, Robert Francis, Ashland.
Secrist, Fred Jason, Springfield.
Whitney, Dick Edward, Newberg.
Wright, James Alfred, Boring.

Marine Corps

Downs, Edwin Alfay, Charleston.
Gauche, David Peter, Portland.
Kleinsmith, Robert Lloyd, Eugene.
Miller, Richard Thomas, Hermiston.
Murphy, Patrick Edward, Eugene.
Winfrey, Authran Wayne, Fall Creek.

PENNSYLVANIA

Army

Anderson, William Lee, Templeton.
Beebe, Larry Charles, Erie.
Cardwell, Tyree, Philadelphia.
Clarke, Edward Allen, Cowningtown.
Day, Arthur Michael, Levittown.
Dewar, James Craig, West Elizabeth.
Donavan, Timothy Charles, Pittsburgh.
Dunkle, James Robert, Milton.
Finnegan, David Garth, Pittsburgh.
Flagiello, Richard James, Upper Darby.
Fluharty, Donovan Russel, Beaver.
Greth, Robert Eugene, Reading.
Hagerty, Patrick Michael, Youngstown.
Hawkins, Charles E., Jr., Philadelphia.
Hill, Howard Scott, Irwin.
Karpy, Joseph Ruben, Canonsburg.
Kelly, Gerald John, Jr., Philadelphia.
Kiezkowski, Edward Thomas, Butler.
Lamelza, Mario, Philadelphia.
Lesh, Terry Lee, Bedford.
Logue, John Edward, Jr., Franklin.
Lovsnes, Neal Wallace, Jr., Carlisle.
McCormick, Richard H., Jr., Pittsburgh.
McLaughlin, John Robert, Scranton.
Miller, Arlen Jay, Emmaus.
Patton, Francis G., Upper Darby.
Phillips, Edison Richard, Plymouth.
Richardson, Jeffrey Allen, Red Lion.
Saylor, Scott Edward, King of Prussia.
Sessions, William Robert, Philadelphia.
Smith, Clem Wainwright, Erie.
Stephenson, Lynn Ladelle, Irvona.
Stone, Joseph Charles, Pittsburgh.
Trinkala, David Allen, Heidelberg.
Vaughn, Robert Lee, Jr., Collegeville.
Walls, Carl William, Lancaster.
Watkins, Mahlon Hugh, Crooked Creek.
Weir, Phillip Grant, Du Bois.
Whittle, Albert Allan, Philadelphia.
Williamson, Ervin Howard, Mifflin.
Witmer, Kenneth Eugene, Millersville.
Worden, Robert Lee, Lock Haven.

Air Force

Wanner, Carl Joseph, Philadelphia.

Marine Corps

Atkucunas, Edward, Philadelphia.
Bliss, Thomas Robert, York.
Boyer, Lary Eugene, Ellwood City.
Brown, Emmett Ruben, North Hills.
Dobson, Carey Lee, Elverson.
Funk, Bruce Elliott, Philadelphia.
Haynes, Clifford Earl, Jr., Carnegie.
Hoch, Larry Dean, Topton.
Kercsmar, Robert Calvin, Butztown.
Leighton, Gary Willard, Washington.
Schwartz, Samuel Bruce, Philadelphia.
Shultz, William Harry, Columbus.
Stratton, Thomas Allan, Seneca.
Warren, Larry, Chester.

Navy

McNelis, Patrick Robert, McKeesport.
Rhen, Dennis Henry, Harrisburg.

RHODE ISLAND

Army

Blair, Gerald Allan, Warwick.
De Palma, Thomas Carmine, Providence.
Fegatelli, Peter Frank, Providence.

Marine Corps

Borges, Joseph William, Bristol.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Army

Brigman, Johnnie Lee, Cayce.
Christmas, Michael Lynn, Camden.
Christopher Samuel, Jr., Hilton Head Island.
Ellis, James Marion, Honea Path.
Evans, Henry Franklin, Columbia.
Hardin, Curtis Levence, Blacksburg.
Lisbon, Johnny, Elliott.
Matthews, Roy Gibson, Aiken.
Moreno Ramon, Belvedere.
Oliver, Randy Dewitt, Leesville.
Owens, Henry Lawrence, Effingham.
Pauley, Washington, Timmonsville.
Poole, William David, Jr., Marietta.
Smith, R. J., Salley.
Stukes, Isaiah Truman, Summerton.
Thompson, Carl, Woodruff.

Air Force

Taylor, Cecil Franklin, Seneca.

Marine Corps

Cooper, Calvin Emanuel. Kingstree.
Henson, Larry Keith, Rock Hill.
Thompson, Albert C., Columbia.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Army

Johnson, Ronnie Wayne, Burke.
Whyte, Richard Alan, Rapid City.

TENNESSEE

Army

Amick, Richard Michael, Nashville.
Anthony, Gerald Douglas, Tullahoma.
Barnard, Leon Edward, Tazewell.
Blanton, James Lee, Jr., Memphis.
Brown, Dale Frazier, Ashland City.
Cheney, David Paul, Jr., Memphis.
Flurry, James Durward, Nashville.
Green, Wilbur Leon, McMinnville.
Heatherly, George Glenn, La Follette.
Hedden, Harold C., Jr., Chattanooga.
Henry, Jimmy Lynn, Kingsport.
Hill, Clearbern William, Jr., Stantonville.
Latham, Thomas Eugene, Sweetwater.
Lockhart, Kenneth Eugene, Kingsport.
Lovell, Jerry Michael, Shelbyville.
McCarrell, John Edward, Loudon.
Patterson, Richard Lee, Harriman.
Reasons, James Alton, Jr., Finley.
Smith, Winston, Osborne, Madisonville.
Steagall, Edsel Wayne, Shady Valley.
Swanson, William Henry, Nashville.
Williamson, Charlie C., Jr., Memphis.
Woodard, Joseph Wilbert, Jr., Nashville.
Yewell, Bobby Joe, Memphis.

Air Force

Troglen, Jackie Wayne, Sparta.

Marine Corps

Pilkington, Charles H., Jr., Knoxville.
Shinault, John Michael, Memphis.
Thornburg, Scott William, Loudon.
Vandergriff, Rodger Alan, Knoxville.
Williams, Eddie Jones, Jr., Memphis.

TEXAS

Army

Aguillon, Jose Jesus, Dallas.
Belt, Robert Eric, Houston.
Borrego, Luis Carlos, Jr., El Paso.
Butcher, Davis Carroll, Houston.
Cevallos, Robert G., San Antonio.

Clark, Howe King, Jr., Rockdale.
Dees, Curtis Cleveland, Kerrville.
Dimock, James Albert, Jr., Houston.
Dobbs, Robert Arthur, San Antonio.
Garza, Jose, Jr., San Antonio.
Gonzales, Felix G., Jr., Luling.
Grace, Larry, San Antonio.
Green, Clyde Ray, Denison.
Harrison, James Roy, Abilene.
Kelly, Donald Glenn, Dallas.
Leija, Louie Zapata, Tulia.
Lozano, Matthew T. Jr., San Antonio.
Manning, Charles Edward, Marshall.
Marrs, Ronald Wayne, Lancaster.
Martinez, Enrique, El Paso.
Melton, Michael Dennis, Fort Worth.
Morado, Domingo Flores, San Antonio.
Nicholas, John Alvie, Tyler.
Palacio, Gilbert Gonzales, San Antonio.
Patrick, Calvin Ray, Houston.
Pelajic, Arturo, El Paso.
Phillips, Dennis Michael, Irving.
Pitts, Robert Ardell, Galveston.
Queen, Cecil Wayne, Taylor.
Reynolds, Ronald Burns, Dallas.
Rice, Patrick L., Franklin.
Rodriguez, Joe, Austin.
Rosemond, John L., Dallas.
Smithee, Ronald Gail, Ralls.
Stahlstrom, Allan Emile, Markham.
Tello, Joaquin Rodriguez, San Antonio.
Triana, Salvador Pjga, Cuero.
Valencia, Amado Acosta, Austin.
Vasquez, Alberto Rios, Jr., Orange Grove.
Waid, Billy Gene, Corpus Christi.
Warmsley, Harold James, Dallas.
Watt, Robert Lee, Humble.
Yates, Robert Clyde, Hondo.
Yeatts, John Marshall, Ft. Worth.

Air Force

Manske, Charles Jerome, El Campo.

Marine Corps

Carter, Gary Don, Tyler.
Cartledge, Albert J., III, Dallas.
Contreras, Juan Leonardo, Edinburg.
Cook, Nathaniel, Cleburne.
Early, Wiley B., Dallas.
Fuentes, Robert Martinez, Bartlett.
Guana, Daniel, Jr., Corpus Christi.
Gutierrez, Arturo B., Crosbyton.
Johnson, James Doyle, Bedford.
Melton, George Cecil, Three Rivers.
Munoz, Ernest Cedillo, San Antonio.
Newman, Robert Nelson, Odessa.
Padilla, Fidel, Laredo.
Phillips, Norris Arthur, Houston.
Ramsey, Henry Charles, Waco.
Salas, Felix Juan, Luling.
Trevino, Esteban Angel, Jr., Bay City.
Wheeler, Kennith Wayne, Brownwood.

UTAH

Army

Blain, James Allen, Huntsville.
Brown, Neil Shipp, Salt Lake City.
Cowdell, Melvin Thomas, Salt Lake City.
Palmer, Lyle Clint, Blanding.
Parker, Euan John Ernest, Brigham City.
Sommer, Douglas John, Kearns.

Marine Corps

Knoppert, Andre Louis, Salt Lake City.
Mascher, Brent Thomas, Salt Lake City.

VERMONT

Army

La Course, David Anthony, West Burke.
Lamonte, George Andrew, St. Albans.
Pettis, Steven Gene, Fair Haven.
Weston, Wendell Allen, Warren.
Witham, James George, Franklin.

VIRGINIA

Army

Barnes, Merrill, Colonial Heights.
Beale, Mills, III, Franklin.
Bradsby, Kernell Persone, Williamsburg.
Brown, George Arthur, Whaleyville.
Buchanan, Charles Don, Wise.
Gilmer, Giles Wilson, Lebanon.
Judy, Herman Leroy, Jr., Alexandria.
Lassiter, Richard Leon, Norfolk.
Mears, Ralph Judson, Jr., Norfolk.
Page, Gilbert Wayne, Poquoson.
Sigholtz, Robert H., Jr., North Springfield.
Silver, William F., Jr., Vinton.
Slaughter, William Shelley, Arlington
Smith, Charles Porter, Jr., Richmond.
Spencer, Kenneth Darrell, Fosters Falls.
Stewart, John Francis, Lynchburg.
Tharpe, Samuel Charles, Bentonville.
Tyler, Allen, Montvale.
Williams, Raymond Leroy, Alexandria.
Wilson, David Wayne, Bassett.
Wright, Gary Wayne, Hayes.

Marine Corps

Brown, Iran Courtland, Roanoke.
Starkes, Robert B., Jr., Glen Allen.
Thomas, George Dolbryn, Dayton.
Ward, James Clinton, Alexandria.

WASHINGTON

Army

Baker, Samuel Thomas, Naches.
Damitic, Martin Leo, Olympia.
Duro, Ignacio Escobar, Seattle.
Kraft, Donald Ray, Sappho.
Lickey, Michael Lewis, Monroe.
Paynter, Thomas Bernhard, Seattle.
Peterson, William J., Spokane.
Risher, Clarence Irwin, Belfair.
Snow, Earl Patrick, Prosser.

Marine Corps

Gillard, Gary Lee, Wenatchee.
Johnson, Henry David, Bremerton.
Lawson, Donny Ray, Grandview.
Lopeman, Stephen Ray, Port Townsend.

WEST VIRGINIA

Army

Borsay, Peter Samuel, Morgantown.
Clark, Roy Edward, Culloden.
Coffman, Freddie Lee, Hardy.
Dawson, Harold Carl, Jr., Wellsburg.
Haverland, Mark Joseph, Jr., Poca.
Ice, Wesley Gene, Bridgeport.
Kinney, David Washington, Charleston.
Koval, Robert Gary, Fairmont.
Lipscomb, Thomas Delano, Williamstown.
Moore, Teddy Ray, Shinnston.
Olenick, John David, Weirton.
Powell, Wavel Wayne, Kopperston.
Shiflett, David Henry, Montrose.
Workman, James Edward, Logan.

Marine Corps

Danehart, Edwin Russell, Elm Grove.
Haynes, Richard Wayne, Excelsior.
Ingram, Lafe, Crum.
Mayo, George Othel, Huntington.
Murphy, Herbert Burgess, Huntington.
Perry, Gordon Dean, Morgantown.
Taylor, Robert Thomas, Burlington.

WISCONSIN

Army

Babcock, Dennis Lee, Mauston.
Dickenson, Llewellyn Paul, Neopit.
Doll, Jerome Norman, Port Washington.
Dunbar, Roy William, Jr., Elkhorn.
Evans, William Anthony, Milwaukee.
Fahrni, Dale Allen, Spring Green.
Gustafson, Dennis Russel, Wentworth.
Heinrich, Gregory Allen, West Allis.
Janke, Keith Brian, Ashland.
Mee, Randall Alan, Tomah.
Robson, Timothy Francis, Green Bay.
Rosenow, Robert James, La Farge.
Schaefer, David Roy, Sturgeon Bay.
Singer, Alan Edward, Shawano.
Spurley, James Virgil, Jr., Madison.
Tessmer, David Lee, Wausau.
Treible, Thomas Charles, West Allis.

Marine Corps

Best, Patrick Wallace, West Allis.
Kirchner, John Ward, La Crosse.
McClure, Patrick Ryan, Racine.
Thomas, Larry Edward, Pittsville.
Thomas, William Philip, Belmont.
Walz, Gary Thomas, Prairie Du Chien.

Navy

Bredesen, David John, Whitelaw.
Johnson, Gary Allan, Madison.
Mahner, Lin Albert, Medford.
Stindl, Richard William, Beloit.

WYOMING

Marine Corps

Bustos, Candelaric Patrick, Rock Springs.

GUAM

Army

Perez, John Anthony, Dededo.

PUERTO RICO

Army

Alicea-Serrano, David, Rio Piedras.
Arroyo-Sierra, Felix, Jr., Las Piedras.
Galarza-Quinones, Jose M., Rio Piedras.
Marrero-Estrada, Heriberto, Bayamon.
Mendez-Ortiz, Fredes Vindo, Villalba.
Montoyo-Rodriquez Noberto, Barceloneta.
Rios, Pedro Antonio, Ponce.
Roman-Rodriguez, Edwin, Aguadilla.
Vazquez-Nieves, Ramon Luis, Puerto Nuevo.

Marine Corps

Torres-Rodriguez, Jose R., Guayama.

MONTHLY CASUALTY FIGURES

Calendar year	U.S. deaths as a result of action by hostile forces	U.S. nonfatal wounds as a result of action by hostile forces
1965		
January	12	109
February	45	254
March	15	79
April	41	126
May	32	172
June	71	272
July	76	347
August	88	547
September	97	545
October	169	823
November	469	1,470
December	254	1,370
1966		
January	282	1,318
February	435	2,624
March	507	2,960
April	316	2,470
May	464	2,882
June	507	2,779
July	435	2,326
August	396	2,470
September	419	2,652
October	340	2,189
November	475	2,998
December	432	2,424
1967		
January	520	3,456
February	662	2,853
March	944	5,314
April	710	4,964
May	1,233	8,3[illegible]0
June	830	4,946
July	781	5,471
August	535	4,604
September	775	6,909
October	733	4,122
November	881	4,165
December	774	4,841
1968		
January	1,202	7,483
February	2,124	9,464
March	1,543	11,614
April	1,410	9,409
May	2,169	11,947
June	1,146	9,943
July	813	6,107
August	1,080	6,079
September	1,053	6,802
October	600	4,391
November	703	5,157
December	749	4,424
1969		
January	795	5,569
February	1,073	5,966
March	1,316	7,904
April	847	9,726
May	1,211	7,635

XUM

YEARLY CASUALTY TOTALS

Calendar year	U.S. deaths as a result of action by hostile forces	U.S. nonfatal wounds as a result of action by hostile forces
1961	11	3
1962	31	78
1963	78	411
1964	147	1,039
1965	1,369	6,114
1966	5,008	30,093
1967	9,378	62,025
1968	14,592	92,820
1969[1]	[1] 5,242	[1] 36,800
Total	[1] 35,856	[1] 229,383

[1] Through May, 1969.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. **FINDLEY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all other Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in connection with my special order.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF ILLEGAL OCCUPATION OF POLAND OFFERS TRAGIC TESTIMONY TO COALITION GOVERNMENTS

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. **PUCINSKI**. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 25th anniversary of the illegal occupation of Poland by the Communists. It is a sad day for freedom-loving people all over the world, for indeed we have viewed for 25 years the gallant and valiant people of Poland enduring Communist bondage against their will.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken time today to note this observance because it affords those of my colleagues who would support efforts to impose a Communist coalition government on the people of South Vietnam an opportunity to see what happens to a country when there is coalition government with the Communists.

Poland and all of the captive nations of Europe serve as a living reminder—a living example—of how quickly a country loses her freedom once a coalition government gets a foothold in such a country, and how impossible it is to drive the Communists out once they have a hold on a nation.

Poland offers a notable example of Marxist-Leninist united-front methodology. While the armed forces of the Polish Government-in-exile—Armja Krajowa—were fighting during World War II, on the Western Allies' fronts, the CPSU/U.S.S.R. created another "liberation" army called Armja Ludowa—People's Army—which was participating in operations on the Soviet front. After the so-called liberation of Poland by the U.S.S.R., troops of the "London" armed forces were not permitted to return home because of their "capitalist-imperialist background."

With the loyal Polish patriots conveniently out of the way, the Communists, then a small minority, formed a government bloc of parties, consisting of Socialists, Communist-faction-controlled "Lublin" Peasant Party—Piast—and the "Democrats"—a party for intellectuals formed under Communist auspices—besides their own Workers' Party. In November 1945 the activities of the Independent Socialist group were banned and its leaders arrested through intervention by the Socialist leader M. Cyrankiewicz, a Communist ideopartisan. In December 1948, the Socialist Party "merged" with the Communist Workers' Party into a new party which was then described as "Marxist-Leninist Party, revolutionary and international and, therefore, expressing most fully the national interests of the Polish state."

In May 1948, the remaining Peasant Party reluctantly announced its "fusion" with the already Communist-controlled "Lublin" Peasant Party under a new name of the United Peasant Party, whose political program was identical with that of the United Polish Workers' Party (Communist).

The Polish national unity government was formed on the base of the decisions of the Yalta Conference and to this day continues illegally to keep 34 million Poles in Communist bondage against their will.

These are the tragic consequences of coalition government.

Once the Communists get a foothold, they create crisis after crisis and turmoil after turmoil until they wear down all other forces and ultimately take over.

I think we ought to look again and again at the tragedy of Poland and the other "captive" nations. In front of the National Archives Building there are two huge monuments. On one are inscribed the words, "What is past is prologue." On the other, "Study the past." Those who naively believe that forcing a Communist coalition government on the people of South Vietnam will lead somehow to a solution of the Southeast Asia problem need only look at the tragedy of Europe. Today 180 million people are behind the Iron Curtain, forced to suffer the indignities of communism, denied their freedom, denied human dignity, and in each instance the Communists got their footholds through coalition governments.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that for us to impose upon the Government of South Vietnam a coalition government would be an invitation to disaster in a very short time.

It would not be long before the Communists gained control and engaged in distortions such as we see in Poland today.

Recently the Polish Communist press carried a series of stories stating that I am "anti-Polish." The basis of these stories were speeches that I have made in the well of this House calling attention to the fact that the Communist rulers of Poland do not represent the people of Poland, and calling attention to the fact that the Communist government of Poland today is an illegal government, never sanctioned by the people of Poland, and if the Polish people had an opportunity, this government would be thrown out tomorrow.

In my Polish Constitution Day speech here on the floor of the House, I pointed out that the present Communist regime in Poland, unable to explain its own domestic failures, has tried to seek out a scapegoat, and so they tried to blame their problems and their failures on a handful of Polish Jews who still remain in Poland. Fifteen thousand Jews in all still remain in Poland. I said then, and I say now, it is the height of folly to suggest that the failures of communism in Poland can be blamed on a handful of Jews who still remain in that country.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, if the Polish Communist government wants to blame these Jews for its failures and domestic unrest, it has a very simple solution: give all of these Jewish people passports to leave Poland, to emigrate to some other country.

All that the Communists have to do is to issue these people passports. There are only 15,000 of them and all of them will leave tomorrow if permitted. But the Polish Communist government has ceased issuing passports. Why? Because once all the Jews are gone from Poland, the Communists would no longer have a scapegoat to blame for their failures.

Mr. Speaker, the Associated Press carried an item from Warsaw quoting some of the Polish press in Warsaw that I am anti-Polish because of my attacks on the Polish Communist government.

It is rather significant that in America, the Associated Press can, in pursuit of its freedom of the press, carry articles like that, even though the Associated Press knows they are not true. But I defy the Polish Government to let the Associated Press carry in Poland the true story of my attitude.

In the 11 years that I have been in the Congress of the United States I have fought the illegal government of Communists in Poland. Apparently my Radio Free Europe messages are getting through.

For the Polish Government to suggest I am anti-Polish is to torture the truth. I am not anti-Polish. I am proud of my Polish ancestry. My forefathers have contributed to the struggle for human dignity and I am proud of my own contribution on the battlefield for human freedom. I am not anti-Polish, but I am proud to say that I am anti-Communist.

The regime in Poland today is an illegal regime. It is there against the will of the people. It holds these people in bondage. It is a government that has broken faith with the people of Poland. Let the record be clear, I am not against the people of Poland, but I am against their illegal Communist government.

In 1956 the Gomulka regime came to power in Poland. Premier Gomulka promised liberalization for the Polish people. He promised an easing of their suffering under the days of Stalinist oppression. Great promises for greater freedom were made, but not one of those promises has been kept.

The United States, hopeful for a thaw from oppression for the Polish people, in the wake of Mr. Gomulka's ascendency to power in Poland, granted the Polish Government many concessions.

Poland is only one of two countries today enjoying "most-favored-nation treatment" in its foreign trade relations with the United States. We gave the Polish Government considerable concessions in tariffs, and we gave the Gomulka regime these concessions in the hopeful belief that somehow or other Poland could be weaned away from total Moscow rule. I stood in the well of the House year after year, defending the most-favored-nation treatment for Poland, and last year was most instrumental in saving the program when it was doomed to defeat.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps that doctrine should now be re-examined, for, indeed, since Mr. Gomulka ascended to power in Poland, in 1956, we have not seen any proof that he and his regime have restored to the Polish people any of the freedoms which they have historically enjoyed, nor has the Polish regime shown any independence from complete Moscow domination.

The Polish press is not free to write what it wants in Poland. Polish intellectuals and scholars and writers and poets are harassed by the Communists. No one can honestly say elections in Poland have any particular meaning. A single slate of Communist candidates is presented to the Polish people, and it becomes only a matter of choice as to which of the Communists will be worse than the other.

The church continues to suffer harassment from the Gomulka regime.

Is there anyone in the free world naive enough to suggest that the 34 million people of Poland have free elections and have an opportunity to elect their own parliament and elect their own government?

I can tell Members this, Mr. Speaker. If the 34 million people of Poland had the freedom to vote freely as they wish, there would not be a single Communist in the Government of Poland today. The Polish people never will be Communists and never will accept communism willingly. Their ties to freedom go back 1,000 years. The people of Poland were the first to bring to the European continent a concept of humanity when they adopted their Constitution of May 3.

Poland continues to be a slave of Soviet rule. Her raw materials are forcibly exported to Russia and in the barbaric invasion of Czechoslovakia, Premier Gomulka was the first to offer his allegiance and support to the Kremlin. Is this the "independence" we are supporting through our concessions to Poland?

So I say, Mr. Speaker, today on this 25th anniversary of the Communist seizure of Poland, all Americans and free peoples throughout the world ought to pause and think of the consequences of coalition governments with the Communists. There are other coalition governments in Europe that give us living examples of what happens when we give the Communists a foothold in the government.

The Czechoslovak Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had a treaty in December 1943, which among other subjects laid also the foundation for the formation of CSR Armed Forces on the Soviet front under the command of General Svoboda, now president of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic—CSR. Czechoslovak Armed Forces of the government-in-exile in London who fought on the Western front were permitted to return home, where they were politically isolated because of their cooperation with the "imperialists"—the West—and finally completely removed from the armed forces after the Communist coup of February 1948.

In accordance with the Kosice program of April 1945, a national front government of four Czech and two Slovak parties was constituted. First steps toward the control of Socialist parties by the Communists were taken during the war, when the exiled leaders of the Czech Social Democratic Party in London and Moscow accepted for the sake of "allied unity" the leadership of the Social Democrat Fierlinger, a Communist ideo-partisan (fellow-traveler).

In the first Czechoslovak Government set up after the war in 1945, the Communists took charge of the Ministry of Interior—internal security, police, gendarmeries, and so forth—as well as the Ministries of Information and Agriculture. In Slovakia the Social Democrats "merged" with the Communists in 1944.

In 1948 with the help of the Red Guards—workers' militia—the action committees—party factions in nonparty organizations—and the armed intervention of the national police, the Communist Party—KSCZ—seized power through a coup d'etat. The present Czechoslovak Socialist Government is still nominally a national front government composed of political parties whose political programs are identical with the program of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.

Both in Poland and Czechoslovakia, the insurrections of August, 1944, of the internal resistance forces were crushed by the German forces because of the "inactivity" of the U.S.S.R. Armed Forces standing by. The Warsaw uprising under General Bor-Komorowski and the Slovak uprising under Colonel Golian.

In Hungary a patriotic peoples front competed in the elections of November 1945. Of the votes cast for the front the Smallholders Party obtained 57 percent, the Social Democrats 17 percent, and the Communists 16 percent. Despite their relatively small poll, the Communists nevertheless claimed the Deputy Premiership for M. Rakosi as well as the Ministries of Interior, Communications, and Social Welfare. They were thus in the control of the national police and gendarmerie and communications. In 1948 the Social Democratic Party "fused with the Communist Party." After the liquidation of the Socialist Party and the Catholic People's Party, Communist leader M. Rakosi announced the formation of the National Independence Party and the institution of a single list of candidates in the next election after which the democratic government in Hungary came to an end. U.S.S.R. Armed Forces were present in Hungary during this transition period from "capitalism to socialism."

In Bulgaria the fatherland front was formed on the 9th of September 1944, the day on which U.S.S.R. Armed Forces arrived in that country. This front was composed of "Zveno" Republicans, Agrarians, Social Democrats, and Communists. The Communist Party first attacked the Agrarian Party which had the support of two-thirds of the population, and was strongly pro-Western. The Communists imposed a new executive committee on the party and arranged for a new leader to be demanded. The fall of Social Democrats followed swiftly, the Social Democratic Party was of nonreliable elements and merged with the Communist Worker's Party in August 1948. The Zveno Republican Party disappeared in the spring of 1949.

The Social Democratic Party in Rumania agreed to join the Communist Party in October 1944 which formed the people's democratic front against the National Peasant Party and the Liberal Party. When the Communist-faction-controlled front was imposed by the U.S.S.R. Government intervention in March 1945, the Social Democrats remained in the government with three ministers drawn from the left—Communist-faction-controlled—wing of the party. The Communists fostered disagreements inside the party—right-wing—and infiltrated CP factions into its central committee. Merger of the Social Democrats and the Communists took place in February 1948. The destruction of the Peasant Party followed through staged trial of the party's leader and followed by the formation of a pseudo-peasant group and total suppression of the original party, allegedly on its own wish, on January 22, 1949. U.S.S.R. Armed Forces remained in occupation during this period of restructuring of the Rumanian society.

In January 1949 attempts were made to resurrect the Front Popolaire of 1935 by forming a movement for the formation of a government of democratic union in which the Communist Party of France—CPF—would assume the responsibilities entrusted to it by 6 million French voters. French Communists have not stopped since in attempting to form various types of fronts to suit the conditions in the country. Attempts to form a national front of liberation in Spain continue to the present time. The Communist Party of Spain is illegal and operates from exile in Czechoslovakia.

Today there are united front governments in North Korea, Laos, Kerala and West Bengal states in India, and united fronts in many countries where the Communists are seeking power.

From the foregoing description and excerpts of the role and tactics of united fronts and national liberation movements a question remains open concerning the background and role of the Third World liberation movement, the American liberation movement and a multitude of other united fronts in America.

So we see, Mr. Speaker, example after example of how the Communists destroy the freedom of a nation when they get a foothold.

I would say to you today, on this 25th anniversary, that it should serve as a living reminder to all Americans. We want peace. We want to live in peace

XUM

with the world. But we want the people of this world to have an opportunity to enjoy their freedom.

The gallant people of Poland suffered bitterly through World War II. Their sacrifices are beyond description.

We remember well the Warsaw uprising, when indeed the Polish people could have driven the Nazis out of Poland and restored their freedom, and the Nazi Wehrmacht pounded away at the heroic Poles who were fighting against these huge German armies with their bare hands, clubs, sticks and shovels, and those brave and gallant Poles held out for months trying to beat off the yoke of Nazism that was holding Warsaw and Poland in bondage. Those Poles could have won that heroic uprising against the Nazis if they had gotten an iota of help from the Communists, but the Soviet Air Force and Soviet fighters were sitting on air bases across the Vistula, watching Warsaw burn and waiting for the collapse of the Polish people so that the Communists could walk in.

Why doesn't the press in Poland tell the Polish people about this Soviet infamy?

Mr. Speaker, we remember well the gallant struggle of General Bor-Komerowski for the freedom of the Polish people.

You cannot separate the barbarity of the Nazis from the barbarity of the Russians but Mr. Gomulka and his Communist puppets remain silent about this Communist deceit.

Nor, on this 25th anniversary, will the Polish leaders in Poland today talk about the tragedy of Katyn.

We remember well the Katyn Forest massacre.

The Polish Communist government would like to have you believe that Congressman PUCINSKI is anti-Polish, but to this day the Polish Government has not dared tell its people that it was Congressman PUCINSKI who was the chief investigator of the Katyn Committee, which investigated this massacre for the Congress of the United States and it was Congressman PUCINSKI who was the architect of the first indictment against the Soviet Union for committing one of the most monstrous crimes of man's time, when the Soviet Union methodically selected 15,000 of Poland's best officers, her reservist doctors and lawyers and scholars and businessmen and scientists—methodically selected these 15,000 Polish officers, in uniform of the Polish Armed Forces, at the beginning of World War II, and then, under guard, transferred them to the Katyn Forest near Smolensk, Russia, and there brutally assassinated them and buried their bodies in mass graves. This was one of the most infamous crimes ever committed by the Communists, and the Polish press remains to this day mute on this subject, afraid to tell the Polish people that it was the Soviet Union which was responsible for the Katyn massacre.

The Communist-controlled press in Poland can go ahead and smear me all they want. The fact of the matter is that sooner or later freedom will be restored to Poland and the Polish people will eventually learn the truth. The Polish people know the truth today, because they know that the present regime continues its blind loyalty to Moscow and its surrender of Polish freedom to Soviet rule.

The Polish people are not free. So long as this Communist regime remains in Poland and holds the Polish people against their will and in Communist bondage, the conscience of the free world cannot rest nor should we be frightened by Communist reprisals in the Moscow-controlled press.

Mr. Speaker, we have a lesson to learn. The great sacrifice made by the Polish people living today under the Communist yoke should be a lesson to all Americans. We, too, can lose our freedom when we lose faith in the dignity and the freedom of man. We only need to look to those countries behind the Iron Curtain to see how poignant is this message.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time today to call attention to the fact that this 25th anniversary of the illegal seizure of Poland should be a reminder to all of us that we cannot rest and cannot be deterred from our determination that freedom in this country shall not perish.

I have also taken the time to remind us of other nations of Europe that fell to communism because of coalition governments.

HISTORIC WHITE HOUSE SERMON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Holifield and I had the privilege of attending the President's morning church service at the White House on Sunday, July 20. Our thoughts and the thoughts of all those in attendance were, of course, focused on the three American astronauts who were at that time preparing for a landing on the moon. The sermon, entitled "Reaching for the Moon" was delivered by Dr. Paul S. Smith, president of Whittier College and the first member of the Religious Society of Friends to be invited to particpate in the President's Sunday morning services.

I might add that in keeping with the mention of Whittier College Mrs. Holifield and I were accompanied by the summer intern in my office, David Edinger, a senior at Whittier College and like Dr. Smith, a member of the Society of Friends.

Dr. Smith's sermon was especially appropriate on that day in history and his remarks also expressed our Nation's desire to reach for another great goal, that of achieving world peace.

At this time I include the text of Dr. Smith's sermon, "Reaching for the Moon," in the RECORD.

REACHING FOR THE MOON

(By Dr. Paul S. Smith)

It seems fitting that all in this auspicious congregation should know that I enjoy a long established and tender relationship to our host. He was a major student in history and government in the Whittier College department of which I was the chairman.

He himself may not know that as an undergraduate at Earlham I earned my way in part as an itinerant minister of the Indiana Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends. But never in my most evangelistic moment as a birthright Quaker did I ever see myself as standing in the presence of the mighty to proclaim the word.

Nor am I now a wandering prophet. I am by gracious invitation with the general directive to concern myself with the historical import of the moon landing and its relation to world peace. Because of my profession and my birthright, I could scarcely have spoken otherwise and shall therefore entitle my sermonette, "Reaching for the Moon."

For centuries man has used the expression literally and figuratively to describe an essentially human characteristic which, paradoxically, is at once the most infantile and mature capability that makes him what he is. In the fond groping of the cradled child we smile upon the act with tender commiseration. In the fantastic insight that produced the simple formula $e=mc^2$, we behold with awe man's ability to find out the combination of God's most secret locks.

For most of us, one must confess, maturation is a process of capitulation. We gradually resign ourselves to successive recognitions of goals that are beyond our reach. For most of us life acquires a network of enveloping guidelines that surround us with conventional limitation. It is the poet then, the artist-poet, fancy's child, who alone can find it in his heart to say, "Ah, but a man's reach should exceed his grasp, or what's a heaven for?"

There would seem to be a certain spark of artistry in us all until it is snuffed out in the stuffy atmosphere of the worldly network. And even the artist comes to recognize the limitations of his medium, be it paint, wood, stone, bronze, sound, or lanugage.

The philosopher is in a somewhat different case. His medium is his own artifact, language, and in a sense language is not subject to the limitations of the other media I have mentioned. As the poet works his wonders with word-borne images, so the philosopher applies his magic to word-fabricated abstractions. He can take the terms *knowing, powerful,* and *present* and place before them the prefix *all* and *ever;* he can then take the word *God* and with the word *is* and make the sentence "God is all-knowing, all-powerful, and ever-present."

As a student of history and government, I am profoundly conscious at this epochal moment in the history of mankind that most of this selected gathering are responsible members of the oldest political democracy in that history. And I am struck by the irony of the fact that the context is one in which the term *light-year* is becoming a house-hold word, for I must remind you ladies and gentlemen that this democracy has yet to celebrate its second centennial. It is, indeed, younger than the city of San Diego.

I am further mindful that the charter and the later constitution of this most stable of political democracies was the inspired work of philosophers who worked with such magic abstractions as *all, unalienable, right, liberty,* and *justice,* and that many of them in their context were deliberately subscribing to the "unalienable right" of revolution while in the very act of composing the verbal guidelines for the establishment of law and order.

It may be said within my remarks that the year 1787 was a great year for rational thinking that prerequisite for an enduring Republic. Hopefully there is a mystical strength to be found by our people simply in speaking of this on a First Day in the White House, this place of great tradition which so dramatically relates reverence and patriotism, realism and compassion.

There is no other framework in which any of our contemporary economic, political, or educational problems can be reasonably approached. There is no need to specify the character of any of these when the pecu-

XUM

liarity of each one is of lesser importance than is the matter of method common for solving all of them. This is a difficult lesson to teach and a hard one to learn but we need to make a very thoughtful effort to reverse the dangerous doctrine that the end justifies the means.

But back to the philosopher: here one who usually finds himself faced with apparent contradictions of principle when moving in the company of philosophers and lawyers. It was a philosopher, by the way, who, two thousand years ago, first recounted a voyage to the moon. Lucian called it *The True History* but confessed in the preface that he wrote "of things which are not and never could have been." It was a political satirist's precautionary disclaimer, because his real subject was the stupidity of human warfare. His lunar voyagers got caught up in internedine strife between the moonmen and the sunmen over the colonization of Venus!

If there is something instructive in the thought, it may be the implication that after two millenia of philosophy men are still fighting over real estate and still dying in the name of philosophical abstractions, but that a voyage to the moon is just as feasible (though somewhat more expensive) as a trip to Timbuktu. And this fact suggests my last consideration of the scientists.

I do not mean the scientists as a man, but man as scientist. For there are profound implications relevant to my present directive in scientific procedures. The general polity in the republic of science is democratic; logic and corroboration are the sole tests of validity and truth; a commitment to clear communication and unreserved cooperation are essential. If scientists compete with one another, it is because they are human, not because they are scientists. But I do not wish to imply that scientists do not have emotions relevant to their field. They may be said to worship truth and their concept of elegance might well be called the beauty of simplicity.

The titanic operation now coming to its magnificant conclusion is certainly the most prodigious demonstration of the reasoned behavior of cooperative humanity in the continuing drama of civilization. Can such behavior be motivated only by the fact of competition and the threat of war?

"The question," said Esme Wingfield-Stratford between the two world wars, "whose answer spells life or death for civilized man is being put with ever more menacing insistence—are the human mind and spirit capable of being adapted to the requirements of a Machine Age? With blind precipitancy, we have revolutionized our environment; it has yet to be seen whether we can effect a corresponding revolution in ourselves. If the old platitude about human nature being unchangeable is really true, there is nothing for it but to design ourselves to the doom that has overtaken every species whose circumstances have changed more rapidly than its powers of adaptation. The next experiment in suicide need not lack for completeness.

"To face facts is not to counsel pessimism. We know that human nature can be changed because history shows us that it is constantly changing. We have faith that it must and shall be changed, in time to save the bright adventure of our civilization from ruin. God's image must not be allowed to go the way of the giant lizards, its predecessors."

My own faith in mankind is renewed this morning in the knowledge that countless millions of all nations are praying today not so much that one brave astronaut may set foot upon the moon, but that three brave astronauts may put their feet again upon the earth. And my own hope for mankind is strengthened in the knowledge that our intrepid President himself will soon go into orbit, reaching boldly for the moon for peace. God grant that he, too, may return in glory and that the countless millions of prayers that follow him shall not have been uttered in vain.

FOREIGN INFORMATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today we join in tremendous admiration for all of those Americans who have contributed to landing on the moon. This achievement is a gigantic tribute to our scientific community, our business enterprise, and to the personal courage of our astronauts.

Aside from all the other fantastic aspects of this event that we are so aware of today, there seems no question but that this is one American event which, because of its immense significance and drama, is today becoming known to persons throughout the world.

This is one part of the American story which is going into homes in almost every country on television, radio, and in newspapers, magazines, by word of mouth and by every other form of human communication.

Furthermore, the story of this event is being told in ways which certainly are at least generally accurate. And the story is being told with minimum effort of U.S. Government personnel. It is being brought to the world substantially by non-Government communication media of various kinds and origins.

But what about the far less dramatic, but still important, parts of the American story? What about presenting to the world the accurate story of successes and failures on American college campuses, about our farm life, about our business enterprise and about our system of representative government?

These and other aspects of our Nation are not so dramatically told to citizens of other countries and yet it is important to us that they are understood in realistic terms.

In the Smith-Mundt Act of 1948 Congress first gave authorization to U.S. Government information, education, and cultural programs overseas. In the two decades since then these programs have proceeded largely under direction of the U.S. Information Agency.

I take the position that the importance of these programs is vastly underrated in terms of attention that we in Congress give to them. They are important because they have a real bearing on the success or failure of our overall foreign policy objectives.

This is one of the most sensitive, vital things this Government is doing and yet these programs are being conducted off in a corner without anyone except those directly involved able to know what these activities are, and whether they are effective or not.

I believe it is a safe observation that few of us in this Congress have more than the most generalized knowledge of just what it is that the USIA is doing. And I believe it is safe to say that even fewer of us can make a useful judgment as to whether the USIA is operating as well as it should in the national interest.

In the same legislation Congress enacted providing for these informational programs there is included provision for the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information as a group to serve as continuing observer of USIA activities.

That group in 1968 issued a valuable and comprehensive report recommending a "searching reexamination" of USIA programs. This year it again has urged a thorough review of these programs.

That position was supported in 1968 by the Fascell subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Yet to my knowledge Congress has taken no additional steps to carry through these recommendations.

With this in mind, on July 10, I introduced H.R. 12726, the Foreign Information Act. This bill provides for implementation of the Advisory Commission's plan: the establishment of a committee for the purpose of conducting a full review of U.S. Government foreign information activities.

Cosponsors of this legislation are as follows: Mr. JOHN B. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ROBERT TAFT, JR. of Ohio, Mr. J. GLENN BEALL, JR., of Maryland, Mr. HOWARD W. POLLOCK of Alaska, Mr. DANIEL E. BUTTON of New York, Mr. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL of Maryland, Mr. GEORGE ANDREWS of Alabama and Mr. DANTE B. FASCELL of Florida.

I welcome additional cosponsors for this bill, and it is my hope that it will be accorded full consideration at an early date.

There is no partisan element to this project. There is no ideological question. And there is no crusade involved here except the national interest.

A moment ago I mentioned the 1968 report of the U.S. Advisory Commission in support of its recommendation. I include brief portions of that report at this point in my remarks as an indication of the kinds of topics with which it is concerned:

> It is time for a searching reexamination of USIA mission and execution. We recommend, first, that such a study be authorized and, second, that it be accomplished both outside the Agency and beyond the confines of an executive or legislative investigation. It is our view that an independent organization should be retained under contract to conduct not only a detailed inspection of how well USIA functions under its present understanding of its mission, but of how best to reshape that mission to a changing world.
>
> We recommend further that, as there is need for a new look at USIA, so also is there need for reexamination of the role—and indeed the existence—of the Commission on Information. Our mission, too, must be responsive to the times, and we invite Congressional satisfaction of that question.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The question of major interest is not whether USIA has done well in the past, but whether it might do better in the future. This Commission thinks it can, particularly in the area of educational and cultural exchange. The continued separation of the exchange programs into United States Information Service (USIS) administration abroad and Department of State administration in Washington has become an anachronism, an anomaly leading to ineffectiveness, excessive bureaucracy, and to an unfortunate diminution in funds for this imperative segment of long-range communications effort overseas. We believe that division should end; that it

is time to draw together into a restructured USIA, or into a new independent agency, the reins leading to our now fractionalized public affairs programs overseas.

* * * * *

The Commission recognizes the difficulty in coordinating the media and producing multimedia projects and campaigns, in coordinating what the media are doing with what the areas need, and in establishing procedures for communicating more effectively within the Agency in Washington and between headquarters and the field. This is a management problem of the first order. Communications need to be improved up and down the line in order that Agency policy and purpose be shared by all. Because of the size of the organization and the worldwide range of its operations, a gulf often separates top management from the rest of the organization. An agency expert in fostering the communication of ideas among the nations of the world should be adept in exchanging ideas and suggestions among its own.

The Commission is concerned about the swollen staff in headquarters. There is danger, as a previous Commission said, that USIA Washington is becoming a bureaucracy with so many unexamined routines, controls, restrictions and clearances, and with so much paper production, that administrative arteries have begun to clog and ossification to set in. A deliberate effort should be made to break down the compartmentalization that has characterized headquarters operation. As a relatively small agency, USIA still has an opportunity to prevent the entrenchment of excessive bureaucracy.

* * * * *

But while urgent information seems slow in coming, certain less urgent materials arrive all too quickly—those which ought not appear at all. Many overseas posts, and especially the smaller ones, find the constant internal communications bombardment unending and inundating. The ironic result—many officers are tied to their in-baskets. Both paper and paperwork need to be reduced, lest the main task go undone. As one PAO reports:

"The problem of paperwork is really one of quantity. . . . We have just made a three-month survey which shows that five thousand [communications per month] *is a minimal average. It is not only the communications from Washington, but there are the letters from the host country nationals, which average about 43% of the total.*

"If the post's main job is communicating to the nationals of the host country, which implies a certain amount of guidance or information about the resources from Washington, then it is time that the Agency took drastic steps to curtail the quantity of pieces of paper which the average post must, if not handle, at least move from the in-basket to the out-basket—or the waste paper basket."

* * * * *

We say it is time to examine assumptions.

Is the United States Information Agency to be but an agent of American "propaganda"? Should it be more than an arm of foreign policy? Are information, educational and cultural objectives compatible within one agency? Were they consolidated outside of the Department of State, should that body have Cabinet rank? Or should the reins be drawn together within a restructured Department of State? Does the responsibility of those who create the foreign policy of the United States go beyond its declaration? Should they have charge of its promulgation as well? Should USIA have a hand in information dispersal for Government agencies beyond the Department of State? Should it play a role in the influence of policy as well as in its execution? Should it help support those private organizations whose overseas activities had been subsidized covertly in the past by the federal government and whose future funding is under study by a committee chaired by the Secretary of State? Do we really intend that USIA work toward *"mutual* understanding"; is it to help us understand them as well as to help them understand us?

We presume to pose the questions but not to propound their answers. Our earnest hope is that others will join in the seeking after them.

Finally, we call to the attention of Congress the reality that this Commission, like USIA, is itself 20 years after the fact. The incumbent members feel it timely to suggest that the Congress give similar overview to the role of this body in discharging Congressional intent, and to the question of whether, indeed, it has fulfilled its mission. We submit respectfully to the question.

* * * * *

LET US GO DOWN TO THE STATION AND WATCH AMERICA'S LAST PASSENGER TRAIN COME IN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, in an earlier, more rustic—and probably happier—time, one of the supposed pleasures of smalltown life was going down to the station to watch the train come in.

I do not know where it is going to happen, nor exactly when, but one day soon, unless we do something about it, the residents of some town here in our land will have the doubtful privilege of going down to the depot and watching America's last remaining passenger train come in.

The question of the decline of railway passenger service—in this supposedly most technically advanced Nation in the world that is now in the process of sending men to the moon and, hopefully, returning them safely—is one of the greatest examples of legislative and administrative neglect that I can think of; like the weather, "everybody talks about it, but nobody does anything about it."

Mr. Speaker, it is time we stopped talking and wringing our hands and did something about preserving a base on which to rebuild railway passenger service in this Nation, for it is far later in this respect than most of us think.

Last week, Wednesday, the Interstate Commerce Commission, which has been as guilty of neglect of this most serious problem in recent years as anyone else, transmitted its report entitled "Investigation of Costs of Intercity Rail Passenger Service" to the Committee on Commerce in the other body and to our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, along with a covering letter from its Chairman, Virginia Mae Brown. This is a rather forbidding document, full of statistical information about how difficult it really is to measure the true and separable operating losses of those rail systems that still, with the utmost reluctance, offer what passes for railway passenger service today.

But all that, Mr. Speaker, is of far lesser importance than some of the statements and the recommendation made by the commission's chairman, in her covering letter. I would like to now quote some of the key passages therefrom, and ask my colleagues to listen closely, for what she says is of extreme importance to all of us and, if anything, adds up to a gross understatement of the true depth of the problem with which we are faced in this connection.

Mrs. Brown states:

> The past year has only substantiated our opinion that significant segments of the remaining intercity service, except for rail service in high density population corridors, such as the Northeast Corridor, will not survive the next few years without a major change in Federal and carrier policies. In June, 1968, there were approximately 590 regular intercity trains providing service. Today, there are less than 500 regular intercity trains in scheduled service. A number of the last trains which are still operating have been proposed for discontinuance because of increasing losses. Approximately 50 of the remaining intercity trains are presently involved in discontinuance proceedings before this Commission.

And:

> We continue to believe that the paramount requirement for establishing an adequate national policy for noncorridor intercity rail passenger service is a broad evaluation of what rail service is required by the public for medium and long-distance trips outside of major population corridors, how much the provision of that service will cost, and what Federal assistance is necessary to provide that required level of service.
>
> Unless a study similar to the one recommended by this Commission last year and introduced as in S. 3861 and H.R. 18212 in the 90th Congress is begun immediately, intercity rail passenger service in this country appears destined to be reduced even more drastically in the next two years. We cannot overemphasize the need for immediate action if a minimal network of passenger service is to be preserved, and massive capital outlays for equipment avoided.

Then, this recommendation:

> In view of the need for prompt resolution of this problem and the mounting losses to the carriers, we urge that such a study be completed in no less than twelve months and that, in the interim, more restrictive provisions be placed on the discontinuance of the last remaining passenger trains on intercity rail routes in operation today. Relief from operating losses of other trains would still be possible under the present discontinuance procedures, except for those last trains which are shown to be required by the public.

Mr. Speaker, when Mrs. Brown speaks of "last trains," I am keenly aware of the question she raises for, at this very moment, only a temporary stay-of-execution has prolonged the life of southern tier New York's only remaining passenger trains, the Erie-Lackawanna's trains Nos. 5 and 6, called the "Lake Cities" and operating now 7 days a week between Chicago and Hoboken, N.J. Originally scheduled to be dropped July 18—last Friday—the ICC has ordered the company to keep them in operation, pending an investigation, at least until next November 14.

The pattern of that investigation—and its eventual result, again unless something is done—is predictable. In fact, if I participate therein, or in whatever official hearings may be held by the ICC, I will feel as if I were watching a "late, late show" that I had seen several times before for this will be the third, but now final, experience the commu-

XUM

nities I am privileged to represent here in Congress will have had with the Erie-Lackawanna's inexorable drive to divest itself of the burden of carrying any more "human freight." Of course, the Erie-Lackawanna is no different from the rest of America's railroads in this respect—apparently none of them want any longer anything to do with a passenger service unless it be to experiment, at substantial Federal expense, with high-speed, limited-service trains like the New York-Washington Metroliner.

Now I happen to have long since lost patience with railroad management in this connection. I think their attitude that railway passenger service is necessarily a hopeless financial risk is shortsighted, temporarily self-serving, and certainly a far cry from those more adventuresome and optimistic early railroaders who built this Nation's rail system, and, at the same time, helped build a nation.

I have spoken about this here before, in this Chamber, and have decried both the railroad management's attitude and its deliberate attempts to make rail passenger service so inadequate and inconvenient as to kill it off piecemeal—which is something Mrs. Brown's statistics do not and cannot show—and the ICC's tendency to act in recent years like a "county coroner" in certifying to the death of the service with never a thought for suggesting preventive medicine, which was the brave criticism advanced by John S. Messer, an ICC examiner, in the case of the Southern Pacific's once crack train, "The Sunset."

I wonder whatever happened to Mr. Messer—an unsung hero who tried to stick his finger in the dike.

But it serves no purpose, Mr. Speaker, to point the finger of blame at any one direction in this connection, and, truth to tell, if we point too accurately we will end up also pointing at ourselves, for Congress has done nothing in recent years to recognize this advancing problem, or to lay the foundation for a true national transportation policy and system based thereon in which railway passenger service will necessarily be a keystone.

In 1967, I testified before the Commerce Committee in the other body in support of a bill that would have declared a moratorium on further passenger train discontinuance until the kind of study Mrs. Brown is now talking about had been made. I said, then, we were well on the road toward the ultimate and early elimination of virtually all railway passenger service and I quoted then-President Johnson's statement to the effect that—

> In a nation that spans a continent, transportation is the web of union.

Then I urged the necessity of preserving a basic rail passenger service as an integral part of that "web," and called for a truly integrated national plan for air and surface transportation designed to meet the needs of the America of tomorrow.

My plea was an earnest one, but evidently not compelling, for nothing was done.

Mr. Speaker, it is very late in this respect, and something must now be done.

We are a nation of 200 million people, reaching toward 300 million. We are paving mile after mile of super-highways and, incidentally, the size of the Federal investment in the Metroliner, to show how badly our priorities may be off, is about equal to the cost of 14 miles of expressway, and worrying our heads off over air-congestion problems that, for most major cities, have become a real safety question, while meanwhile permitted the discontinuance of over 200 interstate passenger trains in the last 2½ years; trains that, had the service they rendered been attractive, might have carried who knows how many people and reducing highway and air congestion by that same factor.

I am not plugging rail travel over any other form of travel but, on the other hand, having mentioned safety it is worthwhile noting that, using the traditional yardstick of the casualty rate per 100-million passenger miles, rail travel is three and a half times safer than air travel, nearly twice as safe as bus travel, and more than 23 times as safe as travel by automobile. And, as the Metroliner experiment shows, certain rail travel can be as fast and considerably more-convenient than air travel over shorter intercity distances, when figured to one's ultimate point of destination.

In any event, as Publius wrote, centuries ago, "Amid a multitude of projects, no plan is devised," and that, Mr. Speaker, has been the source of our problem, or, as the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER) said here, earlier this year, it is necessary to stop thinking in terms of another highway, another airport, and so on, and to begin "utilizing and locking together the pieces of our national transportation puzzle."

Mr. WEICKER's remarks were offered in connection with his introduction of a bill which he entitled the "Federal Transportation Act," aimed at encouraging coordinated State transportation planning, interrelated with neighboring State plans, and which bill would create a "transportation trust fund" from which, apparently, Federal assistance in support of the various forms of air and surface transportation systems would be drawn.

I am not prepared to say that the Weicker bill's language and provisions could not be improved upon; but I am convinced that it points us in the right direction, and I plan to be a cosponsor of it with him when he reintroduces it in the near future.

For piecemeal programs and piecemeal "solutions," whether emanating from downtown or cultivated here on Capitol Hill, can produce neither a true national transportation policy nor a balanced national transportation system.

This is why, though recognizing the problem areas to which they are addressed, I view with some concern such well-intentioned proposals in the transportation field as those made by the President, himself, recently for a trust-fund supported airport and airways developmental program, or by such legislators as Senator WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, and others including several House Members for a trust-fund supported program to relieve the increasingly urgent commuter-crunch in the mass transit area.

To my mind, these are after the nature of crash programs, aimed at financing a single type of service, and which, though perhaps needed, do not help move us in the direction of a balanced transportation system based on a soundly planned national transportation policy, which is precisely what we now lack.

One can well forecast the kind of hurdles a proposal such as that made by Mr. WEICKER will have to get over in working its way through the jurisdictional jungle posed by the competitive administrative agencies or departments and bureaus in the transit field downtown, and the equally competitive committee structure here in Congress. But it is necessary to try for the "transportation system" we have today in America is not a system at all. Instead, it is a group of different transit modes, each with its inherent advantages and disadvantages, none of which is equipped to do the whole job, and each with its own supporters. Such a "system" is not the product of any plan but instead a fragmented, uncoordinated and wasteful effort serving no overall goal in terms of the national interest.

Besides which, as our former colleague from Maryland, Senator MATHIAS, pointed out some weeks ago, some of these modes of transportation are regulated while others are not, some are subsidized—and heavily subsidized—while others are not, and "there is constant competition for the tax dollar."

Senator MATHIAS went on to note:

> The component parts of the "system" are not developed as a whole. The public is not served to the extent it might be because of this patchwork of regulations and subsidies which help to prevent the development of the best in each transportation system.
>
> To administer these highway, airway, waterway and a variety of other programs, a number of Federal agencies (have) over the years sprung up. None (is) concerned with the needs of the other. Each (has) its own promotional job to do. Each (tends) to serve as special counsel and advocate for its own kind of transportation.

Then Senator MATHIAS states:

> The job of the Department of Transportation, it seems to me, is to rationalize these differences. (But) as yet, this concept has not taken hold.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is understandable why, in the recent change of administrations, DOT's new Secretary, Mr. Volpe, has needed time to review and get to understand the nature of this Nation's transportation problems, and to determine how best to begin to meet them. I respect the need for such time on his part, but I would hope that by now the clear and obvious nature of the need for coordination and national planning has reached home, and that this Congress would soon now receive the recommendations of Mr. Volpe or the President along the lines I have been suggesting.

In the meantime, I believe we here in Congress must do what we can to save what remains of intercity rail passenger service as at least a base on which to

XUM

eventually rebuild such a service, for it will surely be needed.

Thus, we should proceed with early committee consideration of what Mrs. Brown has had to say; making the kind of basic study needed to determine how much intercity railway passenger service the public interest demands, both for present needs and to preserve a foundation on which to build so as to meet projected future needs, perhaps through extension of the Metroliner concept; finding out how much that present level of minimum service will cost to maintain, and working with railroad management to determine some cooperative arrangement for financing such service until a broader and more permanent plan, perhaps along Mr. WEICKER's suggested lines, can be worked out.

As Mrs. Brown notes in her covering letter to the aforementioned committees, a bill to accomplish her basic recommendations is already pending before our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This is H.R. 12084, as introduced by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SKUBITZ) and others, and I am, today, introducing a similar measure, H.R. 12084 and my bill, when it has received a number, are similar to H.R. 18212 as introduced in the previous Congress and to which Mrs. Brown referred in portions of her letter I have previously quoted from. It authorizes a 12-month study, to be made by the Secretary of Transportation, acting in cooperation with the ICC and other interested Federal agencies and departments, "of the existing and future potential for intercity railroad passenger service in the United States."

In making this study, the bill directs the Secretary to consider, among other things, existing resources of all types for meeting the Nation's present passenger transportation needs; the anticipated expansion of those resources by 1975 on the basis of current governmental or private efforts, mentioning the interstate highway program as one example; the Nation's expected passenger transportation needs in both 1975 and 1985; the ability of the existing resources, or resources as expanded by current governmental or private programs, to meet those anticipated needs adequately, safely, and so forth, by at least as far ahead as 1975; the ability of improved railroad passenger service, specifically, to help meet those anticipated needs, and the proper role of the carriers and governmental bodies in developing the required quality and quantity of such service, including specifically methods of financing operations "which are necessary but not economically visible."

In addition to providing for such a study, which is where we at least need to begin, H.R. 12084 addresses itself, as did Mrs. Brown, to the immediate problem relating to the discontinuance of the last remaining passenger trains on intercity rail routes in operation today. It seeks to do this by directing the Commission to require such "last remaining trains" to be continued for 1 year, under certain circumstances, despite the carrier's wish to discontinue the same, and will shift the "burden of proof" for establishing the fact that "public convenience and necessity" permit the discontinuance of any such train to the carrier—a burden heretofore carried by the public in its efforts to show the continuing need for such trains on its part.

Although this portion of the bill sounds rather harsh I believe the exigencies of the situation in which we find ourselves in this respect, as so well illustrated by the situation now existing in Southern Tier New York, require strong medicine and, as Mrs. Brown has also pointed out, relief from operating losses of other than "last trains" would still be available to the carriers in question under existing procedures used by the ICC.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I introduced H.R. 11162, a companion to Mr. PELLY's bill to serve the same purposes, which would also establish a Commission on Passenger Railroads, such Commission to be composed of 12 members appointed by the President and including representatives of railroad labor and management, as well as public and private members. This proposal may still be useful, but in light of Mrs. Brown's stated position and the availability of the Skubitz proposal, I think it would expedite matters if we went in the latter direction—as I now have.

But, obviously, whether we move in the Skubitz direction for a study and some more restrictive treatment covering the discontinuance of "last trains," as a holding operation of sorts, or whether we sit down and begin some serious consideration of methods for obtaining the long-needed, integrated planning to meet the Nation's future transportation needs along lines such as Mr. WEICKER and I both now urge, makes little difference.

For what is important, what is essential, Mr. Speaker, is that we move now in some direction in order to save what little remains of America's fast-vanishing railway passenger service, knowing as we must that such a service must be a part of any balanced national transportation system.

Unless, that is, Mr. Speaker, we are truly preparing to all go down to that station some day, and watch America's one, last passenger train come in.

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF BRETTON WOODS—DR. GARDNER'S PROPOSAL FOR REFORMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, on July 22, 1944, the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development were signed at Bretton Woods.

The anniversary is highlighted by the publication of a new edition of the trailblazing study of the international monetary and trading system by Dr. Richard N. Gardner, Henry L. Moses, professor of law and international organization at Columbia University, and Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs from 1961 to 1965. The study, Sterling-Dollar Diplomacy: The Origins and the Prospects of Our International Economic Order, is being published today.

Dr. Gardner's proposals include the following:

First. Finance ministers of the major developed and less developed countries should meet regularly at the International Monetary Fund so that the Fund—now bypassed by the Group of Ten and the Basle Club of central bankers—can play its intended role as the central forum for international monetary cooperation.

Second. Exchange rates should be permitted to fluctuate up to 2 percent on either side of parity instead of the 1 percent agreed to at Bretton Woods, and exchange parities should be allowed to "crawl" 1 or 2 percent a year in response to market forces.

Third. The International Monetary Fund should make specific proposals for adjustment not only to deficit countries in need of credit but also to surplus countries that pull reserves out of the system.

Fourth. The new facility for special drawing rights in the International Monetary Fund should be activated immediately, with a first year allocation of special drawing rights of at least $5 billion in order to compensate for the failure of world reserves to grow during recent years.

Fifth. National holdings of dollars, sterling, and gold should be deposited in consolidated accounts in the International Monetary Fund to protect the reserve currencies against speculation and provide a more orderly method for reserve creation.

Sixth. Special drawing rights should eventually be issued to the International Development Corporation—for soft-loan affiliate of the World Bank—for relending to the less-developed countries, thus bypassing the problem of annual aid appropriations.

Seventh. Aid should be increasingly channeled through multilateral institutions with commitments to more aid by donor countries linked to commitments to better development efforts by the recipients.

Eighth. After the Kennedy round tariff cuts are completed, the United States and other countries should sign a "free-trade treaty" calling for the elimination of tariffs and other trade barriers on manufactured goods in stages over a period of approximately 10 years.

Ninth. Countries in balance of payments surplus should have a special obligation in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—to reduce their tariffs and border taxes and diminish rebates and other export incentives; and

Tenth. The jurisdiction of GATT should be enlarged to permit discussion and resolution of the conflicts of national economic interest arising out of operations of multinational corporations.

HOW REALLY BAD GOOD HUNGER PROGRAMS ARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, by all standards, Fulton County, Ga. has one of the better hunger programs in America. The county, which includes most of metropolitan Atlanta and a good deal of rural territory, has more than doubled the number of those participating in its surplus commodity program since 1963. In May of this year, 33,995 received free food in the county, a figure which represents 23 percent of those eligible. This rate of participation stands more than 5 percent above the national average.

Then, too, the county carries 20 of the 22 foods made available by the Department of Agriculture to participating counties. Of the 78 counties in Georgia on the program, only nine carry as many as 20 commodities. Nationally only 26.5 percent of the counties carry 20 or more commodities. According to the Department, a diet of all 22 commodities does not provide a totally adequate diet. If several of the available commodities are not carried by a county, its poor do not have the opportunity to enjoy even that inadequate diet.

In terms of eligibility standards, Fulton County also ranks quite well; for it does not have any of the many arbitrary requirements imposed by other counties to exclude otherwise eligible individuals from assistance. It does not deny a person food, for example because they have a dog in their house.

By all objective standards, then, Fulton County enjoys one of the better hunger programs in the country. But as two days of hearings recently disclosed, "better" does not mean good.

A Christian Science Monitor article which discusses the results of these hearings follows:

GEORGIA PANEL FINDS SURPLUS FOOD ISN'T REACHING THE HUNGRY

(By Leon W. Lindsay)

ATLANTA.—Fulton County includes most of metropolitan Atlanta and a good deal of rural territory. The county distributes surplus food to more individuals—33,995 in May—than does any other county or city in the Southeast says the United States Department of Agriculture.

This would seem a laudable record. But testimony at recent hearings in Atlanta disclosed conditions that were enough to tarnish any prideful glow.

For two days, members of the Metropolitan Atlanta Conference on Hunger and Malnutrition listened as medical and nutritional experts, government officials, and the poor themselves vividly exposed gaps in this nation's programs for feeding the hungry.

COMMUNICATION SPOTTY

It was brought out that in Fulton County there has been a marked upsurge in the number of people receiving surplus food in the past year. Only 16,000 were participating in the program in 1963. The greatest gain has occurred since last September, a county official said.

This was interpreted as an indication that, at least in the metropolitan area, many of the needy have been made aware of the availability of the food and have been able to get to the distribution point.

However, as evidence accumulated in the House Chamber at the Georgia State Capitol, it became clear that some of the persons most in need of nutritional help are not being reached.

Specifically, pregnant women and adolescents, infants, the aged, and those in remote rural situations were found to be missing out on much-needed help.

It was also disclosed that lack of communication between agencies which minister to the needs of these people and those which could make food available is a major problem.

For example, some nutritionists who have been working with pregnant adolescents and prescribing special diets were not aware that these young mothers could be certified to receive special food supplements from the USDA warehouse.

Likewise, an elderly, ailing man who had been told to eat certain types of food testified he could not afford to buy it. No one had informed him he was eligible for the food supplement program.

A white woman from rural Fulton County, mother of seven with a husband unable to work, said she lives 11 miles from the nearest food distribution center and 6 miles from the nearest store. The only transportation the family has is an old bicycle someone gave them.

THE KIDS WON'T EAT IT

The woman, obviously much underweight, said she is ill also. When she is able to find someone to take her to Atlanta to get the surplus food she has to take a month's allotment at a time. Much of it will not keep, she said, and "a lot of that stuff the kids just won't eat."

This woman, like many, has no decent stove on which to cook, few utensiles, and little knowledge about how to make the foods palatable. There are programs to help her and others make better use of the surplus food, but testimony makes it clear that such programs are inadequate.

A nutritionist points out that it is really necessary to go into the home and demonstrate cooking methods. She suggests that more could be done with volunteers in this area.

A woman official of the Fulton County Department of Family and Children's Services discloses that she has on file in her office the names of the 9,000 families who receive surplus food in Fulton.

But when State Rep. Gerald Horton of Fulton County asks whether she has given or can give these names to agencies which could send volunteers to show mothers how to use the food, the reply is that the county would have to vote more money and hire people to do this.

Another witness, the director of distribution for the county, was asked by Mr. Horton whether the limited hours of distribution could be expanded, whether people could be allowed to pick up food more than once a month, and whether more distribution centers than the one poorly located warehouse could be provided. The answer was essentially the same. Not enough funds, he was told, not enough personnel, and regulations of other agencies such as USDA which prevented some of the steps.

The "other agencies," in later testimony, could cite no specific, limiting regulations.

Mr. Horton promised to see if he could get county personnnel to do as much as possible with the personnel and funds available before falling back upon lack of these as an excuse.

Another request by Mr. Horton and others who questioned officials was for more volunteer work. Fulton County officials indicated, however, that they could not use volunteers to distribute food, as they could not be bonded.

CONTINUED INADEQUACY SEEN

This response visibly astonished members of the conference, since apparently the county is able to get bonding for convicts who man the distribution lines.

Georgia welfare officials, who have been successful in getting food to many of the needy in a two-year war on hunger, now talk about finding the "hidden hungry" Metropolitan Atlanta found some of its hidden ones last week.

As testimony piled up it also become evident that even if the most far-reaching bills now before Congress are passed, national programs for feeding the hungry will not meet many of the desperate situations exposed here.

Members of the conference on hunger, in a posthearing session, pledged a program of action to mobilize volunteers, draft legislation, and build fires under officials who they feel have often let bureaucratic red tape dehumanize the task of seeing that children, old people, the ill, indigent mothers, and other malnourished people are fed a basic diet.

Conference members agreed that the least legislative bodies can do is affirm that every American has a human and constitutional right not to be hungry.

SCHEDULED DISARMAMENT TALKS WITH RUSSIA

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, in the next few weeks we will have a precious, fleeting opportunity to stabilize and slow the deadly roller coaster we call the international arms race. Scheduled talks in Geneva between the United States and Russia can and should be expedited. Instead, they are being delayed.

We can and should forestall further activity on MIRV and ABM while pursuing such talks with the Soviets. It is imperative that the administration exercise unselfishness, vision, and statesmanship. Instead, they seem to be playing political games at the expense of all mankind. Candidly, I am most apprehensive.

Months ago, all Americans were heartened when the administration announced our participation in these talks, to take place in late spring or early summer of this year. Late spring is gone. Early summer is almost past. No talks are going forward. Nuclear clocks tick ominously. Our opportunity and perhaps our destiny melts away. It seems our negotiators will not convene with the Soviets in Geneva before late summer or early fall.

What is behind the administration's logic? A fundamental difference between Secretary of State Rogers and Secretary of Defense Laird regarding Soviet intentions and evaluation of their capabilities. Mr. Rogers has hopes of abandonment of ABM and MIRV, or so it seems. Mr. Laird plays nuclear roulette in Pentagon basements and think tanks. His efforts to sell us on ABM have not been convincing, as incontrovertible scientific proof piles up against it, eliciting further political opposition, much of it from the Republican Party.

So our distinguished Secretary of Defense constructs a thermonuclear strawman—Soviet first-strike capability. Therefore, we must tie arms talks to alleged political considerations and concessions in Asia and the Middle East.

I do not pretend to read the administration's mind or question motives of our Secretary of Defense. Yet it seems obvious that with arms talks stalled, temptation to covertly proceed with ABM and MIRV might be irresistible. Congress has been stampeded before into approving full funding of a system which is either useless or a futile escalation of the arms race.

Effective control of new weapons is essential in their early stages or it is impossible to keep them in check. Further steps down the arms race road will bring us to a point of no return. If we place useless super weapons development before peace talks, we will have taken the wrong turn down a path of no return—it is a blind alley of annihilation.

Brinkmanship is outdated. It only frightens America and calls forth negative reactions. Rousseau stated that common interest matters less to players and actors than peculiar advantages for which they aim. Our game's goals must be changed in favor of disarmament. Look at what has already been accomplished on the fringes of disarmament by Democratic administrations willing to work toward this goal. The list of their achievements is impressive, indeed.

First, total disarmament achieved in Antarctica;

Second, testing of nuclear weapons has been banned in several environments;

Third, risk of atmospheric contamination has been halted;

Fourth, outer space has been ruled out for nuclear weapons;

Fifth, Latin America has been ruled out for nuclear weapons;

Sixth, a curb has been placed on proliferation of nuclear weapons through the nonproliferation treaty;

Seventh, work has been started on securing another environment—the seabed—from encroachment by weapons of mass destruction;

Eighth, we have offered to move toward regional arms control in Europe; and

Ninth, to insure and verify integrity of arms control agreements, we have developed an elaborate and effective system of detection, inspection, and surveillance.

It is vain for us to continue to rattle thermonuclear sabres at one another. Daily, more Americans rise against past follies and future menaces. Our political approach must be as mature as our technology. Perhaps Communist intransigence will foil our best attempts, but we must try. We simply must. If we move immediately to open Geneva negotiations with the Soviets, I am certain they will meet us half way. Disarmament now, before it is too late. Another alternative is unthinkable. I know Mr. Nixon is a sincere lover of peace and pray fervently that he will take up this initiative.

NERVE GAS OVERSEAS: PULLING DEATH'S WHISKERS

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, it is damningly obvious that there has been an accident on the island of Okinawa involving a deadly nerve gas known as VX. Twenty-five American military personnel have been hospitalized. It is also obvious to us as a result of this occurrence that U.S. Armed Forces have been stockpiling such substances and weapons on Okinawa, our major advanced base in that area of the world. It is within our realm of logic to conclude that other facilities similar to Okinawa in importance are now serving as storage areas and stockpile facilities for this and similar deadly substances.

If this is the case, Congress has no information regarding it. If this has been done, it ranks with the recently revealed secret treaty with Thailand as a major violation of the congressional prerogatives to control such acts and commitments. In their wisdom, the people who founded this Nation made provision for a system of checks and balances, insuring that one branch of Government would always keep close watch on activities of her branches. At no time has this process been more essential than now. Yet we seem to be receiving masses of evermore incontrovertible evidence that congressional authority over such activities and commitments is decreasing rather than increasing.

Again and again revelations surface of acts measurably detrimental to major long-range interests of our Nation. All such acts are results of commitments made illegally and in violation of constitutionally defined and guaranteeed rights of Congress.

Secret agreements with Franco. Commitment of American troops to maneuvers in tandem with Spanish troops in a highly questionable exercise. A secret treaty with Thailand making significant American military and political guarantees without advice or consent of the Senate. Now we have lighted a flaring bonfire of anti-American indignation in Japan, fueling arguments of America's bitterest opponents because of the nerve gas incident on Okinawa.

Nerve gas is an offensive weapon. Why, by any stretch of imagination, is it being stockpiled on a forward major offensive base? Surely it could not have been scheduled for use in Vietnam. It is my understanding that our Nation is pledged to a policy of abstention regarding use of such agents, following policies laid down by Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Is the Pentagon in the process of changing its mind in regard to this policy? Does Congress not have a right to be informed of such a proposed change? Shall we not have an opportunity to debate whys and wherefores of such a far-reaching, contemplated move?

We now have the dawning realization of significant deployment of nerve gas to major American bases without consultation or informing of the Congress. The same is true of allies intimately involved in such moves and exposed to their automatically attendant consequences. It is obvious that Japan was told nothing about such a deployment or presence. Gas involved in this case is the same agent responsible for the major Utah sheep kill.

Mr. Speaker, nerve gas can have nothing whatsoever to do with defense of bases in forward areas. We can only conclude that they are there for possible offensive purposes. It seems, therefore, that a departure from F.D.R.'s theorem is not only contemplated, but can today be called a fait accompli. The Pentagon, of course, says nothing, which tells us much.

Logic leads us to still other questions. Who has access to such menacing materials? Are others being trained in their use? By whom and where? It is publicly claimed that small quantities of nerve gas are being shipped by us to West Germany. Is this not a violation of the 1954 West European Union Protocol? We are also told that high-ranking officers from Spain and Nationalist China have toured our CBW facilities. Why? Especially Franco's Spain. Since when does his military establishment rate such treatment and access to such highly classified information?

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with one of the most horrifying death-dealing products of man's mind. CBW is in danger of getting out of hand completely. On all sides we have suddenly discovered what is being done with such weapons in the name of national defense. All these acts cumulatively are gross violations of the spirit and strict rules of our Constitution. Such acts are positively forbidden under basic documents governing our Nation. Are we going to allow a military ethic to attain and preserve a momentum all its own which now carries so far as to result in these revelations?

If any military establishment is allowed to develop, experiment, and deploy such agents, who will actually prevent them from being used? If we have failed to prevent deployment at forward major combat bases, who shall dare say we have actual control over them at any time?

Our military have taken it upon themselves, in the sacred name of patriotism, to take steps which remove them from strict supervision by the civilian branch of Government. They are in danger of becoming a law unto themselves. We must reach out a strong constitutional hand immediately and rein these well-meaning gentlemen in before someone makes a mistake that will kill thousands of Americans here or abroad, or commits some unspeakable atrocity overseas. Or even worse, before we blunder into a major conflict. Minimally our alliance with Japan has been placed in

XUM

further jeopardy because of this latest incident. Stupidity and possible deliberate avoidance of civilian control today threatens the linchpin of our Asian alliance.

A basic constitutional question is before us, fraught with geopolitical and military consequences.

JOB EVALUATION POLICY ACT OF 1969

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which will begin the process of major revisions of the position classification systems of the Federal Government.

In January of this year, my Subcommittee on Position Classification issued its "Report on Job Evaluation and Ranking in the Federal Government." The result of a year of comprehensive study, the report outlined a series of findings and recommendations concerning both the concepts behind and the administration of position classification in the Federal Government. That report is the basis of the bill which has been introduced today.

Position classification is one of the keystones of modern personnel management. Simply stated, the concept behind position classification is that it is the position, or the job, which should be classified and ranked rather than the individual holding that job. Ideally, the process by which the duties and responsibilities of a position are determined, and the position is thereby assigned a relative value, should have an important role in such diverse functions as budgeting, manpower allocation, determination of recruitment and training needs, performance evaluation, and many others. Unfortunately, during the course of the study, we found that often the position classification programs of the various departments and agencies were being used almost exclusively as a pay-setting device and little else.

There are many reasons for this failure to use position classification to the fullest extent possible. As pointed out in our report, much can be done to improve the administration of classification systems in the various departments and agencies. Classifiers should be better trained. They should be more knowledgeable about the program needs of their agencies and should make greater efforts to act as a technical adviser to line management rather than as an isolated professional using jargon and procedures imcomprehensible to all but the personnel management fraternity. Greater efforts should be made to insure consistency in classification within and among agencies. Attempts need to be made to simplify what is now an overwhelmingly complex general schedule system to make classification more understandable to managers and employees.

These, and many other things, need to be done. However, they lie within the realm of administrative reform and hence do not readily lend themselves to legislation. We in Congress must do all we can, however, to encourage the Civil Service Commission and the other departments and agencies to institute needed administrative reforms and to change archaic and outdated attitudes toward classification in particular and personnel management in general.

My bill is designed to be a catalyst in the two areas which I feel are most in need of reform.

The general schedule classification system, under the general control of the Civil Service Commission, is predicated on the assumption that all positions in the Federal Government can and should be classified substantially under one method: narrative standards and guidelines. As a result, the Commission has developed a series of standards which are bewildering in their complexity and overwhelming in sheer volume. The basic principles underlying the use of these standards have remained virtually unchanged since the passage of the first Classification Act in 1923.

The reasoning behind this rigid adherence to one method is understandable. The Commission is the apex of a classification system which covers almost 2 million employees and thousands of different occupations. It would be natural to wish that one approach be adequate for all, if for no other reason than to reduce the intellectual strain incumbent in using several different methods to achieve a common goal.

As modern government has grown in the past 40 years, as it has become more intimately involved with the social, economic, and scientific structure of our country, the demands on position classification systems have grown proportionately. Countless occupations which did not exist 40 years ago have been pressed into the general schedule classification system which was originally designed for jobs which were comparatively easy to categorize in 1923. And, with the content, nature, and relative value of many occupations changing almost daily, serious doubt has arisen as to whether one method alone is adequate to maintain the flexibility necessary to keep classifications current. Conversely, it is also questionable whether complex narrative standards are really necessary for a large number of easily categorized positions, such as those in the clerical fields.

The sin on the part of the Commission, then, is one of omission rather than commission. What it has done, it has generally done well. But the Commission has failed to experiment with and adopt the several recognized methods of job evaluation and ranking to determine which best suit the needs of the various departments and agencies and occupational groups.

This relatively narrow approach is rather like creating an orchestra with nothing but violins. The sound might be good; the musicians could be the finest in the world. However, no matter how competent the violinists might be in imitating the sounds of the missing instruments, they could not achieve strength and versatility of a full orchestra. Just as the incorporation of additional instruments can enhance the total sound of an orchestra, so the use of various methods of job evaluation and ranking can be orchestrated by the Civil Service Commission to achieve equal treatment among positions throughout the executive branch while at the same time encouraging much-needed flexibility in administration.

This brings us to a second major problem area pinpointed by our report. The Classification Act of 1949 contained more than 20 exemptions from its provisions. Since that time, other exemptions have been added. Thus we now have large and small blocks of positions which are classified under unrelated systems. The Postal Field Service uses one approach; the Atomic Energy Commission, National Security Agency, Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service, and the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration all have their own programs; and the Foreign Service uses yet another approach. Most of these separate systems were created because the general schedule system did not meet their needs; and most of them are competently administered. Yet, to quote our report:

> The number and variety of classification and ranking systems in the Federal service create confusion and result in differences in the methods of selection and appointment, promotion, conditions of work, and pay of employees in comparable conditions.

With these two problems in mind, we can then move on to the major purposes of the bill which I have introduced. I feel that all civilian, white-collar positions in the executive branch should be placed under a single classification plan under the general control and supervision of the Civil Service Commission. However, the integration of the several separate systems under a single "umbrella" would serve no useful purpose if the general schedule system remains unchanged. Thus, I also feel that the proposed plan should utilize as many job evaluation and ranking methods as appropriate. The primary change, and it is a major one, would be that under the proposal there would be one agency, the Civil Service Commission, responsible for establishing a common set of values for the classification of all positions and supervising the use of the various methods of position classification within and among all departments and agencies toward the end of consistent treatment of various occupational groups throughout the Government.

The bill is divided into three titles. Title I outlines some of the major findings of the "Report on Job Evaluation and Ranking in the Federal Government."

Title II declares that the executive branch should operate under a coordinated job evaluation and ranking system for all civilian positions, utilizing such methods as may be appropriate, under the general supervision and control of the Civil Service Commission.

XUM

Title III establishes the mechanism by which proposals for placing the above principles into effect will be prepared and presented to Congress for action. A unit is to be established within the Civil Service Commission which shall report directly to the Commissioners. This office will be responsible for preparing a plan for the establishment of a coordinated system of job evaluation and ranking for all civilian positions. The Commission is given the authority, which it does not now have, to investigate all systems. The title directs that the Commission submit an interim report within 1 year of enactment, and that the study be completed and legislative proposals be submitted to the Congress within 2 years after the date of enactment. It also provides for periodic consultation with the House and Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committees and with appropriate employee organizations.

This bill does not represent the final answer to the many problems outlined in the report. However, it does represent an essential first step. Our subcommittee plans to follow carefully the progress of the Commission's study on a day-by-day basis. I am sure that we can all work together fruitfully to bring about the reforms in position classification which are necessary for personnel management in the Federal Government to meet the demands of the future.

As mentioned in the report, it would be incorrect to say that we are at the crisis stage. The classification systems, as they stand now, have worked moderately well, and valiant efforts have been made by the Civil Service Commission and the departments and agencies to improve the administration of the various systems.

However, as the complexity of modern Government increases, the inadequacies of the present systems will be magnified until a crisis does exist. The time to begin to change is now while we still have the latitude and breathing space to carefully consider reform.

Changing job evaluation or ranking systems is a delicate and time-consuming job. It raises many questions and doubts in the minds of employees subject to the systems. It breaks patterns of thought and action with which personnel officials have become comfortable—perhaps too comfortable—over the past 45 years. Perhaps several years will be necessary to fully implement the recommendations contained in the report and the program outlined in my bill. However, if adopted, these recommendations should result in greater equity to employees throughout the Federal service, assurance of more consistency in the evaluation and ranking of positions, and the foundation for a system which will be more readily adaptable to the changing needs of the Government in the years to come.

ROBERT D. BYRNES

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers of July 21, 1969, bore the news of the death of Robert D. Byrnes.

For nearly a quarter of a century Bob Byrnes was the Washington bureau chief of the Hartford Courant and in that period he rendered outstanding service to his newspaper and to the people of the State of Connecticut.

There was no newspaperman in Washington who was more painstaking or who knew his job and the sources of news better than did Bob Byrnes. A political editor of the Courant, Bob came to Washington in 1943 and from that time until his retirement at the end of 1967 he performed the difficult, important, and exacting task of finding and distilling national news for the people of Hartford and the State of Connecticut at large.

Bob's forte was thoroughness and Members of Congress were often surprised to find how quickly he learned of a news story or how closely he followed their activities on the floor or in committee. Members sometimes felt that his coverage was too close as when he reported their positions on unrecorded teller votes, but the people of Connecticut never had to complain about lack of information from Bob.

So long as he was at his job, the State could rest secure that virtue would be rewarded, sculduggery revealed, and fairness prevail on the Washington news front for newspaper readers of the Nutmeg State.

At Bob's resignation a reception was held in the Senate wing of the Capitol and his many Capitol Hill friends joined in presenting him with a silver cigarette box as a token of their affection and esteem. I was honored to have had the privilege of presenting that box to Bob on behalf of all his friends and I am honored today to pay this tribute to Robert D. Byrnes, a dedicated and able commentator on the Washington scene.

We regret his death but we are grateful for his contribution to Connecticut journalism and to American public life.

AN ACT OF REALISM

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the President of the United States on his courage and boldness in scheduling a visit to the Communist State of Rumania.

What the President has done is simply to place the Eastern Communist world on notice that the United States will move toward friendship, step for step, with those who wish to move toward friendship with us. It places the Western world on notice that the United States has recognized the cracks in the Communist monolith and we intend to pursue these developments in the interests of the peoples of Eastern Europe, and in the interests of peace.

The President is and has always been a realist toward the Communist world. He rejects the naive assumptions of past policy that, by throwing away economic concessions, we will win political gains. He deals with the nations of Eastern Europe as an American head of state should deal with them—recognizing that they have interests and we have interests and we do not intend to give up something for nothing. If they seek trade advantages in the United States, we will hold those out, but there are political and diplomatic dividends which we seek in Eastern Europe—and we welcome a horse trade. There will be no something-for-nothing deals with the Communist world with President Nixon in the White House.

The President has been criticized for not clearing his visit with the Soviet Union. It is not the custom of American Presidents, certainly it is not the practice of this one, to clear our diplomatic moves in advance with Moscow. They have never cleared theirs with us. Indeed, if we are to take Foreign Minister Gromyko at his word, the visit to Bucharest is not seen by them as a provocative act.

I am encouraged by the fact that we have in President Nixon a Chief Executive who initiates moves in foreign policy rather than simply reacting to them. It is good to have a dynamic foreign policy for the United States rather than a static one. The President takes with him on this first visit into Eastern Europe and the Communist world by an American President our hopes that he can bring back some sign of a more just and enduring peace. He should be commended by the American people for making this historic effort.

ONE SMALL STEP FOR MAN

(Mr. CASEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, few men in history have been so privileged as we to be eyewitnesses at the birth of a new era.

The magnificent and incredible voyage of Apollo XI has brought to all mankind a keen sense of participation in our greatest moment in history. Now, this journey nears an end, as the skillful hands of our three valiant astronauts guide their spacecraft safely home.

To these men, Neil Armstrong, Edwin—Buzz—Aldrin, and Michael Collins, our humble congratulations for a superb job well done. If, indeed, our destiny lies among the stars—then you have placed us on the threshold and turned a brilliant guiding light upon the path. Experts claim that the footprints you have placed upon the lunar dust will last a half million years. But I say that these shall fade forever before the memory of your magnificent achievement shall be forgotten by mankind.

To the thousands of hard-working men and women of NASA and the aerospace industry, whose dedication and ability made this lunar landing and ascent a flawless performance, goes the grateful thanks of all our people.

It was my great privilege to be with you at the Manned Spacecraft Center during this most critical phase of the lunar landing, and to share with you the tense moments when the whole world watched and listened in awe. You are the unsung heroes—the very backbone of our efforts to send men among the stars, and safely bring them home. No words of mine can add to the luster of your accomplishments, nor increase the great and justifiable pride you can take in the job you have done. But on behalf of your friends and neighbors in our 22d District, and indeed for all your fellow citizens, I express our grateful and heartfelt thanks for your magnificent achievements. You built and placed the boots upon the feet of the first man to step upon the Moon—you made the "giant leap for all mankind" possible.

Few moments during the long and tortuous vigil we kept, Mr. Speaker, were more heartwarming than those in which the television newsmen interviewed the loved ones these great astronauts left behind. To Mrs. Janet Armstrong, Mrs. Patricia Collins, Mrs. Joan Aldrin, their youngsters and parents, goes a special thanks for the patience and understanding they showed to a world eager for details on this incredible journey and the men who were making it. The wonderful confidence they expressed was reassuring to us all, and they know, I am sure, that millions of us around the world joined with them in prayer for the safety of these three valiant men.

Last, but not least, Mr. Speaker, I think a special word of thanks goes to every American, whose hard-earned tax dollars made this program and this journey possible. Each of us bought a portion of Apollo XI, of Columbia and Eagle, and the hardware which safety required be left upon the lunar surface. While history will not record our part in this tremendous undertaking, each of us can take pride in knowing that without our support, both moral and financial, this journey would never have been made. Each of us can take pride in knowing that we made possible mankind's finest hour. I watched with keen interest many of the interviews of the "man in the street" and his reaction to this great adventure. As one who has long supported our fullest participation and funding of this great space program, it was heartwarming to see that our citizens by far expressed full support for our efforts and indeed, urged that we continue our great efforts in space.

Millions of words shall be written through the years on this epic adventure, Mr. Speaker, but none shall be so important as those written by this Congress in the coming weeks. For upon our shoulders rests the heavy responsibility of being the architects of man's future in space, in guiding the programs in our quest for knowledge, and providing the funds to make them possible. We have gathered under NASA a brilliant and highly competent team that has put us first in space and opened the door of the future. We now stand in danger of succumbing to the siren call of false economy, of being niggardly in our support and permitting the erosion and disintegration of this program and the dispersal of the men and women who made it possible. To permit this to happen is to break faith with the men of Apollo XI and unborn generations for whom we have opened wide the door to knowledge of man's universe. We have both the resources and the ability to attack and resolve our problems here at home and our commitments abroad, and still move forward swiftly in this vital program to roll back the frontiers of space. No higher priority can be given to any program than one which furthers mankind's undying quest for knowledge. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will agree and join with me in full support of this vital program and in seeing that it moves forward swiftly.

Again, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of the 22d District of Texas—home of NASA's great Manned Spacecraft Center—I extend our heartiest congratulations and best wishes to our three great friends and neighbors: Astronauts Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Mike Collins. Your incredible journey has inspired all mankind and will live forever in the pages of history. You have given us our finest hour, and the great pride we have at being a witness to such a magnificent event shall live with us forever.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) on account of illness in the family.

Mr. LIPSCOMB (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) on account of official business.

Mr. KLEPPE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for July 24 through July 28, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, for 10 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENNIS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ROBISON, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EILBERG) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REUSS, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. FARBSTEIN, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN, for 60 minutes, on July 24.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. COHELAN, to revise and extend his remarks immediately following the remarks heretofore made.

Mr. HOLIFIELD in five instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. FOREMAN and to include extraneous material during his remarks of today on H.R. 12781, while in Committee of the Whole.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENNIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CONTE in two instances.
Mr. TEAGUE of California.
Mr. ERLENBORN.
Mr. BEALL of Maryland.
Mr. ASHBROOK.
Mr. TAFT.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. HASTINGS.
Mr. POLLOCK.
Mr. PRICE of Texas.
Mr. BUSH.
Mr. BOB WILSON.
Mr. FINDLEY.
Mr. RIEGLE.
Mr. ESCH.
Mr. BROWN of Michigan.
Mr. SHRIVER in two instances.
Mr. SPRINGER.
Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.
Mr. MOSHER.
Mr. DERWINSKI.
Mr. WIGGINS.
Mr. RHODES.
Mr. AYRES.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EILBERG) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EILBERG in two instances.
Mr. MARSH.
Mr. BRASCO in two instances.
Mr. DINGELL in two instances.
Mr. FARBSTEIN in two instances.
Mr. RARICK in four instances.
Mr. NICHOLS.
Mr. JONES of Tennessee.
Mrs. GRIFFITHS in two instances.
Mr. BOLLING.
Mr. RYAN in five instances.
Mrs. CHISHOLM.
Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.
Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.
Mr. O'HARA.
Mr. BRINKLEY.
Mr. RIVERS.
Mrs. MINK.
Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.
Mr. HAGAN in two instances.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on July 18, 1969, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7215. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Diplomatic Courier Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 23, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

981. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the requests for appropriations transmitted in the budget for fiscal year 1970 (H. Doc. No. 91–140); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

982. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide for a 2-year extension of rural housing authorizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

983. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effectiveness and administration of the community action program in Phoenix, Ariz., under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, Office of Economic Opportunity; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

984. A letter from the Administrator of General Services, transmitting prospectuses proposing acquisition of space under a lease arrangement at various locations, purusant to the provisions of Public Law 90–550; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FASCELL: Committee on Foreign Affairs: Report on "New Direction for the 1970's: Toward a Strategy of Inter-American Development" (Rept. No. 91–385). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL of California:

H.R. 12993. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs, and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 12994. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an individual receiving benefits thereunder to earn outside income without losing any of such benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12995. A bill to require a radiotelephone on certain vessels while navigating upon specified waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 12996. A bill to amend section 1677 of title 38, United States Code, relating to flight training, and to amend section 1682 of such title to increase the rates of educational assistance allowance paid to veterans under such sections; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12997. A bill to amend section 1682(d) of title 38, United States Code, so as to modify the requirements for the farm cooperative program under such section; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 12998. A bill to assist small business and persons engaged in small business by allowing a deduction, for Federal income tax purposes, for additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 12999. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. Corbett, Mr. Olsen, Mr. Daniels of New Jersey, Mr. Nix, Mr. Charles H. Wilson, Mr. Waldie, Mr. William D. Ford, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Brasco, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Purcell, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania, Mr. Button, Mr. Meskill, Mr. Lukens, and Mr. Hogan):

H.R. 13000. A bill to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system, to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOREMAN:

H.R. 13001. A bill to amend the act of June 13, 1962 (76 Stat. 96), with respect to the Navajo Indian irrigation project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13002. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of State to participate in the development of a large prototype desalting plant in Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 13003. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Division of American Youth in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to prescribe its functions, which shall include providing assistance in the establishment of youth centers throughout the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 13004. A bill to provide for a fair and random system of selecting persons for induction into military service, to provide for the uniform application of selective service policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 13005. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to encourage shipbuilding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 13006. A bill to amend chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional education and training assistance to veterans and to provide for a predischarge education program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 13007. A bill to amend the Agriculture Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HANLEY (for himself, Mr. William D. Ford, Mr. Purcell, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Waldie, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. McClure, and Mr. Meskill):

H.R. 13008. A bill to improve position classification systems within the executive branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 13009. A bill to amend the act of September 5, 1962 (76 Stat. 435), providing for the establishment of the Frederick Douglass home as a part of the park system in the National Capital; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 13010. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in memory of Ernie Pyle; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mrs. Mink, Mr. Udall, Mr. Kastenmeier, Mr. Foley, and Mr. O'Hara):

H.R. 13011. A bill to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. St Germain, Mr. Adams, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Anderson of California, Mr. Annunzio, Mr. Barrett, Mr. Biaggi, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Blanton, Mr. Blatnik, Mr. Boland, Mr. Brasco, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Burke of Massachusetts, Mr. Burton of California, Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania, Mrs. Chisholm, Mr. Clark, Mr. Clay, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Daniels of New Jersey, Mr. Diggs, and Mr. Donohue):

H.R. 13012. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to double the amount of the basic personal income tax exemption allowed a taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN (for himself, Mrs. Mink, Mr. Eckhardt, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Eilberg, Mr. Fallon, Mr. Farbstein, Mr. Friedel, Mr. Galifianakis, Mr. Garmatz, Mr. Gettys, Mr. Giaimo, Mr. Gibbons, Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Gray, Mr. Hanley, Mr. Hanna, Mrs. Hansen of Washington, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Hechler of West Virginia, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Hicks, Mr. Holifield, Mr. Hungate, and Mr. Jacobs):

H.R. 13013. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to double the amount of the basic personal income tax exemption allowed a taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. St Germain, Mr. Johnson of California, Mr. Karth, Mr. Kluczynski, Mr. Koch, Mr. Kyros, Mr. Leggett, Mr. Long of Maryland, Mr. Lowenstein, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McFall, Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts, Mr. Madden, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Miller of California, Mr. Mollohan, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Murphy of New York, Mr. Murphy of Illinois, Mr. Nix, Mr. Obey, Mr. O'Hara, and Mr. Olsen):

H.R. 13014. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to double the amount of the basic personal income tax exemption allowed a taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN (for himself, Mrs. Mink, Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts, Mr. Ottinger, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Philbin, Mr. Pickle, Mr. Podell, Mr. Price of Illinois, Mr. Pucinski, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Rogers of Colorado, Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Roybal, Mr. St. Onge, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Shipley, Mr. Slack, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Stuckey, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Tunney, and Mr. Udall):

H.R. 13015. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to double the amount of the basic personal income tax exemption allowed a taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

XUM

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. St Germain, Mr. Waldie, Mr. White, Mr. Charles H. Wilson, Mr. Wolff, Mr. Kazen, and Mr. Gaydos):

H.R. 13016. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to double the amount of the basic personal income tax exemption allowed a taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 13017. A bill to provide for the closing of U.S. ports to the fishing vessels of any foreign nation which closes its ports to U.S. fishing vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 13018. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 13019. A bill to establish a commission to be known as the Commission on Air Traffic Control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13020. A bill to amend section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, to authorize a study of essential railroad passenger service by the Secretary of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 13021. A bill to amend section 801 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that the Civil Aeronautics Board shall make the selection of air carriers in international route matters, subject to veto by the President, within 90 days after such selection; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13022. A bill to prohibit members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission from negotiating for their own employment with persons subject to regulation by the agencies of which they are members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 13023. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 13024. A bill to authorize the Smithsonian Institution to acquire lands and to design a radio-radar astronomical telescope for the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory for the purpose of furthering scientific knowledge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. Brademas, Mrs. Chisholm, Mr. Culver, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Daniels of New Jersey, Mr. Dellenback, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Kyros, Mr. Leggett, Mr. Madden, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Minish, Mr. Obey, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Preyer of North Carolina, Mr. Sandman, Mr. St. Onge, Mr. Tunney, and Mr. Yates):

H.R. 13025. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to provide for a fair and random system of selecting persons for induction into military service, to provide for the uniform application of selective service policies, to raise the incidence of volunteers in military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 13026. A bill to amend the Truth-in-Lending Act to exempt certain regulated lenders; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 13027. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for annual reports to the Congress by the Comptroller General concerning certain price increases in Government contracts and certain failures to meet Government contract completion dates; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WEICKER:

H.R. 13028. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to require substantial residential redevelopment in the case of any urban renewal project which involves the demolition or removal of residential structures; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 13029. A bill for the relief of the Civil Air Patrol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 13030. A bill to authorize appropriations to be used for the elimination of certain rail-highway grade crossings in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. de la GARZA:

H.R. 13031. A bill to provide for a comprehensive and coordinated attack on the narcotic addiction and drug abuse problem, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13032. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to simplify, in the case of small hospitals and small nursing homes, the procedure for reimbursement of costs incurred by providers of services under the medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 13033. A bill to provide for an examination of U.S. Government public information activities in foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 13034. A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Gen. Douglas MacArthur; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 13035. A bill to amend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 to extend its coverage to certain additional counties; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 13036. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to encourage shipbuilding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 13037. A bill to amend the act approved September 18, 1964, authorizing the addition of lands to Morristown National Historical Park in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 13038. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 13039. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, relating to the students insured loan program, in order to provide the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall prescribe the maximum rate of interest allowed for the purposes of such part, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 13040. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility and desirability of establishing a park system within the Atlantic urban region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 13041. A bill to authorize appropriations to be used for the elimination of certain rail-highway grade crossings in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 13042. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.R. 13043. A bill to authorize the establishment of fees for entrance to, and use of, certain Federal areas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 828. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN:

H.J. Res. 829. Joint resolution designating the 21st day of July in each year as "Lunar Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.J. Res. 830. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.J. Res. 831. Joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the intent of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H. Con. Res. 303. Concurrent resolution relating to an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 488. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of Captive Nations Week proclamations and pertinent material; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Res. 489. Resolution expressing the commendation and gratitude of the House to the men and women of the national space program on the occasion of the Apollo 11 mission; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 13044. A bill for the relief of Giovanni LaBarca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 13045. A bill for the relief of Manuel Catiloc Duran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 13046. A bill for the relief of Anthony John Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

183. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Clarence Martion, Sr., Washington, D.C., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

184. Also, petition of Wayne L. Smith, Sacramento, Calif., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

185. Also, petition of Geraldine M. Vickers, Lawndale, Calif., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

XUM

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DIFFICULTIES OF COMPUTER COMPONENT OF PROPOSED SAFEGUARD ABM SYSTEM

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Dr. Glenn K. Manacher, of the Institute for Computer Research, University of Chicago, has furnished a report of his views on the proposed Safeguard ABM system, emphasizing the difficulties of the computer component.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF DR. GLENN K. MANACHER, FOR THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

I am honored to furnish a report of my views of the new version of the ABM system being proposed by the Administration. I have had direct experience with the ABM project. I have also had experience with computer languages and systems, especially their design and implementation. This experience is relevant since ABM will be heavily dependent on a computer for decision-making, discrimination, guidance and control.

None of the opinions in this report in any way reflect the views of the University of Chicago or any part of it.

My period of employment on the ABM project terminated in 1965. However, I have since that time and am today engaged in computer research at the University of Chicago. I remain in contact with non-classified information bearing on the computer systems used in the ABM system, via public and private sources.

The concept I represent today is that there is a practical limit, at least at present, to the sophistication and mass of detail that may be built into such complex systems as the ABM without compromising reliability.

I will present my main points, reserving more detailed discussion for the appendix. The points raised are in no particular order.

1. The decision-making capability of the computer lies almost entirely in the "software" or in another word, the programming. Senators, let me explain what I mean by the term "programming." Suppose I wanted to find out how many times the word "military" appeared in yesterday's Congressional Record, I would have to write a program to tell the machine how to organize its elementary capabilities to find the word. This, many more times complex, is what a program means in terms of the highly sophisticated operation of the ABM.

2. The ABM effort may be one of the largest, if not the largest, coherent programming efforts ever organized. The problems of management, coordination, and quality control on software effort of this size are known to be very difficult, and schedule failures are the rule rather than the exception.

3. All other large software systems have presented tremendous problems in the areas of maintenance, integrity and updating that could not in my judgment be tolerated by ABM. One exceedingly well-known system, for instance, has an "update manual" that comes out about bi-monthly. A recent issue is being included as an exhibit. It details several hundred *unresolved* errors covering just this period. The system in question has been in existence for about four years, and a large staff is kept busy trying to keep it up-to-date and to remove bugs as they are discovered.

4. No other system of comparable size has been presented with the problems of precise control and synchronization in so-called "real-time" that the ABM program must face. This means that the computer cannot slip behind the jobs it must control; it must keep pace with *all* of them simultaneously.

5. The problems of designing a testing scheme that will mimic a real attack are acute and will recur as long as the adversary can significantly change the character of the attack. It appears, moreover, that the only testing of the system that will be done will be with tapes that contain data simulating an attack. These tapes represent the best approximation of an attack we can devise. There may, however, be subtle differences between the simulation and the real attack that are not detected. Proponents of the system who are familiar with it point out that there are limits to how unexpected or unconventional an attack can plausibly be made. Neverthless, there is a wide divergence of opinion within the field as to the degree to which a series of simulations, however cleverly devised, can shed light on the expected performance of the system under a real attack.

6. The complexity of the programming effort will presumably be simplified by the inclusion of human beings who make early decisions where judgement rather than data processing is required. One can imagine that these people "load" a program appropriate to the attack into the machine. However, the sheer size of the programming effort, as opposed to its complexity, may be increased thereby.

7. Large programming efforts are especially prone to errors which cause them to fail *entirely*. Programs which attempt to extract maximum performance from a machine are particularly prone to this trouble.

8. If other large efforts are a guide, the software development of this project is at a state which does not make reliable estimates of its performance possible at present. It may be estimated from inferences drawn from Sec. Laird's testimony that a thorough shakedown of the software is about three years away.

9. There is no science of software development to help make judgements such as these firmer; each case rests on its merits. There are, I believe, general guidelines to past experience relating program size to development difficulty, and these can be summarized in a table, which appears as table 1 in the appendix.

10. If we accept the soundness of the DOD estimates, particularly the 95% kill rate of Minuteman under an all-out S–9—MIRV attack, the ABM system, assuming it works and can be shaken down on schedule, appears to be the soundest short-to-medium term *technical* solution to the preservation of an invulnerable second-strike deterrent.

11. From a technical point of view, I believe that Safeguard represents a sound redeployment of the components originally designed for NIKE–X.

I now wish to offer some judgements about the matters discussed above.

1. As I understand it, the mainspring of the pro-ABM argument is the "classical" one of preserving an invulnerable second-strike force while avoiding dependence on hair-trigger responses, and I personally believe that it cannot be faulted on this ground.

2. The purpose of this posture, as I understand it, has been succinctly stated by Prof. Albert Wohlstetter at hearings conducted by the Armed Services Committee. It is to insure that at no level of acceleration of "conventional" hostilities can either side calculate it to his interest to start a nuclear war.

3. The argument is thus made persuasively that ABM might play a crucial role in maintaining deterrence. It is my judgement that ABM might also play a role in destabilizing deterrence, precisely because of the technical factors I have outlined. For instance, suppose that both sides wish to hedge on the possibility of the failure of deterrence. Say they choose to develop preemptive weapons at a level of deployment somewhat below destabilizing. If these calculations are based on an assumed high level of ABM that unexpectedly fails to materialize, one or both sides may find themselves propelled willy-nilly into preemptive capability.

4. Many of my colleagues believe that the discovery in the system of a minor bug or even a fairly large number of such bugs would not be destabilizing since the adversary would not know what they were, or be able to take advantage of them. This, in my judgement, brings up grave issues: How much of this nature could an adversary find out by espionage? Could knowledge of the existence of a large number of bugs, even without knowledge of their exact nature, goad an unwise adversary into the assumption that he enjoyed however temporarily a preemptive advantage?

5. From many unclassified sources has come the unanimous judgement that the Russians do not have anything comparable to the NIKE–X computer. Since this is the heart of the system's decision-making capability, it follows that they could not at present proceed with their own "Safeguard" system. The American MIRV deployment may be regarded by Russia therefore as more destabilizing to deterrence than the Russian MIRV deployment appears to us.

6. My central conclusion follows. The ABM software system is complex, incomplete, immature, and risky. Its technology has no precedent in many important respects. Its delivery date is subject to sharp slippage. These problems will be ameliorated by virtue of the excellence and conscientiousness of the people working on it, and every effort will be made to simplify it and subject it to the broadest range of simulated tests human imagination can devise. The risks will thereby be reduced. But there is no one today who can tell this Committee whether the risks will be reduced to an acceptable point on a realistic timetable.

This element of risk must be taken into account, especially in the context of a build-up of preemptive weapons that is usually assumed will occur concurrently. If the risk of failure or setback of MIRV systems is sharply less than risk for the Safeguard system, the concurrent development of both may lead straight into preemptive capability for one side or both, a situation viewed by many as irreversible. My colleagues' view of this disturbing possibility leads some of them to wonder whether negotiations, however unproductive they have been in the past, might not produce results of a lesser degree of risk.

I believe this issue of risk is being avoided and I am very uneasy about it. The question, "What is the risk of deploying Safeguard?" is *meaningless unless* one states candidly one's assumptions about all competing weapons systems: their deployment and the constraints on their deployment.

I am sure of one thing: The weighing of risks is very delicate. Alternative proposals or proposals for combinations involving ABM with partial inspection, etc., obviously also involve risk. But it is not clear at present which course offers least risk, and I think that a thorough analysis will result in an unusually large table of alternatives and combinations. I would not hesitate to recommend the deployment of Safeguard if *it were clear that this were part of the pursuit of the course of least risk*. What worries me is not that ABM will or will not be deployed, but that the choice will blunt the search for policies of least risk.

I wish to add two more remarks.

1. Despite its problems, my own observation and that of my colleagues is that we should press on with software development and research, and that this effort should not be affected by any decision with regard to deployment of the system or part of it.

2. There is a strong feeling among the scientists in the ABM project that if an overseeing commission of the type proposed by Dr. Killian were to probe every facet of the operation, every component—including those that seem esoteric—could be translated into simple English suitable for public understanding. There is a great deal of feeling that much of what is known and solidly understood, both of a classified and unclassified nature, is not at present being properly translated into public terms and that indeed there is much distortion. Moreover, there is no easy way for individuals inside the project to correct the distortion when it occurs. There is also some feeling that such a commission might help to create a freer flow of information within the project.

The following details may be of interest.

I believe that there is almost universal concurrence among softwork (i.e., programming) people that the ease with which a program can be written, maintained, and "debugged" is a function of several variables, and that the *size* of the program is a crude but good measure. The above terms may need explanation. A program as written generally contains "bugs". These are program errors. There are trivial ones which involve, let us say, a key punch error. But there are nontrivial ones which arise not so much from the encoding of the problem is from subtle and rarely-exercised discrepancies between the assumptions and structures present or latent in the program, and the formal statement of the problem. In general, attempts to make programs as efficient as possible sharply increase the incidence and subtlety of bugs.

In a similar fashion, as the uses and expectations of a program change, and bugs are uncovered, the program must be subtly and carefully modified almost as though it were a living thing. In general, the larger a program the more difficult the problem of maintenance and the higher its proportionate cost. For the largest programs, the figure of 50% is often heard as a ratio of maintenance to total program cost.

The size of programs is generally measured in *words* or *lines* of code. I believe that the following expresses the current state-of-the-art in this area:

Program size: 100; characteristics: Logically almost trivial. Can be "debugged" with very little effort.

Program size: 1,000; characteristics: Logically complex. Usually written by one person. The person writing the program can usually devise a strategy to test the program thoroughly and thereby to eliminate bugs.

Program size: 10,000; characteristics: Logically so complex that it will likely be written as several subprograms. Often programs of this size are designed for use by many people as "service programs". Complete debugging unlikely to result from efforts of authors alone; may require help of users. Errors may occur months from time when program was believed to be debugged.

Program size: 100,000; characteristics: Written by moderately large groups. Almost always is a service program of some sort. Reasonable strategy to debug is virtually out of the question. Bugs remain for years because they are discovered faster than corrected. Serious maintenance problems because of these factors.

Program size: 1,000,000; characteristics: [Conjectural].[1] Keeping track of parts of program a very difficult job. Maintenance barely manageable. Some bugs never corrected and some *never noticed*.

It should be borne in mind that the size of programs envisaged for the Safeguard system will have to be in the upper part of table 1 (100,000–1,000,000 word range or larger).

In addition, Safeguard programming is done, I believe, in a somewhat peculiar style in which the programs must operate in precise periodic "time slots" in order to control the interceptor missiles. This is done in order to synchronize the outgoing signals to the intercept-missile control. There is virtually no body of experience to draw on as a precedent for this new and untested programming art. Moreover, the time slots make the problem of program debugging even worse than the suggestions of table 1, as does the constant need for major reprogramming [p. 96.].[2] Also, the main functions—guidance and discrimination, must be done concurrently.

It might be thought that a computer program could be constructed that could remedy "bugs" in another computer program. It can be shown with mathematical rigor, however, that such a program is *impossible*.

In order to make it clear just how persistent a problem "bugs" are, I am including a part of a sort of "correction manual" sent out approximately bi-monthly by IBM. It concerns the central operating control system "OS" used by all large IBM model 360's. I believe that IBM maintains a staff of perhaps 50–250 programmers whose sole purpose is to maintain OS.[3] It is IBM's most central and most important program. The enclosed list covers just *some* of the *unresolved* errors for this period. (OS has been in existence for about four years, and is close to million-word size.)

How can a customer run a shop when he is dependent on such a program? The answer is simple. He is likely to depend on only a very few services provided, and his operation is likely to consist of repetitive usage of these services. If these services involve no bugs, he is in good shape.

I have reason to believe that a tentative operating package of software for Safeguard has or will shortly be completed. However, there are indications that the Safeguard software groups are spiritedly looking at all sorts of new principles and theories as guidelines for future development. This suggests that the software may not yet be in a state of maturity.

These observations jibe with an estimate that a reliable working system—software included—is regarded by the DOD as about three years away. This may be inferred from the testimony of Messrs. Packard and Laird [p. 198] as follows. Since this testimony says that deployment *following* prototype success would mean a delay of three years, it can only mean that this is the length of time prototype success may take. The main obstacle to prototype success at the present time is software. Therefore, it seems to me, the defense department has the bulk of *hardware* ready to go, so it figures: Why not just deploy the hardware *and* maintain the prototype testing program? This is typical "PERT-chart" thinking and is completely understandable. The basic idea is to do as much as possible in parallel.

However, there are occasional misleading bits of testimony on this score. The "shakedown" of the "system" in Montana mentioned on page 276 obviously refers to an incomplete system. Mr. Laird's testimony on p. 127 to the effect that the system is working, in which he invites members of the Committee to watch an interception on Kwajalein, is similarly misleading, and the interception he speaks of is, I suspect, from some earlier generation of system.

To my mind, the most important modification of the technical claims made by DOD in connection with the conversion of Nike-X to Safeguard is the current representation of Safeguard as a system with only a certain probability of interception. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that it is regarded, apparently [p. 211] as a valuable protector of second-strike capability even if it protects only a *fraction of our deterrent power*. This claim makes it easier for its proponents to stop claiming miracle results, narrows the discussion, anchors it to principle, and makes it vastly more honest.

Secretary Laird makes it clear that an ABM system protecting only some fraction of Minutemen sites would be acceptable. This is not a compromise with mutual deterrence (hereafter MD), as the fraction of Minutemen remaining intact after a strike obviously constitutes a deterrent.

Let P_1 be the probability for a missile to survive a heavy attack with Safeguard protection, and let P_2 represent the probability that the system will perform reasonably near expectation.

Suppose P_1 and P_2 (as defined above) turn out to be fairly low. Is there still deterrence? The discussion is tricky. If P_1 is low, the statistical argument above is still valid. If P_2 is too low, the system would not pass simulated tests. The fact that it must pass simulated tests means that it will have at least moderately high value, say, for the sake of argument, 5. There is an interesting though vaguely disturbing argument which says that an adversary simply cannot afford to attack in this case because finding out whether his attack could cripple the system is too costly. In other words, the system acquires a sort of "bluff value." When undergoing modification for "bugs" of some subtlety, the system would be left "up" with a subtly defective program, to be sure, but again the price of a probe would be too great. Whether bugs serious enough to undermine the system could be detected by espionage is a subject which can be debated, though even among skilled programmers and engineers such debates quickly become reminiscent of a sequence from *Dr. Strangelove*.

If the ABM system is only moderately reliable, it may be a good idea to come fairly close to automating some of the intended responses to *some* threats. For instance, in the event of *absolutely unmistakable* evidence of an *overwhelming* attack, I am hard pressed to believe that an "emptying the holes" policy would not be in force.

In the event of an "accident," or stray missile, the precoded policy would of course be to ride out the attack, ABM or no ABM.

The intermediate cases are the difficult ones, where one wishes to involve administrative decision and to avoid hair-trigger responses. If one believes that an attack that looks "intermediate" can in fact only be "intermediate," then conventional hardening may well be sufficient. *However, there may be ultimately believable forms of attack which would make it impossible for Minutemen to be fired before bearing the brunt of the attack*. In this contingency, Safeguard looks like a necessity.

The system may possibly be compromised in its MD capability by virtue of its dependence on the PAR (perimeter acquisition radar.) In the hearings, the testimony was conflicting as to the viability of the system once the PAR is gone. My personal belief is

---

[1] There are few, if any, programs in existence of this size.

[2] All page references are to the March 6–March 28 hearings, "Strategic and Foreign Policy Implications of ABM Systems."

[3] OS "bugs" occur in its "real" environment, not in synthetic tests.

XUM

that the system will be viable although both P_1 and P_2 will suffer from the loss of PAR. Since we must assume that PAR will be attacked early, we must base calculations on the assumption that it plays no role in actual ABM defense. Similar considerations apply acutely to MSR (missile site radar).

The rather cloudy account in the testimony of the emergence of the SS–9—MIRV threat is hard to follow. The threat is a combination of large size improved guidance, and massive MIRV carrying capacity.[4]

Is the development of MIRV automatically an attempt of first-strike capability? Secretary Laird is asked [p. 201] and refuses to answer, implying that perhaps *our* MIRV is not wholly defensive. Senator Symington quotes Dr. Enthoven's opinion to the effect that SS–9 was, at least at some time in the past, intended *defensively*.[5] The picture one gets is mixed and ambiguous. Was there a studied attempt to put together a first-strike weapons system, or did pieces of it just evolve?

These considerations lead me to believe that the determination of what can be done mutually is of enormous importance and ought to take precedence over unilateral efforts, because unilateral actions are necessarily at the limits of reliable technology and are therefore inherently risky. The policies built on such risky technology are likely to both count on and hedge the risk, and call the combination "prudence", rather than more risk.

REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON EARTH RESOURCES AND POPULATION

HON. CHARLES A. MOSHER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to direct the attention of the House to the work of the Republican task force on earth resources and population, a very active, interested group of Members who, under the imaginative and very energetic leadership of Congressman GEORGE BUSH, of Texas, is currently conducting a series of hearings into the complexities of these two vital subjects, population and earth resources.

Although our investigations are not yet complete, it is already quite clear the two questions of earth resources and population are inextricably linked together, that each one affects the other in a myriad of ways, and that a truly concerted national program to deal with either of these questions must clearly recognize this close relationship.

Our task force hearings so far have centered on learning precisely what the Government's policy is in these areas at the present time—what the executive agencies are now doing. A number of distinguished officials of the executive branch have met with us to discuss and explain their programs. For instance, several weeks ago, Dr. Thomas Paine, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, offered an excellent briefing on the applications of earth resources satellites.

On July 10, the task force was particularly honored to have the President's science adviser, Dr. Lee DuBridge, join us for a significant and wide-ranging discussion.

It occurs to me that Dr. DuBridge's brief opening remarks may be of special interest to other Members of the Congress who were not present at that meeting, for in it he sums up in a succinct and cogent manner—as is his custom—some of the most important issues facing this Nation. His remarks follow:

STATEMENT OF DR. LEE A. DUBRIDGE, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Task Force: It is a pleasure to be here today to discuss with you some of the most important issues facing this Nation. We are in need of new ideas for coping with resource and population problems in a democratic society.

I note that you have considered these matters with a number of competent people and that you anticipate further discussions to develop a perspective of the range and priorities of problems facing the world today. One of the foremost of these, as you have heard, is the question of population growth and its consequences to society.

It is quite apparent that humans cannot continue to increase their numbers indefinitely. Already in several nations, population growth is so rapid as to nullify economic gains. Other more fortunate countries such as our own will be faced with the housing and employment needs of an unprecedented number of people in the next few decades. We will have to develop new techniques for coping with this situation in a more rational manner than we have in the past if our already crowded metropolitan areas are not to become hopeless tangles of humanity.

But we cannot divorce the question of population growth from the related matters of food supplies, natural resources and environmental quality. These are interdependent factors, no one of which can be treated separately without considering its impact on the others. For example, in our foreign programs we cannot advocate population stabilization as the sole solution. People must have enough to eat and economic improvement must proceed if developing nations are to take their place in modern society. The President in his Foreign Aid Message outlined fresh approach in this area based on moral principles and "a world order of peace and justice." To stimulate private enterprise he proposed the establishment of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation; to encourage development, he advocated emphasis on technical assistance, international cooperation, food production and family planning. Incidentally, with regard to these latter two factors, I would like to quote an interesting point which was expressed in the President's Science Advisory Committee Report on the World Food Problem.

"We are faced with the apparent paradox that a reduction in mortality should reduce rather than raise the rate of population growth. If this is the case, reduction of malnutrition among children, by increasing the quantity and quality of food supplies, may be a key factor in solving the population problem of our time."

On the domestic hunger front, the Administration has proposed an expansion of family food assistance and a special program for needy pregnant women and mothers of infants, as well as administrative actions to improve the national response to inadequate nutrition. In addition, there will be a White House Conference on Food and Nutrition this fall which will recommend how the private food market can be used to improve the nutritional status of Americans, and how Federal food programs can be improved.

But food should not be our only concern. With unprecedented prosperity, Americans are using the products of technology at an ever-increasing rate. This is placing new demands on resources as well as threatening the quality of our environment. Rising power requirements necessitate the development of techniques to meet them; greater housing needs require the provision of adequate amounts of building materials without exhausting supplies; increased water consumption requires new strategies for conserving this important resource.

Meanwhile, the undesirable by-products of progress increase in our environment and, at best, are costly to control. At worst, they bid fair to overwhelm us. To cope with this situation, the President recently established a Cabinet-level Environmental Quality Council of which I am the Executive Secretary. The Council has initiated actions to deal with pressing environmental problems of air pollution, water pollution, land pollution and noise. Specific concerns in these areas include solid wastes, automotive vehicle pollution, noise abatement and handling of toxic materials. In addition, a sub-cabinet level committee on outdoor recreation has been established.

The Council is supported by a Citizens Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality which will advise the President and the Council on matters assigned to it.

Mr. Chairman, I have deliberately kept my remarks brief so there will be an opportunity to respond to any questions you may have. As you mentioned in your report on the activities of this task force, Mr. Chairman, it seems as though we are "having to run fast in order to stand still." And yet, progress is being made in all of these areas. It is progress based in good share on research into new methods for solving these problems. We will have to continue to emphasize research if we are to meet the challenges of a world swept up in change.

THE NATIONAL SECURITY

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Southern Conference, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, composed of 14 Southern States, met July 11–13, at Norfolk, Va., to coordinate the policies and communities programs of that region for the coming year. It is reassuring to me to note the timely statements regarding our security which were issued by National VFW Commander in Chief Richard Homan on the occasion of that conference.

Mr. Homan spoke out plainly about some of the many dangers facing our country. He warned of the challenge of Soviet naval and maritime growth, spotlighted by the appearance of a Soviet naval task force steaming near our east coast en route to Cuba.

Mr. President, I believe that Mr. Homan's statements merit the attention of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

---

[4] The chart on p. 285 [which incidentally seems to be off by a factor of 10 on the abscissa] clearly shows that *many small missiles* are far more dangerous as a first-strike force than one big one. The danger, for instance, of 25 1-megaton weapons to hardened missile sites is probably greater than (say) 3 8-megaton weapons.

[5] How long is the SS–9 countdown? If it is more than 30 minutes, it is almost assuredly intended *at least in part* as a first-strike weapon.

XUM

Soviet Fleet Visit to Cuba

A few columnists, analysts and commentators have suggested that the visit of a Soviet naval task force to Cuba on July 20, 1969, is the result of President Nixon's plans to visit Rumania. This reasoning may be true, but I doubt it. The general public never knows why closed societies such as the Soviet government does anything, and they never tell.

As a rule, the Soviet government acts for substantial reasons and with the intention of following through on what they have begun. When Sputnik went into orbit, the Soviet Union had emerged with a long-range and well-planned space program. When the first few Soviet fleet units trickled into the Mediterranean, we saw the beginning of a long-range and well planned political, military and naval influence in and around the Mediterranean basin and along the northern rim of Africa. Therefore, it is my personal conviction the Soviet government has closed the power gap at sea, that Soviet naval expansion, both qualitatively and numerically, has reached the state where fleet units can try their rudder as an influence in this hemisphere. It is my belief that the Soviet leaders learned a lesson less than a decade ago, when their ships tried and failed to deliver missiles to Cuba. Those missile carrying ships were met and turned away by a more powerful U.S. fleet. Now, a Soviet cruiser capable of launching nuclear tipped missiles, plus several destroyers, submarines and supporting ships, are visiting Cuba with impunity. There has been no hint of a diplomatic transgression. Now we see a fleet of 50 or 60 ships in the Mediterranean. During certain operating periods we see a Soviet "Sixth Fleet" that actually outnumbers the American Sixth Fleet.

It should be noted that the recent announcement of the Soviet Navy's visit to Cuba came at a time when the missile cruiser was reportedly operating in mid-Atlantic. I believe we are witnessing the beginning of a new expansionist phase in Soviet naval and maritime diplomacy and influence. The Soviet Navy has reached such a threshold that the Soviet government hopes to reap a new harvest of world opinion from its new strength at sea.

It is anticipated that we will see more visits by Soviet fleet units to this hemisphere once respected for its Monroe Doctrine.

The question for Americans to answer is this: Will we maintain a balanced military posture capable of countering Soviet military capabilities at sea, on land and in space, or will we depend on the Soviet government's peaceful intentions to avoid a direct confrontation?

Until the Soviet government renounces its publicly stated aim for world domination, we have no choice. Superior military strength remains our best bet to deter aggression.

STATE BLOCK GRANTS THWART WAR ON CRIME

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House an article which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, June 22. The conditions revealed in the article point out a major weakness in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; a bill which includes many provisions initiated in the House. This weakness lies in the fact that the States and State administrative agencies have been given the major responsibility for distributing the funds that have been made available to wage a more effective campaign against crime in our Nation. The States have failed to allocate these funds in a responsible manner and have failed to put them to their maximum usefulness. In doing so they have neglected the crying needs of the large urban areas which need the money the most.

This regrettable condition exists as a result of the Cahill amendment to H.R. 5037, which later became the basis for title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. This was the amendment that gave the States the major responsibility in administering the act and we are now seeing the damaging effects of this amendment. The block grants to the States, which exist as a direct result of the amendment have proven to be a major obstacle in the battle against crime. It has created a situation in which anticrime funds are not being used where they are crucially needed, but have been channeled by the States to other areas of lesser need. Thus, the potential benefits of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act in fighting crime in the big cities have been largely negated by the provisions of this amendment.

This danger was apparent to many of us in the House and along with 146 of my distinguished colleagues I voted against the amendment, which subsequently passed by a vote of 256 to 147. The precise breakdown of support for the amendment was 172 Republicans and 84 Democrats for; while opposition was four Republicans and 143 Democrats.

We see more clearly than ever before the need to channel Federal aid directly to the municipalities where the need is greatest and we must not allow the States to continue to divert these funds to the other less urgent purposes.

I am sure that each Member is concerned about the problems and issues raised in this article and I include it in the Record at this point:

Big-City Mayors Find Failures in State Control of Crime Drive

(By John Herbers)

Washington, June 21.—Many of the nation's Mayors are complaining bitterly that the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is proving to be a failure in the larger cities.

They say the states, which have been given the prime responsibility of administering the act, are building a new layer of bureaucracy, robbing the cities of administrative talent and distributing the funds on a per capita basis that ignores the concentration of crime in urban areas and enriches rural and suburban sections where crime is at a minimum.

These complaints, which have been mounting in the year since the law was enacted, have become widespread and now are leading some Mayors to press Congress for changes in the law. The United States conference of mayors this week adopted a resolution urging Congress to amend the law to permit direct grants to the cities.

Vice President Agnew acknowledged that the complaints may have merit and promised the mayors that the Nixon Administration would look into the matter, although the act is geared to the Administration's philosophy of channeling grants through the states.

Previously, the National League of Cities had surveyed municipalities with high crime rates and concluded that the funds were "being dissipated broadly without regard to need."

The comment of Mayor Arthur Naftalin of Minneapolis was typical.

"Experience to date," he said, "demonstrates that the involvement of the states weakens rather than strengthens Federal assistance for the larger cities in the field of law enforcement."

The act is designed to upgrade the quality of the police and the courts through grants and technical assistance. By June 30 all 50 States are expected to have their plans completed. The initial $29-million in block grants to the states is being distributed, and the grants are expected to total $300-million by 1970 and $1-billion a year thereafter.

In passing the act last year, Congress, over the objections of the cities, provided that most of the money under the act go to the states in block grants. The states were authorized to set up planning and administrative agencies and to decide how the funds would be distributed locally. This mirrored a trend in the Federal Government to take control away from Washington and bring the states more into the administration of aid to the cities.

Mayor James J. H. Tate of Philadelphia said Pennsylvania's experience under the act was typical.

GOT MINIMUM AMOUNT

"During the current year, Pennsylvania received $880,000 for planning purposes under the act," he said. "Congress established a floor of 40 per cent for planning by local governments; but there was no ceiling or maximum amount which a state could allocate to local governments if the state wishes to realistically deal with the problems of law enforcement within its jurisdiction.

"Regrettably, the State of Pennsylvania has retained 60 per cent of the planning funds to create a new state bureaucracy, and the absolute minimum of 40 per cent has been allocated to local governments. The 40 per cent has been distributed to eight geographic regions of the state, on a population basis."

He said Philadelphia received $62,419, or 7 per cent of the total planning grant received by the state but that Philadelphia had 25 per cent of the major crimes in the state.

Mayor Naftalin said a similar system was at work in Minneapolis and most other cities.

CITIES' NEEDS DESCRIBED

"The states inevitably dilute attention to the needs of the larger cities because they regard their primary responsibility as statewide and thus place on the same level the needs and demands of urban, suburban and rural communities, regardless of the degree of need," he said.

"In the process of developing their capability, states reach out to raid cities of very scarce professional personnel who have training and experience in law enforcement planning," Mr. Naftalin said.

He said all this has added up to "partisan influence, administrative clumsiness, unfair treatment of the cities and, generally, a failure to meet the purposes of the act."

Charles H. Rogovin, administrator of the act in the Justice Department, said that the distribution of the bulk of the funds was left up to the states by Congress but that the Administration was doing what it could to help the cities.

"We told state planning agencies they should give special consideration to urban areas with pressing needs and make certain there was adequate representation by local government officials," he said. "Then we took another step—making a total of $1.1-million

XUM

of discretionary action funds available to the nation's largest cities for special anticrime or prevention projects."

He said the Administration planned to award $100,000 to each of those cities soon and would give that type of grant priority in the future.

But the mayors are convinced that as long as the bulk of the funds go to the states the cities will not receive money proportionate to the crime. They are mounting what many consider a futile campaign to change the law.

THE TEXTILE IMPORT PROBLEM

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I have been greatly interested in the recent remarks of the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from South Carolina on the textile situation. I believe that the Senators have performed a useful service to the Members of this body and to the public at large by opening inquiry and discussion into the facts surrounding the textile import problem. As a further contribution to this inquiry, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum in response to the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina of July 10, 1969, prepared by the Textile & Apparel Group, American Importers Association, from my State of New York.

For ease of reference in following the memorandum, I would also ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina, together with the materials which he placed in the RECORD at that time, be printed in the RECORD following the Textile & Apparel Group memorandum.

I hope that this material and the continuing discussion on this important subject will prove to be of value to the Senate.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM IN RESPONSE TO SENATOR HOLLINGS' STATEMENT OF JULY 10, 1969

This memorandum is in response to a statement by Senator Ernest Hollings (D-S.C.) printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 10, 1969, pp. 19000 et seq. This memorandum deals only with the material on the textile situation and does not comment upon general material at the beginning of the statement based upon a report of the Trade Relations Council of the United States.

For ease of reference, copies of Senator Hollings' statement are attached hereto. This includes a reprint of a "Memorandum on the Performance of the U.S. Textile and Apparel Industries and the Impact of Imports" of the American Importers Association, Textile & Apparel Group.

The augumentation and the version of the facts set forth in Senator Hollings' statement do not disturb the basic contentions of the Textile & Apparel Group that imports have not caused or threatened serious injury to the American industry producing textile and apparel products, and that there is no economic justification for the imposition of quotas or other import restrictions on imports of such products.

We repeat that every economic indicator shows a pattern of growth in the textile and apparel industries and there is no indication in the available data that these industries are being injured or are threatened injury by imports. These conclusions are emphasized by the tables included in Senator Hollings' remarks.

Senator Hollings' contention apparently is not that these industries have been injured or threatened injury, but rather that despite their growth, performance has been below the average performance of all industries, of the nondurable goods industries, or of the economy as a whole.

This is a novel standard by which to measure the impact of imports. If every industry must perform as well as the average, the concept of average is meaningless. We do not believe that industries are entitled to import protection if they show none of the signs of injury and are growing, even though this performance might be below the national average.

In this connection, Senator Hollings takes issue with our use of the word "phenomenal" in our sentence "The textile industry has enjoyed a phenomenal growth since 1961 through 1968." We agree with the definition of "phenomenal" as meaning "extraordinary" or "remarkable" and stand by our statement.

We believe that the performance of the domestic economy as a whole from 1961 through 1968 has been phenomenal, and believe the performance of the textile and apparel industry is not less phenomenal even though, measured by some indicators, slightly below the average for all industries, especially since performance has been above the average measured by other indicators.

Thus, we believe it is phenomenal that textile industry sales have grown by 55.6 percent from 1961 to 1968, and that sales of the apparel industry have grown by 67.7 percent in the same period.

We think it is phenomenal that profits, before federal income tax, of the textile industry have grown by 116.6 percent over the period and that profits for the apparel industry have grown by 181.3 percent.

We believe that this performance is extraordinary, and we believe that this is remarkable.

What is particularly phenomenal, extraordinary, and remarkable, is that in the face of this record of performance the textile and apparel industries nonethelesss feel that they have a claim to invoke the extraordinary remedy of import controls.

We find it notable also that whereas Table I of the Senator's statement shows the percentage change in sales for the textile and apparel industries and for manufacturing industries (the point being that growth for textile and apparel were below the overall average) the same computation is not shown for profits. That computation, based on figures in Table 2 of Senator Holling's statement, would show that for the period 1961 to 1968, while textile profits were growing by 116.6 percent and apparel profits were growing by 181.2 percent, profits for the nondurable goods industries grew by 78.5 percent and profits for all manufacturing industries grew by 104.4 percent. (See Table A attached.) Surely, this is "phenomenal" even by Senator Hollings' standards for "phenomenal."

It is also phenomenal that sales in 1968, as shown on Table 1 of Senator Hollings' statement, for the textile mill products industry, grew by 11.62 percent over the previous year, and apparel grew by 14.02 percent over the previous year, whereas sales for all manufacturing grew by 9.82 percent over the previous year. Certainly, then, by Senator Hollings' own standards, the growth in sales was at least phenomenal in 1968, the year in which the textile and apparel industries commenced in earnest their pleas for special treatment by way of import control.

Table 2 is misleading in that profits as a percent of sales is used as the only measure of profitability. The textile and apparel industries have been traditionally low margin industries. Nevertheless, it is interesting that during the period 1961 to 1968, when import competition was presumably increasing, these ratios increased substantially from 4.4 percent to 6.1 percent in the case of textile mill products, and from 2.7 percent to 4.5 percent in the case af apparel—hardly an indication of injury.

A more meaningful measure of profitability is the rate of profit on stockholders equity shown on Table B (attached).

Although textile mill products are somewhat below the average for all manufacturing corporations, and for the nondurable goods industries, the rate for apparel is above. This is the very sector—apparel—where imports are supposed to be hurting the most. Here again, the ratio has shown upward movement. From 1961 to 1968 the rate increased by 30.1 percent for all manufacturing corporations, 20.7 percent for nondurables, and by 59.6 percent for textiles and 55.2 percent for apparel.

We would make the same arguments with regard to Table 3, the value of shipments, where the increase from 1961 to 1968 in shipments for the textile mill products industry was 53.2 percent and home goods and apparel 49 percent. Here again the apparel industry in 1968 out-performed the average for all manufacturing corporations.

Similar comments could be made with regard to Table 4, the index of industrial production.

Table 5 with regard to employment shows a lower rate of employment increase for the textile mill products and apparel industry than for all manufacturing. Nonetheless, the table shows absolute increases in employment of substantial magnitudes. This is particularly significant in view of the large increases in production in the industry indicating increased levels of productivity. The nation as a whole has been enjoying one of the lowest rates of overall unemployment in its history. The trade press is replete with statements emanating from textile leaders that they simply cannot get enough labor. As the Tariff Commission report stated, this is an industry in which labor shortages exist.

What is important is that all of these indices show a rising level of production, sales, profits, employment and shipments. One may quibble about whether or not this is "phenomenal," but certainly one cannot seriously argue that these figures demonstrate injury.

In point 6, supported by Table 6, brushing over the fact that mill consumption of fibers has increased by 47 percent in the period 1961 to 1968, the technician who prepared this statistical data gropes for a comparison with growth in personal consumption expenditures and consumer disposable income. This is a non sequitur. This suggests that somehow the textile industry has a right to a constant share of the consumer dollar.

What is particularly objectionable about point 6 and Table 6 is that comparisons are also made to broad woven goods production. The only thing that the table really shows, given the relative performance of mill consumption and broad woven goods production, is that broad woven goods production is losing out to other kinds of textile production. It does not take a great deal of familiarity with this industry to know of the massive shift away from broad woven goods to knit goods, both for apparel and other end uses. Certainly, however, it makes no sense to compare broad woven goods production alone to mill consumption.

Senator Hollings is apparently of the opinion that the man-made fiber industry is part of the textile industry. The Standard Industrial Classification system, however, utilized by the U.S. Government Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, in all official publications, shows the textile industry as a separate group (major group 22), apparel as a separate group (major group 23), and man-made fibers as a part of major group 28, chemicals and allied products (2823 and 2824).

Certainly, man-made fibers compete primarily with raw wool and cotton fiber. If man-made fibers are a textile product, so are raw cotton and wool. Most technicians agree that the "textile industry" begins with yarn, excluding monofilaments and grouped filaments. We do not believe, therefore, it is legitimate to include what are termed "primary" man-made fiber products in Table 7–A.

Whether the man-made fiber industry is a textile industry, or a chemical industry, it is certainly an industry which is not in need of protection. Production (excluding glass fiber) increased from 1,846.1 million pounds in 1961 to 4,781.8 million pounds in 1968, an increase of 159 percent.

Point 7 involves the old chestnut of the competitive relationship of products at earlier and later stages of processing. The argument in Senator Hollings' statement is that the importation of any products in the textile and apparel complex affects the producers of products at all earlier stages of production. Thus it is argued that imports of apparel have an adverse effect upon fiber producers.

However, the more realistic standard which has been a traditional part of American law and which is embodied in international standards (GATT Article 19) in judging import impact is whether a product is directly competitive.

The Trade Expansion Act provides in Section 405(4):

"An imported article is 'directly competitive with' a domestic article at an earlier or later stage of processing, and a domestic article is 'directly competitive with' an imported article at an earlier or later stage of processing, if the importation of the imported article has an economic effect on producers of the domestic article comparable to the effect of importation of articles in the same stage of processing as the domestic article. For purposes of this paragraph, the unprocessed article is at an earlier stage of processing."

The House Ways and Means Committee in its report stated:

"The term 'earlier or later stage of processing' contemplates that the article remains substantially the same during such stages of processing, and is not wholly transformed into a different article." (H. Rept. 1818, 87th Cong., 2d Sess., 1962, p. 69.)

The Section does not comprehend a "directly competitive" relationship between apparel and yarn, or apparel and fabric, or fabric and yarn, since from each stage to the next, the article has been "wholly transformed into a different article" and the article does not remain "substantially the same." In any event, the importation of a finished garment does not have a "comparable" effect on fabric production as importation of fabric.

This traditional standard makes sense since the competitive factors in the importation of apparel for instance are separate and distinct from those involved in yarn importation, and certainly the competitive impact of apparel imports is markedly different on the apparel and on the yarn sectors—one direct, the other indirect and remote.

The other consideration which makes the analysis in point 7 misleading is that the chain of production can be analyzed forwards as well as backwards. The users of imported yarn are American knitters and weavers, and the users of imported fabric are American apparel manufacturers. The Tariff Commission estimated that over two-thirds of textile imports are further processed in the United States. Thus, imports of yarn and textiles are benefiting the American industry.

Table 7–B not only disregards the concept of "directly competitive," but is erroneous in that it also embodies an unrealistic segmentation. What the table purports to show is the indirect effect upon the production of fiber producers for apparel end use without including the entire production of their industry as must be done under present law. Production for apparel end use involves only about 40 percent of fiber production in the United States with the remainder being taken up by fibers for industrial goods, household goods, and other end uses. If fiber producers have increased production by 159 percent since 1961, are currently running at a high level of capacity, are adding new capacity, and are highly profitable, with increasing employment what sense does it make to segment out 40 percent of their production?

The text accompanying Table 7–B creates the impression that somehow the impact upon the apparel industry is being measured, although the table itself measures the *indirect* impact on the *fiber* industry, after unjustified segmentation. The high percentages shown by the table distort reality and are thus essentially meaningless.

Table 7–C directly contradicts Senator Hollings' stated agreement with the importers that this is an all fiber industry. This table measures imports of wool products against consumption of wool. This simply does not make sense, given the rapid shift by the American industry from wool to man-made fibers and to blends of wool with man-made fibers, a shift which has been much greater in domestic production than in the imports.

We would agree, however, that overall measurements based on mill consumption of fibers is a crude measurement of competitive impact. It is, however, the only method by which any overall figure can be reached. As we stated in our basic memorandum:

"Even in the overall figures discussed above, there are a number of distortions when all imports and domestic products are combined in terms of weight. The most valid and revealing comparisons are separate comparisons by the major categories of yarns, fabrics, and apparel."

We have been able to bring up to date the Tariff Commission computations for these major sectors as shown on Tables C, D and E (attached). By this more realistic method of measuring import impact, the ratio of imports to consumption is at low and relatively stable levels: 1 percent for yarn in 1967, 5.9 percent for fabric in 1968, and 6.4 percent for apparel in 1968.

We believe that these tables are the most accurate measure of the impact of imports on the textile and apparel industries, avoiding the distortions inherent in analyses based upon fiber consumption. This was the method utilized by the U.S. Tariff Commission and is, in our view, conclusive that this industry is not being injured or threatened injury—let alone seriously injured.

TABLE A.—PROFITS OF THE TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES COMPARED TO NONDURABLE AND ALL MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES, 1961–68

[Profits before taxes data in millions of dollars]

	Textile mill products		Apparel		Nondurable goods		All manufacturing	
	Profits before taxes	Change (percent)	Profits before taxes	Change (percent)	Profits before taxes	Change (percent)	Profits before taxes	Change (percent)
1961	589		331		13,862		27,508	
1962	724	22.9	415	25.3	15,114	9.0	31,863	15.8
1963	721	–.5	414	–.2	16,421	8.6	34,924	9.6
1964	947	31.3	553	33.5	18,324	11.5	39,567	13.2
1965	1,268	33.8	644	16.4	20,260	10.5	46,487	17.4
1966	1,272	.3	740	14.9	22,610	11.5	51,787	11.4
1967	982	–22.7	728	–2.1	22,050	–2.4	47,772	–7.7
1968	1,276	29.9	931	27.8	24,756	12.2	55,405	15.9
Change, 1961 to 1968		116.6		182.2		78.5		101.4
Average annual change		13.57		16.51		8.7		10.8

Source: Federal Trade Commission-SEC.

TABLE B.—RATE OF PROFIT ON STOCKHOLDERS' EQUITY, FOR ALL MANUFACTURING CORPORATIONS, CORPORATIONS MANUFACTURING NONDURABLE GOODS, CORPORATIONS MANUFACTURING TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS, AND CORPORATIONS MANUFACTURING APPAREL, 1961–68

[In percent]

Year	Rate of profit on stockholders' equity			
	All manufacturing corporations	Corporations manufacturing—		
		Nondurable goods	Textile mill products	Apparel
1961	15.6	15.4	10.4	14.5
1962	17.3	16.2	12.5	17.3
1963	18.1	16.8	12.3	16.4
1964	19.4	17.8	15.7	19.5
1965	21.3	18.4	18.9	21.1
1966	21.9	19.2	18.1	22.2
1967	18.8	17.5	13.7	20.0
1968	20.3	18.6	16.6	22.5

Source: Federal Trade Commission-SEC.

TABLE C.—COTTON, WOOL, AND MANMADE YARN—U.S. PRODUCTION, IMPORTS, EXPORTS, AND APPARENT CONSUMPTION, 1963–67

[In millions of pounds]

Year	Production	Imports	Exports	Apparent consumption	Ratio of imports to consumption
1963	6,723.5	40.5	107.2	6,656.8	0.6
1964	7,252.7	33.2	127.2	7,158.7	.5
1965	7,847.5	47.8	108.6	7,786.7	.6
1966	8,488.5	121.8	77.9	8,532.4	1.4
1967	7,692.8	79.0	94.1	7,677.7	1.0

Source: U.S. Tariff Commission, Bureau of Census.

TABLE D.—BROADWOVEN FABRICS OF COTTON, WOOL, AND MANMADE FIBERS—U.S. PRODUCTION, IMPORTS FOR CONSUMPTION, EXPORTS OF DOMESTIC MERCHANDISE AND APPARENT CONSUMPTION 1963-68

[In millions of square yards]

Year	Production	Imports	Exports	Apparent consumption	Ratio of imports to consumption
1963	13,612.0	614.0	668.9	13,557.0	4.5
1964	14,366.0	582.0	693.0	14,254.0	4.1
1965	15,230.0	837.0	539.2	15,527.8	5.4
1966	15,265.0	1,022.0	592.0	15,695.0	6.5
1967	14,814.9	853.7	534.6	15,134.0	5.6
1968[1]	15,195.0	923.5	525.7	15,592.8	5.9

[1] Conversion from linear yards to square yards for production on the same basis as computed by the Tariff Commission for previous years.

Source: U.S. Tariff Commission, Bureau of Census.

TABLE E.—WEARING APPAREL OF COTTON, WOOL, AND MANMADE FIBERS—U.S. PRODUCTION, IMPORTS FOR CONSUMPTION, EXPORTS OF DOMESTIC MERCHANDISE, AND APPARENT CONSUMPTION, 1963-68

[In millions of pounds, raw fiber equivalent]

Year	Production	Imports	Exports	Apparent consumption	Ratio of imports to consumption
1963	3,152.5	135.0	21.4	3,318.3	4.1
1964	3,341.5	157.8	25.2	3,474.1	4.5
1965	3,468.5	186.1	26.4	3,628.2	5.1
1966	3,617.6	193.7	28.9	3,782.4	5.1
1967	3,622.9	225.0	32.2	3,815.7	6.0
1968	[1]3,971.0	268.1	38.2	4,200.9	6.4

[1] As shown on table 7-B of Senator Hollings' statement.

Source: U.S. Tariff Commission, Bureau of Census.

[Excerpts from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 10, 1969]

EFFECT OF U.S. FOREIGN TRADE POLICY ON BASIC MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, we are in the 7th month of the 91st Congress and of the new administration. Congress has been patiently awaiting the development of administration programs in many areas before rolling up its own sleeves and getting down to the task of legislating solutions to the difficult problems which challenge the health, welfare, and economic security of the American people.

Included in the major problems requiring our attention is that of our Nation's foreign trade policy, especially as it relates to our basic manufacturing industries. Many of America's basic industries are facing strong and increasing import competition. Some indication of the wide-ranging extent of this problem is given in a recent report of the Trade Relations Council of the United States.

Using U.S. Government statistics, the council made a computer analysis of employment, output, and foreign trade of 349 of the Nation's 425 manufacturing industries as defined at the 4-digit level of the standard industrial classification. The correlation of foreign trade data with domestic employment and output data at this level of industry classification is a difficult undertaking. Data were available to make such an analysis possible for the period 1958 through 1966 for a total of 313 industries.

Mr. President, the 313 industries accounted in 1966 for about two-thirds of total employment in all U.S. manufacturing industries. They supplied 85 percent of the value of shipments of manufactured goods in 1966. Products like or competitive with the output of these 313 industries accounted for 99 percent of total U.S. imports of manufactured goods in 1966, and of 85 percent of U.S. exports. These data show that the 313 industries are quite representative of the manufacturing sector of the U.S. economy.

Of the 313 industries, the council found that there were 128 which experienced a balance of trade deficit in 1967. These 128 industries accounted for 25 percent of total employment in all manufacturing industries in 1966, and for 29 percent of the value of shipments of manufactured goods. Imports of manufactures were concentrated in the product lines of these industries to such an extent that articles like or competitive with their output accounted for about two-thirds of the total imports of manufactured products in 1966, but their exports accounted for only 12 percent of total U.S. exports.

From the point of view of the impact of this imbalance in foreign trade on the United States, it is most significant that the balance of trade deficit in these industries was equivalent, at the value of shipments per worker in each industry, to a net loss of nearly 368,000 jobs. For the most part, these 128 industries are labor-intensive industries, so that the lost employment opportunities represent the waste of an especially precious asset to the Nation; namely, job opportunities for comparatively unskilled workers.

It is our hard-core unemployed, residents of economically distressed inner city areas, and the less developed sectors of our Nation such as the Appalachian region, who are the principal victims of the loss of job opportunities represented by the extreme foreign trade imbalance in the products of these 128 industries.

Mr. President, Members of this body are aware that I have been vigilant, in season and out of season, in my efforts to secure relief from excessive import pressures for the textile industry. My efforts to contribute to a solution of the textile import problem should not be taken, however, as any indication that I am less interested in the comparably distressed position of other basic manufacturing industries in my State and in the Nation.

Mr. President, economic hardship to U.S. manufacturing industries stems primarily, though not exclusively, from our trade with Japan. The previously mentioned study of the Trade Relations Council shows that in 1967, of our foreign trade in manufactured products, we experienced a deficit of $1.3 billion in our trade with Japan. Our next largest deficit was incurred in our foreign trade in manufactures with West Germany, where we suffered a deficit of nearly $600 million—large but less than half as great at that we experienced in our trade with Japan.

Mr. President, the experience of my own State is a reflection of what is happening broadly in the Nation as a result of the inordinate volume and rate of increase of imported manufactured goods. South Carolina has made strenuous and highly successful efforts to attract manufacturing industries to establish facilities and jobs within the State. This is part of the major and important efforts which the entire South has made to escape from the limiting economic effects of being merely an agricultural economy.

We currently have 786,000 residents of our State who are employed on nonagricultural payrolls, and 330,000 of them are employed in manufacturing occupations. During the past 10 years, employment in manufacturing industries in South Carolina has increased more rapidly than total employment on nonagricultural payrolls. In 1967, there were nearly 3,300 manufacturing establishments operating in South Carolina with an annual payroll of about one and a half billion dollars. Of the major industries located in our State, the following experienced a foreign trade deficit nationally in 1968:

Textile mill products, $437.3 million. At the output per worker shown by the 1967 Census of Manufactures of $21,232, this foreign trade deficit represented the loss of 20,600 jobs.

Apparel and related products, $674.5 million. At an output per worker of $15,224, this foreign trade deficit represented the loss of 44,316 jobs.

Lumber and wood products, $317.2 million. At an output per worker of $19,316, this foreign trade deficit represented the loss of 16,418 jobs.

Paper and allied products, $431 million. At an output per worker of $32,546, this foreign trade deficit represented the loss of 13,240 jobs.

Stone, clay, and glass products, $515.1 million. At an output per worker of $24,412, this foreign trade deficit represented the loss of 21,103 jobs.

Iron and steel mills and foundries, $1,430.9 million. At an output per worker of $32,613, this foreign trade deficit represented the loss of 43,880 jobs.

Miscellaneous manufactured articles, $416.7 million. At an output per worker of $19,889, this foreign trade deficit represented the loss of 20,951 jobs.

These seven basic manufacturing industries are of major importance to the economy of South Carolina. Together they provide employment for 222,000 residents of our State, over 70 percent of the manufacturing jobs in the State. Neither my State nor the Nation can afford to ignore the fact that U.S. foreign trade in products like or directly competitive with the articles produced by these seven industries resulted in a deficit of $4.2 billion. Further, we must be concerned about the loss of 180,508 new or existing jobs in these industries.

Mr. President, to this point in my remarks I have not alluded to the very serious import problems affecting the domestic footwear industry. There are no footwear manufacturing plants in the State of South Carolina, but in view of my general interest in the national aspects of the foreign trade problems affecting our basic manufacturing industries. I am, of course, familiar with the serious plight of the domestic footwear industry.

In 1968, our Nation had a balance of trade deficit of $377.3 million in footwear. In that year, domestic consumption of leather footwear amounted to 804.0 million pairs of shoes, of which imports supplied 175.4 million pairs. Thus in 1968, imports were equivalent to 21.8 percent of domestic consumption, up sharply from the import penetration ratio of 5.8 percent in 1961. There can be no question about the fact that the domestic footwear industry is faced with a very serious problem.

The rapid increase in the penetration of the domestic market by imports has contributed to an absolute loss of 3,100 jobs in the industry during the 1961-68 period. The latest data for the month of May 1969 shows that employment has decreased by an additional 6,000 jobs in comparison with the average employment in 1968.

Mr. President, my priority of attention to the import problems of the textile industry is based upon the fact that the textile and apparel group accounts for 182,000 of the 222,000 jobs provided by this group of industries in South Carolina.

It is not merely on the basis of employment in South Carolina that the textile import problem calls for priority of attention. With 2,525,000 workers, the textile mill products, apparel, and manmade fiber producing industries are by far the Nation's largest employers of workers among manufacturing industries.

But I say to my friends from other States who are concerned, as I am, not only with textiles but with steel, footwear, glass, wood products, paper, chinaware and pottery, synthetic organic chemicals, and electronic products, that the national policy we establish in the textile import area should be useful in guiding the way to a legislative solution in these other basic industrial product areas. I ask them, therefore, to join with me in setting about to exercise in a constructive way the initiative which belongs to the Congress under our Constitution to fashion a policy for the regulation of foreign commerce in the textile area with the realization that in so doing, they will also be contributing to the establishment of national policy for the regulation of imports in the product areas of these other basic and import-sensitive manufacturing industries.

Mr. President, this brings me in my remarks to a specific consideration of the policy problems which some people believe to exist in applying a corrective to the excessive importation of textile articles into the United States.

When Secretary of Commerce Stans together with his associates traveled to Western Europe and then to the Far East to consult with our Nation's trading partners concerning the textile import problem, he found that he had been preceded by an advance man not of his choosing who had undertaken to brief representatives of the foreign governments and their textile industries concerning that person's concept of the textile import problem. I refer, Mr. President, to the general counsel for the American Importers Association who traveled in advance of Secretary Stans to present information evidently intended to fortify the other nations to resist the invitation of the United States, expressed through Secretary Stans, to engage in meaningful consultation in regard to the U.S. textile import problem. These views on behalf of the American Importers Association are set forth in a memorandum which, with unanimous consent, I ask to have printed in the Record following my remarks.

The Presiding Officer (Mr. Pearson in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. Hollings. Mr. President, as Members of this body are aware, those of us who have been concentrating on the search for a solution to the textile import problem during this and preceding administrations encounter frequently arguments conceived by Americans who act as apologists for maintaining the status quo in defense of the assumed economic interests of those foreign countries who are the principal suppliers of imported textile articles into the U.S. market.

These arguments have a sameness in quality and in concept. Much of the content of the paper distributed on behalf of the American Importers Association consists of such arguments, newly adorned with statistical array.

Mr. President, the memorandum of the American Importers Association serves a useful purpose by bringing out into the open and reducing to writing the arguments being used behind the scenes in opposing the achievement of an agreeable solution to the textile import problem. It deserves our careful study, and it is now my purpose to take up one at a time the contentions of the importers' paper and to refute them with incontrovertible fact. I shall support my analysis of that paper with statistical data compiled from official sources and ask unanimous consent that my numbered tables be inserted at the appropriate places in my remarks.

The Presiding Officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. Hollings. Mr. President, first, the importers assert that "the textile industry has enjoyed a phenomenal growth from 1961 through 1968." The word "phenomenal" means extraordinary or remarkable, according to Webster's Third International Dictionary. The record shows that the textile industry's growth has been neither extraordinary nor remarkable. In the data presented in my table 1, it is established that during the period 1961 through 1968 the average annual rate of growth in the sales of textile mill products and apparel was below that of the average of all manufacturing industries in the United States. Can a below-average rate of growth fairly be described as "phenomenal," Mr. President?

TABLE 1.—U.S. SALES OF TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS AND APPAREL COMPARED WITH ALL MANUFACTURING, 1961-68

[Sales in millions of dollars]

	Textile mill products		Apparel		All manufacturing	
	Sales	Change (percent)	Sales	Change (percent)	Sales	Change (percent)
1961	13,398		12,365		356,424	
1962	14,449	+7.84	13,241	+7.08	389,917	+9.40
1963	15,092	+4.45	13,696	+3.44	412,678	+5.89
1964	16,249	+7.67	14,880	+8.64	443,072	+7.37
1965	18,028	+10.95	16,263	+9.29	492,201	+11.09
1966	19,513	+8.24	18,110	+11.36	554,180	+12.59
1967	18,672	−4.31	18,170	+0.33	575,427	+3.83
1968	20,841	+11.62	20,718	+14.02	631,911	+9.82
Average annual change		+6.64		+7.74		+8.57

Source: FTC-SEC quarterly financial report for manufacturing corporations.

Second, the importers' memorandum, under the heading "Analysis," offers the statement that "every indicator of performance shows a picture of health and growth in the textile and apparel industries." I have just shown that this is not the case when measured by the sales of the industry. Now let me turn to the next indicator referred to by the importer, that of profits.

My table 2 shows that profits of both the textile mill products and apparel industries, whether measured before taxes or after taxes, expressed as a percent of sales, persisted far below the average of all manufacturing industries, and below profits of the nondurable goods industries, to which textiles and apparel are most closely identified, throughout the 1961-68 period. The ratio of profits after taxes to sales for the apparel industry remained less than half that of the nondurable goods and all manufacturing industries throughout the period while those of the textile mill products industry failed to rise above 60 percent of the average of all manufacturing and nondurable goods industries by the end of that period.

Mr. President, can two basic manufacturing industries be said to evidence "a picture of health and growth" from the standpoint of profits when their earnings rate remains from 40 to 50 percent below that of the average of all manufacturing industries and of the nondurable goods sector of manufacturing industries throughout the most recent 8-year period?

TABLE 2—THE COMPARATIVE "PROFIT" PERFORMANCE OF THE TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES, 1961-68

Dollar amounts in millions]

	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968
Textile mill products:								
Profits before taxes	$589	$724	$721	$947	$1,268	$1,272	$982	$1,276
Profits after taxes	$280	$354	$354	$507	$694	$702	$540	$654
Profits as a percent of sales:								
Before taxes (percent)	4.4	5.0	4.8	5.8	7.0	6.5	5.3	6.1
After taxes (percent)	2.1	2.4	2.3	3.1	3.8	3.6	2.9	3.1
Apparel:								
Profits before taxes	$331	$415	$414	$553	$644	$740	$728	$931
Profits after taxes	$157	$212	$189	$318	$377	$432	$420	$507
Profits as a percent of sales:								
Before taxes (percent)	2.7	3.1	3.0	3.7	3.9	4.1	4.0	4.5
After taxes (percent)	1.3	1.6	1.4	2.1	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.4
Nondurable goods industries:								
Profits before taxes	$13,862	$15,114	$16,421	$18,324	$20,260	$22,610	$22,050	$24,756
Profits after taxes	$8,450	$9,150	$10,011	$11,611	$12,983	$14,564	$14,429	$15,546
Profits as a percent of sales:								
Before taxes (percent)	7.6	7.8	8.1	8.5	8.6	8.6	8.0	8.4
After taxes (percent)	4.7	4.7	4.9	5.4	5.5	5.5	5.3	5.3
All manufacturing industries:								
Profits before taxes	$27,508	$31,863	$34,924	$39,567	$46,487	$51,787	$47,772	$55,405
Profits after taxes	$15,308	$17,727	$19,481	$23,208	$27,521	$30,934	$29,008	$32,069
Profits as a percent of sales:								
Before taxes (percent)	7.7	8.2	8.5	8.9	9.4	9.3	8.3	8.8
After taxes (percent)	4.3	4.6	4.7	5.2	5.6	5.6	5.0	5.1

Source: FTC-SEC quarterly financial report for manufacturing corporations.

Third, the importers point to the fact that shipments in 1968 were larger than shipments in 1961 by some 55 percent as though that in some way corroborated their claim of "phenomenal growth" by the U.S. textile industry. The fact of the matter is, as my table 3 establishes, that shipments of textile mill products and apparel increased at a slower rate than the average of all manufacturing industries. Again, Mr. President, the question may fairly be posed: Is an expansion in the value of shipments at a rate below that experienced by the average of all manufacturing industries any evidence of "phenomenal growth"? In my book "below average" is not equal to "extraordinary" or "phenomenal."

TABLE 3.—VALUE OF SHIPMENTS BY THE TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES, COMPARED WITH ALL MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES, 1961–68

[Value of shipments in millions of dollars]

	Textile mill products		Home goods and apparel		All manufacturing	
	Value of shipments	Change (percent)	Value of shipments	Change (percent)	Value of shipments	Change (percent)
1961	13,999		36,997		370,612	
1962	15,154	+8.25	39,555	+6.91	399,696	+7.85
1963	16,537	+9.13	39,759	+0.52	417,291	+4.40
1964	17,808	+7.69	41,750	+5.01	445,552	+6.77
1965	19,318	+8.48	44,909	+7.57	483,343	+8.48
1966	20,407	+5.64	49,609	+10.47	528,448	+9.33
1967	19,241	−5.71	51,206	+3.22	548,542	+3.80
1968	21,458	+11.52	55,126	+7.66	603,718	+10.06
Average annual change		+6.43		+5.91		+7.24

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, "Business Statistics," 1967; "Survey of Current Business," June 1969.

Fourth, the importers' text is unclear but implies that production of textile mill products and apparel increased rapidly over the period. The fact of the matter is that in production, as in the case of the other indicators which I have discussed, the performance of the textile mill products and apparel industries was significantly below the average of all manufacturing industries. A rate of increase well below the average of all manufacturing industries cannot fairly be characterized as a rapid increase. The word "rapid" connotes some relative measure. If we gage the pace of production by the benchmark of the average of all manufacturing industries, we find that production of textile mill products and apparel increased relatively slowly, not rapidly. This is shown by my table 4.

TABLE 4.—INDEX OF PRODUCTION IN THE TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES, COMPARED WITH ALL MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES, 1961–68

[1957–59=100]

	Textile mill products		Apparel		All manufacturing	
	Index	Change, (percent)	Index	Change (percent)	Index	Change (percent)
1961	107.1		112.1		109.6	
1962	115.3	+7.66	118.9	+6.07	118.7	+8.30
1963	116.9	+1.39	125.6	+5.63	124.9	+5.22
1964	122.9	+5.13	134.1	+6.77	133.1	+6.57
1965	134.9	+9.76	145.1	+8.20	145.0	+8.94
1966	142.5	+5.63	150.1	+3.45	158.6	+9.38
1967	142.0	−0.35	147.6	−1.67	159.7	+0.69
1968	150.4	+5.92	149.4	+1.22	166.2	+4.07
Average annual change		+5.02		+4.24		+6.17

Source: Federal Reserve Board.

Fifth, the importers cite a gain of about 300,000 workers in the textile mill products and apparel industries as additional evidence of "phenomenal growth" between 1961 and 1968. The facts are again contrary to the impression which the importers' statement purports to convey.

In my table 5 I have traced the growth in employment in the textile mill products and apparel industries compared with all manufacturing and compared with the growth in the Nation's total labor force. It is very significant, I believe, that the average annual rate of change in employment in the textile mill products industry is only about half that of all manufacturing industries, and is well below the rate of growth in the Nation's total labor force. Clearly the textile mill products industry is being retarded in its capacity to generate new employment to accommodate its share of the responsibility for providing jobs for the Nation's ever-increasing labor force.

It is of interest that while the apparel industry is increasing employment at an average annual rate far below that of the average of all manufacturing industries, it has maintained a growth of employment in excess of the rate of growth in the Nation's labor force. Realistically we must recognize that the tremendous quantities of broadwoven and knitted fabric being imported into the United States are the raw material for apparel plants, where it is cut and sewn into finished textile products. The apparel industry is being forced, as other American industries before it have been forced, to attempt to stay alive in the face of import competition by reducing its costs wherever possible, including the substitution of cheap foreign-produced fabric for the more expensive domestic article.

The employment growth rates in my table 5 clearly suggest that the victim of these combined pressures is the textile mill products industry whose employment growth rate is significantly below that of the apparel industry—though, as I have already pointed out, growth in apparel employment is far below the rate of growth in all manufacturing industries.

In any event, Mr. President these data certainly do not support the use which the importers attempt to make of the overall change in employment; namely, as support for their thesis that the textile industry has enjoyed a "phenomenal growth" during the past 8 years.

TABLE 5.—EMPLOYMENT IN THE TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES COMPARED WITH ALL MANUFACTURING AND WITH THE NATION'S TOTAL LABOR FORCE, 1961–68

[Employment data in thousands]

	Textile mill products		Apparel		All manufacturing		The Nation's total labor force	
	Employment	Change (percent)	Employment	Change (percent)	Employment	Change (percent)	Employ. ment	Change (percent)
1961	893.4		1,214.5		16,326		73,031	
1962	902.3	+1.00	1,263.7	+4.05	16,853	+3.23	73,342	+0.43
1963	885.4	−1.87	1,282.8	+1.51	16,995	+.84	74,571	+1.68
1964	892.0	+.75	1,302.5	+1.54	17,274	+1.64	75,830	+1.69
1965	925.6	+3.77	1,354.2	+3.97	18,062	+4.56	77,178	+1.78
1966	961.5	+3.88	1,398.8	+3.29	19,186	+6.22	78,893	+2.22
1967	951.5	−1.04	1,390.7	−.58	19,434	+1.29	80,793	+2.41
1968	984.9	+3.51	1,416.8	+1.88	19,740	+1.57	82,272	+1.83
Average annual change		+1.43		+2.24		+2.76		+1.72

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Sixth, the importers turn to statistics concerning the mill consumption of fibers in a further effort to bolster their notion that the textile industry has enjoyed phenomenal growth and is the picture of health. They content themselves with calling attention to the fact that the amount of fiber consumed in 1968 was 47 percent greater than that consumed in 1961 and calling attention to the increased use of manmade fibers in U.S. textile operations.

It is not surprising, Mr. President, that U.S. textile mill consumption reflects an increased use of manmade fibers in comparison with cotton and wool. The American textile industry has pioneered, innovated, and promoted the use of manmade fibers, alone and in blends, in conventional and new fabric constructions in an imaginative effort to gain and hold the allegiance of consumers for increased expenditures for textile articles. To a degree this effort was successful in the past, and it is this success that for a time helped cushion the blow of the rising import competition.

As the liberally administered restraints of the Long-Term Cotton Textile Arrangement placed some limitations, however generous, on exports of cotton textiles to the United States, the principal supplying nations shifted increasingly to the use of manmade fibers, alone and in blends, in part to escape the restraints under the LTA, and in part to take advantage of the consumer demand which had been stimulated by the developmental and promotional programs of the U.S. textile industry.

As in the case of the other alleged indicators of phenomenal growth cited by the importers, it is not sufficient, as they do, merely to call attention to the fact that there has been an increase in the consumption of fibers. I can accept for purposes of discussion the thesis of the importers that overall fiber consumption should be considered rather than a segmented study of cotton, wool, and manmade fibers. Indeed, I am happy to see the importers take this position, as it is precisely this fact which has been the basis for the efforts of the American industry and textile State Members of Congress to persuade the executive branch of the Government to recognize that the textile industry complex is interdependent from a fiber point of view and that all-fiber regulation is required, not merely imports of cotton textiles.

The fact is, however, Mr. President, that the rate of increase in mill consumption of all fibers in the United States has lagged seriously behind the increase in consumer disposable income and of personal consumer expenditures for clothing articles in the United States. It is also significant that textile sales valued in constant dollars have grown at a rate very close to that of mill consumption, both being far off the pace of the growth in consumer disposable income and expenditures for clothing.

As will be shown in a subsequent section of my remarks, the mill consumption of fibers standing alone is an insufficient indication of the pace of activity in the textile mill products industry. The heart of this industry is represented by the establishments engaged in the production of fabric for use in apparel. A substantial part of the fiber consumed in the United States goes into floor coverings and industrial textiles. The growth rate in these sectors, including, notably, tufted carpets and rugs, has been exceptional and the amount of fiber consumed in such manufacturing activity tends to invalidate the use of mill consumption data standing alone as an index of textile mill activity. This point is emphasized by the data in my table 6 concerning the production of broadwoven goods, where the annual average rate of change is far, far below the increase in the mill consumption of fibers.

These facts, established by my table 6, refute the suggestion contained in the importers' memorandum that in some way the change in mill consumption of fibers supports their general thesis. The facts as set forth in my table 6 show that in this area, as in the case of the other factors cited by the importers, the truth is opposite to the impression they seek to create.

TABLE 6.—TEXTILE MANUFACTURING ACTIVITY AS MEASURED BY MILL CONSUMPTION OF FIBERS, BROADWOVEN GOODS PRODUCTION, AND TEXTILE SALES IN CONSTANT DOLLARS, 1961-68

	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	Average annual change (percent)
Mill consumption of all fibers (millions of pounds)	6,561.0	7,042.1	7,246.1	7,782.1	8,494.4	9,007.5	8,982.0	9,781.7	
Percent of change		+7.33	+2.90	+7.40	+9.15	+6.03	−0.28	+8.90	+5.92
Broadwoven goods production, all fibers (millions of linear yards)	11,863	12,301	12,104	12,766	13,431	13,304	12,753	12,968	
Percent of change		+3.69	−1.60	+5.47	+5.21	−0.95	−4.14	+1.69	+1.34
Textile sales, 1961 (millions of dollars)	$13,973	$14,971	$15,510	$16,673	$17,910	$19,311	$19,279	$20,708	
Percent of change		+7.14	+3.60	−7.50	+7.42	+7.82	−0.17	+7.41	+5.82
Consumer disposable income (billions of dollars)	$364.4	$385.3	$404.6	$438.1	$473.2	$511.6	$546.3	$589.0	
Percent of change		+5.74	+5.01	+8.28	+8.01	+8.11	+6.78	+7.82	+7.11
Personal consumption expenditures: Clothing and shoes (billions of dollars)	$27.9	$29.6	$30.6	$33.5	$35.9	$39.8	$42.1	$45.7	
Percent of change		+6.09	+3.38	+9.48	+7.16	+10.86	+5.78	+8.55	+7.33

Source: Textile Organon, March 1969; Bureau of the Census; Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Seventh, the importers next contend that "imports have increased modestly in comparison with the spectacular growth in mill consumption." They insist that data pertaining to the apparent domestic consumption of textiles and to imports be evaluated on an overall pound equivalent basis. They then point to the smaller increase in the quantity of textile imports than they assert occurred in the textile mill consumption of fibers as support for their contention that "there has been no injury to domestic production due to imports."

The importers' argument is facile: By substituting the concept of "injury to domestic production" for the more appropriate test of "injury to the domestic industry" the importers seek to avoid the implications of the retarded growth rate in employment and sales, and the marginal earnings performance of the textile mill products and apparel industries in comparison with the average of all manufacturing industries which I have previously discussed and documented.

Their stratagem should not succeed, Mr. President, because it is addressed superficially and in misleading way to a fragment of the data reflective of the industry's situation which is far less cogent in evaluating the industry's position than the systematic analysis which I have presented in these remarks.

A study of the relationship of imports to the mill consumption of fibers can be helpful, Mr. President, if it is approached with a correct understanding of the structural nature of the textile import problem and with appropriate methodology. This I shall now undertake to do.

A fair analysis of the textile import problem must begin with the recognition that manmade staple fiber, filaments, and filament yarn are textile articles, recognized as such by the United Nation's Standard International Trade Classification, the Brussels Nomenclature, the Tariff Schedules of the United States, the Tariff Commission in its January 1968 report on "Textiles and Apparel" made at the joint behest of the President and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, by the textile industry itself in its testimony before congressional committees and the Tariff Commission, and in the definitions of all of the pending textile import quota bills.

This recognition leads necessarily to the inclusion of imports of manmade fibers in the data which undertake to measure in pound equivalents, imports of textile articles. Just as imports of apparel articles have an impact upon the textile mills which weave fabric by displacing the consumption of domestic fabric by domestic apparel plants, so, too, the importation of apparel, fabric, yarn, and staple of manmade fiber have an impact upon the manmade fiber producers, part of the textile industry complex, by displacing domestically produced fiber in textile articles destined for consumption in the U.S. market.

The importers ignore this basic fact in their memorandum and, hence, their data significantly understate the true extent of import penetration of manmade fibers as measured by the ratio of imports to domestic consumption of fiber. My table 7 sets forth the data pertinent to this measurement. The importers have undertaken to measure only the ratio of imports of secondary textile articles to domestic consumption, whereas the true measure must be based upon the ratio of total imports of textile articles, including manmade fibers, to domestic consumption. Thus, the correct measurement of the import penetration of textile articles on an all-fiber basis in the year 1969 is 10.5 percent rather than the 7.7 percent claimed by the importers in their memorandum.

TABLE 7-A.—RATIO OF IMPORTS OF TEXTILE ARTICLES TO DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION, 1961-68

[Amounts in millions of pounds of fiber]

		Imports			Ratio of imports to domestic consumption (percent)	
	Domestic consumption	Primary manmade fiber products	Secondary cotton, wool, and manmade fiber products	Total	Secondary	Total
1961	6,564.0	60.1	339.8	399.9	5.2	6.1
1962	7,206.4	87.6	486.0	573.6	6.7	8.0
1963	7,422.2	145.2	493.0	638.2	6.6	8.6
1964	7,938.0	158.2	491.3	649.5	6.2	8.2
1965	8,758.9	159.3	595.7	755.0	6.8	8.6
1966	9,425.4	212.7	772.2	984.9	8.2	10.4
1967	9,339.0	196.3	697.8	894.1	7.5	9.6
1968	10,235.5	293.2	784.3	1,077.5	7.7	10.5

Source: Textile Organon, March 1969.

But these data, even when corrected as by my table 7–A, still conceal the true extent of the import penetration of textile articles in the most seriously affected area of the industry; namely, the apparel manufacturing sector with the supporting textile mill products operations which supply the yarn and fabric which ultimately become apparel articles. It is possible to determine that portion of the mill consumption of textile fibers in the United States which has apparel as its end use. Imports of yarn, fabric, and apparel on a fiber pound equivalent basis can then be related to the domestic consumption of fiber for apparel use to derive a more accurate indication of the extent of import penetration in this major and most sensitive sector of the textile industry. This analysis is presented in my table 7–B, which establishes that in 1968 imports accounted for nearly 18 percent of domestic consumption of textile fiber in apparel manufacture, more than double the extent of import penetration in 1961.

TABLE 7-B.—RATIO OF THE AGGREGATE IMPORTS OF YARN, FABRIC, AND APPAREL TO THE DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF FIBER IN APPAREL END USE, 1961-68

[Amounts in millions of pounds]

	Domestic consumption of fiber in apparel end use	Imports of yarn, fabric, and apparel	Ratio of imports to domestic consumption (percent)
1961	2,883	270.2	9.4
1962	3,065	408.1	13.3
1963	3,152	430.5	13.7
1964	3,342	424.5	12.7
1965	3,469	526.1	15.2
1966	3,618	680.3	18.8
1967	3,623	612.7	16.9
1968	[1] 3,971	699.6	17.6

[1] 1968 consumption calculated based on ratio of apparel end use to total consumption in 1967, applied to 1968 domestic fiber consumption as reported in source.

Source: Textile Organon, March issues, 1964, 1966, 1969; January 1969.

Mr. President, the use of overall statistics concerning imports and domestic consumption on an all-fiber basis not only tends to obscure the heavy impact of imports in the apparel sector of the industry and those sectors of the textile mill products and fiber industry which support apparel manufacturing; it also obscures the very grave position of the woolen and worsted industry in the United States as a result of inordinate import pressures. My table 7–C shows that the penetration of textile articles of wool has risen to the extraordinary level of 31.3 percent in the year 1968, up sharply from the already excessive level of imports which existed in 1961 of 23.8 percent.

TABLE 7–C.—RATIO OF IMPORTS TO DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION FOR WOOL, 1961–68

[Amounts in millions of pounds]

	Domestic consumption	Imports	Ratio of imports to domestic consumption (percent)
1961	535.0	127.4	23.8
1962	570.3	145.6	25.5
1963	558.6	152.5	27.3
1964	490.8	141.1	28.7
1965	527.5	156.1	29.6
1966	500.4	142.9	28.6
1967	423.5	121.7	28.7
1968	466.4	146.0	31.3

Source: Textile, Organon, March 1969.

Mr. President, the issue posed by the contentions of the American Importers Association and the currency which those contentions gained as a result of their energetic distribution and exposition by that association's representatives in advance of Secretary Stans' visit to the nations whose representatives be consulted in regard to the U.S. textile import problem can be stated as follows: Does the Congress wish, as a matter of policy, to leave without remedy basic American industries whose rate of growth is retarded under the pressure of excessive and rapidly increasing import competition to a degree where such industries fall below the average rate of growth of the manufacturing sector of the American economy and below the rate of growth required if the industry is to contribute proportionately to employment of the growing labor force of the Nation?

The importers seek to obscure this fundamental issue by simplistic presentation of absolute growth figures over an 8-year period without in a single instance relating such growth to the growth of the Nation's work force, or of its economy, or of the manufacturing sector of the economy, or to the earnings performance of other industries. The essence of the importers' position is that the Congress ought not to inquire into the relative performance and growth of the textile industry in comparison with the rest of the American economy nor be concerned about a submarginal growth rate for a basic American industry.

Mr. President, I believe that the issue is clearly joined by the type of attack which the American Importers Association is making upon the U.S. textile industry and the manner in which the importers have set about to obfuscate the essential facts.

To my colleagues in this body I state that the time has come when we must cleanly and squarely face up to our responsibilities. It is we who are charged with the regulation of foreign commerce. It is we who are expected to strike a balance between the legitimate interests of foreign nations intent upon trading with the United States and benefiting by our open market, on the one hand, and the equally legitimate interests of American industries to sustain on a reasonable basis their work force and economic growth so that they may continue to contribute to the strength and well-being of our Nation.

It is not, Mr. President, a heinous act for Members of this body to respond to their constitutional responsibilities. It is not an unworthy act for a Congress which has always been keenly sensitive to our Nation's moral and legal obligations to other members of the community of nations to act now to develop a policy based upon concepts of fairness and equity which will afford our basic domestic industries at least an equal opportunity to share in the economic life and progress of our Nation.

In view of our traditions, we recognize as Americans that freedom is accompanied by responsibility. The right to freedom of our choice does not give any of us the right to shout "fire" in a crowded theater, nor the right to drive at a reckless rate of speed irrespective of the right of others on a public highway. By act of Congress our free enterprise system does not give any American manufacturer the right to pay wages below the statutory minimum nor to require his employees to work in excess of the maximum hours without the payment of the prescribed overtime. Our free enterprise system must also yield to the strictures of the antitrust laws and to the prohibition contained in the Federal Trade Commission Act against the use of unfair practices in commerce.

Why is it that we in the Congress, with the full realization that no responsible member or group in society have the right to exercise their liberty in a way that does positive harm to their neighbors, refuse to recognize the true nature of excessive import competition based upon the competitive advantage of wage scales and working conditions which are outlawed in this country? Opponents of import regulation choose to state the problem in terms of simplistic alternatives, using expressions such as "shutting out imports." That type of dialog does a disservice to the difficult task which is our responsibility as Members of the Congress to recognize the problems, to study and understand them, and to have the courage to undertake their solution.

It is no longer sufficient, given the widespread exposure of our basic industries, for us to take refuge in the thought that the best solution, as implied in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, is for the Federal Government to subsidize the relocation of entire industries and their workers to some other line of endeavor. Mr. President, it is manifestly impossible to "relocate" the textile and apparel industries: they are spread across the face of America in literally hundreds of communities. It is difficult to retrain the workers in the textile industry for some other occupation. In many cases the textile mill represents the only source of gainful employment for miles around the community in which it is located. In Appalachia and a 50-mile belt surrounding it, employment in the textile mill products, apparel, and manmade fiber industries accounts for one out of every four jobs in manufacturing industries available to that depressed economic area.

Mr. President, for many years the United States has based its foreign trade policy on the myth that our capital-intensive industries whose technological sophistication enables them to compete in world trade will supply jobs for all of the workers who are displaced by rising import competition in the product sectors of our labor-intensive industries. The study to which I referred at the outset based on a computer analysis performed on behalf of the Trade Relations Council of the United States demonstrates conclusively that this assumption is fallacious.

I have already alluded to the fact that the labor-intensive industries included in the Trade Relations Council study suffered a net loss of 367,552 jobs as a result of the balance of trade deficit experienced in our foreign trade in products like or competitive with the output of those industries in 1966 alone. The Council's study also established that the foreign trade surplus of the capital-intensive industries generated employment equivalent to only 201,532 jobs, leaving the U.S. economy with a net job deficit in manufacturing of 160,000 jobs. While the capital-intensive industries generated in dollars a trade surplus of $10.4 billion, somewhat greater than the trade deficit of $9 billion of the labor-intensive industries in 1967, the net favorable dollar balance of $1.4 billion will not supply a surplus of jobs as a result of our foreign trade in manufactured products.

Mr. President, this Nation will always require a complete range of manufacturing industries, including the labor-intensive as well as the capital-intensive, if our responsibilities to provide employment for all of the members of our work force are to be met. The Nation's labor force does not now, nor will it ever, consist entirely of persons possessing the types of technical skills which are needed in the sophisticated capital-intensive industries; nor will those industries ever be able to employ the entire portion of the work force which must find its employment in the manufacturing sector of the economy.

What we are witnessing is a strong erosion of jobs and job opportunities in labor-intensive industries because our foreign trade policy exposes those industries to unrelieved pressure from sharply rising imports without hope for limitation. Unless we promptly undertake to creat a realistic foreign trade policy that will preserve for our labor-intensive industries equal opportunity to share in the growth of the American market with foreign products, we are dooming our basic manufacturing industries to a slow death and their workers to an insecure and uncertain future.

I say to the Members of this body that the time is overdue in which we manfully face our responsibilities and undertake to act in the interests not only of the textile mill products, apparel, and man-made fiber industries, but also the other basic industries which are similarly affected by excessive imports. To this end, Mr. President, I shall shortly introduce as an amendment to an appropriate bill pending before this body a legislative solution not only to the textile import problem, but also to the problems besetting any other American industry which is being harmed in its employment of economic health by excessive import competition. I shall at an appropriate time ask the distinguished Members of this body who have displayed leadership on these problems to join with me in the sponsorship of this important new approach to the solution of these problems.

Exhibit I

American Importers
Association, Inc.,
New York, N.Y.

Attached is a revised copy of our earlier Memorandum entitled "Memorandum on the Performance of the United States Textile and Apparel Industries and the Impact of Imports." The revisions include several 1968 figures which had been estimated or were preliminary. Most of them apply to sales and profits, Table 1, Figures 1 and 2.

Michael P. Daniels,
General Counsel.

Memorandum on the Performance of the U.S. Textile and Apparel Industries and the Impact of Imports

[Figures referred to not printed in Record]

The purpose of this memorandum is to summarize the reasons of AIA–TAG for asserting the complete lack of economic justification for controls on imports of textiles and apparel products, whether by way of legislative quotas or a negotiated international agreement. A more extensive treatment is contained in the statement of AIA–TAG before the Committee on Ways and

Means on Foreign Trade and Tariff Proposals (Part 6, pages 2415, 2417, et seq. 1967).

Foreign governments, it is believed, will reject approaches to enter into an international agreement controlling world trade in textiles and apparel because of the absence of data supporting the United States industry's special pleas for such controls.

SUMMARY

The textile industry has enjoyed a phenomenal growth from 1961 through 1968. This growth was briefly interrupted by a slight recession in the general economy in 1967 resulting in a minor downturn from the record levels achieved by the industry in 1966. In 1968, the industry completely recovered from this recession and surpassed, in almost every instance, the record performance of 1966. Indications are that 1969 will be another record year for the textile industry. This depends largely upon general economic factors and the overall condition of the American economy.

Imports over the period have also grown, but such growth has been commensurate with the growth in domestic production. Imports also declined during the slight recession of 1967, but picked up in 1968. During 1968, and at the present time, imports have been stimulated by extraordinary demand conditions within the United States and inflationary price levels. Nonetheless, imports represent a very modest and stable proportion of domestic consumption of textile and apparel products.

Import growth must be seen within the context of the growth in domestic production and domestic consumption of such products. Figures showing the growth of imports in percentage terms without reference either to the absolute volume of increase or outside of the context of overall domestic consumption are misleading and considerably distort reality.

Another major distortion engaged in by the domestic industry is analyses by each fiber: cotton, man-made, and wool. Man-made fibers are substituting for both cotton and wool. This is clearly admitted by the United States textile industry. The consequence of that admission, however, is that one must look to the overall performance of all fibers in making valid comparisons.

ANALYSIS

An analysis of every indicator of performance shows a picture of health and growth in the textile and apparel industries. These indices are shown on the attached tables and charts.

SALES AND PROFITS

Sales of the textile mill products industry grew from 13.4 billion dollars in 1961 to 20.8 billion dollars in 1968, an increase of 55.6 percent. Sales for 1968 were 11.6 percent above the level for 1967.

Profits of the textile mill products industry grew from 589 million dollars in 1961 to 1,276 million dollars in 1968, an increase of 116.6 percent. The increase in profits for 1968 compared to 1967 was 29.9 percent.

Apparel industry sales grew by 67.6 percent from 1961 to 1968. Profits grew by 181.3 percent over this period from 331 million dollars to 931 million dollars. These figures are shown on Table 1 and are plotted on Figures I and II.

SHIPMENTS

Shipments from the textile mill products industry grew from 14.0 billion dollars in 1961 to 21.7 billion dollars in 1968, an increase of some 55 percent. These figures are shown on Table 2 and Figure III.

PRODUCTION

Industrial production increased rapidly over the period. For the apparel industry there was a slight decline in 1967 but a pickup in 1968 almost to the peak level of 1966. The textile mill products industry also showed a slight decrease from 1966 to 1967, but a strong upward turn in 1968 with an increase of about 8 points in the index of industrial production. These figures are shown on Table 3 and Figures IV and V.

EMPLOYMENT

Employment has also shown an increase over the period with a gain in almost 300,000 workers from 1961 to 1968. During 1968 alone, there was a gain of 50,000 workers. These figures are shown on Table 4 and Figure VI.

MILL CONSUMPTION OF FIBERS

Mill consumption of cotton, wool, man-made and other fibers are shown on Table 5 and Figure VII. It should first be noted that total consumption of all fibers, which is a measure of overall textile activity, increased from 6.6 billion pounds in 1961 to 9.7 billion pounds in 1968, an increase of 47 percent. What the figure illustrates so graphically is the switch from the natural fibers to the man-made fibers. Thus, the performance of wool has remained fairly static with some decline evident and there was a drop in cotton consumption. Man-made fibers, on the other hand, have increased from 2.1 billion pounds to 5.2 billion pounds, an increase of 115 percent. In 1968 for the first time, man-made fibers surpassed cotton consumption. It is this dramatic switch to the man-made fibers which has made analysis by separate fibers irrelevant.

The domestic industry can point to a declining performance of cotton and wool. This is not attributable to imports, however, but to the competition from man-made fibers. Total consumption, as shown on Figure VII, has increased.

COMPARISON OF IMPORTS AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION

Table 6 and Figure VIII show mill consumption, apparent domestic consumption, (mill consumption, plus imports, minus exports) imports and exports. Imports have increased modestly in comparison with the spectacular growth in mill consumption. It is here that the "percentage game" is belied. It is true that imports have increased by 135 percent from 1961 to 1968, whereas mill consumption has increased by 47 percent. However, the absolute magnitudes are the important factor. While imports increased by 450.7 *million* pounds, mill consumption increased by 3.1 *billion* pounds. Thus, the growth in mill consumption was about seven times the growth in imports. Of the total growth in mill consumption plus imports, imports accounted for only 12.7 percent, while domestic mill consumption accounted for 87.3 percent.

Certainly as Figure VIII illustrates, there has been no injury to domestic production due to imports. The slight decline in mill consumption in 1967 was matched by a greater decline in imports (see Table 6). As Table 6 also shows, the ratio of imports to domestic consumption has remained fairly stable, certainly since 1962. The ratio in 1968 was only one point above the 1962 ratio and in 1967 and 1968 there was an actual decline from the highest ratio reached in 1966. This overall measurement has a number of imperfections so that the ratio should not be taken as accurate in the absolute sense; however, as an index it measures the relative performance of the domestic industry compared to imports.

ANALYSIS BY FIBER

As pointed out above, analysis by separate fibers is unfair and misleading.

The situation in wool and cotton is impossible to illustrate because of the rapid substitution of man-made fibers for the natural fibers on the cotton and the woolen and worsted systems. Thus, simple minded comparisons of imports, chiefly of cotton or wool with domestic production by chiefly fiber, are completely misleading.

The domestic industry has made a large point of the growth in imports of man-made fiber products. These figures compared with mill consumption and apparent domestic consumption are shown on Table 7 and Figure IX. Imports have grown from 23.2 million pounds in 1961 to 172.4 million pounds in 1968. Mill consumption, however, during the same period grew from 2.1 billion pounds in 1961 to 5.2 billion pounds in 1968. Thus, while imports increased by 149.2 *million*, mill consumption increased by 3.1 *billion*. As the figure also illustrates, the ratio of imports to domestic consumption has remained at extremely low rates, at its highest, 3.3 percent in 1968.

COMPARISONS BY SEGMENT

Even in the overall figures discussed above, there are a number of distortions when all imports and domestic products are combined in terms of weight. The most valid and revealing comparisons are separate comparisons by the major categories of yarns, fabrics, and apparel. Unfortunately, it is almost impossible to compute figures for 1968 because of the time lag in statistical reporting, and even in 1967, there are difficult problems. Judgments as to conversion factors and other technical matters complicate the matter. The most reliable computations available are those by the United States Tariff Commission. The Commission found that the ratio of imports to consumption in 1966 for yarns was 1.4 percent. for broad woven fabrics, 6.5 percent, and for apparel (in 1965), 5.1 percent.

Given the general relative performance of imports and domestic production for 1967 and 1968, we do not believe that these percentages would have materially changed. Indeed, the overall analysis showing a higher ratio in 1966 than in 1967 or 1968 (see Table 6), can be taken as an indication that in some areas the ratios might also have declined.

ANALYSIS BY INDIVIDUAL PRODUCTS

The domestic industry has often cited particular products, for example, white shirts, with very high ratios of imports to domestic consumption as reason for overall quotas. Such particular instances, however, affecting a minute portion of the trade, cannot be utilized to support overall controls. In many instances, even with a very high ratio of imports to consumption, imports cannot have been deemed to have caused any injury to domestic production. This depends on the particular nature of the trade and the nature of the product, where, in many instances, one is dealing with specialties traditionally imported in large proportion from overseas.

Such particular products should, in our view, be handled through the Escape Clause mechanism, first to determine whether imports have caused or threatened serious injury, and second, to determine what relief might be appropriate if injury is found.

To this end, we have endorsed the general notion of an Escape Clause amendment suggested by the report of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations and by the Hon. Wilbur Mills, Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, as the appropriate method of dealing with the problems of particular products. Such problems, if any, will certainly not support the overall quota relief sought by the domestic industry.

TABLE 1.—SALES AND PROFITS: U.S. TEXTILE AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES, 1961–68

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Textile mill products		Apparel and other finished products	
	Net sales	Net profits before Federal income tax	Net sales	Net profits before Federal income tax
1961	$13,398	$589	$12,365	$331
1962	$14,449	$724	$13,241	$415
1963	$15,092	$721	$13,696	$414
1964	$16,249	$947	$14,880	$553

XUM

TABLE 1.—SALES AND PROFITS: U.S. TEXTILE AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES, 1961–68—Continued

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Textile mill products		Apparel and other finished products	
	Net sales	Net profits before Federal income tax	Net sales	Net profits before Federal income tax
1965	$18,028	$1,268	$16,263	$644
1966	$19,513	$1,272	$18,110	$740
1967	$18,672	$982	$18,170	$728
1968	$20,841	$1,276	$20,718	$931
Increase: 1961 to 1968 (percent)	55.6	116.6	67.6	181.3
Increase: 1967 to 1968 (percent)	11.6	29.9	14.6	27.9

Source: Federal Trade Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission.

TABLE 2.—U.S. MANUFACTURERS' SHIPMENTS: TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS, 1961–68

[Millions of dollars]

1961	13,999
1962	15,179
1963	15,734
1964	16,998
1965	18,294
1966	19,608
1967	19,241
1968	21,742

Increase: 1961–68, 55 percent.
Increase: 1967–68, 13 percent.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 3.—INDEX OF INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

		Textile mill products		Apparel products
Annually:				
1961		107.1		112.1
1962		115.3		118.9
1963		116.9		125.6
1964		122.9		134.1
1965		134.9		145.1
1966		142.5		150.1
1967		142.0		147.6
1968		150.3		149.9
	1968	1967	1968	1967
Monthly:				
January	147.6	141.4	145.2	150.2
February	148.8	139.2	146.4	147.1
March	149.9	139.2	148.5	146.3
April	146.3	138.3	148.9	142.5
May	147.2	138.3	149.6	142.6
June	148.8	136.9	151.4	142.4
July	150.9	135.8	150.4	144.2
August	151.4	137.9	149.0	146.4
September	152.0	140.6	149.9	146.8
October	153.3	144.3	152.1	146.2
November	155.1	147.1	152.5	148.6
December	153.5	151.9	149.2	150.9

Note: Monthly figures seasonally adjusted.
Source: Federal Reserve Board.

TABLE 4.—EMPLOYMENT: U.S. TEXTILE AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES

[In thousands]

	Textile	Apparel	Total
Annually:			
1961	893	1,215	2,108
1962	902	1,264	2,166
1963	885	1,283	2,168
1964	892	1,303	2,195
1965	926	2,354	2,280
1966	964	1,402	2,366
1967	957	1,400	2,357
1968	985	1,417	2,402

TABLE 4.—EMPLOYMENT: U.S. TEXTILE AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES—Continued

[In thousands]

	Textile	Apparel	Total
1968 monthly:			
January	972	1,399	2,371
February	981	1,403	2,384
March	979	1,408	2,387
April	979	1,417	2,396
May	982	1,422	2,404
June	990	1,433	2,423
July	987	1,416	2,403
August	990	1,412	2,402
September	987	1,422	2,409
October	988	1,426	2,414
November	992	1,419	2,411
December	994	1,425	2,419

Note: Seasonally adjusted.
Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

TABLE 5.—U.S. MILL CONSUMPTION OF FIBERS, 1961–68

[In millions of pounds]

	Cotton	Wool	Manmades	Others	Total
1961	4,081.5	412.1	2,057.7	12.7	6,567.0
1962	4,188.0	429.1	2,418.5	12.4	7,048.0
1963	4,040.2	411.7	2,787.8	13.1	7,252.8
1964	4,244.4	356.7	3,174.3	14.2	7,789.6
1965	4,477.5	387.0	3,624.1	13.3	8,501.9
1966	4,630.5	370.2	4,002.2	14.7	9,017.6
1967	4,423.0	312.5	4,240.4	10.4	8,986.3
1968[1]	4,136.1	345.0	5,175.0	11.9	9,668.0

[1] Estimated.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 6.—U.S. MILL CONSUMPTION OF ALL FIBERS, COMPARED TO THE FIBER CONTENT OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF ALL SEMIMANUFACTURED AND MANUFACTURED TEXTILE AND APPAREL PRODUCTS, AND APPARENT DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION, 1961-68

[In millions of pounds

Year	Mill consumption	Imports	Exports	Apparent domestic consumption	Imports as a percent of domestic consumption
1961	6,567.0	333.6	326.0	6,574.6	5.1
1962	7,048.0	485.4	313.4	7,220.0	6.7
1963	7,252.8	492.7	307.6	7,437.9	6.6
1964	7,789.6	491.2	325.5	7,955.3	6.2
1965	8,501.9	595.7	320.2	8,777.4	6.8
1966	9,017.6	771.4	342.8	9,446.2	8.2
1967	8,986.3	697.7	333.0	9,351.0	7.5
1968[1]	9,668.0	784.3	321.0	10,131.3	7.7

[1] Preliminary.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 7.—U.S. MILL CONSUMPTION OF MANMADE FIBERS, COMPARED TO THE MANMADE FIBER CONTENT OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF SEMIMANUFACTURED AND MANUFACTURED TEXTILE AND APPAREL PRODUCTS, AND APPARENT DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Mill consumption	Imports	Exports	Apparent domestic consumption	Imports as a percent of domestic consumption
1961	2,057.7	23.2	82.5	1,998.4	1.2
1962	2,418.5	30.0	89.0	2,359.5	1.3
1963	2,787.8	35.9	95.1	2,728.6	1.3
1964	3,174.3	49.9	105.7	3,118.5	1.6
1965	3,624.1	79.0	131.2	3,571.9	2.2
1966	4,002.2	121.5	141.0	3,982.7	3.1
1967	4,240.4	137.5	134.4	4,243.5	3.2
1968[1]	5,175.0	172.4	124.0	5,223.4	3.3

[1] Estimated.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

CONTINUATION OF COLLOQUY

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished Senator from South Carolina for this masterly analysis of the desperate situation which confronts the textile industry, as well as other industries in this Nation. I commend him not only for his analysis, but particularly for the concluding words of his speech, in which he justifiably states that the time has come for something more than words. It is time for action on the part of Congress.

As the distinguished Senator knows, I have been in conference with him, and shall wish to join him when he introduces the bill which he is preparing. I have two bills of my own before the Senate on this subject.

In my own State, where we have lost the bulk of our textile industry, we find we are now going down the same road with the shoe industry, which is vital to my section of the country. Eleven plants have recently closed, seven of them within the last 3 years. Nearly 3,000 jobs have been destroyed, and, in the last 6 months, the trend has speeded up to the point where we have lost over a thousand more jobs in the shoe industry alone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator's time be extended 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. I shall only use 2 of those minutes.

Mr. President, I shall not take the further time of the Senate, except to repeat, in a few sentences, what I said when the Senator from Georgia made his speech to the Senate on this subject the other day.

This is not in any way a reflection upon the very able speech of the Senator from South Carolina—but time after time we have had a field day in the Senate, and Senators have delivered speech after speech about this situation, but it has ended here and been limited to talk.

Now the straws in the wind indicate that the present administration is preparing or is inclined, at least, to follow the example of the administrations of President Johnson, President Kennedy, and President Eisenhower, and place our foreign relations and the attitude of the State Department ahead of the preservation of American jobs.

I am a friend and admirer of the President of the United States, and I am with him 98 percent of the time, I hope. But the time has come to do something more than talk; and the opportunity will be before the Senate within a very few days to indicate our intent to do something about this situation. I think such an indication would strengthen the administration rather than hurt it, because it is time that the world should know and the country should know that Congress is prepared to perform its duty to save the jobs provided by American industry.

I commend the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his remarks. The Senator from New Hampshire has given most distinguished leadership in Congress over a period of a decade or more in an effort to present to Congress the desperate situation of textile industry employment in America.

The Senator from New Hampshire as the senior committee member on the minority side, and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), as a member of the Special Textile Committee and as the senior committee member on the majority side, have led the fight over the years.

Rather than talk, we have given hard statistical information and gotten down to the root of the problem and told it like it is.

As the senator from Missouri stated the day before yesterday with reference to the importers' position in his brief remarks:

"Let us lay the facts on the table and then talk in adjectives and specific language."

I thought it was time to get to the facts.

Mr. Murphy. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. Hollings. I yield.

Mr. Murphy. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator. I have never heard the case stated more clearly and the problem put forth in a more practical and understandable way.

In my State, the manufacturing industry depends upon the textile industry as the eighth largest in the State. It has a payroll of $280 million a year. It is worthy of all our consideration. The industry employs 68,000 people, of whom 50,000 people are employed in my particular area of Los Angeles.

Thea Presiding Officer. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. Murphy. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 2 minutes.

The Presiding Officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. Murphy. Mr. President, I point out that there are 230,000 businesses, mainly small. They form the main strength and backbone of this industrial complex that we call America. Large numbers of the members of the minority groups who need special help are emloyed in the industry.

I point out to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that as the story is told and as the bill comes up for consideration, I would like to do whatever I can to join enthusiastically with the Senator and others in this most needed concern for this particular industry.

Mr. Hollings. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. Murphy) was a strong worker and supporter of a similar measure in the past. There is industrywide support in California. As we emphasized the need for this measure and as we see southern support for the northern textile industry, we are talking about a national industry.

Mr. Baker. Mr. President, I would like to associate myself with the concern for the textile import problem that the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina has expressed. The textile industry is the largest manufacturing employer in the State of Tennessee, with many plants being located in rural areas. I am particularly concerned that jobs for workers in these areas may be jeopardized. I am most hopeful that the Nixon administration will be able to negotiate a fair and reasonable voluntary import quota system.

The Presiding Officer. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Florida for 15 minutes.

Mr. Holland. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished majority leader wishes me to yield briefly.

Mr. Mansfield. Without losing his rights to the floor.

The Presiding Officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TEA BAGS AND TEMPESTS

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a recent address by the Reverend A. Craig South of the First Congregational Church in Battle Creek, Mich., to the graduating high school seniors of his congregation, so inspired my friend and constituent, Mr. Art Fettig, that he has asked me to bring it to the attention of my colleagues. I am happy to do so. The text of Reverend South's sermon, "Tea Bags and Tempests," follows:

Tea Bags and Tempests

(By Rev. A. Craig South)

We are pleased today to recognize in a special way those graduating seniors who are a part of our church fellowship. Graduation from high school has become a significant factor in the lives of the youth of our society; and the accomplishment which graduation signifies is no small one. So we, the fellow participants in this church, seniors, take pleasure in adding our congratulations to those of your family and other friends. On occasions such as this, the speaker is supposed to say something profound, to give you one last crash lecture which will set you on the straight and narrow, just in case the past twelve years haven't quite done the job. I can make no guarantee of the profundity of this sermon, but I would like to share with you some of the concerns which we would have you think about seriously.

Being the astute observers of the human scene that you are, you are well aware, probably even more aware than some of your elders, that we are living in a time of great and rapid change—and it isn't only Mr. Jones who doesn't know what is happening, most of us don't know what is happening. We all feel the sting of the unfamiliar and we all are subjected to the pressures of these changing times. The pressures of school, work, our social rounds and the family often make us feel that we are adrift. And when we add to our personal concerns the tumult of the great upheavals of our world; the student unrest, the racial conflicts, the drug scene, the changing moral climate, the war in Vietnam, the arms race, the pollution of our natural environment and the rising cost of living, we all feel conspired against and tossed into confusion and frustration. There have been a number of responses to this confusion and frustration: some are immobilized and drop out; some turn to hate and violence, some hang on out of sheer determination and fortitude, and some survive wrapped in a rapidly diminishing cocoon of apathy.

But certainly there ought to be some better alternatives. If, as the scripture tells us, God has given to us dominion over the earth—a charge to fill the earth and subdue it—he must have provided a means by which we can handle our problems, deal with our adversaries and rejoice in the gift of life which he has given us . . . and the Christian faith claims that he has. This morning I would like to discuss three parts of a Christian alternative. Remember, these are not the answers to our predicament, but they do provide a stance, a foundation, from which we can better deal with our problems and work for their solutions.

I

The first block in the foundation of our stance is Faith; faith! Now, we need to approach the word, faith, with some care; it is one of the abused words in our vocabulary. Let's look at some things which faith is not. Faith is not believing in what you know isn't so, it's not a substitute for knowledge. Faith is not the acceptance of creed or dogma. Faith is not the performance of religious duties; faith is not being a good moral person with a pious, churchy decoration. Basically, faith is a relationship of trust. Faith is confidence. Faith is a relationship of trust in God. Now that's profound! Faith is a relationship of trust in God. Faith in God means that we trust, we have confidence, that under all of the events of our lives, from the smallest of our personal lives and the greatest of the global, lies the sure hand of God. It means that we trust that life has a meaning and purpose; that life is not a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing. Faith means that our plans and actions have meanings which are not lost in the long run; it means that the whole historical process is growing toward a future that God understands even if we don't and which will come to fruition in his good time provided we have the good sense to see it through without blowing ourselves up or poisoning ourselves with pollution.

Jesus talked quite a bit about the importance of faith. He said that if we had faith the size of a small mustard seed we could move mountains. I don't know if he meant that literally or not; but I do know that the great achievements of mankind have come principally from people who felt that life was worth getting out of bed for, and who felt that the efforts of their thinking and labor were not just exercises in futility ending in rubble and oblivion. Without this faith, this relationship of trust, this confidence, every thought, every action would be tainted with tedium and the wonderful zest for life which we received from God as children, and will turn sour, leaving us shrunken lives to be lived out in quiet desperation. Faith in God and his process is essential to any stance from which we can move against our problems and adversity and it is an equally essential ingredient in any meaningful celebration of the joys of life.

II

The second block in the foundation of our stance is reason. Man, so far as we know, is the only creature endowed by God with the power of reason and rational thought. In the great commandment, we are urged to worship God with our minds, as well as with our heart, spirit and strength. But all too often today we turn our backs on reason. In our feelings of frustration and futility we lash out violently at our real and imaginary tormentors. We react rather than respond; shoot before we think; strike without any thought of consequences. And as a result we often end up in a worse situation with only an increase in our frustration as our reward.

Now these quick reflexes toward violence may have served us well in the past. But we have reached a new age. "New occasions teach new duties. Times make ancient good uncouth." Our whole disposition toward violence needs radical re-evaluation. In the world of today with our sophisticated warheads and almost faultless delivery systems violence is a deadend street. The situations which face us today cannot be solved by a shoot-out, cannot be handled with force; cannot be resolved by an international or inter-racial or inter-personal quick draw. The days of the guys in the white hats and the black hats at the corral are gone. It's going to take all of the hard thinking and creative imagination that we possess to solve our predicament. And in the end, reason, not thoughtless reaction, is going to be the major factor.

But, in order for reason to work, we have to keep our cool. And keeping our cool today demands concessions. Take for example the conflict between the young and the old. There must be concession from both sides. The young must remember that the mess in today's world was not created by their parents and grandparents—it is the creation of generations of human greed and human ignorance. To expect that the mess created over thousands of years can be cleared up in six months is ridiculous. To work it out, even to a more tolerable degree is going to take time. Reason demands of the young patience. But the old must remember that time is growing short, terribly short; that the pleas

XUM

for patience which we make—sometimes with justification, sometimes without—are often viewed as being another put-off, and our delays are seen as being tactics of reaction aimed at reinforcing a dubious status quo. A radical re-evaluation of our national and personal priorities is in order, not tomorrow but *now!* As John F. Kennedy said, this world cannot survive half rich and half poor, half slave, half free. This world cannot continue half affluent going its merry way and half crowded, starved, beaten and oppressed. To follow this road is to court disaster. So the day calls for people young and old to think, reason, respond.

III

The third block in the foundation of our stance is love; this is perhaps the most important. This word, like faith, needs some thought. It is in that list of abuse terms. The term as I use it today is not to be confused with all of our hang-ups on sex. It has little to do with physical intimacy or touch; it has absolutely nothing to do with the desirable and the loveable.

Now I realize that love cannot really be defined, but following Eric Fromm I would like to point out four basic elements in any love—elements which are essential to a Christian stance in today's world.

First, love involves *care*. Care begins with taking the existence of other people as seriously as we take our own. Care means the willingness to work (that's a four letter word, you know) for the well-being of the beloved, to see their welfare as being essential to us as our own.

Second, love involves respect—to see and see again, *re specere*. That is the power to see every man as a human being, with feelings, hope, aspirations and needs as a part of the human family. On the other hand, respect involves the power to see that each person is unique in his own right and that his uniqueness is of value. Respect means seeing each as an important part of the human family with an individual uniqueness and being able to honor both his humanity and his personal uniqueness.

Third, love involves responsibility—the ability to respond to the needs of the beloved. Responsibility involves sensitivity to human feelings; an awareness of where the other guy lives; and an understanding of what makes him happy, of what hurts him; and the ability to work for his happiness and to fight with him against that which hurts him. And all of this means that:

Fourth, love involves knowledge. We cannot care, we cannot respect, we cannot respond, unless we know! How do our adversaries feel? What are their perceptions of the human predicament? Where do they see us? Where do they hurt? Where do they rejoice? I believe very deeply that a lot of the trouble in this world would vanish if we really understood, if we really knew just how the other guy feels and lives; if we were aware of his own private warfare within, of all of his hang-ups, of all of the restrictions in which he feels he lives, if we really understood the frustrations of the situations of others. Love begins with knowledge; and knowledge begins with dialogue; and dialogue is half listening.

Part of the problem of our time is that we come at each other with our mouths open and our ears closed. The time has come for us to listen, to understand, to know, and to feel. Only then can we love; only then can we care; only then can we respect; only then can we respond. We are, as it were, tossed about in a tempest. And we are only going to get out of it if we get into it. There is no way over, no way under, no way around—you have to go through. There has to be involvement.

We are as pleased as we can be with this group of seniors, with many of their classmates, with many of their generation. They have an idealism not gone sour; they have hopes not turned cynical; they have a strength not yet debilitated. Jump into the tempest. Like a tea bag in hot water. You're going to get into hot water; everybody gets into hot water. The question is not whether you get into hot water, but what kind of tea you make; and we could all stand some good tea. Involvement is the key.

In the scripture, God says to the church at Laodicea: I would that you were hot or cold, but you're a bunch of lukewarm fuddy-duddies! And I'm going to spit you out of my mouth! I can't stand apathetic, unconcerned, uninvolved people. Get with it! Get involved, make that cup of tea.

It's a big tempest. And some of us are going to drown in it; and some of us are going to make lousy tea. But, it will suffice to be said; they were involved, they tried, they gave their all.

My parting words—the last two minutes of this crash course to keep you straight, are: Face this tempest from this Christian stance. Faith, trust, be confident that the hand of God holds all.

Remember that reason and rational thought form our God-given crown and it must not be abdicated to irrationality and violence.

And that all we do, and all we say, and all we are must be tempered by love.

Then abide these three; faith, reason and love and the greatest of these is love. And therein lies our hope.

Prayer at Graduation

(By Rev. David L. Evans)

O Lord God, on this special day we pause before your greatness and wisdom to admit that as this phase of our education draws to its conclusion we have not learned very much about living together in peace and justice; that we do not have adequate answers to the ancient problems of hunger, poverty and prejudice.

We would pray that our learning might be the occasion of a new appreciation of those qualities in our common heritage which are of enduring worth and value to mankind; that we might come to the maturity which recognizes those things from the accumulated wisdom of the past which rightfully claim our allegiance and our support.

May our learning be such that it strengthens us in daring to be different in dreaming dreams; in thinking the unthinkable and speaking the unspeakable—not for the sake of being strange or difficult, but because those times call for vision, integrity and courage. Thus we ask that we might not be part of the problem but a source of the answer to the age-old divisions of mankind caused by fear, suspicion, greed, ignorance and pride. So may our prayers for these young men and women be not so much for their material success as for their contribution toward a better society, a more human, livable world; in these terms we hope that they achieve great success.

This we pray in the name of the Great Redeemer. Amen.

SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, one of the major problems we are having in this country today is trying to squelch "instant experts." These paragons of knowledge will spout for hours on any subject—you name it.

It is particularly sad to me when some honored members of the scientific and engineering professions are those who are generating invective about many subjects—subjects in which they have little or no expertise. By lending the eminence of their names to dubious debates and dubious causes they generally end up debasing their professions.

Dr. Karl Cohen, outgoing president of the American Nuclear Society, spoke on the "Ethics of Scientists" at the society's 15th annual meeting in Seattle last month. I would like to quote briefly from his speech:

> The diminishing popularity of the physical sciences and engineering among students is symptomatic of a decline in confidence in the ability of technology and technologists to solve the world's problems. Sober people have asked for a moratorium on technology generally, and as for nuclear energy, there is a spectrum of similar attitudes, ranging from opposition to the spread of nuclear technology, lest it increase the possibility of its misuse, to a desire to put the genie back in the bottle—together with those who released him in the first place—and put the cork in.
>
> These are the dimensions of the problem of public alienation. What can we do to improve it?
>
> Here are a few suggestions (I am sure that many others will occur to you):
>
> Restraint and modesty will create a better public image of scientists and engineers than arrogance and conceit. Only science is amoral; scientists should have ethics.
>
> Let us begin with a sense of respect for those who disagree with us. The purpose of technology is to serve people, and they must be satisfied that they are being served.
>
> It is difficult to separate one's interests from one's beliefs. Achieving dispassionate objectivity is an ideal probably beyond most of us. We may, however, attain relative freedom from our own biases if we acknowledge them explicitly—at least to ourselves.
>
> A scientist should certainly recognize and accept his social responsibilities. Only on occasion, however, will his particular expertise confer special merit to his political opinions, even on subjects with high technical content. He should avoid this implication when it is not valid. What is occasionally true for individual scientists will be very rarely true for a whole scientific society. In particular, the ANS should observe scrupulous neutrality on any technical issue with a strong political content or indeed a strong subjective content of any sort.
>
> The correlation between the leveling off of federal R&D appropriations and deep philosophical concerns over federal R&D policy is striking. The social responsibilities of scientists should extend beyond the question of why the federal government should spend more money on science.
>
> An invidious comparison between your nuclear project and someone's else does not prove that your project is desirable; it merely pollutes the atmosphere for all nuclear projects.
>
> Likewise, do not make invidious comparisons between nuclear technology and other technologies. They also are trying to serve the public.
>
> Postponing a project because we do not know everything about its effects on the ecology is equivalent to cancelling it. We

shall never know all there is to know about anything.

Above all, let us try to win better acceptance, not by belittling our critcs, but by acting more responsibly ourselves. The fault is not in our stars, but in ourselves.

THE OSTEOPATHIC PROFESSION

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, the persistent shortage of physicians in our Nation is accompanied by another problem that merits our attention. I speak of the diminishing numbers of general practitioners—physicians who are the "family doctors" on whom our citizens rely so heavily for their health care needs.

In this regard, the osteopathic profession, represented by the New York City Society of Osteopathic Physicians and Surgeons, is performing an invaluable role in attempting to provide solutions for these problems.

First, because osteopathic physicians put emphasis on general practice and comprehensive health, they are assuming the role of the "family doctor" in ever-increasing numbers. Indeed, in New York State, some 95 percent are general practitioners.

The society also is doing its share to stimulate a greater interest in a health career among college and high school students. Members of the society make themselves available to address undergraduate organizations on the contributions to the community which they can make by entering the osteopathic profession.

The society in advising students as to career opportunities, points out that virtually all osteopathic physicians in preparation for practice take an internship of at least 1 year in a hospital inspected and approved by the Bureau of Hospitals of the American Osteopathic Association.

Many doctors of osteopathy, it should be noted, have taken training residencies in various approved osteopathic hospitals throughout the country.

Throughout the country, osteopathic physicians are affiliated with osteopathic hospitals; and in their private practices, as in their work in the hospitals, they adhere to the highest standards of their profession.

I believe it is important to stress that osteopathy is a school of medicine whose most distinctive quality has been and is the constant development of techniques for releasing man's natural abilities to combat stress and strain which could conceivably result in disease.

Moreover, osteopathic physicians and surgeons integrate all accepted methods of treatment of disease and injury, including manipulation, drugs, surgery and physical therapy, as dictated by diagnosis of the individual patient.

Osteopathic physicians and surgeons are performing an enormous service in behalf of the health and well-being of our citizens, and it gives me great pleasure to salute the membership of this dedicated profession.

REDUCTION OF THE OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in an unprecedented action the Ways and Means Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives voted to slash the oil depletion allowance from 27½ to 20 percent. I am totally and unequivocally opposed to the action, and I will work for its reversal.

This unwarranted cutting of the oil depletion allowance was motivated and inspired by individuals and groups in our country who fail to understand the economic conditions accompanying the locating and producing of oil and gas. Rather than examine the true facts and circumstances, these individuals and groups have yielded to emotions and misconception, and have erroneously attacked percentage depletion as a tax haven and a tax subsidy. In fact, it has become quite fashionable for big city Congressmen to attack the depletion allowance. They think the issue has a lot of political appeal with urbanites who forget how much of their individual well-being and material comforts depend on continued oil production, and a stable price structure for oil and gas distribution.

The fact of the matter is that the full depletion allowance is needed to maintain the vitality of the oil extractive industry, an industry in which only one out of nine drillings produce some oil, while merely one out of 45 is even profitable. As a natural consequence, net return on investment in the petroleum industry is lower than 50 percent of all the industries in the United States.

Without the full oil depletion allowance the incentive to assume the risks inherent in the oil business will be reduced and many small independent companies which help to keep the petroleum industry competitive will be forced out of business or absorbed into the giant petroleum corporations. As a result, the price of oil and gas will increase, and the final consumer will be forced to pay more for gas, oil, and other petroleum products.

In addition to the impact on the individual consumer, our national security will be impaired by the reduction in oil production. Critics of the oil depletion allowance contend that we can supply all our petroleum needs from abroad. However, I believe that the situation in the oil-rich Middle East is too uncertain and too volatile for the United States to rely on the area as a prime source for oil supply.

I believe that the value of the full 27½-percent depletion allowance over the last four decades is clear. It has been the most effective procedure yet devised for maintaining the vitality of the petroleum industry while at the same time providing a fair and equitable industry tax base. The fairness of the tax base is evidenced by the fact that the petroleum industry pays 5.1 cents tax for each dollar of gross revenue, while mining and manufacturing corporations pay 5.4 cents, and U.S. business corporations pay 4.5 cents.

Mr. Speaker, I will reiterate the true facts surrounding the oil depletion allowance to my colleagues as I believe this is a matter which is too important for partisan or regional politics; it is a matter of national security and individual well-being.

INSTANT LEASING PROGRAM

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, frequently, we in the Congress pass laws which we believe to have meritorious prospects and then forget about the actual operation of those laws, particularly when they operate satisfactorily.

One of those sections to which my attention has been called recently is section 23 of the U.S. Housing Act providing for low rent for public housing and private accommodations, commonly known as the Widnall amendment or the rent certificate program. This was first incorporated in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 and has been particularly useful in my own community. In this regard, I am enclosing a memorandum on this so-called instant leasing program, from a member of my congressional staff, which recites the specific experience in four separate cases benefiting from this program in the Cincinnati area. I know that it will be of interest to many.

The material follows:

INSTANT LEASING PROGRAM

Housing or shelter is one of man's basic requirements. Our government recognizes this need and I would like to advise of the success of the Instant Leasing Program as experienced by my District Office in Cincinnati during the past twelve months. This program is carried out in the Cincinnati area by the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority under the auspices of HUD. They currently have 237 units under lease and hopes for expanding the program by 100 more units.

Many people come to a Congressional District Office with a variety of problems, Social Security, welfare, employment, etc. However, the basic problem is frequently financial, and too large a proportion of their budget is being spent on housing. If the person is elderly or disabled, the Metropolitan Housing Authority can with the cooperation of the landlord directly lease the apartment or

XUM

house from the owner and in turn lease it to the applicant at one-fourth of their income.

To directly understand the impact of this program is to cite specific cases. Case A is a polio victim about 30 years old currently on Welfare. She originally contacted our office for job help. She then lived in a $75 a month air-conditioned apartment right on the street with no steps, which made the use of her wheel chair feasible. The landlord was about to put the tenant out on the street when our office recommended Instant Leasing. The request went through and the tenant was able to remain in her convenient apartment and work with the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation training for suitable employment.

A widow, Case B, with an incurable disease recently lost her sister who shared the expenses of an apartment. Case B's income is a Social Security disability check of $93 per month. She contacted us originally to see if we could help her with a Workmens Compensation claim with the State of Ohio. It was not possible to help with the Workmens Compensation claim but we did recommend the Instant Leasing program and she was able to reduce her rent payment from $75 per month to approximately $23 per month, which enabled her to purchase more food, cleaning supplies, and make more frequent visits to her doctor for pain shots. She was particularly pleased to be able to purchase cleaning supplies and clean her apartment.

Case C is an elderly lady, a widow of a dentist who has for the past year or so been caught trying to sleep in the restrooms of our Federal Building. Through the help of the Basen Ministry, The American Dental Society granted Mrs. C a pension of $100 per month. Her efforts to work after the death of her husband enable her to collect a minimum Social Security benefit of $42 per month. After the Dental Society granted her pension, she located an apartment in an acceptable area for $85 per month. She was having difficulties with her Social Security checks due to a change of address and contacted our office to help her in this matter. Since she was a frequent visitor in our office, her financial situation eventually became clear, and we recommended again the Instant Leasing Program. She proved acceptable to the program and has $49 more a month for necessities.

When Case D's husband died early this year, he left his widow with $127 per month widow's pension from Railroad Retirement. She wrote to me to see if there was any possibility of obtaining any more money. She stated that she was 75 years old and unable to work. She was not eligible for any more pension, but the Instant Leasing Program was recommended and put in effect. Case D was able to remain in her apartment where she had lived for many years and pay only $32 per month rent which was in keeping with her income.

We currently have six more recommendations before the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority of similar circumstances and hopefully they will turn out as successfully as the cases outlined above.

BOBBY WINKLES, AN OUTSTANDING BASEBALL COACH

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of America's annual All-Star game, I should like to give special recognition to the baseball coaches throughout our land for the contributions they have made to this much loved sport, and in particular, I should like to give tribute today to an outstanding coach from my State of Arizona, Bobby Winkles.

Bobby Winkles has amassed an enviable record during his 11 years of coaching at Arizona State University. Most recently, as I am sure most sports fans will recall, his team captured the World Series college championship for the third time. It is self-evident that Bobby Winkles possesses those capabilities prerequisite to producing three championship teams in such a short span of time, for he must have had to instill a winning, enthusiastic, and competitive spirit, along with a fine balance of subordinating personal prominence to the efficiency of the whole in each member of those teams.

All Arizonans take great pride in Bobby Winkles, and I am pleased to express publicly today our appreciation, and congratulations to him.

NEWSLETTER

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith my newsletter of this week which perhaps some of my colleagues may be interested in reading:

NEWSLETTER

In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth.

And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

And God said, "Let there be light," and there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness . . .

Thus it was that Frank Borman, in the chandeliered East Room of the White House on Sunday, July 20, read these three verses from the Bible's Book of Genesis.

Ahead of him and facing him were the nation's leaders, the President, the Vice President, Cabinet members, Congressmen and Senators, those of the military, and representatives of foreign governments in the Diplomatic Corps. Almost 350 were present to participate in these simple services. This service was much like the one attended by this writer a few weeks ago.

The President always says a few words, and on last Sunday he used these: "This is a historic day, the day when man will first set foot on the Moon."

There were also prayers for all of the astronauts, and these probably were the same kind of prayers that were offered by Columbus and his men near the end of their search for the New World.

Also on the minds of those who prayed were the problems with which we are faced throughout the world.

As the leader of the Senate Prayer Group said: "Even as our astronauts go to the Moon in the name of peace, our world aches from the pain of war. We perfect the means for destroying human life, and then believe we have found security. May the nation trust not in the power of arms, but in the Prince of Peace, Thy Son."

Washington is an overly sophisticated town. It takes something truly remarkable to stir its soul. The astronauts' trip to the Moon moved the governmental community as has nothing in my time in Washington.

These astronauts to the Moon were pioneers, as was Columbus. It will be remembered that Columbus made five trips to the New World and still touched only a small part of North and South America.

Even as the astronauts flew home, people in the space world were talking about a trip to Mars by 1979. Mars is in an entirely new satellite system, and its distance at its nearest orbit is 35 million miles from the Earth. In a conference at the White House on Monday, someone asked, "And where does it all end?" And to this, even the President did not make an answer.

MAJOR BREAKTHROUGH IN THE DENTAL PROFESSION

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, the enormous public attention focused on the need for adequate health care programs has been accompanied in recent years by a greater awareness of the importance of dental care. Parents especially have become increasingly concerned about proper dental care for their children.

In the field of orthodontia, there has arisen a need for new prosthetic devices that have beneficial corrective qualities and at the same time enhance the wearer's appearance.

As anyone whose child has had to wear orthodontic dental braces can attest, these devices have hardly proved popular with young people. The fitting of these braces requires several uncomfortable hours in a dentist's chair, while the patient has his teeth separated and wired in heavy, unsightly metal bands.

Now, there has been a major breakthrough in the dental profession, one which virtually eliminates the fears in the minds of parents and their children concerning orthodontic braces.

An attractive lightweight plastic dental brace has been developed as a replacement for the conventional and often painful orthodontic metal teeth braces.

These new braces are being brought to the public by Dr. Francis V. Pribula, the orthodontist who heads Ortho International Services, Inc., of Wilmington, Del.

Almost 2,000 orthodontists throughout the Nation are now using this new OIS plastic dental brace with their patient's approval. The application of these braces reduces by two-thirds the time it previously took to apply metal braces. The new brace employs small tooth-colored plastic brackets which are easily affixed by a special adhesive to the front of the teeth, resulting in the same support previously provided by the heavy metal bands. A scarcely visible threadlike wire is tied to the brackets affording the required tension.

For youngsters, there are many advantages in wearing such braces. They are more comfortable than the heavy metal welded braces. They are tooth-colored for cosmetic reasons. Also, there is no need to separate teeth prior to application. They do not cause cuts or abrasions inside the mouth. The number of potential cavities are reduced because of the diminished size of the brace and the elimination entirely of braces on the back of all teeth. Tooth brushing is much easier.

Moreover, the adhesive system utilized in this new orthodontic system does not damage teeth. It is easily removed at the completion of treatment.

Metal braces give youngsters, and even adults, an embarrassed, tight-lipped appearance. The success of this new plastic brace stems from the fact that it affords people of all ages a more pleasant facial appearance.

TO ANNOUNCE AN ANNIVERSARY

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on June 29, 1961, the United States launched its first nuclear power supply into space aboard what is now the Navy's, and the world's, oldest operating navigational satellite. On its ninth anniversary, the Snap-3A—system for nuclear auxiliary power—will have circled the earth 40,530 times and traveled more than a billion miles.

I remember that first launch well. We had quite a time getting the White House to agree that it was safe. The Secretary of State, or somebody in that conservative organization, was afraid that the small isotopic power supply device might fall on Cuba and give the Communists a propaganda advantage.

This grapefruit sized—large California sized, that is—power supply converts the heat from the decay of plutonium into about three watts of electricity. This power, plus some from solar cells, has kept the navigational beacon in operation 3 years beyond its predicted 5-year life.

This use of the atom in space has contributed to man's better understanding of the shape of the earth on which he lives, and was a forerunner of the current Navy satellite navigation system.

The United States has another nuclear power system operating in space—the 50-watt Snap-19 which helps power the Nimbus 3 weather satellite.

When man lands on the moon with the Apollo 12 moon lander which is scheduled for this fall, present plans call for him to place on the moon's surface the Apollo lunar surface experimental package, which will be powered by the 60-watt Snap-27.

I would like to place in the RECORD the press statement which the Atomic Energy Commission has prepared to commemorate the 9th year of atomic power's operation in space at the conclusion of my remarks.

OCEANOGRAPHIC USE OF NUCLEAR POWER

I am also appending to my statement a letter from the Atomic Energy Commission dated June 23, 1969, and a press release describing another potentially important test of a radioisotope power system. This test concerns the potential application of nuclear energy in the marine environment. This device designated as Snap-21 contains two 10-watt strontium 90 prototype power sources and will be implanted in the Pacific Ocean off Clemente Island. We are confident that this new power supply will make a valuable contribution in the field of marine exploration and communication. It is intended to meet an ever-increasing demand for reliable, long-lived power sources for oceanographic applications.

In closing I would like to remark that it is a shame that the detractors of the atom do not consider it worthwhile to mention these accomplishments. The detractor's only hope is to sit around, like a bunch of carrion converters, waiting to pounce on some careless atom that might stray from the field.

The press statement and letter follow:

ATOMIC BATTERY BEGINS 9TH YEAR OF OPERATION IN SPACE

A grapefruit-sized atomic battery, launched in 1961 on a navigational satellite, begins its ninth year in orbit on June 29. The compact radioisotope thermoelectric generator already has operated three years beyond its five-year design life.

The nuclear generator, developed by the Atomic Energy Commission, is supplementing the power from solar cells on the Navy's oldest operating navigational satellite in space. On its ninth anniversary, the satellite will have circled the earth 40,530 times and traveled more than a billion miles. The drum-shaped satellite is the first to carry a nuclear power supply.

Operated now on command from The Johns Hopkins Applied Physics Laboratory, Howard County, Md., the satellite still beams information "loud and clear." The satellite contributed to a better understanding of the shape of the earth, and was a forerunner of the Navy satellite navigation system, which now is used by the fleet and by scientific and commercial ships.

The first space nuclear generator, designated SNAP–3A, is about five inches in diameter and 5½ inches high. It converts the heat given off by plutonium directly into 2.7 watts of electricity. It was built by the Martin Company, Baltimore.

In all, five Snap (Systems for Nuclear Auxiliary Power) nuclear generators have been launched, and a compact reactor power system was demonstrated in space in 1965.

April 1969 saw the first civilian use of atomic energy in space with the launching of NASA's Nimbus-3 weather satellite, which carries two nuclear generators as supplementary power to solar cells. This combined power is resulting in the acquisition of data of such significance that it has been characterized as "unprecedented" by the scientific community.

When Apollo 12, the second manned lunar landing mission, reaches the moon, an atomic-fueled generator will be placed upon the lunar surface where it will provide the power for a package of instruments—the first nuclear power on the moon.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 23, 1969.

Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. HOLIFIELD: In the past we have advised the Joint Committee as to significant milestones in the AEC's program to develop radioisotope power systems for remote terrestrial and marine applications. Pursuant to this policy we now wish to inform you of the planned initiation of an ocean test program involving several second generation deep sea prototype devices.

During the week of June 23, 1969, two 10-watt strontium-90 prototype power sources (Snap-21) will be implanted in the Pacific Ocean for long term environmental testing. The implantment will be carried out by the Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory (NRDL), as part of a joint AEC-Navy program. The actual implantment site is located off the coast of San Clemente Island, which is, in turn, located some 60 miles from Long Beach, California. San Clemente Island has been selected as the test site because of its remote location, extensive test facilities and Navy controlled access.

The planned environmental test program is expected to last from one to two years. The specific purpose of these ocean tests is to establish the long-term operating characteristics of each power source in an in-situ marine environment. These highly instrumented prototype units will be monitored continuously and the data generated utilized to assess the long-term effects of ocean exposure and to conform reliability and endurance capability. Although the 10-watt system is designed for deep ocean operation at depths up to 23,000 feet, the initial tests will be conducted in relatively shallow water; e.g., approximately 100 to 200 feet. Each of the prototype units has, however, been hydrostatically tested at the design pressure of 10,000 psi. Deep ocean testing is contemplated following successful completion of this initial phase of testing.

The 10-watt power system has been developed by the 3M Company for the AEC to meet an increasing demand for reliable, long-endurance power sources for oceanographic and ocean engineering application. The absence of such power sources has been frequently cited by representatives of the oceanographic community as a critical factor limiting this nation's ability to establish a meaningful ocean engineering and marine sciences program. In this regard, the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources, in its January 1969 report to the President and the Congress, strongly endorsed and recommended the continued development of undersea power sources, including nuclear sources. In our judgment, the development of the Snap–21 deep sea nuclear power system will represent a major milestone towards the development of reliable power sources for multipurpose undersea use. Further research and development effort is currently under way as part of AEC's program to develop a second generation of highly reliable, long-endurance and economical radioisotope power sources for terrestrial and marine application.

The 10-watt, Snap–21 units presently being readied for ocean testing represent a significant technological improvement over the first generation, proof-of-principle Snap–7 devices developed by the AEC in the mid-1960's. A comparison of the Snap–21 unit with the first generation Snap–7E, which represents the only deep ocean radioisotope power source previously developed by the AEC, is shown as in the following summary:

XUM

	SNAP-7E	SNAP-21
Size	30 inches diameter by 70 inches high	16 inches diameter by 28 inches high.
Weight	3,500 pounds	650 pounds.
Power output	6.5 watts	10 watts.
Design life	2 years	5 years.
System efficiency	≈4 percent	≈7 percent
Weight/power ratio	540 pounds per watt	65 pounds per watt.

An extensive nuclear safety review of the SNAP-21 and related ocean test operations has been conducted by specialists in the AEC, Navy, and the 3M Company. The AEC has reviewed all aspects of generator design and operation, and has concluded that the planned underwater testing activities may be conducted without undue risk to the public health and safety. It has been further concluded that no undue hazard, either to operating personnel, the general population or to marine life, will result from any credible accident or incident which could occur during unattended operation of these devices at the San Clemente Test Site.

A draft public announcement concerning the implantment of the SNAP-21 devices is attached for your information. This announcement will be released upon successful completion of these ocean operations.

We will continue to keep your Committee informed of our progress with respect to these second generation systems.

Sincerely,

R. E. HOLLINGSWORTH,
General Manager.

ADVANCED NUCLEAR GENERATORS IMPLANTED IN PACIFIC OCEAN BY AEC IN PROGRAM TO ASSIST OCEAN EXPLORATION

The Atomic Energy Commission (date) implanted in the Pacific Ocean two 10-watt nuclear power generators whose successful operation should help fill a critical need in ocean exploration.

The nuclear radioisotope power generators, designated Snap-21, were implanted for a long-term testing by the Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory off the coast of San Clemente Island, California, as a part of a joint AEC-Navy program. A third unit is scheduled for implantment later this summer.

These 10-watt radioisotope powered generators have been developed by the AEC to meet an increasing need for long endurance and highly reliable energy sources for use in the ocean at depths up to 23,000 feet. They are designed to provide uninterrupted electrical power for periods of five years or longer and are intended for use as power sources for underwater navigational aids, sonar beacons, seismological stations and for general purpose oceanographic and ocean engineering application. Reliable and long endurance power sources have been frequently cited by ocean engineers and scientists as one of the most critical needs associated with ocean exploration and technology. In many remote applications where frequent maintenance, refueling or battery recharging or replacement is difficult or expensive, compact radioisotope power sources promise important operational and economic advantages over conventional power sources. Conventional power sources are generally limited to endurances of less than six months.

This phase of the test program off San Clemente Island is expected to last from one to two years. The highly instrumented prototype units will be monitored continuously to determine their long-term behavior in an ocean environment. Although the generators are capable of operation at depths of 23,000 feet, they will be tested initially in shallow water at a 200 foot depth. The purposes of the shallow water tests is to subject the nuclear devices to marine growth generally found at depths of 500 feet or less. Deep water tests are planned following successful completion of the initial phase of testing. Eventually, these units will be recovered for laboratory analysis and evaluation.

Each of the units is fueled with radioactive strontium-90. The heat energy from the decay of the fuel is converted directly into electrical energy by solid state semiconductor thermoelectric materials. The absence of moving parts contributes significantly to inherent reliability and endurance capability.

The nuclear fuel is obtained from the waste fission products generated by nuclear reactors. The waste fission products are recovered from the reactors and reprocessed to separate the long-lived strontium-90 from other radioactive material. The strontium-90 fuel used in these power sources is encapsulated in a heavy-walled, high strength, nickel alloy cylinder capable of containing the fuel under normal operating and accident conditions for hundreds of years. After this period the nuclear fuel will have decayed to an insignificant quantity. An extensive safety test program has been conducted to demonstrate complete integrity of the fuel container under all handling, transportation, implantment, operation and accident conditions.

Each power package is 16 inchs in diameter, 28 inches high and weighs about 700 pounds, including shielding and pressure vessel.

Deployment of these nuclear power units represents the culmination of the initial phase of the AEC program to develop a second generation of highly reliable, long-endurance and economic radioisotope power sources for terrestrial and marine applications.

The power units were developed for the AEC by the 3M Company, Space and Defense Products Department, St. Paul, Minnesota. The Linde Division of Union Carbide Corp., Buffalo, N.Y., provided the high temperature vacuum insulation subassembly as principal subcontractor to 3M Company. The strontium-90 fuel was provided by the AEC's Oak Ridge (Tenn.) National Laboratory.

APPENDIX

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in the many special tributes being paid to our Nation's astronauts for their successful voyage to moon. The full significance of this landmark in exploration will not be known for some time and pending further discoveries resulting from the space feat, we can only ponder our extraterrestrial future.

Here is a list of a few of the headlines we might be reading in the years ahead:

You See One Planet, You Seen 'Em All!

Moon Hilton Opens for Tourist Season at Tranquillity Bay.

Pentagon Calls for $10 Billion Defense Network To Protect U.S. Military Interests on Moon.

Ralph Nader To Investigate Safety of Moonbeams Sold by NASA on Earth.

Pete Rozelle Approves NFL Franchise for Tranquillity Eagles.

Secretary of Interior Declares Pluto Water Polluted.

Joe Namath Retires After Rozelle Demands He Sell Mars Bar.

Ambassador to Saturn—Calls for U.S. Intervention To Resist Mars Aggression.

Senate Foreign Relations Committee Calls for Withdrawal of U.S. Troops From Saturn.

Vice President Agnew Charges That Chairman Is "Soft on Milky Way."

United Nations Censures U.S. for Dumping Trash on Mars—Approves Interplanetary Beautification Act.

Mayor Lindsay Runs for Jupiter City Council on Fusion Ticket—Proposes Busing Night School Students to Moon.

Attorney General Denies Interplanetary Wiretapping—"Moon Bugs Me," He Declares.

Beatles Call Halley's Comet Gig a Bad Trip.

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL CEMETERY AT VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIF.

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the nationwide shortage of national cemetery facilities. Statistics made available to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reveal that the Department of the Army now operates 54 national cemeteries that are still open and available for the interment of deceased veterans. Additionally, there are six open national cemeteries operated by the Department of the Interior. In the next 30 years, 40 of these 60 national cemeteries will be closed. On the other hand, approximately 750,000 servicemen are being separated annually from the Armed Forces. All of these veterans are eligible for burial in a national cemetery. Despite these rather alarming statistics, there has been no expansion of the national cemetery system for many years.

The situation is even more acute in the State of California than it is across the Nation generally. There are more than 2,800,000 living veterans residing in the State of California, all eligible for burial in a national cemetery. The three national cemeteries located in California, Fort Rosecrans, San Diego; Golden Gate National Cemetery at San Bruno; and San Francisco National Cemetery at the Presidio in San Francisco, are all closed to future veteran burials, because of the unavailability of space. On the entire west coast of the United States there is only one national cemetery with space available for future burials. This is the Willamette National Cemetery at Portland, Oreg. In an effort to alleviate the problem as it relates to veterans in my own State of California, I have introduced a bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery within the boundaries of Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif.

The proposed site is located between San Francisco and Los Angeles and is readily accessible to both northern and southern California residents. I am informed that there are three areas of Vandenberg Air Force Base controlled land that could be utilized for this worthy purpose with no acquisition cost to the Government. The land is unencumbered and has natural features that would eliminate the need for excessive development costs. This Government-owned land meets all the established criteria for national cemeteries as set forth by the Chief of Support Services, Department of the Army. I am hopeful that the committee will act promptly upon this legislation so that veterans in the State of California may be entitled to burial in a national cemetery within reasonable proximity of their hometown.

GOLDEN EAGLE PASSPORT

HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which authorizes the President to establish annual fees for entrance to and use of Federal recreational areas. We have often encouraged our citizens to visit, use, and enjoy their outdoor recreational facilities, but because of action in the 90th Congress, the "Golden Eagle Passport" designed to make it easier for our citizens to do just that, will expire March 31, 1970.

There is no doubt in my mind that the citizens want the Golden Eagle to live. Like some of my colleagues, I too have received letters from constituents, many of them retired and enjoying the opportunity to travel and visit our beautiful country, who have asked that the Golden Eagle program be restored.

I realize others have introduced "Golden Eagle Passport" bills which only extend the present program, but it is my opinion that a better approach would be to take this opportunity to improve on the 5-year-old program.

The bill I have introduced will add flexibility and strength to the already growing passport program. For flexibility in determining and establishing the appropriate fees, I have authorized the establishment of a "reasonable fee" for annual passports, single visits, and users fees for highly developed facilities.

The collection of fees has been streamlined to reduce the excessive cost in administering the program. Under the new plan I propose, the fees may be collected by public or private agencies, much like a fishing license. This approach to the problem should save both time and money.

A problem under the present system is that some individuals take advantage of their "passport" by remaining for excessive periods of time in one recreational area. My bill is designed to protect the facilities from the abuse of this minority by authorizing the President to establish a time limitation on visits to specific areas as he determines to be necessary to protect the interest of the United States, thus giving strength to the proposed program.

Mr. Speaker, the "Golden Eagle Passport" program may not produce a dollar profit, but to the extent that it encourages the fuller utilization of our national parks and other recreation areas, the lives of our citizens are richer for the experience.

This is sound legislation, Mr. Speaker, and I urge its prompt consideration and passage.

THE CENTENNIAL YEAR CELEBRATION OF OUR NATIONAL PASTIME

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, Washington is honored this week by the presence of the greatest gathering of baseball players, past and present, ever assembled in one place. The centennial year celebration of the national pastime will be highlighted by the playing of the All-Star game tonight in Robert F. Kennedy Stadium.

The names of our visitors read like a "who's who" from Cooperstown, home of baseball's Hall of Fame—Joe DiMaggio, Lefty Grove, Joe Cronin, Bill Dickey, Jackie Robinson, Frankie Frisch, Willie Mays, Casey Stengel. The list goes on and on and the quality does not fall off.

But even among these illustrious heroes of yesterday and today, no star shown brighter last night at the gigantic baseball dinner at the Sheraton-Park Hotel than that of the new baseball commissioner, Bowie Kuhn.

I was honored, Mr. Speaker, to be a head-table guest at that grand affair last night. The evening sparkled, not only with the presence of so many of the real jewels of the game, but also with true warmth and spirit.

Although many stars contributed to the success of the event, including former Olympic great, Jessie Owens, it was Commissioner Kuhn's show. In his short reign, Mr. Kuhn has injected welcome leadership, vigor and excitement into the baseball world.

Shirley Povich, sports editor of the Washington Post, devoted his daily column to Mr. Kuhn Monday. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert that article in the RECORD at this time:

THIS MORNING WITH SHIRLEY POVICH

The kid who used to get a peek at the ball games by tending the scoreboard at Griffith Stadium for a dollar a day is back in town this week, now age 42. The scope of this success story must leave Horatio Alger to mourn, and ask the nearest celestial spirits where he had failed, and why his own imagination was so constricted.

The poor but honest heroes of Pluck and Luck, and Ragged Dick, climbed and prospered to mere pismire heights compared to the moon shot of Bowie Kuhn from scoreboard boy to commissioner of baseball. The man who has described his boyhood in Washington and Maryland as comfortably poor will be presiding at the All-Star Game on Tuesday night.

In RFK Stadium, he will be outranked only by the President of the United States. The annual All-Star Game, like the World Series, is the commissioner's game, and, like the World Series, it will not commence until the commissioner gives the umpire in chief a nod or other signal that all is in order.

The same boy who used to dream of some day sitting in one of those box seats at an All-Star Game, perhaps, has pre-empted several hundred box seats for the commissioner's official party at RFK Stadium. Senators, congressmen, cabinet officers, baseball bigwigs and some old friends will be in his group. In the White House box, Commissioner Kuhn will be an official host along with President Bob Short of the Senators.

Others will be minding the scoreboard while Bowie Kuhn makes certain that all of his guests, including Richard Nixon, are comfortable. There already will have been some other official duties performed by the commissioner. For instance, on Monday night at the Sheraton-Park Hotel he has plans for a cozy gathering of 2200 fans and other people who can get up front-money of $35 per ticket. It has been sold out.

This is only one of the imaginative things Kuhn and his chief aide-de-camp, Joe Reichler, are doing. Never were baseball's treasures so brightly exploited by any commissioner, especially in a year of need, when the game was being put down as a creeping bore by its detractors. For their $35 the commissioner is giving the 2200 a view of 35 living members of the Cooperstown Hall of Fame, in the flesh, plus close-up introductions of the 56 All-Stars selected for this year's game.

Not as a money-making gimmick for baseball is the commissioner staging the All-Star dinner. On the contrary, the expenses are such that it could cost the commissioner's office $100,000. Originally a television network was supposed to pick up most of the tab, but conflict with the moonshot knocked that out. Kuhn went ahead with the lavish show anyway, as an investment in good will.

The former scoreboard boy will be throwing another party a couple of hours before the game Tuesday night, for special guests, about 4000 of them. This one will be held just outside the stadium on the D.C. Armory grounds under perhaps the biggest tent ever shipped into Washington for a social event. This bash could cost another hundred grand, but the commissioner is very blithe about that.

Lest it be suspected that the new commissioner is off on some Bacchanalian binge with his grand-scale socializing, let some truths be known. Mr. Kuhn has utterly no ambitions to be a social lion. He is a home-and-hearth family man who would rather reach for his slippers than a white tie.

He isn't trying to make any points with the 24 major-league club owners who are, in a nominal sense, his bosses. Bowie Kuhn didn't ask for the job they gave him as a compromise commissioner in February after opposing factions could not elect Mike Burke or Charles Feeney. He didn't need their measly $100,000-a-year sinecure as a figurehead commissioner. He was doing very well as a $200,000-a-year New York lawyer.

Kuhn's friends suspect he hasn't even bothered to sign the one-year contract the owners tendered him, because the moment they cross him the job is theirs, not his. In office barely six months, he has knocked two club owners out of their Las Vegas hotel stock speculation, has told the gadfly Houston club owner, Roy Hofheinz, to hush his mouth, and declared Joe Namath's saloon off limits to the baseball athletes.

Never, along the 29-year route from scoreboard boy to commissioner of the game, did Kuhn's baseball interest lapse. He knew last year, before he was commissioner, who was hitting fifth for the Cubs or Minnesota or St. Louis or the Orioles. Now he knows who is leading off for Seattle, Kansas City, Montreal and San Diego.

He's been a buff all these years and now he's calling the game's most important shots, from on high. There seems to be nothing wrong with what he is doing, and the fact that he is presiding over the game when it is having its biggest year in decades suggests that the Kuhn boy was cut out for bigger things than that scoreboard job.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR INFLATION?

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of U.S. News & World Report features an exclusive interview with Arthur Burns, the President's counselor, who is generally considered to be one of the most authoritative White House advisers. Mr. Burns states that the greatest problem facing the United States at this time is inflation. He ranks this problem above all others: he ranks it above the problem of crime, above the problem of chronic poverty in our major cities, and above the interest-rate scandal which is at the heart of the inflationary pressures within our economy.

It is ironic that the President's chief adviser on domestic matters should say that inflation is our No. 1 problem when the Secretary of the Treasury seems willing to accept a continuing upward climb in the prime rate. Someone is clearly out of phase, or perhaps the administration generally is becoming guilty, not of a credibility gap, but of a credibility crisis. Another aspect of the same problem is to be seen in the many pronouncements coming forth on the issue of wage and price controls. Mr. Kennedy says we may need them; the President is quoted as saying "Never." Who speaks for the administration?

Basically, the theory which lies behind high-interest rates as a solution to inflation is fallacious. Profits are higher than ever, especially for the banks. What has happened as a result of high-interest rates at the Federal Reserve Board is that the banks have gone elsewhere to find funds. They have gone into the corporate markets and they have gone to Western Europe for dollars held in Swiss banks. And the high rates of interest they pay for these funds have been passed on to American consumers.

We now face the worst housing shortage in 20 years. The rise in the cost-of-living index, at 4.2 percent, is the largest in 17 years. All of this results from the tight money philosophy which dominates the thinking of the bankers at the Fed and the bankers at the Treasury Department. The high cost of capital creates the credit squeeze both on the corporations and the consumer, with resulting higher prices and higher wage demands. That is the inflation cycle. The only interests which have made money off this inflationary situation are the banks. Let us look at their profits.

It might be instructive to look at a group of representative banks on the basis of 6-month earnings for the first half of 1969. This table shows an average net operating income increase from a year ago of 23 percent. The leader is Royal National Bank of New York—up 60.5 percent. At the lower end of the group is the National City Bank of Cleveland at 13.8 percent, still a considerable profit increase over last year. My source for these figures is the Gallagher Presidents' Report, a monthly economic newsletter:

6-MONTH EARNINGS OF SELECTED BANKS

Net Operating Income 1st 6 Months

[Dollars in millions]

Bank	1969	1968	Percent increase
Royal National Bank, New York	$1.96	$1.22	60.5
Security National Bank, New York	3.79	2.66	42.5
Marine Midland Grace Trust	7.20	5.50	30.9
Republic National Bank, Dallas	8.57	7.03	21.9
Fidelity Union Trust, Newark	5.23	4.31	21.1
Manufacturers-Hanover Trust	40.12	33.14	21.1
Northern Trust Co., Chicago	7.66	6.44	19.0
Citizens & Southern, Georgia	7.35	6.18	19.0
United California Bank	8.41	6.87	17.8
Cleveland Trust, Ohio	13.87	11.90	16.5
Security Pacific National Bank	28.11	24.27	15.8
First National Bank, Dallas	7.52	6.52	15.4
Mercantile Trust N.A., St. Louis	6.83	5.99	14.0
Wells Fargo & Co.	16.80	14.76	13.8
National City Bank, Cleveland	9.10	8.00	13.8

My advice to Mr. Burns, then, is to look within the permissive policies of his own administration for the roots of the No. 1 problem—inflation. It is indeed a curious spectacle to see the Secretary of the Treasury invite the banks in, ostensibly to discuss prime rates, and yet to issue a statement which indicates no alarm whatsover. I hope that the fiscal and monetary experts in the administration will sit down together and come to some understanding of what is wrong with the economy and what we can do about it, rather than sending forth an endless stream of contradictory and self-defeating statements.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we embark once again on the commemoration of Captive Nations Week, I find myself experiencing simultaneously three different emotions. They are sadness, optimism, and caution. I am saddened, because as I view the world spectrum in which we live, I recognize the human bondage that 1 billion people suffer every day of their lives when they are denied the most basic of human rights; namely, that of self-determination. I am optimistic when I perceive the forces of the free world working together in an effort to crack the Iron Curtain which separates truth from fiction on our planet. I am cautious in that I fully realize that this is a vision which cannot be expected to meet with instant success. Instead we must be prepared to accept the proposition that this will be a never ending fight as long as the earth is populated with men who are determined to pursue self-serving objectives at the cost of their fellow citizens.

I am proud to join with a great many people in this country and abroad who are rededicating themselves to the great cause of liberty for all people. It is my hope that as each day passes our civilization will move one step closer to truly world freedom.

LEARNING DISABILITIES: WHERE HAVE WE BEEN? WHERE ARE WE GOING?

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week the general Subcommittee on Education held 3 days of intensive hearings on the subject of learning disabilities and what assistance the Federal Government might provide to aid children who are capable of competing intellectually with their classmates, but who have slight neurological or physiological deficiencies which impede their ability to absorb information.

Among the many witnesses who testified before this subcommittee was Dr. Jeanne McRae McCarthy, director of special education for the Schaumberg schools in Schaumberg, Ill. Dr. McCarthy's testimony helped measurably to increase our knowledge of the special needs of children with learning disabilities.

In order that my colleagues might also benefit from her experience in this field, I am including excerpts from her paper which she presented at the 47th annual convention of the Council for Exceptional Children in Denver, Colo., on April 7 of this year.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. McCarthy's excellent presentation follows:

EXCERPTS FROM LEARNING DISABILITIES: WHERE HAVE WE BEEN? WHERE ARE WE GOING?

(By Jeannie McRae McCarthy)

Seldom has a concept burst upon the educational scene with such cataclysmic force as has the concept of special learning disabilities. Although the early impetus of the published work of Strauss and Lehtinen with the brain-injured dated from the late 1940's and early 1950's and the work of Orton and the dyslexia group dated from the 1920's and 1930's, the educational scene remained quite unruffled as late as the early 1960's. With the possible exception of some isolated research and practice in childhood aphasia and related language disturbances in centers like Syracuse University, Northwestern University, Purdue, the University of Illinois, and Bellevue Hospital, activity in the area which we now call learning disabilities was largely subliminal, or limited to abortive excursions into new methods of remedial reading, or new approaches to psychiatric or child-guidance practice with children whose non-learning was seen as a hostile response to parental pressure or rejection.

State legislatures had not yet been bombarded by parental pressure groups to enact enabling legislation. The U.S. Office of Education was blissfully unaware of what was about to erupt. Universities, with rare but notable exceptions, had no courses or the books to train personnel either to diagnose a learning disability, or to teach the child who had one. Nor were there any plans afoot to initiate such training programs. Even The Council for Exceptional Children, the professional organization devoted to the education of children with special needs, at their annual convention in 1960 had not one program or paper which addressed itself to the topic under any of the various aliases which have been used to describe the child who cannot learn.

It is probably safe to say that in 1960 there were few public school classes for these children except for remedial reading programs. In Illinois, in 1959 and 1960 we were able to bootleg service to a limited number of children by christening them "multiply handicapped"—the most common combination of handicaps was educational retardation, emotional disturbance, and brain damage. Thus labeled and documented, the public schools could legally initiate an educational program to teach them.

There were few parent groups organized to serve these children in 1960. I believe the New York Association for Brain Injured Children, the California Association for Neurologically impaired Children, and the Illinois Fund for Perceptually Handicapped Children were the only ones in existence.

In a very few years since 1960, when all was relatively quiet on all fronts, until now, a great deal of progress has been made in all areas . . . At least 13 states now have within their educational code a term which relates to learning disabilities. Parent groups have been organized at the national level, at the state level, and at the local level. There are now over 200 local and state affiliates of the Association for Children with Learning Disabilities. Many universities now have a sequence of courses leading to a Masters degree or a doctorate in learning disabilities. There are many summer workshops or institutes in which a classroom teacher may enroll in order to upgrade her skills in meeting the needs of children with learning disabilities. Programs to train speech correctionists are collaborating with other disciplines to provide services for these children. Guidance counselors, particularly at the elementary level, are looking at learning, or non-learning as an essential part of their training and practice. Psychological diagnosis, as well as the training of clinical or school psychologists, has taken a decided turn away from an emphasis on the dynamics of psychosexual development to an emphasis on learning as a modifiable behavior, and on perception and cognition rather than concentrating on emotional responses to environmental pressures. The total involvement of the field of medicine, whether in a positive or negative way, is everywhere apparent, whether it be in the obvious fields of pediatrics, neurology, and psychiatry, or in the less obvious fields of endocrinology, obstetrics, opthalmology, otology, or genetics.

What meaning does all of this activity have to you as you attempt to integrate these new concepts into your established body of knowledge, into the organizational structure of your school system—whether you direct a program in New York, Florida, Wisconsin, Utah, or California: In simplest terms, it means that your job will be infinitely easier in this year of 1969 than it would have been at any other time. This is not to suggest, however, that your job will be easy. However, you do have some models—some other programs which have been started in public schools—from which you can learn a great deal. You do have a body of research theory and practice from which you can build a sound program for children with learning disabilities. You also have a series of mistakes and blind alleys to assist you in plotting an educationally sound program . . .

. . . Each year, I have attempted to delineate trends and issues in the field of learning disabilities which seem to be evolving from year to year. By far the most important issue in the field today is that of *definition*. In some areas there is still a serious question in the minds of special educators over the very existence of learning disabilities. Are we just talking about "dumb kids" as one notable educator suggested to me last week? Is the child with special learning disabilities just the mentally retarded kids in the suburbs? Is this not just another label for the emotionally disturbed child? As we look at the trends in definitions, it becomes apparent that the early medical emphasis is being replaced with an educational emphasis. The early emphasis on etiology is being replaced by an emphasis on remediation. The six or seven current definitions which seem acceptable to the majority of practitioners in the field, including the Task Force I and Task Force II definitions—federal studies which tried to define the learning disabled child—the Association for Children with Learning Disabilities definition. Kirk's early definition, the definition of the Northwestern Conference, or the National Advisory Committee definition, all have two concepts in common; the first is the intact clause, the second is the discrepancy clause. Most definers seem to agree that the child with special learning disabilities is basically an intact organism. This concept of intactness is expressed differently in different definitions. Some follow Dr. Gallagher's comment in St. Louis at The Council for Exceptional Children meeting, when a small group was attempting to formulate a definition acceptable to all factors, "whenever you start to define a horse, you first have to define a non-horse." Thus, the "non-horse" part of the definitions may be more specific than the definition of what a learning disability is. We seem to be quite sure that the learning disability is not "primarily due to visual, hearing or motor handicaps, to mental retardation, emotional disturbance or to environmental disadvantage." These are basically intact children.

However, "the discrepancy clause" seems to be somewhat less specific. The National Advisory Committee describes the children with special learning disabilities as those who "exhibit a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using spoken or written language." These may be manifested in order of listening, thinking, talking, reading, writing, spelling, or arithmetic.

This definition seems to be one upon which a sound educational program can be based. You will notice that there is no statement of possible etiology in this definition. We seem to have outgrown our need for a medical model around which we can build an educational program. We have learned from the experience of those programs which have included a medical diagnosis of organicity that the neurological examination or the electroencephalogram (EEG) provides a tenuous base upon which to build an education program. For those of you who are saddled with legislation or program which includes some statement of physical disability before these children can be served, I highly recommend that you read, in the Fall 1967 issue of the *Journal of Special Education*, Roger Freeman's article entitled "Special Education and the Electroencephalogram: A Marriage of Convenience." After reviewing the extensive research involving the EEG, Dr. Freeman recommends that Special Education consider at least a trial separation from neurology and the EEG.

My reason for spending this much time on the evolution of a viable definition is that I am convinced that the most important decision you will make is that of the definition—because your definition will dictate for you the terminology to be used in your program, the prevalence figures, your selection, criterion, the characteristics of your population, and the appropriate remedial procedures.

I would like to point out that this emphasis on definition seems to be of more intense concern in the area of learning disabilities than in any other area of handicap. We still do not have a definition of deafness which is acceptable to people working in the field, nor of mental retardation, for that matter, but it does in the field of learning disabilities.

The question of incidence, or more correctly prevalance, is one that is causing a great deal of difficulty at the present time. "Guesstimates" of how many children there are with special learning disabilities range from 1 per cent to 40 per cent of the total school population. Prevalence is determined directly by the definition used. Dr. Myklebust, in discussing the question of "how many children are there" has said, "Tell me how many you want to find, and I'll write you a definition that will find that many." Using the National Advisory Committee definition there is some evidence to suggest that learning disabilities exist in varying degrees in children. While the milder learning disabilities may profit from the individualization of instruction in the regular classroom, the more severe problems require special remedial procedures. An extremely conservative estimate of the latter group would include 1 to 3 per cent of the total school population, according to the Report of the National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped.

Regardless of which guesstimate you elect to use in your program, be assured that you will find that there are too many children with learning disabilities which require educational modifications to be served by special class placement, and to be individually diagnosed by trained specialists. This also suggests that speech correctionists will begin to become more directly involved in the limited disorder program. . . .

Dyslexia will be viewed as a sub-set of learning disabilities, not a distinct limited disorder. Severely disabled readers will be programmed just as severely disabled learners of any other type. It is probable that remedial reading populations are now made up of some children who have special learning disabilities and some whose failure to learn is due to causes outside of the child. Thus, care will need to be taken by administrators to avoid duplication of services, without cutting out needed services to children with corrective reading problems. It is probably safe to say that the current practice of some districts of having parallel programs serving the same child will be discontinued.

It seems well within the realm of probability that the National Advisory Committee on Dyslexia and Related Reading Disorders will, in their final report due in June, help to clarify the relationship between limited disorders and dyslexia, thus providing a base for better articulation between reading specialists and limited disorder specialists at the National, State, University and Public School levels. Learning disabilities may be the bridge which will increase communication and articulation between elementary education and special education, since most children with special learning disabilities will *not* need a self-contained special class, but will remain in a regular class for part of the day.

The current furor over "an IQ of average or above" seems quite likely to dissipate rather quickly, as psychologists and educators continue their disenchantment with the IQ as a measure of functions in children. We are now aware that IQ's in many children respond to programs aimed at training intelligence, and are unstable enough to warrant careful matching to performance in and out of the classrooms. The number of hours of expensive professional time being wasted on trying to decide whether a child with an IQ of 79–81 is mentally retarded with a learning disability or merely a Limited Disorder should reduce sharply, as classes for mentally retarded children begin to individualize instruction and utilize the concepts of clinical teaching commonly found in Learning Disability classes.

In the immediate future, I predict that little or no valuable time will be wasted trying to decide whether a child is primarily emotionally disturbed or learning disabled. In the normal school population, the child with a learning disability will stick out like a sore thumb. The fact that he also has emotional problems is *given*. Psychotic, schizophrenic, and autistic children will also stick out like sore thumbs, and obviously need to be programmed differently than the child with minor adjustment problems. Between these two extremes lies a large group of conduct problems—learning disabled children who can profit from a carefully structured, purposeful, learning-focused classroom atmosphere, regardless of the label for the condition. . . .

. . . I am indebted to Dr. Samuel Kirk, Chairman of the National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped and Dr. Masland, Director of National Institute of Neurological Disease and Blindness, for confirming some of my ideas about the future of learning disabilities in the speeches they made at the recent Association for Children with Learning Disabilities Conference in Fort Worth. I am also indebted to Alice Thompson for sharing some of her ideas in a paper she presented to the California Council for Administrators of Special Education group last year. By pooling these expert opinions, I have gathered the courage to make some predictions about the future:

(1) I predict that special learning disabilities will continue to gain prestige as a respected category of special education.

As learning disabilities stabilizes, so should those areas which seem to be clouding the picture at the present time: language problems, aphasia, dyslexia, remedial reading, slow learners, and some emotionally disturbed and mentally retarded children.

It seems quite clear that the National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped definition includes children with developmental aphasia.

Thus, a district with a program for children with learning disabilities would automatically include aphasic children in such a program.

You will also find that learning disabilities come in all shapes and sizes. The varying degrees of learning disabilities in children requires varing degrees of intensity of service in the schools. To describe an “exemplary program” for all children with learning disabilities, as if any one type program will serve all children, is to oversimplify an extremely complex problem.

(2) My second prediction involves a proliferation of new programs and services for children with special learning disorders. Pressure from parents will continue to keep pace with the demands of society. As administrators it is urgent that you come to grips with some of the pressure points involved in the program, and plan carefully to avoid the booby traps. By all means plan programs of varying degrees of intensity to match the varying degrees of severity of learning disabilities in the children. You will need (1) consultants to regular classroom teachers, either on an itinerant basis or on a one consultant per building basis; (2) You will need some resource room teachers, where children are bussed to the school to spend a portion of each day in the regular class and a portion in the special class; (3) You will need some self-contained classes for the most severely involved children where the major focus is on behavior management, not on the learning problem itself. The emphasis in the self-contained classroom should be on return to a resource room program in the school where the child “belongs in” since research and experience indicates that the farther a child is removed from the normal educational program, the more difficult it becomes to return him to the mainstream. Major emphasis needs to be placed on the individualization of instruction for most children with learning disorders within the regular classroom. . . .

. . . By the same token—the best prevalence figures we have suggest that most districts would have enough children to start a class in their own district, rather than as part of a joint agreement or cooperative arrangement. . . . It may be necessary to provide diagnostic services on a cooperative basis, but major emphasis on programs needs to be placed at the local district on local building level. The ramifications for preservice and in-service training are monumental. We need to work toward a drastic change in attitude on the part of regular classroom teachers from the current “He doesn't belong in my class” to an attitude of “What can I do to help him?”

(3) My third prediction in answer to where are we going involves early identification of these high-risk children, and a complete change in attitude toward our interest in and responsibility for pre-school children. There is no question that these children can be identified in kindergarten. Many of them could be identified and served at four. The current trend toward mandatory education at age three is one that I believe will continue to gain support at all levels. Impetus for this will come from the one hundred demonstration programs funded under Public Law 90–538, the Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act.

If you do not have a program, I heartily recommend that you start with early identification and programming at the kindergarten or first grade level. This is a difficult place to start, since awareness of failure on the part of the child has not yet hit his parents or his teachers. You will also be fighting a large segment of kindergarten teachers who still subscribe to the “'eave them alone and they'll come home” philosophy. At the very least, begin to reexamine your entrance policies for high risk children and design a program to serve them rather than sending them home for another year in an environment which already has them behind their peers.

(4) My fourth prediction involves the relationship between learning capabilities and cultural deprivation—or between special education and compensatory education, if you will. We have already excluded culturally deprived children from the learning disability population by definition, but this does not solve the practical problems for you. I am not too hopeful that learning disability concepts are going to have a great deal of impact on the problems of the culturally deprived. I am quite convinced that the answers to these problems will need to encompass total societal involvement, of which special education is a small part. There is no question that massive changes must take place in the community, in the home, and in the school system before we begin to find answers to these learning problems. But let us not fail to provide for the smaller number of children with special learning disability of unknown etiology, while we wait for answers to the much larger problem of cultural deprivation.

(5) My fifth predication involves our current concept of the diagnostic process. At the present time diagnosis is primitive, time-consuming, expensive, and fraught with problems of validity and reliability. Our instruments for diagnosis and prediction are at best rudimentary. Test constructors will continue in their efforts to provide valid microscope measures of cognition. As psychologists become more disenchanted with the traditional tools of their trade and as a new breed of psychologists replaces those left over from the Rorschach days of their Veterans Administration Training, you will begin to see more creative use of some of the good diagnostic instruments available to your school psychologists.

(6) My sixth prediction involves remedial methods. We seem to have tried all the global approaches to remediation that can be conceived. Now we are ready to begin differentiating the teaching methods so that we will see the emergence of real clinical teaching, where the goal is a precise match between the cognitive style of the learner and the cognitive demands of the task. We will be seeing emphasis placed on the diagnostic role of the teacher, as well as the training of specialists who are both psychoeducators, diagnosticians, and clinical teachers.

In the foreseeable future I suspect that neuropsychologists will be able to tell us something meaningful about the chemistry of learning in human children. At the present time, they are quite knowledgeable about earthworms, or rats, or pigeons, and even chimpanzees, but not about children. I am not willing to sit around and wait for the “pill” which will prove to be the panacea that will solve all of the problems of children who do not learn. In the meantime I hope that you will be as aware as I that children who do not learn, do not do so for an infinite variety of reasons. For some of these it is because of a special learning disability. For these, we can and should provide special educational programs.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA OF JEANNE M'RAE M'CARTHY

Educational background

I. Ph. D. University of Illinois, 1965.

Major area of Concentration: The Administration of Special Education Programs.

Minor Area of Concentration: Psychology.

Thesis—The Psycholinguistic Development of Mongoloid and Non-Mongoloid Severely Retarded Children.

II. Master of Arts—Loyola University, Chicago, 1951.

Major: Clinical Psychology.

III. Baccalaureate—Barat College, Lake Forest, Illinois, 1944.

Major: Psychology.

Minor: Education.

Professional experiences

I. U.S. Office of Education Fellow—University of Illinois, 1960–62; U.S. Office of Education Consultant—1967, 1968.

II. Associate Professor, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, Director of the Learning Disabilities Program—1968 to present.

Visiting Instructor—Summer Sessions: West Texas State University, Texas Christian University, Georgia State College, University of Wyoming, Boston University, Iowa State University, University of Virginia, University of Kansas, University of Arizona, San Francisco State University, Ball State University.

Graduate Extension Division, University of Illinois.

III. Public School Experience:

Niles Township Department of Special Education: School Psychologist, Director of Special Education.

Glenview, Illinois: Director of Pupil Personnel Services.

Schaumburg District 54, Hoffman Estates, Illinois: Director of Special Services.

IV. Clinical Psychological Experience:

Loyola Center for Guidance and Psychological Services, Chicago, Illinois.

Wichita Guidance Center, Wichita, Kansas.

Institute for Research on Exceptional Children, University of Illinois, Urbana.

Institute for Juvenile Research, Chicago, Illinois, Consultant in Learning Disabilities.

V. Research:

Project Director—Research and Demonstration Project—1966 to the present; “A Public School Program of Remediation for Children with Severe Learning Disabilities”—Public Law 88–164.

VI. Professional Organiaztions: APA, IPA, CEC, ICEC, AAMD, NEA, IEA.

CEC—Vice President: Division of Children with Learning Disabilities (1968–69) President Elect (1969–70).

ACLD—Advisory Board (1967–present); 1967 Conference Planning Committee, Educational Advisor; 1968 4th Annual Conference Planning Committee; 1969 5th Annual Conference Planning Committee; Recipient of President's Award (1969).

XUM

JULES VERNE'S SPACE PREDICTIONS WERE AMAZINGLY ACCURATE: WEST VIRGINIAN CONTRIBUTED TO KNOWLEDGE FOR MOON TRIP

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in the past week the attention of the world has been riveted on the heavens where three Americans are engaging in one of the greatest adventures of all time.

The courage, daring, and resourcefulness of the American astronauts is beyond compare. Their journey to the moon is the culmination of many years of work and study by untold thousands of talented and dedicated people. Among those who made their own contributions to the conquest of space is Col. Charles Yeager, a West Virginian who in 1947 became the first man to fly faster than the speed of sound and later broke other barriers in the knowledge of high-speed flight. Such ventures into the unknown were part of the accumulation of experience and information that made the moon landing possible.

The trip to the moon is surely a mightly technological and engineering achievement. It is also one that has captured the emotions and imagination of mankind, just as the thought of flying to the moon has for centuries been a preoccupation of dreamers and poets as well as of scientists.

Some of the most vivid speculation about space flight was provided in the 19th century by Jules Verne, whose stories remain today a model for science fiction writing. His predictions about the methods of conquering space have proved to be incredibly accurate as the dream turned into reality just 2 days ago.

Just how accurate Verne's forecasts were is shown in an article written by Associated Press writer Harry Rosenthal and published in the Huntington, W. Va. Herald-Advertiser of July 20, 1969. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Moon Flight: Jules Verne Had It Almost 104 Years Ago

(By Harry Rosenthal)

Cape Kennedy, Fla.—"In America," wrote French novelist Jules Verne, "all is easy, all is simple . . . a thing with them is no sooner said than done." And then, 104 years before Apollo 11, Verne proceeded with phenomenal accuracy to describe America's trip to the moon.

"Such a journey must be made sooner or later" said a Verne character in "From the Earth to the Moon," written in 1865.

In the classic, Verne described how President Impey Barbicane of the Baltimore Gun Club proposed building a giant cannon—Columbiad—and sending a projectile to the "queen of night." It was to be a "cylindro-conical shape" of aluminum, 15 feet high and 9 feet in diameter.

(The Apollo 11 command module, nicknamed Columbiad after Verne's book, is cone-shaped, made of aluminum alloy, 10 feet 7 inches high, and 12 feet 10 inches in diameter.)

"Figures impossible to gainsay have convinced me that any projectile starting with an initial velocity of 12,000 yards a second and shot in the direction of the moon must surely and necessarily reach her," said Barbicane.

(Says the Apollo 11 press kit; "Midway through the second revolution in earth parking orbit, the S-4B third-stage engine will restart. The velocity will increase . . . to 35,533 feet per second.")

"An important question was that of choosing the ground where the great experiment was to be made," Verne wrote. A spot in Florida, near the 27th degree North latitude, called Stone Hill, was selected as the ground . . ."

(Cape Canaveral, on the East coast of Florida near 28 degrees latitude—not more than 150 miles east of "Stone Hill"—was announced Aug. 24, 1961, as the spot from which America would launch her moon men.)

The Columbiad, 900 feet long, got its crew when a Frenchman, Michael Ardan, demanded permission to be enclosed so he could be carried to the moon. He persuaded both Barbicane and a Capt. Nicholl to join him.

On Dec. 1, precisely on schedule, the cannon was fired.

"An appalling, unearthly report followed instantly, such as can be compared to nothing whatever known, not even to the roar of thunder, or the blast of volcanic explosions," Verne wrote. "An immense spout of fire shot up from the bowels of the earth as from a crater . . . with great difficulty some few spectators obtained a momentary glimpse of the projectile victoriously cleaving the air in the midst of the fiery vapors."

In Verne's vision, weightlessness was "the realm of the marvelous, they felt that their bodies were absolutely without weight, their arms fully extended, no longer sought their sides . . . their feet no longer rested on the floor. In their efforts to hold themselves straight, they looked like drunken men trying to maintain the perpendicular."

(Said astronauts Thomas Stafford after Apollo 10: "It feels good to me." "You can do everything so effortless." And fellow astronaut John Young added: "It's really an enjoyable and exhilarating experience to literally be able to do everything with your fingertips.")

After five days, the gun club's passengers whipped around the moon—because of an aiming error. "The lunar disk struck the travelers as glittering with a splendor and purity of light that they had never witnessed before."

(Cernan reported: "There are significant colors of browns in the moon, light browns, the blackest blacks that we've ever seen, the whitest whites that we've ever seen.")

"Candidly and truly speaking, never before had mortal eye reveled on such a scene of starry splendor," wrote Verne.

(Said Cernan: "It's really a very fascinating landscape. You see something new every pass you make, your eyes don't have the capability to gather in all the information that's there.")

The nearer the travelers approached the lunar surface, said Verne, "the drearier, the more inhospitable and the more unearthly everything seemed to look."

(Said Frank Borman after Apollo 8 flew around the moon last Christmas: "My own impression is that it's a vast, lonely, forbidding type existence or expanse of nothing. It looks like clouds and clouds of pumice stone and it certainly would not be a very inviting place to live or work.")

Verne's version: "Wrinkled, pitted, knotted, furrowed, scarred, the surface of the moon looked like an immense battle field."

(Said William Anders who flew with Borman: "You can see by the numerous craters that this planet has been bombarded through the eons with numerous small asteroids and meteorites pockmarking the surface every square inch.")

Verne wrote of the lunar sunrise as "gilding the summits of the mountains on the moon's rim."

(Said Anders: "These in particular bring out the stark nature of the terrain and the long shadows really bring out the relief that is here and hard to see at this very bright surface."

Verne's crew splashed down in the Pacific Ocean, near the USS Susquehanna.

"Who can describe the welcome that greeted these long lost, beloved sons of earth now . . . rescued . . . and restored . . . to the wonderstricken eyes of admiring humanity," Verne wrote.

He added in an epilogue: "If we reflect a moment on the audacious goaheadiveness of the Yankee we shall easily conclude that the American people will never rest quietly until they have pushed to its last result and to every logical consequence the astounding step so daringly conceived and so wonderfully carried out."

And 97 years later, John F. Kennedy, the President of the United States, stood in Rice Stadium in Houston and said:

"No man can fully grasp how far and how fast we have come. The exploration of space will go ahead whether we join it or not. It is one of the great adventures of all time and no nation which expects to be the leader of other nations can expect to stay behind in the race for space."

THE ROTC

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, as a strong supporter of our Reserve Officers training program on our college campuses, I am disturbed by the vocal opposition to the program from many people. Mr. K. L. Lott of Mobile, a former ROTC officer and past president of the Auburn University Alumni Association, has sent me a fine editorial on this subject which appeared in the July issue of Nation's Business magazine. This editorial expresses many of my own sentiments about ROTC, and I include it in the Record so that our colleagues may read it also:

Who Are the Victims?

(By Alden H. Sypher)

The easiest explanation of the campaign to drive the United States armed forces officer training programs off some of the nation's campuses is that it is part of a spontaneous revolt against war by students.

That probably is the farthest from the truth of any possible interpretation.

There's been no popular revolt against the ROTC on any campus, as far as news reports have revealed. The demand originates among a few bearded activists whose purpose is not change, but turmoil.

Although the apparent intent is to deny training facilities for the officer corps, that's hardly a likely goal. If it is, the drive is failing. As Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird points out, more schools are adding ROTC programs than are dropping them. And there's a list of schools waiting to sign up.

Among officials in Washington who study such things, some see a pattern of organization behind the campaign.

If they are right, the strategists who laid out and direct the movement must be well aware of that waiting list, and of the fact they could accomplish little in the way of diminishing training facilities available to the armed forces.

Which suggests another and more serious purpose: To bring disrepute to all of America's armed forces and defense efforts by creating such contempt for the ROTC as a foul and vile thing that it is driven from such newsworthy campuses as Harvard's.

Who's doing the driving?

The Washington officials who see organization in the campaign attribute its origin to the communists' over-all strategy for war in Viet Nam and peace negotiations in Paris.

They see it as one of the many projects being used to hack away at American power and prestige that could be used against them in Da Nang or Paris.

This interpretation is spoken off the record. Washington is concerned about the political popularity of such a position these days, and concerned about the backlash possibilities of a witch-hunt tag.

Whether they're right or wrong in their assumptions, the action on a sampling of the nation's campuses must please Ho Chi Minh much more than it could comfort President Nixon or Ambassador Lodge.

In any case, expulsion of the ROTC either by direct methods or by denying credit for its courses cannot be attributed to students. They haven't the authority necessary to abrogate a contract between the school and a branch of the armed services.

Faculties make such decisions. Even those members who don their beads and join with minority activists in screaming obscenities at the police during scheduled campus confrontations usually have full voting power on decisions that determine the policies and practices in the schools. Theirs is the leadership supporting self-righteous young radicals who try to break down democracy by force.

This is the traditional faculty power brought to this country from Europe, along with the concept that a campus offers sanctuary from the police—an idea hardly valid on many campuses today since it stems from the times when schools were branches of the church.

Even the yards of those schools still connected with churches hardly seem proper sanctuaries for those who burn buildings and screech four-letter epithets at policemen and presidents alike.

Who are the victims of this drive against military training on college campuses?

Everyone in the country would be, if the campaigns were successful, for the effectiveness of the nation's defense forces depends on the effectiveness of the officer corps.

The service schools at Annapolis, West Point and Colorado Springs are far from big enough to produce all the officers required. The Army depends on the college training program for half its commissioned officers. A third of the Navy's officers and 30 per cent of Air Force officers come from the civilian schools.

There are no plans for expanding service schools to take over the entire training load. Armed services under civilian top command and sensitive to civilian attitudes need a large part of their leadership trained in a civilian environment.

So there will be continued dependence on colleges and universities to turn out Army, Navy and Air Force officers.

The more immediate victims of the drive are the particularly able young men who have won Navy scholarships through competitive examinations, and had chosen to go to schools that recently have terminated their ROTC agreements, or have changed their minds about giving credit for ROTC courses.

Among the latter group is Harvard, which made an agreement with the Navy in 1926. It lasted until this year when a few Harvard students not in the program instigated demands that military training be denied the entire student body.

Thus motivated, the faculty passed a resolution recommending that credit be withheld from students in military classes, and that all such classes be considered extracurricular. The administration acquiesced.

The direct victims are 21 outstanding high school graduates who won full Navy scholarships, and had chosen to go to Harvard. Because of the conditions imposed by Harvard, these young men were told by the Navy to choose other schools. Such Navy scholarships are among the best offered by any institution. They include full tuition, book costs, and a $50 a month allowance. More than half the Navy's nearly 10,000 ROTC students in 54 colleges and universities are on full scholarships won in competitive examinations.

In setting up conditions the Navy decided it could not meet, Harvard was well within it rights. It is a private school. But its administration must feel a public responsibility in view of the vastness of its endowment, its magnificent plant, its stature as America's oldest institution of higher learning.

Harvard's library, for example, with more than 7.6 million volumes and an annual expenditure rate of $7 million, is exceeded in size in this nation only by the Library of Congress and the New York City library system.

Harvard has 150,000 more books than the entire collection in the Air Force system with its 667 worldwide library locations.

Harvard's endowment is more than $600 million, the largest of any school in the country. That's slightly more than $40,000 for each of its 15,000 students. At 5 per cent interest it would produce more than $2,000 a year per student.

Yet, at $2,000, Harvard's tuition is in the top bracket among the nation's universities. All this indicates the quality of education that may be offered at Harvard, including a faculty nearly half the size of the student body—a teacher-student ratio of nearly 1 to 2.

This is a facility denied the most promising young men the Navy could find, because the university administration broke a 43-year-old agreement by approving a faculty recommendation that followed the strident demands of a small minority of Harvard students militantly against the military.

The Brown University faculty, also nearly half the size of the student body, made a similar recommendation under like circumstances.

Brown's president, Dr. Ray Lorenzo Heffner, didn't accept his faculty's decision. He is said to have assured the Navy the existing agreement would be honored.

Faculty reaction to this is said to be one of the reasons Dr. Heffner resigned to return to teaching at the University of Iowa.

Altogether this is a small thing from the services' point of view, measured against the 260,000 students enrolled in Army, Navy and Air Force programs in colleges and universities across the nation.

But it does bring up the question:

Who's doing the driving?

Is student power so tremendous that faculties and administrators must bow to the demands of a few aggressive bigots who seek—too often successfully—to deny freedom of choice to the great majority?

Is the problem accurately analyzed by faculty and students at Amherst, who took two days off for discussion, and concluded that what's wrong on campuses can be cured only by the White House, since the problems are war, poverty and racial repression?

Or do we just need strength and resolution at the top?

S. I. Hayakawa, the acting president who met student disruptions at San Francisco State College head-on, has become so popular in California that only Gov. Reagan could beat him in an election today, according to a survey.

In a democracy there's always a chance that the people are right.

U.S. COMMITMENTS

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial captioned "Our Commitments Require It," published in the Northern Virginia Daily of July 18. The editor of the Northern Virginia Daily is J. J. Crawford.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR COMMITMENTS REQUIRE IT

Speaking on behalf of the military procurement bill, Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr. had some wise counsel for those members of the Senate who would use the debate on the bill as another springboard for criticism of Pentagon judgment, for propagandizing opposition to the Vietnam war, and for attacking the Defense Department generally.

The outgoing Administration of President Johnson had recommended a $23 billion authorization. President Nixon reduced the authorization to $22 billion. After long deliberation, the Senate Committee on Armed Services recommends a further reduction of $2 billion, which would make the total authorization for military procurement, missiles, aircraft, naval vessels, tanks and research, $20 billion.

Sen. Byrd spoke in support of the Committee's recommended reduction describing it as a fully realistic and justifiable cut which can be achieved by more efficiency, and without "jeopardizing our national security." But, here the senator would stop. He apparently regards further tampering with the Department of Defense's estimate of requirements as dangerous.

Sen. Byrd's reasons are primarily two-fold. First of all, reason dictates that the strategic advantage long held by the United States, and which is now beginning to disappear, be maintained. We cannot second guess the intentions of the Soviet Union. The senator put it this way:

"The entire strategic concept upon which the United States has been relying to avert a nuclear war is that the United States be so strong that any foreign power deploying missiles against us would know that we could retaliate by destroying him who struck the first blow."

Secondly, there is the worldwide responsibility imposed by the mutual defense agreements which the U.S. has with 44 countries. Here, again, Sen. Byrd's reasoning was sound:

"We have guaranteed the security, insofar as foreign aggression is concerned, of 21 Latin American nations; we have guaranteed the security of 15 West European nations; we have mutual defense agreements with Vietnam, and Thailand, and with Australia and New Zealand; we have guaranteed the security of Free China, and the Philippines and Japan.

XUM

"So I say the United States is in a difficult and awkward position. We have over-extended ourselves militarily and financially.

"But until major reappraisals are made in our foreign policies—and until effective arrangements for arms controls can be worked out with the Soviet Union—the United States has no recourse except to appropriate large sums of money for the national defense."

We agree with Sen. Byrd, there is no alternative.

SEQUEL

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, Hamburger Hill is a familiar and poignant term to many, many Americans. Some of our very finest young men gave their lives there.

But as a specific place, it is more than a familiar term to Charles Black, of the Columbus Enquirer, for he has a personal intimacy with Vietnam, its people, its geography, and its direction, which is equaled by few people. His comments have the ring of factual authority and I commend the perspective of the within article to my colleagues:

QUESTION FOR PUBLIC: WHAT HAPPENED AFTER HAMBURGER HILL FUROR?

(By Charles Black)

Television commentators last week were wisely talking about a slowdown allegedly ordered by President Nixon in our Vietnam military efforts and saying that it came because of that horrendous "Hamburger Hill" criticism a while back.

They would have to say that, of course, or the code of controversy in news wouldn't be served properly, but let all of that go by and consider something else.

What finally happened in Ashau Valley?

No, you tell me first.

You are the one who hung on every word from Kennedy or Cronkite or the guy across the country while that was going on. You are the one who was kept on easy chair edge every evening for weeks thereafter as the big question of "another Hamburger Hill?" was filling its appointed spot in the evening news schedule.

You certainly were interested enough in what had happened, what was happening, and what was going to happen then, weren't you?

All right, you tell me what finally happened.

What have you heard about Ashau Valley lately? After all of your interest and curiosity was whetted, after you were belted by that political barrage, after Ashau Valley had served its domestic political purpose—what happened finally?

If not knowing doesn't make you feel cheated; if not knowing the final fate of our military operations in Ashau Valley doesn't demonstrate once and for all the fine relationship between Kennedy politics and a huge percentage of the purveyors of mass audience information; then you deserve just what is done to you every night in the week where this war in Vietnam is concerned.

Or it it true that you really do want to know facts?

If true, then here is what happened in Ashau Valley after the television cameras pulled out and the politicians moved on, leaving the GIs behind:

Through June 25, Operation Kentucky Jumper killed 1,324 North Vietnamese and captured 1,411 individual weapons; Operation Lamar Plain killed 294 enemies and captured 78 weapons; and on June 8, a third operation called Montgomery Rendezvous was started which by July 7 had found slight resistance but had killed 132 enemies and captured 64 weapons.

That last operation—all involved the 101st Airborne Division now commanded by Maj. Gen. John M. Wright—is still going.

The 3rd Squadron 5th Armored Cavalry, with Lt. Col. Thomas E. Carpenter III, Miami, Fla., its commander, riding in the lead armor personnel carrier, left Fire Base Blase at 7:30 a.m. June 20 and seven hours later brought the first road convoy of 80 vehicles safely into the new U.S. air strip a mile north of Ta Bat in the middle of Ashau Valley.

On that strip, built by the 326th Engineer Battalion, the first Caribou transport planes landed June 30. Supplies are coming into the place by land and air while paratroopers operate to keep it clear of enemy.

On July 4, Co. D, 1st Bn, 502nd Airborne, celebrated by painting a pole red, white and blue and mounting it across the old North Vietnamese highway from Laos with a sign on it "pay toll here." The G.I.'s call that North Vietnamese road, which all during 1967 supplied every enemy attack in I Corps, the "Yellow Brick Road."

That's what happened afterwards in Ashau Valley. We own it. Not that you're interested in such things of course, there being no argument over something like that.

THE EDUCATION OF SECRETARY ROGERS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very timely editorial discussing the frustrating and objective education being acquired by Secretary of State Rogers in the realities of foreign affairs was carried in the Monday, July 21, Chicago Tribune.

In view of the fact that the Soviets are increasing their doubletalk and maneuvering and as usual find a naive audience in the West for their lures, this factual commentary merits review.

The editorial follows:

THE EDUCATION OF SECRETARY ROGERS

When William P. Rogers, a lawyer, was appointed secretary of state in President Nixon's cabinet, he had no special qualifications for the job. The generally accepted explanation was that Mr. Nixon intended to be his own secretary of state and wanted a trusted friend to serve as a front man.

Some of the new secretary's remarks on the Viet Nam war were ambiguous, and this raised doubts among the hardliners, as well as hopes among the advocates of a sellout, about the Nixon administration's intentions. In testifying before the House Foreign affairs committee Thursday, however, Mr. Rogers demonstrated that his education in the problems of war and peace and negotiations with Communists is progressing satisfactorily.

The United States and South Viet Nam have made concession after concession to try to break the stalemate in the Paris peace talks, Rogers said. "The only reaction we get from the other side," he added, "is totally negative. They call names and use phrases like swindle and fraud. All they've been is more intransigent, more unreasonable, more inhumane."

There was never any excuse for expecting any different reaction from the Communists. There are hundreds of captured enemy documents in which Hanoi's masters have boasted of their determination to "fight and negotiate" until the American people are so sick and tired of the war and its dreadful cost in lives and money that the United States will pull out.

The Johnson administration put the United States in this terrible dilemma when it resolved to wage a "limited war" for goals that did not include military victory. The Communists are not fighting a limited war. Their minimum objective is South Viet Nam. All military history proves, as Gen. MacArthur said, that in war there is no substitute for victory. The best recent example of ending a war by winning it was Israel's crushing defeat of the Arab states in six days in 1967. The most recent example is the cease-fire agreed to Thursday by Honduras and El Salvador after only three days of fighting. El Salvador, which has a larger army, invaded Honduras, and the Hondurans quickly agreed to a cease-fire.

The United States would have won the war in Viet Nam by destroying North Viet Nam's warmaking capacity in 1965, and more than 30,000 American lives would have been saved, if the politicians in Washington had listened to the military leaders.

BE A GOOD GUY

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is too often the case nowadays that our local police forces are more remembered for what they do wrong than for the many things they do right in protecting our communities and maintaining justice in them.

In Miami, Fla., a program was recently started to promote better relations between the police department and local schoolchildren. This effort, originated by Mr. Bill Winn, a dedicated police officer of the Miami Police Department, is known as the "be a good guy" program.

Officer Winn instigated his campaign in the hopes of establishing a better rapport and respect between young children and police officers. Under the program, two officers in uniform, one black and one white, tour all the elementary schools within the city of Miami. As they tour, they issue pins to all the schoolchildren urging them to "be a good guy" and discussing with them the requirements for "good guys."

Mr. Winn, a member of the force for 14 years, was recently honored for his efforts in fostering better community relations. On May 22, he received the Good Newsmakers Award from a local television station—WTVJ. The award was presented by the station's executive vice president, Mr. Ralph Renick.

Mr. Speaker, with great pleasure, I would like to call to the attention of my honorable colleagues, the presentation of this award to Officer Winn and to commend him and his colleagues on the

Miami police force for their fine efforts. At the same time, I would hope that other police departments around the Nation take notice of this fine effort.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT DECISION ON PUBLIC HOUSING

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently a decision affecting public housing in Chicago was rendered by U.S. District Judge Richard Austin, which I believe will create very serious problems in meeting the housing needs of America.

I can fully sympathize with efforts by the court to prevent a repetition of concentration of huge public housing projects such as we witness today along the entire route of the Dan Ryan Expressway in Chicago, commonly known as Dan Ryan Village.

I am mindful of the court's attempt to desegregate public housing in keeping with the Civil Rights Act but in so doing, well meaning as the decision may be, it will, in my opinion, seriously impede the building of public housing in this country.

While this decision is directed at the Chicago Housing Authority and affects only public housing in Chicago and Cook County, it may very well turn out to be a landmark decision which will affect all public housing throughout the United States.

In my judgment, if the provisions of this decision become applicable on a nationwide basis, two fundamental consequences will follow: First, local communities just will not get engaged in public housing development projects; and second, Congress itself will undoubtedly seriously curtail appropriations for public housing.

This decision fundamentally provides seven major points. These are as follows:

First. The next 700 dwelling units to be built by the Chicago Housing Authority must be in basically white Chicago neighborhoods.

Second. Chicago Housing Authority must design each project for no more than 120 persons, or 240 at the most if it can't build the smaller design.

Third. The Chicago Housing Authority should not begin construction on any housing unit until not less than 700 dwelling units in predominantly white Chicago neighborhoods are started.

Fourth. Three-fourths of all future public housing built after today must be located in predominantly white neighborhoods.

Fifth. No public housing dwelling units shall be built in any census tract it such Chicago Housing Authority facilities would amount to more than 15 percent of available housing.

Sixth. No dwelling units shall be provided above the third floor in any structure except for families without children.

Seventh. Not more than 50 percent of the dwelling units in all public housing projects shall be made available to eligible neighborhood residents.

On the surface, this opinion would seem to aid the underprivileged people of this country who desperately need housing. But as a practical proposition, it will actually bring to a serious halt much of the public housing now scheduled for Chicago.

I am today including in my remarks the text of Judge Austin's decision and I am also including a memorandum for the United States prepared by the Housing and Urban Development Agency which had been asked by Judge Austin to prepare its views on his proposed order.

I am also including an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily News which generally supports the decision, but which also quite properly points out the problem it will create.

I believe the HUD memorandum, while basically supporting Judge Austin's motives and desires to desegregate public housing in Chicago, to some degree sustains some of the questions properly raised by the Chicago Daily News editorial.

While I can appreciate Judge Austin's interpretation of the law in requiring that hereafter three out of four public housing units must be built in white communities, I believe one cannot ignore the very cogent observation of the Daily News editorial on this subject.

The Daily News editorial states:

> As a matter of fact, Judge Austin's ruling may observe the letter of the law, but it fails to accommodate the facts of human nature that the CHA and the aldermen must live with. One salient fact is that a white neighborhood subjected to forced, substantial dilution with blacks frequently reacts with a sense of panic that is next to impossible to calm with appeals to reason. Racial tensions set in, and mount. Over the long run, the neighborhood tends to become all-black as the whites grudgingly retreat and finally flee.

I believe a careful reading of the HUD memorandum will sustain my own position that well meaning as the judge's order may be, it will not serve the housing needs of our community.

The city of Chicago now has 2,000 public housing units scheduled for construction in four model cities target areas.

Under Judge Austin's order, we would have to build more than 6,000 public housing units outside the model cities target areas before we can proceed with the 2,000 units in the model cities target areas.

The judge's order further provides that no housing project can have more than 24 units. This means that for the city of Chicago to build 6,000 public housing units in white communities, the city would have to find almost 250 individual sites for public housing construction in the white areas of Chicago for these 6,000 projects. Anyone who knows anything about availability of property for multiple-housing construction in the outlying areas of Chicago or in the suburbs will readily know that it is literally impossible to find 250 sites for public housing construction. In those areas where sites might be available for this type of construction, the cost of land is so prohibitive that HUD could never agree to pay such prices for public housing sites.

The HUD memorandum itself states:

> 1. The 75 Percent–25 Percent Requirement: It is impossible to evaluate the workability of the basic 75 percent–25 percent requirement of the proposed Order. It will require the location of many sites in an area where site availability is still an unknown factor. To the extent that there may be difficulties in obtaining sites and getting production in the "General" area, the formula would impose another restriction on a program which is already failing to make available sufficient public housing to families in non-white areas, or indeed to any of the poor families in Chicago. The necessity for dispersion and a balanced distribution of public housing in the City must somehow be reconciled with the need for accelerated response to the housing needs of persons in the "non-white" and buffer areas.

Mr. Speaker, I submit these documents for the RECORD today because I think it is important for Members to have the fullest opportunity to review these historic decisions.

I sincerely hope that the judge will amend his order and exclude model cities and urban renewal areas from its provisions.

There is no question in my mind that the model cities program will permit orderly development of integrated communities in large sections of our cities.

The model cities program offers the greatest hope of saving the large cities of America and for that reason it would be my hope the judge would carefully consider an amendment to his order. Fortunately, and this is a tribute to Judge Austin's sincerity and integrity, he has left the order open-ended so that amendments are in order.

Judge Austin's order, the HUD memorandum, and the editorial follows:

[U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division]

DOROTHY GAUTREAUX, ODELL JONES, DOREATHA R. CRENCHAW, EVA RODGERS, JAMES RODGERS, ROBERT M. FAIRFAX AND JIMMIE JONES, PLAINTIFFS, *v.* THE CHICAGO HOUSING AUTHORITY, A CORPORATION, AND C. E. HUMPHREY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, DEFENDANTS

(Civil action No. 66 C 1459)

JUDGMENT ORDER

This matter coming on to be heard pursuant to this Court's Memorandum Opinion of February 10, 1969, and Orders entered on such date denying defendants' motions for summary judgment, denying plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment as to Count II of the Complaint, and granting plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment as to Count I of the Complaint, and

The Court having conferred with counsel for the parties and having determined that the several provisions of this judgment order are necessary to prohibit the future use and to remedy the past effects of the defendant Chicago Housing Authority's unconstitutional site selection and tenant assignment procedures, to the end that plaintiffs and the class of persons represented by them, Negro tenants of and applicants for public housing in Chicago, shall have the full equitable relief to which they are entitled,

It is hereby ordered:

I. For purposes of this judgment order,

A. "CHA" shall mean the defendant, Chicago Housing Authority.

B. "Dwelling Unit" shall mean an apartment or single family residence which is to

XUM

be initially made available to and occupied by a low-income, non-elderly family, subsequent to the date hereof, directly or indirectly by or through CHA, whether in a structure owned in whole or in part by CHA (whether or not newly constructed) or to be otherwise made available for occupancy by or through CHA to such a family. "Dwelling Units" include "Leased Dwelling Units" as hereinafter defined.

C. "Leased Dwelling Unit" shall mean a Dwelling Unit in a structure leased or partially leased by CHA from any person, firm or corporation.

D. "Limited Public Housing Area" shall mean that part of the County of Cook in the State of Illinois which lies either within census tracts of the United States Bureau of the Census having 30% or more non-white population, or within a distance of one mile from any point on the outer perimeter of any such census tract. "General Public Housing Area" shall mean the remaining part of the County of Cook in the State of Illinois. The terms "non-white" and "white" shall have the meaning given to such terms by the United States Bureau of the Census.

For purposes of this subsection D, results of the 1970 and each subsequent census taken by the United States Bureau of the Census shall presumptively determine the non-white population of census tracts until results of a subsequent such census are officially published; provided, that any party may, on motion, offer evidence as to the non-white population of any census tract for the purpose of rebutting such presumption; and provided further, that Dwelling units located or proposed to be located in any census tract subsequent to official publication of the results of the last previous such census shall be taken into account in determining the population of such census tract, and for such purpose it shall be assumed that such Dwelling Units will be occupied by non-whites at the rate of two persons per bedroom.

For the period from the date hereof until the official publication of such 1970 census results, the census tracts in the City of Chicago listed on Exhibit A, attached hereto, shall be presumed to have 30% or more non-white population; and, subject to evidence offered on motion by either party, the non-white population of census tracts in the County of Cook outside of the City of Chicago shall be presumed to be as stated in the 1960 census of the United States Bureau of the Census.

E. "Public Housing Project" shall mean any thirteen or more Dwelling Units which are located (1) in the same structure, (2) on the same lot or parcel of real estate, or (3) on two or more lots or parcels of real estate which are contiguous to one another, or are separated only by streets, alleys, bodies of water, railroad tracks or the like.

II. Following the date of this judgment order CHA shall not authorize, approve or implement any plan for Dwelling Units, nor shall CHA seek any approval or request or accept any assistance from any government agency with respect thereto (including without limitation approval of the acquisition of any interest in real estate), unless such plan affirmatively requires that,

A. All Dwelling Units provided for in such plan shall be located in conformity with the provisions of Article III hereof, and

B. The activities to be performed in order to render such Dwelling Units available for occupancy (whether construction, purchase, rehabilitation, leasing or otherwise) shall take place at such times as will result in the loction of such Dwelling Units in conformity with the provisions of Article III hereof.

III. Following the date of this judgment order CHA shall provide Dwelling Units as follows, and not otherwise:

A. The following Dwelling Units may be made available for occupancy without restriction imposed by this order:

(1) The 1458 Dwelling Units provided for by pending CHA projects Ill. 2-27, 2-28 (exclusive of Dwelling Units proposed to be located at 70th and Harper streets in the City of Chicago), 2-32, 2-33, 2-51, 2-64, 2-69 and 2-74.

(2) Leased Dwelling Units (but not more than two per structure) which have been occupied for at least six months prior to CHA's leasing the same by tenants who continue in occupancy following CHA's leasing thereof.

B. CHA shall not commence or cause to be commenced the construction of any Dwelling Units, other than said 1458 Dwelling Units referred to in Subsection A of this Article III, until CHA shall have commenced or caused to be commenced, and shall be continuing or shall have completed, the construction of not less than 700 Dwelling Units located in the General Public Housing Area of the City of Chicago.

C. Subject to the provisions of Subsection E of this Article III, CHA shall not commence or cause to be commenced the construction of any Dwelling Units in any Limited Public Housing Area, other than said 1458 Dwelling Units referred to in Subsection A of this Article III, unless within three months following such commencement of construction at least 75% of the Dwelling Units on which CHA shall have commenced or caused to have commenced construction, and shall have continued or completed construction, since the commencement of construction of the last of the 700 Dwelling Units referred to in subsection B of this Article III shall have been located (at the time of commencement of construction thereof) in the General Public Housing Area of the City of Chicago.

D. Subject to the provisions of subsection E of this Article III, no Leased Dwelling Unit shall be made available for occupancy in the Limited Public Housing Area of the City of Chicago (in addition to Leased Dwelling Units in such Area which are already occupied) unless, immediately following such occupancy, at least 75% of the Leased Dwelling Units then occupied are located in the General Public Housing Area of the City of Chicago; provided, that such number of Leased Dwelling Units located in the General Public Housing Area of the City of Chicago may be less than such 75% to the extent Dwelling Units other than Leased Dwelling Units have been occupied, or are under construction which is continuing, in the General Public Housing Area of the City of Chicago in excess of the 75% minimum requirement of subsection C of Article III hereof.

E. Not more than 33⅓% of the Dwelling Units required by subsection C of this Article III to be located in the General Public Housing Area of the City of Chicago, and not more than 33⅓% of the Leased Dwelling Units required by subsection D of this Article III to be located in the General Public Housing Area of the City of Chicago, may, at the option of CHA, be planned for and located in the General Public Housing Area of the County of Cook in the State of Illinois, outside of the City of Chicago, provided that (whether or not constructed by CHA) the same are made available for occupancy by CHA to, and are occupied by, residents of the City of Chicago who have applied for housing to CHA, and provided further that all such Dwelling Units comply with the provisions of Article IV of this order.

IV. Following the date of this judgment order CHA shall not concentrate large numbers of Dwelling Units in or near a single location. Without limiting the foregoing, unless part of a development specifically designed to assist in achieving the purposes hereof as to which the Court by order shall have given its approval,

A. No Public Housing Project shall contain Dwelling Units designed for occupancy by more than 120 persons, except that if it is impossible for CHA to provide within such limitation Dwelling Units which it is otherwise capable of providing, and if it will assist in achieving the purposes of this judgment order, a Public Housing Project may contain Dwelling Units designed for accupancy by not more than 240 persons.

B. No Dwelling Units shall be located in any census tract if, following such location, the aggregate number of apartments and single family residences theretofore made available to low-income, nonelderly families, directly or indirectly by or through CHA, in such census tract would constitute more than fifteen percent of the total number of apartments and single family residences in such census tract; and

C. No Dwelling Units shall be provided above the third story in any structure except for families without children and except Leased Dwelling Units in a structure in which the number of Dwelling Units aggregates no more than 20% of the total number of apartments in such structure.

V. Within 30 days following the date of this judgment order CHA shall file with the Court and serve upon counsel for the plaintiffs evidence that CHA has modified its tenant assignment policy, adopted by CHA Board Resolution No. 68-CHA-232, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B, and its practices thereunder, to include all Leased Dwelling Units as a single "location" for the purposes thereof. Such policy and practices, as so modified, shall be applicable until the further order of this Court.

VI. Within 60 days following the date of this judgment order CHA shall file with the Court and serve upon counsel for the plaintiffs a tenant assignment plan. Such plan shall include, but need not be limited to, provisions having the following purpose and effect:

A. Such modifications, if any, shall be made in CHA's tenant assignment policy and practices as will assist in achieving the purposes of this judgment order.

B. New registrations on CHA's list of persons desiring housing (the "waiting list") shall be temporarily ended; a determination shall be made promptly as to which registrants remain eligible for and still desire public housing; intensive publicity shall then be employed in such manner as effectively to inform low-income families throughout the City of Chicago, including present CHA tenants, that substantial numbers of Dwelling Units will be made available in the General Public Housing Area of the City of Chicago pursuant to the provisions of this judgment order; and thereafter the "waiting list" shall be reopened to new registrants, including present CHA tenants who wish to apply for Dwelling Units in the General Public Housing Area.

C. Not more than 50% of the Dwelling Units in all Public Housing Projects shall be made available to eligible neighborhood residents, the remaining Dwelling Units to be made available for occupancy in accordance with subsection A of this Article VI.

D. Vacancies in CHA's Trumbull, Lathrop, Lawndale, and Bridgeport projects shall be filled in accordance with subsection A of this Article VI, except that such tenant assignment plan may contain provisions designed to assure that such projects do not become racially segregated.

E. Suitably detailed information shall be regularly filed with the Court and served upon counsel for the plaintiffs showing CHA's compliance with the provisions of this Article VI and such tenant assignment plan.

Following the filing and service of such tenant assignment plan the Court will enter such further order as it deems appropriate.

VII. Following the date of this judgment order CHA shall file with the Court and serve upon counsel for the plaintiffs, the Civil Rights Division of the United States Department of Justice, and the Regional

XUM

Administrator of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the following:

A. A statement of the following information respecting each location for one or more Dwelling Units, such statement to be filed and served not more than 10 days after any such location is approved by the Board of Commissioners of CHA (or by the appropriate CHA officer or employee with respect to any location not required to be approved by the Board of Commissioners) and prior to the formal submission thereof to any other government agency or official for consideration or action:

(1) a map showing boundaries, placement in relation to adjacent streets, and where available, street address;

(2) the area location (whether within the Limited or General Public Housing Area);

(3) the census tract number;

(4) the white and non-white population of such census tract;

(5) the aggregate number of apartments and single family residences theretofore made available to low-income, non-elderly families, directly or indirectly by or through CHA in such census tract;

(6) the aggregate number of apartments and single family residences in such census tract as reflected by the most recent census taken by the United States Bureau of the Census, supplemented by such information with respect thereto as is available to CHA from any other government agency or official (but the statement need not include such number if the number supplied with respect to the preceding paragraph (5) is zero);

(7) the total number of Dwelling Units proposed to be provided at such location;

(8) the number of structures, and the number of Dwelling Units in each, in which such Dwelling Units are proposed to be provided; and

(9) such additional data as will show that such proposed Dwelling Units will be made available for occupancy in conformity with the provisions of Articles III and IV hereof, including without limitation, in the event such proposed Dwelling Units would result in a Public Housing Project designed for occupancy by more than 120 persons, information showing that the provisions of subsection A of Article IV hereof have been met with respect to such Public Housing Project.

B. Statements setting forth any change in the information included under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (5), (7), (8) or (9) in a statement filed and served pursuant to subsection A of this Article VII, and covering the period up to initial occupancy of all Dwelling Units at any location, such statements to be filed and served not more than 10 days after any such change occurs.

C. Statements covering the periods from the date hereof until December 31, 1969, and from the date hereof until the end of each calendar semi-annual period thereafter, containing such data as will show that (1) all plans for Dwelling Units during the period covered by such statements have been in conformity with the provisions of Article II hereof, and (2) all Dwelling Units provided during the period covered by such statements have been in conformity with the provisions of Articles III and IV hereof, such statements to be filed and served not more than twenty days after the end of each calendar semi-annual period beginning with such period ended December 31, 1969.

VIII. CHA shall affirmatively administer its public housing system in every respect (whether or not covered by specific provision of this judgment order) to the end of disestablishing the segregated public housing system which has resulted from CHA's unconstitutional site selection and tenant assignment procedures. Without limiting the foregoing,

A. CHA shall use its best efforts to increase the supply of Dwelling Units as rapidly as possible in conformity with the provisions of this judgment order and shall take all steps necessary to that end, including making applications for allocations of federal funds and carrying out all necessary planning and development; and

B. CHA is hereby permanently enjoined from invidious discrimination on the basis of race in the conduct or operation of its public housing system, including without limitation the "pre-clearance procedure" described in the Court's Memorandum Opinion of February 10, 1969.

IV. This order shall be binding upon CHA, its officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and their successors, and upon those persons, including the members of the City Council of the City of Chicago, in active concert or participation with them who receive actual notice of this order by personal service or otherwise.

X. This Court retains jurisdiction of this matter for all purposes, including enforcement and the issuance, upon proper notice and motion, of orders modifying or supplementing the terms of this order upon the presentation of relevant information with respect to proposed developments designed by CHA alone or in combination with other private or public agencies to achieve results consistent with this order, material changes in conditions existing at the time of this order, or any other matter.

XI. The costs of this action shall be taxed against CHA, subject to the further order of this Court.

Enter:

——— ———,
Judge, U.S. District Court.

Dated: July 1, 1969.

CENSUS TRACT NUMBERS

114 through 116
120 through 137
280 through 282
340 through 347
348–Z
349–Z
350 through 352
353–Z
354 through 355
357 through 362
363–Z
364 through 373
375–Z through 378–Z
379 through 383
384–Z
389–Z
390–Z
391 through 392
395
399–Z
401–Z
403
410–Z
412 through 420
428 through 429
431–Z
432
434–Z
440 through 441
442–Z
444 through 449
450–A
450–B
451 through 457
460 through 467
468
469–Z
470
487
519–Z
520 through 521
524
527–Z
532–Z
534–Z
539–Z
541 through 553
554–Z
556 through 562
564–Z
567–Z
569–Z
574 through 610
613–Z
614 through 619
620–Z
621–Z
623 through 641
642–A
642–B
643 through 650
652
653–Z
655
656–Z
657
658–Z
659 through 662
664
666 through 667
675 through 678
681–Z through 683–Z
685 through 686
687–Z
688
690 through 691
695
697
711
717–Z
719–Z
720–Z
723
803 through 805
852
855
858 through 859
861 through 862
867–Z
868 through 895
897–Z
898 through 900
903
905 through 911
912–A through 912–D
922
923–A
923–B
924 through 927
932
934 through 935

EXHIBIT A

Tenant selection and assignment plan

Each applicant shall be assigned his appropriate place on a community wide basis in sequence based upon date and time his application is received, suitable type or size of unit, and factors affecting preference or priority established by the Local Authority's regulations. At a given time, the applicant first on the waiting list shall be offered a dwelling unit in accordance with the following plan:

1. If at the time the applicant comes to the top of the waiting list there are suitable vacancies in three or more locations, the applicant shall be offered the unit at the location that contains the largest number of vacancies. If the applicant rejects the first vacancy offered he shall be offered a suitable unit at the location containing the next highest number of vacancies. If the applicant rejects the second vacancy offered he shall be offered a suitable unit at the location containing the next highest number of vacancies. If the applicant rejects the third vacancy offered he shall be moved to last place on the eligible applicant list. When an offer of a suitable vacancy is made to an applicant, there must be a rejection of such offer before the applicant will be offered another location. Thus, the offering of a unit at the location with the second largest number of suitable vacancies will not be made until the applicant has first rejected the unit offered at the location with the largest number of vacancies. The offering of a unit at the location with the third largest number of suitable vacancies will not be made until the applicant has rejected the unit offered at the location with the second largest number of suitable vacancies.

2. If at the time the applicant comes to the top of the waiting list there are suitable vacancies in only two locations, the applicant shall be offered the unit at the location that contains the largest number of vacancies. If the applicant rejects the first vacancy offered he shall be offered a suitable unit at the second location. If the applicant rejects the second vacancy offered he shall be moved to last place on the eligible applicant list. When offers of suitable vacancies are made to applicants, there must be a rejection of the first offer before the applicant will be offered the second suitable vacancy.

3. If at the time the applicant comes to the top of the waiting list there is only one location at which a suitable vacancy exists, the applicant will be offered a unit at that location. If the applicant rejects the unit offered, he shall remain at the top of the waiting list until a second offer of a suitable vacancy can be made. Should the applicant reject the second offer of a suitable vacancy he shall be moved to last place on the eligible applicant list.

In carrying out the above plan, should the applicant be willing to accept the unit offered but be unable to move at the time of the offer and presents clear evidence of his inability to move to the Local Authority's satisfaction, refusal of the offer shall not count as one of the number of allowable refusals permitted the applicant before placing his name at the bottom of the eligible applicant list.

In carrying out the above plan, should the applicant present to the satisfaction of the Local Authority clear evidence that acceptance of a given offer of a suitable vacancy will result in undue hardship or handicap not related to considerations of race, color, or national origin, such as inaccessibility to source of employment, children's day care and the like, refusal of such an offer shall not be counted as one of the number of allowable refusals permitted an applicant before placing his name at the bottom of the eligible list.

[U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division]

DOROTHY GAUTREAUX, ODEL JONES, DORETHA R. CRENCHAS, EVA RODGERS, JAMES RODGERS, ROBERT M. FAIRFAX AND JIMMIE JONES, PLAINTIFFS, v. THE CHICAGO HOUSING AUTHORITY, A CORPORATION, AND C. E. HUMPHREY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, DEFENDANTS.

(Civil action No. 66 C 1459)

MEMORANDUM FOR THE UNITED STATES

Introduction

In response to the request of the Court and in light of its interest and concern in this case, the Government, and particularly the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), offered on May 16th to advise the Court of its views in regard to the proposed judgment orders in this case and the practical impact of the proposed orders on the model cities, urban renewal, leased housing programs in Chicago. In addition, we were requested by the Court to provide information as to how the various HUD programs and activities could be utilized to further the objectives of the Court.

This memorandum is presented in response to the Court's request for our views.

The United States strongly supports the objectives of the Court in this case. We are concerned that the Court Order be realistic, so as to permit the provision for badly needed housing for poor families and that it be effective, in order to accomplish the objectives previously indicated by the Court.

We have considered the alternative Judgment Orders proposed by both parties (copies of which are attached), that transmitted to the Court by Mr. Polikoff by his letter dated June 2, 1969, and that presented to the Court by Miss Kula with her letter of June 4, 1969. Our comments are addressed to the provisions of Plaintiffs' proposed Order, for two reasons: First, Plaintiffs' Order is more comprehensive in scope and raises the full range of issues which the Court and the parties have considered, and in addition has received more extended consideration by the Court; second, we accept the Court's view that a generalized Order such as that proposed by CHA, substituting for specific criteria a requirement for judicial review and approval of all project proposals, will not serve the Court's purpose of removing constraints which have heretofore inhibited both housing production and production of housing so located and administered as to serve the objectives of the Order. See, *e.g.*, *Louisiana* v. *United States*, 380 U.S. 145, 154 (1965); *Local 53, Asbestos Workers* v. *Vogler*, 407 F. 2d 1047, 1052–53 (5th Cir., 1969). *Accord: Green* v. *County School Board of New Kent County*, 391 U.S. 430, 437–8 (1968); *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, 349 U.S. 295, 299, 301 (1955).

We accept the Court's intention to lay down specific requirements for dispersed and desegregated housing and base our comments on the provisions proposed by Plaintiffs. These comments deal first with factual material that we have been able to gather relating to the probable impact of the Order on provisions of new or rehabilitated public housing units; on leasing; on urban renewal; and on the model cities program. The second section of the material which follows sets forth certain comments and observations based upon the preceding information. The third section which follows deals with affirmative actions that can be taken by HUD in furtherance of the objectives of the Court.

I. Impact of proposed order

1. Impact on Provision of New or Rehabilitated Public Housing Units

From September 1958 through December 1967 CHA completed construction of 11,817 family dwelling units. However, of this number only 1,284 units were completed during the last 5 years of this period—an average of 257 units per year. Since December 1967, only six units have been completed, but 1,259 are now in various stages of construction.

On the basis of an application filed by the CHA in January 1967, the HUD regional office is currently considering the reservation of 4,000 family units and 1,000 elderly units.

The proposed Order would hereafter require placement of at least three quarters of all family public housing units (and all of the next 1,330 units built) in a "General Public Housing Area." Out of a total city area of about 200 square miles, a rough calculation indicates that an area of approximately 75 miles is available for the location of such units. The Order further requires the scattering of such units by means of limitations on the amount of public housing which may be placed in any given census tract and by project size limitations. Within this area there will, of course, be further limitations of site costs, availability and suitability.

The "Limited Public Housing Area" includes approximately 85 square miles classified non-white, to which have been added one mile buffer areas which aggregate approximately 40 square miles. Under the terms of the Order, no more than one quarter of the family public housing would be built in this area.

A measure of the change contemplated by the proposed Order may be gained from an analysis of the 8,050 units (or 10,903 units counting repeat requests) in "white" areas submitted to the city council by CHA over the past 15 years and disapproved by it. Sixty percent of those units were on sites along the boundary areas between the non-white and buffer zones. Twenty-five percent were in areas now classified non-white; and only 775 appear to have been proposed for the "General" areas as it is now delineated.

While we would support the objective of constructing housing outside the City of Chicago, in light of the probable difficulty of obtaining the required cooperation of local governments, that appears unlikely to be a major factor in the immediate future.

2. Impact on Leasing Program

The proposed Order also places the leasing program under a 3 to 1 requirement, requiring that 75 percent of units leased be in the "General" area.

There is a city-wide vacancy rate of less than 1 percent, and virtually no availability of three or more bedroom units. CHA reports that since 1965 it has leased only 180 family units, of which 44 are stated to be in white areas. Few, if any, are large units.

Currently, CHA has commenced using the leasing program for a number of purposes in the "Limited" area. It is being used to support nonprofit moderate-income housing projects where up to 20 percent of the units in such projects can be leased in order to assist sponsors in achieving financial feasibility, to reach poorer families, to accommodate larger families. The T.W.O.-Maremont Project in Woodlawn is an example of such an undertaking. The leasing program is also an element of certain rehabilitation programs, such as programs under the "Chicago Plan Agreement" and in the Department of Urban Renewal's rehabilitation programs on West Douglas Boulevard and Independence Avenue. Some leasing has already commenced and it is planned that several hundred units be leased under these three programs in the "Limited" areas.

3. Impact on Urban Renewal

The so-called "Proxmire Amendment" requires that 20 percent of the housing units provided in urban renewal projects subject to the Amendment shall be for low-income families or individuals. As stated in the Senate Report on the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 (Report Numbered 1123), this amendment "reflects the committee's concern that the present emphasis in urban renewal on the provision of housing for persons of low or moderate income be continued and reinforced, in view of the urgent need for housing at these levels." Low-rent public housing is a major source for the provision of such units. The location of the urban renewal projects is such that probably at least four-fifths of the necessary public housing would have to be built in the "Limited Public Housing Area."

The maximum number of dwelling units permitted on land to be disposed of in projects subject to the Proxmire Amendment is 59,002 units, assuming actual construction at maximum permitted densities. Should this total be reached, 11,800 low-rent units would be needed in the project areas involved in order to meet the statutory requirement.

The statistics above must be considered in light of several other factors which reduce the impact of the order on this program. The projects involved are recent projects, in early stages of planning or development. Therefore, only a small fraction of the indicated housing will be needed in the years immediately ahead. In addition, the City proposes to rely on Section 236 of the National Housing Act for much of the low-income housing required by the statute. Projects developed under this FHA moderate-income housing program will be able to house families in the public housing income range if they are operated to utilize the maximum Federal subsidy available. Moreover, a substantial portion of the public housing programmed for these projects will undoubtedly be housing for the elderly, which is not affected by the Order.

The urban renewal program is directed at slum and blighted areas, most of which in Chicago are in the "Limited" area, and Congressional mandates increasingly require provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families in such project areas. In addition, the national goals to which the program's priorities are directed by the Department make provision for housing of these income groups the primary factor for priority of approval of projects. The Order can be reconciled with urban renewal efforts, but its effects on the present renewal program must be carefully evaluated.

Urban renewal is important not only in terms of housing production but in terms of the objectives of desegregation. Urban renewal affords one of the few possibilities for making inner city neighorhoods sufficiently attractive to partially reverse the out-migration by bringing some white families back into the center city.

The neighborhood preference aspect of the proposed Order may have an adverse impact on relocation efforts connected with urban renewal and other public programs causing displacement of families and individuals. The latest workable program submitted by the City of Chicago to HUD estimates displacement from January 1969 to December 1970 by urban renewal and other public programs as including 5,165 families, of whom 3,484 are non-white. In addition, we estimate urban renewal displacement over the life of projects now covered by contracts to involve 21,381 families and 14,435 individuals. Of these, 11,514 families and 8,556 individuals are non-white. A few thousand families and individuals have already been displaced; on the other hand, estimates do not include three large rehabilitation areas.

While neither set of figures is broken down by incomes, a sizable percentage of displacees are persons of low income. Public housing is the essential resource to provide relocation housing for such persons, and is counted on in planning and scheduling urban renewal undertakings. A 50 percent "neighborhood preference" in "white" areas where most of the dwelling units must be placed under the Order could reduce by half the number of

XUM

units available for rehousing of displaced non-white families and individuals.

4. Impact on Model Cities

Three of the four model neighborhoods in the Chicago model cities program are in the "Limited Public Housing Area." Current proposals for these four areas contemplated provision of 4,400 units of public housing over a 5-year period, but under the City's program, 2,450 are for the elderly, and would not be affected by the Order. Of the 1,950 units slated for family occupancy, 1,450 are in the "Limited" area. Some or all of these units may duplicate units required to meet the statutory urban renewal requirement.

Federal law does not require such units to be placed within model neighborhoods. Nevertheless, in view of the statutory objective of improving living conditions in such areas, an Order will certainly have substantial impact on rebuilding or restoration of the model neighborhoods.

In the three areas involved, 12,716 families out of 113,355—or slightly more than 11 percent—earn less than $3,000 per year. Many additional families are within the initial occupancy income limits for public housing in Chicago which range from $4,200 for a single person to $10,000 for a family of twelve. Public housing is the only program in Chicago which has been able to reach families in the lower segment of this income range.

II. Comments

We have carefully reviewed the provisions of the plaintiffs' proposed order, and have come to the conclusion that the basic structure and direction of that order are appropriate to accomplish the Court's objectives. In light of the absence of information concerning the availability of sites in the "General" area, we are not in a position to assure the Court that these provisions are the best ones, or that the order is workable as stated. After the order has been in effect, and the results of the site survey discussed below are available, it may be necessary to make changes in the order. Accordingly, we suggest that any order of the Court expressly recognize that the specific features (e.g., 75–25 percent requirement) are subject to revision based upon experience and further information.

1. The 75 Percent-25 Percent Requirement

It is presently impossible to evaluate the workability of the basic 75 percent-25 percent requirement of the proposed Order. It will require the location of many sites in an area where site availability is still an unknown factor. To the extent that there may be difficulties in obtaining sites and getting production in the "General" area, the formula would impose another restriction on a program which is already failing to make available sufficient public housing to the families in non-white areas, or indeed to any of the poor families in Chicago. The necessity for dispersion and a balanced distribution of public housing in the City must somehow be reconciled with the need for accelerated response to the housing needs of persons in the "non-white" and buffer areas.

The 100 percent requirement for 1,330 units in the "General Public Housing Area" to balance 1,330 units now being provided will intensify the problems above. It would appear preferable and more logical to regard the latter as part of the past record on which the Court's opinion was based, and to confine the Order to one formula uniformly applicable to all future housing production.

We recognize and accept the Court's belief that specific criteria are essential to an Order. Any ratio calling for provision of housing units in "white" areas equal to or greater in number than those in "non-white" areas would require a striking change in CHA's program. It is, therefore, particularly unfortunate that there is little or no information as to the prospective availability of usable sites in the "General Public Housing Area" as delineated in the proposed order. We regret that we are unable at this point to advise the Court whether the particular 3 to 1 ratio proposed by the plaintiffs, or any other ratio, is in fact appropriate.

2. The Leasing Program

Application of the proposed Order to leasing may present some special problems. The primary present utility of the leasing program in Chicago is in connection with new moderate-income housing projects and rehabilitation programs in non-white areas. If units for leasing are as scarce in other areas as we understand them to be, the proposed Order would make it virtually impossible to use the leasing program for this purpose. In order not to deprive neighborhood and other nonprofit projects in the "Limited" area of the support which this program can furnish them, the effect of this provision of the Order must be carefully evaluated.

3. "Neighborhood Preferences"

There is basis for concern in regard to the proposal to give a preference to "neighborhood residents" for 50 percent of the dwelling units in a project. Such preferences can have the effect of denying admission to public housing to some non-whites who have been waiting for public housing for long periods. The proposal may be subject to misunderstanding and attack by non-whites denied admission, and it may be subject to abuse.

To the extent that the Court requires that projects be small, the location of such projects in white neighborhoods may well achieve the desegregated living pattern which is sought without regard to the precise composition of the residents of the projects. Though this is less true of larger projects, we question whether such preferences or quotas are sufficiently useful to overcome the disadvantages as well as the complications they would add to already cumbersome tenant assignment procedures.

4. Other Comments

We agree that the Court's proposal to limit project size to occupancy by 150–200 persons is preferable to a 24-dwelling unit limitation. This still does not permit judgments on size to be made in relation to neighborhood development, services, and facilities, except to a very limited extent, but it ought to be possible to make provision for exceptions in cases where somewhat larger projects would not be disadvantageous in light of the location and facilities available.

It appears that some exceptions to the limitation to 15 percent of the family living units in a census tract will be necessary if statutory and other requirements are to be met, particularly in the urban renewal program. It should not be difficult to provide for such exceptions where needed.

In our view the following clarifying revisions might improve the proposed order:

(1) To more clearly state the objectives of the Court, we would suggest deleting the second paragraph in the proposed judgment order, and substituting therefore the paragraph contained in Attachment A to this memorandum.

(2) In Paragraph V. B, the relationship between persons presently on the "waiting list" and new registrants is not clear. Consistent with the first-come, first-served policy of the HUD Title VI Regulations, 24 C. R. F. 1.4(b) (2) (ii) we believe that those people who have been on the "waiting list" prior to this time should receive credit for that period of time in determining the order in which eligibles are to be offered new units in accordance with existing priorities. Similarly, persons who are already tenants should be allowed to transfer only in accord with their place on the new "waiting list."

III. Affirmative actions

HUD has considered possible means of utilizing its various programs in support of a CHA program under a Judgment Order. There are several supporting actions which we are prepared to take.

We can promptly make funds available for a survey to locate available and suitable sites. We can also fund activities to modernize existing public housing so as to make that housing located in the "Limited" area as desirable and as well serviced as possible. Another action this Department can take, as occasions may arise, is to encourage and approve utilization of other HUD programs for improvement of neighborhoods into which housing projects are introduced pursuant to a Court Order.

In one specific respect, HUD is ready and willing to assist the Court directly. We will be happy to participate in any arrangement whereby CHA proposals are screened or reviewed by HUD in order that we may furnish technical advice as to their conformity to the dictates of the Court. We believe that some such procedure could substantially relieve the Court of a technical burden which it would otherwise be forced to assume.

In conclusion, we assure the Court that we fully support the objectives of overcoming segregated and overconcentrated patterns of low-rent public housing in Chicago. We hope that they can be achieved together with the production of a stubstantial volume of sorely needed housing. We will do all that we can to contribute to the achievement of these objectives.

Respectfully submitted,
SHERMAN UNGER,
General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development.
S. LEIGH CURRY, Jr.,
Associate General Counsel.
JERRIS LEONARD,
Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice.
THOMAS A. FORAN,
U.S. Attorney.
JACK B. SCHMETTERER,
Assistant U.S. Attorney.
DAVID L. ROSE,
Attorney, Department of Justice.

ATTACHMENT A

The Court having determined that the defendants, Chicago Housing Authority and its Executive Director have violated their obligations under the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States by following racially discriminatory tenant assignment practices and racially discriminatory site selection procedures and practices, with the puropse and effect of maintaining patterns of residential segregation in Chicago; and the Court having conferred on several occasions with counsel for the parties and having received their written and oral statements as to the provisions of this judgment order.

[From the Chicago Daily News;
July 3, 1969]

HOUSING DECISIONS DUE

U.S. District Judge Richard B. Austin's order that a massive portion of any future public housing built in Chicago must be placed in white neighborhoods unquestionably means a temporary halt in public housing here.

Before anything worse happens there is a stern obligation on the Chicago Housing Authority and the City Council to come to grips with this issue. For if public housing does grind to a halt in Chicago it will be because the aldermen, eager to mollify their constituents, have fumbled their larger task of serving the entire city and its future. There is still time to avoid that.

Judge Austin's order requires the CHA to build 75 per cent of its future public housing in neighborhoods that are predominantly white, and the reaction in those neighborhoods has been prompt and predictable. As a matter of fact, Judge Austin's ruling may observe the letter of the law, but it fails to accommodate the facts of human nature that the CHA and the aldermen must live with. One salient fact is that a white neighborhood subjected to forced, substantial dilution with blacks frequently reacts with a sense of panic that is next to impossible to calm with appeals to reason. Racial tensions set in, and mount. Over the long run, the neighborhood tends to become all-black as the whites grudgingly retreat and finally flee.

Another salient truth, however, is that suitable housing accompanied by individual freedom of residence is one of the imperatives on the way to according blacks the social justice that must finally resolve the race problem.

Are these two points hopelessly irreconcilable?

We refuse to believe it.

Certainly at this stage the CHA and its chairman, Charles R. Swibel, must buckle down to a serious, exhaustive and imaginative study of the alternatives open under the law.

Legal appeals are likely, and it may well be that some of the strictures imposed by Austin will be removed by a higher court.

But it is doubtful if a higher court will reverse the main thrust of Austin's ruling, which is that, one way or another, white neighborhoods are going to have to yield a measure of their adamant resistance to any form of integration.

One serviceable device might be the quota system in which percentage figures are established for whites and blacks in the same projects. Elsewhere this system has had some success in bringing whites and blacks together as amicable neighbors, and in allaying fears of a massive population "invasion."

Whatever plans are produced should be brought before the City Council, and that body should react with something more responsible than grandstand politics. For one thing that Judge Austin has done is to put Chicago face to face with its most crucial issue—whether it is to be a city united or a city divided. The Council, under the leadership of Mayor Richard J. Daley, must act in the full knowledge that if the decision is for a divided city, that can only be a stopgap on the way to a city in social and economic ruin.

RAISE THE PERSONAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTION

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, today I join with hundreds of my colleagues in introducing legislation which will raise the personal income tax exemption from its present meager $600. I have chosen to cosponsor Mrs. Mink's bill, which will double the present exemption.

I voted against the income tax surcharge, Mr. Speaker, because I felt it would hinder efforts to secure meaningful tax reforms this session of Congress. Whether such a hindrance indeed exists will soon be seen as the bill wanders its way through the legislative quagmire. For this bill—which aids the already overburdened average American taxpayer—is the first step toward any true tax reform. If it is defeated, my prediction will have come true.

The average, middle-class American taxpayer is carrying much more than his fair share of taxes. With rising inflation and the increasing cost of money, he can ill afford this burden. Many of these persons are moving from the cities to the suburbs, not so much because they love the often sterile suburban life, but simply because they cannot afford to live in the cities. Thus, as the tax base moves out of the city, the city begins to decay. And as the cities rot, our whole Nation begins to fall apart at the seams. Something must be done, and it must be done soon.

Secretary of the Treasury Kennedy has already told us that the time is too late, that we are facing a taxpayers' revolt. The only way we can quell this revolt is to bring overdue justice to the taxpayer. I ask all my colleagues to join with me in this fight for tax reform.

APOLLO 11

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, mankind has awakened from a dream of a million years. And through the miracle of earthly technology and a prodigious accomplishment by the television industry, an incredulous world watched in breathless wonder as man took the first step into his own dreams.

Astronauts Neil Armstrong and Edwin "Buzz" Aldrin—with their "guardian angel" Michael Collins hovering above—have actually walked on the face of the moon.

These bold men have traversed the untrespassed sanctity of space. They have soared like the eagle on an unparalleled, unprecedented journey into the sunshine and shadows of man's future.

They have captured the rays of the solar wind, raised the Stars and Stripes over the Sea of Tranquility, have gathered "purple rocks" and moon dust, and have left the footprints of mortal men to endure for 500,000 years.

And in taking this "giant leap" on that dead satellite a quarter of a million miles away, they have perhaps discovered the secret of life.

Wilbur Wright, who with his brother Orville made man's first flight into the air 65 years ago in my home State of North Carolina, once said:

> It is not really necessary to look too far into the future; we see enough already to be certain that it will be magnificent. Only let us hurry and open the roads.

The Eagle has landed. The roads to the future are opened.

Now the exultant crew of Apollo 11 is earthward bound—and mankind will never again be bound by earth.

SPEECH OF MAURICE BLOND

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in a stirring speech in New York City, Maurice Blond, whose credits are listed below, delivered a message of hope to the Mended Hearts International Convention.

This organization is composed of people from all over the world who have undergone heart surgery.

Mr. Blond is to be congratulated for this fine speech which I am placing in the Congressional Record for the benefit of my colleagues and to the people of the country.

I have known Mr. Blond for over 40 years and I am proud to recall that he was born and grew up on the Lower East Side, which I have represented in the New York State Legislature and in the House of Representatives.

As a young lad, he was active in the Clark House, a settlement house, where he served as president of its Junior Athletic Association, president of its Alumni Association, elected to its Hall of Fame, and continues to serve the people of my neighborhood as a member of the board of directors of the Grand Street Settlement.

He was one of the founders of the Henry Street Settlement Federal Credit Union and for many years was its educational director.

As a young adult he was the organization secretary of the Lower East Side Public Housing Conference which was responsible for the passage of early legislation making possible the many low-rent housing projects that stand today all over America as a shining monument to their activities.

Mr. Blond, a successful general agent of the Travelers, specializes in the counseling of pension and profit-sharing plans. He is the insurance consultant to the Council of Jewish Organizations in Civil Service, Inc., with a membership of over 110,000.

It is Mr. Blond's interest in the handicapped that I am particularly pleased with and share his philosophy that a man should be judged as an individual whether it be in search of employment or insurance.

I rejoice in the national recognition he has received by being asked to serve on the National Advisory Committee of the National Diabetes Foundation and with the new honor tendered him with his election to the Advisory Council of the Mended Hearts, where I know he will serve with distinction among such world-renowned members as Mr. David Baird, Mr. Rome A. Betts, Mrs. John W. Chapman, Mr. Morris Chartkoff, Dr. Harold A. Collins, Dr. Denton A. Cooley, Dr. Michael A. DeBakey, Dr. Arthur DeBoer, Dr. Lewis Dexter, Mr. Donald Farmer, Sister Mary Frances, S.A.C., Dr. David G. Greene, Dr. Robert E. Gross, Dr. Dwight E. Harken, Dr. James A.

XUM

Helmsworth, Dr. Ormond C. Julien, Dr. Harold D. Levine, Dr. Benedict F. Massell, Dr. F. Lloyd Mussells, Mrs. Walter A. Oates, Dr. Walter L. Phillips, Mrs. Abraham E. Pinanski, Dr. Willis J. Potts, Col. Louis J. Rosenfield, Dr. George Schimfrt, Miss Mary E. Switzer, and Dr. Luis Soltero Harrington.

The address referred to follows:

WHY HEART SURGERY PATIENTS ARE INSURABLE

(Address by Maurice Blond)

Madam President Mrs. Cleston Ray, President-Elect Fred Howard, and officials of The American Heart Association—I am honored to appear before so rare and distinguished an audience of ladies and gentlemen from all the world who have undergone heart surgery, wearing proudly the insignia of The Mended Hearts.

As a member of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, I bring you warm greetings from our Chairman, Harold Russell, who agrees with me that the work you are doing—calling attention to the activities of people who have undergone heart surgery—is vitally important. The entire world needs to know about your message of hope. It is an optimistic battle cry and a credo all humanity should live by: "It's great to be alive—and to help others."

I recall quite well my initial reaction when first invited by your Convention Chairmen, Herman Brown and Paul Raskin, to speak on the availability of insurance for the heart surgery patient. It brought to mind some terrifying moments in a jet in the Far East when the voice of the pilot came over the loudspeaker: "Will the passengers please fasten their seat belts. I have two items of important information—one good and one bad. I will tell you the bad news first. We have strayed off course. We may land suddenly and we don't know where. And now for the good news. We are well ahead of schedule."

As a navigator guiding the financial destiny of many a former uninsurable, let me assure you that the insurance industry is right on course. We know our destination and are way ahead of schedule.

We are especially grateful to the magnificent skills of the medical profession who, in no small measure, are responsible for the excellent shape you are in. It was Cicero who brilliantly saluted these miracle men when he said, "In nothing do men more nearly approach the Gods than in giving health to men."

Not too long ago, in 1883 to be exact, a Dr. Billroth said "The Surgeon who should attempt to suture a wound of the heart would lose the respect of his colleagues." He has long since been proven wrong. The research I have done uncovered the fact that actually the year before that a Dr. Block had already shown the feasibility of suture in animals and proposed it for man. Within 13 years, 3 attempts were made to close wounds in human hearts. Of these, two were technically successful though only one patient survived. In 1896 a Dr. Farina closed a stab wound in one of the ventricles. The heart's muscles healed perfectly—though the patient died of broncho-pneumonia. Napoleon's great surgeon-in-chief, Dr. Larrey, saved a life by inserting a catheter into the pericardial sac to draw off an excess of fluid following a wound of the pericardium. In 1902 Dr. Brauer operated on cardioysis to relieve a crippled heart. Sir Thomas Lauder Brynton recommended the use of anylnitrite for angina pectoris stating "The good results which have been obtained by a surgical treatment of wounds in the heart emboldens one to hope that before very long similar good results may be obtained in cases of mitral stenosis." This proposal awakened a storm of criticism but revived attempts dating back many years to create and study valvular lesions in experimental animals.

Consonant with the dismal prognostic views which prevailed clinically until recent years, the Insurance Companies avoided insuring persons with known heart problems. However, a sizeable and valuable mortality experience has accumulated by virtue of the disability features of the insurance contracts. Disability claims following attacks of myocardial infarction have provided abundant material for follow-up mortality studies. In addition, reflecting a more optimistic clinical climate, experimental underwriting of persons with known coronary disease has been increasingly undertaken. Early experience has begun to emerge from these studies as well. Although adequate long term mortality data is still lacking, an interesting number of clinical as well as actuarial studies suggest that life expectancy on selected groups with heart problems is so far better than was formerly supposed that insurance contracts may now be offered on a sound basis without prohibitive expense.

Up until recently the Insurance Underwriter rejected all diabetics. Today the climate is such that Companies compete for this business. I am proud that I have in some small way contributed to the prevailing attitude in the insuring and hiring of diabetics which is that the applicant should be judged as an individual and not as a class.

Another group of persons, who have at times been denied insurance, and who most certainly are insurable, often as standard risks, are those who have had episodes of acute periacarditis. Very often, both clinically and electro cardio graphically, an erroneous diagnosis of acute myocardiac infarction has been made. I am happy to state that where curative surgery has been carried out, and there are no residual structural or functional abnormalities, a normal or near normal life expectancy may be anticipated, and such persons are freely insurable after a short time has elapsed. This is the situation following repair of parent ductus arteriosus, and perhaps with somewhat greater reservation, coarctation of the aorta and interatrial septiac defect of the predominant secundum type. In instances, as yet uncommon but increasing rapidly, cure has been accomplished with lesions such as interventricular septal defect, primum atrial defects, pulmonic and aortic stenosis and other anomalies using a direct open heart approach employing a by-pass procedure. With the relatively recent advent of such techniques as cardiac catherization and angio cardiography, a new day is dawning for The Mended Hearts. You are no longer the "Untouchables"—you are becoming the "Desirables". These are sophisticated procedures and well worth the effort and it has been my experience that they have paid off. The heretofore uninsurables are now being covered.

Too often, the examining doctors report is long on diagnosis but short on description. It is more important that the attending physician be consulted to counteract and contradict findings detrimental to the applicant. We know that heart murmurs are among the most common impairments detected on insurance examinations. What does this mean? A functional murmur is a physiological murmur that should be called a "romantic murmur", because although it may sound impressive, its message may be one of sweet nothings. In order to help make up the mind of the Underwriter affirmatively, I insist on a complete workup, EKG and X-ray and interpretation of same by a cardiologist or an internist, with special knowledge in the field of cardiovascular medicine.

There is still not very much usable material from an insurance standpoint on the insurability of people like yourselves, who have had heart surgery. It is by far the most important problem in the field of insurance as it is, too, in clinical medicine. The Association of Life Insurance Medical Directors has had two conferences with the Committee on Congenital Cardiac Defects of the Council on Rheumatic Fever and Congenital Heart Disease, American Heart Association. From this type of meeting, with free interchange of ideas, cardiologists and medical directors of insurance companies have a much better understanding of each other's problems.

The fact is that not enough time has elapsed as yet from the time this kind of surgery was first performed to draw any accurate conclusions. There is so much individual variation of such factors as the severity and complexity of the heart lesion, the extent of irreversible or only partly reversible secondary changes in the lungs, heart, kidneys and the probably long term deterioration of synthetic prosthetic materials, such as teflon patches, valves and vascular graft implants. Surgically corrected septal defects one year after surgery have been written with a small rating, along with pulmonary and aortic stenosis cases. Coarctation of the aorta and surgically corrected patent ductus anteriosus have been accepted in a like manner with all of the abovementioned procedures issued on a standard basis with the passage of 3 to 5 years. As of this moment heart transplants are not insurable. I am certain that with improvements in techniques and materials we will eventually be able to insure these cases, too.

The scarcity of reliable statistical reports to assist medical underwriters in the assessment of proper extra premiums is the big stumbling block. While remarkable postoperative improvements are being achieved day by day, the insuring of people like yourselves must necessarily be on a highly individualized and personalized basis.

You should know that Insurance Companies vary in the action they will take on such cases. Most Companies will not accept a case where a heart valve has been replaced. It has been my gratifying experience to have placed several of these cases with the helpful assistance of Dr. Michael A. DeBakey, Dr. Denton A. Cooley, Dr. Adrian Kantrowitz and Dr. Benjamin Stein who have convinced the underwriters in their Attending Physician Statements that what they have done is indeed truly life giving-Life Insurance in the best sense of the word.

I am also grateful and would like to express my appreciation to such eminent medical directors as Dr. Albert L. Larson. The Travelers, Dr. Richard A. Nelson, Prudential, Dr. Paul S. Entmacher, Metropolitan and Dr. Harry E. Ungerleider, North American Reassurance Co. for their valuable assistance in the preparation of this address. It is to their everlasting credit that they hopefully look to the future to see whether their predictions on longevity will be realized. The difference between treating the individual patient, which is your Doctor's responsibility and the medical director's concern for relating dollar values to human lives, is not so far apart as it may seem. Financial stability will remain as long as insurance is based on the probabilities within large groups. There must continue to be close cooperation. Only in this way can we prevent the physical problems from becoming economic tragedies. This must be appreciated by you who have first-hand experience and are making history. The very fact of your being here today is gratifying not only to your family who depend on you, but to the Supreme Underwriter in the Heavens who has seen fit to protect you and keep you alive.

Several years ago Calvin Coolidge made the following statement: "Nothing in the world can take the place of persistence. Talent will not; nothing is more common than unsuccessful men with talent. Genius will not; unrewarded genius is almost a proverb. Education will not; the world is full of educated derelicts. Persistence and determination are omnipotent."

This Convention must persist in its determination in establishing a program of assistance to surgeons, physicians and hospitals in their work with heart patients. We already have the know-how to cure many heart defects through surgery, but 100,000 people a year still die, which points up the fact that further research is vitally needed.

I came to bring a message of hope and was in turn exhilarated. I came to console—and leave with spirits soaring. I came to talk insurance and am assured.

It is heart warming to know that you put into practice what you preach—"It's great to be alive—and to help others."

CORNING GLASS HELPS NATION TO SEE MOON LANDING

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, Sunday night, two Americans set foot on the moon marking what certainly must be the most extraordinary venture in all mankind.

This historic achievement which took men from this world through 260,000 miles of space to that incredible landing defies description and makes what was once exciting science fiction a fantastic reality. Every American can puff out his chest proudly in seeing this oldest of man's dreams come true.

The epic accomplishment is the result of courage, skill, faith, and dedicated work. And a lesson which I think can be learned from this lunar landing is that the same kind of courage, skill, faith, and dedication can result in epic achievements here on earth as we strive to solve social and economic problems.

Eight years of work, involving at one time almost a half million people, went into the development of the Apollo program, which reached that dramatic climax Sunday night when millions of Americans watching on television saw man land on the moon. As unbelievable as the landing itself were those magnificent pictures permitting nearly one-quarter of the world to witness this event.

I am happy to say that one reason why we here on earth were able to visually share the landing was the research and development by a company located in my 38th Congressional District. I speak of the Corning Glass Works in Corning, N.Y. A piece of glass, about the size of a half dollar and containing 31 million glass strands, helped make the pictures beamed from the moon's surface by the Apollo TV camera brighter and clearer.

The company also developed other glass products for use in the Apollo program, and its men and women are typical of the thousands of technicians, engineers, and laborers who teamed up to make the moon landing a reality. They deserve the highest praise.

I submit for the RECORD a story in the Corning, N.Y., Leader which tells in detail of the role played by the Corning Glass Works in the Apollo program:

LOCAL PRODUCTS TO HELP BEAM BACK FIRST PICTURES FROM MOON'S SURFACE

When the first television pictures come back from the moon's surface next week, the world will see them through a piece of remarkable glass—a glass that didn't exist 10 years ago.

It's a chunk of glass about the size of a half-dollar (but somewhat thicker), developed by Corning Glass Works.

"If you could look inside, you would find 31 million separate strands of glass, each one only one-twelfth the thickness of a human hair, each one fused to its neighbor in a precise pattern," a CGW spokesman said.

These minute glass strands act as light "pipes," picking up light from the moon's surface and transferring it inside the camera. With the strands fused together in a solid piece, it's called a fiber optic faceplate, it was explained.

In the Apollo TV camera, this unusual glass helps to intensify the image—that is, it helps make the image brighter, hence easier to see. The tube for the television camera was made by Westinghouse Electric Corp. at Horseheads.

From its beginning to its end, Apollo 11 will depend upon some highly unusual glass products that came from the Corning research laboratories. They include:

Giant glass resistors (as big around as telephone poles and four feet long), located at every ground tracking station around the globe, will help clarify, or sharpen, the tracking signals. These massive resistors use glass because it doesn't conduct electricity. A thin metalic film on the glass provides the resistance.

When the Apollo astronauts look out into space, they'll be looking through perhaps the strongest, most perfect windows ever made—10 times stronger than the windows in your home. During their manufacture, Corning subjects them to numerous exhaustive tests, including one in which the glass panels are heated to 1,200 degrees F. and then plunged into cold water. Every American spacecraft has carried Corning windows.

When Apollo 11 re-enters the atmosphere, its radio antenna will be protected from searing heat by another extraordinary Corning glass—fused silica. These rod-shaped antenna shields are small—only two inches in diameter and five inches long—but they provide a vital service that virtually no other material could do. Four of them will be aboard.

Aboard the Saturn rocket that boosts Apollo 11 into orbit will be an IBM computer, and in the computer will be glass delay lines—thin, five-sided slabs of still another rugged glass. They're called delay lines because they delay electrical impulses, perhaps for only 80 millionths of a second, before feeding them to the computer.

TAX REFORM * * * RELIEF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very direct, timely, and effective commentary on the need for tax reform and relief from the oppressive tax load was carried in the Thursday, July 17, Harvey Tribune which, I believe, reflects the basic thinking across the country.

The editorial follows:

TAX REFORM . . . RELIEF

A higher interest rate on United States savings bonds is in the works as inflation finally catches up with this aspect of federal government. The treasury requested an increase, from 4¼ per cent to five per cent, in an effort to be on an equal footing in the competition for the attention of savers.

Perhaps with the passing of time and a return of the government's bank roll to robust health, another move might be made in the direction of keeping step with the times. This is the amount of personal exemptions permitting in the filing of income tax returns.

Year after year, despite annual moves upward in the cost of living, the exemption for federal tax purposes has held steady at $600 per person. But the ranks of those who can remember when a dependent could be supported in any kind of style at that figure are rapidly being depleted. Reports of persons who, paradoxically, pay income taxes while receiving public assistance are not hard to believe.

For the time being, of course, not only the regular tax payments but an extension of the surcharge are needed. The next subject will be tax reform, and it will be approached from many angles as attempts are made to close loopholes and otherwise make the federal levy more equitable, particularly at the upper levels.

But it is not unreasonable to hope that real tax reform will be considered to include more realistic treatment of dependents and perhaps a little extra consideration for those who are buying a college education.

ONE GIANT LEAP

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, America's three astronauts are on their way home, having accomplished one of humanity's greatest feats. The success of the astronauts in their quest has been an inspiration to all of us and should serve as a guide to what this Nation is capable of doing when it puts its mind to it. I am hopeful that the determination evidenced in the space program can now be directed toward attacking the problems of poverty, racial prejudice, and urban decay here at home.

Today the Christian Science Monitor carried an editorial on the moon landing and what it should mean to us. I include this editorial in the RECORD at this point for the benefit of my colleagues:

ONE GIANT LEAP

Mankind has again been taught one of history's still most needed lessons: humanity's greatest triumphs are those that come through peace, through intelligence, through inspiration, not through war. The worldwide outpouring of support, of joy, of prayer for man's monumental achievement on the moon is proof of how deeply all men share the desire for peaceful, orderly progress. And President Nixon, in speaking with the astronauts on the moon, voiced a profound truth when he said that the event had momentarily made all men truly one.

Few events in man's long struggle upward and forward have given a greater uplift to man's thought and spirit. In seeing what men could do, all persons felt new hope and confidence in humanity's further conquests. Helping lift men still further out of ignorance, fear, discouragement, and small-thinking, the moon-landing gave promise of ever more magnificent conquests in a multitude of fields. Feeling no longer confined to his immemorial home, man today can take a broader and less selfish view of the great problems still besetting him on this dear but crowded earth.

One may feel that Astronaut Neil Armstrong was modestly underestimating the achievement when he termed it "one small step for man," but all would agree that he spoke a profound truth when he also called it "one giant leap for mankind." The widening of horizons which will flow from it are beyond humanity's farthest ken. Although it is clearly one of the climaxes of human progress, it is also but one step upon the ladder of man's mastery of the universe. It helps provide insight into the promise which lies behind that great question to be found in Psalms: "What is man, that thou art mindful of him? . . . Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou has put all things under his feet."

Although in the deepest sense, the landing on the moon was an overall, worldwide accomplishment, it was also a peculiarly American one. For it demonstrated—powerfully and unmistakably—all that is right in what, for want of a better word, is called the American system. While free politically and economically, the United States proved itself able to outdo, with the whole world watching, the tightly bound Soviet Union in a venture which required the highest degree of collective organization. This is a lesson which must surely make a deep impression on men everywhere as they ponder the best system for their own material advance.

America and the world can rightfully be proud of the three astronauts. They demonstrate so much that is good and hopeful in the present day. Their calmness and efficiency, their lack of conceit, the broad and inspired view they take of their accomplishments are the qualities so urgently needed as the world's attention turns back from the moon to the earth.

THE USE OF U.S. PORTS BY FOREIGN FISHING VESSELS

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a commonsense proposal regarding the use of U.S. ports by foreign fishing vessels. This bill provides for the closing of U.S. ports to fish or fish products from vessels of any foreign nation which closes its ports to U.S. fishing vessels.

This proposal is not a vindictive response to the policies of another nation, and it does not blindly lash out at all who are in some way inhospitable. The bill is simply an appropriate means of protecting Americans involved in the fishing industry.

At the present time, vessels far away from home sometimes use foreign ports to repair their ships and to process their catch. When two nations share such port facilities, fishermen from each country may stay out of home port longer. Both take full advantage of profitable fishing grounds.

But when one nation severs its services by closing its ports, an unearned advantage is established for the inhospitable nation's citizens. They alone reap the benefits of cooperation while undercutting the ability of rivals to compete.

When a nation bars American vessels, it places an unjust and unnecessary burden on American fishermen. By closing our ports to that nation's fish products we can reestablish the balance necessary for fair competition.

STATEMENT ON THE VOTER EDUCATION PROJECT OF THE SOUTHERN REGIONAL COUNCIL

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 7 years the Southern Regional Council has been sponsoring a voter education project designed to research the causes of low political participation, particularly among blacks, in the South. A major component of this research effort has been the funding of voter registration drives by the voter education project.

The first voter education project was initiated in March of 1962 and ended in the fall of 1964. As a result of the activities carried out under this project, nearly 700,000 Negroes were registered in 11 Southern States during this 2½-year period.

The second voter education project was put into effect in early 1966, following the adoption of the Voting Rights Act by Congress in 1965. This project is ongoing and now includes nonpartisan education and leadership training programs as well as voter registration and voter participation research.

The importance of the voter education project is perhaps best judged by the extensive use which a recent report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Political Participation, has made of it. The project has been a valuable source of statistics and information as well as an important reason why the Voting Rights Act has achieved the significant gains it has during the 4½ years it has been in operation. If progress is to continue to be made in bringing blacks into full political participation in the South, it is imperative that programs like the voter education project be continued.

Unfortunately, the work of the voter education project is now threatened by changes in existing tax law presently being considered by the Committee on Ways and Means. One of the provisions of the committee's "Tentative Decisions for Drafting Purposes," which was released on May 27, would "prohibit foundations from directly or indirectly engaging in activities intended to influence the outcome of any election—including voter registration drives—or to influence the decisions of any governmental body—whether or not such activity is substantial." Since the voter education project from its inception has relied almost exclusively on contributions from foundations, the proposed prohibition imperils the continued viability and usefulness of the voter education project.

I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to redraft the language so that voter registration drives such as the voter education project will be able to continue to receive foundation support. Tremendous work remains to be done before political equality becomes a reality in the South. In view of the commitment made by Congress in the Voting Rights Act of 1965, Congress has a responsibility to see that every effort is made to eliminate the last remaining barriers to full political participation by all our citizens in all political processes and institutions.

I include at this point in the RECORD a statement made on June 14 by the executive committee of the Southern Regional Council, Inc., on this subject, and urge my colleagues to give it their closest study:

A STATEMENT ON THE VOTER EDUCATION PROJECT OF THE SOUTHERN REGIONAL COUNCIL, INC., ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, JUNE 14, 1969

The Southern Regional Council launched the first Voter Education Project in 1962. A major purpose of the new undertaking was to be research into the causes of low political participation, particularly among blacks, in the South. And a major method of this research was to be the direct funding of voter registration drives in the South as a means of determining the types of difficulties encountered.

While the SRC Executive Committee felt this project to be of the first importance, it stipulated that the Council could not sponsor this effort without review and assurance from the Internal Revenue Service that this program would be in accordance with tax-exempt activity as interpreted by IRS. The Council received that assurance from IRS on March 22, 1962. In addition, of course, the Southern Regional Council has filed annual reports with IRS on this as well as all of its programs and expenditures.

SRC's first Voter Education Project began in March of 1962 and ended in the fall of 1964. As a result of these efforts, an increase in Negro registration of nearly 700,000 was recorded in 11 Southern states.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965, suspending literacy tests in six states and otherwise providing new protection for prospective black voters, substantially changed the circumstances of civic participation in the South. Accordingly, the Southern Regional Council decided to launch a second Voter Education Project.

This second VEP began work in early 1966 and remains in operation today. Research into the causes of low political participation remains a major function. Support of voter registration activities continues to be a method of determining the causes of low political participation. However, the second Voter Education Project has placed an increasing amount of emphasis on non-partisan citizenship education and leadership training programs, particularly the latter.

As Congress recognized in the adoption of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the recent history of the South is darkly stained by the systematic exclusion of Negroes from the political process. A summary of the repressive statutes and practices which enforced this exclusion can be found in "Political Participation," published in May of 1968 by the Civil Rights Commission, and in "Climbing Jacob's Ladder," by Pat Watters and Reese Cleghorn, published by Harcourt, Brace and World in November of 1967. The latter book is largely a description of the work of the Voter Education Project. A feeling for the importance of the research activities of VEP may be gained by noting the number of citations of VEP material in the Civil Rights Commission's report.

The activities of the Voter Education Project have unquestionably brought more Negroes into the political process in the South. With the passage of the Voting Rights Act as a contributing factor, the second Voter Education Project—like the first—estimates that its programs have added 700,000 blacks to the registration rolls in the South. Year-by-year progress can be seen in the following table:

INCREASES IN BLACK REGISTRATION—11 STATES

Year	Black registration	White registration
1960	1,463,333	12,276,127
1962	1,480,720	12,109,680
1964	2,164,200	12,263.820
1956	2,689,000	14,309,704
1968 (summer)	3,112,000	15,702,000

It should be noted that although black registration has risen to 62 per cent of the black voting-age population in the region, white registration stands at 78 per cent of white voting-age population. Much remains to be done before it can be said that Negroes in the South are full partners in the regional and national political process.

The amount of money allocated for each project hardly can be described as large (although it must seem large to an organization with no other source of support). An average grant for voter registration runs between $1,000 and $2,000. The allocation generally covers a period running from one to two months.

A grant letter is sent to the local organization which sets out in unequivocal terms that the money is to be used only for non-partisan voter education and voter registration and may not be put to any partisan or other use, and specifically not to serve any political campaign. The grant letter is followed by a research letter which sets our reporting requirements. Organizations receiving funds are required to submit both financial and status reports weekly. These reports are reviewed in the VEP office in Atlanta. All money spent must be accounted for precisely.

Money is supplied on a cash-draw basis. No lump-sum grants are given. This furnishes VEP with a means of cutting off support instantly when a report indicates partisan activities or any other irregularity.

In addition to all this, VEP employs a full-time field director. The field director makes both announced and unannounced visits to all projects receiving VEP support. The field director also visits projects prior to funding to determine that they qualify for support. Non-partisanship is a major item checked by the field director in these on-the-spot inspections.

It should be pointed out that VEP does not endeavor to pay the entire cost of voter registration activities in the South. Local organizations, to the extent possible, are expected to raise funds of their own, particularly in urban areas. Candidates and others directly connected with political campaigns are not permitted to hold positions of responsibility in VEP-supported registration activities or in any way utilize VEP-supported projects, funds or facilities in aid of their own campaigns. While VEP has never found instances of partisan activity to warrant terminating a grant, several grants have been discontinued on other grounds.

Registration activities are not limited to blacks. Several projects have involved registration of Indians and Mexican-Americans. A few projects have reported registering some white Southerners. Relevant to the last point, however, is the fact that white registration in most of the South already is quite high.

The weekly reports are the backbone of VEP research. It is through these reports that VEP learns of difficulties Negroes continue to encounter in their attempts to register and vote in the South. Directors of voter registration projects supply the research department with a wide variety of facts and figures relating to Negro political participation in the South. VEP is the central point of such information by government, the press, scholars and universities, publications, research organizations, authors, and foreign visitors.

As already mentioned, the registration drives provide tremendous amounts of information and knowledge that otherwise would not be available. For many years, the Southern Regional Council has been the main source of information about black registration and voting in the South. Because several states have discontinued publication of registration figures by race, these local registration drives have become increasingly important in arriving at registration figures by race. The Voter Education Project continues to be the main source of this information.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

During the last three years, VEP has held a number of seminars, workshops and conferences for candidates and officeholders.

We have felt that black candidates and black officeholders, like black voters, have been so long denied a part in the political process that these special educational programs were warranted and, indeed, necessary.

The seminars and conferences are restricted to discussions of the duties and responsibilities of candidates and/or officeholders. Discussion of campaign techniques and strategy, of how to get elected, etc. is not permitted. Incidentally, VEP has consistently rejected requests for funds for get-out-the-vote activities and has cautioned grant recipients against using VEP funds for this purpose. Similarly, we have felt that the new voters should be informed about the government they now are helping elect, and that is the basis for the programs in the field of citizenship education.

As the number of black elected officeholders in the South climbed rapidly toward 400 last year, VEP scheduled the first Southwide Conference of Black Elected Officials. The conference was held in Atlanta last December with approximately 200 black elected officials attending. With the total number of black elected officials now standing at about 460, VEP has set up service centers for elected officials at five predominantly black colleges in the South. Although these centers now serve mostly black officials, we look forward to the day when they will be serving officials of any race who need technical and research advice. The centers may be compared, in terms of techniques and approach to the problems of government, with the Institutes of Government of the Universities of North Carolina and Georgia.

FINANCES

The Voter Education Project is but one of the many programs conducted by the Southern Regional Council, but it is the largest. Although VEP continues to receive small gifts from individuals, the bulk of funds comes from foundations.

Between 1966 and 1968 VEP received $1,163,446. Foundations which gave $2,500 or more each during this period include Aaron Norman, Abelard, Field, Ford, Irwin-Sweeney-Miller, Mary Reynolds Babcock, New World, New York, Rockefeller Brothers, Robert E. Moton Memorial and Taconic.

Grants for 403 programs, most of which involved voter registration totaled $736,956.70, for an average of approximately $1,830 per grant. The rest of the expenditures went for publications research and consultants, scholarships, student interns, meetings and seminars (including the Southwide Conference), and salaries and administration.

The first Voter Education Project (1962–64) received $870,371. Principal supporters were Taconic Foundation, Field Foundation, and the Edgar Stern Family Fund.

CONCLUSION

The Voter Education Project was formed as a result of widespread urgings from many concerned persons and groups, including high government officials, particularly in the Justice Department, that the energies of the sit-ins and freedom rides of the early '60s be channeled also into voter registration and citizenship education. It should be noted that there was some resistance within youthful civil rights circles to this development, the objection being that the idea sounded like an "Establishment" effort to blunt the thrust of activists undertakings.

It is true that the voter registration, citizenship education and leadership training programs have sought to bring black Southerners into the political process as a means of correcting the injustices that black people have historically suffered. The registration of thousands and the election of scores of black people have given many blacks in the South some hope of improving their lives through the existing political structure.

The Voter Education Project is the only organization conducting such programs on a region-wide basis. VEP could not have undertaken its task without foundation support. Without foundation support, VEP could not have existed. And without VEP, the black registration in the South would be substantially less than it is today.

Yet, as already pointed out, much remains to be done. Some two million voting-age Negroes in the South have not been registered to vote. Gradually, there are signs that white officeholders are responding to the needs of black voters. There are encouraging signs, here and there across the South, that blacks and whites can work together in the councils of government.

In large part these gains were made possible through voter registration, which in turn was made possible in large part through foundation support. To continue and sustain these gains will require a continuing effort, which in turn hinges upon continued foundation support. Gradually white Southerners are becoming accustomed to Negroes as a part of the political process. To roll back that trend now would be tragic. Discontinuance of foundation funds for voter registration, coupled with the prospective expiration of the Voting Rights Act, would surely halt and reverse the trend toward full political participation in the South.

Sustained registration campaigns are needed to test the willingness of Southern registrars to follow non-discriminatory procedures (especially if the Voting Rights Act is not extended). However, most black people in the South are poor and can scarcely meet their daily needs. A few communities would be able to raise local funds to finance a voter registration campaign, but most would not. For all practical purposes, voter registration in the South would grind to a halt without foundation support.

In the years after Reconstruction came a dark period called Redemption. During this period, white Southerners turned back the clock and reasserted their control over the lives of black people. Tragic and bloody years followed, and the nation is still undoing the damage. Total exclusion of blacks from the political process was a major factor in that Redemption period.

A second Redemption is unthinkable if the region—and the nation—is to survive as a multi-racial society.

POLLUTION AND HEALTH

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. BEALL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been a great deal of discussion concerning biological warfare and as is too often the case in matters of this sort, the argument tends to become so emotional that we lose sight of pertinent information that should be of interest.

One of the installations involved in this discussion is Fort Detrick located in Frederick, Md., and I think it should be pointed out that people at this location are playing a vital role in the field of public health. For instance, Fort Detrick scientists were involved in research on the bacterium believed responsible for the massive Chesapeake Bay fish kill in 1963. There is probably no other laboratory in the United States with the equipment and experience necessary to study live fish experimentally infected with dangerous human-disease organisms. Furthermore, as a result of this experience Fort Detrick scientists were requested by the Lunar Sample Receiving Laboratory at Houston to develop methods for detecting diseased producing agents in the lunar sample which might effect commercially important fish. The knowledge, experience, and equipment resulting from work at Fort Detrick is of great value to society directly and it is highly unlikely that any other American research establishment could do some of the work required at this installation. As an evidence of the kind of work going on at Fort Detrick and of the quality of the personnel. I would like to include in the RECORD the remarks of Mr. Werner A. Janssen who is medical microbiologist at Fort Detrick. These remarks were made at the Pollution and Health Conference of the American Public Health Association held on July 2 in the Washington area.

ADDRESS BY WERNER A. JANSSEN

Fish and shellfish are not yet a major food source in the United States, but as our growing population rapidly encroaches on farm lands for living room, we will have to turn more and more to our water resources for food. Unfortunately, this will occur at the same time that our water resources will be used increasingly for waste disposal and recreation if present trends continue. I think that the time is rapidly approaching when fish and shellfish may become carriers of human infectious disease of equal importance with domestic animals and poultry. I say this even though it is generally believed that few human disease organisms infect fish and even fewer fish disease organisms infect man. This conclusion is based on very little experimental evidence, and may be quite incorrect.

The fact that fish and shellfish serve as mechanical carriers of human disease organisms associated with sewage is well known, but how long and how far the animals carry the organisms is not known with any degree of accuracy. If it is simply a matter of contamination of the animals' surface or gut, then perhaps they may become decontaminated by swimming in uncontaminated water, as some authorities claim. But if the animals become actively infected by the human disease organisms they may spread these organisms over great distances and for long periods in areas thought to be safe according to the usual public health department methods of assay. For example, a graduate student at Kansas State University found that a variety of fish caught within one and one-half miles below the sewage treatment plants of 2 towns on a river in Kansas contained many different kind of bacteria capable of causing serious human diseases. He was also able to isolate many of these bacteria from the polluted water itself. In addition, he found that catfish experimentally fed several kinds of disease-producing bacteria associated with sewage continued to excrete these organisms for at least 30 days later.

Other workers have shown that fish become actively infected with the bacteria that cause cholera and para-typhoid fever, and they excreted these organisms for days.

In Japan, the chief cause of food poisoning is the eating of raw fish infected with a certain marine bacterium. This organism is probably indigenous to the marine environment, but it is also spread via the feces of human carriers. The organism has recently been isolated from diseased striped bass, crabs and oysters in Chesapeake Bay. No doubt our western habit of cooking fish and shellfish has avoided a great deal of trouble with infected and contaminated aquatic animals.

A few years ago I was involved in investigating a massive fish kill in Chesapeake Bay, which probably originated in the Potomac River. About half of the white perch in the upper bay region were believed to have been killed by a bacterium which closely resembled the organisms which cause human plague and pseudotuberculosis. I might point out in retrospect that it was because of the resemblance of this organism to the extremely deadly plague bacillus that our unique facilities and experience at Fort Detrick were called upon. Fortunately, we found the organism to be noninfectious for mammals. But we also found that some white perch caught in rivers of the western shore of the bay which flow through highly populated areas had definite evidence of having been infected with either the organism believed responsible for the fish kill, or any one of a number of human diseaseproducing bacteria associated with pollution. In contrast, white perch caught in rivers of the eastern shore of the bay, which flowed through areas of low population, had no evidence of infection with the organisms tested for.

Contaminated or infected fish can, of course, infect anyone handling the fish directly through wounds or abrasions, but I think the biggest danger from fish exposed to contaminated water is the possibility that they may become actively infected with the human disease-producing organisms associated with sewage and spread them to areas thought to be safe which are far removed from the polluted area. The role of fish as potential carriers of human disease, especially as related to pollution, needs much more research, and I hope you will all do what you can to see that it gets done in time.

FIRST STEP IN SPACE

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reality at last, man's first step onto another body in the universe was so much like what we had expected that it seemed like just another science fiction movie except for the anticipation, pride, and exhilaration of the moment.

Neil Armstrong and his companions on Apollo 11, and all of his fellow astronauts, the NASA team, the scientific and industrial personnel, and American taxpayers who made this moment in history possible, are to be congratulated for their daring and their faith and their willingness to face the future.

The exploration of space demonstrates the tremendous teamwork which has always made this Nation great. There should be no doubt in anyone's minds today that we are reaching to the heavens openly and freely for the benefit of all mankind. But this accomplishment today is uniquely American. It was conducted openly for all to see and hear, as have all our space triumphs and failures. And we are a richer country for it.

Man's faith in his own scientific and personal achievement is based on his faith in God, as evidenced by the strong commitment of our astronauts. "In the beginning, God," as Col. Frank Borman quoted from Genesis. This Nation, which itself is based on its belief and faith in our Creator, can truly thank God today for the blessing of this successful mission into God's universe.

The new voice of our people can be heard through Neil Armstrong and all his associates and the young men and women who have been inspired by their accomplishments and who will lead us even farther. And perhaps there is even hope for those of us of an older generation who, when confronted by talk of the "generation gap," can point with some pride to the fact that it was our generation which provided the knowledge, the money and the willingness to take this historic first step into the universe.

OUR MEN ON THE MOON

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues in expressing congratulations to the members of the Apollo 11 crew following the successful landing of the lunar module "Eagle" on the moon. The courage and abilities of these men are part of that spirit which continues to make America the leader of the free world.

When man first stepped on the moon, one fact was paramount: when America sets a goal, that goal is accomplished.

Of course, we must achieve a balance among our national commitments. Improvements need to be made in housing, education, nutrition, civil rights, urban and rural improvement, and social order. We must develop a program appropriate to the total problem, and we must meet that program with a total commitment.

Our country realizes we can accomplish what we intend to do. As we develop our priorities in a balanced program, our space achievements assure us our domestic goals will be accomplished, also.

AN OPEN LETTER

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from a distinguished fellow Texan, Mr. F. T. Wilson, president of KLRN, Inc., of Ralls, Tex., whom I have known and esteemed as a great citizen of our State of Texas and who has always been responsive to human need. For many years he has labored in the field of the radio media, in fact, I had the honor of knowing him when he operated radio station KGNB at New Braunfels, Tex.

Mr. Wilson has sent with his letter a most touching message written by a grieved father of an American hero who died patriotically in the defense of our country, in fact, in the defense and in behalf of every one of us, even those who are today reviling the United States for answering the cause of human freedom.

This letter was printed in the Crosbyton Review of June 26, written by Mr. and Mrs. Andres V. Minor, whose son, as I said, died heroically in Vietnam. I place this great, though simple, and inspiring message into the RECORD at this point:

AN OPEN LETTER

(The following is the message delivered in Crosbyton Wednesday by Andres V. Minor, father of the late Arman Minor, for whom funeral rites were held Wednesday afternoon:)

MY DEAR FRIENDS OF CROSBYTON: I come to you to express my feelings. I have lost a son in Vietnam, a son who belonged to me and also to this town, where he was educated and grew up. My heart aches and suffers, but at the same time, I am very proud of this son, Arman Minor, who served his country well, even unto death. Perhaps some people in Vietnam thank him also, for he fought for their freedom.

I am talking in his place, and I want to thank the town and the people of Crosbyton, for the opportunities given to him to educate himself and to serve this great Country to the best of his ability.

Everyone, under the blue beautiful skies of this Country, has a duty to perform. My son, Armando Minor did perform his duty. I always taught him to respect his elders and all authority, and though my heart aches, I am proud of him, for he is honor for the family, Crosbyton and the United States.

I am a simple man, had very little schooling, all told about Thirty days with a teacher by the name of Benito Jimenez of Floresville, Texas.

I am also a man of peace. I love peace and have taught all my children to do so. As strange as it might sound, my son died fighting for peace, fighting for the peace of unfortunate people, who have not known peace for a very long time.

In the name of my son, and in the name of my whole family and my own, I would like to thank God and this Country of the United States for the opportunity to serve them both, first God and then the United States, as my son has done.

This is our ideal for me and my whole family

Andres V. Minor and Ines A. Minor and my sons: John C. Minor, Marcelina M. Cruz, Juanita M. Candanoza, Andres C. Minor, Jr., Ignacio C. Minor, Adolpho C. Minor, Jose Guadalupe C. Minor, Consuelo A. Minor, Pfc. Romualdo A. Minor.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minor, is far more representative of that great body of people of Mexican descent, sometimes very condescendingly, and in my opinion, mistakenly, referred to in hyphenated form as "Mexican Americans." This great conglomeration has proven in two great world wars and sequela their loyalty, patriotism, and bravery. Mr. Minor's simple but fervent expression is most typical of these Americans. In time they will establish their great national contribution, as Walt Whitman prophesied last century. Indeed, I believe they have already—except they are not by tradition given to tumultuous and rebellious presentations, despite and notwithstanding some present day "leaders," or "spokesmen," or "redeemers," except in circumstances of justifiable and unbearable causes. Rather, despite prejudice and antipathy it is forging forward in the traditional American manner, within the law and framework of American social ideals.

I am proud and grateful and also humbled before such great Americans as Mr. Minor and his wonderful family. I feel sure you, Mr. Speaker, and every Member will share this sentiment with me.

TRIBUTE TO CLARENCE MITCHELL

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Clarence Mitchell, director of the Washington bureau of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People—NAACP—recently was justly praised in a syndicated column by Whitney M. Young which appeared in the July 21, 1969, issue of the Washington, D.C., Daily News. Mr. Mitchell is one of the ablest legislative lobbyists I have encountered during my 21 years in the House of Representatives. The achievements of Clarence Mitchell demonstrate that injustices can be ultimately corrected in this country. Furthermore, Clarence Mitchell is a true militant. For years, probably in quiet desperation, he has patiently but determinedly prodded, pressured and pleaded the cause of justice in America. No setback sent him yelling in frustration into the streets and no achievement caused him to pause in self-satisfaction. I insert the column at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 21, 1969]

CLARENCE MITCHELL

(By Whitney M. Young)

Some time in the future, when historians look back at the civil rights movement, they'll pay a lot of attention to a man most Americans never heard of—Clarence M. Mitchell, Jr.

They'll write about demonstrations, the March on Washington, and a lot of dramatic events that captured headlines. But they'll also write about the major legislation that was passed, laws that gave Negroes the legal rights denied them for so long.

And the story of how those laws came to be passed is also the story of Clarence Mitchell's tireless efforts as a one-man civil rights lobby in Washington. He's been so effective that he has been called the 101st Senator.

He recently was awarded the coveted Spingarn Medal for his outstanding contributions in the fight against racism. As director of the Washington Bureau of the NAACP since 1950, there hasn't been a bill of importance to black people before the Congress that didn't find Clarence Mitchell working to make it better, to pass it, or to kill it if it was bad.

You may not recognize his face when you see it on television, but there isn't a Senator or Representative who doesn't know Clarence Mitchell.

Clarence Mitchell is a lobbyist for America's poor and he has served them well. He helped to get the first civil rights bill in over 80 years passed in 1957. In 1964, he worked long and hard to get the great Civil Rights Act on the books.

Last year saw perhaps his greatest triumph. After one fair-housing law had been defeated, everyone agreed that another could not be passed. But Clarence Mitchell rolled up his sleeves and went to work. He told wavering Congressmen how important such a bill was. He met argument with argument; encouraged the bill's supporters, counted votes, and kept after Congressmen and administration officials alike. Finally, in April, 1968, the fair-housing bill no one thought possible was enacted.

Too many people think equality is going to come about by shouting and thru rhetoric. But open expressions of anger have to be backed up with sound legislative savvy.

Laws are made in Congress, and the civil rights movement needs shrewd men who can get those laws passed. We've been fortunate in having just such a man—Clarence Mitchell.

His success is also a lesson to those who are so impatient with the NAACP as an organization. It may not do or say things some people consider to be dramatic or exciting enough, but it has made, and is making, a vital contribution to securing equality for black people.

The Urban League often gets the same kind of criticism. So do other organizations. Even CORE is attacked as being too moderate, by some whose definition of "militancy" is total irresponsibility.

What is too little understood is the need for a division of labor among the various civil rights groups. Each has its thing that it does best. But they all work together.

MISS KANSAS 1969 IS MARGO SCHROEDER OF HILLSBORO

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Kansas, the land of two Miss Americas, has crowned Miss Margo Schroeder of Hillsboro as Miss Kansas of 1969. She will represent her State, her county, and her hometown in an outstanding fashion during her reign the coming year. Margo follows in the proud and beautiful tradition of Debbie Bryant and Debra Barnes who reigned as Miss America.

I am especially proud that this talented young lady resides in my congressional district in Kansas. She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Dean Schroeder of Hillsboro and attends Wichita State University where she is preparing for a teaching career. Prior to winning

XUM

the title of Miss Kansas, Margo reigned as Miss Marion County.

The citizens of Hillsboro and Marion County honored Miss Kansas at a homecoming celebration Monday, July 21. I regret I could not be in Kansas on that occasion because of legislative responsibilities. However, I join in congratulating Miss Kansas of 1969 and wish her happiness and success in the future.

THE 20TH OF JULY

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, July 20, 1969, marked the 25th anniversary of a memorable event which testifies to man's unquenchable desire for freedom from tyranny even in the darkest hour.

I refer to the attempt by German Col. Count von Stauffenberg and his resistance group to overthrow the Hitler regime on the 20th of July 1944.

Throughout the 12 years of the "Third Reich," there were many groups of men and women who protested the regime's laws and actions. But they were isolated by the state-party machine, and when detected they were mercilessly hunted down. They could not prevent the war. Gen. Ludwig Beck, the German Chief of Staff, who was one of their number, resigned his command rather than accept Hitler's dictates.

Notwithstanding the Gestapo's efficient machinery, the spark of freedom lived on. A group of men of high ideals, known as the "Kreisau Circle," planned again and again to overthrow Hitler. Many had religious scruples against taking the life of the "Führer," but in the end they decided there was no other alternative. They also knew well that failure would cost them their lives.

Against all odds, Count von Stauffenberg, a young, highly decorated battlefront officer, planted a bomb in Hitler's staff briefing room at the Prussian headquarters "Wolfsschanze." Then he rushed to Berlin to help wrest control from the regime. But Hitler survived the explosion to wreak his vengeance upon all his opponents. Count von Stauffenberg was immediately executed by a firing squad. Many thousand others were less fortunate. Anyone with the slightest connection to the resistance group was arrested and literally slaughtered. Field Marshall Rommel, a soldier respected by friend and foe alike, was forced into secret suicide to protect his family from Hitler's wrath.

Although this attempt failed, even in failure it stands out as a monument to the belief in freedom and to the sacrifices which freedom is worth.

At the entrance to the auditorium of the German Embassy here in Washington, there is a small bronze plaque for a former diplomat serving in this country. It reads: "20 July 1944—Otto Kiep—He gave his life for the honor of the German people."

In remembering him and his countrymen who died in the aftermath of the 20th of July 1944, we honor all those who have given their lives to fight oppression. We accept also their vindication of their country's honor.

FREIGHT TRAIN DERAILMENTS INCREASE 20 PERCENT A YEAR IN NEW YORK STATE

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been calling the attention of the House to the ever-increasing number of train accidents and derailments.

Obviously, the railroad industry is making no effort to police its own operations and it is, therefore, necessary that we "throw the book" at them with some tough laws enacted by the Congress; laws that have teeth which the executive agencies can use to bring about safety precautions that are effective.

Previously I have been using national figures in citing the need for tough legislation.

Now, I have some State figures for New York. They are appalling. Imagine, derailments in the State are increasing at the rate of 20 percent a year. This is just one State.

The need for legislative action is clear.

Following is an article detailing the New York statistics as detailed in the July 16 edition of the Buffalo, N.Y., Courier-Express:

Train Derailment Disasters Mount

(By Modesto Argenio)

Freight train derailments in New York State have increased by more than 20 per cent a year contributing to concern over disasters triggered by such derailments, a Courier-Express survey indicated Tuesday.

The most recent derailment-collision in Western New York occurred Monday when four Erie-Lackawanna Railroad crewmen were injured after their freight train struck a road paving machine near the Wyoming County community of Castile. Three diesel engine units and 16 cars were derailed in the wreck.

FIGURES COMPILED

The most recent figures compiled by the state Public Service Commission (PSC) show statewide increases in freight train derailments and grade crossing accidents.

PSC figures, compiled for July-through-June periods, show a 23 per cent jump in freight train derailments from the 1966–67 period to the 1967–68 period. There were 178 freight train derailments reported for 1966–76 and 231 for 1967–68.

Grade crossing accidents increased from 183 in 1966–67 to 201 in 1967–68.

Concern over derailments was voiced by the National Transportation Safety Board recently because of the increased shipment of volatile, hazardous commodities by rail.

About 2 billion pounds of industrial explosives alone are transported throughout the country annually, according to the U.S. Interstate Commerce Commission. This is besides increased shipment of military explosives, rocket fuel and radioactive material.

There were no reported hazardous materials on the Erie-Lackawanna freight train involved in Monday's collision.

MOTOR VEHICLES

The PCS reported that the total number of railroad accidents increased slightly from the 1966–67 period to the 1967–68 period. There were 1,585 accidents in 1966–67 and 10 more during the following period.

The total number of passenger trains derailed decreased from 19 in 1966–67 to 12 in 1967–68. Seven passengers were killed and 57 injured during the 1966–67 period. Three passengers were killed and 253 injured during the 1967–68 period.

However, the total number of grade crossing collisions involving motor vehicles striking moving trains increased from 66 in 1966–67 to 72 in 1967–68.

WARNING ISSUED

The number of persons killed in grade crossing accidents dropped from 40 in 1966–67 to 27 in 1967–68. Eighty-eight persons were injured in grade crossing accidents during each of the reporting periods.

The National Transportation Safety Board has warned that there appears to be a need for a general re-examination of existing railroad and maintenance and operating procedures.

NIXON'S PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, 6 months have elapsed since Richard M. Nixon was inaugurated as President of the United States. White House watchers have spent the first half of 1969 scrutinizing the apparent successes and failures of the new administration. For the most part, these evaluations have been couched in prophetic and noncommital language. With the administration still unpacking, most political analysts preferred to suspend judgment until more time had elapsed. But after half a year, comprehensive critiques of the Nixon administration are beginning to appear.

I want to call the attention of my colleagues to a thoughtful critique, which was published in the June issue of Commentary, by Robert Lekachman, professor of economics at the State University of New York, Stony Brook.

In brief, Professor Lekachman's analysis suggests that the administration is pursuing a course which offers little hope that the necessary concerted and aggressive attack against the problems confronting our cities and the Nation's poor will be launched during the next 4 years. In area after area requiring a change in policy—in housing, education, extravagant military expenditures, and tax reform—the administration has evidenced a desire to stand pat, rather than redirect national resources toward solving the mulitude of problems comprising our domestic crisis. As Professor Lekachman says:

> The President is disinclined to support urban problems not because there is no money available for them, for, of course, there is money available.

Tax reform, higher taxation of corporate profits, and even a modest reduction in Pentagon spending could easily generate the funds necessary. As Professor Lekachman emphasizes:

> We could . . . control inflation and at one and the some time finance social reform at decent levels.

However—

> President Nixon's actual tax and expenditure policies have decidedly different aims from these.

Professor Lekachman's analysis points out the need for Congress to undertake a reordering of budgetary priorities. For, if the administration will not lead the way toward social and economic progress, Congress must. I urge my colleagues to carefully study this article. If Congress is to provide effective leadership during the current session of Congress, it is essential that we understand the inadequacy of the Nixon administration's approach to our growing unresolved domestic needs.

The critique follows:

[From Commentary, June 1969]

Nixon's Program

(By Robert Lekachman)

Superficially the initial months of the Nixon administration can be interpreted as something of a relief from the exaggerated fears and dismal visions of the President's more devoted enemies. The New Frontier has not been surrendered to the Indians. Ramshackle as ever, the Great Society stands. The gloomiest forecasts centered upon the programs administered by Health, Education, and Welfare, but thus far at any rate Secretary Robert Finch has averted massive financial bloodletting. Moreover, in spite of Strom Thurmond, the fabled Southern strategy of the Nixon campaign, and the ambiguities of the President's own utterances on the subject, the guidelines governing Title VI funding of local school districts under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act have been only bent here and there, not discarded. The appointment of Dr. James Allen as Commissioner of Education certainly suggests some inclination not to reverse the outcome of the Civil War.

Elsewhere the omens are equally cheerful or at worst ambiguous. Congressman Donald Rumsfeld's surrender of a safe House seat in order to become head of the Office of Economic Opportunity implies the continuation of that agency. Even the Job Corps camps which Mr. Nixon the candidate condemned as flat failures are promised a continued life on a more modest standard of living under the aegis of the Department of Labor. Head Start, though it is presently the target of a somewhat dubious evaluation, is for the coming year promised as much money as it got last year.

A resolute viewer of the bright side of life can find a little more that is pleasing. The Model Cities program has been adopted by Secretary Romney as his own. Mr. Finch has actually asked for more money with which to enlarge the studies now underway in New Jersey into the effects of negative income taxes. There is manifest a Presidential disposition to proceed against at least two of the many tax inequities which make the American system of so-called progressive taxation something of an international laughing stock. These are: the tax assessment of individuals and families whose incomes put them below the poverty line and, at the other end of the scale, the total escape from tax liabilities of fat cats whose incomes each year run in excess of $200,000.

The much touted budget reassessment, received with yawns when it was finally released on April 15, has not proved to be any occasion for alarm, either. "The President's objectives," it proclaimed, were "threefold: . . . to make the expenditure cuts that are a necessary part of efforts to combat inflation; to bring federal outlays under control; and to begin redirecting ongoing federal programs toward his administration's goals." Fair enough, at least if it were possible to identify the goals in question. But all that the fanfare announced was a small stage army of some fifty minor alterations in the last Johnson budget. The two largest cuts were the least likely to stick. Of the $4 billion in announced savings, $1.1 billion comes from the Pentagon, but more than half of that figure represents a problematical reduction of B-52 bombing raids in South Vietnam. The other large saving amounts to $1 billion to be derived from smaller and postponed increases in Social Security benefits. Here again the outcome is uncertain. Congress, which has recently awarded itself a 40 per cent pay rise, may feel obliged to give the old folks a bit more than the 7 per cent improvement in their monthly checks which the administration has recommended.

Not very many of his constituents have ever expected a great deal from Mr. Nixon and it might plausibly be argued that in his initial months in office the President has fulfilled expectations. He never promised much action and he has delivered. Mr. Nixon is not a thorough-going reactionary, but on the other hand his public record has never betrayed much trace of original thought about domestic needs. Instead, as a prudent conservative, he publicly seeks better administration of programs invented by more imaginative men, patient sorting of the successful from the unsuccessful in job training, urban renewal, welfare administration, and so on, and careful balancing of the interests of blacks and whites, Northerners and Southerners, and urban and suburban dwellers.

Before I complete this penance of fair-mindedness, I must note another respect in which the administration has been unexpectedly temperate. This is control of inflation. In the demonology of American politics Republican administrations traditionally consort with depressions and recessions and Democratic regimes with wars and riots. But possibly because Mr. Nixon is aware of this association, having himself suffered through three Eisenhower recessions (he reportedly is convinced that he lost the 1960 election because unemployment rose in the summer and early autumn of election year), he has studiously refrained from an abrupt braking of the economy, which would be certain to cause substantial unemployment. His economic counselor, Arthur F. Burns, and his Council of Economic Advisers, though noticeably more conservative than their Democratic predecessors, are responsible economists who, in a time of racial discord and high black unemployment, know better than to advocate the trading-off of very much unemployment in favor of a reduced rate of price inflation.

Last year the country chose to elect a conservative, non-charismatic politician who promised them a quieter life, an end to the Vietnam war, a firm hand on inflation, and an improvement in the management of the federal bureaucracy. In Washington, if no place else, life is quieter. Mr. Nixon, keener of vision than most, perceives progress toward peace in Southeast Asia. Although the pace of inflation is notably unchecked, the administration is making the right noises and probably even some of the right moves to bring results pretty soon. As for the federal establishment, nobody in his right mind could expect even gifted Republican businessmen to produce instant results. It is possible, then, that in contrast to the activist types who enter the White House equipped with unfulfillable challenges to greatness and commitments to get the country moving again, Mr. Nixon merits a modest quantum of praise—administered naturally in the lowered tones favored in Republican Washington—for restraint, caution, temperance, and conciliation.

Unfortunately this quasi-quietism simply won't do as a recipe for social harmony in a racially and politically torn country. The reasons the Nixon strategy is unlikely to give even the appearance of success for very long derive partly from the character of national needs and partly from the direction of national policy at the end of eight years of Democratic administration. The Kennedy-Johnson years ended in a whimper as far as domestic policy goes; even their most successfully executed programs were demonstrated to be inadequate responses to the problems which they were designed to solve. Possibly the least flawed achievement was the attainment of something like full employment. By historical standards (though not by post-World War II European and Japanese criteria) an unemployment rate below 3.5 percent probably represents the best American performance we are likely to get until we succeed in integrating into our labor force blacks, Puerto Ricans, and rural whites. Although the Vietnam war has had something to do with high employment, there is no need to deny the Keynesians their fiscal policy success. The 1964 tax cut was that truly rare event, a public policy which worked according to plan and prediction. Walter Heller and the Council of Economic Advisers said that a major tax cut would, through its multiplied impact, expand the 1964 Gross National Product to produce nearly full employment, and, *mirabile dictu*, they were quite correct. One cannot say as much for some of the later forecasts made by the economists.

The more important of the other legislative innovations of the Kennedy-Johnson era include Medicare (proposed in a more generous form fifteen years earlier by Harry Truman), aid to public education, and the War on Poverty. Of the three, the last may yet deliver some unexpected results. Despite the botching or sabotage of many programs sponsored by OEO, it may turn out that the community action and neighborhood legal services programs of the War on Poverty will produce more lasting consequences than some of its better-funded, more conventional programs. The Supreme Court decision in April of this year which outlawed residency requirements as a condition of welfare eligibility, for example, was the result of a case fought through the courts by poverty lawyers. Another of their cases, to be heard at a later date by the Supreme Court, claims the right of welfare recipients to a hearing before their assistance can be cut off.

This is not the occasion for detailed discussion of programs which are in any event so familiar. What I want to make clear is a judgment of the significance of the limited changes which they wrought. In the case of the 1964-65 series of welfare measures, the program was limited, conservative (with the partial exception of some OEO experiments), and always underfinanced. Nevertheless, this was the first successful movement for social change of even a moderate, meliorative variety since the first Roosevelt administration.

It is plain, however, that the Great Society had stalled by the end of 1935, and if we are to understand where a new President is starting from and why we should not rejoice unduly at his restraint in tampering with Democratic programs, we should not forget that the original Kennedy-Johnson programs existed on lean rations at a time when price inflation and rising population would by themselves have required substantially larger appropriations just to maintain them at their original levels. Appropriations for the schools under the Secondary and Elementary Education Act have never risen above 50 per

XUM

cent of Congressional authorization. The War on Poverty has done well to get as much money each year as it got the one before. The propaganda for Model Cities has been a great deal more generous than the appropriations recommended by the President or approved by Congress. Rent supplements and public housing have been the annual victims of Congressional budget cutters. For some time the Congressional disposition has been to trim welfare support, impose more onerous conditions upon mothers who receive Aid to Dependent Children allotments, and restrict the scope of Medicare coverage. The Great Society was a starved social experiment years before the Nixon administration began to reevaluate it.

The Republicans' mean-spirited reaction might be taken more calmly as part of an inevitable period of national digestion of legislative novelties if only one could be confident that all of the novelties would survive an extended period of financial malnutrition. Of course this would be to suppose in turn that eight years of liberal Democratic administration had modified significantly the structure of American plutocracy, either by redistibuting income in the direction of equality or by diffusing power among some constituencies not used to its exercise. But neither of these alterations in our economic arrangements has been either attained or sought for.

Today income is distributed very much as it was in 1961. Now as then the lucky 5 per cent at the top of the income pyramid collect 20 per cent while the unhappy 20 per cent of the population at the base of the pyramid struggle along with a symmetrical 5 per cent of the national income. This pattern is not the mere consequence of blind chance, much less the play of free markets, for much in the policy of two Democratic Presidents was calculated to promote inequality. The first two tax initiatives of the Kennedy administration liberalized depreciation guidelines and granted 7 per cent investment allowances to the business community—exceedingly valuable privileges for the prosperous folk who run and own large corporations. Fiscal success that it was, the tax cut of 1964 was no victory for egalitarianism. With a few minor exceptions the tax reform provisions of the original measure failed to survive, and what remained was a measure which reduced corporate taxes and cut the top personal income tax rate from 91 to 70 per cent. The effect was to reduce burdens on prosperous taxpayers and thus to make the tax system less progressive.

Moreover, many of the new social benefits, notably Medicare, were financed largely through the Social Security mechanism which in itself contains a highly regressive tax feature. Because Congress maintains low ceilings on the maximum amount of income subject to Social Security levy, those with lower incomes are the exclusive source of periodic increases of the levy. This is an important reason why working-class and lower-middle-class taxpayers have been screaming for relief. And their plight has been aggravated by the sharp rise in real-estate and sales taxes upon which states and localities must depend to finance schools and other services. By comparison with the inhabitants of other advanced industrial states, Americans are lightly taxed. But the system produces so many inequities that many Americans feel, and some actually are, harshly dealt by.

The Democrats did nothing to bring the tax system into some less whimsical relationship with one's ability to pay. As the system now operates, individuals of quite modest incomes pay larger percentages of those incomes than do their more affluent fellow citizens. And the number and the value of the loopholes increase as incomes rise. Overall, for example, taxpayers who earn more than $100,000 annually pay *lower* effective rates than those in the $50,000-$100,000 bracket. Up to this moment, Congress has been far more disposed to widen than to close or narrow the tax hatches that make this possible.

There is one further comment to be made about income distribution. Any inflationary period favors the recipients of the more volatile forms of income. Thus it was that in the fourth quarter of 1968, in spite of tax surcharges and the expenses arising from credit shortages, American manufacturing corporations earned $8.7 billion after taxes. This was a pleasant 5.2 per cent of sales, higher than the preceding quarter's 4.9 per cent or the 5.1 per cent record for all of 1968. As the *Wall Street Journal* approvingly noted, this level of profit has been matched or exceeded only five times since 1950.

Profit, it can more or less plausibly be argued, is the reward of efficient enterprise. But inflation often rewards most richly those whose claims to efficiency are the most tenuous. The tax laws in an inflationary period grant stock speculators, real estate promoters, and conglomerate organizers something very like the right to print their own money (although that last bubble appears to have burst). This too is part of the reason why so many people are feeling no richer or are actually feeling even poorer at a time when the GNP bounds forward each quarter, industrial output rises, and the familiar roll call of statistical indicators seems to prove that Americans never had it so good. In fact, as the Teamsters' Nicholas Kisburg recently demonstrated in a study of real earnings in the New York metropolitan area, higher taxes and price inflation often leave even tightly organized workers no better off than they had been when wages, prices, and taxes were each rising less steeply.

As for any potential redistribution of economic power, what seems to have been going on instead is another movement toward further concentration of assets and corporate control. Recent Federal Trade Commission data reveal continued acceleration in the pace of corporate mergers. In 1966 there were 1,746 company acquisitions, in the next year 2,384, and last year no fewer than 4,003.[1] All this was of course in addition to the normal growth of the established goliaths of American manufacturing and finance. One recent dodge, the bank holding company, allows banks to acquire unrelated manufacturing and distributing enterprises in a fashion which reminds a good many observers unpleasantly of the operations of the Japanese Zaibatsu or the German industrial banks which have traditionally merged financial and industrial power.

It is no exaggeration to say that when the Johnson administration passed into history, it left the Republicans a country operating at full economic blast, equipped with an inadequate but marginally improved set of social services (by comparison with 1960), and handicapped by a distribution of income and wealth possibly still less equitable than in 1960 and a concentration of economic and military power far more menacing than the military-industrial complex which had aroused Mr. Eisenhower's apprehensions.

What I have been describing is close to the policies of classic English conservatism: inegalitarian as to power, income, and wealth, and disposed to pay most of us off with high employment and modest social benefits. There have been occasions when that policy was, if not appropriate, at least successful in both England and the United States. This is not one of those occasions. I do not intend to rehearse the familiar catalogue of social needs which a new administration, saddled with an expensive war and harassed by a serious inflation, must nevertheless cope with. Two concluding statements will suffice. Massive new funding is required for federal programs now on the statute books, among them aid to schools, Medicare, public housing, model cities, welfare, and manpower training. In addition, federal assistance is urgently required to bail out the states and localities in their attempts to finance the growing burden of public services out of taxes which offer little financial and less political scope for increase.

Race and the cities: we cannot avoid as a nation the confrontation which they impose upon us. As a people we have faltered before the choice of a full integrationist strategy designed to open white suburbs and white schools to black families and, in the inner-city ghettos, a strategy calculated to make life humanly tolerable and financially viable. Both approaches require very large quantities of resources for any hope of success, and although we all know by now that money alone does not resolve racial tensions deeply rooted in human prejudice and American history, we should be equally aware that these problems are highly unlikely to be ameliorated in the absence of a very large national commitment of public funds.

There then is President Nixon's dilemma. A conservative by temperament, Affiliation, and political choice, elected by rural and suburban seekers after lower taxes and improved public order, he is faced with menacing maladies of race and urban life whose treatment will surely require that large wads of cash be diverted from the thrifty white voters who installed him in the White House to the blacks, Puerto Ricans, and Mexican Americans who preferred Mr. Humphrey. And yet there appears to be no money available. When the war in Vietnam subsides, the generals and admirals will have grasping hands extended for the funds to buy new and more expensive toys. And if the President resists the military, he will face a clamor (which he himself has encouraged) for tax reduction.

Within this grim context, the unfolding Nixon domestic program seems a good deal less reassuring than I was earlier suggesting. The President is disinclined to support urban programs not because there is no money available for them, for, of course, there *is* money available, financially if not politically. Repeal of the investment tax credit (unvitiated by a promise to reduce other taxes) would supply the Treasury with over $3 billion each year for domestic spending. Or, as Andrew Brimmer, a governor of the Federal Reserve Board, has recently urged, the tax surcharge on corporate profits might be *raised* from 10 to 15 percent. It is, after all, the business sector which is the major source of inflationary pressure. Accordingly it is the business sector, not the unhappy consumer, that ought, on economic grounds as well as on grounds of equity, to be squeezed. A real effort to close such enormous loopholes as the tax treatment of real estate and capital gains, building depreciation, charitable and foundation allowances, and the mineral depletion scandal could readily generate anywhere from $5 to $15 billion in additional tax receipts. A modest slice from the Pentagon establishment could easily grab another $5-$10 billion. We could—but of course we will not—control inflation and at one and the same time finance social reform at decent levels.

President Nixon's actual tax and expenditure policies have decidedly different aims from these. The administration tax program, sent to Congress on April 21, is a carefully carpentered piece of merchandise. It commences with a major surprise, the repeal of the 7 per cent investment tax credit and the companion 3 per cent allowance now granted

---

[1] Large companies acquired small ones. Often large companies acquired other large companies. In 1966 the 200 largest corporations bought 33 other companies with total assets of $2.4 billion. The score for 1967 was 67 companies endowed with assets of $5.4 billion. Last year the giant 200 picked up 74 companies and assets of $6.9 billion.

XUM

to utilities. Mr. Nixon adroitly couples with this proposal, presumably highly unpalatable to his business supporters, a promise to reduce the tax surcharge from 10 to 5 per cent, come January 1, 1970. As far as the Treasury is concerned, the two changes offset each other and the net revenue effect will approximate zero. This is not the way to generate additional funds for urban programs, although on January 16, 1970 the tax system will be a trifle less unfair than it now is.

The remainder of the program is equally astute politically. The President puts a liberal face upon mild changes which will no doubt be used as arguments against more substantial tax reforms. The new "low-income allowance" will, according to Treasury estimates, "remove more than 2 million of our low-income families from the federal tax rolls and assure that persons or families in poverty pay no federal income taxes." At present a family of four with income in excess of $3,000 is subject to some tax. After the Nixon reform only families that earn over $3,500 will be assessed. Today a married couple whose total income is $2,300 still pays a $100 federal income tax. The Nixon plan would relieve such a couple of all liability. And so on. As far as it goes, the changes are commendable and long overdue.

The revenue lost by this bow to equity is to be replaced by imposing tax liabilities upon some affluent citizens who legally have been able to avoid such liability under existing tax regulations. The key innovation is the "minimum income tax" which, says the President, will impose a "50 per cent limitation on the use of the principal tax preferences"—notably not including tax-exempt securities and capital gains. In the absence of specific legislation, it is difficult to say just how much importance should be attached to this device. Even Congressman Mills and the New York Times have reacted by stating a preference for a direct assault upon the loopholes themselves, surely a more fundamental approach to the problem.

As on so many other occasions, one is led almost irresistibly to say of a Nixon action: it could have been worse. Small changes in the right direction are better than none at all, unless of course they spoil the chances to make more substantial improvements later on. But it would take a real optimist to think that there ever existed an opportunity to be spoiled in this administration to do away with oil depletion allowances, inheritance tax escape hatches, capital gains avoidance devices, and the rest of a list which costs the Treasury up to $50 billion a year in uncollected revenue. My guess is that if Congress enacts this package, it will be about as much tax reform as we can sensibly anticipate in the next four years.

Nixon's expenditure policy should be divided into its current and, one hopes a post-Vietnam phase. The current Nixon budget, as I have said, is the last Johnson budget modified by a very small number of changes. As far as social policy goes, the most significant of them may turn out to be the slight reduction in the funds sought for Model Cities. Romney intends to spread out what is left after the cut over a much larger number of communities. The effect almost inevitably will be the conversion of a scheme designed to operate powerfully upon a limited number of slum areas into a conventional federal subsidy spread thinly on the usual political assumptions over so many claimants as to eliminate the possibility of substantial success anywhere. The most disastrous current failure of course is the President's refusal to take on the Pentagon, which is the major consumer of federal tax receipts and, one would have thought, the likeliest candidate for budgetary curtailment.

After Vietnam what is promised in the way of new federal spending is revenue-sharing with the states and tax credits for business firms that invest in poverty areas or hire and train the hard-core unemployed. The strategy is faithful to the Nixon themes of decentralization and reliance upon the energies and ingenuity of private business. Both of these devices are potentially retrogressive in their effects, although revenue-sharing had liberal origins and carries some continuing liberal sponsorship. Walter Heller, while still Chairman of the Johnson Council of Economic Advisers, proposed distribution to the states of a portion of annual federal income tax receipts, with few strings attached. As he saw it there were three practical merits to the device; the states would be relieved of some of the dreadful financial poverty in which they now conduct their affairs; revenue-sharing might strike many Congressmen as a preferable alternative to tax reduction in a time of fiscal surplus; and finally, state government itself would be appreciably strengthened. Heller thought of revenue-sharing as supplementary to the wide variety of categorical grants to states and localities which had been federal practice since the early days of the New Deal.

The idea was quickly adopted by such astute Congressional conservatives as Melvin Laird and Charles Goodell who saw in revenue-sharing a potential *substitute* for federal social programs. It would appear that Laird and Goodell were rather more astute than Heller in their perception of the political potentialities of revenue-sharing. In fact, there is rather more wrong with the scheme from a liberal perspective than there is right with it. It is no accident that the governors have to a man favored and the mayors with equal unanimity opposed revenue-sharing, for there is no way of assuring that the states will treat the large cities any more equitably with federal funds than they do under the various state-aid formulas now in use. There is a racial count against the device as well. It is exceedingly difficult even under existing categorical grants to control the ways in which states spend federal money. Funds given to the states without strings or standards are certain to be disbursed in the South and elsewhere with scant attention to racial equity. The last and possibly the most powerful argument against revenue-sharing is embedded in the history of social innovation in the United States. In our conservative land, social change has come with extreme rarity from the states. Where progress has been made, it has usually been at the federal level. An occasional activist President is from time to time able to push Congress in progressive directions. To diminish the political importance of the federal government and increase that of the states is still further to shift the balance of power in a conservative direction.

Nixon's favorite scheme, granting tax incentives to business for applied social work, is subject to both technical and social reservation. Technically there is great difficulty in writing a statute which would genuinely reward the *extra* efforts at ghetto investment and job training engaged in by corporations without giving subsidies to corporations that in the absence of the reward would have followed the same policies anyway.

The larger, social issue is one that I have earlier alluded to. Are we going to encourage the drift of two separate societies, one black and the other white? Or are we going to strive still against the odds to achieve an intergrationist resolution of the American dilemma? There is no doubt that tax incentives for ghetto investment support a separationist strategy. Is is this perception which explains the odd alliance of the Nixonites and such Black Power advocates as Roy Innis.

I thus come to a brief but unhappy conclusion. The Nixon domestic program is drastically inadequate to meet the social needs with which only the federal government can cope. This is bad enough, especially since the President shows no sense of urgency in somehow scraping together more resources for urban programs. But what is worse is the direction in which the signposts point. The danger is real that the more innovative policies of recent years will be whittled away or blurred in their impact, that reveue-sharing with the states will strengthen conservative political elements throughout the country, and that tax incentives will encourage the drift to white and black separatism which now menaces us. The voices of the new administration are low and courteous, but their message is not one of joy.

CAPTIVE NATIONS—PEOPLE IN CHAINS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, those in our midst who understand the true value of freedom are those who have been deprived of their freedom.

No more vivid reminder of the tyrannies and constant threat from international communism exists than the presence of those friends among us who are exiles of the 27 captive nations enslaved by the Red terror.

One such articulate advocate of individual freedom is Dr. Alexander Sas-Jaworsky—a Ukraine American who lives in my State at Abbeville.

Dr. Sas is one of the millions who have voted with their feet. He uses his free speech to warn his fellow Americans.

I have had the privilege of hearing Dr. Sas speak. I know him personally and have had the opportunity to discuss his persecution and experiences firsthand. I wish that every Member of this body could also have this opportunity—that every American could hear his story. They would learn that freedom is more than a word.

If more of our people could hear the unpopular truth from someone who has been there and known the human tragedies that always accompany Red conquest, we would have found a way to do something for the captive nations people over the past 10 years.

I include Dr. Sas-Jaworsky's letter as follows:

CAPTIVE NATIONS: AMERICA'S SHAME

In the history of mankind there was never a period when a great nation urgently needed friends as the United States at the present time. Our country which was conceived of the intense hope for afflicted humanity reached its peak of power, glory and respect throughout the world at the end of the second world war. The United States fought World War II not for glory, territorial gains, or other ambitious reasons, but for one purpose—to establish throughout the world peace built on the principle of God and the Declaration of Independence.

Did the people in responsible government positions who handled foreign affairs and especially East European affairs in the last 35 years succeed in their jobs? Every impartial historian must answer No. For after many sacrifices in lives and material goods, the United States is on the brink of losing its physical existence.

XUM

Now the average American would ask what happened? The answer is simple and one. During World War II we chose a "friend" who supposedly stood by our side. In reality this "friend" (and to be specific we are talking about the Russian communists) never were our "friend", are not our "friend", and never will be our "friend", for they have a definite goal—to overthrow our legitimate government and establish a Soviet United States.

And what is our reaction? Instead of being faithful to the principles of our Declaration of Independence and giving all moral support to the 27 countries enslaved by the Russian communists, we are continuing stubbornly to court the Russian imperialistic conquerors and do everything possible not to hurt them. While we are prepared to meet their military attack, we are doing absolutely nothing as far as psychological warfare, which is equally important, especially in the atomic age, for the solution will not be on the battlefield. The United States does not intend to attack the Soviet Union and the Russian communists do not want to take over our country devestated by the hydrogen bomb. They want to take us over intact with all our beautiful developments. The three per cent of their followers have succeeded up to now and 97 per cent of the complacent Americans are doing nothing.

The purpose of this communication is to request support for House Resolution 102–103 for the creation of a special House Committee to study Captive Nations and the establishment of a Freedom Academy.

Twenty-seven nations enslaved by the Russians are waiting for a word of moral support from the American people. Those 27 captive nations are our genuine friends.

Ask your Senators and Congressmen what was done concerning this matter after they voted unanimously 10 years ago to proclaim "Captive Nations Week". Americans, ask your Senators and Congressmen when will there be en end to our suicidal foreign policy. Ask your Senators and Congressmen in letters why after devestating proof that we are following this deadly wrong direction in dealing with Russians, we still continue to perpetuate our mistakes.

After all, you have full moral right to do so, for you are the one who pays the heavy price for our leaders' mistakes.

ALEXANDER SASJAWORSKY.

ABBEVILLE, LA.

COMMENDING MR. LOWENSTEIN FOR HIS CONSTRUCTIVE WORK WITH YOUNG PEOPLE

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago, 22 Republican House Members made an unannounced tour of some 50 university campuses across America to try to understand the problem of campus unrest. We later met with the President and submitted a report which outlined our findings and recommendations.

Today, I wish to commend another Congressman, ALLARD LOWENSTEIN, of New York, who also has been visiting the college campuses in an effort to help develop constructive answers for dealing with campus unrest and violence. Having personally visited campuses where Mr. LOWENSTEIN has appeared, I have found his efforts to have been highly successful in isolating campus revolutionaries and others promoting violence, while encouraging the moderate students to seek constructive change in a proper manner.

I salute AL LOWENSTEIN for his individual efforts and for the significant contribution he is making in encouraging the use of reason, in place of revolution, on our troubled campuses. He is one of a very few people in our society who is convincing our young people, by word and action, that violence is wrong and has no place in our universities or in society.

The Christian Science Monitor, in a very thoughtful article, discussed the excellent work Mr. LOWENSTEIN is doing with young people. I insert the full text of this article which appeared on May 20, 1969:

LOWENSTEIN TAKES FIGHT TO THE CAMPUSES

(By Lucia Mouat)

WASHINGTON.—"All I want to do is shake his hand—this guy's my hero you know."

Soon the University of Maryland student with the sideburns got his wish as freshman Rep. Allard K. Lowenstein (D) of New York came zipping out of his office in a last-minute dash to the airport. With one handshake and a brief greeting later, he was off for a speaking engagement at Notre Dame University.

As leader of the "Dump Johnson" movement and a longtime articulate critic of the Vietnam war, Mr. Lowenstein is an over-30 liberal with considerable under-30 appeal. But what he says as he speaks to college campuses this spring is not always what students expect.

He assures them that change is possible without violence and disruption. And he puts the message strongly. He refers to burning buildings and spitting at university presidents as "pointless nonsense" which will not bring the war to a close or solve the nation's domestic problems "one second sooner."

"There is something between Melvin Laird and the SDS," he tells his young audiences. (The Secretary of Defense and the Students for a Democratic Society are considered at opposite poles in their view on Vietnam.)

STANDING OVATIONS

As a politican Mr. Lowenstein admits it would be easier and more natural for him to denounce violence before civic groups or on the floor of the House. Instead, he decided to "take the fight where it's at" by going straight to the campuses.

While on-campus radicals predictably try to disrupt the speeches or at least make noisy exits, Mr. Lowenstein is often given a standing ovation at the close of his remarks and often takes part in late-evening "bull sessions."

As a liberal, he carefully links his indictment of violent tactics with an impatient plea for social change. He charges that members of Congress are wasting vital time and energy by simply congratulating themselves on how virtuous they are because they are against violence and rioting.

If Congress is really eager to stamp out the disruption, he suggests, it would not allow itself to become preoccupied with cutting off scholarship aid to campus rebels but would hasten to solve some of the nation's most pressing problems.

"It's now more fashionable to denounce than approve," he says, "but if we don't get out of the current lockstep, present violence is going to get worse."

"ONLY SHOW IN TOWN"

The Congressman from Nassau County, who has taught variously at Stanford, North Carolina State University, and the City College of New York, sees his mission in campus speaking as reminding the "great majority" that they are not alone.

"There's great toleration for violence mainly because it's the only show in town," he remarked in the course of the hectic ride to the airport. "On no campus that I've visited does disruption by the Left have the support of any substantial number. But you've got to prove there are plenty of alternatives or it becomes the prevailing wind and the majority acquiesces."

He argues that the student majority, like the bulk of the American people, needs to be convinced that there is an effective choice between violence and parliamentary procedure.

"We can pull together the vast majority of Americans or we can split among ourselves and fight as to what's the acceptable way to bring change," he adds.

In this congressman's view—though he does not consider ending the war a cure-all—students around the country would do well to emulate Yale University's senior class this year in petitioning the administration to dedicate commencement activities around the goal of ending the war in Vietnam.

EDWIN A. LAHEY

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I know that we were all distressed last week to learn of the passing of one of the greatest reporters of our times, Edwin A. Lahey, of the Knight Newspapers.

It was my privilege to have known Ed Lahey for the entire 20 years of my political career. Having served with him on charitable enterprises, I know of the deep sense of compassion that he felt for the underprivileged.

Ed Lahey was a crusader for all of us in these United States of America. He spoke the words of truth and fairness in every line that he wrote.

He had little patience for the deluder and dissembler. He tore the masks from the faces of the hypocrites and revealed their machinations.

I hasten to say that Ed Lahey was not one who used his columns to destroy those with whom he was in disagreement. He had a full understanding of the frailties of man. He was a gentle man.

Though he achieved the position of chief of the Washington Bureau for the Knight newspapers, his principal interest remained that of a reporter. His articles were often carried nationally.

I know of no man in his field who so well gained and held the respect of his fellow worker. Many of the great reporters of today received the guidance of this great reporter.

Ed Lahey has been called an irreverent man but he was never irreverent for the sake of irreverence. He simply believed in the true equality of man.

No one knew this great reporter better than his employer, John S. Knight. The following remarks on Ed Lahey's passing are taken from a column by Mr. Knight:

ED LAHEY

During my time as editor and publisher of the Chicago Daily News, the only man of whom I stood in awe was Ed Lahey, the best newspaper reporter in my profession.

Admittedly, my feeling about Ed was touched with more than a tinge of envy. For what other writer could turn out a story on any subject and make it sing with Lahey's flair for facts and fluency? As an associate once remarked: "Ed was born with a silver phrase in his typewriter."

In time, my reverence of an respect for Ed Lahey deepened into a warm and understanding friendship. Though Ed held strong convictions on a variety of subjects, his reporting was a model of accuracy. He sought to report the world, not to reform it.

As chief of our Washington Bureau, Ed Lahey sought no favors from management. As he enjoyed saying, "I demand nothing of my publisher except that he be solvent."

Ed Lahey had no peers in the reporting field. He could spot a phony or a saint with equal celerity. Ed walked with the great and loved the lowly.

His professional code was such that during the 1960 Democratic Convention he rejected one of my stories because he did not believe it to be true. Not many men would do that to their boss.

Ed Lahey was no ordinary man, as his record in journalism will attest. Nor was any Washington correspondent more admired by his colleagues for the quality of his work.

He died as he lived, with indomitable courage, and in later years serene acceptance of the inevitable.

We shall miss Ed, and in all probability never see his like again.

The New York Times carried the following story about this great American:

EDWIN A. LAHEY IS DEAD AT 67; KNIGHT'S CHIEF CORRESPONDENT: FORMER HEAD OF WASHINGTON BUREAU WAS AMONG THE FIRST NIEMAN FELLOWS

WASHINGTON, July 17.—Edwin A. Lahey, chief correspondent and former chief of the Washington Bureau of the Knight newspapers, died today of complications of emphysema at the Washington Hospital Center. Mr. Lahey was 67 years old.

NEWSPAPERMAN 42 YEARS

Small, tough, sentimental and irreverent, Edwin Aloysius Lahey earned in his 42 years as a newspaperman a reputation as one of the nation's outstanding reporters. His affection for his job was unmistakable, yet it was typical of his hardbitten attitude toward his profession to pronounce it "better than working in a steam laundry."

Although he was the friend and confidant of Supreme Court Justices, Senators, labor leaders and other luminaries of Washington, where he was based for the last 28 years, he adopted as his motto five words attributed to Thomas a Kempis: "Fawn not upon the great."

"I have advised my associates," he once wrote, "to reserve one paragraph in my obituary to point out that in my long career as a Washington correspondent, five Presidents have ignored me at press conferences."

Mr. Lahey sensed danger in too great a desire for acceptance by reporters in the capital. "After some 27 years in Washington, where the importance of being accepted is so overemphasized," he said in his address as Elijah Parish Lovejoy Fellow of 1967 at Colby College in Waterville, Me., "I am convinced that the 'inner ring' mentality, the inordinate desire for acceptance, can produce more spiritual corruption than any combination of things put together by the world, the flesh and the devil."

Having established a reputation as a superb crime reporter during the early 30's, Mr. Lahey became in 1938 a member of the first class of Nieman Fellows at Harvard, where he studied economics, history and political science.

"COLLEGE COMPLEX" CURED

The Nieman Fellowship, he said, cured "the worst damn inferiority complex about college you ever saw." It was clear that Mr. Lahey had been a school dropout, but there was always some doubt about the exact extent of his formal education.

At Harvard he reportedly filled a blank space on a form requesting information on prior schooling by writing "fourth grade Chicago public schools." But on another occasion, he left the impression that he had dropped out at the age of 13 or 14. "None of that Abe Lincoln stuff," he said, "everybody did it—not to build character, but to bring in five dollars."

But the academic atmosphere of Harvard failed to smother the irreverence of a man who was well-known then and later for his terse and trenchant summations of people and events.

One day when a notoriously verbose instructor was concluding his lecture, Mr. Lahey asked: "Would you mind summarizing that last point in 10,000 words?"

To another speaker who appeared to be dealing with him as a nitwit, Mr. Lahey said, "Ah, Shakespeare! I'm nuts about him. I read everything he writes, as fast as it comes out."

At Harvard he became a friend of Felix Frankfurter, the professor of law who later became a Supreme Court Justice. Mr. Frankfurter once gave him a collection of essays inscribed:

"To Ed Lahey, to whom I owe so much of my education."

It was characteristic of Mr. Lahey that exposure to Harvard's intellectual community did not prompt him to turn his back on his gangland connections. One day he took a hoodlum to the Harvard Club for a chat, commenting afterwards, "I figured nobody there would recognize a couple of crumb bums like us."

Mr. Lahey had turned to labor reporting in 1936, and the following year added to his reputation with coverage of sit-down strikes in the automobile and steel industries. In 1941, The Chicago Daily News sent him to Washington, where his reputation continued to grow.

"Anyone who goes out on a labor story and doesn't fall flat on his face," he declared, "becomes, quote a labor expert, unquote.

In the capital, he continued to maintain a stubborn resistance against taking himself seriously.

I don't know anything duller than an expert," he remarked. "I have constantly striven for superficiality. The best stories are written by guys who don't know anything about the subject. A kid who goes in cold to cover a labor convention may make it sing."

During World War II, he traveled extensively, in the China-Burma-India theater of operations and later his byline appeared over reports from Europe, Africa and Latin America, the last being an area for which he developed special concern.

Mr. Lahey was named chief of the Daily News Bureau in Washington in 1956, and remained with the Knight newspapers after the Chicago paper was sold in 1959 to Marshall Field. Two years ago, he retired as bureau chief but remained a chief correspondent.

RECONCILIATION REALIZED

Among his best remembered articles were a beat on the resignation of Martin Durkin, a former labor leader, who was President Eisenhower's first Secretary of Labor; and an interview with Senator Robert A. Taft that led to a reconciliation between Mr. Taft and General Eisenhower after General Eisenhower had defeated Mr. Taft for the Republican Presidential nomination in 1952.

To the late Meyer Berger of The New York Times, who was often described as the best reporter in the country, Mr. Lahey was "the best reporter in America."

He was born in Chicago, on Jan. 11, 1902, the son of the former Alice Burns and James F. Lahey, a machinist. After leaving school, he worked as an office boy, shipping clerk, railroad yard clerk and dishwasher on an excursion steamer before beginning his career in journalism with The Glen Ellyn, Ill., Beacon in 1927.

Leaving the weekly, which is now defunct, he worked for The East St. Louis Journal and The Associated Press until 1929, when he joined "the only paper I ever wanted to work for," The Chicago Daily News.

LEAD CONCERNING STABBING

One of his famous leads concerned the fatal stabbing in prison of Richard Loeb, whose trial with Nathan Leopold for the murder of a small boy had been one of the century's most sensational. When Loeb was killed by a man to whom he had made a homosexual overture, Mr. Lahey drafted a lead that read: "Dickie Loeb, despite his erudition, today ended his sentence with a proposition."

Once he characterized an ex-Communist employed by a garment union to fight Communism as "half cloak and suiter, half cloak and dagger."

Mr. Lahey was a heavy drinker early in his career, but gave it up and joined Alcoholics Anonymous in 1940. He helped others to solve their drinking problems.

He was a member of the National Press Club, the Harvard Club and the Gridiron Club, and his friends were legion.

"He reminds you," J. A. C. Dunn of The Charlotte Observer once wrote, "of an elf who grew too big for the burrow and had to go live with people."

Mr. Lahey is survived by his widow, the former Grace Seidcheck; two daughters, Mrs. Allen Kobliska and Mrs. Bernard Nigro; two brothers, James and Joseph; a sister, Mrs. Gertrude Meyers, and five grandchildren.

A funeral service will be held in Washington tomorrow at 11 A.M. at Blessed Sacrament Roman Catholic Church. Burial will be at Gate of Heaven Cemetery in Wheaton, Md.

We deeply sympathize with his widow, Mrs. Grace Lahey, her children and grandchildren, over their great loss.

HUMANE TREATMENT FOR PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, both Secretary of State Rogers and Secretary of Defense Laird have appealed to the authorities of North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front in recent weeks to make known the names of men who are held as prisoners of war.

This disclosure is part of the Geneva Convention on the treatment of prisoners, a pact to which we subscribe and with which we make every effort to comply. North Vietnam has endorsed this convention but so far has refused to adhere to its provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that Secretary Rogers, Secretary Laird, and other high officials in our Government will continue to press this point. Only an aroused world opinion is likely to convince the North Vietnamese that compliance with the Geneva Convention and the humane treatment of prisoners is the best course.

XUM

A PERSONAL TRIBUTE TO HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

HON. EDWARD JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the eulogies to my fine predecessor, Representative Robert A. Everett, have just been printed and have paid due respect to a fine public servant.

There is one further tribute that I feel should be brought to the attention of Mr. Everett's friends here in the Congress. This is the personal tribute written by his former professor and close personal friend, Dr. Forrest C. Pogue, who is also the author of the historical volumes about the life of Gen. George C. Marshall.

Dr. Pogue's tribute was published in the Murray State University Alumnus magazine of March 1969, and reads as follows:

A PERSONAL TRIBUTE TO FATS: HIS DESIRE TO HELP AND PASSION TO SERVE

(By Forrest C. Pogue)

Regularly over the past eleven years, my telephone would ring, and I would find one of my oldest friends—Representative Robert A. "Fats" Everett of Tennessee, whom I first met in 1933 when he was a sophomore in my class at Murray—was on the wire.

Almost invariably, his opening words were, "Hello, Pogue, what you knowing?" It was a ritual he followed with many friends—in Tennessee, Kentucky, Washington—as he canvassed his sources, hungry for reports on friends or the most recent events of the day. He also looked at a score of papers daily, tearing our clippings to send on to friends.

His calls were short—he knew how to husband his time. He said what he had to say, got what I had to report, passed on a funny story or remark, and then went on to another call or to his daily grist of correspondence—sometimes running to 100 letters a day, expressing his thanks, congratulations, condolences, or best wishes.

HE LIVED FOR HIS FRIENDS

His network of callers represented a source of strength, nourishing him by contacts with new acquaintances and old friends. The telephone and mail helped him to re-charge his energies as much as they furnished information for his work.

Fats lived for his friends and his constituents. From his early days in high school and college he had made friends, blunting their efforts to tease him about his size by winning their affection, turning the name "Fats" from a possible epithet of ridicule into a badge of honor.

"Call me Fats" was the slogan he put at the top of his letterhead when he went to his first responsible post, and he never ceased to use it after he entered Congress.

Restless people are supposed to be nervous and thin—Fats was a living denial of that theory. He sat quietly with difficulty. Quiescence robbed him of time to be performing a service for those he represented or prevented him from renewing his drive from the springs of friendship.

LIKE A FLOWING TIDE

He walked through a public meeting like a procession and through a Homecoming gathering like a flowing tide—grasping hands, booming out greetings, gathering to himself the assurance that he was prized for his openness of heart.

He was a prodigal of his friendship as he was of his personal fortune. His great body seemed almost too small to house his tremendous interest in others, his desire to help them, his passion to serve. He enjoyed sitting with friends over a meal, conscious that their happy talk and easy laughter were basic parts of his existence.

His insistence, so often, on picking up the check was a sign in part that he felt he had gained most from their comman meeting. It was not true, as his many friends who gained much from knowing him can attest, for perhaps his greatest legacy was the wealth of friendship he amassed and then passed on to others.

New acquaintances were overwhelmed with the knowledge he was making them part of a great relationship that embraced all those he had known. He wanted his new friends to know and value his other friends. No matter how many newcomers he met—and he constantly reached out for new hands to clasp—he held on tightly to those he knew. And he cultivated their friendship as if the whole country were his electoral domain.

He served, first of all, the people of his district—for that was his duty; and then the people of his state, for that was his cherished inheritance; and last, all those he had met and their friends, for that was his great pleasure.

NEVER NARROW IN INTERESTS

Although he was deepful grateful to those who elected him and faithful in performing his congressional duties, he was never narrow in his interests. Having served in various positions which brought him into contact with people throughout Tennessee, he knew no strangers from his state. To all these he added the people of West Kentucky, particularly those who had gone to Murray, and anyone else who passed his way.

Near the end of 1964, friends in West Tennessee decided to hold an appreciation day for him at Tiptonville. Some 2,000 contributed to a fund to buy him a station wagon, and they came, overflowing two halls, to do him honor.

He had asked me to give the address and I attempted to catch some of the essence of my friend's nature—a hard job to do when nearly everyone in the audience knew Fats of old.

HOW TO WIN FRIENDS

So I spoke simply of the things they already knew—of his sense of humor as shown in quips already finding their way into the columns of the nation's press, of his hearty commonsense, of his joy of living, his hard work, his direct approach, his loyalty to his friends, his great interest in encouraging the young, his work for veterans, his support of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the waterways that concerned his state, his love of people, and his expert knowledge of how to win friends and influence people—a process which he had perfected before Dale Carnegie decided to write a book.

He never forgot to come back to his friends (he probably visited his district more regularly in the last year of his life than at any time during his membership in Congress), and he nearly always managed to stop for a moment in Murray. And they never forgot him.

As a member of Congress, he mirrored faithfully the beliefs and wishes of his constituents. No representative ever spent his days and nights performing more personal services for those who elected him.

He was the kind of friend who anticipated when you might want a favor or looked for some means by which he might recognize suitably some tribute to a friend he wanted other friends to know about. A column by Bill Powell of the *Sun-Democrat* on Dr. Lowry, Dr. Wells, Dr. Hortin, or "Daddy" Trail was almost certain to appear in the *Congressional Record*. Every favorable notice of an old acquaintance which he read or heard about drew a personal word of congratulation, for he delighted in the success of others.

FAITHFUL IN HIS DUTIES

He was not an initiator of legislation, but he was keenly aware of the interest of his constituents in pending legislation and he made tremendous efforts to be on hand for every key roll call and to be present for all sessions of the committees of which he was a member.

To me the tip-off that the end of his life was near came from the fact that despite almost superhuman exertion, at a time when his energies were fast ebbing, he could not remain for all the roll calls in the first weeks of the present session of Congress.

As a fellow-graduate of Murray, one of his former professors, and a close friend for a third of a century, I shall remember him as the graduate of Murray who best qualified for the title of "No. 1 Alumnus" and all-time booster.

There were some whose duties as members of the Murray staff included almost constant attention to the college's development. But no graduate took as much time from his other duties to spend time and thought and money in pressing Murray's cause. Every Murray graduate could assume that he possessed an extra congressman in Fats.

HE EXTENDED FRIENDSHIP TO ALL

Naturally, he was most closely attached to the schoolmates he had known in college. But he extended that friendship to all those he met at Homecomings, tournaments, and season games.

When a classmate came to Washington, Fats tried to think of other Murray people who would like to see or talk with him, and he often arranged a luncheon meeting at the House Restaurant or, if time did not permit, set up a three-way conversation from his office.

A few weeks before his serious illness in October, he told me he was going to Murray for Homecoming, and he talked of the many friends he expected to see.

When that day came, he was in the Veterans Hospital at Nashville, but his old friends remembered him and hundreds signed a telegram to him which he treasured.

My last memory of him, when my wife—who was one of his classmates—and I went to the hospital to visit him on Nov. 12, is of his pleasure in telling of this tribute. As we went out the door, he returned to the pleasant task we had interrupted—reading get-well cards which a friend was opening and handing to him.

In recent months, he had worried over the loss of tolerance for the views of others that was being shown on many college campuses and he was pleased that Murray had escaped the great turbulence experienced elsewhere, not that he opposed disagreement nor decried change.

BACKER OF STUDENT ORGANIZATION

As a student, he had been a staunch backer of the movement which gave Murray its first Student Organization, and he had worked diligently to see that it was made effective.

He was delighted at every Murray athletic victory and its successes in every field of endeavor. He favored instinctively any measure that would aid the college. And yet his championing of Murray did not lessen his enthusiasm for the progress of other schools in Tennessee and Kentucky. His friends at the other institutions knew their programs had a friend in Fats. He was a strong supporter of education.

Like many of us, Fats was a child of the depression. He knew the problem of finding money for tuition and expenses. He set high value on the part that Murray, and many schools like it, with low costs and special understanding for the student with little money, had played in the bleak years of the 1930s.

XUM

MURRAY ONLY SOLUTION

For many students in that area, Murray had offered the only possible solution. He was convinced that the opportunity for a college education had meant the way up for him and his contemporaries. He liked to tell of newspaper editors, successful doctors and lawyers, devoted teachers, and fluorishing businessmen, all of whom had started with nothing but next week's meal ticket and had made their way with Murray's help and the encouragement. He wanted that help to continue.

One of his first acts as president of the Alumni Association, an office to which he was elected not long after he graduated, was to propose the first alumni scholarship offered at the college. It meant an act by which graduates could help to pass on to others an opportunity which they had enjoyed at college.

Later, on the death of Dr. Rainey T. Wells, founder of Murray, Fats joined loyally in the move by the alumni and friends of the former president to establish a memorial in his honor. I recall the day he met with Marvin Wrather and me to plan a special appeal for funds. Although Dr. Wells had left Murray not long atfer Fats went there, his true home was Murray, and he was back often enough for Fats to know how much he had meant to the college.

As we went through a list of former students, Fats selected the names of those he knew best. During most of that day, he would pick up a card, recall an incident or two about the individual, and then in the warm glow of reminiscence would dictate the special letter which made clear to the recipient exactly what he, as well as the rest of us, owed Murray. It was a tremendous performance.

WRATHER PRAISED FATS

All of this was in Marvin Wrather's mind in 1967 after a meeting of the alumni in the Washington area. Fats was as friendly as ever, but he seemed to lack some of the drive and ebullience he normally showed. Marvin was worried about Fats' health, and he said to me, "Before it might become too late, I want him to know from me what he has meant to Murray."

In a splendid letter, Marvin wrote to Fats of what he had given Murray even in his student days, of his great work as alumni president, of his key role in raising funds for the Wells Memorial, and of the constant encouragement he had given to Murray and its graduates.

"I know of no one," wrote Wrather, "who has constantly rendered greater service than you to our university. . . . You have generously given of your time and ability to help."

Fats appreciated praise. Like all of us, he wanted the good opinion of his fellows. But in his reply to Marvin, he minimized his contribution. He stressed instead the extent to which he valued the opportunity to serve. His key paragraph said it all:

"I know that Murray State College did a lot for me, and I feel that what little effort I put forth is to try to show in a small way my appreciation for the great opportunity it afforded me so that I might get a college education."

FATS EVERETT SCHOLARSHIP

What he had to say should have a special meaning for each alumnus.

I feel the greatest tribute those of us who knew Fats and valued his friendship could pay would be to contribute generously to a scholarship fund providing a large enough endowment to permit a Fats Everett Scholarship to be offered annually.

If this is to truly honor him, it should be a gift in addition to the scholarship contribution made by many alumni each year. Otherwise the contribution to the Fats Everett Scholarship would be at the expense of others awarded annually.

This one, being continuous, would keep alive the fine spirit, the warm friendship and the loyal support to Murray that was exemplified by Fats Everett.

NOT THE RIGHT MAN

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has completed his first 6 months in office and has been given a resounding expression of approval by most Americans.

To be sure, some people who are to the left in the political spectrum are not ecstatic about the tenor of this administration. The objects of their ire include: the nomination of Warren E. Burger as Chief Justice of the United States, the conviction of the administration that Safeguard is essential to the national security, the action to couple fiscal and monetary policy to control ruinous inflation, the extension of tax reform proposals to include political activities of tax-exempt foundations, the allowance of greater flexibility in guidelines to bring about a meaningful and realistic program of desegregation, the declared war against crime and the proposals to furnish protection against obscenity in the mails.

In large measure, Mr. Speaker, these persons were not among those who supported President Nixon in November and would understandably be opposed to his present policies. The people who voted for President Nixon did so because they were fed up with left-leaning politicians whose pseudosolutions to national problems fared so dismally in recent years. They opted for a change in the direction of responsible conservatism promised to them in the campaign and, true to those promises, this accurately describes the quality of leadership which President Nixon has so ably provided in his first half year in office.

Along these lines, an editorial in the Arizona Republic of July 14, 1969, might be of interest to my colleagues, as follows:

NOT THE RIGHT MAN

Our reaction to the entire controversy involving Dr. John H. Knowles, the hospital director who was rejected as the U.S. government's chief health officer, was one of studied indifference.

We felt Knowles probably would have been a good health officer, as we are sure Dr. Roger Egeberg—who finally received the nomination—will be.

And although we dislike seeing partisan politics brought into such important appointments, for the life of us we can't understand the feigned cries of outrage—particularly from critics who regarded it as sacred duty that Democratic administrations clear appointments not only with Sidney Hillman, the CIO bigwig who greatly influenced FDR, but with a succession of labor union officials and professional liberal organizations.

Now, on the basis of Dr. Knowles' embittered remarks the other day, we are pleased that he was denied the nomination. For he obviously has neither the temperament nor perception needed for that important post.

Knowles charged that President Nixon "is in the grip of the archconservatives," and he claimed that the archconservative bandwagon is running the White House.

Conservatives, yes; archconservatives, no. And only a man suffering from political myopia could make such a charge—in view of the fact that liberals Daniel Moynihan, James Farmer, and HEW's liberal Robert Finch, all occupy prominent positions in the administration.

The Nixon administration is basically apolitical. That is, ideology is relegated to the back seat in the formulation of most political, economic, and social programs. But where ideology does play a part, conservative ideology usually prevails.

This is hardly surprising, however, considering that Mr. Nixon was elected precisely because he promised to reverse the nation's leftward drift—the direction in which it had been pushed by the liberals. Why should the administration be other than conservative, considering the mess liberal administrations have made of public affairs during the last several decades—a mess cogently detailed by liberal columnist Joseph Alsop during the last several weeks?

Knowles himself said that Medicaid "is the lousiest waste of taxpayers' money and the most ill-conceived program that ever came down the chute." Yet that program was conceived by the very liberals who appear to be affronted that the conservative Mr. Nixon is fulfilling his campaign promises to slow or reverse the tide of ritualistic liberalism.

The Nixon administration is responsibly conservative. It values the individual, society, and economic thrift. That is why Richard Nixon was elected. And that is why, according to the most recent Gallup Poll, the President is highly popular in every section of the United States.

WERNHER VON BRAUN: "SPACE—AN ALTERNATIVE TO WAR"

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, our brave astronauts, Armstrong, Collins, and Aldrin, are well on their way returning from the moon. As they continue successfully to complete this remarkable flight, it seems important to reflect on the importance and significance of our national space program.

Dr. Wernher von Braun in August 1969 Pace magazine offers a thoughtful commentary. Dr. von Braun points to the value of our space program as an alternative to war.

When Congress considers the authorization and appropriation of funds, this is certainly a significant aspect in the determination of congressional support. I commend this thoughtful discussion to your reading:

WERNHER VON BRAUN

Suddenly the eyes of the powerful man across the table lose their humor. "How sad," he reflects, "that scientific progress has been fastest when nations were fighting. Now the space program is doing what war used to do.

For the first time in history a nonmilitary program is making enough demands on human ingenuity."

The authoritative, guttural voice is that of Dr. Wernher von Braun, master of both war and space. His V-2 weapons of World War II came close to changing history, and he masterminded the giant Saturn V rocket which thrusts man to the moon.

"At last man has an outlet for his aggressive nature," he explains. "Unless you give a small boy an outlet to vent his energy and his sense of contest he'll come home with black eyes. Then you can either chew him out or make a sissy of him or channel his energy into sport or skills. That's the way it is with space."

Wernher von Braun was eight years old when he first dreamed of playing with stardust. He was practicing the violin in the nursery of Wirsitz Castle in Prussia when his mother, the Baroness Emmy von Quistorp, an amateur astronomer, returned from the market with a small telescope. The boy ran outside into the frosy night and looked at the moon. "How near it is!" he shouted. "One day I'm going up there."

Two decades and a world war later Dr. von Braun arrived in America as the world's first expert on rocketry. Today his castle is a steel-and-glass one rising above the cotton crops and dairy herds on verdant hills near Huntsville, Ala. Here he conceived and developed Saturn V.

Since his first telescopic look at the moon, von Braun has kept telling himself, "How near it is—how near!" Now he reflects, "When we wheel out one of the rockets to the launch pad I find myself thinking of all those thousands of parts—and all built by the lowest bidder—and I pray that everyone has done his homework."

At 56, Von Braun is athletically fit. It has been said that when he sucks in a breath he creates a vacuum around him—one of many legends about a man who is a pilot, skier, skin diver, mountaineer, pianist, philosopher, writer and theologian.

"The most fateful question of our time? I would say that it is simply how people are going to use their knowledge."

The blue eyes moved to the ceiling, "Let's understand that science itself has no ethical standards. Take drugs. They are neither good nor bad. It's the same with nuclear power—it can blast cities into cosmic dust or create a new Renaissance. Space technology can bring the best out of men or hold terror over their lives and homes."

Von Braun compares the exploration of space and NASA's role with the Renaissance "which was also a time when the mental and spiritual blocks of mankind were blasted away. As old concepts came under scrutiny and as the spiderwebs were pulled away, the church had its problems. But in the end the church and the spirit of man benefited. The same thing is happening now.

"What I'm saying is that the space program is the cutting edge for science and technology. Man needs a cutting edge as he hunts for truth."

He is convinced that space will bring nations closer together. "Space people have a tremendous respect for each other," he says. "The world knows we're not going to the moon to put up a sign, 'Uncle Sam was here.' Nor is it just to bring back samples of moon sand. Our purpose is to extend human knowledge."

After the moon Von Braun and his technicians will be looking at Mars "and probably going there in 15 years. We must evaluate the options available to us in the continued exploration of the universe. We need a timetable."

This is the year of the moon—the year dreamed about by a small boy, who lived in a faraway castle, who looked through a telescope and said, "One day I'm going up there."

His Parthian shot: "I still plan to."

THE ADMINISTRATION'S EDUCATION BUDGET GUILLOTINES OUR EDUCATION PROGRAMS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, as you are no doubt aware, I and other Members of Congress are appalled at the shortsighted attitude of the administration with respect to its appropriations requests for funding of our education programs.

The cuts which the administration is proposing for our education programs will be disastrous not only for elementary and secondary schools but also for our colleges and universities. If all education programs were fully funded at the levels which the Congress has authorized, this Nation would still only be spending 2.5 percent of its total Federal budget and a half percent of the total gross national product. I do not believe that such an expenditure is too great an investment to make in the future of this Nation and of our children. Therefore, I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to carefully study the administration's education budget requests and keep in mind the thoughts expressed in an excellent article which appeared in the Washington Star last Sunday, "School Projects Are Guillotined." The author of the article was Sylvia Porter. Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert that article in the RECORD and encourage my colleagues to heed the warning it contains:

SCHOOL PROJECTS ARE GUILLOTINED

(By Sylvia Porter)

A House Appropriations subcommittee is about to complete a bill to provide cash for the national education budget during the 12 months ending July 1970. In the form prepared by the Nixon administration, this bill would downgrade education to a very low place on the list of national priorities. It would, in fact, erase several education advances achieved under the three previous administrations of Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson. Specifically, in its Nixon administration form, this bill would:

Reduce the total Office of Education budget from $4.1 billion in fiscal 1968 to $3.2 billion in fiscal 1970, a reduction of 25 percent at a time when more and better education is a must;

Reduce to zero funds for school library materials under the Elementary & Secondary Education Act of 1965;

Reduce to zero matching funds for materials and equipment for elementary and secondary schools under the National Defense Education Act of 1958;

Reduce to zero funds for guidance and counseling services, also under the NDEA, passed during Eisenhower's administration;

Cut in half funds for college library materials, under the Higher Education Act of 1965;

Cut in half matching funds for public library programs and materials under the Library Services & Construction Act of 1956, another Eisenhower education law.

In summary, eliminate entirely three education-library programs and emasculate another two and shrink to less than 1½ percent of the federal budget the total for education-libraries.

The fact that this is a very real threat and may well happen is just starting to penetrate education circles; until now, educators could not believe that the Nixon administration would adopt such policies of retreat on education in a period of explosive social unrest.

They are fighting back. A National Citizens Committee to Save Education & Library Funds (SELF) under the chairmanship of Detlev W. Bronk, president emeritus of the Rockefeller University, is publicizing the crisis.

On July 9, 150 trustees of libraries from 33 states marched on Washington to obtain pledges of votes for registration of the funds from 100 lawmakers.

A fight on the House floor seems a certainty.

No one denies the need for curbing federal spending now; this is imperative to dampen inflationary psychology and control the price-wage spiral. But what is swelling the federal budget are such items as military spending in general, the Vietnam war in particular, skyrocketing interest on the national debt. As one comparison, Texas Democratic Senator Yarborough cites the fact that we are spending $21,666 per American for ammunition to fight the Vietnam war—against 25¢ per American for libraries and teaching materials. As another, while our national education budget is threatened with mutilation to the $3 billion a year range, interest going to owners of the U.S. debt is soaring above an annual $17 billion.

These cutbacks would wipe out libraries in areas where the need is greatest; for instance, many bookmobiles would disappear in regions of New Mexico where the Indian pueblos and Spanish-American migrants live. Thousands of children would suffer; the key cause of failure in school is inability to read.

In the words of New York GOP Senator Javits: "Guillotining the education budget is not responsible fiscal belt tightening." Or even more to the point, as Yarborough asks in obvious disgust:

"What kind of priorities do we have in this country?"

A DIALOG ON FUTURE OF U.S. SPACE PROGRAM

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, as we await the safe and triumphant return of the men of Apollo 11 a national dialog has started on the future priorities of the space program. This is a healthy and timely dialog. I recently received an enlightening and constructive letter from a 16-year-old constituent, Lyndon Gamelson II of Wichita, Kans. Speaking as an intelligent representative of our younger generation, he makes a strong case for continued progress in the space program.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to bring Lyn Gamelson's views to the attention of my colleagues in the House. Excerpts from his letter to me follow:

DEAR SIR: As you are now reading this letter, three Americans are on the greatest voyage of our time. This voyage represents billions of dollars and many millions of hours of hard, strenuous labour. It has also cost lives. But it is well worth it. If life is to continue for mankind, we must reach out for what beckons us. The space exploration program of this country, or even this world, cannot stop. What would become of us if humans were not inquisitive? The wonders and fascination of everyday life would mean nothing. But since mankind is naturally curious, I hope that he has the courage and strength to continue our space program. If we, as humans, cannot find answers to our problems, then we must reach out and grasp those answers. I believe that space exploration is the answer. Cures for diseases; new, stronger elements; life . . . on other planets is out there. We know not what, but if we stop now, all will be lost. We can do it. We can. We can go where no man has gone before. If we do not have the wisdom to stop fighting, then maybe a superior intelligence does. Who knows?

I ask you now, since our goal is almost reached, to speak out, and convince your fellow men, that space exploration is necessary. It offers the wonder and splendor that we do not know. Only God knows what wonder, challenge, fascination lies beyond the stars. But if we discontinue our priceless space exploration program, we would be taking a step backward. I hope you can see my point. I know that it will cost billions more, but look at the profit. Look at the profit!

Sincerely yours,

LYN GAMELSON II.

JOIN THE CONSPIRACY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, little by little the extreme and anarchistic nature of the Students for a Democratic Society is being brought to public attention. Through press stories, congressional committee hearings and the recent annual appropriations statement by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, the message is getting around that SDS goals are synonymous with revolution and the destruction of our way of life. As pointed out previously, the 1968 national convention of SDS included a workshop on sabotage and explosives to disrupt selective service and police facilities during riots, the use of letters dipped in combustible materials, the use of "bird bombs" in toilets to destroy plumbing, employing "thermite bombs" in manholes to destroy communications, to name a few of the devices considered.

In a workshop on self-defense and internal security a proposed pamphlet included suggestions on starting rifle and karate clubs, infiltrating right-wing organizations, starting rogues galleries of police officers and spotting plainsclothesmen by observing them as they testify in court.

The SDS national convention for this year was held in June in Chicago, with the nonunderground press being barred from the proceedings. Much more respectable than the press in the eyes of SDS leaders were representatives from various groups hewing to one form of communism or other. Several members of the Illinois Communist Party were observed by local and Federal investigators attending the convention sessions, in addition to members of the Socialist Workers Party and, of course, the Progressive Labor Party, some of whose members are also members of SDS.

We can form some idea of the type of thinking which pervaded the convention by examining a sampling of the resolutions, leaflets, tracts, and news releases which circulated during the sessions. Similarly, resolutions presented at the convention convey at least a glimpse of the extremist trend so characteristic recently of this group. The July 21, 1969, issue of Barron's, a weekly of financial and business news, ran excerpts from a recent article by Alice Widener, the nationally syndicated columnist and long-established authority on the so-called Left, Old and New. The following excerpts appeared in the July 11 issue of Miss Widener's biweekly publication, U.S.A., which, incidentally, lists among its subscribers an impressive list of readers from business, Federal agencies, the field of journalism, and other areas.

The list of responsible organizations subscribing to U.S.A. are not at all surprising when one reviews the information provided by Miss Widener in past years. In late 1965 one could have read of the history of SDS which for years was the student arm of the League for Industrial Democracy under the title, "Student League for Industrial Democracy"—SLID. Other reports included the three conferences of the socialist scholars where the sophisticated left met to fret; the National Conference on New Politics, that calamity in Chicago in August 1967, in which the black militants steamrollered the white militants into militant acquiescence; another SDS operation, the radical education project conference, and other studies too numerous to mention.

A collection of the above-mentioned articles and others are now available under one cover entitled "Student Subversion," which is available from U.S.A. at 530 East 72d Street, New York City. Studies of this type are extremely valuable at this time when one considers Director Hoover's recent statement that—

> Never before in our history has there been such a strong revolutionary Marxist movement of young people so eager to tear down established authority.

The Widener articles provide a veritable scorecard by which one can identify the player in their various roles of revolution and upheaval.

At this point I wish to insert the article mentioned above as it appeared in Barron's of July 21 and which was extracted from the July 11 issue of U.S.A. by Alice Widener:

JOIN THE CONSPIRACY—A SUMMARY OF THE LATEST SDS BLUEPRINT FOR REVOLT

Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), self-described as "communist, with a small 'c'," held a national convention in Chicago last month from which the press was barred. From the outside, a New York newspaperman observed that as the delegates streamed into the hall, there was "an overwhelming sense" that last spring's college campus confrontations had proven SDS to be an organization with considerable power. One SDS delegate, on the way into the convention, reportedly said: "We showed them we mean business and can put action behind words." Another boasted: "In the past six months, we have proven to be a maturing revolutionary organization. And we will be 10 times as strong next year."

Will they be? Nobody knows. Most of the press reported that the delegates split irrevocably into two separate groups. "Two rival factions calling themselves the SDS have so far emerged from the national convention in Chicago," stated National Review Bulletin. "One group, the 'Revolutionary Youth Movement,' retains control of SDS offices, files and funds. The other is dominated by the Maoist Progressive Labor Party."

In fact, Students for a Democratic Society has never been a monolithic organization. By and large, such a political set-up is very rare in human affairs, since factionalism is endemic to politics. It is often said that in political unity there is strength; what is not said nearly after enough is that in minority political activism, even on the part of one person or a small group, can lie real power. Soon after the Bolsheviks seized the reins in Russia during the First World War, one of them said to another: "And to think that a short while ago we were only a handful of propagandists!"

As 20th Century history has clearly shown, it is a great mistake for the majority to dismiss as mere words the propaganda of the minority. In the U.S. today, for example, the Socialist Scholars are a minority among university faculty members, but serve as the brilliant Marxist brain trust of the so-called New Left, in which Students for a Democratic Society wield power great enough to convulse such universities as Columbia, Harvard, Stanford and Cornell.

"We can put action behind words," exults an SDS delegate. So they can, regardless of the faction to which members belong. Unfortunately, though the press paid close attention to the mechanics of the SDS National Convention, scant notice was given the ideas circulated there in the form of resolutions, leaflets, tracts and news releases. Yet SDS words always precede SDS actions. That is why study of the following excerpts from documents presented at the SDS National Convention, June 1969, is imperative for Americans who hope to prevent the disruption of U.S. communities and the breakdown of duly constituted government:

"RADICAL DECENTRALIZATION PROJECT, RESOLUTION NO. 1: TOWARD A POST-SCARCITY SOCIETY

"The period in which we live closely resembles the revolutionary Enlightenment that swept over France in the 18th Century—a period that completely reworked French consciousness and prepared the conditions for the Great Revolution of 1789. In both cases, the old institutions are slowly undermined by molecular action from below. This molecular movements creates an atmosphere of general lawlessness: a growing personal, day-to-day disobedience, a tendency not to 'go along' with the existing system, a seemingly 'petty' but nevertheless critical attempt to circumvent restriction in every facet of daily life. The society, in effect, becomes disorderly, undisciplined, Dionysian—a condition that reveals itself most dramatically in an increasing rate of official crimes. A vast critique develops of the system—the actual Enlightenment itself, two centuries ago, and the sweeping critique that exists today—which seeps downward and accelerates the molecular movement at the base. Be it an angry gesture, a 'riot' or a conscious change in life style, an ever-increasing number of people—who have no more of a commitment to an organized revolutionary movement than they have to the society itself—begin to spontaneously engage in their own defiant propaganda of the deed. . . . The revolution that ushers us into a post-scarcity society must be a complete revolution or it will be no revolution at all. . . ."

Proposal by Bruce Allen, Harvard-Radcliffe SDS; Carol Schik, University of Illinois Circle SDS; Henry Illian, University of Illinois Circle SDS:

"SDS, as a movement based on campus, cannot win struggles for the workers, but can aid this process in many ways, e.g., strike support, community leafletting, and particularly through Work-In. We should

XUM

carry on the Work-In year round and attempt to draw in many of the thousands of students who already work part-time in factories, as well as winning SDSers to getting jobs during the year. For instance, many universities are associated with hospitals which hire students and workers. . . . Students could be very effective in building a militant worker-student alliance in such hospitals on a long-term basis. . . ."

Radical Science Conference News: Science Students Union (SSU). On a recent visit to Madison, Fred Gordon, National Education Secretary of SDS, met with members of the SSU to discuss science organizing. . . . There are SSU people in many parts of the country whom you can contact for additional information. . . .

"We're in contact with the Technology and Society Committee, a science group from the San Francisco area, many of whose members work at Stanford Research Institute, Lockheed Missile & Space Co., Stanford University, and many other smaller institutions on the peninsula. They plan to send us their film, But What Do We Do?, a documentary about a young defense engineer who gradually becomes aware of the actual destructive consequences of his research work. . . ."

Radical Science: A Working Paper by John Neko; Duane Peres; Howie Halpern; Chuck Lowry—"We Are Part of a New Front."

"Capitalist society and an over mechanized civilization are being attacked from many sides, e.g., by the militant labor movements, by anti-militaristic organizations, by anti-authoritarian students.

"In close cooperation with these attacks, a new front is opening, that of specific action by radical scientists against vital parts of the post industrial capitalist state: against its technological machinery and the cynical, pseudo-scientific methods it uses to develop the consumer economy.

"The most direct way open to us is to sabotage and ultimately to stop altogether our contribution to the functioning of the industrial complex. . . . One of the aims of this conference is to discuss how to build such an organization and how to connect its strategy with the existing revolutionary currents. . . . We probably shall have to join forces with the powerful pacifist and non-violent traditions among the American intelligentsia. Although this alliance implies a departure from our radical position, the pacifists, on their part, will go part of the way to meet us. . . .

"The radical scientists should undo what the short-sighted, or soldout scientists have done. We must insure that this role will be taken over by the coming generation of scientists. . . . On a personal level, the development of a radical strategy implies a fundamental change of attitude toward life and research. Fortunately the young generation of scientists, under the influence of the world-wide radical youth movement, are breaking loose from their elders' traditions. This has a dual consequence.

"Firstly, when the science students and the young research workers choose to be radicals, they find a political background through which creative change can be made. . . . Secondly, association with the radical movement at large will affect the internal dynamics of our movement—in particular the personal evolution of its members, their regard for the place of science in society. . ."

TARGET CHICAGO

"SDS in Chicago cordially invites every person in the movement to come to Chicago and participate in a project to turn Daley's pig police state into the greatest movement city in the country. We invite you to move here, live here, and bring the revolution to the factories, the schools, the communities and onto the streets.

"Why Chicago? Chicago is the heartland to America, the worst elements of provincialism, racism, police fascism, exploitation, and general lack of class consciousness among the proletariat are to be found here. . . .

"In Chicago there is a tremendous opportunity for movement people to contribute to the future of radicalism. . . . Organizing and radicalizing the youth of Chicago's street gangs, bringing the socialist struggle to thousands of workers in hundreds of unorganized plants, working with newly emerging community organizations to bring the power of the people to bear, and of course, challenging the pigs and their corporate masters in their greatest stronghold—this and more awaits those who will come and help us in the biggest and most comprehensive work-in ever attempted in American history.

"Right now, SDS members in Chicago are setting up the machinery to set movement people up in Chicago, and to coordinate their activities. We will help people get into apartments, schools, services and job opportunities of every kind in every part of the city. . . . Women are particularly welcome; women's liberation is sorely needed in factories that exploit working mothers. All we ask is that you come to Chicago and contact our office. . . ."

Eight-Point Program of the American Servicemen's Union:

"We demand an end to saluting and sirring of officers.

"We demand the election of officers by the vote of the men.

"We demand rank-and-file control over court-martial boards.

"We demand an end to racism in the Armed Forces.

"We demand federal minimum wages.

"We demand the right to collective bargaining.

"We demand the right of free political association.

"We demand the right to disobey illegal orders, like orders to fight in Vietnam."

CLASS WAR

"We must win white students and workers to seeing why it is necessary to use revolutionary violence to defeat imperialism. We must win them to supporting the violence of Black workers. But that isn't enough. We must defeat pacifism, especially among students, and engage in revolutionary violence. This does not mean we stand for individual terrorism. We must learn from and advance the example of S.F. State and Berkeley on the question of using mass violence. No social class ever surrendered. . . ."

Jared Israel, Harvard-Radcliffe SDS, PLP
Mike Schwartz, Harvard-Radcliffe SDS

"If the government intends to use phony charges as a new instrument of legalized oppression, we must turn such charges into a rallying cry for liberation, winning millions to militant and open conspiracy against the forces that brought us Vietnam, racism, counter-insurgency programs at home and abroad, a capitalist system which exalts private profit and the prerogatives of property over people's needs.

"On September 24 (1969), eight political activists go on trial for 'conspiring' to bring people to Chicago's Democratic Convention. The eight—Rennie Davis, Dave Dellinger, John Froines, Tom Hayden, Abbie Hoffman, Jerry Rubin, Bobby Seale, and Lee Weiner—face sentences of 10 years each in the first tests of the new 'antiriot' law. Attorney General Mitchell has announced that the antiriot law will be the main weapon in the government's arsenal of repression to 'get the student disrupters.'

"Join the Conspiracy. Here are things you can do:

1) "Support the United Front against Fascism. National action around the first week of the Chicago Conspiracy trial (September 24–27).

2) "Organize Conspiracy rallies locally. Defendants will speak, if desired. Contact Conspiracy offices.

3) "Publicize the 'Conspiracy Institute,' an intensive training program for movement lawyers, law students, and potential political prisoners on strategies for fighting the courts, law and order, police and fascism. Institute to run during the Conspiracy trial. For more information, contact a Conspiracy office.

4) "Join in putting the actual conspiracy of racism, imperialism and capitalism on trial. In November, the Conspiracy will put the real criminals on trial in a People's Tribunal, involving international revolutionaries. Fight to get campus administrators to pay for closed circuit radio and TV hook-up direct to classrooms on the tribunal topic: America, the outlaw nation.

5) "Raise funds and publicize the Conspiracy. Literature, buttons and posters are available from Chicago and New York Conspiracy offices.

"Chicago Conspiracy Office: 28 E. Jackson Blvd. Chicago, Ill. 60604 (312) 427–7773.

New York Conspiracy Office: 339 Lafayette St. New York, N.Y. (212) 228–1231."

The foregoing documents, presented at the SDS National Convention in Chicago last month, are self-explanatory evidence of why the non-underground press was barred from the hall. Regardless of which radical faction issued them—SDS or SDS-PLP—the contents make a mockery of the widely held view that the members of the Old and New radical Left are mostly well-intentioned idealists. The only uses SDS makes of idealism are as bait to lure prospective members, and as a cover to mask cynical plans for the destruction of U.S. society.

THE POLICE AND THE COMMUNITY

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the dedicated efforts of one man to promote the safety of his fellow citizens. Deputy Inspector Richard DiRoma of the New York City Police Department, who commands the 24th Precinct in the 20th Congressional District on Manhattan's West Side, has made it his business to understand the community in which he works. Thus he is able to communicate and cooperate with the citizens of our community.

The causes of crime in our cities are many, and the solutions are complex. The attempts to reduce crime are not aided by the demagoguery of some, but rather by the efforts of men like Richard DiRoma to promote understanding between the police and the city's residents. Respect for law comes in part from respect for those responsible for upholding the law. By responding to the community's needs, Inspector DiRoma inspires such respect.

The rapport between Inspector DiRoma and the people of the 24th Precinct is evidenced by the clamor which arose recently from the community at the time of his promotion from captain to deputy inspector when it appeared that he might be transferred to another assignment. Fortunately, Police Commissioner Leary responded to the community and continued Inspector DiRoma in command of the 24th Precinct.

I would like to insert at this point in the Record an article about Richard DiRoma written by Don Pride for the Manhattan Tribune of July 5, 1969:

Checker Players Versus Muggers, Sneak Thieves, and Burglars

(By Don Pride)

The deadly serious game that cops play with robbers in this city of eight million mostly frightened citizens was described not long ago by Deputy Inspector Richard DiRoma at one of his Community Council meetings in the 24th Precinct.

"We must play checkers," he said. "Where crime becomes acute, we try to contain it."

Inspector DiRoma's precinct, bounded by the Hudson River and Central Park between 86th and 110th Streets, has one of the highest crime rates in New York. There is evidence, though, that the recently-promoted DiRoma is one of the best police checker players in the city.

When he was elevated by Commissioner Howard Leary last month from the rank of captain, for example, Inspector DiRoma wasn't transferred to a desk at Central Headquarters.

Commissioner Leary broke with the usual pattern of putting deputy inspectors in division administrative jobs, because the people of the 24th Precinct want Inspector DiRoma to stay there.

In 27 years on the force, Inspector DiRoma has become something of a model of the modern officer who tries to balance tough law enforcement with community imagery.

It's a tough balance to obtain.

"What do we do about strange men in our building?" asked a pretty brunette, wearing a red sweater and splashy red and blue bell bottoms, as she sat with her husband in Inspector DiRoma's office one night.

"In the last two weeks we had two armed robberies with knives in the elevator," said her husband, a young man in horn rim glasses, gray suit, striped tie.

The couple live on Central Park West and they came into Inspector DiRoma's office, in the front of the West 100th Street stationhouse, at 7:40 that evening representing 80 residents who were alarmed at muggings and other violent crimes in the neighborhood. The residents hired a private guard for their apartment building but it did not stop the robberies. The couple came to seek police help, they said, to avert a wider confrontation between the irate residents and the police.

They told how three young black men had gotten into the elevator the night before, a knife was stuck in the ribs of a resident as the car went up and one of the three said, "This is a holdup." One woman handed over some money; another, petrified, screamed. A neighbor called 911, the police emergency number at Central Headquarters, and said, "Somebody is screaming for help in the hall."

When the police clerk insisting on more information, the caller expressed fear that the robbers would get away. The man at headquarters, according to the couple, snapped, "So what?"

It took five minutes for the police to respond to the call. The young man in the gray suit said he thought that was too long.

"Absolutely!" agreed DiRoma. He leaned forward in his chair as the couple talked. His dark eyes, very prominent in an angular face, never left the two visitors. He kept a pen in his right hand and made notes on what they said.

Then, suddenly, Inspector DiRoma turned defensive. The primary election had taken part of his patrol force on the night of the Central Park West robbery, the police do need certain information before responding to a call, the police cannot patrol inside a building, and they need the cooperation of residents who should report suspicious people in their buildings.

"I need a description," he said. "We don't want to go around just stopping any male Negroes . . . we can't violate the Constitution or their civil rights."

"All right, what are we supposed to do?" the woman asked at one point.

"Cooperate with us by calling us," he said.

The woman pressed further and the Deputy Inspector loudly declared, "Beyond that, I cannot help you!"

Before the couple left, however, Inspector DiRoma assured them he would check crime reports to determine what, if any, police action is needed. He also promised to meet with the residents and furnish a new set of guidelines on how New Yorkers can protect themselves in their apartment buildings. "I think we can lick this problem," he said, "but we can't police inside the building."

Apparently satisfied, the couple promised cooperation from the building residents.

It was now past 8:00 and Inspector DiRoma was late for the monthly Community Council meeting in an adjoining squad room. But another delegation was at his door.

About forty persons had marched to the station from a sidewalk rally on 107th Street, between Broadway and Amsterdam Avenue, where nearly one hundred residents agreed to demand more police protection. Inspector DiRoma arranged to have most of the delegation join the Community Council meeting underway in the next room. Then he sat down in his office with three leaders of the group, Stephen Halpern, Theodore Greenblatt, and Estelle Katz, all of 262 West 107th Street.

"We've had eight incidents in the last two and a half weeks," said Mr. Halpern, a slender man in a pin-striped suit who teaches at Manhattan Community College. "One 80-year-old woman was beaten with a chain."

"When these things start up they come in a rush," said Mr. Greenblatt, a heavyset man with a mustache who wore an open shirt and smoked a pipe.

Inspector DiRoma knew the block. "That's the one where the florist is on the corner," he said. But when he started talking quickly about what he could do, Mrs. Katz interrupted. "You talk as fast as your patrol cars go past," she protested.

They asked for a foot patrolman on 107th Street.

"We will give you one," Inspector DiRoma declared.

A man would be assigned to patrol 107th between Broadway and Columbus Avenue, he told the three visitors. He also promised to attend a meeting in their building and furnish the new guidelines he was drawing up for apartment dwellers. "When you know what to do, you don't panic," Mrs. Katz agreed. Then she told how she and her neighbors carry whistles to summon help in an emergency. "Is there any objection to this?" Mr. Greenblatt asked the Deputy Inspector.

"Absolutely not . . . providing that you call us in addition," he replied. "We don't want someone to blow a whistle and not call us."

The three got up to leave and Mr. Halpern commented on how reassuring it would be "to see a man in blue" on the block. Inspector DiRoma followed them into the squad room where the Community Council, a group of citizens concerned about the precinct's problems, was meeting. The Deputy Inspector was greeted by warm applause and, as he welcomed the group to the stationhouse, he noted, "The squeaking wheel, the responsive community, is the one that gets the best service."

Then he announced, "We're going to give you people of 107th Street a patrolman, 16 hours a day."

The people from 107th cheered.

Then Inspector DiRoma cautioned that putting a man there means pulling him off another beat. "The robberies and muggings and purse snatchings are not happening only on 107th," he said.

The police can't patrol every street, he said; they can only play checkers.

When he finished, the forty people from 107th Street left the meeting. It quickly became apparent that the other residents who stayed, and who regularly attend the police-community sessions, were not as pleased by the Deputy Inspector's announcement.

"We have a robbery a week on 110th and we don't seem to have a foot patrolman at all," complained a blonde in the back of the room.

"I will not give you a foot patrolman," Inspector DiRoma declared in the midst of the ensuing exchange. "But I will give you a scooter patrolman."

The woman sat down, shaking her head.

Another woman, in the front, got up and wondered why she saw so many foot patrolmen on Broadway and none on the side streets.

"That is not true," Inspector DiRoma retorted sharply. "I'll show you my records this evening . . . my records are open to your inspection at any time."

A balding man in a sports jacket rose and, with a Swedish accent, said, "You always can see on Broadway one or two policemen standing around . . . but never on 96th Street.

"Maybe they are there," he added, "but I don't see them."

Two members of the Community Council, sharing the head table with Inspector DiRoma, were openly distressed about the quick decision to patrol 107th Street. One of them said such actions amounted to "decentralization—all the way to the block level."

He warned that the muggers will watch to see where the police deploy their men in response to the latest block demand and then they will go hit an unprotected block. "We need long-range answers," he insisted.

The other man noted that the 107th Street delegation left after its demands were met. "We satisfy some people too quickly," he said. "We need their badgering, but we need their help too."

Both men seemed, though, to be taking pains to aim the brunt of their criticism at the 107th Street delegation rather than at the man who made the decision. They led the applause earlier when Inspector DiRoma entered the meeting and it was announced that his promotion didn't mean that he would be leaving the precinct.

Despite the conflicting demands reflected by stationhouse meetings, Richard DiRoma apparently couldn't be happier about remaining in the West Side precinct. At night's end, before boarding a subway for his home in the Bronx, the new Deputy Inspector summed up his feelings: "To be close to the people, to have personal contact with them—that's the greatest reward of police work."

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY—ALICE IN WONDERLAND

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, now that the present administration seems determined to aid and abet the Communist dictator Mao Tse-tung by opening trade and travel with Red China, we may expect North Vietnam, North Korea, and

Cuba to be made our next allies. This will then leave the courageous anti-Communist people of Rhodesia as the only "threat to international peace" feared by our present administration and the United Nations organization. Americans will be free to travel and spend U.S. dollars all over the Communist world but forbidden to do business or visit Rhodesia.

It is amazing to see our State Department sending up such a trial balloon—cozying up to Red China—at the same time the administration wages a touch-and-go battle for the ABM system announced to be our defense against nuclear attack from that same Red China. It is even more amazing to see a civilized, peace loving nation like Rhodesia, our ally in fighting Red China in Korea, get the back of our hand as a highly theoretical threat to world peace because the packed U.N. organization dislikes its internal policies. The strange result is that strategic chrome—vital to our defense and previously imported from friendly Rhodesia, must now be procured from the Soviet Union.

The United States, under the U.N. organization flag, is still at war with Red China in Korea. We are still taking casualties when it suits the enemy to ignore the "cease fire" there.

It is almost psychotic for the United States to seek relations with Red China while we deliberately impair our national security by a boycott of Rhodesia, a friend and ally in the Korean war.

Mr. Speaker, is it possible that our negrophile State Department considers our ally, Rhodesia, a greater threat to the American people than our enemy, Red China, only because no race problem exists in Peiping?

News reports on Red China and the U.S. State Department follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 22, 1969]

United States Eases Curbs on China Trade

(By George Sherman)

On the eve of the President's first trip to Asia, the Nixon administration has made a symbolic gesture to ease tensions with Communist China.

Yesterday the State Department announced a modest revision of the travel and trade bans against the Chinese mainland to go into effect tomorrow. Officials immediately admitted the changes have far more symbolic political than practical importance.

On the trade side, Americans abroad—mainly tourists—will now be able to bring $100 worth of Communist Chinese goods home without special clearance. But all Chinese goods over $100 will still have to have a "certificate of origin" to prove they are not Communist-produced, and special clearance for entrance, if they are. Many of these goods are sold in Hong Kong and Singapore.

On the travel side, six categories of Americans will now have their passports automatically validated for travel to Communist China without application.

The six groups are members of Congress, journalists, professional teachers, scholars with post-graduate degrees and college students, scientists and physicians, and representatives of the American Red Cross.

Most of these people previously could get permission easily to visit Communist China, but they had to make application to have the passport restriction removed. Now validation will be automatic. For others, people such as tourists and businessmen, the old procedure will still apply.

"CLOSED DOOR" POLICY

Furthermore, Peking has not permitted an American to travel to China for more than three years, and precious few before that. Officials note that the changes in both travel and trade restrictions mean little until there is a change in this "closed door" policy on the mainland.

The chief benefactors are tourist spots like Hong Kong and Singapore, where both Communist Chinese goods and fake "certificates of origin" to bypass the American embargo, abound.

Officials in both places, as well as in Japan and on Nationalist Chinese Formosa, were informed of the changes in advance.

The timing of the State Department move, just before President Nixon and Secretary of State William P. Rogers depart tonight for the Pacific, has aroused most curiosity here.

Officials admit that this token of the Nixon desire to ease the U.S. isolation of Communist China is in line with policy lines increasingly backed in several of the countries he will visit—the Philippines, Thailand, India, Pakistan and Romania.

IN LINE WITH POLICY

But the State Department emphatically denies any direct connection between the trade and travel moves and the President's journey. They underline the "modesty" of the moves and insist that they are in line with the "gradualism" of ending the isolation of Communist China followed by the United States at least since 1961.

"Both measures, in addition to their modest benefits to American citizens," said State Department spokesman Robert J. McCloskey, "are consistent with the administration's desire to relax tensions and facilitate the development of peaceful contacts between the people of the United States and Communist China."

McCloskey held out little hope that Peking would respond in like fashion.

"We've made clear many times," he said, "that we have no hostile intentions toward Communist China. We hope Peking comes to realize that. But on the basis of past performance we would not be surprised if these decisions were dismissed out of hand."

Officials maintain that Peking was given no advance inkling of the move. No direct contact with Communist China has been made, they said, since Feb. 18 when Peking called off the scheduled Feb. 20 meeting in Warsaw with representatives of the Nixon administration. It was to have been the 135th meeting, the first in 13 months, between the Chinese and American governments.

Since February, U.S. officials say, the administration repeatedly has impressed upon third parties the sincerity of Rogers' announcement, after the Chinese cancellation, the United States stands ready to meet with the Communist government any time, anywhere. So far, these officials add, Peking has given no direct or indirect hint of willingness to take up the dialogue.

The Chinese press has unleashed bitter personal attacks on Nixon, claiming that he and his policy are identical with former President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The modesty of the new Nixon move is underlined by the difficulty the State Department already had in enforcing the general travel ban in American passports. Four countries are involved—Communist China, North Vietnam, North Korea and Cuba.

A court decision in Washington during the last administration made this travel restriction virtually unenforceable legally. The court held that, while the government has the right to put the ban in the passport, it has no right to deny a person a passport as a penalty for abusing it. The right to travel is absolute, the court held.

For the reason, Rogers gave serious consideration last March to dropping the restrictions entirely. But political pressure, plus the "moral effect" of dissuading travel to Cuba, carried the day. He extended the restrictions six months until September.

The predominant feeling among policy advisers today is that the small step announced yesterday points toward dropping the ban entirely in the Fall. In the meantime, they say, it is now up to the Communist Chinese to show a willingness to begin coexistence with the United States.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 16, 1969]

Chiang's Raid Criticized

The United States has expressed displeasure to Nationalist China about a raid in which several Formosan small craft sank mainland Chinese supply ships. State Department spokesman Robert J. McCloskey avoided saying the July 2 raid in the Formosa Straits near the Min River estuary was in violation of a formal understanding between the United States and Nationalist China, but he said the United States "would regret any action which increased tensions in the straits."

NEED FOR NEW GLOBAL POLICIES

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is time for serious consideration of the road ahead of us as a nation seeking peace. Worldwide there is no peace. Within recent days war has broken out in Central America, a war fought with U.S. weapons and a war that could not have been fought without those weapons. In the Middle East another war simmers, a war that could spread to involve the United States in that ultimate confrontation which we all recognize would end in a nuclear exchange and an end to civilization.

Man has been able to walk on the moon, but he is unable to bring peace to his native planet. Man now has the power to destroy himself and all life on earth, but he seems nearer to bringing peace through death to this planet than peace through law and cooperation.

It is in this frame of reference that I suggest the wise words of Herbert Brucker, a distinguished American journalist, as published in the Palo Alto Times on May 9, 1969, be studied. Mr. Brucker, a former president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, is now associated with Stanford University in its excellent program of journalistic training. In his recent article he outlines the stresses we now live under and proposes some solutions. I include his article in the Record at this point:

Remember the "Pueblo"—Breaking Out of the Pattern

(By Herbert Brucker)

The Pueblo flurry has now been disposed of, a year and a quarter after it began, neatly and effectively. Everybody has won.

The Navy, demanding a court martial for

XUM

Commander Bucher and others, has kept flying high the motto, Don't Give Up the Ship—even one armed only with pea-shooters. But the admirals were overruled by Secretary of the Navy Chafee, so that "the charges against all the officers will be dismissed." And the public, which might have raised an unholy howl had there been courts-martial, can now rest content in the conviction that, indeed, "They have suffered enough."

So no one raises the cry, "Remember the Pueblo!" Yet the Pueblo is a reminder that basic questions about American strategic policies need to be asked, and answered. So too that EC121 spy plane, lately shot down with 31 lives lost, to the renewed humiliation of the United States, is also a reminder. The need is to rethink the global policies we have inherited from a different day, so that we may catch up with the world we actually live in.

WE AND THEY

We and our potential enemies alike act as though we were mentally paralyzed, incapable of recognizing the plain truth that the armed sovereign nation-state, living in anarchy with its armed fellows, is as outmoded as the bow and arrow in this day of nuclear ICBMs.

The nation-state was a natural development when it took shape in the time of Napoleon. It became impractical with the development of modern weapons, by the time of our Civil War. And it was made obsolete by the cataclysm of World War I.

Because that shattering experience didn't teach man his lesson, the world had to suffer the six-year hell of World War II. Then came Hiroshima. Yet here we still are, acting as though the new world of teeming, restless, multiplying peoples, elbow to elbow in a polluted world of instant communication and instant destruction, did not exist.

It is written in all history that the only way to end war is to establish a rule of law over potential enemies. So it was when individual man gave way before the tribe, the tribe before the larger language group and the city-state, and the city-state and principality before the nation-state.

It remains only to go one step further. But that way lies world government, or rather a long chain of way stations to it. Just mention world government and you get either a shrug of helplessness, or else goose pimples from the notion that it is some kind of Communist plot. If you want to know better, read the Federalist Papers, especially Nos. 15 and 16. These explain why the 13 caterwauling states of the original confederation adopted the Constitution, as a single law over them all.

IF . . .

If we do not have the wit and the drive to continue on that long and difficult path into the future, does that mean that we are stuck where we are until someone makes that final mistake, and we all blow up? Must we have ever new ABMs, which are billed as defense but can have no other effect but to force an increase in the other side's offense?

This is no security. It is the height of insecurity, as is the temporary expedient of the nuclear deterrent. It is time some statesman had the vision and the courage to break out of the paralysis of carrying forward ancient ways in a world that makes those ways fatal.

Since Glassboro, Presidents Johnson and Nixon have flirted with the idea of breaking out of the pattern. The test-ban treaty, the prospective anti-proliferation treaty, are signs that progress can be made. So is Europe's fresh stirring of interest in union, now that the Big Bad General is once again in seclusion in Colombey.

All this points the way ahead. Compared to that way ahead agitation over the ROTC, or napalm, or chemical-biological warfare, are peripheral to the point of being irrelevant. But because the only way out is long and hard nobody, from campus to White House, even bothers to talk about it.

TELL IT LIKE IT IS

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, Mr. Robert S. Small, president of Dan River Mills, addressed the textile section of the New York Board of Trade regarding the textile industry. His topic was "Tell It Like It Is."

Mr. Small knows the textile industry. He knows the threat it faces. He knows the indifference his Government has shown to its plight. He knows what the textile industry means to the rank and file American and to the economy of America. He knows that the American textile industry is the wonder of the free world. Mr. Small has spent most of his adult life since leaving college learning every facet of textiles—one of the most basic elements of our free enterprise system; and he has risen to the top as president of the Dan River Mills, one of the largest in the industry.

Mr. Speaker, day in and day out our system is challenged by cheap labor and a different way of life from the American standard. No nation in the history of the world pays to its employees the benefits which American industry guarantees to those who compose its makeup. Almost every store and shop in America—large and small—sells some commodity which competes with our free enterprise system. Mr. Small understands the real threat to our way of life. He understands the indifference men in high places continue to hold for the future of our system. He understands the irresponsibility of many segments of the press to the daily danger of this competition.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we looked after our own. I commend to this body Mr. Small's remarks:

Tell It Like It Is

(By Robert S. Small to Textile Section, New York Board of Trade, June 19, 1969)

I had two reasons for choosing as my topic: "Tell It Like It Is". One, it's the "in" thing to do, and if you don't believe me, visit any college campus (providing you have proper escort, of course), or ask your teenage child. Second, when you have the facts as the foundation for your story, why not "Tell It Like It Is?".

Charlie Myers, president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, reminded a recent audience of an interesting editorial. The editorial said in part: "With its mature economy the United States has out-grown textile manufacturing as an appropriate livelihood . . . the point to remember is that no amount of protectionism can help the textile industry". Continuing, the writer observed: "Efforts by the President to provide relief for the textile industry are temporary protection against the inevitable day when textiles as a major American industry will not exist."

This editorial appeared in the Washington Post in May 1961, just after the late President Kennedy announced his seven-point program for the textile industry. But shortsighted and ludicrous as the writer's observations were, they brought into focus the pat assumption that textile manufacturing is an easy-entry business, produces commodities so basic, relatively, that a technologically sophisticated and affluent society need not waste its resources, its talents, and energies on producing these things.

This contention is pure hogwash, of course. I'll tell you clearly that if this industry earned its livelihood from producing just basic necessities, the editor of the Washington Post would probably have seen his prediction come true. What he . . . and many others . . . fail to comprehend is this: Namely, as a society's affluence and technological capabilities grow, it's interpretation of needs undergoes evolution, too. Fulfilling a basic obligation to clothe society is almost incidental to our role today. Sure, we do this, but much more besides, and in the process, we not only compete with other textile firms here and abroad, we compete with boat builders, leisure time industries and a host of others. We, like most other industries, are competing for the attention of the rising discretionary purchasing power of the consumer. And in so doing, we have to produce the fabrics and products which suit the life style of a sophisticated, affluent people.

When you come right down to it, there is only one thing basic about the American textile industry—and that is its contribution to the American economic system. Textiles are the mainstream of industrial America! Textiles have a good case to sell to the American public—as mentioned earlier, you members of the Board of Trade have been our spokesmen in this important market since 1927—let's take a look at our case, both pro and con.

During the past 10 years, sales rose from 14 to 21.5 billion dollars; production increased over 38 percent; and the industry invested almost eight billion dollars in new plants and equipment—which incidentally is 50% of total textile plants and equipment—this is a modern industry!

The textile-apparel industries have 36,000 plants in all 50 States. Today, by any yardstick, the industry is large ($21½ billion annual sales volume), important to the economy (2.5% of gnp), and a significant employer of the Nation's labor force (.03% of the gainfully employed).

However, the full significance of the industry is far greater than these numbers suggest. The chemical industry, for example, depends upon the textile industry for over 50% of its sales volume. The cotton growers depend on the industry to consume most of their output. Moreover, numerous jobbers and middlemen are dependent upon distribution of the industry's products to durable, nondurable, and service industries across the Nation. The products of the industry supply two of the most basic needs of every individual—clothing and shelter. The Nation must have the capability of fulfilling both of these needs by domestic manufacturers in time of war and peace.

In the industrial skill ladder textiles are not at the top, but they certainly are not at the bottom. It would be wonderful if all of our industrial workers were all well-educated and had the potential for the most sophisticated skilled jobs. Clearly, this is not the case—and unlikely to be the case in the foreseeable future. The fact is—and let's tell it like it is—the United States needs gainful employment for all degrees of unskilled and

XUM

skilled employees rather than welfare extension! It needs self-supporting jobs for all, especially in our under-developed areas and in our urban ghettos. Consider Appalachia for a moment which is a case in point. In the Appalachian region, embracing 373 counties in several major textile producing States, there are some 453,000 people employed in the textile industry alone. In many of these counties, textiles account for almost all manufacturing employment.

Another case in point is right here in New York City where over 325,000 persons are employed in the textile and/or garment trades.

The fact is we are providing steady, gainful employment in many of our most needy areas. Our theoretical economist would do well to recognize this.

Although textile wages are somewhat below the national average for all manufacturing, with the most recent wage increase just announced, textile wages will have been increased eight times since 1961 and payroll costs, including fringe benefits, upped more than 60 percent.

At the same time the wholesale price index for textile mill products shows an increase of only .06 percent over 1957–59. Many important textile items such as carpeting show a reduction in price. The wholesale price index for textile mill products throughout 1968 averaged 100.6 compared to the all-industrial commodity index in 1968 of (109 percent). Certainly, textiles are not contributing to the inflationary price spiral affecting almost all other consumer products.

How do you account for this tremendous performance? Maybe this way! For the past 23 years, the textile industry has increased its productivity at an average rate of 4.5 percent per year (which is absolute and does not include inflation) while American manufacturing as a whole has averaged only 2.8 percent. Somehow this impressive performance by our industry doesn't get the headlines which are accorded to more sensational subjects.

Closely associated with these facts, is the question of equal employment opportunity. The industry has made dramatic progress in recent years, newspaper accounts notwithstanding. It is ironic, indeed, that one of the newspapers which has pontificated regularly about the alleged sins of the textile industry in this regard found its own house was not in order, and that its performance in equal employment opportunity was something less than impressive. It will come as no surprise to you that this publication did not use its own pages to publicize its own shortcomings.

Negro employment in the textile industry has advanced four times faster than the national average for all manufacturing since 1960. While employment ratios vary from company to company and State to State, the textile industry offers unusual opportunities for unskilled Negro employees to become productive and skilled members of the manufacturing segment of our economy.

Since 1960, for example, the number of nonwhite employees in the industry has tripled, from only 3.3 percent to over 9.5 percent in 1968. It is undoubtedly higher today. In my own company, this figure currently is nearly double that—or more than 17 percent. And in some mills, as many as 50 percent of all new hirings in 1968 were Negroes.

The improving role of the Negro in the textile industry is reflected in both opportunities for initial employment and opportunities for advancement. U.S. Department of Labor statistics show that of the 984,000 production workers employed in primary textiles in 1968, approximately 94,000 were Negroes. This was an increase of 10,000 over 1967.

And I predict that over the next decade the employment and promotion of Negroes and other minority groups by the textile industry will be the most important single economic factor effecting our total economy during this period. We will provide this opportunity as no other industry can.

Against this background of achievement, progress, and economic contribution to our Nation's welfare, the future contribution of this vast industrial complex is being besieged by a steadily growing flow of low wage imports.

Let's take a realistic look at this import picture—

In 1968, textile imports exceeded 3¼ billion square yards. This left us with a textile trade deficit last year of $1.1 billion and the gap grows wider every year.

Worship at the altar of free trade has become one of the rituals of our age. Prominent among the worshippers—to mix metaphors—are those whose ox has not been gored by imports. But free trade simply does not exist. There is nothing free about trade unless the rules are the same for everyone. And this clearly is not the case. In this imperfect world, it is not likely to be in the future.

It is high time that some responsible economist or government official addressed himself—honestly—to the subject of so-called free trade.

There has never been free trade among independent nations—there is none now. Cordell Hull at least addressed it for what it was intended to be when he fathered our present trade policy with the "Reciprocal Trade Act of 1934." Reciprocal was the word then and the intent then. It should be now!

Somehow over the intervening years, we have lost the drive for reciprocity and have allowed our trade policy to be dubbed "free trade," by certain elements of the press and the professional economic fraternity. "Free trade" has become an unimpeachable clarion call, such as the Bible, the Bill of Rights, or motherhood. No man can question it, much less condemn it—except to risk castigation as an irresponsible profligate advocating the utter ruin of the world—not just the United States. But let's face it, there are circumstances when even motherhood is not the most desirable condition.

President Nixon has also seen fit to describe his trade policy as free trade. And, I hasten to add, I for one, believe there is no creditability gap in the White House. But why doesn't someone say it like it is and affirm a policy of organized trade!

Organized trade is flourishing in the world today and our trading partners recognize it as such. Our trade negotiators were astonished to learn last year that all of the members of the E.E.C. had secret import quota agreements with the Far Eastern countries, including Japan—and had had them for several years.

Before the so-called Kennedy round of tariff reduction agreements of 1967–68 were even begun to be implemented, our trading partners in Europe were increasing border taxes, custom duties and other trade impediments, in some cases by more than the tariff reduction.

Here are just a few of the hidden trade restrictions which exist among the so-called developed trading nations which to this date have been non-negotiable: Border taxes, custom duties, transportation tax, added value tax, import licenses, trading associations, Government subsidies, downright embargoes. I'm sure there are many more.

Now, let's speak specifically about Japan—

The arrogance of Japan in refusing to discuss quota restrictions on wool and manmade fabrics with the Stans' mission last month is incomprehensible. If the facts were known, Japan, the free world's second most advanced country economically, is probably exporting directly or indirectly to the United States well over 35% of all imported goods, and possibly as much as 50% of manmade blends.

Do you realize that Japan is running a surplus trade balance with the U.S. of over $1 billion annually?

Do you realize that while Japan ships into this country over a billion yards of cloth annually, yet Japan effectively embargoes U.S. cloth from her market? What kind of reciprocity is that!!

Do you realize that Japan, a mature economic nation, pays her textile workers less than 40c per hour? And, in addition, frequently subsidizes her exports—by our standards both illegal—yet, our textile workers lose their jobs while our government tolerates an ever increasing percentage of these imports.

Do you realize that Japanese have 100% owned textile plants in this country, yet U.S. textile firms are forbidden ownership in Japanese textiles?

Do you realize that Japanese manmade fiber producers are constructing or have constructed plants in Korea, Taiwan, Thailand, Indonesia, and are looking at the Philippines—in some cases aided and assisted by the Japanese government?

Secretary Stans went to Japan, pointed out the fact that the U.S. was the only free market in the world for textiles, that imports of textile products had increased 300% in six years, and that Japan had gotten more than her share of this increase. He indicated Japan would not be asked to reduce its exports to the U.S. but in addition would be allowed to participate in the annual anticipated growth of the U.S. market. All he asked was that Japan join with the U.S. and work out some orderly organization of this textile trade—he didn't even suggest that Japan lower her barriers to the U.S. textiles.

What did he get? An insulting rebuff. Responsible textile officials refused even to meet with him. No high American official in recent years has been treated so discourteously by Japan—a country, as I said, enjoying a fat trade balance over one billion dollars and whose budget for defense in effect is paid for by the American taxpayer.

There is a question of equity and fairness involved in the textile situation. What we are talking about is simply this. Must the U.S. carry almost the entire burden of reciprocity when it comes to the textile industry?

Less developed countries have been singled out as being readily adapted to the production of textiles. Consider the situation of 19 less developed countries in Latin America and Asia. In 1967 these countries had a favorable balance of trade in textiles with the U.S. of $318 million dollars. On the other hand, the E.E.C. countries with an aggregate population equal to the U.S., sold $50 million more in textile products to these 19 less developed countries than they bought from them. In the case of Japan again, that country had a favorable textile trade balance of $211 million with these same less developed countries.

In other words—and putting it bluntly—the U.S. is on the short shaft of both the developed and underdeveloped countries—and the shaft is sharp, not blunt.

In spite of these problems, whatever an American does or wants to do—go to work, drink cocktails, ski at Aspen, cruise the Bahamas, take a bath, camp at Jackson Hole, dance at a discotheque—we provide him with a selection of products and a selection of prices.

The choice of textile products today is literally unlimited. When one considers what technology and fashion have accomplished with just three basic weaves of textiles, it's truly amazing.

The Bureau of Census publishes periodic production figures on more than 350 different variations of the basic weaves. When you count the blend possibilities of at least 14 generically different fibers, including cotton, manmades, wool and silk, we already have a near-infinite number of basic fabric possibilities.

Now add to this the more than 100 chemical and mechanical finishes—consider the fact that there are somewhere between 40,000 and 50,000 different printed fabrics in retail stores at any one time—bear in mind that the Bureau of Standards lists five million conceivable color possibilities for textile products—then consider that clothing design by itself offers virtually unlimited possibilities to the consumer.

All told, it's not difficult to conclude that every man, woman and child in the United States could easily be provided with a complete wardrobe—and no two garments would be exactly alike—we are going to continue to offer to the American consumer exciting new products to stimulate the imagination and satisfy the demands of the world of tomorrow—we have every intention of meeting the obligations imposed on us by a changing economy and a viable social structure. We have done so in the past; we can do better in the years ahead, it is our purpose to do so.

We refuse to be tolerated or written off by the Washington Post or any other simplistic theorists who have deluded themselves into believing that textiles is a simple, elemental industry.

This industry is an integral factor in the Nation's complex economic system. We are an important and vital contributor to all facets of our national life. We will strain our talents and resources to assure this continues to be true. We insist we be recognized for what we are and what we do, and are ready to do combat with those who would cast us in a lesser role.

Gentlemen, that's telling it like it is and like it has to be!

EX-POSTMASTER GENERAL GRONOUSKI ACCENTS THE POSITIVE: POSTAL REFORM IS VITAL, BUT DO NOT OVERLOOK AMAZING SERVICE YOU HAVE NOW

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, our House Committee on post Office and Civil Service has been holding hearings now for the past 3 months on the matter of postal reform.

No one argues with the need for postal reform; the Department must have the tools and the authority to do the job of handling the ever-increasing volume of mail.

Our first witness this morning was a former Postmaster General, John A. Gronouski, who served from 1963 to 1965 when he took an ambassadorial assignment from then President Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, in all of our hearings to date we have not had a more objective witness in his discussion of the Post Office Department as it exists today.

The situation is not nearly so chaotic as some people would contend. He puts the much-cited Chicago breakdown of 1966 in its proper perspective: It did happen, but there has not been another, so the Department must be doing something right in its management of postal affairs.

As I told Mr. Gronouski when he completed his testimony, it "will be most helpful to the committee in its deliberations as to the best way to achieve meaningful postal reform."

Mr. Gronouski and I are in agreement upon the need for postal reform, although we disagree on the form. He favors the public corporation approach, while I feel we can do the job—and better—within the present Government Department.

But in laying his case before the committee, he does an outstanding job of providing the basic background we need as we near the close of the public hearings. His testimony warrants wider circulation and I am including it with my remarks:

REMARKS OF FORMER POSTMASTER GENERAL JOHN A. GRONOUSKI BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, TUESDAY, JULY 22, 1969

I am pleased to have the opportunity to appear before this Committee for the purpose of discussing post office reorganization. For the record, I am John A. Gronouski, Postmaster General in the Cabinets of President Kennedy and President Johnson from September, 1963 until November, 1965. Subsequently I served as Ambassador to Poland until June, 1968. I am at present engaged in private pursuits which are in no way connected with any group or organization which has a vested interest in the operations of the postal establishment.

I should also note for the record that on April 4, 1967 and again on May 21, 1967 I expressed support for then Postmaster General O'Brien's postal corporation idea. I also testified in favor of the general thrust of the Kappel Commission recommendations before the Platform Committee of the Democratic Party in August, 1968.

The first observation I wish to make is that much of the current criticism of postal service is both petty and unwarranted. It is my judgment that postal employees at all levels—department and regional administrators, postmasters and postal workers—have succeeded in providing the American people a remarkable postal service at moderate cost. When I can have a mailman pick up a letter at my door and another mailman hand-deliver it to the door of a friend in California, often the next day, at a cost of six cents, I am receiving a service very hard to duplicate this day and age. Admittedly a letter occasionally goes astray, but considering the fact that our post office is handling almost a quarter billion pieces of mail each day, the number of pieces temporarily misdirected is remarkably small. I suggest that critics of the service provided by this government enterprise compare its performance over the past year with that of the private brokerage industry's handling of Wall Street security transactions during the same period.

I cannot refrain from relating an experience with my favorite morning newspaper, a newspaper which, incidentally, has not been reluctant to call the post office to task. During the past six months my newspaper was not delivered on five occasions—five days out of 180, or almost three percent of the time. Now this is not a bad record, and I am not complaining, but I simply note that were the Post Office to experience a three percent rate of non-delivery, at least the Postmaster General, and perhaps the President, would be impeached!

Now the morning newspaper to which I refer is conscious of its responsibilities and has provided a phone number which, they say, will insure delivery of a substitute paper if one calls before 8:30 A.M. This I have done three times to no avail. A pleasant enough voice at the other end of the line takes down my name, address, telephone number and other data, but a substitute paper is yet to appear.

What I am suggesting, really, is not only that the postal service is not as bad as some charge, but that it is often better than that of private enterprisers who are often its greatest critics. The fact is that we expect more from the post office and while we usually get it, the fact that we don't always get it makes us indignant. Remember the roar that went up in 1949 when mail delivery was cut from twice to once a day. I well recall the spate of angry editorials when it was my lot to respond to budgetary exigencies by reducing post office window service about an hour a day.

But where was the angry roar when drug stores dispensed with clerks and required the shopper to find what he wanted and wait in line to pay for it? Or when grocery stores (with rare exception) eliminated the delivery service that my mother received in the depth of the depression of the 1930's? There wasn't any, for with private enterprise these decisions are regarded as being in the province of management choice. But the fact remains, these services are gone in the drug and grocery stores—and for good reason, for if they continued to supply them, the proprietors would probably go broke. Yet with the post office we demand such services and then bitterly complain when it costs six cents rather than a nickel to deliver a letter from one door to another three thousand miles apart.

I should also like to take note of another line of criticism which some approach with almost religious fervor. I refer, of course, to the role of politics in the appointment of postmasters and rural letter carriers. Lest I be misunderstood, I want it known that I hold no particular brief for the political advisor selection system. In fact, when I was Postmaster General I often lamented the fact that under the prevailing system the Democratic Congressmen treated their selection of the postmasters and rural carriers in their district as a matter of right. Thus, when I made the appointments of their choice I was deprived of any credit for doing a favor, for you cannot get credit for giving a Congressman something he already has. However, during my tenure as Postmaster General I never was adroit enough to get Presidential backing for a shift of postmaster and rural carrier appointing power from the Congress into my hands, and thus I was deprived of the kind of real effective power that administrators dream of having.

So I do not object on principle to removing the selection of postmasters and rural carriers from Congressional politics. What does bother me is the strong implication that the postmasters and rural carriers that have been selected by the Congressional advisor process are really a bunch of incompetent political hacks. This I say from personal knowledge is a lot of nonsense. I have met at their national and state conventions, in their post offices and in their homes a good cross section of our politically appointed postmasters and rural carriers. I say categorically that these are highly competent professionals who have a deep dedication to the postal service, and I think it is incumbent on those of us who know this to say so.

The case for reorganization of the Post Office along corporation lines as suggested by the Kappel Commission cannot be made, therefore, by pointing to an intolerable quality of service or the incompetence of management personnel, for in neither case does the charge hold water. Nor do I have much patience with these who point to the 1966 service breakdown in Chicago as evidence that

XUM

our postal system is on the verge of total collapse; the fact that this three-year old exhibit A has not been supplemented by an exhibit B—that the Chicago experience has not occurred subsequently in Chicago or Los Angeles or New York or Philadelphia or Washington or anywhere else—suggests to me that the "Chicago Catastrophe" was just that and that it does not provide a measure of the viability of our postal establishment.

Finally, I cannot accept the implication that nothing has happened to improve the capability of the Post Office to handle the ever-expanding mail volume over the past several years. Without dwelling on the point, I will simply state that in my judgment the implementation of the ZIP Code and the introduction of sophisticated mechanization into our newly constructed major facilities has provided in less than ten years the basis for a major technological revolution in mail processing and distribution.

What I am saying, in effect, is that supporters of a basic structural change in postal management and organization along lines originally proposed by former Postmaster General O'Brien, seconded by the Kappel Commission and supported by the present Administration, do not strengthen their case when they paint a picture of gross mismanagement by political hacks yesterday, crisis today and catastrophe tomorrow. There are fundamental and persuasive reasons for supporting the basic postal corporation proposal; to argue successfully for it does not in my judgment require ill-founded and unsupportable charges of past incompetence and impending doom.

As I noted earlier, I have supported the postal corporation idea ever since it was advanced by Larry O'Brien early in 1967. I have supported it, not because of a lack of confidence in the managerial competence of our postmasters and other postal management personnel, but because I believe these managers can perform much more effectively if they are given the greater authority and responsibility implicit in the postal corporation idea. Those charged with administering the postal service are placed under a severe handicap when they are deprived of a relevant role with respect to major elements of the decision making process, particularly those involving wages and prices.

I support the postal corporation idea, also, because of my conviction that postal workers generally, and particularly those in larger cities, have been ill-treated by the prevailing wage determination systems. I would look for a substantial improvement in postal worker wages and fringe benefits under conditions where both management and workers are equipped with and are prepared to implement effective tools of collective bargaining.

I have said that I do not find the Post Office in a state of crisis or facing imminent catastrophe. But I also do not disagree with the general consensus I find in reading the testimony of those who have appeared before this Committee—that reforms in the structure of the postal establishment are needed, and that there is room for significant improvement in both the efficiency of operation and the quality of service provided by the Post Office. I also believe there is a need for a healthier and more responsive labor management relationship, and that the postal rate-making procedure is badly in need of major overhaul.

I do not believe that an acceptable rate of progress can be made in these areas under conditions of divided management responsibility that characterizes the postal establishment. This is because management decisions do not stand alone; for any one decision to have a chance of achieving its purpose it must be compatible with and supported by a host of related decisions. Decisions with respect to post office modernization and mechanization, for example, are directly related to the impact of ZIP Code on patterns of mail transporation and distribution, and both have an impact on and are critically affected by policies adopted in the field of employee relations.

Postal management, in the interest of efficient and effective postal service, has the responsibility for making technological and operational changes which affect the lives and well-being of thousands of postal workers. To successfully implement these changes, therefore, it should also have the responsibility and authority to negotiate with employee representatives a wage contract which gives postal workers a share in the increased productivity stemming from these changes, and a pattern of fringe benefits which insures that the workers directly involved are relieved of whatever financial burdens the transition would otherwise impose upon them. As long as Congress retains jurisdiction over wages and fringe benefits, managers of the Post Office will lack a vital tool needed to make technological and operational changes tolerable and acceptable to postal workers and their union leaders.

But if management is to have genuine authority to negotiate wage and benefit agreements, it must also have control over the other half of the financial equation—the prices charged for postal service. It would be meaningless to suggest that postal management had authority to negotiate wage and benefit agreements if the validity of any agreement was dependent upon the willingness of Congress to appropriate money or raise postal rates to pay for it.

Congress should, of course, retain an ultimate veto power over the final rate determination of the agency charged with this function, but I am convinced it would be a mistake to retain more authority than the right to vote yes or no on the entire package. In my judgment the policy of Congress should be clearly one of establishing broad guidelines with respect to the principles of rate-making, and charging an administrative agency with responsibility for allocating postal costs among users in accordance with these principles.

I do not mean to suggest that once a postal corporation becomes established as a going concern the need or desirability of "public service" appropriations by Congress will be eliminated. The primary function of the Post Office is public service, and this should be no less true of the postal corporation than it is of the Post Office Department. A persuasive case can be made for general fund appropriations to underwrite special costs incurred by the postal service in performing its basic function of providing a communications network tying together all sections of the country. For example, in some rural areas where volume is low, pricing of mail service at a level that covers cost would result in rates prohibitively expensive. The same is true where distances are great and providing tolerable service requires use of expensive modes of transportation, e.g., Alaska and Hawaii. I would argue that it is in the national interest that those living in such areas of the United States not be disadvantaged in basic communications with other parts of the country. This is essentially a consideration of national integration and unity the cost of which is properly allocated against the general revenue.

While I would argue that the postal corporation should establish a level of rates adequate to cover its operating costs, therefore, I am not proposing the elimination of public service appropriations. I am simply saying that the effect of such appropriations should be on the price of service paid by those affected by the subsidy which Congress determines, not on the total revenue available to the postal corporation. Thus, the rate schedule submitted to Congress by the rate-making agency should provide sufficient revenue to cover the cost of postal operations, and such rates should be reduced only in the amount and for the purposes that subsidy funds are voted by Congress.

Mr. Chairman, before concluding my remarks I would like to address myself to a particularly important aspect of postal reform, that which directly affects the well-being of some 700,000 postal workers. While in many important respects my views are in accord with those expressed in the Administration's H.R. 11750, I want it known that I take exception to those sections dealing with labor-management relations.

In this connection I should observe that I distinguish the postal service from most other functions of government on two grounds: first, the Congress has historically given emphasis to the proprietary nature of the post office, charging the user a fee for services rendered; and, second, unlike most services of government—police and fire protection, defense, welfare—the service provided by the Post Office is "postponable."

It is primarily because of this latter characteristic that I am not nearly as disturbed by the thought of postal workers gaining the right to strike under a postal corporation form of organization as are many of my friends. Now I am not suggesting that a postal strike would be a good idea, and I am well aware that such a strike would be both costly and inconvenient. But so is a steel, automobile or transportation strike. The point I am making is that the postal service is clearly distinguishable from such "non-postponable" governmental services as police and fire protection where a strike would be intolerable.

Whatever the merits and disadvantages of incorporating the right to strike as a part of postal corporation legislation, however, as a practical matter the question appears to be academic. While there has been some flirting with the proposition, I have seen no ground swell in favor of a right to strike provision—not among postal workers, nor among leaders of postal employee organizations, and certainly not from within the administration, the Congress or the general public.

The practical problem, therefore, is to establish a procedure for genuine collective bargaining and, in the event of an unresolved disagreement between management and labor, to provide for use of a tool that will serve as a refuge of last resort for labor, management or both. Under terms of H.R. 11750 the so-called refuge of last resort would be a nine-man "Postal Disputes Panel" which would, at its discretion, determine whether either party in the dispute could take its case to binding arbitration and, in the event it so decided, define the issue or issues to be arbitrated. The Disputes Panel could also make a binding decision in favor of the status quo by simply refusing to accept jurisdiction in the dispute.

Mr. Chairman, much as I favor the postal corporation approach to postal reorganization, were this provision to remain an integral part of H.R. 11750, I could not in conscience support it. I say this for the simple reason that however impartially the Disputes Panel is chosen, the postal workers and their leaders will properly regard it as part of management. Furthermore, the procedure established through the Disputes Panel clearly denies the postal worker and his union representative the right to demand binding arbitration as a matter of right. In short, the worker is denied an ultimate weapon in those cases where collective bargaining, mediation and fact finding fail to provide an answer to a dispute.

Fortunately, this serious flaw can be corrected by simply eliminating the Disputes Panel, and establishing in its place procedures for fact finding, mediation and conciliation, provisions for a cooling-off period and, ultimately, the right of either party to demand that the issue in dispute be taken to binding arbitration. A change along these lines would correct the major flaw in H.R. 11750.

PROTECTING THE CONSUMER

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the law must change with the times. Examination of legislation which has just become law and legislation now pending before the Congress provides us with an excellent example of this need.

My colleague, LESTER L. WOLFF, of New York, and myself have introduced legislation which would regulate the billion-dollar-a-year trading stamp industry. The main thrust of the legislation would be to provide the consumer with cash options on redemption.

However, the Truth in Trading Stamps Act also would require protections for the consumer against a "run" on a redemption center. The bills drafted by Mr. WOLFF and myself would require that companies in interstate commerce provide sufficient cash reserve to insure that their redemption centers could handle a "run."

On the face of it, there is a scintilla of the absurd in all this. Some may ask with bemused scorn, "A run on a trading stamp redemption center? Really, now." Well that is just what is happening in New York.

Trading stamp companies have issued what in the American marketplace certainly must be considered currency of exchange. Just as certainly, those persons who have been issued this script have every right to demand that their Government provide them with certain protections.

On behalf of the American consumer, I urge the distinguished chairmen of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Banking and Currency Committees to schedule early hearings on the legislation which I and Mr. WOLFF have introduced.

And for those who greet in disbelief the notion of a "run" on a trading stamp center, I enter, with unanimous consent, the following account, published in the New York Times of July 18:

STATE WILL ASK FOR SECURITY FROM KING KORN ON STAMPS

(By Isadore Barmash)

Louis J. Lefkowitz, the state's Attorney General, announced yesterday that because of many complaints he had received, he would ask the King Korn Stamp Company to deposit a security with his office as good faith that all outstanding books of King Korn stamps will be redeemed.

A spokesman for the Attorney General said the complaints had been received from housewives who had been saving the stamps but who had been unable to redeem them for merchandise.

For about two weeks, thousands of savers of the trading stamps have been streaming into the company's five redemption centers in Brooklyn, Queens and Manhattan.

The runs on the centers began over fears that the company was going out of the stamp business since the H. C. Bohack supermarket chain stopped distributing them last month, Mr. Lefkowitz's office said.

In Chicago, a King Korn executive, speaking for the company's president, Ira Kaplan, denied the reports that the company was leaving the stamp business and said that all stamps would be redeemed.

CONSUMERS WAIT IN VAIN

According to the Attorney General's office, as many as 1,000 people a day have been waiting in vain at the redemption centers here to get merchandise. At one center, some housewives have waited on line up to eight hours without success, the Attorney General's office said.

Asked in Chicago why the merchandise was not available, the King Korn executive said that stocks at the local redemption centers were maintained for from one to two weeks' demand.

"But the redemption rate in New York has been exceedingly heavy—about two to three times the normal rate," he said.

"We are replenishing the stocks at our redemption centers," he said.

The company, which said that the Bohack stores had represented a major account, reported that it still had about 500 clients in the New York area and one million King Korn stamp savers here.

No exact sum has been fixed as yet for the security, the Attorney General's office said.

Mr. Kaplan is expected to meet with Mr. Lefkowitz here early next week.

Trading stamps have long been a subject of debate in merchandising circles. The tiny, bright pieces of paper bearing the name of the stamp company are estimated to have a cash value of about a 10th of a cent and are redeemable for a wide variety of merchandise.

Advocates call the stamps a valuable promotional tool, but detractors say they result in higher prices because they add to the business expense of retailers who distribute them.

A spokesman for the Trading Stamp Institute, a trade organization of stamp companies, commenting on the King Korn situation yesterday, said:

Some six years ago, a similar incident occurred here in New York City when the Gold Bond Stamp Company of Minneapolis was dropped by the First National Stores.

"There was a disturbingly similar occurence when near-mobs made a run on Gold Bond's Manhattan redemption center, resulting in the calling out of mounted police guards. But all Gold Bond stamp holders had their books honored, and a redemption center was maintained in Manhattan for many months after the cutoff date to effect just this."

On July 1, the Truth-in-Lending Act became law. A decade in the making, the advocates of this law also had to overcome the disbelief of "Doubting Thomases."

The Nation and its economy ran on credit, but all too frequently the consumer has little idea of how usurous this credit can be. Hopefully, the consumer will now not need a course in credit financing before he understands the cost of a loan on a car, a house, an appliance.

Ten years ago many thought this legislation was not necessary, just as many today doubt the need for Federal regulation of the script-issuing trading stamp industry.

It is my hope, that a decade is not needed to make the Truth-in-Trading Stamps Act public law.

For any law to be truly effective, its terms must receive wide public dissemination and I applaud WCAU-TV, Philadelphia's CBS affiliate, for its editorial broadcast July 11. "Seller Beware" is more primer than editorial and with unanimous consent, I enter it in the RECORD:

SELLER BEWARE

(Presented by Peter W. Duncan, WCAU-TV editorial director)

It used to be "caveat emptor"—buyer beware. Now the roles are getting reversed. Now, it's becoming more a matter of seller beware. Legislative reins are tightening on many merchants who need to have the reins tightened.

Truth In Lending legislation became the law of the land last week and what it's done is this: it's uncovered the hidden figures and undercover carrying charges. For years, smooth talking salesmen have cooed to prospective buyers: "It's only 'X' dollars a month." Too many people didn't realize that when all the months were added up, and all those payments of 'X' dollars were totalled, they were buying themselves a bucketful of interest for a pocketful of product.

As of last week, those days are over. The salesman can continue to coo at the prospective buyer, but while he's cooing, he has to show you in writing exactly what you'll be paying—to the penny—for what you're buying. In other words, he has to come up with a grand total. Maybe then, if you realize you're paying (let's say) $160 for an $89 item, you'll change your mind about buying it.

Even so, some salesmen can win over almost any customer explaining that even with the extra costs, you shouldn't pass up the deal.

On many large credit transactions, the consumer's house is put up as a security. Let's say then, that you're convinced that a deal is a good deal and you sign your name on the contract and put your house on the line. When you leave the place of business, you begin to reconsider. By the time you get to that home that you put on the line, you wish you could change your mind. And after going over the family books and discussing it with your wife, you're certain you shouldn't have signed the contract. Well, when a consumer's house is written in to the contract as security, Truth In Lending gives the consumer three business days to think about the deal. If within the three-day period he decides he made a mistake, he can back out of the deal.

There are other aspects of Truth In Lending which benefit the consumer but the basic meaning of the legislation is to make it mandatory for merchants and businesses to spell out clearly and uniformly what the interest charges are in dollars and cents. This also makes it easier for the consumer who wants to shop around to get the best credit deal.

Truth In Lending legislation was almost a decade in the making. WCAU-TV has supported it along a rather rocky legislative route. Now that it is the law of the land, WCAU-TV hails the Truth In Lending legislation as a victory for consumers. Now, because of it, it's substantially easier for you to be a wiser user of credit and a better shopper for credit.

THE MENTAL HOSPITAL CRISIS IN CALIFORNIA

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, my subject is failure. It is the failure of the State of California, specifically the Governor of California, to live up to its responsibility in the care of the mentally retarded and the mentally ill.

XUM

Since the beginning of his term as Governor, Ronald Reagan has wielded a meat ax on California's program for caring for the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. He has turned a nationally recognized system of excellence into a national disgrace, a national scandal. In doing so he has embittered thousands of people in California, Republican and Democrat alike.

The meat ax he has used on the budgets of the State hospitals, has not produced economies, instead it has inflicted wounds on the helpless patients.

A recent report, made public only over the protests of Governor Reagan's administration, points out these conditions. It is the report of the Human Relations Agency on conditions in the 12 State hospitals.

The Fremont News Register in my district recently outlined the conditions of the State hospitals and the Governor's responsibility for them. I include this excellent editorial in the RECORD:

WHO'S RETARDED?

Within days of the date of release of an official report on California's State institutions providing hospital care for the mentally retarded. Governor Ronald Reagan showed his non-concern for the care of the retarded by blue-penciling $500,000 from the state budget for expanding facilities and staffing these institutions.

He had barely started warming the gubernatorial chair when, through Hatchetman Spencer Williams, one-time able assistant county manager of Santa Clara County, the governor started pennypinching mental health service and facilities.

There have been numerous public-relations-oriented official statements and press handouts doubletalking how more service would be provided for less money—efforts designed to allay public anxiety over the slashes in budget and personnel—but conditions at the institutions—which is the only accurate means of measuring service—are abominable for a state as wealthy and presumably civilized as California.

The Human Relations Agency in Sacramento of which Williams is secretary has just made public findings of studies on 12 hospitals. It was like pulling teeth to get the nitty-gritty of the report—much of it was unpublished except for 12 copies—but enterprising reporters have smoked out the full report.

The report on Sonoma State Hospital became public property only after interested citizens obtained a court order for its release. It described Sonoma as a huge, decaying plant; patients herded into barn-like wards with the dignity of the individual wholly violated; a shortage of personnel resulting in minimal custodial care for patients.

And indeed, Sonoma is back in the news with the resignation from the hospital's board of trustees of Thomas J. Farrell, Santa Rosa insurance man, a Republican, whose daughter has been a patient there 15 years.

In his letter of resignation to the governor. Farrell said that since the Reagan-appointed Dr. James V. Lowry assumed directorship of the State Department of Mental Hygiene, "he has seen fit to abolish the annual trustees' meeting; has never consulted with the duly-elected president of the State Hospital Trustees' Association, and has not had any meaningful dialogue with hospital trustees and parents of children in the hospital."

He charged that in the eight years he has been close to the scene, the average IQ of patients has dropped from 50 to 25.

Bitterly, he continued, "It is too bad our retarded children were not born fish, because if they were, they would have the lobbying support of the Izaak Walton League. If they were born animals that lived in the woods, they would have the support of the National Rifle Association. However, they are not fish and they are not animals. They are human beings who cannot speak for themselves, and therefore, because they do not have the support of their fellow human beings, they are placed in hospitals where society does not have to look at them . . ."

If the legislature would take the time to personally look into conditions, interview parents and personnel, it would "come up with an adequate program that could be handled at a reasonable cost to the taxpayer, and would contribute greatly to the welfare of patients," he believes.

The Human Relations Commission's task force found one hospital—DeWitt, near Auburn—so intolerable the Commission recommends phasing it out of existence as soon as its 900 patients can be relocated.

"The physical plant is highly unsuitable. The continued use of punishment and isolation rooms, some without a bed, providing only a mattress and blanket on the floor, implies a major weakness in programming, probably related to more than merely staff shortages."

Napa looks with apprehension at the prospect of absorbing the overflow of retarded patients from Sonoma, the task force found, adding that Napa has achieved "better custodial care in a more humanitarian manner," which has evoked a favorable patient response.

Although it found Porterville State Hospital "poorly designed," with bare day rooms, too few chairs, inadequate toilet facilities and limited living space," the investigators found "excellent" diagnostic and evaluation services there. Overcrowding exists, and rehabilitation at Porterville "may be a misnomer" with only two physical and two occupational therapists.

Agnews it found to be in need of renovation, but the staff possesses "excellent morale," is energetic, flexible and enjoys a sense of achievement.

While Stockton Hospital is in excellent repair, it already is functioning above capacity—this despite the fact the state intends to send 300 more mentally retarded patients there.

Summing, Dr. Irving Phillips, clinical professor of psychiatry at Langley Porter Neuropsychiatric Institute in San Francisco and a member of the task force, has stated that all the state hospitals treating the retarded are "totally inadequate according to modern standards of care."

"We've simply got to break them up. If we cannot normalize the retarded themselves, we can normalize their environment. We can get many more of our retarded doing more if we follow the example of Norway, Sweden, Denmark and even England."

This, it would seem, should be the concern and the goal of Ronald Reagan, rather than trying to make a name for himself as the penny-saver.

VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, as the war in Vietnam drags on, the urgent needs of our cities continue to be unmet. While $30 billion a year is spent on military operations in Southeast Asia, only about $2 billion is being spent in the current fiscal year on housing needs, and the war on poverty—which raised the hopes of so many of our poor and disadvantaged citizens—continues to limp along on less than $2 billion per year.

A letter by W. Stanley Rycroft, chairman of People for Peace, which appeared in the June 11 Yonkers, N.Y., Herald Statesman, points out the concern with which the American population is viewing this imbalance in priorities and underlines the need for Congress to take immediate action to end the war in Vietnam and to reallocate the bulk of our national resources toward solving our growing urban crisis. Mr. Rycroft's call for an end to wasteful and unnecessary Pentagon spending and for greater allocations to the domestic sector is a call which Congress should heed.

The letter follows:

PEOPLE FOR PEACE CHAIRMAN BLASTS WASTE OF VIET WAR

To the HERALD STATESMAN:

It now seems abundantly clear that government at every level in this country—federal, state and city—is facing unprecedented financial stringencies, and a disturbing inability to meet urgent urban needs.

The Budget Director of the City of Yonkers now warns us that certain vital services may have to be curtailed next January unless additional income can be found, and he mentions a city income tax and a county sales tax as possibilities.

The constant increase in taxes—sales, property and income—places an intolerable burden on all citizens, while inflation hits them from all directions. In the meantime, our elected representatives never seem to forget to put up their own salaries.

As the head of a delegation from People For Peace, the writer made a statement before the City Council on May 27, requesting it to urge Congress to scrutinize carefully all proposals for military appropriations, and to make sure that savings from any curtailment of military operations in Vietnam—or from the ending of that unspeakable war—be allocated to the cities instead of being given to the Pentagon to replenish its already bulging arsenal.

In our statement before the Council, we mentioned two aspects of military spending which are causing great concern in the nation, (1) the enormous size of the current defense budget of 80 billion dollars (to which, according to Senator Eugene McCarthy, should be added billions for international programs, research, interest on past wars, and veterans' benefits, and (2) the incredibly extravagant waste of our money on planes and missiles which are never used. On May 12, WCBS-TV showed its viewers one after another of the planes and missiles which had been cancelled, either because they were obsolete, or due to malfunction. Some of these items cost up to two billion dollars each.

How long will the American people tolerate this fantastic waste of their resources, while urgent domestic problems are neglected? In addition to the shocking loss of American lives (over 35,000), the war in Vietnam has already cost the nation over 100 billion dollars. In the decade from 1959 to 1968, U.S. defense outlays amounted to 551 billion dollars. When will this madness stop?

W. STANLEY RYCROFT,
Chairman, People For Peace.

NEW PLAN OF NASA FOR SPACE WORKSHOP WITH APOLLO TELESCOPE MOUNT

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration announced plans today to launch its first orbital workshop in 1972 using the first two stages of the Saturn V as the launch vehicle.

Use of the first two stages of the Saturn V will permit full outfitting of the workshop on the ground and will permit the launching of the workshop with Apollo Telescope Mount attached into a 220-nautical-mile circular orbit.

At an earlier date, NASA announced its intent to use a second stage of the Saturn IB as its first orbital workshop in 1971. After its initial use as a propulsion system to reach earth orbit, the spent stage was to have been prepared by the astronauts while in orbit for the conduct of scientific and biomedical experiments. The Apollo telescope mount was to be launched by another Saturn IB, with automatic rendezvous and docking to the workshop after arrival in orbit.

NASA now plans to use the launch capability of the larger Saturn V to launch the workshop and the ATM together. The workshop will be outfitted on the ground, and will arrive in orbit equipped for immediate occupancy by the astronauts.

Basic program objectives remain the same as those originally announced. The purpose of the workshop is to provide an environment in which man can live and work under controlled conditions for extended periods of time in space beyond that provided by Gemini and Apollo.

The experiments will study man's physiological and psychological responses in the space environment and provide more detailed information on his capabilities for extended manned flight.

The Apollo telescope mount will permit man to conduct astronomical observations under conditions free from optical interference of the earth's atmosphere, and will provide a platform to demonstrate man's ability to perform scientific experiments in space by operating high-resolution astronomical telescopes.

The Saturn V workshop will be launched unmanned from Complex 39 at NASA's John F. Kennedy Space Center, Fla. About a day later a three-man crew will be launched in an Apollo spacecraft atop the smaller Saturn IB vehicle from Complex 34 at Kennedy Space Center. The spacecraft will rendezvous and dock with the workshop and occupy it for up to 28 days during which time Apollo telescope mount experiments will be conducted. Later revisits of up to 56 days' duration will be made using the Saturn IB/Apollo combination.

The Saturn V workshop is a modified SIVB stage which will have its 10,000-cubic-foot hydrogen tank equipped to offer living and working areas for three astronauts for periods of up to 56 days. The Apollo telescope mount will be attached at the forward end of the workshop and launched integrally with the workshop thus making it available for use throughout the workshop operation.

The change in plans will permit simplification of the previously announced 1971 mission as well as augment the capability of that mission to perform space and earth-oriented research. Saturn V hardware from the Apollo program is available to support the revised plan.

CONSERVING THE COUNTRYSIDE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in Roll Call entitled "Conserving the Countryside."

The article follows:

CONSERVING THE COUNTRYSIDE

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

During the past week this writer visited in Northeastern Maine, near the town of Machias. Notable in the past for its rugged rocky coast, for its lobsters and clams, and for the tranquility which city dwellers always seek in the countryside, the face of Machias is now somewhat different.

A mounting crisis has reached the area as plans have been developed for making Machiasport into an international tax-free oil zone. The prospect of an oil refinery in Machias, of huge ships entering a waterway now filled only with lobstermen going about the business of setting their traps, have divided the town.

As with most towns, there are those who seek to keep it the way it has been, and there are those who look forward to the expansion and economic advance which such a change would produce. A payroll adding hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Machias market is certainly a pleasing prospect to local businessmen. The fishermen, however, fear that the possibility of pollution will destroy the waters, and that the entrance and exit of ships will eliminate all possibility of fishing.

Whatever the merits of the issue, whether the Department of Commerce finally decides to permit the plan for an international oil zone or not, the question which faces the citizens of Machias, Maine is also a question which faces the rest of us.

In the San Francisco Bay area, for example, a quietly maneuvered land transaction that preserves 330 acres of marshland indicates a new approach in the effort to save Bay area shorelands from the commercial development that now threatens them.

The Nature Conservancy, a national nonprofit organization in the land-saving business, is purchasing Lower Tubbs Island, a privately owned area amid 2,500 acres of state-owned tidelands at the north end of San Francisco Bay. These 330 acres constitute only a fraction of the 57,000 acres of privately owned bay lands. But Huey D. Johnson, western regional director of the Nature Conservancy, sees the acquisition of Lower Tubbs Island as the first part of a plan to acquire key natural and recreational lands in the bay and on the shore. In as many cases as possible, the conservancy hopes to locate purchases so the effect of preservation will exceed by many times the actual area acquired by the Nature Conservancy.

"By checkerboarding, we can with $10 million worth of acquisitions save $100 million worth of land," says Mr. Johnson. Because almost 70 percent of the water of San Francisco Bay is less than 18 feet deep, the baylands afford a target of opportunity for commercial development. Much of the 276-mile shoreline around the bay already has been purchased by industry and commercial real estate developers.

Another bay-saving activity of a different type has been launched just south of San Francisco. It is an all-out effort to produce citizen political pressure on California state legislators now considering legislation to protect the bay area. The Save Our Bay Action Committee (SOBAC) has been started in Menlo Park by some conservation minded residents. SOBAC has taken out full page two-color ads in Bay Area peninsula newspapers featured by bold, two-inch type stating: "Demand a halt to 122 years of destruction of San Francisco Bay." The ad urges readers to write or wire their "public servants" in Sacramento to support bay conservation.

Whether the problem of conservation is faced in the northern reaches of Maine, or in sunny California, or in any other part of the country, the question is the same. Should we sacrifice what natural beauty which remains for the quick profits brought about by commercial development? Do we not have a responsibility to preserve not only our natural resources, but our natural beauty? Can't a campaign against ugliness be as important to the good health of the nation as a campaign against cigarette smoking?

Americans, by and large, have not thought so in the past. Too busy moving westward and constantly building, we have ignored things which we should not have ignored. The vision which John D. Rockefeller had when he restored Colonial Williamsburg in Virginia was very much a response to this fact. He saw that America, in its rapid movement from coast to coast, had built few memorials, and maintained little of what was old. When a building aged, we tore it down. We felt that there was little value in preserving what was past; there was a desire to break the ties which bind generations together, and not to create new ties. Yet, as Edmund Burke has said, "People will not look forward to posterity who never looked backward to their ancestors." It was this dilemma which Rockefeller attempted to deal with.

Williamsburg is symbolic of gracious living, of deliberation, of conviviality, but not of luxury in our gilted twentieth century way. If Americans were not interested in recapturing the spirit of that age which they held in some reverence, they would have ignored Williamsburg. Instead, it has been made a kind of national shrine.

It is dignified as a shrine not only by the thousands who visit it but by the fact that the government itself has chosen Williamsburg as an initial starting point for the visits in this country of foreign dignitaries. Winston Churchill has visited Williamsburg, as has King Hussein, Queen Elizabeth, and Marshal Tito. We have chosen Williamsburg as a starting point for the exploration of America by such foreign visitors for a reason we may not always understand.

Within the fibre of our being, although not necessarily intellectually, we know somehow that Williamsburg represents something important about the American tradition which Chicago, and St. Louis, and Seattle do not. Perhaps we feel that by returning to our very beginning we can capture the important spiritual values we seem to have abandoned along the way to what Aldus Huxley has called the "Brave New World," and George Orwell called "1984," and other critics and seers still insist upon calling progress.

XUM

Driving into most American towns, the visitor is initially impressed by the ugliness of the hamburger stands, the neon signs, the glaring lights. Beauty seems less and less important, commercial advertising appears to be our ultimate life purpose. And now we see the countryside vanishing. Who was it who said, "If you have seen one Redwood tree you have seen them all"?

But it is not only because of beauty in the abstract that it is important for us to take immediate steps to conserve the natural environment of our country. Men cannot function as man solely in huge, impersonal cities. It is his uprooting from the countryside which has left him alienated and alone in our huge metropolitan areas, and it is essential that a countryside remain to which he may return for the sustenance and perspective it provides.

As Lord Byron reminds us in "Childe Harold," man, through his communion with nature, is better able to commune with his fellow men: "There is a pleasure in the pathless woods,/There is rapture on the lonely shore./There is society where none intrudes./By the deep sea, and music in its roar;/I love not Man the less, but Nature more,/From these our interviews."

If we succeed in destroying nature, in preserving only buildings and machines and other evidences of our industrial and technological era, we will have destroyed an essential element in man's nature. "One touch of nature," Shakespeare wrote, "makes the whole world kin." It is that kinship which is in serious danger.

Conservation must become a national priority, for anyone who has traveled this country widely realizes the danger we face. What if all of our Machiases become oil refineries, where then can we go to look at ourselves and see something other than the reflection of the world from which we seek some distance? The modern world has its virtues, but man has his own imperatives, and man divided totally from nature remains only a part of himself. It is to this subject that more of those who express concern for the future of our society should return.

KERNER COMMISSION—COLORS BEGIN TO SHOW

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, running the thoroughly discredited Warren Commission a close second is the fantastic Kerner Commission, which concluded that the bloody race riots in the North were not the fault of the rioters but were only because the aspirations of the lawless element in our society were not understood by law-abiding citizens.

Gov. Otto Kerner was promptly rewarded by a lifetime appointment as a judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit—just in time to avoid the defeat at the polls which befell his successor as the people of Illinois expressed their opinion on law and order.

The police representative on the Kerner Commission is the liberal Atlanta police chief, Herbert Jenkins. Police officers, through their association, the Fraternal Order of Police, made a blistering attack on Chief Jenkins calling his department "the worst example of police administration we have ever seen." Georgia's Governor, Lester Maddox, indicated that he might send 180 State officers into Atlanta to fight crime.

Meanwhile, back in Chicago, Otto Kerner, now wearing his judicial robes, reversed a ruling of U.S. District Judge Julius J. Hoffman in order to permit one of the Chicago convention riot leaders to make a trip to Hanoi. Judge Hoffman had refused to permit Rennie Davis to leave the jurisdiction of the court pending trial for his part in the Chicago disturbances called, of all things "a police riot," because he did not feel that the court should intrude in political activities or enter the field of foreign relations.

Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Presidential Commissions, with fancy titles, and for the purpose of publicizing preconceived conclusions is a ruse without any further value. The American people have caught on. The colors are showing.

I include two news clippings at this point:

[From the Atlanta Constitution, July 18, 1969]

JENKINS BLASTED BY FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE

(By Bob Hurt)

Leaders of a national policemen's association launched a bitter attack on Atlanta Police Chief Herbert Jenkins Thursday and charged that the Atlanta department is the most poorly administered police force in the nation.

Jenkins was also the target of blistering criticism from local leaders of the association—the Fraternal Order of Police—and came under fire indirectly when Gov. Lester Maddox warned in a speech to the F.O.P. that he may send in a 180-man team of state officers to fight crime in Atlanta.

Only 15 of Atlanta's approximately 800-man police force attended the first day of the two-day seminar that has attracted about 150 policemen from Georgia and 15 other states.

The F.O.P. said more Atlanta officers would have attended, but stayed away because of "intimidation" and warnings from superior officers that membership in the F.O.P. would be the "kiss of death" so far as promotions within the department are concerned.

The seminar, which has as one of its goals the bolstering of Atlanta's struggling F.O.P. chapter of 242 policemen, also attracted three top contenders in the Atlanta mayor's race—Vice Mayor Sam Massell, Aldermen Rodney Cook and G. Everett Millican.

Cook and Massell spoke to the F.O.P. group and used the opportunity to bear down on their support of "law and order" as they define the team, and Massell applied for membership in the F.O.P. Both he and Cook are eligible because as aldermen they have arrest powers.

Millican, who could not speak to the group because he was at the opening ceremonies of his campaign headquarters, said later that he took strong exception with the F.O.P.'s attack on Chief Jenkins.

The F.O.P. denunciation of Jenkins, which dominated all of their comments about the Atlanta Police Department, is only the latest blast in an old feud between the chief and men within his department who want an F.O.P. chapter.

Jenkins has declined to comment on any F.O.P. charges.

Jenkins, who has been chief for 22 years, has said many times that an F.O.P. chapter would lead to a "police union" and the threat of strikes. Despite his opposition, the Atlanta chapter was formally organized last December.

John Harrington, a police sergeant in Philadelphia and national president of the F.O.P., led the attacks on Jenkins during an afternoon press conference.

Of the Atlanta department, he said. "This is a dictatorship. The chief is a czar, and it has ruined morale. Where low morale exists, a high crime rate exists."

He said that since January, 102 Atlanta policemen have resigned from the department, giving it the highest resignation rate of any city police force in the nation.

"This is the worst example of police administration we have ever seen," Harrington said. Asked if he meant that Atlanta has the worst police department in the nation, Harrington said yes.

"You've got a beautiful city here, but it must be as unsafe as hell to walk the streets," the F.O.P. president said.

Harrington and Jenkins have been frequent opponents in the past concerning the issue of policemen belonging to fraternal and professional police organizations, and once debated each other on a television program.

Asked why Jenkins would not want to press for higher pay and better benefits for his department, as the F.O.P. has charged, Harrington said the chief was interested in "not rocking the boat."

Asked how Jenkins had been able to move into top national law enforcement organizations, including being a past president of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Harrington said, "It ain't what you know, it's who you know."

The F.O.P. members voted earlier to send a telegram to President Richard M. Nixon asking that Jenkins be removed from the President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders because he "does not represent the policeman's interests." The telegram was to be drafted and sent Thursday night.

However, the 11-man commission referred to by the F.O.P. was dissolved when it completed its report in March 1968. Chief Jenkins was the only policeman on the commission, appointed by former President Lyndon B. Johnson in 1967 and headed by Illinois Gov. Otto Kerner.

Local F.O.P. members charged that Jenkins has "run off" many former policemen because of their F.O.P. affiliation.

Vice Mayor Massell said that the F.O.P. is "making the wrong person the scapegoat" by attacking Jenkins. He said that the mayor and board of aldermen, including himself, are responsible for the police department operations. He pledged to strengthen the department by both higher salaries and better equipment."

Alderman Cook said he "thinks we have a good department, but I have some questions to ask about it. I will examine this and every other department when I become mayor."

Earlier, Gov. Lester Maddox unloaded with a major attack on city officials in Atlanta for what he called their shortcomings in fighting crime.

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 16, 1969]

PEACE GROUP LEAVES TO AID FLIERS' RELEASE

NEW YORK.—Rennard C. (Rennie) Davis, 28, flew to Paris last night with a delegation of peace activists, en route to Hanoi to obtain the release of three American fliers held by North Vietnam.

Davis, one of eight protesters indicted for actions during last summer's disturbances at the Democratic national convention, was permitted to make the trip by Judge Otto Kerner of the 7th U.S. District Court of Appeals, Kerner had reversed a ruling of U.S. District Judge Julius J. Hoffman, who had refused to allow Davis to make the trip. Hoffman had expressed "great misgivings about the court entering into the field of foreign relations" and said he "did not want to intrude on political activities."

Kerner, a Democrat and Illinois governor from 1961 to 1968, acted on an emergency motion filed on behalf of Davis.

Davis' attorneys had asked Hoffman's permission for Davis to go to Hanoi as head of a four-member delegation as part of an agreement worked out with the North Vietnamese delegation to the Paris peace talks for the release of three American fliers.

Davis left Chicago immediately after Kerner's decision was announced. He flew first to New York and then to Paris.

Davis identified the other members of this delegation to Hanoi as James Johnson, New York, a Negro who refused to serve in Vietnam while an army private at Ft. Hood, Tex.; Grace Taley, New York writer and anti-Vietnam activist; and Linda Evans, Detroit, a national officer of Students for a Democratic Society.

AMERICANS UNITED IN OUTRAGE AT DENIALS OF PERSONAL AND NATIONAL LIBERTY IN EASTERN EUROPE

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, this week Americans have observed Captive Nations Week to pay special tribute to the gallant and suffering people of Eastern Europe, so many of whom still find themselves kept forcibly under the domination of the Soviet Union.

This year the renewed and extended agony of Czechoslovakia has added poignancy to this commemoration, and has given new currency to our indignation. We had hoped things might be getting better, however gradually, in Eastern Europe. Now that hope rests with so many others in a kind of vast international graveyard of things that ought to be.

What a peculiar tragedy it is that almost a quarter century after the end of World War II the Soviet Union continues its oppression of whole nations in Eastern Europe. No longer can the Soviet leaders even conjure up a conceivable aggressor to provide some a faint pretext excuse for their misbehavior toward their neighbors. The offense, always grave, grows worse with time.

Let there be no mistake about this: there are many and profound disagreements among Americans these days, but we stand together in our outrage over the denial of national and personal liberty to so many peoples—peoples who have made such great contributions to Western civilization and to our own national development, and who have such great histories and cultural traditions of their own. We join in prayer for the well-being of these valiant men and women who have kept alive their aspirations for freedom and justice through the long night of foreign occupation and intimidation. Their courage and constancy should inspire Americans to meet our own discouragements and difficulties with less self-pity and greater effort.

A large number of us in the House were privileged and fortunate to be able to begin Captive Nations Week at a luncheon with the Honorable Zbigniew Stypulkowski, representative of the Polish government-in-exile in this country.

Mr. Stypulkowski has been one of the great leaders of his people over three decades, in war and peace, in independence and captivity. He was one of the heroes of the underground during the war, and was captured by both the Russians and the Germans. He endured the horrors of Lubyanka Prison, and emerged as one of the few men to confess nothing to the brainwashers. How much we can learn from such a man. His example of courage, wisdom and sacrifice, and his capacity to retain balance and humor under conditions of extreme adversity, have challenged and inspired those who have known him all over the world through the years of his exile.

What an honor it is to meet with Mr. Stypulkowski as he carries on, undaunted, enlightened, still struggling for freedom for his and all people. We join in saluting him as a personification of the capacity of the free human spirit to survive untold difficulties in pursuit of high purpose, and as an especially valuable representative of the people of Eastern Europe.

Perhaps the example of millions of Americans working to change the policies of their Government could inspire millions of Soviet citizens to do likewise.

Would it hurt the leaders of the Soviet Union, in this period of vastly increased national stability to listen to questioning voices among their own people? Is it really too much to hope that the Soviet Union, in the strength of its military security, could reassess its conduct in Eastern Europe—especially the recent performance in Czechoslovakia—and perhaps could even reassess its policy toward dissent at home? Such a reassessment, if it were to lead to less archaic and more humane attitudes toward its conscience and its neighbors, could only help the Soviet leaders in their desire to influence people around the world.

Such an increase in Soviet influence would be a small price for the world to pay for the easing of the light of those whom we salute during Captive Nations Week. And it would be a great contribution to the possibility of a genuine detente, a detente that could lead to broadened negotiations, and thus perhaps could lead on to peace at last for much of this scarred and tired planet.

HUNGER IN DETROIT

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Detroit Free Press, Mary Ann Weston wrote an article entitled, "Thousands Know: What It's Like To Go Hungry in Detroit." She described the plight of numerous citizens of our city both young and old as they fight the forces of hunger, malnutrition and disease. This problem, of course, is not confined to Detroit alone. It is of national concern.

We are aware that there are many people for one reason or another who are improperly nourished but who do have enough money to eat the right foods. In this article, Miss Weston discusses the plight of another group—no one knows how large—of people who just do not have enough to eat. Into this group are born children who must be given equal opportunity to take their place and to grow in our society without the constant fear of not knowing when they will have another meal. I include this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues and once again I urge a review of our entire welfare system, which to a large degree has permitted these conditions to exist and flourish in our country.

The article follows:

THOUSANDS KNOW: WHAT IT'S LIKE TO GO HUNGRY IN DETROIT

(By Mary Ann Weston)

There are people in Detroit who go to bed at night with empty stomachs, who eat only once a day, who get fat on too much starch and lethargic on too little protein.

There are children who stay home from school because they've had nothing to eat and can't afford 35 cents for a school lunch, old folks who regularly run out of food days before their Social Security checks come, pregnant women who give birth to undernourished—and sometimes retarded—children because the mothers were poorly nourished in pregnancy.

No one knows how many hungry people there are—nor, for that matter, just what constitutes hunger. There are many people—rich and poor—who are improperly nourished but who have enough money to eat the right foods.

But there is another group—no one knows how large—of people who just don't have enough to eat.

Dr. George Pickett, Wayne County health director, said there are 325,000 "medically indigent" children in the county. But no one knows how many of them are hungry. No one really knows how many families are hungry.

Rainwater trinkled into four metal pots dotting the linoleum floor of the mouldering old house near the Fisher Building where the Smith family lives.

The rain splatted on the red linoleum in the dining room because there were more holes than Mrs. Smith had pots. The older Smith children (there are 11) yanked the younger ones out of the puddles.

"It's kind of hard not to be hungry," sighed Mrs. Smith, a large, slow-moving woman who has not completely recovered from heart surgery last winter.

The children, who seemed quiet and polite, stayed home from school that day because they were hungry. They hadn't had anything to eat for 24 hours.

Mrs. Smith said there wouldn't be anything to eat until her husband got home from work at 2:30 with his paycheck. Then she'd go shopping.

When the seven school-aged children do go to school, they come home for lunch. Mrs. Smith said she can't afford the $2.45 a day to buy a 35-cent hot lunch for each child.

Lunch at home is usually sandwiches of bologna or salami or peanut butter and jelly—until there isn't any bologna or peanut butter or bread left for lunch. "We run out of food practically every week," she said.

At their last meal, Mrs. Smith said, "they had some neck bones and white potatoes and rice." And no breakfast.

XUM

The last time the children—except for the baby—had milk was two days earlier.

The last time there were any greens or vegetables or fruit in the house was the previous weekend—five days before.

And, things have been that way for the Smiths for quite a while. "We came from down South, and it was still worse there," Mrs. Smith said.

Smith works at an auto plant. The family used food stamps—Mrs. Smith pays $58 for $82 worth every two weeks.

Smith takes-home about $120 a week. This has to cover rent, utilities, clothes, transportation, medical expenses, incidents, everything for 13 people.

Mrs. Smith prefers to do her grocery shopping alone. She doesn't like to take the children with her, "because they be wanting things." Things like hot dogs and candy and hamburger, and breakfast food in bright packages and cookies and pop-tarts and potato chips.

What is hunger for the children?

"It's feeling empty inside." says the 10-year-old boy.

"It feels like you don't got no food," said his 14-year-old brother.

Mrs. Smith worries about the children. She says they often complain of stomach aches, of being hungry. On paycheck day they say, over and over, "I'll sure be glad when Dad gets here."

"It worries me so bad I think that is the reason I have heart trouble." Mrs. Smith said. "I don't see no way things'll get better, but I guess they will—I hope so."

For many of Wayne County's more than 127,000 public welfare recipients, hunger is always near.

Paul Conlan, director of the Wayne County Department of Social Services, knows the food allowance of 83 cents a day isn't enough.

"We have tried for some years to get increases in the allowances," he said.

The efforts have met with some success. Conlan said there were plans to raise the grants $2 to $3 per person per month on July 1—"depending on how our budget gets through the legislature."

Welfare recipients have been alloted 83 cents a day for food since 1960. Food prices have risen about 20 percent in the same time.

Two years ago a nutritionist with Project PRESCAD (a federally-funded children and adolescent health program) set-up a nutritious diet on a welfare allowance.

"She came within five percent of the allowance," said Dr. Louis Heideman, associate director for pediatric services for PRESCAD. "It could be done, but it requires tremendous skill and know-how."

Skill and know-how that the average ADC mother doesn't have.

There's a bowl of plastic fruit on the coffee table in the living room of Mrs. Violet Jones' little house on the East Side.

Mrs. Jones and her three teenage sons are on ADC. She can't remember the last time they had fruit to eat.

"There's no such thing as three meals a day. We just don't have it," said an 18-year-old son who is about to go into the Navy. "Usually there is no breakfast, just supper at about 3 p.m. When we do have breakfast, it's last night's beans.

"Most of what I eat I get from my friends."

A 17-year-old son was laid off his job when his boss found out he is an epileptic. He is supposed to take medicine three times a day after meals.

When the food runs out before her check comes, Mrs. Jones gets credit at a small neighborhood grocery to tide them over. Then it takes most of the check to cover it.

"After I take it up, I have to pay it back," Mrs. Jones said. "I could take up (charge) more than I could pay back any time."

Food is cheaper at a supermarket, but she can't get credit there. And she would have to pay a jitney—a man who transports shoppers to their homes—a dollar or two to get the food home.

One day last week the Joneses' only meal was blackeyed peas. The day before they had some leftover cooked cabbage and three chicken backs.

"When I don't have any money I try to get by as cheap as I can," she said.

That means a diet of mainly potatoes, beans, bread, cornmeal, hamburger and chicken. "I'm so tired of chicken I don't know what to do, but it's cheapest," said Mrs. Jones.

She gets greens—or cabbage occasionally—when the store has them. "I love vegetables, we all do. But I'm hardly ever able to buy them," she said.

"We don't ever have just what we want to eat. We're just eating to live off it—just something to keep living."

Mrs. Jones, who can't work because of arthritis, daydreams about pork chops and steak. "If I could buy something like that I know it would change my taste a little. I ate so many beans when I was young that I hate beans. They don't kill my hunger no way. It's just like I never ate anything."

Often, the "experts" say hunger is a result of poor money management. Mrs. Gloria Brown, an organizer for the Detroit Metropolitan Welfare Rights Organization (WRO), says that, given their miniscule budgets, recipients do quite well.

Food is usually the item that comes last in a poor family's budget. Bills for rent, utilities, payments on car or furniture usually get paid first. What's left over goes for groceries.

Though food stamps are a help to some, many welfare families can't scrape together the lump sum to buy them.

Sister Annette Marie Byrne, a nurse at St. Joseph Mercy Clinic, told of one family.

"They'd need about $34 for the initial stamps and they can't save that up," she said. "They live from day to day. They're too poor to get enough money ahead to buy stamps."

When Sister Annette first heard of this family—mother, daughter, and the daughter's five children—they had been subsisting on grits, day-old bread, dried beans or peas. They got an ADC check of $170 every two weeks. "The children were not getting milk. The little meat they got was usually frozen TV dinners because the family had no refrigerator to keep meat," Sister Annette said.

The mother came to the clinic when she was expecting her fifth child. She was underweight and anemic. Iron deficiency anemia is frequent among people who do not get enough iron and protein.

The children were not getting enough protein.

The family is doing better now because Sister Annette helped them with food from the Capuchin Monastery supplemented by things bought from her own budget.

According to Mrs. Brown of the Welfare Rights Organization, families on welfare are "constantly in a bind" to make their budgets stretch.

In an attempt to help things a little, the WRO gave the Department of Social Services forms for several hundred women and children, requesting special diets to alleviate malnutrition. The forms were all signed by doctors.

The special diets would have raised the daily food allowances from 83 cents to 96 cents.

The requests were turned down by the department.

Paul Conlan, head of the department, said there was not an adequate diagnosis and that the doctors had not actually examined the women and children whose forms they signed.

Anyway, Conlan said, "malnutrition is not a diagnosis." He said there was a provision in welfare regulations for a malnutrition diet, "but it would have to be associated with a medical problem."

The trouble is, Mrs. Brown said, malnutrition often goes undiagnosed, even when patients have other medical problems.

Mrs. Forester of Crittenton Clinic added, "Often it is hard to discover who is hungry and who is not. Some patients are willing to tell you. Others try to hide it." Some, she indicated, are too proud to admit they don't have enough to eat.

Federal surplus food now can be "prescribed" for undernourished patients at the obstetrics clinics at Crittenton, Detroit Memorial, Hutzel and Mt. Carmel Mercy hospitals. At Crittenton alone, about 80 orders a month have been written since February.

Dr. Crockett said: "Starvation? Yes, we see it."

She told of one elderly woman who confessed she ate scraps scrounged from Eastern Market. Her son was sent home from school because he was to hungry to learn.

Teachers in Detroit schools learn to spot the symptoms of hunger: Children who are unusually quiet, listless, sleepy, who seem frail or pale, whose skin seems dry.

"A child who comes to school hungry is not apt to have much energy to divert to learning," said Dr. Elsie Jinks, divisional director of the Detroit Schools' department of evaluative services.

Children at schools that serve breakfast "are more alert because they are freed from the basic drive to satisfy thier hunger."

The Detroit Public Schools do provide free lunches. Just who gets them is officially at the discretion of the principal.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has recommended that welfare children automatically get a free lunch.

But the board of eduction can't afford to do that. Last year it cost the schools $461,000 to give free lunches. The year before, it was $300,000, in addition to a partial federal subsidy.

In March, an average of 8,967 free lunches a day were served. But there are about 50,000 ADC recipients' children in the Detroit schools, and no one knows how many other hungry children there are whose families don't receive welfare.

Regulations say the principal can grant or deny free lunches based on whether the child can go home for lunch, or bring a lunch from home, and the family's economic situation.

Each free lunch grant is to be "reinvestigated" at least every semester.

The financially hard-pressed schools are serving more free lunches and so far no principals' requests have been turned down.

But, in 70 "poverty schools" there are no lunches at all—free or otherwise.

One of the schools that has a large number is Burton, at Cass and Peterboro, where the principal, Miss Monica Mullally, said: "We're pretty liberal with free lunches here. It's very hard to deprive a child of lunch when the parent, through no fault of the child, didn't budget for it."

Often when a family has run out of food and can't get more, the Salvation Army steps in to help. According to Mrs. Ada Fraser, 20 to 35 people a day come to the lodge at 78 Peterboro seeking help—about half of them seeking food.

Many of them are elderly, on Social Security or other small, fixed incomes.

According to Mrs. Fraser, it's not unusual for old folks to come in for food orders after they have been mugged and their money or groceries taken.

"That happens quite often," Mrs. Fraser said, "It is a common situation in the inner city."

A plump, efficient-appearing woman who sees the city's hungry daily, Mrs. Fraser manages a quiet kind of anger when she talks about it.

"In this city there is hunger," she said, "Because so many have missed the mainstream, especially the older people. And everyone is so busy making a living, they forget this exists."

THE PEOPLE ARE SPEAKING—ARE WE LISTENING

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday I appeared before the Democratic National Party Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection at New Orleans, La.

Because I remain convinced that the will of the American people should not be denied and cannot be denied—that people punish political parties and politicians—not vice versa, I include the text of my remarks:

Statement of Mr. Rarick

Mr. Chairman, I am John Rarick from Baton Rouge, Louisiana, and I am a Louisiana Democrat, serving as the Representative in Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of Louisiana.

Before going to Congress, I served five years as an elected District Judge. As a young man, before coming to Louisiana, I was a member of the Democratic Party of Indiana where I had the pleasure of serving as City Chairman of the Indiana Democratic Party at Goshen, Indiana. I have never been a member of any other political party than the Democratic Party of the state in which I resided.

Upon learning that your Commission was entering my state to hear witnesses on party structure, delegate selection, and grassroots participation—not having been invited, I have taken the initiative to ask that I might be permitted to appear and give testimony that I feel is representative of my people.

I think that I should add that I have contacted Mr. Arthur Watson, the State Chairman of our Party, and Mr. J. W. Ellis, elected Sixth District Democratic Chairman of my District and was astonished to learn that neither had received notice from this Committee or been invited to appear.

If such is the case, I can but advise you that I feel such lack of courtesy seems to have been our consistent experience with some of the National Party Representatives and may well explain why the Party was fatally divided last November and why it remains fragmented today.

If it is the intent of this Committee truly to move forward into the traditional strength of the Democratic Party, by opening the umbrella for the admission not only of all minority and pressure groups but for the great majority of the American people, then I think that your hearings can serve a useful purpose.

On the other hand, if the purpose for your hearings is merely to enter into our Democratic state—one of only two all Democratic delegations in Congress, the other one being Mississippi—under some subterfuge to usurp or by-pass the existing state party structure—elected by the Louisiana Democrats, then I most strenuously object to your action and ask that my objection to your proceedings on any such scheme or plan be reserved in the record of these hearings.

We Democrats of Louisiana are proud of our record of political independence and determination. As true Democrats feeling that our duty is to our people and our state, we have stood steadfastly against unrelenting pressures to oppose ideas and philosophies that we consider not only detrimental to the best interests of our people but likewise the United States.

It is no secret that the elected state Democratic Central Committee of Louisiana by democratic action voted not to permit the candidate of the national party to run under our emblem in last November's election—the Louisiana party's right to do so was upheld by the Supreme Court of our state. It is no secret that an Alabama Democrat, George C. Wallace, running as an independent was the overwhelming choice of Louisiana Democrats last November.

Likewise the election returns show that the ticket nominated in Chicago—on incumbent Vice President—backed by all the prestige of the federal government, the United States Treasury and political patronage could not interest 40% of the American people in the candidates or the Chicago platform.

This is past history—I don't think party discipline or revenge will accomplish anything unless the representatives of states outside Louisiana wish to deliberately destroy the Democratic Party of Louisiana. And I remind the Commission of the wisdom of the American Democratic voters, for at this very moment Mr. Humphrey, the former Vice President and national party candidate is behind the Iron Curtain fraternizing with the Communists in Soviet Russia.

The problem that faces you is not that Mr. Humphrey was defeated, nor that Mr. Wallace carried the state, but rather—if your interest is broadening the appeal of the party to the voters—the question is "why?"

Any observer of the mood of the American people and of "grass-roots" political action can readily see that from Los Angeles to Minneapolis to New York City, the American people are repudiating the failures of national socialism. Louisiana and other southern Democrats have been in the forefront of this inevitable wave of the future. There is no need to create appearances of grassroots interest and activity when it already exists in mounting proportions.

In flat, the majority of the American people—the decent, hard-working taxpayers—have become fed up with 30 years of flowery promise and abject failure to produce. If the party does not go back to the people—the people will abandon the party in ever-increasing numbers.

At present, the extremist views of a handful of men, who are self-appointed spokesmen of the national party, have become so offensive and objectionable to the American people, they bring the party—the very name "Democrat"—into public contempt.

I feel that any astute observer of politics in the United States must realize that if there is any gap in our country, it is a responsibility gap—a gap between the political specialists, the government leaders and the people. And it does no good for the promoted leadership to talk among themselves and figure out how to fool the people by talking of party purges, party discipline, and party loyalty oaths.

You can not deny the American people their vote and their preferences, and if we do not offer them a choice within the party, they will leave and seek out a candidate of their own. If the heralded right to vote means anything, it means more than a captive vote for a minority-controlled candidate—a right to vote only for the lesser of two evils. It must mean the right of the people to vote proudly for a candidate who best expresses their beliefs, wants, and aspirations.

If the party expects loyalty from the people, it must first demonstrate its loyalty to the people. So long as it is loyal only to minorities, it will receive support only from minorities.

If the party leadership proposes to recruit mindless and unqualified members who can be manipulated to vote as a bloc—who will take orders—and accept party discipline without a struggle—those leaders should candidly admit their intentions and form a Fourth party as a vehicle for their ideology rather than masquerade under the name and banner of the Democratic Party.

If we trust the democratic system we must trust the will of the people. There should be no room in our party for hand-selected delegates or other representatives who are not responsible to the people of the state.

The weaknesses of the existing national Democratic Party will continue so long as it remains without an honest and substantial base. It can have no strength from the top down if it is not based on a firm foundation, meeting the goals—not of the party—but of the people themselves. True improvement for the national party would be to realize that the greatest political strengths in our country are at the state level and therefore every effort must be made to return confidence and recognition to the state parties—rather than the seemingly increased tendency to concentrate more and more control in a handful of opportunists who seem more bent on promoting their own political future than in entering into dialogue with the real reservoir of political savvy and the closest liaison with the voter—the state Democratic committees.

We must stop playing headline politics and start putting the good of our country and people ahead of party control. To represent the majority of the American people should be our goal. Their views are clear. They have been unmistakably expressed at the polls—in November 1968, in Los Angeles, in Minneapolis, and in New York.

We should get our party in line with the American people and not waste time trying to whip the American people into line with our party. The majority of the American people are Democrats—Let them come home.

GOOD STATESMANSHIP AND UNDERSTANDING OF TOM PAINE, NASA ADMINISTRATOR

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration,
Office of the Administrator,
July 18, 1969.

Dear Jim: This record of my talk with Rev. Abernathy at the Cape may interest you.

We're working on your suggestion to speed up our legislation, but its extremely difficult now.

Delighted you were with us at the launch of Apollo 11, and that—so far—everything has gone well.

Tom Paine.

Memorandum

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration,
Washington, D.C., July 17, 1969.

On Tuesday morning, July 15, while Dr. Debus and I were driving from the Apollo Executives meeting at KSC to Patrick Air Force Base to meet former President and Mrs. Johnson, we discussed the Rev. Abernathy's SCLC group and security measures which were being taken to avoid possible disruption of the launch activities. He expressed some concern that demonstrations might block access to the Kennedy Space Center which, with expected traffic conditions, might prevent technicians reaching their work stations during the final countdown. I told him that if it would help avoid potential difficulties, I would be glad to meet with the Rev. Abernathy, listen to his statements, and respond as appropriate. Dr. Debus immediately telephoned his security people from the car to contact the Rev. Abernathy and offer him a meeting in the afternoon. The message came back somewhat later that the Rev. Abernathy would indeed welcome such an opportunity, so we made an appointment to visit his camp just outside the Kennedy Space Center gate at 3 p.m. I designated Julian Scheer as the only person to accompany me, but asked that the press not be invited, although they could be told about it in response to queries.

Julian and I drove out to the site, arriving at 3:00, and directed that the Florida police present there not accompany us to the meeting. The Rev. Abernathy sent word via the NASA security man that he would like us to stand in the north end of the roped-off field so that he could assemble his people at the south end and march over to us. Julian Scheer and I walked over to the appropriate position in the field. It was a somewhat dramatic picture. We were coatless, standing under a cloudy sky, with distant thunder rumbling, and very light mist of rain occasionally falling. After a good deal of chanting, oratory and lining up, the group marched slowly toward us, singing "We Shall Overcome." In the lead were several mules being led by the Rev. Abernathy, Hosea Williams and other leading members of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. The leaders came up to us and halted, facing Julian and myself, while the remainder of the group walked around and surrounded us. A microphone and loudspeaker were produced, and several press photographers snapped photos. The Rev. Abernathy gave a short speech in which he deplored the conditions of the nation's poor, stating that although he had no specific quarrel with the space program, it represented an inhuman priority at a time when so much suffering exists in the nation. One fifth of the population lacks adequate food, clothing, shelter and medical care, he said. The money for the space program, he stated, should be spent to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, tend the sick, and house the shelterless. He pointed out that his people were Americans too, with no homeland but America, and wanted to improve their lot in this country. He developed this theme at some length. He had three requests to make of me:

#1 in his scale of priorities was that ten families from his group be given passes to enter KSC and join the VIP's viewing the launch the next day.

#2 was that I support the movement to combat the nation's poverty, hunger and other social problems, and

#3 was that the scientists, engineers, and experts of NASA find new ways to use their skills to tackle the problem of hunger. He understood that we had developed new sources of nutrition in our program, for example. He then passed the microphone to me.

I stated that with respect to his first request, I would be delighted to invite the ten families which he requested to join us and the many other Americans who would be viewing the launch to the moon. (Julian Scheer later extended this to include one busload of the Rev. Abernathy's people; with breakfast and a candy bar placed on each seat of the bus.) I then said that I wished it were as easy to meet his other two requests. I stated that if we could solve the problems of poverty in the United States by not pushing the button to launch men to the moon tomorrow, then we would not push that button. I said that the great technological advances of NASA were child's play compared to the tremendously difficult human problems with which he and his people were concerned. I said that he should regard the space program, however, as an encouraging demonstration of what the American people could accomplish when they had vision, leadership, and adequate resources of competent people and money to overcome obstacles. I said I hoped that he would hitch his wagons to our rocket, using the space program as a spur to the nation to tackle problems boldly in other areas, and using NASA's space successes as a yardstick by which progress in other areas should be measured. I said that although I could not promise early results, I would certainly do everything in my own personal power to help him in his fight for better conditions for all Americans, and that his request that science and engineering assist in this task was a sound one which, in the long run, would indeed help.

He thanked me for my remarks and for coming to meet them. I said that I was there because they had invited me and because I wanted to be there. I said that I had one request to make of his people: that in the prayer meeting he had scheduled for that evening they would pray for the safety of our astronauts. He responded with emotion that they would certainly pray for the safety and success of the astronauts, and that as Americans they were as proud of our space achievements as anybody in the country. We shook hands all around and Julian and I returned to the Kennedy Space Center.

T. O. PAINE,
Administrator.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURPHY

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, two topics most talked about by Americans today are taxes and inflation. Higher taxes and rising prices are gouging deeply into the taxpayers' hard-earned income. He is demanding relief, and rightfully so, from his Government. These two problems and proposals for overcoming them were analyzed this week in a superb speech by California's distinguished senior Senator, GEORGE MURPHY, before the Comstock Club, in Sacramento. So that our colleagues in the House can have the benefit of Senator MURPHY's assessment of these two problems, I insert the text of his speech in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURPHY

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Guests, Gentlemen: I know that every speaker who addresses this distinguished body begins with telling all of you how pleased he was to get the invitation. I would like to go beyond that and congratulate you on your excellent timing. This meeting today will serve as a sort of belated birthday celebration for me. And, of course, as always, it is a great pleasure to have the opportunity to come back to Sacramento to the seat of government of the Great State which I represent in Washington.

I might say that I am happy to be here at the end of July rather than at the early part of the month. My good and longtime friend, Governor Reagan, observed the Fourth of July in Sacramento with the Legislature and the celebration went off just a few days ahead of time. That fireworks display, you will be glad to know, was bright enough to be seen in the press in Washington, D.C. as well as clear across the country. And I would like to congratulate him on making possible a safe and sane Fourth for the rest of us, particularly those who were wondering whether they were going to get paid or not.

You know, it occurred to me that day that I must be getting much stronger because on my birthday a year ago my dear wife sent me to the market and a box boy had to help me carry ten dollars worth of groceries to the car. And this year he put the whole thing in one small brown sack and I could have carried it in my mouth.

On the way home I picked up the afternoon paper. In addition to the report of the Governor's budget problems, there were a number of other disturbing items. There was the continuing story of the general complexities and problems of our civilization all over the world, and particular focus on the tale of the agony of the Los Angeles School District. You are all aware, of course, that the Los Angeles Board of Education, for the first time in its history, has been forced to adopt a deficit budget. There is just not enough money to pay the bills. Superintendent Jack Crowther has been forced to recommend drastic cuts in various essential educational services. His problems are repeated not only throughout the State of California but also in most of the 35 large cities in our nation. In June, for example, voters in Oakland, San Jose, Marin County, and Livermore all turned down tax increases for education for one reason or another. The net result was the same.

There was also a report in the financial section of this same paper telling of the effect on businesses of spiraling interest rates, a serious concern of the manufacturers and industrialists, the building industry over the cost of money, labor and materials. You all must have read, as I did, of the demands of the plumbers union in Southern California for a four-day work week with a raise from $5.79 to $9.30 in pay and dramatic increases in wages and fringe benefits; the strikes of the nurses in the hospitals in Los Angeles; the problems of the teachers; the longshoremen; grape boycotts; and all of the other disconcerting and disturbing problems of our great complex society.

In yet another article, welfare recipients were complaining that increases in the cost of living and in the general cost of food were destroying the value of the checks they were receiving, making it impossible for them to get along on the small subsistence provided for them.

There are accounts of similar problems all across the country. In Chicago, Governor Ogilvie had warned that his state is teetering "on the brink of bankruptcy." Wisconsin had to deal with a $416 million revenue gap. And in North Carolina, Governor Scott did an unheard of thing in that famous old tobacco growing state, where tobacco was considered sacrosanct. He was so desperate he even proposed a tax on cigarettes. And at the same time, in Washington, D.C., the Department of Labor announced yet another increase in the cost of living—six percent for the first six months for the year 1969.

I am pleased to say, however, that all the news is not bad, and there are some very hopeful signs appearing on the horizon. Under the new Administration of Richard Nixon, our Federal Government is, for the first time in a decade, facing up to the realities of our national fiscal crisis and advocating policies which will return our economy to a safe and sound basis. Politics has been, at long last, replaced by practicality. Obviously, this return to fiscal sanity and health cannot be accomplished immediately or without some major irritation. You cannot effect a cure resulting from twelve years of injective fiscal malignancy with one trip to the doctor's office. And may I say the medicine will not always be pleasant to take. But I think we all agree that we must do whatever is necessary to cure the disease of inflation which eats away at all the permanent values of our system, destroys the increases in wages and salaries, stock values, and which, worst of all, punishes the old and the thrifty by devouring their hard-earned savings. And this problem must be cured now. We can put it off no longer.

I am happy to report to you that the one concern of all economists with regard to inflation is the necessity for a balanced budget, and I can report that after six months of the Nixon Administration, it would seem that we most certainly will have a balanced budget. And better than that, you can imagine how we in Congress, who have long pleaded for fiscal responsibility, welcome the sight of a surplus in the first budget presented by the new Administration. And, may I say this is the first surplus that has been achieved in the Federal Government in nine years, since President Eisenhower ended his administration with a $1.2 billion surplus. And, just as important, we welcome the return of an attitude of painstaking care in the spending and use of taxpayers' hard earned dollars, of an attitude that free spending does not necessarily cure all of our problems. That, in fact, free spending may be responsible for many of our problems, that practical planning is necessary, that we should know what we are going to do before we rush into operation and waste time, effort and money. Unfortunately, one theory that I have found rampant in Washington is that if you have a program that is not working right, just pour some more taxpayers' dollars into it and it will pick up speed and just work fine. Now, you and I know that that isn't exactly always the truth. Sometimes these programs are wrong; and often they overlap; sometimes the thinking that went into them was improper, and sometimes a lot of these programs never should have started in the first place.

With a sound economic basis, our government, without question, can help the individual citizens in private enterprise in this country to grow as it has in the past and to continue to provide for all of our people the highest standard of living that man has ever achieved.

As stated briefly, may I say that I believe that there are more efficient ways of using the tax dollars collected from our already overburdened citizens than are presently in effect. And the plans that I have proposed, and will be proposing, will be designed to make the same amount of tax dollars return more benefits to our people. I think this is a good place in which to start.

The problems this country faces at home and abroad are at a crisis level. They range from the war in Vietnam, where our President is leading the way, hopefully, toward an honorable, peaceful solution to the difficulties in our cities and suburbs and our slums at home. These problems are real, and they have been with us for a long time. Those who chose to ignore them or do nothing about them have not only neglected their obligation to fund the cures which in the beginning might have been simple, but they have provided more time for the complications to multiply, and thereby have increased the necessity for drastic measures.

Two of the issues presently before us in Washington, about which I know you are reading and hearing a lot, are the ABM and the extension of the surtax. I think that before going on to my principal subject for today I should report to you briefly on where these two matters stand.

With respect to the President's proposal to construct the Safeguard ABM System, I believe the opponents have spread much unfortunate confusion. The first question raised is whether or not we need such a defensive system. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I have listened to much expert testimony by members of the military and I have heard the request of the President who is, in the final analysis, responsible for this nation's security. And I might add that in the current fiscal crisis he is as anxious to cut corners and save money as is anyone—if not more so. Based upon the evidence, I am sure that we need this system to help keep the peace by depriving any other nation of the temptation of feeling it has the power to knock us out.

Next it is argued by some members of the scientific community that the system will not work. Others, of course, have established that the components of the system do work and that the only real way we will know about the effectiveness of the system is to construct one—and they feel it is worth doing. I have noticed that those scientists who argue against the system have a long record of opposing the establishment of effective military systems over the past years.

And then there is the argument that we dare not construct a military system which might offend the Russians—even though they of course have done the same thing already. I would point out that the Russians have not stated this would offend them and that certainly President Nixon is anxious to go as far as safety will permit in working with them toward a lasting peace. In the final analysis, of course, the decision must be based upon the needs of our national security, and I believe that this criterion leaves us no choice in this decision. That is why every poll shows that the American people overwhelmingly endorse the President's proposal and it is why I believe the Senate will support the President when the vote finally comes.

With respect to the tax bill, the Senate Finance Committee presently has before it the Administration-sponsored bill to extend the surtax which was passed by the House of Representatives. Unfortunately some members of the Democratic leadership are attempting to withhold action on the surtax, asserting that such action should not be taken without comprehensive tax reform. I would point out that the Democratic Party, now crying so for tax reform, has controlled Congress since 1954 without passing such proposals and that their leaders were in the White House since 1961 without fabricating such measures. You can understand why I am suspicious of the argument now being advanced.

I am not only suspicious. I am upset because I believe that everyone who has studied the matter recognizes that fast action on the surtax extension is necessary to provide the cornerstone to the admirable program of the Administration to combat inflation. This should not wait for the deliberation required in putting together a comprehensive tax reform bill. Nor is it necessary to use the surtax as a sweetener to force tax reform, because President Nixon, the leadership of both political parties, and members of both Houses of Congress, most certainly including myself, and certainly the American public, are strongly for tax reform. Furthermore, the House Ways and Means Committee is presently considering such a tax reform bill, and it would seem sensible that the Senate wait for that bill, which Chairman Mills has promised to report before our August recess, so that we can benefit from all the study and resources which will have gone into constructing it. This is the logical way to do it.

It is all too obvious that politics has crept into both the opposition to the ABM and the immediate extension of the surtax, but I believe the people know what is right in these matters and that their will in the end will prevail.

In the months ahead, from time to time, I hope I will have a chance to be discussing with you many of these problems, the steps which have already been taken toward their solution and proposals which will be made in the future. In the limited time available today, however, I want to share with you my thinking in one of these areas.

We all know that two-thirds of all taxes collected in the United States today find their way to the Federal Government in Washington. State and local governments are left with only one-third, and today, my friends, this is just not enough to meet the needs at the local level. The portions that dribble back from Washington to the state and local governments in the form of grants or matching funds, and all the rest of the ways in which it is handled, is subject to a handling charge by a series of bureaucratic middlemen each step of the way, very often supervised by inexperienced enthusiasts who are uncertain in their design and sometimes faulty in their desires. I have tried to get reliable figures on what this handling charge amounts to and I have arrived at all sorts of figures from 20 percent to 45 percent. That's just for brokerage. Remember this, my friends. Our citizens don't live in Washington. That's where the Federal Government lives. Citizens of the United States live in the fifty states, and they live in the counties and the cities and on the farms. And I think all the expertise in finding the solutions to these problems may not be concentrated in the Federal Government, or in the federal bureaucracy. I know there are many people at the local level with a great deal of talent, knowledge and experience and determination to find answers to some of these problems.

Most of the states, I find, and I think this includes California, have exhausted all proper potential sources of revenue. As a result, local and state governments are becoming less able to meet public demands for better schools, law enforcement, highways, mass transit facilities, health care, parks, recreation facilities, and for the basic protection of the subsistence level of those who are otherwise unable to help themselves. We find endless numbers of people spending endless hours looking for new ways to take more and more tax dollars away from the defenseless, and I believe already overtaxed, citizens.

But the Federal Government—that great colossus on the polluted Potomac—already seems to have drained off all the available resources, and it has expanded its size and scope and its endless need for more funds, as the years have gone by. Centralize the control has been the watchword. Well, I hope those days have come to the end. Federal assistance to states and municipalities has risen from one billion dollars in 1946 to 15 billion dollars last year, and is expected to reach an overwhelming figure of 60 billion dollars by 1975. We find there are about 200 separate federal aid programs now on the books, financed by more than 400 separate appropriations and administered by 21 federal departments and agencies. There are more than 100 federal aid programs just for education. This massive bureaucracy has developed a substructure of 150 Washington bureaus and 400 regional offices. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has 386 separate advisory committees made up of 5,308 employees at a cost of $7 million yearly. Of every tax dollar paid in by Californians, as near as one can calculate, at least 65 cents goes to the Federal Government. And this leaves just 35 cents to finance those services closer to home, closest to you. And I think that this is way out of balance. And I believe that we should now start to make this division more equitable.

Add to that the fact that our state enjoys such great national blessings that we have about 30,000 people a month unable to withstand the temptation to come here and live

XUM

permanently, is it any wonder that the State of California and the local school districts have crucial budget problems today?

That is why the concept called tax sharing was advocated some time ago by colleagues of my political persuasion—the lead taken by the Republican Governors in the 1960's. I am happy to say that last year, as a member of the leadership in the Republican Policy Committee, I helped in writing the tax sharing proposal which was adopted at that time. And the plan was relatively simple. It will allow the Federal Government to remit to each state a portion of the taxes collected in that state. This would have an obvious advantage for us in California. It would return actually more money to California than any other state for the simple reason that our taxpayers pour more money into the federal coffers than any other state.

Not long ago, those of us in the California delegation in Congress received a request from Governor Reagan in which he suggested a form of federal tax sharing to meet California's acute educational crisis. I have given it long and careful consideration because I believe as does the Governor, that the focus on education is probably the right place to begin. We hear and read a lot about the one percent of our youth who are troublemakers and, because he has defended the 99 percent who want to get an education, sometimes our Governor has been subjected to abusive attack. But I am glad, at long last, that not only in the State of California but clear across the Nation he is beginning to command the complete high regard and respect of so many thoughtful citizens for the courageous and determined stand which he has taken in the defense of our free system of education. I have been trying, as your Senator, to help the children of this nation stay in school. I authored a Dropout Prevention Program which was incorporated in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1967. Every year one million students drop out of school. One million of our youngsters drop by the wayside to face a life that could possibly put them on the welfare dole, in prison, or, at best, on a hard, uphill treadmill that will not allow them to achieve their full potential.

I know from my experience that education and job training are needed today as never before, and so I have worked successfully for the model vocational school and the skill center program, and I have pushed hard for the Cooperative Vocational Educational Program which has proved to be so successful over the years and to stimulate the development of work-study programs at the secondary school level. I co-authored the Bilingual Education Act which would give our Spanish-speaking children a chance to get an even start in the primary schools. Last week I introduced a bill, the Urban and Rural Education Act of 1969, which I believe will aid the cities and impoverished rural districts and rescue them from growing fiscal crises and enable them to compensate for the educational deficiencies of disadvantaged students.

I have been told by several of my colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, that they believe this to be the most significant education legislation before Congress this year.

We have an intolerable situation today in the United States where large numbers of students with significant education handicaps are found in school districts with resources unequal to the challenge of educating them. This challenge, I feel, is more difficult and as exciting as the moon race. Earlier in our history, the city's wealth was tapped to equalize educational opportunities in less affluent areas. Now that situation is reversed and our major cities are in desperate need of financial help in this critical field. Time is running out.

I have similarly been involved in support of the Teacher Corps, funding for school aid to disadvantaged youngsters, handicapped children's early education assistance, Vocational Education Act and the Higher Education Act of 1968. These experiences I guess help to account for my receptiveness to the Governor's suggestion for tax-sharing as a direct aid to education. And I believe that the time has come not just for Congress to begin sharing its taxing ability with the states but to actually share the taxes. In my judgment I consider the field of education one of our most critical and so I have directed my original proposal to that area for a start. I think it's a good place to begin.

And so I announce to you today that I will introduce in the Senate shortly a resolution in support of a complete in-depth study for the concept of tax-sharing with specific emphasis on the availability of such share funds to be used to meet local educational needs. I know there are some questions that will be raised and that must be settled about the proposal, but I am quite confident they can be resolved. Such Senate resolutions are not, of course, legislation in the formal sense. But they are a means of summoning the support of members of the Senate to the concept itself and to create an atmosphere of dedication and determination, to get at the job of finding the proper programs to take care of these particular needs.

As you may know I introduced in April, as a co-author with Senator Baker of Tennessee, a broad base tax-sharing proposal which is presently before the Senate Finance Committee. This bill would result initially in a rebate to the State of California of approximately $95 million, about $5.00 for every man, woman, and child in the state, and the best available estimates for protected increase in the rebate over the next three years to about $400 million.

As we have discovered, however, there is a danger in waiting for funds to come back from Washington. And a critical time lag takes place. Then there's the handling charge and the bureaucrats to toss in some special conditions to make certain that the states will hew to the line made by the bureaucrats and that all at the state level would be at lest partially dependent upon Washington for the use of the money, which, strangely enough, came from the citizens within the states.

These self-evident facts emerge for any realistic discussion of this general issue.

(1) Some form of federal tax, state tax sharing is necessary to meet the present urgent needs.

(2) The greatest of these needs, and the one which legislative bodies must be most sensitive of, is in the field of education, and

(3) The maximum amount of dollars may be made available for local use if they are paid directly to the local government rather than being paid first to Washington and then sent back.

For these reasons, I will soon introduce legislation which will allow a direct credit of up to one percent of the taxpayers' federal income for money that he pays to the state to be used for education.

This is direct sharing of tax revenues, I believe, in the most efficient manner. It is also, I think, the most readily attainable type of tax sharing and will help to meet the most pressing need, in the shortest period of time.

This type of tax credit—not a return from Washington but a natural direct credit before it ever gets to Washington—will enable local government to meet its obligations without imposing further unneeded, unbearable burdens on its taxpayers. By eliminating the federal middleman, it will increase the available potential use of the tax dollars by possibly thirty percent or maybe even more. And, in the long run, it may have the effect of making a tax reduction possible. I firmly believe this to be a practical, partial answer to our immediate problem of legislation and its cost. There is no doubt that Californians consider education their most important single investment.

In the last fiscal year, the state spent more than $2 billion for education—over thirty-six percent of the total budget. Our citizens are determined that their children must get the benefit of the best schools possible, and they must be given this right whatever their race—black, brown, yellow or white. And I believe that this proposal will help bring this to reality and by the next Fourth of July make it possible for Governor Reagan, the school districts of the State of California, and all of the families of children up and down the state to have a new and extremely important reason for a very, very gala celebration.

I also believe it will help to set a pattern which may form a basis for a complete tax reform which certainly we have needed in this country so very desperately for many, many years.

I hope that it will not be too long before I will be able to announce to you that my plan has been accepted and is under way.

And in the meantime, may I give you my sincere thanks for the pleasure of your company and your patience today.

PROSTITUTION IN DETROIT

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 22, the Detroit Free Press carried an article in a Detroit magazine entitled, "Prostitution in Detroit," in which the author, Ronald L. Phillips, related the tragic story of girls who become trapped in the world of prostitution, the majority of whom come from homes where the parents were divorced or never were married. I urgently request my colleagues to read this article which I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the warning that it is a story with an unhappy beginning and a perfectly dismal ending. Every effort should be made to rescue these girls.

The article follows:

PROSTITUTION IN DETROIT: OUT ON THE STREETS, WHERE THE GIRLS ARE; THIS, TERRIBLY AND REALLY, IS THE WAY IT IS

(By Ronald L. Phillips)

Tami walks briskly up Third St. She feels a little better now. The bleeding's stopped at least. And so far her dinner has stayed with her.

Tami knows exactly where she's going, and she marches eyes front. A little while later, she'll retrace this route and take her time. Then she'll let her eyes meet the eyes of the johns cruising the area in their cars.

Tami looks down at her new outfit. Suede—all suede. Suede pants. Suede top. It's like the clothes Davy Crockett wore on that TV show she used to watch when she ditched school. Course, there was no leather fringe hanging off Davy's sleeves. And her pants are bell bottom.

She rubs her right hand up and down her left arm. Feels like skin. Then she remembers, it IS skin. Zara told her that last night. Suede's the inside of leather.

And leather is skin. Cow skin.

Tami feels more sure of herself. Because of that new outfit. If . . . if she could only have a new outfit every day. Tami remembers: New clothes—that was all she really ever wanted. But her mother never gave her any. Her mom always had money for booze.

But all Tami ever got was hand-me-downs. Dirty, stinking old lady dresses from the Goodwill. Then Tami saw the nighttime face again. Horrendous devil's face. Piercing eyes. Dripping lips. Before she can stop it, the memories break through. Of those nights when her mother was gone or blind-drunk. Of ugly awful nights when Tami pretended she was asleep and wished she was dead.

Tami walks into the bar for the ten-thousandth time. And stops. The stench is oppressive. But Tami's immune to it.

She smiles at Lonnie behind the bar and starts to pan the room.

There's Dirty Gertie, a coarse, ugly, lardy hag who looks 50, yet is only barely 30. She's wearing a motley squirrel coat and hustling two drunk white punks. They're mean. But Gertie's beyond hurt now. There is no perversion, no degradation she hadn't suffered. Her hair is Tiny Tim's hair. Her face, a dime store cosmetic counter.

Then she sees George. Over to the right by the wall. George john is back. George john with the four little ones. George john with the new ranch home in the suburbs. George john with the $1,500 raise. George john with the greenest lawn on the block. George john with the wife he can't sleep with.

He smiles at Tami.

"This. This is Dodge City." Detroit Patrolman Louis Penick announces matter-of-factly. "Go into one of those bars, and you've got as good a chance of getting shot or beat up as you'd have had in Dodge City."

It's night.

We leave main Police Headquarters at 1300 Beaubien, and drive up Woodward. We stop for a light at Charlotte. Sergeant Joe (Jake) Jakubczak and Patrolman Louis Penick of the Detroit Police Vice Bureau are giving me a prostitute's tour of Detroit.

Lou Penick has been in the Vice Bureau for 22 years. That's years longer than anybody else. He explains it this way: "I guess I look like the perfect john."

If Lou is right, the perfect john is short, grey-haired, pencil-mustached and handsome—in a rakish kind of way. Lou wears an inexpensive—but flashy zircon ring and a fake Rollex watch. He feels they make him look like a big spender.

The only way a cop can arrest a girl is when she stops him. She's got to make it abundantly clear that she's suggesting a sexual act. That's called, "Accosting." Finally, she's got to put a price on it. That's called "Soliciting."

Put them all together and you've got "Accosting and Soliciting." The law under which prostitutes are arrested.

No prostitute will accost, let alone solicit a man, if she has the slightest inkling he's a cop. Most vice men become as well known as Ed Sullivan after a couple of years. And they have to move on to another bureau or precinct.

Sergeant Jake has only been on the squad a couple of years. And he spends most of his time at Police Headquarters booking the girls when they're brought in. Still, the pros know him already. In fact, they knew him within a couple of months after he was transferred to the squad.

Jake explains it this way: "I guess I look like the perfect cop."

If Jake is right, the perfect cop looks just like a movie cop. Tall. Quiet, Raincoat and porkpie hat. Serious.

"There. There's a couple." Jake nods.

Two girls across the street stand in front of a bar. You don't need a degree in sociology to tell they're prostitutes. Micro skirts. Tall black boots. High, sexy hairdos.

They certainly aren't the girl next door.

"And there's the pimp." Lou points to a '68 Cadillac Eldorado parked in front of us with the motor running. At the wheel is a young dandy (wearing toothpick and shades) peering over his shoulder at the girls.

"Why is he keeping his motor running? For a fast getaway?" I ask.

"Naw. Lou shrugs. "He's just cold. He's got his heat on. We can't touch him. He lets his girls do all the dirty work. And he stays safely off to the side. So the only time the louse can be arrested is when a girl testifies against him. Or when he tries to solicit a john. Which very seldom happens. Only a Murphy boy does that."

Now we're at Columbia and Brush. Jake's driving his own car. A '66 Plymouth. White. Straight shift.

I spot them this time. There are five girls on both sides of the street. They're obviously available. When they see us, they know we're cops. But they simply turn away with indifference. Their eyes glaze over. Zero.

We turn the corner and stop. Out of sight. I get out of the car and walk back toward the corner.

One of the girls—stocky and blond-wigged—motions to a slowing-cruising car. The car stops. She leans over to talk with the driver, keeping a yard or so from the door. After about 30 seconds, she opens the door and gets in.

"How can you let them get by with that?" I ask, self-righteously. "She hailing guys. Curb Service."

"Nothing we can do about it." Lou answers dryly.

"Used to have the 'Yoohoo' ordinance. Then they'd run when they saw us. Not anymore." Jake adds.

"What happened to the ordinance?"

"The courts threw it out." Jake tells me with disgust. "Judge said the girls could've been waving at their grandma."

Tami and George walk up the street to the "Hotel." That's what the sign says. It looks like another one of the decaying apartment houses just off Third. The front door is locked. Tami rings the bell. George is quiet. He's always quiet until they get to the room.

There's a buzz and the door opens a crack. Inside, George walks over to a dutch door. The top half is open. A man in a sport shirt and nicotine-stained fingers and teeth is behind the door. Behind him is a room. A TV is playing. There is a program about police on the screen.

"Sign here, please," he says politely.

George writes "George Jones" on a dirty ledger turned open to a ruled page that looks like a petition. On the lines and pages before his are hundreds of "Jones" and "Lincolns" and "L. B. Johnsons."

The man tells Tami, "Room 7." He looks at George for the first time. "Two-sixty—including tax."

George pays him the exact change. He's a frequent guest. No bellhop is needed. No key. They climb two flights of stairs and enter a small room. About 12 by 10.

Inside is a double bed and little else. The bed is 1930-cheap-hotel-type. Complete with metal-spooled headboard and no bedspread. There are sheets, though. Stained and marked with a dozen different stamps of hotels and institutions that have owned them previously.

George and Tami are in a crib. A hotel maintained for the express purpose of renting rooms to prostitutes and johns. Two-sixty is pretty cheap rent for a room.

Cribs are strictly volume operations. A crib may have as few as three rooms. But those three lonely rooms can be rented as much as 20 times each a night.

There's a sink in the room. And a couple of towels. A single, bare 150-watt lamp is screwed into a shipwheel fixture on the ceiling.

George crushes out a new cigaret nervously and puts a $20 bill on a beat-up dresser. Tami starts undressing. It's as mechanical as taking clothes out of a dryer. She sets her things over a chair. Puts the $20 in her purse.

She smiles. It's hard to smile. The pain in her belly is back. A ballooning, rolling lead weight.

"Last year the United Community Services did a study. And figured there were 5,000 known prostitutes in Detroit. That's conservative." Lou is talking over a 7-Up in a bar. This is not a place where hustlers usually work. That might be one reason why it's empty except for the owner and his bartender.

Lou talks to me. "There isn't just one kind of prostitute. There are all kinds. Take the streetwalkers we just saw. They—they and the girls that turn tricks in a whorehouse—the lowest rung. Simply because their kind of hustling is the most dangerous. Soliciting on the street is the easiest way to get arrested. And the girls get the worst kind of johns. They don't know who the guys are. And lots of them are maniacs and weirdos.

"There are hundreds of prostitutes we call bar cruisers, too. They work everywhere in town. Especially the downtown spots where there's good trade in traveling execs. Or the nice spots on Eight Mile or Telegraph where there's lots of young guys with expense accounts.

"These gals are careful. They usually make a deal with the bartender. And they won't go with a john unless the bartender knows the guy and says he's safe.

"There's no flat rate. Price is pretty much negotiated. Streetwalkers will try to get $15 or $20. But they might settle for $10—plus the cost of the room.

"The next rung up is the hotel girl. She makes her contact with a bellhop or hotel clerk. These girls work everywhere. The best hotels to the fleabags.

"A telephone girl works out of her own apartment." Lou continues. "She has bartenders and friends who set up johns for her. And she gives them gifts for the help. This is a shrewd con. If she gave the guys cash, they could be arrested. Gifts are okay, though. There are grifters who make a fine living out of selling cuff links and other stuff to prostitutes. The prostitutes give them to a bartender who in turn sells them back to the grifter. Some of this jewelry is bought and sold 20 times a night.

"Some girls even have answering services. One girl's telephone bill was $275 a month.

"Then there's the party girl. Many of these girls get $500 a night. They're pretty, intelligent and well-endowed. For the most part, businessmen hire them to entertain big customers. The gals will go out to dinner with the customers. And be their escorts for the entire evening."

Lou suddenly turned to me seriously. Almost menacingly. "You know, there's one thing that really bugs me. Really. And it's the way most guys write about prostitution. Or show it in the movies. You know. The girl always has a heart of gold. Loves everybody. And she has a hell of an easy going life. Well, that's all a dumb john's dream. The truth is, a prostitute is pitiful. A poor, sick creature. She's little more than a slave. Ultimately she'll die from disease. Or dope, or murder. Psychiatrists say they're often suicidal.

"I talk to almost every girl we arrest now. And it's like having the same bad dream over and over.

"She usually comes from a home where the parents are divorced—or never were married. In her home there was absolutely no love for her or anybody else. So she runs away. She gravitates to what we call Boulevard Circle—the area Grand Boulevard arcs as it runs from Jefferson to Jefferson.

"Then—since she doesn't have much schooling and no business training to speak of—she probably gets a job as a waitress. She may be only 13 or 14. But with makeup and hairstyles today, she gets by for 18 or 20 with no sweat.

"Well, pretty soon a guy shows an interest in her. He's a sharp dresser. And really hip

XUM

acting. He's nice and hits at her loneliness. He brings her little gifts. And pretty soon he talks about getting her a big apartment. Fancy clothes. Nice cars and jewelery.

"All she's got to do is 'have a party' with some guys. The pimp feeds her with how she'll make a lot of money in a hurry. And he promises that once they get some bread, they'll go off and set up a legitimate business. 'What the heck,' he says. 'Most people give it away. Why not get paid for it?'

"Well, before long she says okay. Not just for the money—but because she loves the louse. Or because she's trying to get back at her dad for not loving her. Or some other reason nobody seems to want to take the time to fathom.'"

Tami gets into a new Buick and hands the $20 bill to Ted. It's a dark, foggy night but he still wears shades. He reeks of Jade East. He's poured into a shiny sharkskin Petrocelli suit with an electric blue shirt and matching tie.

"I . . . I don't feel so good. I'm bleeding. I better go home."

"No." That's all he says. All he has to say. Tami couldn't bear another beating. So she nods.

Ted takes Cocaine. It's expensive. So he can't afford to have Tami quit early tonight. Or any night.

"Prostitution is a misdemeanor by state law. At least the first offense."

We have driven by a bevy of street corner hustlers on Mack Avenue in East Detroit. We turn around. And now we're heading for Third Avenue. Jake is filling me in on the penalties for hustling.

"On a first offense, we book girls on 'Accosting and Soliciting.' A 448. This is a misdemeanor. And if the judge finds a girl guilty, he can give her 90 days and/or a hundred buck fine. If a girl's been arrested five or six times—and we see a clear pattern of prostitution—we can book her under a 451. This is a high misdemeanor. And the penalty can be a year in DeHoCo—The Detroit House of Correction—and/or a $500 fine.

"The third offense is a felony. That can be as much as two years in DeHoCo and/or a 500 buck fine."

"We talk to every girl that's booked." Lou tells me. "We do our best to show the kid the one-way-sewer she's sinking into. But, sadly, we don't have anything much better to offer her. There's a real need here. Psychotherapy. Counseling. Job training. A lecture don't mean a hell of a lot to a lonely, sick kid."

We're on Third. We walk into the most notorious bar in town. It is one big room. A rectangle at least three times as long as it is wide.

An old oak bar runs the whole length of one long side of the rectangle. Stools line the front of the bar. And they're all filled. People are crowded next to the stools. The rest of the bar is filled with chairs around 2 by 2 tables. They're full too.

A pretty girl with a short impish haircut looks at us sharply. She's sitting at a table by the front door. A man, thin, 40ish, well-dressed and wearing a black raincoat is sitting at the same table. She gets up and walks past us and out the door. I admire her outfit. Very mod. Bell bottom slacks and a groovy matching vest. All natural-color suede.

Her friend gets up and follows her out.

We walk to the far end of the room and stand by the edge of the bar. There's a public phone hanging on the wall about 10 feet from us. It rings incessantly. For Joan. Or Trudy. Or any of the dozens of girls in the bar, or temporarily out on business.

Sue, a voluptuous ersatz blonde (probably in her late 20's), walks over and greets Lou heartily. She knows Lou well. And, by her action, everyone in the bar now knows we're cops.

Sue is the spokeswoman for the sisterhood. And it's her job to see what's up when the cops come calling. She's a pleasant person. Her white flannel dress is just a bit tight on her ample figure (prostitutes don't wear girdles; an occupational encumbrance). And her peroxide-blond hair is a little too yellow. She is attractive.

A jocular, ribald banter follows. I'm struck by the kinship between the hunter and the hunted. There seems to be sympathy, understanding and honest concern. Yet Lou has arrested Sue twice. And Jake has booked her any number of times.

A skinny man in a ball cap and corduroy coat with a fleece collar is talking to a heavy-set, middle-aged man across the room. The older man is self-conscious. He's patently here for the first time.

Jake follows my eyes. "The skinny guy. He's probably a Murphy boy."

"What's that?" I ask.

"A Murphy boy is worse than a pimp," Lou explains distastefully.

Jake picks up. "A Murphy boy sees a green john like that one over there. He asks the john if he wants a girl. Then, he tells the john he's got a cross between Sophia Loren and Marilyn Monroe just dying to go to bed with him. All the john has to do is give him five or ten bucks to show his 'good faith' and he'll give the john the gal's address."

Lou shakes his head. "And when the john goes to the address, it's usually a church or funeral parlor or someplace like that.

"Or it's a dark spot where the Murphy boy can mug him." Jake adds.

I see the nervous john being steered outside by the Murphy boy. There's nothing that can be legally done to stop it. I turn away, sensing the same draining, helpless feeling I once got watching a bull fight.

In a few minutes we leave too. I save the question that's been nagging me until we get outside.

"Okay, a place like this couldn't exist unless the cops let it. How come?"

"It's not the cops." Lou speaks up. "We used to have a law where a known prostitute couldn't frequent a bar where 448's had been made. Whenever we saw a girl we had a laundry list on in a pickup joint like that, we'd warn the owner. And boy, he couldn't get her out of there fast enough. His liquor license was at stake."

Jake interrupts. "To a guy who owns a bar, his liquor license is golden. Without it, he's dead. So bar owners don't pimp. They don't even get a cut from the prostitutes. It would jeopardize their licenses. But they do go along with pimp bartenders and prostitutes because it brings in a lot of business."

"Getting back to what I was saying," Lou says, "the judge threw it out. He said it didn't allow for a human being's redemption. Just because a girl was a hustler once, didn't mean she would be one forever."

"That sounds fair." I say.

"Sure, it's fine in theory. Absolutely fair. But," and he motions to the bar we just left.

Tami is a zombie, as she walks down Selden. She feels all wrapped-up. Like that mummy in the movie she saw one Halloween. Funny. Her head is clear enough. The "speed" makes everything come in loud and clear. But the rest of her body is on strike. It wants to stop. Lay down. Rest.

But Tami's head won't let it. Tami's head keeps her moving.

Tami wants to go home. When she was with the last john she noticed a big ugly black and blue welt had swelled up on her right side. That's where Ted kicked her last night. Worse, she's started coughing up blood. Gawd. Gawd. Tami knows she should quit. But Ted would get mad. And besides, there's a new GTO cruising beside her with a straight-looking john at the wheel.

The john stops. He edges over to the passenger side of his GTO and rolls down the window.

Tami asks: "Looking for a party?"

"Yeah, my girl stood me up."

"Well, what're you looking for?"

"Oh . . . just a good time, I guess. How much?'

"What've you got to spend?"

"I dunno. . . ."

"Have you got twenty?"

"God, no. How about ten?"

"Ok." Tami gets into the car. Suddenly a bolt of pain shoots through her belly. It even knifes through to her head—in spite of the "speed."

Tami doubles over to try to ease the pain. The john looks concerned.

"Is . . . is something wrong?"

"No . . . no, I'm ok." She answers after a minute. But she knows she has to quit right now no matter what Ted says. Or does. She reaches for the door. "Sorry. But I got to go."

"No!" Instantly the john's right hand shoots over and grabs her arm. He pulls out a leather case with his left hand and flicks it open. Inside is a police badge. "You're under arrest," he says with a trace of sadness.

Tami's eyes register shock. Then terror. But then—just before they fold back into her head and she passes out—the officer sees an unmistakable glimmer of relief in them.

We're in the Vice Bureau at 1300 Beaubien. It's a big, open room about 25 by 30. Just as you enter, there's a short counter about five feet long and three feet high in front of you. The duty sergeant sits behind it.

When a girl is arrested, she's brought here and booked. Then one of the officers interviews her in a spare, monk-cell to the right of the counter.

It's now past 2 a.m. Jake and Lou show me the forms they fill out everytime a girl is booked. They tell me a girl is seldom, picked up just once. Some girls have been arrested 30 times. Most prostitutes are picked up at least five times a year.

There's a small photo area in the room where they take mug shots of the girls. A file cabinet chock full of these photos. Thousands of them.

Just then a young officer comes in. He's obviously shook. And bitter. He tells us about a girl he just picked up. He picked her up near Third. He thought she was drunk or something the way she was walking down the street. But when he slowed down, she propositioned him.

Then, just as he identified himself, she completely passed out. He tried to bring her around, but he couldn't. Blood started pouring out of her mouth.

He rushed her right over to the hospital then.

And they're doing their best to help her. But she's in bad shape. Very bad shape. Her insides are bleeding like crazy. Probably from a violent beating. And on top of everything else, she has an advanced case of syphilis.

The officer guesses her pimp beat her up. And that he's now through with her.

She finally woke up. And when the officer asked who he could notify, she gave him a phone number and told him to ask for Ted. She said her name was Tami.

The officer called the number. And Ted answered. But when the officer told Ted who he was, and that Tami was in the hospital, Ted said he didn't know anybody named Tami. The officer described the girl and asked Ted if he knew anybody like that by another name. Ted insisted he didn't. There must be some mistake. Then he hung up.

The officer shakes his head sadly. "The poor dumb kid. She was bleeding all over the place. And half out of her mind. But, she kept begging, 'Please, please. Don't let me bleed on my clothes. They're skin. Cow skin. Blood will soak in and never come out'."

FIRST STATE SCIENCE POLICY CENTER ESTABLISHED IN PENNSYLVANIA

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania will become the site of the Nation's first research center devoted to helping the States use science and technology to solve the problems of the cities, of pollution and other environmental dilemmas of modern man, Gov. Raymond P. Shafer said July 19, 1969.

Shafer said his administration, through the new Pennsylvania Science and Engineering Foundation, has agreed to help fund a Center for the Study of State Science Policy with the Federal Government and Penn State University.

The National Science Foundation will contribute $61,000; the Science and Engineering Foundation, $25,000; and Penn State, $12,595. The center will be established at the State College campus. Shafer said:

> This center will be established to help our Commonwealth and other states use the enormous potential and resources of science in their efforts to improve the standard and comfort of living for all citizens.
>
> For years, we have been using science in industry to produce more and better goods, and in government to produce sophisticated machinery for defense and space conquest.
>
> But we have not demanded that the full attention of our scientists be given to solving the problems of water, air and land pollution. We have not asked them to devote full time to producing better and cheaper low income housing with new metals and other modern materials. We have not involved the scientists enough in finding ways to provide better and less expensive health care facilities.
>
> This fact has greatly concerned my Science Advisory Committee, which is now at work on ways we Pennsylvanians can develop a "Science for Society" program. Establishment of the new center is part of that plan.
>
> The first assignment of the center's staff will be to examine what Pennsylvania and other states have done to develop policies for the involvement of science in public matters.
>
> Too often states establish long range programs in urban aid, conservation, environmental health, and transportation without being fully aware of the scientific implications or without using the expertise of the scientific community.
>
> Pennsylvania has attempted to correct this problem by the establishment of the Governor's Science Advisory Committee. The committee has been helpful in conservation and transportation policy-making and, most recently, suggested guidelines for the establishment of a policy for developing "new towns" within the Commonwealth.
>
> The new center will be very helpful in the exchange of information between the states. For example, other states with the problems of acid-mine water pollution will benefit from Pennsylvania's new experience with treatment plants. The center will be able to communicate that experience fully and intelligently to those states that are establishing programs to combat pollution from mining operations.
>
> I am proud that Pennsylvania has the foresight to develop this center at a time when the world is observing the most historic event of our time—the landing of men on the moon. This is being done because the people of the Nation had the spirit and willingness to meet the challenge and the faith that their scientists could produce the result.

ATOM IN THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the June 16, 1969, Washington Evening Star concerning the civilian applications of atomic energy is worthy of the attention of all of us. The editorial does an excellent job of putting in proper perspective the society's need for electrical energy and the need to limit pollution. The editorial is based upon remarks made by Atomic Energy Commissioner James T. Ramey. We have had Commissioner Ramey and many other knowledgeable people testify before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy numerous times on the impact of the atom on our environment. Based upon the many hearings we have had, the editorial interprets and reports the factors involved concerning the atom and the environment in an accurate way. The committee in this year's report on the Atomic Energy Commission's fiscal year 1970 authorization, House Report No. 91–315, of June 17 1969, addressed itself at length to the attempts to maintain the purity of the environment and still meet our energy needs. I would like to commend all who are interested in this matter to read pages 16 through 21 of our report. It is most unfortunate that the need for a balanced view on the matter of environment and energy does not exist in many quarters. As explained in our report, the task confronting the responsible and informed is to harmonize the contending goals of a pristine environment and the supply of an abundant amount of economical and reliable electrical power.

The Star editorial follows:

ATOM AND ENVIRONMENT

> Atomic Energy Commissioner James T. Ramey, in his remarks to newsmen the other day, said some timely things about the misconceptions, oversimplifications and scary distortions that occasionally creep into print or get on the air regarding the need for and the development of nuclear power.
>
> The need, of course, is clear beyond doubt. The nation's electric power requirements are doubling every decade, and generating facilities must double with them. Since most falling-water sites are already developed, the new facilities will have to be almost entirely steam-driven. Over the next 20 years, according to authoritative estimates, it will be imperative to build no fewer than 255 huge new plants across the country, and it is expected that 91 of these will be fossil-fueled (oil or coal) and 164 atom-powered.
>
> This prospect has caused understandable concern in many quarters. The worry is that the advent of such facilities may create serious environmental problems in terms of scenic values, harmful discharges of heat into streams, and new dimensions of air pollution. Indeed, there still are bitter arguments in some communities over proposed sites for nuclear plants. What the opponents say, among other things, is that nuclear plants, which now release more heat than fossil plants, threaten to be highly damaging to rivers and bays. But the fear is exaggerated. As soon as the "breeder" reactor becomes operable, the thermal effects of the nuclear facility will be no greater than that of a conventional plant. Meanwhile, it can be said that those effects are already manageable to a significant degree.
>
> In Ramey's words, there is every reason to believe that "these waste heat discharges can be controlled or, better yet, perhaps put to good use." Instead of being released into streams, for example, they could be put into cooling towers or man-made lakes around the plant site. The thermal problem thus seems to lend itself to effective abatement through coordinated planning and action between the private utilities and governmental agencies, particularly the AEC. And the same may be said of constructing facilities that will harmonize with the landscape.
>
> As for air pollution, the quiet nuclear plant is in a class by itself. Apart from its many other superior qualities as an energy source, it has the "strong and unique" advantage of being able to produce power without sending contamination skyward. In contrast, the fossil plant, like so many other industrial facilities, releases a disturbing amount of sulfur dioxide and other pollutants into the atmosphere.
>
> In sum, as Ramey has emphasized, our country, with properly sited and carefully controlled facilities, can safely and cleanly produce all the nuclear power it must have—without environmental damage and in a way that will benefit all Americans.

SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING SPEAKS OUT ON THE DRAFT

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, during his years of distinguished service in the U.S. Senate, former Senator Ernest Gruening was a keen critic of many aspects of U.S. foreign policy. His early understanding of the tragic consequences of American policy in Vietnam helped to focus attention on the ill-advisedness of our military involvement in that country and to bring the underlying assumptions of America's role in Southeast Asia into question. Senator Gruening opposed the Vietnam war from the beginning. Along with former Senator Wayne Morse, he was a constant and constructive critic of the conduct of American foreign policy in Southeast Asia.

I deeply regret that Senator Gruening is no longer a Member of the other body; however, I am pleased to see that he is nonetheless continuing, with his customary insight and vision, to speak out on vital national issues. I am inserting in the RECORD today the text of a letter from Senator Gruening which appeared in the July 21 New York Times.

In that letter, Senator Gruening points out the failure of President Nixon's draft reform proposals to deal with the substantive issues surrounding the growing opposition to the Selective Service System. Senator Gruening makes clear, reform of the methods of selecting draftees will not in itself eliminate the most obnoxious feature of the present system; namely, the drafting of young men

XUM

to fight in a war which many of them believe to be immoral and unjustified. The only way in which the dilemma facing thousands of draft eligible young men can be resolved is to eliminate the Selective Service System.

A few months ago, over 250 student body presidents and college newspaper editors issued a statement in which they stated their intention to refuse induction into the Armed Forces so long as the war in Vietnam continues. The dilemma which they face is shared by thousands of other young men.

I have introduced a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 278, which would express the sense of Congress that the President should suspend the draft calls for 6 months. This would prevent the drafting of any more young men to fight in Vietnam and would provide Congress with a period of time in which to devise alternatives to the existing draft system.

This bill, and those introduced by other Members, which would eliminate the Selective Service System, must receive the immediate attention of Congress if the crisis of conscience which confronts thousands of draft eligible young men is to be alleviated. I urge my colleagues to support action on this legislation and to give careful attention to Senator Gruening's thoughtful and persuasive letter.

The letter follows:

DRAFT AS SERVITUDE

To the EDITOR:

Your July 11 editorial "A Moral Obligation" which chides the Congress for not holding hearings on President Nixon's draft reform proposals in my view misses the vital point. There is no moral obligation to implement either Nixon's proposals.or the other so-called draft reforms which were urged in the last Congress by Senator Kennedy and other Senators, on which hearings were held but did not result in any legislation.

These reforms, merely altering the method of selecting draftees, do not go to the heart of the issue which is that the draft itself for this war is the inequity, the injustice, the immorality. What difference does it make whether our young men are selected by a lot or any other way to become cannon fodder in a war which many consider totally unjustified and immoral?

What this means is that they are compelled in violation of their consciences to kill people against whom they feel no grievance, perhaps get killed or maimed in the process, with the alternative, if they refuse, of imprisonment for five years at hard labor with probable ruin of their future career in civilian life.

This is an infamous dilemma, and no American citizen—indeed no member of a society that calls itself free—should be subjected to it. But so far as the executive and legislative branches of our Federal Government are concerned, neither has had the vision or understanding to face this issue. Neither (with the exception of Justice William Douglas) has the Supreme Court, which has repeatedly refused to overrule the draft convictions.

It is difficult for a layman—and for this layman—to understand why the 13th Amendment of the Constitution which the Warren Court has done so much to interpret and implement is not applicable to the draft.

The draft is involuntary servitude and it is a betrayal of our finest traditions and of everything America should stand for. The moral obligation on the Congress should be not to reform its procedure but to abolish it for the rest of this war, particularly as we continue to exact the wanton sacrifice of our young men in a war that we can't win, shouldn't want to win, and which President Nixon has declared we have no purpose to win militarily.

No wonder there is unrest, bitterness and rebelliousness among our young people.

Why should we keep on sending our boys to die or be crippled in vain?

ERNEST GRUENING,
Former U.S. Senator.

WASHINGTON, *July 11, 1969.*

SENATE—*Wednesday, July 23, 1969*

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., a Senator from the State of Virginia.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who art the truth, deliver us from all that is false. We pray Thee to teach us step by step what we do not know, to preserve in us what we do know, to correct us in our mistakes, to strengthen us when we fail, and enable us to grow in grace and wisdom. May we and the people of all nations learn to trust not in the power of their arms, but in the power of love. In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C. July 23, 1969.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., a Senator from the State of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 22, 1969, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On July 19, 1969:

S. 1647. An act to authorize the release of 100,000 short tons of lead from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

On July 22, 1969:

S. 648. An act for the relief of Ernesto Alunday.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR TYDINGS AND SENATOR JAVITS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the concurrence of the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), and without infringing on his time, I ask unanimous consent that after the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) has completed his statement, the distinguished Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes; and that following his remarks, which would be a little after 1 p.m., which is the time the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) desires, the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from New York, there be a brief period for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR JORDAN OF IDAHO, AND SENATOR HART

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of morning business, the distinguished Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN) be recognized as the first speaker, for a period not to exceed 45 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Idaho, the distinguished Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) be recognized for a purpose which he will elucidate at that time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider two nominations on the Executive Calendar under "New Reports."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated, as requested by the Senator from Montana.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Roderic L. O'Connor, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Spurgeon M. Keeny, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator from California for being so gracious.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) for a period of 1 hour.

THE SPECTER OF ESCALATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, the specter of escalation in Vietnam has risen to threaten us again.

It is stalking the Halls of Congress, and lurking in the minds of millions of our countrymen.

Like many Americans, I thought the dangerous notion that the way to end the violence in Vietnam is to intensify it had been thoroughly discredited. I thought we had learned through the futile and bloody years, painfully and at great price, that escalation in Vietnam leads only to counterescalation and to higher and higher levels of violence and death.

Like many Americans, I thought that the escalation theory was shot down when President Johnson ordered a halt to the bombing of North Vietnam.

And, like many Americans, I thought it had finally been slain and buried when President Nixon, in his address on May 14, forswore a military solution in Vietnam.

Yet, even now, responsible and influential Americans are once again suggesting that escalation is the way to end our tragic plight.

In the course of the current debate on the military authorization bill, I have heard Senators say that we could have won the Vietnam war long ago if our military efforts had not been throttled by civilians.

I have heard Senators say that we could win a military victory now.

I have heard Senators say that military authorities in both this administration and in the previous administration have stated that we can still win the war if we decide to spend the money and make the sacrifices.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield with pleasure to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If anyone has made a statement to that effect, I would hope most sincerely that he would keep in mind that the casualties—the dead—in Vietnam overall are now somewhere in the vicinity of 44,000; that the wounded are well in excess of 200,000; that the cost of the war is approximately $100 billion; and that the war is in danger of becoming the longest war in which this country has ever engaged.

If there are those, as indicated in the statement made by the distinguished Senator from California, who think that this is possible if only we spend the money and make the sacrifices—and that means using up the manpower—I would hope that they would think again. Vietnam is a tragedy. It is an area in which we never should have become involved. It is a difficulty which has been responsible, directly and indirectly, for many of the difficulties which beset us internally and externally.

I would hope that those who seem to advocate that kind of proposal would take to heart what the President seems to be doing in that respect, and that is to bring about a gradual deescalation and an honorable solution of the war. This is something which no American should ever forget, and certainly something which all of us should keep in mind.

I would say that the President has been trying as hard as he knows to find a way out of the impasse which Vietnam is and that those of us who would advocate otherwise would be doing a disservice to him and, more important, to the country.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader.

It may sound as though what I had started out to say stems from a nightmare of my own. Actually, what I am saying reflects what I have heard said on the floor of the Senate. I have heard these things said by men of great influence in the Senate.

So the specter of escalation, the suggestion that we should step up the war, is present on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere as my remarks will make very plain; and remarks made on the floor of the Senate are documented and appear in the RECORD.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRANSTON. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I do wish to thank the Senator because, after a rather hasty reading of the Senator's speech, I feel that probably we are all saying the same thing. I wish to congratulate the distinguished majority leader, who is always a man of conscience and conviction. I think what we are all saying is that all three of us are in favor of a deescalation of this war as soon as we can. If that helps clarify the matter, I wish to make it clear that I am in no way finding any fault or criticism of what the Senator from California says. It is true that some people do advocate escalation. I think it is much better if the President has the benefit of all our thoughts, particularly with respect to how we may deescalate the war and find a way to get out of it honorably as soon as we can.

I thank the Senator for yielding. In my opinion he is contributing some very important thoughts to this dialog.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to the distinguished acting minority leader. I know he is an advocate of a sensible course in Vietnam. I know I have never heard, and I am certain I will never hear, from his lips advocacy of the escalation that would be so disastrous in Vietnam.

Mr. President, I wish to recount a few other things I have heard said on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere. I have heard Senators say that military authorities in both this administration and in the previous administration have stated that we can still win the war if we decide to spend the money and make the sacrifices. Those references are to conversations with these military authorities that are not on the public record; but the statements about such conversations have been heard here and appear in the RECORD.

I have heard Senators downgrade the enemy in Vietnam as one-half of a country which does not have a single production complex, which cannot build a tank, which cannot build a plane, which cannot produce big ammunition, which cannot build modern electronic equipment, and which has to rely entirely on handouts from Communist allies.

I have heard these statements from the lips of Senators who have great influence in the White House.

I have read, too, that the presidential

XUM

candidate who came so close to throwing the 1968 election into the other body—and who now stands waiting in the wings for 1972—demands that we escalate the war if peace is not soon achieved.

I know also that every opinion poll shows that a very substantial number of Americans want the administration to adopt what is loosely referred to as a "win it" Vietnam policy. I have seen in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent poll taken by a Representative revealing that 39 percent of his constituents favor "an all-out offensive against North Vietnam, utilizing full available military power."

And I know that the President, and every Senator, and every Representative, daily receive heartbreaking letters like one that came to me a few days ago from a Californian who has just lost his son in Vietnam. In his grief, he asked simply:

> Why?
>
> Why have we dropped more bombs in Vietnam than in World War II and not accomplished a thing? Why do we keep taking objectives in the conflict and then withdrawing? Why do we turn around again and sacrifice our best of youth for an ideal which seems to me to be all in vain?
>
> Do you wish to have us bow our heads in shame and negotiate a peace with no victory for our great Country? Let us have total victory or give it up altogether. The sacrifice of our Boys has already been too great a loss of lives.

And he concludes:

> Let's make the one Big Push and win.

Mr. President, these are signs of a frustration, disillusion and anger over Vietnam that all of us share.

All of us pray that the present lull in the fighting offers hope for peace. But General Wheeler, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, discounts the significance of the lull. And when we make positive suggestions at the Paris peace talks, all we receive is a response which Secretary of State Rogers must characterize as "totally negative," "intransigent," "unreasonable," and "inhumane."

We hope that even without peace the killing and maiming of American boys in Vietnam will end in 1970 as President Nixon pursues his goal of de-Americanizing the war ahead of Clark Clifford's schedule. But General Wheeler declares the South Vietnamese Army cannot take over the full war effort by the end of 1970, and President Thieu agrees with him. Meanwhile, young Americans die daily in Vietnam.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRANSTON. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I read in the RECORD today the debates had in the Senate yesterday in which some of our distinguished colleagues praised the recently publicized proffer of President Thieu for elections in South Vietnam. I also read today wire dispatches from South Vietnam which reported a speech President Thieu made this week in which he said that those elections which he promised could not occur until some 2 years after the National Liberation Front agreed to his proposals.

This leads me to wonder how valid is the offer of elections as a means of arriving at peace. I wonder if the able junior Senator from California read that dispatch.

Mr. CRANSTON. I read it and I share the concern expressed by the Senator from Tennessee. It seems to me this is but further evidence of delaying tactics by South Vietnamese rulers, and further evidence that they will do all they can to postpone deescalation, to keep us there with our combat troops so that Americans do the bleeding and dying and the South Vietnamese evade their responsibility for their own self-defense. Until we take firm steps, and make plain that we are taking firm steps, in Vietnam they will never undertake that burden and we will carry it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have listened with rapt attention to the remarks of the able junior Senator from California. I believe it is true that there is sentiment held by a goodly number of people that the United States should use whatever force is necessary to bring a peace by victory in South Vietnam. If the silence of death is peace, then this would be within the power of the United States because within a matter of hours by the unleashing of nuclear war the inhabitants of North Vietnam and South Vietnam could be obliterated and the country made uninhabitable. I do not believe such sentiment is held by a majority of our people, nor by the leaders of our Government. Yet so many of our leaders who have become enmeshed in Vietnam policy seem, somehow, to have become mesmerized. I would not have anticipated that a pragmatic man like Secretary Laird would say so soon after becoming Secretary of Defense:

> We have certainly turned the corner in the war.

He made that statement in colloquy with me before a committee. I thought I recognized that corner when he turned it. I have heard and watched other people turn it. I hope, indeed, that we are nearer to peace, but I recall that other people have made such statements.

For instance, on April 10, 1968, General Westmoreland said:

> We have never been in a better relative position.

Then, on July 13, 1967, former President Johnson said:

> We are generally pleased—

Then he added—

> We are very sure we are on the right track.

Ambassador Lodge said, on January 9, 1967:

> I expect the war to achieve very sensational results in 1967.

I hope the Senator from California is willing to yield to me a bit further.

Mr. CRANSTON. I most certainly am.

Mr. GORE. Secretary McNamara, in October 1965, said:

> We have stopped losing the war.

I seem to remember, too, that our boys were going to be home by Christmas. Does not the Senator from California recall that?

Mr. CRANSTON. I do. I recall the sad series of hopeful predictions which we heard from so many leaders.

Mr. GORE. Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester said:

> The corner has definitely been turned toward victory in South Vietnam.

Secretary Rusk said the struggle in Vietnam "is turning an important corner."

I am not sure that all these are the same corners, but it is hard to find which corner we turned.

Mr. CRANSTON. If we turn four corners, we get back to where we started, do we not? That is where we seem to be.

Mr. GORE. All of us can be wrong in our assessment. There is enough blame to attach to everyone. Therefore, I do not rise to be critical but, rather, to plead that all of us—particularly those in executive authority—avoid becoming mesmerized by policies or words and maintain the capacity to look the situation squarely in the face and realistically consider the facts.

It may be that I have fallen victim to my own criticisms. No one can be certain. But, for whatever it is worth, it has not been my view, and it is not my view, that a phased withdrawal of a relatively few men at a time, over a long period of time, is not the path to an early peace.

More certainly, it has the earmarks of a formula designed to prolong the war by retaining in South Vietnam sufficient U.S. forces to maintain the Thieu-Ky regime in power.

It is my further view that the United States should utilize its pervasive presence, its influence, and its power, to persuade a coalescence of forces, factors, personalities, factions, religious groups, tribal sects, and other diverse elements in Vietnam, into a formula by which they could agree to live together in peace.

I do not know how there can be peace in South Vietnam unless the people who live there have a will to live together in peace.

It seems to me it is no more within the capacity of the United States to force that will for peace than it is within the Senator's capacity to force the man and wife living next door to live together in peace. If they wish to live together in peace and harmony, we know from our own experience it is possible, but if they wish to fuss, fight, and harangue each other in continuous domestic turmoil, the Senator has no power to force them to live together in peace and harmony. If he tries to intervene, or to force it, he may suffer the consequences.

This oversimplification of the situation, ridiculous as it may seem, nevertheless, in principle, is about what we face in Vietnam.

We intervened there in what was essentially a civil war. It became more than that, but it was essentially a civil war. We took sides. In my view, as long as we seek the objective of a society in South Vietnam made in our own image, run by people of our own preference, or perhaps of our own choosing, the war will continue, and there will be much more bloodshed.

I submit that that has been the objective of our Government. Secretary Laird, in testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee recently, testified that there had been no change in either U.S. objectives in Vietnam or orders to our military forces there by the present administration from the orders and objectives of the previous administration. So if our objectives are the same, if the tactical and strategic orders are the same, and the indigenous conflicting forces remain adamant, that certainly does not lead one to the easy and optimistic conclusion that we have "turned the corner."

Now if the Senator will yield further—and I apologize to him——

Mr. CRANSTON. I wish to say, along the way, that I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator's statement that we cannot achieve our objectives and defend the American interest properly if we have a long, drawn-out, phased withdrawal from Vietnam. I do think President Nixon has suggested what would be a proper timetable, and that is to try to beat Clark Clifford's timetable and get out of Vietnam by 1970. Anything more rapid than that probably would lead to other great difficulties in Vietnam.

I would also like to say that, in a sentence in the Senator's remarks, he summed up what I am taking a speech to say; and that is, if the silence of death is peace, then we can achieve peace; because that silence of death would be the consequence of the escalation that the Senator and I and many others are so concerned about.

Finally, I would like to say that the Senator's sense of others' intentions is even more acute than mine. It was not until a week ago that I learned how strong the sentiment is for escalation. But 1 month ago the Senator from Tennessee most astutely referred to the fact that he saw lurking everywhere that sentiment for escalation.

Mr. GORE. Well, I have spent each week this year in Tennessee, and, therefore, have had personal contacts with a great many people. I believe I correctly assess the situation with reference to the one sentiment held by the largest number of people. There are various ideas, views, and sentiments, but the single largest group, it seems to me, holds the view that we ought to win or come home. And, I dare say, this sentiment is held by a great many people in all States, and many people still want to win a military victory.

Anything short of victory is very hard for our people to take. We are a new and a vigorous, a young and a powerful nation. Victory has been ours in some other conflicts. One of the most difficult political and diplomatic movements for any nation to execute, and particularly a young and vigorous and powerful nation and a democracy such as ours, is a settlement of a war short of victory or something which can be camouflaged as victory.

So I am not without sympathy for the President as he undertakes to execute a gradual disengagement from Vietnam. My view does not stem from lack of sympathy and lack of understanding of the difficulties. My view stems, rather, from the impracticality of a phased withdrawal tied to a survival of the Thieu-Ky regime.

Mr. CRANSTON. I totally agree.

Mr. GORE. So long as we equate our security and our interest with the political survival of the Thieu-Ky regime, we are on a hazardous course.

I know that political face is involved. I know that prestige is involved. I know that great forces—psychological, political, and economic—are involved. And yet I know, too, that the lives of American boys are at stake. We have suffered more than 50,000 casualties since President Nixon's inauguration.

A great deal has been made of the fact that 25,000 of our sons are being brought home.

Mr. CRANSTON. Does the Senator know we have more troops today in Vietnam than we had on January 20, when President Nixon took office?

Mr. GORE. I did not know that. I inquired of the Pentagon as to how many American sons had been sent to Vietnam since the conference at Midway between President Nixon and President Thieu. I placed that information in the RECORD yesterday. More than 51,000 have been sent to Vietnam since that conference.

I know one can hardly equate the two, because men are there until they serve their time and there is necessarily a replacement program underway, unless those who are there are to be required to stay beyond their terms——

Mr. CRANSTON. Yes; some are going in and some coming out all the time. The fact is that we have a few thousand more in Vietnam today than we had on January 20, despite the commencement of the withdrawal of 25,000.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield once more, and then I will close?

Mr. CRANSTON. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. I wish to return to the principal thrust of the remarks of the able Senator, which is that there lurks in the country a sentiment held by an indefinite but, I agree with the Senator, substantial number, including some political leaders and military leaders, who believe we should yet strive for a quick military victory. In this, I submit, great dangers are involved.

Mr. CRANSTON. The sentiment indeed lurks in the Capitol and in the country, and I think our responsibility is to seek to portray exactly what the consequences would be to us and to others if those who advocate that course were able to cause our country to embark upon that course.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his extremely helpful statements and discussions.

Mr. President, there is indeed reason to feel frustrated, disillusioned, and angry.

If our hopes for an early end to the American tragedy in Vietnam are not fulfilled, I fear we will soon face new and grave dangers. So will the North Vietnamese.

We must face the fact that our hopes for an early peace may not be fulfilled.

We must also face the fact that if our hopes are not fulfilled, American patience may run out.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRANSTON. I am happy to yield to my esteemed colleague from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may refer back to what the distinguished Senator from Tennessee said, I was one of those who were impressed by the offer by President Thieu, 2 days ago, of all-Vietnamese elections, North and South; but I must say that because of later developments, as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has pointed out, I was distressed, because what he said, in effect, was that these elections could not take place until 2 years after a peace agreement had been reached.

It would have been far better had he said nothing, because on that basis, it looks like a diplomatic ploy that offers no real hope. It had been my hope that on the basis of the offer of President Thieu, which, I repeat, I approved at the time it was made, and thought was a good offer, the elections could well take place in a minimum of 3 months to a maximum of 6 months.

This is most important, because the one missing ingredient in the Geneva accords of 1954—which in a certain way, perhaps a most significant way, laid the groundwork for the difficulties in which we find ourselves today, the impasse which we cannot seem to break out of—is that under the 1954 Geneva accords it was stipulated that there would be all-Vietnamese elections 2 years after the signing of the agreement. The accords have not been put into effect as far as that particular stipulation is concerned. I think that is one of the handicaps which will keep the North and South Vietnamese apart and prevent the carrying out of these provisions, to which all of the parties agreed except Ngo Dinh Diem, the then President of South Vietnam, nor did we agree, because, while our State Department was careful not to do so openly, it participated indirectly in the negotiations, but this Nation is not a signatory to the accords.

I wanted to bring out that particular point, which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee thought was pertinent—it is highly pertinent—and make some comments on it at this time.

Mr. CRANSTON. The majority leader, in his usual perceptive and penetrating way, has put his finger right on the fundamental flaw in the position taken by President Thieu of South Vietnam. If there are to be no elections until peace is negotiated, that hands over to the Communists the power to prevent elections from ever being held. That is, because without negotiation with the Communists, there can be no peace unless there is conquest, or unless we escalate to achieve conquest through escalation, and that in itself leads to disaster.

It seems to me, as I am sure it seems to the Senator from Montana and to many others, that it is time for us to start making some decisions of our own, and it is also time for South Vietnam to start doing that also, without permitting the Communists to call the tune and determine both of our courses. It is time for us to start determining our own course.

As I stated a moment ago, we must face the fact that if our hopes are not fulfilled, American patience may run out.

It would be well if Hanoi faced that fact, too.

For it is far from certain that the end of American patience would mean the end of fighting in Vietnam.

It could mean the exact opposite.

It could mean that the advocates of escalation will finally carry the day, and that we will set out to "win" the war in Vietnam.

That day must never come.

Before it is too late, we must come to grips with the false god of "military victory" in Vietnam.

We must destroy that false god once and for all, before it destroys us.

The question, more urgent now than ever, is: What is victory in Vietnam?

Is victory something that can be achieved by full military escalation?

What would escalation be likely to cost in additional American lives?

What would it be likely to cost in additional American tax dollars?

What are the estimated costs—in men and money—of an expanded war, including China? or Russia? or both?

Was President Johnson, despite all his Vietnam mistakes, right in determining to limit the nature of the war? Was he right, at the end of his term, in deciding that we should not seek military victory?

Is President Nixon right in ruling out military victory in Vietnam?

I hold that President Johnson was right then. I hold that President Nixon is right now.

The struggle in Vietnam is basically a political and social upheaval that can be won only by the people of South Vietnam themselves. We can help them but we cannot do their work for them. We cannot create for them the sense of national unity; we cannot build the political climate; we cannot compel the economic and social reforms that are essential if South Vietnam is to survive. The Vietnamese must do these things themselves.

American military power cannot build a nation in Vietnam. The South Vietnamese must build it.

The traditional theory of a military victory simply does not fit in the Vietnam situation. In a guerrilla struggle you win by winning over the people, not by winning in battle against the enemy. If the people are with you, the enemy is defeated; if they are against you, you are defeated.

The "win-it" theory assumes that our military power is so superior that all we need do is escalate the war to a height which the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese can neither match nor endure. According to this notion, our enemies will then crumble and fall.

The advocates of escalation concede that American casualties and expenditures will rise for a time. But they believe the final result would be total military victory.

This reasoning overlooks some essential facts.

First off, as we all know, the men in Hanoi and in the southern jungles and villages are not alone. They are backed by the Soviet Union and Red China. So the fact is that we are not fighting only a small, undeveloped nation.

Compared with our massive efforts, Communist assistance from outside has been relatively modest. But they seem to have gotten a much better return on their investment than we.

And, if we step up our activities, they have the option of stepping up theirs.

A second fact that escalationists neglect is that this is not a conventional war to be fought and won with conventional military approaches. It is a special guerrilla type of war.

It conceivably might have been forgivable to misunderstand the distinctive features of the Vietnam engagement years ago. But the military activities there have been described with increasing detail over the years by press and radio, and on television. And high Washington officials have had access to more detailed, classified intelligence reports.

Thus it is difficult to understand how anyone can still ignore the fact that though certain areas have been "conquered" by American and South Vietnamese troops, military operations still go right on, and continue to go on, as long as a significant part of the population in the area is intent on sabotage and possesses devoted hatred of the occupying forces.

Now that we have taken these often overlooked factors into account, let us imagine that the stalemate in Vietnam persists, accompanied by rising frustration and fury in America, until proponents of escalation finally are given their way.

Let us consider a number of forms that escalation could take.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRANSTON. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it is very wise of the Senator to raise this question, but what interests me is what leads him to believe there is serious consideration being given to escalation of the war, by which I presume he means resuming, on a bigger scale, the search and destroy missions, and even possibly renewal of the bombing of the north. Does he have any evidence that leads him to believe that this may occur?

Mr. CRANSTON. I have evidence that there are powerful Senators with influence in the White House, who believe that this is the course we should follow. My evidence is that I have heard them make remarks along those lines on this floor.

One Senator said that he has talked with many military leaders during this administration and during the previous administration, and that they tell him we could win now if we were prepared to pay the costs and make the sacrifices.

I note the polls that indicate that many people, out of frustration and anger, now feel that we should escalate.

The poll was placed in the RECORD on the House side recently by a Member of that body. It indicated that 39 percent of his constituents feel that we should go in this direction.

The mail that I receive every day—and I am sure that in the mail that other Senators receive—reflects a rising anger and frustration.

I find daily in my mail—and I am sure that the Senator does in his—suggestions and demands that we win the war. These sentiments suggest that if the frustrations and delays go on and on, we may find rising and conceivably irresistible demands in our land that we take the necessary although devastating and catastrophic steps to win.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I agree that there are signs that the failure of the administration to move in any noticeable way in the Paris negotiations toward a solution is contributing to the frustration.

That, together with the suggestion that troops in some small numbers will be withdrawn, creates almost a schizophrenic attitude.

People are even more confused than they were before over the announcement of troop withdrawals when they see no progress being made in the negotiations.

Is that what the Senator is saying?

Mr. CRANSTON. The Senator is correct. And I think we have to separate the need for American extrication, the need for American troop withdrawals in accordance hopefully with the timetable suggested by the President, from the peace negotiations, because the peace negotiations may never succeed. If the Communists do not want them to, they never will result in peace.

We cannot let the Communists decide what we should do in Vietnam. We must proceed with care and honor and without waiting forever for the Communists to talk peace.

I would like to cite one further bit of evidence regarding the danger of escalation. Vice President Ky, of South Vietnam, has suggested that we should forget all about the Paris peace talks and walk out on them. He has said that we must renew full-scale combat. The trouble is that he means us. He means that the Americans should stay there and do that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator's interpretation is correct.

It strikes me that the one reason why no progress has been made in the peace talks is that there has been no progress by the U.S. Government in making up its mind that it does not intend to stay there, either itself or by proxy—meaning the continued control and support of the Thieu-Ky government.

If maintenance of that government is a condition for a negotiated, political settlement, I am afraid there will not be any settlement. And I am not sure that has been made clear enough.

As I read many of the public arguments by the administration, they would indicate that our policy is to support the Thieu-Ky government to the point where that government can maintain itself in power regardless of whatever else might happen and whatever that may require in the way in money and arms and time.

I agree with the Senator from California. I think the Senator is raising the very timely point that we have been on this particular track now for some 6 months and no progress is being made.

The only progress has been in the deescalation of our casualties due to the fact that there has been a lull, certainly on the other side, participated in recently by ourselves.

That has been all to the good. Fewer men have been killed and wounded during the past few weeks. But that is about the only change I know of.

While I would like to see that continue, I do not think there has been much other change. I would hope that what the Senator is saying will be taken most seriously by the administration and our colleagues. I realize that some people still think the war can be won in a military sense. I have never been quite sure what would be won if we were to win.

I remember one of the earlier questions raised with Secretary of State Rusk—I believe it was by the Senator from Tennessee—was the question, "If we win a military victory, what do we win?"

That was a very difficult question to answer. And it has not quite been answered yet.

The ultimate objective, even if there is a military victory—at least on the part of the last administration and this one—would appear to be that we should then depart gracefully from the continent of Asia and leave it to whoever might succeed in those particular circumstances—which would probably be the same ones who would succeed if we had a negotiated peace.

I think it is timely to raise this question. We become so frustrated by going to the moon and having the All-Star game rained out and various other things that people have almost forgotten about the war in Vietnam. Yet, it grinds on and kills hundreds of our men each week and consumes vast sums of money.

It is time that we come back to earth and examine some of the questions that plague us here.

I am pleased that the Senator has brought up the matter.

Mr. CRANSTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

In response to the question he more or less left hanging in the air at the end of his remarks, it would seem to me that if we would proceed to take the steps advocated by some in the Senate and achieve what is loosely called a military victory, we would be required to stay in Vietnam everlastingly in order not to lose what we thought we had won. There would be so much chaos and hatred there that we would, I think, have to stay there forever.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. What I meant was that the previous administration—and I think this administration—has suggested that we do not seek one inch of territory. I know the previous administration was always saying, "We do not seek to gain a colony. We do not want a base. All we want is to guarantee the people the right of self-determination."

That is about what it came down to. It was an oversimplification. However, the Senator is right. If we did win, it would be a great tragedy if it were to mean that we would be saddled with occupying that country until we ourselves became so weak, as France did, that we could no longer maintain ourselves and would go bankrupt as a society. None of us would want that.

I do not wish to impose on the Senator's time any longer. However, I am very happy that he brought up the matter.

I do not know what to do. Does the Senator have any ideas of what we can do in the Senate? I have exhausted my brain trying to think of something we could persuade or influence the administration to understand that they should close out this horrible tragedy.

Does the Senator have any good ideas on that? I agree that we do not want to escalate the war. However, is there any suggestion the Senator might make to bring the war to a close?

Mr. CRANSTON. The President has indicated what I think is the right course to pursue. He has stated that he would like to get all of our combat troops out by the end of next year. He is now being pushed by many Americans, including some Senators, in the opposite direction.

I think there are those who do not wish to see the President meet that timetable or to succeed in seeking a solution.

I think one of our responsibilities is to support the President in that laudable objective.

I think that we should do all we can to assist him.

He will fail to meet that timetable unless several things are done.

First, we must convince those in power in South Vietnam that we will move out and that they cannot upset our timetable.

Second, we should make it plain that after we get our troops out of Southeast Asia, we will give them assistance in terms of supplies and training roughly matching that given the other side from outside sources—Russia and China—but that that aid will come only if they make the necessary reforms to earn the allegiance of their people. If they refuse to do that, they cannot be saved. And they cannot win the allegiance of their people.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am very glad to hear the Senator say that he feels that what the President has proposed for the withdrawal of our troops, on our timetable, is what we should support. I am prepared to do that if he continues to advocate it and there is no wavering in his determination to go through with what I think is his statement—with this one reservation. A question is left in my mind—this is not clear—as to whether or not we are tied to this particular regime and intend to see to it that it is capable of maintaining itself. I am not saying that we should reverse on that and throw them out. They should be given an opportunity, along with other people in Vietnam, to establish, as the Senator has said, a broad base of political support among the people, if they can do it. We support other dictators in other countries, because circumstances are such that I do not think we have an alternative. But that is not the same as saying they have the same opportunity as other factions to participate. But I think that to say we are going to escalate or to say we are just going to leave unilaterally is impracticable.

I hope I have never contributed to the idea in North Vietnam that we were just going to turn around and leave, as much as many people would like to do so—simply because this would lead, I guess, to the North Vietnamese refusing to negotiate. I had hoped we could have an orderly, negotiated settlement, carrying out what President Nixon has said in his objective, which is the withdrawal of our troops, but in an orderly manner. I mean without chaos following and there being economic, moral, and political disorder following our withdrawal.

This is what I think we contemplated in the Geneva Conference. I think the accords entered into at Geneva tried to set down the principles on which withdrawal of the French could have been done at that time. I have said many times since then that if we would follow that course as closely as possible now, I think it would still provide the framework in which we could withdraw; that is, we could disengage or we could do—whatever words one wants to use—to end this war and leave it to the Vietnamese people to determine what kind of country and what kind of government they want.

As I said earlier, I am prepared and am eager to support the President, with this one reservation: I do not think it will work, nor will they get an agreed settlement in accordance with the kind of principles entered into at Geneva, unless we make it clear that we are not there to support the existing government, without any alternative, without anyone else having an opportunity to participate. I think that is the key to getting the kind of agreement that would be the most civilized and most useful for everybody concerned.

Mr. CRANSTON. I agree with every view expressed by the Senator from Arkansas in regard to the current situation and to the need to support the President, to strengthen the President, and to persuade him to take the additional steps that the Senator has suggested, in order to make it possible for the President to achieve the policy he has offered to the American people.

I thank the Senator from Arkansas for making a very important contribution to this effort to clarify the thinking in this body, in this Capital, and in this country on this crucial matter.

Let us, then, consider a number of forms that escalation could take.

The other day, I heard a powerful Senator complain, because we have not interdicted the port of Haiphong.

The U.S. Navy could surely stop all sea shipments to Haiphong and elsewhere into North Vietnam, and could halt most of the local small marine traffic along the coast.

This would require a major step-up in American military activities, however; and our vessels engaged in this activity would at once be targets for North Vietnamese retaliation. Soviet-produced, land-based and STYX missiles would almost certainly be hurled against our forces.

We would have to step up our air activities to protect our naval operations.

The new dimension of naval and air operations would cost us additional billions a year, plus additional casualties.

We could choose the simpler course of mining the approaches to Haiphong and other North Vietnamese harbors. We would, in either case, face a major confrontation with the Soviet Union the first time we stopped or sank a Russian ship.

For all that, sealing off North Vietnam's ports would not stall the North Vietnamese war machine. The Soviet Union, and perhaps China would simply step up supplies to North Vietnam by land. Even now, virtually all military supplies come to North Vietnam by overland routes, and at the height of our bombing we were unable to cut off these supplies.

Another step many escalationists have urged is unrestricted use of American airpower over North Vietnam. The airpower alone, they believe, could bring the North Vietnamese to their knees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EAGLETON in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CRANSTON. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CRANSTON. This argument ignores all the history of the air age. It has been shown repeatedly that conventional airpower alone cannot defeat a nation.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield with pleasure to the distinguished senior Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that my distinguished colleague will be finished in 15 minutes?

Mr. CRANSTON. I hope to be finished in 15 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. I ask for a general purpose. I have reserved time, as he has, and I have made a complete schedule. I wonder how long the Senator desires to continue.

Mr. CRANSTON. I believe I can complete my remarks within 15 minutes, particularly if the current moment of time is not deducted.

Mr. MURPHY. I realize that the Senator has been interrupted, and I was concerned. It is not my intention in any way to deny him the floor. I am just wondering about my schedule and my arrangements.

Mr. CRANSTON. I believe I can conclude in 15 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. I have no objection.

Mr. CRANSTON. If other Senators wish the floor, it may take a little longer than that.

Mr. MURPHY. In this case, then, I am afraid I reserve the right to object.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. First, I desire to congratulate the distinguished junior Senator from California on his outstanding speech today. I am in complete accord with many—in fact, most—of the statements he has made. I feel that I know something about the matter, as I spent nearly a month in Vietnam in 1965 and again last year.

Very definitely, in asking for an orderly, negotiated settlement, the Senator is taking a position that all Americans feel is sound. This should not be, as it has become, an American war in Vietnam.

The distinguished junior Senator from California has expressed the factually correct statement that there are at the present time more Americans fighting in the ugly civil war in Vietnam than there were on last January 20. It is to be regretted that while we hear about deescalation from the White House, one of the first actions of the President was to remove a distinguished negotiator, a truly great American and diplomat, Averell Harriman, and put in his place Henry Cabot Lodge, who is a close friend of Vice President Ky, the flamboyant air marshal.

So it is discouraging to contemplate the situation with which we are now confronted. The period of service of most of the 4½ percent of the Americans withdrawn from Vietnam by order of President Nixon had about expired.

I am in agreement with the views of the Senator from California with respect to escalating the combat. It seems to me that combat has been escalated in recent months despite what has been said. Any person who reads the statistics of the number of troops killed and wounded in Vietnam cannot help but agree. During May, June, and so far in July more Americans have been killed and wounded in Vietnam than the total number of South Vietnamese.

The Senator is so correct in calling attention to bombing by our airpower, and what would happen if that is escalated, as some Senators on the other side of the aisle have been advocating recently, and what would happen if we interdict the port of Haiphong, where few supplies come in anyway. The Senator is correct in stating that that course would jeopardize our position there.

I am sure the Senator and I are in agreement that Vietnam is of no importance whatever to the defense of the United States. I shall not take any more of the Senator's time except to say that Gen. James Gavin has said that to increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi would add to our problems rather than detract from them, and that it would not stop the penetration of North Vietnamese troops into the South. General Ridgway, who was the commander of U.S. Forces during the Korean war, and who is an expert on Asian affairs—he was also my commander during World War II—said:

> It is my firm belief there is nothing in our code that requires us to bomb a small Asian nation back into the Stone Age period.

Again, I compliment the distinguished Senator from California. I agree with him. Vietnam is a national tragedy of immense proportions and the war must be brought to an end as soon as possible by negotiation. Then we will have an opportunity to take care of the problems which need our attention so much at home.

Mr. CRANSTON. I thank the able Senator from Ohio for adding those constructive thoughts and useful facts to this discussion on Vietnam.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield with great pleasure to the distinguished Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from California for making what I consider to be a very timely speech with respect to the risks and some of the problems connected with possible escalation in the fighting in South Vietnam.

That frustrations do exist is revealed, I suspect, in the mail of every Senator—as people contemplate the sacrifices being asked of our young men, and as taxpayers contemplate the burdens imposed upon them without the prospect of an end.

I wish to emphasize one point which the Senator made in this connection. Hanoi and the other side should not misread this frustration and misinterpret its possible consequences. I think the enemy is relying quite heavily on the hope that this kind of frustration may lead us to panic for unilateral withdrawal, whatever the consequences, in Vietnam. I think the pressure, indeed, be in the other direction, pressure for the kind of escalation which the Senator is discussing. I think Hanoi should pay attention to what the Senator is saying.

On our side, and indeed among some Senators, there appears to be sentiment for escalation, total military victory, and the big push. That same kind of sentiment exists in Vietnam if we are to believe the evidence available to us. Its existence apparently inhibits movement in Paris on the part of negotiators for Hanoi and the National Liberation Front.

We are not going to achieve a negotiated settlement until each side concludes that a negotiated settlement is in its own best interests.

This factor of the possibility of escalation, it seems to me, is a complicating factor here and it is a complicating factor and influence in Hanoi, as well as the National Liberation Front. So I compliment the Senator for making this point.

Secondly, I wish to compliment the Senator for pointing out the fruitless consequences that escalation would bring. We have not had this kind of discussion of the escalation options that might be considered for a long time. I think it is good for us to be reminded of them. Only one outcome of this war can serve the best interest of all the parties, and that is a negotiated settlement which will convert the conflict from a military struggle to a political struggle. That has got to be our objective. It is in the best interests of Hanoi; it is in the best interests of the National Liberation Front; and it is in our best interests.

I wish to compliment the Senator for making a speech which deals with the frustration and the difficulty of devising a formula, approach, or policy which can contribute constructively and visibly toward the objective of a negotiated settlement. It frustrates us all.

The Senator makes some suggestions in the closing pages of his speech, and I commend him for making them. I have suggested that the President should consider the formal offer of a standstill cease-fire to the other side. I think that kind of offer, coupled with the unqualified offer of free elections, which unfortunately, has now been qualified by President Thieu, could serve as an addi-

XUM

tional initiative which might just possibly move the other side another step or two toward a negotiated settlement. It is this sort of thing to which we should address ourselves: What meaningful steps can we take in our interests, and those we seek to protect, to advance the possibility of a negotiated settlement? New and continuing initiatives in this direction—an escalation of our efforts to achieve an end to the fighting and a political settlement, rather than an escalation in the fighting—should be our objective.

I commend the able Senator.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRANSTON. I shall yield to the Senator, but, first, I wish to thank the Senator from Maine and say that he is one of the great leaders of this Nation. I hope that the American people will heed his words today. I hope also, as he suggested, that his words and other words spoken in this Chamber today will be heeded by the men in Hanoi, Peking, and Moscow. If that be the case, today could get a message across that could lead to a solution in Vietnam.

I thank the Senator. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for yielding. I do not ask the distinguished junior Senator from Maine or the distinguished junior Senator from California to agree with the senior Senator from Tennessee. I just must say that I question the validity, probity, and actuality of a so-called peace proposal by which President Thieu offers elections which are to be conducted under his administrative authority, even though observed by an international body, and in which the Vietcong would be permitted to vote only after forswearing force and arms, such elections, we are now told, to be held 2 years after the end of the war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) has expired.

Mr. CRANSTON. May I ask my colleague from California what his time situation is.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I do not in any way wish to impede my distinguished colleague. I think the colloquy and dialog now going on is most important and I also would like to enter into debate. I have no intention of cutting it off. I should like to suggest that, in order not to impede my distinguished colleague, that he be permitted all the time he desires, and, to that end, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my time, which was supposed to begin at 5 minutes after 12 be moved up to 1:30 p.m. instead, in order to accommodate my distinguished colleague from California. I think that would take care of it, would it not?

Mr. CRANSTON. Yes. I am very grateful to my colleague for his suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the request of the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY)?

Mr. MURPHY. That all the time desired be given to my distinguished colleague from California (Mr. CRANSTON) and that the time which had been reserved for me, which I believe was at 5 minutes after 12, be moved up to 1:30 o'clock p.m. in order to accommodate him, and let other Senators continue the colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would advise the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) that the difficulty is that there are a series of orders already agreed to, one following another after the expiration of each speech, and thus to agree to this new arrangement would throw everything out of order.

Mr. MURPHY. In other words, the Chair rules that he would cancel my request, is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would point out that following the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) will have the floor, and then the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), and their time, of course, would be contingent upon the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Well, Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is willing to rule the request out of order.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President——

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I will accommodate myself to my colleague.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed regardless of the pending order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For what period of time?

Mr. CRANSTON. For 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I have no intention to ask for the regular order. I congratulate my colleague on being so alert, but I have no intention of asking for the regular order.

Mr. CRANSTON. I am very grateful to my colleague from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, evidence has just been placed before the Senate that my colleague and I do agree on procedural matters, and I want to say that there are also some substantive matters on which we agree, even though our views may be different on the matter I am presently discussing.

Mr. President, the other day I heard a powerful Senator complaining because we have not interdicted the port of Haiphong.

The U.S. Navy could surely stop all sea shipments to Haiphong and elsewhere into North Vietnam, and could halt most of the local small marine traffic along the coast.

This would require a major step-up in American military activities, however. And, our vessels engaged in this activity would at once be targets for North Vietnamese retaliation. Soviet-produced, land-based and STYX missiles would almost certainly be hurled against our forces.

We would have to step up our air activities to protect our naval operations.

The new dimension of naval and air operations would cost us additional billions a year, plus additional casualties.

We could choose the simpler course of mining the approaches to Haiphong and other North Vietnamese harbors. We would, in either case, face a major confrontation with the Soviet Union the first time we stopped or sank a Russian ship.

For all that, sealing off North Vietnam's ports would not stall the North Vietnamese war machine. The Soviet Union, and perhaps China, too, would simply step up supplies to North Vietnam by land. Even now, virtually all military supplies come to North Vietnam by overland routes, and at the height of our bombing we were unable to cut off these supplies.

Another step many escalationists have urged is unrestricted use of American airpower over North Vietnam. The airpower alone, they believe, could bring the North Vietnamese to their knees.

This argument ignores all the history of the air age. It has been shown repeatedly that conventional airpower alone cannot defeat a nation. It did not work in Vietnam where our earlier restrictions were designed primarily to keep our bombs away from populated areas. It did not work against Germany in World War II when we bombed without restriction, nor did it work against Japan until we went to nuclear bombs.

The evidence is clear that terror bombing does not break a people's morale. In some instances after saturation bombing of populated areas military production actually increased. Short of nuclear warfare, airpower alone cannot win in Vietnam.

Suppose, instead, that we invade North Vietnam. Our aims would be to take over all of North Vietnam, and capture Ho Chi Minh if we could. We would want to gain complete control over North Vietnamese production, transportation, and communication facilities. And, by firm military occupation, we would seek to suppress hostile activities of the population to eliminate North Vietnam as a viable military force.

But, clearly, that could not be done without calling up added millions of American troops.

A half million Americans have been sent to South Vietnam where only some of the population is hostile and where a very substantial part is either actively cooperative or neutral.

If we took on all of North as well as South Vietnam, we would be tackling a totally hostile population that has been propagandized for years with an intense hatred of Americans as foreign invaders.

Even with millions of Americans fighting, we still would be outnumbered by people who surely will never meet us in a conventional military engagement of large-scale forces.

There is absolutely no reason to think that the North Vietnamese would ever surrender to us.

Let us admit the best and the worst of our foe: He has demonstrated his willingness to resist until the last man, woman, and child.

The North Vietnamese are now in their 28th year of almost constant fighting: First against Japan, then France, then South Vietnam, and now the United

States, Korea, Australia, Thailand, and the Philippines.

We have learned to our sorrow that the will, the determination, and the morale of the North Vietnamese are no less today than on the day they forced the French to withdraw.

If we invaded North Vietnam, the leaders and most of the trained men would simply pull out before we took over, retreating into neighboring non-Vietnamese territory where they would be free to continue their sabotage and guerrilla activities.

American casualties would rise in proportion to the rising numbers of men in combat.

With a half million Americans in South Vietnam, 36,000 have been killed.

Many more would be doomed to die over the years if we tried to conquer a hostile, seething, rebellious North Vietnam.

This bleak picture of an American expeditionary force sentenced to futile, endless punishment in Asian jungles does not even take into account Russian and Chinese reactions to an expanded land war.

We must expect, at the very least, that ample Soviet and probably Chinese supplies would be available to the Vietnamese opposing American occupation.

The entire Vietnam land, with its jungles and mountainous terrain, would be unsafe for Americans anywhere at night. Even in the daylight, except where we had large troop concentrations, our forces would be continuously subjected to harassment, sniping, and shelling.

The Soviet Union and Red China would probably do more than simply step up the flow of supplies if we try to occupy all of Vietnam. But even assuming that is all they would do, the best we could hope for would be years of increased American casualties, and increased American spending. We now spend $30 billion a year on Vietnam. The figure could easily rise to 50, 70, or even a hundred billion dollars a year.

Taxes would be vastly increased, and so would our inability to come to grips with our critical domestic problems.

With casualties and expenditures up at a new high, escalationists would have only one direction in which to go; up, to still more escalation. Inevitably, they would demand that we attack the suppliers of the guerrilla sabotage operation.

Their argument would be that we could not "straighten it out" and "win it" as long as the North Vietnamese had sanctuaries to flee to, and allies to help them.

Their cry would now be: Occupy Laos and Cambodia.

So we would reach the logical next step of escalation; further escalation.

I said that it was probably foolish to imagine the Soviet Union and Red China sitting idly by through all of this.

If they did, it would only be to watch us bleed ourselves into military impotence abroad and economic bankruptcy at home.

The Soviet Union today provides North Vietnam and the Vietcong with the means to sustain such strong activity against U.S. operations in South Vietnam that it costs us $30 billion and unacceptable American casualties each year. It costs them an estimated $2 billion a year, and no casualties.

If we were to build up toward $100 billion a year, while putting perhaps 3 million Americans in Vietnam and suffering vastly increased casualties, the Soviet Union might be very content to let that situation continue for years.

While neither the U.S.S.R. nor Red China could be totally pleased to see the United States occupying still more territory in Asia, they would weigh that against the severe penalties the United States would be paying for undertaking so foolish an escalation.

Red China would uncontestably be uneasy with proponents of escalation in command of our Nation and moving closer to their borders. Faced with this threat, they would unite internally. The United States, meanwhile, would be a scene of increased division and turmoil.

If the Chinese found our escalation too threatening to them, their next logical countermove would be to send their massive land armies into North Vietnam to contest our occupation.

Then we would be at war with Red China—the major Asian land war that General MacArthur repeatedly warned us against. He knew, as every American military authority knows, that the United States must never engage in a ground war over the sweeping terrain of Asia against China's vast population.

Our military leaders know that we could not vanquish China by dropping conventional bombs across the great Chinese land mass.

They know that we could not possibly contain the situation without disaster—unless we went to nuclear weapons against China.

And that, too, would mean disaster.

American nuclear weapons would kill Chinese by the millions.

But they would not create a stable peace in Asia. Quite the opposite.

Nuclear war would fragment China. Along with anarchy, suffering, disease, starvation, and massive deaths without burials, there would come worldwide horror directed against the United States.

The revulsion within our Nation would leave an irreparable wound in America's soul.

And, to add futility to dishonor, the villages in South Vietnam that are now in Vietcong hands would still be in the hands of the Vietcong on the day we occupied Peiping.

The Soviet Union, I suspect, would simply stand by and enjoy the utter chaos.

What does all this add up to?

Clearly, escalation would take a bad situation and make it worse. It would lead only to further escalation, and to a nightmare of consequences.

There is another way.

President Nixon pointed to this other way when he expressed the hope that we can replace all American combat troops with South Vietnamese troops before the end of 1970.

Our task, I believe, is to support and strengthen him in that effort.

Once and for all, we must stop thinking of military escalation as an alternative to diplomatic frustration. No matter what happens in Paris, we must not reverse what should be an irrevocable commitment to extricate ourselves militarily from Vietnam.

Indeed, it is because peace negotiations keep dragging on endlessly that I believe we must speed up the process of extrication. We must start moving our troops out of Vietnam in significant numbers before the frustrations of Paris overtake and overwhelm us and get us in deeper than ever.

I would like to see us move faster, and I know President Nixon would like to do so.

The way to move faster, I believe, is to make two things absolutely clear to the Government of South Vietnam.

First, that we are determined to withdraw all our men from combat in accordance with a timetable of our design—our design and no one else's.

Second, that after our troops are gone, we will keep on providing supplies and training only if the regime there takes effective steps to rally to it those courageous men, women, and children who have resisted both the callousness and corruption of Saigon and the cold ruthlessness of Hanoi and its southern minions.

The South Vietnamese Government will not assume the combat burden that is rightfully theirs as long as we are willing to carry it for them.

The rulers of South Vietnam will not broaden and reform their government and share power with other non-Communist South Vietnamese, as long as we are willing to prop up their government while it jails avowed anti-Communists, tolerates torture in its prisons, and suppresses freedom of speech and religion.

We simply cannot let our course be determined by men in either Hanoi or Saigon. In Vietnam, as elsewhere, we must remain the masters of our own fate.

In the last analysis, certain basic truths remain.

There are approximately 15 million South Vietnamese, and 15 million North Vietnamese.

South Vietnam and North Vietnam are roughly equal in geographical size.

South Vietnam is stronger than North Vietnam in vital resources—agriculture, mineral, and timber.

Thus, if the aid we give a united South Vietnam matches the aid China and Russia give to North Vietnam, the people of South Vietnam will be able to defend themselves—if they possess the character, the will, the determination, and the desire.

Surely, the last thing Ho Chi Minh wants to face is a strong and united South Vietnam prepared to stand on its own feet and defend itself. Then he would lose the "hated foreigner" slogan that he has used these many years to recruit his fighting forces. A stalemate in a war strictly between Vietnamese would be the circumstance most likely to produce a reasonable settlement in Vietnam.

If South Vietnam lacks the character and capacity to produce that stalemate, we could stay forever fighting its battle—

and forever fail to achieve victory or peace.

That we cannot do.

That we will not do.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I congratulate my colleague on a very careful and well-designed presentation. At this time, just to make certain that there can be a minimum of misunderstanding, I would like to read exactly what the President has said with regard to troop withdrawal. He said:

> This, then, is the outline of the settlement we seek to negotiate in Paris. Its basic form and terms are very simple—mutual withdrawal of non-South Vietnamese forces from South Vietnam and free choice for the people of South Vietnam. I believe that the long-term interests of peace require that we insist on no less and that the realities of the situation require that we seek no more.

In other words, as my distinguished colleague has pointed out, the President would be more than happy to withdraw troops as fast as possible, provided we had the assurance that other, non-South Vietnamese troops are withdrawn at the same time. To do otherwise I think would be very foolhardy.

CHANGE IN ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR TYDINGS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the previous order, the distinguished Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) be recognized immediately following the address by the distinguished Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), rather than follwing the address by the senior Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from California.

THE SAFEGUARD ABM SYSTEM

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of the inclusion of the Safeguard system in the military authorization bill for fiscal year 1970, as requested by President Nixon.

At the outset, I wish to compliment most highly the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator STENNIS, for the excellent job he did in conducting the enormously complicated hearings on this issue.

I would also like to congratulate Senator MARGARET SMITH, the ranking minority member of the committee, as well as Senator MCINTYRE, on whose Subcommittee on Research and Development I had the pleasure of serving.

I think that all concerned deserve a great deal of credit for doing such a thorough and productive job in bringing this bill to the floor of the Senate at this time.

I am somewhat sorry that the results of their efforts and of the admirable work of the full committee must be subjected to such a long and exhaustive debate because of considerations which, in many cases, appear to be matters of policy rather than procurement, or international politics rather than arms purchase.

However, in these troubled and complex times, I guess that this is the way it has to be.

Regardless of the length of the debate and the far-ranging issues discussed during it, a final decision regarding the President's request for a Safeguard system must be made on the merits, and this decision quite properly should be made now.

For over a week I have listened attentively to both proponents and opponents of the Safeguard system as they have made their arguments, pleaded their cases, and reached conclusions which I found sometimes enlightening, sometimes most confusing, and often, I fear, based more on wishful thinking than fact, more on whim than substance, and more on desire than reality.

For instance, I have heard statements in this Chamber which amaze and dismay me at the same time, such as "aerial bombardment has not been effective." I wish to assure my colleagues that this statement is very misleading and does not tell the entire story. In spite of impossible imposed restrictions laid on by civilians during the past several years in the Department of Defense, I have seen adequate proof and have heard reports which would indicate that airpower has been very effective and that the power of the B–52's in North Vietnam was one of the most effective things we had going for us.

I suggest that my colleagues might request and look at the films of the relief of the siege of Khe Sanh, and see the magnificent job done by our airmen—not in indiscriminate bombing, but in bombing more careful, more precise, and with greater concern for civilian noncombatants than ever before in the history of war.

Beyond that, I have been informed that during the first weeks of October, by hitting supply roads and river crossings, practically all of the overland supplies and reinforcements from North Vietnam into the south were almost completely shut off when President Johnson ordered the bombing stopped. Many North Vietnamese regiments had given up the fight and had gone into sanctuary because of lack of food and lack of ammunition. At other times I have heard it stated repeatedly, "we could not win the war militarily." I can only accept this statement as being incomplete. We could not win the war militarily because that was the policy decided on by our so-called civilian leaders and because they decided that certain conditions be imposed to accomplish exactly this conclusion. To me it seems false, misleading, and provocative and, of course, when used as propaganda by the North Vietnamese Communists, it unquestionably gave false hopes to the Communist forces at Hanoi and inspired them to continue the fight. Then, too, we have heard from so many who have given the impression that we should get out of Vietnam regardless of the cost or conditions. I am very pleased that some of my colleagues, within the last several days, have taken the occasion to speak on the floor of this Chamber, in order to make the record crystal clear that this is not the wish, the intent, or the plan of the American people. We Americans hope very much to arrive at an honorable and lasting negotiated peace, but we have no intention of walking away from our obligations or our national commitment to the principles for which so many of our young men have sacrificed their lives, regardless of the urgings of the "peace at any price" groups. Many military experts believe now and have believed for the past several years that had our military men been permitted to fight in the conventional manner, the war in Vietnam would have been won, or at least the fighting could have been concluded, some time ago.

I should like to point out, at this point, that their suggestion did not include what has been spoken of here today as grand style escalation. It was rather de-escalation. The plan was to cut off the enemy's supplies, and thereby make it impossible for him to continue fighting. This is not a new idea in warfare; it has been used effectively for many, many years in the past.

We had almost exactly the same condition and experience in Korea, and for almost the same reason. Our policymakers decided that there would be no military victory and consequently in Korea we had what we called a "no-win" policy, whereas in South Vietnam we find the same policy dressed in a new package now called "limited response."

I was glad to hear my distinguished colleague refer to the comments of General MacArthur. To complete his study of the views of that distinguished gentleman, I would suggest that he read the remarks of General MacArthur with regard to the restrictions placed on him in Korea. That, too, was a strange war. We did not lose; we were not permitted to win, and it dragged on and on, I believe in some cases unnecessarily.

I might say that others who have the same desire for peace that compels all of us keep suggesting that we take one more first step toward appeasing the Communists in their design for world domination. I might say that I have listened to this suggestion, at first hopefully, later with some suspicion, and finally with a feeling of frustration. And it has seemed to me that if we keep taking the "first step," as suggested, our national shoes would be worn out before the Russians give any sign of reacting favorably to our friendly gestures. We are now, I believe, in about our 40th year of having done good to the Soviets time after time without getting anything in return but abuse and vilification, and further threats of destruction of our system. It would seem that historically they have only reacted properly when there has been a threat of force or a show of force as in Greece, Lebanon, and Cuba, and I believe that the time has most certainly arrived when we must be completely realistic in our assessment of the needs for the security of our Nation and how to achieve this security. I have even heard that one of the most distinguished Members of this body asked the rhetorical question, "has anybody psychoanalyzed the Russians?" In answer, I would say that I do not think psychoanalysis is particularly called for when the records of

XUM

the last 40 years provide us with a full and complete story by which we may judge their motives, their methods, their national interests, and their final hopes. They have been most definite in their design—we should learn from our experience.

With these things in mind, and having studied the presentations of my colleagues and reviewed them in the light of the testimony regarding the proposed ABM system that I have heard during the debate here in the Senate and during the hearings of the Armed Services Committee, I feel that the most important considerations to which we should direct our attention in our evaluation of the Safeguard system are these:

First. Do we need it?

Second. Will it work?

Third. Will it offend, in any way, the Russians or increase their activity to hasten the arms race?

Fourth. Can we afford it?

Fifth. Is it important to the defense and future security of the United States?

Sixth. Should the decision to construct and deploy be made at this time?

I would like to discuss these points one by one.

First, Mr. President, is the question, "Do we need it?"

The opinion of those on both sides of the argument is almost unanimous that we should, without question, have an effective ABM system and that we should proceed with all possible speed to research and develop such a defense but not build it.

The major argument seems to revolve around the timing and location of the actual construction of the system.

We must remember, Mr. President, that a great deal of the research and development has already been done on most of the components which will go together to make up the Safeguard system.

Therefore, the next important step is to assemble these component parts and program them into one operational unit so that the end result will be a workable, viable ABM system, as requested by the President.

Where and when this should be done has been discussed at length. One of our colleagues who opposes the Safeguard defense system as requested by the President suggests it might be practical to use existing facilities in Kwajalein and add to these facilities the necessary components which would make it effective as an ABM system. In answer to this, may I say that the suggested Pacific deployment would fulfill the requirement—providing the needed radar facilities—but only that. It would not provide any capability nor would it provide a basic installation which might be later expanded if the threat indicated the need for such expansion. In this regard, the suggestion to build the installation in the far-off Pacific is, to my mind, without value and would merely serve to cause a delay in starting construction or deployment in the continental United States, where it would be effective if needed. Also, I would point out, there is the matter of cost. It must be recognized that construction in faraway areas such as Kwajalein would be much more expensive than construction in the United States. Therefore, I would conclude that the Pacific installation as suggested would be unacceptably expensive, provide no defense, and would only serve to delay the start of the much-needed defense of the Minuteman.

But underlying this entire debate there seems to have been a general agreement that we do, indeed, need a defensive system against any present or future plans for a nuclear attack on our country or against any miscalculation or mistake on the part of some other nuclear nation which, if not intercepted, might cause us catastrophic damage.

I like the way it was put by the distinguished Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY) the other day when he said that it would be nice to give the President of the United States the option of several buttons and that if there were a mistaken, unfortunate launch, we would not have, in our own defense, to launch our offensive weapons. We would have a choice of using defensive weapons which would cause no destruction to anyone or anything except the unfortunate weapon that was headed our way.

Therefore, Mr. President, I suggest that to the question, "Do we need Safeguard?", the answer, without any doubt whatsoever, is that we most certainly do and we need it very badly.

Next we come to the question, "Will the proposed system work?"

This, of course, is a most important consideration, and the answers which have been offered to it cover a range as broad as the entire scientific spectrum and involve factors as complex as the proposed construction of the Safeguard system itself.

I regret to say that I have listened to some of the most extreme and unsubstantiated statements I have ever heard during recent weeks, some even from men of high scientific and legal reputation who should have exhibited more professional expertise or at least more restraint in their statements.

Others have backed up their statements with impressive presentations.

We find, then, that some of the very best scientists say, "Yes, the system will work."

Others give an unequivocal "No."

And a few faint hearts, who seem to be keeping their options open, say "Maybe."

The net result of all the testimony seems to assure us that we will only know for sure—after we have built one. All seem to agree on that.

It is extremely important to note, however, that all of these experts agree—whether they say "yes," or "no," or "maybe"—that the Safeguard system is the only possible ABM system presently available to us at this moment in history and that this is the only one available as far as I have been able to find out within the state of the art.

So, logically, we really have very little choice.

Furthermore, we must look at the deterrent aspects of Safeguard, too, as the Los Angeles Times did so effectively in an editorial entitled "ABM Deserves 'Yes' Vote."

In the editorial, the Times pointed out:

> A number of prominent scientists have expressed skepticism that Safeguard will actually work. But equally prominent scientists are convinced that it will.
>
> The Russians are unlikely to gamble on who is right. As one eminent scientist put it, "They will be deterred by the very fact that it might work"—and deterrence, after all, is the name of the game.

I agree deterrence is the name of the game, or at least of a vital part of it.

In fact, this one consideration alone is, in my opinion, important enough to justify an "aye" vote on this floor for the Safeguard system.

Yes, deterrence is a prime consideration, but still we have an obligation to ask, "Will it work?"

Consequently, I have given careful study to the lineup and past performances—the track record, so to speak—of the scientists who have entered into the ABM debate, and I have tried to the best of my ability to evaluate their opinions in the light of their scientific background plus their past performance.

Being a realist, I have, in some cases, also considered their political persuasions since, I am afraid, there have been some few indications that certain statements have reflected political philosophy rather than purely scientific evidence and opinion.

I have listened to arguments from men such as Dr. DuBridge, Dr. Teller and General Schriever, who was charged with the development of our entire space program, and they have been most helpful on a completely nonpolitical basis on one side. They all seem to agree. They are in favor of the ABM.

I have also heard testimony from those with opposing views, including Dr. York, who has done a great deal of work with the so-called military-industrial-scientific complex in California, Dr. Panofsky and Dr. Jerome Wiesner. All are eminent men with wide-ranging backgrounds as physicists, nuclear physicists, propulsion experts and so on, but at times they have failed to limit their testimony to their particular specialties and, instead, have strayed into the field of international relations, foreign policy and the possible political consequences of some of our scientific endeavors.

As I have indicated, I have tried to evaluate the record of these scientists in the light of their accomplishments in their specialties as well as in the light of their past history as effective advisers and their disposition to confine their observations to objective statements dealing only with their own fields of expertise.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MISSILE TEST FACILITIES AT KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE, AND RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTH

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

XUM

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2546) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

THE SAFEGUARD ABM SYSTEM

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the result is that I find that I am inclined to prefer the recommendations of those who advocate proceeding with the development of Safeguard, and consequently I myself am convinced that if, God forbid, we ever need Safeguard to ward off a nuclear threat, it will work.

This conviction, which stems from the evidence I have heard, is based on the fact that there seems to be wide agreement among the entire scientific community that each of the integral component parts of the system will work, or at worst has an excellent chance of being made to work.

Since this is the case, I am quite certain that our great American scientific-industrial complex will be able to harness its know-how, its capability, and its skills and provide us with a system which will be not only a deterrent but also, in reality, an effective defense against any attempted nuclear strike.

In other words, I am certain that our scientists will make this system work, just as in the past, whenever they have been permitted, they have managed to keep this country ahead of all of the other nations of the world in scientific accomplishments. If there is any question in anyone's mind as to this capability, I suggest that it should have been wiped away completely by the magnificent exhibition we have all had the privilege of watching over the last weekend by the astronauts in their tremendous achievement with regard to the moon shot.

Having seen, therefore, that we need an ABM system and that Safeguard will work—as a deterrent, at the minimum, and almost certainly as an effective defense—we must ask ourselves the third question I originally proposed: "Will it offend, in any way, the Russians or increase their activity in the arms race?"

There are those who have told us, Mr. President, that any deployment of Safeguard would impel the Russians to speed up their present arms buildup and thereby increase the danger of nuclear war which, of course, nobody in this Chamber desires.

I wonder how those who make this claim are so sure of how the Russians will respond in this situation when they have admittedly been unable to predict Russian reactions in the past.

Be that as it may, I would like to remind my colleagues that on several occasions the Russians have indicated—and their statements are in the RECORD—that our construction of a defensive weapon would in no way influence their planning or decisions concerning offensive weapons.

In other words, they would not consider the ABM to be provocative and our deployment of Safeguard would have no adverse effect on any disarmament talks which might be conducted. As a matter of fact, the announcement of the plan seemed to speed up the Russians' desire to enter into such talks.

Now, Mr. President, as most of my colleagues know, I am not one who is willing to give blind acceptance to statements from the Soviet Union. I have studied their history carefully; I have watched their actions and reactions over the years with interest.

I think they should be studied, analyzed, and reviewed in the context of history, and, when all of this has been done, judged in the light of their stated purpose as well as the political self-interest which seems to determine Russian policy.

Then, and only then, can we hope to find out whether the Russians are, in fact, saying in this instance what they mean.

In this case I believe they are.

There is no evidence to indicate otherwise.

In fact, judging from their past pattern of obstructionism and harassment, one would have thought that the mere mention of Safeguard would have been enough to inspire a torrent of vicious propaganda from the Soviet leaders.

Instead, the Russians stated their position clearly, and in the absence of any evidence to indicate that they are not sincere, we should take them at their word.

The Safeguard system would not—I repeat, would not—cause any acceleration of the arms buildup on the part of the Russian Government. They have said so, and I suggest that we believe them.

I might point out that Russia is now completing the deployment of Galosh ABM missiles on launchers around Moscow, but this is not causing us to increase our missile capability; nor, I suppose, will we do so if the Tallinn defense system, which is very extensively deployed throughout the Soviet Union, is upgraded to give it an ABM capability.

Safeguard is purely defensive.

It cannot be converted into an offensive system.

I am sure that the Russians know this as well as any of us in this Chamber.

Before concluding my remarks on this specific point, I would like to make one comment on the debate which has taken place concerning the value which approval of Safeguard might have to the President in any disarmament negotiations with the Russians.

The other day we were told by one of the most knowledgeable and respected Members of this body that in his opinion a close vote in favor of Safeguard would give the President a weak hand in his bargaining for an arms limitation agreement whereas a top-heavy vote for some sort of a watered-down compromise would strengthen the President's position.

I can only say to this, Mr. President, that I have the deepest regard for the always statesmanly views of my colleague, but in this case I must disagree with him, and disagree completely.

I would much rather see this body, if necessary, cast a 51-to-49 vote to give the President an ace than agree unanimously to hand him a deuce as he goes to the upcoming "international poker game."

We now come to the question, "Can we afford to build Safeguard?"

I would like to remind my colleagues that the President has pointed out that Russia may be substantially ahead of us in overall nuclear capability by 1972 or 1973 if we stabilize our forces at present levels and they continue building ICBM's and *Polaris*-type submarines at the present rate, and then I would like to rephrase the question I just asked, as follows: "Can we afford not to build Safeguard?"

It is my opinion that the ABM question must be studied on its own merits and should not be made conditional on any other national issue, whether it be poverty, health, urban development, or even the war in Vietnam.

However, even if other critical matters are injected into the consideration, it is obvious that we would have a hollow victory, indeed, if we conquered the problems of our poor and our ill and our oppressed and then had our (utopian) civilization blasted from the face of the earth by an aggressor's unchallenged nuclear bombardment—or some miscalculation or mistake.

That, it seems, is self-evident.

But let us look at the actual dollar amount of Safeguard, too, since even those of us who are convinced that it is necessary are concerned about the expenditures it will entail.

We are talking today, Mr. President, about an expenditure of $793.5 million, not $10 billion or $50 billion or $100 billion, but $793.5 million. That is all this bill provides. This will pay for the start we need at the time we need it.

And no more can be spent unless this body agrees. It is that simple.

If we discover that our initial efforts do not produce the desired results or if, hopefully, it developed that they are no longer necessary, we can terminate the program. The President's plan calls for yearly reassessment and either renewal or if necessary, cancellation if it appears safe. If we find later that we acted too soon, we can curtail our deployment schedule.

On the other hand, I find it appalling to think of what might happen if some day we were suddenly to find that we acted too late.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, there is one other matter that seems to get lost or heavily laminated in the conversation which I think is of extreme importance. All of the experts, and, as far as I can ascertain, nearly all of my colleagues,

XUM

agree that we should continue with the research and development. The present "hang-up," as the young people, say, only concerns the word "deployment"—or, to translate it, the actual building or construction of the system at the two sites suggested by the President.

Now, let me point out that the entire figure provided in this bill for research and development on the Safeguard system amounts to $400.9 million, and let me point out further that the projected cost of research, development, and deployment, amounts to $793.5 million, so that really the difference in cost between research and development alone and research, development, plus deployment, as requested by the President, is a matter of $392.6 million. I consider this a very small price to pay for the added security which we could acquire in this matter.

I personally am convinced, as I have said, that we need Safeguard and we need it now, but to those who still have misgivings about the necessity or the timing, I say this: If we are to err, let us err on the side of caution and security rather than on the side of carelessness and vulnerability.

I submit that the price of the investment is right—$793.5 million. I emphasize that not one dollar more than that amount can be spent without the approval of this body.

It might well be that the annual costs will continue and that in the years ahead we will have to authorize additional expenditures to provide us with an ABM system worthy of an increasing Russian threat.

If this happens, we will have been buying safety.

On the other hand, it might be that we will find in the near future that for one reason or another we can safely discontinue our Safeguard program.

If this happens, we will have bought safety and important time—time in which we were able to keep our options as open and as flexible as possible.

In either event, it will, I feel, be a case of money well spent.

Now, Mr. President, for the last question I offered, "Is it important to the defense and future security of the United States?"

I have touched on this point in commenting on several of the other questions I proposed, but I would like to conclude my remarks by pointing out that, yes, it is important to our defense and future security.

Who says so? The President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense and his military advisers, a majority of the members of the Committee on Armed Services, probably a majority of the Senate, probably a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives and certainly, according to all the polls that I have been able to see, a great majority of the people of the United States.

Mr. President, I cannot withstand the temptation to recall to the Members of this distinguished body a happening which took place not too many years ago in a place called Munich in Germany. There was a meeting held there and representatives of two great nations met at a most critical time in history for discussions which would decide whether or not the world would become involved in World War II. One man was lampooned and cartooned and millions of jokes were made about him and his umbrella going to such an important meeting.

I would like to point out, Mr. President, that when Neville Chamberlain went to Munich to represent the British Empire against the German maniac, Adolph Hitler, about the only weapon he had to strengthen his position was this same umbrella.

Wishful thinkers and dreamers in his own country had so weakened his position militarily that Mr. Chamberlain was forced to accept what Hitler chose to give him. Thereby the advent of World War II was assured. This must not happen to President Nixon or any President in the future.

Now for my last point. Should the decision and determination to go forward with the construction and deployment of the ABM be made at this time?

It is my belief that it most certainly should and the reason is simple. It has been carefully explained that to delay this decision 1 year at this point would hold back the capability of finalizing the system by 2 years and I do not believe that we can afford the luxury of this time under the known military plans and progress of both the Soviet Union and Communist China. If there is to be an error of judgment that error must be in favor of the security of the United States. Therefore, Mr. President, I am completely convinced by all the discussion and debate that it is without question in the best interests of the United States of America that we accede to the President's request and vote him the funds for the initial phase of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system and do it now. Therefore, I would urge that all of my colleagues review these most pertinent points in the hope that our conclusion when we vote will be overwhelmingly in favor of the future safety of America.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, first, I wish to express my thanks to the distinguished Senator from California for making such a tremendous contribution to this debate in his usual lucid and eloquent fashion.

I think we all feel a sense of elation this week after having placed two men on the moon and successfully recovered them from the moon, and now have them speeding home for what we hope will be a routine recovery.

Much has been made of the fact we have not tested all the components of the ABM system which will go into it as an integrated unit.

Is the Senator aware that the rocket that lifted the——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional 10 minutes of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. I was saying that the engine and vehicle that lifted our astronauts off the moon to rejoin the command module had never been tested before; is not the Senator aware of that?

Mr. MURPHY. I was aware of it. I am glad that my distinguished colleague has brought it to the attention of the Senate. I point out that many of the components that went into the successful moon shot were made in many different parts of the country. They were assembled and skillfully put together by men of imagination and accomplishment and we have watched the components work successfully.

It seems to me to be a shallow argument of some of the members of the scientific community to say, "Well, it won't work."

I recall one of our witnesses, not a scientist, but a highly publicized legal adviser to a former President of the United States, when I asked him before the hearings, "What about the Russian system?" replied, "It doesn't work. I think it's a bunch of junk."

I asked him further if he had any personal, firsthand knowledge to come to that conclusion, and he admitted that he had none.

I think it probably will work. They have good scientists in Russia. Fortunately, we have better. Man's accomplishments in the scientific field have gone clearly beyond his imagination.

I have not the slightest question that the ABM system can be made to work. I know from the testimony that this is the only system available at the present time.

Mr. TOWER. In light of the events of the past few days, does not the Senator agree that American technology can make this thing work, that the argument the system is not sufficiently advanced to the extent it can intercept missiles is a little bit shallow, in light of the events of the past few days?

Mr. MURPHY. The Senator is exactly right. Anyone who makes that statement should go back and watch a re-run of the action of the past few days, and I think he will possibly have more confidence in the so-called scientific-industrial-military complex than he exhibits now.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator from California very much.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SAFEGUARD: THE QUESTION OF RISKS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, during the debate concerning the Safeguard ABM, I had a colloquy with the distin-

XUM

guished Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower), who is now in the Chamber, on the question of "risks" to our national security inhering in the ABM issue. In his prepared remarks, the Senator from Texas made his usual able presentation of the issue of risks to our security, as seen from his point of view, a point of view shared by other like-minded Senators. While I respect the sincerity of these Senators, I feel very deeply that the question of risks to the national security as it relates to the ABM has not been accurately assessed by the supporters of Safeguard deployment now.

The question is whether to deploy or not to deploy now. Both sides are in agreement that research, development, testing, and evaluation should go forward in every way up to the point of deployment. If it proves impossible within a given period of time—which those of us against present deployment have set, generally speaking, as 1 year—to arrive at an arms limitation agreement which will encompass the ABM, then we may very well be for some deployment ourselves. However, we believe that a better perfected ABM system could then be available and that we will probably have a new decision to make.

The proponents of Safeguard have made conspicuous use of the argument that we cannot afford the risk to our national security of any delay in the Pentagon's timetable for deployment. In my judgment, this argument must be met directly by the opponents of ABM deployment, because all of us in this debate are equally concerned with the security of the United States. In my view, the risk to our national security of proceeding now with Safeguard deployment is much greater than the risk of delay.

The implication that the opponents of present Safeguard deployment are prepared in effect to weaken the security posture of our Nation and to incur serious risks to win a better Soviet attitude on nuclear arms control assumes a lack of sophistication in the ABM opponents which is extreme and regrettable. Particularly regrettable, in my judgment, is the effort that has been made to characterize ABM opponents as "unilateral disarmers." Such arguments of this sort debase the level of the debate and suggest a lack of confidence by such proponents in the merits of their case.

Hence, today, I wish to speak more fully on the question of risks to our national security with respect to the Safeguard deployment.

Practically no one in this debate has challenged the view that the greatest addition to our national security would be an effective nuclear arms limitation agreement with the Soviet Union. That would be of even much higher security importance than the claims for Safeguard.

Another one of the exchanges I had with the Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower), related to the prestige of the President of the United States and how it is involved in respect to the Senate's pending action. In my judgment—and I feel deeply that this is true—he will go down as a much bigger President for bringing about a nuclear arms limitation agreement with the Soviet Union than he would be if he won on Safeguard.

I do not believe there is a Senator who would not agree that the next generation of strategic nuclear weapons will be even more awesomely dangerous and destructive than the present weapons upon which the "balance of terror" rests.

Thus, we come down to the question of whether the risk of not trying our utmost to achieve a really substantial nuclear arms limitation breakthrough now—before crossing the Rubicon of the next generation of nuclear weapons—ABM and MIRV—is greater than the alleged risk that we might not be ready to meet a Soviet threat to our Minuteman force in 1975. I believe the former risk to be so much greater than the latter that I want to defer Safeguard deployment for, say, a year to give the negotiations a chance to prevail.

The key issue is not whether the Soviets will not be deterred from the negotiations by the phase 1 deployment recommended by the President. They will not; that is admitted. The real question is what effect will the arms limitation negotiations and a possible agreement have? Will they be capable of bringing about a freeze on strategic nuclear weapons now, or will the beginning of ABM deployment by the United States mark a new plateau in the nuclear arms race requiring the Soviet then to review its position in view of the new situation? Therefore, the ABM deployment would, in effect, abort the SALT negotiations and make possible only some peripheral agreement—say about nuclear weapons on the sea bed—instead of the historic breakthrough for which the moment is propitious to freeze the nuclear arms race at this point.

Some miscellaneous arguments have been made about the deployment of Safeguard. For example, Secretary Laird has said that both the United States and the Soviet Union could agree to have limited ABMs—both understood to be addressed to the "Chinese threat," which is likely to be of a very limited nature even 5 years from now.

The Defense Department takes the view that the acquisition of a MIRV capability by both ourselves and the U.S.S.R. would also not be an impediment to reaching an arms control agreement.

In other words, Mr. Laird says we can agree both to have limited ABMs, within the compass of an arms control agreement. The Defense Department also says both of us can have MIRV without interfering with such an agreement.

I cannot agree with these complacent viewpoints. The prime characteristic of United States-Soviet behavior in the nuclear field is the "action-reaction" cycle described so clearly by Secretary McNamara in his San Francisco speech of September 1967. If the military planners in the Pentagon and in the Kremlin are both determined to get ABM and MIRV in "under the wire," so to speak, before the SALT talks begin, we can look for very long, drawn-out negotiations with a very minor result at best. Both sides will have moved up the ladder from the current plateau—a plateau which provides both sides with a "comfortable" degree of security and a workable "balance of terror." It will be necessary for planners on both sides to reassess the entire situation, before agreeing to any significant nuclear arms limitation agreement.

Let us understand that the whole nuclear arms race is some unbelievable chess game of "war gaming" in which the risk of obliteration of each of the superpowers is so great that it might well be decided by nuclear blackmail rather than nuclear weapons.

On several occasions, Defense Department spokesmen have explained the assumptions upon which our strategic planners work with reference to the U.S.S.R. It can be described as the "worst case" approach. Dr. Foster, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, most recently described it in the following language:

> We continuously make a series of calculations starting with intelligence to compare our own estimated leadtime with the worst case for the deployment leadtime of a potential enemy. . . . Where information is inadequate and uncertainty high, we run some risks of overinvestment to insure that our capability will be adequate, that it is sure to fulfill our strategic objectives.

I have noted that Senator Jackson, who spoke on the policy unreliability of the leaders of the Soviet Union, described the Soviet approach to strategic weapons, in the debate on Wednesday, July 16, in the following way:

> The Soviets, in my judgment, have decided on what they feel they might need if they ever got into a nuclear war, in order to be in a better position than the opponent if such a war does come.

This conceptual approach, as I understand it, is very similar to the approach of our own strategic planners which Dr. Foster described. In essence, each superpower strives to be in a position to achieve its strategic objectives against the other in the event that nuclear war should occur. But, it is just not possible for both to possess nuclear "superiority"—but both can possess nuclear" sufficiency." So long as both seek "superiority" there will be an endless arms race, especially as each takes a "worst case" view of the other's capabilities. Both the costs and the risks mount with each new generation of nuclear weapons systems. And, more and more, we must rely on automated and preprogramed command and control systems—the inevitable result of such a race is automaticity of response and loss of nuclear weapons' control by either the United States or the U.S.S.R.

The argument has been made that the United States has possessed nuclear "superiority" over the past decade, and that we cannot afford to lose that "superiority" now. If by "superiority" the advocates of this viewpoint mean a greater "overkill" capability then we must concede that the United States has possessed "superiority" in this sense. Moreover, we must also concede that the ratio of our "overkill" capacity in relation to the U.S.S.R. "overkill" capacity may be diminishing from perhaps 4 to 1

XUM

down to 2 to 1. But, in real terms, what does all this mean?

It has been estimated, for example, that the United States presently has the assured capability of destroying each of the 50 largest cities in the Soviet Union, and then of charring the rubble 47 more times with additional "overkill" weapons.

On the other hand, for more than a decade, the U.S.S.R. has had an assured destruction capability against the United States as well as an impressive "overkill" capability to make the rubble of our destroyed cities burn again and again. Probably the Soviets are "catching up" with us, relatively speaking, with respect to the number of times they could make the rubble of our population centers burn in a full nuclear exchange.

To be panicked by such information will do no good and can do much harm. I would much rather concentrate our national energies on halting the nuclear arms race at the present uncomfortable resting point.

In this historic ABM debate, Secretary Laird, at a rather late date, introduced the idea that the Soviet Union was striving for a "first strike"—that is, a preemptive—capability with its multiple warheaded SS–9. After a great deal of controversy that position now seems to have been laid to rest. Secretary of State Rogers publicly expressed his disagreement with this notion, and now Secretary Laird himself has backed off after the Foreign Relations Committee confronted him with the formal assessment of the U.S. Government's intelligence community.

But, speaking of risks, even assuming that the Kremlin was seeking a "first strike" capability with its SS–9—even then the risks of going ahead with Safeguard as now designed would be greater than the risks of not deploying now, but proceeding with perfection of the system. The components of the Safeguard system are the same as those designed for the Sentinel system, but the strategic mission is very different. Testimony of the scientific experts is, I believe, convincing that Safeguard is not the optimum system for its mission; that the vital missile sight radars are just too "soft" and vulnerable, and that the problems of computer technology and especially of computer programing for the Safeguard system are just not sufficiently solved. If we go ahead to deploy Safeguard, we will be deploying a system that could be defective. I consider this to be a great risk—an unacceptable risk—if we are, indeed, to counter a possible U.S.S.R. "first strike" preemptive capability.

Mr. President, another one of the justifications offered for Safeguard is the protection it is alleged that it would provide against an "accidental launch" of an offensive missile by the U.S.S.R. or some other nuclear power such as Communist China. Dr. Teller has argued in favor of this proposition. At first glance, there might seem to be some plausibility to this argument. However, there is not a sufficient case in the accidental launch to justify the ABM deployment—especially in view of the inevitable escalation of the nuclear arms race inherent in an ABM deployment at this time.

In his "white paper" presentation to the House Appropriations Committee, Secretary Laird cited as one of two "minor purposes" of the Safeguard system, "Protection against the improbable, but possible, accidental launching of an ICBM toward the United States."

The fact that the Pentagon itself regards the accidental launch threat as "improbable" and gives scant mention to Safeguard's defensive capabilities in this regard under the heading of "minor purposes" is a good indication, in my judgment, that a persuasive justification for ABM deployment cannot be made on these grounds. There is also the admitted fact that even full Safeguard deployment will still not be a perfect defense against all incoming missiles, because, in the case of Safeguard, we would seek to protect the Minuteman silos, whereas, in the case of Sentinel, we thought we were going to attempt to protect population centers. Even the best estimates concede that the system could never "kill" all incoming missiles and could be overwhelmed by an all-out attack.

In addition to the "improbable" nature of the threat of accidental launch, there are grave problems in adjusting the Safeguard system to cope with them. First, there are serious "command and control" problems. The Safeguard system is designed to be fully operative only when it is fully "tuned on" under Presidential command. This presupposes a political "warning time" which just would not be available in case of an accidental launch. And, the risk of maintaining the Safeguard system in a "fully-tuned" readiness state at all times is greater than the protection it would provide against an accidental launch. It is greater, Mr. President, because the Russians would surely take that as evidence of our reaching out for a first-strike capability.

We would then also be faced with the possibility of accidental or unauthorized firings of Safeguard—a risk which many experts consider more dangerous than an accidental ICBM launch. Moreover, there would be inevitably serious political consequences to any decision to maintain the Safeguard system at a full alert status at all times. Given the degree of suspicion which already exists, and the "worst case" assumptions of strategic planners in both the United States and U.S.S.R., there is little doubt that the Soviet Union would feel compelled to make extra compensation in its own security posture if faced with a "hair-trigger" ABM in the United States—which is what would be needed if Safeguard were to provide serious protection against the possibility of an accidental launch.

However, the overriding point in the whole debate is that the Nixon administration—like the predecessor Johnson administration—has, in my judgment, failed to grasp the urgency and the imperative necessity of a nuclear arms control breakthrough. It has failed also to comprehend the significance of the opposition in the Senate, and the Nation as a whole, to the deployment of the Safeguard ABM system.

With the evidence showing how hard it is in the United States to resist the Pentagon's desire to move ahead with ABM and MIRV, it is not surprising that moderate elements in the Soviet Union have also thus far failed to halt the SS–9 buildup. Yet Mr. Gromyko's speech indicates that there is at least a struggle going on in the Kremlin between the moderates and the hardliners—just as there is in this country. The U.S.S.R. has many concerns and pressures, both domestic and external. I do not believe that the Stalinists have won any final battle against the modernizers and moderates in the U.S.S.R. And I think that even the Kremlin "hardliners" are becoming increasingly concerned about Communist China. In short, I feel that there are at least enough real and potential inducements on the Soviet side to reach a nuclear arms accord, or nuclear detente, with the United States to justify a really big effort by our side to make the SALT talks a watershed in the arms race.

The evidence presently at hand indicates that the United States and the U.S.S.R. will begin the SALT talks soon. The evidence also indicates that these talks will be conducted at the "trading" level. The longer they are delayed—while both sides press on with the development of the very weapons the talks are designed to obviate—the less are the chances of a really meaningful agreement. The result of negotiations conducted in a "trading" frame of reference cannot help but fall far short of the goal mankind demands of them.

The United States now has the opportunity to transform the frame of reference of the SALT talks by the exercise of restraint with regard to deployment of Safeguard. If we stay our hands now, the incentive to negotiations on both sides of the table will be much greater than if we routinely move ahead. Something dramatic is needed to provide an escape from the action-reaction cycle of the arms race. One of the superpowers must be able and willing—I emphasize both words—to forgo for a time the deployment of a nuclear weapons system in pursuit of an historic international nuclear arms limitation agreement.

Given the accelerating momentum of technological advance in both the United States and the U.S.S.R., the dynamics of the arms race are such that each step forward in the development of weapons technology has an exponential effect on the total question. We are now poised on the brink of a vast new escalation of the arms race which could well gather so much momentum as to preclude for all time the possibility of meaningful international control agreements. It is literally possible that at the end of the next round of the nuclear arms race we could each find ourselves sitting on top of an automatic doomsday machine—where computers have replaced the element of human judgment and control.

The path to that tragic new plateau of nuclear arms equilibrium will be the most perilous mankind has yet trod in all history. It will be the most expensive also. We must not fool ourselves about the cost. The figures could run in the hundreds of billions of dollars. The expenditure of that kind of resources on military hardware over the next decade will foreclose much of our option to rehabilitate our cities, to meet the needs of black America, and to assure our posterity an unpolluted environment.

The challenge before the Nixon administration is to rise above the conventional course it is now following. The fact that the Soviet Union today—with the increasing influence of a group of old guard marshals and generals—is following true to their course and seems headed also conventionally down the path of a new round in the nuclear arms race is added reason why the United States should put itself into a position to seek nuclear arms control limitation on the level of high purposes which the present circumstances demand. This requires that we forgo ABM deployment for, say a year—which can be done without endangering the security of the United States. This may be a fateful turning point for all mankind. There may not be another such opportunity to insure mankind's survival for years to come.

Mr. President, I suggest tne absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **TYDINGS**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. At this time, under the previous order, following the speech of the Senator from New York (Mr. Javits), routine morning business is to be taken up. At the close of routine morning business, the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Jordan) is to be recognized.

Is there routine morning business to be taken up at the present time?

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report of Actual Procurement Receipts for Medical Stockpile of Civil Defense Emergency Supplies and Equipment Purposes

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law on actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes for the quarter ended June 30, 1969; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Recreational Opportunities at Hydroelectric Projects Licensed by the Federal Power Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the publication, "Recreational Opportunities at Hydroelectric Projects Licensed by the Federal Power Commission" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

Proposed Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report of the Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the effectiveness and administration of the Atterbury Job Corps Center for Men under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Edinburg, Indiana, Office of Economic Opportunity (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Settlement of Claims by Railroad Retirement Board

A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, reporting, pursuant to law, on the settlement by the Board of claims of civilian personnel for damages to or loss of property incident to service during fiscal year 1969; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the New York Department, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, Island Park, N.Y., protesting against the use of property or personnel of the United States without fair and adequate compensation to the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. **JORDAN** of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 212. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to expend additional funds from the contingent fund of the Senate;

S. Res. 213. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures for hearings before the Committee on Armed Services;

S. Res. 215. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on the Utility Consumers' Counsel Act of 1969 (Rept. No. 91–329);

S. Res. 218. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 18 of Senate hearings on Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders (Rept. No. 91–330);

S. Res. 219. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 17 of Senate hearings on Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders (Rept. No. 91–331);

S. Res. 220. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the District of Columbia to expend additional funds from the contingent fund of the Senate;

H. Con. Res. 208. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of parts 1, 2, and 3 of the publication entitled "Subversive Influences in Riots, Looting, and Burning" (Rept. No. 91–332);

H. Con. Res. 209. Concurrent Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print "The Analysis and Evaluation of Public Expenditures: The PPB System" (Rept. No. 91–333); and

H. Con. Res. 291. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of inaugural addresses from President George Washington to President Richard M. Nixon (Rept. No. 91–334).

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware:

S. 2680. A bill to provide for the recapture of accelerated depreciation on real property;

S. 2681. A bill to provide for the repeal of capital gain treatment for sales of livestock;

S. 2682. A bill to provide for the removal of interest rate ceiling on certain government bonds and to provide for the issuance of U.S. savings and retirement bonds; and

S. 2683. A bill to deny an income tax deduction for a charitable contribution by a public officials of his collection of letters and other papers, and to limit the tax benefits of other gifts to charity of certain property which has appreciated in value; to the Committee on Finance.

(The remarks of Mr. Williams of Delaware when he introduced the bills appear later in the Record under the appropriate headings.)

By Mr. **DODD**:

S. 2684. A bill for the relief of Antonio Da Cunha Cerqueira Da Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **MATHIAS**:

S. 2685. A bill to require a special report to the Congress by the President on the current status of research and application techniques in the field of weather modification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. **DOLE** (for himself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Packwood, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Pell, Mr. Percy, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Stevens, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Tower, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of North Dakota):

S.J. Res. 139. A joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual "Day of Bread" and "Harvest Festival" Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. Dole when he introduced the joint resolution appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

S. 2680—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO MAKE CERTAIN NECESSARY TAX REFORMS

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk a series of bills for appropriate reference, the purpose of which is to make certain necessary reforms in our tax structure. Each of these bills will be reintroduced as amendments to the major tax reform package when it is received from the House.

The first bill provides for the recapture of accelerated depreciation of real estate when sold at an early date.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and explanation thereof be printed in the Record.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanation thereof will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2680) to provide for the recapture of accelerated depreciation on real property, introduced by Mr. Williams of Delaware, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2680

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)

XUM

section 1250(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to gain from dispositions of certain depreciable realty) is amended—

(1) by striking out "one percentage point" and inserting in lieu thereof "one-half of one percentage point", and

(2) by striking out "20 full months" and inserting in lieu thereof "40 full months".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to dispositions of section 1250 property (as defined in section 1250(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The explanation, presented by Mr. Williams of Delaware, is as follows:

RECAPTURE OF ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION ON REAL PROPERTY

Present law provides an incentive for the construction of new real property by permitting the owner of real property to claim depreciation at a higher rate (accelerated depreciation) during the early years of the property's life than could be claimed if depreciation were taken in equal amounts each year (straight-line depreciation). If the property is sold after ten years, the owner has the advantage that depreciation has been deducted from income subject to ordinary income tax rates, while the difference between the depreciated cost of the property and the actual sale price is taxed at capital gains rates—a maximum of 25 percent. To prevent a situation where new property is constructed and sold soon afterward solely to reap tax advantage, the law provides for the recapture of part of the tax benefits attributable to accelerated depreciation. If the property is sold before ten years, only a part of the difference between depreciated cost of the property and the actual sale price may be taxed at the lower capital gains rates; the rest is subject to ordinary income tax rates. If the property is held 20 months or less, the entire tax advantage is recaptured by taxing 100 percent of the cumulative difference between the amount depreciated under accelerated depreciation and the amount that could have been attributed to straight-line depreciation at the ordinary income tax rates. For each month after 20 months, one percent less of the difference is recaptured by being subject to ordinary income tax; the balance is taxed at the lower capital gains rates. Thus, after ten years (120 months), the entire difference is taxed at capital gains rates. This bill doubles this period of time, providing that the entire tax advantage will be recaptured if the property is held 40 months or less, with one-half percent less subject to ordinary income tax rates for each month thereafter. No part of the tax advantage would be recaptured if the property is held more than 20 years.

S. 2681—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL ON TAX REFORM

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the second bill deals with the question of the so-called hobby farming and proposes to correct this inequity by repealing the capital gains treatment for the sale of livestock.

In my opinion there is no reason why the sale of livestock should be treated any differently under our tax laws than that of other agricultural commodities.

I know the suggestion has been made in some quarters that this could be corrected by extending the holding period in order to be eligible for capital gains treatment. However, in my opinion, the real answer lies in the outright repeal of the capital gains provision.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and explanation thereof be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanation thereof will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2681) to provide for the repeal of capital gain treatment for sales of livestock, introduced by Mr. Williams of Delaware, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2681

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) Section 1231(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of property used in the trade or business) is amended—

(1) by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (1)(B);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (1)(C) and inserting in lieu thereof ", and";

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1)(C) the following new subparagraph:

"(D) livestock (including poultry)."; and

(4) by striking out paragraph (3).

(b) Section 1221 (relating to definition of capital asset) is amended—

(1) by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (4);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"(6) livestock (including poultry)."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act, but only with respect to sales, exchanges, and involuntary conversions occurring after such date.

The explanation, presented by Mr. Williams of Delaware, is as follows:

REPEAL OF CAPITAL GAIN TREATMENT FOR SALES OF LIVESTOCK

Under present law, the capital gains tax (instead of the higher ordinary income tax rates) may be applied to profits realized from the sale of livestock (other than poultry) held for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes for at least 12 months. From the Congressional Committee reports written when this provision of law was enacted, it is clear that the term livestock was meant to be given a broad interpretation. Treasury regulations have indeed given it a broad interpretation, including cattle, hogs, horses, mules, donkeys, sheep, goats, and fur-bearing animals. The courts have broadened the interpretation still further. As a result of court decisions, race horses, cattle used for show or exhibition, and even chinchillas have been considered livestock for purposes of capital gains treatment. The 12-month period specified in the law dates from the acquisition of the animal rather than from its first use for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes. In fact, the animal may never have been put to the prescribed use (or even be old enough to be capable of it), as long as it was being held for the purpose of being put to that use. Present law accords a different tax treatment to the expenses associated with raising livestock compared with the tax treatment of the profits associated with their sale. While the costs of livestock husbandry may be deducted currently from income subject to ordinary tax rates, proceeds from the sale of this sort of livestock are subject to capital gains rates, which are at least 50 percent lower.

This bill would delete the provision of law specifying that sale of this kind of livestock is subject to capital gains taxation. In fact it would go further and clarify the law by stating specifically that livestock does not qualify for capital gains treatment. This clarification is desirable for the reason that before this special livestock provision was written into law in 1951, there was considerable confusion as to the extent to which livestock sales could receive capital gains tax treatment. This was due to conflicting legal interpretations by the courts and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the 1942 amendment allowing capital gains treatment of certain property used by the taxpayer in his trade or business. To avoid a return to this confusing situation, the bill makes it explicitly clear that livestock may not be considered either a "property used in trade or business" for capital gains purposes or a "capital asset."

S. 2682—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO REMOVE THE INTEREST RATE CEILING ON CERTAIN GOVERNMENT BONDS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the third bill provides for the removal of the interest rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds and for the issuance by the U.S. Government of savings and retirement bonds providing for the rate of 6 percent. This new series of savings bonds would have a lower limit allowed for each individual.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and explanation thereof be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and the explanation thereof will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2682) to provide for the removal of interest rate ceiling on certain government bonds and to provide for the issuance of U.S. savings and retirement bonds, introduced by Mr. Williams of Delaware, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2682

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first sentence of the second paragraph of the first section of the Second Liberty Bond Act (31 U.S.C. 752) is amended by striking out "not exceeding four and one-quarter per centum per annum,".

(b) Section 25 of the Second Liberty Bond Act (31 U.S.C. 757c–1) is amended by striking out ": *Provided, however,* That in no event may the interest rate or the investment yield exceed 4¼ per centum per annum".

(c) Section 22A(b)(1) of the Second Liberty Bond Act (31 U.S.C. 757c–2) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) (1) Retirement and savings bonds shall be issued only on a discount basis, and shall mature ten years from the date as of which issued. Such bonds shall be sold at such price or prices and shall be redeemable before maturity upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, except that the issue price of such bonds, and the terms upon which they may be redeemed at maturity, shall be such as to afford an investment yield of 6 per centum per annum, compounded semiannually. The denominations of such bonds shall be such as the Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time determine and shall be expressed in terms of their maturity values. Not more

XUM

than $2,400 in maturity value of such bonds issued in any one year may be held by any one person at any one time. Within the limitation prescribed by the preceding sentence, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized by regulations to fix the maximum amount of such bonds issued in any one calendar quarter that may be held by any one person at any one time."

(d) Notwithstanding any provision of subsection (a) of section 22A of the Second Liberty Bond Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, beginning not later than July 1, 1969, issue United States retirement and savings bonds authorized by section 22A of such Act in such amounts (subject to the limitations imposed by section 21 of such Act) as may be necessary to permit individuals to purchase such bonds in the amounts permitted under subsection (b)(1) of section 22A of such Act (as amended by subsection (a) of this section).

The explanation, presented by Mr. Williams of Delaware, is as follows:

Interest on long-term Federal Bonds.—This bill repeals the 4¼ percent ceiling on interest paid on long-term government bonds. It also repeals the 4¼ percent limitation on the interest paid on United States savings bonds. Savings bonds are currently being issued at the maximum rate.

United States retirement and savings bonds.—In 1966 a law was enacted authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to issue a new type of savings bonds called "United States retirement and savings bonds," paying an investment yield of up to 5 percent annually (compared with a 4¼ percent limit on series E savings bonds). An individual could purchase up to $3000 of such bonds each year. The period of maturity for these bonds could range between 10 years and 30 years. Despite the new authority, no retirement and savings bonds have been issued by the Treasury since the law was passed. Section ——— of this bill contains several revisions of the retirement and savings bond authority. First, the bill would *require* the Secretary of the Treasury to issue retirement and savings bonds, beginning July 1, 1969. Second, the interest rate for the bonds would be set at a mandatory 6 percent. Third, the maximum amount that could be purchased in a year would be set at $2400, but the Secretary of the Treasury would be authorized to fix the maximum amount of these bonds that could be purchased in any quarter of the year.

S. 2683—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL DEALING WITH CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS OF APPRECIATED PROPERTY

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on May 22, 1969, an article appeared in the Wall Street Journal telling how personnel in the executive department, how legislators and members of the judiciary are making money by giving their official papers to schools and colleges.

The Wall Street Journal article explained the tax gimmick in the following manner:

> The tax-saving device is simple: A Representative, Senator, governor, Supreme Court Justice or perhaps even a President—when retiring or when still in office—donates his office files to a library, a university or a historical society. The recipient or an outside professional appraiser puts a dollar value on the papers. When tax time rolls around, the donor deducts the appraised value from his income as a gift to an educational organization, thereby reducing his tax.

The article indicates that several dozen past and present lawmakers are trimming or planning to trim their taxes through such deductions. The article also states that former Vice President Hubert Humphrey is giving the Minnesota Historical Society 589 boxes bulging with documents from his career as mayor of Minneapolis and Senator from Minnesota. The article states:

> One knowledgeable Government source says Mr. Humphrey has already taken "substantial" tax deductions.

The article also states that ex-President Lyndon Johnson may be planning to deduct the value of certain materials he is deeding to his presidential library at the University of Texas. The article indicates that the items he is donating number some 20 million.

One of the things that bothers me about getting special tax benefits through the gift of official papers is that the parties doing this are making a profit from the "charitable" giving of what are really official papers which, in my opinion, properly belong to the Government and not to them as individuals. I am sure that in many cases many of the papers are just plain junk, but to the extent that they do have value, they were developed by Government officials on Government time with the aid of Government staff personnel, were typed by Government secretaries on Government paper, and were even stored in Government files. I ask leave to insert in the Record at the end of my remarks the article from the Wall Street Journal to which I have referred.

You may ask how can one make money by giving property of any kind to an educational or charitable organization. The answer to this problem lies in the fact that in the case of gifts of property which have appreciated in value there are two tax benefits involved in each charitable contribution. One is the deduction the taxpayer receives for the charitable gift itself. This benefit is the same whether the taxpayer gives cash or other property. The second benefit, however, is different. This exists only where the taxpayer has given appreciated property. By giving property which cost the taxpayer little or nothing, yet has a substantial market value today, the taxpayer receives a second tax savings since he can dispose of this property without having to include this unrealized appreciation in income.

Let me illustrate the double benefit first with the example of a taxpayer in the 50-percent bracket. Let us suppose that he gives property having a fair market value of $100 to an educational organization. The $100, first of all, is a charitable contribution deduction which will reduce this taxpayer's taxes by $50. If the property he is giving to the educational institution represents papers which cost him nothing, there is a second tax saving of $25. This is the capital gains tax he would have incurred had he sold the papers for $100.

As an aside let me say it seems to me that the papers in this type of case should result in ordinary income rather than capital gain income. If this were true his additional saving in this case would have been $50 instead of $25.

However, even where they are considered capital gain his total saving is at least $75—and if the sale were to represent ordinary income his saving would be $100. I think you can see from this that since the total tax saving for a taxpayer in the 50-percent bracket is at least $75—$100 if the gain from the sale of the papers were ordinary income—it should be evident that for higher bracket taxpayers these savings would be substantially greater.

For a 70-percent bracket taxpayer the double saving from the charitable contribution in the case of a $100 contribution of papers, even when the sale is treated as giving rise to capital gain, is a saving of $95. If the property were treated as giving rise to ordinary income rather than capital gain the savings would actually be $140, or $40 more than the value of the property given. This is how you can make money by giving to charity.

For someone subject to the top bracket 70 percent plus the surcharge, even in the case giving rise to capital gain, the saving is $104.50. Where the saving is ordinary income, the saving on the charitable contribution actually is $154.

It seems to me that tax savings of this type, especially on something that really belonged to the Government in the first place, are entirely inappropriate and should not be allowed to continue.

Because of my concern over this problem, I am introducing a bill at this time dealing with this tax avoidance device. The bill I am introducing provides that in the case of a charitable contribution of letters and other papers collected by a public official during his term of office, any copyright or literary, musical, or artistic composition, or any other tangible personal property given to educational institutions, or to charities, or other organizations for which tax deductions may be taken, the deduction taken is to be limited to the cost or other basis of the taxpayer in the property. In other words, he can take a charitable deduction in the case of these types of contributions, only for what the property cost him less any depreciation deductions he may have taken with respect to it.

An alternative treatment is provided for those who prefer to take as a charitable contribution deduction the full fair market value of the property given to charity, educational institution, or other organization. Taxpayers may take this full charitable contribution deduction, but if they do so they must include as income in that same year the appreciation in the value of the property given to charity which has never before been taxed to the taxpayer.

Let me illustrate with an example. If a work of art which cost the taxpayer $10 is given to charity when it has a value of $100, the taxpayer can elect to treat the transaction as a sale. In such a case there would be a long-term capital gain of $90 but the taxpayer would be treated as having contributed $100 to charity for which he would obtain a full charitable contribution deduction. Ordinarily if a capital asset is donated to charity it would be to the taxpayer's advantage to elect to this treatment—that is, to treat the transaction as a sale to charity followed by a gift of the proceeds. In other cases the taxpayer may permit the general rule in my bill to apply—that is, restrict the deduction to the cost or other basis of the property in his hands and include no additional amount in income.

My bill makes another change in the law with respect to the tax treatment of letters and other papers collected by a public official. As I said previously, it seems to me that if a Government official has the right to dispose of the papers at all—they should at least be treated as giving rise to ordinary income, in the same way as when an individual writes a book and subsequently sells it.

Because of this, my bill provides that such papers—including papers prepared by persons other than public officials—are not to be treated as capital assets. As a result, if a public official or other person sells his collection of letters and papers he will have ordinary income and not capital gain from the sale. Moreover, if he makes a gift of such papers to a charity and elects to have the transaction treated as a sale his gain on the sale would be ordinary income, and he would then be allowed a charitable deduction for the full fair market value of the property.

The amendment made by this bill applies to dispositions of property made after January 1, 1969.

I shall make all efforts possible to see that this tax loophole is closed. I think it is a serious matter for people to be developing a racket out of giving to charity by getting double benefits from gifts of this type. I believe that charity and education would be much better off if they depend upon real contributions rather than on these "tax gifts."

Mr. President, I introduce a bill to correct this loophole in the law. The bill would approach the matter by making the value placed upon this property taxable income to the individual who is making the donation and thereby offsetting the tax advantage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill and the Wall Street Journal article to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and article will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2683) to deny an income tax deduction for a charitable contribution by a public official of his collection of letters and other papers, and to limit the tax benefits of other gifts to charity of certain property which has appreciated in value, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, was received, read twice by its title, refered to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2683

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 170(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special rule for charitable contributions of certain property) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Special Rules for Charitable Contributions of Certain Property.—

"(1) No deduction for appreciation in value in certain types of personal property.—In the case of a charitable contribution of—

"(A) letters and other papers collected by a public official during his term of office;

"(B) any copyright, any literary, musical, or artistic composition, or

"(C) any tangible personal property, the amount of the charitable contribution, for purposes of this section, shall be equal to the adjusted basis (for purposes of determining gain) of the property in the hands of the donor or its fair market value, whichever is the lower, less the amount of any consideration received by the donor for the transfer of the property. This paragraph shall not apply if the donor has made an election under section 82 to have the contribution treated as a sale of the property followed by a contribution of the proceeds.

"(2) Contributions of real property.—The amount of any charitable contribution taken into account under this section for a gift of real property shall be reduced by the amount which would have been treated as gain to which section 617(d)(1) or 1250(a) applies if the property contributed had been sold at its fair market value (determined at the time of such contribution)."

(b) Section 1221 of such Code (relating to definition of capital asset) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"In applying the provisions of paragraph (3) and section 1231(b)(1)(C), letters and other papers collected by a public official during his term in office (including papers prepared by persons other than the public official) shall be treated as property created by the personal efforts of the public official and as similar to the other types of property described in such provisions."

(c) Part II of subchapter B of chapter 1 of such Code (relating to items specifically included in gross income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 82. Certain gifts to charity treated as sales of property.

"(a) Election to Treat Certain Gifts as Sale of Property and Donation of Proceeds.—In the case of a charitable contribution of—

"(1) letters and other papers collected by a public official during his term in office;

"(2) any copyright, any literary, musical, or artistic composition, or

"(3) any tangible personal property,

such charitable contribution shall be treated for purposes of this subtitle, if the donor so elects and the fair market value of the property exceeds the adjusted basis (for purposes of determining gain) of such property in the hands of the donor, as a sale of the property to the donee for an amount of money equal to the fair market value of such property, and the gain on such sale shall be recognized. If such election is made, the donor shall be considered, for purposes of section 170, as having made a charitable contribution of money equal to such fair market value reduced by the amount of any consideration actually received by the donor from the donee for the transfer of the property.

"(b) Election.—The election to have this section apply with respect to any contribution or gift of property shall be made in such manner and at such time as may be set forth in regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate."

(d) The amendments made by this Act shall be applicable with respect to disposition of property made after Jan. 1, 1969

The article, presented by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, is as follows:

POLITICIANS' LOOPHOLE: MANY OFFICEHOLDERS CUT TAXES BY DONATING FILES TO VARIOUS INSTITUTIONS — CONGRESSMEN, SENATORS USE DEVICE; HUMPHREY GIVES PAPERS TO HISTORICAL SOCIETY—DETERMINING VALUE IS TRICKY

(By Jerry Landauer)

WASHINGTON.—Most Congressmen are talking loudly these days about reshaping the tax laws to shrink loopholes. But at the same time many officeholders are quietly enlarging a little-known loophole that lets them pay less than they otherwise would.

The tax-saving device is simple: A Representative, Senator, governor, Supreme Court Justice or perhaps even a President—when retiring or when still in office—donates his office files to a library, a university or a historical society. The recipient or an outside professional appraiser puts a dollar value on the papers. When tax time rolls around, the donor deducts the appraised value from his income as a gift to an educational organization, thereby reducing his tax.

Several dozen past and present lawmakers are trimming or planning to trim their taxes through such deductions. Among them: Democratic Congresswoman Leonor Sullivan of Missouri, former Democratic Reps. Frank Karsten of Missouri and Eugene Keogh of New York, former Republican Sens. Frank Carlson of Kansas and Kenneth Keating of New York and ex-Congressman William Miller of New York, the GOP's 1964 Vice Presidential candidate.

A GIFT TO CORNELL

Mr. Karsten, among others, doesn't care to tell how much he saved. "It's none of your damned business," he snaps. But Mr. Miller is not a bit shy in saying that papers he gave to Cornell University were appraised at $26,000; the deduction has surely saved him many thousands.

Gifts by still bigger political names can bring much higher appraisals, and some famous figures are taking the donation-deduction path. Former Vice President Hubert Humphrey is giving the Minnesota Historical Society 589 boxes bulging with documents from his career as mayor of Minneapolis and Senator from Minnesota. One knowledgeable Government source says Mr. Humphrey has already taken "substantial" tax deductions.

What's more, ex-President Lyndon Johnson may be planning to deduct the value of certain material he's deeding to his Presidential library at the University of Texas. The items he's donating number some 20 million.

"I assume there will be an appraisal, but I'd better steer clear of that subject," says library director Chester Newland. He claims he doesn't know the purpose of a recent visit to Austin by Ralph G. Newman, Chicago appraiser-dealer, LBJ aides profess ignorance of the former President's tax plans.

ENCOURAGED BY LAW

Every taxpayer, of course, can deduct the presumed value of property given to religious, charitable, educational, scientific or literary organizations. The tax laws are designed to encourage such giving, and the Internal Revenue Service says the practice contributes significantly "to the welfare of our nation." Tax breaks for donated material considered valuable for research or teaching are being taken by all manner of people—generals, scientists, novelists, labor leaders, television commentators and newspapermen.

But it can be argued that politcal figures are different. Most of the material they give away—correspondence, bill drafts, speeches, studies, reports, memos, photographs, tape recordings, office diaries—was generated or accumulated at taxpayer expense in Government offices by employes who, like the boss, are on the public payroll.

Some of the donated material, in fact, consists of ordinary Government publications; occasionally this winds up in Government institutions, including the Library of Congress, after the giver has taken a deduction from Federal taxes. One Congressman even hopes to save on taxes by giving away bound volumes of the Congressional Record; the IRS is discreetly trying to discourage him.

SOME SHUN PRACTICE

Whatever the material included in a gift some politicians doubt that taking a tax deduction is legitimate. "It doesn't seem ethical to me," says Republican Rep. Albert

XUM

Quie of Minnesota, who donates papers to his state's historical society. "After all, it's nothing that I paid for."

Republican Rep. Fred Schwengel takes a similar view: "I don't think it's right." He gives material to the University of Iowa and takes no deduction. Democratic Sen. Stephen Young of Ohio believes he would be a hypocrite if he deducted the value of documents given to the Western Reserve Historical Society. "I'm always speaking out against tax loopholes," he says. "I'm not about to take advantage of any."

Yet the belief that tax breaks for donated office documents are improper appears to be waning. "When I began 20 years ago, taxes were never mentioned," says Lucile Kane, manuscript curator of the Minnesota Historical Society. "Now there's a contagion about it." A spokesman for another Midwestern depository agrees: "Once upon a time you were honoring the man by preserving his papers. Now it has become very much a matter of money."

Appraiser Newman and a handful of other experts who specialize in the tricky, subjective task of evaluating politicians' papers are increasingly busy these days. Mr. Newman is currently assessing the Humphrey papers lot by lot; while no one is forecasting how much the 19-year mayoral-Senatorial collection may be worth altogether, some idea can be gained from the value placed on the papers of the less renowned Mr. Miller—$14,100 for those covering his 14 years in Congress, $5,600 for those gathered while he was chairman of the Republican National Committee and $6,300 for papers tracing his 1964 campaign as Barry Goldwater's running mate.

Some donors stretch gifts over several years to avoid bumping against the tax law's ceiling, generally 30% of a taxpayer's annual income, on charitable and similar deductions; under IRS rules, a deduction can be taken only for the year in which the contribution is made. Mr. Miller says he spread his gift to Cornell over three years. Former GOP Sen. Keating, now President Nixon's ambassador to India, similarly stretched out his gift to the University of Rochester.

Not surprisingly, lawmakers who have served on Congressional committees dealing with tax legislation seem most aware of the donation-deduction possibility. But some of these donors are dissatisfied with the tax savings they're getting.

AN IRS CHALLENGE

Mr. Keogh of Brooklyn, an alumnus of the House Ways and Means Committee, complains that his gift to Syracuse University trimmed just $7,500 from his income and that even this "very conservative" appraisal is being challenged by the IRS. "Frankly, I did the university a favor," Mr. Keogh contends. "I have no sense of guilt or conscience or anything."

Congresswoman Martha Griffiths of Michigan, a present Ways and Means member, seems miffed that her papers, given recently to the University of Michigan, will yield tax deductions of only $4,500 on next year's return. "If Bill Miller's are worth over $25,000, mine are worth at least $50,000," she says. (Nonetheless, Mrs. Griffiths leans toward legislation to end the donation-deduction practice: "We're giving away stuff that's of no value to us, and we're getting something for it.")

In contrast, Republican Ways and Means member Barber Conable seems surprised that a four-year collection of his papers, covering two years' service in the New York State Senate and two in Congress, brought deductions of $2,200 this year. "I was thinking in terms of a couple or maybe three hundred dollars," he says. These papers have gone to Cornell, and Rep. Conable expects to keep donating documents to the university at frequent intervals; he wants to avoid building up a "great big tax break" all at once.

Whether the appraisals are fair or not, taxwise legislators seem eager to take deductions. Frank Carlson, who served as a Senator from Kansas from 1950 to 1968, shipped 800 boxes of political memorabilia to the Kansas State Historical Society after his retirement. In the Senate, he was a member of the tax-writing Finance Committee. Each year's accumulation was appraised at about $1,000, according to Nyle Miller, secretary of the Kansas society.

SENATOR ANDERSON'S GIFT

Sen. Clinton Anderson of New Mexico, the ranking Democrat on the Finance Committee, sent $50,000 items to the Library of Congress in 1967; the library lists the material as deposited but not yet donated, possibly because Mr. Anderson intends to stretch out the tax saving. The Senator's secretary says her boss is too busy to answer questions about the dollar-value, and the library won't even tell whether the deposit is being appraised.

Another Senate incumbent who's donating documents is Republican Sen. Gordon Allott of Colorado. He, like many other givers, says he wasn't originally aware of the tax benefit to Sen. Allott promised his papers years ago to his alma mater, the University of Colorado. "When I first committed myself the tax angle didn't occur to me," Mr. Allott says. But now he knows: "I'm going to utilize it from tax standpoint that is most advantageous to me," he says.

One member of the judiciary who employs the donating device is Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas. He gives to the Library of Congress—and takes a tax deduction for—more of the voluminous "personal files" he has amassed while on the court. The Justice's gifts totaling some 30,000 items over the years, include legal memoranda plus diary-like docket books showing the disposition of cases and the votes of brethren Justices. Scholars consider such documents most important for trading the evolution of court decisions. How rich the Douglas papers are can't be determined yet; they will be sealed from public view until after Mr. Douglas' death, and the Justice, speaking through a secretary, says it would take some digging on his part to refresh his memory about the appraised value for tax purposes.

As a service to donors, the Library of Congress staff offers free "advisory evaluations" on manuscripts, rare books and other materials though urging donors to hire commercial appraisers, too. It's exclusively up to the donor to decide how much he'll try to deduct.

The library's appraisal work is highly secretive. Since the Government's legislative branch is exempt from the Freedom of Information Act, library officials refuse even to identify gift-givers, for whom evaluations are made. "This is confidential information." General Counsel Lewis Coffin argues. "For us to give it out would be an invasion of the donor's privacy."

The preservation of manuscript collections for research isn't a recent development, of course, for the papers of notable men are the raw material of history. Moreover, the files of Presidents and their immediate staff have been considered private property ever since George Washington took his Presidential papers home to Mt. Vernon. Congress appropriated substantial sums to buy from heirs or executors the papers of President Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe and Jackson.

What's relatively new is the donation-deduction practice. The trend is being spurred by spirited bidding for certain material by universities, regional archives and historical societies. Some academic scouts regularly prowl Capitol Hill corridors looking for good prospects. "My university leans on the tax angle pretty hard," one Congressman confides.

Former GOP Senate Whip Thomas Kuchel's papers were solicited by Bancroft Library at the University of California, and when Mr. Kuchel indicated interest the library dispatched a negotiating agent to Washington. A deed of gift was signed last New Year's Day, but Mr. Kuchel doesn't yet know the appraised value of 870 crammed cartons that have been shipped to the library.

Tax considerations both ease and complicate the archivists' task. "If an income-tax deduction is the incentive I'm all for it," says Philip Mason, director of Wayne State University's archives of labor history and urban affairs, where the papers of Detroit Democratic Congressmen Charles Diggs and John Conyers are being appraised. But Mr. Mason adds: "Probably there's no more critical problem for archivists and librarians than appraisals for income tax purposes. . . . It gets to be pretty subjective really."

EVALUATING PAPERS

In general, the tax deduction allowed for donated property equals its fair market value. But document collections are rarely sold, so it's necessary to fall back on subjective judgments: How many scholarly monographs or doctoral dissertations are likely to be written from the donated documents? How many similar collections bear on the same subject? Were the donor's recorded experiences unique? How thoroughly do his papers trace particular events?

Until recent years the Library of Congress was the nation's favored political depository. Nowadays, the richest documents often wind up in the growing network of Presidential libraries.

In encouraging the construction of these libraries (built with private funds but staffed by Government employes), Congress may be encouraging tax havens for a favored few. A departing White House aide can take his papers with him, use the documents to write a best-selling volume of memoirs, then donate as tax-deductible gifts to a Presidential library not only the White House papers but the manuscripts of his book, too. Among other Kennedy aides, Arthur Schlesinger and Theodore Sorensen both hired professional appraisers to assess the value of material they intend to give to the John F. Kennedy Library being built at Cambridge, Mass.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 139—INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ANNUAL "DAY OF BREAD" AND "HARVEST FESTIVAL" WEEK

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution along with 21 other cosponsors designating October 28, 1969, as a "Day of Bread" and the last week of October as a period of "Harvest Festival." The joint resolution requests the President to proclaim a "Day of Bread" and "Harvest Festival" this year and in successive years and to call on the people of the United States to join with those of other nations in the observance of these occasions with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

But why a "Day of Bread"? Mr. President, it seems to me that in times like these—when so many serious agricultural problems beset us—we sometimes fail to recognize the positive contributions being made by numerous farm products. Bread—symbolic of the harvest and of all foods—is one of our greatest assets. Wheat and the products of wheat, most commonly bread, are perhaps man's oldest crop and cultivated food.

XUM

Wheat provides more nourishment for peoples of the world than any other food, serving as a staple in 43 countries with almost a billion people. The word "bread" gains greater meaning every day in the growing concern of governments around the world with the problems of feeding the hungry and malnourished.

In recognition of these values, the inheritance of the past merges with the custom of the present throughout the world. Since 1953, the people of West Germany have celebrated a "Day of Bread" as part of a harvest festival on a commonly-accepted date in October. The observance has spread to Austria. In the United Kingdom, the Anglican Church annually joins in a similar occasion marked by a display of different breads and ecclesiastical mention of their significance.

The practice of marking a "Day of Bread" each year is being introduced in Central and South America, and the Orient. Consideration of an international observance has also been indicated by the Bread Institute of Sweden and Millers' Associations of Switzerland and other European nations.

In the United States, the idea of a "Day of Bread" encompassed by a week of "Harvest Festival," has been reviewed and enthusiastically accepted by the American Bakers Association, the Millers' National Federation and the National Association of Wheat Growers. Wheat producer groups, flour millers and bakers in almost every State have embraced the concept.

From such tradition, cooperation, and potential participation, the conclusion is apparent that the "Harvest Festival" and "Day of Bread" transcend national consideration. They represent an effort to promote greater international communication and understanding among the nations of the world.

The coordination of an international "Day of Bread" carries bright promise as more and more countries adopt the concept to celebrate the annual harvest. Understandably, nations of the Southern Hemisphere would mark the date during autumn in that area. March 26, 1970, has been under consideration in Venezuela, where a display of bread would be housed in the Industrial Palace in Caracas and members of the milling-baking union would receive a holiday. Great Plains Wheat, Inc., has served as a coordinating agency through offices in Latin America and Europe. Western Wheat Associates serves the same function in the Far East and it is anticipated other international associations will extend the influence of the movement.

Mr. President, my State of Kansas is the leading wheat producing State in the Nation. I am proud to represent the people of an area which has contributed so much toward the production of a wholesome nutritious food. As a member of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, I am aware that much needs to be done to alleviate malnutrition in this country.

I would add, in all seriousness, that if the American public had increased, instead of diminished, its consumption of enriched wheat products, we would have much less evidence of dietary deficiency diseases than we have today. The wheat producers, millers, bakers, and other end product manufacturers are working hard on the development of new, highly nutritious wheat-based foods, and on the nutritional improvement of the existing basic products.

Our recognition of a "Day of Bread" and a "Harvest Festival" will provide important evidence to the U.S. wheat economy that we in Congress support and encourage its efforts.

Mr. President, in order that these industries may move ahead with their carefully worked out plans, I urge that the Senate give speedy approval of this joint resolution establishing a "Day of Bread" and a "Harvest Festival" Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 139) providing for the establishment of an annual "Day of Bread" and "Harvest Festival" Week, introduced by Mr. Dole (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

S. 2554

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Mondale) I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. Yarborough) be added as a cosponsor of S. 2554, the proposed Federal Employees Pre-Retirement Assistance Act of 1969.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE RESOLUTION 222—RESOLUTION TO PAY A GRATUITY TO ERMA POPE CURRY

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution, which was placed on the calendar:

S. Res. 222

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Erma Pope Curry, widow of James G. Curry, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to eleven months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PROVISION OF TAX CREDIT FOR ORGANIZATIONS AND GROUPS WHICH ESTABLISH AN APPRENTICESHIP-JOB INSTRUCTOR PROGRAM—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 100

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on June 19, I introduced legislation, S. 2450, which would provide a tax credit for organizations and groups which establish an apprenticeship-job instructor program.

I said then that the key to a successful program is to provide the young apprentice with an older, interested counselor to instruct and supervise the development of the apprentice's skills.

However, it has come to my attention that there is an organizational gap in the proposal which should be filled.

Therefore, I am submitting an amendment to S. 2450 which will include the salary of a full-time coach-coordinator for the corps of job instructors as an expense of the program.

The role of the coach-coordinator would be a dual one: First, he would train and supervise the corps of voluntary job instructors. In addition, he would guide the overall administration of the apprentice-job instructor program.

No group would be eligible unless 50 apprentices and 30 job instructors were enrolled.

With this leadership, the smoothly geared replacement process to provide young skilled craftsmen will be insured.

The importance of the apprenticeship program is clear. However, competent leadership is vital to its success.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to give S. 2450, and the amendment which I introduce today, full consideration, and to act upon them at the earliest possible date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MISSILE TEST FACILITIES AT KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE, AND RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTH—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 101

Mr. HART (for himself, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Cranston, Mr. Gore, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Symington, Mr. Mondale, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Eagleton, Mr. Pell, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Moss, Mr. Javits, Mr. Percy, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Goodell, Mr. Case, Mr. Saxbe, and Mr. Nelson) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 2546) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be printed.

(The remarks of Mr. Hart when he proposed the amendment appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 85

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, on July 18 I submitted an amendment, No.

85, to S. 2546, the military procurement authorization bill. At this time, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) be added as cosponsors of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

C. Nelson Day, of Utah, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Utah for the term of 4 years, vice William T. Thurman.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Wednesday, July 30, 1969, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON ALASKA NATIVE LAND CLAIMS, AUGUST 6, 1969

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has scheduled a further hearing on S. 1830, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1969, for August 6, 1969. The hearing will begin at 10 a.m. in room 3110 of the New Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive additional testimony from the Alaska Federation of Natives, the State of Alaska, and the administration with respect to their positions and recommendations on the land claim issue and the settlement proposed in S. 1830.

The prepared statements of other interested persons will be received and made a part of the committee hearing record.

EXPENDITURE CONTROLS AND EXTENSION OF THE SURTAX

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last year in enacting the 10-percent surcharge Congress included a section in that bill placing a limitation on Government expenditures. This expenditure control section was of equal importance to the surcharge itself in controlling inflation.

Today there is pending on the Senate Calendar H.R. 12290, the purpose of which is to extend this surcharge through the remainder of 1969 and at a reduced rate for the first half of 1970.

Earlier this year as a part of H.R. 11400, Congress enacted an expenditure control provision which in the opinion of many of us was not effective.

I expressed my concern over the flexibility of the expenditure control provision as finally approved by the Congress and in conversations with the executive branch found that the President was equally concerned.

As a result, the President, under date of July 16, 1969, forwarded to me a letter wherein he spelled out in definite terms that the administration would not take advantage of the flexible provisions of the expenditure controls as approved in H.R. 11400 by the Congress but that he would recognize the $192.9 billion as the maximum ceiling on fiscal 1970 expenditures.

I read for the information of the Senate the President's letter of July 16, 1969:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 16, 1969.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I am aware of the concern over extension of the surtax and repeal of the investment credit unless expenditure controls are made clearly effective. Possibly some of this concern arises from the flexibility of the expenditure control provision of H.R. 11400 just passed by the Congress.

In this legislation the limit on expenditures for fiscal year 1970 would appear to be $191.9 billion—one billion below the $192.9 billion projected in my revised budget. However, the actual language (1) authorizes me to exceed this ceiling by two billion dollars for increases in specified items of uncontrollable spending, thereby raising the ceiling potentially to $193.9 billion; and (2) enables Congress to raise expenditures by any amount for any program, thereby permitting automatic Congressional increases in the ceiling.

There is an obvious advantage in having a precise ceiling—one which clearly specifies the maximum allowable expenditures. I therefore assure you and your colleagues that I accept in good faith the $191.9 billion ceiling as passed by Congress. More than this, barring a plainly critical and presently unforeseeable emergency, I will hold total expenditures for fiscal 1970 within the $192.9 billion indicated in my April budget proposals.

I will regard this $192.9 billion maximum as a ceiling on fiscal 1970 expenditures, on this premise—that when an increase is approved by Congress or develops in one program it will be offset by a corresponding decrease in another program, thereby keeping the total budget within the $192.9 billion maximum.

For the Executive Branch this means that if uncontrollable spending, such as interest on the public debt and social security benefits, should exceed the April estimates, or if other spending essential to the national welfare is approved, the additional spending will have to be offset by reductions elsewhere. Further it means that, if the Congress should vote expenditures above those provided for in the breakdown of the $192.9 billion total, it will also need to impose compensating reductions in other programs. Failure to establish such priorities in allocating funds within the $192.9 billion total will compel the Executive Branch either to impose offsetting reductions itself in programs approved by Congress or to refrain from spending the increase.

I believe this firm expenditure control, prompt extension of the surtax and the excises, and repeal of the investment tax credit will give us the tools our country needs to brake and stop inflation. It is my understanding that the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee will follow this action with prompt consideration of a major tax revision package which will include many of the reform proposals I recommended to Congress last April.

Working together, I am confident that the Congress and the Administration can establish sound priorities and keep within a $192.9 billion expenditure total for 1970. I assure you that I intend to see that this is done.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

As evidence that the President is determined to keep total Government expenditures within this prescribed ceiling I call attention to an article appearing in today's Washington Post by Richard Homan entitled "Nixon Cuts Spending $3.5 Billion, Hits Hill."

This article calls attention to the fact that President Nixon, as the result of increased expenditures in certain programs, is finding it necessary to make offsetting reductions in other areas totaling $3.5 billion.

I compliment President Nixon upon the firm stand he is taking to combat this inflationary danger, first, by emphasizing the need for the extension of the surcharge, and second, by making a determined effort to hold Government expenditures within the agreed limits.

I ask unanimous consent that the article referred to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIXON CUTS SPENDING $3.5 BILLION, HITS HILL

(By Richard Homan)

President Nixon, chiding Congress for failing to accept a number of his money-saving proposals, yesterday ordered a $3.5 billion cut in spending by Government departments and agencies to offset increases in areas over which he has no control.

More than half the $3.5 billion will probably come from defense spending not associated with the Vietnam war, Budget Bureau Director Robert P. Mayo said.

Mr. Nixon blamed Congress for $1 billion of the anticipated $3.5 billion growth over his Administration's proposed budget for the current fiscal year. The rest is unexpected increases in "uncontrollable" areas of Government spending such as Social Security, interest on Federal borrowing and Medicare.

The cuts would not reduce the Administration's proposed $192.9 billion budget for the current year. Rather, since programs the President cannot control appear likely to add $3.5 billion to the budgeted spending, Mr. Nixon has ordered an identical amount cut in other areas to keep the budget at $192.9 billion.

The President said that "some highly desirable programs will have to be stretched out—others reduced" and he said that the "dollar reductions will be accompanied by a further lowering of the personnel ceilings established last April."

Mayo said his office would recommend detailed cuts to the President by early August. Multi-billion-dollar cuts in the Pentagon budget would probably require a significant reduction in the size of the armed forces—a move already being considered by Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird—or outright elimination of major weapons programs.

The President and his budget chief accused Congress of failing to match the Administration's cost-cutting efforts—by adding costly programs, failing to reduce others and failing to enact revenue-producing legislation proposed by Mr. Nixon.

"Last April I presented a revised 1970 budget to the Congress," the President said in a statement. "That budget contained specific reductions totalling $4 billion from the budget left by the previous Administration.

"It brought the proposed Federal spending figure for this fiscal year down to $192.9 billion, a figure I still believe reflects a responsible fiscal policy in our highly inflationary environment.

XUM

"If we hold the line on that spending figure, as I intend to, and if the requisite revenues are provided, this fiscal year will produce the kind of budget surplus needed to cool off an economy that was dangerously overheated before we assumed office."

Mr. Nixon said Congressional action "has been inconsistent" with his cost-cutting proposals made in April.

Congress has not acted on his request for a postal rate increase that was to have taken effect July 1, it has not ended special milk and agriculture conservation programs as he recommended and, instead of reducing aid to schools in Federally impacted areas, as he recommended, it is moving to increase them.

On Monday, Mayo noted, the House Appropriations Committee voted to raise the Administration's proposed $15.9 million for merchant marine shipbuilding to $200 million.

"Thus our current estimate of Fiscal 1970 spending has risen to $196.4 billion even though we in the Administration have done nothing in the way of discretionary action to add to our earlier $192.9 billion estimate," the President said.

Mr. Nixon announced the spending cut as he signed into law the final supplemental appropriations bill for the fiscal year that ended June 30. The bill contains a $191.9 billion ceiling, with some exemptions, for spending in the current year.

"The new ceiling will be of little help in keeping Federal spending under control if the Congress that imposed it does not cooperate fully with the Administration in meeting it," the President said.

THE BOYCOTT ON CHINESE GOODS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in a week in which man has reached out and touched the moon, it is also heartening to see an attempt by man on earth to reach out to touch his fellow man. I refer to the administration's decision, early this week, to end partially the secondary boycott on Chinese goods as it applies to American citizens traveling abroad. It is my understanding that they will now be permitted to purchase up to $100 worth of goods originating in mainland China. In addition the administration has decided to validate automatically the passports of six categories of American citizens for travel to mainland China.

Regardless of Chinese reactions, these are steps in the right direction. I would hope that they will lead to the removal of all special restrictions on the travel of Americans and also to our placing trade with China in nonstrategic goods on the same basis as trade with other Communist countries.

I hope that the Government of mainland China will respond to these overtures in some way. But even if there is no response, these actions on the part of the administration will have been useful and important if they mark, as they seem to do, the beginning of a more rational and more realistic official attitude on the part of the executive branch toward relations with the most populous country on earth.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 10 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISSENT ON THE ABM: A CONGRESSIONAL OBLIGATION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, debate on the administration's Safeguard system is nearly complete. Over the course of the past weeks the Senate has thoroughly discussed the principal substantive aspects of the proposed ABM system: its strategic implications, its probable capabilities, its likely effects on the arms race, its cost.

On April 25, in a speech delivered in the Senate, I attempted a careful analysis of the arguments offered in support of immediate deployment of the Safeguard system. It was my conclusion that deployment would not enhance our national security—indeed, it was more likely to initiate an arms race that would ultimately leave us less secure—and that the billions of dollars required for deployment could better be invested to meet other national needs.

In short, it was my considered judgment that deployment at this time would be a dangerous and unwise decision both in terms of national security and opportunity costs.

However, during the waning days of this debate, the Safeguard's supporters have introduced an additional argument that must be confronted seriously before any final decision on deployment can be rendered. The argument, stated in its most persuasive form, reads:

> Whether or not the Safeguard system performs up to expectations is not the most relevant consideration. The President has stated unequivocally that he desires deployment of the Safeguard to strengthen his hand in arms control negotiations with Moscow and in his dealings with other governments. Since the President is the principal government official charged with the conduct of the nation's foreign policy, the Congress should not deny him the tools he believes necessary for the successful implementations of that policy.

The effect of this new tack by Safeguard supporters has been to shift consideration of the system from strictly a defense authorization context—in which Congress' right to exercise independent judgment is undisputed—into the more contentious arena of foreign affairs. Instead of debating the strategic importance and cost-effectiveness of the Safeguard, the proposition to be tested becomes Congress' moral obligation to grant the President what he requests for the conduct of our international affairs.

In order to pass judgment on the soundness of this proposition, we must undertake a definition of the respective roles of the President and Congress in the area of foreign policy; the constitutional issue debated during consideration of the foreign commitments resolution last month.

Turning to the Constitution itself does not yield a ready answer to the question of who shall possess the final or determining voice in the formulation of our foreign policy. What the Constitution does, and all that it does, is to confer on the President certain powers capable of affecting our foreign relations, and certain other powers of the same general kind on Congress. The question of who should defer to whom in time of disagreement between these two branches of Government is not resolved.

However, according to an eminent student of the Presidency, Edwin S. Corwin:

> Actual *practice* under the Constitution has shown that, while the President is usually in a position to propose, the Senate and the Congress are often in a technical position, at least, to dispose. The verdict of history, in short, is that the power to determine the substantive content of American foreign policy is a *divided power.*[1]

An issue raising the same constitutional questions as the proposition that Congress is morally obligated to give the President the Safeguard system if he requests it for the conduct of U.S. foreign policy came before the House of Representatives in 1798. The issue was whether Congress was obligated to grant the President the funds to dispatch a given number of ministers to foreign capitals.

In the historic debate that ensued, Representative Albert Gallatin, of Pennsylvania, delivered a brilliant defense of Congress' right and duty to exercise its independent judgment in such situations.

After establishing the constitutional fact that "Congress, having the sole power of granting money, are judges of the propriety or impropriety of making a grant, and that they have a right to exercise their discretion therein," Representative Gallatin, in 1798, moved to the core of his case:

> Whenever the powers have been so distributed between two departments, in relation to another certain act, that neither of the two can complete the act by virtue of its own powers, then each department is controlled by the other, not in relation to the operation of its appropriate powers but in relation to the act itself. Each department, in that case, may go as far as its own authority will permit, but no further. The refusal of the other department to exercise its powers in relation to that act, in the same direction and in concurrence with the first department, is no abridgement of the legitimate powers of the first. It is the Constitution which, in that case, abridges the powers of both, and which has rendered the concurrence of both necessary for the completion of the act. If either of the departments, . . . after having exercised its own authority towards the completion of the act, shall pretend to have a right to force the powers of the other in the same direction so as to have the act completed against or without its voluntary consent, it is that department which abridges the legitimate exercise of the powers of the other. Thus, in the instance before us, the President may appoint as many public Ministers as he thinks fit, and if he can [induce them to go, he may] send them to their intended mission without the assistance of any act of the Legislature; if he can, as in the case of the Consuls, find men who will serve without a salary, he has a right to do it, and thus to act uncontrolled by the Legislature; because, on this supposed instance, his own authority is sufficient to carry into effect his intentions. But further than that he cannot go; for the Constitution, in no part, gives him any power to force the Legislature to grant the money which may be necessary to pay the Ministers. In the same manner the Legislature have a right to appropriate a sum of money for the purpose of paying twenty public Ministers, if they shall in their judgement think so many necessary. But further than that they cannot go; they cannot force the President to

---

[1] Edward Corwin, *The President: Office and Powers, 1787-1957*, New York, New York University Press, p. 171.

XUM

> appoint twenty Ministers, if he does not think them necessary. In this instance the act is placed partly under the jurisdiction of the Executive, and partly under that of the Legislature—under the jurisdiction of the Executive so far as relates to the creation of the office and to the appointment—under the jurisdiction of the Legislature so far as relates to granting the money—and the concurrence of both departments is necessary to complete the act.

Mr. President, as if to anticipate the case before us today, Representative Gallatin concluded:

> When it is found that the Constitution has distributed the powers in a manner different from that contended for, although there is no clause which directs that Congress shall be bound to appropriate money in order to carry into effect any of the Executive powers, some gentlemen, recurring to metaphysical subtleties and abandoning the literal and plain sense of the Constitution, say that, although we have a Constitutional power, we have not a moral right to act according to our own discretion but are under a *moral obligation* [italics added] in this instance to grant the money. It is evident that where the Constitution has lodged the power, there exists the right of acting and the right of discretion. Congress is, upon all occasions, under a moral obligation to act according to justice and propriety.[2]

In short, it is clear that Congress has vast powers to determine the bounds within which a President may be left to work out a foreign policy—powers which certainly include denying the President the Safeguard as a card in his negotiating hand if Congress determines it is not needed. Indeed, as Edward Corwin has written:

> The Congress may effectively block presidential policy by simply declining to pass implementing legislation—for example, appropriations. It results that, in proportion as the prosecution of a foreign policy—"The Marshall Plan," for instance—requires lavish expenditure, so is the insistence of the body that controls the nation's purse strings that it be accepted as a partner in the determination of the objectives of our diplomacy likely to increase.[3]

I believe it is imperative to firmly establish this point. I say this not simply because it effectively counters the argument that Congress ought to give the President the Safeguard because he wants it—though it does cut the ground from under this case—or out of some peevish desire to defend congressional prerogatives. Congress' right and obligation to rule independently on the Safeguard must be established beyond question—whether viewed as a defense appropriation or in a foreign policy context—because we have permitted the steady erosion of the fundamental principle on which our political system was founded: the separation of powers. Senators in this Chamber have seen this happen, particularly in the last 10 or 15 years.

Thus, far more is at stake as we approach the vote on the Safeguard than a complex of expensive military hardware. For the Safeguard has become a crucial test of the Senate's will to exercise its judgment independently of the wishes of the Pentagon and the President.

Too often since World War II we have neglected our constitutional responsibility by interpreting the wise injunction to keep partisan politics out of international affairs to mean the Senate must act as a rubberstamp for the Executive's foreign policy.

Too often in recent years we have failed to exercise the same critical judgment in appraising military and international matters that we afford domestic programs and proposals. Continued failure to abandon this course and to restore the vital balance in our system prescribed by the framers of the Constitution will surely invite disaster. For as Gibbon wrote in "The Decline and Fall":

> The principles of a free constitution are irrecoverably lost, when the legislative power is nominated by the executive.[4]

That is one of the issues in the vote pending on the Safeguard system.

Having attempted to demonstrate Congress' right and responsibility to render an independent judgment on the ABM—even if it is regarded as an element in the President's foreign policy plans—I would like to conclude by turning briefly to the question of whether denying the President the Safeguard actually will weaken his position in arms talks with the Soviets and in his dealings with other governments.

The weight of the evidence indicates it will not.

Surely, Soviet understanding that we can proceed with the deployment of an operational ABM system if they appear intransigent in arms negotiations or begin to expand their own limited ABM system around Moscow provides sufficient incentive for the Kremlin's representatives to seriously discuss limitations on systems like the ABM in Geneva.

On the other hand, deploying at this time could well undermine the chances for successful talks. In the judgment of Nobel Prize Laureate, Professor of Physics Bernard Feld:

> What we are dealing with here is the tendency until now for arms control negotiations and agreements to lag behind weapons technology. If we and the Russians continue to insist on the criterion that an agreement be both foolproof and riskproof before it is accepted, while at the same time being willing to deploy new weapons systems whose operations and implications retain considerable uncertainties, then arms control will continue to lag hopelessly behind military technology, and the arms race will continue on its merry but deadly upward spiral.[5]

As for the effects of the decision to deploy the ABM on our relations with other states, I believe they can only be detrimental. In return for agreeing to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, the nonnuclear nations of this world insisted on the inclusion of article VI in the treaty. This article binds each of the nuclear parties to the treaty to undertake to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control."

The nonnuclear nations can hardly regard a decision to deploy the Safeguard system as anything but contrary to the terms and the spirit of this agreement. Based on his experience in negotiating this treaty as our Ambassador to the United Nations, Arthur Goldberg has stated:

> I do not hesitate in stating that the world community views with apprehension what appears to them to be an escalation of the nuclear arms race through deployment of competitive ABM systems.[6]

Mr. President, last year after much deliberation, I voted against funds to deploy the Sentinel ABM system. In April, after carefully studying the present administration's Safeguard system, I stated that I would oppose deployment of an ABM system at this time because I felt it would not contribute to the security of this Nation.

Nothing has happened in the interim to change my mind.

CHANGES IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I was interested and I must confess somewhat dismayed to read in the press today a statement attributed to President Thieu of South Vietnam saying it would take 2 years to set up machinery for holding elections in South Vietnam after the Vietcong agree to participate in such voting.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Election Delay Seen by Thieu," published in the Washington Post today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELECTION DELAY SEEN BY THIEU

SAIGON, July 23.—President Thieu has been quoted as saying it will take two years to set up machinery for holding elections in South Vietnam—after the Vietcong agree to participate in such voting.

Saigon newspapers reported today that the president made that statement in a speech Monday at the seaside resort of Vungtau, where he spoke before a graduation class of pacification workers. No official text of Thieu's speech was made available.

The newspapers quoted Thieu as saying South Vietnam is "now strong and steadily growing stronger."

"The National Liberation Front realizes that once they agree to participate, it will take two years to set up the machinery so elections can actually take place," he said.

"By that time, we will be so strong that the Communist army of North Vietnam will have to withdraw completely."

Thieu was reported to have added that under those circumstances "the NLF would not dare stump openly as Communists because the elections will be under the watchful eyes of foreign observers."

---

[2] *Annals*, 5th Cong., 2d session, pp. 1120–1122.

[3] Op. cit., Corwin, pp. 192.

[4] Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, New York, Random House, Vol. 1, pp. 54.

[5] Bernard Feld, "The ABM and Arms Control," *ABM: An Evaluation of the Decision to Deploy an Antiballistic Missile System*, Washington, 1969, pp. 9.

[6] Arthur Goldberg, "The Attitude of the World Community Toward the ABM," *ABM: An Evaluation of the Decision to Deploy an Antiballistic Missile System*, Washington, 1969, p. 1.

In his recent peace proposals, Thieu suggested that an international body be set up to oversee elections in South Vietnam. The next regularly scheduled elections for a President are to be held in 1971. There have, however, been suggestions that the voting could be moved up if the Communists agreed to take part and abide by the results.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, that statement on the part of President Thieu leads us to some other reflections on the political situation in Vietnam.

The Nixon administration's commendable changes in American policy are at last being manifested in Vietnam. President Thieu's proposal for Communist participation in free elections in South Vietnam indicates that the voice of America has at last been heard in Saigon. Now we may hope that the voice of the Vietnamese people may also some day be heard in that embattled city.

Today, however, Thieu seems to grant more rights to the Communists than he does to his non-Communist opposition. While he invites the Vietcong to join an electoral commission and to take part in a free vote, the best he has to offer his anti-Communist opponents is free food and lodging—in his country's congested jails.

Thieu's democratic pretensions will be more convincing when he allows Vietnamese not in the ruling military clique to take part in their country's politics—even if they do not choose to join the Vietcong.

At present, a convention of anti-Communist South Vietnamese leaders to select democratic opposition to the military regime could only take place in prison. There are uncounted tens of thousands of non-Communist prisoners convicted for advocating too soon such negotiations as have now at last been undertaken or for otherwise offering encouragement to the enemy. Among them are: Truong Dinh Dzu who received over 900,000 votes and came in second in the 1967 elections; Thich Thien Minh, leader of the Buddhist youth movement and regarded as one of the two most important Buddhists in this dominantly Buddhist country; and Nguyen Lau, publisher of the Saigon Daily News, the most influential English language newspaper.

Last week my office was in touch with Dzu's son, David Troung, who is in New York, and who fears, on the basis of what he believes to be authoritative reports from inside the Saigon Government, that his father's life is in danger. The usual method, he says, is to transfer a prisoner to a hospital, contrive a grenade attack and attribute it to the Vietcong. This previously happened to Thich Thien Minh, the Buddhist.

Fearing incarceration, other leaders have fled the country. Trung Thanh, often envisaged as a possible leader of a reconciliation government, is in France. Duong Van Minh, known as Big Minh, leader of the coup against Diem in 1963 and excluded from the 1967 elections because of his popularity, has just returned to Saigon from exile in Bangkok. He is currently being subjected to surveillance so intense it amounts to house arrest.

Such men are as opposed as ever to Vietcong control of their country. According to the recent report of the U.S. study team on political and religious freedom in Vietnam, the overwhelming majority of prisoners represent, in fact, the middle ground of Vietnamese political opinion on which a non-Communist political alternative to the current regime must be based.

An alternative is clearly needed. As General Ky's recent comments indicated, the military regime cannot be maintained without a continued American military presence. In fact, since the total number of South Vietnamese among our Communist adversaries in the country is continuing to increase, continuation of the Thieu-Ky regime enlarges the likelihood that it will be succeeded by Communist rule.

At present, American policy seems devoted to the proposition that although we must withdraw our forces from Vietnam, we cannot withdraw our support from the present government. This policy both makes our withdrawal more difficult and Communist victory more likely.

The self-defeating implications of this approach are symbolized by Thieu's apparent offer of free elections to his Communist but not to his anti-Communist opponents. The United States should not tolerate it. We can no longer permit ourselves to be exploited, at incalculable cost of blood and treasure, by a regime that is systematically destroying both its own minimal public support and the available non-Communist alternatives to its leadership. We must as a matter of most urgent priority encourage the kind of democratic political processes indispensable to the creation of a government in South Vietnam with a sufficient popular base to survive without continued engagement of American military force.

The first step in opening new possibilities in Vietnam is to open the jails. Dzu and the others must be released. Political popularity must no longer be treated as a crime. The second step is truly to open the elections. The Thieu-Ky government is becoming as great a threat to democratic self-determination in that country as the Vietcong.

President Thieu's statements show a change chiefly in American, not South Vietnamese policy. The Nixon administration is to be commended for beginning the necessary process of American withdrawal. But our policy cannot succeed unless it is accompanied by a change of heart—and change of course—in Saigon.

THE CHALLENGE OF URBAN PROBLEMS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, good government has always been a matter of adapting institutions to changing social conditions. In an era of rapid social evolution, an urban crisis has developed, and the demands it places on our political system are increasing.

The measure of that system will be determined, to a great extent, by the character of its response to those demands. We are at a decision point in history: what we do now to meet the challenge of urban problems will shape the Nation's future. Our decisions must be well considered, but they must not be delayed. "Too little, too late" would be a fitting epitaph for a political system which decided not to decide, and thereby made the worst decision of all.

On June 19, 1969, former Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey addressed the Minnesota League of Municipalities, and presented a forthright plan for the solution of our pressing urban problems. In calling attention to the crisis confronting American cities, Vice President Humphrey expressed confidence that with decisive leadership from government, most urban problems could be solved.

Because of the timeliness of his remarks, and because of the importance of his proposals, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, Minnesota League of Municipalities, June 19, 1969

Today we are part of a massive, concentrated society. Seventy percent of the U.S. population lives in metropolitan areas. Indeed, one out of five people lives within the limits of cities with a population of over one million.

We hope to land a man on the moon within a month. We are deciphering the innermost secrets of the human cell. We have created enormous energy from minute nuclear reactors. The science of communication—telephone, radio and television and radar and computers—has made commonplace occurrences which my father—and your father—would have regarded as supernatural.

We have an industrial economy which this year will record a gross national product of one trillion dollars. Only eight years ago we somehow existed with a GNP of only 500 billion dollars.

Can we keep pace with these changes? Can we preserve the dignity of the individual?

Can our educational institutions transmit an ever-increasing body of knowledge?

Can our religious institutions become a force for justice in a changed world which complicates spiritual and moral concepts?

Can our labor and business institutions change so that management techniques and technology are the benevolent servants of man, rather than their malevolent masters?

Can our financial institutions find new ways of allocating credit other than by increasing interest rates?

Can our law enforcement institutions, now costly and slow-moving, change so that swift justice is available to all?

These are the questions which concern an ever-broadening cross-section of the American people—and these are the questions which concern persons—like yourselves—who are charged with making our municipalities true communities of *people,* living rewarding and satisfying lives.

Change is inevitable. Change creates crisis only when our response is inflexible and rigid. Today I want to propose two specific programs which I believe will provide a much needed flexibility and adaptability to our basic economic, political, and social institutions—those established structures which in large measure must decide the kind of local communities we are able to build in the final third of the 20th century.

My first proposal is for each state government to create and establish a new department or office for Community Development. The title and the purpose of the department should reflect the development of urban

XUM

centers. Therefore, it could be called a Department of Urban Development or preferably a Department of Community Development. This new department in state government should be the equivalent at the state level, to the Department of Housing and Urban Development at the national level. The Department of Community Development should be authorized to coordinate and activate all housing and urban development programs, particularly those from the federal level which require state participation. This new department should have its own Community Development program and budget designed to assist and stimulate local activity. It must engage in broad research pertaining to urban needs such as community planning, economic development, the proper use of land and such areas as zoning, building codes and all social services. Urban research must not be the special prerogative of the federal government. We desperately need the input—the ideas, the long-range proposals—of local and state government. This new department should be strengthened by the creation of a broadly representative advisory committee on urban and community development. This advisory committee to include representatives of local government, business, labor, the academic community, social services, financial institutions and other community leaders. Active participation by state government in urban development is essential if there is to be any hope for our cities. State governments must recognize that we are essentially an urban, industrialized nation with a highly mobile population.

But emphasis on development of urban America and new cities does not mean less attention to rural America. It means above all making rural America a more inviting place to live—making rural America modern, forward looking and attractive to its children. After all, when we talk of cities, we talk of people and new cities will have to find their location in rural America.

The second proposal outlines a new approach to amassing the credit cities need to supply basic community facilities for the coming years.

Even if our population remains stable—and it certainly will not—the amount of capital needed to clean our air and water—to build schools and hospitals—to improve law enforcement and justice is truly staggering. But this country is *not* standing still—we will have to provide for an additional 27 million people in the next 6 years.

A conservative estimate of the cost of replacing obsolete facilities, reducing backlogs, and meeting needs of an expanding population by 1975 is $625 billion.

Between now and the turn of the century, the Institute of Public Administration estimates that *$6 trillion* will have to be raised just for housing and community facilities.

In the past, current tax revenues supplied about ½ the cost of community facilities. For the other half, states and cities issued bonds—a well-established method of obtaining credit and one which should be preserved.

But we must also realize that this magnitude of borrowing will likely force interest rates beyond the point which many municipalities can pay. In addition, procedures for issuing bonds are cumbersome, expensive, and time consuming.

Many municipalities will find it difficult—if not impossible—to raise the needed money. Moreover, a bond resolution creates rigid patterns of obligations which can be changed only at great cost to the municipality.

In order to lessen these burdens, I have proposed that the U.S. Congress establish a National Metropolitan Development Bank, and I have been developing legislation which I hope Senator Mondale will introduce.

The Metro Bank—as I call it—would provide an alternative source of low-interest credit for communities. It would raise money in investment markets throughout the nation from all groups of investors. Of greater significance to local governments, it would relieve the pressure on bond markets so that communities could pay less for money whether they borrow from the Metro Bank or whether they issue municipal bonds.

The Metro Bank would sell federally guaranteed bonds and debentures on the national investment market, and then lend to local governments at rates of interest 30–50% below the rates of the federally guaranteed bonds. The range of interest rates insures that local governments would not pay more to borrow from the Bank than they would to issue tax exempt bonds.

The Federal government would make up the difference by an annual appropriation. Because the federal bonds are taxable, however, this would not constitute a net cost to the government.

The Bank would be authorized to make long term—40 to 60 years—low interest loans for building basic community facilities. It would also make "soft" loans for up to 20 years to promote economic development in those areas where an increase in investment would be in the national interest. Such a determination would be made by the Council of Economic Advisors, with the advice of counsel of the various Federal departments with responsibilities for urban and economic development.

The Metro Bank would be chartered by act of Congress, but it would not be a Federal agency. It would work closely with the Federal government and appropriate Federal departments and agencies would be represented on the Board of Directors.

I propose the Bank be capitalized at $6 billion—½ to be borrowed from the U.S. Treasury over a 10 year period, and the other $3 billion by the sale of commercial stock. Each user would be required to purchase a portion of this stock based on the number of persons within its jurisdiction.

The Metro Bank would not only provide a wholly new alternative source of money for local governments, but it would also enable the Federal government to utilize flexible approaches in aiding the construction of essential community facilities.

The third proposal I want to discuss today involves a broader view of the future of our cities—how and where our people will live, work, learn, and play—30 years from today.

I believe we must find a way to build brand new cities. Whether they are located on the fringes of today's suburbs, on the sites of existing small towns, or on wide open spaces, we need no less than 100 *new* cities flourishing by the year 2000. Population increases alone could make necessary 20 new cities of one million population.

New cities provide an alternative to both excessive concentrations—up to 140,000 persons per square mile in New York's Harlem—and excessive sparseness found in area of suburban and rural sprawl.

In new cities we have the opportunity to avoid the mistakes of unplanned cities—to eliminate parking on the street, on-street loading and highway clutter. We can begin with new communications, using tunnel economics for the delivery of essential services, utilities and goods, and we can plan open spaces and pedestrian pathways.

Can our social and political institutions meet the new challenge?

We already possess the technical knowledge for building such cities. We have the management tools and skills—computers, cost-benefit analysis.

We have an understanding of the economic forces which must serve as a basis for a new city. The most vital task in building a new city is the creation of an industrial and employment base.

We know some of the social problems we want to avoid, and to a certain extent, we know how to avoid them.

What we lack is a public policy—a framework in which all our knowledge can be put to use. City planners, architects, sociologists, financiers, public officials and bureaucrats have produced considerable insight and knowledge about what to do—now we must generate the popular support and the governmental structures to carry out these plans.

I propose that a joint committee be created in the United States Congress charged with the responsibility of

defining the fundamental social, economic, demographic, and ecological objectives to help guide the growth of new cities;

deciding how many new cities we need and where they can be located;

designing the public development corporations that would be necessary to establish and manage the new cities until local governments are elected.

A word about the corporations themselves. First, it is absolutely essential that they be formed jointly by states and the Federal government. It is the state, and only the state, which can delegate the legal power of local self government. On the other hand, the national interest in the success of the city is so great that the corporations must reflect national developmental goals.

Second, the corporation must have available the planning skills and management skills necessary for such a complex undertaking. And the corporation should have the power of eminent domain to procure adequate land area.

But the work of our political institutions is not fulfilled solely by the activities of the Joint Congressional Committee. As I stressed earlier, the task of creating an economically viable city is essential. While much of this task can be accomplished by imaginative recruiting and promotion, or by inexpensive or free land, other incentives will be required. The Federal and the state governments can help provide these incentives.

This issue is not whether the Federal government should try to influence local development; the issue is whether the influence which the Federal government already exercises will be haphazard or directed by fundamental national goals for urban development.

The government is a major buyer. Its defense procurement practices have literally created Los Angeles.

The Congress must define national goals of development and then it must assure that practices of the Federal government contribute to those goals.

The placement of government facilities has a profound effect on local community life. The government is a major employer. The location of a defense installation, a new university, even a government office complex can mean new economic life for a community. Federal financial incentives such as tax, loan, or direct payment arrangements can foster growth in new cities. Placement of Federal procurement contracts and construction projects can provide jobs.

Federal policies such as resettlement allowances, on-the-job training allowances, and job placement, can neutralize the factors producing excessive population concentration.

These will be cities to protect and foster man's natural inclination toward community. The physical design of these cities can relieve the pressures of urban living pressures which too frequently result in the breakdown of the family. Families in our new cities can prosper, can develop a viable, modern form of this most natural and basic unit of human organization.

These cities can also relieve the pressures confounding our old cities. They can provide a moment of relief, a pause in their constant struggle against the intertwined problems of urban life.

In order to do the things which I have

XUM

been talking with you about, we need a willing electorate—a clear political decision by the American people to get the job done.

We also need creative and decisive leadership from mayors, governors, and particularly from the President of the United States.

Because the task is so complicated, because the problems are so vast, our people must be inspired to act. Only qualities of real greatness can inspire our people to greatness.

SPACE AND EARTH PRIORITIES

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the very fact of the moon landing is so remarkable that there is little one can say which will embellish it. It was truly an achievement for all mankind, and a striking symbol of our common destiny.

Our responsibility now, it seems to me, is to try to determine how man can take hold of that destiny—how he can "spin off" from this great scientific success solutions for some of the world's political, social, and economic problems.

Of course, the moon walk must not be the end of our space odyssey. We must continue a steady program of development with the idea that someday we will go on to other planets in our own universe—even to other galaxies of stars. But it is premature now, I believe, to talk of going on to Mars as though that were to be the objective of another feverish 10-year plan.

We must set some national priorities, and our first priority must be to use the great technological breakthroughs which took us to the moon to improve our lives here on earth.

Our commitment should be first to America.

How can a society which can perform such miracles as putting men on the moon condone the highest crime rate in the world?

How can we justify having so many poor—so many who do not have enough to eat and who live in houses that are little more than shelter?

How can we tolerate our polluted water and air; our expanding concrete jungle; our unequal opportunity for an education, our untrained, and our jobless?

How can we explain that we do little to control our galloping population which will soon expand our pollution and education and training problems into monsters which even our most advanced technology will not let us conquer?

Mr. President, we must turn more of our national effort to our problems on the globe's surface, and I am hopeful that the mind-opening events of the last few days, and the technology which made them possible, will allow us to attack our age-old sore spots here on earth with greater skill and plausibility.

PLANETARY EXPLORATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, I have probably a little more interest than other Members of the Senate in what lies ahead for NASA now that the moon venture is practically completed and successful. Under the National Academy of Sciences, the National Research Council of the Space Sciences Board has submitted a report entitled "Planetary Exploration." I do not want to burden Senators with the complete text of the report, which is extremely interesting, so I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the principal recommendations of this learned group.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL RECOMMENDATIONS OF "PLANETARY EXPLORATION"

1. We recommend that the planetary exploration program be presented, not in terms of a single goal, but rather in terms of the contribution that exploration can make to a broad range of scientific disciplines (page 3).

2. We recommend that a substantially increased fraction of the total NASA budget be devoted to unmanned planetary exploration (page 3).

3. (a) We recommend that duplicate missions for a particular opportunity be undertaken only when a clear gain in scientific information will result from such double launches (page 4).

(b) We recommend that NASA initiate now a program of Pioneer/IMP-class spinning spacecraft to orbit Venus and Mars at every opportunity and for exploratory missions to other targets (page 5).

(c) We recommend the following larger missions to Mars: A Mariner orbiter mission in 1971, and a Mariner-type orbiter and lander mission, based on a Titan-Centaur, in 1973 (page 5).

(d) We accord next priorities (in descending order) to a Mariner-class Venus-Mercury fly-by in 1973 or 1975, a multiple drop-sonde mission to Venus in 1975, and a major lander on Mars, perhaps in 1975 (page 6).

4. (a, b) Rather than attempt to define in detail payloads to be carried aboard high priority missions, we have selected several sample payloads (page 6).

(c) We recommend that with regard to Mars and Venus, NASA continually reassess, in the light of current knowledge of the planets, its program, methods, and mathematical model for meeting the internationally agreed objectives on planetary quarantine (page 11).

5. (a) We recommend strongly that NASA support radar astronomy as an integral part of its planetary program. In particular, we recommend that NASA fund the development and operation of a major new radar observatory to be used primarily for planetary investigation (page 12).

(b) We recommend that NASA planetary program planning be closely coordinated with Earth-orbital telescopes being designed for the 1970's and with the infrared aircraft telescopes now under construction (page 13).

(c) We recommend that the NASA program of ground-based optical planetary astronomy continue to receive strong support and that opportunities for planetary astronomical investigations be increased by:

(1) Construction of an intermediate sized optical telescope in the Southern Hemisphere.

(2) Construction of an infrared telescope employing a very large collecting area and permitting interferometric measurements at a dry site

(3) Development of new infrared devices, including improved detectors and high resolution interferometers (page 14).

(d) We recommend that steps be taken to facilitate the analysis by qualified investigators of the data secured by the photographic planetary patrol (page 14).

6. (a) We recommend that NASA openly solicit participation in all future planetary missions by the issuance of flight opportunity announcements with adequate time for response from the scientific community (page 15).

(b) We recommend that NASA develop a summer institute program expressly designed to introduce interested scientists and engineers to the science, technology, and administration of the planetary program (page 15).

7. We recommend that those resources currently intended for support of manned planetary programs be reallocated to programs for instrumented investigation of the planets (page 16).

8. We recommend a coordinated effort involving representatives of NASA, the Department of State, and the National Academy of Sciences, for the purpose of contacting knowledgeable Soviet scientists in an informal way with regard to the possibility of joint planning of planetary exploration (page 16).

THE EL SALVADOR-HONDURAS WAR

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Honorable Murat W. Williams, who was U.S. Ambassador to El Salvador from 1961 to 1964, and who is now retired, has been kind enough to send me a copy of a letter he has written to the editor of the New York Times concerning the war between El Salvador and Honduras. I ask unanimous consent that Ambassador Williams' letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Ambassador Williams has some cogent comments to make concerning the role of the U.S. military missions in both of these countries, and he recounts his unsuccessful attempts as an ambassador to reduce the size of the mission in El Salvador where, as he points out, there were more men in the U.S. air mission than there were fliers in the Salvadoran Air Force.

It is hard to see how the United States can totally avoid some of the responsibility for the present war. There seems to be little doubt that the activities of the military missions and the military assistance program have contributed to the growth and influence of the national military establishments in both Honduras and El Salvador.

The war between these two little countries has been partly overshadowed by the flight of Apollo 11, and its comic opera aspects tend to obscure the tragedy which it represents for the countries involved and potentially for all of Central America.

It is long past time for the withdrawal of U.S. military missions from Latin America and for a halt in military assistance. I hope that Congress will take steps to bring this about when it acts on the pending foreign aid bill.

EXHIBIT 1

JULY 16, 1969.

To the EDITOR,
The New York Times.

DEAR SIR: It is easy to imagine U.S. Military Missions as "seconds" to the fighters in that bloody and useless contest in the Salvadoran-Honduran forests.

The Missions should not be in either country. With transient encouragement from Dean Rusk, I urged our Government in 1963 and 1964 to fade out our ridiculously large Missions in El Salvador. (We had more men in our Air Mission than there were flyers in the Salvadoran Air Force.) The Secretary was getting too busy with other problems and he left my plea to deputies. One of these said:

"I agree with you, but we can't do anything. You have annoyed the Pentagon by making the suggestion." A many-starred general was sent to "negotiate" with me. After several days, he consented to cut back two out of about forty positions, but not until the end of the tours of duty of the individuals concerned, a year or so later.

Anyone can see now that if money spent on Military Missions and supplies had been put into more economic development, not only would more have been done to root out the social and economic causes of this war, but also we would not be guilty of helping to build up armed forces, on both sides, that make fraticidal war possible. We would not have helped thwart progress towards the fraternal union that the peoples of Central America have dreamed of achieving in their Patria Grande.

By now the Missions may have wistful instructions to "urge restraint," but do we need still more arguments against fomenting military buildings in the once Good Neighborhood?

Respectfully yours,
MURAT W. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Ambassador to El Salvador, 1961–64.

IN SUPPORT OF THE ABM SYSTEM

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on the ABM issue, I will cast my vote with the President of the United States simply because I believe he is right; and I call upon my friends in the Senate to support him on this very crucial matter.

There has been a great deal of criticism regarding the technical feasibility of the ABM system. I suppose if the academic community were polled it would be quite evenly split on the question of whether or not the Safeguard system would work. Those who oppose the system at this time must base a major part of their argument on the position of that section of the scientific community which believes it will not work. I suppose a logical reaction to that is to base the argument for ABM on the position of the scientific community that says it will work.

There is, however, a third group in the scientific community which I think must be reckoned with. May I quote from Dr. John Foster to prove my point:

> The Safeguard system has been designed by competent people, and the best that are available. Its design has been reviewed by outside experts. Those who do, in fact, study the aspects of the system that are within their area of technical expertise are convinced that it will do what it's designed to do. There are some eminent scientists who for one reason or another claim that it will not work. On that I would like to say first that they have offered no problem which we have not long since addressed and resolved. Second, I want to point out that one does not obtain a meaningful, technical judgment by taking a vote of the scientific community, or even of Nobel Laureates.

Dr. Foster's statement is critical to this debate. What he is saying—and I believe he is correct—is that our scientists who are working with this system and deeply involved in its development know it will work. I submit further, Mr. President, that these are the men most qualified to say if it will work. While I have a great deal of respect for the scientific community that says it will not work, I am afraid their judgment is less convincing, simply because they do not have a first-hand working knowledge of the ABM system.

I am reminded of a great scientist who freely predicted that the hydrogen bomb would not explode. His position was once described as that of a man who did not want it to explode, but of course, history has proven that nuclear power, in spite of the early doubts and predictions against it, is a reality.

I wish to point out, further, not so much for the sake of this body but for the people of my State, that the Sprint interceptor, which is a part of the Safeguard system, has been tested at the White Sands Missile Range. Ten of the first 11 test firings have been completely or partially successful. The Spartan interceptor, also a part of the system, has undergone seven launches in the Pacific. Five have been completely successful; two have been partially successful. These facts have convinced me that the ABM system is technically feasible. I recall the days in the late 1950's and the early 1960's when we used to watch the test firings of early ICBM's and wondered what percentage would be successful.

The only aspect of the ABM which we cannot test is the actual interception in cases where nuclear warheads are being used. We are precluded from doing that, as we all know, by the 1963 Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

Yet the opposition continues to say it will not work. The futility of their arguments and the blindness of their position is epitomized in a New York Times editorial dated March 29, 1969. The editorial did not deal with ABM directly. It reported test firings of ICBM's in North Dakota. Not content with covering the ICBM's itself, it had to draw an analogy with the ABM and question the reliability of the intricate rocketry which powers the Minuteman system and the ABM. No one has argued that both will work perfectly. Nonetheless, the New York Times editorial states:

> Farmers who plow around the Minuteman are skeptical that it will ever fire when needed.

I suppose that if the Times had its way, farmers would be the determining factor in our rocket programs, and because farmers doubt that it will work, we should give up. Mr. President, I believe our scientists have developed the American rocket program to the point of sending man to the moon. They have developed a highly reliable ICBM system and are in the process of developing a workable and effective ABM system notwithstanding the highly technical scientific expertise of farmers and the New York Times editorial board.

Let me turn now to a second aspect of the ABM. The Soviet Union, according to our best intelligence, as pointed out by President Nixon in his March 14 statement, "has already deployed an ABM system which protects to some degree a wide area centered around Moscow. We will not have a comparable capability for over 4 years. We believe the Soviet Union is continuing its ABM deployment directed either toward improving this initial system or, more likely, making substantially better second generation ABM components."

The distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), in his recent speech concerning four myths about the Soviet Union, pointed out that the Soviets acted first to test fire an ABM against an incoming nuclear armed missile. They did this in 1962, and are the only nation to have done so. We are some 7 years behind and will never, so long as the Test Ban Treaty remains in force, be able to test the actual interception of a nuclear armed missile.

I suppose some Members of the Senate would say that because we are thus denied a key aspect of the testing, we should bury our heads in the sand and give up. The other side of the argument is that the Soviet Union has tested all aspects of their ABM system; they know it will work in spite of the New York Times, the farmers, and the academic community which has never worked on it.

I wish to emphasize again what President Nixon has said. The Soviet Union is working on a second generation ABM, which proves it will work and which I think very significantly affects the nuclear balance of power in the world. I think the evidence is overwhelming that a workable and effective ABM can and should be built by the United States.

I now turn to the question of Soviet diplomacy within the context of the ABM debate in the United States. I am neither an apologist for the Soviet Union, nor do I advocate a return to the coldest days of the cold war. However, I do believe that in deciding whether we should build an ABM, the postwar history of the Soviet Union must be considered.

It is an old axiom in international politics that power more than anything else determines the conduct of a nation. Whether we like it or not, the nuclear superiority of the United States enjoyed from 1945 until this year has disappeared. Secretary Laird has testified—and I for one accept his information as reliable—that in ICBM's, conventional forces and in many other aspects the Soviet Union is equal to the United States and its major allies. Furthermore, if the current military trend being followed in Moscow continues, the situation will change from nuclear parity to nuclear superiority favoring the Soviets. Some will say, "So what?" Let me list briefly some of the things Russia has done in the past 25 years, at a time when the United States had the upper hand in nuclear power.

She gained control of Eastern Europe and fomented the war in Korea. She initially aided China in the acquisition of atomic weapons and has been the major supplier to North Vietnam in its efforts to subvert the Saigon government.

Perhaps if we turned our cheek, we could forget those episodes, but I think we cannot dismiss the current role of the Soviet Union in other parts of the world. As its military position has been strengthened, it has become more ambitious in its worldwide objectives. It is now a major influence, perhaps more than we wish to admit, in the very critical and highly strategic Middle East. It has a major fleet in the Mediterranean and is even now seeking to obtain naval bases

XUM

in South Asia and Southeast Asia. It has built the world's largest merchant fleet and is producing Polaris type submarines at a rate of about seven a year. It has an ally 90 miles from the coast of the United States, where, we all too painfully remember, it attempted to place offensive missiles in 1962.

I am sure the New Left and the apologists for the Soviet Union can explain these things away, but I think they are the hard facts of international politics and the United States cannot ignore them. I believe that Soviet diplomacy in the past decade has been brazen and in many ways very successful. If the United States makes a decision not to deploy the ABM, not to retain nuclear parity with the Soviet Union, then I predict that Soviet diplomacy will become more brazen, more pushy throughout the world, and a greater threat to American security. I do not know how else to explain the new Soviet missile the SS–9 with its capacity to deliver nuclear warheads up to 25 megatons.

There has been a great deal of debate about the significance of the SS–9. Secretary Laird has described it as a first-strike type capability. Others have derided this assessment, but they cannot explain what it really means if it is not a first-strike capability. A 25-megaton warhead seems to qualify for that definition. It is not unlike sitting in a trench when the attacker comes forth with a tank of the first magnitude.

I am sure the boys in the foxhole and the trench might convince themselves that the tank is not an offensive weapon, but the fact is that the tank and the SS–9 are offensive weapons, and the latter can be and probably has been designed as a first-strike capability.

During the past 8 years, American nuclear strength has been gradually reduced from the 5-to-1 advantage which President Eisenhower left this Nation. In the last 2 years of the Johnson administration we were told on several occasions that the Soviets would reach a plateau in their feverish nuclear weapon production and then level off. This simply has not occurred. On top of this dramatic progress in offensive nuclear weapons, we now have a Soviet ABM system in place and to a large extent operational.

I cannot accept the position of the apologists for the Soviet Union, simply because the facts of the matter are otherwise. How else can one explain the Soviet MRV and FOBS systems, the Cuban missile crisis, its submarine and merchant fleet, its frantic nuclear weapons program, and, most unfortunately, the Brezhnev doctrine and the rape of Czechoslovakia.

I find it truly incredible that anyone could call the American safeguard ABM system a provocation. On the contrary, I predict that if we do not build it and do not retain at least a nuclear parity with the Soviet Union, we will see a Soviet diplomacy the likes of which we have not seen since Lenin came to power in Moscow.

Let me turn now to the issue of disarmament. I have been appointed as an observer and adviser to the U.S. disarmament conference in Geneva. I believe that if the major nations of the world can jointly reduce arms with a foolproof system of safeguards, we should work to that end with all our energies.

I disagree strongly, however, with those who say that the ABM decision of President Nixon will hamper our disarmament efforts. I submit that the Soviet Union is not in a disarmament mood as evidenced by its frantic pace of nuclear arms production in the past several years.

I also strongly believe that to build a defensive missile system very similar to the Soviet system which is now operational is in no way provocative. To say so is the height of naivete. I think the President has every indication from the Soviet Government that such a decision by the United States to build the ABM would not be provocative and even if it were, that is no reason for us to back down. Perhaps, though, the Soviet ABM system is provocative to certain Americans.

Another argument—and I think past experience bears me out—is that any new disarmament agreements may well take several years. I need not remind any Senator that the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty took many years of painstaking negotiations. We worked on the Nonproliferation Treaty for a long time before it was realized, and those were areas where the interests of both major powers were served and were not in conflict. The problems we are now facing are of the first magnitude, and it could be many years before there is any type of arms agreement.

Are we asking the American people in the meantime to take a second place in terms of national security? Are we asking them to disregard the nonpartisan assessment of ABM by President Nixon and by President Johnson before him? Are we asking the American people to ignore the assessment of our finest civilian and military defense planners and scientists? I think those are critical questions, and I for one would not ask the American people to accept the status that would be imposed upon them if ABM is defeated by the Senate.

I am afraid the ABM debate, in large measure, stems from our frustration about Vietnam and our ofttimes unjustified criticism of the military-industrial complex. I do not believe the Pentagon planners, be they military or civilian, have gained control of American society, and I think to deny this defense system to the American people on those grounds is fallacious, foolish, and would create a security risk of the first magnitude. I will cast my vote with the President simply because I believe he is right, and I call upon my friends in the Senate to support him on this very crucial matter.

I do not believe that people who support this necessary defense system are insensitive to the domestic needs of this country. Rather, I think they realize the consequences of defeating the ABM system. Let me close by saying that if the advocates of the system are wrong, we may have spent unnecessarily some $5 to $10 billion. If the opponents of the system are wrong, it may not matter since there might be few people left in the United States to remember the debate about the cost of building a system they opposed. I think the gamble is too great, and I for one will not ask the American people, nor the people of my State, to accept the risk involved should the Senate defeat the Safeguard ABM system.

THE PESTICIDE PERIL—XXVIII

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the growing controversy over the use of persistent, toxic pesticides is not confined to the United States. At the beginning of this year Sweden became the first country to ban the use of DDT, and Denmark recently announced that a similar ban will go into effect this fall.

Now the British press reports mounting pressures on its Government to curb the use of DDT.

The quality of our environment is of concern to all nations. The carelessness and abuses to the environment in one country will have an effect on the environment of its neighboring country. The threat is international, and we can no longer afford to be careless.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three articles from the British press regarding the pesticide problem.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DDT—AS PRESSURE FOR A BAN GROWS

(By William Breckon)

Mounting pressure is being put on the Government to curb the use of DDT pesticide in Britain.

For a growing mass of evidence, from all over the world, shows that DDT—one of the most widely used agricultural pesticides—presents a major threat to our wildlife, from the smallest garden creature to the golden eagle.

In Denmark and Sweden they have recently banned its use; it is banned too in Michigan, U.S.A.; in Arizona and Australia they restrict its use.

In Britain, yet another Government committee is slowly sifting the evidence—it should report by the end of the year.

There is no doubt that over the years DDT has proved to be one of the greatest chemical boons ever discovered. But in the last decade, niggling doubts have begun to accumulate about DDT—doubts which have sparked a vociferous international campaign for a ban.

These are the facts:

DDT is NOT going to kill anyone—in Britain the average person has some two to three parts per million of the chemical in his body, that is, about 100th of an ounce for the average man.

In the U.S., where it has been used far more indiscriminately than here, the levels are about four times as high. The average U.S. man has a higher concentration of DDT in his bloodstream than is permitted in meat on sale there.

BALANCE

But for wildlife DDT is potentially far more dangerous. It is, unfortunately, a chemical which can be stored in the body and deposits can slowly accumulate.

These probably will not be fatal, but they can radically affect the breeding habits—and hence the very existence—of whole species.

Recent experiments have shown:

1. In killing off micro-organisms in the soil, DDT has upset the delicate life-balance

XUM

which keeps the soil "sweet." But no one knows what the long-term effects could be.

2. Plankton in the sea accumulate DDT and so do the fish which eat them—and the bigger fish and birds which eat those fish. Similarly the birds that eat the slugs and the birds of prey that feed on them steadily build up DDT residue.

The trend towards extinction in birds of prey—notably the golden eagle and the peregrine falcon—has been attributed largely to DDT residue.

There ARE other ways to control pests, although some are more expensive and less effective.

But we must weigh the short-term gains against the long-term potential hazards. We must take steps now to control our growing pollution of the world about us—and the evidence is weighted against the continuing unrestricted use of DDT.

CASE FOR MORE BANS ON DDT

The Danish Government's ban on DDT, announced this week, may strengthen the case of those who wish Britain to take the same course. The campaign against DDT has been gathering recruits rapidly in the past few months.

Sweden, the first country to ban it, declared in March a two-year ban on DDT to start in 1970. In April the state of Michigan banned the pesticide in spite of a court case which went against the opponents of DDT. A petition to end the use of DDT is being heard in Wisconsin and legislation has been introduced in the United States Senate.

In Britain a decision on DDT and related pesticides is more than two years overdue. A Ministry of Agriculture committee recommended in 1964 that no restrictions should be put on the uses of DDT then current, but that this should be reviewed at the end of three years.

The committee charged with the review, the Advisory Committee on Pesticides and other toxic chemicals, is not expected to publish its report until the end of this year. Evidence being prepared by its scientific subcommittee is likely to be the major influence in whatever decision is reached.

In Britain the average person carries two to three parts a million of DDT in his body, or about a hundredth of an oz. for a 150lb. man. The concentrations are four times as great in the United States, where for many years DDT was used indiscriminately over large areas.

CONTAMINATED ENVIRONMENT

As far as is known these quantities of DDT are not toxic to man. Nevertheless the presence of DDT in man and animals, even at levels that cannot be proved to be poisonous, is alarming evidence of man's contamination of his environment.

DDT and the other organochlorine pesticides, which include dieldrin, aldrin and lindane, are highly persistent in nature because they resist chemical degradation by the usual biological processes. DDT and its residues last in the soil for months or even years. They are spread by rivers and winds and creep up extended food chains because of their tendency to accumulate in the fat of animal tissues. Small quantities are absorbed by the plankton that inhabit the surface of the oceans. It accumulates in the fish that eat the plankton and in the birds that feed on the fish.

DDT and its derivatives are now one of the most widely distributed synthetic chemicals on earth. The kind of evidence that ecologists find particularly disturbing is the detection of organochlorine residues in birds and fish of the Antarctic, thousands of miles away from main sites of application.

As a general index of contamination round Britain the Monks Wood experimental station monitors the organochlorine residues in the eggs of seabirds. Typically these average a few parts a million, which is not a lethal concentration. But evidence is coming to light that sub-lethal concentrations may exert a pernicious long-term effect, for instance by reducing the reproductive ability of certain species.

In Sweden particular concern was caused by the discovery that DDT residues in nature were greater in the northern part of the country, where population is sparser and less DDT is used, than in the south. Dr. Norman Moore, a member of the Advisory Committee on Pesticides, believes this was one of the factors behind the Swedish ban, though the extent of DDT contamination was similar to that in Britain.

DAMAGE TO ANIMAL LIFE

The case against the organochlorines rests in part on the natural dislike among biologists of unnecessary pollution of the environment and in part on the damage, some of it half proved, some merely suspected, that the pesticides may do to numerous forms of animal life. The scientific case for outlawing The organochlorine pesticides are used in fore. The evidence before the advisory committee will doubtless point towards tighter restrictions or a trial ban on DDT and possibly the other organochlorines.

Whether the committee will take this action depends on the economic cost of a ban. The organochlorine pesticides are used in Britain not because they are essential—less persistent pesticides have already been developed for most uses—but because they are still cheaper than the alternatives. Dr. Moore has calculated that a total ban on aldrin, dieldrin, Heptachlor and DDT would add about £1m. to farmers' yearly pesticide bill.

Britain's general policy towards the organochlorines has been one of phased withdrawal. This gradual approach is reasonable on the argument that DDT residues have been at their present levels in animal and human tissue for several years without any catastrophic effect.

But so little is known about the toxicology of the organochlorines that their long-term effects may be more damaging than is realized. Dr. Moore believes that all countries that can afford to ban organochlorines without serious harm to health or agriculture should certainly do so.

DUTCH COUNT COST OF RHINE POISON FIASCO

(By Peter Deeley)

FRANKFURT, June 28.—The Rhine, the open sewer of Europe, flows poisonously on today.

Holland will stay on emergency water supplies until well after the weekend, said the Dutch Secretary for Foreign Affairs and Public Health, Dr. Roelof Kruisinga.

He is unwilling to allow the water purification plants which supply Rotterdam, The Hague and Amsterdam to draw water from the Rhine again until the level of insecticide which has poisoned the river has dropped to under one-tenth of the dose lethal for fish. The latest tests put the level at one-fifth.

The Dutch are busy adding up the cost to their disrupted inland shipping fleet, industries without water supplies and depletion of the fresh-water fishing stock (alone estimated at £300,000). Even the tourist industry has been hit by cancellations from abroad. Now Holland intends to ask Bonn for compensation.

Holland has suddenly woken up to the fact that it could be paralysed by a slow-dissolving poison further up the Rhine. Emergency reservoirs hold only four weeks' supplies. The Government has now promised a new early-warning system to spot contamination of the Rhine and bigger reservoirs.

It was about two o'clock in the afternoon of Wednesday 18 June that the trouble was first discovered. Shoals of dead fish were spotted floating on the surface of the Rhine at Bingen-loch, about 20 miles from the Hoechst chemical factory at Geisenheim near Frankfurt. Twenty-four hours later the district Ministry of Agriculture got the warning and alerted the water board in Dusseldorf. But that warning did not filter through to the Dutch authorities for another five days.

Holland knew its fate then only because of the watchfulness of the Nijmegen police. They saw a tidal wave of dead fish floating down river ahead of the contaminated water. Meanwhile every fish in the Rhine from Bingen-loch downward—an estimated 25 million—has died.

Nijmegen warned The Hague. The drinking-water purification plants there and in Rotterdam and Amsterdam switched to emergency reservoirs. The Dutch State Institute for Public Health asked the German authorities what was causing the pollution. The Germans said they did not know.

The lack of prior communication spotlights a serious flaw in the so-called "early-warning system" which the river authorities along the Rhine have set up.

NERVE GAS RUMORS

This time, either, as some people suspect, the Germans simply forgot or they underestimated the seriousness of the problem.

At 4 o'clock on Tuesday morning the State Institute for Public Health at Bilthoven in Holland sent out its floating laboratory. Samples were taken back to the institute's toxicology division. Sinister rumours, since discounted, were floating the length of the Rhine that the poison was a basic component of nerve gas.

By Tuesday evening the analysts had discovered an insecticide, Endosulfan, which is lethal for cold-blooded animals such as fish.

It took the Germans several days to reach the same provisional diagnosis. The Germans say the Dutch were just lucky, the Dutch wonder if their German neighbours, with all the resources of the chemical industry on tap, might have been deliberately dragging their feet.

The German chemical firm of Hoechst is the only manufacturer of Endosulfan in Europe. It is widely used in crop-spraying against over 400 types of insects and is classified as an organo-chlorine compound of persistent nature.

How did it get into the water? Hoechst is convinced that the Endosulfan did not get in from its Giesenheim plant on the River Main, a Rhine tributary which is clear. Tests have shown that fish there have been unharmed and that the pollution began several miles down-river.

German police checked 23 ships which passed Bingen-loch on Wednesday afternoon and by today had eliminated all but two. Hoechst checked the contractors' barges which carry its cargoes of Endosulfan down the Rhine to Rotterdam for export, three barges loaded with 11-gallon lead-welded tin canisters, marked 'Poison,' passed down-river during the crucial days. The barges and the crews and receiving agents have been questioned. They have told Hoechst that all the journeys passed without incident and that every canister was accounted for at the unloading point.

The firm is unwilling to say that the insecticide alone caused the pollution, "With the Rhine in such a contaminated state it is possible that Endosulfan dealt a lethal blow to fish which were already half poisoned," it said.

THE 88TH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF JUDGE EDWARD A. BARNEY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, Judge Edward A. Barney, one of the most beloved and colorful sons of New Hampshire, celebrated his 88th birthday anniversary yesterday.

Judge Barney is a resident and native of Canaan, N.H., where his father founded the Canaan Reporter in 1867. At his father's death Judge Barney continued as publisher of the paper until his retirement. He has continued, as has Mrs. Barney, as a writer and contributor to the Reporter.

For 37 years he was justice of the Canaan Municipal Court, which embraces neighboring towns. During my 9 years as county attorney, I appeared in his court frequently and have been honored by his friendship for many years.

As a young man, he came to Washington and served for a period of years as secretary to Representative Frank D. Currier, who represented New Hampshire's Second District for 12 years, starting about the turn of the century.

A reminiscent article by Judge Barney appeared in the Union Leader of Manchester, N.H., on his 88th birthday, July 22. Obviously, the judge has not lost his skill as a writer, because the article portrays such a vivid picture of Washington and Capitol Hill in the early 1900's that I am sure present Members of Congress will find it fascinating reading. With the knowledge and consent of the present Representative of the Second District, JAMES C. CLEVELAND, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDGE RECALLS CRUCIAL DECISION: NEW HAMPSHIRE CONGRESSMAN REFUSED SENATE SEAT; CURRIER SWALLOWED A BITTER PILL

(By Edward A. Barney)

The wall telephone in Rep. Frank D. Currier's committee room in the national Capitol broke in on the stillness of a dull afternoon. One with a vivid imagination would have said afterward that the bell jangled with a tone of authority that no mere routine call could assume.

Be that as it may, the ring proved the precurser of an ordeal that would demand the most crucial, off-the-cuff decision of the Canaan Congressman's political life.

The date was Jan. 7, 1907. The little city on the Potomac was a sprawling, yet close-knit community vastly different in its quality of neighborliness than the overcrowded metropolis of today.

SAFE STREETS

It was a leisurely area of unlimited elbow room in which everybody and his wife knew everybody else—a proper town whose streets, even the waterfront, one could traverse at midnight, as this writer so often has done, without fear of molestation or annoyance.

The streets were as tidy at it was possible for any city thoroughfare to be, but Washington's buildings presented a study in contrast with the swanky new Willard and Raleigh Hotels looking down their noses at musty Pennsylvania Avenue neighbors that had seemed equally elegant as places of public accommodation in the days of James K. Polk. Even on fashionable Connecticut Avenue an imposing residential pile would as likely as not actually abut a squalid cabin.

Theodore Roosevelt was the White House tenant in 1907 and the notable nonentity who served as his vice president was Charles W. Fairbanks of Indiana. Fairbanks' duties were not so onerous as to deny him an abundance of time for hobnobbing in his office at the Senate end of the Capitol and he was as genial and companionable a gentleman as any nextdoor neighbor in Enfield or Canaan. No caller was allowed to nurture an inferiority complex in his presence.

Rev. Edward Everett Hale, most illustrious of all Senate chaplains and the creator of Philip Nolan, The Man Without a Country, was equally approachable. Conversations with lovable Doctor Hale were priceless privileges.

CLEVELAND LIVING

Grover Cleveland was the nation's only living ex-President; he divided his time between Princeton and Tamworth and he made no secret of his love for New Hampshire. A tinge of Abraham Lincoln still lingered about the Capital. There were Washingtonians barely turned 50 able to recall the tall, gangling figure who perambulated the District's noisome streets much like any mere denizen.

An aging group of Lincoln's contemporaries and at least one associate—Uncle Shelby M. Cullom, senator from Illinois—were in service yet on Capitol Hill. A mile to the northwest, a buoyant young lady was making elaborate preparations for her White House wedding with Nick Longworth, Ohio's bachelor congressman. It was the boast of Rep. Thomas W. Hardwick of Georgia, that he had won his seat in the House by receiving every one of the 1,700 lily-white votes cast in the November election.

STAFF OF THREE

Currier as a committee chairman commanded an office staff of three. His second assistant was Fred Batchellor of Littleton, a Dartmouth sophomore who was taking time out from his college course to pursue a year of special study in Washington.

And there was Sam Butler, an 18-year-old youth of chocolate hue who had served from time undated as guardian of the committee portals and courier par excellence. No crook or cranny of that Capitol building nor even the city itself was too remote to thwart Sam in his quest for information or the discharge of other appointed rounds.

Sam received an annual salary well in excess of many a white adult's and during his long period of service he never drew a word of censure or criticism.

But regardless of such recognition of his intelligence and efficiency, Washington drawing rooms and dinner tables were off limits for Sam. His money would buy him an aerie-like perch in a theatre commanding an eagle's-eye view of the stage, but he couldn't tuck a napkin under his chin in even a second-class Capital eatery.

Teddy Roosevelt had evoked bleats of protest from higher social echelons by entertaining Booker T. Washington as a dinner guest in the White House and Lew Dockstader, the nation's premier minstrel man burlesqued the incident in his show until a brusque directive from headquarters commanded him to cease and desist.

"WE HAVE THE VOTES"

The chairman's aide, alone in the office, took the phone call. The voice came through loud and surprisingly clear for a day when long-distance communication could be the antithesis of unalloyed delight.

"This is ——— at the State House in Concord. Is Frank there?"

Currier was on the floor of the House and the caller was so apprised.

"All right; I'll get him there. We want to place Frank in nomination at the caucus tonight. And don't let him say no. We have the votes to put him over. Goodbye."

The call came as something of a thunderbolt. The man at Concord was a commanding public figure whose wishes and will carried a lot of weight. He was one of an emerging progressive element that was already making its power and influence felt in state politics.

Only the previous summer had the liberals' standard-bearer, glamorous young Winston Churchill, America's most successful novelist and certainly no demagogue, thrown a scare into the regular organization by coming within a cat's whisker of bearing off the gubernatorial nomination.

The caucus referred to by the Concord communicant was the one at which the Republican candidate for the upcoming United States Senate term would be named. By way of making the situation clear a few words of explanation are pertinent.

LEGISLATURE MADE CHOICE

The time was long before the Constitution granted the right of election of senators by the people. The choice still was one for the members of state legislatures to make, and as far back as the birth of the century there had been smoldering dissatisfaction with such an archaic mode of selection. In New Hampshire this year, Sen. Henry E. Burnham of Manchester was announced as a candidate to succeed himself and he had up to now been faced with only token opposition.

There was no kindlier, better-loved gentleman in his state's public life than Judge Burnham. But even in a period when thrift and fiscal integrity in national affairs were not the profane words they were later to come to be, his extreme conservatism had lost him the favor of a dissident bloc of young Republicans.

In their view the senator was a hopeless anachronism—a disciple of an outmoded philosophy, blind to the needs and the ability to supple an affluent nation of eighty millions.

Even in the councils of the state delegation, his fellow members found themselves occasionally irked by his mood of excessive caution. But the antipathy was purely political. Judge Burnham had not an enemy in the world.

CURRIER DOMINANT

Frank Currier's razor-sharp mind and parliamentary talents had made him a dominant figure in the arena of New Hampshire politics. At the age of 33, as a freshman, he had been elected to the presidency of the State Senate, and later while speaker of the House he had fulfilled his pledge of legislative adjournment by Town Meeting Day.

During his 12 years in Congress, Currier never failed of unanimous nomination by his party. He conducted his campaigns from his office desk, or, more accurately, a plain, long table with an inkstained felt top that with a few chairs comprised the furnishings of his Canaan office.

Notwithstanding his love for politics he was no ruthless climber. He had deferred his congressional debut out of a decent consideration for the deserts of other men. But on this fateful afternoon an organized draft movement was to force him to decide which to forfeit: His loyal attachment to Senator Burnham or his own political advancement. His ascent would project him into the contest with better than even chances of winning; and the politician indifferent to acquiring a seat in the U.S. Senate was then even as today an all but non-existent figure. An abortive attempt to wrest the prize from the incumbent would have no significant effect upon his future for he still had in reserve a full elective House term that would not begin for another two months.

TELEPHONE BARRAGE

And now the telephones in both committee and cloakrooms were beginning what was to be a barrage of urging and exhortation from determined party cohorts in the home state.

The calls were not alone from starry-eyed visionaries; they came, too, from stalwarts whose counsel had on past occasions been sought and gratefully considered, and the mode of approach ranged all the way from friendly persuasion to insistent demand.

Wonderful as it would be to move up to the prestigious job of senatorial aide, there was at least one involved person who found himself hoping that the great decision would be negative.

Such an eleventh-hour onslaught upon the aspirations of a respected colleague who had up to now conducted a comparatively unchallenged campaign seemed hardly cricket. It would require a thick skin to face without embarrassment the good friends on the Burnham staff in the event of their ouster.

Maybe similar thoughts were having their effect upon the beleaguered congressman. Currier did not go to the length of burning his draft card, even in a figurative sense, but throughout the siege his response remained a tactful though resolute no, and in the end his decision prevailed.

REFUSES NOMINATION

After adjournment, Currier, his face plainly bearing the mark of inner turmoil, returned to the committee room where he was helped into his overcoat by the faithful Sam. Then he seated himself at his desk.

Instead of talking over the House events of the afternoon as was his habit, he was silent for a full 20 minutes. At last he arose, and with hand on the doorknob he spoke for the first time.

". . . I wouldn't give a tinker's dam to be a United States senator. Goodnight."

It was a brave disclaimer but it fooled not even the stripling to whom it was addressed.

Even without benefit of nomination in that night's caucus, Currier received a handsome complimentary vote well above that of Senator Burnham's active opponent.

THE MOON, THE FUTURE, AND JOHN DAVID HOLT

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, late on July 20, I watched the landing on the moon and watched the first man ever to reach another celestial body step out of a lunar module onto the strange soil and a strange, but still very familiar, planet. With me at the time were my wife, our youngest daughter, our latest grandchild, John David Holt, who has a total of 3 weeks behind him, and his mother, our youngest daughter, Peggy Holt.

My wife and I viewed this unique spectacle through probably the same eyes of other 60-year-old people who had become convinced long, long ago that Americans dedicated to a specific problem and dedicated to the work and the task involved in that problem can accomplish literally anything.

Our youngest daughter viewed the spectacle through the eyes of a younger generation filled with complete wonderment and awe, but still I feel that in her heart she knows that what we know is right, that an unshackled American can accomplish anything; knows no bounds.

But, Mr. President, it is what my 3-week-old grandson, John David Holt, will think in his coming years that is going to prove what all of this really means to mankind. We have heard accolades from all parts of the world, and they were richly deserved; we have heard statements to the effect that this event completely changes the entire outlook of man and that from here on in we must be thinking along different lines on different planes. I tend to doubt this to some extent, but there is no question that one important and vital thing has happened as a result: People across the length and breadth of this great America have once again been filled with a great sense of patriotic pride, a great sense of participation and a realization that only in an atmosphere of freedom can human beings perform at their maximum efficiency and effectiveness. It is true that the Russians have made flamboyant efforts in the space field with some success. There have been some great achievements in this field; but when the chips were down, we were the ones who pulled in with the experience and the results.

Ever since that dreadful day when my friend President John F. Kennedy was killed and the emotional accolades began to pile up, I kept saying to myself that someday, something that this young man did would stand out as a lasting monument to his memory. I felt that it would not be the renaming of airports; it would not be the naming of streets; it would not be the changing of historical and geographical names; it would not even be the eternal flame that burns at his grave. What it will be came clearly to me on July 20 as I watched the moon spectacle with my youngest daughter and my youngest grandson, even though I must admit that my youngest grandson did not know what was going on.

The point is, I believe, that he will come to realize in the future that the moon landing was a target established by a young President when he addressed a joint session of Congress in 1962. At that time, John Kennedy proclaimed as a mission for America the placing of a man on the moon by 1970. He set up a target which was probably the most difficult of any ever established by any man in the history of the world, and that target was hit on July 20.

So, to the everlasting memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy will go the belief in American ability and the inspiration which his decision gave to those chosen to be astronauts, those chosen to serve NASA as scientists, and those chosen from many walks of life to put this whole moon venture into being. It represented a reawakening of the vital idea that man, operating freely with all of his ingenuity and dignity and unhampered by a meddling Federal Government, can really achieve the seemingly impossible.

That young grandson of mine, John David Holt, will come to realize this in a more profound way than was the case with my generation. For this venture, successful as it is, should convince all the skeptics in this country that there is nothing that free man cannot achieve.

This monument, hewn out of the substance of the basic principles found in the Declaration of Independence and carved from the concepts of man's dignity, wisdom, knowledge, and judgment, will be something more enduring to the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy than the Presidency or all of the other honors that man has tried to bestow upon him. This conquest of the moon was an idea of his, a product we might say, of the inborn knowledge that he possessed of the goodness of America and the greatness of America. It was founded in his faith in the ability of Americans to achieve what they set out to do.

I would suggest, in closing, that one approach we might make to further this great addition which he made possible would be a serious effort to bring together the great and small countries of the world through an interchange of scientific knowledge, academic knowledge, and eventually political knowledge. This is another goal, an even higher goal than reaching the moon, because with it comes a real chance for world peace.

THE FUTURE OF "BROWN AMERICANS"

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I think it is now widely recognized that America awakened many years too late to the problems facing its Negro citizens—problems of which we all were vaguely aware decades ago but on which the Government and society as a whole failed to take prompt action at a time when the problems were more manageable. As a result, our land is plagued today with racial bitterness, violence, and a growing polarization of the races.

Our lesson with the problems of the American Negro should alert us to the urgent importance of recognizing the problems of another group of Americans who are fewer in number but who generally have even more complex and difficult problems—the Mexican-Americans.

This is a group of Americans, more than 5 million in number, who occupy one of the very lowest economic rungs on the ladder of American society. They are called Latins or Chicanos; in the new lexicon that labels many simply as blacks and whites, Mexican-Americans are called the browns.

Mexican-Americans live all across the great Southwest and hold as a common bond a language and culture which is considered foreign by many of their fellow citizens. In Wisconsin, we see them mainly when they come north to pick cucumbers and cherries, hoping to earn enough money through a hard summer's work to exist for another year.

The message which these people are sending us today is that Mexican-Americans are tired of waiting to be granted their full and unqualified rights as American citizens.

These Americans, most of them native born and with deep roots in this country, have been forced to make their way in an alien world. And their children, accustomed to speaking Spanish at home, have been forced to attend schools where only English is spoken.

The Spanish-speaking American's place at the bottom of the economic ladder puts him even below the disadvantaged Negro in the fight to live a decent life. The unemployment rate of Mexican-Americans is at least twice the national average and higher than the rate for Negroes.

This is not a pretty picture in a land made great by diversity, but it is an accurate picture.

Just who are these people who are treated as foreigners by so many in their own land?

For one thing they are not foreigners. Eighty-five percent of all Mexican-Americans are native born and virtually all of them are citizens of the United States. The 1960 census gave a figure of 3,464,999 as the number of persons with Spanish surnames, but updated estimates count more than 5 million Mexican-Americans in this country. The majority of our Spanish-surnamed citizens live in five Western States—Arizona, New Mexico, California, Colorado, and Texas, but there are Mexican-Americans in many other States, including Wisconsin.

Historically, the first Mexicans to become citizens did not acquire their citizenship; the United States acquired them—by forceful annexation. They did not come to the United States; the United States, through a war with Mexico, simply extended its boundaries to include a large territory, about the size of present-day Mexico, in which some 75,000 Spanish-speaking people were then living.

Under the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, the United States formally assured the Spanish speaking that their property rights would be respected. In addition, the treaty guaranteed to them the right to use the Spanish language, to adhere to their own customs and traditions, and to retain their Roman Catholic faith. But in the end these assurances did not provide adequate protection for the Spanish speaking.

The Anglo-Americans who came surging into the vast territory which the United States had acquired from Mexico knew little about the region or its people, but they took over the land. As a result, the Mexican-American lost his footing in his own community to the invading pioneer. He became the governed in his village. His language became the mark of a foreigner.

The Mexican-Americans were pushed into menial jobs as the years passed; their children rarely reaped the benefits of education, and today this tragic cycle of neglect and discrimination is seen in figures like this:

The average Mexican-American child in the Southwest drops out of school by the seventh year, and almost 90 percent of them drop out before entering high school.

Along the Texas-Mexico border, four of five Mexican-American children fall two grades behind their Anglo classmates by the time they reach the fifth grade.

Although Spanish-surnamed students make up more than 14 percent of the public school population of California, less than one-half of 1 percent of the college students enrolled in the seven campuses of the University of California are of this group.

These figures of educational deprivation at all levels spell lives of abject poverty in most cases. Job opportunities, income levels, economic advancement, in fact, all aspects of personal and family well-being are closely linked to educational achievement and the ability to communicate effectively with one another. Even the Negro child, with all the marks of discrimination that affect his upbringing, completes 9 years of school on the average. That is almost 2 more years of schooling than the average Mexican-American child finishes.

In the Southwest, according to a special report by the University of Wisconsin based on the last census, Mexican-Americans average 7.1 years of schooling against 12.1 years for Anglo-Americans. In Texas, the Mexican-American child finishes 4.8 years on the average. Economists say a high school diploma is worth at least $60,000 over a lifetime. But what if you do not even have a grade school diploma? The answer is, you pick fruit or cucumbers or sugar beets, and you maintain throughout your lifetime the low economic status of your father and your grandfather, the status of a poor, uneducated itinerate fruitpicker in a highly educated and affluent society.

What makes educational attainment so difficult for Mexican-Americans? The major problem seems to be the Spanish language and the prejudice and discrimination which it seems to provoke.

The Spanish-speaking child begins with an educational handicap the very first day he goes to class. English is the language of the classroom, but Spanish is the language of his home. Little children are trapped in a clash of cultures, discriminated against by teachers if they do not speak English, and sometimes by their peers if they do.

The whole school curriculum is often designed to make the Mexican-American child an Anglo-American. He does not want to become an Anglo, or he does not know how. The children around him, so friendly with one another and so much at ease, look at him with suspicion. There is little from which he can draw comfort.

Diversity should be a strength not a weakness, and bilingualism should not be considered a handicap, but a potential national asset, if we would only develop it as such. What an absurdity it is that our national educational policy has directed the expenditure of $1 billion a year to teach foreign languages—in our high schools, colleges, universities and government agencies—while children who already have this ability find it a handicap as they struggle to learn English.

Salvador Ramirez, director of the El Paso, Tex., Boys' Club, said in a speech recently:

> Getting a job—any job—is harder than it used to be for those without preparation for the world of work. For a Mexican-American male, 18 years old, a school drop-out living in the slums of a large city, the chances of obtaining employment are less, even less than for an Anglo, 18-year-old, high school drop-out who lives a few blocks away. Because in addition to the aforementioned characteristics, the Mexican-American youth happens to possess characteristics which are viewed by many employers as undesirable. Because his eyes are brown, not blue; because his skin is brown, not white, he is often thought to be "inferior, stupid, lazy, a poor employment risk."

Jobs, as Mr. Ramirez' comments indicate, are another critical problem of Mexican Americans. Unemployment is twice as high for Spanish-speaking citizens than the national average—around 8 percent—and underemployment is even worse. Although the number of Mexican-Americans living in urban areas has increased greatly, there has been little accompanying increase in the level of their occupational skills.

In fact, of the total number of Mexican-American males employed in urban areas in the Southwestern States, only 5 percent are in professional occupations. Three-fourths of the employed Mexican Americans are categorized as manual workers. State Senator Joe Bernal, of Texas, put those jobs in perspective recently in a speech before the National Association for Community Development in Washington. He said:

> As I've said all along—everyone loves us. How could they hate us? We've been doing the dirty work in his country for a long, long time. We built the railroads, constructed the oil rigs, hewed the cactus and the cedar, and raised the children of the monied families of our area. As a matter of fact, they love us to death.

There are some signs of progress in bettering the lives of Mexican-Americans.

The Bilingual Education Act was signed into law last year as an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; $7.5 million was appropriated in fiscal 1969, a sum only one-fourth as large as that authorized, but at least it is a beginning. We can thank Senator YARBOROUGH, of Texas, who led the fight for bilingual education legislation, and has long worked for the betterment of Mexican-Americans.

Under the new legislation the U.S. Office of Education has approved 65 programs thus far involving 140,000 children, but there are 10 times that number needing help. The Bilingual Education Act will provide funds to school districts for special help to Spanish-speaking children. And the act gives moral and legislative recognition to the assets of a people whose mother tongue is not English. It also will provide a Spanish-speaking child the opportunity to learn educational concepts in all phases of the curriculum in his mother tongue while he is learning English.

Another progressive step is being taken by the Teacher Corps and the Mexican-American unit in the U.S. Office of Education, which itself is only 2 years old. Intensive Spanish language courses will be given this summer in Denver and Los Angeles to social workers, police officers, Teacher Corps interns, and regular teachers.

Other Teacher Corps projects are training Mexican-American youths at six universities in California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas. Many of these youths are returning to teach in schools primarily attended by Mexican-Americans.

In San Antonio and Houston, Tex., the concentrated employment program, funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity, is making an impact in the Mexican-American community. CEP provides such services as outreach, recruitment, testing, skill and work training, job development and job placement to unemployed Mexican-Americans.

By and large, though, the steps taken to alleviate the immense problems of Mexican-Americans have been inadequate and time may be running out. There are accounts in the newspapers that indicate young Mexican-Americans are not as willing as their parents to accept poverty and discrimination. The crowded urban barrios are usually adjacent to the Negro ghettos, and the rising ferment among Mexican-Americans has been stimulated in part by the gains of the Negro civil rights movement. More militant than their parents, young Mexican-Americans cry "brown power" at demonstrations and threaten that if negotiations will not accomplish anything, violence will appeal to some.

XUM

A Roman Catholic priest in Phoenix, the Rev. Miguel Barragan, field representative of the Southwest Conference of La Raza—People—has warned:

> If there are no immediate changes in the Southwest, no visible improvement in the political and economic status of the Mexican-American, then I definitely foresee that our youths will resort to violence to demand the dignity and respect they deserve as human beings and as American citizens.

We must not allow a breakdown in communications with young Mexican-Americans. That route has been traveled with young Negroes and has engulfed the country in a crisis between races, a polarization that the Kerner Commission said is dividing the Nation into two societies, separate and unequal.

The diversion of this Nation's migrant workers from the mainstream of society has already occurred, and it certainly is separate and unequal. Many of the 1 million migrants are Mexican-Americans and their existence amounts to a day-to-day fight for survival. Even that existence is now being threatened.

Mechanization is taking over the farms, and even though thousands of migrant families still flock to the fields the demand for their labor is declining.

In Wisconsin, one of the largest food processors completely shifted to machines on its 2,000 acres of pickle fields last year. Of the 5,100 picking jobs migrants held last year in Wisconsin, at least 1,000 have disappeared through mechanization.

The Milwaukee Journal recently published an excellent series of articles on the Mexican-Americans, which made clear that the Wisconsinites who share this culture are undergoing the same ferment we see all across the country.

The title of the Milwaukee Journal series was, "Viva la Raza—Long Live the People." The author, Jo Sandin, reported:

> Led by a whole generation of young men—articulate, eloquent in English as well as Spanish—the former migrants and immigrants from Mexico and Puerto Rico are beginning to realize that poor housing, dead end jobs, and political powerlessness are not inevitable.

Those in Wisconsin who are taking the leadership in seeking to help these disadvantaged people are learning an important lesson: Mexican-Americans want to make their own decisions and manage their own affairs. The spirit of paternalism and charity with which well-meaning people approached disadvantaged groups in the past is no longer acceptable.

Father John Maurice, a Catholic priest who directs a Spanish center on Milwaukee's south side, is limiting his activities to providing advice and support.

Mexican-Americans in Wisconsin and elsewhere—just like black Americans—also are no longer willing merely to be absorbed into traditional white American culture. While they want to obtain the educational, social and economic advantages available to white Americans, they want at the same time to preserve their authentic Spanish culture.

The Reverend Orlando Costas, 28, pastor of Milwaukee's Evangelical Baptist Church, protests the tendency of public schools "to crucify Latin culture," a mistake which Americans often have made in their missionary zeal to make others "just like us."

The Reverend Mr. Costas says:

> We need to develop the kind of educational system that takes into consideration the cultural background of the student, operates in a bilingual situation, and seeks to involve the parents.
>
> This is a country which is linked geographically, politically and historically to our fatherland. Immigrants from Latin America are not cut off from their culture in the way that those from Europe were. As long as Mexico remains just south of the border and Puerto Rico just three hours away by air, there are going to be ties.

The Protestant, Catholic, and Episcopal churches of Wisconsin have developed a program, United Migrant Opportunity Services, Inc., to help the Mexican-Americans and other migrant workers in Wisconsin who are facing a bewildering array of problems as a result of mechanization of farming. The UMOS program, funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity, has helped some 700 families already with job training, job placement, adult education, Headstart and day-care programs. It is one example of the kind of program which is so desperately needed by our Mexican-American citizens.

The problems of Mexican-Americans are severe. There is no denying that fact. But there are Mexican-Americans who have made their way. Perhaps we should listen to them.

Armando Rodriguez, chief of the Mexican-American affairs unit of the U.S. Office of Education, says:

> I suggest that the time has come to develop strategies in all communities for facing forcefully the imperative need for turning our attention away from the minority problem and toward the majority problem. This cannot be achieved by just being well informed on culture and language and racial and ethnic differences and how they effect the performance of youngsters in school. Being informed is, however, a first and vital step.

There are other steps that should be considered, too:

Substantially increasing funds of the Bilingual Education Act to meet the language needs of all Spanish-speaking youngsters, not just 10 percent of them.

Developing through local, State, and Federal Government cooperation areas along the Texas-Mexico border that today forces Mexican Americans into the migrant stream because of a lack of jobs.

Helping migrants who are so inclined to relocate in States that have better job and educational opportunities.

Recognizing that cultural and language integration must be as acceptable as racial integration.

There is no question that a number of Mexican Americans are being reached by the poverty program; a few have emerged as successful entrepreneurs, and a number have been trained in the Job Corps.

But for the most part Mexican Americans still live in a separate world, denied the full advantages and opportunities of American citizenship. Our experiences with the Negro show this is disastrous in a modern society.

We cannot have two societies—one black, one white. We certainly cannot have three societies—one black, one brown, one white. To break these barriers, to heal these divisions, to lead these longstanding Americans into the full rights and responsibilities of citizenship, is one of the urgent challenges facing this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the Milwaukee Journal's excellent series of articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIVA LA RAZA—LONG LIVE THE PEOPLE: SPANISH SPEAKING WANT TO CONTROL OWN DESTINY

(By Jo Sandin)

"El patron esta muerto! Viva la raza!"

In English that means: The boss is dead. Long live the people!

Those two sentences summarize what is most important in the events of the last nine months for Milwaukee's Spanish speaking community.

What they mean is simply this: Latin Milwaukeeans no longer are content to let someone else speak for them or run their lives.

This is not to imply that, before last August, there were no vocal, active Latin American leaders. Or that Latin Americans suddenly have decided to expel all non-Latins—Anglos (English speaking whites) and blacks alike—from their friendships, their communities and their organizations.

VIEWS CHANGED

It is just that, as Juan Alvarez, 23, of 830 W. Maple st., said: "The eyes of the people have been opened."

Led by a whole generation of young men—articulate, eloquent in English as well as Spanish—the former migrants and immigrants from Mexico and Puerto Rico are beginning to realize that poor housing, dead end jobs and political powerlessness are not inevitable.

Among other things, they are taking exception to the fact that many organizations working in the Latin community are run by Anglos.

According to the Rev. Orlando Costas, 28, pastor of the Evangelical Baptist church, 1231 S. 7th st., "This doesn't mean we're not interested in working with Anglos. This means that there is a sense of dissatisfaction with the idea that Latins cannot be involved in decision making."

ORGANIZED UNION

Jesus Salas, 25, said: "There are a lot of people who really don't feel we can do things for ourselves, who feel we Latins are children."

Salas, who organized Wisconsin migrant workers into a union, Obreros Unidos, and who led a migrant march on Madison to demand better pay and working conditions, now is program co-ordinator for a federal antipoverty program which seeks to move migrants out of the harvest cycle and into better jobs and houses.

The fact that he occupies that position in a drastically reorganized United Migrant Opportunity Services (UMOS) is a dramatic example of what the Latin community can accomplish when it is organized.

Salas, who works out of the program's Milwaukee office at 809 W. Greenfield av., sees himself not as the head of an agency, but as the implementer of programs planned in large part by former migrants throughout the state.

Last July things were different. The agency not only had a head, but a chain of command which included five top administrators. When agency funds were cut by the federal government, positions eliminated were those of counselors who dealt directly with the relocated migrants.

From the viewpoint of the administrators, except for a shortage of funds, the program was going well.

Many of the relocated migrants felt differently.

To them it seemed that UMOS was doing too much administering and not enough problem solving. By November, that discontent erupted onto the floor of a board of directors meeting at which the former migrants voiced their complaints for several hours.

RESIGNATIONS ACCEPTED

By January, the five top administrators felt sufficiently threatened by the furor to say they would resign if they were not given contracts to insure their jobs until the end of the program year.

To their surprise, the board's executive committee refused to grant the contracts.

In February, at a five hour board meeting attended by more than 90 relocated migrants and other Latin Americans, the executive committee meeting was declared invalid on a technicality, but the resignations were accepted.

In the reorganized UMOS, the staff members are mostly Latins advised by other Latins, the latter being the relocated migrants for whom the program was established and who now have a place in its operation, not as clients receiving social service, but as participants planning their own progress.

The change was not easily effected.

Armando Orellana, 28, who was a UMOS counselor before joining the staff of the concentrated employment program, explained: "In our community people are not familiar with parliamentary forms."

Esquiel Guzman, 26, who works with the Spanish Credit union, 524 W. National av., said: "This is a new experience to them. They're not used to participating in this way. Many people are too used to belonging to a club that means just going to weekly dances."

Salas said: "It takes so long. It's frustrating to realize how long it took to change UMOS and discouraging for people to see that all we have won is a lot of hard work."

Yet all three are convinced that the process, however tedious, is absolutely necessary.

The battle cry of the Spanish speaking revolution here may be the passionate "Viva la raza," but the tactics are strictly pragmatic "self-help through community organization."

There is healthy skepticism among these young men about how much government can or will do to help their people.

By abandoning the agency's casework approach to helping the migrants, Salas hopes to build self-help groups that would continue to solve problems if UMOS were to be abolished.

Even if the agency survives, Salas said, he does not plan to remain in his present position for more than a year or two.

"Then it's time to let somebody else have a chance, he said. "This is an unnatural way to work, perhaps, since usually people try to maintain their own positions, but it is the way to continue to build leadership."

"Anglo" Advice Is Enough for Latins

(By Jo Sandin)

Friends of the Spanish speaking community must learn how to offer advice without taking over if they are to be helpful.

That's the opinion of Jesus Salas, 25, the former Wisconsin migrant leader who is now program co-ordinator of United Migrant Opportunity Services, a federally financed agency to relocate migrants.

Salas, who has set a time limit on his own position, said that other individuals, especially those in the church, also will have to relinquish their dominant roles if the community is to build a supply of experienced leaders.

Salas said: "The church has been the source of the most sincere effort from the largest organized group to assist poor people. But it also has been too long in a position of 'patron.' "

SOME HAVE LEARNED

Some clergymen and nuns have learned how to overcome their impulse to run everything. These people remain our friends and true sources of help. But there are still churchmen who approach our people in the old role of shepherd of the flock. We don't need that.

The Rev. Orlando Costas, 28, pastor of Evangelical Baptist church, 1231 S. 7th st., is a clergyman who agrees with Salas.

Costas said: "If we clergymen are going to be effective, we are going to have to stop being prima donnas and take only advisory roles."

Father John Maurice, director of the Spanish center, 524 W. National av., increasingly has limited his activities to those of providing advice and support.

At the time when the community considered joining the NAACP youth council to protest alleged discriminatory hiring by the Allen-Bradley Co. last August, he stayed away from the decisive meeting, saying that he had been for too long their "gringo priest."

At that meeting, 75 persons loosely organized into a group called the Latin-American community, voted to form a temporary coalition with the youth council for the protest.

DEMANDS MADE

They demanded that Allen-Bradley hire enough Spanish speaking Americans to make up 5% of the work force, start a training program for minority group members and halt expansion which, they said, was destroying the Latin neighborhood.

At the time 14 Latins were employed by Allen-Bradley. Now there are about 55.

From the young men who participated in the Allen-Bradley protest, the Latin American Union for Civil Rights was born. The 98 member union is trying to organize the community so as to solve its own problems and to insure that Latin-Americans will have a say in policies and projects that affect them.

The union's president, Miguel Rodriguez, 29, said: "To show people we are not a racist group, we welcome Anglo and black members. We are seeking the free exchange of ideas. But they only have a voice in our meetings. When the decisions are made, it is the Spanish members who have a vote. It is they who speak then."

Determined to see that Latins have a say in programs which affect them, the union has been no more inclined to accept black patronage than Anglo patronage.

SPURNS TOKENISM

Costas said: "We have learned a lot from the black community. To a great extent, it is a matter of black and brown together. But we are going to accept tokenism from those who have complained of tokenism from whites. The concentrated employment program (CEP) is a perfect example."

CEP is a federally financed effort to recruit, test, train, counsel and place in jobs the hard core unemployed.

Spanish speaking CEP workers have complained that decisions affecting the course of the program are always made in terms of north side community needs. On Apr. 17 they walked out of a board meeting in protest of such policies.

"We are not against anyone," Rodriguez said. "But we are tired of taking leftovers and we are not going to continue to take handouts. We want to make the decisions."

To develop strong community groups from which Spanish speaking leaders can emerge, the civil rights union employs a full time community organizer, Ernesto Chacon, who recently completed a training program in California and Texas.

His first year's salary and expenses of $9,000 were scraped together from various church groups and individuals by an interim board for Spanish community organization, which has since voted itself out of existence, deferring to the union.

The union is in the process of getting a three year grant of $77,000 from the Inter-Religious Foundation for Community Organization, New York city, which the Rev. Lucius Walker, formerly of Northcott Neighborhood House, heads.

Rodriguez said the union hoped to become an umbrella organization over a number of Latin groups.

MANY INVOLVEMENTS

Therefore, it has involved itself in everything from promotion of parent involvement in a bilingual education school program (to be explained in a later article) to the development of a Spanish language newspaper, La Guardia.

The project that has attracted the most attention is the union's effort to win a model cities program for the south side.

Co-operating with a number of other community groups and some social service agencies, the union has held a series of meetings for Latin and Anglo south siders to inform them about the model cities program and to sound out community interest in the program.

Because of the model cities program's many sided approach to multiple problems, "it's natural for us to be interested in model cities and to feel we need such a program on the south side," Rodriguez said.

Members realize the effort may fail.

Rodriguez said: "If model cities were the only thing we were working on, then that would be bad for us. But we have other projects already successful."

Costas said: "Besides, the whole concept of failure has to be part of community organization. We use failure as a way of going forward."

At an informational meeting, he told 70 south siders: "Even if we do not get a model cities program this time, if we get together, they will not be able to ignore the south side in future programs. They will see that we are tired of getting handouts, leftovers and raw deals."

This impatience is currently expressing itself in traditional democratic processes.

Juan Alvarez, 23, a member of the Union for Civil Rights, said: "Up to now, hope is a good word for what everybody in the Spanish community feels. I don't think losing hope is something we will feel until a long way from today."

Salas said: "I think if you say you can bring about a change by going out and disrupting things, I hope you know you have tried all other avenues, because in such cases it's only our own people who get hurt.

"There is still hope for us now. The community is responsive. People want to participate. I'll bet the black community was like this at one time.

"But they've been burned so much that a lot of people have given up on anything that comes from the power structure. That hasn't happened to us yet. I hope it doesn't."

Young Latin Leaders Serve People

(By Jo Sandin)

Juan Alvarez, a 23 year old artist who grew up in Texas and Mexico, is designing a 48 by 8 foot mural on the theme to which he is devoting his life: "La raza."

On the walls of the inner city development project office at 12th and W. Mitchell sts., he will plaint his expression of the phrase which has become a battle cry for the migrant movement across the United States.

He speaks about "la raza" as vividly as he paints.

"To me, it means my people, especially the underprivileged, those who in Mexico are called 'los de abajo' (those on the bottom)," he said. "It is an emotion that I feel. I will keep on doing and working for my people until their problems are solved. I have given all myself to this—la raza."

XUM

TWO VOLUNTEERS

Alvarez earns his livelihood painting. Most of his formal education has been in art. A friend, Esquiel Guzman, 26, who has a bachelor's degree in political science from Texas A&I university, works at the Spanish center's credit union, 524 W. National av.

Both are members of the Latin American Union for Civil Rights, which works to give Latins a say in policies and projects that affect them. Both attend the same community meetings—on a bilingual educational program for four Milwaukee schools, on a proposed model cities program for the south side.

And when working committees are organized, both volunteer.

Neither thinks it strange that a political scientist and an artist have the same commitments and exercise some of the same responsibilities. Neither should.

TRUE TO TRADITION

Alvarez is simply being true to a tradition in which such greats as Diego Rivera and Jose Orozco concerned themselves with improving the lot of the people they immortalized in Mexico's mural art.

And that tradition is just a small part of the culture he and his friend and their fellow Latin Milwaukeeans are trying to preserve and communicate to the community at large.

The Rev. Orlando Costas, pastor of Evangelical Baptist church, said: "There is a great sense of loyalty to friends. A friend is someone to be helped, someone to be treasured, someone to be looked forward to . . . even if he needs your help at 2 o'clock in the morning.

For a Latin, then, moving into a city where people don't even know the name of the family in the next apartment is "a shattering experience," he said.

Costas said: "There is a sense of coldness, of formality in non-Latin society. He feels hurt when he expresses his warmth and the Anglo does not reciprocate."

One Anglo who did not keep his distance, of course, was Robert F. Kennedy. Costas feels that was why the late senator from New York was so popular among Latins.

Another Anglo who is a friend of the Milwaukee Latin community is Father John Maurice, director of the Spanish center.

"Persons, rather than ideas or structures, are what excite enthusiasm," he said. "Milwaukee is very fortunate right now in having quite a few personable, able young men who inspire the response necessary to lead."

But it is not only the young who are interested in "la raza."

Mr. and Mrs. Ponce Renteria, 2179 S. 6th st., have lived in Milwaukee for more than 25 years. Their grocery store provides enough income for them to be considered among those who have "made it" financially.

She is treasurer of both the state and local Mexican-American Political Education committees As its name implies, the group, which has 150 members in Milwaukee, is devoted to educating Latin Americans to their citizenship responsibilities. Members also promote better educational opportunities for Latins.

SENSE OF UNITY

Mrs. Renteria described the community:

"Most newcomers at first move into the near south side around 6th and National, although some come to the near east side. Once they get established and get jobs, they move out wherever they can find better housing—to Bay View, to Greendale, Wauwatosa, Mequon."

But despite the dispersal and the economic success of some, there is a sense of unity, she said.

"Latins have a great love for any other Latin," she said. "It is a matter of saying, 'No matter how little I have, I am always ready to give a helping hand.' "

That helping hand is extended in at least one way that the Anglo community finds incomprehensible.

Mrs. Renteria said: "I remember what people said when the Puerto Ricans started moving in (about 10 or 15 years ago). The neighbors were scandalized. A landlord would rent to one persons and soon there would be six or seven persons living in the house. They didn't understand."

TIGHT FAMILY TIES

To be a Latin in the United States also is to have strong family ties in a society in which the family is said to be falling apart.

"A child is taught that his parents give him the gift of life, and for this they can never be repaid," Mrs. Renteria said.

Therefore, Latins usually have other members of their family living with them. There is no question of putting a mother or a father in a home for the aged.

"We have a saying," Mrs. Renteria said, "that 'even if I have only one tortilla, half of it will go to my viejita.' "

The term means "little old lady," but it is used, she hastened to add, with respect, not with familiarity.

JOBS FOR PARENTS

Similarly, Costas explained: "Being a mother and a father are considered full time jobs. The Spanish parent has a total commitment to his child."

That does not mean that the Latin American family is what American sociologists call child centered. The child is given love, not license.

According to Mrs. Enriqueta Gonzales, 49, of 1125 S. 2nd st., it does mean that "we are very strict with our children."

She explained that in her family, "I am the one to give permission for things until the children are 12. The older children have to ask their father for permission to go some place or do something. They have to tell him where they are going and what time they will be back. And I have to report whether they are back on time."

These, of course, are the traditions. Not all families have maintained their strong ties.

Costas said: "What happens is that our family patterns are threatened in a real sense by the wealth and dominance of the Anglo community."

Even the absolute dominance of the man as head of the Latin family is being modified, Costas said. A group of Spanish speaking couples in his congregation had suggested recently that one of the responsibilities of the housewife ought to be to learn to speak English and to participate in the community.

"We want to be good American citizens," Mrs. Renteria said.

"But we also want to preserve our cultural values," said Costas.

Miguel Rodriguez, president of the Latin American Union for Civil Rights, feels that preserving the warm, human Latin culture in a society in which people complain of alienation, can be a gift from the Latin to his Anglo neighbors.

AVOID ANTAGONISM

"We want to preserve cultural differences without promoting cultural antagonism and prejudice," he said.

He said: "People tell me that because this is an industrialized, highly mechanized society, people come to the point that they just use each other for their own gain and benefit. I don't accept that. That's not any excuse for you to become dehumanized."

Cultural exchange between Latins and Anglos can enrich both, he said.

"Yet there is a danger, for the man from Puerto Rico, for the man from Mexico, who has something in here," he said, pointing to his heart. "There is a danger he will forget all that.

"That's why maybe it is beter for everybody if he does not become 100% assimilated."

Identity for Latin Children Pressed

(By Jo Sandin)

"Our children have no identity!"

That anguished exclamation from the Rev. Orlando Costas expresses the fear that underlies much Latin American criticism of Milwaukee schools—public and private.

Costas, pastor of Evangelical Baptist church, will be leaving that post soon to work full time with Latin youngsters as administrative supervisor of the Spot, a teen age gathering place at 810 S. 6th St., sponsored by Milwaukee Christian center.

"Our children grow up with a tremendous cultural and social ambivalence," he said.

SCHOOL PRESSURES

Costas knows what he's talking about, from experience. The situation was much the same in Bridgeport, Conn., where his parents moved from Puerto Rico when he was 12 years old.

In school he was urged to "pass for Italian." At church he was told over and over: "You cannot be this way."

By 1962, when he went to Inter-American university in Puerto Rico, where he also served as minister of a local church, "they had made me into a good New England pastor," he said.

Costas said: "I am just in the process of becoming myself. Not until I went back to Puerto Rico was I ever allowed to be myself. So I can look at some young people and see what they're going through—it is a conflict of to be or not to be what we are."

In the absence of Latin teachers, the ignorance of Latin culture on the part of Anglo teachers, and the counseling of Spanish speaking students to prepare for technical vocations rather than college, Costas sees an attempt of the educational system "to crucify Latin culture."

GEOGRAPHIC LINKS

He said: "This is a country which is linked geographically, politically and historically to our fatherland. Immigrants from Latin America are not cut off from their culture in the way that those from Europe were. As long as Mexico remains just south of the border and Puerto Rico just three hours away by air, there are going to continue to be ties.

"Yet our kids grow up learning about what the German and Polish and Italian immigrants did, but nothing about the contributions Latin Americans have made."

Lack of cultural awareness on the part of teachers complicates the basic problem facing Spanish speaking students in Milwaukee's schools—the language barrier.

Mrs. Ponce Renteria, of the Mexican-American Political Education committee which has concerned itself with improving the education Spanish speaking children receive, said: "Many children have never spoken a word of English until they go to school."

PUPILS FALL BEHIND

Even though they pick up the language as they go along, they slip steadily behind until many are two to three years below grade level, according to Father John Maurice, director of the Spanish Center.

Some even have a worse problem—they speak English without an accent.

Although their teachers cease to think of them as Spanish speaking, their English vocabularies are still limited enough so that they may miss a key word in an explanation or the crucial phrase in an assignment, Mrs. Renteria said.

"Latins are proud," she explained. "They do not want to have to ask for another explanation in front of everybody."

Even teachers who are not prejudiced need to supplement their good intentions with

XUM

some kind of cultural understanding, she said.

For example, a well meaning teacher may encourage a teen aged girl to participate in extracurricular activity.

"It does no good to tell that to the girl without winning the parents' approval," she said. "Many Latin parents are very strict. The girl may have to be home immediately after school every day. If she is not, her father may even beat her."

Mrs. Enriqueta Gonzales, president of the parent-teacher association at Vieau school, 823 S. 4th st., where 70% of the students are Spanish speaking, explained further.

"There are a lot of teachers who are very sarcastic, who don't respect the child," she said. "Children have their pride, too, and once you kill that pride, you can't get anything from them."

Spanish speaking students, Costas said, are routinely guided toward vocational training rather than toward courses that would prepare them for college.

PUPILS MISJUDGED

Mrs. Gonzales said: "Lots of the counselors don't tell the kids things they need to go to college, the courses they should take. Sometimes I think the teachers judge a child because he doesn't look like someone who would go to college, maybe because his clothes are wrinkled. Who knows? Maybe his family can't afford an iron."

Mrs. Renteria said: "Our children can do it, if they have the incentive."

Until now, it has been up to the family alone to provide that incentive.

As a high dropout rate among Latin students reflects, that is not always enough.

TELLS OF REASONING

Mrs. Renteria explained one of the reasons: "Many people who come here, especially migrants, have no more than a fifth or sixth grade education. So when Juan gets to be a sophomore or a junior in high school, the parents think, 'Juan is very well educated. Now he can stop school and start working full time.' "

That's why parental involvement in the schools is important, she said.

However, Mrs. Gonzales points out that involving Latin American parents has its difficulties.

In the first place, United States schools traditionally contact families through the mother.

"In our culture, the man is boss," she said. "That means he is in charge of the children's education as well."

The father often works at night, when school meetings are being held, said Mrs. Gonzales, and he's reluctant to have his wife leave home.

REQUIRES COURAGE

There is another problem.

"We look at the school with big respect," Mrs. Gonzales said. "Many people don't know English too well. They are scared to speak the wrong word. It happens to me. And to speak in front of teachers, you have to be brave."

Costas said: "We need to develop the kind of educational system that takes into consideration the cultural background of the student, operates in a bilingual situation, and seeks to involve the parents."

Such a system is being developed on an experimental basis for four schools at which there are large numbers of Spanish speaking students—Vieau, Holy Trinity, 621 S. 4th St.; South Division high school, 1321 W. Lapham St., and Lincoln high school, 820 E. Knapp St.

CITY GETS FUNDS

Under a 1967 extension of the elementary and secondary education act, small amounts of federal money are available to cities which want to develop pilot programs of bilingual, bicultural education.

Last September the Milwaukee public school system filed an application for such a program. It has received $45,000 for a one year pilot program, which, if successful, could be continued and expanded.

Coincidentally, the application was filed shortly after Father John Maurice, director of the Spanish Center, had filed a complaint about treatment of Latin Americans in the schools with the civil rights commission.

The committee planning the program includes five members of the community at large, two students (one from each high school involved in the program) and eight parents. All were elected at a public meeting Apr. 15.

BEWILDERING IDEA

Mrs. Gonzales, who is one of the parent members, is a bit bewildered by the idea of giving students an opportunity to learn both in Spanish and English from kindergarten on.

She explained: "For years they (the school system) have been telling us not to teach the children Spanish because they have to learn English."

Juan Alvarez, who was elected from the community at large, said he thought the program would be an advantage for both Spanish and English speaking students.

"Maybe if we had had this kind of a program long ago," he said, "we in the United States wouldn't be in such trouble in Latin America."

CERTAIN OF BENEFITS

Sister Charles Anne, director of the Guadalupe Head Start center, 239 W. Washington St., is certain of the benefits. "Our experience here has shown that small children who are made comfortable and at ease about themselves learn very easily," she said.

She sees another advantage: "I would hope that the principal result of such a program would be the development of a respect for whatever culture the young student has, so that he may be accepted as different, but not bad, and so that we may enrich all our students with what is best from each culture."

Good Jobs Here Are Scarce, Latin Americans Discover

(By Jo Sadin)

In terms of statistics, the employment picture in Milwaukee's Spanish speaking community is bright. In terms of people, it is grim.

Armando Orellana, 28, instructional supervisor for the concentrated employment program, said: "Any official will tell you how wonderful the employment situation is here in Milwaukee, how unemployment is lower than the national average, how many job openings there are."

Unemployment among Latin Americans here is hard to figure, since no definite current figures on the population here are yet available. However, guesses range from as low as 3% to as high as 15%.

According to Orellana, whose group attempts to coordinate all federal job development programs in the inner city, the real question is not how many Latins have jobs, but how many have good jobs.

The answer, Orellana said, is few.

For many Mexicans and Puerto Ricans who moved to Milwaukee to find better opportunities, the move has meant trading a $25 a week job in a warm climate for an $80 a week job in a cold climate.

For many former migrant laborers who left the harvest cycle for a place where their children could go to school year around, the move has meant abandoning the familiar rural life for the harsh big city ghetto, which they find terrifying.

Francisco Rodriguez, a job development specialist with the concentrated employment program, explained what happened to them.

LITTLE HOPE

With little formal education and less ability to speak English, he said, they take the first job available, usually a nonunion position with no hope for advancement.

"That's the end of the world," he said.

Sometimes even a bad job is hard to find.

Orellana said: "They tell us all about how many jobs are open. But when I send someone to apply for that job, they say: 'Have you a high school diploma? No? Then I'm sorry, we can't use you.' "

Unrealistically high job qualifications distress people like Rodriguez, who insisted: "You don't need a high school diploma to be a good machinist, if you have been trained as a machinist."

LANGUAGE BARRIER

In other cases, the language barrier has kept educated Latins unemployed.

Charles Salas, who also works with the program, told of a young man with a bachelor of science degree in social work who had two and a half years of experience in Puerto Rico.

Because he spoke virtually no English, he was considered unqualified for anything more than, perhaps, carrying skins in a tannery.

In a city and county where hospitals, the welfare department and other agencies which deal with Latin Americans have virtually no Spanish speaking employees, Rodriguez finds the young man's case ironic.

"The city and county are telling everybody else to help find jobs for the poor, but they're not doing anything themselves," Rodriquez said.

The concentrated employment program has funds for English classes, but they're in conversational English. Although this is necessary, the course doesn't help a person to fill out a job application properly. And it doesn't help him acquire the technical vocabulary he may need to get job advancement.

"Giving a person a job is not the solution," Rodriquez said. "The whole object is in upward mobility so that Latin Americans won't run into dead ends as the majority are now, spending the rest of their lives in entrance level jobs where hardly any skills are needed."

SEEKS VOLUNTEERS

The program office at 809 W. Greenfield av. is seeking English speaking volunteers to offer supplemental training in English. Similarly, the adult basic education program at the Spanish Center offers English instruction that is job related.

Rodriquez said: "We encourage them to come back to practice their English. But it is difficult. Many people have a long hour's drive across town to and from where they work. They find it is too hard to have a full time job and come back at night and study."

There also is the problem of apathy.

Salas explained: "The migrant has a fantastic ability to survive. He has worked for years in the fields with bad pay, bad housing, not enough food. But that kind of experience makes him resign himself. And even when he is in a position to work himself out of the hole, he cannot believe it possible. We have to motivate him."

The Rev. Orlando Costas, pastor of the Evangelical Baptist church, said there also was fear of risking something sure for something uncertain, even if it was the next step up.

He said: "Maybe a man makes $80 a week. It still may not be enough to feed his family, but is more than he has ever made before, and he is afraid of losing it."

Providing motivation may be difficult, but it is not impossible.

Salas told of a migrant family of 10 relocated by United Migrant Opportunity Services. The man makes $105 a week but knows he will never go any further unless he learns English. So he attends class from 8 a.m. to noon each day and then goes to work for a full shift at 2:30 p.m.

Rodriquez's job is to encourage companies to provide opportunities for such individuals.

He wants "upward mobility built in to any program of hiring the poor."

He spoke with pleasure of a truck drivers' training program that will teach Latins a skill that is in demand and help them get drivers' licenses, often unattainable for those with limited English.

Although some companies "play the different government programs against each other for their own benefit," Rodriguez said, he has met with co-operation by such firms as Borden Co. and Patrick Cudahy.

AGREEMENT WITH FIRMS

Some firms even have agreed to notify counselors from the employment program if one of the new employees is in danger of losing his job.

Often the matter is a misunderstanding of the kind Father John Maurice, director of the Spanish Center, described:

"The Latin is a member of a person-oriented culture. He moves to Milwaukee and gets a job. To his employer, the important thing is that the guy get to work on time. But then the guy's child becomes ill. If you are a Latin father, you are the head of the household and you do not leave it to your wife to bring the child to the doctor. This is your responsibility, and you perform it. Meanwhile, maybe you forgot to even to call the plant to say you'll be late.

SEEKING UNDERSTANDING

Rodriguez is trying to develop sensitivity programs in firms which employ Latins so that supervisors will be able to deal intelligently and sympathetically with such conflicts.

Counselors also tell new employees what will be expected of them.

But it is not enough to have co-operation from the companies.

Salvador Sanchez, field operations co-ordinator of the United Migrant Opportunity Services, which seeks to relocate migrants in better houses and jobs, knows of openings for unskilled workers in Hartford, Oshkosh and Beaver Dam.

The problem is to make those openings available.

They are not available, Maurice said:

When the job is 40 miles away from the only house a man can find for his family.

When there's no public transportation between a man's neighborhood and his livelihood.

When a man can't speak English well enough to get a driver's license and couldn't afford a car if he had a license.

Maurice told of 200 entry level jobs about which the Spanish Center was notified last year by the Mirro Corp. in Manitowoc.

"The problem was finding someplace for families to live," he said.

Housing, Jobs Closely Tied in Latin Community

(By Jo Landin)

To talk about jobs in Milwaukee's Spanish speaking community is also to talk about housing.

As the people at United Migrant Opportunity Services know, there is no way to separate the two problems. The service is a federal program which tries to offer migrant workers an alternative to the harvest cycle by relocating them in better jobs and houses.

Salvador Sanchez, 31, field operations coordinator for the program, said one of the complaints which led to its reorganization was that 75% of the persons relocated during the program's first three years had been brought to Milwaukee.

It would have been easier for them to adjust to a new way of life somewhere other than in a big city, he said.

CHOICE OFFERED

Under the program's new policy, migrants who want to relocate will be given a choice.

"There are lots of smaller towns—Beaver Dam, Hartford, Oshkosh—where there are jobs available the year around," Sanchez said, "if we could just get a few houses."

That's the hard part.

Father John Maurice, director of the Spanish Center, 524 W. National av., said: "It would be much easier for Mexican Americans or Mexican immigrants, most of whom come from a rural environment, to adjust in a semirural, small town setting. But there's no housing available for them."

FEW HOMES FOR RENT

Maurice said active discrimination wasn't necessary to keep people out of many places.

"This is the damnable thing about Wisconsin," he said. "This is the point on which you get a clear idea of the insidious nature of prejudice."

He said most small communities had very little rental property.

"What there is, is beyond the realm of possibility for a family living on the wages of a man in an entry level job," he said.

Ironically, Maurice said, many small Wisconsin towns were waging campaigns to attract industries which would need to employ the very people for whom there was no housing.

"This is prejudice," he said. "People think they can make money off the poor, but they don't want the poor to come and live with them."

Even federal housing programs help confine poor people to city ghettos, he said.

"When you analyze the federal programs for housing, you find that those of the most benefit to low income people can only be used in cities with a total program for urban renewal," he said. "And only two cities in the state—Madison and Milwaukee—qualify."

However, he said, public housing under present regulations really is not much of a solution to the problem facing Latin Milwaukeeans.

RELATIVES WELCOMED

The closely knit Latin family is an extended family in which the maiden aunt, the widowed uncle, and the aged grandparent are not merely tolerated, but welcomed into the home, he explained.

Yet regulations require that only the father, mother and children live in a public housing unit.

"A Latin—for whom the extended family is everything—says to himself: 'Who wants to live in such housing?' " Maurice said.

Ruben Garcia, a counselor with the migrant service, said: "It's real hard to get houses for large families. Nobody seems to want to rent to a family with more than five children, and most Latin families have more than five children."

RENT TOO HIGH

Where housing is available, he said, it's at rents of $130 to $190 a month, which is out of the question for large families with small incomes.

Another problem is location. Relocated migrants, for whom a large city can be a terrifying experience, understandably want to live near the largest concentration of other Spanish speaking people. Here, it is on the near south side.

Maurice said: "There is a more critical housing shortage on the south side than on the north side, a fact which many people want to ignore."

What was torn down for freeway construction and industrial expansion has not been replaced.

Some view the city's plans to expand the south side industrial park as a direct threat to the Latin community.

"They're zoning us right out of this area, just like they zoned us out of Juneau Village," said Avelardo Valdez, 21, a senior at the University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee.

The housing left is old.

Sanchez said: "You know that migrants live under severe conditions in the field—in shacks, nothing more. So you know when you show a former migrant a house for rent and he says 'I cannot live in that!' what kind of housing we have available here."

Even where the rent is low, total housing expenses are high.

"People don't count on having to spend $90 a month on heat," Maurice said. "That throws a lot of budgets out of whack."

CENTER MOVED

When the Spanish Center moved to its present location, a family moved into its previous quarters, a converted store at 818 S. 6th st.

It rented for only $40 a month, Maurice said, but it cost $80 a month to heat, even with plastic sheets on all the windows, "and still I had to keep my coat and boots on when I was working there."

Some of the housing is in considerably better condition according to Anthony B. Gruszka, inspector for the city health department in an area bounded by 1st and 8th sts., the Menomonee river and Lapham st.

In other cases, conditions are appalling, he said.

One large old house he routinely condemned once a year.

After Gruszka's annual warning, the landlord would put it back together again, using the cheapest materials, because he couldn't afford anything else.

ALL WORN OUT

Four families—a total of about 30 people—were living there.

Gruszka said: "With that kind of wear and tear and no yard space for the kids to play outside and the dirt from the expressway and surrounding industries, things are bound to wear out."

Now the house is being torn down to make way for a service station, he said.

Gruszka explained that he depended more on persuasion and warnings than on court orders.

There are many structures he'd like to condemn but can't, he said. The reason: "There's no place else for the people to go."

Maurice provided an example. Last year Gruszka condemned a house where a family with seven children lived. It took nine months for the Spanish Center and the welfare department and the health inspector himself to find them another place. The day after that family moved, the house was rented to another couple with five children.

"I advise people that a place is dangerous to live in and tell them they really should move," he said. "But there's no use in condemning one house if it means the family just has to move into someplace as bad or worse."

CASUALTIES IN VIETNAM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on July 17 and again yesterday, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE) noted in the Senate the number of casualties in Vietnam since the inauguration of President Nixon. I point out to the Senator that prior to President Nixon's inauguration, 30,000 Americans had been killed in Vietnam and another 192,000 had been wounded and 1,200 were missing in action.

These are tragic statistics—just as tragic as the number of Americans killed since January.

It does not help the cause either of winning the war or bringing about peace in Vietnam, however, to have these statistics labeled with a name. It does not help the men in Vietnam to label 50,000 of their casualties as Mr. Nixon's any more than it does to label 220,000 of their casualties as Mr. Kennedy's and Mr. Johnson's.

I submit that every effort is being made to bring this bloody and devastating war to a speedy end.

The cause of peace can best be served, I believe, by all Americans showing a united effort to bring about peace.

OUTDOOR RECREATION IN THE WEST

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it gave me great pleasure to see that Newsweek magazine has joined the growing number of national publications which have acknowledged the tremendous benefits which millions of people now derive from multipurpose dam projects in the West. Reporting on the recent trip of our colleague (Mr. Kennedy) and his party down the Green River in my home State, the July 21 issue of Newsweek observes correctly that before the advent of hydroelectric dams on the Green, the Colorado, and other western rivers, these streams were wild, unsafe for boaters, and wholly unmanageable. Only a handful of the hardiest outdoors types dared brave their hazardous waters.

On the other side of the coin, some of the rapids have dried up in the summer in past times. Now, the article notes:

> Daily releases of water at the Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge dams keeps the Green and Colorado white-water rapids in interesting, manageable turbulence.

Now persons of all ages can safely enjoy the pleasures of those rivers.

That is just a part of the remarkable recreation picture in our reclamation West and throughout the Nation. It seems to me that a water recreation explosion has occurred. Each year additional millions are attracted to water's edge for swimming, boating, fishing, water skiing, and sun bathing.

According to the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to the President:

> Water is a focal point of outdoor recreation. Wherever they live, most people seeking the outdoors look for water to swim and to fish in, to boat on, to walk, picnic and camp by, and just to look at. The demand for water-based recreation is increasing more rapidly than the demand for outdoor recreation in general.

The Outdoor Boating Club of America reports that some 40 million people participated in recreational boating last year. They spent about $3 billion in retail purchases of equipment and they own more than 8 million boats. And skimming and banking in graceful precision behind those millions of boats are about 8 million water skiers; about 750,000 of these are newcomers to the sport within the last year.

Not to be outdone are more than 23 million licensed fishermen, who managed to spend about $2.6 billion last year on assorted rods, reels, lures, boats, licenses, food and lodging. Then there is that increasingly popular sport: skindiving; a leading sports publication says that there are now more than 3 million skindivers in the United States.

How did all this happen? Well, we naturally have to consider as basic factors the growing affluence of our country and the constantly increasing amount of leisure time available to our expanding population. But you have to have places to do all this and that is what river management—thanks to dams—has provided for our people.

And where are all these glorious recreation areas? The Federal Power Commission has a publication available now which gives a summary of the 515 reservoir-lakes and the more than 6,200 recreational facilities that are maintained for the use of the American public at hydroelectric power projects in the United States. It was my purpose to discuss only the recreational values of dams today; I will take up their many other economic and human benefits at a later date.

I ask unanimous consent that the Newsweek article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Rafting the Rapids

Sixteen soaked and sunburned members of the Kennedy clan, led by Sen. Edward M. Kennedy and accompanied by an equal number of assorted congressmen, boatmen and mountaineers, celebrated last July 4 weekend by shooting the rapids on Utah's Green River. The Kennedy pontoon rafts bounced, slithered, submarined and skyhooked down 63 miles of boiling white water, carrying the group on the kind of four-day river trip that is the freshest Western tourist bit since the invention of the dude ranch.

The West's turbulent rivers are drawing thousands of summer thrill seekers. In addition to Utah's Green and San Juan rivers, vacationers are riding the Colorado River through mile-deep Cataract Canyon, Marble Canyon and the Grand Canyon, gliding through the scenic Tetons on the upper Snake River in Wyoming and adventuring on the Salmon River in Idaho. National Park Service officials estimate this season that about 12,000 float-boaters will brave the Colorado and Green River rapids alone.

One reason for the boom in white-water boating is that historians are focusing attention on the centennial of John Wesley Powell's pioneering 1869 exploration of the Green and Colorado rivers. A hundred years ago, on May 24, Powell, a one-armed, self-educated geologist, began his historic run down the Green to its junction with the Colorado, through a vast region marked "unexplored" on the maps of the day, and on through the Grand Canyon, to emerge—1,000 miles, three months and six days later—at the site of today's Lake Mead.

DANGERS

Powell's ten-man group started off in the face of reports that the rivers vanished underground, plunged over waterfalls higher than Niagara, and were inhabited by savages. The dangers were hardly exaggerated. Two of Powell's four wooden boats were wrecked, most of his supplies were lost, three members of the party were killed by Indians and the surviving explorers emerged from the Grand Canyon near starvation and total exhaustion.

Powell left behind some moving descriptions of his trip. Camped in Lodore Canyon, the same area the Kennedys ran, Powell noted in his journal: "This evening as I write the sun is going down, the shadows are settling in the canyon and vermilion gleams and roseate hues are slowly changing to somber brown above. Black shadows are creeping over them below and now it is a dark portal to a region of gloom, the gateway through which we are to enter tomorrow. What shall we find?"

COMFORT

Today's Colorado River tourist still finds awesome sights—sandstone pinnacles, prehistoric cliff dwellings—but his white-water trips make quite a contrast to Powell's journey. Most canyon adventure seekers arrive by jet at Salt Lake City, transfer via feeder airlines to Vernal, Utah, or Page, Ariz., and travel to the white water in air-conditioned station wagons. At an average cost of about $30 a day per person, boating firms provide plenty of comfort along with roller-coaster spins through the rapids, furnishing everything from bedrolls and cots to portable toilets. And at the end of a day's runs, the vacationer can cool off under white waterfalls, while his dinner broils over a charcoal fire.

The boating itself is usually safer than driving on U.S. highways. Since 1949, river runners have been using uncapsizable World War II surplus pontoon rafts, equipped with outboard motors to stabilize the raft, prevent swamping and keep voyagers from being swept past good camping spots. Even the rivers themselves have been partially tamed. In the past, some of the rapids have dried up in the summer. Now, daily releases of water at the Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge dams keep the Green and Colorado whitewater rapids in interesting, manageable turbulence.

BUILDING CONTRACTS SHAKE-DOWN

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 20, 1969, contained an article entitled "Former Housing Aide Tells of 'Shakedown' on Building Contracts," written by Donald A. McDonough and Leonard J. McAdams.

In the article Frank M. Steinberg, a former director of the Philadelphia Housing Authority, is quoted as having made the charge that developers seeking to obtain contracts with the housing authority had been forced to make contributions to the Democratic City Committee in order to get on the approved list to rehabilitate used housing.

This is a serious allegation, and in view of the fact that Federal money is involved in this program I am asking the Attorney General of the United States to investigate.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Former Housing Aide Tells of "Shakedown" on Building Contracts—Steinberg Accused of "Iron Rule"

(By Donald A. McDonough and Leonard J. McAdams)

A former top official in the Philadelphia Housing Authority told the District Attorney last February that developers had to make contributions to the Democratic City Committee to get on the approved list to rehabilitate used housing.

The required contribution was believed to be $500, he alleged.

He also charged that Frank M. Steinberg, who resigned last week as chairman of the housing authority, operated it like a "fiefdom"; that he pushed for a firm partly owned by his brother to get 100 houses approved for rehabilitation, and that some firms got financing at inflated interest rates from a prominent Democratic contributor.

FORMER AIDE

All this reportedly was told by Christy P. Emerson, former director of development for the Philadelphia Housing Authority, in an interview last Feb. 24 with Assistant District Attorney Robert E. Gabriel.

Gabriel confirmed Saturday that he had met with Emerson in February but he refused comment on the nature of the interview.

Emerson, known in his professional field as a "good-government" man, is reported to have said he would be willing to repeat his allegations under oath and, if necessary, go before a grand jury.

The only string he attached to his offer was the assurance that something good would come of it and not just publicity.

IRON HAND RULE

Steinberg ws pictured by Emerson as ruling the activities of the housing authority with an iron hand. At one point when the members were approving developers, Steinberg suddenly came up with the name of Cotler Associates. Herman Steinberg, Frank's brother, is a partner in this firm.

Herman and his partner Paul Cotler were arrested on charges of obtaining money under false pretense in District Attorney Arlen Specter's preliminary investigation which led to his petition for a special grand jury investigation.

Emerson testified before that grand jury on Thursday. The district attorney's office flew him in at a cost of $300 to testify from Berkeley, Calif., where he is a housing consultant.

LAUDED BY TATE

Frank Steinberg's resignation as chairman of the Housing Authority was disclosed Thursday by Mayor James H. J. Tate who said the resignation was accepted with regret and recounted Steinberg's long service in many positions with the city.

In conjunction with other development firms, Steinberg, 69, had participated in the erection of some of the newest and largest additions to the center city landscape.

The district attorney's office apparently had not intended to call Frank Steinberg before the jury until all phases of the authority's activities had been looked into.

CANNOT BE FOUND

But with the announcement of his resignation the D.A.'s office set about to call him in when they found he could not be located. Reporters visiting his American Steel Engineering Co. in East Falls were told he was out of the country.

First Assistant District Attorney Richard A. Sprague ordered a subpena for him and Gabriel set up a telephone search that stretched to California, Florida and some of the offshore islands where a passport would not be necessary.

Two weeks ago it was disclosed that Steinberg had sold his holdings in Citizens Bank of which he is a director. Oddly enough it was a suit by Steinberg and Sander L. Field, chairman of the bank, which also helped spark the grand jury investigation.

BANK SITE

They had purchased a property on 16th st. for use as a banking site and this was later included on the block-square tract the Redevelopment Authority assigned to National Land Investment Co. for development.

This firm is headed by Jack Wolgin, chairman of the Art Commission, and a staunch supporter of Mayor Tate—as had been Field.

Field charged the Redevelopment Authority members with conflict of interest and filed the suit which eventually was settled out of court.

But the charges had already attracted public interest and were made part of Specter's petition for a special grand jury. The project, called 1500 Market Street, had ground-breaking ceremonies last week. Known now as Center Square it takes in the area between Market and Ranstead, 15th and 16th sts.

Field had testified three times before the grand jury before entering the hospital for treatment of a heart condition. This condition has prevented his appearance before the jury since.

THE POTENTIAL OF OCEANOGRAPHY FOR HAWAII AND THE PACIFIC

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the role of Hawaii and the Pacific in oceanography was the subject of an informative speech given in Honolulu by Dr. Edward Wenk, Jr., executive secretary of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development.

In his keynote address before the Governor's Conference on Oceanography on June 26, Dr. Wenk discussed opportunities in two different dimensions: from the points of view of Hawaii as a pivotal State in our national effort; and second, as a staging area within the Pacific basin, from which to mount new efforts that will mark this region's special maritime development.

Dr. Wenk performed a real service not only for the State of Hawaii but for all who are interested in the potential of the vast Pacific Ocean in the future of oceanography.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Dr. Wenk's address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BEFORE THE GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE ON OCEANOGRAPHY, HONOLULU, HAWAII, JUNE 26, 1969

(By Edward Wenk, Jr.)

It is always a great pleasure to return to these gorgeous islands and to your gracious and unforgettable hospitality. And, it is a very great privilege to be your keynote speaker before this distinguished audience on this occasion to discuss Hawaii's Stake in the Sea.

Although our Nation has a proud maritime legacy, no one of our 50 States has a greater claim to a significant involvement with the sea than does Hawaii. Matching its oceanic geography is the vision of your leadership. Governor Burns, your congressional representation in Washington, your scientists, and your citizens, have long understood the potential role of the oceans in the destiny of this State. And they have also perceived the unique contributions Hawaii could make to our Nation's and the world's effective use of the sea.

This conference, first responding to the challenge recently presented by the National Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources, can be the turning point in matching opportunities with action. To this end, I bring you special greetings and good wishes from Vice President Agnew—the Chairman of the Marine Sciences Council. As a former Governor, he especially recognizes the value of state initiatives and welcomes this partnership with the Federal Government.

In a few opening words, I should like to paint a backdrop about your opportunities—opportunities in two different dimensions: from the points of view of Hawaii as a pivotal State in our national effort; and secondly, as a staging area within the Pacific basin, from which to mount new efforts that will mark this region's special maritime development.

These remarks are bound to reflect a viewpoints from the Nation's capital. But I intend to emphasize an underlying theme to our goals and our plans, however—a recognition that the ideas, the capabilities, the leadership and even some of the capital will come from the grass roots. Thus, in speaking as a "Potomac Oceanographer," I am also eager to listen and to learn as to how Hawaii views the future—nationally and internationally.

OUR NATIONAL INTERESTS

For a Nation with strong maritime origins, it is a paradox that this interest has waxed and waned. Since 1959, when a National Academy of Sciences report reawakened our Nation to the untapped potential of the sea, that neglect has fortunately become a matter of continuing policy-level attention.

Two circumstances stimulated this new outlook:

We have begun to recognize that the resources of the sea may help meet our Nation's and mankind's most pressing economic and social needs, and

A new marine technology has evolved that will make these aspirations possible.

The Congress, even before the executive branch, sensed these converging forces. Beginning in 1959 and continuing to this day, both branches of Government are probing the question of whether the Nation is adequately equipped to meet this promise of the sea—equipped in terms of oceanographic research and engineering capabilities, but also whether it is equipped in terms of institutions by which the energies of the Federal Government, and the energies of our States, industry, and universities can best be mobilized, strengthened and welded together in what would be a truly national effort.

We have made progress toward that end. As Vice President Agnew has characterized this era, the 1960's have been a "Decade of Preparation." The decade of the 70's should be the "Decade of Realization." Thus, today we are at one of those hinges of history by which our collective decisions may make a considerable difference as to how promptly and how effectively we make the future happen.

THE DECADE OF PREPARATION

As to the Decade of Preparation—funding for research and exploration has increased since 1959 by over a factor of five. We have added 50 ships of 65,000 tons to our oceanographic fleet. Training and education has been sharply emphasized so that today we are enrolling ten times as many graduate students as a decade ago and annually conferring six times as many Ph. D. degrees.

I am among those who have been impatient in getting on with this job. But we must not let impatience blind us as to how far we have come, how primitive, feeble and inadequate were the beginnings of this endeavor. And how steady has been our course during these ten years in not being lured into unproductive side roads, but in assembling the tool kit for the longer pull ahead.

This Decade, at least the latter part, must be characterized yet a second way—in terms of a transition from scientific oceanography to one which now adds, a concern for human affairs. The result of this broadening of perspective has been:

To elevate concerns as to use of the sea to a new policy level of consideration in the Federal Government;

To bring these opportunities to a policy level of interest among industrial leaders, university presidents, State officials and statesmen throughout the world.

To study the potential of the sea: to contribute to world order and humanitarian concerns; to preserve the environment for esthetic and spiritual values; and to foster economic growth and well-being.

In other words, we have sought to control and bring to the service of man the forces generated by what Victor Hugo called "an idea whose time has come."

Put another way, we have identified new maritime solutions to old problems and we

XUM

have taken steps to make these solutions work:

To match the productivity of ocean fisheries and means of producing protein concentrate with the critical problem of imbalance between the burgeoning population and world food supply;

To anticipate the accelerated concentration of urban areas along our coastlines, and provide for harmonious accommodation among competing uses of our seashore, our wetlands, our bays and estuaries;

To make sure that the increasing volume of pollutants generated by an industrialized society are not simply dumped further downstream;

To turn to the sea for economical sources of petroleum, gas, and minerals to match the requirements of a growing industrialized society whose appetite for fuel, ore and chemicals is growing exponentially;

To recognize that the sea still furnishes the most economic highway for the commercial transport of bulk commodities;

To tap our knowledge of the sea to improve forecasting of weather and storms, and to "learn the code" for eventually controlling climate;

And finally, to recognize that cooperative endeavors among nations to explore the oceans may be a further step to unite rather than divide mankind.

In examining these peaceful uses of the sea, we must not forget that the oceans have played a significant role in national security. As our Nation enlarges its quest for world peace we have had to maintain whatever naval forces are required to assert a persuasive seabased deterrent and undersea warfare capability, to balance our military forces with a maritime versatility and readiness to meet the uncertainties that lie ahead.

The most significant event that marks the transition from oceanography to marine science affairs was passage in 1966 of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act.

The Act: declared it to be a policy of the United States "to develop, encourage, and maintain a coordinated, comprehensive, and long-range national program in marine science for the benefit of mankind"; assigned responsibility to the President to give the field necessary leadership and direction; created an interim Cabinet-level, policy planning Council, chaired by the Vice President, to help set goals and strategies, coordinate resources of 11 Federal agencies internally and with many interests that lie outside the Government; established a public advisory commission to recommend major next steps, especially related to Federal organizational structure—a Commission of 15 distinguished citizens and four congressional advisors.

MARINE SCIENCES COUNCIL

Immediately after the legislation was signed in 1966, the Council was activated and has since operated as a creative, goal-oriented body, seeking to relate the oceans to the full spectrum of national objectives. It has sought to establish targets and priorities, to identify unmet needs and opportunities and to eliminate marginal ones, to isolate impediments to progress and to coordinate Federal programs of 23 bureaus to insure that the Government speaks with one voice. It has sought to improve communications among participants in ocean activities, for example, through consulting with private industry to ascertain its views on needs for reasonable investment incentives, and with State officials.

As you know, the Council was designated to expire a few days from now, on June 30. The Congress, however, recognized the significant contributions to be made by the Council in advancing its mandate. And the Administration, in examining the Council, considering it to be an effective instrument of Government well-tuned to the management concepts of the new President. On May 23, President Nixon signed the bill extending the Council's life for another year.

As to the Council's actions—the past three years have seen identification of a number of steps to meet the needs and opportunities mentioned earlier to assist in the War on Hunger, through a new Food-from-the-Sea program; to improve our comprehension of the sea, chart its resources and foster international cooperation in ocean exploration, through an International Decade of Ocean Exploration; to strengthen multi-disciplinary research and broaden our sources of manpower, by implementing the Sea Grant college legislation; to insure safety of life and property at sea, developing and putting into effect contingency plans to meet potential disasters from massive oil spillage; to meet conflicts in use of the coastal zone where people and the sea meet, laying the groundwork for both quality standards in our bays and estuaries and for locally or regionally managed coastal authorities responsible for land management in the public interest; to foster development of marine resources, it has taken steps to evaluate international law that would preserve the traditional freedom of the seas, create incentives for private investment, and recognize the legitimate interests of all nations in eventual benefits from that portion of the deep ocean floor beyond national sovereignty.

As a further step toward world order, this Administration has just laid before the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference a draft treaty which would limit the arms race by prohibiting emplacement of nuclear weapons on the seabed of the deep ocean.

MARINE SCIENCE COMMISSION

January 7, 1969, is yet another milestone in the Decade of Preparation. On that day the Marine Sciences Commission submitted its report after two years of intensive deliberations. One of your distinguished citizens—Taylor Pryor—was a member of that Commission and he must share the satisfaction of praise for a job well done.

The new Administration acted promptly and deliberately to examine these proposals. Almost immediately after his inauguration, President Nixon requested the Marine Sciences Council to review that Report and recommend immediate steps. Despite the problems which attend any major transition in Government, this study was accomplished. By March 27, comments from each individual Council member had been solicited, and analysis completed by the President's Science Adviser and the Council's Executive Secretary. Vice President Agnew then recommended to the President: (1) six priority areas for immedite attention, selected out of over 100 proposals by the Commission; and (2) procedural steps to evaluate within the broad context of a review of Federal organization the Commission's major, albeit controversial, proposal to establish a new independent agency—the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency.

The President has accepted these V.P. recommendations and issued instructions for all agencies to take the Commission proposals into account in their planning for 1971 and beyond; task groups have been established by the Council to evaluate these six areas in terms of Government-wide goals and programs, and the President's Science Adviser is examining marine affairs in the context of science and technology across the board.

These six priority areas, incidentally, are to: foster wise and productive use of coastal resources through encouragement of state action for coastal zone planning; expand exploration of coastal and deep sea resources and strengthen weather forecasting services; improve the competitive position of the U.S. fishing industry; establish national/regional laboratories and provide a stable base of support for them; establish a legal regime for the deep ocean floor that will encourage development of ocean resources; initiate a long-range Federal contract program in basic marine technology.

We are not standing still. We are taking positive, deliberate and logical steps.

The President's Cabinet is considering these possibilities now as no prior Cabinet has ever done. The President's Council on Executive Organization was requested to give early attention to the question of NOAA in the time scale that could permit the President to make decisions and recommendations to the Congress on marine affairs in phase with other initiatives when he lays proposals of his Administration before the Congress next spring.

Ths is the national framework in which we look ahead to the decade of realization.

This is the perspective of national policy in which context all of the participants in the oceans can examine their roles, make their decisions, commitments and express their views to provide guidance to Washington as to what the people want.

Each State has a role to play. The coastal states have a special responsibility because they hold the coastal resources in trust for their citizens.

They decide how the mineral resources beneath coastal lands and the territorial waters are to be exploited. They decide how best to utilize the living resources of these areas. They decide how lands and waters are to be altered to benefit their people, and which uses should receive preference in the inevitable trade-offs which result. The States, through their universities, colleges, technical institutes, and extension programs furnish a substantial number of the researchers, scientists, technologists and other trained manpower needed to investigate and make use of the oceans and the coastal zone.

HAWAII'S ROLE

Thus Hawaii has an unprecedented opportunity to assess its surrounding marine environment and to contribute its experience, its talents, its vision and its resources to advance our own Nation's stake in the ocean. You have the opportunity to consider the opportunities related to our national activities in shipping, coastal development, fishing, mineral extraction, weather prediction, and exploration.

But Hawaii can do more. For one thing, the oceans are inherently international. Washing impartially the coastlines of over 100 nations, the oceans serve as a bridge of commerce and of culture. This State has known the strategic importance of the Pacific largely pivoted around the sea as a shield and as a lifeline to support ground forces and supply allies during conflicts of the Pacific basin. World War II, Korea and Viet Nam are still fresh in our memories. Now, however, we look to the oceans in terms of their potential for peace.

Since 1966, international interests in the oceans has sharply increased. This Nation has even taken the initiative in many forums to encourage other nations to examine their role so that the oceans will not become another site of conflict that has historically marked exploitation of all of our land frontiers. The world has much to learn about this evolution, with fishing boats still being seized off of Latin America, the *Pueblo* captured in international waters, with the Soviets and other nations expanding their influence in distant seas. The U.S. response to this challenge lies in sea power but in new dimensions related to the oceans as a vehicle for commerce.

THE PACIFIC BASIN

This Pacific basin has its own special challenges, and I look forward to its own special response. The people who border the Pacific basin are characteristically imaginative and energetic. Hawaii is the melting pot of these different races. You speak all languages.

Our own States of California, Oregon, Washington, Alaska and Hawaii are distinguished by their frontier spirit. Many of the

XUM

other Pacific nations—Japan, Korea, Australia are noted for their entrepreneurship.

This is a region where things can happen.

You may question whether the Pacific basin is a natural entity for development, since most human progress is categorized by function rather than by geography.

History reminds us, however, of the development of the Mediterranean 3,000 years ago. The evolution of human culture, the development of political power, the extension of trade, largely involved transactions across that inland sea. It is hard to conceive of that epic in human history in the absence of either the Mediterranean or the activities that transpired on it.

It might be hazardous to consider the Pacific as an exact analogy. For one thing, people today can reach other lands by air, and in fact, prefer this over sea transport. Nevertheless, technology is shrinking oceans so that in terms of transit time and in terms of traffic, the Pacific today must closely resemble the Mediterranean of 3,000 years ago.

Not only has technology shrunk the oceans, but has stimulated the tempo. It is not only feasible but economically advantageous to use the sea in carrying fuel, ore and chemicals that an industrialized society requires. With the development of bulk sea carriers, particularly since the 1957 Suez crisis, the cost/distance factor has been so radically altered that coal can be shipped from Norfolk, Virginia, more cheaply to Japan by ship than to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, by train.

Nations are linked together by such trade, but there are other political and economic factors which add significance to the family of nations bordering the Pacific.

Until World War II, many of these nation states were colonies or dependencies which looked to one mother country or trading entity for political and economic guidance. Now these nations have become independent. Notwithstanding the diversity of interests and levels of economic and political development, they all share a rising sense of nationalism and all are faced with similar expectations by their citizens for a rising standard of living.

While these nations strongly defend their independence, they have become increasingly aware of regional cooperation and as a consequence there are a growing number of harbingers of such advances. The Asian Development Bank, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, reflect but a few and this trend of cooperation is being extended to the oceans as well.

One of the measures of this progress is the rate of change of gross national product. The free world as a whole for which statistics are more readily available, show signs of doubling GNP over the next ten years. Omitting the United States, which as a heavily developed nation has by comparison a moderate rate of growth, the other Pacific basin states are expected to at least triple their GNP during this interval. United States exports *to* the Pacific basin are expected to double by 1980, but exports *from* the region are expected to quadruple. Among the phenomena reflected by such growth are triangles of trade involving today Australia, Japan and the United States, but we should expect other similar developments involving many other of these nations.

The political complexion and the economic promise of this area have sharpened attention on the Pacific for its resources as well as its function as a highway. Protein deficiency exists in many of the nations bordering the Pacific almost in close proximity to uncaught fish off these shores. Oil discoveries off the Indonesian coast and favorable geology in the Yellow Sea suggest that the emerging fuel requirements may be met even closer to home than is the case today. Air transport, though it might be thought of as competitive with the sea, has actually proved a boon to development of the region and no area more than Hawaii recognizes the growth in recreational industries stimulated by the quick, convenient transport of people scarred by urban living on the mainland. The attractive setting and salubrious climate of the Pacific maritimes become yet another resource which is often overlooked.

Finally, we should not forget the oceans as a source of weather or climate and the influence which the Pacific Ocean thus has through its currents on the weather of all of its surrounding States and the mainland North America.

With the enormous size of the Pacific basin and its growing interest, we are immediately struck by the relative lack of knowledge of this region of the earth.

PACIFIC EXPLORATION

Here lie the incentives for exploration and if there is any single lesson we have learned in recent years about marine sciences, it is that our explorations must proceed simultaneously from two different motives—from scientific curiosity of the world around us and from the urgency of need.

Again, as we reflect on past events, we recognize that these same motives propelled explorers around the Pacific and from the Old World to the New. The quest for treasure and the quest for knowledge have become almost completely satisfied on the continents, but in the oceans we have just made an elementary beginning. To some extent we have been handicapped by a poor memory of even how to explore. Our early sailors frightened by the violence and the mystery of the sea sought mainly to traverse it quickly to meet the opportunities of the distant shore. But with 20th century marine technology, the sea is no longer hostile. Today, man can do on, in, or under the sea any of the things he long sought to do but was limited by his own frailty.

We are making a beginning. The United States has between 30 and 40 oceanographic ships operating all over the Pacific. Satellite navigation has improved the precision of ship location and observations from space provide us with precise charts and data on currents and sea state. Buoys are being deployed to study the formation and progression of thermal anomolies to increase understanding of their influence on continental weather; even the farmer in Kansas will benefit from what we learn of the Pacific weather machine.

Circumstances today thus weave new cohesiveness within the Pacific basin, particularly in terms of sharing knowledge about the environment that affects all the nations bordering the region, about the potential of resources and about the technologies by which they may be transformed to use, for a rapidly developing economy.

How will we go about planning exploration of our largest ocean basin?

The first step is to collate and assess all available data about ocean characteristics, and to interpret those data to delineate marine resources: unused fishery stocks, seabed manganese nodules, pockets of oil and gas.

This is the theme of the International Decade of Ocean Exploration.

This proposal is not merely a continuation of past efforts, but has several unique aspects. The approach anticipates a sustained exploration of the basin, planned and coordinated on a long-term basis, in contrast to the sporadic efforts of the past, developed project by project; is oriented as much toward delineation of marine resources as toward science, and is thus broader than past scientifically oriented oceanographic research programs; envisages more deliberate coordination of overlapping international interests; foresees an intensified effort toward more systematic collection of data and prompt dissemination, with particular attention to adoption of internationally agreed-upon standards to maximize the value of the data as a commodity for international exchange.

SCIENCE FOR COASTAL DEVELOPMENT

Understanding the marine environment must include inshore as well as remote reaches of the Pacific. The coastal margin—where ocean and land meet—is itself a resource, both scarce and perishable. On the mainland by the year 2000, 50 percent of our 300 million citizens will be located on 5 percent of our land—along our coasts. Management of that resource is essential, yet it is hopelessly fragmented by political subdivision, torn by conflict between competing private interests and the public interest; confused by greed for short-term versus long-term gain. We need scientific data to understand natural forces at work—waves eroding beaches and starfish decimating marine life; and information to predict consequences of man's own insults to his environment. With better knowledge, we can generate criteria to illuminate choices and bolster political courage.

As Thoreau admonished: "What is the use of a house if you haven't got a tolerable planet to put it on?" In other words, matching our advances in scientific knowledge must be creation of legal, administrative and institutional machinery to assure a rational development of these marine resources—with a foresight we did not enjoy on land.

We can also utilize scientific knowledge to create new industries.

One promising step in that direction is already being undertaken in our Strategic Trust Territory of Micronesia. The South Pacific Commission has recently approved a joint project with the United Nations Development Program to set up the South Pacific Islands Fishery Development Agency to identify, survey, and seek new ways—including through aquaculture—to increase fishery output in this vast area. (It would be nice to think that such developments would ultimately help reduce Hawaii's own high cost of fish.)

CONCLUSION

To summarize, Hawaii has a critical role to play in the effective and intelligent use of the sea: to contribute to your own economic development, to the growth of our Nation, and to the viability of the entire Pacific Basin. Lest I be misunderstood, I do not want to suggest that the oceans are a panacea for all of man's needs for food, for fuel, for living space. But they have been a neglected region of our planet and an untapped resource that—like our land frontiers—will yield to vision, to determination, to willingness to take risks, and to an appreciation that long-term investments will pay off.

You have a major role to play. You are a crossroads for commerce, with a strategic reach into a rapidly developing heavily populated Asia. You are a focal point for recreation, for shipment of cargo, for naval deployment. You can also be a focal point for that part of the International Decade of Ocean Exploration which is inevitably to be carried out on a regional basis, perhaps as a data center. You can be a site for mounting and industrial development of the living and nonliving resources of the sea, which *I predict will be more rapid in the Pacific* than in any other ocean.

Your human resources are already developed—in your private laboratories, your universities, your state facilities and Federal facilities close at hand. Political leadership of your state recognizes this promise. You have all of the ingredients of success.

The challenge is to "turn on your ignition switch."

Your new Commission is undertaking its study of "Hawaii and the Sea" to convert these opportunities to plans for action. I would urge you to be bold but realistic—that you adopt a long rather than short, opportunistic view—that you blend together the basic elements of science with the other factors of engineering, economics, law, public administration, banking, and finance that carry the science into the real world.

This is perhaps the most difficult part of your undertaking. Scientists and bankers inevitably speak different languages. Even scientists from one discipline have trouble communicating with those from another. Simply having representatives of different interests around the table does not guarantee understanding. But this state, of all states, is multilingual, and I am confident that you will succeed.

In closing, may I offer you assistance from the Council. We have learned, for example, about the problems of bringing together the centrifugal interests of competing Federal agencies. I suspect at a different scale you may have the same problem within your state government. We have learned the importance of listening to what people outside the Government want. We have learned that many good ideas fail for want of follow-through.

We have learned that it is necessary to couple together the knowledge producers and the knowledge consumers—to consider the whole maritime system if we are to realize the true potential of the sea.

But most of all we have learned that the oceans offer a fresh vehicle for man to realize his noblest aspirations.

We welcome you as a partner in this adventure.

BLACK ECONOMIC UNION OF KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, the Greater Kansas City chapter of the Black Economic Union recently celebrated its first 400 days of service to the Kansas City community. This organization is a branch of the National Black Economic Union, a group devoted to involving the black community of this Nation in the mainstream of American economic life.

I had the privilege July 12 of touring the new headquarters of the Kansas City chapter and of visiting several businesses that have been started or assisted by BEU during its brief but auspicious history.

BEU is led in Kansas City by Mr. Curtis R. McClinton, Jr., the executive director. He works with a talented and able staff of individuals concerned with the future economic advancement and involvement of the black community.

Curtis McClinton has been a star for the Kansas City Chiefs for 7 years. During the early years of his career in professional football, Curtis became involved in numerous successful business enterprises in the Kansas City area. He was instrumental in establishing the first black-controlled bank in Kansas City, Mo. During 1968, McClinton started the local chapter of BEU with the cooperation of many civic-minded local residents. At a recent dinner celebrating its first 400 days, the Kansas City chapter was recognized by Jim Brown, the founder and president of the national organization, as the outstanding branch of BEU and McClinton was cited as the BEU director of the year.

The efforts of Curtis McClinton and his colleagues in the work of BEU in Kansas City are, indeed, praiseworthy. In this era of strident extremism, racial tension, unfulfilled promises, and frustration, the work of this group is deserving of the support of those interested in economic and social justice for all Americans.

The activities of this organization are motivated by the desire to assist black Americans in achieving a traditional American goal—economic prosperity and independence.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that editorials, published in the Kansas City Times, of July 15, 1969, and the Kansas City Call of July 18, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City Times, July 15, 1969]

GOALS OF THE BLACK ECONOMIC UNION

The celebration the past week of the first 400 days of the Greater Kansas City chapter of the Black Economic Union took note of that young organization's impressive achievements. But characteristically, the meetings and most of the talk were directed toward the future. No one knows better than the men and women of the B. E. U. that the task has just begun of tearing down the barriers that have retarded black enterprise and Negro ownership of businesses in this country.

National officers, including the founder, Jim Brown, cited the Kansas City group as an outstanding chapter that has set the example for generating community support and participation. Brown observed that Curtis R. McClinton, the local executive director, established the Kansas City chapter before the national organization could help financially.

Primarily, the B. E. U. serves to help establish Negro ownership of businesses and to assist those already in existence. It is a complicated and many-faceted operation that helps arrange financing and makes available advice in taxation, insurance, credit and the numerous other important details that can mean the difference between success and failure. It also stands as a challenge to the total American economic system that cannot be ignored.

Essentially, the B. E. U. is saying that it is playing by the rules of the economic game as they have evolved and that it expects the co-operation, understanding and normal assistance to which black entrepreneurs are entitled.

At a time when the economic system is criticized as inflexible and unresponsive to large areas of human need, the B. E. U. is asking whether the system has room for people who have been on the outside and denied the opportunity to make use of their own talents and initiative. The successes so far of the organization are an encouraging trend. But the ultimate answer is ahead, and the entire community has a large stake in a fair and beneficial conclusion. The objectives of the B. E. U. are reasonable, logical and in the interests of us all.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Call, July 18–24, 1969]

THE BEU'S FIRST YEAR

The Black Economic Union, which has just celebrated the completion of its first 400 days of operation in Kansas City, is an asset to this city in more ways than one and we congratulate it upon the long list of achievements it has chalked up over so short a period of time.

The BEU, as it is popularly known, has demonstrated in a tangible way its value to Kansas City as a whole as well as to the black community. In one short year, it has assisted in the establishment of 14 new businesses and has been instrumental in creating 65 new jobs. This in itself is no mean accomplishment. If it had done nothing else in its first year, the BEU would merit applause.

But its success is deeper and broader than that.

Dedicated to assisting black people enter the mainstream of American economic life, the B.E.U. has made inroads during its first year that offer untold possibilities, yea probabilities, for the future.

The Black Economic Union follows the policy of self-help on the part of the black business man and at the same time utilizes resources in the white community for finance and expertise. This involvement of the total community is one of the basic tenets of the B.E.U.

The Black Economic Union is not a "union" in the ordinary sense of the word but it does seek to promote unity in the black community and among segments of the whole community. And the Black Economic Union is not "black" as its name might imply. Rather, it seeks the cooperation and affiliation of individuals and businesses of all types, regardless of race or ethnic background. The awards which the B.E.U. presented to firms and individuals at its annual Awards night, which climaxed its week-long first-year celebration, are indicative of the wide-spread cooperation which the new organization has received.

Jim Brown, founder of the B.E.U. and principal speaker at the banquet, put it well when he said: "We are not Uncle Toms and we are not radicals. We do not believe in separatism but neither do we believe in bowing down. We are for self-help and black pride. We also believe in whites and blacks working together."

In emphasizing the economic development of the Negro, the B.E.U. is concentrating on a long-neglected area in the Negro's struggle for freedom. It is working on the Negro's weakest link in the first-class citizenship chain. The Negro has reached the top in many fields—entertainment, sports, music and the professions, but in business and industry, he lags behind.

The Black Economic Union, in Kansas City and in the four other cities in which the B.E.U. operates, is striving to bridge this gap in our development. With the exception of Negro newspapers, Negro insurance companies and funeral establishments, Negro business has been limited in the past to small retail, service operations and we have too few of these.

Getting jobs for Negroes in other people's businesses is progress. But helping black people establish businesses of their own and thus provide employment for themselves and others will lead to a strong economic base.

We are proud of the far-sighted, unselfish athletes like Jim Brown, founder of the B.E.U., and our own Curtis McClinton who are using their money, their time and energy and their prestige to help strengthen their race rather than wasting their talents in frivolous activity and luxurious living.

WITHDRAWAL OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR NEW ORLEANS EXPRESSWAY

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Saturday, July 19, issue of the Washington Post contains an article written by Wolf Von Eckhardt on the Department of Transportation's recent withdrawal of Federal funds for the controversial riverfront expressway in the historic French Quarter of New Orleans. In my view, both Secretary Volpe and Assistant Secretary Braman are to be complimented for the action they have taken to preserve portions of our national history from the relentless pressures of development.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

XUM

Victory in New Orleans

(By Wolf Von Eckhardt)

In one of those surprises you hardly dare hope for, these days, a powerful former road contractor has stopped a road.

Moved by what people all over the country who care about America's cityscape consider enlightened civic conscience, the Secretary of Transportation, John A. Volpe, has withdrawn Federal funds for the controversial riverfront expressway in the historic French Quarter of New Orleans.

The name of this enlightened civic conscience is James D'Orma Braman.

Braman was Mayor of Seattle and now holds the unlikely title of Assistant Secretary of Transportation for Urban Systems and Environment.

Urban transportation systems, he believes, ought to be balanced and the environment livable. What is more, Braman is optimistic and thinks it can be done. The Nixon Administration is starting to do it, he says with conviction.

"Look," he explained in a recent interview, "we have already saved the Vieux Carré (as New Orlean's French Quarter is locally known) and we are rapidly moving toward a Mass Transit Trust Fund."

And Volpe, too, must be aware that taking Braman's advice on the New Orleans decision has suddenly made him a hero among the very people who thought of him as a freeway bulldozer with shoes on.

The Vieux Carré is unique, of course. But the ten-year-long battle to save it from being mortally mauled by an elevated freeway has followed the same plot as the freeway battles in other cities—Washington, San Antonio, Philadelphia, New York, San Francisco, you name them.

In New York it was Robert Moses, in Washington it was Harland Bartholomew, who, almost a generation ago, doodled their prescription for the city's salvation on an Esso map. At the time these planners believed as firmly and sincerely that carving up the city with superhighways would cure traffic congestion as the medics of a century ago believed that leeches would cure cancer.

Then came the Highway Act of 1956 which, as a matter of national defense, ordained that the Federal Government, through the Highway Trust Fund, pay 90 per cent of all interstate freeways. This made it all but irresistible for the cities to convert the doodles on the map into six- and eight-lane concrete ribbons. If you are broke, it's not easy to pass up a chance to take all that money.

Most planners, not to speak of those concerned with poor peoples' homes, neighborhoods and public parks, soon saw that the leech cure did nothing but drain the lifeblood from the city. The mayors eventually did too.

But the lushly endowed doodlers prove very tenacious. They promise suburbanites a 60-mile-per-hour trip to work and back home to that martini. They are supported by Congressmen who get more campaign contributions from highway contractors than from displaced blacks.

And in New Orleans, as in Washington and other cities, the newspapers uphold the conventional doodle wisdom because they are prone to uphold the wisdom of the downtown merchants. The merchants think more cars will bring more trade. Though, as Victor Gruen put it, not even a Cadillac has ever bought a nickel's worth of merchandise.

What is more, whenever the freeway doodle system was challenged, the highway engineers would run another study which, of course, always proved what it was paid for to prove, namely that the first doodle was absolutely the last word of proven need and efficiency. Independent studies—in New Orleans and Washington they were made by the renowned systems analysts, Arthur D. Little—were ignored or poohpooed.

Whether or not, in the face of indifferent Congressional unreason, Volpe can do anything about the Washington freeway-subway stalemate, his New Orleans decision may at last break this disastrous mold.

Nor was the decision only negative. At the urging largely of Congressman Hale Boggs (D-La.), the Federal funds withheld from the Vieux Carré will be spent on New Orleans' beltway, which, by most accounts will much benefit the city.

Much of the credit for the New Orleans victory goes, of course, to New Orleans' devoted preservationists, notaby Martha G. Robinson and Mark Lowrey and their lawyer, Louis F. Oberdorfer. It must also go to the President's Advisory Council on Historic Preservation which backed them in their hope of developing the Vieux Carré riverfront into something the whole country can be proud of.

But when Braman, investigating the conflict for Volpe, found it "irreconcilable," he didn't mean just the conflict between old iron grillwork and elevated combustion engines.

He knows, as Lawrence Halprin, the San Francisco environmental designer, told the highway builders last year, that if historic preservation could succeed in New Orleans, "we may in fact turn the whole course of urban design in America."

Braman is no emotional anti-freeway fighter. Deep in his sixties, the former lumber and hardware business man looks and talks just like one.

As Seattle's mayor, Braman devised what is probably the Nation's one transportation plan that is truly integrated with a social and physical development plan for an urban region. If New Orleans had such a plan, it would have avoided a lot of infighting.

To develop it, Braman also devised what is now known as a comprehensive design team. It is comprised of not just highway engineers, and transportation experts but also architects, sociologists and other specialists in the various aspects of urban ecology.

The difference between Braman's design team and those that are now much publicized in Baltimore, Chicago and other places was that, in effect, he, the mayor, headed it. He was the usually missing link between paper planning and political action.

But to put such workable urban design into effect, the Federal Government must make it just as easy for the cities to get help for public transit transportation as it is to get freeway subsidies for private cars.

That is the idea of the Mass Transit Trust Fund, which Braman and the mayors are working for. He hopes to see it enacted by the time the present highway act expires in 1972. From then on, under new legislation, two-thirds Federal highway and mass transit trust fund money would be equally available.

SENATOR PACKWOOD ON THE SURTAX

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I commend the junior Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD) on the extremely thoughtful and persuasive speech he made yesterday on the surtax.

He outlined the issues clearly. This Nation is in the grip of inflation which, unless checked, will seriously distort our economy and weaken the dollar. Inflation is a tax on those who can least afford it. When prices of food, clothing, and housing go up constantly every American suffers and especially those on low or fixed incomes.

The President is doing what he can. He is reducing the Federal budget in every way possible. The Federal Reserve is attempting to restrict the flow of credit. It is now up to the Senate to take responsible actions in line with those of the President. The surtax package we have before us would yield the Federal Government $9.1 billion in additional revenue in fiscal 1970. This is needed to withdraw that amount from the stream of spending in this country and to enable the Federal Government to run a substantial budget surplus.

This is a nonpartisan issue. The economy of the country is at stake. To those who insist that tax reform must be coupled with the surtax. I say that the economy of the country cannot wait. Tax reform is coming and this year. The President has pledged it, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has pledged it, I pledged it.

We must pass the surtax quickly, and I again commend Senator PACKWOOD for so well pointing out why it is needed, and needed now.

A POET'S EYE VIEW OF HUNGER

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the poets continually surpass those of us who are confined to prose to express our views.

I offer in support of this conclusion two pieces of poetry dealing with hunger which have been brought to my attention.

One is a poem written in April 1917 by Joseph Gladden Hutton, which appears in the April 1969 issue of the South Dakota State University Alumnus, illustrated by a photograph of an appealing little girl taken by Chuck Cecil on the Sisseton Waheton Indian Reservation in my State.

I ask unanimous consent that his poem, "Hunger," appear in the RECORD at this point.

The second poem is by a local author, Mr. Milton Hoffman, of 5800 Broad Branch Road, who hoped that it might be printed on the fence now surrounding Lafayette Park, but the space had already been committed to the Society for Historical Preservation by the National Park Service. As a consequence, Mr. Hoffman gave me his verses, captioned "Priorities," and they are worthy of circulation. I wish every American might read them. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poems were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hunger

(By Joseph Gladden Hutton)

Behold me!
The arch enemy of all mankind am I!
All peoples I destroy.
Their bodies I consume.
Their souls I blast until their Maker
In their hideous forms
No longer sees His image.
With blood-shot eye and sunken cheek,
With ashen lip and wolfish fang I come.

The infant at it's mother's breast
As my first prey I claim
When the fount maternal shrinks
And no longer satisfies the emptiness
Which only death can fill.
The aged and the ill,
Yielding up their last bit of strength,
Succumb: and, torn with mortal pain,
Are crushed in my relentless jaws
To appease my savage rage.

XUM

The maiden chaste her virtue flings to me
And to the lowest depth of shame descends
To save her rotting body from my greedy maw;
But without avail, for she is mine
And she must be consumed.

The stalwart youth cannot escape me.
The groom who swore his bride to cherish,
The father and the mother,
The husband and the wife,
Damn all the ties of love and of humanity
And slay and gnaw each other
In their vain attempt to live.

Through the land I stalk
And leave behind a prospect hideous.
And my great ally is War.
When War has stormed the ramparts of humanity,
Behold! I come. Beware!

PRIORITIES

(By Milton Hoffman)

What shall this park address
To those who do not eat
What shall this nation say
To those who cannot stand?

When will this nation learn
That all of us should weep
If there is one child hungry
In this land?

When will this nation learn
We should address ourselves
To building children
Saving men?

When will our statesmen learn
That happiness
Can but exist
When there is peace 'mongst men?

U.S. TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, the U.S. Training and Employment Service—long so overburdened with paperwork that it was able at times to render only the most cursory service to employer and applicant alike—has entered the age of automation.

Two experimental operations—the Baltimore Job Bank, a simplified printout of job openings which is updated each night on the same computer that writes unemployment compensation checks during the day; and the Utah man-job matching system, a more sophisticated operation requiring computer equipment with random access and mass storage facilities—have proven the value of an automated employment service.

The Labor Department plans to duplicate the job banks in 36 additional cities and to extend the Utah system to three additional States within the next year. In line with President Nixon's wishes, a nationwide computerized job placement system is projected within the next 5 years.

Writing in the July 1969, issue of Business Management, Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz notes that the old system has at best "been frustrating for the applicant and harrying for the overburdened interviewer."

Secretary Shultz points out that the cost of fully automating the Federal-State employment service system is estimated at $83 million annually.

He adds:

> But the benefits of such a system are many. In human terms, the Baltimore prototype has already demonstrated improved manpower services to the disadvantaged . . . In terms of sound business practice, the advantages of full automation are obvious.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article, entitled "New Management Boon: Automated Federal-State Job Placement," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW MANAGEMENT BOOM: AUTOMATED FEDERAL-STATE JOB PLACEMENT

(By George P. Shultz, U.S. Secretary of Labor)

The U.S. Training and Employment Service has entered a new era—an era in which machines are aiding the men who, it was feared, they might one day replace.

The employment service has long been overburdened with paperwork—and the volume has increased markedly since the start of the drive to aid the disadvantaged. The result has been that trained professionals have been forced to devote their time to clerical work—time sorely needed for counseling and job development.

At best, it has been frustrating for the applicant and harrying for the overburdened interviewer.

Automation is changing all that and, at President Nixon's request, automation of the Federal-state public employment system is among the Administration's top priority items.

Two basic approaches have already been tried—The Baltimore Job Bank, a relatively simple, inexpensive system, utilizing existing equipment, and the Utah man-job matching system, a more complex statewide system in which the machine can match applicant with job in a matter of seconds.

BALTIMORE JOB BANK

The Balitimore Job Bank has proven highly successful in its first year of operation. It utilizes a second generation computer which is used during the day to write unemployment compensation checks. At night, the computer updates and prints out lists of job openings throughout the entire metropolitan area.

Each morning, about 30 sets of the Job Bank Book are distributed to desks in the Baltimore central local office and to 15 "outreach" stations at key points throughout the metropolitan area. The book normally contains about 10,000 current job openings, arranged in DOT (Dictionary of Occupational Titles) code sequence. Training slots and orders from the National Alliance of Businessmen, the organization that spearheads the drive for jobs for the hardcore unemployed, are included in the listings.

The computer listings contain such information as the amount of education required, physical demands of the job, working conditions, whether bonding or security clearance is required, and whether a handicapped person would be considered, in addition to type of job and rate of pay.

Although many of the jobs listed require little or no experience, the Job Bank also shows openings for professionals—e.g., orders for a marine architect at $14,000 and a group of flight analysts at $7,000–$17,000 were on a recent listing. Baltimore employers have become aware of the efficient service rendered under the Job Bank system and are increasingly turning to it for needed personnel.

A battery of order-takers, usually numbering eight, records new openings received during the day. If these openings are not filled the same day, they are key-punched after the offices close to appear on the Job Bank lists the next morning.

UTAH JOB-MATCHING SYSTEM

The Utah man-job-matching system is a pilot operation which became fully effective at the end of January. It requires more sophisticated computer equipment with random access and mass storage facilities and is, therefore, a more expensive undertaking.

The computer is located at the central office of the Utah Department of Employment Security at Salt Lake City, with video data terminals and terminal printers in three local offices—Salt Lake City (serving about 300,000 population), Ogden (90,000) and Logan (30,000). Other local offices of the Utah agency batch and mail orders and applicant information to the central office, where they are matched overnight, or they may telephone urgent requests to the computer center or to one of the three pilot offices for immediate access to the data bank.

Within the next year, we plan to extend the Utah matching system to three additional states which have more complex labor markets. Installation of this sophisticated system as a nationwide network is projected for completion within the next five years.

In the professional field, the Department has taken a number of other steps toward facilitating the matching of applicants with jobs. In California, for example, where a three-city system known as LINCS (Labor Inventory Communications System) connects Sacramento, San Francisco and Los Angeles, it was found that some feasible matches of higher-level applicants and jobs were being missed by reliance on DOT codes alone. As a result, the development effort in California now centers around the creation of a computer-resident vocabulary covering professional, managerial and technical jobs, which will supplant the DOT codes.

Even without this refinement, however, the LINCS system has succeeded in placing a $50,000 a year bank vice president who was squeezed out in a merger and a 78-year-old civil engineer who staked his last hope for a new position on the computer's job-hunting ability.

Another development is the installation of a self-service system in our professional placement offices. The idea is to offer better service to professional applicants and to employers seeking professional help by giving them immediate exposure to all available openings. It eliminates the need to spend time with an interviewer when both applicant and employer know just what they are looking for.

The professional offices in New York and Washington, D.C. are already operating on a self-service basis, although the system in New York to date is limited to jobs in the social work, academic and medical fields. The Chicago and Milwaukee professional offices expect to be on a self-service basis this summer and we anticipate that the system will ultimately be extended to the entire Professional Office Network operating in 103 cities.

The self-help concept has been operating in Washington for about a year and in a new ground floor location, where it is known as an Information Center, for the past six months. About 300 applicants per week use the center, where they have free access to a series of loose-leaf books broken down by occupation and geographical location. In addition, in some specialized fields, other books are available containing listings of both job openings and applicants compiled by our Convention Placement Service, which services 25–30 conventions each year.

Again, automation has entered the picture in the form of National Employment Registries for selected occupations—an outgrowth of our Convention Placement Service. Six such registries now exist—three in Washington for the American Anthropological Assn., the American Statistical Assn. and the American Correctional Assn.; and three in Chicago for the American Library Assn., American Economic Assn. and American Philosophical Assn.

Applications for jobs in any of these specialized fields are recorded on microfilm and can be automatically retrieved in seconds. Detailed resumes may be obtained from the files.

The Washington office also maintains on microfilm an Overseas Personnel Registry, containing applications from about 500 men and women, displaced as a result of the recent cut-backs in State, United States Information Agency and the Agency for International Development. Many of these individuals have experience applicable to private industry in this country or abroad—e.g., small-scale industry development, program development, or public information. Employers interested in this source of personnel may write or telephone the Washington office or contact their local public employment office.

A similar registry for retired military personnel is now in the process of development by the Washington office. It is expected to be helpful in locating suitable civilian jobs for those whose entire work experience has been in the military.

The cost of fully-automating the Federal-state employment service system is estimated at $83 million annually—to be borne in its entirety by the Federal government.

But the benefits of such a system are many. In human terms, the Baltimore prototype has already demonstrated improved manpower services to the disadvantaged.

In terms of dollars and cents, if the more direct service provided by computer-aided systems were to result in a reduction of the unemployment rate by as little as 0.1%, the approximate increase in wages would be $600 million annually and unemployment insurance would decrease $50 million.

In terms of sound business practice, the advantages of full automation are obvious. Not only would the worker find his job faster, but the employer would have immediate access to information about availability anywhere in the nation of the skills he needs for his office, factory or service establishment.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT NEEDED FOR THE FUTURE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the repeal of the investment tax credit will result in some additional revenue for the Federal Government but at the expense of much greater Federal revenue in the future. That lost revenue would have been generated by the increased productivity made possible by the investment tax credit. I oppose the repeal of the investment tax credit because it is not only bad economics but because it cannot effectively influence our present inflation.

The impact of the removal of the credit will not take effect until the last quarters of 1970 and early 1971. By that time, repeal will not be needed or will be hopelessly inadequate to control inflation. As a matter of fact, the need for repeal as an anti-inflationary device is seriously questioned by Secretary of Commerce Stans' statement on June 23, that "we expect inflation control to begin to show substantial results in 2 or 3 months."

The wisdom of the repeal of the investment tax credit should be judged then on the past experiences of our economy and the future needs of our businesses.

The investment credit was established in 1962 because of our totally inadequate pace in plant expansion and modernization during the fifties. The investment credit has done much to help productivity keep pace with expanding needs but the expansion in capital expenditures was not such as to eliminate its need.

Pierre Rinfret, a noted economist and adviser to President Nixon, estimates that in real noninflation terms, our private capital investment did not rise from 1966 to 1968, and the real rise in 1969 is going to be small. At the beginning of this year, it was estimated that capital expenditures for new investment would be 14 percent higher than last year. Today it is quite obvious that capital expenditures will only be 7 to 8 percent higher. It should be remembered that inflated prices distort these figures. In terms of constant dollars, the present expectation for an increase in capital expenditures this year will probably be no more than 4 percent. A 4-percent increase in expenditures for plant and equipment is neither inflationary nor even adequate for our inevitably growing economy.

A soaring population, a shortage of skilled manpower, a technology explosion, and continued exposure to world trade makes the investment credit as necessary for the future as it was for the past.

Everyone talks about free trade but few are willing to implement measures that will make free trade possible. With our high standard of living and high labor cost, does anyone think we can compete with foreign producers in labor costs? If the United States is to compete in the world markets, we must have higher productivity made possible by the most modern techniques and equipments. The investment credit is one of the very few measures assisting American industry to remain competitive with foreign producers. Overseas industries enjoy not only low labor cost but also investment credits of their own as high as 25 percent.

The repeal of the investment credit would seriously injure our competitive position in world trade, with grave consequences for our balance of payments and monetary stability. For these reasons I oppose repeal.

Let me say to Senators who remain unpersuaded by my remarks that a temporary suspension of the credit would have the same alleged benefits as outright repeal, but would offer greater flexibility. If it should turn out that the effect of removal is detrimental to our economy, the administration would at least be able to respond with a quick restoration of the credit. I have, therefore, introduced a bill (S. 2648) that would suspend the credit for 1 year as an alternative to repeal

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article published in the Journal of Commerce of July 15 which states:

> The arguments advanced by the Nixon administration for repealing the investment tax credit appear to have lost much of their relevancy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Tax Credit Repeal Case Weakening: Businessmen Believe Possibility of Reform Lessens Repeal Need

(By Sidney Fish)

The arguments advanced by the Nixon Administration for repealing the investment tax credit appear to have lost much of their relevancy, owing to new developments in Congress and in the economy.

Businessmen have been strongly opposed to the "permanent cancellation" of the investment tax credit requested by President Nixon. They have already sustained a substantial profit squeeze since Jan. 1, 1968, as a result of the 10 per cent income tax surcharge. Termination of the 7 per cent investment tax credit, as of April 18, as proposed by the administration, would mean $3 billion to $3.5 billion in additional income taxes for corporations.

The income tax rate has climbed, even before the proposed cancellation of the investment tax credit, to higher levels than prevailed before the two tax reductions of 1964 and 1965.

NEW FACTOR

A new factor in the tax outlook is the possibility that meaningful tax reforms will be enacted at the same time that the surtax is extended by Congress or shortly thereafter.

The tax reforms, if broad enough, could provide sufficient revenue to balance the federal budget. Businessmen contend that this would eliminate the need for the funds that would be provided by the termination of the investment tax credit. The tax reforms would basically be felt by individuals with large incomes who have successfully used tax avoidance provisions.

Furthermore, recent developments have shown that the anti-inflationary brakes have begun to grab even before the proposed termination of the investment tax credit.

OVERKILL OF THE BOOM

Retail sales have not shown real strength for months, housing starts have declined, and in the capital investment field, major corporations, such as Chrysler and Leasco have announced substantial cutbacks. To rescind the investment tax credit would represent on overkill of the boom, businessmen believe.

To obtain extension of the surtax, it now seems likely that the Nixon Administration will have to agree to such tax reforms as a levy on tax-exempt foundations; a reduction in the oil depletion allowance, and a minimum tax on individuals with great wealth who have avoided income tax payments through ownership of real estate, etc.

Altogether, it is possible that revenues obtained from these new taxes may reach a substantial sum. The federal budget will be balanced, in that event, even if the investment tax credit is not cancelled, particularly if deescalation of the war in Vietnam continues, and costs are reduced by further pullbacks of troops from the numerous overseas bases.

ORIGIN OF PROPOSAL

The proposal for cancellation of the investment tax credit had its origin in forces that have lost their urgency. First, it was felt that the rescinding of the tax credit would slow down the investment boom. But plant investments already seem to be leveling off, as a result of the money squeeze.

Groups who were opposing tax reform also thought they could work out a deal in Congress under which tax relief would be ordered to some low income groups and the investment credit would be ended, in return for an indefinite delay in passing any tax reforms.

Now this deal appears to be dissolving in thin air, like the smoke of the cigars of the lobbyists who were proposing it in Congress.

The average stockholder has already made a full contribution towards balancing the federal budget, through the increased tax payments paid by corporations under the surcharge as well as through his tax payments on dividends. The surcharge boosted corporation rates above the levels prevailing in 1963, prior to the tax cuts of 1964 and 1965. Taxes on individuals, on the other hand, remain lower than they were in 1963. Corporation earnings have failed to make any progress since Jan. 1, 1966, while living costs have risen 4 per cent a year.

The investment tax credit is needed to stimulate industry to modernize and expand, businessmen say. Such efforts tend to control inflation in the long run. Moreover, incen-

XUM

tives for investment are needed to enable U.S. corporations to compete with overseas industries. The latter not only enjoy investment credits running as high as 25 per cent, but they also have the advantage of low cost labor.

CASE AGAINST REPEAL

The case against repeal of the investment tax credit was summed up yesterday by Edwin A. Locke, Jr., president of the American Paper Institute, before the Senate Finance Committee.

"All the evidence we have examined has convinced us that repeal of the investment credit would expose the economy to grave and unnecessary risks. It would aggravate the long-term inflationary danger, do major harm to the nation's foreign trade, and dangerously retard our rate of economic growth.

"Moreover, repeal might well produce a major downturn in the economy. Already new investment in 1969, measured in constant dollars, has fallen far below earlier calculations. The full impact of repeal would not be felt until 1970–71. By that time, current anti-inflationary measures will almost certainly be slowing down the economy, and the additional pressure resulting from repeal would be dangerous.

"In advocating repeal, the report of the House Ways and Means Committee assumes that capital expenditures by industry in recent years have been excessive. In fact, however, our economy is now suffering from a deficiency in productivity which is pushing wages and prices upward."

TAX EXEMPT "FRINGE BENEFITS" FOR BUSINESS EXECUTIVES

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) recently placed in the RECORD an article I wrote for True magazine about tax loopholes, exemptions, and subsidies.

At the outset of that article I mentioned a circular I had seen issued by a New York business concern which offered for a tax-deductible fee, a service for business executives who wished to learn a variety of ways in which Federal income taxes on sizable personal expense items, otherwise taxable, might be avoided. Personal expenses involved include vacations, college expense, life insurance, auto expense, and some others.

I have had a number of requests for the circular, or the material on how to avoid taxes. It occurred to me that members of the Committee on Finance might also be interested in the tax-avoidance advice our citizens are getting. I am sure some citizens, not able to take advantage of such tax loopholes, would also like to know how others do it.

In order to make the information I have on the subject available to the public and the Finance Committee, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD the circular or letter sent out by Prentice-Hall, Inc., entitled: "These Great 'Fringe Benefits' Tax Exempt to Salaried Executives."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE GREAT "FRINGE BENEFITS" ARE TAX-EXEMPT TO SALARIED EXECUTIVES

If the bulk of your income is in the form of salary where it's all exposed to taxes and nothing goes tax-free, you should immediately request a copy of the special Handbook we're distributing, showing The "Fringe Benefits" *Tax Free* To Executives.

Here are the fringe benefits an executive can receive. Do you get them? Remember: As legitimate "fringes" they're *completely free of tax:*

1. An extra $500, $1000, $1500 a year for car expenses—*above* what most men figure business driving usually costs;

2. $50,000 of paid life insurance on you (and now your wife and children can be covered) at company cost—you pay no premiums and you pay no tax;

3. Vacation travel that can be so combined with business it's tax deductible by the company and completely tax-free to you;

4. Annual medical checkups not only for the executive himself but for his wife as well—completely free to both;

5. Loans at no interest charge! Here's an executive whose $25,000 mortgage costs him almost $1,000 a year for interest alone. On his 6%, 25-year mortgage he'd pay out $23,893 and have nothing to show for it but interest receipts. Instead, he gets the $25,000 as a no-interest loan and saves the entire $23,893 interest!

But let us make clear at once that all this has nothing to do with tax tricks or deferred pay. The benefits we're talking about pay off *now,* are thoroughly legitimate, a recognized part of executive compensation.

Yet with this great difference:—If a man in say the $24,000 bracket got another $4,000 *as salary,* he'd have to hand over at least 36% of it for taxes. But a man can receive five, even ten thousand dollars the fringe benefit way, and pay no tax on it whatever! Why? Because that's the law. The law leaves legitimate fringe benefits tax-exempt as a partial recompense for the high tax rates on ordinary salary.

Let me give you an actual illustration of this without mentioning the name of any individual or company. This man—call him Mr. X—is a well-paid executive of a successful company. Yet if you saw his salary check you'd be surprised. You would have thought his compensation to be much larger.

It is much larger. Only he doesn't receive it as "salary." As salary it would be taxed—and taxed at the stiffest rate of all. The fringe benefit way, it comes to him completely tax-free.

He gets his life insurance, his health-and-accident policy, his medical checkups, and tax-free scholarships for his youngsters . . . all of which he'd otherwise have to defray himself with after-tax dollars.

And don't miss the big point: This "4,000" is equal to a salary raise thousands of dollars bigger for Mr. X, since the salary would be taxed—the fringe benefits aren't.

So many executives can get these un-taxed benefits but just never quite knew how to go about it, our editors have now explained them all in a special Handbook:

HOW TO REWARD TOP EXECUTIVES FOR MAXIMUM TAX ADVANTAGE

Open this Handbook and you'll see when and where a man can get—

1. Extra dollars each year for car expenses in business;

2. His family life insurance coverage paid;

3. Free travel, meals and lodging going to and from vacation spots;

4. Annual medical expenses for himself, wife, children, all paid;

5. No-interest loans.

The 24-page Handbook is yours with our compliments with a subscription to Prentice-Hall's regular weekly "Executive Tax Report"—a leading source of sound tax guidance in this country, which helps over 30,000 executives learn how to lighten their tax load.

But aside from that, one thing is sure: the Handbook, "How To Reward Top Executives for Maximum Tax Advantage," will come as a revelation if you have often heard of tax-free fringe benefits and wondered how to get them. The Handbook will show you how. Merely return the attached card.

The page beneath shows why over 30,000 use Prentice-Hall's regular weekly Executives Tax Report.

Here is why over 30,000 tax-wise executives use Prentice-Hall's regular weekly *"Executives, Tax Report"—*

Many executives earn excellent income *Before* taxes, yet have been unable to build up a decent retirement nestegg.

Because steadily rising taxes and inflation eat up such large portions of their income.

There may be other ways to lighten this tax load, but here is the *one* way that applies directly to top men. You'll find it in Executives Tax Report, where week after week—52 times a year—appear *the tax-wise methods an executive can use to cut his income tax sharply.*

1. Are you using all the methods whereby part of your compensation reaches you as Capital Gain, taxed but *half?* This way, on each $10,000 only $5,000 is taxed, and $5,000 is tax-exempt!

2. Are you aware of that great rule in the Tax Law whereby money you set aside for your retirement can now go legitimately free of tax? You get your retirement nestegg from tax dollars!

3. We mentioned in our letter loans at no interest—no interest loans:—did you know a company can reward a key man with $25,000—even $50,000—*that's both interest free and tax-free?*

4. If you own stocks, do you know about what amount to *tax-free dividends?*

5. Here's something even more surprising—the way to help put a youngster through college on tax dollars. Under this arrangement, a goodly chunk of the tuition is paid with the tax dollars saved.

6. Maybe you won't be drawing your profit-sharing or pension money for many years yet—*but when you do* you want to be sure you draw it in the way that gets half of it to you tax-free! You should learn this point now, so you know just how to start the thing.

You can see from the above samples that Executives Tax Report is built by some of the best tax brains in this country. It is built for those realistic executives who know that if they are going to offset today's living costs and shrinking dollar, it will have to be through taxes.

Executive Tax Report will help you do that job. And with it you'll now get free of charge your *bonus* copy of How to Reward Top Executives for Maximum Tax Advantage.

Here are typical comments on *"Executives Tax Report":*

"We have always saved enough from information in Executives Tax Report to pay the price of the subscription."—L. M. Blair, Richmond, Mo.

"The best publication of its kind that we have found."—C. H. Dake, Smyth Worldwide Movers, Inc., Seattle, Wash.

"Used in our overall planning."—L. D. Berry, Rio Farms, San Francisco, California.

"Helpful in handling family tax problems, corporate tax moves, executive compensation and personal taxes. Circulated and filed for future reference."—L. S. Pawkett, L. S. Pawkett & Co., San Antonio, Texas.

"In several instances Executives Tax Report has prevented us from laying ourselves open to additional tax."—J. F. Sheehan, Thomas J. Sheehan Co., St. Louis, Mo.

"Keeps me abreast of the latest rulings with a minimum of reading."—D. W. Malaby, Texarkana, Texas.

"For years, your Executives Tax Report has given me ideas in nearly every issue. It is good help for any business man."—G. C. Wharton, Wharton Coal Co., Wise, Va.

"I circulate Executives Tax Report to my associates. . . . Comes in handy to me by

XUM

pointing out possible savings both personal and corporate."—A. L. Clifton, Waco, Texas.

"Has helped us make tax saving on executive compensation, also on handling of corporate expenses."—A. L. Nickson, Nickson's Machine Shop, Inc., Santa Maria, California.

Subscribers to the weekly *"Executives Tax Report"* include—

Calumet and Hecla, Inc.; King Motor Co.; Shamrock Oil and Gas Co.; Plains Sheet Metal & Roofing; Industrial Brush Co.; Kiely Corp.; Winslow Product Engineering Corp.; McCarthy Steel Construction; State Farm Mutual Insurance; Holly Corporation; Red Aircraft Service, Inc.; Hagstrom Holding Trust; Ezell Fruit Co., Inc.; Nunn Electric Supply Co.; Western Republic Life Insurance; Curry Motor Freight Lines; General Acceptance Corp.; Bethlehem Steel Corp.; Alice Cotton Oil Co.; Hupp Corp.; United States Sugar Corp.; Lake Garfield Nurseries Co.; Belleville Imported Motor Car Ltd.; Amarillo Plate Glass Co.; Caldwell Music Co.; K–B Farms, Inc.

To begin receiving the weekly Prentice-Hall "Executives Tax Report," simply return the attached card. You'll also get your free copy of the new Handbook, *How to Reward Top Executives for Maximum Tax Advantage.*

Mail this card for your Special Handbook on the Fringe Benefits that are tax-exempt to executives:

"HOW TO REWARD TOP EXECUTIVES FOR MAXIMUM TAX ADVANTAGE"

If you receive the bulk of your income in the form of salary, where it's *ALL* exposed to taxes and nothing goes tax-free, mail this card for your Special Handbook on the *great Fringe Benefits that are tax-exempt to executives*—shown in our letter.

It's free with a single year's introductory subscription to Prentice-Hall's regular weekly Executives Tax Report (a leading source of tax-saving guidance for businessmen) . . . yours at only $4 a month. *The full annual cost is tax-deductible* and not payable until after Executives Tax Report starts reaching you.

Firm ---------- *Individual* --------------
Street ------------------------------------
City ---------- *State* ---------- *Zip* ----

SENATOR McGOVERN SPEAKS OUT ON MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the question of Safeguard ABM deployment which is presently before the Senate exemplifies a vastly enlarged concern over what President Eisenhower described as the military-industrial complex.

The issue runs much deeper than the efficiency or advisability of a specific weapons system. After 25 years of arms race experience, the futility, danger, and enormous costs of arms competition are becoming quite clearly established. More and more Americans are insisting that we find a better way of preserving the Nation's security. At the same time, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the potentially unlimited appetite for new weapons systems cannot be fed without intolerable neglect of urgent domestic needs. Finally, the cost overruns, sweetheart deals, and lack of arms-length dealing between Government officials and defense contractors stand as shocking evidence of our failure to maintain adequate control over this vast portion of the Federal budget.

The highly respected Christian Science Monitor is one of a number of newspapers in the country which have devoted special attention to the current national discussion of these issues.

On July 12, in the 15th of 16 articles on the subject, it published an extremely worthwhile interview with Senator George McGovern, of South Dakota, one of the country's most persistent and knowledgeable critics of our overgrown Defense Establishment. Senator McGovern has been deeply involved in these questions as long as any Member of this body, and he has provided a most enlightening commentary. I commend it to the attention of other Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Senator Warns Against "Complex" Power

(Sen. George McGovern (D) of South Dakota says the ties between American industry and the military are a threat to peace, economic stability, and civilian control of government. He answers questions submitted by staff correspondent Guy Halverson.)

Question. Last December, Sen. McGovern, you stated that the so-called "military-industrial complex" was the most serious problem facing the nation. What led you to this conclusion?

Answer. There are two broad reasons.

First, is the rapidly growing conflict between domestic needs and the budgetary hopes of military planners. It is not uncommon to hear predictions that when the war in Vietnam ends, military spending, instead of declining, will grow to $100 billion or more. Meanwhile, we learn from the Urban Coalition and urban America that "we are a year closer to being two societies, increasingly separate and scarcely less unequal."

If we continue to neglect causes of internal division and dissatisfaction in order to accumulate overkill, we may well be inviting a much greater threat than those conceived in Pentagon hypotheticals.

Second, excessive military spending involves much more than a waste of precious resources: It can stimulate grave external dangers as well. The combination of the antiballistic missile system (ABM) and multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles (MIRVs) on offensive missiles is a case in point. If both the United States and the Soviet Union build these systems, we could find ourselves in a situation where both sides have lost their second-strike capability, or their deterrent, and where either side might hope to emerge the victor in a nuclear exchange in which it struck first. As opposed to the present relative stability, the dangers of nuclear war in such circumstances would be enormous.

Question. What about adequate defense for the nation?

Answer. I believe we have long since passed the point of diminishing returns in military spending. In strategic weaponry, we have total force loadings of about 4,200 warheads.

In contrast, [former] Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara estimated that only 400 deliverable one-megaton warheads would destroy the Soviet Union as a viable society. Moreover, our submarine-launched missiles, uniquely capable of surviving a preemptive strike, pack enough might to provide a full deterrent all by themselves.

No matter how much we spend, we can buy no more "security" than we already possess.

Question. How would you define the military-industrial complex?

Answer. It includes all groups and individuals that have an interest in more arms spending.

Defense contractors press for more business. Communities in which they exist or where defense installations are located seek to preserve and expand the local economic stimulus of arms dollars. Workers want job security. The scientists and technicians who work in the research phases have a built-in interest in seeing their work bear fruit. Politicians list, among their accomplishments, their successes in bringing military business to their districts.

The military establishment headquartered in the Pentagon—in economic terms a bigger enterprise than all but seven other *countries* in the world—is at the center. It has four "legislative liaison" offices, and their combined budget for pushing the Defense Department's legislative program, providing services, and handling inquiries for members of Congress is about 14 times that of the largest private lobbying group. Trade and professional military associations keep their members informed on arguments for new weapons.

Question. How can we measure the influence of the military-industrial complex?

Answer. By examining its successes in winning approval of its programs. This will take the kind of thorough, critical analysis of the military budget that we ordinarily apply as a matter of course to other less costly federal activities. It is possible to infer from the few cases that come to light, as well as from its nature, that its influence is unsurpassed by any other institution in our society. But we have yet to explore it fully.

A major obstacle is simply the size and complexity of the military budget. It is not unusual for military spending programs totaling $70 or $85 billion to be approved by Congress in a matter of hours—while health, education, housing, and other domestic programs are examined for days and even weeks.

There are political, as well as practical, pressures contending against careful examination. There are important private defense plants and government installations in a great majority of the congressional districts. In addition the arms budget has going for it the respect and/or fear which Americans generally hold for men in uniform—plus the fear which Americans generally feel about threats to our security. Charges of "bomber gaps," of "missile gaps" or, most recently, of "security gaps" have great political strength. These factors combine to give the defense budget the sacrosanct status it enjoys today and has enjoyed for a number of years.

Question. In what ways is the American political process being affected by the presence of the military-industrial complex?

Answer. In theory the principles of American democracy have not been changed. But as a practical matter both the Congress and the executive branch are becoming less and less capable of exercising the powers we read about in government textbooks.

Surely the congressional responsibility to "provide for the common defense" is severely restricted when the Congress, because of practical limitations or political pressures, finds that its relationship with the military is one of master and servant, with Congress in the role of servitude.

In the executive branch the concept of civilian control is deeply ingrained in our traditions. But if the military can generate overwhelming pressure on behalf of its point of view, these roles, too, tend to be reversed.

The military is a massive enterprise. Its internal organization and orientation is, of necessity, authoritarian. Its leaders are affected only slightly, if at all, by the checks and balances of democracy—if they are not answerable to the president and to the Congress, they are answerable to no one. To the extent the military dictates policy, democracy is endangered.

It was essentially this trend which I believe President Eisenhower was warning against in his oft-quoted farewell address in

XUM

1961. He had said earlier, in March of 1959, that if considerations other than strict military needs were allowed to prevail, "everybody with any sense knows that we are finally going to a garrison state."

Question. What about effects on other areas of American life, such as secondary education, the films we see, our moral attitudes?

Answer. The influence in these areas is more subtle, but it does exist. The services, for example, cooperate with motion-picture companies in the production of films that improve or preserve their image. Research grants with colleges and universities—of the kind which have placed the Massachusetts Institute of Technology among the top 100 defense contractors—create a form of dependency for those institutions.

Just last year two well-known professors at the University of California who had received Army and Navy support for unclassified statistical research for some 16 years were notified that their contracts were being questioned. A letter they received from the Army said:

"While you as individuals have every right to your own opinions and convictions, your present position vis-a-vis that of the Department of Defense must place you in a most uncomfortable, and perhaps untenable, situation; continuance of this relationship could well serve as a source of embarrassment to you."

The professors had signed an advertisement in opposition to the war in Vietnam.

The military-industrial demand probably gets first call on the nation's scientific expertise. In 1968 federal research and development expenditures totaled about $16.3 billion, far surpassing private industrial research spending. Of the total of $16.3 billion, $14.1 billion was spent by the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Question. Does the "complex" affect U.S. foreign policy?

Answer. In a broad sense the mission of defense is to accomplish foreign-policy objectives through force or the threat of force. If we rely too heavily on military advice, therefore, our foreign policy is likely to be characterized by the use of force in situations where it is unnecessary and counterproductive. The costs can be immense.

Vietnam may be an example. I suspect that our heavy involvement will someday be traced back to the Pentagon's confident assessments of what military power could achieve—assessments of the kind which led Secretary McNamara and General [Maxwell D.] Taylor to predict the return of American troops by the end of 1965. There was a misplaced reliance on a military solution when other factors—the degree of indigenous support for the government we seek to save, the intricacies of local politics, the probable political results of military escalation—were likely to have a much greater effect on the outcome.

Similar reasoning holds true in the cold war and in the area of strategic weaponry. If we believe we have the capacity to be the world's policeman we are likely to assume that role.

Question. Does the military-industrial complex have a "vested stake" in the perpetuation of the cold war?

Answer. If industry has billions of dollars tied up in capital equipment which would be rendered useless by a lessening of mutual suspicion then certainly it has a vested interest.

This does not mean this group deserves condemnation. It merely recognizes the reality that it is not their job to determine national priorities or to design foreign policy.

Certainly the power and the prestige of the Pentagon would decline if we were to reach accommodation with our enemies. I am quite skeptical of suggestions that the military is consciously promoting conflicts to test its techniques or preserve its powers, but it does have a political stake in the cold war.

The crux of the question is not really the motivation of the military-industrial complex, but whether Congress and the executive branch will recognize that they have broader competence and broader responsibilities than either the industrial or military establishments.

Question. Are we gradually losing civilian control over the Pentagon?

Answer. We have certainly been moving in that direction. The freedom of civilian leaders to exercise their judgments, while it still exists in theory, has been very much diminished in practice.

Quite obviously the Secretary of Defense cannot singlehandedly counter the influence of the military-industrial complex. But he is in a critical position. If Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird sees his role as being an *advocate* for the military instead of a *manager* of the military, then the outlook is grim indeed.

Question. In what respect is military procurement based upon nondefense, political factors?

Answer. We can assume that no member of Congress escapes some form of direct or indirect persuasion from one or more elements in the military-industrial complex.

It may come in the form of a belief that if the military is offended a congressman's district will be looked upon with disfavor in site selections and contract awards. Or it may be that a specific cut in military spending will cause an economic decline for his constituency.

At a 1963 press conference, President Kennedy, in responding to a question about the ill-fated TFX or F–111 aircraft contract award to General Dynamics, did not deny that in some cases the failing financial status of a company could be an important factor in channeling arms business its way. He did, however, argue that that did not happen in the case of the competition between Boeing and General Dynamics.

I want to stress here, however, that often *too few* nondefense factors go into a decision. While we should not yield to political pressures which have us constructing superfluous weaponry, neither should we build systems that can be justified on military grounds if they interfere heavily with foreign policy or disarmament objectives.

Question. Are present Pentagon and congressional controls over military procurement practices adequate to prevent waste or malfeasance?

We have strong evidence that they are not. The C–5A aircraft is expected to cost some $2 billion more than the original ceiling price of $3 billion. The Mark II avionics unit for the F–111 is now expected to cost $1.5 million, up 46 percent over the original contract estimates and more than was paid for many of the entire fighter aircraft currently in service.

These are not isolated instances. A former defense official recently wrote that 90 percent of the major weapons systems end up costing at least twice as much as was originally estimated. A Brookings Institution study of large military contracts in the 1950's found costs of from 300 to 700 percent higher than original contract plans.

We are even more shocked to learn that our great investments give us shoddy merchandise. Richard Stubbing, on leave from Princeton University to work on the Budget Bureau staff, found in his recent study that the performance of weapons systems started in the 1950's is bad, that those of the 1960's are worse, and that the Pentagon seems to be awarding the highest profits to the poorest performers.

Question. Should the American people be concerned by the large numbers of ex-high-ranking military officers employed by major defense contractors?

Answer. Since 1966 there has been an executive order prohibiting a retired officer from negotiating contracts with his former service, but it is questionable whether it is being enforced or is even capable of enforcement. The purchase of proprietary rights to the M–16 rifle which I questioned in the Senate last year was approved by a defense official who later went to work for Colt Industries, the seller of the rights. A recent random survey of six major defense companies found former Pentagon officials and officers in all of them.

Question. What can the public do to ensure that the military-industrial complex does not gain an inordinately large seat in the councils of government?

Answer. I think we need three distinct kinds of action, each of which will require strong public support if they are to be instituted.

First, Senator Proxmire has recommended a highly important series of steps to deal with excessive costs, contract overruns, and other forms of economic waste. They include zero-base budgeting for the individual services, more penetrating Budget Bureau review, more competitive bidding, penalties instead of rewards for cost overruns, uniform accounting for military contractors, penalties for late deliveries, stronger inventory control, and improved monitoring and auditing of contracts while they are in process.

Second, we must undertake a coordinated national effort to explore and establish alternatives for those elements of the military-industrial complex that are dependent on arms spending.

Just recently I introduced, with the cosponsorship of 34 other senators, a "National Economic Conversion Act," designed to facilitate the conversion of human, industrial, and financial resources from military dependency to hopeful pursuits in other areas. The legislation takes into consideration the essential nature of most of the interests contending for more arms spending, not as a sinister conspiracy aimed at achieving a garrison state but as people who are legitimately concerned about the dislocations they would experience if our priorities were reordered.

In addition to removing some of the political pressures on military plans, it can bring the resources no longer necessary to the military into quick focus on the domestic challenges we need so desperately to meet.

Finally, we should begin insisting on a much higher standard of proof for arms-spending programs, recognizing that we have passed the point where more weapons can add to our security; that superfluous armaments are dangerous as well as wasteful; that military spending, as parasitic growth, is a poor way of stimulating the economy; that weapons become obsolete at a rapid rate; that military welfare or public works cannot be justified; and that military judgments on defense items fall short of the broad analysis which should be undertaken.

We must develop a countervailing force strong enough to overcome the political impact of the massive arms establishment.

THE PERCY-ACHESON DEBATE

Mr. SAXBE. Mr. President, on July 15, 1969, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) and former Secretary of State Dean Acheson debated the ABM issue on national television. In so doing, they brought new dimensions to this controversy to which thinking Americans are devoting so much time in these days. Because the arguments are so well stated, I ask unanimous consent to bring the transcript of this televised debate before the Senate by having it printed in the RECORD.

XUM

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DAVID FROST SHOW—ABM DISCUSSION WITH FORMER SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN ACHESON AND SENATOR CHARLES PERCY OF ILLINOIS

(Telecast in New York, July 15, 1969, WNEW-TV, 8:30–10 p.m.)

FROST. Welcome back. And will you welcome now—we're privileged to welcome, on my left—Senator Percy just pointed out he ought to be on the right—but Senator—will you welcome on my left the Honorable Dean Acheson, and on my right Senator Charles Percy.

And initially at the beginning we want to try to do something that's rarely done on television and open this, in a sense, first of all as a debate, and then open it wider. And first of all, particularly in view of the audience's views, and so on. I want to turn, if I may, to you, Mr. Acheson, and ask you if you could outline for us first of all what you regard as the imperative reasons why this country should have ABM.

DEAN ACHESON. I'll do my best. I've been involved in this nuclear business since the end of the war. Over twenty years, and every once in a while we come to what I think is a corner, a crisis, a turning point in the—in the development of our relations with the other super-state, which is the other great nuclear state, the Soviet Union.

And it seems to me we've reached one of them now. We started off with a great attempt on the part of our government to turn this whole nuclear matter over to international control. This was the first big effort that we made with our allies on the other side of the ocean. First of all in '46 when we presented the Baruch plan, and then in '51, when I presented the disarmament plan in Paris.

But the Russians turned them all down. In fact, Vishinsky said that my proposal kept him awake all night because he laughed so hard. Well, it didn't seem to me that was quite the right response to this effort. But at any rate, we did our best to have international control, and failed.

So we started protecting ourselves, developing our nuclear power, and they were already doing this also. And we have come, to put it very briefly, over the twenty intervening years, to a point where each of us is armed to the extent that Mr. Churchill said created the delicate balance of terror. By which he means that we were both in a position to prevent the other person from making a first move, because it would be what is called doomsday if that happened. The retaliatory power would be so great that once the other person shot, the riposte would kill everybody. This was the balance of terror.

Every once in a while, in this development, a new weapon is introduced. This has to be met. We now have on each side the old manned bombers. They're still in operation and still carry their bombs, and they are provided against by the other side.

The next development was land based missiles, in which the Russians had the lead. We rapidly caught up with them and passed them. And we are now, roughly speaking, approximately equal.

Then we developed the nuclear submarine, the Polaris, and they developed one. And again we had this balance of terror.

Now a new weapon has been introduced into the balance. And that is the S–99, which is a very large, long range, intercontinental ballistic missile, developed by the Russians, with three warheads which are discharged in space, separate, and each one goes to a target. Each one is not separately aimed, but the whole weapon is directed so that when they divide, each one will go to a predetermined target. And these are so developed that each warhead, if directed toward one of our land based missiles, would, we think, destroy it.

Now there will be a difference probably between the Senator and his advisor, and me and mine, as to the efficiency of these Russian weapons. That is part of the argument that we will have here tonight.

To meet that there has been developed on both sides an anti-ballistic missile. The purpose of this is to meet an incoming missile in space and destroy it in space before it lands. This is to prevent the great destruction which the weapon causes when it hits either a city, or another missile, and the fallout which occurs if it attempts to destroy one of the silos on the ground and throws up a great deal of nuclear charged dust.

Now Russians have these deployed all around Moscow. We are now, under the President's proposal, developing anti-ballistic missiles to deploy around the sites where the Minute Men, our land based missiles are buried.

Now the debate between the Senator and me will be around several issues. One is, is the Russian S–99 a real danger? We claim it's a serious one. I think his attitude will be that it is not as serious as we think. Or that the Minute Men do not need as much protection as we think they need.

Another issue will be: does the ABM do what it is claimed to be able to do? That is, meet these S–99s as they come, and destroy them. Another issue will be: are there other ways of meeting this than the one that we propose, or the President proposes? Are they cheaper? Are they better? We say there are none as good. The Senator will doubtless believe that there are some equally good, or even better. That's another issue.

And finally there is an issue as to whether our deploying these weapons will inhibit in any way the furtherance of discussions with the Russians for the purpose of stopping further development of nuclear weapons, or if possible disarming.

Now on some of these issues obviously I've had experience and am able to make some contribution of my own. On others I'm a layman and don't understand the nuclear scientific issues as well as people who are trained in that discipline, and therefore I have to make a judgment on the basis of what I am told.

Let me therefore start out by saying a word or two about a matter on which I've had a good deal of experience, which is: does this interfere with our negotiations with the Russians?

I believe that it does not. I've had a good deal of negotiation with the Russians. They are not delicate, shy people. They are not frightened by what the other people do. They, themselves, have developed an anti-ballistic missile. They know its function, its purpose. They are quite aware of the fact that this is inherently a defensive weapon. It is to meet something which is aimed at you, as far as we devise it, and destroy that thing. Therefore they are not going to be any less willing to talk, they're going to be more willing to talk if they believe that we are stronger and there's something worth bargaining about.

FROST. At that point we're coming to the end of the first segment, and I know Senator Percy is yearning to come in to answer. Is there a last sentence you want to add to that before we go to a break?

ACHESON. Well, I will save my last sentence to worry Senator Percy.

FROST. All right, very good.

Senator Percy, the floor is yours in a moment's time. We'll be right back.

FROST. Senator Percy, you have the threat of Mr. Acheson's last sentence still hanging over you. But what of all those several points he raised, all of which I want to raise with you, which of those would you choose to answer first?

Senator **CHARLES PERCY.** Well I'd like first to indicate that Secretary Acheson and I do not always disagree. We happen to on this one, and I do very strongly. But we agree on many issues, and I have the utmost respect for the tremendous contribution that he has made to this country over the many years that he's served it.

We happen to agree, for instance, that the Europeans ought to be paying today for more of their own defense, and less by the American taxpayer. And we're working together on that.

FROST. What am I supposed to say to that? is the question.

PERCY. You're a British citizen and you can't say anything on this point. But I'm really going to be talking to the American citizen, but I do think the citizens of the world are watching the debate, which is a tremendously historic moment in the Senate, when one hundred men charged with the responsibility of the security of this country are now debating: how best can we secure our national interests and the interests of the free world.

FROST. Well there's no doubt about—incidentally—about the international involvement in this, in the sense that, you know, the decisions here . . .

PERCY. You're saying this on your own time, aren't you?

FROST. I'm not interrupting you, I'm just applauding your point that everybody is watching this debate, tonight.

PERCY. Well I think so too. And I think really what Secretary Acheson has said, where he's given us the historical background of what we've done as the defense—that we've built defenses against the bombers, and against the missiles, is really why we're having this great debate. Because what we've done over a period of years because of this tremendous presumed threat from the Soviet Union, have spent billions and billions and billions of dollars building DEW lines, building NIKE sites. I suppose the cost goes thirty, forty, fifty billion dollars, and much of it is now covered by the Arctic snow, and the wastes, and abandoned. Because it simply didn't develop that way. The world didn't turn out the way those defenses were planned for.

And I just wonder today how different this nation might be, and how different life might be here, if we had not had to spend those billions and billions of dollars in the defense establishment.

I don't for a moment presume that the Department of Defense is anything other than utterly patriotic, and zealous in their attempt to guard us against every conceivable type of threat to us. In fact, they are able to plan, and they have on the books, planning two major wars and one minor war, carrying them on simultaneously, and being able to carry them out any place on earth, against any conceivable kind of threat. And I suppose this is their job.

But it's our job in the Congress to set the priorities. To finally and ultimately decide what is more important. And I have come to the conclusion that the threat is greater from within this country, if we don't do the right things and have the right national priorities, than it is from outside.

Now I don't for a moment, David, presume that we do not have to have a credible deterrent. We must have. No possible enemy of ours should ever feel we'll be weak. And we must be strong. From this standpoint I think, however, we have tremendous strength.

And two points are very important to have a credible deterrent. First you must have the power to strike. And second, you must have the will to use that power if you're ever struck against. I can't imagine the Russians, or anyone, as so naive as to believe we do not have the power. We have incredible power. And I hope they wouldn't be so naive as to assume we wouldn't have

XUM

the guts and the will to use it if we were ever attacked.

That's all I think we need. It's sufficiency. And President Nixon used that word. How many times do we have to prove our ability to destroy the whole world? And how many times as we escalate this nuclear arms race now, do we have to? How many pounds, tons, megatons of firepower do we have to have to destroy every human being on earth?

I think we have enough. And I think the time to draw the line is now. And the ABM is a very good place to draw that line.

Actually I'd have to go back. I felt the Sentinel ABM was the time to draw the line. A few of us fought against it, you remember, when President Johnson was in office. We said it was not a good design, it would escalate the nuclear arms race, it would cost far more than they told us it would cost, and it was not a credible defense of our cities.

We've been proven right, oddly enough. The President has now said the very same things. And where are all the people who before were defending the Sentinel system? Not one of them has stood up since the President said it isn't right for this country, it will escalate, it will cost too much, it's not worth it, and you can't really defend the cities, it's not a credible defense of the cities.

Now we have a new name for it, the Safeguard. We have a way of taking these old systems that President Eisenhower, the NIKE-Zeus and the NIKE-X, said we shouldn't go ahead with; and President Kennedy said we shouldn't go ahead—and now we've bundled it into a new sort of package, with the sex appeal of the Sentinel name first, and then that didn't work, and now the Safeguard.

But it's the same old package. And it's the same old weak design, I think. In fact, the Safeguard is even weaker. It was designed for area defense, the defense of our cities, and now we've abandoned that thought. We've moved it back to the bases, to get them out of the cities where people will protest about being saved from a nuclear war by dragging nuclear bombs right into their neighborhood and back yard, and we're tucking them away out in South (sic) Dakota and Montana.

The odd thing is that the design of, say, the eye of the system, the MSR, the missile site radar, a huge structure, costing a hundred and sixty-five million dollars for each installation—the eye is the most vulnerable part of it. It was designed for an entirely different job, area defense. And now we don't need that design for point defense of the silos. And yet we're going to quickly rush into production and deploy a design that today is very weak. And any technician would admit that they don't even need to use the SS–9's that Dean Acheson mentioned. They can knock that out with the SS–11, which is only a megaton. And they take one-eighth of their existing supply of those, never touch the SS–9's and knock out every single one of the MSRs that we build.

Once you knock out the eye of the system, what good are the Sprints, and the Spartans, and the computers? What good's all the programming? And why wouldn't they use that less costly means of knocking out the heart of the system?

This is the defect of it, it's a weak design. It costs much more, too, than the 6.8 billion we've been told. I'd give you all the tea in China that it would not be built for less than twenty billion—that's Nationalist China—be built for less, less than twenty billion dollars. And I do feel when we're on the brink of negotiations, and we will begin negotiations, I feel confident, with the Soviet Union early in August, why, just as we're about to see whether we can't, both of us, find a mutuality of interest in stopping this madness of piling bombs, on bombs, on bombs, increasing the terror, which does not increase my sense of security and safety.

Why don't we sit down sensibly and rationally, and see, as Secretary Rogers said and President Nixon, whether we both can't go out of the ABM business? In fact, they have said, if they want to go out of the business, we'll go out of the business. And why not just first determine, while we're going ahead and redesigning the eye of the system, the MSR, see whether or not the Soviet Union wouldn't find a mutuality of interest in de-escalating the nuclear arms race?

So for these reasons I think a delay in the deployment of this system would be very wise. It serves our interest, it serves the interest of world peace. I think we'll be more secure that way, rather than rushing into an ABM system which they will retaliate against by increasing their offensive weapons. And they can build those a lot cheaper and faster than we can build this, the most complex, intricate electronic and mechanical system ever devised by mankind—and we have no idea whether it will work. In fact, Secretary Acheson said it may not work. And if it's not workable, at least when we're through with all of this—and he means maybe six to twenty billion dollars—we at least would have the satisfaction of knowing that it's not workable.

That's a pretty expensive thing to try to experiment with, when I can take twenty billion dollars as a Senator, and find a great many places to nation-build here at home with that money, and offer the promise of America to more people, and stop this tremendous flow of rampant inflation, which is distorting every priority we have in this country, and picking the pockets of every single American family.

Frost. We're going to take a break now. We'll be opening it up in one minute's time.

Well, you've heard both of our distinguished speakers explaining this thing about as well—this complex thing about as well as it can be explained. And our audience here in the studio have been listening too. Let me throw it towards them.

Are there any of you who want to speak now, agree or disagree with something that's been said? Can I put a question to one of our distinguished—yes?

Man. Mr. Acheson, you spoke about the need for deterrents. And deterrents, I believe, is defined as the ability to destroy your enemy if he strikes first. Now Senator Percy indicated that for the foreseeable future, if the Soviets strike first, we will still have the power to destroy them ten or fifteen times over. If we have the ABM in addition, it's true we might be able to destroy them twenty five times or thirty times over. You said, if we don't have the ABM it weakens our deterrent. In a sense it weakens our deterrent because you're weaker if you can destroy them ten times over instead of twenty times over.

But does it make any sense, really, to talk about weakening our deterrent if that is the case? And if that is so, then the main rationale for the ABM, which is the need to protect our deterrent all the way—and there simply remains the point you made about the importance of having a strong position for bargaining with the Soviets.

And for the second part I would ask this——

Frost. Let's stop there.

Man. Okay, should we leave it? I'm sorry.

Frost. All right, isn't the power to destroy ten times over deterrent or not?—is really the question.

Acheson. I think the questioner is being deceived by the idea that these figures are absolutes; that you are really saying something which means something, when you say ten times over and twenty times over. Nobody knows that, nobody has tried the idea, nobody has tried to destroy them, there's no proof of this.

The point of deterrents is that the other side should believe that to start a nuclear war is destruction for him.

Now why have the Russians invested a lot of money in the S–99? Why? Because they think that will reduce our retaliatory power. And if they are permitted to believe that and achieve their end without a response from us, then they will believe that they can take a greater chance than they did before.

Frost. The gentleman over there, yes.

Man. Senator Percy, in your first rebuttal of Secretary Acheson's talk, you mentioned two ideas why—your major reasons why you're against the ABM. And if I'm not mistaken, one of them was because basically that it's never been tested. And you said that they should take it out in the Pacific Ocean and test it every major way possible to show all kinds of defenses around it.

Now if it was taken out in the ocean and it was tested and it proved to be successful, and that it could defend our country basically better than it's being defended now, would you change your idea, and possibly more—be more affirmative on the program?

Percy. Well, I'd feel better about going into production on something that costs twenty billion dollars if I thought ahead of time I might have some idea that it would work. But secondly, I wouldn't even feel very good about going into spending that kind of money if I thought I could avoid it. And if we can avoid it by a negotiated agreement with the Soviet Union and they indicate a willingness to want do it—and our own President has indicated a desire and willingness to want to do it—I'd want to see first whether we can reach an agreement.

Because I think it's silly to spend twenty billion dollars if you don't have to.

Acheson. I'd like to comment on that reply.

Frost. Yes.

Acheson. Three years ago Mr. Gilpatric said, "Wait three years before you deploy an ABM, and then see whether the Russians will do something." We have waited three years, and now the Senator says wait another God knows how long. I think the time for waiting is over, and that they have made their deployment, we must make ours. And then they will be moved to get on with it or not get on with it.

Percy. Mr. Secretary, those are almost precisely the words the military establishment used to President Eisenhower. "We've been waiting long enough, let's now go into production on the Nike–Zeus, the Nike–X", whatever it was. And Eisenhower rightly said no. And President Kennedy said, rightly, no. And they were absolutely right because the whole system, everyone admits, would have been a twenty to forty billion dollar boondoggle, totally obsolete by present standards now.

Frost. Do you think the system you're advocating is open to the same danger of being an anachronism in a very short time?

Acheson. I think everything is open to that danger, everything. Science is moving very fast. But you cannot turn over one whole field of development to the opponent with any degree of safety. One must stay with it, Mr. Frost, one has got to stay all the time with it. If you delay and delay and delay, and the other person experiments and develops and develops, you are losing ground.

And the fact that Eisenhower took a chance and got away with it is no reason . . .

Frost. The gentleman in the back row.

Man. Secretary Acheson, you said that the main purpose of the ABM is that it should be a deterrent and that it doesn't matter if it works or not. Therefore, why don't we just pretend to build one?

Acheson. If I said what you say I said, I'm a bigger fool than I think I am.

Frost. Someone else put up their hand over there. Yes, the lady there.

Woman. Well for twenty-four years now, since 1945 when I was a young girl in school, I've been hearing that the Russians will do thus and so, and watch out for the Russians. Now in the twenty-four years that followed we have, according to the people that wanted more and more atom bombs, more and more

XUM

hydrogen bombs, and people who want the anti-ballistic missile system to go into effect, we've been hearing that we need all this, and at this particular time and that particular time we were so very vulnerable.

Now if we had been that vulnerable, and we are at this very moment this vulnerable, with this terrific weapon that Russia has, how come they haven't used it? Perhaps it's time that we ought to just end our suspicions. And there is another premise that slipped in, that the hundred sixty-five billion dollars that this reaction weapon—defensive weapon—costs would not necessarily be used for peaceful purposes.

Now I'd like to know, what kind of a premise is that? Where would the hundred sixty-five billion dollars be spent?

Frost. That's a hundred and sixty-five million there, or twenty billion. It's so much money, all the same.

Woman. Millions. Well you see the amount is so staggering that I can't even imagine it. You know, like, how much is it per week? But I feel that it's a false premise that it won't be used for peaceful purposes. And I know—may I continue for a moment—that if my little child were in a hassle and were arguing with a lot of children, and I wanted him to stop and do his homework, I wouldn't throw his books out the window and spend my last fifty cents on a little old shield for him so he can defend himself in his fight. I would try to see that he stopped the fight, stopped the arguing, stopped that approach completely, and turned his needs and his attention towards peaceful ends.

Frost. Let me put . . .

Let me put that question to you: Is it a false premise to imagine that the hunderd and sixty-five million that's been spent on the eye, or the twenty billion—is it a false premise to suggest that that can't be spent on peaceful means?

Acheson. I'm sorry, I don't under—I couldn't hear what the lady said and I don't quite understand what you're saying.

Frost. Well, she was making the point very well. She was disputing your earlier suggestion that Senator Percy was wrong when he suggested the money could be spent on better things. You said . . .

Percy. Or not even spent at all; just let the people spend it and not raise our taxes so much.

Frost. You disputed that. You're on safe ground there. You then disputed that earlier and you said it's not a question that the money could be spent on anything else. And the lady was disputing your point. Now why did you say it's not a question, that the money can't be spent on something else?

Acheson. Well I still don't understand what the issue is. But I think I do. At any rate, let me answer a question I want to answer.

Frost. I thought you might do that, yes.

Acheson. Maybe it's this—let's get the proportions here right. What are we talking about? What are the orders of magnitude we're talking about? We're talking about spending over five years, a figure which is eight billion dollars. Or you can call it eleven, if you want to add in development expenses, research expenses, which you must spend anyway.

Now this doesn't make the difference between not paying taxes and paying taxes, or the good life or the bad life, or anything else. It is about one-tenth to one-eighth of the military budget. The whole gross national product of the United States will be a trillion dollars in this period.

The cost, for instance, if you want to stop pollution of the air, is a hundred and fifty billion dollars. We must meet it, and we will meet it. But the order of magnitude of the things that we must do is so infinitely greater than this that they are not comparable.

It reminds me now—if I may end up, and then I'll stop talking—with a recollection of Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, whom I used to know very well when I was young. He used to say, what I'm sure will shock all of us now, that there is no check that he wrote with greater pleasure than the check to pay his taxes. And he said to himself, "When I sign this paltry check"—you can know how long ago that was—"I buy civilization."

Now I say when we spend this money, which is not paltry but substantial, we buy security. And that is what we're concerned with.

Percy. Can I just simply——

Frost. The last word from you too, Senator Percy.

Percy. Well, I'll answer a question that I haven't been asked, but I'll respond to Dean Acheson. I think that this is the least cost-effective system that I could devise. I think the holes that we've punctured in it have shattered the thinking of even some of its most previous ardent defenders.

It's a question now of how—whether we are for defense; we're all for that—it's a question of sufficiency. And I think we conclusively proved that as of the moment, we have a sufficiency.

I don't think the public—not the eleven million people that I serve in Illinois—are impressed with a trillion dollar economy or what percentage this is of the gross national product. They're impressed with the fact that maybe they're a blue collar making ninety-five hundred dollars, more than they ever dreamed of before, but they're spending ten thousand. They're going in debt. They can't seem to keep ahead of the game. Everyone is being harder pressed, higher prices, and they wonder why.

It's because this defense establishment is so big, so out of control almost, that it now involves one out of nine people. We have eight and a half million people working forty hours a week on just military equipment alone in this country. We place billions of dollars, forty-four billion dollars in contracts, fifty-eight per cent of it without even advertising for bids. It's just a negotiated bid. And we are in such a condition that today the Congress wants to try to get ahold of it. And that's what this great struggle is about.

We're struggling for the standard of living, and for a sense of priorities and rightness in this country. We want a sufficiency of defense. But we don't want to have the military dominate our lives and wreck our economy with this kind of eighty and eighty-plus billion of spending at the national level. It's that additionality now, on top of everything else, that's causing us this great crunch in our credit markets today.

And what we're trying to do is simply save four, five, six billion dollars, which might take that extra pressure off and enable us to have a more stable, normal economy.

Frost. And there we've got to leave it. Thank you for your last words. To both of you, thank you, Secretary Acheson. Thank you, Senator Percy. And our thanks to our audience for all of their participation and all of their questions. I'm sure, with me, you'd like to thank our speakers and our experts.

COUNTERVAILING DUTIES: TREASURY MUST ENFORCE LAW

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, this year Congress and the Nation are taking a hard look at our national priorities.

With our Nation's growing concern for eliminating hunger and improving nutritional levels, the maintenance of a strong food production capability ranks high in such priorities.

Axiomatically, this involves maintaining a healthy economic climate for food producers, as well as adequate protection against unfair—and unlawful—competition from foreign countries.

For these reasons, I am deeply concerned about discriminatory practices of U.S. Treasury relating to its failure to impose certain duties on imported dairy products.

Under section 1303 of United States Code 19, duties on imports subsidized by foreign countries are required to be increased by the amount of the subsidy—in addition to the regular duty. This is mandatory—not permissive—law.

Despite protests by the domestic dairy industry, as well as Members of Congress, however, the Treasury is failing to enforce this law in relation to dairy products.

Mr. President, this is a matter of real concern, first, for those interested in maintaining an economically sound and productive dairy industry, and second, for those who believe in essential, just and equitable enforcement of our laws.

Unless expeditious action is taken by the administration to impose the required countervailing duties on dairy products, Congress, I believe, should seriously consider, first, a probe into the Treasury's failure to impose countervailing duties on dairy products; and, second, legislation to create stronger import control laws.

The number of dairy cattle in the United States has been declining steadily since 1945.

In that year we had 27.7 million cows and heifers in the milk herd. This year, we have only 14.1 million. In 1940, there were 4.6 million farmers reporting milk cows. This year, there are 1.1 million farmers milking cows. Due to better breeding and greater efficiency in milk production, per cow, our total output of milk for consumers did not decline with the reduction in herds and the number of producers until 1966. Production peaked at 124 billion pounds of milk in 1965 and has now declined to an estimated 115 billion pounds this year. Unless the economic returns for dairying improve and improve speedily, we confront real problems in relation to adequate supplies of one of our finest foods.

Certainly a law intended to protect these producers from imports subsidized heavily by the exporting countries abroad—a law already on the statute books—should be enforced to protect dairymen from the most unfair sort of competition.

NEW YORK TIMES CALLS FOR RATIFICATION OF THE GENEVA CONVENTION ON CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the least understood and most serious problems of our time, as momentous for the future of world peace as the nuclear arms race itself, is the rapid proliferation of chemical and biological weapons. History records remarkably few instances of the use of these weapons, but their rapid development by an increasing number of nations makes the danger of our losing control over them daily more serious. To those knowledgeable on the sub-

XUM

ject, the prospects of heading off this grim occurrence seem bleak indeed.

I invite the attention of the Senate to an editorial published recently in the New York Times. Though I would like to find its cautious optimism encouraging, the progress it describes is slim indeed and far from the amount needed to achieve effective control of these weapons. Much more is needed, and primary among these needed measures is the ratification of the Geneva protocol of 1925 banning the aggressive use of these weapons, a measure called for in the editorial.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LUNACY OF GERM WARFARE

Dean Swift himself could not do justice to a world which over the centuries and with great skill has eliminated diseases one by one for the sake of humanity, and then systematically bred the germs of those diseases as a possible weapon of war. Yet all the major countries, even those that have the nuclear power to wipe out the earth's population several times over, persist in the solemn lunacy of stockpiling lethal bacteria and poisonous gases in thte name of national defense.

Fortunately a few rays of good sense have been penetrating this Kafka-like realm, and it is at least possible that the world may be spared further hazardous progress along a particularly gruesome road. Among the hopeful signs, the first in recent weeks was the vigorous campaign against the chemical and biological warfare program of the Defense Department by Representative Richard D. McCarthy of Buffalo. It was Mr. McCarthy who induced a rare briefing of Congressmen on the subject by hitherto reticent officers of the Pentagon. And it was the same Congressman who almost singlehandedly prevented the crosscountry shipment of several hundred freight cars filled with obsolete but deadly gas bombs the Army irresponsibility planned to dump in the Atlantic.

Entering into the questioning spirit, the Senate Armed Services Committee has just voted to cut out of the defense budget all funds for researching offensive measures in the field of chemical-biological warfare. President Nixon himself has shown a marked interest in moves to reduce this whole category of armaments. He has ordered a full-scale review of the program and pledged to the opening session of the Geneva Disarmament Conference that the United States would seek "reliable arms control" for this potential type of warfare, which "arouses horror and revulsion throughout the world."

Perhaps even more significant, the United Nations has just issued a report that should be required reading for responsible government officials around the globe. It documents not only the frightful dangers of chemical and biological warfare but the folly of their contemplated use as well as their total unpredictability, their possible destruction of the environment even where they do not immediately wipe out a whole population, including those who initiate their use; and the easy and frightening proliferation of such weapons among nations that cannot afford nuclear armaments.

In transmitting the work of the fourteen distinguished scientists who drew up the U.N. report, Secretary General U Thant has appealed to all states to accept the Geneva Protocol of 1925, renouncing the use of chemical and biological agents—a declaration ratified by sixty nations but not by the United States—and to eliminate such agents as quickly as possible from their arsenals.

If these steps are taken, such is the irony of the situation, the world would breathe more easily at having to ward off only the threat of nuclear destruction.

AIR FORCE OFFICER STATISTICS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a short while back I placed in the RECORD figures showing the comparison of the number of officers obtained through ROTC with officers obtained from the military academies and Officer Candidate Schools. Unfortunately, at that time the Air Force did not have their figures complete. I ask unanimous consent that the Air Force statistics and a portion of a letter I received from the Secretary of the Air Force be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statistics were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since the inception of the Air Force in 1947, the AFROTC has continually been the major long-lead procurement source of commissioned officers. We anticipate that it will continue in the foreseeable future.

Unfortunately, we have been unable to locate any statistics that would reveal the percentages of officers who were commissioned through the AFROTC or its earlier counterparts in World War II and the Korean conflict. Records of graduates who served between 1941–1945 are maintained by the Army and we understand that they do not reflect which officers were in the Air Corps/Army Air Forces. The AFROTC was instituted in 1948 following the establishment of the Air Force as a separate service the previous year. Many of the ROTC graduates who were on active duty in the Air Force during Korea had also participated in World War II and the records fail to separate them from officers commissioned from other sources.

The following figures are provided which show the annual total active duty officer strengths and ROTC percentages thereof for the past several fiscal years:

As of—	Total strength	ROTC inventory	Percent
June 30, 1964	133,987	32,483	24.5
June 30, 1965	131,578	33,473	25.4
June 30, 1966	130,724	36,306	27.8
June 30, 1967	135,485	39,742	29.3
June 30, 1968	137,533	42,296	30.8
May 1969	134,364	42,452	31.6

As a matter of historical interest, in 1920 the Army established the first Air Service ROTC units at the University of California in Berkeley, the University of Illinois, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and the Texas Agriculture and Mechanical College. Today, 174 institutions are participating.

We appreciate your continuing interest in this vital program and hope the foregoing information will prove helpful.

THE INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, on July 7, 1969, I placed in the RECORD a number of letters responding to a letter I had written requesting views of businessmen on the repeal of the 7 percent investment tax credit.

I have now received another group of very thoughtful letters on the subject. Eighty-five percent of those responding are opposed to the suspension or repeal of the investment tax credit.

So that the Senators may see another representative sample of thinking on this subject, I ask unanimous consent to place a number of these responses in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ILLINOIS TOOL WORKS, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., July 17, 1969.

Senator CHARLES H. PERCY,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHUCK: The current legislative situation with respect to the 7% investment tax credit is most distressing to industry generally and to ITW in particular. The purpose of this letter is not to urge the retention of the 7% tax credit in its present form, which we recognize to be well-nigh impossible in the light of the current political situation. We do suggest, however, that the United States economy needs some form of recovery for capital outlay if we are to remain competitive with foreign competition. In additon, capital expenditures, although seemingly inflationary in short range view, are actually an anti-inflationary element when considered over the long haul.

Every major industrial nation encourages investment in capital equipment—either through tax incentives or through accelerated depreciation provisions, or both. It was for this reason that the Kennedy Administration suggested the 7% investment tax credit in the first place. Frankly, most businessmen favored alternative approaches at the time the 7% tax credit was enacted, because they recognized that the 7% credit would be forever vulnerable from a political standpoint, as it is now. Some of these alternatives will be discussed further in this letter.

The point is, however, that perfectly understandable political pressures have caused a Republican President and a Democratic Majority in the House to agree on repeal of the 7% investment tax credit, and nothing has been suggested to take its place. The likely result of this action will be a substantial reduction in corporate outlays for needed capital equipment over the next few years and well into the future. This trend is not likely to manifest itself this year (or perhaps even next year), because corporate managers, relying in part on the 7% investment tax credit, have already made plans for purchases of capital equipment for this year. These plans cannot now be changed, even though the tax write-off is likely to be repealed. Therefore, the inevitable downturn in capital outlays will not occur for some time.

Healthy expenditures for capital equipment are vitally necessary to a healthy, non-inflationary economy. They are also necessary in order to protect our markets at home and abroad from foreign intrusion. American wage rates are obviously higher than foreign wage rates, and this is good. But this also means that American industry can remain competitive only if the cost of the final end product of its enterprise is competitive with foreign producers. The only way that this objective can be accomplished is through developing better, less costly methods through newer, more productive machinery. Thus, a national policy of providing incentives to businesses to remain competitive through purchase and renewal of capital equipment (machinery) is essential and should be of high priority. As I said earlier, every other major industrial nation provides such incentives, and for the United States to be without them, while maintaining much higher wage rates than foreign competitors, puts us at a double disadvantage.

In addition, from the standpoint of inflation—one of the best ways to control inflation is to provide for greater productivity. This objective can be accomplished only if there is a continuing capability to im-

XUM

prove production volume through newer and better capital equipment (machinery). Thus, stepped up capital expenditures actually operate as a counterinflationary force on the economy because, in the long run, they contribute to better productivity.

For these reasons, we urge you and your colleagues to seek means of encouraging capital investment now that the 7% investment tax credit is to be repealed for political reasons. Here are a number of alternatives:

1. Reduce the 7% investment tax credit to 3½% and liberalize accelerated depreciation rules so that industry can recapture capital outlays at a faster rate and with lower interest payments than is now possible.

2. Couple accelerated depreciation liberalization with a capital allowance equivalent to the 7% investment tax credit (in other words, a capital allowance approaching 14%). Many other industrial nations use this technique as an incentive for capital expenditures. In other words, a company could write off capital depreciation at a depreciation schedule chosen by them at no long range loss of revenue to the Federal government. In addition, they would be given an additional allowance of, let us say 14%. For example, a company making capital expenditures of $1,000,000 in a single year could depreciate $1,140,000 over any depreciation period the company (and not the Internal Revenue Service) decided.

Other alternatives are likely to be advanced. We would be interested in discussing them with you from time to time, at your initiative.

I want to make it clear that ITW is not making this presentation to you because *we* are interested in a tax break. As a matter of fact, our accounting procedures have been such that the 7% investment tax credit and accelerated depreciation are claimd over a longer period than most companies. However, as a producer of capital equipment and as suppliers to other producers, we are concerned with the overall economic and international trade implications of merely repealing the 7% investment tax credit without providing for some other means of encouraging corporate expenditures for capital equipment.

Sincerely,

James H. Mack,
Manager, Public Affairs.

Reynolds Metals Co.,
Richmond, Va., July 18, 1969.

Hon. Charles H. Percy,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Chuck: The new directions which tax policy discussion is taking make it highly desirable to reconsider the relevance and wisdom of the proposed repeal of the investment tax credit to present conditions and needs. The necessity to strengthen the dollar in world markets continues to be of paramount importance to the nation's economic welfare. Repeal of the investment credit would weaken the dollar internationally, insofar as it puts those industries which must compete internationally at a cost disadvantage as against the foreign competitors.

Since repeal of the investment credit was proposed, labor, financing, and other costs have continued to rise here. Foreign manufacturers continue to enjoy some cost advantages, including a wide array of tax incentives and low cost financing. Consequently, now more than ever before, industries which must compete in the world markets need the investment tax credit to prevent their international market position from becoming even weaker. And the less American industry is able to compete overseas, the weaker the dollar would become. A weaker overseas dollar would hurt the domestic economy in many ways, including the efforts to stem inflation.

The repeal of the investment credit would be especially unfair to the domestic aluminum industry. The U.S. industry must compete worldwide more than the vast majority of industries, both for raw materials and markets.

Aluminum is also an advanced technology industry, requiring continuous and substantial investment in better facilities to keep cost and prices as low as possible and yet be able to pay relatively high wages and provide increasing employment. To stay technologically competitive requires advanced planning, as well as large scale financial commitments for inter-related facilities. With world aluminum markets growing, the domestic aluminum industry must either continue to participate in the growth or decline. It cannot stand still. Consequently, Reynolds Metals, as well as its foreign and domestic competitors, are in the midst of large-scale capacity expansion and facility improvement programs. All of our current plant investment programs are designed to provide overdue improvement or "missing links" in our existing facilities. They cannot be abandoned, or even delayed, without seriously damaging the ability of our present facilities to compete effectively and to provide jobs. The failure to take these facts into account with respect to aluminum and similar capital investive essential industries would both hurt the individual companies and the health of the U.S. economy generally.

If, despite the foregoing, Congress should decide to repeal the investment credit, it should make provision for those basic industries, such as aluminum, where expansion is expensive and requires various types of inter-dependent facilities that take several years to complete. In our company we are in the midst of such a program for which we borrowed several hundred million dollars. Different facilities are at different stages, such as drawing of plans, land purchase, equipment orders, and building construction, and many of these expenditures which must be made in connection with projects already started are not subject to the investment credit under the termination language recently passed by the House. Unless the termination language is amended and its scope enlarged by the Senate, a number of our basic industries will be unable to apply the investment credit to facets of multiple projects already substantially completed.

Sincerely yours,

R. S. Reynolds, Jr.,
Chairman of the Board.

Arrow Gear Co.,
Downers Grove, Ill., June 25, 1969.

Re 7% Investment Credit.
Hon. Charles H. Percy,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Percy: Thank you for your letter asking for comments on this matter.

We fully agree that this is an inappropriate tool for short-run economic stabilization. The very nature of the problem of purchasing fixed assets for use over a long period of time does not lend itself to tampering with the tax provisions.

In a small business such as ours, we cannot weigh the various factors in an equipment purchase as accurately as can a large corporation. The main elements get all the consideration. Naturally, one of the principle factors is the tax aspects. Should this factor keep changing from time to time, we are put in the position of making major business decisions without the necessary facts.

Investment credit helps us both in the purchasing of machines and the selling of parts which are used by machine tool builders. This, no doubt, contributes to inflationary pressures. It would seem, however, that we must decide basically what we are trying to do with this investment credit. As you point out, the purpose was to insure plant modernization and purchases of productive equipment in order to place us in a more competitive position in world trade. This is particularly critical in view of the great disparity between the wages paid in this country compared to wages paid in Japan and Europe.

A decision on investment credits should be made on its own merits, without reference to inflation control. Once the legislation is enacted, it should be left alone without being changed periodically.

I appreciate you having asked my views and give permission for printing this in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

Frank E. Pielsticker,
President.

R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.,
Winston-Salem, N.C., June 27, 1969.

Hon. Charles H. Percy,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Percy: R. J. Reynolds is opposed to the repeal of the 7% investment tax credit. We believe the investment credit has proved to be a valid tool for stimulating the continuing modernization of the nation's production facilities. Such modernization has reduced total net manufacturing cost. Lower manufacturing cost is a deterrent to inflation and makes it possible for U.S. manufacturers to continue to effectively compete in foreign markets. The foreign countries which have made the most economic progress in the last decade wholeheartedly endorse the investment credit concept.

In our opinion your contention that more realistic and rapid depreciation schedules are needed is indeed correct. Schedules that fully reflect the fact of rapid technological obsolescence would provide some of the funds necessary for American industry to continue to combat rising production costs and to remain competitive in the world market.

We do not believe the investment credit should be expanded to cover all depreciable property, plus additions to inventory and accounts receivable.

Expansion, per se, does not necessarily enable industry to produce at a lower cost, which is the purpose and result of the investment tax credit on production facilities. However, the Government's economic policies should stimulate savings, so that expansion financing can come from individuals and financial institutions.

Thank you for asking our opinion. You have our permission to print this reply in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

A. H. Galloway.

Telegraph Savings & Loan Association,
Chicago, Ill., June 27, 1969.

Hon. Charles H. Percy,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Percy: Thank you for transmitting to me the information on the investment tax credit together with your views.

The 7% investment tax credit is, in my opinion, an inappropriate tool for short run economic stabilization. I am not sure that it should have been enacted in the first place, but contrary to the opinion of many of my fellow Republicans, I believe that the tax credit should be repealed.

Since early 1966, a few respected economists and money managers have been telling us to take steps to cool off the over-heated economy. Mr. Martin from the Federal Reserve was nearly tarred and feathered when he finally, against the wishes of the Admin-

XUM

istration, took action in late 1966. Mr. Herbert Prochnow of Chicago, reported in December 1966, upon his return from a visit with the heads of most of the European central banks, that the head of the Italian Bank and German Bank had taken drastic action when they realized that inflation was beginning, their results were effective. As we know, inflation in Germany is slight and their currency strong. We too, here in this country, must be willing to take monetary action when necessary even though such action may be at the time politically unpopular.

It is my impression that the 7% tax credit is better utilized by the largest of our corporations who are able to obtain funds today, whereas the small corporations find no credit available even at high rates.

The major point made by you and other members of my party are important and must also be given much weight. I also believe strongly that our products for export must be competitive in world markets. It is inflation, however, that is the problem not our corporate tax rate.

I usually agree with you, Senator Percy, but am sorry that it can't be 100% this time. Thanks again for asking my opinion.

Very truly yours,

Wm. E. Strasser.

Note.—This letter may be used at the discretion of the Senator.

Commonwealth Edison Co.,
Chicago, Ill., June 30, 1969.

Hon. Charles H. Percy,
U.S. Senate.
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Percy: We welcome the opportunity to comment on the investment tax credit.

We agree with you that the nation's industry should be encouraged to modernize its productive plant through automation, the purchase of new equipment, and the updating of existing facilities. The investment tax credit is such an encouragement. It has played an important part in making American industry more productive and more competitive in international trade. We also support your view that more realistic tax depreciation schedules would provide important inducements for modernization. In my opinion, these things are vital to create a long-run, healthy economic climate in America. Your advocacy of measures such as these in the Joint Economic Committee and in Congress has our appreciation and complete endorsement.

Checking inflation is certainly of paramount importance and we would support sacrificing the investment tax credit were it to make a material contribution to that end. But we doubt that killing the credit will have the desired effect, in view of the long lead-times characteristic of planning for large-scale plant investment. If, however, the prevailing judgment is different, then we urge suspension rather than repeal. We recognize the arguments against on-again, off-again use of the investment tax credit, but we believe, for the reasons already stated, that its retention as a permanent part of the country's tax structure is desirable, even if it is inapplicable during certain periods.

If the Congress determines that the national interest requires repeal or suspension of the investment tax credit, as the impending vote on the House Ways and Means Committee proposal indicates it may, a serious inequity in that proposal should in any event be cured. The transition rules in the current legislation provide for decreasing the investment tax credit applicable to equipment already ordered but placed in service after December 31, 1970, in a series of steps, with a zero credit applicable to equipment installed after December 31, 1974. Obviously, the proposed reduction in the credit can have no function in checking investment already firmly committed and can, therefore, serve no significant purpose in checking the current rate of inflation. This discrimination bears especially hard on the utility industry, which must make plant commitments as to major portions of its investment five to seven years in advance and which has made such commitments based on economic parameters including the investment tax credit.

Earlier this year, when the Ways and Means Committee of the House was considering action on the investment tax credit, we wrote to the Committee setting forth the views expressed above in somewhat greater detail, and also pointing out the importance of avoiding a discriminatory withdrawal of the credit by denying it to certain industries—in particular electric utilities—while allowing it to others. A copy of our communication to the Ways and Means Committee is enclosed.

You have our permission to print this letter and the enclosure in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely yours,

Gordon R. Corey,
Chairman, Finance Committee.

Commonwealth Edison Co.,
Chicago, Ill., May 21, 1969.

Mr. John M. Martin, Jr.,
Chief Counsel, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Martin: This letter is submitted in connection with the Committee on Ways and Means hearing on the repeal of the investment tax credit.

We feel strongly that any action taken with respect to the investment tax credit should be applied across the board. It has been occasionally argued that electric power company investments are governed by consumer requirements and are, therefore, not responsive to a special investment tax credit. This is not true because the plant modernization programs of the electric power industry are especially sensitive to changes in taxes and other capital costs. Consequently, we especially urge that electric power industry not be singled out for repeal of the credit.

As to the broader questions of repeal or retention, repeal or suspension, and possible retention of special credits for anti-pollution facilities and the like, we feel that the Ways and Means Committee itself is best able to weigh the broad fiscal consequences which must govern these decisions. On balance we favor suspension over outright repeal because we believe that over the long pull the investment credit is a desirable antidote for the "drag" on plant modernization produced by the corporate federal income tax.

A more detailed statement of the reasons for our position on these matters is attached hereto. We respectfully request the inclusion of this letter and the attached statement in the printed record of the hearings.

Respectfully submitted,

Gordon R. Corey,
Chairman, Finance Committee.

Household Finance Corp.,
Chicago, Ill., June 26, 1969.

Hon. Charles H. Percy,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator: It is a pleasure to respond to your recent letter regarding the proposal to repeal the 7% investment tax credit. We concur wholeheartedly that "the very nature of the 7-percent investment tax credit makes it an inappropriate tool for short-run economic stabilization." Therefore, its suspension at this time as a part of the proposal to extend the surtax on corporate and personal incomes is unsound and should be opposed.

We feel strongly that the Administration should take every reasonable step to stem the tide of inflation. The continuance of the surtax and the excise and other taxes which would otherwise expire are a wholly appropriate method of doing so. This is necessary to complement appropriate stems by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to retard the increase in total monetary credit. At this juncture, it is also imperative that Federal expenditures—both in the defense and non-defense areas—be held to the lowest possible level. It is particularly important to restrain the growth of non-defense expenditures until the termination or deceleration of hostilities in Viet Nam makes possible a substantial reduction in defense expenditures.

We believe that realistic depreciation schedules should become a part of the tax modernization program being considered currently by the House Ways and Means Committee, and in due course by the Senate and its appropriate committees. We hope that realistic depreciation allowances and other measures to improve the long-range competitive position of American industry vis-a-vis the rest of the world, will have your most serious consideration and study. Such thorough study may disclose preferable alternatives to the investment tax credit. However, whatever provisions are enacted should be permanent and should not be utilized as a tool for short-run stabilization of the economy.

We have no objection to your insertion of this reply in the Congressional Record.

Respectfully,

W. D. Hendry.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY'S LETTER OF MAY 21, 1969

1. *The electric power industry should not be singled out for repeal or suspension of the investment tax credit.*

Critics of the investment tax credit as it applies to electric power companies have argued that investments by these companies are largely governed by consumer requirements and are subject to regulated service charges designed to provide a prescribed after-tax rate of return on investment and, therefore, would not be especially responsive to an investment tax credit.

In reality, the investment tax credit probably has a greater incentive value to the electric power industry than to most other businesses. Technological changes in the electric power business have been among the most dramatic in industry. For example, Commonwealth Edison alone has committed over $900 million to nuclear power plant construction and fuel. Furthermore, the electric power business is among the most capital intensive in American industry. An electric power company must invest at least $4 in plant and equipment to produce $1 of annual revenue. In contrast, in many other businesses, $1 invested in plant and equipment will produce as much as from $4 to $8 of annual revenue. Thus, the investment tax credit has been a significant factor in enabling electric power companies to build modern and efficient facilities earlier than they would otherwise be built.

In addition, the investment tax credit, like any other tax reduction, has a direct effect upon the level of electric rates. It reduces either rate base (in jurisdictions like ours) or current operating costs (in some other jurisdictions), thus in either case directly reducing charges to customers.

2. *Suspension of the credit is preferable to repeal.*

When the investment tax credit became law in 1962, it clearly was intended to be a permanent part of our tax system. When first proposed by President Kennedy, he stated "I believe this investment tax credit will become a useful and continuous part of our tax structure." This position was reiterated

XUM

by Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon in hearings before the Senate Committee on Finance in 1962 when he stated: "The arguments I have made for the credit clearly reveal that such legislation must be a permanent part of our tax code if we are to meet foreign competition. . . ."

Since its adoption, the investment tax credit has been effective in improving the investment climate, has increased cash flow and cut the cost of capital for American industry. In doing so, it has enabled industry to offset rising costs by encouraging the modernization of old inefficient facilities and the development of new products, processes and services. All of this has led to increased national productivity and an increasing capability to compete effectively in world markets.

In short, to repeal rather than suspend an effective and important tool in assuring a long-run healthy economic climate for our nation would be a serous mistake."

3. *Special problems of the electric power business.*

The cost of capital for electric power companies and their needs for capital are both rising very rapidly. Tight money, higher and higher tax burdens, and the increasing demands for reducing the impact of operations on air, water and the landscape are exerting unprecedented cost pressures on the electric power companies.

Despite these special problems, electric power companies in general over the years have been successful in holding down the cost of their services. In fact, the cost of electricity is less today than it was during the depression days of the thirties. Thus, the electric power industry has made significant contributions in helping check inflation in the nation's economy.

Repeal or suspension of the investment tax credit, without some offsetting tax relief such as reduction or elimination of efforts to continue this record in the future.

REGENSTEINER PUBLISHING ENTERPRISES, INC.,
June 27, 1969.

Subject: Investment Credit.
Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: I have seen your letter of June 16 on this subject and I can tell you as Treasurer of Regensteiner Publishing Enterprises I am very much concerned about plans in Congress to terminate the 7% Investment Credit.

The basic idea under which this form of business incentive was implemented hasn't changed. The credit is given to industry not only to avoid recession and to make sure that the manufacturing of capital goods will be continued but also to help manufacturers to modernize their equipment without burdening the consumer with the full cost of this modernization.

Today's dynamic economy and evolution of all sorts of equipment in utilizing the latest developments of science and technology require consistent changes and replacement of equipment. Without this, American industry will fall behind our foreign competition and the updating of production tools is the most efficient way the American manufacturer will be able to compensate for the permanent increase of wages. Therefore the improvement of equipment in the long run will be helpful in stopping inflation.

Proponents of the termination of the Investment Credit emphasize their belief that the reduction of capital spending will be a factor in stopping inflation. This is not true. Reducing the manufacturing of capital goods may reduce the work force but will not prevent those earning more than they had previously spent from going into additional purchases and buying more than industry, with antiquated machinery, cal. produce, and thus inflation will not be stopped but fostered.

To stop inflation and to keep industry growing and competitive, it is necessary to maintain the investment credit and I shall appreciate everything you, dear Senator Percy, will do to maintain this tax benefit and help the struggling American industry to maintain the level of efficiency and quality that made our country great.

Certainly you are free to use this letter in any way you deem fit.

Assuring you of my full appreciation for the support you are giving Illinois industry, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
ERICH KERT,
Treasurer.

GREYHOUND LEASING & FINANCIAL CORP.,
Chicago, Ill., July 2, 1969.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We appreciate receiving your letter of June 16, 1969 in which you discussed the proposed repeal of the Investment Tax Credit and requested our advice regarding said repeal.

Greyhound Leasing & Financial Corporation (Greyhound Leasing) and its subsidiary Greyhound Computer Corporation (Greyhound Computer) fully endorse the views expressed in your letter and those contained in the policy statement of the Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress. Greyhound Leasing and Greyhound Computer have purchased and leased to their respective customers an aggregate of over $550,000,000 worth of new capital equipment since the inception of the Investment Tax Credit in 1962. Greyhound Leasing and Greyhound Computer have passed the benefits of the Investment Tax Credit earned on the aforementioned investment through to mostly small and medium size businesses in the form of lower rentals and have thereby enabled such businesses which could not otherwise have modernized their plants and facilities to do so and thereby remain or become competitive with larger domestic and foreign industries. In this manner, the Investment Tax Credit has been beneficial by stimulating competition which contributes to the stable growth of the Nation's economy. If the Investment Tax Credit is repealed not only will small and medium sized businesses be hampered in their ability to compete with larger domestic businesses, but all of United States industry and commerce will suffer in its competition with other countries in the world market.

As the United States' negative Balance of Payments continues it becomes all too clear that, in the long run, the only way United States industry can continue to compete in the world market is to keep its plants and equipment as modern and efficient as is humanly possible. If the Investment Tax Credit is repealed, it is our opinion that the Nation's ability to compete in the world market will be clearly diminished. In such a case, Congress could elect to protect United States industry from foreign competition by resorting to increased import tariffs and more rigid import quotas. To our way of thinking, however, such tariffs and quotas are an artificial means of treating this long term problem and will ultimately fail because they treat the symptom and not the disease. It is our feeling that within a short period of time after the repeal of the Investment Tax Credit, Congress will not only be asked to reinstate the Credit but may also be asked to increase the size and scope of the Credit.

It has been our experience that the short term cyclical fluctuations in the United States economy can best be controlled by temporary changes in income tax rates and by the exercise of the powers granted to the monetary authorities. The Investment Tax Credit was designed to solve a long term problem, i.e., the maintenance of modern plants and equipment capable of competing favorably in the world market. As such, we feel the Investment Tax Credit is not an appropriate tool for use in controlling the short term problem of the inflation now being suffered by the United States and in fact should not be so used.

It should be pointed out here that we have no objection to the Investment Tax Credit also being used as a tool to channel capital funds to areas of social need and in fact we would support such a plan. However, such a plan should not be adopted in lieu of the present Investment Tax Credit, for ultimately any permanent social improvement in the United States will have to depend on the stability and growth of the United States economy and its ability to compete in the world market.

Thank you for inviting us to express ourselves on this subject. We hope that our views may be of some use to you and your colleagues in your attempt to reach a correct decision with regard to the Investment Tax Credit. Your decision will undoubtedly have a serious and long range effect on the economy of our Country. If you deem it appropriate, you may feel free to print this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Very truly yours,
W. CARROLL BUMPERS,
President.

KENNECOTT COPPER CORP.,
New York, N.Y., July 3, 1969.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
Senator from Illinois,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: Your thoughtful letter of June 16 affords a most welcome opportunity to express Kennecott Copper Corporation's point of view on the proposal to repeal the investment tax credit.

We, of course, share your concern over the inflationary trends evident in the national economy today. And we agree that governmental action is a vital part of any broad-based solution to the problem.

For a number of reasons, however, we also concur with your stand that repeal of the investment credit is not an appropriate anti-inflationary device.

1. As it affects much of the mining industry, repeal of the tax credit would actually have an inflationary effect. As we told Kennecott shareholders at our May annual meeting:

"The investment tax credit has provided the industry an incentive to invest in mining plant and equipment, with resultant additional production of minerals and metals. Shortages of needed minerals and metals are a basic reason for price inflation in the minerals industry today. Additional, not reduced, investment incentives are needed to fight inflation under these conditions."

2. When the investment credit was first enacted in 1962 to help make our depreciation system more competitive with liberal practices overseas, American industry was assured that the credit was to be a permanent feature. In early 1962, former Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon said:

"I consider our program of depreciation reform—including the investment credit—a central part of our economic policy . . . The achievement of this objective . . . requires both the investment tax credit and the faster write-offs that would be permitted under depreciation policies, which, in broader recognition of the increasing importance of obsolescence in the postwar world, would permit American firms to assume shorter tax lives for depreciable property."

3. Careful study should be given to the events of 1966 when the Administration was successful in achieving a temporary suspension of the tax credit. The original plan called

XUM

for withholding the credit for a period of 16 months. But after 5 months when other forces were causing a slowdown in the economy, the credit was not only reinstated, but liberalized. The result of this ill-advised experiment was to burden business and government with expensive and unproductive record-keeping and auditing problems.

Repeal of the tax credit will result in a deceleration of industrial expansion only after a considerable period of time in view of the long-range spending plans of business, at which time it may be necessary again to stimulate the economy and it is probable that the credit will be proposed again as such a stimulant with the burdensome results as set forth above. This lag in effectiveness clearly illustrates that the credit is highly unsuitable as a contracyclical device.

4. Perhaps most importantly, we are concerned about the impact repeal of the tax credit would have on the future ability of the American mining industry to meet the nation's steadily growing demand for minerals. By the year 2000, requirements for copper in the United States are expected to quadruple; iron and coal demand to double; and aluminum demand to be almost six times what it is today. Assistant Secretary of the Interior Hollis M. Dole recently acknowledged that meeting such demands "will require billions of dollars in investment and development." And he warned that "if due significance isn't given to the real value of our mineral industry today, the mineral shortages of the future could well become a social problem."

Since the mining industry is unusually capital intensive, repeal of the tax credit will severely restrict the industry's ability to accomplish its mission in support of the nation's burgeoning economy.

5. The same point must be considered in the broader context of America's total industrial productive facilities. As Joel Barlow emphasizes in his May 23, 1969, letter (copy attached) to House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur Mills, statutory changes are required in the tax law to provide the depreciation system necessary to assure the desirable growth, modernization and competitiveness of U.S. productive capability. Until such changes are accomplished, maintenance of the investment tax credit is essential.

6. Linkage of the tax credit repeal proposal with eventual removal of the income tax surcharge may be good politics, but it is neither good arithmetic nor good economics. Treasury officials estimate that the revenue loss from reduction of the surcharge would amount to $1.9 billion in the fiscal year 1970. The revenue gain from repeal of the investment credit would be $1.8 billion . . . almost balancing out the loss.

We believe that extension of the surcharge would be a more effective restraint to inflation. Repeal of the investment tax credit may well serve to accomplish just the opposite.

If, in your judgment, this statement may be of assistance, please feel free to insert it in the Congressional Record.

Very truly yours,

FRANK MILLIKEN.

LETTER TO HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE ON THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSAL TO REPEAL THE 7 PERCENT INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT, BY JOEL BARLOW, WASHINGTON, D.C., ATTORNEY (OFFICIAL TEXT)

MAY 23, 1969.

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: My position on the 7% investment credit and on tax credits generally is set out at some length in my testimony before this Committee in 1961 [1] and 1966 [2] and in my testimony before the Senate Finance Committee in 1966 [3] and 1967.[4] In this statement I shall consider only certain general aspects of President Nixon's proposal to repeal the 7% credit.

It is my view that tax credits for investment and other business expenditures can be justified, if at all, only as emergency and transitional measures to correct deficiencies in the tax structure on a temporary basis. For example, in another war requiring expansion of facilities, a tax credit might well serve as a substitute for the 60-month amortization allowed in World War II and during the Korean War. The deficiencies in the depreciation tax structure in 1961 were ample justification for the enactment of the 7% credit as a temporary, transitional measure. Its continuance today has the same justification.

I am entirely in accord with the views you and Mr. Byrnes have heretofore expressed that as a general rule tax credits should not be grafted on the tax structure with the principal purpose of bringing about social and economic change; and that acceptance and adoption of the tax credit device as a matter of policy will inevitably lead to a proliferation of tax credit and an unwarranted and unnecessary erosion of the tax base.

You will understand then that I am opposing the proposed repeal of the 7% investment credit at this time only because the Treasury has suggested no alternatives, and this particular credit has proved to be necessary on a transitional basis to compensate partially at least for the obvious deficiencies in our depreciation tax structure. This structure, which is largely written into regulations and not the Code, is so full of uncertainties and unreasonable restrictions such as the reserve ratio test that it is wholly inadequate to provide the assurance needed for the modernization, replacement and expansion of productive facilities.

It is so inferior to the capital recovery tax structures of other industrial nations that United States industry, already burdened with the highest labor costs in the world, is at a great disadvantage in trying to maintain its world markets and a favorable balance of trade and international payments.

We can label the 7% credit a tax "subsidy," as Mr. Nixon has done in his tax message urging repeal, and we can, as Americans, be opposed to all subsidies on principle; but we must not forget that the United States is no longer the self-contained and self-sufficient economic unit it once was, and if other nations subsidize investment to compete with us, we have little choice but to provide equivalents.

In 1934, President Roosevelt arbitrarily reduced capital recovery tax allowances to increase tax revenues [5] just as President Nixon now proposes to do in 1969 by repealing the investment credit.

So far reaching were President Roosevelt's 1934 disallowances that the industrial plant of the United States has not yet fully recovered from the obsolescence and higher cost production that resulted from the unwise and unrealistic depreciation policies and practices the Government required and business adopted after 1934.

Even at this late date, the United States has the highest percentage of overage, obsolescent production facilities of any of the leading industrial nations of the world.[6]

Despite the beneficial effects of the 7% credit, the liberalized Depreciation Guidelines, the 1954 accelerated depreciation methods, and the 60-month amortization allowances of the 1940's and the 1950's, the United States has not been able to do more than slowly narrow the gap. These remedial provisions have generally been too temporary and uncertain, or too hedged in with restrictions in both language and administration, to insure the modernization and replacement of productive facilities that is so sorely needed.

It is clear that the United States will not be able to close the obsolescence gap until it adopts a permanent, integrated capital recovery tax structure that is as liberal and realistic as the tax structures of the other principal industrial nations. One searches in vain the language of President Nixon's tax message and the recent testimony of Treasury officials to find any recognition of the need for this high priority legislation.

At a time when the United States' balance of trade is increasingly threatened, and we are faced with a critical and continuing imbalance in international payments, one would almost be certain that the new Administration would assign a high priority to the task of making our tax depreciation structure comparable to that of other nations, instead of giving it a low priority and further restricting it as Mr. Nixon proposes to do in repealing the 7% credit.

The Treasury recently has promised a further survey and study of depreciation, presumably to plant the thought that it may ultimately change course, and also, perhaps, to soften the blow of threatened repeal. But there is no assurance under the depreciation concepts that the Treasury has traditionally espoused, or under the present depreciation statute as interpreted by the courts, that such a survey will not lead to further restrictions.

In the past year Treasury officials have repeatedly stated that the survey material before them would seem to indicate that instead of proceeding to eliminate restrictions, such as the reserve ratio test, the Treasury should extend the depreciable lives of the Guidelines, and, in addition, make the accelerated depreciation methods available only to those corporations that are willing to use them for financial reporting purposes.

The prospects then for some permanent change and improvement in the tax structure simply as a kind of quid pro quo for the loss of the investment credit are not very encouraging, to say the least, unless the tax-writing committees of Congress intervene. Thus, to keep any semblance of a competitive capital recovery tax structure, industry must, until such intervention comes, cling to the credit on a transitional basis.

---

[1] Hearings on the President's 1961 Tax Recommendations before the Committee on Ways and Means, May 12, 1961, Volume 2, pp. 983–1006.

[2] Hearings on the President's Proposal on Suspension of the Investment Credit before the Committee on Ways and Means (H.R. 17607), September 14, 1966, pp. 208–231.

[3] Hearings on Suspension of Investment Credit before the Senate Finance Committee (H.R. 17607), October 5, 1966, pp. 106–139.

[4] Hearings on Incentives for Investment in Urban Poverty Areas before the Senate Finance Committee (S. 2088 and S. 2100), September 14, 1967.

[5] T.D. 4422, XIII–1 Cum. Bull. 58 (February 28, 1934); Mim. 4170, XIII–1 Cum. Bull. 59 (April 4, 1934). President Roosevelt effected this reduction by lengthening the depreciable lives of facilities through the issuance of Treasury Decision 4422 and the controversial Bulletin F schedule of much longer depreciable lives. President Kennedy supplanted Bulletin F with the Depreciation Guidelines in 1962 which substantially shortened depreciable lives and liberalized depreciation allowances.

[6] 1969 Survey of McGraw-Hill, Inc.

After two proposals in the last three years to suspend and repeal the credit, it should finally be clear to industry, however, that the investment credit can be regarded as nothing more than a temporary transitional measure. It is really nothing more than an interim expedient to tide over capital-intensive industry to the day when the Government will recognize (1) that competitive and adequate investment allowances are not necessarily subsidies, and (2) that different kinds of income have to be taxed in different ways at different times depending on the risks and the national interest that may be involved.

Of course, industry's endorsement of the 7% credit in 1961 as a permanent solution was understandable. President Kennedy had made it clear that none of the alternatives suggested at the time by industry would be considered; and Treasury officials, with the best of intentions, had promised that the credit would be permanent. Industry's defense of the credit today is also understandable simply because the Administration has given no assurance that there will be any permanent improvement of any kind, such as the elimination of the reserve ratio test.

It has become increasingly clear from the rigid position taken by the Nixon Administration that just so long as business persists in its unrealistic view of the 7% credit as a long-range permanent measure, and shuts its eyes to the vulnerability of the credit to political and economic change, just so long will the enactment of an adequate capital recovery tax structure be postponed.

The Nixon Administration has now reiterated all the arguments for proposing repeal in 1969 that the Johnson Administration advanced in proposing suspension in 1966. And all of these arguments, such as the alleged inflationary impact of the credit, have been rebutted in 1969, just as they were in 1966. Nevertheless, the credit is almost certain to be repealed in 1969 without regard to the merits, just as it was suspended in 1966.

This would seem to be proof positive that in its present form at least the credit stands directly in the way of the kind of permanent allowances that are needed to keep American industry competitive. If it were not for the dire economic consequences that are certain to result from repeal, elimination of the credit might be considered a blessing.

When the investment credit was originally proposed in 1961, I opposed it in testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means, principally on the ground that both as a contracyclical device and a politically vulnerable tax subsidy, it would be turned off and on; and that, accordingly, it lacked the permanence required to shore up our tax structure and encourage long-range industrial planning for modernization, replacement and expansion.

I purposely did not testify before the Senate Finance Committee in 1961 to oppose the tax credit there because President Kennedy and the Congressional leaders had made it very clear after the House hearings that none of the alternatives I had recommended to this Committee would be adopted; that it was either the investment credit or nothing.

Also, the original draft of the credit provision as submitted by the Treasury had been greatly improved and, among other changes, the progressive rates and the complicated, inequitable tie-in with depreciation allowances had been eliminated. In addition, the Treasury had responded to my earlier criticism in my testimony before this Committee by giving repeated assurances that the credit was not to be considered just a contracyclical measure or manipulative device, but instead a permanent part of our tax depreciation structure. We had the Treasury's word on that in 1961 and again in 1966 and 1967.

The Treasury said that the credit was not a spigot, as I had described it, to be turned off and on with every shift in the political and economic winds.

Actually, these were assurances that the Treasury could not give, but they did suggest that the credit might enjoy some longevity. However, as we all know, four years after the credit was enacted, it was suspended in 1966 as a contracyclical measure. In 1967 it was hastily reinstated to counter the unintended consequences of the 1966 suspension. And now, two years later, a Republican administration proposes to repeal this Democratic measure as a contracyclical move, and also to get rid of what Mr. Nixon has described in his tax message as an unwarranted and unneeded tax subsidy to business with a relatively low priority in terms of revenue needs.

No thoughtful person will disagree with the high tax priorities that must be given to the demands of the Vietnam War, inflation and the pressing needs of our cities. But it seems very clear that the Administration handicaps itself in trying to meet these demands by giving no priority or any recognition to tax changes that are urgently required to keep the United States competitive in world markets, improve our critical balance of trade and international payments and maintain a sound dollar.

Quite understandably, depreciation and other technical tax allowances for business investment seldom if ever enjoy a very high priority in the public mind or in the world of politics. It is only when the President or the Committee on Ways and Means, or both, provide the necessary leadership to educate the public and the Congress, as they did in 1961 and 1954, that major improvements can be made in the tax depreciation structure.

At a time when the public is somewhat understandably emotional about tax reform, it is easy to discredit business investment allowances in the public mind, no matter how essential they may be to the nation's economic health, by labeling them tax subsidies, tax preferences and tax loopholes.

The much more difficult task that is so essential at the moment is to make the public and the Congress understand that it is not in the national interest in this competitive world to put further restrictions on investment in industrial facilities, or to postpone any longer the enactment of an improved and realistic depreciation tax structure.

What are some of the changes that are so urgently needed?

1. Revision of Section 167(a) of the Internal Revenue Code to permit the elimination of the reserve ratio test from the Depreciation Guidelines. This test is so restrictive and so complex that it has discouraged many taxpayers, particularly small taxpayers, from using the Depreciation Guidelines. If the test is not eliminated, its application will give rise once again to the wasteful and needless controversies in which Revenue agents use hindsight to try to lengthen depreciable lives.

2. Enactment into law of the Depreciation Guidelines (minus the reserve ratio test) on the model of the Canadian system. At the present time too large a part of our depreciation tax structure is embodied only in regulations of uncertain tenure. Statutory permanence is required to provide assurance for long-range planning for modernization, replacement and expansion of facilities.

3. Revision of Section 1245 of the Code to tax fully the gain on the disposition of real property as well as personal property at normal and surtax rates subject only to the exceptions and limitations of Section 1245(b).

4. Elimination of the present requirement that salvage value be established. After amendment of Section 1245 as proposed, the salvage value requirement will no longer be essential or even important to minimize tax avoidance. Needless controversies with Revenue agents over salvage value will come to an end.

5. Revision of Section 179 of the Code to eliminate the dollar limitation on the additional first-year depreciation allowance, and to increase the rate of the allowance to 15% upon the repeal of the 7% investment credit.

6. Retention of the 7% investment credit until such time as the changes in items 1 through 5, *supra*, have been adopted or until the effective tax rates on corporations and individuals are reduced below 50%. Repeal of the 7% investment credit when it takes place should not be on a selective basis.

Respectfully,

JOEL BARLOW.

CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION,
H. D. HUDSON MANUFACTURING CO.,
Chicago, Ill., June 27, 1969.

Senator CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your letter of June 16, 1969, requesting an expression of opinion regarding the proposed repeal of the 7% Investment Tax Credit, presently extended to U.S.A. Industry.

I would consider such a repeal definitely detrimental to the development and progress of American Industry. With the numerous direct and indirect taxes which industry must pay, it is essential that project planning be done well in advance of actual execution. Planning based on a cost factor reflecting this investment tax credit becomes immediately obsolete, and furthermore, executing of these plans being more expensive, will eventually have to be reflected in higher unit prices, contributing rather than restraining inflationary tendencies. Plans for expansion and improvement of industrial facilities are a constant task, not one that can be turned on or off, at the inclination of a group of individuals.

You state so correctly that "unit cost must be held down in order for U.S. Industry to better compete with industries in other Nations."

The tendency prevails that industry, rightly or wrongly, is held responsible for an unfavorable balance of payment. Yet, as a person who has been active in international trade for approximately 4 decades, it is still difficult for me to understand why the exporting fraternity receives so little consideration in the form of tax incentives, or other tangible help, which other governments do extend to their export industries, either directly or indirectly.

These, in a few words, are my basic feelings, and it must be understood that I speak only for myself and not for anyone else in the company, or for the company itself, which employs me. I have no objection to having this reply printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely,

G. M. RAPPICH,
Staff Manager, International Operations.

AUTO DRIVEAWAY CO.,
Chicago, Ill., June 26, 1969.

Re investment tax credit.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: I have received your form letter relative to the investment tax credit. Personally I believe that it is a very good thing for business, and it serves a good purpose. I think, however, that it should be repealed at the present time, because of the hectic situation we are in, the inflationary spiral, and the huge overseas deficit we are running.

If you members of the Senate would cut federal spending so the budget would show a reasonably large excess each year; and if you members of the Senate would cut out

XUM

overseas expenditures such as Foreign Aid, then I believe we could afford to have the investment tax credit given to industry.

I am a small business man and there have been a few occasions where we have been able to take advantage of the investment tax credit, therefore, we would like to see it remain on the books, but I am first of all an American, and we believe that the over-riding considerations today have to be a surplus in our Federal Budget, the elimination of the huge inflationary spiral, and a favorable balance payment in our international accounts.

I don't like to be so blunt, but I honestly feel that the trouble on the above could be laid at the doorstep of the Senate, who have repeatedly voted larger expenditures than the House, and I honestly feel that the Senate should start to cut back on expenditures so the investment tax credit can be reinstated at a future date.

You have asked if we would give permission to print this reply in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have no objections. This is not meant to be a critical letter, it reflects my honest thinking and I appreciate the opportunity to express my views.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. SOHL,
President.

DVORAK BUICK CO.,
Cicero, Ill., June 26, 1969.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: Your letter of June 16th and the statement of the Republican views contain strong and realistic facts supporting the retention of the 7% investment tax credit.

The small businessman who operates on a small profit (as per cent of sales) needs this tax credit. This year especially profits for small businesses are under great pressure. Real Estate, Personal Property, and Social Taxes are higher and are climbing. Demands from hard to replace employees are beyond the employers ability to pay. Every item of expense is up sharply.

In order to purchase expensive pieces of equipment the small operator must deplete his cash or borrow at these high rates. To the small business the 7% investment tax credit is a substantial help. Equipment is being replaced constantly. The small business needs the 7% tax credit in order to continue to employ people.

I would like to see you and your colleagues adhere to the Republican views and work against the repeal of the 7% investment tax credit. You have my permission to print this reply in the Congressional Record.

Yours very truly,

JERRY W. DVORAK,
President.

MARCOR,
Chicago, Ill., June 26, 1969.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: I have your letter of June 16 in which you ask for advice on the investment tax credit. The following statements are made as an individual businessman and not as a representative of company opinion.

I have always believed that the 7 percent investment tax credit should never have been instituted in the first place. To me it represents a subsidy to business which corporations should avoid with a vengeance. We cannot, in effect, talk out of both sides of our mouths.

American industry always has and should continue to be ingenious enough to improve its capital investments without requiring a special subsidy.

It is maintained that the 7 percent investment credit contributed to the improved efficiency of American business by encouragement of investment in modern equipment. I personally question this assumption. However, I strongly recommend that Congress give consideration to more realistic and rapid depreciation schedules and much attention ought to be given to this factor even to the extent of eliminating all restrictions on depreciation. This suggestion has far reaching implications I realize, however, from the standpoint of cash flow, it would contribute greatly to industry in the area of replacement of obsolete equipment sooner than present depreciation restrictions permit.

I have no objection to your printing my reply in the Congressional Record.

Cordially,

CARL BLUMENSCHEIN.

DICKS VENDING SERVICE,
Aurora, Ill., June 27, 1969.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: I certainly appreciate your interest in this vital matter of investment credit.

As a small businessman I am feeling the ever increasing pressure of price and wage increases. In our particular type of business it is extremely difficult to pass price increases on to our customers. As a result, in order to expand our business in a sound and profitable manner we are heavily dependent on investment credit to assist us in making a profit.

The repeal of the investment credit would be of such great significance to our company, we could be forced to a decision of liquidating our company to one of the nationally operating companies that continually try to acquire companies of our type.

I urge you to support our position to maintain the investment credit.

Thank you for our continued efforts on our behalf.

Respectfully,

RICHARD A. BAKALA,
President.

P.S.—You have my permission to print this reply in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE EDUCATION OF CONGRESS AND OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, from time to time, either by direct statements or indirect reference, Members of this and the other body of Congress have insinuated that the officers of our armed services are not particularly well educated. This, I believe, is all a part of the antimilitary posture of those who see dire evil in the so-called military-industrial complex. I have been interested in these remarks because when I served as a Reserve officer in the Personnel Headquarters of the Air Force I was in constant touch with the continuing efforts of the Air Force to upgrade education, not only in the officer forces, but in the enlisted forces, as well.

I have investigated the educational record of Members of the Senate and the House, and I have also obtained figures from the Air Force relative to the percentage of Air Force officers having college degrees. I offer the figure in statistical form below. I believe a reading of them by any Member of Congress should cause him to think twice before comparing the record of Congress in education with that of the Air Force or any other branch of the military.

While engaged in research on Congress, I thought it might be interesting to discover the percentage of law degrees held by Members of both bodies. I find 295 law degrees, or 58.9 percent of the total membership.

I ask unanimous consent that a breakdown on these figures and an interesting statement by Thomas Jefferson be printed in the RECORD. By inserting Jefferson's statement, I by no means indicate that I share his feelings; I merely point out that thought had been given to this subject long ago.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Republicans	Democrats	Total	Percentage
Senate: Law degrees:				
LL.B	23	37	60	60.0
LL.M	1	--------	1	1.0
J.D	1	5	6	6.0
Total	25	42	67	67.0
House: Law degrees:				
LL.B	78	129	207	48.0
LL.M		1	1	--------
J.D	13	1	20	--------
Total	91	131	228	53.0
Grand total, law degrees for both Houses			295	58.9

	Republicans	Democrats	Total	Percent
Senate:				
No college record	0	0	0	0
College, no degree	7	4	11	11
B.A. or B.S	8	6	14	14
M.A. or M.S	3	3	6	6
Ph. D	0	2	2	2
House:				
No college record	17	28	45	8.4
College, no degree	12	9	21	4.8
B.A. or B.S	49	53	102	23.6
M.A. or M.S	10	13	23	5.33
M.D	2	1	3	.7
B.D	2	0	2	.4
Ph. D	4	3	7	1.6

Percentage of Air Force officers with college degrees as of Nov. 21, 1968

BS	60
MS	12.6
Ph. D	5.5
No degree	21.9

NOTE.—These figures were supplied by the Air Force on Tuesday, July 22, and represent the latest figures available. Another report will be available in November, showing similar information on a more current basis.

THOMAS JEFFERSON. I served with General Washington in the legislature of Virginia, before the Revolution, and, during it, with Doctor Franklin in Congress. I never heard either of them speak ten minutes at a time, nor to any but the main point, which was to decide the question. They laid their shoulders to the great points, knowing that the little ones would follow of themselves. If the present Congress errs in too much talking, how can it be otherwise, in a body to which the people send one hundred and fifty lawyers, whose trade it is to question everything, yield nothing, and talk by the hour? That one hundred and fifty lawyers should do business together ought not to be expected.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING ASSISTANCE FOR VETERANS

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, on July 18 I introduced for myself and other

Senators S. 2668, a bill to amend chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional education and training assistance to veterans and to provide for a predischarge education program. This bill would establish a broad range of educational and training assistance benefits for preveterans preparatory to their undertaking education and training under the regular GI bill program after their discharge. Thus, we refer generally to this bill as the "Prep" bill.

As I indicated in my remarks on the 18th in explaining the provisions of the bill, my staff has been preparing a comprehensive table showing by States the location of all major military installations in the United States; the number of military personnel assigned there; the Department of Defense transition program contact on those bases participating in that program; the nearest city to the base; the average monthly separations at those bases participating in the transition program; and the nearest college—including junior colleges—university, or technical school to each base.

I indicated in my previous statement that such schools are located within an hour's drive of more than 91 percent of the bases listed. Upon completion of the table, I find that the actual figure is 98.8 percent; that is, as far as we can determine, there is an educational institution in the vicinity of all but five of the 423 bases listed. I think that these figures and the rest of the data in the table make abundantly clear the enormous potential that the prep program has for providing predischarged education to our servicemen in the last year of their active duty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJOR DOMESTIC MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

[*Indicates those presently participating in transition program]

Installation	Service branch	Number of military personnel as of June 30, 1968	Transition program contact	Nearest city	Monthly average separations as of April 1969 for transition program sites	Nearest college, university, or technical school
ALABAMA						
Anniston Army Depot	Army	28		Anniston		Harry M. Ayers State Technical Trade School.
*Fort McClellan	do	6,910	Malcolm S. Croker	do	137	Do.
*Redstone Arsenal	do	5,122	Paul R. Fisher	Huntsville	80	Oakwood College, University of Alabama in Huntsville, J. F. Drake Technical Trade School.
*Fort Rucker	do	11,555	William W. Smith	Dothan	427	Enterprise Junior College, Alabama Institute of Aviation Technology.
*Brookley Air Force Base	Air Force	465		Mobile		Carver State Technical School.
*Craig Air Force Base	do	2,220		Selma	19	William R. King State Technical Trade School
*Gunter Air Force Base	do	1,088		Montgomery		Alabama State College, Huntingdon College. Patterson State Technical Trade School.
*Maxwell Air Force Base	do	3,179		do	30	Do.
ALASKA (entire State served by University of Alaska extension)						
Fort Richardson	Army	6,507		Anchorage		Alaska Methodist University.
Fort Wainwright	do	5,237		Fairbanks		University of Alaska.
Fort Greeley	do	848		do		Do.
Adak Naval Station	Navy	1,772		Adak		University of Alaska extension.
Adak Naval Communications Station	do	171		do		Do.
Kodiak Naval Station	do	1,016		Kodiak		Kodiak Community College.
Kodiak Naval Communications Station	do	229		do		Do.
Eielson Air Force Base	Air Force	2,802		Fairbanks		University of Alaska.
Elmendorf Air Force Base	do	8,310		Anchorage		Anchorage Methodist University.
ARIZONA						
*Fort Huachua	Army	9,154	James W. Lewis	Tucson	150	University of Arizona Extension Center.
Navajo Army Depot	do	9		Flagstaff		Northern Arizona University.
*Yuma Proving Ground	do	2,259	Harold R. Loftus	Yuma		Arizona Western College.
Yuma Marine Corps Station	Air Force	8,083		Tucson	65	University of Aroizona.
*Davis Monthan Air Force Base	do	5,730		Glendale	37	Glendale Community College.
*Luke Air Force Base	do	2,946		do	16	Do.
*Williams Air Force Base	do	2,946		Chandler	16	Mesa Community College.
ARKANSAS						
Pine Bluff Arsenal	Army	85		Pine Bluff		Agricultural, Mechanical & Normal College.
*Blytheville Air Force Base	Air Force	2,703		Blytheville	158	Arkansas State University extension.
*Little Rock Air Force Base	do	6,168		Jacksonville	58	Little Rock University, Philander Smith College.
CALIFORNIA						
Fort Baker	Army	197		San Francisco		Numerous colleges, universities, and technical schools in the San Francisco area.
*Fort Irwin	do	2,157	Harold R. Hall	San Bernardino	77	San Bernardino Junior College.
*Fort MacArthur	do	1,220	Robert G. Rutt	San Pedro		California State College at Long Beach, Long Beach Junior College.
*Fort Ord	do	29,830	Frank D. Barnes	Monterey	1,161	Monterey Junior College.
Presidio of Monterey	do	1,115		do		Do.
Sacramento Army Depot	do	53		Sacramento		Sacramento Junior College, Sacramento State College, University of California at Davis.
*Presidio of San Francisco	do	4,648	Joseph W. Burke, Edwin Kelley	San Francisco	140	San Francisco area.
*Sharpe Army Depot	do	217	Joseph E. Cain, Jr	Lathrop	28	University of the Pacific, Stockton Junior College, Humphreys College.
Sierra Army Depot	do	158		Herlong		Susanville Junior College.
*Letterman Army Hospital	do	2,088	Bernadine Plamondon	San Francisco	82	San Francisco area.
*Oakland Army Terminal	do	7,041	Edward W. Rader	Oakland	230	Do.
Tracy Depot—Defense Supply Agency	do	30		Tracy		University of the Pacific, Stockton Junior College, Humphreys College.
Barstow Marine Corps Supply Center	Marines	1,128		Barstow		Barstow Junior College.
*Camp Pendleton (including hospital)	do	37,976	Lt. Col. C. C. Hossli	Oceanside	1,000	Oceanside Junior College.
China Lake Weapons Center	Navy	794		San Rafael		College of Marin.
El Centro Naval Air Facility	do	459		El Centro		Imperial Junior College.
Lemoore Naval Air Station	do	4,114		Lemoore		Visalia Junior College.
Moffett Field Naval Air Station	do	1,347		Mountain View		Stanford University, San Jose State College, San Jose City College.
Corona Weapons Laboratory	do	7		Corona		University of California at Riverside.
*El Toro Marine Corps Air Station	Marines	10,051	Maj. R. E. Loughridge	Santa Ana		Santa Ana Junior College.
*Long Beach Naval Station (including hospital, shipyard, and supply center).	Navy	1,848	Lt. Comdr. Harry J. Nelson	Long Beach	600	California State College at Long Beach National Technical Schools.

See footnote at end of table.

MAJOR DOMESTIC MILITARY INSTALLATIONS—Continued

[*Indicates those presently participating in transition program]

Installation	Service branch	Number of military personnel as of June 30, 1968	Transition program contact	Nearest city	Monthly average separations as of April 1969 for transition program sites	Nearest college, university, or technical school
CALIFORNIA—Continued						
Los Alamitos Naval Air Station	Navy	972		Los Alamitos		Do.
San Pedro Fuel Depot	do	245		San Pedro		California State College at Long Beach, National Technical Schools, Long Beach Junior College.
Monterey Graduate School	do	2,051		Monterey		Monterey Junior College.
Point Hueneme Construction Center	do	3,685		Oxnard		Ventura Junior College.
Point Mugu Missile Range	do	1,004		do		Do.
*San Diego Naval Station (all units, including Marine Corps Recruiting Depot, Ream Field Air Station, Coronado Amphibious Base, Training Center, Hospital, North Island Air Station).	do	49,396	Lt. Albert H. Benge	San Diego	750	University of California at San Diego, University of San Diego, San Diego State College, San Diego City College.
Alameda Naval Air Station	do	2,102		Alameda		San Francisco area.
Concord Weapons Station	do	154		Concord		Diablo Valley College.
Mare Island Naval Shipyard	do	3,921		Oakland		San Francisco area.
Oak Knoll Naval Hospital	do	1,254		do		Do.
San Francisco Naval Shipyard	do	333		San Francisco		Do.
*Treasure Island Naval Station and Marine Barracks.	Navy Marines	6,145	Lt. Comdr. Rhodell L. Holderby, Capt. W. L. Eberhardt, Jr.	do	1,500 450	San Francisco area.
Oakland Supply Center	Navy	174		Oakland		San Francisco area.
Skaggs Island Naval Security Station	do	375		Sonoma		Sonoma State College.
Stockton Naval Communications Station	do	495		Stockton		University of the Pacific, Humphreys College, Stockton Junior College.
Twenty-Nine Palms Marine Corps Base	Marines	1,982		Twenty-Nine Palms		
*Beale Air Force Base	Air Force	6,307		Marysville	54	Marysville Junior College.
*Castle Air Force Base	do	5,459		Merced		Merced Junior College.
*Edwards Air Force Base	do	3,756		Edwards	45	Lancaster Junior College.
*George Air Force Base	do	5,666		Victorville	82	Victorville Junior College.
*Hamilton Air Force Base	do	4,467		Novato	78	College of Marin.
*Los Angeles Air Force Station	do	1,368		Los Angeles	9	Numerous colleges, universities, and technical schools in Los Angeles area.
*March Air Force Base	do	6,016		Riverside	59	University of California at Riverside.
*Mather Air Force Base	do	5,743		Sacramento	42	Sacramento State College, University of California at Davis, Sacramento City College.
*McClellan Air Force Base	do	5,605		do	86	Sacramento City College, Sacramento State College.
*Norton Air Force Base	do	6,305		San Bernardino	54	San Bernardino Junior College.
*Oxnard Air Force Base	do	1,233		Oxnard	15	Ventura Junior College.
*Travis Air Force Base	do	12,623		Fairfield	197	Vallejo Junior College.
*Vandenberg Air Force Base	do	8,417		Lompoc	79	Santa Maria Junior College.
COLORADO						
*Fort Carson	Army	25,074	James M. Tolstrup	Colorado Springs	1,160	Colorado College, Western Technical Coll
*Fitzimmons Army Hospital	do	3,080	John Holt	Denver	177	University of Denver.
Pueblo Army Depot	do	24		Pueblo		Southern Colorado State College.
Rocky Mountain Arsenal	do	139		Denver		University of Denver.
*Air Force Accounting and Finance Center	Air Force	409		do		Do.
*Ent Air Force Base	do	4,275		Colorado Springs	51	Colorado College.
*Lowry Air Force Base	do	11,174		Denver	36	University of Denver.
Peterson Air Force Base	do	1,084		Colorado Springs		Colorado College.
CONNECTICUT						
Groton Submarine Base	Navy	3,835		New London		Mitchell, College, University of Connecticut.
New London Underwater Sound Laboratory	do	65		do		Do.
DELAWARE						
*Dover Air Force Base	Air Force	9,085		Dover	164	Delaware State College.
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA						
Army Map Service	Army	141		Washington, D.C.		Numerous colleges, universities, and technical schools in Washington, D.C., area.
Harry Diamond Laboratory	do	23				
Fort Lesley J. McNair	do	546				
*Military District of Washington, Headquarters	do		Miss Dorothy Martin			
*Walter Reed Army Medical Center	do	2,200	Robert E. Hynes		248	
*Naval installations (including Washington Naval Station, Naval Security Station, Naval Research Lab, etc.).	Navy	1,423	Lt. Hercules Michas		[4] 115	
*Bolling Air Force Base	Air Force	2,065			49	
*1005th Special Investigation Group	do	476			15	
*1035th USAF Field Activities Group	do	601			9	
*1070th Medical Service Group	do	16			4	
*U.S. Marine Corps Headquarters	Marines		S. Sgt. J. L. Crumbacker		90	
FLORIDA						
*Jacksonville Air Station	Navy	5,641	Lt. Comdr. F. W. Reynolds	Jacksonville	90	Jacksonville University, Jacksonville School of Technology.
Cecil Field	do	3,785		do		Jacksonville University.
*Key West area naval installations (including Naval Station, Naval Air Station, Fleet Sonar School, and hospital).	do	5,614	Lt. Comdr. E. E. Wiggington	Key West	[4] 110	Florida Keys Junior College.
*Pensacola Air Station	do	8,153	Lt. Comdr. M. F. Caetano	Pensacola	125	University of West Florida, Pensacola Junior College.
Saufley Field	do	507		do		University of West Florida.
Communications Training Center	do	1,971		do		Do.
Mayport Naval Station	do	551		Jacksonville		Jacksonville University.
Panama City Mine Defense Laboratory	do	165		Panama City		Gulf Coast Junior College.
Sanford Naval Air Station	do	991		Sanford		Seminole Junior College.
Whiting Field	do	2,306		Pensacola		Junior Colleges.
Ellyson Auxiliary Air Station	do	1,492		do		University of West Florida.
*Eglin Air Force Base	Air Force	14,368		Valparaiso	198	Okaloosa-Walton Junior College.
*Homestead Air Force Base	do	5,811		Homestead	83	University of Miami.

Footnotes at end of table.

MAJOR DOMESTIC MILITARY INSTALLATIONS—Continued

[*Indicates those presently participating in transition program]

Installation	Service branch	Number of military personnel as of June 30, 1968	Transition program contact	Nearest city	Monthly average separations as of April 1969 for transition program sites	Nearest college, university, or technical school
FLORIDA—Continued						
*MacDill Air Force Base	Air Force	7,570		Tampa	86	University of Tampa.
*McCoy Air Force Base	do	4,624		Orlando	43	Orlando Junior College.
*Orlando Air Force Base	do	433		do		Do.
*Patrick Air Force Base	do	3,656		Cocoa Beach	33	Brevard Junior College.
*Tyndall Air Force Base	do	4,365		Panama City		Gulf Coast Junior College.
GEORGIA						
Army General Depot	Army	102		Atlanta		Atlanta University Center.
*Fort Benning	do	44,439	Leonard S. Ozley	Columbus	1,280	Columbus College.
*Fort Gordon	do	31,157	John T. Pollock	Augusta	332	Augusta College.
*Fort McPherson	do	2,723	Rosswell F. Phelps and Charles C. McDaniel.	Atlanta	34	Atlanta University Center, Career Academy Schools, Southern Business University.
*Fort Stewart	do	[1]10,827	William H. Cannady	Savannah	[1]889	Savannah State College.
Marine Corps Supply Center	Marines	1,795		Albany		Albany Junior College.
Albany Naval Air Station	Navy	692		do		Do.
Athens Naval Supply School	do	675		Athens		University of Georgia.
Atlanta Naval Air Station	do	704		Atlanta		Atlanta University Center, Career Academy Schools, Southern Business University.
Glynco Naval Air Station	do	2,463		Brunswick		Junior College.
Dobbins Air Force Base	Air Force	1,259		Marietta		Kennesaw Junior College.
*Moody Air Force Base	do	2,317		Valdosta	13	Valdosta State College.
*Robins Air Force Base	do	6,271		Macon		Mercer University.
HAWAII						
Note: All military installations in Hawaii are located on the island of Oahu. Army units are Fort Shafter, Schofield Barracks, and Tripler Hospital. Air Force units are Hickam and Wheeler Air Force Bases. Kaneohoe Marine Base and Pearl Harbor are largest Navy units.	Army Navy Air Force	5,669 11,756 10,687		Note: All military installations in Hawaii are within commuting distance of Honolulu.		University of Hawaii, Electronics Institute of Hawaii, Mid-Pacific Technical Institute.
IDAHO						
*Mountain Home Air Force Base	do	3,059		Mountain Home		
ILLINOIS						
*Fort Sheridan	Army	3,578	W. J. Overocker, Gilbert L. Stewart.	Chicago	317	Numerous colleges, universities, and technical schools in Chicago area.
Granite City Army Depot	do	180		East St. Louis		University of Missouri at St. Louis.
Joliet Arsenal	do	100		Chicago		Chicago area.
Rock Island Arsenal	do	128		Devanport, Iowa		Augustana College Institute of Drafting and Technology.
Savanna Army Depot	do	241		Savanna		Shimer College.
Forest Park Ordnance Station	Navy	37		Chicago		Chicago area.
Glenview Naval Air Station	do	1,252		do		Northwestern University.
*Great Lakes Naval Training Center, hospital, and electronics supply office.	do	31,722	Lt. Comdr. Francis D. Kelly	do	[2]200	Chicago area.
*Chanute Air Force Base	Air Force	10,749		Rantoul	78	University of Illinois.
Chicago, O'Hare International Airport	do	18		Chicago		Chicago area.
*Scott Air Force Base	do	6,581		Belleville	28	University of Missouri at St. Louis.
INDIANA						
*Fort Benjamin Harrison	Army	2,715	George E. Maynard	Indianapolis	174	Butler University.
Jefferson Proving Ground	do	4		Louisville		University of Louisville.
Crane Naval Ammunition Depot	Navy	67		Bloomington		Indiana University.
Indianapolis Avionics Facility	do	178		Indianapolis		Butler University.
Bakalar Air Force Base	Air Force	25		Columbus		Indiana University extension.
*Grissom Air Force Base	do	3,729		Peru	33	Indiana University at Kokomo.
IOWA						
*Sioux City Air Base	do	1,233		Sioux City		Morningside College.
KANSAS						
*Fort Leavenworth	Army	2,706	Loren L. Hughes	Kansas City	107	University of Kansas at Lawrence.
*Fort Riley	do	13,533	Roger H. Heylin	Junction City	679	Washburn University.
Olathe Naval Air Station	Navy	1,084		Kansas City		University of Missouri at Kansas City.
*Forbes Air Force Base	Air Force	4,488		Topeka	74	Washburn University, Northeast Kansas Area Vocational-Technical School.
*McConnell Air Force Base	do	8,253		Wichita	74	Wichita State University, Friends University, Wichita Area Vocational-Technical School.
KENTUCKY						
Blue Grass Army Depot	Army	10		Lexington		University of Kentucky.
*Fort Campbell	do	26,640	Melvin H. Wagner	Clarksville, Tenn	1,444	Austin Peay State College.
*Fort Knox	do	34,821	James A. Jones	Louisville	1,020	University of Louisville.
Louisville Naval Ordnance Plant	Navy	140		do		Do.
LOUISIANA						
*Fort Polk	Army	29,304	Donald O. Thompson	Alexandria	375	Louisiana State University at Alexandria.
New Orleans Naval Air Station	Navy	1,047		New Orleans		Tulane University, Delgado College.
*Barksdale Air Force Base	Air Force	6,825		Shreveport	67	Louisiana State University at Shreveport, Shreveport Trade School, Centenary College.
*England Air Force Base	do	3,246		Alexandria	47	Louisiana State University at Alexandria.

Footnotes at end of table.

MAJOR DOMESTIC MILITARY INSTALLATIONS—Continued

[*Indicates those presently participating in transition program]

Installation	Service branch	Number of military personnel as of June 30, 1968	Transition program contact	Nearest city	Monthly average separations as of April 1969 for transition program sites	Nearest college, university, or technical school
MAINE						
Brunswick Naval Air Station	Navy	669		Brunswick		Bowdoin College.
Cutler Naval Radio Station	do	112		Bangor		Ricker College.
Winter Harbor Naval Security	do	316		do		University of Maine at Orono.
*Dow Air Force Base	Air Force	1,184		do		Husson College, University of Maine in Orono.
*Loring Air Force Base	do	4,077		Limestone	20	Presque Isle State Teachers College.
*Topsham Air Force Station	do	38		Topsham	7	Bowdoin College.
MARYLAND						
*Aberdeen Proving Ground	Army	8,104	John J. Lichi	Baltimore	183	Note: All military installations in Maryland are within commuting distance of 1 of the numerous universities, colleges, or trade schools in the Baltimore, Washington, Salisbury, Annapolis, or Hagerstown areas.
Fort Detrick	do	810		Frederick		
Edgewood Arsenal	do	1,753		Baltimore		
Fort Holabird	do	2,508		do		
*Fort George G. Meade	do	17,394	Gustaf E. Berglund, David C. Berry.	do	600	
*Fort Ritchie	do	706	Stanley M. Kupp	do	30	
Naval Ship R. & D., Carderock	Navy	38		Carderock		
Bethesda Medical Center	do	2,156		Washington, D.C		
Annapolis Area Installations (all)	do	6,855		Annapolis		
Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent	do	3,275		Washington, D.C		
Cheltenham Naval Communications Station	do	1,250		do		
White Oak Naval Ordnance Laboratory	do	72		do		
Indian Head Naval Ordnance Station	do	288		do		
Bainbridge Naval Training Center	do	3,891		Baltimore		
*Andrews Air Force Base	Air Force	8,799		Washington, D.C	64	
*6970th Support Group, Fort Meade	do	1,385		do	24	
MASSACHUSETTS						
Boston Army Base	Army	80		Boston		Note: All military installations in Massachusetts are within commuting distance of one of the numerous colleges, universities, and technical schools located throughout the State.
*Fort Devens	do	9,125	William P. Hynes	Worcester	375	
Watertown Army Research	do	142		Boston		
Natick Laboratories	do	211		do		
All Naval Installations	Navy	1,773		Boston area		
*L. G. Hanscom Field	Air Force	1,894		Bedford	25	
*Otis Air Force Base	do	4,120		Falmouth	25	
*Westover Air Force Base	do	6,638		Chicopee Falls	79	
MICHIGAN						
Army Tank Auto Command	Army	143		Detroit		University of Detroit, Wayne State University.
Grosse Isle Naval Air Station	Navy	543		do		Do.
*Custer Air Force Station	Air Force	41		Battle Creek	36	Grand Valley College.
*K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base	do	3,465		Gwinn	56	Northern Michigan University.
*Kincheloe Air Force Base	do	3,651		Kinross	39	Lake Superior State College.
*Selfridge Air Force Base	do	2,861		Mount Clemens	24	University of Detroit.
*Wurtsmith Air Force Base	do	3,236		Ascoda	48	Alpena Community College.
MINNESOTA						
Twin Cities Naval Air Station	Navy	611		Minneapolis-St. Paul		University of Minnesota.
*Duluth International Airport	Air Force	2,125		Duluth	36	University of Minnesota, at Duluth.
Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport	do	77		Minneapolis-St. Paul		University of Minnesota, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Northwestern Electronics Institute.
MISSISSIPPI						
Waterways Exp. Station	Army	43				
Meridian Naval Auxiliary Air Station	Navy	1,824		Meridian		Meridian Junior College.
Gulfport Construction Battalion Center	do	1,173		Gulfport		Perkinston Junior College.
*Columbus Air Force Base	Air Force	1,849		Columbus	16	Mississippi State University.
*Keesler Air Force Base	do	16,875		Biloxi	120	Perkinston Junior College.
MISSOURI						
*Fort Leonard Wood	Army	29,680	George W. Farror	Rolla	578	Lincoln University.
*Aeronautical Chart Center	Air Force	139		St. Louis		University of Missouri at St. Louis.
*Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base	do	2,802		Kansas City	44	University of Missouri at Kansas City.
*Whiteman Air Force Base	do	3,119		Knob Noster		Central Missouri State College.
MONTANA						
*Glasgow Air Force Base	do	1,166		Glasgow		
*Malmstrom Air Force Base	do	5,094		Great Falls	54	College of Great Falls.
NEBRASKA						
*Offutt Air Force Base	do	11,013		Omaha	92	University of Nebraska at Omaha.
NEVADA						
Hawthorne Navy Ammunition Depot	Navy	149		Reno		University of Nevada.
Fallon Naval Auxiliary Air Station	do	530		do		Do.
Indian Springs Air Force Base	Air Force	250		Las Vegas		Nevada Southern University.
*Nellis Air Force Base	do	7,058		do		Do.
NEW HAMPSHIRE						
Naval units in Portsmouth area (Disciplinary Command, hospital, and shipyard).	Navy	1,867		Portsmouth area		New Hampshire Vocational Institute.
*Pease Air Force Base	Air Force	2,411		Portsmouth	30	Do.
NEW JERSEY						
*Fort Dix	Army	38,090	Victor D. Matt	Trenton	352	Rider College, Trenton Junior College.
*Fort Monmouth	do	9,908	Kenneth K. Huhn	do	139	Do.
Picatinny Arsenal	do	203		New York City		Numerous colleges, universities, and technical schools in New York City area.

Footnotes at end of table.

XUM

MAJOR DOMESTIC MILITARY INSTALLATIONS—Continued

[*Indicates those presently participating in transition program]

Installation	Service branch	Number of military personnel as of June 30, 1968	Transition program contact	Nearest city	Monthly average separations as of April 1969 for transition program sites	Nearest college, university, or technica school
NEW JERSEY—Continued						
Bayonne Naval Supply Center	Navy	11		New York City		New York City area.
Earle Naval Ammunition Depot	do	379		Trenton		Rider College, Trenton Junior College.
Lakehurst Naval Air Station	do	1,880		do		Do.
Trenton Air Turbine Test Center	do	36		do		Do.
*McGuire Air Force Base	Air Force	8,321		Wrightstown	109	Rider College, Trenton Junior College.
NEW MEXICO						
*Sandia Base	do	1,863		Albuquerque	9	University of New Mexico.
*White Sands Missile Range	Army	1,989	William D. Black	do	50	Do.
Wingate Army Depot	do	8		Gallup		
*Cannon Air Force Base	Air Force	3,758		Clovis	28	Eastern New Mexico University.
*Holloman Air Force Base	do	2,800		Alamogordo	28	New Mexico State University.
*Kirtland Air Force Base	do	3,262		Albuquerque	35	University of New Mexico.
NEW YORK						
Army Pictorial Center	Army	139		Long Island	280	Numerous colleges, universities, and technical schools in New York City area.
Camp Drum	do	159		Watertown		
*Fort Hamilton	do	2,607	Christopher McHoney	Brooklyn		
Seneca Army Depot	do	173		Ithaca		Cornell University.
Watervliet Arsenal	do	13		Albany		State University of New York.
Brooklyn Naval Air Station	Navy	739		Brooklyn		New York City area.
Brooklyn Naval Station	do	1,761		do		Do.
St. Albans Naval Hospital	do	859		New York City		Do.
*Griffiss Air Force Base	Air Force	3,502		Rome	85	Utica College, Utica School of Automation.
*LaSalle Station and Niagara Falls International Airport.	do	[3] 1,242	George O. Caviness	Niagara Falls	15	Niagara University.
Plattsburgh Air Force Base	do	3,180		Plattsburgh	19	State Teachers College in Plattsburgh.
*Stewart Air Force Base	do	3,654		Newburgh	35	State University of New York at New Paltz.
*Suffolk County Air Force Base	do	1,721		New York City	23	New York City area.
NORTH CAROLINA						
Fort Bragg	Army	50,844	Andy Edmondson	Fayetteville	1,954	Methodist College, Fayetteville State College, Fayetteville Technical Institute.
Sunny Point Terminal	do	15		Wilmington		Wilmington College, Cape Fear Technical Institute.
Camp Lejeune	Marine	30,431	Maj. J. Laws	Jacksonville	1,000	East Carolina University at Camp Lejeune.
Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station	do	9,301		Kingston		East Carolina University at Cherry Point.
New River Marine Corps Airfield	do	3,125		Wilmington		East Carolina University at Camp Lejeune.
*Pope Air Force Base	Air Force	4,019		Fayetteville		Fayetteville State College, Fayetteville Technical Institute.
*Seymour Johnson Air Force Base	do	5,805		Goldsboro		Wayne Community College.
NORTH DAKOTA						
Grand Forks Air Force Base	do	5,464		Grand Forks	73	University of North Dakota.
*Minot Air Force Base	do	5,902		Minot	64	Minot State Teachers College.
OHIO						
Columbus Construction Supply Center		25		Columbus		Ohio State University, Career Academy Schools, Ohio Technica College.
*Lockbourne Air Force Base	Air Force	6,668		do	63	Do.
*Wright-Patterson Air Force Base	do	10,716		Dayton	73	University of Dayton.
Clinton County Air Force Base	do	233		Wilmington		Wilmington College.
Dayton Electronics Center		30		Dayton		University of Dayton.
OKLAHOMA						
*Fort Sill	Army	29,701	Russell F. Crooch	Lawton	978	Cameron College.
McAlester Naval Ammunition Depot	Navy	162		McAlester		Eastern Oklahoma College at Wilburton.
*Altus Air Force Base	Air Force	2,537		Altus	36	Altus Junior College.
*Clinton Sherman Air Force Base	do	1,692		Burns Flat	27	Southwestern State College at Weatherford
*Oklahoma City Air Force Station	do	376		Oklahoma City		University of Oklahoma.
*Tinker Air Force Base	do	4,578		do	63	Do.
*Vance Air Force Base	do	1,277		Enid	3	Phillips University.
OREGON						
Umatilla Army Depot	Army	7		Pendleton		Eastern Oregon College.
*Adair Air Force Station	Air Force			Corvallis	31	Oregon State University.
*Kingsley Field	do	1,319		Klamath Falls	10	Oregon Technical Institute.
Portland International Airport	do	48		Portland		Numerous colleges, universities, and technical schools in Portland area.
PENNSYLVANIA						
Carlisle	Army	464		Harrisburg		Harrisburg Area Community College.
Frankford Arsenal	do	55		Philadelphia		Numerous schools in Philadelphia area.
Indiantown Gap Military Reservation	do	342		Harrisburg		Harrisburg Area Community College.
Letterkenny Ordnance Depot	do	70		do		Do.
New Cumberland Army Depot	do	195		do		Do.
Tobyhanna Army Depot	do	155		Scranton		Lackawanna Junior College.
*Valley Forge General Hospital	do	2,508	Thomas J. Rollo	Philadelphia	160	Numerous schools in Philadelphia area.
Johnsville Air Development Center	Navy	472		do		Philadelphia area.
Mechanicsburg Supply Depot	do	143		Harrisburg		Harrisburg Area Community College.
Naval installations in Philadelphia area (*naval station).	do	5,923	Lt. Richard W. Bates (naval station only).	Philadelphia	[4] 500	Philadelphia area.
Willow Grove Naval Air Station	do	831		do		Do.
Greater Pittsburgh Airport	Air Force	737		Pittsburgh		University of Pittsburgh.
Philadelphia Ind. Supply Center		50		Philadelphia		Philadelphia area.
RHODE ISLAND						
Davisville Construction Battalion Center	Navy	585		Providence		Brown University, Providence College.
Quonset Point Naval Air Station	do	1,409		do		Do.
Naval installations in Newport area (*naval station).	do	5,659	Lt. Comdr. Harry H. Misakian (naval station only).	Newport area	[4] 400	Do.

Footnotes at end of table.

MAJOR DOMESTIC MILITARY INSTALLATIONS—Continued

[*Indicates those presently participating in transition program]

Installation	Service branch	Number of military personnel as of June 30, 1968	Transition program contact	Nearest city	Monthly average separations as of April 1969 for transition program sites	Nearest college, university, or technical school
SOUTH CAROLINA						
Charleston Army Depot	Army	12		Charleston		College of Charleston.
*Fort Jackson	do	26, 982	Phil H. Sawyer	Columbia	179	University of South Carolina.
Beaufort Naval Hospital	Navy	204		Charleston		College of Charleston.
Beaufort Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station.	do	5, 343		do		Do.
*Parris Island Marine Corps Recruiting Depot.	Marine	13, 252	1st Lt. M. F. Brueckner	Beaufort	160	Do.
Naval installations in Charleston area (*Naval Station).	Navy	3, 049	Lt. Cmdr. Richard D. Canter (Naval Station only).	Charleston	[4] 260	Do.
*Myrtle Beach Air Force Base	Air Force	3, 285		Myrtle Beach		University of South Carolina at Myrtle Beach.
*Shaw Air Force Base	do	6, 331		Sumter		University of South Carolina at Columbia.
*Charleston Air Force Base	do	7, 963		Charleston	90	College of Charleston.
SOUTH DAKOTA						
Ellsworth Air Force Base	do	4, 718		Rapid City	36	South Dakota School of Mines and Technology.
TENNESSEE						
Memphis Naval Hospital	Navy	344		Memphis		Memphis State University.
Memphis Naval Air Station	do	14, 096		do		Do.
Arnold Engineering Development, Center	Air Force	121		Tullahoma		University of Tennessee Extension.
Sewart Air Force Base	do	4, 049		Nashville		Vanderbilt University.
Memphis Ind. Plant Equipment Center		25		Memphis		Memphis State University.
TEXAS						
*Fort Bliss	Army	29, 075	Miss Lois M. Godfrey	El Paso	719	University of Texas at El Paso.
*Fort Hood	do	31, 870	James Gillon	Killeen	1, 833	Temple Junior College, Central Texas State College.
*Fort Sam Houston	do	15, 529	Corles N. Goff, Tolmer S. McKinley.	San Antonio	690	Trinity University.
*Fort Wolters	do	4, 391	Henry B. Walker	Fort Worth	77	Texas Western University, Texas Christian University.
Red River Depot	do	41		Texarkana		Texarkana College.
*Corpus Christi Naval Air Station	Navy	4, 140	Lt. Robert N. McKinley	Corpus Christi	200	Delmar College.
Dallas Naval Air Station	do	863		Dallas		Southern Methodist University.
Kingsville Naval Air Station	do	2, 474		Corpus Christi		Texas College of Arts and Industries.
Chase Field Naval Air Station	do	2, 247		do		Delmar College.
Corpus Christi Naval Hospital	do	237		do		Do.
*Amarillo Air Force Base	Air Force	6, 800		Amarillo		West Texas State University.
*Bergstrom Air Force Base	do	4, 424		Austin	50	University of Texas.
*Brooks Air Force Base	do	1, 312		San Antonio	14	Trinity University.
*Carswell Air Force Base	do	3, 814		Fort Worth	44	Texas Western University, Texas Christian University.
*Dyess Air Force Base	do	4, 761		Abilene	43	Hardin Simmons University, Abilene Christian College.
*Ellington Air Force Base	do	457		Houston	6	University of Houston, St. Thomas University, Rice University.
*Goodfellow Air Force Base	do	3, 086		San Angelo	28	Angelo State College.
*James Connally Air Force Base	do	429		Waco		Baylor University.
*Kelly Air Force Base	do	7, 203		San Antonio	85	Trinity University.
*Lackland Air Force Base	do	23, 470		do	49	Do.
*Laredo Air Force Base	do	2, 293		Lerado	16	Laredo Junior College.
*Laughlin Air Force Base	do	2, 675		Del Rio	20	Uvalde Junior College.
*Perrin Air Force Base	do	2, 777		Sherman	28	Austin College.
*Randolph Air Force Base	do	5, 406		San Antonio	20	Trinity University.
*Reese Air Force Base	do	2, 543		Lubbock	15	Texas Technological College.
*Sheppard Air Force Base	do	13, 924		Wichita Falls	88	Midwestern University.
*Webb Air Force Base	do	2, 682		Big Spring	12	Howard County Junior College.
UTAH						
*Dugway Proving Ground	Army	440	Dale P. King	Salt Lake City	20	Several universities, colleges, and technical schools in Salt Lake City area.
Fort Douglas	do	181		do		
*Tooele Army Depot	do	183	William V. Christiansen	Tooele		
*Hill Air Force Base	Air Force	3, 613		Ogden	40	Weber State College.
Ogden Supply Depot		35		do		Do.
VIRGINIA						
*Fort Belvoir	Army	15, 432	Dr. E. A. Eber	Washington, D.C	314	District of Columbia area.
*Fort Lee	do	15, 758	Lee Slaydon	Richmond	492	University of Richmond, Richmond Professional Institute.
*Fort Eustis	do	11, 808	John W. Williams	Norfolk	486	College of William and Mary
*Fort Monroe	do	1, 778	Henry Stone	do	57	Do.
Fort Story	do	1, 482		do		Hampton Institute.
*Fort Myer	do	9, 090	Margaret A. Lcokwood	Washington, D.C	275	District of Columbia area.
Gravelly Point	do	556		do		Do.
*Vint Hill Farms Station	do	1, 243	Coralis E. Thomas	Warrenton	49	District of Columbia area.
Cheatham Annex Supply Center	Navy	196		Richmond		University of Richmond.
Dahlgren Weapons Laboratory	do	145		Washington, D.C		District of Columbia area.
Naval installations in Norfolk-Portsmouth area (*Naval Station).	do	19, 336	Lt. Comdr. Rex H. Harris (Naval Station only).	Norfolk-Portsmouth	[4] 500	Hampton Institute, Old Dominion College.
*Quantico Marine Base	Marines	8, 705	Lt. Col. Frank Marcus	Quantico	250	District of Columbia area.
Yorktown Weapons Station	Navy	515		Yorktown		College of William and Mary.
*Langley Air Force Base	Air Force	8, 893		Hampton	106	George Washington University extension program.
*33d Air Division, Fort Lee	do	42		Petersburg	11	University of Richmond.
*1127th U.S. Air Force Activities Group, Fort Belvoir.	do	153		Washington, D.C	4	District of Columbia area.
Richmond General Supply Center		575		Richmond		University of Richmond.
Cameron Supply Station		225		Washington, D.C		District of Columbia area.
The Pentagon		13, 501		do		Do.
WASHINGTON						
Fort Lawton	Army	897		Seattle		University of Washington, Automation Institute of Seattle.
*Fort Lewis	do	40, 961		Tacoma		University of Puget Sound.
*Madigan General Hospital	do		Mrs. Rose Sowa	do	65	Do.

Footnotes at end of table.

MAJOR DOMESTIC MILITARY INSTALLATIONS—Continued

[* Indicates those presently participating in transition program]

Installation	Service branch	Number of military personnel as of June 30, 1968	Transition program contact	Nearest city	Monthly average separations as of April 1969 for transition program sites	Nearest college, university, or technical school
WASHINGTON—Continued						
Bangor Ammunition Depot	Navy	189		Seattle		University of Washington.
Keyport Torpedo Station	do	248		do		Do.
Bremerton Naval Hospital	do	273		do		Do.
Puget Sound Shipyard	do	554		Tacoma		University of Puget Sound.
*Puget Sound Naval Supply Center	do		Lt. Comdr. W. E. Carroll	Seattle	330	University of Washington.
Bremmerton Naval Supply Center	do	596		do		Do.
Jim Creek Radio Station	do	40		do		Do.
Oak Harbor Naval Air Station	do	2,658		do		Do.
Pacific Beach Naval Facility	do	128		Tacoma		University of Puget Sound.
Seattle Naval Air Station	do	1,078		Seattle		University of Washington.
*Fairchild Air Force Base	Air Force	2,980		Spokane	67	Whitworth College.
*McChord Air Force Base	do	7,440		Tacoma	165	University of Puget Sound.
*Paine Field	do	1,233		Everett		University of Washington.
WISCONSIN						
Camp McCoy	Army	74		Sparta		River Falls State University.
General Mitchell Field	Air Force	10		Milwaukee		University of Wisconsin, Marquette University, Milwaukee Institute of Technology.
*Truax Field	do	281		Madison		University of Wisconsin.
WYOMING						
*F. E. Warren Air Force Base	do	3,457		Cheyenne	21	University of Wyoming extension courses in Cheyenne.

[1] Including Hunter Army Airfield.
[2] From training center only.
[3] Airport only.
[4] From naval station only.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MISSILE TEST FACILITIES AT KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE, AND RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTH

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2546) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Under the previous order, the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN) is now recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I intend to support President Nixon's request for deployment of phase I of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system. No issue of recent years has been more vigorously debated than the deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system. Advocates both pro and con have no disagreement on objectives. Both want a lasting peace but they differ in how best to achieve it. Because the stakes are so high, one must not jump to hasty conclusions. It makes no difference whether one considers himself an expert or a novice like most of us.

I do not intend to get into the numbers game of relative strength of the superpower nations in the matter of either offensive or defensive capability. That is a job for the experts and there are plenty of them around even though they do not always agree.

It is enough for me to accept the proposition that either side could incinerate the other but with varying degrees of effectiveness. Because 70 percent of our people live on 1 percent of the land, it is quite likely that an equal exchange of nuclear missiles delivered to the most strategic targets in each of the superpower countries would do more damage to us because our population is much more concentrated. One expert claims that we would have to deliver six times as many missiles to achieve a comparable destruction. All of us recognize the sheer folly of a nuclear arms race. It is important to get the superpowers to the bargaining table. We await word from Soviet leaders and we have waited for some time. But in the meantime what should we do—deploy or not deploy the Safeguard system which President Nixon has requested.

Without going into the statistics of comparable capability, I shall deal only with a few points that seem important to me. Frequently, we hear the argument that ABM will require vast sums that could better be used in higher priority items in our domestic budget. It is true that deployment of ABM would require some expenditures that could very well be used elsewhere to meet urgent needs, but insofar as priorities go in this uncertain period, none can be higher than survival.

It is well to keep this issue in proper perspective. In no sense does the bill that is before us commit us to an irrevocable course of action from which there is no return. Compared to the defense budget, this is a very modest request. Let us look at some cost figures.

The budget request for fiscal year 1970 is $759.1 million to continue development, test and radar deployment. Of this, $400.9 million is for development and test, which does not appear to be controversial; and of the remainder, $345.5 million is for procurement of radars, computers, and ground equipment; and $12.7 million for Kwajalein operations. The only amount in the bill for missile parts is $600,000. No Sprint or Spartan missiles will be deployed without congressional approval. The amount in contention is about equal to the cost of 4 days of the war in Vietnam. Each successive step must have congressional approval. Favorable progress at the bargaining table could freeze the program at any stage.

Personally, I do not regard the $80 billion Defense budget as a sacred cow. In my opinion, it contains several items of lower priority than Safeguard. The committee has done a good job in trimming this budget, but I believe there is more work to be done here.

Phase I of this deployment is limited to the location of Safeguard components at two Minuteman wings. Deployment at these two sites provides an opportunity to find and remove those technical and operational bugs which are not likely to show up in research and development efforts.

Total cost of Safeguard is estimated at $8 billion, subject to annual review, but an important point to remember is that the Safeguard program can be terminated at any time the Russians will negotiate a deescalation of the nuclear arms race.

This aspect of the President's decision to deploy the Safeguard system has not received the attention which I believe it deserves, and this has led to misunderstanding. The Safeguard plan has been approved in principle, but insofar as execution is concerned only two installations have been recommended to Congress for authorization—one at Malmstrom Air Force Base in Montana and one at Grand Forks Air Force Base in North Dakota. Before further deployments are approved, the intelligence estimates on which the potential threats described here are based, will be updated and reviewed and at the highest levels of Government. If those estimates reveal a change in the development of the threat as we now see it, the Safeguard deployment will be modified accordingly. The progress of deployment will also be governed by the status of any arms control discussions we may be having with the Soviets. In short, Safeguard will be deployed only as the threat, against which it is designed to protect, develops and only if it is not inconsistent with any progress we might be making in arms control talks. Moreover the Congress retains absolute control through the authorization and appropriation functions for each successive phase of Safeguard.

Some opponents of Safeguard claim it will not work and they present a long list of scientists to attempt to prove it. This is not the first time that the scientific community has been divided. Back at the turn of the century some of the skeptics were sure that the Wright brothers were tinkering with a heavier-than-air machine that could not possibly defy the law of gravity in sustained flight.

Mr. President, a few days ago, I clipped from the New York Times an article which I think is revealing and bears on this same subject. It reads:

> TIMES CORRECTS A 1920 ERROR
>
> NEW YORK, July 17.—The New York Times ran a correction today on an error made in 1920 about the future of rockets.
>
> The Times, on Jan. 13, 1920, scoffed at Professor Robert H. Goddard, the father of space exploration, for believing a rocket could function in a vacuum. "He only seems to lack the knowledge ladled out daily in high schools," the Times wrote.
>
> With the Apollo 11 headed for the moon today, the Times decided:
>
> "It is now definitely established that a rocket can function in a vacuum.
>
> "The Times regrets the error."

Mr. President, then there are other opponents of Safeguard who not only claim it will not work but that its deployment would be provocative—that somehow it will escalate the arms race. I find a lack of consistency here—obviously if it will not work—and I am sure the Russians would know it if we did—it could not provoke escalation. Our potential adversaries should be pleased to find us dedicating our talent and dissipating our energies and resources on a system that was doomed to fail.

So the experts disagree on how well the system might work. Each of us is entitled to his own opinion, but with our scientists now able to send men to the moon and bring them back, I do not feel competent, as a nonscientist, to challenge the technical feasibility of the system.

Admittedly, it is a new round of weaponry, but Safeguard is wholly a defensive system. Like all nuclear weapons systems, we hope it need never be used. Unlike other systems, it is a method of deterrence which will save lives and not destroy them. It seems to me that Safeguard is no more provocative than a parachute in a fighter plane, a life preserver on a sail boat, or a seat belt in an automobile. All are designed for the same purpose, and that is to save lives. Moreover, it is more consistent with the moral objectives of the United States for this country to provide more effective ways of protecting people than it is to base our deterrent power wholly upon our ability to kill people in other countries or to "accept" heavy casualties here at home.

Briefly stated, the main purpose of Safeguard will have been accomplished if its deployment discourages others from attacking us.

Of equal importance, it seems to me, is the function of a deployed Safeguard system to intercept and destroy a missile or missiles that others may fire at us through mistake or accident. We have no way of knowing what safety precautions any of our enemies employ against the unintentional release of ICBM's with nuclear warheads that are now deployed ready, and aimed at U.S. targets. Would it not be better to intercept and destroy such incoming missiles than to do nothing and accept the strike or to unleash a salvo of retaliatory missiles?

I shall not presume to interpret the intent of the Russians, but as to their capability there is little disagreement. Those who profess to vouch for the peaceful intentions of the Kremlin leaders leave me unconvinced. If Russia truly wishes world peace, let them come to the peace table with serious intent. The United States must never be maneuvered into a position where nuclear blackmail becomes tempting.

All of us recall, with pain and anguish, the immediate event that thrust us into World War II. Pearl Harbor is still very vivid in my memory. In 1941, our Nation had been lulled into a feeling of complacency by the constant repetition of such comforting statements as "Japan would never be so utterly reckless as to attack a nation so rich and powerful as the United States." Except among a few alarmists, our feeling of security was universal. On that fatal Sunday morning our leadership was so completely duped that almost the entire Pacific Fleet was anchored at Pearl Harbor while everyone responsible enjoyed a good sleep. Because of our utter contempt for the ability and our ignorance of the intentions of the enemy to strike, we discarded every defensive precaution that could and should have been taken.

I hope we do not again misread the signs and lower our defenses in a euphoria of misplaced trust.

At the same time that President Nixon asked for the ABM he stressed our desire to negotiate with the Soviet Union and end the strategic nuclear arms race. The President said:

> I have taken cognizance of the view that beginning construction of a U.S. ballistic missile defense would complicate an agreement on strategic arms with the Soviet Union.
>
> I do not believe that the evidence of the recent past bears out this contention. The Soviet interest in strategic talks was not deterred by the decision of the previous administration to deploy the Sentinel ABM system—in fact, it was formally announced shortly afterwards. I believe that the modifications we have made in the previous program will give the Soviet Union even less reason to view our defense effort as an obstacle to talks. Moreover, I wish to emphasize that in any arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union, the United States will be fully prepared to discuss limitations on defensive as well as offensive weapons systems.

In summary, the President has decided that we should take this minimum step consistent with both preserving our security and at the same time enhancing the chances for meaningful negotiation with the Soviet Union. Failure to take the step could not only endanger our security by the mid-seventies, but also weaken our negotiation position in the immediate future.

The most compelling need of the present times is to stop this devastating nuclear arms race. This is a long, hard road—but like any long journey, it must start with a single first step. That first step is serious negotiation by the principals at the bargaining table. Whether steps to deploy a Safeguard ABM system would advance or retard negotiations is again a matter about which the experts disagree. Frankly, I do not know. The President thinks we need the start that this bill gives us and he thinks we need it now. He thinks we are protecting valuable leadtime should negotiations fail. Personally, I might be willing to take that "risk for peace" which proponents endorse. The President cannot take that risk. I shall support the President. If I am to err in judgment, let it be on the side of oversecurity rather than undersecurity for the Nation.

Each Senator will vote the dictates of his own conscience. When I vote to sustain the President in his awesome responsibility of planning and committing our resources in the most effective manner possible in order to achieve a lasting peace, I shall be at peace with my conscience.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Yes; I yield to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished Senator from Idaho for a very brilliant, logical, and persuasive presentation of his reasons for supporting the President on the ABM issue. I believe he particularly did an outstanding job in explaining why and how the Safeguard ABM system is a defensive system which in no way should be provocative.

My thoughts particularly focus on the one paragraph in which he says:

> It seems to me that Safeguard is no more provocative than a parachute in a fighter plane, a life preserver on a sail boat, or a seat belt in an automobile.

I believe those are very excellent comparisons which drive home in a very

XUM

persuasive way what we are talking about in this particular issue.

How anyone could say or suggest that this is a provocative move on the part of the United States, in light of that comparison, is difficult to understand.

Earlier, before the Senator from Idaho spoke, the senior Senator from Maryland spoke and articulated the power of Congress, on an issue such as the ABM, to refuse to go along with the President. I agreed with what the Senator from Maryland had to say. I note in his remarks that the Senator from Idaho essentially agrees that Congress does have the constitutional power to disagree with the President of the United States. In fact, the Senator from Idaho has pointed out that, at every stage of actual deployment, and on an annual basis, Congress will be carefully reviewing this decision and program; and at any stage when the intelligence estimates are different or justify a different decision, Congress could at that point depart from its previous course and disagree with the President of the United States. But at this point in history, it seems to me the question is not so much whether the Senate or the Congress has the power to do that; the question is whether it is the wise thing for the Senate and the Congress to do.

I am very conscious of the fact that in many respects the President of the United States today is much like a negotiator about to sit down at the negotiating table, as we sometimes see in labor-management negotiations. In a sense, perhaps, the President is like the chief negotiator for the union bargaining team. I am conscious of the fact, and I know the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), who is present on the floor and who has had much experience in labor-management affairs, would agree with me, that it would be unheard of for union members, just as their negotiators are about to sit down at the negotiating table, to pull the rug out from under the chief negotiator, particularly in a situation where the arguments pro and con are close.

The very most one could say for the proponents in this particular case is that they present some persuasive arguments which make a close case. But even where the case is close, it seems to me, as in a situation like this, you give the chief negotiator the benefit of the doubt, and you do not pull the rug out from under him as he is about to sit down at the bargaining table, if you expect him to reach an agreement.

I think all Americans wish and hope that we may reach a meaningful arms control agreement with the Soviet Union; and the really crucial question, it seems to me, is how we can best achieve that result. I am persuaded, with the Senator from Idaho, that the better and wiser course, if we really want to achieve such an agreement, is to support the President, at least at this crucial point in history.

So again I say, I believe the Senator from Idaho has made an excellent contribution to the dialog on this issue, and I commend him for his scholarship.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. I thank my distinguished colleague, whose judgment I value so highly. I am glad that he agrees with me that this is not an irrevocable commitment. It is a first step, and it can be brought to a conclusion at any time that the Soviets show an inclination to want to bargain meaningfully.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. I yield to my distinguished friend from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I, too, congratulate my friend on the thoughtful and concise exposition he has made today of this problem.

Sometimes our discussions seem to go far afield. I have noted that in some of the dialog we have been bogged down discussing what the Secretary of Defense said one day, as compared to what some other officer in the Government said another day, and we get into a mixture of semantics and political philosophy from time to time. I am glad that my distinguished colleague has kept his argument on a practical, simple, straightforward basis. Earlier today I made a presentation based on almost exactly the same approach.

I believe there can be no question about the fact that the system will work. The great preponderance of the evidence is on the side that it will. If at first it does not, there is no one who can tell me that a group of scientists, engineers, and industrialists who can do what we have seen done on the moon cannot put this system together and make it work. I am sure they can.

Will it upset the Russians? No. The Russians themselves have said so. As a matter of fact, when we started with it, they immediately said, "Let us sit down and talk." Sometimes they react that way. They are realists.

Can we afford it? Of course we can afford it. The only thing we are talking about, the actual difference, the hang up, is less than $400 million. That is the difference between the cost of research and development and the cost of actual construction and deployment.

So there can be no question, I believe, if we approach the problem reasonably.

Some of our colleagues have said, "Well, let us make another gesture." Mr. President, for many years our gestures have not been productive. I do not think the Soviets would understand, and I am certain the Chinese would not understand further gestures. I think we ought to be realists, for a change, and give our President every implement, every tool, every card in his hand that we can before he goes to that negotiating table.

I congratulate the distinguished Senator for the position that he has taken, and for the clear and concise way that he has explained this problem today.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. I thank my distinguished friend from California for his comments. He stressed the point that I have tried to make, and that I know he made earlier in his own speech, that there is no difference among the Members of the Senate, as I see it, concerning the need for research and development, which constitutes more than half of the authorization requested for Safeguard in this 1970 budget.

But there comes a time when we must go a litle bit further than research and development. We must start putting the pieces together on a site, so that we can get the bugs out of it.

Does the Senator agree that the difference that divides the Senate is a matter of something less than $400 million?

Mr. MURPHY. I do exactly. I should like to point out that the other night I had the great privilege of spending about 3 hours with General Schriever, who was the man charged with the initiation, at the beginnnig, of the entire space program. He stated that it started in a little old church out in Los Angeles, not too far from the airport. He got together a team; I think there were 30 or 35 men in the team, and they began working out this first step into space.

As he explained to me, the most important decision was the decision to begin. After you begin, then, from time to time, as the state of the art changes, as the capabilities change, as the necessities change, and as world conditions change, you change with them; and you do only what is necessary in the interests of national security.

Mr. President, we are not talking about some sort of Fourth of July exhibition. We are not talking about any sort of scientific or industrial flexing of muscles to impress some other nation. Not at all. We are talking about building a defense for this country.

The one thing that appeals to me in the President's request is the fact that it provides for 1 year at a time; and at the end of each year, you look at it, reassess it, study it, and find out whether you need it; and if you do not, you cut it out.

But if you need it, how best can you continue it? If it needs improvement, your research is continuing all the time. So it is truly a most practical approach.

In our discussions, sometimes we hear the word "deployment." Deployment means to sort of spread around. Actually, I think that word may have been ill-advised, because to fulfill the requirements of research and development, you must also have construction. You have to build your test models.

We decided, to be very practical, to ask for two; and, in building them, to put them in locations where they would be actively on duty the minute they are completed to protect our hard points, so that if some nation was tempted to attack us, they would have to think twice or perhaps three times, and hopefully would decide never to attack us at all, so that the system would never be needed.

These are the considerations that have not only appealed to me, but have made it crystal clear, as I have listened with an open mind to all the witnesses in both the closed sessions of the Armed Services Committee and in the public hearings, and to the debates here on the floor. The more I have listened, the more I have studied, the more convinced I am that this is a proper and badly needed program, and that is why I am so pleased that my colleague has taken the floor today to speak for it.

My distinguished friend from Michigan joins in this statement, incidentally.

It is inconceivable to me that anyone would consider for a moment, for whatever reason, that we have the right to deny America this protection.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. I thank the Senator from California, who has served with great distinction on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. I join in the comments of the Senator from Michigan and those of the Senator from California, in commending the Senator from Idaho and point out one further thing that may be of interest.

It may be the feeling of some that the Senate is divided down the middle on the issue of preservation of our national security. It may be the opinion of some that 50 Senators, or 45, wish to do nothing insofar as the ABM is concerned.

Such an impression, if it exists, has probably been created by the press and the media unintentionally. As the Senator pointed out, there are strong proponents and strong opponents of the ABM system, but I know of no Senator who wants to do nothing.

Some say, "Let us spend more billions on research." Some say, "Let us beef up the Polaris system or have a new offensive weapons system."

I feel that sometimes the American public is misled by what is said here and what is reported.

As a junior Member of the Senate, I discern in the arguments for and against the system that no Senator indicates nothing should be done.

We all are concerned with the preservation of our security and our role as a leader in the free world.

I agree with the Senator from Idaho. I believe that the proposed ABM system is a flexible system, that the President has used discretion, and that we would do him a disservice if we were to pull the rug out from under him.

I imagine that 80 or 90 percent of the American people would find the choice easy if asked whether we should do as President Nixon proposes or do nothing.

I join the Senator and believe as he does that we should give the President the same strong bipartisan support given President Johnson when the issue was before Congress last year.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas who may be a junior Senator, but who comes here with very high credentials after many years of service in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled, "How Important Is Missile Defense?" written by R. B. Pitkin and Gerald L. Steibel, and published in the American Legion magazine of August 1969.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW IMPORTANT IS MISSILE DEFENSE?

(By R. B. Pitkin and Gerald L. Steibel)

As these words are written, a remarkable debate is coming to a head in Congress. The argument is: Should we have a system of missiles that can destroy enemy missiles in flight if they should be launched against us? Such missiles are called ABMs in the current news jargon. That stands for "anti-ballistic missiles." They are also called BMDs (for ballistic missile defense). Whatever you call them, their function is not attack, but defense against enemy missiles.

A lot of laymen thought we had such missiles standing by a long time ago. But we do not. You may recall that Congress did approve a "thin" system of ABMs to ring some of our cities during President Johnson's last years in office. They were supposed to protect us from "Chinese" destructive missiles. However, not one of them exists or is apt to. There were at least two major problems with Johnson's "Sentinel" system, and what has been debated this year is President Nixon's "Safeguard" system, which should overcome the two main weaknesses of the older proposal. Yet, while Johnson's proposal was approved for one year, as we write these words not enough votes have been assured in the Senate to OK funds for 1969–70 to get going on Nixon's. Unless the Senate vote is delayed, you may know its outcome by the time you read this. If the vote is "no," then for at least another year we will be making no progress toward putting some clothes on our nakedness in the face of a missile attack against us. If it's "yes," then for at least the next year we'll be making headway.

A lot of the debate about ABM's is based on guesses about what the Soviets will do or can do. In fact, the most rational arguments against our having any ABMs stand almost entirely on such guesses. If the guesses are right, the arguments are reasonable up to a point (if you think it is reasonable for us to gamble our lives on guesses about the Soviets).

Other arguments against ABMs are not so respectable. One is that they won't work and can't be made to work. That is simply untrue. The Soviets tested one against a missile in flight in 1962, showed one off at a parade in Moscow in 1964 and since 1966 have been installing a whole system of them.

ABMs, as proposed by the Nixon Administration, are related to three possible levels of missile warfare—a small attack on us, a large attack on us or no attack on us.

The first level deals with what happens if a lone missile or two or three were fired at us. This could conceivably happen if one of those "fail safe" things occurred. Say an overeager Russian officer fires one or two at us in some crisis before his superiors can stop him. Or a small country gets its hands on a few, as Cuba almost did, and sends one at us out of sheer recklessness.

What happens then? The way we are set up now we have 1,054 intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMS) in hardened land-based silos, and more than 650 submarine-based Polaris missiles—all weapons of destruction against people and cities. We can let loose destruction at the source of a lone missile and hope our counterblow gets through, but we can't knock that incoming missile down. Even if the hot line got to us in seconds and somehow persuaded us that a lone missile wasn't the start of the Big War, we'd still have to take that missile. If it were well aimed, we'd lose at least a whole city. We have nothing to destroy it in flight. Only an ABM can do that.

The second level is the other extreme. Another nation launches an all-out nuclear war against us. If we have by then (and it takes time) a good system of ABMs, what good would they be? Nobody has challenged the 1967 testimony of former Defense Secretary Robert McNamara that they might save from 80 million to 110 million lives—depending on how much we want to spend—if the projected loss of life without them is 120 million. This, of course, is a guess, but the only fault that has been found with it is that the ABMs couldn't provide an "impenetrable shield," as McNamara put it, and save us from any damage at all. In fact, the rather loosely bandied claim that ABMs "won't work" is really based on the common knowledge that they couldn't make us immune to *all* damage. In honesty to our people it should be fairly stated that "won't work" could mean saving 80 million or more lives in the most intolerable of situations. Mr. McNamara, it should be noted, was not arguing for ABMs, but against them, based on his belief in 1967 that we should increase our offensive strength to discourage an all-out nuclear attack.

But he changed his position later, as did President Johnson and McNamara's immediate successor, Clark Clifford. And for good reason. By late 1967, the Russians had moved rapidly to cancel out the peacemaking power of our weapons as they were—and still are.

This brings us to the third level of nuclear possibilities, the level of so preparing ourselves that we need not fear an attack by anyone but a madman. (Though the ABMs might take care of the madman, too.) Our actual policy has long been based on having enough nuclear missile strength so that even if we were hit by surprise, we'd have enough undamaged missiles left to strike our attacker a mortal blow. That being so, he wouldn't dare strike the first blow, and there would never be a nuclear war.

Some years ago we halted the expansion of our land-based missiles at their present 1,054. Any more, it was adjudged, would just provide "overkill"—that is, the ability to do far more destruction to an attacker than would ever be needed to stay his hand.

If we genuinely do have "overkill" power, then, of course, it is senseless to keep on adding to our attack power. And (except for defense against an irrational attack) we have little need for ABMs because nobody is ever going to launch any missiles against us, or try to blackmail us with threats of having superior power. But do we still have assured "overkill" power?

Not everything that alarmed President Johnson, and then President Nixon, into seeking ABMs in a hurry, from 1967 on, is necessarily known. Dr. Edward Teller, the hydrogen-bomb expert, recently urged Congress to get an ABM program going on a year-to-year basis at least. He noted that time was running out to get a defense against launched missiles under way (it could take years), and he said in effect that Congress cannot safely keep postponing all action, in view of what is and is not known.

What is known? Chiefly that the Soviets have taken three major steps to offset the peacekeeping power of our attack missiles. Each step either gives them more offensive power, or tends to neutralize the threat of our weapons to deter them, or both.

First, they are greatly expanding the number and power of their missiles of attack. The London Institute for Strategic Studies estimates that the Soviets now have about 200 more land-based missiles than we do, and are on the way to installing about 2,500 of them in all (more than double ours in number). Some opponents of our ABM have tended to kiss this off as more "overkill"—that is, no matter how many they might build, the Russians still wouldn't dare launch them and couldn't threaten us with them. What our fewer missiles could do in retaliation is still enough to scare them out of starting anything.

If the number of the projected Soviet missiles seems like foolish "overkill," the enormous power of some of their individual warheads can easily be portrayed in the same way. Both the Soviet Union and the United States have been depending chiefly on one megaton warheads, which is 50 times the power of those we used in WW2 and more than enough to wipe out a city. Yet the Soviets are building from 400 to 500 SS–9 triple warheads, with from five to 25 megatons each—and Soviet warheads of 50 and 100 megatons appear to be on the way.

It is extremely costly for the Soviets to set up such great numbers of tremendously powerful missile-borne warheads, so it is dangerous for us to base our policy on a belief that they are just being stupid in creating so much more strength than they could possibly ever need. The expense they are going to argues that they have a clear purpose in mind.

Nixon's Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, gave the Senate Foreign Relations Committee his view of the meaning of all this. The numbers and the power of the Soviet missiles make no sense if undefended American cities are their targets. They are just waste power for any such mission. But they make sense if they are to be used in a first strike to annihilate our retaliatory missiles in their silos.

The great power of the SS-9s makes good sense if it is to be aimed at our Minutemen and our few Titans. Both sides bury their attack missiles in concrete-hardened clusters, in underground sites, where it almost takes a direct hit to knock them out of action. But as you step up the power of a warhead, you can be farther and farther off target from a direct hit and still destroy your foe's missiles in their silos—or wreck a whole cluster with one hit.

Laird's point was clear enough. If the Russians are building a flight of special weapons of enormous power to annihilate our strikeback power within the first few minutes of an attack, their respect for our missiles approaches zero as their confidence in wrecking them on the ground approaches 100. Meanwhile, in the absence of any American ABM system, only Russian error could keep all their SS-9s from getting through. Thus they are the sole judges of their chances of success, and our own power to deter them by owning undefended missiles becomes ever more imaginary.

Senate Foreign Relations Chairman J. William Fulbright (Ark.) said that he was sure the Soviets still feared our missiles enough to stay their hand, and he told Laird that Laird was just trying to scare Congress to death with his description of the SS-9s so that it would vote money for ABMs. This hardly seems fair to either Laird or the American people. If the Soviets are building superbombs capable of wrecking our retaliatory missiles on a previously impossible scale, it's Laird's duty as Defense Secretary to tell Congress and the people, and not hold back because the news is unpleasant.

Just what those SS-9s could do to wreck our missiles on the ground is, of course, guesswork. Nuclear physicist Ralph Lapp, who is a consultant to Nuclear Science Service in Washington, has been campaigning mightily against our setting up an ABM system. He contends that from half to three-fourths of our Minutemen would survive any blow that the Soviets could level at us by the mid-1970s, and about half of them would be able to hit back effectively. He means without any ABMs. That's enough to deter an attack on us, he suggests. Even if he's right, which is doubtful, his guess doesn't extend beyond seven or eight years from now. That's about when we could have a full ABM system operational if we start now. And that's when the Soviets could have over 400 SS-9s, at their present rate of installation.

Lapp's opposition to ABMs as a scientist is often hard to follow. Writing in the New York Times Magazine he took the position of a spokesman for the American people, which he simply is not. He professed that the people were up in arms against the ABM, though a Harris Poll that week showed 47% for ABMs, 26% against and 27% not sure.

The people were bound to be against the ABM, he said, because they were "wearied of the war in Vietnam, dismayed and disturbed by the North Korean capture of the intelligence ship *Pueblo* and resentful of the continued diversion of dollars from the domestic front to defense."

Since it wasn't really the people, but Lapp, who was talking, this is an excellent insight into the mind of one of several distinguished scientists who have diluted opposition to ABMs with emotional, irrelevant, non-scientific reasons. The *Pueblo,* the Vietnam war, hatred of the military or a desire to divert the funds to other causes hardly have a place in a discussion of whether we now need ABMs if we are to continue to maintain a stance that will prevent nuclear war.

If Lapp thinks most of our missiles would survive anything the Soviets could throw at them for some years hence without any more protection than earth and concrete, what do our responsible officials believe? Defense Department research chief John Foster contends that only a tenth—or about 100—of our land-based missiles would survive a Soviet attack by the SS-9s. Ordinary people have no way of judging who is right, or why there is that wide a gap between the thinking of two highly qualified men.

Foster has the responsibility, and, in the end, so does President Nixon, who plainly goes with Foster.

If Foster is right, the Soviets can expect us to launch 100 missiles if they attack first. Laird fears that 425 SS-9s might destroy all but 50 or so of our Minutemen in one strike. But in any case it is not up to Laird, Foster or Lapp, it is only up to the Soviets to decide at what stage they can destroy enough of our stuff on the ground if we leave it all defenseless.

They are building to destroy our strikeback power. Whether it takes 100 or 1,000 SS-9s, so long as they don't have to risk guessing how many we can knock down, the initiative is theirs. At some point, without any worry about our defenses so long as we lack ABMs, they can decide they have enough to cut our retaliatory launchings back to some figure like 100 or 70 or you name it.

Whatever they decide, it would be a "safe" figure for them in view of the second thing the Soviets have been pushing ahead since 1966—their own ABM system. It's now seven years since the Soviets test-fired their first ABM against a missile in flight and we've never launched one and have none in operation. In view of McNamara's estimate that we could whittle away as much as 90% of the damage of a full-scale attack on us with our own ABMs, it would be tempting fate to suppose that the Soviet ABM system could not whittle 100 or so American missiles down to only a few while still in flight.

This offers us an uncomfortable equation—the possibility that by the mid-1970s the Soviet Union could launch 2,000 or more missiles against us with the expectation that they'd all get through, while no more than a handful of ours might be expected to weather destruction on the ground here or interception by the Soviets in flight.

Meanwhile, the Soviets are proceeding with steps, some of which are ominous, to save themselves as much as possible from the effects of any American missiles that might get through. They are training their people in civil defense, almost from the cradle to the grave. It begins in the lower grades and never stops. They are developing energetic and elaborate steps, in fine detail, to save their population from the effects of an attack. The subways in many of their larger cities have been designed to serve as deep shelters, too.

While all of this further reduces the potential effectiveness of any American retaliation to a Soviet attack on us, Princeton's Prof. Eugene Wigner finds another Soviet civil defense program to be "frightening." They have "elaborate plans for the evacuation of their cities . . . in the minutest detail," he reports. Professor Wigner, holder of four of the highest honors that can go to an American scientist, ranks near the top of American experts on Soviet civil defense. Among such experts, plans to evacuate cities are menacing. It's generally conceded that there's no time to evacuate a city once enemy missiles are on the way. Only a nation that plans to strike the first blow—hence knows the day, hour and minute—can have the time to profit from detailed plans to empty their cities. But "evacuation is . . . now at the center of the Soviet program," Professor Wigner reports.

What we have said to this point goes to the guts of why first Johnson, then Nixon, wanted us to get started pronto on an ABM system.

The rapid growth of Soviet attack power, and the Russian steps to neutralize the peacemaking power of our own missiles so alarmed both of them that they laid their prestige and their influence with Congress on the line to front for ABMs—but fast.

Both were shrewd enough politically to know that they would be subjected to the very attacks in Congress, in the press and on TV that have in fact resulted. But they pushed ahead anyway.

If the reader wonders why they knew that they'd meet intense resistance to a proposal better to safeguard the nation, the opposition to ABMs has not even pretended to be subtle about it.

At the bottom level of resistance we have seen "protest demonstrators" toting placards says "Down with ABM," while ABM has become a prime dirty word to American Communists, be they of the Chinese, Cuban or Soviet school. This is the enemy talking, of course, and needs no further elaboration.

A more important level of resistance is found right in Congress among those who openly say that they'd like to appropriate more of the Defense budget for more popular programs here at home. They particularly like to equate Defense spending with such things as the anti-poverty program, as if national defense and welfare-like programs were interchangeable. Irrelevant as it is, this is a potent political argument. If all other things were equal, a politician would rather show his constituents how he appropriated money to satisfy their immediate desires, rather than for hardware for their future safety that will work best if it is never used.

President Johnson had enough respect for the raw political appeal of this kind of opposition to emphasize that he only wanted a "thin" ABM system (i.e.: to play down the cost). Since he proposed to protect cities, a "thin" system couldn't easily be explained as a worthwhile one against the Soviet power to attack cities. So he said he wanted it to protect us from "Chinese" missiles. They might be ready in small numbers about the time we could have ABMs operational if we'd gone ahead with them last year.

Nobody was deceived by this. Americans and Soviets alike understood that he was after the beginnings of something to knock down Soviet missiles, and nobody supposed that, once his Sentinels had been installed, those in control would inquire into the nationality of an approaching missile before knocking it down.

Since Johnson's language made his proposal politically palatable, and the majority of Congress was of his party, his Sentinel ABM program was approved.

It ran into trouble when hardly any city wanted it, each one being morally certain that having ABMs around it would make it Target #1 in a Soviet atttack. Only two Sentinel sites were started, one near Pittsburgh and one near Boston. (Both have been, in effect, ploughed under.) Meanwhile, there was no answer to the objection that to defend each city adequately against Soviet attack would require a perfectly enormous setup of ABMs, and the *real* concern was over the great Soviet menace and not the limited Chinese one.

When President Nixon took office, he proposed the more sensible and forthright Safeguard system. Let's defend our land-based missiles and our command centers with ABMs, not our cities, he proposed. This is feasible, though it is still offered as a "thin"

XUM

system. There are less than 20 sites to protect. No city becomes more of a prime target, thereby. If we protect our attack missiles the Soviets will have lost their assurance that SS–9s or warheads of any power can get through in time to stop us from retaliating against an attack. Hence we'd have moved back toward the peacemaking balance of power that has been our true policy all along.

Another kind of opposition to our having defensive missiles helps explain the mystery of the intense opposition to Nixon's plan, when it overcomes the major objections to Johnson's. This is the widespread, well-publicized, emotional and irrational opposition which has chosen to make the defeat of the ABM a convenient club for various political, personal and ideological grievances. Even some Senators have minced no words in opposing the ABM as a way of "punishing" the military, or the so-called "military-industrial complex."

This is highly attractive reasoning to some extremely vocal minorities. Draft-card burners, Vietnam war protestors, the various "militants" for this and that who are mad at The Establishment readily follow such leadership. A club to beat The Establishment with is what they want. We have already seen so outstanding a nuclear expert as Lapp making the *Pueblo* incident a reason to oppose the ABM, and a recent two-page ad by a major book publisher in the New York Times summoned opposition to ABM's in huge black letters on the basis that we never had to use the bomb shelters that some people built some years back.

What these approaches lack in good reasoning they more than make up for in emotional wallop and in their appeal to headline writers. They have gotten far more publicity than the detailed, painstaking exposition of the hard military facts by defense experts.

Whenever public debate is based on irrelevant hostility, it can frustrate all attempts of intelligent discussion. Consider this dilemma of Professor Wigner in a debate with Cornell's Prof. Hans Bethe about ABMs. Professor Wigner is the Princeton scientist whom we have already quoted on Soviet civil defense and city evacuation plans. Bethe is almost as distinguished. Both men are Nobel Prize winners in the sciences. A year and more ago, Bethe was bringing his scientific reputation to bear against President Johnson's Sentinel ABM system. This year he was opposing Nixon's Safeguard system, while Professor Wigner was arguing for the Nixon proposal as an urgent national necessity.

The two men met in a panel debate on ABMs before The American Physical Society last April 29. Professor Wigner pointed out that when the Johnson system was being considered by Congress. Professor Bethe had testified against it, and had volunteered, instead, the very system Nixon switched to. Said Professor Wigner: "At the end of his Congressional testimony, Professor Bethe said. A completely different concept of ABM (from Johnson's city defenses) is to deploy it around Minutemen silos and at command and control centers. This application has gone in and out of Defense Department planning. I am in favor of such a scheme.' "

Professor Wigner wanted to know why, when Nixon adopted the plan that Professor Bethe had recommended, Professor Bethe then came out against it.

The ABM actually offers us one of several weapons choices in a rapidly changing shift in the international balance of nuclear power toward Soviet—and soon Chinese—might. It has almost nothing to do with most of the best publicized public debate about it. When the Soviet power increase had become obvious by 1967, McNamara wanted us to increase our retaliatory power to offset it. His argument, as interpreted by D. G. Brennan in a recent issue of Foreign Affairs, was highly complex in its details, since it involved comparative costs and their effect on both sides. But it added up to something like this:

If we install defenses, the Soviet will increase their attack power even more to offset them. Then both sides will be put to pushing their attack power even farther than if we just balance destructive power against destructive power, without any defenses. As Brennan put it, McNamara wanted us to do whatever was necessary to maintain an ability after suffering the first blow to destroy 50 million Russians, because *that* would forever stay their hand from hitting us first.

Perhaps the Johnson Administration realized finally that we could never be sure of our striking power, in the face of Soviet developments, and we'd have to have defenses of our own if they were to continue to respect our posture. At any rate, it switched from seeking more destructive power to an urgent request for ABMs. Of course there were other factors, perhaps the chief of which was the overwhelming evidence that the Soviets were escalating both the offensive and defensive aspects of nuclear power as fast as as they could, without our doing anything new to force them into an arms race.

This touches on an interesting part of this year's American debate over ABMs. One of the sternest warnings of the opponents of our ABMs is that they would "escalate the arms race"—it would provoke the Soviets if we should set up weapons to knock theirs down.

This drove Washington's Sen. Henry Jackson to distraction because, on the record, they have been racing as hard as they can without any new provocation from us. In a speech this March 20, he listed what he called "five myths" about our "aggressive provocation" and the "peaceful intentions" of the Soviets. His comments on "Myth Number Three" are worth quoting in full:

> Myth Number Three is the idea that it is the United States that is responsible for heating up the arms buildup.
>
> The evidence decisively refutes this notion.
>
> The Soviets acted first to test-fire an ABM against an incoming nuclear-armed missile (in 1962) and they are the only nation to have done this.
>
> The Soviets acted first to develop and test a 60-megaton bomb—and they are the only nation to possess anything like that size bomb.
>
> The Soviets acted first to develop and deploy a fractional orbital bombardment system (FOBS), a first-strike oriented weapon—and they are the only nation to have developed or deployed such a system.
>
> The Soviets acted first to deploy an ABM setup and they have been testing, improving and updating the system ever since. Today, they have over 60 anti-ballistic missiles deployed on launch pads. We, on the other hand, have not yet deployed an ABM setup of any shape or form.

The current campaigners against the ABM say that when the United States acts to deploy an ABM *we* are "escalating the arms race." I have never heard one of those people say that because the Soviets were first to deploy an ABM, they were the ones that escalated the arms race.

Fortunately, the American people, if they get the facts, are able to recognize this obvious double standard—crudely biased against their own country.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that Soviet Premier Kosygin has explicitly rejected the proposition that deployment of a defensive missile system heats up the arms race or is "destabilizing."

At a London press conference on February 9, 1967, Premier Kosygin was asked:

"Do you not share the opinion that the development of the Soviet anti-missile system is a new step in the arms race?"

Premier Kosygin replied: "Which weapons should be regarded as a tension-factor—offensive or defensive weapons? I think that a defensive system which prevents attack is not a cause of the arms race but represents a factor preventing the death of people."

No weapons system, of course, is or will be perfect. Our offensive weapons aren't perfect, and our defensive arrangements won't be either. But that doesn't mean we refuse to deploy them when we believe they can perform a useful and important task well enough to make a substantial contribution to the overall deterrent.

I commend President Nixon for his determination to proceed with the phased deployment of a thin ABM system, and I believe all Americans should now support their President in his statesmanlike decision. It would make no sense to leave this country altogether "naked" to enemy missile attack. And it is important to steady and fortify our President's hand in this very unsteady world. I am a Democrat. But I am proud that over the years I have supported my President—whether he was a Democrat or a Republican—in the critical decisions to safeguard the national defense and to protect the future of individual liberty.

It is interesting to note that even Soviet Premier Kosygin sees what many of us ought to see, too. He also told one reporter in London. "Maybe an antimissile system is more expensive than an offensive system, but it is designed not to kill people but to preserve human lives," Professor Wigner, in his debate with Bethe, said, "I quite agree with Kosygin and do not consider the defense of the people to be objectionable, or, as it is often put when our own defense measures are considered, provocative."

If both sides could some day develop even a fairly "impenetrable shield," there is at least a faint promise of an eventual end to the matching of destructive power with more destructive power, "overkill" with "overkill."

The Soviets ignored the approaches of President Johnson to discuss nuclear arms control so long as they erected defenses and we did not. Congress had hardly approved the now-dead Sentinel plan when the Russians offered to sit down and discuss the whole subject. Without pretending to read their minds, or trust them farther than you can spit, it is entirely possibly that they recognized that if the other side has ABMs you can never risk an attack on him. Whether his ABMs would work well or not, you'd never know without taking too great a risk. In this view, and it makes sense, the Soviets may have long seen that the basic condition for seriously discussing nuclear arms reduction is that both sides have defenses. But if *they* had defenses and *we* didn't it would be preposterous for them to bargain with us, because they'd have the upper hand beyond all bargaining. At least they made a prompt offer to talk the moment the Senate OK'd Johnson's ABM plan.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, during these days of debate on the military procurement bill, I have repeatedly raised the question of this Nation's treaty commitments around the world and just what they could mean to us in terms of military operations that may become necessary in the future.

We are here debating a bill that eventually will authorize in the neighborhood of $77 or $78 billion for military purposes. And we are being bombarded from all sides with demands for retrenchment, economy, and across the board reduction of expenditures for defense purposes.

My point is, Mr. President, that we must have an accurate picture of just what our total commitments might call for before we go in for any wholesale cutting back on our present level of defense expenditures. By this I do not mean that we should ease off in our efforts to cut back and eliminate as much waste and inefficiency as we possibly can in the area of military procurement. Instead, I am speaking of efforts to eliminate or cut down on entire programs and systems which may be needed in the future.

There is a concerted effort within this body and in the intellectual and academic communities to pull back from our international commitments. President Nixon has referred to this as a form of neoisolationism and I believe that that is an accurate description. For if I understand correctly the opponents of the ABM and the critics of the military-industrial complex, they would like to see this Nation turn away from its foreign entanglements, go back on its foreign commitments and forego the possibility of coming to the defense of any nations where freedom is threatened or where there is a threat of Communist aggression.

I believe there is no doubt that this desire for a resumption of isolationism stems in large part from a great yearning to be rid of the prolonged and irksome war in Vietnam. Mr. President, I yield to no man anywhere in my concern over the great cost to this country in lives and money that is being extracted in Southeast Asia. I can understand thoroughly the desire of the American people to rid themselves of this burden and the desire of public officials to find an easy way out of the dilemma. But I also know that if we cut and run in Vietnam and signify our intentions to avoiding any comparable conflicts in the future, we will—in the eyes of the world—be defaulting on our obligations as leader of the free world.

By the same token, I realize that we have on the domestic front many requirements for public expenditures. We need better housing, we need better hospitals, we need better schools, we need a vast variety of urban renewal programs, and all of these cost money.

I realize, too, that it is popular to point at defense expenditures and regard them as wasteful in their very nature. And there can be no denying the fact that money spent on missile systems, naval vessels and military hardware of any kind is nonproductive in the accepted sense.

But it has a purpose to serve and that purpose is the defense of the American people and the cause of freedom. There is no way you can place a monetary or material value on the type of yield which we obtain from military hardware. But I believe we must understand that in today's world we are required to make expenditures, and very heavy expenditures, in the name of defense.

It would be a marvelous thing if all the nations of the world were to decide once and for all that war and the implements of war and defense and the implements of defense are wasteful and unnecessary and that the money spent for these implements could be put to better uses for the good of humanity. Unfortunately, the nations of the world are not about to reach any such level of trust. And because of this, we must regard all recommendations for unrealistic reductions of military expenditures in the light of wishful and dangerous thinking. Just saying that a reduction in arms by the United States would lessen the chance of war does not make it true. But I do believe the chances for an outbreak of hostilities on the scale that the world knew in World War I and World War II are increasing rapidly with the expansion of Russian military might and our seeming interest in relinquishing our world leadership and its responsibilities.

And this has a direct bearing on the treaties which we now are a party to. I think there are a total of 44 such agreements and in at least 15 of them we are committed to armed intervention if the other nations party to the treaties are attacked.

The connection appears obvious. The Russians, by expending the reach of their military operations through the development of a large navy and air force are enlarging the area of a possible world involvement. The Soviet Union, heretofore, has always been defensive in nature—content to confine its military defenses to its own homeland. Thus the development of a powerful navy represents a significant departure from Russia's historic and traditional attitude.

The determined drive of the Soviet Union to become all powerful in all areas of military endeavor—nuclear, naval, space, and the conventional sphere—is bound to produce a new level of worldwide tension. We may as well acknowledge the fact that the Soviet Union shows every sign of making preparations on all fronts to move into any power vacuums which might be created through withdrawal of American influence, such as now is being urged for Southeast Asia, Germany, and other areas. The theory is that the masters of the Kremlin believe that American "doves" will prevail and that this Nation will retreat from its position of world leadership in order to devote a preponderence of its attention and its money to domestic problems. As right as this might seem, it would be wrong.

The Russians have already made their move in the Middle East. When the United States more or less declared a hands-off policy in that tense area where the world sealanes cross and four continents touch, the Soviet Union moved in quickly to arm the Arab nations with the sinews of war. Our default of responsibility and the Soviet Union's aggressive intent have already caused one vicious all-out war between Israel and the Arab nations. Israel, of course, won the war of June 1967, hands down and captured much of the Russian supply equipment. However, all of it has since been replaced and the Middle East remains one of the foremost tinderboxes of the world.

By the same token, the Soviets are obviously waiting for us to turn tail and withdraw from Vietnam so that its Communist counterparts can take over Vietnam and finally all of Southeast Asia. They also are waiting hopefully for us to withdraw from Berlin and other areas of Western Europe.

It is obvious that the U.S.S.R. is reaching for a position which would enable it to exert undisputed world leadership.

The whole question of world power balance is now undergoing a very subtle but a very vital change as the Russians move into a position of nuclear parity with the United States.

Professor Brzezinski of Columbia University has dealt expertly with this subject in an article entitled "Peace and Power" which was published in Encounter magazine.

He points out that as the power of the two superstates begins to overlap on a global basis, the competition between the United States and the U.S.S.R. could easily become more intense and less stable.

He wrote:

> Both powers may be drawn into hostile confrontations even though they may not actually desire them. The termination of the Vietnam war, far from ushering in a new era of detente between Washington and Moscow, might be followed by a more complicated phase in international politics . . .
>
> A domestic crisis in America, and especially a panicky disengagement for world affairs because of frustration spread by the Vietnamese war, would have a catastrophic effect on world stability. It would probably result in a wave of upheaval that could not but stimulate a dangerously erratic sense of optimism in Moscow, conceivably precipitating the Soviet Union into courses of action that so far Moscow has been careful to eschew.

Professor Brzezinski points out that until now deterrence has always been unbalanced in favor of the United States. He says the United States never has had to face a crisis with the Soviet Union in the setting of parity and wonders what might have happened in the Cuban missile crisis if an equality of deterrence had then existed.

Mr. President, President Nixon has told us that his purpose in the area of military strength is to make sure that we have a "sufficiency" of power to guarantee our national strategic interests. I believe that we do not now have a sufficiency in the area of missile defense. We certainly are far short of "parity" with the Soviet Union, because we are only now debating the deployment of an ABM system while the Russians have been in the process of deploying their ABM system for 5 years.

I believe, Mr. President, that it is vital to our position in the world that our defense against missile attack be strengthened and that our military expenditures be kept equal to the tasks that confront us today and may confront us in the future in our role as leader of the free world.

In conclusion I would suggest—particularly to the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations—that before they join any concerted effort to cut our military procurement below the level regarded as adequate by the Defense Department and the President, they thoroughly examine the treaties to which we are a party and whose provisions might require us to go to war at some time in the future. I believe that if we are to withdraw into a shell of neoisolationism, it is incumbent upon the Committee on Foreign Relations to make recommendations which would make our treaty commitments conform to a new reduced stature in international affairs. If we are not to have the arms sufficient to guarantee the provisions of these treaties, we

XUM

should not be bound by them, we should not be a party to them.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I should like to ask my distinguished colleague about one aspect of the entire international situation which I am sure has occurred to him, as it has to me, which sometimes gets lost in the discussions.

We talk about treaties. We are told about an entirely new approach, a new spirit, with regard to the Russians. I wonder whether the Senator would explain to me under what rules the Russians are still threatening to try our prisoners of war as war criminals. Is the Senator aware of this statement?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes, I am aware of that statement.

Under the treaty at Geneva, the international rules of law established for the treatment of prisoners, this has been outlawed, in my opinion; and they would be operating, as they often have operated, against the law of the world, one might say.

Mr. MURPHY. Would it not be a most important consideration for the President, in his negotiations, to put this high on the list, for example, with respect to the Air Force officers who have been prisoners—that there be some message, some news, about their condition, some word as to their manner of treatment?

These are some of the things that the Soviet Union and the Communists of North Vietnam might see to before we proceed with a complete area of trust in matters of international strength.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think that would be a perfectly natural request for the President of the United States to make, even though I am not sure that this type of information is required to be given by the Geneva agreements. I am not aware that such information is required, although I am aware that in World War II getting information relative to prisoners was not an impossible task—on either side, I should say.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 101

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I think it was indicated, when the order was entered permitting me to obtain the floor at this time, that it was for the purpose of calling up an amendment that the able Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER), I, and others had filed.

I send to the desk an amendment which modifies, more in language than in substance, the earlier amendment. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed and that the reading be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The modified amendment is as follows:

SEC. 402. Funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or any other Act for the acquisition of an antiballistic missile system may be used only for research, development, testing, evaluation and normal procurement incident thereto, and may not be used for such purposes at any proposed antiballistic missile site; further, such funds may not be used for the deployment of an antiballistic missile system or any part or component thereof or for the acquisition of any site or preparation of any site for the deployment of any such system.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I make this statement on behalf of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) and myself.

On July 11, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services (Mr. STENNIS), asked a series of questions concerning the purpose of the amendment that has been offered on the part of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), myself, and a number of other Senators who oppose deployment of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system in this coming fiscal year.

The amendment offered on July 9 read as follows:

Funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or any other Act for the acquisition of an antiballistic missile system may be used only for research, development, testing, evaluation and normal procurement incident thereto, and may not be used for the deployment of an antiballistic missile system or any part or component thereof or for the acquisition of any site or preparation of any site for the deployment of any such system.

The amendment as now modified, which was just sent to the desk by the Senator from Michigan, reads as follows:

Funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or any other Act for the acquisition of an antiballistic missile system may be used only for research, development, testing, evaluation and normal procurement incident thereto, and may not be used for such purposes at any proposed antiballistic missile site; further, such funds may not be used for the deployment of an antiballistic missile system or any part or component thereof or for the acquisition of any site or preparation of any site for the deployment of any such system.

The amendment as modified does not alter its central purpose—to prohibit the deployment of any component or element of the Safeguard system on any proposed site in fiscal year 1970.

The amendment does not strike any funds that may be available in this bill or under past acts of the Congress. It does require that all funds may be used only for research, development, testing, and evaluation with one exception: "Funds may be used for normal procurement incident thereto," concerning research, development, testing, and evaluation.

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) referred to page 25 of the committee report and correctly outlined the proposed uses of $759.1 million requested by the administration in fiscal year 1970:

(a) The Authorization for the procurement of elements in the Safeguard missile program is in the amount of $345.5 million. To this amount of new obligational authority would be added $15 million of funds previously appropriated but not reflected in the request of $345.5 million.

(b) The request for an authorization for funds for research and development for the Safeguard system in the amount of $400.9 million.

(c) The request for an authorization for the construction of missile test facilities at Kwajalein for the Safeguard system totaling $12.7 million.

Our amendment accepts items (b) and (c) as approved by the committee as they are concerned with research, development, testing, and evaluation only. The amendment we offer does not delete the $345.5 million which the administration requests for deployment. It would, however, restrict the use of such funds and any other funds carried over from previous acts similarly to research, development, testing, and evaluation, with the exception of the procurement of items normal to research, development, testing, and evaluation processes. Our amendment leaves to the administration authority to determine whether action, including procurement, is in the category of research, development, testing, and evaluation.

If the administration chooses to use any of the $345.5 million originally earmarked for deployment for research, development, testing, and evaluation purposes at any testing sites such as Kwajalein, our amendment would permit it to do so.

Secretary Laird stated that phase 1 of the Safeguard system cannot be completed until 1974 and phase 2 until 1976. The state of development of the components of the Safeguard system as described by administration witnesses indicates that no significant part of the Safeguard ABM system could, in fact, be emplaced during fiscal year 1970 at the proposed deployment sites.

Outstanding nuclear weapons scientists have given testimony that the Safeguard ABM, as proposed and assuming it is workable, would require a minimum expenditure of $40 billion, as compared to the administration's estimate of $10.3 billion. It is agreed by most nuclear weapons scientists that effective missile site defense can be designed, but that the Safeguard system cannot in its present form fulfill that purpose. The redesign required could provide a more effective defense at a lesser cost. In order to facilitate this necessary research and development, our amendment has left available the $345.5 million originally earmarked for procurement, with the view that the administration could use the funds to carry on required additional research and development efforts, to design and test an effective system should it prove necessary in the future to deploy one. In any case, any system should be tested fully as a unit before a deployment decision. At present this can be best done at recognized testing sites such as exists at Kwajalein.

None of the funds could be used for the deployment of any component or element of the proposed Safeguard system at any proposed deployment site. Again, we emphasize that the central purpose of the amendment is to prohibit in the coming year a premature commitment to deployment.

The energies, the purpose of our Government should be directed toward negotiations with the Soviet Union in an effort to arrest the nuclear arms race—an objective upon which all are agreed. We should not make a decision now to deploy nuclear weapons systems which negotiations seek to control.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky very much. I know that the Senator from Mississippi

XUM

has been advised of our clarifying statement, and he will have an opportunity to study it.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Will the Senator be good enough to explain the difference in modification? I have read it several times, and any substantial difference escapes me.

Mr. HART. The language change makes clear, we believe, the purpose of the amendment; namely, that the moneys authorized be available for research, development, testing, and evaluation and the normal procurement incident thereto, but that the moneys may not be used for such purposes at any proposed deployment site.

Basically, the objective of this amendment is to insure that there be a full funding of any undertakings necessary for research and development of an anti-ballistic-missile system, but insuring that that activity shall not occur at any of the 12 proposed anti-ballistic-missile sites. This has been the position of Senator COOPER and those of us who have offered this amendment from the outset. It was suggested to us that the new language might make more plain and more consistent this purpose.

Mr. TOWER. If I correctly understand, the Senator is saying that the change is not substantive; it is merely for the purpose of clarification.

Mr. HART. The Senator from Texas is correct.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on July 11, I set forth my reasons for opposing the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART). In the process of explaining what I believe would be the unfortunate effects of this amendment, I stated that there are thousands of valuable personnel now employed on this project who probably would have to be discharged if this amendment were to be adopted. I now have more complete figures regarding these personnel and I should like to share them with my colleagues at this time.

In addition, I would like to point out that the language change in the Cooper-Hart amendment presented today does not cure the basic fault of the amendment. The distinguished Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) was kind enough to clarify the modification for me a moment ago, and he did state that it did not provide for a substantive change. That basic fault is that adoption of the amendment would delay deployment of the Safeguard system for 2 years. Since one of the reasons for this delay is the difficulty we would face in attempting to reassemble the technical and production personnel now prepared to begin work on phase I of Safeguard, I think that this fact sheet which I have had prepared is highly relevant.

There are presently approximately 6,000 personnel employed in preproduction and production tasks for the Safeguard deployment at the prime and principal subcontractor offices and plants. If the deployment were halted, all of these personnel would cease their work on Safeguard. Some of these personnel (but only something less than 1,000) would be retained by their present employers on other tasks and might be available at a later date for work on reinstituted ABM deployment. Therefore, it is estimated that about 5,000 trained civilian employees would be discharged or otherwise lost from the prime and principal subcontractor roles as a result of discontinuance of the deployment.

A breakout of this estimate by contractor and location is as follows:

Western Electric, Greensboro/Burlington, N.C	2, 240
McDonnell-Douglas Aircraft, Santa Monica, Calif	632
Raytheon, Boston, Mass	1, 268
General Electric, Syracuse, N.Y	496
Martin-Marietta, Orlando, Fla	378
Total	5, 014

The corporations above include prime and first tier subcontractors only; therefore, the personnel loss estimate does not take into account losses that would surely occur in other numerous enterprises involved with the supply of essential material, minor hardware components and other essential services. These numbers cannot be estimated and hence are not included.

Production losses above would be mainly clerical and administrative and assembly workers and junior technical and supervisory personnel.

In addition, there would be some 500 trained personnel from architectural engineering firms engaged in construction engineering work which would be terminated. Of this number, it is estimated that about 435 would be discharged or otherwise lost by discontinuance of the deployment.

A breakout of the loss estimate by company and location is as follows:

Ammann & Whitney, New York, N.Y	150
Bechtel, Los Angeles, Calif	45
Parsons, Vernon, Calif	150
Black & Veatch, Kansas City, Mo	45
Sperry-Rand, Huntsville, Ala	45
Total	435

Construction engineering losses would be primarily technical and professional engineer personnel such as design and construction engineers, mathematicians, and computer specialists.

There are, of course, a sizable number of Government employees engaged in planning and supervision of Safeguard PEMA and MCA activities. These also have not been included in the above loss estimates. An attempt would be made to find employment elsewhere in the Government for these trained people, should deployment be discontinued, and to obtain their services again if deployment were subsequently approved.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I do not take lightly the task of outlining the full dimension of the debate on which we are now embarked.

The debate involves differences of philosophy as well as differences of judgment.

The questions range from narrow technical considerations to broad policy decisions and, yes, perhaps even to survival of a world threatened by an ever-escalating nuclear arms race.

The issues involve not only the proper role of the Congress in setting national policies and priorities, but also whether a free society has the will and wisdom to debate such broad concepts and to recognize which threats are the greatest to the national security.

Clearly, this is an historic debate, and as we begin I should like to recall some words of Abraham Lincoln which are pertinent today:

> If there ever could be a proper time for mere arguments, that time surely is not now. In times like the present, men should utter nothing for which they would not willingly be responsible through time and in eternity.

It is important that we conduct this debate with those words in mind not only because the effects of the decision we make may well last through time, but also because there are those in our Nation who, questioning the decisionmaking process of our Government, may use the conduct of this debate as a test of the validity of our system.

Therefore, before turning to an attempt to outline the case against immediate deployment of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system, I would first like to make two points about the nature of the debate:

First, this is not a partisan debate, nor should it ever become that.

A Cooper-Hart amendment seeking a cutback in an ABM system was first introduced more than a year ago when a Democrat was in the White House.

In all, we worked together on three amendments designed to delay deployment of the Sentinel ABM system.

While those amendments all failed, it is interesting to note that the proposal to which we objected last year is today acknowledged and rejected as unworkable by some of those who proposed it.

Some of them are now among those who tell us that Safeguard will work, despite the fact that it is, for all intents and purposes, the same system renamed with a new mission.

On July 9, we introduced another amendment dealing with an ABM system, and there is a Republican in the White House.

Our concern is people, not politics; sanity in a nuclear age, not partisan gain or political embarrassment.

Second, it is important to keep in mind that in opposing the Safeguard proposal, we do not seek to paint our defense planners, civilian or military, as overaggressive, single-minded proponents of destruction. Rather we seek to determine if the defense policies we have asked these planners to carry out are realistic and responsive to conditions at home and abroad. This, I submit, is a proper concern of Congress, a concern to which Congress has paid too little attention in recent years.

Having attempted to set the tone of the debate as I see it, let me attempt to structure the substance of the discussion, again, as I see it.

The debate might be divided into three parts: hardware, the arms race, and national priorities.

In turn, each of these parts involves a series of questions.

HARDWARE

Under the heading of hardware considerations, we must ask:

At this point in time, do we really need to provide additional defense for our Minutemen ICBM deterrent force?

If so, will the proposed Safeguard work and provide a credible defense?

At the risk of oversimplification, I will attempt to provide some brief answers to these and other questions which I will pose subsequently.

Our deterrent rests where? So far as tools and weapons are concerned, our deterrent rests with ICBM Minutemen missiles, nuclear submarines, strategic bombers, and a vast array of tactical nuclear weapons located abroad.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield at that point?

Mr. HART. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Those are all offensive weapons, are they not?

Mr. HART. They are.

Mr. MURPHY. In the ABM, we are talking about purely defensive weapons, is that not true?

Mr. HART. That is the label that is given to it.

Mr. MURPHY. I see. So that technologically at the present time the ABM could become an offensive weapon.

Mr. HART. No, indeed. I question whether the technology would suggest that the ABM presently proposed is an effective defensive weapon.

Mr. MURPHY. Well, there are some differences of opinion about that. I will say that it is a matter of choice——

Mr. HART. The choice that confronts us is one which we imprudently made last year, and which I hope we will correct this year.

Mr. MURPHY. If the Senator will permit me, I thank him for responding to my questions. I shall be interested in the continuation of his presentation.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, only by accepting as fact a series of highly improbable assumptions about Russian missile and antisubmarine developments can a case be made that we need additional defense to preserve our ICBM deterrent. I, for one, am not persuaded that the effectiveness of our deterrent is or will be threatened in the near future.

However, if one draws a different conclusion on the nature of the threat to our deterrent, he must still ask whether Safeguard will counter that threat.

Again in brief, there is a large body of scientists and technicians who believe that the computer which will direct the Safeguard missiles cannot work with the reliability required to provide a credible defense.

There is considerable doubt within the scientific community—particularly that not attached to the Pentagon—that the system will significantly increase our defense posture because the radar which tracks incoming missiles is easier to destroy than the Minutemen missiles themselves.

And finally, persons experienced with developing sophisticated weapons systems point out that such systems have almost always required rigorous and realistic field testing and sometimes actual use to iron out all the bugs, and I think it is safe to say that Safeguard is one of the most sophisticated weapons systems ever proposed.

Perhaps the strongest technical argument against Safeguard assumes that the radar and computers will work, but the system still will not provide a credible defense.

That argument is:

Even if the system works with a degree of reliability, it can be overcome easily by merely increasing the number of missiles launched against it.

One study estimated that in 3 months Russia could build the additional missiles needed to exhaust an ABM system which will take us more than 4 years to install.

A group of University of Michigan scientists have concluded that even if Safeguard works, it would have to be greatly expanded to provide a credible defense—an expansion which, in their estimate, would increase the price tag to the $40 billion range.

Without pretending to know the exact figures, for they are classified, it would appear as if the ABM is a multibillion dollar defense system which at best might afford some hardpoint protection against, say—these are by no means precise figures because, again, they are classified, but to illustrate the point of the argument—450 Russian missiles, but not against 500 Russian missiles; might provide some area defense against 25 Chinese missiles, but almost none against 50 or 75 Chinese missiles.

The figures are merely illustrative. The gap between protection and nonprotection may be broader or narrower, but the best information we have is that the gap can be bridged with addition to an enemy missile arsenal.

THE ARMS RACE

If one is persuaded that despite the probability the system will not work, despite its cost, and despite its limited effectiveness, we ought nevertheless to deploy Safeguard—he still must consider the effect deployment will have on the arms race.

Here two questions come immediately to mind.

First, will ABM deployment cause the other side to increase its number of missiles in order to protect the effectiveness of its deterrent force?

And second, will deployment of ABM strengthen our hand in any talks with Moscow on limiting the arms race?

The answer to the first seems clear.

In response to information that Russia was working on an ABM system, this country developed and is deploying multiheaded missiles and begain development of multiple-independently-targeted-reentry missiles—MIRV.

There is no reason to believe that Moscow will not react the same way to deployment on our part.

Equally important, it is quite possible and rational to interpret deployment of an ABM system as part of building a first-strike capability. If Russia makes that interpretation, then, indeed, the hands of the nuclear time clock will have been moved closer to that ultimate midnight.

It has been argued that the decision to deploy Safeguard will enable the U.S. to lead from a position of strength in arms talks with Moscow.

If indeed an ABM system, with all its technical shortcomings, could be a factor in arms limitation talks, would it not be more effective as a lever which has not yet been pulled rather than one that has?

Not deployed, but under continuing research and development to improve it, an ABM system becomes a more effective bargaining card.

I think there is a suggestion and indication that proponents of deployment argue their case both ways.

On the one hand they argue that deployment will have no effect on the arms race, that Moscow understands defense and will not be alarmed by an addition to our defensive system.

On the other hand, they argue that the President needs Safeguard ABM to strengthen his position in arms talks.

Frankly, I fail to understand how Safeguard can at once be an effective bargaining card and a card our opponents consider to be of no real threat.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES

All of which brings us to the broadest and most important questions involved in this debate which has its roots in computers and radar.

The questions here are awesome indeed:

Is a defense policy which strives to meet all contingencies, no matter how remote, realistic, and responsive to the Nation's needs?

In the face of growing and pressing domestic problems, problems which run the gauntlet from urban rot to inflation, can we afford such a defense policy?

Does such a defense policy actually add to the national security?

Can the world survive a continuation of an arms race that matches escalation with escalation—replaces old contingencies with new—a race that siphons resources of nations away from the needs of people in order to simply stay even?

Why not call a halt now to the race that nobody can win? Yes, one side can gain a lead at some point in time, but what will one do with a lead which is certain to evaporate?

Mr. President, these, then, are the ultimate questions we debate these days in the Senate.

In opposing immediate deployment of Safeguard, we seek to start a discussion leading to some sensible world policy on nuclear armaments. We seek to replace what might be described as a condition of nuclear anarchy among the superpowers with policies of nuclear responsibility.

We ask that the national commitment be focused on the prompt start of arms talks with Russia.

We ask that nothing be done further to complicate those talks which represent man's best chance of ending a competition which benefits no nation and threatens civilization.

In opposing immediate deployment of Safeguard, we seek to reexamine our all-contingency defense policy which is used to justify huge expenditures for defense systems to meet offensive threats existing only on paper and only then if highly improbable assumptions are accepted as fact. It is used to justify systems adding only marginally and for a limited time to our defense posture.

In opposing immediate deployment of Safeguard, we seek to reorder national spending priorities toward domestic problems which pose clear and present dangers to the Nation's security.

I do not pretend that I read Toynbee at night all the time. I must confess I read this last night. My prepared notes say that I note the observation of historian Arnold Toynbee who, after studying the demise of great civilizations, said:

> In all the cases reviewed the most that an alien enemy has achieved has been to give an expiring suicide his coup de grace.

I think we ought to roll that one a second time.

Yes, arms talks may fail. And, yes, the other side may escalate the arms race. But let history not say of us that when the opportunity beckoned, we were not wise enough, thoughtful, courageous enough, or willing enough to explore that opportunity to the fullest.

Let history not say of us that we did not strive to replace nuclear anarchy with nuclear responsibility.

Let it not be said of us that we were unable to recognize what are, in fact, the greatest dangers to national security.

For all of these reasons, I urge approval and adoption of the amendment introduced July 9 by the able Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER), myself, and others, as now modified.

The amendment has been modified, without change in substance, by the amendment which we called up a few minutes ago. I ask unanimous consent that the names of all the Senators who cosponsored the July 9 Cooper-Hart amendment be added as cosponsors of the amendment just called up and now pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HART. In addition, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the able Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, this amendment reflects what has been our position during the more than 1 year we have been debating deployment of an ABM system. That position has been to delay deployment and to continue research and development.

We say, let us continue research in the interval, to insure that if the day for deployment comes, we will deploy something more effective and more efficient.

This amendment will allow:

First, a pause in the arms race while seeking agreement with Moscow to end this expensive and wasteful competition.

Second, continued study to learn if we can develop an effective ABM system in the event we ever need one.

Mr. President, as to the question of how much this system is going to cost when it is all built, you can grab any handful of billions of dollars you choose, but if the arms agreement can be reached, it will save whatever that billion-dollar handful is, if we delay deployment now.

If continued research and development indicate the ABM system now envisioned cannot provide a credible defense at an acceptable cost, as I believe is the case, additional R. & D. will have proved the hardware portion of our position and saved us whatever number of billions of dollars Senators wish to suggest as the ultimate price tag.

Our amendment also is written to give the Senate a meaningful and clear cut vote on the issue.

The amendment bars deployment of any component of any ABM system at any of the proposed Safeguard sites, but allows the administration to continue R. & D. at test sites, such as at our facilities in the Pacific.

This approach, we believe, accomplishes two things: It insures the adequacy of continued R. & D., and it establishes the credibility of our decision not to deploy.

To deploy components of Safeguard at the proposed Safeguard sites in the name of research and development would not only be wasteful in terms of meaningful testing, but would certainly raise doubts about the credibility of our decision not to deploy while seeking an arms limitation agreement.

I think it rather certain that we can test better in the Pacific than we can in Montana and in North Dakota; and deployment by any other name can be interpreted as deployment.

And finally, our amendment keeps the issue clear by avoiding a debate over the amount of money authorized by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Let me explain briefly why we have not recommended a cutback in funds.

The bill authorizes $400.9 million for research and development, $345.5 million for deployment at Safeguard sites in Montana and North Dakota, and $12.7 million for test facilities at Kwajalein.

Conceivably the Department of Defense may make a case for additional research and development funds on the grounds that adjustment in its R. & D. program would be required in the light of the amendment. As far as I know, we have heard no testimony on how much, if any, additional R. & D. funds might be needed if our amendment is adopted.

It would be my assumption that in the event the Senate approves our amendment, and the amendment becomes law, the Senate Appropriations Committee will question closely the Department of Defense officials to determine how much if any sum in excess of the $400.9 million and the $12.7 million would be required for an adequate R. & D. effort. I would hope the answer would be none, but that question is for a future vote. To debate figures today would be to engage in a number's game at the risk of confusing, or at least blurring, the far more important and clearcut question of whether to deploy ABM.

I think the intent of our amendment is clear.

No one can question the adequacy or credibility of testing permitted by this amendment.

Test adequately and fully; do not deploy. Test under circumstances which make clear it is not deployment in disguise.

We believe that this amendment offers the Senate the course of wisdom, prudence, and responsibility.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I believe that the amendment, if adopted, would have the effect of gutting the ABM program. It has been said we can test as well at Kwajalein as in Montana, or better; but the fact is that the men who would have to deploy the system feel that the testing and evaluation would be better on the deployment site.

The effect of the amendment would be virtually to eliminate predeployment activities, so that we would lose valuable leadtime while we assemble the personnel and facilities necessary for deployment.

We must reject out of hand the argument that the deployment of such a facility would make us the provocateur in the arms race. We have never been any such thing, and we are not now. Going back into history, following World War II it was the United States that demobilized. We felt then that, if we disbanded our vast Army, Navy, and Air Corps, the rest of the world, tired of fighting, would do the same. But they did not. The Soviets proceeded to improve on their military capabilities, proceeded to assert their military control over all of Eastern Europe, and proceeded to overcome the government of Chiang Kai-Shek and to aid the Chinese under Mao Tse-tung.

I think the Soviets know that we have no designs on them. There was a day when we had nuclear weaponry and they did not. They provoked us, and we acted with great restraint, and did not initiate war against them. They must know that we have no aggressive designs on the rest of the world, or we certainly could have fulfilled those designs in that period immediately following World War II when we were the only country in the world powerful enough to do so.

I reject the notion that the deployment of an ABM system is going to fuel the arms race. We did not start the arms race. The Soviet Union started the arms race. It is the Soviets who are trying to achieve vast military superiority, to the extent that they can accomplish their designs on the rest of the world; and they are not going to be stopped by anything that we do or fail to do.

The Senator from Arizona pointed out the other day that we have leveled off, but there has been no similar leveling off so far as the Soviets are concerned. They are going ahead. It has been pointed out that we have not developed a new air superiority weapon since 1955, but the Soviets have developed eight. The Senator cannot convince me that if we will just slow down and quit, the Soviets will do the same.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it not true that during the nuclear treaty talks, while those talks to find means of stopping all testing in the atmosphere were in process, the Soviets prepared and tested weapons in the atmosphere while they were meeting with our negotiators, and gained tremendous advantages in scientific know-how and experience, that have given them advantages right now that we do not have?

Mr. TOWER. What the Senator has said is quite correct; and they only agreed to a test ban treaty—they only concurred with it—at such time as they knew they were ahead of us in certain areas of nuclear testing and we would be irrevocably behind them.

Of course, we know the typical Communist technique of negotiate-and-fight, negotiate-and-arm, and that is precisely what they are going to be throughout any arms negotiations.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it not true, if the Senator will permit me another question, that at the present time the speed with which the Soviets are building their military force—their striking force, if you will—has even far exceeded the projections made by all of our information agencies and all of our military?

Mr. TOWER. Our intelligence estimates have always been on the underside. I am not criticizing our intelligence community; I think they are doing the best possible job that they can, but it has always been on the underside, because obviously they are a closed society and we are an open society.

It is easier for them to gather intelligence on us than it is for us to gather intelligence on them. They have so much more expanse of land than we have that they are able to conceal things. They might have an airplane, and we not know it until it is suddenly displayed at the Paris air show or somewhere else.

We have to accept the projections based on what they will be in the mid-70's and then add a few percentage points and say that this is where they might be by that time.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator comment about the condition that exists at present under which we found to our surprise a few years ago that the Soviets had placed missiles in Cuba. This fact was suddenly disclosed to the President, and he immediately did what was necessary to get those missiles out of Cuba and remove that threat from an area 90 miles from our coast.

To go back 5 or 10 years in history, this would have been unthinkable. However, is it not true that at the present time a Soviet flotilla is anchored in Cuban waters?

Mr. TOWER. The Senator is correct. I understand that they paused long enough to watch our successful moon shot and then moved on.

Mr. MURPHY. The flotilla is made up of two new-type missile-launch cruisers, and I am told that there are other elements of tremendous firepower. Is it not also true that this is the first time in history that the Soviets have had a fleet this close to the United States?

Mr. TOWER It is the largest fleet of surface vessels this close to the United States in recent times.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, is it not also true that the Soviets have moved into the Mediterranean fleets that used to remain in the Black Sea?

Mr. TOWER. At the present time the Soviets will, I think, pretty well balance out our seapower in the Mediterranean in a very short period of time.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator comment on what our intelligence tells us with regard to the number and the power of the new Soviet intercontinental ballistic missile, the SS-9?

Mr. TOWER. The total number of hard sites they have now is estimated to be very close to 1,100. We have 1,054 at the present rate, and we estimate that they have about 1,100. They have surpassed us in terms of fixed sites.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it not also true that at least some of these missiles presently have, or in the near future will have, the multiple reentry vehicle?

Mr. TOWER. The SS-9 would be capable of carrying a multiple reentry vehicle. Of course, we have to multiply it by whatever number of warheads they choose to use and multiply that by the number of missile sites they have. That tells us what they can shoot.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, Is it not also true that over a period of the last 5 years, to our knowledge, the Soviets have been preparing and have been in truth deploying an ABM system around Moscow?

Mr. TOWER. They have been. They have a system around various populated areas of the Soviet Union. They have a defense system in other parts of the Soviet Union.

Their whole disposition suggests to me a doctrine that I think we must be prepared to defend against. I do not want to go too far in this point because we would relate to classified material. This has all been covered. So I do not want to get too far into it.

Mr. MURPHY. I appreciate the reluctance of the Senator with regard to getting into the classified area. I assure the Senator that I will respect his reluctance.

I merely ask the question to make certain that Senators will understand that the balance we talk about is the same balance we hope to achieve.

Something has been said to the effect that we should have kept the preponderance of power that we had a few years ago; not to worry anyone or to make war or for any imperialistic reason, but merely to guarantee the peace. That balance may have already been disturbed.

All the evidence I have been able to gather would indicate that the Soviet Union is already escalating the arms race on their own to a degree that has even surpassed all of our estimates.

Mr. TOWER. I think the Senator is correct. I believe we are in a perilous position now; and if the pending bill is gutted by agreement to this amendment, we will be in a more perilous position.

We must understand that we do not have a first-strike policy. We are not going to initiate a nuclear war. We do not have a first-strike policy.

We must then proceed on the assumption, I think, to be safe that the Soviet Union does have a first strike policy and that at such time as the Soviets determine they can safely do so, they might implement that first-strike policy. I think, then, that we must be prepared to defend the system that will deter the first strike.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for pointing out that fact. There is one other matter I wish to cover.

There seems to be complete agreement that there should be full speed research and development. In other words, the logical conclusion is that since there is that agreement, we do need a defensive weapon.

Mr. TOWER. The rationale is to go ahead and do a lot of research and development on it, to research the dickens out of it, but not to put it together because to do so would supposedly have some sort of massive affect on the arms race and make it spiral upward or dampen any possibility for negotiations on armaments.

I remember that Admiral Rickover said, "You can do so much research and development, but ultimately, to find out whether the thing works, you have to make one."

That is what we will have to do in this instance if we get an instrument that will defend our country with a retaliatory force against a first-strike capability.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, is it not correct that the system suggested by the President and by the experts responsible for planning in the Department of Defense is to be made up of component parts, many of which have been tested, or most of which have been tested?

Mr. TOWER. It is a matter of assembling them. The opponents argue and say, "You do not know whether it will work as an integrated system. Maybe you have tested the components, but have you tested them in an integrated system?"

We have not done so. However, the engine and the vehicle that lifted the astronauts off the moon had never been tested, either.

Mr. MURPHY. The Senator is correct. There is only one way in which we can be certain that we have a practical, effective, and viable system. That is to build one.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MURPHY. And that is what the President has proposed.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MURPHY. The President asks that we build one and that we do it in a practical manner so that we do not build it at Kwajalein where it would be more expensive.

Mr. TOWER. It would cost more money to build it at Kwajalein and then decide in the final analysis that we should deploy it here.

Mr. MURPHY. We can build it here, test it, and assemble it at a location where it can be useful. The money would not then be wasted, as so much has been in the past in research. However, if we need it, it will be there, and it will have been constructed. We will know whether it works.

I disagree with the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I think that the preponderance of the scientists with whom

I have talked certainly think that the chances of it working are much better than of it failing. All of the components have been tested. They do work, and it is safe to assume that they can put it there.

Is it not better to do this at the sites the President has suggested and under conditions where each year we take another look, we reevaluate and reassess, depending upon whether we need it or not. If the arms talks are successful and it is safe, we can stop the deployment, stop the manufacture.

Does this not make a great deal more sense than to hold it up 1 year, whereby we will lose I do not know how many years in case we should go into it?

Mr. TOWER. It certainly does.

Let me reiterate the point that I think we have all made so many times that we are blue in the face, and that is that there is no provision for deployment in the present proposal, but there is provision for certain predeployment, things that must go on now, or we lose valuable leadtime. There is not going to be any operational deployment this year or even next year, for that matter. It is going to take more time than that.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it not true that the amount of money we are talking about in this bill——

Mr. TOWER. Is $759.1 million.

Mr. MURPHY. Period.

Mr. TOWER. Not $40 billion or $10 billion or any of these other big figures.

Mr. MURPHY. And there can be no further expenditure unless it is so decided and decreed at some future date in this body.

Mr. TOWER. They have to come to the Hill, with hat in hand, next year, and ask for more money, if they get more.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that there are no funds in the bill and no intention to deploy any component of the system during fiscal year 1970?

Mr. TOWER. I said "operational deployment." There is not going to be any operational deployment. There will be site preparation, yes.

Mr. COOPER. I believe we are in agreement. We argue, through our amendment, and contend that there should be no deployment in fiscal year 1970. The bill only is concerned with fiscal year 1970.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator's amendment would prevent any kind of predeployment activity.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. TOWER. So we agree on that.

Mr. COOPER. I ask the Senator this question: Is there any element, any component, of the anti-ballistic-missile system which can be actually emplaced on any anti-ballistic-missile site in fiscal year 1970?

Mr. TOWER. I cannot say with certainty, because I am not sure of all that is technically involved with site preparations, but I think it is probable that there could be.

Mr. COOPER. My information is that there is no element of a component and certainly no component which could be in place on any missile site in fiscal year 1970. It is my information that the sites could be acquired, access roads might be built, and there might be some digging on the sites.

We are proposing, through our amendment, that there be no deployment on these sites in fiscal year 1970; and, if I have heard correctly, the Senator has agreed with me that actually there cannot be any physical deployment in this year.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I do not recall that there has been any guarantee in any of the hearings, open or closed, that I have attended that there would be no procurement of the site, preparation of the site, building what might be later part of the system. I think we are hung up a little in semantics.

I believe that the men in charge of the construction of the system, the assembly of the system—the building of the system, if you will—should be the ones to decide this. I have confidence that the Secretary of Defense and the President of the United States, who have the responsibility, in the final analysis, for the policy, have gone over this very carefully and that they have decided that to restrict them in any way, to restrict them for a period of 6 months or a year, would set back the final construction—the final deployment, if you will—of the system, in the event that we need it, by 2 years. Every year we wait, we lose 2 years. We lose more than that.

As we have just seen in some of the aircraft construction, where great leadtime is necessary, where there is an assemblage of talents from different areas of industry, the leadtimes never seem to diminish; they always seem to increase. And I know that my distinguished colleague is just as conscious of the cost as I am.

Mr. TOWER. Do not forget the money.

Mr. MURPHY. The cost always seems to increase. We have had a talk of the overruns in the Air Force in connection with this bill, and they increase.

I can only say, first, that those who have the final responsibility have gone over this quite carefully, and they have talked to an endless number of experts; and they have decided that this is needed for the best interests of the security of the United States.

Second, the President, who has certainly had as much experience as almost any other man in dealing with the Soviets in the past—and, may I say, he has had one of the most successful experiences that I can recall; and I call to mind the "kitchen meeting" with former Premier Khrushchev—has an instinct in these matters which seems to be very good. President Nixon has said and continues to say that he would like to have this program the way the committee—a majority of the Committee on Armed Services—reported it and put it in this bill. We did not do it lightly. We did not do it overnight. We did not do it just to have something to put in the bill. We did it after great thought, great study, and after we had examined carefully all the things that had been discussed on the floor of the Senate.

At the last moment, before he left on his around-the-world tour in quest of permanent peace, the President assured us that he would like to have this; he would like to have it to safeguard our security; he would like to have it to strengthen his bargaining position.

If my distinguished colleague will be patient with me for a moment, I said this morning, on the floor of the Senate, that I recall vividly Mr. Chamberlain going to Munich, and all the jokes that were made of poor Chamberlain with his umbrella—a very ineffective weapon. Well, that is all he had; and he had to take what Hitler chose to give him, because the British Government had decided that they did not need to remain strong. At that moment, the once powerful British Empire began to diminish as a No. 1 world power, because they had misjudged the intent of the adversary.

I say that we in this body cannot take that chance. If we are going to make a mistake, we have to make it in favor of the United States. If we are going to talk about the expenditure of less than $400 million, which is the difference between research and development and the construction that the President has asked, I say it is a very, very small amount to pay for the safety of this country, for the deterrent effect that it must have upon the Russians. I say that we enthusiastically should say this might be the finest investment we could ever make. God help us if we make a mistake in our judgment in this condition.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I do not think I can add anything to the very comprehensive speech of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) which brought the debate to a higher level than we have recently experienced. In a very brief way, I wish to try to bring the debate today into focus.

We are talking about a bill which deals with fiscal year 1970. Our amendment would prohibit the deployment of any component in 1970. I believe the distinguished Senator from Texas has admitted that no component could be deployed on any missile site.

Mr. TOWER. I not only admitted it, but I have been trying to make the point with my distinguished friend.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TOWER. I would like to emphasize that.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, from the testimony of officials of the administration this program for fiscal year 1970 would be, in effect, a research and development program. I believe that I heard the Senator from California say a while ago that all of these components had been tested. I may not have heard him correctly but that is what I thought he said. As a matter of fact, the bill only requests money for testing the Sprint and Spartan and some long leadtime times for the missiles amounting to $600,000.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. No; I do not yield at this time. I wish to finish my remarks. The Senator from Texas yielded to me.

Mr. President, the administration does not request and the bill does not provide any funds for procurement of Spartan and Sprint except for testing. The committee report admits it is a research and development program as far as the missiles are concerned.

A prototype MSR with two faces is being tested in Kwajalein. Testimony before the Committee on Armed Services was to the effect that the MSR prototype could not be used in test for guidance of Sprint and Spartan until 1970; Spartan and Sprint have never made any intercepts, and those tests of intercepts will follow later in 1970 and 1971.

PAR construction has not even started. A prototype does not exist. Secretary Laird testified that its configuration and design had been agreed upon. Construction had not yet commenced.

The data processors used with the radars, I understand, are being developed in New Jersey by the Bell Co. The software has not been developed. In fact, testing of some data processing elements are scheduled for Kwajalein. Essentially, the Department of Defense program in this fiscal year is one of research, development and testing. Our amendment would not in any way inhibit these activities and would provide funds for them, as the Senator from Michigan has said. Many believe that a better, more effective system can be constructed. The amendment which was introduced by the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) would provide ample latitude for developing and testing a better system.

I wish to make one other comment on the remarks of the Senator from Texas and the Senator from California. There is a great deal of truth in what they said about Soviet action since World War II. I am as familiar with the record as they are. However, we have reached a point in history where for the first time there is a prospect for negotiations on the control of nuclear arms. The Senator from Michigan correctly said they may fail. I share the caution that they may fail, but if we follow, always the argument that has been made again and again in this Chamber since World War II, that there is no possibility of any agreement—the same argument made against the nuclear test ban treaty, the nonproliferation treaty—there never will be any hope of stopping the arms race. Our amendment proposes that we make the supreme effort in this year.

No premature decision to deploy in this fiscal year, and no decision to deploy in future fiscal years should be made at this time—when our purpose is to stop, not accelerate the arms race. That is all we propose. We think it is very reasonable.

I wish to say frankly that I will not lower the line of debate, of what we hope to achieve, and what I believe the country hopes to achieve, by references to Munich. I merely say that I do not think that such argument elevates the debate in the Senate. All of us have had some experience in the service of our country, in the Senate, and in other occupations, including the armed services.

Mr. President, I will stop with that final comment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I shall be very brief.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I wanted to interrupt my distinguished colleague to present some good news. As of the eighth inning the National League is ahead by a score of 9 to 3 in the All Star game. I think in the heat of these great debates we should not lose sight of what has been for many, many years a great American custom that is extremely important to the background and ability of our great Nation.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator. With such a great ball club as the Houston Astros being represented, the National League cannot help but be ahead.

Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I must reiterate the argument that although there is not going to be any deployment, there are predeployment activities that must be funded by this bill. If that is not done in this bill—and if we adopt the pending amendment the money would not be available—almost 5,500 people are going to be thrown out of their present jobs. These are highly skilled people and they would not lose employment permanently, but they would go some place else. However, we would have to start over at a later date.

Although we are authorizing a process leading to deployment, if there is no deployment there is a considerable period of time in which we could come back and decide whether to go on with deployment, if we make the decision we are going to deploy. That does not mean we cannot change our minds. We could come back next week and make that decision and there would not be any loss.

However, getting back to the argument about the arms race, we did not start the arms race. Any time we level off we see no commensurate leveling off by the Soviet Union. We worry about our doing something provocative. The Soviets know we do not have aggressive designs on the world and that we do not have a first strike policy. I think we should recognize that they have been the provocateurs. For us to say that even though they provoke us, let us not do anything because it might make them angry, is like a criminal shooting at a policeman but the policeman does not shoot back because it might make the criminal angry.

I think the reason we have this problem in trying to carry out the wishes of the President and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is the fear that somehow this is going to fuel the arms race, that somehow this is provocative, and that if we do not do it the Soviets will realize we are good fellows and the rest of the world will bring pressure on them to sit down and negotiate, and that they will beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. I think it will not happen.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I want to react to one point which is by no means a major one, but one which I would hope we would put away; namely, that if we do not deploy this weapons system, 5,450 jobs will be lost; that between 5,000 and 6,000 jobs hinge on this proposal.

We have never regarded the Defense Establishment as an auxiliary WPA——

Mr. TOWER. May I clarify that?

Mr. HART. Let me explain first why I rose——

Mr. TOWER. I did not mean that they would be out of work, because they would go elsewhere. They are skillful employees, and they will still be able to get jobs elsewhere. I was not trying to play upon the popular emotion of losing a job.

Mr. HART. That was the impression I got. What is the point, then?

Mr. TOWER. The point is, we do not want to lose the team. We would have to reassemble all these people once they were dispersed.

Mr. HART. All right. I think, in any fashion or form——

Mr. TOWER. If we broke up General Motors, I am sure most of its employees would get jobs somewhere else.

Mr. HART. This is an aspect of the debate and the whole defense deployment problem that we would be wisely advised to handle with some understanding. Why do I say that? Well, the Senator and I tell each other that the United States can be trusted to keep the peace. Yes, we are in the Mediterranean and we have been there a long time. We have ringed Russia, but at invitation. We are, nonetheless, the peace force of the world.

It is wrong for the Russians to get a fleet to Cuba, someone says, and it is disturbing that they are now in the Mediterranean, "crowding" us in the Mediterranean.

I do not know what the arithmetic is as to their proximity in the Mediterranean and to Cuba but the whole point is that there are people in this world who are sometimes attracted to the anti-American argument that America is the country that cannot be trusted to keep peace. Why? Because we cannot afford it, because we cannot afford to disarm.

I thought the Senator was saying that we had better not shelve this missile system because 5,500 fellows will be out of work. We tell each other that we can be trusted to keep the peace but we will be more credible if we do not measure weapons systems proposals in terms of payrolls. I know, and so does the Senator from Texas, that any time a weapons system is phased out, if the principal employer in some town in our State is the provider of that weapons system, that town does not like disarmament and they are down here on our backs saying, "Do not let them do it."

Mr. TOWER. If the distinguished Senator would yield on that point, so that I can clarify what I said, I was not making an emotional appeal for the jobs of these people, because they will have no difficulty getting work elsewhere. They are highly trained and skilled people. That does not bother me, the fact that they might lose their jobs. They will be snapped up by other companies very quickly. What I am talking about is breaking up the team, the fact that it

XUM

will have to be reassembled all over again.

Mr. HART. That gets to the business of momentum. Once we begin to turn it on, we cannot turn it off because look what will happen. Fortunately, the people of this country rescued us from the mistake we made last year. We have not gone full blast with the system. "We have 5,500 fellows we have to worry about." That is part of the thing that now bears the label of caution. Weapons systems have their own momentum, and part of it is, "Do not break up the team."

Before we get that team any larger, let us have it clearly understood that they are engaged in research and we are not getting this stuff on the ground. Happily, we have a second chance. We took this position last year and we were beaten. I repeat, the people have sort of given us a chance to correct it. After we started site acquistion, the people of America woke up and did not like it. Now that proposal has been shelved and we are not going to have Sentinel which was advertised last year as saving 20 million to 30 million Americans. No, we are not going to have that. Why? Because it would not work.

We who oppose ABM deployment are saying the same thing this year with respect to this one.

I hope that this time we will be more persuasive.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator from Michigan has underscored what motivates the opponents of the ABM system, that they do not want any arms system to have any momentum. They feel that by stopping the momentum of development of our arms system we will, somehow, end the arms race.

I say, I do not think we can do that.

Mr. MURPHY. I can appreciate that point of view very much. I am sure that I will join most enthusiastically if I could believe that the international situation were such, in present days, that it would be safe, that it would be practical.

Mr. President, I made reference earlier to Europe. I am sorry that my distinguished colleague from Kentucky apparently felt something personal in my remarks on that. That was not intended. I merely wished to remind the Senate of the historic occasions that took place and the circumstances under which a great nation had to take what they were given by a madman simply because they had nothing to go to the bargaining table with. They were bargaining from a position of weakness. The people in their government, I am sure, in the very best of faith, had done what they thought was good and right, but it turned out that the decision was an unfortunate one.

I merely remind Senators of this, because it occurs to me. I am sure that the President feels as the proponents of the system feel—I am sure that he has thought of it—that he would rather go to that bargaining table and be able to enter the discussions from the standpoint of strength rather than weakness.

Over the years of my memory, we have done many things to prove that we are not an imperialistic nation, that we do not want territory. When we talk about this particular weapons system, I remind my colleagues that they want a weapons system in the pure sense of the usual understanding of the word; namely, as a defensive shield. It is not going to destroy anything except incoming missiles which have been launched to destroy us. It is not going to create fallout over our cities, as I have seen depicted in some cartoons—cartoons very cleverly put together, I must say, but very misleading—because so far as I can find out, there will be no fallout.

It seems to me that the men responsible have urged us to permit them to go forward with the amount of money asked for—not billions of dollars, but the difference between research and development and building two sites, assembling and putting the machine together to see whether it will work, and if it will not work, then to make the changes necessary, which will amount to less than $400 million.

I hope that people understand that. I hope that is understood by those who are concerned that it might cost $10 billion, or $50 billion, as I have heard.

I agree with my colleague that sometimes these things get started, as is possible and as is so often the case with too many Government projects and it is difficult to stop them. It is difficult to say, "Wait a minute. We do not need this," or, "This is not working. This is not practical. There is a better way to do it."

When that day comes—and I hope it will come soon—when we can say we do not need it, I will join enthusiastically with my distinguished friend from Michigan. When that day comes when we can say there is a better and a cheaper way to do it, I will join him enthusiastically.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. May I finish?

I hope the day will come, but at the present time, with all respect, that under the existing conditions, under the conditions laid down by the President, who at long last has the responsibility, by the Chiefs of Staff, by the Secretary of Defense, whose job it is to do these things, I just cannot see why or where or for what reason we should put a restriction on them that they have asked us to avoid. Therefore, I will have to continue, as long as this debate continues, to speak against and oppose in any way I can this proposal, which, in my judgment, as my colleague from Texas has suggested, would gut the entire bill, and put off the construction which is so necessary for at least 2 years of precious time that we may not have.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. HART. The Senator said that if the day ever came when we could afford not to do these things, he would join us.

Mr. MURPHY. I shall be glad to.

Mr. HART. The Senator was very enthusiastic last year. He did not join us last year. He wanted to deploy a different system last year.

Mr. MURPHY. If I may reply to the distinguished Senator, in my humble opinion conditions last year did not present conditions that I thought would make it safe for us not to deploy.

Mr. HART. Was the Senator right or wrong?

Mr. MURPHY. I think I was right.

Mr. HART. Why does the Senator propose we do it now?

Mr. MURPHY. Do what?

Mr. HART. They have abandoned the system of last year.

Mr. MURPHY. I have done so on the advice of experts who have far better experience than I do.

Mr. HART. They are the same experts who counseled the Senator last year; are they not?

Mr. MURPHY. No; we have a new man in charge this year. We have a new man in the White House.

Mr. HART. I hope the Senate will take charge this year.

Mr. MURPHY. Well, I am not certain that it is the exact job of the Senate to take charge. I do not presume to explain government to a Senator who knows much more than I do about it, but I take it, under our system, which is our system until we change it, it is the duty and the responsibility of the President. It is the duty of the Senate to advise and consent and to provide the funds in these matters, which is the purpose of the bill before us at this time.

As I pointed out before, the Armed Services Committee met at various meetings. It is a bipartisan committee. As a matter of fact, the distinguished Senator from Michigan is a member of the party which is the majority party. A majority of that committee joined on the side with which I agree, that we need this system and that its authorization should be a part of the bill.

So in view of those considerations, the request of the President, the best judgment of the top experts, the decision of having to take prior responsibility, as I said earlier—and I hope I am not redundant—if the decision is this close, please God that, in the best interests of the United States of America, we do not make a mistake in our judgment.

Mr. HART. Of course, I share the fervent hope of the Senator from California that we do not make a mistake.

Mr. MURPHY. I know that.

Mr. HART. I think the Senate made a mistake last year. I hope we do not repeat it this year.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I have enjoyed listening to this desultory but enlightening debate on the part of Senators on the floor concerned with the subject. I must say I congratulate the Senators from Michigan and Kentucky on the reasonable and sensible approach that they have taken.

I recognize, as do they, that the merits of these questions are not all black or all white. As in many problems that come before the Senate, they are more various shades of gray. They have decided that, on balance, it would be best to postpone actual deployment for the next 11 months, although in no way slowing down research and development. That is the net effect of their proposal. I must say I find myself in agreement with it.

I am struck by one point that the Senator from Michigan made, which is in connection with the ships and the movements of our own ships and the

XUM

Soviet ships. I am struck by the fact of the movement of Soviet ships to the Caribbean at the present time. Speaking as a Senator from Rhode Island, I do not like to see Soviet fishing vessels, or vessels of any kind, too close to our shores, but I think we must bear in mind how the situation looks from their standpoint. From the viewpoint of the Soviets, our naval vessels made 11 visits to the Black Sea, which is as much a Soviet lake as the Caribbean is an American lake.

When we look at the map, while we know we are good guys and will not make the first strike, I am not sure that conviction is shared by other nations around the world, although I believe we are doing the best we can to get our point across.

In connection with the system itself, I am struck by the fact that we are fitting the enemy to the system. Last year the enemy about whom we were told was China. We were persuaded that it would be a good system in case we had a strike from them. Now it is to protect us against the possibility of a Soviet strike against our weapons system.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5833) to continue until the close of June 30, 1972, the existing suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 12781) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 12781) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

DEATH OF MOISE TSHOMBE, FORMER PREMIER, REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it seems just a short time ago that I made a statement in this Chamber deploring the continued confinement in Algeria of Mr. Moise Tshombe, the former Premier of the Republic of the Congo. Now I must speak with deep regret about his death in captivity, which occurred at the end of last month.

This is one of those occasions to which the old saying applies that one speaks more in sorrow than in anger. Indeed, no anger is called for in this situation, even if one were an admirer and supporter of the ex-Premier of the Congo—which is not a description which has any application to me. Yet I can feel the fullest measure of sorrow on at least three distinct counts.

First, no matter whether one agreed or disagreed with Mr. Tshombe, there can be no question that he was a man of singular capacities and energy, capable of arousing the deepest loyalty among his followers. The locs of any man of his abilities is a matter of regret, and one must sympathize wholeheartedly with his relatives and his friends.

The second count on which I must express sorrow is the sheer waste of talent involved in keeping in captivity and incommunicado a man who had a definite contribution to make in whatever peaceful pursuits he might follow. To a certain extent, Mr. Tshombe destroyed some of his own effectiveness and his ability to help his country in its early years of independence. Nevertheless, it was entirely possible that under the right circumstances and with the cooperation of his countrymen, Moise Tshombe might well have made a further and far better contribution to the future of his native land.

The third reason for my sorrow on the occasion of Mr. Tshombe's death relates to the position and stature of the Government of Algeria. That Government, by calling in almost a dozen doctors, sought to assure world opinion that Tshombe's death was not attributable to foul play; his body was also turned over to his family for burial in Belgium. I, for one, have no reason to believe that Mr. Tshombe did not die of a heart attack as announced by the Algerian Government. Nevertheless, I regret the fact that by its behavior the Government of Algeria has opened itself to the kind of suspicion which it sought to ward off by taking such unusual measures. How much better it would have been for everyone concerned if that Government had displayed a merciful and generous attitude toward returning Mr. Tshombe to European soil after the hijacking of his plane 2 years ago.

Mr. President, just as with individuals, the fact is that no government or country can claim to have a record entirely without blemish. And it is not really up to me to make judgments about the Government of Algeria. I cannot help but feel, however, that it is a matter of sorrow for all of us that the relatively new government of a relatively new country should have invited such a dingy spot on its record. Speaking as one who would like to see improved relations between our country and Algeria, I can only express the hope that something profitable has been learned from the tragic fate of Moise Tshombe.

FISH FLOUR—ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARING BY SELECT COMMITTEE ON NUTRITION AND HUMAN NEEDS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, at a time when all eyes are focused on the heavens and the accomplishments of our space explorers, it is easy for us to forget the importance of area which was also once the reason for adventurous explorers leaving the security of their homelands for a trip into the unknown. Although long since explored, the oceans have yet to be adequately developed as a natural resource. The funds that we expend for research and development in space programs is many times larger than the funds we invest in the exporation of the seas.

The importance of foods from the sea, such as fish protein concentrate, as means for improving the nutritional condition of the country was recently emphasized by the Providence Evening Bulletin in an editorial entitled "Fish Flour," published on July 19, 1969. I ask unanimous consent to have that editorial printed in today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISH FLOUR

The concern expressed by Dr. Thomas L. Meade of the University of Rhode Island's department of fisheries and marine technology, over the slow progress of U.S. fish flour production for the world's underfed peoples deserves sharp notice. For several years, Rhode Island has had an interest in the processing of fish protein concentrate (FPC), an almost odorless and tasteless light grey flour made from whole fish. Two years ago the state narrowly missed having a "pilot" FPC plant located here. But the possibility of Rhode Island's participation in improving the diet of distant peoples still exists, especially if there is any new federal interest in the program.

After federal food and drug investigators, and scientists determined that fish flour was safe and wholesome for human consumption, spokesmen for the starving or poorly fed peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America took heart. However, as months passed one congressman after another criticized the delays in constructing processing plants, and the "bureaucratic footdragging" by the federal food and drug administration.

Dr. Meade's major point is that the government is overly restrictive on the varieties of fish allowed in the fish flour concentrate, and that the fish catch must be broadened to include abundant stocks of under-utilized fish. Broadening the catch plainly would quicken the incentive for American processors to boost production.

With sophisticated technology taking us to the moon's surface, Americans can and should perform a similarly distinguished feat in satisfying the dietary needs of people right here on earth. As Dr. Meade suggests, all manner of fish protein concentrates should be available in various forms, and the U.S. fish processing industry should not be required to fumble a request from a hungry nation whose people might have—to American tastes—a peculiar diet.

Further, America's research and development budgets have soared during recent decades, principally for defense and space exploration. But it's time that something more than comparatively niggardly spending were applied to developing and producing for hungry people some high protein products from our marine resources.

Mr. PELL. I also wish to mention that there will be a hearing of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs on July 31, which will explore the potential uses of food from the seas as a means for improving the nutritional status of our country's citizens.

EXPERIMENT AT 2 WHELAN ROAD

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to an article published in the June 1969 issue of College Management magazine. It is en-

XUM

titled "The Campus at 2 Whelan Road" and focuses upon a unique educational experiment currently being conducted in a public housing project in Providence, R.I., by Roger Williams College.

Briefly stated, the college has established a satellite campus in an abandoned housing project where students of urban sociology live, study, get to know the people of Hartford Park and their problems, and hopefully find a way to make 2 Whelan Road livable again.

The president of Roger Williams College, Dr. Ralph E. Gauvey, summarized the main objective of the experiment as "a magnificent opportunity for a college to convert its ideals of community service into action."

An institution of higher learning cannot suddenly be implanted into a grim housing project without serious repercussions. Eleven months ago, at the project's inception, the 28 students and three resident instructors were separated from the Hartford Park community—86 percent white, 14 percent black—by far more than the "scarred wooden doors, always locked, that separates the enclave from the outside world." Neighborhood resistance was based on two fears; First, that the people in the project were to become guinea pigs, and, that the college students were no improvement over the worst of project youth. Nevertheless, the project has grown from the locked enclave into the community itself and the people's confidence has been gained. The students take part in their community's activities by acting as Scout troop leaders, big buddies to neighborhood kids, or as organizers of a local baseball team.

The results of these efforts are encouraging. Daniel E. Mellor, director of the project and a former intern in my Washington office, succinctly put forth the beneficial effects of the project for the community:

> College students provide different models for the kids. The kids begin to see college as something feasible. The idea of higher education is no longer frightening. I think our presence changes their perception of themselves. All of a sudden, it's not just a lousy low income neighborhood. It's a neighborhood with an institution of higher learning.

This energetic project deserves recognition and praise because it is a strong effort by an urban college to unite itself with the community, to participate in it, and to do meaningful things. Roger Williams College is moving to directly assume a responsibility in the community by employing its facilities for the amelioration of a disadvantaged community while furnishing its students with a realistic, meaningful educational experience.

I salute the school for its efforts and hope that other institutions of higher learning will follow the lead of Roger Williams College.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CAMPUS AT 2 WHELAN ROAD

Roger Williams College has established a satellite campus—or perhaps a beachhead—in an abandoned building of a housing project. The results in terms of community, students and learning—along with the difficulties and defeats that have been sustained—can provide important insights to any institution interested in establishing its presence in the city.

It's called a "satellite campus," but to the impartial observer it looks like a monstrous obscenity in reinforced concrete, a cruel joke of a dwelling that ought to be ground back into the urban grit.

The 11-story building at 2 Whelan Road in the Hartford Park public housing project, Providence, R.I., is very likely the last place you'd choose to call home.

Scores of low-income families have fled the place. Two years ago, when the last of them finally gave up the battle and moved out, the Providence Housing Authority boarded in the lower windows of 2 Whelan Road and tried to forget it was there.

As if they could. Vandals had made the building notorious. They had smashed windows and scrawled vulgarities, decommissioned the elevator and turned the hallways into urinals. Nothing was secure. Family life was virtually impossible—as the fleeing families testified.

To the leadership of Roger Williams College, then a junior college centered in and around a YMCA three and a half miles distant, the vandalized structure at 2 Whelan Road represented a unique opportunity.

Dr. Ralph E. Gauvey, the president of Roger Williams, proposed that 2 Whelan Road become an extension of the college—a satellite—where students of urban sociology would live, study, get to know the people of Hartford Park and their problems, and hopefully find a way to make 2 Whelan Road livable again.

Here was "a magnificent opportunity," Dr. Gauvey said, for a college to convert its ideals of community service into action.

The Providence Housing Authority agreed to give Roger Williams use of the 11-story building rent-free. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development approved a $50,000 grant. Daniel M. Mellor, director of special projects for Roger Williams, took charge of community relations and last September, 28 students and three resident instructors moved into 2 Whelan Road—to see what their ideals were made of.

To date the satellite campus has produced no studies or conclusions. The tensions of living at close quarters in a grim housing project (86% white, 14% black) have taken their toll on students and staff. The future of the program is not clear. Yet Roger Williams is having an impact on the neighborhood; that much is certain. The institution's ideals seem to be holding up under fire.

Much of the credit for this success must go to Mellor, the ruddy-faced, mustachioed director who calls his students "troops" and barks at them like a sergeant first class. Neighborhood kids in Hartford Park call him "The Bear." Mellor describes himself to a visitor as "the father figure" of the satellite campus.

Moving into 2 Whelan Road was something like winning a beachhead. Neighborhood resistance fed on two fears: one, that Hartford Park people were going to become guinea pigs; and two, that college-type young people were no improvement over the worst of Hartford Park youth—and who needed more of *that* kind?

"All they saw was long hair," Mellor says, "bearded kids high on dope, probably sexually promiscuous, drunk half the time. And I said, 'For God's sake, give them a chance.' "

The guinea pig fear cropped up time and time again as Mellor began to make contacts with neighborhood leaders. He spent most of one year sounding out local opinion, modifying the hostile parts of it when he could. His training as a political scientist helped. His natural skill at politics was probably more useful.

At first he tried to avoid the guinea pig question because he felt that no satisfactory answer was possible until the community had developed some trust in its college neighbors.

"These people have been sold everything from Bibles to fresh eggs to Encyclopedia Brittanica to diaper service. And I think that I was trying to sell them something at the beginning.

"So I finally said: 'Look, we're not coming in here to *do* anything to you. I want to establish a learning environment for my students. That's the major thing I'm interested in. Now if, as a result good things happen to you, well, that's fine. I hope they will and I think they will. But that's not what I'm here for.' "

A neighborhood committee of Hartford Park voted 36–14 to give the Roger Williams Satellite Campus a chance. Most project residents now seem glad that the college has moved in. And college students and staff seem happy to be there—much of the time, at least.

Anxiety remains.

Mellor's original plan was to integrate students, staff, and low-income families in 2 Whelan Road. But $300,000 of renovation funds never came through and the families had to be excluded. Consequently 2 Whelan Road has become a college enclave.

The point of highest tension at the satellite campus is the scarred wooden door that separates the enclave from the world outside. The door is kept locked—always. It cannot be opened from either side without a key and only students and staff have keys. Neighborhood visitors must be met at the door—locked in and locked out.

At one level the door is a simple security precaution—a safeguard against theft and nuisance. But at another level the door is a powerful symbol of Roger Williams' program in Hartford Park. And as a locked door it may seem to be a contradiction to much of the program.

Students sensed this and a few months ago petitioned Mellor and his staff to unlock the door, at least for a few hours each day. No other building in the project is locked, the students pointed out. Locking 2 Whelan Roads is an assault on the integrity of project residents. How will they trust us if we don't trust them?

The staff consented: students could unlock the door from 3 to 6 p.m. every day, provided they took charge of building security during that period.

But the students rejected that risk and the door has remained locked, plain evidence that Roger Williams, though in the neighborhood, is not *of* the neighborhood.

Despite the locked door, many good things have happened in Hartford Park because of the college's presence. Once a new student musters the courage to leave the enclave, there are countless ways for him to join community life. The satellite campus was barely days old when Progress for Providence, a community action agency, asked students if they wanted to be Big Buddies to neighborhood kids. Twenty-two students acquired little buddies in the housing project.

And . . .

One student works in the local Progress for Providence office.

Five ran for Neighborhood Advisory Council board elections—and one won.

Two work in a nearby boys' club.

Four open and supervise a school gym two nights a week.

Two are Scout troop leaders.

One has organized a basketball team.

Most are tutors to at least one boy or girl.

Four escort elderly persons to the neighborhood health center.

That's the sort of summary that annual reports are made of. Other effects of Roger Williams' presence resist such neat packaging and are practically impossible to document. They are things like images and models, and they may be the most important effect of all, Mellor believes.

"The neighborhood kids see a burly six-footer who can whip his weight in wildcats walking around with a book of poetry. He's an admirable thing. He means that you don't have to carry a gun or a jackknife or have been in the school for wayward boys to be an admirable figure."

The satellite campus has become a neighborhood hangout, one fairly reliable index of rapport.

"They hang out with a vengeance," Mellor says. And he thinks that's good. "College students provide different models for the kids who live in Hartford Park. I think that some of them start to see college as a feasible thing.

"We don't frighten them anymore, I think," says Mellor. *"Higher education* isn't frightening. *College professor* isn't frightening. I think our presence changes their perception of themselves. All of a sudden they are not just a lousy low-income neighborhood. They're a neighborhood where there's an institution of higher learning, and that makes a difference, though I'm not sure that I can define it exactly."

Jim Frasier, an Antioch graduate and Peace Corps veteran, is the "supervisor" of community involvement, as much as it can be supervised. Frasier is also assistant director of the program and one of the three staff members who live at 2 Whelan Road. He talks about the spontaneous—even unconscious—student-community relationships as the important ones.

An example is the large gap in age distribution at Hartford Park—the rarity of people in their 20's—that students are filling without even thinking about it.

"We have large families here, many without fathers. Mothers have four or five, seven or eight kids—young boys on the run. There is kind of a felt need, not openly expressed, for relationships between the project kids and the college student," Frasier says, "and some very close relationships have developed."

For most Roger Williams students who have stayed with the program, Frazier adds, "the emotional attachment and love of involvement is tremendous."

"I don't think you could *drive* them out of here," Mellor interjects.

"We've got activist students here," Frazier continues. "Not SDS-type activist, not the radical or militant, but students who are really involved."

"Yet these kids give you the same arguments as the SDS," Mellor adds. " 'There has to be a change,' they say. There has to be all kinds of change. The thing I like about these kids is that they're really out looking for things."

The 28 students—seven women and 21 men—who moved into 2 Whelan Road last September were generally apprehensive at first about their strange new learning environment, and their reaction was appropriate.

Neil Ross, the resident deputy director of the satellite campus, instructor in sociology, and another Peace Corps veteran, comments:

"Initially we made a conscious effort not to involve ourselves formally. We wanted to avoid having our students come in as missionaries. We felt it was necessary to get to know the community, each student doing it on his own, going out and meeting people as human beings. From that point we could begin our research."

"This point is very important," Mellor adds, "not coming in and generating high levels of expectancy."

By the end of first semester 10 students had quit the program for a variety of reasons, mostly personal. Three students left because of the Hartford Park environment. It wasn't easy, as these student journal entries indicate:

"A boy threw a rock through our living room window tonight. Went up to tell the project director and saw the same boy and another boy throwing rocks at cars traveling along Harvard Avenue. Called the police. They never came."

"When I left my apartment about 11 p.m. I looked down into the parking lot and saw a boy standing with a rifle. He lifted the rifle and took a shot at me. Luckily it was only a BB gun—and he missed. I didn't know what to say to the kid so I just kept walking."

"Last night there was a fire at the project. A Molotov cocktail was thrown in the window of a house. It was awful to see. Six kids were left homeless . . . they were lucky to get out alive."

Spring semester enrollment was 26 resident students, including eight women, at 2 Whelan Road, and five commuters, for 31 total.

Their curriculum is evolving along two broad guidelines. One is that course work take advantage of the unique laboratory situation in Hartford Park. In other words, nothing should be taught at the satellite campus that could be done just as well at the main campus. The other guideline is that course work, in Mellor's words, "meet the legitimate educational wants and needs of the students" while satisfying obligations to the research sponsors, the Providence Housing Authority and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Resident students at 2 Whelan Road take a three-course load each semester for nine credits. They also have two classes at the Roger Williams downtown campus for six additional credits. The spring semester called for research, a seminar in some aspect of sociology and supervised community involvement.

Research is the academic keystone. By the end of the term, Roger Williams students will have designed survey questionnaires under faculty guidance, conducted family and individual interviews in Hartford Park and prepared information for computer sorting. The first beneficiary of their findings will be the funding agencies.

But just what is the point of another study? Couldn't an astute urban-ologist answer all of Hartford Park's problems from the scores of old studies on delinquency, fatherless homes and low-income urban family folkways?

"I suspect so," Mellor admits. "I could say that a delinquency problem exists without even walking through Hartford Park. But I couldn't postulate much past that generalization without an in-depth investigation.

"Allegedly the building was closed because of teenage vandalism, terrorism and so on. Well I suspect at this stage of the game, after we have lived here nine months, that that is not the whole truth. The truth seems to be that people were moving out of this building *before* vandalism became a problem. It looks as if the condition for vandalism—a vacating building—came before the vandals."

Then what really caused families at 2 Whelan Road to desert the place? Students at the satellite campus may find the answer.

If the Hartford Park campus were only a social science laboratory for Roger Williams students, closing it when the study is done would have little effect on the neighborhood. But the college's immediate importance to the neighborhood has nothing to do with social science research. When the studies are finished—or when the funding runs out—will the Roger Williams program leave anything of value besides a research report?

Mellor does not have much of an answer now, though he can suggest some possibilities. One is that the building be converted into a community center of social and educational services to carry on and expand the work that Roger Williams students have started. Another is that the building be returned to public housing—provided the neighborhood has learned how to make life tolerable in 2 Whelan Road.

A third possibility is that Roger Williams maintain its 2 Whelan Road campus as a permanent part of the college.

"We feel strongly that an urban college has to get out into the community. This is our first attempt to show that a small college, and certainly not a wealthy one, can participate in the community and do useful and meaningful things. That's not to say that I know what everything is that we can do yet. I don't. This is a new experience. It's only 10 months old.

"But I think it's good that we have had the willingness to do it—and have shown an ability to do it. If little Roger Williams can do it, other places can, too."

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PERCY TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that, at the close of morning business tomorrow, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Percy) be recognized for not to exceed 40 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 24, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 23, 1969:

U.S. Attorney

Stanley G. Pitkin, of Washington, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Washington for the term of 4 years, vice Eugene G. Cushing.

U.S. Marshal

Seibert W. Lockman, of North Carolina, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of North Carolina for the term of 4 years, vice J. Paul Teal, Jr.

U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

Philip J. Farley, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, vice Adrian S. Fisher, resigned.

Census Bureau

George Hay Brown, of Michigan, to be Director of the Census.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 23, 1969:

Agency for International Development

Roderic L. O'Connor, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

Spurgeon M. Keeny, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, July 23, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Harry M. Crim, Strasburg Presbyterian Church, Strasburg, Va., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we thank You for this wonderful land in which we live.

Give us a clear vision of the blessedness we may achieve for ourselves and all mankind, by courageously accepting and following the principles and ideals of democracy.

Inspire us with a sincere desire to cultivate and bring to fruition those noble, moral, and spiritual aspirations and values which Thou has planted within the soul of humanity.

Fill us with love and open to us the treasures of Thy wisdom. Perfect what Thou hast begun, and what the spirit of God has awakened us to ask in prayer. Turn not Thy face from us, but show us Thy glory. Then shall we know Thy plan and way of life for us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3379—An act for the relief of Sgt. 1st class Patrick Marratto, U.S. Army (retired); and

H.R. 6585. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. F. Elgin.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 92. An Act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Wong Yui.

FEDERAL DISABILITY AND DEATH BENEFITS SHOULD BE EXTENDED TO POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN

(Mr. JACOBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, today 120 Members of the House, representing 33 States of the Union and both political parties, are introducing legislation to extend Federal disability and death benefits to policemen and firemen throughout the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty.

Mr. Speaker, we are a nation of travelers.

A would-be victim whose life might be saved by a fireman or policeman in Atlanta might be a resident of San Francisco, while a policeman or a fireman in San Francisco might be killed by a resident of some other city who is just passing through.

In short, when a police officer or a fireman dies in the line of duty, he dies for America. Therefore, I hope that the Congress will pass this legislation to extend to policemen and firemen this protection at the earliest possible date.

PRESIDENTIAL MOON LANDING COMMISSION TO DESIGN A MONUMENT IN HONOR OF OUR LANDING ON THE MOON

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in order to commemorate in perpetuity the first successful landing of man on the moon, and in order to give every man on earth an opportunity to participate in the commemoration of this epochal achievement of mankind, I have today introduced a resolution calling upon the President to appoint a Commission to be known as the Moon Landing Commission, consisting of 15 members.

Mr. Speaker, it shall be the duty of the Commission to prepare a plan for the solicitation, evaluation, and judgment of designs for a monument to be erected in Washington, D.C., in commemoration of this event.

The Commission may specify a specific monetary award for the best design for the monument.

The Commission is further authorized to accept donations of money, property or personal services; to cooperate with State, civic, patriotic, and historical groups, and with institutions of learning; and to call upon other Federal departments and agencies for their advice and assistance in carrying out the purpose of this resolution.

The Commission would be required to report back to the Congress not later than July 1, 1970, with its recommendations for a suitable and fitting monument to this great and historic achievement.

PROTECT THE FAMILIES OF POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which will provide survivors' benefits to the families of law-enforcement officers and firemen killed in the line of duty.

At present, Federal law extends the benefits of the Federal Employees Compensation Act to police officers injured in the line of duty and the survivors of police officers killed in the line of duty, if that duty involves enforcement of Federal law. My bill would extend these benefits to all law-enforcement officers and firemen killed or totally disabled in the line of duty.

Mr. Speaker, our law-enforcement officers are our first line of defense against subversion, sabotage, and crime. He is in uniform for the security of our Nation and the protection of our very lives no less than a fighting man in Vietnam. A policeman who loses his life in the war on crime is a patriot the same as our fighting men in uniform who sacrifice for the cause of freedom throughout the world. His widow and family should be provided for.

The war on crime is intrastate, interstate, and even international. To win this war against crime is essential to the very survival of our Nation. Law and order in our country is as essential to the security of our Nation as our Armed Forces standing guard on the ramparts of freedom.

The No. 1 target of kooks, anarchists, subversives, and criminals in our country today are our policemen, patrolmen, deputy sheriffs, and firemen who are protecting our homes and our law-abiding citizens.

This legislation will reassure our gallant law-enforcement officers and firemen that someone does care. It will help the morale of these men and their families who share their trials and tribulations.

REQUEST FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Oklahoma be good enough to tell us the reason for meeting at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. The reason is that we would like to finish general debate on this bill today and meet early tomorrow and finish the bill tomorrow so that Members who plan to go to the All-Star game today may do so. That is the reason.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any assurance that there will be a ball game?

Mr. ALBERT. There may be; but I cannot give that assurance to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the distinguished majority leader that this bill was programed for action nearly 3 months ago. It has been difficult for me, although a member of the committee, to again get a handle on this bill. This is rather complicated legislation. It was programed for action in the last part of April, as I remember the situation, and that is nearly 3 months ago. I can see no reason in the world why this bill should not be completed today.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Should it rain, I would

XUM

ask that the order be vacated if it is granted.

Mr. **GROSS**. That is tailoring the legislative business of the House to depend on a baseball game, and I doubt very much that should be done.

Mr. **KYL**. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The **SPEAKER**. Objection is heard.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. **HAYS**. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 116]

Alexander
Ashley
Baring
Belcher
Brock
Broyhill, Va.
Cahill
Carey
Clark
Culver
Daniel, Va.
Diggs
Foley
Gray
Halpern
Hawkins
Henderson
Howard
Kirwan
Landrum
Lipscomb
Madden
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Konski
Philbin
Pike
Powell
Rosenthal
Scheuer
Sisk
Stanton
Symington
Teague, Tex.
Tunney
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright

The **SPEAKER**. On this rollcall, 395 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

(Mr. **FULTON** of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. **FULTON** of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, throughout our Nation we have been extending and completing vast sections of our Interstate Highway System. At the same time major Federal programs are rejuvenating our cities through urban renewal projects.

In both cases the overall benefit has adversely affected certain individuals whose homes have been taken either through purchase or through condemnation for both our interstate highway program and our urban renewal projects.

Many of our veterans who have purchased their homes under their GI bill of rights have been faced with such condemnation proceedings, and learned that once their home has been taken they are no longer eligible to purchase a second home through their GI home loan programs.

At the present time, all GI entitlement for World War II veterans will expire in July of 1970.

These veterans who originally bought their homes utilizing their hard-earned GI home loan benefits are now faced, through no fault of their own, with the loss of their homes. It is the responsibility of Congress to see that such an inequity is corrected.

Therefore, I have today submitted legislation which would correct this inequity. Specifically this legislation would restore to these displaced World War II veterans the right to purchase a home under their GI bill of rights at any time before July 26, 1971, and by Korea conflict veterans any time before February 1, 1975.

Such legislation, I feel, is eminently fair and would restore to this group of veterans the opportunity to replace homes originally lost either through purchase or through imminent domain by our Federal, State, or local governments.

It is my hope that my fellow Members of the Congress will agree with me that such legislation deserves favorable consideration by the Congress.

RING OUT THE BELLS

(Mr. **KUYKENDALL** asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. **KUYKENDALL**. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow afternoon the whole world will set up a cheer as three brave Americans return home from man's first round-trip journey to the moon.

In order to mark this once-in-civilization event, the city of Memphis, Tenn., will mark the moment of the splashdown by ringing all the church bells in our community. Not only will the bells ring out the joyous news, but they will emphasize our thanks to God for the success of the project and its significance for all mankind. The ringing of the church bells will emphasize, once again, the strong spiritual base upon which our Nation and its achievements are founded.

I hope that other cities across the land may follow the example of Memphis and from sea to shining sea there will be a great clamor as the bells ring out, "Welcome home, our thanks be to God from whom all blessings flow."

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

JULY 22, 1969.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture today considered and unanimously approved the work plans transmitted to you by Executive Communication and referred to this Committee. The work plans involved are:

Big Slough, Georgia, Executive communication 893, 91st Congress.

Carpinteria Valley, California, Executive communication, 893, 91st Congress.

Chatlin Lake Canal, Louisiana, Executive communication 893, 91st Congress.

Cottonwood Creek, Wyoming, Executive communication 893, 91st Congress.

Dunloup Creek, West Virginia, Executive communication 893, 91st Congress.

Fredonia, Arizona, Executive communication 893, 91st Congress.

Mud Creek, Tennessee, Executive communication 893, 91st Congress.

Poinsett, Arkansas, Executive communication 893, 91st Congress.

Roberson Creek, Mississippi, Executive communication 893, 91st Congress.

Rock Creek (Cass), Indiana, Executive communication 893, 91st Congress.

Walnut-Roundaway, Louisiana, Executive communication 893, 91st Congress.

Yours sincerely,

W. R. POAGE,
Chairman.

CONTINUING EXISTING SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON CERTAIN COPYING SHOE LATHES

Mr. **MILLS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5833) to continue until the close of June 30, 1972, the existing suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, after line 9, insert:

"SEC. 8. (a) Section 1903(e) of the Social Security Act is amended (1) by striking '1975' and inserting in lieu thereof '1977'.

"(b) The provisions of section 1903(e) of the Social Security Act shall not apply for any period prior to July 1, 1971. In performing his functions under title XIX of the Social Security Act, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall issue regulations and give advice to the States consistent with the preceding sentence.

"(c) Section 1902(c) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out 'aid or assistance (other than so much of the aid or assistance as is provided for under the plan of the State approved under this title)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'aid or assistance in the form of money payments (other than so much, if any, of the aid or assistance in such form as was, immediately prior to the effective date of the State plan under this title, attributable to medical needs)'.

"(d) Section 1902 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(d) Whenever any State desires a modification of the State plan for medical assistance so as to reduce the scope or extent of the care and services provided as medical assistance under such plan, or to terminate any of such care and services, the Secretary shall, upon application of the State, approve any such modification if the Governor of such State certifies to the Secretary that—

"'(1) the average quarterly amount of non-Federal funds expended in providing medical assistance under the plan for any consecutive four-quarter period after the quarter in which such modification takes effect will not be less than the average quarterly amount of such funds expended in providing such assistance for the four-quarter period which immediately precedes the quarter in which such modification is to become effective,

"'(2) the State is fully complying with the provisions of its State plan (relating to control of utilization and costs of services) which are included therein pursuant to the requirements of subsection (a)(30), and

"'(3) the modification is not made for the purpose of increasing the standard or other formula for determining payments for those types of care or services which, after such modification, are provided under the State plan,

and if the Secretary finds that the State is complying with the provisions of its State plan referred to in clause (2); except that nothing in this subsection shall be construed to authorize any modification in the State plan of any State which would terminate the care or services required to be included pursuant to subsection (a) (13). Any increase in the formula or other standard for determining payments for those types of care or services which, after such modification, are provided under the State plan shall be made only after approval thereof by the Secretary.' "

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS)?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not intend to continue the objection except for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Arkansas to make an explanation of the Senate amendment, and then be able to answer any inquiries that other Members of the House may have with respect to the amendment to the legislation, and I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of H.R. 5833 as it passed the House were not changed in any way. The Senate amended the bill by adding three amendments to title XIX of the Social Security Act which provides grants to the States for medical assistance programs.

The first of these amendments would suspend the application of section 1903(e) of the act which requires the States to have in operation comprehensive medical assistance programs by July 1, 1975. Under the Senate amendment, this provision would be suspended in application until July 1, 1971. This means that the States would not be required to take any action pursuant to the requirements of section 1903(e) prior to that time. In addition, the Senate amendment would postpone the date when the comprehensive care requirement would finally apply from July 1, 1975, until July 1, 1977.

Mr. Speaker, section 1903(e) has been of concern to many States in considering whether or not they should establish a medical assistance program. There has been some question since this provision was enacted as to just what it requires of the States.

The amendment adopted by the Senate provides an opportunity for the Congress to further consider the type of requirement of this nature which should be in the law and if necessary to modify the requirement, to take into account the experiences that have been gained so far under the medical assistance program.

The second Senate amendment relates to section 1902(c) of the Social Security Act. This amendment is more in the nature of a clarification of original congressional intent than a modification of the provisions of the section.

Section 1920(c) of the law states that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall not approve a State program for medical assistance if he determines that the plan will result in a reduction in aid or assistance provided for individuals on public assistance prior to the adoption of the State's title XIX plan. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has interpreted this section to mean that a State could not adopt a title XIX program providing less in the way of medical benefits for public assistance recipients than were provided prior to that time in the form of medical vendor payments for any cash assistance recipients. This was not the intention of section 1902(c). As spelled out in the 1965 House and Senate committee reports on this legislation, the intention of this section of the law was to prohibit the States from reducing cash payments to public assistance recipients at the time they adopted their title XIX plans, and diverting the funds to pay for medical care.

This intention was clearly stated in the following language from the House Report on the 1965 amendments:

> In addition, the Secretary is directed not to approve any State plan for medical assistance if he finds that the approval and operation of the plan will result in a reduction in the level of aid or assistance provided for eligible individuals under title I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI. An exception is provided allowing States to reduce such aid to the extent that assistance now provided under titles I, IV, IX, XIV, and XVI is to be provided under title XIX. The reason your committee recommends the inclusion of this provision is to make certain that States do not divert funds from the provision of basic maintenance to the provision of medical care. If the Secretary should find that his approval of a title XIX plan would result in a reduction of aid or assistance for persons receiving basic maintenance under the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act (except as specified above) he may not approve such a plan under title XIX. Your committee recognizes the need and urgency for States to maintain, if not improve, the level of basic maintenance provided for needy people under the public assistance programs. The provision is intended to prevent any unwarranted diversion of funds from basis maintenance to medical care.

The amendment adopted by the Senate clearly spells out this intention in section 1902(c) of the act.

The third amendment adopted by the Senate would add a new provision to title XIX in the form of section 1902(d) which would require that whenever a State desires to reduce the scope or extent of care and services provided under its medical assistance plan, such modification must be obtained on the basis of an application submitted by the Governor of the State and approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In such cases, the Governor of the State would be required to certify with respect to three important matters.

First, he would have to certify that the amount of funds expended in providing medical assistance from State and local sources in the year after such modification takes effect is not less than the amount of such funds expended in the year prior to the quarter in which such modification is to become effective.

Second, the Governor of such State must certify that the State is fully complying with the provisions of its State plan relating to control of utilization and costs of services. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would also be required to make a specific finding that the State is complying with its plan requirements concerning utilization and costs.

Third, the Governor must certify that the modification is not made for the purpose of increasing the standards for determining payment to doctors, nursing homes and other providers of services under the State plan. Provision is made in the amendment, however, that if there is a demonstrated need to increase the formula or standard for determining payments under a State plan after a modification has been adopted in the State's plan, such increases may be provided but they shall be made only after the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has been obtained.

Mr. Speaker, these three amendments are very pertinent to the concern of Congress over the sharp and unanticipated increases in the cost of operating the medicaid program. They do not constitute a retrenchment in the medicaid program, but they will allow the States great freedom in determining the dimensions of their own programs in the light of their own individual needs and resources.

These amendments were adopted on the Senate floor without opposition. The first two of these amendments had earlier met with some opposition in the Senate and had held up action on the bill for a number of days. The third amendment which was added to the bill after it was reported out of the Finance Committee, however, along with a modification of the amendment to section 1903(e) gained complete support for the entire set of amendments from those Senators who had opposed the amendments as they had been reported.

I urge that the House accept the Senate amendments.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to reserve my right to object, so I could make a few points with reference to the pending matter, but I will accept the time yielded to me by the gentleman from Wisconsin to achieve the same objective.

Title XIX, when enacted, provided a meaningful hope for the American people that comprehensive medical care would someday soon become reality. Also of importance, it provided a mechanism to obtain meaningful data for all of us to weigh when we consider to what extent we should move ahead to provide comprehensive medical care under the social security mechanism.

I must respectfully completely disagree with the view of our very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means with reference to the second amendment relating to section 1902(c). The amendment before us will not be a clarification of the original intent of Congress with respect to the States being required to maintain not only their level of cash benefits, but, more importantly in the health field, the level of health services provided to public assistance recipients.

The fact of the matter is that when title XIX was approved there was the dual requirement on the States to main-

XUM

tain effort both on the cash side as well as on the health side to public assistance recipients.

The modification proposed by the Senate eliminates the requirement that States must comply with meeting their preexisting level of health services in order for their title XIX plan to be adopted. This is a step backward in terms of the health care that we require the States to provide in order to receive Federal funding under title XIX. Its significance is not so much today as it will become if we are ever to reach the triggering date of 1975 wherein State plans were supposed to be comprehensive in terms of providing health services.

So we have here two interrelated amendments. I do not like, but understand, the background that led up to the other amendment providing a delay for 2 years, from 1975 to 1977, to give the States further time to comply with the requirement in the law that there be comprehensive medical care and services.

If this matter were subject to a rollcall, I would vote against it. I believe the realities of the situation are that this is reasonably well considered, but nonetheless clearly a step backward in terms of our meeting the national objective to provide comprehensive medical care to the American people.

I would hope that we will not find ourselves in future sessions agreeing to further retrenchment and relaxation of the objectives to provide comprehensive medical care for the American people, at least through the mechanism provided under title XIX, by 1977.

I thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding this portion of his time to me.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT FINANCING AND BENEFITS

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 380 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 380

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9825) to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes, and all points of order against section 103 of said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to save the civil service retirement fund. If it were to drift the way it has been going, by 1975 the outgo would exceed the income.

This legislation is long overdue.

The rule provides the waiving of points of order on section 103, an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

The purpose of the bill is to improve the financing and funding practices of the civil service retirement system so as to maintain its soundness and to assure that the necessary moneys are available when needed to pay the annuities of our Government retirees and survivors' annuities in the full amount.

It is also the purpose of this legislation to provide certain limited but needed improvements in the benefit structures of the system within the limits of the new financing approach.

The waiver of points of order, of course, is a restriction of the power to report appropriations. There are two sections which I will refer to of this bill. The first section is on page 5 of H.R. 9825, beginning on line 9, where it is stated that the civil service retirement and disability fund is appropriated for the payment of benefits and administrative expenses and is made available subject to the annual limitation by the Congress for the expenses incurred in connection with the administration of the retirement and annuity statutes. Then further on, on page 6, beginning at line 17, a new subsection of section 8348 requires the Secretary of the Treasury to credit annually the civil service retirement and disability fund as a Government contribution in an amount of money equal to a specific percentage of the amount of interest on the unfunded liability of the fund.

It is clear, therefore, that this waiver is necessary on section 103 so that the heart of the bill not be destroyed by a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, a great deal of study has been put into the revision of this retirement fund. It has been put off year after year until now we are down to a point where we are near a crisis. The bill has been covered in the committee hearings and will be covered on all points during debate. It is long overdue, and I urge adoption of this rule so that we can get to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Did I understand the gentleman to state in his preliminary remarks that the waiver of points of order also applied to section 102?

Mr. DELANEY. No. Section 103.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for that clarification. I obviously misunderstood him. I listened with unusual attention to his subsequent explanation of the waiver of points of order pertaining to section 103. I disapprove heartily of a waiver of points of order even under such a circumstance. I think the individually elected Members should not be precluded from their elected responsibilties by even the distinguished Committee on Rules waiving such points of order, but in line with the new policy of the Committee on Rules wherein the distinguished gentleman from New York has explained on a line-by-line basis everything within the bill applicable thereto, I, for one, wish to state that I appreciate this method. I recognize the inevitable in House Resolution 380, and compliment the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

Mr. DELANEY. I thank the gentleman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the main purpose of the bill is to increase the current funding provisions of the retirement system to assure that the necessary money will be available to pay beneficiaries. The bill also improves some of the benefits now existing.

The retirement fund is in trouble unless something is done. While Federal employees have fully met their share of the cost, the Government has not met its obligations. By the end of the fiscal year the deficiency of the fund will amount to about $57,700,000,000 in unfunded future obligations. By 1975, as fund disbursements exceed income paid in annually, a serious problem will arise. It is estimated that by 1987 the current $20,500,000,000 fund will be exhausted. To forestall such a result, the unfunded liability, resulting from the Government's arrears in making payments to the fund must be reduced and finally eliminated.

The bill will increase the employee-employer contribution from 6½ percent each to 7 percent. Congressional employees will have their contribution rate increased to 7½ percent, the same as Members. These increases become effective in January 1970.

The existing unfunded liability is to be eliminated over a 30-year period by payment of annual installments by the Government. Permanent appropriating authority language is contained in the bill. Beginning in 1971 payments will begin from the Treasury to reduce the unfunded liability now existing and the interest thereon. The committee believes this system of payments will insure a sound, healthy retirement system for civil service employees.

Title II of the bill improves several of the benefits now available. These are more than covered by the increase in contributions.

First, the current formula for arriving at a retiree's annuity is modified. Now, it is based on a high 5-year average. This has caused some to remain on the job longer than they should. The new base period will be a high 3-year average.

For congressional employees the 15-year period upon which to apply the year average rate is removed.

Unused sick leave is recompensed by increasing the total actual work service credited to an employee by the length of service represented by the calendar value of his unused sick leave. One calendar month will be added for each 22 days of unused leave.

The cost-of-living automatic increase for annuitants is increased by adding 1 percent to all such future increases.

It is estimated that the 1-percent increase in contributions will increase fund income to $220,000,000 per year, which covers both normal costs and the benefits increased by the bill. It is also estimated that by 1980 the amount to be transferred by the Treasury to the fund to cover the interest on the unfunded liability will be about $2,700,000,000 annually. This figure is to be reached in 10-percent increments during the 1970's until full annual funding is achieved in 1980.

The administration supports the bill.

A waiver of points of order is needed for two sections of the bill as in two places appropriation language is provided for the Government-funding provisions. These occurs on page 5, lines 18 to 22, and page 6, lines 17 to 25, and page 7, lines 1 to 7. Both of these sections violate rule XXI, clause 4, which prohibits appropriation language to be in a bill not reported by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I doubt that there is a Member of Congress, either in the House or the other body, who does not want to do something about the chaotic condition of the Government employees' retirement fund, but what has happened is that this bill has been converted into a Christmas tree with a lot of tinsel and ornaments—something for everybody—especially the Members of Congress.

I propose to make a further statement under general debate, but I would like at this point to read a letter which I received this morning from the Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget:

> Dear Mr. Gross: This is in response to your letter of July 15, 1969, in which you asked whether the Bureau of the Budget would recommend to the President that he approve H.R. 9825 if it were enacted in its current form. Title I of H.R. 9825 would provide for full funding of the Civil Service retirement system and Title II would provide a number of benefit liberalizations.
>
> In our letter of March 16, 1969, to the Chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, we stated that "retirement legislation enacted this year should be confined to improving the financing and funding of the retirement system. . . ." In addition, in our report of July 10 to the Chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, we stated that enactment of the liberalizations contained in Title II would not be consistent with the Administration's objectives and that the Congress should limit its action this year to enactment of the Title I financing provisions.
>
> We believe the Administration's position on H.R. 9825 is clear. Thus, in view of the legislative history, the Bureau of the Budget would have to seriously consider recommending to the President that he disapprove H.R. 9825 if it were passed by the Congress in its current form.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Robert P. Mayo,
> *Director.*

Mr. Speaker, let me repeat:

> We believe the Administration's position on H.R. 9825 is clear. Thus, in view of the legislative history, the Bureau of the Budget would have to seriously consider recommending to the President that he disapprove H.R. 9825 if it were passed by the Congress in its current form.

Mr. Speaker, I propose at the proper time to offer an amendment to strike title II from the bill. In that event I can support it. I am not opposed to the rule for, as I said previously, we do something about the chaotic condition of the retirement fund, but that does not mean that to accomplish that end it is necessary for us to stage another unwarranted raid on the Federal Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. Martin).

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, we have before us a bill today which is in two sections. Title I of the bill I approve of heartily, because it would result in fiscal responsibility in the operation of our civil service retirement system and put it on a sound basis, but on the other hand title II offsets the benefits derived from title I of the legislation, because it increases the liability under its provisions to the tune of $3.7 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from the report on page 28 in a letter from the U.S. Civil Service Commission, written by Mr. Robert E. Hampton, and I quote from that letter:

> Title II would liberalize existing benefits in the following ways:
>
> 1. Gross earnings, rather than basic pay, would be used in determining retirement benefits and deductions.
> 2. Average salary for annuity computation purposes would be determined on the basis of 3 rather than 5 years.
> 3. Unused sick leave would be added to the actual length of service in computing annuities.
> 4. An extra 1 percent would be added to each annuity increase resulting from changes in the Consumer Price Index.

And I quote further:

> In summary, if the bill is amended to delete those financing provisions which we consider unnecessary and to delete the liberalizing amendments proposed in title II, we strongly urge enactment of H.R. 770.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from the letter to the chairman of the committee from the Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, written by Mr. Wilfred H. Rommel:

> Title II of H.R. 770—

And that H.R. 770 was the original bill sent down to the Department—

> Title II of H.R. 770 would provide a number of liberalizations primarily designed to enhance the value of annuities earned by long-service employees. In the aggregate, they would have the effect of increasing the unfunded liability by more than $3.7 billion. We believe it would be incongruous to include in a bill designed to halt the growth of the unfunded liability of the retirement system, provisions which would of themselves increase the existing unfunded liability by more than 6 percent.

And I quote further:

> Therefore, we recommend that the liberalizations contained in title II be deleted.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has set a limitation on expenditures for the fiscal year 1970 by the executive branch of the Government and here we are in legislation proposing today under title II to increase further the cost of the operation of our Federal Government.

Title II will probably pass the Congress today, but it seems to me the height of irresponsibility to propose setting this fund up on a fiscally sound basis, and then on the other hand in title II to eliminate the good that is being done by the provisions of title I.

I would like to direct a question to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Dulski).

In the Rules Committee hearing I asked the question whether there would be any changes in the retirement for Members of Congress and the answer, as I recall it, was that the 7½ percent currently taken out of our pay checks would remain the same; is that correct?

Mr. DULSKI. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN. The bill last year increased that one-half of 1 percent—but this remains the same?

Mr. DULSKI. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN. Let me ask one other question of the chairman of the committee.

In reducing the basis for retirement from the high 5 years to 3 years, would this apply to the retirement of Members of Congress as well as civil service employees?

Mr. DULSKI. Yes, it would.

Mr. MARTIN. It would apply to Members of Congress as well?

Mr. DULSKI. Yes, it would.

Mr. MARTIN, Mr. Speaker, I am also opposed to that, because it increases benefits without any increase in the amount paid in.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. The gentleman made a statement referring to the report of the Bureau of the Budget in which he stated that the bill would add over $3 billion to the unfunded liability.

I believe that report had reference to the bill, H.R. 770, which was the bill I originally introduced on the opening day of this Congress. Do you know there is a substantial difference in one important feature of H.R. 770 and the bill, H.R. 9825, the bill presently under discussion?

Do you not know that the bill, H.R. 9825, does not include provisions as included in the bill, H.R. 770, relating to the inclusion of overtime, premium and differential pay of employees as basic pay for retirement purposes? Because that particular provision would cost over $2½ billion, in the judgment of our com-

XUM

mittee, we deleted that and it is not included in the bill, H.R. 9825, the bill we are presently considering.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the gentleman why he did not——

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. If I may have the gentleman's attention, I will tell you exactly what the increase——

Mr. MARTIN. I will not yield further to the gentleman to make a speech. He can do that on his own time.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I am going to make a speech later.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the gentleman a question: Why were not the departments downtown requested to give their opinions on the bill which we have before us instead of the bill which you introduced last January, and why were not their letters included in this report?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Representatives of the departments appeared before the committee.

Mr. MARTIN. That does not answer my question. Why did you not have letters from the departments that would pertain to the legislation we have before us instead of some other bill that was not reported out by your committee?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. This is a clean bill, sir.

Mr. MARTIN. This does not look like a very clean bill to me. The committee has the responsibility to write a report and include letters from the proper bureaus which accurately reflect their thinking on the bill before us. I note that the two letters from which I quoted, were written last March 19, although the letter from the Bureau of the Budget shows March 19, 1968.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question as ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9825) to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 9825, with Mr. McFALL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CORBETT) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, before yielding to the chairman of the Retirement Subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS), I will say that the bill before us is a special tribute to him and every member of his subcommittee, as well as the fine bipartisan support given by the minority side of the committee.

This landmark legislation has been carefully worked out through diligent and unceasing effort over a period of 2 years. It has been developed, refined, and tested through hearings, conferences, and executive deliberations that were among the most intensive in the history of our committee.

H.R. 9825 achieves a delicate, yet ideal, balance—a balance that should not be disturbed—in coupling together long-overdue retirement financing and a very moderate updating of the benefit structure—the first major benefit changes in 13 years.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to give this excellent bill the overwhelming approval it so richly deserves.

I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS), the chairman of the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans, to give their strong support to the legislation before you today, H.R. 9825, the major purpose of which is to improve the financing and funding practices of the civil service retirement system, and to provide certain limited, but needed, improvements in the benefits structure of the system within the framework of the new financing approach.

It is a good bill, a sound bill, and the product of many months of intense work, study and consideration by the House Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits in conducting extensive public hearings, executive sessions, and conferences with official representatives of agencies of the legislative and executive branches; namely, the Honorable Robert E. Hampton, the present Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission; the Honorable John W. Macy, J., the former Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission; the Honorable Philip S. Hughes, Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget; the Honorable Elmer B. Staats, Comptroller General of the United States, and others.

This three-pronged financing approach—dealing with normal cost, future unfunded liabilities, and the present unfunded liability—contains the recommendations, the unanimous recommendations, of the honorable gentlemen whose names I just mentioned. Also, I think the Members of this House should know that this bill was cosponsored by 25 Members, 24 of whom serve on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; that an identical bill, H.R. 10219, has been cosponsored by 14 other Members, several of whom previously served on the committee; and that all of the members of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations cosponsored a bill embodying the basic financing proposals contained therein, H.R. 8608. It is worthy of note, also, that H.R. 9825 was reported favorably by the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits and the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service without a dissenting vote. Of further significance is the fact that Senate bill S. 2326, which is identical to this legislation, and introduced by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Senator McGEE, was the subject of public hearings by the Senate Retirement Subcommittee on July 10 and 11.

Therefore, H.R. 9825 is the product of the common effort of the officials of the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and by the members of the Retirement Subcommittee whose devoted attention and energies have been directed to a most involved and complex subject.

This body demonstrated its concern for the financial integrity of the civil service retirement program in the last Congress by passing a similar measure, H.R. 17682. While the bill was passed on October 1, 1968, unfortunately, time did not permit the Senate to act thereon.

I want to publicly commend the members of the subcommittee, our ranking majority and minority members—the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman HENDERSON, and the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman SCOTT—and the chairman and ranking minority member of the full committee, Congressmen DULSKI and CORBETT, for their tireless efforts and contributions toward the development of a good and sound piece of legislation, H.R. 9825.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service believes that the civil service retirement system is one of its most important responsibilities. It is an essential part of a modern employment system designed to attract and retain employees of the caliber to conduct the complex business of government. It contributes importantly to the financial security of millions of past, present, and future Federal employees and their dependents. There should never exist the slightest doubt of the system's ability to meet its commitments to these people.

The results of an in-depth study conducted by our standing Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits over an extended period of time most assuredly attest to the fact that any doubt which exists as to the system's ability to meet future commitments is attributable to funding practices which have been grossly inadequate since the program's very inception in 1920.

Federal employees have always contributed the full amount set by law. While the Government has contributed substantial amounts to the trust fund, it has failed to appropriate regularly and systematically, on a concurrent basis, sufficient funds to meet the ultimate cost not covered by employees' contributions.

Retirement system financing has been a problem of continuing concern to the Congress, to its respective committees, and to officials of the executive branch. The history of actuarial reports has indicated successively for a long time past an increasingly pessimistic view with respect to actuarial costs and liabilities under the escalating benefits and other liberalizations in the specifics of the retirement programs. In past years, several methods for determining appropriations to meet the Government's obligation to the system have been considered, and some have been adopted. However, the attitudes of various administrations, Congresses, and respective congressional committees has changed from time to time, but facing the problem realistically has been long delayed.

At the end of the fiscal year 1969 the unfunded liability of the system approached $57.7 billion. Full implementation of the 1967 salary statute in the fiscal year 1970, beginning this month, is expected to increase that deficiency to $61.1 billion. Under present financing practices, the unfunded liability will continue to grow by more than $2 billion every year, sometimes much more. By 1975 the disbursements will begin to exceed annual income of $3.8 billion. Thereafter disbursements will continue to escalate appreciably under a relatively static income, and result in a declining fund balance. Consequently, to meet benefit payments, all disbursements in excess of current income will have to be met from the fund balance. Without additional funding, that balance will be totally exhausted by 1987. Immediately thereafter, disbursements will exceed income by $3½ billion, and will require direct appropriations to meet benefit payments.

During ensuing years, progressively higher amounts would be required until, at the turn of the century, the necessary direct appropriations will approach $5 billion. These substantial sums, it is emphasized, will be an addition to the approximate $3½ billion income received by the trust funds from then active employee and agency contributions.

The historical pattern of employee-employer contributions to the retirement fund supports the conclusion that deficiencies—that is, accrued liability for which contributions to the fund have not been made—are the responsibility of the Government as the employer. The major causes of such deficiencies have been:

First. Creditable service for which neither the employee nor the employer contributed—such as free credit for military service, and for Federal civilian service during which the employee was not currently subject to the program.

Second. General wage increases which result in benefits based on a higher pattern of salaries than that upon which at least a portion of contributions is based.

Third. Liberalizations applying to benefits based on past and/or future service without a commensurate increase in contributions.

Fourth. Loss of compounded interest income which would have been earned if the accrued liability had been fully funded.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service feels strongly that, in furtherance of the objective of prudent management of the Government's financial affairs, it is important that Congress provide a definite plan to improve the system's financing.

The major purpose of the legislation is to improve funding practices so as to maintain confidence in the soundness of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability fund, and to assure that the necessary money is available when needed to pay the annuities of Federal retirees and survivor annuitants—in full and on time. The legislation also provides certain limited, but needed, improvements in the benefit structure of the program within the limits of the new financing approach.

The bill contains a three-pronged approach, as follows:

First. Normal cost financing through equal employee-agency contributions is retained. Because of the inadequacy of current contributions, implementation of normal cost financing of the existing benefit structure—including the legislation contained in title II—requires an immediate 1-percent increase in the combined contribution rate from 13 to 14 percent of payroll, in the case of employees, and from 13 to 15 percent of payroll in the case of congressional employees, effective in January 1970.

Second. The costs of future incremental unfunded liabilities which will result from benefit liberalizations for the active work force are to be fully financed by the Government through direct appropriations to the fund, in equal annual installments, over 30-year periods.

Third. Direct appropriations, under permanent indefinite authority, will be made to meet the Government's obligation for the presently increasing unfunded liability which arises from legislation already enacted, including that created in title II of this legislation, in amounts equivalent to interest on the future accrued deficiencies. This responsibility will be fulfilled by transfers of moneys from the Treasury, beginning on a modest scale in 1971 and progressively increasing by 10 percent each subsequent year. In 1980 and thereafter, the amounts will equal the full equivalent of interest on the unfunded liability.

In the committee's judgment, this approach, while somewhat new in concept and mechanics, is sound and will accomplish the desired results by providing in full for the permanent financing of the civil service retirement system.

The legislation also provides for these limited improvements and remedies in certain areas of the benefit structure of the retirement program:

First. Annuities of employees and Members would be computed upon the average of the 3 highest years of earnings, in lieu of the existing provision of computing benefits upon the 5 high years of average pay.

Second. The 15-year limitation imposed under the congressional employee computation formula would be remedied by removal of such limitation.

Third. A new provision would be incorporated into the program to include for service computation purposes the value of unused sick leave to the credit of an employee upon death in or retirement from Federal employment; thus, allowing credit of one additional month of service for each 22 days of accrued sick leave in computing his annuity, or that of his surviving spouse.

Fourth. An additional 1 percent would be added to future cost-of-living adjustments payable to retirees and survivor-annuitants, so as to compensate for the 5-month waiting period which elapses between the Consumer Price Index attaining a rise of 3 percent and the eventual belated payment of the annuity increase.

Fifth. The remarriage provisions of present law with respect to the surviving spouses of the active work force would be extended to any surviving spouse whose remarriage occurs on or after July 18, 1966, the date that existing law was so amended.

Mr. Speaker, these minimal changes provided by title II of this legislation are attainable within the framework of the increased normal cost and incremental financing provisions of title I of the bill. The normal cost of present benefits, 13.86 percent of payroll, would be increased by thirteen one-hundredths of 1 percent, to 13.99 percent of payroll. The combined agency-employee contributions of 14 percent required by title I will not only cover those present benefits which are underfinanced by eighty-six one-hundredths of 1 percent, but the thirteen one-hundredths of 1 percent of those normal cost items provided herein. The additional unfunded liability incurred by all of title II will be stabilized by the payment of interest thereon, under the permanent-indefinite appropriations authority provided in title I.

Mr. Speaker, the magnitude of the problem of retirement financing is such that it is imperative that Congress take action toward a prompt and positive solution. While the budgetary impact of this legislation will be sudden and sharp, it will, nevertheless, be far less drastic than if present financing practices continue unchanged.

In view of the urgency to enact a definite program of action to insure the system's ability to fulfill its future obligations, I strongly urge the adoption of H.R. 9825, without amendment.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is not only a good bill but, title I of the bill is an absolute must.

Mr. Chairman, if we do not properly finance this retirement program, we as a Congress are going to be in serious trouble come 1975 when the payments out of the fund are expected to exceed payments into the fund. And, by approximately 1987 the fund could be without any reserves whatsoever. So, I simply believe that there is no argument possible regarding title I. We simply have to pay the bill. We have ordered the meal and have consumed it. Now the check has come.

As a matter of fact, in approximate figures, we estimate that every day that this bill is not enacted into law is costing the fund $500,000—$500,000 a day. Therefore, it becomes increasingly clear that we have to have this part of the bill.

Now, then, regarding title II, there are those who raise some sincere objections

XUM

to it. To these objections we can only say that if we are going to charge our employees one-half of 1 percent more of their salaries, they are entitled to any benefits for which their money pays.

Now, then, very definitely the amount of money which will be coming into the fund, new money, will more than offset the cost of the additional benefits that are provided for in the bill. As the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) pointed out, the most costly benefit that might have been included was stricken from the proposal. Consequently, this bill provides for an actuarially sound program and should, as the gentleman says, be adopted without amendment.

I think it only fair to say also that if title II is continued in this bill without change, I propose and shall offer a recommittal motion to require that the Members pay 8 percent instead of their present 7½ percent.

I noticed on the news sheet being circulated in the cloak room yesterday that the business of the House today was to liberalize employee's and congressional pensions. This is absolutely misleading. This bill is primarily to properly fund the retirement program, and only very incidentally to improve the ultimate annuities. Consequently, I join in congratulating the members of this subcommittee for the fine job they have done, and I join with most of them, if not all, in urging that the bill be passed as it came from committee. It is complicated and involved, and in the event that we start mixing up certain phases of it we are apt to get the whole thing out of balance.

So, Mr. Chairman, with that admonition to the House that we pass this bill, I will conclude my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 15 minutes to the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who worked on this bill with the Congressman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 117]

Adams
Anderson, Tenn.
Ashley
Baring
Belcher
Biaggi
Boland
Brock
Brooks
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, Va.
Carey
Clark
Clay
Conte
Culver
Daniel, Va.
Davis, Ga.
Diggs
Evins, Tenn.
Feighan
Flynt
Fountain
Frey
Fuqua
Goldwater
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Hastings
Hawkins
Hébert
Henderson
Horton
Howard
Joelson
Kastenmeier
Kirwan
Landrum
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McCarthy
McClory
MacGregor
Mann
Mayne
Mollohan
Moorhead
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Powell
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Purcell
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Riegle
Sebelius
Sisk
Staggers
Stanton
Stephens
Stratton
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Udall
Weicker
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wolff
Wydler

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCFALL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 9825, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 353 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time of the quorum call, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) had been recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9825. In my opinion, it is a much better bill than that approved by the House last year. In this bill, the Congress retains control over the setting of contributions to the civil service retirement fund by both the Government and the employee. Under the measure we approved last year, this function would have been transferred to the Civil Service Commission. This seems to me to be a legitimate legislative function of the Congress and one that should not be transferred and I feel the bill is strengthened by the elimination of the provision.

The primary purpose of the bill is to stabilize the civil service retirement fund. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has already explained in detail the way in which the financing provisions will work. But I do want to endorse what he has said and to assure the Members that title I of the bill will vastly improve our retirement system and assure that the necessary money is available when needed to pay the annuities of the Government's retirees and survivor annuitants. Let me add, however, that this bill will not eliminate the present unfunded liability in the civil service retirement fund. As I understand, if all liabilities should suddenly become payable at one time, the Government would be obligated to pay $78.3 billion; but, of course, not all Government employees could retire at the same time and demand complete payment of all obligations on the same day. Their right to retire does not accrue in this manner.

There is a balance of approximately $20.6 billion in the retirement fund and an unfunded obligation of $57.7 billion. Perhaps we should emphasize that this unfunded deficit is $57.7 billion. What this bill does do is to tend to stabilize the unfunded liability by providing for payment of interest on the deficit in an increasing percentage over a period of years, as shown in table B on pages 10 and 11 of the committee report, so that by fiscal year 1980 the Government will be paying 100 percent of the interest on this deficit. I might mention, however, that this table is not entirely accurate in that it was prepared in connection with last year's bill rather than the current one. Interest alone at that time and each year thereafter will be $2,690 million which, of course, is a sizable amount even for the Government to pay, but the consequence of bankruptcy of the fund and payment to Government employees out of direct appropriations each year is so undesirable that, in my opinion, we must stabilize the retirement fund in the interest of both the Government and the employees.

In an informal conversation with a Civil Service Commission official knowledgeable in this field, he indicated that if the Government would appropriate the entire $57.7 billion represented by the unfunded liability, there would not be any immediate need for the appropriated funds, but the funds would be placed in interest-bearing obligations of the Government. In other words, the unfunded liability is presently an obligation of the Government upon which the interest would be paid in full annually beginning in 1980, and the same situation would exist if this money were appropriated. This is brought to the attention of the Committee so that no one will believe the passage of this bill will eliminate the unfunded liability of $57.7 billion.

I think the Members should also be aware of two provisions in the bill which were the subject of some controversy during committee consideration. One provision will permit retirement service credit to be allowed for the calendar value of unused sick leave of Federal employees. Under this provision, an employee who meets the age and service requirements for immediate retirement will be able to add to his years of service 1 calendar month for each 22 days of sick leave for the purpose of computing his annuity. This sick leave would not, however, be counted in determining average pay or in attaining eligibility for retirement.

As is pointed out in the committee report and in the supplemental views, this is a departure from the historic philosophy of the sick leave system. But the committee believed that the provision was justified and would be beneficial to the Federal service.

Another provision of the bill relates to the computation of retirement annuities for congressional employees. These employees are defined in section 2107 of title 5, United States Code, as follows:

First, an employee of either House of Congress, of a committee of either House, or of a joint committee of the two Houses;

Second, an elected officer of either House who is not a Member of Congress;

Third, the Legislative Counsel of either House and an employee of his office;

Fourth, a member of the Capitol Police;

Fifth, an employee of a Member of Congress if the pay of the employee is paid by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives;

Sixth, the Architect of the Capitol and an employee of the Architect of the Capitol; and

Seventh, an employee of the Botanic Garden.

Presently, congressional employees have their annuities computed by multiplying the average pay times 2½ percent times so much of their congressional, military, or Member service as does not exceed 15 years. Any service above 15 years is computed at the rate of 2 percent. The amendments in this bill would eliminate the 15-year ceiling for computation at the higher percentage and would also limit the years of creditable military service to 5 years. This provision will bring congressional employees on a par with Members of Congress in these respects. However, it would also increase their contribution to the retirement fund from 6½ to 7½ percent, with the Government matching this contribution. The increase in contribution should more than offset the cost of the enlarged benefits as pointed out on page 13 of the committee report.

Mr. Chairman, the various provisions of this bill have been thoroughly discussed in both the subcommittee and the full committee. We have not been unanimous in our feelings toward all of the provisions. However, in my opinion, it is a good bill, one long desired by Government employees and one that should eliminate their concern for the continued worsening conditions of the retirement fund. Passage will assure them that necessary funds will be available when needed to pay all obligations of the fund.

Let me add one more thing: concern has been expressed by several Members of the House because title II of the bill provides that annuities will be computed on the basis of the highest 3 years of average earnings of Government employees rather than the highest 5 years under existing law. During a period of time when salaries are increasing, this will, of course, result in higher annuities. However, employees will have 7 percent deducted from their salaries for retirement purposes rather than 6½ percent; congressional employees and Members will have 7½ percent, all matched with an equal Government contribution. Our committee has been assured by the Civil Service Commission that these contributions will be sufficient to cover the benefits received by the employees. You may be interested in reading the discussion of this matter on page 12 of the report.

The chairman of our subcommittee has been very fair in permitting all points of view to be presented. We have adopted a number of amendments to the measure as originally introduced and as passed the House last year. In my opinion, we have a much better bill. I hope the Committee will see fit to act favorably on the bill.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the dean of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER).

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am pleased to rise in strong support of the legislation before this House today and of our colleagues on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and particularly the members of the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits.

Mr. Chairman, the thrust of the bill primarily is to protect the retirement fund. This fund to my mind is a sacred trust. It must be protected from any and all factors that might in the slightest degree militate against its integrity.

We must keep the faith—the faith to the thousands of Federal employees who years after faithful toil retire from their labors and enter into the deserved age of slippered ease and comfort. All employees look anxiously to this period of leisure. How frightening to them it would be if they had any doubts about the retirement fund which we are under obligation to protect. They would remain in fear constantly if there were the slightest danger of impairment of that fund.

We must keep that fund impervious to all dangers. The fund, unfortunately, is now in danger and we must address ourselves forthwith to erase that danger.

I am not going to go into all of the ramifications and convolutions of the financial aspects of this problem, particularly with reference to title I.

Suffice to say that there is involved herein a solution to the difficulties. The relief is through a three-faceted funding program that first, increases employee-employer contributions from 6½ to 7 percent of payroll to cover normal costs; second, provides payment of all future increases in the unfunded liability; and third, provides for the stabilization of existing unfunded liability.

This funding approach, as I understand, is fully endorsed by the Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Service Commission, the General Accounting Office and the House Independent Appropriations Subcommittee.

I do not think we can find greater authority than that for the efficacy and worthwhileness of this bill.

The three steps—in combination—that I have mentioned provide sound and permanent financing of this important program, cover the full cost of all future changes in the program; ease their budgetary impact; control growth of the deficiencies; keep the fund solvent, and at the same time avoiding excessive buildup of the balance before the money is actually needed, and restore confidence in the program's ability to make benefits available promptly and in full.

Such remedy is full and complete.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman say that the Executive supports this bill?

Mr. CELLER. I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman say that the executive branch of the Government supports this bill?

Mr. CELLER. I took the words that I just read from the report itself. If the gentleman has any opinion to the contrary, it might be well to let the House know that there are contrary views on that subject.

Mr. GROSS. I would say to the gentleman that I have already let the House know, but for the gentleman's information, the executive branch does not support title II of this bill.

Mr. CELLER. I heard the gentleman's remarks. I usually have great respect for his remarks, but I do not think the statement he read before is unconditional. It was in futura. The gentleman does not know exactly whether the Bureau of the Budget will or will not finally approve this legislation. The assistant who wrote that letter himself is not sure as to what action the Bureau of the Budget would take.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CELLER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The letter was signed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Mayo, not an assistant.

Mr. CELLER. That may very well be, but it might be also that enlightenment will strike between now and the passage of the bill and the time the President may have an opportunity to sign it, and I doubt very much, sir, whether the President will take upon himself the grave responsibility of vetoing a bill of this character. The President will think many times over before he would follow the Bureau of the Budget in advice to veto a bill of this nature.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Since he is the dean of the House, I wonder if he could recall back over the years whether, during the time the gentleman has been in Congress, the executive branch has not usually had some objection from a monetary point of view to improvements or liberalizations in the Government employees retirement fund.

Mr. CELLER. As I very quickly search my own memory, I do not recall any such incident where the Chief Executive took upon himself such a responsibility. I doubt very much whether the President of the United States would deign—and I use the world "deign" advisedly—to veto a bill of this character that seeks, in the main, to put the fiscal house with reference to the retirement fund in order. I cannot conceive how the President would do such a thing. The President is too shrewd, too conversant with the political repercussions of his actions to veto this bill.

Reference has been made to title II. I will say that perhaps there may be some objections to some of the forms involved in title II. You cannot get a perfect bill, gentlemen. In my long experience, I do not know whether we have ever had a perfect bill. Even the diamond has its flaws. Our experience always tells us that worthwhile legislation is always the result of compromise, and I take it that within the confines of this committee the intelligence of the members thereof has dictated some sort of compromise, so they have given us the best of their endeavors. I think we must have great confidence in the members of this committee, and if we would try to subvert and upset the labors of the committees of the House, we would get nowhere. We have neither the expertise nor the opportunity to learn all there is to be known about a given subject. In a word, the members of the committee must know everything about something, but we outside the committee must content ourselves to know something, be it ever so little, about everything.

So I cannot offer myself as an expert against the experts of this committee. I, therefore, hope this bill, a very salutary bill which requires attention of a very extreme nature; namely, the stabilizing

XUM

of this fund, will pass—and pass overwhelmingly.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely want to support the main purpose of this legislation, which is to save the Federal employees' retirement fund from disaster and complete bankruptcy. But, I take vigorous exception to several provisions in the bill.

This measure is brought to the floor of the House under the guise of legislation needed to refinance the retirement fund. However, included in this bill is title II which grants over $1 billion in retirement liberalizations. The administration opposes the provisions contained in title II because of the increased cost and has served notice as I stated earlier today that it will give serious consideration to a veto if those provisions remain in the legislation.

I shall offer an amendment to strike out title II of the bill which provides the following liberalizations: First, sick leave credit for retirement purposes; second, a 1-percent cost-of-living adjustment for retired employees; third, an increase in survivor annuities; fourth, computation of retirement based upon the high 3-year average salary.

Another provision to which I take serious exception is the language of the bill, exempting the liberalizations it provides from the financing provisions of title I which provide that such liberalizations in the future shall be financed by equal annual appropriation installments over a 30-year period.

Believe it or not, the added liberalizations, or the liberalizations in this bill are not included in the unfunded liabilities which this bill seeks to correct.

I will offer an amendment to make any retirement liberalizations effective after July 1, 1969, as well as the retirement cost of the pay increase which became effective earlier this month subject to the 30-year financing provisions of title I.

There is another financing provision in this bill which provides that the Government shall assume responsibility for present retirement fund deficiencies by payment of interest on the unfunded liability created by past legislation which now amounts to over $60 billion.

It should be pointed out that the Secretary of the Treasury was not invited to submit his views with respect to this section of the bill. It seems to me that where the Treasury Department is called upon to credit the retirement fund with tremendous Government payments beginning in fiscal year 1971 and each year thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury should have been afforded an opportunity to submit his views in person. In case anyone believes this is a minor matter, I call attention to the fact that this provision requires the Treasury Department to credit the retirement fund with $230 million in fiscal year 1971, which will gradually increase each fiscal year thereafter until fiscal year 1980. From that year on an amount of $2.69 billion annually will be required, merely to pay the interest on the unfunded liability to keep the fund at the same level.

This bill originated last year when it took the form of a Johnson administration recommendation containing only the financing provisions which are in title I of H.R. 9825.

Thereafter, the bill was amended and the retirement liberalizations were added by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, which are now in title II. That bill passed the House of Representatives last year on October 1, 1968, but the Senate did not consider it.

The former administration and this administration both opposed the liberalizations contained in title II. But, in order to get favorable action on this legislation, I strongly suspect the former administration was willing to accept the provisions of title II. However, there is no assurance that the President this year will approve the legislation in its present form, for the administration has opposed the enactment of title II in this bill.

As I stated earlier, the amendment which I shall offer is to make the provisions of the bill consistent by fully complying with the financing sections to prevent the retirement fund from absolute depletion. I believe this amendment is necessary if we are to approve sensible legislation today.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. OLSEN).

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9825.

The testimony presented to the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits most assuredly attests to the fact that it is of the utmost urgency that we in the Congress address ourselves, promptly and positively, to this alarming situation. It is the responsibility of the Congress to insure that the civil service retirement fund will have the ability to fulfill the Government's obligation to its present and future retirees, and to their families.

I would invite the attention of this House to the "Statement of Operating Receipts and Disbursements from the Retirement Fund from 1920 to 1968," appearing on page 6 of the committee report. You will observe that from the system's inception until the early 1960's, that annual disbursements approximated, on the average, about one-half of the annual income.

It will be noted, however, that in the present decade the percentage of disbursements has gradually increased in proportion to the income. It will be observed that disbursements in past several years, and during the last fiscal year, are equivalent not to 50 percent—but to more than 60 percent of current income. In the present fiscal year it is estimated that receipts will total about $3.6 billion, whereas disbursements will total $2.3 billion—or 65 percent of current income.

Under existing funding practices, disbursements will continue to gradually exceed this 65 percent of annual income by an additional average of 5 percent each year, and eventually equal total receipts by 1975. Thereafter, outgo will continue to progressively exceed income over the following 12 years, and will be twice as great as income by the year 1987. In order to pay out more than 100 percent of current income during that 12-year period, it would be necessary to spend the entire assets of the retirement fund.

Since the entire fund is appropriated for the payment of benefits, those benefits would be paid as long as there is a dollar in that fund, supplemented by whatever comes into it by then-current employee deductions and agency contributions, plus interest thereon. The situation that H.R. 9825 proposes to preclude is the necessity of relying upon direct appropriations of billions of dollars each and every year to meet disbursements estimated to exceed $6½ billion in 1987, and $8 billion by the end of this century.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this body's unanimous support of H.R. 9825.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HICKS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that the House is considering today the long-delayed legislation to improve the financial condition of the civil service retirement fund in an effort to assure that necessary funds will always be available to pay annuity benefits.

I am particularly interested in this measure because there are nearly 25,000 Government employees in my district, the Sixth District of Washington State, who have rightly become increasingly apprehensive over the rapidly mounting level of the unfunded liability of the retirement fund. This results from the fact that many are just becoming fully cognizant of the great amount estimated to be needed to fully finance all benefits due employees and former employees, less money to the credit of the fund and that to be placed in the fund in the future. This amount of potential deficit has doubled since 1961. These employees realize that this trend cannot be allowed to continue or the fund balance will ultimately be depleted, possibly as early as 1987. Action must be taken to forestall this contingency.

Judging from the correspondence and inquiries I have received, the workers in my district favor the limited improvements in the retirement benefits this legislation would provide and are willing to pay for them with the increased contributions required by this bill.

Thinking that retirement annuities determined under the high 3 years provided in this bill would be more in line with today's cost of living, many people postponed their retirement when Congress began considering this retirement legislation. They have now been waiting nearly 2 years. As I understand H.R. 9825, it provides for adequate funding for this and the other benefits provided in title II.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the Government employees in my district, there are thousands of people receiving retirement and survivor annuities. The people are having great difficulty keeping abreast with the continual increases in the cost of living. Although the pro-

XUM

cedure adopted in 1965 for providing cost of living adjustments helped considerably in solving this problem, the most recent round of inflation has demonstrated an additional gap in this process. The committee's bill should narrow this gap and provide a mechanism which will keep annuities more nearly in line with prices.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the subcommittee and its chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman DOMINICK V. DANIELS, for the excellent job they have done on this legislation. In my own view H.R. 9825 will restore confidence in the retirement system and correct the more glaring problems presently facing the system.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, before addressing myself to the details of this issue, I would first wish to inform the Members who are here hard at work that the National League is leading in the all-star game 8 to 2. If someone thinks that this is quite a departure subject-matterwise from the bill before us, I believe that it is not so at all, since you might note the big league baseball pension fund is in very excellent financial shape, which is not a description that could be applied to the fund of the Federal employees.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I support title I of this bill along with the illustrious members of the subcommittee and the full committee who are writing such a fine, impressive, eloquent, and determined history of legislation this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, as I see it, title II of the bill represents a backward step. Having developed at progressive approach in title I, the committee starts to chip away at it in title II. However, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa and myself are very concerned over this. We intend to aid the majority of the subcommittee and the full committee by helping to correct the innocent little items that have crept into this bill through the vehicle of title II. Once we do it title I will serve its real purpose.

If I may have the attention for a moment of the floor manager of the bill, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS), in an effort to help clarify the record, could the gentleman explain to the House or define for the House the Congressional employees as covered by a provision in title II? Just whom are we covering or for whom are we providing under the term "Congressional employees"?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Any employee of the House or Senate in the employ of the Architect and the Architect.

Mr. DERWINSKI. And I presume also the Capitol Police.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. They are employees of the House and the Senate.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Are any of these employees presently entitled to annual or sick leave or other fringe benefits?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I understand and am reliably informed that the employees of the Architect are.

Mr. DERWINSKI. What about the Capitol Police? My recollection is they have their own administrative benefits of some sort. Do they not?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I am advised by my chief staff assistant that they are entitled to such benefits also.

Mr. DERWINSKI. It would seem to me, then, that we in the House are adding a dubious additional fringe benefit for these employees who are presently covered in some form for sick leave and annual leave.

I am concerned that there is unnecessary controversy over this bill basically because of the little goodies that have crept into title II. This is why the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) and I are trying to be helpful this afternoon in straightening up this bill.

If I may refer the Members to a letter that should have reached the office of everyone yesterday, from the chairmen of the full committee and of the subcommittee and ranking minority members of the full committee and of the Subcommittee on Retirement—and these are all outstanding Members of this body—these gentlemen in their letter stated, and I quote:

> Because of some earlier confusion and misunderstanding we think it is most important that the record be set straight concerning this vital piece of legislation.

Then the letter goes on to discuss title I and the provisions to which we evidently all subscribe, but it does not really provide any explanation for the so-called confusion and misunderstanding which is contained in title II.

And, Mr. Chairman, if I were cynical, I would be led to believe that perhaps it is impossible to clarify the misunderstanding and confusion which is contained in title II of the bill, because this letter from the four distinguished Members never really did it.

I wonder if we would not solve this whole problem by accepting the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Iowa to strike title II and then send it over to the other body and thereby avoid this confusion and misunderstanding.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out that there is a provision contained in the bill that the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) to strike title II would correct, but if it does not prevail, I have an amendment to strike the provision for credit for unused sick leave. The reason for this amendment is that I am greatly disturbed at this departure from the basic provisions for which sick leave was intended. Sick leave was intended to provide for a situation under which an employee who was legitimately ill would have this sick leave to use under circumstances whereby he would be endangering his health or endangering the health of his associates if he were to continue working while he was suffering from an ailment which poses a problem for himself and his associates. This is the intention. The argument that sick leave is abused, as I see it, is no argument for scrapping sick leave as such.

However, this is what we would do if we provide credit for unused sick leave. We would encourage employees who are sick to continue to work anyway. This is hardly practicable. We would create a complete departure in philosophy from the concept of sick leave. If it is impossible to administer sick leave, then the committee should adjust the administrative provisions so that sick leave cannot and will not be abused. In my opinion that would be a logical step, and I am sure if it becomes necessary for me to offer that amendment, I would receive some interesting support for it.

I also suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we have a few other items contained in title II that require consideration. One is the matter of the present highest 5-year average for annuity which the committee proposed to be lowered to the highest 3-year average. Unfortunately, as I read the report, especially the major portion prepared by the committee itself, I find very few statistics to back up the claim that this would cause only a minor dent in the fund. I am concerned over the possible abnormal costs which are not calculated and which are not clarified in any way in this bill.

It may well be that the overall logic which has been emphasized by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) will prevail. I think the manner in which we all could be of help to the chairman of the subcommittee and to the full committee as well as the ranking Members is to support this position, is to reconsider and strike out title II. Then we would have a fine bill which would restore at long last fiscal responsibility to this retirement fund.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There is one phase in this matter that puzzles me, and that I would like to have clarified, and if the gentleman can do so I would appreciate it.

Mr. Chairman, if one were to deposit money in the bank he gets compound interest. Does the gentleman know whether or not the moneys that are contributed by the Members as part of this annuity fund earn compound interest, or straight interest?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Theoretically—and I will cross-check with the chairman of the subcommittee—theoretically the interest should be compounded. Is that correct?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, would the chairman of the committee join in this, if the gentleman does not mind?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, in response to the inquiry, as I understand it, the funds are invested in Government securities. This morning I reported to the Democratic caucus that the funds are invested according to restrictions imposed by law, and which produce a return of 3.5 percent. And in speaking to the chief of our staff I am told that the entire portfolio today is now being broadly invested, and currently has a return of 4.6 percent.

XUM

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Compounded or regular interest?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I believe it is compounded annually.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I believe this would require further clarification. The previous year's interest income would be reinvested which, in effect, means that it is compounded.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I thank the gentleman for the additional time, and I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, on the basis of compound interest, money earning 4.5 percent would double within 14 years. Does the gentleman know whether or not the funds contributed by the membership have been given credit in the fund for this compound interest, or normal doubling over a period of 14 years for those members who have been in this system more than 14 years?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the contribution of members throughout the history of this retirement fund, so far as the Members of the House are concerned, has been adequate to meet the necessary contributions to the fund, including the earned interests on the funds deposited.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, to give a direct answer to the gentleman from New York, if I may, I would say if you take a specific sum of money and put it out at interest, compound it annually at 4½ percent that in a period of 14 years it would double itself. However, in the case of contributions of Federal employees to the retirement fund they make the contributions in small semimonthly installments. They are not investing the total amount of money in one lump sum at interest for a full period of 14 years.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Then the real question is for their small sum that they deposit, does that draw compound interest? Because if you were to take that small sum, irrespective of how small it was, and deposit it in a bank, it would get compound interest, would it not?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. If I may answer the question posed by the gentleman from New York, and I believe I answered that question before, it is that the present practice today of investing the funds is for it to earn compounded interest.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. It would appear, therefore, to me—if the gentleman would yield further——

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield further to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. It would appear that the funds contributed by the membership under these circumstances are not being adequately compensated, so that in effect the membership in getting their pensions are not being equitably treated.

Mr. DERWINSKI. We need a technical clarification that should be provided for the record——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I again thank the gentleman for this additional time.

As I understand it, when the funds are invested, any interest earned accrues to this fund. This in effect is compounding the interest. This is the point of the gentleman's question.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I read from section 8342 of the United States Code wherein it is stated:

> (h) Amounts deducted and withheld from the basic pay of an employee or Member from the first day of the first month which begins after he has performed sufficient service (excluding service which the employee or Member elects to eliminate for the purpose of annuity computation under section 8339 of this title) to entitle him to the maximum annuity provided by section 8339 of this title, together with interest on the amounts at the rate of 3 percent a year compounded annually from the date of the deductions to the date of retirement or death, shall be applied toward any deposit due under section 8334 of this title, and any balance not so required is deemed a voluntary contribution for the purpose of section 8343 of this title.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Has the gentleman analyzed that section which you just read?

Mr. GROSS. No, I have not. But I simply cite that section of the code for the edification of the gentleman, for whatever it is worth.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Does the gentleman mean the contribution of the Members to the pension fund is given credit for compound interest?

Mr. GROSS. I think it does—at the rate of 3 percent.

Mr. DERWINSKI. If I may comment on that point, that furnishes another argument for possible confusion and misunderstanding about this bill and perhaps further study by the committee might be in order. All the controversy revolves around the provisions of title II and if we go ahead and pass only title I of the bill, as the gentleman from Iowa recommends, it would solve these problems?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I posed that question to the head of the Civil Service Commission. I think it was last year or 2 years ago when the question was raised in connection with the bill that came out of the Foreign Affairs Committee dealing with this subject, insofar as Foreign Service officers were concerned. I inquired then whether compound interest was paid and I was told, no. It was only given simple interest. This is the reason I pose the question I would like to have clarified as to whether only simple interest is being paid.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that the Foreign Service retirement is a different retirement system.

Mr. DERWINSKI. The passage read by the gentleman from Iowa clearly states that interest is compounded subject to other conditions of the act.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I would like to respond to the question or the statement made by the gentleman from Iowa with respect to the passage he read from the United States Code dealing with compounded interest.

My chief of staff informs me that the section to which the gentleman from Iowa referred provides for an amount of interest charged to employees for period of service not covered by retirement deductions.

In other words, if you pay into the fund for periods of service that were previously not covered or refunded, then you have to pay a specific sum of money, with interest compounded at 3 percent per annum.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Of course, that puts a different phase on the matter, do you think not?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. NIX).

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS), indeed deserves the gratitude of all Federal employees and annuitants who have a vested interest in their retirement system, for the deep concern and great courage he has displayed in dealing with a serious and complex matter which has been neglected far too long. Our colleague has described in detail the features of the committee's proposal for the future financing of the civil service retirement system, and the modest improvements in benefits proposed therein.

The real problem of retirement financing, as I see it, is primarily one of budgetary and legislative responsibility. Responsible procedures require that the full retirement system costs involved in Federal program and legislative actions be fully disclosed and the necessary steps be taken to cover those costs when program and legislative decisions are made.

It is useful, I believe, in considering the budgetary and overall financing aspects of H.R. 9825, to think of it in three basic parts.

First, current service liabilities. Each year's service by each Federal employee adds to the future benefits which the retirement system must eventually pay out. Since the employee only contributes part of these benefits through a payroll deduction, the remainder must be paid by the Federal Government.

Each man-year of Federal employment, therefore, has a retirement cost attached to it which is just as truly an employment cost as the wages and salaries currently paid out. To the extent that the sum of the Federal and employee current contribution rate covers actuarial costs, the retirement benefits covered by each current man-year of employment pay for themselves and add nothing to the unfunded liability of the retirement fund.

Second, the potential increase in unfunded liability for past service, caused by pay raises and liberalizations of retirement benefits. Every time a Federal pay raise is enacted, the retirement value, and the cost, of the past service of Federal employees is increased. After a pay raise, all the past years of service will be multiplied against a new and increased high average salary in determining retirement benefits. Automatically, the cost to the Federal Government of future retirement payments increases, and none of the increase is covered by employee contributions. Similarly, when benefit liberalizations are enacted, or current annuitants given a benefit increase, or new groups blanketed into the retirement system, the value of future retirement payments increases. Unlike the first category—currently accruing liabilities—these costs are not related to current level of employment, but simply reflect the impact of pay raises or benefit liberalizations on past service. It is worthy of noting that each $1 of general pay increase entails a retirement cost of $2.55.

Third, the unfunded liability which now exists because the civil service retirement system was not adequately funded in past years. Even if the Federal and employee contribution rates were sufficient to cover fully the currently accruing liabilities, and even if appropriations were made to cover the increase in unfunded liabilities due to future pay raises or benefit liberalizations, the retirement system would still have a large and growing unfunded liability. This arises from the fact that in prior years the retirement system was not funded to cover its full actuarial costs. And since the fund is far below the full actuarial level, it foregoes interest payments each year which add still further to the actuarial deficit.

There, then, are the three major financing aspects of the retirement fund, and each of these aspects is covered by this legislation, in the light of sound budgetary and financial principles.

It is essential to good budgeting that each Federal program be judged and evaluated in the light of its full costs. Each man-year of civil service employment represents a cost to the Federal Government, not only in terms of direct wages and salaries, but also in terms of what that man-year of employment adds to the cost of the retirement system. Federal agency contributions, together with employee contributions, should therefore cover the full amount of what each current year's service by a Federal employee adds to retirement costs.

At the present time, the normal cost of each year's service by a Federal employee amounts to 13.86 percent of his salary. Further changes in the system recommended by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will raise normal cost to 13.99 percent. The combined agency-employee contribution amounts to 13 percent, almost a full percentage point lower than full-cost coverage would require. As a consequence, the bill specifies a contribution rate of 7 percent for Federal agencies and 7 percent for employees, to cover the full normal cost of present benefits and those contemplated in this legislation, beginning in January 1970.

It is emphasized that requiring employees to share the normal cost on an equal basis does not mean that employees are paying half the cost of the retirement system. Continuing improvements in salary rates and benefit liberalizations have increased—and undoubtedly will continue to increase—the retirement value of past service, whose cost the Federal Government bears fully.

The principle of full-cost coverage for currently accruing service liabilities is not so much a matter of financing, but of full-cost disclosure. We ought to know what the full costs of any Federal program are. Even if the entire Federal retirement system were on a pay-as-you-go basis, principles of good budgeting would require that in making evaluations of Federal programs we "impute" a retirement cost of each Federal employee hired.

Of equal importance is that aspect of funding which relates to increases in past service liabilities. Here again, full-cost disclosure is important. When the Executive considers, for transmission to Congress, and when the Congress itself considers pay increase or benefit liberalization legislation, these considerations should be based on a full awareness of the future costs to the taxpayer of the increased retirement payment which will result from the proposed actions. Every pay raise and benefit liberalization has a price tag for increased retirement payments on past service. Those additional payments will be a cost to the taxpayer. The price tag should be known and action taken to meet it each time legislation is proposed and enacted. H.R. 9825 makes provision for handling this situation by amortizing such additional costs by appropriation payments into the fund scheduled to relatively coincide with outflow from the fund.

Of paramount importance is that aspect relating to the unfunded liability which has already been incurred, and to be further incurred, by failure to practice full-cost funding in prior years. As pointed out in the committee's report on this legislation, the system's existing multibillion unfunded liability, while being substantially affected by consistent liberalizations, recurring salary increases, and annuity adjustments, is largely attributable to the loss of interest on the deficiency—an amount that today approximates $2 billion annually.

The board of actuaries of the civil service retirement system has repeatedly recommended that the Government, with respect to the system's deficiency, do no less than appropriate the amount of accruing interest thereon. The committee does, indeed, concur with the actuaries that the existing unfunded liability should not be allowed to continue to soar by reason of the system's not being fully funded in terms of complete actuarial costs. H.R. 9825 provides for minimizing further loss-of-interest growth, and for the stabilization of those deficiencies within the next decade.

Mr. Chairman, the Government's financial obligation is clear. The Government's recognition of, and action to meet, that obligation is imperative. The situation has been studied intensively during the past few years by the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, the Cabinet Committee on Federal Staff Retirement Systems, and the board of actuaries and has been discussed extensively with congressional committees. It is time, now, that Congress face the problem realistically and adopt a definite program to meet that problem. Such a program is offered in this bill. I urge this body's full support and unanimous adoption of H.R. 9825.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN).

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the Subcommittee on Retirement, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 9825. I am also privileged to be a cosponsor of H.R. 9825. I support it fully and urge its prompt passage here this afternoon.

In brief, Mr. Chairman, what we are doing here today is finally facing up to the unpleasant fact that a most vital Federal employee fringe benefit—one which holds the promise of the future for many millions of persons—faces complete bankruptcy.

The civil service retirement fund is now $58 billion in the red. This unfunded liability is growing automatically by more than $2 billion every year, and by 1975 expenditures from the fund will exceed annual income. If the action we contemplate here today is not taken, the cash balance in the fund will be totally exhausted by 1988, and, thereafter, in order to meet our responsibilities and obligations under the retirement program we will have to make direct appropriations beginning with $3½ billion a year, escalating upward to $5 billion a year at the turn of the century.

The present fiscal crisis facing the retirement fund is the result of many years of inadequate financing, neglect and mismanagement. While Federal employees have always paid their full fair share of retirement costs set by law, the Government itself has not done so.

It is true that moneys have been appropriated to the fund from time to time in the past; but the Government's share of retirement costs has not always been paid regularly and systematically, or in amounts sufficient to meet its share of operating the program. And, in addition, over the years the Congress has enacted many benefit liberalizations which were never adequately financed.

Consequently, it is extremely imperative that we now act to put the retirement fund on a sound financial basis as contemplated by the provisions of H.R. 9825. If we do not, the situation can only get progressively worse and become even more difficult to resolve.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, the remarks the gentleman is making are so extremely important and germane to the bill as to require me, for the first time in my service in Congress, to make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the

XUM

following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 118]

Addabbo
Alexander
Ashley
Baring
Belcher
Biaggi
Blackburn
Blanton
Boland
Broyhill, Va.
Carey
Celler
Chisholm
Clark
Clay
Conte
Culver
Daniel, Va.
Diggs
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Feighan
Fish
Flynt
Fountain
Frey
Fuqua
Gray
Gude
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hastings
Hawkins
Hébert
Henderson
Howard
Joelson
Kastenmeier
Kirwan
Landrum
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McClory
MacGregor
Mahon
Mayne
Minshall
Moorhead
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Powell
Price, Ill.
Randall
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Riegle
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Ruppe
Scheuer
Sebelius
Sikes
Sisk
Smith, Calif.
Stanton
Stuckey
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Weicker
Widnall
Winn
Wydler

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McFALL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 9825, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 353 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN), has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. KEE) for his generous remarks.

I attended the hearings on this measure and, from the expert testimony I heard, it was clearly evident that there is an immediate need to overhaul and improve the funding and financing practices of the civil service retirement system.

The urgency of prompt enactment was best attested to by the distinguished Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Robert E. Hampton, during the hearings, when he said that the retirement fund is now losing $2 billion in interest each year due to the failure of the Government to make all of its authorized contributions.

Mr. Chairman, this is admittedly a very complex piece of legislation. However, I think it is extremely important to point out that the major financing proposals contained in the bill were carefully worked out with, and have been approved by, the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of the Treasury, the Comptroller General, and the Civil Service Commission. These are the agencies which will be committed to any financing plan which we enact and their complete and unequivocal support and endorsement are imperative to the successful implementation of the bill. H.R. 9825 is a giant step forward in fiscal responsibility. It would solve the finance problem by a three-step method:

First. The full normal costs of present and future benefits which would be paid currently through matching agency and employee contributions would be increased from 6½ to 7 percent.

Second. The Government would be authorized to cover in 30 equal annual installments all increases in the Government's obligations created by new legislation, such as pay raises and benefit liberalizations.

Third. The Government would fulfill its obligations created by laws already in effect by gradually increasing appropriations which would eventually replace the interest being lost by the retirement fund.

In essence, H.R. 9825 represents our commitment that the integrity of the civil service retirement system will be maintained and that there will always be enough money in the retirement fund to permit payment of all benefits—in full and on time—to all past, present, and future Federal employees.

In addition to the financing changes, there are several proposals in the bill that would result in improvements in benefits for civil service retirees. Annuities would be computed on the high 3 years, rather than the current high 5 years, of average earnings. The calendar value of unused sick leave would be included for the purpose of determining length of Federal service. At the present time, unused sick leave goes down the drain when an employee leaves the Government service.

An additional 1 percent would be added to all future cost-of-living increases to compensate for the usual 5-month delay in granting these increases. To me, this is only fair.

Finally, certain inequities would be removed regarding the annuities of surviving spouses.

Mr. Chairman, I support these benefits because I feel that the Government should lead, rather than follow, private industry in providing such benefits to employees. I think these benefit increases are absolutely warranted and will fill a legitimate need of Federal employees.

While I enthusiastically support H.R. 9825, I would like to take this opportunity to point out to the Members that a very serious inequity in the retirement coverage of many thousands of our dedicated employees remains uncured by this bill. I refer to the exclusion of overtime and premium pay for the purposes of computing annuities.

H.R. 9743, which I introduced on April 1 of this year, would correct this deficiency. Provisions similar to my own bill were in the retirement bill which passed this House last October and in the original bill, H.R. 770, which our committee considered earlier this year. It is a source of disappointment to me that the provisions were not included in the bill before us today.

At the present time, Mr. Chairman, we have large numbers of Federal employees who, because of the very nature of their employment are required to work a considerable amount of overtime. Some of these employees are the customs inspectors, border patrolmen, Weather Bureau employees, FAA traffic controllers, and Government Printing Office employees.

These employees receive overtime pay and premium pay for their overtime, but the amounts of such overtime are excluded from their total gross pay when computing retirement annuities. The consequence is that an employee approaching retirement who has established a certain standard of living by reason of his consistent overtime, finds that he goes into retirement at an annuity which is much lower in relation to his final salary than do other Federal employees whose occupations do not require that they work a considerable amount of overtime. The employee who has worked long enough to earn the maximum annuity of 80 percent of base pay finds that his standard of living is not reduced by 20 percent, but a much larger percentage due to the fact that the 80 percent is not computed on the basis of his gross salary.

The crediting of overtime and premium pay does not entail any additional normal cost in view of the fact that both the employee and the agency would be contributing the customary 6½ or 7 percent into the retirement fund. I sincerely believe, and I know that many who have studied the retirement program share my view, that total gross pay earned by an employee for his personal services should constitute the basic compensation for retirement purposes.

While the bill before us today does nothing to correct this serious inequity, I am hopeful that my own bill, H.R. 9743, will be acted upon separately by the committee and the Congress in the very near future.

Sometimes there seems to be a prevalent attitude which considers the Federal employee as a "stepchild" of America's work force. Yet, the very structure of government would cease to function if it were not for these loyal and devoted civil service employees. Having been a longtime Federal employee myself, I can attest to the work done and to the contributions made by our Federal workers. These employees are an integral part of America's productive strength and they play a vital role in our progress.

Therefore, I believe that we would be remiss in not voting for this measure which would recognize the contributions of these employees, correct inequities in the current system, and avoid potential hardships which would result from the financial chaos which will occur if the financial problems inherent in the system at the present time are not resolved.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to do what is right and equitable for our Federal workers by enacting H.R. 9825 without amendment.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANLEY).

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support this measure designed to strengthen the financial condition of the civil service retirement system—a program in which all Federal civilian employees and retirees, and their families, have a vital stake.

All of the Government's several staff retirement systems are costly and, even without the liberalizations advocated by employees and retirees, costs are soaring. Benefits already earned but not yet payable will, in a few years, require additional appropriations amounting to billions of dollars annually. Rising costs of living, to which benefit adjustments are now tied by law, will add billions more to the future liability. So will future salary adjustments. Retirement system financing has, therefore, become a major problem to executive branch officials and to Congress, as well as a matter of serious concern to thousands of individuals who fear that the economic security they have been counting on for their old age is slipping away.

Against this general background, facing the need for decision on a specific financing proposal is imperative. Methods of financing and funding Federal retirement systems vary: Some are contributory, some—technically at least—are noncontributory; some are fully funded, some partially funded, and some are pay as you go. While disagreement continues unresolved over the extent to which the individual employee should share retirement costs, and over the best approach to financing, methods of resolving these problems will have a tremendous impact on the budget of the Government.

Clearly, no one social or economic philosophy can adequately explain all of the changing currents of the retirement movement. The society in which the civil service retirement system was originally designed was relatively static; today's society is characterized by a dynamism that we have not yet learned to assess adequately, much less cope with, and the system shows the strains of the continuing effort to accommodate to this dynamism.

It attempts to cope with a particular set of employment conditions specific to most, but not applicable to all, who serve the Nation's largest and most diversified employer; it must continue to meet those special conditions if retirement is to serve its purpose for these employees and make a positive contribution to the Government's missions.

It attempts to balance divergent interests, accommodate conflicting values, and adjust to continually changing manpower needs and policies; it must continue to do so because that is what our democratic system demands of its public institutions.

It is costly because, despite its various inadequacies, it is essentially generous; it must remain so if the Government is to be a responsible employer.

The public hearings held by the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits, together with the considerable volume of correspondence it received, presented an opportunity to give appropriate consideration to a number of topics for study. Our major findings and recommendations are summarized in the committee report accompanying this legislation.

The provisions for financing and funding the civil service retirement system has been designed so as to first, require Government and employees to share normal costs, including those resulting from the liberalization of benefit provisions; and, second, to identify clearly and recognize Government's responsibility for other costs, including those for past service liability and those for post-retirement adjustment of benefits; and also to provide for maintenance of the retirement fund at a level sufficiently high to assure that all retirement benefits can be paid promptly as they fall due.

This legislation will completely cover normal cost, will automatically neutralize prospective causes of future financial deficiencies as they occur, and ultimately will stabilize the existing unfunded liability of the program. The mechanics of the legislation will require virtually full disclosure of retirement costs and explicitly allocate responsibility for such costs to, first, employees and agencies jointly; second, agencies only; and third, Government, as distinct from agencies.

Mr. Chairman, in order that there is no question as to the ability of the civil service retirement system to fulfill its future obligations to Federal employees and annuitants, I urge the adoption of H.R. 9825.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BRASCO), a member of the committee.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9825. First, I wish to commend the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits, the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman DOMINICK V. DANIELS, for the leadership he has demonstrated in bringing before the House a bill which embodies the subcommittee's major legislative effort of the last session of the 90th Congress, and its initial legislative endeavor of the 91st Congress. The bill was reported by both the subcommittee and the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service without a dissenting vote.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize that within 6 years, we will be paying out more than present financing methods bring in. I emphasize that within 18 years the fund balance will have dropped from the present $20½ billion to zero. Unless appropriations of billions of dollars are then made in full, and on time, each and every year thereafter, we will be unable to pay retired employees and their survivors the benefits they have earned through years of dedicated service, and upon which they are counting for support in their old age.

Nonreceipt, or even delayed receipt, of their annuity checks would be extremely serious for thousands of these elderly persons, many of whom have no other source of income. We would be delinquent in our responsibility, I say to the Members of this Congress, if we did not insist upon timely and effective congressional action to assure that such a situation does not occur.

During the course of this debate I have heard title II of this bill described as controversial and described as a Christmas tree ornately decorated with light bulbs and tinsel. Now, I have great respect and admiration for the integrity and intelligence of both of the members of the committee who described title II of this bill in that manner. Certainly it is with great trepidation that I pursue a path which would be directly opposite to their line of thinking. I do not know of any Federal employee who is living high on the hog today. I do not know of any Federal employee who has been able to bring his family up in dignity and decency. I certainly do not know of any retired Federal employee who can maintain that retired status in the manner we ought to want them to have in their twilight years. Among the Federal employees I know are those from New York, among them the post office employees, clerks and carriers, who start out at less than $6,000 a year and after a long period of 21 years make less than $8,000 a year. I think it is certainly fitting that some of the benefits in title II which are due to these dedicated employees be granted in this legislation.

I would like, if I may, now to go over what these benefits consist of. We heard one distinguished member of the committee concern himself with the fact that unused sick leave would be used in the formula to arrive at one's annuity payments. We have had testimony before the committee from the Civil Service Commission in which they stated that about one-third of those retired are retired by virtue of disability. That means they are directed by the Civil Service Commission to take all of their unused sick time. That means also that they are on the payroll for full salary and during that period they are charged against the agency's service list, so that no other manpower can be provided for that slot. We find—and the Civil Service Commission has so testified—that the difference between the one-third and up to 50 percent of those people who are not disabled but are retired are at a stage in their life when they are sick. So they are in the same position.

The last 50 percent forfeits, yes, forfeits some of its unused sick time. But I think that this legislation would represent a great deal of incentive in marginal cases to have Federal employees preserve their unused sick leave.

Then, Mr. Chairman, we come to the 1-percent cost-of-living increase. I do not believe there is any Member of Congress who would disagree that this is necessary for our retired civil service employees today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, then we come down to the next great benefit and I guess this one is the one with all of the tinsel, to restore to widows their rights of survival annuities. During the course of any man's employment when he is married, one of the foremost thoughts in his mind is to provide for his surviving spouse, and he pays for that. In some instances many men will retire at

XUM

reduced benefits only to continue the survivorship benefit for their wife. Are we going to take that away from him because a woman decides to remarry and perhaps remarries a man who is earning only a meager income? Mr. Chairman, do we say that this is tinsel and a type of a Christmas tree provision?

Then, Mr. Chairman, we have the next provision in which we take the 5-year average on which we basically compute retirement down and reduce it to 3 years.

It is interesting enough, and I would agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CORBETT) when he says that all of this is being paid for by the Federal employee when we increase their rates paid into the fund from 6½ to 7 percent. I agree that is accurate.

Mr. Chairman, there is one thing that may cause some controversy and that is the fact that Members of Congress may be included in this provision. I understand there is going to be an amendment offered today to have Members of Congress taken out of this 3-year provision. You know something, I have been around here not very long, but long enough to be sort of tired, respectfully so, but tired of listening to that old song, "Your Lips Tell Me No, No, But There Is Yes, Yes, in Your Eyes."

Mr. Chairman, Members come here constantly and vote against benefits for Members, but as soon as such benefits are voted, run to the disbursing office to collect their benefits.

Mr. Chairman, I think there should be some kind of distinction between those who are voting against these benefits for Members, not because they are not entitled to them, but vote against them only because they may receive the benefit in the end.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one-half additional minute.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I was going to suggest that anyone who has such an amendment might draft the language in this way so that we will once and for all dispense with this kind of demagoguery and do away with the national pastime of "let us kick the Members of Congress around." I suggest that we could do this through an amendment by providing that any Member of Congress within 31 days after this act becomes effective may just write a letter to the disbursing office authorizing them to compute his retirement benefits on a 3-year period instead of 5, so we can honestly separate those who favor the provision and those who do not.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BRASCO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 9825 is a most important piece of legislation, for until the refinancing provisions of this bill go into effect, we do not have a sound financial base for the civil service retirement fund.

I have, in the past, indicated my support for this vital legislation by introducing an identical bill, H.R. 10219. A major reason for my interest in generating support for this bill is because the legislation provides for an additional 1 percent to each future cost-of-living increase and, as my colleagues in the Congress well know, the way things are moving now it appears another cost-of-living increase will soon be due. We simply cannot afford to allow our Federal employees and public service workers to fall further behind in the inflationary spiral we are presently experiencing.

We simply cannot afford to delay this measure any longer. In reporting the fiscal 1970 independent offices bill, I remind my colleagues that the House Appropriations Committee declared:

> The committee again calls attention to the fact that the deficit in the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund continues to increase. The deficiency is estimated at $57.6 billion at June 30, 1969, and the fund will be paying out more than it is taking in by 1975 unless sound financing is provided for.

The many reports, telegrams, letters, and personal conversations I have had on this matter requesting a favorable vote leave me in no doubt as to what course the Members should take this afternoon on this bill.

I stress the great need for our prompt enactment of H.R. 9825 today in order to strengthen and maintain the viability of our civil service retirement system.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA).

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9825, a dual-purpose bill which would strengthen the financial condition of the civil service retirement system and at the same time provide certain needed improvements in the employee benefits structure of the retirement system. H.R. 5831, a bill that I introduced, is similar to the one we are now considering.

As a former member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I am keenly aware of the fact that the financing of the civil service retirement system has been a continuing problem for many years. For too long a period, the reports of the actuary have been pessimistic. In 1958, for example, the unfunded liability of the program was about $18.1 billion, and over the ensuing years it has risen so that by the end of this month, upon full implementation of the latest salary statute, the deficiency will exceed an estimated $61 billion. The dire prediction has been made that if no changes are made in the law, the civil service retirement and disability fund will have a zero balance in about 18 years. It was in this climate that the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee considered and reported out a predecessor bill, H.R. 17682, in the last Congress.

On October 1, 1968, the House passed that bill without a dissenting vote. That bill was the result of careful and extended study by the committee in conjunction with the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, and the General Accounting Office. I regret that the other body did not have an opportunity to consider the bill. Like the bill we are now considering, H.R. 17682, presented a rational approach to financing the civil service retirement program. In addition, it would have made several worthwhile improvements in the benefits provided.

No one can honestly deny that the financial reforms provided in H.R. 9825, the bill now under consideration, are urgently needed. In the current fiscal year the unfunded liabilities of the program will rise by about $1.9 billion due to the interest that accrues. If enactment is put off for another year, there will be a similar increase in fiscal year 1971. Now is the time to put a stop to this unwanted growth in needless cost to the taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, in the current budget-conscious year, we have heard from some quarters that we ought to preserve the financing features of H.R. 9825 while dropping the employee benefit improvements. I would like to point out that title I and title II of the bill supplement each other and are integral parts of the whole legislative package. The employee benefits provided under title II are long overdue. The cost of their enactment will be fully covered by the new combined employee-employer contribution rate of 14 percent of payroll provided under title I.

The employee benefit provisions, encompass such improvements as the reduction in the average pay computation period from 5 to 3 years, the credit for unused sick leave, the 1 percent increase in future automatic cost-of-living percentage adjustments, the deletion of the 15-year limitation from the congressional employee computation formula, and the reinstatement of a remarried widow's annuity without regard to the time her husband died or retired. These are all needed modernizations that do not in any way thwart our effort to strengthen the financing provisions.

Mr. Chairman, there is very little need to engage in lengthy debate today over these provisions of the bill. The need is present and clear. The House in the 90th Congress demonstrated its understanding of these problems and recognized the worth of the proposed solutions. There is no reason why we should not take the same course today with respect to this long overdue legislation.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of interest in this legislation, and any legislation dealing with pensions in the last 3 or 4 years, and as chairman of the General Subcommittee on Labor, I have had the responsibility of the Welfare and Pension Funds, Reporting and Disclosure Act. This act covers the affairs and trusts and the operations of approximately 1,255,000 separate pension funds in the United States.

I have not had an opportunity to look at the whole million or so funds, but I can say to the Members that the highest contribution of any contributor to any of the funds we have studied is the contribution made by the Members of the Congress into the congressional fund.

The trouble with this fund is that it is mixed up in the whole general funding picture of the GSA, or the regular civil service employees retirement, but the truth of the matter is that the soundest pension fund that has come to our notice is the pension fund of the Members of the Congress of the United States.

I can understand why certain Members harbor a false premise on this particular situation of the pension fund in the Congress, because of a great deal of misinformation on pension funds in general, and especially those that attach themselves to Members of the Congress in this instance.

There is a serious problem that we ought to be looking at. We ought to be looking at it because in the days when I was investigating this particular pension fund of ours, in line with other pensions, I received a great number of letters from former Members of Congress who, in detail, gave me the problems they faced after they left the Congress, after having served here for 10 or 20 years or 15 years, and they found themselves completely away from whatever profession they may have had or whatever business they may have had.

If that was true in those days—10, 12, or 15 years ago, how much truer is it today when the Congress finds itself in the position of being a full-time job, practically.

I do not know how the rest of you may be able to carry on your affairs at home, but I have not been able to and I have had to give up all my other business and activities. I am strictly a Member of the Congress of the United States 7 days a week. For that matter I doubt if anyone could actually say that he is not called upon, at all times like a good general practitioner in medicine.

However, I want to get down to the basic fundamental principle of pension legislation—not this particular legislation—but legislation dealing with pensions for the Members of Congress.

First of all, because of the fact that you have to serve 32 full years in the Congress to get the maximum pension allowance under the law, it forces the Members of Congress who, after being here for 10 or 12 years, have to stay to the end of their endurance and the will of the people. Many of us know that Members of Congress reach a certain age where I am sure they ought to be retired and should be retired and should have the inducement to retire.

Some of us worked out what we thought was a reasonable plan. There would be no less paid into the pension fund by Members but it would be paid in a shorter number of years and would allow retirement after a shorter number of years of service.

It is not a question of whether a person is able to serve when he is 78 or 79 years of age—it is a question as to whether he ought to be serving. We are all creatures of habit and we form certain habits and policies and opinions over the years—and they never change.

I hate to say this, but a great number of Members of this Congress who were here back in 1932 and 1933 and 1934 and 1936 are still fighting the old depression. There has been so much water over the dam since then and they are still talking about trade relations of the days of the horse and buggy when we just flew men to the moon the other day.

In other words, we become creatures of habit and form habits and opinions and we follow them—and we follow them more so in our later days when we do not have that vim and vigor or the notion to do any new thinking.

Let me just give you some facts that are very important. I want these facts to be understood for what they are. These are the actual facts of the pension plan of Congress.

First of all, anybody who conceives the idea or who thinks you can make a Government plan actuarially sound using the private insurance company basic figures is just simply out of any rational mind that he may have. It is impossible because any contract that is made with a private insurance company for annuities is based upon a contract that is not changeable during the lifetime of that contract.

You cannot compare the Federal pension to a regular pension system, simply because in the Government pension system we increase the benefits without adding contributions because all of those who are already retired receive benefit increases and do not contribute into the fund.

We have changed this fund in such a way that we have added enough extra cost to it so that even if we were to triple or to quadruple the amount of the contribution, it would not be actuarially sound in future years, as the private insurance companies figure it out.

It is also true that insurance companies as a group have greater earnings, more holdings, and more money in mortgages than any other business enterprise.

On the other hand the Government is not in the business of exploitation for profit and the Government fund should only be self-sustaining, not profitable.

The reason I make that statement is because it proves itself out mathematically and it proves itself out practically. For example, in 1947 we started this fund, and during that period of time the Federal Government was supposed to contribute its matching fund with ours. However, for the first 9½ years the Federal Government did not pay 1 cent into this fund, and at the 9½-year mark, it paid a half a year. Then it paid the next 10 years, according to the figures received from the Bureau in 1967. During that period of time our average annual income from investments, or parts of it, averaged less than 3 percent per year. If this money had been put out at 4½ percent under a prudent investor's rule, and if the fund were run like any other intelligently run fund, the fund for the Members of Congress would have over $26 million over and above the amount of money that was required to pay out all claims.

In respect to claims, a Member of Congress who retired in 1955 received $180 a month in 1955. To be accurate, so that there will be no question of the facts that Member—and I will give you his name if you so desire—now receives $259 a month. Mind you, if you had an actuarially sound plan, and you based it upon the idea of being actuarially sound, you could not pay him $259 a month. He would still have to receive $180 a month. But we have generously added widows and others without funding. We have generously added other benefits for noncontributing Members into the fund, and the Members of Congress have paid for it.

Federal judges pay nothing into the fund but get full retirement benefits. The military has the same setup.

As of 1967 the facts were clear. Preliminarily, I would like to point out that there is one thing you must always remember. Political expediency and common justice seldom sleep together. They are very strange bedfellows.

We have added all of these extras. We are paying for them out of the fund, without matching contributions, or contributions being made out of the general fund. That is where these added benefits should come from since they are not benefits for the contributors. We are paying for them out of our pension fund. We are paying enough in our pension fund, as of the last figures available, to take care of the original program, but I would like to point out that the facts simply put are as follows:

First. The Members' pension is sound and is solvent as a pay as you go with a surplus as of the end of 1967 of over $12,900,000 over and above all charges and costs against it, since its inception in 1947.

Second. The Federal Government never met its matching requirements for the first 10 years and in the 11th year, 1957, it met only 50 percent of its matching and yet the Members' contributions were high enough to meet all claims against the fund and still have a reserve of $3,227,000 for the 11-year period.

Third. During all these years—1947–67—the fund earned less than 3½ percent interest per year for a total of $3,114,000 as against a total of $10,508,000 if the Government had met its matching requirements and the fund had earned 5-percent annual interest.

Fourth. The fund would have a surplus of over $25,008,000 instead of $12,915,000 if the Government had paid its share as all other employers do on a matching basis.

This shows the amount of surplus over costs for the full retirement system of the Federal Government with the exception of free pensions to Judges, and special categories:

XUM

INVESTMENT OF THE RETIREMENT INCOME

Type of security issue and interest rate	As of Dec. 31, 1966, investment (at par) (in thousands)		Rate of interest	As of Dec. 31, 1967, investment (at par) (in thousands)	
	Amount	Percent		Amount	Percent
Special, 2½	$585,000	3.46	2½	$200,000	1.11
Special, 2⅝	3,677,140	21.73	2⅝	3,148,359	17.43
Special, 2⅞	1,009,576	5.97	2⅞	869,014	4.81
Special, 3¾	[1] 1,295,200	7.65	3¾	[1] 1,234,224	6.83
Special, 3⅞	[1] 2,104,888	12.44	3⅞	[1] 2,024,661	11,21
Special, 4⅛	[1] 4,243,254	25.07	4⅛	[1] 1,400,780	22.71
Special, 4¾			4¾	[1] 1,758,171	9.74
Special, 4⅞	[1] 1,907,732	11.27	4⅞	[1] 1,867,040	10.34
Special, 5	[1] 63,072	.37			
Special, 5⅛	117,876	.70			
Special, 5¼			5¼	[1] 43,004	.24
Special, 5⅜	[1] 279,199	1.65			
Special, 5⅝			5⅝	[1] 517,468	2.87
Total, [2] 3.681	15,282,937	90.31	[2] 3.885	15,762,721	87.29
Public, various [1] 4.246	1,640,403	9.69	[2] 4.463	2,295,953	12.71
Grand total [2] 3.736	16,923,340	100.00	[2] 3.959	18,058,674	100.00

[1] Amounts invested since Oct. 4, 1961, under the 1961 law.

[2] Average rate, weighted by face amount at each rate.

Note: Public Law 87–350, approved Oct. 4, 1961, changed the basis for future investment of the retirement fund with respect to special issues from an average coupon to an average market yield basis. It also provides for the redemption of investments made under the old basis and their reinvestment under the new basis over a 10-year period.

The calls and letters to Members by retirees—voluntary and otherwise—attest to the willingness of Members to pay more to get more in pensions and insurance plans. The following is quoted from one of many letters from former Members:

> As you know, I was elected to Congress in 1934 and served until 1947, with the exception of 1943 to 1945.
>
> It was my privilege to be a Member at the time the so-called Congressional pension or annuity was adopted in 1946. Our salary was then $10,000 per year. We should have had an increase in salary long before that time, but we were thankful for the passage of the pension act.
>
> Even though we former Members are not on the payroll, as such, we are called upon to render service because of our former Membership. Our opinions are sought after because of that standing. One does not realize the number of times this happens. We are happy to render such service; however, I feel that our pension or annuity is inadequate.
>
> Of course, I fully realize that our contribution of 5% of our salary, based on our basic salary of $10,000, was voluntary and was paid back to the time of our entry into Congress, and it was the best we could expect to pass at that time. My pension or annuity began in May 1955 when I became 62 years old at the rate of $180 per month or $2,160 per annum and has risen to $259 per month or $3,108 per year because of the increase in the cost of living.

You will note that his pension has increased 33⅓ percent without any contributions. The serving Members of Congress paid for this increase out of their contributions since no appropriations were provided for the increases.

This is another reason we cannot make the fund actuarially sound.

Following is a list containing the history of retirement legislation:

HISTORY OF LEGISLATION AFFECTING RETIREMENT OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

1. Act of January 24, 1942, Public Law 77–411, extended retirement coverage to Members of Congress.

2. Act of March 7, 1942, Public Law 77–490, removed Members of Congress from coverage under the retirement system.

3. Act of August 2, 1946, Public Law 79–601, extended retirement coverage to Members of Congress.

4. Act of June 19, 1948, Public Law 80–707, allowed a Member leaving his office to enter the armed forces during a war or national emergency, upon returning as a Member, to have the time spent in the military credited toward retirement, with no contribution to the retirement fund.

5. Act of April 4, 1953, Public Law 83–18, eliminated the 30-day waiting period for joint-and-survivorship-annuity elections by Members.

6. Act of March 6, 1954, Public Law 83–303, liberalized Member's retirement provisions with respect to creditable service, conditions for retiring, amount of annuity, and death benefits.

7. Act of August 31, 1954, Public Law 83–730, provided that Member's annuity title could arise only if at least 1 year within the 2-year period next preceding Member's separation was served subject to the retirement law.

8. Act of August 11, 1955, Public Law 84–369, added a benefit for Members, separated July 1, 1955 or later, who had prior Government service other than as Member. Also permitted use of prior Member service in computing annuity upon retirement from non-Member employment.

9. Act of June 4, 1956, Public Law 84–556, waived 1-out-of-2 requirement in case of Member's death in service.

10. Act of July 31, 1956, Public Law 84–854, completely liberalized, revised and re-enacted the civil service retirement law with respect to all types of covered personnel, including Members.

11. Act of June 21, 1957, Public Law 85–58, liberalized the commencing date of annuities for survivors of Members who died subsequent to April 1, 1956 and prior to October 1, 1956.

12. Act of June 29, 1957, Public Law 85–65, liberalized the commencing date of annuities for survivors of Members who died on or after January 1, 1957.

13. Act of June 25, 1958, Public Law 85–465, provided annuity increases to retired Members or their survivors who were receiving or entitled to receive annuity on August 1, 1958, based on service terminated prior to October 1, 1956.

14. Act of August 14, 1958, Public Law 85–661, provided for payment of Member's voluntary contribution accounts prior to receipt of any additional annuity resulting therefrom.

15. Act of August 27, 1958, Public Law 85–772, provided annuity protection for survivors of employees who are elected or appointed as Members of Congress.

16. Act of July 7, 1960, Public Law 86–604, liberalized Members retirement benefits with respect to refund rights, annuity elegibility, deferred annuity and re-employment of former Members.

17. Act of July 12, 1960, Public Law 86–622, liberalized Members retirement benefits with respect to excess contributions, deferred annuity, immediate reduced annuity upon involuntary separation and survivor annuity.

18. Act of September 6, 1960, Public Law 86–713, accelerated the commencing date of Members annuities and the annuities of their survivors.

19. Act of July 31, 1961, Public Law 87–114, made permanent authorization for payment of annuity increases authorized for Members and their survivors by the Act of June 25, 1958.

20. Act of October 4, 1961, Public Law 87–350, liberalized the restoration to earning capacity provision of the retirement law relative to Members who retire on account of disability.

21. Act of October 11, 1962, Public Law 87–793, liberalized Members' survivor benefits and provided annuity adjustments to retired Members and survivors of Members.

22. Act of September 27, 1965, Public Law 89–205, as amended by the Act of November 1, 1965, Public Law 89–314, provided cost-of-living annuity adjustments to retired Members and to survivors of Members.

23. Act of July 18, 1966, Public Law 89–504, liberalized Members' survivor benefits for student-children and provided survivor annuity increases.

24. Act of December 16, 1967, Public Law 90–206, liberalized Member's maximum basic annuity at 80% of the final pay of an appointive position in which the Member serves after termination of Member service.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN).

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 9825, the Civil Service and Retirement Financing and Benefits Act.

The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has done an excellent job in the area of drafting legislation intended to improve both the financing and funding practices of the civil service retirement system in order to maintain confidence in the soundness of the retirement fund. In addition, this legislation, in my judgment, provides certain limited, but necessary and needed, improvements in the benefits structure of the system within the confines of the new financing approach.

Certainly, we in the Congress must insure that the necessary money is available when needed to pay the annuities of Government's retirees and survivor annuitants in full and on time.

Essentially, this bill provides four basic improvements in our Civil Service Retirement Act.

First. An additional 1 percent will be added to all future annuity cost-of-living increases. This, I believe, is absolutely essential. Thus, if the cost of living is increased by 3 percent, annuities would be advanced by 4 percent to offset the increase.

Second. Annuities of surviving spouses who have remarried since July 18, 1966, will be continued or restored under certain conditions.

Third. Retirement service credit will be allowed for unused sick leave. While this provision may be debated, it should, nevertheless, be recognized as a valuable incentive for faithful service.

Fourth. And, last, annuities will be

computed on the high 3 years rather than the high 5 years of average earnings.

On this latter provision of pay averaging and, in order to be consistent, it is my understanding that a motion to recommit will be offered on the basis that this provision includes Members of Congress. If the 3-year averaging provision is limited to Federal employees and excludes Members of Congress, I will support it. If it includes Members of Congress, however, I shall be compelled out of conviction to support the motion to recommit on that basis.

Increasing the salary and benefits for Members of Congress, as I see it, is not the answer to the problem and, whenever I have had the opportunity to cast my vote on this question, it has been against increasing Members' salaries and benefits. This was true during the last session on the question of establishing the so-called Presidential Commission on Executive Salaries and it is true here today.

While I fully support improving the financial condition of the civil service retirement system, I cannot, in good conscience, believe that our actions here today will be construed as improving the critical problem of properly financing the system by improving benefits for Members of Congress which, in my judgment, are adequate at present.

While some may disagree, I believe that, over the years, Congress has just not provided sufficient funds or adequate "machinery" so that our civil service retirement system is capable of keeping pace with the cost of living or rising price index. Nor, in my judgment, has proper attention been paid to surviving widows.

This, then, is the problem that we should be addressing ourselves to here today.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. KEE).

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the major purpose of this legislation is to improve the financing and funding practice of the civil service retirement system, so as to maintain confidence in the soundness of the retirement fund and to assure that the necessary money is available when needed to pay the annuities of Government's retirees and survivor annuitants in full and on time.

It is also the purpose of this legislation to provide certain limited, but needed, improvements in the benefits structure of the system within the limits of the new financing approach.

During the past 1½ years, the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has devoted its full time and attention, in extensive public hearings, executive sessions, and conferences with the official representatives of agencies of the executive and legislative branches, to a searching review of the financial condition of the civil service retirement system—a program which is a vital part of the Federal employment system, and one of paramount importance to the Government's millions of retired, active, and future employees and their families.

The subcommittee's aim was to attempt to recognize the problems resulting from past and present funding practices, to resolve any doubts of the system's financial integrity, and to develop a definite plan of action to insure its ability to fulfill its obligations.

The results of the indepth study most assuredly attest to the fact that any doubt which exists as to the system's ability to meet future commitments is attributable to funding practices that have been grossly inadequate since the program's very inception in 1920.

Federal employees have always contributed the full amount set by law, but, while the Government has contributed substantial sums to the trust funds, it has failed to appropriate regularly and systematically, on a concurrent basis, sufficient funds to meet the ultimate costs not covered by employees' contributions. In past years several methods for determining appropriations, to meet the Government's obligation to the system have been considered, and some were adopted. However, attitudes of various administrations, Congresses, and committees have changed from time to time, but facing the problem realistically has been long delayed.

The significance of expected continual deficiency increases is that the fund will ultimately be depleted unless action is taken to forestall this contingency. Thereafter, direct appropriations would be required each year, in addition to employee, and employing agency contributions, in order to meet benefit payments as they fall due. Unless steps are taken to eliminate, or at least halt the growth of, the unfunded liability, the fund balances will be drawn down and substantial direct appropriations will be required to meet future obligations.

In the committee's judgment and mine, its recommended approach, while somewhat new in concept and mechanics, is sound and will accomplish the desired results. Its impact on future budgets will be considerable, but the impact will nevertheless be far less drastic than if present funding practices continue unchanged. The longer action is delayed, the larger will be the problem to be dealt with. The committee believes that this bill will provide in full for the permanent financing of the civil service retirement system, so as to assure that there will always be enough money in the fund to permit the payment of all benefits due—in full and on time. I fully concur with the committee on these matters.

The annuity computation formula is an all-important technique of expressing basic policy decisions as to how much annuity to award specified groups of employees, and how much recognition or weight to give to length of service, level of earnings, and other relevant factors in arriving at the amount of annuity.

Substitution of the final salary, of the salary in the last full year of employment, of a high-2 average, or of a high-3 average have all been urged as remedies. Each of these would be more advantageous than the high-5 average from the viewpoint of most employees, of course, in that each would produce more favorable annuities.

On balance, it is my judgment that the high-3 average appears to be the best available alternative from the standpoint of both the Government and the employees. Normal costs will be increased by 0.07 percent of payroll—from 13.86 percent to 13.93 percent—or $15.4 million annually—$7.7 million each from employees and agencies—but will be fully covered within the normal cost financing provision of section 102 of this legislation.

A continuing concern has been expressed over the years that, while some employees are heavy sick leave users toward the end of their careers, many others retire with substantial balances accumulated by virtue of conscientious usage of the sick leave privilege. While one-third of all retirements are for disability—and such retirees are properly entitled to the full protection provided by their sick leave—the leave problem is brought within the scope of this legislation because the use of sick leave by employees otherwise planning to retire is creating difficulty for Federal agencies.

Recent studies indicate that there is a growing tendency, particularly among State and municipal governments, to provide some form of recognition for unused sick leave at the time an individual retires or dies while employed. In instances where a lump-sum payoff is provided, this recognition frequently equals 50 percent of the cash value of the unused leave. Statistics disclose that, since the adoption of such plans, overall sick leave usage has declined from an average of 8 to 7 days yearly. Further, that such a payoff is not quite unique is demonstrated by the practice in the Canadian Government's retirement system of continuing to pay a retired employee the equivalent of full salary and annuity benefits for the period equal to his unused sick leave.

The bill provides a limited measure of recompense for unused sick leave by increasing the total actual service performed by an employee—who retires on an immediate annuity or dies leaving a survivor or survivors entitled to annuity benefits—by the length of service representative of the calendar value of his unused sick leave. An employee who has met the age and service requirements for immediate retirement, such as one who is age 55 and has served 30 years, for example, will have his service increased by 1 calendar month for each 22 days of unused leave; or a retired or deceased employee who has accrued sufficient leave to be carried in a paid-leave status for 1 year will be given retirement service credit of 1 calendar year. Consequently, the latter employee's annuity would be computed upon 31 years of service. The additional service so granted, however, shall not be counted in determining average pay or in attaining eligibility for retirement.

This legislation embraces a change in the basic historical philosophy underlying the sick leave system, and grants a

XUM

limited recognition to those employees who have prudently utilized the sick leave privilege. It is expected that by providing a benefit as an additional incentive to conserve sick leave, there will be extra consideration given by employees, generally, to the use of the leave as it is earned. By crediting such accruals, normal cost will be further increased by 0.06 percent of payroll—from 13.93 to 13.99 percent—or $13.2 million, but will be fully covered within section 102 of this bill.

It is the consensus of the committee that such additional costs will be significantly offset by the savings resulting from a reduction in the number of days of average sick leave usage throughout the Federal service. Again, I concur with the committee.

Federal staff retirement systems represent a mixture of insurance and humanitarian principles. In the matter of adjusting annuities after retirement, insurance practice would guarantee that whatever annuity an employee had earned at the time of retirement should be preserved without change. On the other hand, humanitarian considerations would urge that the welfare of the retired person is the major concern, and that annuities should be adjusted to changing needs. The latter theory has prevailed through congressional action; but putting theory into practice has proved difficult.

The level of benefits at the time of retirement is established by a formula based on service and salary. The needs and desires of annuitants are influenced by the cost of living and also the general level of standards of living. When these variables are stable or declining, annuity adjustments are no issue; this was essentially true from 1920 to 1945. When the variables increase, however, problems arise; and that has been the situation continuously since the end of World War II.

The Congress has tried a variety of devices to cope with the problem. After the Civil Service Retirement Act was passed in 1920, civilian salaries were adjusted by the Classification Act of 1923 and a subsequent increase in 1925; but a retirement recomputation principle was never adopted. In 1926 and 1930 new formulas for computing benefits were introduced. Annuities for persons already retired were increased to the levels provided by the new formulas. Under the 1930 act the maximum benefit was $100 a month, and most employees retiring after a full career received this amount. During the 1930's salary schedules were stable except for temporary flat percentage cuts, and no changes were made in annuity formulas. The cost of living and general standard of living declined. Annuitants were relatively well off and, therefore, annuity adjustments were no issue.

During World War II, wartime controls ruled out any general action on salaries and annuities alike. However, one change was made: the $100-a-month lid on annuities was removed in favor of a percentage of high-5 average, thus benefiting higher paid employees—which at the time meant those paid over $2,800 a year. In 1946 this provision was also extended to cover employees who had retired before the amendment was passed.

As a result of inflation during and after the war, both active and retired employees found themselves in a new and bleaker economic world. The Consumer Price Index in 1946 stood 40 percent above the 1939 level. In 1951, with a boost from the Korean conflict, it reached 87 percent. Fortunately, civilian production recovered rapidly and action was taken to restore lost values, at least in part.

By 1956, pay schedules for most active employees, and annuities for new retirees, had pretty well caught up with the cost-of-living increase since 1939. However, national productivity still increased and wages and salaries in industry continued upward. Annuitants who had retired before the effective date of the 1956 act received a 10-percent cost-of-living raise. Those retired later received nothing under that act.

In 1962 a major effort was begun to establish annuity adjustments on a stable basis. The act of October 11, 1962, first established the principle that Federal civilian salaries should be comparable with industry salaries for similar work, and new salary schedules took steps toward effecting the principle. The act also established the policy that the purchasing power of annuities would be maintained by adjusting benefits automatically whenever the Consumer Price Index for a year exceeded the base year by 3 percent. At the same time, annuities for 1962 and earlier years were raised by 5 percent; and to supplement the effect of the 1962 increases on high-5 averages, annuities for 1963 were raised by 4 percent, for 1964 by 3 percent, for 1965 by 2 percent, and for 1966 by 1 percent. Further, the 1952 and 1955 ceilings on annuity increases were abolished, so that all earlier retirees got the benefit of previous increases.

The Consumer Price Index had increased 118 percent from 1939 to 1962, and while the Consumer Price Index formula was a welcome innovation, its operation disappointed annuitants. It fell barely short of forcing an automatic increase in 1965 and left them to wait another year.

The 89th Congress reacted by passing new legislation in 1965. The Consumer Price Index formula was revised to provide automatic increases whenever the Consumer Price Index rose by 3 percent over the previous base period for 3 successive months. The new formula generated an automatic increase of 4.6 percent for all annuitants in 1965. In addition, the Congress provided additional increases of 6½ percent for civil service retirement annuitants who had retired before October 1, 1956, and 1½ percent for those who retired between that date and December 31, 1965—an average of 7½ percent. Subsequent automatic adjustments of 3.9 percent, respectively, have become effective on January 1, 1967, May 1, 1968, and as recently as March 1, 1969.

If the present Consumer Price Index formula had been in effect since 1920, it presumably would have been suspended during the period of wartime inflation as a result of wartime controls. After the war, however, it would have provided a guide more effective than any then available for bringing the value of annuities back to a reasonable relation with the rest of the economy. Once the annuities regained their original purchasing power, the formula would have maintained them by prompt and equitable action when living costs rose further.

While values are in better balance now, on the whole, than at any time in the past, a notable deficiency continues to exist. A period of 5 months elapses between the initial month in which the Consumer Price Index rises by 3 percent over the previous base month and the month in which the cost-of-living adjustment is reflected in the annuity checks. During that elapsed period the Consumer Price Index continues its upward trend, generally attaining a level in excess of 1 percent of the actual percentage rate of adjustment.

In order to correct this serious deficiency in the adjustment formula and thereby compensate retirees and survivor annuitants for the intervening incremental rises in the cost of living. H.R. 17682 will add 1 percent to all future percentage adjustments. For example, if the highest level attained during the 3-month measuring period equals 4 percent, an additional 1 percent will be added thereto and result in an automatic adjustment of 5 percent. Annual costs would be increased by approximately $23 million on each occasion.

Mr. Chairman, the above constitutes a synopsis of the views of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with which I am pleased to join.

Mr. Chairman, this bill (H.R. 9825) vigorously attacks a number of inequities presently existing in the civil service retirement system. I strongly feel that the Congress must meet its obligations to the millions of dedicated workers in the Federal service. I urge passage of this essential legislation.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to thank my very dear friend of many, many years standing (Mr. CORBETT of Pennsylvania) for his courtesy in yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend Chairman DANIELS, and the members of the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits, and all of the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for reporting H.R. 9825, sound legislation now under consideration, which was cosponsored by 24 of 26 members of the committee.

Under the wise and able leadership of our distinguished colleague (Mr. DANIELS), of New Jersey, we have before us legislation that deserves the unanimous support of every Member of the House without amendment. This measure was reported unanimously by the subcommittee, and by the full committee it was supported by a vote of 22 yeas and 1 present, and with not a single nay. Mr. Chairman, I submit to the Members of the House, this is an excellent example of bipartisan support.

For 1½ years, the subcommittee

XUM

chaired by Mr. Daniels has devoted full time and attention in extensive public hearings.

Title I improves the financial condition of the civil service retirement fund.

Title II provides moderate liberalization, which will amply be covered by title I. This is sound fiscal legislation.

I should note that the employees of the executive branch of Government are by law required to contribute to the fund.

The members of the legislative branch, including Members of Congress and congressional employees, are the only Government employees who have the choice of choosing to participate or not to participate. Some do, and some do not. The choice is up to the individual alone.

I might point out at this time that members of the executive branch, once they are appointed, even on a temporary basis, do contribute. But when they stay and they are qualified, for permanent civil service status, they have their jobs for their lifetime, as long as they perform their assigned duties in an acceptable fashion.

The Members of the House, however, have to go before the electorate, before the voters of our districts, twice every 2 years. We have to report to our people in our primary elections and in our general elections. Our congressional employees are dependent upon our success. Without them, of course, none of us could be successful.

Mr. Chairman, I should also like to add that our Nation was founded with the idea that our Nation would survive or fall upon the performance of the U.S. House of Representatives.

This legislation is designed to fulfill this sacred obligation. As we look to the future, this measure, when approved, will serve to help attract some of the most capable and qualified citizens into public service. Because of this fact, our country will benefit.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, this legislation is an investment in the future of America.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfuly, therefore, urge every Member of this House, and I strongly beg and plead with every Member of this House, let us pass this measure unanimously, without a single amendment.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Pelly).

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, this legislation to provide proper financing for the retirement fund is long overdue.

Mr. Chairman, the question here, to my mind, is whether the good outweighs the bad. No one opposes the objective of H.R. 9825; namely, to improve the financing and funding practices of civil service retirement. For years I have called for legislation to eliminate the $57 billion deficit in the system. This title I of the bill would accomplish. But, by the same token, title II of the bill would increase the unfunded liability, and I oppose that.

Since I have been in Congress—which is more than 16 years—I have contributed to the retirement fund almost $30,000. That fund for Members of Congress has a substantial surplus, I am informed. So I do not feel obligated to vote against more benefits for Members of Congress. But this is a civil service retirement for all Federal workers, and I feel constrained to look at it in that way.

So, Mr. Chairman, when a vote comes—as I believe it will—to raise the contribution from 7½ percent to 8 per- after the consumer price index rises by 3 eliminate more deficit financing. I am for higher benefits but I want the program to be fully financed. I hope that amendment carries. I will pay 8 percent of my salary willingly for the liberalization of the program.

Also I will support a reduction in benefits, if that is necessary to bring the fund into balance.

But I support the objective of the bill. It is long overdue, and its passage, especially title I, is most desirable.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. May).

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I find it most objectionable that this bill contains provisions which would liberalize the retirement financing and benefits for Members of Congress. I submit that the people of this Nation will view this section of the bill as further special benefits which Members of Congress bestow upon themselves.

Mr. Chairman, can anyone doubt that the American people are upset about the 41-percent increase in pay that the House of Representatives allowed themselves this year? And just before asking the people to submit to an extension of the income tax surcharge?

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, the provisions for Members of Congress in this bill are just as untimely as was the pay increase for Members earlier this year.

It is possible that my opposition to benefits for Members of Congress may be construed by some as opposition to retirement financing improvements and benefits for civil service workers. This is not so. I fully recognize the need to improve the situation of civil service employees, and I have always supported those provisions of the bill. But I cannot in good conscience support a bill that retains these benefits for Members of Congress.

It would be wonderful if our national economy and budgetary situation were such that we could do anything we wanted to do. We tried that for the past few years, Mr. Chairman, and as a result we are faced with economic catastrophe.

To survive, we must realine our national priorities and a good place to start is right here in this Chamber.

I will not vote for any bill that contains any monetary benefits for Members of Congress. Not with the taxpayers of this Nation being asked to tighten their belts and pay high taxes at the same time.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in wholehearted and enthusiastic support of H.R. 9825, legislation to liberalize and reform the civil service retirement system.

This bill takes a series of much needed steps in the direction of directly improving benefits for recipients. The program currently computes retirement benefits on the basis of the average of the high-5-year salary. H.R. 9825 would substitute a high-3 average computation for the present high-5, the cost of the increased benefits are taken into account in the financing provided by the bill. The high-3 substitute is an especially welcome provision of the bill because it would assure that retirement benefits more closely resemble a person's final salary—which is generally also his highest salary—than does the present high-five computation.

The civil service retirement program now increases retirement benefits to match cost-of-living increases 5 months after the consumer price index rises by 3 percent. In order to compensate for this 5-month lag in providing retirees with increased benefits, H.R. 9825 provides that the cost-of-living increase paid to retirees would be 1 percent higher than the rise in consumer price index.

Under present law, widows and widowers of Government employees may remarry after age 60 and still receive annuities if their deceased spouses were employed after July 18, 1966. The bill under consideration would extend these benefits by applying this provision to all widows and widowers whose remarriage took place on or after July 18, 1966.

H.R. 9825 makes an additional improvement in the program by giving credit for unused sick leave. Presently, employees seem to use an inordinate amount of sick leave during their last year of service. In order to encourage them to accumulate it rather than use it unnecessarily, this bill would provide that accumulated sick leave would be given credit in the computation of retirement benefits. The cost for this provision, too, is covered by the bill's financing provisions, though the committee reports that it believes that the savings resulting from the decreased use of sick leave would greatly offset the increased costs.

This legislation would also put the civil service retirement program on a much sounder financial footing. The need for this legislation has been sorely felt for a number of years. If no changes are made in the benefits or the financing of the program, it is forecast that the civil service retirement funds will have a zero balance in 18 years.

Thousands of men and women have chosen to serve their country in one of the most direct possible ways; by working for their national Government. As a legislator and also as a citizen, I am grateful to them. And I am anxious for them to have advantages similar to those they would receive in the private sector. The level and type of employee retirement benefits without doubt present one of the areas where the good intentions and the ultimate fairness of the Government can be clearly judged. Up to this time, the judgment on the matter of equitable and sound retirement benefits would have gone against the Government. The Congress now has an opportunity to reverse that judgment; I urge that we make use of that opportunity by passing H.R. 9825.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 9825, which has tremendous significance for all Federal employees,

XUM

legislation that will vastly strengthen and renew our confidence in the civil service retirement system. This bill will greatly improve the financing and funding practices of the retirement fund.

Federal employees have consistently contributed to the Government's retirement since its inception in 1920 with the assumption that their contribution would be supplemented with allotments from the Government, thereby enabling them to live comfortably in their golden years. Now it seems that this hope for a comfortable retirement may be endangered due to a lack of sufficient moneys in the retirement fund. While the Government has contributed substantial sums to the fund since 1920, it has failed to appropriate regularly and systematically, or on a concurrent basis, sufficient funds to meet the ultimate costs not covered by employee contributions. Unfortunately, none of the several methods of financing proposed from 1920 through 1957 provided for an automatic reflection of the Government's share of retirement costs in annual appropriations. As the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service pointed out in its report:

> The stabilization of employment during the early fifties, combined with sporadic and inadequate employer contributions, made it apparent that as the system matured, annual trust fund revenues would soon be less than benefit payments.

For these reasons, the deficiency, or the unfunded liability in the fund when computed for fiscal year 1969 is expected to have reached a level of $57.7 billion.

To meet this deficiency, three major provisions are contained in H.R. 9825, which will dramatically alter the financing of the system. The bill would raise Government and employee contributions to the civil service retirement fund from 6.5 to 7 percent and from 7 to 7½ percent for congressional employees. A second provision calls for costs of future unfunded liabilities from benefit liberalizations, salary increases, and extensions of coverage to be met by the Government through appropriations to the fund in equal annual installments over a 30-year period. Third, the bill provides for appropriations to meet the Government's presently increasing unfunded liability in amounts equal to the interest on future accrued deficiencies.

The possibility that the fund eventually may be depleted demands our prompt action today. It is up to us now to take the necessary steps to insure a viable fund for the hundreds of thousands of dedicated Government employees who comprise our federal system.

Along with the above provisions, H.R. 9825 is designed to increase substantially the retirement benefits available to Government employees by computing retirement annuities on the highest 3 instead of the present 5 years of average salary and granting civil service employees credit at retirement for unused sick leave.

It was disclosed during the committee's consideration of H.R. 9825, that there is a growing tendency, particularly among State and municipal governments, to provide some form of recognition for unused sick leave at the time an individual retires or dies while employed. Such a policy has acted as an incentive to employees to conserve their sick leave in anticipation of applying this unused time to their length of service when computing retirement benefits. The bill provides that unused sick leave shall not be counted in determining average pay or in attaining eligibility for retirement. This provision has long been a goal of the Government employee unions and would guarantee that those employees who have judiciously utilized their sick leave will receive adequate compensation in their retirement years.

Federal employees nationwide are eagerly awaiting congressional action on this bill and are universal in their hopes for prompt passage of comprehensive reform legislation. I urge my fellow Members to give their full support to the provisions of this bill.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fiscal integrity and commonsense, the House should pass H.R. 9825. This is a very well-structured bill that both puts the civil service retirement trust fund on a fiscally sound basis as well as providing increased benefits for retired personnel.

Title I of this act proposes a positive plan of action to solve the problem of financing the system by improving past and present funding practices which have proven to be inadequate. It is not the employee contributions which have caused the present troubles, but rather, the method of computation of agency contributions. By the end of this fiscal year, the unfunded liability of the system will be over $48 billion. Under the present financing system, the unfunded liability will continue to grow by more than $1.5 billion each year. If the system is continued disbursements will outstrip revenues by 1974. At the present time there is a balance of somewhat more than $17.1 billion in the trust account. This balance willl be totally depleted by 1987 under the current contributory system.

Although total collapse of the civil service retirement system is still 18 years away, it is incumbent upon us to take remedial action now so as to avert the consequences which are so clearly indicated.

While Government employees have always contributed their share to the fund, the Government has not appropriated sufficient sums with any regularity, and the sums so contributed have not been sufficient to meet the portion of accrued costs attributable to the Government contribution account.

While I have already pointed out that the fund is still sufficient to meet present and immediately future obligations, the laxity in Government contribution has resulted in a loss of possible interest which now amounts to $1.7 billion per year.

This is not the whole story however. While the fund can meet existing obligations, actuarial studies indicate that at the present time—right now—no funds exist in respect of nonretired persons, whether to their accrued annuities or as to their own accumulated contributions. A private insurance company certainly could not operate in this manner and retain its license. I see no reason why the Federal Government should be automatically entitled to a stance of fiscal irresponsibility.

It is contended, however, that modern economists generally accept that Federal retirement systems, backed by the "Full Faith and Credit of the United States" need not accumulate reserves to the same extent that are required of private pension plans. This concept may be valid, and is certainly necessary when we are involved with mandatory spending programs in which deficit financing is the only alternative to no program at all. Here however, we are presented with a financial package which will go far to reduce the expected deficit in the trust fund without dislocating any other options. The ultimate conclusion is clear. If title I is not passed, the future deficiencies will have to be met by annual appropriations in addition to employee and agency contributions. Title I offers a solution which must be accepted.

Title II of this bill provides for certain limited increases in benefits, both cash and otherwise. It is the title II programs which have generated an enormous amount of mail to my office. This mail is overwhelmingly in favor of the bill, and I am sure that most of my colleagues share this experience. I fully support that section of the bill providing that the retirement annuity be based on the high 3-year average rather than the present high 5-year average. The present 5-year standard tends to keep Government employees on the job beyond the age when they would normally retire, is not consistent with retirement schedules now becoming prevalent in industry, and does not necessarily reflect the rationale behind the program—which is to reward the Federal employee in a manner commensurate with his contribution to the Government.

Equally valuable is the section of the bill providing a credit for unused sick leave. This section is the most morally justifiable provision in the bill, for it rewards those persons who have shown a competence and responsibility far above that of the average civil service employee. At present, unused sick leave is forfeited if not used. It has been common for many employees to use up their accrued sick leave prior to retirement. This, of course, results in long absences from work, and in the case of agencies under hiring curbs, work not completed. Many of the conscientious and often high level employees recognize their responsibilities however, and do not take advantage of their accrued sick leave. When the retirement date arrives they must forfeit this leave. In essence, the present system penalizes the competent employee and rewards the irresponsible employee.

It is argued that inclusion of this section will set a bad precedent, and that inclusion of this section implies that the present sick leave policy is being abused. I think the present policy is being abused. Agency reports confirm this.

While the purpose of sick leave is to provide income for a certain amount of time for those employees who are absent from work due to illness, experience clearly shows that as many employees reach retirement, they go through long periods of "illness" and then experience a quick recovery upon separation. Contrary to the supplemental views in the committee report, I do not feel that inclusion of this section will result in employees reporting for work if they are sick in order to gain the credit.

Crediting unused sick leave will in all probability result in increased efficiency as the long-term employee will have the incentive to continue active work up to the time of official separation.

In conclusion, I am convinced that H.R 9825 is a well thought out package which will stabilize the present chaotic system and provide the necessary benefits that have been lacking and which are certainly due the Federal employee.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Chairman, it is with a great deal of pride and a sense of relief that I rise today to give my support of H.R. 9825. I am sure all my colleagues will agree that the bill was a long time getting to the floor and those of us who have cosponsored the legislation are just plain glad it is here now.

I am hopeful that we will pass this bill again this year as we did at the end of the 90th Congress. When it is enacted, it will insure the solvency of the civil service retirement system and make some improvements in that system which are long overdue so that it will be more modern and capable of meeting the present and future needs of our retired civil servants.

I believe that maintenance of the civil service retirement system is one of the most important responsibilities of the Congress. It is an essential part of the modern employment system which we have tried to develop to attract and keep employees of the highest caliber to conduct the complex business of Government. Enactment of H.R. 9825 will contribute greatly to the financial security of the many past civil servants and their families as well as to future retirees. It will represent a landmark in our efforts to maintain the system and remove any doubt as to the retirement fund's ability to meet its commitments to our Federal civil servants.

The results of a comprehensive study conducted by the Committee's Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits testifies to the need for this legislation. Federal employees have always contributed the full amount to the fund but, while the Government has contributed substantial amounts, it has failed to appropriate regularly and systematically sufficient amounts to meet the ultimate cost of the system which are not covered by employee contributions.

At the end of the 1968 fiscal year, the unfunded liability of the system had approached $55 billion. If we do not pass this bill, under current system funding practices, this unfunded liability will continue to grow at the rate of $2 billion per year. When the latest salary statute was implemented and Federal salaries at last in most cases came within striking distance of comparability, this coupled with cost-of-living increases for annuitants increased the unfunded liability to about $60 billion. The need for action is evident and I am confident that we will decide overwhelmingly to take that action today and approve this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am alarmed that the Bureau of the Budget recommended against enactment of some provisions of this bill specifically those which would liberalize existing benefits in the following ways: First, gross earnings, rather than basic pay should be used in determining retirement benefits and deductions; second, average salary for annuity computation purposes would be determined on the basis of 3 rather than 5 years of service; third, unused sick leave would be added to actual length of service in computing annuities; fourth, an extra 1 percent would be added to each annuity increase resulting from changes in the consumer price index; and fifth, amendments which permit continuation for the annuity when a surviving spouse remarries after reaching age 60, and restoration of annuity upon termination of a remarriage which occurred before age 60, would be made applicable to all cases in which remarriage occurs after July 17, 1966.

I support all these provisions and I hope that my colleagues feel likewise. Enactment of this legislation is absolutely necessary to the continued efficiency of our Government.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, today we consider what I am sure will be one of the most worthy bills to come before this session of Congress. Basically, it is legislation to provide just retirement benefits for our Federal employees, and improve the funding of the civil service retirement program.

I am sure that there will be general agreement on the objectives of this legislation. I have cosponsored a bill, H.R. 10219, identical to the measure before us, and so have many other Members. The need for this type of improvement is clear and compelling, for it is imperative that we provide adequately for the retirement of career Government workers who have devoted their lives to public service.

H.R. 9825 is a "clean bill" in that it is a final version of similar legislation which has long been studied by this body. It incorporates refinements and improvements which reflect the extensive consideration devoted by the Congress to this field. No Senate action was taken on the similar bill passed unanimously by the House in the last Congress, but in view of the increasingly severe hardship caused on retirees by inflation, I feel confident that the other body will be in a more receptive mood this year.

One of the best elements of this bill is its provision reducing the average pay computation period to 3 years from the present 5 years. This provision is strongly endorsed by employees and their professional organizations, and it deserves our wholehearted support. It is needed in part because of the recent pay increases we have enacted to bring Federal employee salaries into closer comparability with private enterprise salaries. It would do little good for thousands of valuable Government employees if we raised their pay briefly before retirement, then computed their retirement income based on 5 years of previous salaries that were admittedly inequitable. Justice demands that we at least reduce the computation period to 3 years so that the pay increases which we found to be justified are taken into better account.

During this period of rapid escalation, those whose pay has finally been brought to comparability with the rest of the Nation should not be penalized by continuation of the 5-year base period. This long a period overlooks the rapidly changing nature of the Government pay structure and our efforts to upgrade Federal salary levels.

The other provisions of this measure are also sound. By adding unused sick leave to the length of service of an employee who is retiring or has died while employed, for example, we are justifiably rewarding the employee's good work and attendance record. This provision will add a significant incentive for employees to not "use up" all of their allowable sick leave during their years of service and should result in large savings to the Government.

To help pay for the increased benefits, the bill adds an extra 1 percent to the rate of employee and agency contributions to the retirement fund. This contribution would rise to 7½ percent from the present 6½ percent, but I feel that the overwhelming number of our Government employees will be happy to share this additional burden in view of the higher benefits they will eventually receive.

As one who has supported an adequate civil service retirement program throughout his congressional service, I enthusiatiscally endorse this legislation. I hope and expect that we can win its final enactment in the current Congress, thereby meeting our responsibilities to our faithful Federal employees.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my complete and enthusiastic support for H.R. 9825.

This bill will effectively ameliorate our present civil service retirement system. That this program needs improvement is quite obvious. The unfunded liability of the system was $18.1 billion in 1958, and jumped to $57.7 billion at the close of fiscal year 1968. At this terrifying rate of increase, it is anticipated that if no changes are made in the law, the civil service retirement trust fund will have a zero balance in about 18 years.

To preclude such a dire financial crisis, H.R. 9825 utilizes a three-pronged approach to the problem. First, and of greatest importance, the bill provides for payment of the interest accruing on the $57.7 billion. This would be accomplished by paying 10 percent of the interest in 1970, 20 percent in 1971, 30 percent in 1972, et cetera, until 1980 when all of the interest would be paid up. In such a manner, the astronomical growth of the unfunded liability would be stopped since the interest is what is responsible for the major increase of this deficit.

Second, the bill would assure any increase in principal that may occur through further liberalization of the program would be paid for by the Government in 30 equal annual installments.

In order to fund the above two financial improvements, H.R. 9825 would raise employee and agency payroll contributions one-half of 1 percent, from 6½ to 7 percent. This contribution increase would be effective January 1970.

XUM

In addition to promoting a health financial situation, H.R. 9825 would also considerably improve the benefits derived from the civil service retirement program. There are four of these major improvements.

First, the bill calls for an increase in benefit payments 1 percent greater than the rise in the cost of living. This would alleviate the present lag in the timing of the benefit increase since it takes at least 5 months before the increase takes effect. Since the cost of living generally goes up month by month, this 5-month lag in increase can sometimes be most serious.

Second, the bill will provide for the restoration of benefits to certain remarried widows who are denied them only because their spouse died or retired before July 18, 1966.

The third benefit improvement which H.R. 9825 would make is to change the number of years of high salary from 5 to 3 on which retirement benefits are based. In this way, the retirement benefits would be more closely related to the salary at time of retirement—normally the highest—and would lessen the tendency of employees to postpone retirement indefinitely.

Finally, the bill would provide that in the computation of annuities credit would be given for unused sick leave accumulated by an individual at the time he retires. This would of course encourage employees to accumulate sick leave rather than to use it unnecessarily, particularly as some do during their last year.

For all of these important and significant reasons, I heartily endorse H.R. 9825. Thank you.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of legislation being offered to the House today by my disinguished colleague DOMINICK DANIELS and the hard-working members of the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits.

It is a special pleasure to support H.R. 9825. Chairman DANIELS and his colleagues have engaged during the last year and one-half in the sort of conscientious and thorough preparation of legislation that is a credit to all of us in the Congress. The subcommittee has conducted a searching examination of the civil service retirement program, and the result of that study is an admirable piece of legislation which deserves the wholehearted support of everyone in this Chamber.

The Federal Government must be able to attract and retain the most dedicated and best prepared people in the Nation. And those people who enter Government service have every right to expect adequate retirement payments in return for their years of service. Thus, this legislation is another investment in efficient government and in dedicated people.

Moreover, I cannot emphasize enough that the Congress must be more responsive to the needs of our senior citizens generally. There are thousands of older Americans who live in real poverty. And there are millions of older Americans who subsist on the most meagre of resources: budgeting themselves rigidly so that they may take an afternoon bus ride, or buy a Sunday newspaper, or a new pair of shoes. This is an unacceptable living situation; and I contend that the poverty of the aging in America is assuredly the most unnoticed—but in many ways the most compelling. Theirs is the worst poverty of all, for it is companion to the loneliness of silence.

If the House would take an important step toward reassuring the American people that it will not tolerate economic deprivation among the elderly, this body will authorize the provisions of H.R. 9825, which will make our retirment program for Federal employees financially secure, adequate in payments to retirees, and equitable in structure. Specifically, the House will have addressed itself to the financial necessities of Government employees in their later years. But in the larger framework, the House will have indicated its concern and determination to insure financial security for all of our older citizens.

This bill puts the retirement fund on a sound basis through an improved program of financing and funding. In meeting the need for resources, H.R. 9825 increases the rate of employee and employer contributions from 6½ to 7½ percent.

Important improvements are made in retirement benefits. The average pay computation period is reduced from 5 years to 3 years. The bill takes a realistic approach to the rise in the cost of living and the inadequacy in the adjustment formula. Unused sick leave is added to length of service of an employee who is retiring.

H.R. 9825 was thoughtfully prepared. It is a practical response to the retirement needs of Federal employees. H.R. 9825 deserves the immediate attention and support of both Houses.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Alabama, Mr. JOHN BUCHANAN.

I think his bill would completely eliminate the controversy which surrounds this piece of legislation. I do not think that we should do anything at this time that would lead the citizens of this country to believe that this body is voting special privileges for themselves, so therefore, I favor Congressman BUCHANAN's amendment to base the retirement for Congressmen on 5 years of service instead of at the 3 highest salaried years as is proposed in the bill.

The purpose of this legislation should be to strengthen and improve the retirement for civil service employees and not special benefits for Congresmen. I urge the passage of this amendment which I think would greatly improve the bill and make it more acceptable.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state my strong support for H.R. 9825, to strengthen the civil service retirement system. This bill which sets new and liberalized retirement benefits is, in my opinion, absolutely necessary.

At a time when we must, more than ever, attract and hold competent individuals in the civil service, we must build a retirement fund that is on a par with the best of labor unions and private industries. Certainly, we cannot allow Government employees to suffer from substandard pension programs.

The report of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee noted that the deficiency in the retirement fund will reach $57.7 billion this year. By 1975, the disbursements, because of the increased number of eligible people, will skyrocket beyond the income level, which will remain relatively static over the next 6 years. If we would allow such a situation to develop, the soundness of our civil service system would reach a low point.

I also would like to express special support for that provision of the bill which provides for an adjustment of the benefits to the cost of living. The inflation we are currently experiencing has made us painfully aware of the suffering of those living on fixed incomes and pensions. Is this a proper reward for years of faithful Government service?

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee has worked long and hard in producing such a fine piece of legislation. I urge the immediate adoption of this bill.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to endorse with all the vigor at my command and to urge passage of the legislation we are considering today, to improve both the financing and benefits of the civil service retirement provisions.

On March 13, 1969, I urged the Congress to give the earliest consideration to H.R. 770, predecessor of H.R. 9825, introduced on the first day of this Congress by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS). On that same day I introduced a companion bill, H.R. 8924, to add to my verbal support for this legislation.

When the bill under consideration today, H.R. 9825, was reported by the Subcommittee on Retirements, I again added my support to this revised bill by cosponsoring another companion bill, H.R. 10219, on April 16, 1969.

Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in this Congress taking the necessary steps to insure the financial soundness of the civil service retirement fund and to improve benefits to annuitants under the civil service retirement system.

The chairman and members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service are to be commended for the more than 2 years of work they have done in formulating this legislation and bringing H.R. 9825 to the floor of the House. The modifications of the original bill have been minor, and I believe they insure its passage by both Houses of the Congress.

The soundness of the fund is insured by raising the deduction from an employee's base pay from 6½ to 7 percent for classified employees and from 6½ to 7½ for Members and employees of the Congress. With the fund now over $55 billion in the red, the need for this increase is obvious, as is the like increase in the Government's employer contribution.

The high 3-year average in determining base pay for annuity computation purposes rather than the previously enacted high 5-year average is completely justified and long overdue, as is the provision that unused sick leave can be added in computing the employee's

XUM

total actual service performed for annuity computation. Finally, a 1 percent addition to all future automatic cost-of-living adjustments will go a long way toward bringing Federal annuities up to the level we would hope to provide for our retired civil service employees.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 9825 provides for urgently needed improvements in our civil service system, and I urge our colleagues to support it.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Chairman, in view of the unfavorable public reaction to the congressional salary increase earlier this year and the subsequent loss of confidence by the people we represent, I am disappointed to learn that H.R. 9825 includes some self-serving provisions. It is my understanding that a motion will be made to recommit this bill in order to strike these self-serving provisions. I intend to vote for this recommitment with the hope that this legislation will be returned to the House floor unencumbered by these objectionable provisions. The necessity to increase the current funding provisions of the civil service retirement system is fully recognized; however, as a conscientious body, we must stricken the self-serving provisions from this bill in the interest of fairness. If the motion to recommit fails, I intend to vote for passage of this bill because of the great necessity for improvements in the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time merely to state I have no further requests for time, and to take this opportunity to express to Members who have participated in this debate my gratitude, and also the gratitude of the subcommittee for their serious concern over this very vexing problem we face here today.

The budgetary impact of solving the problem has resulted in congressional, as well as Executive, hesitation; so we have gone much further today in trying to solve this problem than we ever have done before.

I think we have before us a program for the financing of the Retirement Fund which is very sound and businesslike. I urge all Members of the House on both sides of the aisle to give their support to this bill without any crippling amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 9825

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT FINANCING

SEC. 101. Section 8331 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (15);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (16) and inserting a semicolon in lieu thereof; and

(3) by adding immediately below paragraph (16) the following new paragraphs:

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

"(17) 'normal cost' means the entry-age normal cost computed by the Civil Service Commission in accordance with generally accepted actuarial practice and expressed as a level percentage of aggregate basic pay;

"(18) 'Fund balance' means the sum of—

"(A) the investments of the Fund calculated at par value; and

"(B) the cash balance of the Fund on the books of the Treasury; and

"(19) 'unfunded liability' means the estimated excess of the present value of all benefits payable from the Fund to employees and Members, and former employees and Members, subject to this subchapter, and to their survivors, over the sum of—

"(A) the present value of deductions to be withheld from the future basic pay of employees and Members currently subject to this subchapter and of future agency contributions to be made in their behalf; plus

"(B) the present value of Government payments to the Fund under section 8348(f) of this title; plus

"(C) the Fund balance as of the date the unfunded liability is determined.".

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I should like to outline an amendment which I shall offer to this bill. It is not a crippling amendment; it is a perfecting amendment. It is one recommended by the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to provide for one case I know of, which has been brought to my attention, of a constituent of mine who received advice in writing from an employee of the Civil Service Commission, acting for the Commission, that she would not forfeit her pension if she remarried. She has a letter to that effect. The Civil Service Commission regrettably acknowledges that now she has had her pension cut off, since she remarried relying on this statement. The amendment I will offer reads as follows:

Notwithstanding the prohibition contained in the first sentence of this section on the payment of annuity for any period prior to the enactment of this section, in any case in which the Civil Service Commission determines that—

(1) the remarriage of any widow or widower described in such sentence was entered into by the widow or widower in good faith and in reliance on erroneous information provided in writing by Government authority prior to that remarriage that the then existing survivor annuity of the widow or widower would not be terminated because of the remarriage; and

(2) such annuity was terminated by law because of that remarriage;

then payment of annuity may be made by reason of this section in such case, beginning as of the effective date of the termination because of the remarriage.

As I have already mentioned, the Civil Service Commisison has passed on this matter. Despite the fact that I have introduced a private bill to accomplish this same result, they feel it ought to be remedied in this bill. They prefer it be remedied in this bill. So, at a later time, when we reach the proper point in the discussion, I shall offer the amendment.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I happen to be in possession of a report of the U.S. Civil Service Commission with respect to the private bill the gentleman introduced, H.R. 10356, and in substance the Civil Service Commission states that this lady acted like a reasonable and prudent person, that she made inquiry of the civil service examiner and received an opinion in writing.

I further understand that an aide in the gentleman's office who was consulted by this lady, Mrs. Hicks, also made inquiry of the Civil Service Commission and likewise was advised that if she remarried her annuity would not be cut off.

Under those circumstances, since she remarried and under the law lost her annuity, I believe it not more than fair and reasonable and in justice to this woman that we should make an exception in this case for this particular individual, who received an opinion in writing from a governmental agency. In such a case what more could one expect a private individual to do?

She did what I think is a fair, reasonable, and sensible thing, and in justice to her we ought to allow this amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the gentleman very much. I will offer the amendment at the proper time and at that time I will ask the minority to accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 102. (a) Section 8334 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(a)(1) The employing agency shall deduct and withhold 7 percent of the basic pay of an employee and 7½ percent of the basic pay of a Congressional employee and a Member. An equal amount shall be contributed from the appropriation or fund used to pay the employee or, in the case of an elected official, from an appropriation or fund available for payment of other salaries of the same office or establishment. When an employee in the legislative branch is paid by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Clerk may pay from the contingent fund of the House the contribution that otherwise would be contributed from the appropriation or fund used to pay the employee.

"(2) The amounts so deducted and withheld, together with the amounts so contributed, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Fund under such procedures as the Comptroller General of the United States may prescribe. Deposits made by an employee or Member also shall be credited to the fund."; and

(2) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

"(c) Each employee or Member credited with civilian service after July 31, 1920, for which retirement deductions or deposits have not been made, may deposit with interest an amount equal to the following percentages of his basic pay received for that service:

Service period

"Percentage of basic pay:

Employee:

2½—August 1, 1920, to June 30, 1926.
3½—July 1, 1926, to June 30, 1942.
5—July 1, 1942, to June 30, 1948.
6—July 1, 1948, to October 31, 1956.

6½—November 1, 1956, to December 31, 1969.
7—After December 31, 1969.

Member or employee for Congressional employee service:
2½—August 1, 1920, to June 30, 1926.
3½—July 1, 1926, to June 30, 1942.
5—July 1, 1942, to June 30, 1948.
6—July 1, 1948, to October 31, 1956.
6½—November 1, 1956, to December 31, 1969.
7½—After December 31, 1969.

Member for Member service:
2½—August 1, 1920, to June 30, 1926.
3½—July 1, 1926, to June 30, 1942.
5—July 1, 1942, to August 1, 1946.
6—August 2, 1946, to October 31, 1956.
7½—After October 31, 1956.

Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the deposit with respect to a period of service referred to in section 8332(b)(6) of this title performed before January 1, 1969, shall be an amount equal to 55 percent of a deposit computed in accordance with such provisions".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a)(1) of this section shall become effective at the beginning of the first applicable pay period beginning after December 31, 1969.

Sec. 103. (a) Section 8348 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(a) There is a Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund. The Fund—

"(1) is appropriated for the payment of—

"(A) benefits as provided by this subchapter; and

"(B) administrative expenses incurred by the Civil Service Commission in placing in effect each annuity adjustment granted under section 8340 of this title; and

"(2) is made available, subject to such annual limitation as the Congress may prescribe, for any expenses incurred by the Commission in connection with the administration of this chapter and other retirement and annuity statutes."; and

(2) by striking out subsections (f) and (g) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"(f) Any statute which authorizes—

"(1) new or liberalized benefits payable from the Fund, including annuity increases other than under section 8340 of this title;

"(2) extension of the coverage of this subchapter to new groups of employees; or

"(3) increases in pay on which benefits are computed;

is deemed to authorize appropriations to the Fund to finance the unfunded liability created by that statute, in equal annual installments over the 30-year period beginning at the end of the fiscal year in which the statute is enacted, with interest computed at the rate used in the then most recent valuation of the Civil Service Retirement System and with the first payment thereof due as of the end of the fiscal year in which the statute is enacted.

"(g) At the end of each fiscal year, the Commission shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury of the amount equivalent to interest on the unfunded liability computed for that year at the interest rate used in the then most recent valuation of the System. Before closing the accounts for each fiscal year, the Secretary shall credit to the Fund, as a Government contribution, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the following percentages of the amounts equivalent to interest on the unfunded liability: 10 percent for 1971; 20 percent for 1972; 30 percent for 1973; 40 percent for 1974; 50 percent for 1975; 60 percent for 1976; 70 percent for 1977; 80 percent for 1978; 90 percent for 1979; and 100 percent for 1980 and for each fiscal year thereafter. The Commission shall report to the President and to the Congress the sums credited to the Fund under this subsection.".

(b)(1) The provisions of subsection (g) of section 8348 of title 5, United States Code, as contained in the amendment made by subsection (a)(2) of this section, shall become effective at the beginning of the fiscal year which ends on June 30, 1971.

(2) Paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not be held or considered to continue in effect after the enactment of this Act the provisions of section 8348(g) of title 5, United States Code, as in effect immediately prior to such enactment.

Sec. 104. Section 1308(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "on a normal cost plus interest basis".

Sec. 105. The proviso under the heading "CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION" and under the subheading "Payment to Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund" in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1962 (75 Stat. 345; Public Law 87-141), is repealed.

TITLE II—CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Sec. 201. Paragraph (4)(A) of section 8331 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "5 consecutive years" and inserting in lieu thereof "3 consecutive years".

Sec. 202. Subsection (g) of section 8334 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out the word "or" at the end of paragraph (3);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or"; and

(3) by adding the following new paragraph immediately below paragraph (4):

"(5) days of unused sick leave credited under section 8339(m) of this title.".

Sec. 203. Section 8339 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out of subsection (b) the words "so much of his service as a Congressional employee and his military service as does not exceed a total of 15 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "his service as a Congressional employee, his military service not exceeding 5 years,".

(2) by amending subsection (c)(2) to read as follows:

"(2) his congressional employee service;"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(m) In computing any annuity under subsections (a)-(d) of this section, the total service of an employee who retires on an immediate annuity or dies leaving a survivor or survivors entitled to annuity includes, without regard to the limitations imposed by subsection (e) of this section, the days of unused sick leave to his credit, except that these days will not be counted in determining average pay or annuity eligibility under this subchapter.".

Sec. 204. Subsection (b) of section 8340 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting "1 percent plus" immediately after the word "by".

Sec. 205. The provisions of subsections (b)(1), (d)(3), and (g) of section 8341 of title 5, United States Code, also shall apply in the case of any widow or widower—

(1) of an employee who died, retired, or was otherwise separated before July 18, 1966;

(2) who shall have remarried on or after such date; and

(3) who, immediately before such remarriage, was receiving annuity from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund;

except that no annuity shall be paid by reason of this section for any period prior to the enactment of this section. No annuity shall be terminated solely by reason of the enactment of this section.

Sec. 206. (a) The amendments made by sections 201, 202, and 203 of this Act shall not apply in the cases of persons retired or otherwise separated prior to the date of enactment of this Act, and the rights of such persons and their survivors shall continue in the same manner and to the same extent as if such sections had not been enacted.

(b) The amendments made by section 204 of this Act to section 8340 of title 5, United States Code, shall apply only to determinations of amounts of annuity increases which are made under such section 8340 after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill de dispensed with, that it be printed in the Record and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Derwinski: On page 3, line 9, strike out the word "and" and insert in lieu thereof a comma.

On page 3, line 10, strike out the word "and" and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and 8 percent of the basic pay of".

On page 4, immediately below "7½----After October 31, 1956." insert the following: "8----After December 31, 1969.".

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is fairly simple and self-explanatory. It would merely raise to 8 percent the figure upon which the basic pay of a congressional employee or Member shall be subject to deduction and contribution to the fund.

We have had all sorts of statements made this afternoon by Members wishing to have this fund as strong as possible and also to make the most equitable contribution possible.

I understand that this amendment is supported by the ranking member of the full committee on the minority side, and therefore I hope it will be accepted by the floor managers of the bill and that we can move on expeditiously to other items.

Would the gentleman from Pennsylvania care to comment on this?

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I will in just a moment, but first I would like to get the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Corbett), because I understood him earlier to support such a provision.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CORBETT. The gentleman from Virginia was going to ask if your amendment did not include congressional employees as well as Members.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes, it does.

Mr. CORBETT. I can inform the gentleman that the amendment I spoke in support of earlier only included Members. Now, I will go that far with the gentleman from Illinois but not the whole way.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Well, then, perhaps the gentleman could offer a substitute to my amendment to strike the congressional employees from my amendment and then we would be in perfect harmony and could accept it and go on from here.

Mr. CORBETT. If the gentleman will yield further, I believe that this proposal only becomes fair if the 3-year formula is continued in the bill for Members. So at this particular time, with the possibility that the 3 years might be stricken from the bill, I could not support the amendment. I will take a position on the matter when I find out that the fate is of title II. I think the gentleman's amendment comes just at the wrong time.

Mr. DERWINSKI. May I say I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania is an excellent tactician even though I may not necessarily concur in his strategy. But I think this is an amendment which as I stated earlier is self-explanatory by making the contribution for congressional employees and Members 8 percent in order to alleviate a great deal of criticism that might come from what I might say the fourth estate.

I, therefore, hope the amendment will have the quick support of the membership.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have a copy of his amendment at hand?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman read the copy of his amendment which, I believe, refers to page 4, between lines 7 and 8.

Mr. DERWINSKI. At page 4, immediately below "7½—After October 31, 1956," insert the following: "8—After December 31, 1969."

Mr. GROSS. That does not include legislative employees.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Let me review the language in the bill on page 3, line 10—that is right. The gentleman is correcting me properly.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; this is the amendment that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CORBETT) said he wanted to introduce and wanted to support.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Excuse me. I misread the amendment. It was my intention, in order to help the gentleman from Pennsylvania, to offer the very amendment that he has said he would support. That is why I wanted the gentleman's attention. You may say this is a "Corbett proposal misinterpreted by DERWINSKI." It does the very thing that the gentleman from Pennsylvania will do and at this time I presume I have his support.

Mr. HAYS. Does the gentleman not think the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CORBETT) was a reasonable request? You are increasing the contribution in title I. Title II is wiped out. Why should we pay more into a fund that is already stable, one where we are paying sufficiently into it now for Members of Congress?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. HAYS) Mr. DERWINSKI was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes, certainly.

Mr. HAYS. I think the gentleman should withdraw his amendment and offer it at a later time when we see what happens to this 3-year thing. He might get an acceptance of it.

I made a study of this, as the gentleman knows, in connection with the Foreign Service retirement last year, and found that, although the members' pension fund is not separate, it has made a profit of about 100 percent since it has been put into effect. In other words, there is about 100 percent more there now than has been paid out. You are, in effect, increasing contributions by more than has been paid out.

I have no objection to your amendment, but if you are going to continue to base it on 5 years, I do not see why Members of Congress should be taxed to the extent of building up a surplus more than they have already. In other words, we are now more than carrying our own weight in this matter.

I think this would be the thing to do. I commend the gentleman for what he has done, and I think it is eminently fair.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his contribution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have in hand a letter from Mr. Andrew Ruddock, Director of the Bureau of Retirement of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, in which he says this:

> We estimate the total cost of the present retirement provision for Members of Congress will be about 25 percent of payroll.

In other words, if the Members of Congress were to pay what the Civil Service Commission says is their share of the cost of payroll, they would be paying 12.5 percent.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I innocently, of course, added a new controversy to this bill, and that is why I would think we were at the point now where the members of the subcommittee and the full committee, having recognized for months the problems that they have, and presumably because of those problems have withheld floor action on this bill, might not just drop title II and solve the whole controversy.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated originally when I took the floor today, the Subcommittee on Retirement Insurance and Health Benefits made an in-depth study of this legislation. It conferred with the heads of the governmental agencies such as representatives of the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, and the General Accounting Office, not only in the present administration, but in the prior administration, and they fully endorse the financing approach undertaken by this bill, the three-pronged approach, one of which is the increasing of the employees' contribution from 6.5 to 7 percent, with a like increase on the part of governmental agencies, making a total of 14 percent.

It was reported to our committee, and it is undisputed, that the normal cost for carrying the retirement benefits comes to 13.86 percent. So by virtue of each employee and his employing agency contributing a like sum, we have a total of 14 percent, resulting in a surplus of fourteen one-hundredths of 1 percent.

It was for that reason we have had the problem in title II. I am assured by all the witnesses who have appeared—and there is not a bit of testimony in the record to contradict this statement—that the financing under title I is not only adequate to take care of the sections of title I to put the fund on a sound economic and businesslike basis, but in addition thereto we have provided for those benefits provided in title II of this bill.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, does memory serve me correctly that there was an 8-percent contribution provided for Members of Congress in last year's bill?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. In last year's bill this is absolutely true. But when we continued hearings it was the judgment of our committee that in view of the testimony that had been adduced that it was not necessary to increase the contribution of the Members. There is no reason why we should overcharge the Members of Congress.

Mr. GROSS. But the Director of the Bureau of Retirement in the Civil Service Commission says that the Members of Congress should be paying in 12.5 percent. In other words, a total payroll cost of 25 percent.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. The Members of Congress would be required to pay 12.5 percent, and with the Government picking up 12.5 percent, as required by law, would make a total of 25 percent; yes, that amount of money would be necessary if we were picking up the debt. But I see no reason why Members of Congress have to pick up the debt. If we do, then we should compel Federal employees to do so. In that case you would need 24 percent with the employee contributing 12 and the Government contributing 12. So why should we make an exception with the Members of Congress?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Ruddock predicated this on normal costs.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. No, normal costs are an entirely different matter.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. No. When you refer to 25 percent you are referring to Members of Congress picking up the debt.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

XUM

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: Strike out all of title II beginning with line 1, page 8, and ending with line 17, page 10.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to strike out title II of H.R. 9825 which contains provisions opposed by the administration.

The announced purpose of this legislation is to refinance the civil service retirement fund. This administration and the prior administration urged the Congress to eliminate the liberalization of retirement benefits contained in title II of this bill.

If we are to take any constructive action toward eliminating the $61 billion retirement fund deficiency we cannot at the same time provide liberalizations in retirement benefits which amount to over $1 billion.

The retirement benefits provided in title II are unnecesary at this time. The present retirement benefits for Federal employees are most generous and such benefits are equal to if not better than similar benefits provided employees in private industry.

One provision in title II would permit computation of annuities based on the high-3-year average salary rather than on the basis of the high-5-year average salary. This will increase the obligation of the retirement fund by $337 million.

Retaining this provision in the bill is even more costly to the Federal Government if we consider the fact that it will encourage many experienced and competent employees to leave the Federal service before their productive and useful years of service are completed. The Federal Government has invested many millions of dollars in training experienced and knowledgeable employees. I do not believe we should unwisely waste this investment.

Also, to be considered is the fact that in the past several years substantial pay increases have been granted to Federal employees on the theory that we must attract and retain the best qualified persons in the Federal service. To encourage these employees to leave Federal employment prematurely is a disservice to the American people.

I need not remind my colleagues that this extreme liberalization in H.R. 9825 also provides benefits for Members of Congress which are, in my opinion, out of all proportion to their retirement needs. Under the provisions of title II of this bill, if adopted, Members would be voting to give themselves greater retirement benefits right on top of an exorbitant pay increase.

Another provision in title II proposes to give Federal employees retirement credit for unused sick leave at the time of their retirement at a cost of $329.5 million to the retirement fund.

The underlying basis for laws granting sick leave benefits is that such benefits are a privilege granted by the Government to its employees for the purpose of time off with pay during periods of legitimate illness. They were never intended to be converted into retirement benefits. Sick leave is a protection for the employee and whether it is used or not, its existence creates an attitude of confidence for the employee to know that it is available if necessary.

The principal argument in support of crediting unused sick leave for retirement purposes is the contention that it would prevent sick leave abuses and therefore save payroll costs for the Government. This is a spurious allegation. The sick leave provision in title II will have the effect of encouraging employees to come to work when they are ill. Efficiency will decrease and the exposure of coworkers to illness in turn will create greater loss to the Government.

During the debate on this legislation on October 1, 1968, we were told that the sick leave provision in this bill would increase Federal payroll retirement costs by $22 million annually. This year we are told that such costs will be increased by $13.2 million. I am unaware of how this payroll cost could be reduced by almost one-half in less than a year, but it remains a fact that such provision is costly because it will increase the unfunded liability of the retirement fund by $329.5 million.

Another inequity created by this provision is the clear discrimination against those employees who, through no fault of their own, are forced to take legitimate sick leave for serious operations or catastrophic illness.

The sick leave provision in the bill completely reverses the basic concept of such leave which has governed its uses from its inception.

The other two retirement liberalizations proposed in title II are equally unmeritorious and will add $393 million to obligations of the retirement fund.

The addition of 1 percent to all future percentage adjustments in annuities is an outright gift and cannot be justified on any objective basis. This provision costing $243 million does not belong in this legislation.

The adjustment in survivor annuities for spouses who remarry provided in title II costing $150 million does not belong in legislation primarily concerned with refinancing the retirement fund.

The record of the Congress is far from encouraging to millions of Americans who are experiencing the pressures of inflation in the form of higher taxes and higher costs of living with no relief in sight.

The examples that are being set in Congress provides the people with little confidence in a Government that continues to give its top officials record-breaking increases in salaries and retirement benefits.

We point with grave alarm to the inflationary pressures in our economy. We tell our constituents we cannot long survive if we continue on this path. We should reduce appropriations, but we increase them. Industry and labor are asked to hold the line. We point to the fact that some economic indicators suggest a slowdown in business, while at the same time interest rates continue to soar.

And in the first 6 months of 1969 we in Congress have done nothing except to encourage every inflationary pressure in our economy, and this bill is one of the worst examples.

I urge the Members to adopt my amendment striking out the unnecessary provisions in title II of H.R. 9825 and thereby save over $1 billion in Federal funds.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MARTIN. I wish to commend the gentleman for his remarks. I agree with him completely. I understand that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee is currently considering legislation which would increase further the pay of postal employees to the tune of approximately $300 million a year, and that favorable consideration of this legislation is very imminent. Is that correct? Is that legislation in your committee?

Mr. GROSS. The bill, I assume, will be brought before the committee tomorrow. The estimate of its cost is $300 million. I could not say to the gentleman whether it is more or less, but the preliminary estimates I have heard are close to that figure.

Mr. MARTIN. And that would further increase the amount of retirement benefits eventually, of course.

Mr. GROSS. That is correct, and I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for his timely observations.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Since the new combined contribution rate of 14 percent of payroll will actually exceed the present normal costs of benefits—now at 13.86 percent of payroll—the committee decided, in the interest of equity and fairness to Federal employees, to provide certain limited, but needed, improvements in the benefits structure of the retirement system.

Every single benefit proposal that had been introduced in the Congress in the past several years was carefully considered in both the subcommittee and the full committee. All were eliminated—primarily on the basis of cost—except the moderate liberalizations which are contained in title II. The normal cost of these improvements is fully covered by the new combined employee-employer contribution rate of 14 percent of payroll. The Civil Service Commission has assured the committee that the other funding provisions in title I will adequately take care of any increase in the unfunded liability which may result from the enactment of these benefits.

In brief, then, title I and II of the bill supplement each other and are integral parts of a total package that will not only put the Federal employees' retirement program on an actuarially sound basis but, also, make limited, but long overdue, improvements in the program.

Therefore, I urge the defeat of the proposed amendment.

I would also like to read from a letter

XUM

from the U.S. Civil Service Commission, dated May 22, 1969, addressed to me as chairman of the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits:

Hon. DOMINICK V. DANIELS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DANIELS: This is in reply to your letter of May 13.

In my opinion, Title I of H.R. 9825, as reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, does make adequate provision for financing the additional normal cost and the unfunded liability that would result from the enactment of Title II of the bill.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT E. HAMPTON,
Chairman.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the proposed amendment.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa is not an attempt to get Congressmen cut out of this, which would also hurt all other Federal employees as well. As I said earlier, I made a little study of this Federal pension system. It all depends upon whose figures we want to take. We can get all the actuarial figures we want, but these are all suppositions. I am not going to deal with actuarial figures, but I am going to tell Members when this congressional pension fund was set up in 1946, everybody who was in the Congress was blanketed in as though he had been paying into it all the time he had been here. Members with 20 years of service, with 30 years, with 5 years or 10 years, whatever it was, they all started paying into it as of the beginning of the fund.

If we have that clear, let me tell Members what happened. Over the years, with all those people blanketed in, and with some of them retiring immediately, without contributing anything, I imagine, and some of them retiring after 2 years with 25 years of service and contributing only for 2 years, in spite of that, if the fund were separate, and if we had separate figures, the fund would show $7 million more was paid in than was paid out.

I proposed to increase contributions to 10 percent and increase benefits by 2.5 percent, because 7.5 percent is to 2.5 as 10 percent is to 3.3, but the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) and others said we would destroy the fund. I remind Members the fund started with no pay in, nothing, and it has made money.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Ohio for the statement he is making.

I certainly agree with the gentleman that one of the troubles I found in my studies of this, one of the places where people get misled is they take nice actuarial figures which deal with all kinds of typical industrial employees who look forward to retiring and are forced to quit then by the rules of the company and do retire at 65. Then they apply those figures to the people who serve in Congress. But in this institution many Members serve into their seventies and into their eighties and do not retire as soon as typical industrial employees.

The figures given by the gentleman are correct.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. Chairman, I want to comment on the actuarial figures which are used by the insurance companies. They charge people money and pay people on retirement, but who has all the money in this country? Which are the richest people in this country? Which are the richest corporations? I am not running them down, but it is the insurance companies, and they operate on actuarial figures. They figure not only what we pay in and what is taken out, but the profit they make. That is taken into consideration.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman from Iowa, but before I do, I want to comment on the statement about the exorbitant salaries for us. I assume the gentleman is accepting his salary increase, as he indicated to me the other day?

Mr. GROSS. As long as the gentleman voted it, I will take it.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman voted against it, but he will take it.

Does the gentleman have a question?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I expect I am worth about as much as the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. That is a matter of opinion. If the gentleman were to put that to a vote, he might lose.

Mr. GROSS. It is a matter of opinion.

Mr. HAYS. I said it is a matter of opinion. The gentleman thinks he is worth as much as I am, and I think he is worth about half as much. It is a matter of opinion.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman speaks of actuarial figures. The retirement fund is actuarially unsound to the tune of about $60 billion.

Mr. HAYS. I am talking about the Members' fund and the gentleman is talking about a fund that is actuarially unsound, as the gentleman puts it, because for many years the Government did not put in its share. That is the reason it is actuarially unsound, and the gentleman knows it and I know it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield further.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Ruddock has had many years of experience in this business. He is the Director of the Retirement Bureau in the Civil Service Commission, and he says that to meet the normal costs of this fund the Members of Congress should be putting in 12½ percent of their pay.

Mr. HAYS. That is what you say. That is what the letter to you says. That fellow is anti-Congress. You know it. I know it.

Again, that is his opinion. I am stating to you how much money is there, and how much profit has been piled up by the Members' contributions. You cannot deny those facts and those figures, because if you write him a letter he will have to tell you that is it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chariman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa to strike title II of the bill.

The present normal cost of all benefits being earned by employees covered by the retirement program is 13.86 percent of payroll. Since title I of this bill sets a new combined contribution rate of 14 percent of payroll, we would be overcharging employees unless some limited benefits were given to them within the framework of the new contribution rate.

Under this amendment we would raise the employee contribution from 6½ to 7 percent without any benefit of any nature to them. I believe in fairness we must admit that the Government, not the employee, is responsible for the present deficit. The employee over the years has been putting in his share of the cost of this fund and the Government oftentimes has not.

Many proposals have been introduced in the Congress over the years to liberalize the retirement program in a number of ways. Our subcommittee and the full committee carefully considered these proposals, and all of them except the moderate liberalizations contained in title II were eliminated primarily on the basis of cost. It is also significant to point out that the Federal employees' retirement program has remained rather static since the retirement act amendments of 1956, and that the moderate liberalizations contained in title II represent the first real improvements in this program in the past 13 years.

Mr. Chairman, in the opinion of the majority of the members of the committee, titles 1 and 2 complement each other and each title is an integral part of a total package that not only will put the Federal employees' retirement program on an actuarially sound basis, but also will improve and modernize the program.

Title 2 will improve the retirement program and its elimination from the bill would be grossly unfair to all Federal employees. The normal cost of all benefits provided in title 2 is completely covered under the new combined contribution rate of 14 percent of payroll, and we are reliably informed by the Civil Service Commission that the other financing provisions of the bill adequately take care of any increases in unfunded liabilities.

If we eliminate title 2 we destroy one of the principal purposes of this legislation. We will be denying to our Federal employees certain benefits to which they are entitled and for which they will be paying.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the membership in the interest of fairness and equity, to vote down this amendment.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my chief objection to this amendment, as stated by my colleague, is the fact that we are charging the employees a half percent more of their salaries and in return therefor they should get something.

It is exactly in that spirit, in the event this amendment is voted down and the 3-year formula prevails, that I will make the recommittal motion raising the Member's contribution to 8 percent of salary. I do this because if we are going to get the benefit, we ought to pay for it. We are definitely charging the employees a half percent more. Therefore, they should get something for their money. Again, if we raise our own payment to 8 percent, we are maintaining the historical differential of 1 percent between the employees and the Members.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there is one serious matter which has not been discussed at length and of which this body should be cognizant. We can talk about statistical tables, economics, and economic laws. We all recognize that psychological reaction is an important thing. Perhaps one of the greatest benefits of last week's scientific achievement is the psychological effect of the moon shot on the governments and the people of all the nations of the world.

The people of this country today are in a state of unrest. Their paycheck does not reach from one week to the next. Living costs are high. Interest rates are high. So the people attack the symbol of all their difficulties, which is taxes, and they shout loudly for tax reform.

The point I make is this, Mr. Chairman: In our present circumstance especially, it is very important that the Congress of the United States and especially this House, which I consider to be the very heart of our free system of representative government, must be aware of public attitudes. If the people lose faith in this body, then they lose faith in the fundamental institutions of this great Nation. Anything which seems to be a self-serving process engaged in by Members of Congress further dissipates the respect and the faith that the people have for their Government.

I do not present myself as one who is more ethical or more moral than any other in this body, but I do feel very keenly that we must not only do those things here which are right and refrain from doing those things which are wrong, but we must also refrain from doing those things which seem wrong to vast segments of the electorate. Even if the preponderance of the evidence makes it logical that the Members of Congress should have an adjustment in their retirement program, this is no time to effect that adjustment. Therefore, I join my colleague in supporting his amendment.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I listened rather carefully to the remarks of the gentleman who has just concluded. They have a great deal of appeal, but I think we should recognize that we have a responsibility here as the directors, for all practical purposes, of this fund for all of the employees of the Federal Government and that we should provide reasonably competitive working conditions. I believe throughout the industries of this Nation the majority of retirement systems would compare very favorably to, and with a great deal of advantage over, that which we offer to the employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out a few facts of the matter of retirement. I am not totally unfamiliar with it. I worked on the last retirement bill that made any significant change in the system of the Federal employees retirement system.

What we are talking about here for congressional Members is .0001908 of 1 percent, roughly one-fiftieth of 1 percent or seven-tenths of 1 percent, the amount that changing the formula from 5 years as the basis for computation of retirement to 3 years would cost in its entirety, or $15.4 million a year. That is what we are talking about with reference to cost. One-fiftieth of that is attributable to congressional employees. Now, we are doing this by raising the rate of employee contributions, a rate of contribution which in my judgement as I stated previously exceeds that of many corporate employers today.

In fact, many of the systems require no contribution from employees. We in the Federal Government have systems requiring no contributions from the employees. We have this procedure in our judicial system and we have it in our military system.

This is an attempt for the first time in 13 years to bring a measure of greater equality to a system which is designed to provide for the men and women who render faithful service to this Government. I am one of those who believes that the average employee of the Federal Government is equal in every respect in competence and in dedication to the average employee of American industry.

I think there is an awful lot of fussing and fuming being made here on the premise that somehow or other if you can criticize Congress loudly enough, it is going to produce votes in your district. I have pride in the Congress and I have pride in the Federal service. I have a deep conviction that I am worth what I voted for as a salary and I think that those gentlemen who feel that the salary was outrageous or unconscionable should make every effort to return it to the people. They have made the judgment and not I that they are worth less than the amount they are being paid.

It is difficult for me to understand the reasoning here today, "if it comes, give it to me, but I am opposed to it."

If I were opposed to it, I would fight it all out and I would not want the benefits of it. But the great majority of people concerned with the civil service retirement system have not the privilege of the floor of this House and they cannot come here and tell their story. I think we should listen a little bit to them. They are our employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that the House is in a mood for a vote and I also recognize from a quick glance at the membership that this amendment will probably be rejected. But I would like to point out that this debate has now degenerated completely beyond the purpose of the amendment.

I would like to state that the primary purpose of this bill is to improve the financial condition of the retirement fund.

Title II does a disservice to the financial condition of the retirement fund. Title II includes little things that are often referred to as Christmas-tree items, that type of thing that the other body loads into many House bills. I do not believe it would be wise at this point for the House to accept a title in which Christmas-tree items are loaded into this retirement fund. The gentleman from Iowa is actually performing a great service to the House in offering his amendment. The delay of 3 months, and the concern the members of the committee have had in bringing this bill to the floor, could well have been alleviated if we took this amendment and struck title II from the bill. We would then achieve the purpose of strengthening the financial condition of the civil service retirement fund. There would not be any controversy, any quibbling, or any debate over the solvency of the fund.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BRASCO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I was curious—and certainly in committee I respect the opinion of the gentleman, and certainly his intelligence, and I am wondering whether or not the gentleman considers the restoration of the widow survivors' annuity a Christmas-tree decoration?

Mr. DERWINSKI. No, but under the procedure which we are following we have no choice but to take this title.

Mr. BRASCO. But the gentleman would be for that?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes.

Mr. BRASCO. I thought the gentleman would.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask another question. I am wondering whether or not the gentleman considers to be a Christmas-tree-decoration approach, the 1 percent cost-of-living increase for retired employees, when we know the cost-of-living index has risen from, say, December of last year, until now, about 2-point-something percent. Does the gentleman not think retirees would need that in order to live?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes, and we could even do better than that in a separate bill. But that is the very reason that I used the term "Christmas tree" approach, because you lump a few of these items into a title in order to carry a few other items, and that is the issue this afternoon.

Mr. BRASCO. Is the gentleman against that, though, specifically?

Mr. DERWINSKI. No.

Mr. BRASCO. The gentleman would be for that?

Mr. DERWINSKI. But I am against the entire title, because of how it is being used, and therefore it is a Christmas-tree title.

Mr. BRASCO. Because I assure the gentleman——

Mr. DERWINSKI. Just one moment. I would hope that the gentleman would use his abnormal influence on that side to join with me with regard to the Christmas-tree items.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman at this point that the gentleman's Christmas tree is drooping and that is why I want to find out just how much of a Christmas tree it is. Those are two items that the gentleman seems to agree with.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Let me just say this to the gentleman——

Mr. BRASCO. Let me ask about the third item.

Mr. DERWINSKI. It is not my Christmas tree.

Mr. BRASCO. Well, it is the gentleman's description of this bill.

Mr. DERWINSKI. All I am trying to do is to preserve the portion of title II which is the guts of the bill, which is the one thing that we should not purposely just overload.

Let me say that I did not directly participate in the overloading of title II which the gentleman from Iowa is seeking to correct by his amendment.

Any item which will stand on its own merits we could take up, we do have a meeting tomorrow, and pass out a new bill.

Mr. BRASCO. I suggest the gentleman is for retrenchment, but not for retreat.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I really had not intended to take the microphone, but there have been some charges made here on both sides of the aisle by the proponents and opponents of this particular legislation. Having been in the life insurance business I would like to make a few comments that might help us to see what it is we are voting for or against.

In the first place, the profit question our colleague from Ohio referred to is not profit, in my view.

It is forward funding to meet the liabilities that will occur or accrue at the time we reach retirement age. It is the reserve to pay the claims when they mature.

I did a little computing as I was listening to the debate as to what would happen if this goes through and how much a Congressman would get—how much he would pay in—and how much it would cost the Federal Government to pay its share.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. Will the gentleman deny that insurance stocks are about the best buy on the market and that insurance companies are making the most profit of any corporations in the country? Of course, I am not against that. But you can call that forward funding or whatever you want to.

Mr. KEITH. I do not want to waste the gentleman's time. The insurance companies are supposed to be good investments. I was with a mutual insurance company and the policyholders got dividends and no profits as such.

Mr. HAYS. And I suppose the president got a pretty high salary, did he not?

Mr. KEITH. Yes, they certainly did and they got a better plan than we are getting.

But if you are interested in what you are going to get and how much it is going to cost—at the outset I have done a little computing on this and it might be helpful to you.

So if you have a salary of $42,500 and if you work here for 20 years, we would have earned a total of $950,000 during 20 years time and when we put in 8 percent and add a little interest to it, which the total value of that contribution might be somewhere in the vicinity of $125,000 when you add the interest portion to it. The benefits when you reach age 60 will be 50 percent of pay—that is 20 years times 2½ percent. Fifty percent of $42,500 is $21,250 which divided by 12 means you get about $1,770 a month.

Now—what is such a pension worth? How much would it cost to buy $1,770 a month?

At age 60 it costs about $15,000 to buy $100 a month so multiplying it out, your pension works out to be worth more than a quarter of a million dollars.

That is what the insurance company would charge you roughly if you were 60 years old and were to buy a pension of $1,770 a month. It is a pretty good pension. Although I happen to think it is a little generous in this instance, I am going to vote for the amendment.

Now as to the provision of a pension for your second wife—should your first wife predecease you—if you are going to get remarried and you want to transfer some pension to your new wife maybe the insurance company is the best bet, rather than adding such a fringe benefit to our own pension system. Are we supposed to take care of ourselves and our wives and their successors? If we do all of this through this pension plan there would be fewer opportunities for the private companies to which our colleague from Ohio referred. I would think we should patronize the private sector for our private benefit for our second wife who may become a widow.

In any event, I just had these thoughts and I thought I would share them with you. I think our present plan is generous enough and we should not in these times of high taxes vote ourselves any pension benefits that will increase taxes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The proposed "payoff" for sick leave is not an expensive benefit. In fact, it will be paid from the $220 million collected each year by increasing the employee-employer contributions to 7 percent. The formula prescribed in the bill would grant 1 month of service credit for each 22 days of unused sick leave. The normal cost of this benefit, estimated at $13.2 million, would be equally shared by employees and employing agencies, each contributing $6.6 million toward such normal cost.

In testifying for this cost, representatives of the Civil Service Commission also stated that, if this provision served as an incentive to reduce the overall usage of sick leave by only 1 day each year, that savings would exceed $90 million annually.

My reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows that during last year's debate, and again during committee consideration of this incentive provision, the opponents argued that, first, there is no justification for "payoff" or "incentive legislation" to encourage or motivate employees to conserve sick leave; and second, sick leave has been granted by Congress for only one purpose: to protect employees against loss of income during periods of illness.

The reasons used by opponents may have been valid in the past, but do not meet the problems of today.

The Congress and most State, county, and city governments are enacting or proposing many forms of incentive legislation to accomplish specific objectives. Congress has passed incentive legislation which rewards more than 1,600 prosperous farmers with subsidy payments of $50,000 or more per year for not planting crops. Congress has passed generous incentive legislation to encourage or motivate oil companies to constantly expand their search for more oil. Congress has also passed incentive legislation to encourage or motivate military reenlistments, to build highways, tear down slums, build low-income housing projects and we also grant subsidies to railroads and airlines.

All of the Government agencies also encourage or motivate their employees with cash awards for adopted suggestions and superior performance of duty. The cash spent on incentive sick leave legislation to motivate employees to conserve sick leave would return more savings to the Government than the money which is now spent on superior achievement awards.

Incentive sick leave legislation would also provide some monetary protection to many conscientious employees who now forfeit 1,000 to 2,000 hours of sick leave at time of retirement, and sometimes become seriously ill after retirement.

Many States, counties, and cities now have effective incentive sick leave provisions for workers. I have some interesting data on the results of these laws. The following information is based on a sick leave survey of 67 State, county, and city agencies taken in 1967:

The average number of sick leave days granted by these agencies was 13½ days as compared to the 13 days granted Federal employees.

XUM

Twenty-four agencies, or more than one-third of the 67 agencies surveyed, had some type of sick leave incentive plan. There is, of course, presently no incentive sick leave plan in any Federal agency.

The average number of sick leave days used annually in the non-Federal agencies was 7.1 days. The average number of sick leave days used annually by Federal employees is 8.5 days and 10 to 11 days per year in some of the larger post offices.

Statistics show that the use of sick leave increases materially during the last working year before an employee retires or resigns from the Federal service. This use of sick leave by Federal employees is probably motivated by the use-it-or-lose-it situation now prevailing.

Most of the non-Federal agencies surveyed claimed that the use of sick leave was reduced after the adoption of a practical incentive sick leave plan.

The State of Michigan, which has 42,000 employees, released a report on July 27, 1967, which stated:

> The average use of sick leave by State Civil Service workers declined for the third straight year during 1966. A Civil Service Department study showed that although full-time classified workers are allowed 13 days' sick leave a year, the actual use last year averaged 7.61 days. Employees may accumulate unlimited sick leave and are paid one-half of the total on death or retirement.

H.R. 9825, which is before us today, does not provide even 50 percent of the hourly compensation allowed the State of Michigan employee. If a Federal employee lives for 12 years after retirement, he would receive only 24 percent of the average salary from H.R. 9825, whereas the Michigan State retiree receives 50 percent of his hourly rate at time of retirement, multiplied by all of his unused sick leave hours.

Many other States, counties, and cities now have or are considering incentive sick-leave legislation to reduce absenteeism and thereby save on replacement costs.

The Ohio State legislators are considering a bill that would provide a lump-sum payment for a maximum of 180 days, or 1,440 hours, of sick leave at time of separation or retirement. Terminal pay would be based on the individual's daily rate of pay at the time of his leaving.

Incentive sick-leave legislation would benefit the Government and also motivate Federal employees to conserve sick leave. The cost to a Federal agency for each employee who uses all of his sick leave before he retires is approximately $8,000, and this cost factor will increase each year. Additionally, considerable cost is frequently involved to replace the sick employees.

Mr. Chairman, the importance of retaining the limited credit for unused sick leave in this legislation cannot be overemphasized. I urge defeat of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 64, noes 147.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BENNETT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BENNETT: On page 10, immediately after the period at the end of section 205, insert the following: "Notwithstanding the prohibition contained in the first sentence of this section on the payment of annuity for any period prior to the enactment of this section, in any case in which the Civil Service Commission determines that—
>
> "(1) the remarriage of any widow or widower described in such sentence was entered into by the widow or widower in good faith and in reliance on erroneous information provided in writing by Government authority prior to that remarriage that the then existing survivor annuity of the widow or widower would not be terminated because of the remarriage; and
>
> "(2) such annuity was terminated by law because of that remarriage;
>
> then payment of annuity may be made by reason of this section in such case, beginning as of the effective date of the termination because of the remarriage."

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I have already discussed.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I would like to ask the gentleman in the well whether this is the amendment he discussed previously.

Mr. BENNETT. It is.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. On behalf of myself and the members of the committee on the majority side, we accept the amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. May I hear from the minority?

Mr. SCOTT. We have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUCHANAN

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BUCHANAN: On page 8, strike out lines 3 through 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "SEC. 201. Paragraph (4) of section 8331 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:
>
> "(4) 'average pay' means the largest annual rate resulting from averaging—
>
> "(A) an employee's rates of basic pay in effect over any three consecutive years of creditable service; or
>
> "(B) a Member's rates of basic pay in effect over any five consecutive years of creditable service;
>
> with each rate weighted by the time it was in effect;".

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, it is frankly with regret that I offer this amendment to legislation which I do support. I commend the chairman of the subcommittee and the other members of the subcommittee in reporting out this bill, and also the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It has been my privilege in a previous Congress to serve as a member of that subcommittee and to become aware of the need for legislation to improve the funding of the Federal retirement system. It does strike me, therefore, as meritorious legislation deserving of our support, and a step toward meeting that need of better funding.

Because the real problem is the lack of Federal payment of its share of the cost of the retirement program through the years, and because the employees have paid their share, I feel it equitable and just that they should receive additional benefits from adding to this cost of the retirement system to them. Therefore, that which they desire, the reduction from 5 years to 3 years as the years upon which to figure their retirement, and the very meritorious provision which provides for sick leave being counted toward retirement—these, I think, are equitable.

Nor would I challenge the value of Members of Congress nor express any lack of confidence in the worth of every Member of this body. I believe in the people of this country, and I believe in their elected Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the best of all possible worlds, and even though I know there is not a Member who sponsored this bill and there is not a Member who reported it out of committee and there is not a Member who will vote for it on the floor this day who is doing it to benefit himself, we all know it is being so portrayed, and it can be so portrayed, and it will be so portrayed, and the people in many cases will, in fact, believe that Members are voting another benefit to themselves on top of the salary increase.

Because I share the concern of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL) that not only should we be doing right, but also the people should understand that this is a responsible body that is concerned about our fiscal crisis, and to show this is a body that is trying to pass legislation on its merits and not for the Members' self-benefits, I cannot in good conscience fail to offer this amendment to take the Members out of the provisions of this bill.

If my amendment is adopted, it will simply do this: Members at present, like others in the Federal retirement system, upon meeting the qualifications for a retirement annuity, receive a pension, the amount of which is based on the average of their salary during the highest 5 years of their Federal service, which is taken into consideration in figuring their retirement. If my amendment is adopted, this will continue to be the case. If this is not adopted, we will, with other people participating in this system, have to serve only 3 years at our new salary level in order to retire at the higher retirement figure.

I urge support of this amendment, although I offer it regretfully.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Does the gentleman from Alabama not believe if we change the bill further to

XUM

raise our own payment into the fund, that we will be in effect paying for this very slight benefit?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will say to the gentleman I will support his proposal and will vote for it, but we already have a richer formula than the other people in the system and, therefore, it seems to me that putting us on a more equal footing might well justify a heavier contribution to the system. Therefore, I will support both my amendment and the proposal of the gentleman, and feel that both are justified.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have already been over all this subject. The fact of the matter is that the fund has made a profit from the Congress. That is the shape of things today. That will continue to be the fact. So there is nothing at all wrong with the proposition of our enjoying the same benefit of retiring on the high 3 years as any other Federal employee will enjoy. I submit that there will still be a profit in the fund with this new bill.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we can defeat this amendment unanimously.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama. I am not arguing the cause of whether or not Members of Congress are entitled to more liberalized retirement benefits—they undoubtedly are, but this is not the time nor is this Nation in a fiscal situation to warrant such action.

The administration has just asked the Congress to continue the surtax for another year. In doing so the President has made it abundantly clear that without this tax this country would face economic chaos and inflation that would make our present inflationary spiral look weak by comparsion. I cannot, therefore, in good conscience ask the already overburdened taxpayer to pay additional taxes and vote to liberalize my own retirement benefits. The American people expect their Representatives to exercise prudence and economy in spending their tax dollars. Under our present fiscal dilemma I do not consider liberalizing congressional retirement benefits either prudent or good economy and therefore must support the amendment. I urge the House to accept this amendment and strike from the bill that provision which liberalizes congressional retirement benefits. Let us not put any more burden on the already fatigued taxpayer.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama, a former and highly respected member of this subcommittee. We have been over this question. I think every Member of the House understands it. We have gone through it not only during the course of debate, but in the course of discussion of previous amendments that have been offered.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to vote this amendment down.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in general, I supported the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS). As it affected other employees, other than Members of Congress, I was not in complete agreement, but I did vote for the amendment. The need for improving the financing and funding for the civil service retirement system is certainly in order and much needed. In fact this should have been done several years ago. It seems to me that now is the time since it was not done earlier to start restoring the solvency of our Government and its agencies.

The argument has been made that the funds paid in by Members of Congress have been much greater than the amount paid out as retirement benefits to retired Members. This is good, but let us keep it that way. The $7 million now in the fund is the best protection I can think of to keep the fund strong. I wish other agencies of our Federal Establishment were in as good of shape financially. But this is no reason to raid the account now.

I hope to be able to vote for this bill. The refinancing feature to build up the account is good. I will find it difficult to support the bill, however, if it contains the provision for recalculation of time for Members.

This amendment now offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN) does what is needed and I will support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 6, strike out all of line 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "(f) Any statute which authorizes, effective on or after July 1, 1969—".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to make the provisions of title II of this bill conform to the policy established under title I. This simply means that the Government shall pay costs of every increase in unfunded liability created in the retirement fund by new legislation, including three liberalizations granted in title II, through equal annual appropriations installments over a 30-year period.

This bill is brought to the floor of the House of Representatives with a great deal of fanfare and laudatory comments by the proponents who say that at last we are putting the retirement fund on a sound financial basis. However, in the next breath they state that the liberalizations created under the provisions of title II of the bill shall not be subject to the 30-year financing provisions of title I. This is inconsistent and makes the bill a mockery. To millions of Federal employees who have invested their retirement deductions in the retirement fund, which has a $60 billion deficit, this action and this inconsistency is a cruel hoax.

I hope the Members will read my comments on this matter on pages 37 and 38 of the committee report on H.R. 9825, which explain in detail what the committee has done.

I call attention specifically to the statement by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who on April 22, 1969, stated:

> This administration is thoroughly in accord with the objective of fiscal responsibility which your proposed amendment is intended to achieve.

It is unnecessary to debate the question as to whether the bill actually creates the inconsistency which my amendment corrects. I raised this question during committee deliberations on this legislation and the author of the bill agreed that the 30-year funding provisions in title I do not apply to the liberalizations in title II. However, a quick reading of subsection 103(a)(2)(f) on page 6 of the bill leads one to the conclusion that it is intended to cover the costs of all future liberalizations.

My amendment covers the following liberalizations and increases in the unfunded liability contained in title II of the bill:

First. High 3-year average, $337 million.

Second. Sick leave credit, $329.5 million.

Third. Survivor annuity, $150 million.

In addition, my amendment will apply to the Federal pay raise effective this month which will increase the liability of the retirement fund by $3.4 billion.

The total increase of $4.2 billion in the unfunded liability of the retirement fund under my amendment, would be authorized to be paid into the fund in 30 annual equal appropriation installments, as provided in subsection 103(a)(2)(f) of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reemphasize my deep conviction that something must be done to prevent the constant erosion of the employees' and Government's contributions to the retirement fund. Title I of this bill, in some measure, secures this objective. But, I am certain that we cannot go on indefinitely into the future exempting liberalizations from the financing provisions of the bill.

The proponents of the bill will argue that to exempt the liberalizations in this bill is not of great importance provided we do not exempt them in the future. I disagree. If we are going to establish a policy of the nature contained in title I, then I think now is the time to adhere to that principle and not wait until some indefinite time in the future.

I urge the Members to support my amendment.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my good friend from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The amendment would add nothing to the value of the bill as a means to strengthen the financing of the civil service retirement system.

The general philosophy of this legislation is—for very practical reasons—to eliminate present unsound financing practices on a gradual basis, spread over a reasonable period of years because of

XUM

the tremendous sums involved, and thereby preclude excessive impact on any one or a few annual budgets.

The proposed amendment would depart from this policy and, if adopted, would have an excessive impact on budgets in the immediate future.

In fact, adoption of this amendment would most seriously endanger final approval of this desperately needed legislation.

The officials of the Civil Service Commission assure the committee that title I of H.R. 9825, as reported, makes adequate provision for financing the additional normal cost and the unfunded liability which would result from enactment of title II of the bill.

If the distinguished gentleman's amendment was adopted, the budget for the fiscal year 1970 would require a supplemental appropriation request of $55.6 million to cover title II benefits, and a $178½ million request for the July 1969 salary increases, or a total of $234.1 million.

The budgetary impact will be eased by financing these items as contemplated in the bill by requiring a $15¾ million payment in 1971—10 percent of the interest due thereon—progressing by an additional $15¾ million each year, until in 1980 and thereafter interest thereon would entail a payment of $157½ million yearly.

Adoption of the amendment could very well preclude the bill's final enactment in this session of Congress.

For those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I oppose the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CORBETT

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CORBETT: On page 3, lines 10 and 11, strike out "and a Member." and insert in lieu thereof "and 8 percent of the basic pay of a Member.".

On page 4, between lines 7 and 8, amend the table headed "Member for Member service" by adding the following new line:

"8 -------------- after December 31, 1969.".

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I had earlier stated that I was going to put in a recommittal motion to this same effect. I thought it better, since title II has been preserved, to offer it at this time as a straight amendment. It would simply increase the payment by Members into the retirement fund from 7½ to 8 percent. There are two reasons for this. First, it maintains the 1 percent differential which has existed historically between what the employees pay and what the Members pay, but more importantly, for the very small amount of benefit that the 3-year formula would give us as opposed to the 5-year formula, I believe that we ought to be willing to pay for it. As a matter of fact, if our pensions were raised a great deal more, I, for one, would certainly be willing to pay a great deal more into the fund. But in any event I do hope this amendment will be adopted in order that we can go to the public and say that we paid for what we are getting. Now, the psychological effect is something different. We, again, are faced with the fact that we must do the right thing regardless of what someone seems to think we did.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I believe all Members of the House understand this amendment very well, the proposal which has been offered by the ranking minority member of the committee because it is one-half of the amendment that was offered earlier this afternoon by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

That original amendment provided for an increase to 8 percent in contributions not only of congressional staff members, but also the Members of Congress. So, what the distinguished ranking minority member would do, in proposing his amendment, is to confine his amendment strictly to Members of Congress.

I would like to point out one further thing: Just bear in mind, gentlemen, that if you are elected for 3 years beyond the present session of Congress, it does not make a particle of difference if we have the highest 5 years, or the highest 3 years, or the highest 1 year. Our salaries would be $42,500 under all circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CORBETT).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CORBETT and Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 119, noes 138.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I have everyone's attention for 30 seconds?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS), who wishes to make a request to see if debate may be closed in 5 minutes?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes, and hopefully in 30 seconds. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS).

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, may I ask—are there any amendments pending at the Clerk's desk?

The CHAIRMAN. There are no amendments pending at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that upon conclusion of the remarks to be made by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) that is, in 5 minutes, debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, in order to provide the utmost possible cooperation with concern of the majority and the gentleman from New Jersey who wish to expedite action on the bill, I may take just a minute to inform the Members what will be involved in the motion to recommit.

May I emphasize that the motion to recommit is properly designed to help the bill and to speed this legislation through the other body.

The motion to recommit will do just two things. It will strike the provision as to the high-3-years average on retirement as it would apply to the Members of Congress and anyone covered by the civil service retirement fund. In other words, it would leave the law as it is at present, with the 5-year-high provision.

The other change it would make is that it would strike line 20, page 8, the liberalization provision for congressional employees.

It does not touch unused sick leave, it does not touch the retirees' annuity. It does not touch title II as it applies to widows and widowers. It merely eliminates the 3-high-year provision and removes from the bill the additional liberalization that was to be afforded only to congressional employees.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the spirit of anxiety in the House and the desire of the House to move expeditiously but effectively, these are the provisions of the motion to recommit.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. Your motion to recommit strikes out the provision for the high 3 years for all Government employees; is that right?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Right, and for all Members of Congress.

Mr. HAYS. Well, I know that—but I want the Members to know what they are doing to Government employees if they vote for the motion to recommit.

Mr. DERWINSKI. The purpose, of course, is not to have premature retirement of the affected Government employees that we have covered by the civil service retirement fund.

In view of that fact and obviously from what I see by the expression of the Members, I got my message across and they may be rallying to the support of the motion to recommit.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCFALL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9825) to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 380, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I am, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DERWINSKI moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 9825, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendments:

On page 3, line 10, strike out "Congressional employee and a".

On page 4, between lines 7 and 8, strike out the schedule relating to Member or employee for Congressional employee service.

On page 8, beginning with line 20, strike out all of line 20 and all that follows down through the end of line 3 on page 9.

On page 9, line 4, strike out "(3)".

On page 8, strike out all of section 201 beginning with line 3 down through line 6 and renumber the succeeding sections and references thereto accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 129, nays 281, answered "present" 1, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—129

Abbitt
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Arends
Ashbrook
Baring
Beall, Md.
Belcher
Betts
Brock
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Burleson, Tex.
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Collins
Colmer
Conte
Cowger
Cramer
Daniel, Va.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Denney
Dennis
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dorn
Dowdy
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Findley
Fisher
Ford, Gerald R.
Foreman
Fountain
Gaydos
Goldwater
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Hall
Hansen, Idaho
Harvey
Hastings
Hull
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
Kuykendall
Langen
Latta
Lloyd
Lujan
McClure
McCulloch
Mahon
Marsh
Martin
Mayne
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mize
Mizell
Montgomery
Mosher
Nelsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Pickle
Poage
Poff
Price, Tex.
Quillen
Railsback
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes
Robison
Roth
Roudebush
Ruth
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Sebelius
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Thomson, Wis.
Vander Jagt
Wampler
Watkins
Whalley
Whitten
Wiggins
Winn
Wold
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Zion

NAYS—281

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Aspinall
Ayres
Barrett
Bell, Calif.
Bennett
Berry
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Calif.
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Caffery
Cahill
Casey
Celler
Chappell
Chisholm
Clark
Clay
Cohelan
Conable
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Coughlin
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels, N.J.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Esch
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gubser
Gude
Hagan
Haley
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Hathaway
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks
Hogan
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Hungate
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
King
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Koch
Kyl
Kyros
Landgrebe
Leggett
Lennon
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
McCarthy
McClory
McCloskey
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McKneally
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Madden
Mailliard
Mann
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Melcher
Meskill
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mollohan
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Morton
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Podell
Pollock
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roybal
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Scheuer
Schwengel
Scott
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Symington
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Watson
Watts
Weicker
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Yates
Yatron
Young
Zablocki
Zwach

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Brown, Mich.

NOT VOTING—21

Ashley
Biaggi
Blackburn
Broyhill, Va.
Burton, Utah
Carey
Culver
Fish
Halpern
Hawkins
Henderson
Howard
Kirwan
Landrum
Lipscomb
Lukens
O'Konski
Powell
Rostenkowski
Stanton
Ullman

So the motion to recommit was rerejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Henderson with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Blackburn.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Lipscomb.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mr. Howard with Mr. Lukens.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Stanton.

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Ullman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 359, nays 43, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

YEAS—359

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Beall, Md.
Belcher
Bell, Calif.
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Calif.
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Caffery
Cahill
Camp
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Clay
Cohelan
Collins
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Coughlin
Cramer
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Foreman
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gaydos
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Hagan
Haley
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey
Hastings
Hathaway
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks
Hogan
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Hungate
Hunt
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
King
Kleppe
Kluczynski

Koch
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Landgrebe
Langen
Leggett
Lennon
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
Lujan
McCarthy
McClory
McCloskey
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McKneally
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Madden
Mailliard
Mann
Mathias
Matsunaga
Meeds
Melcher
Meskill
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Mizell
Mollohan
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Podell
Pollock
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Roybal
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Scheuer
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weicker
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wold
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—48

Abbitt
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Ashbrook
Bray
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Daniel, Va.
Dennis
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Duncan
Eshleman
Foley
Goodling
Gross
Hall
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jonas
Latta
Lloyd
Mahon
Marsh
Martin
May
Mayne
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Montgomery
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Price, Tex.
Quillen
Roth
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Springer
Steiger, Ariz.
Whitten
Wylie

NOT VOTING—25

Ashley
Biaggi
Blackburn
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burton, Utah
Carey
Chisholm
Cowger
Culver
de la Garza
Fish
Halpern
Hawkins
Henderson
Howard
Kirwan
Landrum
Lipscomb
Lukens
O'Konski
Powell
Rostenkowski
Stanton
Ullman

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Henderson with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Powell.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Brown of California with Mrs. Chisholm.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE THURSDAY AND FRIDAY

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Select Committee on Small Business be permitted to sit during general debate on Thursday and Friday of this week, July 24 and 25.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

THE 91ST CONGRESS—A REPORT

(Mr. HANNA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, it is already presaged by some statements and easily predictable in more to follow that the press will be characterizing this session as a "do little Congress." In anticipation of such unjustified categorizing and in an attempt to place things in their proper perspective may I suggest a closer view of what this Congress really is all about.

First and foremost it must be realized and appreciated that Congress does not sit to simply arithmatically score up a continual enactment of legislation. Rarely has there been such a disgorging of legislative bills as was experienced in the first 2 years of the Johnson administration. It is discernible by even the most casual observer that Mr. Nixon has assumed the stance of caution and deliberation for his administration's first 2 years. Following as he does the exuberant Johnson years of vigorous legislation, his approach has much to commend it. Now we need to measure the performance of these programs; perfect their application, and to make effective the implementation of laws already in existence. Congress plays a dynamic and effective role in this approach as much as in the more dramatic business of passing new laws.

The U.S. News & World Report of July 14, 1969, made this careful observation:

> Although action on the floors of the Senate and House has been almost nil, key committees have devoted days and weeks to a close and initial study of such existing programs as medical care, anti-poverty programs, school aid, food programs and related subjects.

Significantly, for the first time since World War II defense spending is losing its status as a sacred cow. Possible extravagance in the almost $80 billion Pentagon expenditures are being seriously challenged. Automatic approval under the guise of "national security" is no longer the order of the day. In this new look many hours of congressional study and hearings are involved and the individual considerations by each Congressman has been significantly increased.

The function of reviewing and overseeing the programs of the Executive is one of the Congress' most important obligations. This Congress is taking this obligation seriously. As a result, bureaucrats are scurrying in an attempt to put their agencies in order, and this is precisely where the attention needs to be paid.

Any novice in political science will report that the success of a program is in its implementation. The Congress is spending many long hours in insuring that the administration of its programs is done in the manner intended when the programs were initiated. This congressional review has been long overdue and is already producing susbtantial and important results.

Finally, there remains the ever-increasing load of casework. More and more private individuals, local institutions, educators, local labor leaders, and businessmen turn with increasing urgency and volume to their Congressman, who serves as this Nation's only ombudsman. In this role he engineers the multitude of requests for assistance through the mushrooming and ever-increasing complex executive agencies.

Also unabated is the growing correspondence and accompanying requests for materials and assistance from contracts to job appointments. Add to this the political requirements for appearances at public functions both in Washington and in the district. In perspective, one could hardly characterize life in the 91st Congress as "Do Nothing."

LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1970 BUDGET OUTLAYS

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President signed the second supplemental appropriations bill, the final appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1969.

Upon the occasion of the signing of the bill, the President issued a statement in regard to the overall expenditure ceiling provision in the bill and in regard to expenditures generally.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the President's statement in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

XUM

The statement of the President follows:

Statement by the President

I have today signed into law the final supplemental appropriations bill for the fiscal year ended June 30. In addition to providing budget authority for the operation of the Federal Government, the measure removes a restriction that had been placed on federal hiring by the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968.

Written into the law is another ceiling—on federal spending during the fiscal year 1970, the one we have just entered. This new ceiling is set at $191.9 billion—one billion dollars below my own fiscal 1970 expenditure recommendations of last April.

However, the Congress has made this new ceiling somewhat flexible. There are a number of categories in the federal budget—such as medicare, interest on the public debt, social insurance benefits and farm price supports—where costs can rise without new appropriation action. Congress has determined that increases in these items—up to $2 billion—will be exempt from the $191.9 billion ceiling.

There are other outlays such as military expenditures in Southeast Asia, public assistance, medicaid benefits and veterans benefits, where it is also very difficult to budget a precise figure. Any additional appropriations the Congress votes in these categories—above our 1970 revised budget estimates—will result in an upward adjustment of that $191.9 billion ceiling.

There is another aspect to the proposal. If, after voting this new lower ceiling, Congress fails to cut the budget to fit under it, the President must take over and finish the job. On the other hand, if Congress should cut the budget below $191.9 billion—that new lower figure automatically becomes a new ceiling. The latter hypothesis does not appear at this point to be a strong probability.

In making the new ceiling somewhat flexible, the Congress has acted wisely. However, the new ceiling will be of little help in keeping federal spending under control if the Congress that imposed it does not cooperate fully with the Administration in meeting it.

Last April I presented a revised 1970 budget to the Congress. That budget contained specific reductions totaling $4,000,000,000 from the budget left by the previous Administration. It brought the proposed federal spending figure for this fiscal year down to $192.9 billion, a figure I still believe reflects a responsible fiscal policy in our highly inflationary environment. If we hold the line on that spending figure, as I intend to, and if the requisite revenues are provided, this fiscal year will produce the kind of budget surplus needed to cool off an economy that was dangerously overheated before we assumed office.

Three months have passed since the Administration's revised budget was sent to the Congress. We are already three weeks into the 1970 fiscal year—and the Congress has not completed its action on a single regular 1970 appropriations bill. It seems apparent that it will not be known until the late fall just how much of a contribution the Congress intends to make toward meeting the spending ceiling Congress itself has imposed.

In the meantime, since April, the budget picture has worsened. We now anticipate further increases of approximately $2.5 billion in expenditure for such uncontrollable items as interest on the public debt, medicare, social security, civil service retirement benefits, reduced receipts from off-shore oil leases, public assistance, and veterans' benefits.

In addition, Congressional action to date has been inconsistent with a number of my proposals in April. For example, Congress has not acted on my recommendation for a postal rate increase to be effective July 1. Nor has it terminated the special milk and agricultural conservation programs as I recommended. Instead of reducing aid to schools in impacted areas, it is moving to increase such aid. These, and similar actions, could add at least another billion dollars net to Federal spending in 1970.

Thus our current estimate of fiscal 1970 spending has risen to $196.4 billion even though we in the Administration have done nothing in the way of discretionary action to add to our earlier $192.9 billion estimate.

Given our commitment to hold Federal spending to the April figure of $192.9 billion there is only one course of action open to the Administration, and we are taking it. I am directing the heads of all Departments and agencies to reduce spending in the fiscal year just begun by an additional $3.5 billion, the amount necessary to bring current estimates back in line with the $192.9 billion target figure we set in April.

No federal program is above scrutiny. Some highly desirable programs will have to be stretched out—others reduced. The dollar reductions will be accompanied by a further lowering of the personnel ceilings established last April.

I know the Congress shares my determination to make the budget an effective instrument against the inflation that has wrought so much damage to the income and savings of millions of Americans. If the Congress did not share that commitment, it would not have imposed this spending ceiling. However, this general expression of support for fiscal restraint must now be matched by specific acts of the Congress.

The Congress should also recognize that if it approves further increases above the April Budget estimates, we cannot live within the $192.9 billion figure unless more off-setting cuts are made.

I would prefer that the Congress make these off-setting cuts in programs it considers of lesser priority, if it votes increases over my April budget for activities it considers essential. If it does not do so, the duty of making such cuts clearly becomes mine.

INEQUITIES IN SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, in private enterprise workers pay part of their salary into a private pension fund from which they are guaranteed an annual annuity when they retire. Of course, if it were ever proposed that the Congress enact legislation to place an income limitation on persons receiving private annuities, all Members would quickly agree that this action would unfairly deprive a worker of his property.

However, upon examination, one finds this to be the situation existing under our social security laws. The social security system was established in 1936 as a Government-sponsored retirement insurance fund to allow workers when they retire, after age 65, to receive funds to supplement their income. During a man's working years he pays social security taxes and his employer pays an identical amount into a special social security trust fund. Upon retirement, the worker naturally expects to receive his retirement benefit. The benefits under the old age, survivors, and disability insurance program are paid from the funds received from the employee and employer contributions, and the Government pays only the cost of administering the program.

Under the present system, a minimum income level of $1,680 a year is established. Further income earned up to $2,880, the maximum income—reduces the benefits by $1 for each $2 earned. When examining the income level which is usually considered to be the poverty level, we find for an individual it is $1,600 a year, and for a married couple $2,100. By making such low income levels in our social security laws, we are committing many of our elderly citizens to years of poverty.

Too, it must be remembered that funds from nontaxable sources such as municipal bonds, industrial development bonds, series E and H bonds, are not subject to the income limitations of the social security law. Thus, a person can still receive social security benefits when he is receiving additional income from such nontaxable securities. A man with such income is not penalized for supplementing his income, while a person who supplements his income by working is penalized.

I strongly object to the income limitation provision because it deprives a person of his rightful income if he wishes to work. Under this provision a man cannot even consider working part time without endangering his social security benefits. Incentive is stifled and dependence on relatives and society is encouraged. The whole concept of social security as stated in 1936 was that the program would supplement retirement income. This section of the law is a direct contradiction of this principle.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would correct this basic inequity. My bill, when enacted into law, will completely remove this income limitation for those individuals who are otherwise eligible for social security. In fairness to our retired citizens, I request that the House act upon this measure as soon as possible.

TO REDESIGNATE THE GEOGRAPHIC NAME OF CAPE CANAVERAL

(Mr. FREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, the name Cape Canaveral holds a special place in the history of our Nation. Discovery of this point on Florida's east coast in present-day Brevard County is accredited to Ponce de Leon, the same explorer who discovered the State more than 450 years ago. We know for certain the name appears on a Spanish map printed as early as 1564, and on the maps and charts used by world navigators during and since those early days. Floridians have long been proud of the name and its historical significance.

In 1963, following the tragic death of our late President, John F. Kennedy, two orders were issued from the White House. President Johnson's Executive Order No. 11129, dated November 29, 1963, designated the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and Department

XUM

of Defense facilities on Cape Canaveral as the John F. Kennedy Space Center. We are proud that these facilities bear the name of the man who committed this Nation to the goal reached Sunday night by the Apollo 11 astronauts.

During this same time period, the Board of Geographic Names of the Department of the Interior held a special meeting to act on a Presidential request to redesignate Cape Canaveral as Cape Kennedy. The Board, which has the responsibility to make the name change affecting official Government maps and documents, voted for the President's request. While there is considerable doubt that this Board followed the procedure as required by law, or even had a quorum, this is not the point. It seems to me that the Board's action in changing the name of the geographical point was probably a mistake and ill advised. I am privileged to represent this area in the U.S. Congress. The vast majority of the people who work and live in this area adjacent to the Space Center, as well as in other parts of Florida, feel the name should be changed back to Cape Canaveral. A somewhat similar resolution introduced by State Senator Elizabeth Johnson of Brevard County was unanimously passed by the Florida Legislature during its recent session.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, today my distinguished colleague, Congressman CHAPPELL and I are submitting a resolution which would redesignate the geographic name of Cape Kennedy as Cape Canaveral. This resolution also provides that the NASA and DOD facilities referred to in Presidential Executive Order 11129 shall continue to be known as the John F. Kennedy Space Center. This is a joint resolution offered by the two Congressmen who represent Brevard County in Florida. Our distinguished colleagues on the Senate side, the Honorable SPESSARD HOLLAND and the Honorable EDWARD J. GURNEY, have introduced similar legislation.

I would hope that the House would give early consideration to this resolution.

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING GUIDELINE COMPLIANCE ACTIVITIES OF HEW

(Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in addressing the House at this time is to ask for the help of my colleagues in compiling information about school and classroom closings brought about by guideline compliance activities of HEW and the Federal courts.

I have asked HEW to supply me with a list of the school districts who have closed schools or school classrooms in order to satisfy the desegregation requirements of the HEW guidelines. HEW has advised me that they cannot supply this information. It is imperative that someone compile the true facts as to the financial loss and educational loss brought about by such activities. It is for this reason that I am requesting all my colleagues to advise me of any school closings which have occurred in their districts.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when virtually every school system in the Nation is hard pressed for classroom space to take care of rising enrollments, bonded to the hilt to construct new school buildings and strained to the limit for operating funds, it is inconceivable that the Federal Government which is supposed to be helping local communities with their educational problems could be involved in depriving these communities of the use of badly needed school buildings.

Yet, that is exactly what is happening. It is happening in my own congressional district, in the neighboring Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, and elsewhere in the Nation. In many instances, it is happening under the guise of "voluntary" compliance with HEW's school desegregation guidelines. But this voluntariness would hardly pass the same muster that confessions must pass in the U.S. Supreme Court. There is not a Member here who has had any experience with HEW's repeated rejection of compliance plans, under the threat of cutting off Federal aid to education funds until they get the "voluntary" compliance plan they want, who would uphold the claim that such schools are closed "voluntarily." They are closed only as a last resort to avoid losing Federal funds which most school systems badly need.

Just a few weeks ago, about six schools in De Kalb County, Ga., were closed, because they were allegedly racially identifiable schools where appropriate racial balance did not exist. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that these schools were located in black communities and their student bodies were black and as long as a neighborhood school concept is followed, there is no chance for them to have a "racially balanced" student body. After all, no such requirement exists in any law passed by the Congress. To the contrary, in section 409 of Public Law 90–557, we specifically provided that no Federal funds were to be used by HEW to require racial balance, busing, or the closing of any schools. But this law is being intentionally ignored every day through so-called voluntary actions by school boards who are being blackjacked into closing schools under the threat of having their Federal funds taken away. Similarly, three black schools were recently ordered closed in Austin, Tex., under identical circumstances, according to press reports.

This is the central issue in the controversy existing in my own school district with HEW. It is not a discrimination problem, for none exists. The problem exists with HEW attempting to require exact percentages of racial balance in all schools, including those located in all-black neighborhoods, and, failing to achieve such balance, requiring schools to be closed and the students bused to other schools to achieve "racial balance." In College Park, Ga., there are two high schools, one serving a predominantly white student body and one serving an all-black student body, located within a mile of one another. The racial makeup of their student bodies is the result of housing patterns; all the students attend the school closest to them with the exception of seven black students who chose under the system's freedom of choice plan to attend the white high school. The other black students exercised the same choice and chose to attend the all-black high school.

But this freedom of choice plan did not produce the racial balance that HEW's social planners felt was desirable. So they are seeking to impose on the Fulton County board of education, through their tactic of constantly rejecting compliance plans until they get what they want, a compliance plan that will require the closing of a virtually new high school. The Eva Thomas High School was built some 6 years ago at a cost of $850,000 with 18 classrooms and laboratories. It is more modern than the white high school, College Park High. Its location was partially determined by the Federal Government, since it is located in an urban renewal area. But because HEW's compliance officials are going beyond the law and requiring the closing of schools under so-called voluntary compliance plans, the taxpayers of my county and my State are being denied use of this structure. They are being denied equal protection of the law.

Mr. Speaker, just how many other schools have been closed by similar "voluntary" compliance plans is not known. As I stated earlier, the Office of Civil Rights at HEW piously asserts that "it is not the policy of the Office of Civil Rights to require the closing of schools" and any statistical data pertaining to the closing of schools "is not available" from the Office of Civil Rights. That is like saying General Motors does not make Chevrolet automobiles and does not maintain statistics on the number of Chevys sold.

Among the biggest losers in the compliance program of HEW are the taxpayers. Their money has been used time after time to build schools in the neighborhoods where they are needed, whether black, white or mixed. When they approved bond funds in bond elections or voted operating funds through their school boards, there was no question of "racial balance" but simply providing what was needed at the time. The ultimate power in our country rests with the people and though HEW and the courts may not realize it, the people also control the purse strings. I have every confidence that one of the main reasons that a major school bond issue was defeated in Metropolitan Atlanta—Clayton County—only 3 weeks ago was, because of the action of the closing of the six schools in De Kalb County in order to bring about racial balance. The people simply are not going to stand idly aside and see their tax money wasted.

This money is being wasted, because of the absurd positions some have been taking such as the position of HEW that all-black schools cannot constitutionally exist even though they are located in a black neighborhood, unless there is racial balance. It is a travesty on the educational process of this Nation and an affront to the rights of the American taxpayers to have their interest in these buildings destroyed.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am appealing

to every Member of this body in whose district or State a school or schools has been closed by virtue of HEW's compliance activities to provide me with that information. The American people need to be told the truth about the monetary loss, the educational loss, they have suffered because of Federal bureaucrats who want to manipulate the lives of schoolchildren and produce unrealistic artificial balances which are unrepresentative of the communities where these children live. It is being said that the American people are fed up with many things and I think it can be truthfully said, Mr. Speaker, that this is one of the activities with which they are fed up.

A SALUTE TO MANY BANKS FOR NOT FOLLOWING THE LEAD OF THE EASTERN GIANTS

(Mr. KLEPPE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the big New York banks and most of the other large financial institutions have jacked up their prime interest rate to a crushing 8½ percent, I want to commend the many other banks around the country which have not followed the lead of the Eastern giants.

In my own State of North Dakota, many bankers are continuing to make loans to their regular customers at rates ranging between 7 and 7¾ percent. Moreover, they have not closed the window to new borrowers. They have money to lend.

As a one-time country banker, as a former vice president of a Minneapolis investment banking firm and as a present director of a Bismarck bank, I am deeply disturbed over this most recent boost in the prime interest rate. I do not believe it was justified. I think it should be rescinded. Moreover, if the big New York banks do not take the lead in such a reduction, as they did in the increase, I believe the Federal Reserve Board should supply whatever persuasion is needed.

The big Eastern banks have performed what is unquestionably a classic nonpublic relations job. They have succeeded in giving the entire banking community a black eye. They have touched off more public and congressional demands for tighter Government restrictions on banks than has been heard for many a day. Finally, their decision to put one more turn on the screw could not have been more atrociously timed, coming as it did when the big banks were reporting tremendous increases in net profits.

I find it difficult to accept the argument that the prime interest rate boost was the only way the big bankers could restrict borrowing and thereby make their own patriotic contribution to the war on inflation. If a bank turned down a borrower at the old prime rate of 7½ percent and then proceeded to make the loan at the new 8½-percent rate, I do not see how this would help to curb inflation. Actually, such action might add to it.

Voluntary restrictions on loans by bankers themselves would reduce the enormous capital outlays which have helped to overheat the economy, without penalizing the man who buys an automobile or a television set on the installment plan. Lenders can restrain credit by devices other than interest rate increases.

I have never known a banker whose vocabulary did not include the word "no."

Again, I would admonish the banking giants to back off from their most recent interest rate increase before they get backed off.

I would also emphasize again that many of the smaller banks across the country have refused to charge all that the traffic will bear. I salute them for the good sense they are showing.

WASHINGTON CRIME

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a young Marine, in his Nation's Capital, was murdered Monday night during an $8 robbery. A U.S. Senator was robbed of $28 at gunpoint, the same evening.

Crime conditions are so bad in Washington that even April of this year showed a 2.7-percent increase over April of 1968, the month last year which saw the destructive riots when police stood by while entire stores were looted and burned. There were no riots to blame this April. Tourist propaganda flowed forth from the city proudly proclaiming that all was quiet and peaceful for the Cherry Blossom Festival. Yet the crime rate turned out to be higher than even during the riots last year.

And almost as if the 2.7-percent increase in April was insignificant, May recorded a 12.2-percent increase. Again, the riot period of last year is important to keep in mind, because lawlessness was still prevalent during the post-riot month of May. Yet this May, without the aftermath of riots, crime increased 12.2 percent.

And now we have the June increase of 23.9 percent.

Those Members of Congress who have been concerned about the Washington crime problem in the past can be no less concerned today. And the President, who did not hesitate as a candidate to place the blame on a lack of leadership and forthright action by the previous occupants of the White House and Justice Department, cannot today fail to shoulder the responsibility for action now to meet the crisis.

New legislation may be needed, but we cannot wait another 6 months for the leadership in areas of more immediate relief.

This morning's newspaper reported, in addition to the murder of the Marine and the holdup of the Senator, a man robbed of $2 by four men with knives, a man beaten unconscious and robbed of $9, a man beaten to the ground by two men for $85 and a watch, a man robbed of $17 by two men with guns, a vendor robbed by two men with a gun, a man and women robbed by a man who took money and a ring, a man beaten and robbed of his wallet by three men, two men beaten and robbed of their wallets by two men, another vendor robbed of his money and a ring by a man, the robbery of two High's Dairy Stores—two robberies of High's stores were reported in yesterday's papers as well—the robbery of two service stations, the robbery of a grocery store, and the robbery of a laundry.

THE INTERSTATE TAXATION ACT

(Mr. WALDIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, on June 25, 1969, I expressed my opposition on the floor of the House, to the enactment of H.R. 7906, the Interstate Taxation Act. I would like to reemphasize my opposition to the measure by placing an exhibit in the Record which lists some of the different types of businesses that would gain immunity from sales and use tax collections:

Exhibit: Sales and Use Tax Jurisdictional Limitations in Proposed Federal Interstate Taxation Acts

California based businesses would be at a competitive disadvantage with out-of-state sellers under "Interstate Taxation Acts" now pending in both houses of Congress. Tax shelters which would be available to interstate sellers under H.R. 4178 (McCulloch), H.R. 7906 (Rodino), S. 611 (Mathias), or S. 916 (Ribicoff) would also cause substantial losses of California income taxes and state and local sales and use taxes.

Among other things, each of the proposed bills would impose arbitrary and unreasonable jurisdictional standards on state and local government, jeopardize collection of local taxes under the California Bradley-Burns Uniform Local Sales and Use Tax Law, and create inequities in the apportionment of corporate income for California income tax purposes.

Common to all the bills is the jurisdictional limitation applicable to sales and use taxes. Specifically, the California Sales and Use Tax Law presently provides that an out-of-state retailer shall collect the use tax if it has an office, warehouse, representative, agent, salesman, canvasser or solicitor in this state. Under the proposed bills this requirement would not apply to interstate retailers unless they maintain a business location in this state or regularly make household deliveries in this state.

To illustrate the widespread tax and competitive impact of this restriction, we have selected the following typical businesses from the many that make California sales *without* maintaining a fixed place of business or inventory within the state:

1. This firm sells ready-to-wear dresses. Sales personnel within California obtain "hostesses" to arrange a "social party." A "stylist" attends the party and exhibits sample garments. Orders are submitted by the "stylist" to, and are filled from, a point outside the state by a combined shipment to the "hostess." State and local sales and use taxes in California for the fiscal year 1967–1968 totaled $403,500. It would no longer be subject to sales tax, nor required to collect the use tax. This translates into sales in excess of $8 million in direct competition with California retailers.

2. A shoe manufacturer makes sales in California through commission salesmen direct to consumer customers. California sales for the fiscal year ended 6–30–68 amounted to $350,000 with tax paid in excess of $17,000.

3. A shoe manufacturing firm sells through

XUM

sales representatives on a house to house basis. This firm paid tax of more than $48,000 on sales of $960,000.

4. A company sells household utensils, pots, pans, etc., through independent representatives to consumer customers on a house to house basis. Sales last year exceeded a quarter million dollars, with a tax payment in excess of $12,500.

5. This business is conducted by two related corporations. One sells jewelry, and the other sells cosmetics, through solicitors operating within California. Their method of doing business is somewhat similar to that outlined in No. 1. Their annual state and local sales and use taxes aggregate $175,000. Under the proposed federal restriction $3,500,000 of sales with local solicitation would not subject the companies to the California Sales and Use Tax Laws.

6. A large greeting card firm has independent sales solicitors taking orders from consumer customers in California. Last year's volume of sales in California was almost a half million dollars, with tax paid of $24,900.

7. A firm sells educational books through commissioned salesmen on a door to door basis. Sales made were in excess of $525,000, tax paid of $25,300.

8. Another firm sells on a door to door basis through commissioned salesmen, Bibles of all denominations. Sales for last year totaled more than $460,000, and tax paid exceeded $23,000.

9. A firm engaged in the sale of books, magazines, and record albums, has agents located in California who operate from their homes. These agents solicit orders which are filled, and shipped from a point outside the state direct to the purchaser. It would be discharged from further liability on $7,500,000 of annual sales, on which it now pays $375,000 in taxes. An affiliated corporation of this firm does maintain offices in California. It would be an easy matter to direct all publications of a non-taxable nature through the corporation maintaining an office in the state, and all taxable publications, and other items of a taxable nature, through the corporation with no office in the state. The enactment of this legislation would provide the opportunity for tax avoidance.

10. A firm with independent sales representatives sells dry goods direct to consumer customers. This firm's sales last year fell jut short of $500,000 and they paid tax of $24,350.

11. A correspondence school makes sales of educational material and school supplies directly to the student, through independent sales representatives. Annual sales in California total $732,000 with tax payable of $36,600.

12. A corporation makes direct sales of general merchandise to credit card holders of large national firms. Individual sales amounts are small, however, the volume is quite large, with last year's sales exceeding $450,000 and payment of tax in the amount of $22,700.

13. This firm has 20 photographic salesmen in California who take and sell pictures to students and schools. Annual sales exceed $800,000 with a tax liability of $40,650.

14. This manufacturer is engaged in the sale of desks and public seating equipment to many vendees within the state. Sales are made by resident salesmen. Tax last year was in excess of $37,000.

15. This firm supplies prescription lenses, frames, and accessories to optometrists and occulists. All sales are made through resident salesmen. The sales to California purchasers in the last fiscal year amounted to $1,252,000 with a tax liability of $62,600.

Four additional optical firms making sales in the same manner as described above made sales in the amount of $1,600,000 with total tax paid of $79,000.

16. A manufacturer and seller of yearbooks makes sales through representatives without offices to students and schools. The tax paid amounts to $110,000.

17. Another publisher of yearbooks makes sales of these and other specialty publications in the same manner as indicated in number sixteen. Their sales are also to students and schools. The tax revenue from this account is $120,000 per year.

18. Another company has independent sales agents soliciting orders for their products which are advertising specialties, executive gifts, metal signs, etc. This firm paid tax of $27,050 on sales of $540,000.

19. This taxpayer operates in California through resident salesmen making sales of uniforms to various employers and organizations throughout the state. All sales are made through taxpayer's sales representatives. California taxable sales during the last fiscal year exceeded one quarter of a million dollars.

20. A manufacturer and seller of rubber processing machinery and garbage disposers makes sales as a result of solicitation by sales representatives, with no office maintained in this state. Sales for last year totalled $1,600,000 and tax paid of $80,000.

21. A supplier of industrial chemicals and disinfectants made sales through resident salesmen in excess of $2,000,000 last year and paid tax in the amount of $110,000.

22. This firm is a manufacturer of industrial mixers. Most of its sales are to bakeries and other food processing industries. Orders are solicited by an independent sales representative. Sales for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1968, exceeded $500,000, with total tax paid in excess of $25,000.

Sales made by the first twelve firms are direct to consumer customers who are not normally registered with the state for the purpose of reporting or paying sales or use taxes. The individual sales amounts would be so minimal as to preclude any pursuit of the consumer customer for payment of the tax. The absolute loss of revenue, as a result of this legislation, from these accounts would amount to almost $1,200,000 annually.

At least a part of the sales of the last ten of the listed accounts are made to purchasers engaged in business in California. For this reason, some part of the tax now collected and paid to the state by these vendors would be paid directly to the state by purchasers otherwise required to file sales and use tax returns. The greater percentage, however, would be lost. The greater cost of collecting tax from purchasers would further limit the net tax yield from sales by these firms.

In addition to sellers which would be immediately excused from compliance with the California Sales and Use Tax Law, there are many others who could easily arrange to come within the protection of the "Interstate Taxation Act." Some examples follow:

(a) A large publishing firm presently maintains sales offices in California, but does not carry stock of goods within the state. Orders are obtained by personal solicitation within California, and shipments are made from a point outside the state. Last year this publisher paid over $400,000 in state and local sales and use taxes in California. The mere closing of the sales offices would exempt the publisher from this liability.

(b) A firm making sales of incentive programs and related materials maintains one sales office in California. Taxable sales reported by this organization last year amounted to $4,400,000 with a payment of $220,000 in tax. The closing or relocation of this single sales office would eliminate the need for this firm to pay any tax.

(c) A mail order shoe retailer has agents in California soliciting orders which are filled from a point outside the state. Sales are in excess of $800,000 per year. An office maintained in Los Angeles could easily be closed and relieve this seller of further tax liability.

The passage of any one of the proposed "Interstate Taxation Acts" would provide the out-of-state retailer with a distinct competitive advantage over the California retailer. The limiting jurisdictional factors, which would permit unlimited direct sales solicitation within the state without tax liability, would encourage many out-of-state sellers who presently are not making sales in California, to engage in such sales activity due to the lucrative market represented by California consumer customers.

ATTENTION, WINDOW BOX FARMERS

(Mr. TALCOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin is to be commended for the determined effort he is making to solve the very complicated problems confronting the U.S. farmer.

By holding hearings in the various agricultural centers throughout the United States he is obtaining first-hand testimony from the farmers.

One such meeting was conducted in Fresno, Calif., July 9, 1969. One of the farmers testifying at the meeting was Mr. Jack Stone, of Stratford, who is president of the Western Cotton Growers. In a plain talk speech, Mr. Stone put his finger on a number of vital points affecting agriculture in general and the cotton program in particular.

Mr. Speaker, for the edification of our urban colleagues I include Mr. Stone's remarks in the Record:

STATEMENT OF JACK STONE

FARMERS UNORGANIZED

With less than half the farmers of a few years back, our capacity to produce is seemingly unlimited. But we are one industry in this nation that is unable to put a price on our produce that covers the expenses forced upon us by our suppliers. There seems to be too many of us and we love freedom too much to organize ourselves into a tight group that could do this job.

LOOK TO SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR LEADERSHIP

So we turn to you as we have to others who held your position and to the USDA, the department that is big enough, and strong enough, and has information, to give us the organization or a workable program to exist in this organized society.

We have complete confidence in this administration and its pledge to maintain farm income. However, some farmers would like it improved some.

FOOD STAMPS

We like your idea to help make the abundance of American agriculture available to more people. In addition to the food stamp plan which we approved we have suggested a clothing stamp plan with emphasis on cotton, of course.

We wish that every man, woman and child in this country could have his and her share of what the American farmers are capable of producing.

LOW PRICES

Last year, according to your Department reports, California growers received an average of 23.5¢ per pound for cotton, down 8½¢ from the previous year. Even at that low price we are not really meeting the competition of foreign producers and man made fibers. They are still gaining on us and the cost of producing cotton is still going up. Last year, economists say, it cost 26¢ to 36¢ and above to produce a pound of cotton.

XUM

FEDERAL SUBSIDIES NECESSARY

The federal subsidies were necessary to keep most of the California cotton farmers in the business, and under present prices and conditions, without the federal subsidies most of them would go out of the business.

Like the U.S. Merchant Marine we are dependent upon a subsidy. And Congress provides the shipping industry with that subsidy because it feels that it is in the national interest to have a merchant marine.

PROGRAMS FAVORED

We have favored choice programs in cotton legislation which would give the grower the maximum freedom to use his land in the best way he can, and would give him the opportunity of producing more cotton with less government subsidy and help, if he were able to do so.

We have favored land retirement programs which allow a farmer to retire his land from production and seek a better living in other fields, if he wishes to do so.

RESEARCH AND PROMOTION

We believe that only through research and promotion can cotton stand on its own feet. This effort has been started through our C.P.I. $1.00 a bale program—and we're pleased with its progress. But we have just started and have a long way to go.

We hope that the U.S.D.A. will step up its research program to reduce the cost of production and to improve the cotton product with better qualities, such as durable press. It has been suggested, by some farmers, that some of our subsidy payments go for this cause.

LIMITATION OF PAYMENTS

Payment limitations would put large farmers out of the program and they in turn would put the smaller farmers out of business with over production of their crops.

If the cotton program were suddenly scrapped or drastically curtailed, hundreds of thousands of acres of fertile cotton land would sooner or later be shifted to other crops. This would result in such over production and drop in market price that those crops, too, would be dragged down.

NEED PUBLIC RELATIONS HELP

We can use your help in public relations. You're the top farmer. Help us tell the people and Congress the truth!

That they spend less of their income for food and fibers than any other country in the world, thanks to us.

That farmers received less on their investment than any other industry.

That farmers are affected by inflation more than anyone else—and that farmers do more to *curb* inflation than any other system—such as higher interest rates.

Tell them we'd like to raise the wages of our workers—but how can we, when we get about 14¢ for the cotton in a cotton shirt?

Tell them that prices for farm commodities today are basically the same as 15 years ago, yet our costs are up 50%.

Let them know what happens to a farmer's subsidy payment. It's not extra profit, it goes to pay bigger bills forced upon us by everybody and his brother.

URGE ACTION NOW

We urge you and your department to take the lead, now, so we don't have any hasty action that might seriously injure farming. And we pledge to work with you and other farm groups and Congress, in developing a sound and workable program that will build farm income and stability to our foundation or basic industry—agriculture, and in turn stimulate the nation's economy.

CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRESS

(Mr. CLAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague Louis Stokes, of Ohio, to vent the concern of black Americans that this administration is intent on letting years of hard-earned civil rights progress be compromised by embittered conservatives. Black people joined by white liberals are convinced that our only role over the next 3 years must be to conduct a holding action. It is not easy to accept this new kind of responsibility, for over the past 8 years we have learned to work for progress through legislation, through local, State, and national involvement in the issues, and through articulating the needs of people to an attentive audience.

I am not saying that our former audiences always responded as we would have had them respond—but they did listen and they did make strides toward equal educational, social, and economic opportunities for black people.

Now there is no audience except the people of this Nation. It is to them we must appeal for understanding of the conditions and deprivations which must be overcome through a national commitment. In this administration, the demands of the poor, of minorities—and of black people in particular—are falling on deaf, insensitive ears.

President Nixon started off on a sour note by telling us he did not appoint any black people to his Cabinet because he could not find any qualified black citizens. In this day and age, saying that is like saying, "Some of my best friends are black." To add insult to injury, Mr. Nixon visited the campuses of Yale, Harvard, and Princeton seeking qualified black talent.

To the President's surprise, he found there were few blacks at Harvard, Yale, or Princeton. Of course, anyone who knows anything about the plight of black people in this country would not expect to find many black people at Yale, Harvard, or MIT. The simple truth is that the annual tuition of students at these institutions is in excess of $4,000 a year. The other ugly truth is that the average income of black people in this country is less than $4,000 a year. Why would any thinking man expect to find black people at the universities of Princeton, Harvard, and Yale.

Furthermore, since Mr. Nixon graduated from Whittier College and he is qualified to be President of the United States—why do blacks have to attend Ivy League schools in order to qualify to serve in his administration. It is also interesting that only one of Mr. Nixon's Cabinet attended any Ivy League school—but all of them are millionaires except three. If whites who do not attend Ivy League schools qualify why must blacks attend in order to qualify?

Why should we not rise today, then, to exclaim that black people know, by now, what the President's views are on black people? Sometimes, we think we have been swept into a time machine, and it is right back to 1877 when Rutherford B. Hayes was President.

Consider the record: With the first week of the Nixon administration, title VI guidelines for school desegregation were "suspended" so as to provide five southern school districts—which had disregarded the law of the land since 1954—extra time to meet Federal standards.

Under Executive Order No. 11246—with rules and regulations promulgated thereunder—the Federal Government is obligated to do no business with companies which practice employment discrimination. In March, the Department of Defense awarded major contracts to three textile firms with established records of discriminatory practices. They were awarded in violation of regulations which require written assurances of future compliance with the Executive order.

The Federal contract compliance mechanism has the potential for affecting one-third of the jobs in this economy. If the Government resolves to enforce the law, thousands of minority group citizens could thereby gain access to jobs and dignity.

Before finally testifying on June 26, the Attorney General canceled five scheduled appearances before the House Judiciary Committee to present administration views on extension of the Voting Rights Act. The cancellations coincided with reports emanating from the Justice Department that the delays were precipitated by administration desires to dilute the effectiveness of the enforcement mechanisms provided in the present act. Unfortunately, the Attorney General's testimony proved these reports were accurate. I am gratified by the wisdom of the House Judiciary Committee which has reported the legislation to extend the Voting Rights Act without administration revisions.

The handling of the appointment of a new head of the EEOC added to the evidence that this administration will weaken enforcement on civil rights generally and mandates against job discrimination in particular. I do not dispute the right of the President to appoint a chairman of his own choosing—but to have the White House announce on the day following Dirksen's vicious attack on Clifford Alexander—that Alexander would be replaced—leads to the conclusion that the President definitely agreed with Dirksen's rantings. The Senator stated, in fact, that a firm enforcement of equal employment opportunities amounts to harassment of business firms.

This administration has even recommended that the tax reform bill include a provision calling for foundations to lose their tax exempt status if they give any money to voter registration programs. Black people know that without the financial assistance of major foundations, we would not have registered black voters in the Southern States. Mr. Evers would not now be mayor of Fayette, Miss., and Carl Stokes would not be mayor of Cleveland.

The city of St. Louis has been struck particularly hard by this administration.

First, we lost our Women's Job Corps Center which was among the 59 centers determined "inefficient" by President Nixon's team of investigators. Over 16,000 youth suffered the impact of that decision. This administration said to them, "You simply are not worth the price." Now, the Department of Labor is still trying to initiate its new, more

XUM

efficient program—probably for well-bred, well-to-do kids who for some reason decide not to go to college. Needless to say, this new program is not underway—even though the old one is history. In the interim, nothing is happening.

As a member of the special ad hoc task force on poverty designated by chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, CARL PERKINS, I observed close up the response of this administration to the problems of the youth enrolled in Job Corps. As a Member of Congress, a member of that task force committee, and as a representative of people who were directly affected by the administration's decision to close down the Job Corps—I addressed in three separate letters to this administration—my concern and my questions on the subject decision and its implications.

My concern and my questions were communicated in search of a response. The sincerity of my correspondence and the urgency of my very real need for such responses was overlooked. My letter of April 9 to Secretary of Labor George Shultz was answered June 16, more than 2 months later. My letter of April 15 to President Nixon was responded to June 3, and my letter of May 9 to the Secretary of Labor in which I raised important questions to clarify for the people of St. Louis the procedures whereby they might submit a proposal to participate in the "new" manpower program was answered only last week, July 14. Telephone inquiries from my office have been accorded similar consideration by Department of Labor personnel. If my experiences constitute an oversight or merely evidence of the machinations of bureaucracy, so be it, but I do not consider it a trivial matter or an excusable negligence.

My colleagues here know that the Economic Opportunity Act and its program is being dismantled with the precision of a surgeon's knife. All that is left is the office to administer to poverty. And to administer to poverty, the President chose a former Congressman who represented a district where the average income of his constituents was $9,300—a man who knows little about poverty, a man who voted against the original Economic Opportunity Act. This is how poverty is being administered in Washington.

Less than 1 month ago, the city of St. Louis received notice that it is no longer an area which is eligible for economic assistance from the Department of Commerce economic development program. This was only 9 months after a careful study had been conducted and submitted to the Federal authorities documenting to their overwhelming satisfaction that St. Louis needed funds for economic development.

On June 17, I addressed my concern for this decision to the Honorable Maurice H. Stans, Secretary of the Department of Commerce, in a letter of that date. I called to the attention of the Secretary the fact that only 1 week prior to the receipt by the city of St. Louis of the decision to withdraw EDA funds, an EDA technical assistance grant was extended. Now, four programs in St. Louis have been brought to a halt, and one more time hope has been withdrawn. The people and city officials of St. Louis are concerned and perplexed. I am concerned and perplexed by the EDA decision—and yet, as of this date, I have received no clarification or explanation for this decision from the Department of Commerce in response to my letter. The only thing I can conclude is that St. Louis has made a miraculous improvement in our economic well-being since last August—so much so that none of us has yet digested the full impact of our progress.

Rumor has it that the Economic Development Administration designation of St. Louis as an area eligible for funds was withdrawn because our unemployment rate has dropped. Yet, I cannot consider that statement consistent with the latest statistics released by the Department of Labor on unemployment. July 18, 1969, the Department of Labor released information that the gap between "black and white unemployment rates in the poverty neighborhoods of the Nation's 100 largest cities was wider in the second quarter of 1969 than a year earlier."

The release stated:

> The ratio of black to white unemployment was 2.0 to 1 in the second quarter of 1969, compared with a 1.6 to 1 ratio in the second quarter of 1968.

I shall insert for the attention of my colleagues the complete report released by the Department at the conclusion of my statement.

When Treasury Secretary David Kennedy first took office, he testified before a Senate committee to the effect that some increase in unemployment might be the price of controlling the inflationary spiral. In the past month, while consideration of the surtax was pending before the House, the administration spread the word that their anti-inflationary policies would soon be felt by the economy. Consequently, I am not surprised by the labor statistics report indicating an increase in black unemployment in poverty neighborhoods. Black people know that they are the last hired and the first fired.

The report shows that one out of every three black youths is unemployed, while only one of every eight white youths suffers joblessness. The kinds of employment and training needs of black youths and adults who are confined to the cores of our cities are simply not being addressed. There has been no response to their conditions. The black youth unemployment rate is merely an indication of harder times to come—when these youth become adult unemployment statistics.

Indications from this administration are that the commitment to the need for comprehensive youth training and all-around job preparation will be deferred. This Nation can put a man on the moon, but it cannot put black men on the job.

I am pleased to note that the city of St. Louis has received funds for the model cities program, not, may I assure you, without sufficient bickering and cajoling of HUD officials who were, at one time, significantly prompted by the request of their Secretary, George Romney, to consider dropping St. Louis. I would welcome assurances that black involvement and control in the St. Louis model cities plan did not play a part in the vacillations of HUD officials on the St. Louis award. So far, I have witnessed no evidence to warrant such an assurance.

Consider the Small Business Administration and discriminative practices which have brought forth special hearings by both the Senate and House committees having jurisdiction over SBA policies and practices. Before the week is up, I shall submit to my House colleagues the results of my study of Small Business Administration practices in the city of St. Louis.

It is all downhill in the Nation's Capitol—priorities are sadly confused while this President acts on his obvious decision to accommodate conservatists and southerners. Our hypocritical society continues.

In fiscal year 1968, this Government paid well over $1 billion in farm payments—and this figure does not include subsidy payments made in an amount less than $5,000 per farmer. Over 100,000 farmers in the United States collected more than $5,000 apiece last year for not growing crops—and over 4,000 farmers collected more than $100,000 each.

Meanwhile, during this same period, the Government spent less than $300 million for its low-rent public housing programs and only $900 million in the Federal food program which includes school lunch and milk payments, commodity distribution, and food stamps.

It has been said before, but it deserves repetition—there is something basically wrong when a nation fails to feed its hungry while it pays its farmers not to produce food. The State of Missouri, I am sorry to say, is one of the worst offenders. It stands at the top of the list in collecting from the Federal Government farm subsidy payments and at the bottom of the list in administering food programs to its poor people.

Any discussion of a guaranteed income program for poor people in this Nation must be prefaced by a discussion of the guaranteed income program which now exists—not for poor people but for rich farmers.

Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, third ranking member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, received a subsidy of $116,978 last year for his plantation. At the same time, citizens of Mississippi suffer the most dire hardships of hunger. In the State of Mississippi a ceiling has been applied to payments for dependent children of $9.50 a month, or $114 for a full year. And yet Senator EASTLAND has consistently opposed the proposal to place a ceiling on farm subsidy payments. No comment on this situation is necessary; it speaks for itself.

On May 17 the House of Representatives passed a proposal to limit these farm subsidy benefits to any one farmer to a maximum of $20,000 a year. This ceiling would effect a savings of at least $300 million to the Federal Government which could be applied to a decent food subsidy program and to almost double our effort for low-income public housing. The people of St. Louis are well aware of the desperate need for funds for housing. Do you realize that in 1949 the men of Congress pledged to build 810,000 public housing units over the ensuing 6-year period? Let me point out that 20 years have passed since they set that goal, and still we have not met it.

XUM

In fact, it was not until the activity of the past 2 years that this Government brought the number of public housing units to 800,000, still 10,000 short of the 6-year goal set in 1949.

Back on the farm subsidies continue. In spite of House passage of a subsidy limitation, the Senate 2 weeks ago declined to accept that limitation. Once again, it seems the guaranteed income for rich farmers will continue into the future.

At the same time, 12 percent of American families will probably continue under the conditions they are in. They cannot afford decent housing. Some 7.8 million American families—or one in every eight—cannot now afford to pay market prices for standard housing which would cost no more than 20 percent of their incomes.

I have introduced legislation in an effort to bring reform and activity into the Federal housing effort. It has too long lagged behind and caused too much suffering.

In the period 1962–67—the following amounts were spent: $356.3 billion on national defense, a conservative estimate; $33.2 billion on farm subsidies; $24.2 billion on space exploration; $22.2 billion on highway construction, and only $8.1 billion for all housing and urban renewal programs, and $1.25 billion for Federal housing subsidies.

My bill provides for more housing subsidies, that the Government would contribute money to local housing authorities sufficient to lower public housing rents to a maximum of 25 percent of tenant income. This is merely a starting point. If we are successful in getting committee attention of this bill, I am hopeful they will go a step further—apply their experience with housing legislation and pursue a total meaningful reform of public housing law.

Expressing optimism on that point would be difficult in light of the ax being applied to appropriations of this sort.

The Bureau of the Budget has made the most damaging recommendation of the past decade relating to support for education and libraries in America. The total allotted for all purposes for fiscal year 1970 to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is $3.2 billion, or about 1½ percent of the total Federal budget. That means 98½ percent of the total Federal budget. Ask any American what service he would most desire his Government to provide and I believe most would say education. Our faith in education is truly one of the distinctions of this country. In America we have been taught that through education, anything is possible for our children. Men are more concerned than ever that their children be given a better start, a better job, a better and more secure life, and they are believers in education and training toward that end.

Now we have a government which upholds its responsibility for a common defense and ignores its responsibility for justice and domestic tranquillity. And in the Preamble to the Constitution the responsibility for establishing justice and insuring domestic tranquillity comes first.

These misplaced priorities bring a severe blow to the pursuit of equal educational opportunity and quality. It is a sad commentary on this Nation's social conscience that defense spending should equal $80 billion while health, education, and welfare spending totals only $3.2 billion.

The President proceeds on the MIRV system at an estimated completed cost of $20 billion. The President is trading votes right and left—more right than left—for the ABM. That is another $20 billion down the drain—"America's biggest mistake," popular name for the ABM.

We continually hear about honoring some vague commitment to the people of Vietnam—and nothing about the specific commitments recorded in law to the citizens of this land. I can find no sense in this sort of honor to weapons and dishonor to human beings.

I participated in the reading of Vietnam war dead names with the Quakers. In a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives I stated:

> The issues are clear. First, the rights of Americans to take a stand and to make known their views through both assembly and speech, and, second, the reason for standing on the steps of the Capitol, which was to protest the dying of American boys in a war which is unquestionably illegal and immoral.

I object to the flagwaving which accompanies each escalation of American spending and Americans dying in Vietnam. The emphasis is tragically misplaced all around.

The flag waves over the poor and over the hungry and over the black and over the Quakers, just as it waves over soldiers going into battle.

It is quite evident that we will have to have our own flag over the next 3 years—implant it on our grounds and fight to hold it. Nothing short of our individual concern and involvement and awareness can prevent a total repression of minorities.

The issues have been enumerated quite clearly in the decisions flowing forth from the White House. I urge your interest and your thoughtful analysis of your own responsibilities to yourself, your children, community, State, and Nation, and I hope you will join in the battle and help us wave the flag where it also flies—for justice and for equality for all Americans.

Racism must be removed from this land. The Federal Government can accelerate or impede this progress by its own policies and practices. Presently, the incidents of discrimination by this Government are flagrant abuses of responsible leadership.

I include the following excerpts from publications in the Record as evidence of the concern—and the very reason for concern for and by black citizens of this Nation:

The Employment Situation in Urban Poverty Neighborhoods: Second Quarter 1969

The gap between black and white unemployment rates in the poverty neighborhoods of the Nation's 100 largest cities was wider in the second quarter of 1969 than a year earlier, the Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics reported today. The ratio of black to white unemployment rates was 2.0 to 1 in the second quarter of 1969, compared with a 1.6 to 1 ratio in the second quarter of 1968.

The jobless rate in these poverty neighborhoods, at 5.7 percent in the second quarter of 1969, remained unchanged over the year. This marked the first quarter in more than a year that the unemployment rate in the poverty neighborhoods had shown no over-the-year improvement. During the same period the unemployment rate for other urban areas and the Nation as a whole edged down.

The unemployment rates for blacks in these neighborhoods, however, showed a slight rise from 7.3 to 8.0 percent. This reversed the over-the-year declines reported for the past five quarters.

The jobless rates for white workers living in poverty neighborhoods showed a decline from 4.6 to 4.0 percent during the same period.

The decline in the jobless rate for whites in poverty neighborhoods took place among adult men, as the rate for white adult women rose slightly.

The rise of black unemployment in poverty neighborhoods occurred despite the fact that over the same period the unemployment rate for blacks in the Nation as a whole and in other urban neighborhoods remained unchanged.

The increase in jobless rates for blacks in poverty neighborhoods between the second quarters of 1968 and 1969, primarily reflected an increase in joblessness among teenagers.

More than 1 in 3 black teenagers in poverty neighborhoods was unemployed in the second quarter of 1969, while only one in seven white teenagers in these neighborhoods was jobless.

At 5.0 percent the jobless rate for blacks in other urban neighborhoods of the 100 metropolitan areas was virtually unchanged over the year, as was the rate for whites. The rate among these black urban workers remained higher that the jobless rate for white workers in the poverty neighborhoods.

(Note.—The poverty neighborhood classification used in this report was developed by the Bureau of the Census and is based on a ranking of census tracts according to 1960 data on income, education, skills, housing, and proportion of broken families.The poorest one-fifth of these tracts in the Nation's 100 largest metropolitan areas are considered poverty neighborhoods. The poverty neighborhood statistics probably include some middle- and upper-income families and also exclude some poor families who live in other urban neighborhoods. In 1967, for example, only about one-third of the nonwhite families living in poverty neighborhoods had incomes below the poverty level as defined by the Social Security Administration. These data, therefore, do not represent the exact dimensions of the employment problems of all poor people but are instead minimal estimates of the adverse conditions of residents in these specific poverty neighborhoods.)

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, May 28, 1969]

Urban Peace Linked to End of Racial Bias

America will never have peace in the streets until it solves the race problem, Carl B. Stokes, mayor of Cleveland said here yesterday.

Stokes, who in 1967 became the first Negro mayor of a large city, spoke at a conference on "Crime and Your Community" sponsored by the national emergency committee of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

The two-day conference, which ends today, is being held at Stouffer's Riverfront Inn.

Stokes said that crime could often be traced to deeper social illnesses in American life.

"Poverty and racial discrimination cement the Negro in place and thousands of his white brothers are equally entangled in poverty," he declared.

XUM

"Helplessness and frustration destroy resolve. And even though only a very small minority of the poor make a response outside the law, this minority accounts for a substantial proportion of all crimes committed."

He said that change would come through lawful means but commented:

"Law and order cannot be a substitute for the fulfillment of basic human needs."

Stokes condemned the Vietnam war as "the brutal maceration of a small agricultural nation" and said the brutality of the war might be one cause of antisocial behavior at home.

He called also for gun control laws, increased professionalism among police and a vigorous campaign against organized crime.

He charged that the current stress on certain kinds of crime was the product of racism in the white community.

"I cannot but feel that much of the emphasis on so-called 'street crimes'—to the exclusion of white-collar crimes like embezzlement, tax evasion, bribery and shoplifting—is basically a result of anti-Negro attitudes," Stokes said.

At a press conference earlier, Stokes called for massive federal aid to the cities as a means of fighting crime.

"We have to realize that making war on poverty, on inadequate housing, on unemployment, is making war on crime," he said.

"A civil rights law is a law against crime. Money for decent schools, is money against crime. Money for family counseling is money against crime. Any effort to improve life in America's inner cities is an effort against crime."

Another view was presented last night by Will Wilson, Assistant United States Attorney General in the criminal division.

Wilson condemned violence on American college campuses and declared:

"The wave of student disorders has brought personal injury, death and millions of dollars in property damage." He said the disturbances were probably attributable at least in part to "planned and concerted action by small groups."

He said that colleges, besides noting room for improvement in cetrain areas, should "speak up and teach this generation of college students something good about America."

He said that the nation had achieved more racial equality than any other nation with a significant racial mix.

Wilson quoted a stanza from "America the Beautiful" and at another point, asked:

"Where else in the whole world do the disadvantaged achieve even a portion of what they have achieved in the good old U.S.A.?"

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 18, 1969]

Volpe Alters Bias Rules, Stirs Row

(By David S. Broder)

A new controversy over the racial policies of the Nixon Administration erupted yesterday when Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe announced major changes in the equal-employment enforcement program for Federal-aid highway construction.

Contractors who had complained that the Johnson Administration's anti-bias program was cumbersome and confusing hailed the change.

But Clarence Mitchell, head of the Washington office of the NAACP, said Volpe's action was "a spineless capitulation" to the road builders.

The controversy centered on Volpe's decision to scrap the "prequalification procedure" ordered by the Johnson Administration last October.

Under that procedure, contractors had to meet nine tests of nondiscrimination before being allowed to bid on big highway contracts. Construction firms complained to the Senate Roads Subcommittee in January that the criteria were so vague that some firms were being approved in one state at the same time they were being rejected in another.

Under the new plan announced by Volpe, standard nondiscrimination clauses will be included in the specifications for new highway jobs when they are put up for bid.

State and Federal inspectors will enforce the anti-bias clauses and Volpe implied that allowance will be made for local and regional hiring practices.

Volpe, a former Federal highway chief himself, made the announcement in a speech to the convention of the Associated General Contractors at the Washington Hilton Hotel.

He insisted that his order will "strengthen the effectiveness" of the antidiscrimination program.

"It is in no way a lessening of our determination to establish equal opportunity . . . as a way of life" in Federally financed road construction, the former Massachusetts Governor said.

Jim Sprouse, assistant executive director of the Associated General Contractors, said only 15 per cent of the previously qualified firms had been able to meet the standards imposed by the Johnson Administration. He called Volpe's action "extremely gratifying."

The NAACP's Mitchell, by contrast, assailed the Secretary's decision. "It just proves that the big, powerful highway contractors, by use of their muscle, have forced the Federal Government to backtrack in fair employment in highway construction," he said.

The press release from the Department of Transportation stressed that the anti-discrimination requirements will be included in all highway contracts of more than $10,000—bringing virtually all of the $4 billion-a-year Federal aided road construction under the compliance program.

The "prequalification procedure" used by the Johnson Administration applied only to contracts of $500,000 or more—about one-fourth of the numerical total.

Volpe did not spell out this change in his talk to the contractors at the Hilton.

The Secretary said that "since uniform requirements are used, they will be more readily understood and can be more effectively enforced than the previously variable requirements."

But he added that "these uniform requirements are not carved in granite" and can be modified "whenever we encounter particular equal opportunity problems . . . in particular geographical areas."

Volpe told the contractors he sympathized with their problems because his Department ranks "fifth from the bottom" of all Government agencies in its ratio of minority employes.

"I mean to change that," he said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 10, 1969]

Black Graduates' Jobs

A recent letter to your paper cited an alleged inaccuracy by your reporter, Myra MacPherson. The letter stated that it was incorrect to assume that black college graduates in the United States have an unequal opportunity.

The facts that I gave to Miss MacPherson which she relied on are as follows:

1. A black college graduate over 25 earns $1040 less than a white high school graduate.
2. At the median, a black college graduate earns less than a white with a tenth grade education.
3. A black college graduate earns $3095 less than a white college graduate.

The source for the above information is a report prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics Department of Labor, *Social and Economic Conditions of Negroes in the United States*, dated October, 1967.

Clifford L. Alexander, Jr.

Washington.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 12, 1969]

Minority Job Gap on Coast Studied—U.S. Panel Explores Picture in Three Key Industries

Los Angeles, March 12—Almost nine out of 10 persons employed in aerospace, one of this area's largest and most prestigious industries, are white persons of the category known locally as "Anglos."

Only 11.1 per cent of the industry's employes are Negroes or persons with Spanish surnames, even though those two groups make up 20 per cent of the Los Angeles area population.

Minorities get even fewer jobs in motion pictures and network television, two other industries that have important centers here.

The Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has brought about 25 staff people and commissioners from Washington this week to try to find out and publicize why Negroes and Mexican-Americans—who are presumed to comprise most of the Spanish-surnamed persons in the official records—are so little employed in these three industries.

The commission also wants to know why the few minority employes in these industries fare so poorly in promotions and in moving into positions of management.

PERSONNEL MEN HEARD

A string of personnel managers of the largest aerospace companies appeared before the commission today, testifying voluntarily. The commission will hear from the motion picture industry tomorrow and from television Friday.

The personnel managers read into the record long descriptions of programs that their companies had established, some many years ago, to increase the number of minority employes on their payrolls.

But, under questioning by Clifford L. Alexander Jr., the commission chairman, and his colleagues, most of the corporate officials conceded that the results of their efforts had been unimpressive.

Mr. Alexander dramatically illustrated the slow rate of progress. An official of North American Rockwell Corporation, which makes or helps to make space vehicles, rockets, nuclear reactors and airplanes, among other things, had testified that since December, 1966, the company's Negro officials and managers had increased from 46 to 58 and its Mexican-American officials and managers had increased from 46 to 66.

Mr. Alexander had brought to the hearing room a silent, portable calculator and a young woman to operate it. The calculator buzzed for a moment and the operator handed a note to Mr. Alexander.

He studied it briefly and said to the startled company official that it would take 15 years, at the present rate of increase, for Negroes to obtain 3 per cent of the management jobs of the corporation.

QUESTION OF SALARIES

He then proceeded quickly to another figure provided by North American Rockwell—that the company had 600 Negroes and Mexican-Americans earning more than $10,000 a year.

"What are the salaries of the 10 highest paid Anglos in the company?" he asked.

The official, Elmer P. Wohl, vice president for administration, tried to parry the question. Several Negroes and Mexican-Americans in the audience hooted loudly.

Mr. Alexander insisted on an answer, and Mr. Wohl finally said that the top 10 salaries—all paid to "Anglos"—ranged from about $35,000 to a high of $120,000.

Summing up to the press after the hearing, Mr. Alexander said industry needed to reach into minority communities for employes as eagerly as it reaches into Anglo communities.

"The way it is done now, it is word of mouth," he said. "Word goes to the segregated church, to the segregated country

XUM

club, to segregated friends. But word doesn't get out to the minorities."

[From the New York Times, May 15, 1969]

JOBS OFFICIAL ATTACKS UTILITIES FOR RECORD ON DISCRIMINATION—BROWN, A REPUBLICAN, USES STYLE OF ALEXANDER, HIS DEMOCRATIC PREDECESSOR

(By Roy Reed)

WASHINGTON, May 15.—William H. Brown 3d, the new Republican chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, attacked job discrimination today.

Addressing a group of electric utilities leaders in Denver, Mr. Brown characterized the electric power industry as "one of the poorest performers" in abolishing discrimination against minorities and women.

He said that reports submitted to the commission this year from 115 members of the Edison Electric Institute, the sponsor of the Denver meeting, showed "continuing failure" of the electric power industry to comply with the antidiscrimination laws.

DATA ON NEGROES GIVEN

He said that Negroes held only 4.8 per cent of all jobs in the 115 companies, only 2.8 per cent of white-collar jobs and less than half of 1 per cent of the managerial and professional jobs.

"While fully one-fourth of the companies' laborers are black," he said, "less than 2 per cent of craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers are black."

Mr. Brown cited a similar pattern in the utilities' employment of women and Spanish-surnamed Americans, and concluded: "It is quite obvious from this recital of statistics that in the aggregate, your industry is one of the poorest performers in the field of minority and female employment."

"You cannot in all conscience continue to attend such meetings as this and then return to your offices to do what amounts to nothing," he told the members of the institute, an association of the major electrical companies.

WARNED A YEAR AGO

He said the industry had been warned a year ago that the utilities might be required to comply with the 1964 Civil Rights Act through "the time-consuming compliance process"—referral to the Justice Department for legal action—if they did not progress voluntarily.

"I do not mean to threaten—and the commission presently lacks real enforcement power—but do want to make a simple statement of fact: We have seen in the intervening year what must have been more motion than action, by most of you, and I am not disposed to see another such year go by."

The text of Mr. Brown's speech was made available in Washington by his office.

Mr. Brown was confirmed as chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission by the Senate earlier this month in spite of opposition by Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen of Illinois, the Republican Senate leader.

Mr. Dirksen had criticized Mr. Brown's predecessor, Clifford L. Alexander Jr., for what he called "harassment of businessmen." He had expressed an initial fear that Mr. Brown might perform the same way.

VIGOROUS FIGHT PROMISED

Mr. Brown had declared on the day of his confirmation that he intended to fight discrimination just as vigorously as Mr. Alexander had.

In a related matter, the former Democratic head of the Rights Division, Stephen J. Pollak, now a Washington lawyer, called today for stronger laws and enforcement to fight job discrimination.

In a speech to the American Civil Liberties Union of Eastern Missouri at St. Louis, a copy of which was made available here today, Mr. Pollak said enforcement of the laws against job discrimination needed to be robust enough to convince businessmen and labor leaders that they risked lawsuits and loss of contracts if they continued to discriminate.

He said the Attorney General must have "the will and the resources to bring suit where he believes there is a pattern or practice of employment discrimination."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 2, 1969]

UNITED STATES ACCUSED OF SUBSIDIZING BIAS IN HIRING

(By Frank C. Porter)

The U.S. Civil Rights Commission accused the Federal Government yesterday of subsidizing race discrimination in jobs.

The charge accompanied the Commission's release of Brookings Institution report calling for a crackdown on Federal contractors whose hiring practices reflect racial discrimination.

The report also recommended transfer of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance (OFCC) from the Department of Labor to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC).

It was sharply critical of some Labor Department agencies. In particular, it charged that "the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training offers a clear illustration of an old line agency that has been slow to move on the equal opportunity front."

It took to task the Department's U.S. Employment Service and its state-level partners for an orientation that "too often remains that of serving the employer rather than the client." Many state employment services "lack a vigorous equal employment opportunity stance and a record which corresponds," the report said.

Author of the report, "Jobs and Civil Rights," was Richard P. Nathan, who subsequently became Assistant Director of the Budget Bureau for Human Resources Programs.

The Civil Rights Commission stressed that the study was prepared prior "to the problems and criticisms which have beset the (contract compliance) program in recent months."

Among these problems and criticisms was the oral agreement negotiated by Deputy Defense Secretary David Packard and three major textile suppliers after OFCC and the Defense Department's compliance officers found the firms in violation of the presidential order against job discrimination by Government contractors.

Labor Secretary George P. Shultz, under whom OFCC operates, drew further criticism from those who felt sanctions should be imposed until the companies complied. He backed Packard. "Intensive mediation," Shultz said, is a much more effective means for opening up jobs for minority groups than suspending contracts.

The Nathan report issued yesterday disagrees. "The key is political," it said. "Our conclusion is that more determined application of sanctions under (the presidential order) is imperative if this program is to be effective and respected as such."

The Brookings report was accompanied by a letter in which Howard A. Glickstein, acting staff director, wrote: "In the Commission's view, enforcement of the Executive Order has been seriously deficient, at high cost to the Federal civil rights effort.

"It is the judgment of the Commission that by continuing to contract with employers who practice discrimination, the Federal Government not only fails to use a powerful, readily available mechanism (contract cancellation) to help end discrimination in private employment, but in addition spends public funds actually to subsidize such discrimination."

The Commission is an independent, bipartisan agency created by Congress in 1957. It is headed by the Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame University.

OFCC is charged with coordinating and supervising contract compliance programs within all Federal agencies. EEOC's mission is to seek compliance with the 1964 Civil Rights Act's provisions against job discrimination in private employment.

Nathan, who headed pre-Inauguration Nixon task forces on public welfare and inter-governmental fiscal relations, said merger of OFCC into EEOC would end duplication and overlap of functions, provide stronger links between equal job enforcement and manpower programs and strengthen the Government's position in withdrawal of contracts of employers not in compliance with fair employment standards.

Asked for President Nixon's reaction to the report, White House Press Secretary Ronald L. Ziegler said that the President wants more forceful enforcement of the civil rights law and that the Administration is studying ways to strengthen EEOC.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 12, 1969]

THE PENTAGON DISPENSES SOUTHERN COMFORT

One of the more mystifying episodes of the past several weeks has concerned a verbal agreement reached between the Deputy Secretary of Defense, David Packard, and the representatives of three Southern textile firms—J. P. Stevens, Burlington Mills and Dan River Mills. The employment policies of all three firms had been under investigation and review by the Pentagon and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance for over a year owing to well substantiated charges that they were racially discriminatory; and all three firms had been so unyielding to Government efforts to bring them anywhere near compliance with the guidelines for Federal contractors that neither the Pentagon's own investigators nor the OFCC would recommend that contracts with them be approved.

Early in February, however, Mr. Packard awarded the three offending firms $9.4 million in Federal contracts, asserting that he had received assurances that they would put "affirmative action plans" into practice. Ordinarily, and by provision of an Executive Order, such assurances would have been put in writing. However, no one but Mr. Packard and the textile firms' representative seems to know of what these assurances or "plans" consist. They were not committed to paper or shared with officials at the OFCC or elsewhere in the Department of Labor who were involved in the cases and who have a clear responsibility for their outcome. Indeed, more than a month after the contracts have been awarded and despite the OFCC's effort to find out more about them, the most that could be learned was that the firms had assured Mr. Packard that they would try to meet the Government's standards.

There are a couple of things that ought to be said by way of providing some background and perspective on all this. One is that Mr. Packard's own reputation in this field appears to be good, as is that of the firms for which he was responsible in private life. The other is that contract cut-off or denial has been anything but standard operating procedure in these tangled matters—the custom has been to threaten it or delay the award until the Government's racial requirements were met. But when you have said this, you have pretty well exhausted what assurance or extenuation is to be found in Mr. Packard's odd act.

The dangers inherent in what he has done are more readily apparent. The Southern textile cases had been building for a long time. They were ripening for a big decision and had acquired the status of test cases, being widely watched in the South and elsewhere for evidence of Washington's seriousness on the question of contract compliance. Now whatever meaning they had in that regard has been spent. Moreover, weak as the Government apparatus for assuring compliance had been, there is little question that it has been drastically further weakened by the exclusion of the OFCC—presumably the maker and judge of compliance policy—from the deliberations between Mr. Packard and the spokesmen for the mills.

Finally, there is the matter of example and direction. In the South, and especially in the areas of greatest recalcitrance, Federal guidelines and official statements about them are read with excruciating, comma-picking care, there is a kind of stock market effect at work, whereby the most minute evidence of loss of resolve in Washington is registered at once in declining cooperation on the part of those companies or school districts or local governments still holding out. Reportedly, right on the heels of Mr. Packard's decision, inquiries did start coming in—from other Government agencies as well as from private concerns—as to whether this did not mean new and relaxed procedures were now in effect.

By May 1, the Southern textile firms in question will be obliged to issue a quarterly report on their progress in meeting Government requirements. Customarily, the Pentagon would issue instructions as to what it wished answered in that report. This routine procedure offers an opportunity to retrieve the situation somewhat: a public and specific list of what the Federal Government expects to hear about in that report would have the effect, retroactively to be sure, of establishing the compliance terms the mills are expected to meet. Nor would it be a bad idea to issue such a public declaration before the end of March, since additional contracts are scheduled for award by then and some are expected to go to the same three firms. The Administration, via the Pentagon and the Labor Department, should be trying to strengthen the compliance program, not weaken it. They will have the most cause for regret if they open a Pandora's box of resistance and regression.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Sentinel, Apr. 19, 1969]

Bias Is Charged in Civil Service

(By Ethel L. Payne)

WASHINGTON.—Clifford L. Alexander Jr., outgoing chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, charged the U.S. Civil Service Commission with gross discriminatory practices within its own agency and called for taking away its equal employment responsibility and placing it in EEOC. At present, the Commission is empowered to deal only with discrimination in the private sector of employment.

Alexander made his remarks at the Eighth Annual Business Week Luncheon of Alpha Gamma chapter of the Iota Phi Lambda sorority last Saturday in the Hotel America honoring Mrs. Ruby C. Martin, former director of the Office of Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and Mrs. Etta Horn, chairman of the City-Wide Welfare Alliance.

Under Sec. 103 of Executive Order 1142, issued in 1965, the Civil Service Commission has the duty to supervise equal employment opportunity within the federal government. Recently, President Nixon issued a new directive to heads of all agencies re-emphasizing his desire for carrying out the policy of equal opportunity.

Significantly, he did not make any reference to private industry or the work of EEOC. There are 2,800,000 employees under Federal Civil Service.

THE FIGURES

In the Civil Service Agency headquarters, Alexander cited these figures:

GS-18—6 (no blacks).
GS-17—8 (no blacks).
GS-16—29 (no blacks).

This means that of the 43 super grades in the agency there are no blacks or other minorities. In GS-15 of 115 employees, four are blacks. The responsibility for carrying out the provisions of the executive order for the entire Federal Government lies with one GS-15 who has a staff of one. Alexander said the Commission is giving only the barest token attention to the problem. This can be changed by executive order.

"I am in favor of administrative neatness in equal employment," said Alexander.

In contrast to the poor record of the Civil Service Commission, Alexander said his agency, EEOC, has one GS-17 black of two in this category; GS-16—7 blacks and GS-15 of 26, eight are blacks.

"Of course, we are a much smaller agency than the Civil Service Commission," said Alexander, "but this is all the more reason why the Commission which has the responsibility for supervising fair employment ought to set the best example."

POLITICAL CLEARINGHOUSE

Alexander charged that the Civil Service Commission has become a political clearinghouse for the Nixon Administration to reward friends, and said that either it should set absolute standards to apply fairly to blacks, Spanish sur-named people, Orientals and women or else get out of the business. He said that he had personally sent over the résumés of four blacks in career status who are qualified for promotion to GS-17 four months ago, and these have been languishing on the desk ever since.

Alexander criticized testing methods as devised by the bureaucrats in the Civil Service Commission as grossly unfair to minorities. They are geared entirely to paper qualifications with emphasis on college education.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 24, 1969]

Finch Sees Easing of Integration Drive

(By Shirley Elder)

The Nixon administration seeking a more "sophisticated approach," plans to ease up on the drive to compel school and hospital desegregation under the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Robert H. Finch told a House Appropriations subcommittee the government's past efforts to carry out the law's command resulted in a "numbers game" that fails to reflect honest intentions to obey.

"They (government agents) came in with percentages that really did not explain the whole problem," Finch said. "I think in many early cases decisions were based on very limited and totally statistical data that didn't really tell whether a particular district was really trying to comply."

A record of the budget hearings conducted in March and April was released today.

In approaching the problem differently, Finch said, he hopes to work more closely with the states, rather than fighting for racial balance district by district.

"I do not think we have involved the state superintendents and state governing bodies to the extent we should," Finch said. "We can keep the heat on, but we need some help to accomplish what Congress intended in 1964. . . .

"There are a lot of buttons we can push. We do not have to go in with an ax; we can and should use a scalpel and work with the leadership of the community."

Finch said he was asking Congress for only seven more staff members in the civil rights compliance division of HEW. Added to the present staff, he said, this would enable HEW to investigate one-fourth of the cases listed with "possibly serious compliance problems."

Of 1,165 Southern schools that might be violating the law, Finch said, only 575 will be reviewed. However, all colleges will be checked out.

Of 4,000 hospitals and 5,000 nursing homes possibly in violation, he said 1,000 and 600, respectively, will be studied.

"I am convinced, particularly in the South, there is a bona fide effort on the part of almost all districts to comply," he said. "Our trickier and tougher areas are in the North and West."

As of March 1, HEW had begun a noticable shift in emphasis away from Southern school districts.

According to HEW figures, 64 members of the compliance staff were assigned to the North and 51 to the South. Last October, there were 32 in the North and 67 in the South.

OTHER TOPICS DISCUSSED

Among other subjects discussed in the wide-ranging hearings were the threatened freeze on the number of welfare recipients, campus unrest, and what to do about far-flung agents of the secretary, who are posted in regional offices.

On welfare, Finch said he hopes Congress will lift the freeze for another year. The Senate already had voted to suspend it altogether. If the House fails to act, the restriction, cutting welfare case loads back to Jan. 1, 1967, levels, will go into effect.

On campus disorders, Finch said he has alerted college officials to the law requiring revocation of federal grants to students convicted in disturbances.

On regional directors, Finch said he hopes to make these posts political appointments instead of civil service to assure greater loyalty to Washington.

NO JUURISDICTION CHARGED

The Justice Department yesterday asked a federal court to dismiss suits challenging defense contracts to three textile mills that had failed to comply with equal job opportunity standards.

In motions filed in U.S. District Court here, Justice contended the court lacked jurisdiction on the complaint brought by the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund. It also said the fund had failed to exhaust other remedies before bringing the suit.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Afro-American, July 15, 1969]

Wilkins Speaks

(By Roy Wilkins)

To help them properly appreciate the Fourth of July, colored Americans were told by their government July 3 that the federal school desegregation requirements were "too rigid" and "too inequitable."

But to the puzzlement of everyone the government maintained vehemently that it was not changing policy. With this kind of inexorable tread, the nation enters another crisis involving white and black citizens and the relationship of the latter to the government of the United States.

Whenever we come to a crunch period in race relations, those who are not in direct, face-to-face conflict with blacks usually sanction the control ideas of the whites on the racial fear and the racial aggrandizement battle lines.

Today, five years after the enactment of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, those far above the border clashes are seeking to ease the provisions of that act. They are not disowning it. No, indeed. Instead, they insist, they are "enforcing" it, but with interpretive variations.

Nearly every newspaper called the government action on enforcement of the 1954 Supreme Court decision a "scrapping" of the already mild rules. The remaining school districts which, by hook or crook, defied all pleas to comply, need not concern themselves with deadlines.

There need be no alarm, no scurrying about, no contrived tales. The heat is off. Talk vaguely about administrative and educational problems and the district has it made. The "white" schools will continue to get the cream off the federal monies and the black schools the left-over skimmed milk. No change in the generations-old formula. Just a "more efficient" administration of it.

PACKAGE OF JOY

Not satisfied with its July 4 package of joy on public education, the Nixon Administration is "re-structuring" the provision of reinforcing the Civil Rights Act's equal employment opportunities commission. Through Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, it condemned in sonorous tones the "harassment" of businessmen to get them to employ colored workers. Reaction was sharp.

Seeking to erase the unflattering Dirksen image, the Department of Labor announced that a formula for hiring minority group workers must be followed if employers want government contracts. No less a commentator than Barron's, the financial weekly, let out a roar of editorial objection. Barron's wound up joining the late Dwight D. Eisenhower in his celebrated "minds and hearts of men" judgment. Such matters, said the Barron's editorial, are best left to "example, persuasion and goodwill."

We shall see what we shall see. Will the government back down on its formula for black jobs and return to the Dirksen harassment thesis, just as it has backed down on school desegregation?

The government statisticians know that jobs for blacks in the building trades, despite policy statements from high labor officials, are simply not there. They know the equal employment commission does not have enforcement powers. They recall a 100 per cent failure of 300 blacks by a union oral examining committee after all 300 had passed written tests.

UNCHANGING JOB RATE

The government knows that the unchanging high unemployment rate among colored people is revealed each month by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The affected blacks may not be able to evaluate statistics, but they know they are jobless. Moreover without a degree, they can recognize an all-white skilled work force a half mile away.

If no redeeming steps are taken to enforce the law on discrimination in the schools and on deprivation on the job front, a real crisis will be upon the nation. It will be on the loss of faith in the perception and impartiality of organized government.

Tragically in 1969, it will revive the tradition of leaders doing the bidding, in a crisis, of the racially-biased camp followers.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Afro-American, July 15, 1969]

To Be Equal: Attack on Foundations Part of Backlash Movement

(By Whitney M. Young, Jr.)

At this time, when we hear so much about how important it is for the private sector to become involved in voluntary efforts, a major attack has been launched on organizations doing just that.

Proposed changes in the tax laws include provisions that could just about wipe out any meaningful work for social progress by foundations.

The proposals include: a five percent tax on foundation income, a ban on voter education programs, and a ban on attempts to influence government decisions. There are others too, but these are the most damaging.

The proposed tax on income would yield only about $60 million and probably cost more to collect than it would bring in. But schools, hospitals, and other beneficiaries of foundation grants would feel the pinch. And the government would probably have to spend even more money to take up the slack caused by reduced foundation support of such institutions.

The ban on voter education drives is totally unjustified. The creation of informed electorate and the education of citizens to get them to register and vote is something the government itself should be doing. Instead, its been left to foundations to support such projects.

A democracy can only survive if its citizens take an active interest in political questions and vote. Stopping the foundations from such activities can only increase voter apathy and non-participation. And it might even lead some to believe that social change can't be accomplished by the ballot.

INFLUENCING FEAR

Preventing foundations from "influencing government decisions" is also ridiculous. It's so vague that it can be interpreted to mean that a foundation couldn't sponsor a meeting on a social problem, for fear that a government official may attend and be "influenced."

Internal Revenue regulations already on the books stop foundations from lobbying openly or giving their support to those whose major efforts are overtly political. Simple enforcement of these is enough to stop whatever abuses exist.

Other abuses, such as creation of private foundation as a tax dodge for the wealthly can easily be handled by whatever law or regulation is required. And the foundations themselves have proposed that a new office be set up to regulate such activity.

But if the new law isn't aimed at the minor abuses that may exist by some fringe foundations, why has it been proposed?

It appears to be a politically inspired effort to punish foundations for their newly discovered interest in racial and urban problems.

Several foundations have pioneered in voter registration drives among rights groups and others interested in making democracy work.

COUNTRY LOSER

So the word has gone out among the backlashers: Punish the foundations. But the real loser is the country.

The major contributions foundations have made is to support new ideas and programs; the kinds of things, especially governments, have been unwilling to take a chance on. Without foundations, there might never have been public libraries, teacher pensions, better health facilities, cures for malaria and other diseases, or educational television.

While black people were being firehosed and beaten in the South, and while the government was wringing its hands trying to figure out what was to be done, foundations were tooling up to tackle the major problems affecting black people.

If some foundations are abusing their tax-exempt status, regulate them. But don't punish all foundations by short-sighted punitive steps that can only result in great harm to the vitally important role they play in our national life.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 10, 1969]

Racism Held Peril to Mental Health

Bal Harbour, Fla., May 9.—An unpublished task force report of a national commission has asserted that racism threatens the mental health of every child in America.

This finding was not included in the final report of the Joint Commission on the Mental Health of Children, released here Monday during the annual meeting of the American Psychiatric Association.

Its elimination from the Commission's final report prompted the resignation of three of the 14 task force members. But two of them agreed to rejoin the task force on minority group children when the Commission promised to publish its report sometime in the future.

The task force found "racism the No. 1 health problem facing America." It used the higher-than-normal rates of infant mortality, mental retardation, complications of pregnancy, and mental illness among minority groups to bolster its conclusions.

But Dr. Reginald Lourie, president of the Joint Commission, said his staff disagreed with the task force's major conclusion on racism. He added that the task force is "completely entitled" to have its report made public. He did not say, however, if it will be presented to Congress next month along with the Joint Commission's own report.

The Joint Commission has called for a $6-billion to $10-billion-a-year attack on mental illness in children during the formative first three years of life. The minority group task force calls for increased spending and improvement in existing programs, but concentrated on an elimination of racism as the first step in improving mental health.

"The conscious and unconscious attitudes of superiority which permit and demand that a majority oppress a minority are a clear and present danger to the mental health of all children and their parents," the task force report said.

"We can no longer afford the feelings of guilt, fear, anxiety, and the other crippling emotions that affect both sides in a national atmosphere of hostility and aggression evoked by racial tension."

As an example, Dr. Frederick Solomon said in the report that ghetto children "are plagued by nightmares of rats and insects crawling on them." These nightmares "can be truly handicapping to a developing personality," the Washington psychiatrist said.

The member who resigned and refused to rejoin the task force, Dr. Chester M. Pierce, yesterday was named Chairman of the Black Caucus of the American Psychiatric Association, which has also called racism the Nation's major mental health problem.

Another of the task force members is Mrs. Fred R. Harris, the wife of the Oklahoma Senator.

The task force found the family "a principal contributing factor to the mental health" of minority group children. "The strength and love of the Negro mother is virtually a legend in our culture," the task force said.

It recommended the formation of "The National Council Against Racism" to act as a clearinghouse for effective racism-reducing programs and to gather statistical information on minority groups.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 4, 1969]

Pentagon Hiring Bias Startles Congressmen

(By Carl T. Rowan)

A few weeks ago I wrote that the Defense Department, the largest employer in the nation and the biggest spender of the public's money, is also the biggest racial discriminator in employment.

I didn't know how bad things really were.

But thanks to Reps. Gus Hawkins and Glenn M. Anderson, both California Democrats, the Defense Department has come up with some facts that Anderson's office calls "hard to believe."

Referring to my earlier column, Anderson asked Defense Secretary Melvin Laird just how many civilian "policymaking" jobs De-

XUM

fense has and precisely how many such posts are filled by black Americans.

Roger T. Kelley responded for Laird. He said that as for "super-grade" positions (GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18—not to mention executive level jobs), the Army has 136, not one of which is filled by a Negro. The Navy has 88 such posts, with one black GS–17. The Air Force has 96 super-grade posts, none of which is filled by a Negro American. The office of the Secretary of Defense and the defense agencies have 203 super-grade slots. Two are filled by black men.

So of a total of 523 super-grades in the military complex, only three Negroes are employed, and two of them are in "civil rights" jobs.

None can really be called a policy-maker. Of 48 executive positions, none is held by a Negro.

Yet, Kelley wrote on behalf of Laird: "Please accept our assurance that affirmative action, to assure equal employment opportunity at all levels within this department, is a matter of first priority."

And with that Kelley sent the two congressmen mimeographed copies of Laird's "equal employment" directive that no one seems to take very seriously.

I must point out, however, that Laird and President Nixon are not solely responsible for the appalling employment picture at Defense. It was just as pathetic during the tenures of Clark Clifford and Lyndon Johnson, of Robert McNamara and John F. Kennedy. It seems no one has ever had the guts or the inclination to do anything about it.

After my earlier column there was a lot of hand-wringing in the Pentagon, but not over the question of who was going to take steps to at least create a pretense of fair hiring policy. The hand-wringing arose from a fear that what I had written would be mailed to black GIs in Vietnam, Thailand, and Korea and intensify the racial unrest that has been building among our troops in the Far East.

The Pentagon has tried to keep this seething racial discontent from the public, but some of the facts have leaked out in recent weeks.

The truth is that more and more black troops feel that they are getting the dirtiest, most dangerous jobs, are being wounded and killed in numbers larger than their proportion of our fighting force in Vietnam, yet they have a harder time getting a promotion in the military or a fair chance once they return to civilian life.

Some of the 300,000 black men in the military are clearly in a mood to rebel.

This column has never advocated anything other than that young men of all races face up to and discharge the responsibilities of citizenship, onerous though they become on occasion.

But nothing encourages a "hell no, we won't go" attitude on the part of young blacks more than knowledge of the kind of civilian hiring policy the Defense Department is following.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 20, 1969]

Equality Is Called Mostly Talk in Federal Jobs

(By William Raspberry)

The past two columns in this space have dealt with weaknesses of the Federal Government's equal employment opportunity program, based on a 13-page memo from the former chairman of the Justice Department's Community Relations Service.

The thrust of the memo is that equal opportunity has been a good deal more talk than action, that blacks are still concentrated in the lower civil service grades and that many government executives have either not understood or only half-heartedly supported equal opportunity goals.

But the memo also offered some suggestions for change.

"If Federal administrators and managers can agree that career development training for Government employes is a general problem, they should see also that the problem is greatly magnified and much more serious for minority employes," the memo said.

"When minorities reach the upper echelons of their particular job categories as clerks, typists, messengers, etc., there are no significant means for those with ability and desire to enter other areas leading to rewarding careers.

"For those who wish to pursue greater self-development, the Federal Government should be the catalyst. There should be aggressive, on-going training programs for improving morale, promoting self-help and productivity and good citizenship generally."

The memo notes that the Government's Career Development System does provide for executive training (grades GS–16 to 18) and some mid-career training (GS–12 to 15), but charges that there are only spotty training opportunities for the lower grades where minority members are concentrated.

(Approximately 78 per cent of all Negroes in General Schedule jobs are in grades GS–1 to 4.)

Aside from training programs, the memo calls for the hiring of more Negroes in policy-making jobs as "essential to any serious effort" to increase the quantity and quality of Negro assignments.

Then it makes this interesting point:

"Early in the Kennedy Administration, it was the practice to bring well-qualified blacks into Federal employment in staff rather than in line jobs . . . At least half of the blacks that came into the Government at GS–12 and above during these years came in as special or staff assistants.

"Whether inadvertent or not, the placement of blacks in staff positions tended to perpetuate black dependency inside the Government. The ability of the black staff man to influence policy depended almost entirely on his ability to have access to and to persuade his principal . . . His ability to influence the placement of black employes in programs with which he was connected was almost nil."

The memo proposes that if these "talented blacks" are qualified to be special assistants at GS–12 and above, they are also qualified to run programs. And if they are in supervisory positions, the presumption is that they will be "more sensitive to the need for black talent and better able to find it."

But is the talent there? The framers of the memo answer was an emphatic yes.

"The fact is the responsible people are not really looking for opportunities for minorities," they charge. "It is interesting to note that white academicians from big schools or lawyers from prestigious firms are presumed able to perform in a fantastic variety of posts while specific background for the task seems irrelevant.

"The blacks who have attained high posts for the most part are not the result of any exhaustive talent search. Someone with the power of decision wanted a certain man in a certain post and put him there. The backgrounds have been varied, the performances superb."

One other point made in the memo is that many blacks who feel they have been discriminated against in assignments and promotions are reluctant to file formal charges because they have little faith in the civil service grievance system.

The suggestion was that the Civil Service Commission end the practice of having agencies investigate themselves and instead place both the initial grievance and the appeals process outside the employing agency.

The memo, written under the supervision of former CRS Chairman Roger Wilkins, is the work of seven Negro employes of several agencies who run the gamut from an assistant secretary to a chauffeur.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch]

Cites Ratio of Negro Collegians

(By William K. Wyant, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, May 17.—A higher education survey made public today shows that in 80 predominantly white state universities less than two in every 100 students are American Negroes.

The study, called "State Universities and Black Americans," was a joint effort of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, the Southern Education Reporting Service and the Southern Education Foundation.

"There is a widespread assumption, sometimes spread by press accounts of campus disorders, that a massive wave of black students is having a malevolent effect on higher education," the report says in a summary.

"That assumption is not borne out of this study. It is apparently wrong on two counts: The 'wave' is more like a ripple, and the effect, though often unsettling, is more salutary than sinister."

In the 80 predominantly white state institutions, it is pointed out less than one of every 100 graduates and faculty members are American Negroes. The black proportion of the United States population is given as about 11 per cent.

MORE FOREIGN STUDENTS

The report indicates that there were more foreign students at American colleges and universities last year than American Negroes. A majority of this country's black college students are still in institutions formerly all-Negro.

Basis for the survey was a questionnaire mailed out last November to the 100 member institutions of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. All 100 made reply, and 98 provided information on enrollments in the fall of 1968.

The 80 predominantly white institutions, including those in Southern and border states, had 23,630 Negroes (1.93 per cent) in a total undergraduate enrollment of 1,222,382. They had 6,149 Negroes (1.91 per cent) among 322,069 students in all graduate and professional schools.

For 17 originally all-Negro state universities and Land Grant colleges in 16 Southern and border states, total enrollments were 44,803 for undergraduates and 3,576 for graduate students. Their non-Negro enrollments were 1,993 (4.4 per cent) and 236 (6.6 per cent) respectively.

Separate figures were also given for 28 predominantly white state universities and land-grant colleges in 17 Southern and border states, including Missouri.

The 28 southern-border institutions showed 6,004 Negroes (1.76 per cent) in a total undergraduate enrollment of 398,249 in graduate schools. There were 1,552 Negroes (1.69 per cent) in a total enrollment of 10,732.

MISSOURI UNIVERSITY CITED

At the University of Missouri, the report indicated 750 full-time Negro undergraduates in a total of 28,794 and 200 graduate students in a total of 8,151.

Citing previous surveys made by others, the state university report says the proportion of Negroes in private institutions of higher learning is slightly higher than in the case of state colleges and universities, but the number of Negroes enrolled in public institutions is almost five times as great.

The report has 96 pages. It includes articles on Federal City College in Washington, Rutgers University, the University of California at Los Angeles, Wayne State University and Indiana University.

"In the past two or three years," the report says, "many institutions of higher learning have begun to increase educational opportunities for black Americans. The

XUM

statistics . . . indicate that almost half of the Negroes in predominantly white state universities are freshmen."

CIVIL RIGHTS

(Mr. STOKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleague, Mr. WILLIAM "BILL" CLAY, in his remarks regarding this important subject. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, I, along with many other Americans, had the breathtaking experience of personally witnessing the historic launching of Apollo 11. As an American, I, too, shared the exhilaration which raced through the hearts of all others as the sky burst open in a cloud of fire and Apollo 11 was launched.

The events of the next few days established our Nation as the world leader in scientific and technological advancement. This Nation, by placing man on the moon had conquered space, a feat never before achieved.

It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that the first step on the moon represented the step that divided history. Therein the sands of time will record for posterity man's greatest achievement.

It is now—while we are jubilant, while we exalt in this step that for a moment made time stand still—that we ought to take time to reexamine our claim of greatness.

Mr. Speaker, in the short span of 10 years, this Nation set as its goal to send a man to the moon and bring him back safely again. In pursuit of this goal, we spared neither manpower nor finances. This Nation utilized all of its great resources in a collective venture which culminated in a successful bridging of the 238,000 mile gap between earth and the moon.

Now as we stand at the center of stage and take our bows, can we, on a day like this, continue to forget about those Americans who stand offstage—those who have never heard the plaudits of the crowd?

Today is a good day for us to reexamine our national priorities, to evaluate the posture of the President of the United States and the goals which he has set for people here on earth.

As Apollo started its historic trek to the moon, all of us recalled the commitment made by this Nation at the call of our late President, John F. Kennedy, in 1961. How, Mr. Speaker, for instance, does this Nation justify sending a man to the moon while we are still studying hunger. Just think of the difficulty we have had just discovering hunger—not on another planet—but right here in America.

Sharing equal time with our achievement in space is our underachievement on earth—our joblessness, homelessness, poverty, ignorance, blight, pollution, racism, discrimination, and a myriad of unsolved domestic problems which make life on earth miserable for many Americans. Let us examine whether goals have been set by our President to eradicate these ills from our society. Let us see what goal or goals he has set to commit this Nation to its unfulfilled promise of equality of opportunity for every American regardless of race, creed, or previous condition of servitude.

Numerous blemishes are discernible when one reviews the administration's 6-month record on civil rights. Some are readily apparent, like the absence of nonwhites from the Cabinet, the shabby treatment of former Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Chairman Alexander, or the easing of the school desegregation deadlines. Others, such as the early abandonment of the war on hunger, the budget cuts in the aid to education program, the failure to fight against similar slashes in low-income housing programs, and the unwavering devotion to military spending were only slightly less obvious. I have spoken out on many of these subjects previously. Today, however, I would like to review two particular instances when the administration not only managed to perform a disservice to the cause of a united America, but actually attempted to convince the country that they were striking a blow in behalf of that goal. I refer to Mr. Nixon's failure to request an extension of the 1965 voting rights bill and his earlier emasculation of the Job Corps program.

Everyone in this Chamber knows why the Voting Rights Bill of 1965 was passed. It is no secret, and I see no reason to resurrect the infinite numbers of incidents of bigotry and cruelty which finally convinced the Congress that black American citizens in the South were systematically being denied the primary right of their citizenship. On June 26, however, Attorney General John Mitchell announced on behalf of the administration that this law had outlived its usefulness and recommended that Congress allow it to lapse in August of next year. His reasons—and I attempt to state them as objectively as possible—were—

First, that the 1965 law is "regional legislation" and that voting rights was a national problem;

Second, that the substitute bill be proposed would "strengthen and extend existing coverage in order to protect voting rights in all parts of the Nation"; and,

Third, that the old law had achieved its objectives since more than 50 percent of the eligible black voters were registered in every Southern State.

I have studied the Attorney General's reasons, Mr. Speaker, and have found them not to be persuasive. Let us examine them in the order in which they were stated.

The "regional legislation" argument is absolutely ridiculous, first, because the law does indeed apply to the whole country. While only two counties outside the Deep South have, thus far, been affected, all jurisdictions are theoretically subject to its requirements. More importantly, however, it conveniently overlooks the fact that much of the legislation passed by this body can be termed "regional" by Mr. Mitchell's definition—that is, predominately affecting only certain States. Are the oil depletion allowances and import controls aimed at the New England or Pacific Northwest States? Or the cotton subsidies for the Midwest? Hardly. Our complex set of fishing laws have little direct impact between the coasts, yet no one, to my knowledge, has indicated that these are in any way unfair. How about the plethora of public works bills we pass every session? The point is, Mr. Speaker, that very often the Congress is viewing only a particular part of the Nation when it adopts a law. There is nothing whatsoever wrong with this, because obviously any problem should and can be solved where, and only where, it exists. Moreover, just as the cotton subsidy program, the fishing laws, or a new dam are only directly concerned with a given number of States, they are nevertheless important to consumers all across the country. And if we can admit this, it seems no logical jump at all to say that the denial of the right to vote to any American is of nationwide importance in our supposed democracy.

Mr. Mitchell's second argument, that stronger national laws are needed against literacy tests and State residency laws, is no argument at all. One can only respond, "Wonderful, I am all for it, but what does this have to do with discrimination practices in the South?" I have urged several times during the past year that legislation encompassing these points be enacted, and would be more than happy to support an administration bill of this nature. I cannot, however, perceive how the need for one kind of legislation in any way vitiates the need for another. The administration bill does not even purport to deal with racial discrimination other than that effected through the use of literacy tests. Therefore, it seems a bit incredible that it pretends to be a substitute for the 1965 law.

The administration's final reason for not recommending extension, that the need for the law has ceased to exist, would be a persuasive one if it were only true. Unhappily, it is not. While we all share the Attorney General's enthusiasm about the 800,000 Negroes registered to vote in the seven States to which the law has primarily applied, it nevertheless seems a bit naive to stop the investigation at the statistical level and not explore the substance of what is currently happening in the South.

I would like to refer to a report compiled by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights concerning irregularities in municipal elections in the State of Mississippi. The report delineates the numerous problems which the black voters faced when attempting to participate in those elections. Many did not register because of bombing threats. Others could not because of intentionally shortened registration hours or deceptive practices which gave the voters the impression they were registering when they were not. Many potential black candidates were purposely given false information on how to file. On election day, black poll watchers were not allowed near the polling places, the token number of black election officials were not permitted to assist the blind or the handicapped, and white election officials attempted to influence illiterates not to vote for black candidates. In one town, an armed deputy harassed black citizens until many

XUM

gave up without voting. The report summarized the day in this way:

> Most of the Black candidates interviewed, regardless of whether they won or lost and regardless of whether they believed the election has been fair, believed that there would not have been as fair an election had it not been for the presence of Federal Observers and the presence of numerous lawyers and others serving as poll watchers. Although there were criticisms of the manner in which the Federal Observers carried out their duties, not one Black candidate in a county where Federal Observers were present believed the election would have been run in an honest manner were it not for the presence of these observers.

And when did this all-too-familiar parade of horrors occur? Not in 1965, 1966, or 1967, but on May 13, 1969. In fact, the Commission report to which I have alluded was issued on June 16, just 10 days before Mr. Mitchell indicated that all was now well in the Southland. In light of this kind of evidence, and there are stacks upon stacks more of a similar nature, I have a very difficult time understanding the Attorney General's rationale.

So why was this epitaph written for this vital legislation on such flimsy reasoning? That, Mr. Speaker, is the key question. Only two possibilities come to mind. Either the administration simply did not do its homework—which is very difficult to believe since Mr. Mitchell canceled five appearances before the Judiciary Committee spaning a 6-week period before showing up—or this was but another rebate by Mr. Nixon to Senator THURMOND and other participants in the southern strategy. If the latter is the case, and it indeed appears so, then the President has intentionally alined himself with the forces of reaction and bigotry, and deserves the shame of all of his countrymen who sincerely believe in the concept of equal rights for all Americans.

The earlier administration decision to shut down 59 of the 109 Job Corps centers, thus eliminating 17,000 slots from the program, was one which superficially, and to some degree actually, affected all youth without regard to color. Certainly, many of those turned out of the centers to return to lives of misery, ignorance, and property were white. But an analysis of the administration's stated rationale for ordering the cutbacks lends strong credence to those who have found racial overtones in this action.

To understand this, one must juxtapose the Job Corps concept of vocational preparedness with those of the other major Federal manpower programs to which the evicted and potential Job Corps trainees will henceforth be referred: Concentrated employment program—CEP—job opportunity in the business sector—JOBS—manpower development and training—MDTA—and the on-the-job training program—OJT. All of these projects have great merit, and are potentially vital steps toward achieving the goal of jobs for all who want them. All have some provision of counseling and other minor services as well as simple training. And all will receive funding increases in fiscal year 1970. For these reasons, the administration decided that the Job Corps could be sacrificed, and announced to the country that this was being done to promote efficiency in the Federal manpower effort.

But again, Mr. Speaker, the decision was either carelessly or malevolently conceived, and will operate to deprive many young people, especially urban blacks, of the only possible avenue of escape from a life of uselessness and destruction.

The Job Corps, as opposed to CEP, JOBS, MDTA, or OJT, is much more than a job training program. It is, as one writer has noted, "a human reclamation program." Some figures on the enrollees reflect the source of this title. Sixty-four percent of its enrollees are dropouts from schools. Over 60 percent are from broken homes. Almost 40 percent are from welfare families. Eighty percent had not seen a doctor or dentist in 10 years. And while they averaged 9 years of schooling, they read at a fifth-grade level. Many are blacks from our inner cities, and they bring 16 to 21 years of bitterness, resentment, and anger with them to the centers. They are the true outcasts from our educated, healthy, and affluent society—the harvest of decades of discrimination and neglect. Their recent backgrounds are replete with various forms of antisocial activity, and few have any real hope of ever changing that life style. They are, in sum, the youthful incorrigibles.

To combat these enormous difficulties, the Job Corps was instituted to provide not only job training, but physical rehabilitation, remedial education, and counseling services as well. All trainees are given round-the-clock attention and help by full-time staffs with great expertise in dealing with the enrollees' problems. Moreover, the urban trainees are physically removed from the mentally and spiritually dehibiliating environment of the central city. Thus, the Job Corps program has become our first attempt to virtually reconstruct the hardest-core unemployables into productive individuals—individuals who would not only be equipped with the mechanical skills of a trainee, but also with the equally essential attitudes and abilities to cope with the often alien world of punctuality, responsibility, and teamwork. Years of studies and research clearly dictated that this approach was the only one with possibilities of success. And the Job Corps has had pronounced success with these youngsters. Seventy percent of all trainees either got a job, entered military service or even went back to school. That to me is an outstanding record when one considers the incredible barriers which accompany the trainee to the center.

Why, then, Mr. Speaker, are we abandoning, or at least hamstringing, this program when every indication is that it is the only major Federal manpower program which can successfully reach the very toughest and most resentful segments of our society? Has Mr. Nixon just decided to forget the hate-filled youngsters of the ghettos? This I cannot believe. No, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid we have negligence and pride at work here, not outright bigotry or callousness. The President promised over and over again during the campaign that the Job Corps would be absolutely eliminated. He said it again on national television the night of November 4. And he did this, I believe, without having sufficient information of the kind I have offered above. By the time he took office, he apparently had different thoughts, for absolute elimination became a 35-percent cutback. In short, the President seems to have painted himself into a corner.

What I ask vis-a-vis the Job Corps program, therefore, is that the President swallow a bit of pride and once again examine the facts, looking not only at the cold, hard statistics, but also at the human needs of some of the desperate young people in the inner city. I think he will find that these needs cannot be solved by a 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. job, a hot lunch, an armful of junior high textbooks, and the rest of the day back in the grim caverns of the ghetto. Only a total rehumanization process like that offered exclusively by the Job Corps can rescue these men and women. Indeed, if the President does not choose to make this reexamination, I fear we must all be prepared to suffer the consequences of another generation of young people who have grown up completely antipathetic to all the ideals we hold to be of value.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if the first 6 months of this administration is any criteria of what the poor, the uneducated, and the black citizen of this Nation can expect, then an opportunity for greatness will have eluded this President. A nation which has set foot on the moon can no longer explain to the world why some Americans do not have shoes. A nation which now talks of building satellite stations in space can no longer explain to the world, why some Americans do not have a home to live in. A nation which can provide oxygen and water for men to live on on a planet where the gravitational change would occasion death within 3 minutes, can no longer explain why air and water remains polluted here on earth. A nation which possesses the engineering, scientific, and technological expertise to place a man on the moon can no longer explain why every American does not have an opportunity to be educated.

No, Mr. Speaker, our going to the moon did not settle for once and all time, the greatness of America. Our chance at greatness lies here on earth. One does not need months of laboratory testing to determine that our going to the moon points up our inadequacies on earth. Mr. Nixon, as leader of this Nation, the challenge is yours. How you answer it will, in a large measure, determine whether it is better to have gone to the moon or to have stayed on earth.

BLACK AMERICA IS GIVING UP ON NIXON

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues, Mr. STOKES and Mr.

CLAY in an examination of the Nixon administration 6 months from its inception. I must begin by noting that his promise to end the war, made during last year's campaign, is still unfulfilled.

Black Americans are deeply concerned about this war, not only because of the young men who fight and die there, but because of their relatives who suffer at home because we do not have the money so desperately needed for domestic programs. Black Americans voice grave concern about the United States continuing military, economic, and moral support of a repressive, dictatorial government in South Vietnam which has caused some to wonder whether similar tactics might be used in the United States. If this administration truly believes in freedom and democracy, it is doing a poor job of proving it, not only to black America, but to the world, by continuing its support of a foreign government which has shown little or no interest in freedom, justice, or democracy.

Black Americans continue to be greatly disturbed by the Nixon administration's seemingly endless efforts to appease the South—watering down the desegregation guidelines, the proposed dismantling of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the closing of Job Corps Centers that provided some small amount of training to ghetto youngsters, and a Small Business Administration that has moved so far away from any notion of developing black capitalism that even Republicans are demanding removal of its Administrator.

The Nixon administration has done little in positive terms to guarantee equality to black Americans, in fact, it has made some backward steps, notably the forced resignation of the former Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission who sought only to effectively point out the bias and racism which is still pervasive in private industry and government alike.

The latest Labor Department statistics tell the story all too clearly, the unemployment rate in the black urban poverty areas continues to rise, while the rate in white areas goes down. The quality of inner city schools deteriorates even more as Federal funds become more difficult to come by. Housing segregation worsens in every major city in America. The stockpile of hard-core unemployables mounts in a nation whose gross national product continues to rise. The urban crisis and the race problem have yet to command the attention of President Nixon and his administration. This administration studies and re-studies the problem of hunger in America while millions continue to starve.

Professor Robert Lekachman, in the June 1969 issue of Commentary, made the following statement which reflects the concerns of black America:

> Race and the cities: we cannot avoid as a nation the confrontation, which they impose upon us. As a people we have faltered before the choice of a full integrationist strategy designed to open white suburbs and white schools to black families and, in the inner-city ghettos, a strategy calculated to make life humanly tolerable and financially viable. Both approaches require very large quantities of resources for any hope of success, and although we all know by now that money alone does not resolve racial tensions deeply rooted in human prejudice and American history, we should be equally aware that these problems are highly unlikely to be ameliorated in the absence of a very large national commitment of public funds.

As for myself, any hope of reporting to black America that the Federal Government will move with more commitment or more speed to overcoming the inequality in this country is rapidly fading; and this point of view, I am sorry to note, is increasingly being shown across the country. The New Republic, July 12, 1969, made the following assessment which I hope will be reflected upon by those of my colleagues who seek to understand the dilemma of black Americans and who will join in the all important struggle against racism in America:

> THE NATIONAL MOOD
>
> Mr. Nixon figures that most Americans are fed "right up to here" with a lot more than the crime he mentioned when he thrust a hand under his chin and said at his press conference that dissatisfaction with public disorder explained the defeats of liberal candidates for city office in New York, Los Angeles, and Minneapolis. He figures that enough people to place Republican majorities in control of Congress next year and to relect him in 1972 are fed up with, among other things effective federal measures to guarantee black southerners the right to vote and black children the right to attend the public schools that white children attend.
>
> Evidence that the President figures this way is to be found in the voting rights legislation recommended to Congress by Attorney General John N. Mitchell. More evidence to the same effect will be apparent when the Administration comes up with the revision of school policy that Nixon officials and the Departments of Justice and Health, Education, and Welfare are concocting. A common interpretation is that the voting-rights proposal and the pending school statement represent necessary payoffs to the white Southerners to whom Mr. Nixon is so largely indebted for his nomination and election last year. They are payoffs, and crude ones at that. But they also signify something of greater significance, and that is Mr. Nixon's reading of the predominant American temper. His assistants at the White House have been saying for many weeks that the kind of people who see in his concessions to the white South a retreat from nationally accepted standards of social and political decency do not understand what is really cooking in this country, and that Mr. Nixon does. What he perceives and is gambling upon is a national mood that is fundamentally identical with the Southern mood to which he catered last year and to which he is catering now in the hopes of national rewards at the polls in 1970 and 1972. He was not speaking idly last year when he included his Southern supporters in "the solid majority . . . the new coalition" of conservatively minded Americans that he then saw in the making. The coalition proved large enough to give him only 41 percent of the popular vote last November. But, with Southern help, it also gave him his electoral majority and that, quite plainly, is what he remembers and is undertaking to improve upon.
>
> Only this line of calculation can explain the Administration's initial proposal to let the Voting Rights Act of 1965 lapse next year. It has worked quite well in the eight Southern states where it was intended to work. The Administration complaint that it is "regional legislation" and therefore unacceptable is so much rot. It is regional legislation because it deals with and has partially corrected a form of deliberate political denial that prevailed in 1965 and, if allowed to do so, would again prevail only in the Southern states and counties at which it was aimed. The Administration's "national" substitute for it is, even if it is not enacted, notice to Mr. Nixon's Southern white supporters and to his "silent majority" everywhere that he sympathizes with their reluctance to underwrite the political rights of black Americans with the full power and energies of the federal government. Some of his officials suggest that it is a signal flashed only for the record, that he and his Attorney General knew that Congress wouldn't let the '65 Act die, wouldn't replace it with the Nixon-Mitchell version. If so, the Administration proposal was political cynicism of the basest sort.
>
> It is possible, perhaps even likely, that the forthcoming statement of school policy will not be quite so crass. We may expect that, like the Voting Rights proposal, it will be padded with claims of intent to continue enforcing the rights that it in fact impairs. The one conceivable reason for issuing it is to assure white Southerners, falsely, if the accompanying assertions of decent purpose are intended to be believed, that in this matter, too, they have the sympathy of the Nixon Administration, and have all the time to comply with the United States Constitution that Mr. Nixon and his officialdom can procure for them.

"CINDY" EDWARDS SPEAKS OUT

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, with the summer well underway, many of us are privileged to have young people from our respective congressional districts serving in our Washington offices as interns.

In this regard, I am extremely fortunate this year to have Cynthia Edwards, from Santa Rosa, Calif., serving on my staff. Recently "Cindy" and I were discussing some of the issues and problems facing the Nation and our district. What this young lady had to say on the question of campus disturbances was so thought provoking and penetrating, that I could not help but feel that I had just heard some things articulated, that, to my knowledge, had never been publicized on the question. So, I inquired of "Cindy" if she would put the thoughts she had just expressed to me down on paper so that I might share them with some of my colleagues and record them permanently in the official records of Congress because I believe the points expressed are very timely.

Here then, are the thoughts of a young college student who attends the University of California at Davis, on some of the problems and challenges facing young people today. I do not suggest or pretend that "Cindy's" views represent those of any majority of college students. But, they are her views and, as such, they merit the attention of every Member of Congress and every person in this country who cares about how young people really feel and think about current issues and, more specifically, the so-called campus unrest question.

"Cindy" Edwards is reasonable, responsible, rational and very balanced

XUM

and mature in her evaluation of campus life and life in general. I sincerely believe she ably represents the character and views of the overwhelming majority of our young people—in whom I personally have a great deal of confidence.

Her statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CYNTHIA EDWARDS

It has been my observation that the impetus behind the present disruptions on our college campuses lies with a *small* hard-core element of students and non-students who are highly organized and extremely skillful in the process of manipulating our society's values toward their own revolutionary goals. By a careful selection of issues, such as the recent "people's park" dispute at UC Berkeley, where they tried, in the name of "human rights", to appeal to the emotional instincts of their fellow students and citizens, and more broadly, through a steady exploitation of the race problem, they sought to create a deep schism between these so-called "repressed" and all sources of authority—a division which they realize is essential to the destruction of our educational institutions and, in turn, the structure of our society.

One fact that these revolutionaries never lose sight of and which those who would attempt to correct this problem must realize, is that the success of this movement depends on the ability of this small group to manipulate minds. The large numbers which throng to their various incidents represent their ability in this endeavor. The majority involved do not realize what lies at the heart of this movement. They have reacted just as their leaders had hoped they would, having been swept up by the emotional charge of repression on the part of the establishment.

The frightening fact is that such a large number of our youths are hungry for this kind of cause—providing the opposition with a prime target. The target is composed of young people who, for a variety of reasons, carry some grudge against authority, and more than that, against *success*. Most are frustrated individuals who are dissatisfied with their personal achievement and who find, in this radical campaign, a kind of refuge—in fact, a rationalization for their own shortcomings. This movement offers them an escape, somewhere to belong—a cause where they find a certain respite from a world in which they haven't been able to compete successfully.

I found a number of persons with physical appearance problems, such as weight or unattractiveness, jumping into this radical cause where supposedly appearance is immaterial and where, in fact, the object is, conveniently enough, to forget personal appearance altogether. It offers them an easy way out, a way to turn inferiority into superiority, which is, in essence, the primary attraction of this movement.

There are, furthermore, those who have frustrating home lives, either where they have experienced unreasonable authority, or where too much has been expected of them or where affluence of varying degrees has presented a situation where life has been very materialistic, lacking human warmth and/or offering an abundance of idle time which is used to theorize, and leads often to the misdirected idealism so characteristic of this far-left cause. It is generally in this category that one finds an increasing number of professional students who seem content to theorize for the rest of their lives, never experiencing participation in the day-to-day functions of the world outside—the world which they denounce.

I find also a segment who feels that government, as well as our educational institutions, are monsters over which they can have no control and consequently with which they have no identity. The present disruptions have offered them a chance to vent this bitterness.

Another segment which cannot be ignored consists of those who find a certain glory in belonging to, or being part of, the latest fad, and in assuming leadership positions thereof which bring them into public focus.

Whatever the specific cases may be, the fact remains that the frustration felt by much of our society, particularly the youth, is being exploited by a group who will not lead them to the correction of their problems but rather, to a much worse state, where everything positive that this country has achieved will be destroyed and replaced with utter chaos. It is this large frustrated group which is now so vulnerable to the radical segment which, in my opinion, must be reached if we are to halt the present trend.

What I find most disturbing about this present situation is that a striking majority of those in my generation who plan to make their careers in government are of this mis-directed liberal group. Idealism is widespread—mine is a very philosophically oriented generation of college students. Never have young people had so much time to think, and it seems that never has the number of practical, pragmatic doers in the field of political science been so limited.

An effort must be made to bring this group out of the clouds, to awaken them to what they are in truth contributing to, and lead them in a direction which will be of real practical value to their country.

A $20,000 LIMIT IN NEW WHEAT PROGRAM?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in recent communications to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Comptroller General, I have raised questions as to the legality of formulating the wheat program for 1970 if it fails to provide for a $20,000 ceiling on payments to individual farmers.

The question arises because the appropriation for fiscal 1970 for the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies has not yet occurred. Both the House and Senate have passed bills but they are in disagreement on a number of points, including the question as to a $20,000 limit on individual payments.

House conferees have not yet been named.

During the period of disagreement the provisions of the continuing resolution are effective. It requires that, pending the completion of the new appropriation, the affected department must be governed in its expenditures by the bill whose provisions are the lower of the two.

I received today a reply from the Secretary of Agriculture.

Text of my telegram of July 11 to Agriculture Secretary Clifford Hardin:

The provisions of H.J. Res. 790, passed by the House of Representatives on June 30 and subsequently by the Senate and signed by the President, provides authority for departments and agencies of government to continue operations pending final approval of appropriation bills. Careful reading of Section 101 raises serious questions as to the legality of any expenditures being made at this time by the Department of Agriculture or the Commodity Credit Corporation for the formulation of programs for the 1970 crop year which fail to establish a $20,000 ceiling on aggregate payments under wheat, cotton and feed grains programs to any individual farmer. I call this to your attention with special urgency, because your staff may well be in the process of formulating the 1970 wheat program, and perhaps the 1970 programs for cotton and feed grains as well.

The section clearly requires that the House version of the agriculture appropriation act for fiscal 1970 be followed. It further directs that, as between House and Senate versions the more restrictive authority be followed.

The language of Section 101-a-4 would not set aside this requirement, because the $20,000 limitation derives from a single appropriation, a single fund and a single authority.

Until disagreements between the House and Senate versions of the money bill are resolved, it would therefore seem illegal to spend funds during fiscal 1970 to formulate these programs unless subject to the $20,000 limit.

Text of Mr. Hardin's reply:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, July 22, 1969.

Hon. PAUL FINDLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FINDLEY: This refers to your telegram of July 11, 1969, concerning the question of whether H.J. Res. 790 (P.L. 91-33), making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970, prohibits the use of funds for the formulation of price-support programs for the 1970 crop year which fail to establish a $20,000 ceiling on payments under wheat, cotton, and feed grain programs to any individual farmer.

As your telegram points out, paragraph (3) of section 101(a) of the continuing resolution provides that whenever the amount which would be made available "or the authority which would be granted" under the Appropriation bill as passed by the House "is different" from that which would be available or granted under the bill as passed by the Senate, the program shall be continued under the lesser amount or "the more restrictive authority."

However, paragraph (4) of the same section of the resolution contains the following express exception:

"*Provided,* That no provision (except a provision authorizing the filling of positions) which is included in an appropriation act enumerated in this subsection but which was not included in the applicable Appropriation Act for 1969, and which by its terms is applicable to more than one appropriation, fund, or authority shall be applicable to any appropriation, fund, or authority provided in this joint resolution unless such provision shall have been included in identical form in such bill as enacted by both the House and the Senate."

It is the conclusion of the General Counsel of this Department that this exception applies to the $20,000 payment limitation and that the payment limitation is, therefore, not applicable to the appropriations provided in the joint resolution. His reasons for reaching this conclusion are as follows:

The $20,000 payment limitation provides: "*Provided further,* That *no part of the funds appropriated by this Act* shall be used to formulate or carry out any price support program (other than for sugar) under which payments aggregating more than $20,000 under all such programs are made to any producer on any crop planted in the fiscal year 1970." [Emphasis supplied.]

The Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1970, (H.R. 11612) in which the payment limitation appears is a bill "Making *appropriations* for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30,

XUM

1970, and for other purposes." [Emphasis supplied.] It contains separate specific appropriations for various agencies and offices of the Department. The $20,000 payment limitation by its terms is applicable to each appropriation providing funds which are used in formulating or carrying out a 1970 price support program. As pointed out by the Comptroller General of the United States in his opinion of June 19, 1969, relating to the applicability of the $20,000 limitation, several of the appropriations which are contained in H.R. 11612—*e.g.*, the specific appropriations made to the Office of the Secretary of the Office of the General Counsel—provide funds for the payment of salaries of officials and employees of this Department whose services are utilized in formulating or carrying out a price support program. Since the $20,000 payment limitation applies to each of the several appropriations used in formulating or carrying out a 1970 price support program, it is clearly applicable to more than one appropriation. Therefore, since the limitation was not included in the Appropriation Act for 1969 and has not been enacted by both the House and Senate, paragraph (4) of the resolution expressly makes the limitation inapplicable to any appropriation, fund, or authority provided in the resolution.

Since we have submitted other questions concerning the payment limitation to the Comptroller General, we are requesting his opinion on the question which you have raised.

Sincerely,

Clifford M. Hardin,
Secretary of Agriculture.

THE NEED FOR A FAMILY DOCTOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Edmondson). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Rooney) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in this age of specialization, it often is an almost impossible chore for a family to locate a doctor who will attend to the multiple medical needs of all members of the family. In my own State, Pennsylvania, the number of family doctors has declined by 300 within 5 years, despite substantial population growth.

The answer, I believe, can be found in a major national effort to encourage young people contemplating medical careers to specialize in family medicine. Several months ago I introduced a bill intended to produce the necessary national effort.

I am pleased to reintroduce this legislation today, with only slight variation of its original form, for myself and 41 of my House colleagues including several of the senior Members of this Chamber. The bipartisan list of sponsors reflects, I believe, broad recognition of the critical shortage of doctors in this Nation and the relief which could be provided all specialties of the medical profession if the training of family doctors can be stepped up.

This bill will establish a 3-year program of assistance to medical schools to expand existing programs or establish new programs to train general practitioners. It would authorize expenditure of $50,000,000 during fiscal 1970, $110,000,000 during fiscal 1971, and $160,000,000 during fiscal 1972 to develop the general practice training programs and facilities and to enroll greater numbers of potential family doctors in them. Priority for grants under the program would be assigned to those medical schools which provide for expanded enrollment.

This legislation is in keeping with the goal recently outlined by President Nixon to overcome critical shortages of doctors, and the more specific call of Dr. Roger Egeberg, the new HEW Assistant Secretary for Health, for training of many more general practitioners.

As Dr. Egeberg explained, there is an urgent need for family doctors who can treat 90 to 93 percent of the illnesses that afflict our population and which do not necessarily require attention of a specialist.

I am pleased to announce that the initial bill I introduced on this subject already has been endorsed by the board of directors of the American Academy of General Practice. Dr. Maynard I. Shapiro, academy president, advised me recently:

> The Academy stands solidly behind your proposal and will encourage its 50 state chapters to support it.

The urgency of America's short supply of health professionals—particularly doctors and nurses—cannot be over stated. Congress must act to combat the shortage if the ever increasing wealth of medical know-how is to be made readily available to all our citizens. The measure which my colleagues and I introduce today will provide the means to combat that shortage. I am convinced it warrants priority consideration.

A list of cosponsors of the bill follows:

Mr. Olsen of Montana.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado.
Mr. Helstoski of New Jersey.
Mr. Podell of New York.
Mr. Reuss of Wisconsin.
Mr. Hungate of Missouri.
Mrs. Mink of Hawaii.
Mr. Carter of Kentucky.
Mr. Perkins of Kentucky.
Mr. Rees of California.
Mr. Roybal of California.
Mr. Gaydos of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Wyman of New Hampshire.
Mr. Pepper of Florida.
Mr. Murphy of New York.
Mr. Stanton of Ohio.
Mr. Matsunaga of Hawaii.
Mr. Scheuer of New York.
Mr. Mikva of Illinois.
Mrs. Chisholm of New York.
Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Hechler of West Virginia.
Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Donohue of Massachusetts.
Mr. Biaggi of New York.
Mr. Fish of New York.
Mr. Patten of New Jersey.
Mr. Rosenthal of New York.
Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Philbin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Derwinski of Illinois.
Mr. Dent of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Wolff of New York.
Mr. Hanley of New York.
Mr. Kluczynski of Illinois.
Mr. Kuykendall of Tennessee.
Mr. Gubser of California.
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey.
Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Conyers of Michigan.
Mr. Biester of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 10264

A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to develop training in family medicine

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part D of title VII of the Public Health Service Act is amended to read as follows:

"Part D—Grants for Family Medicine Training

"AUTHORIZATION OF GRANTS

"Sec. 761. There are authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and $110,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and $160,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, for grants to medical schools to assist in meeting the costs of special projects to plan, develop, or establish new programs or modifications of existing programs of education in the field of family medicine, and including the development and equipment of appropriate facilities.

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"Sec. 762. (a) The Secretary shall by regulation prescribe the time and manner in which applications may be made for grants under this part.

"(b) To be eligible for a grant under this part, the applicant must be (1) a public or other nonprofit school of medicine, and (2) accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner of Education, except that the requirement of this clause (2) shall be deemed to be satisfied if, in the case of a school which by reason of no, or an insufficient, period of operation is not, at the time of application for a grant under this part, eligible for such accreditation, the Commissioner finds, after consultation with the appropriate accreditation body or bodies, that there is reasonable assurance that the school will meet the accreditation standards of such body or bodies prior to the beginning of the academic year following the normal graduation date of students who are in their first year of instruction at such school during the fiscal year in which the Secretary makes a final determination as to approval of the application.

"(c) A grant under this part may be made only if the application therefor—

"(1) is approved by the Secretary upon his determination that the applicant meets the eligibility conditions set forth in subsection (b) of this section;

"(2) contains or is supported by assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that the applicant will expend in carrying out its functions as a school of medicine during the fiscal year for which such grant is sought, an amount of funds (other than funds for construction as determined by the Secretary) from non-Federal sources which are at least as great as the average amount of funds expended by such applicant for such purpose (excluding expenditures of a nonrecurring nature) in the three fiscal years immediately preceding the fiscal year for which such grant is sought;

"(3) contains such additional information as the Secretary may require to make the determination required of him under this subsection and such assurances as he may find necessary to carry out the purposes of this part; and

"(4) provides for such fiscal control and accounting procedures and reports, and access to the records of the applicant, as the Secretary may require to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this part.

"(d) In determining priority of projects, applications for which are filed under this part, the Secretary shall give consideration to—

XUM

"(1) the extent to which the project will increase enrollment of full-time students receiving the training for which grants are authorized under this part; and

"(2) the extent to which the project may result in curriculum improvement or improved methods of training or will help to reduce the period of required training without adversely affecting the quality thereof."

RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH PERMANENT DRUG COMMISSION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES, MEXICO, AND CANADA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a resolution which would establish a permanent Drug Commission between the United States, Mexico, and Canada.

For some time now I have been concerned about the illicit flow of narcotics and dangerous drugs across the U.S. borders. Statistics from the Bureau of Customs and other agencies, and the present administration's interdepartmental task force conclusions provide sufficient proof that this problem warrants not only immediate action, but long-range planning. Various efforts have been made in the past by the United States, Mexico, and Canada to stem this unlawful trafficking of drugs; but despite these efforts, the problem still clearly exists. The situation I believe necessitates the combined efforts of the countries involved.

So it is that I am suggesting at this time that the Congress urge the President to seek the formation of a permanent drug commission with Mexico and Canada so that a full-force international effort be embarked on to investigate ways and means of reducing the unlawful trafficking of drugs. Such a Commission has never before been established, and I am hopeful that such a collective and comprehensive movement may be feasible at this time. The urgency of curbing these unlawful activities has long been recognized by the individual countries; what is needed now is a vehicle such as this Commission to coordinate international efforts for more effective planning and implementation of programs.

HIGHWAY SAFETY: COMMENTARY NO. 10

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, last week I came across the following editorial reprinted in the Daily Eagle, of Claremont, N.H., from the Burlington Free Press of Burlington, Vt. The editorial indicates the concern that one of our Northern States has over the problems of attaining highway safety. The analogy that is drawn is an interesting one.

The editorial compares the annual slaughter on our highways to that of the Revolutionary War. The use of the image of war is appropriate. We ourselves must begin a war against highway carelessness. As the Revolutionary War freed America from British rule, so may a war against the senseless carnage on our roads free us from the rule of fear and danger that exists on our roads today. I recommend this editorial as worthy of careful reading by all people who are disturbed by the rising number of highway deaths:

HIGHWAY SLAUGHTER

There were 10,600 casualties in America's Revolutionary War two centuries ago. Now, in 1969, Americans are engaged in another kind of war which is far more costly in human lives than was the Revolution.

There were tens of thousands of casualties from highway accidents over the Fourth of July weekend which ended Sunday night. The exact number of casualties is uncertain, but the number included at least 570 deaths. More than 50,000 Americans will die in highway mishaps this year alone—five times the number of people killed and injured in the entire Revolutionary War!

Nine out of ten of these "accidents" are caused by driver error and lack of judgment. And most of them occur in good weather and on good roads.

Ethan Allen and his fellow Vermonters fought to run their enemies out of the country. Today many Vermonters seem determined to run each other off the road.

Allen was safer fighting the Redcoats than Vermonters are today fighting traffic. The reason is obvious: Although Allen was often reckless, he was never stupid.

Any Vermonter who is careless on the highways is stupid. Surely no sensible Vermonter would ride with Death!

Don't be stupid. Don't become a statistic among the 50,000 Americans who will die on the highways this year.

SPIRIT OF ST. LOUIS

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, while railroads are notorious for their efforts to deliberately downgrade passenger service so they can discourage people from riding their trains, Penn Central went a little too far in its efforts to eliminate the once famed Spirit of St. Louis. Some 35 passengers aboard one car on the Spirit of St. Louis did not take too kindly to the elimination of water, electricity, and air conditioning. So they did something about it instead of wringing their hands and having their complaints fall on deaf ears. They invoked the true Spirit of St. Louis as the following Associated Press article in the July 17 edition of the Huntington, W. Va., Advertiser shows:

THIRTY-FIVE PASSENGERS LIE ON TRACKS, FORCE RAILROAD TO FIX COACH

ALTOONA, PA.—Some 35 persons protesting what they called poor conditions on the once famed Spirit of St. Louis laid in front of the train and held it up for an hour and 35 minutes Wednesday night.

The passengers spontaneously got off the train during a short stop at the Altoona station and laid in front of the locomotive.

They told Penn Central Railroad Co. officials they wouldn't move until the railroad repaired their car. They said the car didn't have water, air-conditioning or electricity.

Penn Central officials repaired the car and it continued en route to St. Louis from New York. The railroad says it has been trying to eliminate the run because it is losing money.

CAPTAIN ROY: LEBANON, N.H., TO PAY TRIBUTE TO OUTSTANDING OFFICER FOR 32 YEARS OF SERVICE

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to call to the attention of the House an article on the career of Capt. Raymond C. Roy, Sr., of the Lebanon, N.H., police department.

Captain Roy is retiring after 32 years of service to the community. His fellow citizens are giving a big dinner in tribute to him next Tuesday and the reason is readily apparent from reading the article.

Captain Roy exemplifies all the best qualities needed for an effective local police officer. He understands his community. He understands human nature and, even in the case of the culprits he must bring to justice, he respects it. In turn, the citizens look up to and respect this police officer. He has courage, impartiality, and wisdom in dealing with human beings.

He is a splendid example for his junior officers. I consider Captain Roy one of the outstanding police officers in the country. He is a leading figure in his community. It is no wonder his fellow citizens want to pay this tribute to him. They will miss him mightily after three decades of dedicated public service.

Captain Roy's career is described in the following excellent article by Jeff McLaughlin from the Valley News. The Captain's career is a model and I hope it is studied by police officers from around the country.

I also want to take this means of congratulating him and of wishing him the best of good fortune in the years to come

The article follows:

A GOOD MAN RETIRING AFTER 32 YEARS: CAPT. RAYMOND ROY

(By Jeff McLaughlin)

LEBANON.—One of the younger members of the Lebanon Police Department remembers the time a weaving, bleary-eyed oldtimer came to headquarters and announced, "I'm drunk."

The officers on duty found it easy to agree with the oldtimer, and offered to put him in a cell to sleep it off. Mustering his dignity, trying hard to speak distinctly, he said, "No, if I'm going to be arrested, I want Captain Roy to arrest me."

Raymond C. Roy Sr. will retire from a lifetime of police work on July 21, and law-abiding citizens and quite a few not-so-do-gooders will miss him. From his first days on the Lebanon Police Force in 1938—as a swing man working as many as 70 hours per week—through his patrols in what has become known as beautiful downtown dug-up Lebanon, Captain Roy has earned respect and made friends easily. Those friends will demonstrate their respect on July 29 at a dinner-dance in his honor at the Lebanon Elks Club. The Lebanon Police Dept. and the Chamber of Commerce are in charge of arrangements.

Thirty-two years, thousands and thousands of hours of work—it's impossible to summarize. For a man like Captain Roy, the best

XUM

summary is his own—even if he is a little embarrassed that it's repeated:

"I think I can say I've never made an enemy, even though I've arrested hundreds of people. If you can look back and say you've done something worthwhile with your life, tried to do your job as a policeman and a father, and made a lot of good friends, then you're all right."

Newcomers to Lebanon think of Captain Roy in terms of a smile, a wave of the arm and a hearty good morning. The smile and the good cheer have always been there, but whenever duty required it, Captain Roy performed the less pleasant tasks of a policeman with considerable dispatch:

In the early 1940's Ludlow, Vt. was a rough town. Women and children were afraid to go upstreet after 8 in the evening. The town manager wanted to clean Ludlow up and hired young Raymond Roy to do the job.

"One of the first days I was there, I noticed a big crowd had gathered upstreet. I walked over and found a big lumberjack standing in the middle of the crowd. He was pretty drunk, and he had heard there was a new chief in town. I guess he figured he'd have to try me out."

Young Roy walked up to the lumberjack and told him he'd have to come along. The jack laughed and roared back. "I feel like a crosscut saw; it'll take two men to handle me."

Captain Roy chuckled as he remembered the scene, and with typical modesty described the outcome: "Well, Tex and I rassled around for a while, and then I put the cuffs on him and took him to Woodstock."

"He tried it again a couple of times, and he wound up with the cuffs. He was such a nice guy when he was sober, too."

Another time in Vermont, Roy captured three of the most-wanted men in the state. For the deed, he earned a special commendation from the Attorney General and the Governor, but what you remember about the recollection is Captain Roy describing two of the men running away when he accosted them:

"My gun was drawn, and I could have shot them, but I never wanted to kill a man."

When Raymond Roy left Ludlow to return to his hometown Lebanon, Ludlow had changed dramatically.

A man who has gained a great deal of respect often has done so because he respects his fellow man. Captain Roy is a case in point.

"Often-times I'd be in the station when one of my fellow officers would come through the door hauling a resisting prisoner. A couple of nights later I might have to arrest the same guy, and the officers couldn't understand why he came peacably for me. But it's just common sense; you let a man blow off a little steam and he feels a little better. He knows he's done something wrong, and after he's let off a bit, he'll most likely come with you."

In an age when magazines and papers are filled with learned speculation on young people's lack of respect for law and order it's instructive—as well as refreshing—to talk to Captain Roy:

"Lot of times you find a youngster doing something wrong, and you tell him, 'Keep that up and you'll wind up in court with a record. Now you just go home and think about it.' "

"I don't think it's wrong to say there's a fair number of good citizens in this town who've thanked me over the years for one of my talks to them when they were young."

You can talk to merchants, workers, mothers, fellow police officers . . . anyone at all, and at the mention of Captain Roy's name the response is the same:

"The Captain? He's a good man."

On July 29, those merchants, workers, mothers, fellow officers and a lot of other people will thank a good man for three decades of good work.

COAL MINE SAFETY

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following excellent article on coal mine safety appearing in the July 19 edition of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette and written by George Daugherty, prominent Charleston attorney, who has taken an active interest in coal mine safety:

STATE NEEDS MINE SAFETY LEGISLATION—WITH TEETH

(By George Daugherty)

"78–4 how many more".

The symbol of 40,000 miners in West Virginia in their fight for mine health and safety legislation, the 78 representing the dead comrades at Mannington, the four at Hominy Falls.

The questions here to be discussed are:

Does immunity from civil law suit promote lack of safety? The answer is a loud and clear yes.

Are the compensation laws of West Virginia adequate to protect the workers? Answer: Not as presently written and interpreted by the Supreme Court of West Virginia.

What is the most effective way of enforcing industrial safety? Answer: To provide the right to sue in a civil court for failure to maintain an adequate safety program.

Over 12 men per month were killed in West Virginia coal mines in 1968. Subtract the 78 killed at Mannington—and still over six men per month were killed.

In the month of April only four months after the Mannington tragedy, 10 men lost their lives in the same industry in West Virginia.

Ironically, the West Virginia Legislature met shortly after the Mannington holocaust. Safety legislation should have been on every public official's mind in view of the above morbid statistics. However, in spite of the fact that tragedy usually moves indifferent men to action, not one bill with teeth in it was passed concerning mine safety.

The coal association lobby in West Virginia deserves an A plus for its excellently organized success in preventing passage of a single bill designed to prevent disasters such as Mannington from occurring again. The lobby served its master well—and they were aided by the indifference of you, me, and every West Virginian who is willing to put up with legislative indifference.

But who is going to speak up for the West Virginia miner, or worker in other industries for that matter, and their families, who must run these fantastic risks to their lives and physical well-being in order to earn a living?

It must be you, me and every West Virginian; because if we continue to be indifferent we will simply continue to leave our fate to the politicians, and you see where that has gotten us in West Virginia so far.

Lest I be correctly called to task for criticizing without offering a constructive alternative let me suggest a constructive solution to industrial safety, with teeth in it—the kind of teeth industry understands. If they don't run a safe shop, they will have to pay for it. Pay, not in fines, which go to some government fund, but in restoration to the individual who they have maimed, or his family, if they killed him. And such indebtedness shall be decided by that same tribunal which decides what you and I must pay if we are negligent—the common law jury.

Thus, a jury in each community will set the safety standards for industry, just as they set the safety standard by which you and I must drive our automobiles. Why should industry get a better deal than you or I? Further, every working man on the job will be an "inspector" because he will be a potential witness to the unsafe working conditions which might kill or maim his fellow worker. Such inspectors will not be subject to the same pressures as federal and state paid inspectors, because their own safety hangs in the balance. And such a program is not unfair to the employer, because running a safe shop is an absolute defense to having to pay a verdict. Thus, an incentive toward safety is an important factor in this proposal.

Pass a bill such as this and every industry in West Virginia will immediately reevaluate its safety program. A few $150,000 verdicts for amputees or $110,000 verdicts for deaths will do more to improve safety programs and conditions in industry in West Virginia than all of the fines and inspectors in every bill now pending before Sen. Jennings Randolph's committee in Washington.

The key to safety is awareness—the way to keep industry aware is to make them pay if they are not, and thus the teeth in the proposal I am making—for if industry isn't safe it must pay—and it must pay by way of restoration to the victim of its indifference, with a jury as the arbiter of the justice of the matter. This is the American way.

Immunity to being sued spawns lack of awareness, or indifference. Industry is now immune from suit.

The West Virginia Workmen's Compensation Act makes every employer immune. Thus employers needn't worry too much about safety. If they worried very much about it how could they have killed 12 men per month in West Virginia last year, in only one industry?

In 1913 an exception to immunity was made in our original Workmen's Compensation Act. Our legislature said if an employer injured or killed an employe through "deliberate intent" a lawsuit could be brought and the jury would decide the damages, giving the employer an offset for compensation benefits paid or payable. You would think such a provision would supply the purposes I am suggesting, but no man has ever been reported, in the official West Virginia Law Reports, to have won a case under the "deliberate intent" provision in its 56-year existence. In fact, our West Virginia Supreme Court has intimated that there must be prolonged premeditation present against a specific employe before recovery is possible. Surely our 1913 legislature did not mean such provision to apply only to murders, but this is essentially what our court has held. Our court did intimate that further clarification probably was a legislative matter, and that is why I propose the following.

The next session of the West Virginia Legislature should pass a bill which would provide that if a jury should find an employer permitted a known and correctable, inherently dangerous condition to exist for a long enough time that an ordinarily prudent employer would have corrected it, they may conclude that such employer deliberated and intended to run the risk of injury or death to his employe rather than correct the condition, and thus may award such damages as they deem fair, just as they would in an automobile or other type accident case.

All you and I can do is write to Gov. Moore, and our delegates and senators. If you agree with these views, take the time

XUM

to write because this campaign to see passed into law a significant industrial safety bill, with teeth, must not fall prey to that same indifference which has defeated us for so long in West Virginia.

Such a law would make it cheaper to be safe, as it ought to be, than safer to be cheap, as it is now, on the West Virginia industrial scene.

The lives and health of our fellow citizens is the price we will continue to pay for indifference.

West Virginia should be number one in its laws concerning industrial safety, particularly mine safety. It is difficult to understand how any conscientious industry could oppose this proposition, but the absence of safety legislation of any real significance and the struggle now being waged in Congress would lead one to believe that industry is not really interested in safety, if it costs money. They seem to have forgotten that their most valuable asset is their men, alive and in good health.

WEST VIRGINIA'S AIRPORT PROBLEMS

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Associated Press writer Ron Jackson, a veteran pilot, has written a two-part series of articles on West Virginia's airport problems. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to these articles since they describe just a small part of the crisis gripping our national air transportation system which will escalate into a catastrophe unless the Congress takes prompt action to enact legislation to finance construction of new airports and modernization of existing airports and airways.

The articles follow:

There's No Margin for Error by Jet Pilots at Kanawha

(Editor's Note.—Associated Press writer Ron Jackson, a licensed jet pilot and a veteran of 4,200 hours of fight time, took a deep look at problems troubling commercial airports and the men who fly today's commercial jet airliners. This report, the first in a two-part series, looks into the problems plaguing the airline industry, Charleston specifically and West Virginia generally.)

(By Ron Jackson)

Charleston.—The pilot of a sleek United Air Lines jet flying into the battered runways of Charleston's Kanawha Airport says "the penalty of a mistake here is horrendous."

"There is absolutely no margin for error when you set up to land here," Capt. Don Ramsey said. "When the conditions are good," he added, however, "the runway is good, the length is enough."

A planned runway extension "will help," Ramsey said, "but it won't solve the problem."

"A regional airport would put them way ahead," the pilot stated.

Ramsey, 43, based at Newark, N.J., was one of several commercial pilots who discussed the difficulties of airport operation during interviews this week.

The pros and cons of regional airports, those serving more than one community, have been voiced frequently.

Individual communities want their own facilities, but airlines contend regional airports would be less expensive in that one installation would serve the needs of several population centers.

The expense of maintaining an adequate aircraft facility is one of the major problems facing residents of the Charleston area.

The weathered, bounce-battered main runway at Kanawha Airport has deteriorated since the advent of heavy, fast-flying jet traffic. The runways are cracking under the strain and the result could be both expensive and dangerous.

The crumbling of the runway surface is occurring where the big jets make contact and again in the area where they start applying brakes to slow down.

It has developed into such a problem that airport manager Calvin Wilson says it will cost $900,000 to repair the runways. This money is in addition to the $2.5 million planned, 700-foot extension to the end of the runway.

Ramsey said it's not at crisis proportions right now, "but it will develop if it isn't fixed."

The runway at Kanawha Airport is asphalt, without a concrete base for added support. The heat from the sun causes the asphalt to become soft and cooling makes it brittle. The weight of airplanes causes it to break.

Large chunks of the surface have been gouged out.

The heat and the huge jets also have caused grooves cut in the runway to bend and become less effective in reducing the "hydroplane" phenomenon that plagues aircraft on wet runways and automobiles on superhighways.

Wilson said repairs slated to start before Sept. 1, call for pouring 18 inches of concrete, about 50 feet wide down the entire length of the 5,600-foot strip.

American Airlines Capt. Woody Nelson says the Boeing 727 apparently is "too heavy for the construction of the runway," although it was "designed, and is well equipped, for short runways."

Nelson's first officer, Jim Wheeler, said the airplane is designed to "haul 160,000 pounds. This weight goes down to 126,000 when the temperature goes up to 80 degrees," a condition in which the aircraft's engines generate less than full power.

Nelson called Kanawha a "safe operation . . . we just can't land at night or if its wet."

Ramsey agrees the field is basically safe but, "I don't overlook a straw of usable goods (winds, weather, condition of the runway) when coming in here."

The planned 700-foot extension "will help," Ramsey said, "but it won't solve the problem. A regional airport would put them way ahead."

The regionalization concept was approved by many of the commercial pilots who come into Kanawha Airport.

"There's no doubt about it," Nelson said. "An airport that serves more people would mean more freight and more money and might generate longer hauls."

Are Mountain 'Ports Putting State Behind?

(By Ron Jackson)

Charleston.—As the superjets continue to compress travel around this earth, will West Virginia, with its mountaintop airports, miss the boat?

Many state officials and influential citizens, especially those proponents of regional airports, think so, but it apparently isn't worrying the airlines themselves.

Freight and passenger records continue to be set at Charleston, Huntington and Parkersburg and the aircraft makers are assembling smaller jet transports for the state's limited runways.

To spotlight the states concern the legislature recently appropriated more money for local airports than it had in the past 20 years.

At the state government level, Gov. Arch Moore Jr. favors the regional airport concept and said he would support building such a facility "anywhere in the state where the population could support it."

He added, however, that favoring a concept and realizing construction are two different matters.

"We just don't have that kind of money," he said and "the state is not in a position to appropriate that kind of revenue."

In the area of building airports, Gov. Moore said that he was able to get $500,000 from the legislature to build at least 20 airports, equipped with lighted 3,500-foot, paved runways.

The $500,000 is more than the legislature has allocated for new airports in 20 years but Moore said it wouldn't pay for the planning of a regional airport, let alone its construction.

The cost of a proposed regional airport near the Putnam County town of Hurricane, midway between Huntington and Charleston was estimated at $20 million. A bond issue for its construction was defeated last fall by Kanawha County after passing in Cabell and Putnam.

George Jackson, regional sales and service manager for United Air Lines, said passenger boardings at Kanawha Airport are running about five percent below the rate last year. He said it reflects a slowdown in area business and a loss of some major industries in the Kanawha Valley.

"Seventy per cent of the people who get on planes at Kanawha are transients . . . who have come to Charleston to do business and leave again," Jackson said. He said that there just aren't any people who fly into the area and stay.

Jackson said that, industry-wide, boardings are increasing at an average of 18 per cent each year.

However, the Federal Aviation Administration said it recorded 221,416 passenger boardings in 1968 at Kanawha Airport, up from 213,736 for the previous year. Huntington recorded 77,905 boardings in 1968, an increase from 76,531 for 1967.

Other statistics, which have been attracting more attention, reveal the amount of air freight shipped from the two airports. Kanawha Airport shipped 760.72 tons of freight in 1968, up 123 tons from 1967. Huntington's Tri-State Airport shipped 170 tons in 1968 compared to just over 140 tons in 1967.

Parkersburg sent over 425 tons of freight by air in 1967 and better than 446 tons in 1968.

AIR FREIGHT UP

FAA coordinator Goodwin Glassman said many areas of the country are finding that air freight traffic is showing a more rapid growth than is air passenger traffic. He said many industries are trying to locate near airports. Aircraft manufacturers recognize this trend, he added, and are designing planes, such as Boeings's 747, primarily for freight hauling.

Boeing also is involved in making a convertible 727, the same type aircraft that serves both Kanawha and Tri-State. It can haul passengers when necessary and freight if needed simply by removing its seats.

Regardless of the national forecasts for aircraft and airport needs, however as one airline put it, "This area (West Virginia) won't have to worry about a 747 coming in here."

NATIONAL AIR TRANSPORTATION CRISIS

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important

XUM

pieces of legislation pending before us today is H.R. 12374 to develop airports and airways. While we seem to have little difficulty in getting men to the moon, the hard fact remains that thousands of people every day experience difficulty in getting off the ground because of our obsolescent airports and airways systems. I fully support H.R. 12374 sponsored by the esteemed dean of the West Virginia congressional delegation, and wish to insert into the RECORD my testimony on this legislation before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

STATEMENT

(By Representative KEN HECHLER, July 22, 1969)

It is significant that when Houston signalled Astronaut Buzz Aldrin yesterday afternoon that he was cleared for take-off, Aldrin promptly asked from the surface of the moon whether he was Number 1 on the runway. The energy, effort and technology used in providing a round-trip to the moon can and must be applied to solve the serious air transportation crisis here on earth.

The runways on earth are clogged to capacity. Gate positions are difficult to find. Terminals, parking areas, and access roads are jammed. Without entering into the buzzsaw argument about air traffic controllers, the facts are that the equipment now in use at many airports was designed for the propeller age of aviation, it was designed up to 20 years ago, and by 1975 this equipment will be critically obsolescent, over 15 years old, and totally inadequate for the demands of modern aviation.

Ten years ago, 50 million people a year travelled by air. Last year, it was 150 million. In 1979, it will be over triple that amount—470 million. Within ten years, an average 1,200,000 people daily will board aircraft operated by U.S. airlines. We face the possibility before long of having more than two million people airborne over the United States on any one busy day. In ten years, our 114,000 private aircraft will virtually double.

Yesterday Secretary of Transportation Volpe and FAA Administrator John H. Shaffer testified before this committee in support of this legislation. Secretary Volpe labelled airport and airway development "one of our most urgent transportation problems." Mr. Shaffer stated: "Unless action is taken to institute a major program of improvement and expansion, the capability of the airport and airways system to accommodate the demands will continue to deteriorate and potential beneficial growth will be curtailed."

Mr. Chairman, I submit that that kind of testimony is far too weak to describe the air transportation crisis already upon us. Make no mistake about it. We *are* in an airport-airways crisis today. And it is fast escalating into a catastrophe due to the inaction of Congress.

Congress has delayed and temporized while the airport-airways crisis has deepened. Federal aid to airport funds has been diminished to a trickle just when the urgent need was increasing. From 1966, when $161.7 million in Federal aid to airport funds was requested, the amount of requests for Federal aid to airports has skyrocketed to $448.5 million for the fiscal year 1970—nearly three times the amount four years ago.

Yet Congress which appropriated $75 million for Federal aid to airport funds for the fiscal year 1966 appropriated only a paltry $30 million for the fiscal year 1970. I have introduced amendments on the floor to increase these Federal aid to airport funds by as little as $10 million, and have been beaten back on every occasion. Congress must measure up to its responsibilities, and pass this authorizing bill, which will put the burden where it belongs—on the airport users rather than the general taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that the House Ways and Means Committee will be dealing with the tax portion of this bill, but I would like to throw in my two cents about fuel taxes. There is a 9-cent-a-gallon tax on general aviation fuel, and a 8% ticket tax. Presumably the increase in the ticket tax is in lieu of a fuel tax on commercial airlines. I suggest it would be fairer to put a tax on fuel used by commercial airlines instead of a portion of the ticket tax. Maybe it was adjusted in that fashion to gain support for the bill, and that is only a detail.

The FAA has testified we will need 900 new airports and improvements to some 2,750 existing airports. I am very pleased that Section 203 of the Staggers Bill provides grants for airport system planning to areawide planning agencies. Travellers from all over the nation use airports, and we should develop a national system more in keeping with the national airport plan. There is no excuse for one selfish or provincial interest to dictate to the nation an airport which may be unsafe or poorly located from the standpoint of passengers and taxpayers from fifty states which use it. We lost out in West Virginia in 1967 on airport which the Federal Aviation Administration stated on May 15, 1967 would best meet the needs of the area. At that time, the FAA stated: "The Federal Aviation Administration believes that the long-range airport requirements of the people of Southern West Virginia are best met, and the public interest best served, by the least-cost development of a midway regional airport. Moreover, development of a single regional facility affords the opportunity for spreading the development cost over the widest possible user base and holds the greater promise of better scheduled transportation service to the benefit of the entire area of southern West Virginia.

The Federal Aviation Administration believes this recommendation warrants consideration for grant-in-aid assistance, within the limits of available Federal resources. The FAA, therefore, urged immediate consideration and unified support by all state and involved local officials to build a regional airport at the Midway site." West Virginia and the nation lost out on this superior airport which I am confident would have been ours if this legislation had been passed two years ago: (1) it was argued that insufficient Federal funds were available to build this superior airport; and (2) the planning funds contained in this bill would have conclusively documented the statements included in the FAA decision of May 15, 1967.

The West Virginia example can be repeated many times throughout fifty states; all of which face serious and deepening crises in air transportation. According to the FAA, in the next five years we will need about $2 billion to build and develop airports, and more than $5 billion over the period 1970–1979. In the next five years, we will need about $1.2 billion in new facilities and equipment if the airways system is to handle the anticipated additional traffic. Over the full decade 1970–1979, well over $2 billion will be needed. Required research to develop sophisticated new electronics equipment will add a need for several hundred million more dollars.

Despite the growing congestion and the critical needs, the FAA has not overlooked its main mission—safety in aviation. But here also, the life of every human being who boards a plane will be increasingly endangered unless we can gear up our research and development work and tie it more closely with what is being done in our aerospace effort. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration is spending over $100 million annually on advanced research in aeronautics. Just because the NASA authorization is handled by one committee and the FAA authorization by another is no excuse for Congress to fail to integrate these highly significant research efforts to improve aircraft, to improve navigational aids, to prevent mid-air collisions, to examine clear air turbulence, and the aeromedial aspects of aviation safety. The exciting new technological breakthrough in solid state electronics and micro-miniaturization can be applied in modernizing equipment to man our airways more safely. With the advent of the jumbo jets and other high-speed performance aircraft, we must increase our research and development efforts to achieve greater air safety. We can no longer tolerate air carrier accidents attributable to faulty equipment or flaws in the air traffic control system.

The pending legislation would provide the resources necessary to protect the safety of passengers in a vastly enlarged air transportation system. The bill proposes that the program for construction of airways facilities and equipment be increased to about $250 million annually for the next ten years. It is also proposed that Federal aid to airport development amount to $180 million in fiscal 1970 and $220 million in 1971, totaling $2.5 billion for airport aid over a ten-year period.

The user taxes recommended are as follows: increase existing ticket tax from 5% to 8%; impose a new $3 head tax on passengers travelling to points outside the contiguous states; impose a new 5% tax on air freight waybills; and levy a tax of 9 cents a gallon on all fuels used by business, private and utility aircraft. These taxes would produce revenues of $569 million in the first full year, an increase of $274 million over the present taxes. During the next ten years, the yield from the new taxes would approximate $9 billion, or nearly double the amount that we would have realized with presently existing taxes. To do the job adequately, we need these revenues.

I strongly support the pending legislation, which is similar to bills which I introduced at the last session of Congress (H.R. 19203) and also on January 20, 1969 (H.R. 4119). Congress must act and act now or bear the responsibility for triggering the catastrophe which will inevitably follow.

SUPPORT FOR ABM

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have the tabulated results of a poll taken in my 18th Congressional District of Illinois. They indicate an overwhelming measure of support for President Nixon's ABM program. They also show that people are not prepared to pay for a guaranteed annual wage financed by Uncle Sam, that they are against lowering the voting age to 18, and that they want a Federal corporation to run their mail service.

It also shows that the people will support a "pay-as-you-go" social security system maintained with increases in tax collections to pay for increases in benefits.

The Vietnam war troop withdrawal is desired by the majority of 18th District people, regardless of what developments occur in negotiations with Hanoi. President Nixon's draft lottery system has the approval of a majority of my constituents, according to the poll results.

Dissatisfaction with campus rioting runs high, and a huge majority wants action taken to see that the Federal Government does not provide financial

XUM

aid for those who take part in disrupting our colleges and universities.

A large majority desires a direct vote for the Presidency to take the place of the outmoded electoral college system. A significant majority believes that Congress should pass legislation outlawing strikes by public employees.

The President's revenue sharing plan with the States has the approval of the bulk of people who answered my questionnaire.

Mr. Speaker, more than 17,000 people completed this 12-question poll, giving me their views on issues before Congress and the Nation. They have evidenced a desire for action on our part to change some of the present system. They have indicated that they want a strong defense, peace, a new Selective Service System and financial responsibility on the part of their Government.

I am pleased with the large number of responses received. It indicates that people are knowledgeable about what is going on in Government, do not like what they see in some areas of our national life, and will insist that Congress cooperate with the President in his efforts to find meaningful solutions to these nagging problems.

The questionnaire results are as follows:

Constituents Responses—All 17,168 Respondents

[Responses in percent]

1. Do you think the United States needs an anti-missile defense system, ABM?

Yes (10,737)	62.6
No (5,090)	29.7
No response (1,322)	7.7

2. Do you think in the near future the United States should begin to withdraw some of our forces from Vietnam, regardless of the outcome of the Paris peace conference?

Yes (9,794)	57.2
No (6,338)	37.0
No response (1,000)	5.8

3. Do you favor a lottery system with no exceptions for drafting of military personnel?

Yes (9,998)	58.4
No (5,798)	33.9
No response (1,325)	7.7

4. Do you favor legislation which would return to the States and local governments for use as they see fit, a percentage of the money now collected in Federal income taxes?

Yes (12,178)	71.1
No (3,608)	21.1
No response (1,344)	7.8

5. Do you believe the Federal Government should guarantee a minimum annual income to heads of families, whether or not they are working?

Yes (1,176)	6.9
No (15,291)	89.3
No response (656)	3.8

6. Should Congress insist that any Social Security increases be tied to tax increases to keep programs on a pay-as-we-go basis?

Yes (12,177)	71.1
No (3,804)	22.2
No response (1,157)	6.8

7. Should Congress deny Federal grants or scholarships to university students charged by their school officials with disrupting normal campus activities?

Yes (15,143)	88.6
No (1,353)	7.9
No response (595)	3.5

8. Should the Federal Government enact laws to prevent strikes by public employees such as policemen, firemen, schoolteachers, garbage collectors, etc.?

Yes (9,905)	57.8
No (6,333)	37.0
No response (884)	5.2

9. Do you favor lowering the voting age to 18?

Yes (5,580)	32.5
No (10,983)	64.0
No response (587)	3.4

10. Do you favor abolishing the electoral college and electing the President by direct popular vote?

Yes (13,947)	81.5
No (2,443)	14.3
No response (1,732)	4.3

11. Do you support the proposal to convert the Post Office into a Government-owned corporation to operate as a self-supporting operation?

Yes (13,048)	76.2
No (2,959)	17.3
No response (1,126)	6.6

12. Red China—do you favor U.S. support for admission of Peking to the United Nations?

Yes (4,970)	29.0
No (11,043)	64.4
No response (1,123)	6.6

THE GOLDEN SUMMER

(Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the Journal of Commerce, in its July 17, 1969, edition, carried a most interesting editorial entitled "The Golden Summer." For the benefit of those Members who may not have read this comment, it is included at the end of these remarks.

The editorial points out certain economic parallels between conditions prevailing in the summer of 1929 and now. While the conditions are not all precisely alike, they are similar enough to give us pause for thought and consideration. And, my purpose in bringing this editorial to the attention of the Members leads me also to comment briefly on the legislative history of farm program legislation since 1920 and to call attention to the fact that the Committee on Agriculture on July 15 began hearings on the continuation of the farm program at a time when many urge us to terminate, or phase out, such programs.

Soon after World War I, American agriculture was in a state of chaos. Farmers, who had suffered under rigid price controls during the war, were caught in a cost-price squeeze. Although food costs were high, the prices that the farmer received for his production were disastrously low. Farm leaders and legislators seeking remedies were joined by astute business leaders who realized that farmers were their biggest customers. When Edgar Wallace, representing the American Federation of Labor, testified before the Congress on efforts to stabilize farm prices in 1922, he said:

> When I appeared here about a year ago or a little more than a year ago, there were some 5,000,000 workingmen walking the streets. We considered then that the reason for the depression in the industries was the fact that the farmers were not getting prices for their products and consequently were unable to buy.

George N. Peek of Moline, Ill., a businessman who had been a member of the War Industries Board, and his business associate, Gen. Hugh S. Johnson, became the main promoters of an agricultural stabilization proposal that later became the basis for legislation sponsored by Senator Charles L. McNary, of Oregon, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and Representative Gilbert N. Haugen, of Iowa, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture. The legislative committee had the assistance of Charles J. Brand, a consulting specialist in marketing in the Department of Agriculture, in developing the initial McNary-Haugen bill. Similar legislation to stabilize farm prices was introduced by Senator George Norris, of Nebraska, and Representative James H. Sinclair, of North Dakota.

It is interesting to read the House report—No. 631, 68th Congress, first session; May 2, 1924—on the initial McNary-Haugen bill. One statement in the report has a familiar ring:

> There will be a further diminution of farm purchasing power, hence a further lessening in the demand for manufactured goods, a lessening need for labor in urban industries, with an increasing supply of labor, due to the movement from the farms. This will result in increased unemployment, wage reductions, lessened factory production because of lessened demand, and finally an urban depression similar to the farm depression. The majority of far-seeing men in the commercial, financial and industrial world recognize the interdependence between prosperity in industry and prosperity in agriculture. The labor organizations have indicated a similar recognition by appearing before the committee in favor of the passage of this farm-relief measure.

But the clear warning signs were not heeded. True, some stop-gap credit measures were taken but it was not until 1927 that Congress approved a McNary-Haugen bill aimed at economic solutions to the firm situation. The bill was vetoed by President Calvin Coolidge. The following year Congress again passed the bill and, again, President Coolidge vetoed it.

More perceptive, Herbert Hoover ran on a platform promising farm relief and he signed into law the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929. The new authority, based in part on the McNary-Haugen and the Norris-Sinclair proposals, enabled President Hoover to establish the Federal Farm Board, appointing as Chairman a businessman, Alexander Legge, president of the International Harvester Co.

But the damage already had been done. Farm fed and farm lead, the economy of the Nation exploded while stockbrokers in Wall Street jumped out windows. Men tried to sell apples on the street for suddenly all the warnings of disaster contained in the House report of 1924 had come true.

One of the first efforts under the new administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt was enactment of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933. But, when the courts found this law unconstitutional, farm economy again threatened to push the entire Nation into another depression and the Congress responded, enacting the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Since then, learning by experience and building on the principles of assistance to agriculture in stabilizng prices and maintaining a balance of supply and demand, the Congress, in 1965, approved, and the President signed into law the Food and Agriculture Act. The authority did improve farm net income and it did result in reducing burdensome Government-held surpluses. Consequently, in the last Congress I sponsored legislation to continue the program. But, Congress, in its wisdom, resolved to permit the new administration taking office in 1969 its say on farm policy, and the law was extended only for 1 year and will expire on December 31, 1970.

Thus, we are faced again with legislating on agriculture. As the basis for such studies I have introduced a bill to make the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 and the Food Stamp Act both permanent programs. The Committee on Agriculture began hearings on this matter July 15, and we shall continue during the summer.

As we conduct these hearings, we can recall another statement in the House Report of 1924:

> The free-trade remedy, if undertaken at this point would inevitably accentuate the trouble and increase the panic, making it general instead of being confined to agriculture, as is largely the case at present. There are three great essentials to create and maintain general farm prosperity. First, an adjustment between the prices of farm commodities and the prices of nonagricultural commodities that will give the farmer a decent and reasonable and equitable purchasing power; second, a price level equal to the general range of prices at which the major part of farm indebtedness has been incurred; third, the maintenance of a reasonable stability in the general price level preferably with a gentle rise such as occurred during the basing period from which ratio prices are to rest, extending for ten years from 1905 to 1914."

And, with such prefatory remarks, I commend to your study the Journal of Commerce editorial, "The Golden Summer":

THE GOLDEN SUMMER

Few attempting total recall now are entirely successful in remembering just how it was 40 years ago when the nation was getting into what would be the last golden summer it would experience in many a year.

Prosperity was on every hand, but six consecutive years of economic expansion had made some conservative leaders cautious. The Federal Reserve Bank of New York was restive. Earlier in the year it had prevailed on the Board in Washington to caution banks against money for speculative purposes.

But this didn't satisfy a number of people. It didn't satisfy Paul M. Warburg, or Russell Leffingwell or even one of the Board's own members, Adolph Miller. These men wanted the Fed to put on the brakes slightly by raising the rediscount rate to 6 per cent. They feared things might be getting out of hand.

The argument on the other side was not as reckless or ill-informed as some may think today when they look back on that summer in retrospect. Business inventories were mounting but consumer spending was beginning to slacken. New building contracts and housing starts were off sharply. Industrial production had been doing well up to June and employment continued to climb in July. Thereafter, both seemed to slack off a bit. And this, combined with significant declines in commodity prices convinced some of the economic experts that the time might prove unpropitious for a general braking action.

Those who favored an expansionist policy warned in subdued tones that such action at a time when parts of the economy were showing signs of hesitancy might push the whole nation into a recession.

A number of businessmen and college economics professors were then under the influence of a book published the previous year by William Trufant Foster and Wadill Catchings, the latter destined to become a partner in Goldman Sachs. Entitled "The Road to Plenty," it developed the rough thesis that an economy could keep expanding indefinitely so long as its consumers were supplied with enough money income. The authors maintained, however, that a high rate of production didn't automatically mean a corresponding high rate of consumer buying. Oversaving, time lags and other factors could create buying lags and excess capacity. The government, in such circumstances, should move in and put "more money into consumers' hands" until the situation was corrected.

No one could have known in July, 1929, that President Roosevelt would be putting part of these teachings into practice on a massive scale some years thereafter and today—40 years later—it is uncertain just to what extent the "expansionists" did influence the course of events and non-events that summer.

The Federal Reserve Board waited until August before deciding to take the risk of restraining the economy by raising the discount rate. But by then call money rates were so high they were sucking in funds from all over the country.

The prevailing atmosphere was one of rosy optimism—much of it generated by the continuous, spectacular run-up of securities prices. Congress had been taking little interest in the general state of the economy. Most of those months it was discussing tariffs and a new farm program, although it did begin discussions late in the summer of a new conservation measure proposed by President Hoover.

A few warning voices were raised. The markets experienced a few jolts in September. But overall there was little to prepare the nation for the black tidings that would begin pouring out of Wall St. on Oct. 23.

A good many bitter accusations accompanied the collapse—some of them certainly misplaced. Was the Fed wrong in raising the rediscount rate? Things would have been worse if it hadn't. Was Mr. Hoover wrong in expressing confidence in the economy? One can imagine what might have happened if he had failed to do so. Were the expansionists right after all? Perhaps, but the patient had to endure prolonged and cataclysmic convulsions before getting a probationary discharge.

These questions should not be considered of solely historical significance. Those who are trying to read the economic indicators today—who are not sure whether the government should apply more brakes, or what kind; or when, who are not sure whether it is better to risk more inflation than a recession—are confronting dilemmas that their counterparts of four decades ago would find vaguely familiar.

To be sure, the signs today are different. And some basic problems are different. Then the inflation was in securities. Today it is in commodity prices. The levers that should have been pulled in 1929 or earlier are not those that should be pulled today. In fact, it may be another 40 years before everyone will agree (alas, in retrospect) on which they should have been.

What does strike us as being particularly interesting is the thought that despite all the learned economic tomes that have been written, the statistics that have been collected, the agencies that have been created and the safeguards built into the economic system, the authorities don't seem much more firmly in command of the situation today than they did 40 years ago. So perhaps things haven't changed all that much since the golden summer of 1929.

ELDERLY TRANSIT FARE REDUCTION ACT—OUR SENIOR CITIZENS MUST BE HELPED—THEY CANNOT BE OVERLOOKED ANY LONGER

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the squeeze on the lives of millions of older Americans is constantly growing worse. Their incomes are almost always severely limited. Drug prices are at despairingly astronomical heights for the vast majority of them. Inflation and taxation tear at them from almost every side, as efforts to gain tax relief for them on earned income flutter helplessly by the wayside.

So many efforts to aid our elderly have been warped to the profit of others more than that of intended recipients. Such indications have surfaced in regard to medicare and medicaid recently. All in all, the picture is a sad one.

On the other hand, some bright spots have appeared. Individual jurisdictions have taken it upon themselves to extend considerations to the elderly which would alleviate their situations. In New York City, the elderly may ride for half fare on mass transit during nonrush hours, weekends, and holidays. This is a minimal benefit, which gives these citizens an incentive to utilize transit, keeping the scope of their activities wide. There is no reason at all why such a benefit cannot be made available to all senior citizens throughout the Nation.

We may do this through amendment of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1965. Priority in allocation of funds under the act could be made to those cities and other public agencies which will permit persons at least 65 years of age to use such mass transit facilities at specially reduced fares. This is the thrust of the measure I am introducing.

Under the 1965 act, local public bodies and various other public agencies that own or operate urban transit systems may apply to the Secretary of Transportation for financial aid. This measure amends the act to give priority to jurisdictions which offer at least a 75 percent fare reduction to those over 65. This reduction must occur on week days during nonrush hours, and all day Saturday, Sunday and holidays.

This is the only manner in which our Federal Government may exercise any authority in this area. The measure also amends the Interstate Commerce Act to authorize the Interstate Commerce

Commission to allow privately owned and operated carriers to reduce their rates for those aged 65 or over. This would affect trains, buses and water carriers.

Any increase or reduction in fares for interstate carriers must be approved by the ICC. This bill would give the ICC authority to approve deductions in this area.

In no way is this a punitive measure aimed at coercing urban mass transit jurisdictions to give the elderly an unfair benefit. We must upgrade the quality of American life for all older citizens. We simply have not addressed ourselves to the problem.

It should be possible to make available to these citizens an entire range of life-enhancing benefits. Other societies have done so. Why can we not? A list of possible benefits follows:

1. Reduce rates on commercial airlines for the elderly.
2. Support gerontology centers.
3. Allow deduction of all medical expenses incurred by them.
4. Allow retirement credit for service in Federal-State cooperative programs.
5. Make available outpatient drug coverage under Medicare.
6. Increase monthly benefits and cost of living raises.
7. Allow Federal employees to elect old age, survivors and disability coverage.
8. Increase the older person's personal income tax exemption from $600 to $1,200.
9. Provide an additional $5,000 exemption from income tax received as annuities, pensions or other retirement benefits.

I have introduced each of these measures in the Congress. There is broad popular support for every one of them. Further, the need for each of these benefits is positively established. None of them would penalize any sector of the economy.

Mr. Speaker, only in America do we ignore the basic needs of too many older Americans. They are too often patted on the back, given an absolute minimum and then ignored by society. It is a sad commentary on the quality of life in our society that we must beg for such gains now, after other nations have given all or most of them to their older citizens.

Mr. JOE HATCHER, OF THE NASHVILLE TENNESSEAN

(Mr. FULTON of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, for over 40 years, Mr. Hatcher, of the Nashville Tennessean, has dealt with the political scene in both our State and national affairs.

As the dean of Tennessee political columnists, Mr. Hatcher has become a tradition in our State, and a byword on all matters relating to the political activities of candidates of all parties. He has reported with insight and authority, and his store of knowledge on political affairs within Tennessee are unsurpassed.

Recently Mr. Hatcher was honored at a luncheon here on Capitol Hill, attended by the entire Tennessee congressional delegation; Representative CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma, our House majority leader; and Speaker of the House, Representative, JOHN McCORMACK, of Massachusetts. That luncheon was covered by the Nashville Tennessean's Washington correspondent, Mr. Edmund Willingham, and I include Mr. Willingham's article on that occasion in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON IN SALUTE TO HATCHER

(By Edmund Willingham)

WASHINGTON.—National leaders, Tennessee lawmakers and fellow newsmen turned out yesterday to pay tribute to Joe Hatcher, dean of Tennessee's political columnists.

Among the first to praise Hatcher's work at the Nashville Tennessean over a 48-year period was Bascom Timmons, the dean of Washington's political columnists.

Timmons, who covered Woodrow Wilson's nomination for President in Baltimore in 1912 and who has been covering the nation's capital ever since, said he had seen thousands of newspapermen float through this city, and added:

"Joe Hatcher is the peer of any newspaperman I've ever known. Go back and write some more columns, Joe. I need to keep informed."

The tributes came at a luncheon in the Capitol hosted by Rep. Joe Evins. Others present included the entire Tennessee delegation, newsmen who represent Tennessee papers in the capital, Rep. Carl Albert, D-Okla., House majority leader, Speaker John McCormack, D-Mass., and John Seigenthaler, editor of the Tennessean.

McCormack began his tribute by recalling that, as a young congressman, he had visited Silliman Evans Sr., the late publisher of the Tennessean, who was then serving as assistant postmaster general. McCormack said he was seeking four or five favors and that Evans graciously agreed to help him on each one.

McCormack thanked Evans, and then Evans thanked McCormack.

"But why are you thanking me?" McCormack inquired.

"For leaving me my desk," Evans said with a smile.

McCormack told Hatcher that the newsman's profession was an important one as it molded public opinion, and could do so on a sound or an emotional basis. "We of Massachusetts know of your profound mind and your great contribution," the speaker said.

Evins said Albert Einstein was asked why man could develop nuclear energy, but not solve his political problems. He said Einstein replied that politics was vastly more complicated than science.

"Joe is an expert in this complicated field," Evins said.

Gov. Buford Ellington wired his congratulations to Hatcher at the lucheon, saying:

"It is a great pleasure for me to join your many friends in Tennessee in offering congratulations on this occasion in your honor. Your 40-plus years as a political reporter and columnist are to be commended, and we are all proud of you and your distinguished career.

"May this occasion be an enjoyable and memorable one for all of you, and you have my best wishes in the years ahead."

Evins presented Hatcher with two gifts—a plaque on which a crystal ball was mounted, which Evins said Hatcher could use in the state's Senate race next year, and a pen about four times the normal size, which Evins said represented the power of Hatcher's pen.

Seigenthaler recalled some of the lighter moments of Hatcher's years on the paper, also noting that he had influenced the lives of many young newspapermen, including his own.

Rep. Richard Fulton presented Hatcher with a parchment certificate making him an honorary page of the House of Representatives. Fulton said Hatcher was not eligible for a poverty grant, or foreign aid, but that he was glad to honor him in this way.

Bill Keel, a former reporter for the Nashville Tennessean now serving as congressman Evins' administrative assistant, said he had the honor of being the only reporter to have been desk mate to Hatcher, Seigenthaler, and Amon Evans, publisher of the Tennessean. He said Hatcher was an important part of the "Tennessean tradition," which held the loyalty of the paper's alumni, now spread around the country.

DIRECT ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

(Mr. LOWENSTEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge that quick and positive action be taken to reform the U.S. Constitution. I fear that we are in danger of losing the sense of urgency for constitutional reform that we felt only months ago. But if we act forthrightly, we can avert a possible grave constitutional crisis while at the same time forging a governmental system that is more responsive to and representative of the American people.

One of the most pressing needs is for the inclusion of our younger citizens in the political process. I favor an amendment to the Constitution which permits 18-year-olds to vote. I will present further statements on this issue in coming days.

More immediately, we must address ourselves to the essential question of electoral reform. Before the sense of urgency that was recently with us has evaporated, we must eliminate the outmoded electoral college and substitute instead the more democratic system of direct election. We are all indebted to Senator BAYH for his fine efforts in illustrating the critical need for electoral reform. We should listen carefully when the Senator impresses upon us the need for speedy reform.

I favor the direct election of the President.

We elect all our Governors, mayors, legislatures, and town councils, and most of our homecoming queens, auditors, trial judges, "best athletes," and school board members—sometimes to gain experience in using the democratic process, sometimes to prove we do, in fact, believe in and use it. We elect all these people without benefit of intermediaries. I cannot believe there is any basis for continuing to deny ourselves the opportunity to do as much in the one election that counts about as much as all the rest put together.

As you know, the electoral college was devised specifically to prevent the people from voting directly for President, on the theory that they were not qualified to do so. The electors were to be better qualified than the general public, wiser men, men who would shun popular passions and prejudices and who, by reasoning together, would pick a President while sparing the Nation the consequences of undiluted campaigning and direct participation.

Does anyone now contend that the people are not qualified to elect their own President? That electors are better qualified? That they are wiser men who "reason together," or that if they were and did so it would be an acceptable way to choose a President? Or that the elector system spares the Nation the consequences of undiluted campaigning and direct participation? Or that the Nation wants to be—or should be—so spared?

Simply to state these questions is to establish that the theory that produced the electoral college is not valid in contemporary America, that in fact the application of that theory is impossible.

Occasionally an elector, remembering or hearing of the theory behind the creation of his job—perhaps wondering if he would earn his keep if he did not revive at least the spirit of the theory that produced the job—strays from the implementation of the wishes of the general public, tries as it were, to spare the general public the undiluted consequences of their participation in the general campaign. With what shock and rage we greet the behavior of so rash a fellow. What, we demand, gives him the authority to act as if he knew better what was good for the people than they know themselves?

But if indeed nothing so equips the elector, if to act thus independently of the people who elected him is to be "unfaithful" to his charge, what excuse then remains for his existence? What purpose if not mischief can be served by his existence?

In short, the electoral college remains as a vestigial hangover of an abandoned theory, a kind of residual relic of a time of limited trust in the capacity of the people to govern themselves at a time of narrowly limited franchise and narrowly delineated freedom.

So new theories have had to be concocted to justify the continuation of the electoral college, theories which seek to cloak their supporters in the rhetoric of democracy while limiting the application of democratic process at the most critical point and at its most critical time when people are most in need of assurance that they can in fact effect the policies of their Government and select the persons who are to run it. Thus, we march toward one-man, one-vote for every office except the one where it would have greatest significance, and try to bury the contradiction in high-flown phrases about lesser lingering inequities in the system. Some concern is expressed about the possibility that a third- or fourth-party candidate who had received a relatively small percentage of the popular vote might be able, through manipulation of the electoral college, to create a substantial constitutional crisis by delaying a decision as to who the new President would be. There is concern lest the selection of the President be reduced in this fashion to the temptations and seamy bargainings invited by electoral deadlock. And these concerns are surely justified.

But just as surely, the graver potential crisis is the one that would result from an election that produced a popular lead for one candidate and an electoral majority for another.

Nor, as we know, is this a far-fetched or vaguely hypothetical possibility, for we have come gymnastically close to precisely this result in three of the last six national elections. And although it is possible that the worst of the dangers inherent in an election in which no candidate received an electoral majority could in the event be averted, there is in fact no possible way to avert the gravest kind of crisis of confidence in leadership and process alike, that would result if the Nation were obliged to accept as President a man whose popular vote was less than that of his defeated rival.

Supporters of the electoral college sometimes suggest that only intransigent, if not fanatic, disciples of majoritarianism would attach crucial importance to the fact that a candidate winning an electoral majority missed a popular vote victory by a few thousand votes. But tiny margins are significant to the American electorate, and every year we give mandates to all manner of people elected by small pluralities.

And preserving a system for electing the President and Vice President which makes possible the most fundamental frustration of the will of the people is an invitation to disaster at a time when millions of Americans have already become cynical about how real democratic process is in the United States. To continue to extend this particular invitation seems especially gratuitous and unwise in these circumstances.

The simple fact is that only direct election can give equal weight to the vote of each citizen and assure that whoever receives the most votes will become President.

When all is said and done, many of those who oppose the direct election of the President place themselves in an extraordinary posture. The most sophisticated of them continue to try to cloak their opposition in democratic rhetoric, to base their support for the electoral college on elaborate hypotheses about delicate balances and countervailing powers. But if they are really concerned about the strengthening and extension of the democratic process—perhaps even in the Halls of Congress itself—they can hardly add to their credentials or to the force of their argument by seeking to preserve archaic subterfuges when it comes to filling the most important office of all. The sacrifice of the basic principles exemplified in, and served best by, popular election, is ill-balanced by speculative conjectures about which group, or bloc, or point of view might profit the most from such a denial.

The simple fact is that we do not know what group or bloc or point of view would profit from direct election of the President. We do know that the majority will of the American people would so profit. We do know that the use of the electoral and that had it cancelled out the votes millions of Americans every 4 years, and that had it canceled out the votes of only a few thousand more Americans on any of several recent occasions, it would have done so at enormous risk to the ability of the new President to govern and at enormous cost to the respect of the people for their own form of government. I see little sense in continuing to preserve, protect, and defend a booby trap which could blow apart the national electoral procedures simply to head off speculative infringements on theoretical special privileges of particular groups. I would remind the House how easy it is to drift, to find ourselves at the next presidential election still unprepared and ripe for constitutional crisis.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BIAGGI, for Wednesday, July 23, on account of official business.

Mr. BLACKBURN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for July 23 and 24, on account of official business.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and the balance of the week, on account of death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENNIS), to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WEICKER, for 1 hour, on Monday, August 4.

Mr. FINDLEY, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. SAYLOR, for 1 hour, on Thursday, July 24.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STOKES), to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DIGGS, for 60 minutes, on Wednesday, August 6.

Mr. MILLS (at the request of Mr. DORN), for 40 minutes, on July 28, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. KEE.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, immediately following the remarks of Mr. DENT in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. GROSS to include a letter in the colloquy with Mr. HAYS in the Committee of the Whole.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENNIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. KYL.

Mr. KEITH.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN in two instances.

Mrs. MAY.

Mr. BUSH in two instances.

XUM

Mr. Hosmer in two instances.
Mr. Derwinski in two instances.
Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Wyman in two instances.
Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Price of Texas.
Mr. Morse.
Mr. Conte.
Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Miller of Ohio.
Mr. Mizell in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Stokes) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. Chisholm in four instances.
Mr. Fisher in four instances.
Mr. Eilberg.
Mrs. Griffiths.
Mr. Rarick in four instances.
Mr. Gaydos in four instances.
Mr. Powell.
Mr. Ottinger in two instances.
Mr. Gonzalez in two instances.
Mr. Pepper.
Mr. Kee.
Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. William D. Ford in two instances.
Mr. Biaggi.
Mr. Shipley.
Mr. Koch in three instances.
Mr. Edwards of California in two instances.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania in two instances.
Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Dulski in two instances.
Mr. Miller of California in five instances.
Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Ullman in five instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 92. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Wong Yui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 24, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

985. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment for the quarter ending June 30, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

986. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effectiveness and administration of the Atterbury Job Corps Center for Men at Edinburg, Ind., under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Office of Economic Opportunity; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

987. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Program and Policy, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting the first annual report on the steps being taken to strengthen management practices in the foreign aid program, pursuant to the provisions of section 621(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

988. A letter from the Chairman, the Advisory Committee on the Arts, Department of State, transmitting the annual report of the cultural presentations program for fiscal year 1968, pursuant to law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

989. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of the publication "Recreational Opportunities at Hydroelectric Projects Licensed by the Federal Power Commission"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13018. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–386). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 6778. A bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself, Mr. Cowger, and Mr. McCloskey):

H.R. 13047. A bill to revise the laws relating to post offices and post roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 13048. A bill to create a Department of Youth Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 13049. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 13050. A bill to provide that John F. Kennedy's birthday shall be celebrated as a legal public holiday on the last Friday in May; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13051. A bill to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system, to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 13052. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to extend by 1 year the period in which certain guaranty and insurance entitlement may be used by World War II veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JACOBS (for himself, Mr. Adair, Mr. Albert, Mr. Andrews of Alabama, Mr. Annunzio, Mr. Barrett, Mr. Biaggi, Mr. Blanton, Mr. Brasco, Mr. Burton of California, Mr. Button, Mr. Carey, Mr. Clark, Mr. Davis of Georgia, Mr. Dent, Mr. Dorn, Mr. Eckhardt, Mr. Eshleman, Mr. Feighan, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Gaydos, Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Gray, Mrs. Green of Oregon, and Mr. Hagan):

H.R. 13053. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS (for himself, Mr. Hansen of Idaho, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Horton, Mr. Kastenmeier, Mr. Kluczynski, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. McDade, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Miller of Ohio, Mrs. Mink, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Murphy of Illinois, Mr. Ottinger, Mr. Patten, Mr. Podell, Mr. Powell, Mr. Preyer of North Carolina, Mr. Price of Illinois, Mr. Purcell, Mr. Reuss, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Rosenthal, and Mr. Sisk):

H.R. 13054. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS (for himself, Mr. Symington, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Ullman, Mr. Vigorito, Mr. Waldie, Mr. Wampler, Mr. White, Mr. Whitehurst, Mr. Winn, Mr. Wolff, Mr. Teague of California, Mr. Wright, Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania, Mr. Brinkley, Mr. Dowdy, Mr. Hechler of West Virginia, Mr. Rogers of Colorado, Mr. Fulton of Tennessee, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Carter, Mr. Andrews of North Dakota, Mr. Lukens, Mr. Madden, and Mr. Buchanan):

H.R. 13055. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS (for himself, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Culver, Mr. Hogan, Mr. Kee, Mr. Flowers, Mr. Bray, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Findley, Mr. Matsunaga, Mr. Anderson of Illinois, Mrs. Chisholm, Mr. Giaimo, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Cowger, Mr. Abbitt, Mr. McCulloch, Mr. Biester, Mr. Sandman, and Mr. Burton of Utah):

H.R. 13056. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 13057. A bill to assure an opportunity for employment to every American seeking work and to make available the education and training needed by any persons to qualify for employment consistent with his highest potential and capability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 13058. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide priority in the allocation of funds thereunder to those cities and other public agencies which will permit persons who are at least 65 years of age to use the facilities at specially reduced fares, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 13059. A bill to require the President to appoint a Moon Landing Monument Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 13060. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the basic workweek of firefighting personnel of executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 13061. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida (by request):

H.R. 13062. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act in order to provide for changes in the method of payment of referees for the National Railway Adjustment and Special Adjustment Boards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. Olsen, Mr. Rogers of Colorado, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Podell, Mr. Reuss, Mr. Hungate, Mrs. Mink, Mr. Carter, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Rees, Mr. Roybal, Mr. Gaydos, Mr. Wyman, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Murphy of New York, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Matsunaga, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Mikva, Mrs. Chisholm, Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania, Mr. Hechler of West Virginia, Mr. Andrews of North Dakota, and Mr. Donohue):

H.R. 13063. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to develop training in family medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. Biaggi, Mr. Fish, Mr. Patten, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Anderson of California, Mr. Philbin, Mr. Derwinski, Mr. Dent, Mr. Wolff, Mr. Hanley, Mr. Kluczynski, Mr. Kuykendall, Mr. Gubser, Mr. Daniels of New Jersey, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Conyers, and Mr. Biester):

H.R. 13064. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to develop training in family medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 13065. A bill to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system, to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STAFFORD (for himself, Mr. Harvey, Mr. Shriver, and Mr. Robison):

H.R. 13066. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 13067. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 13068. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to encourage shipbuilding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. UTT (for himself and Mr. Bob Wilson):

H.R. 13069. A bill authorizing the President to proclaim the week including the Fourth of July as "God Bless America Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 13070. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLD:

H.R. 13071. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 13072. A bill to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 13073. A bill to authorize appropriations to be used for the elimination of certain rail-highway grade crossings in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 13074. A bill to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system, to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COUGHLIN (for himself and Mr. Schneebeli):

H.J. Res. 832. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 833. Joint resolution for the establishment of a Drug Commission between the United States, Mexico, and Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FREY (for himself and Mr. Chappell):

H.J. Res. 834. Joint resolution to redesignate the area in the State of Florida known as Cape Kennedy as "Cape Canaveral"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H. Con. Res. 304. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress relating to films and broadcasts which defame, stereotype, ridicule, demean, or degrade ethnic, racial, and religious groups; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCARTHY (for himself, Mr. Biaggi, Mrs. Chisholm, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Corman, Mr. Culver, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Fascell, Mr. Foley, Mr. Green of Pennsylvania, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Hathaway, Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Kluczynski, Mr. Kyros, Mr. Mollohan, Mr. Nix, Mr. O'Hara, Mr. Roybal, Mr. St Germain, Mrs. Sullivan, Mr. Symington, and Mr. Wright):

H. Res. 490. Resolution urging the President to resubmit for ratification the Geneva Protocol of 1925 banning the first use of gas and bacteriological warfare; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURLESON of Texas:

H.R. 13075. A bill providing for the extension of patent No. D–170,115; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 13076. A bill for the relief of Peter Heinrich Joehnssen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 13077. A bill for the relief of Dr. John D. Fissekis and his wife, Jennifer Ann McPhee Fissekis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 13078. A bill for the relief of Herman Frederick Erben; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

186. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Vick Gould, Bellevue, Wash., and others, relative to amending the Constitution to limit taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

187. Also, petition of Karl H. Stell, Hyattsville, Md., relative to redress of grievance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GROWTH OF INDIA

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

[From the Pittsburgh Press, July 9, 1969]

INDIA SHOWS SOLID SIGNS OF GROWTH—NEW ECONOMICS GIVES FREEDOM FROM SUPER-POWERS

(By Dale D. Morsch)

New Delhi.—India at last is showing solid signs of economic growth.

It follows an era of preoccupation with the super-powers, a grappling with the illusive policy of nonalignment and serious internal economic problems.

India has certainly not turned into an economic giant. Serious problems of food and finance still plague its development.

But the country is close to achieving self-sufficiency in food. Improved seed and agricultural techniques are bringing in bumper harvests and may enable India to export grain within a few years.

Industry is developing slowly but steadily after a serious recession following devaluation of the rupee in 1966. India now has technical know-how in many industries including steel, heavy engineering, fertilizer, oil exploration, chemicals, antibiotics, textile machinery, aviation, railways and shipbuilding.

India is diversifying its exports from traditional agricultural commodities and raw materials to finished industrial and chemical goods, including military hardware.

NEW REGIONS

As a result, New Delhi is in the proces of gearing its foreign policy to this new economic policy, exploring new regions of the world and improving relations with others.

This wind of change was reflected in two conferences held for Indian envoys who were summoned to New Delhi this year—one for the southeast Asia envoys in January and another for representatives in the Mideast and North Africa held in May.

At both meetings the emphasis was on increasing trade and economic relations with the nations in these regions. The envoys were asked to concentrate on finding markets for Indian goods and striking colaboration agreements in which India will supply the know-how, plant and machinery.

Since the greatest scope for achieving these aims lies in the developing countries, India is looking mainly towards Asia, Africa and South America.

TRADE INCREASE

Trade already has increased with several countries in these regions and India has contracted bilateral collaboration agreements with some of them. New trade and cultural agreements with nations as far off as South America are being negotiated.

Prime Minister Mme. Indira Gandhi's visit to six Latin American countries last year was the first for an Indian prime minister.

India's more flexible foreign policy also is apparent in New Delhi's gradually changing attitude toward the United States and the Soviet Union.

By and large, India has been dependent on the United States for foodgrains and on the Soviet Union for arms. Both situations are changing with India slowly gaining self-sufficiency in both.

A new independence from the super-powers is taking shape, though India still has heavy economic commitments to them.

SPEECH OF HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT ON THE 51ST ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, July 17, 1969, the Department of the District of Columbia of the American Legion opened its 51st annual convention at the Sheraton Park Hotel in the city of Washington.

As a member of the Joseph G. Weeda Post No. 66, Department of the District of Columbia, it was my privilege to attend, as a delegate, the formal opening ceremonies on Thursday evening.

Mr. Speaker, the opening ceremonies were most impressive. The performance of the National Guard of Honor of the American Legion, the Navy Band, and the memorial services emphasized the gratitude that we should all have for the opportunity to be American citizens.

Our very distinguished colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT, of the Eighth Congressional District of Virginia, who is also a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, presented a most inspiring and informative address as the principal speaker.

Because our principal speaker, Congressman SCOTT, made such an excellent speech, I feel that his outstanding remarks should be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all of us to share. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have requested unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the inspiring words spoken by our principal speaker to the 181 delegates, 181 alternate delegates, and guests of this historic occasion:

Mr. Commander, comrades, ladies and gentlemen:

It should not be strange to address the Department of the District of Columbia because I first joined the American Legion in 1945 as a member of Justice Post, but about 2 years later moved my membership to Fairfax Post 177 in Virginia to which I still belong. 1945 to 1969 is almost half of the time that the Legion has been in existence, so I have had an opportunity not only to participate but to observe your youth and your rehabilitation programs. In my opinion, there is nothing better that we, as Americans, can do than to instill a program of Americanism in our youth and I doubt that there is any finer way of doing this than by sponsoring "boys or girls state or nation." Under these programs, our youth learn of the spirit of America which is essential in our Nation today.

A colleague of mine in the House of Representatives this week inserted an article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD written by a county agent from his district. Let me read it to you.

"He is an American—a good man—and as he walked out of the club house of his country club and stopped a few yards from the flag pole, he looked up, his eyes searching for the sparkle of the stars and the glow of the colors, and he realized that it had been a long time since he had paid any attention to the flag. It was dirty, frayed and faded.

He whispered, "say, what's happened to you, old glory? Where's the sparkle in your stars, the beauty of your colors, and the proud way you used to wave in the wind?"

The flag fluttered slightly in the night air, and it seemed that echoes from the ghost of a thousand patriots answered him, "times have changed since World War II."

"Oh, I don't know," Joe shrugged, "I've lost some hair, but I'm just as proud of you as the day we landed in Normandy. Boy! Wasn't that a day! We sure showed the enemy a thing or two."

"When was the last time you did the pledge of allegiance to old glory?" the echoes asked.

"Now, wait a minute. I've been busy. I've got a living to make, a family to raise and I've done a pretty good job of it too, if I do say so myself."

"Have you taught them the pledge of allegiance?" the echoes asked.

"Now, wait a minute! That's the teacher's job. That's what we pay them for," Joe answered.

"When was the last time you did the pledge of allegiance?" the echoes persisted.

"Now how can you expect me to remember? People just don't go around spouting the pledge at the drop of a hat. Besides, they think you are a square nowadays if you get sentimental about things like God, and country and all."

"Would you do the pledge for old glory?" the echoes asked.

"What! Right here in the open? They'd think I had flipped my lid, or something."

As Joe talked, he noticed the flag flap against the pole and go limp. The night hissed about him. Joe looked up and said, "All right, I guess it won't hurt anybody to say it. Boy! It sure has been a long time. Anyway, here goes—" He placed his hand over his heart, looked up at Old Glory and said, fervently, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the nation for which it stands, one—one—one" he stammered. "One nation—" The struggle continued, and he finally gave up. "Well, what do you know? I guess I forgot."

"We thought so," the echoes seemed to mourn.

"Say, what's with you anyway," Joe asked. "Has somebody been giving you a hard time?"

"I guess you could say that."

"They have? Who?" he asked.

"Well, for starters," the echoes began, "how about those students in Sweden who painted the swastika over the stars and paraded the flag in front of the American embassy."

"But, why would they do that?"

"Because of the Vietnam war," chimed the echoes, "and in England they climbed the flag pole, tore down Old Glory, and threw it in the sewer."

"But wait a minute!" Joe exclaimed. "They are supposed to be our friends."

"We thought so too." The echoes agreed. "And that's not all. DeGaulle has thrown us out of France."

"DeGaulle has thrown us out of France!" Joe exploded. "Has he forgotten so soon how we hit the beaches of Omaha, caused the breakthrough at St. Lo, crushed the Krauts in the hedge rows over all France, and lit up the streets of Paris with your beautiful colors?"

"He has forgotten," the echoes mourned.

"Well, that's over there, Old Glory. You're over here now. We love you over here."

"You would think so," the echoes droned, "But on Veteran's Day in New York they called the police and asked to have the veterans and Old Glory off the streets because they were blocking traffic."

"But—but—but," Joe stammered.

"And that hotel in Minneapolis," the echoes continued, "refused to serve our wheelchair buddies because it might embarrass the guests."

"Yes! I remember that," Joe said.

"And how about those parades in San Francisco and New York where draft cards were wrapped in Old Glory and set aflame; and then a great, young athlete, a world heavyweight champion who made millions of dollars fighting with his fists. refused to lift a hand in defense of his country."

The echoes grew silent, Joe stared at Old Glory and shivered; and as he turned and walked toward his car it seemed he heard the echoes again as they cried, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

The writer must be a concerned citizen and we need more of them. But let's look back for a moment in history. Our country was settled by people who came here to build a nation. They were asking for nothing but a chance to work, and the hardships they faced made them more determined to succeed. These self-respecting people built a great land, a great society, created by the labor and driving force of great Americans. While we would not worship our ancestors, we should remember that individual effort and self-determination operating within a friendly climate provide us with the high standard of living we enjoy today. We still have young men taking any job they can obtain and furthering their education at night; young wives working by day and housekeeping after hours; making their way, building a future for themselves and their families. This is the strength of America. It should be encouraged.

While the American Legion can be proud of its accomplishments, we, as individuals, can do more. We have associated ourselves together to maintain law and order, to foster and perpetuate a 100% Americanism; to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom and democracy. There are familiar words to all legionnaires, but there is nothing in the preamble about a permissive society where any action is tolerated, about a kept society which undermines individual effort and initiative. We can blame the courts for crime and unrest in the country; we can say they favor the accused rather than protect society; we can blame our churches for providing funds for those who riot and demonstrate; we can blame our teachers for encouraging and sometimes joining in disturbances; we can blame the news media for giving unwarranted publicity to militant groups. But if we are responsible citizens, we need to think about solutions to the problems confronting society. As legionnaires we can be proud of the religious emphasis program to bring people closer to their Creator. We can point with pride to the support given to the G.I. bill of rights adopted unanimously 25 years ago in the House of Representatives and providing opportunity for the returning veterans.

But with our pride of accomplishment, there is a need to recognize that problems exist and to look for solutions.

Within the past few weeks, a number of Congressmen, 22 of them in fact, visited college campuses and filed a report with the President about college disturbances. They found that a small nucleus on our college campuses were radicals who were willing to overthrow the university or the country by almost any means, but that a larger number were loyal students who felt that no one listened to them; that they had something to say and an inadequate outlet. Aside from the racial problems, some felt that the Government was spending too much money on defense programs and not enough to relieve poverty and hunger; some felt that there was too much reliance upon force; some felt that there was economic oppression in the country; some felt that they were too remote from the persons making decisions over their lives; some felt that the war in Vietnam was immoral and unjust; some felt that the establishment was hypocritical, that we spoke of ideals which were non-existent in day-to-day life.

Now, for my part, I believe our schools should be operated by the establishment and do not believe that the students generally have the know-how, the wisdom or the experience to operate a school system. In my opinion, authority must be given to the teacher if he is to teach the student. And yet, the student needs an outlet; he needs to be able to submit his grievance to someone who will listen, even though the final decision by the school authorities may be different from his suggestion. I would submit also that any students' attitudes are implanted long before they reach the college campus and that places a responsibility on us as parents, upon teachers in the elementary and high schools, upon those in our church schools and others having contact with youngsters, to train the child early in life to have the proper relationship to society and to government.

I believe we, in our Legion Posts and in our civic organizations, can help with disorder in our city and in our suburbs by recognizing law enforcement officials who have made some outstanding contribution to the community; by honoring the "officer of the week"; by sponsoring "law enforcement days:" By encouraging the newspapers to highlight the impact of crime upon the community; by becoming involved. Perhaps the reluctance of the average citizen to become involved is a major contributing factor to today's problems I wonder if the job of a police official is not easier if he feels that the public is interested in his work and appreciates his effort.

One of the items presently being considered in the Congress is the anti-ballistic missile program. As you know, the Senate is now considering the matter and, if approved, it will later come before the House. I read in yesterday's paper that some activists will hold round the clock vigil on the capitol steps in opposition to this program. Yet I'm convinced that a majority of our citizens favor it. The President's program is based upon the best professional and technical advice available to him. It is supported by the National Security Council. It is a defensive program. It's an alternative to offensive action or destruction of our Nation. But some say it will not work; that some missiles may get through; that even if we knock down 9, the 10th may get through. Certainly, we hope that this is not true, but even if it is, the enemy would have to greatly multiply his arsenal before he would attack us. Some say it is too costly and that we should be spending the money on our cities. But if we fail to defend the country, there may be no cities or suburbs. Now I'm not in favor of waste by any branch of the Government, but, in my opinion, national defense is essential to all other programs. The safety of millions of Americans, the survival of the country may depend upon having a strong defense system. Past experience indicates that we can't expect the Soviet Union to stop military spending if we unilaterally weaken our defenses. They might well exploit our weaknesses. We cannot concede the world struggle to communism by default. This is a program to seek out and destroy missiles that may be aimed at our shores by potential enemies. Therefore, I fully intend to support the President's program if it passes the Senate intact and hope that our country will be united against any threat to our national security.

There is division within the country about how to deal with crime and disorder at home and how to wage war abroad or even whether we should be in Vietnam. And there is reason for concern about this division. For looking at Mark's gospel, we find: "And if a kingdom be divided against itself, that kingdom cannot stand. And if Satan rise up against himself, and be divided, he cannot stand, but hath an end. No man can enter into a strong man's house, and spoil his goods, except he will first bind the strong man; and then he will spoil his house."

We must not let our country be destroyed by militants who appear to have a vicious hatred for everything good and who would tear the world as it exists to the ground. On the campus of the University of California, one of the militants stated: "If necessary we will destroy the entire university; if necessary, we will destroy the entire government." One of our more thoughtful columnists James J. Kilpatrick has said: "Too many months have been wasted in trying to reason with unreason;" that the term "students for a democratic society" is a travesty of semantics and he offers constructive suggestions by stating that the problem lies in the absence of leadership among the law-abiding students, professors, administrators and public officials. Kilpatrick states that discipline is the foundation of learning and of freedom; that students who are not at the university to learn should be expelled so that those who are on the campus for that purpose can learn.

We hear a lot about student rights, but nothing compels a student to enter a university and to partake of private benefactors or the public purse. Learning is a process of transmitting tradition and analytical understanding from the teacher to the student. If the proper relationship of subordination between the student and the teacher is destroyed in the name of equality or student rights, the probability of teaching and being taught is destroyed.

So whether we are talking about student disorders, crime or national defense, there are questions to be resolved. How far do individual rights and liberty extend before they become license? Is the American heritage of pride in principle as important today as in past generations? Is loyalty and love of country vital and necessary to maintenance of the American way of life? If we answer all of these in the affirmative, to whom do we look to preserve the true character, the dignity, the power and prestige of our country? We must look to you and to others who love our country and respect its institutions. For we know that "bad things happen when good men do nothing."

Most of our citizens are patriotic. They love God and country. But proper leadership is needed in government at all levels, in our schools, in our churches, and in our homes. Americanism is an expression of faith, of convictions, of attitudes, and actions here at home among our own people. We're as good as we think we are. You and I, the ordinary citizen, must maintain the spirit of America, the will to succeed, pride in our country and its accomplishments.

So I urge you to be active in the affairs of your government, in your church, your schools, your civic and fraternal organizations. It's easy to recall the recruitment poster with the old gentleman pointing his finger and saying: "Uncle Sam Needs You!" This is true not only on the battlefield but on the home front. I am confident that the challenge will be met and that we will not be found wanting.

ASTRONAUT NEIL ARMSTRONG PREDICTED MOON FLIGHT DURING 1964 VISIT TO WEST VIRGINIA

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, yesterday I called attention to the contributions of a West Virginian, Col. Charles Yeager, to the accumulation of knowledge and experience that resulted in the manned flight to the moon.

Today I have seen a newspaper article about the visit of Neil Armstrong, the first man to set foot on the moon, to West Virginia. Armstrong visited the National Youth Science Camp in 1964 and talked with the 100 talented young men who participate in its programs each summer.

During this visit Armstrong was interviewed by Eldora Nuzum, the capable editor of the Elkins Inter-Mountain, and confidently predicted that men would go to the moon before 1970.

Mr. President, a United Press International article recounting Armstrong's visit to West Virginia was published in the June 20 issue of the Post-Herald & Register of Beckley, W. Va. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Astronaut Was Recent Visitor to Pocahontas County Science Fair

Elkins.—"A man who may be the first American to land on the moon was in the outer limits of Elkins Tuesday," the Elkins Inter-Mountain reported on July 8, 1964.

At that time Neil Armstrong of Wapakoneta, Ohio, was one of three civilian astronauts. Early Monday, he and Edwin Aldrin were scheduled to land on the moon.

Armstrong had visited the West Virginia National Science Camp at Green Bank, Pocahontas County, and was interviewed by Editor Eldora Nuzum of The Inter-Mountain at the Randolph County Airport.

"When will the United States attempt the first moon landing?" Mrs. Nuzum asked Armstrong.

"Our intention is to bring men back from the moon prior to 1970," the astronaut answered.

Even five years ago Armstrong expressed the utmost confidence that man would reach the moon.

"Current emphasis in the Apollo program is how to bring a man back to earth from the moon," Armstrong said five years ago.

XUM

When Mrs. Nuzum asked the Apollo 11 passenger why he wanted to be an astronaut, he retorted:

"Doesn't everyone want to be an astronaut?"

In a more serious vein, Armstrong said he wanted "to participate in a great adventure and contribute to the knowledge of man."

The astronaut said of the delegates to the science camp, two top science students from each of the 50 states:

"I was impressed by the boys at the science camp. Those boys are intelligent. It kept me on my toes keeping ahead of them."

WE NEED A DAY EACH YEAR TO HONOR THE LEGACY OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which would declare the last Friday in May as a legal holiday to honor the birth date of the late President John F. Kennedy. President Kennedy was young, vigorous, aggressive, and scholarly. He was a man who estimated the need of his country and of the world and sought to fulfill the need. He was a man who was wedded to peace and vigorously sought this greatest goal of all mankind. He sensed how catastrophic nuclear conflict could be and he sought a realistic course to avoid it. He was a man who saw the dangers inherent in continuing inequality in our land and sought rational and lasting ways to overcome it. President Kennedy was a man to whom the words "national interest" were much more than words. He believed that each generation must contribute its best to the fulfillment of the American dream.

I believe it is especially appropriate that legislation which would establish a national holiday in honor of the birth date of this great American should be introduced today while we all watch our astronauts zoom homeward toward the completion of their Apollo 11 mission. As I watched the launch from Cape Kennedy last Wednesday morning on television, I was reminded of a hot sunny Thursday in May of 1961 when then President Kennedy rode up Capitol Hill to address a joint session of the Congress on national needs. There was only one real surprise in this speech when he said:

> . . . I believe the nation should commit itself to achieving the goal before this decade is out, of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to earth. . . .

As we all know, we reached President Kennedy's goal for the Nation this past Sunday night when Neil Armstrong disembarked from our lunar landing ship and stood on the moon surface. The fact that this goal was achieved is a tribute to the Kennedy spirit and to our ability as a Nation to achieve seemingly insurmountable obstacles.

I believe we need a day each year in which we can honor the spirit of challenge which President Kennedy brought to the Nation. When we are facing difficult times, we should always remember, as President Kennedy did, that this Nation is capable of any goal we set for it. When he said that we should all ask not what our country could do for us, but what we could do for our country, he made us all stop and think. In these times, I think a national holiday in honor of his birth date will make us stop and think and remember how much America means to each of us. Earlier this year, the council of the city of Philadelphia passed a resolution asking the Congress to declare a national holiday in honor of the birth date of President Kennedy. I hope the other Members will feel as strongly as I do about the legacy which this great American left us all and move swifty to honor him as is his due.

POPULATION CONTROL

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, people in the United States tend to think of population control as something which mainly concerns India, China, and Africa and other areas where teeming millions are already poor and underfed, and where a further surge in population will mean starvation for many.

In an article published in the Washington Post on Sunday, July 20, Dr. Jean Mayer, member of the Center of Population Control Studies at Harvard University, makes the significant point that the world's population control problems lie not mainly in the poor countries, because we will probably be able to meet the food problem in 20 or 30 years, but in the areas of the globe where the people are becoming richer, because:

> Rich people occupy much more space, consume more of each natural resource, disturb ecology more and create more land, air, water, chemical, man and radioactive pollution than poor people.

This is a new perspective on the population explosion, and one which is of direct concern to America. I commend Dr. Mayer's article to the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S THE RICH DOING CROWDING

(By Jean Mayer)

One theme of this essay is that food is only one of the elements in the population problem. Admittedly, at present, it is a major factor in some parts of the world, but there are large areas where the national food supply is a minor factor and others where it is not a factor at all. Furthermore, considering the world as a whole, there is no evidence that the food situation is worsening and there is at least a likelihood that food may at some time (20 or 30 years from now) be removed altogether as a limiting factor to population.

Yet to deny that the population problem is basically one of food for survival is not to deny that there is a population problem; it is in fact to remove the appearance of a safety valve and also to reveal the problem in its generality. For were we really to starve when the population reaches a certain magic number, this in turn would cause a drastic increase in child and infant mortality, decreased fertility and a shortening of the average life span.

In other words, it would cause the increase in population to be self-limiting. If the world can continue to feed—however badly—an ever-increasing number of people, this safety valve (however unpalatable, it *would* be a safety valve) is missing. And if lack of food is not a component of the definition of overpopulation, rich countries become candidates for overpopulation.

Another theme is that there is a strong case to be made for a stringent population policy on exactly the reverse of the basis Malthus expounded. Malthus was concerned with the steadily more widespread poverty that indefinite population growth would inevitably create. I am concerned about the areas of the globe where people are rapidly becoming richer.

For rich people occupy much more space, consume more of each natural resource, disturb the ecology more and create more land, air, water, chemical, thermal and radioactive pollution than poor people. So it can be argued that from many viewpoints, it is even more urgent to control the numbers of the rich than it is to control the numbers of the poor.

That the magnitude of the population problem has increased dramatically in recent years is well publicized. Scholars have estimated that after hundreds of thousands of years of slow growth, the population of the world reached the quarter billion mark some time around the beginning of this era. It doubled to 500 million by 1650. Two centuries later, it reached the billion mark.

The next doubling took 80 years, with a population of two billion in 1930. It would appear that the world is on its way to the next doubling, to four billion in 45 years, by 1975; and a population of eight billion may well be reached within the following 30 or 35 years unless rates of growth are drastically decreased. The present growth rate would lead to a population of 500 billion by the year 2200 and give the surface of all continents a population density equal to that of Washington, D.C. at present.

This increase has been due not to an increase in birth rates but to a decrease in death rates. Around 1700, life expectancy at birth of European populations was about 33 years, and had increased little in the previous 300 to 400 years. By 1950, life expectancy in Western and Central Europe and in the United States had increased to 66–69 years, an increase of over 100 per cent.

This decrease in mortality rates is no longer confined to populations of European stocks. In 1946, the death rate of the Moslem population of Algeria was higher than that of Sweden in 1775. In 1954, in spite of generalized guerrilla war on its territory, the death rate of this population was lower than that of Sweden in 1875. A similar telescoping of the drop in death rates is going on all over the world.

From the demographic point of view, it must be noted that a drop in the death rate, with birth rate unchanged, not only results in an increase in the rate of population growth but also produces an acceleration in the rate of growth itself: a decline in age-specific mortality rates in ages prior to the end of the childbearing age has the same demographic effect as an increase in the birth rate. In the United States, 97 out of every 100 newborn white females reach the age of 20; 91 reach the age of 50. In Guatemala, only 70 reach the age of 20; 49 that of 50. If the death rate in Guatemala fell within the next decade to somewhere near the 1950 United States level, a not unlikely development, this alone would increase the number of women reaching the beginning of the childbearing period by 85 per cent.

Because of the high proportion of young

people in underdeveloped countries generally—a country like Costa Rica has twice the proportion of people under 15 that Sweden has—this drop in the death rate in the prechildbearing period has now and will have in the next few years a gigantic effect on the birth rate. Brazil had 52 million people in 1950, 71 million in 1960 and 83 million in 1966. If present rates prevail, it should have 240 million by the year 2000, or 14 times the 1900 population. With a drop in mortality in the young age groups, the increase could be even more spectacular.

DEPRESSION A FACTOR

The significance of the demographic trends within this country is not generally appreciated. The United States, with a population of 200 million, has at present 1/16th of the earth's population on 1/16th of the land area. Though a number of underdeveloped areas are piling up population faster, we are accumulating about 2.2 million people per year, more than any increase before 1946. The rate of growth seems unimpressive, 1.1 for the year 1967 (the highest rate reached was 1.8 in 1946 to 1957). If the rate prevailing over the past five years persists, the population of the United States will reach 300 million by the year 1990.

What most of us have tended to ignore is that the so-called baby boom of the postwar era followed a period of depression and very low birth rates: from 1920 to 1933, the birth rate had fallen steadily from 27.7 per 1000 in 1920 to 18.4 in 1933. The absolute decline in births was less steep, because the numerical base of women of childbearing age was still growing. When the birth rate started rising in the early '40s, the increase was applied to the still large number of women born between 1916 and 1924. Since 1945, the baby boom that has been so well publicized had actually been taking place on the basis of the shrinking group of women of childbearing age born since 1924.

As of 1963, the last of the undersize groups had entered the reproducing age. From 1964 (when the first girls born in the big postwar years reached the age of 18), the number of women in the childbearing age has started increasing rapidly. While in 1940 there were 32 million women 15 to 44 years of age, in 1950, 34 million, and in 1960, 36 million (a very slow increase), there will be 43 million in 1970 and 54 million in 1980.

While the birth rate is declining (and while a better index, the age-standardized general fertility rate based upon women of childbearing age only, is also declining), the sheer existence of the number of women and girls alive now means that even in the unlikely event that the fertility rate fell to the historical lows of the depression years and never departed from it, the population of the United States would still more than double in the next century. The reader will, I trust, give me credit for not minimizing the problem of total population either at home or for the world at large.

"DENSITY" MEANS LITTLE

With this picture of ever-increasing numbers of people, the first reaction among a portion of the public is that we are running out of space, that the "population density" is becoming dangerously high.

This concept of "population density"—number of people per unit surface—has underlain the concept of "overpopulation" in the past. It is not very useful except where the primary resources are extractive (mining) and where the most primitive types of agriculture (independent of industry for fertilizers, machines, etc., and hence essentially dependent on area) and forestry prevail. It also presupposes that there is no industry to absorb surplus manpower.

It is a concept of dubious value where nonextractive industries are dominant and where trade is possible. The high density band from Boston to Washington has an area of 14,000 square miles, an aggregate population of over 30 million (or over 2000 persons per square mile) and very limited natural resources. The median family income is $1000 more than for the United States as a whole. Can this area be said to be overpopulated from a material standpoint?

To those who object that this area is part of a larger and less densely populated whole, one might point to prosperous Holland or Belgium, or even Hong Kong, which, although trade with its hinterland is very meager (imports from mainland China represent only 17 per cent of total imports), not only houses 3.1 million people on 398 square miles (12,700 per square mile) but has shown an unexcelled increase in national product of 7 to 10 per cent per year—a doubling of real output within ten years.

Once one argues that a certain population density should be preserved, such as density with respect to capital, for example, one is dealing with a much more complex concept. From it follows the idea that some sparsely settled countries need rapid increases in population, preferably through immigration, for optimal use of resources. The mental image of population density entertained by most people is, in any case, complicated by esthetic and social considerations, and "high density" is more likely to be ascribed to Calcutta than to Paris, to Costa Rica than to Denmark.

This leads us to the second and more popular concept, that overpopulation can best be appraised with respect to food resources and that the present rate of increase in the world's population is rapidly carrying us to the brink of or to actual starvation. It is my contention that this is not happening.

Furthermore, I do not consider that my belief, which I shall now endeavor to justify, makes me an "optimist" as compared to the legions of conservationists, social scientists, etc., who have embraced a Malthusian "pessimism." If anything, this view makes me even more pessimistic about our chances of limiting the world's population at an early date: famine or the threat of famine is perhaps the worst method of limitation, but it would work.

A SHORT-LIVED "TREAT"

World War II was not a Malthusian check. In spite of the horrendous numbers of soldiers and civilians killed, in spite of the massive genocide perpetrated by the Nazis, food production decreased much more than population. By 1945, intake per capita was 16 per cent lower than the 1934–38 average. The creation of the Food and Agriculture Organization, a specialized United Nations agency that was endowed during its first years with particularly articulate spokesmen, dramatized the worldwide concern over the food situation.

The difficulties inherent in getting agriculture going while industry and the means of communication were not yet rebuilt led to a generalized feeling of pessimism. Cereals, oils, meat, dairy herds were, in succession, the objects of great attention, the conclusion being in each case that prewar levels of production and consumption were not going to be reached for years. The chaotic state of international trade accentuated shortages, which UNRRA and various emergency agreements attempted to cope with on an ad hoc basis.

And yet very quickly the situation improved. The oil shortage vanished first; while the gigantic ground nut scheme of the British government, which was supposed to mitigate it, was taking off to a very slow start, the reappearance in the channels of trade of adequate amounts of fats and oils eliminated the motivation for the scheme itself.

U.S. production of cereals and animal products, which had grown during the war in spite of the lack of abundant manpower and the diversion of the chemical industry to military purposes, had to be slowed down as surpluses started accumulating and, with their appearance, the threat of a collapse of agricultural prices loomed. By 1952-3, the worldwide rate of per capita production of food had overtaken prewar rates.

Since then, the average rate of increase in the production of food for the world at large has been 3 per cent per year while the population has increased on the average 1.7 per cent. In document No. 8148, the State Department estimates that if individual consumption levels remained at the 1955-7 level, the world at large would show by 1975 an annual surplus of 40 million tons of wheat and 70 million tons of rice. (This estimate is based on the postulate that there will be no increase in rice production in Europe and North America and no increase in wheat production in North America.)

Actually, this slight but steady gain of food production over population is part of a secular trend. E. S. and W. S. Woytinski, in their monumental "World Population and Production," estimate that since 1850 the increase in output has been more rapid than the increase in population.

MALNUTRITION WIDESPREAD

As Chairman of the National Council on Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States, I have been talking of these evils at home for years. I have done extensive work in malnutrition in Asia and Africa and have just returned from a trip to Nigeria and Biafra, where I went to study the famine and the means to alleviate it. I am, therefore, as well aware of the widespread character of malnutrition as anyone in the world.

Caloric undernutrition is still found in many parts of the world, and not always as a result of war or civil disorder, earthquakes or floods, invasions of insects and other parasites or abnormally prolonged droughts. Protein deficiency—kwashiorkor where it occurs without accompanying caloric deprivation; marasmus when both caloric and protein intakes are inadequate—is encountered in varying degrees of prevalence among the young children of most countries of Asia and Africa and in many of Central and South America.

Vitamin A deficiency is perhaps underestimated as a threat to the life, and the sight, of children of most of the same areas where protein deficiency is also seen. Riboflavin deficiency, thiamine deficiency (beriberi in its various forms) and a number of other deficiencies are still very much with us. Still, there is no evidence that the situation is getting worse.

The food balance sheets on which postwar pessimism was based are imperfect instruments. As an officer of FAO, I spent considerable time attempting to gauge such unknowns as figures for waste at the retail level and within families, and that portion of the food supply that does not move within the channels of trade (food grown by the farmer for his family is very inaccurately known, particularly as regards fruits and vegetables, which tend to be underestimated). The nutritional standards against which available supplies are gauged are themselves being refined.

As the results of additional experimental and clinical work become available. It is realized that a number of such standards—those for protein and calcium among others—were probably unnecessarily high. Even without such re-evaluation, the evolution of food balance sheets, the only instruments we have to judge the race between food and population, make it apparent that most regions do show the same slow increase of per capita supplies exhibited by the world at large.

It must be recognized, of course, that many of the worst nutritional scourges of mankind have been historically due as much to ignorance and to callousness as to lack of nutri-

XUM

ents as such. Thousands of children die of protein deficiency in areas where the proteins which would save them do in fact exist and are often consumed in sufficient amounts in the very households where infants and toddlers die for lack of them. A faulty understanding of a child's needs may be the main reason he is denied some of the food consumed by his father and older siblings.

As for man's inhumanity to man and its contribution to starvation, it could be illustrated by thousands of examples: cereals being shipped from Ireland under the protection of naval guns during the famine; stocks being withheld during the Congo famine to keep prices up; crop destruction policies in South Vietnam; the food blockade of Biafra.

LAND KEPT IDLE

Certainly, as far as food is concerned, ours is not one world. The U.S. Government rents 20 million acres from our farmers so that they will not grow food on them. A study made at Iowa State University a few years ago suggests that 62½ million acres ought to be similarly retired so that surpluses will not continue to be created in relation to the present market. Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Argentina and France have been, or are at present, involved in similar efforts to restrict production.

Nor is this idling of food production restricted to highly developed countries. A recent study estimates that Ghanaian farmers work only an average of two hours a day in the cocoa area, the wealthiest agricultural area of the country.

It is fair to say that in most areas of the world, the race between food and population would be more favorable to the development of adequate nutrition if the rate of population growth was decreased. But I believe that there are no grounds for saying in 1969 that the nutritional state of the world is getting worse. It is not.

And I believe that improvement in communication, availability of surpluses in certain countries, the existence of solid international organizations and the gradual improvement in international morality make large-scale famines, such as the Irish or the Bengali famine, less likely to occur in this era—except perhaps in Red China, because of its alienation from the two richest blocs of countries. (It appears, moreover, that the food situation in China has improved considerably in the past two years, making the recurrence of famine there, as in India, more remote.)

Bad as it is, the present is no worse than the past and probably somewhat better. But what of the future? In absolute numbers, the increase in population is likely to accelerate for some time. Can the food supply be kept up? My contention is that, for better or for worse, it can and will.

First, let us consider conventional agriculture. FAO's figures indicate that 3.4 billion acres are at present under cultivation. This represents less than 11 per cent of the total land area of the world. Some experts—Prasolov, Shantz, Zimmermann—estimate the area that can eventually be made arable at from 13 billion to 17 billion acres. Colin Clark, director of the Agricultural Economics Research Institute of Oxford, uses the figure of 19 billion acres, but counts double-cropped tropical lands twice. (He considers, incidentally, that if the lands were farmed as well as the Dutch farmers work their acres today, it would support 28 billion people on a Dutch diet; if Japanese standards of farming and nutrition were used, this area would support 95 billion people.)

THE FERTILIZER PHENOMENON

The biggest potential increase of food production does not, however, come from the extension of the area under cultivation, but from the increase in the use of fertilizers. The phenomenal increase in food production in this country has actually been performed with a reduction in acreage farmed.

By pre-World War I standards of cultivation, it took 1½ acres to support an American. If such standards prevailed today, we would need to add at least 40 million acres to our farm area every ten years, or the equivalent of an additional Iowa every decade.

In fact, we use fertilizers instead. One ton of nitrogen is the equivalent of 14 acres of good farmland. The use of between 200,000 and 300,000 tons of nitrogen (and corresponding amounts of other necessary elements) per decade has obviated the need to discover another Iowa.

And our use of fertilizer is less intensive than it is in Japan, where it is well over twice ours, or in Western Europe. (Incidentally, in spite of its already high standards of cultivation, Japan is still increasing its agricultural production at a rate of 3 per cent per year.)

India, Africa and most of Latin America use only an infinitesimal fraction of Japenese or Western amounts of fertilizer, or none at all. Garst has estimated that an expenditure of $10 an acre per year for fertilizers would, alone add 50 to 100 percent to the low yields in underdeveloped countries. Applying this investment to an area of 1.5 billion acres would be an equivalent to adding at least 750 million acres to the crop areas of these countries, the equivalent of a continent bigger than North America.

It is interesting to note that this primacy of fertilizers was recognized relatively late. In this country, the recognition dates back only to World War II, and has accelerated since the Korean conflict. In Japan, it dates back to 1950 or thereabout. And the leaders of the U.S.S.R. only recently realized that a large-scale increase in fertilizer output would be easier and more rewarding than the extension of cultivation to the "virgin lands."

There are many other advances in agriculture that have yet to be applied on a large scale. The identification of necessary trace elements and their incorporation into fertilizers and feeds have opened vast areas to cultivation and husbandry in Australia and elsewhere. Selective breeding of plants and animals has permitted the development of species with superior hardiness and increased yields. In the greater part of the world such work has hardly begun.

Advances in animal health and nutrition have permitted the mass producton of milk and eggs in indoor conditions on a scale that was unimaginable a few years ago. The City of Los Angeles, for instance, is now an important and efficient dairy area. In some large installations, computers programmed to calculate the cheapest method of providing a diet of known energy and known content in ten essential amino acids, total protein and other nutrients, automatically set the controls that will mix basic staples providing the cheapest adequate poultry diet as they are informed of the latest commodity prices.

Herbicides increase yields; pesticides prevent losses from rodents, insects and fungi. In many underdeveloped countries, one-quarter of the crop is lost before it reaches the consumer. Certain methods of preservation of foods by radiation have just been approved by the Food and Drug Administration. The control of weather by seeding clouds for rain, speeding cloud formation by heating lakes by atomic energy, the desalinization of brackish water by various methods are entering the realm of practical feasibility.

FOOD FROM PETROLEUM

Powerful though these methods of "classical" agriculture are, I believe that they will within the lifetime of most present inhabitants of this planet, be left far behind as methods of food production. The general public is still unaware of some new developments, their promise and the extent of the means likely to be expended in the next decade in bringing the results of research to practical application.

Large-scale manufacture of food from petrochemicals started during World War II, when the Germans manufactured synthetic fats to feed forced labor groups. These fats did not conform to desirable standards of taste or safety (they contained a high proportion of branched-chain fatty acids not normally found in nature and probably not fully metabolized, and retained a petroleum-like odor). After the war, interest in "synthetic" fats persisted for a while during the years when it appeared that a shortage of natural fats was likely to be protracted.

During the '50s, little or no work was done in this field, but recently some of the larger international oil companies have again become actively interested, and pilot plants are now in operation. Fatty acids, triglycerides (the constituents of our common oils and fats) and fully metabolizable simpler compounds, such as 1.3-butanediol, may soon be manufactured at very low cost for human food and animal feeds. While the promise of abundant and cheap atomic power, widely heralded for the morrow in the more immediate postwar period, has shown itself slow to be realized it is coming, and it may well be that oil will be increasingly a raw material for food and plastics rather than a fuel.

As a potential source of food production, photosynthesis can be used much more efficiently in algae than in higher plants. With proper mineral fertilization and with the proper rate of removal of the finished products, one square meter may serve to support algae production sufficient to feed one man. And a large proportion of the calories produced—as much as one-half—are derived from protein; vitamins are also produced into the bargain. Several universities are working with a number of species, chlorella in particular, and large industrial firms are yearly becoming more interested.

The problems entailed in passing from the theoretically feasible to the economically feasible are formidable, but their solution is likely to be hastened for an unexpected reason. Interplanetary travel of long duration and the organization of distant stations require not only recycling of oxygen and waste water; they necessitate the fabrication of food and its integration into the recycling of oxygen, water and excreta.

Over the next two decades, an increasing fraction of the several billion dollars that the United States and the Soviet Union will spend every year for space travel is going to be channeled into life support systems. The money spent in the aggregate on new methods of food production will probably, during that period, dwarf the cost of the Manhattan Project.

In many ways, we may have in space exploration what William James called "the moral equivalent of war." We will probably also have in it the technological equivalent of war without the corresponding losses in men and resources. The usable "fallout" of such research is likely to be enormous. Certainly, if economical harnessing of photosynthesis, through biological units or directly, can be realized under the hostile interplanetary, lunar or martial conditions, it should become relatively easy to put it into effect on earth.

All this is no longer science fiction. It is as much of a reality as the Federal income tax. Obviously, a breakthrough in this field could for centuries altogether remove food as a limiting factor to population growth.

A POOR BATTLEGROUND

I hope I have said enough to show how dangerous it may turn out to link the population problem so closely to food, as so many writers have done. These have generally been conservationists and social scientists rather than agricultural or nutritional scientists, concerned—rightly—with the effects of crowding which they had observed. At the same time, not sure that the public and governments would agree with them that there was cause for concern and action based on these grounds, they have turned to the threat of a worldwide shortage of food as an easily understood, imperative reason for a large-scale limitation of births.

Had they consulted nutritionists, agriculturists and chemists, they might have chosen a more appropriate battleground. For if we can feed an ever-increasing number of people—even if we feed them as badly as many of our contemporaries are fed—their argument fails. And yet there is a need for the establishment as soon as possible of a sound population policy for the world at large.

There is, of course, another good reason for not tying population control to food. This tie eliminates from contention rich countries and in particular surplus countries such as ours. Our population is increasing faster than it ever has; our major nutrition problem is overweight, our major agricultural problem is our ever-mounting excess production.

Does anyone seriously believe this means that we have no population problem? Our housing problems; our traffic problem; the insufficiency of the number of our hospitals, of community recreation facilities; our pollution problems, are all facets of our population problem.

I may add that in this country we compound the population problem by the migratory habits of our people: from rural farm areas to urban areas and especially to "metropolitan" areas (212 such areas now have 84 per cent of our population); from low-income areas to high-income areas; from the East and Midwest to the South and Southwest; from all areas to the Pacific Coast; from the centers of cities to suburbs, which soon form gigantic conurbations, with circumstances everywhere pushing our Negroes into the deteriorating centers of large cities. All this has occurred without any master plan, and with public services continually lagging behind both growth and migrations.

Let us conclude with one specific example: Four million students were enrolled in U.S. colleges and graduate schools in 1960; six million in 1965. The Census Bureau estimates that eight million will seek admission or continued enrollment in 1970; ten million in 1975; 12 million in 1980. No one questions our ability to feed these youngsters. But are we as a Nation at all prepared for a near doubling of the size of our colleges and universities in 11 years?

PARKS REFLECT TREND

Let us now examine the other argument, that in certain ways the rich countries are more immediately threatened by overpopulation. A corollary of this is that the earth as an economic system has more to fear from the rich than from the poor, even if one forgets for a moment the threat of atomic or chemical warfare.

Consider some data from our own country. We have already said that "crowding" is certainly one of the pictures we have in mind when we think of overpopulation. The increased crowding of our cities and our conurbations has been referred to, but what of the great outdoors?

In 1930, the number of visitor-days at our national parks was of the order of three million (for a population of 122 million); by 1950, it was 33 million (for a population of 151 million); by 1960, it was 79 million (for a population of 179 million); by 1967, 140 million (for a population of 200 million). State parks tell the same story: a rise in visitor-days from 114 million in 1950 to 179 million in 1960, an increase in attendance of over 125 per cent for a rise in population of less than 20 per cent.

Clearly, the increase in disposable income (and hence in means of transportation and in leisure) becomes a much more important factor in crowding and lack of privacy than the rise in population.

Not only does the countryside become more rapidly crowded when its inhabitants are rich; it also becomes rapidly uglier. With increasing income, people stop drinking water as much. As a result, we spread 48 billion (rustproof) cans and 26 billion (nondegradable) bottles over our landscape every year. We produce 800 million pounds of trash a day, a great deal of which ends up in our fields, our parks and our forests. Only one-third of the billion pounds of paper we use every year is reclaimed.

Nine million cars, trucks and buses are abandoned every year, and while many of them are used as scrap, a large though undetermined number are left to disintegrate slowly in backyards, in fields and woods and on the sides of highways. The eight billion pounds of plastics we use every year are nondegradable materials. And many of our states are threatened with an even more pressing shortage of water, not because of an increased consumption of drinking fluid by the increasing population but because people are getting richer and using more water for air-conditioning, swimming pools and vastly expanded metal and chemical industries.

That the air is getting crowded much more rapidly than the population is increasing is again an illustration that increase in the disposable income is perhaps more closely related to our own view of "overpopulation" than is the population itself. From 1940 to 1967, the number of miles flown has gone from 264 million to 3334 billion (and the fuel consumed from 22 million to 512 million gallons).

The very air waves are crowded. The increase in citizen-licensees from 126,000 to 848,000 in the brief 1960–7 interval is again an excellent demonstration of the very secondary role of the population increase in the new overpopulation. I believe that as the disposable income rises throughout the world in general, the population pressure due to riches will become as apparent as that due to poverty.

I trust that I have demonstrated how dangerous it is to link constantly in the mind of the public the concept of overpopulation with that of undernutrition. I believe that it is dangerous to link it necessarily with poverty. It is absurd on the basis of any criterion of history, economics or esthetics.

Some countries are poor and densely populated. A few countries are poor and so sparsely populated that economic development (e.g. road building, creation of markets) becomes very difficult. It is easy to demonstrate that a couple with many children will be unable to save and invest.

It is perhaps also true that, as the comparison to 19th century France, England and Germany suggests, at a certain stage of development, too low a birth rate (as in France then) decreases the ambition and labor of part of the population so that the savings expected from the decreased birth rate never materialize. (Losing wars because of a smaller population and having to pay a heavy tribute, as happened to the French at the conclusion of the 1870–1 war, also nullified this advantage.)

TAXING THE ECOLOGY

The fact is that we are not yet in one world and that while in general it is true that population increases make improvement in nutrition and in delivery of social services more difficult, the relation of changes in wealth to changes in population has to be examined in each area on its own merits.

We have seen, furthermore, that there is more to the problem of population than the decrease in income consequent to overpopulation. We have seen that the increase in disposable income creates a population problem that is becoming every day more acute. The ecology of the earth—its streams, woods, animals—can accommodate itself better to a rising poor population than to a rising rich population. Indeed, to save the ecology, the population will have to decrease as the disposable income increases.

If we believe, like Plato and Aristotle, in trying for excellence rather than in rejoicing in numbers, we need a population policy now for the rich as well as the poor. Excellent human beings will not be produced without abundance of cultural as well as material resources and, I believe, without sufficient space. We are likely to run out of certain metals before we run out of food; of paper before we run out of metals. And we are running out of clear streams, pure air and the familiar sights of Nature while we still have the so-called "essentials" of life.

Shall we continue to base the need for a population policy on a nutritional disaster to occur at some hypothetical date when it is clear that the problem is here, now, for us as well as for others? Shall we continue to hide the fact that a rational policy may entail in many countries not only plateauing of the population to permit an increase in disposable income, but a decrease of the population as the disposable income rises?

TWO GREAT DREAMERS

HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is always wise to talk in a positive fashion and yet so much is negative today—we talk, read, and think in the latter day so often. Recently, at the Holiday Inn, in Kirksville, Mo., Dr. and Mrs. George S. Reuter, Jr. had an interesting dialog. Dr. Reuter's part is expressed in "Two Great Dreamers," and I want my colleagues to share in his words.

The speech follows:

TWO GREAT DREAMERS

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

INTRODUCTION

Even a chronic optimist must recognize, I think, that this country has entered a great internal crisis, the third in our history. The first came to its climax in the Civil War. The second, which scarred this nation and marked the lives of all our parents, was the Great Depression of the 1930's. The third crisis has developed late in these 1960's, and it still lacks a name. Of course, Americans have always had a curious love-hate relationship with their environment. Unlike the original inhabitants of the continent, the American Indians—who were bound to their land in a marriage of love—the white settler viewed the charms of a virgin continent with greed in his heart.

Also, our country has a surplus—a surplus of prophets of doom. Hardly a day goes by without a new statement by another prophet that America lacks the ability to cope with her admittedly serious urban and racial problems. These prophets are intellectual and ordinary, black and white, rich and poor. And, they are having their effect. As I returned home recently from Georgia, I sat on the plane, next to a man who was reading a magazine article on the crises in our cities. He read for a while, then turned to me and said: "Things sure are going to hell in this country. It looks to me like in a few years we won't have any cities at all."

XUM

The American conditions are almost anything you want to prove. Without exaggerating any particular item of evidence—just by careful selecting of the items—it is possible to demonstrate that this Class of 1969 is graduating out into a nation in the last stages of social, political and moral decay. Also without exaggerating, just by selecting—and this takes very careful selecting—it is possible to show that you are graduating a group just in time to get in on the ground floor of a Golden Age. Which kind of evidence one hunts hardest for is perhaps a matter of individual temperament or chemistry. I have a weakness for optimism.

When William F. Buckley, Jr., wrote that he would far rather entrust his governance—by which he would include the preservation of his civil liberties and his intellectual freedom—to the first hundred persons listed in the Boston telephone directory than to the faculty of Harvard University, he was saying no more than what Thomas Jefferson or Henry Adams would have thought self-evident. The remark was greeted with considerable derision in Cambridge at the time, but it may be stated with certainty that more than one tenured professor of that ancient institution has come of late to see its truthfulness with excruciating clarity.

Certainly if this violence is not curbed, and the campuses brought under control—and that quickly—the damage to higher education and ultimately to society may be irreparable. Professor Sidney Hook of New York University, a noted radical over the years, has pointed out that "When black students and SDS radicals use the same methods Nazi students employed to destroy the Weimar Republic and trample into the dust traditional ideals of academic freedom, then no matter how different their rhetoric may be, fundamentally both are enemies of the rational process and of those values of civilization which have developed over the centuries against the forces of obscurantism and barbarism." Yes, any individual who damns the land of his birth, desecrates our flag, and mocks Him who died on Calvary's cross is a disgrace to the concept of a nation created under God. Also, one recalls Archibald MacLeish's remark: "There is nothing worse for our trade than to be in style." The equivalent is those whose concern in government is submission to the noisiest problems of the moment to the exclusion of the most important ones.

But so long as a society retains a capacity for non-violent political change, resort to violent political action is anathema. Only if most Americans were convinced that this country was no longer open to peaceful political evolution, to transformation of institutions and policies through the available channels of persuasion, would they consider revolutionary force permissible. That most Americans are not so convinced is evident in the growing vehemence of public attitudes on campus disorders and in the rising popular impatience with the efforts of academic administrators to deal fairly and considerately with student rebels.

RETAINING A SOUND FOUNDATION

Our Founding Fathers built America on a sound foundation without thought of sacrifice. Those gallant men and women of 1776 were teachers, doctors, preachers, farmers, merchants, bankers, lawyers, hunters, and fishermen. This was no revolution of little men filled with big hates, but a revolution of big men who hated littleness in government and were resolved to put an end to it. They recalled Edmund Burke who said: "For evil to triumph, good men have but to do nothing."

Much later in time—in fact it was at the end of World War II—General Douglas MacArthur made one of the greatest speeches of all time when he spoke at the formal surrender of the Japanese on the Battleship Missouri. In that marvelous speech he pointed out the horrors of war and man's failure to cope with it. General MacArthur said: "The problem basically is theological and involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character that will synchronize with our almost matchless advance in science, art, literature, and all material and cultural developments of the past two thousand years. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

Two great intellectual giants have greatly aided in fortifying America's sound foundation. Perhaps, if we reflect concerning their lives it will be easier to build a great tomorrow. The names of these giants are Dr. William Bell Riley of Minnesota and ex-Governor Adlai Ewing Stevenson of Illinois. The first one was among the greatest religious statesmen of all time, and the second one was among the few true "citizens of the world."

A chapter in one of my books, entitled "A Dreamer of Dreams,"[1] is about Dr. William Bell Riley. Dr. Riley, who was born in Greene County, Indiana, on March 22, 1861, and who died in Minneapolis on December 5, 1947, was Pastor of the First Baptist Church of Minneapolis from 1897 until 1943, and Pastor-Emeritus until he died. He was also founder and President of Northwestern Schools. His first book was published in 1914 under the title "The Coming and Kingdom of Christ," and the last three were "Problems of Youth" (1941), "Sunset Sermons or After Eighty" (1943), and "The Preacher and His Preaching" (1947). He wrote some fourteen other well-known books.

Although Dr. Riley completed a teacher's course at Valparaiso, he was ordained as a Baptist minister in 1883. On June 3, 1885, he was graduated from Hanover College. Later, he received an M. A. degree. He had the highest academic average of any person to be graduated from Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville. He gave the seminary address at graduation in 1888, which was held at the Broadway Baptist Church, and historians have described the address as excellent. Later such well-known and highly respected universities as John Brown University and Union University awarded honorary doctorates to Dr. Riley.

Dr. Riley married Miss Lillian Howard at the Trinity Methodist Church in Lafayette, Indiana, on December 31, 1890. Six children were born to that union. Mrs. Riley died on August 10, 1931. Dr. Riley married Miss Marie R. Acomb on September 1, 1933. His widow still survives and is author of the well-known biography, "The Dynamic of a Dream," a book written in 1938 about her beloved husband.

The First Baptist Church of Minneapolis was organized on March 5, 1853, by Mr. and Mrs. Asa Fletcher, Hezekiah Fletcher, and seven other charter members. It became the largest Baptist church in the Northern (now American) Baptist Convention under Dr. Riley's leadership. This is only one reason why Dr. Riley is still so well remembered. Also, his noble anti-evolution and fundamentals fights, his ability as a church builder, his world-renowned ability as a pastor-evangelist, his opposition to Communism, and his deep interest in Christian education are some of the other phases of his active life.

Just as Mrs. Riley called her husband "a great dreamer for a better tomorrow," so has Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey termed Adlai E. Stevenson "the great world dreamer for a better day." Certainly Adlai Ewing Stevenson was just as dynamic a dreamer as Dr. Riley. Governor Stevenson, although born in Los Angeles on February 5, 1900, was a true son of Illinois. After being graduated from Princeton in 1922, he received his law degree from Northwestern University in 1926. Honorary degrees were awarded to him from such well established universities as Oxford, Columbia, Amherst, and Princeton.

His best known books were "Call to Greatness" (1954), "What I Think" (1956), "The New America" (1957), "Friends and Enemies" (1958), "Putting First Things First" (1960), and "Looking Outward" (1963). His home life was another story. Three fine sons were born to his union with Ellen Borden (married December 1, 1928), but they were divorced while he was Governor of Illinois. Although future events proved he was the innocent party and that his wife was of unsound mind, the divorce probably prevented him from being elected President of the United States in 1952 and 1956. A series of references to his greatness appeared in a 1957 book[2] prior to his outstanding service as Ambassador to the United Nations. Few people better understood the meaning of democracy and the purposes of a free society than Mr. Stevenson. For example, in 1963, he said: "Democracy is not self-executing. We have to make it work, and to make it work we have to understand it . . . not only external vigilance but unending self-examination must be the perennial price of liberty, because the work of self-government never ceases."

Five days before he died, Ambassador Stevenson made his last formal speech. It was before the United Nations Economic and Social Council in Geneva, and it was one of his best. These words seem appropriate:

"We travel together, passengers on a little spaceship, dependent on its vulnerable reserves of air and soil; all committed for our safety to its security and peace; preserved from annihilation only by the care, the work and I will say the love we give our fragile craft. We cannot maintain it half fortunate, half miserable, half confident, half despairing, half slave to the ancient enemies of man, half free in liberation of resources undreamed of until this day. No craft, no crew can travel safely with such vast contradictions. On their resolution depends the survival of us all."

CONCLUSIONS

Only a brave man or a fool would claim to know the full meaning of the turmoil now that wracks the world. But the more I see of it the stronger my conviction grows that we may be witnessing the birth of a new era in relations among men if we can develop the proper type of dreamers to lead us in resolving our problems. Yes, dreamers of the scholarship and leadership of Riley and Stevenson are needed.

Learned Hand, as William James before him, urged that we must develop the habit of an open mind and a recognition that "the deepest convictions of one generation are the rejects of the next." He stated further: "I believe that community is already in process of dissolution where each man begins to eye his neighbor as a possible enemy; where nonconformity with the accepted creed, political as well as religious, is a mark of disaffection; where denunciation, without specification or backing, takes the place of evidence; where orthodoxy chokes freedom of dissent; where faith in the eventual supremacy of reason has become so timid that we dare not enter our convictions in the open lists, to win or lose."

Dr. Riley is buried at Lakewood Cemetery in Minneapolis. Governor Stevenson, who died July 14, 1965 in London, England, is buried in Bloomington, Illinois. The eulogy for Adlai Stevenson at Washington's National Cathedral could have been for either dreamer—Riley or Stevenson—and it is consistent with the teachings of Judge Hand. The words follow:

"That voice is still now. But its echoes are likely to be sounding down the corridors of history for a long time. For it is the essence of faith to believe that the world in its advancing age will set no less store than have we upon reason, upon intelligence, upon gaiety, upon charity and compassion and grace—all these things and mcre of and with which this voice has spoken to us so often and so clearly in the past."

---

[1] George S. Reuter, Jr., *Some Educational Statesmen and Basic Principles* (Arkansas A. and M. College: College Heights, 1956), pp. 74–78.

[2] George S. Reuter, Jr., *Essays in Education and Related Areas* (Arkansas A. and M. College: College Heights, 1957).

Riley and Stevenson were two of our great dreamers. We need more such dreamers to continue to achieve progress. Yes, it is going to be hard work, but we are used to that. It seems to me that we gain encouragement by looking to Don Quixote who was always reaching for that unreachable star. Let's listen for a moment to Don Quixote as he describes our quest:

"To dream the impossible dream,
To fight the unbeatable foe,
To bear with unbearable sorrow,
To run where the brave dare not go.
To right the unrightable wrong,
To love, pure and chaste from afar.
To try, when your arms are too weary,
To reach the unreachable star."

So it can be with us! We have a Father and an Eternal citizenship! We may wander far, but the Father's love follows us no matter how lost we may seem. That will redeem us as we turn our steps to that home from whence we came if we believe.

VIRGIN ISLANDS GOVERNOR'S INAUGURAL SPEECH

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Melvin H. Evans, Governor of the Virgin Islands, made a perceptive and forward-looking inaugural speech on July 1, 1969. He granted the problems of the islands, but submitted proposals that would assist toward the solutions. His approach is such that much may be expected in the way of improvement. Certainly, this speech by Governor Evans is very appropriate for an inaugural speech. I include it herewith:

INAUGURAL SPEECH OF GOV. MELVIN H. EVANS

Fifty-two years ago, these Virgin Islands began a new life—a life of association with and as a part of—the greatest nation the world has ever seen. It was, to be sure, not a perfect association. The great democratic institutions upon which this Nation of ours had been built, and to which it was securely anchored, were at first denied an arm of government, charged mainly with the defense of this country, was entrusted with the task of assimilating us into the fabric of America. Where will and desire and good intentions were undoubtedly present, the capacity to perform this extraneous job proved insufficient.

The sad impact of the Prohibition Act which deprived these islands of a main source of revenue and the coup de gras of the great economic depression of 1929 reduced these islands to a state of penury as repugnant to the islands as it was unwelcome to the mainland.

It was at this point of time that the conscience of this great country began to stir and in 1931 a civilian form of government became the order of the day.

It would be unfair to dismiss this period with no further comment. Much had indeed been accomplished. Sanitation had been improved; roads had been built; hospitals and medical facilities increased and enlarged, and the educational system expanded. Much money had been spent. But even then, the soul of man was yearning and striving for more than bread. Even then, that inate force which drives man to place freedom above food, self-determination above satiety, dignity above security was at work and let it be everlastingly to the credit of this great Nation that the pulse of the people was felt and recorded and the diagnosis made that the time had come for more self-government.

And so it was that a former Governor Evans—Captain Waldo Evans of the Navy—gave way to the Honorable Paul M. Pearson who brought with him the hope that at last we were becoming a part of the true America.

One organic act succeeded another—In 1936 granting universal suffrage and in 1954 loosening the economic shackles—until today we stand on a new threshold, one on which the boundaries of self-determination are still further extended so that the selection of a chief executive by the democratic process of election is ours in a matter of less than a year and a half. *It is, therefore, crucial that we evaluate our position now.*

Perhaps we have in the past been like that mythical animal with its eyes in the back of its head so that it could see where it had been rather than where it was going. We have, perhaps, understandably been concerned with how many classrooms have been built, how many housing units erected, and how big the increase in revenue is one year over the previous. I submit we should now take stock and look ahead to analyze our future—the future which is in our hands *today.* Are we preparing these islands for the full life which is our potential? Are we *really* cognizant of the fact that the day is past when we could "go it alone"? Do we *understand* the great turmoil and upheaval in our cities, on the campuses, in the civil rights movement, among the young in general, the minorities, the have-nots, the non-conformists? Do we understand that we are *not* insulated? Are we *seeking* to solve these problems while it is still possible—or do we want to wait until the inevitable tide overwhelms us?

Let us take stock.

EDUCATION

A decade and a half ago, a Governor of these islands described the Virgin Islands as second only to one State in the Union in spending the lowest amount per capita on education. Today, the Virgin Islands has lost that dubious distinction as it spends a great deal more for education. Unfortunately, however, an improvement in the end product has not kept pace and there are many informed analysts who would assure you that the quality has deteriorated. Our high school graduates are encountering increasing difficulties in the pursuit of education abroad and our own college has to spend increasing efforts in remedial work with students before or after they enter. We, thus, come to the unavoidable conclusion that money does *not* necessarily bring success.

What we clearly need is a new *thrust,* increased *efficiency,* and an *approach more suited* to the unique needs of these islands.

The educational system has had more than half a dozen heads in the past fifteen years with no possibility of continuity in conceptualizing, planning and implementing the needed programs. When the very nutrition of a people—the education of its young—suffers, catastrophe can only be averted by prompt, vigorous and imaginative action.

HOUSING

The housing situation in these islands is bad. Deplorable or scandalous would probably be more descriptive terms but hardly more contributory to a solution. The underlying conditions are basically economic. There is a greater demand than supply and the cost of construction, repair and maintenance is astronomical. During the past decade, thousands of homes or housing units have been built. But during these same years, many more thousands of people have come to the islands to live. Today, many residents who are economically able to pay for good housing are actually unable to find such. Additionally, as the cost of land acquisition and construction increases, the cost of renting also soars not only adversely affecting our own people but also the skilled and professional people we desire and desperately need. Thus, substandard living in this oasis of affluence all too often is the rule rather than the exemption. By the very nature of things, this falls most heavily on those in the lower economic brackets and the deleterious effect on individuals and, yes, on family life itself, is incalculable. What is needed is a fresh new approach—not just a game of catching up. We must not only continue to build and accelerate the rate at which we build but also we must take positive steps to control the run-away demand. Ways *must* be found to increase the efficiency of building thus increasing the rate of construction and lowering the cost of each unit. We *must* find an answer—time is running out.

POLLUTION

For the past years, we have seemed to subscribe to the concept that the solution to pollution was dilution. Thus, we poured raw sewage into our harbors and bays with the smug belief that dilution would remove all danger. We looked to the tradewinds to carry away all noxious gases while we brought in more automobiles, erected new industrial plants and *belched* more poisons into the atmosphere. Today our harbors are virtual cesspools—offensive to sight and smell and a constant threat to our health.

HEALTH AND MEDICAL FACILITIES

Generally, the health in these islands has been good. The various indices such as general mortality and infant mortality rates point to good and improving health. But, there are clouds on the horizon. In public health, the rapid increase in population with over-crowding in substandard homes—often without the barest sanitary facilities—is like an explosive charge with a time fuse. The fuse may be long, or it may be short, but eventually the explosion occurs. We cannot continue to ignore the threat of communicable disease which the lack of proper sewage disposal, over-crowding, and inadequate water supply poses.

But, let us consider in a more general way our position. What are we doing to break down the sectionalism that pits island against island, town against town and group against group? Are we really living and working together or we are each occupying our own little territories of home and job and play? Are we really communicating with each other or are we merely talking to each other. I ask this question: Are we Virgin Islanders?—or are we native Virgin Islanders, Puerto Rican Virgin Islanders, or Continental Virgin Islanders? Let us in our own hearts provide the answer.

As we have grown in the past years, have the cultural, social and political aspects kept pace with the economic factors? Has the very growth itself been channelled or controlled—or have we just grown like "Topsy"? Have the economic benefits filtered down through all strata or are we still nurturing pockets of poverty? Have we developed—or are we developing—political education in its broadest sense as a part of our life or are we individually abdicating our civic duties and responsibilities to "the other fellow"?

I have asked these questions. Now let me point directions.

We must differ without fighting. We must debate issues—Not men and personalities. We must listen sometimes—not always talk. We must place home and country before self for even though it may appear naively altruistic, it is a cold reality that without country and home, there can be no self.

We must speak out wholly against that which we consider wrong—not whisper derogations hiding behind anonymity. We must

XUM

plan—but planning must not become a euphemism for procrastination. We must oppose when in good faith we feel constrained to do so but we must propose alternatives. Nihilism is not compatible with progress.

I have often said that geometry and forensics should be included in every curriculum—the former to promote logical thinking: the latter to give substance to the cliche that there are really two sides to every question.

And now, as I take the oath of office, I do so with humility, seeing the challenge and not the honor—the opportunity to serve, not to rule: the chance to lead, not merely to complain. I pledge that to the limits of my physical and mental abilities and with constant quest for divine guidance, I shall be the servant of all the people of these islands so that with God's help, we may move forward to a better life for all of us.

WHO PERILS THE PEACEFUL ATOM?

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, within the past 6 months, two books have been published which attempt to frighten the public concerning the alleged dangers of the civilian nuclear power program.

The books are "The Careless Atom" by Sheldon Novick and "Perils of the Peaceful Atom" by Elizabeth Hogan and Richard Curtis.

Both books have been widely discredited by those with a sophisticated understanding of the issues involved. It is clear to me that both are biased, distorted efforts to frighten and confuse the public about a program which has been a high-priority national effort since the end of World War II.

In the event that some Members of the Congress might receive inquiries from concerned constituents about these books, I am including in the RECORD an article from Electrical World magazine of July 21, 1969, which contains a review of "Perils of the Peaceful Atom" by two distinguished experts in the nuclear power field, Dr. James G. Beckerly, president of Radioptics, Inc., and Dr. Norman Hilberry, professor of nuclear engineering at the University of Arizona and a member of the Arizona Atomic Energy Commission.

In addition, I am including a review of "The Careless Atom" by Dr. Theos J. Thompson, former professor of nuclear engineering at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and now a member of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

The reviews follow:

[From Electrical World magazine, July 21, 1969]

WHO PERILS THE PEACEFUL ATOM?

Is nuclear power endangering society? Or, is society endangering nuclear benefits? Industry people, who have already read the just-published, *Perils of the Peaceful Atom*, by Elizabeth Hogan and Richard Curtis [Doubleday & Co—$5.95], are inclined to agree with the latter—that the nuclear power industry is in trouble, and that the real perils are public ignorance and misunderstanding.

Not that the book points out these perils. It is, rather, an example of them. And, according to one observer, if *Perils* has any sway at all with the public thinking, it will compound the growing thicket of misunderstanding surrounding nuclear power now.

Laymen authors Hogan and Curtis argue for an abandonment of nuclear power and a return to fossil-fueled generation. They sum up their feelings by the hand-wringing statement: "A survey of the perils of nuclear peace is like a Dantean survey of Hell—one leaves each level certain that he has seen the worst, but ahead lie scenes more fiendish still!"

All of which shows that the authors understand little of nuclear power and even less of the Divine Comedy.

There has been at least one prominent attack on "Perils." The rebuttal comes from Dr. James G. Beckerly, President of Radioptics, Inc, and Dr. Norman Hilberry, professor of Nuclear Engineering at the University of Arizona, and a member of the Arizona Atomic Energy Commission. It appeared this month in the form of a book review, published by the Atomic Industrial Forum's INFO. The remainder of this Management Newsletter is a précis of that review.

"The Perils of the Peaceful Atom" is an emotional attempt to create public reaction to the menace of nuclear power. The goal of the book is "the complete abandonment of the nuclear power plant program." In the context of the book as a whole, this implies the total renunciation of the use of nuclear fuels as a national energy resource. Although not stated explicitly, the authors eventual goal is the elimination of all use of nuclear radiation and radioactive materials.

Because the authors are laymen and do not appear to have had qualified guidance [they rely completely on published source materials] they have been compelled to substitute for scientific and technological facts a miscellany of excerpts, quotes, and fragments of quotes that, in many instances, are taken out of their original context and are therefore misleading. As laymen, the authors seem to select phrases on the basis of their colloquial or popular usage, apparently unaware of the fact that the scientific and technological usefulness of these phrases depends upon precise definition. That this distorts the meaning of the quote is unrealized, or is ignored. Therefore, "fact" has a drastically different meaning to the authors of this book than to the scientific and technological community.

There are basic informational problems in the book. These are serious, but even more serious are the problems coming from the way in which the authors develop their arguments. Almost every high school student is aware of the essentials of logical analysis upon which scientific and technological progress depends so vitally. The data concerning a given physical or biological system are gathered. They are examined for their completeness to assure that, as far as can be determined, nothing has been overlooked. They are then scrutinized for their validity and reliability. They are studied until they are understood and then are subjected to objective analysis within the framework of recognized natural law. In this way, the basic character of the system is established, and from this it is then possible to predict the system's behavior reliably in a wide variety of circumstances. It is only within such an objective framework that the safety of nuclear power generation, and the nature and validity of the measures taken to assure that safety, can be discussed intelligently.

The axiom on which "The Perils of the Peaceful Atom" is based, however, is: "Whatever can happen, inevitably will happen." This statement obviously can have no standing as a scientific or technological fact, and consequently has no merit in any form of scientific analysis. It has no meaning to the scientists or engineer in his professional role.

Another assumption that the reader must take if he is to accept the conclusions of this volume is that the scientific method is not required to prove the truth of natural law or to provide that understanding which is requisite to bring natural systems under assured human control. All that is necessary is "feeling the truth." Clearly, this approach makes fewer intellectual demands on the subject than exposition to the scientific method and its conclusions. Moreover, the scientific method may leave a member of the lay culture emotionally cold, while the succession of emotional impacts involved in the book's declaratory approach to truth involves him emotionally and gives him a visceral feel that this is indeed the truth.

Before the reader can even open the cover, the principal conclusion of the book has been heralded and it is immediately repeated on the title page—the peaceful atom is perilous. To continue this shock treatment, the next page states, "This book is dedicated to tomorrow's children." Had these first two pages not already signaled the course the book was to take, the next page, the Table of Contents, most certainly would do so. It would be hard to imagine a more blatantly Madison Avenue list of chapter titles than those displayed here. They dispel at once any hope that the book might present rational and objective and understandable information. Thus, the title of the foreword is "In Defense of Fear". The chapter headings sound like the titles of Class B movies of the 40's and 50's including such gems of objectivity as "That Goose That Laid the Radioactive Egg", "Thresholds of Agony", "The Thousand-Year Curse", "Don't Bother Running" . . .

The book drums away with such phrases as: "The menace of nuclear power", "the hazards of nuclear power", "the dangers of nuclear power", "nuclear calamity", "the deadly process of nuclear power", "the atom's nuclear garbage" . . . on goes the chant and eventually the reader's mind is supposed to yield to the hypnotic spell, the induced "belief" becomes ascendant. And with belief achieved, the call to political action promises an almost certain favorable response.

But can this acutely annoying technique of repeated psychological threats of ever-impending doom, strung together with half-truths, honest misunderstandings, and similar "authoritative" evidence offered in substantiation of the validity of the declarative threats, actually succeed? With the members of the scientific and technological community, the answer is "No."

With a considerable number of the members of the lay culture, however, the technique is sure to be successful. The "declaratory" process is one to which they have become thoroughly conditioned. They believe in the "declared" marvels of the latest deodorant and of all the other declared wonders propounded over and over on radio and television and in the magazines and daily press, from the time they get up until bedtime. They have come to prefer authority because it takes so much less mental wear and tear than choosing the right one. And now this book, using this familiar conditioning technique, "answers" the nagging questions that occasionally arise about "these atom bomb power plants."

There are, however, many people who, while not professional members of the scientific and technological culture, are nonetheless, by native interest and ability and to some extent by training, more closely akin to it than they are to the lay culture. These people may be completely baffled by this book. While to correct all the downright errors in it and to remedy all of the mistaken impressions it gives would require more space than is available for this review, some few comments must be made because of specific errors or injustices, and these may provide some guidelines by which these individuals will find it possible to answer for themselves the host of questions that cannot be answered here.

The reviewers were dismayed to note that none of the individuals cited in the "Acknowledgments" appears to be qualified in the technical aspects of atomic power plants. With adequate technical guidance, the authors could have avoided many glaring er-

XUM

rors. It is not our intention to make a catalog of these, but merely to point out a few of the more significant mistakes. One particularly disturbing mistake is the equating [e.g. in Chapter IV] of the reactor fission products with bomb fission products without even noting that the release of fission products in any conceivable reactor accident creates a physical situation entirely different from that associated with any atomic bomb explosion. The manner of dissemination of the fission products, their chemical form, etc., are entirely different. And being different, the associated hazards are quite different.

The authors are completely at sea in discussing curies. One curie of a particular substance may present only one-billionth of the biological hazard of one curie of another substance. One just doesn't add up numbers and bandy them around to suit his prejudices as the authors appear to do.

As another example of the authors' technical naivete, the reviewers noted a number of instances where the authors assume that an increase in reactor power level carries with it a directly proportionate increase in the associated hazards. This is simply not true. Different type reactors have different hazards associated with their operation. Even when comparing two reactors of the same type but operating at different power levels, the hazards don't necessarily double if the power level is doubled. In other words, the site and environment, the engineered safeguards, the operational plan, and all other details must be considered in the safety evaluation of each reactor. Unless you get into these details, you really cannot understand the problem.

Another example of the authors' failure to appreciate a technical point is in their discussion of the views of the advisory committee on reactor as safeguards [Chapter VIII]. The "power density" is not the same as the power level. The difference is enormously important in the discussion of reactor safety. Because the authors do not seem to appreciate this, the discussion is misleading. In the same connection, the authors' statement about scaling up the power level of a reactor, that it "amounts to an entire new technology", is not generally correct; it just depends on how the scaling up is done.

A lack of understanding also leads the authors to imply that there is a shady discrepancy between the cost estimate given by the Chairman of the AEC for decommissioning a power reactor and the AEC General Manager's cost estimate for decommissioning another reactor. The figures are different simply because reactors of two different types are involved. [The difference in power level is not the significant difference.] Without some comprehension of the technical aspects of decommissioning, any discussion of costs is meaningless.

All radioactivity looks alike to the authors. In Chapter VIII, they discuss shipments of radioactive fuels, "capsules" radium, etc. in such a mixed-up way that it is unclear what they are concerned about. The tragic story of the radio-cobalt capsule has nothing to do with the safety of nuclear reactors, nor is it relevant to the shipment of wastes. Nor are the trivial comments in the same chapter on paper studies of atomic-powered dirigibles.

In Chapter XVI, the authors consider what the available uranium fuel supply will be in the future. This is a complex and highly technical problem that is treated very superficially. The conclusion that there won't be enough uranium to sustain the projected nuclear power program at a profitable level is at variance with the conclusions of many others. We would only comment that the authors have chosen to make pessimistic and unrealistic assumptions in their discussion. Again, the presentation misleads the reader with "facts" about future nuclear power, which are at best biased "guesstimates".

In connection with future energy resources, the reviewers were surprised at the superficial, almost evasive, discussion of the problems associated with increasing use of fossil fuel. Sulphur and fly ash pollution difficulties were mentioned, but no mention was made of the really significant problem arising due to increasing the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. Effects of such increases on the earth's heat balance will result in irreversible ecological changes of enormous relevance to human life. These are not even touched on in this book, although they are vitally important to any consideration of future energy production.

The reviewers conclude that this book is not a balanced account of the safety aspects of present and future nuclear power production. It is strictly a biased, misleading, sensational political tract. It constitutes a public disservice. We are sorry to see it published, not just because it is a bad book, but because we sincerely feel that a factual, balanced, honest discussion of the problems of nuclear power, as they really are, is badly needed by the public. It could be written. The authors' assertion in Chapter XIX that "vital information about the atomic power program has been obscured from public consciousness" is false. There is a vast amount of information in the public domain. As far as the reviewers know, there is no significant information about the atomic power program that has not been made public. However, the task of integrating this into a book that will be a source-book for public policy discussion and determination will require an order of understanding and a degree of impartiality that the authors of *The Perils of the Peaceful Atom* simply have not exercised.

REVIEW OF THE CARELESS ATOM

(By Theos J. Thompson)

There is a great need for public understanding of the problems we face as a nation in developing adequate sources of electrical power over the next years. The advent of nuclear power has given us an alternate fuel source with some advantages and some disadvantages when compared with coal or oil. Reliable information, full dispassionate discussion, and carefully drawn arguments are needed to help in achieving sound public understanding and, ultimately, in making the correct decisions as to the direction of our future electrical power growth.

The debates, the discussions, and the books covering the various aspects of the problems of how much power we need, and from what sources, should continue to be open and searching for at least a number of years. There is a real need for honest, thoughtful books by qualified authors on these problems.

But there is no need for the distortion of facts and half truths and unqualified opinions which dot the book, *The Careless Atom* by Sheldon Novick. It is a pity that this first book on the subject did not review the provisions made for reactor safety factually and fully. The implications throughout the book are that almost nothing is being done about reactor safety and that only Mr. Novick stands between the general public and disaster. An ad for the book in the New York Times Book Review, March 2, 1969, by the Houghton Mifflin Company reads:

"The Hiroshima bomb is alive—and ticking—in Indian Point. Atoms for peace can blow us to pieces! When electricity is produced by an atomic reactor, the danger is equivalent to a fused H-bomb."

This statement, evidently written by the publisher, since I can't find it in the book, is completely and utterly false. The author of the book, it seems to me, must also bear some responsibility for letting his publisher advertise in this irresponsible manner. I state categorically the reactors at Indian Point cannot be made to behave like bombs—to say nothing of fused H-bombs. Surely, the common sense of the neighbors of the Indian Point Reactors is such that they must realize that the separate safety and regulatory personnel of the AEC's Division of Reactor Regulation, with its 469 employees and inspectors laboring every day to insure reactor safety, would never permit a potential bomb to be located near them. The parents plus 22 close relatives of one of my MIT colleagues in Nuclear Engineering live within three miles of the plant and, though he is completely technically knowledgeable, he has no worries in regard to their safety. The greed of the publisher in trying for a best seller has completely overtaken his sense of responsibility for honesty and fair-mindedness.

Evidently, Mr. Novick has ambitions to become the Ralph Nader of the nuclear industry. Since safety has always been a fundamental principle of the nuclear reactor industry, he is a little late. There are literally hundreds of genuine experts who have been considering these problems for years. This is an irresponsible book in almost every way. In checking those quotations which I could, I have so far not found a single one which has not been taken out of context, often shortened, to distort or totally change its original meaning.

For instance, Dr. Alvin Weinberg, Director of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, wrote an article titled "Todays Revolution" in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Vol. XII No. 8, 1956. That was the second year of free exchange of nuclear reactor information after the Eisenhower "Atoms for Peace" Conference in 1955. It was before any civilian reactors were built and this explains why the first paragraph quoted below talks of an "unborn technology". He said:

"My purpose in this essay will be to offer some rational explanation for the extraordinary role which an unborn technology—civilian nuclear power—now plays in public affairs. The viability of the technology cannot be demonstrated until substantial amounts of economic electricity are generated, and this has not yet occurred; still the tremendous impact of the technology on public affairs is undeniable, as the great interest in the Geneva Conference for the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy showed.

"There are three quite separate explanations for this curious situation. The first has to do with the connection between nuclear energy and nuclear weapons. *There is an understandable drive on the part of men of good will to build up the positive aspects of nuclear energy simply because the negative aspects are so distressing.*"

The italicized sentence serves as the frontispiece for the book *The Careless Atom*. The quotation is thus completely distorted as the frontispiece of a book purporting to describe nuclear reactors, not nuclear weapons.

Dr. Weinberg's views on the subject being discussed are more nearly reflected in a speech he gave in Sao Paulo, Brazil on November 29, 1963:

"In discussing the social responsibility of science we tend to stress the *recognizable* dangers to society that technical mistakes would cause. The tendency is to pressure scientists and technologists into *not* trying new schemes because of their evident danger. I believe this is the force of both Rachel Carson's views with respect to insecticides, and of the views of some of the detractors of nuclear energy.

"But there are social consequences, sometimes of an even grave sort, if the technologists does nothing. The new technologies of abundance—abundant power, abundant water, abundant food—convey danger with them. But I believe the new technologies of abundance are mankind's only hope of buying time necessary to stave off the catastrophe of Malthus. It would be well if the problem of resources—i.e., how ultimately to deal with the population explosion—could be solved cleanly and sharply, without compromise or danger. This, unfortunately, does not seem to be the way of the world. The means available to man to solve the problem of pop-

XUM

ulation pressure are tainted, even as W. Jacobs' Magical Monkey's Paw that granted its owner three wishes was cursed.

"I continue to be optimistic that science contains a means for removing the taint and the danger. We are deeply concerned with the biological hazards of radiation, both somatic and genetic. Yet, as the examples I have given suggest, we are making significant progress in understanding these problems and with understanding should come an ultimate means of control. We are concerned with the dangers of reactors, yet we continue to make striking progress in the technology of containment, not to speak of the technology of waste disposal. More Generally, with deeper understanding of ecology and insect physiology will come answers to the Rachel Carson problem, or to the general problem of physical insult to the biosphere that seems to be a major untoward byproduct of our ever pervading technology.

"We nuclear scientists have no choice but to view our social responsibility constructively—as the imperative to seek out technical answers to the taints which mar our new technology. We can then look forward with confidence to science providing the means for an abundant and peaceful world with instrumentalities that are untainted—in short, are both socially responsible and scientifically effective."

At the present time, this nation and the world are examining again the Malthusian catastrophe mentioned by Dr. Weinberg. A number of predictions have recently appeared setting the crisis period within this century. When it comes, it will probably not be with a roll of thunder and flashes of lightning, either manmade or heaven sent, but quietly and stealthily.

Even in this country, we can now begin to see the forerunners of the problem. Our waters, which we have used so freely and so carelessly, are polluted and in short supply. Our air is becoming hazy and full of smog. The increase in carbon dioxide content in the air may be affecting the rate of energy absorption from the sun and hence perhaps affecting our ability to raise food and obtain water. Indirectly then, our demands for a higher standard of living, the better life, are hastening the advent of the Malthusian crisis. Certainly, the combination of these demands for higher living standards, combined with the population growth, cannot help but have serious effects on the ecology. We must soon face some grave national and worldwide issues that will not go away. They will grow and engulf us unless we conquer them first.

An important facet of the problem is the growing demand for electrical power. Future projections based on the present rate of growth of power demand are fantastically large. A fair fraction of this new load consists of modern conveniences such as air conditioning, electrical heating cooking, electrical space heating. Even in the northern part of the United States, the peak load demands in large cities now fall in the summer during hot humid weather when everyone has their air conditioners on. Each year the consumers of electricity press harder on the electrical generating and distributing systems of the country, both private and public. Peak electrical capacity is pushed to the limit by the demands. In some areas, electricity must be brought from long distances to meet these demands. Older equipment fails faster under the strain. Construction delays in building new electrical plants become critical items in the public interest.

Amidst all of these demands there has arisen a proper concern for conservation. Those of us who are interested in preserving nature as it was, deplore the pollution of our rivers and air, the replacement of field and forest by subdivisions and factories, and the loss of the chance to be alone with nature. We do not like to see unsightly power lines or to see our rivers grow warmer. But those of us who understand even the vague outlines of the complexity of the overall problem, know that there is no easy solution. Groups and individuals are trying to attack various phases of this complex network of problems. But almost no one is trying to achieve a balanced view of the overall problem.

The power generating plants of the country are caught in the middle—squeezed by demands for more power, cheaper power and more reliable power—and squeezed by demands for no change in the ecology or the beauties of nature. Often these conflicting demands come from one and the same person or group.

The electrical power generating and distribution industry has only one primary goal—to supply reliable inexpensive electrical power as demanded. They are not advocates for any particular method of generating electricity, be it by use of heat from the nucleus, coal, oil or candles. A survey of the major reactor fabricators indicates that they are involved as suppliers of conventional coal and oil fired plant components as well as nuclear reactor components. The movement of these fabricators and the utilities into the nuclear power field has been taken to follow what appears to be a better and cheaper way to make electrical power. In general, they have no special axe to grind. In fact, both utility managements and the fabricator managements are moving only gradually into the nuclear field following favorable experience with the first generation plants and pending experience with the second generation plants being built now.

Oil and coal fired plants help to create some smog and some contamination of the atmosphere, possibly causing increased disease incidence. The fly ash must be disposed of. The coal piles are unsightly. A nuclear plant is cleaner and does not cause air pollution, but such plants to date release some routine amounts of radioactivity resulting in increased radiation levels—but the increase is small compared to the levels already found in nature to which we are exposed all the time. (It is surprising to find that many people are not aware that each of us since the beginning of time, has had radioactivity contained within his own body, that it is present in varying degrees in the materials we come in contact with every day, not to mention daily bombardment by cosmic rays from outer space.)

Definitive studies of the effects of smog and air pollution on human lives are difficult to make in an unambiguous way. Studies of the effects of low levels of radiation are also difficult to make. I know of no good studies which attempt to compare the possible effects of these two separate problems. It is possible to reduce the amount of smoke or radioactivity emerging from a power plant, at a cost. How much reduction is worthwhile to protect us adequately without going to ridiculous and extremely costly methods—which are ultimately charged to us in our electrical bills? Both coal miners and uranium miners are afflicted with occupational diseases. Reactors require special and often quite costly safety precautions which increase the capital cost of the plants and tends to make coal more competitive. These problems and many others, often similar, sometimes differing, go into decisions to choose a coal fired or a nuclear plant. It is a complex problem. This newly available source of power, the nuclear reactor, is still undergoing changes, modifications, improvements, and size increases. Coal fired plants are being modified to trap more of the emitted smoke and fly ash. New mining methods are being developed. But we can perhaps conclude some things even now.

The presence of a competitive alternative source of heat has had an impact on the cost of electricity and has challenged the coal industry to moderize and become a better competitor. The experience with power reactors to date has been generally encouraging. Clearly, it would be a grave disservice to the country and the world to eliminate, without a many year test, this new and important alternate power source. Its elimination will be principally in the interests of one group—the coal industry. We need experience with these plants. Not all will run equally well. Some unfavorable experience must be anticipated. We must have patience. We must watch developments. We must be careful.

The general tone of *The Careless Atom* is well illustrated by the dust jacket of the book which reads, "In principle nuclear reactors are dangerous. . . . In my mind, nuclear reactors do not belong on the surface of the earth', Edward Teller. Up to now, nuclear accidents have been relatively minor. How long can we hope to avoid major disaster?" The latter part of the dust jacket quote is not from Edward Teller but is presumably written by Sheldon Novick, the author of the book, although the uncritical reader might think both parts were written by Teller. On page 38, Teller is quoted in more detail as saying:

"In principle, nuclear reactors are dangerous . . . By being careful, and also by good luck, we have so far avoided all serious nuclear accidents. In my mind, nuclear reactors do not belong on the surface of the earth. Nuclear reactors belong underground."

Now we begin to see the true thrust of Edward Teller's arguments. Although no special friend of nuclear power reactors, he states in the more complete text that "we have so far avoided all serious nuclear accidents." The abbreviated quote on the dust jacket is a part of a longer quote presenting a statement arguing for underground containment of reactors. The complete text of this statement in the original reference is: E. Teller, "Energy from Oil and from the Nucleus", Journal of Petroleum Technology, p. 506, May 1965. Edward Teller acknowledges in the complete text that "we have so far avoided all serious nuclear accidents". He attributed this to "being careful, and also by good luck".

This reviewer believes that it is very largely by being careful and only to a very small extent due to good luck. On page 1 of *The Technology of Nuclear Reactor Safety,* I wrote in 1964:

"Safety has been an important consideration from the very beginning of the development of nuclear reactors. On December 2, 1942 when the first atomic reactor was brought to criticality, Enrico Fermi had already made safety an important part of the experiment. In addition to a shutoff rod, other emergency procedures for shutting down the pile were prepared in advance. Fermi also considered the safety aspects of reactor operation. Shortly before the reactor was expected to reach criticality, Fermi noted the mounting tension of the crew. To make sure that the operation was carried out in a calm and considered manner, he directed that the experiment be shut down and that all adjourn for lunch. With such leadership in safety at the very beginning, it is no wonder that the operation of reactors to date has been singularly free of mishaps.

I have seen no reason to change that view today, five years later.

On page 11 of *The Careless Atom,* Novick writes:

"In 1964, T. J. Thompson of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology wrote that there had been nine serious reactivity accidents since 1949 in nonmilitary installations alone. 'To date, nine (reactor fuel) cores have been destroyed or seriously damaged. Three reactors have been put out of action by accidents and never revived.' Late in 1966 there was still another serious accident, at the Enrico Fermi plant at Lagoona Beach, Michigan; as we shall see, this accident was potentially the most serious of all."

The actual text on page 699 of *The Tech-*

nology of Nuclear Reactor Safety reads:

"To date, nine cores have been destroyed or seriously damaged. Of these only two (Borax-1 and Spert-1 destructive tests) can be said to have been destroyed on purpose as a part of a test. Three reactors have been put out of action by accidents and never revived. Two of these, Windscale No. 1 and the SL–1, were deemed beyond reasonable repair. The third, Clementine, had really reached the end of its useful life and was no longer believed to be a competitive research tool. It was dismantled and replaced by another higher flux research reactor—the OWR.

Again Novick has distorted the original text by adding the words, "in nonmilitary installations alone" and taking out sections of the complete text. In fact, no serious reactor accidents at military reactor installations have occurred, unless the SL–1 is considered a military reactor, and it *is* included in my tabulation. *The Careless Atom* quotes these volumes again several times partially or in a distorted manner.

I am concerned, as the Technical Editor of these volumes and as an author as well, at having the meanings of the writings of the various authors distorted by partial out-of-context quotes. While I have not had time to investigate the correct statements of all of those quoted in Mr. Novick's text, my investigations to date indicate that the cases quoted above are typical. For instance, Mr. Novick quotes part of the minority opinion in the Enrico Fermi Supreme Court Hearing, but not the majority opinion. I am especially concerned when this man not trained in nuclear reactor technology, on his own authority then makes such statements as:

"A reactor like the one planned for Bodega is a complex and temperamental device, under the best of circumstances. It would seem unreasonable to expect such a device to go on functioning safely during an earthquake yet this is precisely what the designers of the PG and E plant intended. (p. 38) or "Although present reactors could, at least in principle, be made safe and clean, it is hard to see how the far greater difficulties of the fast breeder are to be solved."

Mr. Novick's background as a Program Administrator of the Center for the Biology of Natural Systems at Washington University in St. Louis scarcely qualify him to deliver with such authority these opinions on complex and weighty technical matters. Clearly, this book should be read with caution.

As I indicated earlier, safety has been an important consideration from the very beginning of the development of nuclear reactors. The need to insure that large quantities of fission products would not be released to the general environment was recognized early. The AEC acknowledged the importance of this consideration by creating a Reactor Safeguards Committee. Later, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of Congress formalized this action by making the Committee statutory, and thus independent of any influence from the Atomic Energy Commission or from the Joint Committee itself. Thus, with great foresight and wisdom, they created an independent committee of knowledgeable citizens with the sole responsibility to protect the safety interests of the public. In addition, the Commission itself early established a separate Division of Reactor Regulation under the direction of Harold Price which has extensive technical knowledge and which investigated in detail the safety of each proposed reactor. Each power reactor is given a third hearing review by a separate and independent Hearing Board. In fact, a much more true book on the present situation might be titled, "The Careful Atom". Certainly any implication in the book title that safety matters are being treated lightly by anyone, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of Congress, the Atomic Energy Commission, the reactor industry, or the utilities is totally false. Any utility or reactor fabricator can testify and provide facts which document the measures taken and level of expenditures provided to assure reactor safety. Further, I can state that no one within the AEC itself or outside of it has ever tried to influence my personal technical judgment on any reactor license application when I was a member of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, nor have they tried to impede the open and honest consideration of all of the facets of reactor safety considered in the writing of the two volumes titled *The Technology of Nuclear Reactor Safety*. In fact, the AEC reviewers have generally demanded more material and more complete coverage—not less, and certainly, not a muffled coverage.

This comment brings me to one of my chief concerns about this book. Appearance of a book of this sort, which changes the meaning of quoted statements by partial omissions and by taking them out of context and which then adds nonauthoritative opinions as authoritative conclusions, makes almost impossible the task of the engineer and scientist who is trying to prepare an honest safety evaluation or safety technical document.

Safety deliberations by their very nature must consider accidents and their consequences. If one were to talk about an earthquake in the San Francisco Bay area of the magnitude of the design earthquake considered at the Bodega Head reactor plant, many thousands of people would be killed, bridges would probably be in ruin and many buildings would be rubble. Yet the reactor involved was to be designed to withstand such an earthquake "without loss of function." To my best knowledge, no one has deliberated the consequences of a very severe earthquake to the entire population of the San Francisco Bay area. Such questions have only thus far been raised in regard to nuclear power reactors. No consideration has ever been given to establishing a national level of acceptable safety from the consequences of disasters resulting from natural or man-made causes. Such deliberations should be initiated. The nuclear reactor safety deliberations represent one of the first times that the facts concerning conjectures on the consequences of such occurrences have been available to the public. If people like Mr. Novick distort honest attempts to put into the public record and to educate those who need to know about reactor safety, there will be a great tendency to be less open in putting such records in the public domain. No bridge, no sky-scraper, no baseball park, no air field has ever been built without some safety considerations involved. Almost never do these reach the attention of the public. Yet in the consideration of nuclear reactor installations, these are made a matter of public record much more openly than in almost any other present engineering situation. It can be argued that Mr. Novick has done a grave disservice to his fellow citizens by presenting such a distorted document that he will discourage responsible engineers and scientists from further attempts at full open and honest public disclosures.

There is a need for a continuing dialogue on the relative merits of the various types of possible electrical power sources available to mankind. The best solution to the increasing electrical power demands is to reverse our increasing population trend and stabilize our population. But even then, people will probably continue to add air conditioning, new electrical gadgets, perhaps electrical cars. No one suggests or considers cutting back in their own usage of electricity. Therefore, our electrical power needs will continue to rise in the foreseeable future. The question we must answer is, "where does it come from—nuclear, coal, oil, a combination, or something else?"

RESCUING CHILDREN BEFORE SCARS OF POVERTY BECOME INDELIBLE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times earlier this week printed a story about a small town in northeast Vermont which has done something about the children of its poor families.

Testimony before my own subcommittee, the General Subcommittee on Education, has proved beyond question the enormous gains to be made by reaching young children with educational experiences even before they start to school.

It occurred to me that my colleagues would be equally interested in the work of this small community. I know that the efforts of the good people of Barton, Vt., are being repeated in countless communities and neighborhoods across America. Unfortunately, however, we do not have an opportunity to hear about these successes. But it is these very successes, despite their lack of publicity, that will help immeasurably to determine our course for the future.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times article of July 15 follows:

RESCUING CHILDREN BEFORE SCARS OF POVERTY BECOME INDELIBLE

(By Lisa Hammel)

BARTON, VT.—This town of a little more than 1,000 people in the northeast corner of the state has a scattering of stores on the main street that ends suddenly in cows. Traditional New England white clapboard houses thin out on the edge of town, nestling singly in rising hills that are green velvet under summer sun.

About 100 yards along a quiet road that leads off from the main street is an old farmhouse half surrounded by shadowed woods. At the back of the farmhouse is a playground, filled on a sunny day with children racing around on tricycles, swinging vigorously, pushing doll carriages, running and laughing.

An onlooker would assume that it was a nursery school until he noticed something a little odd: most of the children would be too young for school, for among them are infants gurgling on blankets and fat-legged little toddlers lurching happily across the playground.

If the visitor had been glancing over the fence last summer, he would have observed something even stranger, and not a little disturbing: children obviously old enough to walk, who did not seem able to; children silent and sullen in a corner of the yard; children listlessly playing with the equipment; children grabbing violently and greedily at the toys, as if they would never have another chance at them.

For this is not a nursery school. It is an experimental center for deprived children of very poor families in this area. And the children range in age from infancy up to 3.

The Barton Parent and Child Center, as it is called, is one of 36 pilot projects begun in 1967 as a unit of Project Head Start to deal with the physical, intellectual and emotional problems of disadvantaged children under 3.

The federally funded project had its beginnings in the discovery that many children entering the Head Start program for 3- and 4-year-olds were suffering from the results not only of medical and nutritional neglect, but of intellectual and emotional neglect as well.

HELP MUST COME EARLY

To prevent children from being seriously crippled in their later development, many experts had begun to believe something would have to be done from the moment the child entered the world, and even before, in prenatal care.

The 36 centers, each awarded a renewable one-year grant of $175,000, are scattered in urban and rural areas throughout the 50 states—including one center on an Indian reservation and another in a migrant workers' camp.

Each has a slightly differing point of emphasis, according to the needs of the community it serves, but there are a few factors common to all. The primary focus is on helping the babies and little children through physical care and affectionate and stimulating attention; the secondary focus is generally on helping the parents or the mothers in whatever ways they seem to need it most.

In this sense, the Vermont operation can be considered typical.

The center is situated in what Vermonters call the Northeast Kingdom—a rather ironic designation for three depressed counties in the northeast quarter of the state near the Canadian border. In Orleans County, of which Barton is the center, and where there are probably more cows than people, the per capita income is about $1,600 a year, less than half the national average.

The poverty in this area ranks with that of Appalachia, with one additional disadvantage. The winters here are long and bitter, and there are families that cannot afford to heat their dilapidated, dirt-floor shacks. There are few jobs, and there are generally seasonal and poorly paid.

The Barton Parent and Child Center found that it could not even begin helping the children until the chaos in the lives of the 70 or so families it had enlisted in the program was ameliorated a little.

The 10 to 12 family aides hired by the center spent much of their time at first introducing fearful and disorganized mothers to some of the basics of housekeeping, while the professional staff utilized connections with antipoverty agencies and other state operations to relieve some of the worst of the hunger and other physical needs that poverty, isolation and ignorance had produced.

Linda Wright, one of the family aides, went to visit one of her more secure families on a recent morning.

Mrs. Wright, who, like all the other aides, is a mother herself and comes from the area, has had a sufficient taste of poverty to understand it from the bone out.

All of the aides were given preliminary training in subjects that ranged from health care to children's games—a training that continues as they work at the center with the youngsters, who generally each come one day a week, or go around to visit their assigned quota of families, and play with the children in their homes.

The home of Gerry Renard, a sagging yellow clapboard house with an overgrown front yard, just off the main street of Barton, was said to be among the best of the houses that the P.C.C. families live in.

A WOMAN WITH ADVANTAGES

Mrs. Renard has several other advantages. She has a husband who lives with her, unlike about 85 per cent of the mothers, and who is employed, in a local sawmill. And she is within walking distance of stores. Many of the families live on back roads miles from a town and are too poor to afford any kind of transportation.

The small kitchen with its tattered linoleum where her four children, aged 1 to 4, awaited Mrs. Wright's visit, was crowded with a large table on which lay a mammoth pile of dirty clothes that Mrs. Renard endlessly sorted. In the next room her elderly stepfather sat silently, leafing through newspapers. An overwhelming and acrid smell of dampness filled the rooms.

The children played, a little restlessly, with the bag of toys Mrs. Wright had brought. At one point, William, the 4-year-old, began violently beating the toy figure of a child.

He explained, when questioned, that he was hitting it because "her cried."

The aide said later that the Renard children were wildly destructive with the toys at first, but eventually they had come to understand that Mrs. Wright would bring the bag of goodies back with her each week, and they began to play more calmly with them.

Some of the mothers like to watch or join in when the aide comes on her weekly visit, but some, it was reported, are so jealous of the attention being paid to the children, it is difficult for the aide to do anything.

The children of these families, it was explained, are rarely talked to or played with by their parents. Often communication is limited to a beating.

What kinds of differences has the program begun to make to the children of the 70 or so poor families in the area who are involved in the project, most of them for about a year now?

Penny Wetherell, whose year-old daughter attended the center, now works there under the aegis of the Youth Corps. She said that when she first came, the children seemed "so pathetic" she didn't think she could continue.

But she did, and after a while children who "didn't know how to play and didn't even know what a fairy tale was" began to be more responsive.

There were health bonuses too.

"They started gaining weight," she said, "and got color in their cheeks and, many of them who couldn't, learned to walk. We also potty-trained most of them. I think just love and understanding makes that much difference."

Denise LeTourneau, who started last summer as an aide and is now supervisor of the center, said that at first the children "were very shy and sort of closed within themselves."

"Within just two weeks," she said, "the change was so big."

PLAY AND SPEECH IMPROVEMENTS

The hyperaggressive children, she said, began to play better in groups. The inarticulate children, who "weren't asking for anything—just pointing or grunting," began to speak.

"And they all got a lot cleaner," she said. Washing and baths are a regular part of the program.

"At the beginning," Mrs. LeTourneau continued, "there really weren't any make-believe games. It took some time for them to begin to play imaginatively.

"They are just starting to build barns and castles or use a block as an animal or a truck. And the girls are just starting to play house or mothers."

"The sense of fantasy," said Mrs. LeTourneau, "developed through reading books to them and also by visiting with them and playing with them in their homes."

"Before," she added, "they didn't have anyone but the mothers."

BOULDER AND FLAGPOLE DEDICATION

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, recently the employees of the Robbins Co. of Attleboro, Mass., dedicated a memorial boulder and flagpole on the O'Neill Boulevard lawn of their factory.

The purpose of this dedication—the affirmation of faith in this Nation and its ideals—should not be overlooked in this time of national doubt. The words of Mr. Robert H. Sweet at the dedication are well worth notice, and I submit the following article on the dedication for the benefit of my colleagues:

ROBBINS CO. DEDICATED BOULDER AND FLAGPOLE

Many employes of the Robbins Company were on hand Saturday forenoon for the dedication of a memorial boulder and flagpole on the O'Neil Boulevard lawn of the Attleboro factory, which manufactures jewelry and emblems. A color guard from the Attleboro Veterans Council, with Oscar Watters in charge, was also on hand for the ceremony.

Pres. Robert H. Sweet spoke briefly after introduction by Personnel Director Thomas Marino, and Ernest Falardeau, an employe of the company, raised the flag; the honor went to him because he recently lost a son, Robert, in action in the Vietnam War.

President Sweet spoke as follows:

"Today when the loyalty of the American citizenry is a topic of general conversation discussed in the same breath with baseball scores and political issues; when oil companies and veterans organizations are waging campaigns to have Americans display their flag.

"It seems fitting and right that we the People of the Robbins Company somehow show that we are loyal Americans.

"For this reason we have decided to dedicate this flag on flag day during the 275th anniversary of Attleboro, the city in which we work.

"All of us know or have heard of someone who has given their life for our country. All of us here, have either served in some branch of the armed forces or have had a relative or friend that has, and for those of us who haven't served in the armed forces, have done something for our country in our own way.

"Therefore the purpose of this flag dedication today, is to honor all loyal American citizens who have served our country, from medal of honor recipients to housewives, mothers and everyday good Americans."

TIMBER

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, there have been introduced during the 91st Congress several bills to provide a revised timber management program on certain Federal public lands. I have received considerable mail from conservationists in opposition to the pending bills, including H.R. 12440. The general feeling is that the proposed legislation is both undesirable and unnecessary. For my part I am greatly concerned about the impact of this legislation, if adopted, upon the fish and wildlife resources in the timber lands which would be affected by the proposed new management program.

The June issue of the magazine National Parks, the publication of the National Parks Association, carried an editorial on this legislation by Anthony Wayne Smith, the association's president. So that my colleagues may be aware

XUM

of the views expressed by Mr. Smith, I include the text of the editorial at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TIMBER!

The timber interests having just launched a vigorous campaign for overcutting the national forests, we are moved to reminiscences and forecasts.

The national forest system arose out of widespread raids on the public domain which were leaving forests land in devastation. Gifford Pinchot was the most important figure among a handful of men who brought significant portions of the public lands into the forest reservations and eventually the national forests. Pinchot was an advocate of what we would now call ecological forestry (of which more below), and a bitter enemy of wholesale clearcutting.

Some twenty years or more ago we took part in the successful defense of the national forests against proposals for their surrender through the states to private interests, which were to return them to the Government, after cutting, to hold through the costly period of regrowth, and for eventual surrender again for private harvest and profit.

And more recently there were serious attacks in terms of certain large private grazing interests.

Now it is said to be a housing emergency; more lumber is needed; most of the remaining saw timber is in the national forests; the large private forest holdings have been heavily cut over; most of the small woodlots have been in ruin for generations.

This situation strikes us as a confession of bankruptcy on the part of the private corporate timber interests, and hardly a justification for stepping up the cut in the national forests at the expense of the future. We predict—we do not exhort, but merely predict—that conservationists and environmentalists will unite in opposing the increased cuts in the national forests.

A bad situation in the private timber lands ought not to be pinned on housing. In this day and age there are plenty of other materials if lumber is really short. And perhaps it is not so short, and someone should take a hard look at the lumber inventories of the large corporations. Recent sharp rises and drops in lumber prices more than hint at a privatey administered price and supply situation.

II

Confusion between private and public property also seems to have arisen at Mineral King in Sequoia National Forest in California.

We are wholly in favor of the use of the national forests for the kind of natural outdoor camping recreation which has been typical in the national forests in the past.

We have never questioned a reasonable use of the national forests for skiing; we have favored cross-country skiing, non-mechanized, in both national parks and national forests. But when it comes to enormous resorts like Mineral King with a splurge of mechanical ski lifts, a cityful of so-called chalets, the inevitable shopping centers, attendant parking lots, even though at a distance, and the logistics of big highways, the discourse drops to a lower level.

We still think the Forest Service should abandon Mineral King as not in keeping with sound recreational development in the national forests. We think the Department of the Interior should rescind permission to construct an access highway across an arm of Sequoia National Park. We recommend to the prospective concessioner that it withdraw from the enterprise in the interest of its own public relations. And we think conservationists should continue to oppose the project.

It is not just Mineral King; it is the example which will be set for similar developments in other national forests. Simple campgrounds for natural outdoor recreation are one thing; building up vested private interests in big construction is another; subsidizing concessioners with huge roads and sanitary facilities is yet another. Mineral King moves in the wrong direction and ought to be stopped.

III

The laws governing the national forests provide authority, among other things, for multiple-use management.

We always thought this arrangement was good and will continue to support it. If the traffic which is smothering our national parks, to the injury of what people seek there, is to be mitigated, recreational facilities must be provided outside the parks, and among other places in the commercial cutting areas of the national forests. If timber-harvest and recreation are to be reconciled under the heading of multiple use, harvesting has to be by compatible methods.

Not only for recreational reasons, but for the sake of soil, waters, wildlife, scenery, and most certainly the perpetual yield of wood and wood products, ecological forestry must become the norm. In recent years the harvesting of forest products has been linked too heavily to the convenience of big machinery; it has trended away from selective cutting to clear-cutting; this trend must be reversed. There needs to be a wider understanding that selective cutting was once regarded as the standard of excellence by good foresters; that forests can be managed and timber harvested in ways not incompatible with considerations of recreation, wildlife, and scenery. The journals of the conservation movement, ours among others, should dedicate themselves to such education.

And it is also time we got going on a reforestation program in America. The revelations provided by the timber interests in connection with the present overcutting program should shock us as a nation into action.

The national forests are in relatively good condition because the principle of sustained yield has never been wholly abandoned. There are enormous areas of privately-owned land, however, often in large tracts, which were cut in such manner as to leave them unproductive. Small holdings all over the continent, including farm wood lots, have been timber-mined and high-graded to the point where little remains but brush. Complex economic and legal problems are involved but are not so difficult as to defy solution.

We think that the present Administration should have a look at the timber problem as a whole, refrain from being stampeded by pressures for quick solutions which solve nothing, and offer the nation some plans based on the protection of present public holdings against overcutting and recreational commercialization, and for ecological forestry and vigorous reforestation.

The growing awareness of the significance of the entire environment in the life of the nation would ensure a cordial response and strong support for such a forward-looking forestry program.

HOI POLLOI: DO NOT DISTURB MARCUSE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

HOI POLLOI: DON'T DISTURB MARCUSE

(By Eric Hoffer)

The anti-Americanism of the foreign intellectual stems not from his fear of the debasing effect America might have on literature, art, music, the cinema, etc., but its effect on the masses. We see again and again how the Americanization of a country results in the deproletarianization of the workingman.

Americanization means the stiffening of the workingman's backbone, and the sharpening of his appetites. He not only begins to believe that he is as good as anyone else, but wants to live and look like anyone else. The Americanization of a society amounts to giving it a classless aspect, the sapping of its aristocratic traditions, the diffusion of a sameness which has all the earmarks of equality. And it is this that the foreign intellectual fears and resents.

He not only feels the loss of the grandiose background of mute masses ranged in their millions behind him, but he is also deprived of the aristocratic climate which he feels is vital for the realization and exercise of his creative talents. It is to him a drab, uninspiring world where every mother's son thinks himself as good as anyone else, and the capacity for reverence and worship has become atrophied.

Scratch any foreign intellectual, even one who has lived for decades among us, and you find a would-be aristocrat who loathes the sight, the sound, the smell of common folk. Take Professor Marcuse. This self-styled savior of humanity came to this country in 1934, a refugee from Hitler's Germany.

He has lived among us for over 30 years, and now, in his old age, his disenchantment with this country is spilling over, into book after book. When you brush aside the Hegelian double-talk and the philosophical claptrap you discover what it is that is ailing him.

In plain English, Prof. Marcuse is offended by the degree to which common people in America are allowed to intrude into the sphere of life which ought to be the preserve of chosen spirits: "to break the peace wherever there is still peace and silence, to be ugly and uglify things, to ooze familiarity, to offend against good form."

Nowhere on this continent is there a spot where Marcuse can escape the sight, the sound and the smell of the vulgar, common Americans.

Last summer the professor went to Venice. The place was full of Americans and Americanized vulgarians. In an interview with a reporter for Il Tempo, Marcuse wondered whether Venice could not be reserved for high-class tourism, so that the hoi polloi would not disturb its solemn beauty.

Marcuse was born in Berlin in 1898. He was in his thirties in the days of the Weimar Republic. As one of the far left he probably fought the democratic republic as a sham and a swindle and worked for its destruction. Hitler did the destroying. It is worth noting that in 1956 Marcuse had no use for the Hungarian revolution.

EXTENDS CONGRATULATIONS

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago last Saturday, July 19, 1969, Laos became an independent sovereign state within the French Union. On this memorable occasion, I would like to extend warm congratulations to His Excellency Souvanna Phouma, Prime Minister of the Royal Government of Laos; and His Excellency Khamking Souvanlasy, Ambassador of Laos to the United States.

The gentle people of Laos have yearned for independence for many years; her struggle has not yet ended.

The Laotians are descendants of Thai

XUM

tribes that pushed southward from China in the 13th century. Free of the bellicosity that characterizes her Vietnamese, Thai, and Chinese neighbors, the Laotians were unfortunately not free of their domination. By 1893, the French had replaced these powers in Indo-China, and Laos became part of the greater French protectorate.

With the onset of the second world war, Laos traded French hegemony for Japanese suzerainty. After the war, the French returned and with the support of the new Laotian dynasty of Luang Prabang ruled the country until 1949. During the Indo-China War of 1950–54, many Laotians who disputed the legitimacy of the Luang Prabang dynasty went to Vietnam under the leadership of Prince Souphannouvong and joined the Viet Minh to fight the French.

On October 22, 1953, the Laotians gained full sovereignty, and all special ties with the French were abolished by the Paris agreements of December 29, 1954.

Ever since, right- and left-wing factions have disputed the leadership of neutralist Prince Souvanno Phouma. We can only hope that the Government of Laos can resolve the differences without the kind of conflagration which tis tearing its neighbor, Vietnam, apart.

With over 95 percent of her population engaged in agriculture and an annual per capita income of $50, Laos easily qualified as one of the world's underdeveloped countries. The political hostilities have had a deep and unfortunate effect on the economy, and we hope that the burdens of poverty will soon be alleviated. Tin, green coffee, and wood are the nucleus of a hopefully expanding trade. Rice is her main staple.

We hope that the third decade of Laotian independence will be a peaceful and prosperous one.

JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT WINNER

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and admiration that I call attention to the activities and accomplishments of BAYALT, a Junior Achievement company, sponsored by Fisher Body, Pittsburgh.

The excellent education, training and experience provided by the Junior Achievement program is of inestimable value to these young achievers and to the future of our Nation. I invite the attention of my colleagues and submit for the RECORD at this time, an article on BAYALT from the Fisher Body Craftsman.

PLANT SPONSORED JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT COMPANY WINS MANY TOP AWARDS

BAYALT, one of the Fisher Body, Pittsburgh sponsored Junior Achievement companies, won the highly prized Company of the Year Award at the Mon-Yough J. A. Center in McKeesport. The award is based on the best overall performance in management, sales, attendance, company records, liquidation and annual report.

BAYALT achievers added the Company of the Year honors to an outstanding list of accomplishments for the year at the Center, which already included—Company of the Month in each of the five months during which the Mon-Yough Center judged performance, Best Annual Report Award and top company sales with $2,577.03.

BAYALT Achievers receiving individual honors were company president Bob Pastor, voted Officer of the Year, Dolores Palinsky, Achiever of the Year, and Ed Palinsky and Bob Pastor, Best Salesman Winners. The top individual salesmen of the company were Bob Pastor with $605.80 and Dolores Palinsky with $511.83.

SOUTHWEST PENNSYLVANIA HONORS

After sweeping honors at the Mon-Yough Center, BAYALT then competed at the J.A. Southwest Pennsylvania Awards presentation at the Hilton Hotel in Pittsburgh. The Southwest J. A. covers the entire metropolitan Pittsburgh area. It includes ten different J.A. Centers (Mon-Yough is one of them) totaling 3,700 students and 182 Junior Achievement companies.

The BAYALT Annual Report took top honors for Southwest Pennsylvania and now will be entered in national competition. In the "Company of the Year" competition the two top companies from each Center were considered for the coveted honor. After preliminary judging, BAYALT was selected as one of the "Super Six" companies of Southwest Pennsylvania.

The officers of these companies were interviewed by a panel of judges from the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh. The judges then ranked the top six J.A. companies based on their interview scores and the records previously scored by the Center coordinators. BAYALT was awarded the No. 2 spot in Southwest Pennsylvania and will continue in regional finals to be held in Cleveland.

Dolores Palinsky, daughter of Jim Palinsky (Press Room), was presented a citation for having been chosen "Achiever of the Year."She was also awarded this year's $1,000 J. A. scholarship award for her academic excellence. Dolores, a senior at McKeesport High School, was the Mistress of Ceremonies at the Hilton presentations.

Romance candles, apple-aire refrigerator deodorizers and personalized laminated license plates were the products made during the year by BAYALT. The name BAYALT, meaning *B*usiness *A*nd *Y*oung *A*chievers *L*earning *T*ogether was chosen as the company name by the achievers.

ADVISOR TEAM OF YEAR

The enthusiasm and energy of the members of BAYALT in this J. A. venture have been outstanding. It was only through team-effort that they were able to enjoy success.

The advisor team for BAYALT consisted of Ken Fair (Master Mechanic), Andy Meszaros (Personnel) and Mario Volponi (Accounting). They were awarded the "Advisor Team of the Year Award".

The future of America depends on the education and training of its youth and a better understanding of the free enterprise system. Fisher Body-Pittsburgh is extremely proud to be a part of the Junior Achievement Program.

PRIDE IN OUR COUNTRY AND UNITY OF OUR PEOPLE

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have received such an excellent letter expressing the general feeling of the people of the United States on the Apollo 11 project, that I want to share it with the U.S. Congress and the general public.

Hal C. Davis, vice president of the American Federation of Musicians of the United States and Canada, has written to me under the date of July 22, 1969, describing the feeling that the Apollo flight alone has brought an awareness to the people of the United States that unity and pride in our country's efforts should be foremost in our thinking.

It is a pleasure to place this excellent letter in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF MUSICIANS
OF THE UNITED STATES AND
CANADA

July 22, 1969.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
U.S. Representative, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: Thank you very much for your invitation to Marion and me to attend the launching of Apollo 11 at Cape Kennedy on July 16th.

While it was not possible for us to attend, we consider it an honor and a privilege to have been invited and will proudly keep the invitation among our most valued papers.

The entire mission has been one of awe and majesty and we have watched every minute of it on television. Our flag has been flying day and night since lift-off and, looking around the neighborhood seeing other flags, leads me to believe that perhaps this alone has brought an awareness to the people of the United States that unity and pride in our country's efforts should be foremost in our thinking.

With every good wish, I am,
Sincerely yours,

HAL C. DAVIS,
Vice President.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1969

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration is to be complimented for the alacrity and timeliness with which it has submitted a much-needed and long-overdue reorganization proposal for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

In the past years, a number of studies of the independent regulatory agencies have pointed out the pressing requirement for a continuity of leadership within these agencies and also the need to delegate authority for internal administration of such agencies to the agency chairman. These studies have often cited the Interstate Commerce Commission as one of the independent regulatory agencies most in need of such reform, particularly in view of the fact that it has the largest body of Commissioners of any of the regulatory agencies.

The requirement for and the desirability of the administration's proposed reforms are clearly and effectively expressed in the President's message to

Congress. Both Hoover Commissions in recent years and the Landis report of 1960 strongly recommended similar reforms of the ICC's leadership function. Within the past decade alone, Congress has approved Presidential reorganization plans which provided for appointment by the President of the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission and the Federal Trade Commisssion and centralized administrative authority in the Chairmen of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

I was pleased to observe in newspaper accounts that the current Chairman of the ICC and a number of her fellow Commissioners have already spoken in support of the President's plan. It is my understanding that representatives of the railroad industry have also endorsed this proposal, as have members of the Senate Commerce Committee. This proposal should have the active support of every Member of Congress who is concerned over the present plight of America's transportation industry.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that this proposal represents the initial step to a more far-reaching program for a better coordinated and more comprehensive approach to Federal policy development, ratesetting, and general regulation for our Nation's transportation system.

LET US TAKE A CLOSER LOOK AT FEDERAL SPENDING

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the role of Congress to levy taxes is a clear and unchallenged responsibility. Congress has an equal responsibility to insure that these taxes are wisely spent.

It is apparent to many that Congress in recent years has not fully accepted its job of guarding the public pocketbook. We have too often acquiesced to spending requests from the Executive without knowing all the facts. Abuses have resulted. It is time to reverse this trend.

The Congress has begun to move in the right direction. It recently passed the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1969 which effectively sets a Federal spending ceiling for fiscal year 1970 of $191.9 billion, $1 billion below the estimates set by the Nixon administration. President Nixon signed the bill this week. Last year, the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act imposed significant limitations on Federal fiscal outlays.

But we must go further. We must insure fiscal responsibility in the billions of dollars consigned each year under Government contracts. We must establish an early warning system against the development of excessive costs on these contracts, such as have mounted in the current construction of the Air Force C-5A cargo transport plane.

I have introduced a bill that would supply this need by providing an annual reporting mechanism for Congress on Government contracts. The disclosure of cost overruns would be made before they are allowed to soar irrevocably out of control.

Specifically, this bill (H.R. 13027), which has also been introduced by many of my distinguished colleagues on both sides of the House, will require annual reports to the Congress by the Comptroller General on all Federal contracts above $10,000 where costs are exceeding original estimates by 10 percent or more. These reports would be made within 90 days of the end of each fiscal year.

If we are prepared to vote to increase the taxpayer's burden, we should be willing to pledge more firmly than ever that these tax dollars will not be squandered.

WORLD POPULATION CRISIS

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly encouraged to read the timely and comprehensive message of President Nixon concerning the world population crisis. In recent years, the problem of overpopulation has emerged as the most inevitable of several developments with the potential for destroying human life. I can only stress with the greatest urgency that extensive work in this area begin immediately. Many parts of the world are already strangling themselves as the natural dynamics of human existence are blocked by food storages, land shortages, lack of medical care, and myriads of other problems caused by multiplying populations. I heartily concur with President Nixon's recommendations that we continue to assist these areas of the world with increased funds, with more concentrated research, and with a greater coordination of effort.

The aspect of the July 18 Presidential message which I noted with the greatest approval, however, is the administration's obvious realization of the immediacy of the overpopulation threat to our own way of life. The United States has not yet developed the extensive overcrowding which leads to universal degradation such as is found in some parts of Asia. Yet the symptoms of overpopulation are rampant in our society. There are primary problems such as the millions of unwanted babies born every year, the families forced into poverty because of too many children, and the even more evident secondary manifestations affecting all levels of American society such as the housing shortage, extensive pollution, dwindling resource base, and traffic congestion.

President Nixon's official recognition of the paramount importance of fighting overpopulation and its dangerous effects in the United States, and his concrete recommendations for approaching the problem, provide much hope for viable solutions to safeguard the future of the United States as well as the rest of the world. I wish to offer my heartfelt congratulations and continued support to President Nixon in his courageous attempt to maintain dignity and freedom of choice in human life.

OIL DEPLETION

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, if the pending cut in oil depletion allowance is enacted the public should prepare itself for an increase in the retail prices of gasoline and other petroleum products.

What some people may not realize is that there has been a 12-year decline in explorations for new oil discoveries, and that the Nation continues to use up its proved reserves faster than new supplies are being found. Exploratory drilling declined from 14,707 wells in 1957 to 8,879 wells last year—a net drop of 40 percent. If the present depletion rate is reduced this drop will undoubtedly be accelerated

To the gasoline consumer who patronizes the filling stations this spells bad news. As indicated by a Wall Street Journal article, dated July 17, a rise in retail prices may be expected in the near future. I include that article as a part of my remarks. It follows:

OIL DEPLETION CUTS SEEN CAUSING BOOST IN PRICES OR REDUCED EXPLORATION—PROPOSED DECREASE TO 20 PERCENT WOULD LIKELY LIFT GASOLINE QUOTE BY 1 CENT A GALLON, INDUSTRY SAYS

A reduction in the percentage depletion tax deduction for petroleum to 20% from 27.5%, likely would mean higher prices for consumer products or sharply reduced spending on domestic oil and gas exploration, a survey of oil companies and economists indicates.

The director of a leading petroleum research organization estimated that the move, recommended Monday by the House Ways and Means Committee, likely would cause a 1-cent-a-gallon increase in the price of gasoline or a $400 million reduction in annual domestic capital outlays by oil companies.

"The petroleum industry, whose average rate of return on investment is below that of other manufacturing industries, cannot absorb this additional tax and would have to pass it on to consumers through increases in prices of petroleum products, particularly gasoline," asserted John Houchin, president of Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

In a study being released today the Petroleum Industry Research Foundation Inc., New York, says that full elimination of the depletion allowance would have added $1.3 billion to the industry's tax bill if it had been applied last year. This, it said, would have raised the oil industry's tax burden to 8 cents of every dollar of gross revenue, up from 5 cents in 1966 and compared with 4.75 cents that same year for all business corporations.

The foundation declared that elimination of the allowance would "inevitably" mean an increase in gasoline prices of 2.5 cents to 3 cents a gallon. It asserted the heaviest burden would fall on families with less than $3,000 in annual income, who spend 6.2% of their annual expenditures on gasoline. By contrast, the foundation said families with $15,000 of annual income spend only 1.5% of their annual outlays for gasoline.

It asserted that taking the increased taxes out of earnings would result in a one-fifth

XUM

reduction in the industry's 12.2% return on capital investment. That would put oil in the nine lowest of 44 major mining and manufacturing categories for return on investment, despite being a high risk business, the foundation said.

Cities Service Co., New York, said domestic oil and gas reserves already have been declining in recent years "due to steadily mounting exploration costs" and asserted that "a reduction in percentage depletion will increase costs to oil producers, which can only result in higher prices to consumers for petroleum products."

Percentage depletion-tax deductions are granted on 100 minerals. For petroleum, a producer can deduct 27.5% of the gross income from each well up to 50% of the net income from that well. It is estimated this results in an average of about 23% actually being deducted. The industry asserts that the deduction is aimed at avoiding taxation of capital, as opposed to taxation of income, since mineral resources in the ground are considered capital and merchandise rolled into one.

A tax official of a major international oil company, however, reported that the recommendation by the Ways and Means Committee to eliminate use of the 27.5% depletion allowance on foreign oil production probably wouldn't have any significant impact on most companies. The reason for this, he explained, is that in most cases foreign taxes and royalty payments generally exceed any liability for domestic income taxes on the output.

Mobil Oil Corp., New York, asserted, "Any reduction in percentage depletion can only result in reduced exploration for the increased oil and gas reserves in our country—unless this increased tax burden is offset by higher oil product prices."

HATS OFF TO THE FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

HON. JOHN KYL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, last week the Future Farmers of America held a national leadership and citizenship conference in the Nation's Capital. I can report that the conference was full of meaningful accomplishment.

They call this organization Future Farmers of America. Subjects discussed at program sessions demonstrate a dedication to the future. But they also attest to the fact that the organization is not provincial. FFA is concerned with all America.

One session discussed "Adapting FFA to a Changing Program of Agricultural Education." Group discussions determined what adaptations are a must and how they are to be implemented. In another period, the discussion concerned bridging the gap between high school and employment.

In every discussion, the key subject was leadership. This was the matter highlighting the visit to Mount Vernon where the question was asked, "What qualities did this man—George Washington—possess which made him a great leader?"

The chapter presidents from all over the Nation took full opportunity to discover Washington, D.C. Members of the House and Senate discussed lawmaking and other procedures of government.

I had an opportunity to spend considerable time with the FFA visitors. The contact has again affirmed my pride, faith, and confidence in our teenage citizens. Here was a serious-minded assembly. Here were youngsters who are deeply appreciative of our American heritage, of our social, political, and economic systems. They recognize our shortcomings, and they are completely concerned with our problems. But they seek solutions by rational thought and free discussion.

My hat is off to FFA, its members, and its directors.

IN THAT SPOT

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Dallas Morning News reflected on the reactions of the people of Dallas to President Nixon and the accomplishments of his administration. According to the article, the general citizenry of Dallas harbors a very realistic attitude toward Mr. Nixon and his performance to date.

Significantly, the article asserts that people are aware of the complex nature of the problems he faces in this high position, and they are aware of his intent to translate proposals into realities.

In his efforts to improve the quality of life of all our people, I think this editorial quite aptly affirms President Nixon's case for the American people.

The editorial follows:

IN THAT SPOT

It is axiomatic among political professionals that politics is the art of the possible. In that context, Dennis Hoover of The News found that the voters of Dallas generally have a very professional attitude toward the Nixon administration so far.

The reactions of most of the people he talked to were neither wildly enthusiastic nor bitterly disappointed, but they were realistic. Fairly typical were a doctor's diagnosis that Nixon is "doing as well as could be expected" and a housewife's observation that "I guess he's been doing as well as he can under the circumstances."

The noteworthy aspect of the present relationship between the President and the people is not what he has done or not done to solve the nation's problems, but the fact that so many voters view these problems with an awareness of their complexity.

Americans once liked their political promises big, bombastic and impossibly expansive. Candidates were expected to guarantee an answer to every problem and the really star-quality performers promised that, once in office, they would pass a miracle on alternate Tuesdays.

Much as voters might like to believe such talk, an increasing number now recognize the fact that miracles are not so easily come by. If Nixon is doing as well as can be expected, those expectations did not include any sudden miracles or overnight solutions to problems that defeated the efforts of other good and able men in previous administrations.

If Nixon is doing as well as he can "under the circumstances," the voter realizes that "the circumstances" are not the type that can be dispelled with a wave of a wand or the railroading of a batch of new spending programs.

In his campaign last year, Nixon directed his appeal to these voters. He did not try to portray the incumbents as criminals, traitors or lunatics, nor did he promise instant paradise after he took office. He did promise to attack the most urgent problems from a somewhat different direction and with somewhat different concepts.

Politically, this candor and understatement has paid off. Witness the voters' statements that "we haven't heard any of the grand promises of the Johnson administration" and "he's fulfilling the promises he made in the campaign, which is unusual."

Even more unusual is the number of voters who have learned that the most powerful office in the world also comes furnished with the world's toughest problems. As an engineer put it, "he's done as well as anyone could do in that spot."

The nation has taken an encouraging step toward political maturity if it realizes that when it puts a man in that spot, it makes him a president but it doesn't make him a magician.

FLIGHT OF APOLLO 11 HAILED BY POPE PAUL

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, July 21, 1969]

FLIGHT OF APOLLO 11 HAILED BY POPE PAUL—WARNING ISSUED

CASTELGANDOLFO, ITALY.—Pope Paul VI hailed the "extraordinary and astonishing" Apollo-11 flight to the moon but warned against "idolatry" of the instruments of technical progress.

The Pope referred to the day as "a great day, a historic day for humanity" in his weekly blessing yesterday to pilgrims and tourists at the papal summer residence in this hill town.

The Pope also recorded a special message for the three Apollo astronauts to be shown later on Italian television.

Vatican sources said the Pope planned to watch the Apollo mission on television and also to peer at the moon through the giant telescope of the Vatican observatory in Castelgandolfo.

"We will do well to meditate on this extraordinary and astonishing event," the Pope said of the Apollo mission during his blessing.

But he warned that men run the risk of being fascinated "perhaps even to the point of madness" by their own instruments and the products of man's genius.

"Here is the danger," he said. "Against this possible idolatry of the instrument we must be on guard."

Instruments multiply the efficiency of man, he said, but this may not always be to man's advantage.

"Could not the instrument imprison the man who produces it and make him the servant of the system of life that the instrument . . . imposes on its very owner?" he asked.

"Everything still depends on the heart of man," the Pope continued.

"It is absolutely necessary that the heart of man becomes even more free, good and religious, the greater and more dangerous is the power of machines, arms and instruments that man puts at his own disposition."

CLOSING THE DEPLETION LOOPHOLE

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, I have introduced legislation that would phase out the oil import program over a 10-year period. I have also introduced legislation that would reduce the depletion allowance to 15 percent in the case of domestic oil and eliminate it in the case of foreign oil.

You can well imagine how pleased I am with the direction in which the House Ways and Means Committee is moving in this area. In fact, my only complaint is that they may not be going far enough. Nonetheless, important steps are being taken to remedy what is probably the biggest loophole in our tax laws.

With this in mind, I was interested to read a New York Times editorial entitled "Closing the Depletion Loophole" on July 23, 1969. The editorial does a good job explaining why something has to be done about the depletion allowance and why a reduction would help, rather than hurt, the country. It does an especially good job knocking down the national security argument, about which you hear so much. And it also points out how the allowance and the oil import program result in higher prices to the consumer.

I submit, therefore, that editorial for inclusion in the RECORD at this time.

CLOSING THE DEPLETION LOOPHOLE

The House Ways and Means Committee took a significant step toward meaningful tax reform when it voted to reduce the oil and gas depletion allowances from 27.5 to 20 per cent. Proportional reductions would also be made in the allowances for other minerals, which now range from 5 to 23 per cent.

If adopted by the Congress, those recommendations would add about $400 million to tax revenues. But that figure grossly understates the importance of the reform, both as a symbolic attack on the citadel of tax privilege and as a means of ensuring a more efficient allocation of economic resources.

The petroleum industry has long defended on two grounds the depletion allowances and the companion privilege of writing off drilling costs as a current business expense rather than treating them, for tax purposes, as investments. One argument relates to the risks of oil exploration; the other rests on the national defense need for maintaining proved domestic reserves of oil through continuous exploration.

A spokesman for the petroleum industry pointed out in a recent discussion of the oil and gas depletion allowances that of "50 new field wildcat wells drilled . . . only about one well is likely to turn out to be a profitable producer." Assuming that statement to be accurate, it does not follow that the oil and gas exploration is so much riskier than other business ventures as to justify special tax treatment. The reasoning about risk is circular because much of the wildcat drilling would never be attempted in the absence of the tax shelters.

The more important question concerns the national defense. First, it should be pointed out that the link—essential to the industry's case—between the depletion allowance and the growth of proved oil reserves has never been convincingly demonstrated. Second, it is doubtful whether the growth of oil reserves within the continental boundaries of the United States is really essential to the national defense.

In a nuclear conflict that engulfed the major centers of population, the adequacy of oil reserves would not be preeminent on the list of priorities. In limited, nonnuclear wars, such as those that have occurred in the Middle East, the flow of petroleum may for a time be disrupted. But the dangers on that score are being diminished by the new strikes in Canada and Alaska as well as the very large reserves in Latin America, Indonesia and Australia.

The economic fact of the matter is that there is a superabundance of low-cost oil outside the United States. Its flow, to be sure, can be interrupted. But it is highly unlikely that all of the sources of supply would be dried up at the same time. It follows that the American public is shouldering an unnecessarily costly burden by subsidizing the oil industry, not only by special tax treatment, but also through the imposition of import quotas and cartel restrictions on domestic production. As a result, prices to consumers are higher, tax revenues are lower and—because of the tax shelter—capital flows into domestic exploration that would yield higher returns invested elsewhere.

The proposed reduction in the mineral depletion allowances will provide a crucial test of whether Congress is willing to vote for a fairer tax system. A failure to adopt the recommendation of the overwhelming majority of the Ways and Means Committee can only lead to the further erosion of public confidence in the democratic process.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week is Captive Nations Week. Throughout the week, Americans everywhere are conducting appropriate ceremonies, television and radio programs, and public discussion forums in rememberance of their fellow human beings who are trapped behind the Iron Curtain.

This is the 10th year since the late President Eisenhower issued the first proclamation declaring the third week in July to be Captive Nations Week. Each year since, we have paused as a people and a nation to reflect on the repression of millions of freedom-loving peoples by the Soviet Union. For the 10th year, our Nation cries out its abhorrence of the enslavement of a hundred million people who, were it not for the guns, the terror, and the slave labor camps, would enjoy the fruits and blessings of justice and liberty.

The observance of Captive Nations Week 1969 is a particularly compelling occasion, for this is the year that the difference between communism and democracy was highlighted by the Soviet rape of Czechoslovakia and the oppression of liberty which accompanied it, and the historic flight of Apollo 11 which was a monument to American liberty, freedom, and justice. History will record the difference, and I hope that mankind will profit by a study of it.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to communicate both my feelings and the feelings of the residents in the 18th Congressional District in Texas, and convey to my colleagues our solemn commemoration of this annual time of national rededication to the ideal of liberty and justice for all.

THRESHOLD OF NEW AGE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the July 28, 1969, issue of U.S. News & World Report makes several important points with respect to the Apollo 11 lunar landing and the outstanding performance of Astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins. Rather than concentrating on the technical achievements of Apollo 11 this article points to other aspects of our national welfare that are supported by a strong national space program.

The article follows:

THRESHOLD OF A NEW AGE

An estimated half billion people in 49 countries, eyes fixed on TV screens, watched in fascination as America's Apollo 11 sped through space on its awesome mission.

For many, back of the spectacle itself was the nagging awareness that something just might go wrong at any point that triumph might be trumped by disaster.

Even so, the feeling was as big as the earth itself that the age of man had entered a new era, and its focal point was the United States of America.

To most—from the world's dignitaries to the man in the street—the entire universe seemed suddenly to shrink. The moon and the stars appeared closer to the heart of the matter than the war in Vietnam or the hatreds in the Middle East. An observation from a European:

"The world has had to forget itself."

BRIGHTER HOPES

The fate of Apollo 11's venture coincided with a host of developments that could only be read as the opening of a new chapter in history. At home and abroad, the feeling spread that the United States was once again on the move—in new and significant directions that had, at most, only a psychological link to space.

Richard Nixon, the 37th President of the United States, assembled a staff for a personal mission to Southeast Asia that for the first time in years was not a war conference.

Mr. Nixon was looking beyond the war to a period of peaceful development in that part of the world—and the role the United States should play in it.

Beyond Asia, his itinerary took him around the world to Rumania, once forbidden territory behind the Iron Curtain. But that Iron Curtain had become a rusted vestige of the days of the cold war. In mid-1969 it seemed to be in sagging neglect. The Communists in the Kremlin were too preoccupied with troubles at home to bridle at the bold jour-

XUM

ney of a Western leader to the fringes of the Russian empire that Stalin forced on the world by arms and bluff after World War II.

A TONE OF MODERATION

Instead of cold war, there was a growing prospect of disarmament talks between the U.S. and Russia. The Soviet Union's Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko—once one of the most abusive of America's antagonists—was using soft words and encouraging a closeness between Washington and Moscow that hadn't existed since the Roosevelt-Churchill-Stalin days of a quarter century ago.

The saga of Apollo 11 tended, even at home to push into the background the very things that were big news not too long ago. The course of events helped that trend.

The American campuses—peopled by summer students—were relatively quiet once again. Nobody who follows the situation closely felt that the "campus crisis" was a thing of the past—it could come roaring back with September—but the respite brought a sense of calm.

It had been, through mid-July, a comparatively peaceful summer in the big cities, when measured against the hot-weather days of recent years. Sporadic trouble in 1969 was nothing like the neighborhood-demolishing riots many metropolitan areas had come to fear.

LESS TERROR?

Street crime seemed less of a terror, even though the statistics showed no significant change.

President Nixon sent a message to Congress calling narcotics "a serious national threat" and urged action. The crime figures supported him, but the average American reacted with a calm that outwardly bordered on indifference.

The pulling and hauling over the extension of the income tax surcharge continued on Capitol Hill. The debate over the President's plan for an anti-ballistic-missile defense against Russia ground on.

But, for the present, such things were dimmed by the light of the moon—a light of such brilliance that mankind's earth may never be the same again.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we have just ended the observance of Captive Nations Week. In my mind, this occasion symbolizes the importance of the struggle for freedom of expression in the world. It should provide all Americans with an awareness of the breadth of their constitutional guarantees. It should make us recognize that millions upon millions of people in the world do not enjoy the rights of free speech and free political choice and free thought that we in this country have established and are fighting to preserve.

In Eastern Europe, 100 million people live under the control of regimes that stifle freedom. The shocking events that took place in Czechoslovakia more than a year ago were but a painful warning of the extent to which the Soviets will go to suppress the voice of freedom. And yet the Czechoslovakia experience is a tribute to the indomitable spirit of men and women in the Baltic States, in Poland and Hungary and the Balkans—men and women who under the most adverse conditions will dare to be free. Despite their setbacks, they will continue the struggle because they believe that some day they will win that freedom. Captive Nations Week is a reminder of the noble and humane cause of the people in Eastern Europe. I am honored to associate with this cause.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF APOLLO 11

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the dramatic and heroic success of the Apollo 11 mission is certainly something in which all Americans can take great pride. The implications of man's first landing on the moon are infinite in terms of future space exploration.

But there are serious implications as well for our entire system of national priorities, and these implications must be carefully considered by the Congress, the administration, and all citizens who are concerned about the future of their Nation.

Two recent articles in the New York Times, one by Columnist Russell Baker, the other by the noted historian, Lewis Mumford, deal with this issue from interesting perspectives. I commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

WHY ON EARTH ARE WE THERE? BECAUSE IT'S IMPOSSIBLE

(By Russell Baker)

So there he is at last. Man on the moon. The poor magnificent bungler!

He can't even get to the office without undergoing the agonies of the damned, but give him a little metal, a few chemicals, some wire and twenty or thirty billion dollars and, vroom!, there he is, up on a rock a quarter of a million miles up in the sky.

Ask him, "Man, why are you up there on that rock?" And the best reply he can give you is a tired old wisecrack, "Because it's here." He doesn't even know what makes him tick.

What he is doing up there is indulging his obsession with the impossible. The impossible infuriates and tantalizes him. Show him an impossible job and he will reduce it to a possibility so trite that eventually it bores him.

Because it was impossible to make the night blaze with light, he did it. It was impossible to put the world in a box in the living room, so he did it. Because it was impossible to fly, he flew. Impossible to bring the sun's power to earth? Of course. So he released nuclear energy.

The impossible he does with dispatch, but do not bore him with requests to try the possible. He believes with Browning that a man's reach should exceed his grasp, and he is very good at reaching. What he is capable of grasping, however, he has little stomach for.

Like Ahab on the doomed Pequod, he would rather die attempting to assert his mastery of fate than cope with the workaday excitement of doing the possible.

This is why the triumph of man on the moon is diluted with so many banal ironies. How ingenious, we may rightly marvel, that man was able to provide himself on this adventure with a pure atmosphere to breathe on that airless rock.

How ironic that while he was contriving to breathe pure air on the moon, he was at the same time poisoning the sweet air of the home rock with the byproduct garbages created by old impossibilities overcome.

It is entirely, dully, boringly possibly, of course, to preserve the air of the home rock, which is why man has so little appetite for doing it right now. Later, when he is told authoritatively, with the proper Doomsday voice, that it is impossible to salvage enough air here to keep him alive, his blood will stir and he will start trying.

The same principle applies to the other possibilities he declines to pursue because they are "too expensive," or "too complex," or because somebody—industry, labor, kids, parents, teachers, blacks, cops, the establishment, the Russians, etc.—"wouldn't stand for it."

The public school system, for example, was allowed to decay for years when it was possible to do something about it and will probably rot a few more before it is pronounced "impossible" and man's juices begin to flow at the challenge.

When the juices do begin to flow, man is a formidable fellow indeed. Cranking up for one of his impossible feats like going to the moon, he immediately creates for himself the kind of environment necessary for him to perform at his peak. This of course is the same kind of environment he could easily live in at home if doing the possible were not such a bore.

The space vessel must take air. Shall it be the kind of air he breathes in his cities? Good God, No! Get us some air that's fit to breathe.

How about some water from one of the great American rivers or lakes? Insanity! Men's lives will be at stake.

Shall we cut corners on rocket development in order to hold down costs, as we do with programs for mass transportation and city maintenance? Congress, President and public wouldn't dream of it. The lives of three men would lie on their consciences. Let the billions be poured.

No one would dream of asking three men to stake their lives on a program financed as parsimoniously as the programs affecting the lives of the multitudinous poor and city dwellers.

No one would dream of manning the rocket with the product of the typical ghetto school, or of fitting it with equipment of the shoddiness that goes into millions of cars and home appliances.

Doing the impossible, man contemptuously abandons the standards of the shabby everyday world he inhibits, a world made shabby by his blundering refusal to tackle the possible.

And now he is up there and marvels at himself. They said it couldn't be done, so he did it. And if somebody points out something else that can't be done, he'll show them by doing that too.

It is hard not to like him up there. Moby Dick got away from Ahab, but now man is having another last word by bringing back the big one.

("Look what I got in there." "Hey, isn't that—?" "That's right, Jack, that's the old June-croon-moon itself. Bigger than the white whale and twice as dead.")

What courage! What ingenuity! What excellence! What a shame that he will now come back to the mother rock and continue to shirk its possibilities.

And why did he do it? Because it was there? Not really. He did it because it is intolerable to him to know that there is any place in the universe where man can not leave his tracks and boast to an astounded posterity that "Kilroy was here."

Lewis Mumford, Historian and Urbanologist

The most conspicuous scientific and technical achievements of our age—nuclear bombs, rockets, computers—are all direct products of war, and are still being promoted, under the guise of "Research and Development" for military and political ends that would shrivel under rational examination and candid moral appraisal. The moon-landing program is no exception: it is a symbolic act of war, and the slogan the astronauts will carry, proclaiming that it is for the benefit of mankind, is on the same level as the Air Force's monstrous hypocrisy—"Our Profession is Peace."

The program to land men on the moon serves more than one purpose. From a military standpoint, it was deliberately planned as a means of swiftly perfecting the equipment for total extermination—the strategic goal toward which our entire megatechnic power system, in the lethal grip of the "myth of the machine" is now pointed. The secondary purpose of space exploration, which commends it to our affluent society, is to support on a more exorbitant scale than ever the military-industrial-scientific establishment and maintain the current rates of industrial expansion and financial inflation.

I order to achieve both military power and economic "prosperity" and support the power élite and their factotums in the style to which they are accustomed, every other human enterprise must either be trimmed to meet their needs or abandoned. It is no accident that the climactic moon landing coincides with cutbacks in education, the bankruptcy of hospital services, the closing of libraries and museums, and the mounting deflement of the urban and natural environment, to say nothing of many other evidences of gross social failure and human deterioration.

In order to make this misappropriation of public funds and human energies acceptable, the Space Agency has turned the moon landing program into a national sporting event whose excitement is augmented by the fact that, as in speed racing, it provides a morbid thrill in the ever-present possibility of a spectacularly violent death. To further mask the real nature of this enterprise, the promoters of space exploration have made the credulous and the scientifically uniformed believe that a better future may await mankind on the sterile moon, or on an even more life-hostile Mars—as if such a change of scene would bring our sick rulers and their still acquiescent victims back to health.

The old name for such regressive escapist fantasies was lunacy, and that epithet is still accurate as both a topographical and a psychiatric description. If the military space strategists do not terminate their own activities by turning the whole planet into a crematorium, they will soon transform it into a collective lunatic asylum, in which the patients, the attendants, the physicians, and the Board of Guardians (read Pentagon and Kremlin) will suffer the same hallucinations and be under the same escapist compulsions. They have already demonstrated their inability to perceive, still less to cone with, the earthy human realities that urgently demand attention.

If a successful moon landing leads to a further expansion of space exploration, with a further drain on more important human enterprises and a further neglect of the conditions essential for human survival and development, we may look forward to a corresponding increase in social demoralization and psychological regression. Only a return to full waking consciousness, with an overwhelming transfer of interest from our dehumanized technology to the human person, will suffice to bring our moonstruck nation back to earth. Meanwhile, thanks to the very triumphs of technology, the human race hovers on the edge of catastrophe.

BLACK-OWNED BUSINESS NO LONGER A DREAM

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, much emphasis has been placed in recent times on programs to bring minority groups in America into the productive mainstream of the Nation's economy as owners, managers and entrepreneurs. By whatever name it is called—"black capitalism", minority business enterprise—it is a goal to which President Nixon has committed his administration.

In my home State of New Jersey, the Rutgers University Graduate School of Business has taken the lead in minority business programs. The Newark Sunday News of July 20 published an article describing the Rutgers program and the success it has achieved in the city of Newark.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to read this article. It is highly convincing evidence of the vast potential of minority business programs.

The article follows:

Black-Owned Businesses No Longer Just a Dream

(By Chester L. Coleman)

To be black and own a business in the Greater Newark area is no longer just a dream. Such a vision has become a reality for nine aspiring minority group entrepreneurs.

The potential of black capitalism is at hand and its growth is, in some cases, due to the foresight of the Rutgers Graduate Business School.

Rutgers hopes to establish a minimum of 25 minority group businesses each year for the next three years, at an annual cost of $50,000, according to Dr. Horace J. DePodwin, dean.

Last week the school was awarded a $65,400 grant from the Ford Foundation to expand its program of aiding black and other minority group members to go into business. E. I. duPont deNemours and Co., recently gave a $5,000 grant to support the same program.

The original program was developed by De Podwin and Prof. Louis T. German two years ago in conjunction with the Interracial Council for Business Opportunity and the Small Opportunity and the Small Business Administration.

SEMINARS HELD

The program is the outgrowth of work started after the Newark riots in 1967. German started a series of seminars for minority groups where the rudiments of operating a small business and accounting were discussed.

Among those who have already established businesses, some in areas where the rioting occurred, is Willie Pool, 40, and Wilbur Richardson, 31, partners of the Sky-View Radio and TV Co., 708 Springfield Ave., Newark.

Pool said he was inspired to go into business 12 years ago when he could not get a "break" while employed at a factory in Lancaster, Pa. "I was limited," says Pool, "but in my own business I can push myself and if I fail it's my own fault."

Pool and Richardson, who is married and the father of two children, repair television and radio sets and electrical appliances. They also buy sets in need of repair, recondition them and offer the sets for sale as used equipment.

HELPED WITH LOAN

The two men attended the Rutgers seminar on small business and worked with German in September, 1968. The next month the school helped them obtain a bank loan for $2,500. Together, they applied for a $20,000 Small Business Administration loan and now gross $45,000 a year, after being in business 20 months.

In another case, a man who had a persevering, though unsuccessful record operating small window washing and porter service, was drawing unemployment insurance, but also had his eye on a grocery business.

The man, William O. Wright, an Air Force veteran, attended the Graduate Business School's seminar, and in October of last year he became the proprietor of a grocery-delicatessen at 537 South Orange Ave., Newark.

"I just couldn't get ahead," Wright said, "and I never had money to save for those rainy days."

German estimates that in the first year Wright's income will be approximately $10,000. Wright, 31, said that the food stamp program recently started in Newark, is a "great asset" to his business.

Benjamin Joseph, a 32-year-old Newark fireman said he had dreamed of owning a small business for years so he decided to attend the lectures.

Joseph was able to purchase a laundromat at 139 Belmont Ave., Newark, for $20,000 in July of last year entirely on borrowed money.

"I just walked up to the owner one day and made him an offer for the business . . . I didn't have a dime in my pocket at the time," Joseph explained.

SUCCESSFUL LAUNDROMAT

Today he estimates that his business will produce a net income of $25,000 in its second year. The coin-operated enterprise is described as the largest in the city, with 46 washers and 15 dryers. The firefighter supervises the operation, when he is off duty. He employs one other person.

A highly-motivated entrepreneur had started several small businesses, but saw them go up in smoke in the Newark riots of 1967.

This serious-minded person is John Mitchell, 32, of South Orange.

However, following German's counselling, Mitchell was granted a loan and started a cleaning business at 120 W. South Orange Ave., South Orange. He now has two other stores, one in Newark and another in Westfield.

Mitchell said that by attending the lectures he was taught how to make money and how to spend it wisely. "I was given the strength to help myself and others too," explained Mitchell.

He employs 10 persons and operates the only black-owned business in the South Orange shopping center.

LeRoy Brickus, a trained mortician, had once been a factory worker. He now operates his own funeral chapel at 183 Littleton Ave., Newark.

Brickus, 40, said that by attending German's course, he obtained knowledge that was the "key" to his success. "It had been but a dream so long," Brickus admitted, "but I had the desire to have something of my own."

He received his training at the American Academy in New York and has been in business since April, 1968. His wife, Marie, who is active in civic and social organizations, said, "It's hard work, but the benefits are rewarding."

Another Newark resident who has established his own business under the Rutgers program, is Freeman Thomas, a skilled refrigerator and appliance repair man who obtained a loan to expand his operation at 504 Springfield Ave., Newark.

He received bank financing that helped him provide storage facilities for some 3,000 refrigerators, air conditioners, stoves and washing machines.

WASN'T MAKING IT

Norris Knott, a Montclair fish merchant, had been in business for a little over a year but "wasn't making it."

He was ready to close his shop at 154 Bloomfield Ave., and seek employment, but instead Knott decided to attend the Rutgers course and he gained advice on better management and purchasing policies.

Knott had purchased the business in November, 1967, and his volume was approximately $200 a week. German said his prices were too high and his volume too small because he purchased fish from a wholesaler who would make deliveries and carry the accounts receivable week-to-week.

Knott needed a truck, but he did not have the cash. It would have enabled him to go to New York to buy fish more cheaply.

German assisted Knott in getting a small business loan for $8,000 and with this money he purchased a truck. The professor said it is estimated that Knott's income will now be approximately $10,000 per year.

John Cheatam, father of 10, was referred to Rutgers by Knott. Cheatam is an assistant shop steward with a stevedoring company and had been doing upholstering work from his home, 579 Orange St., Newark, on a part-time basis.

He received a $1,000 loan from a Newark bank with the assistance of the school and has opened a small upholstery store in Newark.

German said that a program to offer classes for minority group persons who are interested in learning "how they can help themselves" is now under way in Paterson, Camden, New Brunswick and Newark.

Associate Dean David W. Blakeslee said, "We want them to learn how they can help themselves in the approach to government agencies and banks, and ways and methods to improve their businesses."

Benjamin Zwerling, a consultant to the Rutgers business school, said: "This is a program whereby black people with no assets except their initiative and drive, can build a business and eventually hire workers of their own race."

HON. WILLIAM BATES

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the deep sense of loss we all felt upon learning of the untimely death of our colleague, Bill Bates, will not be lessened for some time to come. It is with a growing awareness of the tremendous void in our ranks that I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of this outstanding gentleman and statesman and in extending heartfelt sympathy to his wife and family.

We will remember his dedication, his hard work, his knowledge and understanding, his never failing warmth and friendship. Just as it is true that a man lives as long as the memory of him lives, it is true that Bill Bates will live for a long time in our hearts and in the annals of this Nation he served so well.

In our shared sadness, we also want to express our gratitude to the divine providence that gave this Chamber and this Nation the benefit of his wisdom and counsel during these past 19 years.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we are observing Captive Nations Week, I think that this is a particularly appropriate time to honor the memory of Pius Grigaitis.

Pius Grigaitis, an outstanding Lithuanian journalist in the United States, was born on October 16, 1883, in Lithuania and died May 22, 1969, in Chicago. He graduated from the high school—Gymnasium—in Marijampole, Lithuania, and already as a schoolboy was active in national Lithuanian and revolutionary causes against the Russians and their czar. In 1903 he enrolled at the University of St. Petersburg and became active with the Lithuanian amateur theatrical groups as a performer and producer. When in the wake of the revolution the Russian universities were closed because of student strikes protesting the "bloody Sunday" of January 22, 1905, Grigaitis returned to his native country. He was very active in the revolutionary movement, constantly on the move and giving speeches on the meaning of the Revolution against Tsarism. He joined the Social-democratic Party and organized its Lithuanian branch. During one of his trips, on December 6, 1905, he was seized by Russian soldiers, arrested, manhandled, and jailed. A military tribunal sentenced him to death. An appeal to the Russian Prime Minister Count Vitte resulted in a retrial before a civilian court. When the trial failed to take a favorable turn, he escaped on June 6, 1906, with the help of his friends from the prison in Suvalkai and emigrated to the United States. Soon after his arrival he collected about 29,000 rubles to support the revolutionary movement in Europe.

In 1907 he went to Bern, Switzerland, where he finished his law studies and continued to study philosophy for another 2 years. In 1913 he returned to the United States, settled in Baltimore, and edited a Lithuanian weekly "Pirmyn"—Forward—and also a journal "Naujoji Gadyne"—The New Era. In 1914, Grigaitis was initiated to become editor of the newly founded Chicago Lithuanian daily newspaper "Naujienos"—News—and with a short interruption he retained this position until his death. He also earned the degree of doctor of jurisprudence at the University of Chicago.

Grigaitis took a very active part in Lithuanian affairs, as a frequent speaker at Lithuanian events, an astute columnist, an outspoken anti-Communist, and an active fighter for the cause of Lithuania's independence, after his native country was occupied by the Soviet Union in 1940. For many years Grigaitis was a member and secretary of the American Lithuanian Council. He was a participant in numerous Lithuanian delegations to the Congress and the White House, and was well-known to many Members of Congress as a tireless fighter for the freedom of his native country.

GREECE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, conditions in Greece grow more serious by the day. The ruling military junta is proving its desperation by removing the judges it appointed, by making and then repudiating offers for impartial examination of charges of government by torture, and by continuing its policy of midnight arrest of the few qualified military officers it has left.

We know the military junta will fall. We merely do not know the date. Sadly, the United States has not ended its involvement in Greece. We continue to supply military aid, aid used to oppress the people of Greece, who will not soon forgive our sins.

The paradox of American actions and American ideals in Greece was recently outlined in the July 12 New Yorker magazine's "The Talk of the Town." I insert that excellent piece of reporting in the RECORD at this point:

THE TALK OF THE TOWN

A Greek-American friend of ours who lives in Boston has written to let us know about the birth of his son, whom he has named Eleutherios, which means "free," and about a few other things that are on his mind: "Of some chapter in Greek history, somebody wrote. 'Today, to be Greek is to be in mourning.' It is a little like that now. Since we are not characters in a Greek tragedy, no messengers have been supplied to deliver the bad news in breathless stichomythy or a three-page heroic utterance; nevertheless, it has been delivered, in voices harsh with pain, testifying in a closed room in Strasbourg, France—voices to notify us once again of innocent persons locked away in the middle of the night, of beatings and reprisals and all the boringly ingenious apparatus of a scared, exhausted tyranny. A number of people were brought by the Greek government to Strasbourg last November to repudiate, at hearings of the European Commission on Human Rights, charges that they had been tortured. Two men duped their custodians and told what I must believe to be the truth; one woman was never permitted to talk. She was last reported weeping over her dinner in the company of her guards. I am haunted by her tears. We are all Greeks. We are patriots of a country that struggled to give a name to pain, that invited man to encounter his destiny on the fiery ground of the spirit. It advanced the idea that suffering is important. I saw the play 'Dionysus in 69' when I was in New York last month, and it horrified me, not because the players kept stripping to the buff (I found this rather diverting) but because they perverted that idea, husking Euripides' shattering play of its sensational brutality and discarding the essential tragedy. With pity and terror, I watched a bunch of naked actors con a nice audience in good clothes into complicity in the death of Dionysus' victim, when you are meant to be a compassionate witness to it. Dionysus makes a convenient Pop hero for this bloody-minded year. It's as though we were all so dazzled by the spectacle of violence we've forgotten the hurt. The Greeks were more concerned with its effects. I think, for example, of Prometheus, heroically wronged, whose loud outrage at what was done to him has to speak for those who are oppressed but silent. There are so many victims around, and no one will ever hold up their suffering to the clear light of intellect and poetry and ask for an explanation. But we need not assent to it. We Americans could stop giving Greeks rifles with which to beat other Greeks over the kidneys. We could throw them out of NATO until they gave the people back some rights. We could cancel our airline reservations. How many, I wonder, of those who sat with me through all that exciting box-office blood and nudity are streaking toward Greece this very minute to drink ouzo, and discover that the Parthenon is yellow, and photograph the Lion Gate at Mycenae, where poor, crazy Cassandra kept trying and trying to tell about the evil in the house but no one cared to understand what she was saying?"

DAY AT TRANQUILLITY

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 21, 1969]

DAY AT TRANQUILLITY

Nothing that can be written, nothing that can be said, no amount of eloquence, could top the drama, the excitement, the superlative performance of Apollo 11. There is no use trying.

Never in history has one step by a human foot signified so much—so much genius and effort to make it possible, such spectacular prospect for the future. The world assuredly never will be the same again; and what it all bodes for the universe at the moment may tax the imagination, but not much after Sunday night.

The dream of going to the Moon is ages old. The first progress undoubtedly began with the early astronomers, who determined the orderliness of the universe—the regularity of the Moon's motions being crucial to Apollo 11.

The evolution of science provided the knowledge for man's venture beyond his own earth, but it was the recent and relatively rapid development of rocket power which provided the means.

In only a little more than 10 years, actually, the United States literally has exploded into space—from Explorer I's comparatively modest probe to Neil Armstrong's cautious footfall in the soft, powdery surface of the Moon.

The only event in history that seems comparable for its time was Columbus' discovery of the Western Hemisphere. But Columbus sailed off into the unknown on a theory, with utterly primitive transport by present standards.

Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin arrived at their destination armed with enormous knowledge of what to expect and fully prepared with unbelievably precise equipment.

It was five months after his discovery before Columbus was able to report the news back to Spain. But the whole world saw the scene instantly as Armstrong and Aldrin went about their chores on the moon. Nobody had to take anybody's word for it.

The amazing clarity of the television pictures and the graphic play-by-play descriptions of the two astronauts made the science fiction of the past come astonishingly true.

It was all simply too overwhelming—from the exhilaration and anticipation of the blast-off to Eagle's manually directed touchdown to the easily heard telephone conversation with the President.

The heavens, as the President said, have indeed become a part of man's world. But for this momentous occasion, the words by which the history textbooks will mark the event are Neil Armstrong's as he put down his first foot: "One small step for man, one giant leap for mankind."

It brings us to more nearly understand what a famous astronomer, Dr. Forest Ray Moulton, said more than 30 years ago when he assured us that "this apparently limitless planet on which we dwell has been reduced relatively to a particle of dust floating in the immensity of space."

But for the moment, in our goggle-eyed state after a night spent vicariously on the Moon, we can only collapse in prideful relief and join millions and millions around the globe to support the prayer of Astronaut Armstrong's mother that everything goes well all the way back home.

REMARKS ON PROBLEMS OF TODAY

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I had the privilege of hearing Mr. William P. Kelly, former director of the Job Corps, address a meeting of the Women's National Democratic Club.

I believe that Mr. Kelly's speech deserves the attention of all of my colleagues in the House because of the excellent insight it gives on problems which should be of utmost concern to us today—the problem of lack of communication between those of us in varying age, economic, and racial groups, and the problems of economically deprived youngsters in an affluent society and affluent youngsters in what they view as a plastic society. It calls attention to the role Job Corps has played in daring to believe that young people who could not read or write and from the worst of economic and social backgrounds, could be trained and given an opportunity to participate in the good life and to know that society cares about what happens to them.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that each of my colleagues will read, with particular attention, Mr. Kelly's speech.

The speech follows:

SPEECH GIVES INSIGHT ON PROBLEMS OF TODAY

(By Mr. William P. Kelly)

John Kenneth Galbraith, writing in a recent issue of Harper's, issued the ominous warning that peace, if it comes in Viet Nam, may turn out to be more expensive than war.

He went on to say that waiting off-stage to gobble up the money currently being spent to conduct the Viet Nam war were bigger and better ABM's, new manned bomber systems, new and more sophisticated surface units for the Navy, and on, and on, and on.

America has always been relatively free with its dollars for expenditures on things. It has also been relatively free of criticism of those people who promise success in the production of things and who fail.

There has been little hue and cry over the reduction of automobile warranties from 24,000 miles/24 months to 12,000 miles/12 months. The automobile industry was almost 60 years old before anyone really focused attention on its failures in safety.

We have come to accept planned obsolescence in nearly everything we purchase as being the order of the day—and we have been taken advantage of—by automobile service managers and TV repairmen.

This is not to say that our mastery in technology in many fields is not the best in the world, and perhaps good economics dictate some lesser degree of excellence in what we produce.

It would be hard to sell the notion to anyone, anywhere, that our lunar space program is not a marvel of technical excellence and personal bravery. But there are some who mark the beginning of this excellence in the charred command module in Cape Kennedy in January 1967, when three astronauts died.

On the other hand, our view of man has tended to be different than our views of things. From the very beginning of the industrial revolution, which heralded the start of man's triumph over nature, it was not considered a crime to work 8 year old children 14 hours a day in the spinning mills of Birmingham, England, nor was it perceived to be a tragedy that boys began work in Welsh coal mines before they were 10, and were dead of silicosis before they were 20 years of age.

It appears to be a fact of life, and of history, that moral systems lag behind industrial and technological systems. Western civilization was based for more than two centuries on the moral concept of hard work, thrift, prudential management of resources, saving and investing of money, and the repression of personal and private expression of emotion.

Until the third decade of the 20th century, poverty was considered to be the punishment one incurred for violating the principles of hard work and frugal living. Poverty, after all, was the deprivation of things and poverty was the result of being sinful.

It was not until the new deal that the first awareness appeared that poverty was perhaps the result of a failure of institutions to arrange men's lives in such a way that all had equal opportunity to partake of the wealth of the society.

And I think it is interesting to note that for many years prior to the 1930's many people, including theologians, only gave lip service to the ethic of hard work and frugal living, and that during the 1920's, the virtue of thrift was a horrifying thought to a stockbroker selling on margin, or a Ford dealer selling on credit; that hard work and frugal living should be reserved for those who had no jobs nor the wherewithal to participate in a system in which only the few prospered.

Today, in 1969, we have produced the greatest affluence in the history of man, and yet 22 million Americans continue to live in grinding, hopeless poverty.

The creation and availability of more things for more people has created some extraordinary paradoxes in our society. Many of our middle class youth view middle class America as crass, overly commercial, and cheap. Things have not allowed them to find some kind of identity, some kind of meaning to their lives. Things have not really made it possible for them to participate in meaningful kinds of activities.

Many of our middle class youth look on our rich adult society and say, "where are its values?" "What are its values?" Many of our young people have had their fill of split level houses. They perceive white collar life as a business where you don't upset the boat; where one's personality is more important than one's skill and ability; where how you dress is more salient than what you contribute.

Our middle class youth look at all those things and say that in spite of them, we are caught up in a terrible crisis that threatens to destroy us—the war, the cities which have been abandoned to rot and stagnate and which cannot be rescued because of the enormous resources that are going into the

XUM

war, and may never be rescued unless we are to heed Professor Galbraith's warning that peace may be more expensive than war.

On the other hand, you have the poor youth who are often too hungry to be concerned about ideological questions, about a philosophy of life; who do not have the leisure time and the luxury to search for an identity; who really do not have the privilege of growing up. This young person is not allowed to take the time to think things over because he has to live on the hustle and by his wits on a day-to-day basis.

He has no middle class parents who will pay his way through life. And this is the kid who doesn't think that homes in the suburbs are overly commercial; who doesn't think that a new car and good food and a good job are either crass or not worth it. He awakens every day to all the symbols of failure: The wino in the alley, the hooker on the corner, the pusher in front of the pool room.

It is a society in which if you are a black male, you are economically emasculated, and if you are a black female, out-moded welfare regulations won't allow a father in the house.

This is the kid who yearns to become middle class, and what he lacks is the ability, the social skills, the verbal skills, the intellectual skills, the resources, the dollars and the power and, most important, the people who can intervene in his behalf.

This is a great problem—the paradox of youth in our society—the paradox of the middle class youngster rejecting a system of values, and the ghetto youngster worshiping them from afar. Both perceive that they have been four-flushed. The youth in the ghetto has the poorest of everything—the poorest schools, the poorest housing, the poorest health care, the poorest police protection, and the poorest access to justice.

Whereas the middle class youngster in an institution of higher learning suffers an estrangement between himself, the faculty, and the administration of the university.

Many faculty members and administrators would probably concede that institutions of higher learning would be wonderful places if there were no kids; if somehow all you had to worry about was whether or not you were going to get a grant from the National Science Foundation, or the Rockefeller brothers; if all you had to deal with were nice, docile, graduate students who would toil in the vineyards of the library producing the next paper that would be read at the next professional meeting, or published in the next edition of a particular learned journal.

The middle class youngster recognizes that the faculty and administrators think that merely talking about the great problems that face the Nation—the poor, the ghettos, the hard-core unemployed, the war—they are somehow participating in the mainstream of American life. And the kids know its a phony.

Out of all of this has been born an alliance—unspoken, tacit, ill-defined—an alliance between the middle class youngster, estranged from his parents and his professors, and the ghetto youth, who has been virtually forced out of society.

If our society, a society of things that the youngsters call a plastic society, is to save itself it must begin to save its people.

And let it be clear that the savings of its people is not just a matter of urban renewal—of things—but of human renewal: That merely giving a man a job does not solve the problem of years of poor medical and dental treatment; a job does not solve the problem of getting him a decent place to live when he is excluded from the suburbs; a job does not get his child a decent school; a job does not get his family decent law enforcement.

And we are not merely saving the poor. We are saving the rich and the affluent because millions of youth who represent the next generation of American leadership do not perceive that this society is worth saving unless, through their efforts, they save the poor and, in turn, themselves. This is the issue of the 6th decade of the 20th century.

It was not quite 4½ years ago that the Job Corps opened its first centers. And I suppose if we were to sum up the history of the Job Corps there are some words that describe it, typify it, or identify it better than any others. The Job Corps has dared! The Job Corps has risked! Risk and daring are not attributes very often found in this society. That is one of the things that our middle class young people are critical of. It is much safer not to dare; it is much more comfortable not to risk. For those who dare and for those who risk often pay the price of failure, and it takes great courage to contemplate the possibility of failure in any undertaking.

The Job Corps, however, was willing to dare, to help, over 200,000 youngsters who represented the poorest of the poor—and it was willing to *risk failure* in doing this.

In Washington there is a tendency not to dare. Bureaucrats find it much easier to undertake endeavors in which their next promotion is guaranteed; in which the vista of their career is unclouded.

I suppose it is the same in business. There are those business executives and firms who would not dare to do those things fraught with risk. And I'm sure it is the same for women's organizations and institutions dedicated to education and philanthropy.

But the Job Corps dared to do what no one else had done before. It dared to help youngsters:

30 percent of whom could not read or write.

60 percent of whom came from broken homes.

The Job Corps dared to do what no one else had done—to risk failing 100 percent because it was dealing with 100 percent failtures to begin with. But the fact of the matter is that Job Corps suffered no failure at all.

There are those who say that having placed 76 percent of the young people who have been in the Job Corps in jobs, or school, or the Armed Forces, is a spotty record. Those people have never dared anything. Those people have never risked anything.

In last year's political campaign, Job Corps was called an expensive failure, and so it has been consigned to a slow oblivion. And this is the pity of it all—a nation so affluent and so rich that it can spend one billion five hundred million dollars on a B–70 airplane and receive, for ante-ing up this much wealth, two airplanes; or can spend one billion dollars on a Sheridan tank that has hundreds of technical deficiencies; that it can spend nearly a billion dollars on a Cheyenne helicopter that won't fly; that it can spend four hundred and fifty million dollars on a Dinosaur space vehicle that will not operate; and that it can experience a two billion-plus dollar overrun on a C–5A military transport.

Things we will pay for—even things that fail or that we are double-dealed on—but when it comes to people we still have a reluctance to ante-up the treasury needed, or to re-arrange our national priorities, in order to provide the treasure for the good life for all.

The Job Corps demonstrated above all other things that if the Nation was willing to expend, not the kinds of untold billions that is spent on things, but $7,000 a year on people, that it could produce a situation among the poorest of the poor—and that's what these Job Corps youngsters were—where they perceived that their society cared—and this is the final word to describe Job Corps care—and in perceiving this, they did not attempt to burn down the Job Corps, there never was a sit-in in the Job Corps, no Job Corps administrator was ever bearded in his office—and I think this is the most conclusive demonstration—that if you can make it clear to people—even poor black people—that their society, that their nation, cares, then we start up a road, a broad road to new freedoms for all men, and where the quality of our society will not be judged by the number of TV sets in our homes, but in the quality of life for our people—all our people.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues for their well and eloquent speeches they gave in observance of Captive Nations Week. This type of support is exemplary of a well informed Congress concerned with more than just their constituency. I am proud to view it in our midst.

As I pondered upon what would be appropriate to say, I decided that we reflect upon our freedom far too little except when we feel that our freedom has been violated or threatened. I believe this to be true because freedom by its very nature implies the absence of inhibiting boundaries. Yet it is the nature of man, as seen by history to date, that when there are no bounds to freedom, a few always expand their expression of freedom at the expense of others. Thus, in any society, which could be thought of as any collection of more than two individuals who come in contact with each other, there must be a choice by those individuals between the limits of utter chaos, where everyone rules, and totalitarianism where only a few rule. The Government which perpetuates the attitudes of our society is the most difficult of all to construct and maintain. Traditionally it has been the desire of each American to have just enough government to insure that his individual freedom cannot be impugned by another individual with the understanding that he too must not abuse what we believe to be basic human rights.

Just think what we have undertaken. To protect the rights of 200 million people without abusing some people's rights is nearly impossible. But, it is far better that we try and partially fail than to give up and accept the much easier form of government, totalitarianism, for it is much easier to subjugate the many than to represent them.

Such is the case in Communist Russia. Only a few are actually members of the Communist Party. They are the paragons of power. The subjugated missions are subject to their every whim. This week we remind ourselves of the plight of the 100 million people in 27 different countries which have fallen before the red wave of communism.

This observance is important for four reasons. First, we remind ourselves of what freedoms we have. This is an important realization, because, as I have said before, it is in the nature of living in a free state to forget the benefits one receives until those benefits are questioned. Second, it is part of our moral duty to publicly support our ideology, and in doing so, condemn those states which violate what we feel to be right and just. Third, our recognition of the captive peoples' plight is a source of hope to those who have not forgotten the dream of a free state. Four, it is a continual area of irritation for the Communist leaders. Better proof of this could hardly be found than this quote from the Communist newspaper Trybuna Luna in Poland:

> An annual, pitiful undertaking. One could treat it as a joke. . . . One could treat it like that, if it were not for the fact that Captive Nations Week, an annual undertaking organized by men who have long since lost contact with their nations, it is supported by the U.S. Congress and by a proclamation of the President of the U.S. (July 27, 1965)

Mr. Speaker, our observance of Captive Nations Week shows where our sympathies lie. It is a small stone slung against the Iron Curtain but a necessary one as I have tried to point out. Let us not forget how lucky we are to enjoy the freedom we do, nor forget the toil which lies before us.

POPULATION GROWTH

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the American people have a major problem of population growth that underlies all of our economic and social problems. As chairman of the House Republican task force on earth resources and population, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the text of remarks by Gov. Edgar D. Whitcomb, of Indiana, presented to the Midwestern Governors' Conference on Wednesday, July 2, 1969:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY GOV. EDGAR D. WHITCOMB, OF INDIANA, PRESENTED TO THE MIDWESTERN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, JULY 2, 1969

We are told that the world will soon be unfit for human habitation unless the increase in population, and the pollution of air, land, and water is arrested. We are told that effective steps to prevent the deterioration of our environment can only be taken by the imposition of the repressive methods of a police state. I believe the first statement is true and that the second one can become true unless we change some aspects of the way we deal with public problems.

I am convinced that our environmental crisis is the unanticipated and unwanted by-product of the way we have dealt with public problems in the past. We tend to formulate policies affecting millions of people as a reaction to a crisis not to prevent one. As a consequence, we treat symptoms rather than causes of problems. Because we are forced to act under the pressure of a crisis, there is little time to design alternate ways to deal with the problem and there is little time for realistic consideration of the consequences likely to occur in the event any one of the alternatives is adopted.

We think we know what our problems are. We formulate policies as if we do. I'm not certain that we spend enough time defining the precise nature of our problems. I am certain that our failure to do so may produce disastrous results.

Let me give you some examples to illustrate my point.

In response to the great pressures to resolve the many problems related to the depression of the 1930's, we formulated, under crisis conditions, public policies to help maintain and raise farm income. The farmers' low income was a symptom of some deeper social problems very complicated and ill defined to this very day. By treating the symptom we obscured the search for basic causes. We still have a farm problem after all these years and after the expenditure of billions of dollars. We did not measure the probable consequences nor the total costs of the policies which were adopted. If we had, we might have learned that policies designed to support farm income had the effect of driving small farmers from the land. Where did the farmers go who left the land? Most of them went to cities in search of economic opportunity. When they arrived in our cities, most of them were unskilled laborers—the last to be hired; the first to be fired. Their low incomes forced them to congregate in low rent slums. They and their neighbors were uprooted from their home communities and divorced from most of the human relationships which make a community in the real sense of that word. These are the uprooted, the alienated, the hostile rioting inhabitants of our ghettoes. These are the breeders of discontent—grist for the mill of revolution.

The migration of masses of poor, unskilled people to our cities created enormous demands on urban political systems which their tax and human resources cannot handle. Beyond a certain point, the greater the density of population, in urban areas, the greater the unit costs of providing necessary services. It costs twenty times as much to build a highway in Chicago as it does in rural Indiana. Not only this, but there are other effects on human environment which are related to forcing masses of unskilled hostile people into a hostile urban area. People are forced in many cases to live greater distances from the places in which they work. The time it takes them to travel these distances is increased substantially. A man who spends two or three hours a day commuting on smog ridden, traffic-clogged highways not only doesn't have time to spend with his children, but during the time he does spend with them, he is more likely to be a weary, irritable inhabitant of a house than an energetic, interested companion.

The costs imposed on society by such circumstances are absenteeism, delinquency, mental disorders, and impossible demands on urban police, on fire departments, on disposal facilities and on all other urban services. These costs are social costs. Ultimately, all social costs are translated into demands for tax dollars or into behavior which disrupts society. These costs can be so enormous that our failure to consider them in making every major policy decision can destroy this nation.

Government policies which crowd people into areas without sufficient land and tax resources to deal with them create enormous social costs beyond the capacity of administrative sciences and technology to deal with them.

For instance, the awarding of a government contract to an industrial firm requiring expansion of that firm in an urban area because that firm can produce an item at low cost figured in conventional ways may mean more jobs, but it may also create enormous social costs by forcing migration into areas which can't afford the strain on highways, schools, and other public facilities. The cost of eradicating pollution created by the manufacture of an object in an urban area is not included directly in the cost of manufacturing an item, but it becomes a charge on all taxpayers. Tax resources are not unlimited.

A final example of a government policy which compounds environmental problems is the property tax. The property tax, as it is administered in most states, rewards urban decay and penalizes the reconstruction of our cities. In fact, the property tax is a huge public subsidy for the creation of slums. The property tax creates slums faster than any urban renewal program can deal with the problem. It is rather ridiculous to raise billions of dollars in tax money to renew cities when tax policy destroys them at the same time.

The statement I have made today is a departure from the usual treatment of the subject of environmental management. I made such a departure because I think the usual discussions are sterile and do not come to grips with some of the basic causes of environmental problems.

We have created unwittingly powerful incentives to get large masses of people actively and even rapaciously involved in the degeneration of human environment. We have demonstrated such ingenuity and attained such success that there is no doubt in my mind that we have the ingenuity to find the incentives to regenerate that environment. Let us find ways to make it profitable to do what is necessary to preserve life on this planet. Our failure to do so will destroy human society as we know it.

What can we do as Governors to encourage better management of human environment?

Before the federal government spends billions of dollars on untried social policies, we can insist on basic research necessary to give us some indication of the probable consequences of implementing proposed policies.

HUD's program to stimulate the construction of 26,000,000 housing units in ten years is an admirable goal. HUD proposes to do this by aggregating markets. But if we build thousands of houses in areas which we do not have the tax base to support schools and other services adequately, we may create more problems than we can solve.

My argument in essence is this: We need to know more about the existence and distribution of emerging demands on our political system. We need to know more about the human and material resources available to meet those demands under varying conditions. We need to identify, to catalog, and to invent as many proposed solutions to specific problems as possible. We need to develop the information necessary to assess the probable social and political consequences of applying alternate solutions in social and political systems with varying characteristics.

These suggestions are made with the knowledge that the information obtained may be valid for a limited point in time; that the inquiries will be expensive; that periodical retesting on some selective basis will probably be necessary.

Planning is, or should be, an effort to avoid *ad hoc* decisions. It is a desirable function of democratic government. But who are the planners? To what extent are their plans reactions to symptoms? To what extent are their plans relevant to the values of the people upon whom those plans may be imposed?

Planning in a democracy should not be an exercise in abstract idealism. Rather, planning should be done with as much knowledge as possible of the distribution of values and demands held by the categories of people who must live in the areas governed by those plans.

How can we measure current demands? I don't know. But I believe the science of inquiry may be sufficiently advanced to design the appropriate methods. Information derived from the use of such methods can be used to discover specific irritants in the political system; to construct a profile of the needs and wants of the people; and to acquire a sense of the priorities people assign to meeting needs and wants when resources

XUM

are scarce. With such information we might develop new indicators of consensus and cleavage in the political system, indicators of the measure of support and opposition to alternate solutions to specific problems, indicators of the kinds of action or inaction most likely to reduce the level of hostility within the system or to redirect that hostility to constructive purposes.

Among other things, information obtained from such survey investigations might tell us more about the dynamics of urban growth. Where do migrants to urban centers come from? What motivated them to migrate? Are their expectations being fulfilled or frustrated? What new demands are they imposing on the political system? Does the system have the resources to meet those demands? If it does not, what are the alternatives, and what are the social and political costs of applying them or failing to apply them?

Information collected from non-survey sources could tell us the degree to which a political system has the material and human capabilities required to meet current and future demands.

As a consequence of collecting and integrating information of this nature, public officials and planners will have some more rational bases for assessing the relevance of their policies to the needs and demands of their constituents. The indicators thus provided might enable us to predict trouble spots in advance, to establish priorities for the solving of problems, to make more rational arguments for changing institutional arrangements which inhibit the effective solution of problems, and to take action to prevent the build-up of explosive tensions where the indicators tell us such action is essential.

Another possible product of the collection and analysis of such information is the classification of communities into those with similar characteristics, tensions, problems, resources, population attributes, and institutional set-ups. Information concerning solutions to problems of communities in the same class, and information concerning unsuccessful attempts to solve problems, could then be made available to other communities in that class.

In summary, we need information to make it possible to assess the probable consequences of applying alternative solutions to problems, to review the capacity of existing political arrangements to solve problems, to establish reasonable priorities for solving problems, to treat causes as well as symptoms, and to avoid actions more likely to aggravate than to solve problems.

When we consider alternative solutions to problems, we must consider social costs as well as economic costs—not only because it is humane to do so, but because social costs can lead to economic costs of enormous magnitude. The social costs of a policy might include the alienation of large numbers of people from the social and political system, the polarization of conflicting ideologies, and the destruction of that degree of consensus on fundamentals necessary to maintain a democratic society.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, this administration has made a nonpartisan pledge to promote efficiency and responsiveness in Government by means of an improved organization of its activities.

Accordingly, President Nixon sent to Congress a Grant Consolidation Act on April 30, 1969, which was designed to coordinate the hundreds of overlappng Federal programs and insure that they reach the intended recipients in an efficient, economical, and effective manner.

Today, the President has proposed that these principles of sound and efficient management be applied to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and has sent Reorganization Plan No. 1 to the Congress.

There are two provisions in this plan: First, it authorizes the President to designate the Chairman of the Commission from its members as he does presently in every other major Federal regulatory agency; and second, it vests the administrative and executive functions of the Commission in the Chairman as recommended by the Hoover Commission almost 20 years ago.

These are sound nonpartisan reforms which, I am confident, will be promptly approved by this body.

A YOUNG MAN OF PROMISE

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, a young man who lives in my congressional district has been chosen a presidential scholar. Arthur Baron Ellis, son of Mr. and Mrs. Nathan Ellis, is an unusually creative individual. Both scientific and humanitarian causes have been of interest to him.

I would like to share with you some of young Mr. Ellis' accomplishments. He was a member of Boy Scouts of America. He reached the highest position of that organization, that of eagle scout, and was selected to be a member of the honorary order of the arrow.

The Miami area is fortunate to have both professional and colleagiate football teams. Arthur took advantage of these by sponsoring two exceptional children to the Miami dolphin games and the University of Miami hurricane football games. His own athletic achievements include third position on his school tennis team.

Ellis also completed recordings for "Recording for the Blind." He founded the Spiral Service Club at Florida's Hialeah High School with Lions International sponsorship.

When he found a dangerous traffic intersection lacked traffic lighting, Arthur singlehandedly brought this to the attention of the proper authorities and pushed for the successful installation of such lighting.

Arthur's most definite contributions have been in the field of scientific endeavor. Arthur was one of 14 high school students in the nation to be selected for a summer institute, sponsored by the National Science Foundation, in chemistry at North Dakota State University. He was also one of six in the State invited to the National Science and Humanities Symposium at West Point.

Prior to his graduation from high school, young Mr. Ellis obtained 20 credit hours at the University of Miami in mathematics, sponsored by the National Science Foundation. He was one of six people in the State of Florida asked to present a paper at the State Science and Humanities Symposium. He was one of two boys in the State of Florida to be selected for the National Youth Science Camp in Morgantown, W. Va.

Arthur is a recipient of many outstanding honors. I would like to familiarize you with some of these. He was one of 300 high school students in the Nation to be chosen winner of the Westinghouse awards honors group. He earned the first runner-up award at the South Florida Science Fair by a demonstration of chess being played by calculus. He was chosen first runner-up in chemistry and overall at the Florida State Science Fair. There he was winner of the only scholarship, which was donated by the Gulf-Life Insurance Co.

Arthur is a member of many national honorary groups, some are the National Honor Society and National Math Honor Society, and was a National Merit Scholarship winner. He received further honors as the valedictorian of his class of 960 seniors. He was treasurer of the Junior Academy of Science. He was recipient of the Silver Knight Award in Mathematics, sponsored by the Miami Herald newspaper. He won the Renssalaer medal for juniors and the Bausch and Lomb medal for seniors in Math and Science. He was accepted under early decision by California Institute of Technology.

Arthur is also a member of the German National Honor Society, and in connection with this, he is editor-in-chief of the German Student in Florida newspaper. The fine arts have been of concern to Arthur. He was in the first violin section of the South Florida Youth Symphony and was assistant concert meister of the Hialeah High School orchestra.

I believe that all of us can be proud of Arthur Baron Ellis and others like him. Many excell in other fields; all are working for a constructive future. I am very proud that this young man can represent my congressional district as a presidential scholar.

FAMILY MEDICINE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, today Mr. ROONEY introduced H.R. 10264 a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act. That bill would provide grants to develop training for young men and women as specialists in family medicine.

In short the bill is intended to increase the number of medical students who do not specialize in the sense that we now use the word. The moneys to be authorized by this bill are absolute necessities; to not only the medical schools and students of the country, but also to those lower income citizens who hopefully will be the prime recipients of the benefits of such a program. In a time where we see constantly spiraling medical costs, and most of those costs of specialists, something must be done to make general medical care available to low-income and other families at prices they can afford. This bill proposes a step in that direction and I suggest to all of my colleagues that we support and pass it.

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, our recent experience on Okinawa, along with even grimmer experience elsewhere, demonstrates the immediate need for a change in policy in regard to chemical and biological warfare.

Our programs in these areas have not only become accident prone, but the programs themselves appear to have grown up by accident without careful and public debate. Instead these horrible weapons, weapons which cannot be controlled, have been developed in hidden laboratories.

The case against chemical and biological warfare and possible steps to end this threat have been well outlined by the Mid-Atlantic Committee on Fort Detrick. I insert the committee's statement at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF POSITION

Secret research led by scientists and military strategists resulted in the development of the atomic bomb which destroyed Hiroshima on August 6th, 1945. The threat of annihilation by still another means is before us. Highly secret research, development and testing of chemical and biological weapons is proceeding at a tremendous rate.

The United States has used weapons of mass destruction in the past and will use them again. Their use threatens the entire human race.

Chemical-biological weapons, like atomic weapons, are indiscriminate, inhumane and uncontrollable.

Our Nation's major biological weapons research and development program is, at this moment, being conducted at Fort Detrick in Frederick, Md. We object to this manufacture of death. The dangers to our environment as well as the prospect of the eventual use of these weapons is horrifying.

No longer should our CBW policy be determined by secretive, military strategists. An informed and concerned public must call for:

(1) Immediate cessation of all chemical-biological weapons tests.

(2) Immediate halt to all research, development and stockpiling of chemical-biological weapons with provisions for civilian supervision of disposal of existing stockpiles.

(3) Immediate resubmission of the 1925 Geneva Protocol for ratification.

(4) Initiation by the United States of serious chemical-biological warfare discussions leading to international disarmament agreements.

As citizens we have a right and an obligation to demand a voice in affairs which concern our very lives.

THE PRESSING PROBLEM OF CUBA

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on February 10 of this year the American Security Council issued its weekly Washington report entitled "Nuclear Research in Cuba." It cited the nuclear agreement between Havana and Moscow which had been signed on January 8, 1969, and which was hailed as the most significant of a series of scientific research treaties enabling Cuba to become an important center for oceanographic and meteorological research, according to Dr. Antonio Nunez-Jimenez, president of the National Commission of the Cuban Academy of Sciences. Dr. Nunez-Jimenez added that the arrangement with Moscow would be "within the framework of internationalism, as the Marxist-Lenin ideology forces us to do." He also disclosed that the number of top Russian scientists now serving in Cuba amounts to 231, with 222 more due to arrive by the end of this year. In addition, more than 300 scientific specialists in all fields of advanced research have settled in Cuba from the Communist satellites in Eastern Europe. Considering the Marxist-Lenin ideology, one can pretty much surmise how much of the efforts of these scientists will be expended in the peaceful use of oceanographic and meteorological findings.

The latest development involving the Soviet Union and Cuba is, of course, the visit to Cuba of a Soviet naval squadron comprising a guided missile cruiser, two accompanying missile warships, a frigate and a destroyer, plus two diesel-powered submarines.

Coupled with these developments, the pledge by Castro recently to support "any true revolution" in the Western Hemisphere would compel any sane person to be suspicious of our bearded neighbor to the South.

Yet, a July 19 column by Willard Edwards, the Chicago Tribune newsman of long standing, reports that the "Castro is mellowing" line of thinking is prevalent in some State Department echelons. They believe that Castro would be responsive to friendly gestures, such as a relaxation on travel by Americans to Cuba. Even before the visit of the Soviet naval squadron to Cuba, arguments that Castro was softening were, as in the past, dangerous and wishful thinking.

On July 16 the Christian Science Monitor scooped other newspapers with an account of a Cuban defector, now in the United States, who had served Castro as an intelligence officer in Paris. Although not a major official in the Cuban Government, the officer had considerable access to documents and other intelligence materials as a part of the Cuban intelligence service in Europe. The Monitor article demonstrates once again that Castro is deadly serious about his goal of revolution, and any daydreams about an accommodation with him are unrealistic.

I include the article, "Cuba More Sovietized," from the Christian Science Monitor of July 16, 1969, in the RECORD at this point:

CUBA MORE SOVIETIZED: DEFECTOR FROM CASTRO INTELLIGENCE NETWORK SAYS 1968 PACT BINDS HAVANA TO MOSCOW LINE

WASHINGTON.—A Cuban intelligence officer, who defected to the United States earlier this year, says that Premier Fidel Castro signed an accord with the Soviet Union in 1968 which commits him to a pro-Moscow line.

The assertion, it is felt, would explain the noticeable pro-Moscow line being followed by Cuba—a trend which began at the time of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia last August.

According to the defector, Orlando Castro Hidalgo, the Cuban-Soviet agreement requires the Cuban leader to mute his criticism of the Soviet Union and of Moscow-oriented Communist parties in Latin America.

In return, the Soviet Union agreed not to diminish its economic support of Premier Castro's government and also to provide some 5,000 technicians to work in a variety of fields to support Cuba's lagging economy.

These disclosures are part of the testimony being given by Mr. Castro Hidalgo, who is no relation to the Cuban Premier. It was learned from informed sources that he left his post as protocol officer of the Cuban Embassy in Paris late in March of this year and sought asylum for himself and his family at the United States Embassy in Luxembourg.

Since then, Mr. Castro Hidalgo has been undergoing extensive questioning together with explaining an attaché case full of documents he carried with him when he arrived in Luxembourg.

Mr. Castro Hidalgo now is in the United States under protective custody.

The Christian Science Monitor learned of Mr. Castro Hidalgo's presence in the United States, and as far as is known this is the first mention of his defection and his disclosures to United States officials.

It is understood that the Cuban Government has asked the French Government for assistance in returning both Mr. Castro Hidalgo and the documents he brought with him when he defected. But Cuban sources would make no comment on this subject nor admit that Mr. Castro Hidalgo had defected when asked for comment.

Informed sources here say that Mr. Castro Hidalgo has been a veritable gold mine of information on developments in Cuba. Although he was not a major official in the Cuban Government, he apparently had considerable access to documents and other intelligence materials as a part of the Cuban intelligence service in Europe.

That service, according to Mr. Castro Hidalgo's testimony, is put at the disposal of the Soviet Union under terms of the 1968 agreement. Known as General Directorate of Intelligence (or DGI after its Spanish initials), the service has been extending its operations in Europe recently.

According to Mr. Castro Hidalgo, this growing Soviet influence in Cuba was the reason for his defection.

BETRAYAL SEEN

In his own way, Mr. Castro Hidalgo sees this increasing Soviet influence, brought on by Premier Castro, as a betrayal of the Cuban revolution and the goals for which he personally fought both in the Sierra Maestra and afterward.

Mr. Castro Hidalgo, in his testimony, says that his immediate superior in the Paris Embassy, Armando López Orta, returned from Havana last January with word of the Cuban-Soviet treaty and this pronouncement:

"Somos más sovieticos" (We are more Sovietized).

According to Mr. Castro, Hidalgo's version of the accord, which has remained secret until now, the Soviet Union for its part agreed to keep up the level of economic assistance which has been flowing to Cuba in the past several years. That aid is computed in official circles here at something in the neighborhood of $350 million yearly.

TECHNICIANS PROVIDED

The Soviet Union, it is understood, also agreed to increase badly needed petroleum shipments to Cuba, to purchase more of Cuba's production of nickel ore, and to send some 5,000 Soviet technicians to advise the Castro government in the fields of science and technology.

These technicians, Mr. Castro Hidalgo says, are to be used in providing support in agriculture, mining, atomic energy, fishing, and military fields.

However, some Soviet assistance in the DGI is part of the agreement.

To informed sources here, this aspect of the secret agreement is particularly significant in that the DGI is understood to have taken on many of the diplomatic activities formerly handled by foreign service officers.

In light of the general reduction of Soviet intelligence operations in France and elsewhere in Western Europe in recent years, the presence of a Soviet-oriented Cuban intelligence system is regarded by informed sources here as important.

CLAIM CONFIRMED

Mr. Castro Hidalgo claims to have been part of that system and the documents he brought out confirm this claim.

But the documents are of even greater importance—although they do not contain the text of the Soviet-Cuban agreement.

Moreover, taken together with his testimony and known facts about situations in Latin America, Europe, and elsewhere, the United States has learned a great deal about Cuba and its activities through Mr. Castro Hidalgo's defection.

The defector was a DGI operative in Paris. He states that he helped organize and operate a clandestine apparatus in the French capital aimed at providing Latin-American revolutionaires and guerrilla leaders with money, false passports, and hideouts during their travels to and from Cuba.

According to Mr. Castro Hidalgo, the Paris center for the DGI conducts operations into South America, while the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City coordinates operations in Central America and the Caribbean.

As far as guerrilla activities in Latin America are concerned, Mr. Castro Hidalgo says that the secret Cuba-Soviet accord makes no specific mention of their role—presumably leaving Premier Castro free to operate much as before in the question of armed insurrection throughout Latin America.

CONFLICTS APPARENT

There are apparent conflicts between the Soviet Union and Premier Castro over this question, but Mr. Castro Hidalgo says that Havana's support for the "export of revolution" to Latin America is not diminished by the accord.

However, the DGI is reported to have told its people that there must be a more meticulous screening of Latin Americans before they are put into the pipeline for guerrilla training in Cuba. It is also understood, according to Mr. Castro Hidalgo's testimony, that Cuba has decided not to send out military leaders to aid Latin-American revolutionary groups until these groups have reached a significantly high state of development.

Implicit in the Castro Hidalgo testimony is awareness on the part of Cuban officials that the guerrilla effort led by Ernesto Ché Guevara made a number of errors.

It is understood that Mr. Castro Hidalgo's disclosures of Cuban plans and the names of agents and others working for Havana throughout the world has been an important development in United States intelligence activities.

The presence of Mr. Castro Hidalgo and his family—a wife and two small boys—was confirmed by the Department of State, although it would give no further details.

Mr. Castro Hidalgo is a 31-year-old Cuban, born in Puerto Padre, in Oriente Province in the eastern part of the island. His mother and five younger brothers and a sister still live on the island.

He joined Premier Castro's 26th of July Movement in March, 1957, fighting mainly in the Sierra Maestra. After Premier Castro came to power, Mr. Castro Hidalgo stayed with the Army and served in campaigns against guerrillas in the Escambray Mountains and against the invaders at the Bay of Pigs.

His schooling has been somewhat sparse. He left in the middle of secondary school and since then has been largely self-taught. He talks slowly, measuring his words carefully, and has an air of self-confidence and sophistication.

SELECTED FOR TRAINING

Selected for intelligence training by the Castro government in 1965, Mr. Castro Hidalgo got a grounding in both intelligence theory and tactics and guerrilla warfare practice. He also was given training in language prior to being sent to France in March, 1967.

His wife, Norma, had originally been on a list of those Cubans desirous of emigrating to the United States under the provisions of a Cuban-United States accord—but took her name off the list when she married.

It is understood that the fact that her name had been on the list was discovered by Cuban intelligence people in Havana and that an investigation of the situation was under way at the time the family defected to the United States Embassy in Luxembourg. Sources here say that she played something of a role in leading to the defection, but at the same time, Mr. Castro Hidalgo had his own reasons for defecting.

OTHER DISCLOSURES

Among other disclosures made by Mr. Castro Hidalgo are these:

Col. Francisco Caamaño Deñó, the leader of the 1965 Dominican revolution, is now in Cuba and that he arrived there shortly after Mr. Guevara's death at the hands of the Bolivian Army in October, 1967. At first Cuban officials thought they would use the Dominican officer as a replacement for Mr. Guevara, but since that time there has been no evidence that they have done so.

Guyanan Prof. Dr. Walter Rodney, whose presence in Jamaica last year caused a furore, was helped by Cuban intelligence forces in Paris to travel to Cuba by way of both Paris and Prague.

Prensa Latina, the Cuban news service now regarded as being run by DGI elements, was involved in a plan to infiltrate pro-Cuban agents into the ruling military junta of Gen. Juan Velasco Alvarado in Peru.

The names of Cuban intelligence agents in Chile—together with the concern on the part of Premier Castro and his associates that Eduardo Frei Montalva, Chile's reformist president, was usurping Premier Castro's place and influence in Latin America.

THE MOON AND CLEAN WATER

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday evening most of the world watched the most spectacular achievement of America's technological capabilities to date—the lunar landing of the crew of the Apollo 11.

It is a tribute to the skills and dedication of the hundreds of people who have devoted their lives and their careers to developing and utilizing the techniques of modern systems management in order to deal with the tremendous numbers of diverse and interacting elements and factors of man in space. No problem is as complex, yet we have brought the universe within our reach.

Is it not within our realm, then, to bring the solution to complicated public problems—such as those of our environment—within reach?

In 1966, I proposed that we study the application of our modern management capabilities to our vastly complex and difficult public problems, such as transportation, housing, education, and pollution, in order to find effective solutions. Since then it has become increasingly clear that our traditional methods of problem solving will not suffice. If we are to eliminate these problems, we must use means which are commensurate with the magnitude and complexity of the challenge.

The problem of water pollution is only one area in which a solution is urgently needed, but it is a critical situation and one in which action is most readily at hand. As noted columnist Drew Pearson wrote earlier this month, the Atlantic coast is desperately short of the second essential to man's life—water—"all because of the lack of planning, lack of foresight and lack of money—the same ingredients which have put the moon shot on the verge of success."

I have urged that we put these ingredients to use to clean up our rivers, and in 1966 proposed that the Merrimack River Basin become a demonstration project for the application of systems management in pollution control from which the entire Nation could learn.

Mr. Pearson has stated that "the same ingenuity used in reaching the moon would solve our water problems," and the Merrimack demonstration project would be an important step in realizing this potential. It is a concept which has gained the interest of the administration and the endorsement of the General Accounting Office, which has already awarded a contract for a mathematical "systems" model of the Merrimack River to obtain additional water uses at reduced cost. It is a direction for our efforts that needs every support, and I am hopeful that Mr. Pearson's comments, which I am including here, will be as persuasive to my colleagues as they have been encouraging to me in continuing my own efforts:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe,
July 12, 1969]

WE CAN LAND ON THE MOON, BUT WE CANNOT KEEP WATER CLEAN

(By Drew Pearson)

Along the Atlantic seaboard right now are two illustrations of man's efficiency in achieving the thrills of life and man's inefficiency in not achieving the necessities of life.

At Cape Kennedy, the United States is about to launch the most carefully rehearsed, most expensive, most unnecessary project of this century by which man will reach a piece of drab, radioactive, lava-like real estate hitherto romantic because of distance—the moon.

XUM

The launching will succeed because a vast amount of money and the best scientific brains in America over a period of seven years have been lavished on this moon shot.

Meanwhile, up the Atlantic coast, the capital which voted the 20 billion dollars to reach the moon is desperately short of the second essential to man's life—water—all because of lack of planning, lack of foresight, and lack of money—the same ingredients which have put the moon shot on the verge of success.

The Potomac River from which the capital of the United States draws its water is gradually drying up. Its upper reaches are so shallow that rocks stick out of the stream bed like the bones of a starving old woman. Drained by communities and real estate development along its banks, the upper Potomac is starving.

Below, as it flows through Washington, the once majestic river has become an open sewer. Two hundred and forty million gallons of human excrement, detergents, wash water and industrial waste are poured daily into the river. The sewage is only partially treated.

Not even fish can live long in this poisonous water. The days when small boys splashed and cavorted off the piers of Alexandria are no more. The bacteria count is 100 times higher than the level considered safe for swimming.

However, none of this had to happen. Twenty-five years ago the Roosevelt administration foresaw the fact that growing Washington would need more water, and the Army Engineers prepared a comprehensive plan for a far-flung system of dams and reservoirs on the Potomac and its tributaries.

Immediately there was an outcry from real estate interests and big farmers whose land would be inundated. The plan was shelved. It was revived under Kennedy, only to be shelved again. This time the conservationists joined the real estate interests.

There was talk of small dams instead of big ones—dams which would not spoil the river's natural beauty. But nothing was done. There was a lot of talk. A tri-state commission was appointed. Surveys were made. Commissions traveled up and down the river, inspected the Virginia and Maryland tributaries. But nothing happened.

So for lack of planning, lack of action, lack of money, the once full-bosomed, beautiful Potomac has become an emaciated old lady, her bones protruding, smelly, unkempt, unsightly.

And water is short all over the capital of the United States while the same government which has neglected its own front yard reaches for the moon.

The plight of the Potomac is not confined to the capital alone. It illustrates what is happening all over the United States, from New York City where drinking water is still not served in restaurants, to Chicago which is reaching further and further into Lake Michigan for its water.

Gradually at first, but now accelerating rapidly as the population grows, water is becoming a problem. Yet the same ingenuity used in reaching the moon would solve our water problems.

There is an illustration. Russia has reversed the direction of some of its great rivers which flow into the barren Arctic where they freeze and are wasted. What a communistic nation can do, presumably a capitalistic nation can do—if it eschews politics.

For less money than it takes to reach the moon, the Missouri River could be diverted westward at around Omaha and made to flow through the parched plains of Nebraska, Kansas and Texas instead of adding its vast volume to the already brimful Mississippi.

What the nation needs, however, is a water pollution czar who can look ahead, make plans, spend money, as the moon-shooters have done. Until that time, the city of Washington will be periodically starved for water as will other cities of this short-sighted nation.

ECONOMIC WARFARE AGAINST THE SOUTH

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it is most heartening for a Southerner to note that more and more people from other sections of the country are becoming suspicious of the intensified blasts against the South. The American people are seeing through the misrepresentations against Southern products—tobacco, cotton, rice, sugar, and even oil.

Many Americans now question whether the economic warfare is directed against the products or against the region—the people, the culture, and self-sufficiency of the South. They are remembering statements made by those dedicated to the overthrow of the United States indicating that the South would be the final bastion of religious and moral strength and individual liberty in our land. They are realizing there is an economic war against the South.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Frank Capell's Herald of Freedom, Zarephath, N.J., of July 15, 1969, entitled, "Economic Warfare Against the South" following my comments:

ECONOMIC WARFARE AGAINST THE SOUTH

Television viewers have been subjected to a scare campaign against the use of tobacco which has been growing in intensity and which on the surface would seem to be motivated only by humanitarian concern for the health of "our children." Another campaign which had the same ostensible motivation was the drive to "poison the wells" of our nation by the fluoridation of central water supplies. We have been told that the next target for the fanatical guardians of our health will be peanuts (another product of the South), excessive eating of which they will try to convince us is a cause of cancer, that dread disease whose cause is still unknown.

One of the guidelines which has proved quite reliable for conservatives who wonder about an issue which does not lend itself to a "left" or "right" interpretation is the manner in which the matter is treated in the "liberal" press. When only one side is favorably and constantly reported we can be sure that it is important to the left-wing planners' designs. Its immediate purpose may seem fine, logical and ethical but, at the risk of seeming "paranoid," we must warn that things are not always what they seem. In the case of the tobacco controversy it has been pointed out that what is involved is both a power grab and a blow at the South where tobacco is important to the welfare of the people.

Although the youth of America is in far more danger from the smoking of marihuana and the use of LSD, heroin and other dangerous drugs, the busy bureaucrats are trying to "save" them from tobacco. While the use of tobacco may not be desirable, and those who oppose it for moral or religious reasons are honest and upright people, those who are emotionally opposing it for "health" reasons seem a bit too anxious to impose their will. Those who are against the use of tobacco for religious or moral reasons are usually also against the use of alcohol. This is logical as both serve no useful purpose and can be classed together as temptations of the flesh to be avoided, but our anti-tobacco bureaucrats and their do-gooder helpers seem to have no concern over the hazards of alcohol in their "Big-Brother" health program.

When the tobacco industry was called a "legal" industry, one Congressman went to great lengths to point out that in many states it is not legal for persons under a certain age to smoke, thereby implying that this casts doubt upon the "legality" of the tobacco industry. He did not bother to list the other things which persons under certain ages cannot do, among them vote and drive a car as well as drink alcohol. All these things apply to persons deemed by the makers of the above regulations or laws to be too young, and after a certain age the law no longer applies to them. In the case of the anti-tobacco forces there is to be no age limit at which we can escape their ministrations. The Volstead Act and "Prohibition" were a dismal failure and brought more evils than they cured, taking the alcohol business away from legitimate industry and putting it in the hands of gangsters and "bootleggers." People did not stop drinking, they merely got their alcoholic beverages in "Speakeasies" and from criminal sources, or made their own "homebrew" or "bathtub gin."

The way the bureaucrats hope to destroy the tobacco industry is not by prohibiting smoking as they prohibited drinking during "Prohibition" but by frightening the American public into turning against smoking. By requiring the cigarette manufacturers to print in a prominent spot on each package a warning about the horrible things which will happen if the prospective buyer is foolish enough to go through with the purchase, Big Brother will see to it that only a mentally ill person would want to be seen possessing such a dangerous weapon. And, of course, there will be bigger and better ways of dealing with persons who set such a bad example and are so incapable of taking the good advice Big Brother forces upon them at every turn of the radio or TV knob.

The warning approved by the House of Representatives reads: "Warning: The Surgeon General has determined that cigarette smoking is dangerous to your health and may cause lung cancer or other diseases." The Federal Trade Commission has proposed the following: "Cigarette smoking is dangerous to health and may cause death resulting from cancer, coronary heart disease, chronic bronchitis, pulmonary emphysema and other diseases." Anyone who continued to smoke after reading the above would really have to be a masochist.

The fact that no scientific evidence has ever been introduced to prove that cigarette smoking actually causes any of the above diseases, including the "and others," does not seem to enter into the picture. All the fear peddling stems from a report, called the Surgeon General's Report of 1964, which "was developed not by the time proven method of hearings involving confrontation and cross-examination, but instead was based on a 'review of the literature'—a review which proved to be highly selective and did not cite much contradictory experimental evidence." (CONG. REC., June 17, 1969, p. 16172.)

How seriously the Surgeon General took his own report was commented upon by Rep. Carter on the floor of the House of Representatives:

"You know, the Surgeon General appeared before our committee, and in my opinion he is a real fine gentleman, and he had three other distinguished advisors with him who strongly supported legislation for labeling cigarettes and I understand perhaps would

XUM

go even further. Yet at the same time I saw that they were all heavy smokers, including the Surgeon General. As I sat there we saw great layers of smoke arising from the witness stand and going up to the ceiling. In other words, they were saying in my opinion. 'Do not do as I do, but do as I say do.' This was the Surgeon General of the United States."

Hearings were held before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives during the end of April 1969 and on May 1. Out of these came 1420 pages of testimony which added no further information supporting the Surgeon General's Report of 1964 but which did produce information refuting it. A funny thing happened, however, the anti-tobacco forces continued their propaganda and the testimony which did not support their "cause" received little or no publicity. Commenting on this, Rep. Harsha stated: "It is an ironic commentary on our times that the testimony of medical and scientific experts who dispute the scientific evidence against smoking cigarettes is buried by the press. Yet the same kind of testimony that questions the scientific evidence against the use of marihuana gets headlines. Apparently many Americans are closed minded about a legal product and open minded about an illegal one."

Congressman Richardson Preyer prepared a press release, generally ignored, which sums up the "evidence" pro and con, and states in part:

"Experimental research conducted since the Surgeon General's Report of 1964 and brought out in the recent tobacco hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, raises the most serious doubts about the conclusions reached in that report," the North Carolina Representative stated . . . "Evidence reveals it is at least as likely that constitutional factors other than cigarette smoking are the cause of lung cancer, heart disease, and emphysema. Not a single witness for the anti-smoking forces testified to any research which he himself had done, while 18 witnesses testified that their own research cast serious doubts on the theory that cigarettes cause disease," Preyer declared. . . . "Actually, the experimental and statistical evidence has seriously undermined the conclusions of the 1964 report," he said.

Rep. Preyer went on to list seven "myths" and accompanied them with the facts to refute them. They were as follows:

1. Myth: "Every smoker is damaged by his smoking."

Fact: Most smokers suffer no impairment or shortening of life. For example, the disease most closely connected with smoking is lung cancer. The lung cancer incidence among smokers is 5/100 of 1%.

2. Myth: "There is an epidemic of lung cancer."

Fact: There has been a tremendous reduction in overall respiratory disease since 1900 when respiratory death rates were over five times what they are today. It is particularly misleading to say lung cancer is an "epidemic" in view of the declining rate of increase (indicating that the incidence will level off in the next few years).

3. Myth: "Cigarette smoking causes 300,000 premature deaths a year."

Fact: These claims have no basis in fact.

4. Myth: "Cigarette smoking turns the lungs black," or "Doctors can tell cigarette smoker's lung from a non-smoker's lung."

Fact: It is impossible to tell a smoker's lung from a non-smoker's lung upon examination either grossly or microscopically.

5. Myth: "Heavy smoking will shorten your life by 8 years."

Fact: This statement is based on a statistical study by Dr. Cuyler Hammond who has refused to disclose the raw data in his studies so as to permit independent evaluation. To the contrary, recent "twin studies"—where one smokes and other does not—indicates there is no difference in their death rate.

6. Myth: "Giving up smoking makes one healthier."

Fact: According to the Public Health Service "Morbidity" report former smokers have more ill health than present smokers or those who never smoked! This may only show how misleading statistical information can be.

7. Myth: "There are 77 million excess work days lost each year by smokers."

Fact: The study on which this claim has been based has recently been found to contain such unbelievably large errors that it is worthless. These new analyses have been made available to the Public Health Service with no result.

Rep. Quillen of Tennessee challenged the anti-tobacco forces:

"Mr. Speaker, we grow tobacco, not cancer, in the First District of Tennessee and throughout the Nation, and I challenge the Surgeon General of the United States to prove otherwise.

"In the uproar over the alleged connection between smoking and cancer which followed the Surgeon General's report, many people were led to believe that there is conclusive medical proof of such a connection.

"This is not true. In spite of all the research that has been undertaken, there is still dispute, even among members of the medical profession, about a connection between smoking and ill health.

"It is unfair to let one individual and a bureaucratic agency put a great industry out of business, when it is entirely up to the individual whether he wants to use tobacco.

"The issue goes far beyond the question of smoking and health. It strikes at the fundamental question of policymaking by the elected legislative branch or by appointed regulatory agencies which have been called the headless 'fourth branch' of Government.

"The American people have been barraged with anti-smoking literature, commercials on radio and television, newspaper stories, films before their civic clubs, and pamphlets, and all of this has been one sided."

Rep. Quillen then introduced the statements of many eminent physicians concerning the claims of the anti-tobacco forces that smoking causes a long list of terrible diseases, lung cancer, heart disease, emphysema, black lung, besides being addictive and shortening life.

Lung cancer: Sheldon C. Sommers, M.D., Clinical Professor of Pathology, Columbia University College states: "After at least 30 years of experimental work, and many smoke inhalation experiments in animals, lung cancers of the most common, squamous cell human type have not been produced. It is usually difficult to prove a negative, but if cigarette smoke were a cause of lung cancer, it is indeed surprising that no animal experiments have succeeded in its production."

Victor Buhler M.D., Associate Clinical Professor of Pathology and Oncology at University of Kansas School of Medicine, and former president of the College of American Pathologists, states: "The cause of cancer in humans, including the cause of cancer of the lung, is unknown."

Duane Carr, M.D., Professor of Surgery, University of Tennessee College of Medicine: "As of the present date, the cause of lung cancer remains unknown."

Heart disease: William Evans, M.D., former consulting physician, the Institute of Cardiology London, England, states: "The incrimination that smoking causes or accelerates heart disease is wholly unwarranted."

Walter S. Priest, M.D., Emeritus Professor of Medicine at Northwestern University Medical School, states: "It is very doubtful that such a relationship exists. If heavy smokers suffer coronary thrombosis in a significantly greater proportion than non-smokers the cause of the phenomenon could be related to the stress that usually goes together with the smoking habit."

Campbell Moses, M.D., Medical Director, American Heart Association, states: "There is no proof that cigarette smoking causes (disease of) coronary arteries . . . let's be sure we understand the American Heart Association position. We do not say we have the data which says cigarette smoking causes coronary artery (disease)."

Emphysema: Edwin Rayner Levine, M.D., Associate Professor of Clinical Medicine, Chicago Medical School, states: "I cannot find any actual evidence that . . . cigarette smoke or anything else, has a causal relationship to the development of this disease."

John P. Wyatt, M.D., Professor and Chairman, Department of Pathology, University of Manitoba, states: "Most authorities agree that emphysema presents a complex problem which awaits scientific explanation."

Israel Rappaport, M.D., Former Associate Clinical Professor, Columbia University Medical School, states: "The 'protagonists of the anti-smoking campaign' have refused to face this paramount question: 'If it is true that we do not know what emphysema is and whence it originates, how can they maintain the claim that it is linked to cigarette smoking? How can their position be reconciled with scientific principles?"

Black lung—"Smokers' lung": Dr. Sheldon C. Sommers states: "The knowledge of what the black pigment represents, namely, carbon particles or coal dust, is known to every well trained second-year medical student, and . . . it is not possible to equate blackening of the lung to exposure to tobacco products."

Hiram T. Langston, M.D., Professor of Surgery, University of Illinois College of Medicine, and President of the American Association for Thoracic Surgery, states: "The color of the lung has to do with the matter of carbon, and I am unable to recognize the difference between a smoker and a nonsmoker . . . and I have never been able to correlate it with the use of tobacco."

Dr. Victor Buhler states: "I have examined thousands of lungs—and I cannot tell you from examining a lung whether or not its former host had smoked. . . . I state flatly and equivocally and emphatically that cigarette smoke will not turn the lung black."

The biased approach of the anti-smoking propaganda was noted by two others.

John W. Sawyer, Ph. D., Professor of Mathematics, Wake Forest University, stated: "The (Public Health Service) Morbidity Report expressly conceded that errors in some of the results were too large to permit meaningful conclusions; at the same time conclusions from these results were advanced. This type approach is not scientific, but shows bias and desire to reach predetermined conclusions.

"(The Public Health Service) has gone even further in using portions of the Morbidity Report, often out of context, as a basis for a condensed propaganda pamphlet entitled 'Smoking and Illness.' This pamphlet boldly ignores even those inherent limitations acknowledged in the Morbidity Report. It flatly, and without qualification, asserts precisely how much illness and disease is due to smoking. Nowhere does the pamphlet disclose that the basic data included no medical diagnoses by doctors but only self and proxy diagnoses by laymen. In the light of this Critique, the further use and compression of the Morbidity Report in this pamphlet can only be regarded as a dangerous and misleading deterrent to further scientific study."

Dr. Duane Carr stated: "Unfortunately, many supposedly well informed officials in the Public Health Service and certain voluntary health organizations have permitted their emotionalism and zeal to outdistance the actual scientific knowledge and proof. This has resulted in misleading the public into believing there is proof where none exists. A bandwagon effect has resulted even in the medical and scientific community where too many have accepted the pronouncements of dedicated zealots, lacking the time to examine the scientific basis, or lack of it, for such pronouncements."

Science today seems to be the handmaiden of politics and propaganda. The hardy soul who makes a scientific discovery which disagrees with the "accepted" viewpoint (especially on the race question) had better just keep it to himself if he does not want to be ostracized and intimidated into "reevaluating" his facts. All these men of science who have dared to oppose the propaganda myths concerning the dangers of smoking to health may find their lives becoming a bit more difficult since the anti-smoking forces like the anti-gun forces will not give up until their mission is accomplished. This means destroying or discrediting the opposition.

Since the danger of smoking cannot really be scientifically proved, it is obvious that there is more to the scare campaign than meets the eye. Since drugs and alcohol are so much more dangerous to health and happiness and do not evoke such an emotional attack, the anti-smoking zealots are not just interested in health problems even if they are sincerely convinced smoking is dangerous, for there are more dangerous things for them to crusade against. Alcohol and drugs break up homes, cause children to be neglected and result in untold misery to others beside the user himself. Alcohol is the cause of over half of the automobile fatalities with the innocent suffering along with the guilty. Tobacco may or may not injure the user in some way but it cannot harm an innocent bystander or the user's family.

Homer Brett Jr., a former Commander in Naval Intelligence, a career officer with 25 years of intelligence experience, and an expert on Soviet clandestine economic warfare, stated in a prepared speech at a Herald of Freedom Seminar: "It is my opinion that the political and economic war against our tobacco industry goes far deeper than the question of whether or not smoking is healthy. I believe it is a war to damage a great American industry and to damage the South a most recalcitrant area of this nation . . . a conspiracy of International Socialists in America is now waging clandestine economic warfare against what they call 'Imperialist' American free enterprise. . . . If, as I believe is highly probable, a USSR economic warfare team operating inside the USSR embasy in Washington, mounted the clandestine operation aaginst the American tobacco industry, the officer or officers who conceived and mounted this operation are outstanding."

Commander Brett recalled that a move had previously been made against the tobacco industry by an "Easterner" in the Senate and had been prevented by Sen. Strom Thurmond proposing that equal restrictions be placed on the production and sale of liquor as the "Easterner" had proposed for tobacco. He warned that: "For years the Executive Branch of the American Government seems to have been completely incapable of resisting the assaults of the USSR economic warfare strategists against American free enterprise and America's foreign trade. . . . After deep and prolonged study in this field, some of us, who are vitally interested in the problem, have reached the conclusion that we are slowly and steadily being choked out of the world's trade routes. So far the USA has not felt any major effects from the Soviet economic garotte, but in time we will. This is a large and powerful country economically. It takes time and patience to choke a giant to death."

In case anyone is wondering which side of the tobacco controversy the U.S. Communists are on, he has but to look at page one of the official Communist organ, Daily World, of July 2, 1969. It features a half-page photo of Surgeon General William H. Stewart leaning on a large sign which says "No Smoking."

ED LAHEY'S FINEST STORY IS ENDED BY HIS DEATH

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Ed Lahey, who died last Thursday in this city, was in my judgment the most expert writer of our times. Not only were his reports informative but a delight to read. With all of his friends and admirers, I mourn his passing and extend my deepest sympathy to his family. To refresh the minds of those who have read him, I would like to extend the obituary carried in the Detroit Free Press, a Knight newspaper, and his employer.

Also, I would like to extend the remarks of Mr. John S. Knight concerning Ed Lahey in "Knight's Notebook":

[From the Detroit Free Press, July 18, 1969]

ED LAHEY'S FINEST STORY IS ENDED BY HIS DEATH

(By Lee Winfrey)

Edwin A. Lahey, whose writing was admired by millions of readers and whose character was admired by hundreds who knew him, died Thursday in Washington (D.C.) Hospital Center at the age of 67.

Lahey had been chief of the Washington Bureau of Knight Newspapers 13 years, and then its chief correspondent. He was a reporter 42 years altogether, the last 28 of them in Washington.

Services will be at 11 a.m. Saturday in Blessed Sacrament Church, 6001 Western Ave. NW, Washington, D.C. Burial will be in Gate of Heaven Cemetery, Wheaton, Md.

He is survived by his wife, Grace; two daughters, Mrs. Allen Kobliska and Mrs. Bernard Nigro; two brothers, James and Joseph; a sister, Mrs. Gertrude Meiers, and five grandchildren.

Personally and professionally, Ed Lahey was for three decades one of the most respected reporters in this country.

A small, gruff, hard-bitten Chicago Irishman, he rose from grammar-school dropout to become the friend and confidante of presidential candidates, Supreme Court justices and national labor leaders.

Along the way he conquered alcohol, cigarettes, an inferiority complex caused by never having attended college, and the determination of hundreds of news sources to keep him from the truth.

Thirty years ago, after already having built a reputation as a reporter of crime and labor news in Chicago, Lahey was a member of the first class of Nieman Fellows to attend Harvard University in 1938–39.

Moving to Washington two years after leaving Harvard, Lahey scored a number of news beats that made him nationally known.

In 1953, he was first with the story of the resignation of Martin Durkin, President Dwight D. Eisenhower's first secretary of labor.

In 1954, he predicted the coup that overthrew the procommunist government of Guatemala a month before it occurred.

In 1952, he interviewed a brooding Sen. Robert A. Taft in Quebec—a story credited with arranging Taft's famous Morningside Heights reconciliation with Eisenhower, then the Republican presidential candidate.

In 1956, when communist Gilbert Green decided to surrender to federal authorities after jumping bail, he made his decision known, in a special delivery letter to Lahey.

To his colleagues and competitors Lahey perhaps was most admired as one of the best lead writers in the business. He had a gift for compression, for distilling the essence of a story into 15 words or less in a sentence at the top.

An ex-communist employed by the Ladies Garment Workers Union to fight communism never really recovered from Lahey's description of him as "Half coat-and-suiter, half cloak-and-dagger."

When kidnap-killer Richard Loeb was killed in prison after making a pass at a fellow inmate, Lahey's lead said: "Dickie Loeb, despite his erudition, today ended his sentence with a preposition."

Lahey's personal language was salty, pungent, often ribald. Some of his best lines never got into print, such as his frigid description of Lyndon B. Johnson:

"Johnson always reminds me of a small-time pool hustler in Odessa, Tex., leaning against the wall cleaning his ear with a kitchen match while he waits for some sucker to come in."

While unstuffing stuffed shirts and deflating windbags in public print. Lahey mocked himself with equal good humor.

The Chicago Newspaper Guild gave him an award in 1966 for "outstanding contributions to the newspaper industry" "which I guess was for leaving Chicago," Lahey observed.

"My reputation as a prophet was unalterably established," he liked to tell friends, "when I predicted that Fidel Castro wouldn't last six months."

Lahey's personal style, unbuttoned and informal, was the product of a hard childhood and a rough early youth.

He was born in Chicago Jan. 11, 1902, the son of a machinist. Unclear all his life was the matter of exactly how long he went to school.

When he signed in at Harvard as a Nieman Fellow, and was faced with the blank labeled "previous education," he wrote in: "Fourth grade, Chicago public schools."

Apparently he dropped out at the age of 13 or 14. "None of that Abe Lincoln stuff," he said years later. "Everybody did it, not to build character, but to bring in $5."

He worked as an office boy, a shipping clerk, a hod carrier and a railroad yard clerk. Once he made some move-on money as a dishwasher aboard the old excursion steamer Tashmoo, running between Detroit and Port Huron.

Years later he loved to ride in railroad sleeping cars. Recalling his early itinerant days, he said: "I rode so many miles on the outside of the car, it's nice to ride inside now."

He broke into the newspaper business in 1927 as a reporter for the Glen Ellyn (Ill.) Beacon, a now-defunct weekly.

"The newspaper industry," he later recalled, "rescued me from a life of toil in Yard Three of the Proviso (Ill.) yards of the Chicago and North Western Railroad."

He liked to say in later life that one of the reasons he enjoyed the newspaper business was that there was "no heavy lifting."

From Glen Ellyn, Lahey moved on to the East St. Louis Journal and the Associated Press. In 1929, he landed a job with the Chicago Daily News, "the only paper I ever wanted to work for."

In the gangland-era Chicago of the early 1930s, the hard-drinking, hard-working Lahey was one of the best police reporters around. He seemed to know everyone he wrote about on both sides of the law.

When "Machine Gun" Jack McGurn was

killed, for example, in a Chicago shooting match, Lahey wrote a sympathetic obituary that took note of the mobster's love of golf. His story concluded:

"Jack was killed last night. He died in the low Eighties" (an address on the South Side).

After several years of covering crime, Lahey volunteered for his first labor assignment in 1936. His coverage of steel and auto sit-down strikes in 1937 brought him a wide reputation.

The next year he went to Harvard to "cure the worst damn inferiority complex about college you ever saw."

He was less than awed, however. To a long-winded teacher, he observed: "Would you mind summarizing that last point in 10,000 words?"

Felix Frankfurter, later a Supreme Court justice, was a Harvard law professor at the time. He gave Lahey a collection of essays with a flyleaf inscription saying: "To Ed Lahey, to whom I owe so much of my education."

Lahey did not neglect his old gangland contacts meanwhile. He took one of his hoodlum pals to New York's Harvard Club for a chat, saying; "I figured nobody there would recognize a couple of crumb-bums like us."

Lahey quit drinking in 1940, joined Alcoholics Anonymous and stayed dry the rest of his life. In 1941, the Daily News sent him to Washington, where he reached his greatest fame.

He traveled extensively in the China-Burma-India theater during World War II and old photographs of him at work there still lined his office wall in Washington's National Press Building more than 20 years later.

His byline appeared from all over the world, from Europe and Africa and Latin America—the latter a particular interest of his for which he taught himself Spanish so that he could travel.

In 1956 he was named chief of the Washington bureau of Knight Newspapers. He remained with Knight after the Chicago Daily News, his old home paper, was sold in 1959 to Marshall Field.

Lahey covered every presidential campaign from 1944 through 1964. "I have advised my associates," he once wrote, "to reserve one paragraph in my obituary to point out that in my long career as a Washington correspondent, five presidents have ignored me at press conferences."

Always he abided by his personal motto: "Fawn not upon the great," a quotation from Thomas a Kempis. Always his point of view was irreverent, as when he diagnosed John Kennedy's victory in the 1960 election:

"Nixon had the wrong kind of kisser. Kennedy sends the women."

It would be difficult, without sounding cloying, to tell how much Ed Lahey was loved by people who knew him.

Among his close friends were many of the great—Robert F. Kennedy, Arthur Goldberg, Robert A. Taft, Philip A. Murray, Clarence Mitchell.

Equally admiring were a host of newspapermen he helped. He never was too busy to offer writing advice, give background information or simply entertain a caller with a story or two.

Lahey always looked small and a little frail—"He reminds you of an elf who grew too big for the burrow and had to go live with people," wrote J. A. C. Dunn of the Charlotte Observer.

In 1960, his health began to fail.

He underwent surgery that year for what doctors thought was cancer. His friend, Arthur Goldberg, helped make out his will.

When surgery showed no cancer, one of his friends who knew how Lahey like to be approached, told friends: "Tell the bum to send back the flowers."

But in 1963, Lahey developed emphysema and had to quit smoking, a habit that burned up two to three packs a day for most of his life.

By June of 1968, he no longer was strong enough to get to his Washington office regularly. After covering every presidential campaign for 20 years, he had to sit out last year's race.

The newspaper business will miss him, because he was one of a kind. In the 1950's, when everyone was apprehensive about the atomic bomb, he liked to say that "the only defense against a nuclear blast is a state of grace."

If anyone ever died in that blessed state, his friends will all swear that it was Ed.

JOHN S. KNIGHT'S NOTEBOOK: ED LAHEY, REPORTER

During my time as editor and publisher of the Chicago Daily News the only man of whom I stood in awe was Ed Lahey, the best newspaper reporter in my profession.

Admittedly, my feeling about Ed was touched with more than a tinge of envy. For what other writer could turn out a story on any subject and make it sing with Lahey's flair for facts and fluency? As an associate once remarked: "Ed was born with a silver phrase in his typewriter."

In time, my reverence of and respect for Ed Lahey deepened into a warm and understanding friendship. Though Ed held strong convictions on a variety of subjects, his reporting was a model of accuracy. He sought to report the world, not to reform it.

As chief of our Washington bureau, Ed Lahey asked no favors from management. As he enjoyed saying, "I demand nothing of my publisher except that he be solvent."

Ed Lahey had no peers in the reporting field. He could spot a phony or a saint with equal celerity. Ed walked with the great and loved the lowly.

His professional code was such that during the 1960 Democratic convention he rejected one of my stories because he did not believe it to be true. Not many men would do that to the boss.

Ed Lahey was no ordinary man, as his record in journalism will attest. Nor was any Washington correspondent more admired by his colleagues for the quality of his work.

He died as he lived, with indomitable courage, and in later years serene acceptance of the inevitable.

We shall miss Ed, and in all probability never see his like again.

THE CRITICAL NEED FOR DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, on July 9, I was privileged to testify before the Select House Subcommittee on Education which held hearings on the proposed Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969, of which I am a cosponsor.

In view of the reaction to these remarks that I have received from my district and other Members of Congress who have read them, it was my thought to have them reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues; many of whom who have expressed an interest in this serious national problem of drug abuse:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DON H. CLAUSEN ON THE DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1969 TO THE SELECT HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, JULY 9, 1969

Mr. Chairman, as one of the co-sponsors of H.R. 9314, (the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969), I appreciate this opportunity to testify in support of this proposed legislation.

I also want to take this opportunity, at the outset, to commend this distinguished committee for scheduling early hearings on what, in my judgment, may well be one of the single, most important, and most vitally needed legislative proposals to be considered by the 91st Congress.

Drug abuse—a critical national problem: Drug abuse and narcotics addiction have reached staggering proportions in recent years. The Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs reports, based solely on law enforcement statistics, that one out of every 3,000 persons in this country is a "recorded addict"—that most addicts are from four states (California, New York, Illinois, and New Jersey)—that nearly 46% of the "recorded addicts" are between 21 and 30 years of age—that, for some "hard users", $100 a day is needed to feed the habit—that drug addicts not only "feed the coffers" of organized crime but account for a high percentage of street crimes such as muggings, holdups, shop lifting, robbery, forgery, and prostitution.

The Bureau further advises that the cost to the taxpayer for rehabilitating just one narcotic addict per year is approximately $1,300 and $3,000 per addict is needed for a full six weeks of inpatient rehabilitation treatment.

While these figures are alarming—they do not begin to tell the real story of the drug problem in America.

WHO ARE DRUG ABUSERS?

The fact is, that these figures and statistics deal only with "recorded addicts", as reported by private and law enforcement agencies. The users of marijuana, halucinogens, stimulants, and depressants, however, are seldom "recorded" or discovered unless they are arrested.

Therefore, at the present time, there just is no way to account for this vast army of "drug abusers". But, if the estimates of our educators and guidance counselors mean anything, there may be as many as 20 million "drug abusers", in addition to the one out of every 3,000 "recorded addicts" in this country.

The truly shocking facet about the "drug abuser" group, Mr. Chairman, is that the vast majority of them are in their teens!

And, regrettably society has failed to meet or even properly recognize this national threat because drug abuse in America is, beyond any shadow of doubt, a very serious, compelling, and potentially explosive national problem.

For those of us in the so-called "over 30" age group, drugs are drugs. Period. We've known about them for a long time and we've heard about the "dark recesses of society" in which addicts live—half free, half alive!

Times are changing: What apparently has passed us by, however, is the fact that, in recent years, drugs have suddenly become a source of growing fascination for millions of young people. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that an entirely new "subculture" has developed around drugs and narcotics that the adult generation in America is only vaguely aware of—or, more realistically, totally unaware of.

To a great extent, in my judgment, the basic problem involved in this entire area of narcotics addiction and drug abuse—is one of "communication"; no matter how abused and overused that term has become of late.

Too often, both sides of the "generation gap" are very reluctant to let facts interfere with opinions when it comes to drug abuse. Quite frankly, I'm of the view that

XUM

the general public has neither been adequately informed nor sought to learn the vital facts or the real truisms about how drug abuse can completely ruin a young persons entire life.

A "creeping social disease": I have seen at first hand how easily and how relatively unnoticed the drug problem can "creep up" on a community, a school, or a family. It is happening right now in my Congressional District in California and throughout America, and, in spite of valiant local efforts to fight back, we have a long way to go before we can even fully comprehend the total dimensions and impact of this "social disease" that is sweeping across our land.

As a concerned parent, citizen, and legislator, I have come to the realization that we've made many mistakes in the past in attempting to deal with this drug abuse problem. I have received hundreds of letters and even phone calls late at night from the grieving parents of addicted or "experimenting" teenagers asking: "Where did we go wrong—what can we do now?"

Americans still uninformed: In 1962, the White House Conference on Narcotics and Drug Abuse stated that:

"The general public has not been informed of most of the important facts related to drug abuse and, therefore, has many misconceptions which are freightening and destructive. This situation is due to many causes, among which are the *failure of schools to recognize the problem and provide instruction of equal quantity and quality as that provided for other health hazards.*"

This conclusion was reached, Mr. Chairman, in 1962 at the executive level of our government. However, in the seven years that have slipped by since then, the general public has still not been awakened to this drug abuse threat, no significant role has been undertaken by our schools to combat it, and the problem itself has been compounded three-fold.

A community fights back: One of the communities in my district, Fort Bragg, discovered in 1967 that at least 50 percent of the students in the local high school admitted "using drugs". Even this estimate seemed low, however, since 35 percent said they were having "a serious involvement with drugs".

Several counselors and key officials at Fort Bragg High School, once the initial shock subsided, quietly decided they had to act. So, they proceeded to "wake the town and tell the people". In addition, they visited a nearby State Hospital where former addicts were being utilized in a drug abuse program there as counselors. *The thought was, if these high school kids who are "experimenting with drugs won't listen to their parents, church leaders, or school officials on the subject of drug abuse, perhaps they will listen to former drug addicts who have known and lived in the tragic, unreal world of narcotics and drugs.*

At first, the idea got nowhere. The community was apprehensive and suspicious. By and large, the people of Fort Bragg were in an understandable state of shock and not readily amenable to any "new" or "radical" innovations. The bitter, hard, cold facts, however, clearly revealed that:

1. The use of drugs among teenagers is very widespread.

2. Teenagers in general have no real knowledge of the dangers involved in drug abuse and, in fact, are unbelievably naive on the subject.

3. *Those procedures previously thought to be effective in combatting drug abuse (i.e. law enforcement and clinical rehabilitation) have caused only alienation and bitterness between teenagers and their parents, teachers, and the community at large.*

The "awareness house concept":

In Fort Bragg, as the realities became better known and understood, shock soon gave way to reason. Something had to be done! A new approach was needed if there was to be a meaningful and effective solution to this community's problem.

And, it came in the form of *"Awareness House"; a place where young people could go voluntarily and anonymously to receive expert and qualified guidance and counseling in the true dangers of drug abuse from former, rehabilitated narcotics addicts.*

(Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to insert at this point in the record a reprint from the March 21, 1969 issue of Life magazine and several reprints from local newspapers in my district detailing the background, organization, and effectiveness of the "Awareness House" concept.)

A model community action program: In April of this year, the future potential of the "Awareness House" concept as a pilot community action program for the entire nation was recognized in the form of a training grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Under the Education Professions Development Act (PL 90-35), this grant will be utilized to train 12 former drug addicts to serve as counselors in the public school system of Mendocino County, California, using the "Awareness House" experience as a basis for this training.

The fact of the matter is, that the "Awareness House" approach has worked effectively where other so-called community action programs to combat teenage drug abuse have failed.

Why? Fundamentally, because *the "Awareness House" philosophy recognizes that "times are changing" and that a new technique of communication with young people is vital to not only closing the so-called "Communications Gap"—but to solving the drug abuse problem!*

The answer, I believe, lies in one word—"Awareness"!

Grave misconceptions about drugs can and do interfere with sensible talks between parents and their children or effective instruction between teachers and their students. For years it has been said that smoking marijuana is "bad"—but a deafening silence usually follows when a teenager asks what is so different about alcohol or nicotine so commonly used by adults?

The education-generation-communication gap: How many parents or teachers can talk about the mental effects of prolonged marijuana smoking—or about the relationship of LSD and birth defects? More important, how many parents or teachers are talking about it at all?

How many schools today have a realistic, effective drug abuse program or even a "block of drug abuse instruction"? Regrettably, very few! Some states do not even require it. Many are devoting more time and attention to shop, sewing, cooking and sex than they are to the exploding social cancer of "mind-bending", life-destroying drug abuse by teenagers.

Today, responsible, realistic and constructive drug education is being hampered by three basic factors:

1. A lack of "awareness", and effective training by our educators.

2. An uncertainty about and unavailability of the "right" teaching materials.

3. Prevailing community resistance to any form of effective drug education—a continuing reflection of public fear and controversy over drug abuse.

But, I submit, that unless and until we begin to "communicate" with our young people about the real dangers of drugs and narcotics, the problem of teenage drug abuse is going to grow and eventually become totally destructive to them and to our society.

The kind of communication I refer to here applies to parents, educators, law enforcement officials, and young people and, in my judgment, education is the key.

The role of education in combatting drug abuse: As was done in Fort Bragg by the high school staff, *our educational institutions in this country must now "wake the nation and tell the public" that drug abuse has become a social menace in America and that, through knowledge and truth, we can avoid having the young lives of millions turned into a nightmare from which for many, there is just no return!*

This is why, Mr. Chairman, I am such an enthusiastic sponsor and supporter of and believer in the need for The Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969. Experience has amply and clearly demonstrated that our law enforcement agencies, rehabilitation facilities, and community action programs are largely "after the fact" stop-gap measures which, at best, deal with drug abusers "after" they become personally involved.

What we need, Mr. Chairman, is an effective and hard-hitting educational program for adults and teenagers alike that tells it like it really is—"before" the damage is done!

Federal funds authorized under this proposed legislation could be used to devise and evaluate factual and realistic new drug education curricula, help communities set up "Drug Alert Seminars," and assist local school districts in providing demonstration projects for drug abuse education.

In addition, a key section in this bill, in my judgment, would make funds available so that our educators, law enforcement officials, and community leaders could participate in short-term or summer college-level courses on drug education.

Getting together—finally: Using the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969 as a vehicle of cooperation and coordination, I can foresee all parties to the drug abuse problem coming together and joining forces—parents, teachers, students, law enforcement officials, and community leaders. Only in this way, as I see it, will we achieve that "better understanding" that is vitally needed to combat drug use and abuse.

Along with the enactment of this legislation, I believe we, as a Nation, must move forward on many other fronts. Among these, are:

1. *Law enforcement:* The absolute necessity for Federal and state law enforcement agencies to crack down even harder on the "pushers" responsible for illegal traffic in dangerous drugs and narcotics and who prey on the weaknesses of human beings.

2. *Community action programs:* The compelling and urgent need for more communities to develop local action programs such as the "Awareness House" concept or comparable projects which utilize rehabilitated addicts to "tell it like it is" and reveal the real dangers to young "drug abusers".

3. *Coordination and cooperation:* The critical necessity at every level of government and within every political subdivision in America to enlist the support of the news media, civic and social groups, and our educational and law enforcement institutions to work together to help combat drug abuse through factual information, logic, and a better understanding of both the nature and the scope of the problem.

4. *"Drying-up the source":* A more concentrated effort to determine how, when, where, and by whom narcotics and dangerous drugs are entering this country and being made available to the general public. Where applicable, such as in my own State of California, hearings and investigations by the Congress and the Justice Department should be conducted to determine if additional border restrictions with neighboring countries should be implemented during this emergency period.

5. *Education and training:* The fundamental and underlying ingredient of any effective drug abuse program in America is factual and meaningful education and training. Federal legislation in this regard, such as the Drug Abuse Education Act, must be supplemented and "dove-tailed" by state and local drug abuse education programs

that are tailored to cope with special or local problem areas.

6. *Treatment and rehabilitation:* The Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 recognizes and provides for greater emphasis on treatment and rehabilitation rather than on disciplinary action as the primary role of society in coping with addicts. While these programs are and will be improved and expanded, the gains made by patients quite often cannot be maintained after discharge due to the almost total absence of "aftercare services" in the community.

7. *"Aftercare services":* More privately endowed "aftercare drug centers" are needed throughout the country where the progress and, if necessary, follow-up treatment of recently released drug addicts can be secured. These include private hospitals, "halfway houses", service organizations and religious groups.

Summary: At a time when all of us are vitally concerned about spiraling inflation and especially the skyrocketing costs of education, the absolute essentiality of priority spending is most acute. Nowhere, in my judgment, is the need for a high priority in domestic spending more acute however, than in the area of drug abuse.

I view the drug problem in America, quite frankly, as part and parcel of the rising spectre of moral, social, and national decay that is creeping over America. I see it as an important and integral part of the effort underway to alienate young people in this country from their parents, the family structure, the church, the educational institution, the so-called "establishment", and from those basic precepts and moral values that Americans have long held valid and endurable.

What better way to alienate and immobilize young Americans, than to "bend their minds and bodies inside out with "easy to get" drugs and narcotics?

For too long, we have tried "preaching and sermonizing to our young people about the dangers of drug abuse—and it has been notoriously ineffective!

With The Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969, we can provide a well-coordinated and integrated national program whereby the required funds and assistance will be made available for realistic, effective, and vitally needed drug abuse education.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge favorable action and swift passage of this legislation in the deep belief that it is both imperative and mandatory that we in the Congress move in a positive, constructive way to put down this threat to American youth and the society in which we live.

As President Nixon has said: "America faces a crisis of the spirit." Certainly, the drug abuse problem is part of the crisis and millions of Americans look to us for an answer.

The Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969, in my judgment, goes a long way in providing that answer!

IS IT TIME FOR A PAUSE IN OUR CONQUEST OF SPACE?

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, all of us take great pride in the tremendous achievements of our space program, climaxed by the latest great demonstration of our scientific ability in the successful lunar landing of Apollo 11.

The question has been asked repeatedly: Where do we go from here?

There is much yet to learn in space, of course. We have literally but scratched the surface.

But, at the same time, is it perhaps a time when we really should pause, maybe even take a step backward, and decide where we should go next.

I have been a strong supporter of the space program and I still am. I also am cognizant of the drain which the space program has been on our Federal budget.

Nearly 40 years ago, Germany pioneered in rocket research—in those pre-World War II days—under the guidance of a large team of scientists, including Dr. Walter D. Dornberger and Dr. Wernher von Braun, who since the war have been doing vital research work for our own country.

Dr. Dornberger, now a resident of the town of Boston, a suburb of my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., was at the launching of Apollo 11 last week. He is now retired from his research role at Bell Aerosystems Corp., Buffalo, but he was a guest of Dr. von Braun for the launching.

Calling the Apollo 11 launching "the greatest technological accomplishment in the history of mankind," Dr. Dornberger says he feels that now it is time to pause in seeking new ventures and begin to make practical use of the wealth of information we have accumulated.

He feels that the United States now should be concentrating on establishing space stations in permanent orbit 200 or 300 miles above the earth.

With these stations, he believes the Nation then could cut its space exploration costs by having recoverable and reusable rocket-propelled vehicles which could operate as shuttle vehicles between earth and the space satellites.

Dr. Dornberger elaborates on his well-founded views in the following article from the July 16 issue of the Buffalo, N.Y., Courier-Express:

EX-BELL SCIENTIST AWAITS LIFTOFF

Dr. Walter R. Dornberger of Back Creek Rd., Town of Boston, will watch the blastoff this morning of Apollo 11 on its moon trip from Cape Kennedy, convinced he is seeing "the greatest technological accomplishment in the history of mankind."

"This is the final, crowning triumph of my life," the 74-year-old Dornberger told The Courier-Express by telephone Tuesday from Coca Beach, Fla., where he is waiting out this morning's lunar launch.

He concedes that the Apollo 11 moon shot is a "magnificent achievement." But he also believes it may have cost too much and may be a misguided use of the science of rocketry to which he has devoted 40 years.

SEES NEED FOR STATIONS

"We had to do it for political and prestige purposes," he said. "Now I think with the present money problems we have in the country, we should take one step back and really start to study space."

Dr. Dornberger then mentioned a theme that has become a favorite with him since he retired four years ago as vice president in charge of research for Bell Aerosystems—space stations in permanent orbit 200 or 300 miles above the earth.

"All my life has been spent with chemical propulsion," he explained. This system is just too wasteful—throwing all that hardware into the ocean or burning it up in orbit, we could devise rocket-propelled vehicles which would be both recoverable and re-usable.

"These really would be shuttle vehicles, flying from Earth to the space stations on schedule, like an airline. If we can launch 50 planes a day from Kennedy Airport to Europe, we can learn to launch six or seven rocket flights a day from Earth to space stations."

CITES UNTESTED NUCLEAR POWER

Orbiting platforms outside Earth's atmosphere would permit man to undertake serious research into space itself and that incredible source of energy—the sun, he said:

"From an orbiting launch platform 300 miles out in space we wouldn't need all those million pounds of thrust we will use to get Apollo 11 off its pad at Cape Kennedy," Dr. Dornberger said. "We wouldn't have to contend with Earth's gravity. We probably could use some of the efficient, durable electric and nuclear propulsions systems which have been conceived but never tested.

"They can't be tested here on Earth because the thrust is too low. But they will work in outer space—and they may give us faster space vehicles and last longer than chemical propulsion."

WE CAN BUILD HOSPITALS OUT THERE

Dr. Dornberger believes both space and the sun offer immense practical benefits to mankind—the kind of thing that will give "taxpayers something in return for the money they're spending."

"We can build a hospital out there to give patients radiation treatments for things like arthritis and other hardening of the bones and joints," he explained. "We have a perfect vacuum out there, something we cannot create on Earth. We should use it on research into technical procedures which private industry needs.

"Our space satellites can make geological and hydrological studies of the minerals and waters of Earth to tell where oil or iron might be found, or where ocean currents go.

"We can do research into sunlight, our greatest source of energy. Perhaps we can learn to concentrate this energy and build plants to convert it into power. Or maybe we can use it to cultivate the deserts of Earth—the Sahara and Rocky Mountains. The possibilities are limitless.

"And space is beautiful. Perhaps we can even get Hilton or the Holiday Inns to build a resort in space."

Dr. Dornberger believes that the moon is as far into space as we should go in the immediate future. It took man only 20 years from the time he fired his first rocket into space to reach that mysterious satellite of Earth, and there's no real reason to hurry any more, he said.

"Mars and Venus are not inhabited, so why get there?" Dr. Dornberger asked. "As far as we know, the planets of our solar system are uninhabitable.

"Perhaps in the next 100 years or so, we will have inventions that will enable us to leave our solar system. Meantime, we have space and we must learn to take advantage of it."

IN NO HURRY FOR SPACE ISLAND

Dr. Dornberger believes sincerely that the system of orbiting space stations will not cost as much as the Apollo lunar shot—"and everybody knows what that has cost so far, $40 billion."

"We are in no hurry," he explained. "It will take at least 10 years before we have a successful space station."

Dr. Dornberger will watch the launch as a guest of the National Aeronautics & Space Administration (NASA). He will see the blastoff from one of the official visitors' platforms while Dr. Wernher von Braun, who used to work for him at Peenemunde, Nazi Germany's rocket-research station on the Baltic Sea, will see it from the main control station at the cape.

A DIFFERENCE IN CHEMICALS

Though the Apollo 11 will develop millions of pounds of thrust in its liftoff phase, it is still essentially the same chemically-propelled rocket with which Dr. Dornberger began working in 1929.

"I used liquid gas oxygen and alcohol; Apollo uses liquid oxygen and hydrogen." he said.

Dr. Dornberger began his military career with the German army two days after World War I broke out in 1914. He served continuously until 1945, when he surrendered to the American army. He was a major general.

He attended the Technical University of Berlin, Charlottenburg on leave from the army from 1925 to 1929. He took a doctorate in jet propulsion in 1934.

TAKES VON BRAUN TO PEENEMUNDE

In 1931, he laid the basis for Germany's pre-eminence in pre-World War II rocket research by establishing a center at Kummersdorf-West, near Berlin, to which young von Braun and other brilliant scientists were attracted.

This group under Dr. Dornberger transferred in 1937 to Peenemunde, where, as "Army Experimental Station North," they developed the V–1 (buzz bomb) and V–2 rockets which bombarded Britain in the late stages of World War II.

Dr. Dornberger spent two years in a British prison after World War II. He and von Braun, now one of the top executives in the U.S. space program, came to this country under the famed "Project Paper Clip" program which recruited more than 100 Nazi rocketry experts for work in our rocket-missile program.

Dr. Dornberger joined Bell Aerosystems in 1950. He retired in 1965.

Though he did not get one of von Braun's closeup seats at the launching, he did get to interview the three astronauts who have been picked to ride Apollo 11 to the moon. He found them "very relaxed, very confident" and "everything running smoothly" in the tense hours before blastoff.

CHARLESTON HOSPITAL WORKERS STRIKE

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the recent conclusion of the Charleston hospital workers' strike may well signal a new and vital phase of the civil rights struggle in America. It is the kind of incident that occurred in Memphis last year and indicates that a combined effort for racial harmony and simple economic justice can bring together black and white Americans in common cause.

The implications of this strike surpass those of a normal labor dispute or even of another racial confrontation in the South. Rather it signifies the compounding of a labor problem with a civil rights issue into a social, economic and political operation. The settlement—which included de facto recognition of unions and a statewide minimum wage increase of 30 cents per hour effecting 20,000 low-wage employees—was a success for the black hospital workers and for similarly empoverished workers throughout the country.

The poor of this Nation which Michael Harrington referred to as the "other America," continue to be denied recognition as full citizens with equal opportunities for self-determination. Society glorifies work as the prime tool for social and economic mobility, yet even employment does not preclude poverty when the terms of the job are defined by absolute decree of the employer. The nonwhite poor are particularly vulnerable to such exploitation, lacking both the political and physical power with which to resist. As the Freedomways editorial points out, the Charleston strike evidences a growing sense of class among the "underclass," a feeling shared with the Mexican-American grape pickers in another part of the country, that only through unity and organization can they gain recognition as equal citizens.

The battle for the right to unionize was supposedly fought and won several decades ago, but evidently not so for black workers in Charleston, S.C. Their attempts to improve working conditions and inferior wages—$1.30 per hour—through organization were answered by the firing of their leaders. Efforts in behalf of the striking workers by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference produced police abuse and outrageous handling by the courts. An example of this was the charging of Rev. Ralph Abernathy, renowned for his nonviolence, with "inciting to riot" and then setting bail at $50,000. As Magistrate Donald Barkowicz explained his action—recorded in Jet magazine July 10, 1969:

> For an offense of this nature, in fairness to the people of this city, I cannot order bond for a penny under $50,000.

Within Charleston the sides divided on strictly racial lines, although the issues and the means of settlement were economic.

Political support for the strikers from around the Nation was interracial, however. Four of my colleagues and I spent a day in Charleston to support and identify with this important movement. In contrast to this and similar efforts by concerned people is the attitude of the Nixon administration to which my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH), refers in his account of our trip reprinted below. For over a year, HEW has been negotiating with the hospital over numerous violations of civil rights laws that could have had the legal result of cutting off Federal funds. Late in June HEW indicated that funds would be stopped unless the discriminatory employment practices, among the main issues in the strike, were ended. A few days later, however, that position was withdrawn. The administration had apparently retreated into the neutrality which President Nixon advocated in his letter to Congressman KOCH. It was that attitude which prompted my colleague to quote from Dante:

> The hottest places in Hell are reserved for those who, in time of great moral crisis, maintain their neutrality.

From this incident in Charleston, repercussions will emanate throughout the South and the Nation, announcing to all who are enslaved in poverty by low wages and discrimination without recourse for change that they need not tolerate that condition any longer. Charleston marks a way to break through: a coalition between the civil rights and the labor movements. The recognition of common interests developing between the economic and racially exploited within this Nation is leading to a unity and a political strength with which the underclass may achieve equal citizenship.

I would offer for my colleagues' consideration the following articles pertaining to the strike by hospital workers in Charleston, S.C., which has finally been settled. They provide accounts of the strike from several perspectives emphasizing different aspects of the situation. They testify to the monolithic resistance from the State of South Carolina and all its resources—with the Federal Government too long a silent accomplice—encountered by poor blacks in Charleston as they assert their basic right to unionize. The articles document one instance of a determined attempt made by the employed poor to overcome their status.

The above-mentioned articles follow:

[From Freedomways, spring 1969]

CHARLESTON—BATTLEGROUND FOR THE DIGNITY OF THE POOR

At this writing the Hospital Workers' Strike in Charleston, South Carolina is well into its third month. The arbitrary dismissal of workers for their union activity, court injunctions arbitrarily limiting the number of pickets to a token, mass arrests of citizens of all ages, who have attempted peaceful demonstrations in accordance with their rights under the First Amendment of the Constitution—such is the experience of the hospital workers today. It must be kept in mind that the employer in this instance is the State of South Carolina. The State is carrying out its declared policy of not recognizing unions among employees who work for the State. This is a policy articulated in words by the Governor and the Attorney General and reinforced in deeds by the use of state troopers, national guardsmen and police to create an atmosphere of intimidation.

The South Carolina Medical College Hospital and the Charleston County Hospital are public institutions financed by the taxes of South Carolina citizens, including the hospital workers—yet not even Federal law guarantees these workers the right to have a union to bargain for wages and conditions with their employers. The South Carolina hospital workers are indeed part of the public but they are also part of the poor of America which numbers some forty million Americans.

In their courageous strike the hospital workers in South Carolina are serving as the advanced guard representing the aspirations of more than three million other workers in hospitals and nursing homes throughout the country who have such low incomes they are part of the poverty scene in spite of the fact that they have full time jobs and work long hours. The machinery of the State in South Carolina, confronted with this effort of the hospital workers to gain respect, union recognition and job security, is showing its contempt for the poor and demonstrating once again how unrepresentative government is in our country. And once again the glaring contradiction is posed that what this nation is allegedly fighting to guarantee to South Vietnam it hasn't guaranteed to the poor in America—that is, representative government.

The State of South Carolina, in this instance, has created a social crisis through the preponderant use of the military and then

XUM

used the atmosphere that it has created as an excuse for imposing a curfew on the city of Charleston, which, of course, is supposed to be in the interest of "public safety."

Charleston is a crucial battleground, therefore, in this new phase of the Freedom Movement. The dignity of the poor is being asserted in a determined effort to build organization powerful enough to deal with the conditions under which they labor. Like every healthy movement it is producing its own capable, indigenous leadership. Mary Moultrie, President of the Hospital Workers Local 1199B in Charleston, is one example and there will be many more as the movement spreads.

Fortunately, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference has brought the talents and prestige of its organization to the support of the hospital workers in Charleston. The Reverend Ralph Abernathy, President of SCLC, has called this the opening of the "second chapter of the Poor People's Campaign." With characteristic energy and dedication Reverend Abernathy and members of his staff have lent their physical presence and involvement to the struggle in Charleston—while at the same time cementing bonds of unity and cooperation with the leaders of the Mexican-American farm workers on strike in California.

The multi-ethnic character of the developing movement of the poor is one of its greatest strengths. The Mexican-American workers striking the commercial grape farms on the West coast and the Afro-American hospital workers in Charleston are in a common struggle against exploitation. Symbolizing the employed sections of the urban and rural poor these current struggles embody the best in the nation's future. Once they and others so situated win the power which comes through organization, they can become the rallying center for all of the poor across the nation.

The cold arrogance which President Nixon and members of his Cabinet recently showed the citizen's delegation from the Poor People's Campaign will surprise few. Much to the contrary, it served to clarify relationships in our country today. The present Administration in Washington, in its composition, is very much the brainchild of Strom Thurmond, Mendel Rivers and the military "Defense" Establishment—political forces in American life antagonistic to the aspirations of the poor for a better life.

The struggle for the human dignity and "civil rights" of the *poor* is rapidly being defined as the unfinished business of the Freedom Movement. This definition is being spelled out in the over-all experience of the hospital workers in Charleston and the farm workers in California. And success can absolutely be assured by massive support from the public at large throughout the country in as many tangible forms as possible.

[From Jet magazine, July 10, 1969]

Beatings, Hospital Strike End in Charleston, S.C

Only hours after William Kircher, director of organization for the AFL–CIO threatened already uptight Charleston, S.C., with an economically strangling dock shutdown, Medical College Hospital, largest of the two struck hospitals in the city, agreed to demands for recognition of 400 striking workers, mostly black and mostly women. The hospital even agreed to rehire all the strike leaders it fired earlier. The heavily black Longshoremen's Union was set to close the ports when one hospital capitulated and the other, County Hospital, appeared ready to settle.

Rev. Andrew Young, executive vice president of SCLC, hailed the settlement as "a great victory for nonviolence," and observed that more than 20,000 black and white state employees will benefit to the tune of $5 million next year as a result of the militant three-month-long stand of 400 SCLC-backed black strikers. Said Rev. Young: "The civil rights and labor coalition begins a new era in the struggle for economic justice."

Notable also in the agreement is the stipulation that SCLC president Rev. David Abernathy, winner of his first major victory as top leader, and an aide, Hosea Williams, will be released from jail on personal recognizance bonds. Abernathy and Williams were charged with inciting a riot, parading without a permit and disorderly conduct after Police Chief John Conroy ordered an Abernathy-led demonstration of 400 black marchers to disperse. Both Abernathy and Williams, who knelt to pray, were picked up bodily by police and put in the paddy wagon. They had been in jail since, and Abernathy had refused to eat. Mrs. Juanita Abernathy, his wife, expressed concern for his health. Abernathy's personal physician, Dr. C. A. Brown of Atlanta, flew in and after performing a thorough examination, announced that Abernathy was in good health. Another visitor to the jail was Rev. Martin Luther King Sr.

SCLC lawyers filed suit in federal court to invalidate the South Carolina law that encompasses "inciting to riot." They say the law is vague and unconstitutional. In setting an unusual $50,000 bail on Abernathy and Williams, Magistrate Donald Barkowicz declared, "for an offense of this nature, in fairness to the people of this city, I cannot order bond for a penny under $50,000." Civil rights observers noted bitterly that Abernathy, a nonviolent leader for 14 years, "is now charged with inciting a riot while praying. It's preposterous."

The hospital strikers, mostly black and female, fought hard for union recognition, higher pay (they were paid $1.30 an hour), upgrading, on-the-job security and dignity as workers and the rehiring of 12 workers who were fired in the first days of union organizing. The strike involves two of the city's largest hospitals, both state operated.

SCLC has supported the strikers since almost the beginning. While Abernathy and Williams were in jail, the Rev. Andrew Young SCLC veteran activist was in charge of the organization's activities. When Abernathy and Williams were arrested black youths reportedly responded by throwing rocks, bricks and bottles. Gov. Robert McNair reimposed a curfew and National Gaurdsmen were reactivated. About 40 youths were arrested a few days later.

(Note.—Captions under pictures accompanying *JET* article: "With bayoneted rifles at a menacing ready, heavily armed guardsmen advance in wedge formation on black demonstrators." "At start of march, Abernathy, strike leaders Mary Moultrie, Williams are accosted by Police Chief Conroy, cops, newsmen." "Undaunted by amputated foot, veteran SCLC rights worker, Ben (Sunshine) Owens, joins march with Hosea Williams.")

[From the Park East, June 12, 1969]

Bid From Abernathy Takes Koch to Strike-Torn Charleston

(By Edward I. Koch)

(Editor's note.—On a recent one-day visit to strike-torn Charleston, So. Car., Park East Congressman Edward I. Koch met with leaders of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, toured the city and gained what he believes are certain insights into the entire question of relations between blacks and whites, both here in New York City and throughout the nation. Here, he chronicles his day in Charleston, from the correspondence which preceded it to the thoughts which concluded it. We felt that it would be of interest to our readers as an example of how men and women of dedication and compassion can work together towards a common goal, despite the differences in the color of their skin.)

On April 29, I prepared and sent the following letter to President Richard Nixon which I circulated here on the Hill among my colleagues in the House. Out of the 33 to whom I submitted the letter, 25 cosigned it. The letter reads as follows:

"Dear Mr. President: The most serious problem which this country faces and which you as our President must deal with every day is the racial confrontation. It shows itself in a multitude of forms: the violent student demonstrations, the wild melees in our ghettos sometimes resulting in burning and looting, the disrespect for law and order. We all know that while violence can never be tolerated, it too often arises because the peaceful forms of protest, the lawful avenues of dissent, are shut off from those who have been shut out of our society. A vivid and current demonstration of the hopelessness and helplessness which lead to violations of the law and in this case, apparently peaceful non-violent demonstrations, is taking place in Charleston, South Carolina.

"In Charleston, hospital workers, seeking the right to unionize so as to be able to attempt a peaceful way to secure for themselves and their families a decent wage are being subjected to the kind of treatment that those who now make up the great unions of the country were faced with in 1935 when we had the age of the factory sit-ins, when courts enjoined picket lines. The workers of that era, primarily white, overcame the power structure of that day and as a result of their efforts, the Wagner Act was passed which made it clear that collective bargaining from that point on was to be the norm and not the exception. Today in Charleston, the most deprived of our society are seeking the same norm, namely collective bargaining and the power structure is again resisting.

"Mr. President, you have the opportunity to use the prestige of your great office and intercede on behalf of our most impoverished citizens who are not on welfare but are attempting to earn a living wage and who need our help. The same issue was present in the Memphis sanitation strike which culminated utimately in the tragic assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., who was present for the purpose of leading a protest march in support of the sanitation men on strike. History has a way of repeating itself so that today we see his widow, Coretta King, going to Charleston for that same purpose. We urge you to send your most trusted representative to be present so that those who feel they have no stake in our society will know that the President stands with them."

THE PRESIDENT RESPONDS

As I write this article, I have before me the response from the President dated May 6 which reads as follows:

"Dear Congressman Koch: I appreciate your letter of April 29, co-signed by various of your colleagues, requesting that I send a representative to Charleston 'to be present so that those who feel they have no stake in our society will know that the President stands with them.'

"The Administration has kept itself fully apprised of developments in Charleston during this controversy. I have directed the Attorney General to have observers on the scene. He is keeping me informed on a regular basis.

"I question whether the presence of a Presidential representative would aid in a fair resolution of the controversy, under the circumstances. I think each of us has an obligation, in situations of this kind, to do what we can to urge contending parties to resolve their differences in a calm atmosphere of mutual good faith. Let us join in urging the parties to quiet the situation and continue to seek a peaceful and mutually satisfactory solution to their problems.

"Sincerely,

"Richard M. Nixon."

The day after I sent my letter, I received a telegram from the Rev. Ralph Abernathy, as did a number of other congressmen here on the Hill. The telegram requested that I come to Charleston on May 11 to participate in what he referred to as a Mothers' Day March in support of the hospital employee strikers. When I received the telegram, for a brief moment I thought of the day of relaxation that might have been, but how could I not go?

In 1961, when New York State did not recognize the right of collective bargaining for its hospital workers, I marched in a picket line in front of the Manhattan Eye and Ear Hospital. And last year, when the sanitation workers in Memphis, Tenn., were seeking union recognition from the city, I marched with them.

So, I left LaGuardia Airport on Sunday morning at 11:10 a.m. for Charleston. For the next three hours I had as a seat companion a gentleman to whom I introduced myself and who, it turned out, was an affluent member of the business community. He had just come back from a pleasure trip to Greece and Turkey.

As we ate our meal and were served our drinks we talked. I rarely drink at 11:30 in the morning, but what can you do when the stewardess rolls through the plane with her liquors and plunks two—not one but two—miniature bottles of whatever you want on your table? When I was young I thought that the only people who drank during the day were the superintendents who fixed the plumbing when my mother called them. After they had fixed it, she would give them a drink with a tip. But, there I was, thirty or more years after those childhood episodes, drinking in the morning.

All I could manage was one Bloody Mary and when I returned the second bottle unopened to the stewardess, she said, "But, take it with you, it's yours."

TAKING NO CHANCES

"No," I said after a moment's thought. "I am going to Charleston and I don't know what's going to happen down there, but if I get arrested, I don't want the cops to find a bottle of liquor in my pocket." So, my seat companion took it home with him.

In those three hours of conversation that I had with my acquaintance, whose name I don't even recall now, I asked him about the racial situation in New York City. What did he think? What would he do? And he said, rather wistfully. "The people who used to be satisfied to earn a good living are now militant past the point of propriety." I decided not to argue with him—what good would it do? But I thought to myself, "What would he say to those on strike in Charleston who are earning $1.30 an hour? What would he say to the great number of under-employed and unemployed blacks in this country?"

We made one stop before Charleston—it was Charlotte—and about eight blacks got on the plane; one in particular stood out because of his flamboyant manner. Dressed in a suede vest cut with an Indian floral pattern, dark glasses and sideburns, he looked for all the world as though he were acting a part. I was sure he was going to the march and, sure enough, about two hours later I saw him on the platform at the County Convention Hall where he was introduced as Jessie Jackson, the man who was in charge of affairs at Resurrection City last year.

When we disembarked at Charleston and I approached the terminal, I noticed three blacks wearing buttons which said "Committee." I looked expectantly at them and one asked. "Are you Congressman Koch?" It was Mr. Harrison, a member of SCLC, who was to drive me to the motel where the committee was meeting. He was a big heavy-set man who said he taught school. I commented that he had no distinguishable southern accent for he really talked like a New Yorker, and he seemed startled by this observation.

At the motel, I entered a small room where there were about 15 people. In the center was the Rev. Ralph Abernathy and as I looked around I saw two old friends, Deputy Mayor Tim Costello and Jim McNamara. On every march I have ever been in involving civil rights. Tim and Jim were always there and I thought, "How nice."

I was introduced to Mr. Abernathy who was the only man in the room wearing cuff links and a carnation in his lapel, but somehow they did not seem out of place. "Let's all have lunch," he suggested, and we proceeded to the hotel's dining room. Sitting next to me was Ralph Abernathy's son, Ralph Abernathy III, a youngster about ten years old with a bright eyes and a sweet smile. He told me he was the only black child in his class which was located in a white Atlanta neighborhood, that he liked his teachers and that he was learning French. I asked him, "What do you want to be when you grow up?" And he said to me, "Well, I haven't made up my mind. I want to be either a minister, an attorney or a freedom fighter."

Also sitting next to me was a young man I judged to be about 30 years old. He said he was employed by the State of South Carolina and assigned as a bodyguard to Mr. Abernathy. I asked him whether being employed by the state made him suspect by others and he said, "Sure, it does for some," But, it was clear that there was a wealth of good feeling between the minister and his bodyguard.

When we left the restaurant to go to the county auditorium, I saw the Rangers for the first time, the men assigned to the job of security and order for the march. They wore red Texan stetsons, white bush jackets and trousers, black boots, and red or black kerchiefs. How different they seemed from the Black Panthers who, had they been present, would have worn their black berets, leather jackets and dark glasses. My hostility toward the inflammatory Panthers made me feel an empathy, a rapport with these Rangers who clearly were capable of defending the march without scaring the marchers. One of them, Francois Alvarez (the leader, I believe), looked like a young Juano Hernandez and assisted me in finding a seat on the platform.

In the car on the way to the County Hall, I sat next to a young black who was still in high school. Asked what he planned to do after he finished school he said he had already been interviewed by the FBI for placement with them and that he hoped to be accepted. It occurred to me that we have come a ways if J. Edgar Hoover is seeking out blacks and blacks, in turn, are thinking of an FBI career.

Perhaps 60 people were grouped on the platform, union leaders who included Leon Davis, the head of Local 1199 who had grown whiskers since I had last seen him. Then there were the interminable speeches, two of which were very moving—one by Walter Reuther, the other by Walter Fauntroy.

Mr. Reuther talked about unionism and solidarity and how they had brought General Motors to recognize in the early '30s that men have the right to organize in defense and sale of their labor. After speaking, he gave a $10,000 check to Mary Moultrie, a young black woman, chairman of the hospital strikers, who was perhaps 28 or 30. He kissed her as he gave her the check and then, as he gave Ralph Abernathy a bear hug, one of the people on the platform said to me, "The $10,000 will last us three days." Reuther, of course, had recognized this and said there would be more money coming so long as the strike lasted.

And then Walter Fauntroy, a minister, spoke. He talked about Martin Luther King. He repeated over and over that "Martin had had impossible dreams and had made some of them come true." He said, "Martin was different—he talked the talk and walked the walk." At the conclusion of his speech he sang the "Quest" song from The Man of La Mancha—of the impossible dream and the unreachable star. And the hall was hushed as he sang *a capella*, and tears trickled down his face.

When he finished, two ladies were introduced; one was the mother to be honored that day, the other was Rosa Parks, the woman who, in Montgomery, Ala., back in 1956 or so, had been the instigator of the Montgomery bus boycott. She was a woman, very fragile and serene, who appeared almost white in feature and color and said not a word as she held the floral bonquet that was handed to her. Here, I thought, stands one of the great women in America's history who had the courage and the stamina not to give up her seat to a white man just because the law said she must, and who, because of her bravery, inspired Montgomery to walk to work for 364 days until the bus company was brought to its knees and changed its rules, rules which, had they been attacked in court five years later, would have been ruled unconstitutional in any event.

Time was running out; we would have to leave shortly to catch our plane. Congressman John Conyers from Detroit, who led the delegation of five Congressmen—which included William F. Ryan, Allard K. Lowenstein, and myself from New York, and Charles C. Diggs Jr. and John Conyers from Michigan—was asked to speak for all of us. As I sat there, a train of thoughts ran through my head which went something like this. What has happened since the March on Washington? Why is it there are warmth and brotherhood here in Charleston and coldness and apartheid in New York City? I thought of other civil rights campaigns I had been in—walking in the 1963 Washington March; volunteering as a lawyer in Laurel, Miss., in 1964; and lending moral support in Montgomery, Ala., in 1965 and in Memphis, Tenn., a little over a year ago. I remembered those events and I thought of New York City today and wondered why we had permitted the lunatics, black and white, to end the partnership.

Then, John Conyers introduced each of us by name, and as I returned to my seat, Mary Moultrie held out her hand, saying thank you. I gave her a kiss and then went over to Ralph Abernathy who stood with his arms held out. We embraced one another in an *abrazo*.

As I left the hall to get to the airport in the Volkswagen that was jammed with three Congressmen and one Deputy Mayor of the City of New York and a driver, I kept thinking of what I would have liked to have said. I wanted to tell them that Ralph Abernathy III had summed it up when he said he wanted to be a freedom fighter, and I would have told them that he would not have to choose as he thought, but that he could be a freedom fighter along with being a minister or an attorney. Sophomoric as it might have sounded, I would have said that I intend to be a Congressman and a freedom fighter.

I thought again of President Nixon's response, "I question whether the presence of a Presidential representative would aid in a fair resolution of the controversy . . . How different from what John F. Kennedy would have said, and I was reminded of the quote from Dante which the late President often used, "The hottest places in Hell are reserved for those who, in time of great moral crisis, maintain their neutrality." It is not the President alone, but all of us who will be damned if we stand aside.

[From the New York Times, July 19, 1969]

SECOND HOSPITAL ENDS CAROLINA STRIKE—113-DAY WALKOUT MARKED BY TURMOIL IN CHARLESTON

CHARLESTON, S.C., July 18.—A 113-day strike at Charleston County Hospital ended today.

XUM

The settlement came three weeks after an end to a larger, companion strike at the South Carolina Medical University Hospital.

The walkout by low-paid Negro nonprofessional workers, most of whom are women, brought organized labor and the civil rights movement together for the first time in the South.

Sitting beside Miss Rosetta Simmons, chairman of a five-member negotiating team for the strikers, Mitchell Graham, chairman of the Charleston County Council, told a news conference, "I am happy that strike and turmoil in the streets of Charleston have ended."

Miss Simmons said, "We are returning to work with a relation of mutual respect and dignity."

Forty-two of the 65 workers will return to work Tuesday and the council agreed "to make every effort" to employ the others within three months without any overstaffing.

An announcement of the settlement scheduled for 10 a.m. was delayed six hours by a disagreement over details of a grievance procedure.

Finally, the County Council agreed to a proposal by the workers to end the strike, but to continue to work on the grievance procedure.

After a two-hour morning session ended without agreement, the Charleston project director for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Carl Farris, was arrested outside the council offices on a disorderly conduct charge and a charge of blocking a driveway while leading a demonstration of about 30 teenagers.

About an hour earlier pickets had been ordered to return to the hospital, and there was a possibility that the settlement talks would collapse.

The workers' committee and the County Council met most of Wednesday and yesterday working out settlement terms.

Mr. Graham termed the settlement a victory "only for the people of Charleston county and those who are ill at the hospital."

"We gained recognition as human beings in this community," Miss Simmons said of the striking workers. "It has accomplished a lot for the poor people of the city," she said. Mr. Graham promised a minimum hourly wage of at least $1.70 next year and to attempt to make it $1.75.

The hospital had increased its minimum wage from $1.30 an hour to $1.60 on July 1 to conform with the new minimum at the Medical University Hospital.

A week ago the County Council had refused to set a time table on the rehiring of all the workers, a key demand by the strikers.

Miss Simmons expressed confidence that all would return to work before 90 days.

In adidtion to accepting the timetable for re-employment the County Council also dropped a ban on union activities by the workers from its offer of last week. Also dropped was a provision that would have made a worker with pending criminal charges ineligible for re-employment.

Several workers had been jailed during street demonstrations earlier in the strike.

The strike brought the leadership conference and Local 1199 of the Hospital and Nursing Home Workers together in Charleston. Miss Simmons praised leaders of both groups for their roles. Isaiah Bennett, state director of Local 1199B in Charleston, said the next emphasis would be on voter registration and an attempt to organize poor workers throughout the state.

The grievance procedure was slowed by an insistence by the workers' committee for a written provision to allow a worker with a grievance to have another worker accompany him at any stage of the grievance procedure.

This was provided in the settlement of the Medical University strike.

Mr. Graham said the grievance procedure would be reviewed with all county employees and changes adopted if found necessary. But a union official, Henry Nicholas, told newsmen later that the council had agreed privately to continue negotiations with Miss Simmons and her committee on this point. Mr. Nicholas is assistant national organizing director of Local 1199 in New York.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, July 24, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear?—Psalm 27: 1.

O God, our Father, in a world filled with the noise of those who put their faith in violence and whose loud clamor would drown out the efforts of those who seek the rights of men in the right way, we come praying to be kept steady in a world of change and to be made strong in a swiftly moving age.

Grant unto us a vision of Thy greatness and an experience of Thy presence that we may lead our Nation in the good paths of righteousness and peace.

Help us to meet this hard day with high courage, to do our demanding duties with undying devotion and to practice what we profess lest our professions be proven impractical.

Give to these leaders of our people the insight and the inspiration to lead our beloved Republic in making the American dream a reality in our day.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO FILE A REPORT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight, July 24, 1969, to file a report on the bill H.R. 13079, to extend the interest equalization tax until August 31, 1969.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 13080

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H.R. 13080) to continue for an additional 15 days the existing rates of income tax withholding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 121]

Abbitt
Arends
Blackburn
Broyhill, Va.
Cahill
Carey
Celler
Clark
Conyers
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Halpern
Hawkins
Howard
Ichord
Kirwan
Kleppe
Landgrebe
Lipscomb
Lowenstein
Lujan
May
O'Konski
Ottinger
Pike
Poage
Powell
Rostenkowski
Scheuer
Stokes
Teague, Tex.
Wiggins

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 396 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on International Trade of the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this been cleared with the minority?

Mr. ASHLEY. It is my understanding that this has been cleared; yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 4813 UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until midnight Friday, July 25, to file a report on the bill H.R. 4813.

Mr. Speaker, this has been cleared by the minority side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY)?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the nature of this legislation?

Mr. GRAY. The bill, H.R. 4813, extends the provisions of the U.S. Fishing Fleet Improvement Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12964) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous concent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, and that the time be equally divided and controlled by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

APOLLO 11 SPLASHDOWN

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I announce to the House the very wonderful news that Apollo 11's droge chutes are now out, it is on the way down, and is 5 minutes from splashdown. The astronauts are back.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman if he thinks that 2 hours will be enough time to properly discuss that part of the hearings dealing with Mr. Bator and others from the Educational and Cultural Center.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman is referring to Edmund Bator?

Mr. GROSS. I believe that is the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I do not think we will spend too much time with that gentleman. I do not think he has any brains in his head.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 12964, with Mr. HAYS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

As I have previously mentioned, this is the bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

On page 2 of the committee report there will be found a table which indicates the action of the committee as compared with the amounts of the budget requests and as compared with last year's appropriations. As indicated in this table, the total amount recommended in the funding bill in new obligational authority is $2,534,134,200, which is an increase of $479,461,300 over the total provided for fiscal year 1969. This large increase is due primarily to the additional $244,466,000 provided to the Department of Justice to combat crime and narcotics violations, the increase of $120,850,000 provided for the taking of the 19th Decennial Census and the increase of $89,739,000 for the Maritime Administration, principally for new ship construction. The amount requested in the budget estimate for the Maritime Administration for the item of ship construction subsidies was $15,918,000, which is a completely unrealistic figure.

The table I have referred to reads as follows:

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969 (enacted to date)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the bill	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969 (enacted to date)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Department of State	$398, 091, 600	$408, 381, 000	$404, 122, 600	+$6, 031, 000	−$4, 258, 400
Department of Justice	545, 582, 000	845, 976, 000	790, 048, 000	+244, 466, 000	−55, 928, 000
Department of Commerce	767, 563, 000	812, 486, 000	956, 450, 000	+188, 887, 000	+143, 964, 000
The Judiciary	109, 944, 900	125, 024, 600	121, 026, 200	+11, 081, 300	−3, 998, 400
Related Agencies	233, 491, 400	283, 837, 000	262, 487, 400	+28, 996, 000	−21, 349, 600
Total	2, 054, 672, 900	2, 475, 704, 600	2, 534, 134, 200	+479, 461, 300	+58, 429, 600

For many years past, we have been appropriating $120, $130, $140 million and more for American ship construction subsidies. It would appear that with the ridiculously low requested amount, to wit: $15,918,000, together with the unobligated balance in the hands of the Maritime Administration, provisions would be made for the building of eight to 10 new ships during this fiscal year. The committee, fully realizing this completely unrealistic approach to solution of our merchant marine problems has appropriated $200 million carried in this bill for ship construction subsidies. This would provide not even a sufficient number of ships necessary to catch up with the Soviet Union and other foreign powers in their ship construction programs. It would provide approximately 30 to 33 new ships this year.

Continuing with regard to the contents of the pending bill, and beginning with the first of the departments provided for therein, we find that the Department of State revised budget estimates for fiscal year 1970, as presented to the committee, totaled $408,381,000. The committee has included in this bill $404,122,600, which is a reduction of $4,258,400 in the total budget estimates and is an increase of $6,031,000 over the total appropriations for fiscal year 1969.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an announcement?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is a great pleasure to announce that the three astronauts have now splashed down 9 miles off the carrier *Hornet*. The horizon is 10 miles. So they are now proceeding in the *Hornet* to pick up the astronauts.

Everybody hoped they would land safely. They have now returned safely to earth, and we hope they will be picked up safely.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am sure there is not a person in this Chamber and in this Committee of the Whole who does not welcome the news just delivered by our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON).

To return to the requested appropriations for the Department of State, we say in this report that much has been said and written about the number of positions in the Department of State, both here and abroad. Insofar as the appropriations therefor, which are contained in title I of the accompanying bill, the total number of positions provided amounts to 15,073, which is actually less than the number provided 8 year ago. This record has been accomplished through the efforts of the Department of State, headed by Secretary Rusk in the previous administration and by Secretary Rogers in the current administration, as well as some little assistance on the part of the Committees on Appropriations and the Congress. Two career foreign service officers, Deputy Under Secretaries of State for Administration William J. Crockett and Idar Rimestad, are also entitled to commendations for their leadership.

The first of the items for the Department of State is entitled "Salaries and Expenses." The committee has included $207,095,600 for these salaries and expenses. I should point out, as indicated at page 3 of the report, that no funds were requested for the opening of any additional passport offices and no funds whatever have been provided for that purpose in this bill.

The next item is the so-called representation allowances, which I believe the distinguished gentleman from Iowa has commented on on previous occasions. The committee is including for these allowances $993,000, as authorized by section 901 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946. This amount is the same as provided in the 5 preceding years.

It is the full amount requested in the budget estimate. It should provide, I shall say to my distinguished friend, ample entertainment for our Embassies and posts abroad.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I should think a million dollars would be ample for liquor and food.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Oh, but that is not all, I must say to my distinguished friend. We also have some money in this bill in connection with the American mission to the United Nations. They must have some entertainment money. And the U.S. Information Agency has to do some entertaining, too.

Mr. GROSS. That would have been the next question. How much do you have for all the rest of these international organizations of one kind or another?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We have not increased any one of them.

Mr. GROSS. Could there not have been a cut with respect to this?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Theoretically there could have been a cut. However, we must make sure that they have enough money to dispense martinis, gibsons, whiskies and sodas, and such things when they are required. This is a worldwide operation, I say to my distinguished friend.

Mr. GROSS. I understand. It seems the more money we spend the more trouble we get into around the world. If it is trouble we want, we ought to spend more money.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, we considered a number of items in this bill which we thought might contribute to trouble between ourselves and other countries, and we have not allowed any funds at all for them. But we certainly cannot deny our diplomats the entertainment which becomes necessary. These are—what did we call them some years ago?

Mr. GROSS. Tools of the trade.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Tools of the trade.

Continuing through the Department of State, I should like to pause here and point out, with regard to the item for international fisheries commissions, that the committee has allowed the sum of $2,335,000 to cover the U.S. share of expenses of eight international fisheries commissions in which it participates, and also for the expenses of the U.S. commissioners. The amount allowed is $260,000 more than was appropriated for fiscal year 1969 and is $180,000 over the amount of the budget estimate.

The committee has approved $1,263,000 for the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, which is an increase of $200,000 over the amount of the budget estimate, for the control of sea lamprey eels.

The final item to which I should like to direct attention under the Department of State is entitled "Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Activities." Here the amount allowed is the same amount as was appropriated for fiscal year 1969 and is a decrease of $3,975,000 from the amount of the budget estimate.

This has been the result of the committee's discovery that the Department of State has been sending some viciously obscene and filthy plays abroad to be exhibited, of all places, in countries behind the Iron Curtain. We all know that when the Soviet Union and Iron Curtain countries send their examples of their culture to this country they are meticulous insofar as their being above reproach as to obscenity or pornography.

First they proposed to send a certain play which was observed by a representative of the Department of State, who is no longer with them. He is back in the Information Agency, which he should never have left. This was Mr. Bator, referred to by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. Bator went out to the University of Kansas and attended a pre-presentation of these plays. He saw the exact presentation which was to be given behind the Iron Curtain in such countries as Yugoslavia, Poland, et cetera. He thought one of these plays "America Hurrah" was so raw that it should be deleted from the program. By the time the committee was holding hearings we had obtained the script of a play called "Chicago," which Mr. Bator approved. This play was so vicious that we thought they would abandon the whole project, but, no, lo and behold, they decided to also take that one out, and then sent the screwball professor who directed the presentation and eight or nine students from the University of Kansas abroad behind the Iron Curtain. I recited lines from the script of one of the plays sent abroad in the full Committee on Appropriations last Monday. However, I do not believe I shall do that at this time. If there is any Member present who wishes to read the lines of these plays, we have them here at the committee table and would be glad to let Members read them. For instance, in one of these plays, the one entitled "Chicago," there is an obscene word of five letters used in the form of the present participle and it appears seven times in this one paragraph [indicating]. This is here for any Member who cares to read it, as well as the scripts of the other two plays. One of those plays which was sent abroad I read to the full committee on Monday. I would rather not do that today, however, but anyone who wishes to read about "you know what" from the American dream can do so.

Now, the next item in this bill is title II for the Department of Justice.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he leaves that subject?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman see the article in the Topeka, Kans., State Journal of July 10?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I hope the gentleman is not going to remind me that the professor came from Brooklyn.

Mr. GROSS. That is what the item says. He is one, Frederick Litto, professor of drama at the University of Kansas.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is what I was afraid of.

Mr. GROSS. And he describes the play "Chicago," in this fashion: "it is very simply a man sitting in a bathtub commenting on a fictitious society."

Mr. ROONEY of New York. He is nuts. You can read the script right here which shows that they use the obscene word seven times in that one paragraph, and, if I recall correctly, they used it three times in this next paragraph. They struck out an obscene four-letter word in the form of the present participle and added the five-letter obscene word in the form of the present participle. The gentleman, Mr. Bator, told us that he thought the five-letter obscene word with "ing" attached to it is not as bad as the obscene four-letter word with "ing" attached to it.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that I have just seen a copy of the script of this play "Chicago," and I do not know when, if ever, I have read a filthier, more poorly written play. It is almost beyond description.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The script of "Chicago" in the printed hearings is not in pure, unadulterated form, because we had to use dashes for the many vicious words, but if the gentleman wants to read it in the raw, here it is.

Mr. GROSS. It is bad enough in the copy that the members of the committee supplied me with on this side of the aisle a few moments ago. This is a play that is being exported to the Communist countries or, at least, was intended to be exported to them. Is that not correct?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. With money from the taxpayers of this country?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is true.

XUM

Mr. GROSS. And what is the appropriation for this mutual educational and cultural business? Has the gentleman's committee cut them down?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We not only cut them down. We cut out every dollar for the so-called special educational and cultural projects.

Mr. GROSS. Cut them out altogether?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Altogether. And, incidentally, this action will allow $685,000 over the amount provided last year for the student exchange program which has some merit.

Mr. GROSS. I commend and compliment both the gentleman from New York and the other committee members for this action. The gentleman is aware that he is going to be accused of being uncultural?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I have been accused of that since I was a young fellow in Brooklyn, although I happen to have been a charter member of local 802 of the musicians' union.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to revert to the Department of Justice, the revised budget estimates for fiscal year 1970 total $845,976,000. The committee recommends in the pending bill $790,048,000, which is a reduction of $55,928,000 in the total requested and is an increase of $244,466,000 over the appropriation for the preceding fiscal year.

This large increase allowed for the Department of Justice is primarily related to the crime control program. It would in that regard include funds for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Bureau of Narcotic and Dangerous Drugs, the Bureau of Narcotics now being a part of the Department of Justice. It was formerly in the Treasury Department.

Then we have funds for U.S. attorneys and marshals and the funding of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act.

In connection with the Community Relations Service which is referred to at page 9 of the report, the committee has included the sum of $3,077,000 which would provide an increase of 43 positions. This is one of a number of items where the present speaker proposed the full amount requested but could not obtain sufficient votes in the subcommittee therefor, or, for that matter, in the full committee.

The gentleman from New York also proposed the full amount requested for the Federal Judicial Center, the Department of Health, Welfare, and Education, Office of Education, Civil Rights, Education, and the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, salaries and expenses.

Now we shall proceed, if we may, to "Law Enforcement Assistance Administration." The committee recommends a total of $250 million for grants, contracts, loans, and other law enforcement assistance authorized by title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, including departmental salaries and other expenses in connection therewith.

In addition, the sum of $3.4 million included in the appropriation for the Federal Bureau of Investigation is authorized within the same act.

The distribution of the $250 million will be found at page 12 of the committee report.

We next proceed to the Department of Commerce, which is title III of the bill.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. NIX. I understand that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission——

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I have not as yet gotten to the details of that.

Mr. NIX. Well, then, I shall be glad to wait until we come to that item to discuss it with the chairman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The committee recommends an increase of $188,887,000 over the 1969 appropriation for the Department of Commerce. This increase is due primarily to the funding of $137,850,000 for the Nineteenth Decennial Census which is $120,850,000 over the 1969 appropriation, and the $200 million which I previously mentioned for Maritime Administration ship construction subsidy.

If there are any questions with regard to the Department of Commerce, I shall be glad to endeavor to answer them. If not, with the permission of the Chairman, I shall turn to page 16——

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman goes to that subject, I believe—and if I remember correctly, in the hearings, the gentleman said he could not find where the expenditure for the Department of Commerce Tourist Bureau had produced one single tourist.

What did you do? Did you give them some more money to perpetuate that kind of an operation, or did you cut them off?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that, no, we did not give them any extra money at all. We gave them the same amount as they had in the fiscal year just ended.

Mr. GROSS. How much was that?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It was $4.5 million.

Mr. GROSS. And on the record of past performance that they could not say last year's expenditure had produced a single tourist?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I do not believe there is any question about that. In the countries where we do not have a travel service office the increase in visitors, as I recall, was about 183 percent as compared with only 132 percent increase from the countries where we do have a so-called travel service office. But we run a democratic committee, I say to my friend from Iowa—and that is a small "d." I get outvoted ever so often.

Mr. GROSS. What did the gentleman say about Iowa? I could not hear the gentleman?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I said "I say to my distinguished friend from Iowa."

Mr. GROSS. But the fact is that you appropriated as much money as you did last year for an outfit that, on the record of the hearings, could not show that they had produced a single tourist.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is so. One would have to admit that. We have been pointing out the same thing for a number of years, as a matter of fact, since the U.S. Travel Service was born, and back when they illegally spent the money for cuff links and ladies' bracelets and gave them away free of charge.

Does the gentleman remember that?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. The gentleman showed me a set of jewelry, if you can call it that. But I would hope that next year the committee, unless they show results, would clip their wings, but good.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I can assure the gentleman that I will be guided by the record of next year's hearings, with the Lord's help.

Now, there is one other item in the Department of Commerce that I should like to call to the attention of the committee, and that is the so-called minority business enterprise, salaries and expenses.

This is an amount of $1.2 million for the Office of Minority Business Enterprise, which was established in March of 1969 by Executive Order 11458. This Office is responsible for developing and coordinating programs aimed at increasing and strengthening the role of minority groups in the business life of America.

Proceeding to page 19, we find title IV of this bill, "The judiciary."

The total amount of the estimates for fiscal year 1970, as prepared and presented by the judicial branch, is $125,024,600. The committee has allowed a total of $121,026,200, which is a reduction of $3,998,400 in the total amount requested, and is an increase of $11,081,300 over the appropriations for fiscal year 1969.

The various courts and the provisions made therefor are included on the pages following page 19.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes, I yield to my distinguished friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is my understanding that two Justices of the Supreme Court requested 10 more policemen, because they claimed the present 32 policemen at the Supreme Court are inadequate—I am quoting—"are inadequate under today's conditions to maintain the standard of security needed for the Supreme Court Building."

It seems to me it is ironical for Justices of the Supreme Court to come in wailing about the lack of police to protect them in view of the Court's decisions that have contributed to the lack of law and order.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The amount which is provided for 10 additional policemen, approved by the committee as requested by the Supreme Court, is merely $78,000. The committee feels that the building itself, the physical building across Capitol Plaza here is of such value and means so much to the American public that we want it adequately protected at all times.

XUM

So, for that reason, we augmented their police force by $78,000.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with that, but——

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I knew the gentleman would.

Mr. GROSS. But I would hope the gentleman would impress upon the Justices that they have contributed to the situation that exists in this country.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman from Iowa must realize that the present speaker is only a lowly Congressman from New York who would not presume to dictate to the Chief Justice and the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. I do not underestimate the effectiveness of the gentleman when he wants to be.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The committee had a request for nine additional law clerks for the eminent Justices but did not approve all of that request. The committee did allow three law clerks this year. Perhaps the committee will give them three more next year. At the end of the third year, they might have their requested nine additional law clerks.

This seems to be the orderly and sensible way to go about this. If they had taken the committee's suggestion 3 years ago, they would have their nine additional law clerks by now.

Mr. Chairman, under title V—related agencies, a total of $262,487,400 is included in the accompanying bill for the 13 different agencies funded under this title. This amount is a reduction of $21,349,600 in the total amount of the budget estimates and is an increase of $28,996,000 over the total amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1969.

Included in the 13 agencies, the total amount requested for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is allowed. The full amount for the Civil Rights Commission has again been allowed, to wit: $2,650,000, the full amount in the budget estimate and the amount authorized by law.

Also included in these 13 related agencies, is the item to which the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. NIX) made reference a while ago. This is to be found on page 23 of the committee report. It is an allowance of $10,000,000 for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which is an increase of $880,000 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

Mr. NIX. If the gentleman will yield, I understand the request by the Commission was for $15.9 million.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is correct.

Mr. NIX. In view of the fact that the past chairman, Mr. Alexander, complained bitterly about the lack of cooperation and the lack of money and in view of the fact that the present chairman, Mr. Brown, echoes that criticism, I wonder what the thinking of the committee was? What was the discussion in the committee on this question?

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I rise to say that at the appropriate time I expect to offer an amendment which will increase substantially the amount, and I would like to say, since the chairman is himself too modest to say it perhaps, that he has been very helpful and has been trying to obtain funding. I hope I am not telling a secret out of school when I say he has been trying to obtain full funding.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I proposed that the committee approve the full amount in the course of the markup, but I just did not have the votes. This Commission ought to be realistic. Whether Mr. Alexander or Mr. Brown is the head of it, I must point out that they have been furnished a substantial number of additional people every year. With the number of additional people we have given them we find the situation becomes no better than it was the year before.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. NIX. I understand that upwards of 11,000 cases were presented to the Commission in the year 1968. I am hopeful that I am being given some assurance at the present time that some effort will be made to increase the amount.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I can only assure the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I will offer an amendment. I cannot assure him of what the result will be.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The great trouble with this outfit in Government is that they are not too realistic.

Here is the situation: In 1967 they had 314 positions. In 1968 they had 389 positions. In 1969, the year that ended just this past June 30, they had 579 positions.

How far and how fast are they going to go? They come along now and they want 241 additional positions for a total of 820, and yet with all of these increases the backlog of complaints or whatever it was the gentleman from Pennsylvania referred to has not been reduced.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I think it is important, however, to give some idea of the number of investigations that were made. I have some figures on that from the Commission. Back in 1966 they had some 8,000 cases——

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I think the gentleman from Ohio will find all of those figures in the printed hearings of the subcommittee.

Mr. TAFT. I agree, Mr. Chairman, but in view of the fact that there will be an amendment offered later, I think it would be well to point out now that there were only 8,000 investigations in 1966. The figure went up to 12,000 in 1969, and to some 15,000 which are expected next year. The increased number of personnel and the increase to be asked for by the amendment would be in view of those figures.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am glad the gentleman feels as he does about this matter. I would like to have had him with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON) and myself when we were marking up this bill. Of course, I would not want the gentleman's help on a number of other items in this bill—and I say that facetiously.

If there are no further questions, Mr. Chairman, that concludes my statement on the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG).

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, as usual, the distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of our subcommittee, has covered this bill so well that it is difficult really to find any area on which he has not already touched. My intention is to take very little time on this subject because I am sure we are ready to get into the amending procedure.

I do, however, want to mention just a few things. First, the gentleman commented regarding the State Department and the fact that the State Department has less employees today than it had 6 or 8 years ago. I think probably the State Department is used more as a whipping boy than almost any agency, and yet when we realize the number of new posts that have been added, with new nations coming into existence around the world, the Department has been able to hold the line on new employees. As far as the total budget is concerned, I think State's is one of the tightest we have in this bill, and probably one of the tightest we have in Government.

Not only do I believe credit is due to the efforts of former Secretary of State Dean Rusk and the present Secretary of State William Rogers, but I believe also over the years the Secretaries have had very fine Deputy Under Secretaries for Administration. Bill Crockett, who is now retired, was an excellent administrator, and he has been followed by Idar Rimestad, who is the present man in the post. He has done an equally good job.

I want just briefly to touch on the question of mutual educational and cultural exchanges. I think we can all agree it is important that we exchange people, and it is important that our people go abroad and that others come here. I have never heard anyone opposed to this. However, when we get a program that expands rapidly, we do run the risk of incurring abuses. The distinguished chairman of this subcommittee has pointed out one of them. I also believe the Department was negligent in not paying attention to the record developed in our hearings and in not stopping this "play" from going overseas. As a result of their failure to do so, we felt we had to take action ourselves.

But, just so no one will get the idea we are not going to have plenty of people to exchange, I call attention to page 839 of part 2 of our hearings, and there under the heading of "American Lecturers, Research Scholars and Professors, 1968–1969 Academic Year," in order to have all of them listed, we have to go from

XUM

page 839 to page 977. There are literally hundreds of these professors and scholars going overseas.

I do not object to a reasonable number going over, but sometimes there are fiscal conditions that would indicate some of them might very well stay home. I have said this before and I will say it again. I wonder sometimes how we have enough professors to take care of the growing student load in the United States when we have so many going overseas, and some of them for, perhaps, studies that I am not sure will have a great deal of impact on the long-term best interest of the United States.

I also want to call attention to one item here, and I call it to the attention of Members, because it has a particular impact in the area which I represent, and that is the Great Lakes area. I want to express my appreciation to the subcommittee and to the full committee for recognizing the need for eradication of the lamprey eel. We did add $200,000 over the budget for lamprey eel eradication. I am sure most of the Members who have been here over the years recognize this has been a very difficult problem in the Great Lakes area.

We have appropriated money for this commission for many years and we have had great success, especially in Lake Superior and in Lake Michigan with the eradication of the eel. The problem now is in Lake Huron, where they report 50 percent scarring on the Cohoes which have been caught in that lake. This is a wise expenditure. It will also generate some funds from the Canadian part of the commission to help bring this problem under effective control.

If we can continue to have a well-funded program, it will prevent a crash program later on.

Over the years because of the lamprey eel we had an absolute stop in trout and whitefish commercial fishing in Lake Superior and Lake Michigan. That fishing had been a substantial part of the area's economy many years ago. Now that the lamprey eel is being eradicated, fishing is coming back, and I am grateful we are going to be able to have a program that will extend to other areas affected by the lamprey eel.

With respect to the Department of Justice, the gentleman has alluded to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration for which we put in $250 million. The budget request was approximately $297 million. Last year it was funded at about $60 million.

I do not want this reduction of approximately $47 million to indicate in any way that our subcommittee is not concerned about adequately funding this program. However, we do want to fund it as orderly and as sensibly as we can. I particularly believe when we go from $60 million in one year to $250 million in the next year, this is a rather substantial amount to try to digest.

The fact is that one-quarter of this fiscal year will have gone by before the bill becomes law. I believe we have done well by this program.

In the narcotics area we funded 100 percent. We are not unmindful that the President sent up a message on narcotics, and more funds may be required. We are ready to do everything we possibly can to be sure that this program is carried out as intended, but we are not going to give them so much money that they can just spread it around and not use it effectively.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee is to be commended for its generous yet prudent recommendations with respect to the Justice Department appropriation for fiscal year 1970. The committee has reduced this budget request of $845.9 million by $55.9 million, or a modest 6.6 percent. This is clear evidence of the committee's commitment to improved criminal justice and strengthened law enforcement in America.

I am particularly pleased to see that the committee has recommended full funding for the FBI and the Bureau of Narcotics. Another vitally important program within the Department of Justice is the Law Enforcement Assistance program authorized in title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. Title I embraces the all-important block grant funding concept which insures full partnership in law-enforcement functions by State and local governmental officials.

The Appropriations Committee has recommended $250 million for these title I programs which is down $46 million from the request submitted by both this and the previous administration. The action grant portion of the Law Enforcement Assistance program was reduced from $229.6 million to $200 million—a drop of 13 percent. While I can fully appreciate the tremendous demands being made on our limited general revenue funds, I would hope that in the future we could provide full funding for these title I programs as well as for the FBI and the Bureau of Narcotics.

The States have done an outstanding job of developing their comprehensive plans for the utilization of Federal funds. I am convinced that an appropriation of $200 million for these action grants during the current fiscal year represents one of the wisest investments we can make in strengthening and improving the quality of law enforcement and of the administration of justice throughout America.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota. I am well aware of the contribution which he has made in the formulation of this legislation as a member of the Judiciary Committee and his keen interest in it. I have to agree with him that the action grant program to the States of $200 million, we feel, will be most important in trying to do something in this particular area.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. As I said earlier, we did allow everything for the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, and also for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. These are a rather substantial increase, but as we pass these new pieces of legislation we always add more work for the FBI and more investigative people are required year after year, so we felt that we could do nothing less than this.

As to the Department of Commerce, I can say I believe none of us fully agrees with everything in an appropriation bill. It is a result of a meeting of minds in the subcommittee.

The Secretary of Commerce was interested in having his administrative arm strengthened. I should have liked to have strengthened it even more. We only allowed him eight new positions in this area. I believe it might have been wise to have done somewhat better here.

I also have some reservations regarding the Economic Development Administration. I believe we cut them too much. This is another difference of opinion existing within the subcommittee, and if there are any changes we will iron them out in conference.

As everyone knows, we will be taking a decennial census next year, and funds are provided for that. It may be of some interest to the members of the committee to read some of the testimony given by the Director of the Bureau of the Census.

We have had a great deal of discussion about this decennial census, the asking of questions, and whether or not this ought to be mandatory and so forth. It might be helpful to answer some of your mail if you will read the hearings on the Bureau of the Census, because I believe they are enlightening.

The chairman of the subcommittee did mention that we provided $200 million for ship construction in this bill. I believe this is an indication of the concern of our subcommittee for the merchant marine and the deterioration of the merchant marine fleet, and our recognition that something is going to have to be done in that regard.

As I understand the situation, there is a proposal which has been presented by the Department of Commerce to the White House. It is under active study and consideration now. I believe that probably late this year or perhaps early next year the administration will present some kind of orderly ship replacement program which is going to be essential if we are to keep an active merchant marine.

No one has said much about the U.S. Information Agency here today. This is another area where we may have cut a little too deeply.

I do not know. We had this agreement in the subcommittee and we are trying to live up to it.

The U.S. Information Agency, I believe, under the direction of Mr. Shakespeare, a former CBS executive is going to try to do the kind of a job which is essential in order to permit us to put our best foot forward on the international scene.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Has the gentleman taken notice of anything that

XUM

Mr. Shakespeare has done worthwhile up to now, outside of going on a trip abroad.

Mr. CEDERBERG. You really do not get much knowledge of anything within the span of only 5 months. However, let me say this: I have been impressed with most of the former Directors of the U.S. Information Agency, whether they were under the Democrat administration or under the Republican administration. I remember when Mr. Edward R. Murrow came before the committee; he did a very, very acceptable job. I also remember Carl Rowan who was once Director of that Agency. Mr. Shakespeare, is a former executive of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman will yield further, is he not a television man? He is not a book man or a playwright.

Mr. CEDERBERG. He may be a television man, but that is one facet of the Nation's news media, and television is becoming more and more important in the communications business than it ever has been before. I appreciate the colloquy I had with the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The distinguished gentleman appreciates my help, does he?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I appreciate the help of the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. The gentleman from Michigan knows, coming from the State of Michigan, that the States of Michigan and Ohio especially northwestern Ohio is subjected to very severe storms throughout the year. In northern Ohio we have just experienced on July 4 a very, very severe storm. We have heard over the last year or two about the inadequacy of the Toledo Weather Bureau's record and so forth.

I am just wondering whether or not there is anything in this bill which will provide some additional equipment. I am sure that in the case of Toledo additional equipment is needed and that more manpower is needed for these weather bureau stations so that they can adequately forewarn the people of these oncoming storms.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I cannot answer specifically the gentleman's question regarding the station at Toledo, but I do not believe there is anything in this legislation which would not permit them to do whatever they feel is necessary in that particular area of interest.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, let me call the gentleman's attention to page 8 of the hearings, part 3, to the colloquy between the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) and Secretary Stans wherein he stated as follows:

> We have worked on eliminating 14 Weather Bureau stations because of our manpower limitations, and after a lot of analysis of their importance to the communities we decided to keep 4 of those and close 9 or 10, and this has caused a great amount of pressure on us from various people.

Then the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) stated:

> You had better stay with the 14.

Then, the discussion went off the record. I am interested in what might have happened in this discussion off the record as pertains to the Toledo Weather Bureau station. Is the gentleman from Michigan familiar with it?

Mr. CEDERBERG. No, I am not, but I do not think it was discussed off the record at all. Was Toledo one of the stations that was closed?

Mr. LATTA. I do not know whether it is or is not. But it should not be closed. We should have additional manpower at that station and we should have some additional equipment. I say this in view of the fact that we lost 34 lives in the State of Ohio as a result of that July 4 storm and we lost millions and millions of dollars in property. The Federal Government and the President declared this area a disaster area and the sum of $1 million has already been allocated for it and additional millions are going to have to be allocated for it.

It seems to me, in view of the fact that we have these storms in that area year after year, we are being penny wise and pound foolish in not putting in the additional few dollars that would be necessary to forewarn these people of these oncoming storms.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I do not disagree with the gentleman at all. I can only assume that the gentleman and members of his delegation have been in touch with the Weather Bureau people. I can only speak for myself in saying that as one member of the subcommittee I would certainly support whatever is necessary to provide the manpower and the equipment to adequately forewarn citizens of the area. I see nothing wrong with that at all.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I would merely like to point out that this last week the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works was out in this area. Certainly its members, sitting in Toledo, Sandusky, and Cleveland, will attest to the fact that they need additional storm warning in that area. I would hope there is no cutback in this field and that in fact additional spending will be forthcoming.

I might say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that on this coming Saturday the director of the Weather Bureau will be in Toledo to investigate the inadequacies of that station. I hope when they come to your subcommittee for additional financing, that there will be money forthcoming for this purpose.

Mr. CEDERBERG. You can be mighty sure when they come before us we will certainly give the matter a hard look. We are reaching a point where this science is advancing so fast and the state of the art has advanced so much that consolidations can take place. With new equipment we can cover wider areas and do a much better job. Nevertheless, the point you bring up is certainly worthy of consideration, and I can assure you that we will do this.

Mr. LATTA. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Along the line of the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio, we have much the same situation in our home State, and as the gentleman in the well knows, I was in the subcommittee with him when the director of the Weather Bureau was present and talked about the state of the art relating to weather forecasting. The problem is not so much a matter of installation and maintenance of the individual weather stations but of being able to devise methods by which more accurate forecasts can be made.

Just a few short moments ago we saw in the splash-down of our moon craft the problem which is facing us with relation to accurate weather predictions. Here we have the best scientific brains in America involved in an enterprise which can bring us a telecast from the moon, but even though they moved the splash-down site 100 miles this morning to get into clear weather, they did not reach it, and in fact clouds came over. This was against all of the predictions.

We can see that we need to have much more done in the field of research so that we can do a better job in predicting what will come along with on-site stations which will tell what is happening in a given location at a given time with respect to particular problems. With the combination of the two and with the Director of the Weather Bureau moving in this direction, we do know we can have the type of forewarning of weather problems which we badly need in this country.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I thank the gentleman.

It is increasingly true, as the gentleman knows, that everyone talks about the weather, but it is difficult to do anything about it.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY), as chairman of our subcommittee, and the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) have done their usual excellent job of explaining this bill.

Although there is little that can be added to their explanations of the bill item by item, I do want to make a few observations about the bill and emphasize and comment on some of the points which they have covered in their discussions.

As reported, the bill provides new obligational authority of $2,534,134,200 which is $58,429,600 above the budget estimate of $2,475,704,600. The increase allowed by the committee over and above the budget request is occasioned by the fact that the committee has recommended $184,082,000 above the $15,918,000 amount proposed for the Maritime Administration's ship construction program in fiscal 1970.

I have pointed out on many occasions in the past that our merchant marine fleet is rapidly deteriorating and falling well behind our needs in this area. The addition of the $184,000,000 above the budget request by the committee together with carryover balances should provide for a construction program level of about $300,000,000 in 1970. Such a program level will provide subsidies and allowances for the construction of something more than 30 new ships.

Our merchant fleet is one of the first arms of our national defense program, and it is imperative, it seems to me, that we must undertake an aggressive ship construction program if we are to avoid having to rely on other nations for assistance in time of national emergency.

The committee allowed the total request for the Federal Bureau of Investigation of $232,855,000. That amount will permit the employment of an additional 525 agents and 336 clerks to assist the Bureau in carrying out its responsibilities under the administration's intensified investigative activities in the field of organized crime and in the continued expansion of police training. Director Hoover of the FBI made an outstanding presentation as he has done through all the years of my service on the committee. He and his associates certainly are to be commended for the outstanding job which the Bureau has performed as the general investigative arm of the Federal Government. His testimony indicated that the Bureau had posted a new record of $302,938,789 in fines, savings, and recoveries this year. This indicates that for every dollar which Congress appropriated for the FBI last year, the returns in fines, savings, and recoveries were $1.55.

With respect to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration the committee allowed $250,000,000 out of a request for $296,570,000. This is a new agency which was created under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, and the majority of the committee felt that an appropriation of $250,000,000 would be adequate in this second year of the agency's operation. $200,000,000 of the total appropriated is for action grants to State and local law-enforcement agencies, and that to my mind is where assistance is needed.

The Economic Development Administration in the Department of Commerce requested an appropriation of $278,600,000, and the committee has allowed $266,000,000, or a cut of $12,600,000. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that I think the $170,000,000 which the committee allowed for grants and loans for development facilities under EDA is $10,000,000 below the amount provided by Congress in 1969. I do feel that this $170,000,000 may not be adequate to do the job. However, I should say that a majority of the committee felt the amount to be sufficient.

The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, which is one of the related agencies covered by this bill was provided with only $450,000 out of a request for $781,000. The $781,000 requested was to be used for settling claims as follows: China, $214,000; Cuba, $389,000; Yugoslavia, $13,000; Italy, Bulgaria, and Rumania, $111,000; and $54,000 for a review of the claims program. The committee disallowed in total the $214,000 requested for the Chinese claims, and the $117,000 balance of the reduction from $781,000 to $450,000 is to be spread among the various claim settlement items which I have mentioned heretofore. We do anticipate, however, that settlement of Cuban claims will be timely within the limit of the funds made available to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

Mr. Chairman, as always the provision of funds is a give and take proposition, and while there are items in the bill which I would have funded differently, the proposals are the result of majority action by the committee. On the whole, I think it is a good bill, and I urge its adoption.

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I want to voice my concern over one item in the bill; namely, the U.S. Information Agency. The committee report, on page 24, indicates that $173,300,000 is provided for the USIA.

This is not a large amount of money relative to overall Government spending or even to other items in this bill. However, I want to suggest that this $173 million represents in my mind a double-edged sword.

On one hand this $173 million is the most sensitive $173 million that appears anywhere in all U.S. Government appropriations. And by "sensitive" I mean in the influence it commands for the course of our country in the maelstrom of world affairs.

On the other hand I believe it is very possible that we know less about just how that $173 million is going to be spent than any other $173 million in the same overall appropriation picture.

To read the very few lines in the committee report, on pages 24 and 25, and to read the hearings on the USIA presentation, gives us very little idea as to just what USIA is doing in its total program, or why it is doing it.

In my view we should know a great deal more. These are the people that are telling the world the story of our country. I do not know, frankly, whether or not they are doing as good a job as they should be. I do not know whether their $173 million is too much, too little, or is about right.

My point is that I doubt that very many of us know these things, and this is a condition that should not be tolerated at a time such as this when the world's image of our country has become an extremely vital element in the overall psychological-military context of world events.

I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if we cannot determine with satisfaction the operating methods and objectives of the various USIA programs, and this same thing has been going on for 10 to 15 years now, if we cannot now be satisfied that our Government foreign information programs are operating as effectively as we can reasonably expect, then we had better do something about it. If our present machinery for getting this job done is not working then we had better build some new machinery.

Each year the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) conducts subcommittee hearings which shed some valuable light on USIA activities. He should be commended for some of the nuggets of information and observations that he is able to turn up. But I contend that we are barely scratching the surface.

For example, permit me to refer to page 678 of the hearings record where, at the bottom the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) is quoted as suggesting to Mr. Frank Shakespeare, director of the USIA:

> You have been captured.

He evidently refers to being captured "by the people in this Agency" which he had mentioned a moment earlier.

I have had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Shakespeare, and he does not appear to me as a person likely to be captured by the bureaucracy. But I am sufficiently disturbed by the observation of the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) following his many years of attention to the USIA, so as to make me believe we need to know more about this. Maybe the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) is correct. In any case, the question is of sufficient importance that calls for investigation. If it is true that the incoming leadership at USIA has been unable to overcome the controlling influence of the continuing bureaucracy at USIA then Congress and the administration both should know about it and should do something about it.

What I am saying here is that, like so many other things about this Agency, we simply do not know. And if we do not know, how can we give the people of this country the satisfaction that the story of America is being conveyed to the world effectively and accurately?

I raise this question because a reading of the hearings shows clearly that the major thrust of the USIA presentation was provided not by the new Director, or the new Deputy Director, but by another gentleman who has occupied a top staff spot at USIA for many years. And the presentation offered by the Agency in this year's hearings does not appear to differ in any significant way from USIA hearings going back 10 to 15 years.

Near the beginning of the hearings, for example, on pages 457 and 458, the Director states that a new man is being hired for the task of assessing what the Agency is doing. But the gentleman from New York elicits from Mr. Posner, the old hand, the information that this sort of thing has happened at least 10 times previously at USIA.

The hearings do bring out that USIA intends to put a new emphasis on television activities, and this is instructive. But otherwise the hearings tell us very little. They follow generally the same pattern of the past many years.

I have the impression that the Agency and the subcommittee alike are playing a kind of numbers game with regard to the appropriations figure finally to be approved.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is not good enough here because we are dealing with the opinions of people the world over about our Nation, or Government, and the kind of leadership we are providing.

I believe the important thing about USIA is not how much it spends in a year, not how many people they have, but rather the important thing is what they are doing and how they are doing

XUM

it; what they are saying and how they are saying it. We need to think in terms of quality, not quantity; in terms of the direction of Agency programs, not in terms of dollars.

The hearings show that USIA now has 409 people on the payroll in Vietnam. Of these, 92 are Americans. They show that the Agency plans to cut back these positions by seven Americans and 28 local employees. I think we should know more about what these 85 or 92 Americans are doing in Vietnam.

Maybe they are all doing work that must be done. But maybe they are not. I have heard that these USIA Americans in Vietnam are the first to acknowledge that their numbers are far too large—that they are bumping into each other without enough work to do, and that this has been going on now for quite a long while. My point again is that these are things we should know, and unfortunately we do not know.

I am also seriously concerned, Mr. Chairman, with a reference to the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information on page 25 of the committee report. It states:

> When applying the reduction recommended by the Committee the overstaffed U.S. Advisory Commission on Information (4 employees and $75,662 appropriation) should not be overlooked.

What about the Advisory Commission? If it is doing a job, perhaps it ought to have a good deal more than four employees. Or if it is not doing a job then perhaps it ought to be abolished. Here again, I offer the suggestion that perhaps we need to know more about it.

My impression is that the Commission was set up as a kind of continuing watchdog over what the USIA is doing. In any case I have seen its reports in recent years. And their findings seem to be consistent in many respects with the views of many of us. For example, the Commission's 23d report in 1968 offered this observation regarding the management of USIA:

> The Commission is concerned about the swollen staff in headquarters. There is danger, as a previous Commission said, that USIA Washington is becoming a bureaucracy with so many unexamined routines, controls, restrictions, and clearances, and with so much paper production, that administrative arteries have begun to clog and ossification to set in. A deliberate effort should be made to break down the compartmentalization that has characterized headquarters operation. As a relatively small agency, USIA still has an opportunity to prevent the entrenchment of excessive bureaucracy.

That 1968 report, as well as the new 1969 report of the Commission, recommends that machinery be set up for conducting a basic and complete review of USIA operations. This seems to me like an eminently reasonable suggestion, and I have introduced legislation to carry it through. The bill is H.R. 12726 and I invite attention to it and I urge its adoption.

Aside from what the Commission recommends, I also wonder if it is really wise to include the Commission's appropriation as part of the USIA appropriation. Would it not make better sense that it be part of the Bureau of the Budget or the Executive Office of the President? It seems to me that it needs to be set apart in terms of its support, from the agency over which it is supposed to be looking. And to achieve this the Commission's appropriation ought be entirely independent of the USIA appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, my understanding of the situation at USIA is that over the years right up to today, the same old attitudes and the same old operating procedures have prevailed. My impression is that today, in spite of the incoming Nixon administration, the same people hold the controlling influence as was the case last year and the year before.

I have the strong impression that this agency needs a real review, that old assumptions need to be challenged, and that we need to find satisfaction that innovation and fresh thinking is a part of our effort to convey America's story to the world.

The U.S. Advisory Commission says these same things, and so does the Subcommittee on International Organizations of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we need to know much more about what the USIA is doing. A good place to start is by supporting H.R. 12726.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, as a first question, Can the gentleman tell us what has happened to Tom Two Arrows?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. As I recall, the State Department originally sent him abroad under the name of Tom Two Arrows, and then later he became Tom Dorsey. That is the last I heard of him. He must still be in the woodwork.

Mr. GROSS. It intrigued me, because he has certainly disappeared.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I have not heard of him for years.

Mr. GROSS. He used to be prominent in the hearings of the gentleman's committee.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. He was sent all over the world by the State Department.

Mr. GROSS. It appears that there is perhaps a worthy successor in the person of a $21,438 man who went over to Jordan apparently to direct and administer the programs of the King Hussein Sports City, whatever that is.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is an athletic enterprise, I take it?

Mr. GROSS. Well, I am not so sure that Tom Two Arrows was not engaged in certain facets of that.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. No, he was not in any athletic business. I believe he was engaged in Indian folklore.

Mr. GROSS. But can the gentleman describe the King Hussein Sports City?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I have not been in Amman, Jordan, in many years. I generally confine myself to the holy places in Jerusalem, so I am not familiar with the King's sports center.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that I found the hearings of his committee most revealing, and when he gets through page 3, I will ask him—I could not read them all—about the American specialists, the lecturers, and heaven only knows what else——

Mr. ROONEY of New York. They sure have got some dillies in there.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, there are some dillies in there.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am afraid they are not going to be any better in this administration on finding dillies than they were in previous administrations.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I am not sure of that, either but let us hope.

Now, the Supreme Court wants more law clerks. How many more did the Court get?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The Supreme Court did not get any more law clerks except three.

Mr. GROSS. They got three? Well, I would hope the Justices would go to work and obviate the necessity of providing them with an increasing number of clerks.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I will say this: I happen to know quite well the new and distinguished Chief Justice. It might seem strange that a Democrat from Brooklyn would be on intimate terms with such a distinguished gentleman as Warren Burger, who came to Washington from the State of Minnesota. We became quite friendly 15 years ago when he came with the first troops of the Eisenhower Administration, and was appointed Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Division of the Department of Justice. I think the country is in good hands when we are in the hands of Chief Justice Warren Burger. I am not going to predict what he does. Whatever he does, he will do because he thinks it is the God-directed thing to do—he is that kind of a man—and I am a great admirer of his.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from New York has control of the time.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The distinguished gentleman is from Minnesota, and I believe he wants to get in here to put in a plug for Chief Justice Burger.

Mr. MACGREGOR. The gentleman is absolutely right, and I might even say a nice thing or two about the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) while I do this.

The gentleman's comments—although belonging to Brooklyn—about the gentleman from Minnesota, who is now the Chief Justice of the United States, are very well taken indeed, and I do not think it odd that the gentleman from Brooklyn should be a close friend of the Chief Justice of the United States. It just shows that the gentleman from Brooklyn has good judgment.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota. I might say that I was very proud of the fact that, being just a lowly Democrat from Brooklyn, I was seated practically alongside the President of the United States on the morning that Chief Justice Warren Burger took the oath of office.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gen-

XUM

tleman will yield further, I am pleased to hear what the gentleman has said about the new Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and I fervently hope that the gentleman is right.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Of course, all of this would have nothing to do with the pros or cons of any request for appropriations.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I understand.

Now, the gentleman heading the office of Water for Peace—did he get the $360,700 that he asked for in view of the fact that we have water desalination appropriations all over this place and in the millions of dollars?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman reminds me that after the hearings, when the answers of the Water for Peace people were so bad, the Department of State itself withdrew the entire request.

So there is nothing in this bill for water for peace.

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to hear it. On page 4 of the report the committee castigates the State Department over the contribution to the international organizations but then goes ahead, I believe, and provides $11,700,000 more than last year for a total of $130 million plus.

I do not have the report with me today, but I am sure the committee has the report of the General Accounting Office saying that they cannot get the accounting of these funds from international organizations; that is, United Nations, UNICEF, the World Health Organization, and certain inter-American organizations.

I am a little surprised that the committee would go ahead with an added appropriation of $11 million plus in the light of their refusal to give the Congress an accounting of how this money is being expended.

Would the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should be glad to. The gentleman from Iowa is a member of the distinguished Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am sure he realizes that it is a result of the legislative authorizations of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs that the Committee on Appropriations is required to sign the check. That is what we are always confronted with. We deplore these increases in these world organization budgets, but our State Department, our people, never seem to be able to cope with them. The result is here we are with $11 million extra.

Mr. GROSS. I do not believe we are obtaining testimony from these organizations I have mentioned before our committee on a direct basis.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. They have all come before the gentleman's committee for authorization.

Mr. GROSS. As I say, I do not believe we are getting these organizations I have mentioned before our committee on a direct basis and, if so, then the appropriations in this bill are subject to a point of order because we have not acted upon these authorizations this year.

If what the gentleman says is true, we could and should go into this in the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. These authorizations were for the purpose of authorizing the United States to join the international organizations—and these are continuing from year to year.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, yes; they are.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. And they are increasing and increasing from year to year.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs could go into this situation if it wanted to. But I think your committee has done a good job in exposing what is going on. However, I am just a little surprised that you have given them all the money they have asked for when they refuse to tell Congress how this money is being spent.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I wish we could accommodate the gentleman further in this regard, but as long as the House Committee on Foreign Affairs approves of our membership in these international organizations, then this committee feels it has no alternative but to pay our dues in these organizations.

I would like to see some activity within the House Committee on Foreign Affairs cutting down on the authorizations for these international organizations.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think the statement of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY), is exactly correct. We are at the mercy of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

As a matter of fact, we do not have any members of the Committee on Appropriations assigned to special duty at the U.N. but you do on your Committee on Foreign Affairs and they sit in on these hearings and they make the determination as to the amount of money and our participation in these organizations. But we cannot do anything about it.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I have suggested on previous occasions to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that if he receives an invitation to go up there to be wined and dined at the U.N. and to serve on the budget committee, as have many members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs previously, that he should accept the invitation. I expect that some good might come out of it.

Mr. GROSS. Do you mean that place that has been described as a haven for "ladies of the corridors?" Is that what the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I have never come across that even in any of these plays sponsored by the Department of State.

Mr. GROSS. It might be subject to being adapted to other purposes, I am not sure.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am unable to answer the distinguished gentleman other than to say I am not familiar with any of the corridors.

Mr. GROSS. I have a couple of additional questions, and then I will be finished if the gentleman will bear with me.

I read the hearings with respect to all of the basketball coaches, tennis players, athletic trainers, and ballet dancers that have been sent abroad by the State Department. Is there no end to this business of expending the taxpayers' money, particularly at a time like this, to send all of these trainers, ballet dancers, and athletes abroad?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, I am in favor of sending good trainers, good athletes, good musicians, and good plays abroad. This whole area surely needs cleaning up, and that is what we are trying to do by the action of the committee this year.

Mr. GROSS. Since the House Foreign Affairs Committee does not move very expeditiously or at all on some of these issues, you have my best wishes for success in cleaning it up.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am not going to criticize that distinguished committee. There are a great many hard working members on that committee, including the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. That is true.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. They sit day after day for months and months, as does the Appropriations Committee. This pending bill is 6 months in preparation.

Mr. GROSS. But I wish that committee—and I am a member of it—would spend more time delving into where the money goes than continually promoting the spending of more money. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TAFT).

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I shall take just a very few minutes to direct some remarks on the subject of the $10 million figure in the bill for the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission. It seems to me that as Members of Congress we have a unique duty not only to respond to the will of the people but at times to educate and to guide that will.

Presently we are under great pressure from our constituents to cut back on Federal spending. In doing so, we must look carefully at our priorities in order that our cuts will not be made in vital areas.

But it seems to me further that no area of congressional concern should be more vital than that of equal employment opportunity. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has been in existence for approximately 5 years. During that time many thousands of citizens have brought complaints of discrimination before it. Many have benefited from its activities with jobs, promotions, and increased benefits. Some have had to take their cases to court for satisfaction. A great many are patiently awaiting decisions on their cases, because the Commission is overloaded

XUM

with work and has a considerable backlog.

The $10 million appropriation proposed by the committee would allow the Commission to operate only at the same level that it has during the last quarter of this last fiscal year. During that time the Commission's backlog continued to grow. Many more complaints were received, were decided, or were conciliated, and with the growing backlog, the frustration of those who have been awaiting action by the Commission has grown also.

For the record, I would just like to give you some of the figures on the investigation backlog that has now been built up. At the end of the fiscal year 1968 the backlog of investigations was 1,675. At the end of fiscal 1969 it had grown to 2,556. Based on the proposed appropriation, at the end of the fiscal year 1970, with no appreciable increase in staff—the small increase would be taken up almost entirely by the pay increases involved and some other increased expenses—the backlog is estimated to go to more than 4,700 cases. This is based on an expected charge level of some 15,000.

The charge levels, too, have gone up during this period. For example, in 1966 it was expected in the first full year of operation to have some 2,000 charges. Actually there were 8,000. This grew until in 1969 it was 12,000. As I have just indicated, for the fiscal year 1970 it is estimated that it will be in the neighborhood of 15,000. I might say that while there are imperfections in the program which should be corrected, as have been mentioned by the members of the committee, the field staff output in the investigation of charges has gone up more than 10 percent per year over this period which I have mentioned.

I hope that when an amendment is offered later to increase this amount, probably to $12,500,000, the House will give consideration to this increased caseload and to the needs that exist in this area. It seems to me this is a justifiable increase. The increase will be almost entirely used up in increased personnel for the field offices. It would provide somewhere in the neighborhood of 200 additional field personnel.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot tell people they are equal in the area of employment and then effectively deny them any recourse. We have added $200 million to the various approaches to the crime control problem.

At the same time I point out that the frustrations that arise in lack of equal opportunity are some of the principal factors involved in the crime increase we see. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission must be provided with adequate funds. Two hundred years ago we, the citizens of the United States, declared that all men are created equal. Today we must act to insure that all men are treated as equals.

(Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. ROONEY of New York) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, it is anticipated that an effort will be made to eliminate on a point of order the language contained in section 706 of this bill. If that should be the case, I propose to offer substitute language as an amendment.

First of all, let me call to your attention the language which now is provided in section 706. It is as follows:

> SEC. 706. No part of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be used to provide a loan, guarantee of a loan, a grant, the salary of, or any remuneration whatever to any individual applying for admission, attending, employed by, teaching at or doing research at an institution of higher education who has engaged in conduct on or after October 12, 1968, which involves the use of (or the assistance to others in the use of) force or the threat of force or the seizure of property under the control of an institution of higher education, to require or prevent the availability of certain curriculum, or to prevent the faculty, administrative officials or students in such institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies at such institution: *Provided*, That such limitation upon the use of money appropriated in this Act shall not apply to a particular individual until the appropriate institutions of higher education at which such conduct occurred shall have had an opportunity to initiate or has completed such proceedings as it deems appropriate but which are not dilatory in order to determine whether the provisions of this limitation upon the use of appropriated funds shall apply: *Provided further*, That such institution shall certify to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare at quarterly or semester intervals that it is in compliance with this provision.

The language of section 706 is clear. It is intended to spell out specifically the intent of Congress that Federal funds not be made available to students or to staff members who participate in or encourage campus disorders, incite riots, and destroy property. The law is clear enough on these matters, but regretfully, it has not been enforced. It is the intent of the language in section 706 to tighten the law and to make it very clear that there must be compliance by institutions of higher learning. Specifically, it is proposed that they certify at quarterly or semester intervals, according to the system which they follow, to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that they are in compliance with the law. Compliance with the law is what the Congress intended when it passed legislation to curb Federal fund contributions to those participating in campus disorders, and compliance with the law is what section 706 is intended to insure.

In the event, however, that section 706 should be stricken by a point of order, I am prepared to offer an amendment which I trust cannot under any circumstances be interpreted as legislation on an appropriations bill. It would be worded as follows:

> SEC. 706. No part of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be used to provide a loan, guarantee of a loan, a grant, the salary of, or any remuneration whatever to any individual applying for admission, attending, employed by, teaching at or doing research at an institution of higher education which has not certified at quarterly or semester intervals to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, that it has, after reasonable opportunity, initiated or completed appropriate proceedings arising from any conduct by any such individual on or after October 12, 1968, which involves the use of (or the assistance to others in the use of) force or the threat of force or the seizure of property under the control of an institution of higher education, to require or prevent the availability of certain curriculum, or to prevent the faculty, administrative officials, or students in such institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies at such institution.

It is, I believe, obvious that the intent is the same, and I trust, in final analysis, that the language will be as effective as that now in the bill. In other words, I believe the Congress has had its fill of campus disorders—I know this is true of the people of our country—and I hope that we can spell out in this bill beyond a shadow of doubt that, in the future, the law is not to be violated by those who receive their education or those who teach through the help of the Federal Government.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, in 1965, President Lyndon Johnson appointed a blue-ribbon panel, made up of police experts, lawyers, including several former presidents of the American Bar Association, and others who knew as much as anyone else about the nature, causes, and possible solutions of the problem of crime in America. These men were commissioned to make a thorough study of crime, as thorough as any that has ever been made, and to report back with their findings and recommendations. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice reported to President Johnson and the Nation in early 1967 with the conclusion that, and I quote:

> Controlling crime in America is an endeavor that will be slow and hard and costly. But America can control crime if it will.

Of major importance in the program they outlined for controlling crime was Federal financial assistance. They concluded that the entire criminal justice system, the police, the courts, and the correctional institutions, were, as they put it, "undernourished," and that State and local governments were desperately in need of financial assistance to meet their fundamental obligation of protecting citizens from violence, from theft, and from an increasingly all-pervasive fear that threatens to make a mockery of our freedom.

In the words of the Commission:

> The Federal program the Commission visualizes is a large one. . . . If this report has not conveyed the message that sweeping and costly changes in criminal administration must be made throughout the country in order to effect a significant reduction in crime, then it has not expressed what the Commission strongly believes.

This conclusion was accepted by both President Johnson and the 90th Congress. In 1968, the Congress passed legislation authorizing an initial appropriation, for the planning stages of the law enforcement assistance program, of slightly over $100 million, and subsequent annual appropriations of $300 million. The December 1968 deadline for planning grant applications was met by every one of the 50 States, indicating the unqualified nationwide support of the program and eagerness to participate in it. At this point, as I understand it, many States have had their comprehensive anticrime plans accepted, and are in the process of administering initial action grants to implement these plans.

The appropriation bill under consideration today authorizes $250,000,000 for the continuation of this program, which is administered by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration within the Department of Justice. This represents a cut of approximately $46.5 million from the figure of $296,570,000 requested for fiscal 1970 by both President Nixon and President Johnson before him. I want to take this opportunity to indicate my wholehearted support of the Federal anticrime assistance program administered by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. I urge not only the commitment by the Congress of the $250 million authorized by this legislation, but the restoration of the full amount requested by the Justice Department.

I say this as both a Congressman from the State of New York, well aware of the concern of my constituents about crime, and as a former policeman. We cannot fight crime with political speeches and good intentions. Fighting crime is costly. Our police are underpaid and inadequately equipped. Our criminal courts are jammed. Our correctional system too often confirms those passing through it in criminality. We are today paying for our financial neglect of the criminal justice system in terms of ever-increasing crime rates. As a former police officer who spent twenty-three years working within this system, I urge full financial support of the law enforcement assistance program.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned about the action which the Appropriations Committee has taken with regard to the budget for the Department of State's mutual education and cultural exchange programs.

I refer specifically to the committee's action, outlined on page 7 of the report, to provide no funds whatever for the special education and cultural projects programs. I think this is a grave mistake. Let me just mention a few of the activities carried on under this program of special education and cultural projects.

First. The Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies here in Washington, which as we all know has a fine reputation for training scholars in international studies, maintains a center in Bologna in Italy. I think it is fair to say that were it not for the contribution that we make to the center it would not exist today. Cutting out all funds for these special education and cultural projects will completely eliminate our contribution to the Bologna center.

Second. The United States makes a significant contribution to the Salsburg seminar which brings together leading European citizens with leading American educators and people from public life for several weeks in a graduate seminar on American studies. It is an immensely valuable input to increased knowledge and understanding between this country and the people of Europe. Our participation in that effort would also be eliminated.

Third. U.S. support for the Asia Foundation and the U.S. Youth Council would be eliminated as a result of this cut. In addition, several American studies institutes, such as the American Institute of Indian Studies, the American Studies Research Center in India, the Institute of American Studies in France, would be cut off from U.S. financial support. Such organizations provide valuable opportunities for American students to study in India, France, and elsewhere as well as to bring students of those countries to the United States.

Finally, I want to mention especially some of the programs which we have been carrying on with some East European countries which will be literally extinguished because of this action.

For example, Wayne State University, in collaboration with Yugoslavia, administers a regional studies project, the object of which is to establish a center for continuous research and training in regional and urban planning in Yugoslavia.

Second, there is a project carried on between Indiana University and a Yugoslavian university under which Indiana University is helping them to establish business administration courses and management courses. I do not think I need to belabor the great contribution which can be made by making American management approaches and skills available to the Yugoslavians, both in terms of their development and in terms of our relationship with them.

These programs, Mr. Chairman, are a marvelous combination in terms of their long-range effect. They contribute enormously to the process of developing common views and attitudes between East and West and to the overall goal of expanding freedom of thought and communication. By cutting off U.S. participation in such programs we remove our most effective weapon in the struggle to expand the free market of ideas.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Joelson), to increase fiscal 1970 appropriations for the Commission from $10 million to $11.5 million.

I doubt that any Member in this Chamber would deny that the Commission has a continuing, serious assignment. Unless we can offer equal employment opportunities, most of the jobless in this country will not find meaningful work. And, without jobs, all we will have are increased welfare rolls, which no one wants—least of all, the jobless.

Discrimination in employment is still at the heart of the problems of our cities. It is one of the key causes of the unrest that continues to exist in this country. The Negroes and other minority groups still are shunted to menial occupations without the remotest kind of employment security. Job discrimination is the most basic grievance of our minority population. It is the main reason why the promise of America has become hollow in meaning to so many.

In its 4 years of operation, the Commission has made many strides toward the goal of nondiscriminatory employment practices. This has been done with insufficient staff, insufficient funds, and insufficient power.

The Commission's work increases in importance as our national manpower programs are expanded. Since 1964, Federal expenditures for these programs have increased some fivefold to an estimated $3 billion in fiscal year 1969. The rise in these expenditures reflects the increasing concern and emphasis on manpower programs as a method for increasing the employability of some 2 million disadvantaged Americans.

But new skills are of no use to a black worker if his potential employer's only criterion of ability is a white skin.

The Commission is the only Federal agency explicitly responsible for nondiscriminatory employment practices. To refuse it adequate funding would directly impair the effectiveness of every Federal manpower program. It is difficult to imagine a more wasteful and ill-considered economy.

In a period of rapid economic expansion, when national manpower needs are reaching major proportions, discrimination in employment is not only a burden to the individual, but a cost to and drain on our economy. The Council of Economic Advisers in 1965, pointing to its own study of this problem, estimated the annual cost to the economy of job discrimination against Negroes alone at $23 billion. This figure would doubtless burgeon when reestimated in 1969 and amended to include persons of other minority races. The amount requested for the operations of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission vanishes by comparison. It does not take any major restructuring of our national resource priorities to permit $11.5 million for this program, but the potential payoffs, to Americans of minority races, to our Federal investment in manpower development and resources, and to our expanding economy are immense.

Can we continue to educate and train some 2 million disadvantaged persons annually only to find that jobs are denied many of them because of the color of their skin?

Mr. Chairman, I am totally in agreement with the amendment to increase to $11.5 million funds for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for the next fiscal year.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. Joelson). There is no doubt that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is an agency deserving of our firmest support. In a time when study upon study documents the psychologically debilitating effects of job discrimination, the Commission bears the entire responsibility of contending with discrimination in private employment. Unfortunately, after being assigned this monumental and significant task, it has been given severely limited resources with which to do the job.

The Commission has been conscientious in executing its assignment, and the need for a substantial increase in its appropriation stems not from a desire to "empire build," but from the simple necessity of catching up with its burgeoning workload. A quick glance at the Commission's annual reports reveals that

XUM

the number of complaints filed with the Commission has steadily increased, and, at the same time, so has its backlog of cases. The backlog currently stands at some 2,500 cases and is likely to double unless the Commission is granted additional resources. All of these cases pending decision represent delays of a year and a half to 2 years in resolution of a complaint filed, and an individual who may very well have been wronged stands behind each of those complaints. It is not very difficult to understand how this situation might breed disbelief in the laws of this land and the promises made by this Government.

The manner in which the Commission operates has a great deal to commend it. The authority of State fair employment commissions is not ignored; rather the Federal agency defers to the State commissions. The Commission neither imposes quotas nor preferential treatment requirements on private employers; indeed it is specifically denied this authority by statute. Complaints are resolved through informal means and conciliation agreements are the product of consultation and cooperation between each employer and Commission personnel. Complaint proceedings are handled with the strictest discretion, away from the publicity which can sometimes force the parties involved into extreme positions. Grants are awarded to State and local fair employment agencies by the Commission in an attempt to encourage non-Federal activity in equal employment opportunity.

Statutory limitations on the extent of the Commission's power and financial limitations weaken its potential impact in an area where positive action is critical. Continuing reliance on welfare payments is not healthy for the citizens of this country, and, ultimately, must weaken the country itself. The only realistic alternative is, if not meaningful employment for all our citizens, at least the opportunity to compete for such employment on an equal basis. The history of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission reveals all too clearly that this opportunity for equal employment remains rhetoric rather than reality for all too many of this country's citizens. Given these circumstances, it is necessary that the Commission receive our deepest support. We can best demonstrate this support through a realistic appraisal of the size of its task and the resources it needs to carry out its legislative mandate in a way that will bear results.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, H.R. 12964, would appropriate funds for fiscal year 1970 to the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce; the Judiciary, and related independent agencies.

While there are several appropriations recommended by the Committee on Appropriations which merit discussion, I will limit my remarks to two specific items for which the appropriations contained in H.R. 12964 must be increased if title IV and title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 are to be fully enforced.

The first item is the $10 million appropriation recommended by the Appropriations Committee for the activities of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission during fiscal year 1970.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is responsible for carrying out title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which forbids discrimination in employment. The goal of the EEOC is eliminate discrimination in employment in the private sector. This goal is pursued in several ways by the Commission, including the investigation of complaints of discrimination and, if the Commission finds "reasonable cause" for action, attempted conciliation of complaints, technical assistance by which employers subject to title VII are encouraged to voluntarily comply, cooperative programs with State and local fair employment practices commissions, and consultation with other Federal agencies charged with enforcing equal employment opportunity.

While it is true, as the committee report on this bill notes, that the $10 million appropriation recommended by the Appropriations Committee represents an increase of $880,000 over EEOC's fiscal year 1969 appropriation, the sum recommended is simply not adequate to the task of rooting out employment discrimination in the private sector. During the hearings on this bill, the former Chairman of the EEOC, Clifford Alexander, testified that since the beginning of the Commission in fiscal year 1965, "budget and staff resources have proven inadequate to deal with the inflow of complaints from citizens under title VII." Hearings before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce; the Judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year 1970, part 4, page 332. Chairman Alexander estimated that, because of inadequate funding, the Commission will enter fiscal year 1970 with a backlog of over 2,600 investigations and over 2,800 conciliations.

This backload results from the fact that the Commission has lacked the resources to compile the required statistical data and tabulating and analytical materials needed to support the enforcement program and, additionally, has not had sufficient staff to take positive steps against those employers, unions, and apprentice programs with demonstrable patterns of discrimination. Chairman Alexander testified that, if granted adequate resources, the EEOC could make substantial progress during fiscal year 1970 by integrating existing data systems from the EEOC and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance into a unified data base which could be used to identify areas of employment in the private sector where progress could most readily be attained. As Mr. Alexander pointed out, "The estimated costs" of achieving this progress "are exceedingly modest in relationship to the anticipated benefits."

The largest single increase over fiscal year 1969 requested by the Commission for the current fiscal year is for additional investigative positions required to reduce the current backlog of complaints and conciliations and to cope with the rapidly expanding workload. In my view, such an increase is not only justified but imperative if the Commission is to fulfill the role assigned to it under title VII.

I am pleased that the Appropriations Committee has agreed to accept the Joelson amendment which would increase the appropriation to the EEOC from $10 million to $12.5 million. However, this sum still falls over $3 million below the $15,905,000 requested by EEOC. I would hope that more money will be provided so that EEOC will have sufficient resources to vigorously enforce title VII prohibitions against employment discrimination.

Second, the appropriation of $12 million recommended by the Appropriations Committee for carrying out title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 must be increased. The Office of Civil Rights in the Office of Education has requested an appropriation of $20 million, $8 million above the sum requested by the committee. Under the program supported by these funds, special training grants and contracts are awarded to school boards and to training institutions to help pay the costs of training school personnel and for professional services to deal with problems of desegregation.

The importance of the title IV program, and the need to expand its effectiveness, was pointed out by the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders in March of 1968, which said:

> We believe that the Title IV program should be reoriented and expanded into a major Federal effort to provide comprehensive aid to support State and local desegregation projects.

More than 40 percent of the $20 million requested by the Office of Education for Civil Rights Education is to increase support for projects of this nature.

As Dr. James Allen, the U.S. Commissioner for Education, stated during the hearings on H.R. 12964:

> The task to be accomplished has just begun.

His estimation of the work which remains to be done reinforces the need to increase the appropriation for civil rights education to the full $20 million requested by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. According to the Office of Education, only 20 percent of the Negro children in the South now attend desegregated schools. A large part of even this progress, according to Dr. Allen, represents school districts that were relatively easy to desegregate. The truly difficult situations, according to the Commissioner, remain to be tackled.

If the promises made by Congress in the 1964 Civil Rights Act are to have meaning, substantial resources must be committed to the task of eliminating discrimination in all areas of our society and especially in education. The goal of an equal opportunity for all Americans—regardless of color—is implicit in the Civil Rights Act. Congress must recognize, however, that legislation is not in itself sufficient. If equal opportunity is to be achieved in education, and, for that matter, in employment, adequate financial support must be committed to programs designed to achieve the end embodied in the 1964 Civil Rights Act. To do less will only increase the frustration

XUM

which inevitably occurs when the promises of progress made by the Federal Government are not accompanied by a commitment to spend whatever amount of money is necessary to fulfill those promises.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my support for the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON) to increase the fiscal year 1970 budget of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. When title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was written, the Commission it established was not intended to be eternally crippled by lack of funds. The ideals title VII set forth and the goals it established were not incorporated into law just to be so many words in the United States Code.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's operation can be meaningful only if it is current. Yet the present inadequacies and inefficiencies of the Commission—the lack of staff, the shameful length of time it takes to approach settlement of complaints, the serious percentage of failures to conciliate—prevent this from being a reality.

We all know that the EEOC is weak by its lack of statute. It does not have cease and desist powers, and it can conciliate only through moral suasion. But it is also weak because it has been financially starved by the Congress so that it cannot even exercise the limited powers it has been given. Today, we can at least go part way toward eliminating this second disgrace by supporting Mr. Joelson's amendment. We can afford to go no other way without being hypocrites.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 12964 bears the very innocuous title, "Making Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes."

It is the "for other purposes" that removes this bill from the category of a routine funding of governmental operations.

Buried in the bill we find some of "the other purposes" to be—

Obligations of membership in international multilateral organizations	$130, 187, 000
Community relations services	3, 077, 000
Minority business enterprises	1, 200, 000
Commission on Civil Rights	2, 650, 000
Civil rights education, HEW	12, 000, 000
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	10, 000, 000

Experience teaches that an informed people invest their money where their hearts lie. If this be true it must come as a crushing disillusionment to those American taxpayers and people who still think we are fighting communism that this same bill authorizes a measly $344,400 for the Subversive Activities Control Board which bears the awesome responsibility of informing the American people who the dangerous subversives are in our country.

Compare the Subversive Activities Control Board appropriation of $344 thousand to the civil rights education fund of $12 million. The latter purports to be for "training of school personnel and for professional services in dealing with the problems of desegregation," but those of us who have watched HEW in operation know that "training" means "guidelines' means "forced compliance." I voice the feeling that moneywise our people at home will conclude we in Congress are 36 times more determined to fight them than we are to protect them from the ever-growing threat of Communist tyranny.

This bill has been decorated like a Christmas tree to place Members on the horns of a dilemma—if one wants to vote for the good he has to go along with the bad. Sooner or later enough Members will tire of this political hocus pocus and insist that appropriations bills funding Government operations be taken up individually or by related categories so there can be a meaningful vote to better voice the constituents' feelings at home. Until that day arrives the only way to express disapproval of the freeloaders in the bill is to vote against the entire measure.

If Members start voting against these conglomerate appropriations mixtures, I think the day not far off before we can have the opportunity for selective voting on individual appropriations. If this bill fails it will not be the defeat of all the programs, because we all know the Appropriations Committee will be back on Monday morning with a revised bill amended to remove some of the most obnoxious features.

I do not want my people to think I would be a party to any such "pig in a poke" deal. I am constrained to oppose the bill as is and cast their vote "no."

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12964, the bill which would appropriate $2.53 billion for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year 1970.

The world is spellbound by America's epic achievement of landing a man on the moon by means of Apollo 11 and its undaunted crew. Despite our acknowledged leadership in the space program and our remarkable advances in the physical sciences, it is to the eternal credit of this Nation that it also recognizes, and is doing something about, the urgent needs in the areas of human relationships encompassed by the social sciences. In terms of the legislation we are now considering, our concern for the improvement of relations among the peoples of this world is nowhere more clearly shown than in a modest sum which has been included in the Department of State appropriations.

I refer, of course, to the appropriation for the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West in Honolulu, Hawaii. For the continued operation of the center, H.R. 12964 includes the sum of $5.26 million, the full amount of the revised budget estimate and the same amount as was appropriated for fiscal year 1969.

The money, which indeed represents an investment in every sense of the word, will make possible our continued efforts toward the objective of promoting better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific. This cultural and technical interchange program is carried out by grant to the University of Hawaii which operates the center and administers grants, fellowships, and scholarships to qualified persons to engage in study or training at the center.

Since its creation in 1960, very close in point of time to the space program impetus provided by the late President John F. Kennedy in his pledge to land an American on the moon before the end of this decade, the East-West Center in Hawaii has become an effective institution and a showcase of international friendship. The center has provided the vehicle for this Nation to reach out laterally to other countries here on earth, even as Apollo 11 has served as the vehicle to reach into space and land, not one American but two Americans on the moon. As a giant step forward in international relations, the East-West Center has become one of America's most significant contributions toward better world understanding and one of her best investments in world peace.

Mr. Chairman, by approving the East-West Center appropriation for fiscal year 1970, we will be giving continued life to an America-conceived institution which today is recognized as a highly valuable international asset.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, the debate in the Committee of the Whole on the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill was so abbreviated that I inadvertently missed the opportunity I had intended taking to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY), a question or two about funding for the Office of State Technical Services within the Department of Commerce.

The State Technical Services Act of 1965 created a cooperative Federal-State program to establish and maintain technical services programs that would encourage the application of science and technology supposedly in such a way as to stimulate industrial use of the new techniques that have been largely obtained through Federal research programs of one kind or another. The intent was to reach, through this program, a cross-section of all business and industry, small as well as large, in the hopes of thereby obtaining a broader application of the fruits of Federal research than would otherwise be possible.

During the last 4 years, the Congress has appropriated $20.8 million for this program which has begun to show that it is useful in the development of new ideas—and new businesses—that redound to the general benefit of our economy. Through university and industrial cooperation, it has stimulated noncredit short courses, workshops and seminars for engineers and technical people in the communities where they live and work to help them, as individuals, keep pace with the rapid advances of science and technology that mark the vitality of America today. In many instances, because of the travel problems and time problems that would otherwise pertain, such up-grading courses would not otherwise have been available to such engineers and technicians.

It is true that this program has been slow to get off the ground and that it was greeted with some skepticism on the part of both industry and the academic communities in some areas at the start. It is also true that its potential benefits have not been applied evenly across the Nation. But, certainly in my State of New York, as in many others, we are just beginning to realize the true potential of a cooperative venture of this sort. In my own district, I know what has been achieved through this program for the benefit of smaller firms that cannot afford their own R. & D. programs, and for small shops that, in the ever-fiercer competition with "big business," could make good use, for another instance, of computer facilities or tape-controlled machines, but have been wary of their competence to do so as well as of the initial cost and complexity involved in trying.

I have received a good many letters from individual engineers and technicians in support of this program, people who have had benefit therefrom, especially in those smaller or more-rural communities where easy access to seminars and the like at centers of higher education is simply not available.

And I have seen enough, on my own, to know that the program is beginning to achieve its intended results, and is worth maintaining.

Now, the budgetary situation is this: For fiscal 1969, a total of $5.3 million was appropriated—to be applied mostly on a State-matching basis—but for fiscal 1970 the budget request was only for $290,000 for the continuing expense of administering the State and special-program grants awarded from fiscal year 1969 and prior year funds. This amount the subcommittee recommended and the House has now approved. But the future of the program has obviously been left very much in doubt. The subcommittee's hearings indicate that the Secretary of Commerce has ordered an independent study of the program's overall effectiveness, to be made by Arthur D. Little, Inc., with a report due therefrom next month. As Secretary Stans told the subcommittee:

> If (the program) has real merit, we may need to reverse our reduction . . .

I would personally hope this would be the case and we should know in a month or two. But, in the meantime, I do feel it unfortunate that the subcommittee and the administration, did not see fit to recommend a further appropriation for the purposes of keeping the program alive during the period of reevaluation. There are some held-over funds, of course, but as best I can find out these will be all expended well before the end of fiscal 1970, if not by the end of calendar 1969. If this is the case, and if the other body does not reconsider the situation, and take a more careful look at the program's accomplishments to date as well as its promise, then I fear the momentum here that has finally been achieved will be dissipated. In the long run even considering our current budgetary dilemma, I do not believe that to be in the national interest.

I would therefore express the hope, Mr. Chairman, that the other body will inquire more deeply into this matter than we have, and that it will reconsider our rather hasty action to save some money and to approve what Mr. Rooney saw fit to call a "wholesome decrease" from last year's appropriation.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which would increase the appropriation to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The $15.9 million which was requested cannot by any stretch of the imagination be considered unreasonable or improper in light of the fact that this Commission's responsibility covers some 44 million workers. And that responsibility is to protect the most basic right of every American—the right to work at any job for which he or she is suited, in order that he might support his family to the best of his ability.

EEOC cannot possibly discharge this responsibility in the best interests of the people, the economy, or the Nation with the $10.1 million budget approved by committee. Funding in this amount, due to rising costs, would barely allow the Commission to keep up the level of compliance activity achieved in the past year, activity which included grappling with a backlog of complaints that is large and growing.

The backlog itself is a legacy of the Commission's first year of operation, for which the Congress anticipated and provided funds for handling of about 2,000 complaints of job discrimination. Instead, EEOC during that year was inundated with over 8,000 charges—legitimate grievances from American citizens who believed they had been discriminated against in job hiring or promotion simply because of their race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. In each succeeding year, the backlog has continued to mount, in spite of increased compliance productivity on the part of the Commission. It grows, on the one hand, because more and more people, thousands more, are coming to EEOC each year for help and, on the other hand, because each year the Congress has failed to provide a realistic appropriation, one that would meet the critical need that is so clearly present.

We cannot afford to put it off any longer. I most strongly urge that this be the year in which we take care of this vital unfinished business. With the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, a commitment was made to America's minority groups and women workers—on behalf of all the people—a commitment that the Government is wholeheartedly in support of nondiscrimination in employment and will work, through the efforts of a Federal agency, toward the achievement of this ideal. The least we can do now is to adequately fund the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to perform the task we assigned it.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

SHIP CONSTRUCTION

For construction-differential subsidy and cost of national-defense features incident to construction of ships for operation in foreign commerce (46 U.S.C. 1152, 1154); for construction-differential subsidy and cost of national-defense features incident to the reconstruction and reconditioning of ships under title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1154); and for acquisition of used ships pursuant to section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1160); to remain available until **expended, $200,000,000.**

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language of the bill, on page 31, lines 13 through 24, as an appropriation not being authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that he begin with line 14.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would amend that to line 14, because there are further provisions alluding to the Maritime Administration.

I make a point of order against lines 14 through 24.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that because of existing conditions, where we do not have authority in law for even the $15,918,000 requested by President Nixon's Bureau of the Budget for ship construction, I shall have to agree that there is merit to the point of order of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. Sikes).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I believe the Record should show that the distinguished gentleman from New York has made a great effort to improve America's maritime posture and by his work in seeking to provide enough money to make a meaningful effort to keep American ships on the high seas and the American flag flying he has done something that this House, the Congress, and the Nation should appreciate and applaud.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

APOLLO 11

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield briefly to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Fulton).

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to announce to the Congress that the epic voyage of Apollo 11 is now successfully completed at this moment. The astronauts are now on the hanger deck of the carrier *Hornet* and they are all in fine shape and good spirits.

The United States is now first in space. We Americans and we in the U.S. Congress are very proud of our three U.S. astronauts today.

XUM

Americans have every reason to be proud as a people of this fine accomplishment and the technical excellence involved.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, in being constrained to admit the validity of the point of order, I should like briefly to say that this point of order would not at all have been successful previous to last year, were it not for the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries action which now requires annual authorizations. Both this year and last year we have come to the floor with this bill with substantial money provided for the construction of additional new ships for our mecrhant marine, and I have had to stand here and admit the validity of a point of order against the funds carried in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further on the point of order since others are being heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be heard.

Mr. GROSS. Let the RECORD show, regardless of any other consideration, that the point of order is conceded.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The point of order is conceded, with all those considerations.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HAYS). The gentleman from New York concedes the point of order, and the Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I share the sentiments of other Members who believe that America needs a strong merchant marine, and as such deeply regret that a point of order was made against the funds provided in this bill for our maritime program.

I realize, of course, Mr. Chairman, that there are members of the Committee on Appropriations who have never been happy with the fact that the House, in its wisdom, saw fit to provide the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee with authorizing authority. In this connection, what happened last year, and again this year, could have been deliberate efforts to embarass the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. Last year, as this year, in the other body the House-passed authorization bill was delayed. Under these circumstances, why a rule waiving a point of order on the maritime appropriation was not requested is hard to explain.

Whatever the reason, to me at least, the Appropriations Committee could be shown at fault.

Mr. Chairman, it would be unfortunate if a feud developed between the two committees over jurisdiction. That would be detrimental to our American merchant marine. It is the merchant marine that stands to suffer and no one's pride or personal vindication is important.

Before long the administration will come in with a new maritime program. I believe it will call for construction of more ships which will take more money. The House authorization which we passed anticipated such a new program and I can now only hope that any damage arising as a result of this point of order will be undone by prompt and well-considered action in the other body.

(Mr. GARMATZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I would just like the RECORD to show that the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, in accordance with its legislative responsibilities, held extensive, in-depth hearings commencing on April 15 on the authorization of appropriations for certain maritime programs in the Department of Commerce. Every responsible witness in this area was heard by this committee, which then reported the bill, H.R. 4152, out on May 7. On Thursday, May 15, the House passed the maritime authorization bill by voice vote.

Our position in this authorization bill was substantially upheld by the Senate Commerce Committee in the bill it reported out. Unfortunately, the Senate has not been able to consider and pass this measure apparently because of the priority consideration given to the ABM problem. This is indeed unfortunate because it presents exactly the same situation which prevailed last year.

As all undoubtedly recall, the appropriations bill for State, Justice, and Commerce was brought up on the floor before the authorization was passed by the House and signed by the President, and points of order were made deleting key provisions of the maritime authorization.

Mr. Chairman, I deeply regret this whole legislative tieup. I regretted it last year and said so on this very floor. I think it is especially deplorable that the same thing is happening again and that it puts in jeopardy the United States merchant fleet which, as we all know, is struggling for survival. Many of us here in Congress have worked hard to help this floundering industry and it is frustrating to see this work blocked by these technicalities. The Appropriations Committee knew full well that the authorization bill has not passed the Senate, and it knew full well what hapened last year—at the very least a rule could have been requested waiving these points of order—yet this was not done.

I just want the RECORD to show that the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has discharged its obligations with respect to these maritime authorization-appropriations procedures. If this process is crippled and the hard-pressed U.S.-flag fleet forced further to the wall, I submit that the fault lies elsewhere.

(Mr. DOWNING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I deeply regret that we have to suffer this temporary setback in something so vital to our Nation's defense and economy.

Congress now obviously is aware of the sad plight of our merchant marine and is now ready do something about it. Due to a parliamentary situation, we will have to delay taking remedial action until the other body passes the authorization bill. As soon as this is accomplished, this necessary funding can be included in their appropriation bill. I hope this will be done as quickly as possible.

I am delighted, however, to see that the Appropriations Committee has seen fit to fund this program in the manner which it has. They have approved an unprecedented $200 million for new ship construction. With the $100 million carryover from previous years, this will allow a total sum of $300 million for this purpose for the next fiscal year.

The Maritime Administration will decide the type and number of vessels to be built, but we estimate this will provide funding for 30 to 33 new ships.

This is a good start, but it is only a start. Our Nation has got to have a long-range shipbuilding program which will regain our status as a major seapower on the high seas. By the end of the next decade our prestige as a powerful Nation will be enhanced, but this is not the reason for this emergency program.

Our country is essentially an island greatly dependent on international commerce to sustain its economy. We cannot continue this commerce without ships and our present fleet of American-flag ships is old and fast dwindling. Nor can we place our dependence on foreign-flag ships which we have to do at the present time. American-flag ships now carry only about 5 percent of our own international commerce. Foreign flags must carry the balance. The uncertainties of international harmony make this a precocious dependence at best. And then too—and this is of vital importance—our military preparedness and defense is vitally affected by the absence of an adequate merchant marine. We can fly our troops whenever they are needed, but they have to be supplied by ships—American ships. If we lose this capability—and we are losing it now—we jeopardize the security of our Nation.

These are some of the reasons why we must start a new national maritime program right now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission established by title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed $700,000 for payments to State and local agencies for services to the Commission pursuant to title VII of the Civil Rights Act, $10,000,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOELSON

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOELSON: On page 45, line 17, strike out the figure "$10,000,000" and substitute therefor the figure "$11,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey, is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, as far as those of us on this side of the aisle are concerned, the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey is acceptable.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

XUM

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, as far as the minority is concerned, we will accept the gentleman's amendment.

(Mr. CLAY (at the request of Mr. HATHAWAY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I stand to endorse the amendment offered to this appropriation bill, H.R. 12964, which would provide additional funds for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

It was in 1941 that the first order requiring that nondiscrimination clauses be inserted in Government contracts was issued—by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Every subsequent President adopted the same policy.

Finally, when Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964, it included a formal statement of "equal employment opportunity" embodied in title VII of the Act prohibiting discrimination in hiring, upgrading and all other conditions of employment. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission—composed of five members appointed by the President and approved by the Senate—was established as a result of title VII. The Commission's responsibility is monumental—to assure that all Americans will be considered for hiring and promotion on the basis of their ability and qualifications without regard to race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

Still, discriminatory practices run rampant, not only outside but within the mechanism of this Federal Government. The law was written, the law was passed and the law is clear—that job discrimination is illegal. People across this Nation who know the need for justice in employment opportunities have taken the Congress at its word, and no longer do they silently tolerate job discrimination and employment injustices. They seek relief and they call upon this Nation to stand behind the law. They do not understand that laws can be turned into meaningless rhetoric, if the Congress or the administration chooses to deny funds for implementation of the law. This, Mr. Chairman, is regretfully and tragically the hoax perpetrated by the inadequate funding of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Chairman of the EEOC, William H. Brown III, has stated that the Commission is running 18 months behind in processing complaints of job discrimination. Funding is not the only factor inhibiting the effectiveness of the EEOC to seek respect for the law, but it is a crucial factor which, until resolved, cannot be overcome by any other legislative revisions desperately needed and sought.

The Commission occupies a hotbed of controversy, subject to criticism for not accelerating equal employment opportunities, subject to criticism for harassing employers by persons who see no need for the law in the first place. I sympathize with the difficulty this Commission will have in maintaining any sort of acceptable posture—particularly under an administration which has yet to make any strong stand for civil rights guarantees. But I have more sympathy for the victims of job discrimination who will have no effective recourse.

Surely, the body of the House can see fit to appropriate money to make good the promises that every man in this Nation shall have a chance to become a part of society. If there is any serious intent of this Nation to solve problems constructively within the workings of the American system, that intent must be verified by commitment to the law of the land. Without sufficient funds, the intent of title VII of the Civil Rights Act is meaningless.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Might we have some explanation for this increase in this appropriation?

Mr. JOELSON. Well, I had not intended to speak on it in view of the fact that both sides agreed to the amendment. The revised budget recommendation to the agency from the administration was $15.9 million. So that in appropriating, as I suggest, $11.5 million, we are still considerably below the recommendation of the administration of which the gentleman is a part.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that part of it. As the gentleman says, it is still below the budget recommendation, but why should it be increased above the committee figure?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New Jersey yield to me for the purpose of responding to the question which has been posed by the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am one who went for the $10 million in the committee. However, I have had an opportunity to get more detail as to the workload of this agency and what is necessary in order for it to perform its duties. After discussions with members of the agency, I find that there is some validity here in increasing this amount. Now, I think it might not be wrong to go into a little of the history through which we went last year. This is why, to be perfectly frank, we reached a compromise arrangement at this time. We, of course, recognized that the gentleman had an amendment before and I did not agree to vote for a $1 million increase. The gentleman and I did not make the compromise last year, but we made it this year. In my opinion it will be better for everyone concerned to stick with this with the situation as it is at this time. I further feel that the caseload of this agency will justify the action which we are about to take.

Mr. JOELSON. I recall that last year I offered an amendment containing a larger figure and that the gentleman from Michigan suggested a compromise which I did not accept. As a result, we got nothing. I in the space of a year learned slowly, but I do learn, and I thank the gentleman for his support at this time.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for offering this amendment to provide additional funds for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The amendment is sound and is needed. I am glad the gentleman has taken this initiative and I hope it will have broad support from both sides of the aisle.

Discrimination in employment practices is indeed one of the most pervasive and serious problems which we, as a nation must face today. Our efforts on behalf of minorities and women cannot be minimized or decreased. For far too long, millions of Americans have been unjustifiably and senselessly denied equal job opportunity because of their race, creed, national origin, or sex.

It was not until the passage of title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act that any hope existed for these individuals. We have now given them this hope; let us not fail in our responsibility to insure its implementation.

Considering that the investigation backlog of the Commission is now at approximately 2,500 and is increasing, how can we, in good faith, expect the Commission to fulfill its statutory responsibilities under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by only providing an appropriation which fails to increase their ability to handle these cases expeditiously.

I respectfully submit that an appropriation which does not provide for the Commission's effectiveness in minimizing this backlog will, in the end, be much more costly to our Nation. We can no longer afford to postpone a confrontation with job discrimination.

Under present conditions, there is minimal satisfaction to an individual whose complaint is 18 months in the processing. Can we, as legislators, seriously contend that we have done our best in providing for the implementation of title VII as long as the individual's remedy is delayed for over 1 year? Can we, as legislators, seriously expect the Commission to fulfill its statutory obligations if we do not provide sufficient staffing?

The mandate of title VII is clear. Let us not fail to fulfill our promise, so long in its coming, but so necessary in its effect.

Other steps must be taken to strengthen the EEOC—such as the passage of legislation I have introduced with Congressman HAWKINS to give the Commission power to issue cease and desist orders. But the most essential step is sufficient operating funds. I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. JOELSON. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I have asked the gentleman to yield in order that I may make a statement in justification for the increase in the appropriation for this agency which I gave to the House in a discussion of the bill just a while ago.

XUM

There has been a large increase in the backlog of last year from about 1,500 investigations up to 2,500 investigations. Further, it is expected that with this increased appropriation we can still expect this backlog to go to something near 4,500 cases next year. The number of investigations is going up and the appropriation of additional funds is needed in order to provide additional field office personnel.

Mr. JOELSON. The gentleman from Ohio has made the speech which I intended to make.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for offering this amendment. The gentleman indicated to me a short while ago that he would do so. I think it is a most valuable contribution which the gentleman is making.

Mr. JOELSON. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is this addition designed to cover any unusual purpose?

Mr. JOELSON. It is designed, as I understand it, to catch up with the tremendous backlog. They are now 18 months behind.

Mr. GROSS. But it is for no unusual purpose that this money is being requested?

Mr. JOELSON. The answer is no specific case.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, in connection with this, I am one who proposed the allowance of the full amount in the markup. There is a request for $1,470,000 for travel as compared with only $615,500 in the current year. Would the gentleman agree that that travel should be kept at that amount? When I say the current year, I mean the past year that ended June 30.

Mr. JOELSON. I certainly feel that it should, and I think the legislative record here will so indicate, and that is the reason I did not request more money than I did.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Chairman, I understand from the report that the request for funds for the United States-Mexico Commission for Water Development and Friendship were not approved, and that nothing was appropriated for this; is that correct?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman is correct. There were a number of the members of the committee who felt that, since we have not had any recent war with Mexico or the Mexican people, and that we Americans and Mexicans are living in amicable relations, that we did not want to create a war or any incident down there along the border. The committee saw no necessity for expending all this requested money, $1.5 million, for this Commission.

It was only this morning in the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill that an interagency committee on Mexican-American affairs was approved in the amount of $510,000.

Mr. KAZEN. What the gentleman is referring to is for money to be spent among the related agencies for Mexican-American affairs within the United States. This is a different item altogether.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is correct.

Mr. KAZEN. All right, sir.

It is something entirely different from the Commission.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, it depends on how one looks at it.

Mr. KAZEN. It surprises me that the chairman does not know of the work of this Commission. We certainly do not want war with Mexico and we certainly have not had that.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We have not had trouble with Mexico since about 1916, as I recall, with Pancho Villa.

Mr. KAZEN. I would call to the attention of the gentleman that that is a fact because of the work being done along the borders that is very, very important to this country.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I would suggest to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Texas, that he read the testimony on this item before the subcommittee, which is in the printed hearings.

Mr. KAZEN. What did that testimony show? What does it show was the testimony of this Commission?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It indicated that the committee should be sent to St. Elizabeths if it tried to appropriate a nickel for this Commission.

Mr. KAZEN. Is this what the representatives of the Commission showed in their testimony?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I do not think that they said that. I probably said that.

Now the gentleman knows that the people over there in the State Department agree that this is a ridiculous request—$1,500,000 for something that we might never get off the books again. Now is the chance to get it off the books.

Mr. KAZEN. I just want to get in the RECORD the basis for the committee turning it down. If you say it was the Chairman of the Commission who made that statement—I will accept it.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. If the gentleman would just take a copy of the printed hearings, and I have one here for him, he can find out exactly who testified and what was said.

Mr. KAZEN. I just wanted something in the RECORD at this point, Mr. Chairman—that people representing this Commission made this statement that this Commission was not worth the money that they were asking for. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. What was the gentleman's question?

Mr. KAZEN. That someone appeared before your committee representing this Commission and said that the Commission was not worth the amount of money that they were requesting.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Someone else suggested it, I thought.

Mr. KAZEN. I thought, Mr. Chairman, that you said this was in the testimony before your committee. I asked the distinguished gentleman if he meant it was someone who was representing and in favor of the request for this Commission who made this statement that the money was not needed for this Commission and that they should not appropriate a single penny for it.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Oh, no; I do not believe I said that. I was quoting someone that the gentleman knows who thought that $400,000 would be tops for this Commission. But they are here asking for $1,500,000 and the committee felt that they were not worth 15 cents.

Mr. KAZEN. I just wanted to get the record straight as to who was testifying before this committee.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The record is in the printed hearings and if the gentleman would only pick up one of these volumes of printed hearings and read it, he will be thoroughly familiar with it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for the spending in this fiscal year of almost $480 million more than was approved for the State, Justice, Commerce, and related agencies last year. Regardless of the purposes of the increases, this is far too much. This is not the way to fight inflation. If the increases represent new and necessary expenditures then some of the old programs ought to have been cut to accommodate the priorities.

We simply cannot go on spending at this rate and expect anything but national insolvency. I have no alternative but to vote against the bill.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAYS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideraion the bill (H.R. 12964) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, had

XUM

directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 366, nays 31, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

YEAS—366

Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashbrook
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Beall, Md.
Belcher
Bell, Calif.
Betts
Biaggi
Biester
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Caffery
Camp
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chisholm
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Clay
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Collins
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Coughlin
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dennis
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Foreman
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gaydos
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Goldwater
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Haley
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey
Hastings
Hathaway
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks
Hogan
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
King
Kluczynski
Koch
Kyl
Kyros
Landgrebe
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McCloskey
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McKneally
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Mann
Marsh
Martin
Mathias
Matsunaga
Mayne
Meeds
Melcher
Meskill
Michel
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Mizell
Mollohan
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Podell
Poff
Pollock
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes
Riegle
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roth
Roudebush
Roybal
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St. Onge
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weicker
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wold
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—31

Abernethy
Bennett
Bevill
Brinkley
Buchanan
Chappell
Colmer
Daniel, Va.
Dickinson
Dowdy
Edwards, Ala.
Flowers
Fountain
Fuqua
Gonzalez
Griffin
Gross
Hagan
Hansen, Idaho
Henderson
Jones, N.C.
Lennon
Montgomery
Nichols
O'Neal, Ga.
Patman
Rarick
Rivers
Stephens
Thompson, Ga.
Utt

NOT VOTING—35

Abbitt
Anderson, Ill.
Arends
Berry
Blackburn
Broyhill, Va.
Cahill
Carey
Celler
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Dorn
Hall
Halpern
Hawkins
Howard
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kuykendall
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Lujan
May
Morton
O'Konski
Poage
Powell
Reuss
Rostenkowski
St Germain
Stokes
Stratton
Teague, Tex.
Tunney

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Poage with Mr. Kleppe.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mrs. May.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Reuss.
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. FOUNTAIN, and Mr. PATMAN changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight to file a certain privileged report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING THE COMMENDATION AND GRATITUDE OF THE HOUSE TO THE MEN AND WOMEN OF THE NATIONAL SPACE PROGRAM ON THE OCCASION OF THE APOLLO 11 MISSION

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 487) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 487

Whereas the United States has completed its first decade in space, with the combined talents of Government, industry, and education having been effectively employed in the space program to open a new frontier; and

Whereas in the development of the space program science and technology have been brought to new levels of achievement, and inspiration and intellectual stimulation have been generated not only for the people of the United States but for the entire world; and

Whereas the mission of Apollo 11, representing as it does the first real step by mankind into the universe beyond the planet on which we live, is not only a great adventure but demonstrates substantial progress toward the achievement of the objectives originally expressed in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958; and

Whereas the achievement of these objectives—the expansion of human knowledge, the improvement of aeronautical and space vehicles, the development of information useful to our national defense, and the preservation of the United States' role as a leader in space science and technology and its application for peaceful purposes, with international cooperation in the peaceful application of the program's results—has importance for our Nation far beyond the specific areas of science and technology to which the program directly relates; and

Whereas this mission provides a uniquely appropriate occasion for expressing public appreciation of the past achievements of the space program and public recognition of the potential of such program for benefits to mankind in the future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives commends the magnificent team of men and women throughout the United States and the world at large, in Government, industry, and education, who have contributed so much to the accomplishments of our national space program; and expresses gratitude and appreciation, for itself and on behalf of the American people, for the outstanding dedication and tireless effort of all those who have been associated with the Apollo program in general and the Apollo 11 mission in particular.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Today we have seen the consummation of the ambitious statement made by President Kennedy less than 10 years ago that we would put a man on the moon and return him safely to earth within the decade of the 1960's. This has been a great accomplishment.

Those of us who are privileged to be alive today will pass this on to our children and our grandchildren, and they in turn will brag about the fact that we were here.

The flight of Apollo 11 is perhaps the greatest secular achievement that the world has ever seen. I do not have to tell you that. You have followed the adventure very closely. I am happy to say that these men are now back on the planet earth. They are in the quarantine van. For the 22d time we have sent men into space and brought them back.

(Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we Americans are a proud and happy people today. The safe splashdown of the Apollo 11 in the Pacific Ocean has brought to an end the most amazing journey in man's history.

As ranking Republican member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, as well as the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee, I know what a tremendous effort has been made by so many people over the years to bring about the successful flight of Apollo 11.

The courage, creativity and competence demonstrated by every individual on the NASA team is a tribute to our American heritage.

Astronauts Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins are to be congratulated on the manner in which they accomplished man's first lunar landing, and the entire NASA team is to be commended on the successful completion of this mission.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I shall be happy to yield to our distinguished Speaker, but before doing so I would like to say that the gentleman in the well, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, is as much responsible for the establishment of NASA and the space effort as any man in the United States.

He chaired the ad hoc committee that put together the space law and I am very happy to yield to him now.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are all very happy with the successful accomplishment of this most difficult, sensitive, and historic feat. Not so long ago it was thought to be impossible, but this shows what America can do—the brains and ingenuity of Americans and the courage of Americans.

We all watched the commander, Neil Armstrong, and Colonel Aldrin when they were walking on the moon carrying out their very dangerous and historic mission, and we all watched Lieutenant Colonel Collins when he was in close proximity, performing his very difficult and delicate task and duty in connection with the two astronauts who actually landed on the moon.

The entire world paused—that part of the world in particular who were permitted by their governments to know of the mission to the moon and of the accomplishments that resulted therefrom. The entire world admired what these three men did and also admired the thousands of others who contributed to the successful accomplishment of this mission.

All of America is proud, and justly so. Without going further into detail on this occasion, I think it is only proper that these three brave Americans be properly recognized by the Congress of the United States. I have conferred with the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Albert) and the leadership on the other side, the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Gerald R. Ford), and I have also talked over the telephone with the majority leader of the Senate, and I know that the minority leader of the Senate would be in complete accord, and it is our intention after the recess, which will be the earliest time possible, to accord these three distinguished gentlemen, these Americans, the fullest recognition that the Congress of the United States can afford to them by inviting them to attend a joint meeting of the Congress of the United States. I think this is an appropriate time for me to make this statement and to make this announcement. I know that NASA will cooperate in every way possible.

So, again, we are proud of them. I know I speak the sentiments of all my colleagues in the House and the sentiments of all Americans in extending to them our congratulations and in thanking God that He, in his wisdom, guided and directed and protected them, not only in their dangerous journey to the moon, but also in their successful arrival back in the United States.

I also congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. Miller), chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics for the outstanding legislative leadership given through the years in the successful accomplishment of this mission to the moon.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from California permit me to yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished gentleman yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear that these three brave astronauts—Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins—will be invited to address a joint meeting of the Congress shortly after their return in the month of August. This is one way in which we can dramatically express to them our gratitude and our appreciation for their heroic effort and their scientific achievement.

As I was watching, on the memorable night of Sunday, the step-by-step movement of Neil Armstrong from LEM onto the moon, naturally I was proud of him and all those associated with him in this magnificent team effort.

But I believe it would be appropriate also to mention at this point that my memory went back to a sad and tragic episode of our space program. I believe it was January 1967 when I was notified, as all others connected with the program in one way or another were notified, that three equally brave astronauts had lost their lives in a tragedy at Cape Kennedy. It made a particular impact on me, because Roger Chaffee, one of the three, came from my home town of Grand Rapids, Mich. Roger Chaffee lost his life, as did Gus Grissom and Ed White on that occasion.

As one would imagine, that tragedy, the loss of Roger Chaffee's life has left an indelible imprint on our community because he was an outstanding young man and he represented all that was the best in our Nation. The fine parents of Roger Chaffee were deeply affected by the loss of their wonderful son. However, they, I am sure, have been as proud of what Neil Armstrong and his associates have done, even though their son, Gus Grissom, and Ed White lost their lives in the program.

I wish to say that we on our side wholeheartedly concur in the resolution offered by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. This is a way the Congress can express its gratitude and our appreciation for what has been accomplished not only by the three astronauts themselves but also by all those associated with the program.

This is truly and typically an American achievement which deserves the highest commendation by those of us elected to the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate very

XUM

much the remarks made by my distinguished friend.

In conclusion, we are looking forward, at the coming joint meeting, to meeting and honoring these distinguished Americans who have brought great credit not only upon themselves and their families but also upon our beloved country. Their accomplishment, as we look into the future, will be a marked contribution toward a better pathway for mankind.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the majority leader, a former member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I, of course, join the distinguished Speaker, the distinguished minority leader, and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics in expressing our congratulations to three brave, great, and talented men who are also Americans.

I join the entire world in offering a prayer of thanksgiving to almighty God that these men have safely returned after successfully accomplishing their mission. What they have done is a part of the miracle of America—the strength, the ingenuity, the dedication, which this great Republic is capable of putting into any task. Our great space team not only accomplished its mission but achieved a splashdown almost on the precise second for which it was programed when the mission was first setup.

If the world lasts a million years, men will still have to say that it was the genius and courage of America that first conquered the mysteries of outer space. We are thankful not only as Americans but as human beings that these three extraordinary men have done this on behalf of our country and mankind.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the Record on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, a decade ago, the thought of two Americans setting foot on the moon before 1970 seemed absolutely unbelievable. Curiously, the magnitude of this achievement is such that Sunday night's moon walk still seems unbelievable. Man has progressed so far and so fast in so short a time, I hesitate to predict the wonders that await us during the next decade.

The moon landing is more than a tribute to astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins, and is more than a tribute to the efforts of those so completely engaged in our space efforts. The moon landing is a tribute to our entire system of free enterprise, a system where man is spurred on to greater and greater achievements because he reaps the rewards of his own labor.

Three Delaware firms deserve special recognition for their own major contributions to the success of the space flight. ILC Industries in Dover has been under contract to the National Aeronautics and Space administration for almost 4 years to produce all the space suits used in the Apollo series. The commemorative stamp for Apollo 11 will show an astronaut wearing an ILC suit. I would like to insert at this point in the Record a brief advertisement that appeared in the Delaware State News on Monday, July 21:

TAKE ONE GIANT STEP

The first step onto the lunar surface by Neil Armstrong was truly a giant step . . . for mankind . . . for our country's technology in the eyes of the world . . . and for thousands of individuals in our space industry.

This giant step was made possible through years of effort by a hard-working, dedicated team—people in industrial firms who have assisted ILC Industries during our years as prime contractor to NASA for the Project Apollo space suits.

We congratulate astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin and Collins and the entire NASA-Industry team for their outstanding accomplishments. We are proud to be associated with them and we are especially proud of our role in Project Apollo.

Apollo 11 represents a "bench mark" in space progress but it is also the first of a series of scheduled lunar landings. With each subsequent flight and exploration comes new data, new requirements and new challenges. To meet present challenges and those to come ILC Industries will continue to supply the best available equipment. We are committed to an intensive, long-range program of continually improving equipment and we plan to play a vital role in man's future conquests of space.

Hercules, Inc., based in Wilmington, has actually been involved in our space program since 1915, when the company provided smokeless powder for Dr. Robert Goddard's exploratory rocket flights. It was a Hercules motor that boosted the third stage of Pioneer I into orbit, in 1958, and Hercules motors have powered a total of more than 100 unmanned space flights. Hercules has provided oxidizer for all Apollo flights, producing 35,000 pounds of oxidizer for Apollo 11 alone. And a subsidiary of Hercules produced almost 60 miles of wiring for the Apollo 11 command module and lunar module.

The other Delaware company that should be saluted is E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., which had a hand in many different areas of the command module and the Eagle, the craft which rested on the Sea of Tranquility. An article from the Wilmington Evening Journal, July 21, 1969, sums up Du Pont's role quite well:

DU PONT KEEPS TRIO WELL SUITED—SEVEN DEPARTMENTS AID APOLLO CREW

Products manufactured by seven Du Pont Co. departments will be aboard Apollo 11.

In the moon suit, each of the 21 layers either contains or is made entirely of products developed by Du Pont.

Nylon provides strength for restraint layers, while neoprene-coated nylon is used as bladder material and ripstop in the pressure garment. Non-woven Dacron polyester fiber is spacer material between layers of aluminized Mylar polyester film, which provides thermal protection.

Aluminized Kapton polyimide film is also used for thermal insulation. Fiberglass coated with Teflon TFE fluorocarbon, forms an outer layer, more than half of which is covered with fabric of Teflon yarn for abrasion protection. Nomex high temperature nylon provides an inner protective layer.

Aluminized Kapton and Mylar cover the exterior of the Lunar Module to provide protection against the extreme heat and cold. Kapton is used as electrical insulation on 14 miles of wiring in the module. Inner wall panels of the Command Module are made of Pyralin polyimide impregnated sheets.

When not in their spacesuits, astronauts wear white coveralls of Teflon fiber. TFE monofilament is used in a Velcro patch on the soles of the astronauts' footwear which enables them to position themselves in the weightless environment.

As the LM approaches the lunar surface the astronauts will use telescopically photographed lunar landing maps printed on Cronapaque polyester print film.

Couches in the command module are made of Armalon TFE-fluorocarbon-coated glass fabric; felts of similar material are used as gaskets. More than 15 miles of wiring in the module is insulated with Teflon TFE fluorocarbon resin.

High strength hydrogen peroxide is used to power attitude controls. Ludox colloidal silica serves in the booster's thermal insulation and Freon fluorocarbon propellant is used to pressurize the capsule's fire control system.

Parts incorporating polyimide resin—a high temperature resistant plastic—are used throughout the command module in applications such as circuit breakers, scuff covers and food boxes.

The movie and TV cameras astronauts will use on the lunar surface depend on Vespel precision parts of polyimide resin.

Krytox fluorinated grease and oil, which have no ignition point, are used as lubricants in the moon suit and in Command and Lunar Modules.

When the capsule and its passengers have returned from the lunar surface, parachutes of Du Pont nylon will cushion their splashdown.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, today three men have returned safely from a successful flight to the moon. While many of us, myself included, have expressed serious doubts about the necessity and the expense of our huge space program, I am sure I speak for all Americans in expressing gratitude to God for their safe return and pride in their magnificent accomplishment.

The number of scientific byproducts from our space program, which may well revolutionize our way of life, is impressive. Because of our space program, we have put satellites in orbit for instant communication with the world, developed fantastic new computers, accomplished great things in the miniaturization of electronic equipment and have made great breakthroughs in weather forecasting. And these are just four of many examples I could name.

In addition, the landing on the moon and future explorations will greatly expand man's knowledge about himself and the origin of his earth. It may also help him to preserve his planet.

Finally, I sensed in scenes across the Nation a new spirit of unity and purpose, at least for the moment. Perhaps the flight of Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins can fullfill President Nixon's hope of "bringing us together."

Besides the progress we have already made, scientists tell us of the potential for many more achievements. I have heard that in the zero-gravity conditions of a manned orbiting laboratory a

XUM

new structural material, lighter in weight but stronger than anything yet known, can be produced. We will increase our knowledge of earthquakes, leading to a day when perhaps we can predict or even prevent them.

In all of this, Purdue University has made significant contributions. This great educational institution is located in West Lafayette, Ind., within the Second District, which I am privileged to represent.

Neil Armstrong, the first man to set foot on lunar soil, is a 1955 aeronautical engineering graduate of Purdue. Two of the men who lost their lives in the tragic launching pad fire of 1967, Virgil "Gus" Grissom and Roger Chaffee, are also Purdue men, as is Eugene Cernan, whose achievement aboard Apollo 10 paved the way for Apollo 11's success.

Purdue's faculty has also contributed mightily to the NASA program. Dr. Donald Stullken, a Ph. D. graduate of Purdue and a former faculty member there, was the man in charge of the recovery program, the final step in the safe return of America's spacemen. Dr. Gerald A. Leonards of Purdue assisted in the design of the lunar module's landing gear. Dr. Leonards, with five other Purdue professors, also designed the soil sampler which will be used by the men of Apollo 12 to bring back an uncontaminated sample of lunar soil. The other five men who developed this sampler are Profs. William H. Perloff, Edwin J. Kirsch, William Baron, Joseph Modrey, and Kenneth E. Botkin. Also, Dr. Joe Waling, associate dean of the Purdue Graduate School, is the regional secretary of the University Space Research Association.

Purdue's famous astronaut and Purdue's professors are only part of the story. This great Indiana school has also educated many other men who have gone on to contribute quietly, but effectively, to our lunar achievement. Purdue graduates involved in the NASA program include:

Alpha R. Bond, chief of the Resources Management Branch, Marshall Space Flight Center; Ervin S. Boothman, project engineer, Marshall Space Flight Center; Gene T. Bridwell, manager, Saturn V S–II Stage Propulsion Subsystems, Marshall Space Flight Center; Alfred N. Caves, flight management, Spacecraft Operations Branch, Goddard Space Flight Center; James E. Dening, Data Requirements Information Systems Branch, Kennedy Space Flight Center; Richard E. Dozung, technical management specialist, Office of Manned Space Flight; Charles E. Foggett, aerospace engineer, Manned Space Flight Center; Joseph M. Haas, quality engineer, Quality Assurance Directorate, Kennedy Space Flight Center; Donald Lovall, aerospace technician, Information Systems Branch, Kennedy Space Flight Center; Clyde Metherton, launch flight operations planner, Launch Operations Directorate, Kennedy Space Flight Center; George E. Mueller, Associate Administrator for Manned Space Flight, Washington; Ronald D. Paulus, special assistant for Inter-Center Configurations Management, Kennedy Space Flight Center; John R. Schaibley, executive assistant to the Apollo Program Director, Washington; Robert J. Schwinghamer, Jr., chief materials director, Astronautics Laboratory, Marshall Space Flight Center; James R. Shaw, flight systems engineer, NASA; Leland D. Smith, procurement analyst, Marshall Space Flight Center; James J. Taylor, chief, Advanced Mission Studies Section, Manned Space Flight Center, and Robert K. Wolf, mechanical engineer, Marshall Space Flight Center.

From this impressive list of Purdue men who have done so much for our space program, it is obvious that when I congratulate the men of Apollo, I also congratulate Purdue University.

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, the world has never been so united in its emotions as it is today as we hail the astronauts of Apollo 11 on their safe return from the moon. Each successive step in this venture has made the event more incredible, more historic, and more indicative of what can soon be done. The landing on the moon, the moon walk, the takeoff from the surface, the redocking with the command module and now the safe reentry and landing: as great as each of these events were in and of themselves, each succeeding one made the previous one that much greater.

It is a tremendous tribute to our technology that we achieved any of these successes, but the totality of them is what awes us today. At no point did we fail. We set out to place men on the moon and to bring them safely back from the moon and this we did. The elements of planning were impeccable: from the facts as they were known the men of Apollo drew the proper conclusions and made their preparations accordingly. The possible contingencies which might arise in such an unfamiliar situation stagger the imagination. It is to the everlasting credit of the men responsible that in the event their plans were not found wanting.

Nor did the mechanics of Apollo 11 ever falter. Engines which had never fired in space did so faultlessly. No gadget broke, no dial failed to register, no wire failed to conduct. Apollo 11 was astonishing in its complexity and hence the more astonishing still in the infallibility of its machinery. The craftsmanship responsible must certainly rank with the finest in the world that has ever been produced.

Of course, much had to be left to the judgment of the astronauts themselves and they shouldered this burden in a way that makes us all proud to be their fellow citizens. While the world waited Neil Armstrong skillfully navigated the lunar module across a hundred yards of rocky terrain to a perfect soft landing. Intrepidity has always been the hallmark of the pioneer and it was present in full measure this week despite all of the scientific trappings.

The sky is no longer the limit for man. We watched on Sunday night as the astronauts moved freely and proudly in an alien environment. Far from what the social scientists would term their natural habitat, the space explorers established that man is a more marvelous and versatile creation than we had ever thought. Our spiritual horizons have always stretched to eternity; now our physical horizons do so too.

The potential of man is immeasurably expanded by that moment in which Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin first hopped across the face of the moon.

The competence of all the men involved; the men who planned; the men who built; the men who flew has earned our applause and inspired our confidence. But I think that we all held our breaths and silently prayed this morning that this last vital step might go well. It has indeed.

All of the countries around the globe are now our neighbors more nearly than ever before and while we celebrate mankind's triumph together and congratulate those to whom this success is owed, it is meet that we remember the higher thanks which we owe to Him who granted to us our talents and stood with each of us during this crucial moment in the life of man.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, today, the 24th of July, 1969, is one of the great days in history. Not only does the day mean the safe recovery of our three brave astronauts from the moon, but this day marks the 122d anniversary of Mormon pioneers who entered the Salt Lake Valley in 1847.

The Mormon pioneers—who traveled the many miles from Nauvoo, Ill.—suffered the pains of hunger, disease, and even death as they crossed the treacherous mountains, the barren plains, braved the cold during the winter, to finally end their journey as Brigham Young announced, "This is the place."

Now, today, other pioneers in space have safely come back to earth. I think the two events this day somewhat parallel each other—the Mormon pioneers who made the "desert blossom as the rose" in the Salt Lake Valley—and our astronauts who pioneered the surface of the moon, which may make way for mankind to progress with civilization even further than we have before—certainly should receive the tribute of a grateful nation.

My ancestors crossed the plains in covered wagons to begin a new life. Now, our colleagues have crossed space to perhaps a new way of life on other planets.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support for this resolution honoring the people and institutions that made possible the astonishing success of our space program.

No one person—nor any group of persons—can claim exclusive credit for the lunar landing. Apollo 11's historic mission took the pioneer work of visionaries like Kepler, Tsiolkovsky, and Goddard—men who were hooted at in their own time. It took the work of contemporary theoreticians such as Wernher von Braun, John Houbolt, and Charles Draper. It took the work of literally millions of scientists, administrators, technicians, and other workers associated with NASA and private industry.

Special credit should go to Astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins, and NASA's administrators, but we should keep in mind that this staggering achievement is the end product of cen-

XUM

turies of work by millions of people in virtually every part of the globe.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include with my remarks editorials published by the Springfield, Mass. Daily News and the Springfield Union, and a New York Times column by James Reston—all discussing the significance of the lunar landing.

The editorials follow:

A Genesis in Space

Man's first landing and exploration of the moon is a genesis which begins to cut the universe down to human size and opens the way for the exploration of other planets by future generations.

Astronaut Neil A. Armstrong—the first man on the moon—described his initial step on the lunar surface as: "One small step for man—one giant leap for mankind."

President Richard M. Nixon, speaking from the White House to Astronauts Armstrong and Edwin E. Aldrin Jr., summed up the feelings of millions of Americans and countless millions the world over when he said: "Because of what you have done, the heavens have become part of man's world."

However, the historic Apollo 11 flight is a dramatic ending point just as much as it marks the beginning of a new space era.

Up until 10:56 p.m. last night when Astronaut Armstrong stepped gingerly off the lunar module ladder onto the dusty surface of the moon, man had been bound by the fears of the ages which warned him that the moon is a dark and forbiding place which contains all kinds of unknown perils.

Despite all his scientific knowledge and the amazing workings of his computers, man was an explorer into the unknown on this mission to the moon—just as Columbus, the polar explorers, the American pioneers, and Charles Lindbergh embarked into mysterious and uncharted regions with no assurances that they would succeed.

Astronauts Armstrong and Aldrin discovered, in the short space of only a couple of hours, that the moon is not such a terrifying place after all. Moving cautiously at first, they soon began to bounce around on the lunar surface with an almost reckless abandon which highlighted an amazing live telecast to astonished earthlings.

This was the ending point on the Sea of Tranquility landing site—the signal from the moon to earth that man had cut himself loose from centuries of fears which chained him to this planet.

It would, however, despite the vast implications of the first moon touchdown and lunar exploration, be premature to say that man has "conquered" the moon.

The Apollo 11 mission itself still has a number of difficult maneuvers to perform before Astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Michael Collins, the command module pilot, return safely to earth.

And, although the first lunar exploration surpassed the success-expectations of everyone concerned, a series of other Apollo flights will be needed to tell us all we want to know about the moon's surface. Subsequent missions will expand, also dramatically, on this initial Eagle-Columbia probe.

Meanwhile, the U.S. space program must be reviewed as a cumulative effort despite the glory which properly belongs to Apollo 11.

It was only a shade over eight years ago that the United States sent its first man into space when Navy Cmdr. Alan B. Shepard Jr. ventured forth on the first suborbital flight in Freedom 7 on May 5, 1961.

John H. Glenn Jr. became a national and global hero on Feb. 20, 1962, when Friendship 7 orbited the earth three times in less than five hours.

And, only last December, Astronauts Frank Borman, James A. Lovell Jr. and William A. Anders became the first men to orbit the moon.

Every astronaut who has flown into space in the Gemini and Apollo programs has been a pioneer in the truest sense of the word. And the thousands of scientists who have spent untold hours at their drawing boards, in the laboratories, and at the computers have been coequal pioneers.

America and the world salutes the first men on the moon. But, even more, we pay tribute to man's will to know and conquer his universe—a determination which has joined all of us together as pioneers who share this space triumph of Apollo 11.

Footprints on the Moon

Probably the most spectacular—possibly the most significant—achievement of mankind is now on the record. What this "Year of the Moon" will mean to future generations is difficult to imagine. But for now the voyage of Apollo 11 has spread a kind of excitement that knows no boundaries. The world is paying tribute to the courage of Astronauts Aldrin, Armstrong and Collins, and to this nation's leadership in space.

The question of whether man, with his present knowledge and inventive capacity, can walk on the moon and survive there for a limited period, at least, has been answered clearly in the affirmative. But there was, it seemed not much doubt on this score. More speculative has been the ultimate relationship between man and the earth's only satellite. That broad and complex question is still unresolved.

Physically, the moon is a dismal place in the context of man's existence on earth, and its use as anything more than an interesting place for a very brief visit may continue in doubt for some time. Some scientists believe the moon will never be anything but an inhospitable slag pile, as far as man's survival there is concerned. With no atmosphere, the lunar surface is open to the full impact of space radiations. Temperature ranges from 260 degrees fahrenheit below zero to 240 degrees above. Meteoroids can slam into the moon at 45 miles per second.

If the expense of getting a man to the moon was out of all proportion to the benefits, as many Americans have felt, it would be dwarfed by the expense of keeping a manned laboratory—or a colony of settlers—there for a prolonged period. Special shelters, perhaps under the surface, would probably be necessary, to say nothing of all the sophisticated life-sustaining equipment that would be needed. Even then, unsuspected hazards could make such a project completely unrealistic, and the moon might have to be written off as valueless for any human activity.

What the Apollo 11 astronauts have found may, in fact, determine the shape of whatever space exploration there is to be in the future—whether the moon can be used as a staging area for deeper space probes and whether there is anything to be derived from manned exploration of the moon itself. The Soviet Union may have suggested the better way—the gathering of materials by robot vehicles that can be sent to the moon and brought back.

The philosophy that man was never meant to venture to another celestial body may be supported by the obstacles he encounters. On the other hand, he was endowed with qualities that have enabled him to go as far as landing on the moon. The same qualities will determine what more he can do—but more importantly, what he should do.

The Moon and 1976

(By James Reston)

One of the lessons of the present spectacular voyage to the moon is that the American mind and the American political system seem to need great challenges and clear goals to work at their best.

Humiliations and disasters help, too. The American people are watching this flight with their uttermost pride, but it was the hurt to their pride—first in the Soviet Sputnik I flight of 1957 and then in Yuri Gagarin's first human venture into space in 1960—that created the psychological and political conditions for the United States decision to go to the moon.

Even then, President Kennedy might not have aimed so high as the moon if it had not been for his disastrous gamble at the Bay of Pigs. After that it was clear that something had to be done. Thus the formula for success: disaster, challenge, and a vivid objective to be achieved by a date certain.

THE NEW GOAL

Fortunately, these same ingredients exist for another great adventure in the seventies. It would be hard to describe our race relations as anything but a disgrace, and Vietnam makes the Bay of Pigs look like a regrettable incident. The challenge to the American pride, imagination and organized intelligence of these stains on the national record is clear and the two hundredth anniversary of 1776 is just close enough and yet far enough away to give us a definite target in time.

THE COMPLICATED JOURNEY

It is, to be sure, a more complicated journey. It is harder to concentrate the mind on creating a just and decent society than it is to mobilize the intelligence and machinery to rocket to the moon. Human nature is more volatile and less predictable than the chemicals, fuels, and measurable mathematics of rockets and electronics. Still, the challenge is clear and the anniversary of the nation's birth has emotional and political possibilities that should not be underestimated.

In July of 1969, we are just seven years away from the 200th year since the Declaration of Independence. That is two years less than the time between the decision to go to the moon and the present culmination of that decision, but it is a goal of great historical significance, and it provides an opportunity to channel the energies and talents of the American people toward the national purpose and ideal.

This is not a new idea. Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon have all talked occasionally about it. The citizens of Philadelphia naturally led the parade, and committees of distinguished citizens have been formed all over the country to prepare for the great celebration.

But it has not yet become a central point and aim of national policy and is not part of the conscious public mind. The funds, the brains, the organization that went into the objective of going to the moon have not been mobilized and directed toward achieving certain definite social and economic objectives, and this is a missed opportunity.

THE PRESIDENT'S OPPORTUNITY

There is an enormous difference between appointing committees for a celebration seven years away and setting a goal for achieving definite national, state, and community goals. It takes leadership from the White House, organization and funds to create a national awareness of problems to be solved in thousands of communities by July of 1976, but this could be done.

It is much more difficult than persuading the Congress to appropriate funds to beat the Russians to the moon and then organizing the scientists, engineers and industry to produce the machines and train a limited number of brave men.

THE EDUCATIONAL PROBLEM

Landing successfully on 1976 involves making the voyage and the goal, or at least the question, clear to the leaders of every community of the nation, but the thing could be done. Not with the precision of the astronauts, to be sure, but greatly to the achievement and redemption of the ideals of the American Declaration.

If done, this might be more important to the Republic in the end than landing on the moon. But the moon project may have given us the key. It had imagination. It mobilized intelligence. It had a specific goal within a specific time, and the goal was to do something no man had ever done before.

Maybe the analogy is wrong. Space science and political science could not be more different. But the whole idea of America was to create a society nobody had ever created before, and it could be that the moon-men, with their concentration, purpose and time-schedule have shown us the way.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join in support of House Resolution 487 and to join my colleagues in expressing gratitude for the Apollo 11 astronauts' safe return to this earth. This has been as exciting and as historic a week as any that our Nation has ever known. A Chinese philosopher said, "May we live in interesting times." We can be thankful that we have that privilege.

In watching the launching of Apollo 11 at Cape Kennedy, I was impressed by the tension, the excitement, the jubilation, and cheers as the rocket left the earth and thundered into space. I thought of the fact that this missile weighed 6½ million pounds, which is the equivalent of over 2,000 automobiles, each weighing 3,000 pounds. I thought of a statement that Astronaut John Glenn made when he was speaking to a joint session of Congress, that he was glad that pride in this country and its accomplishments is not a thing of the past. I believe that the space program has done much to restore American prestige in the eyes of the world and to make people in other nations proud of this Yankee daring, with the whole world watching. At Cape Kennedy, I studied carefully an Apollo capsule. The crowded quarters increased my sympathy for the men who had to live in the capsule for over a week. The compact mass of switches and control gadgets increased my respect for the knowledge of the astronauts who operate them.

The question has been frequently asked, "Why spend so much money on space exploration, while millions on earth are in need?" Of course, the space money goes to American industries, businesses, and individuals, and much of it comes back to the Federal Government in taxes. Also, the space program is tied closely to our national defense efforts. Had Hitler perfected the V–2 rocket a few years earlier, he likely would have won World War II. The nation with the most know-how in space is apt to be the one most powerful militarily on earth.

Also, it is this advance in science and technology which has produced for America our dynamic industrial economy. It has made America the economic powerhouse of this century. Without it, our economy could be like that of China or India or Central America. This advance in technology and know-how has enabled most American citizens to rise above the poverty level and to share in the highest standard of living ever enjoyed by any people. Scientific and technological development must continue.

One lesson that we can learn from the last week is that our Nation can accomplish wonders when there is a total national commitment and when people are willing to work together. A total of 17,000 industries and businesses, and a total of one-half million people had a part in developing the Apollo 11 missile and in making the trip to the moon possible.

I believe that even greater accomplishments can be made in the space field if the other technically-advanced nations joined the United States in future space exploration. Today I became a cosponsor of a concurrent resolution, inviting other nations to join ours in future space efforts. I believe the time is right for national rivalry in the realm of space to be put aside and for a truly international space effort to begin.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to take this historic occasion to wish our astronauts a safe journey home and compliment them—and the thousands who contributed to their voyage—on their majestic achievement. This is truly a triumphant hour for the human race.

The first landing of men on the moon has been brought about through unexcelled organization and hard work. It is living testimony to the unlimited potential of human ingenuity diligently applied.

Many of us would recommend, however, that in future space projects the United States seek a greater balance between manned and unmanned operations Earth Resources Satellites—ERS—hold great promise. Among their uses are monitoring crops and water resources, precise, long-range weather forecasting, and guidance for navigational traffic. An accelerated ERS program would yield an immediate return on the taxpayers' investment.

And surely, Mr. Speaker, as we are exploring space we should also be able to investigate the dark labyrinth of human fear, poverty, and violence. Surely, in the light of today's achievements, man has the needed technology to raise the poor, the sick, the dying, and the persecuted here on this earth to a more livable existence. I would hope that we might apply that same devotion and organizational know-how to the ponderous social problems now confronting us, and vow that there, as with the moon landing, hopes will become plans, and dreams will become destiny.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this first landing of human beings on the surface of the moon is surely one of the great events in all of human history. Only a few short years ago the idea of having men travel in space seemed fantastic.

That this is an enormous technological achievement is obvious. Needless to say it has come about only as a result of many years of hard work by thousands of dedicated scientists, engineers, administrators, and skilled workers.

It is, however, more than merely an illustration of scientific genius. It represents a new venture of the human spirit.

Sunday, July 20, 1969, will be marked forever as the day man transcended the bonds of his nature and his environment, and the human race entered a new era leading to realms beyond comprehension and even beyond imagination. Now one can believe that the limitations to the accomplishments of man are set only by the limitations of the human spirit.

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, we thank God for the safe return today of our three heroic astronauts, Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin, and Michael Collins.

We cannot visualize the extensiveness of the progress made in the world of science and technology, because of this moon landing and subsequent reentry. And we are probably incapable of comprehending how much prestige this voyage to the moon will bring to our Nation.

Man's exploration of the moon, the flawless flight of Apollo 11, is the most monumental and significant achievement of this youthful Nation and possibly of the entire world.

I feel especially proud today that our space efforts have been so successful and that I am privileged to live in this great land at the time of this remarkable and historically unequalled experience.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 487 introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, Mr. MILLER, one of the great leaders in our national space program. It is indeed appropriate that the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) should on the occasion of the return of our three brave astronauts from the moon cite the participation of all Americans in this great undertaking. The Apollo program has required the effort of over 400,000 talented people throughout the United States and the world. At the peak of the Apollo effort over 20,000 contractors and subcontractors throughout the United States and the free world have made major contributions to this magnificent achievement.

Today we stand on the threshold of a new era in science and technology. I need not remind my colleagues that science and technology is one of the basic ingredients that makes our Nation great. Without this Nation's acceptance of the challenge to seek new knowledge and to utilize it for the betterment of mankind we would not be in the position to offer hope for improved opportunities for all the people of this world.

The flight of Apollo 11 has demonstrated man's capability to learn and work in a new environment. Millions of Americans have contributed to this effort. Our universities, industry, and Government have teamed to apply the knowledge developed by our fundamental researchers and with that have built a complex but practical system for space exploration and its ultimate utilization.

It is significant to note that one of the experiments conducted on the moon to analyze the solar winds was an experiment developed and provided by the Swiss. Even today we have the beginnings of international cooperation in our national space program. We already have cooperated with over 20 countries in cooperative project agreements in space sciences. We work today with 72 nations

XUM

in ground base space related programs. Apollo 11 points the way to bringing nations throughout the free world even more intimately into our space effort.

The flight of Lunar 15 at the time of the Apollo 11 lunar landing and the exchange of information between astronaut Frank Borman and Soviet officials give hope, at least, that our national space program can provide the ground on which international understanding may be improved.

It is my view that our space program is already contributing significantly to the growth and well-being of our society. Through NASA's technology utilization program over 900 innovations developed from the research and development of our national space program are finding applications in our industry.

A strong basis and fundamental research is being supported through our national space effort in our educational institutions throughout this country.

Today we take communications satellites and weather satellites for granted but the potential for the utilization of space for scientific exploration has only begun to be realized. We are at the point in our space effort where it will be necessary to make major decisions on our future directions. We have the capability to explore the solar system by means of automated or manned spacecraft. We have the opportunity to utilize near space for the benefit of mankind in various resource applications.

We may find it valuable over the next several decades to send men on voyages within our solar system. In the next few months and years we should build on the achievements of Apollo 11 and its predecessor flights to assure a balanced national space program.

So today we salute not only astronauts Neil A. Armstrong, Michael Collins, and Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr., but also all the people of America in the fulfillment of our national goal of a lunar landing in this decade set by President Kennedy only 8 short years ago.

We welcome those brave men back to earth and thank God for their safe return.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, as a licensed airplane and helicopter pilot, I have witnessed many great experiences in the air, but the successful landing of our astronauts on the moon with the Apollo 11 mission was the greatest expeditionary thrill of my life.

I want to join our beloved Speaker, Mr. McCORMACK, the distinguished minority leader, Mr. FORD, and our great majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, Mr. MILLER, and all of my colleagues in offering humble congratulations to these brave Americans on this most magnificent feat. I know all of the people of the 21st Congressional District in southern Illinois are rejoicing with the rest of the Nation in this historic event.

We will all be looking forward to the joint session of Congress at which time we can personally extend our felicitations, thanks, and best wishes.

A new day has dawned in America.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, they are home; Astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins are home at last and the entire Nation—perhaps the entire world—can breathe a sigh of relief.

How can we ever thank these men? How will we ever adequately recognize the thousands of faceless technicians who made this magnificent gift possible? their gift to mankind is not fully recognized; they have presented us with technological advancement that will have impact on every American life.

We are a proud Nation and it is my fervent hope that we will translate this pride into action. Let us help the world keep peace with this "giant leap for mankind." Some results have been immediate; we know well the way our space technology has been integrated into the field of medicine, for example.

This is indeed a compliment to the military, industrial, and scientific complex.

Mr. Speaker, we are extremely proud of the chairman of the House committee, the Honorable GEORGE MILLER, and of his understudy, the Honorable OLIN TEAGUE. We are proud of the work of Dr. Thomas Paine, NASA Administrator—and of Dr. George Mueller, Associate Administrator for Manned Space Flight.

I also know this Nation owes a special thanks today to former President Lyndon B. Johnson for the way he—more than any other man in America—insisted on embarkation of this program and who literally pushed the Congress into this great adventure as a U.S. Senator, as Vice President, and as President. Without his early leadership and without his strong recommendations to President Kennedy, I wonder when and if we would have reached the moon. We have dared the heavens and we have won. To President Johnson, our Nation again says "thank you," for your contribution.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA).

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) and to join my colleagues in extending congratulations to the three brave astronauts, Neil Armstrong, Mike Collins, and Edwin—Buzz—Aldrin, who only a few hours ago successfully completed their mission to the moon. I wish to congratulate also those who played a supporting role in launching and returning Apollo 11 safely to earth, for certainly without their effort the mission could not have been accomplished. The success of the American miracle was, indeed, the result of a beautiful team effort.

It is with especial pride that I call the attention of the House to the major role which my own State of Hawaii has played in our Nation's space program. Many citizens of the Aloha State actively participated in the preliminary scientific investigations, in tracking and communications, and in the recovery process.

Working in 14-hour shifts, 115 technicians at the Kokee Tracking Station on my native island of Kauai formed an important link in the global network responsible for tracking and communicating with Apollo 11. It was at this station back in 1965 that Astronaut Neil Armstrong, who was then a part of the Kokee tracking team in the Gemini mission, waited in eager anticipation for his epic voyage to the moon.

During last Sunday's historic moonwalk, specialists at both the Palehua Solar Observatory above Barbers Point on Oahu and the University of Hawaii's observatory on Haleakala, Maui, made a careful watch on solar flares capable of producing storms which could have threatened the astronauts. Had a solar flare developed, radiation emanating from it could have showered the astronauts with dangerous charged particles if they happened to be outside of the lunar module's protection.

Participants in Hawaii also played prominent roles in the functioning of the two pieces of scientific equipment left by the astronauts on the moon's surface. One of these instruments, a solar-powered seismograph designed to radio back data on future moonquakes or meteoric disturbances, was conceived by Dr. George H. Sutton, professor of geophysics at the University of Hawaii. This instrument could, among other things, help reveal whether or not the moon has a liquid core.

The well-publicized laser beam experiment designed to enable scientists to measure the precise distance between the earth and the moon was carried out by a team of University of Michigan scientists operating in Hawaii. From atop Mount Haleakala on the island of Maui, the Michigan astronomers were able to transmit and catch the beam of laser light reflected from the mirror-like device installed by the astronauts on the lunar sphere.

In the near future the University of Hawaii's Agronomy and Soil Science Department may play a significant role in characterizing the moon soil brought back to earth by the Apollo astronauts. Having the necessary technical equipment and personnel, the department has already submitted a request for samples to NASA officials.

With the splashdown taking place in the Pacific, military units from Hawaii played a vital function in the recovery operations. Carrying President Nixon, among other notables, the aircraft carrier *Hornet* served as the prime recovery ship for the Apollo 11 astronauts. Among the first to welcome back the astronauts from their historic mission was a team of Naval swimmers led by Lt. Clancy Hatleberg, who assisted the astronauts in their required contamination procedures before boarding the *Hornet*.

Pararescuemen from Hickam Air Force Base near Honolulu, were responsible for securing the flotation collars to the module to insure the safe recovery of the lunar spacecraft. When the *Hornet* docks at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, the astronauts will be winging back to Mission Control in Houston sealed in a van aboard an Air Force C–141 from Hickam.

On this epic day the people of Hawaii are certainly proud in extending their warmest aloha and sincere congratulations to the three courageous astronauts, to the dedicated people who comprised the Apollo mission team, and to their fellow Islanders who shared in the success of man's historic journey to the moon.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Pucinski).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this is certainly a historic day. I join in supporting this resolution. I join in congratulating the brave astronauts for their herculean accomplishment on behalf of all mankind. I join in congratulating the chairman, Mr. George Miller, and the members of the Science and Astronautics Committee.

If we have learned one lesson from this monumental feat, it is the lesson of total commitment. We are now entering into an era of total commitment. We have seen what man can do when he makes up his mind to do it. It has been the excellent leadership of the gentleman from California, the chairman of the Science and Astronautics Committee, who time and again came before this Congress and defended the program, telling us what could be done if we supported this program.

It would be my hope that all Members of this Congress would gain inspiration from this in addressing ourselves to the problems of America today, whether they be in the field of education, health, housing, the feeding of the poor, the bringing of an end to hostilities, and in working toward an era of tranquillity where man can exist without destroying himself. If we have learned anything—and the world desperately needs this lesson—it is that with the achievement of these men and all of us in Congress working together in a total commitment, we can reach the heights.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Brown).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the only Ohioan on the floor, I should like to say one word in parochial pride about Neil Armstrong and the fact that the first man to set foot on the moon is an Ohioan, just as John Glenn was the first American to orbit in space, and also is an Ohioan. In making that footnote to this historic occasion, I should like to add that when I was growing up as a young man, there used to be a radio show about Jack Armstrong, the All-American boy.

It occurs to me that all Americans today feel that Neil Armstrong is an All-American boy. However, at this moment in history I am sure that we would echo the sentiments that many others have already expressed that Neil Armstrong, Colonel Aldrin, and the other member of that distinguished trio, Colonel Collins, are not only All-American boys, but All-World boys, men who have contributed a great deal to all nations on this globe of ours.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. McCulloch who represents the Fourth Ohio Congressional District from which Mr. Armstrong comes and which neighbors the district I represent, I am sure would echo these sentiments had he been aware that this invitation to a joint session was going to be discussed at this time. For him and all Ohioans, all Americans, and all the people on earth, I congratulate these gallant men and look forward to greeting them in this Chamber.

I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. Miller) very much for yielding.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman tfrom Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that I concur completely in the remarks of the chairman in praise of our space program's splendid accomplishments. I was particularly interested in his introductory remarks, in which he paid tribute to the role of my most prominent "summertime constituent," our former President, the late John F. Kennedy.

In order to accomplish the remarkable achievement which culminated in today's successful splashdown by our astronauts, it was necessary to first direct the Nation's attention to the heavens—to raise our people's aspirations to the stars. This is what John Kennedy did. He gave our Nation the goal of conquering space, and the will to commit ourselves to achieving that goal. He gave us a dream—and today that dream came true. And America will never forget who first gave us the direction and the inspiration, that we might soar through the heavens and reach this final success.

Now we have succeeded, and once again are faced with an unknown future. We need to establish new goals, even more lofty and ambitious, to guide us as we continue to press forward. One such goal that I know John Kennedy would have approved of is to try to translate the dream of world cooperation that has been stirred so strongly by the events of the past week into reality. Mr. Kennedy's dream provided a strong first stage. Now it is time to think in even bolder terms, so that we may continue on the path we set out on 8 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that President Nixon will give the world another new dream—a dream of joint programs of space exploration, with all of the world's technical and scientific resources united in the future exploration of other planets that are still out there in the vastness of space.

A key phrase, Mr. Speaker, from President Kennedy's inaugural address is worth remembering at this time: "But let us begin." Thanks to his efforts, we have begun splendidly in space. I hope and expect that out of the culmination of his beginning will come new direction, and new inspiration, to begin a new era of international cooperation in exploring the mysteries of the universe that surrounds us.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND FOR NEXT WEEK

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of the week, if any, and the schedule for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, there will be no further legislative business this week.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District Day. There are seven bills scheduled for consideration, as follows:

H.R. 9551, to enlarge Metropolitan Police Band;

H.R. 6947, to amend Chancery Act, grandfather clause as to chancery locations;

H.R. 9553, to amend District of Columbia Minimum Wage Act for hospital employees;

H.R. 8868, Interstate Compact on Juveniles;

H.R. 5967, to provide two auto tags per Member;

H.R. 12671, to permit employment of minors—14 to 16; and

H.R. 255, to deduct interest in advance on installment loans.

Also on Monday the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Mills) has advised that he will seek to bring up under a unanimous-consent request two bills which have been unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. Those bills are as follows:

H.R. 13079, to extend interest equalization tax for a temporary period; and

H.R. 13080, to extend for 15 days existing rates of income tax withholding.

Also on Monday we will consider H.R. 2, separate Federal Credit Union agency, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week, the Department of Labor and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill for fiscal year 1970;

H.R. 471, to hold in trust certain lands for the Pueblo de Taos Indians in New Mexico, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate;

House Joint Resolution 247, relating to the administration of the national park system, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate; and

H.R. 13018, military construction authorization for fiscal year 1970, subject to a rule being granted.

Mr. Speaker, this annnouncement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program may be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, for the edification of the Members I desire now to advise the House that the House will meet next Friday. So we will be in session 5 days next week.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 28, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House

XUM

adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday Rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

JULY 24, 1969.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It has been my privilege to serve on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct since it was first established. It is with sincere regret that I hereby submit my resignation as a member of it effective at the close of business today.

Sincerely,

LES ARENDS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

JULY 24, 1969.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It has been my privilege to serve on the District of Columbia Committee and it is with great regret that I tender my resignation to become effective at the close of business today, July 24.

Sincerely yours,

CATHERINE MAY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF U.S. GROUP, NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 689, 84th Congress, as amended, the Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. group of the North Atlantic Assembly the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Devine, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 42, U.S.C., section 2251, the Chair appoints as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the gentlewoman from Washington, Mrs. MAY, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 492) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 492

Resolved, That Jack H. McDonald, of Michigan, be and he is hereby elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION SHOULD BE FULLY FUNDED

(Mr. NIX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, today we acted on H.R. 12964, the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies appropriations bill, fiscal year 1970 appropriations, House Report No. 91384.

This bill appropriates the huge sum of $2.53 billion for fiscal year 1970.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country will accept, though with grave misgivings, the $480 million increase over the fiscal year 1969 total, as well as the $58 million above the administration's amended budget request, but I can assure the Members of this body that there will be widespread condemnation when it becomes known that the request for $15.9 million by the Equal Opportunity Commission has been cut to $10 million.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House can never explain to the people of their separate districts why they supinely approved appropriations, among others, of $36 million for education exchange programs, $250 million for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, $121 million for the judiciary, while displaying a wanton disregard to a reduction of $5.9 million from the request of an agency created out of the turbulence, the inequities, and the blatant injustices of our society for the exclusive and often proclaimed purpose of stamping out discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, or sex, and the enforcement of title VII of the Civil Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues dare not plead ignorance to the published facts that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission was presented 11,172 charges of discrimination because of race, color, religion, national origin, or sex during the year 1968.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues must be aware—some are acutely aware—of the disenchantment voiced by the past Chairman of the Commission with the seeming indifference of this administration to the vital work of job discrimination; and in this context, the Members of this body are not unaware that the present outstanding Chairman expressed the urgent need for greater cooperation with the hope and belief that such sympathetic support would be forthcoming. Both expressions were pertinent to this issue—the one a bitter conclusion—the latter a hope, perhaps a belief that help would come, but with judgment withheld.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the responsibility is ours. Will we face resolutely the obvious or evade in the hope that there will be a tomorrow without this problem?

My position is, and my demand is that we bodly meet today's problem now. So I urge this body to wake up, get out of the world of fantasy, face reality, and admit that we have problems in discrimination. Let us meet the problem by restoring the $5.9 million and each Member may feel confident that he has given verity to the statement:

> One small step for man—one giant leap for mankind.

Let us here and now restore the original figurc $15.9 million to this Commission.

AN UNUSUAL BEQUEST

(Mr. MIZE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, all Members of Congress are called upon to perform a wide variety of duties, some pleasant, and some unpleasant. I see that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency is on the floor, and I wish that the chairman would listen to this.

One of the most unusual chores to befall me during my tenure in the House of Representatives arrived by mail today. I have been requested to serve as the middleman in a transaction, the likes of which I have not heard about before, and the kind I do not expect to repeat too many times in the future.

Mrs. Mattie Meisner, a widow residing in Sabetha, Nemaha County, Kans., provided in her will that after several bequests to individuals and charitable foundations:

> All the rest and residue of my estate, real and personal, and wherever located or situated, I give, devise and bequeath to the United States of America and to the State of Kansas, in equal shares, to be used respectively for the payment of the Federal debt and the debts of the State of Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Meisner's estate has now been settled and the distributions have been made under the terms of her will. I have in my possession a check in the amount of $55,657.79, drawn on the Farmers State Bank of Sabetha, Kans. I am making arrangements to turn this check over to the Treasury Department so that this amount can be applied on the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, the last report I had from the U.S. Treasury, listed our national debt in excess of $358 billion, and it is increasing every day. Even though Mrs. Meisner's bequest will make only an infinitesimal payment on the liquidation of this obligation, I just want to observe that her gesture is typical of patriotic, frugal Americans who live in the cities and farms of Kansas. They are grateful for the good life and the unlimited opportunities this country affords to those who are willing to apply themselves and get ahead by the sweat of their brow.

I would just like to observe that in making this gift to her Government, Mrs. Meisner has probably done more toward the retirement of the national debt than any of us can take credit for, even though we supposedly wrestle with the problem every day.

I include at this point the correspondence I received in regard to this matter:

Seneca, Kans.,
June 22, 1969.

Mr. Chester Mize,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Mize: I am pleased to inform you that the estate of Mattie Meisner was closed today in the probate court of Nemaha County, Kansas. The will of deceased under item 13, gave one-half the residue to the United States of America, for the payment of debts.

Since I am unable to present the bequest to you personally, I enclose herewith check in the amount of $55,657.79 payable to the United States of America for debts, and trust that you will see that proper persons are notified and the deceased be given proper recognition for her kindness to the United States of America.

Very truly yours,
Thomas L. Medill, Jr.

Last Will and Testament of Mattie Meisner

Know all men by these presents, That I, Mattie Meisner, a widow, a resident of Sabetha, Nemaha County, Kansas, of sound mind and memory, do make and publish this as my last will and testament, hereby revoking any and all former wills made or purporting to be made by me:

Item 13: All the rest and residue of my estate, real and personal, and wherever located, or situated, I give, devise and bequeath to the United States of America and to the State of Kansas, in equal shares to be used by them respectively for the payment of the federal debt and the debts of the State of Kansas.

PROPOSED ASTRONAUT MEMORIAL AT KENNEDY SPACE CENTER

(Mr. FREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, this country's greatness does not lie in its material assets, but rather in the spirit of its people. This spirit has never been more prominently on display than in the flight of Apollo 11. The success of this flight and the entire space effort is due to the teamwork of many dedicated men and women throughout our Nation. The three Apollo 11 astronauts—Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Mike Collins—are only representative of men whose belief in God, courage, and will to conquer the unknown has helped make this the greatest Nation on earth.

I have been joined today by all 31 of my colleagues on the House Science and Astronautics Committee, including the distinguished Chairman, George P. Miller, and the distinguished ranking minority member, James G. Fulton, in proposing the establishment of an Astronauts Memorial Commission. This Commission would be responsible for erecting and maintaining, at no expense to the Government, a memorial at the Kennedy Space Center honoring all of our astronauts. It seems most appropriate to reintroduce the legislation at this time when all of America is united in its pride over the accomplishments of Apollo 11.

It seems fitting that this memorial should be near the point where each of the astronauts begin their journey into space. This memorial will serve as a tribute to all astronauts—past, present, and future—including the seven NASA astronauts—Chaffee, White, Grissom, See, Bassett, Freeman, and Williams—who have been killed in the performance of duty and their fellow astronaut, Edward Givens, who died in an automobile accident. It will serve as a constant reminder to all of us that the American spirit will remain strong as long as we have the courage to face and conquer the unknown. It will be a constant reminder to all of what can be done by teamwork and cooperation. It will remind us as a nation that there is no goal beyond us if we commit ourself to that task. In essence this memorial is for the astronauts but even more is for each and every one of us who has looked up into the heavens and dared to dream.

WASHINGTON CRIME OUT OF CONTROL

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, June crime statistics confirm what many of us have been saying for a long time—crime is completely out of control in Washington and little is being done by responsible officials to bring it to a halt.

Crime is up 23.9 percent over June of last year. There was a crime committed in Washington at the rate of one every 8 minutes during June, and the rate for crimes against persons was one every 40 minutes. Murder was up 60 percent; rape, 80 percent; robberies, 17½ percent; burglaries, 40 percent; and larceny, 53 percent. Only auto thefts dropped, but there were still 951 cars stolen during the month.

The greatest crime increase was reported in the First Police Division, where many of the Federal office buildings are located. Overall crime in this area was up a staggering 84 percent.

No one expected miracles in the fight against crime this year, but neither can a 23.9-percent increase in crime in 1 month be tolerated. We need leadership from the White House and the Attorney General, the Mayor and District government now. It has taken them 5½ months to get their crime package up to Congress, and it will take many months more to get it enacted. But what is being done within existing law to launch a major anticrime crusade? Little or nothing that can be seen, or reflected in these appalling statistics.

Eight daytime robberies were reported in this morning's newspaper. A woman was held at gunpoint in her own apartment and robbed Tuesday afternoon. Three men robbed a man at gunpoint in downtown Washington in midday Tuesday. A deliveryman was robbed during the noon hour by a group of 10. In one robbery of a laundromat in midafternoon, the police arrested four youths, aged between 14 and 17, armed with a sawed-off shotgun. How long must this city remain an armed camp of people living behind double-locked doors?

THE WHOLE WORLD WELCOMES MEN FROM THE MOON

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in public service, we of the Congress have become professional in the art of language. It is part of our job to be able to translate the meaning of events into the understanding of their significance. And yet today, with the successful splashdown of Apollo 11, we have exhausted the power of mere words to evoke the grandeur and triumph of that voyage.

The picture of the command module blazing through the friction of our atmosphere recalls the mythic voyages of the Greek God Apollo who was believed to drive his fiery chariot across the sky to give light to the world. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, that analogy can serve as well today in paying tribute to the significance of Apollo 11, and its courageous crew.

Like the Greek god our astronauts have tamed the fiery chariot, but with a very important difference. Apollo of the age of Pericles was one in a succession of dream figures symbolizing man's desire to explain the unknown. Apollo 11 of 1969 is a realization that the unknown can be understood and conquered. The dream of a thousand years becomes a reality, and we will never again be able to slip into the easy answers of giant myths.

There are other dreams, Mr. Speaker. Dreams of understanding our lives here on the "good earth." Dreams of conquering myths of prejudice, hunger, and poverty. We owe an awesome debt to the men and women who by their efforts in the mastery of space have shown us the tinsel quality of myths.

I believe as we welcome home the brave and daring astronauts, it would be well to remember the words from President Kennedy's famous speech of May 25, 1961:

> We go into space because whatever mankind must undertake, free men must truly share.

The triumph of Apollo 11 is one of mankind's monumental undertakings. In a fitting tribute to President Kennedy, it was truly shared by free men everywhere.

CONTROLLING INFLATION AND BALANCING THE BUDGET

(Mr. MESKILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

XUM

minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, I was interested to see that the President was reported yesterday in the Washington Post to have chided Congress for failing to accept a number of his money-saving proposals. The report indicated that the President had ordered a $3.5 billion cut in spending by Government departments and agencies to offset increases in areas over which he had no control.

Mr. Speaker, being a strong supporter of the administration in its attempts to control inflation and to balance the budget, I find myself in a rather unique position of agreeing with President Nixon in principle, but questioning some of his priorities.

In lookng at the President's budget requests for 1970, I was surprised to see that the President had included a request of $807,000 for the controversial Dickey-Lincoln power project. If the President was looking for unnecessary projects to wield a scalpel on, this is certainly one that should have received his full attention. My colleagues, to be sure, are well aware of the shortcomings of Dickey-Lincoln. I need only remind the President that the House has rejected Dickey-Lincoln on five separate rollcalls. The House has forcefully and unmistakably said "no" to this project. Less than 4 years ago, its authorization was rejected by a rollcall vote. Three rollcall votes were cast in 1967 against appropriations for it. And last year, on a rollcall vote, the House voted to delete the requested appropriation of $617,000. The will of the House could not be more obvious. And yet, here again in this year's budget requests from the White House appears a request for $807,000.

I thought we had put this one to bed last year. Now it looks like we will have to do it again. If the President is to start wielding his scalpel, then this is where he should begin.

Now, if the President had chided Congress for covering up the cost overruns of the cultural-industrial complex by appropriating $12.5 million more to bail out the sponsors of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, that would be one thing. But he could not do even that because he would have found that he had included the request for these funds in his budget as well.

The point I want to make is there are cuts that can be made and should be made. I regret that the President failed to perform the surgery needed on these two projects. They were within his control.

However, there are areas that are just too important to cut indiscriminately. One of these, I believe, is education.

There have been reports that the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee will recommend funding above the Nixon requests for library programs and vocational education. Should the House vote more funds than the President has requested for these urgent educational needs, I hope Mr. Nixon will refrain from chiding us for extravagance. In my thinking, the education of our children must be given priority of the funding of the Dickey-Lincoln boondoggle and the J. F. K. Center which was never intended to receive Federal funding.

SPACE EXPLORATION DAY

(Mr. McCLORY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the landing of men on the moon on Sunday, July 20, 1969, and their safe return to the earth today is regarded by many as the most historic event in the history of mankind.

Certainly, the moon voyage of astronauts Neil Armstrong, Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr., and Michael Collins—which included a successful landing on the moon, a brief exploration of the moon's surface, and a safe return to earth—is worthy of commemoration as a national holiday as truly as other great national events are celebrated by us today.

In immediate recognition of this event, President Nixon proclaimed Monday, July 21, as a "National Day of Participation." This was interpreted by many as a holiday for the purpose of following our astronauts' successful experiences on the moon's surface, their liftoff, and the start of their return trip to earth.

Commemorating this event on Monday is consistent with the action taken by the Congress at the last session in enacting uniform Monday holiday legislation—a measure which I and a number of my colleagues sponsored—designating four of our national holidays to be celebrated on specific Mondays. The uniform Monday holiday bill has received widespread approval, with the result that more than 35 States now have enacted legislation consistent with the Federal law, to the end that Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Columbus Day, and Veterans Day will be Monday holidays commencing in 1971. The successful mission of the three astronauts should logically be commemorated as a Monday holiday.

I am today introducing legislation designating "Space Exploration Day" a national holiday, to be celebrated on the third Monday in July of each year. While Public Law 90–63, the Uniform Monday Holiday Act, does not become effective until January 1, 1971, I am confident that the American people will want to celebrate "Space Exploration Day" in 1970, and thereafter to include it in the Monday holiday legislation when it becomes effective in 1971.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we may have early action on this legislation in order that plans and preparations may be made by schools and business institutions, and by the Federal, State, and local governments, to celebrate "Space Exploration Day" on the third Monday of July in 1970 and in subsequent years.

SENATOR FRANK PORTER GRAHAM

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. LOWENSTEIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting today as we pay tribute to the three valiant Americans returning from the moon, to pay tribute also to Frank Porter Graham of North Carolina, teacher, university president, U.S. Senator, international civil servant, pioneer, mediator, inspiration to the young and disinherited, intrepid battler for justice and liberty, personification of kindness and courage; and above all, man of peace; he, too, came in peace for all mankind. If iron could be gentle it would be Frank Graham.

Frank Graham returns this year to his beloved Chapel Hill, in time to mark the 60th anniversary of his graduation from the university. We commemorate his retirement from active duty at the United Nations with gratitude for his great service to world peace, and with joy that he is able at last to return to his roots, to his gracious and generous sisters, to the village whose name he did so much to make synonymous with humaneness and honor and high quality; to the State he did so much to lift ahead of its region and out of its byways. The only sadness that intrudes into the sense of celebration that attends his homecoming is the fact that his wife, Marian, cannot return home with him.

No one who knew Marian Drane Graham will ever forget what it was like to be in the presence of such loveliness. She lived with a twinkle and carried a glow about her that lit any path she trod and warmed any life she touched.

Nor will anyone who knew Marian and Frank Graham together ever forget what harmony between husband and wife, between human beings, does to those enjoying it, or to those enjoying those who are enjoying it.

So this salute is no exercise of ritual tribute, no recital of titles held, no obeisance to power feared. It is, rather, a simple effort by people whose entire lives were forever blessed by Frank and Marian Graham to convey a fraction of the love and gratitude felt for them, by countless human beings of all stations in all places. It is hard to think what our lives would have been like without the Grahams, but it is clear that they would have been neither meaner, narrower, nor sadder.

A few things more should be said about the gallant and triumphant life of Frank Graham, who, while men all around him were seeking power and fame, forgot himself, in Martin King's phrase, "Into immortality for himself."

At the university he defied the odds to befriend workers and students, to defend the untrammelled mind and the unracial heart, and survived to rank—in longevity as well as effectiveness—among the fore-

XUM

most college presidents in the land. In the Senate, he voted his convictions, and set such standards of selflessness that he attained in less than 2 years an influence among his colleagues that is denied most men who remain on long enough to acquire chairmanships of committees. He lost an election—does anyone remember someone called "Willis Smith"?—to a sea of distortion and induced hate, without losing his patience or his faith or his will to carry on the good fight in the spirit of love that came of his commitment to God. He left us from that campaign a testiment of democracy and to America that touches us now, after these decades of upheaval and challenge, as it did then:

This Is America

> In spiritual faith and the American dream, America is being made safe for democracy without vulgarity, differences without hate, and excellence without arrogance; where men become brothers in the sight of God and in the human heart; where the opportunities of the children in homes and schools are the chief hope of a nobler society; where enduring progress in human relations is made through religion, education, and voluntary cooperation in the minds and hearts of the people; and where the struggle for the fulfillment of our historic Americanism is the best answer to fascism and communism in the present global struggle against totalitarian tyranny for freedom and peace in the world.
>
> In this America of our struggles and our hopes, the least of these our brethren has the freedom to struggle for freedom; where the answer to error is not terror, the respect for the past is not reaction and the hope of the future is not revolution; where the integrity of simple people is beyond price and the daily toil of millions is above pomp and power; where the majority is without tyranny, and the minority without fear, and all people have hope. This is America, God bless America.

It is as great an honor as I expect I shall ever have to be able to participate in these statements of thanks to this astronaut of the human heart, always risking himself that others may follow with less danger, robust and uncomplaining amidst the discomforts of difficult journeys, always so far ahead of his time and always so much a part of it; always transcending the ordinary limits of geography and custom to adventure on toward new horizons and new opportunities for all his fellow men.

How shall we measure how much we owe to such a man, how much our country owes, how much the tired and bruised world? Best simply to say that the least we owe is to try harder to do better for an America at last providing liberty and justice for all, and for a world at last resolving her differences with compassion and in peace.

I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. **PREYER** of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, few citizens of my State have equaled the record of public service that Frank Porter Graham can claim. None has loved North Carolina or the United States more, and none has shown greater devotion to the cause of the unfortunate in State and Nation.

A conservative southern Senator once said of "Dr. Frank" that he is the living embodiment of the early American patriot; it was not an idle comment. He believes in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. He has fought for them as a marine, a teacher, a college president, a U.S. Senator, and a U.N. mediator.

His contributions to this country as a labor mediator, as a Member of Congress and in innumerable public positions under every President from Franklin Roosevelt through Lyndon Johnson have earned him the respect of liberal and conservative, Democrat and Republican.

He has helped end one civil war and helped bring a partial peace in another.

Yet great as are his accomplishments as an American, I would think of him today primarily for what his life has meant to North Carolina.

When, in the depths of the Depression, our university seemed on the brink of closing, Frank Graham traveled the State raising money to make loans to students so they could stay in school; when children in our rural areas were deprived of the opportunity to gain greater horizons of hope and understanding, he worked to organize a public library program that crosses every road and corner of North Carolina; and, when in the twenties and thirties our State's people suffered from inadequate roads and hospitals, he helped give birth to the good roads and good health movements and was content to let other men gain the credit.

And while he is himself essentially a man of most conservative traits, he has been a fighter for progress who fought with all the vigor of the bantamweight wrestler he once was. When trustees complained because a great Negro singer was extended the courtesies of the university, he welcomed her; and when another trustee threatened the university if it provided a forum for the Republican candidate for Vice President of the United States, Frank Graham sat on the platform with him. The fact that both circumstances are of unquestioned acceptance by today's standards should not belie the courage he exhibited then.

There are literally hundreds of people in North Carolina today, many of them among our leaders, who are indebted to Dr. Graham for his generosity when they needed money or a voice to plead their case; there are millions who are indebted to him for what has been his contribution to the character of our State.

No Tar Heel has reaped more of her honors. Every major institution of learning in North Carolina has awarded him an honorary degree—some as often as three times; he is the only North Carolinian to hold such degrees from every campus of the consolidated university; our State legislature has made him a trustee of the university for life; and he has received the highest honor the State can officially bestow on a distinguished son—the North Carolina Award.

Yet all of these honors seem to pale in the splendid reflection of what he, as a man, has meant. In a time when some would preach progress through violence, his quiet faith in the eventual victory of any good cause advanced with respect for the common man under the law stands as a positive example for our youth. In a time when advocacy of compulsion to bring about change is popular, his devotion to the power of honest persuasion to bring men together should remind us all of how much we have accomplished through good will.

A leader in our State once challenged because he, a conservative, could be such an advocate of Frank Graham, the progressive, replied:

> His dimensions of goodness and greatness transcend philosophic differences.

And so they have.

Not long ago a lady in a sister State wrote the Governor of my State that she admired us because we celebrate our victories with a rose and not a whip. It is a source of that character of North Carolina that for so long she has had the splendid example of Frank Graham and in him the tremendous power of one good man.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point letters and articles concerning Dr. Graham:

RALEIGH, N.C.,
May 7, 1969.

FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.:

My love to you as a great southerner of your generation and one of the great humanitarians of all time.

JONATHAN DANIELS.

MAY 5, 1969.

MY VERY DEAR DR. GRAHAM: When on December 31, 1939 you, the President of the great University of North Carolina, came to the door of the recently opened Danziger Candy Kitchen in Chapel Hill and knocked on our door we, the Danziger Family and some of our friends, were very surprised and puzzled that a president, a professor, and a scholar would take time out on a cold winter evening to see us.

We all had come to this country not too long ago; we could hardly speak the language, had escaped our birthplace because of hatred, prejudice, dictatorship, persecution and threats of death. We were a bunch of unknown, unwanted men and women without any means, standing, money, friends, and without any importance whatsoever.

You came to wish us all a Happy New Year, a new and prosperous future, peace and happiness and a new life in this, our new country. We could not understand that a man in your outstanding position would take time out to even speak to us, the refugee, the outcast.

But we have learned in these 30 years that this "God's own Country" is so great and beautiful because of men like you. Men with a big heart, a feeling and an understanding for the underdog, the persecuted and the oppressed.

My dear Dr. Graham, this country and Chapel Hill have been wonderful to us, but we, the Danziger family, will never forget your kindness, your understanding, and your love for your fellow man.

In deep appreciation and thankfulness.

Respectfully,

EDWARD G. DANZIGER.

[From Solidarity, December 1966]

FRANK PORTER GRAHAM

(By Al Adams)

If the world ever gets around to picking its number one citizen, up close in the running should be Frank Porter Graham.

But not of his own choosing, for the mild-mannered, little educator-statesman from North Carolina would, in modesty, deny such an honor.

He goes almost unknown among the masses of his own countrymen who are

XUM

blandly unaware that he has influenced every American's life.

Now 80 years of age, Dr. Graham has lived a dedicated life as high school teacher, college professor, World War I marine, university president, governmental advisor, U.S. senator and United Nations mediator—a post he still fills.

Its no wonder that buried beneath deed after deed as a professional man lies forgotten his frequently extended helping hand to agricultural and migratory workers. Their rootless, homeless and almost defenseless plight moved him to describe them as "the most forgotten and neglected human beings in our land."

He could be the nation's original poverty-fighter. And he certainly spoke out loud and clear for the labor movement during those most hateful years when most southern towns and villages had an "open season" on union organizers.

Back in 1955, late in his career but still a full decade before the grape workers of Delano, Calif. dramatically focused national attention on the conditions he decried, this soft-spoken little man who never tilled a field again clearly saw an ominous sign overshadowing field hands.

Cautioning the nation that Federal laws under the Eisenhower Administration tended to help big farmers, Dr. Graham felt this would drive little farmers off the land.

"More and more migrants, with their miserable conditions, will be sought to work the factories-in-the-fields of the large farm corporations," he feared. "If this happens, it will be a sad day for America."

Such is his concern for all men.

"The dignity and worth of the human person is a way of life to him," said one of the many citations he has received.

Illinois Senator Paul Douglas, who once shared a corner of the Senate with Dr. Graham, called the methodic man "the nearest thing to Mahatma Gandhi that America has yet produced." And Oregon Senator Wayne Morse said: "He is the most Christlike man I ever knew."

Talk your way into the office of Raleigh editor Jonathan Daniels, himself a giant in North Carolina affairs, mention an interest in Dr. Graham and everything seems to stand still. Undisturbed by the hum and clacking of a newspaper office, Daniels' mind races through the years, picking out the little figure of a man who spoke out for justice on street corners, along dusty roads and just off the football field of the university he came to head.

"He's a genuine man. . . ."

The spry, twinkling-eyed educator—his tiny five-feet five, 130-pound stature far outweighing his ego—speechlessly rubs his glowing gray hair when confronted by words of honor. In a lifetime of tributes he has yet to become accustomed to praise.

For with the praise often has come persecution—and once a burning cross—as his deeds earned for him a reputation as a consistent fighter for union security and wage stabilization and for the right of working men to organize.

In the days when the words "labor organizer" and "Bolshevik" were synonymous in the south, he fought for abolition of the 60-hour work week and 12-hour day; abolition of night work for children, and in favor of better working conditions for women. As early as the 1920s, he helped frame a model workmen's compensation law.

Scorning the advice of friends to temper his crusades lest he endanger his own future, the "tee-total" liberal forged ahead almost singlehandedly for what he considered right.

"Whether you stand as one person, one of a minority or one of a majority, the main thing is the principle, rather than popularity."

Such is the philosophy he lives by.

How is such a philosophy born and nurtured to maturity?

For Frank Porter Graham, some of it began when he was born in Fayetteville, N.C., on October 14, 1866. It has been nurtured by fate.

One of nine children of Alexander Graham, who helped found the state's grade school system, Frank grew up in the knowledge that education is one cornerstone of freedom.

He pursued his own education diligently, graduating Phi Beta Kappa from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1909. He enrolled in UNC's law school and was licensed by the Supreme Court to practice. But friends say that on his first and only legal case, a divorce action, he beat himself out of a fee when he concentrated on reconciling the unhappy couple.

Fate introduced him to a career more suited to his easy-going temperament when he was forced to interrupt graduate study and accept a teaching job to earn money.

He became so engrossed with teaching that it became the first of three major phases of his life. Only against his will did he leave the classroom to become president of UNC and, later, a national and international statesman.

He was pursuing his education in the 1920s—working on a Ph.D. at the University of Chicago after serving as a marine in World War I—when awarded a two-year travel-study fellowship. Graham set out for England where he studied economics and industrial history. He then went to the League of Nations in Geneva.

Although he never got back to completing his doctorate (he now holds more than a dozen honorary degrees), the work abroad proved more valuable.

"I became more acquainted with the coming of the industrial revolution and its social consequences," he said. "When I went back to North Carolina (as a professor) I thought it was my opportunity to tell the people we should begin making more humane adjustments . . ."

He was "one of those few men up on the cutting edge of what was evolving as a new era," said William C. Friday, now president of the university so long piloted by Dr. Graham.

Later, as the seeds of "humane adjustments" which he planted had begun to bear the fruit of collective bargaining and union security for textile and factory workers, Frank Graham found it necessary to retrace his steps on behalf of farm workers whom the south's new economy left "on the frontier of the American labor movement."

North Carolina farm families and workers never forgot their champion, said Hubert Robinson, Graham's personal aide for 18 years. "People around here tell their children about Dr. Graham the way they would if they knew someone in the Bible."

Robinson, a former Chapel Hill councilman, lights up from the inside as he remembers: "We'd go into some of those communities and he'd be welcomed like the President. Folks reached out just to touch him. . . ."

If there were those in the south who welcomed the coming of the new industrial day Frank Graham heralded, there were others who resisted the inevitable with their very souls.

"These very simple proposals we were sponsoring, such as a workman's compensation act, shorter hours, organization of unions, equal rights in collective bargaining, decent wages and working conditions, were the cause of my first being branded a communist," Graham recalled.

But the brand did not burn. In 1930 the University of North Carolina board of trustees plucked him out of his history classroom and placed him at the helm of the state campus.

Thrust into the second phase of his career over his protest, Dr. Graham became president when few persons wanted to tackle the problem of consolidating three state-supported schools and, more important, fight with a legislature which was cutting the school's budget each year of the depression.

Showing his political savvy, Graham bypassed the legislators, carried his fight for funds up and down the dusty back roads to the people of North Carolina. And he won!

Not everything Frank Graham dedicated his life to was so warmly received. His labor and civil rights stands were lauded by liberals but cursed by conservatives.

"He is both the best-loved and best-hated man in North Carolina," the Saturday Evening Post said almost two decades ago.

This divided reaction to the work of Dr. Graham was at no time more evident than in the North Carolina election of 1950.

In 1949, Gov. Scott Kerr appointed Dr. Graham to fill a U.S. Senate seat left vacant by the death of J. Melville Broughton. In a run-off election for a full term in 1950 against segregationist Willis Smith, Dr. Graham found himself caught between the Dixiecrat forces trying to hold back the tide of time and President Truman's Fair Deal.

The campaign became one of the bitterest ever waged in the state.

Smith won.

It was a sad day in the politics of a state destined to show the way for the new south.

"I just wasn't masterful enough to overcome all these forces—this forest fire which spread across the state fanned by racial fears, deep prejudice and even demagogy," Dr. Graham said.

"He's not a strategic planner," said Chapel Hill clergyman and close associate Rev. Charles Jones. "But once he took a stand on something, he stayed stood!"

Commenting editorially on the election results, the New York Times said: "One hopes that this defeat does not mean the end of his public life."

Fortunately it did not.

Public service was in his blood, the only way of life he knew.

So varied and so frequent were the calls from government for his help while he was UNC president that a student editor once wrote good-naturedly: "President Graham is visiting us for a few days."

Early in the Roosevelt Administration, he had served as chairman of the President's Advisory Council on Social Security and helped draw up much of the New Deal Social Security legislation. He also was a member of Roosevelt's committee on education and was appointed by FDR to the War Labor Board, representing the public.

Dr. Graham won the CIO's Sidney Hillman Award for effort on behalf of labor while on the War Labor Board.

Under Truman, he served on the Commission on Civil Rights and supported racial equality measures which irked many of his fellow southerners but which opened the south's door to civilization and a trace of democracy.

He was appointed in 1947 as the U.S. representative on the United Nations' three-man Good Offices Committee to help resolve the Dutch-Indonesia dispute. He favored self-determination for Indonesians.

He was the first president of the Oak Ridge Institute for Nuclear Studies.

Less than a year after the Senate election loss, Dr. Graham was again serving the public as defense manpower administrator in the Department of Labor. The appointment came at a crucial time, when labor was dissatisfied with the policies of mobilization director Charles E. Wilson.

Labor's tribute to his integrity is evident in the fact that in 1951, when the executive board of the CIO voted for a court-enforceable contract barring jurisdictional disputes and calling for final settlement by arbitration, only the name Frank Graham was proposed as arbitrator.

He was forced to decline the position because of international work with the United Nations.

No task, however, diminished his interest in young people nor detracted from the fondness with which UNC students regarded their "Dr. Frank," as he is called in North Carolina. And major world problems notwithstanding, it has been said that nothing ever gave "Dr. Frank" more pleasure than coming to the aid of a youngster passing through the gates of the university on the way to life.

On Sunday evenings, he turned on his porch light as a signal to students that he and Mrs. Graham were ready for the weekly "bull session" to begin in their living room.

Former Michigan Gov. John B. Swainson recalls Dr. Graham walking the halls of the campus infirmary, comforting the patients. "The sight of him was medicinal. . . ."

If ardent concern for such seemingly inconsequential affairs appears as time-consuming as were endeavors to settle international disputes, it shows both the depth and breadth of the man's concern for his fellow man.

Dr. Graham applied his energies with equal fervor to the interpersonal and the international. And he is equally at home at an international conference table and a country gathering.

Long chairman of the National Sharecroppers Fund, Dr. Graham was named co-chairman with AFL–CIO Vice President A. Philip Randolph, of the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor. Founded with the aid of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, the 21-member committee of civic and religious leaders seeks to educate the public on behalf of equal rights for agricultural workers in organization, minimum wages and fair labor standards.

The committee held public hearings which put the lie to big growers' propaganda depicting the migrant's life as "carefree, expense-paid travel with cash thrown in."

Migrant workers averaged $892 income in 1958, the committee learned. It reported: "Although some good housing exists, many farm workers have makeshift housing shacks, tents, barracks, even trucks," and "most migrant children are retarded in school; the older the child, the greater the retardation."

Fighting what Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell called "the most powerful opposition I have ever seen (big growers)," the committee headed by Dr. Graham and Randolph called for "immediate action to improve substandard conditions of farm workers" and adopt measures needed toward "dragging the industry of agriculture, reluctantly, into the 20th century."

"One thing I learned from Dr. Graham, Mrs. Roosevelt and Norman Thomas," former UNC student Al Lowenstein said, "is that it's not a waste of time to fight for the things you believe in, even if the prospect of winning seems unlikely."

Reporting to the National Sharecroppers Fund, whose board includes UAW Region 9 Director Martin Gerber, Dr. Graham castigated the nation for a condition described by M. T. Van Hecke, head of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor in American Agriculture.

"We depend on misfortune to build up our force of migratory workers," said Van Hecke, "and when the supply is low because there is not enough misfortune at home, we rely on misfortune abroad to replenish the supply."

In a world of organized power, said Dr. Graham, "the farm laborers and migratory workers need union organization." And he challenged American labor to help bring this about "for its own soul's sake."

Meanwhile, Dr. Graham was again projected into the international scene—and the third phase of his life—when the United Kingdom nominated him to mediate the bitter three-year-old dispute between India and Pakistan over Kashmir.

At the UN there exists the kind of community he urged last June's graduates of his university to strive for: "one world neighborhood of human brotherhood."

Those who have known him over the years say, almost reverently, that the staunch Presbyterian Scotsman "has sought to put into men's hearts, during the span of his own lifetime, principles of tolerance and brotherhood which the Christian church has been trying to put there for 2,000 years."

He pushes too hard, say some.

But all who have been touched by the man's influence can agree on one thing, said so well upon one of Frank Porter Graham's numerous public appointments:

"He won't represent North Carolina alone, nor the south, nor even this nation. He'll speak for all mankind. He is truly a citizen of the universe."

DR. FRANK: DURABLE HIGHLANDER

(By Mary Lee McMillan)

Dr. Frank P. Graham is celebrating his eighty-third birthday in Chapel Hill this year. Dr. Robert House, his friend and co-worker, says that "Frank Graham is our greatest poet. When he was president of the University of North Carolina he used to say, 'People come out all right if you trust them. You must trust them.' No one in Chapel Hill can touch our hearts as this man can."

Their friends who visited the home of Dr. Frank and his beloved wife, Marian, (who died several years ago), will never forget the beautiful arrangements of roses in every room in their house. Marian grew these roses. She and Dr. Frank enjoyed the wonderful new roses, including the All America Rose Selections, but the exquisitely fragrant old roses were their special favorites. Their garden of these old roses was their pride and many young gardeners were inspired to study and grow hundreds of them all over North Carolina. Dr. House says, "Frank Graham's life is a continuing prayer of gratitude for the eternal goodness which surrounds our lives."

DURABLE SCOT

I have asked Dr. Gerald Johnson of Riverton and Baltimore, Md., to share his birthday greeting to his friend and kinsman, Frank Graham, with our readers, many of whom are his friends and former pupils. Dr. Johnson says: "The Scotch Highlanders who poured into the Cape Fear River Valley after Culloden were for the most part made of very durable material but not many have been more resistant to the teeth of time than Frank Porter Graham. It is not simply a matter of years. At the age of 83, Frank could be considered getting along, but not until he has crossed 90 is a North Carolina Scot considered really old. This one's survival value is attested, not by his years, but by his scars, more numerous than those of a Zulu warrior who collects them for decoration."

Dr. Johnson continues, "For at least 50 years—and this is no heresay, but eye witness testimony—slaughtering Frank Graham has been one of the favorite sports of the Tar Heel nobility and gentry. Even as a young professor of history he was suspected of adhering rather to the heretic W. J. Cash than to the inspired writings of Tom Dixon. As president of the University of North Carolina he never passed a year without some effort to indict him in the court of public opinion, but the grand jury always refused to return a true bill. Only when he was a United States Senator did they finally get him and then by indirection.

"In that office, in the fateful year 1954, he was tried, convicted, sentenced and beheaded, not for any crime of his own, but for that of the Supreme Court of the United States in abolishing segregation in the schools. But the headsman's axe had hardly fallen when Frank, like John Barleycorn, 'got up again and sure surprised them all' by reincarnation as an official peacemaker of the United Nations, finally beyond the reach of the Tar Heel nobility and gentry.

"This resilience was the everlasting mystery of the man, and no philosopher can analyze it completely. The basis was, of course, transparent honesty, but it was compounded of many other elements. It is a tradition in North Carolina that he was not merely eloquent, but spoke with the tongue of men and of angels; yet a reader of his speeches finds in them, beyond an extraordinary command of lucid English, little effort at stylistic ornament and a careful avoidance of booming and empty rhetoric. He followed the scriptural injunction to let his communication be yea, yea, and nay, nay—but he never said yea, meaning nay or nay, meaning yea. In politics, that made him remarkable, but not beloved.

"What made him in his time the great tribune of the people and their idol is most succinctly expressed in language that his Presbyterian orthodoxy would deplore. Frank Graham didn't give a damn. Whatever he thought was right, he said, and if he risked getting lynched for saying it, what of that?

"His heart's desire was not for long life, or riches, or honors, but merely to say what ought to be said and to do what ought to be done in the North Carolina of his time. Like the young Solomon, he desired above all else an understanding heart, to discern between good and bad. He was given it, and, again like Solomon, he was given what he had not asked, long life, and honors, and in lieu of riches the unfailing love of a great people.

"Surely, then, it is reasonable to suggest that even among the durable Highlanders this one has outlasted them all."

CITIZENS BANK & TRUST CO.,
Andrews, N.C., May 17, 1969.

DR. FRANK PORTER GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

DEAR DR. GRAHAM: I was delighted to see that you had been honored by two national organizations for the "Years of Dedication and Service in the cause of Justice and Equal Opportunity for all".

While it has been some time since I have seen you, I think of you often and the time that you were president of the University. I want to take this opportunity to wish for you success in all your undertakings and the best of health.

Sincerely,

PERCY B. FEREBEE.

CHAPEL HILL, N.C.
May 8, 1969.

DEAR DR. GRAHAM: I am pleased to have this opportunity to join with the many others in expressing appreciation to you today.

It would sound trite if I were to recite all the good things you have done; so I'll not do that.

One characteristic of your life, though, stands out clearly; dwarfing in importance even the best of the good deeds. It is a rare thing, one often talked about and seldom realized. I refer to the simple, yet extraordinary, fact that in your life of humility, in acting as the humble servant of your fellow men, you are the greatest among them.

This doctrine is widely taught, and, even after 2,000 years, it is widely suspect.

And yet, you have lived it, and you continue to live it.

I am awed. And appreciative.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES C. WALLACE.

YALE UNIVERSITY,
New Haven, Conn., May 5, 1969.

DR. FRANK PORTER GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

DEAR DR. FRANK: At this time of profound social change abroad and at home, the lesson you have taught us and the example you have set for us take on special significance in our lives. Always you have championed justice, but with love for the just and the unjust alike and never with hate for the latter or pity for the former. Always you have added your strength to those seeking to enlarge the freedom of human beings to shape their own lives, but your strength is wisdom and your counsel is of reason, and never of the power of brutish force. Always you have directed our attention to that which is faulty in our society, so that we might change it, but with equal fervor you have distinguished and affirmed the good that is here also, so that we might be heartened by it, and thereby encouraged to go on living and serving. Always you have witnessed a vision of individual and social man which transforms present imperfections into waystations on man's journey to be tolerated impatiently but never to be rejected until the next waystation is in reach. Always you have served that vision, and by your devotion to it have sanctified it for us all, but never have you been willing to sacrifice for it your devotion to love, to reason, to equity, and to grace.

No life in our time has had a greater influence on me than yours. Never in my lifetime has your moral example been of greater importance to our nation than now, and by my life I shall try to bear witness to it.

With immense admiration, gratitude, and Love,

Joel L. Fleishman.

Thomasville, N.C.,
May 5, 1969.

Dr. Frank P. Graham,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

Dear Dr. Frank: I simply want to say "thank you" for everything you have stood for over the years. Your example has served, and will continue to serve, as an inspiration to people of good will. Your accomplishments will stand as a foundation for the building of a better world. I thank you in the name of all the poor, the outcast, and the mistreated human beings throughout the world who have benefited from your life.

Devotedly,

Charles F. Lambeth, Jr.

The Miami Herald,
Miami, Fla., May 5, 1969.

Dear Dr. Frank: This day of further recognition for all you have done for your fellow man, not to speak of your old students, is full of meaning. I remember something Gerald Johnson wrote during the war years about the right to pay tribute. I am sure that is in our minds now as we think back over your career and the influence you have had on so many lives which, I believe, have been devoted to useful purposes.

Slowly we see the promise of the American dream. I remain eternally optimistic that it is going to be achieved as long as men of integrity and courage contend for it as you have contended.

In gratefulness for what you have done for me and others who cross your path, I remain,

Always faithfully,

Don Shoemaker,
Editor.

Duke University Medical Center,
Durham, N.C., May 6, 1969.

Dr. Frank Porter Graham,
Chairman, National Sharecroppers Fund,
New York, N.Y.

Dear Dr. Frank: One of the privileges of our lives is the good fortune to know you and to be inspired by you. We cherish your friendship and hold dear the great tradition of humanity and freedom you have instilled in all of us.

A few days ago a small group gathered in Winston-Salem and were discussing the problems of our time—campus difficulties in particular. Someone asked the question, "How does the University in Chapel Hill manage to go through disruption and periods of dissent and great criticism and quickly return to general acceptance where alumni reassemble and conservatives and progressives alike fall in behind it with genuine love and strength." A man in the gathering spoke up with an instantaneous answer, "The reason is Frank Graham. His spirit of liberalism—his personal approach, his love of people, education and U.N.C. in particular."

We have been asked to speak several times lately on the subject of the arts in North Carolina and why this State has been among the top three in the nation in fostering the Arts. One of the main reasons we point out is your own emphasis in the arts and humanities.

Doctor Frank, these are only two of the many, many illustrations. We could write of the daily influence you have on all our lives. You have given us the courage to continue in controversial tasks like the Civil Liberties Union and to do things because they are right.

You are truly a Christian gentleman and we send you hearts filled with love. Thank you for your friendship. May God bless you always and do please remember that we stand ready to help you with any new project you may embark on.

Your devoted friends and admirers,

Mary Semans
Mary Duke Biddle Trent Semans.
Jim Semans
James Hustead Semans, M.D.

Charlotte, N.C.,
April 8, 1969.

Dr. Frank P. Graham,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

Dear Dr. Frank: This is by way of extending to you my appreciation and esteem.

You raised the State of North Carolina in prestige where it became known as a liberal State, and you raised the University of North Carolina to the highest point of academic life in America.

I remember very well the night you had Dorothy Maynor, the Negro contralto, at the University and you desegregated the audience. This was back there in 1943. And the troubles you had with the trustees, Clarke and others.

But you fought them through as you did with the depression when you asked boys to stay in college and give you a note for their tuition. There's many a lawyer in North Carolina who thanks you from the bottom of his heart for this today.

On top of all of this, I have to thank you for your friendship; that you should call me friend is a great honor to me. I remember Senator Morse telling me, "Dr. Graham was the most Christ-like man I've ever met."

You ain't what's wrong with America and I love you very much.

Sincerely yours,

Harry Golden.

The University of North Carolina,
Chapel Hill, May 5, 1969.

Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once said that "Since life is action and passion, one must share the action and passion of his time upon peril of being thought not to have lived".

No one can ever accuse Frank Porter Graham on not "having lived". He does share the action and passion of his time, to the benefit of his state, region, and country; and especially to those who have been inspired by knowing him.

Daniel H. Pollitt.

Sanford, Cannon, Adams &
McCullough,
Raleigh, N.C., April 25, 1969.

Dear Dr. Frank: You have been the inspiration of the forward-looking leadership of North Carolina, most of the South, and much of the Nation. I count my student days and later friendship with you as among my richest blessings, and I will always be grateful.

Sincerely,

Terry Sanford.

The University of North Carolina,
Chapel Hill, N.C., April 25, 1969.

Dr. Frank P. Graham,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

Dear Dr. Frank: I am delighted to have the privilege of joining with hundreds of your friends and admirers in this tribute to you from the National Sharecroppers Fund and the National Child Labor Committee.

Speaking for your University, you know how proud we are to see this justly deserved tribute paid you.

There are many men and women who have done wonderful things for those less able to care for themselves; but none, Dr. Frank, exceeds your contribution of time, energy, and spirit to those who need assistance.

We are indeed happy to see this national tribute paid you.

Cordially,

William Friday.

Chapel Hill, N.C.,
May 9, 1969.

Dr. Frank P. Graham,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

Dear Frank: Along with others, I am extremely proud of another award that will be given to you by the National Child Labor Committee and the National Sharecroppers Fund.

Over the years you have earned many awards of distinction. Your dedication to public service and your very sincere interest in human beings has brought light and happiness to many individuals and to many groups.

All of us are very proud of you.

My very best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

Luther H. Hodges.

Columbia University in the
City of New York,
New York, N.Y., May 1, 1969.

Dr. Frank P. Graham,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

Dear Dr. Frank: Much is said these days of the quality of life. It is a phrase most often used to describe the quality the environment in its broad sense contributes to the way people live.

But there is another way to look at those words: it is to understand them in the context of the qualities that a person brings to life, the qualities that enable a man to transcend or transform his environment.

During nearly thirty years you have exemplified for me (and much longer than that for others) the qualities that make life worthwhile, whatever the limitations imposed by environment and events. You have shown us, by exhibiting them in their fullness, that among those qualities are to be loving, to be friendly, to be brave, to be modest, to be patient, to be staunch, to be thoughtful, to have convictions and to work for them, to be caring, to be optimistic, and to try to be godly. All these words are old words, bred into the memory of the race by the deeds of its most valiant members through centuries of testing times. But I am convinced that all you have done to mold events and the environment for others stems from these root qualities in your own life.

In this time when all values are being tested and questioned as seldom before in history, you shine for all of us privileged to know you as one through whose triumphs and tribulations runs the radiant, unbroken

XUM

strand of humanity at its highest exemplified in a victorious life.

Mary Jane and I so much enjoyed the hour we spent with you in March. As always, it was a privilege. With very best wishes to you and to your sister.

Sincerely,

Douglass Hunt.

National Sharecroppers Fund,
New York, N.Y., May 6, 1969.

Dr. Frank P. Graham,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

Dear Dr. Graham: One of the special joys of my life has been my association with you as Chairman of the National Sharecroppers Fund over these many years. Unlike others who often serve as chairman in name only, you gave vigorous leadership to our organization and to the struggle for a better life for all deprived farm workers.

You were always available to me when I needed you. You never made me feel that I was taking too much of your time. You were always ready and eager to discuss our problems and offer your counsel. Rarely have you missed a meeting of the Board and your presence always brought a warmth and the kind of knowledge and understanding which made Board meetings rewarding occasions.

Over the years I have learned a great deal from you, not only from your rich knowledge of history, but from your experiences and your guidance in helping our work along when serious problems had to be faced. You knew how to be firm when firmness was required but always your gentleness and love shone through. Your association with the National Sharecroppers Fund has meant a great deal to me, to our staff, to our Board members, to our supporters, and to all of the agencies with which we have been associated.

My life has been enriched through our association and I write you now to express my appreciation and love for all that you are and have been to me.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

Fay Bennett,
Executive Director.

Hartsville, S.C.,
May 6, 1969.

Dr. Frank P. Graham,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

Dear Frank: How does one describe a diamond when it sparkles as the light shines on all its facets?

How can one portray the throb of one's heart as he takes his six year old to school and looks down on his face so full of hope?

How can one paint with words the sunset which comes in ever-changing, glowing colors?

How does one know the pride, the confidence, and the dedication of a young boy of fifteen as he receives his Eagle Scout award?

How does one know the feeling of achievement when it comes to a young man who has dropped out of school only to return several years later to receive his high school diploma, a Phi Beta Kappa key from his college, and a Ph. D. from his university?

So one cannot describe Frank Graham's sparkle, his hope, his beauty of character, his poise, or his confidence that education and goodness will win some day. He has had such qualities that have inspired men and women of many ages to go forward with such education and purpose that they have become leaders in the professional fields, the educational fields, and in the most important one of all, the occupation of educating Christian men and women.

He has shared his life, his gifts with everyone with whom he has come in contact. He is courageous and determined, as well as completely selfless. He has been an inspiration to those around him in his work, and he has helped thousands around the world to render more useful lives. He has made greater everyone he has touched.

With love and admiration, your devoted friend and admirer,

Mrs. David R. Cokes.

Atlanta, Ga.,
April 23, 1969.

Dear Dr. Frank: To keep encountering you, Dr. Frank, physically and otherwise, through the years is almost a talisman against a life misspent—at least so it has seemed to me in the numerous years since I met you, a brash young outlander at the South's finest university.

I remember, as do many other participants, the high point of that first encounter. In the trying years surrounding the outbreak of World War II, a group of anti-war dissidents decided to hold a Peace Day on that vehemently pro-war campus. By nightfall, when the Peace Rally was scheduled, an ugly mood had seized the campus. The two dozen young people backstage heard with dismay, that eggs, sticks, and stones were bulging out of the shirts and sweaters of the students filing into the auditorium.

The program began, I believe, with my production of "Bury the Dead." Before the drama was well underway, a missile or two landed on the stage. Thereupon social scientist Stanley Diamond, then a gangling, gutsy undergraduate, stepped out of role to urge the audience to play fair, assuring them that they would have ample opportunity to state their case at the end of the program.

This reasonable request seemed only to exacerbate the militants—eggs flew, sticks appeared, and a baleful din rose from the hall. At that point, someone had the good sense to fetch the college president, Dr. Frank. He came in and stood at the edge of the stage, alone—a small, unintimidating, white haired man. He stood perfectly still and waited. The great wave of noise rolled back; in a few minutes, the auditorium was absolutely quiet. Then Dr. Frank spoke, very briefly.

He expressed some sympathy with the emotions of the audience: he, too, disagreed with the viewpoint of the rally. He then reminded them how controversy was traditionally handled in the American democracy and departed. The meeting proceeded without further incident. I have often wondered whether the dogmatists in the audience learned as much from that three-minute lesson as the dogmatists on the stage.

After this introduction, it was no surprise to encounter Dr. Frank in the flesh at the Sharecroppers Fund and in the history of the Farm Security Administration, the War Labor Board and its enormous helpfulness to Southern labor, the Southern Conference on Human Welfare during its major phase, and many, many more.

For all these we remember, honor, and love you, Dr. Frank.

Vera Rony.

Oakton, Va.
April 18, 1969.

Dr. Frank Porter Graham,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

Dear Dr. Graham: It has been a pleasure and inspiration over the years to know of the work you have done—as student leader, teacher, statesman, and friend of the forgotten folk.

As my first teacher at the University of North Carolina, you made an indelible impression on me. Your "evolution of revolutions" was history at its best, with a solid dash of good sociology inherent in it. So I did my undergraduate work in history and my graduate work in sociology.

Also, in far off Indonesia, I was almost feted one evening on the fifth anniversary of the United Nations when the Indonesian leaders learned I had been a student of Dr. Frank Graham, who was they said in truth the Father of their country as an independent nation.

We still remember with hurt the imposing battery of national opposition brought against your candidacy in North Carolina for the U.S. Senate. We regret, too, that the Kashmir question remains unresolved. One day, in faith we expect your recommendations there, too, to be acted upon.

We salute you as a historian who has been sensitively aware of current affairs, and not afraid to attempt difficult tasks.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur F. Raper.

Washington, D.C.,
May 6, 1969.

Dr. Frank P. Graham,
Chairman, National Sharecroppers Fund,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

Dear Dr. Frank: It was with much pleasure that I learned of the tribute which the National Child Labor Committee and the National Sharecroppers Fund was arranging for you and I considered it a privilege to be asked to have a part in it.

I share with them and with your host of other admirers a full awareness of the very real and significant contribution which you have made to the state we both love and indeed to your country and the world by your many years of dedicated service.

You have made an indelible mark as an educator, philosopher and statesman but even more importantly as a man of courage, integrity and dedication to the causes of justice and equality.

As you now receive the recognition which you so much deserve I want to add this assurance of my own high regard and my warm wishes for your renewed health and many more satisfying and fulfilling years with your friends and loved ones.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

B. Everett Jordan,
U.S. Senate.

CBS News,
Fairbanks, Alaska, May 28, 1969.

Dr. Frank P. Graham,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

Dear Dr. Frank: A letter from the National Sharecroppers Fund just caught up with me here in Alaska. They wanted me to write a letter to go in the book from your friends and disciples, and I am disappointed that I did not learn of this project in time.

But then, I reflected, surely you know the central part you have had, and have yet, in the lives of so many of us. So much of what I know, and believe, and hope for in our home state and in the nation and on this small planet springs from what you have said and the example you set with your life. There must be thousands of men in this world who would say the same. Through my father, and some of my teachers at Chapel Hill, and directly from you have come the directions of my life.

It is not necessary for my letter to be included in the collection of the National Sharecroppers Fund, but it does somehow seem necessary for me to say these things.

As ever,

Charles Kuralt.

Boone, N.C.,
May 12, 1969.

Dear Dr. Frank: We have heard of the collection of personal letters which were to have been presented to you this past Friday night. It is not too late, we hope, for us to add ours, or at least send directly to you our expressions of deep appreciation.

As you know, both of us prized greatly the friendships you and Marian shared with us. Yours continues to be a source of pride and satisfaction to us.

XUM

Whatever successes we may have had as President and First Lady of Appalachian has been due in great measure to you and Marian. Oftentimes we have said, "This is what Dr. Frank would have done," or "This is the way Marian would have done it."

Sometimes I am accused of being two democratic. My usual reply is to the effect that I learned democracy from one of the greatest democrats of all, Dr. Frank Graham.

You have been an example and inspiration to untold millions at home and abroad. We are proud and feel fortunate to be among these and to be able to claim you as a close personal and professional friend.

As you know, my retirement as President of Appalachian becomes effective this summer. Before I leave office and we leave the President's home, we want to thank you again and a million times for all the help and inspiration you have been to us and to tell you that you will always have a favorite spot in our hearts.

We look forward to a visit with you on one of our next trips to Chapel Hill.

Both of us send our love and very best wishes to you.

Most sincerely,

THE PLEMMONSES.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join some of my colleagues today in extending greetings to Dr. Frank P. Graham as he returns to private life after a long career of public service.

My association and friendship with Dr. Frank, which was the term most of his friends always used in speaking to or of him, began many years ago when I was a student at Chapel Hill and he was professor of history. That friendship continued and ripened through the years—while he was president of the University of North Carolina, U.S. Senator from our State, and in his service in the cause of world peace with the United Nations.

Dr. Frank Graham is a remarkable person. While he had opponents, during his presidency of the university as well as after he entered the political arena, I do not believe he ever had an enemy. His sincerity was always so genuine that even those who opposed him through the years could not help but admire him for his dedication to any cause he espoused. He also held the admiration of all who knew him for always having the courage of his convictions.

Frank Graham's courage, sincerity and dedication often led him to embrace causes that were not popular but he always continued on his course if he believed it was the right course to follow and regardless of the consequences to himself.

As Dr. Frank returns to private life, perhaps to the Chapel Hill he loved so much, I should like to be numbered among his many friends who extend to him sincere good wishes for long life, good health and peace of mind in the years ahead.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PREYER) for taking this time to pay tribute to a most unusual and most remarkable American. He represents so many of the fine things in our tradition. His courage and his vision and his great contributions, not only to his State and his region, but also to the country and to the world, will be long remembered.

Mr. Speaker, I commend those gentlemen for taking this time to pay this tribute to Dr. Graham today.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the distinguished gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I enter into the RECORD the following letters and telegrams collected through the devotion of Miss Faye Bennett, who has worked under the vigorous leadership of Dr. Graham as executive director of the National Sharecroppers Fund, and of Eli E. Cohen, who has given so much as executive secretary of the National Child Labor Committee:

UNITED FARM WORKERS
ORGANIZING COMMITTEE, AFL–CIO,
Delano, Calif., May 5, 1969.

FRANK GRAHAM,
Chairman, National Sharecroppers Fund,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR BROTHER GRAHAM: Those of us who have toiled under the sun and know the need for organization of farm workers appreciate your work on behalf of field laborers. You have been an inspiration to us all.

The National Sharecroppers Fund under your chairmanship has made great strides especially in the area of preventing bad legislation and presenting the plight of the farm worker to Congress and the public at large. This was especially true regarding the termination of the bracero program.

We congratulate you on the occasion of your receiving of the awards and wish you better health.

Viva la causa!

CESAR E. CHAVEZ.

ENCINO, CALIF.,
April 13, 1969.

Dr. FRANK GRAHAM,
National Sharecroppers Fund,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR DR. GRAHAM: I wish it were possible for me to be personally in attendance this evening to offer my compliments for your many years of dedicated public service.

As a quite minor player in the drama of the American farmworkers' fight for social justice, I am mindful of your own major contributions in this field.

Please accept my warmest congratulations and good wishes.

Cordially yours,

STEVE ALLEN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.:

Warm congratulations on awards being presented to you today by the National Child Labor Committee and the National Sharecroppers Fund. This recognition and tribute are certainly fully merited. I hope that your health is steadily improving. Best wishes.

U. THANT.

WASHINGTON RESEARCH PROJECT,
Washington, D.C., April 8, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Executive Director, National Sharecroppers Fund, New York, N.Y.

DEAR DR. GRAHAM: As a black southerner I have long watched and admired your attempts to provide decent leadership in the south. Such an example has always been and remains rare. It remains a small source of hope that you, Ralph McGill and a few others did stand strong and attempted to point the way toward things in common rather than our differences. We are very grateful.

My best hopes for many more happy and fruitful years.

Sincerely yours,

MARIAN WRIGHT EDELMAN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 15, 1969.

Hon. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

DEAR FRANK: I was so glad to hear that, on May 9th, you are to be honored by the National Child Labor Committee and the National Sharecroppers Fund. I wish I could be present to express to you in person my sentiments of admiration and affection. You were one of the men in the Senate to whom Herbert felt closest; and he so often spoke of you in the highest terms. He valued your friendship tremendously, and was always so interested in anything that affected you.

As for myself, I have enjoyed knowing you over the years and, more recently, it has always been a great pleasure for me to sit next to you at dinners which we both attended.

I do hope you are feeling better, and that you will let me know when you get to New York so that I can have the pleasure of seeing you again.

In the meanwhile, heartiest congratulations, and affectionate greetings.

Yours,

EDITH A. LEHMAN
Mrs. Herbert H. Lehman.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 23, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

DEAR FRANK: What a magnificent occasion. The National Child Labor Committee and the National Sharecroppers Fund are honoring one of this country's most eloquent, courageous and dedicated battlers for human freedom and dignity.

In these difficult and tumultuous times, we need occasions like this to refresh our spirits and to rekindle our commitment to the goals for which we have all been striving over the past decades.

I will never forget your many kindnesses and your courage and counsel during those lonely years in the Senate when these issues were very much on the back burner for most people, but not for you.

You have given so much to your country and to the less fortunate people of our land, especially those in the South. It is a great honor to join in this tribute to you.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chairman, National Sharecroppers Fund,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR FRANK: It is my sincere pleasure to join your many friends in appreciation of the years you have dedicated to the cause of justice and equal opportunity for all.

I wish I could be there when the National Child Labor Committee and the National Sharecroppers Fund present awards to you.

I am happy that it was my good fortune to serve in the Senate with you.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON.

APRIL 11, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chairman, National Sharecroppers Fund,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR DR. GRAHAM: Personally and on behalf of the AFL–CIO I am delighted to join your many friends in this demonstration of affection and appreciation.

It seems to me that all your fellow citizens owe you a deep debt of gratitude for your devoted service to the nation and its people. But no group has a greater obligation than organized labor for you have been the friend of the worker in good times and bad, in crisis and in victory.

So in the name of the AFL–CIO and on behalf of its members all over the country, I am honored to extend to you our grateful thanks.

With sincere best wishes and warmest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,
George Meany,
President, AFL–CIO.

International Ladies' Garment
Workers' Union,
New York, N.Y., April 11, 1969.

Dr. Frank P. Graham,
Chairman, National Sharecroppers Fund,
New York, N.Y.

Dear Dr. Graham: I was happy to learn that you are being honored by the National Child Labor Committee and the National Sharecroppers Fund with awards for many years of dedicated and selfless service. You surely deserve these as well as many other honors.

This offers me and many of your friends an opportunity to tell you how we feel about your many achievements and contributions to liberal causes. Yours is an outstanding record—your whole life has been devoted to public service in the broadest sense, not only to the exploited and the underprivileged but also as president of a great university, as United States Senator and United Nations mediator.

In the sphere of organized labor, your many efforts to advance social justice are highly esteemed. In serving with you on a number of committees over the years, I came to appreciate not only your sincerity and integrity but also the depth of your devotion to everything that concerns the welfare of humanity. Your record as a liberal is greatly admired and your accomplishments will be long remembered by those who benefitted from your interest and service.

With warmest personal regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,
David Dubinsky.

Tuskegee Institute,
Tuskegee, Ala., April 29, 1969.

Dr. Frank Graham,
National Sharecroppers Fund,
New York, N.Y.

Dear Dr. Graham: I deem it a privilege to be able to join with your many friends throughout the country in congratulating you on receiving awards from the National Child Labor Committee and the National Sharecroppers Fund. You richly deserve these tributes.

My colleagues at Tuskegee Institute join me in this expression of appreciation for the splendid contributions you have made over the years in the area of equal opportunity for all citizens of America. We are especially grateful for your long-standing interest in Tuskegee Institute and your outstanding work in behalf of minority groups in this country.

You have our best wishes for a continuing happiness in the years ahead.

Kind regards.

Sincerely yours,
L. H. Foster,
President.

April 28, 1969.

Dr. Frank P. Graham,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

Dear Frank: I am delighted to learn that the National Child Labor Committee and the National Sharecroppers Fund are presenting awards to you on 9 May. These two organizations are to be congratulated on the wisdom in their selection for there is no one more deserving of the tributes being paid to you by them than yourself. I heartily join them in praising you for your years of dedicated effort in behalf of social justice, of decency and morality in our society. You have been always in the vanguard. You have been a courageous and unflinching pioneer and crusader. Wherever you have been, wherever you have spoken, whether on domestic matters or in support of the United Nations, you have left a glow of goodness and of hope.

It is with great admiration and affection that I take this occasion to salute you,

Yours sincerely,
Ralph J. Bunche.

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C. April 24, 1969.

Hon. Frank P. Graham,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

Dear Dr. Graham: My best wishes to you and most congratulations on your richly deserved awards. Your friends are not only quite proud of you—they are quite grateful for you.

Sincerely yours,
Margaret Chase Smith,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1969.

Dr. Frank P. Graham,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

My Dear Friend: It is a rare privilege indeed to have known you, and of your work over the years during your all-too-short period of service in the United States Senate, as well as your service with the United Nations, and in so many additional ways.

Citizens of your state, your nation and other countries owe you a great debt of gratitude for able and dedicated service in the cause of prosperity and peace for America and the world.

Let me join with your host of friends in expressing tribute to a great public servant.

With affection and respect,

Sincerely,
Stuart Symington.

Atlanta, Ga.,
May 1, 1969.

Dr. Frank Graham,
National Sharecroppers Fund,
New York, N.Y.

Dear Doctor Graham: Few men in my lifetime have served the cause of education as constructively and effectively as you have; and few men in my time have served in the cause of international and interracial good will as you have.

I am very glad that Morehouse College had the good judgment many years ago to confer upon you an honorary degree. In doing this, we honored ourselves.

May the years ahead be gracious and kind to you and bring you many good things.

Sincerely yours,
Benjamin E. Mays.

EDP Technology International, Inc.,
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1969.

Dr. Frank P. Graham,
Chairman, National Board, National Share-Croppers Fund, New York, N.Y.

Dear Frank: I am delighted to have the privilege of joining with your many many friends to express my feelings for you and your great service to this Nation at this time.

Very few men have over such an extended period of time in so many walks of life contributed to others in a measure even close to yours. In your home community, in your state, with your Federal Government and then in the international sphere, you have brought devotion, sensitiveness and gifted leadership to the many tasks you have undertaken.

In the progress, you have charted a trail of integrity, courage and humanitarian concern for your fellow human beings particularly those who are suffering discrimination, hardships and lack of opportunity which will not be forgotten. Liberals everywhere revere the name Frank P. Graham, and rightfully so.

I am delighted to join with so many others in this expression of appreciation, affection and high regard.

Sincerely yours,
Orville L. Freeman.

Independence, Mo., *April 30, 1969.*

Dr. Frank P. Graham,
New York, N.Y.

Dear Frank: I am informed that the National Child Labor Committee and the National Sharecroppers Fund is presenting you with Awards for your many years of dedicated service to their needs.

I well know how you have performed in response to every call to help improve the lot of the less fortunate among us. I am happy, therefore, to extend to you on this occasion warm personal greetings and congratulations.

With every good wish to a long time friend.

Sincerely yours,
Harry S. Truman.

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1969.

Dr. Frank P. Graham,
Chairman,
National Sharecroppers Fund,
New York, N.Y.

Dear Frank: Since I have been in public life, I have learned that many fine public servants are not given full credit for the good things they do.

There is one reward, however, which cannot be taken away and this is satisfaction. And on this thesis Frank Graham must be one of the richest men in the world. All your life, you have been concerned with the needs of others—and your life's aim has been to help them.

In doing so, you have made enemies that tried to discredit you. They have failed and today you not only have satisfaction in your own heart but the gratitude of a host of people at home and abroad.

And, finally, let me say that one of the richest rewards in my own life has been knowing you and working with you.

Sincerely yours,
George D. Aiken.

Saturday Review,
New York, N.Y., April 23, 1969.

Dr. Frank P. Graham,
National Sharecroppers Fund,
New York, N.Y.

Dear Frank Graham: Warmest greetings to one of the finest, most courageous men I know. Courageous because you were wedding high purpose to practical action long before it was safe or fashionable to do so. I can remember—and you certainly can too—when words like action and commitment were on the whole foreign to the academician's vocabulary, and *engage* was a foreign term in every sense of the phrase. It took a stout heart and a keen mind to speak out strongly in those days about social justice. You not only spoke out—by your example you encouraged others to take heart and speak out too. The past four decades of this country's social history have been the richer for your presence, and the decade that looms ahead will need you even more than we've needed you in the past. In honoring you today, the National Sharecroppers Fund and the National Child Labor Committee are speaking for all concerned Americans. Please accept my warmest best wishes.

Felicitations,
Norman Cousins.

American Civil Liberties Union,
Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico, April 1969.

Hon. Frank P. Graham.

Dear Frank: They tell me that you are having a little party in May at your home to celebrate what other friends think of you, and I must join them at long distance.

I doubt if you need to know by new testimony the love and admiration which so many bear for you, but it is always pleasant to hear. From me, your contemporary, I can say that these years of tumult and hope always seemed more tolerable when I knew you and I were on the same side, both undefeated, both struggling, both firm in a common faith in mankind.

You have cheered me on often when you did not know it, just by being you. I got your inspiration often—at the Harvard commencement when you spoke after getting a degree, at the UN on so many occasions, and in all good causes to chart a happier future for the under-dogs everywhere. If character is what counts in the influences of a man your faith and unflinching direction will count, as it has in these long years. I've never lost the sense of it.

Always with the affection and admiration of an old colleague.

ROGER N. BALDWIN.

DETROIT, MICH.,
April 18, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM.

DEAR FRANK: There are a few Americans I have met in my career who have given of themselves as unstintingly and in so many varied capacities as you have in your full and active life.

Your conscientious response to every call of duty has led you into many fields of endeavor that seem only tenuously related, if at all, to your first vocation of educator. Yet they all have one element in common: a desire to improve the human condition and particularly the condition of those millions in our country and throughout the world who are denied an equal opportunity to enjoy economic security, good health, and intellectual, cultural and spiritual growth.

Those of us who have had the privilege of working with you, as I have had over the years, have enjoyed an experience difficult to articulate but nonetheless real and rewarding. It is the experience of working with a person, warm and wise, of unimpeachable integrity and infinite compassion, an intrepid champion of all our democratic rights and freedoms, who is sustained by an unshakable faith in the ultimate triumph of human wisdom and the best impulses of the human spirit.

I am honored to join with your many other friends in expressing to you on this day our warm appreciation and our high esteem for your great accomplishments and your years of selfless dedication and service in the cause of humanity.

Affectionately,

WALTER REUTHER.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

DEAR FRANK: Midge and I wish we could be with you on May 9. However, I am committed to be in Hawaii on that date.

I shall be giving a series of lectures on the Bill of Rights including its guarantee of the right to dissent against arbitrary, capricious, discretionary and often unconstitutional exercise of power by mere men holding government positions. As you know I have opposed our involvement in the Vietnam War from the very beginning on the grounds that it is an unconstitutional involvement of the American people in a war which also is both immoral and unjustifiable. In my lectures I shall stress the importance of our returning to the checking powers given to the Congress by the Constitution over the President of the United States in the field of foreign policy.

Although the views I shall express in the continuation of my dissent aganst our war-making policies in Vietnam are my own responsibility, I want you to know that your devotion and dedication to our constitutional system of self-government and your superb record as a scholar and teacher of American Constitutional History have been a source of great inspiration to me.

How well I remember the applications of the historic background and meanings of our constitutional system which you brought to your work on the War Labor Board. The discussions we had together, and the insight you transmitted to me in regard to the application of constitutional guarantees to the daily lives of all Americans if they are to remain free men, greatly enriched my knowledge of American Constitutional History. I shall always be grateful and indebted to you, as are hundreds of your students and friends not only in North Carolina but across the entire nation and throughout the world.

Midge and I are looking forward to stopping in Chapel Hill for a visit with you the next time we drive to South Carolina to visit our daughter, Nancy, and our son-in-law, Hugh Campbell, and their family. In the meantime, our congratulations for the richly deserved awards you will receive on May 9, and our affectionate best wishes.

Cordially,

WAYNE MORSE.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
New York, N.Y., May 2, 1969.

Dr. FRANK GRAHAM,
National Sharecroppers Fund
New York, N.Y.

DEAR FRANK GRAHAM: In behalf of the NAACP, I am pleased to extend cordial greetings and heartiest congratulations. This tribute is an honor you richly deserve.

Yours has been a full and uncommonly rich life, whose reward has been the attainment of many of your ideals. Few crusaders for human rights have lived to see so many of the causes they espoused in their early years become realities during later years.

In North Carolina you carried the liberal banner through the rough seas of anti-Negro sentiment when few others would publicly discuss the issues. The soundness of the ideals which you advocated can be recognized today. Through your gentle, but persistent, pursuit of justice and equality for all, you have contributed immeasurably to our progress.

It is with pleasure that I send you our warm thanks and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

ROY WILKINS,
Executive Director.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April, 1969.

To have known Dr. Frank is to have been enriched.

Dr. Frank is a man among men. His use of his life in the service of others is a pattern for *others* to follow.

He has lived his life in the noblest Southern tradition. No Fourth of July orator he, he expressed in service his belief that all men are created equal.

Gentle, but tough . . . he never raised his voice in loud speech, but no amount of opposition stilled it in his demand for justice and fair play.

Never blinded by personal considerations, he has seen clearly the conditions under which the oppressed live . . . in his community, in the world.

The battle to right wrongs hasn't embittered him. The battle hasn't discouraged him. The battle hasn't diluted the quality of his gentle, loving nature. The battle hasn't weakened his stubborn, tough belief that justice and fair play can and must be realized for all.

Dr. Frank is proof that The Struggle does not destroy; it enriches.

HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS.

A. PHILIP RANDOLPH INSTITUTE,
April 11, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
National Sharecroppers Fund,
New York, N.Y.

MY DEAR FRIEND: Just a word of remembrance and congratulations to you upon having been chosen to receive awards from the National Child Labor Committee and the National Sharecroppers Fund for your long years of dedicated service.

I wish it were possible for me to be present upon the presentation of the awards to you for I have had a pleasant, happy, and rewarding association with you throughout the years in working for the cause of justice and equal opportunity for all.

Sincerely yours,

A. PHILIP RANDOLPH.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues to pay tribute to Dr. Frank Porter Graham who has recently celebrated his retirement from many years of public service and the 60th anniversary of his graduation from the University of North Carolina.

Dr. Graham has lived a dedicated life as a high school teacher, college professor, World War I marine, university president, governmental adviser, and United Nations mediator.

One of the many citations he has received said:

> The dignity and worth of the human person is a way of life to him,

All who have been touched by his influence can agree on one thing which has been said so we'l upon one of Frank Porter Graham's numerous public appointments:

> He won't represent North Carolina alone, nor the South, nor even this nation. He'll speak for all mankind. He is truly a citizen of the universe.

Mr. RUTH. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of attending the University of North Carolina while Frank Porter Graham was its president. His door was always open and the counsel of this beloved man was most helpful. Just as I took pride then in his being the president of my college, I take pride today in participating in this tribute.

So thanks, Dr. Frank, for several jobs well done, all of which were in service to your fellowman.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to pay tribute today to a great American; a man who has worked as an educator, champion of civil rights, and peacemaker for nearly four decades. I speak of Dr. Frank Porter Graham.

Dr. Graham began his celebrated career as an educator. In this, as in all else, his actions have been motivated by high moral standards. As president of the University of North Carolina from 1930 to 1949, Frank Graham stanchly defended intellectual and academic freedom on all issues for all people. He fiercely struggled to maintain the university as an open forum for even the most unpopular speakers.

Frank Graham truly believed in the virtues of a good education. When asked what the responsibilities of a university president were, Dr. Graham replied:

> First, to keep the university open and free for fair-balanced discussion of all vital issues and to support the students in their right to have open forums.

XUM

> Second, to keep and enlist the strongest faculty possible.
>
> Third, to help promote student self-government, not as a front for the administration, but as an organic part of the government of the university.

With the same force and conviction that he pursued an open forum at his own university and the consolidation of the campus, Frank Graham also worked fervently as a champion of civil rights.

I have already spoken of the pressure he exerted to maintain free speech at the University of North Carolina. In addition, Dr. Graham began working toward desegregation even before the Supreme Court decision of 1954. He spoke all over the State of North Carolina for obedience to the ruling as the "law of the land and as a matter of wisdom."

Dr. Graham was also strongly in favor of the nonviolent civil rights movements of Martin Luther King, Jr. and A. Phillip Randolph. His warm feelings for those Negroes sitting down to stand up for the American Bill of Rights was generated by a genuine belief in freedom and liberty for all of humanity on an equal basis. It has been said:

> He was seeking to put into men's hearts principles of tolerance and brotherhood which the Christian Church has been trying to put there for 2,000 years.

His high character has led him to defend integration on the ground that no man's human rights should be violated.

Dr. Graham's undaunted zeal for political, economic, and educational equality is equalled only by his genius as a peacemaker. During the war, as a public member of the War Labor Board, Dr. Graham was amazingly successful in placating stubborn antagonists. When labor and management were fighting over the question of the open-shop versus the closed shop, Frank Graham was able to propose a solution suitable to both sides. Through soft persuasion, Dr. Graham was able to arrive at a compromise agreeable to the most truculent antagonists.

Dr. Graham was a representative of the Good Offices Committee of the United Nations which arranged for a truce in Indonesia. He also served as the United Nations representative to India and Pakistan during the Kashmir dispute.

Dr. Graham was appointed by the Governor of North Carolina to serve the remainder of the late Senator Broughton's term when he died in office in 1949. During the election of 1950, Dr. Graham was described by the Raleigh News and Observer as "a truly distinguished man" as opposed to simply a "man of distinction." Through his efforts to guarantee human rights to humanity and create a peaceful world, Frank Porter Graham has certainly proven himself to be a citizen of the world.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN) in this tribute to an outstanding American—former Senator Frank P. Graham, of North Carolina, and president of the University of North Carolina for 19 years. The mutual esteem and bonds of affection which exist between ALLARD LOWENSTEIN and Frank Graham make it appropriate that he take this time for this tribute, and I commend him for his devotion to the principles for which Frank Graham has always stood.

Frank Graham's career is long and distinguished. A humanitarian in the best sense of the word, he has throughout his life spoken out for the cause of those men everywhere who have been denied justice.

As a professor of history at Chapel Hill, and later president of that institution, he was instrumental in maintaining, and furthering, the reputation of the University of North Carolina for academic excellence combined with a spirit of dedicated liberalism. Before the 1954 Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in the schools, Dr. Graham had promoted at the University of North Carolina discussion of the "injustice" of segregation and after 1954 vigorously supported the Supreme Court decision as both morally and legally binding. He later championed the cause of Negro demonstrators who sat in at a lunch counter in his home State, saying:

> The Negroes sitting down were standing up for the American Bill of Rights. In their hearts they were not breaking the law but testing it in order to fulfill the higher law of the Bill of Rights.

Following his interim appointment to the U.S. Senate in 1949–50, he accepted an appointment to the United Nations, where he consistently worked in behalf of a settlement of the Kashmir dispute between India and Pakistan. During the speaker ban controversy at the University of North Carolina several years ago, he was asked how, as an international official, he justified his intervention in a local, North Carolina controversy. Dr. Graham replied that by his association with the United Nations, he spoke under authority of the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights—of which the speaker ban was obviously in violation.

Prior to his concern with the Kashmir issue, Dr. Graham had previously arbitrated the controversy between the Netherlands and Indonesia in 1947–48, as U.S. representative on the Good Offices Committee of the United Nations Security Council. Prior to that, he had accepted, throughout and after World War II, numerous arduous assignments from the U.S. Government, including positions on the National War Labor Board, the President's Commission on Civil Rights, and with the U.S. Department of Labor. He was, furthermore, first president of the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies, thus continuing his efforts in the search for peaceful solutions to national and international problems.

It is not surprising that Dr. Graham's humane concerns, in addition to civil rights and international peace, are reflected in his defense of the rights of labor, his denunciations of child labor, his calls for the right of labor to organize, his demand for workmen's compensation, which were virtually his hallmark during the 1920's and early 1930's.

Dr. Graham is a man of unusual kindness and humanity, while possessing a virtue which few can boast—absolute consistency in defense of his principles. Indeed, his fierce devotion to conviction belies the mildness of his aspect, as the Saturday Evening Post once took note:

> . . . For all his chuckling bonhomie, he has started more fights than any other man in the state and has fought them more joyously, loving his enemies tenderly while dealing them mighty blows. His smile is, indeed, warm and friendly, and his handclasp is so fervent that it most often ends up in an affectionate hug. But, his fellow citizens hasten to point out admiringly, his jaw juts out like a chunk of rock, and when he plants one foot firmly on the Sermon on the Mount and the other on the Bill of Rights, there is no moving him. His attitude of meekness and humility, they add, clothes a stern Presbyterian conscience which compels him to belabor sin, selfishness, ignorance, injustice and intolerance wherever he finds them.

Indeed, no area of human endeavor, if it serves the cause of human freedom, has escaped some measure of Dr. Graham's attention. He has borne out the prophecy of one of his admirers, made many years ago:

> He'll speak for all mankind. He is a citizen of the universe.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to Dr. Frank Graham, former Senator from North Carolina and president of the University of North Carolina, on his retirement from many years of service to his country.

Dr. Graham's full professional life includes careers as a U.S. Senator, university president, United Nations mediator, World War I marine, governmental advisor, college professor, and high school teacher.

For most, adequate discharge of any of these professions requires full time and energy. Yet, it is an understatement to say that Dr. Graham's capabilities exceed those of most men. Indeed, former Senator Wayne Morse once characterized Dr. Graham as "the most Christ-like man I ever knew."

His efforts on behalf of migratory workers, his fight for the labor movement in the South, and his strong stand on racial equality as a member of the Truman Commission on Civil Rights will always be remembered.

It has been said that, to Dr. Frank Graham, "the dignity and worth of the human spirit is a way of life." Perhaps better than any others, those words capture the essence of the man.

FEDERAL ELECTRIC POWER PROJECT REPAYMENT ACT OF 1969

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the present condition of Federal water resource project development—from evaluation analysis through congressional authorization to construction and repayment—is in chaos.

The criteria for project evaluation analyses are outdated and inadequate. Data supplied to Congress upon which project authorization is considered are, at very best, inaccurate and misleading. Actual construction costs are skyrocketing to the point where they have rela-

XUM

tively little relevance to authorized project costs. And project repayment is confused and inadequate. The time has long since past when we, as a nation, with such huge and demanding priority drains on our Federal Treasury, can allow such conditions to continue.

The Federal Water Resources Council has been studying the problems of water project evaluation criteria and has made a small contribution toward making these criteria more timely and meaningful by their increasing the interest rates to be used in project evaluation. Today, legislation is being introduced which, when enacted, will make a major contribution toward clearing up another part of this chaos by establishing a uniform Federal policy on repayment of the reimbursable Federal costs of power features of water resource projects. Several of our distinguished colleagues—Representatives CLARK, DORN, JONAS, HALEY, HOSMER, MICHEL, MILLER of Ohio, SLACK, UTT, and WOLD—are joining me in this endeavor.

PROJECT EVALUATION

The executive agencies have been given specific policies, standards, and procedures by the President to be used uniformly in formulating, evaluating, and reviewing plans for use and development of water and related land resources. A statement of these policies, standards, and procedures is contained in Senate Document 97, 87th Congress, second session, May 29, 1962. Occasionally these policies are amended to reflect changing times and conditions. A significant change in the interest rate standard used for discounting future benefits and computing costs was made by the Water Resources Council late last year and published in the Federal Register on December 24, 1968—33 F.R. 19170.

The old standard, as contained in Senate Document 97, provided:

> The interest rate shall be based upon the average rate of interest payable by the Treasury on interest-bearing marketable securities of the United States outstanding at the end of the fiscal year preceding such computation which, upon original issue, had terms to maturity of 15 years or more.

The Water Resources Council amended this section to read:

> The interest rate . . . shall be based upon the average yield during the preceding fiscal year on interest-bearing marketable securities of the United States which, at the time the computation is made, have terms of 15 years or more remaining to maturity. . . .
>
> This section shall apply to all Federal and federally assisted water and related land resources project evaluation reports submitted to the Congress, or approved administratively, after the close of the second session of the 90th Congress.

Therefore, the new interest rate to be used for all Federal and federally-assisted water resource project evaluation reports submitted to the Congress after the close of the 90th Congress shall be based "upon the average yield during the preceding fiscal year" rather than "the average rate of interest payable by the Treasury." The change from average rate payable to average yield has resulted in a substantial increase in the applicable interest rate over the 3¼ percent that prevailed in 1968. The increase, however, was limited by the Council to 4⅝ percent until July 1, 1969. Since July 1, it is increased to 4⅞ percent. The Council also provided that the rate shall not be raised or lowered more than one-quarter of 1 percent for any year. This certainly is a more realistic rate in light of today's economic conditions, but still falls far short of the current average yield of something like 6¼ percent.

The Water Resources Council notice was clear in its intention that the new interest rate would not apply to Federal projects for which evaluation reports were submitted to the Congress before the close of the second session of the 90th Congress. Seven proposed Bureau of Reclamation projects presently pending before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee fall into this category and still apply the old interest rate calculation in their evaluation reports. They are: First, Kennewick extension, Yakima project, Washington; second, Touchet division, Walla Walla project, Washington; third, Merlin division, Rogue River project, Oregon; fourth, North Loup division, Missouri River Basin project, Nebraska; fifth, O'Neill unit, Missouri River Basin project, Nebraska; sixth, Narrows units, Missouri River Basin project, Colorado; and seventh, Columbus Bend project, Texas.

There are probably Corps of Engineers projects in this category pending before the Public Works Committee. Evaluation reports on any proposed project other than those pending in the Interior and Insular Affairs or Public Works Committees must be prepared using the new, higher interest rates.

The Water Resources Council amendment represents a substantial step in the direction of correcting some of the inequities previously used in water resource project benefit/cost analysis. However, this benefit/cost analysis applies only to the preauthorization evaluation reports submitted to the Congress prior to consideration of a specific project.

But, Mr. Speaker, the tragic truth is that the interest rate used in the benefit/cost statements given to the Congress in these reports has absolutely no relationship whatsoever to the interest rate actually used by Government agencies in establishing the amortization schedule for repaying project costs after it has been constructed. Necessary policies, standards, and procedures for project cost allocation, reimbursement, and cost-sharing are not covered in Senate Document 97.

The 1962 statement of purpose and scope of Senate Document 97 asserts that—

> Problems of cost allocation and of reimbursement or cost-sharing between the Federal Government and non-federal bodies will be covered subsequently.

In the intervening 7 years, the requisite standards have neither been "covered" nor established. The time is now upon us when we, the Congress, must take prompt, affirmative action to stop the establishment of repayment schedules for power facilities in Federal projects using interest rates which are totally unrelated to the interest rates used in evaluating costs and benefits for project authorization; and, more seriously, which are completely out-of-touch with the realities of sound, sensible fiscal management.

The Congress was warned of this monetary manipulation, since section VI (c) of Senate Document 97 contains the caveat:

> The period of analysis and discount rate established herein for purposes of formulation and evaluation of comprehensive plans and project plans (Sec. V–G–1 and 2) shall not be construed as establishing the payout period or rate of interest to be used in reimbursement and cost-sharing arrangements.

Because the Congress has not put a stop to this strange arrangement, several bills to authorize construction of individual projects already have been introduced in the 91st Congress providing for a specific interest rate to be used in calculating repayment which substantially differs from the new rate required for project evaluation. It is true that before these bills are considered by the Congress, the preauthorization project evaluation reports—using the new interest rate—will be submitted. It is also true that the new rate will effect benefit/cost ratios and, thus, will affect authorizations; but—I repeat for emphasis—the new interest rate will in no way affect interest rates for repayment of the reimbursable costs of Federal projects to the taxpayers.

PROJECT REPAYMENT

Mr. Speaker, the bill we are introducing today is one which would correct this monetary manipulation by establishing "a uniform Federal policy for repayment of costs of Federal electric projects" which will assure to the tax paying citizens of this Nation that the funds they have advanced for construction of these projects will be repaid on the same basis as advanced. The bill has been referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The bill, when enacted, will establish the uniform policy of the United States requiring each and every Federal electric power project to be self-liquidating through amortization, with interest, of its total costs within 50 years after the project is first used for power production. When there is more than one unit in a project, the 50-year payout period will apply to each unit rather than the whole project, for power ratemaking purposes, however, the composite costs of the project's units shall be considered. It should be understood that use of the term "project" in this context may mean either one single water resource development unit or a series of several units. For example, the Colorado River storage project was authorized to include four storage units. These units are Glen Canyon in Arizona, Flaming Gorge in Utah, Navajo in New Mexico, and Curecanti in Colorado. Also there are 16 participating units. Thus, all 20 of these units should be considered as one project for ratemaking purposes. In the case of the Boulder Canyon project there is only one unit, the Hoover Dam.

The amount to be repaid, with interest, would include all construction costs

XUM

allocated to electric power, plus interest during construction. The interest rate to be used for computing interest during construction and on the unpaid balance of the Federal costs would be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of computed average yields of outstanding marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a redemption date of 15 years or more from the date of issue. This would make the interest rate formula to be used in calculating repayment the same as was used in figuring costs and benefits for authorization.

The power rates charged for the power produced in Federal projects would be established at levels sufficient to meet the required repayment at least. They would still, however, be "low" by any standard for comparison with the power rates charged by non-government electric power suppliers.

While these so-called low Federal power rates are generally unfair, there is no attempt in this legislation to correct all the inequities contained in the Federal power rate structure. For example, the principal reason for these "low" Federal power rates is the fact that present Federal power pricing relieves users of Federal power of the burden of making any payment whatsoever, in the price they pay for that power, toward the costs of carrying on the necessary activities of the Federal Government. Last year between 75 and 80 percent of the Nation's electric customers paid an average of 22 cents on every dollar they spent for that electricity in the form of Federal, State, or local taxes to help pay for the operation of these governments. These 75 to 80 percent were customers of investor-owned electric companies.

The 20 to 25 percent of electric consumers who get their electricity from other sources paid no comparable Federal taxes and almost no State or local taxes.

This is not a new or unknown phenomenon. Over 14 years ago the Task Force on Water and Power of the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government called attention to this grossly unfair situation by saying:

> There is no economic nor social reason why the customers of Federal power should not pay their proportionate share of the costs of Federal Government as do the users of non-federal power. . . .
>
> There is no economic nor social reason nor reason in equity why all customers of Federal power should not pay in their rates their fair share of the costs of State and local governments.

Still nothing has been done to correct this inequity. While fairness and equity to the vast majority of electric consumers would require inclusion of a factor for taxes foregone in the rates to be charged to the users of Federal power, this legislation we are introducing today does not go that far. However, the issue would be appropriate for consideration by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during hearings on our bill.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Mr. Speaker, there has been a pressing need for enactment of this kind of legislation for a long time, since there is no overall requirement in Federal law at the present time that costs allocated to Federal hydroelectric power development be repaid in any uniform manner. The result is confusion and inequity in the application of repayment criteria. Section 3 of our bill points this out by stating in part:

> Existing laws contain a variety of formulas and requirements for repayment of the Federal costs of electric power projects and related facilities. Some laws contain no specific repayment provisions. Electric power from some Federal projects is being sold at rates which do not cover the financial costs of such projects to the government.

Provisions for repayment in a specific number of years have been written into the authorizing statutes of a few different power projects or systems, but no one law applies uniformly to all such projects. Consequently, project repayment is in shambles with the result that unknown millions of dollars of Federal revenue are being lost each year.

DISCUSSION OF PROBLEM

Mr. Speaker, let us discuss this problem for a few moments for the benefit of our thoughtful colleagues. There are two significant, salable products of Federal water resource developments—water and electric power. Revenues from the sale of these products are used to meet the theoretical requirement for repayment of the Federal costs which is clearly set forth in basic law.

The water is sold for irrigation or for industrial or municipal supply. The Reclamation Project Act of 1939—53 Stat. 1187—provides the basic standard that construction costs allocated to irrigation shall be repaid to the Federal Government by an approved water organization. The repayment obligation shall be spread over annual installments for a period not to exceed 40 years plus an approved development period not to exceed 10 years. Actually, however, a large portion of the reclamation projects cannot and do not meet this repayment requirement. Such projects have been individually authorized by specific statutes which set forth definite—but exceedingly more liberal—repayment requirements. This is the same situation I described a few moments ago relative to some of the authorization bills presently pending in the Congress. The water Supply Act of 1958—72 Stat. 297—provides the basic standard for repayment of costs of Federal projects allocated to municipal and industrial water supplies. That act requires the entire amount of construction costs allocated to water supply, including interest during construction, shall be repaid within the life of the project, but in no event shall this repayment period exceed 50 years.

As far as the other salable product—hydroelectric power—is concerned, however, there are several unresolved problems:

First. Diverse statutory provisions cover the rates to be charged for power from federal projects. They fail to provide for uniform standards concerning the period of repayment for such facilities and the rate of interest to be charged on the unamortized balance.

Second. Congressional direction for the review of power rates are either nonexistent or sorely inadequate.

Third. After the financial cost of power facilities in some projects has been repaid, power revenues are being used to repay power facilities in other projects without any specific congressional authority.

Fourth. In all too many instances, power rates are inadequate to repay power investment even according to the announced standards for those individual projects.

Mr. Speaker, these problems are of such important magnitude that they must not be passed over lightly; but, rather, they should be given serious consideration by the Congress.

First, lack of uniform standards: Almost all laws relative to Federal power projects do not contain specific requirements that the power investment be repaid in a definite period, with interest, at a determinable rate. In some instances, they do not even provide that the rates must be adequate to repay the power investment with interest. In others, repayment is required, but the time period is not specified; and there is not always a clear statutory mandate that interest be paid on the unamortized balance.

There are a few exceptions to this general statement, however. In the case of Hoover Dam, the statutory repayment requirements are clearly laid down in the authorizing legislation, the Boulder Canyon Act of 1928—45 Stat. 1057. The law provides, in effect, that before any appropriation could be made for the construction of Hoover Dam, the Secretary of the Interior shall have made contracts for the sale of power to be produced at rates sufficient to cover all costs of producing power and the repayment of the power investment in 50 years with interest at 4 percent.

The authorization legislation for the Colorado River storage project—70 Stat. 105—is also specific by providing that power produced at this project should be sold at rates sufficient to provide for the repayment of the power facilities in 50 years with interest. Concerning the rate of interest to be paid on the unamortized balance, the law, as originally passed by the Congress, stated it was to be based on the "average yield to maturity on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date of 15 years or more." This provision is significant because it was the first statutory requirement to use an interest rate based on yield rather than rate payable in calculating project repayment.

Four years later, however, in June of 1960, an unrelated section was added to an otherwise acceptable bill authorizing construction of the Norman project in Oklahoma which had the effect of changing this interest rate formula for three dams in the Colorado River storage project. During the discussion in this chamber concerning the Norman project, the late Representative Clarence Brown, Sr. of Ohio said:

> This particular section of the bill, section 9, was put on the measure in the other body as a rider without any committee hearing whatsoever being held on the rider or on the

measure at all, as I am informed, and was approved and slipped right through that body.

During that some discussion, I attempted to clarify the situation by making the following statement:

> Just to make sure that the legislative history of this bill will be correct, it is not the intention of the chairman or the members of the [Interior and Insular Affairs] committee to have this provision applied to any project except the three which have been specified by the gentleman from Colorado, the chairman of our committee.

Those three projects for which the interest rate formula was changed were Curecanti, Central Valley of Utah, and San Juan-Chama in New Mexico. The original formula based on yield was to continue to apply to all other projects in the Colorado River storage system.

The statutory repayment requirements applicable to the Boulder Canyon Act and the Colorado River Storage Act are exceptional and just a little research reveals that the law applicable to most other projects is not nearly so precise.

Different statutory requirements have been set for interest rates for power generated at various reclamation projects. For example, the Congress, in section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, provided:

> Any sale of electric power or lease of power privileges, made by the Secretary in connection with the operation of any project or division of a project, shall be for such periods, not to exceed 40 years, and at such rates as in his judgment will produce power revenues at least sufficient to cover an appropriate share of the annual operation and maintenance cost, interest on an appropriate share of the construction investment at not less than 3 percentum per annum, and such other fixed charges as the Secretary deems proper.

Several things should be carefully noted about this quoted language. The 40 years mentioned relates only to the maximum duration of any allowable sales contract and not to project repayment. There is no specific reference made to amortization as an element of cost. The language states that power revenues shall be "at least sufficient to cover" a share of the annual operating and maintenance costs and interest. The implication from this is that such revenues might be larger than would be required merely to cover such minimum costs. The interest at not less than 3 percent on an appropriate share of the construction investment could go on and on without limit, since there is nothing in the law providing that it would be applicable only to the unrepaid investment. Thus, for power facilities built under the Reclamation Act, there is no statutory requirement for their repayment. However, the Bureau of Reclamation states that the average rate for firm commercial energy is determined "as that which is necessary to provide sufficient revenue to repay all costs to be borne by power." The Bureau goes on to state:

> Construction costs to be borne by power are divided into two parts for most studies. The first part covers those costs attributable to production and marketing of commercial power. This power investment is to be repaid with interest at 3 percent or such other rate as may have been specifically authorized for the particular project. Interest during construction is included where shown on the individual studies. The second part covers those remaining project costs which are assigned to power, and are to be repaid from power revenues. These costs are, for the most part, irrigation costs which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay and are repaid without interest, in accordance with the Reclamation Project Act.
>
> All construction costs borne by power are reimbursable, and the rates for firm commercial energy are set to accomplish the repayment of these costs within a specific period after the costs are incurred. Since construction investment generally is not made in a single year, but may be made over a period of years as irrigation and power needs develop, the total period from initial operation of the project to final repayment of all costs may be more than 50 years. However, the repayment period for the commercial electric plant investment for a particular year does not extend beyond 50 years. (U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, "Power Systems, Average Rate and Repayment Studies, FY 1968," pages 2–3.)

The bill we are introducing allows for the fact that construction costs are spread out by providing that the 50-year repayment period begins when project is first used for production of power. In the case of multi-unit projects, the repayment on each unit shall begin with the use of that unit for power purposes.

The Bonneville Project Act of 1937—50 Stat. 731—establishing the Bonneville Power Administration originally to market power from the Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River, was not explicit as to repayment and interest on its power facilities. This act provides that rate schedules for the sale of power should be drawn by the Administrator "having regard to the recovery of the cost of producing and transmitting such electric energy, including the amortization of the capital over a reasonable period of years." It also said such rate schedules shall "become effective upon confirmation and approval thereof by the Federal Power Commission." This law does not prescribe the maximum period of repayment for the power facilities or require that interest be charged on the unrepaid balance. In practice, rates have been drawn supposedly to provide for the repayment of power facilities in not more than 50 years. The Senate Committee on Appropriations stated on March 23, 1965, that—

> The Committee notes, however, that at present Bonneville power rates, the costs allocated to power cannot be returned within a period of 50 years . . . since projects in this area were individually approved and authorized by the Congress on the basis that the costs allocated to power would be repaid with interest over a period of 50 years, the Committee expects them to be repaid on that basis. (89th Congress, S. Doc. 167, page 28).

Although the Bonneville Act did not expressly require the power rates be sufficiently high to cover interest on the unrepaid investment, such interest charges have been considered as a cost in setting power rates. For many years, interest was computed at 2.5 percent, but on some of the more recent facilities, a different rate has been used. For new works, the interest rate is based on the average rate payable on interest-bearing marketable Government obligations with a maturity of 15 or more years.

The Congress, in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944—58 Stat. 887—made the Secretary of the Interior the marketing agent for practically all multiple-purpose power projects of the Corps of Engineers. Like the Bonneville Act, this act provided that rate schedules for power from such projects should be drawn by the Secretary having regard to the recovery of the cost of producing and transmitting the power, including the repayment of the power investment "over a reasonable period of years." Such schedules are to become operative and effective upon approval by the Federal Power Commission. Here again, although the law is not specific, power rates are set supposedly to recover the power investment in not more than 50 years with interest at 2.5 percent.

Mr. Speaker, it should be apparent to all of us, therefore, that there is a total lack of uniformity in the statutory requirements for repayment of Federal power projects. This lack of uniformity is one of the factors contributing to the present chaotic condition of the Federal water resource development picture.

So far as this unresolved problem of the "lack of uniform standards" is concerned, our bill will resolve it.

Second, inadequate rate review: Power rates for most Federal hydroelectric projects are set by the Secretary of the Interior without outside review by an agency such as the Federal Power Commission. The FPC has the responsibility under the Flood Control Act of 1944, the River and Harbor Act of 1945—59 Stat. 22, the Fort Peck Act—52 Stat. 403, the Bonneville Act, the Falcon Dam Act—68 Stat. 255, and the Eklutna Act—64 Stat. 382—to approve rate schedules applicable to the sale of electric power and energy generated at certain Federal electric power projects. During fiscal year 1968, for example, the FPC had the responsibility for approving power rate schedules at 59 Federal hydroelectric projects. However, as of January 1, 1968, there were 137 federally owned projects in operation. Therefore, there were 78 federally owned projects—or almost 60 percent of the total—for which the FPC had absolutely no authority to approve power rates.

Even where the law provides for FPC approval of power rates schedules, there are numerous shortcomings in this regard which have not been corrected by the statutes.

First, there is no one law which provides a method of compelling the Secretary of the Interior to file power rates for a project with the FPC in the first instance, if he does not wish to do so. For example, the Secretary consistently refused to file the power rates for the Missouri River Basin project. Our bill will correct this shortcoming.

Second, should the FPC disapprove a proposed power rate schedule, there is no way to compel the Secretary to submit a new rate schedule that might prove to be more satisfactory to the FPC. For example, in 1958, the FPC disapproved power rates for projects on the Cumberland River. The FPC did not approve of the Secretary's use of the incremental method of allocating joint costs and opposed his use of 2 percent as the rate of interest—19 FPC 744. Although the Comptroller General complained to the Congress about the Secretary's failure to file a new rate schedule, the Secretary did not do so until December 1963—over 5 years later. The FPC approved this new schedule, although it met only partly the objections raised in 1958—32 FPC 1523. In 1964, the Comptroller General recommended to the Congress that the 1944 Flood Control Act be amended to prescribe the course of action to be taken if the FPC disapproved a power rate schedule. The 1964 report of the Comptroller General on "Sale of Hydroelectric Power at Rates Not Approved by the Federal Power Commission" was the most recent report on this subject. Our bill will correct this shortcoming.

Third, except in a few instances, the laws imposing the responsibility on the FPC for approving power rates do not specify who is to determine what portion of the joint costs of the projects should be allocated to power. Such allocation might possibly be made by the constructing agency—the corps—the power marketing agency—Interior—or by the FPC. On several occasions, the FPC and the Corps have differed as to how such costs were to be allocated to power. Our bill will correct this shortcoming.

Fourth, the FPC has taken a restricted view of its role in reviewing power rate schedules submitted by the Department of the Interior. Thus, the FPC in approving a power rate increase for the Bonneville Power Administration in December 1965, said:

> Congress obviously did not mean that we were to supplant the Secretary's responsibility for initiating appropriate rates, nor were we to make a *de novo* determination. The statutory standard leaves the Secretary a measure of discretion. It follows, therefore, that we need not necessarily reach the same conclusion as the Secretary. Our role is to review the Secretary's proposal and confirm and approve it if we conclude, on the basis of our independent judgment, that it comports with the dual statutory standard of providing consumers with the benefits of power at the lowest possible price consistent with good business practices as well as protecting the interests of the United States in amortizing its investment in the projects within a reasonable period.

Our bill will correct this shortcoming by giving FPC final authority in the rate making.

Mr. Speaker, enactment of the legislation we have introduced today will represent a giant step in the direction of resolving the problem of inadequate review of Federal power rates because the Federal Power Commission will have the authority to approve power rates at all Federal projects and will report to the Congress annually on each project's compliance with the new uniform requirements.

Third, use of power revenues after repayment: Although it is assumed generally in setting power rates that power facilities will be repaid in not more than 50 years, this does not mean necessarily that the facilities will be repaid in such a period solely from the revenues resulting from their own power production. A number of power marketing agencies have followed the practice of using revenues from a fully repaid installation to repay other more costly facilities, even though Congress has not authorized this practice except for the Federal Columbia River power system. In 1966, the act authorizing construction of the third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam allowed this scheme of "rolling amortization" as it is called. The power marketing agencies which are using this scheme, contend that all facilities are to be repaid in 50 years, but, in effect, this is accomplished only by using power revenues from some projects for much more than 50 years. The BPA explained this manipulation in its 1963 annual report as follows:

> Thus, when Bonneville Dam, the first in our system, is paid out in 1994, its revenues beyond that date will be used to help pay out the newer dams in the system. Fifty years after the last dam on the system is completed, it will be paid out from its own revenues and those of the older dams which were paid out earlier. In this manner, the power investment in each dam still will be repaid within 50 years after its completion.

The Southwestern Power Administration and the Southeastern Power Administration also use rolling amortization, even though the Congress has not authorized its use in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, I think the following point should be noted by our colleagues and should be brought strongly to the attention of the various Federal power marketing agencies. Since the Congress took the position that this rather unique financial arrangement had to be specifically authorized for the Federal Columbia River power system, the strong inference has been created that where it has not been so authorized, it cannot and must not be used.

Fourth, power rates are inadequate: The power rates charged for power produced at a number of Federal projects have not been sufficient in recent years to meet all of the costs of its production, including interest and repayment. An excellent case in point is the Southwestern Power Administration which markets 1,425,000 kilowatts of power generated at Corps of Engineers dams in all of Arkansas and Louisiana, and parts of Missouri, Kansas, Texas, and Oklahoma. In August 1968, the Federal Power Commission found—

> Our examination of SWPA's rate/revenue relationship shows that SWPA will not be able to meet its financial payout obligations under present marketing practices and existing contractual arrangements. . . .
>
> SWPA is in its 26th year of operation and, to date has not met its scheduled repayment obligations. As shown in its 1967 study, at the end of fiscal year 1966, the accumulated initial power investment for hydroelectric projects and associated transmission facilities was $410,328,728. Accumulated revenues have been sufficient to pay off operating costs but have fallen $41,474,048 short of paying interest charges in the investment and generation and transmission facilities. (FPC order on Docket No. E–7172, August 15, 1968, pages 1 and 6)

Another example of a project failing to meet payout schedules is the Falcon Dam of the Bureau of Reclamation on the Rio Grande River in Texas. This 31,500-kilowatt project has very little dependable power. Since it was completed in 1955, it has never earned the $444,000 required annually to cover all of its costs, including interest and repayment during a period of 50 years, because no one would buy the power at rates designed to yield such revenue. As a result, on January 17, 1963, the Bureau of Reclamation sought approval from the FPC for a period of 5 years of a rate schedule that would yield annually only $320,000 of revenue. The FPC in approving this proposal, stated:

> The sale of this amount of energy under the currently proposed rates would produce an annual revenue of $320,000. Annual power costs, exclusive of amortization charges, are estimated to average about $345,000. Of this estimated annual cost approximately $180,500 is attributable to interest on the investment. It would, therefore, appear that although the power revenue to be provided by the project falls short of its total costs, it does exceed the out-of-pocket costs and provides for a substantial portion for the interest on the investment. (29 F.P.C. 457, 459)

According to the Bureau of Reclamation, this project from 1955 through fiscal 1968 had total revenues of $3,850,489 However, total revenue deductions were $1,897,029 for operation and maintenance, $2,540,968 for interest, and $1,783,545 for depreciation. Therefore, the Falcon project lost a total of $2,493,968 during this period and has fallen almost $716,811 short of meeting its repayment requirements. The Bureau of Reclamation estimates that the project will have funds available by 1978 to restart paying the Federal Government, and when the project is 59 years old—in the year 2013—still about 68 percent of the project power costs will be unrepaid.

The Rio Grande project has 24,300 kilowatts of installed generating capacity in Elephant Butte Dam. The power installation was completed in 1940. Between 1940 and 1968, the project has lost $2,663,221, after the payment of interest. Although every year after 1950 the project failed to earn enough to cover all charges, including interest but excluding repayment, the Department of the Interior expects that in 1972 it may begin to earn some repayment and in the last year contained in the repayment study for this project—2020, 80 years after project completion—approximately 50 percent of the costs will still remain to be repaid.

The giant Missouri River Basin project with its numerous generating units—which by the way has cost the taxpayers over $1.1 billion to date for the power facilities alone—lost money every year between 1954 and 1965 for a total of $57,649,187. In 1965, the law was changed to help bail this project out of its financial difficulties. The sale of power from the Missouri River Basin project is governed by the Reclamation Act of 1939 and the Flood Control Act of 1944. These acts require that the Secretary of the Interior sell the power at such rates as, in his judgment, will produce sufficient revenues to recover operating costs and the Government's expenditure for power facilities, with interest. Successive repayment studies made by MRBP subsequent to 1950 indicated a worsening

XUM

financial position for the project and the 1962 study clearly showed that the expenditures for commercial power facilities would not be repaid within 50 years from the date they had been incurred.

A few years ago the financial condition of MRBP became so obviously bad that our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs felt compelled to request a study be made by the Department of the Interior on ways and means of placing the project in a sound financial position. To comply with this request, the Bureau of Reclamation undertook a new study using revised criteria and principles for interest rates, expenditures, time periods, and revenues which were deemed necessary. The report was submitted to the committee on December 17, 1963.

The MRBP average rate and repayment studies prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation for fiscal years 1966 through 1968 did not include projections as to when the commercial power costs will be repaid but instead indicated that economic analyses were under way. On March 18, 1968, the Comptroller General reported to the Congress on the "Need for Change in Method of Computing the Cost of Power Sold for Commercial Purposes, Missouri River Basin Project." In that report, the Comptroller General recommended a comprehensive study be made of power rates for the eastern division of the Missouri River Basin, to determine the extent to which MRBP rates would be raised and still remain in line with other power rates in the area. Our bill will resolve this problem of inadequate power rates or the Congress will be kept currently informed of the reasons for the rates being inadequate.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has made substantial progress in recent years in establishing uniform policies applicable to water resource development standards as they apply to irrigation, municipal and industrial water supply and recreation facilities. But, there still remains the need to write uniformity into the law relative to repayment of power costs. The time is long past for the Congress to procrastinate in correcting this problem. The enactment of the legislation we introduce today will accomplish this desirable goal by establishing a uniform policy relating to project repayment through amortization within 50 years using interest rates based on average yields of outstanding marketable public debt obligations. Enactment of this legislation will be a memorable milestone in correcting chaos which exists in Federal water resource project development. Therefore, we, the sponsors, respectfully urge its speedy enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the Record a section-by-section analysis of the bill for the information and use of our colleagues:

Section-by-Section Analysis of the Bill

Section 1: This section of the bill is the enacting clause and short title—"Federal Electric Power Project Cost Repayment Act of 1969."

Section 2 states the declared policy of the United States to be that federal electric power projects should be self-liquidating through repayment with interest in not to exceed 50 years from when the project or unit is first used for power production.

Section 3: (a) States the Congressional finding concerning lack of uniformity in federal power project repayment.

(b) The purpose of the legislation is to establish: (1) power rates set to produce sufficient revenues to repay at least the capital cost of power facilities as well as maintenance, operation, and replacement costs; (2) standards to insure annual payments sufficient to liquidate, with interest, the project costs allocated to power; (3) authority for the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the stated policy; (4) a time schedule for complete effectuation of this policy; and (5) requirement that the Federal Water Resources Council develop cost allocation and cost sharing standards.

Section 4 contains definitions of certain terms as used in this legislation.

Section 5 requires the Federal Water Resources Council to set up procedures and standards for project cost allocation and cost sharing within 180 days.

Section 6: (a) Requires repayment of federal costs in not over 50 years.

(b) Requires annual repayment payments.

(c) Requires rate of interest applicable to federal power projects to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of the computed average yield on outstanding public debt obligations with a maturity of 15 years or more as of the beginning of the year in which construction of the "power facilities" was initiated.

Section 7 gives the Federal Power Commission authority to fix power rate schedules to assure project compliance.

Section 8 gives Secretary of the Interior responsibility for having marketing agencies carry out this act and for setting rate schedules under this act. If power in a project cannot be sold in three years at a price that conforms to this act, then it is to be sold at the highest marketable price and the Secretary is to report to the Congress on the reasons why an exception to the policy is necessary.

Section 9:

(a) Provides that power revenues may not be earmarked or encumbered after the 50-year repayment period "without specific authorization by the Congress."

(b) After project repayment, revenues go into General Fund of Treasury.

(c) Contains instructions for setting power rates after project repayment.

Section 10 makes legislation applicable to all federal power projects except those of TVA "and any research and development project" of the AEC.

Section 11 requires the Federal Power Commission to maintain a continuous review of the repayment status of all federal power projects and report annually to the Congress regarding compliance with the law.

Section 12: "All earlier provisions of law in conflict therewith" shall be superseded.

Section 13: This is the usual separability provision.

Section 14: The legislation takes effect when enacted.

RISE IN CONSUMER PRICE INDEX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Udall), is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the long-suffering consumers of this country were given another shock this morning when they learned that the Consumer Price Index has taken another sharp jump, this time to an annual rate of 7.2 percent. This is shocking testimony to the failure of the Federal Government to get its house in order.

Last fall during the presidential campaign the voters of the country were led to expect something different. In his acceptance speech at Miami, Mr. Nixon said:

> I see a day when our senior citizens and millions of others can plan for the future with the assurance that their government is not going to rob them of their savings by destroying the value of their dollar.

Well, those were encouraging words, but the record of this administration to date is a very different story. It is a record of indecision, delay, miscalculation, and a total failure of leadership which has left the business of labor communities adrift, unaware of any constraints, guidelines, or national policies relating to wages, prices, and the cost of living.

It seems that the administration is clearly against sin, but unwilling to define it.

Mr. Speaker, I have withheld any criticism of the new administration, on this or any other issue, until it had time to work out its policies and put them into effect. Even now I am willing to support President Nixon on an effective program to check inflation. And he knows that I supported him on extension of the 10-percent surtax in spite of my strong feeling that tax reform deserves equal priority.

However, the price of my continued support of the surtax—and it will undoubtedly meet another test in the form of a conference report—is some demonstration that the administration is actually serious about inflation and willing to face some of the hard realities related to it.

The dialog between the President and Secretary of the Treasury Kennedy has not been an inspiring one. In fact, it brings back memories of that weird dialog of 1957 between President Eisenhower and his Secretary of the Treasury, George Humphrey, when Mr. Humphrey announced that Mr. Eisenhower's budget had "a lot of fat in it," and Mr. Eisenhower alternately agreed and disagreed with this view.

In this case Secretary Kennedy has clearly shown that he knows how serious is our inflation situation. With complete realism he has warned on several occasions that, unless the threat is met in other ways, inflation will have to bring on wage and price controls. In each instance, often before nightfall of the same day, President Nixon has put out statements contradicting his Secretary, at the same time declaring that he stands behind Mr. Kennedy in his fight against inflation.

I think Mr. Nixon is suffering from a crisis of identity. He knows what he does not want to be, but he does not know what he wants to be.

What he doesn't want to be is Lyndon Johnson, the man so long denounced by Mr. Nixon and his associates as an arm-twister and jawbone persuader.

Yet what role does Mr. Nixon plan to play as the value of the American dollar skids and skids and skids? Just since he became President the value of every bank account and insurance policy in the country has declined more than 5 percent. And yet he apparently is unwilling

XUM

to exercise the slightest bit of leadership to halt this tragic decline.

What affirmative action we have seen since January 20 has come from the Federal Reserve, which has applied increasing pressure to reduce the money supply. The effect of this has been a steady rise in interest rates, which is starting to create serious problems in housing and elsewhere. But without some leadership from the President the job is not going to be done, either by a money squeeze or surtax extension, or a combination of them.

Apparently, Mr. Speaker, the President believes that, if Congress will only complete action on the surtax bill, the whole problem will go away. I think he is badly mistaken.

The fact is that the President, and only the President, has the means to exercise moral leadership in this area. And Mr. Nixon thus far has refused to do so.

What a different story it would be right now if President Nixon had started his term with a strong statement of policy on wages and prices, a clear signal to the leaders of business and labor that restraint would be the order of the day. Instead, Mr. Nixon chose to tell the country, at his first press conference, that labor and business leaders "have to be guided by the interests of the organizations that they represent."

What leadership. What a blank check.

Apparently, Mr. Nixon cannot make the transition from candidate to President. It was fun castigating Lyndon Johnson for interfering with the freedom of the marketplace through his guidepost system. But by chopping down those guideposts he has left the economic forces of this country to do what comes naturally; namely, to raise prices and wages to the maximum.

No one should believe that Mr. Nixon could have stabilized the dollar overnight. But as a newly inaugurated President he had a rare opportunity to set a new course for our economy. Because of his personal identity crisis he did not, and we are now paying the price, not just with a continuation of the inflation of the last 3 years, but with an accelerated rate of inflation.

Where will it end? And when will it end? These are questions that can have no answers until President Nixon faces up to his responsibilities and exercises the moral leadership expected of him as our Nation's Chief Executive.

What would it take? Let me be specific. I believe the President should go before the people of this country and say something like this. "Inflation is a reflection of public attitudes. It is as much psychology as economics. People buy today because they think prices will be higher tomorrow, and their buying insures that prices will go up. People demand higher wages today because they think prices are going up, and their wage increases guarantee that prices will go up. You and I talk ourselves into each successive round of inflation. Acting together with determination we have the means of stopping it in its tracks.

"What this country must do," the President should say, "is exercise restraint. Working together, we can accomplish what we can never do working separately. I say to you people in business, trim your profits for a while, do everything possible to hold down price increases. I say to you people who work for wages, you people in the labor movement, demand no more than the productivity of our economy entitles you. I say to all of you, who in addition to everything else are consumers too, hold on to your money for a while, defer your purchases where possible, give our economy a chance to stabilize.

"And finally," the President should say, "I want you to know that as President I am establishing a price stability board composed of leading representatives of business, labor, and Government. And I am going to charge that board with the responsibility of reviewing all price and wage proposals in the key industries and sectors of our economy. That board will have no power to control prices or wages, but it will carry the authority of my office in exercising moral leadership in this vital area. Its job will be to use the maximum pressure of public opinion against any industry or any labor group exceeding reasonable limits in wages or prices. Working with this board and with your help, I intend as your President to see that inflation is brought under control, and that this is done starting today."

If the President were to take such steps, I firmly believe we would see immediate results. The syndrome of inflation would be broken up, the psychology of inflation undermined, and we would begin to see some restraint and some moderation in our economy. Then, passage of the surtax and income tax reform could be given a chance to work. Fiscal and monetary policy, and Presidential leadership, would all be working for the same end—a restoration of confidence in the American dollar.

Let me say that if the President does not exercise this kind of leadership, there is still something that the ordinary citizen can do, and I urge that he do it. The burden of inflation is intolerable, particularly to persons on fixed incomes, and it is a burden which gives all of us a feeling of helplessness. Yet we are not totally helpless. If the President will not say it, then each of us should say it together. This is a time to hold back on purchases, to seek out and favor those businesses which have shown restraint, to use our collective purchasing power to lessen some of the pressures on our economy. The act of one consumer multiplied by millions of others can produce a force more powerful than the inflation psychology which is wreaking such damage to all of us today.

Mr. Speaker, just last month I published a report for my constituents on the problem of inflation. It should be noted that I withheld any criticism of President Nixon in that report. But I think the time has now arrived when he must be held responsible for what is happening, and he must be persuaded to take prompt, affirmative action. Without objection, I insert the text of my report and an article from today's Wall Street Journal at this point in the RECORD:

[From Congressman MORRIS K. UDALL's report, June 13, 1969, vol. VIII, No. 5]

PREPARING FOR PEACE—IV: THE CASE OF THE VANISHING DOLLAR

Three years ago in one of these newsletters I made the preposterous suggestion that we should increase taxes in an election year. A member of my staff thought that report ought to be titled: "Election Year Memo from a Political Lunatic." And, as a matter of fact, many of my constituents viewed my proposal in just that light. One angry former friend wrote: "Udall, are you out of your cotton-picking mind?"

Well, thirty-nine months have passed since then. History will record that former President Johnson didn't take my advice. He may have recognized the need for a temporary tax increase, or surtax, to take the steam out of the economy, but it was an election year, and he may have calculated that Congress wouldn't do it—so why take a defeat? Also, a debate over taxes, made necessary by the Vietnam War, might have forced a war-policy debate he was not anxious to have. At any rate, we didn't enact the 5% surtax I proposed and which most of the country's leading economists were advocating. We simply closed our eyes and plunged headlong into ever-heavier war expenditures which would upset our economy and trigger the worst inflation since the late 1940s.

By the time we got around to passing a surtax last summer, inflation fever was so high that the medicine wasn't very effective—at least not immediately. And, as every taxpayer knows, the tax we finally had to apply was twice as big as the one we were talking about back in 1966.

WE HAD A GOOD THING GOING

When you have a good thing going, you often don't fully appreciate it at the time. Looking back at the five years of 1960–65 we can now see that we had achieved something quite spectacular, precious and elusive:

Between 1960 and 1965 the average rate of inflation in the United States was 1.3%, the best record of any industrially-developed nation in the world.

Even better, we were able to achieve this price stability alongside steady economic growth and declining unemployment.

Because of our price stability U.S. products were unusually competitive in world trade, and we were enjoying a $5 billion trade surplus.

What happened to change this? There is no doubt that the real cause was our decision to escalate the Vietnam War, which in 1965 started its spiral toward an annual cost of $30 billion. How ironic it is to recall that the Federal budget submitted in January, 1966, made the assumption that the war would be over by June 30, 1967, and that the war cost for that fiscal year was underestimated by $10 billion!

As I wrote that newsletter in March, 1966, I saw disturbing signs on the horizon. The Consumer Price Index had crept up to an annual rise of 1.7%. The Wholesale Price Index, almost static since 1959, had started moving up at a rate of ½% a month. Our utilization of industrial capacity had climbed to 91%, close to the point at which efficiency drops off. And an inflation psychology appeared to be developing; manufacturing firms were building up inventories of supplies, anticipating an increase in the price of raw materials. It was clearly a time, it seemed to me, when the country needed a dose of fiscal medicine—a small, temporary increase in taxes to slow down the economy, just as we had cut taxes to speed it up.

WHAT THE "UDALL SURTAX" WOULD HAVE COST

Let's see what a 5% surtax in 1966 would have cost the taxpayers of this country. And,

XUM

recognizing that it might have been extended up to the present moment, let's see what it would have cost for the three-year period. Here is a breakdown for three levels of income (assuming in each case a married couple with two children taking the standard 10% deduction):

	Annual income	Regular tax	5-percent surtax	Total cost to date
(A).....	$5,000	$290	$14.50	$43.50
(B).....	10,000	1,114	55.70	167.10
(C).....	25,000	4,412	216.60	649.80

In other words, the "fiscal medicine'" proposed for the *threat* of inflation in 1966 ranged from $14.50 for a couple making $5,000 to $216.60 for a couple making $25,000. If left in force to the present, this 5% surtax would have cost those same couples $43.50 and $649.80 rspectively as their share of the fight against inflation.

WHAT WE ACTUALLY HAD TO PAY

Now let's see what our country's failure to face up to the threat of inflation actually cost those same taxpayers. Instead of an average rise of 1.3% during the years 1960–65, the Consumer Price Index has risen an average of 4% for the past three years. This has meant that the real incomes of all Americans have been cut more than 12% since the spring of 1966. Every pension, every insurance policy and every bond is that much less valuable today as a result.

Let's look specifically at the extra 2.7% of annual inflation that was *added* after 1966 and the 10% surtax which went into effect last year. Here is what our three taxpayers have actually had to pay for this round of inflation:

	Annual income	2.7 percent added inflation for 3 years	10 percent surtax, 1968–69	Total cost to date
(A).....	$5,000	$405	$50.70	$455.75
(B).....	10,000	810	194.95	1,004.95
(C).....	25,000	2,025	771.10	2,796.10

As you can see, the couple making $5,000 actually lost $455.75 instead of $43.50, and the couple making $25,000 actually lost $2,796.10 instead of $649.80. And, of course, they're likely to pay another year of surtax, while the loss from the increment of inflation will go on forever—reducing the value of all their future income by that percentage.

We might also note that, as a result of three years of 4% inflation, the real income (in 1966 dollars) of Taxpayer A has been cut to $4,400, Taxpayer B to $8,800, and Taxpayer C to $22,000.

Obviously, no one can absolutely prove that the 5% surtax of 1966 would have prevented *any* increase in this country's rate of inflation. But I don't think it takes any great sophistication in economics to recognize that fiscal measures taken early, before the onset of real trouble, need not be as severe as those required at the height of an inflationary spiral. And their chances of success must obviously be much greater.

EFFECTS OF INFLATION

The tragedy of inflation is that it hits hardest those who are in the most meager circumstances—old people who are retired on fixed incomes, and unorganized, low-wage workers who lack the bargaining strength to demand higher pay. Such people find the cost of rent and of groceries going up while their incomes remain the same.

But even people in the work force whose incomes ultimately adjust at a higher level will find inflation exacting a high price. Take, for example, the cost of housing. Inflation has forced successive increases in interest rates, with devastating results.

Suppose you set out in December, 1965 to finance a $20,000 home. Let's say you paid 10% down and signed a 25-year FHA-insured mortgage for the remaining $18,000. You could have obtained such a mortgage then at 5½% interest. Your payments in principal and interest would have been $110.54 a month, or a total $33,162 over the life of the mortgage.

Now it's April, 1969, and the purchasing value of the dollar has declined 12.8%. You're setting out to buy an identical house. You find it doesn't cost $20,000 anymore; the price has gone up to $22,560. And the interest rate has jumped from 5½% to 8%. After a down payment of $2,250 you end up making monthly payments of $156.68, or a total of $47,004 over the life of the mortgage.

In just a little over three years the cost of financing that house will have jumped over $550 a year or $13,842 over the life of the mortgage.

There are other ways that inflation hurts. Recently the Southern California Edison Co. announced it was withdrawing from the combine of power agencies planning a plant at Page, Arizona, to produce pumping power for the Central Arizona Project. The reason they gave: rising interest rates. Bonds that used to sell for 3.9% interest are going now for 7.25%; this cost of doing business hurts all businessmen, large and small.

Or look at the Federal budget. In one sense, the income tax is self-adjusting; when money declines in value, more taxes are collected. But this doesn't mean there are no problems. Between 1965 and 1970 the Federal debt will have grown by 14%, but because of rising interest rates the cost of *servicing* that debt will have jumped *at least* 40%. This has the effect of robbing programs that provide some service to the people.

And if that's a problem, think about all the state and local governments that depend on real estate taxes for an important part of their income. When the value of the dollar declines, tax rates or tax valuations have to go up. Adjustments of this kind aren't easy, and they don't win friends or votes. This is why it's becoming increasingly difficult to pass local bond issues for anything, as the people of Tucson, Yuma and Green Valley learned recently.

WHO STARTS THE SPIRAL?

An age-old argument is: who starts the inflationary spiral? Is it labor demanding higher wages, business demanding higher profits, or *both?*

Some months ago the *Wall Street Journal* devoted a column to this question and came down on the side of profits. Looking at the record of inflation since World War II, the *Journal* quoted Peter L. Bernstein, president of a New York investment counseling service: "The pattern is clear enough. Instead of labor costs pushing prices up, what we see instead is a sort of profit-push. Profits are already well on their way up before prices begin to rise, and prices are well on their way up before wages begin to rise faster than output."

In truth, inflation is something like the Hongkong flu. It's hard to trace and hard to stop. Government, ignoring the state of the economy, orders more planes and tanks and ships than the country can produce without running up excessive demand for labor and raw materials. Manufacturers, faced with the opportunity for higher profits, up their prices. Labor, faced with rising prices, demands higher wages. Using another metaphor, we might say that inflation is like a tailspin in an airplane; the longer it goes on, the tighter the spin becomes. Wages drive up prices; prices drive up wages. People speed up their buying to beat higher prices later; their buying decisions help to assure that prices will go higher. Meanwhile, the United States finds its products less and less competitive in world trade, and our balance of payments problem, a perennial headache, gets worse.

There are obviously many forces contributing to inflation. That's why, once it's started, inflation is so hard to stop. But I think it's important to realize that the decisions of government play a unique role requiring the greatest of attention. In an economy approaching $900 billion the Federal budget of $190 billion obviously plays a crucial part. As a customer of this country's goods and services the Federal government, clearly, can be very helpful, or very damaging, in the spending decisions it makes. I think, in the last three years, it hasn't helped very much.

DID THE "NEW ECONOMICS" FAIL?

In the summer of 1965 I wrote a series of newsletters entitled, "The Silent Revolution in Economics." It was a review of the lessons this country had learned through 30 years of depression, war, inflation, recession and stagnation—interspersed, of course, with occasional prosperity, relative price stability and growth. Comparing money to water in a river—water which can be used and re-used as it flows downstream—I tried to show how the "new economics" works. The point was that the Federal government, through its decisions to spend more or less than it takes in during a given year, can stimulate or retard the economy as needed.

Did the "new economics" fail? Some people seem to think so But significantly, this is not the view of President Nixon or his economic advisers. In fact, this is worth noting: the "new economics" has survived the transition in administrations. Like Medicare and federal bank deposit insurance, I think it's here to stay. Different approaches will surely be taken; more or less emphasis will be placed on fiscal policy (taxes and spending) as opposed to monetary policy (regulation of credit and interest rates). But the critical role of government fiscal decisions in influencing the economy—for good or for ill—is now an accepted fact. No longer will monetary policy be expected to carry the load alone.

A corollary is also worth nothing: balance or imbalance of the budget must still be watched, but no one is talking any more about balancing the budget every year as a first priority. There is great concern about the current situation, and we certainly must balance the budget this year. But you won't find any Nixon Administration economists arguing that all budgets must be balanced as a matter of principle. Like their predecessors, they recognize that what they do with the budget—for example, running a surplus in a period of impending recession—can have dire consequences for the nation's economy.

I think most economists, of various persuasions, agree that it wasn't the "new economics" that failed it; it was the tardiness with which it was administered. Where they will disagree is in the possibility of its ever becoming a tool available for timely use.

CAN WE AVOID ALL INFLATION?

Perhaps we ought to put this discussion in some perspective. Inflation is bad and must be held in check to the greatest extent possible. But we should not be deluded: this country has always had some inflation. A dollar in Abraham Lincoln's pocket bought less than one in George Washington's. Inflation is a by-product of industrial development—not just in this country but everywhere. The day will probably never come when the value of the dollar will remain constant year after year.

How many times have you heard it said that New Deal spending started the erosion of the dollar? There is probably no more firmly-held opinion in the American body politic. Yet it's not true. The 1890 dollar had shriveled to 61 cents by 1929; at the end of the New Deal period and the start of World War II it was actually worth 65 cents!

XUM

With the war and postwar period we resumed our old-established pattern of steady, occasionally rapid, inflation.

Similarly, I think it's important that we recognize that along with inflation we have had tremendous growth in personal income, the product of improving technology and increasing productivity. Thus, while it would be better if we had had no inflation, we should not lose sight of the gains we have made *in spite of inflation*. A Cleveland machine tool company ran an ad recently pointing to some of these gains. Here are a few:

In 1914 an average American worker had to work 6 hours and 44 minutes to earn enough to buy a shirt. Today he earns a better shirt in 1 hour and 39 minutes.

In 1914 he worked 1 hour 37 minutes for a pound of butter; today, 19 minutes.

In 1914 he had to work 1 hour 14 minutes for a pound of bacon; today it's 22 minutes.

For better or worse, we have learned to live with *some* inflation. I don't think we can ever expect perfect price stability. But I do believe that the kind of inflation we have endured the last three years can be prevented if we are willing to keep abreast of our economy, to analyze the economic facts available to us, and to make the tough decisions necessary to deal with them.

AN OLD PROPOSAL REVIVED

Anyone can tell after serious inflation has developed. All you have to do is open a newspaper and look at the grocery ads. The trick is to detect the early signs of inflation before it becomes evident in the price of sugar and lard. And this is what the President's Council of Economic Advisers is for. Studying monthly reports on business activity, building contracts, housing starts, inventory accumulation, prices and all the rest, these men have the job of assessing what is happening and advising the President what steps ought to be taken to avoid recession, reduce unemployment, prevent further inflation or prolong growth and prosperity. The trouble is that *prompt* action may be required, and Federal fiscal decisions are *never* prompt.

You may recall that President Johnson finally asked Congress to enact a Vietnam surtax in August, 1967. However, it wasn't passed by Congress until late June, 1968, by which time the value of the dollar had dropped another 4%.

I am reminded of Great Britain's initial experience with the nationalization of industry in the early days after World War II, when the Labor government attempted to make policy decisions concerning coal production, electricity and even airline operation in the halls of Parliament. It didn't work, of course, and ultimately these "socialized" industries were accorded autonomy similar to that enjoyed by the managers of private industry. The lesson here is that legislative bodies are ill-suited to play management roles; when they try, they're likely to fail. (The Post Office Department is another example.)

The parallel isn't perfect, but I think this same kind of problem faces us in attempting to apply fiscal policy through the slow and tedious decision-making procedures of the Congress. In 1964, when we made a big cut in Federal income taxes, we got results: it was a successful move. But I wonder how timely, or effective, would have been a move to *increase* taxes a like amount. In reducing taxes we have politics on our side; in raising them we don't. Thus the lag from early 1966 to mid-1968 before enactment of some kind of surtax to check inflation.

What's the answer? Back in 1962 President Kennedy proposed legislation giving the President standby authority to raise or lower taxes within a limited range—say 5% to 10%—subject to congressional veto. Thus when the economy appeared to be heading for trouble, he could act quickly to prevent a recession or check the onset of inflation. The proposal got nowhere, mainly because Congress is very reluctant to give up any of its taxing authority, even if it be subject to limitations of time, size and veto.

However, I think this kind of idea needs another look in the light of our experience of 1966–69. We now face these hard realities:

1. Congress is a deliberative body, not an operational agency. Given a sound reason for doing so, every congressman will vote to *lower* taxes with enthusiasm and dispatch. But he will tend to drag his feet on *raising* them, since inaction will rarely hurt him *politically*.

2. When inflationary pressures build, *prompt* action is absolutely essential.

3. Congress is unlikely to give up any of its power to *cut* taxes.

4. Inaction by a President on the threat of inflation can hurt *him* politically, yet he is powerless to adjust taxes, potentially his most powerful anti-inflation weapon.

Recognizing these realities, it seems to me we ought to have the talent and the brains to devise machinery which would accept these realities and yet put some flexibility into our system, machinery which would let us use the effective tools we have learned about in recent years. I think there is one possible answer which would work like this:

Congress would keep its full and unfettered right to *lower* taxes.

But to prepare for the future possible threat of inflation Congress would pass legislation encompassing a series of prospective tax increases to deal with various possible emergencies. In other words, Congress would pre-package to *its* specifications and put *on the shelf* for the President's use as needed a series of prescriptions for economic over-indulgence. One might be a 5% surtax expiring at the end of one year. Another might be a 10% surtax expiring after six months.

With this standby authority the President would be given the power to deal *promptly* with the threat of inflation. Perhaps it might be written to take effect 30 days after an executive order signed by the President, subject to veto by either branch of Congress within that period.

Another device with much the same effect would be a change in congressional rules permitting the President to send up a proposed income tax adjustment (either raising or cutting tax rates) with a declaration that it be given priority consideration. When such a message was received, the rules of the House and Senate would require a floor vote—up or down—within, say, 60 days.

If President Nixon had either of these approaches available to him today, I think we could anticipate an extension of the 10% surtax for another six months or a year—long enough, in any case, to slow down our inflation. But, since he doesn't have that authority, we can't be sure what's going to happen.

OTHER POSSIBLE WEAPONS

Taxes and interest rates are two very powerful weapons which can be used to fight inflation. There are others which could be used along with them; unfortunately, they are much less acceptable to one element or another in our economy. I'm speaking of the various devices, either tried or proposed, to restrain the excessive rise of wages and profits in our industrial system.

On the one hand, it is proposed that all major, nationwide *labor disputes* be subjected to compulsory arbitration—both sides being required to abide by the decisions of the arbitrators. I find few labor leaders or corporation executives who favor this approach.

On the other hand, there are those who favor outright *wage and price controls*. The last time this approach was tried was during World War II. However, there are so many problems with this—enforcement, equity, the encouragement of needed investment, to name a few—that I doubt we will ever choose this route again short of an all-out war.

Finally, there is the approach which was actually used by the last two administrations—an attempt to restrain these contending forces through mere power of persuasion. The key word for this approach was "guideposts." Through this device management and labor were given a rather precise indication of what price and wage increases would be consistent with the rise in productivity in the entire economy; anything beyond that was considered inflationary. Though lacking the force of law, these "guideposts" succeeded to a considerable degree until economic pressures became too great to restrain any longer. The Nixon Administration has now abandoned them.

This persuasion approach, or what some critics have labeled the "jawbone technique," probably isn't a very good idea on a permanent basis. For one thing, labor leaders tend to search for a White House scolding to show their members how much they're getting away with. For another, it isn't really fair to single out one steel producer or electrical manufacturer for allegedly unjustified price increases when other companies or other industries remain untouched by official criticism.

The British have tried an idea which has had some success. Prices aren't controlled, and wages aren't controlled, but excessive increases are restrained nonetheless through a requirement that they be reviewed by an impartial high-level public panel. The moral force exerted has made a considerable contribution to price stability.

Last year in the United States lumber prices were increased as much as 100%. Ordinary home-buyers and other citizens didn't know this was going on until a whole new pattern of really unjustified lumber prices had been established. Rolling them back at that point was almost impossible.

It occurs to me that something like the British system might work here. If we had a Price Stability Board composed of leading economists and top labor and business executives, it might be able to restrain through *moral force* the kind of excessive increases in key industries which trigger whole rounds of inflation. This would be especially true, I think, in the case of the large oligopolies which have acquired very considerable control over their own price structures.

There may be other approaches which would be better. But at least this formal, structured system of price and wage review would get away from the suspicion of personal vendetta which was always a possibility in the days of White House arm-twisting. And it just might work.

WILL WE KEEP THE SURTAX?

No one in his right mind would try to put out a fire by pouring gasoline on it, and yet something of this kind could happen if Congress fails to extend the 10% surtax before June 30. The President has made an urgent appeal. The Budget Bureau says it's absolutely essential. The Council of Economic Advisers agrees. But there are a lot of reasons why that might not happen.

For one thing, many Members of Congress feel tax reform must take precedence over surtax extension. Others see the surtax as financing the Vietnam War, and they're against the war; cutting off the surtax, they reason, might force the Administration to end the war. Still others are simply opposed to the surtax, and they don't want to have to answer to their constituents for continuing it. And, of course, time is running out.

In the end, I expect we will extend it. It's strong medicine, and it was administered late, but giving it up now could make matters even worse. As before, if the choice is between 4–6% annual inflation or a 5–10% surtax (applied, not to your whole income but only to your regular tax), there can't be any doubt which is better.

XUM

In preparing for the period of peace we all hope lies ahead, I think we ought to give real attention to this problem of inflation. It need not be a by-product of war; surely we know now we can't have both "guns and butter." And it need not be a byproduct of peace. It is my hope that out of this costly experience will come a determination to improve our fiscal and other machinery to deal with the problem of inflation. If we will do that, we may never again go through such an unstable period or see so many of our hard-earned dollars disappear.

I had intended this report to deal with one of the great debates taking shape in Congress—the need for tax reform. Because of developments in the Ways and Means Committee, where our tax laws are written, I decided to reverse my original order. Tax reform will be next.

As always, I'll appreciate your comments.

Morris K. Udall.

Consumer Price Index Rise in June Doubled From May Rate; Half of Gain Tied to Food

(By a Wall Street Journal staff reporter)

Washington.—The consumer price index rose at a steep 7.2% annual pace in June, the Labor Department reported, double May's 3.6% rate. Officials said the surge was about half accounted for by food price jumps.

Government economists had indicated after the May report that larger increases lay ahead but the June rise was larger than expected, according to some analysts.

The cost-of-living measure climbed 0.6% last month to a record 127.6% of the 1957–59 average from May's 126.8%, the previous high, the department said.

The June index was 5.5% above the year earlier 120.9%, slightly ahead of the 5.4% year-to-year increase recorded in May. It was the 29th consecutive monthly increase.

The June gain matched the 7.2% annual-rate increase in April, but was down from the exceptionally rapid 9.6% of March.

In the first half, the index rose at a 6.4% annual pace, up from 4.6% in the 1968 period. For all 1968, the index rose 4.2%. Officials generally have said the Administration's anti-inflationary measures should begin to produce smaller price gains toward the end of the year.

In the first six months, prices of commodities rose at a 5.6% pace and services climbed at a 7.6% rate.

At a news briefing, Arnold Chase, assistant commissioner of labor statistics, attributed about half of June's increase to "sharply higher prices" for foods, particularly beef and pork. Consumer services accounted for about one-fourth of the advance, and prices of commodities other than food rose at a 4.8% annual pace, the report said.

Food prices climbed a strong 1.5% last month, the report said, up from a 0.4% rise in May. Leading the way, the meats, poultry and fish category rose 4.5%, after climbing 1.3% a month earlier.

Meat prices recorded the largest increase since June 1965, the report said, and in the second quarter, after seasonal adjustment, advanced nearly 9%. Beef and pork prices were especially high, the department said. Mr. Chase attributed this to a "strong climb" in livestock and wholesale prices of meats. He noted that an 18% gain in wholesale meat prices in the past year has "put a squeeze" on retail prices, which have advanced about 9.5% during the same period.

For the first half, fruit prices rose 3.5%, a sharp increase from the 1.8% rise in the 1968 period, Mr. Chase said.

Most other commodities also showed increases in June, he said, but smaller ones than the food gains.

Apparel prices climbed 0.3% in June after an 0.8% gain a month earlier. In the first six months, Mr. Chase said, apparel prices rose 2.2%, down from the 2.7% gain a year earlier.

Prices for services rose 0.4% last month after a 0.5 gain in May, the report said. Medical costs rose 0.5% following a 0.6% May gain.

Housing prices rose 0.4% last month, the same as in May, and rents continued to climb at an 0.3% monthly pace. Home ownership costs advanced 0.5% after a 0.7% gain in May.

Transportation costs rose 0.5% last month, in contrast to an 0.5% decline in May, as a 1.1% June rise in used-car prices reverse a recent downtrend. "Used car prices are back to their levels of a year ago, and apparently have recovered from their sharp decline," Mr. Chase said. New-car prices didn't register any change in June, after falling 0.1% in May.

Cost-of-living pay boosts provided in union contracts will go to about 77,000 workers as a result of June's rise in the consumer price index, the Labor Department said. The major increases: about 40,000 people, mainly in the aerospace industries, will receive an 8-cent hourly pay raise; 22,000 workers, mostly in public transportation, will get 4 to 6 cents more an hour, and 6,000 metal workers in California will receive a 7-cent hourly increase.

Despite the "substantial increase" in consumer prices, the department said, a longer workweek plus a penny gain in hourly earnings lifted workers' weekly purchasing power 46 cents, or 0.5%, in June, up from a 39-cent increase in May. In terms of 1957–59 dollars, the average non-farm, non-supervisory worker with three dependents had "real" weekly purchasing power in June of $78.64, up from May's downward-revised $78.18 but below the $79.03 of a year earlier.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. I would like to say to my friend that I am delighted to see the evidence of his concern with inflation at this time. I noted a different attitude on the part of his party in the past 8 years under different Presidents, but I am delighted to see it changed now. I think it is timely and highly important.

Mr. UDALL. I must disagree with the gentleman. There have been few people on my side of the aisle who have talked or written as much about the need for fighting inflation as I have. I was one of those few who advised President Johnson in 1966 that the whole disastrous inflation was coming on and that we ought to have a surtax then and there. We did not get it until 2 years later. And I will put my record in fighting inflation in the past 8 years against the gentleman from Tennessee's or anyone else's, as a matter of fact.

Mr. BROCK. I appreciate that fact. I would like to take issue with the gentleman on just a couple of points. It does seem that we tried this jawbone approach under President Johnson. At the same time we in Congress, and the executive, exercised a degree of fiscal irresponsibility that exceeds any parallel in the history of this Nation.

Our deficits probably came close to $100 billion in the last 8 years, and, despite the jawbone, prices rose year in and year out and are continuing to rise.

Mr. UDALL. Well, I would say to the gentleman——

Mr. BROCK. If the gentleman will let me proceed for just a moment I believe I may be able to add something to this colloquy.

Mr. UDALL. Certainly, I want to have a dialog with the gentleman with reference to this very serious matter.

Mr. BROCK. Pressures built in this economy to an almost intolerable degree. Our working people were trying to the best of their ability to get by as they watched prices inch up and up and up. They tried to act responsibly as the President requested. However, finally, the dam broke. There was no recourse. They had to go to their union leaders and say, "We cannot continue to see our dollar erode; we cannot continue to accept wage increases which do not take into account the impact of inflation."

They got their wage increases in the last couple of years and now they are a part of the inflation problem as is the price of goods.

I wonder, as a matter of fact, what this situation has to do with, for instance, the price of tomatoes. The price of tomatoes has gone up from 31 cents to 48 cents in the last year. I wonder how much massive impact this Government can have on a little tomato farmer.

Mr. UDALL. I think the approach I am recommending is this: We do not ask the Government to do it. We ask the people—all of us together to do it. But we need the President of the United States and you and I to provide some leadership. I would like to see a campaign which will result in business firms beginning to advertise that it has held the price line when others had raised prices; a program where people would take pride in their union in holding off exorbitant wage demands.

We had something really precious going for us in this country in 1965. The gentleman keeps talking about what took place between 1960 and 1965. The average annual inflation 1960 to 1965 was 1.3 percent per year. The people ought to know today for the first time that it it is going to be 7.2 percent in just this 1 year if the present rate continues. The dam broke in 1966 when we made a mistake as a country—and I place the blame squarely on the Democratic Executive as well as the Congress at that time, in trying to fool ourselves into believing that we could continue big domestic programs and also fight a new $30-billion-a-year war in Vietnam, while at the same time refusing to raise taxes to pay the extra costs. That is why we are having this inflation today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What the gentleman is suggesting is an informal effort to control wages and prices without the formality of legislation. This Congress would apparently have to pass such legislation to provide authority to impose such wage and price controls since there is nothing now on the books to permit such controls. But, would the gentleman subscribe to the theory of economics that we have inflation as a follow-on of Federal deficits and untoward spending without taking into consideration the deficit of the economy in the form of taxation?

Mr. UDALL. Certainly.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What we have

XUM

been experiencing in the last few months from the beginning of this administration and the end of the last one going back to 1966, as you know, is the result of the profilgacy of the Congress and the executive preceding that time. Had we done a successful job of sound economics then, we would either have reduced spending to live within our income or imposed necessary taxes then to cover what we were spending. But we would not have had success in controlling inflation by imposing wage and price controls. We would still have had to pay for this profilgacy sometime or other anyway.

This was the experience in World War II. We had imposed wage and price controls at that time. After World War II when we took off wage and price controls, everything shot right through the roof. So we have been paying for the last several months for what happened preceding the present period of time.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman is right. Once this chain starts it is like a fever. To a degree, it has to run its course. But, we have now corrected the underlying imbalancing factors by balancing the budget and we will do the rest of the job that needs to be done by continuing the surtax. But psychology will determine as to how soon the thing runs its course.

Here is where we need presidential leadership, and here is where we need individual leadership in stopping the psychology of inflation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, let us talk about that for just a little while. Actually psychological leadership does not have to be shown by the administration, but I believe the gentleman will agree that in several instances it has been shown.

The gentleman from Tennessee has pointed out that psychological leadership is not always successful. It takes more than that. I am trying to check right now to find out the exact time, but a number of hearings were held in the Committee on Government Operations a couple of years ago on this issue of the effectiveness of jawbone economics. When we got into it, we found out that President Johnson's jawbone, unlike the jawbone Samson used against the Philistines, was not tremendously successful in halting inflation.

The whole question of leadership has been raised by the comments made by the gentleman from Arizona, so I would like to ask the gentleman something further because I think he is in a position to speak to this problem. The gentleman is one of the few on the other side of the aisle who did support the President's leadership on the surtax vote; and I trust that the gentleman is not one of those who criticized the President at the time for his effort to influence Members on both sides of the aisle on this important economic issue.

Mr. UDALL. No. I thought the President exercised leadership in that regard. He used some of the same techniques which you used to call the arm twisting under the last administration. You now can call them "vigorous and effective persuasion." But the same techniques have been used by Presidents of both parties. They are part of the system.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thought it was vigorous and effective, but most of all effective.

I would like to point out that the surtax is not the only effort against inflation which has been utilized by the President. As you will recall, when the President made his budget request he made requests that were some $4 billion less than President Johnson had requested in his budget of just a few weeks before.

Mr. UDALL. I commend him for the total reductions though I might have preferred specific cuts in other areas.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think President Nixon's reductions show some leadership. The Congress then tended to freeze that budget request into a maximum spending limit by legislating it as such.

The President just yesterday—and I trust the gentleman read the message wherein he made note of the limit to the $192.9 billion budget when he spoke about the supplemental appropriation that he had just signed—President Nixon announced that he would cut an additional $3.5 billion to maintain spending within the statutory limit. He said he believed he could take additional funds or expenditures out of the budget, because of the increase of uncontrollable portions of our Federal spending, such as interest on the debt.

Now, in addition to that the President has asked for a postal rate increase which would take some more money out of the private sector and put it into Government funds which would further assist in balancing the budget. If we continue to cut spending and try to get more money out of the private sector, then the President has taken effective economic action.

I think these things will be reflected in just what the gentleman is seeking, and that is a dampening effect on the psychology of inflation.

I do not know whether the gentleman looked at the news wire this afternoon to see what the stock market did today. It did today just what it has been doing for the past several days. It went down again.

Mr. UDALL. This report today about the 7-percent annual rate of inflation is going to kick off another round of fears. It will kick off additional wage raises, and companies will decide that they had better make more profits now, and they will raise prices.

What the gentleman says is true. There are several levels of effort halting inflation. One is budgetary, and I give the President a high mark in this regard. I commend him for that leadership in extending the surtax. But moral leadership is the most crucial of all in stopping something which is basically psychological. The President ought to be saying, "People of the country, rally around me. Follow me. Defer purchases for a few weeks or months. Do not buy anything. And we are all going to point the finger at the companies, the people, and the unions who persist in feeding these fires." If he did this kind of thing, we could stop it in a matter of weeks, if we would just make up our minds to do it. Instead, he folds his hands and rebukes Secretary Kennedy. In effect there is a burglar in the house. The ultimate weapon is a gun. We hope we do not have to use it—that of wage and price controls—but the President announces in advance that regardless of how desperate things become we will not use that weapon. I do not think really that wage and price controls will work in all probability. But maybe someday we will have to try them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman 100 percent—wage and price controls do not work. They merely defer the impact of inflation.

The important thing that has to be said at this point is that in this administration unlike the administration that preceded it, we are taking specific action to do the things the gentleman would like to have done and not just talk quite so much about it.

In the previous administration the executive leaders talked a good deal about the problems of inflation, but it seems to me very little was done that created real economic impact. Talking about the surtax issue, President Johnson said it was a necessary thing and, as I recall, it was passed last year with a different dispersion of votes on the other side of the aisle than was the extension a few weeks ago. That is something I do not fully understand because I do not understand what happens in politics that changes people's views about the economy.

Mr. UDALL. I noticed changes in voting patterns on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But it was passed under President Johnson, and as soon as it was passed his administration started the printing presses operating in this country and increased the money supply. I do not know whether that had anything to do with the fact that 1968 was an election year or not, but increasing the money supply tends to buoy up the economy and set the fires going in inflation.

The result was that the effect of the surtax was washed out by action to increase the money supply and credit at the Federal level.

I would hope that in spite of what was said by any President or administration leader, that economic policies and statements are consistent in our economic effort to meet the problem of inflation. I think this Nixon administration has been consistent.

I think President Nixon and most Republicans in Congress have been consistent in what we have done and what we have said. The difference is that before we had an administration which was talking an anti-inflationary game, but it was taking the actions that were inflationary and that is exactly how we got where we are today.

Mr. UDALL. I do not agree that the gentleman is entirely correct.

I am one who was critical of some aspects of President Johnson's campaign against inflation.

But I do claim that he took the tough steps which laid the groundwork so that the budgetary situation could be brought under control. I am willing to praise that just as I am willing to praise President Nixon for his action to bring about budgetary balance.

XUM

I do not agree as to some of the actions you pointed out with regard to the budget.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. I would just like to make one correction. The President did not bring the budget into balance by increasing income and decreasing expenditures. He did so by changing the way the budget was handled, by moving away from the administrative budget and adding income from trust funds. This "mirror" washed out what was under previous methods of accounting a $6 or $7 billion deficit last year and brought it into balance.

That is not really an exercise of the hard muscle that it takes to do something about inflation. That is a little bit of chicanery.

Mr. UDALL. I have seen no action by President Nixon to go back to an administrative budget system. The budget balance you claim for the present administration is based on the overall national accounts budget rather than the administrative budget.

Mr. BROCK. There was just announced further, may I say, a $2.9 billion cut on executive agencies.

Let me point this out to you. I think the reason I am on my feet is not that I disagree with the gentleman on the terrible economic crisis facing this Nation, but rather to disagree as to the actions of President Nixon in this regard in the past 6 months.

I do not know that I can remember a person in my lifetime who has exercised more political courage than the President of the United States in bringing the Nation's attention to this problem. I really question whether or not it is the responsibility of the President to go out and chop down the tomato farmer. The tomato farmer is not looking so much to President Nixon, who has made his record clear by standing up and insisting on a tax surcharge, insisting on budget reduction, and advocating a tax reform, as his eyes are fixed on the Congress of the United States.

And what does he see? He sees a Congress raising its own salaries by 40 percent as the first official act of the Congress of the United States. Then we go on and we add more and more expenditures to every single budget item that is brought before the House. Then the coup de grace is administered when the House finally rises to its responsibility and passes a surtax bill. The bill is then sent to the Senate, and the majority leader of the Senate says, "We may get around to it in a few months, but only—only—when we consider tax reform." And the gentleman knows as well as any Member of this House that that is a false issue. It has nothing to do with the basic economic facts of life and the problem of inflation facing this country.

You cannot lay the charge of lack of leadership on the doorstep of this administration, with the gentleman's own party leadership acting the way it is in the other body.

Mr. UDALL. I do not want my silence to imply that I agree with the gentleman's analysis of the situation, because I do not. I have tried to say frankly, candidly, and openly here that the President and the administration have taken some of the action that is necessary, and some of it has been painful. My charge is limited today to a default in this one vital area. The thrust of my remarks today has been that inflation is as much psychological as economic, and that we can stop it through counterpsychology. Leadership in this area is vital, and in this area the President has almost totally defaulted.

We have been waiting to see if he would come forward with a program to educate the people of this country and to lead them. Your tomato farmer in Tennessee is dying for someone to tell him how he can help fight inflation. I am not worrying about him making too large a profit. But I am worried about the profits of the steel companies, the auto companies, the drug companies, and the oil companies which are showing record highs and are still going up. Until we stop that kind of rise in profits, we will not solve the problem.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I have been interested in listening to the gentleman's special order and to the contributions of the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN). I would like to address myself for a moment to the charge of the gentleman from Arizona that the President has been deficient in speaking out on the question of the inflationary psychology which grips many elements of the American body politic as a result of several years of overspending by the previous administrations and by previous Congresses.

I must say to the gentleman from Arizona that my recollection of what the President has said on this issue and what has been said most forcibly by the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Stans, and the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Kennedy, is different from that of the gentleman from Arizona.

On Saturday of last week the Secretary of Commerce, Maurice Stans, in my presence and before an audience of some 1,000 Minnesotans, spoke out at great length about the inflationary psychology and the inflationary syndrome. In doing so he referred frequently to statements made by President Nixon in speaking out against this inflationary psychology and urging voluntary action on the part of elements of our society to which the gentleman from Arizona has referred, asking them to react, to protect their own interests by showing restraint in this area. So I must express a modest disagreement with the gentleman from Arizona in his charge that the President of the United States and his principal Cabinet officers have been silent in speaking out about inflationary psychology or inflationary syndrome. I believe that the record is to the contrary.

Mr. UDALL. I concede to the gentleman his very sincere views, and I regret that we disagree on this point. A lot of pious sermonizing—and maybe that is an unfair characterization—but a lot of generalized conversation against inflation will not do the job. Someone must exert a specific moral force so that a business that raises its already exorbitant profits to a higher rate is going to know that the public is looking, and that the public will not patronize such a concern. The President seems so afraid of doing something that Lyndon Johnson did, or maybe overdid. Because he singled out some specific labor unions, or steel company, or some particular segment of industry, Mr. Nixon does nothing.

Perhaps there is a middle ground. I am suggesting that there may be a bipartisan approach. I am suggesting that the President get a half dozen economists, a half dozen specialists from both political parties, not identified with this administration, to tell the Nation that the profits in this industry or in that industry are too high, that a wage settlement in a key industry is really out of line in the present situation. That action would be taken, not with any legal force, but with some moral force. If the tomato farmer in Tennessee can read those findings, he will not buy from that kind of company which is raising prices to an exorbitant level. This is the kind of specific leadership I am calling for.

We do not have to be told about inflation. The gentleman from Minnesota knows how bad inflation is. I know how bad it is. The question is what to do about it.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACGREGOR. The gentleman has used the word "psychology." He has said that there has been no speaking out by the President on the problem of America's inflationary psychology. It is on that issue that I must respectfully disagree with the gentleman from Arizona.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

OPENING UP OUR SPACE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, my purpose today is to comment on the future space program, and my hope—and I trust it is shared by most of my colleagues—to broaden it, that we might become even more effective in the years ahead.

However, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) is still in the Chamber, I would like to say we in the Congress certainly share equally the responsibility for this inflation spiral in which we are caught. We could have set the tone in the previous administration. Inflation is a giant phenomenon that is very hard to resist and then to reverse. We in Congress share, to a large extent, responsibility with the previous administration for the inflation that we have had in the last 7 or 8 years and which will continue at least until this admin-

XUM

istration and this Congress do more than we have done to reverse it.

So far we have not made a very good start: We have increased our own pay, we have increased the appropriation that was requested for the Veterans' Administration, we have increased the request of the administration insofar as the NASA program was concerned, and yesterday we increased our pensions, and the liability of the government—and that means the taxpayers—for benefits that will eventually cost nearly half a billion dollars.

So we have to have stronger leadership on both sides and in both branches of the Government, if the inflationary spiral is ever to be slowed.

Now, as to my observations on the success of the Apollo program, Mr. Speaker, today the Nation and the world are united, as never before, in admiration of the brave men of Apollo 11. Their flight has brought mankind to a truly new frontier, and captured the imagination of us all.

Last Sunday night, the whole world was watching the exploits of our astronauts as they stepped onto the moon. Today, as they return from their epochal journey, all the nations of the world recognize again how much they have in common. For America's astronauts came to the moon in the name of mankind, and all of mankind shares in America's pride. As astronaut Neil Armstrong said with his first step onto the moon's surface: "One small step for man. . . . One giant leap for mankind."

This is a particularly appropriate time, I feel, for the United States to offer to join with other nations of the world in joint space exploration efforts.

For 10 years we have carried the total burden of developing our national space exploration capability. At the same time, as the world knows, the Russians have pursued parallel goals, with some success as well. But, the duplication of national efforts has caused a huge waste of money for both countries. And other nations—with specialized skills that could have proved most helpful—have only stood on the sidelines and watched.

Apollo 11 has shown conclusively that the planets are not our national province. The victory of our three brave astronauts over the extraterritorial vacuum was mankind's victory, not our own. It is time for all mankind to share the burden and the benefits, as well as the glory, of the conquering of this last, greatest frontier.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that this is not a new concept. From the very beginning our space program has been based on the principles of openness and sharing of information.

The original legislation establishing NASA orders specifically that our space program be conducted for the benefit of all mankind, and in cooperation with other nations and groups of nations. And, we are today working with dozens of nations in various aspects of space exploration—from tracking satellites to exchanging meteorological data.

Now, when all the world's attention is focused on this arena—now is the time for us to tread new ground on earth, as our astronauts have trod new ground on the moon. We have in the past offered limited cooperation, and gotten limited response. Let us now offer total cooperation. We may not get a total response—indeed, we may not get any response. But it would be a gesture in the finest American tradition—in the tradition of President Truman's Marshall plan and President Eisenhower's atoms-for-peace plan and open skies proposal.

We have always been a generous, sharing nation, willing to contribute our skills and rescurces to the international good. To offer to share our space technology, in the wake of the Apollo success, would follow in that tradition.

Another reason for offering to share in the exploration of space is the less altruistic one of cost. Rich as we are, we as a nation cannot afford to spare the resources that a truly comprehensive space program requires. With other nations involved, we would not only be moving strongly toward decreasing international friction, but also toward easing domestic problems, since we could then afford more for our housing, our cities, and our environmental needs.

Let me suggest that there are many precedents for such cooperative efforts as those I envision. In oceanography, to some extent, and to a larger extent in fisheries, we have been holding successful joint research projects with the Russians and many other nations for a number of years.

I am under no illusions that this resolution will usher in the millenium. The Soviets have traditionally been cautious of western contacts. They have feared, with some justification, that exposure to different social systems, with such different ideas about freedom of thought and expression, would not be to their advantage.

This is how it has been in the past; but things are changing, perhaps even in the Soviet Union. Let me quote Dr. Thomas Paine, NASA's director:

> We have seen in the past several years a more open relationship with the Soviet Union. They have revealed far more than they ever had in the past. It would be my guess that this trend would continue, and perhaps in the future there may be opportunity for this sort of thing, that in the past would have been precluded.

That future time about which Dr. Paine talked may be at hand. If we were to offer again our hand in space cooperation, and they were to refuse, we would have lost nothing. But if they were to accept, the cause of world cooperation would have gained immeasurably.

This is an unparalleled opportunity to emphatically and formally present America's invitation to other technologically advanced nations to join our space programs. Such a joint effort would certainly produce a more comprehensive space program than we alone can afford to support, wealthy as we are. More importantly, it would engender a spirit of cooperation and of unity that could significantly foster world cooperation and contribute to the lowering of world tensions.

Now is the time for the President to make such a generous gesture. I hope that he will—such opportunities are rare indeed. Not often does the world feel the unity and pride in man's achievement than it does today.

And so, Mr. Speaker, today I am offering a concurrent resolution which I am glad to report is being cosponsored by several very distinguished colleagues, on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, those colleagues number among them the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Fulton) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Mosher), prominent members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. In addition, there are Mr. Meeds, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Kastenmeier, Mr. Ottinger, Mr. Pike, Mr. Anderson of Illinois, Mr. Wampler, Mr. Foley, Mr. Wright, Mr. Rees, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Coughlin, Mr. Cahill, Mr. Giaimo, Mr. Dellenback, Mr. Winn, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Hungate, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. Taft, Mr. MacGregor, Mr. Roth, Mr. Cowger, Mr. Findley, Mr. Mayne, Mr. Don H. Clausen, Mr. Carter, Mr. Reid of New York, Mr. Koch, Mr. Whitehurst, Mr. Morse, Mr. Conte, Mr. Ryan, and Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

The resolution is as follows:

H. Con. Res. 305

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the future exploration of space frontiers jointly by the United States and other technologically advanced nations of the world

Whereas the flight of Apollo 11 has brought mankind to a truly new frontier and captured the imagination of all the peoples of the world; and

Whereas the Apollo 11 flight has made all nations of the world aware of how much they have in common in the exploration of the frontiers of space, as expressed in Astronaut Neil Armstrong's historic phrase, "One small step for man—one giant leap for mankind"; and

Whereas the combined efforts of the technologically advanced nations of the world would certainly produce a more comprehensive space program than the United States can afford to support alone; and

Whereas by sharing the burden of space exploration with other nations of the United States could increase its commitment to improve the quality of life here on earth; both at home and abroad: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should take such steps as he may deem appropriate to formally invite other technologically advanced nations of the world to join with the United States in future efforts to conquer the frontiers of space exploration for the benefit of all mankind.

The eagerness with which these Members of Congress responded to the mimeographed letter I sent out to them, telling them of my intent to offer this resolution, indicates to me, and I believe to the Congress and to the country, the soundness of this principle.

I hope that the executive branch of the Government, regardless of what action is taken on this, will get the message and once again try more formally and more emphatically to make this a worldwide effort so that all mankind all over this globe might share in this great effort to open the secrets of space, and hopefully to help all mankind for all time.

XUM

INTER-AMERICAN LINK—CHARLES APPLETON MEYER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, when President Nixon announced the appointment of Charles A. Meyer to be Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, few of us were acquainted with him or his unique qualifications for that very important position.

In the succeeding months we have had an opportunity to see Charles Meyer at work and I, for one, have been enormously impressed with his performance. In these few months he has demonstrated his complete grasp of the complex problems being faced by Latin America, and his ability to deal competently with them. He has shown a sense of humor and a long standing dedication to and regard for the people of Latin America which will stand him in good stead.

Although it appeared some months ago, an article in the New York Times outlined Mr. Meyer's background and I think my colleagues will be interested to become better acquainted with this outstanding gentleman who, in my estimate, is doing a very fine job indeed.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

INTER-AMERICAN LINK—CHARLES APPLETON MEYER

WASHINGTON, March 10.—Charles Appleton Meyer admitted publicly today—probably for the first time in his life—that he was "a little bit frightened."

A few moments before, at an impromptu news conference, Secretary of State William P. Rogers introduced the tall, elegant New Englander as his new Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. President Nixon, he said, would shortly send Mr. Meyer's name to the Senate for confirmation.

The State Department press corps, puzzled and rumor-ridden for the last eight weeks as to who would eventually fill the post, reacted to Mr. Meyer with unusual benevolence.

"He was good," said one hard-bitten observer. "He said little—which was smart. He declined to comment on policy questions until he could get briefed. He looks like a diplomat—and he behaved like one."

GRANDFATHER AN AMBASSADOR

Diplomacy runs in "Charley" Meyer's blood, although this will be his first taste of Government service. His grandfather, George von Lengerke Meyer, was President Theodore Roosevelt's Secretary of the Navy and Ambassador to Italy and was a prime mover in persuading Czarist Russia to accept the United States mediation that ended the Russo-Japanese war at Portsmouth, N.H., in 1905.

The Assistant Secretary-designate has risen to eminence not through diplomacy but through retailing. Born into the Massachusetts "establishment" on both sides of his family—his mother was a Saltonstall—he entered Sears, Roebuck at the bottom upon graduation from Harvard in 1939.

He helped the company president at the time, the redoubtable Gen. Robert E. Wood open a company outlet in Havana in 1942. After service in the Pacific as an Army captain, he rejoined the company and spent the next 12 years—from 1947-60—expanding Sears, Roebuck operations throughout Latin America.

"We started out originally hoping to export our products to Latin America and sell them at competitive prices," he recalled today. "But between 1948-49 the Latin countries had run through the accumulated foreign exchange they'd earned during the war. This resulted in a totally different ball game."

From then on Mr. Meyer's main task was to travel throughout the hemisphere persuading Latin manufacturers to produce goods for sale through Sears outlets. From 1953-1955 he lived in Bogota, Colombia, acquiring fluency in Spanish and coming to know and appreciate the Latin American mentality.

From 1955 to 1960 he was based in Chicago as vice president in charge of Sears' hemisphere operations. Largely as a result of his policies, all goods sold now in Sears outlets in Colombia, Mexico and Peru are locally produced and in other countries the proportion of locally manufactured products is steadily rising.

For the last nine years Mr. Meyer has been vice president for the company's United States Southwest and Eastern areas—with about 85,000 employes under his supervision.

"We chose him," said a senior State Department official recently, "because we wanted someone who knew Latin America, who spoke Spanish, and who had broad administrative experience. We also thought that Charles Meyer had a personal manner—you might call it a style—that would help in dealing with our Latin American friends."

Mr. Meyer, who was born June 27, 1918, is tall, courteous and soft-spoken and still has a trace of his New England accent. He is likely to go over well with the Latin diplomats and officials—once they come to know him. The Latins are extremely sensitive to background and Mr. Meyer combines family background with a hardheaded sense of business, Latin politics and economics.

His directorship in the United Fruit Company may prove an initial handicap owing to the company's "big business" image among Latin leftists. But Mr. Meyer took pains today to point out that he has resigned from the board of United Fruit and five other companies to avoid any possible "conflict of interest" problems in his new task.

He is also conferring with State Department legal experts on his holdings in Sears, Roebuck and the Gillette company.

SEEMS "FIRST RATE"

"At least his background is retailing—and not oil or mineral mining," said one Latin ambassador. "We don't know him yet but he seems to be a first-rate appointment."

To help him with the complexities ahead—notably the gathering quarrel with Peru over expropriation of United States oil properties—the new Assistant Secretary brings expertise, a sense of humor and a wife and family who share his regard for the Latin American peoples.

His wife, the former Suzanne Seybur, and their two children, Brooke and Nancy, keep up their Spanish with two Colombian maids who have been in their service for 16 years.

"We bought a ski lodge in Vail, Colo., some years ago and it's the nearest to home the kids have ever had," Mr. Meyer said. "We try to get there several times a year whenever we can. But don't get the idea that there's any conflict of interest between my little ski lodge and skiing interests in Portillo, Chile. There isn't!"

NEW YORK BAR FOR ATLANTIC UNION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the New York Federal Bar Council's Committee on Legislation has recently added its prestigious endorsement to House Concurrent Resolution 283, the Atlantic Union resolution.

Toward the end of the last Congress, this resolution was approved and favorably reported out by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Although there was not sufficient time to get floor action on it in the rush to adjourn, prospects are much better this year. Presently, over 80 Members are listed as cosponsors of the Atlantic Union resolution. In addition, we have a new President who has himself recently and enthusiastically endorsed the concept of Atlantic Union. Hope for the peace and freedom which unity and confederation make possible is now nearer than ever before. I hope that we have the courage and wisdom to act now that it is within reach.

Because of the timeliness of the Federal Bar Council's endorsement, I include the text of it in my remarks at this point:

REPORT ON RESOLUTIONS CALLING FOR CONVENTION TO EXPLORE CLOSER UNITY OF FREE PEOPLES

Bipartisan resolutions offered by Representatives Paul Findley of Illinois (H. Con. Res. 283) and Donald M. Fraser of Minnesota (H. Con. Res. 284) in the 91st Congress first session on behalf of themselves and others seek to establish a United States delegation to discuss the possibilities of future union with other free nations. This concept, which has been endorsed by such diverse leaders as President Richard M. Nixon, Hubert H. Humphrey, Robert F. Kennedy, Eugene J. McCarthy, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Barry Goldwater and Nelson Rockefeller, was overwhelmingly approved by the House Foreign Affairs Committee in the 90th Congress. H. Rep. No. 1656, 90th Cong., 2d Sess. (1968). The proposal has likewise received the unanimous endorsement of the Committees on Federal Legislation of the New York State Bar Association and of the New York County Lawyers Association. 114 Cong. Rec. No. 157, H9168 (daily ed. 9/25/68); 115 Cong. Rec. No. 15, E434 (daily ed. 1/23/69).

We agree with the State Bar panel that:

"The resolution approved by the House Committee would not commit this country to anything. It would merely give express Congressional approval to exploration of the possibilities of a future Atlantic federation or wider union of free peoples. Although the resolution is drafted in Atlantic terms, we see nothing in it which would preclude inclusion of other free peoples in the discussions proposed or in any resulting union. Likewise, we see nothing in the resolution to preclude consultation with non-governmental as well as governmental representatives from other free nations.

"The tragedy in Czechoslovakia in August 1968 has lent new poignancy to careful exploration of these possibilities. The need for such exploration is emphasized by currency crises and the need for cooperation for aiding developing nations. . . ."

Winston Churchill told a joint session of the Congress of the United States on December 26, 1941, that "Prodigious hammer strokes have been needed to bring us together . . ." He also said of the tragedies of his time that their explanation was that ". . . there was no unity. There was no vision . . ." The pending resolutions offer us the opportunity to move toward such unity without waiting for further hammer strokes in the form of currency crises or tragedies such as that of August 1968.

As stated by former Secretary of State Christian A. Herter, greater than national problems require greater than national solutions. The needs of the last third of this century cannot be met without great new initiatives such as those proposed by Representative Findley and Fraser in their resolutions and approved by the House Foreign Affairs Committee in July 1968. We therefore urge favorable action on the resolutions.

Respectfully submitted,

Committee on Legislation, Federal Bar Council: Richard A. Givens, Chairman; Peter K. Leisure, Secretary; Harold Baer, Jr., Robert Belton, Vincent L. Broderick, Thomas Cahill, Sol Neil Corbin, Clarence Dunaville, Thomas R. Farrell, Mahlon M. Frankhauser, Victor Friedman, William J. Gilbreth, Federick Greenman, James Greilsheimer, Arthur M. Handler, Robert L. King, Moses L. Kove, Pierre N. Leval, Anthony P. Marshall, Robert McMillan, J. Edward Meyer III, Edith Miller, Gary Naftalis, Paul Perito, John Robinson, Mortimer Todel, Nancy F. Wechsler, Gerald Walpin, James D. Zirin.

CAPTIVE NATIONS DECLARATION SIGNALS FOREIGN POLICY RETREAT

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. **ASHBROOK**. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1961, I addressed the House and pointed out that the Kennedy administration had shown incredible naivete in its soft and useless declaration on Captive Nations Week. I contrasted the late President's weak and apologetic proclamation to the dynamic and hard-hitting declaration of President Eisenhower in 1959 and 1960.

As a strong supporter of President Nixon, I hoped that we would see forceful and effective pronouncements in the field of foreign relations and a strategic shift in foreign policy. After waiting for 6 months, I must say that I have seen no basic change in either the State Department or our foreign policy Possibly the best example of this "business as usual" trend at the State Department is indicated by the President's 1969 Captive Nations declaration. It was frustratingly inane and perfunctory.

What did President Eisenhower proclaim? Note his statement well:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1959

(A proclamation by the President of the United States of America)

Whereas many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

Whereas the people of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent; and

Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas by a joint resolution approved and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as Captive Nations Week and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world:

Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 19, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week."

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and I urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations.

What did President Nixon proclaim? Note it well, too:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1969

(A proclamation by the President of the United States of America)

By Joint Resolution on July 17, 1959, the Eighty-Sixth Congress authorized and requested the designation of the third week of July as Captive Nations Week. Ten years have passed and there have been many changes in international affairs. But one thing that has not changed is the desire for national independence in Eastern Europe.

Now, therefore, I, Richard Nixon, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 13, 1969, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to renew their devotion to the high ideals on which our nation was founded and has prospered and to sustain with understanding and sympathy the just aspirations of the peoples of all nations for independence and human freedom.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this eleventh day of July, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-nine, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-fourth.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE.

Think of that. No mention of Czechoslovakia, no mention of the repressive Communist policies, no mention even of the word "Communist" or the Soviet Union.

This is merely one of the many cases of the State Department thumbing its nose at the Congress and at the American people. The Congress did not anticipate the type of declaration that President Nixon announced when it passed the original resolution calling for a Captive Nations Week in July of each year. Lest there be any doubt, reread the text of the joint resolution embodied in law:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—PUBLIC LAW NO. 86–90

RESOLUTIONS

S.J. Res. 111

H.J. Res. 454, 459

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such people through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

President Eisenhower clearly knew who the subjugator, the captor was. He referred to "imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism" and the "peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations" throughout his declaration. Have the 10 years from 1959 to 1969 found communism mellowing or changing? Of course not. Hundreds of examples could be given of Communist brutality, treachery, and subjugation of its people and those of the captive nations. The events in Czechoslovakia are but one of recent memory. I recently placed in the RECORD the 10-part series of Anatole Shub which vividly portrays the vindictive repression of civil liberties within the Soviet Union by the Kremlin leaders.

In the face of all of this, why such a meaningless Captive Nations declaration? Those of us who have always been distrustful of the State Department have no reason, whatsoever, to think that we are any better off there. I have more confidence in the President than his predecessors, but even he has not lived up to his promise of cleaning out the State Department.

As a daily State Department watcher,

XUM

I will make one case in point. Contrasted to the weak and disappointing Captive Nations declaration, Secretary Rogers publicly complimented Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko last week. The front page of the Saturday, July 12, 1969, issue of the Washington Post contains the following three-column heading: "Rogers Praises Gromyko for 'Positive Tone' of Talk."

Is our foreign policy one of complimenting the enemy when they make a favorable gesture and then saying nothing when they continue on their regular conspiratorial, aggressive, and subversive way? Balance the July 12 statement with the Captive Nations declaration and you get some idea why many of us do not trust the State Department.

We have not seen any real change in the State Department. Even worse, we have not seen anything that would indicate there will be a change in the State Department. We were promised a change. As a loyal Nixon supporter, I told people there would be a change and I will not be satisfied until there is a change.

Whether you liked John Foster Dulles or not, it was at least recorded in history that there was a fundamental change in policy from the Truman administration to the Eisenhower administration. There has been no such change from the Johnson administration to the Nixon administration. Like many Americans, I am still hoping but it would be the height of cowardice to sit back and supinely wait. What we Republicans criticized under Johnson and Kennedy we should continue to criticize under our party's President if we are to retain any of the faith that the American people have in us as legislators and as Republicans.

MEAGER APPROPRIATION FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McClory), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, although I voted today for the passage of H.R. 12964, appropriating funds for fiscal year 1970 for the Department of Justice and other departments and agencies of Government, I must express my dismay and dissatisfaction with the funds included for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. I am particularly discouraged at the meager appropriation for the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice established by the 1968 omnibus crime bill, which was intended to provide a large measure of support for our States and municipalities in the fight against crime.

Mr. Speaker, as the author in the House of Representatives of the amendment to establish the National Institute, I am particularly distressed that the Appropriations Committee report—page 12—recommends a distribution of funds which would leave the National Institute with a mere $7.5 million. This is almost $13 million less than the administration recommended in its conservative budget estimate. It is far below the figure of $30 million which my colleague from Minnesota (Mr. MacGregor) recommended during debate on this measure on August 8, 1967, see the Congressional Record, volume 113, part 16, page 21843.

Mr. Speaker, in the considered judgment of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, by establishing a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice it was expected that through grants, studies, research, and the collection and dissemination of information, the Institute might serve as the focal point for advancing modern techniques for combating crime and for providing improved training facilities to enable local and State law enforcement officers to deal with every aspect of criminal activity and violence.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, by shortchanging the National Institute, and by second guessing the Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate, as well as the responsible elements in our administration dedicated to reducing crime in America, the goals of the National Institute have been seriously set back.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the corresponding committee of the other body will deal more generously with the needs of the Nation to combat crime and with the responsibility of the Congress to direct that effort. In addition, I am hopeful that members of the Appropriations Committee, when meeting in a committee of conference, will recognize the importance of more adequate funding of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. Indeed, a full funding at the figure recommended by the administration of $20.9 million should be a minimum for fiscal year 1970. It would be my hope that the conference report might include a figure of $30 or $40 million in order that a substantial and effective program of research, development, and training might be initiated—in fulfilling the objectives of the omnibus crime bill passed in the 90th Congress.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLORY. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York, who has been an active supporter of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, and who is extremely well versed on its provisions and potential.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend my colleague from Illinois for his remarks and to congratulate him for his fine leadership in the successful effort to establish the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.

I would strongly echo my colleague's eloquent testimony that the research and development funding for the Department of Justice's Law Enforcement Assistance Administration is totally inadequate. The Department's request for $20.9 million for R. & D. covering all of criminal justice has been cut by the Appropriations Committee to $7.5 million. With crime rates mounting and citizen fear of crime reaching unprecedented levels in our history, this $7.5 million represents less than four-hundredths of 1 percent of the total Federal expenditures for research and development in all fields and only 3 percent of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration appropriation. Recent polls show that crime is the No. 1 concern of American citizens, and this low level of investment in research and development, to me, reflects a scandalous and irrational establishment of national priorities and allocation of resources.

Our police are solving fewer than 20 percent of crimes reported to them; our courts are clogged so much that the threat of deterrence is all but depleted; our corrections establishment produces recidivism rates up to 70 percent. Mere infusion of new "action" money for more police, more judges, and more prison guards is not going to make a dent in the current deplorable performance of criminal justice. These dedicated men need new methods, new equipment, new organization, new procedures. Indeed, as the President's Crime Commission stated, the greatest need is the need to know.

The budget cut for the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice severely affects their program. Development programs for personalized transceivers for police, for license plate scanning, for aerial mobility, for vehicle locators, for automatic fingerprint search and retrieval, for command and control system, for mobile facsimile equipment—each of these could cost over $1 million just for the design and development of prototype models. And yet this is just a small list of possible needs of the police alone. It excludes moneys needed for courts and corrections, for criminal law revision and for criminal procedure developments to cope with constitutional restraints and the need for speedier justice. It excludes the whole field of crime prevention, demonstration programs and juvenile delinquency. Indeed, $7.5 million could be swallowed up in four or five hardware projects and leave no funds for the broad mission of the Institute.

With all our talk about crime and criminals, about fear and the breakdown of law and order, I simply cannot understand the false economy of cutting back development of new ways in a field long bound to obsolete, 19th-century practices. If we are to move ahead, we can do so only through a crash program utilizing the best scientific minds of this Nation. The sum of $7½ million represents a commitment to a perpetuation of today's ineffectiveness. Let us now begin to make some sense and appropriate the full $20.9 million for the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.

Mr. McCLORY. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. Scheuer) for his statement.

U.S.S. "KANSAS CITY"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. Winn) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be present at an event some time ago which, in my opinion is significant enough to deserve recognition in the permanent Congressional Record. I say this not only because the event involved one of our colleagues, but also because the event represented a stride forward in the effort to maintain superiority of the seas.

I refer to the christening of the U.S.S. *Kansas City*.

It was my pleasure to be in the audience at Quincy, Mass., on Saturday, June 28, upon the occasion of the christening program of the *Kansas City*—AOR3. It was a beautiful morning. A crowd of several thousand had assembled to witness the launching of this new ship at the Quincy, Mass., yards of General Dynamics.

The lovely and gracious Mrs. Harry Darby, wife of the Kansas industrialist and former U.S. Senator, was the sponsor of the U.S.S. *Kansas City*.

A resident of Kansas City, Kans., Edith Darby is a person who is loved by all. She has participated with her husband for years in the civic and cultural affairs of her home city and State. She kindly asked my wife Joan to serve as matron of honor.

Because the matron of honor is a sort of stand-in, to serve or perform the actual act of christening a ship if for some unforeseen reason the sponsor cannot serve or act, no one was more pleased that the popular sponsor of the *Kansas City* was able to fulfill her assignment with complete efficiency and enthusiasm, as did Mrs. Darby, than was my wife Joan.

The principal speaker for the occasion was our colleague, William J. Randall, of the Fourth Missouri District, who represents a portion of Kansas City, Mo.

Mr. Speaker, to me the invocation which followed the national anthem that morning, given by the Reverend G. Harris Collingwood, Rector of the Church of the Advent of Boston, Mass., and a former constituent of mine opened these christening ceremonies in a beautiful and impressive way when in the invocation he intoned:

> Let us pray almighty Father—strong to save—whose arm hath bound the restless wave. Protect, we beseech thee, this ship from the moment of her launch until the ending of her days as thou has blesed the labors of those who designed and built her. Bless also we pray thee, those who shall command and sail her.
>
> We humbly acknowledge that she was built for war but thou in thy mercy grant that she may sail in peace, and for the nation of Peace. May she carry her name proudly and may she always move with the courage, determination and accomplishment of those pioneers who founded the twin Kansas Cities on the vital growing edge of this nation. Oh, Father, as the Kansas City plies the vast ocean reaches, keep her in the hollow of thy hand, grant her fair seas and a mission of peace. This especially we pray thee. Oh, Father of all—make the Kansas City an instrument of thy Peace. Amen.

The christening of a ship is somewhat like the countdown of a space project such as the Apollo. The countdown commences at midnight and every foot of the ways are checked on which the huge vessel must slide into the water. Supports are balanced one against the other and removed in sequence to the point where, when all is in readiness, only the slightest pressure is necessary to cause the great new beautiful ship to slide down into the waves.

Following the invocation the words of welcome and introduction were well timed by Mr. Robert V. Laney, vice president of General Dynamics and general manager of the Quincy division. He was followed by Mr. Roger Lewis, president of General Dynamics, who made some appropriate remarks for the occasion and introduced the speaker.

It is my pleasure to report that the remarks of the principal speaker, Congressman Randall, were to the point and that his selection as speaker was certainly an appropriate choice because he is a member of the House Armed Services Committee and served in World War II with the Amphibious Forces in the Pacific Theater of Operation. The remarks of Congressman Randall were as follows:

Remarks of Hon. William J. Randall

It is a rare privilege and high honor to be permitted to participate in this traditional launching ceremony. One quite apparent reason this is such a happy day is that this ship, the Kansas City, bears the name of two fine Midwestern cities—Kansas City, Missouri (a portion of which it is my good fortune to represent), and Kansas City, Kansas, our sister city across the state line. It is a thrill for all of us here assembled to welcome this fine ship to our fleet.

I am here with a sense of humility. The reason I feel humble is that I am not sure I fully contemplate the potential added to our fleet by this ship and her several sister ships of this same class.

It is most pleasant to be here with our lovely, charming and gracious sponsor, Mrs. Harry Darby. Today she is the first lady of this christening but she is a first lady whereever she may be and a great lady every day. She is the wife of a great Kansas industrialist, Harry Darby, and former United States Senator, whom all of us on the Eastern side of the Missouri-Kansas state line are proud to call "Good neighbor, Harry Darby." On the other side of the state line he is respectfully regarded as "Mr. Kansas." I know he feels much at home on this shipyard because he happens to be a shipbuilder. In World War II it was his LCT's, LCM's and LCI's which enabled the "Infantry of the sea," our Marines, to make possible the capture of the Pacific Islands from the Japanese which would otherwise have been long delayed, if not impossible.

Behind us this morning is one of a new class of versatile replenshiment ships. It is designed to replace the Navy's aging oilers. 80% of our Navy's present service forces are over-age. until very recently the replenishment fleet has truly been the "forgotten force" of the Navy. It is now on the way to being remembered. There is hope for a brighter future because this and other ships are the forerunners of a substantial modern replenishment fleet.

The Kansas City will be capable of provisioning destroyers while underway by means of a newly developed high speed transfer system known as "FAST" which means fast automatic shuttle transfer, using highlines for packages, and conduits for liquid transfer between ships. On board will be complex machinery which can accomplish a gentle transfer of delicate missiles and ammunitions. She can service combatant ships with a wide range of supplies, petroleum, refrigerated items and ammunition. She will carry all types of ammunition including missiles and torpedoes. The Kansas City will be equipped with electric powered fork lift vehicles to raise the stores from inside the ship, thence to be transferred across highlines to the receiving vessels alongside.

The vessel to be christened today is a fast ship with a 20-knot capability. She is not only fast but exceptionally maneuverable, for a ship of her size. Moreover, there is an alternative transfer capability called VERTREP meaning Vertical replenishment, accomplished by at least two helicopters to operate from a landing launching platform on the stern of the ship.

This morning we are honoring a new improvement of an old concept in naval logistics. Logistics means getting the right amount of military materiel and men, in the right place at the right time. It is always a complex operation. Throughout military history the repeated lesson of logistics is that too little, too late sets the stage for defeat. In World War II it was "Underway Replenishment" that was the "Secret Weapon" that won the war in the Pacific. By adding the Kansas City to the fleet we are making a substantial step toward more efficient replenishment.

In the Viet Nam conflict I am convinced too many people have been bedazzled by the headlines which acclaim the capabilities of our giant cargo carrying airplanes. The truth of the matter is that almost 98% of war materiel goes to Viet Nam by ship and less than 2% by air cargo.

I am most mindful the good people of Kansas City are proud this morning. They will be greatly pleased to know that this fine ship will carry the name of our fair city around the world. Some of the participants in the ceremony this morning are convinced Kansas City is already known around the world, because Kansas Citians, as they travel, are always proud to say they are from the friendly heart of America. But this ship will add significantly to the good name already earned by our city. It is my prediction she will be a sort of sea-going advertisement because there will always be some of the crew of the Kansas City, as they replenish a combatant ship at sea, to be proud to pass the word that they are carrying oil from Kansas and remind the recipients that the fresh fruit and vegetables are from Missouri, and the meats, including the famous steaks, are packed in Kansas City.

The beauty that sits before us here on the runs this morning is the product of the work of many thousands of men. I called her a beauty because shipbuilders take greater pride in their craft than perhaps other workmen, blending art and science to shape a vessel to serve the men who will sail her.

A ship's christening is a thing of deep significance. It is a time when a vessel takes on its own unique personality which will forever be hers alone. Until this moment the Kansas City has been a gaunt mass of steel and machinery, or just so much equipment without a soul. The breaking of this bottle of champagne will transmute this mass of steel and brass into a vibrant and living thing of grace and charm. You will observe I have repeatedly referred to this ship as "She", or to "Her." The vessel before us may be christened the Kansas City, but it will always be called "She" because sailors believe that ships have the attributes ascribed to woman, including beauty, mystery and endearment, along with those other qualities which give them their vital place in our hearts.

The christening is really the birth of a ship. It is the most important moment of her life. She is endowed from this moment on with a spirit and will of her own. I hope you would agree that this thing of beauty here before us is possessed of charm and a personality comparable in some degree to the unique personality of our gracious sponsor, Mrs. Harry Darby. For men of the sea, ships are not cold, inanimate objects, but cherished friends endowed with individual personalities.

The ancient ceremony we celebrate today links us to the past centuries of man's super-

XUM

stitions and fears. To give him strength as he faced the unknowns of the sea, a sailor turned to his Gods. All the way back to the days of paganism, sailors have found the need to make a ship a living creature. Although the Navy assigns to a ship a name before she is launched, the ship does not receive such a name until the sponsor christens her in a ceremony such as ours today.

The builders of the "Kansas City" are to be commended. The Quincy Division of General Dynamics is to be congratulated on its effort at New Assembly Line Methods and the New procedure for Preoutfitting of subsections of ships. In short, to try to hold down construction costs.

All at once it seems to have become fashionable and popular to be critical of any industry which happens to be working on defense contracts. There is no need to deny that there have been some cost overruns or cost growths due to abnormal inflation over which bidders have no control. But defense contracts should be put in perspective, by comparison with other non-defense contracts. I think we should recall and recognize that there have also been cost over-runs in non-defense expenditures in our Government much greater than in defense oriented industries.

Our Interstate Highway system experienced a huge cost overrun. In the space field the Lunar Module which hopefully will be landed on the moon sometime after July 16th and which is being so well acclaimed in this country at the moment has suffered the highest overrun of any project, Military or Civilian.

Let us not lose sight of the fact the cost of services has also experienced some overruns in the field of expenditures for the medical care of our aged. The Medicare Program has seen a very substantial percentage increase over the original estimates.

Cost overruns are not limited only to Military procurement. They exist in many worthwhile non-defense projects. My point is the Congress should and must be equally interested in controlling cost overruns no matter where they may be found. We must find a way to locate this kind of a trend toward cost growth and arrest it before it grows too great in size. The procedure we plan to adopt in the Armed Services Committee is called "Milestone" and calls for a thorough study of cost trends every 3 months, that is every quarter on all defense contracts. Let me say straightforwardly that every member of the House Committee on Armed Services intends to scrutinize very carefully every escalating defense procurement cost. Our objective is the same as yours—to obtain the best equipment for our defense forces at the lowest possible cost.

But we must replace the aging ships of our fleet. Nearly two centuries ago, John Paul Jones said, "Without a respectable navy—alas America."

In the light of that quotation, the Kansas City is not only a thing of beauty, but an important addition to our fleet and moreover, to our Maritime Power. We have for far too long neglected our Navy and also our Merchant Marine. There is no denying the Soviets have become a major Naval and Maritime power. They know it. The Chief of the Soviet Navy, Admiral Georshov, has insisted they intend to become master of the seas. They are building with the Number One spot in mind. If we were only in the automobile rental business like Avis, we could tolerate being number two, and then try harder. In the deadly game of national defense, there is no prize for second place.

In conclusion we may have to concede the Kansas City may never become a famous fighting ship. Yet it will always be a ship that will sustain our sailors on the fighting ships of our fleet. She will supply the 3–B's—Beans, Bullets, and Black Oil," which are necessities for our fighting men and our combatant ships.

Given tools for our Military Forces like the Kansas City, we will be able to weld a mighty shield behind which we can work to adjust to a happy America and a safer, saner world.

As we are about to launch the Kansas City, we bestow on her our heartfelt wish for Good Luck and Smooth Sailing. To you, our Kansas City—may your winds always be fair!

Mr. Laney once again, perfectly on time as the countdown proceeded, introduced the sponsor, who without hesitation and acting as though she had been a veteran of repeated christenings, grasped the bottle of champagne with both hands and with a beautiful swing broke the bottle square upon the bow and at the exact second of 10 o'clock, with the countdown complete, the beautiful *Kansas City* began to slide down the ways and into the Fore River.

It was an impressive ceremony. The countdown was perfect. The remarks were to the point. The sponsor performed in an excellent fashion and distinguished herself by her perfect timing and with the poise and grace characteristic of her qualities as a lovely lady.

Thus the U.S.S. *Kansas City*, an important addition to our fleet, was baptized, in accordance with all of the customs of an ancient christening. In a few months, when she is fully equipped, she will be commissioned and will join the growing new fleet of the United States Navy.

NATIONAL MAN IN SPACE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is a time for all our citizens to be particularly proud of being Americans. It is also a time for us, in humbleness and humility, to give thanks for the blessings that have been so abundantly bestowed upon us.

Today, with the safe landing of the spacecraft *Columbia*, I cannot think of a more appropriate time for Congress to call on the President to proclaim a National Man in Space Week so that each year the American people and people around the world can celebrate and commemorate our space pioneers and our space program.

I believe that more than mere congratulations should be accorded to the three astronauts, Mission Commander Neil Armstrong, Col. Edwin "Buzz" Aldrin, and Lt. Col. Michael Collins, the Apollo 11 crew, and to all those connected with the space program. These individuals have worked long and hard to make this singular success possible for our Nation and our world. They all have been inheritors of centuries of painstakingly accumulated knowledge, and they have used the fruits of the ages wisely and well.

The scope and excellence of the Apollo 11 mission and the courage of our three astronauts is in the tradition of greatness that has made the United States what it is today. The determination and ability of our men in space reassures us that man can reach unlimited heights of achievement when there is total commitment to a worthy goal.

The momentous feat of landing a man on the moon will rank in history with Columbus' landing on this continent and discovering a new world. The seconds before the landing of Eagle on the moon's surface will be remembered as one of the moments of greatest drama in the history, and the phrase, "the Eagle has landed," will be added to the collection of immortal phrases that have marked man's progress through the ages. Man's first step on the moon truly was a giant leap for mankind. Man throughout history has been engaged in the never-ending process of increasing his knowledge and expanding his horizons—the successes of Apollo 11 are a watershed in this regard.

My longtime friend Col. Buzz Aldrin made a particularly compelling observation when he informed the world yesterday:

> We have come to the conclusion that this has been far more than three men on a voyage to the moon. More still than the efforts of a government and industry team, more even than the efforts of one nation. We feel that this stands as a symbol of the insatiable curiosity of all mankind to explore the unknown.

I firmly believe man's curiosity to explore the unknown, and his desire to fathom the mysteries of his being, his world, and his universe, will be well served by space exploration.

Mr. Speaker, there will be many honors and celebrations awaiting our three astronauts after the completion of their mission duties. But after the ceremonies have been concluded and the honors accorded, we must provide some means by which the American people can recall, rejoice in, and be inspired by the deeds and achievements which our men in space have made a part of our national heritage.

I believe I have found such a means, Mr. Speaker, and at this time I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution setting aside the third week in July of each year to be designated by Presidential proclamation as National Man in Space Week.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, today H.R. 12964, the appropriations bill for fiscal 1970 for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies, passed the House without providing for the expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of title II of the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968 which was passed in the last Congress.

The House Committee on Commerce reported out the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968, unanimously agreeing that this legislation was essential because of the inadequacy of efforts being made to protect the American public

XUM

from the perils of fires. The hearings brought forth particularly disturbing evidence to warrant serious consideration of the problem and effective action to provide solutions.

The United States has the highest per capita death rate from fires, causing approximately 12,000 deaths back in 1965 and property damage amounting to almost $2 billion. This situation is necessarily being compounded yearly by the growth of our society especially in the absence of comprehensive fire research and safety programs. What else can be expected but a continuing rise in the per capita number of fires—dramatized daily by the number of deaths, injuries, and amount of property damage. The Congress has recognized the need for legislation to cope with this problem by enacting Public Law 90–259. All that is needed now is the appropriation to implement at least part of our commitment to the American people by establishing a Commission as provided for in title II which would undertake a "comprehensive study and investigation to determine practicable and effective measures for reducing the destructive effects of fire throughout the country . . ." The Commission would be composed of the Secretaries of Commerce and Housing and Urban Development and 18 other members appointed by the President, plus four advisory members from Congress. The report would be submitted in 2 years. More specifically, the Commission would look into fire preventive and suppression methods, evaluate present and future needs of training and education for fire service personnel, analyze the administrative problems affecting the efficiency or capabilities of local fire departments or organizations, among other things.

The need for this appropriation is clear. I am hopeful that this small sum can be included in this appropriations measure before its final enactment into law. The benefits that will be reaped will be far greater in the long run.

THE SHERIDAN TANK—ANOTHER MILITARY SUCCESS STORY

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, we have listened in shock, disbelief, and increasing apprehension to repeated revelations of overspending on military projects. Certainly basic truths have been revealed regarding the entire military procurement and contracting process. Reform is in order and in the fullness of time will arrive.

It is bad enough that billions have been thrown away. It is another stench entirely when we have incontrovertible evidence that American soldiers have been placed in jeopardy, wounded, crippled, and killed because of faulty equipment. When our system tolerates full knowledge of such faulty hardware, insisting upon shipping it to a combat zone, the evil is compounded. When injuries and deaths result, guilt becomes criminal.

We know one American soldier is dead; three severely burned, and others made casualties because of technical faults and failures of the Sheridan. We also know the Army took a calculated risk in sending it into combat, after being told before it left the United States that it was prone to breakdowns and deficiencies which would jeopardize American troops.

Congress again and again has been assured by high-ranking Army officials that the Sheridan tank has been operating successfully under Vietnamese combat conditions, that it was the greatest thing on wheels and treads since the model T and the first panzers.

Yet there is an as yet unpublished report telling another story entirely.

According to the report, the Sheridan has had "16 major equipment failures, 125 electrical circuit failures, 41 weapons misfires, 140 ammunition ruptures, 25 engine replacements caused by overheating and persistent malfunction of the 152-millimeter cannon." One can imagine the overwhelming confidence among crews who must live or die by this tank's performance.

Another gem of note is the Army's field manual on the Sheridan, which as every veteran knows is essential to operation and repair of the vehicle. It did not arrive in Vietnam until after the first 64 tanks had been in combat for 6 weeks. The 20-page manual makes heartening reading for crews, informing them the electrical system is prone to failure and its new combustible cartridge is subject to malfunction. Yet we are positive all this was known to the Army before the tank entered combat or even left American shores. The test manager warned:

> The Sheridan is of limited dependability and unknown limitation. I do not believe that a combat situation where mission and lives depend so heavily on equipment reliability is the test environment to question and resolve these problems.

The project manager said this on November 5, 1968. On February 8, 1969, the tank was on its way to Vietnam. On February 15, one of them hit a mine that would not have severely damaged one of the Army's older tanks. The explosion ruptured the vehicle's hull, ignited ammunition stored directly over the rupture, and killed the driver. Three crewmembers were severely burned when an exposed cartridge was struck by an enemy shell as they tried to extract it from the chamber. The shell had misfired twice. Reports show that the combustible cartridge leaves a residue which must be removed manually. They also tend to break open from vibration and swell from moisture.

Engines become overheated when air intake grills, because of faulty design, become clogged with grit and because aluminum fan belt pulleys proved too weak.

Yet during the first week of June, Lt. Gen. A. W. Betts, Chief of Army Research and Development, told a New York audience that the Sheridans had "clearly proved their worth in combat, in spite of the technical bugs." Perhaps the general would care to take command of one of his prizes and lead the next charge.

Mr. Speaker, the Army now plans to ship 171 more of the vehicles, built by Chrysler as prime contractor, to Vietnam. Good news for America's soldiers.

Here we see the proof of the pudding. We not only spend a fortune on what turns out to be worthless hardware which is delivered late and at ridiculous cost. When the test comes, they are sent to combat regardless of danger to the men involved. Critics are hushed up or ignored, and young boys are exposed to death needlessly, all to preserve reputations, continue appropriations and preserve a facade of military performance and infallibility. Is this how some of our other expensive and highly touted weapons systems will perform? Indications point to an affirmative answer in more than one case.

In the lexicon of many of these gentlemen, anything which smacks of criticism or questioning borders on the edge of high treason. If there is anything this proves, it is that we in the Congress must subject each and every one of these projects to the most intense and pitiless scrutiny.

As for the Sheridans, I feel we should recall every one from Vietnam forthwith. I leave it to your collective imagination as to what we might seriously consider doing with those responsible for this state of affairs.

NONE DARE CALL IT REASON

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the Petroleum Industry Research Foundations, Inc., has assailed minimum reductions of oil industry tax privileges just recommended by the Ways and Means Committee. Not only do they assail oil tax reform proposals in toto and on principle, but these public servants claim that discarding depletion provisions would inevitably result in gasoline price increases. To be precise, 2.5 to 3 cents per gallon.

To begin with, their response is a threat as well as an answer. It is aimed squarely at the Congress, which must vote on these tax reform recommendations. Their secondary target is our general consuming public. In effect, they are mounting a crude, blatant offensive in order to blackjack this Congress into opposing tax reform of oil industry privilege. Boldly and callously, they seek to frighten an already overburdened public into inundating Congress with protests against reform on the grounds that prices will rise. No effort could be more ill-fated or fraught with disaster.

Let us recollect that this very same oil industry, bloated with profits gained in large measure through tax privilege, raised its crude oil prices on March 21, 1969. This was the second general price hike this year, and can be condemned as nothing more than a $600 million annual swindle of the gasoline consuming public. Its motivation was pure greed rather than economic necessity. Now, in the face of a massed national outcry for at least minimal reform, these modern swashbuckling desperadoes of the marketplace shreik bankruptcy and threaten the Nation with yet another price rise.

To our oil industry, the public marketplace is a private, lucrative plaything. In the face of damning, overwhelming proof that their industry is sucking millions of citizens dry of billions of dollars, they dare stand up and plead for reason, decrying emotionalism on the part of critics. Reason and logic have fallen on deaf ears. Suasion has failed. It is time for sledgehammers to be employed.

There is a superabundance of low cost oil in the world. Yet the American consumer is paying twice the going world price for every oil product. He is subsidizing the oil industry through special tax treatment, import quotas and cartel restrictions on domestic production. Now these looters in three-button suits dare to publicly threaten an entire Congress and consuming public with still higher prices if we dare bleed off even a fraction of their stupendous profits. Logic is not the least of their sworn enemies.

Their pledge of allegiance reads:

> One oil industry, under an umbrella of tax privilege, unassailable, with tax evasion and ever-growing profits for all directors, officers and major stockholders.

Mr. Speaker, the reply of Congress should be swift and uncompromising. Let us drive these reforms home with dispatch, and dare the oil industry to raise prices again. If during the debate or immediately afterwards, they do raise them, a cry will go up for a thorough, massive investigation of the entire oil and gas industry's price structure. Our entire consuming public would demand and applaud such a probe. Who knows what peculiar forms of industrial life we might find under this particular rock.

I fear this industry is living in the past. Fondly do they recall those gaudy days, when no one dared challenge them. Those times are gone forever. National interest requires such a challenge. I would refer them to the study of French literature and the words of Victor Hugo.

Nothing can stop an idea whose time has come.

Tax reform of oil privilege is a concept whose time has come. Resistance only invites drastic reform. Previous assaults will be pinpricks compared to what will follow if they deny the public its due. This is not a threat. Rather, consider it a fact of life.

ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS PERSONNEL TRAINING ACT OF 1969

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to extend and modify the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act for 3 fiscal years. The present law expires on June 20, 1970.

This law was first enacted by the 89th Congress and signed into law on November 3, 1966. It was amended in the 90th Congress by Public Law 90–490 which extended the program for an additional fiscal year, through fiscal year 1970.

Basically, the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act authorized four types of grants in aid to "training centers for allied health professions": Such a training center means a junior college, college or university which provides an associate degree or higher in medical technology, optometric technology, dental hygiene, or other allied health professions curriculums.

First, the act provides grants for the construction of new or expanded teaching facilities for training centers and affiliated hospitals. Fiscal year 1968 was the first year for which construction grants were made and thus far for 2 fiscal years the appropriations have totaled only $4.8 million, although $25.5 million was authorized for fiscal year 1967 through 1969 and another $20 million is authorized for fiscal year 1970. Three universities, Ohio State University, New Hampshire Institute of Technology, and the University of Vermont, have received construction grants totaling $3,522,932. Yet, unfunded applications from other schools total nearly $12 million.

Second, the act provided for basic improvement and special improvement grants to upgrade the quality of training careers. Basic improvement grants are awarded on a formula basis of $5,000 for each eligible curriculum plus $500 for each eligible student. In fiscal year 1967, 164 colleges and universities and 28 junior colleges received basic improvement grants. In fiscal year 1968, 197 colleges and universities and 33 junior colleges received such grants, and over 280 applications have been received for 1969.

Mr. Speaker, the basic improvement grant program has been impressive but the picture is not so bright when we look at the special improvement grant program. This is so because special improvement grants are made on a project basis, utilizing funds remaining after the basic improvement grant entitlements are satisfied, and can only be made to an institution for which a basic improvement grant application has been approved.

To date no funds for the special improvement grants have been made available and no awards have been made.

The legislation that I am introducing today would correct this problem by providing separate appropriation authorization for the special improvement grants. This change in the act would remove the restrictions on the special improvement grants which now make their award dependent on a prior basic improvement grant award and there would be no formula basis on which the award would have to be made.

This change in this bill recognizes the existence of a weakness in the existing law which, due principally to a lack of funds, prevents a training center from receiving funds to provide, maintain or improve the specialized function that the training center serves.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, by changing the special improvement grant provisions of the act, we will be providing funds to capture an untapped reserve of health manpower: the thousands of military medical personnel who will be returning to ciivlian life and who possess extensive knowledge about allied health professions techniques and training.

The Department of Defense estimates that there are presently approximately 109,000 medical personnel in the Armed Forces, and that some 30,000 to 35,000 return to civilian life each year, but no specific data is available to determine how many of these remain in the allied health field. Estimates range anywhere from 3 to 20 percent, but this is hardly encouraging in face of the national civilian need—a present shortage of over 100,000 such personnel—and the number returning each year.

I believe the corpsman or "medic" can be a valuable contribution to the overall health care system and this bill will help encourage more corpsman to remain in the allied health field.

The special improvements grants in the bill that I am introducing could be used to gear up a junior college, college, or university to encourage enrollment by these former military medical personnel in order that they may continue to improve and use their talents and skills to provide better health care for all Americans.

The basic act also provides for advanced traineeship grants awarded to public or nonprofit allied health training centers that in turn make awards to students who have completed the basic professional preparations required for employment in one of the designated eligible disciplines and are pursuing advanced training to qualify them for positions as teachers, supervisors, administrators or specialists. Thus far 718 students have benefited from the traineeship grants at 107 institutions.

Finally, the act also provides developmental grants to allied health training centers for the development of curriculums for training new types allied health personnel. The act provides that grants may be awarded to agencies, institutions, and organizations to develop, demonstrate, and evaluate methods as well as curriculums for the training of known as well as new types of health technologists. Sixteen such grants in 10 States have thus far been awarded.

This last area covered under the act is of particular interest to me because I sincerely believe that if we are to really improve the delivery of health services to millions of Americans, we must create new types of health personnel who can better deliver the expertise and technology that we are developing. These so-called paramedical personnel hold the key to reducing health care cost and at the same time are improving the quality and time of delivery of health services.

I am talking about such concepts as a diagnostic microbiology technician, a biomedical photographer, a radiopharmacist, an extra corporeal circulation specialist just to name a few of the projects currently underway to find new ways and new positions to deliver services.

In conclusion, let me say that we should not be lax in realizing the significance of the problem of meeting our allied health personnel needs. In 1967, it was estimated that there was a deficit of some 110,000 medical allied manpower and this deficit is expected to more than double by 1975 unless some corrections are made.

XUM

I am hopeful that the Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare will be able to hold hearings on this legislation in the near future.

ADMINISTRATION'S POPULATION PROGRAM A GOOD FIRST STEP

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, this week President Nixon outlined an ambitious program for population and family planning policy; now it is time for Congress to act in this critical area.

The race between a rapidly expanding population and the ability of a society to meet the demands posed by an ever-larger amount of people is already entering a crucial stage. Even as technological advances increase utilization capabilities of scarce resources, these same technological breakthroughs can also rebound and amplify already streaking population growth rates.

Thus, while technology increases the total amount of goods and services, it also tends to raise income and health levels, and, as death rates drop—resulting from the higher income and health services available—overall population rates begin to spiral as long as birth rates remain relatively unchanged.

Too often, the population squeeze so created has become a characteristic of lower-income areas—here in America and throughout the world. And, it is in these lower-income areas where there are usually fewer available resources devoted to active population control programs.

Last year, the President's Committee on Population and Family Planning issued an outstanding report which focused on the main problems of overpopulation here and abroad. As the committee noted:

> For the one-fifth of Americans who are poor or nearly poor, however, current programs will not be enough. The current availability of family planning is of little help to those who cannot afford the services, who do not know that they are available, or who live where medical services are scarce.
>
> The lack of family planning services among the poor is not a problem confined to one race, nor is it confined to the urban areas; in fact, two-thirds of the nation's poor are white, and only one-third live in central city slums. Neither is the problem confined to certain geographic areas; the people needing services live in all sections of the country.
>
> Moreover, the poor are precisely those for whom a lack of family planning services is most disastrous. While surveys indicate that poor people want no more children than those who are not poor, they have in fact many more children. Excessive fertility can drive a family into poverty as well as reduce its chances of escaping it. The frequency of maternal deaths, the level of infant mortality, and the number of children who are chronically handicapped are all markedly greater among the poor than in the rest of the population. One of the most effective measures that could be taken to lower mortality and morbidity rates among mothers and children would be to help the poor to have the number of children they desire.
>
> It is estimated that five million American women want family planning services but cannot get them because they cannot afford them or have no ready access to them. Basic legislation already exists, but modifications to provide adequate authorizations and appropriations will be needed. Under present legislation, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Economic Opportunity have programs to bring family planning services to the poor. Such programs and private efforts now reach about one million needy women. In view of the scarcity of health resources in poor neighborhoods, services needed to reach an estimated five million women will require dedicated effort and careful planning.

And:

> A number of countries have recently adopted official policies or programs designed to make family planning services available as health measures or to decrease their rates of population growth or both. The policies and programs differ widely. In some countries, policy statements are unaccompanied by programs; elsewhere, programs are operating without official policy statements. Yet in all the developing world, perhaps two thirds of the people live in countries where programs have been started or policies announced.
>
> In many countries, family planning is gaining support as a means of improving the health and welfare of families. More and more countries are also explicitly recognizing that their plans for economic and social progress are being jeopardized by high rates of population growth. In terms of the recency of the effort, the progress is impressive. However, given the magnitude of the problem and the objectives set by many countries, the scale of the effort is grossly inadequate.
>
> While a great deal can and should be done now with the personnel and knowledge already available, this is a new field in which it is essential to build a sound base for larger efforts in the coming years. Population problems will almost certainly be of urgent concern to the world beyond the end of this century. Every delay now will increase the difficulties of future generations.
>
> POLICY
>
> The policy of the United States for international assistance in this field is based on the fact that excessive rates of population growth impede economic and social progress and on the principle that effective access to family planning information and service should be universally available.
>
> The United States should encourage all nations to consider the impact of population factors on their development programs and to undertake action appropriate to their own situations. At the same time, this nation should not require any particular population policy as a condition of economic or other aid. The United States should continue, through appropriate public and private agencies, to be ready on request to assist any country to develop or strengthen population policies and programs based on respect for individual conscience and choice. Such assistance should be available even to those countries not presently receiving U.S. foreign assistance funds.

As the main thrust of their report, the Committee made eight recommendations for immediate Government consideration, and earlier this year, I introduced a series of bills based upon a number of those proposals.

I am pleased to note that President Nixon's request for a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future closely approximates H.R. 9107, my bill calling for a Population Commission. H.R. 9108 would establish a Federal grant program for construction of population study centers, and H.R. 9109 creates a National Institute for Population Research within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

While I commend the President for putting priority on the need for population control programs, I hope that Mr. Nixon's proposals are only his initial suggestions and that a larger scale effort already is under consideration.

Today, I sent the President the following letter which explains more fully my position in these matters:

JULY 24, 1969.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The proposals offered this week by the Administration in the crucial field of population control and family planning represent a major step forward in government's response to the serious problems posed by overpopulation pressures. As noted in your Message to the Congress, an impending population crisis ranks as a prime issue facing all society, and solutions can only result from thorough advance planning.

Last November, a distinguished panel of experts in the population policy field presented to President Johnson a report as members of the President's Committee on Population and Family Planning. I am pleased that many of the specific recommendations suggested by the Committee are reflected in your Message on population growth.

Earlier this year, I introduced in the House of Representatives a series of bills based upon the President's Committee recommendations. One of these bills, H.R. 9107, calls for creation of a Commission on Population identical to the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future you described in your Message.

I am also happy to see your Administration requesting higher funding for family planning services. According to the President's Committee report, "increases of $30-million annually for the next few years can be put to high priority use regardless of later variations in unit costs. In any case, costs are low compared to health and social benefits." I hope that the Administration can heed this recommendation and push for further increments so that fiscal 1970 appropriations for family planning services could reach the minimal level of $60-million proposed by the Committee.

Your Message emphasizes the need for increased research. The President's Committee proposed that a larger research program could be developed in both size and scope, and that a full-scale National Institute for Population Research be established within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. H.R. 9109, which I introduced in the House in March follows this recommendation, and I urge you to give consideration to this important proposal.

In addition, the President's Committee requested that population studies centers be set up primarily in universities to undertake research and training programs in the biomedical, health and social sciences. I also translated that recommendation into legislation, and H.R. 9108 would provide Federal grants for construction and support of such centers.

Debate and rhetoric over national priorities capture much attention these days. Unfortunately, the dialogue too often unduly prolongs final decision-making while severe problems fester. I stress the importance that must be given to population control policies—both here in America and throughout the world—as a key factor in maintaining the quality of life for our generation and for the future. I commend the proposals already presented to the Congress, and I look forward to even more emphasis by your Administration in this crucial area.

Sincerely,
GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

XUM

Already, during this session of Congress, many new and forward measures relating to population control have been introduced by Members of both parties. The administration finally has made an initial move; it is time now for Congress to respond to this crucial need.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following articles from the Washington Post and the Los Angeles Times concerning various aspects of population policy in the RECORD at this point:

Lowering the Baby Boom

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

Some people may think it both ironic and a betrayal that a President who's talked so much about getting the Government out of this and that part of our lives should be the man who sent Congress a message on birth control. If there were ever an activity that we have considered nobody's damn business but our own it's how many kids we're going to have. No amount of keyhole peeping by J. Edgar Hoover appears to be such an intrusion on our private liberties.

In effect, the message said the number of children we have is as much the state's business as our own. The message is correct and the men who wrote it and the President who signed it should be given cigars and the same kind of hearty congratulations we accord to people who have so many babies. The only criticism you can make against it is that it didn't go far enough. However, it was probably as much as an elected politician could do in a country of many Catholics, sexual conservatives and baby worshippers. Now it's for the rest of us to raise a supportive clatter.

The document predicts that within our lifetime there will be a hundred million more Americans. This country needs that only slightly less than an atom bomb attack. We're already running around like the old lady who had so many long-haired children she didn't know what to do. We can't accommodate the people we have without the most drastic changes in our living patterns.

When some people deprecate worries about our excessive production of babies, they say there will be enough food to go around. They talk about how we can avoid mass starvation by making protein comestibles out of fish scales or sea algae. They don't speculate on the pleasures of a life sustained in perpetual scarcity by processed help. For human beings there is a distinction between survival and living. They also overlook the fact that we are learning that many of the methods we use to increase food production—chemical fertilizers and insecticides, for instance—boomerang and turn out to be dangerous to health.

The easiest and most practical course is to cut back on our baby production. Nothing in the presidential message indicates the Government's willingness to do that, even though its own figures demonstrate the need. The program envisioned by the Administration draws a line at "infringing upon the religious convictions or personal wishes and freedom of any individual . . ."

That means the Catholic Church, the largest, best organized and most-moneyed enemy of birth control. There is some reason to believe that very large numbers of otherwise obedient Catholics use contraceptives, but you can't blame a politician for drawing back from asking such a hefty percentage of the voters to choose between themselves and their bishops. (Though one American bishop has resigned rather than buy the Vatican line.) The rest of us also are loathe to say much because it may smack of religious intolerance.

Yet something has to be said. The unchecked begetting of kids isn't like other religious practices. If an orthodox Jew wants to stay away from pork, that's his business. He isn't hurting anybody else, but that's not true of babies. What is true is that the 70-year-old Italian celibates who cling to their aversion to contraceptives won't be alive to suffer the consequences of their erroneous teachings.

There's little we can do about the erroneous teachings, but do the taxpayers have to subsidize them? Do we have to give tax exemptions and financial aid to Catholic educational institutions while they teach children to follow practices that are going to ruin all of us? The least the Government could do is support only private schools which teach and advocate birth control.

This is the barest of beginnings. The Catholic problem is the hierarchy's political opposition to population-reduction programs: Catholic birth rates aren't that different from everybody else's birth rates. We're all having too many children, but changing that isn't going to be easy. Many long-lived ideas must be stamped out first.

There is the notion, absurd in the era of the ABM, that many babies makes us militarily strong. This idea is not only connected with raising cannon fodder for the infantry, but also the masculine definition of virility. You're a man, you really got what it takes, lotsa you know what, because you can make a female pregnant. If you can do that you're a bull, a stud, a rooster. When we hear of a 70-year-old male fathering a child, we make awed sounds and exclaim about what a man he must be. It's going to be hard to convince men that impregnating women is an antisocial act.

The case with women is more desperate. Many American women are brought up to believe their essential worthwhileness derives from motherhood and childrearing. From the cradle they're schooled in attitudes that make them disdain any other occupation but the manufacturing of babies. Unmarried or childless women are spinsters, career girls, barren soil, somehow less than female.

Often people get married and have children because they have no other real choice. By their mid-twenties, women who're not married frequently are in a state of near panic as the source of likely husbands is used up, and they contemplate being single persons in a married people's world. It's somewhat better for a man, but not much. With both sexes the married majority tends to exclude the single minority during the years between 25 and 50, when the men begin dropping dead. Everything is set up to encourage getting married and having unholy numbers of kids; the married couple with children gets tax incentives to reproduce, gets credit more easily, is considered a better risk for car insurance and is regarded as a potentially more stable and therefore more desirable employe.

People have children as a form of social security. A bunch of kids is a better health and retirement program than anything the Government is offering or proposing. Moreover, we're weighed down with a lot of balderdash about perpetuating ourselves or that particular genetic pool known as our family through baby making. Life ought to be sufficiently fulfilling and satisfying that we don't feel the urge to recoup our own disasters by living it out again through our children.

Limiting population production will exact other very large changes. We must divest ourselves of the belief that a stable or declining population is a sign of a stagnant or degenerate society. This means a good deal more than accepting abortion for any reason a woman wants it; it means reordering our economics. Our whole profit system is based on the proposition that the higher we can push the volume, the lower we can depress our per unit costs. This once useful way of arranging things is outliving its utility. If some other way isn't found to provide Ford or GM with another basis for profit, we will perish from the most horrible and painful lung diseases.

Men like Ralph Nader have shown us that with cars, with drugs, with food and many other items what we need isn't more but better quality. But we've managed our economics and technology so that money is made out of quantity. Our big manufacturers have as much of a vested interest as the Pope in frustrating birth control.

Viewed from this point of view, our lunar escapades aren't high human adventures, man realizing his destiny or the rest of the high-sounding bilge we've been dishing out; from this point of view it is tragic escapism, an enormous entertainment, a romance that distracts us from our peril unless one of our astronauts can find a new, large inhabitable planet and get about three billion of us rocketed on to it while there is still time.

Overpopulation and World Starvation

(By David Kaplan)

According to the best scholarly estimates, it took thousands of years to reach a world population of 250 million by AD 1. By 1650 world population doubled to 500 million. Another doubling took place by 1850, when world population reached one billion. Then, 80 years later in 1930, population doubled again to two billion people. By 1975, 45 years later, if present trends continue, population will have doubled to four billion people.

At our present rate of growth, we can look forward to 14 billion people in 2035 and 28 billion by 2070. Why has there been such an acceleration of growth in world population? The answers are easy.

Medical advances have eradicated the dreaded plagues of the past centuries and conquered other serious diseases by devising processes which make our food and drinking water clean. In addition, modern sanitation has sharply reduced insect-spread diseases, such as malaria.

In short, we have instituted various forms of death control.

No longer, and happily so, is world population going to be decreased by any of the ancient pandemics. While we should applaud these medical advances which have saved so many lives all over the world, we also must observe that historically it was high death rates that accounted for the slower rates of population increase.

ECONOMIES ARE HIT HARD

The eradication of high death rates while high birth rates continue has led to an increase in the rate of world population growth which in many cases has had pernicious economic effects, particularly on the underdeveloped nations.

If one were to describe these economics generally, one would see a pattern of poverty, capital shortages, low agricultural productivity, limited development of markets, and unequal distribution of income. One would also see that the poorest economies are located in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Perversely, these areas have the highest rates of population growth, which act as a serious drag on economic growth. More people mean more mouths to feed. This cuts down the amount of product that can be saved. With low savings rates, little capital is available to modernize agriculture and industry—a modernization these economies desperately need if they are going to increase their production of food and other products.

What little production is obtained, say in agriculture, must be immediately consumed. These economies thus have very low savings rates, and these translate into low rates of capital formation. One of the basic prerequisites for economic growth for these economies—increasing levels of capital accumulation—is being seriously impeded by rapidly increasing populations.

XUM

LATIN AMERICA IN TROUBLE

Latin America clearly reflects how population increases have all but eradicated economic growth. Latin America has had a 4.7% increase in gross national product annually. However, when you include population growth of 3% yearly, the per capita growth rate actually comes down to 1.7% annually.

In 1900 Latin America had a population of 63 million. It now has a population of 268 million. This population, if the present rates of increase continue, will double in 23 years. By the end of the century, Latin America will have 650 million people. It will be growing then at a rate of 100 million people every 5 years. Obviously, with geometric population increase of this magnitude, Latin America will be very fortunate if it is able to record *any* per capita growth in the final 30 years of this century.

All of these areas which have rapidly increasing populations have extremely low annual per capita incomes: under $400 for Latin America and under $150 for Africa and Asia. (Those incomes look especially low when compared to North America's annual per capita income of well over $3,500.) Yet, Africa and Asia have rates of population increase which will result in a doubling of both their populations by the year 2000.

Latin America, Africa, and Asia have approximately 2.6 billion people now. If present rates of population increase continue, these areas will have approximately 5.2 billion by the end of the century.

The ominous consequences of this spiraling population growth are clear.

First, there will be a continued exacerbation of the gross inequalities in the shares of world income going to the underdeveloped countries and to the developed nations. Economist Barbara Ward, in her book *The Lopsided World,* states that 80% of the world output is now going to only 20% of the world's population. This inequality will become even more pronounced if the underdeveloped nations continue to experience rapid population growth.

As an example, India's real national income has risen about 3.5% annually in recent years. However, India's annual population growth is about 2.5%. Thus, her per capita increase in income is only about 1% yearly or, in dollar terms, about 75 cents. The U.S. per capita increase in income is about 3% yearly or, in dollar terms, about $120.

For the near future, at the very least, we are going to have wider disparities in the shares of income between the "have" and the "have not" nations. Rapid population growth can only accelerate these disparities.

Second, the famines that the people of various nations are experiencing now will be dwarfed by even more massive and prolonged famines in the 1970's. William and Paul Paddock, writing in *Famine—1975!* have said that the people are already born who will be the future victims of the race between food and population growth—a race which, according to the authors, already has been lost.

Furthermore, population pressures have already compelled the poorer countries to become importers of basic foodstuffs where, in the recent past, they were exporting these commodities.

Thus, Tadd Fisher writes that before World War II, Africa, Asia, and Latin America exported 11 million tons of grain yearly. By 1964, they were importing 25 million tons yearly. In addition, and even more ominously, she reports that Latin America's population increased 11.5% between 1959 and 1964, but food production increased only 6.5%. Thus, we see more evidential support for the accuracy of the predictions of more pervasive famines in the 1970's.

Third, the low incomes and prevalence of hunger in the poorer countries can only mean a continuance of political instabilities. It is the underdeveloped nations that are most often wracked by military coups, civil wars, and violent revolutions. Future uncontrolled population growth can only increase these instabilities.

Fourth, overpopulation means increased pollution. In the United States we are caught between two very malevolent forces: a population that will grow from roughly 200 million today to 300 million in the next 35 years; and an increase by 1980 in our urban population to 175 million people. The results of these two forces are already discernible. A growing population consumes more energy, drives more cars, and produces more waste products. All this will result in our air and water becoming even more contaminated than they are now.

MASSIVE COMMITMENT NEEDED

It is easy to come to the conclusion that some drastic measures must be taken immediately. It is imperative first of all that we have a massive increase in resources committed to the overpopulation problem. Special care should be taken with the underdeveloped countries.

It should be made abundantly clear to these nations that excessive population growth is one of the central reasons for their lack of economic development. Family planning programs should be initiated where the country does not have a program, and the program should be strengthened and extended where we find one already initiated. Further, more research should be done to discover the most effective methods of family planning. We must realize, however, that even effective voluntary systems of family planning may not be a total answer to the problem. We are at a point in time when serious consideration may have to be given to mandatory governmental programs for population control.

It is obvious from the evidence that it is already too late for many people now living. We must be concerned, however, that the millions who are going to starve to death in the 1970's should not be followed by many more millions, yet unborn, in the 1980's.

QUERIES FOR OPPONENTS

Those who argue against contraception and family planning on the basis of their fundamental immorality must be prepared to answer the following questions:

Is it moral to bring a child into a world where he will suffer daily the ravages of hunger, where the poverty is so abject and the life of that child so desperate than an early death is hoped for as a way to end his seemingly interminable suffering?

Is it moral to add to the two-thirds of the world's population, approximately 2.5 billion people, who are living in a dehumanizing poverty?

Is it moral to markedly increase the pollution of our air and water?

No one, of course, would claim that increasing the levels of poverty and starvation, pollution and filth, pain and suffering is moral; yet, if we tacitly assent to the present rates of world population growth, we are then implicitly consenting to this claim. *That* is the immorality, not the advocacy of birth control and family planning.

In the time it took you to read this article the population of the world increased by approximately 750 people. Each day the world adds 190,000 more humans, each year approximately 70 million. Given the present food-population ratio, millions of these are doomed to early tragic deaths. If we do not act now, countless millions more, yet unborn will face the same fate.

SALUTE TO MORMON PIONEERS

(Mr. **HANSEN** of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. **HANSEN** of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we have just received the happy and welcome news that the Apollo 11 astronauts have returned safely to earth following their historic journey to the moon. It is fitting that this event comes on the same day that we commemorate the end of another historic journey 122 years ago.

On July 24, 1847, a small band of sturdy Mormon pioneers led by Brigham Young entered the Salt Lake Valley. Thus ended one of the most remarkable events in the history of the American West.

The early Mormon pioneers endured many months of hardship and privation as they crossed the mountains and plains. Hundreds of graves along the wagon trails attest to the severity of the conditions they faced in their westward trek.

When they arrived in the Salt Lake Valley, the Mormons immediately began to colonize vast areas of the mountain West. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints has been a creative and constructive force in the building of our Nation. During the 30 years following their arrival, under the leadership of Brigham Young, more than 350 communities were established in six States.

Dozens of these communities are in my own State of Idaho. The pioneers who laid their foundations brought little with them in the way of material goods, but they were sustained during periods of great trial by their unswerving faith in God and in the work they were doing.

They built a civilization out of the wilderness. Idaho owes much to the Mormon pioneers whose courage, dedication, and energy caused the valleys and plains to blossom and bear fruit. They demonstrated the value of hard work, sacrifice, and a willingness to help each other.

The bold pioneers of 1847 have set an example that will serve us well today as we face a future filled with great danger and bright promise. The kind of faith, courage, and vision that was exemplified in the lives and achievement of the Mormon pioneers are no less needed today as we enter the dawn of the Space Age.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting, therefore, on this day when parades and other activities mark the anniversary of the entry of the Mormons into the Salt Lake Valley that we in the U.S. Congress take note of this historic event and pause to pay tribute to those who have contributed so much to the building of our American Nation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Udall, for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Keith, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Morse, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Findley, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Ashbrook, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. McClory, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Winn, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Price of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Weicker, for 60 minutes, on July 28.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Anderson of California), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Gonzalez, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson, for 10 minutes, on July 28.

Mr. Mikva, for 30 minutes, on July 29.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Bow (at the request of Mr. Cederberg) immediately following the remarks of Mr. Edwards of Alabama in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. Morse (at the request of Mr. Cederberg) in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. Gross in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. Randall in two instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Rooney of New York to revise and extend his remarks made today in the Committtee of the Whole and to include certain tables.

Mr. McCulloch and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Gross immediately preceding passage of State and Justice Departments appropriation bill.

Mr. Foley (at the request of Mr. Anderson of California) to extend his remarks following those of Mr. Udall on his special order today and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Dennis) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Sebelius.

Mr. Pollock.

Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. Morse in two instances.

Mr. Zwach.

Mr. Utt in two instances.

Mr. Wyman in two instances.

Mr. Gude in two instances.

Mr. Roth.

Mr. Don H. Clausen in two instances.

Mr. Camp in two instances.

Mr. Halpern in two instances.

Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Derwinski in two instances.

Mr. Wold in two instances.

Mr. Landgrebe.

Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mr. Meskill.

Mr. Brotzman.

Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Anderson of California) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Powell.

Mr. William D. Ford in two instances.

Mr. Boland.

Mr. Bolling.

Mr. Mollohan in three instances.

Mr. Ottinger.

Mr. Pucinski in six instances.

Mr. Eilberg.

Mr. Bingham.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee.

Mr. Burton of California.

Mr. Gonzalez in four instances.

Mr. Rarick in three instances.

Mr. Daniels of New Jersey.

Mr. Annunzio.

Mr. Rodino.

Mr. Wolff.

Mr. Olsen in two instances.

Mr. Delaney.

Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. McCarthy in three instances.

Mr. Dorn in four instances.

Mr. Symington.

Mr. Pickle in two instances.

Mr. Brasco.

Mr. Hungate in two instances.

Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Minish.

Mr. Joelson.

Mr. Marsh in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 28, 1969.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

990. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effectiveness and administration of the Albuquerque Job Corps Center for Women at Albuquerque, N. Mex., operated by the Packard Bell Electronics Corp. under a contract with the Office of Economic Opportunity, pursuant to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

991. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a proposed amendment to the draft Foreign Assistance Act of 1969; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

992. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of the publication, "Alaska Power Survey"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3687. A bill to designate the Ventana Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 7621. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 491. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 681, joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President (Rept. No. 91–390). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FLOOD: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 13111. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 13079. A bill to continue for a temporary period the existing interest equalization tax (Rept. No. 91–392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 13080. A bill to continue for an additional 15 days the existing rates of income tax withholding at source (Rept. No. 91–393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS (for himself and Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin):

H.R. 13079. A bill to continue for a temporary period the existing interest equalization tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13080. A bill to continue for an additional 15 days the existing rates of income tax withholding at source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 13081. A bill to encourage employment among the needy and to provide job opportunities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13082. A bill to permit an individual who is eligible for a civil service retirement annuity to waive his right to have military service after 1956 included in the computation of any benefits to which he is or may become entitled under title II of the Social Security Act, and to include such service instead in the computation of such annuity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 13083. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize payment under the program of health insurance for the aged for services furnished an individual by a home maintenance worker (in such individual's home) as part of a home health service plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 13084. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to exempt ammunition from Federal regulation under the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13085. A bill to afford protection to the public from offensive intrusion into their homes through the postal service of sexually oriented mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

XUM

H.R. 13086. A bill to repeal chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code (relating to firearms), to reenact the Federal Firearms Act, and to restore chapter 53 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as in effect before its amendment by the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 13087. A bill to establish an independent agency to be known as the U.S. Office of Consumers' Counsel to represent the interests of the consumers of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13088. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to require persons operating sewage treatment works to be licensed; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13089. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to help cities and communities of the United States develop and carry out intensive local programs to eliminate the causes of lead-based paint poisoning; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13090. A bill to provide that Federal assistance to a State or local government or agency for rehabilitation or renovation of housing and for enforcement of local or State housing codes under the urban renewal program, the public housing program, or the model cities program, or under any other program involving the provision by State or local governments of housing or related facilities, shall be made available only on condition that the recipient submit and carry out an effective plan for eliminating the causes of lead-based paint poisoning; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13091. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to help cities and communities of the United States develop and carry out intensive local programs to detect and treat incidents of lead-based paint poisoning; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 13092. A bill to provide for a comprehensive and coordinated attack on the narcotic addiction and drug abuse problem, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 13093. A bill to amend section 412(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, with respect to contracts relating to the selection or appointment, or the utilization of the services, of ticket agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN (for himself, Mr. Kluczynski, Mr. Clark, Mr. Denney, Mr. Dorn, Mr. Howard, Mr. Johnson of California, Mr. Melcher, Mr. Roberts, and Mr. Wright):

H.R. 13094. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to designate the Alaska Highway, and to authorize construction, reconstruction, and improvement of part of such highway, including a connecting highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 13095. A bill to permit the exportation of certain copper mined in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 13096. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 13097. A bill to provide that hearsay evidence shall be admissible at preliminary examinations in Federal criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13098. A bill to authorize appropriations to be used for the elimination of certain rail-highway grade crossings in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 13099. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a personal exemption for a dependent who is his grandchild and is under 19 years of age or a student, without regard to whether such grandchild's income is less than $600, the same as would presently be allowed the taxpayer if the dependent were his son or daughter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 13100. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend for 3 years the programs of assistance for training in the allied health professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 13101. A bill to adjust agricultural production, to provide a transitional program for farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself and Mr. Frelinghuysen):

H.R. 13102. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of State to participate in the development of a large prototype desalting plant in Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 13103. A bill to designate certain lands in the Petrified Forest National Park in Arizona as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 13104. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 13105. A bill to provide that Space Exploration Day shall be a legal public holiday which shall be celebrated on the third Monday in July; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 13106. A bill to extend for 3 years the period of time during which certain requirements shall continue to apply with respect to applications for a license for an activity which may affect the resources of the Hudson Riverway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. Clark, Mr. Dorn, Mr. Jonas, Mr. Haley, Mr. Hosmer, Mr. Michel, Mr. Miller of Ohio, Mr. Slack, Mr. Utt, and Mr. Wold):

H.R. 13107. A bill to establish a uniform Federal policy for repayment of costs of Federal electric power projects, to provide the Secretary of the Interior with authority to carry out this policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 13111. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

By Mr. FREY (for himself, Mr. Miller of California, Mr. Teague of Texas, Mr. Karth, Mr. Hechler of West Virginia, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Davis of Georgia, Mr. Downing, Mr. Waggonner, Mr. Fuqua, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Cabell, Mr. Podell, Mr. Aspinall, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Biaggi, Mr. Symington, and Mr. Koch):

H.J. Res. 835. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of the Astronauts Memorial Commission to construct and erect with funds a memorial in the John F. Kennedy Space Center, Fla., or the immediate vicinity, to honor and commemorate the men who serve as astronauts in the U.S. space program; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FREY (for himself, Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania, Mr. Mosher, Mr. Roudebush, Mr. Bell of California, Mr. Pelly, Mr. Wydler, Mr. Vander Jagt, Mr. Winn, Mr. Pettis, Mr. Lukens, Mr. Price of Texas, Mr. Weicker, and Mr. Goldwater):

H.J. Res. 836. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of the Astronauts Memorial Commission to construct and erect with funds a memorial in the John F. Kennedy Space Center, Fla., or the immediate vicinity, to honor and commemorate the men who serve as astronauts in the U.S. space program; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 837. Joint resolution designating the third week in July of each year as "National Man in Space Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.J. Res. 838. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the terms of Members of the House of Representatives shall be 3 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH (for himself, Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania, Mr. Kastenmeier, Mr. Pike, Mr. Morse, Mr. Anderson of Illinois, Mr. Wampler, Mr. Foley, Mr. Wright, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Cahill, Mr. Giaimo, Mr. Dellenback, Mr. Winn, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Hungate, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. Taft, Mr. MacGregor, Mr. Roth, Mr. Cowger, and Mr. Findley):

H. Con. Res. 305. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the future exploration of space frontiers jointly by the United States and other technologically advanced nations of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEITH (for himself, Mr. Meeds, Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Ottinger, Mr. Reuss, Mr. Coughlin, Mr. Mayne, Mr. Don H. Clausen, Mr. Carter, Mr. Reid of New York, Mr. Koch, Mr. Mosher, and Mr. Conte):

H. Con. Res. 306. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the future exploration of space frontiers jointly by the United States and other technologically advanced nations of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. Adams, Mr. Albert, Mr. Brademas, Mr. Brasco, Mrs. Chisholm, Mr. Clay, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Dent, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Friedel, Mr. Hathaway, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Joelson, Mr. Lowenstein, Mr. Mikva, Mrs. Mink, Mr. Nedzi, Mr. O'Hara, Mr. Rogers of Colorado, Mr. Roybal, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Udall):

H. Res. 493. Resolution to provide that the employees of the House restaurant, cafeterias, and snack shops shall have the right to form and/or join an employee organization for the purpose of entering into a collective bargaining agreement with the Architect of the Capitol regarding working conditions, hours, and wages; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 13108. A bill for the relief of Maurice Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 13109. A bill for the relief of Larry G. Piper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 13110. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved mineral interests of the United States in certain land located in the State of California to the record owners of the surface thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

188. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Future Political Status Commission, Congress of Micronesia, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, transmitting the final report of the commission, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE—*Thursday, July 24, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Infinite and Eternal Spirit, on this day of days, with reverent and thankful hearts, we rise to celebrate a glorious triumph of the human mind and spirit, the fulfillment of man's obedience to Thy directive "to have dominion over the works of Thy hand." We thank Thee for the intrepid voyagers to lunar lands and spaces, for their dedicated talents, for their disciplined demeanor, and the constancy of their devotion. We thank Thee, too, for all those whose vision, toil, and talents combined to support their mission. We thank Thee for the managers, machines, and money, but above all for Thy guiding light and Thy providential care.

Lift our vision now to behold the time when nations compete not for markets or money but for treasures of the spirit. Prepare us and all the people of this land, in the depths of our nature, that in the new age we may export only good will, brotherhood, and the peace of Thy kingdom.

In the Redeemer's name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 23, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF SPEAKING TIME FOR SENATORS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over the past week or so, the leadership has been receiving an extraordinarily large number of requests for speaking time to be allocated to various Senators. While we are delighted to accommodate the proceedings in the Senate to the wishes of individual Senators, we think that it should be signified that this manner of operation goes contrary to Senate procedures. Unless Senators want the Senate to convene early for a stated period of time to accommodate them, Senators hereafter are requested to take their chances and will not be given special consideration by being recognized in sequence, as was the case yesterday with respect to six or seven speaking requests, one after the other. When other Senators who are not aware of the special consideration that had been extended to colleagues enter the Chamber, they are disappointed and chagrined that they are unable to obtain the floor, and problems are created.

So we hope that Senators will understand the position in which the joint leadership finds itself and will act accordingly. If any Senator wishes to come in early for the purpose of delivering a speech, we shall be delighted to accommodate him as much as we can, but we would not want the procedure to get out of hand.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am in hearty accord with the position of the majority leader. I know that he could not take any other position. I have been guilty, to a degree, of making these requests, but it was in an attempt to accommodate Senators on each side as best we could, so far as that is concerned. I knew the time would come when we would have to decline.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has made very few requests.

If it happened only once in a while, the joint leadership would be glad to go along. But it seemed that it was becoming a habit, and we felt that before it went too far, we should serve notice on the Senate that, with its cooperation, we would like to get back to the regular procedure.

Mr. STENNIS. I think the majority leader's procedure now will do much to move the debate along and possibly bring the matter to a vote soon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That was one of the purposes behind the joint leadership's statement: that we could speed up debate and begin to get votes at least on the beginning amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF THE INCOME TAX SURCHARGE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the bill passed by the House of Representatives to provide for a limited extension of the income tax surcharge has been reported favorably by the Committee on Finance and is now on the Senate Calendar. Previously, Congress had adopted a measure providing for a temporary extension of the surtax. As we all know, this measure will terminate on July 31.

I believe it to be imperative that the Senate take prompt action to adopt the bill passed by the House of Representatives prior to the July 31 expiration date of the temporary extension. To fail to pursue this course of action would, in my judgment, seriously weaken the fight against inflation and would unduly jeopardize the economic health of our country.

I will not at this time belabor the fact of inflation except to say that during the past 6 months consumer prices have risen at an annual rate in excess of 6 percent, a rate that would double the cost of living within 15 years. Only yesterday, the Department of Labor announced that food prices throughout the country were increasing at an annual rate of 7 percent. It is apparent that this trend cannot continue, and I believe that the extension of the surtax would be a significant factor in alleviating this inflationary pressure by continuing the reduction in the purchasing power of the private sector of our economy.

The alternative course of action for Congress would be to permit the surtax to lapse, thereby permitting a continuation of the inflationary spiral which is, in its effect, not unlike a tax. In fact, as inflation occurs and the real purchasing power of the dollar decreases, the people

XUM

of our country are confronted with the cruelest and most deceptive tax of all, a tax levied most heavily against the elderly and others who live on fixed incomes.

Mr. President, while some Senators oppose extension of the surtax on the merits, the principal opposition stems from those who are demanding tax reform as a condition to extension. Let me say that I am an enthusiastic supporter of many of the enormously important tax reform proposals that have been advanced. Most of these measures are designed to provide tax justice and a more equitable distribution of the Federal income tax burden, and they should be enacted. However, as we are all aware, the House Ways and Means Committee has devoted untold hours to a tax reform package with Chairman MILLS now indicating that a comprehensive bill will be sent to the Senate prior to the August 13 recess. There can thus be little doubt that the Senate will have the opportunity to consider a tax reform bill and that every Senator will be able to introduce any tax reform amendment that he believes should be enacted. For this reason I do not believe the call for tax reform to be a legitimate device to delay consideration of the bill extending the surtax. As the Washington Post stated on July 19:

> We can see no excuse for holding the urgent surtax bill merely for the sake of having the less urgent but enormously important reform bill follow it in the legislative channel. Good management seems to call for passage of the surtax bill before the withholding extension expires on July 31.

The majority party leadership, which is now preventing action on this bill, contends that since the surtax revenues are being collected under the provision for a temporary extension there is no urgency in taking final action on the permanent measure now on the Senate calendar. But every good economist recognizes that to fail to determine once and for all whether to adopt the extension creates additional chaos in the financial community and augments the difficult problem of inflationary psychology, which continues to persist. It is obvious that the only way to lay inflationary speculation to rest is for this Congress to adopt promptly the surtax bill. The temporary extension decreases the purchasing power of the private sector by collecting the revenues, but it does very little to stem inflationary speculation. To rely on the temporary extension means that the American people are being required to pay additional tax dollars but are not getting the benefit for which these dollars are being collected.

Mr. President, for these reasons I call upon the majority party leadership to bring this bill to the Senate floor prior to July 31.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAKER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may be permitted to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee who, as always, is cogent in his reasoning, which I share, and his concern for the continually worsening condition of the average American citizen, and particularly for those taxpayers who, if we pass this tax bill for the orderly phasing out of the surtax, will be themselves removed from the tax rolls. There are 5 million of those people. If I were one of those 5 million people who knew that the other body had provided that I would not have to pay taxes and that the Senate is unwilling to give me that relief I would look around the Senate and say, "I wonder who it is that does not give me relief?"

If I were one of the 8 million people benefited dollarwise by the bill sent over to us, I would look around the Senate and say, "I wonder who does not want us to be benefited." Then, I am sure I would be told, "They do not want to benefit you at this time because they want something vaguely called tax reform." If I were one of the 5 million people who did not have to pay taxes, I would say, "That is a big tax reform." If I were one of the 8 million people, I would say, "That is a big tax reform." If I were one of the big businessmen who would have to pay dividends by reason of the repeal of the investment tax credit, I would say ruefully and painfully, "That sure is a reform."

So, Mr. President, whichever way you cut it, I can see no excuse whatever for those in the Senate who are unwilling to give us the opportunity to vote on the tax relief and reform measure—a measure which phases out the surtax, a tax that we did not put on, and, finally, takes it off—simply because, they say, "We want more reform."

Meanwhile, the other body has said, "We are going to give you tax reform whether you like it or not, and we are going to do it soon, and we are going to do it as fast as we can." But in the meantime, this body says, "We cannot give tax relief at all. We are sorry. We want to give you tax relief. We want you to believe us, because our hearts are in the right place."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I suggest they put their votes where they say their hearts are. I suggest they put their actions where they say their emotions lie.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief question?

Mr. SCOTT. I shall yield, but I would like to finish this thought.

If they could come out into the atmosphere where the only value in their remarks is their antiquity and their ancient statement that they are for the people, and do something for the people, then they would be au courant for the American people.

The Senator from Tennessee has the floor, but I have finished my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall be quite brief. I did not know whom the Senator from Pennsylvania was talking about when he referred to "they." Who is the "they" doing all these despicable things counter to the welfare of the people? Who is "they"?

Mr. SCOTT. I was not talking about my distinguished friend from Mississippi. I know he favors this tax.

Mr. STENNIS. I beg the Senator's pardon. I do not know that I do.

Mr. SCOTT. I thought the Senator did.

Mr. STENNIS. If "they" are going to be kicked around on a political basis, I reserve my vote on the tax. Anyone tires of hearing beratement and criticism of others, so to speak, just because one does not agree with the Senator's approach. I shall consider the tax on its merits. However, I just want to know if I am in the "they," and, if I am not, who is?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I have no thought that the Senator was in the "they" category, because the Senator has a strong fiscal position and always has expressed it. But I believe the Senator is aware, as I am, that the delay does come from some decisions not made by this Senator from Pennsylvania; and, therefore, certainly it is perfectly proper that we advert to those decisions and the wisdom of them.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to say that periodically this body goes through spasms of argument and indecision on certain rules, and especially rule XXII relating to limitation of debate. In most cases the question is put: Is it not fair that the Senate should be permitted to work its will and come to grips with the issues of the controversy. I think this situation is not unlike the controversy which rages on the filibuster rule. I respectfully submit the time has come when this matter should be submitted to the Senate so that it may work its will promptly and effectively.

I yield the floor.

(At this point Mr. TOWER assumed the chair.)

THE CHOICE BETWEEN THE SURTAX AND CONTINUING INFLATION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, inflation represents perhaps the greatest domestic problem of our day. Prices of consumer goods and services have risen 25 percent in the past 10 years. Fifteen percent of that has taken place in the past

XUM

4 years and nearly 5 percent last year. Our economy is experiencing the greatest rate of inflation ever during a prolonged period of high production of civilian goods. A 1958 dollar is worth 79 cents and a dollar earned this January, today is worth 96 cents—by Christmas, if present rates continue, it will shrink to 92 cents. Inflation in these proportions erodes confidence in our dollar and our whole economic system—both here and abroad.

SURTAX OR INFLATION

Today, we face a choice between the surtax and continuing inflation. Inflation hurts everyone, but especially those who can least afford it—the aged, the young, those who own Government bonds or demand deposits, those who lend money, and all those who are bound by a fixed income, who are unable to respond with wage or price increases. Inflation has been described as a race with no real winners. And those who do win—who can respond with wage or price increases—merely push the inflation on, merely magnify the spiraling effect.

There is no joy in raising taxes, or even continuing a raise. It would be much easier and much more politically expedient to end the surtax, to conceal this economic loss through continued inflation. But the welfare of the entire country is at stake. The surtax spreads the cost over the entire income earning group while slowing down the economy to help solve the problem. Since this could strike hardest at those in the lower income brackets, I am pleased to note that the present bill excludes those below the poverty level.

SURTAX BECOMING EFFECTIVE

At last there are some indications that the surtax is becoming effective in the fight against inflation. Our action last year was hampered by an overly expansive monetary policy during the last half of 1968. However, since the first of the year monetary policy has been restrictive and has been working in harness with a restrictive fiscal policy. Recent figures would tend to indicate that this joint monetary fiscal policy is beginning to take hold. Consumer buying is running slightly below levels of last summer. Just this week it was announced that for the second month in a row durable goods orders are down, and for the first time in 11 months, durable goods shipments exceeded new orders, thus reducing inventories. Likewise there has been a steady decline in the rate of economic growth over the last four quarters. Real growth in GNP has declined from a 4-percent rate in the third quarter of 1968 steadily downward to a rate of 2.3 percent in the second quarter of 1969. These figures would seem to indicate that our policies are beginning to succeed. It would be a tragedy—indeed a cruel hoax on the American taxpayer—if we were to suspend the fight against inflation just when the tide is turning.

SURTAX UNCERTAINTY

Already the uncertainly of whether the surtax will be continued has contributed greatly to an inflationary psychology. With inflation becoming the accepted economic state, people are going excessively into debt, striking for unrealistic wage demands, moving their money into foreign banks, charging exorbitant interest rates, and spending rather than saving, all of which merely aggravates the problem. Just the act of passing this bill—aside from its economic repercussions—will be a long step forward in defeating the inflation psychology which has been gripping our economy. It will let everyone know that the Congress intends to do whatever is necessary to reverse this inflationary cycle and to return America to a stable economic and monetary position.

CUT FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

I am confident that this administration is and will continue to do everything possible to cut Federal expenditures. Even with the Vietnam war, the budget for this last fiscal year is expected to be close to being in balance. After last year's $25.2 billion deficit, this—along with general slowdown in economic growth—represents a great step toward control of the runaway inflation we have been experiencing.

TAX REFORM

I am also confident that this administration will continue to press for far-reaching tax reforms. This is one issue which both Houses and both sides of the aisle can agree on, tax reform is necessary, and it is necessary this year. Yet, when we set our priorities, the welfare of our Nation's economy and the stability of our dollar must come first. It would be a sad case indeed for those who have controlled the Congress for a decade to now choose to use tax reform as a political bludgeon by holding up legislation which our economic stability depends upon. I am therefore gratified that the Senate Finance Committee has reported the surtax bill to the Senate calendar.

I earnestly hope that the majority leadership does not implement a procedure which would be tantamount to a "phantom filibuster." It is essential that the Senate now be given the opportunity to work its will on the surtax bill. If the majority leadership will schedule the bill for floor action, I am confident that the Members of this body will act responsively, following the bipartisan leadership of the House and will promptly enact H.R. 12290 into law.

This session, I personally intend to do everything possible to work for meaningful tax reform, so that everyone will pay his fair share, both in the cost of the Federal Government and in the added tax necessary to bring inflation to a halt.

THE HARD CHOICE

The choice before us is between extending the surtax and letting loose a spiraling inflation on the entire economy. The Congress must ultimately bear the responsibility for the economic welfare of the country. Whether popular or not—to refuse to extend the surtax would be to close our eyes to that responsibility. The inflationary rate slipped away 2 years ago largely because the Congress delayed taking action at the proper time.

We must have the courage and the insight to take the necessary action now. To allow the surtax to lapse for a week or a month could be fatal for the United States and the entire world.

The surtax must be extended.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will take action at the earliest possible time on this most important matter.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I should like to speak on two subjects this morning, on one very briefly and on the other at greater length in the time which has been reserved for me.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Does the Senator contemplate speaking under the order granted him yesterday, or speaking during morning hour business?

Mr. PERCY. I wish to speak under the order of yesterday which granted me 40 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not during the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would advise the Senator from Illinois that the Senator would not be recognized to speak for 40 minutes until conclusion of morning business.

Mr. PERCY. I am sorry, Mr. President. I wish to make a few brief comments during the morning hour, then, on the surtax, and then will reserve my comments on the ABM until after conclusion of the morning hour and my being recognized for 40 minutes.

THE MILITARY BUDGET AND INFLATION

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, there is great relevance to the subject we are discussing and have been discussing for several weeks; namely, the military budget and the problem of inflation.

There is one point which has not been raised as effectively as I think it should. For several weeks I have been studying what has been happening to wage rates in the United States and will, next week, discuss at greater length this whole subject of inflationary increases in wage costs which has added so much to the cost of living. Again this morning an increase was announced in the cost of living—and also a tremendous increase in the cost of military procurement.

I do not know how the military budget at the present level can possibly fulfill its expectations if inflation continues at its present rate. Inflation means wage increases across the board. Some 8½ million personnel are involved in the Military Establishment, either in the armed services or in defense-related industries. Wage rates reflecting inflationary prices in this country will be reflected in increased requests for supplementary appropriations for the military.

I therefore feel that we are on a fiscally unsound program and policy right now. Unless we secure, in law, and make it perfectly apparent to the world, as well as to this country, that we intend to fight inflation by tightening our belts and keeping on the surtax through the end of the year, and act as quickly as it is possible to move, then inflation which is the greatest single domestic threat we have now will destroy the integrity of every program we have in Congress.

I feel, once again, that the urging of the distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS) in this regard, that we promptly extend the surtax and make it a part of law, has been responsible, is right, and should be bipartisanly supported.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Illinois on his remarks and join him in expressing the hope that the Senate will act responsibly and promptly in considering the surtax.

The indecision and uncertainty which is prevailing today is contributing greatly toward acceleration of the inflationary spiral.

Only yesterday we were advised that the cost of living rose six-tenths of 1 percent in the past 30 days. That is an average of better than 7 percent per year. We cannot afford to continue down this inflationary road.

I cannot conceive of U.S. Senators not standing up like men and meeting their responsibilities on a bipartisan basis and acting in a way they know in their own minds is for the best interests of this country.

Certainly to be toying with the idea that there will be an August recess, where Members can go home and enjoy themselves without meeting this grave issue head on, is unconscionable.

Senators should stay in Washington with their noses to the grindstone until this issue is resolved, which could easily be done in the next few days.

A CLASSIC IN AMERICAN PATRIOTISM

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, several months ago, a young Californian, Robert "Bobby" Lira, gave his life in Vietnam while serving as a marine machinegunner.

A student publication attempted to use the tragedy as propaganda designed to promote a philosophy apparently completely alien to the one which had marked Bobby Lira's life.

However, Bobby's brother, Sal, quickly set the record straight in an open letter to a newspaper editor.

This letter, written by Sal Lira, Jr., was included in an article published in the Water Gazette, which is published by the Public Information Office of the Coachella Valley County Water District, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EAGLETON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I recommend that my colleagues take a moment to read this letter. They will find it to be one of the most inspiring documents they have ever had a chance to look at. I am sure that they will share with me, with justifiable pride, the dedication and patriotism which marked young Bobby's life and which are so apparent in the life of his brother who wrote the letter.

This is one of the most inspiring letters I have had the good fortune to receive, and I get about an average of a thousand letters a day. I think it would be well worthwhile that this letter be read not only by Senators but also those who have the good fortune to get the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EXHIBIT 1

MARINE BOBBY LIRA KILLED IN VIETNAM

Fighting in Vietnam on April 5 claimed the life of Robert (Bobby) Lira, son of Mr. and Mrs. Sal Lira, Sr. Sal is employed in the meter department of the CVCWD.

Bobby was serving as a U.S. Marine machine gunner at the time of his death. His whole family had felt a great pride in his service for he was carrying on a tradition of his father, uncle and brother who had been in uniform of their country before him.

When local newspapers carried the account of Bobby's death, a student publication sought to make propaganda out of it by asserting that he had been drafted then sent off to a distant land to die. But this diatribe was most effectively squelched in an article written for the paper by Bobby's brother, Sal, Jr.

A real classic in Americanism and patriotism, it is reprinted below so that every member of the CVCWD can read it and appreciate the loyalty of the Lira family:

"To the EDITOR:

"The other day I received a copy of a new (to me) paper, called the 'Grapevine Rose,' in which was written a well-meaning (I hope) but misinformed write-up about my late brother Robert Lira.

"It may be that I am being overly sensitive because he was my brother, but it seemed to me his death was being exploited to express this kid's (Kelly Leonard's) feelings towards the war in Vietnam.

"To begin with, Bobby was not taken and sent somewhere without his full knowledge of the danger he was going to face. He volunteered! To Bobby it was not a question of a just or unjust war; to him our way of life was being threatened.

"My Dad was wounded in the Battle of the Bulge, my Uncle Sebero was rendered half-blind by a grenade and my Uncle George received three Bronze Stars and the Purple Heart; he was a machine gunner like Bobby. I myself was in three in-flight fires while an aircraft mechanic in the Air Force. My brother George was a fire technician aboard the cruiser *Topeka*.

"My brothers and I went in knowing we were playing with the Big Boys at 17 years of age. I thank God most of us came out alive, a little more thoughtful, older by many years, but proud!

"The author of Bobby's writeup says he didn't know Bob well enough to call him friend, maybe it's for the best, because Bob was the old fashioned type guy that loved his country and although his life in this country was brief, he died so that Kelly Leonard and people like him can have the right to express their opinions about it, even if it is to downgrade it.

"SAL LIRA, JR."

SURTAX EXTENSION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I want to make a few comments about the statements made earlier by the distinguished Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) and the distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS), on the extension of the surtax.

It seems to me that we are missing the point that we are continuing the surtax withholding. That means that we have removed the opportunity for expending it to try to cut inflation, we are doing that; but both domestically and abroad it will have scant psychological effect.

We have already had three cliff hanger votes on the surtax. The surtax passed the House of Representatives by only five votes. It came out of the Ways and Means Committee by one vote. It came out of the Finance Committee by one vote.

Certainly those abroad who are concerned about inflation in the United States can take scant solace from an extension of the surtax by those very scarce margins.

I am prepared to vote for a surtax. I want to vote for a surtax. But I think this is the time and this is the opportunity to have meaningful tax reform.

I have been in Congress a long time, and I have participated in many, many hearings for tax reform. Every time we have tax reform come up, we have hearings, we have discussions, we have studies and nothing happens. This time we have a real opportunity.

The Ways and Means Committee in the House, and the chairman of that committee, I believe, are dedicated to a tax reform program. We are still withholding the money. It would seem to me that the withholding took care of the need for taking the money out of the ordinary expenditures that would create inflation. At the same time, it would seem to me it would be much more beneficial psychologically, both domestically and abroad, to have a tremendous vote in the Senate for the surtax than to have just another cliff hanger vote such as we had in both committees and in the House of Representatives. Actually, in the House, the surtax failed, and it was only because Members of that body changed their votes at the end of the rollcall that they got that five-vote majority.

I cannot see why we cannot extend the surtax withholding from time to time until we have before the Senate two bills. I would be reluctant then to have my proposed tax reform measures considered as amendments to the surtax. I would like to have them considered as a part of a tax reform measure. I hope we can consider tax reform legislation immediately after passage of a bill in the House of Representatives and consider a surtax separately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, may I have some time to yield? I ask unanimous consent to have an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

XUM

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senator points out that the bill passed the House by a very narrow margin and that it was approved by the Senate Finance Committee by only one vote as an argument that it should not be considered on its merits in the Senate. I remind the Senator that the surtax of last year, as originally proposed by President Johnson, never passed the House of Representatives at all in the beginning, because not a member of the President's party would introduce the bill. It was not introduced in the Senate until the Senator from Delaware, later joined by the Senator from Florida, introduced it. It was not reported by the Finance Committee at all. It was rejected in the committee because when offered the amendment in the Finance Committee last year we got only one member of the Democratic Party to support the surtax. This year two members of the Democratic Party supported the extension when it was voted on in the committee, twice as many. I appreciate their support. This tax bill should be considered in the same bipartisan way.

The fact that the Senate delayed and did not face up to the vote last year is no reason why it should not face up to it this year. All I am asking is to put the bill before the Senate so that Members can vote on it. If Senators want to defeat it, then defeat it. If they want to pass it in a different form, that is their privilege. But let us put it before the Senate and find out where they stand, and let those who vote accept their responsibility.

Mr. METCALF. I want to vote for a surtax bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then call the roll.

Mr. METCALF. And I am one of those who want to pass a surtax bill, but I want tax reform this session, and I believe we should wait until the tax reform bill comes over from the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives is working hard, sincerely, and conscientiously for a dedicated tax reform program.

The point I was making is that we are talking about the psychology of the surtax bill. Certainly, foreign representatives who are concerned about inflation are not going to be convinced by a one-vote or a five-vote majority for a surtax, but why can we not wait until there will be an overwhelming vote for a surtax in the Senate of the United States as a part of a reasonable and meaningful tax reform measure?

I have worked for a surtax and have supported it. As the Senator from Delaware knows, I have worked for tax reform in the Finance Committee, in the Ways and Means Committee, and elsewhere. This is an opportunity to have a substantial tax reform measure.

It seems to me completely immoral to pass a 10-percent surtax when there are hundreds of people in America with incomes of over $100,000 a year who are paying no income tax at all and who would pay no surtax at all. It seems to be immoral to place a surtax on people when there are those who would escape taxes unless we had meaningful tax reform. I think we should wait for tax reform and then place a surtax in an equitable income tax bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just 1 minute?

Mr. METCALF. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I join the Senator in the thought that we need meaningful tax reform of our tax structure. I assure him that I will cosponsor his proposal to tax some of these millionaires who have been escaping taxes through oil depletion. I will welcome him as a cosponsor of such a proposal. I look forward to working with him in correcting some of the inequities which exist.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I am glad to yield,

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair recognize me, so we do not have to fuss for extensions of time.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute and a half.

Mr. JAVITS. That is enough.

Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Montana will challenge my credentials for joining him in efforts to tax those who are not now taxpayers and should be, or for reforms, including oil depletion or anything in that sense. He knows I will be with him most of the time.

Mr. METCALF. I am convinced he will.

Mr. JAVITS. At the same time, I am one of those who, along with the Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS), thought that we needed to have this surtax. I come from the most sophisticated financial and banking community in the world. I checked this matter, and, long before I came here, I represented all of these "moneybags," or many of them, anyway——

Mr. METCALF. I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. I checked that out and I found confirmation in the financial world that our determination to halt the inflationary spiral which is raging right now was paramount, in my judgment. So I tried to adopt a compromise. I do not ask the Senator to join with me; I only give him the psychology of one Senator similarly dedicated to pledging our action on meaningful tax reform this year. I believe—and I think the facts confirm my conviction—that we will lose more in the inflationary fight by doing what the Senator says is morally just than by doing—and I thought we could come close to realizing our moral obligation—what we have pledged in regard to the surtax bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. What we are talking about here is the element of the confidence of the American people. The American people who are being taxed are disturbed that there are so many people with large incomes who have to pay no taxes at all; that there is a favoritism in our whole tax structure. They are saying, "If you are going to lay on our backs this burden of taking out of our weekly pay this additional 10 percent, why do you not bring about justice in the whole tax structure?"

That is the important question. Here we have involved the confidence of the American people. I realize what it means to the banking community, whether it is national or international, to make sure that we have an extension of the surtax. But who is denying the extension of the surtax? That is not the question here today.

All we are saying here is, let us extend it temporarily for a period of time, to assure the American people, not on anybody's word, not on anybody's pledge, but upon the fact that, for one time in the 19 years I have been here, we are going to bring about a tax reform.

The Senator from Delaware knows that I have stood shoulder to shoulder with him when he suggested that we lower the oil depletion allowance, which is a grab, and nothing more than a grab, for the oil industry in this country. Something needs to be done about that. If we let this occasion pass, and extend permanently this surtax without tax reform, we will never, never, never have tax reform.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. METCALF. I am happy to yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Generally speaking, I find myself in accord with the Senator from Rhode Island, but, with all respect, I very strongly do not now, with all his implications that this is to butter up the banking community.

It is the banking community that is setting up these high interest rates. It is the banking community that is behind the idea of the price inflation moving as it is. We will not satisfy them, and we will not serve the people, with a temporary extension of the withholding. That is not an extension of the tax; they know it and we know it. It does not in any way make us extend the tax. We can still withhold and not extend the tax, and that is the reason, and I say it decisively and affirmatively, for the highest 1-month price increase reported in this morning's newspaper.

I was not paid to come here in order to be a computer for what the people want me to do. They are trusting my judgment. I am their representative; and in my judgment, in my deeply convinced and pronounced judgment, and on my qualifications as a humanitarian, or as a friend of the people, or as a person who believes in democracy, which I think equal those of anyone else on this floor, I tell you, gentlemen, that we are making a disastrous mistake in the interests of those very people.

Sure, they want tax reform, and they are going to have it. But we are holding ourselves hostage. We can get tax reform. The President will sign any bill we send him. We are holding ourselves hostage, in a manner disastrous to them, by the very extension of the debate against having an extension of the surtax.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island. I hope I may have the floor soon.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the words "buttering up" did not come out of my mouth at all. I am not trying to

XUM

butter anybody up. I am not suggesting that the Senator from New York is trying to butter anybody up. But he made the assertion here about reassurance of the banking community by extending this tax, and I brought up the subject of the reassurance that is due to the American taxpayers.

I am saying it takes two to tango; and it is about time we just get ourselves into a nice, slow foxtrot, and if we do not have that foxtrot on this surtax, I am telling you we are not going to have tax reform, because that has been our experience.

I ask the Senator from Delaware, how successful has he been all these years in getting his oil depletion allowance lowered? How successful has he been in all the other tax reforms he has suggested?

I am telling you, sugar-coat this surtax with a coating of tax reform, and then we can swallow the pill.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, my whole point is that we may win a pyrrhic victory by putting the surtax before the Senate at the present time. I for one will vote against it until there is meaningful tax reform before the Senate.

My suggestion is that we show the people of America, that we show these bankers that the Senator is concerned about and I am concerned about, just as he is, and that we show the international financiers that we are going to control inflation by an overwhelming vote of the Senate.

They would have demonstrated that, I am sure, in the House of Representatives, had they had a tax reform bill alongside the extension of the surtax. But if I were an international banker, I would look with a skeptical eye upon a five-vote majority in the House of Representatives, or a one-vote majority in the Finance Committee, and say that that could be turned over overnight.

I think psychologically—and this is what we are talking about, because we are withholding the money, and we are doing everything that we could do under the surtax—the best thing to do would be to wait until we have both of these bills together, until we can consider them together, and vote overwhelmingly for the surtax and in approval of meaningful, across-the-board tax reforms, which the Senator from New York, the Senator from Delaware, the Senator from Rhode Island, and I, are all concerned about.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me one-half minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Montana may have 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I think we have outlined the argument pretty well here now, except for one thing, and this turns to a party proposition.

The danger here is that this tax reform business, because it is a tough one—but I think its hour has come; that is the answer to Senator Pastore—the hour has come, and even the House of Representatives has now, through its Committee on Ways and Means, acted to reduce the oil depletion allowance. That is the signal. The signal has now been flashed that there will be tax reform.

But laying that aside, I would make the Senator this proposition: Frankly, personally—and I am the author of this whole idea—I am not excited about it, though it is costly, we are paying the cost right now in this inflationary figure of a 0.6-percent increase in the cost of living in 1 month. It is a terrible cost to pay, but I am willing to pay it with the Senator if it could be confined in time, let us say, if I could have the Senator's attention, to a stated period of a few weeks or 30 days, at the most.

It is costly, but nonetheless, there must be some way out. I think what worries people like the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Williams) and myself is that this process may take us into November or December, and that could be disastrous. By then the situation could really get out of hand.

So I would turn to the Senator from Montana and say this—I am not asking him the question, but making a statement, because it would be unfair to ask the question—I would hope the Democratic Policy Committee will assume a degree of discipline itself, cognizant of that fact. This does not have to be formal; we do not have to move to discharge the Finance Committee; but I think if the Democratic Policy Committee will stay tightly together in running this risk for the country and the world, so that, when that bill gets over here, they will be ready to get it out within 2 weeks or less, if that is the case, all our judgments may merge and practicality may solve the problem for us all.

But what Senator Williams and I are concerned about, based on experience, is that this will be a matter of months, and that could be really disastrous.

Mr. METCALF. May I say to my friend, I am not a member of the Democratic policy committee nor a member of the Finance Committee. I am speaking only as a Senator, on the floor of the Senate today.

But speaking as a Senator, I wish to say we are withholding the money today. We are withholding just as much as if we had passed a surtax bill. The whole economic program is underway.

The rise in the cost of living, and so forth, that the Senator has talked about, has taken place in spite of the fact that the withholdings are being continued, and they are going to be continued, and I am sure that the Senate is going to insist that we continue to withhold, so that the ordinary rank and file worker will have his wages withheld just the same as if the surtax is passed, and he will not recognize the difference.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator will give me 30 seconds on that, I have said it many times, but I just want to say it again: It is not the same thing, in terms of its effect on inflation.

May I just point out that the withholding does not assure there will be extension of the surtax. Right now there is no surtax. It may be withheld, and then have to be returned, if there is no surtax extension.

The decisive thing—I am only replying to the Senator—the decisive thing, in terms of the monetary situation and the fiscal situation in our country and the world, I am convinced, is the juridical extension of the surtax, and the withholding will not do it, for the reasons I stated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield me just 1 minute here?

Mr. METCALF. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Delaware, and then I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator mentioned that to continue the withholding has just the same result as extending the tax. That is not correct.

The continued withholding from the standpoint of the wage earners does have the same mathematical results; the Senator is correct on that point. But there are the large taxpayers and the corporations that pay their taxes on an estimated return, and they are not covered under this extension proposal and are not required to pay this surcharge until Congress acts affirmatively on the law itself.

The Treasury pointed out the other day—and I put the report in the Record—that by December there would be a $1,355 million loss in withholding revenue from that group.

Mr. METCALF. By December we can pass both of the bills.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It will involve over $600 million if we do not pass it in the month of August. What are we going to do about the investment credit? Many of the corporations file on a fiscal year basis.

I was talking with the treasurer of one company the other day. Their fiscal year closes August 1. They bought about $10 million worth of equipment that would be eligible for the investment credit if it is not repealed, and that equipment was purchased after the April date mentioned in the House bill.

If they file their return August 1, as they must do under the law, they are required to pay the taxes based on the law as of August 1. That means that they will take their investment credit and then have to file amended returns several months later.

In the meantime they can invest this amount in Treasury bills and collect 6 percent interest on money that should be in the Treasury.

Delayed action is creating a state of confusion in the financial community.

Let us act now. Let us not forget that last year while the Senate was indulging in the same semantics of whether or not it would pass the surcharge the American dollar almost went over the brink. The Senate had to adjourn one Friday about noon to avert a dollar crisis. The Senate was about to vote on the tax bill, but it was admitted the bill was scheduled for defeat. A call was received from the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, who at the time was in Stockholm attending a meeting with the Central Bank of Europe. We were warned that if we did not act affirmatively on the tax bill the dollar would be gone within 48 hours. To avert this dollar crisis and to give the administration enough time to muster the necessary Democratic support for the bill, the Senate adjourned without a vote.

Let us not again gamble with the financial stability of our country in the manner in which it was done last year and the manner in which the Democratic policy committee is now doing.

Surely the Democratic policy committee does not want to be held responsible for triggering a recession in this country, yet that is what can happen if they insist upon following this course of deliberate delaying tactics.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, my only comment is that those large taxpayers are going to have to file adjusted estimated returns anyway. And they are on notice from the House bill as far as the investment credit is concerned. They are prepared, and they must have bookkeeping facilities to take care of it.

No one anticipates that we can pass a surcharge bill before the first of August. I will have some amendments to the surtax bill if it comes up without meaningful tax reform.

Therefore, I again reiterate that a strong Senate vote in behalf of the surtax would be the greatest psychological thing as far as a vote on domestic policy is concerned. The way to get a strong Senate vote is to consider the two measures together.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the debate which has just transpired on the surtax is interesting and I think that it would be amusing to many people when it is recognized that the surtax has been in effect since July 1, 1968; that is, for 1 year.

Yesterday we had a report on the Consumer Price Index for the month of June, when the surtax was in effect legally and every other way. And how effective was the surtax in holding down prices? We had an enormous increase in the cost of living in June.

In the first 6 months of this year, with the surtax in effect, did it work? We had the biggest rise in the cost of living that we have had in 18 years.

The surtax just has not worked.

Senators get up on both sides of the aisle, and they seem to agree that all we have to do to cope with inflation is to extend the surtax. They may feel that way. I do not think the American housewife and taxpayer can feel that way.

I was in Wisconsin this last weekend, and I was shaking hands in a shopping center. One man came up to me and said, "Senator, I don't understand the reason behind the surtax. Do you mean to tell me that because the Government takes from my pocket part of my income so that I don't spend that income, but the Government spends that income, that this somehow is restraining inflation?"

The point that man made is absolutely correct. I think any economist would have to agree that if the Government is going to spend the sums that it raises through taxes, it has an inflationary effect, and perhaps more so, than if the funds were left with the individual taxpayer. That is what has happened.

The one logical, sensible way in which we should try to restrain inflation is to cut back Federal spending. Where do we cut? There are many areas in which we can cut it back—military, space, and other areas.

People argue that the surtax restrains inflation. Of course, if one breaks down the elements in the cost of living that have been inflationary, I think the argument that the surtax is so effective and so essential fades away.

What was the biggest element in the rising cost of living last month? It was the rise in meat prices. Meat prices skyrocketed. Does anyone argue that the surtax can have any real effect on the price of meat?

Does the surtax mean that people are not going to buy as much meat? Does it mean that the meat producer is not going to have as much meat on the market? Obviously not.

Then, when we recognize that the surtax affects less than 1 percent of the gross national product, the $10 billion surtax in a $1 trillion economy, I think it is perfectly obvious that all of the reliance that Senators on both sides of the aisle place on the surtax for restraining inflation is very badly misplaced.

I cannot believe that the moneybags, as one Senator referred to the bankers, who are so anxious, they say, for the surtax, or anyone else with any economic background or intelligence, really thinks that this 10-percent surtax has that kind of significance.

THE RETURN OF THE ASTRONAUTS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Columbia returned. The splashdown is successful. The prayers of the world have been answered. Pride in mankind's achievement is enormous.

Man has left the only planet of which he has knowledge.

Columbia has returned from tranquillity to earth. Let us hope they will bring to mankind some of the tranquillity for which we all pray and strive.

I am reminded, Mr. President, of the words of that old hymn which begins, "Eternal Father, Strong to Save," and of that verse which goes like this:

Hymns 512, 513: verse 3:
O Spirit, whom the Father sent
To spread abroad the firmament
O wind of Heaven, by Thy might
Save all who dare the eagles flight,
And help them by Thy watchful care
From every peril in the air.

THE PASSPORT IMPASSE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, for sometime I have been watching the development of a situation which directly affects the citizens of my State, but which also affects people all over the country. I am referring to the recent difficulty which an American citizen has in obtaining a U.S. passport.

For many years the clerks of both Federal and State courts in Connecticut have accepted passport applications for citizens in the State. The applications were forwarded to the Boston Passport Agency for issuance. This was a very satisfactory procedure.

However, recently both the Federal and State courts in Connecticut began discontinuing this service. This was the result of the increasing amount of actual courtwork which must be performed by the clerks of these courts and of the increasing demand by citizens of my State for passports.

Chief Judge Timbers of the district court at New Haven reported over a 100-percent increase in passport applications in his court alone between 1961 and 1968. He advised that his court simply could not continue the passport function in addition to all its other pressing duties.

In April of this year the State Superior Court of Connecticut, which had previously accepted passport applications in Bridgeport, discontinued this service. Subsequently, passport services were discontinued in New Haven. Then, White Plains, N.Y., refused to accept applications from Connecticut residents due to the mounting volume.

As a result, only one deputy clerk in the Federal court at Hartford was accepting passport applications for the whole State of Connecticut. My office has been deluged with calls and letters from irate citizens of Connecticut concerning the situation.

While I am naturally primarily concerned with the situation in my own State, I know from some of my colleagues that similar situations are developing in Michigan, Texas, Alaska, and elsewhere.

The Passport Office of the State Department maintains 10 passport agencies, in addition to its Washington office, located in strategic cities in the United States.

A little over 50 percent of the applications the Passport Office receives are sent in by clerks of Federal and State courts who accept and execute passport applications from citizens in their immediate communities.

The Passport Office has no control over these clerks and there is nothing it can do if they refuse to continue accepting passport applications.

The blame for this situation cannot be placed on the individual courts.

Increased criminal activity and other legal work have buried the courts.

Add to this the hundreds of thousands of Americans all over the country who want to travel abroad, and are therefore applying for passports.

The courts as they are presently constituted simply cannot handle the workload.

And considering the crime situation in our country, the backlog of court cases, the varied duties of officers of the court, it is obvious that the courts are inadequately staffed now and cannot do more.

The administrative office of the U.S. courts has time and again asked for additional clerks to handle the increased workload, only to be refused.

XUM

Last year Congress denied the courts their request for 183 additional deputy clerks.

Recently, in a supplemental appropriation 83 deputy clerks were authorized for the Federal courts, but the major damage from understaffing has been done.

The additional employees were needed last year and as of today the patchwork solution is too little—too late.

The people of my State are among those who are reaping the harvest of this shortsightedness.

The blame for this deplorable situation cannot, under any circumstances, be placed on the Passport Office.

With its present inadequate complement of personnel and physical facilities, that office is unable to meet the ever-increasing demands of the public for passport services.

The Passport Office and its agencies have been required to put in long hours of overtime work 6 days a week, to keep from being inundated by thousands of applications received each day.

In the past fiscal year alone over $89,000 was spent in overtime pay for passport employees who are exhausted from overtime work pressures. There is a limit to the physical endurance of the personnel involved.

I know the Director of the Passport Office has warned her superiors for years of the growing crisis in the passport field resulting from increased travel.

She has repeatedly asked for funds to provide more flexible measures to meet this crisis.

She has made efficient and practical suggestions for coping with the crisis, but the Department of State has chosen to do nothing but "study the situation."

Year after year the Passport Office has faced arbitrary cuts from its budget despite the fact it is one of those rare organizations in our Federal Government which returns a profit or revenue to the Treasury each year.

In the past 5 years the Passport Office has returned over $33 million to the Treasury and estimates it will return in the neighborhood of over $20 million in the next 2 years.

Why is it that the Passport Office is refused the authority and the funds to open additional passport agencies and service offices which would relieve the pressure on its present agencies and on the clerks of court in our more populous areas?

Why is it continually denied the personnel it needs to maintain its fine reputation of providing efficient service to the American public?

What is the answer for the citizens of my State and for those all over the country?

All we know from answers to our inquiries is the phrase that the Department of State is studying the situation.

This has been going on for years.

Very recently under extreme public pressure and criticism two new deputy Federal clerks of court were assigned to Connecticut, on a temporary 90-day basis, to take passport applications, one to Bridgeport and one to New Haven.

But this is only a temporary solution to a problem which demands a practical and permanent solution.

How soon will it be before the courts, as presently staffed, are again unable to cope with the situation and are again forced to discontinue this service to the public?

Mr. President, there is a solution to this problem.

The Department of State has the authority to establish additional passport field agencies around the country.

It can provide adequate personnel for the Passport Office and the field agencies and further provide emergency assistance to those district courts that are so burdened with passport applicants during the height of the travel season.

Furthermore, instead of reducing the cost of a passport from $15 to $10 for a 5-year period of validity, as was done last year, the Department of State should ask Congress to reestablish the $15 rate and out of these funds which are presently deposited in the U.S. Treasury, make the necessary provision for sufficient funds to restore the efficient and expeditious public service for which the Passport Office has been noted.

These are the simple facts about an outrageous bureaucratic blunder.

The American people deserve better treatment and they should and will get it.

The American taxpayer pays for this service. He wants his money's worth.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF CHAIRMAN BUDGE TO IDS MUTUAL FUNDS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last Friday I wrote to Chairman Hamer Budge, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, asking for an explanation of reports that Budge was negotiating for a position with the IDS—the Investors Diversified Services—mutual funds while he was still Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Chairman Budge has still not clarified his relationship to IDS mutual funds which have over $6 billion in assets, accounting for more than 10 percent of the entire mutual fund industry. In a statement released by Chairman Budge he indicated that he declined an offer to become the president of IDS funds. I said in my letter that I regarded this as a conspicuous and serious conflict of interest.

Although Mr. Budge says he has declined an offer to become president of IDS, the Washington Post has quoted Chairman Budge as saying that negotiations between himself and the IDS funds are still open. In my letter to Chairman Budge, I requested that he specifically affirm that these negotiations have been broken off. The current statement by Chairman Budge does not provide these assurances.

Accordingly, I have asked the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), the Chairman of the Securities Subcommittee of the Senate Banking Committee, to hold hearings on the Budge negotiations with the IDS funds. In view of the importance of getting all of the facts on the record, I believe that early congressional hearings are warranted.

I am delighted that Senator WILLIAMS has agreed to hold hearings on the Budge matter on July 30. I am confident that the hearings chaired by the able Senator from New Jersey can provide the Congress with the information it needs in this sensitive area.

S. 2691—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ELIMINATE CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, for myself and for Messrs. GRIFFIN, HART, MANSFIELD, MCGOVERN, MONDALE, MUSKIE, NELSON, PEARSON, SCHWEIKER, TYDINGS, WILLIAMS of Delaware, and YARBOROUGH, I introduce a bill which would bar Federal contracting or procurement officers from taking jobs with contractors or other direct beneficiaries of the contracts that they have participated personally in granting, awarding, or administering. The bill would bar such employment for a 2-year period.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON) be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, my bill broadens substantially the existing statutory provisions which apply to subsequent employment by Government employees. Generally, those provisions prohibit a former employee of the Federal Government from acting as agent or attorney for any person or corporation in whom—or in which—the United States has a direct and substantial interest, if his representation would involve a matter in which he was personally and substantially involved while he was working for the Government.

The present legislation, which my bill would amend, is so weak as to be virtually ineffectual. In fact, only one case has been brought under this very narrow proscription during the 7 years of existence.

Let me cite an example of just how weak this present law is. During the course of hearings last month, before my Economy in Government Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, on the military budget and national economic priorities, it came to light that five former Air Force officers had blocked efforts to cut costs on the Minuteman missile guidance and control system. Obviously, in doing that, they helped the contractor. They blocked efforts to cut the cost the contractor was submitting. Subsequently, these officers accepted executive jobs with the system's manufacturer, the Autonetics Division, or with the parent company, North American Rockwell.

I do not know how there could be a more conspicuous and direct conflict of the interest of the taxpayer and the Government.

I urged the Attorney General, in a letter on June 23, to take immediate action on these charges. A few days ago, on July 17, the Assistant Attorney General, Will Wilson, replied that the Justice Department found no indication of a violation of the conflict of interest statutes.

XUM

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of the Justice Department's letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., July 17, 1969.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your letter dated June 23, 1969, wherein you forwarded to the Department information obtained during the hearings before the Subcommittee on Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee concerning alleged violations of the conflict of interest statutes by five former Air Force officers who went to work for the Autonetics Division of North American Rockwell Corporation after they retired from military service. The information furnished has been carefully examined and reviewed by the Criminal Division in regard to possible violations of criminal statutes. Our review did not encompass possible infractions of the Code of Ethics or the Standards of Conduct for Government employees because the enforcement of these provisions are within the jurisdiction and responsibility of the Department of Defense and the Civil Service Commission.

There are generally four criminal statutes which concern the area of your inquiry. These statutes are Title 18, United States Code, Sections 207, 208, 281 and 283.

Section 207 is a twofold statute. Subsection (a) prohibits any former employee from *acting as agent or attorney* for anyone other than the United States in connection with any "particular matter" in which the United States is a party and in which matter he personally and substantially participated while he was a Government employee. This is a lifetime bar. It is to be noted that the former employee must act as an agent or attorney. The office of the Attorney General stated in a January 28, 1963, *Memorandum Regarding Conflict of Interest Provisions of Public Law 87–849* (which can be found in the supplement to Section 201 of Title 18, U.S.C.A., and also at 28 F.R. 985) that—

An individual who has left an agency to accept private employment may, for example, immediately perform technical work in his company's plant in relation to a contract for which he had official responsibility—or, for that matter, in relation to one he helped the agency negotiate.

Subsection 207(b) basically prohibits a former Government employee for one year from *personally appearing* before any court or Federal department or agency *as an agent or attorney* for any party other than the United States in connection with any particular matter involving a specific party in which the United States is a party and which particular matter was under his official responsibility while he was a Government employee. Official responsibility is defined in 18 U.S.C. 202(b).

It can, therefore, be readily seen that both of these subsections require some act of a representational nature on the part of the former Government employee before they are violated.

With regard to retired officers of the Armed Forces of the United States, there are two additional statutes. Section 281 of Title 18, United States Code, forbids any retired officer to "*represent* any person in the sale of anything to the Government through the department in whose service he holds a retired status." (Emphasis supplied.)

Section 283 of Title 18, U.S.C., forbids a retired officer for a period of two years after his retirement to—

. . . *act as agent or attorney for prosecuting or assisting in the prosecution of any claim* against the United States involving the Department in whose service he holds a retired status, or to allow any such retired officer to *act as agent or attorney for prosecuting or assisting in the prosecution of any claim* against the United States involving any subject matter with which he was directly connected while he was in an active-duty status. (Emphasis supplied.)

It can readily be observed that once again both of these statutes require some act of a representational nature by the retired officer. It is to be noted that these statutes are a prohibition against the retired officer selling to his former service (Section 281) and acting as agent for prosecuting or assisting in the prosecution of any claim. It is to be further noted that the term "claim" is not as broad as those particular matters set forth in Section 207 of Title 18, U.S.C.

There also exists a provision of Section 208 of Title 18, U.S.C., which requires a Government employee to notify his superiors if he is negotiating employment with any firm with which he is officially dealing as a Government employee. There are no criminal statutes which prohibit a retired military officer from being employed by a corporation or company solely because he had been dealing with that corporation or company in his official capacity as a Government employee. There is a non-criminal statute (37 U.S.C. 801(c)) which provides, in essence, that a regular retired officer shall not receive his retirement benefits if, within three years after his retirement, he engages for himself or for others in the selling or contracting for the sale or negotiating for the sale of any supplies or war materials to any agency of the Department of Defense. It can be observed that this statute also requires a representational act.

The information supplied in your letter and its enclosure is insufficient to indicate a violation of any of the aforementioned statutes. While there exists an opportunity for possible conflict of interest violations to occur when a former Government employee takes a position such as described in your letter, the employment is not, in and of itself, a violation. In view of the fact that thousands of Government employees leave Federal service for private employment each year, evidence that there is a specific allegation of a violation, and not a mere opportunity for the violation to have been committed, is needed to justify the initiation of a criminal investigation. If, however, you have additional facts sufficient to indicate the existence of a violation, I assure you that the matter will be thoroughly investigated and evaluated for possible criminal prosecution.

I hope this letter has helped clarify the existing law in this difficult area.

Sincerely,

WILL WILSON,
Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. I am interested in the Senator's remark that Air Force officers, while in the military services, arranged to stop the cutting of the cost of an item which was to be manufactured and sold to the military. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. This was the Minuteman missile guidance and control system, and the contractor was the Autonetics Division of North American Rockwell.

Mr. MURPHY. Was any reason given why they did not want the cost cut?

Mr. PROXMIRE. There was some discussion and debate on that. They felt that the cost should not be cut, that it would be a burden or would be unfair to the contractor. Other officers of the Air Force testified before our subcommittee that they felt that the cost should have been cut. It is possible that the officers who felt that the cost should not be cut were right and their critics wrong.

The point I make is that the officers who helped the contractor by fighting to keep the costs up were rewarded by finding employment with the very contractor who benefited by their decision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Justice Department said that under the present law, this was not a violation of the conflict-of-interest statutes.

Mr. MURPHY. I would be very interested in reading the testimony.

It would seem to me very strange that men in the military would insist that they keep the cost up, unless they had a very good reason, unless there was some particular technical reason, unless the possibility existed that, by cutting the cost, they might in some way impair the efficiency of the guidance system. I think that is most important. Will the Senator's committee go into the details of that?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, the committee did, and the witnesses did; and this is moot and debatable. It may well be that the officers who took this action were right. I do not think they were. I think the preponderance of the evidence indicated that they were wrong in taking it.

But whether they were right or wrong, I am convinced—and I think most American taxpayers and citizens would be convinced—that they were wrong in taking that position and immediately going to work for the contractor who benefited by that decision; that we should have laws that are effective enough to prevent that kind of situation.

Mr. MURPHY. If there is a conflict of interest, if they made a deal with North American Rockwell and said, "Look here, we are going to help you keep your price up, and you give us a job later on," they should go to jail. But if these are two separate and completely divided incidents in which in one case they thought the price should remain rather than be cut and thereby impair the efficiency of the guidance system, and then subsequently, because of their training or expertise and knowledge, North American Rockwell hired them, because of their background, and the two things were unrelated, I think that is an entirely different case. That is why I rose to ask my distinguished colleague the question. In one case, there should be no question that they should go to jail. In the other case, I think we must be very cautious not to say that simply, because a man was in the Air Force and now goes to work for Lockheed or someone else—we have just been through the discussion about Lockheed, in which there was an implication of all sorts of wrongdoing. At the conclusion of the hearings, I do not think that the committee found any indication that was not known, that had not been reported to Congress, and it was not what it appeared to be.

This was my only purpose for questioning.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I undertand that.

My point in bringing this matter up is that the present conflict of interest statutes are inadequate. I am not at this time citing these men, although I did ask the Department of Justice to inquire as to whether their action was legal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the most significant statement in the letter from the Justice Department is this sentence from the last paragraph:

> While there exists an opportunity for possible conflict of interest violations to occur when a former Government employee takes a position such as described in your letter, the employment is not, in and of itself a violation.

My view is that this employment should be a violation. It is perfectly proper for those Air Forces officials and Army and Navy officials, in my view, to work for a defense contractor, but not for the defense contractor with whom they were dealing just before they left their Federal employment.

In other words, present legislation is too weak to reach this flagrant example, this outrageous flaunting of the public interest.

The bill I am introducing today would remedy that situation, and make this type of activity a violation of Federal law, subject to criminal penalties.

My bill would bar an employee who participated personally and substantially in the granting, awarding, or administration of a contract or grant from taking a job within 2 years of terminating his Federal employment with anyone who has a direct or substantial interest in the contract or grant. The penalty for violating this bar would be a maximum fine of $10,000 and/or a maximum prison sentence of 2 years.

This legislation is designed to cut down on the incentive for Federal contracting and procurement officers to make lucrative awards to private companies and then leave the Federal Government to accept a generous job offer from one of those companies. The ultimate effect should be to cut down substantially on the tremendous cost overruns that the Federal Government has been experiencing on its contracts.

The bill will apply to those individuals who play an important role in the decisional process which confers a financial benefit upon a contractor, grantee, claimant, or any other beneficiary. However, I do not intend to prevent any Federal officer or employee who works for the procurement or grant office, or who has responsibility over it, from taking subsequent employment with any beneficiary of Federal largesse. My bill would only prevent such employees from taking jobs with those contractors or grantees who have benefited directly from some action on their part—the participation must be personal and it must be substantial. The pro forma signature of the Secretary of Defense on a procurement authorization, for example, would not, in my opinion, constitute personal and substantial involvement such as to bar subsequent employment under this bill.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Would the proposed legislation apply in the matter of subcontractors?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, I think it would apply to subcontractors or prime contractors.

Mr. MURPHY. In other words, subcontractors might be denied for 2 years the right of applying for employment in as many as 300 different industries.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No. He would be denied only from applying for employment with the firm with which he had directly and explicitly worked on a contract or award and for which he was directly responsible.

Mr. MURPHY. My question is directed to a situation of this type. In case of a Boeing 707 probably 35 or 40 subcontractors are involved in the major contract. Suppose a man were the project officer in charge of developing, let us say, the military version, Air Force 1 or Air Force 2. Would he be denied the right to apply for employment with all subcontractors involved in that major contract?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The legislation would prohibit him from going to any company which has a direct or substantial interest. In the hypothetical example where there is a prime contractor who deals with the subcontractors, the Federal employee who had supervision over the prime contract, in most cases, would not be prohibited in going to work for a subcontractor unless he worked on that particular part of the contract with which the subcontractor was connected.

Mr. MURPHY. If he were the contract officer I would think he would be involved in all of them. In other words, if he were in charge of the development, I would think the Senator's proposed bill would then not permit him to engage with any of the subcontractors or any of the manufacturers of components that went into that aircraft. I do not think that is the Senator's intention, but I wish to point out that it might be the construction.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

This legislation is not solely limited to the process of negotiating, awarding, or letting a Federal contract or grant. Administration of the contract would also give rise to the statutory bar; this would encompass inspection, implementation, supervision, or any other act relating to the determination whether proper performance standards are being satisfied. Moreover, it should be noted that the bill is designed to encompass in the broadest terms the types of activity that may be involved; "personal and substantial" participation may result from decision, approval, disapproval, recommendation, the rendering of advice, investigation, or any other type of direct involvement in the decisionmaking process.

Finally, I would like to point out that the term "anyone" as used in the bill should receive the broadest possible construction. It may mean a private individual, a corporation, a partnership, a corporate subsidiary—indeed, any type of enterprise other than the United States. This is qualified only by the proviso that is to be added by the second part of my bill—section 2(c)—which permits a former Federal employee to go to work for a State or local government or an educational institution within the 2-year period if the head of his former department or agency certifies that his subsequent employment is in the national interest.

Mr. President, reform of the standards of ethics and conflict of interest for governmental officers and employees is long overdue. The problem of the Government employee who goes to work for the private sector, and what kinds of activity the law should permit him to engage in prior and subsequent to his transfer, is one of the most critical parts of this overall question; yet this is an area that has received comparatively little attention up until now.

I believe that recent reports of gigantic overruns on Federal contracts have highlighted the need for reform in this area. The bill which I am introducing today can meet this need.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2691) to amend Public Law 87–849, approved October 23, 1962, to strengthen provisions relating to disqualification of former Federal officers and employees in matters connected with former duties and official responsibilities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2691

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, Subsection (a) of section 1 of Public Law 87–849 approved October 23, 1962 (76 Stat. 1123), pertaining to disqualification of former officers and employees in matters connected with former duties or official responsibilities, and disqualification of partners, is hereby amended by inserting after the word "responsibility" at the end of subparagraph (b) a new subparagraph (c) as follows:

"(c) Whoever, having been an officer or employee of the executive branch of the United States Government, or any independent agency of the United States, or of the District of Columbia, including a special Government employee, and who, having participated personally and substantially during the last two years of such employment as such officer or employee, through decision,

XUM

approval, disapproval, recommendation, the rendering of advice, investigation, or otherwise, in the granting, awarding, or administration of any contract, bid, grant, or procurement authorization whose total value exceeds $10,000, is employed in any capacity within two years after his employment has ceased by anyone other than the United States who has a direct and substantial interest in the contract, bid, grant, or procurement authorization in which he participated personally and substantially while so employed."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 1 of Public Law 87–849 is hereby further amended by—

(a) striking, after the word "responsibility" at the end of the second subparagraph the dash "—", and inserting in lieu thereof ", or";

(b) inserting, after the words "That nothing in subsection (a) or (b)" in the third subparagraph the words "or (c)";

(c) striking the period "." after the word "employee" at the end of the third subparagraph, inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon ";", and inserting further the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That nothing in subsection (a) or (b) or (c) prevents a former officer or employee from becoming employed by an agency of any State or local government or any educational institution if the head of his former department or agency shall make a certification in writing, published in the Federal Register, that the national interest would be served by such employment, and that such former officer or employee may act as agent or attorney during such employment on any matter formerly within his official responsibility or in which he has personally and substantially participated if the certification shall so state."; and

(d) striking at the beginning of the fourth subparagraph the clause designation "(c)" and inserting in lieu thereof the clause designation "(d)".

THE RETURN OF APOLLO 11

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, in these good hours of shared joy it is well to remember that the cold, barren moon has brought men closer together than the warm, rich earth we share. For ages men have walked this planet together, but it has taken man's step on earth's satellite to create the unique oneness of these moments.

As we herald the wonders of technology and the courage of our lunar explorers, let us not overlook the triumphant harmony of a voyage shared by all mankind. This momentary accord follows the exulting realization that a dream has come true. One dream has come true. How many dreams remain unfulfilled?

Man's dream of a peaceful planet preceded his quest for knowledge of the heavens. Men envisioned a better world before they thought of traveling to another planet. Man is not a one-dream being. Mankind sustains itself on a multitude of dreams.

For 8 days men's eyes have been cast toward the heavens directed by a common aspiration. Now as we lower our eyes and glance sideward at our fellow man, hopefully we will not forget that this unity of the moment can be extended in the harmony of the ages.

All mankind has shared a dream. It has come true. All mankind still shares many dreams of a better world at peace. Today I know these dreams can come true. Tomorrow we may doubt again.

OUR NATION'S FINEST HOUR

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I join with all Americans and with men and women the world over in giving thanks for the safe return of Astronauts Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin, and Michael Collins. Their fulfillment of one of mankind's most ancient dreams will be remembered as long as there is recorded history.

I am especially proud of the fact that the first man to set foot on the moon was a native son of Ohio. Two brothers from Ohio, Orville and Wilbur Wright, were the first men to fly successfully in a heavier-than-air machine more than 60 years ago. It was fitting that destiny called upon a young man from a small town in Ohio to be the first man to set foot on a celestial body.

Neil Armstrong, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Armstrong, spent most of his early life in Wapakoneta, Ohio, where he was born on August 5, 1930. Local residents recall that he rode his bicycle to a flying field outside of Wapakoneta and obtained his pilot's license on his 16th birthday, before he had a license to drive a car.

Like most other Americans of his generation, Neil Armstrong served in our Armed Forces as a naval aviator from 1949 to 1952. He flew 78 combat missions during the Korean war.

Mr. President, following his service in the Navy, this young Ohioan achieved higher education with the help of the GI bill. This forward-looking legislation helped Neil Armstrong on his climb up the ladder of success which has taken him to the moon. This points out once again the tremendous benefits that have accrued to our Nation as a result of millions of young Americans who were able to go to college under the GI bill.

The courage of the three astronauts inspired us all. However, it took the skill, talent, and industry of millions of Americans, and the tax dollars of every American, to make their achievement possible. The moon landing utilized the accumulated knowledge of all mankind. In a way it represented the sum total of all that man has learned throughout the ages. While it was a great national achievement, it also was truly a remarkable human accomplishment.

Five hundred years from now I predict that 1969 will be remembered by people the world over the same as 1492 is now remembered. Earlier this year occurrences in our country paralleled said occurrences early in 1492. In Europe then, the great plague had caused the death of one-third of the millions of men, women, and children. The Nuremberg Chronicle in a folio dated July 9, 1492, made the forecast that the world would end in fire and flood before the end of 1492. In that period men and women in Western Europe looked to the future with foreboding and dread. Institutions were decaying. Intelligent men and women were desperate, cynical. They felt hopeless and helpless. There was a fad prevalent throughout Western Europe to glorify the pagan past.

Now, in 1969, we remember those dread forecasts that California was doomed and would fall into the Pacific Ocean. In fact the date April 15, 1969, was fixed by some mystics as the exact time that California would slide into the Pacific. Hundreds of people fled from California to escape death. There is dissent and disorder wracking our society.

Yet, in 1492, very shortly after those gloomy forecasts of destruction had been made a small Spanish caravel sailed into Lisbon Harbor with news of the discovery of a new world. A historian of the Middle Ages writes that a complete and astounding change then took place. Sir Charles Oman, an Englishman, stated:

> A new envisagement of the world has begun and men will no longer talk about some imaginary golden age of the distant past.

Men and women hopeful and rejoicing were speculating as to the golden age that might lie in the oncoming future.

Our fine scientists in NASA who planned Apollo 11 and those brave astronauts who made this tremendous voyage to the moon have not made any predictions that a golden age lies ahead, but astronauts Neil Armstrong and Edwin Aldrin have made the greatest achievement in known history. It is noteworthy that when they planted the American flag on the moon, no claim of any right of conquest or territorial expansion was made. A treaty entered into in 1967 between the only two powers with the capacity to explore outer space, the Soviet Union and the United States, solemnly provides that the exploration of outer space is for purposes of peace. The orbiting or stationing of nuclear weapons in space has been specifically prohibited.

The discovery of America by Columbus in 1492 brought on a golden age. The achievement of Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin, and Mike Collins, and all associated with them, now marks the advent of a golden age and the dread and forebodings of earlier this year are discarded just as were those forebodings of early 1492.

In James A. Michener's book, "The Bridges of Toko-Ri," an American admiral on the bridge of his carrier early one morning ponders the subject of his brave men, thinking to himself he asks the question of the wind. Perhaps this is the question that all of us should ask ourselves as we think of the men who finally made it to the moon and also the men who backed them up and got them there. "Why is America lucky enough to have such men? Where did we get such men?"

THERE MUST BE REAL TAX REFORM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is extremely important for the welfare of the American people that before this first session of the 91st Congress adjourns, we must enact into law meaningful tax reform of a far-reaching scale helpful to every family and every corporation in our Nation.

XUM

Meaningful income tax reform, in my judgment, means plugging tax loopholes such as the nortorious oil depletion allowance of 27½ percent. This was enacted years ago as a compromise between those Congressmen willing to allow at that time a 25-percent depletion allowance and those Congressmen favoring gas and oil producing corporations seeking a 30-percent depletion allowance. If there were ever any justification for an oil depletion allowance of 27½ percent, that justification no longer exists. This oil depletion allowance should be reduced to 20 percent at the most, as recommended by the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. I believe it should be reduced at this time to 10 percent.

Genuine income tax reform means legislation to provide some Federal income tax on bonds issued by municipalities and States. These bonds are now totally tax exempt. They are eagerly purchased by extremely wealthy men and women of our Nation and placed in their vaults. These individuals, although their incomes may exceed $100,000, $500,000, or a million dollars a year, pay no income taxes whatever. They enjoy cutting the coupons, receiving the interest checks, and banking the money. Of course, such bonds should be subjected to some tax so that no individual is permitted a complete tax-free shelter.

In addition, it is the duty of this Congress to consider some different formula of taxing long-term capital gains and fixing the period of long-term capital gains.

Also, it has been scandalous that special treatment has been given for stock options, accelerated depreciation on speculative real estate and payment of estate taxes by redemption of Government bonds at par.

The loophole must be closed that permits wealthy owners of so-called "Gettysburg farms" to charge off as losses thousands of dollars a year, while at the same time the land value is increasing.

All loopholes whereby some individuals receive and have been over the years receiving special privileges must be plugged.

It is essential that Congress should enact into law substantial income tax reform legislation to stabilize our economy and equalize our tax system. Families with incomes of from $3,300 per year to $14,000 per year bear an extremely heavy income tax burden. Due to tax loopholes such as depletion allowances and many tax-exempt foundations, which were really created to evade payment of taxes, the extremely wealthy evade payment of their fair share of taxes. If such private tax-exempt foundations would be subjected to but 5 percent income tax on net investments, this would bring in some additional billions of dollars.

In 1967, 21 persons with incomes exceeding $1 million, 35 with incomes exceeding $500,000, and 150 with incomes exceeding $200,000 paid no income taxes. Also, oil- and gas-producing corporations in some instances paid but 6 percent—and some paid no income taxes whatever—while a workingman receiving but $4,500 paid approximately 20 percent in Federal income taxes. This, due to the indefensible 27½-percent oil depletion allowance.

We must ease the tax burden on low- and moderate-income families. President Nixon's proposal to continue the 10-percent surtax should not be considered unless it is made part of a wide-ranging tax reform proposal effectively closing tax loopholes. Also, the personal income tax exemption must be increased from $600 to at least $1,000 a year.

Income taxes should be levied according to ability to pay. Essential tax reform must include removing tax loopholes favoring the wealthy and eliminating altogether income taxes from families with incomes under $3,300.

If the surtax is extended without substantial and equitable income tax reforms, the battle to achieve tax justice may well be lost. The allegations by administration leaders that failure to extend the surtax will result in massive inflation is pure political propaganda. The surtax has been in effect for more than a year; inflation continues to run rampant. If the surtax does in some small way reduce inflationary tendencies, then by continuing a temporary extension of the withholding rate, the same effect can be obtained.

The surtax bill, as reported by the Senate Finance Committee, is unfair to the great majority of American taxpayers. The surtax extension must be considered simultaneously with income tax reform. That is what taxpayers demand. That is what taxpayers deserve.

Mr. President, I report that for more than 10 years as a U.S. Senator, and prior to that as a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, I have studied the tax structure of our country and the problem of tax loopholes. Very definitely, I know that the 27½-percent depletion allowance has enabled some of our Nation's oil and gas producing corporations to pay less than 6 percent of their net profits, and a few pay no income taxes whatever from their huge earnings.

In 1967, one of our greatest oil producing corporations, the Atlantic Refining Co., by reason of the 27½-percent depletion allowance, paid no income tax whatever upon its tremendous net profits for that year. This corporation has now been merged with the Richfield Oil Co., and last year the Atlantic-Richfield Corp., of which I am a stockholder, paid but approximately 6 percent of its net earnings to our Government as taxes. This due to the 27½-percent depletion allowance.

Mr. President, if a personal reference may be adverted to I report that I own more than 6,000 shares in oil-producing companies including 2,000 shares of Phillips Petroleum and many shares of Continental Oil, Mobil Oil, and Atlantic-Richfield and other oil producing corporations. Just recently in the envelope with a dividend check from one of the oil and gas-producing companies in which I am a stockholder, I believe it was Occidental Petroleum, came the urgent request that I, as a stockholder, immediately write to my Congressman urging that he vote to maintain the present 27½-percent depletion allowance. Frankly, Mr. President, I am not about to do that. However, this definitely explains why all of my Senate colleagues receive a large number of these letters urging them to continue this 27½-percent depletion allowance. This is an income tax loophole favoring the wealthy men and women of our country and greatly favoring huge corporations. It is a loophole which truly should be closed. Very definitely, no private selfish considerations will influence me nor cause me to change my views nor to change my vote. I will vote in the public interest to close this depletion allowance tax loophole of 27½ percent.

I report with pleasure, Mr. President, I voted and spoke out against imposing that 10-percent tax on a tax, or surcharge. In the year following its enactment there was more uncontrolled inflation than before. I am opposed to continuing this 10-percent tax on top of a tax unless accompanied by meaningful tax reform.

VOTING AGE SHOULD BE LOWERED TO 18

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, youngsters who are 18 years old should have the right to vote at National and State elections. Frequently, we hear the claim that 18-year-olds, old enough to be drafted and to fight in Vietnam, are old enough to vote. This is not a valid argument. It is, in fact, a perfect example of a non sequitur. The real reason 18-year-olds are entitled to vote is that a youngster of today upon graduation from high school has attained a better education and is better informed than a college graduate of 30 or 40 years ago. Boys and girls of 18 may not be smarter than 18-year-olds of a generation past, and I do not believe they are, but they are certainly better informed, more knowledgeable about what is going on in the world, better trained and better educated and more knowledgeable on all matters, foreign and domestic, than youngsters of 10, 20, 30, or 40 years ago. With television tuned in and radios blaring, of course, youngsters acquire more knowledge than those of preceding generations.

I believe that this generation of young people is the best ever—that they are healthier, quicker of mind, and better trained than their predecessors. Also, that there is a moral energy in this generation that exceeds that of 18-year-old boys and girls of any previous generations.

There is no reason for assuming that 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds are not capable of casting a responsible vote. Most of those young people have completed high school and more are attending college than ever before in our history. They are clearly as capable as other Americans in the effective use of the franchise.

Over the years I have met with hundreds of groups of college students and high school students and other young people. I know that today they are better informed than many others in our society. Their interest in public affairs and their potential for public service at home and abroad has been clearly shown through their participation in the Peace

XUM

Corps, VISTA, and through the active part that millions of young Americans have played in the political events of recent years.

In the midst of great ferment in our colleges and universities, we must reiterate our faith in our youth and in the ability of the great majority of them to cope with the problems which beset our society and affect the welfare of our Nation for many years to come.

SAFE RETURN TO EARTH OF APOLLO 11

Mrs. **SMITH.** Mr. President, I am deeply grateful for the safe return of the three astronauts. I am deeply grateful and gratified that this mission was so amazingly successful.

The commitment to which the late President John F. Kennedy pledged this Nation has been kept. Let us remember that on May 25, 1961, before a joint session of Congress then President John F. Kennedy spoke specifically on what he termed to be "urgent national needs" and stated:

> ~~First,~~ I believe that this nation should commit itself to achieving the goal, before this decade is out, of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to earth.

That pledge and commitment have now been fulfilled. Two American astronauts landed on the moon on July 20, 1969, walked on the moon on that date, and returned safely to earth on July 24, 1969.

This unprecedented achievement came only after the dedicated and determined efforts of hundreds of thousands of workers in the space program. It came after not only disheartening setbacks but in spite of the derision and derogation made against the space program and its justification. Our Nation is, indeed, fortunate that the men and women in the space program were not so fainthearted and not of such little faith as to surrender to those who would have terminated the program prior to this epic achievement.

I am deeply grateful to all of the men and women who carried forth in this program. I am grateful to Lyndon B. Johnson and Richard Nixon for keeping the faith with, and the pledge of, John F. Kennedy to have this Nation land a man on the moon and safely return him to earth.

But I am most grateful of all to James E. Webb, who never lost his faith, dedication, and determination through the most trying times when he and the program were under intense attack. I hope that Americans everywhere will never forget that it was James E. Webb, who provided the primary leadership and unreservedly accepted the primary responsibility for the space program for most of its years and literally was the driving force for it until his recent retirement.

APOLLO 11 IS HOME

Mr. **ANDERSON.** Mr. President, Apollo 11 is home. Men have landed on the moon and have returned safely to earth. Astronauts Neil Armstrong, Michael Collins, and Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr., along with the thousands on the ground have conducted an almost flawless mission. I congratulate all those involved and thank them for their dedication. Their performance and what they have done for their country and all of mankind goes far beyond anything I might say.

Mr. President, not only is the Apollo 11 mission a triumph of man but it is also a triumph for our way of life and for our form of government which permitted it to be accomplished in full view of everyone on earth who cared to watch—and hundreds of millions of people all over the world did watch. It, therefore, is disturbing that some of our colleagues are quoted as saying that they rule out further space efforts until problems here on earth are solved; they take the position that only when we solve those problems can we consider further space efforts. It is said that it is their view that the needs of the people on earth and especially the people of this country should have priority. They sum this up by calling for a revision of national priorities to meet the problems of war, poverty, and hunger on earth.

Mr. President, what is the space program if it is not a program for the people? All of the money spent on the program is spent in the United States and if there is a program that has done more for all of the people on earth than the space program, then I would like to know what it is. I would like to know what those who want to stop further space exploration propose to provide the people with the exhilaration and togetherness that is being provided by the Apollo 11 and was provided by the earlier Apollo flights.

They talk of poverty—and there are some in this country who are poor—yet never at any time in the history of man has a nation's people lived anywhere near as well as do the people of the United States today. They call for more money to meet the problem of poverty and hunger but there is already $26.9 billion in the budget for Federal aid to the poor. According to the fiscal year 1970 budget, there are 22 million people in this country classified as poor; this means that there is well over $1,200 in this year's budget for every person in the United States classified as poor. This means that for every family of five classified as poor, there is $6,000 in the Federal budget and this does not include what is available from the State and local governments; nor does it include any private income. It seems to me that this is a substantial financial effort on the part of the Federal Government to fight poverty.

Mr. President, the fact is that we cannot solve, nor can any other nation solve, all problems simply by the expenditure of money.

If the United States is now going to wait until every urban and social problem is solved before moving ahead on other important fronts, then, of course, this country will no longer continue to move ahead because we will never solve all of our problems. The best we can do is to recognize problem areas and work as hard as we can to find and eradicate problem causes. This we must do now if we expect to erase poverty, crime, and pollution, to provide better housing, and to build better transportation systems. But, Mr. President, the solutions to these problems are not wholly financial or technical. If they were, we could solve them now. In some instances we do not understand the problem, in others, there are legal, economic, or political aspects of these problems which are simply not amenable to solution within the constraints of our present institutions. This means that the institutions must be changed, but we must go about such changes slowly because whatever the limitations of our present institutions, they are better than anything man has ever had before. So, Mr. President, I would like to say that those who speak glibly of providing for the other needs of the people have not looked around this country and those who talk of the revision of the national priorities with a suggestion that we must further limit the space program to meet some of the other problems we have, simply do not understand the needs of the American people.

The flight of Apollo 11 to the moon will rank as man's most epic journey and as one of his most noble achievements. For the first time man has journeyed to another celestial body and set foot on it. We are not able at this time to comprehend the full significance of this accomplishment, but even the historic voyages of Prince Henry the Navigator, Columbus, and Magellan hardly measure up to the epic voyage of Apollo 11. Yet, it was hundreds of years before the full significance of these earlier explorations were felt by civilization.

Mr. President, if we are to continue to advance civilization—if this country is to provide as well for its people in the future, as it does now—then we must be willing to struggle at the limits of our technological capability for only when a civilization does that, does it advance. To stop the momentum of the space program now would indeed be a tragedy—a tragedy from which we as a Nation might not recover.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The **VICE PRESIDENT** laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ALASKA POWER SURVEY

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a publication entitled "Alaska Power Survey," dated 1969 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE ARTS

A letter from the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on the Arts, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Cultural Presentations Program of the Department of State for the fiscal year 1968, dated January 1969 (with an accompanying tabulation and report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effectiveness and administration of the Albuquerque Job Corps Center for Women under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964,

XUM

Albuquerque, N. Mex., Office of Economic Opportunity dated July 24, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report Made to Congress of Micronesia

A letter from the Chairman, The Future Political Status Commission, Saipan, Mariana Islands, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a report made to the Congress of Micronesia, by that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Rockland County School Board of Supervisors, New York City, N.Y., remonstrating against the inclusion of municipal bonds within the present tax reform proposal; to the Committee on Finance.

RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF STORM LAKE, IOWA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution from the city council of Storm Lake, Iowa, on the subject of tax reform, and ask that it be printed in the Record and referred to the Finance Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution, presented by Mr. Miller, is as follows:

Resolution

Whereas a number of bills are under consideration in the United States House of Representatives concerning Federal Income Tax Reform, and

Whereas some of said tax reform measures provide for taxation and interest on state and municipal bonds that are presently exempt from federal taxation; and

Whereas any proposal to tax interest on state and municipal government bonds would make it most difficult and expensive to finance various city projects by the sale of municipal bonds: Now therefore be it hereby

Resolved, That the City Council, City of Storm Lake, Iowa, go on record as being opposed to any tax reform legislation that would alter the present tax exempt status on interest from municipal bonds and do hereby direct that the City Clerk certify a copy of this Resolution to Representative Wiley Mayne, Senator Harold Hughes, and Senator Jack Miller and ranking members of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Passed and adopted this 2nd day of July, A.D. 1969.

John L. Evans,
Mayor.

Attest:

Claude M. Thompson,
City Clerk.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mrs. SMITH, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 59. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Army National Guard Facility, Ethan Allen, and the United States Army Materiel Command Firing Range, Underhill, Vermont (Rept. No. 91-335).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session, the following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Gen. John P. McConnell (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general; and

Gen. John D. Ryan (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be appointed as Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force.

By Mrs. SMITH, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nominations of 21 general and flag officers in the Army, Navy, and Air Force. I ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered placed on the Executive Calendar, are as follows:

Vice Adm. Kleber S. Masterson, U.S. Navy, and Rear Adm. Robert J. Stroh, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral when retired;

Lt. Gen. Seth J. McKee (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of general while so serving;

Lt. Gen. John C. Meyer (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force; and Lt. Gen. Jack J. Catton (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of generals while so serving;

Maj. Gen. Harry E. Goldsworty, Regular Air Force; Maj. Gen. John W. Vogt, Jr., Regular Air Force; Maj. Gen. Timothy F. O'Keefe, Regular Air Force; Maj. Gen. George S. Boylan, Jr., Regular Air Force; Maj. Gen. George B. Simler, Regular Air Force; Maj. Gen. David C. Jones, Regular Air Force; and Maj. Gen. Paul K. Carlton, Regular Air Force; to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenants general while so serving;

Col. Clarence E. Atkinson, Delaware Air National Guard; Col. William J. Crisler, Mississippi Air National Guard; Col. Jack Motes, California Air National Guard; and Col. Earl G. Pate, Jr., Tennessee Air National Guard, for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the U.S. Air Force, in the grade of brigadiers general;

Rear Adm. C. Edwin Bell, Jr., U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving;

Maj. Gen. William Joseph McCaffrey, U.S. Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general while so serving;

Lt. Gen. Richard Giles Stilwell, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), for appointment as senior U.S. Army member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations;

Lt. Gen. Harry William Osborn Kinnard, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list, in the grade of lieutenant general; and

Maj. Gen. George Irvin Forsythe, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in addition to the above I report favorably 2,326 nominations for appointment and promotion in the Army in the grade of colonel and below; 817 appointments in the Air Force in the grade of lieutenant colonel and below; and 108 appointments in the Marine Corps in the grade of captain and below. Since these names have already been printed in the Congressional Record, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

Claude W. Abate, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Garland S. Bishop, and sundry other staff noncommissioned officers, for temporary appointment in the Marine Corps;

Hugh E. Loftin, and sundry other officers, for permanent appointment in the Marine Corps;

Laverne F. Huston, for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Air Force;

Robert J. Balint, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force;

Col. William R. Jarrell, Jr., for appointment as Registrar, U.S. Air Force Academy;

Richard H. White, cadet of the U.S. Air Force Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force;

Jimmie B. Kinder, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Otrie B. Barrett, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Glenn E. Nida, for reappointment in the active list of the Regular Army of the United States; and

Gerald D. Cox, scholarship student, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States.

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

William S. Thompson, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the District of Columbia court of general sessions.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FONG:

S. 2686. A bill for the relief of William Phillips;

S. 2687. A bill for the relief of Kwan Yuen Leung; and

S. 2688. A bill for the relief of Horacio P. Monzon, Jr., and wife, Avelina Ramos Monzon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUYE (for himself, Mr. Fong, Mr. Hollings, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Mathias, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Thurmond, and Mr. Prouty):

S. 2689. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same tax exemption for servicemen in and around Korea as is presently provided for those in Vietnam; to the Committee on Finance.

(The remarks of Mr. Inouye when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. DODD:

S. 2690. A bill to authorize and request the President to proclaim April 11 of each year as "National Submarine Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself, Mr. Eagleton, Mr. Griffin, Mr. Hart, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Schweiker, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Williams of Delaware, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 2691. A bill to amend Public Law 87-849, approved October 23, 1962, to strengthen provisions relating to disqualification of former Federal officers and employees in matters connected with former duties and official responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. Proxmire when he introduced the bill appear earlier in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. DOMINICK (for himself and Mr. McIntyre):

S. 2692. A bill to provide additional benefits for optometry officers of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The remarks of Mr. Dominick when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. EAGLETON (by request):

S. 2693. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as heretofore amended, so as to provide that income subject to tax for District income tax purposes shall conform as closely as possible to income subject to Federal income tax, and for other purposes;

S. 2694. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries and for other purposes; and

S. 2695. A bill to provide for the retirement of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, and of certain officers and members of the U.S. Secret Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(The remarks of Mr. Eagleton when he introduced the bills appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. MUSKIE:

S. 2696. A bill to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation and expansion of exports, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

(The remarks of Mr. Muskie when he reported the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. Brooke):

S. 2697. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to encourage the States to adopt firearms information legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2698. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the procurement and retention of judge advocates and law specialist officers for the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT (by request):

S. 2699. A bill to amend sections 701 and 702 of the Housing Act of 1954 to insure that assistance furnished thereunder to State, metropolitan, regional, and other areawide planning agencies, or to certain other public agencies, will not be used to provide local governments with services which they could reasonably obtain through private business channels; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CRANSTON (for himself, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Schweiker, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 2700. A bill to amend chapter 3 of title 38, United States Code, in order to provide for a Veterans Outreach Services Program in the Veterans Administration to assist eligible veterans, especially those recently separated, in applying for and obtaining benefits and services to which they are entitled, and education, training, and employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(The remarks of Mr. Cranston when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. DODD:

S.J. Res. 140. A joint resolution to provide for the striking of medals in honor of American astronauts who have flown in outer space; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(The remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the joint resolution appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

S. 2689—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO TAX EXEMPTION FOR SERVICEMEN IN AND AROUND KOREA

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same tax exemption for servicemen in and around Korea as is presently provided for those in Vietnam. The bill will amend section 112 by adding a new subsection exempting from Federal taxation servicemen's pay earned in the Korean combat area.

This bill is a companion to H.R. 9636, which was introduced by Congressman Lester Wolff, of New York. The measure has already gathered more than 200 cosponsors in the House who feel that the legislation is necessary because of "the unhappy fact that Korea continues to be a hostile area." Fighting near the demilitarized zone and in adjacent waters has increased considerably in the last few years, as North Koreans send trained infiltrators across demarcation lines. Outside of Vietnam the members of our armed services stationed in Korea are subjected to a degree of immediate danger greater than any in the world.

It is because of our great concern that Representative Wolff, his bill's cosponsors, and I feel that this exemption is justified as a small form of financial compensation for those men who are risking their lives in a zone where combat activities are being carried on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2689) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same tax exemption for servicemen in and around Korea as is presently provided for those in Vietnam, introduced by Mr. Inouye (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2690—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO MAKE APRIL 11 "NATIONAL SUBMARINE DAY"

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which calls upon the President to proclaim April 11 of each year as National Submarine Day. April 11 marks the anniversary of the founding of the submarine service in 1900.

The men and ships of the U.S. Navy's submarine service are a continuing tribute to valor in the past. They are a source of hope for the future.

The gallant history of the submarine service began when the Navy purchased the U.S.S. *Holland*, which was built by the Electric Boat Co. of Groton, Conn.

Since then, the submarine service has upheld a tradition of courage and devotion to duty. Nowhere are these traits more clearly visible than in the amazing record compiled by the submarine service in World War I and II. At the outset of World War II, the Navy had only 51 submarines in the Pacific. But the skeletal remains of millions of tons of sunken enemy wreckage attest to the performance of these valiant men.

The submarine service comprised only 2 percent of the Navy's manpower. Nevertheless, despite heavily guarded convoys, and, in the early days of the war, erratic and misfiring torpedoes, it was responsible for sinking 60 percent of all enemy ships destroyed in World War II.

The selfless devotion to duty of the men of the submarine service has continued in recent years. Two submarines, *Thresher* and *Scorpion* have been tragically lost in peacetime. And at this very moment, the most effective weapon we possess is the ability of the Polaris submarine fleet to respond instantly to an enemy attack. The men of the Polaris fleet absent themselves from their homes and families for months each year in the active defense of our Nation. We all are thankful for their service and dedication.

Defending our Nation is a priority task for the present. The future, however, may bring the most important contributions of all. As we expand our horizons to outer space, we must not forget that three-quarters of our own planet is as mysterious and unexplored as space. Submarines, such as the nuclear research submarine built in Groton, Conn., will soon be leading the descent into the ocean to begin exploring its massive resources.

I am proud to introduce this legislation as a Senator from Connecticut. Connecticut has pioneered research in nuclear submarines and built most of the World War II fleet. As the home of our largest mainland submarine base, Connecticut is truly the submarine capital of the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2690) to authorize and request the President to proclaim April 11 of each year as "National Submarine Day," introduced by Mr. Dodd, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

XUM

S. 2692—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE INCENTIVE PAY FOR OPTOMETRISTS IN MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McIntyre), I introduce a bill to provide special incentive pay for optometry officers of the uniformed services. This bill corrects a serious inequity which exists in our laws relating to armed services pay.

This bill is essentially the same as S. 2037, which I introduced in the 90th Congress for myself and Mr. McIntyre. The bill provides an incentive pay of $100 per month for optometry officers. Hearings were not held at that time. Now, 2 years later, the need for optometrists in the uniformed services is just as great as it was then. There are four health professions recognized by the U.S. Office of Education. These are physicians, dentists, veterinarians, and optometrists. Only the optometrist does not receive incentive pay. Until, recently, the optometrist entered the military service at a lower rank than the other three professions. But presently, this distinction has been eliminated so that all four categories call for the rank of captain upon entering the service. There is no reason that optometrists should not receive special incentive pay equal to veterinarians. Medical doctors and dentists receive a graduated scale of incentive pay.

Mr. President, we all recognize the vital importance of vision to an individual. This is especially true for our military forces. Visual needs are essential whether one is an infantry soldier, a monitor of a radar screen, a pilot of a high-speed jet, an underwater demolition expert or a tank driver making a night time advance, the vision of this individual is vital to the performance of his duties. The optometrist serves our country and our armed services by providing this necessary service. Well over a million men in our Armed Forces wear glasses. And in fiscal year 1968, the Armed Forces had approximately 600 optometrists to meet the needs of these servicemen. In 1969, over 260 additional optometrists will be required.

Mr. President, it is important that this Congress take action to give optometrists the same consideration as given to the other health professions by providing the necessary inducement to overcome the shortage of optometrists in our military forces. The legislation which I introduce today will provide the same $100 per month incentive pay as we provide for our veterinarians who enter military service.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2692) to provide additional benefits for optometry officers of the uniformed services, introduced by Mr. Dominick (for himself and Mr. McIntyre), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2692

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 303(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (2);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and";

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"(4) a commissioned officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or the Public Health Service who is designated as an optometry officer, who is on active duty on the effective date of this clause for a period of at least one year or who, after that date and before July 1, 1971, is called or ordered to active duty for a period of at least one year."

Sec. 2. The catchline of section 303 of title 37, United States Code, and the corresponding item in the analysis of chapter 5 of that title, are each amended by adding "and optometry officers" after "veterinarians".

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on the first day of the second calendar month following the month in which enacted.

S. 2693, S. 2694, AND S. 2695—INTRODUCTION OF THREE BILLS RELATING TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, and ask that they be referred to the appropriate committee, three bills:

A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 to provide that income subject to tax for District of Columbia income tax purposes shall conform as closely as possible to income subject to Federal income tax, and for other purposes.

A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries and for other purposes.

A bill to amend the basic Retirement Act to provide additional retirement and disability benefits for District of Columbia Police and Firemen.

I ask unanimous consent that the texts of these bills be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the Record.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Eagleton, by request, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2693

A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as heretofore amended, so as to provide that income subject to tax for District income tax purposes shall conform as closely as possible to income subject to Federal income tax, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, (a) Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment, addition, or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, addition to, or repeal of, a title, section, or other provision, such reference shall be deemed to be a reference to the applicable title, section, or other provision of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as heretofore amended.

(a) The District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947, as amended (61 Stat. 328, ch. 258, D.C. Code, sec. 47-1551, et seq.) is amended by striking from the enacting clause the words "District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947," and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "District of Columbia Income Tax Act."

Sec. 2. Section 4 of title I (D.C. Code, sec. 47-1551c) is amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (b) of said section is amended to read:

"(b) The word 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of the District of Columbia as established under Reorganization Plan Number 3 of 1967, and his duly authorized representative or representatives."

(b) Subsection (c) of said section is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The word 'Council' means the District of Columbia Council as established under Reorganization Plan Number 3 of 1967, and its duly authorized representative or representatives."

(c) Said section 4 is further amended by striking therefrom subsection (d), (j), (k), (l), (m), (n), (o), (p), (r), (s), (u), (v), (w), (x), (y), and (z); by redesignating subsections (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (q), and (t) as subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j), respectively, and by adding to said section the following subsections:

"(k)(1) The term 'resident' means every individual: (A) who is domiciled in the District at any time during the taxable year, or (B) who maintains a place of abode in the District for an aggregate of more than ninety days during the taxable year, whether or not consecutive and whether or not such individual is domiciled in the District. In determining whether an individual is a resident, absence of such individual from the District for temporary or transient purposes shall not be regarded as changing his domicile or place of abode. If an individual was domiciled in the District for less than the entire taxable year or maintained a place of abode in the District for less than the entire taxable year (but for an aggregate of more than 90 days) he shall be considered a resident for only that portion of the taxable year during which he maintained in the District such domicile or place of abode.

"(2) An individual shall not be considered to be a resident of the District for any portion of the taxable year during which he is not domiciled in the District and is an elective officer of the Government of the United States.

"(l) The term 'employee' shall have the same meaning as when used in a comparable context in the Internal Revenue Code, but shall apply only to individuals having a place of abode or who are domiciled within the District at a time a tax is required to be withheld by an employer. The term 'employee' shall not include any individual described in subsection (k)(2) of this section.

"(m) The words 'wages' and 'employer' shall have the same meaning as when used in a comparable context in the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to collection of income tax at source on wages.

"(n) The words 'resident estate' mean the estate of a decedent who, at his death, was domiciled in the District, and the words 'nonresident estate' mean the estate of a decedent who, at his death, was not domiciled in the District. The residence or situs of the fiduciary shall not control the classification of an estate as resident or nonresident.

"(o) The words 'resident trust' mean a trust created by will of a decedent who, at his death, was domiciled in the District; a trust created by, or consisting of property of, a person domiciled in the District; or a trust resulting from dissolution of a corporation organized under the laws of the District. The words 'nonresident trust' shall mean a trust other than a resident trust. The residence or situs of the fiduciary shall not control the classification of a trust as resident or nonresident.

"(p) Unless a different meaning is clearly required, any term used in this article which is not defined herein shall have the same meaning as when used in a comparable context in the Internal Revenue Code. The term 'Internal Revenue Code' means the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as heretofore or hereafter amended, and as in effect for Federal income tax purposes for the same taxable year beginning on or after January 1, 1969, or, if the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is repealed or replaced, such term means the statute or statutes in effect for the same taxable year for Federal income tax purposes after such repeal or replacement.

"(q) The term 'final determination' means an irrevocable determination or adjustment of a taxpayer's Federal tax liability from which there exists no further right of appeal either administrative or judicial."

Sec. 3. Title II (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1554) is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE II—EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS

"Sec. 1. The following organizations shall be exempt from taxation under this article:

"(a) Any organization which for the taxable year is entitled to be exempt under the Internal Revenue Code from Federal income taxes by reason of its purposes or activities.

"(b) Any organization which, by another Act of the Congress of the United States, is entitled for the taxable year to exemption from District income taxes.

"(c) Banks, trust companies, building and loan associations, insurance companies, companies which guarantee the fidelity of any individual or individuals, such as bonding companies, and companies which furnish abstracts of title or which insure titles to real estate, all of which pay taxes on their gross earnings, premiums, or receipts under existing laws of the District.

"(d) Any foreign corporation authorized to invest in loans secured by real estate, which does not maintain any office, officer, agent, representative, or employees for the purpose of making, maintaining, or liquidating such investments, in the District of Columbia, provided that the only activities of such foreign corporation in the District of Columbia, other than those of a liaison employee are one or more of the following:

"(1) the acquisition of loans (including the negotiation thereof) secured by mortgages or deeds of trust on real property, including leaseholds, situated in the District of Columbia pursuant to commitment agreements or arrangements made prior to or following the origination or creation of such loans: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein shall be deemed to permit servicing other than as permitted by paragraph (4) of this subsection;

"(2) the physical inspection and appraisal of property in the District of Columbia as security for mortgages of deed or trust;

"(3) the ownership, modification, renewal, extension, transfer, or foreclosure of such loans, or the acceptance of substitute additional obligors thereon;

"(4) the making, collecting, and servicing of loans solely through a person authorized to engage in the District of Columbia in the business of servicing real estate loans for investors;

"(5) maintaining or defending any action or suit or any administrative or arbitration proceeding arising as a result of such loans;

"(6) the acquisition of title to property which is the security for such a loan in the event of default on such loan, either by foreclosure, sale, or agreement in lieu thereof;

"(7) pending liquidation of its investment within such period, not to exceed one year, as the Council may by regulation prescribe, operating, maintaining, renting or otherwise dealing with, selling or disposing of, real property acquired by foreclosure, sale, or by agreement in lieu thereof: Provided, That if, upon the expiration of the period prescribed by the Council such property has not been sold or otherwise disposed of, such foreign corporation shall be subject to tax on all of the income derived by the corporation arising out of its ownership of such property, but such liability shall not be construed as affecting the exemption from tax provided herein for income from other loans made or acquired by it in accordance with this paragraph unless the corporation chooses not to liquidate the property but holds it for investment purposes.

"Income derived from the ownership of real property and not subject to tax as provided in this paragraph shall be reported to the Commissioner by the person servicing the corporation's loans in the District of Columbia or by a participating bank in the District of Columbia at such times and in such manner, together with such information, as the Council may by regulation require, and if there be no such person servicing loans or participating bank, then the corporation shall itself make such report of income including any other income derived from District of Columbia sources which is subject to tax under this article. Any person or corporation who shall fail to report such income to the Commissioner, as herein provided, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be fined not more than $500.

"As used herein, the term 'liaison employee' shall mean a person who does not engage in or make, maintain, or liquidate any investment of the foreign corporation and who is engaged by the foreign corporation solely for the purpose of establishing and maintaining contacts with governments and international bodies and agencies thereof; arranging conferences for, receiving and furnishing legislative publications and other information or material of interest to, transmitting information or material of interest to, transmitting information for, and arranging transportation or other accommodations for, officers or other personnel of such foreign corporation within, or to and from, the District of Columbia."

Sec. 4. Title III (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1557 through 47–1557b) is hereby repealed.

Sec. 5. Title IV (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1561 through 1561e) is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE IV—ACCOUNTING PERIODS AND METHODS

"Sec. 1. General Rule.—A taxpayer's taxable year and accounting method for purposes of this article shall be the same as his taxable year and accounting method for Federal income tax purposes. If the taxable year or accounting method of a taxpayer is changed for Federal income tax purposes, the taxable year or accounting method of such taxpayer for purposes of this article shall be similarly changed. In the absence of any accounting method for Federal income tax purposes, or if the method does not clearly reflect taxable income for District purposes, the taxpayer shall use such method as in the opinion of the Commissioner clearly reflects taxable income for District purposes.

"Sec. 2. Change From Accrual to Installment Method.—If a taxpayer's method of accounting is changed from an accrual to an installment method, any additional tax for the taxable year of such change of method and for any subsequent taxable year which is attributable to the receipt of installment payments properly accrued in a prior taxable year shall be reduced by the portion of tax for any prior taxable year attributable to the accrual of such installment payments, in accordance with regulations of the Council.

"Sec. 3. Other Changes of Method.—If a taxpayer's method of accounting is changed, other than from an accrual to an installment method, any additional tax for the taxable year of change which results from adjustments determined to be necessary solely by reason of the change shall not be greater than if such adjustments were ratably allocated and included for the taxable year of change and the preceding taxable years, not in excess of two, during which the taxpayer used the method of accounting from which the change is made."

Sec. 6(a). Title V (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1564 through 47–1564c) is amended by striking therefrom the word "Assessor", wherever it appears, and by inserting in lieu thereof the word "Commissioner."

(b) Section 2 of said title (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1564a) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking all of said section from the commencement thereof to the end of subsection (b) of said section, and by inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 2. Requirement.—Each of the following persons shall file a return for each taxable year stating such information as the Commissioner shall deem necessary to reflect accurately the taxes required to be paid under this article:

"(a) Residents.—Every resident as defined in title I of this article who is required to file a return for Federal income tax purposes.

"(b) Fiduciaries.—Every fiduciary for every resident estate and resident trust for which he acts and for which a return is required to be filed for Federal income tax purposes. An estate or trust which is subject to the unincorporated business tax imposed by title VIII of this article shall also be required to file the unincorporated business return."

(2) By striking therefrom subsection (d); by redesignating subsections (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (d), (e), and (f); by striking from subsection (e) as redesignated the sign and figure "$10,000" and by inserting in lieu thereof the sign and figure "$5,000"; and by adding at the end of such section the following new subsection:

"(g) Taxpayer Unable To Make Own Return.—If the taxpayer is unable to make his own return for any taxable period, it shall be made and filed by the person or persons authorized or required to make and file the taxpayer's Federal return for such taxable period."

(c) Section 3 of said title (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1564b) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. (a) Time and Place for Filing Return.—Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, all returns of income required to be filed under this article shall be filed with the Commissioner on or before the date prescribed for the filing of the taxpayer's Federal income ta return (without regard to any Federal extension). In the case of an unincorporated business the tax return required under this article shall be filed on or before the date prescribed for filing a Federal partnership return or such other Federal income tax return as is required to be filed reflecting the income of such unincorporated business (without regard to any Federal extension). The provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the treatment of timely mailed returns or other documents as being timely filed shall apply to returns or other documents required to be filed under the provisions of this article.

"(b) Extension of Time.—The Council is authorized to promulgate regulations governing reasonable extensions of time for the filing of any returns, declarations, reports, or other documents required by this article.

"(c) Period Covered by Returns or Other Documents.—Where not otherwise provided for in this article, the Council may by regulations prescribe the period for which, or the date as of which, any return or other document required by this article or by regulations shall be made and filed.

"(d) Identifying Numbers.—Any person

XUM

required under the authority of this article to make a return, statement, or other document, on his own behalf or on behalf of any other person, shall include in such return, statement, or other document such identifying number as may be prescribed by the Commissioner for securing proper identification of such person or other persons.

"(e) Whole Dollar Amounts.—The provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the use of whole dollar amounts for any amounts required to be shown on any Federal return or other document shall apply with respect to amounts required to be shown on any return or other document required to be filed under this article."

(d)(1) Subsection (b) of section 4 of said title (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1564c(b)) is amended by striking from said subsection the last sentence thereof, and by inserting in lieu thereof the following sentence:

"The Internal Revenue Service of the Treasury Department of the United States is authorized and required to supply such information as may be requested by the Commissioner relative to any person subject to the taxes imposed by this article."

(2) Subsection (e) of said section 4 is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Penalty for Violation of This Section.—Any violation of the provisions of this section shall be a misdemeanor and shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding $1,000 or imprisonment for six months, or both, in the discretion of the Court. All prosecutions under this section shall be brought in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions on information by the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia or any of his assistants in the name of the District of Columbia."

Sec. 7. Title VI (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1567 through 47–1567d) is amended by striking therefrom sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 and by inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Section 1. District Taxable Income of Individuals, Resident Estates, and Resident Trusts.—(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the 'District taxable income' of a resident individual or a resident estate or resident trust for any taxable year means the same as the taxable income of such individual, estate, or trust for Federal income tax purposes for such taxable year.

"(b)(1) Subject to the provisions of paragraph 2 of this subsection, the 'District taxable income' of an individual who is a resident for less than the taxable year consisting of twelve months means that portion of the individual's taxable income which he received while a resident or, if he is on the accrual basis, which accrued to him while a resident, and there shall be included in determining the District taxable income of such individuals the following:

"(A) Partners.—In the case of a partner, if the taxable year of the partnership ends while he maintains a place of abode in the District or is domiciled in the District, the entire distributive share of the partnership income for the partnership's taxable year (whether or not actually distributed), or in the case of partnership loss, his share thereof, to the extent that such income or loss is includible in determining the partner's Federal income tax liability.

"(B) Estates and Trusts.—In the case of income or deductions from an estate or trust, if the taxable year of the estate or trust ends while the beneficiary maintains a place of abode in the District or is domiciled in the District, such amounts of income or deduction from the state or trust as are, for Federal income tax purposes, properly includible in the determination of the taxable income of the beneficiary, for the taxable year of the beneficiary in which or with which the taxable year of the estate or trust ends.

"(C) Small Business Corporation.—In the case of a small business corporation electing not to be subject to tax under Chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, the entire amount which, for Federal income tax purposes, he is, as a shareholder of the corporation, required to include in determining his taxable income, or if there is a loss, is authorized to deduct from taxable gross income, provided that the taxable year of the corporation ends while he maintains a place of abode in the District or is domiciled in the District.

"(2) The allowable deductions for personal exemptions shall be reduced to amounts which bear the same ratio as the number of months during which the individual is a resident bears to twelve months, and for the purpose of prorating such exemptions, residence in the District for more than one-half of a calendar month shall constitute a month. If the individual used a standard deduction in arriving at his Federal taxable income he shall use the standard deduction in arriving at his District taxable income, and if he itemized his deductions on his Federal return he shall itemize his deductions on his District return. The standard deduction shall be limited to the lesser of $1,000 or ten per centum of the portion of his Federal adjusted gross income which he received while a resident, and if he itemizes his deductions they shall be limited to those deductions paid or accrued (dependent upon his method of accounting) while a resident of the District.

"(c) In applicable cases the District taxable income shall be decreased and increased by amounts of adjustments required under section 1 of Title X of this article.

"Sec. 2. Imposition and Rates of Tax.—(a) Rates of Tax.—There is hereby annually levied and imposed for each taxable year on the District taxable income of every resident (other than a head of household to whom subsection (b) applies) and every resident estate and resident trust, a tax at the following rates:

"2 per centum on the first $1,400 of taxable income;

"3 per centum on the next $1,400 of taxable income;

"4 per centum on the next $1,400 of taxable income;

"5 per centum on the next $1,400 of taxable income;

"6 per centum on the taxable income in excess of $5,600.

"(b) Rates of Tax on Heads of Households.—There is hereby annually levied and imposed for each taxable year on the District taxable income of every resident who is a head of a household (as defined for Federal income tax purposes) a tax at the following rates:

"2 per centum on the first $2,100 of taxable income;

"3 per centum on the next $2,100 of taxable income;

"4 per centum on the next $2,100 of taxable income;

"5 per centum on the next $2,100 of taxable income;

"6 per centum on the taxable income in excess of $8,400.

"Sec. 3. Tax in Case of Joint Return or Return of Surviving Spouse.—In the case of a joint return of a husband and wife, the tax imposed by section 2(a) shall be twice the tax which would be imposed if the District taxable income were cut in half. For the purposes of this section a return of a surviving spouse (as defined for Federal income tax purposes) shall be treated as a joint return.

"Sec. 4. Residents Paying Federal Optional Tax.—

"(a)(1) Computation by Taxpayer.—The Council, by regulations, shall prescribe tables which shall set forth a tax for each taxpayer which will approximate as nearly as practicable the taxes imposed in sections 2 or 3 of this title, based on the taxpayer's Federal adjusted gross income, standard or minimum standard deduction, and personal exemptions. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 2 and 3 of this title every resident who has properly elected for the taxable year to pay the Federal optional tax, shall determine his tax according to the table applicable to him.

"(2) This subsection shall not apply to any person claiming credit for income tax paid to any other State, territory, or possession; to any fiduciary; to any individual filing a return for a period of less than twelve months; or for any taxable year other than a calendar year; or to any married individual living with husband or wife at any time during the taxable year whose spouse files a return and computes the tax without regard to this section.

"(b) Computation by Commissioner.—Except where, under section 5(c), a joint Federal return is filed and except as to the individuals referred to in section 5(d) and section 5(e) if any resident has properly elected for the taxable year to have his Federal income tax computed by the Secretary or his delegate, he shall report on his District return for such taxable year such information as the Commissioner shall deem necessary to determine the tax imposed under this title and the Commissioner shall compute the tax for such resident as the Secretary or his delegate is required to compute the tax under the comparable provisions of the Internal Revenue Code and mail to the taxpayer a notice stating the amount of tax. Such tax shall be be paid within thirty days after such mailing.

"Sec. 5. Return of Husband and Wife.—(a) If for the taxable year a husband and wife file separate Federal returns, they shall file separate District returns for the taxable year and their District income tax liabilities shall be separate.

"(b) If for the taxable year a husband and wife (other than a husband and wife described in subsection (c) or (d) file a joint Federal return, they shall file a joint District return for the taxable year and their District income tax liability shall be joint and several.

"(c) If either husband or wife is a resident for all of a taxable year consisting of twelve months and the other is not a resident for any part of that taxable year, the resident spouse shall file a separate District income tax return for the taxable year and, in the event they filed a joint Federal return, the District tax of the resident spouse shall be determined in the same manner as provided in this title under either section 2(a) or section 4(a), as the taxpayer may elect, as if such resident spouse was required to file a separate Federal return.

"(d) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (e) of this section, if either husband or wife, or both, are residents for less than a taxable year consisting of twelve (12) months, each shall file a separate return.

"(e) In the case of the death of a husband or wife, or of both, the requirements for the filing for District tax purposes of a joint return shall be the same as the requirements for the filing of a joint return as provided under the Internal Revenue Code, except that, in the case of the filing of a joint return by a surviving spouse, no such return shall be permitted unless both the surviving spouse, no such return shall be permitted unless both the surviving spouse and the deceased spouse were residents at the beginning of the taxable year in which the death occurred, which taxable year began for both on the same day, and the surviving spouse was a resident for the entire taxable year consisting of twelve (12) months; and except, further, that in the case of the death of both husband and wife, a joint return may not be filed unless each was a resident at the beginning of the taxable year, which taxable year began for both

XUM

on the same day, and each was thereafter continuously a resident during the taxable year until the time of death.

"Sec. 6(a) (1). Credit Against Tax.—The amount of tax payable under this title by an individual domiciled in the District during the taxable year shall be reduced by the amount of individual income tax such individual is required to pay, and, in fact, pays to any State, Territory or possession of the United States or political subdivision thereof, for such taxable year or portion thereof that he physically resides therein while concurrently domiciled in the District. The credit provided under this section shall not exceed the portion of the tax otherwise due under this article that the amount of the individual's adjusted gross income received by him or accrued to him if on an accrual basis while he resided in the other jurisdiction bears to his entire adjusted gross income received by him or accrued to him while he was concurrently in the District. The Commissioner may require satisfactory proof of payment of such income taxes. The credit provided for by this section shall not be allowed against any tax imposed under title VIII of this article.

"(2) The amount of tax payable under this title by a resident or by a resident trust or resident estate shall be reduced by the amount of any income tax such resident or resident trust or resident estate is required to pay as income tax for such taxable year to any State, Territory, or political subdivision thereof on income derived from any unincorporated trade or business (including any unincorporated business electing to be taxed as a corporation) carried on or engaged in within such State, Territory, or political subdivision thereof. The credit provision under this subsection shall not exceed the proportion of the income tax otherwise payable by a resident, resident estate or resident trust to the District which the taxpayer's net income from the unincorporated trade or business, upon which the tax was imposed by such other jurisdiction, bears to the entire net income upon which the tax imposed by this title is computed. The Commissioner may require satisfactory proof of payment of such income tax to such other jurisdiction. The credit provided for by this subsection shall not be allowed against any tax imposed under title VIII of this article.

"(b) Credit for Tax Withheld on Wages.—The amount deducted and withheld as tax under this article during any calendar year upon the wages of any individual shall be allowed as a credit to the recipient of the income against the tax imposed by this article, for taxable years beginning in such calendar year. If more than one taxable year begins in such calendar year such amount shall be allowed as a credit against the tax for the last taxable year so beginning."

Sec. 8. Section 2 of title VII (D.C. Code, sec. 471–571a) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. Imposition and Rate of Tax.—There is hereby levied for each taxable year an income tax at the rate of 6 per centum upon the taxable income of every corporation, whether domestic or foreign (except those expressly exempt under title II of this article), which carries on or engages in any trade or business within the District or receives income from sources within the District, provided that the minimum tax payable shall be $25.00. For the purposes of this article, any unincorporated business which for the taxable year properly elects to be taxed as a corporation for Federal income tax purposes shall be considered and taxed as a corporation for such taxable year and shall be subject to the tax imposed by this section."

Sec. 9(a). Section 1 of title VIII (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1574) is amended by striking therefrom the last sentence thereof, and by inserting in lieu thereof the following sentence:

"For the purposes of this article a small business corporation, which for the taxable year properly elects not to be subject to the Federal income tax, shall be considered and taxed as an unincorporated business for such taxable year."

(b) Section 2 of said title (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1574a) is amended by striking therefrom the words "in excess of the exemption granted by section 4 of this title."

(c) Section 3 of said title (D.C. Code, 1967, sec. 47–1574b) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. Imposition and Rate of Tax.—There is hereby levied for each taxable year an income tax at the rate of 6 per centum upon the taxable income of every unincorporated business, whether domestic or forign (except those expressly exempt under title II of this article), which carries on or engages in any trade or business within the District or receives income income from sources within the District provided that the minimum tax payable shall be $25.00."

(d) Section 4 of said title (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1574c) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. Exemption and Salary Allowance.—Before computing the tax upon the taxable income of an unincorporated business, there shall be deducted from taxable income an exemption of $5,000 and a reasonable allowance for salaries or other compensation for personal services actually rendered by the individual owners or members actively engaged in the conduct of the unincorporated business. The aggregate deduction for such services shall not exceed 20 per centum of the taxable income of the unincorporated business before deduction of the salary allowance and exemption. Where the period covered by a return is less than a year, or where the return shows that an unincorporated business has been carried on for less than twelve (12) months, the $5,000 exemption shall be prorated on the ratio the number of days of the taxable year it was engaged in trade or business in the District bears to 365. An unincorporated business which carries on or engages in more than one trade or business or receives income from more than one source shall be entitled to only one unincorporated business exemption."

(d) Section 6 of said title (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1574e) is amended by striking therefrom the last sentence.

Sec. 10. Title IX (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1577 through 1577l) is hereby repealed.

Sec. 11. Title X (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1580 through 47–1580b) is amended as follows:

"(a) By redesignating sections 2 and 3 as sections 3 and 4.

"(b) By striking from said sections the word 'Assessor', wherever it appears, and by inserting in lieu thereof the word 'Commissioner.'

"(c) By striking from section 3, as redesignated, the word 'Commissioners', wherever it appears, and by inserting in lieu thereof the word 'Commissioner.'

"(d) By striking all of said title from the commencement thereof to the end of section 1 thereof, and by inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE X—ADJUSTMENTS; MEASURE OF TAX; ALLOCATION OR APPORTIONMENT

"Sec. 1. Adjustments.—The District taxable income of residents, resident estates, and resident trusts and the net income of corporations and unincorporated businesses shall be decreased and increased by the following amounts:

"(a) Decreases.—(1) The amount necessary to prevent the taxation of any amount of income or gain which was properly included in income or gain under this article for any taxable year beginning prior to January 1, 1969, by the taxpayer, or by a decedent by reason of whose death the taxpayer acquired the right to receive the income or gain;

"(2) The amount of any trust distribution to the taxpayer included in his Federal taxable income for the taxable year, but only to the extent that each amount was previously taxed to the trust by the District;

"(3) The amount of gain included therein which was realized from the sale or exchange prior to January 1, 1969, of any capital asset, as defined in this article on December 31, 1968;

"(4) The portion of any taxable gain, from the sale or other disposition of property having a proper higher adjusted basis for District income or franchise tax purposes than for Federal income tax purposes on the last day of the last taxable year beginning prior to January 1, 1969, that does not exceed such difference in basis. In the case of any taxpayer other than a corporation, if such gain is considered a long-term capital gain for Federal income tax purposes, the adjustment shall be limited to 50 per centum of such portion of the gain;

"(5) The owner's or member's share of the taxable income of an unincorporated business after deduction of the exemption and any salary allowance permitted under section 4 of title VIII of this article.

"(b) Increases.—(1) The amount of any loss incurred in any taxable year beginning prior to January 1, 1969, to the extent deductible in determining Federal taxable income for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1968;

"(2) In the case of a corporation or an unincorporated business, the amount of taxes imposed under this article and any income tax or any franchise tax measured by income imposed by any other taxing jurisdiction to the extent deductible in determining Federal taxable income.

"Sec. 2. Measure of the Tax.—In the case of corporations and unincorporated businesses the measure of the tax imposed under this article shall be that portion of the net income of the corporation and unincorporated business which is fairly attributable to any trade or business carried on or engaged in within the District and such other net income as is derived from sources within the District. Income derived from the sale of tangible personal property by a corporation or unincorporated business not carrying on or engaging in trade or business within the District as defined in title I of this article shall not be considered as income from sources within the District for purposes of this article. For the purposes of this article the term 'net income' means—

"(1) Corporations.—In the case of a corporation, its taxable income for Federal income tax purposes: Provided, That in the case of a regulated investment company or a real estate investment trust such term shall mean the sum of its investment company taxable income or real estate investment trust taxable income (as the case may be) and its capital gains which are subject to Federal income tax.

"(2) Unincorporated Businesses.—In the case of an unincorporated business, the portion of its income which would be taxable income for Federal income tax purposes if the unincorporated business were a partnership."

Sec. 12. Title XI (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1583 through 1583e) is hereby repealed.

Sec. 13. Title XII (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1586 through 47–1586n) is amended as follows:

(a) By striking therefrom the word "Assessor", wherever it appears, and by inserting in lieu thereof the word "Commissioner"; by striking therefrom the word "Collector", wherever it appears, and by inserting in lieu thereof the word "Commissioner"; by striking therefrom the words "District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia", wherever they appear, and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "United States District Court for the District of Columbia"; by striking therefrom the words "Municipal Court of the District of Columbia", wherever they appear, and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "District of Columbia Court of General Sessions"; by striking therefrom the word "Commissioners", wherever it appears, and by inserting in lieu thereof the word "Council"; and by striking therefrom the words "Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia", wherever they appear, and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "District of Columbia Tax Court."

(b) Section 1 of said title (D.C. Code, sec. 47-1586) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 1. Assessment Authority—(a) Authority to Determine Tax.—In determining the correct amount of any taxpayer's tax under this article, the Commissioner is authorized to determine the taxpayer's Federal taxable income and each item entering into the computation thereof. Any assessment made or proposed on the basis of such determinations shall be deemed prima facie correct. Any assessment, compromise, closing agreement, settlement, adjustment, ruling, or other determination of the taxpayer's taxable income or status for Federal income tax purposes made or proposed by the Internal Revenue Service, or other competent Federal authority, shall not be binding or deemed controlling on the Commissioner, the courts, or taxpayers in determining a taxpayer's taxable income for District income tax purposes.

"(b) Mode or Time of Assessment.—If the mode or time for the assessment of any tax (including interest, additions to the tax, and assessable penalties) imposed by this article is not otherwise stated in this article, the Council may establish the same by regulations.

"(c) Supplemental Assessments.—The Commissioner may, at any time within the period authorized for assessment of any tax under this article, make a supplemental assessment (whether as a deficiency or otherwise) whenever it is ascertained that any assessment is incorrect, imperfect, or incomplete."

Sec. 14(a). Section 2 of title XII (D.C. Code, sec. 47-1586a (is amended by inserting "(a)" before *"Statements and Special Returns."* and by adding the following new subsections:

"(b) Change of Federal Tax and Amended Return.—If the amount of a taxpayer's Federal taxable income for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1968, as reported in any Federal income tax return is for Federal tax purposes changed or corrected, so as to increase the taxpayer's Federal taxable income, such taxpayer shall, without being called upon to do so, report such changed or corrected taxable income, and the details thereof, to the Commissioner within ninety days after the final determination of such change or correction, or at such other time as otherwise may be required by the Commissioner, and shall concede the accuracy of such final determination or state wherein it is erroneous. Any taxpayer filing an original or amended Federal income tax return for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1968, setting forth any item, election, or other matter which increases income or tax previously reported on a District return filed under this article shall, within ninety days after filing such original or amended Federal income tax return, file an amended District return under this article, and with such filing pay any additional tax (including any penalties and interest) due under this article.

"(c) For the purpose of determining the liability of any person under this article and the extent of such liability, the Commissioner may require the furnishing of a true and correct copy of such person's Federal income tax return for any taxable year and a reconciliation of such return with such person's District return for such taxable year."

(b) Section 5 of said title (D.C. Code, sec. 47-1586d) is amended by inserting "(a)" before *"Determination and Assessment of Deficiency."* and by adding the following new subsection:

"(b) Mathematical Errors and Overstatement of Tax Credits Not Deficiencies.—If a taxpayer is notified by the Commissioner that the amount of tax shown on the return is insufficient because of a mathematical error appearing in the return or because of an overstatement of any credit allowed against the tax shown on the return, the amount of additional tax due as a result of such error or overstatement shall not be regarded as a deficiency in tax. The amount of additional tax due as a result of such error or overstatement together with appropriate interest thereon may be collected in the same manner as a balance of tax due."

(c) Section 6(b) of said title (D.C. Code, sec. 47-1586e(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Bond To Stay Collection.—The collection of the whole or any part of the amount of such assessment may be stayed by filing with the Commissioner a bond in such amount, not exceeding double the amount as to which the stay is desired, and with such surety or sureties as the Commissioner deems necessary, or, in the alternative, by depositing with the Commissioner such other security, in such form and in such amount, as is acceptable to the Commissioner, which such bond or security shall be conditioned upon the payment of the amount the collection of which is stayed, at the time at which, but for this section, such amount would be due." (d) Subsections 7 (a)(6), (7), and (8)) of said title (D.C. Code, sec. 47-1586f(a)(6), (7), and (8)) are hereby repealed.

(e) Section 7 of said title is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Date Fixed for Payment of Tax.—In any case in which a tax is required to be paid on or before a certain date, or within a certain period, any reference in this article to the date fixed for payment of such tax shall be deemed a reference to the last day fixed for such payment (determined without regard to any extension of time for paying the tax)."

(f) Section 8(e)(1) of said title (D.C. Code, sec. 47-1586g(e)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) An employee shall on any day be entitled to the same number of District withholding exemptions as the number of exemptions to which he is entitled for Federal withholding tax purposes. Notwithstanding the remaining provisions of this subsection an employer may rely upon the number of Federal withholding exemptions claimed by the employee on his Federal exemption certificate, except where the employee claims a different number of District withholding exemptions, in which case the employee shall furnish the employer with a separate District exemption certificate."

(g) Section 8(f) of said title (D.C. Code, sec. 47-158g(f)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) If an employer fails to deduct and withhold tax as required, and thereafter the tax against which such tax would be credited is paid, the tax so required to be deducted and withheld shall not be collected from the employer, but the employer shall not be relieved from liability for any penalties, interest, or additions to the tax otherwise applicable in respect of such failure to deduct and withhold."

(h) Section 8 of said title (D.C. Code, sec. 47-1586g) is further amended by striking therefrom subsections (i), (j), and (k) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsections:

"(i) Estimated Tax.—(1) Individuals.—Every individual who, at the time prescribed for filing a Federal declaration of estimated tax, resides or is domiciled in the District (except individuals excluded from the definition of the term 'resident') shall, whether or not such individual is required to file a Federal declaration of estimated tax, make and file with the Commissioner a declaration of estimated District tax for the taxable year if his estimated District tax for such taxable year can reasonably be expected to exceed $40. The term 'estimated District tax' means the amount which an individual estimates to be his income tax imposed for the taxable year by this article less the amount which he estimates to be the sum of any credits allowable against such tax.

"(2) Miscellaneous Requirements.—Unless otherwise prescribed by the Council, the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code shall apply with respect to amendments of declarations, declarations of husband and wife, return as declaration or amendment, time of filing, time of payment, and penalty for underpayment.

"(3) Credit for Payment.—Payment of the estimated tax, or any installment thereof, shall be considered payment on account of the tax for the taxable year.

"(j) Withholding of Income Tax and Payment to D.C. Treasurer by the United States.—(1) The Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, pursuant to regulations promulgated by the President, is authorized and directed to enter into an agreement with the Commissioner, within one hundred and twenty days of the request for agreement from the Commissioner. Such agreement shall provide that the head of each department or agency of the United States shall comply with the requirements of this article in the case of employees of such agency or department who are subject to income taxes imposed by this article, and whose regular place of employment is within the Metropolitan Area of the District of Columbia as defined in Public Law 85-1, An Act establishing Inauguration Day as a holiday in the Metropolitan Area of the District of Columbia. No such agreement shall apply with respect to compensation for service as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, or with respect to compensation of an employee who is not a resident of the District of Columbia as defined in this article.

"The Secretary of the Senate, The Clerk of the House of Representatives, and the Administrative Officer of the United States Courts are hereby authorized and directed to comply with the requirements of this article in the case of employees paid by them who are subject to income taxes imposed by this article and whose place of employment is within the District of Columbia.

"(2) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to consent to the applicability of any provision of law which has the effect of imposing more burdensome requirements upon the United States than it imposed upon other employers, or which has the effect of subjecting the United States or any of its officers or employees to any penalty or liability by reason of the provisions of this subsection."

(i) Section 10(a)(1) of said title (D.C. Code, sec. 47-1586i(a)(1)) is amended by striking the semicolon at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon; and by adding after the colon the following:

"Provided, That—

"if the amount of a taxpayer's Federal taxable income for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1968, is for Federal tax purposes changed or corrected by a final determination so as to increase the taxpayer's Federal taxable income, or

"if an amended Federal income tax return reporting any increase in the taxpayer's Federal taxable income is filed by or on behalf of the taxpayer for any taxable year.

(whether such change or correction is made, or such amended return is filed before or after the expiration of the three-year period of limitation set forth herein) the amount of taxes imposed by this article shall be assessed within the later of (A) the period prescribed in this section, or (B) six months after the taxpayer either (i) notifies the Commissioner of such change or correction, or (ii) files an amended District return. If the Commissioner is not so notified, or if no such amended District return is filed, the taxes may be assessed at any time."

(j) Section 10(a)(3) of said title (D.C. Code, sec 47–1586i(a)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) If for any taxable year the taxpayer understates taxable income for District purposes by an amount reflecting an omission of 25 per centum or more of his gross income, the tax may be assessed, or a proceeding in court for the collection of such tax may be begun without assessment, at any time within five years after the filing of the taxpayer's District income tax return reflecting such understatement."

(k) Section 10(d) of said title (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1586i(d)) is amended by striking therefrom the word "income".

(l) Section 11(a) of said title (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1586j(a)) is amended by striking the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of section 1 of this title, and notwithstanding the foregoing period of limitations prescribed in this subsection, where there is a final determination of any overpayment of the taxpayer's Federal income tax for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1968 (including any overpayment resulting from a net operating loss carryback), the overpayment, if any, of taxes imposed by this article for such taxable year (other than an amount of tax assessed as a deficiency) shall be credited or refunded upon the filing by the taxpayer of a claim for refund within six months after such final determination of an overpayment of the taxpayer's Federal income tax. The foregoing sentence shall not apply to any part of an overpayment for a taxable year if any part of the tax for that year has been finally determined by a court proceeding in which the District was a party, except for that part of the overpayment, if any, attributable to a net operating loss carryback which was not litigable in that court proceeding. The amount of such credit or refund shall not exceed the amount of the reduction in District tax attributable to such Federal change, correction, or items amended in determining the taxpayer's Federal income for the taxable year. All claims for refund shall be in such written form and filed in such manner as the Commisioner may prescribe."

(m) Section 11(c)(3) of said title (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1586j(c)(3)) is amended by striking therefrom the last three sentences and by inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Such refunds shall be made from moneys collected pursuant to the provisions of this article."

(n) The first sentence of section 12 of title XII (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1586k) is amended by striking therefrom the words "income tax" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "tax imposed under this article."

(o) Said title is further amended by redesignating sections 14 and 15 thereof as sections 15 and 16, and by adding the following new section:

"Sec. 14. Declarations of Estimated Income Tax by Corporations and Unincorporated Businesses.

"(a) Every corporation and unincorporated business required to make and file an income tax return under this article shall make and file a declaration of estimated tax at such time or times, and in such amounts, and under such conditions, as the Council shall by regulations prescribe.

"(b) Failure by Corporation or Unincorporated Business To Pay Estimated Income Tax.

"(1) Addition to the Tax.—In the case of any underpayment of estimated tax by a corporation or unincorporated business, there shall be added to the tax for the taxable year an amount determined at the rate of 6 percent per annum upon the amount of the underpayment (determined under subsection (2)) for the period of the unerpayment (determined under subsection (3)).

"(2) Amount of Underpayment.—For purposes of subsection (1), the amount of the underpayment shall be the excess of—

"(A) The amount of the installment which would be required to be paid if the estimated tax were equal to 80 percent of the tax shown on the return for the taxable year or, if no return was filed, 80 percent of the tax for such year, over

"(B) The amount, if any, of the installment paid on or before the last date prescribed for payment.

"(3) Period of Underpayment.—The period of the underpayment shall run from the date the installment was required to be paid to whichever of the following dates is the earlier.

"(A) The 15th day of the fourth month following the close of the taxable year.

"(B) With respect to any portion of the underpayment, the date on which such portion is paid. For purposes, of this paragraph, a payment of estimated tax on any installment date shall be considered a payment of any previous underpayment only to the extent such payment exceeds the amount of the installment determined under subsection (2)(A) for such installment date."

"(c) Overpayment-Credit of Tax.—Overpayment resulting from the payment of estimated tax in excess of the amount determined to be due upon the filing of a return for the same taxable year may be credited against the amount of estimated tax determined to be due on any declaration filed for the next succeeding taxable year or for any deficiency or nonpayment of tax for any previous taxable year. No refund shall be made of any estimated tax paid unless a complete return is filed.

Sec. 15. Title XIII (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1589e) is amended as follows:

(a) By striking therefrom the word "Collector", wherever it appears, and by inserting in lieu thereof the word "Commissioner", and by striking therefrom the words "Municipal Court of the District of Columbia", wherever they appear, and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "District of Columbia Court of General Sessions."

(b) Section 1(a) of said title (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1589a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Falure to File a Return, Withhold Tax, or Remit Tax Withheld.—In the case of any failure, within the time prescribed by law or by the Council in pursuance of law, to file a return required by this article (other than a declaration of estimated tax), to withhold taxes on wages, or to remit amounts of such withholding tax collected, 5 per centum of the tax required to be shown on the return, or required to be withheld or required to be remitted shall be added to such tax or amounts not withheld or not remitted for each month or fraction thereof that such failure continues, not to exceed 25 per centum in the aggregate of such tax or amount not withheld or not remitted, except if it is shown that the failure to file, withheld, or remit was due to reasonable cause and not due to willful neglect, no such addition shall be made. For purposes of this subsection, the tax required to be shown on the return shall be reduced by the amount of any District tax credits to which the taxpayer is entitled."

(c) Section 1 of said title is further amended by striking therefrom subsections (b) and (c) and by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (b).

(d) Section 6 of said title (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1589e) is amended as follows:

"(a) By striking from subsection (a) of said section the word 'refuses' and by inserting in lieu thereof the word 'fails.'

"(b) By redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c).

"(c) By adding a new subsection (b) reading as follows:

"(b) Negligence.—Any person required under this article to pay or collect any tax, or required by law or regulations made under authority therof to make a return, keep any records, or supply information, who fails to pay or collect such tax, to make such return, to keep such records, or supply such information, at the time or times required by law or regulations shall, upon conviction thereof (in addition to other penalties provided by law), be fined not more than $300 for each and every such failure, and each and every day that such failure continues shall constitute a separate and distinct offense. All prosecutions under this section shall be brought in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions on information by the Corporation Counsel or any of his assistants in the name of the District."

Sec. 16. Title XIV (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1591 through 47–1591f), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 1. Any person who, pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b) of section 1 of title XIV of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as heretofore amended, (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1591(b)) was issued a trade, business, or professional license for the calendar year 1969, shall, upon filing a claim therefor in the manner provided by subsection (a) of section 11 of title XII of said Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1586j(a)), be entitled to a refund without interest of the amount of the fee paid by him for such license. No such refund shall be allowed after ninety (90) days from the date of enactment of this Act unless before the expiration of such period a claim therefor is filed by the licensee. The remedy provided by this section shall be exclusive of any other remedy authorized or provided by law."

Sec. 17. Section 1 of title XV (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1593) is amended by striking therefrom the word "Assessor" and by inserting in lieu thereof the word "Commissioner"; and by striking therefrom the words "Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia", and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "District of Columbia Tax Court."

Sec. 18(a). Title XVI is amended by striking therefrom the word "Commissioners", and by inserting in lieu thereof the word "Council."

(b) Section 1 of said title (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1595) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence:

"The Council is authorized to adopt in whole or in part any rule or regulation prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate pursuant to the Internal Revenue Code."

Sec. 19. Effective Dates.—(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) the provisions of this Act shall be effective with respect to all taxable years beginning after December 31, 1968, and ending after the date of enactment of this amendatory Act.

(b) The amendments made by subsections (d), (f), and (h) of section 14 of this Act shall become effective January 1, 1970.

Sec. 20. Effect of Repeal or Amendment.—(a) Existing Rights and Liabilities.—The repeal or amendment of any provision of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as heretofore amended, shall not affect any act done or any right accruing or accrued, or any suit or proceeding had or commenced in any civil cause before such repeal or amendment, but all rights and liabilities under such Act shall continue, and may be enforced in the same manner and to the same extent, as if such repeal or amendment had not been made.

(b) CRIMES AND PENALTIES.—All offenses committed, and all penalties incurred, under any provision of law hereby repealed or amended, may be prosecuted and punished in the same manner and with the same effect as if this Act had not been enacted.

SEC. 21. SEPARABILITY CLAUSE.—If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the Act, and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 22. DELEGATION.—The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Commissioner of the District of Columbia or in any office or agency under his jurisdiction and control, or in the District of Columbia Council, may be delegated by the Commissioner or by the Council, as the case may be.

S. 2604

A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, Sec. 4-823) is amended to read as follows:

"SALARY SCHEDULE

"Salary class and title	Service steps						Longevity steps		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	A	B	C
Class 1:									
Subclass (a)	$8,500	$8,755	$9,180	$9,605	$10,285	$10,965	$11,390	$11,815	$12,240
Fire private.									
Police private.									
Subclass (b)	9,095	9,350	9,775	10,200	10,880	11,560	11,985	12,410	12,835
Private assigned as:									
Technician.									
Plainclothesman.									
Station clerk.									
Motorcycle officer.									
Class 2:									
Subclass (a)	9,775	10,265	10,755	11,245			12,085	12,575	13,065
Fire inspector.									
Subclass (b)	10,200	10,690	11,180	11,670			12,510	13,000	13,490
Fire inspector assigned as technician.									
Class 3	10,625	11,155	11,685	12,215			12,745	13,275	13,805
Assistant marine engineer.									
Assistant pilot.									
Detective.									
Class 4:									
Subclass (a)	11,475	12,050	12,625	13,200			13,775	14,350	14,925
Fire sergeant.									
Police sergeant.									
Subclass (b)	11,900	12,495	13,090	13,685			14,280	14,875	15,470
Detective sergeant.									
Subclass (c)	12,070	12,645	13,220	13,795			14,370	14,945	15,520
Police sergeant assigned as motorcycle officer.									
Class 5	13,300	13,965	14,630	15,295			15,960	16,625	
Fire lieutenant.									
Police lieutenant.									
Class 6	14,500	15,280	16,010	16,740			17,470	18,200	
Marine engineer.									
Pilot.									
Class 7	15,800	16,590	17,380	18,170			18,960	19,750	
Captain.									
Class 8	18,500	19,425	20,350	21,275			22,200	23,125	
Battalion fire chief.									
Police inspector.									
Class 9	21,500	22,575	23,650	24,725			25,800	26,875	
Deputy Fire Chief.									
Deputy Chief of Police.									
Class 10	23,800	24,990	26,180	27,370			28,560	29,750	
Assistant Chief of Police.									
Assistant Fire Chief.									
Commanding officer of the White House Police.									
Commanding officer of the U.S. Park Police.									
Class 11	28,500	29,925	31,350	32,775					"
Fire Chief.									
Chief of Police.									

SEC. 2. The rates of basic compensation of officers and members to whom the amendments made by the first section of this Act apply shall be adjusted as follows:

Each officer and member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this Act at one of the scheduled service or longevity rates of a salary class or subclass in the salary schedule in Section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled service or longevity rate in effect on and after the effective date of this Act, except that:

(a) Each officer or member who immediately prior to the effective date of this Act was assigned as technician I or plainclothesman in subclass (b) of Class I or as technician II, station clerk, or motorcycle officer in subclass (c) of Class I shall, on the effective date of this Act be assigned as and receive basic compensation as technician, plainclothesman, station clerk or motorcycle officer in subclass (b) of class I at the service step or longevity step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this Act.

(b) Each officer or member who immediately prior to the effective date of this Act was serving as a fire inspector assigned as technician I or technician II in subclass (b) or (c) of Class 2 shall, on the effective date of this Act, be placed and receive basic compensation as fire inspector assigned as technician in subclass (b) of Class 2 at the service step or longevity step in subclass (b) corresponding to that service step or longevity step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this Act.

(c) Each officer or member who on the effective date of this Act was serving in subclass (b) of class 9 shall, on the effective date of this Act be placed in and receive basic compensation in class 10 at the service step or longevity step corresponding to that service step or longevity step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this Act.

(d) The Fire Chief or Chief of Police who on the effective date of this Act was serving in class 10 shall on the effective date of this Act be placed in and receive basic compensation in class 11 at the service step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this Act.

(e) Each officer or member of the Metropolitan Police Force who is performing the duty of a dog handler on or after the effective date of this Act shall receive in addition to his basic compensation an additional $595 per annum, except that if a police private is classed as technician in subclass (b) of salary class I in the salary schedule in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 solely on account of his duties as a dog handler, such police private shall not be entitled to the additional compensation authorized by this paragraph.

SEC. 3. Section 303(c) of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 4-829 (c)), is amended by deleting ", (b), or (c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "or (b)."

SEC. 4. The first sentence of section 304 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 4-830), is amended to read as follows:

"Any officer or member who is promoted or transferred to a higher class or subclass of a higher class shall receive basic compensation at the lowest scheduled rate of such higher class or subclass which exceeds his existing rate of compensation by not less than one step increase of the next higher step of the class or subclass from which he is promoted or transferred."

SEC. 5. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this Act only in the case of an individual in the service of the District of Columbia Government or of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to an officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the

United States Park Police force, or the White House Police force, who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after July 1, 1969, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act for services rendered during such period, and (2) in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, Eighty-first Congress), as amended, for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after July 1, 1969, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act by an officer or member who dies during such period.

(b) For the purpose of this section, services in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the federal government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 6. For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an officer or member is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this Act shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7. The provisions of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1969.

S. 2695

A bill to provide for the retirement of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, and of certain officers and members of the United States Secret Service, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 12 of the Act of September 1, 1916 (39 Stat. 718), as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 4–521), is amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (4) of subsection (a) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(4) The term 'vidower' means the surviving husband of a member who was married to such individual while she was a member."

(2) Paragraph (5) of subsection (a) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(5) (A) The term 'child' means an unmarried child, including (i) an adopted child, and (ii) a stepchild or recognized natural child who lives with the member in a regular parent-child relationship, under the age of eighteen years, or such unmarried child regardless of age who, because of physical or mental disability incurred before the age of eighteen, is incapable of self-support.

"(B) The term 'student-child' means an unmarried child who is a student between the ages of eighteen and twenty-two years, inclusive, and who is regularly pursuing a full-time course of study or training in a high school, trade school, technical or vocational institute, junior college, college, university, or comparable recognized educational institution.".

(3) Subsection (d) of such section is amended as follows:

(A) Paragraph (1) of such subsection is amended to read as follows:

"(1) On and after the first day of the first pay period which begins on and after the effective date of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1969 there shall be deducted and withheld from each member's basic salary an amount equal to 7 per centum of such basic salary. Such deductions and withholdings shall be paid to the Collector of Taxes of the District of Columbia, and shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia.".

(B) Subsection (d) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) In order to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of each former member coming under the provisions of this section who dies after retirement (1) leaving no survivor entitled to receive an annuity under the provisions of this section and (2) before the aggregate amount of the annuity paid to such former member equals the total amount deducted and withheld for retirement from his salary as a member, the Commissioner shall pay the difference to the person or persons surviving at the time of death in the following order of precedence, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person of the amount so paid:

"First, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries designated in writing by such former member, filed with the Commissioner and received by him prior to the death of such former members;

"Second, if there be no such beneficiary, to the child or children of such deceased former member and the descendants of deceased children by representation;

"Third, if there be none of the above, to the parents of such former member, or the survivor of them;

"Fourth, if there be none of the above, to the duly appointed legal representative of the estate of the deceased former member, or if there be none to the person or persons determined to be entitled thereto under the laws of the domicile of the deceased former member."

(4) Subsection (f) of such section is amended by striking out "2 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "2½ per centum".

(5) Subsection (g) of such section is amended by deleting "2 per centum" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "2½ per centum".

(6) Subsection (h)(3) of such section is amended by deleting "70 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "80 per centum".

(7) Subsection (j) of such section is amended by deleting "fifty-five" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "fifty".

(8) Subsection (k) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(k) (1) In the event that any member dies in the performance of duty, and such death is determined by the Commissioner to have occurred as a direct result of an accidental or a violent disastrous act, leaving a widow or widower, such widow or widower shall be entitled to receive an annuity equal to such member's basic salary at the time of death.

"(2) In the case of the death of any member before retirement, other than as provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection, or of any former member after retirement, leaving a widow or widower, such widow or widower shall be entitled to receive an annuity in the greater amount of (A) 40 per centum of such member's basic salary at the time of death, or 40 per centum of the salary on the basis upon which the annuity, relief or retirement compensation being received by such former member at the time of death was computed, or (B) 40 per centum of the salary for Step C, Subclass (a), Class 1 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act salary schedule at the time of such member or former member's death: *Provided,* That such annuity shall not exceed the current rate of compensation of the position occupied by such member at the time of death or by such former member immediately prior to retirement.

"(3) Each surviving child or student-child of any member who dies in the performance of duty as provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection, and who is not survived by a wife or husband, shall be paid an annuity equal to the smaller of (1) 25 per centum of such member's basic salary at the time of death; or (2) such member's basic salary at the time of death, divided by the number of eligible children.

"(4) Each surviving child or student-child, of any member who dies before retirement, and whose death was other than as provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection, or of any former member who dies after retirement, shall be entitled to receive an annuity in the greater amount of (A) 10 per centum of such member's basic salary at the time of death, or 10 per centum of the salary on the basis upon which the annuity, relief, or retirement compensation being received by such former member at the time of death was computed, divided by the number of eligible children, or (B) 10 per centum of the salary for Step C, Subclass (a), Class 1 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act in effect at the time of such member or former member's death, salary schedule/or 30 per centum of such salary divided by the number of eligible children, whichever is the smaller: *Provided,* That such member or former member is survived by a wife or husband: *Provided further,* That such annuity shall not exceed the current rate of compensation of the position occupied by such member at the time of death, or by such former member immediately prior to retirement. If such member or former member is not survived by a wife or husband, each surviving child or student-child shall be paid an annuity in the greater amount of (i) 15 per centum of such member's basic salary at the time of death, or 15 per centum of the salary on the basis upon which the annuity, relief, or retirement compensation being received by such former member at the time of death computed, divided by the number of eligible children, or (ii) 15 per centum of the salary for Step C, Subclass (a), Class 1 of said salary schedule in effect at the time of such member or former member's death, or 45 per centum of such salary divided by the number of eligible children, whichever is the smaller: *Provided,* That such annuity shall not exceed the current rate of compensation of the position occupied by such member at the time of death, or by such former member immediately prior to retirement.

"(5) Each widow, widower, or child who, on the effective date of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1969, was receiving relief or an annuity under the provisions of subsection (k) of this section, shall be entitled to have such benefits recomputed in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of this subsection, as amended. For the purposes of such recomputations, the term 'salary' as used in subsection (k)(2)(A), (k)(3), or (k)(4)(A) shall mean the salary provided for the position occupied by the member at the time of his death or by the retiree at the time of his retirement, as the case may be, increased by any statutory increases relative to such position which have occurred subsequent to such death or retirement, and the term 'salary' as used in subsection (k)(2)(B) or (k)(4)(B) shall mean the salary for the step referred to therein in effect on the date of such recomputation.

"(6) In the case of the death of any former member after retirement, leaving a widower, such widower shall be entitled to receive an annuity equal to 40 per centum of the full annuity such former member was entitled to receive at the time of death: *Provided,* That such former member, at the time of retirement, elected to receive a reduced annuity in lieu of such full annuity: *Provided further,* That the annuity payable to such former member after retirement was reduced by 10 per centum of the annuity computed as provided in subsection (f), (g), or (h). If, at any time after such former member's retirement, the husband dies, and is survived by such former member, the annuity payable to such former member shall be increased to the amount computed as provided in subsection (f), (g), or (h).

"(7) The annuity of any widow or widower under this subsection shall begin on the first day of the month in which the member or former member dies, and such annuity or any right thereto shall terminate upon the survivor's death or remarriage: *Provided*, That any annuity terminated by remarriage may be restored if such remarriage is later terminated by death, annulment or divorce. The annuity of any child under this subsection shall begin on the first day of the month in which the member or former member dies, and such annuity of such child or any right thereto shall terminate upon (A) his attaining age 18, unless incapable of self-support, (B) his becoming capable of self-support after age 18, (C) his marriage, or (D) his death. The annuity of any student-child after this subsection shall begin on the first day of the month in which the member or former member dies, and such annuity of such child or any right thereto shall terminate upon (i) his ceasing to be a student, (ii) his attaining age 22, (iii) his marriage, or (iv) his death. Such student-child whose birthday falls during the school year (September 1–June 30) shall be considered not to have reached age 22 until July 1 following his actual 22nd birthday.

"(8) Upon the death or remarriage of the surviving wife or husband of any member who is killed in the performance of duty as provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection, each surviving child or student-child of such member shall be paid an annuity computed as provided in paragraph (3) of this subsection. Such annuity shall begin on the first day of the month in which such wife or husband dies or remarries, and such annuity or any right thereto shall terminate (A) upon restoration of the annuity of a remarried wife or husband whose remarriage was later terminated, or (B) as provided in paragraph (7) of this subsection. Upon the death of the surviving wife or husband of any member whose death was other than as provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection, or of any former member, or termination of the annuity of a child or student-child, the annuity of any other child, student-child, or children shall be recomputed and paid as though such wife, husband, child, or student-child had not survived the member or former member.

"(9) Any member retiring under subsection (f), (g), or (h) of this section, may, at the time of such retirement, elect to receive a reduced annuity in lieu of the full annuity, and designate in writing the person to receive an increased annuity after the retired annuitant's death: *Provided*, That the person so designated be the surviving spouse or child of the retiring member. Whenever such an election is made, the annuity of the designee shall be increased by an amount equal to the amount by which the annuity of such retiring member is reduced. The annuity payable to the member making such election shall be reduced by 10 per centum of the annuity computed as provided in subsection (f), (g), or (h). Such increase in annuity payable to the designee shall be reduced by 5 per centum for each full five years the designee is younger than the retiring member, but such total reduction shall not exceed 40 per centum. The increase in annuity payable to the designee pursuant to this paragraph (9) shall be paid in addition to the annuity provided for such designee pursuant to paragraph (2), (4), or (8) of this subsection and shall be subject to the same limitations as to duration and other conditions as the annuity paid pursuant to paragraphs (2), (4), (7), and (8) of this subsection. If, at any time after such former member's retirement, the designee dies, and is survived by such former member, the annuity payable to such former member shall be increased to the amount computed as provided in subsection (f), (g), or (h).

"(10) Each person entitled to benefits computed in accordance with the provisions of this subsection shall be entitled to receive, without making application therefor, with respect to each increase in the salary upon which such benefits were computed hereafter granted by law, an increase in his relief or annuity. Such increase shall be in an amount which bears the same ratio to such relief of annuity in effect on the day next preceding such salary increase as such salary increase bore to such salary in effect on the day next preceding such salary increase. Each increase in relief or annuity under this paragraph (10) resulting from a salary increase shall take effect as of the first day of the first month following the effective date of such salary increase."

Sec. 2. This Act may be cited as the "Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1969".

S. 2696—EXPORT EXPANSION AND REGULATION ACT REPORTED—MINORITY, SUPPLEMENTAL, AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (REPT. NO. 91–336)

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably an original bill (S. 2696) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation and expansion of exports, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the minority views of Senators Bennett and Tower, the supplemental views of Senators Mondale, Hughes, and Percy, and the individual views of Senator Goodell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Maine.

S. 2697—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL AND SAFE STREETS ACT OF 1968

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce on behalf of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Brooke) and myself a bill that would amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 by making 50 percent of a State's allocation under the law enforcement assistance program conditional upon the enactment of firearms informations legislation.

I am joined in introducing the bill by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Brooke), who has been a leader in the effort to achieve the enactment of firearms' control legislation over the past few years.

Last year, Congress enacted both the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, and the Gun Control Act. These measures represented the first concerted national effort to curtail the violence associated with the unrestricted availability of firearms. However, it has long been clear that further action is required if we are to counteract the rise in crimes of violence; and we would be deluding ourselves if we did not relate this increase in crimes of violence in our society with the easy availability of guns in many sections of the country.

There were more than 6,000 gun murders in the United States in 1967 compared to 12 in Great Britain, a nation with strong gun control legislation. As the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Hruska) noted in introducing the administration's bills on crime in the District of Columbia, the 1968 preliminary annual uniform crime reporting statistics states that crime increased by 17 percent nationally in 1968 over 1967. Violent crimes increased by 19 percent, with murders up 19 percent, robbery up 29 percent and assault up 12 percent. The Federal Bureau of Investigation reports that crime, as measured by the crime index, increased 10 percent during the first 3 months of 1969 over the same period in 1968. Murders were up 7 percent, assault 8 percent and robbery up 22 percent. As a group, the crimes of violence—murder, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault—rose 15 percent.

The bills passed in 1968—title IV of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act and the Gun Control Act—prohibited the interstate transfer of and mail-order business in firearms. This legislation was designed to enhance the successful prospects of States to develop meaningful firearms control legislation, for the easy availability of guns through interstate commerce had detracted from the effectiveness of such State legislation.

The Congress last year thus made it possible for the States to undertake programs of comprehensive gun control. A few States now have such legislation, including New Jersey, which has perhaps the most comprehensive of such acts dealing with both the registration and licensing of long guns and handguns, and New York, which has legislated only with regard to handguns.

It is interesting to note that 39 percent of murders committed in New Jersey and 32 percent in New York between 1962 and 1965 were with guns. This compares with about 70 percent of murders committed with guns in States with minimal or no gun controls.

To the extent that the 1968 legislation can make the laws of States like New Jersey more effective—and it is perhaps too soon to make judgments about that—than it has been an important and successful contribution to the effort to control firearms. But we must recognize that effective gun control is still dependent upon effective and constructive State action and that there exists in Federal law neither an incentive nor a requirement that States move in this direction. It is to this shortcoming to which the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Brooke) and I have directed this bill.

We have debated the merits of firearms control many, many times over the past few years. There are several polls that make indisputably clear that the people of the United States over-whelmingly favor firearms' control. We have attempted to deal with crime and violence in the past and will again in this Congress, I am sure, but we have not yet fully met the problem caused by the unrestricted and often unknown presence

XUM

of firearms in our midst—particularly, in our densely populated and crime-prone urban areas.

We live in troubled and violent times. We have seen violent urban disorders and assassinations, and, in the past year, a dangerous new element—the presence of firearms—has been introduced into the student unrest which has gripped some of our campuses.

The bill which the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) and I introduce today is a very modest measure. Hopefully, it will help raise this issue before the Senate once again and give the public a chance to be heard on it. Hopefully, the Committee on the Judiciary will seriously consider this bill as a modest attempt to face this issue. Hopefully, this bill has some chance of enactment and, therefore, of making some contribution to the national effort to control firearms and crimes of violence.

As I have noted, this bill would amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 by requiring any State which seeks its full Federal grant for an approved law enforcement project or program to enact legislation requiring the owner of a firearm—including rifles and shotguns, as well as pistols—to furnish to an appropriate State agency information as to his name, address, and social security number, as well as information on the manufacture, type, model, and serial number of the weapon.

It should be emphasized that no State would be required to establish such an information system. Any State legislature could refuse to enact such a bill, but such failure to act would result in the loss of 50 percent of the State's allocation—to which it would otherwise be entitled—under the program of Federal grants for law enforcement assistance.

Every State would have sufficient time to comply with this condition—until the completion of the first session for general legislative purposes following the enactment of this bill. The bill also provides that the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration would be authorized to enter into agreements with any State having such legislation to pay 75 percent of the cost of forwarding this information to the U.S. Department of Justice.

This bill merely seeks to provide an incentive for the establishment of firearms information systems at the State level. It does not establish a national system of firearms' registration and licensing. It does not require licensing at the State or local level. It would not hinder the hunter or the sportsman in any way, nor would it stop any decent, law-abiding citizen from owning a gun. It will merely provide an incentive to the States to obtain minimal information on the presence of firearms among their citizens. It would provide an incentive to the States to begin to bring some order out of the chaos of unfettered traffic in deadly weapons.

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) and I fully appreciate that the enactment of this bill would place a condition—though only a partial one—on a program which to date has been an unrestricted program of bloc grants to the States. I cosponsored the original legislation, and I support it. I will seek full funding of the programs it establishes. However, it seems to me that there is an overriding national interest in moving forward in the area of firearms' information. Moreover, it is perfectly consistent with the purposes and the objectives of the Safe Streets Act and of the program of the Federal law-enforcement assistance grants which established that any State which would benefit fully from this program should take some small step toward obtaining information about the existence of firearms within its borders. Without at least this minimal action, I believe that it can be neither accurately assumed nor validly accepted that the State has a comprehensive and balanced program of law enforcement, deserving of full Federal support.

This issue cannot be allowed to fade away, to be brought to the attention of the Congress again only as a result of more tragedy and violence. I urge the Committee on the Judiciary to give this matter the most serious and favorable consideration in its current hearings on gun control legislation, so that the Senate may have before it the opportunity to take one more step forward in gun control legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2697) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to encourage the States to adopt firearms information legislation, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. BROOKE) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2697

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is amended by inserting immediately after section 522 the following new section:

"SEC. 523. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not more than 50 percent of a State's allocation determined under section 306 to carry out part C of this title may be made available for grants to such State unless the Attorney General has determined that such State has enacted legislation of general applicability within such State—

"(1) requiring the owner of a firearm within such State to furnish to an appropriate State agency the following information:

"(A) the name, address, and social security number, if any of the owner of the firearm; and

"(B) the manufacturer, type, model, and serial number or other identifying characteristics of each such firearm;

"(2) specifying civil penalties designed to insure compliance with the firearms information collection provisions of such legislation; and

"(3) permitting units of general local government the authority to enact firearms information ordinances more stringent than the provisions of such legislation.

"(b) No grant, and no portion of any grant, shall be denied because of the failure of any State to comply with the requirement of this section until the legislature of such State has completed the first session for general legislative purposes convened after the date of enactment of this Act.

"(c) (1) The Administration is authorized to enter into agreements with any State having legislation in compliance with the provisions of this section, to pay 75 percent of the cost of forwarding to the Department of Justice the information collected pursuant to paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section.

"(2) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums for each fiscal year as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection.

"(d) As used in this section the term 'firearm' has the same meaning as prescribed in section 921 of title 18, United States Code."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the junior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), who has joined me in sponsoring the bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR BROOKE

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I rise today with a sense of disappointment and urgency over a continuing problem of national dimensions. My concern is directed to the inadequate development of responsible and effective firearms controls.

The debate over which approach to adopt on the federal level has been clouded at times by emotional arguments advanced in the heat of controversy. Nevertheless, certain basic facts have emerged which demonstrate the relationship between the irresponsible use of firearms and the increasing rate of crime. For instance, we know that since 1965, armed robberies by gun have increased 58 percent and aggravated assaults by gun have increased 76 percent. We also know that the United States is by far the leader of the free industrial countries of the world in both the rate per capita and the absolute number of homicides, suicides and accidents by firearms.

More important than what we know is what we do not know. In light of the inherent danger of firearms, it seems incredible that there has been no comprehensive count of firearms sales by the Government since 1963 when the last study was conducted by the Bureau of the Census. The result is that in the absence of adequate data as to the number of firearms outstanding, estimates range from 100 million to 200 million. Sufficient information is also unavailable as to the number of firearms currently being sold to residents of each State or city and the number of firearms stolen or transferred annually. The importance of complete and adequate information is undeniably basic to an effective form of control. Without it, the only improvement possible is the more rapid transmission of inadequate information.

With these thoughts and concerns in mind, I am very pleased to join my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New York, in the introduction of a measure that is specifically designed to encourage the individual States to enact firearms information legislation. It is important to note that while the States are given strong incentive to adopt their own inventories and to share the collected information with the Federal Government, they are not compelled to do so. However, the efficiency of any central system will be directly proportional to the amount of State cooperation and participation elicited.

Every American citizen has a vested interest in the formulation of effective and responsible firearms control legislation. The improper use of firearms is not limited to

XUM

any one part of the country nor is it peculiar to any one ethnic group or race. I am hopeful that this measure will be considered favorably this session in an atmosphere of constructive debate and positive action.

It is a promising fresh approach to a chronic problem, and represents yet another option in the growing list of reasonable proposals to deal with this grave blight in our national life.

S. 2698—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE PROCUREMENT AND RETENTION OF JUDGE ADVOCATES AND LAW SPECIALIST OFFICERS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the procurement and retention of judge advocates and law specialist officers for the Armed Forces. This bill would provide retention incentives for legal officers similar to those presently provided to other professionals such as doctors, dentists, and veterinarians.

This bill would provide the following retention incentives for legal officers: $50 per month through grade O–3, captain; $150 per month for grades O–4 and O–5, major and lieutenant colonel; $200 per month for grades O–6 and above, colonel and above.

Also, a continuation bonus payable at the rate of 2 months' basic pay for each year for which the judge advocate agrees to remain in active service beyond any then outstanding active-duty service obligation or service commitment. The contract would be for a minimum of 3 additional years and a maximum of 6 years. Judge advocates would be eligible for this bonus on two occasions: first, upon the completion of 4 years' active service; and second, at the time when they become eligible for voluntary retirement with pay. A provision is included which would allow the judge advocate to receive the bonus either at the beginning of the period, or to have it prorated.

Mr. President, there can be little doubt about the need for this bill. The seriousness of the retention problem was highlighted in a feature article contained in the April 8, 1967, edition of the Journal of the Armed Forces entitled "Career Legal Billets Go Begging."

At the outset, Journal Editor Lou Stockstill placed the problem in proper perspective:

> The armed forces are having a tough time filling "lawyer" billets in their career ranks.
>
> As a result much of the legal workload of the Services is being handled by young and relatively un-tried officers whose diplomas still smell of wet ink.
>
> In response to a Journal survey, all four Services say the problem is not one of obtaining sufficient numbers of law specialists and judge advocates—but to keeping them. The turn-over rate is extremely high and the retention rate is very low.

In the intervening year and a half since the Journal article, the retention problem has worsened.

For example, within the Army during the 14-year period from 1951 through 1964, of the 3,020 military lawyers who entered active duty, only 380 remained as of 1968. This represents an overall retention rate of 12½ percent. Since 1960, in the Navy, the number of career lawyers has steadily declined to the point where the situation is now critical. As recently as last October, the Navy had only 38 regular lieutenants out of some 630 lawyers on active duty. This amounts to an average yearly retention of 12 lawyers per year. To assure experienced lawyers in the overall career structure, the Navy must retain 30 lawyers in each year group. Without remedial action, it is anticipated that by July 1972, 75 percent of all uniformed Navy lawyers will have had less than 5 years' legal military experience.

The situation in the Air Force is likewise distressing. Since 1956, that service has been able to retain only 19 percent of its judge advocates, including recallees. If the recallees are excluded the percentage drops to 14 percent. The Air Force estimates that between 40 and 45 percent retention is necessary to maintain the JAG Department at the desired level.

Experienced lawyers in the armed services will give the armed services better justice for all personnel, greater stability, and prove an effective aid to an efficient command.

Mr. President, I think that this situation deserves our careful attention. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2698) to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the procurement and retention of judge advocates and law specialist officers for the Armed Forces, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2698

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by inserting the following new sections and corresponding items in the analysis:

"§ 302a. Special pay: judge advocates and law specialists

"(a) In addition to any other basic pay, special pay, incentive pay, or allowances to which he is entitled, each judge advocate of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, or law specialist of the Coast Guard, as defined in section 801 of title 10, other than one ordered to active duty for less than one year, is entitled to special pay at the rates set forth below while he is performing judge advocate duties—

"(1) $50 a month for each month of active duty, if he is in pay grade O–1, O–2, or O–3;

"(2) $150 a month for each month of active duty if he is in pay grade O–4 or O–5; or

"(3) $200 a month for each month of active duty, if he is in a pay grade above O–5.

"(b) The amounts set forth in subsection (a) of this section may not be included in computing the amount of an increase in pay authorized by any other provision of this title or in computing retired pay or severance pay.

"§ 311a. Special pay: continuation pay for judge advocates and law specialists who extend their service on active duty

"(a) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary concerned, a judge advocate of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, or a law specialist of the Coast Guard, who—

"(1) is entitled to special pay under section 302a of this title;

"(2) has completed his initial active duty service commitment as a judge advocate or law specialist; and

"(3) executes a written agreement to remain on active duty for a period of at least three, but not more than six, additional years;

may be paid not more than two months' basic pay at the rate applicable to him when he executes that agreement for each additional year that he agrees to remain on active duty. Pay under this section may, at the election of the officer, be paid to him in a lump sum at the beginning of the additional period or be prorated.

"(b) An officer who has received special pay under subsection (a) of this section may—

"(1) qualify for a second payment of that pay when he becomes eligible for voluntary retirement, with pay, upon completion of twenty years of active service, by executing a written agreement to remain on active duty for a period prescribed in that subsection; and

"(2) be paid on the same basis as prescribed in that subsection and at the rate of basic pay applicable to him at the time he executes the agreement.

"(c) An officer who does not serve on active duty for the entire period for which he was paid under this section shall refund that percentage of the payment that the unserved part of the period is of the total period for which the payment was made."

S. 2700—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR VETERANS OUTREACH SERVICES TO ASSIST RECENTLY DISCHARGED VETERANS IN OBTAINING BENEFITS AND SERVICES TO WHICH THEY ARE ENTITLED AND EDUCATION, TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, today, I introduce S. 2700, a bill to amend chapter 3 of title 38, United States Code, in order to provide for a veterans outreach services program in the Veterans' Administration to assist eligible veterans, especially those recently separated, in applying for and obtaining benefits and services to which they are entitled, and education, training and employment, and for other purposes.

The Veterans' Administration has been operating a system of veterans assistance centers at 71 points around the country under what could be called, at best, very scanty statutory authority. This bill would provide a very clear congressional mandate for a veterans outreach services program as well as a major new emphasis and design for that program.

Two phrases buried in rather obscure sections of title 38, United States Code, are currently seen as authorizing the Veterans' Administration's veterans assistance centers and other outreach programs which the VA administers and in which it employs 1,200 persons. I will describe these activities and their evolution in greater detail later in my remarks. The authority for most of this VA activity is found, largely by implication, in section 3311, entitled "Authority to issue subpenas," under a subchapter entitled, "Investigations." The statutory language in question is:

> "For the purposes of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, the Administrator . . . shall have the power to . . . aid claimants in the preparation and presentation of claims.

The second piece of pertinent language is found under section 231, "Placement of employees in military installations," which provides:

> The Administrator may place officers and employees of the Veterans' Administration in such Army, Navy, and Air Force installations as may be deemed advisable for the purpose of adjudicating disability claims of, and giving aid and advice to, members of the Armed Forces who are about to be discharged or released from active military, naval, or air service.

These two provisions seem a very slim legislative base for such an important program, almost entirely devoid of congressional direction and statutory guide lines. It has thus been the responsibility of the executive branch to develop the parameters and emphases of the outreach program. The measure I propose today would offer the Congress the opportunity to provide these guidelines and establish some major new directions.

Before describing the provisions of this bill, I wish to relate the general history of the Veterans' Administration's contact activities.

The contact activities of the Veterans' Administration were originated in 1919 to provide veterans and their dependents an opportunity to secure information and assistance on veterans' benefit matters administered by the VA. Prior to World War II the program was not known as the contact program and its total staff was comprised of some 350 personnel located in field offices and hospitals.

With the passage of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, the contact program was formally established and contact offices were opened in 1,049 additional population centers. Contact representatives were also then stationed at the large military separation centers and military hospitals where servicemen were being separated from active duty. During the period of mass demobilization these facilities were established to advise veterans of their entitlement to VA benefits and to assist them in applying for them. The peak of this expanded activity was reached during the latter part of 1946 and early in 1947 when nearly 7,000 persons—as compared with only 1,200 today—were employed in contact activities.

In time the need for the large dispersion of offices and contact personnel diminished. Delimiting dates of statutory benefits were reached, and for the most part veterans had received the benefits in which they were interested and to which they were entitled. By the end of 1962 practically all of the offices opened in the mid-1940's had been closed. Contact personnel had likewise dropped from over 7,000 to approximately 1,000.

During the Korea conflict, the VA still maintained a number of smaller offices to meet requests for assistance from veterans of that conflict. Services to military installations was also reinstated during the Korean conflict.

With the passage of the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966, and with the increased military activity in Vietnam, it became apparent that the VA would again need to provide service to an increasing recently discharged veteran population. Accordingly, personnel were assigned to military hospitals and to military installations separating large groups of servicemen. At the present time, service on benefit matters is available at 184 military hospitals and at 311 separation points.

Since November of 1966 over 158,000 servicemen awaiting separation for reasons of disability have been assisted by VA representatives. Since May of 1967 well over a million men have been oriented on VA benefits at the time of separation. The VA currently has nine representatives assigned at the following locations in Vietnam: Army—Long Binh and Cam Ranh Bay; Air Force—Da Nang, Cam Ranh Bay, Bien Hoa and Tan Son Nhut Air Base; Marine Corps—Da Nang.

I wish to interpolate at this point that the counseling now available at these military installations is not nearly so broad and varied as would be provided for in the bill I am introducing

Concurrently, as a further step toward meeting the increasing requests for assistance, the VA in 1967 extended itinerant service to community locations not having full-time VA installations. Special telephone service, where feasible, has been installed between some large communities and the parent regional office so that veterans can talk toll-free with a specialist on benefit matters.

By early 1968 it was abundantly apparent that these steps were not adequate for the assistance needs of today's veterans. A somewhat dramatic change was dictated in the posture of contact assistance by the sociological and economic needs of Vietnam era servicemen.

A task force on veterans assistance centers had been established by the White House on November 18, 1967. The task force was composed of representatives of the Veterans' Administration; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Department of Labor; Civil Service Commission; Office of Economic Opportunity; Department of Justice; Department of Housing and Urban Development; and Small Business Administration. Based on the detailed plans developed by that task force, the President in his January 30, 1968, message to Congress on servicemen and veterans directed the establishment of an initial group of 20 U.S. veterans assistance centers—termed USVAC's. These centers combined the full capabilities of Government agencies in providing one-stop service to veterans on all Federal benefits. The initial 10 USVAC's were opened in February and the next 10 in March. Later, beginning on July 1, 1968, USVAC activities were extended to an additional 51 locations. Insofar as the VA was concerned, the most skilled of contact personnel were assigned to these centers.

Strong Presidential direction was provided for this program in 1968. In his January 30, 1968, message to the Congress, President Johnson said:

> The ultimate effectiveness of our (veterans) programs turns on these conditions:
>
> The veteran must be aware of them.
>
> He must be able to choose among them.
>
> He must know that the help he needs will be there when he needs it.
>
> We have tried to make certain that men leaving the service become familiar with the benefits that await them as veterans.
>
> Last year, at my direction, the Veterans Administration took its services to the battlefield for the first time. VA teams counseled 220,000 fighting men in Vietnam, before they left their posts to return home.
>
> I have asked the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to step up this program.
>
> Late in 1966, the Veterans Administration began visiting sick and wounded servicemen at their bedsides in our military hospitals.
>
> Since then, over 17,000 applications for special training and disability payments have been processed on the spot.
>
> This program now operates in 110 military hospitals.
>
> I have directed the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs immediately to expand the program to the entire system of military hospitals.
>
> Veterans Administration counseling is also now in operation at 150 military separation points.
>
> I have directed the Administrator to extend this program to all 257 such centers.
>
> Through these expanded services in hospitals and separation centers, the Veterans Administration can reach more than 70,000 servicemen each month.
>
> The remaining task is to make certain all veterans are reached once they have returned to their communities.
>
> Consider the man who comes home today. His Government has made a vast array of programs available to him. But what effect are the programs if he cannot find them? And in our major cities, where facilities are often scattered across widely-separated areas, this is a serious problem—particularly for those who need the programs the most.
>
> The answer, I believe, lies in an effort we have never tried before for our veterans—the one-stop center. I believe we should locate in one place the offices where a veteran can receive personal attention and counsel on all the benefits the law provides him—from housing to health, from education to employment.
>
> I have today ordered that U.S. Veterans Assistance Centers be opened in 10 major cities within the coming month. These cities are New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Detroit, Cleveland, Washington, D.C., San Francisco, Boston and Atlanta.
>
> I propose to have one-stop centers in 10 other cities as soon as possible—Baltimore, Milwaukee, Houston, St. Louis, Pittsburgh, San Antonio, New Orleans, Indianapolis, Phoenix and Newark.
>
> Based on the experience gained in these 20 pilot locations, we look forward to establishing one-stop centers in other cities.
>
> We will seek and welcome participation in these centers by State and local officials, and by community organizations engaged in helping the veteran.

This new program has made a hopeful beginning, and I believe that the executive branch is to be commended for taking the initiative in this vitally important undertaking. I think there is a great need, especially among those recently separated veterans who are high school dropouts—23 percent of all those being discharged—for reaching out to locate the veteran, to inform him of the benefits and services to which he may be entitled, to motivate and assist him to use his educational and training entitlements, to help him resolve and remove impediments to his pursuit of higher education, and to aid him in finding employment.

Veterans' Administration literature describes the USVAC program as follows:

> To provide for recently separated veterans an integrated Federal and other agency assistance program in order to:
>
> a. Promote the highest possible educational achievement.
>
> b. Facilitate rapid social and economic readjustment to civilian life.
>
> c. Further the achievement of a high standard of living and a productive, satisfying life.
>
> d. Receive and channel appropriate actions on discrimination complaints concerning Civil Rights.

The Veterans' Administration characterizes the main thrust of its USVAC efforts as having been directed toward the educationally disadvantaged. Yet only two or three of these centers are located in neighborhoods or communities where the educationally disadvantaged veterans, whom we seek to reach, actually reside and where the outreach services should be most accessible to them. And, to my knowledge, there has been no concerted effort on the part of the VA to seek out and to employ in the outreach program recently returned Vietnam veterans who themselves come from educationally disadvantaged backgrounds. Often the most effective and meaningful counseling is done by those who know through firsthand experience the problems and have met and resolved them.

The Veterans' Administration's own statistics indicate to me that it has been only marginally successful in reaching the educationally disadvantaged veteran. Again, I stress that, according to Defense Department figures, 23 percent of enlisted personnel being separated at this time were high school dropouts. The stakes are very high for society and for these veterans themselves that they be channeled to education and training to give them the means of competing in today's ever-constricting job market for the high school dropout. I need not dwell at length on the very few opportunities for work open to the high school dropout and what his street corner alternatives as one of the unemployables then become.

VA figures show that during fiscal year 1969 there were a total of 232,125 initial interviews at its 71 USVAC's. Of these, only 37,179, that is, about 16 percent, were with the educationally disadvantaged. This does not even approach the 23 percent figure that a random sampling of recently discharged veterans would presumably turn up. Surely, this is not an acceptable result, especially for a program purportedly designed to seek out and reach the educationally disadvantaged.

Furthermore, if we look at this number of educationally disadvantaged veterans receiving initial interviews during fiscal year 1969—37,179—we see that during a year when 940,000 servicemen separated from the Armed Forces, of whom 23 percent, or 216,200 were high school dropouts, the VA outreach program made personal contact with only about 17 percent of that target population. And it should be stressed that this refers only to those contacted, not those successfully motivated or otherwise assisted.

If we focus on the number of educational applications filed by these 37,179 educationally disadvantaged veterans who were interviewed, we find it was 16,331. That is, arguably, not a bad record percentagewise: 44 percent of those contacted as compared with 36 percent of those veterans with above high school educations who were interviewed and filed applications. But even this is very slight reassurance.

First, the VA estimates that of all applications filed by veterans during the last 3 fiscal years slightly more than 17 percent were never used by the applicants.

Second, one would expect that there would be a somewhat higher natural tendency on the part of the educationally disadvantaged, once opportunities and lack of job potential are made clear to them, to try to take greater advantage of the available education and training benefits. But there might also be a greater tendency to file applications and not follow up on the application.

Third, failing to motivate more than half of those interviewed to even file applications is just not acceptable. We must do better.

And fourth, since it can be fairly assumed that about 20 percent of the educationally disadvantaged applicants never followed through on education and training, we end up with only 14,065 of them pursuing education or training out of a target population of 216,200 last fiscal year. That is 6.5 percent.

If we take the overview of these statistics, they become even more alarming. Total post-Korean conflict GI bill participation figures show that only approximately 10 percent of the high school dropouts have taken advantage of GI bill training or education since 1966. It is true that the USVAC's have had only 1½ years to improve this figure dramatically, but 10 percent is a sorry performance.

I must admit that the Veterans' Administration's analysis of its USVAC statistics differs markedly from my own. It would seem from reading some of the VA's literature describing this program that it feels that it has been reasonably successful in reaching and assisting the educationally disadvantaged veteran. For example, it states in one publication that it has been successful in conducting interviews with 69 percent of the educationally disadvantaged veterans residing in areas serviced by the 71 USVAC's.

However, the number of such veterans which the VA identifies as within the areas served by its USVAC's would appear to be less than one-third of the servicemen separated in fiscal year 1969 who were high school dropouts. Such a narrowly constricted definition of the target population leads to a very misleading skewing of statistics on program success. More fundamentally, this failure to be in the position to reach the vast majority of the educationally disadvantaged veterans indicates that a substantial expansion and relocation of the Assistance Centers is most necessary.

In describing veterans outreach activities, I do not wish to overlook the valuable contribution that is being made by the veterans' service organizations and other voluntary organizations in attempting to contact educationally disadvantaged veterans. VA statistics show that some 15,200 such interviews, largely in rural areas not served by USVAC's, were held by these organizations in fiscal year 1969. This is nearly half the total that the entire USVAC program reached.

But, whereas I wish to commend these organizations on their participation in the veterans outreach program, at the same time I think that the statistics which I have just cited indicate that there is a long way to go. And I ask these organizations to rededicate themselves to a massive increase in their participation in the veterans outreach services program which would be authorized by the bill I am introducing.

It is for the purpose of providing the incentive for the educationally disadvantaged to participate fully in GI bill benefits that I introduced S. 2668 on July 18. This bill would provide for and finance, among other programs, a Pre-Discharge Educational Program—PREP—during a serviceman's last year of active duty. I also have cosponsored the bill (S. 338) and an amendment to it proposed by the distinguished chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, which would increase educational and training assistance allowances 46 percent across-the-board. Such increases should help make it more financially feasible for the disadvantaged veteran to take advantage of training and education under the GI bill.

I am dedicated to doing all I can to achieve enactment of both these measures—S. 338 and S. 2668—as well as the one I introduce today.

Now, I would like to describe the provisions of the bill.

This bill would charge the Veterans' Administration with a congressionally sanctioned obligation of seeking out and offering a wide range of assistance to our recently discharged veterans, especially those who are educationally disadvantaged. The aim would be to aid these veterans in obtaining the maximum benefits and services to which they are entitled under VA programs or any other Federal, State, or local governmental program.

This emphasis upon non-VA benefits and services would be a new one, and I believe that it is a much needed part of the theory of a one-stop assistance center. It is an old saw that those who most need assistance are usually the ones who by virtue of their disadvantages are least aware of and least equipped to learn about the availability of—and indeed their entitlements to—governmental benefits and services. In many ways this is unequal protection of the law, and I believe the Government has an affirmative obligation to establish vigorous programs to provide this information and assistance.

The bill would require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide specified outreach services to all eligible veterans and eligible dependents—who de-

XUM

rive educational benefits from deceased or totally disabled veterans, under the War Orphans' and Widows' Educational Assistance Act in chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code—but especially to recently discharged veterans and those who are educationally disadvantaged. The term "educationally disadvantaged" would generally mean the veteran without a high school diploma—that is the meaning of that term in section 1678 which S. 2668 would amend. But, the term would not be so statutorily defined, leaving the Administrator discretion to broaden that category for the purposes of providing intensive outreach services.

The outreach services specified in the bill for eligible veterans and eligible dependents are:

First, distributing full information about all benefits and services to which they may be entitled under VA laws and to which they are entitled under any other governmental program—Federal, State, or local.

Second, arranging for and conducting, to the maximum extent possible, person-to-person interviews to explain these benefits and services and to plan individual programs of education, training or employment best suited to the veteran or dependent concerned.

Third, providing job and other appropriate referrals and job placement assistance. These services would include not only referral to prospective employers for those seeking jobs but also guidance in interview techniques and provision of direct assistance in securing those jobs. Referrals could also be made to other governmental programs, such as State employment offices, U.S. Employment Service offices and Civil Service Commission offices, as well as referral to those programs responsible for other benefits and services to which the veteran or dependent may be entitled. This latter category would include; for example, the local public assistance program or the community action agency; the neighborhood legal services program or the public defender's office; the Social Security office; or the agency distributing surplus food or food stamps.

It should be stressed also that the referral would not pass along program responsibility to someone else, for the VA would be charged with a very important followup function. Under this bill the Veterans' Administration could not fulfill its responsibilities merely by giving a veteran another address. Rather the contact representative would assist in placing necessary phone calls and arranging appointments as well as finding out basic information and passing it along to the veteran in terms most meaningful to him.

Fourth, providing social and other special services necessary to aid in obtaining maximum assistance from the benefits and services available. This would include a broad range of counseling services, including health care and health benefit counseling, some of which I have already described in discussing referrals.

Fifth, providing aid and assistance in the preparation and presentation of claims. The claims concerned would be not only those under title 38 but also those in connection with any other governmental program. Although some of this language is contained elsewhere in title 38—section 3311—it is included, and broadened here, so as to be set forth together with the other outreach services.

The bill would require the VA to maintain full records of all outreach services offered and to conduct periodic followup contacts to determine the success of the assistance offered. For example, although the VA is apparently attempting to remedy this situation, it presently has no data to show how many interviewed veterans who apply for GI educational benefits actually follow through and return to school, or to determine how many stay in school.

The bill would specifically charge the Administrator to locate veterans assistance centers with due regard for areas where educationally disadvantaged veterans and other recently separated veterans reside and to provide appropriate outreach services for veterans in the less populated areas. It would specifically require that every effort be made to locate assistance centers in communities where large numbers of educationally disadvantaged veterans reside rather than in business district office buildings which are often inaccessible or unattractive to many disadvantaged veterans. This provision would require substantial relocations of USVAC's, since only two or three—in the District of Columbia, for example—are located in neighborhood communities.

Along the same lines, the bill would mandate that every effort be made to assign to assistance centers veterans who themselves reside in the community served—or a similar community—and, where possible, who themselves have received assistance from these centers. It would also require strong emphasis in hiring on the ability to relate directly and effectively to educationally disadvantaged veterans. In this regard, information available to me indicates that, for example, minority representation among present VA contact personnel is substantial only in the District of Columbia and Los Angeles and that even there most all the contact representatives are long-time VA employees rather than Vietnam era veterans.

The bill would require that the Veterans' Administration coordinate with and use the services and facilities of other Federal agencies and governmental or service organizations. At the same time, as I have already indicated, this would not in any way discharge the Veterans' Administration's overall responsibility for the effectiveness of the full outreach services program, which this bill would authorize.

The bill would require the VA to conduct studies to determine the most effective program design to carry out the purposes of this bill with respect to the educationally disadvantaged veteran. These studies would be made in consultation with the Federal agencies with most experience in dealing with disadvantaged persons: The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Office of Economic Opportunity; the Department of Defense; the Department of Labor; the Department of Housing and Urban Development; and the Urban Affairs Council.

Finally, in order that the Congress may be kept fully involved in the outreach services program, the bill would require semiannual reports on the effectiveness of the program and the degree of coordination with other agencies and programs, particularly with respect to reach the educationally disadvantaged veteran, and on recommendations for improvement of the program.

I believe that enactment of this bill, the PREP program in S. 2668, the educational services program in S. 2361—introduced by Senator KENNEDY with cosponsorship by Senator YARBOROUGH and myself—S. 2506, and S. 338 as it would be amended by Senator YARBOROUGH's amendment, which I am cosponsoring, and effective implementation of these new programs by the Veteran's Administration would make a substantial beginning toward increasing GI bill participation by Vietnam era veterans, especially those who are educationally disadvantaged. I believe we owe our Nation and these veterans no less than the programs these bills would authorize.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill, which I introduce for myself and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2700) to amend chapter 3 of title 38, United States Code, in order to provide for a veterans outreach services program in the Veterans' Administration to assist eligible veterans, especially those recently separated, in applying for and obtaining benefits and services to which they are entitled, and education, training, and employment, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CRANSTON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2700

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 3 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subchapter:

"SUBCHAPTER IV—VETERANS OUTREACH SERVICES PROGRAM

"§ 240. PURPOSE; DEFINITION

"(a) The Congress of the United States declares that the outreach services program authorized by this subchapter is for the purpose of insuring that all veterans, especially those who are recently separated and those who are eligible for readjustment or other benefits and services under laws administered by the Veterans Administration and under other governmental programs receive personalized educational, vocational, social services and job placement assistance with respect to their entitlement to those benefits and services in order to aid them in applying for and obtaining such benefits and services and further education and training or employment and, in the case of veterans, achieving a rapid social and economic readjustment to civilian life and a higher standard of living for them and their dependents. The Congress further declares that the outreach services program authorized by this subchapter is for the purpose of charging the Veterans Administration with the affirmative duty of seeking out eligible veterans and providing them such necessary assistance in, to the maximum extent possible, one integrated Federal and other agency program through personnel who will be able to communicate with and provide such assistance to the veteran concerned in the most effective and meaningful manner and with the greatest emphasis upon personal contact.

"(b) For the purposes of this subchapter, the term 'other governmental programs' shall include all programs under state or local laws as well as all programs under Federal law other than those authorized by this title.

"§ 241. Veterans Assistance Centers and Outreach Services

"(a) The administrator shall establish and maintain Veterans Assistance Centers at such places throughout the United States, its Territories, Commonwealths, and possessions, as he determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Subchapter, with due regard for the geographic distribution of recently separated veterans and the special needs of educationally disadvantaged veterans and for providing appropriate outreach services in less populated areas.

"(b) Veterans Assistance Centers shall seek especially to provide the outreach services to educationally disadvantaged veterans and shall, to the maximum practicable extent, be located in communities where large numbers of these veterans reside rather than in Federal or other business-district office buildings.

"(c) Special efforts shall be made to employ at Veterans Assistance Centers veterans who themselves reside in the community served or similar communities and, where possible, who themselves have received assistance from such centers. Personnel assigned to such centers shall be selected with major regard to their ability to communicate with and provide the outreach services authorized in this subchapter directly to educationally disadvantaged veterans in the most effective and meaningful manner.

"(d) In carrying out the purposes of this subchapter, the Administrator shall provide all eligible veterans and eligible dependents outreach services, including but not limited to—

"(1) distributing full information regarding all benefits and services to which they may be entitled under laws administered by the Veterans Administration and to which they are entitled under other governmental programs;

"(2) arranging for and conducting, to the maximum extent possible, person-to-person interviews to explain the above benefits and services and to planning an individual program of education, training or employment as may be best suited, in the case of a veteran, for rapid social and economic readjustment to civilian life, to the eligible veteran or eligible dependent concerned;

"(3) providing job and other appropriate referrals and job placement assistance when appropriate;

"(4) providing social and other special services necessary to aid them in obtaining maximum assistance from the benefits and services to which they are entitled;

"(5) providing aid and assistance in the preparation and presentation of claims under this title and in connection with any other governmental programs; and

"(6) maintaining full records of the outreach services offered and conducting periodic follow-ups to determine the success of this assistance.

"(e) To the maximum extent possible, the Administrator shall initiate the provision of the outreach services authorized in this subchapter to servicemen prior to discharge at military installations, especially those overseas, pursuant to the authority of Section 231 of this title.

"§ 242. Coodination With Federal and Other Agencies

"In carrying out the purposes of this subchapter, the Administrator shall—

"(1) utilize the facilities and services of any other Federal department or agency pursuant to proper agreement with the Federal department or agency concerned;

"(2) cooperate with and use the services of any State or local governmental agency or recognized national or other organizations;

"(3) where appropriate, make referrals to any Federal department or agency or State or local governmental unit or recognized national or other organization;

"(4) at his discretion, make payment to cover the cost of services either in advance or by way of reimbursement as may be provided by agreement with any such Federal department or agency, State or local governmental unit or other organization; and

"(5) at his discretion, furnish available space and office facilities for the use of authorized representatives of such governmental unit or other organization providing services under contract or agreement;

"(6) conduct studies, in consultation and coordination with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Defense, the Department of Labor, the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Urban Affairs Council, to determine the most effective program design to carry out the purposes of this suchapter with respect to locating educationally disadvantaged veterans and assisting and motivating them to pursue education and training under this title.

"§ 243. Reports to Congress

"The Administrator shall submit to the Congress not later than September 1 and March 1 each year a report on the activities carried out under this subchapter, each report to include (1) an appraisal of the effectiveness of the programs authorized herein and the degree of cooperation from other Federal departments, agencies, other governmental programs, and service organizations, with particular reference to sections 241(d) (6) and 242(6) of this title, and (2) recommendations for the improvement or more effective administration of such programs."

SEC. 2. The table of headings at the beginning of chapter 3 of title 38 is amended by inserting immediately after—

"236. Administrative settlement of tort claims arising in foreign countries."

The following:

"SUBCHAPTER IV—VETERANS OUTREACH SERVICES PROGRAM

"240. Purpose; Definition.
"241. Veterans Assistance Centers and Outreach Services.
"242. Coordination with Federal and other agencies.
"243. Reports to Congress.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 140—INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY TO STRIKE A GOLD MEDAL FOR EACH ASTRONAUT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the successful and safe return this afternoon of Apollo 11 from her fantastic exploration of the moon's surface is an event for which we all should be deeply thankful. In a journey covering 500,000 miles, brave men have performed flawlessly, and I am truly grateful that they are safely back.

There is a great joy in counting successes. It is especially gratifying because in 1961, when President Kennedy declared that the first man on the moon would be an American, the outlook was grim. Our space program was running a poor second in the world competition, and to many, the goal seemed unattainable. But because of the tireless dedication of thousands of men of NASA, because of the support of the Congress and the leadership of Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon, that commitment has been realized.

Today man has again successfully completed a journey to a new horizon. But today world opinion is clearly one of unrestrained happiness for man's newest triumph.

Centuries ago, explorers also dreamed, wondering what lay beyond their oceans. Like the pragmatic technicians of our space program, they relentlessly pursued a vision. Through courage and persistence, a new continent was discovered, and with it came a new way of life.

However, these early voyages were not universally celebrated as events which would open a new world. Columbus died in disgrace and dishonor because "visionaries" determined that the benefits of the new world would be insignificant.

So, there is no precedent for the enthusiasm which greeted our lunar voyage. Mankind has often been united by great crises, but never has all the world so joyously and spontaneously hailed the success of one Nation.

Perhaps our world has learned the lessons of history.

Just as all of Europe was benefited by the discovery of the new world, all men will benefit from these lunar explorations. The unrestrained praise and shared exhilaration all over the world are wonderfully gratifying.

I am deeply moved and encouraged at witnessing this turning point in man's history.

Because I wish to commemorate this momentous occasion, which has generated new hope for peace and cooperation, I introduce today a joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to strike a gold medal for every astronaut, and to establish a scholarship fund to insure a continuing flow of talent into our space program.

After being presented to every astronaut of the Gemini, Mercury, and Apollo missions, bronze replicas of this medal will be sold to the public. The proceeds of this sale are to be allocated to a scholarship fund. These scholarships will enable deserving young men and women to undertake studies in aerospace and related sciences.

Of course, these funds will only be the beginning of what I hope will become a full scale commitment to recruiting excellence and talent for the continuing needs of our space program.

I believe the events of the past days have brought our Nation two great treasures.

XUM

The first is tangible, for our astronauts are with us, back from the moon. With them are lunar samples for scientists to examine and evaluate.

The second, however, is a more intangible gift. For one brief moment, national boundaries, disputes, and ideologies disappeared.

The inhabitants of the planet earth celebrated together with unrestrained zeal.

To honor the men who performed this outstanding feat and to permanently remind us of man's universal triumph, I urge early consideration and passage of this joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 140) to provide for the striking of medals in honor of American astronauts who have flown in outer space, introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

S. 2315

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN) be added as a cosponsor of S. 2315, to restore the golden eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2506

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), be added as cosponsors of S. 2506, to reduce the number of semester hours that a veteran must carry at an institutional undergraduate course offered by a college or university in order to qualify for full-time benefits under chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2636

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from Delaware (Mr. BOGGS), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA) be added as a cosponsor of S. 2636, to make provisions of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 applicable to individuals preparing to be volunteer firemen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S.J. RES. 87

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) be added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 87, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S.J. RES. 139

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIRKSEN) be added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 139, providing for the establishment of an annual "Day of Bread" and "Harvest Festival" Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF SENATOR COOK AS COSPONSOR

S. 1560

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, his name be removed as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1560) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE RESOLUTION 223—RESOLUTION RELATING TO ESTABLISHMENT OF AT LEAST ONE STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA IN EACH STATE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I today submit a resolution which would declare it to be the sense of the U.S. Senate that the Bureau of the Budget establish at least one standard metropolitan statistical area in any State which at present has none.

Mr. President, only three States in the Union have not a single standard metropolitan statistical area within their boundaries. My own State of Alaska is one; the others are Wyoming and Vermont.

An SMSA is needed in Alaska. One of the major purposes of the SMSA concept is to promote and facilitate commerce among the several States and to facilitate the movement of people, goods, and industries from one part of the Nation to another.

In the words of the Bureau of the Budget: Standard metropolitan statistical areas definitions are used in presenting data from the censuses of business, manufacturers, and mineral industries; the census of population and housing; and the census of governments; in presenting current economic and social data; and in analysis of local area problems. And, the data are used in many market analyses.

Mr. President, my State is entering a new era of development and growth. The problems of crowded urban centers, packed population and traffic jams are unknown to Alaska. As stated by Congressman WOLD, when he introduced House Resolution 482, the companion measure to this resolution:

> It behooves us to encourage the development of outlying portions of this vast country. While the industries concentrated in the great metropolitan complexes overload the air and water of those areas with pollutants, it makes little sense to continue policies which have the practical effect of channeling yet more factories into the same places.

I look forward to the development of Alaska's industries within the guidelines of commonsense conservation practices. In my State, 25 percent of the population have been termed the poorest of the poor. Industry is needed in Alaska, as well as the continued development of Alaska's vast mineral resources. The decision of industry to move to Alaska is being retarded by the arbitrary Bureau of the Budget requirement that a State must have a city area with a population greater than 50,000 persons before an SMSA is established.

Alaska is the largest State in the Union but cannot have an SMSA because Anchorage, its most populous city, had a population of 45,000 in 1960. However, the Greater Anchorage area borough has 113,522 residents. Alaska is not an area consisting solely of villages and farms. It is an exciting place with a potential for an increase in commerce hitherto unknown in our Union. The development of this potential is in part constrained by the lack of information made available to the Nation's industries.

My resolution does not call for the Bureau of the Budget to relax its guidelines regarding the establishment of an SMSA. It merely recognizes the inequity of having three sovereign States of the Union without any SMSA, and requires that this inequity be corrected. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 223), which reads as follows, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations:

S. RES. 223

Whereas standard metropolitan statistical areas are among the statistical standards developed for use by Federal agencies in compiling and presenting statistical data on a comparable basis for general purpose use; and

Whereas, under criteria developed under the sponsorship of the Bureau of the Budget, only Alaska, Vermont, and Wyoming do not have within their boundaries at least one standard metropolitan statistical area; and

Whereas the statistical data of standard metropolitan statistical areas gathered by various Federal agencies are highly useful in the establishment of meaningful economic and industrial profiles of metropolitan areas; and

Whereas standard metropolitan statistical areas are frequently used as market areas by business and industry because they represent a uniform basis for presentation of statistics; and

Whereas some of the Nation's two hundred and thirty-one standard metropolitan statistical areas are composed of population areas more than double the minimum population listed in officially published criteria which indicates that population alone is more a benchmark than a prerequisite for the effective functioning of the standard metropolitan statistical area concept; and

Whereas the majority of the criteria other than minimum population of the central city in the standard metropoltian statistical area can be met by cities in the only three States not now having at least one standard metropolitan statistical area; and

XUM

Whereas the presence of a standard metropolitan statistical area in a State can be considered as helpful to the economic development of the State and region as well as the standard metropolitan statistical area itself: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that in any case in which any State of the United States does not have within its boundaries at least one standard metropolitan statistical area, under criteria used by the Bureau of the Budget in establishing any such area, the Bureau of the Budget should establish within such State without delay at least one standard metropolitan statistical area comprised of the largest city or cities within such State, together with such part of the immediate environs of such city or cities as the Bureau of the Budget may deem appropriate.

CONTINUANCE OF INCOME TAX SURCHARGE AND EXCISE TAXES ON CERTAIN AUTOMOBILES AND COMMUNICATION SERVICES FOR TEMPORARY PERIODS—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 102, 103, AND 104

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am submitting amendments, intended to be proposed by me, to H.R. 12290, that would continue tax credits for investments in depressed areas. In so doing I would like to raise the question of the wisdom of abolishing the income tax credit in total. As you are aware, Mr. President, I am in general support of this administration's efforts to alleviate the increasing problems of inflation and the devaluing of the consumers' and investors' dollars. However, I would not concur in the policy of erasing the tax credit as an instrument to stimulate growth in selected segments of our economy. For millions of Americans in depressed areas inflation is a particularly harsh and cruel fact of life that threatens their very existence every day. Yet it is in these very areas where the jobs are scarce and industry does not invest to create more jobs. If we were to abolish tax credits for investments across the board there would be less and less incentive for potential employers to invest in these areas. I firmly believe that if we continue to allow investors—potential employers—the 7-percent tax credit for investments in depressed areas along with the general abolition of the tax credit for other areas of our country we will simultaneously strike a blow against inflation and a blow against the poverty of these areas of high unemployment. By doing so we would effectively reassert our national policy of combating poverty that has been vigorously pursued by the last three administrations. We would effectively channel investment money into these areas that need it the most.

It is the general intent of an investment tax credit to stimulate investment. Because of the dangerous trend of inflation in this country as a whole, it is unwise to stimulate general investments in this manner any longer. However, it is equally dangerous to continue to permit the areas of high unemployment to continue to be a drag on our society and economy. It is a mistake to treat these areas with the same remedy that we apply to the healthy sector of our Nation. As a stimulus for investment the investment credit would stimulate investments in depressed areas and would not stimulate investments in other areas. It would not contribute to inflation, as it would be stimulating that part of our economy that is deflated. It would also mitigate the effects of the general inflationary trend of the country in those areas that suffer the most—low-income and poverty areas—by directing available investment moneys into these areas rather than into the healthier part of our economy that is suffering from too much influx of dollars. In addition, it would be a positive incentive for the private sector of the economy to help bring these areas up to the standards of economic and social life of the vast majority of this Nation.

It should be pointed out that by using the tax credit for investment stimulus in a particular segment of the economy it is a much more rational approach to fighting the dual ills of inflation and poverty in depressed areas than by establishing a uniform policy for all segments of the economy and treating them all as if they had the same problems and the same diseases.

It is not, and should not be, the policy of this country to have or not have income tax credits for investment. Rather, it is the policy of this Nation to use tolls such as investment credits to obtain desirable effects in our economy. One end or desirable effect of using tax credits in the manner provided for by my amendment would be to provide income, as a direct result of investment, in depressed areas which will bring to parity with the remainder of the Nation those areas that are suffering from poverty. In my own State of Alaska, the dual problems of inflation and unemployment take on even more dramatic extremes than they do in the rest of the country.

I cannot overstate the desperate need for increased employment opportunities in my State. The annual unemployment rate in Alaska is 9.1 percent of the total work force during the summer months and 12 percent during the fall and winter months. These figures are approximately 300 percent greater than the national average. The traditional rural areas of the State with unemployment rates of 80 to 100 percent are not included in this compilation. Some 12,000 Alaskan natives are not even attached to the work force. The true statistic of the annual adjusted unemployment rate in Alaska is approximately 25 percent. During the critical fall and winter months in my State, this unemployment statistic can be doubled. The unemployment rate in winter months for Alaska's native population alone runs between 50 and 60 percent.

This situation is dramatically underscored by the fact that urban Alaskan Indians with any income at all had a per capita income of $1,863 a year in 1959. This can be contrasted with an urban nonnative income of $4,768 per capita for the same period. Most startling is the disparity that exists between urban and rural native incomes. No exact figures have been compiled but it is extremely common for a rural native family of five to have a yearly cash income of less than $1,000.

The harshness of the situation in Alaska is delineated even more clearly when one considers that prices in Anchorage run 25 percent above the Seattle base; Seattle itself is much higher than the national average.

These statistics can only serve to point out the particular need for the effects promised by these amendments in Alaska. But more than just in Alaska, all areas of high unemployment in this country need an influx of investments that will create jobs, jobs that will help the residents of these areas meet the ever pressing harshness of inflation.

To continue with problems that particularly affect my home State, we are beset with problems of attracting industry for a myriad of reasons. However, if industry can expect to benefit from a tax credit for investment in our State, or other depressed areas, then we will begin to have a better expectation of attracting industry. As it is, no depressed area has any advantage in attracting industry to help it alleviate its problems of unemployment and poverty. By abolishing the tax credit we would indeed be striking a blow at inflation. By simultaneously allowing a tax credit for depressed areas we would be making a continued commitment to combat poverty. The extent to which the tax credit would combat poverty would be of incalculable value and the extent that it would be contributing to inflation would be insignificant.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments, submitted by Mr. STEVENS, are as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 102

On page 8, line 15, after "property" insert "and property to which subsection (e) applies."

On page 20, line 11, strike out the closing quotation marks, and after line 20 insert the following:

"(e) INVESTMENTS IN DEPRESSED AREAS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of section 38 property which is located in a depressed area, the provisions of subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section and of section 46(b)(5) shall not apply.

"(2) DEPRESSED AREA.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'depressed area' means section 38 property which is in a state or political jurisdictional subdivision of a state in which the Department of Labor certifies that the unemployment rate for the preceding calendar year was at 6 percent or greater.

"(3) STATE.—For the purposes of paragraph (2) state shall include the fifty states, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and Puerto Rico."

AMENDMENT No. 103

On page 8, line 15, after "property" insert "and property to which subsection (e) applies".

On page 20, line 11 strike out the closing quotation marks, and after line 20 insert the following:

"(e) INTRASTATE PIPELINE PROPERTY.—In the case of section 38 property which is an

XUM

intrastate pipeline property, the provisions of subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section and of section 46(b)(5) shall not apply."

Amendment No. 104

On page 8, line 15, after "property" insert "and property to which subsection (e) applies".

On page 20, line 11, strike out the closing quotation marks, and after line 20 insert the following:

"(e) Small Business Property.—

"(1) In general.—In the case of section 38 property which is small business property, the provisions of subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section and of section 46(b)(5) shall not apply.

"(2) Small business property.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'small business property' means section 38 property which is placed in service by a taxpayer which (at the time such property is placed in service) is a small business concern within the meaning of the Small Business Act, and those regulations established by the Administrator of that Act in defining small business concerns."

REDUCTION OF HOURS A VETERAN MUST CARRY AT AN INSTITUTIONAL UNDERGRADUATE COURSE—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 105

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, on June 30 I introduced S. 2506, a bill to reduce the number of semester hours that a veteran must carry at an institutional undergraduate course offered by a college or university in order to qualify for full-time benefits under chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code. That bill, which is now cosponsored by five of my colleagues—my three immediate predecessors as chairmen of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee (Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. YARBOROUGH), the ranking minority member of that subcommittee (Mr. SCHWEIKER) and the chairman of the Veterans' Legislation Subcommittee of the Finance Committee (Mr. TALMADGE)—would reduce from 14 to 12 the minimum number of semester credit hours that an eligible veteran must carry in order to qualify for a full-time educational assistance allowance under the G.I. bill.

Since introducing that bill I have received considerable support for it and indications that many colleges and universities charge full-time tuition to undergraduate students carrying less than 14 hours. Although the most widespread minimum number of hours for a full-time charge is probably 12, I now believe that the equation between full-time tuition charge and receipt of a full-time educational assistance allowance should not be limited to any particular hourly minimum.

Thus, I intend to offer an amendment to S. 2506, which I am submitting for printing at this time, in order to make two things very clear about the purposes of S. 2506: First, the amendment would make an exception to the present 14-hour requirement for payment of a full-time allowance by providing that a full-time allowance may be paid to an eligible veteran enrolled at a school which certifies to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs that all undergraduate students at that particular school are required to pay full-time tuition for the number of hours—or more—that that veteran is carrying.

Second, it would make clear that S. 2506 is not aimed at reducing the minimum hourly requirement for veterans at schools which charge tuition on the credit-hour basis. I have no evidence at this time that such a reduction might be appropriate in that situation, although it might possibly be. The theory of S. 2506 is that a veteran who is paying full-time costs should receive a full-time educational assistance allowance from the VA. And that theory applies only at schools charging tuition on the term basis, since the veteran being charged tuition by the credit hour does not find himself being charged tuition on one basis and being reimbursed, loosely speaking, on a different basis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment I intend to offer be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment (No. 105) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Amendment No. 105

On page 1, beginning on line 4, strike out all that follows after the word "amended" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: '; except that where such college or university certifies, upon the request of the Administrator, that full-time tuition is charged to all undergraduate students carrying a minimum of less than fourteen semester hours or its equivalent then such certified minimum shall be considered a full-time course' ".

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT — "REMOVING POLITICS FROM THE POSTMASTER SELECTION PROCESS"—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 106

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am submitting an amendment intended to be proposed by me to S. 1583 designed to insure not only that politics will be removed from the postmaster selection process, but also that experienced and deserving postal employees will have the first opportunity to apply for and be appointed to these leadership positions in the postal service.

My amendment would provide two basic methods of filling postmaster vacancies; the first means, being by promotion from within the career postal service. Second, in case there was no qualified career employee present or available for such a promotion, the appointee would be obtained from a register of eligibles determined by competitive civil service examination.

These past few months we have heard a great deal about elimination of politics from the post office, and a great deal about merit promotion. But as it now stands S. 1583 does not provide for merit promotion—it simply permits the Postmaster General to handle this matter anyway he may desire. Having noted the lack of merit promotion entailed in the filling of major positions in the headquarters office of the Post Office Department and in the respective regional offices, I have some reservations about giving any Postmaster General such carte blanche authority. The present Postmaster General seems to regard prior private corporate service only in determining eligibility for postal service promotion, wholly ignoring the faithful postal force. History, I feel, would not look favorably on a Congress which eliminated so-called "political considerations" from this appointment process and then merely substituted a form of corporate favoritism in its place.

Mr. President, there are now over 700,000 dedicated employees in our postal service. Experience is one of the major attributes a prospective postmaster should possess. I would hope that those who truly believe in a merit selection process and in merit promotion from within the postal service will support my amendment to S. 1583.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON VETERANS' EDUCATION TRAINING AND MANPOWER BILLS BEFORE VETERANS' AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE BY SENATOR CRANSTON

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, I wish to announce at this time that the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, will hold hearings on August 4 and 5 at 9:30 a.m. on the following bills pertaining to veterans' education, training, and manpower: S. 1088, introduced by the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS); S. 2506, which I introduced on June 30, 1969, and a proposed amendment to that bill which I introduced today; S. 2668, which I introduced on July 18; and S. 2700, which I introduced today.

The subcommittee expects to receive testimony from a broad range of witnesses in addition to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and I consider these hearings to be of the utmost importance in attempting to come to grips with how the Nation can best offer education, training, and manpower assistance to veterans, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds, so as to increase substantially their current very low rate of participation in the GI bill programs.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold a hearing on Monday, July 28, 1969, on the following nominations:

Carter L. Burgess, of New York, to be an incorporator of the corporation authorized by section 902(a) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, vice Edgar F. Kaiser.

Thomas Hal Clarke, of Georgia, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the term expiring June

XUM

30, 1973, vice Michael Greenebaum, term expired.

The hearing will commence at 10 a.m. in room 5302 New Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to announce that on Wednesday, July 30, 1969, the Subcommittee on Securities of the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold a hearing pertaining to possible conflicts of interest by Hamer H. Budge, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The hearing will commence at 10 a.m. in room 5302 New Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, July 31, 1969, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the following nomination:

Almeric L. Christian, of the Virgin Islands, to be judge of the district court of the Virgin Islands for a term of 8 years, vice Walter A. Gordon, resigned.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The Subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), chairman; the Senator from Michigan, (Mr. HART), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA).

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Harry D. Berglund, of Minnesota, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Minnesota for the term of 4 years, vice William F. Malchow.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, July 31, 1969, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

TRIBUTE TO ALL WHO PLAYED AN IMPORTANT ROLE IN APOLLO 11 ACHIEVEMENT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, as we so rightfully pay tribute today to the three brave Americans who have successfully completed the Apollo 11 mission, Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin, and Michael Collins, we should also pause to honor others who have played an important role in bringing success to this most ambitious goal.

Starting with Dr. Thomas O. Paine, Administrator, there are, of course, thousands of NASA employees and industry personnel without whose diligent and persistent efforts the flight could not have been accomplished. You know the names—Dr. George Mueller, Gen. Sam Phillips, Dr. Robert Gilruth, Dr. George Low, Dr. Wernher von Braun—and many, many others.

But there are a few, whose names have not been so prominently mentioned, that I should like to recall for you today.

First, of course, was President John F. Kennedy, who admonished us, in 1961, to accept this challenge.

Then there is Lyndon B. Johnson who, as first Chairman of the Space Committee and later Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, and then as President has done as much as any man to see us on this course.

I would like to mention the charming Senator from Maine, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, ranking minority member of the Space Committee, and all the other Senators who have served on this committee and the Appropriations Committee through the years, without whose support we could not have funded this program.

We should not forget the late Robert S. Kerr and Styles Bridges who were chairman and ranking minority member, respectively, through the formative years of the program.

It is unlikely that we would have accomplished this goal today without the driving leadership of Jim Webb, Administrator of NASA through the critical period and his predecessor, T. Keith Glennan, who was the first Administrator of NASA.

We must certainly not forget the late Dr. Hugh Dryden, who was longtime Director of NACA and Deputy Administrator of NASA, whose wise and experienced counsel was invaluable to the program.

Dr. Robert C. Seamans, now Secretary of the Air Force, was Associate and then Deputy Director of NASA at the time when critical decisions were being made.

We surely must mention Edward H. White, Virgil Grissom, and Roger Chaffee who gave their lives in the tragic Apollo 204 accident, and Astronauts Charles Bassett II, Theodore Freeman, Edward Givens, Jr., Elliot See, Jr., and Clifton Williams, Jr., who, although they were never able to reach their dreams of space flight, died in the service of their country in the space program.

There are, of course, many, many others I could mention. But perhaps the credits should go to all of mankind, whose evolution of millions of years has led us to this remarkable step into infinity.

SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, my friend and colleague, the majority leader, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, and I have the honor to represent the same State—Montana. As we all know, MIKE MANSFIELD has been the subject of many tributes, features, and news columns here and in the national press.

An article published in the Park County News, Livingston, Mont., on June 19, 1969, gives us some insight of how Montanans think about him. The editor, Fred J. Martin, gives us a fine appraisal of this man and his approach to politics and issues of the day.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTANA'S MIKE MANSFIELD IS TOLERANT, FAIR, RESPECTS VIEWPOINT OF OTHER FELLOW

MIKE MANSFIELD, who as majority leader of the United States Senate holds one of the most sensitive and coveted spots in the American government, has a superb quality—recognition of the right of the other fellow to his or her opinions.

Despite his powerful post, MIKE is still the same as he was as an Army GI, a U.S. Marine, a Navy recruit, a Butte miner while attending the Montana School of Mines, an assistant professor of History at the University of Montana at Missoula, or a Congressman or Senator. He's very much aware that what's happened to him in Washington as a Congressman and U.S. Senator wouldn't have been possible without the support of his fellow Montanans.

Sunday, he completed a whirlwind tour of Montana primarily in the interest of the candidacy of John Melcher, Forsyth veterinarian and legislator, for Congress from the Eastern Montana district, but also to report to his constituency. En route from Billings and with stops at communities along the way he arrived in Livingston late Wednesday, June 11, to spend the night here at the Murray hotel. He was accompanied by an old Butte friend, Ole Reardon of Great Falls, who usually drives him around the state. After dinner he visited with Chairman Jim Beamer and Sec. Bernice McGee of the Park County Democratic Central Comm.

The Montana senator was in a relaxed mood, yet was quick to recognize those who smiled and greeted him as he was having dinner at Martin's. As we sat there we wondered what gave Mike his stature, his ability to win support from political friends and foes and to hold their respect.

Senator Mansfield has positive convictions. He isn't a "yes" man to anyone. He didn't hesitate to disagree with Lyndon Baines Johnson when he was majority leader, vice president or president, and he doesn't hesitate to disagree with President Richard Nixon. But, he recognizes above all else the other fellow's right to disagree with him. He obviously, and says so publicly, intends to give the new Administration his cooperation and not to put roadblocks in their path.

He doesn't believe in prejudging or condemning another's conviction without debate and discussion. He doesn't become ascible or belligerent, but tries through the process of reasoning and persuasion to achieve a concensus. When one understands the sharp philosophical differences and personality makeup between Republicans and Democrats, the liberals of some industrial states and the conservative Southern senators, the different makeups of individual senators, the pressures from various groups, it is understandable that the effort to get a meeting of minds to make progress isn't easy. Mike gets along with Minority Leader Everett Dirksen and the Majority whip, Sen. Edward Kennedy. That's his job.

Mike's prescription is to deal with the issues, not personalities. He does have a sense of loyalty to the Democratic party, which after all has maintained him in office, just as he has a loyalty to the Senate, but in the final analysis his decisions, as we have observed and heard him reiterate down through the years, is to all the people of Montana. He's grateful for what Montanans have done for him and he hopes that he

XUM

can continue to hold their confidence. He wants to win reelection and intends to seek his fourth term in 1970. Perhaps he isn't the wheeler and dealer allying himself with under the table dickering and trading, but he's honest which is more than can be said about some others in public life. As we talked with him last week he seemed relaxed, was ready to answer any question propounded to him and to lay his cards on the table. He's tolerant of the other fellow's point of view. Montana can be proud of him.

ACTIVITIES OF EAST-WEST CENTER

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a recent press release from the East-West Center. I believe the story it tells well exemplifies what we have to gain from international cooperation, specifically from the activities of the East-West Center. The contributions of Dr. Furusato Kazuo, a Japanese botanist, will long benefit the people of Hawaii and our many visitors from throughout the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the press release be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Honolulu, Hawaii.—A Japanese botanist who participated in an East-West Center sponsored training program held in Hawaii in 1968 has repaid his Hawaiian hosts by developing a carnation specially suited for making leis and a hybrid strawberry that will grow in Hawaii.

While in Hawaii to study local plant life, Dr. Furusato Kazuo, director of the Shizuoka Prefectural Useful Botanical Garden, noticed that the calyx (green base) of the carnation flowers had to be broken in order to string them for making leis.

The process seemed inefficient to Dr. Kazuo. So when he returned to Japan, he cross-bred various carnations until he created a flower with a much shorter calyx—hence, no need to break it.

Dr. Horace Clay, the director of the training program which brought Dr. Kazuo to Hawaii, passed through Japan recently and was given seed samples of the new carnation by his former student.

Perhaps it won't be long before Hawaiian lei-makers will be able to increase their lei-making production due to Dr. Kazuo's initiative.

Very few people have ever heard of Hawaiian strawberries, but they can be found growing on the side of Mt. Haleakala on Maui. Admittedly they are white in color and don't taste very good, but they are strawberries.

Dr. Kazuo also took seeds of these strawberries back to Japan determined to improve their color and taste. After crossing the seeds with a Japanese red strawberry, he succeeded in producing a good-tasting, hardier strawberry that looked like a strawberry should.

Dr. Clay also brought some of these hybrid seeds back with him so residents of Hawaii may soon be able to enjoy home grown strawberries.

For Dr. Clay, a senior program officer for the East-West Center's Institute for Technical Interchange, there is an important lesson to be learned from these seeds.

"We Americans assume that technical interchange is a one way street," he stated.

"To many of us, the United States is the expert teacher and the countries of Asia and the Pacific are the untrained students seeking our help. We often forget that the East can provide us with valuable technical knowledge as well."

He concluded by saying, "The East-West Center's basic goal is the interchange of knowledge between East and West to increase mutual understanding. This exchange of knowledge also applies to technical matters."

MILWAUKEE FIRM PLAYS ROLE IN SOLVING HUNGER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am very proud of the role being played by the Krause Milling Co. of Milwaukee, Wis., in the effort to solve the problem of hunger and malnutrition throughout the world. The high-protein CSM, or corn-soy-milk food additive, is providing almost every necessary nutrient to children and adults in 100 countries. In an age when man can walk on the Moon, the problem of hunger on earth continues to grow. Just as the first step onto the Moon was a "giant leap for mankind," the development and distribution of CSM represents a giant leap toward erasing hunger from the entire world. I congratulate Mr. Krause on his company's important contribution to this effort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article on CSM, reprinted from the War on Hunger magazine, and the accompanying letter from Charles A. Krause, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Protein-Rich CSM Nourishes Millions Around the World

When the "Christmas Ship" FORRA left Newport News, Va., in early January it carried 4.5 million pounds of CSM (corn-soy-milk) destined for the starving children of Biafra.

This life-saving CSM cargo was part of more than 750 million pounds of the low cost, high protein, multi-use food which have been sent overseas since the initial shipment in September, 1966.

Highly versatile CSM enjoys ready acceptance in scores of countries as an ingredient in nutritious gruels, soups and soft breads for children. It can be easily used in preparing dough for the chapati of India, the tortilla of Mexico and many other native dishes of both East and West.

In Indonesia, CARE distributes CSM daily to more than 200,000 school children and is making plans to teach parents the importance of good nutrition.

In Vietnam, AID's Food for Freedom officers have distributed hundreds of thousands of pamphlets giving instructions for the proper preparation of CSM and other PL 480 commodities. The voluntary agencies are making a concerted effort to educate mothers to the high nutritive value of CSM.

COMBINED EFFORTS IN DEVELOPMENT

CSM was developed through the combined efforts of the American Corn Millers' Federation, the Agency for International Development, the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Agriculture. It was originally produced as a supplement for nonfat dry milk at a time when the milk was in short supply during the middle 1960s and has since gained wide recognition on its own.

Ingredients for the manufacture of CSM come from the corn field, dairy farms, soybean fields and chemical works of the United States. It is a mixture of 63.8 percent processed cornmeal, 24.2 percent toasted defatted soy flour, 5 percent nonfat dry milk, 5 percent vegetable oil and 2 percent vitamin-mineral and iodized salt pre-mix.

Companies currently producing CSM for Food for Freedom use in developing nations include: Archer Daniels Midland Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; Krause Milling Co., Milwaukee, Wis.; Lauhoff Grain Co., Danville, Ill. and its Crete Mills Division, also of Danville; and Quaker Oats Co., Chicago, Ill.

Their blended product contains 20 percent protein and has an adjusted protein efficiency ratio of 2.48. It is almost completely precooked, bran-free, bland in flavor and smooth in texture.

Just a small amount of CSM will supply a child with many of the necessary daily nutrients with the exception of ascorbic acid (vitamin C). It can be invaluable during the period in a child's life when lack of proper food can seriously damage both his body and his mind.

Although CSM has met with remarkable acceptability, particularly for infant and child feeding, everyone involved in the program is continually looking for ways to make it better.

The Department of Agriculture, AID, textile and paper bag manufacturers and corn millers cooperate on studies to produce the finest possible insect-resistant packaging at the lowest cost to improve delivery of CSM in diverse climates and under a variety of storage conditions.

Individual millers research new grinds and formulas of CSM and attempt to find solutions for some of the inevitable problems which arise as a completely novel food product is introduced to millions of children and adults in a wide spectrum of cultures in approximately 100 countries.

UNICEF has referred to CSM as "the first attempt in history to introduce a new food product simultaneously to millions of people on a world-wide basis." CSM's success is expected to be a big help in paving the way for the acceptance of other new products and other new methods.

Krause Milling Co.,
Milwaukee, June 23, 1969.

Hon. William Proxmire,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Proxmire: We are enclosing several reprints of an article which appeared as the cover story in the April 1969 issue of War on Hunger, the Agency for International Development monthly publication.

CSM—the full nutrition food—is continuing to economically feed a large portion of the world's hungry people. Over 950,000,000 pounds of CSM has been distributed overseas to date and effort is currently being made to introduce the CSM full nutrition food concept into our domestic hunger and malnutrition program.

Your continuing interest in CSM is greatly appreciated. If you desire additional copies of the enclosure for distribution, please let us know.

Sincerely,

Charles A. Krause.

THE APOLLO PROGRAM AND "GENERAL ANONYMOUS"

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, with the recovery today of the Apollo 11 astronauts, it is appropriate to give recognition to a man largely responsible for the unprecedented success of this mission, its director, Lt. Gen. Samuel C. Phillips.

General Phillips is the subject of a profile which appears in today's Washington Star under the byline of Sanders Lamont. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

XUM

“General Anonymous”: Apollo Director Made “Systems” Go

(By Sanders Lamont)

Call him General Anonymous.

He could walk around the Apollo launch pad at Cape Kennedy, Fla., unrecognized by the majority of workers.

But despite such anonymity, he is the man who has been responsible for spending over $30 billion in tax money, for creation of the most sophisticated missile system in history, and—his current job—sending men to land on the moon.

Lt. Gen. Samuel C. Phillips, 48, is winding up five years as director of the Apollo program. Quietly confident, hard-nosed, efficient, he appears neither to seek nor to dodge the limelight. Tall and erect, he's known to military men, congressmen and presidents as a man who gets things done.

MINUTEMAN POST

In 1959, as an obscure Air Force colonel, he took over the faltering Minuteman program. Under his direction, the Minuteman was a success on its first test. The missiles went into silos around the country a year ahead of schedule.

College professors know Phillips as the father of “systems engineering” or “systems management,” a method that is revolutionizing American industry.

Dr. Wernher Von Braun, the German-born expert who designed America's moon rocket, credits Apollo's success to Phillips' management techniques. Many now regard the sophisticated techniques developed around Apollo as the chief spin-off from the entire space project.

Others describe Phillips in more unflattering terms—but not to his face. They remember him as author of the “Phillips Report,” a critical assessment of space contractors' workmanship on the Apollo spacecraft in which three astronauts died during a fire. The report, made before the fire, got into public print, even though it was supposed to be a secret intra-agency letter.

After 10 years of frenetic living—five years on Minuteman and five on Apollo—the general reportedly longs for a quiet military assignment. “The job of program director is very demanding,” he said. “And 10 years in the hot seat is a long, long time.”

Like many other men at the top, Phillips has discovered that the role of commander is a lonely one, with no one to share the responsibility. For example, it was Phillips who decided to send the Apollo 8 crew around the moon last December, although men had never flown on the Saturn 5 rocket before.

“In my mind, it was a private and personal thing,” he said.

MARK OF ENVIRONMENT

Early environment, as well as education, clearly helped to shape Phillips for the lonely responsibility of command he was to have in later life.

Born in an isolated lumber town in Arizona, he moved a few years later with his family to Cheyenne, Wyo. He was graduated from the University of Wyoming in 1942 with a degree in electrical engineering and a second lieutenant's commission in the Army.

After flight training, he was sent to England as a fighter pilot—another occupation calling for split-second decisions where errors could be fatal. Phillips served two combat tours in England. A much decorated major at war's end, he stayed on three years in Europe before returning to the University of Michigan to earn a master's degree.

He still loves to fly. During flights around the country he sometimes takes over the controls from NASA pilots.

Throughout the 1950s, Phillips remained in the background, working on a series of research and development jobs. His assignments included a tour in England to help write an agreement between the United States and Britain on use of the Thor missile.

In 1964, the space agency borrowed him from the Minuteman program, named him deputy director. Shortly afterwards, he was named director of the Apollo program.

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE KIRWAN

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, no Member of Congress has played a more important and more constructive role in the development of our national water resources than Representative MICHAEL J. KIRWAN of the 19th District of Ohio. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Committee on Appropriations, he has performed over the years real and needful service in the cause of water resource development throughout the Ohio River Basin and throughout the Nation. During his more than 32 years of distinguished service in the House of Representatives, MICHAEL J. KIRWAN has dedicated himself to the internal improvement of our Nation. I salute him.

Mr. President, in recognition of this service, the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, on April 18, 1969, established the MICHAEL J. KIRWAN Award for Outstanding Service in the Cause of Ohio River Basin Water Resource Development to be awarded each year. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution to establish this award be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions Establishing the Michael J. Kirwan Award for Outstanding Service in the Cause of Ohio River Basin Water Resource Development

Whereas, the Honorable Michael J. Kirwan has served in the Congress of the United States, as representative of the Nineteenth District of Ohio since 1937, having been a member of the House Committee on Appropriations during the past 26 years, the Chairman of its Subcommittee on Interior and Insular Affairs, from 1949 to 1965 and the Chairman of its Subcommittee on Public Works since that time; and

Whereas, Congressman Kirwan, throughout his long and distinguished career in Congress, has dedicated himself zealously and steadfastly and with incomparable skill and effectiveness to the internal improvement of the United States and its possessions for the welfare of all Americans and their posterity; and

Whereas, Congressman Kirwan has long recognized the vital role of water resource development in the task of building a stronger, more prosperous and more beautiful America for the benefit and enjoyment of all citizens, rich and poor alike, and has rendered unique and invaluable public service in the attainment of these goals, earning thereby national and international renown, the respect and esteem of his Congressional colleagues and the affection and gratitude of countless citizens throughout his beloved America; and

Whereas, the outstanding progress of the water resource development program in the Ohio River Basin for flood control, pollution abatement, water supply, navigation, recreation, fish and wildlife enhancement and other beneficial purposes has been due in decisive measure to Congressman Kirwan's sympathetic understanding and powerful support; and

Whereas, the Ohio Valley Improvement Association considers it altogether fitting and proper that it manifest its deep appreciation for Congressman Kirwan's unexcelled contribution to the cause of water resource development in the Ohio River Basin and throughout the Nation in an appropriate and enduring form;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that in honor of Congressman Kirwan and to foster and encourage the development of water resources in the Ohio River Basin, the Ohio Valley Improvement Association hereby establishes the Michael J. Kirwan Award for Outstanding Service in the Cause of Ohio River Basin Water Resource Development, to be granted not more frequently than once a year to such person as may be deemed worthy by the Executive Committee of this Association, such reward to be in the form of a Certificate suitably inscribed; and

Resolved further, that Congressman Kirwan be invited to present the first such award at the 1969 Annual Meeting of this Association; and

Resolved further, that the proper officers of this Association be and they are hereby directed to present a certified copy of these Recitals and Resolutions to Congressman Kirwan.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Recitals and Resolutions were unanimously adopted by the Board of Trustees of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association at a meeting duly called and held in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania on April 18, 1969.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S TRIP TO RUMANIA

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I want to add my support for President Nixon's forthcoming visit to Rumania. During his election campaign, Mr. Nixon made it clear that he would travel in search of peace. His visit to Rumania is such a quest, and I believe his visit is likely to constitute a step toward peace and improved world relations.

I cannot foresee any possibility that the President's visit would not at least encourage improved international relations. Rumanian President Ceausescu extended the invitation to President Nixon. The Soviet Union has indicated that it does not view the visit as any form of affront. Rumania is a country which is seeking its own foreign policy. It is a country striving to maintain relations with all the world powers.

President Nixon has traveled within Communist countries before, and each time his methods of diplomacy have met with some degree of success. He values the opinions of the leaders of other nations, and he respects their views.

There is no endeavor more important than the quest for peace. While I hope the visit to Rumania will result in a significant step toward peace, I am confident that, at the very least, it should establish a dialog with one Communist country which desires to live in cooperation with the rest of the world, rather than pursue a policy which seeks to dominate it.

For this reason, I applaud the President's decision to visit Rumania, and I wish him every success in his venture.

JAPAN AND UNITED STATES ONLY MAJOR POWERS FAILING TO RATIFY GENEVA PROTOCOL OF 1925

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in Geneva, in 1925, at a conference called to consider the commercial sale of arms, the United States brought up the question of gas warfare. The result was the

XUM

international agreement—now known as the Geneva Protocol of 1925—banning the use of chemical and biological weapons.

More than 60 countries—among them all members of the NATO alliance, the Warsaw Pact including Russia, and Communist China—have ratified the Protocol. Ironically, at this time almost 45 years later, of the major powers only Japan and the United States have failed to ratify.

It seems wise to me, in view of the alarmingly rapid development of these weapons now taking place, to re-examine the reasoning behind our action and to reconsider the possibility of ratifying this agreement. In order to lay the groundwork for further study of this matter, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Geneva Protocol agreement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the agreement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROTOCOL FOR THE PROHIBITION OF THE USE IN WAR OF ASPHYXIATING, POISONOUS OR OTHER GASES, AND OF BACTERIOLOGICAL METHODS OF WARFARE—SIGNED AT GENEVA, JUNE 17, 1925

The undersigned plenipotentiaries, in the name of their respective Governments:

Whereas the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases, and of all analogous liquids, materials or devices, has been justly condemned by the general opinion of the civilized world;

Whereas the prohibition of such use has been declared in Treaties to which the majority of Powers of the world are Parties; and

To the end that this prohibition shall be universally accepted as a part of International Law, binding alike the conscience and the practice of nations; Declare: That the High Contracting Parties, so far as they are not already Parties to Treaties prohibiting such use, accept this prohibition, agree to extend this prohibition to the use of bacteriological methods of warfare and agree to be bound as between themselves according to the terms of this declaration.

The High Contracting Parties will exert every effort to induce other States to accede to the present Protocol. Such accession will be notified to the Government of the French Republic, and by the latter to all signatory and acceding Powers, and will take effect on the date of the notification by the Government of the French Republic.

The present Protocol, of which the French and English texts are both authentic, shall be ratified as soon as possible. It shall bear today's date.

The ratifications of the present Protocol shall be addressed to the Government of the French Republic, which will at once notify the deposit of such ratification to each of the signatory and acceding Powers.

The instruments of ratification of and ascension to the present Protocol will remain deposited in the archives of the Government of the French Republic.

The present Protocol will come into force for each signatory Power as from the date of deposit of its ratification, and, from that moment, each Power will be bound as regards other powers which have already deposited their ratifications.

In witness whereof, the Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Protocol.

Done at Geneva in a single copy, the seventeenth day of June, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Twenty-Five.

A SALUTE TO AMERICA'S APOLLO 11 ASTRONAUTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this is not only a day of national triumph but also a day of national thanksgiving. This Nation has achieved one of its goals for this decade—that of landing men on the moon and returning them safely to earth before 1970. And today, these three men, whose names will forever stand with the greatest of explorers have returned safely home. The sailors of the space ocean are home from the sea.

But today, perhaps the most fitting tribute we can give to these brave Americans is not to boast of past triumphs but to think of future challenges. For the step we have made, however large it may seem to us now, is only a first step on a great journey whose destination lies beyond our vision.

On this most joyous of days, I cannot help but recall the words President Kennedy, who challenged our Nation to land a man on the moon in this decade, said at the dedication of Aerospace Medical Health Center in San Antonio on November 21, 1963, in the last 24 hours of his life:

> Frank O'Connor, the Irish writer, tells in one of his books how, as a boy, he and his friends would make their way across the countryside, and when they came to an orchard wall that seemed too high to permit their voyage to continue, they took off their hats and tossed them over the wall—and then they had no choice but to follow them.
>
> This Nation has tossed its cap over the wall of space, and we have no choice but to follow it. Whatever the difficulties, they will be overcome. Whatever the hazards, they must be guarded against. With the vital help of this Aerospace Medical Center, with the help of all those who labor in the space endeavor, with the help and support of all Americans, we will climb this wall with safety and with speed—and we shall then explore the wonders of the other side.

ABM CRITICS AND THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, many comments have been made, both in the Chamber and in the news media, about the so-called military-industrial complex. Through some eerie thought process, this has become a condemnation of the very people upon whom we depend for national security.

Recently, one of our eminent journalists, Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, wrote an article, published in the July Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, noting this phenomenon and pointing out that most of the problems we have encountered can be attributed to civilians, not the military. Furthermore, he went on to state that these persons were civilians in previous administrations, not in the present one.

On July 6, 1969, the Chicago Tribune published an excellent editorial commenting on this confusion. I ask unanimous consent it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRITICISM FOR OBLIQUE PURPOSES

Clark Mollenhoff, Washington correspodent of the Des Moines Register, says that there is plenty to criticize in the operations of the department of defense, but he objects to attempts to misapply the criticism to wholly unrelated subjects.

Writing in the July Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Mollenhoff says that the news media have been tardy in calling public attention to a decade of corruption, mismanagement, and waste in the Pentagon. He is especially critical of broadcast journalism for following the official line and says that many writers gave fawning and noncritical coverage to former Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara.

"Reporters," Mollenhoff says, "have placed the blame for waste, corruption, and mismanagement at the feet of the military-industrial complex." Without using names, admirals and generals are pictured as corrupt or stupid. Senators and congressmen are often characterized as incompetent or corrupt parties to the waste of billions, tho no details are spelled out.

"Some of the writers seemed bent upon proving a preconceived notion that the generals and admirals, the senior men on the armed services committees of the House and Senate, and the bosses of defense industries have conspired to push the United States into the Viet Nam war and other confrontations for the sake of business profits, promotions, and political deals.

"Certainly there has been waste and mismanagement, but the evidence hardly sustains the general conspiracy theory. Somehow many of the stories ignore the dominant role of the political bosses at the Pentagon or tend to absolve them from blame for what has gone wrong."

Many reports, Mollenhoff says, give the impression that the Nixon administration or Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird has the responsibility for what took place in 1963 or in 1968. Seldom, if ever, is the name of former Secretary McNamara mentioned in a critical manner, even when he was personally involved in a questionable decision or when the decision was dictated out of his office under some much-heralded new system that was to save billions of tax dollars.

"Frequently," Mollenhoff writes, "the whole mess of scandals originating under the Kennedy or Johnson administrations are lumped together and presented as evidence of a general Pentagon laxity. Then this Pentagon laxity is projected into certain waste of money if President Nixon's Safeguard anti-ballistic missile program is permitted to move forward.

"Certainly past scandals should serve as a warning about what could happen to the ABM in the future, but unless there is a direct connection these should not serve as arguments for rejecting a program that the President and the defense secretary believe is essential.

"The merits of constructing the Safeguard ABM should be considered by the press and the public without regard for scandals of an earlier administration, unless there is some evidence of misjudgment and misrepresentations of the Safeguard decision that are clearly linked to past scandals."

Mr. Nixon and his secretary of defense have been unfairly attacked, by such senators as Fulbright and McGovern, not only as if they were being stubbornly perverse in arguing for the ABM defense but also as if they were solely responsible for our being at war in Viet Nam and for the existence of "the military-industrial complex," whereas these developments arose under previous administrations. The carping senators and opposition press are trying to use apples to make arguments against oranges. They are doing the same thing that McNamara's assistant secretary for public administration admitted he was trying to do—manage the news to their own ends.

EXPANDING THE MORTGAGE MARKET

Mr. **PROXMIRE.** Mr. President, on July 9, 1969, I introduced a bill, S. 2577, to help support the mortgage market during periods of tight money. The legislation would extend for another year the flexible authority to regulate the rates of interest on time and savings deposits. In addition, the bill would strengthen the effectiveness of monetary policy and would help to insure a steadier supply of funds to the mortgage market during periods of tight money.

I shall outline briefly the main provisions of the bill; and following my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

OUTLINE OF S. 2577, A BILL TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL MORTGAGE CREDIT, INTRODUCED BY SENATOR WILLIAM PROXMIRE ON JULY 9, 1969

SECTION 1: RENEWAL OF RATE CONTROL AUTHORITY

Mr. **PROXMIRE.** Mr. President, this section extends for another year the authority to establish flexible ceilings on rates paid by financial institutions on time and savings deposits. The authority was first enacted by Congress during the 1966 credit crunch to restrain excessive competition for funds by commercial banks and savings and loan associations. Unless renewed by the Congress, the authority expires on September 21, 1969.

Under the legislation passed by Congress in 1966, Public Law 89–597, and renewed in 1967, Public Law 90–87, and 1968, Public Law 90–505, the Federal banking agencies can establish ceilings on commercial bank certificates of deposit—CD's—according to the size of the deposit. The banking agencies have implemented the authority by establishing a ceiling of 5 percent on consumer type CD's of less than $100,000 whereas larger denomination CD's have ceilings as high as 6¼ percent. The small denomination CD's are most competitive with savings accounts at thrift institutions while the larger denomination CD's compete with general money market instruments.

A bank CD must have a maturity of at least 30 days to qualify at the 5-percent rate. Passbook savings accounts which are ordinarily payable on demand have a ceiling of 4 percent.

The Federal Reserve Board has established these ceilings for member banks under regulation Q. Identical ceilings for nonmember insured banks have been established by the FDIC.

Prior to the 1966 legislation, the Federal Reserve Board had authority under the Banking Act of 1933 to prescribe rate ceilings on time and savings deposits issued by member banks although it did not have authority to establish different ceilings based upon the size of the deposit.

If the 1966 legislation is not renewed, the Board would have to revert to its earlier, less flexible authority under the Banking Act of 1933. This means the Board would either have to raise the ceiling on small denomination bank CD's or lower the ceiling on large denomination CD's. If it did the former, commercial banks would be able to divert savings from thrift institutions with adverse effects upon the homebuilding industry; if it did the later, large commercial banks could suffer a sharp drop in their deposits as investors placed their funds elsewhere. Neither alternative is attractive, hence a renewal of the authority permitting a two-tier rate structure is essential.

The 1966 legislation also for the first time gave the Federal Home Loan Bank Board authority to prescribe the maximum rates of interest which federally insured savings and loan associations can pay on savings deposits. Under this authority, the Bank Board has established a ceiling of 4¾ percent on passbook accounts and 5¼ percent on certificates of deposit.

The 1966 legislation also requires that the Federal Reserve, the FDIC and the Home Loan Bank Board consult with one another prior to establishing deposit rate ceilings for their respective institutions.

A failure to renew the 1966 legislation could precipitate another rate war between banks and thrift institutions. Similar unrestrained competition in 1966 caused thrift institutions to lose billions of dollars of savings to commercial banks—savings which otherwise would have gone into mortgage investments.

SECTION 2: UNINSURED INSTITUTIONS

This section would extend the 1966 deposit rate control authority to State chartered financial institutions which are neither insured by the Federal Government nor members of the Federal Home Loan Bank System. The FDIC would be authorized to establish deposit rate ceilings for uninsured commercial banks and uninsured mutual savings banks. The Home Loan Bank Board would be given the same authority over non-member, non-insured savings and loan associations or similar type institutions. This authority would expire after 1 year unless renewed by Congress.

The FDIC and the Home Loan Bank Board would be empowered to enforce the ceilings established under this section by bringing on injunctive action in a U.S. District Court.

The problem of uninsured institutions is particularly acute in the State of Massachusetts where many State chartered thrift institutions rely upon State rather than Federal deposit insurance. Financial institutions not subject to Federal rate ceilings on deposits have $11.5 billion in deposits and compete directly for savings with institutions subject to Federal rate controls having $7.4 billion in deposits.

By offering higher rates, the uncontrolled institutions have been able to divert deposits from controlled institutions not only in Massachusetts but in neighboring States as well. A continuation of this trend could threaten the safety of federally insured financial institutions in the entire New England region.

SECTION 3: TREASURY BORROWING AUTHORITY

This section amends section 11(i) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act which authorizes the Federal Home Bank Board to borrow up to $1 billion from the Treasury.

The legislation requires that the rate charged on such borrowing be set at the current market yield on Treasury obligations. Existing law permits borrowing at a lower rate, hence the proposed amendment would remove any subsidy involved in such borrowing.

The legislation also provides the Treasury with a positive mandate from the Congress to permit such borrowing authority to be used in order to prevent a drastic reduction in housing starts. Despite many erratic swings in housing construction, the authority to borrow from the Treasury has never been used since its original enactment 19 years ago.

Specifically, the legislation indicates that it is the sense of the Congress that the authority to loan to the Home Loan Bank Board "be used by the Secretary of the Treasury, when alternative means cannot effectively be employed, to permit members of the Home Loan Bank System to continue to supply reasonable amounts of funds to the mortgage market whenever the ability to supply such funds is substantially impaired during periods of monetary stringency and rapidly rising interest rates."

The funds borrowed from the Treasury would be reloaned by the Bank Board to those savings and loan associations about to undergo a sharp reduction in their volume of mortgage lending. During periods of tight money and rapidly rising interest rates, many savers tend to place their savings directly in the securities market in search of higher yielding investments. Moreover, savings and loan associations are unable to compete for funds by raising their deposit rate since they are tied to the earnings on their mortgage loans, the bulk of which were made in earlier years at lower yields. Any increase in deposit rates must be paid to all depositors, whereas, the yields on mortgage loans already made do not increase.

Because of this structural imbalance, savings and loan associations tend to lose deposits when rates rise too quickly. A new term was coined during the 1966 credit crunch to describe the process—"disintermediation." The loss of normal deposit inflows in turn requires a substantial cut in the volume of mortgage lending. During the 1966 credit crunch net mortgage loans at savings and loan associations fell by $5 billion, a reduction of 65 percent from the previous year.

One way in which savings and loan associations can obtain funds during a tight money situation is to go directly to the money market. The association is able to pay a higher rate on its borrowed funds without raising the rate paid to all of its depositors. Borrowed funds enable savings and loan associations to compete effectively for funds in order to continue supplying a reasonable volume of mortgage credit.

XUM

The most effective way in which savings and loan associations can top the money market is through the Federal Home Loan Bank System, which was established by Congress for this very purpose. The home loan banks can issue consolidated obligations in the open market at attractive rates and reloan the proceeds to savings and loan associations. In effect, the home loan banks can reverse the process of disintermediation. Savings which are diverted from savings and loan associations into the money market can be recaptured by the home loan banks and recycled back to the very same savings and loan associations.

There are two constraints which prevent the home loan banks from recapturing all of the funds lost by savings and loan associations during a credit crunch. The first is the veto power which the Treasury has over the ability of the home loan banks to borrow in the open market. This difficulty is remedied under section 4 of the bill which removes the veto power.

The second constraint is one of interest rates. Even if the home loan bank had unlimited borrowing authority, there is some point at which savings and loan associations could no longer afford to borrow from the Home Loan Bank System. State usury ceilings as well as considerations of public policy prevent an unlimited increase in mortgage interest rates. When the upper limit on mortgage interest rates is reached, this rate, less marginal administrative expenses, determines the maximum rate which savings and loan associations can pay on borrowed funds. Whenever the rate on borrowed funds rises above the maximum rate savings and loan associations can afford to pay, they are effectively priced out of the market and are forced to curtail their mortgage lending.

The first line of defense against disintermediation rests with the Home Loan Bank System. But if the rate charged by the home loan bank exceeds the ability of savings and loan associations to pay, the Treasury borrowing authority represents a second line of defense. This is because the Treasury can obtain money at lower rates. During a period of tight money, the differential can be as much as 1 percentage point or even more.

For example, the current average yield on all outstanding Treasury obligations is approximately 7 percent, whereas, the rate paid by the home loan banks is slightly under 8 percent. However, the average cost of all home loan bank debentures is about 6.75 percent since much of their debt was issued in prior months when rates were lower. In determining the rate to charge member savings and loan associations for advances, the home loan banks base the rate on their average cost of borrowing as opposed to their marginal cost. Thus, the rate on advances to member associations is pegged at 6.75 percent.

The home loan banks cannot indefinitely borrow money at 8 percent and reloan it at 6.75 percent. Sooner or later their average cost of borrowing will approach the current rate of 8 percent. When this occurs, mortgage interest rates would have to go much higher than they are now in order for savings and loan associations to borrow at the 8-percent rate. If increases in mortgage rates are held down because of usury ceilings or for other reasons, savings and loan associations are priced out of the market.

At this point, it is expected that the Treasury borrowing authority would be activated. Instead of borrowing on the open market at much higher rates, the home loan banks could borrow from the Treasury at the current Government rate which may be as much as one percentage point below the market rate on home loan bank obligations. This lower rate can be passed on to member savings and loan associations, thus permitting them to continue their mortgage loans.

As monetary policy eased and interest rate differentials resume their more normal relationships, the Home Loan Bank System could refinance its debt by issuing its own obligations and using the proceeds to repay the Treasury. Thus, the Treasury is not expected to provide a permanent source of savings capital to the mortgage market. Instead, it would provide a temporary source of short-term credit, when no other means are available, in order to prevent a precipitous drop in housing starts.

Since the borrowing by the home loan banks would be at the Treasury rate, no subsidy would be involved. Moreover, it is expected that all such borrowings would be refinanced with the home loan bank's own obligations within a short period of time—in most cases within 12 months—hence there would be no permanent impact on the Federal budget.

Hopefully, the need to use Treasury borrowing authority will not arise. But even if it is not used, its mere existence will lend confidence to the mortgage market and permit savings and loan associations to make advance commitments with a greater degree of assurance. The fear of another round of disintermediation can cause a retrenchment in mortgage lending far greater than the ultimate loss in deposits. Knowledge of a firm Treasury backup can prevent this type of overreaction.

SECTION 4: REMOVAL OF TREASURY VETO

This section would repeal the veto power which the U.S. Treasury has over the ability of the home loan banks to borrow in the open market. The repeal of the veto would place the home loan banks on a par with other Federal credit agencies such as the Federal intermediate credit banks, the central bank for cooperatives, the regional banks for cooperatives, and the Federal land banks. All of these specialized credit agencies support the agricultural sector of our economy.

Treasury authority over the borrowing powers of Government corporations is contained in the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 868(a)). However, the first sentence of section 303(d) of that act states:

> Any mixed-ownership Government corporation from which Government capital has been entirely withdrawn shall not be subject to the provisions of . . . this section during the period such corporation remains without government capital.

The public policy contained in section 303(d) is founded on the reasonable proposition that when a mixed ownership Government corporation operates entirely on private capital, it has the right to make its own financial decisions. Under this policy, the specialized agricultural credit agencies operating on private capital have been freed from the Treasury veto power over their borrowing activities.

Contrary to this general policy, the last sentence of section 11(j) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act states:

> The provisions of the first sentence of subsection (d) of section 303 of the Government Corporation Control Act shall not apply to any Federal Home Loan Bank.

In other words, the rights conferred in the Government Corporation Control Act are rescinded in the Federal Home Loan Bank Act.

In view of the crucial role that housing plays in our urban problems, there is no valid reason why the home loan banks should be singled out for discriminatory treatment. All Government capital in the home loan banks has been withdrawn in 1951 and since that time they have operated entirely on private capital.

Treasury naturally has a proper concern that the obligations issued by Federal credit agencies are coordinated with Treasury issues. It likes to think of itself as a neutral "traffic cop" directing an orderly flow of issues to the market.

But the absolute veto power belies the "traffic cop" function. Certainly, the Federal credit agencies are also interested in the proper timing of their issues with Treasury issues. There is no reason why an orderly flow of issues cannot be exercised on the basis of voluntary mutual consultation. The agricultural credit agencies have operated on this basis for years.

What the veto power really amounts to is that Treasury has the ultimate power to say no to home loan bank borrowing, not for "traffic" reasons but for fiscal reasons. During a credit shortage, Treasury is most interested in marketing its own securities. Issues by other credit agencies are competitors for the same funds. Letting the Treasury have an absolute veto over its competitors is like letting the catcher call balls and strikes in a baseball game. No matter how hard Treasury tries, it cannot be a neutral traffic cop.

By removing the Treasury veto power, the home loan banks are not freed from responsible governmental control. The borrowing activities of the Federal home loan banks are under the direct supervision of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, a three-member board of Federal officials appointed by the President. Thus, the President has the ultimate authority over the system. If economic policy required a reduction in the flow of credit to savings and loan associations, the President and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board would have adequate authority to enforce such a reduction.

But a decision to deliberately curtail the flow of credit to the homebuilding industry should be made only after a careful deliberation and discussion of na-

XUM

tional priorities at the highest level of government. It should not be made by second or third level Treasury officials on narrow considerations of debt management. A removal of the Treasury veto power insures that our credit policies will be decided at the right level and for the right reasons.

The experience during the 1966 credit crunch illustrates the importance of the Treasury veto power. Savings inflows into savings and loan associations dropped $5.9 billion in 1966 compared to 1965; yet the flow of credit from the Home Loan Bank System increased by only $200 million during the year compared to the previous year. Their efforts to offset the deposit loss were miniscule.

In its report for 1966, the Home Loan Bank Board explained its failure with the following words:

> The system would have had to obtain these funds in the open market, a prospect that was clearly not feasible under the tight money conditions that prevailed.

The Board presented no evidence as to why it was not feasible to borrow more than it did. One possible explanation is that the Board was deterred from borrowing because of the Treasury veto power.

Despite the rapid increase in interest rates during 1966, at no time did the effective borrowing rate incurred by the Home Loan Bank System exceed the national average of effective mortgage rates on new residential construction. During the tightest month of all—September—the effective rate on new home loan bank obligations was 6.26 percent while the nationwide effective mortgage rate was 6.5 percent, a spread of one-quarter of a percent. In 8 months out of the year, the spread was one-half of a percent or more. Thus, if the home loan banks had borrowed more funds at the going market rate, they could have been used for additional mortgage loans.

Treasury and Federal Reserve officials sometimes argue that it is wrong for the Government to interfere in the allocation of credit during a period of tight money. According to this view, the free market should allocate the supply of credit through the competitive interplay of interest rates.

Yet the events of 1966 show just the reverse situation. It was not the "market" which dealt housing such a severe blow. At least part of the cutback in housing can be traced to an administrative decision to restrain borrowing by the Home Loan Bank System.

The removal of the Treasury veto power over the Home Loan Bank System will give greater weight to free market forces and will insure that housing is not the scapegoat of anti-inflationary policy.

SECTION 5: COMMERCIAL PAPER BORROWING

This section strengthens the authority of the Federal Reserve Board to administer regulation Q which establishes the maximum rate of interest which commercial banks can pay on time and savings deposits. At the present, there is a gaping loophole in regulation Q permitting large banks to obtain funds in excess of the regulation Q ceiling through the bank holding company device. As currently practiced by seven or eight large New York City banks, a bank holding company will issue short-term notes in the commercial paper market at prevailing rates which at the present time are more than 1 percentage point higher than the regulation Q ceiling. The proceeds can then be channeled by the parent holding company to its subsidiary bank. This can be done by purchasing participation certificates in the bank's loan portfolio or even purchasing loans outright. In either event, the bank has additional loanable funds to continue its business lending activity.

The language in section 5 would make it clear that the Federal Reserve Board has adequate authority to bring this kind of borrowing under the regulation Q ceiling. Although many are convinced the Federal Reserve Board already has this authority under existing law, there are some who are uncertain on this point. In order to remove any doubt, the language under section 5 clarifies the authority which the Federal Reserve Board apparently has under the Federal Reserve Act.

SECTION 6: EURODOLLAR BORROWING

Another loophole in the administration of regulation Q is Eurodollar borrowing by large commercial banks. Eurodollars are simply dollars held on deposit at banks outside of the United States. The overseas branches of U.S. commercial banks are free to bid for Eurodollar deposits at rates considerably in excess of the regulation Q ceiling. The foreign branches can then reloan the funds to the parent U.S. bank at the prevailing Eurodollar rate, thereby circumventing the regulation Q ceiling.

The Eurodollar loophole makes it possible for large commercial banks to offset the impact of tight money and to maintain its lending activity notwithstanding a considerable reduction in its conventional time deposits.

Governor Brimmer of the Federal Reserve Board has said publicly that the impact of monetary policy on the business sector is delayed because of the Eurodollar inflow. If we are to restore monetary control by the Federal Reserve Board over large commercial banks, this loophole must be plugged.

The language of section 6 would permit the Federal Reserve Board to establish marginal reserve requirements on additional Eurodollars obtained by U.S. commercial banks. The additional increase in Eurodollars would be measured from a base date which the Federal Reserve Board would from time to time establish. The Board could subject these Eurodollar funds to a reserve requirement of up to 100 percent.

The Federal Reserve Board has recently issued a proposed regulation establishing a 10-percent reserve requirement on incremental Eurodollar deposits. While a 19-percent reserve requirement would effectivley raise the cost of Eurodollar borrowing, it is not likely to have a substantial effect. Commercial banks have paid fantastic rates in order to obtain loanable funds, hence a 10-percent increase in the price of those funds will not be an effective long-term deterrent. However, a 100 percent reserve requirement if applied by the Federal Reserve Board, could effectively close the Eurodollar loophole. Since any additional Eurodollars obtained by a bank would have to be placed in reserve, the bank would have no incentive to borrow additional Eurodollar funds. It is expected this authority would be used sparingly by the Federal Reserve Board. But it would constitute a powerful tool which the Fed could exercise when necessary to insure the effectiveness of its monetary policy.

SECTIONS 7 AND 8: VOLUNTARY CREDIT RESTRAINT PROGRAM

These sections of the bill would reactivate the authority under which the Federal Reserve Board administered a voluntary credit restraint program during the Korean war. This authority was contained in the Defense Production Act of 1950. It authorized the President to consult with representatives of the financial community in order to establish voluntary programs of credit restraint.

Under this authority, as delegated by the President, the Federal Reserve Board established industrywide committees of banks, investment banking firms, life insurance companies, savings and loan associations, and mutual savings banks. The committees established voluntary lending criteria designed to channel credit to the most essential uses. While there were a number of problems in the implementation of the criteria, by and large the program achieved its objectives.

A National Voluntary Credit Restraining Committee issued a statement on March 10, 1952, evaluating the success of the program. This statement was published in the March 1952 Federal Reserve Bulletin and reads as follows:

> At the outset of the Program, which was without precedent in the country's financial history, there was widespread skepticism as to what might be accomplished by a self-regulation effort in the highly competitive field of lending. This has been supplanted by a recognition that the Program has proved practicable, workable, and effective as a supplemental too fiscal, credit, and other anti-inflationary weapons. . . . The Program has been an important factor in holding prices level during the first year of its operation.

Under section 708(a) of the Defense Production Act, the President is authorized "to consult with representatives of industry, business, financing, agriculture, labor, and other interests, with a view to encouraging the making by such persons with the approval by the President of voluntary agreements and programs to further the objectives of this act."

Under section 708(b), the Defense Production Act also provides an exemption from the antitrust laws for any voluntary agreement reached pursuant to the Defense Production Act and approved by the President as in the public interest. However, an amendment to the Defense Production Act made by Congress in 1955 substantially narrowed the scope of the antitrust exemption. The 1955 amendment provides that in the future, the antitrust exemption only applies to voluntary agreements concerning military equipment purchased by the Defense Department. This nar-

XUM

rower antitrust exemption effectively precludes the establishment of voluntary credit restrain committees. Accordingly, section 7 of the bill repeals the 1955 amendment to the Defense Production Act and restores the broader antitrust exemption contained in the original act.

A further obstacle to reactivating the voluntary credit restraint program is contained under section 708(f) of the Defense Production Act which was enacted by Congress in 1952. Section 708(f) states that after June 30, 1952, "no voluntary program or agreement for the control of credit shall be approved or carried out under this section." Accordingly, section 8 of the bill repeals this prohibition and restores the authority contained in the original Defense Production Act.

EXHIBIT 1

S. 2577

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7 of the Act of September 21, 1966 (Public Law 89–587; 80 Stat. 823), is amended to read:

"SEC. 7. Effective September 22, 1970—

"(1) So much of section 19(j) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371(b)) as precedes the third sentence thereof is amended to read as it would without the amendment made by section 2(c) of this Act;

"(2) The second and third sentences of section 18(g) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(g)) are amended to read as they would without the amendment made by section 3 of this Act;

"(3) The eighth sentence of section 18(g) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(g)) is repealed; and

"(4) Section 5B of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1425b) is repealed."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 18(g) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(g)) is amended (1) by changing "insured nonmember banks (including insured mutual savings banks)" in the second sentence to read "insured and noninsured nonmember banks (including insured and noninsured mutual savings banks)", (2) by changing "insured nonmember banks" in the third sentence to read "insured and noninsured nonmember banks", and (3) by adding at the end of said section 18(g) a new sentence to read as follows: "Whenever it shall appear to the Board of Directors that any nonmember bank is engaged or has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of the provisions of this section or of any rule thereunder, the Board of Directors may, in its discretion, bring an action in the United States district court for the judicial district in which the principal office of the nonmember bank is located to enjoin such acts or practices, to enforce compliance with this section or any rules thereunder or for a combination of the foregoing and such courts shall have jurisdiction of such actions, and, upon a proper showing, an injunction, restraining order or other appropriate order shall be granted without bond.".

(b) Section 5B of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5B. (a) The Board may from time to time, after consulting with the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, prescribe rules governing the payment and advertisement of interest or dividends on deposits, shares, or withdrawable accounts, including limitations on the rates of interest or dividends on deposits, shares, or withdrawable accounts that may be paid by members, other than those the deposits of which are insured in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, by institutions which are insured institutions as defined in section 401(a) of the National Housing Act, and by nonmember building and loan, savings and loan, and homestead associations, and cooperative banks. The Board may prescribe different rate limitations for different classes of deposits, shares, or withdrawable accounts, for deposits, shares, or withdrawable accounts of different amounts or with different maturities or subject to different conditions regarding withdrawal or repayment, according to the nature or location of such members, institutions or nonmembers or their depositors, shareholders, or withdrawable account holders, or according to such other reasonable bases as the Board may deem desirable in the public interest.

"(b) In addition to any other penalty provided by this or any other law, any institution subject to this section which violates a rule promulgated pursuant to this section shall be subject to such civil penalties, which shall not exceed $100 for each violation, as may be prescribed by said Board by rule and such rule may provide with respect to any or all such violations that each day on which the violation continues shall constitute a separate violation. The Board may recover any such civil penalty for its own use, through action or otherwise, including recovery thereof in any other action or proceeding under this section. The Board may, at any time before collection of any such penalty, whether before or after the bringing of an action or other legal proceeding, the obtaining of any judgment or other recovery, or the issuance or levy of any execution or other legal process therefor, and with or without consideration, compromise, remit, or mitigate in whole or in part any such penalty or any such recovery.

"(c) Whenever it shall appear to the Board that any non-member institution is engaged or has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of the provisions of this section or of any rule thereunder, the Board may, in its discretion, bring an action in the United States district court for the judicial district in which the principal office of the institution is located to enjoin such acts or practices, to enforce compliance with this section or any rules thereunder or for a combination or the foregoing and such courts shall have jurisdiction, of such actions, and, upon a proper showing, an injunction, restraining order, or other appropriate order shall be granted without bond.

"(d) All expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board under this section shall be considered as non-administrative expenses."

SEC. 3. Section 11(i) of the Home Loan Bank Act is amended by striking out the word "rate" the second time it appears in the last sentence and inserting the word "yield" in lieu thereof; and by adding the following at the end of the subsection:

"It is the sense of Congress that the authority provided in this subsection be used by the Secretary of the Treasury, when alternative means cannot effectively be employed, to permit members of the Home Loan Bank System to continue to supply reasonable amounts of funds to the mortgage market whenever the ability to supply such funds is substantially impaired during periods of monetary stringency and rapidly rising interest rates and that any funds so borrowed will be repaid by the Home Loan Bank Board at the earliest practicable date."

SEC. 4. The last sentence of section 11(j) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1431(j)) is repealed.

SEC. 5. Section 19(a) is amended by inserting after the word "interest" the following: "to determine what types of securities, whether issued directly by a member bank or indirectly by an affiliate of a member bank or by other means, shall be deemed a deposit for the purposes of subsection (j),".

SEC. 6. Section 19(b) of the Federal Reserve Act is amended by inserting "(1) after "(b)"; by striking "(1)"; "(2)"; and "(3)" and inserting "(A)"; "(B)"; and "(C)" respectively and by adding a new paragraph (2) at the end thereof as follows:

"(2) Every member bank shall maintain reserves in such ratios as the Board may require against any incremental liabilities which it incurs to its foreign branches from a date which the Board may from time to time establish. Such reserve ratios shall not exceed 100 per centum."

SEC. 7. Section 708(b) of the Defense Production Act (50 U.S.C. 2158(b)) is amended by striking out everything after "United States" and inserting a period in lieu thereof.

SEC. 8. Section 708(f) of the Defense Production Act (50 U.S.C. 2158(f)) is repealed.

"ONE SMALL STEP FOR MAN; ONE GIANT LEAP FOR MANKIND"

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, it was as long ago as the fourth century that St. Augustine remarked that "some things must be believed to be seen." Of course, St. Augustine was referring to the necessity of having faith in one's religious commitment before truly understanding its depth. But, the same philosophy could well apply to the necessity of having faith in the extent of human possibilities in conquering the evermore challenging problems of existence and understanding man's expanding environment before they will be realized.

Since the beginning of man, dreams have been in terms of the moon and its conquest; and July 20 marked the culmination of what the Wall Street Journal has termed "only a decade of preparation and the expenditure of $24 billion." In effect, the overwhelming feat, in which man planted his feet on the powdery gray surface, St. Augustine's conviction was again affirmed. Dreams do come true.

With no reservations, our highest congratulations are owed the engineering space scientists, the meticulous technicians at the NASA base in Houston, and the particularly courageous Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins. Their accomplishment was in terms of the moon, specifically, but bore even more significance for all mankind—their conquest was proof that man's powers are no more limited than his imagination.

Today, situations here on earth remain a stigma to man. Over 22 million Americans live below the poverty level; 14 to 15 million Americans are unable to afford adequate diets and supplemental programs reach only six million of these people; and nightly, 10 million Americans go to bed hungry. Disease still needlessly claims millions of lives each year; educational opportunities are yet limited; social security benefits remain inadequate; transportation systems are overused; and man's own environment is becoming unlivable. Each year, 142 million tons of smoke and noxious fumes are literally dumped into the earth's atmosphere.

At a time of celebration, it is not my purpose to sound like a pessimist or to bear only the flag of the tasks yet undone. But, the reason for speaking is

XUM

this: I believe, more than any other accomplishment could have, the conquest of the moon presents us with the inspiration necessary to forge ahead—in meeting the innumerable and seemingly insoluble problems remaining here on earth.

The encouragement provided by the successful mission of the Apollo 11 is that it has alerted us to the resources available within our Nation—in terms of intellects, technological equipment, and money. Indeed it has shown us that if problems here at home were attacked with the vigor of those in space, a concerted effort would be capable of bringing about a remedy. While there are more difficulties encountered in dealing with people than foreign objects, evidence of the unlimited capabilities at our fingertips warrants nothing but optimism in addressing ourselves to domestic problems.

Armstrong's first words as he set foot on the moon were:

> That's one small step for man; one giant leap for mankind.

My hopes are this: That in this leap was the impetus for meeting the problems of man—in relation to himself and his survival, and with his fellow men in achieving peaceful and wholesome lives.

THE PESTICIDE PERIL—XXXI

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, a recent study commissioned by Secretary General U Thant of the United Nations reported that a billion pounds of DDT had been spread through the environment and that world production of pesticides of one kind or another amounted to 1.3 billion pounds a year.

It is true that when DDT was first introduced to the world environment it saved millions of lives by controlling the pest carriers of malaria, yellow fever, and typhus. However, now there is sufficient evidence to link this same life-saving pesticide to the killing of wildlife and potentially to serious diseases in man, such as cancer and liver and stomach malfunctions.

Concern about the threat to the environment and to human health from continued use of DDT and other persistent pesticides is international. Sweden, Denmark, and Hungary have banned DDT in their countries. Great Britain and Russia have expressed alarm. In the United States, Arizona and Michigan have banned DDT, while many other States are considering proposals to either ban or regulate the use of this and other toxic pesticides.

The State of New York has been actively reviewing the pesticide issue. This spring, New York City announced that after a 2-year experiment with biological controls it was discontinuing the use of DDT in the city parks. Earlier this month, public hearings were held in Buffalo, at which the director of the Roswell Park Memorial Institute told about a study soon to be published which indicates that DDT produced tumors in mice.

The New York Daily Column of July 17 reviews the DDT controversy. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DDT

In the days just after World War II, DDT was looked upon as chemistry's priceless gift to humanity. Pests that for centuries had plagued mankind, carriers of malaria, yellow fever, and typhus, have been substantially controlled or eliminated through the use of this pesticide.

Refugee shelters established by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration used DDT to delouse and delice survivors of Nazi concentration camps.

Once regarded as a blessing to mankind, DDT has in recent months been characterized as a menace to the environment, a destroyer of natural ecology, and a threat to wildlife, birds, fish, and possibly even people.

Earlier this month, Secretary General U Thant of the United Nations transmitted a study to member governments, warning that damage to the environment is creating a crisis of worldwide dimensions.

In relation to pesticides, this study asserted that a billion pounds of DDT had been spread through the environment and that world production of pesticides of one kind or another amounted to 1.3 billion pounds a year.

International controls over use of pesticides will be considered at a United Nations Conference on Environment, scheduled for 1972.

DDT is highly toxic and highly persistent. After ten years of exposure to the elements, DDT remains 50 per cent toxic.

Its toxicity and persistency are the qualities that make DDT valuable to farmers and other users but frighten the conservationists. These qualities make DDT inexpensive and effective, but also threaten life forms essential to sustain the ecology of an area.

WORLD CONTAMINATED

Scientific evidence clearly demonstrates that every quarter of the globe, however distant from areas of pesticide spraying, is contaminated with DDT.

In many birds, DDT and other persistent pesticides have caused a thinness in the egg shell and a consequent decease in reproductive success. As a result, the penguin in the Antarctic, the bald eagle and the peregrine falcon are on the verge of extinction.

For some years the issue concerning the use of DDT was generating some heat and then erupted last spring when the Federal Drug Administration impounded more than 28,000 pounds of Lake Michigan Coho salmon, found to contain 19 parts per million of DDT, a level regarded as hazardous by the Drug Administration and the World Health Organization.

Senator Gaylord Nelson, a Wisconsin Democrat, had been for some years leading a lonely fight in Congress for legislation to curb the use of DDT, as well as other persistent pesticides.

Senator Nelson reported the case of a Wisconsin farmer who was required to withhold all of his milk and beef from the market for 11 years because DDT was found in his grain, which in turn was eaten by his cows which produced harmful residues in their milk and fat.

According to Senator Nelson, in 1968 Wisconsin dairy farmers received more than $20,000 in reimbursements from the Federal Government under the pesticide indemnity program administered by the Department of Agriculture.

Even breast-fed badies are exposed to milk contaminated with DDT. Dr. Goran Lofroth of the radiobiology department of Stockholm University, reported that breast-fed babies took in a daily average of DDT from mother's milk that was twice the recommended maximum.

Soviet scientists reported that workers who are occupationally exposed to DDT reveal liver and stomach malfunctions after ten years of such exposure.

In the light of more recent scientific findings, DDT was banned in Sweden, where it was first discovered, in Denmark, in Hungary, in Arizona and in Michigan.

In New York State, Assemblyman Andrew Stein, a member of the Assembly Standing Committee of Health, was the first New York Legislator to sponsor legislation to prohibit use of DDT. At a public hearing in Buffalo last week, the Assembly Health Committee heard a report by Dr. James T. Grace, director of the Roswell Park Memorial Institute that a study that will shortly be published indicates that DDT produced tumors in mice.

Studies by the State Health Department showed high concentration of DDT in lake trout in the State's central and northern lakes.

Mayor John V. Lindsay, informed Assemblyman Stein the other day that Dr. Bernard Bucove, the City's Health Services Administrator, and Dr. Mary McLaughlin, the City's Health Commissioner, have under consideration a recommendation of Assemblyman Stein to ban the use and sale of DDT in the city.

The reaction of producers of DDT and similarly persistent pesticides has been similar to the attitude of the tobacco growers toward charges that smoking causes cancer: that there is no direct proof.

Whatever the ultimate outcome may be of various legislative proposals to ban, limit, and control the sale and use of DDT, the controversy will continue for a long time. Even the most dedicated opponents of DDT use concede that it has saved countless lives.

THE MACHIASPORT OIL REFINERY

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the July 1969 issue of Field and Stream, in its conservation section written by Michael Frome, points to many circumstances surrounding the Occidental Petroleum Corp. proposal to establish a refinery supplied by Libyan oil in a foreign trade zone on the Maine seacoast at Machiasport.

The advocates of the Occidental proposal pointed to the cheaper fuel rates to the people of the New England area which had been promised by the company as justification for undercutting the mandatory oil import control program. However, they have been unable to support their claim that the people of New England pay higher rates for petroleum products than the citizens in other areas of the country.

In the past several months, many of us have urged that other factors such as national security, the domestic economy, and environmental quality be considered before the Federal Government establishes a foreign trade zone on the basis of short range, speculative benefits.

In an effort to provide information on the Machiasport proposal from a broad variety of sources, I ask unanimous consent that portions of the conservation column from the July 1969 issue of Field and Stream relating to the Machiasport proposal be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MACHIASPORT PROPOSAL

Since January the Santa Barbara community has been united in demanding that drilling and production be stopped once and for all. "But we are more convinced daily," according to my correspondent on

XUM

the ground, "that privilege and profit have the inside track in Washington, and that our Channel has in effect been made a trust territory administered by the oil companies."

Petroleum is here, there, everywhere. Close to 4,000 tankers carry crude oil from the Middle East to refinery ports in Europe and the United States. By intentionally pumping into the sea oily bilge water and dirty ballast from their cargo tanks, tankers are responsible for an awesome contamination of our oceans. This is "operational pollution," which many who run the tankers regard as inherently right.

In recent times the oyster industry was wiped out after a grounded tanker pumped 310,000 gallons of bunker oil into Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island, in an attempt to refloat herself. Fish, crabs, lobsters retreat from oil; more than 200,000 seabirds were killed by oil off the coast of Newfoundland during a two-year period. As recently as January 1969, thousands of ducks, grebes, swans, and other waterbirds were killed in oil-polluted waters extending from Watch Hill, Rhode Island, to New Haven, Connecticut.

Despite this plain and proven record, Governor Kenneth Curtis and United States Senator Edmund S. Muskie of Maine are beating the tom-toms for a deepwater port and oil refinery at a perfectly innocent place called Machiasport, which lies in the heart of the last stretch of the matchless Maine coast. They and other politicians of New England have endeavored to whip up a hysteria of support on various grounds of dubious validity.

For instance, they allege that such development would create jobs in a depressed area. But modern refineries operate mainly with automatic controls and few people. Odds are strong that money-producing offshore lobster and shellfish habitat would be affected, with the inevitable oil spillage and accidental loss. The further truth is that the administration of Governor Curtis has done a feeble job, at best, in promoting the tourist economy of the Machias region, based on wildlife, fishing, canoeing, unspoiled nature, which could make it a major attraction of the Northeast—and the same holds true of Senator Muskie when he was Governor of Maine.

They have tried to create an illusion that the oil refinery would lower prices for New England consumers. But there is serious question as to whether such prices really are higher than the national average; nor have they shown by what percentage prices would drop. It's a funny old world—Secretary Udall supported the Machiasport project on one hand but on the other hand advocated a new society in which citizens would be willing to pay a bit more for goods and services in order to insure a clean country. "From now on," to use his very words, "the fact that particular machines, goods, or services seem to be cheaper, more convenient, or a bit more efficient will not be decisive. The noise made, the effluvia expelled, the residues deposited, the unabsorbed wastes imposed on other generations must first be weighed in the balance." In short, Save the Maine Coast!

Governor Curtis and Senator Muskie also have promised that pollution would be totally controlled in the refinery development, which is the funniest joke of all. Governor Curtis has already been discredited as a writer of conservation gags when he tried to thrust a so-called industrial "park," complete with monstrous aluminum smelter plant and nuclear power station, upon the community of Trenton, in the shadow of Acadia National Park, only to be rebuffed by the voters in a referendum. Besides this, the Governor and Senator somehow overlooked mentioning that Machiasport lies in an area of persistent, repeated fog, with gaseous concentrations from refinery and oil port a threat to the health of its people.

Moreover, the pollution-control laws of Maine and their enforcement are rather a mockery. There is an agency called the Water Improvement Commission, but its efforts are not meaningful. As a true believer named Kenneth H. Morrison reported in the Bath-Brunswick Times Record, "It is not unlike ordering a three-man police department to wipe out organized crime and round up a submachine-gun-armed Mafia, and then equip its officers with bows and arrows, stoneheaded spears, and lead boots."

The real proof of the pudding is in the Prestile Stream case, in which one company is dumping pollution equivalent to the waste of a city of 270,000, thus destroying virtually all life. It was Senator Muskie, incidentally, who proposed "flexibility" and degradation of state controls in 1964 in order to accommodate this particular firm on the Prestile.

My friendly advice to Senator Muskie is that he start citing a recent Congressional committee report showing that petroleum in automobiles now accounts for more than 60 percent of all air pollution in the United States and for 90 percent of all carbon monoxide pollution. He might even add the conclusion that present approaches "will not solve the air pollution epidemic" and that only replacement by a steam-cycle propulsion system—which could have been developed twenty years ago—will do.

As a chronic optimist and believer in the human race, I feel the tide is turning; the ultimate victory belongs in the hands of the people. "I can't help thinking," wrote one of my constituents, "that millions of fishermen, hunters, campers, scuba divers, and other outdoor-minded Americans can create noise at crucial political moments to drown out the lobbies of the chemical industry and other such special interests whose irresponsible actions endanger the existence of wildlife, natural vegetation and perhaps human life."

THE ENVIRONMENT OF MAN

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, a commentator once observed that the trouble with the environment is man. The science and technology he has developed in the 20th century is a two-edged sword—it has cut the economic barriers to a life of abundance, but it also threatens to cut the fragile web of life which sustains man and all living things on this planet.

Today it is evident that man is destroying his environment—air, water, and land. The litany of facts and figures is well known to citizens and public officials. Each year we pump millions of tons of waste into the skies; we dump huge amounts of sewage into our waterways; and we junk mountains of bottles, jars and other solid wastes across the landscape.

The effect of all this pollution is devastating to our environment. Dr. Thomas F. Malone, senior vice president and director of research for the Travelers Insurance Co., recently told a Senate subcommittee that the overall quality of the environment is deteriorating at a rate of about 6 to 8 percent per year. We have been warned—nature will no longer absorb the cost of depleting the environment.

We are very late in coming to grips with our environmental problems. The Bulletin of Atomic Scientists each year publishes a picture of a clock with the hands set to show the danger in which mankind lives in the nuclear age. If there were a similar clock to reflect the state of the environment I suspect it would be set at about 11:45 p.m.

Now we realize that degrading the environment must stop and the process of regeneration begin. But on the horizon are even more sophisticated forms of pollution to guard against—such as waste heat, the residue from electric power generation by nuclear reactors. Today there are only 13 nuclear powerplants, but 46 are under construction and many more are planned.

One of those under construction is at Vernon, Vt., on the Connecticut River. Cooling its generators will require 780 cubic feet of water a second. The cooling process will raise the temperature of the water used by 20 degrees, and the water temperature below Vernon by a net 13 degrees. In summer this would push the temperature above 90 degrees, too warm for most animal and plant life.

This would seriously damage the river and undermine my proposal for a Connecticut River national recreation area. The park I envision will be a major recreation area for New England and the entire northeastern region, but, for this, the river must be saved from thermal pollution.

To minimize such pollution two giant cooling towers will be built to reduce the temperature of the water to 10 degrees above its natural level. The two towers will, however, cause some noise, pollution, mist, and fog in the vicinity.

These effects will be multiplied many times over across the country. For according to current estimates, by 1980 the power industry will require one-sixth of the total fresh water flows in the Nation to cool nuclear reactors.

No one is sure what will happen when such large quantities of warm water are released into the Nation's lakes and rivers. But biologists are plainly worried. An aquatic ecologist with the Atomic Energy Commission, Jerry Davis, has pointed out that higher temperatures reduce the capacity of water to assimilate organic waste and certain diseases of marine and fresh water fish flourish at warmer temperatures.

All this pollution is the byproduct of our advanced, industrial civilization. We need not give up the benefits of modern life. But if we do not stem the tide of wastes, Ralph Waldo Emerson's prediction, that the human race will eventually die of civilization, may come true.

The responsibility to prevent this falls first on the National Government. However, in many instances we find that the Federal Government is one of the worst offenders. For example, the Army decided that the pesticide residues stored in settling ponds near the Rocky Mountain Arsenal in Denver, threatened civilian water supplies and wildlife. So it drilled a 2-mile-deep well to place these chemicals below the water table used for drinking and irrigation. One month after the Army began pouring millions of gallons of waste down the well, Denver was shaken by its first

XUM

earthquake of the century and has since suffered scores more. Fortunately, none so violent as to cause heavy damage or loss of life.

Some scientists believe the pesticide dumping is related to the earth shocks. No one can be sure. But there is no doubt that the Army has altered the geology of the area.

The Forest Service, which is charged with promoting the conservation and best use of the Nation's forest lands, is engaged in lumbering practices which have resulted in watershed erosion on a huge scale. The topsoil of the Rockies is becoming Mississippi River mud and the Sierra soil is flowing into the Pacific Ocean. Dust and desolation loom ahead.

The Federal Aviation Administration is urging the construction of a 39-square-mile jetport in the heart of the Florida everglades. The airport is next to the Everglades National Park and threatens all life in the park, from algae to alligators. This unique wildlife refuge will not be able to survive the onslaught of pesticides, work crews, and jet exhaust.

Here we have a perfect example of the impact of technology on our environment. Science has made possible giant jets to carry hundreds of passengers economically. The planes, in turn, need large, new airport facilities. Now, unless action is taken to prevent it, a magnificient wilderness will be swallowed up by the onward rush of commerce.

The prospects for meaningful action at the Federal level to preserve the environment are not bright. This year 14 Federal agencies will spend $3.7 billion in unorganized and fragmented attempts to improve the environment.

The Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization has long been concerned with the lack of coordination and obvious conflict in our natural resource programs. In 1967, the subcommittee held hearings on legislation to establish a Department of Natural Resources. The bill would have reorganized many of the Federal natural resource programs in a more comprehensive and efficient way. The hearings demonstrated the need for better organization of Federal efforts in this area.

Last year the subcommittee reported a bill which would have established a new Hoover-type commission to streamline and modernize the entire executive branch. The bill passed the Senate unanimously, but was not acted upon by the House. This year the bill was reintroduced; however, action was deferred pending the report of the Ash Commission.

The subcommittee now is planning hearings on my proposal to create a Commission on the Conservation and Development of the Long Island Sound. This will enable the subcommittee to explore in detail the operation of Federal natural resource programs in one specific geographic area.

It is my thesis that the way we organize programs determines the results they achieve. Organization inevitably affects policy. It is axiomatic that if the pieces do not fit together, the machine will not run well.

Our environmental programs are an example of the lack of systematic organization and overall planning. In a recent unanimous report the Senate Interior Committee summarized perfectly the reasons for their failure:

> In spite of the growing public recognition of the urgency of many environmental problems and the need to reorder national goals and priorities to deal with the problems, there is still no comprehensive national policy on environmental management. There are limited policies directed to some areas where specific problems are recognized to exist, but we do not have a considered statement of overall national goals and purposes.
>
> As a result of this failure to formulate a comprehensive national policy, environmental decisionmaking largely continues to proceed as it has in the past. Policy is established by default and inaction. Environmental problems are only dealt with when they reach crisis proportions. Public desires and aspirations are seldom consulted. Important decisions concerning the use and shape of man's future environment continue to be in small but steady increments which perpetuate rather than avoid the mistakes of previous decades.

This is a harsh indictment, but it is justified. Strong and far-reaching measures are needed to reorganize and redirect our environmental programs.

Earlier this year President Nixon established the Ash Commission to "undertake a thorough review of the organization of the executive branch and provide over-all and specific recommendations for organizational changes to make the executive branch a more effective instrument of public policy." In the environmental area the Ash Commission should focus initially on centralizing program responsibility. It is essential that we unify authority and accountability. In this way Congress and the public will be able to look to a single organization for the answers to our environmental problems.

The present organization of Federal environmental programs is woefully inadequate to their task. The Committee on Atmospheric Sciences of the National Academy of Science pointed out 3 years ago:

> The administrative division of the environmental sciences according to the diverse social purposes of the different Federal agencies, has been rendered obsolete by the increased interdependence among the various areas of environmental research and engineering.

We should begin the reorganization process by grouping related programs together so that they are directed toward defined ends and reinforce each other. In this connection, the Ash Commission should give serious consideration to the formation of a new Department of Human Environment and Natural Resources, encompassing all Federal environmental efforts.

There is no domestic issue facing the American people more urgent than the deteriorating quality of our environment. It affects every person, north and south, east or west, urban or rural. Accordingly, I am writing Mr. Ash to urge that the Commission give this matter the highest priority.

Mr. President, the question before us is simply this—what kind of a nation do we want? For 3 million years we have been trying to protect man against the environment. It is now time to protect the environment against man. Adlai Stevenson said it well in his last public speech:

> We travel together, passengers on a little space ship, dependent on its vulnerable supplies of air and soil, preserved from annihilation only by the care, the work and I will say the love, we give our fragile craft.

Today we are fast approaching the time when our country will become a coast-to-coast expanse of asphalt where no beast can live, interspersed by bodies of water in which no fish can live, compounded by an atmosphere in which no bird can fly—a lethal climate in which man cannot survive.

We stand on the threshold of a new world in space. But we are in danger of losing our precious environment here on earth. Our eyes look past the smudged skies, foul waters, and despoiled land. The barren moon is a grim reminder of what our world could become.

As a nation we must develop a greater sense of environmental responsibility for we are the trustees of the environment for future generations. We can leave them no finer legacy than pure air, clean water and fertile soil. Let us vow to do so.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR MATHIAS IN YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

Mr. SAXBE. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), recently made a speech in the city of Youngstown in my State. Because I thought it to be a fine speech, and because it dealt at some length with the ideals of a man for whom I hold great respect, the late Senator Robert A. Taft, I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF SENATOR MATHIAS, YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO, MAY 27, 1969

In the past a trip from Washington to Ohio was a passage from a realm still dominated by the spirit of Franklin D. Roosevelt to the heartland of Robert A. Taft.

To a Republican it was a reassuring journey. But our gratitude for Taft's contributions did not come without a pang of regret. For the Roosevelt approach—despite President Eisenhower's effort to resist it—seemed durably triumphant.

In recent years, however, the Roosevelt inspiration has come into question. The Federal programs, from the New Deal through the Great Society, became a petrified forest of federal agencies, no longer effective but nearly impossible to prune or cut down.

The persistence of New Deal nostalgia brought ever new demands for just one more round of federal controls. By a strange paradox, however, as government attained greater power, it also grew less effective. Democratic Presidents imitating the rhetoric of FDR, assumed heroic postures and urged dynamic programs for change. But when an aggrieved individual looked to government, in general, he still found only the great stone face of bureaucracy.

The problem was that unless they have a clear goal, firmly endorsed by the people, bureaucracies have the strange faculty of paralyzing both their leaders and their clerks. The lowest level bureaucrats in New York City cannot exceed in their sense of powerless-

XUM

ness the frustration of Mayor Lindsay. And during the Johnson Administration the pervasive demoralization of field personnel in the welfare program was duplicated and reduplicated all the way up the bureaucracy to the Secretary of the Department of HEW—and even to the President himself.

This is the bureaucracy trap. Of course, many government offices escape it. But whenever a bureaucrat realizes he is so bogged down he cannot do much good for the country, he begins to think of doing good for himself. During the Johnson Administration federal employment expanded enormously but many offices were given neither clear purposes nor adequate funding to effectively carry out their programs. They were given enough funds for bureaucratic self-subsistence—to keep their own jobs, which turned out, in a sense, to be a diurnal 9–5 imprisonment, doing time, while the cities broke down in riot and the people cried out in anguish to the great stone face. This was the end of the New Deal approach. It is the end that Robert Taft predicted for it. So I think the vision of FDR exhausted itself; and then proceeded to exhaust the creativity of the Democratic party.

Robert Taft's inspiration, meanwhile, never really came to power. It was often derided by the proponents of the Roosevelt approach. Yet we can say, from the perspective of the fifteen years since his death and at the beginning of a new Republican Administration, that Taft's vision has survived and supplanted Roosevelt's. We can see today that this great Ohioan, bitterly attacked as a reactionary, was in fact far ahead of his time and of his detractors. In returning to Taft, we turn to the future.

Taft was more than the Senior Senator from Ohio; he was also Senior Senator from the Constitution and guardian of the American way. He recognized, however, that the American way was not a dead end street blocked by a Constitutional Shrine. He had a keen perception of the limits of both government and private enterprise and he wanted each to do what it did best. In housing and income maintenance, for example, he proposed government programs more extensive than those in existence today.

Taft understood that individual dignity was often compromised by extremes of poverty which were caused by national trends and could not be easily managed by local or state governments. Therefore, he advocated creation of a nationally financed floor under incomes. The Nixon Administration is adopting this approach today.

Taft also was prophetic in his view of housing policy. The chief author of the Housing Act of 1948, Taft always emphasized that the chief government role in housing was to help provide homes for people too poor to afford them in the private market. During the years since his death, however, Washington lost sight of this principle. While constructing housing for universities, symphony orchestras and wealthy tenants, the Federal Government, under various urban renewal and highway programs, destroyed far more low cost housing than it constructed. HUD Secretary George Romney's recent speech calling for an Operation Breakthrough in low cost housing reveals how little progress we have made in this area since 1949 when Senator Taft was calling for a similar breakthrough.

Romney risked boos in calling on the Building Trades unionists to increase productivity and accept new technical practices to lower the cost of housing. But he is a determined leader. If anyone can generate new thinking in this area it is the man who broke the grip of the leviathan automobile manufacturers on the auto market by producing a compact low-cost car. I believe that Romney's address shows a clear understanding of the housing problems largely neglected by the Great Society. Moreover, the Administration's return to Taft's emphasis on low-cost construction is one of its most promising early initiatives.

To the extent that urban problems are the result of misconceived and misapplied housing and welfare policies, Taft twenty years ago foresaw the impending crisis and advocated far-reaching approaches to forestall it. Today Nixon is turning to the principles of Taft rather than Roosevelt in farming his best new programs. In creatively facing the future, Nixon pays tribute to one of the great Republicans of the past.

Taft was equally prophetic in foreign and defense policy. Although General Eisenhower's strictures against the military-industrial complex are cited more frequently today, Taft was if anything even more vehement in his warnings against the militarization of our society. His speeches against the draft—denouncing it as "totalitarian"—are echoed on campuses across the country and reechoed on the floor of the Senate. Richard Nixon's adoption of the idea of a volunteer military is a direct vindication of the Ohio Senator.

In foreign policy, Taft was often attacked as an isolationist and indeed some of his positions did seem to deny the inevitable responsibilities entailed by American power. But after our melancholy experience in Vietnam, his contention that we must always maintain a careful balance between our commitments and capabilities seems trenchantly relevant. "Nothing is so dangerous," he wrote in 1951, as to commit the United States to a course which is beyond its capacity to perform with success." I am afraid that previous Administrations did not follow this wise counsel.

I think that the Nixon Administration has had a promising beginning. It has chiefly disappointed those who desired a new spate of detailed federal programs for the cities. Yet I believe that his proposals for welfare reform and for sharing federal money without strings among state and municipal governments promise to accomplish far more for the urban areas than all the Great Society intiatives put together. The Nixon Administration has a real possibility of achieving in history the greatness that his predecessors reached only in their rhetoric.

This great promise, however, faces two great threats. The first, of course, is Vietnam and we can only hope that the indications of progress offered in the President's recent speech are fulfilled in action to de-escalate the war and accelerate the negotiations. The second threat is the arms race.

Let us be clear on this point. One sure way to lose an arms race is to spend too much money on it. Not only is our security not improved, but the people are compelled to pay higher taxes to maintain the status quo. We get less security at higher cost.

A good example of this phenomenon was the huge spurt in defense spending during the Kennedy Administration in response to missile gap alarms. By the time the Johnson Administration left office defense spending had nearly doubled. But because the Russians had greatly accelerated their own spending in response to the Kennedy increases, our position today is no more secure than it was under President Eisenhower when we were paying substantially less. Our deterrent, moreover, is still most firmly on the Polaris system originated in the Eisenhower years, when research and development was unstinting; but new systems were deployed only when their necessity could be demonstrated.

Today the Pentagon is issuing alarms directly analogous to the missile gap projections which Eisenhower sensibly rejected and the Democrats applied in 1960. The ABM is the focus of debate. It is enormously expensive; realistic cost estimates approach $20 billion; and as Senator Taft declared in his last speech before his death, speaking of the much lower arms burden of his day: "When I think what you could do in social welfare with just one billion in additional federal money it makes me all the more indignant that we don't subject that program to the most severe scrutiny."

Well, Senator Saxbe and myself—along with a great many other Senators including a number of Republicans—have subjected the ABM to severe scrutiny. We have heard all the Pentagon arguments and we have watched them change from week to week. We have received classified briefings. We recognize that the proposed Safeguard program is both cheaper and more intelligent than the Johnson Administration's Sentinel. We applaud the President's courageous recognition that our cities cannot be protected against nuclear attack. But we remain convinced that deployment is unwarranted at this time. We remain convinced that continued research and development will enable us to act if the Soviet Union ever does pose a dangerous threat to our retaliatory forces, which are impregnable today.

As Rear Admiral Levering Smith, in charge of Polaris technology, stated recently, our Polaris fleet will remain invulnerable for many years and it commands 656 missiles, each bearing a warhead several times larger than the Hiroshima bomb and collectively assuring devastation to any aggressor even if all of our ICBM's were destroyed. Our bomber fleet, moreover, cannot be eliminated simultaneously with our Minutemen. If our radar detects a missile onslaught our bombers can move into the sky where they are not subject to attack. Deployment of the ABM would somewhat increase the invulnerability of our Minutemen. But the price is too high. Our security will benefit far more from mutual agreements with the Soviet Union to cut back on military spending.

Deployment of the ABM, therefore, would be a step toward losing the Arms Race. I can understand how a Soviet General might even welcome U.S. deployment of ABM. A Soviet General would know the ABM is of the most dubious effectiveness except in diverting American resources from more useful purposes and in reducing the flexibility of our defenses. He would recognize that this great commitment of money and technical skills will limit the American capacity to react to real threats as they unpredictably emerge in the future. In sum, ABM deployment would weaken our society without strengthening our security.

I expect, however, that the judicious approach of Senator Taft will prevail on this issue also. I can say already that the Defense budget is now being subjected for the first time to the "severe scrutiny" which he demanded in his final address. And across a wide range of federal policy—from education to revenue sharing—there are real signs that Mr. Republican's principles are beginning to prevail in government even if their great spokesman is not yet fully appreciated in the fashionable histories of his period. Senator Taft, however, is a rare figure whose position in history grows as time passes.

So when I return to Washington, I will not have to leave behind the spirit of Ohio Republicanism. For the legacy of Robert Taft remains strong—not only in the Senate with Senator Saxbe and in the House with such great Ohio Republican leaders as William McCullough, my close friend and the ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee; Robert Taft Jr., and Frank Bow. I can say with all sincerity that the Taft legacy also prevails in the White House and it bodes well for the country.

THE KID IN THE PARK

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, when the young man pressed a gun against my head and said, "Give me

XUM

your money," I wondered, as I reached for my wallet, whether it was only my money he wanted. Or was he going to take the moment and use his gun to balance for him the black and white ledger. He got the money and then he said, "I like you—you cooperate." Then I knew, for that moment, all he wanted was money. Through the mind of Jack Mann, columnist for the Washington Daily News, in his column, "The Kid in the Park" of Tuesday, July 22, 1969, flashed the history of human injustice as he fell under the blows of three young assailants who wanted more than money.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD these thoughts of Jack Mann.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News,
July 22, 1969]

JACK MANN—"THE KID IN THE PARK"

"Post proofs that brotherhood is not so wild a dream as those who profit by postponing it pretend."

—Norman Corwin, "On a Note of Triumph"

I watched the people planting the flag on the moon, but I didn't really pay attention. I was thinking how presumptuous are we to be starting another world with this one in a condition that is, in the most literal and reverent sense of the term, a God —— shame.

Anybody who thinks this is irrelevant is being irrelevant.

It is, pro forma, a sort of open letter to the kid who slugged me in the park the other night. So it doesn't belong on the sports page; on what page does it belong in this sea-to-shining-sea brotherhood we're supposed to be running?

I got 14 stitches in my head from whatever he hit me with and he got my wallet. So it's robbery and assault and the kid is a criminal. And yes, for the 49th time, he was black. I'd like to think that had nothing to do with it, but it had everything to do with it.

The wallet was an afterthought. The scene began with the kid and his two companions denouncing me with the standard oedipal compound word, but I was helping wear the meaning out of that word long before they were born. Then they called me a nigger, and I reacted in Anglo-Saxon.

The motive in the crime was not money, but hate. I know something about hate. "You've got to be taught, before it's too late . . . to hate all the people your relatives hate," and between home and school I had a classic education. I was a prodigy.

We wasps were a minority to both the guineas and polacks, and I was nine the first time a kid pulled a knife on me. About that time I found a kid I could lick—a black kid—and I beat him up every day for a week.

I could hate with fine impartiality: racially, socially, economically, politically. I hated FDR before I was sure who he was. And religiously, wow! Jews were Christkillers and Catholics were crossbacks. I could hate freestyle. Limeys, chinks, spiks—you name it and I'll hate it.

But something went wrong somewhere along the line. Twenty years and one war later I was asking my father to leave my house if he was going to say things like kike and coon in front of the kids. One of the kids brought a drawing home from kindergarten with swastikas on it and I had a fit.

The kid in the park knows by now that he got the wrong wallet. I'd almost rather he grabbed the one with the money. In a garbage can somewhere around 13th and Eye there's a membership card in the Brooklyn Chapter of the Baseball Writers' Association, and you can't hardly get those anymore.

There are a couple of pictures of the kids, and my young assailant would find them strange. They don't hate anybody.

And he'll never dig the letter. It's from a woman in Chicago who was a nun from her 17th birthday to her 28th. She's 30 now and she's quit the order because she decided the racial injustices of this one nation under God could be more effectively approached temporally than spiritually.

She's a full-time black activist. And she's white.

There are people like that, many thousands of them, ashamed of a heritage in which the American people, as Shaw said, have obliged the black man to shine their shoes and then scorned him because he is a bootblack.

There are, but it is a difficult point to make to three young men in a dimly-lighted park at midnight. A stack of membership cards in the Urban League and the NAACP and Core would not be convincing to them, nor would a citation from Martin Luther King, because they too have been carefully taught.

The Carmichaels and LeRoi Jonses and Rap Browns have told them that Whitey is Whitey and you can't trust him. And the evidence to the contrary is not persuasive.

I had time for agonizing reappraisal while the cop was writing "three Negro males," and while the intern was sewing up my head and telling me I wouldn't outlive the scar. I felt pain, and anger, but I didn't feel hate.

I didn't feel disappointed, because the people had warned me about walking thru the park. People had warned me years ago not to walk alone from the Polo Grounds in New York, or Comiskey Park in Chicago, after a night game. I did that too, because I wanted to believe that the terrors of the night were as exaggerated as terrors usually are.

And there were no holes in my head until Saturday night.

I thought about walking with 140,000 people down Woodward Avenue in Detroit on June 23, 1963, in the first freedom march. That reminded me of writing the series on urban renewal, which in Detroit pretty much did mean Negro removal. (It was unpublished, because it would "hurt the image of the city.")

I remembered the man in the neighborhood improvement project saying, "I can't feed my kids and they want me to paint my porch," and Monsignor Kern stroking the young father's head and saying, "My son, those 'anything' jobs don't exist anymore." The unskilled young man had been automated out of work and he didn't like welfare.

I thought about the day I told my kid brother to cut school and go with me to Ebbets Field to see Jackie Robinson play his first big-league game. I told him it was historic, a greater good for a greater number than, say, putting a man on the moon. And I still think it was.

I remembered withdrawing my two sons from a Cub Scout pack because it had shut out two black kids. And saying at the time that if my kids had ever been excluded from a school, or a swimming pool or a playground for being the wrong color, I wouldn't be just a Communist; I'd be a church-burner.

And I decided that if I had been brought up in a ghetto in a house with no screen door and a mother who had four children without benefit of a father who took off when I was 2, and if I went to a school where you get a diploma if you show up reasonably often and don't rape any teachers, maybe I'd be lurking in a park somewhere, laying an ambush for the enemy.

And about the time the intern was shoving the last stitch thru my head, I decided I was angry after all. But not at the kid in the park.

APOLLO 11 AND FUTURE SPACE GOALS

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, prayers of hundreds of millions of Americans and other people throughout the world were answered today with the safe return to earth of the crew of Apollo 11.

In addition to their interest as proud Americans, Alabamians have had a special interest in the success of the entire Apollo program because, Mr. President, this Nation's space effort began in Alabama.

Even before creation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Dr. Werhner von Braun and his team of scientists and engineers working for the Army at Redstone Arsenal, Ala., had launched the free world's first satellite. The Explorer I was placed into orbit on January 31, 1958, by a Redstone rocket developed at the north Alabama missile and rocket center.

When NASA's George C. Marshall Space Flight Center was established at Huntsville, Dr. von Braun was named Director, a position he retains today. Subsequently the United States established a national goal of landing a man on the moon before 1970.

Mr. President, Dr. von Braun and his Huntsville-based earthmen produced for the United States a giant Saturn 5 rocket that made it possible to meet the goal. Along with all Americans and all Alabamians, I salute Dr. von Braun for his great contribution.

These thousands of dedicated civil servants and their industrial teammates in Huntsville deserve much of the credit for America's historic space achievement.

This is an achievement of man that will live until the end of time.

It is with this deep sense of dedication, Mr. President, that Alabamians express the need to map out this Nation's future space goals. They, like myself, favor a well-developed, adequately financed, continuing space program that will make proper use of the NASA team, the equipment and the knowledge that will give the United States continued supremacy in space.

THE ATHENAEUM CLUB OF SWEETWATER, TEX., SUPPORTS 100,000-ACRE BIG THICKET NATIONAL PARK

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Athenaeum Club of Sweetwater, Tex., has passed a resolution calling for the establishment of a Big Thicket National Park in southeast Texas containing at least 100,000 acres. They have joined a host of other organizations throughout the country who are concerned with the preservation of this shrinking wilderness.

Because of the richness and diversity of its plant and animal life, the Big Thicket has immense scientific value. Many major American universities have sent representatives there to do research. Many of the area's plants have been found useful in treating diabetes, cancer, and heart disease. New species of wild flowers are still being discovered. At least a thousand varieties

XUM

of algae and fungi remain to be classified. Ecologists will profit by unraveling the puzzle of why plant communities—characteristic of many diverse areas—flourish in the Big Thicket. Botanists, taxonomist, pathologists, ecologists, scientists of all disciplines have much to lose if the Big Thicket is destroyed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the Athenaeum Club of Sweetwater, Tex., be printed in its entirety including the name of its signer at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Whereas, the Big Thicket of Texas is a meeting place for eastern, western and northern ecological elements; and
>
> Whereas, this is the last stand in Texas of the nearly extinct Ivory-billed Woodpecker; and
>
> Whereas, this beautiful and unique area is rapidly being destroyed by bulldozer and chain saw; therefore
>
> Be it resolved that *The Athenaeum Club of Sweetwater, Texas* urges the preservation of at least 100,000 acres containing the most unique areas of the Big Thicket, these areas to be connected by environmental corridors; and
>
> Be it further resolved that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate of the United States be requested to set immediate hearings on S4 which would create a Big Thicket National Area.
>
> MRS. DAVE R. RIDLEY,
> *President.*

INCREASING BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DEFICIT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, an interesting article appeared in the financial section of the Washington Post of July 22 which, if it had not been for the press accounts of the Apollo accomplishments, would probably have appeared on the front page.

The article begins:

> The U.S. will show a balance of payments deficit approaching $4 billion for the second quarter of this year, government officials said yesterday.

That amount is almost 2½ times the deficit sustained in the first quarter of 1969.

This article then continues:

> The nearly $4 billion deficit, coupled with a $1.7 billion seasonally adjusted first quarter deficit, means a six month deficit of about $5.5 billion—

Or at an annual rate, a deficit of $11 billion.

In this connection it should be noted that for the past decade the U.S. balance-of-payments deficits, on a liquidity basis, have averaged between $3 and $4 billion annually; but nothing remotely approaching an $11 billion deficit. Such a balance-of-payments deficit, or even one half as serious, can only exacerbate an already dangerous world monetary situation, which in turn would threaten the integrity of the dollar.

The obvious necessity for correcting this deteriorating payments picture is but one more reason we must take action, now, to reduce these gigantic military and other expenditures abroad—in Southeast Asia, in Western Europe, and in other parts of the world where it would appear the presence of the United States, at least to the current extent, is no longer in the best interest of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in question, "Payments Deficit Seen $4 Billion in Quarter," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORGAN GUARANTY ESTIMATE: PAYMENTS DEFICIT SEEN $4 BILLION IN QUARTER

(By Richard Halloran)

> The U.S. will show a balance of payments deficit approaching $4-billion for the second quarter of this year, government officials said yesterday.
>
> They said a Morgan Guaranty Trust Company study predicting a $4-billion deficit, seasonally unadjusted, may be too great—but that the deficit would still be very large.
>
> The nearly $4-billion deficit, coupled with a $1.7-billion seasonally adjusted first quarter deficit, means a six month deficit of about $5.5-billion, or a deficit of $11-billion at an annual rate.
>
> The government sources, however, played down the deficit as a "meaningless figure" since it is based largely on a circular flow of funds from the U.S. to the high-interest Eurodollar market and back through commercial bank borrowings to the U.S.
>
> The sharp increase in the deficit, computed on a liquidity basis, must have been due to a deterioration of about $3-billion in capital transactions between the first and second quarters, Morgan Guaranty said.
>
> Of this, about $500-million came from a decline in foreign purchases of U.S. stock and another $500-million from liquidation of long-term assets by central banks and international institutions.
>
> Most of the remaining $2-billion, Morgan Guaranty said, resulted from short-term capital outflows by U.S. residents. Their funds were attracted to the high-interest rates in the Euro dollar market and rumors in April and May that the West German mark would be revalued.
>
> The government sources agreed with this assessment. They pointed out that American banks are, in part, stimulating the high European interest rates by their heavy borrowing, occasioned by tight money in the U.S.
>
> They contended that these, in effect, are domestic transactions and that Americans sending funds to Europe are getting around the domestic barrier of legal limitations on interest commercial banks may pay.
>
> Morgan Guaranty said that if these transactions were considered domestic transactions, the liquidity-basis payments deficit would have been considerably smaller.
>
> The bank cautioned, however, that these short-term funds may not flow back to the United States if banks here reduce their Eurodollar borrowing. "Once new investment opportunities discovered," the study said, "money will continue to move more easily through the new-found channels."
>
> Morgan Guaranty said it expected the balance of payments to show a continuing surplus on an official settlements basis but did not give a figure.

JULY 24—UTAH PIONEER DAY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, 122 years ago today a hardy band of Mormon pioneers entered the desolation of the Salt Lake Valley. They were the first permanent settlers of the region which encompasses the State of Utah.

Led by the inspirational genius of Brigham Young, whose familiar statue represents Utah in the U.S. Capitol, these courageous pioneers came in covered wagons through tempest and storm, torment and tragedy to escape religious persecution in the Middle West and to find a place where they might live in peace.

It was nearly a half century later that Utah finally became the 45th State of the Union; nevertheless, Utahans generally look upon July 24, 1847, as the Beehive State's real beginning. July is thus doubly important to the people of Utah signifying a heritage of freedom won by our American Founding Fathers in 1776 and again by our noble pioneer forebears in 1847.

The Governor of the territory, Brigham Young, during the 30 years from 1847 to his death in 1877, directed the establishment of more than 350 communities in Utah, Idaho, Nevada, Arizona, Wyoming, and California. As a result, this bold people have provided a solid link in the chain and fabric of America.

Once again today, the 24th of July, we witness the efforts of courageous pioneers as our astronauts return from their epic journey to the moon. As we hear critics of our space program who rhetorically question the value of the desolation and barrenness of the moon, I am reminded of the words of Jim Bridger when he offered the Mormon pioneers $1,000 for the first bushel of corn that could be produced from that arid waste known as the Salt Lake Valley. Today, through sweat and dogged determination of Utahans of all religions, creeds, and races, the desert, in reality, has been tamed and does blossom like a rose.

On this day, while parades and celebrations in every part of Utah commemorate the coming of the pioneers, I believe it is proper that we, too, in the Senate should acknowledge this historic day and give tribute to the history, growth, and courage that has built the great State of Utah.

NEW HAMPSHIRE'S PRIDE IN THE HISTORIC APOLLO MISSION

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, all Americans, indeed all the peoples of the world, share the admiration and sense of mingled awe and pride which we have today for the successful mission of Apollo 11.

The State of New Hampshire, which I have the honor to represent, has long held close connections with the space program. America's first astronaut in space, Alan Shepard, was a citizen of the Granite State; and the first American to see Astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins upon their return was a Dartmouth graduate, Clancy Hattleberg, who dived into the sea this afternoon beside Apollo 11 to bring biological isolation garments to the astronauts.

Two New Hampshire corporations, Sanders Associates, of Nashua, which provided the operational display system for the Saturn checkout, and RDF Corp., of Hudson, which supplied the transducers for the Saturn S–II second stage, made significant contributions to Apollo 11's success.

These two companies are among some 37 different New Hampshire organizations which have worked on the space program over the years.

From New Hampshire to the moon is a long distance, but the hopes and prayers and the technical assistance of New Hampshire were there, as are the praise and admiration which all Granite Staters share today.

DRAFT REVISION

Mr. SAXBE. Mr. President, the subject of draft revision is a timely one. At a time when this body is considering matters dealing with our worldwide commitments, arms and troop strengths, our Nation's draft program takes on added significance. Toward that end, I believe my colleagues may find of interest an editorial on the subject which recently was sent to me by a friend. The editorial, "Would an All Volunteer Army Work?" appeared in the Junction City Daily Union, Junction City, Kans. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOULD AN ALL VOLUNTEER ARMY WORK?

One of the important questions which must be answered in the months ahead is whether or not this nation can adequately protect its position and discharge its responsibilities with an all-volunteer Army as its basis of strength.

One man who questions the all-volunteer Army concept is General Bruce Clarke, Ret. We might add few, if any, are far more capable. General Clarke has served in every military rank from private to four star general. The last 21 years of his military srevice, from 1940 to 1961, were spent constantly with or close to troops in two wars, ending his career as commander-in-chief of the U.S. Army in Europe.

In a recent address he declared "The basic hardships and the hazards of duty among the Armed services are not equal, nor are they equal among the various branches of the Army. The Infantry and the Marines by far incur the highest risk in this regard. For practical purposes, a combat soldier is one whose duties require him to close with the enemy, on offense and defense, and defeat him."

Continuing, General Clarke said:

The Infantry of the Army and the Marines are the big casualty takers, a fact which is commonly understood by those in draft age.

The casualty killed in action figures of the Korean War in this regard are illustrative:

Army (84 percent Infantry)	27, 604
Navy	458
Air Force	1, 200
Marines	4, 267
Total	33, 629

The Vietnam war figures are comparable except the Marines have lost 11,000.

Pay alone will not provide the answer. At a play scale of $8,000 a year, the Washington Police Force cannot fill up its authorized strength.

These are the disadvantages of too much "payday income" of soldiers: AWOL's, incidents, accidents, and black markets.

Invidious comparisions with associated allied people and troops when on foreign service.

Poor public relations in general.

Out flow of gold.

We do not want an Army of all professional privates.

We want an Army fully "integrated" and generally in a mix proportionate to our population mix.

We want a "democratic" and a "peoples" Army—an Army of and close to our people.

We want an Army up to required mental, morale, and physical standards. These desired characteristics tend to decrease when undue enlistment and reenlistment pressures are applied.

"Morale" is that great intangible which separates the good armies from the poor. We must not upset the present high morale in the Army.

The present officer-enlisted man relationship in the Army is very good. We must not upset this.

We must maintain the high level of readiness of the National Guard and the Reserve forces.

We must not reduce the motivation of the ROTC students or the desire to enter the Service Academies and make the service a career.

An All-Volunteer Army makes little patriotic impact on the more affluent members of our society.

An All-Volunteer Army drawing a "going rate" of pay reduces an enlistment to a "job instead of a "service" to our country.

Many things can be looked into in order to improve service attractiveness and increase enlistments.

Pay inequities.

Increase in War Risk Insurance. (Present $10,000 was WWI standard)

More benefits for wives and minor children who survive.

Increase in the GI Bill of Rights allowance to veterans to complete their education.

Recomputation of retired pay of retirees on a current pay basis.

A discharge bonus of about $1,000 per year, paid after completion of three years service as an enlisted man and upon final separation. This might be paid in US Savings Bonds.

Provide some retirement benefits after ten years of service (for both officers and enlisted men).

Increase and improve:

Housing at post.

Dental care for men and dependents.

Medical care for men and dependents.

P.X. services.

Commissary services.

Rental allowance.

Ration allowance.

Retired pay.

Married allowances for active duty in the combat zone.

We must not allow the Selective or Draft system to deteriorate so that it is not responsive in a hurry to an unforeseen need.

We should put more effort in better handling our men of all services so as to produce more "alumni boosters." Such veterans will draw new enlistees.

An efficient operating selective service system places the United States in a stronger position in its relationships with foreign countries.

To find the solution we should improve the attractiveness of volunteer service as much as practicable, and fill the deficits in military manpower by the use of a workable Selective Service system kept in good operating condition to be ready to function when and as needed.

DANVILLE AND APPALACHIAN POWER CO.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, during the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee hearings this year on S. 607, the Utility Consumers' Counsel bill, witnesses testified regarding a proposed municipal bond issue, in Danville, Va., to finance expansion of the city's electric power system. On March 17, Danville Mayor W. C. McCubbins and Councilman John W. Carter testified regarding the decision to postpone the election, because of what the council termed "interference" in Danville affairs by Appalachian Power Co., a subsidiary of American Electric Power, which is a New York holding company.

On March 19, the subcommittee took testimony from Chairman John W. Daniel of the New Day for Danville Committee, which, along with the Appalachian Power Co., opposed the bond issue that had been proposed by the city council.

The hearing record shows—part 3, pages 592–593—the following colloquy between Subcommittee Counsel E. Winslow Turner and Mr. Daniel:

Mr. TURNER. Now, after the bond issue of 1967, where the Greater Danville Committee was formed, we have the consideration of another bond issue, I believe, and that was where the New Committee for Danville was formed.

Mr. STINSON. New Day for Danville.

Mr. TURNER. Created to seek to influence disapproval of this bond issue. How much money has the New Day Committee for Danville been able to receive from people in the city for this purpose?

Mr. DANIEL. We have received to date and deposited in the bank $3,732.25.

Mr. TURNER. Now, I am going to ask you the same question about that committee. Has Appalachian Power, American Electric Power Company, any subsidiary of American Electric Power or any officer, director or employee of Appalachian Power or those other companies contributed any money to that committee?

Mr. DANIEL. No, sir.

Later on pages 605 and 606 Mr. Daniel took exception to my statement of February 28 on the Senate floor—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD page 4970—that the New Day for Danville Committee "is the local front organization for American Electric Power, whose president, Donald C. Cook, wants only a dozen power systems in this country." Mr. Daniel elaborated as follows:

As I mentioned in my opening remarks, the New Day for Danville Committee is not a front organization for any person, any group, or any organization. It is a group of concerned citizens who are concerned about the future of our city and we—this group, their aim is to try to bring the full story in this bond referendum or any other issue that might come before our city to the voters of our city. The ads that you have entered into the Congressional Record which bear the name of the New Day for Danville Committee are ads that were requested and asked for and were approved to be put into the newspaper by the New Day for Danville Committee without any assistance or without Appalachian having anything to do with it, and the insinuation that Appalachian Power Co. had prepared these ads and they were put in as information that Appalachian Power Co. had furnished this or paid for these ads or provided these ads, I just would like to set the record straight that they were prepared and entered into the—released to the newspapers by our committee.

Mr. President, an audit of Appalachian Power Co. expenditures by the Federal Power Commission has produced information which appears to be at variance with the testimony of witness Daniel. I refer to the testimony of Russell E. Faudree, Jr., an FPC auditor, which was introduced as evidence Tuesday in the Appalachian Power Case, Project No. 2317.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled, "Appalachian Spent Nearly $25,000 to Influence Bond Referenda in Danville, FPC Report Reveals," published in the July 18 issue of the Danville, Va., Register and the testimony by Mr. Faundree in the FPC proceeding.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREPARED TESTIMONY OF RUSSELL E. FAUDREE, JR., IN THE MATTER OF APPALACHIAN POWER CO., PROJECT NO. 2317

Q. Mr. Faudree, would you state your full name, place of residence and position with the Federal Power Commission?

A. Russell E. Faudree, Jr., I live at 103 G Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. I am a Supervisory Auditor with the Division of Audits, Office of Accounting and Finance.

Q. Will you give us a brief resume of your educational background and qualifications and your experience?

A. I have a B.S. Degree from Oklahoma State University with a major in accounting. I have been employed by the Federal Power Commission for about 5 years. Most of my experience with the Commission has been in conducting field audits of licensees, electric utilities and natural gas companies to establish the original cost of utility plant and to determine compliance with the requirements of the Commission's Uniform System of Accounts. I am a certified public accountant in the District of Columbia.

Q. Did you participate in a field audit of Appalachian Power Company's books and records?

A. Yes, I audited certain accounts of Appalachian Power Company for the period January 1, 1967 through April 30, 1969.

Q. What was the purpose of the audit?

A. The Office of General Counsel requested that the Division of Audits investigate matters relating to accounting included in the complaint filed by the City of Danville, Virginia, with the Federal Power Commission on January 11, 1968. These matters pertain to alleged expenditures of Appalachian Power Company in attempting to influence public opinion on a bond referendum for expansion of the City of Danville's electric generating facilities. Therefore, this audit was conducted to determine if Appalachian Power Company had incurred expenses of a political nature and if so had they been properly accounted for in accordance with the Uniform System of Accounts.

Q. What were your findings during this audit?

A. For the year 1967, the company incurred expenses of $3,288 applicable to City of Danville, Virginia's electric bond referendum and recorded these expenses in their books of account and FPC Form No. 1 in Account 426.4, Expenditures for certain civic, political, and related activities. These expenditures were for radio and newspaper ads and other miscellaneous items relating to the bond issue. The audit disclosed no other similar type expenditures during the year 1967.

Q. In your opinion, were the expenditures totaling $3,288 recorded in Account 426.4 properly accounted for in accordance with the requirement of the Commission's Uniform System of Accounts.

A. Yes.

Q. Did the company's records show any additional expenditures in 1968 or 1969 relating to bond elections in the City of Danville and, if so, what are they?

A. Yes, in December 1968, the company's records show in Account 930 (Co. Acct. 63098), Miscellaneous general expenses, an amount of $4,200 paid to Central Survey, Inc. for a public opinion survey in the City of Danville and that this survey was made to determine if the voters of Danville were in favor of a proposed bond issue to finance a municipal electric generating plant and in my opinion should have been charged to Account 426.4.

Q. Would you tell us what the conclusions of this survey were and why you believe it should have been charged to Account 426.4?

A. The survey concluded that there was a very strong initial reaction in favor of the proposed bond issue. According to the survey, the margin in favor of the proposed bond issue was almost 3 to 1. Also, included in the survey conclusions were certain recommendations as to ways to build up majority opposition to the proposal. It was suggested that effective ways to build up opposition would be to create doubts as to the necessity or the desirability of the proposal by showing that Appalachian Power Company not only has adequate reserves of power available through its interconnections but has far more sources of power available through its interconnections than would be provided by the proposed municipal generating plant and by demonstrating that it just isn't necessary for the City to go into debt for something that is already available, without any expenditures at all on the part of the City. It was further suggested that Appalachian Power Company was not receiving the credit it deserves for helping the industrial growth of Danville and the residents of Danville might resent having the City "take over" the industrial business the company has developed if the people were aware that Appalachian had been instrumental in bringing this industry into the area.

It is apparent from these recommendations that the survey was related to influencing public opinion in connection with the City of Danville's bond referendum and therefore should have been charged to Account 426.4.

Q. Mr. Faudree, where did you obtain the information pertaining to the survey's conclusions?

A. The information is a summary of the conclusions stated in a report by Central Surveys, Inc. which was given to Appalachian Power Company at the conclusion of the survey.

Q. Did your audit disclose any additional expenditures in 1968 of a political nature pertaining to the City of Danville's bond referendum?

A. No. My audit tests disclosed no additional expenditures of a political nature in 1968.

Q. How about 1969?

A. On January 10, 1969, the company opened up a work order to accumulate charges in connection with the bond referendum in Danville, Virginia. The work order was closed to further charges on May 26, 1969. The company accumulated a total of $20,304 in the work order of which $17,463 had been cleared to Account 426.4 as of May 31, 1969. However, I should mention, that according to Mr. J. B. Berg, Accounting Manager, of Appalachian Power Company, a portion of these expenditures were incorrectly charged to the work order and cleared to Account 426.4. He indicated that sometime in the near future these charges will be reviewed and those which in their view are incorrectly classified will be reversed out and charged to the proper account.

Q. What is the nature of the expenditures charged to the work Order?

A. Most of the charges are for services by a public relations firm, John Harden Associates of Greensboro, North Carolina, various radio and newspaper ads in Danville, various expenses in connection with the new Danville office of Appalachian and salary and expenses of company employees.

Q. Did your audit disclose any additional expenditures connected with the bond referendum other than those recorded in the work order for the year 1969?

A. No, my audit tests disclosed no additional expenditures connected with the bond referendum.

Q. Will you give us a more detailed description of payments to John Harden Associates?

A. The company paid John Harden Associates a total of $8,118.81 for services rendered during December 1968 and January through March 1969. The billings were covered by two invoices. The first invoice dated February 12, 1969, was, according to a company memo, in the nature of an advance in that arrangements were made to advance monies to Harden against expenses which would be incurred. Invoices were to be subsequently rendered to Appalachian for services to it and to The New Day for Danville Committee for services to it. The breakdown of the amounts making up the $6,137 is as follows:

Partial payment to Ronald K. Charity, public relations counselor of Danville	$1,200
Payment to Sound Creators of Greensboro for radio jungle for New Day Committee	300
Payment due to Danville Commercial Appeal for four ads for committee (through March 3)	494
Payment due to Danville Bee and Register for 32 ads for committee (through March 14)	2,455
Payment due to four Danville radio stations for 532 spots for committee (through March 16)	1,688
Total	6,137

The second invoice dated April 3, 1969, covered the services rendered to Appalachian which totaled $8,118.81 less the advance previously paid $6,137.00 or a net amount due of $1,981.81.

Q. Would you give us examples of the services rendered to Appalachian by John Harden Associates?

A. Yes. Copies of ads entered into the record identified as Herndon Exhibits Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4 which are captioned "We helped create a $10,000,000 payroll for Danville;" "We've helped create a $10,000,000 payroll for Danville;" "Now Appalachian has a Danville address—539 Main Street;" and "Danville has good connections;" respectively, are all John Harden Associates' ads.

Q. Did your audit disclose any direct payment to or for the New Day for Danville Commitee by Appalachian Power Company?

A. Only one such item was noted. Included in the charges accumulated in the previously mentioned work order was an amount of $298 for printing services by the Stone Printing and Manufacturing Company of Roanoke, Virginia, for printing a letter to the citizens of Danville with a New Day for Danville Committee letterhead.

Q. To your knowledge, did the company incur any additional expenditures of a political nature pertaining to the City of Danville's bond referendums other than those mentioned previously in your testimony?

A. Not to my knowledge.

AFFIDAVIT

District of Columbia:

Affiant, having been first duly sworn, on oath deposes and says:

That he has read the foregoing testimony and if asked the questions therein his answers in response would be as shown;

That the facts contained in said answers are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

Russell E. Faudree, Jr.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 11th day of July, 1969.

Lois B. Winslow,
Notary Public in and for the District of Columbia.

My Commission expires November 30, 1971.

BEFORE THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The Appalachian Power Company, Project No. 2317.

Certificate of service

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing documents upon all parties of record in this proceeding in accordance with the requirements of § 1.17 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure. Dated at Washington, D.C., this 14th day of July, 1969.

Raymond E. Hagenlock,
Commission Staff Counsel.

APCO Funds Also Used by New Day Committee: Appalachian Spent Nearly $25,000 To Influence Bond Referenda in Danville, FPC Report Reveals

The Federal Power Commission has released a report by one of its accountants which showed that Appalachian Power Co. spent nearly $25,000 to influence power bond referenda in Danville.

Appalachia also was found to have made a direct financial contribution to be used on behalf of the New Day for Danville Committee, an antipower bond group whose chairman earlier this year denied to a U.S. Senate Subcommittee that APCO had contributed any money to the committee.

The report on the audit, in the form of prepared testimony offered Monday on the motion of the FPC Staff to the Presiding Examiner in the Appalachian case (Project No. 2317), was made public here yesterday at a special meeting of City Council.

The report also revealed that Appalachian paid $4,200 for a public opinion survey in December 1968 which found Danville voters then favoring expansion of generating facilities by about 3 to 1.

The field audit, upon which the report was based, was made by Russell Faudree, Jr., a supervisory auditor with the FPC, at the request of FPC's general counsel.

The City earlier this year had complained to the FPC of unwarranted interference by Appalachian in a proposed $11 million bond referendum. Funds from the referendum would have been used for expansion of the City's electric generating facilities. Such expansion would have reduced the City's current power purchases from Appalachian.

After the audit report was read to City Council, it adopted a resolution re-affirming the authority of Philip Ardery to file proceedings for the City before the Securities and Exchange Commission. Ardery also represents the City in its complaints to the FPC about Appalachian. The vote on the resolution was 7 to 1 with the no vote cast by F. W. Townes III. Councilman Charles Harris was absent.

The FPC's auditor found that in 1967 Appalachian spent $3,288 "applicable to the City of Danville's electric bond referendum." These expenditures were listed, according to the audit, as for "civic, political and related activities."

The 1967 referendum failed to approve a $9 million bond issue.

On Jan. 10, 1969, Appalachian set up a "work order to accumulate charges in connection with the March 18 bond referendum" which accumulated a total of $20,304. . . . of which $17,463 had been cleared as of May 31.

Most of the charges were for services by a public relations firm, John Harden Associates of Greensboro, N.C. for various radio and newspaper ads in Danville, various expenses in connection with the new Danville office of Appalachian and salary and expenses of company employes, the audit noted.

Harden Associates, according to the audit, was paid $8,118.81 for "services rendered during December, 1968 and January through March, 1969."

The billings were covered by two invoices—the first dated Feb. 12, 1969, which according to a company memo, was in the nature of an advance against expenses which would be incurred.

Invoices later sent to Appalachia for services to it and to the New Day for Danville Committee for services to it, according to the auditor's statement showed:

A $1,200 payment to Ronald K. Charity, public relations counselor of Danville, according to the audit.

A $300 payment to Sound Creators of Greensboro for radio jingle for New Day Committee.

Payment of $494 due Danville Commercial Appeal for four ads for Committee (through March 3).

Payment of $2,455 due to Danville Bee and Register for 32 ads for Committee (through March 14).

Payment of $1,688 due four Danville radio stations for 532 spots for Committee (through March 16).

The FPC auditor reported he found Appalachian had made a direct payment to the New Day for Danville Committee in the amount of $298 "for printing services by the Stone Printing and Manufacturing Co. of Roanoke for printing a letter to the citizens of Danville with a New Day for Danville Committee letterhead."

A copy of the letter was produced at yesterday's council meeting. Dated Feb. 10, 1969, it listed John W. Daniel as chairman of the New Day Committee with C. A. (Buck) Carr as vice chairman and Glenn E. Hile, secretary-treasurer.

After stating its opposition to the proposed March 18 bond referendum, the letter closed with this request, "couldn't you please send us at least $1.00." It was signed by Daniel.

Earlier this year Daniel testified at a hearing of the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations about the New Day Committee. He told E. W. Turner, committee counsel, "We have received to date and deposited in the bank, $3,732.25, "in reference to New Day Committee funds.

Turner then asked Daniel—"Has Appalachian Power, American Electric Power Company, any subsidiary of American Electric Power or any officer, director or employee of Appalachian or those other companies, contributed any money to that committee?"

Daniel's reply, according to the transcript of the hearing, was: "No, sir. We can furnish you a list. It is a rather long list. We had a wonderful response from the voters of the City of Danville."

Turning again to the public opinion survey conducted by a firm known as Central Survey Inc., the FPC auditor said the $4,200 survey cost was charged off by Appalachian to "miscellaneous general expenses" an action he questioned.

In addition to finding Danville voters in favor of the March 18 bond referendum, Faudree said the survey contained recommendations to Appalachian on how to build up opposition to the proposed referendum.

Faudree's specific comment was: "It is apparent from these recommendations that the survey was related to influencing public opinion in connection with the City of Danville's bond referendum."

Effective ways to create opposition to the bond referendum were suggested including creating "doubts as to the necessity and desirability of the proposal," the audit noted.

One survey recommendation was for Appalachian to show it "not only has adequate reserves of power available through its interconnections than would be provided by the proposed municipal generating plant."

Another suggestion was for Appalachian "demonstrating that it just isn't necessary for the City to go into debt for something that is already available, without any expenditures at all on the part of the City."

The audit report noted "It was further suggested that Appalachian Power Co. was not receiving the credit it deserves for helping the industrial growth of Danville and the residents of Danville might resent having the City 'take over' the industrial business the company has developed if the people were aware that Appalachian had been instrumental in bringing this industry into the area."

The City has filed a complaint with the FPC against American Electric Power Co. Inc., and its subsidiary. Appalachian Power Co. accusing it of discrimination and restraint of trade.

The City also has intervened in the New River project in Grayson County where Appalachian seeks a license for a hydroelectric operation. The City wants to share in an allocation of power to be created by the project.

In both of these actions, the City contends Appalachian is in violation of the Federal Power Act forbidding "combinations, agreements, arrangement or understanding, express or implied, to limit the output of electrical energy, to restrain trade, or to fix, maintain, or increase prices for electric energy or service."

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, last week I sent Mr. Daniel a copy of Mr. Faudree's testimony and invited him, if he wished, to amend his denials of assistance from Appalachian Power and submit additional financial data regarding the New Day for Danville Committee.

I am concerned, first, because it appears that a Senate subcommittee was given incorrect information. Second, I am concerned by the auditor's finding that a substantial portion of the political expenditures by Appalachian Power was improperly accounted.

Those political expenditures were included in operating expenses, paid for by the consumers. Permitted political expenditures by a utility corporation, such as the cost of lobbying, should be included in nonoperating expenditures, paid for by the utility stockholders.

Regulatory commissions have for years properly maintained that utility political expenditures should not be passed on to the customers. Memorandums from commissions to utilities on this point have been explicit. As I have pointed out in the past, from time to time, various utility corporations simply choose to ignore the regulators. And now an affiliate of the largest holding company in the Nation appears to be a party to this practice.

Mr. President, most State utility commissions do not have the staff to audit utility books. The FPC staff is spread so thin that many years elapse between Federal audits. The extent of improper political expenditures is unknown. What impresses me is the fact that so often, when the FPC does audit utility books, it discovers improper utility expenditures.

The Appalachian Power case contrasts sharply with utility corporations' repeated, bland denial of political activity. And it illustrates the need for title II of S. 607, the information section of the bill, and especially an amendment suggested by Philip P. Ardery, special coun-

XUM

sel for the city of Danville. The amendment reads as follows:

Title II, Sec. 201(b)(25) page 16, lines 8, 9 and 10. In lieu of the present subsection, substitute:

"(25) A detailed accounting of all expense incurred, whether in payments of money, performance of services, use of officers, agents or employees on company time or any other thing of value whether committed directly or indirectly in relation to any political activity. Such activity shall include attempts to influence any public election whether of candidates running in any federal, state or local election, or any other issue or referendum decided by vote of the people. It shall also include attempts to influence public officials, secure or oppose appointments to public office, and any and all lobbying with any national, state or local legislative or administrative body."

Such information shall be determined on a fiscal or calendar year basis as may be appropriate and shall be reported as soon as practicable after the termination of such year.

Mr. President, there is substantial doubt as to whether the kind of expenditures made by Appalachian Power in this case are permissible. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the colloquy between Counsel Turner and Danville's Special Counsel Ardery.

There being no objection, the colloquy was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

UTILITY CONSUMERS

Mr. Turner. I would like to make a short reference to the bond issue and the statement that Senator Ervin mentioned. I think he used the word "election." There is a prohibition in the Public Utility Holding Company Act that any registered holding company or any subsidiary company by use of the mails or any other instrumentality is prohibited from making contributions whatsoever in connection with the candidacy, nomination, election, appointment in the Government of the United States, a State, or any political subdivision, or to make any contributions to or in support of any political party or any committee or agency thereof.

Now, the question that has been running through my mind as I have been listening is this: Is this a political situation which is tantamount or closely allied to an election or is this something completely alien to that situation? Perhaps counsel would direct himself to that.

Mr. Ardery. May I respond to that?

I have read the section of the Public Utility Holding Company Act to which you refer very carefully, and there is some doubt in my mind as to whether or not the situation in Danville would be covered by that part of the Public Utility Holding Company Act, and it was based upon that that Danville has suggested that the loophole, if it be a loophole, be plugged.

But let me comment just little further, and we do plan to go to see the Securities and Exchange Commission today when we leave here.

One of the major concepts in enacting the Public Utility Holding Company Act was preventing restraints in trade, and preventing enormous growing monopolies.

The Public Utility Holding Company Act by its history we find was not solely an act designed to protect the investors of public utility holding companies, although that was a strong motive in its enactment.

Now, where you find a combination such as American Electric Power attempting to make, keep one of its competitors from expanding its plant sufficient to take care of its own needs, I think it is clearly in violation of the basic concept of the Public Utility Holding Company Act which seeks to prevent restraint on trade.

Mr. Turner. You now have pending a proceeding in the Securities and Exchange Commission on it.

Mr. Ardery. No. We have, the mayor wrote, a letter asking that they make an investigation. They have responded that they will.

Mr. Turner. I won't go further into it inasmuch as it is presently under investigation. But there was a question in my mind.

Mr. Ardery. I think it is good judgment for you to have a question in your mind. There is a question, some of the old cases, one or two of the old cases, seem to go a little bit further than simply to say that that provision is tied to a contribution to a political party or candidate of a political party. But that is a gray area.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, ironically, on the day before the FPC auditor's testimony was entered into the Commission's hearing record, the American Electric Power Co. contended that additional legislation regarding utility accounting is not necessary. In a letter to all members of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, AEP Executive Vice President Herbert B. Cohn wrote:

> Since no industries operate more in a "goldfish bowl" than do the regulated public utilities, the necessity for burdening them with even greater reporting requirements and their customers with the related costs has not been demonstrated and certainly is clearly less compelling than in the case of other industries.

Mr. Cohn went on to oppose passage of S. 607. Despite his words, the actions of his company underscore the need for passage of the bill, including the amendment prompted by the political expenditures of AEP's subsidiary, Appalachian Power.

EXTENSION OF VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, on July 9, 1969, the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Mathias) testified before the Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights in support of S. 818, to extend the provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965—a bill introduced by Senator Mathias in behalf of himself, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Scott), and myself.

Mr. President, the testimony of Senator Mathias was most eloquent in its advocacy of S. 818.

The historic Voting Rights Act was designed to deal with the principal means State and local governments had used to frustrate the effective implementation of the 15th amendment.

I quite agree with the Senator from Maryland and with what appears to be the prevailing sentiment of both Houses of Congress—that the first order of business on civil rights legislation should be the extension of the 1965 act—in the Senator's words, "to continue the gradual, positive, and beneficial change being brought about by the Voting Rights Act." He continued in his testimony:

> That is not to say that other reforms and improvements should not be considered in good season.

I agree.

I ask that the complete text of the testimony of Senator Mathias be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Senator Charles McC. Mathias, Jr.

In 1870, by ratifying the fifteenth amendment, Congress and the nation unequivocally declared that the "right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied . . . on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." But for 95 years until the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, that promise was often ignored and even repudiated.

As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary in the other body in 1965, I took part in many of the hearings, debates and conferences which finally produced the Voting Rights Act of 1965. That Act was a milestone in our national march toward equal rights under the law. It was a clear statement by the Congress that systematic frustration of the fifteenth amendment would no longer be tolerated or condoned.

The central feature of the Act is its "automatic trigger" provision, which suspended literacy tests and similar devices in any jurisdiction in which less than 50 percent of voting age persons either were registered to vote on November 1, 1964, or voted in the Presidential election of 1964.

In addition to suspension of the jurisdiction's test, the Act provides that the Attorney General can designate any county in such area for appointment of Federal examiners (Section 6). The examiners compile lists of persons qualified to vote under state law, which persons state and local officials are obligated to place on their official voting rolls (Section 7).

Section 8 of the Act enables the Attorney General to send Federal observers to any county designated under Section 6 to observe polling places and vote counting.

A fourth consequence of the automatic trigger provision prohibits the jurisdiction from utilizing any new voting qualification or procedure without first either submitting it to the Attorney General for approval or obtaining a declaratory judgment in the District Court for the District of Columbia that the new procedure does or will not have the purpose or effect of abridging the right to vote on account of race or color (Section 5).

A jurisdiction to which the automatic trigger provision would otherwise apply can avoid suspension and related aspects of the Act by establishing before the District Court for the District of Columbia that no "test or device has been used during the five years preceding the filing of the action for the purpose or with the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color." (Section 4(a)).

It is this requirement which is referred to as "expiration" of the Act. If the Act is not extended, any state which suspended a literacy test or similar device at its passage will, after August 6, 1970, not have used a test in any manner, discriminatory or otherwise, for five years and will be able to succeed in the appropriate suit. Such jurisdiction will be able to reinstate all of the techniques and devices of discrimination which the Act was passed to halt. Equal access to the voting booth will then have to be regained, precinct by precinct, through the courts.

S. 818, which I introduced January 31 on my behalf and on behalf of Senator Scott and Senator Fong, "extends" the Act by changing the five-year requirement to ten years. An identical measure, S. 2456, bears the names of 38 co-sponsors.

In the period since 1965, more than 800,000 Negro voters have been registered in the seven states to which the trigger provision applied. That the Act's registration goal is far from attained, however, is evident from the latest available statistics, which indicate nonwhite registration lagging well behind white registration in those areas:

	Percent white registration	Percent nonwhite registration
Alabama	82.5	56.7
Georgia	84.7	56.1
Louisiana	87.9	59.3
Mississippi	92.4	59.4
North Carolina	78.7	55.3
South Carolina	65.6	50.8
Virginia	67.0	58.4

Source: Voter Education Project, Voter Registration in the South, summer 1968.

A county-by-county analysis indicates that less than 40 percent of potential black voters are registered in some 90 counties and parishes in Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina, while the percentage is between 40 and 50 in 107 other counties and parishes.

Impressive evidence of the need for continuation of the Act has been compiled by the Civil Rights Commission in its Political Participation Study, based on work from November 1966 through April 1968. That document indicates that the Negro vote has been diluted by switching to at-large elections, consolidating counties, gerrymandering, and by full-slate voting requirements. It further asserts that Negro candidates are thwarted by abolishing offices, extending terms of white incumbents, substituting appointment for election, increasing filing fees, adding requirements for getting on the ballot, and withholding information.

The Commission found that black citizens have been excluded from party precinct meetings, wrongfully omitted from registration lists, harassed by election officials, and victimized by insufficient voting facilities. It determined that Negro voters have been given erroneous information and subjected to discriminatory disqualification on technical grounds, while Negro poll watchers have been interferred with and excluded.

Allegations of official voting fraud to prevent election of black candidates have been made. There has been a dearth of black election officials.

Finally, both physical and economic intimidation have apparently been used to frustrate the Act's attempt to implement the fifteenth amendment.

Similar abuses were noted by the Civil Rights Commission observation of the May 13, 1969, municipal primary elections in Mississippi, and outlined in a June 3, 1969, staff report.

The Commission will be before this Subcommittee to substantiate its findings. For the moment, I think they speak for themselves and what they say should be compelling.

The President, during the last campaign, pledged to call up the best elements of the new south. Surely one of the primary ways to do so is to continue the gradual, positive and beneficial change being brought by the Act of 1965. That is not to say that other reforms and improvements should not be considered in good season. But first things should be put first. The confidence of the people that the positive gains of the past are to be preserved in the present should be maintained. With this confidence firmly fixed in our people, we can build more surely for the future.

WE WILL BE LOST IF WE DO NOT PULL TOGETHER TO SOLVE AIRPORT-AIRWAYS CRISIS PROBLEMS, SENATOR CANNON ADMONISHES IN MEANINGFUL ADDRESS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, monthly meetings of the Aero Club of Washington bring together knowledgeable persons with vital interests in aviation. Its meetings always are well attended by representatives of commercial air transport, general aviation, business—executive—aviation, officers, and key staff persons from Federal executive branch agencies and congressional staffs and committees, as well as by representatives of aircraft manufacturers.

Indeed, the Aero Club of Washington offers an excellent forum for a speaker with a timely and interesting aviation message.

On Tuesday, July 22, that club held its last monthly meeting of the summer and brought together for luncheon an unusually representative audience to hear an exceptionally important speech on the airport-airways crisis by a thoroughly qualified speaker, Senator HOWARD W. CANNON, our distinguished colleague from Nevada.

Senator CANNON has had many years of experience with aviation as a legislator and as a pilot. His Senate committee membership includes Armed Services, Aeronautical and Space Sciences, Commerce, and Rules and Administration. He is chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections and of the Tactical Air Power Subcommittee, and vice chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee.

The able Senator from Nevada interrupted his legal practice for a military career from 1941 to 1946, during which he was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal with two oak leaf clusters, the Purple Heart, the ETO ribbon with eight battle stars, the French Croix de Guerre with silver star. He was shot down over Holland and evaded capture in a 42-day trek back to Allied lines. He is an Air Force Reserve major general.

The authority Senator CANNON brought to his address to the Aero Club gave it stature far above the ordinary. His thoughts and admonitions on the problems facing the Nation's airports and airways are worthy of very careful attention and consideration. His speech was especially timely, coming as it did at a time when he shares with Chairman WARREN MAGNUSON, of the Commerce Committee, responsibility for hearings by the Aviation Subcommittee on possible solutions to the critical problems facing the airports and airways.

Mr. President, in view of the critical importance of the subject which Senator CANNON discussed with frankness and clarity, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address before the Aero Club of Washington be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOWARD W. CANNON

Ladies and Gentlemen. I approach this assignment with mixed emotions. I am honored to have the opportunity to speak to so many of the experts in the field of air transportation, and yet this very fact gives me a sense of hesitation—almost as though I should be out there in the jury box and you here on the platform.

As one who has spent so many years in your business, both as pilot and legislator, I cherish the resourcefulness and resiliency that has always characterized aviation.

I believe the financial crisis confronting the industry today can and will be solved. After the accomplishments of our astronauts over the weekend, I really believe this country can solve any problem—even though it seems that the installment plan and easy credit, as well as other fiscal schemes, have made it easy for Americans to ignore the economic consequences of their transportation decisions.

As you all know, the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce has at long last opened hearings on the nation's airport/airways problem after waiting for the Administration to decide on a bill it would support.

We really opened in Wichita, Kansas, on May 2, 1969 with a hearing on general aviation. It was a good hearing—we had nineteen witnesses in one day—and all but one allowed that the time had come to admit that user taxes of some kind were, at the very least, part of the answer.

This was new. In the past, user taxes had been shunned as dirty words. It gave me hope that we were on the verge of progress.

When the hearings began in the New Senate Office Building, it soon became apparent that you didn't need a program to tell the names and numbers of the players, because the line-up was well known.

The lead-off man was John Volpe, Secretary of Transportation, supported by Assistant Secretary Paul Cherington and FAA Administrator John Shaffer. These gentlemen presented the long-awaited Administration's airway/airport legislation.

Highlights of that proposed program are a passenger fare tax on domestic flights up from 5 per cent to 8 per cent; on international and over-water flights, a new $3.00 per person charge; air freight way bills, a new 5 per cent tax; and on noncommercial aviation fuel, a 9 cents per gallon tax on gasoline, up from 2 cents; and a new 9 cents per gallon tax on jet fuel.

Hopefully, Administration witnesses estimated, this would pump $250 million annually into the airways with about $60 million per year for R. and D., while $250 million annually would go into airports. Out of the latter, about $10 million per year would go to planning grants, and $5 million per year to state agencies for planning.

There are many other things in this bill, such as provisions for studies and reports, but I will not go into them.

The Administration figured out a way to eliminate the trust fund that seemed to distress the Bureau of the Budget. They diverted away from it by changing the name to "Designate Account."

Under questioning, these gentlemen from D.O.T. thought that if there were ever any unused funds in the "designated account," they could not be put to earning interest as is done in a trust fund.

I am not sure I like it, but apparently the Budget Bureau sees something appealing in this concept.

John Crooker, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, certainly supported the need for action in the field of aviation needs.

Joseph O'Connell, Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board assured us of the safety of air travel. He did not give us a date or time, but it seemed clear to me there was a warning in his testimony to not wait too long before updating the equipment and all that goes with it.

We heard from the President of the Air Transportation Association. It seems this Association has teamed up with the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association to maintain the latter's opposition to users taxes in any form. Their joint plan would help airports by taxing tickets, but there would be no tax on general aviation. General aviation airports

XUM

would be maintained by yearly $50 million appropriations.

Their general approach was to the airports, the airways problem being left to the government. The failure of the appropriations approach to airport problems should be well known to everybody in this room, and it is one of the reasons the whole system is so far behind the times.

The proposed legislation from ATA–AOPA would create a fund for airport development by increasing the domestic ticket tax from 5 to 7 percent with a $2.00 head tax on enplaning international passengers. This tax would bring in about $123 million and could be used in both the terminal and landing areas.

It would authorize the guarantee of locally issued bonds, and the account would be broken down with half going into a discretionary account and the other 50 per cent into a direct airport account. The Act would set out how and what percentage of the discretionary fund could go where, such as 62 per cent for large hubs, with the direct account going to airport sponsors based on a ratio of enplaning passengers.

After this phase of the hearings closed, the ATA wrote Chairman Magnuson changing their approach a little. They will go along with the Administration's passenger tax and international head tax, but they want the 5 per cent tax on freight cut to 2 per cent.

This narrows the gap a little, and that is all to the good. Unless we can find common ground in this problem, progress will not be easy.

Suddenly, in the middle of all this we had some union testimony, some of it constructive, a great deal of it pointing up the overall problem we have with our airport/airways program. The Air Traffic Controller is a very important part of our whole system, and as we upgrade it, bring in new and better equipment, his lot will be much better.

We will look over his entire working arrangement, salary, hours, retirement and what have you at the proper time.

However, I must comment on the power of the spoken word. Some words were spoken by certain witnesses in our hearings and two days later several hundred controllers phoned in sick from all over the country.

We reopen our hearings again tomorrow, this time officially on the legislation itself. There is a third phase on planning for the 1980's, but first things first, so while we can put this last phase off a while, we should not delay too much. In the 1980's there will be 2½ million people airborne at a given time.

I have spoken here in a rather light vein but please understand that I, and I am sure I can speak for the Committee, am grateful for the hard work and efforts our witnesses put forth preparing their statements. They have given us more up-to-date information, statistics and ideas than we have had in a long time, and this will be very helpful as we make our final decisions.

I am deeply dismayed, and I now speak in all seriousness, that the day before the Senate Commerce Committee reopens the hearings on airport/airways development there seems to be a pervasive attitude within the aviation community that Congress again this year will fail to take action on this matter of greatest importance to us all.

There seems to be a spirit of resignation among many in the aviation business that the acrimony, controversy and dispute over financing an expanding and modernized aviation system will again force us in the Congress to do nothing.

This feeling—this pessimism is especially disturbing after sitting in the Committee for several days listening to a parade of witnesses come forward to warn of the perils facing the nation's aviation system unless we take action and take it now. We heard that lack of modern navigation and guidance equipment is creating situations in which accidents occur, accidents which probably would never happen if our system was as modern and well equipped as it can and should be. We have heard that instrument landing systems—that great friend and back-up of pilots in bad weather, exists at only about half of the nation's airports which have air carrier service and that radar—a great aid in keeping airplanes from running into each other—is even scarcer outside of the major metropolitan hub terminals.

We have listened to the airlines' witnesses as they told us that air transportation will at least double in the next ten years requiring airport investment anywhere between 8½ and 14 billion dollars if we are merely to keep pace with this tremendous growth.

The National Business Aircraft Association informed us that business aviation is facing a grave threat to its very existence because the FAA has been forced to greatly restrict the number of hourly operations at the nation's five most congested airports, often making it impossible for the busy executive to make a last minute decision to fly to New York or Chicago or Washington.

We have been told that air traffic controllers—often working six and seven days a week for months on end because of critical shortages in high density areas—are fed up and are about to quit the control service for a career with less strain and demand.

These problems are real, they are critical, they are pervasive and they threaten to wreak chaos on what has been the world's greatest air transportation system. And we know this growth, which we all look forward to, will continue only if we provide a system to move people and airplanes more safely and efficiently. There is not one of you here today who will not agree that the failure to act—the failure of all of us—has created the problems we are facing today, and they are only a prelude to the nightmares we can expect tomorrow if we continue to sit on our hands.

In light of this overwhelming evidence of the fact that our aviation system has reached the point of over-saturation and that future mobility of millions of Americans is in peril, why then is Washington full of doom sayers who either say that Congress will again retreat to an impasse or that we ought to put off a decision for another year or two in order to better assess who is to pay for this expanded system and how.

We will be lost if we do not pull together.

If we are going to argue about who pays what, with each defending his own position thereby hoping to save for a year or two a few cents in fuel tax or a percentage or two on the air passenger ticket tax, then we will be doing a great disservice to all Americans who rely upon air transportation. Today, this negative attitude is going to stifle our air transport system as surely as Pennsylvania Avenue will be clogged with traffic at 5 p.m. tonight. And just as certainly—if this defeatist attitude prevails—those very interests who are fighting so doggedly against contributing revenues to meet some of the costs of a better system will be denied use of that system simply because it will not absorb the increasing use to which we all wish to put it.

Certainly there are private interests who may have the clout—as we sometimes call it—to kill a program that is drastically needed by the country and they are able to stop action because the economic stakes appear to be high. But I would caution that the economic penalties for inaction, for continuing to use and abuse a system designed for the piston fleet era will be even greater. One hundred million dollars a year in fuel wasted on the taxiways will seem to be small change 5 years from now if we continue to allow selfish interests to deter us from this urgent task.

And so I would ask all in the aviation community—one of the greatest enterprises in the history of our country to think again about the costs of delay and inaction. I would ask them again to realize that none of us will get precisely what we want in a new, modern system, but on the other hand we will all receive some of what we want and that is the spirit in which the system operates so as to serve many diverse and essential elements of aviation. Each of us will pay a price for this tremendous growth to which we all look forward and if the price seems a little high in one area or a little inequitable in another let that not deter us from beginning.

All segments of aviation can and must find common ground on which action can be taken and certainly the Congress, and its committees on which the responsibility rests, are willing and anxious to find solutions which may not be perfect to everyone but which will not allow us to stifle the great system of aviation upon which we have come to rely so heavily. For if we do not act—if we continue to procrastinate and do nothing we will be assured of a system that all of us will find a nightmare.

In other words, get ready to give up something, and get ready fast.

I think the time has passed when Congress could sit back and await indefinitely for an agreement from industry. We have done too much of that already.

I think when these hearings are over the Committee must sit down and hammer out a bill.

I think we must do this no matter what industry does, but we want your help and we need it.

So please help us! Help us with a solution: Don't be a part of the problem.

We need the kind of teamwork that put our astronauts on the moon.

We must, as I said, hammer out a bill. Some are advocating a temporary measure, and we could be forced into such a position. The National Business Aircraft Association backs such an idea. They say an emergency exists so let's have an emergency temporary program.

They suggest legislation that would expire in 18 or 24 months and that would place a 5 cents per gallon tax on all aviation fuel. It would raise $460 million per year with $276 million for the airways and $184 million for the airfields.

During the 18 or 24 month period a cost/benefit, cost/allocation study would be made so that a sound long-range plan could be established. This could certainly be an emergency answer.

Let's consider again what we are up against. Delivery rate on commercial jets is better than one a day. General Aviation is adding about 160 new aircraft each month—many of them jets. Public demand for air transportation is growing about 20 per cent a year while air cargo has tripled over the past five years.

There is another piece of legislation you should be aware of. It is S. 2570, a bill that among other things would phase out pure jet aircraft from the use of Washington National Airport. The sponsor of the bill said, "I insist that the jets have got to go from Washington National." This approach would bar small business type jets as well as commercial aircraft, and the legislation is the first to be introduced in the Senate aimed at barring a particular type of aircraft from a particular airfield.

What aroused me was the statement made on the Senate floor, "that this bill will probably be sent to committee and buried." The Senate Commerce Committee does not operate in that manner. However, if a proposal

XUM

in a bill is lacking in merit then perhaps it should be buried, if one must use that word.

I pointed out on the Senate floor that the discontinuance of jets at National would result in a serious cost of manpower to the nation. The shuttles alone carry approximately 20,000 persons per day, and adding one hour ground travel time for each per day would result in thousands of hours of loss in productivity to the nation's economy.

It is easy to say bar the jets, but all possible effects from such a move must be considered before such action is taken.

I would like to be able to forecast how the move to repeal the investment tax credit will make out in Congress, but the whole tax situation is too confused at the moment. The bill is now out of committee and will soon be before the Senate.

I know how important this credit is to all industry, let alone the business most of you are in.

All of you know the Congress, over the years, has created various boards and commissions to do some of the work for which Congress is responsible. The Civil Aeronautics Board is one of these.

This Board for the past couple of years has been struggling with the Transpacific Route Investigation. It was all pretty much decided in 1968, but this Administration reopened and rejected the case because it said it feared there were some political payoffs in the awards. New or improved authority was then granted by the Board to four carriers, and a new carrier was selected for a fifth route.

The President then disapproved that selection, and while he did not name another carrier in so doing, he laid down some interesting guidelines.

This raises some questions. Is this a preemption of authority that belongs to the CAB?

Is not the President's responsibilities confined to considerations of foreign policy, national defense and security? The Federal Aviation Act may need an amendment.

It was a pleasure to be here and discuss some of the problems that give us mutual concern. Thank you.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ABM SYSTEM

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, as the Senate decides whether to authorize the deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system, there are several facts of which we can be relatively sure in this unpredictable and ever-changing world.

We know deployment will be extremely costly. On March 14, we were told it would cost $6.6 billion. Since then estimates have risen by $1.2 billion for nuclear warheads and again, to include approximately $500 million to extend the system to Hawaii, and $2.5 billion for research, development, and testing of the systems components. The cost is now estimated at between $10.3 and $10.8 billion.

If history is a guide to the future, we may expect to pay an even higher cost for a system which fails to meet specifications—more money for less performance.

A Brookings Institution study indicated that missiles generally cost 300 to 700 percent more than original estimates.

A recent study indicated that the more complicated electronic systems procured by the Pentagon seldom perform to even 60 percent of specifications, even after extensive testing. And it is impossible to test the Safeguard as a system.

With inflation still rampant, prime interest rates at 8.5 percent and possibly still rising, we do not need and cannot stand the added inflationary pressures caused by further imprudent Government spending.

A second fact of which we can be relatively certain is that the irresistible logic of the arms race will produce renewed efforts to counter the ABM, further escalating the arms race.

A kind of sustained overreaction is common in the field of weapons systems, and the weapons race does not need a further stimulus at a time when we appear to be, at long last, ready to explore arms control agreements with the Soviet Union.

These distasteful facts are the certainties of the ABM debate—but they are not crucial. The way each Senator answers two other questions is crucial.

First. Will the credibility of our nuclear deterrent be threatened in the mid-1970's?

Second. Is the Safeguard ABM system the most efficient way to meet such a threat?

For the last 19 weeks the Pentagon's case for an ABM has been predicated on a new-found fear that almost all of our nuclear force could be simultaneously destroyed in a first strike by the enemy, leaving us without the power to retaliate with a devastating second strike on the Soviet Union.

Previously the Pentagon toyed with a variety of other threats to justify ABM—an accidental enemy launch, a purposeful Soviet attack, a small and suicidal attack by the madmen in China, and so forth.

Thrown in for good measure are the arguments that only through deployment can further research and development be useful, that the ABM, whether it works or not, is an important bargaining point in arms limitation talks, and simply that the President thinks he needs it.

But finally the Pentagon decided Safeguard is needed to protect our land-based strategic forces. Secretary Laird cites continued development by the Soviet Union of the SS–9, a large rocket comparable to our Titan 2, as the new threat. The SS–9 is capable of carrying three 5-ton multiple warheads. By 1975, an estimated 500 could be deployed.

This constitutes, according to Secretary Laird, a threat to our Minuteman ICBM, the backbone of our land-based retaliatory force.

The threat is calculated on assumptions which are highly questionable: an accuracy of one-fourth mile for a single 5-megaton warhead delivered against a Minuteman silo, a failure rate of only 20 percent, and a capability to retarget, almost instantaneously, missiles for those that fail.

According to many noted scientists, such assured accuracy is extremely difficult to achieve, especially with an SS–9 with either MIRV's or, as is more likely, MRV's.

A 20-percent overall failure rate is highly questionable with a system as complicated as the SS–9 with either MIRV's or MRV's.

The problems of retargeting are almost insurmountable in the 1970's.

As was indicated in the joint report of Drs. Wiesner, Rathgens, and Weinberg:

> Clearly this would be extremely difficult even if one were concerned only about retargeting to compensate for launch pad and boost phase failures, but Mr. Laird apparently postulates reprograming to compensate for other failures as well, including presumably those that occur during separation of the several multiple warheads, which may occur fairly late in the trajectory. The United States rejected the retargeting concept for its own single-warhead missiles some years ago. Yet, Mr. Laird assumes the Soviet Union may adopt and be willing to rely on such a concept with multiple warheads where the problems are much more difficult than for single warheads.

But even if we accept Secretary Laird's questionable assumptions, our second-strike retaliatory capability is not based solely—or even primarily—on our intercontinental ballistic missiles which the ABM is designed to partially protect.

It currently includes our 41 Polaris submarines with their 658 nuclear missiles. Thirty-one of these submarines will have their missiles replaced by the Poseidon missile, each with approximately 10 warheads and greater range—raising our undersea missile total to 5,120.

Also, it includes about 640 Strategic Air Force bombers around the world, 7,000 tactical nuclear weapons in Western Europe, many deliverable to the Soviet Union; and an unspecified number of nuclear weapons at other foreign bases.

I find no one who convincingly argues that this aggregate retaliatory force can be almost instantaneously obliterated—now or in the 1970's.

If development of MIRV's and MRV's continues, the land-based forces of both the Soviet Union and the United States may be vulnerable to a preemptive attack, but not in the mid-1970's as prophesized by Secretary Laird.

At such time, strategic countermeasures to protect our land-based missiles may well be needed; and this raises the second critical question: Is the Safeguard system an effective means—much less the most effective means—of meeting a threat to our deterrent, should such a threat arise?

I doubt it. In the first place, there are technical problems inherent in the ABM itself.

Its indispensable components are a complex radar system and its complex computers. Each ABM site depends on one radar, and should it break down or be destroyed, all intercept missiles would be useless.

And yet this extremely expensive radar system, according to most estimates, is 10 times more vulnerable than the offensive missiles it must defend. The Soviet

XUM

Union could target their SS–11's with far smaller payloads, against the radar—either exhausting the supply of missiles available to protect it or destroying it with the smaller payload carried by the SS–11. In so doing, the Soviets would be able to target their larger SS–9 at the missile's silos where the larger 5 megaton warhead is essential.

The computers would be the largest and most complex ever built. Up to 20 data-processing units with a capacity equivalent to 100 large commercial computers, would be involved.

These computers would have to be programed to perform many tasks at the same time.

According to a recent report:

> The computer would have to interpret the radar signals, identify potential targets, track incoming objects, predict trajectories, distinguish between warheads and decoys, eliminate false targets, reject signals from earlier nuclear explosions, correct for blackout effects, allocate and guide interceptor missiles, and arm and fire them if they get within range of a target. All this must be done continuously and with split-second precision during the short period—ten minutes at most—between the time the attacking missiles first appear and the moment of impact.

This complex computer system can never fully be tested. Far simpler computers and computer programs have malfunctioned, even after years of testing.

The "soft" missile site radar and the computer systems are the weak links in a weak system—and without them the system is entirely useless.

Eminent scientists, such as Dr. George Kistiakowsky and Dr. Wolfgang Panofsky, have suggested that more efficient and less costly defenses for our ICBM's may be technically feasible. If there is a better way, let us find it. But let us not waste money on a system that will not do the job.

But even if the ABM, as now constituted, worked perfectly, the Russians can render it obsolete a few months after it is deployed by simply producing more offensive missiles. As Drs. Wiesner, Rathgens, and Weinberg point out:

> At the rate of SS–9 growth assumed by Mr. Laird, at most three additional months of production would completely offset Phase I of the Safeguard deployment, and at most one year's production would completely negate the Phase II deployment.

My colleague from Missouri, Senator SYMINGTON, an acknowledged and respected defense expert, has continuously called for the declassification of a Pentagon chart which is purported to show that even if the intricate electronics of Safeguard work perfectly, at the projected rate of Russian missile production, the system could be overwhelmed by the addition of relatively few missiles.

I would like to join Senator SYMINGTON in his request that the classified chart presented by the Department of Defense to the Senate Armed Services Committee be made public.

I, too, believe this chart makes a devastating and decisive case against deployment of a costly system which will be obsolete shortly after it is finished—billions of dollars for a few months of doubtful protection.

Should we ever legitimately need protection for our land-based retaliatory force, there are several more effective, less costly methods.

More ICBM's could be constructed with far less leadtime at far less cost. Secretary Laird states:

> It only takes 18 to 24 months from the start of construction to the operational availability of an ICBM in a silo.

This alternative would allow decisions for the mid-1970's to be made in the mid-1970's based on hard information and facts—not on the speculation and possibilities of 1969.

Another alternative is the addition of more Polaris submarines. The Polaris provides an invulnerable retaliatory capability not likely to be challenged by the mid-1970's. The addition of the Poseidon missile provides 10 times the present number of warheads and increases the range, making ASW even more difficult. The leadtime on submarine construction is approximately 3½ years, which also allows for more realistic planning.

Still another possibility is superhardening. Using Secretary Laird's assumptions, if we tripled the hardness of the silos, the Soviets, in order to maintain the same kill probability, would be forced to use a 20-megaton warhead. The size of such a warhead would preclude the use of multiple warheads on the SS–9 and thus the projected 1975 first-strike capability of the Soviet missile force would be reduced from 1,500 deliverable 5-megaton warheads to 500 20-megaton warheads—no threat to our over 1,000 land-based missiles.

It is true that superhardening could be offset by improvements in Soviet accuracy from one-fourth of a mile—as hypothesized by Secretary Laird—to one-sixth of a mile. But if such advance were made, the yield of Russian warheads could be reduced to 1½ megatons to have the same kill probability against unguarded sites. The SS–9 could carry at least four or five 1½-megaton warheads and therefore only three-fourths to three-fifths as many SS–9's would be required to destroy our Minuteman. The remaining missiles would be more than enough to offset either phase I or the full Safeguard system.

Why does the Pentagon continue to press for an ABM system? In a June 8 editorial, the St. Louis Post Dispatch offers one explanation:

> Of course everybody knows what the script calls for. Long before mid-1970's, the Pentagon would undoubtedly go to Congress with the alarming news of a forthcoming Safeguard gap, and the public would be told that national security imperatively demanded an enormous expansion of the antimissile system. This is, quite obviously, the true mission of Safeguard—to serve as the first stage of an unlimited escalation of the nuclear arms race, guaranteeing juicy contracts and military proliferation and cold war psychosis far into the future.

If we buy this system, it will have to be expanded if it is not to be completely useless. The Pentagon must also know that the Russians can expect to keep even or ahead of the ABM simply by building a few more offensive missiles which are less expensive to produce. I think it is time the Pentagon leveled with Congress and the American people.

And I think it is time Congress leveled with itself.

More weapons, defensive or offensive, do not necessarily mean more security. A vote for another weapon is not necessarily the patriotic or even the prudent thing to do.

It is not patriotic or prudent to vote for a costly weapons system which will provide very little security for a very short time.

It is not patriotic or prudent to vote for a costly weapons system of such technical uncertainty to meet an equally uncertain threat.

It is not patriotic or prudent to vote for a costly weapons system which will stimulate the arms race for the next decade—the reaction and counterreaction we are all so familiar with.

We are told on the Senate floor that "Clearly, we cannot discount the danger that these men—leaders of Russia—who are showing themselves unequal to the need for reforms at home, may make serious errors of judgment in their conduct of affairs abroad." Can the Russians think less of this country and this body, which after free and open debate would direct our wealth to build a costly, unneeded, unworkable weapons system.

I believe the Pentagon has failed to make its case that our deterrent is threatened or that the proposed Safeguard system is the best way to meet such a threat should one develop.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Missouri has made one of the clearest speeches on the subject that has been made in the Senate in this debate. It is analytical, well reasoned, and comprehensive. I think it has been made with such simplicity that almost anyone could understand and comprehend the involved issue.

The Senator is a new Member, and I think it is a great thing that those Senators who have come here this year have entered into the debate and contributed a great deal.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, and I take the word simplicity in the nicest sense of that term.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I associate myself with the comments of the Senator from Kentucky. I think his statement is a concise, clear, and forthright statement that can be understood by every Senator and by the average American citizen who is deeply involved and concerned about the problem.

Would the distinguished Senator from Illinois' great sister State of Missouri tell me whether there are defense contracts in the State of Missouri that would be affected by the ABM system?

Mr. EAGLETON. One of the largest employers in our State is the McDonnell Douglas Corp. and the Douglas branch thereof, a merged corporation, would be one of the significant contractors for the ABM system.

Mr. PERCY. I know well the McDonnell Douglas Corp., and I know Jim McDonnell, one of the really great men of American industry. He, above many other men I know, has been responsible for the success of our space program.

I think this great company wants to produce what they are told to produce. I have never heard any sort of campaigning by them for any particular military system. They serve the interest of the Government and the American people.

I think it is rather interesting that, though the company headquarters are in Missouri and the company is affected by the ABM system, both Senators from Missouri oppose the deployment of the ABM system.

It is significant also that we have a proponent of the ABM system from the great State of Washington, a State that has no such contract.

So, clearly, self-interest or parochial concern is of no interest to anyone concerned, that I know of, in the debate.

The debate far transcends any interest in the military-industrial complex.

The matter concerns the question of where we put our national priorities, what is important, and whether we have a sufficiency of security and adequacy of protection for our national interest.

I think this debate has been greatly enhanced by the clear and forthright statement of the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I am very pleased to hear those fine remarks from the Senator from Illinois.

I hasten to add a footnote and an observation to make it abundantly clear for the Record that at no time during the many weeks this ABM debate has gone on, both directly and indirectly, has any amount of pressure, even the smallest amount of pressure directly or indirectly, been applied to me by any member of the McDonnell-Douglas Corp.

They are magnificent people. They are fine producers of excellent machinery, and they have let me make my decision for myself without trying to influence it by any parochial question which might apply with respect to that corporation's future profits.

I think the point brought out by the Senator from Illinois is an excellent point to have made clear in the Record.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I have been most interested in the presentation of the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

I have spoken on the matter on the floor several times. There is disagreement, and honest disagreement.

It seems that after all the hearings—and I am a member of the Committee on Armed Services—closed hearings and open hearings and all of the evidence received, we had to conclude that all concerned thought that we should have some defensive system.

I heard no one disagree with that.

I listened while some said this system would work, this system would not work, and this system might work. But all the scientific experts agreed, after questioning, that the only certainty as to whether it would or would not work would come after the components required to make the ABM system were assembled. In other words, it was necessary to construct one; it was necessary to put it together; it was necessary, as the President has asked, to deploy one.

Then some said that the system might not work. Almost all the experts agreed that all the component parts had been tested and that all of them worked. It was merely a matter of opinion, not scientific expertise, when they said they thought it might not work.

I have heard statements on end. One scientist in California told me that it had only a 14-percent chance to work. I asked him how he arrived at that, but he was not certain.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MISSILE TEST FACILITIES AT KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE, AND RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTH

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Allen in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair must lay before the Senate at this time the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The Assistant Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 2546) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question pending before the Senate is the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Hart).

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Under a previous order, the Chair at this time is to recognize the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Percy). Will the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from California, so that he may conclude his statement?

Mr. PERCY. I am very happy to yield so that the Senator from California may finish his statement.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the distinguished Senator.

THE SAFEGUARD ABM SYSTEM

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I have heard opponents of the ABM system suggest that we could build additional intercontinental ballistic missiles, while at the same time they argued against an ABM system because an ABM system might encourage an arms race. This is the widest inconsistency I could imagine.

The Russians have said that they do not consider ABM as another step in the arms race to be an argument. They consider ABM as a defensive weapon, exactly as we consider their ABM system. I may say that the Russians have deployed ABM systems for a period of 3 years.

The matter of adding to our ICBM's has been considered, and it was a question, in my opinion, whether to do so would accelerate the arms race. It would create exactly the situation that we would want to avoid in the upcoming meetings between the President of the United States and the Russians.

We have heard of the simplicity of removing the radar of this system. I assure Senators that there has been much testimony by experts that would contradict such a proposal. It would not be that simple.

All the scientific experts with whom I have had a chance to speak—and they include the man who was actually placed in charge of the development of the space program, General Schriever—agree that there may be a better system someday in the future; that new ideas may be developed; that all sorts of knowledge may be obtained as a result of the moon shot. But at present, considering the present state of the art and the present capabilities, the ABM Safeguard system is the only one that is now available. They beg, very simply, to put together the component parts and make them work, to have a chance to build one, to take the bugs out; and if it does work, we will have a defensive system already built. This has been done not by the Department of Defense, not by the Pentagon, but by the President of the United States, who makes this request, simply and directly—and I believe practically—for the security and the future of our Nation. He has asked for it as quickly as he can get it, so that it will be on his side when he goes to the arms negotiation, in the hope of finding a way to come, at long last, to a means of limiting all armaments and, hopefully, eventually to get rid of all armaments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MURPHY. So, Mr. President, I should like the Record to show that, after all the evidence and all the arguments, I am more convinced than I was at the outset—and I assure my colleagues that I attended with an open mind—that we need the ABM, that we can afford it, that it is the best possible protection at the present time, and that I believe the President's request for it should be acceded to.

Mr. SAXBE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

Mr. SAXBE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator yield for that purpose, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. PERCY. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

XUM

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 9825) to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 9825) to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MISSILE TEST FACILITIES AT KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE, AND RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTH

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2546) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurment of aircraft, missiles, navel vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

THE ABM DEBATE AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, for 4 months now, there has been a nationwide debate in our country over three letters: ABM. The public and public officials are engaged in a learning experience that is as complicated as it is vital to the future of our Nation. The Senate is learning in full view of all the people. It is learning to ask questions, make suggestions, and express its concern—not simply over the Defense Department's expenditure of $80 billion a year but also over the risks of war and peace that envelop that $80 billion budget.

The executive branch of our Government is also learning. It is learning how to answer questions in public that it never before had to answer. It is learning how to explain complex and classified issues so that the American people can better express their wishes. It is learning not to make its decisions without great care, and it knows as never before that it is going to have to justify them.

The results of this collective learning process are good and necessary. Inevitably, however, some confusion has developed as to what the debate is really all about. Unless the purposes of the debate are made clear, legitimate questions and answers will be seen as attacks and counterattacks while decisions on the merits of the issues will fall victim to wasteful political compromises. If the debate turns into mutual accusations about personal motives, we shall never get down to the facts. If we do not get down to the facts, if we do not reach agreement on whether it is necessary or prudent for the United States to begin deploying a nuclear ballistic missile defense now, we could find ourselves jeopardizing our national defense while adding nothing to our security—all at enormous cost.

Perhaps it is best to begin by making clear what the debate should not be about.

It should not be an attack on the so-called military-industrial complex. It is patently unfair to charge that our military leaders and the aerospace industry are conspiring to feed on fear in order to sell billion-dollar gadgets for profit.

The problem is with those who are still convinced that our safety lies solely and exclusively in more and newer weapons systems because "that is the only way to deal with the Russians." If the public has not been well served, it is not because of these men. It is because so many have sat silent for so long without asking the hard questions.

Nor should this debate be a disguised attack on President Nixon. The President's performance in his high office has received, and I believe justly, widespread popular support. The support certainly includes the President's handling of foreign affairs.

Specifically, with respect to national security policy, he deserves the highest praise for his reformulation of U.S. strategic doctrine. The President has stated:

> The only way that I have concluded that we can save lives, which is the primary purpose of our defense system, is to prevent war, and that is why the emphasis of this system is on protecting our deterrent.

He has rejected a heavy city defense because it "tends to be more provocative in terms of making credible a first-strike capability against the Soviet Union." In his April 18 press conference, he said that he did not want to put any American President "in the position where the United States could be second rather than first or at least equal to any potential enemy." His Secretary of State has made it quite clear that the administration is flexible to the extent that "if the U.S.S.R. wants to go out of the ABM business, we can, too." The Nixon doctrine should be admirably suited to decisions which can brake the spiraling, dangerous arms race.

The ABM debate encompasses three objectives:

First, to determine and reorder national priorities;

Second, to subject the defense budget to the same kind of scrutiny as other appropriation requests; and

Third, to explore whether a unilateral decision on the part of the United States to deploy ABM's now on the eve of negotiations with the Soviet Union on strategic arms limitations, makes any sense.

We must examine our national priorities. In the light of our tragic Vietnam experience and because of growing civil disaffection, we are trying to seek out a new and proper balance between our domestic and international goals.

We cannot have a meaningful debate on priorities, we cannot set a meaningful national-international balance, without giving careful attention to the $80 billion defense budget, an expenditure which would constitute fully 60 percent of the Federal budget over which Congress can exercise discretionary action.

The specific focus of the ABM debate is whether we need to deploy it now, later, or not at all.

The administration's position is that we must begin deployment now.

Some critics are determined never to deploy.

My position is that I favor not going forward now, both because I strongly believe that it is in the national interest to use the time to improve the design, and because we can make a better decision regarding deployment later, in the context of arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union.

This debate does not rest on whether the proposed system will provide effective protection for our deterrent strike forces, though scores of scientists believe that it does not.

This debate does not rest on whether the Soviet Union or Communist China has embarked on a strategy which will enable either nation to attack the United States with impunity by the mid-1970's. Such a strategy is unrealistic and would be suicidal. Rather this debate rests on our hopes, and the hopes of all mankind, for a genuine and lasting peace. For if we mean to have peace then we must recognize the futility and the danger of military strategies which have no regard for global politics.

Now is the time to take the initiative for peace.

Now is the time when we possess the ability to launch a devastating attack upon any nation that would dare to strike us first.

Now is the time, before deploying a new generation of strategic weapons, to try to prevent a situation whereby the Soviet Union would be compelled to escalate their own weaponry.

Certainly we can accept President Nixon's dictum that we must not be in an inferior strategic position to any other power. We must have the power to deter aggression against our country. And we do have that power. We must have the will then to use our power should any aggressor attack us. And we do have that will.

Our second-strike capability is so awesome that we can safely decide not to deploy Safeguard at this time. Those who want to deploy now say the two Minuteman wings need to be protected by late 1973, and, the whole system should be operative by the end of 1975.

These timing requirements are based on the prediction that the Soviet Union will develop and deploy all they are capable of, regardless of cost. Secretary

Laird's estimate is that, by 1975, the Soviets could have as many as 2,500 ICBM's compared to our 1,000, while exceeding our total of 41 Polaris submarines, and deploying as many as 2,000 ABM's relative, to say, the 1,000 projected under Safeguard.

It is the opinion of almost all Soviet watchers that the Russians are not seriously contemplating the vast expenditures that this estimate would entail.

Indeed, it is hard to believe the Russians would expect that they gained anything after having done so. But, let us nevertheless assume they will do so by 1975, and let us further assume that Safeguard will, in fact, provide a significant added measure of deterrence and protection against such a threat. Does this mean that a year or so from now it will be too late to make the Safeguard decision? In my judgment, it does not.

Our scientists and engineers have given us an alternative. Simply stated, this alternative involves continuing present research and development, engineering and testing and evaluating an ABM system. If we did only this now and if we were also willing to spend a reasonable additional sum of money to meet a shorter deadline, we could still do all that Safeguard advocates desire and have it in operation by 1975 if that course appeared necessary.

In addition to the fact that we have time before we have to make these decisions, there is a second and more basic point that calls for delay. We can make a better decision later. A postponed decision would be better on two counts:

First, it would give us a chance to take the measure of the Soviet Union's intent in arms talks;

Second, it would allow us the time to make necessary improvements in Safeguard technology and strategy.

Most of the ABM debaters understand quite clearly that the United States and the Soviet Union now each has sufficient forces-in-being as well as the technology, additional resources, and the will to compensate for or to negate new strategic deployments by the other side. Whatever we do, they can match, and whatever they do, we can match. This is the basic point governing the futility of the strategic arms race. What has not been made clear by this debate is the conclusion to be drawn from this mirrored capability. The operative conclusion is that neither Washington nor Moscow can make sensible strategic decisions unilaterally.

I am not saying that arms control talks will solve all our problems. But I am saying that these talks may indeed constitute an important initiative for moving further away from a nuclear holocaust. And, moreover, I am saying that what we will learn from those talks, and what we will fail to learn, will help us make better strategic decisions.

For example, we have announced over the last few years that our Minuteman force will stabilize at 1,000 missiles. Secretary Laird claims that the Soviets have the capability for a fixed land-based force of 2,500 by 1975. We should ask the Soviets how many they intend to build, and we can check their answers accurately over a period of time by counting the ICBM silos they construct. We can test their intent regarding a ballistic-missile-defense system. Is it in the interests of both nations for both to deploy an ABM system? Or is it better for neither to deploy?

If Moscow is willing to talk numbers and needs in a mutually reciprocal context, if each side talks about what it believes deterrence requires, then a great deal of the speculation and uncertainty that make both want more and newer weapons can be dissipated.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. The Senator asked the question, would it not be better for neither side to deploy ABM's? Does not the Senator have the knowledge that the Russains have already deployed an ABM?

Mr. PERCY. Yes, they have deployed it, as I understand it, from the intelligence reports I have, but they have considerably slowed down or even stopped deployment of the system. They may have stopped. But the slowdown may be for one of a number of reasons. They may have decided to abandon the whole project as worthless, as we abandoned the idea of Sentinel. They may have decided to go back into research and perfect a better system. That is exactly what the opponents of deployment are now suggesting we do about the Safeguard system—that we perfect the system for to have the capability, but not to deploy it now.

Mr. MURPHY. The Senator gave the impression that there was a balance between what the Soviets had and what we had, but that neither should go ahead with the ABM. I merely rose to point out that they started their deployment 3 years ago, and they have quite a few already deployed around Moscow. The reason for the slowdown is the uncertainty, so far as my information goes, and to improve it, or they may have found out it is not successful—hopefully—but I do not think there has been an exact answer as to the reason for the slowdown. The point I want to make is that the Russians do have an ABM already deployed and we do not, and that is not exactly what the Senator is saying.

Mr. PERCY. The Senator is not suggesting that we should adopt a policy that whatever the Russians do, we should do. I do not suggest that kind of policy. If they make a bad mistake, I am realistic enough to believe that there is no reason for us to go ahead and make the same one.

Mr. MURPHY. The Senator's premise is not very logical. I did not suggest that whatever they do, we do.

Unfortunately, a false premise leads to a false conclusion and it gets developed; and sometimes the main thrust of the discussion gets lost. My point in rising was to emphasize the point in the Senator's remarks that the Russians have the IBM. As a matter of fact, they have another system which is deployed all over the Soviet Union that we think is built for another purpose. So that actually they have two, and we do not have any. That is the reason I do not believe we should react to everything the Russians do. Certainly, I do not think that. We worry about how many warheads they have as compared to how many warheads we have.

I think the main thing is to be conscious of the fact that within the past 5 years we have lost a distinct military advantage. I do not think anyone will argue against that. It is my opinion that as long as we have a distinct military advantage, as long as the character of America and the policy of America is known; namely, that we are not going to attack anyone, or start a war, that we insure a great degree of safety for the security of our country.

On the other hand, we know historically from what the Russians have said, to my knowledge, going back 30 years, every time they have had a meeting lately—I should not say the Russians, I should say the Communists—the Moscow Communists, the Peking Communists, and the Castro Communists—that they all seem to wind up with the main theme, "We must destroy America. We must destroy imperialistic America."

We are not imperialistic. However, we have won the door prize. In a closed society like a dictatorship, it is always necessary to have a "heavy," a "bogeyman"; someone to scare everyone with. "You do what I say, or else."

We do not have that in our society. It is not in the character of the American Nation. I believe that those charged with the security of our Nation are making certain that we are able to do whatever is necessary to protect the safety of the Nation. I do not believe we should be negligent. Where there is a question of making a mistake, I think we are bound to make that mistake in favor of the safety of our country and not in favor of, maybe, saving a few dollars, or giving some scientists a few more months to do research work. All the scientists have agreed that in the present state of the art, this is the only system. They all say we can find a better one. I am sure that we can. I would hope that science would find one so much better we would never need to continue with another—hopefully this would be a lot less expensive.

I would hope more than that. I would hope the President of the United States would be more successful in his meeting with the Russians. I would hope they would come to an absolute agreement and say to us, "Don't you build an ABM or don't you build any more ICBM's and we won't build any more."

I think we would all be very pleased if that happened. But as long as they continue to inveigh against us, as long as they use us as the target, as the design, for destruction, I think we have to take them at least partially at their word and be prepared to think perhaps they mean it.

I can remember some years ago I bought a book for a dollar. It was called "Mein Kampf." It was written by a madman in Germany. I read it. I told some people about it. They thought I had lost my mind. When I read it, I believed that man meant what he said. He did. Look at the terrible trouble he caused. If we had listened to him in the beginning, if we had taken proper precautions in the

XUM

beginning, if the people in his country had been careful in the beginning, the chances are he never could have created the great destruction he did.

This is the only reason for the debate. I, as the Senator knows, have the greatest regard for my colleague. He and I together would like to see the solution of these problems. But I must keep to the point in making the final decision. From what is factually clear and correct as I have been able to hear the facts in all the hearings before the Armed Services Commitee, both open and closed hearings—and the distinguished Senator from Missouri, referred to the closed session of the Senate which took place—we must be realistic and deal in facts. If we had done that in the past in our dealings with the Soviets, we would not have had all this trouble. When we do not deal in facts, they lose respect. They think we are silly. I dealt with them for many years as an adviser on the cultural exchange. It was exactly the same kind of negotiations. They would ask 5 for 1, and settle for 3 for 1. They told us they would have to get more in return, because they would be in trouble when they got home.

That is the trouble with a dictatorship. Two fellows are watching the first fellow, and four are watching the other two, and it all piles up, so nobody makes a decision because they are fearful of making a mistake. That is the trouble. They lost about 7 years in the development of the country. I have watched them.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I am glad to yield for a question——

Mr. MURPHY. I did not mean to make a speech. I got carried away.

Mr. PERCY. I may have trouble sorting through all the Senator's comments to find a question, but he made one important comment——

Mr. MURPHY. The question was this: I thought my colleague had said that neither the Soviet Union nor the United States should build the ABM system. I merely wanted to point out that the Soviet has already built and deployed its ABM system. The Soviets have quite a few of them around Moscow. They have another system, which is around the country, which we think is aimed perhaps at our Tactical Air Force.

Mr. PERCY. I very much appreciate my colleague's repeating the question. I will try to respond to it, because he made another very important comment, that we should try to deal with facts in this case.

It is true that there is a beginning, and it might be or it could be the end—we do not know—of an ABM system around Moscow. The system is limited to Moscow. All the military authorities I have talked with in our own Department of Defense feel it presents no real problem to them whatsoever. They can saturate it. They can penetrate it very easily. Probably that is recognized by the Soviets.

Mr. MURPHY. I would just like to know how they propose to saturate it. I have not heard that.

Mr. PERCY. By penetration. If they have 67 ABM's, we send over 68 ICBM's. When they have sent up their 67, they have exhausted their supply.

Mr. MURPHY. In other words, our military experts have told the Senator that the Soviets have an ABM system around Moscow containing missiles, and we can send one missile over to destroy it?

Mr. PERCY. We can send one additional missile beyond the number of ABM's they have deployed. It is just simple arithmetic. In fact, I do not have to go so high.

Mr. MURPHY. There is more than arithmetic involved. I assure the Senator that if we have an ABM, they cannot send one missile plus one missile to destroy our ABM. I am not sure that is disclosing any secret, but I assure my colleague that is a fact.

Mr. PERCY. Does my distinguished friend from California doubt the accuracy, the power, or the will to use that power on the part of our Defense Establishment? Does he doubt the second-strike capability that we have in this country?

Mr. MURPHY. I do not doubt the second-strike capability. What we are talking about, and the whole purpose of the debate, is to protect the second-strike capability so that we may have a second-strike capability, so that if somebody attacks us, we may be able to respond. That is what the ABM is all about. That is what it is for. It is not to hit anybody else. It is to destroy incoming missiles that would destroy our second-strike capability.

I must tell my distinguished colleague that I am forced to leave the floor. I dislike to leave. I will hurry back if I can.

Mr. PERCY. I would like to comment on one other aspect, to be as factual as we can, and that is what respect to whether or not the Soviets have an ABM system deployed around the U.S.S.R. beyond Moscow. It is my understanding that whatever they have is an antiaircraft system. What we thought was an ABM system around Leningrad turned out not to be an ABM system, but an antiaircraft system. We have an antiaircraft system deployed, as they have, but theirs is just as obsolete in the kind of warfare we are talking about and trying to avoid as is our own defense, covered by snow and Arctic wastes, which is useless against the type of missile attack which might be made against us.

Mr. MURPHY. If my colleague will permit, when I spoke of the second system, I was not speaking of an antiaircraft system; I was speaking of the Tallinn system, which is not really an antiaircraft system. It is an antimissile system. But I have been advised that we think that may be targeted against our strategic aircraft.

The defense of both countries, strangely enough, is laid out in three elements. It takes in the land-based system, the ICBM's; submarines, which they are building at a much faster rate than we are; and the manned bombers. They have some "dandies," there, too. They have medium manned bombers that are excellent, and they have airbreathing missiles that can stay up a long time. So things are not as happy as they were 5 years ago, and that is why I am concerned.

I thank the Senator for his patience.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, just to complete my own comments on these pertinent questions, it is my understanding—and I would stand to be corrected if I am wrong—that there is not an ABM system deployed around Russia; that there is an ABM system that has not been completed around Moscow; but Dr. Foster, head of research and engineering in the Department of Defense, in hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee, said that we have already targeted the Moscow Galosh system out of existence. I think that testimony from such an authority in the Department of Defense is adequate to answer whatever questions have been asked me by my distinguished colleague from California.

Let me continue my comments.

The fear of the unknown, whereby a nation must attempt to plan for all eventualities, would no longer be a telling argument for escalation of the arms race. If, on the other hand, Moscow delays or refuses this kind of dialog and exchange of information, we would conclude the worst about Soviet intentions. We would then be in a position to make decisions accordingly based on knowledge, not fearful speculation.

Quite apart from arms talks with the Soviets, there are some basic engineering questions that indicate the value of delay. There is strong evidence to believe that the Safeguard is not the best system we can devise to accomplish its stated purpose. Here let me simply repeat some uniform concerns of the most qualified U.S. scientists and former high Pentagon officials—concerns which have not, to date, been adequately dealt with by the Pentagon.

Since the Sprints would be blinded and inoperable if the MSR radars were destroyed, how can we first deal with the problem of MSR vulnerability? Do we need hundreds of Sprints just to defend these radars? Should we seek to find new ways to harden these close-in radar sites? Should we disperse from one radar to a multiplicity of radars?

What can be done generally about Soviet saturation tactics? If the Soviet Union does expand its missile force, add multiple warheads and then MIRV's, thus having several thousand separately deliverable warheads, how can only "several hundred" Sprints, now visualized under Safeguard, hope to defend our ICBM's successfully.

These are only a few of the dozens of questions that have been raised by the scientific community regarding the improvement of the Safeguard system. These questions need answers before deployment.

This is one way of stating the case for holding off a decision, pro or con, on deploying Safeguard now. Specifically, I am opposed to a decision that begins the process of starting to gear up for full production of a missile defense system in the United States now. Once any part of this system is begun in the United States, the decision is taken out of our hands—the inertia of military weapons systems dictates that the whole system will inevitably be deployed. And will be deployed regardless of the success of the arms talks and regardless of what the Russians do. Any deployment in the

United States may make a sham of the arms control talks.

I say this despite Pentagon statements about annual reviews and phasing decisions.

I say this because the Pentagon has unequivocally told us that the full system will be deployed "as the Chinese ICBM threat continues to increase."

I say this because that would put us right back in the game of building an ABM system for defense of cities which President Nixon says would be very provocative and destabilizing, and which scientists in and out of the Pentagon believe cannot be effectively provided and would be wasteful.

I am not prejudging the ultimate decision on ABM's. Circumstances might dictate ultimately that we all would support a workable and well-thought-out missile defense system in time. I would be in favor of going ahead with a U.S. missile defense system—hopefully a better system than Safeguard—if the Soviets insisted on deploying a more significant one of their own and we were convinced of its value. We could not afford to let the Soviet Union get that kind of technological jump on us without responding in kind.

It is because of these considerations that the Congress has struggled with the decision on ABM. The ABM debate has not been a foolish one with all the truth on one side. The unfortunate aspect of the debate is that we are trying to settle it all now.

Richard Nixon, as our President and Commander in Chief, has a real responsibility for the Nation's defense, for not taking unnecessary risks with our security. He faces great new uncertainties in the strategic nuclear balance of power. These uncertainties breed fears and demands that are difficult to assess and resist. Both the United States and the Soviet Union are on the verge of being able to deploy a whole new generation of strategic weapons.

We do not know with certainty what effects these new weapons will have on the system of mutual deterrence, that balance which prevents holocaust and keeps the nuclear peace. We never will have this certainty. President Nixon himself made this clear with his own statements on strategic doctrine and with his concept of "sufficiency." What we need is enough, not necessarily more and more. We cannot eliminate risks to ourselves without increasing risks to others. If others are placed in greater jeopardy, they will react from fear, just as we are being entreated to do.

In regard to Safeguard, there is merit to President Nixon's desire to maintain the retaliatory capability of our Minuteman force. This is part of a very sensible doctrine that seeks to maintain separate retaliatory capability in each of our major strategic force components—land, sea, and air. It may well be too risky to place our deterrent capability solely on any one component. This, in turn, means we may have to do something about the potential vulnerability of our Minutemen. But the Pentagon has far from made a convincing case that the sole answer to this problem is to deploy Safeguard now.

Just as the President has responsibilities and problems, so does Congress. We have responsibility, with the President, to determine the Nation's needs and priorities. This should be a cooperative, not a competitive, process. In fulfilling our responsibilities to the American people, many in Congress are simply not convinced that Safeguard, just as we were not convinced that Sentinel, is either right or necessary at this time.

Because our doubts and our questions have not been answered satisfactorily or convincingly, many of us—which may well be a majority—will have to vote our judgment and conscience against Safeguard.

But this is not the way this decision has to be made. There is no need and nothing to be gained from an outright confrontation between Congress and the President. There is a middle ground which does not compromise national security. Indeed it enhances the future security of this Nation.

First, we should not make the decision today that would commit us to deployment of an ABM system in the United States.

Second, we should begin arms limitation talks immediately and make the next round of ABM decisions based on what we learn or can agree to at these talks.

Third, we should continue with research and development, engineering, testing, and evaluation. Speaking for myself and not for my colleagues, I would also approve the preproduction of long leadtime items such as radar components and computer software.

Fourth, we should take steps to deploy a full unit of an improved ABM system at Kwajalein.

This approach would allow us to meet any contingency in the middle and late 1970's. It would keep necessary vital technical personnel together, working as a unit, and it would enable production lines to be readied for a more proven design. It would also allow for fuller testing—which deployment in the northern United States would not. This approach would make the curtailing of the arms race feasible without incurring any new risks.

At the same time, I would like to renew the proposal for a mutual moratorium on MIRV testing, a proposal in which I joined with the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) and 40 other Senators of both parties. I believe firmly that the only way to remove the threat that derives from multiplying numbers of deliverable warheads and increasing their accuracy is for both sides to agree to stop testing them. We did achieve an agreement to prohibit atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons. We did achieve an agreement with the Russians to also prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons to other countries. This is the next logical step, and should be the first order of business at the arms talks.

Mr. President, I should like to point out one deep concern that I have, in which I am joined by many others in this body.

We can accurately determine whether the Russians, and they whether we, are testing a MIRV. But once it is tested, designed, produced, and deployed there is no way that we can inspect adequately the integrity of a limitation agreement without on-site inspection.

I think from our past experience in negotiating we know that this presents an exceedingly difficult problem. I would not consider very useful an agreement that would not be in our mutual self-interest, an agreement that could not be clearly understood, or an agreement that could not be clearly enforced.

We know now that neither an offensive nor a defensive weapons system can be deployed without detection, either by the Soviet Union or by ourselves. We would know if they were cheating, and they would know if we were cheating. The technology and scientific capacity we now have for satellite reconnaissance insures the integrity of such an agreement.

Yet we could not ensure the usefulness of our current means of detection once MIRV had been deployed. This is why the urgency for a mutual—and I say mutual, not unilateral—agreement is the highest order of priority in an arms limitation talk.

And this is not the time to commit ourselves to production of an ABM defense system. If the great debate that has taken place throughout the land has proved any one point, it has proved that now is not the time to expand the world's nuclear arms race. It has proved that both the time and opportunity for further steps toward peace may coincide. We should make every effort toward this end, and take steps that will in any way endanger the possibility that we have today of coming to accord and mutual agreement so that we may stop and arrest the arms race in which both nations are now actively and wholly engaged.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PERCY. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, does the Senator have knowledge of whether the Russians have tested MIRV?

I am trying to establish whether the Russians are ahead of us in the matter of testing, adapting, and employing MIRV.

Mr. PERCY. I presume that we both are at a stage now where we are pushing ahead rapidly. I presume they have certainly done some research, development, engineering, and testing, and so have we.

Mr. MURPHY. Have we tested MIRV, to the knowledge of the Senator?

Mr. PERCY. I assume we have done a great deal of design, engineering, research, and development. And as a matter of fact, from my recent experience on a Polaris submarine, there seemed to be no hesitation in their capability for going ahead with the Poseidon.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I have no knowledge that we have tested an operational MIRV. I do have knowledge that it is believed that the Russians have tested MIRV.

I therefore suggest that they might be a little ahead of us.

XUM

The Senator spoke about arriving at a treaty controlling nuclear testing in the atmosphere. I wonder if the Senator recalls the circumstances preceding that treaty when, during the time that the treaty talks were going on, the Russians did test in the atmosphere and did take advantage of our trustworthy nature and did gain a tremendous advantage and knowledge and did a great deal to change the balance because of that testing. Is the Senator aware of that?

Traditionally, we find that our country is asked to slow down and not take the initiative. I know that we had MIRV available to us 6 or 7 years ago. For one reason or another, it was pushed aside by the then civilians who made those decisions. I believe that Secretary McNamara was responsible.

I am just as hopeful as is my distinguished colleague that the day will come when we will not have to worry about these armaments.

I must point out, however, that the ABM is not a move in the arms race. It is a defensive weapon. It can never be made into an offensive weapon. The Russians know that. They have said so. As a matter of fact, when it was first indicated that we might go ahead, they immediately said, "Let us sit down and talk disarmament."

This is perhaps the way we should approach the matter. Maybe over the years we have been dealing with them in the wrong way. I know that history is replete with the story of people who have tried to deal with the Soviets from a position of weakness. They have accomplished very little. However, people who, from time to time, have had a confrontation with strength backing up their design—as we had in Greece, Lebanon, and Cuba—always seem to be able of accomplishing something.

I wonder if perhaps that is not the way they would rather have the meeting take place.

I am sure of one thing—and I know that my distinguished colleague will join me in this—that I do not think he nor I nor any other Senators have thought of anything or any condition or have as much scientific or technical knowledge of the matter as has the President of the United States.

I always come back to that same point. I know of the sleepless nights spent worrying about the matter. We have to be right. A mistake in this matter could be absolutely vital to the future of our Nation.

I am sure that the President finally came to the conclusion that, in his best judgment, he wanted to have a Safeguard missile, he wanted to be able to protect our second-strike capability so that in the event anyone got a crazy idea that they wanted to attack us or in case anyone made a mistake or there was a misfire, we could destroy the incoming missile before it would do any damage.

He decided at long last that this was what he wanted. That is his responsibility. He has that responsibility in the name of a majority of the people of this country.

I think that in the event there is any question, this fact ought to weigh very heavily in making the final decision. It is his job. Our responsibility is advice and consent.

Actually, our job is also to debate the bill and then act on the bill that we worked over in committee to supply an amount of money, not for policy, but for procurement, to supply the funds for the armed services to buy the things they need, pay the salaries, and keep up the installations.

The debate became part of that. However, in the bill, if that is all we are talking about, there is a matter of less than $800 million involved.

Some have said that once we start, we can never stop. I can. I have stopped a lot of things. We can stop the day we decide to do so. As a matter of fact, the President in his request provided for exactly that. He said that at the end of the year we will look at the matter, and if we do not need it, we will stop it.

If the negotiations are successful, we can stop it then. We should not even start it, if the negotiations are successful before we start. We should not go beyond that point.

I point out that if we do not start it and start it now, the best advice I can get is that we would lose 2 years before we got to the actual finished product. And those 2 years, in the judgment of those in the top jobs of Government, we cannot afford to waste at this time.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, with respect to MIRV testing, it is my understanding that half of the MIRV tests have been completed by us with positive results. The Soviets have tested, to the best of my knowledge, MRV. We are ahead of them in MIRV.

As to whether we would be dealing from strength because of having gone into the production of a weak ABM system, I do not see that that argument is particularly strong. I do not think the Soviets would be greatly impressed if we were to go into production on it.

If we wanted to expend our resources in that way and have a low level in our defense systems, I do not think it would be particularly worrisome to them, any more than we should be particularly worried by the so-called ABM system they have deployed in part around Moscow.

I feel it would be a great mistake for us to just simply say that they have one and, therefore, we have to have one and had better rush into production, no matter what the vulnerability of certain parts of the system is and no matter what the weakness of that system may be.

We have talked a great deal about MSR. We might well talk about the electrical power that will operate this particular system, and we might get into that at some point in the future.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PERCY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his very able address, to which I have listened with close attention.

I have not found a way, vocally, to distinguish with any distinction—in the pronunciation, at least—between MIRV and MRV. The best pronunciation I can give to either is "MIRV." Some distinction will be found in the testimony of Secretary Laird, beginning at the bottom of page 45:

> MIRV is certainly something that is negotiable as far as any arms limitation talks are concerned. It is true the Soviet Union has gone forward with testing of multiple reentry vehicles, and we are going forward with testing MIRV-ed vehicles. We do not plan any deployment of multiple reentry vehicles until [deleted].

I wish to point out, for the benefit of the RECORD and for the benefit of the senior Senator from California, if he should need such information, that in this statement the Secretary of Defense make a clear distinction between multiple reentry vehicles and the multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles.

I think I have heard all the intelligence briefing before my subcommittee—indeed, I know I have. No evidence has been presented to my subcommittee that the Soviets have tested any multiple independently targeted reentry vehicle. They have tested some MRV's which fell in patterns which contain some interest to some people. On the contrary, the United States has tested, as the Secretary has said, MIRV weapons. So in this category the United States is far ahead, as the United States is far ahead in many other respects.

So if it comes to negotiating from a position of strength, I do not know how we could reasonably assume that the United States would be in a more advantageous position next year or the year after or any other time in the future. Indeed, as I tried to say to the Senate on Tuesday, the United States and the Soviet Union, though not on a basis of equality in destructive capacity, are on a basis of equality in one respect—they have the capacity to destroy each other several times over.

Now, when two nations are in such a juxtaposition, does the Senator know of any measure of their mutual security so great as an understanding on the limitation of further deployment and possible use of nuclear weapons?

Mr. PERCY. I think the distinguished Senator has brought out an exceedingly important point, and it is a point that I really tried to get at in my speech.

In the remarks I made, I tried to separate those who are just for deployment today, those who are for having the capability to deploy but who are against deployment now, but are for continuing research, development, testing, and so forth, and those who simply—and I think we should categorize them and isolate them—are against doing anything with the Soviet Union "because you cannot trust the Russians." If that is their philosophy and if that is their approach, then I think they clearly should stand up and say: "We oppose the President of the United States on this policy matter. We oppose the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Defense Department, the State Department, and everyone else, because we are against negotiating with the Soviet Union."

Let them then not hide behind this general opposition or general proposition of deploying the ABM. Let us argue that out, on whether or not, as a matter of national policy, we want to sit down and see whether we have a community of interest in stopping the arms race.

As I understand the President of the United States, he has clearly said, "I am willing to sit down and negotiate." In fact, he set a date and said he would be flexible as to where those talks are to be held. There is no question in my mind that MIRV and ABM and other nuclear offensive and defensive systems will be on the agenda. This action has been approved by the National Security Council.

As to those distinguished colleagues and friends of ours who simply are going to fight any attempt to agree with the Soviet Union on anything, we should clearly have them isolated in one separate category and separated from many of their colleagues—the vast majority in the Senate—who feel that it is utter madness for us not to see whether we do not have a community of interest.

I should like to ask a technical question of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, because he has participated in all the discussions that have taken place before the subcommittee of which he is chairman.

Is it not important that we reach a mutual agreement to cease the testing, because once we have finished the testing, design, and development, and begun the production and deployment of MIRV, we would then require on-site inspection, and our present methods of satellite reconnaissance would not be adequate to insure the integrity of the agreement? I believe, and I believe that he believes, we should have agreements with the Soviet Union, the integrity of which can be preserved by our known technology.

Mr. GORE. In reply to the distinguished Senator, I wish to refer once again to the statement of the Secretary of Defense that "MIRV is certainly something that is negotiable as far as any arms limitation talks are concerned."

So the answer to the Senator is affirmative, in the view of the senior Senator from Tennessee, but affirmative in the view of the position of the administration, also.

(At this point Mr. SAXBE assumed the chair.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I came in at the end of this discussion, but heard both arguments.

I believe it is important to emphasize—and I should like to check with the Senator from Illinois, who I know has made a very fine and thoroughgoing speech in defense of our position—that there are two separate ideas here, both very valid.

I like very much Senator PERCY's concept that if you do not trust the Russians, then make no agreements with them at all, and you do not have to trust them to make an agreement. We just have to look at the history of previous agreements to which they have agreed to see whether they have stuck by them. They horse around in a big way and will take us any time they can when there is no agreement; but the disarmament agreements, like the nuclear nonproliferation and the testing in the atmosphere, have been observed, as have others.

There is another thought in what the Senator from Tennessee has said, which I would like to confirm, and that is the question of risk. I spoke on that yesterday. I debated it with the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER).

The question is, Which is the greater risk? We are not saying that there is no risk in not deploying; but we say the greater risk is in deployment, rather than in nondeployment, because we are so far committed without a commensurate benefit that we lose on the exchange and the hope of freezing the nuclear arms race at this point.

The question I should like to ask the Senator is this: The argument made against that point, which both Senators made and which I made yesterday, is that suppose the people who argue that way may be correct. It may very well be that there is a great difference in risk between the two, but the Russians say that they do not care if we deploy or not. Therefore, they are not going to be inhibited by a consideration of whether we deploy or not. Therefore, the situation will be in the same position if we do not deploy.

I wish to ask this question. Is not the difficulty with that argument, "Sure, the Russians are being very conservative. They are operating the same way. They have their hands in the same cookie jar. Their leaders are doing exactly what we are doing."

Somebody has to have the enterprise to lift this whole operation above that mundane grocery store level—without any disrespect to grocery stores—but everybody is thinking the same thing: Arms under the sea bed.

I wonder if the Senator would care to comment.

Mr. PERCY. I am not a Soviet expert but I have talked with them as I have with our national leaders as to whether or not we have a mutuality of interest here. The best information I have is that the Soviet Union finds that when they are spending a high proportion of their gross national product on defense systems and strategic systems that they are feeling the effect. They have people who want more and more consumer goods. They have all these unmet needs such as housing, automobiles, or whatever it may be.

As they look at Eastern European countries, particularly the window on the West, and into Western Europe, they see great dissatisfaction on the part of the people if they are not provided what they have come to expect all these years.

They have a great mutuality of interest because they know if they continue the race we will have a greater offset because we have a greater capacity to produce. They can simply appropriate the money without having the matter debated in Congress, but they do know they have to fulfill the promises they have been making to the people for some time. They have a great community of interest.

We could offset each other by the actions we take and continue the race and build and build and build; but I cannot feel any safer with all the weapons we have built in the last 10 years than I did 20 years ago. In fact, the reign of terror is substantially greater. I think it is time we deescalated. However, someone always says, "Let us try this new system we have. We have an ABM that we would like to produce. We have a MIRV that we would like to produce." Then, the other side will say, "We have another system we would like to produce." When is this race going to end?

Mr. JAVITS. Never.

Mr. PERCY. The time is now. There is a great mutuality of interest. As I listened several days ago to the distinguished Senator from Washington, (Mr. JACKSON), I was afraid when he was speaking that he was really leading up to saying, "You cannot trust the Russians and, therefore, do not negotiate." I was exceedingly pleased at the end of his analysis when he said, "Of course, I want negotiations; we all want negotiations."

I was very interested yesterday in listening to one of the proponents for the deployment of the ABM, the distinguished Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN), a revered and respected colleague. I have now read every word of his statement because I have tremendous respect for him. Both of us serve on the Joint Economic Committee. He said:

> The most compelling need of the present times is to stop this devastating nuclear arms race. This is a long, hard road—but like any long journey, it must start with a single first step. That first step is serious negotiation by the principals at the bargaining table. Whether steps to deploy a Safeguard ABM system would advance or retard negotiations is again a matter about which the experts disagree. Frankly, I do not know. The President thinks we need the start that this bill gives us and he thinks we need it now. He thinks we are protecting valuable leadtime should negotiations fail. Personally, I might be willing to take that "risk for peace" which proponents endorse.

I repeat once again that the safety of this country depends on two things: our capacity to retaliate against anyone who deals a first strike, and our willingness to use that capacity and strike if we have ever been struck. Let the Russians or the Chinese never doubt that we have the capability—no matter what they throw at us—to devastate them and that we have the will to do it should they dare strike against us. With that sufficiency on our part and, I presume, a sufficiency on their part, is not today the day to say, as the Senator from Washington and others have said, that we have a basis for agreement?

Mr. JAVITS. I agree and the way to do it is to say that we propose to move in view of the proven fact it does not jeopardize our security.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Illinois for a very thoughtful discourse today and to note that his discourse is based not only on his long experience in business affairs and his experience as a Member of the Senate, but it is also based on the experience he has had as an industrialist and businessman in a highly technical industry which has given him insight into this very difficult and complex situation, which is denied a great many of us. I appreciate the leadership he has

XUM

taken and the time he has taken today to wrestle further with this very difficult problem.

In the last few minutes there has been reference by our good friend, the Senator from California, and in the quotation which the Senator from Illinois just read from yesterday's debate with respect to the role Congress should play in this matter. The Senator from California—and I regret he has temporarily left the Chamber—said the primary responsibility lies with the President to make these determinations; that the President spends many sleepless nights.

I think we all appreciate the tremendous burdens that rest on the President in matters which relate to national security. I do not think anybody in any way can diminish the role of the President as Commander in Chief of the armed services and in connection with the security of the United States. I do not think anybody in any way wants to pretend that this tremendous burden is not one that is very heavy for any man to bear.

However, this is the point at which not only do we have to be clear ourselves but I think also the country has to be clear. I was at a meeting last night, and I think it is all too easy for people to fall into the frame of mind that if the President wants it it is automatic that it has to be that way.

That is not the way the Constitution says it. In article I of the Constitution, section 8, it states that the Congress shall have the power to provide for the common defense. As if to underscore this power of the Congress and the discretion vested in Congress, the same section further provides that Congress shall declare war and do various other acts in relation to the armed services.

I do not say this in derogation of the President's powers in this area, but merely to emphasize that we have a role to play here, which is not to rubberstamp, not merely either to approve or veto, but to make a subjective judgment.

That is what the Senator from Illinois, I think, has done. He has made a subjective judgment which weighs not just the mere question of cost, but the question of the desirable course of action, what the effect of that course of action will be, does it actually increase the security of the Nation, or could, in fact, a given course of action decrease the security of the Nation?

That is our job. It is not a job that any member of the executive branch, be he President, Secretary of Defense, or a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or anyone else, can do for us. It is our job.

The Senator from Illinois, I think, has illustrated the intelligent way to go about that job.

Mr. PERCY. Would the distinguished Senator from Maryland, who has served in the other body and now in the Senate, give me the benefit of his judgment on an answer that might be given to those who merely say that the President wants this, he has said it is in the national interest, and in the interest of national security that we have it, and therefore we have an obligation to vote for it?

This has been said not only in this Chamber many times but also by many of our constituents, by the newspapers in our home States, and certainly in some very, very tough letters I have received.

If this principle had not been followed at another time, we might have questioned the decision of two Presidents which took us into a land war in Asia, something that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General MacArthur, and other military authorities have said above all else we must avoid. Would it not have been far better for this country if Congress had been able to stand up and prevent that action from carrying us from an advisory role to a fighting role and putting the whole interests of Presidents of this country on the line in a guerrilla-type war 11,000 miles away? Would not our national security have been better off if Congress had resisted two Presidents of the United States in the decisions that they made, decisions which were made in utter honesty, with complete devotion to the country, and patriotically, feeling that what they were doing was in the national interest?

Today, would not Congress, looking back, and would not the country, looking back, say that Congress somehow, should have prevented those decisions from being made as they were made?

Mr. MATHIAS. The very best answer I can give to the Senator is to refer to the vote which was taken in the Senate a few weeks ago on the national commitments resolution. A great majority of Senators who voted on that resolution—and a great majority of Senators voted for it—were Members of either one House or the other of the Congress during the tragic period in which we became more and more deeply involved in Vietnam. Out of the bitterness of that experience, we rolled up the kind of majority behind that national commitments resolution which is now a part of the history of the Senate.

Mr. PERCY. Although I realize my distinguished colleague was in the House last year, and not in the Senate during the debate on the Sentinel system—and I voted against deployment of the Sentinel system—the argument was used in this Chamber, by editorial writers, and by constituents writing to me, "How can you possibly vote against the deployment of an ABM system when the President of the United States has said it is necessary in the national interest?"

At that time, I, together with some of my colleagues, declared that we were voting against it in conscience because we felt it was wasteful, that it would not do the job it was presumed to do, and that it could not defend the cities. We felt we must not lead the country to believe that the cities would be protected once we dragged in the bombs and put them around the cities, for it would escalate the nuclear arms race because it was provocative.

What does one do then, when we say the policy is to support the President, when the next President that came in said that in the national interest we would not deploy the Sentinel system? In this instance, I think President Nixon was absolutely right. One of the great decisions he has made was to take away the potential for the deployment of a thick system which he himself, by word and implication, said was wasteful and could not accomplish what it was pledged to do. He himself said it would be provocative and would call forth retaliation from the Soviet Union, just as we responded when we thought they were building an effective ABM system.

So that I hope we never hear this argument again on this floor, that we must vote for something merely because the President in his judgment says it is in the national interest. I simply could not feel, in principle, that that should be the principle that governs us. If each of us is governed by conscience and what we think is right, we have a deep responsibility to create and form our own judgment because we are a totally separate and distinct branch of Government.

Mr. MATHIAS. The Senator is absolutely correct. As a Member of the other body last year, the same question was before the House, whether to deploy the Sentinel system. I voted against it last year. I do not believe that we are yet at the point that we should deploy.

However, how easy our job would be, easy to the point of being superfluous, if all we had to do was accept the President's recommendations. In fact, I venture to say to the Senator from Illinois that neither he nor I should be here. If that is the way Congress has to act, I do not believe any of us should be here.

This is a duty of conscience as well as of judgment. As the Senator from California said, the President undoubtedly has spent many sleepless nights considering this question. I think that all of us have devoted a great deal of thought and conscience to it.

As I have said before in the Senate, I walked through the atomic ashes of Nagasaki and Hiroshima less than 30 days after both bombs had been dropped. Thus, I know what happens when atomic or nuclear devices fall upon a city, because I have seen the results. If one needs anything to stimulate his conscience, just have that experience.

I know that this body is not only discharging the duty which is provided for it in the Constitution, but it is also discharging the duty which every one of us is called upon by our consciences to perform. That is why I am extremely grateful for the manner in which the Senator from Illinois is conducting this debate this afternoon.

Mr. PERCY. I thank my distinguished colleague very much.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS).

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding to me. I commend him for his closely reasoned and well put together speech in which he stated his points with clarity and in a challenging way.

I think he is really contributing to this debate, although I think his contribution is on the wrong side; but still it is a contribution, and I am glad to salute him.

Let me ask the Senator this question. Virtually all of us here have agreed that there should be a continuation of the research and development program as to the ABM; that it is not only desirable, but necessary. Is that correct? That is the Senator's position, anyway, and I do not know of any dissent from it.

Mr. PERCY. Absolutely. I think that should be clarified once and for all, because in oversimplifying the reporting of the debate, some newspapers and news media have called us pro-ABM and anti-ABM. I do not know of anyone who is anti-ABM or against our having the capability and capacity to deploy, if needed, the finest, the best ABM system that we know how to put together. It is a question of whether we are ready for deployment and do we have to go into deployment now, on the eve of negotiations?

Mr. STENNIS. I think there is unanimity on the part of all of us about the need for continued research and development, which recognizes that there is a problem here that must be contended with.

Mr. PERCY. And evaluation and testing.

Mr. STENNIS. Some Senators have agreed—and I understand the Senator from Illinois has said—that sometime later we may have to have an ABM system. That was one of the points the Senator made. Is that correct?

Mr. PERCY. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. So all Senators, then, including the Senator from Illinois, recognize by those positions that there is a threat confronting us, and that we should not just be dilatory; we should be moving to some degree in trying to face that threat.

Mr. PERCY. There is a potential threat, without any question whatsoever. We must guard ourselves against that threat and have the capability for meeting it.

Mr. STENNIS. And try, with the limitations the Senator puts on it, to be able to meet it.

That brings the Senator to the field, then, that his only limitation on the ABM is its deployment and advance testing. That is what the Senator objects to primarily, so far as the weapons are concerned?

Mr. PERCY. I have one other departure, which I should like to make clear, in which I differ with Senators who have opposed deployment. I simply feel that we should give the Department of Defense a little extra leeway. I have to look at it as a man who has spent his entire life in industry. If we cannot reach agreement, if these talks fail, and if we are convinced that we have a system that is reasonably invulnerable and can be deployed and can be truly effective and a deterrent for our second-strike capability, I want to be sure we minimize the loss of time and that we complete the design.

So I would be willing to include as a part of the $345 million in the bill—this is not a military spending attack; this is not a charge against the military industrial complex; this is a judgment of whether we should go ahead—a provision to authorize the production of certain long leadtime component parts which take considerably longer than other parts in that design. So these funds would be used not only to perfect the design, but even to take the risk that we might throw away these parts and never use them, but to get the production lines going on those parts that are most difficult to complete.

I would be glad to illustrate, if it is necessary, what I mean by that modification.

Mr. STENNIS. To describe the long leadtime items, does the Senator mean?

Mr. PERCY. The type of components and parts which I have in mind.

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator wishes to, now would be a good time to do it. It would be well to do it, if it is not classified.

Mr. PERCY. It certainly would not be classified. This is simply a principle. Rather than take the ABM system, which is highly complex, which is composed of computers, radars, missiles, and so forth, let me take an illustration of something which is simpler, but serves the purpose.

Suppose we decide now, with the interest in outer space, to develop, and take the great deal of time needed to develop, a far-out-reach telescope which would permit us to see into the universe much more than we can now discern. The design of a telescope, which we have never put together, has been completed. We have never built it. In fact, it is in the same state of the art as the ABM system is today. We have tested certain parts of it, but not the whole. Say we need 100 of them deployed around the world. Do we go to the deployment of all 100, or do we complete one and build it and test it functionally before we build any parts?

My compromise or suggestion is that what we do is go ahead with our evaluation and testing and build one model and make sure it works, but at the same time we test the parts in the telescope. It would have metal, cylinders, springs, washers, all sorts of retaining rings, and glass components. Some would be simple glass components and some would have deep curves which would be difficult to grind and which would require hand honing. Some of these take years to build, just as parts of the ABM do.

I would be quite willing to authorize the production of those components of the optical system that will take perhaps twice as long as all the other components. If we started grinding 100 sets of the glass and we went ahead with the deployment, we would not have lost a bit of time, because all the other parts of the components could be completed before we completed the long lead-time parts. If we decided they would not work, or perhaps there was some other national priority and we decided not to build the 100 telescopes, then we would have to throw away the lenses that had been made, and we would have thrown away only one or two percent of the cost of the total component parts.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

The Senator recognizes the potential threat, as he calls it, and that something ought to be done about it toward preparation to meet it. So the Senator's objection really goes to that part of the bill which is in the field of diplomacy or international political situations. At least, that is the major part of it. That is where the President comes in. I am one of those who have said that the President's position is entitled to a great deal of consideration. No one stands stronger than I for the legislative branch, the Congress, in making its judgments, and that is a direct mandate in the Constitution, which we have to make here. But is not the President, whoever he may be, probably the best judge of what he needs to take to the negotiating table with him? That is my point. After all is said and done, this is not a matter of opinion; it is a matter of judgment; it is a matter of projecting into the future. It pertains to weapons. After all is said and done, is not the Chief Executive's opinion of what he needs to represent us entitled to a great deal of weight and the most worthy consideration?

Mr. PERCY. I think it is due a great deal of weight. If I may be somewhat partisan, I would say, on the part of a Republican who respects the President and has worked with him over the years, to know I am opposing a man whose judgment I respect so much has given me great cause for sleepless nights. But I also know that, in the end, the President, in this particular instance, though his opinion should be given more weight than anyone else's, is not infallible.

I would like simply to illustrate that by citing the judgment of another President, Lyndon Johnson, who took the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff when they said the only way to bring about negotiations was to bomb in the north.

There were many people who believed that for a long time. I did for a long time. I took a position opposite the position of some of my colleagues in my class in the Senate, on national television, opposing the cessation of bombing at that time.

But over a period of months, after many, many deaths, and after agonizing reappraisals, I finally came to the conclusion that the only way to bring about negotiations would be to cease the bombing; and the President of the United States himself rejected his former judgment, he ceased the bombing, and the negotiations in Paris began.

It is another question as to how to make the negotiations successful. But in that case, I could not simply say the President's judgment was infallible and I should not exercise my own conscience and judgment. I did in that case, and I am doing the same thing in this case.

Mr. STENNIS. I do not object to the Senator's exercising his judgment. My point is a good deal farther down the line than that, and, with all deference to the Senator, the bombing, stopping the bombing and starting it, were matters involving an act of war itself, an act of a shooting war going on, where men were dying by the hundreds every day, and we had committed, at that time, close to a

XUM

half million men before the bombing ever started.

With all deference, I do not think the Senator's analogy will hold up. Here we have involved diplomatic relationships at a negotiating table, involving the question of limitation of arms, and so forth. The President of the Unitel States, who is our chosen representative—it makes no difference about party, as the Senator says—needs this weapon at that table, as well as for a part of our national arsenal. I think that if we just withdraw that, or hold back, and say, "You shall not have it, now run along and represent us at this international table," we are cutting the rug out from under him, and will be doing a great injury. I know others think otherwise, and I respect their opinions.

I am confident that ultimately this proposal will prevail. No one can be certain, no one has an absolute answer, no one knows what will be the conditions in 1975.

I conclude by saying again, I think the Senator has put together a mighty good, cogent piece of reasoning here, and I commend him for it. I can tell from the tone of his voice that he is concerned about this matter, and wants to go just as far as he possibly can without supporting the ABM as it is in the bill.

I think the President of the United States did not want to go any farther than he thought was necessary. He has always trimmed these matters down, and, while I do not like to use the word "compromise," he has been very reasonable about it; and I think this is a minimum.

I do not see how anyone can condemn him for changing from the Sentinel to the Safeguard ABM when he did it all in one sentence. Even if his judgment was bad in part, I do not see how it can be upheld in one part and condemned in another. It was his judgment, and a very courageous judgment, too, because the simple thing would have been to say, "Well, in view of all the other troubles we have, let this one go." But he did not do that, and I commend him for taking his stand.

I thank the Senator very much for yielding.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I am very grateful for the Senator's generous and gracious comments, and would like to simply state for the record the deep gratitude that I think this country should have for the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Armed Services. In the past, when the Department of Defense urged deploying Nike-Zeus and Nike-X, Congress had to have an independent judgment in those cases, and the President had to have an independent judgment. President Eisenhower decided not to go ahead; President Kennedy decided not to go ahead; and, if my recollection is correct, though I was not in Congress at the time, I believe that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi was deeply concerned about committing this country to the deployment of a system that might possibly be obsolete before it was finished, that might not be—in the light of the cost-conscious economy and the state of the budget—worth the kind of money we would be putting into it, and technically might not be ready for production.

I think we were saved $20 billion to $40 billion by the Senator's judgment and by his patience. I know that he feels that today conditions are such that it is wise to go ahead. I do not feel that we are hurting the President's hand in negotiations simply because of the word "capability." We have talked about the Russian capability of destroying us many times over. I do not think there is a member of the Politburo who would ever question our capability to produce an ABM system, and a better system than they could ever produce. They have the utmost respect for our technical competence and for our scientific community. But I think they must have read, and certainly read carefully, all of the scientific testimony that we have had about the problems that are involved in this particular system at this particular time.

It has not been fully put to work. That is a statement of fact. It has not been fully tested; that is a statement of fact. It is nowhere near certain that it will provide the kind of deterrent protection that we think it will.

We have mentioned before on the floor of the Senate the vulnerability of the MSR. We know it would be a lot better, now that we are designing for point defense, to have multiplicity of radars and hardened radars. I am not permitted to mention, in open session, the vulnerability of that particular radar; but the Senator knows full well that the SS-9 would never have to be used to knock out that radar today.

A question that has never been raised on the floor of the Senate, to my recollection, and a point of interest to me as I have been trying to research this system, and determine where it is strong and where it is weak—and where it is weak is not from debating holes in it—by asking the Department of Defense what we are doing to strengthen that end of it, because I want us to have the ability to deploy the best system, if we ever need it. The power source alone gives me pause.

I ask the Senator if he would be satisfied with the power source, which today depends on commercial power. We know ourselves, in the midst of a snowstorm—I was in New York City one time when the power went out, and we had to walk up and down all the stairs. We know that power blackouts occur just through natural phenomena, just from overloading, much less a few hydrogen bombs exploding around us.

Can we feel content and absolutely safe with a system using normal commercial power sources, and only shifting to hardened diesel generators if need be, or if as some member of the Department of Defense said, "The balloon goes up"?

We all know, and I know, having been in the military service 3 years, the degree of maintenance that is required for generators, and how to keep them in absolutely tiptop condition, you have to turn them over; and if we have 30 minutes' notice to turn them over, do we know that we would even have a power source to operate this vast complex of computers, radars, and all of the other paraphernalia required? I mention this, not as a debating point, but as a point that I am probing deeply now, to see what more we may need to strengthen and improve, test and evaluate the integrity of this system, so that, should we ever have to go into one, we will go into a good one.

I do not think the Russians are impressed one bit by our rushing into production today with a system that is as vulnerable as Safeguard is, and that offers as little protection to our second-strike forces as it would, considering the whole complex of second-strike forces we have available to us should we ever need them. We have them and would use them, and they had better not ever believe we would not.

Mr. STENNIS. I do not know whether they are impressed with our moonshot or not. We made pretty good headway, but we had to take that one step at a time, so we started early. I know we have to take this one step at a time also, and I think the bell is already ringing for us to make this much of a start, anyway, this year.

I thank the Senator again for yielding to me.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PERCY. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I simply wish to say to the Senator that, while I did not hear all of his talk, I did hear a good deal of his colloquy with the Senator from Maryland concerning the question of the President's requirements. I wish to emphasize a point that I think has been made by the Senator from Mississippi, and also the Senator from Illinois in his colloquy with the Senator from Mississippi, and that is: Because the President has said that in his opinion it is essential to national security, a great deal of weight should be given to that opinion.

Some talk has been reported in the Senate and in the newspapers that merely because the President suggests something, some Senator ought to oppose it automatically. I have heard it said over and over again that, "I am not going to be influenced by what the President's opinion is."

It strikes me that in this kind of a situation, what the President's opinion is and what the Soviet Union's opinion is would be very important to the security of our country. I think the Senator would agree with that.

Mr. PERCY. I would agree. Not only that, but within the last 30 minutes, I have indicated that this is what has caused me sleepless nights and deep concern and caused me to cast aside many projects that I wanted to work on so that I could go back and do research to make certain that my judgment was not wrong in this particular case.

I feel that the President's judgment and the judgment of the National Security Council should be given greater weight than any other single factor and should be taken into account. However, I point out that they have made decisions in the past that have been wrong.

They may be making decisions at present that are wrong. It is possible that they can make decisions in the future that will be wrong.

We have a totally separate responsibility to make our own judgment.

Mr. DOMINICK. I completely agree. As a matter of fact, some 4 years ago I started making speeches and pointing out the need for the Senate and the Congress as a whole to regain some more influence and exercise more judgment in the foreign relations field.

I totally agree with the Senator. The problem as I see it is that a lot of people do not understand this, and that, therefore, as an exercise in independent judgment, they automatically oppose what any President suggests, be he Republican or Democrat. I know that the Senator is not like that, but some others are.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, automatically, under either a Democratic or Republican President, I presume that the President for the most part is always acting in the national interest and that he at that stage is above purely partisan action. That is not to say that he is not partisan on occasion. However, when it comes to national security, I could not imagine and could not name any President who has ever been partisan in that respect.

I am naturally partisan in many matters. It is only with the deepest of misgivings that I take a position contrary to that of the President and the National Security Council.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, in connection with the decision concerning the position the country might be placed in if we do not go forward with the Safeguard system, it would seem to me, having listened to the arguments over a period of about 2½ or 3 weeks, that those who are against the Safeguard system are in fact relying on the offensive capability of our country to inflict a second strike in the middle 1970's.

If our land-based ICBM's that we now have deployed are in fact threatened, then the only position that those who do not want to put up the Safeguard system can take is to say, "We increase our offensive weapons, or we make a preventive strike."

I personally do not want to do either. I do not want to see the number of offensive weapons increased because it might create a real holocaust in the world.

I think, therefore, that when we deploy an ABM system which will defend our credibility, we are doing our best to protect the security of our country. We cannot then be increasing the number of offensive weapons. Does the Senator agree that there is logic in the argument?

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I think that there is, except for one point. I think the decision has already been made by the President and the National Security Council that we would not build an ABM system if the Soviet Union does not. So, that decision has been made. Secretary Rogers reiterates the position, as does the Department of Defense and the administration, backed up by every witness we have heard, that if they want to go ahead with an ABM system, we will go ahead with an ABM system. So, with relation to all of the talk about a Chinese strike and an accidental launch, or whatever it might be, there has been a thorough analysis and appraisal and a balance has been reached on the judgment that if the Soviets want to go out of the ABM business, we will go out of the ABM business.

I regard that as a very significant decision. And I assume that the distinguished Senator would support that decision of the President and the National Security Council and, in fact, advise—as does the distinguished Senator from Washington—talks getting underway to see if we can reach agreement.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is totally correct. I think in each instance that this has been said, it has also been added that they do not anticipate that the Soviet Union would leave itself wide open to an attack by the Chinese and that, therefore, they would retain a degree of their defensive capability in the ABM system, and that we should, too.

Mr. PERCY. Here I think we are coming into accord. This demonstrates that the proponents and the opponents are not really as far apart, if we clarify the matter, as we did with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

It is a question of whether we rush into production. I think we are together here, because I have said many times that if as a result of those negotiations, we both decide that it would be well to deploy an ABM system, I would be perfectly willing to go ahead and do so, because then that would not be provocative. That would not be escalating the nuclear arms race. We would be starting to work together in an area where we think we have a mutuality of interest, to stop the arms race.

I think that would be sensible. But let us wait and see. The President said, "Let us go ahead and get the talks under way by the end of this month."

I do not have any inside information as to what the Soviet Union is willing to do. Perhaps Ambassador Dobrynin is in Moscow now, seeing about the talks.

Let us get under way with the talks and see if they have any real basis for reaching agreement. If so, why should we rush into production at this particular point of an invulnerable ABM system?

Mr. DOMINICK. That is exactly the phrase, "rush into production," that I wanted to question the Senator on.

We are talking about $345.5 million today, because that is the only deployment phase involved. Included in that figure there is $600,000 for long leadtime missile components.

We do not have any actual procurement of the missiles involved. We do have the ability to test this system on a deployed basis if we go forward with the long leadtime items we are talking about.

This is not what I would call rushing into production on all the items, in the context that is usually taken. Is that not true?

Mr. PERCY. No; that is not true in the context in which I would say rushing into production. Certainly the distinguished Senator from Colorado has had a great deal of experience with the military. And I think I have, not only as an officer in charge of production control a quarter of a century ago in the Navy here in Washington, but also as a defense contractor for some 24 years, and a part of the industrial-military complex.

I am deeply impressed with the inertia of these things once they get going. I would like to reiterate one illustration of what it is like when we get into production and then try to stop it.

Mr. DOMINICK. We cut off the F-111B with no problem last year. We took $2 billion out of the pending bill with no problem.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I have seen and experienced this inertia and I feel that once we get the production lines geared up and going, we will have 1,000 reasons why we should not stop production.

There is psychologically quite a difference between not going into production on something and going into production on an item and then stopping production. If we try to stop production, there will be thousands of employees and thousands of contractors in 172 different congressional districts which are touched by the ABM.

I think it is exceedingly difficult. And as I have tried to point out before, I think that by going into production while we are still designing, we will lose time in the end. I think the best way to put an item into production is to put it into production after we have finished the research, design, evaluation, and testing. We can then put one together and know that it works.

Then we can go into production. But if we start to go into production on pieces, parts, components, and segments, and such things, and then rush the program through at the same time that change orders, modifications, research, design changes, and testing are being made, we will cause a great waste of money and a considerable waste of time.

Mr. DOMINICK. A philosopher has said that a long journey starts with but a single step. But that does not necessarily mean there must be a long journey every time one takes a single step.

Mr. COOK. My President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PERCY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOK. I should like to clear up one point with the distinguished Senator from Colorado. When we talk about improving our offensive capabilities and creating nuclear havoc throughout the world, we ought to make it clear that, as of now, this country—and obviously it is public knowledge—has 1,054 ICBM's. If we MRV them—and that means at least three nuclear warheads apiece—we will have 3,162. If we MIRV them, we can go as high as 10,540.

I should like the RECORD to show, so far as I am concerned, that if it is said we can create a nuclear holocaust by increasing our production of ICBM's, we already have the needed capability for producing a nuclear holocaust. We have enough nuclear warheads to destroy any enemy throughout the world. We have the capability to do that.

XUM

When the American people are given—and I am not saying that the Senator from Colorado has done so—the impression that if we improve our offensive capabilities and produce more, we are in fact putting this country in a position to cause nuclear havoc throughout the world, the people ought to know that the Nation indeed has that capability. I wanted to get this point into the RECORD.

Mr. PERCY. It is a very valid point.

I think the most important word that has been added to the defense vocabulary was added by President Nixon, who used the word "sufficiency." I feel that we have a sufficiency of second-strike capability as not to cause anyone, other than an utterly mad person, to push that button if they know that we have the capability and will to retaliate, as we certainly do have.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. PERCY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Following up on the point made by the Senator from Illinois, the Disarmament Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee asked a panel of distinguished scientists what would be the effect of a nuclear exchange with present weapons. His reply was that it would not only destroy the Soviet Union and the United States, but that it would also make the Western Hemisphere uninhabitable. So I think the question is whether we will make it uninhabitable or more uninhabitable.

I should like to return to a point the Senator from Illinois mentioned, which struck a chord in my memory. He spoke of first-strike and second-strike capabilities. Am I correct in saying that the Pentagon's definition of first strike is that it means one side can knock out the other side without any appreciable harm to the first side?

Mr. PERCY. That is correct; that the other side does not have the capacity to strike back.

Mr. PELL. Is it not to our advantage, basically, that the present balance of terror be retained? That means that neither side has the capacity for a first strike, but that both sides have the capacity for a second strike. That would be the best way of avoiding nuclear war. To my mind, nuclear war may come from an accident or because of automaticity of response. But it will not come because of a thoughtful decision to the effect taken either in the Kremlin or the White House.

Mr. PERCY. I think that would be my understanding.

Mr. PELL. So it would be best for both sides to avoid having a capacity for first strike. Along the same line, would it not be correct to say that when we examine our present arsenal and add to it the MIRV and the ABM, we will have a capacity for a first strike?

Mr. PERCY. I think the closer we get to that possibly the greater will be the fear on the other side. I am always concerned about someone who deals from fear.

Possibly the buildup by the Soviet Union is giving them the feeling that they can now afford to negotiate. Still, they also know what the buildup is costing them. They may feel that they now have such a sufficiency to retaliate against us that we will not need a first strike.

I was interested to probe whether there was fear in the Soviet Union that we might make the first strike. It is not possible to test these reactions accurately. I have not talked to any Soviets about it, but I have talked with persons from countries that deal with them. I was shocked to find that there is a considerable body of fear that we will use our weapons. That fear exists among allies and friends in neutral nations. So we can well imagine the fear the Soviet Union might have, because we have dropped the bomb, and we do have a tremendous capacity.

They have escalated, out of fear, to develop a second strike. I do not believe they have the capacity for a first strike. I think they are rational enough human beings to know what would hit them if they ever tried it, because they do not have first-strike capability, in my judgment.

I have heard it said that the Soviet Union is the only country to have a first-strike capability. If by that is meant that they have the capacity to hit us so hard that we cannot retaliate, I have no intelligence that would lead me to that conclusion.

The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He has heard the testimony of many persons and has the advantage of their views. I wonder if he would concur in that judgment.

Mr. PELL. I would. But I think that neither side has first-strike capability today.

Looking at the record, thinking of what has been said in the past, and thinking back to the time of Korea, when some serious leaders in the country discussed the possibility of using nuclear weapons, one can well imagine that the Soviet Union would become anxious and nervous, and that that would be the time when an accident could occur. Therefore, it seems to me that it would be wisest to concentrate on a policy of both sides having a second-strike capability, but neither having a capacity for a first strike. That argument seems to me to be pretty compelling.

Mr. PERCY. The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island has made a valuable contribution to the colloquy. I have not heard the point better expressed.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PERCY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas, a member of the Committee on Armed Services and a seatmate of mine.

Mr. TOWER. I think the Russian intelligence is probably very good. I am sure that as a result of their intelligence, they are aware that we do not have a first-strike policy. As to the institution of a first-strike policy, we are not so deployed as to be able to launch a first strike. I do not think any Senator would, under present circumstances, authorize a first-strike capability on our part.

The Senator from Texas, who is often regarded as a hawk, would certainly not support that notion. I think there are reasons to believe that the Soviets, though they may not now have the kind of first-strike capability that would cause them to launch a first strike against us with impunity, may be building in that direction. We should not think only in terms of the current situation, but in terms of what the conditions will be in the mid-1970's. That is what we are looking at—not the situation as of now, but the situation as it will be in the mid-1970's.

Mr. PERCY. I think that is the responsibility of the President, the Department of Defense, and the Committee on Armed Services.

Certainly, I know the distinguished Senator from Texas has been called a hawk and I have been called a dove. I am not an ornithologist. I do not know what those terms imply exactly. However, no one should imply that I would not be cognizant that our greatest security does lie in strength and in our will as a people to use that strength, and also in the degree of sacrifice we are willing to make to provide the defense establishment that will put us in a position where we will always have a second-strike capability against any adversary. I would say that I would adopt that as a policy.

Our only question relates to today, 1969. Do we need to take this action in connection with what I consider to be a vulnerable system, to go into production on something that has not been fully proved and tested?

If the Senator could take me to see a Safeguard system so that I might see a complete testing of that system—which I do not think is possible—I certainly would feel we should look at it in the context of what is happening, possibly, in 1975. However, our actions are too often geared to what we think they might possibly do, rather than to what we think they might rationally do.

In my judgment, in the judgment of one of my dearest friends who was Deputy Secretary of Defense in the Eisenhower administration and who was in that Department for 8 years, and in the judgment of many other distinguished and knowledgeable people, it is felt we do not need to deploy, nor should we deploy, the Safeguard system today to maintain a second-strike capability.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, those of us who are proponents of the ABM system—and that is, the whole bag of research, development, and deployment—are accused of proceeding on assumptions. I, in turn, have accused opponents of proceeding on assumptions. I am prepared to agree to a stipulation at this point that both sides are proceeding from assumptions. If all of us are honest with each other we can concede that. Certainly, we are making assumptions.

I think my side proceeds more on enlightened and educated assumptions. However, be that as it may, the fact is that if we are proceeding on assumptions, again we come back to what sounds like "old saw" around here and that is that in proceeding on assumptions, if we are going to err, let us err on the side of safety.

To return to testing and evaluation, those two words have been left out of the discussion too much. We talk too

XUM

much about research and development. However, there must necessarily follow, as night the day, testing and evaluation. The fact of the matter is that Admiral Rickover—and I have made reference to this quotation two or three times in this debate and will probably refer to it five or six times more—has said:

> You can go through all of the research and development and you can keep on researching and development; but eventually if you are going to determine whether or not the thing will work you are going to have to haul off and make one.

We feel that in a testing and evaluating situation it can proceed on a much more effective basis and provide much more knowledge in time and at much less cost over the long haul.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PERCY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I have one question in connection with one of the points raised by the Senator from Texas. I would agree with him that we do not have a first-strike policy. There is no question about that. However, would it not be a correct statement that successful MIRV plus successful ABM equals first-strike capability?

Mr. TOWER. I must say we could not develop a first-strike capability. I do not foresee that we will. At least, we will not be so arranged as to be able to implement a first-strike capability. We are treading on the narrow edge of classified ground here and I am a little hesistant to pursue it much beyond this point. I think it is an enlightened assumption but I think the assumption is that we will not have a first-strike policy.

Mr. PELL. I agree with the Senator that we do not have a first-strike policy.

Mr. TOWER. Indeed, we would not have unless Congress approved it and there will be no first-strike deployment without the knowledge of the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and this body.

Mr. PELL. I agree with the Senator, but I also wish to add a further thought. I do not wish to push this matter too far. I agree with the Senator's statement about the delicacy of the ground we are on. However, if both the ABM and the MIRV were a success, we would have the capacity, although certainly not the policy; and I think it is very dangerous in this world to even have the capacity.

Mr. TOWER. Even with MIRV, it depends on when there is deployment and whether it is aimed at missile sites or aimed at cities.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I think the colloquy this afternoon again has demonstrated the deep and strong feelings which we all have. We are trying to deal with the facts and we look at the facts in different ways.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. May I say that that is today's massive understatement.

Mr. PERCY. I believe we do have the second-strike capability. The Russians know it. Let them never be uncertain of the fact that we will continue to keep our capability so that if we are ever struck we will strike back.

With the program we have for not only hardening, but the deep-rock hardening of our missile silos, our ICBM's, the tremendous power we have in our nuclear submarine fleet, the capability we have to keep that capability ahead of anything the Soviets could throw against it, the thousands of intermediate missiles we have deployed in Europe, with all the hundreds of bombers available for takeoff in moments, armed with nuclear weapons, I cannot see that any attack would be made on us or would be made on us by anyone who was rational, or who would not recognize, those things being so, that they would bring forth their own total destruction.

I do not feel that the ABM Safeguard system adds one iota to our national security or our national interest. I think the forthcoming talks, on which we all agree, would get underway in a better atmosphere if we were not in production or going into production on another nuclear system, whether it is offensive or defensive in character.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROMOTION OF HEALTH AND SAFETY IN THE BUILDING TRADES AND CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 311, H.R. 10946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill H.R. 10946 to promote health and safety in the building trades and construction industry in all Federal and federally financed or federally assisted construction projects, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments, on page 2, line 3, after the word "or" strike out "contractor" and insert "mechanic"; in line 8, after the word "on" strike out "the record after an opportunity for an agency hearing." and insert "proceedings pursuant to section 553 of title 5, United States Code, provided that such proceedings include a hearing of the nature authorized by said section."; and in line 22, after "U.S.C." insert "38,".

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I reported H.R. 10946, Calendar No. 311, on July 15, 1969, with an accompanying report, No. 91–320). The act would require all construction contractors and subcontractors to meet health and safety standards on construction projects under contracts entered into under legislation subject to Reorganization Plan No. 14. Construction is a very hazardous occupation in terms of both the frequency of accidents and their severity. Data for 1966, from the National Safety Council, show that the construction industry had an accident frequency rate of 12.24 per million man-hours worked—a rate that was almost twice the all-industry rate of 6.91.

Department of Labor statistics, higher for most industries than those of the National Safety Council, show very high rates for construction, ranging from 20.7 per million man-hours worked for electrical work, to 24 for heavy construction, to 28.8 for general building, to 43.9 for roofing and sheet metal work.

Additional evidence of the hazardous nature of construction is found in the data which reflect the severity of injuries. The severity rates, indicating how badly workers are injured, place construction with a higher number of days lost to accidents per million man-hours worked than any industry except mining, lumber, and marine transportation.

Put another way, the men who risk their lives erecting the buildings that house the Government of this country, who build our roads and bridges, our State universities and hospitals, these workers do not have the benefits of protective legislation. There are no requirements that safe and healthful working conditions prevail for them. This bill corrects this inequity.

I wish to make some observations concerning due process as part of the legislative history of this bill.

Section 107(d)(3) provides that any person aggrieved by the Secretary's action under subsections (b) or (d) may obtain judicial review. This section is designed to assure complete judicial safeguards for contractors and subcontractors who are aggrieved by actions of the Secretary of Labor.

Other elements of the bill are designed to insure due process in enforcement. For example, the Secretary, under section 107(b), can only determine noncompliance after a formal agency hearing. So too, is a formal agency hearing required prior to the Secretary's determinations under section 108(d)(1).

Mr. President, the report of the committee should be corrected as follows:

First. On page 7, line 5 of section 107(a): delete the word "owrk" and insert in lieu thereof "work".

Second. On page 7, line 8 of section 107(a): delete "," after the word "health".

Third. On page 7, line 9 of section 107(b) after the word "section" insert "after an opportunity for an adjudicatory hearing by the Secretary".

Fourth. On page 7, line 14 of section 107(b) delete the words "a violation" and insert in lieu thereof "noncompliance".

Fifth. On page 7, line 14 of section 107(b) after the word "Secretary" insert "after an opportunity for an adjudicatory hearing by the Secretary".

Sixth. On page 8, line 1 of section 107(d)(3): delete "paragraph" and insert in lieu thereof "subsections".

Seventh. On page 8, line 2 of section 107(d)(3): delete "(1)" and insert in lieu thereof "(b) or (d)".

XUM

Eighth. On page 8, lines 9 and 10 of section 107(d)(3) delete "jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or to set it aside," and insert in lieu thereof "power to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part, the order of the Secretary or the appropriate Government agency."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to speak in support of H.R. 10946, the construction industry safety bill reported from our Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

This legislation is long overdue, as it will provide protection for employees in one of our most hazardous industries who have not been covered by any Federal legislation in the past.

We are also finally recognizing that the Federal Government has a special responsibility toward construction employees who work under contracts entered into by the Federal Government.

This, I repeat, is a good bill and one which has been worked out over a substantial period of time by the members of our committee and the committee staff. I am glad to say that the bill which is now before the Senate not only is strongly supported by the building trades unions, but also that it is not opposed by the contractors or other segments of the business community.

It would not be fair to conclude my remarks without referring to the one person who has probably done more over the years to get this type of legislation enacted than any other. That, of course, is Walter Mason of the Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO.

Walter is a good friend of mine, and while we do not always see eye to eye, he is a man of unquestioned honesty and integrity. I commend Mr. Mason for his persistency and unfailing zeal in his longtime effort to obtain satisfactory safety legislation for the construction industry, which is being culminated in the enactment of this measure today.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it is a great pleasure to rise in support of H.R. 10946, the Construction Safety Act. Too long have we tolerated needless waste of human life while on the job. Too long have we been insensitive to the hardships imposed on worker's families when the breadwinner in needlessly injured. Today, the first step toward the elimination of this waste is being taken when the Senate passes this legislation. It will protect construction workers while employed on Federal and federally assisted projects and require the setting and enforcement of occupational safety standards.

I am very proud of my committee. They reported this bill to the Senate without a dissenting vote. And I have faith that the Senate will agree with the committee's report. In the future I hope they will be as favorably inclined to a general occupational health and safety bill.

Last year, when I was chairman of the Labor Subcommittee, I held extensive hearings on a bill which would have protected all workers employed in interstate commerce. We did not pass that bill last year; however, I am sure that hearings will again be held this year.

Too long have we tolerated a waste of human life and capacity resulting from occupational accidents and disease. This past year's total of deaths reached approximately 15,000 and disabling injuries reached the 2 million mark. The direct and indirect effect of industrial accidents on the "gross national product" was a loss of $6.8 billion. In 1965, $1.8 billion was paid in workmen's compensation.

The construction industry has had one of the highest industry accident rates. Today, we are starting on the path toward greater safety. I hope that this is only the first step toward better health and safer life both on and off the job for all our citizens.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-320), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKGROUND

Of the three major Government contractors—suppliers, service contractors, and construction contractors—all but construction contracting is covered by protective legislation. Suppliers are covered by the Walsh-Healey Act of 1936, which requires that the prevailing wage be paid, and that work be conducted under safe and healthful working conditions. The other major Government contractors are service contractors, and their employees are similarly covered under the McNamara-O'Hara Service Contracts Act, which requires that the prevailing wage be paid, and that the workers be accorded healthy and safe working conditions.

But the final component of Government contractors, the construction workers, are covered only by the Davis-Bacon Act provisions that require payment of the prevailing wage. There are no requirements that safe and healthful working conditions also prevail.

This bill corrects the exclusion of the construction workers from this legislative pattern.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

It is the purpose of H.R. 10946, to promote health and safety standards in the construction industry, to rectify the serious oversight in existing Federal statutes which presently only provide safety standards to protect workers in supply and service industries under Federal contract, and to correct these problems by authorizing the Secretary of Labor to set standards which contractors and subcontractors would be required to meet on Federal, federally financed, or federally assisted construction.

Construction is a very hazardous occupation in terms of both the frequency of accidents and their severity. Data for 1966, from the National Safety Council, show that the construction industry had an accident frequency rate of 12.24 per million man-hours worked—a rate that was almost twice the all-industry rate of 6.91.

Department of Labor statistics, higher for most industries than those of the National Safety Council, show very high rates for construction, ranging from 20.7 per million man-hours worked for electrical work to 24.0 for heavy construction, to 28.8 for general building, to 43.9 for roofing and sheet metal work.

Additional evidence of the hazardous nature of construction is found in the data which reflect the severity of injuries. The severity rates, indicating how badly workers are injured, place construction with a higher number of days lost to accidents per million man-hours worked than any other industry, except mining, lumber, and marine transportation.

According to the National Safety Council and the Bureau of Labor Statistics, over 20 percent of the workers killed yearly and over 11 percent of the workers disabled in on-the-job accidents are in the construction industry.

The 2,800 construction workers killed on the job in 1968 represents the highest death rate for an industry in the United States.

Since 1959 there has never been less than 2,300 workers killed per year.

Since 1959 there has never been less than 209,000 construction workers disabled per year.

The construction industry includes 4 million workers and another 20 million workers depend on this industry—one-third of the Nation's work force. The annual economic dollar value of this industry is 10 percent of the gross national product—or $91 billion. Work accidents will cost approximately $3 billion in 1969.

Despite the magnitude of the problem, both in terms of money lost to the economy through on-the-job accidents and in terms of human suffering, there exists today no nationally accepted set of standards concerning safety in construction, nor does the Federal Government have the authority to promulgate or enforce uniform standards on construction contracts. At the same time, many existing State safety laws do not adequately protect workers.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 318, Senate Resolution 212, and that all measures on the calendar subsequent thereto be considered in sequence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS TO EXPEND ADDITIONAL FUNDS FROM THE CONTINGENT FUND OF THE SENATE

The resolution (S. Res. 212) authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to expend additional funds from the contingent fund of the Senate was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 212

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Ninety-first Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

XUM

INCREASE IN THE LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The resolution (S. Res. 213) increasing the limit of expenditures for hearings before the Committee on Armed Services was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 213

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Ninety-first Congress, $20,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE HEARINGS ON THE UTILITY CONSUMERS' COUNSEL ACT OF 1969

The resolution (S. Res. 215) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on the Utility Consumers' Council Act of 1969 was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 215

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations one thousand additional copies of part one of the hearings before its Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations during the Ninety-first Congress, first session, on the Utility Consumers' Counsel Act of 1969.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–329), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 215 would authorize the printing for the use of the Committee on Government Operations of 1,000 additional copies of part 1 of the hearings before its Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations during the 91st Congress, first session, on the Utility Consumers' Counsel Act of 1969.

The printing-cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows:

Printing-cost estimate

Back to press, 1,000 copies	$1,135.95

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART 18 OF SENATE HEARINGS ON RIOTS, CIVIL AND CRIMINAL DISORDERS

The resolution (S. Res. 218) authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 18 of Senate hearings on Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 218

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations two thousand additional copies of part 18 of the hearings before its Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations during the Ninety-first Congress, first session, entitled "Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders".

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–330), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 218 would authorize the printing for the use of the Committee on Government Operations of 2,000 additional copies of part 18 of the hearings before its Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations during the 91st Congress, first session, entitled "Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders."

The printing cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows:

Printing-cost estimate

2,000 additional copies	$1,200

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART 17 OF SENATE HEARINGS ON "RIOTS, CIVIL AND CRIMINAL DISORDERS"

The resolution (S. Res. 219) authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 17 of Senate hearings on "Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 219

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations two thousand additional copies of part 17 of the hearings before its Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations during the Ninety-first Congress, first session, entitled "Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–331), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 219 would authorize the printing for the use of the Committee on Government Operations of 2,000 additional copies of part 17 of the hearings before its Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations during the 91st Congress, first session, entitled "Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders."

The printing-cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows:

Printing-cost estimate

2,000 additional copies	$700

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO EXPEND ADDITIONAL FUNDS FROM THE CONTINGENT FUND OF THE SENATE

The resolution (S. Res. 220) authorizing the Committee on the District of Columbia to expend additional funds from the contingent fund of the Senate was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 220

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Ninety-first Congress, $5,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

ERMA POPE CURRY

The resolution (S. Res. 222) to pay a gratuity to Erma Pope Curry was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 222

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Erma Pope Curry, widow of James G. Curry, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to eleven months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

SUBVERSIVE INFLUENCES IN RIOTS, LOOTING, AND BURNING

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 208) authorizing the printing of additional copies of parts 1, 2, and 3 of the publication entitled "Subversive Influences in Riots, Looting, and Burning" was considered and agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–332), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 208 would provide that there be printed for the use of the House Committee on Internal Security 3,000 additional copies each of parts 1, 2, and 3 of its hearings of the 90th Congress entitled "Subversive Influences in Riots, Looting, and Burning."

THE ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF PUBLIC EXPENDITURES: THE PPB SYSTEM

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 209) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print "The Analysis and Evaluation of Public Expenditures: The PPB System" was considered and agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–333), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 209 would provide that there be printed for the use of the Joint Economic Committee 5,000 additional copies of volumes 1, 2, and 3 of its joint committee print of the 91st Congress, first session, entitled "The Analysis and Evaluation of Public Expenditures: The PPB System."

The printing-cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows:

Printing-cost estimate

Volume 1:	
Back to press, first 1,000 copies	$3,473.71
4,000 additional copies, at $1,186.52 per thousand	4,746.08
Total estimated cost, volume 1	8,220.79

Printing-cost estimate—Continued

Volume 2:	
Back to press, first 1,000 copies	$1,165.44
4,000 additional copies, at $336.33 per thousand	1,345.32
Total estimated cost, volume 2	2,510.76

PRINTING OF INAUGURAL ADDRESSES

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 291) to provide for the printing of inaugural addresses from President George Washington to President Richard M. Nixon was considered and agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–334), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 291 would provide that a collection of inaugural addresses, from President George Washington to President Richard M. Nixon, compiled from research volumes and State papers by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, be printed with illustrations as a House document; and that 16,125 additional copies of such document be printed, of which 10,975 copies would be for the use of the House of Representatives (25 per Member), and 5,150 copies for the use of the Senate (50 per Member). The copies of the document would be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of 60 days, after which the unused balances would be distributed by the respective Senate and House document rooms.

House Concurrent Resolution 291 would also authorize the printing of President Nixon's inaugural address as a separate pamphlet, in such quantity needed to serve as inserts for the existing number of copies of the former edition (through President Johnson) still available for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

My BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LATEST AMERICAN CASUALTIES IN VIETNAM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have been making weekly inquiries as to the number of casualties we are suffering in Vietnam.

The Department of Defense reports that for the week ending July 19, 1969, we suffered 182 killed by hostile action, 39 killed by nonhostile action, and 1,405 wounded, making a total of 1,626 casualties last week.

This brings the total of casualties suffered in Vietnam since the inauguration of President Nixon to in excess of 51,000.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, under the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 25, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"IMPOSSIBLE" MOON LANDING A VICTORY FOR MIDDLE AMERICA

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, since all men of good will are so happy, so pleased, and so grateful for the successful conclusion of "the impossible achievement, the unimaginable voyage to the face of the moon," and the magnificent return to earth, a column by William S. White, in the Washington Post of July 24, 1969, is particularly appropriate.

The column follows and I hope it is read not only in America, but all around this world:

"IMPOSSIBLE" MOON LANDING A VICTORY FOR MIDDLE AMERICA

(By William S. White)

The impossible achievement, the unimaginable voyage to the face of the moon, offers this country the opportunity for a far better and far less abrasive life here on this earth if only the human implications can be grasped amidst the technological vastness of it all.

For not the least of the lessons of these unique days in the story of the human race is the profound proof that the heart of the Nation is still strong and sound and that at the end it is the quiet, undemanding competence and talents of simple and unaggressive Americans, and not really the petulant posturings of a self-nominated "intellectual elite," that express the real America.

Neil Armstrong came from a middle-class family in a middle-American town in Ohio and never knew that he was "alienated" from his family, has region, or even his flag. A strange sort of fellow for a thinking type—he fought without complaint in Korea. He spoke without "glamour" or "style" and even with a certain common touch.

Edwin Aldrin went aloft quite unashamed that he was taking along with him a Presbyterian communion. Mike Collins, in the hovering Columbia, was content to talk language far removed from the more ivied cant of our more ivied halls of learning, and even further removed from pretense and preciousness.

So removed, too, were all those fellows down there in Houston, whose doctorates of philosophy did not alter their casual humanity, their inherent good taste and their humility in the face of something approaching the infinite.

But, most of all, nobody involved in this mission of such unspeakable power and purpose and meaning felt it necessary to act with the arrogance of self-seeking, to press forward at all costs with the promotion of number one.

It was, come to think of it, a quiet vindication for many men who are very far from chic by the standards of the intellectual elite. One of these was a fellow called Lyndon Johnson, who not too long ago was driven from officer by this self-same new leftist new elite for lack of "style" and for persisting in designs so big and dangerous, like the moon search, as to be intolerable to minds so oddly pre-occupied with the small and the mean.

For it was Johnson, whatever his faults and shortcomings, who above all others made this adventure politically, administratively and financially possible, first as a Senator creating a space agency and later as Vice President and President. And another man called Richard Nixon was big enough to tell Johnson so, in a telephone call from the White House to that ranch in Texas.

Contributions scarcely less vital were made, too, by John Kennedy, who had the vision and the courage to go on while the new elite of his time was picking and carping and pointing to the undeniable, if also irrelevant, truth that there were still slums in this Nation.

So, too, of the third man here, Richard Nixon. Any one of these three harried Presidents could so easily and so safely have run away from this challenge of transcendental cost and risk and could have bought so much in quick and cheap popularity by bellowing that he was prudently "saving" billions and was ready to pour them all out in a great, benign flood to cure all ills and discontents in this Nation.

Indeed, for years here in Washington the shortest way to promotion and pay among the elite new leftists, short of being against the war in Vietnam, was to make epigrams at the expense of the space program, though not going quite so far as openly to obstruct it, lest it might after all really work.

So, finally, whose triumph was all this?

It was a triumph of doing men over merely talking men; of plain, outlander types who would never be acceptable in the ultra-liberal drawing rooms; of men out there in the hinterland who still believe there are such things as vital national interests and that it is not necessarily stupid to serve them.

Where, indeed, lives the authentic intellectual elite of this country? At least some of them must be said to live and work a good distance away, in every sense, from those ultra-liberal drawing rooms.

POST OFFICE REFORM BILL

HON. MARLOW W. COOK

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, I recently conducted a poll in my State to sample the feelings of my constituents in regard to the Post Office reform bill. The results of this survey might be of interest to Senators. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that my press release of July 11, 1969, in this regard be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST OFFICE REFORM BILL

Kentucky's U.S. Senator Marlow Cook today released the results of his poll on the president's proposed post office reforms. Cook said he received 3,700 replies to the 10,000 questionnaires mailed.

Of those answering 2,743 replied yes to the question "Do you favor President Nixon's policy of converting the Post Office Department to a public corporation?"

Cook said he decided to conduct the survey, which was a sampling of all areas of Kentucky, "because I had reached no final conclusions on the president's proposals and wanted to see how the people of Kentucky felt."

Several of those who returned the questionnaire refused to answer either of the two questions but just vote across the questions "let's forget about domestic affairs and get to work on getting our boys out of Vietnam."

The post office reform bill is in the House now and probably won't come to the Senate before August, the Senator said.

The full results of the poll follows:

Question 1: "Do you favor President Nixon's policy of taking politics out of the postal system?"

Number voting:	
Yes	2,743
No	435
Percentage:	
Yes	86.31
No.	13.69

Question 2: "Do you favor President Nixon's policy of converting the Post Office Department to a public corporation?"

Number voting:	
Yes	2,169
No	934
Percentage:	
Yes	69.90
No	30.10

Some of those who answered the questionnaire did not respond to both questions.

FIRST PRIORITY—RELEASE OF AMERICANS HELD BY VIETCONG AND NORTH VIETNAMESE

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, thousands of American families face the cruel uncertainties each day, not knowing whether sons, husbands, and fathers, missing and believed captives of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese, will ever return.

Recently I received a letter from the mother of one of these missing servicemen. She wrote:

> My son has been listed as missing in action since Oct. 17, 1967. We have never received any news of his condition other than he was seen parachuting from his disabled aircraft over North Vietnam, nor have we received any mail from him, so we do not know if he is alive or dead.

She adds:

> My son has a wife and four children, and when the children ask grandma when is daddy coming home, it just breaks my heart not to have the answer.

She closes with this appeal:

> Please urge the ones in authority in the Paris peace talks to make the release of these prisoners of war the highest priority. They cannot wait until after final political solutions in Vietnam are reached; to wait could mean the lives of these men.
>
> Please help in any way you can.

I understand that more than 1,300 of our men are missing in action and that many of these are believed captives of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese.

The release of Americans held by the Communists should be one of the first considerations in the negotiation of an agreement to end the Vietnam conflict.

GEN. SAMUEL C. PHILLIPS: MODEST HERO OF THE APOLLO PROGRAM

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, in all the annals of man's explorations, of all his voyages to territories unknown and to regions previously unseen, there is nothing to compare with the glory of this moment. The success of our astronauts in blazing a trail to the moon may well herald the dawn of an age of travel and growth as little dreamt of today as the industrial age was in the time of Christopher Columbus. From Marco Polo to Admiral Byrd, from Columbus to Lewis and Clark, from Magellan to Charles Lindbergh, intrepidity has always been the hallmark of the pioneer. We have seen that hallmark emblazoned on the heavens this past week by the Apollo team.

Unlike previous explorations, the moon landing involved more than solitary individuals. This enterprise represented the commitment of an entire Nation. There are countless men who were essential to the success of the mission, although they did not ride in the capsule itself. Foremost among these is Lt. Gen. Samuel C. Phillips, the director of the Apollo program and a native of Cheyenne. The quiet and effective leadership of this man was of primary importance in the long campaign to place a man on the moon and of the many who deserve the thanks of the Nation for this technological triumph, he is certainly one of the chief.

Sam Phillips has been a personal friend of mine and it gives me great pleasure to congratulate him on this occasion—at the triumphant conclusion of 5 years of ceaseless, untiring effort. To guide an operation so complex and so large is a job which few men could successfully undertake: Sam Phillips could and did.

He grew up in the vastness of Wyoming and when he left he took with him the straightforward manner and the methodical and diligent approach to duty which proved so important to the Apollo program. This was not the first task which General Phillips has done for his country, however.

During World War II he was a fighter pilot in the Army Air Corps. When the cold war set in, he worked with the various guided missile programs. In 1959 he was appointed director of the Minuteman program and proceeded so efficiently and quickly that in 1963 he was transferred to the manned space flight program. Within a year Phillips was the director of Apollo. Long before the tragic fire in 1967, he had seen the need to tighten up the program. Unfortunately, his recommendations went unheeded until too late.

The fire had a sobering effect and General Phillips revamped the program completely. The result of his efforts may be seen in the flawless conduct of all subsequent tests and flights.

Today as we extend our appreciation to the astronauts and all those who contributed to their achievement, we should single out General Phillips, for his was the central role. He is a self-effacing man and his name has never been in the limelight, but he has been there all along and we are grateful that he has. I would like to express my own thanks and congratulations and I am sure that the Congress and people of the United States would also.

Mr. Speaker, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Washington Post of July 18, 1969, and an editorial from the Wyoming State Tribune of July 11, 1969, commending General Phillips for a job well done.

[From the Washington Post, July 18, 1969]

HONESTY, DISTASTE FOR FANFARE MARK APOLLO PROGRAM CHIEF

(By Thomas O'Toole)

HOUSTON, July 17—If Samuel Cochran Phillips were 10 years younger he probably wouldn't be Apollo program director—he might be an astronaut on his way to the moon as an Apollo 11 crew member.

"If it flies, I can fly it," Phillips once said. "I like to think I can fly anything."

Sam Phillips wasn't boasting. In his quiet Western way, he was just telling it as he saw it, without fanfare and with complete honesty.

That is just the way he's been in his five years as top man in the Apollo program. No fanfare. Complete honesty, no matter how it might hurt.

The fire that killed three Apollo astronauts in 1967 hurt everybody in the program—but nobody more than Phillips.

"He took it personally," one of his aides said at the time. "I've never seen a man drive himself the way Sam did when the smoke cleared."

While he immersed himself in work, people heard little of him until Sen. Walter Mondale (D-Minn.) mentioned his name at a Senate space committee hearing on the fire.

Mondale asked NASA Administrator James

XUM

unanimous consent that this petition along with the names and addresses of the signers be printed in the Remarks.

There being no objection, the petition and list of names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Honorable RALPH YARBOROUGH:
The Honorable JOHN TOWER:

We the undersigned desire that you advocate and support the declaration of a National Holiday to recognize and celebrate man's first landing on the Moon. Surely no other exploratory effort in the history of mankind will have been as meaningful.

SIGNERS

Earl L. Chase, Pasadeana, Tex.
Frank H. Broz, Houston, Tex.
Myreta H. Buckholt, Pasadena, Tex.
Ron Kelley, Houston.
Mrs. Willie Thompson, Houston.
Mr. Frank S. Ware, Houston, Tex.
William A. Lankin, Houston, Tex.
James L. Kahlich, Houston, Tex.
Wesley T. Blackmon, Houston, Tex.
Floyd D. Dardar, Houston, Tex.
Bob Flack, Bellaire, Tex.
Deene Sullivan, Houston, Tex.
Shirley B. Cornelius, Pearland, Tex.
Donald R. Bartay, Houston, Tex.
Leroy W. Morgan, Houston, Tex.
Janet Pendleton, Houston, Tex.
Peggy P. Thomas, Houston, Tex.
James L. Goderay, Houston, Tex.

CATASTROPHE IN FUNDING: THE PARTNERS RENEGE

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege recently of serving on a panel with Dr. Norman Drachler, superintendent of schools in Detroit, Mich., during a conference held by the Education Commission of the States in Denver, Colo.

Dr. Drachler made some pertinent and interesting remarks on the problems of school funding. As superintendent of one of our Nation's largest big-city school districts, I think his statements will be of interest to my colleagues, and I take this opportunity to have Dr. Drachler's remarks printed in the RECORD:

CATASTROPHE IN FUNDING: THE PARTNERS RENEGE

(By Norman Drachler)

Financing or funding are disciplines in which most school superintendents cannot claim expertise—after all we've had such limited experience with funds. But as an educator facing a growing deficit for the third year in a row—I specialize in catastrophe! And, like some other superintendents have lost faith in our existing partnership.

Since 1950 the population of Detroit has declined by about 250,000 inhabitants while the public school enrollment has increased by nearly 60,000 students. During the past school year 14,702 students left our school system and 15,847 entered from all sections of the nation. After registration is completed in the fall, we go through each year a school mobility rate of about 40%, ranging from 2.7% in the most stable school to 117.8% in our most changing neighborhood. Detroit is a fiscally independent school district with nearly 300,000 students of whom about 170,000 live in areas eligible for Title I.

Last fall our voters rejected a request by the school board for additional millage—resulting in serious educational retrenchment—and growing unrest and discontent in the community. The last three millage elections have also had racial overtones. In areas where the enrollment is predominantly white, we lose—where the enrollment is over 75% Negro, we win. Due to the erosion of our city tax base—a school mill in 1968 brought in $700,000 less in school revenue than in 1960. Last year this amounted to a loss of $14 million.

Two years ago our state legislature allocated $200,000 for a study on school finance. It was completed in 1968, has not been acted upon and recently our Governor has appointed a commission to review educational needs for our state. In the meantime chaos in school finance prevails throughout the state.

Federal appropriations to Michigan schools have decreased by 10% since 1966—as elsewhere.

Ladies and gentlemen the partnership is not working! Politically the term *partnership* may sound attractive but realistically it has not worked effectively to meet our present needs.

John Gardner observed that the error of the mid-twentieth century was: ". . . to release aspirations without designing institutions responsive enough to satisfy these aspirations." And, Eric Hoffer reminds us that a people who "are discontented, yet not destitute" are most likely to plunge into an undertaking of vast change. Due to America's progress in public education, we have all the ingredients for massive discontent and change.

I conclude, therefore, somewhat regretfully, that the federal government must assume an over-all responsibility for public education. It is the only body that can tap our nation's human and financial resources capable of assessing and performing the task ahead. We simply do not have the time for 50 states to struggle with common challenge independently.

I am not worried about federal control. We are pragmatic people and with the transition of responsibility we can develop guidelines and processes which will result in much greater local influence than we have had in the past. Students of America stress that we have demonstrated in the past, a talent for preserving idealogic principles while devising pragmatic means to adjust to new conditions. We can do so again. Real partnerships can only be achieved when states approach one another as equals in quest of a common cause—and this can be achieved only through equal educational opportunity.

Instead of partners we must think of ourselves as one nation. A nation with a great deal of mobility—where boundaries cannot quarantine ignorance. A nation that realizes that no metropolitan area can survive or prosper if the central city, the heart of the metropolitan community is permitted to deteriorate or decay. A nation, to paraphrase a noted scholar,. may be likened to a tree, whose roots are planted in our federal constitution, and whose branches spread over the fifty states. A tree cannot flourish without roots. Yet, how can it bear fruit without branches? Let us be careful with our branches!

INDEPENDENCE DAY—THE MALDIVE ISLANDS

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, July 26, the Republic of the Maldive Islands will celebrate their fourth anniversary of independence. On this occasion I extend warm greetings to His Excellency Amir Ibrahim Nasir, President of the Republic; and His Excellency Abdul Sattar, Ambassador of the Maldive Islands to the United States.

Located about 400 miles southwest of Ceylon, the Maldives constitute 20 atolls, which cover about 1,087 islands—only 210 of which are inhabited—from Minicoy in the north to Addu island in the south.

The Maldives have a population of about 103,801 and an area of 115 square miles. The people are known for their kindness and generosity, and their virility.

Although the Maldives have no banks, doctors, libraries, or museums, the people are healthy in spirit and many of them are literate in Arabic. Not primarily industrial, the Maldives do maintain a flourishing dried fish industry, and coir making is important.

Since the Islamic conquest in 1153, there has been an unbroken line of 92 elected sultans. From 1759, sultans have been chosen from members of the Didi family. On November 11, 1968, another historic date, the Maldives ceased being an elective sultanate and became a Republic. On that date, Ibrahim Nasir was elected President.

We can only wish the best of luck to Mr. Nasir and his country in the future. The world, who is indebted to the Maldivians for the word "atoll," realizes that to live in peace and tranquillity like the Maldivians is sometimes all that a country can hope for.

MAN'S HISTORIC MOMENT

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the July 14, 1969, issue of Aviation Week contained an editorial by Robert Hotz discussing what has now become the successful Apollo 11 flight, Mr. Hotz' editorial cites many of the benefits being derived from our national space program and outlines well the feelings of all Americans on the occasion of this historic event. The editorial follows:

MAN'S HISTORIC MOMENT

(By Robert Hotz)

Man is poised for an historic moment in his long tenure on this earth. If all goes well on the Apollo 11 mission scheduled for launch from Cape Kennedy this week, the first men will set foot on a celestial body outside their own planet. Twice, within the last seven months, U.S. astronauts have rocketed to the moon in Apollo spacecraft and reconnoitered its surface from close range. Now two of the three Apollo 11 crewmen are scheduled to land and begin man's exploration of the moon.

In this final interval, before the dreams of Apollo are transformed into reality, some retrospect may be appropriate. Apollo is a U.S. program. Its boosters, spacecraft and astronauts all are emblazoned with the Stars and Stripes. It is an American flag that will be spiked into the lunar sand. Every American should take immense pride in the mag-

XUM

nificent accomplishment of his nation in reaching this point. But man's voyage to the moon goes beyond any purely nationalistic boundaries. It is really a triumph of man's indomitable spirit and a source of pride for all mankind.

Certainly history must record an indelible debt to the Soviet Union, whose Sputniks began the space age and whose early pioneering in space exploration shocked this country into successful competition. Although the odds are overwhelming that the U.S. will beat the USSR to a manned lunar landing, the Soviets will still play a vital role in lunar exploration. They will certainly send men to the moon, probably within another year.

Man's overpowering urge to voyage from his planet, which began with such vigorous and productive competition, may reach maturity in a cooperative effort to build scientific colonies on the moon and utilize it as a joint base for further manned exploration of the solar system. Americans and Russians will have to get along together on the moon because they are all humans facing a totally hostile environment. Perhaps the lessons learned there will not be completely dissipated back on earth.

Certainly this is the time to remember John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of these United States, who made the bold decision to commit this nation to sending men to the moon before the end of this decade. It was his message to Congress on "Urgent National Needs" May 25, 1961, that set the lunar landing goal. This transformed the U.S. space program from a sluggish, reluctant reaction to Soviet triumphs into a sparkling American challenge that demanded the straining of industry, science and technology to their utmost potential to achieve pre-eminence for us as a space-faring nation.

Jack Kennedy knew this nation needed a jolt and a challenge. He would be more than pleased to see how it responded in reaching the threshold of the goal he set eight years ago. This has been no easy achievement. It has taken its toll in treasure, sweat and lives. But history will prove it is one of the most profitable and prudent investments this nation ever made in its future.

The tangible technical benefits are already falling out of space research faster and in larger quantities than even the most optimistic prophets anticipated. Science and industry are already absorbing this vast wave of new knowledge. But the real challenge remains for the political leaders of the world. Can they change their outmoded concepts of organization and administration to permit the wonders of space age technology to conserve and enhance the resources of this planet for a better life on earth?

Space research is pointing the way toward better education, better communications, less pollution, better food production and better conservation of natural resources. But man and particularly his political leaders appear unduly slow in receiving this message.

Even though the initial investment in space technology will return tremendous material dividends in the decades ahead, this tangible fall-out may not be man's most important benefit from his venturing into space.

Perhaps the most significant benefit of all may come from the new perspective on himself and his home planet that man will acquire from his new vantage point in space. The six U.S. astronauts who have voyaged to the moon on Apollo 8 and 10 were profoundly philosophically impressed by their changing perspective of earth as they left it 250,000 miles behind. As the first men in the history of the race to get this perspective, their experience may presage some changing concepts of man's relationship to his environment and fellow men.

The Apollo crewmen were sharply surprised by the speed with which all of man's works on this planet faded from view as they sped through space. Only the greens and browns of the continents, the blues of the oceans and the swirling white spume of cloud patterns were visible from their orbits around the moon. They were astonished at what a relatively small planet earth really is when seen in the vast black void of space and how hospitable it seems in contrast to the barren bleakness of the moon and the surrounding infinity.

From this vantage point, it was apparent that we are all voyagers in space clinging precariously to the spacecraft earth, protected from the searing sun and cryogenic night only by a thin layer of gases trapped by gravitational force. Perhaps if the key political leaders of this world could enjoy the same perspective, they might shift their endeavors toward improving humanity's opportunities for survival on this planet instead of striking sparks that could burn it up.

The prayers and hopes of all mankind will be traveling with Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin, Jr., and Michael Collins as they make man's most wondrous journey.

OUR LATIN AMERICAN ERRORS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to our colleagues' attention a very fine letter from our former Ambassador to El Salvador, the Honorable Murat W. Williams, regarding American military assistance to Latin America, which appeared in Monday's New York Times.

An outstanding and dedicated diplomat, Ambassador Williams has very forcefully and succinctly pointed out not only the questionable value and size of U.S. military missions in Latin America but their oftentimes detrimental effect as well. His remarks certainly reinforce the recent recommendations of our distinguished colleagues on the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee that a thorough review of our military assistance programs in the Western Hemisphere should be undertaken.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Ambassador Williams' remarks deserve our full and careful consideration and sober reflection and I insert his letter herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

OUR LATIN AMERICAN ERRORS

JULY 16, 1969.

To the EDITOR:

It is easy to imagine U.S. military missions as "seconds" to the fighters in that bloody and useless contest in the Salvadoran-Honduran forests.

The missions should not be in either country. With transient encouragement from Dean Rusk, I urged our Government in 1963 and 1964 to phase out our ridiculously large missions in El Salvador. (We had more men in our air mission than there were fliers in the Salvadoran Air Force.)

The Secretary was getting too busy with other problems and he left my plea to deputies. One of these said: "I agree with you, but we can't do anything. You have annoyed the Pentagon by making the suggestion."

A many-starred general was sent to "negotiate" with me. After several days, he consented to cut back two out of about forty positions, but not until the end of the tours of duty of the individuals concerned, a year or so later.

Anyone can see now that if money spent on military missions and supplies had been put into more economic development, not only would more have been done to root out the social and economic causes of this war, but also we would not be guilty of helping to build up armed forces, on both sides, that make fratricidal war possible. [Editorial July 20.]

We would not have helped thwart progress towards the fraternal union that the people of Central America have dreamed of achieving in their Patria Grande.

By now the missions may have wistful instructions to "urge restraint." But do we need still more arguments against fomenting military buildups in the once Good Neighborhood?

MURAT W. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Ambassador to El Salvador, 1961–64.
MADISON MILLS, VA.

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE CONSTRUCTION, RECONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE ALASKA HIGHWAY

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing with the cosponsorship of several of my colleagues, a bill to authorize the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the Alaska Highway.

Several members of the Public Works Subcommittee on Roads have just returned from hearings in Montana and Alaska where we received testimony from the proponents and opponents of the Alaska Highway. The support for paving was so overwhelming that I am convinced of the urgent need to commence work immediately.

For my colleagues, who are not familiar with the Alaska Highway, its present total length is 1,525 miles, and it stretches from Dawson Creek, British Columbia, Canada to Fairbanks, Alaska. Only 383 miles of this 1,525 are paved. The greatest percentage of the highway is a gravel-soil base causing hardships either from extreme dust or from complete erosion and slippage.

The highway from Dawson Creek winds southward through the metropolitan centers of our northern neighbor. Both the provincial government seat of Edmonton, Alberta, and the oil capital—Calgary, Alberta, are serviced by this highway, and are linked to the "Electric City"—Great Falls, Mont., with the road terminating at the intersection of Interstates 90 and 15, near Butte, Mont.

I would like to take time to give you a little history about the Alaska Highway, not a new concept in the short span of years we have been on this continent. Even before the United States had acquired the "Folly" of Alaska from the Czar in 1867, a plan was formulated—the Gilpin plan—proposing a railway to Alaska and across the Bering Straits to Siberia as part of a worldwide rail system. The year was 1849. With the adverse reaction to the purchase to Alaska, it would take more than 20 years from the date of purchase before Congress would dare inaugurate legislation suggesting a route to Alaska. Once again the idea was a railroad. The Senate passed on April 19, 1886, a bill requiring a study of a rail route between the United States, Russia, and Japan. This was about as popular as the purchase of Alaska by Seward.

The thoughts about railways for the next few decades turned to an east-west direction, and so the dream of a link with the great frontier of the North was to lie dormant for more than 50 years until the military needs of this Nation revitalized discussion of a route to Alaska.

The gold rush, the fisheries, and World War I drove home the need for some type of land route to the North. Finally in 1933, Congress for the first time authorized the appointment of a commission to report on the construction of a highway from Seattle to Fairbanks. Ten years would pass with the commencement of World War II before Congress would again consider the highway. In 1942, the Corps of Engineers surveyed a route for a railroad to Fairbanks. However, this was abandoned after the decision was made in the same year to build the Alaska Highway. On February 26, 1942, the Permanent Joint Board on Defense recommended that the highway be built. The route followed a system of airfields. The road was built and remains in practically the same condition, providing a miserable trip north for commerce and tourists.

Since the war, a 1950 railway study was once again urged, but refused by the Canadians as unnecessary. Not until the sixties did any real enthusiasm for the reconstruction of the Alaska Highway appear.

In 1961, the Battelle Memorial Institute presented a report on the transportation requirements for the growth of Northwest North America. In its study, the paving of the Alaska Highway is strongly urged. Subsequently there have been other studies particularly designed to determine the cost-benefit ratio and need for paving the Alaska Highway. Most notable and infamous of these is the Stanford Research Institute report of 1966. This one report which hinted that the cost-benefit ratio was not satisfactory turned the Canadian Government against any further consideration of the project. I agree, the immediate ratio is not encouraging, but the projection—especially with the growth of Alaska and her oil fields—is the growth and net return criteria that I rely on.

With the election of Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, I am hopeful that he will be receptive to reconsideration of developing this highway, and for that reason Chairman KLUCZYNSKI agreed to conduct hearings along the proposed route to gain firsthand insight into the problems that face us.

Last year I introduced H.R. 2124, requesting the paving of the Alaska Highway. For the first time we had hearings on this matter, and as a result, my colleagues consented to travel to Montana, Canada, and Alaska last month. Today I am reintroducing a bill once again calling for the paving of the Alaska Highway.

Alaska, western Canada, and the great Inland Empire of the Northwest are linked economically, socially, and geographically. But our commerce links, especially north and south, are very poor. Certainly, the railways have opened up our vast expanses, but only for east-west traffic. This is the case in both Canada and the United States. What we need now, before it is too late, is a north-south route.

I could ramble on for hours about the rationale of why we should pave the Alaska Highway, but I will only take time now to say that we need this route for commerce, for defense, and for tourism.

The commerce to the north now is so risky that prices on the receiving end are often twice those in the Continental United States. A yearlong, modern highway would do a great deal to alleviate this situation.

Our 49th State is of strategic military importance. Because of its proximity to the Soviet Union, early warning systems, Strategic Air Command and missile bases and tracking systems in Alaska are our first line of defense. Yet, our only means of speedy communication is by air and water. This is hardly a satisfactory answer in time of war.

Alaska and the Northwest have received a great influx of tourists in recent years. The last escapist retreat on our continent has the capacity to receive even more people, if they could travel comfortably to its great expanses. There is a great deal of misunderstanding in Continental Canada and the United States in regard to travel conditions in the North. The Alaska Highway goes through areas of very low rainfall and low snowfall, and has few natural hazards to travel. Modern technology has overcome the technical problems of working in areas of continued low temperatures and this is a relatively minor hazard for motor vehicles. This inland route has generally easy grades, a low profile with low passes, and is relatively inexpensive route for trucking.

Of Montana's total tourist traffic during 1963–64, more than 50,000 visitors stated they had Alaska as their destination. And even though the Stanford report was adverse to paving of the highway, it projected an estimated 15 percent per year growth in traffic after completion of the highway.

Our subcommittee has returned completely convinced of the need for this project. It has been more than 25 years since this highway was constructed, with little if any improvements. The Northwest is a growing, vital area with oil in its veins, gold in its teeth, and lumber as its backbone. To share this wealth, and to in turn bring much needed commerce from the industrial States of the Continental United States, we must have a land link easily accessible, safe, and open all year.

Today, we returned man from a safe and speedy trip to the moon, tomorrow let us give him a safe and speedy highway to Alaska.

I insert the text of the bill at this point in the RECORD:

A BILL TO AMEND TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE, TO DESIGNATE THE ALASKA HIGHWAY, AND TO AUTHORIZE CONSTRUCTION, RECONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENT OF PART OF SUCH HIGHWAY, INCLUDING A CONNECTING HIGHWAY

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that (a) Chapter 2 of Title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 215. ALASKA HIGHWAY.

"(a) A highway between Butte, Montana, through Canada to Fairbanks, Alaska, the exact route which shall be determined as provided in this section, is hereby designated as the Alaska Highway.

"(b) The route of the Alaska Highway from Butte, Montana, to the border between Montana and Canada shall follow the presently designated route of Interstate Route 15, through Great Falls, Montana, to a connection with the route designated in "d" of this section.

"(c) The route of the Alaska Highway within Alaska shall be along that highway in existence on the date of enactment of this section between Fairbanks, Alaska, and the border between Alaska and Canada, which highway prior to such date was also known as the Alaska Highway.

"(d) The route of the Alaska Highway within Canada shall be as follows:

"'(1) from the border between Canada and Montana to Dawson Creek, British Columbia, the route shall be designated by the government of Canada along existing paved highways so as to connect with the United States section of the Alaska Highway in Montana; and

"'(2) from Dawson Creek, British Columbia, to the border of Canada and Alaska the route shall be generally along the highway in existence on the date of enactment of this section between such points, which highway prior to such date was also known as the Alaska Highway.'

"(e) The Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the government of Canada in the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the Alaska Highway within the borders of that country (including a connecting highway to Haines, Alaska) between Dawson Creek, British Columbia, and the border between Alaska and Canada.

"(f) There shall be no expenditure of any funds authorized by this section until the governments of Canada and the United States shall have entered into an agreement providing, in part, that the government of Canada—

"'(1) will pay its equitable portion of all costs of the construction, reconstruction, and improvement authorized by subsection (e) of this section of the Alaska Highway (including the connecting highway to Haines, Alaska) within its borders;

"' (2) will provide, without participation of funds authorized in this section, all necessary rights-of-way for the construction authorized by subsection (e) of this section of the Alaska Highway (including the connecting highway to Haines, Alaska) within its borders, which shall forever be held inviolate as a part of the highway for public use;

"'(3) will not impose any highway toll, or permit any such toll to be charged, for use by vehicles or persons of any portion of the Alaska Highway (including the connecting highway to Haines, Alaska) within its borders;

"'(4) will not levy or assess, directly or indirectly, any fee, tax, or other charge for the use of the Alaska Highway (including the connecting highway to Haines, Alaska) by vehicles or persons of the United States that does not apply equally to vehicles or persons of such country;

"'(5) will grant reciprocal recognition of vehicle registration and drivers licenses; and

"'(6) will provide for the year-round maintenance of the Alaska Highway (including the connecting highway to Haines, Alaska) within its borders, including snow removal, after its completion in condition adequately to serve the needs of present and future traffic.'"

(b) The analysis of chapter 2 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"215. Alaska Highway."

TESTIMONY ON BEHALF OF FUNDING THE FIRE RESEARCH AND SAFETY ACT BY CHIEF EDWARD A. BEADLE

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, one of the continuing problems that confront the people back home is adequate protection from the dangers of fire. In recognition of that problem, Fire Chief Edward A. Beadle of Union City, N.J., appeared before the House Committee on Appropriations to testify on behalf of funding the Fire Research and Safety Act.

I have been privileged to know Chief Beadle for many years. He is not only respected and honored in his community, but within his profession as well. He has been fighting fires for over 34 years and has been fire chief in Union City for the last 10. Chief Beadle has served as head of the Eastern Association of Fire Chiefs and, in 1968, was elected president of the International Association of Fire Chiefs.

Because fire protection is a matter of grave concern to all of our citizens, I would recommend that my colleagues consider the testimony of Chief Beadle and at this time I include that testimony in the RECORD:

TESTIMONY OF CHIEF EDWARD A. BEADLE

Mr. Chairman, honorable members of the committee, I am Edward A. Beadle, chief of Union City, N.J., Fire Department, and president of the International Association of Fire Chiefs with a membership of well over 7,000.

We are here to testify in behalf of funding the Fire Research and Safety Act in order to implement both title I and title II of the act.

We believe the Department of Commerce, through the National Bureau of Standards, can make a significant contribution to fire safety for the people of this country and at the same time assist the 24,000 local fire departments improve their operations.

While there are many avenues which can be taken to initiate such action, we call your attention to the report entitled "Wingspread Conference on Fire Service Administration, Education and Research." While this was the work of an ad hoc committee, it has been adopted by the International Association of Fire Chiefs as an official position and does spell out 12 significant areas we believe require serious consideration.

The language and terminology employed in the report cover broad areas of concern to the fire service and encompass action we believe is required to meet the needs. Independent organizations have exhausted their available resources in attempting to meet the challenge. The Federal Government can assist through the Fire Research and Safety Act in the following manner:

1. Through significant demonstration projects and research the National Bureau of Standards can assist the fire service to meet the objective spelled out in points 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the Wingspread report covering demands on the fire service due to social and technical changes in our way of life, public complacency toward loss of life and property, communications with the public behavioral patterns, and assisting in establishing criteria for public fire protection.

2. By establishment of a high level training academy for the fire service to assist in upgrading the professional standing of the fire service members, in conjunction with presently developing college level education and by supplementing existing local level training.

In addition, the implementation of title II of the act will permit the establishment of a Commission which can define areas of necessary action for the National Bureau of Standards. By bringing together persons of prestige such as Members of Congress and representative fire protection authorities from all sections of this country, we believe that the people can be made aware of the areas of concern and the necessary action required to meet the needs for the welfare of our communities and our Nation as a whole.

We wish to call to your attention that this association has supported the necessary action required, over a period of some 8 years, which led to the culmination of legislation in 1968 from which came this act. In all this time we have worked cooperatively with the International Association of Fire Fighters, AFL-CIO in an effort to get Federal recognition of the many problem areas that exist in fire protection and to swing the weight of the Federal Government behind the efforts to find solutions.

One is prompted to ask, "Are we losing the fight against fire?" But even more frightening to us is the life safety factor.

In our great country, boasting the highest standard of living in the world, we must also realize that we have the poorest fire record of any major nation. It is shocking that our per capita death rate from fire is twice that of Canada, four times that of the United Kingdom, and six and one-half times that of Japan.

In 1968, loss of life in fires numbered over 12,000 men, women, and children, and statistics indicate that for every death, there are about 200 injuries and disfigurements from fire. That's over 2 million people directly affected by the physical tragedies of fire.

We in the Fire Service, charged with the responsibility of protecting against these grim statistics, have long cried out for more public concern.

We were pleased when the Fire Research and Safety Act became law. However, we know that unless funds are made available to provide effective action under both title I and title II, little good will have been accomplished.

May we thank the chairman and the committee for the opportunity of appearing before this august body this morning.

Mr. ROONEY. Thank you, Chief Beadle, for a highly interesting and informative statement.

REDS WILL ATTEMPT TO PROFIT FROM NIXON'S VISIT TO RUMANIA

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include an article, appearing in the Copley newspapers, by Dumitru Danielopol, with reference to President Nixon's forthcoming visit to Rumania. Mr. Danielopol is a former Rumanian banker, economist, and diplomat. He was Secretary General to the Economic Delegation at the Paris Peace Conference in 1946, and he is convinced that the Rumanians have used the western newsmen to perpetrate a hoax which will help them to get credits.

The article follows:

REDS WILL ATTEMPT TO PROFIT FROM NIXON'S VISIT TO RUMANIA

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—At a recent press conference, Romanian Ambassador Cornelius Bogdan refused to discuss the agenda of the Bucharest talks between President Nixon and Nicolae Ceausescu.

But it's not difficult to predict Romania's strategy. The Reds will try to get the most out of the visit and give as little as possible.

Ceausescu is likely to tell President Nixon that Romania intends to pursue an independent foreign policy. That it would like to be another Yugoslavia.

To achieve this, he'll say, Romania needs to become economically independent from the Soviet COMECON and the only way this can happen is if it gets help from the West, especially the United States.

There will be hints that Bucharest might honor Romanian treasury bonds owed to American holders and unredeemed since World War II.

Ceausescu will express the hope that the United States will grant Romania "most favored nation" trade status which would permit more Romanian goods to be imported into the U.S.

But Ceausescu will not offer to use his dollars to purchase American goods. He will ask long-term credits with guarantees from the Export-Import Bank.

Romania being an independent country, Ceausescu will say, he cannot accept political strings to such assistance. He will argue that because of its proximity to Russia and its basic Communist tenets, Romania cannot, in fact, become completely neutral but will have to remain a member of the Warsaw Pact.

No internal liberalization is possible, he will say, because it would give the Russians a chance to subvert his regime. He will point to Czechoslovakia.

What Ceausescu will not tell Mr. Nixon is:

(1) How much of the Romanian "independent" attitude has been adopted with the approval and even at the instigation of the Kremlin.

(Some Kremlinologists distrust Ceausescu's "independence." They say that it suits the Russians that Romania, a country of Latin origin, should play such a role with a view of convincing some Latin American countries that under communism, independence is possible.

(2) That Romania is in dire economic straits. Her economy is near bankruptcy—despite glowing reports published in Bucharest and parroted in some Western publications.

(3) That he is head over heels in debt to many Western nations including Western Germany, without any hope of becoming solvent.

(4) That the "most favored nation" clause will make very little difference to the Romanian economy because he has few goods acceptable to the sophisticated American market.

(5) That Romania is already over-industrialized in relation to its shrinking internal market. That she therefore produces mostly for export and her products can't compete. Some are sold at bargain prices as much as 50 per cent below cost.

Ceausescu also will not mention that while Romanian food products are offered for sale abroad the Romanian people go for weeks

XUM

without eggs, meat, bacon and even onions. He won't remind the President that Romanian canned goods shipped to Canada for the United States have been turned back by American health authorities because they were judged a hazard to public health.

Shoddy textile products shipped to Austria have been refused even by poor peasants in Austrian mountain villages. About 90 per cent of a recent shipment remains unsold.

Nor will Ceausescu mention that the much ballyhooed tourist traffic to Romania is in fact a deficit operation. In order to attract hard cash customers from the West he has to offer bargain prices which in some cases represent a 50 per cent loss per tourist.

Who makes up the deficit? The Romanian people naturally.

One can go on and on.

The President must not lose sight of the fact that Romania—one of the richest countries of Europe before the war—is virtually another Cuba.

If Ceausescu is trying to emulate Yugoslavia politically, he must also do so economically. He must give peasants, workers and entrepreneurs the incentive to produce and the necessary purchasing power to buy the products.

PHYSICAL FITNESS

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago, President Lyndon B. Johnson, commenting on the Nation's physical fitness, made the following observation:

> Despite the ease and convenience of modern life, the crucial task of our times demands as much strength and stamina as in the past. Physical fitness is, therefore, a matter of national concern. It should also be a matter of personal concern for every citizen. People who spend some leisure time in vigorous and enjoyable activities are far more likely to lead long, productive lives than those who confuse leisure with laziness. More and more, we are coming to recognize that physical fitness in the young is the best insurance against infirmity and enforced idleness in old age.

Our former President thus gave eloquent expression to the growing awareness among Americans, particularly over the past decade, that physical fitness is vital to general well-being.

This awareness has given rise to the development of facilities that are geared to meet and help the physical fitness needs of our citizens—facilities which are indeed performing a service to the community because of their emphasis on the relationship of fitness to overall good health.

A leader in this burgeoning field are the Holiday Universal, Inc. physical fitness and recreational centers, whose services include fully supervised individual exercise programs and modern physical fitness departments for men and women.

Holiday Universal, Inc., based in Baltimore, currently owns and manages health and recreational centers in Baltimore, Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, and New York.

Holiday Universal's 15th center will be dedicated on July 30 by business and community leaders who will gather for the public opening of the modernistic facility in West Hempstead, N.Y.

This organization's achievements in fostering improved physical fitness among thousands of people are a reflection of the dedicated efforts of its president and director, Frank Bond. The organization's vice president, Jack Lipsky, has been the trainer of the U.S. Weight Lifting Team for many years.

Indeed, Mr. Bond's proven and successful methods to attain physical fitness have won him wide acclaim. He has been honored by the State of Maryland for establishing physical fitness and exercise programs for the State Police. The city of Baltimore has paid him similar accolades for creating such programs for that community.

Through the years, our Nation's leaders have constantly stressed the importance of physical fitness, and have sought to set an example for our citizens by personal participation in sports and in various fitness programs.

This is why I believe it is noteworthy to point out that among those who hold a membership card to Holiday Centers is President Richard Nixon.

Recently, Charles B. Wilkinson, special consultant to the President, wrote Mr. Bond to express Mr. Nixon's appreciation for the membership card.

Mr Wilkinson went on to say that:

> The problem of maintaining physical fitness in an increasingly technological society is of concern to all citizens. Your organization is a positive asset in this regard.

In light of the accomplishments of Holiday Universal health and recreational centers, this is indeed a well-deserved tribute.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week 1969 is a most appropriate occasion for the American people and their Government to reaffirm their commitment that the people in Communist bondage shall some day enjoy freedom. This will not come as the result of catastrophic armed conflict but, rather, because of the strength and vitality of democracy and individual freedom.

Mankind's struggle toward liberty has endured for thousands of years; it continues today around the world. Modern technology has endowed oppressors with the military might and the means of political control to hold captive vast numbers of people. Witness, for example, the brutal Soviet action in Czechoslovakia. Only this week, the Russian people were denied by their government the wonder of seeing man's first step on the moon as it happened. While the Kremlin released word of the event to its people, people on the Chinese mainland remain ignorant because the government continues its suppression of the truth.

In spite of the denials of the turned-off elements of our society, it is the American revolution—the ideals that inspired it—that today inspires national drives for independence and liberty. Some men, some systems of government, have corrupted the ideal of freedom and turned it to their personal power and enrichment. But, they will not last, for history shows that the people and their desire for freedom will sooner or later prevail.

The signs that the Communist monolith is crumbling are unmistakable. But, it is premature to believe that dictatorships and totalitarian governments will soon or easily surrender their power. Neither is it reasonable to believe that the Communist ideological hatred of Western democracies and their economic-political systems is a thing of the past. Having endured alternate periods of "thaw" and "freeze" in our relations with the Soviets, we should look hard at today's cordiality, hopeful that it will last, but maintaining realistic skepticism.

The realities of the modern age dictate that nations do their utmost to avoid ultimate catastrophe, all out nuclear war. It is in our national interest to ease international tensions and to channel national rivalries toward more constructive ends.

American society is not perfect. Many of the criticisms voiced about our society are valid. But more than any other nation, we are trying to come to grips with these problems and to overcome them within the context of our national experience and in a manner that preserves personal freedom. In spite of our problems, then, this country can serve as an example of a nation willing to acknowledge its shortcomings and to undertake to solve them. As we in this country move forward toward perfecting our own freedoms, we shall continue to lend our support and encouragement to people around the world who work for the same cause.

UNDERESTIMATING THE FARM PROGRAM

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ray Pierce of the High Plains Journal, one of our Nation's leading agriculture publications, recently wrote an editorial that I think should be required reading for all employees of the Department of Agriculture.

The article is based primarily upon a most unpleasant fact. The American farmer is being driven into poverty. Caught between low prices for his products and inflated prices for the things he must buy, the farmer is in a most desperate condition.

Faced with this unpleasant reality, the farmer turns to Washington for help only to discover Washington is preoccupied with the problems of our Nation's cities.

While the plight of our Nation's cities is very real and demands immediate at-

XUM

tention we should at least take a commonsense look at the plight of the man whose job it is to feed America. I am sure within the depths of the Department of Agriculture the charts, the graphs, the computers, and, most important, the planners have already determined what constitutes an efficient and accepted farm operation. What they have not computed is the simple fact the American farmer is a human being tired of being ignored.

Mr. Speaker, Ray Pierce's article sums up the frustrations of the farmer very well, and it is written in language every bureaucrat should be able to understand.

So that my urban colleagues will have the opportunity to truly gage the thinking of rural America, I include these remarks and the article by Mr. Pierce in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the High Plains Journal, July 21, 1969]

UNDERESTIMATING THE FARM PROGRAM AND ITS EFFECT MAY LEAD TO FURTHER UPHEAVAL IN ECONOMIC STRUCTURE

We keep receiving rather disturbing reports from the Washington scene—from people back from Washington, from conversations with people in Washington, and from observers. We feel that the administration, our Congressmen and Senators, and staff members both in Congress and in the departments of the federal government are underestimating the farm program, the temper of the American farmers, and the effect that continuation of that farm program may have on the national economy.

At the present time everything has a tendency to slide away like a house on a California hill into the slough of the poverty program. Even the moon shot had background noises about spending all that money to go to the moon, when it should be given to poor people.

The first solid consideration of the farm program—in connection with Congressman Bob Poage's bill, which ties the program up with his pet food stamp program—is questioned. How much, for instance is it in earnest, and how much is it for bedeviling the Secretary of Agriculture?

We reported on the trip of the House Agriculture committee touring the wheat area, and opined that contrary to all the noise being raised about how the tour was conducted, the Congressmen received some new and interesting informaticn about the farm program. This seems to be so, from reports trickling back.

Apparently, some of the information gleaned by our Representatives has penetrated the Department of Agriculture veil which has been up ever since Hardin became Secretary of Agriculture. It has been causing some difficulty, we understand, in the Bureau of the Budget, whose pencil pushers have decided there needs to be a 16 per cent cutback in wheat acreage.

Word is that farmers think a 10 per cent cut in wheat acreage is enough and that 16 (24 also was suggested) is too high. And this word, apparently, has been relayed to the USDA, and taken into consideration in their thinking.

Conclusion to make, it would appear, is that if a 10 per cent cut comes out, Secretary Hardin will have won a round with the Bureau of the Budget. Farmers will be able to see how well Secretary Hardin can represent them.

We also hear rumblings about the International Grains Arrangement.

Wheat groups are concerned because other countries have been able to manipulate the IGA and cut their prices considerably below prices the United States is required to ask for our wheat. Wheat groups in Washington asked that the provisions of the IGA be reviewed, and that U.S. wheat be kept competitive in the world market.

One of the problems of the situation is that the IGA has the force of a treaty, and the State department has a great deal to say about this sort of thing. The State department has been a thorn in the side of the drive to increase exports, in any case, because wheat has been used in international relations, and many leaders are convinced that State department policies will relegate the U.S. to the position of residual supplier in the world wheat market with the State department allowing everything else to "go first."

If there is an overhaul of the IGA, as Congressman Sebelius has suggested in the story on the front of this week's Journal, you can be assured that Secretary Hardin has had some difficulty with the State department before it was achieved—and if it is not overhauled, that the State department view prevailed.

It does not seem that the planners in Washington who predict, for one thing, that we'll have a national guaranteed income in 10 years, can see the effect of driving wheat producers out of the farm program by limiting payments under the program. If big producers pull out and plant wheat fence to fence, there may be a saving on federal expenditures for the programs, but the wheat farmers will suffer from ruinous low prices because of the excess of wheat which is produced.

There is no point in shrieking about a poverty program while you are driving another group of people in the country into that program.

It also does not seem that the planners are taking into consideration the desperate condition of American agriculture caught between low prices for their product and inflated prices for the things they must buy.

One observer comments that this may be the last time the limitation of payments measure is turned down by Congress. The demand is too strong from city constituencies. We feel that it is of utmost importance that these city groups understand the bargain they are getting in food now—that the agricultural producers are subsidizing the consumer through their low prices—and that a fair price will be reached (or more than a fair price) if they continue to drive people off the farms and ranches until agriculture is in the hands of a few who can control their markets by themselves.

We have seen all kinds of protests, demonstrations, and things which can be called nothing but irresponsible riots, because of demands of groups on our government. We believe that the American farmer probably the least likely of all American groups to indulge in such behavior, is close to following suit if he is ignored as a "safe bet" in national legislation.

American farmers don't want to be retrained for city jobs—they want to farm. And if the estimate of needs for food in the world are valid, we had better see to it that he does farm and that his production is marketed.

If we read the signs aright, the American farmer is in no temper to serve at the whims of bureaucrats anywhere, or to be a guinea pig for unrealistic program experiments, or to be shoved down the priority totem pole below the poverty program, the indigent, the unemployable, and the non-producers he has been supporting with taxes lo these many years.

This is no time for underestimating American agriculture.

CONGRESS WARNED ON TAX REFORMS

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include a column by David Lawrence, appearing in the Washington Evening Star of July 23. This is one of the most important analyses of the entire economy of the Nation that I have seen for some time.

I have been disturbed over the daily releases of the happenings in the Committee on Ways and Means. The daily press accounts do not indicate a vociferous minority who have as yet not taken flight away from their senses and who realize that tinkering around with basic tax problems can throw this Nation into such confusion that a real economic depression can be triggered.

These sessions are supposed to be "Executive," but one side of the story seems to get out every day, which leaves an erroneous impression in my State of California that I am acquiescing in all of these decisions, and I most certainly am not.

So far, we have succeeded in killing the municipal bond market, and in removing the incentive for philanthropy. We have staggered the petroleum industry. We have nearly wrecked the farm operation and have killed capital operations by eliminating any alternative capital gains tax.

The fine hand of the AFL–CIO is found in every decision, and I, for one, am not ready to turn the tax writing over to the AFL–CIO. I am anxious for tax reform, but not at the expense of economic sanity, and I will state here and now that I will file a most vigorous minority report and oppose the bill at every step.

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 23, 1969]

CONGRESS WARNED ON TAX REFORMS

(By David Lawrence)

The big news today affecting the pocketbooks of the American people has not yet reached Congress. But back home millions of taxpayers—both individuals and businesses—find themselves confused, uncertain and worried about so-called "tax reforms."

If Congress extends the tax surcharge which has been in effect, this would not disturb the economy. The vague innuendoes and contradictory declarations, however, by the leaders of the Democratic party in Congress have brought a state of uncertainty that could have a damaging impact immediately on business and on employment.

This does not mean that the public doesn't want tax reforms that are proper and equitable. But it doesn't want to see laws enacted that will upset business operations and planning by individuals, including the future of estates and bequests for their children.

Nor do the American people want to see local taxes throughout the country suddenly increased because Congress may have taken away the tax exemptions now permitted on income obtained from interest on municipal and state bonds.

Tax regulations are imbedded so deeply in the whole economic mechanism that if Congress tampers with many of the existing rates and rules, it can only result in panicky sales of property that would not otherwise have taken place. Also, real estate taxes and perhaps sales taxes will have to be raised in almost every state of the union in order to obtain funds for local projects which were previously financed by money borrowed from the general public by the states and cities.

Plenty of concern is being exhibited by colleges and universities, as well as by hospitals and charitable institutions, which have been dependent upon large contributions from persons of middle or high incomes. For the government to require higher tax payments than before will merely diminish the money given to charity. The future value of lots of family farms, too, will be adversely affected by changes in tax rates on what are known as capital gains.

Tax toopholes that ought to be closed can, of course, be found in present laws. But it is one thing to correct inequities here and there, and quite another to institute a program of "tax reform" which changes the basic principles of the existing income tax system. To tamper with the capital gains tax, for instance, is a risk to the economy, and may encourage the sale of property that ought to be held for long term investment.

What is back of all the demands for tax reform? Presumably it arises from a public sentiment which favors tax relief for middle- and lower-income groups. But most people, including members of Congress, will be surprised when they find out the simple truth—namely, that a 100 percent tax on all taxable incomes over $100,000 a year for married couples, and over $50,000 a year for single persons, would produce a revenue of only $3 billion a year. At the same time, this would deprive the American free enterprise system of much capital that is used to build new factories and provide employment for an increasing population. Instead of curbing inflation, the imposition of such a levy could be one of the factors that would bring on a serious breakdown in the national economy.

What is the answer? For one thing, Congress should extend the income tax surcharge promptly. Also, if it is going to enact any tax reforms, they should be adopted in the next few weeks instead of allowing the whole matter to drift for many months while private planning is frustrated and properties subject to the capital-gains tax are dumped on the market, with values falling.

There is, to be sure, a need for tax revision. But unless the Democratic party, which is in control of both houses of Congress, can act immediately to let the people know how they are going to be taxed and what is to be exempted, the United States may find itself in the midst of a recession by the early part of 1970, if not by the autumn of this year. The responsibility for this will be placed in the 1970 elections upon the Democratic party and not on the administration.

All members of the House of Representatives and one-third of the Senate will be elected next year. Unless the current tactics of the Democratic majority in Congress are changed, the resentment of the citizens generally will be apparent in the heavy vote cast against the party in power.

SOLON WANTS NEWSMEN TO DISCLOSE EARNINGS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the July 12 Editor & Publisher may be of interest:

SOLON WANTS NEWSMEN TO DISCLOSE EARNINGS

COLUMBUS, OHIO.—The minority leader in the Ohio Senate has suggested that newspaper reporters covering the Ohio Legislature should be required to disclose their annual earnings.

Charles J. Carney, Democrat, of Youngstown, said: "I am convinced that most reporters are honest. But a few have conflicts of interest because they have been on the payrolls of various lobbyists."

The Senator said that, under his proposal, members of the press corps would be made officers of the court.

THE FLAG WAVED PROUDLY IN THE MORNING LIGHT

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, faced, almost daily, as we are, with examples of flag desecration and examples of disrespect for our country and its institutions, as well as a general lack of patriotism, it is very refreshing when someone takes the opposite stance and gives a public display of their love of their country.

Mr. Speaker, I came across such an instance recently when reading a copy of the Midland Cooperative, a publication going to more than 180,000 families in Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, and North and South Dakota.

The editor, Erick Kendall, came to America 46 years ago as a 15-year-old boy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues and all of the people who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial written by Mr. Kendall and which, appropriately, appeared in the publication just before the Fourth of July.

The editorial follows:

THE FLAG WAVED PROUDLY IN THE MORNING LIGHT

(By Erick Kendall)

Foghorns were ululating their mournful song in the early dawn of a March morning as the S.S. United States cautiously entered the New York Harbor. "We are there," shouted a fellow immigrant, shaking the 15-year old boy. "We are in America!"

The boy jumped into his home spun suit, bashed the furry Cossack cap on his head, and followed the other steerage passengers to the upper deck.

Suddenly, as if on command the fog lifted and there on the port side loomed a world famous lady with her torch of liberty, and near at hand the star spangled banner waved proudly in the light breeze, its red, white and blue brilliantly lit by the early morning sun.

The boy removed his cap and broke into a happy, triumphant smile. "Good bye, old world," he thought. "This is now my land, and these are its symbols. May both of us have luck."

That was 46 years ago and the then 15-year old, now this elderly editor, has been through many a mill. But through depressions and doubts, through national policies he couldn't agree with, through periods when his seemingly god-like heroes turned out to have feet of clay, he has never completely lost that teen-aged enthusiasm for America's symbols.

There have been times when his faith wavered. The great depression. The Joe McCarthy witch hunts. The current growing power of the military and the hopeless muck of its Vietnam quagmire. But the rays of that long-ago morning sun lighting up Old Glory and the torch of liberty have always been beacons beconing toward the perfectibility of a nation and its citizens. Beacons to light the way when he backed away from dubious thoughts and questionable associations.

Question policies? Yes. Criticize corrupt or misguided leaders? Of course. Sneer at "the establishment" in youthful, impatient heat? Naturally. Point to potentially better ways of operating our economy and body politic? That is a duty of all free Americans. But to desecrate our flag? Never!

It is too bad indeed that the immature minds who desecrate our flag and the institutions for which it stands have never shared that wonderful moment of the 15-year old—shared that exultant thought of a steerage passenger, "this is my land!"

PUERTO RICAN CONSTITUTION DAY, 1969

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, 17 years ago today, July 25, a constitution unique in all the annals of government was proclaimed. On that day Luis Muñoz Marin, Governor of Puerto Rico, announced the fulfillment of a compact between his people and their fellow Americans on the mainland.

A semicolonial area had evolved from a status of dependency into a condition of partnership with the Federal Government. Puerto Rico had become a free Commonwealth associated with the United States, and henceforth was to be fully autonomous in local affairs. Its dignity as a self-governing unit within the national framework could be reduced or altered, moreover, only by the mutual consent of the Puerto Rican and Federal Governments.

The proclamation confounded those professional critics of America who had propagated the myth that Puerto Rico would never be permitted to come of age.

In truth, however, this lovely—if "stricken"—island had not fit the classic colonial mold since 1917, when American citizenship was accorded all those Puerto Ricans who desired it. Under this grant, any Puerto Rican who chose American citizenship could, at any time, migrate to the mainland and enjoy all the rights of citizenship accruing to any resident of any of the States.

As for the United States exploiting the island economically, the record reveals the precisely opposite practice. Virtually devoid of natural resources, Puerto Rico's economy was entirely an agrarian one until the inception of "Operation Bootstrap" in the 1940's; and Washington was generous indeed in providing assitance to the impoverished islanders. From 1930 through fiscal 1952 the Federal Government gave Puerto Rico a total of $591,671,582 in direct grants and Federal aid payments. Certainly, this largesse does not reflect imperialistic iniquity.

XUM

But even within America's own territorial complex, Puerto Rico has not followed the norm. The island has never been granted the status of an incorporated territory, which means that, while it belongs to the United States, it is not an integral part of this country. This is why Puerto Ricans pay no Federal income taxes.

Nevertheless, Puerto Ricans have enjoyed since 1947 the right to elect their own Governor. On the other hand, the people of Alaska and Hawaii were denied such a right until their territories, which were incorporated, became States.

Thus, the unprejudiced observer must dismiss any allegation of exploitation with regard to the residents of our Caribbean Commonwealth. The Puerto Ricans govern themselves, they participate in most Federal programs, including social security, and they live under the mantle that protects all American citizens—the American flag—and yet, they are not subject to pay taxes.

This is not to say, however, that the Puerto Ricans live on a one-way street. Their sons are subject to military duty in America's Armed Forces while their own voice is all but silent in the election of national officers and in the determination of national policies. While resident on the island, they are denied entrance into the electoral college and their only direct influence on the Congress lies in the person of their Resident Commissioner, who has unlimited right to talk in committee and on the floor of the House, but cannot vote in either place.

I want to take this opportunity to commend Hon. JORGE L. CÓRDOVA, Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico, who was elected to serve in the 91st Congress and has done an admirable job in representing his people since coming to Congress.

The annual observance of Puerto Rican Constitution Day is of profound importance in at least two major respects. First, the Constitution spelled out, in an instrument approved by the people and governments of both Puerto Rico and the United States, the nature and extent of Puerto Rico's right to govern itself. Its provisions, unlike those in an act formulated by Congress alone, are not, in all probability, subject to unilateral modification. The Constitution, in other words, is a compact, or a contract, written in concrete.

Secondly, the Constitution represents to a proud people an enlightened affirmation of freedom and self-government which they fashioned entirely on their own; Uncle Sam did not dictate a word and offered no patronizing advice. Cognizant that they are masters of their own destiny, the people of Puerto Rico have been inspired to write one of the most remarkable chapters in the history of man's material and spiritual development. They have transformed their "stricken land" into a showcase of democracy in action. They have made magnificent progress in erasing the pinch of poverty from the faces of the young and in smoothing the furrows of despair that had marred the faces of the old. And they walk with pride befitting a people who have lifted themselves by their own bootstraps to an elevation unattained by the citizens of any other country in all Latin America.

Mr. Speaker, I have a particularly warm and close feeling in my heart for the Puerto Rican people, for I have the privilege of representing many of them who reside in the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois. They have made valuable contributions, in the United States as well as in Puerto Rico, and I want to take this opportunity to extend my best wishes to the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for continuing peace and prosperity in the years ahead.

It is indeed a pleasure for me to join in this salute to Puerto Rico and her people on the occasion of Puerto Rican Constitution Day.

TRIBUTE TO GEN. L. J. SVERDRUP, AND HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE NATION'S SUCCESSFUL MOON LANDING

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, thousands of people and hundreds of different companies and agencies contributed to the successful landing of our astronauts on the moon. But as General Ferguson recently said in a public address at the formal opening of the Arnold Engineering Development Center's new airfield:

> In a real sense, the route to the moon passes through Tullahoma, Tennessee and the Arnold Center.

Carrying that thought a little further, the route to the moon also passed through the little village of Sulen, Norway, back in January of 1898. It was here that the man who designed the giant wind tunnels and test cells at Arnold Center, which figured so prominently in the development of the Apollo vehicle, was born.

Eventually, Leif John Sverdrup found his way to the hills of Tennessee, among the people whom I am honored to represent in Congress. Since his life and numerous contributions to the building of this Nation are important and of interest to my colleagues and the American people, I place in the RECORD herewith a few of the facts regarding General Sverdrup and the great company which he heads.

He came to this country in 1914 and 4 years later became a naturalized citizen. He graduated with a B.A. degree from Augsburg College, Minneapolis, Minn., in 1918, after serving with the U.S. Army during World War I and with a B.S. degree in civil engineering from the University of Minnesota in 1921.

He was employed by the Minnesota State Highway Department, after which he joined the Missouri State Highway Department. In 1928, he entered into a consulting engineering partnership, Sverdrup & Parcel, with John I. Parcel, his former professor at the University of Minnesota, and he is now senior partner of this corporation. Numerous companies have grown out of this partnership, including ARO, Inc., which was organized in 1950 to manage and operate the Arnold Engineering Development Center for the Air Force at Arnold Air Force Station, Tenn.

Sverdrup & Parcel served the Air Force as consultant and engineer-architect for the preliminary investigation, site selection, master planning, detailed design of most test facilities, and certain other specialized facilities and preparation of design criteria for facilities to be designed by others at the AEDC.

After the design had been substantially completed, the Secretary of the Air Force asked General Sverdrup, utilizing the expertise of the design team, to establish and set up an organization to bring into fruition the capability of managing and operating the center.

Utilizing the design team as the nucleus he then brought together with them the finest scientific and engineering talent available—from all parts of the country—and trained hundreds of native Tennesseans in the arts and crafts of aerospace testing. More than 3,600 people are currently employed on ARO's payroll and some 300 Air Force personnel both military and civilian are assigned to the Arnold Center—which represent the payment of nearly 39 millions in wages and salaries in my district this year.

To date, AEDC represents a national asset totaling more than $415 million and provides this Nation with the largest environmental test facility in the free world. Such a costly laboratory has, in the words of Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, recently retired head of the Air Force Systems Command, "paid for itself many times over through its contributions to our aerospace progress." Our success in meeting President Kennedy's announced goal of reaching the moon in the next decade, is further affirmation of the center's value to the Nation.

Because of the developmental testing of the Saturn V Apollo spacecraft at Arnold Center, we were successful in landing American astronauts on the moon before the Russians. These tests began on June 6, 1960, with a small scale model of a proposed launch vehicle. They continued until the end of the Apollo 11 mission—when all of the rocket engines, boosters and components of the vehicle had proven that they could get our astronauts to the moon, land them there, and bring them back safely. Years of development time and millions of dollars were saved because of the flexibility of Arnold Center's giant wind tunnels and test cells, and the capabilities and ingenuity of the people in Tennessee who operate them.

The man who is chiefly responsible for the design and operation of this giant complex had been honored many, many times by local, State, National, and international governments. In 1953, Norway conferred upon him the highest decoration which that Government can bestow on a noncitizen, the Order of St. Olav, grade of Commander with Star.

For his outstanding performance in the building of 200 airstrips and airfields,

XUM

numerous roads and bridges, as well as hospitals, docks, and other installations needed in the Pacific during World War II, he has been decorated with this Nation's Distinguished Service Cross, Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit, the Purple Heart, and four foreign decorations. He returned from the Pacific in 1945 with the rank of major general. In 1957, Secretary of the Army Wilbur Brucker awarded General Sverdrup the Department's Certificate of Achievement for his outstanding contributions to the Army.

The company headquarters is located in St. Louis, Mo., with 11 regional offices in the United States including Nashville and Tullahoma, Tenn., and in other cities of the world such as Bangkok, Oslo, Rome, Tokyo and Toronto. He has engaged in engineering achievements throughout the world, Australia, Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Italy, Korea, Kuwait, Laos, Libya, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, South Pacific (Aitutaki, Fiji, New Caledonia, Penryhn, Tongatobu), South Vietnam, and Thailand.

These achievements include transportation facilities, buildings, industrial facilities, research and development facilities, electric power, water management, and construction management. Within these broad categories we may identify a few, such as the Chesapeake Bay Bridge-Tunnel; the two span continuous bridge over the Missouri River at St. Joseph, Mo.; design of the unloading pier at Mena Al-Ahmadi, Kuwait on the Persian Gulf; Lake Maracaibo Oil Field Repressurization System in Venezuela; the Mississippi Test Facility Saturn V Complex; the Thatcher Ferry Bridge over Panama Canal at Balboa, Canal Zone; the Sidney Lanier Bridge near Brunswick, Ga., winner of honorable mention in AISC Annual Aesthetic Bridge Competition.

He also designed and provided engineering supervision during construction of the AMF monorail at the New York World's Fair; the Busch Memorial Stadium; the U.S. Air Force Academy Field House, Colorado Springs, Colo.; the Granite City Steel Co. office building and First Granite City National Bank, Granite City, Ill.; the Anheuser-Busch, Inc., brewery, Houston, Tex.; the Mueller Co. plant at Brea, Calif., selected in 1965 by Factory magazine as one of "Ten Top Plants of Year"; engineering services for "Titan I Missile Launcher System," American Machine & Foundry Co.; the Spacecraft Assembly and Testing Laboratory, McDonnell Co., St. Louis, Mo.; the Polysonic Wind Tunnel Facility, McDonnell Co., St. Louis, Mo., the 12.5 billion electron-volt zero gradient synchrotron, Argonne National Laboratory, operated by the University of Chicago for the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission; the Dalles Powerhouse on Columbia River, Oreg., construction management of V/STOL Wind Tunnel for the Lockheed-Georgia Co. at Marietta, Ga.

> Don't look back, look forward. The building will be in the future, not in the past. The "good old days" are mainly old. The future is the bright and shining thing to look toward.

He said this, and I say these few of his many enumerated achievements are indicative of the ingenuity and capabilities of the man. The State of Tennessee, the Fourth Congressional District, and the Nation are indeed fortunate to have Leif John Sverdrup as a citizen and a friend. His contributions are immense.

CHANNELS OF TRADE FOR ALASKA

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which will open more channels of trade for Alaska. Specifically, it will exempt copper mined in the State of Alaska from the Export Control Act of 1949, and allow Alaskans to export it to non-Communist countries.

Under the present law, unrefined copper ores, concentrates, and matte are under a "closed quota" export system. This means that the Department of Commerce does not approve export licenses unless the unrefined copper cannot be processed in the United States because of technological or economic reasons. Even if a license is granted, it must be renewed every 6 months, with approval by no means guaranteed.

It is difficult and expensive for Alaskan copper to be shipped to the "south 48" States for refining. Thus, domestic processing is impractical. Japanese firms would be interested in developing and purchasing Alaskan copper if long-term contracts could be negotiated, but economical arrangements cannot be made on the insecure half-year basis imposed by the license regulations. As the State director of the division of mines and geology stated:

> It is not a case of getting better prices in Japan, but it is a case of allowing us to get into business because of cheaper shipping in that direction, if we can clear the way for long-term export contracts.

Meanwhile, a wealth of copper prospects are still awaiting development in the State.

Not only are the resources rendered useless, but the economy of the State and the Nation is being hobbled. U.S. smelter production from imported primary copper materials during the time between January and October, 1968, totaled 220,000 tons. During the same period, 700,000 of blister and refined copper and 654,000 tons of unmanufactured copper came into the country. Since we are importing so much refined copper anyway, it would be beneficial to the U.S. balance of payments to supply copper to those foreign industries which are processing ore for America. In addition, mining is a labor-intensive industry. Men, machinery and supplies are required to excavate, crush, concentrate, and transport ore to market. These requirements will be met through the creation of more jobs for Alaskan workers.

The State Division of Mines and Geology and two branches of the Alaska Miners Association have encouraged me to secure trade routes for Alaskan copper resources. While the Export Control Act of 1949 may perform a valuable service in protecting American interests in many cases, in the instance of copper in Alaska, it has only been a hindrance. This bill will enable American industries to free mineral resources, it will boost the Alaskan economy, and it will improve the national balance of payments.

OUR NATIONAL PASTIME

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this centennial year of professional baseball serves to remind us that the game of baseball may truly be considered our "national pastime." It is a game whose popularity first developed during the first half of the 1800's. Interest in the game multiplied yearly, ultimately evolving into the establishment of the Cincinnati Red Stockings in 1869, America's first regular professional team. It is my pleasure to be able to enthusiastically join all Americans in the celebration of the 100th anniversary of this important moment in the history of the sport.

The game of baseball is actively enjoyed by large numbers of Americans. The youth of this country seem to gain an enthusiastic appreciation for the sport which serves them throughout their lives. This enthusiasm is of a nature which allows one, when unable to actually participate in the game, to vicariously experience the many joys and sorrows connected with this great game. The many radio listeners and television viewers, as well as the thousands of fans who flock to the ballparks to support their favorite teams, all point toward this time-honored American baseball phenomenon.

In this country today Americans are forced daily to withstand the tension from the many existing national problems. It is an era where war and the threat of war is the order of the day. It is a time when urban problems and domestic strife place great pressure on every responsible American. It is thus my belief that there has never been a time as fitting as the present when the Nation should express its gratitude for having such a pleasurable national pastime. By attending one of the many games of baseball, an individual, if only for a few short hours, is often able to leave many of his troubling cares and worries at home. Viewing a game often allows one to be able to not only lose oneself in the excitement of the game, but to rid oneself of many of one's pent-up emotions. Few experiences are as totally carefree and enjoyable as to be able to root one's favorite team to victory. It is an enjoyment equally appreciated by all; it is an emotion that knows no social barriers.

XUM

The free expression of this type of emotional release has never been more clearly demonstrated than in regard to my hometown team, the Red Sox. Over the years, along with the thousands of other Red Sox fans, I have cheered and supported the team through its many trials and tribulations. At times, I must admit, it seemed that the Red Sox had more than their share of "bad breaks"; but my enthusiasm never waned. In 1967, after a long and particularly rigorous season, the Red Sox won the American League pennant. After an initial lull caused by the traumatic shock of actually winning the race, the fans broke out of their trance and went wild with elated joy. One could actually feel the emotional fervor and excitement. Names like "Reggie," "Yaz" and "Conig" were proudly on the lips of the many baseball enthusiasts in the Boston area. It was as if every Red Sox fan, through his tenacious and avid support for the team had personally helped the individual players earn the pennant.

This centennial year of baseball is of particular significance to me. One of my all-time favorite Red Sox baseball players, Ted Williams, has come to Washington, my second home, to aid the Washington Senators in their quest to win an American League pennant. I wish Ted all the luck in the world, and hope that he is truly successful in carrying his team to a second-place finish—behind the Red Sox, of course. Drawing from my observations of his managerial performance, he has already instilled much of the same kind of Boston enthusiasm and spirit which I have enjoyed over the years through the Red Sox.

I would also like to take this opportunity to sincerely congratulate Joseph E. Cronin upon his being recognized as the greatest living shortstop. Mr. Cronin is not only a fine baseball player, but is a great gentleman and a credit to the game of baseball. The award could not be given to a more deserving individual.

I should finally like to close by offering a salute to the game of baseball, and thank it for performing its continuing and important role of acting not only as a welcomed emotional outlet but as a source of pure enjoyment for all Americans.

MORMON SETTLERS TO MOON SPACEMEN

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, this is a day of days for all Americans as our most modern-day explorers return safely from the greatest step of mankind—onto the moon. I am reminded of our early-day Americans who took mighty big steps themselves in the exploration and settlement days of our Nation.

It is on this day, July 24, 1969, with the return of the Apollo 11 astronauts, that 122 years ago a very famous and proud people stepped into a new fruitful adventure themselves. Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the thousands of Mormon residents of my State of Nevada and neighboring Utah whose ancestors moved into Utah and 22 years later established Las Vegas, Nev. These were the first settlers of Las Vegas. It is to them, and those first Mormons into Utah, to whom I pay tribute today along with our newest of explorers, the crew of Apollo 11 who touched down on the moon, and thankfully, returned safely to earth today.

Mr. Speaker, as the drama has unfolded for Americans these past days during the epical flight of Apollo 11, so must have been the case for the early Nevada and Utah pioneers. And, those pioneers would surely know Nevada and Las Vegas are as space oriented as our new space age itself when one looks upon the technology located in and around Las Vegas, and, more notably, our own actual space effort at the Nevada Nuclear Rocket Development Station at the Nevada test site.

The settlement of Las Vegas, which grew at first with the 2½ acres which each Mormon settler allotted himself, has grown into the most exciting city Americans know it to be today. So Nevada, and especially Las Vegas, owes much of its heritage to the faithful and brave pioneer Mormons. Today their numbers range from 30,000 to 35,000 in southern Nevada. Their contributions to Nevada have not gone unnoticed nor will they be forgotten, just as the contributions by the Apollo 11 astronauts will be properly recorded in history, never to be forgotten.

JOURNEY FOR ALL MANKIND

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, on July 21, 1969, the Kansas City Star had a particularly wise editorial on the significance of the great journey for all mankind. It follows:

JOURNEY FOR ALL MANKIND

With the touch of his booted foot on an arid lunar plain, man has turned the planet of his creation from a space-locked island to a universal port of call and proclaimed dominion over the stars.

Surrounded and sated by our lesser miracles—the steel birds in the July night overhead, the cataclysm ticking patiently in buried silos, the electronic picture coming live across a quarter million miles—we received the news. And in those tentative steps of the first moon men, rediscovered our capacity to wonder.

There is pride of nation in this moment, and that is forgivable. But there is also a larger pride of species. The creature with the apposed thumb and the boundless dream—scarcely equipped even to rule his own environment—has dared call himself "the eagle" and go where wit alone would let him live. And we—the collective we—are that creature.

One thing is certain: Man's view of himself, or of the potential of his reach, can never again be the same. Children too young today to mark an era's passing will, tomorrow, let go their toes and grasp a universe.

To the biologist, Apollo's journey may be the crowning triumph of an ordered accident in nature. To the anthropologist, it is toolmaking of a consummate order. To the geologist, it may be the key to the cosmic mystery. To the theist, it is a profession of faith by men who, though not divine, are touched by divinity. The plaque left behind in the searing noons and frozen nights on the Sea of Tranquillity is a blend of the rational and the ethical.

"Here men from the planet Earth first set foot upon the moon," it reads. "We came in peace for all mankind." It is written in stainless steel and meant for the ages.

Yet the great pyramids and the Aztec ruins and the flint arrow points in the secret sands of a thousand rivers are there to remind us that the dream is so terribly vulnerable. Only when a divided mankind has met the larger test—which is the test of spirit—can it be known whether that steel marker will be a monument to vision or, perhaps, a wistful artifact of a species that failed.

MRS. HELEN DE YOUNG CAMERON

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I must inform the House that a great lady of San Francisco, Mrs. Helen de Young Cameron, has died.

Mrs. Cameron was a lady of great intellect and human kindness. She was a daughter of Mr. M. H. de Young who was a pioneer newspaper publisher in our city and with his brother founded the San Francisco Chronicle. At her death, Mrs. Cameron was a director of that newspaper publishing company.

During her lifetime Mrs. Cameron was an active participant in the social, cultural, intellectual, and charitable life of our community.

She was a director of the San Francisco Symphony Association and the San Francisco Opera Association, and honorary president of the M. H. de Young Memorial Museum.

During her long lifetime of 86 years Mrs. Cameron was a leader in the local Red Cross, in Catholic charities and hospitals, institutions for foundlings and indigents, and organizations for helping the blind.

She was chairman of the women's board of the Golden Gate International Exposition in 1939, at which time the New York Times referred to her as "one of the leading hostesses of the West, familiar with social technique at home and abroad, a linguist of distinction and a friend of celebrities on two continents."

Mrs. Cameron was born in San Francisco and educated at the Convent of the Sacred Heart there, the Dominican Convent in San Rafael, and the Convent of the Assumption in Paris. She later studied music and languages in Berlin and Dresden. She spoke French, Italian, German, and Spanish.

She married George Toland Cameron in 1908. They built their home, Rosecourt in Hillsborough, in 1913. It was here that she died.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Cameron was a great patron of the arts, a woman who

XUM

cared for her community and for the well-being of its people, whose charities were boundless and joy of life a delight.

Her death is a great loss to San Francisco, a city of whose spirit she was a living example.

We deeply sympathize with her family during this period of sorrow and know they will have consolation, as do we, that the good she has done still lives and will, beyond our lifetime.

GERMAN YOUTH RESTLESS

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Eric Waldman, professor of political science at the University of Calgary and recognized German scholar, has recently returned from a 2-month research and factfinding visit to Germany.

As part of his continuing study of and interest in the problem of political radicalism, Dr. Waldman published in the Calgary Herald of July 5 an enlightening account of restlessness and rebellion among German youth.

In order to share with my colleagues Dr. Waldman's interesting views I am pleased to place his article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

GERMAN YOUTH RESTLESSNESS

(By Dr. Eric Waldman)

Most newspaper readers realize that the Federal Republic of Germany also has her share of student violence and other revolutionary actions, primarily the activities of youthful political radicals. This unrest among the youth is a phenomenon which during the last few years had spread throughout a large part of the world. In spite of the fact that many countries are subjected to these experiences, they are not simply the result of the same set of causes. There are, of course, a number of influencing factors which are similar in nature because they are the outcome of the modern industrial society. These factors are to some degree even of significance in the countries ruled by Communists. Probably among the most important influences are the de-personalization of the production process, the levelling impact of the mass society, and the intensification of an ever-increasing alienation, an experience which must not only be considered in its Marxist interpretation. However, it should be noted that deep changes of our basic values and concepts preceded these developments. The secularization process, beginning with the Enlightenment, and the progressive materialistic conceptualization of our lives provided important stimuli to these developments.

The young men or women, living in a more or less affluent society, are strongly affected by their belief that our world does not offer them a worthwhile purpose or challenging ideals. Many of them become disenchanted and overcome by a frightening boredom and feeling of loneliness in the midst of an urban society.

The "disillusioned" youth frequently becomes impressed by the most radical and critical views of the existing and "decadent" situation, combined with vague notions of a non-realizable future utopian arrangement. Some of these young people join the revolutionary activists wholeheartedly while others merely sympathize with the revolutionary cause.

It would, however, be quite incorrect to include the entire youth in these categories. The largest percentage of young people in most countries, and the federal republic must certainly be included in this observation, has a pronounced conservative attitude toward existing values and institutions. The logical and correct deduction is that the radical and militant revolutionaries are not representative for today's younger generation. However, the small though vocal minority has a perfect knowledge of the best methods of making itself heard. And furthermore, these revolutionary and radical militant groups receive a great deal of support from a substantial portion of reporters and commentators working for the mass media of communication who either are themselves in sympathy or agreement with the revolutionary objectives or who depend on sensationalism in order to sell their questionable products. Also this is a situation which exists in most of the Western countries, although the federal republic might have a larger share of left-oriented so-called intellectuals, and the journalists and reporters are definitely included in this group.

Some observers assert that over 50 per cent of German "intellectuals" are left of center. This high percentage is hardly representative of the political attitude of the over-all German population. As a result of the highly one-sided reporting of incidents of public disorder and violent student actions, the impression is frequently created that "the German youth" or "the students" are pursuing the objective of a revolutionary change of the present value system and of our political and social institutions. One should realize, for example, that from the 20,000 students attending the University of Cologne only about 30 form the cadre of the militant revolutionaries. But still these 30 dedicated activists are capable of keeping the entire university community in a continuous uproar and have managed to create among administrators, faculty and students a feeling of insecurity and helplessness. In other words, when evaluating the significance of the left radical movement in the federal republic, a distinction of the qualitative and quantitative impact must be made.

All left radical organizations and revolutionary groupings are quite small while their influence and disrupting activities are very noticeable in present-day German life. These small groups have been able to disturb official gatherings, national conferences of the major political parties, have managed to organize strikes at the universities and conduct acts of individual terror against professors, judges, and public officials. They have been able to obtain on certain occasions support for their activities from a broader segment of the population because they utilized their activities on issues which are of interest to people who as such are not interested in the real objectives of the militant revolutionaries. For example, the issue of a contemplated increase in the bus and street car fares in Hanover was used to organize mass demonstrations and widespread vandalism.

It is also of interest to point out that the "ideological" basis of the revolutionary part of youth in Germany is a mixture of various influences, and covers a spectrum from Maoism, orthodox Communism, nihilistic anarchism to some of the very confusing doubletalk of the so-called neo-Marxists. Some of the groups stress more the Leninist concepts of the proletarian revolution while others are lost within incoherent notions of revolutionary romanticism. Therefore it is not surprising that the "ideology" loses more and more in significance and the action receives increasingly more attention.

We find here a revival of the syndicalistic tendencies which in some European countries were quite noticeable at the beginning of this century. The "general strike" propagated at that time by George Sorel celebrates a remarkable renaissance in the various violent actions against the "establishment." Sorel emphasized that in the course of the revolutionary struggle, the forms of the future society would emerge and that therefore a statement concerning the future political, economic, and social order represented a "bourgeois" approach and for this reason must be rejected. In the opinion of this writer, the "ideological" idle talk should not be taken too seriously.

The methodology of revolutionary actions in various countries shows a certain similarity. This is at least in part explained by existing personal contacts and the exchange of revolutionary leaders on an international level. For example, German revolutionaries participated during the May revolt of 1968 in Paris and in the demonstrations in London. But also individual revolutionaries are "invited" by left radical groups in other countries to conduct "lecture tours" which in part at least are utilized to pass on experience gained during "revolutionary actions." While there are similarities in the actions, the issues used in the various countries are of considerable difference. For example, a fight against "Fascism" in the federal republic as a result of the passing of the emergency power amendments to the German basic law has absolutely no meaning in North America. In the U.S. the war in Vietnam and the racial problem furnish far more effective issues to conduct the revolutionary struggle against the existing political, social, and economic institutions.

It is the view of many observers that the coming fall will find a marked change in the situation in the U.S. with regard at least to student rebellion and campus disorders. It can be expected that definite actions will be undertaken by governmental organizations, supported by the vast majority of the population which has grown tired of "campus revolutionaries," in order to bring to an end the disrupting influences of the non-representative revolutionary minority. In spite of the fact that within an operational democracy only constitutional means can be used, it must be expected that the implementation of this policy will immediately be identified with a swing to the "right" and with the actions of a "police state." Some leading Canadian politicians have already prophesied this development for the U.S.

It is the opinion of this observer that this significant change in the confrontation between the revolutionary minority and the rest of the population cannot yet be detected in the federal republic. That means that the process of making the people more and more insecure will in all probability continue. This, however, constitutes a development which might have devastating results. This writer does not share the optimistic evaluation of the situation as pronounced by various German public officials, and this includes the federal minister of interior. It is consistently asserted that the peak of the revolutionary activities of the political left has been passed. Quite the contrary is the case. At present, a suitable issue for mass actions is lacking, as was, for example, provided by the fight against the emergency constitutional amendments at the end of 1967 and the beginning of 1968. However, the number of revolutionary actions has very definitely increased. Some of these subversive activities are carried on as long-range objectives, such as the subversion of the high school students and future teachers still studying in the teachers' colleges. Also the soldiers of the German armed forces are a long-range target, but some results can already be seen at this time, as the ever-increasing number of "conscientious objectors" and the number of sabotage acts seem to indicate.

Furthermore, the German SDS (Socialist German Student League), the most active of

XUM

these revolutionary groupings, managed to infiltrate and to take over a number of other organizations which now serve the revolutionaries to broaden their subversive activities under a variety of names.

As pointed out before, the main targets for the revolutionaries are the students attending the upper level classes of the German high schools, the future teachers still at the teachers' colleges, and the members of the German armed forces. The alarming observation made by this writer, is that little or nothing is done against these activities with the important result that the school officials, the company commanders in the armed forces, and the police officials at all levels recognize the fact that they do not receive the essential political support from their highest governmental authorities.

In many instances their resignation and "accommodation" to this situation has shown itself through their inactivity. This observer sees in this undermining process of the democratic institutions, and in the failure of the responsible public and party officials to face squarely the issues caused either by inadequacies of present practices or by the militant revolutionary activities, the greatest danger for the young German democracy.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, the captive nations of Europe have a sad and tragic history, which in the case of some extends through more than three decades. The freedom of the Germans in East Germany had become a casualty of Nazi tyranny before the outbreak of the last war. Unhappy Czechoslovaks shared a similar fate. But the Poles, Baltic peoples, Hungarians, Rumanians, and Bulgarians became captive nations during the war. These peoples suffered and endured the hardship of the war, hoping and praying that their freedom would be restored to them at the war's end. That natural expectation was wholeheartedly shared by the peoples of democracies of the West. At the end of the war, however, when the Nazi tyranny over these peoples was shattered, they found themselves under the Communist totalitarian tyranny imposed by the Kremlin.

This tragic turn of events, deliberately brought about by the duplicity and treachery of the Soviet Government, was the rudest shock felt by the leaders of the West's democracies. They rightly felt that they were hoodwinked by the Soviet Government, and did their best to come to a just and satisfactory understanding on the status and the fate of these peoples with the Soviet Government. But the Soviets considered the issue nonnegotiable, declaring that these peoples were now living under governments of "people's democracies." Actually and unhappily the Communist governments in all Eastern and Central European lands were instituted by the Kremlin and maintained there by the Red army. The Soviet Government then had raised the infamous Iron Curtain between East and West, enslaving all peoples east of that Curtain. Thus Kremlin's perfidy and treachery had caused the captivity of more than 100 million innocent souls in their once free homelands.

The fate of these captive nations has been a most disturbing and serious concern for the governments of the West, especially for the Government and people of this Republic. We have done our utmost to keep that issue alive, and have vowed—through a congressional act and Presidential proclamation—to keep that issue before our public by observing Captive Nations Week in the third week of July annually until the freedom of these peoples from Communist totalitarian tyranny. I am indeed glad to take part in the observance of Captive Nations Week.

DEPEW, N.Y., OBSERVES DIAMOND JUBILEE

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the village of Depew, N.Y., this week is observing its diamond jubilee. Depew is in the district I have the honor to represent and is, I believe, the kind of ideal village we all have in the American dream.

It is small, friendly, filled with lovely well-kept homes. Several key industries provide employment and a healthy tax base. Depew residents are noted for their God-fearing attitude and abiding American patriotism. During World Wars I and II, in the Korean war, and the war in Vietnam, Depew sent her brave young sons off to serve their Nation. They have always been fearless and brave soldiers, sailors, and airmen.

The Fourth of July is always a major event in Depew and it has been my honor to speak at these observances. I have attended religious services and social events at Depew's churches and her people have been very good to me. My wife and I harbor the deepest feeling of respect and affection for her people. Many of our dearest friends live in the village of Depew.

So that my colleagues will see the breadth and variety of activities planned for Depew's 75th anniversary, I am including in the RECORD at this point a comprehensive article about the observance from the Buffalo Evening News of Saturday, July 19, 1969:

DEPEW SET FOR DIAMOND JUBILEE

Depew has planned a week-long birthday party starting Sunday with a plentiful array of contests, spectacles and touches of the past.

A pageant depicting the village's 75-year history is slated each weekday evening and highlights the diamond jubilee festivities.

Depew residents under the direction of professional producers will take part in the pageant on a 200-foot outdoor stage at Dawson Field, Lincoln and Olmstead Sts.

Other features of the celebration include a Parade of Years, and drum corps competition, an inter-faith religious service, costume and beard contests and a carnival show.

OPENS 1 P.M. SUNDAY

The jubilee opens officially at 1 PM Sunday with Mayor Joseph Natale reading a proclamation concerning the week to come. Next, at 1:30, a horse-pull contest is scheduled at F & L Ranch, 4447 Broadway. A total of $260 in prize money is being offered.

The inter-faith service at Dawson Field starts at 2 PM Sunday. Depew's eight churches are expected to participate in the service with choirs and youth groups from various churches giving presentations.

Following the service, Depew officials will dedicate a memorial in front of the post office to Dr. Albin Kwak, a long time Depew physician who died earlier this year.

A 90-MINUTE PAGEANT

A picnic at 6 PM at St. Augustine's Catholic Church at Penora St. ends the day's scheduled events.

The pageant first will be performed at 8:30 PM Monday. Entitled "A Song of Man," the 90-minute show features six major sections with 16 various episodes. Five other choreographed sections will trace Depew's history from early settlement to industrial growth.

Winners of the art show's $450 in prize money will be announced prior to the first pageant presentation. The show will be judged earlier Monday and works will remain on display throughout the week in an outdoor tent in Firemen's Park.

The drum corps competition, with a prize list of more than $2500, helps conclude the week of activities at 3:30 PM July 26. The Parade of Years follows three hours later.

The complete schedule of events follows:

Sunday, Faith of Our Fathers Day: Official jubilee opening, 1 PM, Village Hall; horse pull, 1:30 PM, S&L Ranch; inter-faith service, 2 PM, Dawson Field; choir sing, 3 PM, Dawson Field; dedication of Dr. Kwak Memorial, 4 P.M., front of post office; dinner at St. Augustine's Catholic Church, 5 PM; picnic at St. Augustine, 6 PM.

Monday, Chauncey Depew Homecoming Day: Display and library and Department of Public Works open for inspection, 10 AM, Village Hall, adult flower show, 11 AM, lobby of Middle School on Transit Rd., adult hobby and crafts show, 11:30 AM, Middle School lobby; adult art show, 2–10 PM, Firemen's Park; a Night in Munich, Knockwurst and dancing, 6 PM, Blessed Sacrament Catholic Church, French rd.; Queen's Coronation Ceremony, presentation of court and special pageantry, 8 P.M., Dawson Field; outdoor pageant, first performance, 8:30 PM, Dawson Field.

Tuesday, Youth Day: Youth parade 1 PM, Gould to Bellevue to Terrace to Firemen's Park; adult art show, 2 to 10 PM, Firemen's Park; midway and carnival opens, 2 PM, Firemen's Park; diaper derby, contest for infants, 3 PM, Veterans Park; Return to Munich, 6 PM, Blessed Sacrament Church; band concert featuring Lancaster Town Band, 7 PM, Veterans Park; judging for ladies and children's costumes, 7:30 PM, Firemen's Park; presentation of day's highlights, 8 PM, Dawson Field; outdoor pageant, second performance, Dawson Field 8:30 PM.

Wednesday, Ladies Day: Boy Scout campout, 10 AM, Veterans Park; baking contest, 1:30 PM, Veterans Park; adult art show, 2 to 10 PM; Firemen's Park; luncheon with award for Depew baby born closest to anniversary time, 3 PM; industrial display, 4 to 10 PM, Southside Fire Hall; Night in Poland, Polish dinner and dance, 6 PM, SS. Peter & Paul Roman Catholic Church, Berlington St.; judging for men and family costumes, 7 PM, Firemen's Park; presentation of day's highlights, 8 PM, Dawson Field; outdoor pageant, third performance, 8:30 PM, Dawson Field.

Thursday, Club & Organization Day: Invitational swim meet, 1 PM, Pool 1, Firemen's Park; adult art show, 2 to 10 PM, Firemen's Park; industrial display, 4 to 10 PM, Southside Fire Hall; ball game, Lancaster Fire Department vs. Depew Fire Department, 7 PM; presentation of day's highlights, 8 PM, Dawson Field; outdoor pageant, fourth performance, 8:30 PM, Dawson Field; fireworks, 11 PM, Dawson Field.

Friday, Business & Industry Day: Adult art show, 2 to 10 PM, Firemen's Park; industrial exhibit, 4 to 10 PM, Southside Fire Hall; judging of beard contest, 7 PM, Firemen's Park; presentation of day's highlights, 8 PM, Dawson Field; outdoor pageant, fifth performance, 8:30 PM, Dawson Field; adult moonlight swim, 9 PM, pool 2, Firemen's Park; fireworks, 11 PM, Dawson Field.

Saturday, Veterans & Firemen's Day; industrial exhibit, 10 AM to 10 PM, Southside Fire Hall; fire department open house, firematic display, carnival midway opens, 10 AM, Firemen's Park; rifle salute, military display, 11 AM, Veterans Park; planting of time capsue, 1:30 PM, Veterans Park; adult art show, 2 to 10 PM, Firemen's Park; drum corps competition, 3:30 PM, Dawson Field; parade of years, 6:30 PM, grand finale and fireworks, 11 PM, Dawson Field.

VIETNAM LAND REFORM

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the Appleton, Wis., Post Crescent several weeks ago indicating that the United States is supporting—to the tune of $10 million—land reform efforts in South Vietnam to break up large landholding concentrations in the hands of a small portion of the Vietnamese population.

I applaud the purposes of this program. But it is ironic that at the same time we are spending large amounts of money to break up concentrated landholdings thousands of miles away, there has been a tremendous increase in the accumulation of farm land by relatively few people and corporations in our own country—aided and abetted by unfair Federal tax policies.

The land reform plan described in the article which follows would distribute 3.2 million acres of rice land in South Vietnam to 800,000 small farmers. Mr. Speaker, in the United States many times that number of acres of farm land are owned by nonfarm corporations and the conglomerates who buy farms for the sole purpose of writing off their farm losses against nonfarm income.

I applaud our efforts at land reform in Southeast Asia. I think, however, we should precede our efforts there by setting an example at home. We must take action to eliminate the inequity in our present tax law which promotes at home the concentration of landholding which we are discouraging abroad.

The farmers in my congressional district are fully aware of the growth of the corporate farm menace. They do not understand why they should be forced to compete with corporations who, because of our tax laws, do not have to make a profit in order to stay in business—and are anxiously waiting to see what the Congress and the administration are going to do about it.

I include the following article for reprint in the Record in the hope that it will stimulate the Congress and the administration to do for the family farmer here at home what it is trying to do for the small farmer in Vietnam.

$10 Million Allocated for Vietnam Reforms

Saigon.—The United States today allocated $10 million to support a radical new South Vietnamese land reform program which would give land to more than 800,000 rice farmers.

The plan is the most sweeping in a long series of largely ineffective reform attempts and could have strong political implications.

The enemy long has capitalized on the fact that a handful of landlords own most land used in producing rice, South Vietnam's most important crop. Attempts at land reform have been made for nearly two decades, but vested interests and administrative snarls sharply limited their effect.

PUSH FOR APPROVAL

President Nguyen Van Thieu's government is pushing for legislative approval of the program within a month so it can begin redistributing land in August.

As outlined by the agriculture and land reform minister, Cao Van Than, the plan would involve expropriation of 3.2 million acres of rice land from private landlords, religious groups and local governments, which would be paid 20 per cent of the land value in cash and the remainder in eight-year, 5 per cent bonds.

Tenants would be "allowed and encouraged" to apply for title to their plots, which would be free of taxes the first year.

COUNTERINFLATION

The three-year program would cost $400 million, 10 percent of which the government hopes to get from the United States. The funds allocated today in an agreement signed by U.S. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker and Foreign Minister Tran Chanh Thanh are contingent on activation of the program. The grant is in commodity import aid designed to counter inflationary effects of the program.

In recent years, the Viet Cong has given land to farmers in areas it controlled and promised to continue free land distribution if it gains control of the nation. To counter this, the Saigon regime's new program is being boosted with a big propaganda effort.

Bunker and Thanh signed another agreement today which will give South Vietnam 150,000 tons of American rice valued at $25.5 million.

AFTER MANKIND'S GIANT LEAP

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

[From the New York Times, July 22, 1969]

After Mankind's Giant Leap

The first men on the moon are returning to their home planet. Tranquility Base and Eagle have both been abandoned, their missions gloriously completed, their claim on historical immortality secure.

Here on earth, millions remain stunned and awed, still hardly able to believe that they were eyewitnesses to Neil Armstrong's first step on the moon and all that followed during those unprecedented two and a quarter hours when men first walked on another planet. It was indeed, as Armstrong said, a "giant leap" for mankind.

Artists of every description—poets, novelists, composers, sculptors, painters—will celebrate this event down the ages. This generation, so incredibly fortunate as to be present at humanity's first stride across the void, is too close to the event to be able to judge its full significance.

But one important and immediate lesson learned from the triumph of Apollo 11 is that men can live and work effectively on the moon, limited only by the supplies of oxygen and other life-sustaining essentials available to them. No one who watched Armstrong and Aldrin bound gracefully, comfortably and purposefully around Tranquility Base can have any doubt that the moon can and will be a future focus for human activity of the most diverse kinds.

In the midst of the exciting and unprecedented events of these historic days came the mysteries that surrounded Luna 15. The contrast between the complete openness of the terribly hazardous Apollo flight and the secrecy surrounding the unmanned Soviet Luna effort could hardly be more complete. Soviet space secrecy contributes only to raising suspicions and casting a cloud over the future of that international cooperation so desperately needed for man's journeys toward the planets and beyond.

THE LEXINGTON SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the world stands in awe after witnessing man's most recent advancement to the new frontiers of space. Last Sunday's moon landing was truly one of the most significant events in the history of mankind, and established a milestone in the art of communication.

Today, I would like to call to my colleagues attention another impressive effort in the art of communication. I refer to the work being done by one of the finest schools of its type in the Nation, the Lexington School for the Deaf, located in Jackson Heights, N.Y., in my district. Although not as dramatic or glamorous as the Nation's farflung space communications activities, Lexington, nevertheless, is making an outstanding contribution to the world we live in. It teaches deaf students to communicate with the hearing world.

An interesting account of the work being done by Mr. Oscar Cohen, director of Lexington's after school division, recently appeared in the New York Times, and prompted President Nixon to write a commendatory letter to Mr. Cohen. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point in the Record, the article and the President's letter, which I think my colleagues might find of interest:

The White House,
Washington, June 23, 1969.

Mr. Oscar Cohen,
The Lexington School for the Deaf,
Jackson Heights, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Cohen: I read a recent New York Times report of the work that you are doing at the Lexington School for the Deaf to widen the outlook of some of your students.

As you mention, the lack of real communication in life is based on fear. However, I know that the gentle assistance you are giving your students will go a long way toward breaking down the barriers between them and others their own age who can hear. I have a feeling that as your program develops many will appreciate the choice you are giving them and will move with confidence in both the deaf and the hearing worlds.

With my very best wishes as you continue your dedicated work.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

SCHOOL BROADENING HORIZONS OF THE DEAF

Jimmy Hinchcliffe, pitching for the Mets/Yankees against the Baltimore/Tigers, was delighted when the umpire called, "Strike!"

Though living in a soundless world, Jimmy who is 12 years old, grinned when he saw his excited teammates screaming. "That's the way to go, Jimmy baby, strike him out!"

Jimmy, like more than half of the boys playing ball the other day on a grassy field in Jackson Heights, Queens, is a student at the Lexington School for the Deaf at 26-26 75th Street.

As the two teams used up the last rays of the late afternoon sun, Jimmy led his mixed team—some boys who could hear and some who couldn't—to an 8-to-6 victory.

The deaf students, 7 to 12 years of age, were taking part in an experimental after-school program with a group of neighborhood children designed to break down the barriers between them and boys of their own age who can hear.

AWARENESS OF WORLD SOUGHT

"We want deaf children to become aware of people who can hear and not fear them," said Oscar Cohen, 28-year-old director of Lexington's after-school division. "And we want people who can hear to get over feeling sorry for deaf kids."

"The only way our students can stop feeling inferior is for them to compete with children their own age in sports and activites where they have a chance of winning."

Mr. Cohen's program seemed to be working. "We've even had a few fights between deaf and neighborhood boys," he said. Mr. Cohen doesn't encourage such behavior, but he also does not want his deaf students to be coddled.

The Lexington School, considered one of the finest schools for the deaf in the country, teaches its students to speak because it believes that they should leave Lexington equipped to communicate with the hearing world. They also learn lip-reading, but are not taught sign language.

TEENAGERS NOT INVOLVED

Although the excitment of the softball game broke down many of the reservations of being "different," Mr. Cohen does not consider the program a panacea.

"I don't want to give the impression that just by putting deaf and hearing children together that something magic happens," he said. "It took a month before deaf and neighborhood children would work together in our arts-and-crafts program."

Mr. Cohen has not had much luck involving older teen-agers in the after-school program.

"Their minds are set," he said. "They say, 'We're deaf and we want to stick together." To combat this feeling, he is planning a work-and-recreation summer program for older teen-agers, who will be paid $2 an hour for four hours' work a day, and must participate in afternoon integrated activities with neighborhood teenagers.

Mr. Cohen likened deaf person's relationship with the hearing world to that of blacks and whites.

"Deaf people live in a world set up by the hearing and they feel left out," he said. "They spend most of their social lives only with other deaf people."

OTHER ACTIVITIES OFFERED

As a first step to removing Lexington's students from the insular world of the deaf, Mr. Cohen solicited the help of synagogues, churches and schools 14 months ago when the 100-year-old school moved from cramped quarters at Lexington Avenue and 68th Street to its present spacious new six-acre site.

Thirty-eight neighborhood children responded the first semester. This semester 75 of 160 applicants enrolled in the after-school program of arts and crafts, swimming, softball, Scouts and drama club.

All of the deaf students participating in the school's Drama Club production of "Romeo and Juliet," rehearsing in a basement recreation room at the school, spoke their lines. Although they have been taught to control the loudness and softness of their speech, their voices lack inflection, which is learned by hearing others speak.

The Lexington School is supported by state funds. All residents of the state can go free of cost, but out-of-staters are charged a yearly tuition of $4,600. A total of 330 students from seven months to 17 years old attend the school and 130 of them live at the school. These resident students participate in the after-school program.

"We started this program," Mr. Cohen said, "to give our students a choice. When they leave Lexington they can choose to live in the deaf world or in both the deaf and the hearing world."

Encouraging hearing children and deaf children to form close friendships is Mr. Cohen's next project. "Right now the neighborhood children come to the school and play with our students but they haven't spontaneously invited any of the deaf kids home."

POSTAL REFORM

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much of late about the proposed Postal Corporation and the need for adequate and commensurate salaries for our postal employees as related to cost of living and the pay adjustment effective July 1, 1969.

To get closer to what is actually happening, with respect to postal employment, I obtained some statistics from the Hawthorne, Calif., post office on employee turnover and length of service. Employee tenure is most important in any continuing organization. I believe the statistics for Hawthorne to be fairly representative of not only the 17th Congressional District of California, but for much of the Nation. At Hawthorne, 43 employees out of a complement of 159 resigned in 1968 and only 48.1 percent have over 5 years of service.

The 1968 experience and also the record for several prior years concerns me and it appears the postal service needs further attractions or benefits for its personnel and one of these, I am confident, is an adequate wage with in-grade adjustments. The 4.1 percent effective as of July 1, 1969, I believe is inadequate.

Following are some detail statistics relating to the Hawthorne, Calif., post office, which I believe will be of interest.

Present complement of employees: 159.

In 1966 21 employees resigned; in 1967 37 employees resigned; in 1968 43 employees resigned; for a 3-year total of 101 employee resignations.

Of the 101 employees who resigned during the 3-year period, 89 had under 3 years of service in the Department.

The breakdown as to years of service of those presently employed is as follows:

Under 3 years of service, 40.8 percent.

Over 3 and under 5 years of service, 11.1 percent.

Over 5 years of service, 48.1 percent.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have completed the tabulation of the results of my recent questionnaire and for the information of the Members and other interested persons, I am pleased to present it today. The results of the questionnaire are set out in the form of a newsletter and contain the following caption: "Newsletter from your Open Door in Washington—Congressman Albert W. Johnson, 23d District of Pennsylvania, No. 15, July 1969."

The newsletter also contains a picture of myself in front of the door of my office in which picture I am holding a recent publication of the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce entitled, "Discover the New Pennsylvania." The newsletter then continues as follows:

DEAR FOLKS IN THE 23D CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: The tabulation of the results of a recent Questionnaire mailed to homes in the District has now been completed and I am pleased to devote a "Newsletter" to report the results. The response to the poll was very gratifying, and the returns were accompanied by over 3,000 letters or comments, which we are separately acknowledging.

The results of the poll and the comments are as follows: Where the percentages do not add up to 100%, the difference represents those who had no opinion.

[Answers in percent]

Question No. 1—the war in Vietnam:

Withdrawal of U.S. forces, even if this means a Communist takeover	10
Continue present holding operation	3
Gradually withdraw, forcing South Vietnam to assume a bigger role in the war	47
Mounting a strategically sound effort for a military victory	38

The war in Vietnam continues to be the most important crisis facing our nation today. This was recognized by President Nixon in his speech to the nation on May 14, 1969. In this speech, he stated that he had "ruled out attempting to impose a purely military solution on our battlefield, ruled out either a one-sided withdrawal, or the acceptance in Paris of terms that would amount to a disguised defeat." The President's offer: (1) a simultaneous start in withdrawals by both sides; (2) provide a real opportunity for each significant group in South Vietnam to participate in the political life of the Nation.

As is now well known, the U.S. has started its gradual withdrawal of troops from Vietnam. President Thieu of South Vietnam has agreed to elections in which the Viet Cong will take part. It is now up to North Vietnam to respond to these steps toward peace. The President added in his speech: "If the needless suffering continues, this will affect other decisions."

As the poll indicates, 47% of those replying favor the Nixon plan. However, a large percentage—38% favor a military victory. I note in examining returns of other Congressional Questionnaires that there is a strong sentiment to win the war.

On the question, Should we increase military pressure on North Vietnam, the following are some results:

[Answers in percent]

Reid (R) 15th District, Illinois: Yes	44.0
McClory (R) 12th District, Illinois: Yes	44.3
Burke (R) 12th District, Florida: Yes	52.9
Foreman (R) 2d District, New Mexico: Yes	56.7
Schneebeli (R) 17th District, Pennsylvania: Yes	57.0

Question No. 2—Diplomatic recognition of Red China. The answer:

Yes	43
No	50

I was really quite surprised at the rather large number of persons who favor this move. I note in the comments by those replying that they feel we would be better off to have a window as it were in Red China.

Here are some comments:

"We need China's views made public, good or bad." "It would probably be no more productive or dangerous than our recognition of Russia." "Maybe we can exploit these markets." "It would be better to negotiate with them now, rather than fight it out later." President Nixon has stated he does not favor recognition.

Question No. 3—The draft:

Continue in its present form	19
Replace with an all volunteer army	26
Restore World War II draft lottery	28
Retain the draft, give draftees option to name call-up date during 4 years	22

The poll indicates a displeasure on the part of the citizens of the District with the present draft system with only 19% favoring it. Realizing this widespread dissent. President Nixon on May 13th sent to Congress a far-reaching draft-reform plan keyed to a lottery. Under the plan, a youth would be subject to the draft only during his 19th year. At the beginning of each year, 365 capsules would be drawn from a fish bowl, on each capsule being a different date. If a 19 year old was born on the 4th of July, and that date was on the first capsule drawn, he would be in the first group drafted. If he was not drafted during his 19th year, he would be free of the draft, except later in case of an emergency. This plan is an excellent plan, as it gives a youth the knowledge that his draft duty will come only in his 19th year.

Smith (R) 40th District—New York—asked this excellent question: Do you believe an all-volunteer army can be established to replace the draft system after Vietnam? The answer: No: 60%. I would agree with this conclusion.

Question No. 4—Choosing Presidential candidates by national primaries instead of party conventions. The answer:

[Answers in percent]

Yes	81
No	14

The fact that the last Presidential election could well have been decided by the House of Representatives has caused pressure to be put on Congress to reform our method of electing our President. As indicated above, a large segment of the population in the District want a direct primary. A similar question in other districts brought these results: Marsh (D) 7th District, Virginia—Yes: 48.6%; Burke (R) 10th District Florida—Yes: 84.1%. There is presently no serious consideration being given in the Congress to do away with the nominating conventions.

Question No. 5—The method of electing a President after nomination:

[Answers in percent]

Retain present system	6
Direct popular vote	77
Allocate the electoral votes in each state in proportion to the popular votes cast, making a 40% electoral vote plurality sufficient to choose a President	6
Count one electoral vote for the winner in each Congressional District, with two additional votes for whomever carries the State	9

President Nixon, in a special message to Congress on February 20th, called for changes. The President said he was not "wedded" to any particular plan, but stated he preferred No. (c) plan above. On April 29th, the House Judiciary Committee approved by a 28 to 6 vote, a proposed constitutional amendment which would provide for direct election of the President by nationwide popular vote. In order to win, a candidate would have to get 40% or more of the total popular vote; otherwise, a runoff election would be held between the two candidates with the most votes. The proposal has not yet been voted on by the House.

The chances of final adoption before the next election are slight because it must receive a two-thirds majority vote in both Houses, plus ratification by three-fourths of the state legislatures. Many doubt that the necessary three-fourths of the states will ratify, inasmuch as the most populous states will gain political power, and the smaller and sparsely settled states would lose influence. Also, many are becoming of the opinion that this plan will destroy the two-party system in this country. Thoughtful citizens should study this proposal carefully. Results in other districts: Direct popular vote? Corbett (R) 18th District, Pennsylvania, Yes: 77%; Marsh (D) 7th District, Virginia, Yes: 62.6%; Chamberlain (R) 6th District, Michigan, Yes: 65%; Ford (D) 15th District, Michigan, Yes: 85%.

Question No. 6—Lowering the voting age to 18. The answer:

[Answers in percent]

Yes	42
No	57

This is the second year that I have submitted this question. In 1968, the result was No: 56%. This result follows the same voting trend as indicated by other polls elsewhere in the nation as follows: Ford (D) 15th District, Michigan, No: 63%; Marsh (D) 7th District, Virginia, No: 61.2%; Foreman (R) 2nd District, New Mexico, No: 66.7%; Bennett (D) 3rd District, Florida, No: 52%; Smith (R) 40th District, New York, No: 52%; Quillen (R) 1st District, Tennessee, No: 55.8%; Ottinger (D) 25th District, New York, Yes: 50%. This question brought forth many comments from those who replied, such as: "If a man can be drafted to serve his country, he should be able to vote." "I would restrict it to those under 21, who are members of the Armed Services." "Indications are they are not ready for it." "The 18 year olds might have the education and knowledge, but not the wisdom of how to use it correctly."

Question No. 7—Deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile (ABM) system. The answer:

[Answers in percent]

Yes	50
No	41

While the debate over the limited safeguard system progresses, the people back home are being heard from. For instance, the Opinion Research Corp. of Princeton, New Jersey, has just released the results of a poll taken, in which the question was asked whether Congress should approve the limited ABM system as outlined by President Nixon. 73% voted yes, and 10% no. In other polls taken by Congressmen, the results vary as follows: Corbett (R) 18th District, Pennsylvania, Yes: 65%; Reid (R) 15th District, Illinois, Yes: 60%; McClory (R) 12th District, Illinois, Yes: 64.6%; Marsh (D) 7th District, Virginia, Yes: 62.5%; Bennett (D) 3rd District, Florida, Yes: 75%; Minshall (R) 23rd District, Ohio, Yes: 45.2%; Foreman (R) 2nd District, New Mexico, Yes: 74.6%. Those in Congress who favor the President's plan state that they would have to be absolutely convinced that the President was wrong before they could in good conscience oppose him on a national security matter of this magnitude. With this, I agree. Those against it argue that it won't work when the button is pressed; it is too costly; it will escalate the arms race and present a new threat to the Soviet Union; on completion, because of technological changes, the missile will be obsolete.

Question No. 8—Terminate all public financial help to students found guilty of participating in disruptive demonstrations. The answer:

[Answers in percent]

Yes	92
No	6

The nation has become disgusted with the large increase in student demonstrations this past year, particularly with what took place at Cornell. Congress is most certainly to act on this challenge to our institutions at this session of Congress. One plan calls for colleges to file a set of regulations of student conduct before the college can qualify for Federal aid. Other plans are directed to the student himself, such as an end to Federal scholarship aid or loans. All answers to this question nationwide are about the same, viz: *Expel* violently disrupting students: Yes: 94% (Smith (R) 40th District, New York); *Deny colleges Federal aid* in case of continued flagrant campus disorders: Yes. 78.6% (Minshall (R) 23rd District, Ohio).

Question No. 9—Terminate political patronage in the Post Office Department. The answer:

[Answers in percent]

Yes	92
No	5

President Nixon named Winton M. Blount as his Postmaster General. In appointing Mr. Blount, the President gave him a free hand in re-organizing the Postal system. One of General Blount's first decisions was to divorce the system from politics. On February 5, 1969, he issued an order that removed all postmasters and rural carriers from political patronage and provided for their appointment by national impartial selection boards. This landmark decision at first caused widespread dissent from politicians, but now these persons realize that something must be done to save our postal system from a complete breakdown. As the poll result indicates, the people back home soundly approve.

Question No. 10—Converting the Post Office Department into a Government-owned corporation. The answer:

[Answers in percent]

Yes	54
No	33

Carrying out his resolve to make our postal system the best in the world, and meet the demands of the next 30 years when our national population will reach 300 million people General Blount has asked Congress to turn the postal system over to a government owned corporation, like the Tennessee Valley Authority. This will eliminate the role of Congress in rate making and in fixing postal salaries, and will provide for continuity of management. Hearings are being held on the proposal. I favor it strongly, provided the rights of postal workers will be secured and protected. The plan is favored nationwide as the following polls indicate: Reid (R) 15th District, Illinois, Yes: 70%; Scott (R) 8th District, Virginia, Yes: 57%; Whalen (R) 3rd District, Ohio, Yes: 67%; Chamberlain (R) 6th District, Michigan, Yes: 74%; Ottinger (D) 25th District, New York, Yes: 63%; Snyder (R) 4th District, Kentucky, Yes: 71.3%.

Question No. 11—The right of public employees, other than firemen and police, to strike. The answer:

[Answers in percent]

Yes	43
No	53

This question was prompted by the many strikes that have occurred in the past year by school teachers, garbage workers, and other public employees. The bill before Congress grants postal workers the legal right to organize a union, but does not grant the right to strike. The almost imperative necessity that 60 million monthly social security checks be delivered on time makes such a strike unthinkable. Most polls in other districts indicated the majority do not favor strikes by public employees; viz: Foreman (R) 2nd District, New Mexico, No: 61%; Burke (R) 10th District, Florida, No: 72%; Meskill (R) 6th District, Connecticut, No: 65%; Chamberlain (R) 6th District, Michigan, No: 70%; Corbett (R) 18th District, Pennsylvania, No: 59%.

Question No. 12—Repeal 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act (Right to work section). The answer:

[Answers in percent]

Yes	25
No	50
No opinion	25

The results of this question indicate by the large number of persons registering no opinion (25%) that many persons are not familiar with the issue. While union leaders are strong for the proposal, right now in Congress the matter is in abeyance because of the pressure of other business.

Question No. 13—A constitutional amendment to permit voluntary non-denominational prayer in public schools. The answer:

[Answers in percent]

Yes	84
No	15

Members of Congress have received more mail on this subject since the Supreme Court in 1963 outlawed prayer and Bible reading in our schools than any other issue. Hardly a week goes by but what I receive a petition signed by many persons urging the above amendment. Senator Dirksen is in the lead of the forces to pass the amendment. If the Judiciary Committee in the House would release the resolution to the Floor for a vote, it would pass easily. So far, the Committee is sitting on the resolution. I have sponsored the Dirksen resolution in the House.

Question No. 14—Increase in first class mail rate from 6c to 7c with a guarantee of air mail delivery. The answer:

[Answers in percent]

Yes	32
No	65

Two years ago, postal rates were increased substantially for all classes of mail, and the bill also contained a raise in the salaries of postal workers with the intention that the raise in wages would bring them up to comparability with similar jobs in industry. Now two years later, the postal deficit is $600 million, the workers are demanding additional wage increases, which if granted makes a raise in postal rates almost a foregone conclusion. To bring these factors into a business-like balance, I have agreed to support the creation of a postal corporation which when set up will be charged with the duty to solve the various problems and the deficit.

Question No. 15—Statehood for Puerto Rico. The answer:

[Answers in percent]

Yes	55
No	33

This spring, I spent the weekend in Puerto Rico attending a conference on Urban Growth. I had the opportunity to tour the island and visit forts, the harbor, the Governor's palace, etc. I became convinced that Puerto Rico should become a state. We need this country as an assured part of our defense system, and to help them prosper and raise their standard of living. The target date for statehood is 1980. The population is over 2½ million, and they will, therefore, have at least six members of Congress and, of course, two U.S. Senators. We owe citizenship to the young Puerto Ricans serving in our armed forces. I found the leaders in Puerto Rico of the highest type and well educated men.

Question No. 16—Should the President be allowed to commit U.S. troops to conflicts on foreign soil without the consent of Congress? The answer:

[Answers in percent]

Yes	19
No	80

Since sending out the Questionnaire, the U.S. Senate has voted on this issue. By a vote of 70 to 16, the Senate approved a resolution to the effect that the President should make no "national commitment" without the consent of Congress. A national commitment is defined as "the use of armed forces of the U.S. on foreign territory, or a promise to assist a foreign country, government, or people by the use of armed forces or financial resources of the U.S., either immediately or upon the happening of certain events." Those who voted against the resolution argued as follows: "It is essential for the President to have wide flexibility in the field of foreign relations in order to respond swiftly and appropriately to the mercurial exigencies of international diplomacy in this nuclear age."

Congressional polls favor the Senate action as follows: Quillen (R) 1st District, Tennessee, Yes: 64.78%; Burke (R) 10th District, Florida, Yes: 66%; Whalen (R) 3rd District, Ohio, Yes: 65%.

Question No. 17—Ceiling on individual Federal farm subsidy payments. The answer:

[Answers in percent]

Yes	93
No	3

When the farm subsidy bill was before the House, the Members adopted an amendment limiting payments to $20,000. I voted for this restrictive amendment. The bill is now in conference with the Senate who has deleted the limitation. It goes without saying that our farm subsidy system of controlled production requires a complete overhaul. The Agriculture Committee has been studying the whole program and promises corrective legislation. Some comments on the Questionnaires on this subject were well-reasoned. Here are a few: "Let farmers grow enough to feed the nation. Paying farmers not to grow and people going hungry, I just can't see this." "There are too many free loaders as it is. Let's cut back." "Let supply and demand regulate prices." "Help the poor farmers, not the wealthy ones."

Question No. 18—Return to the States a percentage of the Federal income tax. The answer:

[Answers in percent]

Yes	73
No	22

President Nixon has announced that he considers revenue sharing with state and local governments a high-priority program. Two months ago, ten mayors of the nation's biggest cities at a White House meeting bitterly opposed returning the money to the states. They wanted the money to go directly to the cities. At the White House recently a compromise was reached wherein the money would still go to the states, with a specific amount earmarked for cities. The plan is scheduled to go into effect starting July 1, 1970.

Question No. 19—Transfer of the more successful antipoverty programs to other departments. The answer:

Yes	50
No	32

Under the date of February 19, 1969, President Nixon issued an executive order which as of July 1, 1969, transfers the Head Start Program to the Health, Education and Welfare Department. The Job Corps was transferred to the Department of Labor, and many Job Corps Centers ordered closed.

On March 18th, the U.S. Accounting Office issued a report which questions the results of the Poverty Program. It has cost the taxpayers $7.5 billion in five years. The report charges that the program has been poorly administered and most programs have fallen far short of their goals. The Job Corps, which has cost $1 billion at a 1968 cost of $8,300 per boy, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps which has cost $1.16 billion were both severely criticized. Head Start, which has provided pre-school training for 2 million children was also questioned as to its permanent value. Community Action programs were generally praised as a community mechanism.

The Nixon Administration has decided to give the Poverty Program two more years of life, to be funded at $2.046 billion, with greater state participation and duplicating programs consolidated.

And now in closing, I want to thank those who took the time to return my questionnaire and thus make this report possible. I hope you have found this Newsletter both interesting and informative.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT W. JOHNSON.

LET US DISPLAY MOON SAMPLES IN THE ROTUNDA

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have drafted a joint resolution for introduction early next week which would provide for permanent display in the Rotunda of the Capitol Building of a portion of the moon.

I think we will all agree that the flight of Apollo 11 rates as one of the most spectacular American achievements in the history of this Nation.

Ordinarily, displays of great scientific or historic significance are established at the Smithsonian Institution or other major museums. I would expect this to be the case with some of the moon samples returned by Apollo 11, but I believe this material is of such tremendous and lasting interest that some of it should be placed in the Rotunda so that the millions of U.S. and foreign citizens who visit the capitol annually may see it.

I agree that it is proper that most of the material should be utilized for scientific studies, but I think it is only right that the American people, who made the expedition possible, have a chance to see moon materials during visits to the Capitol.

I would hope the display could be arranged shortly after the quarantine period for Apollo 11 ends in mid-August.

PERSPECTIVE ON POLLUTION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the great public interest in steps to effectively combat water and air pollution, I was impressed to note a letter by Mr. T. F. Patton, chairman and chief executive officer of the Republic Steel Corp., in that company's monthly magazine, June 1969.

Mr. Patton is a well-respected corporate executive who is providing the necessary, progressive leadership to this area of corporate responsibility.

Mr. Patton's letter follows:

PERSPECTIVE ON POLLUTION

FELLOW REPUBLIC EMPLOYEES: As you will see, several pages of this issue of *Reports* are devoted to the subject of air and water quality control.

I urge that you look over this material because I think it may give you added insight into what has become a very important and controversial public issue.

It is understandable that in recent years, the American people have shown a growing concern over the quality of our air and water. After all, most pollution is caused by the activities of people, and within a relatively short period of time we have become a much larger and busier nation. For example, in 1940 our population totaled about 132 million; today, it is more than 200 million. Today, our total output of goods and services is more than three times as high as it was in 1940. And whereas in 1940, we Americans were driving approximately 32 million motor vehicles on our streets and highways, today we operate more than 100 million!

As you know, even such an essential thing as the heating of our homes and buildings discharges impurities into the air. The tilling of our farms deposits unwanted materials into our streams and rivers, as does the fertilizing and spraying of our crops, the clearance of land for building purposes, the everyday use of soaps and detergents and, yes, the disposal of untreated or inadequately treated human wastes.

I cite these examples because too often, people will point to industry as either the sole or the major cause of air and water pollution in this country. But, the problem is much bigger than that resulting from industrial activity alone. And it cannot be solved by industry alone.

Unfortunately, air and water quality control has become a highly emotional issue—one that some persons are quick to expolit to gain public favor. Under such conditions, facts are frequently ignored and reason often takes a back seat to passion. Consequently, the public outcry for immediate remedies has created demands on industry which are often unrealistic in terms of time, cost and the availability of knowhow and equipment capable of accomplishing the desired goals.

It is the firm policy of Republic Steel to incorporate feasible and practical air and water quality controls into its operations. Over the last ten years, we have spent $42 million toward that objective, and we have appropriated another $38 million for control projects to be completed within the next few years. In addition, Republic is planning still further air and water quality control facilities requiring the expenditure of many more millions of dollars. I believe this is an impressive testimonial to Republic Steel's dedication to an improved environment for our plant communities.

But again, I emphasize that the job cannot be done by industry alone, nor can it be done overnight. If we are to successfully accomplish the task of safeguarding the quality of our air and water, we're going to require the cooperation of every one concerned and we will have to approach the problem with utmost intelligence. We're going to have to know the precise facts of each and every adverse situation, exactly what can be done to correct it, how much it will cost to correct, how much time it will take, what parties should rightly contribute to the control effort, and finally, whether or not the benefits to be derived in a particular situation are worth the costs involved.

If we can approach air and water quality control in this manner and spirit, I am sure we're going to achieve great progress in making our communities cleaner and more pleasant places in which to live and work.

T. F. PATTON,
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer.

REDEEMING A MANDATE: TAX REFORM NOW

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the recent vote on the bill to extend the surtax was a mandate for tax reform. The President, the leadership of both parties, and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee all made solemn commitments that tax reform would receive top priority on our legislative calendar.

Today, I have sent the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee a letter outlining the urgent need for tax reform, and especially tax relief—considering that the continued rise of inflation and taxes is sapping the purchasing power of the average American family.

I invite the attention of my colleagues to the letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 24, 1969.

Hon. WILBUR MILLS,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The vote on the bill to extend the surtax was a mandate for tax reform, it is now incumbent upon the members of Congress to fulfill their solemn commitment to make meaningful tax reform the next major priority of business. To do less will have earned the scorn and wrath of the American taxpayers.

For a not-so-quiet revolt is brewing across the heartland of America.

The average working family is being victimized by rising taxes and rising prices, and frankly, they're fed up with the excuses they're hearing for inflation and the justification for accelerating taxes.

We all know that the Internal Revenue Code is riddled with favoritism and notorious inequities, and we all know what has to be done.

Laws were meant to help men govern, not to tyrannize and plague them. Yet its been 15 years since Congress last seriously reviewed our tax legislation. This year some 130 of my colleagues in the House and nearly half of the Senate members have introduced various measures calling for an end to tax abuses.

It would be unconscionable for the leadership to now ignore this mandate for reform. To do otherwise would be suggesting that Congress has a callous disregard for the plight of the American taxpayers.

One-third of the population, those earning between $5,000 and $15,000 annually, are unfairly shouldering the nation's tax burden—paying two-thirds of federal taxes, while the very rich escape paying taxes altogether, or pay pitifully little

Is it any wonder then that the American taxpayers look with suspicion upon Congress?

But not only must we close the loopholes and eliminate preferential treatment, but we must liberalize the deduction and exemption provisions, making them consistent with the economic realities of modern America. It would be fiscally irresponsible if we didn't now extend tax reform to mean tax relief.

The average American taxpayer is living today under the impact of one of the longest sustained inflationary periods in American history that is depressing his buying power. On top of this, people are fed up with the spiraling cost of local government. This year states and cities tried raising nearly $5 billion in new revenue—through property taxes, income taxes, sales taxes and various fees—and in many localities, the taxpayers revolted.

A decade ago 27 percent of the average American's wages went to taxes. Today the tax bite is up to 34 percent. And it's been estimated that this year the average American will work two-and-a-half hours out of every 8-hour day to pay all his taxes.

But, Mr. Chairman, that's only part of the depressing fiscal straits hampering Americans today. Consumer prices are also rising faster today than are salary increases.

A recent study in New York City suggests that in 24 major industries, employees received anywhere from $8 to $30 in weekly-wage increases in the last three years—but rising taxes reduced the actual net gain by 50 percent, and inflation nibbled another 50 percent from the employees' take home purchasing power.

Incredible as it may sound, the $8 weekly increase actually equals a net weekly loss of $6.32 after $4.78 for taxes were deducted and the affect of inflation is considered. The individual earning up to $30 a week more did a little better. He lost $11.13 of his increase to taxes, and after inflation is considered, he is left with $4.93.

Horrible as the word sounds, the Wall Street Journal recently stated that the spiraling cost of living has brought on a recession—"a recession in the standard of living" for many Americans.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, it took $9,076 for a family of four to live moderately-well in 1967 in urban America, but today that salary buys 9 percent less because of rising prices. Indeed, average weekly purchasing power declined from $79.86 to $77.62 in this period.

The Wall Street Journal quotes economic consultant Leonard M. Strunk as saying the nation is "in the early stages of a depression" in which "an increasing proportion of the population will find itself pushed to ever lower economic standards of living" even though salaries may increase.

And a Chase Manhattan Bank Vice-President believes purchasing power will continue to decline until the present inflationary period subsides. "We will be fortunate if that can be done in less than a year, and two or three years is a more likely estimate."

In these circumstances, it is imperative that Congress cease arguing tax reform and produce immediate action. To reiterate, what is needed is a two-pronged attack: reform of existing abuses and tax relief for the average American family. Such an approach is encompassed in an omnibus 12-point tax reform bill and seven-point tax-relief program which I introduced earlier this year. For some time, similar proposals have been offered by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Reuss, and in one form or another by several of our colleagues.

Indeed, if the 12-point tax reform package I advocate was enacted, it would yield, I believe, up to $15 billion for the U.S. Treasury, perhaps increasing the potential for a genuine tax reduction. I call for:

Taxation of capital gains accumulated in estates.

Removal of unlimited charitable deduction.

Taxation of stock option gains at income tax rates.

Require a minimum income tax of 20 percent on net personal income of $50,000 and above.

Requirement for related corporations to be taxed as a single enterprise.

Elimination of tax-free status of municipal industrial revenue bonds.

Reduction of domestic mineral depletion allowances to 10 percent from a high of 27½ percent.

Eliminate depletion allowance on oil produced outside of United States.

Increase of gift tax rates to those established on estates.

Requirement that government bonds used to settle estate taxes be valued at current market prices.

Limitation on farming loss deductions for "gentlemen farmers."

Removal of accelerated depreciation allowances on speculative real estate transactions.

I also advocate that the growth of taxpayer-subsidized foundations be sharply curtailed. The philanthropic purposes of foundations must be vigorously scrutinized, carefully delineating the scope of their tax-free advantages. And the profit earned by foundations on commercial investments must be curbed.

The key elements of the tax proposals, of course, are the closing of the loopholes that permit the rich to escape taxation completely. This is the outrage that really lies beneath the public's indignation.

For instance, under capital gains, the profit made from the sale of stocks and bonds owned for at least six months is now covered under a special tax rate which permits only half of the profits on most long-term investments to be taxed. This allows millions of dollars of revenue to escape taxation.

Municipal bonds are another notorious abuse. Complete exemption from tax income received on state and local bonds permits millionaires to invest large sums to secure tax-free incomes which otherwise would be taxable if they were invested in stocks or property.

It is reported that one wealthy widow earned over $1.5 million tax free annually through municipal bonds while her gardener, earning $5,000 yearly, pays $350 in federal taxes.

One of the more scandalous abuses is the oil depletion allowance. This permits oil and gas companies to enjoy a "depletion allowance" under which 27.5 percent of their net income is exempt from taxation, in addition to being allowed to reduce their tax liabilities by rapid write-offs of operating costs. The result is that many oil companies pay no taxes at all. And it's been pointed out that one non-paying oil firm with a net income of $65 million over a five-year period actually received a $235,000 tax refund one year on losses incurred in a previous year!

These tax abuses are outrageous, and suggest to the average American taxpayer that our tax structure is not really progressive, based on one's ability to pay. The discrepancies must end. But after all those years of abuse, isn't it time that the average American, forced to shoulder an unfairly large share of the tax burden, be given just consideration? Shouldn't real tax reform also mean tax relief where it is most needed and justified?

I call for:

A $1200 personal exemption for individual taxpayers and their dependents instead of the present $600.

A $1500 deduction for the cost of college tuition.

A $250 deduction for commuting expenses.

An exemption on the first $5000 of retirement income.

A $1000 annual deduction for monies expended on home repairs and improvements.

A depreciation allowance for homeowners of one-family homes, similar to the deduction now granted owners of multi-family dwellings and other commercial properties.

A rent payers deduction on income tax for percentage of rent paid by landlord for taxes and mortgage interest charges.

All of these relief measures are necessary and feasible, but if any priority can be given them I say raising the personal exemption rate is the major weapon for granting the average American taxpayer *immediate* tax relief.

The original purpose of the $600 personal income tax exemption was to provide the taxpayer with sufficient untaxed funds to sustain himself and his family. However, since the time when this provision was enacted, the cost of living has more than tripled, and yet the exemption for the taxpayer and his dependents have remained the same.

In 1948, when the existing personal exemption rate of $600 was adopted, the average American family earned $3,031 annually. At that time each $600 deduction meant 20 percent of a family's annual income. Today, average family income is $8,017, which means the $600 exemption comes to only 7.5 percent.

My proposals providing relief for homeowners also deserve priority. It's high time we gave the homeowner a break. For far too long he has been the forgotten man, except when it comes to paying property taxes. His basic rights and needs are all too often neglected or forgotten.

The cumulative effect of delayed home repairs and maintenance is especially vexing. Home deterioration is a progressive blight. A repair that goes undone one year may cost twice as much to correct in the second year.

Since there has been a steady increase in the cost of home maintenance, we can hardly hope that the rate of deterioration has decreased. In fact, we can safely assume that the dilapidation has spread.

The $1000 deduction could be an effective way of stopping the spread of home dilapidation and community deterioration.

And the depreciation allowance I propose would give the homeowner the same break now granted to the owners of income-producing property. Why should there be any differential? Surely the taxpayer who invests in home property has the same taxes, overhead and maintenance problems as a commercial property owner.

Before the American taxpayer loses confidence in Congress we must put an end to tax abuses, eliminating the "double standard" which makes a mockery out of our tradition of taxation based on ability to pay.

Since the American taxpayer pays considerably more than do the wealthy, and the disparity between what the average family pays and what the privileged don't pay, is now public knowledge, Congress is faced with a crisis of confidence that can only be alleviated by direct, immediate tax reform and tax relief.

Otherwise, disrespect for our laws will increase, and the healthy democratic relationship between those who are taxed and those who are representing the taxpaying public in the halls of government will be threatened.

Sincerely,

SEYMOUR HALPERN,
Member of Congress.

REPRESSION IN SOUTH AFRICA

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the English language press in South Africa continues to report on developments in that country with great courage. Following are two articles from the Johannesburg Star of Saturday, July 12, 1969, which make very vivid the steady movement toward political repression. What is so striking about this history is the appalling nature of what can be done under the righteous banner of anticommunism and antiterrorism.

The first article is by Jean Sinclair, president of the Black Sash, a women's organization founded in 1955 to defend the South African Constitution:

FREEDOMS WE HAVE LOST

(Jean Sinclair)

"It is difficult for those who have not themselves lived through the gradual establishment of a tyranny to understand the subtle dangers of the 'softening-up' process, the effect on all but the strongest personalities of intimidation. Laws which would have aroused the fiercest opposition in 1947 meet with sullen acquiescence in 1957."—"Civil Liberty in South Africa," by Edgar H. Brookes and J. B. Macaulay.

And from 1957 to 1969?

Detention without trial.

Gagging without trial.

More people placed under house arrest without trial.

More passports withdrawn and refused with no reason given.

No longer is a person innocent until proved guilty. Some of our laws now state that you are guilty until you have proved your innocence.

We all forget what we have lost under this government.

What have we lost?

Freedom from arbitrary arrest and punishment.

The protection of our courts.

The right to know.

The right to explain.

How did we lose it?

1950: The Suppression of Communism Act defined Communism so widely that avowed anti-Communists are deemed Communists; and gave the Minister powers normally held by the courts.

1953: The Criminal Procedure Act further diminished the powers of the courts, allowing the Minister to refuse bail and to order summary trials.

1962: The Sabotage Act defined sabotage so widely that many normal activities can be punished as "sabotage" in certain circumstances.

1963: 90-day detention clause; replaced by

1965: 180-day detention clause allowing detention for indefinitely recurring periods of 180 days and excluding the courts from access to persons detained.

1967: The Terrorism Act provided for indefinite detention for interrogation and defined terrorism so widely as to include "embarrassing the administration of the affairs of State." This Act was made retrospective for five years before it became law.

1969: The Boss Act makes it an offense, punishable with up to seven years' jail, to communicate anything about security, including anything about what the Bureau for State Security itself is doing. It also deprives the courts of the right to decide whether evidence shall enjoy State privilege, i.e., be

XUM

silence. This applies to evidence affecting not only security but also the "interests of the State."

WHERE INNOCENCE MAY NOT HELP

A police spokesman has confirmed that in the latest swoop between 30 and 40 people are being held under the Terrorism Act in Pretoria. How many are there all over the country?

We have no means of knowing. We are told we have no right to know. Their relatives have no right to know. Parliament has no right to know.

The Minister refused to give figures to Parliament of the number of people detained under the Terrorism Act because "it is not in the public interest."

When asked if all detainees were visited by a magistrate at least once a fortnight he replied "Yes, except in exceptional cases, where the circumstances did not permit such visits."

When asked how many were not so visited, for what period, and what were the circumstances, his reply was "in view of the volume of work involved in the collection of the particulars asked for it is not practicable to furnish the required information."

If this happened to you, your certainty of your own innocence would avail you nothing.

Four people have died this year while in detention: one on the day following his arrest, one three days after, one four days after and one three months after.

Thirty-two people were detained during 1968 under Proclamation 400 of 1960 in the Transkei. Seven people had already been detained this year under this Proclamation by May 20.

Twenty-seven people were detained under 180 days in 1968. Eleven people had already been detained this year under this clause by May.

Banned without trial: On August 30, 1968, 490 people were living under banning orders. Others have been banned since that date.

Mr. Robert Sobukwe, released from jail after serving six years detention imposed by Parliament, in addition to the three years he was sentenced to by the Court, was immediately placed under severe restriction orders.

Forty-two people are at present subject to house arrest. Eleven house arrest orders have been renewed for a further five years. Nine of these people have to report daily to a police station.

If this happened to you, your certainty of your own innocence would avail you nothing.

Banished without trial: 39 people are at present subject to removal orders in terms of the Bantu Administration Act.

Passports refused: 322 people were refused passports or travel documents in 1968. Sixty-nine people left the Republic on exit permits during 1968. They can never return.

The Government spends thousands of rands each year publicizing South Africa overseas but 1,251 applications for visas to visit South Africa were refused during 1968.

What have we got to hide?

Peace at any price: ". . . we can live in the year 1969 in a South Africa which is calm and peaceful. . . ."—the Prime Minister.

A strange sort of peace when bannings, banishments, house arrests, detention without trial, passports refused, secret police, informers, interrogation are an accepted part of our everyday life.

SYMBOL OR SENSE?

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have just finished reading an editorial regarding the attack on the oil depletion allowance which makes sense to me.

I would like to bring to your attention and to the attention of the other Members of this body, this editorial from the Dallas Morning News of July 23, 1969, which is as follows:

SYMBOL OR SENSE?

The attack on the oil depletion allowance, which has long been a regular feature of each political season, seems to have thrust closer to its goal than ever before.

The depletion allowance is a favorite symbolic target of liberals. It is usually portrayed to the public as a loophole in the tax laws, an escape hatch by which the privileged and the get-rich-quick promoter can get away with money that rightfully belongs to the government.

To add to that propaganda advantage, liberals can play on the current revolt of the ordinary taxpayer, who is fed up with bearing the burdens of an increasing load of government. This justifiably angry citizen can easily be set in a rage by the propaganda which shows depletion as a bonanza for the wealthy few, the rich oilmen.

The oil industry, to combat the emotion-charged rich oilman stereotype and the loophole charge, has only facts and figures to defend its case. While these have always been enough in reasoned debate to convince thinking men that the allowance is just, they are not effective weapons in a political propaganda match.

The oilmen have pointed out, for instance, that the depletion allowance was not the result of a loophole, an omission. It was designed carefully by Congress to give the oil industry and other industries that produce natural resources the ability to renew their reserves, as manufacturing industries renew their plants through depreciation allowances.

They have pointed out that in the past the allowance has provided an added incentive to the development of oil production in this country. Having oil available within our own borders has been a vital factor, not only to the growth of the economy, but to national security when war or unrest cut off supplies from overseas.

They have listed facts on the enormous contribution that the industry gives both the economy and the tax revenues of all levels of government. In Texas, for example, the number of oilmen working for the industry is 212,000, plus thousands of landowners, merchants and employes of firms that do a substantial share of trade with the industry.

But perhaps the most eloquent counter to critics' charge that the depletion allowance is a get-rich-quick bonanza of tax-free funds is provided by the market economy itself. If depletion-aided oil production were, in fact, such a bonanza, the market would work to flood that field with new capital and new businesses. It is obvious that businessmen and investors will go into the types of enterprise that return them high earnings. That's economic common sense.

Yet in the supposedly sure-thing business of oil production, the trend has been the other way. In the past 10 years oil well drilling has slumped by a third in the U.S. In the same period, about 50 per cent of the nation's independent oil companies have got out of the business.

In Texas, with only a third of the prospective oil area sufficiently tested, the slump in drilling has contributed to a one-billion-barrel decline in underground oil reserves in the past decade. We're not finding new oil to replace oil that we are using.

If the oil-finding business were the tax-free cinch the critics say it is, it would be drawing swarms of enterprisers and the oil search would be booming. In fact, despite the growth in energy demand and the slump in available reserves, men and money have been going elsewhere to seek profits.

If the prospect is discouraging with the allowance, it's not hard to see what it will be without the allowance.

ONE SMALL STEP—ONE GIANT LEAP

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 21, 1969]

ONE SMALL STEP—ONE GIANT LEAP

The creature who once stood blinking at the door of his Paleolithic cave has come a long way. No longer is he tied to the area or even to the world where he was born. The heavens lie open now. The time nears when he will roam his solar system. At long last, man is on the brink of mastering the universe.

The technological and scientific achievements demonstrated yesterday in the landing of a manned spacecraft on the surface of the moon surpass all that have gone before. The three-man team of Armstrong, Aldrin and Collins has shown that man can travel incredible distances, land safely on non-earthly bodies, devise equipment to sustain human life where nature has not provided for its existence, and prepare to return to earth. Few of their forerunners who explored the planet earth reached their goals with so good a chance of returning to tell of it.

The exploits of these brave men, and of the tens of thousands whose work have made them possible, open new vistas for exploration and thought that end man knows not where. A mere scoopful of soil and rock from the moon could help unlock some of the secrets of the universe and may reveal things about which no one now dreams. The implications of their voyage for religion, philosophy and even human behavior can be foreseen only dimly for they have done the impossible. Man has safely landed in a vehicle, emerged, and walked upon the moon.

This is the third great scientific achievement in an era full of achievements—military, political, and technological. Within the lifetime of most Americans alive today, man has split the atom, broken the genetic code, and conquered space. In each of these, men have pried out of nature some of the very fundamentals of creation. By doing so, they have extended the horizons of all mankind by holding out the promise of unlimited energy, perfection in reproduction, and new knowledge of what life itself is all about. But each of these magnificent achievements holds also the seeds of disaster. Few greater evils could befall mankind than for men to carry their earthly disputes to the stars.

There is, however, something humbling about the landing of men on the moon. Six men have now seen the earth as it really is—a speck in the infinity of space. In that context, man's exploits must seem puny and his egocentric view of the universe must disappear. He is merely baggage on a planet in a solar system that is a tiny part of something he can scarcely begin to understand.

Thus, while this is no doubt a day for national rejoicing and thanksgiving, it is also a day for national renewal. It is true that the United States has won the race to the moon and has thrown back into the face of the Soviet Union the boast of then-Premier Khrushchev, just seven years ago, that his country's space achievements would "demonstrate the great advantage of the socialist system." But it would be tragic if Americans viewed this great event in a nationalistic framework. If this Nation stands taller in the world today, it does so because it stands on the shoulders of men of many countries—the men who from Copernicus and Galileo through Goddard, Von Braun, Tsiolkovsky and Oberth dreamed of such a day. Armstrong and Aldrin landed on the moon not just as Americans but as representatives of the human race.

The hope of Apollo 11 is that this achievement, along with the others in space, past, present and future, Russian as well as American, will rekindle man's dreams and revive his lagging spirits. The world needs men now who believe in their dreams of prosperity and brotherhood at home, peace and good will on earth, and adventure and cooperation in space.

The record of history makes it possible to believe that this hope of Apollo 11 is not in vain. Writing of a part of the world at the time this last great frontier was opened, Samuel Eliot Morrison said:

"At the end of 1492 most men in Western Europe felt exceedingly gloomy about the future. Christian civilization appeared to be shrinking in area and dividing into hostile units. Institutions were decaying, well-meaning people were growing cynical or desperate. . . . Islam was expanding at the expense of Christendom. Every effort to recover the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, touchstone of Christian prestige, had been a failure. The Ottoman Turks, after snuffing out all that remained of the Byzantine Empire, had overrun most of Greece, Albania and Serbia; presently they would be hammering at the gates of Vienna."

Then came the voyages of Columbus and the other captains who pursued the vision of Henry the Navigator. As word of their exploits spread, Morrison wrote, "new ideas flared up throughout Italy, France, Germany and the Northern nations; faith in God revives and the human spirit is renewed."

It was not without good reasons that historians arbitrarily selected the year 1500 as the beginning of modern history. After the discovery of a New World, Will Durant has written, "A pride of achievement inspired the human mind just when Copernicus was about to reduce the cosmic importance of the earth and its inhabitants. Man felt that the world of matter had been conquered by the courage of the human mind. The medieval motto for Gibraltar—*ne plus ultra*—was denied by abbreviation; it became now *plus ultra*—more beyond. All limits were removed; all the world was open; everything seemed possible."

That, then, should be the spirit in which this Nation and the world celebrate the achievement of our astronauts. A new frontier has opened. New worlds are there to be conquered. But success brings responsibility as well as glory. The landing of men on the moon is a challenge as well as a triumph—a challenge that men get on with the task of solving earthly problems as well as confronting nature in space, that he learn to live in peace as well as to compete for supremacy.

Above all, however, every human being can rejoice at being alive today as the space age begins. The words of William H. McNeill never have had a stronger ring of truth. Writing in *The Rise of the West*, he said, "Man some centuries from now will surely look back upon our times as a golden age of unparalleled technical, intellectual, institutional and perhaps even of artistic creativity. Life in Demosthenes' Athens, in Confucius' China, and in Mohammed's Arabia was violent, risky and uncertain; hope struggled with fear; greatness teetered perilously on the brim of disaster. We belong in this high company and should count ourselves fortunate to live in one of the great ages of the world."

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, this year the President of the United States again issued a proclamation designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week." Similar proclamations have been issued since 1959 under the provisions of Public Law 86–90.

On the 11th observance of this most important commemoration, I think it fitting to insert into the Congressional Record the act that provided for Presidential notice to the American people that we have not forgotten others less fortunate than ourselves, and also the proclamations issued by Presidents Eisenhower and Johnson:

Captive Nations Week—Public Law No. 86–90

RESOLUTION

S.J. Res. 111

H.J. Res. 454, 459

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitute a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such people through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

Captive Nations Week, 1959

(A proclamation by the President of the United States of America)

Whereas many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

Whereas the peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent; and

Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas by a joint resolution approved and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as Captive Nations Week and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world:

Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 19, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week."

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and I urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations.

Captive Nations Week, 1967—A Proclamation by the President of the United States of America

Whereas the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas freedom and justice are basic human rights to which all men are entitled; and

Whereas the independence of peoples requires their exercise of the elemental right of free choice; and

Whereas these inalienable rights have been circumscribed or denied in many areas of the world; and

Whereas the United States of America, from its founding as a nation has had an abiding commitment to the principles of national independence and human freedom:

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 16, 1967 as Captive Nations Week.

XUM

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all peoples for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twelfth day of July in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-seven, and the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-second.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

GUN CONTROL COMMENTS

HON. JOHN N. HAPPY CAMP

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two measures affecting the Gun Control Act of 1968 which was signed into law on October 22, 1968. One measure would repeal the ammunition portion of the law, and the other would repeal the entire law itself.

I feel so strongly about the adverse affects of the Gun Control Act, and particularly the ammunition portion, that I included this question on my recent first annual legislative questionnaire.

The questionnaires returned to my office have indicated that the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Oklahoma are overwhelmingly in favor of at least repealing the ammunition portion of the law, that I felt compelled to introduce legislation that would do just that.

The ammunition portion of the act defies all rules of logic. Why punish sportsmen and hunters by restricting their purchases of ammunition? The average criminal will not be seeking this ammunition, nor will he obtain it through normal channels. Why burden our sportsmen with having to go through mountains of bureaucratic red tape simply to purchase a box of ammunition to enjoy a hobby that has been a part of this Nation since its very beginning?

Even more important, in my mind, is outright repeal of the Gun Control Act itself. If I had been a Member of the 90th Congress when this measure was up for debate, I would have opposed it with all the vigor and might I could summon. Why did Congress feel compelled to punish the law-abiding citizens of this Nation when the only laws of this type should be directed toward criminals? Why did Congress think the crime rate would drop if it passed such a law? Obviously, such has not been the case, as our crime rate has been soaring ever higher.

I would like to share with my colleagues a few of the comments my constituents have made to me.

From Arnett, Okla.:

> The entire concept of controlling weapons is wrong, unduly restrictive and oppressive since only people commit crimes, and only people can be convicted of crimes. Laws should be more stringent against people who commit crimes using firearms.

From Ponca City, Okla.:

> Please repeal this bill and concentrate on the speedy prosecution and conviction of the thousands of known criminals and law violators in this country.

From El Reno, Okla.:

> I wish to ask you to resist all attempts at further restrictive gun legislation and to use your influence to repeal those portions of the existing law that pose a hardship on law-abiding citizen-sportsmen. The only laws of this nature should be directed solely at the criminal and his association.

From Laverne, Okla.:

> I feel we need a law punishing the ones that misuse the guns, instead of punishing the respected and honorable citizens that own guns.

From Mustang, Okla.:

> This is my first letter as a voter in 28 years of voting in the state of Oklahoma, to a legislator, and I would like to stand up and be counted against any further absurd gun legislation against the people of the United States.

Another strong objection I have to this act is the manner of enforcement practiced by the Internal Revenue Service. I invite my colleagues, if they have not already done so, to take a few hours to read 19 pages of rules and regulations in the Federal Register of Saturday, December 14, 1968. It is quite interesting to see what the Internal Revenue Service has read into the Gun Control Act passed by the 90th Congress. I also urge my colleagues to take a look at some of the forms IRS has prepared for businessmen selling firearms to complete. This Government has besieged its businessmen with mountains of forms to fill out, and the Internal Revenue Service gave them another one with its interpretation of the Gun Control Act.

In my mind, the Internal Revenue Service has grossly misinterpreted the intent and will of Congress and has created "back-door" firearms registration. It is my information that last year Congress voted overwhelmingly against such registration. Why then should an agency of the Government proceed with such registration against the expressed wishes of Congress?

It is time for Congress to accept its responsibility and pass legislation that prosecutes criminals, particularly those who use firearms in the course of committing a crime. It is also time for Congress to restore to our law-abiding citizens the freedom they are entitled to enjoy, rightfully possess and exercise—the right to bear arms.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ENVIRONMENT—THE MOON IS SAFER

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have felt it appropriate to call to the attention of our colleagues the appalling conditions which exist in Washington, the Nation's Capital. Unfortunately there is no improvement, nor is there any prospect of progress until we in the Congress exercise our constitutional responsibility to provide a system of government for the District of Columbia run by responsible people. The operation of the present municipal government is a disgrace.

Tuesday night a Member of the other body was the victim of an armed robbery as he drove his car into the garage at his home here. Wednesday morning an intruder rifled the purse and stole the wallet of one of my secretaries in my office in the House Office Building. Last night my car was broken into while parked at the diplomatic parking area, while visiting the South Vietnamese Embassy and some of my personal property was stolen.

Mr. Speaker, 10 days ago this Nation demonstrated the high point in our technological development by the launching of a successful expedition to walk on the moon. Today that expedition returned. I include local news clippings illustrative of the deterioration of the civilization in our Nation's Capital during this period following my remarks:

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 16, 1969]

Woman Is Robbed, Raped by Gunman

A 25-year-old Southeast Washington woman was raped and robbed at gunpoint early yesterday as she walked home from a bus stop after seeing a movie.

Police said the woman told them that while she was walking in the 800 block of 21st St. NE she was approached by a man who drew a pistol and ordered her into the bushes, took $4 from her purse and then raped her.

District Lawyer Forfeits $25 on Disorderly Count

A District lawyer was charged yesterday with disorderly conduct after an incident at the D.C. Court of General Sessions.

The lawyer, Thomas M. David, did not contest the charge and was allowed to forfeit $25 by Judge John J. Malloy.

The incident occurred Friday afternoon. A workman who had been installing air conditioning at General Sessions accused David of committing an unsanitary act in a stairwell above the court's third floor.

David, whose office is listed in the Washington Building, 15th and K Streets NW, is a regular practicing attorney at General Sessions, where he handles mostly traffic cases.

Police Employe Wounds Bandit, Faces Gun Count

A civilian employe of the Metropolitan Police Department has been charged with carrying a dangerous weapon as a result of a run-in Sunday night with three bandits.

John A. Herzig, 47, of the 500 block of 20th Street SE, told police he routed three holdup men who confronted him in front of his home, shooting one in the abdomen.

Herzig did not have a permit for his gun, a .25-caliber automatic, according to the U.S. attorney's office, and he was charged with carrying a dangerous weapon, a misdemeanor carrying a maximum one-year sentence.

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 24, 1969]

Girl, 16, Reports Rape by Four Men

A 16-year-old District girl told police that she was raped by four men in downtown Washington early today.

The girl said she was strolling with her boy friend, also 16, in the 1100 block of W Street NW when four men approached them. She said one of the men grabbed her by the neck and her boyfriend ran off to seek help.

She said the four forced her to the rear

XUM

of a building in the 2200 block of the 11th Street, where all four raped her.

She was treated at D.C. General Hospital and released.

Common-Law Husband Charged in Northwest Killing

The common-law husband of a 38-year-old Northwest Washington woman who was stabbed to death yesterday afternoon, has been charged with homicide, police said.

Daisy R. Bolden, of the 2300 block of 18th Street NW, was found in front of her home at about 3:30 p.m., police said. She had been stabbed once in the shoulder and once in the stomach. Charged with homicide was Robert Thomas, 36, of the same address.

Man Shot, Knifed by Two Youths

A Northeast Washington man was shot and knifed last night by two youths who stopped him and asked for a match.

John Davis of 847 21st St. NE is in "undetermined condition" today at the D.C. General Hospital.

According to the police, he was stopped about 9 p.m. at 44th and Ead Streets NE by two youths who asked him for a match. When Davis failed to produce one, one youth cut him with a knife and the other shot him in the abdomen.

Nixon Asks Added Role for White House Police

(By Ronald Sarro)

The Nixon administration today disclosed plans to more than triple the size of the White House police force and use it to protect crime-plagued foreign embassies and chanceries in Washington.

Administration spokesmen said that the plan was devised at President Nixon's personal direction after complaints about crime against foreign personnel and property "became a matter of urgent concern of the President."

The plan for a major departure from the traditional role of White House police, which under the Secret Service have limited their duties to protecting the White House and its offices, was disclosed at a hearing before the House subcommittee on public buildings and grounds.

Before the committee is a measure which would remove any statutory ceiling on the number of White House police and fully authorize the President to use the police and Secret Service for protection as he sees fit.

Committee members expressed support for protection of embassies, but they had serious questions about an unlimited White House police force and granting presidential authority in "blank-check" fashion.

Eugene T. Rossides, assistant secretary of the Treasury for law enforcement, said the administration wants to increase the size of the White House police from the 250 authorized since 1962 to 850. He said 400 of the new men would be assigned to embassies.

Since most White House police transfer from the D.C. police department and U.S. Park Police here, it seemed clear that the plan would siphon off men from those two departments which are currently trying to increase their own strengths.

Maj. Glenard Lanier told the subcommittee that the 500 additional positions could easily be filled from the District and Park police forces. He said they like the idea of working for the White House, but "they do not want to be policemen on the streets."

Rossides said the State Department has identified 20 or 21 embassies or chanceries in the city as needing full-time protection. Motor patrols would be used to cover the balance of the 117 embassies and chanceries, he said.

Rossides said the United States has been exposing itself to serious international problems "terribly" by not living up to its responsibility to protect embassies properly.

He said that when the complaints from embassies came to the personal attention of the President, Nixon called a White House meeting and it was decided to place embassy security under the Secret Service and White House police instead of the State Department's security forces.

Rossides emphasized, as did James J. Rowley, Secret Service director that the Secret Service will work closely with former D.C. Police Chief John B. Layton.

Layton has resigned from the police department to become a special assistant to Ambassador Emil Mosbacher Jr., chief of protocol, to work on the foreign embassy protection problem.

COMPLAINTS RISE

Rowley said that in recent months, "the administration has been receiving numerous complaints from members of foreign delegations . . . concerning the high incidence of crime resulting in the loss of embassy property and the victimizing of embassy employes.

"Embassy personnel have been subjected to acts of vandalism, robbery, bombing threats, and other crimes in close proximity of their embassies," Rowley said, citing specific examples at the Ethiopian Chancery in July and Saudi Arabian embassy in August 1968.

The Secret Service chief said he also wants additional men to provide an adequate force at the White House itself to respond to any eventuality, including rioting, without having to rely on outside forces.

As outlined by Rossides, District police would continue to do investigative work after arrests are made and to control demonstrations and disturbances near foreign property under an arrangement with D.C. Chief Jerry Wilson and Deputy Chief George Donohue.

In response to committee questions, Rossides said the President was not seeking a "blank check" to use the Secret Service for protection duties as he sees fit, but only wanted a congressional stamp of approval on his use of the Secret Service to do such things as guarding Gov. Nelson Rockefeller on his Latin American trip as well as visiting heads of state.

Rossides said the administration would not object if the committee put an 850-man ceiling on the White House police instead of an unlimited one and indicated he did not object to the restriction of their use at this time to the Washington area as long as this did not interfer with protecting the President's family.

NATIONAL HISTORICAL CIVIL ENGINEERING LANDMARK

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I attended the ceremonies providing for the designation of the Great Falls Canal and Locks as a National Historical Civil Engineering Landmark at the Great Falls Park, Va. The designation of these landmarks is a program carried on in conjunction with the Department of the Interior, National Park Service, and the American Society of Civil Engineers. This is a remarkable program, and very worthwhile, as it preserves our heritage in the field of civil engineering—which has played such a large role in the advancement of our country.

The bronze plaque was presented by the president of the society to the director of the National Park Service. The Great Falls Canal and Locks was an undertaking pioneered by George Washington, as president of the Potomac Co., in 1785–89. The completion of the canal and locks marked a major engineering feat in America. Even before the Revolution, a navigable Potomac waterway as a route for trade with the west beyond the Alleghany Mountains was proposed by George Washington. As surveyor, engineer, and military emissary for Virginia into frontier country, he saw the need. Later, he succeeded in importuning the Virginia and Maryland legislatures in 1785, to charter the Potomac Co. to make the river "a common highway for—navigation and commerce." The construction of the Great Falls Canal and Locks took from 1785 until 1802, and were operated until 1821. They marked the first major river navigation system to move this country westward.

It is noteworthy that the ASCE, founded in 1852, representing the private sector of our country, and the National Park Service, representing the Government, are working so closely to preserve this historic landmark.

I would like to take this opportunity to give special recognition of those who made yesterday's program such a success:

Representing the American Society of Civil Engineers

NATIONAL OFFICERS

Frank H. Newman, Jr., President.

Graham P. Willoughby, Vice President, Zone II.

Eugene W. Weber, District 5 Director.

William H. Wisely, Executive Secretary.

NATIONAL CAPITOL SECTION

Albert A. Grant, President.

GEORGE WASHINGTON CANAL AND LOCKS COMMITTEE

Gail A. Hathaway, Chairman.

John Nolen, Jr., Vice Chairman.

HISTORY AND HERITAGE OF AMERICAN CIVIL ENGINEERING

Neal Fitzsimons, Chairman.

REPRESENTING THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

J. E. N. Jensen, Associate Director for Planning and Development.

Nash Castro, Regional Director, National Capitol Region.

Floyd B. Taylor, Superintendent, Great Falls Park.

PUERTO RICAN DAY

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday the State of New Jersey will once again celebrate Puerto Rican Day, commemorating the attainment of commonwealth status by that lovely island on July 25, 1952. The close association between the United States and Puerto Rico goes back many more years, however, years of increasing mutual benefit and cordial cooperation.

Under its present constitution, Puerto Rico has made tremendous strides to-

XUM

ward transforming itself from an agricultural economy into a modern industrial society with a diversified economic base. In many ways, Puerto Rico has been a pace-setter, an example to the world of how economic development can be undertaken and achieved in a young and vital democracy.

In the development of new industry, in the training of workers, in the improvement of education, Puerto Rico has achieved outstanding successes. In the 7 short years between 1959 and 1966, Puerto Rico's national income more than doubled.

Today, she continues to make impressive progress: unemployment is gradually being reduced, while rapid development in both manufacturing and tourism have triggered a phenomenal rise in the standard of living. Puerto Rico has become a model of planned economic development and political stability.

Constitution Day is one for celebration, a day on which to pay tribute to the magnificent Puerto Rican people who love their country, their families, and their heritage. As U.S. citizens, Puerto Ricans have made significant contributions to all areas of public life—we have Rear Adm. Horazio Rivero, Commander in Chief of Allied Forces in Southern Europe; tennis great Charley Passarell; Peruchin Cepeza in baseball, Metropolitan Opera star Justino Diaz, actor Jose Ferrar and actress Rita Moreno. In my own 10th District, many of our leading citizens are of Puerto Rican background. I am looking forward to joining them in Newark on Sunday for the annual Puerto Rican Day parade, and I am delighted to add my warmest good wishes to all Puerto Ricans on this festive occasion.

ADDRESSES OF PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY AND SECRETARY-TREASURER WILLIAM F. SCHNITZLER OF THE AFL–CIO, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 17, 1969

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to be present with many others at a dinner held on July 17, 1969, in Washington, D.C., honoring William F. Schnitzler, the retiring secretary-treasurer of the AFL–CIO.

Under unanimous consent I submit the text of the two principal addresses delivered on this occasion, the first, by President George Meany of the AFL–CIO, and the second by Mr. Schnitzler for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ADDRESS BY AFL–CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY AT THE RETIREMENT DINNER FOR WILLIAM F. SCHNITZLER, SECRETARY-TREASURER EMERITUS OF THE AFL–CIO, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 17, 1969

I don't have to tell you that I am delighted that so many representatives of the AFL–CIO and its affiliates are present here tonight to honor Bill Schnitzler on his retirement and to wish Edith and Bill the best in the years to come, to enjoy that retirement.

Bill came to Washington 17 years ago as secretary-treasurer of the AFL, after many years of service in the Bakery and Confectionery Workers International Union. He has continued as secretary-treasurer of the AFL–CIO from the merger for the last 14 years.

He has seen much progress in that time—the progress of the AFL–CIO measured by the only measurement that is worth anything and that is the measurement of human values. In other words, benefits to our membership have been steady by any measure that relates to the primary function of a trade union center:

Better wages, better contracts, better conditions on the job, higher pensions, welfare benefits, more effective political action and an enhanced reputation and standing as a "peoples' lobby" here in Washington, lobbying for legislation that benefits all the citizens of this great country—education, minimum wage, civil rights—all of these enactments of the last few years bear the AFL–CIO label.

Of course it is not all a success story. We have by no means in these past 14 years pleased everyone by our actions. Some say that we are too powerful, that our wings should be clipped by putting us under the anti-trust laws as an illegal conspiracy against the public interest. And we are told that we are responsible for inflation, among other evils. We are portrayed, almost daily in the Soviet press, as agents of imperialism or lackeys of Wall Street.

And then there are those that say we have not really done our job, that we are essentially a narrow, economic pressure group, unmindful of the problems of our total society.

For instance, we have been told that we failed to develop the social consciousness required to reorder our priorities so as to achieve total commitment of our resources in order to expand the scope and quality of a broad range of essential community and social services (that is quite a mouthful) including guaranteed income for all. This, we are told, can be done by enlisting the maximum and meaningful participation of all those who live in the inner city, as well as consumer and professional groups from the liberal sections of our society.

In addition, we are told that we have failed to work with others to raise the level of public understanding of the great social, political and economic issues that face the American people, understanding that is necessary to stimulate and encourage maximum citizenship participation in the affairs of our nation.

Also, that we have failed to repair the alienation of the liberal intellectual and academic community, as well as the progressive forces dedicated to freedom, democracy, as well as building bridges to the totalitarian world dominated by our totalitarian brothers.

Also, we are told, that we are not responsive to the forces of change which are shaping our tomorrow as we should be, if we are to deal effectively with the new challenges that must be met, if we are to realize the bright new promises of the technological revolution which is shaping the fabric and structure of American life.

We lack, we are told, a sense of national commitment, as well as a sense of national purpose, which we must have if we are to cope with man's deteriorating environment. We should reorder our priorities and then commit ourselves to the implementation of those priorities in order that we may facilitate and accelerate the forces of peaceful social change by developing the economic social mechanism to make this possible.

We must, in short, reassert the sovereignty of man over things. And, we are asked, are we equal to the call of greatness?

Well, all I can say is that I am sorry about that.

Seriously, we must, of course, look ahead. There is much to be done that directly concerns all of us, our membership and their families. We must, for instance, for the benefit of our membership and their families and of all America, raise the minimum wage of the lower paid people of this country.

We must bring about the creation of a massive new jobs program to eliminate hard core unemployment. We must improve our educational system with fully funded programs, scholarships and facilities, with a better paid staff of teachers.

We need 26 million new housing units between now and eight years from now, in 1977.

So I can say to you here tonight that labor is aware of its problems. It is prepared to move ahead in the 1970's to discharge our obligations to the workers of America and to the community of which we are a part.

We need lower interest rates for mortgages so the people of this country can buy homes.

We have come to the point in this nation where a man making $20,000 a year with an average family cannot afford to buy his own home under the present monetary system.

We have got to do something about that.

We need a 50 percent increase in Social Security benefits.

We need a better deal for consumers. We need better protection, by law, for the safety of workers on the job.

And we must attack inflation at its base, the price-profit squeeze of the big corporations of this country.

And we need fair tax laws—laws that will make all pay their taxes in proportion to their income.

So I can say to you here tonight, while we are enjoying ourselves, that we have got to think of 1970—1970 is going to be a crucial election year.

All of the things we believe in will be at stake in that election and I hope it is true that they say we have the best political machine in America. I hope that is true because it is going to be needed in 1970.

And I am sure, as we proceed, that Bill Schnitzler will be an interested observer of the things to come. I am sure that he will have more than a passing interest in the work of the AFL–CIO and in the future progress of the workers of this country.

And, likewise, all of us here tonight (and I think we have demonstrated this by the presence of so many from so many organizations), will have a keen interest in what Bill and Edith will be doing in their retirement.

I am sure that I voice the sentiment of all those in the AFL–CIO and all those here tonight when I say to Bill and Edith:

Good luck, good health and many happy years to enjoy your retirement.

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM F. SCHNITZLER, SECRETARY-TREASURER EMERITUS OF THE AFL–CIO, AT HIS RETIREMENT DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 17, 1969

On an occasion like this, there are many things a man feels and many things he wants to say.

Some of the words won't go past the lump in my throat—so I'll settle for the "priority items", as they say in the jargon of official Washington.

First on the list of priorities is to count my blessings:

My devoted family—which has been not only tolerant of my travels and absences during the past 35 years—they have stood behind me and encouraged me in my work even when the miles I travelled were many and my absences were frequent and long.

I count my blessings for my many friends—those of you here tonight—those who can't be here—and those who have passed on and I'll never see again.

And I consider it a blessing that I have had a chance to work in the labor movement. I'm grateful that the members of Local 84 of the Bakers Union chose me to lead them back in Newark in 1934. They supported me then and I'm proud to say that they supported me for the next 35 years right up to June 30th. Let me say that it is not hard to be a union official when you have stand-up troops like those behind you.

But if I count my blessings, I also have to examine my regrets. I have only one, really. It is that I should have done more for the labor movement. What and how much, I don't know and it isn't really important. But as I stand here tonight I am sure that, along with achievements and successes, I've experienced my share of missed opportunities and setbacks. I know it and I'm aware of it. And I regret those omissions that could, perhaps, have helped to advance the cause of the labor movement.

I have tried to figure out what single achievement gave me the most satisfaction and which could be honestly considered a significant contribution to the cause of America and the labor movement. Without hesitation I come to the work of the Civil Rights Committee, which it has been my great honor to chair.

Long before other organized groups in America took affirmative action to abolish racial discrimination and eliminate prejudice, labor was at work in the field doing it. And since the merger in 1955, we in the AFL–CIO have made great strides to improve human relations and to ensure equal opportunity for all. To me, the chairmanship of the AFL–CIO Civil Rights Committee has been a true experience in brotherhood. Let me tell you, there is no greater cause than brotherhood but achieving it presents a never-ending task.

I would be less than honest if I didn't admit there were times when my heart was heavy and my mind in doubt about the fate of the labor movement. There were times when employer resistance to unions was fierce and to be a union member was to be less than a full citizen in their eyes. Good, hard-working men and women were physically assaulted and beaten and their dignity affronted—those were the times when my heart was heavy.

And then there were times when it was revealed that inside the house of labor itself there were those who weren't true to their trust and I had private doubts and fears again that the American labor movement might not survive.

If I had a guiding principle in those dark days of despair, it was simply to leave the gloom at home and never show it to my fellow trade unionists. I always tried to look ahead and keep my eyes on the doughnut rather than the hole. I tried to inspire confidence and steadfastness in my fellow union members.

But tonight will be wasted if I dwell too much on the past.

It is true, lessons are learned from the past. And we've taken our lumps and learned a great deal. But we've enjoyed some spectacular successes too—and they outweigh the bad days.

Look at the New Deal legislation of the thirties: The Wagner Act, the Social Security Act and unemployment insurance were at the top of the labor movement's legislative agenda and we pushed that legislation through the Congress at a time when there were only 3 million members in our ranks. The lesson here seems to be clear. And it presents a challenge to the labor movement of today and tomorrow. If 3 million union members could win legislative battles for the betterment of America, in the 1930's, then why can't 13½ million union members win the battle for the perfection of America in the 1970's?

From its earliest days labor has said: "In unity there is strength."

I trust today's younger generation of labor leaders will always remember this and keep it as their guiding principle—their slogan—too.

But as we look at the uncertainties of the future and realize the enormities of our needs and problems, slogans will not be enough.

The times will demand new courage; a vision of new horizons for ourselves and for the nation as a whole.

This new courage will have to come from men in the ranks of organized labor. New courage will be demanded of new leaders in the labor movement. For always there will be adversaries and always there will be developments to challenge our existence and our ability to influence the destiny of our country.

But we need not let these forces—whether foreign or domestic, internal or external—turn our vision inward and knot us into crises-encircled enclaves of institutionalized proletarians.

For today organized labor has the resources—the people, the funds, the expertise and talent, and the experience—to take an unlimited view of the future. We are in that position where our goals of tomorrow are providing us with our work now.

We will soon be dedicating our own Labor Studies Center, for example. That was the dream of the century for many of us and now it's almost with us—tomorrow's goal and we are working on it today.

We are doing our own building for the future. We are no longer simply struggling to survive in the here and now.

We are, in fact, a labor movement blessed with architects of courage, dedication and foresight. We are growing and prospering, and with men soon to be landing on the moon, we might even say "the sky is the limit."

But if we are to continue on this upward path, our own architects will have to have a new courage tailored to the temper of their time. They can learn a lot from the giants who were the founding generation of the labor movement. They can learn too from this current generation, for we have laid the foundation for the future and it is solid.

I'm proud, beyond words, to say that I'm honored that I have had the opportunity to help work on that foundation.

Last but not least on my list of priorities tonight, is a tribute to President Meany. My respect for and confidence in President Meany was always great and these have increased enormously since I came down here in 1953.

And without reservation, I can say the same thing about each individual member—past and present—of the Executive Council. Serving with them has been a true honor and a rare privilege.

And let me pay tribute to the officers of all our affiliated international unions. My regard for them has always been high and it is higher today after so many years of knowing and working with them.

In like manner, I take my hat off to the State and City Central Body officers and delegates around the nation. The union men and women who serve in these vital organizations do so at considerable expense and self-sacrifice. They give that extra effort that often makes the difference between a policy decision announced at the national level and a victory at the state and local level.

Last—but certainly not least—I want to pay a special tribute to the staff of the AFL–CIO—to the directors and their associates, to the secretaries and clerks and all the other people who work in the headquarters building and who never get their name in the paper. They're fine people and I consider each of them my friend.

To President Meany, members of the Executive Council, International Union officers, friends and associates, I want to say thank you—for this dinner and its opportunity for good fellowship—for years of satisfaction and warmth—for all you have done for the workers of America, for the people we are all so privileged to represent.

I want to take one more moment, to express my confidence in my successor, Lane Kirkland. He is a good man; he will do a good job. And I want to wish him the very best of luck and success.

And now, Mr. President, to all of you and to each of you—thanks for coming out tonight to break bread with an old baker and his dear wife. We'll never forget any of you—or this night.

OUR JOURNEY TO THE MOON

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is more than appropriate that we pause for a moment to reflect upon the wonderous events of the past few days. The success of our journey to the moon is almost beyond our comprehension and realization. And yet we claim with pride, and hopefully with humility, that we did it.

We delight, and rightfully so, in the experience of having achieved a great accomplishment, an effort unsurpassed in this century. We take pride in our technological and scientific expertise that culminated in this successful venture. We applaud the wisdom of those who had the foresight to approve the research and development of our space program. Like children, we are thrilled to have experienced the true spirit of pioneers and adventurers who have dared to enter the unknown. And all of us had the beautiful and simple excitement of actually witnessing through television this remarkable trip.

The truly beautiful and almost inspirational part of this whole effort is that it simply came to be a result of a determination and unity of effort that we rarely see or ever thought possible in this country today.

Yes, we did it. But let us really think about what we have done and about what we are going to do. The impact of the moon flight will be determined by history. Undoubtedly we will and should continue in our conquest of the unknown. But one thing is absolutely certain. If we can successfully conquer the moon, we most certainly have the know-how and wherewithal to settle our problems on this planet, if we just simply put our minds to it.

And that is what we have to do. It is unthinkable and contrary to what we have just accomplished for us to allow conditions of poverty, hunger, and deprivation and disease to continue to exist. We must reaffirm our stance against war and for peace. And we must continue to work to erase attitudes of hate and prejudice that keep our world in a constant state of turmoil and upset.

We have great resources at our command—great knowledge, great minds, great expertise, and great determination. All that we are lacking is the will. And we have shown that we have that. What we must do is direct it toward this planet.

Mr. Speaker, our responsibilities are tremendous. Let us not lose sight of them in the glory of our most recent national success. Let us rather learn from our victory in space and put this marvelous experience to work for us in a renewed and serious effort to make this world a better place to live in.

UNLAWFUL LAW OF THE LAND

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the American people are becoming increasingly disturbed at the gross usurpations which are being committed by the other two branches of Government. I speak plainly of the unlawful action of the judiciary, supported by the illegal action of the executive, in undertaking to force mathematical integration—not desegregation, but integration—on the citizens, both white and black, who have repeatedly rejected an artificial system which can only destroy their schools and injure their children.

The law of the land, enacted by the Congress, makes a clear distinction between integration and desegregation, but both the judiciary and the executive continue to ignore that distinction. It is our responsibility to use the power of the purse to check these unlawful activities.

The whole concept of financing education at the Federal level, where the Department of HEW can decree that "guidelines" must be followed or the schools will starve of the funds this body has appropriated, is monstrous. In the currently sought appropriations, over $15½ billion is requested for that Department. Of that amount the fantastic sum of over $2,290 million is for Federal education alone, making it one of the highest budgets of all of the Federal agencies.

All over our land our people are frustrated over being mistreated in their efforts to provide a quality education for their children. They blame their problems on Federal judges, guidelines, busing, ratio of races, pairing, and lack of discipline in our schools.

These problems never existed until Federal education was sold to the American people on the premise that it was desperately needed to prepare our children for the lead in technological competition with Russian students because of the threat from international communism. However, the opportunity for a superior public education existed for generations before Federal aid to education was ever even heard of.

I think most of our colleagues regard education as a sacred calf and are afraid to vote against any measure which appears to help give a child a chance to become educated. Yet we would be blind not to see what is taking place under the name of education for purely sociological goals. Certainly it is one thing to help education; another to control education as a means to an end that has never been approved by the people.

Public education in the United States is in a crisis and the crisis is a Federal problem—one to be solved by the Congress inasmuch as it is caused by Congress.

The more disturbances and community unrest that results from Federal interference, the more Federal solutions that are offered, and the more money demanded—but always producing only new problems. This year the Federal education bill is asking over $2 billion—how much next year? The educational-industrial complex wizards excel in the art of spending money to gain more control over education but it is never their money—always the taxpayers' money.

The only legitimate method to preserve quality public education and halt this bid for raw power is to close the dykes at the Treasury. Education is not a Federal function.

The way to solve the education crisis is at the source—to free education either by repealing the Federal education acts or to cease furnishing taxpayers' dollars which are being lavishly expended contrary to the law.

As I have said time and time again, Mr. Speaker, the people are speaking. Are we listening?

I include an informative article in the Dan Smoot Report for July 21, following my remarks.

The article follows:

UNLAWFUL LAW OF THE LAND

In the *Brown vs. Board of Education* decision of May 17, 1954, the Warren Court abandoned the ancient principle that a court should follow its own legal precedents, in order to reverse an 1896 Supreme Court decision, and to rule that racially segregating public schools by law violates the Fourteenth Amendment—though admitting that the Fourteenth Amendment, when written and proclaimed adopted, had nothing to do with public schools.

The Warren Court based its *Brown* decision: (1) on opinions of psychological and sociological "experts"[2] presented by the NAACP—some of whom were officially connected with the NAACP, an interested party in the cases; and (2) on a "Social Science Statement," signed, but not sworn to, by 32 "social scientists," none of whom had any firsthand knowledge of the problems involved in the cases at bar,[1] some of whom were communist-fronters, others of whom were socialists (domestic and foreign).

Brown is of preeminent importance, not because it ended legal segregation in public schools, but because, in it, the Supreme Court illegally asserted itself to be *the* governing authority in the United States. The Court assumed illegal power to change, ignore or abolish the Constitution, the laws of Congress, and the laws of individual states.

The *Brown* decision was immediately proclaimed the "law of the land"—although no court has authority to make law. Only Congress can make a "law of the land," and even that is not valid unless clearly authorized by some specific provision in the Constitution which is the supreme law of the land.

A court decision is applicable only to the parties specifically involved in the decision. The *Brown* decision involved only four school systems.

Nonetheless, there was insistent demand that all southern schools comply with the Supreme Court's new "law of the land." Most southern states resisted. Eisenhower used the Army to enforce the non-existent "law of the land" at Little Rock in 1957. Five years later, Kennedy used military power to enforce the non-existent "law of the land" in Mississippi.

All of this prompted, and gave pretext for, Martin Luther King's "civil disobedience," which quickly escalated, by design, into the sporadic guerrilla warfare that has ravaged our cities and college campuses for the past five years.

In 1964—ten years after the Warren Court's first school desegregation decision—Congress enacted a "law of the land" dealing with segregation in public schools.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 is unconstitutional. The Constitution grants the federal government no power to intervene in educational matters; and the Tenth Amendment specifically reserves to the states, or to the people thereof, all powers not granted to the federal government. Nonetheless, the Act is a law of Congress. The proper recourse of the people is not to disobey the law, but to elect Members of Congress who will repeal it.

Since we are compelled to obey the illegal mandate of the Warren Court's *Brown* decision of 1954; and since our respect for orderly processes of government requires us to obey the illegal mandates of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 until it is repealed, it is important to know what those mandates are.

In *Brown*, the Warren Court remanded the four cases to federal district courts, instructing the lower courts "to enter such orders as are proper to admit to public schools on a racially non-discriminatory basis, with all deliberate speed, the parties to these cases."[1]

The clearest judicial interpretation of this mandate was made by a U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, in *Briggs vs. Elliott*, on July 15, 1955. The Circuit Court of Appeals said:

"The Supreme Court . . . has not decided that the federal courts are to take over or regulate the public schools of the states. It has not decided that the states must mix persons of different races in the schools or must require them to attend schools or must deprive them of the right of choosing the schools they attend. What it has decided, and all that it has decided, is that a state may not deny to any person on account of race the right to attend any school that it maintains. . . . If the schools which it maintains are open to children of all races, no violation of the Constitution is involved even though the children of different races voluntarily attend different schools as they attend different churches. Nothing in the Constitution or in the decision of the Supreme Court takes away from the people freedom to choose the schools they attend."[1]

The intent of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, with regard to public schools, is also merely to order that they be operated on a racially non-discriminatory basis. Like the *Brown* decision of 1954, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not order *integration* of schools. It orders *desegregation*, which it defines as meaning *"the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion or national origin."* The Act specifically says that *"desegregation shall not mean the assignment of students in order to overcome racial imbalance;"* and it declares that nothing in the Act *"shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another . . . in order to achieve such racial balance."*

Southern schools complied with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by adopting freedom-of-choice plans—eliminating racial considerations in school operations, allowing every student, of whatever race, uninhibited free-

---

Footnotes at end of article.

XUM

dom to attend the public school of his choice.

At first, the Department of HEW and the federal courts approved the freedom-of-choice plans; but, as time went by, they perceived that parents and students in the south were not choosing to please judges and bureaucrats in Washington. Negroes were choosing to attend schools in their own neighborhoods, and so were whites.

In March, 1966, President Johnson's Department of HEW laid down guidelines establishing racial quotas for southern schools—requiring them, on pain of losing federal aid, to *force* Negro transfers to white schools, whether the Negroes like it or not, *to achieve such racial balance* as specified by HEW.[3] This action is specifically prohibited by the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Federal compliance teams, some of them using tactics described by one Congressman as brutal and inhuman,[4] roam the south, forcing school integration to comply with federal guidelines, in defiance of the preference of students and parents, and in violation of the law they claim to be enforcing. Federal courts have supported the illegal activities of HEW agents—with decisions holding that freedom of choice is not acceptable, unless students make the choices that Washington officialdom wants.[5]

Many school systems have been compelled to close schools in Negro neighborhoods and to bus the Negro students to schools in white neighborhoods. The inconvenience to Negro students; the overcrowding of schools they are forced to attend; the emotional disturbance and racial self-consciousness that such treatment creates; the economic waste of closing public schools to force Negroes to attend schools with whites; the additional cost to all taxpayers of providing busing services; switching emphasis from learning to racial integration—none of these considerations matters to the federal bureaucrats.

Nor does it matter to them that, under the pretext of enforcing the Civil Rights Act of 1964, they are violating it. They are also violating the Warren Court dictum, proclaimed in the *Brown* case of 1954, that *race must not be a consideration in the operation of public schools.* HEW now requires that *race must be the primary consideration in the operation of public schools.*

Early in 1969, the Warren Court joined the bureaucrats in violating the Court's own 1954 dictum and the 1964 law. The Court ruled that schools in one Alabama county must adopt a racial quota in hiring and assigning teachers.[6]

When campaigning for southern votes last year, Richard Nixon criticized President Johnson's HEW for using federal tax money to force illegal guidelines on schools. President Nixon's HEW secretary continues Johnson's guideline policies intact, and vows he will not change them.[7]

Johnson's HEW fixed September, 1969, as an absolute deadline for *all* schools to achieve total compliance with HEW's illegal racial-balance requirements, or lose federal aid. On July 3, 1969, Nixon's HEW and Justice Department announced that this deadline would be eased to give a few school systems (about 10 in all)[9] a little more time. The National Education Association led the legions of totalitarian liberals in denouncing the Nixon administration for yielding to southern pressure and scrapping HEW guidelines, which they called the "law of the land." Some of Nixon's "conservative" supporters in Congress applauded him for keeping his campaign pledge to relax harsh guidelines. But the clamor from both camps was false propaganda. Nixon officials specifically said they "want action by September, 1969," and made it quite clear that Johnson's HEW guidelines will not be altered even slightly.[9]

A typical situation has developed in Austin, Texas. Though it was not involved in the *Brown* decision of 1954, the Austin school system began, that year, to integrate. Now, 53% of its Negro students are in integrated schools. The remaining 47% of Negro students, exercising their freedom to choose, remain in all-Negro schools.

HEW ordered Austin to abandon freedom of choice, and to take steps that would force all Negro students to attend integrated school. In mid-June, 1969, the Austin school board, under threat of losing federal aid, adopted a plan that would close three schools in Negro neighborhoods and bus the Negro students to schools in white neighborhoods. One of the schools to be closed was the newest and best school facility in the city; the other two were as good as any in white neighborhoods.

On June 23, 1969, 300 Austin citizens (from affected Negro and white neighborhoods) met with the school board and protested. They were angry about the inconvenience and turmoil the new plan would cause; about the closing of expensive facilities and the consequent overcrowding of other facilities; about the additional expense of busing.

The Austin school board rescinded the new plan. Now, President Nixon's HEW says it will stop federal aid to Austin schools, unless the school board can discover some way to force total integration, against the wishes of Autsin students and parents.

Informed observers in Austin predict that the next court test may be initiated by Negro parents to retain voluntary segregation.[8]

A case of that kind has already been filed in Nashville, Tennessee, by Jack Kershaw, an attorney representing 11,087 whites and 2413 Negroes in Maury County.

Kershaw has filed a Petition to Intervene in the case of *Florence Ella Hatton, et al.,* vs. *County Board of Education of Maury County, Tennessee, et al.,* which was originally initiated on a complaint by civil-rights activists purporting to represent not only the named plaintiffs *but all other Maury County Negro children* (*and parents*) in voluntarily segregated schools. A federal judge ordered the defendant (County Board of Education) to abandon freedom of choice and to adopt a plan that will bring about "meaningful integration" of all schools in the county.

The 13,500 parents and students (Negro and white) whom attorney Kershaw represents claim *their rights* have been ignored. They want to keep, and have freedom to use, their neighborhood schools.

Commenting upon his case, Mr. Kershaw points out that the forced integration ordered in Maury County is illegal and unconstitutional on several counts, and adds:

"Then besides all this, the facts of life are such that forced integration would damage both races.

"Since I represent some blacks along with some whites, and since a good many blacks for various reasons have decided they want their own schools or colleges or 'black studies program' etc., I believe we may be coming to a time when we can cry 'halt' with some chance of success."[1]

The original sin in all this is federal aid to education. Clearly illegal (unconstitutional), it was fobbed off on the public under the spurious cry of necessity, and with the false promise that it would not bring federal control or meddling.

Federal aid has produced harmful, lawless government-by-guidelines not only in education, but in other fields critically affecting the welfare and fundamental freedoms of the people.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Letter to this *Report* from Jack Kershaw, attorney, 400 Stahlman Bldg., Nashville, Tennessee 37201, together with copy of Petitioners' Brief prepared by Mr. Kershaw in *Florence Ella Hatton, et al.* vs. *County Board of Education of Maury County, Tennessee, et al.*

[2] *The Role of the Social Sciences in Desegregation: A Symposium,* published by the Anti-Defamation League, 1958.

[3] *U.S. News & World Report,* May 2, 1966, pp. 25–7.

[4] "Browbeating Laid to U.S. Enforcers," *Dallas Morning News,* May 21, 1967, p. A8.

[5] *Dallas Morning News,* June 28, 1969, p. A16.

[6] *Time,* July 4, 1969, p. 63.

[7] *Dallas Times Herald,* July 2, 1969, p. A24.

[8] *Dallas Morning News,* June 23, 1969, editorial; June 28, 1969, p. A16; June 19, 1969, p. A25.

[9] *Dallas Morning News,* July 4, 1969, pp. 1, A10; July 5, 1969, p. A18; July 9, 1969, p. D1.

REDS WILL ATTEMPT TO PROFIT FROM NIXON'S VISIT TO RUMANIA

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as President Nixon departs on a major goodwill mission, it is necessary that the possible developments from this trip be treated in a realistic fashion. This is especially important in analyzing any results of the President's visit to Rumania, a country ruled by a Russian-imposed Communist government.

An extremely knowledgeable observer of the Rumanian situation is Copley News Service foreign correspondent, Dumitru Danielopol, a former member of the Rumanian diplomatic service. Writing in the Aurora-Beacon, Ill., News on July 18, Mr. Danielopol offers frank commentary on the present situation in Rumania. The article follows:

[From the Aurora-Beacon (Ill.) News, July 18, 1969]

REDS WILL ATTEMPT TO PROFIT FROM NIXON'S VISIT TO RUMANIA

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—At a recent press conference, Romanian Ambassador Cornelius Bogdan refused to discuss the agenda of the Bucharest talks between President Nixon and Nicolae Ceausescu.

But it's not difficult to predict Romania's strategy. The Reds will try to get the most out of the visit and give as little as possible.

Ceausescu is likely to tell President Nixon that Romania intends to pursue an independent foreign policy. That it would like to be another Yugoslavia.

To achieve this, he'll say, Romania needs to become economically independent from the Soviet COMECON and the only way this can happen is if it gets help from the West, especially the United States.

There will be hints that Bucharest might honor Romanian treasury bonds owed to American holders and unredeemed since World War II.

Ceausescu will express the hope that the United States will grant Romania "most favored nation" trade status which would permit more Romanian goods to be imported into the U.S.

But Ceausescu will not offer to use his dollars to purchase American goods. He will ask long-term credits with guarantees from the Export-Import Bank.

Romania being an independent country, Ceausescu will say, he cannot accept political strings to such assistance. He will argue that because of its proximity to Russia and its basic Communist tenets, Romania can-

XUM

not, in fact, become completely neutral but will have to remain a member of the Warsaw Pact.

No internal liberalization is possible, he will say, because it would give the Russians a chance to subvert his regime. He will point to Czechoslovakia.

What Ceausescu will not tell Mr. Nixon is:

(1) How much of the Romanian "independent" attitude has been adopted with the approval and even at the instigation of the Kremlin.

(Some Kremlinologists distrust Ceausescu's "independence." They say that it suits the Russians that Romania, a country of Latin origin, should play such a role with a view of convincing some Latin American countries that under communism, independence is possible.

(2) That Romania is in dire economic straits. Her economy is near bankruptcy—despite glowing reports published in Bucharest and parroted in some Western publications.

(3) That he is head over heels in debt to many Western nations including Western Germany, without any hope of becoming solvent.

(4) That the "most favored nation" clause will make very little difference to the Romanian economy because he has few goods acceptable to the sophisticated American market.

(5) That Romania is already over-industrialized in relation to its shrinking internal market. That she therefore produces mostly for export and her products can't compete. Some are sold at bargain prices as much as 50 per cent below cost.

Ceausescu also will not mention that while Romanian food products are offered for sale abroad the Romanian people go for weeks without eggs, meat, bacon and even onions. He won't remind the President that Romanian canned goods shipped to Canada for the United States have been turned back by American health authorities because they were judged a hazard to public health.

Shoddy textile products shipped to Austria have been refused even by poor peasants in Austrian mountain villages. About 90 per cent of a recent shipment remains unsold.

Nor will Ceausescu mention that the much ballyhooed tourist traffic to Romania is in fact a deficit operation. In order to attract hard cash customers from the West he has to offer bargain prices which in some cases represent a 50 per cent loss per tourist.

Who makes up the deficit? The Romanian people naturally.

One can go on and on.

The President must not lose sight of the fact that Romania—one of the richest countries of Europe before the war—is virtually another Cuba.

If Ceausescu is trying to emulate Yugoslavia politically, he must also do so economically. He must give peasants, workers and entrepreneurs the incentive to produce and the necessary purchasing power to buy the products.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS' McDONALD OBSERVATORY ON VERGE OF BREAKTHROUGH IN MOON EXPERIMENT

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, at this very moment a team of scientists at the University of Texas' McDonald Observatory are on the threshold of success in a critical moon experiment. This dedicated group has become the other end of an experiment initiated on the moon by Astronauts Neil Armstrong and Col. Edwin E. Aldrin.

The scientists are probing the moon's surface with a ruby laser fired through McDonald's new 107-inch telescope. They are searching for the reflector left behind by Armstrong and Aldrin.

It is a difficult job that requires pinpoint accuracy. The logistics are complicated since we have no definite fix on the exact position of Tranquillity Base. Hitting the 18-inch by 18-inch reflector with a beam of laser light is no easy task. Hitting a bull's-eye this small at a range of a quarter of a million miles was described by one scientist as something like hitting a dime with a rifle at a distance of 2 miles.

This reflector, which is officially called a laser ranging retro-reflecting prism, weighs 65 earth pounds—the equivalent to 11 pounds on the moon—and consists of a flat, square array of 100 cylindrical cavities. Each cavity contains a prism designed to reflect light back to its source.

Dr. Harlan Smith, chairman of University of Texas' Austin Astronomy Department and director of the astronomy at McDonald, says of the project:

> Scientists have long appreciated some of the remarkable things that could be done if a laser beam could range on a specific target on the moon.

In the past, lasers have been fired to the moon only to bounce off the lunarscape in all directions. Scientists were fortunate to get any return beam at all.

Now, a specific target is there, and—once it is found—our knowledge of the moon will be increased. For example, the measurements taken at McDonald, and later by other stations around the world, will help to determine the distance between the earth and moon to an accuracy within 6 inches. We will also learn the extent of lunar librations—the slow swinging of the visible portion of the moon causing areas at the edges to be visible at times—the lunar radius, fluctuations in the earth's rotation rate on its axis, extent of the wobble of the earth's axis, and the intercontinental drift rate—or how fast the United States is drifting from the Eurasian land mass.

The beam, which will be emitted through McDonald's telescope, will take approximately 2.5 seconds to make the round trip. Since the moon's orbit around the earth is not perfectly circular, these measurements are scheduled to be taken twice daily for the next 7 years to determine what that distance is at any given time.

The telescope will be linked with a computer to help keep instruments on earth and the reflector lined up for approximately 30 minutes while the measurements are being lined up.

Obviously, this is one of the key experiments undertaken by the moon landing. I am especially proud that the University of Texas' McDonald Observatory has the equipment and the trained men equal to the task.

Dr. Harlan Smith has been with the University of Texas since 1963. He left Yale University at that time to become astronomy department chairman and professor of astronomy.

Another key man in NASA's lunar-laser ranging experiment is Charles Jenkins, associate director of management for McDonald Observatory.

Mr. Jenkins is a graduate of University of Texas and a faculty member since 1965.

Johnnie E. Floyd, project manager for the University of Texas' part in the Apollo 11 lunar experiment, is also a graduate of the University of Texas. He also served as chief engineer for the installation of the 107-inch telescope.

The overall project is headed by Dr. Carroll O. Alley of the University of Maryland. Coinvestigators include Dr. Henry Plotkin, of NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center; Dr. Robert H. Dicke, of Princeton; Dr. Peter Bender, of the National Bureau of Standards; Dr. James Faller, of Wesleyan University; and Dr. Dave Wilkinson, of Princeton.

Although McDonald is administratively a part of the University of Texas, it is located some 400 miles from Austin atop Mount Locke in the Texas Davis Mountain.

I was privileged last fall to attend the impressive ceremonies when they dedicated this outstanding observatory.

Discoveries made at McDonald during its 37-year history include the existence of interstellar polarization and satellites of Uranus and Neptune.

More recently, McDonald astronomers have confirmed the first optical sighting of a pulsar—a dying star that is very small and very dense—and have obtained the first conclusive proof of the existence of water on Mars.

R. E. Nather and Dr. Brian Warner at McDonald were asked by two astronomers from the University of Arizona to verify the January 15 sighting of a flashing star in the Crab Nebula at the same position as a previously reported pulsar.

Nather and Dr. Warner had been working for more than a year in anticipation of an optical sighting of a pulsar, so when the request came, they were ready.

Quite obviously, Mr. Speaker, the scientists and equipment at McDonald were ready for the lunar experiment, also. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this team—they play a vital part in the moonshot and I think they represent the host of faceless men who have helped in this "small step for man, a giant leap for mankind."

APOLLO 11

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker—

> I believe this Nation should commit itself to achieving the goal, before this decade is out, of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to earth.

So spoke President John F. Kennedy on May 25, 1961. The historic Apollo 11 lunar landing has accomplished this goal. The technological challenge of the sixties has been met in more than full measure.

This landing on the moon climaxes a decade during which St. Louis Countians have played a major role in America's manned space flight program. Firms and universities in Metropolitan St. Louis have taken a hand in the space program from the beginning. The culmination of their research, engineering, and production skills was witnessed in the Apollo 11 launch and landing.

Of course, the achievement was national in perspective, continental in magnitude, involving the best efforts of industry and labor across the face of the land. Undoubtedly every contribution will be properly recorded. But it is on behalf of the significant input of the St. Louis area that I as Representative of Missouri's Second District wish to speak today.

McDonnell-Douglas, Emerson Electric, Sverdrup-Parcel and Associates, Washington University, St. Louis University, UMC Industries, Baganoff Associates, Davies Supply & Manufacturing Co., Missouri Research Labs, Monsanto Research, and some 70 other firms in the St. Louis area have made vital contributions to this national effort. Serving as a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House, I am well aware of the massive, combined efforts the Apollo flight required. St. Louis has been a leader in these efforts. For their past, present, and future work on the space program, the people of St. Louis and St. Louis County deserve the highest praise.

McDonnell-Douglas Corp. has in many ways been responsible for the successes of NASA's Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo projects. The keen foresight and fine judgment of James Smith McDonnell first brought his St. Louis company into the space field. He put 40 engineers to work on space capsules before our Government even embarked on the race to the moon. In 1959 this company won the competition as prime contractor for design, development, and construction of the Mercury spacecraft. His engineers and production technicians built the craft, as well as two procedural trainers, an environmental trainer, seven checkout trainers, and much of the prelaunch operations equipment at Cape Kennedy. In Project Mercury, six manned flights were completed, and much-needed knowledge on spacecraft control, space vision, and human factors was gained. After the success of Friendship 7, Astronaut John Glenn, America's first man in orbit, sent the McDonnell team his regards as a "very satisfied customer."

McDonnell engineers and technicians literally made Project Gemini, the second major phase of our space program. They produced the two-man spacecraft, and provided other necessary services and equipment. They constructed two mission simulator trainers, a docking simulator trainer, five boilerplate spacecraft, and three craft for ground tests in vibration and impact. Under Project Gemini, 10 flights, each with two-man crews, were completed. This amounted to nearly one thousand hours of space flight time. Among the accomplishments of Project Gemini were orbital flights of up to 14 days, rendezvous and docking operations in the earth's orbit, and controlled reentry and landing in a target area.

The Gemini performance was so flawless that NASA's Flight Director, Christopher C. Kraft, said, "McDonnell's engineers always seemed to be on top of the problem."

McDonnell Douglas men have also made additional and substantial contributions to the current Project Apollo. Engineers of the firm designed and produced the powerful S–IVB rocket, which served as the top stage of both the Saturn IB and Saturn V launch vehicles. In the Saturn I series the S–IV unit was used as the second stage in five space missions. Three of these flights placed giant Pegasus satellites into orbit. As the third stage of the Saturn V, the S–IVB rocket provided the final thrust to insert the Apollo 11 spacecraft and the crew into earth orbit. This rocket then restarted and sped the spacecraft from its parking orbit toward the moon's surface. But for these dedicated efforts by McDonnell Douglas, man might not have reached the moon as soon or as safely as he did.

Other St. Louis firms and universities have also made substantial contributions to the space program. The researchers of Emerson Electric Co. have produced microwave antenna components and provided products for nearly every one of our manned and unmanned space endeavors. Among this company's earlier contributions were multiplexers for Project Mercury, which made possible simultaneous transmission of two or more signals over a single circuit, and C-band and S-band antennas for Project Gemini. Their experts also produced life support systems for the suited astronauts, and tested radar devices for NASA. For the Apollo program the firm designed and developed S-band antenna feed systems for parabolic reflectors. These were used to track the Apollo during earth orbit and reentry, and to track the spacecraft to and from the moon. Emerson telemetry equipment as well was carried aboard the Saturn V vehicle.

Washington University has provided essential information in areas of cosmic ray physics, economics, aircraft structures, and in general science and engineering. A group of distinguished professors at Washington University developed unique cosmic ray detectors for project Apollo. These techniques will be used in measuring and analyzing the effects of cosmic radiation on the soil samples brought back from the moon. St. Louis University researchers have done work on the physiological effects of weightlessness and space radiation, as well as computer analysis for aeronautical vehicles.

Sverdrup, Parcel & Associates is another St. Louis firm which has played a major role in the Apollo lunar mission. This firm designed the test stand at NASA's Mississippi test facility, in which the booster rocket was tested before it propelled astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins toward the moon. The experts of Baganoff, Inc., in Jennings contributed to the acoustic and aerodynamic design of the Saturn V vehicle. Spools, harnesses, and ducts for the first stage, Saturn S–IC, were produced by UMC Industries; and Davies Supply & Manufacturing Co. aided in the development of protective treatments for the Saturn V. Much computer work for the orbiting geophysical laboratories was done by Missouri Research Labs, and Monsanto researchers have conducted optical studies of lubricants in aeronautical vehicles.

There are a number of other firms in the St. Louis area whose technicians, engineers, and researchers have helped advance our space effort. Some of these include Seyer-Buckner Tool Co. in Berkeley; Custom Printing Co. in Ferguson; General Electric Co., Rauch Tool & Manufacturing Co., and Robert Shaw Controls in Hazelwood; Missouri Metal Shape Co. in Overland; Conductron Corp. and Lectronix in St. Charles; and Advance Tool & Die Co., Akurate Tool & Die Co., Bendix Corp., Carondelet Foundry, Clevite Corp., Cobak Tool & Manufacturing Co., Comet Tool & Die Co., Consultants & Design Co., County Business Service, Eastern Stainless Steel, Essex Cryogenics of Missouri, Inc., Feth Karl Co., Ford Bill Kellas Co., Genisco Technology, Gulton Industries, Harris Manufacturing Co., Honeywell, Inc., Interco, International Business Machine, Lambert Tool Specialists, Maffitt Tool & Machine, Institute of Electrical Engineering, Mallinckrodt Institute, Marlo Coil Co., Matco Machine & Tool, McGraw-Edison Co., University of Missouri, Morgan Co., Nooter Corp., Nu-Lite Electric Wholesale, Pandjiris Weldment, Pollak & Skan, St. Louis Fire Door, Sorenson Co., Sperry Rand Corp., Stentor Tool & Manufacturing Co., TSI Thermal Systems, G. L. Tarlton Construction, Tech Manufacturing Co., Thermal Systems, Inc., Tornquist Machinery, Towell Printing Co., UMC Industries, USAF Aerochart Information, U.S. Army Materiel Command, United States Steel Corp., Universal Corp., Universal Marion Corp., Watlow Electric Manufacturing Co., Western Supplies Co., Westinghouse Electric, and C. J. Zone Manufacturing Co. in St. Louis proper.

The researchers, engineers, management personnel, unions, and production technicians of these firms and universities in St. Louis have contributed their thoughts and abilities to the Apollo program. The results of their labors have impressed all of the world.

Last January, Astronaut Frank Borman addressed a joint session of Congress and described himself and his colleagues as envoys of mankind who "stood on the shoulders of giants." The energies and efforts of the people of Metropolitan St. Louis are worthy inheritors of the giant spirits and intellects of the past which through the ages have propelled man's thoughts, and now man himself, to the moon. The pinnacle of achievement represented by this lunar landing removes from the realm of fantasy the exploration of the entire universe.

Today I am proud to pay tribute to those men and women of the Greater St. Louis area who have contributed so much, and so well, to our space efforts—and who have helped immeasurably to

XUM

fulfill the vision of the late President John F. Kennedy:

> It will not be one man going to the moon—if we make this judgment affirmatively; it will be the entire nation. For all of us must work to put him there.

AN ABM RESOLUTION

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, until a final decision has been reached not to deploy the proposed anti-ballistic-missile system, I feel that it is my duty and the duty of every concerned person not to let the matter rest, but instead to keep the issue in the forefront of congressional concern and in the public view.

As I have repeatedly stated, if this system offered the potential of enhancing our national security, I would not oppose it. But the truth of the matter is that it fails to offer this potential. Instead, it stands as a threat to realistic national priorities. In light of this, I am firmly convinced that acceptance of the President's proposal would not be in our national interest.

Recently I received a resolution from the Diocesan Council of the Episcopal Diocese of Long Island which reconfirms my views. Since this group has presented a well-written and concise statement, I would like to extend my remarks to include it in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION ON NATIONAL PRIORITY AND THE ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

The Urban Commission of the Department of Missions, at a meeting on May 22, 1969, adopted a Resolution on National Priority and the Anti-Ballistic Missile System, introduced by the Rev. Louis Ferrara, and requested the Department of Missions to submit the same to the Diocesan Council for consideration. The Resolution is as follows:

Whereas, the issue of national priorities is a matter of grave consequence, not only for the future of world society but also for the future of the American city;

Whereas, the 1968 resolution of this Diocese concerning the report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders urged that Federal, State and local revenue systems be brought up to date in order to provide the resources to pay for the massive and vital needs of large segments of our people;

Whereas, the American economy, because of inflationary pressures, must carefully weigh its fiscal priorities and expenditures;

Whereas, the deployment of a thin anti-ballistic missile system at an initial estimated cost of five billion dollars has raised serious questions among groups in our society—for example, within the United States Senate, and among a large percentage of scientists;

Whereas, the progress in implementing the recommendations of the Kerner Report has been disappointing;

Therefore be it resolved, that the Diocesan Council urge the United States Senate not to approve the administration's recommendation for the deployment of a thin anti-ballistic missile system.

Further be it resolved, that we reiterate our "commitment to national action on an unprecedented scale" which will alleviate the conditions of poverty, deprivation and disadvantage among large segments of our people.

GARBAGE PROTECTION BY FOURTH AMENDMENT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, under the impetus of the unbelievable distortions of our Constitution by the Warren Supreme Court and the outlandish decisions of the local Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, criminals are carefully protected from law-abiding citizens. To arrest a criminal is difficult, to convict the guilty well nigh impossible, and to have such a conviction sustained on appeal borders on the miraculous.

Americans who believe in the maintenance of law and order simply cannot understand the philosophy of these wild theories of coddling of the guilty, and continually raise the fair question—How did this judicial disorientation come about?

Part of the answer, difficult as it is to accept, is spelled out in a news story in yesterday's local papers, which I insert at this point:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 23, 1969]

PROBE ORDERED OF TRASH-SPYING—"SPECIAL PICK-UPS" HELP INVESTIGATORS

Mayor Walter E. Washington today ordered an immediate investigation into the Sanitary Engineering Department's practice of helping police investigators by making a "special pick-ups" of a suspect's trash.

The mayor ordered a "full review" of the sanitation department's practice after a reporter questioned its co-operation with Navy investigators in preparing a case against Seaman Roger Priest, charged with sedition and desertion in connection with an anti-war newsletter he publishes.

A letter investigators said they found in trash gathered at Mr. Priest's apartment house, was introduced as evidence against him in a preliminary hearing yesterday.

Norman E. Jackson, head of the Sanitary Engineering Department, said he did not know the department was making "special pick-ups" for police. He said he did not believe the department had any formal policy about doing this, and ordered William F. Roeder, head of the sanitation division to investigate.

When asked if the former commissioners had made any policy statements on special pickups, Mr. Roeder said Walter Tobriner, "ordered us not to."

Mr. Roeder estimated the department makes half-a-dozen to a dozen pickups a year for police. He said a regular truck is used "but we keep the trash in a burlap bag. We can't send a separate truck because the people would get suspicious.

"If the police ask us to do this we co-operate with them," he said. "If something like this is publicized, people get into the act and say it interferes with their rights. But we say it's in the interests of law and order."

Mr. Roeder said, "Some years back we used to do it quite frequently for the FBI but we had some difficulty. Some organization with communistic tendencies made a big issue about it a few years ago."

EVIDENCE IN SEDITION CASE CAME FROM TRASH—25 AGENTS INVESTIGATED CASE—AND CANS

Evidence used to bring sedition charges against a D.C.-based seaman was gathered by some 25 investigators who, among other things, picked through a bag of garbage hauled from his apartment.

Naval Investigator Robert V. Howard Jr. told a hearing officer yesterday the Department of Sanitation co-operated with the agents in preparing charges against Roy L. Priest, 25, publisher of an anti-war newsletter.

Mr. Priest is also charged with soliciting servicemen to desertion in the newsletter, but the sedition charge, which carries a possible 10-year sentence, is the most serious.

Lawyer David Rein said the defense would be "everything he said in his articles is protected by the First Amendment."

The hearing, which continued today, is a preliminary to a decision by naval officers as to whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant court martial.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 23, 1969]

SAILOR'S LAWYER BLASTS NAVY'S PROBE METHODS

(By David Holmberg)

A hearing in the case of an apprentice seaman accused of publishing an anti-war newsletter ended today with a slashing attack on the Navy's investigation of the case by the sailor's lawyer.

Washington attorney David Rein, in a 25-minute summation in the pretrial hearing in the case of Seaman Roger Priest, said the Navy's methods of investigation have "done much more to bring discredit on the armed forces than anything Roger Priest has done."

Rein referred to testimony at yesterday's hearing that the Navy had assigned 25 agents to the case, had searched the trash of Priest's apartment house in search of evidence, and had used various ruses to gain evidence against the 25-year-old seaman.

TRASH SEARCHED

Referring to the fact that the trash of three other residents of Priest's apartment house had been searched during the investigation, Rein said, "I wonder if they (the Navy) are tending to their business, or to civilians."

Rein also noted that at an anti-war conference attended by Priest six of 15 persons in one workshop were Naval intelligence agents.

In his summation, Rein also gave a detailed critique of the nine charges filed against Priest for publication of the newsletter which he called "OM."

He said that a charge of soliciting to desert could not be proven because there is not a shred of evidence here that the charge does not refer to the "abstract statements and philosophical ideas" contained in the newsletter.

RELATIONSHIP CITED

Referring to a charge of disrespect toward a superior officer, which he said appeared to be based on remarks in Priest's newsletter about Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Earl B. Wheeler, Rein said there was "no proof that Wheeler is the superior officer of Roger Priest," and that there was not the kind of officer-enlisted man relationship between the two men implied in the statute.

Another charge by the Navy—that Priest did not make clear that the newsletter was an expression of his private opinion—was rebutted by Rein, who said the public could not possibly confuse the views expressed in this paper with those of the U.S. Navy.

A decision on whether to continue the case against Priest with a court-martial will be decided in about 15 days, Navy sources said.

If he is court-martialed and convicted, Priest could receive sentences ranging from a dishonorable discharge to 10 years in prison.

The two-day hearing, which was held at the Washington Naval Station, is comparable to a grand jury proceeding in civilian law.

Mr. Speaker, one of these stories quotes a municipal official as saying that

XUM

the cooperation of the sanitation department with law enforcement agencies—in segregating trash discarded by suspects, mind you—brought about difficulty because some organization with "communistic tendencies" made a big thing of it a few years ago.

Lest we question the truth of that statement, I call to the attention of our colleagues the fantastic nature of the situation reported in these news stories. Again a "big issue" is made of the careful manner in which an investigation of an alleged serious felony is conducted. Incriminating evidence which was actually thrown away and discarded in his trash by a suspect was painstakingly recovered. And his attorney loudly complains. And the "mayor" of Washington orders an immediate investigation.

The complaining attorney is one David Rein. This is not a new name in Washington, or to those versed in the identity and tactics of subversives. For the information of our colleagues, I insert the reports on David Rein published by a committee of this House 19 years ago, and again 10 years ago, identifying him as a known Communist, following my remarks:

EXCERPTS FROM REPORT ON THE NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD—LEGAL BULWARK OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1950

(Prepared and released by the Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.)

The committee is reproducing below a list of National Lawyers Guild members who have represented witnesses before the Committee on Un-American Activities. In each case, the witnesses have refused to answer questions regarding Communist affiliations propounded by the committee. In a number of cases espionage activities were involved. It should be noted in this connection that it is standard Communist practice to accept as attorneys only those who agree to abide by the party's propaganda and conspirative directives. Cases are known where attorneys who have volunteered their services have been summarily rejected because they would not become partners to the party's ulterior purposes.

Attorneys, witnesses, and dates of appearance:

David Rein, 1105 K St., NW., Washington, D.C.:

Frank Hashmall	July 14, 1950.
Charlotte Oram	June 28, 1949.
Nathan Gregory Silvermaster	Aug. 4, 1948.
William Ludwig Ullman	Aug. 10, 1948.

The committee does not dispute the right of witnesses appearing before it to have the benefit of counsel. However, the committee believes that the attorneys mentioned above knowingly or unknowingly function under a directive issued by the Central Control Commission of the Communist Party which prohibits its members from cooperating with the committee when subpenaed before it. Cases are known where persons subpenaed before the committee indicated a willingness to cooperate with the committee, but when these persons consulted certain of the attorneys listed above they refused to answer questions put to them by the committee.

COMMUNIST LEGAL SUBVERSION—THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNIST LAWYER

(Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, 86th Congress, first session, February 16, 1959)

DAVID REIN, WASHINGTON, D.C.

David Rein was identified as a member of the Communist Party by Herbert Fuchs and Mortimer Riemer, both former Communists, in testimony before this committee on December 13, 1955, and December 14, 1955, respectively.

Professor Fuchs testified that Rein was a member of a Communist cell of lawyers operating within the National Labor Relations Board where both men were employed as lawyers in the late 30's and early 40's.

Mortimer Riemer testified that he too knew David Rein in the cell of lawyers at the National Labor Relations Board and further testified that Rein in 1943 had tried to reenlist him in the Communist Party after Reimer had decided that communism was not for him.

David Rein appeared as a witness before this committee on February 21, 1956. When he was questioned by the committee concerning his Communist Party membership he refused to answer, basing his refusal on his constitutional privileges, including the fifth amendment.

After finishing law school in 1935, Mr. Rein held a series of jobs with the New York City Charter Commission, the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration, and a Committee To Revise the Constitution of New York State. In 1938 David Rein started to work for the National Labor Relations Board in Washington, D.C., as an attorney. In 1942 he transferred to the legal division of the Office of Price Administration. In 1945, after service in the Marine Corps, he returned to work at the National Labor Relations Board. In 1946 he went into private law practice.

David Rein was retained by the American Committee for protection of Foreign Born to defend various aliens facing deportation because of their Communist activities. In 1956, prior to a Supreme Court hearing on one of these deporation cases, the ACPFB gave a testimonial dinner in honor of David Rein and his law partner. Alec Jones, campaign and educational director of the ACPFB, gave the testimonial speech in which he praised both attorneys and noted that "without their knowledge, guidance, and devotion our cause may well have been set back. * * * There is no way to truly assess the role they have played in our work. * * * If it were not for [them] * * *, we would be lost down there [in Washington]."

Rein has been a member of the National Lawyers Guild since 1938. In 1940 he was a candidate for delegate to the national convention of the guild. He was elected secretary of the Washington, D.C., chapter in 1946 and in 1949 was elected to the guild's national executive board. He was still a member of the board in 1957.

Other Communist fronts in which David Rein has been active are the Washington Book Shop, the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, and the American League for Peace and Democracy. He was a sponsor of the National Nonpartisan Committee to Defend the Rights of the Twelve Communist Leaders.

In opposition to anti-Communist legislation, Mr. Rein has been quite vocal. He was one of those who signed a statement against the Mundt anti-Communist bill in 1948. In a speech before the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born he condemned "the notorious 'Smith Act' as a repressive measure against foreign born * * * which was passed by Congress * * * without any consideration of really what it meant or what it implied."

YOUR SIGN IS NO MORE

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, Leo Rennert, Washington staff writer for the McClatchy newspapers, of Sacramento, Calif., recently shared with his readers the story of Vicki Cole, of Deshler, Ohio—the story that could well be titled "What Happened to Vicki Cole's Dream?"

This 13-year-old miss, obviously with hope in her young heart that the Republican presidential candidate would offer to America a "togetherness" which so many people felt was sorely missing from the American scene, waved a sign saying "Bring Us Together," during a campaign stop in Deshler. It caught candidate Nixon's eye and it became his campaign motto. Upon election, it became the trademark and objective of his administration.

Mr. Rennert, in his commentary, tells Vicki that her sign is no more and that her dream has been shattered.

It would behoove us all, Mr. Speaker, no matter what side of the aisle we occupy, to understand one writer's reasons why young Vicki's sign so quickly became an idle dream.

The commentary follows:

YOUR SIGN IS NO MORE

(By Leo Rennert)

WASHINGTON.—No, Vicki, your sign is no more.

For a while, it lifted the spirits of many people, including presidential candidate Richard M. Nixon as he stumped through Ohio.

The story, with its simple eloquence, flashed across the continent. How 13-year-old Vicki Cole of Deshler, Ohio, waved the sign, "Bring Us Together," and caught Nixon's eye.

The GOP standardbearer found a motto for his drive to the White House. When he was elected, it was your sign which became the trademark of the new administration—the grand objective for the Nixon years.

You attended the inauguration as the President's guest and heard his solemn pledge to bind up old wounds.

But your sign is no more . . .

There were many who believed at the outset that "Bring Us Together" might not be an idle dream. The President inherited a badly divided nation—with a growing gulf between white and black, young and old, rich and poor. But the opportunity for reconciliation, for a new beginning, was there.

YEARNING

Like you, the nation was yearning for leadership which would restore a sense of common purpose and unity. There were even some strong hints that the new occupant at the White House was sensitive to this feeling.

Remember how he publicly confessed that his standing among 22 million Negroes was less than satisfactory but that he was determined to prove by solid deeds that he deserved their respect?

He was going to lead an "open" administration, which would listen with sympathy to the disaffected and the disappointed and then shape its policies on a broad-gauged plane without rancor or politics-as-usual.

All that is part of the distant—and almost forgotten—past.

And your sign is no more . . .

Negro leaders went to The White House and heard soothing words. One of those present got so carried away he later said Nixon would do more for the Negro than any or all of his predecessors. James Farmer, an erstwhile CORE militant, even got named to an assistant secretary post in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

But these, it turned out, were all pleasant preliminaries. Preseason exhibition games, as they say in baseball. When the real ball game began, the strategy and the lineup were suddenly quite different.

ADJUSTMENT

There were "adjustments" in the way the government would handle contracts with firms which refuse to guarantee equal employment opportunities. Over at the Justice Department, officials could not decide whether to support extension of the 1965 Voting Rights Act and then did their best to torpedo it. And despite some objections from HEW Secretary Robert Finch, school desegregation guidelines were reinterpreted to please Southern segregationists.

As a 13-year-old, Vicki, you were old enough to remember Birmingham, Selma and Montgomery—and the white and black civil rights workers who gave their lives so that an aroused Congress finally would pass long-overdue civil rights legislation. But now a "law and order" president has cast a shadow over these statutes and moderate Negroes—let alone radicals—also are beginning to ask whether it serves any purpose to seek progress within the system.

So your sign is no more. . . .

The poor tasted a brief period of hope when White House House adviser Daniel Moynihan and Finch began talking about revolutionary new approaches to welfare to guarantee income security and a basic level of decency for all Americans. But their influence is declining every day. A new coalition of older conservatives and young, hardened public relations professionals now controls the White House. And they are far more concerned with the unblack, the unyoung and the unpoor.

VIETNAM

In the meantime, the Vietnam war—that most troublesome of divisive issues—continues without too much light at the end of that interminable tunnel. The President's assurance he had a plan to end the war has become a bitter joke. So far, he has been more intend on practicing togetherness with Gen. Thieu than with Sen. Fulbright.

The young, observing all this, are confirmed in their cynicism.

And your sign is no more. . . .

It is not a case of the President pursuing deliberately a divisive course. Rather, he has turned timid, hesitant, vacillating in the face of great challenges. And that type of chief executive just cannot inspire the kind of national moral drive and sense of great common purpose necessary to "Bring Us Together."

So what finally happened to your sign?

According to one unconfirmed report, Sen. Everett McKinley Dirksen grabbed it away from the President, used it to bang Secretary Finch on the head, then tossed it into the Potomac, which—as you may have heard—is dangerously polluted.

REAL GOALS OF THE U.S. MISSION TO THE MOON

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the July 28 issue of U.S. News and World Report contains a brief but excellent summary of the goals of the Apollo 11 manned lunar landing. Because of the significance of this succinct but accurate statement I am including it in the RECORD.

The summary follows:

REAL GOALS OF THE U.S. MISSION TO THE MOON

SPACE CENTER, HOUSTON.—Long before their blast-off to the moon on July 16, America's astronauts were thoroughly schooled for this important assignment—

Bring home from the moon some substance that may unlock mysteries baffling to mankind through aeons: How was the earth born? When and how will it die?

Other scientific assignments went into space with Apollo 11. Completing them was the real goal of a mission that could keep the earth's scientists occupied for years.

If all went well, from the launching to splashdown in the Pacific—scheduled for July 24—the stage would be set for nine additional American moon landings in the next three years.

Further information will be sought in those later, more complex expeditions, for many scientists believe that imbedded somewhere on the moon—relatively unscoured by winds and rain that eroded away secrets on earth—is evidence of how life began.

The head of the Apollo program, Dr. George E. Mueller, says there is a "reasonable" chance of finding some evidence of life—past or present—on the moon. He told "U.S. News & World Report" that the life could include tiny plant spores and protozoa—perhaps just under the surface of the moon.

Dr. Mueller, differing from the views of many experts, predicts that the discovery of life may be among the chief surprises that American astronauts will find in their lunar exploration.

The key experiment called for the collection of lunar soil. The instructions to the astronauts: Gather up 50 to 130 pounds from the surface, to be brought back in two sealed, airtight containers. About half was wanted in the form of 50 pounds of bulk samples dug at one spot. Also required were 14 documented samples collected from a circle 100 feet away from the ship. Other material was wanted from at least a few inches to a foot below the surface.

ANALYSIS ON EARTH

The plan was for the material—once returned to the Lunar Receiving Laboratory here at Houston—to be fully examined to make sure it could not unleash some strange plague that would devastate life on earth.

Tests, ready at Houston, were as rigorous as plague specialists could devise. Under the plan: Germ-free mice to be exposed to the moon substance for three weeks. Fertilized eggs to be injected with it. Thirty-three kinds of plants to be exposed to it. Creatures including fish, birds, oysters, shrimp, cockroaches, houseflies and protozoa to be placed with the moon material for prolonged periods.

Only after all these tests indicated that the moon's soil was harmless could the material be declared safe for study outside of a sealed atmosphere.

In laboratories from one end of the earth to the other, excitement among scientists was at a peak over the prospect of having pieces of the moon for detailed analysis.

Some scientists were skeptical that moon material from this or any mission would provide any new information at all. Many others hoped that lunar soil will act as a sort of Rosetta stone to unlock fundamental secrets of the universe.

In all, the space agency arranged for 142 investigators and 400 coinvestigators to study moon samples. The original material was to be sliced up, photographed, X-rayed and studied under microscopes by specialists from all over the world. Twenty institutions in nine countries were directly involved.

For the astronauts—Neil A. Armstrong, Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr., and Michael Collins—there was this plan: upon return to earth, to be quarantined for 21 days, treated as if they were potential carriers of plague from an alien planet. Although scientists generally agreed that the chance of moon contamination is infinitesimal they nevertheless favored treating the hazard with utmost care.

In the flight plan, at every step back from the moon, any lunar dust was to be either jettisoned with unwanted equipment, brushed out, vacuumed up, captured in chemical containers or eliminated in some other way.

As the flight plan spelled it out: When Apollo's hatch was opened as it bobbed on the ocean waves, a frogman wearing a protective suit was to toss the astronauts three similar garments for them to don before they emerged. As further protection, when the astronauts tumbled into a waiting life raft, they and the frogmen were to take turns scrubbing one another with a surgical disinfectant while awaiting pickup by a helicopter.

Once aboard the aircraft carrier *Hornet*, instructions were for the moon explorers to be hustled into a Mobile Quarantine Facility the size of a moving van. From there—remaining in the van—the crew was to get a sea voyage to Hawaii, an air trip by giant cargo plane to Texas, and a short ride by truck to the Lunar Receiving Laboratory.

Here—in 8-million-dollar quarters that were planned years in advance—the three lunar travelers were scheduled to be carefully observed for three weeks.

This quarantine period was chosen because it exceeds the time it takes for any epidemic-type disease to develop on earth. "It is the only thing we have as a guide," space officials explain.

Meantime, a crew was in training for the flight of Apollo 12, scheduled for early autumn. If all went the way the planners laid it down, the opening of a "new world" would be well under way.

OBSCENE MAIL

HON. JOHN N. HAPPY CAMP

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I have never seen the flood of obscene mail as extensive as it is today. My office has been besieged with complaints from parents and businessmen who receive a steady deluge of offensive, perversive, and disgusting mail.

My constituents are angry. They want to know why Congress has not been doing anything about the forces which are eroding the basic, fundamental morality of our young people. They cannot understand why the U.S. mails should be freely available to those who want to corrupt the morals of our young or satisfy the lewd desires of the perverted.

At this point, the only thing I can tell my constituents to do is complete a small, simple form at their local post office stating they do not want to receive such mail. Then what happens? They still receive the mail. They write to me and ask me to have the Post Office Department investigate. I contact the Post Office and learn that they have been investigating a certain firm for years; the offender has possibly had a grand jury indictment returned against him, has appealed the ruling, and awaits further action by the U.S. attorney for that particular geographical jurisdiction. I am then advised that the U.S. attorney must make a decision as to prosecution under the postal obscenity statute, while he keeps in mind recent controlling decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

XUM

The end result of all this is that my constituent still receives the offender's obscene mail in his mail box. The Post Office has spent a great deal of money investigating the offender, and the offender goes virtually free because of the Supreme Court decisions on obscenity.

The Supreme Court, as we all know, has held the position that nothing is obscene—no printed work, no film, no magazine, no matter how obviously filthy, can be outside the limits of freedom of expression and the protection of the first amendment.

Obviously, the questions to be answered are: "Who is to determine what is obscene?" and "How does Congress get around Supreme Court decisions on pornographic cases?"

I have today introduced legislation that I feel answers both questions.

My bill is designed to permit the receiver of such mail to determine whether or not he wants such mail. If he does not, all he needs to do is sign his name and the names of his family to a list at his post office, which is then forwarded to Washington and included on a master list. All sexually oriented mailers will be required to purchase a copy of the master list and remove all names listed from his mailing list. If the mailer does not immediately do so, and if the person still receives such mail, the mailer is subject to immediate court injunction and prosecution, with a fine of $5,000 or imprisonment for 5 years, or both, for the first offense, and a fine of $10,000 or imprisonment for 10 years, or both, for each offense thereafter.

Freedom of speech, the basis of the Supreme Court decisions which have brought about such chaos, is not freedom to poison the minds of our children with books and pictures with no artistic merit or socially redeeming value.

The eminent jurist, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes said:

> Freedom of speech is not the right to cry "Fire!" in a crowded theatre.

Why then must freedom of speech give the right to anyone to increase his own personal finances by sending obscene, sexually oriented material through the mail? Why must freedom of speech give this sick person the freedom to break down and destroy the morality of our young people?

If we pass this legislation, we will have taken a step in the right direction toward protecting minors from being mentally contaminated by prohibiting sex-oriented books, magazines, and materials being sent to them through the mails.

A TRIBUTE TO ESSAE MARTHA CULVER AND HER LEADERSHIP FOR LIBRARIES

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education, which has jurisdiction over legislation affecting the improvement of local libraries, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the outstanding contributions which have been made in this field by Miss Essae Martha Culver.

Miss Culver's name is synonymous with libraries in her own State of Louisiana, where she served as first State librarian and was responsible for establishing a nationally recognized library chain through every one of the 64 parishes in Louisiana.

Miss Culver, the great-aunt of our distinguished colleague from Iowa, Congressman JOHN CULVER, has not limited her talents and expertise to Louisiana, but has served also as president of the American Library Association and the International Library Organization. She has helped develop new concepts and programs, such as the mobile library system, which are being utilized today throughout the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Baton Rouge State-Times recently carried a feature story about Essae Culver, and include it at this point in the RECORD—as a tribute not only to Miss Essae, but to the thousands of other dedicated men and women like her who have helped, through libraries, broaden the horizons of citizens in every part of the country. These are the selfless public servants who we in Congress support when we enact and appropriate funds for programs like the Library Services and Construction Act.

The story follows:

[From the Baton Rouge State-Times (La.), June 27, 1969]

ESSAE MARTHA CULVER'S NAME SUGGESTS LIBRARIES; A GENTLE LADY REMEMBERS

(By Cynthia Woody)

When you think of sky, you think of the color blue; mention of poetry brings to mind rhyme; the suggestion of ham calls for eggs and salt conjures pepper. In free association one image brings immediately to mind another, its complement. Such is the case with Miss Culver . . . when you think of Louisiana libraries the name Essae Martha Culver is a natural association.

A host of "firsts" accrue to her name, so many that you wonder if she is an over ambitious super star. The list of her accomplishments is staggering and "firsts" for her include leadership as the first Louisiana state librarian, the one responsible for developing today's nationally recognized library system. She was the first woman from Southern libraries to be elected president of the international library organization, one of only two American Library Association presidents to be selected from the South, and the first woman to receive an honorary degree from her alma mater, Pomona College in California. (LSU incidentally followed suit. Personal modesty, however, prohibits use of the title.)

But, a super business woman Miss Essae Martha Culver is not. Poised, soft spoken, Miss Essae is a Southerner by adoption with all the cultivated grace of lady to the plantation born.

FULL CIRCLE

Today this lady expresses pleasure and recognition to all the staff and citizenry who helped her in fulfilling the completion of a dream. Approaching a decade after her retirement, 44 years after her first sleepless July night here, a vision too wide to dare to dream has come full circle. This year the last link of a 64-parish library chain fell into place as Jefferson Davis Parish (the last in the state) received its full measure of library service.

Now, comfortable and cool in her bungalow off Acadian Thruway, Miss Culver awaits another series of hot July days. Amid a hodge-podge of personal memorabilia from family, friends and fans, she spends part of each day sorting, filing and discarding letters and papers accumulated during a lifetime of "living libraries."

Along with photographs of the family, art pieces, souvenirs acquired in travels from Alaska to Mexico, is a striking antique, a writing stand given to her by Lyle Saxon, who headed the WPA Writers Project in this state at one point administered by the state library. The set had belonged to Mr. Saxon's grandfather, a Mr. Chambers, who long ago had a bookstore on Third Street.

SETTLED HERE

"I am perfectly content here," remarked Miss Culver, "although I originally intended to return to California . . . but why go anywhere now."

"I want you to know," she stated, raising her voice a bit, "how consistently wonderful the response of Louisiana people was to the establishment of libraries."

"Sometimes I would grow discouraged," she noted, "because I didn't know anybody, not one person in Baton Rouge when I came."

This she remarked as she lapsed into a recitation of the state's leading citizens who shared her burden and enthusiasm for the library project. Among many, many others she mentioned the help of the late Dr. Mary Mims and the late Mr. J. O. Modisette of Jennings, both of whom served as library board members.

RURAL ENCOURAGEMENT

"Even with their help I would grow discouraged," she admitted, adding, "but I needed only to visit Richland Parish, site of the first rural library, and the enthusiasm of the people over their library would renew and encourage me."

Today the breadth of the library service extends from the state library building to remote fishing village. In the early days Miss Culver and Mr. Modisette with encouragement from "wonderful citizens of the state" went from parish to parish telling the people and the police juries about demonstration libraries and about how after one was established it would be their responsibility to see to its support and continuation. The demonstration library is a concept in library jargon coined in the development of this state's parish library system, best described as Culverized.

EARLY YEARS

The Culver family, her father was an attorney and her mother taught school before rearing a family, first settled in Illinois. In Miss Culver's formative years, Kansas and later Arizona were home. The family emphasis was on education, considered one of the most important if not the most important thing, one could pursue in life. This was a strong family attitude among the Methodist Culver family of seven of which Essae M. was the youngest of four girls and two boys.

"Kansas was a prohibition state in those days. You see," she noted, "the whole emphasis was on church and education."

Christian ideals were given due attention by the family and Miss Culver carried her respect for learning one step further in insisting that others also have an opportunity to learn.

"My father always said," she recalled, "that we could have all the education we could take. I recall a time when four of us were in college."

Recalling a conversation with her brother in which she was being admonished for not attending church services, Essae Culver, an Episcopalian, replied, "I consider my work of

XUM

bringing better living and learning conditions to the rural people of Louisiana practical Christianity." Early patterns of thinking were not lost or hurt.

Ironically Essae Martha knew nothing of libraries until she entered college. Being of a retiring nature, she was captivated by the library itself and the learning resources available. She offered her service without pay to the college library in order to become a part of the organization, to see perhaps if this would be her life's direction.

CONSUMMATE INTEREST

The rest is history and the library challenge was such that it came to be her consummate interest every waking moment for 36 years. She was the right person, at the right time in the right place to spearhead a library development program of outstanding quality and national merit. Being in the right place, accepting the challenge, attributed by Miss Culver to luck was only part of the picture. Miss Culver's modesty should not deceive as it was the vision, the leadership, the hard work and the devotion to a course that brought the dream to fruition.

After Pamona her library learning widened with courses at college in Albany, N.Y. and library assignments in Salem, Oregon and in California.

"When I was asked to come to Louisiana, at first, I said, no, that I understand Louisiana didn't like outsiders and the person for the job should be a Southerner," said she. Finally she agreed to come here on loan from California to carry out Milton Ferguson's library mission with the Carnegie Corporation.

"VALOR OF IGNORANCE"

"I call it the valor of ignorance that brought me here," she chuckled as she added, "because I didn't realize that a whole state had to be organized and that there was no law providing for libraries or funds."

The year was 1925 and it was a stifling July night Miss Culver picked for her arrival. Securing a narrow little room in the former Istrouma Hotel, (then called the Alvis) she spent her first night hourly feeding nickels to a small fan on the dresser that offered the only source of moving air.

No quarters had been readied for the librarian, no staff, no desk and what greeted her was an accumulation of 3000 miscellaneous, surplus books (only about half of any value).

The undaunted lonely "pioneer librarian" set about filling the needs of the more than million and a half persons later to become her adopted kinsman from a room made available for her use in the old state capitol by a gesture of goodwill from the then governor, Henry Fuqua.

ANOTHER GOVERNOR SPEAKS

Years later when the Culverized system was well on its way to national recognition in library development another governor, this time Robert Kennon, spoke for the Louisiana people when he said:

"Louisiana is proud of its famous librarian. Your deserved honor reflects credit not only upon yourself and the state library but upon the state as a whole . . ."

Personal observations and insights are hard to isolate in conversation with Miss Culver. Talk inevitably turns to libraries and library development . . . she and they are inseparable.

What interview is complete without the inevitable question about hobbies, which, like one's personal possessions, supposedly serve as guide lines to a personality.

Ask Miss Culver about her hobbies and she hesitately replies something about mountain climbing (wishful thinking in Louisiana). Further questioning reveals the truth, she really does have a consuming hobby . . . Libraries!

MAN PROVING HIS ABILITY TO "TOUCH THE FACE OF GOD"

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Washington Post, July 20, 1969]

MAN PROVING HIS ABILITY TO "TOUCH THE FACE OF GOD"

(By Howard Simons)

It is just conceivable that these past 25 years have been incomparably eventful—not in such obvious matters as assassinations of great men or big and small wars or socio-economic change, but rather in literally cosmic events with more telling and far-reaching consequences.

Thus it seems possible to argue that the most significant event of the 20th century, perhaps of several centuries, took place at Alamagordo, N.M., in 1945. That was when the first atomic bomb was detonated. Nothing since has happened, on a global scale, outside the shadow of the bomb.

And so, too, it is arguable that the most dramatic event of the 20th century, if all goes well, will take place on the moon in 1969. This will be when the first earthling steps onto another heavenly body. Little ever again can happen that will not somehow reflect man's ability to slip "the surly bonds of earth . . ."

There are similarities between these events. Both were forged in the heat of World War II—in complex and Gargantuan crash programs to bring a military victory. The Manhattan Project hidden on one side of the Atlantic; Peenemunde on the other. These were the beginnings of technocracy: antiseptic, secret, near-incomprehensible, scentific, technical, amoral, constructive, and with a voracious appetite for men and material and money.

It is also reasonable to argue that there is still a third event in this time period to rival space and the atom, albeit a less apparent event because it was less visible, less hardware-dependent, less massive in resource commitment and not yet readily televisable as is a mushroom cloud and a Saturn liftoff. This was the cracking of the genetic code in 1953. Now, man has the cutting edge to alter life and to create life.

Historical imagination can serve backward and forward. In the long reaches of future history, the moon landing undoubtedly will be one of its touchstones. Such contemporary disasters as domestic riots and national wars of liberation, though more immediately searing to personal and national psyches, will be less noteworthy in the next century's chronicles.

To escape the earth is to provide an opportunity to soar beyond tribal and cultural, national and ideological stubbornness. It does not, of course, insure against transporting these life-threatening flaws to other worlds.

To be sure, the far meaning of the moon landing may not be immediately apparent. Indeed, it may not be knowable even in the lifetimes of all those now witnessing this seemingly transitional happening.

There is, for example, the expressed hope of many that the liberation of men from earth's shackles will somehow help to bring peace on earth. Alas, it is probably a forlorn hope. There might have been such a chance—if it had been two men from the moon landing upon the earth.

Still, some men are capable of unselfish and far-sighted vision. Donald Hornig is such a man. He helped put the atom bomb together. He helped to fashion American space policy. And he was President Johnson's science adviser. Not too very long ago, Hornig mused about the lunar landing. In effect, this is what he said:

The landing will be a small but significant first premium on an insurance policy against that far, far future date—millions of years away—when the earth's sun begins to overheat in its death throes and to boil away life on earth. It will then be possible for civilization here to uproot itself and travel across space to find a new planet on which to carry on.

There was nothing frivolous in Hornig's view. Too far for the eye to see? Too far for the mind to grasp? Perhaps. Let's foreshorten the perspective and speak not of millions of years but hundreds of thousands; maybe, with bad luck, of just thousands.

What if the planet Earth becomes untenable? There has been no thermonuclear holocaust. Nonetheless, overpopulation and overpollution are beginning to choke humanity, snuffing out life and irreparably altering life forms as well as changing the climate and overwhelming the life-preserving atmosphere. What then?

The nearest star to Earth is Alpha Centauri, only 4.3 years away if a spacecraft could travel at the speed of light, which is not thought physically possible. But Alpha Centauri only marks the edge of the territory to be explored in search of a new homestead. Conceivably, a series of space journeys could take generations to cross vast voids of the cosmos.

Possible? Why not? Even the tentative stirrings of the biological revolution now underway are mind-boggling in their implications.

For example, there is good reason to believe that someday—ten of years, hundreds of years from now—man will be able to replicate himself in the test tube and in perpetuity. Generation after generation could be genetically identical: son indistinguishable from father, daughter from mother, brother from brother from brother from how many brothers are desired or needed. The world could have as many Einsteins or John F. Kennedys or Beethovens or Marilyn Monroes as it wanted.

Moreover, it should be possible to tailor these test tube humanoids to include or exclude any trait the human now exhibits. Thus if boredom were a problem on space migrations, the brain's boredom control could be removed. And so one can play this game of biological possibilities to the limit of one's imagination.

In sum, there seems to be no heavenly reason why future mankind cannot wheel and soar and put out its "hand to touch the face of God," save the earthly reason that the 20th century world has to stay pasted together long enough—an uncertainty for which neither physicist nor engineer nor biologist can provide a positive prediction.

SENATE—*Friday, July 25, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, our need for a wisdom higher than our own drives us daily to come to Thee. Be with those who do pray and hear our prayer for those who ought to pray but do not. In the work of this Chamber give us grace and strength to say what needs to be said and to hear what we ought to hear. Teach us how to differ without being difficult, to disagree without being disagreeable, to contend without being contentious, and in all things to be conciliatory for the higher good. And when the evening comes may we be wiser men, bound more firmly together in comradeship, and with a profounder faith in Thee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 24, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. MONDAY, JULY 28, 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock Monday morning next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR FONG, MONDAY, JULY 28

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the reading of the Journal on Monday next, the distinguished Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG) be recognized for not to exceed 50 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with "New Reports."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated, beginning with "New Reports."

U.S. AIR FORCE

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. ARMY

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. NAVY

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. STENNIS subsequently said: Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the Senate earlier today confirmed three nominations on the Executive Calendar in the military department that are of more than ordinary significance. I wish to say a few words about the men involved: Gen. John P. McConnell, who is retiring as Chief of Staff of the Air Force; Gen. John D. Ryan, who is taking over that position on August 1; and Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, who has been nominated for an additional 2 years as Chief of Naval Operations, which position, of course, would be as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. President, in these days of rather sharp criticism at times and questioning of the ability or capacity of members of the military, I point out that these three men are very exceptional. They are not personal friends of mine. I know them only officially. I have never been in their homes that I can recall, and they have not been in my home. I have shot a few quail with General McConnell, but that is my only personal connection.

General McConnell has been an outstanding member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He was Chief of Staff of the Air Force during a critical time in our history. He is frank, earnest, fearless, courageous, and pointed in his remarks and recommendations. We came to rely on him a great deal and on what he said, and not all that he said was favorable to the Air Force. When he thought the Air Force was subject to criticism, he would be the first one to point out what he thought the facts were. I salute him for his extraordinary career.

I wish to emphasize what a source of strength and satisfaction it is to have men like this going up through the ranks and prepared the hard way for these highly complicated but important positions.

General Ryan comes to the office of Chief of Staff as a man of exceptional ability, and from the school of hard knocks and experience. I shall not relate all his record here, but it includes outstanding leadership and services in the war in Vietnam.

General Ryan has a fine capacity to perform the duties of Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force. He has the same frankness that goes so far in getting to the heart of a problem. I look forward to having him as Chief of Staff.

Admiral Moorer, who is now serving a 2-year term, has rendered an outstanding service. As I see it, we know that he gives us the pros and cons exactly as he sees them. We respect his recommendations. He has an unusual capacity as Chief of Naval Operations. It is a worldwide office. Call it what you will, Mr. President, his responsibilities are worldwide. I was delighted that the President saw fit to extend his time for an additional 2 years to serve the Navy and our Nation in a highly exceptional way.

I am happy to make these comments, Mr. President, in an impersonal and strictly unofficial way.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

The bill clerk read the nomination of William S. Thompson, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—THE AIR FORCE, THE ARMY, AND THE MARINE CORPS

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force, the Army, and the Marine Corps which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President

XUM

be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

PRAYER BY SENATOR HATFIELD AT WHITE HOUSE WORSHIP SERVICE

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, last Sunday, at the White House worship service, a distinguished Member of the Senate, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Hatfield), took part in that service, and at that time he offered a prayer for the safe return of the astronauts and for peace.

Because the prayer bespoke what was in the hearts of many of us at that time, just prior to the landing on the moon, and expressed so adequately and beautifully the desire and wish of all people on earth for peace, I thought it should be placed in the Record. I asked Senator Hatfield if I could place it in the the Record for him, and he has agreed to it.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the prayer be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the prayer was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Prayer Given by Senator Mark O. Hatfield, for the Safe Return of the Astronauts and for Peace, White House Worship Service, July 20, 1969, by Request of President Richard M. Nixon

Our Father, we marvel as three brave space pioneers prepare for landing on the moon. From the depths of our hearts we pray for a safe return of Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin and Michael Collins. Sustain their wives, children and families during these anxious days. We are grateful for the thousands of support personnel who literally are their brothers' keeper. Excite our imagination to transfer this genius of cooperation and spirit of teamwork to our may other needs lest our success on the moon mock our failures on the earth.

Even as our Astronauts go to the moon in the name of peace, our world aches from the pain of wars. We perfect the means for destroying human life and then believe we have found security. May the nations trust not in the power of their arms but in the Prince of Peace, Thy Son.

Oh God, grant us deliverance from the rhetoric of peace when we personally are not willing to do the things which make for peace . . . to love, to forgive, to wisely use all gifts and resources for the good of mankind, and to permit the invasion of the Holy Spirit in the lives of each of us so that it may be reflected in our homes between husbands and wives, between children and parents, and in commerce between management and labor, between citizens and government, and between all races of men.

Oh Lord, keep us mindful that technical success does not necessarily produce wisdom. We pray for wisdom for our President and all who govern this nation. The true wisdom as found in Scripture is described by St. James as:

"The wisdom that comes from God is first utterly pure, then peace-loving, considerate, open to reason, rich in mercy and kindly actions, with no breath of favoritism or hint of hypocrisy. And the wise are peacemakers who go on quietly sowing for a harvest of righteousness—in other people and in themselves."

We pray for this in the name of Thy Holy Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE MOON LANDING

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, since I have not previously spoken here in the Senate relative to the safe return of the astronauts I take this brief opportunity to do so.

As the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Committee on Appropriations, which has under its jurisdiction the NASA appropriations, I have for 10 years been vitally interested in the development of the entire space program. I have supported research and development in this commitment to the conquest of space. I supported President Kennedy in his request that we make it a national commitment to land and return men safely from the moon during this decade.

I raised questions then about the future of the space program, and I think that one of the vital issues facing us today is the question of where we should go from here now that we have successfully achieved the commitment of landing an American on the moon. I know that the President is deeply cognizant of this question, as is demonstrated by the fact that he has already appointed a special task force, headed by our distinguished Vice President, to advise him with regard to the most appropriate response to the challenging future of our space program.

No one, no ordinary human being, could pay too much tribute to the coolness, the steadiness, and the courage of our three astronauts. I would like to say a special word about Mike Collins, however, because, of the three, he played perhaps a less spectacular but nonetheless vital part in the moon landing.

Mr. President, since we have had time to settle down a little and think through our thoughts about the return of the astronauts, it has come to me forcefully, over and over again, just how much depended upon this one man and how much his two companions depended upon him.

Mike Collins orbited the moon alone for many hours—I think approximately 28 hours—and if anything had gone awry in the ascent stage of the Eagle, it would have been his sole responsibility to effect a rescue. I think we all know in our hearts that he would have gone far beyond the call of duty, and perhaps beyond the limits of safety, in order to effect a rescue if he had to do so. Thank God he did not have to do it. But I do think that in this time, when all three have returned safely, we owe a word or two to Mike Collins, who performed such a heroic and valiant part of this whole endeavor but who was, by the irony of fate, denied the great honor of being one of the first to put his foot on the moon. Nevertheless, he is as much a part of it—and I am sure that in the minds of Aldrin and Armstrong he is as much a part of their feet being placed on the moon—as if he actually had been there himself.

SENATOR MANSFIELD TESTIFIES BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Wednesday, July 23, I appeared before the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquence of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which the distinguished Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Dodd) is chairman, to speak in behalf of gun crime legislation, the application of the ammunition aspects to the gun law now in effect, and also to suggest to the subcommittee that it begin hearings as soon as possible on the bills introduced by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Dirksen), and the distinguished Senator from Indiana (Mr. Bayh) having to do with pornography.

I might say that, under the leadership and the sponsorship of the distinguished senior Senator from Utah (Mr. Bennett), an endeavor is being made to correct an abuse with regard to the ammunition sections of present law. I think they have been grossly misinterpreted.

I would hope that a mandatory sentencing law for gun crimes would be enacted soon. I would hope that the question of registration would be resolved soon; registration imposed under the ammunition provisions of present law which, in my opinion, was adopted arbitrarily by the Internal Revenue Service.

I would hope, too, that legislation would be reported shortly having to do with the question of pornography. It is about time that the responsibility for reporting obscenity is shifted from the recipient—the unwilling and unwitting receiver of pornographic smut—and that penalties would be made applicable as are provided in the bills introduced by the distinguished Senator from Illinois (Mr. Dirksen) and the distinguished Senator from Indiana (Mr. Bayh). I understand that under those measures the sender—and I repeat "sender" and not the recipient—would be the one liable for punishment and have to assume full responsibility for what he does. In that way it would not be necessary for the unwilling and unwitting recipient to have to go to the post office personally and in that way attempt to protect himself from smut.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator think that among the rights of American citizens it would be reasonable to hold that a citizen should have the right to have his home free from receipt through the mails of unwanted, unsolicited, vile, and obscene literature?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I certainly do. I think it is going to a tremendous extreme. I have looked at some of this literature. I receive much mail in the way of complaints from the people of my State, and strangely enough much of those complaints come from doctors of medicine. I think it is unfair. Whether or not it is constitutional is another matter. I am looking at the reality and not the legality of the situation. I think the Government, which has control of the mails, has the right to exercise on its own responsibility suzerainty or sovereignty, or whatever one wishes to call it, over the sender of this type literature. The burden should not be on the recipients who have no control. They can only make complaints and perhaps get action that way. It is time for this situation to be corrected.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement I made on these subjects before the Subcommittee on the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUN CRIME LEGISLATION

(Statement of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD)

Let me first thank you for your invitation, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate having this opportunity to testify at the beginning of this series of hearings on firearms legislation and especially on my bill, S. 849.

The gun law thus far has asked a sacrifice on the part of the law-abiding gun owner in return for what hopefully will be a measure of control over the inordinate flow of weapons into the hands of the lawless and untrained, the addict, the drunkard, the incompetent and the criminal. Providing such legislation at the Federal level has provoked numerous questions and the debate still rages on.

What is clear so far is that the burden imposed by the present law on the law-abiding gun owner has not been distributed equally. We in Montana, for example, seldom experience the use of guns by the criminal and unfit. At the same time we Montanans pride ourselves in the responsible use of weapons for sport and even for self-defense. Unfortunately, that is not the case elsewhere in the land. Our large metropolitan centers have been wracked by crime and violence perpetrated by hoodlums having no notion of the responsible use of weapons. Yet we in Montana are asked to bear the full measure of the burden of gun legislation. What we stand to benefit from its hoped-for objective—a reduction in gun crime—is greatly disproportionate when viewed solely within the geographical confines of Montana. Nevertheless, may I say that in Montana the sacrifice asked by this law has been made. It has been made by Montanans though to some the whole notion of gun legislation may be repugnant. It has been made simply because Congress recognized that the ease with which guns are made available to the lawless has become not only a state and local problem, but a national problem as well.

And just as Congress recognized that the ease of gun accessibility by the lawless has reached national proportions justifying Congressional action, so does the penalty for the criminal use of guns warrant equally close attention by the Congress. And that is just what my bill, S. 849, aims to do.

Gun crime is a national disgrace. And with this bill I offer another approach to curtailing the gun crime rate—an approach that says to the criminal in terms that are clear and simple that his resort to a gun will be met automatically with punishment that fits such an act of violence. In contrast to the present gun law, no burden is imposed on the law-abiding gun owner. No sacrifice is asked. The burden falls squarely where it belongs—on the criminal and the lawless; on those who roam the streets, gun in hand, ready and willing to perpetrate their acts of violence.

I am no expert in crime control. I am not even a lawyer. But I know there is something wrong when the FBI tells us that while our gun crime rate continues to spiral upward, our prison population shrinks proportionately. I hope this trend is reversed. I would think an assured prison sentence for criminals who choose to resort to firearms would help establish such a reversal or at least stem the tide. That is the purpose of my bill.

Under its provisions, for a first offender the penalty would be 1 to 10 years in prison; for a subsequent offense—a mandatory 25 years. The proposal varies from present Federal law in two major respects. Under no circumstances can the sentence for using a firearm be suspended or assessed concurrently with the sentence for the commission of the crime itself. The criminal gun user will be sentenced solely for his choice to use a gun. Moreover, the subsequent offender will be compelled to serve 25 years for making such a choice. In this regard, it just seems to me that no leeway or discretion is necessary when it is found that a criminal has chosen a second time to use a firearm lawlessly.

I would add that for the most part I agree with gun legislation; especially in its stated objective: to assist Federal, State and local law enforcement agencies in their fight against crime and violence. At the same time I do object when a Federal agency—when any Federal agency—misinterprets or misconstrues the law in the name of enforcement. That is why I joined as a co-sponsor of the bill, S. 845, offered by the distinguished Senator from Utah, Mr. Bennett, to strike down the ammunition regulations issued by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the Gun Control Act of 1968. In my opinion those regulations fall squarely beyond any authority granted by Congress under the law. Indeed, Congress voted down registration; and registration, in my opinion, is precisely what the Treasury regulations call for.

On February 4, the distinguished senior Senator from Utah (Mr. Bennett) introduced S. 845. It seems to me to indicate that registration by another name is being required by a regulation of the Internal Revenue Service. This regulation covers ammunition for pistols, rifles, shotguns and some components, including primers, propellent powders, cartridge cases, and bullets.

Under sections 992(b)(5) and 923(g) the dealer is required to record the name, age, and address of the buyer of firearms or ammunition, while section 923(g) authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to issue regulations relative to record keeping by dealers. The regulations issued by the Secretary of the Treasury call for far more than sections 922 and 923 require and, in my judgment, go considerably beyond the intent of Congress in passing the Gun Control Act of 1968.

For example, the regulations issued by the Secretary of the Treasury call for the following: Date; manufacturer; caliber, gage, or type of component; quantity; name; address; date of birth; and mode of identification, driver's license, and so forth.

It seems to me that this goes far beyond "the name, age, and address" of the law and covers a good deal more territory which, in effect, amounts to registration.

If there is to be registration, let it be in the open and on the table, and let everyone be aware of it. Congress, in my opinion, opposed registration under the Gun Control Act of 1968, and this regulation, in my judgment, would go far beyond what Congress intended.

This is back-door registration and should be corrected. In my judgment, it is necessary to correct an unnecessary burden and a deceptive form of registration and to bring the regulations in line with the intent of Congress at the time the bill was passed.

With that said, let me again reiterate that I think the objectives sought by the 1968 law are wholly correct. I hope they are met; though it is premature now to make a judgment on that score.

And it is only to complement the objectives of the existing law that I offer my proposal for mandatory jail sentences against perpetrators of violent gun crimes. The message it brings to the criminal gun user is clear. For ultimately the decision to resort to a firearm is up to him. If he finds the penalty so severe as to deter his use of this deadly weapon, only then can society be protected from the violence it produces. The State of Alaska I understand has already adopted such an approach. Other states are in the process of joining the effort. Mr. Chairman, I urge you and your subcommittee—already so distinguished for your leadership in this area—to steer this proposal through the full Judiciary Committee and on through the Senate.

By offering mandatory jail terms in return for gun violence at the Federal level, the Congress will provide, I believe, a splendid model for all fifty states to follow.

Mr. Chairman, another piece of proposed legislation which I would urge the Judiciary Committee to face up to relates to unsolicited obscene and pornographic literature being sent through the U.S. mails. I have received numerous protests from my constituents in Montana, and I believe the situation has reached such a magnitude that it demands action on the part of the Federal Government.

First of all, it is important to protect children against this kind of traffic in smut. Furthermore, I see no reason why the average citizen should have to put up with this kind of unsolicited material sent through the mail. The responsibility for keeping this material out of the mail should be placed on the sender, not the unsuspecting boxholder as is now the case.

It would be my hope, Mr. Chairman, that very shortly hearings on S. 2073 and S. 2074, introduced by the minority leader (Mr. Dirksen) and other Senators, and S. 2057, introduced by the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Bayh) and other Senators, will be held, and the bills given the immediate and considerate judgment which they deserve.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 141—INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO LOWER THE VOTING AGE TO 18

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 141) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older, introduced by Mr. GORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, over the years, I have watched with pride the growing enthusiasm, interest, and spirit the young men and women of our country have shown in politics and government. Each political season finds them ringing doorbells and writing letters, taking surveys and distributing literature, making speeches and discussing issues with a dedication exceeding that of many of their elders. Yet, for all their involvement, we have failed to involve them in that most precious of democratic privileges—the right to vote. It is time we acted to correct this omission.

There may be some who feel that the 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds are not ready for the franchise, that our young people

XUM

are too emotional, that they are too naive to be able to make wise electoral decisions. Yet I fear that these critics confuse emotionalism with spirit and zeal. Perhaps these pessimists mistake idealism and concern for a lack of social grace and traditional political conventionality.

Today's young adults are a new breed. They are not the products of the isolated one-room schoolhouse and the old swimming hole; the farm and the small country hamlet. They have come out of a highly sophisticated school system. Our education system, as never before, is preparing students to enter society as informed, alert individuals. Schools are realizing, on a scale never before achieved, a primary function, that is, the production of the critical thinker, the student capable of analyzing problems and arriving at appropriate decisions. The American political system has need of this infusion of new blood.

Our young people are also the heirs of another great learning medium—the communications system. Young Americans have been brought up on Presidential news conferences and national conventions. They have been nurtured by the evening news at suppertime and national question-and-answer programs with Sunday dinner. Their perspectives are not limited to national occurrences alone, for they learn instantly what is happening in Cairo and Singapore, Saigon and London. They are being informed more fully and educated more broadly. It is now time to serve them and ourselves more completely by granting to them what they have earned—a place in the electoral system of their country.

As I see it, we can do no less than give them the right to vote. To deny them this privilege would symbolize a failure on our part to act consistently with what we demand from them. Every 6 years we ask our young adults to serve us. We trust them to campaign, yet we do not trust them to vote.

At the age of 18 we call on our young men to defend our country, and if necessary, to die for it. Yet we are not willing to let them decide for what they will die.

We tell our young adults, "You are the hope of tomorrow," yet we fail to allow them to help shape their destinities today.

These are times of challenge. The idealism of youth, expressed at the ballot box, will enable us more successfully to meet the challenge.

THE ABM SYSTEM

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes in the morning hour.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, during the debate on the anti-ballistic-missile system, particularly the very valuable discussions on this floor yesterday and from comments from my own State by mail and by editorial comment, a strong theme has been evident in the presentation of arguments for the immediate deployment of the Safeguard system. This is the theme that beneath all of the technical, strategic, military, and foreign policy consideration that there is one compelling reason for deployment—that is "You must support the President."

Two points have been advanced in support of this idea. The first is that the President has greater knowledge and greater wisdom than anyone else on national security matters by virtue of his constitutional position as Commander in Chief of the armed services. Yet the President is only one man and he must rely for advice in this area on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the CIA, and the Secretary of Defense. While no one doubts, Mr. President, their dedication to the Nation or to the truth, these valuable public servants are all agents of the Military Establishment and they focus their recommendations, and justly so, in line with their military responsibilities.

Mr. President, the essential facts, reports, and evaluations which are necessary to make a judgment on this matter, classified and unclassified, are all available to the Members of the Senate. Moreover, let me say that while I think the President in the first days of his administration had ample opportunity and devoted the necessary time to make a decision on the ABM, it should be noted that this is an issue and a matter which has been before the Congress for years. There are Senators on both sides of the aisle and on both sides of this issue who have devoted literally years of study to this matter.

It is the Congress then which has the responsibility to make an independent judgment, and it is the Congress that can broaden the considerations of national security policy beyond the immediate concerns of the military agencies.

A second point associated with the idea, "You must support the President," is the partisan argument that appeals to simply party loyalty. This is a frightening concept for two reasons. It means that all issues, whether they be economic, social, legal national security issues, or foreign policy decisions should be decided along political party lines. This would reduce the Government to the status of a continuous political campaign, to the harm of the American people and to the Nation. It would also mean labelism would take the place of debate on the real questions. Instead of discussing and resorting to reason as to how to maintain our national security, for instance, we would only be dealing with labels such as "liberal" and "conservative" without coming to grips with the real problems, which would substitute the slogan for thought and the false label for the serious goal.

A U.S. Senator must use his own judgment. His oath requires it. He cannot abrogate his responsibility, he cannot turn over to the President his own duty for a reasoned decision. To do so would undermine the separation of powers in our system of Government and destroy the concept of shared responsibility between the executive and legislative branches.

The consequences of leaving these decisions to the President is that a Senator simply becomes a duplicating machine. He is not elected to play this role and no man in good conscience, can choose such a role simply to avoid controversy.

It will not surprise the Members of this body, Mr. President, to be reminded that in many cases those who urge a Senator to support the President on ABM are equally as convinced that that Senator should oppose the President on the surtax. And yet the argument that the President has superior knowledge and information can be made on the surtax issue. He has as his special sources of advice the Council of Economic Advisers, the Secretary of the Treasury, and, if he desires, the Federal Reserve Board, not to mention the opportunity to counsel with fiscal and monetary authorities throughout the private sector.

The meaning of this apparent contradiction is, of course, that a U.S. Senator, to act responsibly, must study an issue and make a decision on its merits. Thus to take a position on the surtax one must study its effect on inflation, on the taxpayer, on economic growth, and the balance of payments; just as in taking a position on ABM one must study its effect on our national security, our relations with the other nuclear powers, and the effect on the arms race.

With specific reference to ABM, those who ask that a Senator always support the President disregard the fact that Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson during the first part of his term rejected the concept of the ABM as a defensive weapons system. If we accept the proposition that the President is always right in national security matters, we must then ask which President, and we must also ask why does one President propose one ABM system with one purpose, and another President another system for yet another purpose.

Of course, the easiest way out of the controversy on the ABM is simply to let the President do it all. Yet the President himself has expressed to me his own feeling that this is not the proper way. I know he understands that some may have a judgment and conviction which leads to the opposition of the ABM and I further know that those who oppose the Safeguard system will be working with him in the future on many important issues.

Only this week it was my privilege and conviction to speak in support of the President in his efforts to find a solution to the war in Vietnam. I took the opportunity to emphasize that the stalemate in Paris must be broken and that Hanoi and the Vietcong should not mistake our desire for peace and our attempt to negotiate for weakness or lack of will and determination. This was done in response to an indirect suggestion by the White House, but it was also done as a matter of conviction which leads me to support the President in his decision not to seek a millitary victory and his determination to find a peaceful solution.

All of this is finally to say, Mr. President, for one in the Senate to make a contribution to the solution to the difficult problems affecting our national security such as ABM and Vietnam each Senator must exercise his own best judgment in accordance with the quiet turning of his own conscience. Not only is this the responsible role for a Senator but it is also the one by which public

XUM

policy can be defined and understood in our democratic process.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as long as we have such a good attendance on the other side of the aisle—I wish we had as many on this side—I ask unanimous consent at this time that I may proceed for not to exceed 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Montana is recognized for 7 minutes.

THE SURTAX AND TAX REFORM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my intention to speak on the surtax and tax reform.

The sole purpose of the majority policy committee at this point is to try to assure a disposition of both tax reform and the extension of the surtax for 1 year. The question is procedural—scheduling—and its consideration is well within the purview of the responsibilities of that committee. There is no desire nor intent nor inclination to disturb in any way the substantive functions of the Finance Committee, or, for that matter, any other legislative committee.

The policy committee is well aware of the administration's view that the extension of the surtax is necessary to fight inflation. It is also aware of a gathering public view that the surtax has been an inequitable and ineffective way to fight inflation and a public demand for changes in the present tax structure in the direction of greater equity.

To date, the surtax may well have served to intensify the resentment against the inequities in the tax system.

Although the surtax has been in effect since last year, the Nation has seen no relief from rising inflationary pressures. Indeed, during the past 7 months inflation has been the greatest in many decades. Interest rates are at their highest point in modern times. Yet it was precisely as a weapon against inflation that the surtax was offered to the people of the Nation. It was offered, I should add—and I am frank to admit it—by a Democratic administration. It was adopted by a Democratic-controlled Congress. I say that to lay at rest the partisan implications which, regrettably, have been raised in this situation. This side of the aisle must carry its full share of blame for the surtax just as it must for Vietnam.

The administration and some Members of the Senate have been urging quick passage of the surtax with tax reform remaining on the back burner. So far as we can see, with this approach, what may come after in the way of reform would be based strictly on a hope and a prayer. In my judgment, that is not sufficient to satisfy the demands of the people of the Nation for greater equity in the sharing of the tax burden. It was not sufficient a month ago. It is not sufficient today. Tax reform is no less urgent than continuance of the level of tax burdens which now falls heaviest on the wage earners and salaried employees of the Nation.

Nevertheless, the policy committee assembled yesterday with the Democratic members of the Finance Committee in an effort to reach an accommodation with the administration. I can tell the Senate on the basis of that meeting—and the Senate should believe me—that enthusiasm for a year's extension of the surtax in any circumstances is rapidly diminishing. Indeed, if it is to pass at all, it may well have to be accompanied by assurances of very substantial tax reform.

I hope nobody considers that a threat. In my opinion, it is a fact based on conversations which I have had with my colleagues representing all spectrums of the Democratic Party and all sections of the country.

It was with this awareness that the Democrats of the policy committee and the Finance Committee acted, in my judgment, in a most responsible fashion when they proposed unanimously yesterday to follow a new course of action, provided the suggestion was acceptable on all sides. Their joint proposal would extend the surtax for 5 months—thus giving the administration what it has described as an anti-inflationary device. The final 7 months of the requested extension, moreover, can still be enacted together with a tax reform package prior to November 30, 1969. Even Senators who are on record as opposed to the year's surtax extension agreed that a 5-month extension in this context would be appropriate.

It is our considered judgment that this offer of yesterday is responsive to the wishes of the administration and to the realities of the issue of the surtax as it confronts the Senate at this time.

Mr. President, on yesterday I had intended to go down personally to see the distinguished minority leader and give to him by hand the results of the meeting held jointly by the Democratic members of the Finance Committee and the policy committee; but unfortunately, the press of the press was so great outside the door that I would have been taking my life in my hands had I tried to undertake what would have been a most pleasant journey on the basis of personal friendship. So I called the distinguished minority leader on the phone, he put his secretary on, and he copied the statement down. So I did the best I could to get it to the minority leader. I wanted him to know of that. I am sure he did. I wanted the Senate to know of the procedure which was followed, because I believe in courtesy and comity between the two parties and the two Houses.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the Democratic policy committee and the Democratic members of the Finance Committee be printed in the RECORD at this point, with footnotes to the effect that the investment credit repeal is, in effect, permanent law; that the extension of the excise taxes remain in effect until December 31, 1969; and that the change of the standard deduction, the so-called help-to-the-poor amendment, would not, under any circumstances, go into effect until January 1, 1970.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The Democratic Policy Committee and the Democratic members of the Finance Committee have agreed upon the following understanding:
>
> 1. Support an extension of the surtax until November 30, 1969. This will be accomplished by attaching this temporary extension to a separate House-passed bill. The House-passed surtax extension containing the investment credit repeal,[1] the extension of the excise taxes,[2] and the change of the standard deduction[3] will remain on the Senate Calendar until the tax reform bill is reported by the Senate Finance Committee.
>
> 2. The Chairman of the Finance Committee and the Democratic members of that Committee have given their assurance that the tax reform package will be reported to the full Senate not later than October 31, 1969.
>
> 3. The Democratic Policy Committee has endorsed the position of the Finance Committee that the date of the investment tax credit repeal will be identical to that date in the House-passed bill (April 18, 1969). The endorsement was at the specific request of the Democratic Finance Committee members to assure all that the investment credit repeal is endorsed and the date is specified as contained in the bill on the Senate Calendar.
>
> Pursuit of this understanding in the Senate is contingent upon its acceptance by the Administration and the Republican leadership which has been pressing in the Finance Committee and on the Senate floor for the extension of the surtax. May I say that many of the members present today went along with this understanding notwithstanding grave reservations about the usefulness of the continuance of the surtax as an anti-inflationary measure. The approach is offered as an accommodation to the Administration. If it is not acceptable, the Majority Policy Committee is compelled to stand on its previous resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was fully aware of the dilemma in which the majority leader found himself last night, and I thought it was indeed generous on his part to phone me and make it possible for the secretary to take down the statement he subsequently made to the press, which disclosed the import and the general attitude of the majority policy committee.

I took it upon myself to convene the minority members of the Committee on Finance at my office at 5 o'clock. I also asked the Secretary of the Treasury to join us in that informal seminar. I had hoped that the Chairman of the Board of the Federal Reserve System might be available, but he was away from the city at the time.

---

[1] Permanent law.

[2] Remain in effect until Dec. 31, 1969.

[3] Scheduled to begin Jan. 1, 1970.

XUM

We discussed the statement at considerable length, and subsequently I rang the Press Gallery, and they were kind enough to come down so that I could make a statement. The Secretary of the Treasury joined in that statement, and it was corroborative of what I have to say.

My remarks, in essence, were about like this:

I said, first, that the proposal that was made to extend until November 30 the surtax simply was not enough, because it still leaves it up in the air; and who shall say what will eventuate before or after that time? A similar proposal was more or less rebuffed in the Senate Finance Committee, and I appeal to the distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS) to corroborate what I say, because he was there.

A somewhat comparable proposal, not quite so long, measured in terms of time, was rejected by the House of Representatives. That only adds uncertainty and confusion to this whole picture.

Now, when I say that to run this until the 30th of November is not enough, I say it for a reason. I think of all those business activities in the country which have to go into the markets and buy, from time to time, for a long period. They have to contract for supplies, for goods of all kinds, and of course they will have to do so at the market price that obtains now. But what will the situation be down the road, when this uncertainty persists? They ought to know what they can depend on.

I tried to illustrate the point to the press out of my own experience. In those days when I was in the wholesale bakery business, you did not buy one car of flour, and you did not buy two or three. You estimated what your needs were going to be, and then, when a flour salesman came, you would say, "Give me a quotation on 50 or 60 carloads of flour, delivered this way, over a period of time."

Well, he would say, "I cannot do it, because we cannot look down the road that far, and we cannot tell what the price of wheat is going to be; and it is the price of wheat that is going to determine what we are going to have to get for flour. Now, if it were not for Federal intrusions," including what was then the Federal Farm Board, "I could tell you, but I cannot tell you now."

These are the uncertainties that hang over the whole business community of the country, and that is why they are so concerned; and we are concerned with them.

I might elaborate even further on this matter, but I think this is sufficient for all purposes. Our hope was to resolve the state of confusion, so that those who handle enterprise in this country may know the conditions under which they are expected to do business.

I said one other thing. I said from the standpoint of inflation, it simply did not go far enough. I would say to my good friend, the distinguished majority leader, that a surtax, standing by itself as a single weapon, is not the whole answer to inflation.

Think of the credit binge that the country is on at the present time, and the great surge of demand for credit that finally compelled the banks to raise their prime rates. I cannot imagine that there is any bank of consequence, from the biggest bank in New York or San Francisco or Chicago on down, that would want to raise interest rates unless they were compelled to do so. And what is the compulsion under which they operate? They want to maintain liquidity in the country. But here is this demand for credit. How do you shut it off? How do you ration it? They have no legal weapon by which to ration it. They can only say, "This much credit we can extend. Here is five times that amount in credit demands. All we can do is put up the rates to discourage them."

It is as simple as that. And, of course, it develops all sorts of complicated consequences. Those who cannot get the credit here will go in the market, if they can, and shop for Eurodollars. The rate, 10 percent, 11 percent, 12 percent. They are determined to get it if they can. So there has to be a weapon in the credit field as well as a surtax in this field to siphon off disposable income that would otherwise move into the bloodstream of consumer goods. It is that simple.

Now we have got that gold imbalance to contend with, and we have a trade deficit to contend with. In every one of these fields, something has to be done, and this was a start. Now it is proposed that it be chopped off, and then we will wait and see what happens after the 30th of November.

I had no choice, therefore, Mr. President, except to say that I did not think it was acceptable. In the memorandum which the distinguished majority leader so kindly made available by telephone while he was a captive in his own office for the moment, because of the surge of people from the press on the outside, I noticed, of course, two things.

He stated, "This should be acceptable to the administration" and "the minority leadership should indicate whether it is acceptable."

I find myself in a difficult position. I am sure that the majority leader will not close that door, if we think, and if we can persuade him and his associates who have made this move, that we are right, and that there ought to be an additional or another approach. So I am content neither to say that I accept it or that I reject it. I rather like to feel that it is a matter that it open for negotiation; and I find it so pleasant, even when we do not always agree, to sit down with the majority leader and place all the cards face up on the table, because we have never played otherwise, and I think out of that and out of the rule of reason, we may yet find the answer to this problem.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished minority leader has indicated that his door is open, as always, because the only information I had relative to our most pleasant exchange of yesterday was what I read in the newspapers and heard over the radio. While I have great faith in the printed as well as the spoken word, I do not have unbounded faith in what they say, because they do delve into the area of speculation all too often, and their speculations are not always correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think there is one angle to the surtax and increased interest rate situation which we should consider thoroughly.

I was talking with the president of a fair-sized corporation the other day. It was about a $50 million-a-year corporation. It was not one of the big ones.

I said, "You don't get 6-percent money anymore."

He said, "No. But that does not bother us in the least. We charge it off as a production expense."

In other words, the price of the product goes up.

I said, "What about the young family that is trying to buy a home? Can they buy a home, and is this high-interest rate any advantage to them?"

We all know the answer to that. I think the same thing is true with a surtax. The surtax on the profits of a big corporation is charged off as a production item and is added to the price of the goods they sell. The accelerating inflation of today is largely chargeable to high-interest rates and the surtax.

Millions of young families are trying to buy homes and educate their children. This means higher prices to them.

I point out that prosperity does not originate with the big corporations and the big banks, because without the millions and millions of families in the lower income brackets from $5,000 to $15,000 that buy their goods and borrow money, the big fellows would just wither on the vine.

In my opinion we should consider tax reform and the extension of the surtax without delay.

It is high time that tax evaders and profiteers were brought to account.

COMMENDATION ON SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF APOLLO 11 MISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader and me, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution, as follows:

S. RES. 224

Whereas Apollo 11 having successfully completed its mission to land men on the moon thus ending this Nation's first decade of achievements in space; and

Whereas these achievements having been obtained and the role of this Nation preserved as a leader in space science and technology for peaceful purposes with international cooperation; and

Whereas the successful completion of the mission of Apollo 11, providing an appropriate occasion for expressing public appreciation and the appreciation of the United States Senate for these outstanding achievements: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States commends the magnificent effort of the men and women throughout the United States and the world at large, in government, industry, and education whose contributions were so vitally necessary to the success of these achievements; and be it further.

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States expresses its gratitude on behalf of itself and of all the American people for the

XUM

dedication, devotion, courage and effort of all associated with the Apollo program and with the Apollo 11 mission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I know I speak for millions of people in congratulating and commending the astronauts who have returned from a safe trip to the moon.

It was my privilege to be at Cape Kennedy and see the launching of Apollo 11, that gigantic satellite that was as tall as a 36-story building. It was a sight to behold.

I do not minimize for 1 second the bravery, the courage, the skill, the knowledge of science, and the many other fine characteristics possessed by the three astronauts who made this trip. However, I pay tribute to all the ground crew and the countless people in Government and private industry and elsewhere who participated in this endeavor. I am told that 400,000 people were necessary to make this shot.

We cannot measure the benefit derived from this exploit any more than we could have anticipated what would be disclosed from Benjamin Franklin's flying his kite or from the invention of the radio or the television.

It is apparent that the vast resources of the universe are about to be used for the benefit of man and to help man solve his problems on earth.

I also commend these astronauts and the entire supporting crew for one other benefit that is flowing and will continue to flow from this historic accomplishment. Because of what they have done and what their supporters have enabled them to do, billions of people around the world are not going to think of America, at least for some little time, as a place of riots and bloodshed and crime. Emphasis will not be placed upon our problems.

The exploit of the astronauts establishes the United States as the leader of the world and as a country upon which the peoples of the world can pin their hopes, plans, and reliance.

I did not want the resolution to pass without raising my voice in praise of what has been accomplished. I think it is very important and timely that the President of the United States should make a world trip at this time. He could not have chosen a better moment in history to make his trip. Everywhere he goes, the image of Uncle Sam will be high. People can rely upon our country, its goodness, its technical know-how, its industrial might, and its academic and scientific leadership.

I congratulate all parties. I wish for the President that same degree of success in dealing with some of the very troublesome problems here on earth that these wonderful Americans, the astronauts, have accomplished not only for us but also for all mankind through their historic flight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 224) was unanimously agreed to.

JOINT MEETING OF CONGRESS TO WELCOME THE ASTRONAUTS OF APOLLO 11

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has just said represents the feelings of every Member of the Senate.

I congratulate and commend the Senator for his remarks. I know also that if the distinguished minority leader and I had taken the time to do so, there would have been 100 sponsors of the resolution just agreed to. I think it can be accepted that the resolution does represent the thinking of 100 U.S. Senators.

I think I should announce also, as long as the distinguished minority leader is in the Chamber, that he and I have been in touch with the Speaker of the House and that we have agreed with the Speaker that, as a mark of signal honor to the three astronauts, there will be a joint meeting of Congress sometime after we return from our August recess and after the astronauts get out of their quarantine.

I wish to make the announcement, because the Speaker called the distinguished minority leader and me, and we did agree that this would be a way of showing our appreciation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for his statement. I wholeheartedly endorse what has been done in the way of arranging a joint meeting of Congress for the astronauts.

I share with the distinguished majority leader the definite feeling that the resolution which has just been agreed to represents what 100 Senators agree upon.

There are cynics who say, "What good is all this?"

We could make many speeches for many days on this matter. However, the very fact that billions of people were able to view this happening over the television as a man stepped down on the moon was made possible by a product of the space program, satellite communication. And we could go on and on and on.

The time will arrive, and it will continue to arrive, when great scientific achievement and knowledge that had to be accumulated to make it possible will affect the lives of men in every area of their activities.

S. 2701—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH A COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND THE AMERICAN FUTURE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), I introduce a bill to carry out the desires of the Nixon administration in connection with its recent statement on population growth.

The purpose of this bill is to create a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. The duties of the Commission shall be primarily threefold; the Commission shall conduct an inquiry into the following aspects of population growth in the United States and its foreseeable social consequences:

First. The probable course of population growth, internal migration, and related demographic developments between now and the year 2000.

Second. The resources in the public sector of the economy that will be required to deal with the anticipated growth in population.

Third. The ways in which population growth may affect the activities of Federal, State, and local government.

Mr. President, I add to that only the fact that the Senate has twice—in the last Congress and again in this one—passed a measure designed to study and assist with the problems of the economic imbalance existing in this country between urban and rural development. That bill, which I was privileged to introduce, is now before the House of Representatives.

It seems to me that these two approaches complement each other very definitely—one related to the existing imbalance between rural and urban development and population trends and opportunity, and the other to study the impact of the population explosion in this country generally; and it, of course, will be related as well to the existing problems with which we grapple.

So I trust that our committee will act promptly in connection with this measure. I think it is important that the Commission recommended by the Nixon administration be established, so that we can get on with the important business of planning for the future in connection with the problems of populations which are expanding, which are concentrating in areas where they find themselves unable to achieve adequate economic opportunity, and to create a better balance in this country of the utilization of our population resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2701) to establish a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. McCLELLAN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM MONDAY, JULY 28, 1969, TO 11 A.M. TUESDAY, JULY 29, 1969

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business on Monday next, it stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. on Tuesday next.

XUM

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF CARL J. GILBERT—ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR COTTON ON TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on Tuesday morning there will be a discussion of the nomination of Carl J. Gilbert to be Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador.

It is my understanding that the able Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON) and the equally able Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) will engage in some discussion of the nomination, possibly extending over a period of 2½ hours.

Following that discussion, there is a strong likelihood that there will be a rollcall vote on the confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. President, I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the prayer and after disposition of the reading of the Journal on Tuesday next, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON) be recognized for not to exceed 2½ hours, with the understanding that the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) will also be given ample time during that 2½-hour period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, it was not inappropriate timing, I believe, that "Dr. Strangelove" was on the Sunday night movie on television recently. This amusing yet penetrating and sobering motion picture brought to light so well the seriousness of the strategic arms race. It portrayed the horror of human and mechanical breakdown; of madness and errors in judgment which led to nuclear war. Although humorous in its portrayal, the point was made nevertheless that nuclear war is not a laughing matter.

We are engaged in debate over whether we should deploy a new addition to the family of nuclear weapons. And as we debate the technical and strategic points I think it important that we not forget the big picture—the specter of nuclear holocaust. I intend to discuss the technical and strategic points as best I can, but let us not lose sight of just what the consequences may be of our decision in Congress this year. The more we stack nuclear weapons on top of nuclear weapons, the more complicated our systems become, the more computers are substituted for human beings, the more the likelihood of error is increased, and the closer we will be to the total devastation with which "Dr. Strangelove" so convincingly acquainted us.

"Dr. Strangelove," Mr. President, depicted the horrifying results of a world in which the major powers always erred on the side of security. If we erred on the side of security as those who propose more and more weapons would have us do, then it is inevitable that the unthinkable will occur. As Senator BROOKE has said, this debate is really a choice of risks. The choice is this: Do we risk entering into a new round of the arms race or do we take a reasonable and responsible risk for peace by choosing not to deploy an ABM system this year. We should choose this time, Mr. President, to err on the side of sanity—to make just one more effort to negotiate with the Soviet Union before we ordain a new round of the arms race. It may be a risk but, in my opinion, it is a far more cautious risk than to add more and more weapons to the world's nuclear arsenal.

Even though I do not want to become involved in an overly technical discussion of the Safeguard system, because certainly I am no expert, it does seem important to reiterate a few points which have been recently raised. The first is the contention by Secretary Laird that the Soviet Union is seeking to achieve a first-strike capability by the mid-1970's. Dr. Ralph Lapp, a foremost expert in this whole field, addressed himself to this question in a recent article in the New Republic. Dr. Lapp points out in great detail the extremely unlikely possibility that the Soviets could achieve a successful first strike against our land-based intercontinental missiles. He uses all the figures and assumptions supplied by Secretary Laird and Dr. Foster and still totally rebuts the contention that a successful first strike is likely or even contemplated at this time. However, even if the Soviets were gearing up for a first strike against our land-based ICBM's, to achieve a true first strike within the traditional meaning, they would have to simultaneously knock out our undersea missiles, Polaris and Poseidon, our B-52 strategic bombers dispersed at bases all over the world, and our nuclear-carrying aircraft in Europe and aboard our aircraft carriers, again all over the world. In addition, all this would have to be done rapidly and simultaneously because once we received a hint of attack on any of our retaliatory capability, we would certainly unleash our remaining force and hail destruction upon the Soviet Union. For example, Lapp asserts in regard to an attack on our land-based ICBM's, and I agree:

> Surely, once the first flight [of Soviet missiles] starts impacting, the United States would begin responding. The Soviets would then be targeting "empty holes."

And, as I have pointed out, all this discussion is postulated upon the assumption that the Russians want a first-strike capability for the mid-1970's. We all agree that they do not have such a capability now. To presume that they will try to achieve such a capability by the mid-1970's is to continue the spiraling arms race by always assuming the very worst intentions on the part of the other side. Our primary intelligence-gathering agency, the CIA, seems unwilling to make such an assumption, therefore, I wonder why the Defense Department insists upon doing so. No one can say for sure what the intentions of the Russians are—not Secretary Laird and certainly not I. Even as I cannot say for certain that the Soviets are not preparing for a first strike, he cannot say that they are. In truth, this matter will entirely be determined by events during the coming years.

We have a chance to determine the course of these events by entering into a period of responsible negotiations with the Soviet Union at the upcoming strategic arms limitations talks. The Russians have indicated their willingness to proceed with these talks. This should not surprise us. No one wins in a nuclear exchange and the Soviets should be, and I believe are, just as interested as we are in limiting the possibility of such a war. Both these great nations yearn for the opportunity to divert more of their resources to crying domestic needs.

Discounting all I have just said about the mutual interest of the Soviet Union and ourselves in establishing some sort of detente in the nuclear arms race, let us assume for a moment that the Russians are indeed seeking to obtain a first-strike capability. Is deployment of an ABM system our best response? The most compelling scientific evidence indicates this is not the best way to defend against the contingency of a Russian first strike: There are at least three other responses which seem to make more sense. One would be to wait for the first-strike threat to actually begin to materialize in relation to buildups. And then to increase our Minuteman or Polaris and Poseidon force. This would take far less time than deploying an ABM system and would give us the precious time we need to see if some arms limitation agreements can be reached. The other alternatives is to superharden our present ICBM silos. This, scientific evidence indicates, would be more effective than ABM deployment even if Soviet accuracies improve to one-sixth mile.

A third possible solution would be to improve our detection devices. During the course of this debate I have heard many of my colleagues indicate great faith that the Safeguard system will be technically sound. Yet most of this group has not evidenced such faith in our equipment designed to detect an attack in advance. The proponents of Safeguard have continually asserted that no President would be willing to release our ICBM force against the Soviet Union solely upon the basis of radar detection of incoming Russian missiles. They have reiterated our policy of riding out an attack before we retaliate. I agree that since our detection is now based on radar along that launching such an attack would be unwise due to the possibility of mistaken images on our radar screens. But what if our detection devices were improved? What of the possibility mentioned often recently that we are experimenting with satellite detection of exhaust fumes which would relay to us immediately the message that a Soviet ICBM attack had been launched? Our perimeter radars would be useful in confining the original judgment of the satellites thus giving us confirmation of an attack.

This kind of confirmation of attack would certainly tell us what our nuclear response should be rather than depending upon the even more complicated device of attempting to destroy incoming missiles with our ABM's.

I repeat that the proponents of Safeguard seem to have great faith in the technical perfectability of Safeguard. My question is, Why do they not have great faith in the technical perfectability of our detection devices? I suggest that we make an all out attempt to improve our ability to detect. If we poured as much of our resources into this as we will be spending on Safeguard, I am confident that meaningful and reliable detection could be developed.

A good detection system might perform two great services it could:

First, provide early warning of a Soviet ICBM attack thus giving us time to evaluate and respond with ICBM's or any other part of our retaliatory force; and

Second, greatly improve our already existing satellite inspection system which is a vital prerequisite to any meaningful arms limitation agreement.

If we must accept the Russian first-strike thesis, one of these steps would seem to be preferable. Admittedly, Drs. Rathgens, Wiesner, and Weinberg have a bias on the ABM issue, but they have raised another important criticism of the Safeguard program to which I have as yet not heard an effective rebuttal. They contend that even if Safeguard works perfectly, which is highly questionable, the offense could, by striking first at our radars, keep the number of Minutemans saved by the full Safeguard system with all phases deployed down to 20 to 80. And this defense could be entirely offset by an increase in the Soviet's SS–9 force from the 420 figure projected by Secretary Laird to less than 465 missiles.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an additional 5 minutes be allotted to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOK. I thank the Senator.

If this is true, and I repeat I have heard no effective rebuttal to this contention, then I question the soundness of the judgment to deploy the Safeguard system on these grounds also.

The dynamics of the arms race, the action-reaction phenomenon, as it has been described, simply must be abated. The difference between pronouncements and actions of the major powers during the nuclear era is similar to the situation before Hiroshima and Nagasaki, when Sir Norman Angell wrote:

> Generally speaking it would be true to say that no one believes that war pays and nearly everyone believes that policies which lead inevitably to war do pay. Every nation sincerely desires peace; and all nations pursue courses which if persisted in must make peace impossible.

Within the conventional warfare context, such a luxury was possible, but it is no longer. The stakes are too high. The threat of total devastation rules out this kind of inconsistency and demands rational action.

It is no longer sufficient to say let us go ahead and deploy an ABM now and hope we can reach an agreement next year. For the first time since the madness of the nuclear arms race began, let our objective be to make our policies consistent with our pronouncements. I support the Cooper-Hart amendment to the military procurement authorization bill because I believe it represents one of the few remaining opportunities to achieve this goal.

The Cooper-Hart amendment represents an opportunity to make our policies consistent with our pronouncements. It will say to the Soviet Union and the rest of the world that we plan to continue our research and development, testing, and evaluation of an ABM system, but that we will delay deployment for a year, thus demonstrating, before SALT talks begin, our interest in controlling the arms race. The world knows that a nation which can put a man on the moon can ultimately develop an anti-ballistic-missile system. Even though I think there are better responses to an alleged Soviet buildup than deploying an ABM, I also believe we can ultimately build a functionable ABM. But this is not the question. The question is whether a great nation in 1969, a year in which it set forth upon another world, will act with restraint to make its own world a safer place for all mankind.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am very glad I have heard the speech of my colleague from Kentucky (Mr. Cook). I do not speak solely because we happen to be on the same side on this question, but I speak of the decision he has made as an index of his character and of his great ability.

I did not know him intimately in Kentucky, but I had the opportunity to watch his work as a member of the Kentucky Legislature, in the House of Representatives, and then as a judge in the county of Jefferson, having the largest population in our State, over half a million people. Though a young man in both of those important positions, he demonstrated not only independence but great ability. He was innovative and I note today innovations in his speech.

The Senator notes that there may be methods which have not yet been considered very seriously, if at all, which would provide greater protection to the security of our country and its people, and that, with our great capacities, we could improve our capabilities to detect earlier and more certainly any incoming enemy missiles, and to provide the early intelligence which would be so sorely needed.

It is quite interesting that I have received a letter from Dr. Ruina, who is one of this country's outstanding radar experts, in response to an inquiry I had addressed to him about the radars that are now being considered for the Safeguard system. Outstanding scientists have testified the MSR would be vulnerable to attack, and its destruction would render valueless the whole Safeguard system. In response to the inquiry, it is interesting that he stated a belief that the radars could be possibly used to provide a more effective early warning system.

Senator Cook has not yet seen that letter, but in his speech, the Senator has suggested this possibility, in the tradition of innovation, so often demonstrated in his career.

What I want to say now, however, is that the Senator from Kentucky has emphasized the chief thrust and purpose of those who oppose the deployment of an ABM system at this time; that we seek in what is the Senator has described this hour in history, this minute in history, when for the first time the Soviet Union has indicated a willingness to discuss control of offensive and defensive nuclear weapons, to determine whether the awesome arms race can be terminated, or whether it will go on inexorably toward disaster, toward fear, toward uncertainty, toward the futility of life, and, lead to nuclear war.

My colleague has raised the debate to a high level.

I have noted in the debate that those who have come into the Senate this year—the Senator from California (Mr. Cranston), who is presiding, the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Mathias), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Eagleton), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Saxbe), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. Hughes), and other Senators—have brought to it great quality. They have emphasized the importance of attempting to stop the nuclear arms race. My colleague is one of those Senators who have given the Senate and the country good advice. They have come immediately from the people. They are not frozen into attitudes, that can develop in the Senate. They come directly from the people. They know how the people are thinking, the young and the old.

I congratulate my colleague.

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. COOK. All during this debate, we have heard it discussed that the Russians will build and will have, by the mid-1970's, some 420 SS–9's. I think this is something that the people of this country should be very much aware of; while the Russians, in the mid-1970's, may have 420 SS–9's, the United States, as of the day that we are standing here, now, has some 1,054 ICBM's. If we were to MRV those 1,054, we would then have 3,162 nuclear warheads, and if we MIRV them to as many as 10 nuclear warheads each, we could have as many as 10,540 warheads. At the same time, if by the mid-1970's the Russians MRV their 420 SS–9's, they would have 1,260; and if they put 10 nuclear warheads in each one of them, they would have 4,200, to our 10,540.

I think this attitude that some of the American people have got, that somehow some other nation is going to immediately overtake this Nation, should be countered by the reminder that this Nation has overwhelming nuclear power in relation to any other nation in this world, and that the idea we are about to be overtaken is simply not true.

Mr. COOPER. It is not true. I do not think anyone has questioned the fact that today the United States possesses at least two and perhaps three times the nuclear capacity of the Soviet Union. I do not doubt that if the Soviet Union continues its present pace of development of nuclear weapons, by the mid-1970's it could have 420 SS–9's and perhaps more, and they could MRV them or MIRV them; and if we did nothing in that period, they might surpass us in number of warheads.

But that assumes, if such a threat develops, that we will do nothing next year and the years after.

Of course, we would protect our country, and if the threat should develop, who could doubt the capability of the United States to preserve its retaliatory strength? As the Senator has said, a country and a people who can put a man on the moon, have the capabilities to increase the number of weapons we already know how to produce.

In fact, in this very bill, money is provided to arm the Minuteman III, with MRV or MIRV. There is money in this bill, though we do not hear talk about it, to continue the program of refitting 31 of our Polaris submarines with Poseidons, which, when completed, would add a factor of three or five or 10 to the warheads we could deliver on the Soviet Union from our submarine forces.

There has been a great deal of talk about the threat to our Polaris submarine. Any affirmation to that effect was contradicted by Admiral White, who has command of the Polaris Fleet, in testimony before the Senate. Not long ago, the Secretary of the Navy maintained the same positions. It is not in the record, but when I heard such a statement made in the hearings when I heard Secretary Laird testify, although I was in bed in the hospital, I was so concerned that I called Dr. Foster on the telephone and asked him about the testimony.

He said in substance, "We have ways to meet such a threat." The Senator is correct; to use an illustration which has been used often, but I think it correct, the United States and the Soviet Union each have sufficient nuclear power to deposit the equivalent of 15 tons of TNT on the head of every person in the two countries. We ought to try to stop the race, and it is what the Senator has proposed.

I have the impression, from the debates, that those who propose to deploy the ABM show greater fear of the Soviet Union and actually less confidence in our capacity to meet any threat than those who oppose its deployment this year.

Mr. COOK. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I simply wish to thank the able junior Senator from Kentucky for the statement he has made today. Unfortunately, I was delayed in getting to the floor of the Senate, and hence not able to hear it in full. But over these many months since the beginning of this session of Congress, as the ABM debate has developed, those of us who, a year ago, cautioned against deploying the ABM, then labeled Sentinel, have been heartened to see that those who have joined us since January of this year are now cautioning against the deployment of the ABM now labeled Safeguard.

One of the problems of human nature—and it is not removed when one is permitted to serve in the Senate—is that once you have said yes or no to a question, even when the question is rephrased, you are apt to feel that you have to say no again, if that is what you said first, or yes if you said yes first, even though you are less sure of your position the second time around.

Senator Cook is not stuck with a yes or no from last year. He comes here, as does the present occupant of the chair (Mr. Cranston), free of that inevitable restraint that attaches to human nature, "Last year I thought one way or the other; I guess I had better stay with it." The junior Senator from Kentucky and the junior Senator from California, now in the chair, are free to take a look at this ABM, now called Safeguard, without thinking back to how they voted on the ABM labeled Sentinel last year; and it is very encouraging to those of us who thought it was unwise to deploy it last year to see these two able Senators come in here this year and look at it, starting from scratch, and rise to say it is unwise at this time to deploy the ABM, labeled Safeguard.

Mr. COOK. I thank the Senator.

EXECUTIVE COMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Property Acquisitions of Emergency Supplies and Equipment, Office of Civil Defense

A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment for the quarter ended June 30, 1969; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Commission on Population Growth and the American Future

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the City Commission of Miami, Fla., praying for a reconsideration by the President on the sums of money planned to be spent in the anti-ballistics-missile plan, in light of the needs of urban areas; ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the third time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. McClellan):

S. 2701. A bill to establish a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(The remarks of Mr. Mundt when he introduced the bill appear earlier in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 2702. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose May Fang-Yen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

S. 2703. A bill for the relief of Antonia Galicia Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 2704. A bill to provide incentive for devotion of nonresidential reuse project land to low- or moderate-income housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(The remarks of Mr. Proxmire when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. GORE:

S.J. Res. 141. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. Gore when he introduced the joint resolution appear earlier in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

S. 2704—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO SITES FOR LOW-INCOME HOUSING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the critical problems in building housing for low- and moderate-income families is the lack of suitable sites. The unavailability of land in our large central cities makes it extremely difficult to build housing for the poor. When land is available, developers are frequently forced to resort to monolithic high-rise structures in order to bring the rents within the reach of low-income families.

One excellent source of land for low-income housing is the urban renewal program. The Douglas commission on urban problems has pointed out that over one-half of the land on urban renewal sites is vacant. It would be a simple matter to use some of this land for low- and moderate-income housing sites.

The problem with this approach is that much of this land is classified for eventual commercial reuse. The resale value of the land is, of course, higher when the reuse is classified as commercial as opposed to residential. Therefore, if cities were to reclassify the land on the existing urban renewal sites from commercial to residential, land values would drop and net project costs would increase.

In order to remove this barrier and provide our cities with an incentive to use more urban renewal land for low- and moderate-income housing sites, I am introducing a bill to amend the Urban Renewal Act. The bill would make it possible for the Federal Government to reimburse cities for any added cost entailed by reclassifying urban renewal land so as to provide for more low- and moderate-income housing sites.

HUD has already shifted its urban renewal priorities from commercial projects toward building residential housing, particularly for low- and moderate-income families. The bill I have introduced would effect a similar reordering of priorities for urban renewal projects already in the pipeline. The bill is entirely in keeping with the goals set forth in the 1968 Housing Act of solving our housing problems within the next decade.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately re-

XUM

ferred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2704) to provide incentive for devotion of nonresidential reuse project land to low- or moderate-income housing, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2704

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Section 103 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, for any urban renewal project under contract for capital grant on the date of enactment of this subsection, involving real property which is to be devoted to nonresidential use pursuant to the applicable urban renewal plan existing on the date of this subsection's enactment, and which, by urban renewal plan changes adopted after this subsection's enactment, is to be devoted to residential use, the Secretary is authorized to increase the capital grant otherwise payable by an amount equal to one-third (or one-fourth in the case of an urban renewal project on a three-fourths capital grant basis) of the difference between the disposition proceeds of any such real property sold or leased pursuant to section 107(a) and the estimated fair value, as determined by the Secretary, of such real property as of the date of this subsection's enactment.

"The local public agency shall not be required to provide any additional local grant-in-aid due to the increase in capital grant authorized by this subsection."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

S. 2667

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) be added as a cosponsor of S. 2667, to provide additional penalties for the use of firearms in the commission of certain crimes of violence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2691

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) be added as a cosponsor of S. 2691, to amend Public Law 87–849, approved October 23, 1962, to strengthen provisions relating to disqualification of former Federal officers and employees in matters connected with former duties and official responsibilities, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE RESOLUTION 224—RESOLUTION COMMENDING THE APOLLO 11 ASTRONAUTS ON THEIR SUCCESSFUL LUNAR EXPEDITION

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 224) commending the Apollo 11 astronauts on their successful lunar expedition, which was considered and agreed to.

(The remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD, when he submitted the resolution, appear earlier in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MISSILE TEST FACILITIES AT KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE, AND RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTH—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 107

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators CASE, COOK, YOUNG of Ohio, and MONDALE, I submit today a disclosure amendment, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the pending military procurement bill, which would affect three classes of persons. Specific annual disclosure statements would be required from former high-ranking military officers and all former military procurement officers who go to work for major defense contractors.

The amendment would also apply to former high-ranking civilian officers and all former civilian procurement officers who work for the major contractors.

Finally, it would apply to former employees of defense contractors who come to work for the Pentagon.

Let me outline the major provisions.

RETIRED MILITARY OFFICERS

The amendment would require retired officers of the rank of colonel or Navy captain and above and procurement officers and former military plant representatives of lesser rank who work for companies doing more that $10 million a year business with the Pentagon, to disclose certain facts to the Secretary of Defense, by March 1 of each year. This would include their name, the title and description of their work during the 3 years prior to retirement, the date of their retirement, the date of employment with the contractor, and the title and description of their work with the contractor. In addition the amendment would require a declaration of any work on planning, research, or decisionmaking on any product, contract, weapon system or component in which the officer was involved while at the Pentagon and in which his employer has a substantial interest.

Mr. President, much of the information this amendment seeks from former officers is now submitted by retired officers under a statement of employment—Defense Department form 1357. What this amendment does is to require additional information about the nature of their work while they were at the Pentagon with special reference to the details of any procurement work they were involved in in which their civilian employer has a substantial interest.

Of course this requirement would apply only to those high ranking officers and procurement officers of lower ranks who go to work for defense contractors.

FORMER CIVILIAN OFFICIALS

The amendment calls for disclosure of the same information from former civilian employees of the Pentagon of grade 15 or above. It also calls for disclosure by former civilian officials of whatever rank who were involved in procurement and who work for or represent companies doing more than $10 million a year business with the Pentagon. The amendment would apply not only to former high ranking civilians who work directly for the contractors, but also to those who "represent" them in any transaction for services or materials. Its intention is to require disclosure by lawyers and others who are involved in procurement.

If a former Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Army, or Navy left the Pentagon and went into private law practice he could be required to report under this amendment.

If he represented the contractor on an income tax or a bond issue matter, he would not have to report. But if he was retained to represent, or did represent, the contractor on a matter involving a weapons system or services or materials to the Pentagon, he would be required to report.

The test is whether he is retained by and represents the contractor in a transaction.

If a contractor retains him and he makes a phone call to the Pentagon or takes an admiral to lunch or plays golf at Burning Tree Country Club on behalf of his client contractor, the former high ranking official would have to file an annual disclosure statement so long as his services were retained.

I think such a requirement is long overdue. And in fairness to former high ranking military officers, it is just as important if not more so to require disclosure from former high ranking civilians.

FORMER CONTRACTOR'S EMPLOYEES

The amendment calls for similar disclosure by present Pentagon civilian employees who previously worked for a contractor doing more than $10 million in business with the Pentagon. It requires disclosure by them of any work by them on specific products, research, weapon systems or components in which his previous employer had a substantial interest, in order that conflicts may not develop.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

The amendment requires that the information be open to inspection by the press and public at the Pentagon.

The amendment also calls for the Secretary to make an annual report to Congress by May 1 of each year giving the information in an organized and tabulated form. While the reporting requirement in the bill has been written in general terms, in order to avoid requiring an excessive amount of data, it is nonetheless the intent of this provision that the pertinent information be provided or summarized.

SUNLIGHT IS A GREAT DISINFECTANT

Mr. President, while I believe that it is extremely important that the very weak conflict of interest laws now on the books should be strengthened, I also believe that disclosure can be of great help.

There is an old saying that sunlight is a great disinfectant.

Furthermore, this amendment is appropriate to this bill while the proposal I made yesterday for tightening the conflict of interest laws would apply to the Government as a whole and should properly have hearings to consider them before they are passed.

Basically what my amendment does is to require more detailed information from high ranking officers and all former procurement officers and plant representatives who go to work for the big companies than is now required. As I have said, much but not all of the information is now in the hands of the Pentagon.

But the major change is to require the same detailed data from the former civilian employees. This, I think, is a very proper requirement and is long overdue.

But more important is the fact that the amendment requires the Pentagon to make the data open to inspection by the press and the public, which they have formerly refused to do. In addition, it requires that an annual report be made to the Congress. This, I believe, will make it possible for Congress and the public to gain an overall view of the situation.

REGULAR FLOW OF INFORMATION

Mr. President, what my amendment would do is to make information available on an annual basis which, in the past has been available only when insisted upon by Members of Congress.

In 1969 I asked for and received from the Pentagon a list of high ranking former military officers now employed by the 100 largest defense contractors. The list given to me totaled 2,124 former officers in the employ of the 100 largest contractors. Ten companies alone employed 1,065 or over half of them.

It has been 10 years since similar information has been made public. In 1959, during the hearings on the Renegotiation Act, former Senator Paul H. Douglas asked for and received similar details. In that year there were 721 former high ranking officers employed by the top 100 companies—88 out of 100 reporting.

In the meantime, efforts by the press and public to get such information from the Pentagon failed even though the Pentagon had such information available from the data from the statement of employment it requires each retired officer to make and to keep up to date.

My amendment will regularize what I think is a proper disclosure practice. In addition, it will extend disclosure requirements to civilian as well as former military officers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT NO. 101

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) be added as a cosponsor of the pending amendment (No. 101).

Through inadvertence, his name was omitted both from the initial and the modified amendments when they were submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Committee on Government Operations has scheduled a hearing on S. 1707, a bill to establish a Commission on Government Procurement, for July 31, 1969. The hearing will begin at 10 a.m. in room 3302, New Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony from the Comptroller General and officials of the executive branch with respect to the bill. Statements from other interested parties will be received for inclusion in the hearing record.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

> David A. Brock, of New Hampshire, to be U.S. attorney for the district of New Hampshire for the term of 4 years, vice Louis M. Janelle.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, August 1, 1969, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

ONE GIANT LEAP FOR MANKIND—NOT ONE BACKWARD STEP

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, more than 100 years ago, the celebrated science fiction writer, Jules Verne, wrote a book entitled "From the Earth to the Moon." In it, he had three intrepid explorers take a trip in a capsule to the moon. Although some of his facts were wrong, this Frenchman unhesitatingly selected America as the country that would undertake such a mission. That was the image America had 100 years ago: Vital. Growing. Enterprising. Building. Willing to undertake new things. Restless to explore new horizons.

Jules Verne was right. Americans have gone to the moon. But the question is: "What does America do now?"

Here is what Jules Verne said:

> The American people will never rest quietly until they have pushed to its last result and to every logical consequence the astounding step so daringly conceived and so wonderfully carried out.

Well, I hope he will be right about that too, but I am not so sure. Our courageous astronauts had hardly set foot on the moon before some people were saying, "Well, that's it. We've done it. We can stop our space program now, and we can turn our attention to other things."

Mr. President, I hope that that is not the sentiment of the Members of this body. Apollo 11 is the beginning of an age, not the end of a program. There is no turning back, and I think we would be foolish if we tried.

Meeting President Kennedy's goal has shown what we as a Nation can do. And many people are saying, "If we can put a man on the moon, why can we not eliminate poverty, eradicate our slums, rebuild our cities, unclog our airways, make our air and water clean, and so forth?" Well, the answer is that we can. This Nation can accomplish these and many other tasks if we have the will to do it. But for the life of me I cannot understand why we should cripple the space program in order to meet these other needs. In fact, it would seem to me that the examples set by the space program—the pride of achievement, the spirit of moving ahead—go-aheadiveness," Jules Verne called it—require that we continue with our space exploration if we have any hope of solving our other problems. The space program has already been cut almost one-third from its peak and now accounts for less than one-half of 1 percent of our gross national product. If we consciously choose to hurt ourselves by reducing this program further, we will begin to lose those qualities which have characterized this country up until now. And if we lose this vitality, this sense of enterprise and "go-aheadiveness," not only will we not solve our economic and social problems, but it is also unlikely that we long maintain a position of leadership in the world of tomorrow.

When Neil Armstrong set foot upon the moon he said it was "one giant leap for mankind."

Let us not dishonor him and his brave colleagues and 200 million Americans by taking a backward step.

NINETIETH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF EDWIN OWEN LEWIS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Honorable Edwin Owen Lewis recently observed his 90th birthday.

His long and distinguished service included 33 years as a judge of the court of common pleas in Philadelphia, the long-time presidency of the Independence Hall Association, and the receipt of Philadelphia's Bok Award, our city's highest honor for civic service.

As his nephew and one-time law associate, I am proud to have benefited from his wise counsel over the years.

Judge Lewis was the originator of the plan to create the Independence Hall National Park. At his insistence, former Representative Hardie Scott and I introduced the bill to create the Park which became law about 1947.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter of congratulations from President Nixon to Judge Lewis be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 8, 1969.

DEAR JUDGE LEWIS: I am delighted to join all of your devoted friends in sending congratulations and very best wishes on your 90th birthday. You have achieved a milestone in a dedicated professional career, and in a life dedicated to public service. It is

XUM

always a pleasure and a source of pride to commend an American who has served humanity and country with such distinction.

I especially commend the inspiration and leadership you have given to the Independence Hall Association, the Philadelphia National Shrines Commission and the Independence National Historical Park Advisory Commission in the rehabilitation and restoration of Independence Hall and the historic landmarks of Philadelphia. For these and all your life achievements, you have my admiration and the gratitude of all your fellow Americans.

May you have a particularly happy birthday, and may God bless you always.

Sincerely,

Richard Nixon.

COMDR. NEIL ARMSTRONG A PURDUE GRADUATE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, every aspect of the Apollo 11 flight has been a brilliant success. Millions of people across the world share the sense of amazed wonder at such a perfectly executed feat. The landing at Base Tranquillity on July 20, followed by the subsequent historic moon walk and safe return, represent more than an incredible aeronautical achievement; they will endure forever as unforgettable events in the history of human aspirations and endeavors.

During the entire epic voyage the three astronauts demonstrated superb skills, unmatched courage, great calm and an imperturbable faculty for decisionmaking. Each of these brave men equally deserves the accolades and credit which has been bestowed on them so generously by the President and by Americans from every segment of our society. In the weeks ahead, after they have emerged from protective quarantine, the Nation is eagerly anticipating the opportunity to extend congratulations to them in a more personal and meaningful way.

Although the commander of Apollo 11, Neil A. Armstrong, is a native of Ohio, because of my Hoosier pride I cannot help but point out that he received his formal aeronautical engineering training at Purdue University in West Lafayette, Ind. While in college Commander Armstrong not only was a competent student but also participated actively in a variety of extracurricular activities. It is interesting to note that in addition to being president of the Aero Club and a member of the American Rocket Society, Neil played in the Purdue Military Band and wrote the lyrics for a varsity variety show. By coincidence, it happened that I was an undergraduate at Purdue during some of the years Commander Armstrong was there, and I am proud to be a fellow Boilermaker.

Recently there came to my attention a very interesting article describing Neil Armstrong's early background, especially his days at Purdue University. In order that others may read this tribute to him, I ask unanimous consent that this article, which was written by Jep Cadou and appeared in the Indianapolis Star on July 15, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Comdr. Neil Armstrong a Purdue Graduate

(By Jep Cadou)

Cape Kennedy, Fla.—It will be nine rungs down an aluminum alloy ladder and then a step into immortality for Neil Armstrong of Purdue University.

On or about 2:17 a.m. (Indianapolis time) next Monday, Armstrong will back out of a 32-inch square front door of the Apollo-11 lunar module on his hands and knees.

He will hop down the ladder with his two feet together, two rungs at a time, facing the ladder.

His last backward hop, probably his fifth, will land him on the silvery, dish-shaped footpad of the landing craft's front ledge.

Then, facing the ladder and grasping it for support, with his right boot set firm on the footpad, he will swing his left leg out and step backward into history.

He will make one of the most significant footprints in the history of mankind when he plants on lunar soil his size 9½–B left foot encased in a white space overshoe 13 inches long and 6 inches wide with a quarter-inch-thick sole and a zig zag thread.

The Boilermaker and his "helper"—Edwin E. (Buzz) Aldrin Jr. will be the stars of one of the best-watched live television dramas in history as an estimated one-half the population of the United States either gets up or stays up for the epoch-making treat and millions of others around the world join them.

What manner of man is this that America has chosen as its first moon man?

Probably most significant, Armstrong is a civilian. Whether this is by accident or design has never been made quite clear but the latter is much more probable: Few things are left to accident by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

It is probable the directors of our space program believe it more fitting to send a civilian—a man of peace—rather than an Air Force, Army or Navy officer—men of war—onto the moon first.

Neil Armstrong also is a solid Midwestern American, a white, Anglo-Saxon Protestant, an Eagle Scout, from a Republican family.

Armstrong's one great interest was aviation almost from the moment he saw his first airplane.

Neil and his brother, Dean, and sister, June, grew up in the atmosphere of thrift born of the Great Depression.

(Dean now is a night supervisor for the General Motors Corporation at Anderson, Ind. and is down here for the moon-shot.)

Neil acquired his first job at 9 or 10, mowing a cemetery lawn for 10 cents an hour. Then, he progressed to a better job in a bakery, washing the bread mixer.

The family settled in 1944 in Wapakoneta, Ohio. Its population was 6,756 according to the last United States census. It was an ideal place for the young Armstrong to grow up and learn the great virtues of our society.

Young Armstrong, trustworthy and loyal, made Eagle Scout at Troop No. 2 of St. Paul Evangelical and Reformed Church. His dad was the Scoutmaster.

Neil played the baritone horn in the band at Blume Senior High School and was also part of a quartette known as the "Mississippi Moonshiners." (They played it, they didn't distill it.)

He also worked for 40 cents an hour as a stockboy at a drugstore where he managed to spend a major portion of his time reading all the flying and science magazines.

He took a healthy interest in the Cincinnati Reds baseball team and, on one cold opening day, he and "the gang" traveled 100 miles south to sit in the upper deck.

Young Armstrong saved most of his money for college but he could not resist spending part of it for flight lessons at $9 an hour. On his 16th birthday, he earned his pilot's license. He rode his bike home from the airport; he hadn't learned to drive a car yet.

The Retrospect, Neil's high school yearbook, said of young Armstrong: "He thinks, he acts, 'tis done."

One of the great disappointments of Armstrong's life came when he was rejected by Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

But MIT's loss was Purdue's gain, and Neil's.

He enrolled at the West Lafayette school in 1947 under the naval air cadet program as a student of aeronautical engineering. His scholarship called for two years in college, four years of active duty, then two more years of college.

Armstrong quickly developed the highest respect for Purdue. He later insisted that his brother go there.

While at Purdue, Neil wrote the lyrics and score for a Purdue varsity variety show titled "Egelloc" (college spelled backward). He also was a member of the Student Chapter of the American Rocket Society, president of the Aero Club, student flying organization, a member of the Purdue Military Band and of Phi Delta Theta fraternity.

His extracurricular activities included a trip with his Phi Delta frat brothers down to the sands Fort Lauderdale.

During the two years of service duty which interrupted his Purdue career, Armstrong flew 78 combat missions, as a Navy pilot in the Korean War. He gained a reputation as a "hot pilot" but doesn't like to talk about his service experiences.

One of his former Purdue professors, George Palmer, recalls: "He was a good student, not outstanding, but quite good, very thorough. I know I made a notation in my grade book: 'completes work when others do not.' "

While at Purdue, Neil met a girl swimmer, Janet Shearon, a member of Chi Omega sorority and a beauty queen. She has been Mrs. Armstrong since 1956 and now lives in El Lago, Tex., with two sons, Eric, 12, and Mark, 6.

The big tragedy of Armstrong's life was the death of their daughter, Karen, 2, of a brain tumor.

When Armstrong left Purdue, he fulfilled his ambition by becoming a test pilot. He flew the F–100, F–101, F–102, F–104, FSD, B–47 and X–1, to X–15 rocket planes. He flew the X–15 to 200,000 feet and 4,000 miles an hour. As a spare-time pastime, he took up soaring in gliders.

In September, 1962, Armstrong became America's first civilian astronaut.

He commanded the Gemini–8 when it made history's first space docking in March, 1966, joining nose-to-nose with an unmanned Agena target vehicle.

When an electrical short circuit caused a thruster to malfunction, Armstrong and his crewmate, David Scott, demonstrated their "cool" and exceptional piloting skill in overcoming the problem and bringing their spacecraft to an emergency splashdown.

That performance undoubtedly influenced NASA officials in picking Armstrong for the big job, which undeniably is risky.

Armstrong knows it.

"I'd be silly to say we won't think of the dangers because that's what we do all the time," he has said. "But we don't really think about it from a personal point of view."

TYDINGS ON CBW

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate and the country to a speech entitled, "The Perils of Chemical and Biological Warfare" made by my able colleague from Maryland, Senator Tydings, in Northwood, Md., on June 12. Senator Tydings gives an extraordinarily lucid and alarming account of the proliferation of these deadly agents and weapons, both in the United States and abroad. I can only

XUM

add my strong support for placing at the top of our national agenda the detailed consideration of the hardheaded measures for immediate action in this area that the Senator proposes at the end of his remarks.

An alarming danger to world peace is posed by the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons. The need to reexamine our stand on ratifying the Geneva Protocol of 1925 which bans the aggressive use of these weapons is an urgent necessity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the speech of the Senator from Maryland, who has given leadership to the Nation in this most serious question, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PERILS OF CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

(Excerpts from speech by Senator TYDINGS)

Revolutionary developments in chemistry and biology in this century have provided medicine with miraculous new weapons to combat disease and save human lives. However, these same developments also possess the potential to destroy all life on this planet if not adequately controlled.

At least 13 nations—including the United States—currently are devoting hundreds of millions of dollars a year to the development and production of weapons to wage chemical and biological warfare.

The U.S. Army operates six full-time chemical and biological warfare installations—2 of which are located here in Maryland—employing 14,000 men at a cost of more than $500 million a year.

In plants near Denver, Colorado, Newport, Indiana, and Baltimore, Maryland, the Army is producing massive quantities of toxic nerve agents. Though the Pentagon claims we have only a limited offensive chemical capacity, it has reportedly stockpiled more than 100 million lethal doses of nerve gas—a poison which causes its victims to literally strangle in their own vital organs.

At Fort Detrich, near Frederick, Maryland, hundreds of scientists are at work developing exotic strains of virulent diseases. Included are anthrax—which kills up to 99 percent of its victims—tularemia, yellow fever, encephalitis, and plague—the "black death" which destroyed almost a quarter of the population of Europe in the fourteenth century.

Large stocks of these diseases have been accumulated, and it is estimated that the Army can convert them into weapons systems—complete with germ-filled missiles and bombs—in a period of 4 to 6 weeks.

Chemical and biological weapons now constitute a threat to man's survival no less serious or alarming than that posed by nuclear arms. During World War II, U.S. scientists isolated a botulism so virulent that 500 grams of it—slightly more than one pound—was considered enough to destroy the world's population.

The international community has recognized the dangers inherent in nuclear weapons. The nuclear test ban treaty and the nuclear non-proliferation treaty represent the first steps in a campaign to bring the use and availability of nuclear arms under strict international control.

No such safeguards now exist with regard to the testing and proliferation of gas and germ weapons. No serious attempts have been made to negotiate the elimination of these deadly agents from the arsenals of the world.

I realize there are formidable scientific obstacles to detection of the gas and germ warfare capabilities of any nation. And such effective detection would be essential to any treaty. But, in view of the threat these weapons pose to our nation and the rest of mankind, we dare not fail to develop these means of detection and control. The stakes are too high.

In addition, the testing, storage, and transportation of chemical and biological agents in this country create a serious health hazard.

Last year at the Dugway proving grounds—the Army's chemical and biological testing station in Skull Valley, Utah—a large quantity of nerve gas was accidentally discharged in the atmosphere. As a result, 6,400 sheep located 47 miles east of the discharge point were killed.

However, more disturbing was the fact that only 35 miles to the north of the discharge point runs U.S. 40, a heavily traveled interstate highway. In other words, had the wind been blowing north instead of east the fatality figures might have been calculated in terms of people instead of animals.

Therefore, in light of the international and domestic dangers created by the unlimited development and production of chemical and biological weapons, I am making the following specific recommendations for action to the Congress and the President:

First, that this Nation significantly increase the funding and manpower of the arms control and disarmament agency to develop the detection equipment necessary to enforce any treaty on chemical and biological warfare.

Second, that we seek to make the limitation of atmospheric testing and non-proliferation of germ and gas weaponry a high priority item on the agenda of the Geneva disarmament talks.

Third, that this Nation pursue, with every means at its disposal, the development and implementation of a workable, safeguarded treaty to limit development, testing, production, stockpiling, and deployment of chemical and bacterial weapons by the nations which now possess them.

Fourth, that a thorough review be undertaken of the health hazards involved in testing, producing, storing and transporting these weapons and of current safety procedures.

Fifth, that in anticipation of effective control of chemical and biological weapons, we begin exploring the possibility of employing personnel and facilities presently devoted to CBW activities in the fight to conquer diseases such as cancer and stroke.

It is not too late to begin these steps. But if by accident or design germs or gas warfare should break out and escalate, it will not only be too late for these steps, it will be too late for all mankind. . . .

THE TOY SAFETY ACT OF 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am extremely pleased that the Senate has acted favorably on S. 1689, the Toy Safety Act of 1969. As a cosponsor of this important legislation to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, I want to add my hope for prompt enactment.

Of considerable importance to me, and to the many Pennsylvanians who derive their livelihoods from the sales of toys and children's articles, is the matter of liability. Should a toy dealer with a warehouse full of federally banned products be required to absorb this enormous loss? I think not. This obvious imperfection in the original bill was notably corrected by the able and talented junior Senator from Vermont, WINSTON PROUTY. His amendment, as accepted by the Senate Commerce Committee on which I have the pleasure of serving with him, places the liability for economic loss because of recall of an unsafe toy upon the manufacturer of the toy. This amendment benefits both toy dealers and toy manufacturers. On the one hand, toy dealers are not forced to take a loss on defective products purchased prior to the enactment of the new law. And on the other hand, because toy dealers will not now have the same recourse when purchasing from foreign distributors, they are encouraged to do business with domestic firms.

Mr. President, I believe that this legislation is a welcome addition to the already growing list of consumer protection measures I have been proud to have played a role in enacting.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SHARON SITES ADAMS, THE FIRST WOMAN TO SAIL THE PACIFIC ALONE

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I have sent the following telegram to my fellow Californian, Sharon Sites Adams, on her outstanding achievement:

America has always taken pride in the adventurous spirit of her people. This week we are again presented with two prime examples of this unique spirit. Yesterday, the Apollo 11 crew returned from a voyage to the Moon—a feat undreamed of a few decades ago. And today, you have returned from a remarkable voyage of your own—a voyage of six thousand miles and seventy-three days, to become the first woman to sail alone across the Pacific Ocean.

Like the Apollo astronauts, you have conquered the unknown with courage and success. Your vessel, the *Seasharp*, like the Apollo craft, *Eagle*, has now become a proud part of America's adventurous heritage.

Congratulations on a most successful journey.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, at this time of year, when we are commemorating Captive Nations Week, it is well for the American people to examine the role they have played in providing a haven for those battered by the storms of history.

The United States has always opened its shores to those who could no longer take the oppression and tyranny that were their lot at home. We have always provided a welcome for these people, from the very outset of our history as a country.

It must be recalled that the very first settlers in New England, the Pilgrims, landed at Plymouth because of religious persecution at home. The great State of Pennsylvania was founded by a man leading his people from religious persecution and into freedom.

Our whole history has been the story of a people welcoming as friends those who were oppressed, downtrodden, persecuted. It might be well, too, to remember that many of the millions who have immigrated to the United States did so because of military conscription at home, primarily in the middle and southern European countries.

MELTING POT

These waves of immigration to the United States from all parts of the world have created within this country what we proudly label a "melting pot." If one

XUM

walks down the street in almost any American city he is bound to run into people whose ancestors came to this country from Scandinavia, from the British Isles, from the European continent, from Asia, and from Africa.

Nowhere else in the world does such a situation pertain. And let it be noted that at no other time in all the history of mankind has any nation ever so freely and for so long a time opened its borders to all who sought and seek refuge. This makes the United States and the people of the United States unique.

The rights of minorities have sometimes been thwarted or ignored. Likewise, the rights of the majority have also been sometimes ignored or set aside.

All of this is true. It is a confession which Americans must make if they are to be honest with themselves.

But—and I must emphasize this—notwithstanding our shortcomings and our failures, we have tried, and we are still trying. And we have achieved a measure of success that is both heartening and a challenge.

SOME SUCCESS

Nowhere else on earth do so many people from so many lands and so many backgrounds live as closely and harmoniously together as in the United States. Men and women from Poland and Czechoslovakia, from Russia and Hungary, from France and Italy, from Germany and Sweden, from Finland and Bulgaria, from Greece and Japan, from China and all the lands of Africa, live side by side.

Not always is their life calm, but always men from every racial and religious background have attempted to work out their differences in peace.

Nowhere in the world have so many people from so many varying backgrounds attempted to adjust themselves to life together as part of a single great nation.

That this degree of harmony exists is heartening to all of us. It is also a challenge to us to meet the new demands placed on our Nation.

Our success to date is not an accomplished end in itself, but merely the basis for further efforts to resolve the great differences that still divide us.

In the growing, changing, developing land that is the United States of America today there is no time to congratulate ourselves on what we have become. We must be too busy about the business of becoming ever more a refuge to all who are oppressed and whose souls cry out for freedom.

That is our goal. If we achieve it, that shall be our place in history. That in all the long and tragic career of mankind there was one place on the road and one time in history that all men could find themselves.

Our past record is but a challenge to the present. Our present is but a stepping stone to a great and noble future.

AJAX PRESSES CELEBRATES 40 YEARS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, a highly successful and important company in Salt Lake City celebrates its 40th anniversary this month. The firm, Ajax Presses, began with a few employees and now claims some 500 persons on the payroll.

Founded by Louis N. Strike in 1929, Ajax Presses today produces more than half the laundry presses on the American market, and exports 15 to 35 percent of the U.S. production annually.

The firm has been awarded the President's "E" flag for its efforts in the Nation's export expansion program. The foreign and domestic successes of Ajax Presses have resulted in excellent annual growth rates, reaching as high as 22 percent.

Ajax Presses is to be congratulated on four decades of public service in producing a much-needed product and in adding significantly to the economy of Utah while boosting the U.S. balance of payments through its exports.

An article from the Salt Lake Tribune of July 20 details the growth of Ajax Presses. I ask that it be printed following these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AJAX PRESSES CELEBRATES 40 YEARS

The phrase "Find a need and fill it" has been responsible for many success stories.

And as Ajax Presses, 1055 W. North Temple, celebrates its 40th anniversary this month, a variation of that theme is credited with much of the company's success.

Louis N. Strike founded the firm in 1929 on the premise that one should "Find out what the marketplace needs and build it."

He did, and in its 40th year the Salt Lake firm produces more than half the laundry presses on the American market and exports 15 to 35 percent of the U.S. production annually.

OPERATION GROWS

From a small shop with a few employees Mr. Strike's Western Laundry Press Co. has grown into the 184,000 sq. ft. manufacturing, research and office complex it is now, employing some 500 persons.

In 1956 Ajax Presses was acquired by American Laundry Machine Co., a division of McGraw-Edison Co.

But Ajax still controls its own product design, marketing and operation functions.

In the early 1950s the founder's sons were taken into the business and a new dealership sales organization was established.

Through the new sales department the company has negotiated license arrangements with foreign producers. The latest is a licensee in Mexico. Arrangements are being negotiated in Britain and Japan.

GAINS NATIONAL AWARD

Because of its export program, Ajax has been awarded the President's "E" flag for contributions to America's export expansion program.

These domestic and foreign successes have resulted in high annual growth rates for the company, ranging as high as 22 percent.

Nicholas Strike, Ajax general manager and a vice president of American Laundry, has his own variation on his father's motto.

"Our principal asset is our ability to remain sensitive to market needs and our ability to design and build for those needs."

THE PESTICIDE PERIL—XXXII

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, more and more concerned people are convinced of the threat to our environment and possibly even to human health from the continued use of persistent pesticides.

People in California, where a law was recently passed banning the use of DDT for home and garden use after January 1, are already puzzling over how to dispose of surplus pesticides and empty pesticide containers without contaminating the surrounding environment. It is regrettable that the U.S. Department of Agriculture has not considered it necessary to update their 1964 bulletin on safe pesticide disposal.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from last week's Milwaukee Journal of Wisconsin reporting on the disposal problem in California, and also a copy of the 1964 Department of Agriculture bulletin entitled, "Safe Disposal of Empty Pesticide Containers and Surplus Pesticides," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and bulletin were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal,
July 16, 1969]

CALIFORNIANS EAGER TO DISPOSE OF DDT

Now that California has passed a law banning the use of DDT for home and garden use after Jan. 1, an unusual problem has arisen:

Many householders, alarmed by reports of the DDT threat to the environment, want to get rid of it immediately.

"Some think it's like a poisonous snake," said Van P. Entwistle, chief of the division of field crop and agricultural chemicals.

Two Stanford university scientists, who favor a bill still before the legislature to ban all DDT provided some unwanted advice: Set up a system of turning unwanted DDT over to the state.

"We don't want it," Entwistle protested. "It would be a big problem for us to get rid of it."

BURIAL SUGGESTED

Instead, he suggested the continued use of DDT.

This will create a smaller problem than if DDT is dumped in concentrated quantities, he said.

He also suggested burying unwanted DDT. It adheres tightly to soil particles and will eventually decompose, Entwistle explained.

California is the latest state to move against DDT. The law banning house and garden use covers the only unregulated use. Farmers are required to get permits from county agriculture commissioners to use it.

USE MAY DROP 15 PERCENT

California will also halt the use of DDT dust on Jan. 1. The move is aimed at controlling the problem of DDT drifting across fields.

The new laws may cut the use of DDT in California 10% to 15%. Two million pounds are now used annually.

Although Wisconsin has not banned DDT, the state is considering it.

A team of state experts studied the problem of DDT as a pollutant and set up voluntary guidelines. Some of the recommendations went into the solid waste disposal rules drawn up by the natural resources department. Many communities have balked at adopting the recommendations because it would be expensive.

Michigan recently banned the use of DDT, but amended the ban to allow its use to control bats, mice and body lice. The exterminator industry claimed that there was no good alternative.

Arizona has banned the agricultural use of DDT for a year on a trial basis.

XUM

[From the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, August 1964]

SAFE DISPOSAL OF EMPTY PESTICIDE CONTAINERS AND SURPLUS PESTICIDES

(Recommendations for: Farmers; commercial pesticide applicators; city, State, and Federal pest control officials; others who use large quantities of pesticides)

The careful disposal of empty pesticide containers and surplus pesticides is an important part of safe pesticide use. Following safe disposal procedures is vital for those who use pesticides extensively because their errors could lead to serious hazards to themselves and others and to serious contamination of the environment.

"Empty" containers can be a hazard to children and pets. Barrels and drums converted into livestock feed troughs, water storage tanks, or raft floats become sources of contamination of feed and water. If discarded in the line of water runoff, these containers can pollute ponds and streams.

Your responsibility as a pesticide user continues until any empty pesticide containers and any surplus pesticides are disposed of safely and properly.

GOOD STORAGE PLACE NECESSARY

Keep pesticides and pesticide containers in a separate building or room or in an enclosure. Use this storage area exclusively for pesticides and empty pesticide containers. Buildings or rooms used for this purpose should be dry, ventilated, and under lock and key. Outside storage areas should be fenced in to protect children and animals and to discourage pilferage.

(Caution: Do not store weedkillers, herbicides or defoliants in the same room with insecticides. Volatile materials such as 2,4-D and its derivatives can contaminate other pesticides. Chlorate salts can create a fire or explosion hazard.)

Remove only the amount of pesticides needed for one day's operation and be sure to return empty containers—and any unused pesticide—to the storage area at the end of each day.

DISPOSING OF PESTICIDE CONTAINERS

Disposal methods and necessary precautions will depend upon the type of container and facilities available. Regardless of the disposal plan you follow, however, you can lessen the amount of hazard by:

Draining any pesticide remaining in the container into a pit dug in sandy soil.

Rinsing glass and smaller metal containers several times with the diluent being used and including the rinse in your spray.

Keeping lids and bungs tightened at all times when containers are not being used.

Keeping all empty containers in a secure storage area until they can be disposed of safely.

Large metal drums can be disposed of most safely and easily by returning them to the supplier or selling them to a cooperage firm equipped to handle toxic materials. Pesticide containers also can be safely disposed of locally at public dumps, incinerators, or private disposal sites.

Public dump or incinerator

Notify the operator of the dump or incinerator of the nature of the material so that he will be able to take any necessary precautions. Before leaving the disposal site, remove lids and bungs, break glass containers with a sharpened pickax. Breaking and puncturing containers will make it less likely that an unauthorized person will remove them from the dump and attempt to convert them to other uses. Containers should be buried at public dumps.

Private disposal sites

If suitable public disposal facilities are not available and containers cannot be returned to a supplier or sold to a cooperage firm, select a disposal site that will be used only for surplus pesticide and pesticide containers. It should not be an area that might later be returned to cropland or some other use. It should be away from homes, wells, streams, and crops and livestock. Level ground is best because it will let the residue be absorbed through the soil and lessen the chance that it will be carried away in water runoff. Do *not* locate the site on the watershed of a public water supply or where livestock have access to it.

Combustible Containers: Paper bags, cardboard boxes, and plastic containers should be burned after making sure that smoke will not drift over nearby homes, people, livestock; and the person doing the burning. Pouring used crankcase oil over the containers before lighting them will aid combustion.

(*Caution*: Some municipalities have restrictions against burning. Consult local authorities before burning containers.)

Non-Combustible Containers: Where economical sources of fuel are available, metal and glass containers can also be decontaminated by burning. After removing lids, use a sharpened pickax to chop holes in the top, bottom, and sides of metal containers. Build a heap of scrap wood, dry brush, old automobile tires, or anything else that will make a hot fire. Then place containers on the pile and start the fire.

Heat containers until they are red hot and hold them at that temperature (800° to 1200° F.) for at least 5 minutes.

You can construct your own incinerator for burning small containers from a 55-gallon drum. Remove one end from the drum and punch holes in the sides, leaving room at the bottom of the drum to hold the fuel. Fuel oil or used crankcase oil will provide complete combustion yet is safe to use if handled carefully.

But do not burn weedkiller containers

Do not burn containers which have held weedkillers such as 2,4-D and its derivates. When these herbicides volatilize, the resulting vapor may damage nearby plants, crops, and shrubbery. Also, herbicides or defoliants containing chlorates may explode when heated.

Dispose of these containers in this manner:

Break glass containers and chop holes in the top, bottom, and sides of metal containers so they cannot be re-used or collect water. A sharpened pickax is best for this purpose.

Bury all weedkiller containers to a depth of 18 inches at a safe disposal site or take them to a dump where they will be covered with soil.

Rinsing Procedure: If burning is not possible, a thorough rinsing procedure will eliminate much of the pesticide residue and hazard. Here is the recommended rinsing procedure:

1. Carefully rinse empty container with water and detergent. (See table below.) Allow water and detergent to remain in the container for 15 minutes with intermittent agitation. Pour rinse solution into a pit dug in sandy soil.

2. Re-rinse container for another 15 minutes with the same amount of water and detergent. Again pour rinse solution into the pit, invert container and let it drain for 15 minutes into the pit.

3. Flush drum thoroughly with clean water. Caution: *Although they may appear to be completely free of residue, these containers should not be used for storing human or animal food or water!*

RINSING SOLUTION FOR VARIOUS CONTAINERS

Container size (gallons)	Water (gallons)	Detergent
5	½	2 tablespoons.
30	3	½ cup.
55	5	1 cup.

SUPPLIER OR COOPERAGE FIRM

If you plan to turn containers over to the supplier or cooperage firm, tighten the bungs, rinse the drums off with water, and keep them in the storage area until they are picked up. Many of these drums rust rapidly and lose their value after more than one season. So make sure they are collected by the cooperage firm as soon as possible. Growers can contact their pesticide dealers or formulators for the names and locations of established cooperage firms.

DISPOSING OF SURPLUS PESTICIDES

Surplus pesticides should be kept in the original containers in the storage area until they can be disposed of safely. If surplus pesticides cannot be given to a responsible person in need of such material, they should be poured into a hole dug in the ground and covered with dirt to a depth of at least 18 inches. Observe all precautions recommended for private disposal sites. Do not take surplus pesticides to a public dump or incinerator. Leftover spray mixture should be poured into a pit dug in sandy soil.

Use Pesticides Safely—Read the Label.

Caution: If pesticides are handled or applied improperly, or if unused parts are disposed of improperly, they may be injurious to humans, domestic animals, desirable plants, pollinating insects, fish or other wildlife, and may contaminate water supplies. Use pesticides only when needed and handle them with care. Follow the directions and heed all precautions on the container labels.

THE STRUCTURAL REVOLUTION IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, when Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin held his "grass roots" conference with farm people at Lincoln, Nebr., on April 12, he heard an impressive short statement by Mrs. Gordon McKeown, of Bushnell, S. Dak., a director of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference. Mrs. McKeown challenged the desirability of the revolution occurring in American agriculture, and questioned the wisdom of this Nation continuing to allow the displacement of farm families in the name of production efficiency.

Mrs. McKeown followed her brief oral presentation at Lincoln with a documented study, which she has now submitted to Secretary Hardin.

Mrs. McKeown questions policies based on production economics under which more than half of all farm families have already been moved off the land. Some believe that another 2 million will be displaced, leaving a million or less farm units in a Nation which once had 6.8 million.

The study is somewhat longer than documents normally appearing in the RECORD, but it deals with such an important national policy problem, and contains so much information on that problem, that I feel strongly that it should be made available to agricultural policymakers—including all of us in

XUM

Congress who will be voting on farm bills this year and for many years to come. I consequently ask unanimous consent that Mrs. McKeown's paper be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STRUCTURAL REVOLUTION IN AGRICULTURE: A CHALLENGE TO PRODUCTION ECONOMICS POLICYMAKING; RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EFFECTIVE REFORM

(Study prepared by Mrs. Gordon McKeown, Bushnell, S Dak.)[1]

Thank you, Dr. Hardin, your staff, and the personnel of the University of Nebraska, in providing this public forum which has been a true forum, open to all for free and frank discussion. By now you must be weary. For us, too, this has been a long journey.

My name is Mrs. Gordon McKeown, farm wife from South Dakota, a member of the board of directors of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

UNDERSTANDING A REVOLUTION

The issue with which we should concern ourselves here today is the revolution of a socio-economic structure—the "family farm." This revolution is scarcely visible on the American scene. It is a very quiet revolution, but it is a structural revolution.

Dr. Tom Stout, Professor of Economics, Ohio State University, said it well:

"I believe we are on the threshold of revolutionary change in agriculture. I mean revolutionary in the literal sense that revolutions leave earlier forms unrecognizable and cause persistence in customary patterns of thought and action to be untenable." [2]

Two points in my remarks must be inserted here. Point one: My challenges to the power of production economics research in agricultural policy making and many of the suggestions for effective reform follow the guidelines of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference's policy statement, *Toward a Sound Family Farm Policy*, adopted at their national convention in Manhattan, Kansas, 1966.[3]

Point two: My sticks are directed to the social scientists, particularly economists who insist that "they wear several hats", but in reality wear only the hat of the technician. My carrots go to the many, many wonderful economists who have tried to educate, to inform me in the labyrinths of modern knowledge. Their patience has been incredible. So let it be clearly understood that these challenges are not a blanket indictment of social scientists per se, but only an insistence that our educators begin to assume a proper role in their various disciplines of learning.

Let us face the real questions—the "gut" issues in the revolution. You educators and we farmers share more problems and have more in common than either of us know or would care to admit. We are both splintered, fragmented. Really we are both in a sorry state. Neither of us has done our homework. Both the legitimacy of the discipline of economics and the family's right to the ownership of productive property, the land, are being challenged.

On what grounds?

In the case of economics, Kenneth Boulding, who I think we would agree is an economist's economist, presented penetrating insights in his paper, *The Legitimacy of Economics*. I recommend that you all run, not walk, to read the entire paper. The following are just scatterings; I have tried very hard not to present them out of context:

Page 11: "Economists have always prided themselves on being the defenders of the long run and have criticized politicians and political processes for throwing up short solutions. . . . Economists themselves, however are open to the criticism that their long run propositions are very hard to test, and indeed most of them are untested."

Page 12: "This is particularly true of propositions relating to economic development and long run change. Economics starts with an equilibrium system which assumes certain technological coefficients to be constant. . . . An institution which does not rely on sacrifice, mystery, ritual, age or even primarily on alliances with other legitimacies, can only derive legitimacy ultimately from its positive payoffs. (economic profit-dollar payoff—my comment)"

Page 13: "We learn, however, not by success but by failure and the very success of economics as a profession may present it with hidden dangers. . . . If the training of the economist leads to his neglecting certain important aspects of the world around him, *once he is in a position to give advice, and to have this advice taken*, disasters might easily ensue." (Italic mine.)

Page 14: "When one is giving advice, therefore, about a system which involves the total society, it is extremely dangerous to be overtrained in a certain abstract element of the total process. If we run into enough of this, we may find indeed a wide-spread reaction against economics and a withdrawal of legitimacy from it. It is my own view frankly, at this point, that we must move towards a more integrated and perhaps even a rearranged social science, that the existing departmental and disciplinary lines often mask real problems and that *economics may even have to lose its life in order to save it.*" (Italic mine.)

Page 15: "Certainly, if economists maintain the haughty and superior attitude which many of them have towards the other social scientists, they may be heading for some rude shocks." [4]

Dr. Stout, in the paper I mentioned previously, in discussing requested new public attitudes asked:

"Namely, what is the role of the agricultural college, the agricultural experiment station the agricultural extension service, the Department of Agriculture—if the agriculture it serves wishes to be known as a big boy; independent, capable, self-reliant? It is not satisfactory to say that the same old demands for information will remain. That may be. But the same old excuse for providing it will not remain. It is probably not unreasonable to speculate that perhaps the modal group of agricultural economists in domestic public service has already been trained." [5]

There are many other fine minds in the discipline of economics pondering these questions. There's only one trouble. They are talking to each other in their cool white ivory towers. They say marvelous things to each other, but they don't say them to the very people they are supposed to be educating—farmers. In the above quotation, Dr. Stout was speaking to a distinguished group of big businessmen, corporate luminaries of John Deere, W. R. Grace and others. If farmers were present at this Farm Foundation-sponsored meeting, it was not noted.

The old "Eyes of the Farmer" routine with information trickling down from the top through Extension specialists is dead. *It should be buried*. Thousands and more farmers are saying "Extension is irrelevant to us. They don't know our needs. They don't even know our questions let alone answers to them."

Gentlemen, farmers should not expect whatever economists solve their problems; we do have a legitimate right to honest answers to honest questions.

What are farmers still receiving from their educators? You know as well as we. The same old wearisome inventory is hauled out, a change here and there, but the speakers, *and* the bulletins *and* the public service programming on TV and radio *and* the field day program directors *and* the dozens of farm-oriented periodicals dance merrily 'round the mulberry bush chanting their litany of technological efficiency.

We have six month forecasts for whatever you want, soybeans or hogs; inventory statistics palmed off as available market supplies; new developments in confinement feeding, including refinements in deodorizing so we will remain good neighbors to suburbia. And through the litany we will all find our salvation in more effective competition with each other, in more specialization, in more acres, in more and bigger tractors, in more fertilizer, in more herbicides, and let's not forget that good old management know-how. But we farmers know that even the early adaptors find their position a tenuous and temporary one (i.e. broiler producers), and we are really only busy eliminating each other in an economic jungle.

And such prestige we have in this production efficiency bit. Dr. Briggs, our state university president, "lent his presence to a day-long tour for farmers to see current work in low-cost long span fencing . . . toured were the station's 80 pastures and more than 22 miles of experimental fencing . . . Special guests were U.S. Steel Corporation representatives B. A. Kinne and P. G. Strom, Pittsburgh, who developed a special fencing machine displayed at the field day." [6]

Could we farmers be permitted to observe that this performance could show all the signs of a selling campaign. If this could be so, I could resent the fact that Dr. Briggs had to demean the dignity of his office to justify research support. More pertinently I could suggest that Dr. Briggs' valuable time be spent on much more important problems. Couldn't the selling of the corporate technology be left to the corporations?

I am wandering. Forgive me, there's a lot of territory to wander over. Let us now turn our attention to the legitimacy of the family farm's right to exist as a viable socio-economic unit feeding the nation its basic foods. My understanding of a family farm is not gross production. It is not a captive broiler producer. It does not rule out family corporations. Family farms must fill three requirements: control decision-making (management), supply labor (½), and control the capital investment.

The family on the land is being written off on grounds of technological inefficiency and only on those grounds. There has been a technological revolution, America is told. The human input in agriculture—people—too many people—Ah! That is the problem. Dr. Hendrick Houthakker is quite frank. Dr. Houthakker gets right to the point with the use of the word "superfluous". His study is typical of specialists concerned primarily with economic growth. He considers the farm sector not a particularly important one in the American economy. The farm problem he considers primarily a problem of economic growth. He suggests if economic growth requires a movement of labor out of agriculture, then in a free economy, this can be achieved only if per capita farm income is low relative to per capita nonfarm income. He says inefficient farmers should be helped to get out of farming, considers price supports wasteful, and recommends a program of diminishing supports until such time as those who are left can compete in a *free market*. His contribution to future policy is to have some sort of government corporation to maintain price stability in grains by "hedging futures." Useful perhaps is the following direct quotation from Dr. Houthakker's study:

"Since all farm legislation has to be approved by the committee on agriculture, it is difficult indeed to get economically rational farm legislation enacted. The narrow outlook of the leadership of these committees may be illustrated from an incident that took place after the defeat of the administration's farm bill in June 1962. The Committee for Economic Development, and orga-

---

Footnotes at end of article.

XUM

nization of public-spirited businessmen, chose this moment to publish a report entitled "An Adaptive Program for Agriculture." This report contained a good analysis of the farm problem, with emphasis on the need for an outflow of resources from the farm sector. It also contained various positive proposals, with one of which we shall be concerned later on. We do not have to agree with everything the CBD said to recognize that its distinguished members performed a service which the House Agriculture Committee had conspicuously failed to provide, namely to present an abjective picture of the farm problem. The CED's timing may have been poor, but its intentions were admirable. Unfortunately its only reward was a systematic campaign of misrepresentation and personal abuse."

Dr. Houthakker's footnote on the next page is illuminating:

"In many respects the Food and Fiber report of 1967 vindicates the CED report of 1962, the adverse reaction to which was discussed earlier in this chapter."[7]

Now I do not know if the good Dr. Houthakker has read the particular hearings to which he referred. I did spend a full day reading the transcript, and photostating statements. I did not find blind abuse, but I did find challenge.

I cannot speak to you in mathematical formulas. Will this homely illustration suffice? If we can afford the cost, we women know that we can stave off the ravages of time, over-maturity, and outright decay of the aging process with face-liftings, and other expensive techniques which obviously I am not familiar with. But as a woman ages, it becomes more and more expensive, more painfully difficult, and she finds she must face the ultimate truth, and if she is rational—to accept age gracefully, and wisely. For Dr. Houthakker to dismiss the challenges of those hearings as abuse is a case in point, I believe, of the irrationality of making policy conclusions from the narrow abstract of *economic growth*, as irrational as the woman who goes from clinic to clinic in a belief that skin, muscles, tissues can forever generate growth (youth). Surely, a *free* society, and particularly the legislative process, must be concerned with considerations other than *economic growth*. A proposal must be probed, inquired into and then a decision is supposed to be made in the interest of the public good.

In this vein, it is important to look back at those hearings.

The CED people represented at the hearings were Theodore O. Yntema, vice president and chairman, finance committee, Ford Motor Co. and chairman of the Research and Policy Committee, CED; Harold Brenton, President, Brenton Cos., Des Moines, Iowa; Professor Theodore W. Schultz, Department of Economics, U. of Chicago; Lamar Fleming, former chairman of board, Anderson & Clayton, Houston, Texas; and others, such as Mr. Alfred C. Neal, president of CED.

Mr. Yntema began by identifying the purposes and policy of the CED. All quotes will be identified by page number and general footnote will be listed at end. "The Committee consists of a board of trustees of about 200 people, mainly business executives with a small minority of college and university presidents. Our basic purposes are research and education in national economic policy." (page 2) I think we may fairly say that we were one of the early sponsors of the ideas which found reflection in the Employment Act of 1946 . . . in the forefront of those who in the postwar period advocated active use of Government's fiscal and monetary policies to achieve a high, stable level of employment . . ." Page 3.

Mr. Yntema said the CED's continuing concern was "individual freedom as the goal", that "The key to the problem of agriculture, as we see it, is to provide opportunities for the employment of the resources now in agriculture in their most productive uses." (Page 3.)

Mr. Yntema stressed the use of outstanding economists from universities "to indicate the nature of the advice we sought." He commented "We do not think that we regard ourselves as experts in agriculture. . . . Our purpose in doing this is an *educational one*." (Page 4.)

Next came Mr. Brenton. He assured the Committee that the CED's concern was to have farmers earn a comparable income with nonfarmers. "The key is the free choice of well-informed farmers. We shall reach our objective when every farmer is a farmer because he prefers to be one—not because he happened to be born on a farm, and didn't know anything else to do . . . (page 5.) And the incomes of those who remain in agriculture have been helped by the movement of others."

Now let us turn ahead to some of the actual exchange between the Chairman and Dr. Yntema. (Harold Cooley was the committee chairman.)

The Chairman. How many times have any of you appeared before the Agriculture Committees of the Congress concerning the problems of agriculture?

Mr. Stein. Our committee has not appeared before the Agricultural committees before. (Page 12.)

The Chairman. Was this statement (CED's policy statement), referred to by Mr. Brenton, of which you did not even send us a copy, published?

Mr. Yntema. We do not send copies in general unless they are requested. We are not a lobbying organization. We are a research organization.

The Chairman. You are not what?

Mr. Yntema. We are *not a lobbying organization*.

The Chairman. What is the purpose of your existence?

Mr. Yntema. To find the truth.

The Chairman. What is the truth?

Mr. Yntema. Well, we hope that the truth will make us free. (Page 13.)

Mr. Yntema. I think that we have contributed a great deal to the advancement of knowledge. *We are not, however, sponsors of legislation*. This is not our job. We are contributing to education.

I will submit here that Mr. Yntema's statements, which I have italicized, are to put it charitably, inaccurate, if not completely false. Please see Note I in the Appendix at the end of this paper.

Continuing the hearing:

Mr. Yntema. I think we have helped to educate the professors of economics who have sat with us and have talked with us about these problems. I think we have made a very important contribution to policy.

The Chairman. You have educated the professors; is that what you said?

Mr. Yntema. I think that we have educated the businessman and professors, and we have educated the schools.

The Chairman. Why have you remained away from this committee?

Mr. Yntema. Our policy statements are materials that are used very widely in the schools and the colleges of the country, and I think we are entitled to the respect that we do have on the part of those who are interested in this and *are competent to judge*. (Page 14) (Underlining mine.)

Mr. Cooley asked each of the witnesses their connection with agriculture. Mr. Brenton, Des Moines banker, to Mr. Cooley's query on taking two million farmers out of agriculture:

It seemed like that is the number that is in excess.

When asked why it seemed like, Mr. Brenton answered:

Well, our studies and our advisers felt that about one-third of the farmers should be removed, and that about two-thirds that remain could produce the crops that we need. . . . This process (off farm migration) has been going on, but it does not go on rapidly enough, because they do not know where to go. . . . Those that live within driving range of Des Moines might seek jobs in industry there. There are little businesses starting up in towns all over the State. So the farmers as they leave, if that opportunity arises, they move and take jobs in those little businesses that are established.

To Mr. Cooley's statement that there were already 4,500,000 people walking the streets unemployed, Mr. Brenton's answer was:

"This process of migration is going on. And *it will eventually, if it continues, solve itself*, but it would take too long. The process can be stepped up." (Italics mine.)

"Too many farmers do not have enough work to do on the farm. I mean that there are too many people that are working only a portion of their time. They are unemployed . . . We do not propose to take him (the farmer) off the farm. We propose to make it possible for him to move if he wants to move." (Page 15.)

Dr. Schultz then entered the fray.

"Let me identify myself. You make quite a bit of whether one has or has not had experience in agriculture. Bear with me. I grew up in South Dakota on a farm . . . I was on a 540-acre farm. We then full-time employed five brothers and my dad. That farm today is operated by my youngest brother with the equivalent of one and one-half persons . . . and produces 50 percent more than we were able to produce when I was a kid . . . I never had a day of high school . . . had to pitch in on the farm . . . My wife and I bought a farm south of Ames when on the faculty, and we remained in that connection close to agriculture. Therefore, I plead with you, Mr. Chairman, that I think I know a great deal about agriculture, having spent my whole professional life concentrating on it and other problems . . . the CBD proposals aim to make it easier for these people (2,000,000 farmers) to get into the nonfarm labor force."

Mr. Brenton. We propose under certain conditions which would be carefully established to help them in moving, to loan them money for moving. (Page 17.)

The Chairman. You want to repeal all price supports, and give the farmer freedom. Would you go a step further and abolish the land-grant colleges, the extension services, and all of those agencies?

Mr. Brenton. Oh, no. Those are very important. We want them.

The Chairman. Why?

Mr. Brenton. They continue increasing the productivity of the farms. *That is what we wish to see*. (Italic mine.)

The Chairman. The farmers of America have mastered the techniques of production and they have been penalized.

Mr. Brenton. I do not understand your question, Mr. Chairman. . . . Farmers will increase their productivity greatly in the future . . . farmers, because they cannot obtain sufficiently large farms, are only working a portion of their time. They do not know where to get a job to work the rest of their time . . . *Farmers want to work more time.* (Page 19.)

Then followed what apparently must have been quite a spirited exchange between Mr. Cooley and Mr. Yntema. Mr. Cooley said Ford Motor Company could sell more cars if it produced more and reduced prices. He implied that Ford should then practice full production if that was what the CED recommended for agriculture. He suggested the car industry administered prices. Mr. Yntema admitted that the Ford Company controlled production and that "Some farmers do control their production. They go to work for the Ford Motor Co. That is one way of controlling their production."

A Committee member, Mr. Lester Johnson of Wisconsin then asked Mr. Yntema "The Ford Motor Co. does not cut the price and make the sacrifice; is that not right?"

Footnotes at end of article.

Mr. Yntema's answer was "I did not get that, I'm sorry—I did not get the first point." To Mr. Johnson's suggestion that local dealers took the cut from list price Mr. Yntema countered "The local dealers are doing pretty well." (Page 24.)

To Mr. Yntema's statement that Soil Banking was an integral part of the CED recommendations for the transition period, Mr. W. R. Poage, vice-chairman of the Committee remarked: "I am not trying to find fault with that, but I do find fault with any dogmatic statement that we should not believe in any subsidy—that we should not believe in any controls—because you do not have much Government without controls or without subsidies." (Page 26.)

The above statements are not out of context. One wishes they could have shown quick brilliance on the part of the CED spokesmen. Below are excerpts from some of the other "abusive" statements. First Mr. Homer Young, President of the Consumers Cooperative Assoc., Kansas City, Mo. (now Farmland Industries):

"Farmers had better get acquainted with this program. They are going to hear more about it. An organization whose membership is sprinkled with presidents and board chairmen of big national corporations carries weight. . . . I happen not to like the idea of businessmen trying to grab the spotlight in the search of solutions to farm problems. But businessemen have done it in this case, and, unless farmers can find some way to offset it, the voice of business is going to influence public opinion and congressional opinion. The result could be disastrous for farmers.

"The CED calls its plan "An Adaptive Program for Agriculture." The whole thing is presented in a handsome brochure—a copy of which probably went to the desk of every Member of Congress. However since writing this I find it didn't. . . . In runinng through the CED report, one observes the frequent reference to the 'excess of resources' in agriculture. I think I know why the word 'resources' is used. The writers just don't like to admit that in talking about agricultural 'resources' they are talking about people—real people. . . . I do not question the good intentions of any member of the CED. I do think, however, that many men in industry are inclined to look upon agriculture as a source of raw materials and to forget all other aspects of the agricultural way of life. The CED report is heavy on charts and graphs and light on its explanation of what these mean in terms of flesh-and-blood people.

"Of all the 200 men who make up the trustee list of CED, not a single one speaks from the standpoint of a working resident farmer. . . . from the standpoint even of a sociologist . . . In contrast to industry's bitterly defended right to keep prices above cost of production, the CED proposal is that farm prices be allowed to drop to the point of ruin. . . . This is a plan to take the planning out of agriculture, by means of national planning. *And farmers have had no part in the planning.* What inconsistency. . . . If the formula is good for agriculture, why is it not good for the steel industry. . . . Steel plants are operating at about 50 percent of capacity . . . these men talk about a 'free market' for agriculture. But many of them have succeeded in businesses that do not operate in a free market in the pure sense of that term." (Pp. 275–276.)

"There is a point at which reduction in the number of farms would bring powerful corporate ownership of farm production into the picture. There are already signs of that. . . . In the end, a concentration of ownership of farmlands in a few hands could create a whole new set of problems, greater in their scope than any we have now. . . . The farm surplus situation has been magnified beyond its proper proportions. . . . We have about an 8-percent excess capacity in agriculture. How many industries have less?

"Excess stockpiling of certain industrial products by our Government is a matter of public knowledge, but it has failed to become a matter of public concern in the way that any irregularity in agriculture does. Does the difference mean that we have come to believe that industry can do no wrong and agriculture must be watched at every turn?

"We need a better definition of just what surpluses are . . . Certainly the entire population should share some of the cost of maintaining a safe margin of food as well as military supplies. Food storage is not always surplus. . . . the fact that farmers themselves are not getting together on basic national policy opens the way of course, for nonfarm groups to start speaking up. . . . What farmers need in times such as these is a unified voice. They need a "CED" of their own, if for no other reason than to let the world know that those who speak for business and industry do not put the interests of the farmer ahead of their own."

On page 279, Mr. Albert Quie, Committee member from Minnesota inserted an interesting item. He discussed his trying to get a new Commission on Country Life established in the 86th Congress, but "it didn't get anyplace." He compared his effort to the Commission on Country Life under President Theodore Roosevelt in 1908. "They had the same difficulty then. They had to get the Chamber of Commerce of Seattle, Wash., to print the report. The Congress would not print it.

On pages 303–305 it was Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman's turn:

"The Committee on Economic Development's 5-year plan to end farm programs threatens to alter the basic character of American agriculture. . . . We have already illustrations of how vertical integration and contract farming take away from the farmer some or all of his managerial independence—even, in some instances, relegating him to little more than a piecework laborer's role. . . . The real threat to the independent family farm is not, in most cases, the giant factory-scale, corporation-owned farm employing labor in large crews. Rather, it is through the imposition of a pattern of controls by centralized private authority over the existing family-farming pattern. . . . It is a pattern, the outlines of which are already clear, by which the farmer might remain on the farm, but would take orders from large business enterprise. . . . Thus, "laissez faire" could result in agriculture as it has in other areas, in the development of a system of pricing as well as production that would be administered by a powerful few."

When Secretary Freeman finished his testimony, Mr. Cooley thanked him:

"I do want to thank you, Mr. Secretary, for your statement. I think that this is a devastating answer to the CED proposal. . . . The CED report has been given wide publication by the press, with very little attention given to opposition to it."

One of the most interesting presentations was made by F. H. Heidelberg, executive Vice President, N. C. Cotton Promotion Association, beginning on page 187:

"It should cause grave concern in this committee that the CED proposal in effect would move our Nation in the direction of monopolistic control of land and its resources . . . and, this is being done while high-level leaders of our Nation are urging neighboring nations to move in the opposite direction to avoid internal social upheaval.

"A review of the eminent ACADEMICIANS WHO MADE UP THE RESEARCH ADVISORY BOARD TO THE CED IN DRAFTING THE ADAPTIVE PROGRAM FOR AGRICULTURE LEAVES ONE WITH THE LONGING TO SOME DAY SEE A PROPOSAL FOR AGRICULTURE DRAFTED BY ACADEMICIANS EQUALLY AS EMINENT IN THE FIELD OF SOCIOLOGY AND POLITICAL SCIENCE, AND EACH WITH A GOOD GRASP OF HISTORY." (Caps. mine.)

Even more interesting was Mr. Heidelberg's insertion in the record the fact that "January 1, 1962, Governor Brown of California signed a contract for his State with the Federal Government for construction of $433 million San Luis water project, a 102-mile canal to be built by the Federal Bureau of Reclamation." He went on to state that California got quite a bargain in water resources at the taxpayer's expense, that the old Cotton Belt area stretching from south central Texas to North Carolina had no such comparable help in its movement toward efficient cotton production.

He also inserted a paper by G. S. Tolley, Dept. of Agriculture Economics of North Carolina State showing how land use adjustment, with spending of huge sums of tax money influences regional transfers of production. On pages 173–175 is a listing of cotton processing facilities subsidized in California, Arizona, New Mexico and West Texas in 1951 and 1952 . . . "The Korean war scare provided the arguments for the revival of fast tax amortization of industrial facilities, including those for cotton. This money was a sizable windfall of resources for cotton's agriculture in the general area which the CED singles out as having exceptional advantages for the production of cotton at their recommended adjustment price of 22 cents per pound. This is because to a large degree these tax-amortized facilities were built by producers of cotton. . . . One thing, is for sure, if the same competitive inequalities existed as a result of public policy in car making, papermaking, or any other industrial field represented on the CED, the protestations would be heard from Tucumcari to the Tombigbee. They would reverberate loudly in the halls of Congress too." . . .

James B. Dyess, Executive vice president of the National Association of Wheat Growers on page 215:

"Under this plan, much of the Plains area would revert from a productive agricultural area, using millions of dollars worth of farm machinery, chemicals, fertilizers, fuel, and so forth, every year, to a region of tremendous cattle ranches using relatively little of the production of our great industrial centers . . ."[8]

Finally, two additional comments: First the hearings contained a lot of testimony from State Vocational Education heads accusing the CED of distorting the funding of vocational training and also accusing them still funding vo-ag education—but in reality training people for industry.

It is also in order to comment that although every major farm organization, and most of the Commodity groups presented testimony before the committee, the American Farm Bureau Federation presented no testimony before Committee either favorable or unfavorable to the suggested program of the CED.

Enough of the actual testimony of the CED hearings, but I feel that knowing what happened is essential to the understanding of our agricultural revolution.

While Dr. Houthakker's study for the ABI was not as widely publicized as those of the CED and the National Commission on Food and Fiber, his main approach, that of surplus human resources, economic growth, technical efficiency, was practically identical to other high-prestige findings. Like the CED and the makeup of the NCFF, the personnel was the business interests of the nation as shown in the Institute's makeup of directors, advisers, and personnel.

The above studies and reports are admittedly done to influence agricultural policy. In a free society business interests and their associations certainly have an unchallenged right to do this. They do not, however, have an unchallenged right to influence education

---

Footnotes at end of article.

or legislation using narrow concepts without granting the right of countervailing groups in society to challenge. For Dr. Yntema to piously maintain that they in the CED's sole purpose was to search for truth was then relinquishing his claim to the role of a scientist. He could not claim the neutrality of science and simultaneously influence national policy.

President Rudolph A. Peterson of the Bank of America, the world's largest, urged a little more gently last December "for a program which will enable the small farmer (uneconomic) . . . to take his land out of production with dignity."[9]

George S. Moore, President of the First National City Bank of New York, wrote in the staunch defender of "free enterprise" *Human Events*, that he considered the CED Adaptive Program for Agriculture the only solution.[10]

Now we laymen are accused of being subjective, and most of the time, gentlemen, you are right, so by all means let us be rational and objective.

Economics is a discipline directed to the efficient production, exchange, and distribution of goods and services over the face of the Creator's earth. Wouldn't we further agree then that agricultural economics should then consist of more than applied research in production problems. Applied technological research is not science. It is technology. There is a big difference here. *Science is a search for truth*. The physical scientists, the physicists, the chemists, the astronomers try to unlock the secrets of nature. They can rightfully claim they are not responsible for their findings, (the classic example: Einstein—$E=MC^2$—the atom bomb) Now social scientists use the same mathematical methods for finding truth and apply them to people. Natural scientists recognize the processes of nature and adjust to them: *Birth—growth—fruit—death. Economists who are up tight on an abstract of continuous economic development, have not realized these scientific facts of life yet.*

The *Name of the Game* today is economic development. "Uneconomic" is a dirty word. Things can be pornographic, vulgar, deadly to life and limb, but never can they be uneconomic. To be uneconomic is to lose the right to existence. (Please see Note II in appendix at end of paper.)

Applied production efficiency research based on growth is primarily a human decision, not a third tablet from Mount Sinai. Today, the USDA calls it MISSIONS. Billions, perhaps 10–15 billions or more of public monies, much in close cooperation with the businesses who will sell the technology, has been spent on research in the past 25 years. Who made these decisions? Farmers? An invisible hand?

POLITICAL POWER IN THE AGRICULTURAL REVOLUTION

How is research determined?

Our educators tell us this research is requested by *us*—the farmers. Let's examine at least part of *our* procedure. On October 21, 1966, "a commitee composed of leaders in private life and officials of Land-Grand Colleges and the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been formed to study the role and responsibilities of the Cooperative Extension Service." Continuing:

"Purpose of the joint advisory committee is to evaluate Extension's past contributions and to project the future scope of the Cooperative Extension Service in order that it can make a maximum effort to meet the needs of the public."[11]

Fifteen members of this Commission were either USDA professionals, presidents of Universities, or directors of state extension services. The members were designated by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. They, and Secretary Freeman designated the following committee members to represent the general public: a bishop of the Methodist Church, from the Iowa areas, a homemaker and former Dean of Home Economics, and an assistant professor from New York University Center for Human Relations Studies. The USDA members were appointed by Secretary Freeman. Also included was George Mehren USDA research head.

In an address to Experiment Station Directors at the Annual Meeting of NASULGC, George Mehren, assistant secretary of agriculture clarified the new role of research further. Yes, Dr. Hardin, this paper runs on and on and on: but we must study these developments if we are to understand this revolution. (All italics or caps in following quotation mine:)

"*Science* has been *turned to technology*—and technology to wealth and power. American *universities* seem to be the *primary channels* for the remarkable translation of the findings of the research-teaching processes to developed *industrial technology that soon is used* . . . a series of distressing issues of agricultural research and education seem to be afflicting the Colleges of Agriculture today; their relationship to the vastly-different non-agricultural departments on their own campuses; their different status as the farm, forest and food economy continues drastically to shift . . . segregation from the intellectual and scientific life of the nation and the world.

"It seems unlikely that the colleges of agriculture, the experiment stations or the fabric of agricultural research-teaching-extension activities in the nation are in clear or present danger of withering away. Yet it seems likely that to avoid withering away, change will be required—and perhaps change that in some respects seem drastic and even hostile to some of the preconceptions and values that have prevailed for a full century . . . *if we are to prosper,* to give that which we can and must give, and perhaps even if we are to survive, there are still other things we must learn to do . . . We are looking forward to *other media of support* for kinds of inquiries that cannot best be done by the institutional procedures that have served us so well in the past . . .

"Now we—the states and the USDA—*do know what we are doing*. We can determine quantitatively and with substantial precision the activities associated with each element of each *mission* . . . We have finished broadly specified projections for each of *91* major *areas of inquiry* both for 1972 and 1977. These projections have been based upon quantitatively specified criteria of priorities formulated *objectively* by many people *from* many *agencies, disciplines* and *operational interests* . . .

"There is promise that we can develop standard packages, media and digital language such that identity or compatibility of sub-systems may be gotten with no severe constraints. This is no mere instrument of management. It can in fact open to scientific method a great variety of questions which until now could not even be identified or answered. . . .

"We are now working together to design some seventeen systems of research in packages that outline *missions; representation of goals;* unanswered but necessary questions related to goals; and allocation of such questions among agencies upon agreed criteria. Some *missions* like *genetics, virology, weather modification, remote sensing*—are promising of imminent breakthroughs. Others, like *nutrition,* must be expanded because so much remains to be done. Still others for example *soybean yields* or *swine* and *dairy industry analyses*—should be formulated because urgent *practical questions should be* answered. . . . It is clear now that structure for administration cannot parallel organization for *missions*. It is also clear that really to develop meaningful relation of *mission operations* to *mission research,* new forms of interagency, interdiscipline, and interstate collaboration must be found."

May I ask between these two paragraphs—Is the following just growth or Parkinson's Law?—let alone broaching the delicate questions the self-interest in survival of those involved in research, or for whom the research is being done?—the development of *nutrition*—the spinning of new protein sources we presume? Mr. Mehren's paper continues:

"There is clear need that programs for buildings, facilities, equipment and other support activities also be determined simultaneously with those for research activities and within the same process. Such programs sharply constrain that which can or should be done in research operations. Accordingly, operating and construction programs must be fully consistent.

"Yet now we can both identify and evaluate all of our activities. We can tie our research allocations directly into program evaluations and planning operations, and *for the first time as an integral part*. We should soon be able to include construction as part of this fabric . . . Coordinated activity is not merely an instrument to enhance efficiency or research performance. Far more important, it *specifies sciences as systems of inquiry* and not as separate and self-contained bodies of specialized knowledge. . . .

"Personally I see *little work* that is *totally devoid of pragmatic* purpose. Perhaps basic work really is that which involves broad latitude in following curiosity—and if that be true, then the *difference between basic and mission work is so diffused that differential status or treatment really may not be meaningful*.

"We need no czar, no high-level brokers of the board, no binding or authoritarian command structure at any level in order to do that which we need to do. Any of these would almost surely emasculate, perhaps even destroy us. . . . *We* all *want* to *optimize mission achievement; to keep our field* and our nation in the *fore of science*.

"I do see evidence that, *given adequate* and competent *staff,* we can get the coordination and the efficiency that quite properly will be required of us. . . . Personally, I see *little necessity to consider structural changes in our still-evolving relationships* and process *of financial support*. . . . In all directions and dimensions of institutional, in house contract and grant activities seem to provide ample latitude for effective service of our goals . . . As a matter of fact *USDA State* agricultural *experiment* stations relationship was *rated highest by granters*."

Among Mr. Mehren's recommendations for joint action in long-range study were to increase concentration and specialization at certain locations is really a primary purpose in our packing planning. It is a difficult matter and we have not really revolved it . . . to *tie more firmly* the *extension function to research and education* . . . that *regional* or *national laboratories* should be planned jointly. . . .[12]

I remember reading not long ago an address by Dr. Mehren to students at a New England college telling students of opportunities in the USDA. He projected the needs for all sorts of technicians in applied research. However he skirted the need for any kind of scientists or humanists that would be concerned with the question "is this good for people"? He said only that *that kind of need was in a state of "flux."*

Let us continue discovering how research evolves. Washington, Dec. 8, 1966.

"The Marketing Research Advisory Committee recommended at its recent meeting that the U.S. Department of Agriculture emphasize research on the problems resulting from the substantial changes which are occurring in freight rates on agricultural products. . . . The Committee met in Washington, D.C., Nov. 30-Dec. 2. . . . Another recommendation of the Committee was to continue

---

Footnotes at end of article.

and expand basic research, which will result in findings have numerous applications in the development of industrial products from agricultural commodities . . . recommended that research to develop methods of biological control of stored-product insects be emphasized even more than at present. . . . to give high priority to research on the effect of mergers of local, regional, or national cooperatives. . . . *studies are needed* on the potential benefits *of other types of group by farmers. Some work* on this has already *been done* concerning *marketing orders,* and *results* of this *should be published,* and *further study initiated* . . . assuring food safety, including sanitation on plant equipment and handling . . . immediate attention be given determining the degree and cause of damage from mechanical harvesting . . . establishment of a pilot market laboratory in Europe to determine the quality of U.S. products being received in European countries. . . .

"The Committee, established under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, is composed of national leaders in the field of marketing research." [13]

The national leaders on the Committee were as follows: Agway, Harry & David's Bear Creek Orchards, Minneapolis Cold Storage, the director of the public administration clearing service, U. of Florida, Packaging Foundation, Inc., Marketing Publications, Inc., Davidson, Talbird and McLynn, Cooperative Marketing Association of Kansas City, North Dakota Public Service Commission, Lewis Grocer Co. of Indianola, Miss. (my note-owned by Super-Valu), Libby, McNeill and Libby, Lady Classen Cafeteria of Oklahoma City, Hannaford Brothers Co.

This lengthy exposition of research evolvement is also necessary for an understanding of the structural revolution, and I might add this paper is increasingly agonizing difficult to write.

To most laymen, the above could sound bewildering. It shouldn't. We can however, begin to make certain conclusions:

1. The complete absence of any farmers on any sort of policy-making in agricultural policy making means that we have abdicated our responsibility in not being on committees. Perhaps many farmers (family farmers, that is) have been asked to participate, but that all have refused. *OR* we have not been asked. Perhaps, Dr. Hardin, you were in school or the armed services when this sort of thing began to evolve. Your letter has gone through the yearly reports of the CBA since 1946. The whole vast scope of the Full Employment Act with its accompanying "congressional intent" determined that *all sectors* of the Economy were to be present, and *represented.* While I have not yet had time to study those years thoroughly, the 1964 report while I do not have at hand the actual page numbers and people concerned, showed that while industry and labor were well represented with their staffs of economists, the sole representative for agriculture, if I remember correctly was Mr. W. Murphy of the Campbell Soup Company.

2. One presumes that all research must come under the scrutinzing eye of a legislative body for justification, but apparently that is a quiet process.

3. That educators study themselves, recommend their own programs, and with the preponderance of career men, not politically responsibile in most part, could easily form a select *elite,* not really responsible to the public any more than the corporate elite, yet using in large part tax monies for their support. This is of course conjecture. We hope so.

But we do feel we have the right to know. Admittedly, in this highly complex society, one cannot run around asking everyone what they think should be done. But then I do remember that a marketing specialist in public debate, told me that farmers should do just that in trying to get a milk price increase. This particular well-meaning young PhD thought it would be helpful if all dairy farmers canvassed all their customers, the housewives to bring about a price increase for all our milk production. Yes, gentlemen, this did happen, I kid you not.

It is reasonable then, to assume that no invisible hand, very few if any farmers directed the brilliant minds of researchers to a concentration of their energies on applied research. Politically powerful commodity groups, professional elites, one farm organization, and regional congressional delegations: these were the movers in the agricultural revolution. It was raw economic and political power.

The "Farmers' Priest", our beloved Monsignor Louis Miller told much of the story:

"There was a time when USDA research was concerned with agriculture that had a three-fold dimension: land, people and society.

"A little over twenty years ago the Bureau of Agricultural Economics made what is now a benchmark study which I call the 'Tale of Two Cities.' The two cities were Arvin and Dinuba in the great irrigated valley of San Joaquin, California. It was one of the few comparative studies of two different kinds of agriculture and their respective impact upon people, community and land. Arvin was the center of corporation farming; Dinuba was a city in the midst of modest-sized family enterprises. The results were newsworthy: The comparisons dramatic . . . In short, it was one of the few studies that brought to the attention of the American Public the value of family farming as an adequate business unit, as well as a socially valuable contribution to *sound social order.* Then things began to happen. Shortly after the publications of this significant study as to the relative merits of family farming as against an absentee owned and operated corporate structure, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics was severely cut in its budget and personnel and their future research in this field was virtually destroyed." [14]

To keep this revolution of agriculture in perspective, the above study was the work of Walter Goldschmidtt and his wife. He began his research project in 1942, 27 years ago. The revolution then as now was veiled by war. While some will call the following material "bone-rattling", the recorded activities of the Congressional hearings, the actions of then Congressman Everett Dirksen cannot be dismissed. Knowledgeable and concerned men documented this travesty.

The Farm Security Administration, a federal agency formed to deal with the almost impossible crisis in agriculture in the 1930's, made a dreadful political mistake. They tried to help black and white yeoman farmers in the South.

"Thirty-eight percent of all borrowers were located in 12 Southern states . . . The point of importance", wrote Grant McConnell, "is not so much that the FSA was energetic and alert in attacking these problems (health, education, housing, farm practices peculiar to southern problems), but that in so doing, it directly antagonized powerful organized interests:"

"The large private grain dealers of Minneapolis centering around loans to the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association.[15]

"The story of the attack (on the FSA) is one of the bleakest in the history of agricultural politics . . . the struggle seems to have been conducted behind a veil of obscurity woven out of superficial complexities and war distractions. The American Farm Bureau Federation was the agency which destroyed the FSA and bureau leadership directed the attack . . . A rider was successfully attached to the appropriation bill to keep FSA personnel out of the Civil Service.

"Slowly, however, an organization was improvised to defend the work of the FSA . . . One of these assorted groups can be said to have been truly effective. The Catholic Rural Life Conference, represented by a remarkable priest, Msgr. John O'Grady. Monsignor O'Grady made by far the most forceful and persuasive appeal in the entire round of hearings asking not only the continuation but also the extension of the FSA. His efforts were nevertheless insufficient to still the charge that the FSA was Communistic." [16]

Ah ha! The magic word—communism! If the public is ill-informed, ignorant of real issues involved, and fearful of a change in the "status quo", and a power structure wants to keep it that way, just interject that little whisper, "Communism!" A tremendous doctorate could be written and defended on the history of this tool of destruction. If the USDA wanted to begin comprehensive land-use planning, per the Mount Weather agreement with farmers involved in doing the planning, just whisper that it was communistic. You see, educators, nothing is new under the sun, not even land-use planning. But I hear no cries of communism today over land-use planning, or regional planning from the leadership of "the largest farm organization" now that it is being done in the name of *economic growth,* by a professional elite. And we certainly have the USDA involved in planning the countryside right down to the county agent. Rural planning could have held tremendous potential for Rural America if we had been asked to share in the planning. The integration of centralized planning by such organizations as the CED (big industry), big foundations, the Federal Reserve System (big banking), big education (the Universities) under the sacred name of *economic growth,* and the sacrosanct title of *education,* is incredible. To put it modestly, Dr. Hardin, the bibliography of this 27 year evolution is formidable.

Let us continue on the history of the destruction of three-dimensional research in the USDA. And again, quoting Monsignor Miller: [14]

"I believe one important decision that has had a terrific impact on present-day policy was the complete reorganization of research in the USDA back in 1953. This reorganization took place with the arrival of a new administration. The old 'BAE' was completely fragmented. How did this *political move* have such tremendous repercussions on future developments? To find out, let's take a brief look back to that year.

"In protesting the reorganization of agricultural research, USDA economists wrote: 'They consider that in this reorganization, the *objectivity* of economic and statistical research may suffer from being too closely associated with *action* programs, that new arrangements could lead to over-emphasis on short run or service research at the expense of basic or longer-run research.'

"'It became very evident to them that Secretary Coke and those who worked on the proposed reorganization were strongly sold on it, and would accept no sweeping departures from it no matter how strong the objections raised. It was also apparent that the top men in the BAE had already accepted it, "sold out to it," no doubt some will say.'

"The short quotes are just some of the protest by top economists to Ezra Benson and Earl J. Coke. At the time, only scattered attention to the battle was given in the press. In the main the press mentioned Paul Sears, father of Soil Conservation in his bitter condemnation of the splintering and weakening of Soil Conservation programs, by the action of USDA. . . .

"We had mentioned a Mr. Coke as the assistant in the department who had drawn up this reorganization of research. Who was Mr. Coke? He only remained at the USDA a few months. He had been a corporate director of the Spreckels Sugar Corporation. After his short sojourn in the Department of Agriculture as under-secretary to Benson, he

---

Footnotes at end of article.

XUM

became California's Director of Extension, then on to the Vice-Presidency of the Bank of America. I might add here, that he is now Governor Reagan's choice to head the California Board of Agriculture.

"This same Mr. Coke in 1963 forecast a 'dynamic new agriculture . . . where successful management will find shares of stock in such an agribusiness enterprise, combining land, production, processing and marketing of food and fiber, a most attractive investment . . . a powerful attractant for risk capital and this is the first time in history that the application has been possible.'

"Another buried fact was that one of Mr. Coke's contemporaries in the USDA was a man called John W. Davis, the head of the Commodity Credit Corporation." [17]

You educators must remember Mr. Davis. He coined the word "agribusiness." In 1957 speaking to the annual meeting of the American Farm Economic Association, he minced no words; his remarks were never common knowledge, but Mr. Davis was obviously in a position of power to speak as he did:

"Developing a Vertically Integrated Agribusiness Policy . . . Obviously, a vertically integrated agribusiness policy cannot be attained overnight, but must evolve step by step as intelligent research, collaboration and negotiation takes place. Such a procedure will be an evolutionary process—starting with the present $8 billion of surplus products in government hands, and building toward our goal. By and large, the blocks with which we build will be a series of commodity policies . . . Actually this basic procedure is nothing new in America. Essentially it is the same technique by which *progress* has been made in the past. (Emphasis mine.) The main new element that I am injecting is that we adapt and apply the process to the development of a more integrated (vertically) policy with agribusiness orientation—a policy that will lead us in the direction of our national objective." [18]

Mr. Davis in his paper kept stressing the democratic method of formulating national policy. His paper was challenged by a fellow economist who made the comment inferring that either Mr. Davis didn't understand what vertical integration really was or was quite naive in assuming one could have a market system and integration too.

But I find Mr. Davis intriguing in other ways. Obvious Mr. Davis could not have been stupid and yet be Director of the Program in Agriculture and Business, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University. That title is quite impressive. But it is my judgment that Mr. Davis' claim to authority in national policy-making based on *growth* alone for *progress* was not valid. Mr. Davis also seems to be a case in point of the sometimes sad contrasts between theory and practice one comes upon. Sorry, I cannot quote from his book, *Farmer in a Business Suit,* done in collaboration with a Kenneth Hinshaw. No reproduction in whole, in part, in any form, says the Foundation for American Agriculture who sponsored the paperback volume. Suffice to say, it is a "pitch" appealing almost to a kindergarten intelligence level, to sell the average farmer on just exactly what happened to him, the "big farmer bit." I would highly recommend it for your education, gentlemen, of what can happen to a perfectly good economist who practices the barrel-visioned theory of economic growth only.

Back to the rational ranch.

You, our educators, say you are scientists, not involved with ethical decisions. May I gently suggest that when you completely allowed yourselves to be oriented into being problem-solvers, in finding solutions to problems, in allowing your "Eyes of the Farmer" to become a vehicle for training in specialization, and increased productivity only, you did make a value judgment—to concentrate on things instead of people.

You've done a tremendous job in helping farmers to increase their productivity. Perhaps it should be enough reward for us to feel a warm glow knowing that each of us now feeds fifty people.

Other speakers at the regional forum have dwelt on price problems. They are correct. One cannot forever keep on feeding those 50 people, for we cannot continue to operate on money borrowed against inflated land values or depreciation, nor on distorted statistics adding over $3 billions or 20% of our reported net earned income in non-spendable items such as farm dwellings' rental values, home-produced food, which have already been mentioned here. It's just not in the cards. Economists cannot solve the price problem particularly when their energies are directed in so much part to increasing farm production or handling of farm production, and the technology involved in that production. So in the present situation I will not berate you gentlemen for not guaranteeing us a price. I don't think that is your job. It's ours.

However, you do have a responsibility which to all practical purposes, you have sorely neglected. While you have made a fetish of mechanics, *you have left us farmers economically illiterate.* It might not be foolish to recommend that required reading for farmers would be to read daily the *Wall Street Journel,* among other things, to find out what really is happening in this agricultural revolution. And economists might learn "how it really is" if they were required to refer to such publications as *Moody's Industrials, Value-Line* in ever-required staff meetings, balancing this kind of fact as an important *variable* in their *model-building.*

You sincerely believe you have insured that America can take forever her bountiful and cheap food supply for granted, like breathing. One just doesn't have to think about it. None of us at this regional meeting think about it either unless we would start choking. This kind of thinking could well prove a dangerous fallacy. *Men trained in one abstract only could stagger a nation with their decisions.*

"THE WAY IT'S GONNA BE"

"That's the way it's gonna be" sing the Chad Mitchell Trio and the rush is on. No revolution, gentlemen?

I don't think Vernon Ruttan of the University of Minnesota is an idiot when he said, "A food and fiber industry in which 80–90 percent of farm output could be produced by 50,000 to 100,000 production units is not only technically feasible but is in the process of evolving." [19]

Harold Breimyer of the University of Missouri (and one of the few shining lights in this barren desert of mechanistic economic thinking), said back in 1964 that "Agriculture stands at the crossroads." [20] My accolades and respect for Dr. Breimyer are based on the fact that he fulfills his responsibilities as an education to people, not just towers:

The good Dr. Breimyer warned the Missouri Farm Bureau Federation two years ago that question is not whether commercial farms as independent proprietorships get bigger, but whether they continue to exist at all. . . . There is no absolute independence in a commercial agriculture. That is confined to a subsistence farming. And as to the role of government, A MARKET SYSTEM IS ENTIRELY THE CREATURE OF LAW AND GOVERNMENT. (Emphasis, mine.) To continue to sound off about avoiding a role for government is the sure path to oblivion. . . . The plain blunt truth is that to bring more system and order to marketing will require farmers to relinquish a little of their total independence in return for the advantages of joint or cooperative action."[21]

The good Dr. Breimyer further warned livestock producers in a seminar at the American Farm Bureau's National convention, 1967, "Despite flurries of rhetoric at annual meetings, livestock groups seem to prefer to bask in reflected glory and give the old issues one more lick than to come to grips with the issues of today and tomorrow. They cannot afford the luxury much longer. Tomorrow no longer lies far ahead. Whether livestock farmers are ready for it or not, it is imminent. And more than that, the choice today, unlike 10 or 30 years ago, is not a costless one between adopting changes the times call for, and staying with the status quo." [22]

No revolution, gentlemen? What did the former dean of agriculture at Purdue, Dean Earl Butz have to say? "Those of us in agriculture and agribusiness must increasingly help develop the rules for the new game we are playing." Dr. Butz in discussing marketing at the same meeting, said businesses moving into the direction of integration dare not expose themselves to the vagaries of an open market.[23]

Now while I could challenge Dr. Butz' objectivity in his agricultural thinking and suggest legitimately, that he had a conflict of interest in his position as dean of agriculture, one surely would not question his knowledgability or competency in knowing "How it's gonna be!" (Dr. Butz while dean of agriculture was also on the board of directors of J. I. Case Tractor Co., Ralston-Purina and International Minerals & Chemicals.) [23]

Your own Don Paarlberg in a very fine paper said:

"The revolution in agriculture has outgrown its technical phase and is threatening cherished institutions. It is out of this setting that new issues are emerging. In a country with a representative government, the people are in position to demand the institutional arrangements that seem to them good, in agriculture or elsewhere. Among these institutions are the family farm and the entrepreneurial status of the farm operator. According to the reasoning of many people, if the continuation of certain cherished institutional arrangements in agriculture should come at some cost in efficiency, this might nevertheless be a good bargain. We now provide ourselves with an excellent supply of food at a cost of less than 20 percent of our income and this figure is certain to drop still further. . . . Should we sacrifice honored institutions just to achieve some incremental efficiency in an already superbly efficient agriculture? It is a fair question, a question that will be asked often in the years ahead, and a question that calls for something more than a categorical 'No!' " [24]

Presently the USDA assures the nation that corporate farming is not important in this nation, and they show research findings to prove it. However they concentrate on number of firms, not market share. With all due respect to Dr. Radoje Nikolitch, we see a different picture. Using Kikolitch's study, "Our 100,000 Biggest Farms", we present the following table:

Year	Number of farms grossing $100,000 or more	Percent of total farms	Average sales per farm	Percent share of total farm marketings
1939	5,000	0.1	$225,600	7.3
1949	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
1959	20,000	.8	249,150	16.9
1964 [2]	31,401	1.4	(1)	[3] 25

[1] Not available.

[2] Figures for 1964 obtained from Nation's Agriculture, publ. of American Farm Bureau Federation, February 1969. p. 28.

[3] Approximate.

In the same study Dr. Nikolitch noted that "family businesses accounted for eight percent of the marketing of farms with sales of $100,000 or more.[25]

Footnotes at end of article.

We have offered this table as more factual data on this structural revolution. Surely 31,401 firms garnering approximately 25 percent of total farm marketings shows a tremendous growth. These facts *have never been* in a USDA news release that we know of. Remember these figures are already five years old. The time lag in research while the economic growth of these large firms pyramid is crucial in agriculture's managerial revolution.

Part and parcel of this managerial revolution is the behavior of the integrators in the past 15 years. No deep dark plot is implicated in any manner whatever, but an understanding of the methods the corporate firm uses in its economic growth is germane to this paper. I have not "picked on" any particular firm to abuse them, for these characteristics are common to all integrators. I am only reporting the actual quotations of those responsible in management. For that matter far more useful would be a study of the behavior of the Conglomerate.

Mr. Wayne Nussbaum, then treasurer of Ralston-Purina said in 1961:

"I don't intend to debate the subject of whether or not integration is good for the industry but simply accept it as an established fact . . . we prefer to stick to our specialty of manufacturing feed and let the retail experts do the retailing." [26]

Mr. Donald Danforth, then chairman of the board of this firm wrote in 1961:

"Our company will tend to become more diversified in the food field which is our business. . . . We will control all stages of certain quality poultry operations, from ownership of breeders and the hatchery, and management of production facilities right through to the final processing and marketing of the eggs and poultry meat." [27]

In 1966, Hal Dean, president of this company told his audience of his firm's worldwide role in feeding the hungry. Fascinating was Mr. Dean's use of the words "free" or "private" enterprise. He used these two words no less than 25 times in a talk of less than 25 minutes. He then consistently used the word "cash market," not competitive market, in describing these countries' farmers' selling activities. It is important to understand his usage of these words. A "cash market" is not necessarily a competitive market.[28] And surely a captive broiler producer does not sell in a market. However, to call a large firm a "private" or a "free" enterprise structure, it must co-exist within a competitive market or "free" market system, *as economists apply the word to farmers' markets. If the competition exists only on one side of the fence, then the modal market so dear to the hearts of the economists and to many farmers is not legitimate* and should be tucked away as lovely symbols of a nostalgic past. I, personally, would relegate it with the hopes I entertained of going to box lunch socials and quilting bees when I moved to the farm from a large city 20 plus years ago.

French farmers did not consider Ralston Purina's opening a chicken processing plant in Brittany in their best interests. Their picketing forced the French government to "decide that Ralston's investments were unrealistic because of a chicken surplus in France." [29]

To gain capital for paying off short-term notes, this same firm issued $40 million in 4⅞ percent debentures due in 1992.[30] Our comment here is: does the family farm entrepreneur refinance his debt in this fashion? If he doesn't, WHY DOES THE FARMER IDENTIFY HIMSELF THEN WITH BIG BUSINESS?

Homer Young warned farmers of this above firm's plans to integrate their feed dealers in cattle-feeding contracts.[31]

New developments in this huge firm's activities have been in the under-developed nations. We offer just one example, South Korea:

"Coöperating with the Agency for International Development, Ralston Purina is putting up $102,000, and arranging a total investment of about $1,000,000 in Korea poultry production. AID is insuring half of Ralston's investment and 75 percent of the bank financing against both commercial and political risks . . . Ralston will own 51 percent of the company with the remaining 49 percent being held by *four* prominent Korean *citizens*, including *some* of the nation's *best farmers*.[32] (italics mine.)

One notes the 75 percent commercial risk insurance by our government. One might even conjecture if AID funds in these possibly corrupt governments (or why political insurance) could possibly involve concessional 480 fund use of our "surplus" grains. We note at least six months ago, export subsidies were in effect for the export of broilers to meet European barriers. Also many millions of dollars particularly in "section 32" funds have been spent in the purchase of poultry. These expenditures cannot be excused to help the "family farm" broiler producers. In most cases, he is a laborer not an entrepreneur with control of management, labor, and investment. Such giants as Ling Temco Vought, Cargill, Swift, Arbor Acres, Textron—Are these infant (giants) firms to be protected? Yet broiler growers are still listed as family farmers.

Whatever kind of definition we wish to give this activity of the giants, and let us repeat, it is commonplace activity, let us not call it "family" farming, "free" enterprise or "private" enterprise. Many renowned economists hold the increasingly accepted view that to develop a nation's economy, capital accumulation in large part must be generated in the farming segment. How much opportunity is this type of investment going to contribute to a country's attempts to accumulate capital for their own "growth take-off"?

Again, Dr. Stout describes this revolution in a wry manner:

"For much of the post-war period, most of us believed that nothing very spectacular was occurring in agriculture, or at least that whatever startling rates of change we did encounter either would not amount to much or could not be maintained. We were too close to the information. Even information has diminishing marginal utility, and when you sit at the communications crossroads, the next little tidbit doesn't excite you too much and gets easily discounted. But the tidbits have been piling up, and while the standard classroom word to cadaver-eyed scholars has been "little opportunity in agriculture," something akin to tablets from Sinai have been accumulating at the crossroads.[33]

* * * * *

So there it is, gentlemen, a minute documentation of a structural revolution. Much of it is conversations of educators with each other. We have deliberately over-killed in our name-dropping and we both know there are dozens of other examples. *We are weary* of the theme-song "technological revolution." Only in small part is this true. Farmers themselves have both invented and adapted the great technologies *long before research teams came on the scene*. We have heard of the discoveries of lone solitary men, the primary discoveries, the mold-board plow, the internal-combustion engine, the reaper.

Hundreds of thousands of us *now know* that the greater part of this revolution has been deliberately directed and politically motivated by powerful groups. Yes, our great-grandparents tried: remember the Granger movement; Our grandparents, our parents, and we in large part have neglected our own house. We are too busy producing, remember? (in spite of Mr. Brenton's concern that we do not have enough to do and want to work more). But your department has a responsibility here too and you have miserably failed just as we have.

THE UNASKED QUESTIONS

As an urban-reared and urban-oriented individual, it would be so easy to just "forget it" and stop trying to be some sort of a John the Baptist figure. You know he did get his head chopped off for his pains. Besides, needlepoint and gardening are much more fun.

But little signals keep flashing in the back of my head, gentlemen, and they won't go away.

Hypothesis I: Will the new agriculture continue to produce an abundant and reasonably-priced food supply, including food imitations, as the nation has had in the past? Is a government agency set up to insure that conglomerates will produce more and more food regardless of price cycles, recessions and—heaven forbid—a complete economic collapse? How powerful would this agency have to be? What kind of anti-trust policymaking would be necessary? Remember America will not have a large number of families on the land such as those rebellious Grangers which came out of southeast Minnesota, and it is relevant, I believe, that the main anti-trust legislation on the books today came from the heartland of family farming.

Will a Ralph Nader be able to pull it off?

Back in 1945, Ted Schultz wrote, "It is obvious that the steady performance in agriculture is a major national asset, while the erratic rate of production in industry is a serious liability." [34]

What did Dr. Schultz mean? If I do not misconstrue his meaning, perhaps Gardiner Means in his book *Corporate Revolution* can help us. If I remember correctly, he used figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the year was 1933–34. The prices are wholesale, for both farm machinery manufacturers and farmers sell wholesale. And remember, these were drought years.

Big Four Farm Machinery Manufacturers cut production 80%, cut prices 6%.

Farm Food & Fiber Producers cut production 6%, cut prices 56%.

We think these implications are staggering. What if a matured food industry had been able to keep its profits from nose-diving by cutting its food production 80 percent? Some historians have said the country could have been in revolution.

Was it of importance that the farms then were a sort of safety valve? What amounts of people were fed on farms out here instead of participating in a soup line, or joining the ranks of the apple sellers, and the relief lines, that I saw in the city? What sort of stability did that terribly inefficient kind of farming using "too many human resources" give to the nation with inefficient production of oats and hay for horses instead of cash gas bills; inefficient use of manures instead of efficient cash fertilizers, inefficient use of home-raised fuels and food instead of efficient modern processed foods. These human instead of capital inputs were *the* important margin in the family's very real and desperate battle for their land. How maudlin can I get? Dr. Hardin, *soup lines were not efficient*. Ghettoes to which farm migrants have gone are not efficient either, sir. There are many kinds of price tags to the nation in the technologies the farmers have adopted, among them instability.

Any national agricultural policy maker must accept the fact that if agriculture is allowed to become completely industrialized, it will then take on all the other more undesirable, unstable characteristics of industrial production. And any who argue otherwise have more blind faith in the unknown than my youngest daughter in her "tooth fairy."

Can then, a *hypothesis* be *proved* that *another agriculture will not produce food and fiber in the manner to which this nation has been accustomed?* Is Chet Huntley right when he said "a decision is being made, but with no profound thought given to it that

---

Footnotes at end of article.

XUM

two million farmers must get off their land. . . . there is a vast social question here, too: what social advantage is there for the nation in having two million or more families living in the stable and peaceful environment of the country. . . . can our already overtaxed cities and towns endure an influx of another two million families? . . . . how wise are we in liquidating two million farmers . . .?"[35]

Where's the research? Doesn't America have the right to know?

Hypothesis II: The new agriculture will not regard stewardship of the land in the same light as the family on the land, and there are important costs that the nation will pay in transfer of the control of the resources of the land. Oh yes, we know about the new Agro complexes being developed at Oak Ridge, and we've read of the marvels of the new sky-scraper *non-land based* urban food factories. We even hear of Rockefeller's Standard Oil's brave promises in mile-long factories to produce protein from oil, and there's always sea-kelp. The inventiveness of men knows no limits. *An important point is missed*. The promises are: incredible supplies of never-ending food. But what is the record when land resources are in the hands of the few?

To me, the earth is the Lord's is no obsolete conundrum. Shades of fundamentalism! Would be many experts' cryptic comments, here. And I would agree, when you have no historians among your experts. On a macro-scale, any civilization that regarded its soil merely as an input for *economical growth* was doomed. The Fertile Crescent; Greece's Age of Pericles after Solon's policy of specialization of fruit and wines for export was very short-lived, and Greece is a beautiful pile of rock. My husband who has stood on the ruins of Carthage, made me go to several history books to prove to him that once she was the grain bin of the Roman Empire. That doesn't prove anything? *Let's go micro*.

Certainly the land wasn't used too gently by the ever-moving westward migrant. But who ravished the land in royal and giant scale?—the forests of Minnesota and Wisconsin; the British-controlled western cattle kings; the strip-miners of the Appalachias; the factored cotton plantations of the South—our tragic South; the Henry Millers of the Sacramento River Valley. *The tools have not been the same but the name of the game has been the same, economic growth*. Specialization, vast absentee-owned or controlled tracts of land, over-development by irrigation, What terrifies me is that these considerations don't go in the policy-making computer along with your multiple or simple regression charts.

"We hear a lot today about 'underdeveloped' and 'developing nations, but these actually tend to be overdeveloped nations," wrote LaMont C. Cole, world-renowned professor of ecology at Cornell University.[36] In particular Mr. Cole called attention to the saline soils of Iraq, and pictured the remains of irrigation ditch complexes with their shoulders several feet above the surrounding countryside.

Changes in Nature are subtle, slow-moving. Lakes do not die overnight. Deserts grow slowly. Even earthquakes tearing the earth apart in an instant build up pressure slowly. So it is with man. The atom and all its implications of destruction were not developed overnight. Most all USDA research and cooperative research stress "toleration", "safety". In the long range how safe—how tolerable—*Do we have the research to prove it?* And farmers are the people who are using these unproved technological tools, again in that "philosophy" of technical efficiency.

Question: Will land treated only as an input, as exploitable source of wealth, then become an exhaustible resource such as oil or minerals?

Question: Are continued, ever-increasing applications of chemicals and fertilizers in combination with each other inducing subtle, slow changes in the living organism of the earth, perhaps inducing a build-up of explosive proportions. If Rachel Carson is not a dirty word to natural scientists, why has she so consistently been written off in ag research work?

Question: Is it profitable in terms of our responsibility to future generations to exploit our exhaustible water resources in production of crops such as cotton, when this water might be desperately needed in the future?

Question: If families in the future are to be denied free access to ownership of the productive resources of the land, could our descendants, our children, find out the meaning of the Marxist siren song of the agrarian reformer "We will give you back your land."

A citizen appearing before your Nebraska Legislature Agricultural committee, just this month of April testified:

"But, in the ultimate and final confrontation between these two giants of industry (mature food production industry) and government when we finally decide *which will own and control the agricultural resources of the United States*, and the life giving product thereof, is there any question in your mind but what the Federal Government will assume title to the agricultural lands of the nation, in the name of the people, in order to guaranty ample production at fair prices. Is there any other answer?

"The successor to the corporate farm system will be a Nationalized Agriculture which will have evolved in the *name of* private enterprise, and have succumbed to government domination in the name of the people, and I dare say with the consent of the people. From this point, one can visualize a revolution, new homestead programs and the beginning of a new cycle, perhaps.

This conclusion is not new with me. It was drawn as early as 1902 by Teddy Roosevelt when he inspired the 160 acre per person limitation in the Reclamation Law of 1902. It takes considerably less mental acumen, in the light of recent history, to draw the same conclusion today. . . . The *economic justification* for few and larger farms has been a favorite *theme* with both the *academic* and the *corporate economists* who are *irrevocably wedded to the economies of scale*.[37] (Italic mine.)

Hypothesis III: Don Paarlberg said the people in America are in a position to choose what kind of agriculture they want (assuming a free society). *We challenge that America is in no position to make a choice*. For a balance sheet of the dollars and cents cost and returns of the two agricultures in this nation has never been run. It could be and would be a most important tool in policy making, and it must be soon. How could this balance sheet be run? (Please see section under suggestions for effective reform.)

Mr. Secretary, perhaps the term balance sheet is not quite accurate. A better word could be *dossier*. I submit that quite a dossier of public and *human costs* can be compiled against an agriculture which depends on *economic growth* for *legitimacy*. The economic apologists, both north and south said cotton must reign. *Economic growth* demanded it, and northern farmers had to have a market for their goods. History proved it. The profits to be accumulated for re-investment were fabulous. Just the return on the slave trade alone—the infamous Middle Passage—returned 30 percent on investment, even after death losses.[38]

Census figures on slaves in Alabama during the years that cotton became highly industrialized showed an increase from 41,879 in 1820 to 342,844 in 1850, and this after the slave-trade was declared illegal. But in terms of *productivity* the increase in cotton production was enough to make any statistician starry-eyed. In the years just from 1834 through 1855, cotton production rose from 469,000,000 pounds to 1,138,935,600 pounds. Just consider what the tremendous *technology* of the cotton gin made possible.[39] But it took the explosion of the Civil War to stop the handling of the Black man as both an input and a part of a chattel mortgage. The Civil War was only the beginning. The South had been laid waste, and only now are the costs beginning to pyramid. Andrew Heiskell, chairman of the board of directors of Time, Inc., understands:

"The other, most obvious reason why cities have been unmanageable is, to put it bluntly, that in the last 15 years five million underprivileged—mostly Negroes—have been driven out of the South and into our cities. I must say it has been a great revenge for the South."[40]

Am I being over-dramatic, irrational? I think not. To tell me times are different in no way erases the *indictment* against a narrow *concept of economic growth and dollar payoff* legitimizing policy which has proved deadly to our country. So far, society is picking up the costs, but shouldn't they be charged against a particular kind of farming?

Now let's check out the kind of agriculture you come from, Dr. Hardin, and I daresay, the majority of your staff and the University personnel. Here I can certainly lay the claim of being a neutral observer. Yes, gentlemen, you are the migrants from family agriculture, and the small rural communities servicing it.

Yes, I grant that you, our children that go to the city cause problems. You and they go to suburbia, and certainly suburbia is a problem. Where you are living, the costs alone of the highway transportation system and its upkeep cost about $20–25,000 per commuter car to bring you into the central city. Our migrants are much more willing to climb over other people's bodies to get ahead by dint of hard work. Don't forget we are pushing the Black man who is qualified off the rung of the economic ladder as we begin our climb. Oh yes, the cities love our kind of migrant. And way back in the recesses of our minds, history reminds us that there was no viable Homestead Act for the Black man.

* * * * *

The unasked questions are the "guts" issues. In my judgment, to continue agricultural policy based only on political pressures, commodity programs and short-run projections and research, while the structure of agriculture is afire, is to apply a very small bandaid to a very traumatic wound.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REFORM

I. Convince farmers to love each other or down with the halo department. This is not as ridiculous as it sounds. Really now—let us farmers just for once, be honest with each other. Do we, as individual operators deserve to be saved? Judging our past public performance, I would second a thundering No! We have screamed much about freedom but have refused responsibility. We're too busy producing. We have not only let everyone else handle our business and marketing affairs. We've expected them to do it. So why are we screaming now that others are doing just that? We hold fast to such halos as "stalwart sons of the soil," worship a Golden Calf of "free enterprise," but reserve our competition to eliminating each other in hopes of being part of the "elite." *Even wolves do not kill their own*. Does this sound too harsh? Dr. James Bonnen can sock it to us even better:

"Like the god of antiquity Saturn, Agriculture is devouring its own."[41]

Many of us belong to farm groups which have become public arenas for intercine warfare rather than concern for each other's welfare.

Footnotes at end of article.

At this Lincoln conference, for example, small groups of farm Bureau members were whispering "Boy, is this a loaded session of the noisy minority," while a noisy minority of NFO people booed the Farm Bureau speaker. To continue in this fashion could sentence us to well-earned oblivion. Sincere FB people had better begin to *loudly* question the motives of those who speak for them publicly. William Sellhorsts, the spokesman for the NFO, was not presenting a mere polemic against FB membership, but an indictment of the leadership.

We have become the most irrational segment in the American society (many say we also share this in common with economists). Many proponents of industrialized farming believe America can no longer afford the luxury of this atomistic bickering and in-fighting. They point out that a mass society must have orderly production and orderly distribution. Their solution is a combination of horizontal and/or vertical integration of farming.

What's to be done? For many years, the NCRLC has been trying to bring farm leaders together, to implant the idea of federation. In main, the efforts have proved a dismal failure. In between teaching her students, Sister Thomas More, a Franciscan nun with a PhD in "Agricultural History of Farm Organizations," has been on a nation-wide circuit as she terms it. She has alternately charmed and outraged leaders and farmers with her witty message.

I have personal knowledge of, by now hundreds of thousands of miles that Monsignor Edward O'Rourke, Executive Director and Monsignor George Weber, Executive secretary of NCRLC have logged *begging* farmers, *pleading with farmers* to unify. As early as 1960, Monsignor O'Rourke wrote:

"By your fruits you will know them (Matthew 1, 16). Extreme competition leads to poverty in the midst of plenty, a crushing of honest and diligent farmers and an economy of scarcity. These are bitter fruit. Let us strike at their roots. Let us establish instead a system of cooperation, especially in the market place." [42]

In 1962, Monsignor O'Rourke told a convention of the NFO: "Your enemy is the disunity among farmers and the unwarranted attacks which are being directed toward good organizations and good policies." [43] And he has never stopped.

The work of these good men and other dedicated priests goes on today, in coordination with such men as Dr. E. W. Mueller of the National Lutheran Council and other concerned Protestant pastors. This is splendid, and the work must continue, for no great reforms or changes ever seem to have come about without the active concern and leadership of the churches. Farmers have to become Christians too.

Some of us have tried to obtain research of modern needs from our educators. Bernie Camp, former director of information for the Nebraska Farm Bureau was quoted in the "Notable & Quotable" column of the *Wall Street Journal:*

"The great want of agriculture, as it has been all the time, is for knowledge of markets, and marketing techniques. Agricultural scientists long since have learned how to 'grow two blades of grass where one grew before' even more than that about production technique. . . . Had the same amount of Government effort and a fraction of the billions of tax money (spent on price support programs) been directed to marketing and price research . . . it is probable agriculture would be a long way on the road to price and market answers. . . . A few million dollars worth of research annually . . . might have speeded development of farmer and rancher controlled bargaining associations which would have given them the muscle to bargain intelligently with distributors and processors." [44]

Kenneth Hood made the point:

"Here is what I have been suggesting to Farm Bureau leaders wherever I go: 1. *Solicit the help of agricultural extension* and others in waging an aggressive, membership-wide campaign on basic economic education. This will equip our members and other farmers to appraise various marketing proposals and to work intelligently on programs they may undertake." [45]

In our own state of South Dakota, a group of us drew up a hypothesis for study of the dollars and cents efficiencies of the family-structured agriculture. After an hour of explaining to us how national research policy was formulated through an interplay of interest groups, all of course democratic, we were questioned at length in our definition of "firms." Then the State Extension Director, John Stone, went to the chalk board to find out what "acreage model farm we considered should be set up to study." All communication seemed suddenly to cease for Dr. Stone didn't seem to understand why we wanted or what we wanted researched. He could only think in terms of models.

If state land-grant universities have set up schools for the training of Chamber of Commerce directors, and home-economists hold seminars for unions in knowing the dangers of debt-financing and wise credit use, cannot leadership schools be quickly brought into play to help farmers learn to cooperate with each other and build leadership and bargaining ability. Now *don't tell me that's too controversial.* Extension supported REA, very audibly, in its construction period. You could begin telling farm leadership, to learn the lesson of Aramco, and other giants of the oil industry. They built one oil line from their oilfields. It was not only efficient, but sensible. If the giants can cooperate and farmers are businessmen, then farmers can cooperate.

Even these helps are not enough. There is another technique which I will term the good healthy scare method, very useful in its way, and this leads into.

II. Political action. None of us, Dr. Hardin, can possibly fathom the stresses to which you are politically subjected, to the powerful pressure of commodity groups, the influence of every agency from the State department to the legislative cliques. But the shift in power from rural to urban areas can work both ways. City congressional leaders are fed up with the petty often mean antics of many rural congressmen who no longer represent the true interests of their rural constituencies (witness the Rat control debate in Congress).

You know you could have other "bosses". *You do have Senator George McGovern you know.*

You could have others such as Jacob Javits, Edward Muskie, Harold Hughes, Abraham Ribicoff, Edward Kennedy, Walter Mondale, Leonor Sullivan, William Proxmire, Philip Hart, Jeffrey Cohelan, and Don Edwards. The list is long and growing, I believe. The power structures in the South are in the process of change. Only blood will stop it. The *true* conservatives in Congress, I must in good faith, believe will cooperate in re-orientation programs. One even notes the recent appointment of the brilliant Allard Lowenstein of New York to the agricultural committee of the House.

Of course it will be difficult; the ancient art of horse-trading is developed to a fine art in the hallowed halls of Congress. Agricultural committees, financial committees are not made in heaven, however, but here on earth. Much *courage, patience and determination* will be necessary. But if we farmers can become Christians, swallow our sinful pride and work together, can we ask less of you educators?

Surely if Senator Ernest Hollings of South Carolina had the moral courage to enter the black hovels in Beaufort County, face the worm-filled, dull-eyed children, under the watchful eyes of national television three days running, and worse yet, face the wrath of Strom Thurmond, then it is a propitious time for your department to act.

III. Government programs. Some farm organizations maintain that they want the Government out of farming. This is rubbish. With the exception of wheat and feed grains, mainly yet in the hands of family farmers, they have consistently fought for and supported every other commodity such as tobacco, rice, sugar, and cotton. While farm programs cannot be cut out overnight, farmers should be told *loud and clear,* that they have a time limit to start running their own affairs. Temporary supports should be based on bushels with a realistic limit. This will help eliminate the distortion of government supports to the huge "factories in the field", and the many pseudo-farmers presently receiving huge subsidies and yet claiming tax-loss farming deductions.

An alternative to bushel limitation payments would be restrictions on government supports in terms of dollar payment, with a limit to each *firm,* whether family or corporate. Criticism of bushel or dollar limitation which come from the experts are not completely logical. General Motors or U.S. Steel surely limit their production and one hears no outcries such as have come from the economists who consider restricting farm production a mortal sin.

Supports, guaranteed supports, must only last for a specified number of years, until we farmers by our own efforts, the help of the government, and you educators learn to manage our own affairs.

Soil banking, which we fear, is already policy is the poorest solution of all. We've seen the Iowa studies, again based on *economic growth;* We've also seen the Meyer and Heady studies prepared for the use of the Food and Fiber Commission.

They are not pretty, are they? Permeating these studies also are those ever-recurring themes of *supply, demand, free market price.* In studying a revolutionary transfer of production areas, we see the same inclination to cling to that nostalgic model of the small atomistic firm competing in a traditional market and nowhere is economic costs to the nation in the creation of more "efficient" producing areas by tax-paid projects such as the Arkansas River project, the Mississippi Delta area, the huge investments in Arizona and California public water, plus the projected Trinity River project in Texas.

The soil banking program would sound the final death knell for the small town, real damage to the not quite so small towns, particularly in the states of the Plains, for these areas would carry a very large percentage of land retirement. The program is politically unacceptable to congressmen from these areas. And don't write off the implications of more hundreds of thousands of us migrating to the beleaguered cities.

And here's a comment on small towns, I know that many will disagree with this opinion for many small towns have made tremendous gains in their efforts to attract industries, to bring about a real viable community. But they are in the minority, the gains, based on *economic growth* only, could be temporary. In general it is my belief from living in these areas and talking with these people, it is futile for you to depend on the small communities as long as present farm policies are being continued. How can you expect a small town to bloom out in the perennial youth of economic growth, when they have no young. If you destroy one economic base before reaching it with another you remain in trouble. People in small towns know they are written off the economic

---

Footnotes at end of article.

XUM

map. They cannot generate hope. One might even compare the present situation with that of the Delta Negro before the national effort of the Civil Rights movement, and increased education. A people without hope do not try to save themselves or improve their position. *Such rapid innovations* as the Litton National Farmer Stores in the Midwest are shaking the thinking of small town businessmen, even our economists.

IV. Public relations of the USDA. Here, gentlemen, the key word is imagination. Take a quick look at representative USDA press releases for the week of March 7th of this year: Milk Quality Standards are Refined by New Research; Aluminum Mulches Repel Disease-Bearing Aphids; Antibiotics May Cure Serious Plant Disease; A Septic Tank for the Hog House Makes Pigs Into Good Neighbors; New Pine Gum Derivative Has Potential in Plastics Manufacture; Apollo 9 to Photograph Farms for Signs of Drouth, Disease; Three New Rabbiteye Blueberry Varieties Introduced.

Do you get the picture? One can just see UPI and AP fighting over first chance at those three new Rabbiteye Blueberries.

Nick Kotz, Homer Bigert, Richard Strout have written tremendous articles on the real action in agriculture, but they didn't get their information from the USDA Press Service. Poor press service? But it can only release what it is given to release. What a waste! And here is where you people come in!

You *can* coordinate hundreds of releases from the brilliant men that I've been name-dropping all over the place, *if you have the courage and will to do so.* It will involve *deadwood removal.* It *means a rapid overhaul and coordination of activities, with fresh new approaches,* a bringing together of state and federal activities. This is not centralization. The *public* has the *right to know* what comes from the minds of *all* their *educators* who are being *paid from tax funds.* Before now, the extreme fragmentation of the state and federal research efforts, and the inter-department rivalry in coordination with the concentration on production research only has pevented this public service.

V. Research orientation. No Government agency can attempt to practice supply management in the industry they serve, and at the same time orient research agencies to increasing the amount of productivity of the industry's producers. One cancels out the other. One or/both is illegitimate. Which has priority? My immediate answer is an abundant *safe* food supply with a *safety margin.* This conclusion of course means that productivity in basic foods must be assured.

Footnotes at end of article.

We go further to say, this nation has never known a shortage of basic foods, and this means before the days of team research, and hybrid corn and internal-combustion engines.

We say a free society can choose its agriculture. We repeat society is in no position to choose, for there is no research showing a rational choice between the two agricultures. Therefore a thorough *revision in research priorities is in immediate order.* No lip-service, but policy-making from the highest echelons of power, the President and you, Dr. Hardin, for you are in the position of power. It means choosing your advisors most carefully. They cannot be just problem solvers. This means bringing economists and others kicking and screaming the same as farmers into cooperation with fellow scientists, agronomists, land-management, sociology, ecology, political science, history, bacteriology, engineering, philosophers, and any other disciplines needed. It also means that people are consulted.

It can't be done? Ridiculous? The Marshall Plan was conceived, oriented, and put to work within one year. It was a matter of priorities!

When you see the latest edition of the *American Legion Magazine* for May 1969, with a lengthy cover story no less on *How Pure Is Our Food?* We know that more than Ralph Nader is at work, and I for one, thank the good Lord, that perhaps public outrage is beginning to wave warning flags. Now perhaps the public's right to know can be served.

To show the contemporary sorry mess of the department's research affairs, and these are only two examples:

The *Wall Street Journal* (12–29–65) published the findings of a team of Cornell cell physiologists working at Cornell, showing possible health hazards in feed irradiation to humans. When I sent for the research summaries, 2 letters were returned with insufficient address given. The other brought two articles on the teams' conclusions, both reprints of articles published in the British magazine *Nature.* Meanwhile the USDA, IBBC's (International Basic Economy Corporation-Rockefeller Family), Ward Foods, have been cooperating in feasibility studies of food irradiation. Irradiated bacon to prevent rancidity has been tested on humans, with G.I.'s the guinea pigs.

Floyd Matthew, a professor of engineering at the South Dakota School of Mines, Rapid City, has been engaged in serious study in water pollution. He has found that the 370,000 cattle on feed, in South Dakota January 1, 1967, had the equivalent pollution capabilities for water, as that of the wastes of a city of 3,700,000 people.[46] Dr. Edward Berry of South Dakota State University was engaged in the same type of work as Dr. Matthew. None of the work was published to my knowledge in Extension Public service bulletins. Nor have I been able to locate Dr. Berry's work as a bacteriologist except through a private source and Dr. Berry personally. There were two small almost want-ad size writeups of Dr. Berry's work in two state farm papers that I came across.

Meanwhile USDA and cooperative extension are doing such things as cooperative research with Montfort Feed Lots in Colorado on eliminating the smell of manure, and Norris Grain has been working in efficiency feeding in feedlots with Illinois State University.

What kind of business is going on here? The USDA and Extension can help farmers with everything from the actual plans for confinement feeding to cost analyses for ever and ever increasing concentrations of animals. It takes no advanced degree to know that huge feed lots choose areas for feeding with care. One of the first requirements is good drainage, and sandy light soils with quick permeability rate high.

You see what is missing are intelligent judgments, a careful weighing of costs and returns. As Ralph Nader testified before House and Senate interns, July 12, 1967:

> By far, the most unyielding obstacles to a safer environment are the old greeds and frailties in modern garb. The struggle to defend, maintain and amplify economic power and bureaucratic position goes on, as it has throughout history . . . the corporate system of partial and partisan control of information crucial to evaluation of products and risk identification cannot be reconciled with democratic control of matters that touch us all.[47]

To bring about a healthy balance in research could serve much more than the public interest. With a re-orientation in research, the *true scientist* could *regain* the intellectual and real freedom which is essential to *freedom* in his research.

A challenging new approach is being considered more and more, that of switching control of agricultural research out of the department. The Committee on Government Operations, particularly the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, has been very active. Senator Muskie has introduced Senate Bill 78 to establish a select Commission to rule on all research. Transferring agricultural research to judgment by many disciplines would relieve self-interest group pressures on your various agencies. Emilio Daddario of Connecticut with his subcommittee of Science, Research and Development, and Senator Fred Harris of Oklahoma are also active in this field. (Harris with the Senate subcommittee on intergovernmental government research.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESEARCH IN COMPILING A BALANCE SHEET—ON THE COMPARATIVE COSTS AND RETURNS IN DOLLARS AND CENTS OF TWO KINDS OF AGRICULTURE IN AMERICA

Costs of corporate, hacienda, plantation, absentee-controlled farming, past and present	Returns	Mutual costs of both agricultures	Cost of family farming, P. & P.R.	Returns of the family farm structure, past and present
Hired labor, cheap, much of it season or migrant. The history of Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, Hindu, Mexican, human costs—death losses of black slave, etc. Present local and State relief load costs of migrant workers in offseason (i.e., Los Angeles County, 40 percent of relief), New York City percentages, ADC, etc. A share certainly of the Civil War costs. Other sundry items such as President Cleveland's putting Army in readiness to force big cattle ranchers off Indian territory. Withering of small communities. The whole legacy of cotton slavery. Many universities have a wealth of material. Political economy of slavery given legitimacy in large part because it generated tremendous economic growth outside the South. No rational decision brought it to an end, only the explosion of the Civil War, much as nature's explosion of the great blizzard finally put "finis" to the Scotch, New England, and English cattle ranching in the West. Costs of overgrazing of ranges, salinization of soils, deforestation, land erosion from specialization of crops beginning with the huge operations in the Hudson Valley to the Sacramento Valley in California, strip mining.	As yet cheap food and fiber; however, in the case of highly specialized products—lettuce—produced by few—wild fluctuations in price. Temporary quicker accumulation of capital. Uncontrolled overproduction such as western cattle companies.	Free land or cheap land in past. Taxpaid research. Farm-to-market roads, although the costs are certainly very noticeable in geography of 2 farmings, i.e., roads in Appalachia and Deep South to those of Midwest. Price-support programs most chargeable to big agriculture. Other subsidies, SCS, soil bank, etc. Which farming has most costs in actual soil conservation—not liming, etc.	A citizen not conducive to a cybernetic society.[1] Increasing soil depletion costs as farmers expand. A type of citizen, reluctant to cooperate, isolated in a philosophy of "rugged individualism" which will have no place in a mass society. (but will qualify statement to say this is a correctable cost, hopefully). Vo-Ag programs.	As yet cheap food and fiber. Millions upon millions of family farm migrants to the cities, educated and trained in rural areas. In past cities have needed them. Today, some say, cities will reproduce themselves. Perhaps in short-run outlook; long-run projection is debatable. What is the benefit to the city and Nation in a youth from rural areas ready to contribute to gross product? Dollars and cents values of 40 percent of all doctorate degrees coming from the heartland of America, many of them farm and rural people. Is this an accident? Comparison percentagewise of youth. Here mental and physical requirement tests for the armed services really can give a researcher a shocker. Internal generation of capital—an economic base for small decentralized communities not huddled in cities or uncontrolled suburbias.

See footnotes at end of table.

XUM

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESEARCH IN COMPILING A BALANCE SHEET—ON THE COMPARATIVE COSTS AND RETURNS IN DOLLARS AND CENTS OF TWO KINDS OF AGRICULTURE IN AMERICA—Continued

Costs of corporate, hacienda, plantation, absentee-controlled farming, past and present	Returns	Mutual costs of both agricultures	Cost of family farming, P. & P.R.	Returns of the family farm structure, past and present
The human costs of the black migrant. Yes, it can be compiled in Watts, Newark, Detroit, etc. These people were rural migrants, from the tradition of this agriculture. Watts did cost dollars and cents. Retraining costs, such as Job Corps—overwhelming majority from culture of rural Appalachia or Deep South—first or second generation. Fast tax writeoffs on migrant housing, outright government grants. Babysitting services in migrant day-care centers for mothers in the fields, Vista, medical and dental services estimated at 33,000,000 over a period of 3 years one example. Land reclamation areas such as Arkansas Delta, Mississippi Delta, Arizona, Great Valley, Trinity, most benefits to big agriculture.	Bringing of new land into production—but is it costless?	Irrigation projects most chargeable to big agriculture. Indirect subsidies free lock usage on waterways, no tax on barge fuel (Federal), etc. 7 percent investment tax credits, capital gains, oil depletion, most to big agriculture.		Soil practices—admittedly much to be desired with increased specialization. SCS research on who is doing the terracing, stripcropping, shelter belts, good soilbuilding practices. Management know-how from diversified farming ability to tie things together. Very hard to tie down in dollars and cents, but very important for rational decisionmaking.

[1] Perhaps with tongue in cheek. Are any of us?

V. Industrial Research. Another part of the healthy scare technique is to have the nation know that the new agriculture will have to do all its own research. It certainly cannot expect the public to pay for it. Industry will have to pay its own production efficiency research bill. That's not quite accurate, is it? The public will still pay it in their food prices. No more unpaid family labor, no more innovation of the individual farmer. The food industry has failed miserably to carry its share of Research and Development expense. The National Science Foundation's statistics for the last available year I have—1965—showed food companies' expenditures for research as *four-tenths of one percent* of net sales, the lowest of any industry with the exception of textiles and apparel. The scholars now engaged in public-paid research should also know that the new agriculture will not be scrupulous in respecting the researcher's vaunted "neutrality."

VI. A favorable climate for farmer bargaining. Past recommendations in group bargaining and marketing orders, etc., are not the solution. Bargaining commodity by commodity in highly specialized products as fruits and vegetables might be the best solution. But the basic foods, the food and feed grains, livestock production and dairy productions are still interwoven too closely to be neatly categoried. Separating this production on the basis of commodity by commodity is part of the present trouble. Yes, there are many complex problems (i.e. substitution of cottonseed meal for soybean meal). But compromise could at least bring about the beginnings of coordination of bargaining in the basic foods. And the nation can far better keep a watch over any exploitation in bargaining done by these producers than it ever could over huge conglomerates.

The policy of one farm organization (NFO) to disposal of surplus production in overseas relief and other charities is commendable. Working through relief groups such as CROP, and Catholic, Jewish and Protestant Services, could be meaningful. The food would go to the hungry, not through other bureaucracies. Cooperation with the government in transportation costs could be shared. The farmer producing 100 bushels of corn with seven or eight percent of it not needed for domestic consumption, cash exports, *if* educated, would gladly give away the surplus if an equitable price were received for the 93 percent.

Research is also needed on the legal limits of farmer bargaining in his own organization. Ground-rules must be established. Can a service organization which sells inputs to farmers, also bargain for his customer's production? I think there are legal questions here.

VII. Public service programming—TV and radio.—Radio and TV stations use the public-owned airwaves. They are subject to regulation. In controversial issues, the equal-time fair doctrine concept is a tool to consider. Dr. Harold Johnston, head of the FCC calls its use the "Law of Effective Reform." In a most interesting recent article, he gave much attention to citizen action forcing anti-smoking public service advertising, and at prime time.

Space does not permit the myriad ideas we can offer in this area. A good beginning could be made in the area of *livestock market news reporting*. The Livestock Marketing Service certainly tries to do a yeoman's service in reporting the disintegrated and decentralized marketing of livestock. However, the usefulness of much material is lessened by different cut-off dates, no efficient breakdown of available market supplies at the terminals. The important consideration however, is that the news media does not report accurately the marketing of livestock. For example, the Sioux Falls TV and radio stations, and all other noon or evening livestock reports covers only the terminals as do the Extension public broadcast service. Terminals we all know or should know handle only a fraction of the livestock slaughtered. But the livestock reporter on the Sioux Falls station is an employee of both the station and the terminal. He, repeating, only reports the terminals. USDA does report much more than this. I believe in the public interest stations could be persuaded to report accurate marketings to farmers.

VIII. A National Land and Farm policy.—If we are to choose the agricultural institution which to us seems good, then America should be asked what kind of farming she wants, and informed of the implication of her decisions. Senators and congressmen send questionnaires to their constituents. How about a question on the choice of farming. How about a highly-publicized Gallup or Roper Poll on this issue. We have polls on everything else. The cities are where the people must be reached. I do believe we can reach them and find a sympathetic hearing.

Thank you for any consideration which you might give this paper. It is an extremely lengthy one, but the structural revolution, the market revolution, the managerial revolution is a lengthy subject. We have tried our best to clarify what we feel are the issues, and to recommend reform.

"Land without population is a wilderness and Population without land is a mob!

FOOTNOTES

[1] The author is grateful for the criticism of Vincent Rossiter, Sr. of Hartington, Nebraska. Thanks are due also to the kind help both technical and critical of Bill Leonard, editor of the *Great Plains Observer*, and the *Madison Daily Leader* of Madison, South Dakota.

[2] Thomas T. Stout, "Effects of Changes in Market Structure on Ownership Patterns of Wealth and on the Distribution of Income Rights and Privileges. *CAED Report 29*, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1967, pp. 360–369.

[3] "Toward a Sound Family Farm Policy," *National Catholic Rural Life Conference*, 3801 Grand Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa, 50312.

[4] Kenneth B. Boulding, *The Legitimacy of Economics*, paper presented to the 42nd annual meeting of the Western Economics Association, Colorado University, August 24, 1967.

[5] Op. cit., Stout.

[6] "Farmers by the Truckload," *Huron Daily Plainsman*, June 16, 1968.

[7] Dr. Hendrick S. Houthakker, "Economic Policy for the Farm Sector," *American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research*, Washington, D.C. 20036, November 1967.

[8] "CED Farm Program", Hearings before the *Committee on Agriculture*, House of Representatives, 87th Congress, Second Session on Farm Policy Recommendations of the Committee for Economic Development, August 6–10, 28–29, 1962. Serial MM, U.S. Gov. Printing Office, Washington: 1962.

[9] Rudolph A. Peterson, President of Bank of America, speaking to the annual meeting of the California Canners and Growers, November 25, 1968, reported in *California Farmer Consumer Reporter*, December 1968.

[10] Reprint in *Human Events*, pp. 8–9, July 31, 1965. They gave source as July Monthly Economic Letter of the First National City Bank of New York, George S. Moore.

[11] USDA Press Release 3345–66.

[12] George L. Mehren, *Let's Move On Together*, address, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C., November 16, 1966.

[13] USDA Press Release 3908–66.

[14] Excerpt from TV talk by Monsignor Louis Miller, March 1967. Actual quoting and background material for these direct quotations will be found in Note III in appendix.

[15] James G. Maddox, unpublished doctoral thesis, *The Farm Security Administration*, Harvard University 1950, addenda: in personal files also a fantastic compilation "Concerning the Farmers Union & Communism", the typical smear of the anti-anti-Communist-fighters. The book could be laughable if tactics were not so frightening.

[16] Grant McConnell, *The Decline of Agrarian Democracy in the United States*, University of California Press, Berkeley, California, 1953.

[17] Monsignor Louis Miller, "Family Farm, Renaissance or Oblivion," paper given at Pastor's Conference, March 29, 1967, *Church and Community Proceedings*, North Dakota State University, Fargo, N.D.

[18] John H. Davis, "Policy Implications of Vertical Integration in United States Agriculture," *Journal of Farm Economics*, Volume XXXIX, No. 2, page 307.

[19] Dr. Vernon Ruttan, Head of Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Minnesota, Journal of Farm Economics, Vol. 48, No. 5, December, 1966, p. 1115.

[20] Dr. Harold Breimyer, former USDA Marketing specialist, visiting professor of Economics, "Agriculture at the Crossroads,"

News From Agriculture, University of Illinois College of Agriculture News Release, July 14, 1964.

[21] Dr. Harold F. Breimyer, professor of agricultural economics, University of Missouri, *Agriculture's Old Dilemma in New Dress*, talk given to the Missouri Farm Bureau Convention, November 14, 1967.

[22] Dr. Harold F. Breimyer, speaking to livestock growers, annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Convention in Chicago, December 12, 1967.

[23] Dean Earl Butz of Purdue, *Learning to Live with Big Business*, talk given to the Illinois Agricultural Cooperatives Recognition Program, University of Illinois, Bloomington, Illinois, October 12, 1966.

[24] Don Paarlberg, Purdue University, *Agriculture and Rural Living in the Next Ten Years*, talk given at a Sectional Meeting on Cooperative Credit, American Institute for Cooperation, Columbia, Missouri, August 9, 1965.

[25] Radoje Nikolitch, "Our 100,000 Biggest Farms, Their Relative Position in Agriculture," *AER Report 49*, USDA, Washington, D.C., February, 1964.

[26] Wayne Nussbaum, "Current and New Financing Methods in the Feed Industry & its Effect on the Industry," *Feedstuffs*, page 7, May 6, 1961.

[27] Donald Danforth, "Purina Notes Integration Steps," *Feedstuffs*, Dec. 9, 1961.

[28] Hal Dean, "The Challenge of World Hunger," *Proceedings* of the Ninth Federal Reserve District Farm Forum, *Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce*, Mpls., Minn. H–H7 March 9, 1966.

[29] *Business Week*, December 6, 1964.

[30] *Wall Street Journal*, December 13, 1967.

[31] Homer Young, "Dealer Feedlot Plan Bodes Ill for Farmers," *Farmland*, February 28, 1967.

[32] Curt Matthews, "Ralston-Purina Exports Know-How to Help Build Developing Nations," feature article, *St. Louis Post Dispatch*, June 8, 1967.

[33] op. cit. Stout, CAED 29.

[34] Theodore Schultz, *Agriculture in an Unstable Economy* research study done for the Committee for Economic Development, McGraw-Hill, 1945, page 13.

[35] Chet Huntley, NBC Moniter, Weekend April 1, 1967.

[36] LaMont C. Cole, "Can the World be Saved?" paper presented at the 134th annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, reprinted in the *Co-op Grain Quarterly, Summer*, 1968, page 6.

[37] Vincent Rossiter, banker of Hartington, Nebraska testifying on Bill 668 Nebraska State Legislature, April 10th, 1969. One economist dismissed him "oh him—He's read one book 'The Worldly Philosophers' and become an instant authority." He has never met Mr. Rossiter, and obviously had never seen Mr. Rossiter's well-thumbed and impressive library.

[38] *American Heritage*, February, 1962, page 23.

[39] *The Culture of Cotton*, Cotton Is King: David Christy, Derby & Jackson N.Y. 1856, 2nd Ed., cotton statistics, p. 287, slave, p. 295. A wide array of sources published at that time carry the same theme as I have expressed.

[40] Andrew Heiskell, "The City at Bay" address published in Magazine Day, Dec. 1967, inserted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 114, pt. 2, p. 2201.

[41] James T. Bonnen, ag. economist, Michigan State University, *Politics, Power & Performance in American Agriculture*, talk given to National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, Washington, D.C. January 18, 1966.

[42] Monsignor Edward O'Rourke, "Cooperation of Farmers will Aid Rural Economy"—*Urges Farmers to Try Collective Bargaining, Catholic Messenger*, Davenport, Iowa, December 29, 1960.

[43] Monsignor Edward O'Rourke, talk given to the 1962 Convention of the NFO, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, December 12, 1962.

[44] *Wall Street Journal*, July 19, 1967, page 1.

[45] Kenneth Hood, Director of the American Agricultural Marketing Association, "Competition in Food Marketing," paper presented at conference at *Agricultural Policy Institute* P.O. Box 5368 North Carolina State University, Raleigh, 27607, May 1967.

[46] Floyd Matthew, professor of engineering, S.D. School of Mines, report on water pollution in South Dakota, *Part I. Sources of Pollution*.

[47] Insertion by Senator Bartlett of Alaska (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, pt. 14, p. 18497).

APPENDIX—NOTES

NOTE I

Background of Hendrick Houthakker

Born in Holland—educated in Europe.

Area of inquiry: Price theory—economic policy.

Books: "Analysis of Family Budgets"; "Review Preference and the Utility Function"; "Capacity Method of Quadriatic Programming."

Testing the claim that the CED does not bring out, or participate in, methods of legislation. Sifting out the more than 1500 sources much of it CED policy statements, is impossible. Perhaps the best direct example of CED influencing legislation is the following:

Congress, in 1953, authorized the creation of a temporary Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (the Kestnbaum Commission), composed of members from both the Senate, together with persons appointed by the President, to make a thorough study of Federal-State relations. In its report, the Commission concluded that the "proper functioning of the federal system requires that concerted attention to be given to interlevel relationships" and recommended the establishment of a permanent center for this purpose.

No action was taken on these proposals of the Hoover and Kestnbaum Commissions.

In 1956, the House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee undertook an intensive study of Federal-State-local relations for the purpose of evaluating the 1955 Kestnbaum Commission report. . . . It is noteworthy that the Kestnbaum Commission's comprehensive 2-year study of intergovernmental relations was the first such *official* undertaking since the Constitutional Convention in 1787. . . .

Amid many hearings on several bills to set up an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, H.R. 6905, H.R. 6904, S. 2026, final action:

Joint hearings were held. . . . H.R. 6904 was subsequently passed by the House and Senate and approved by the President as Public Law 86–380 on September 24, 1959.[1]

One could fill up two more legal sized pages with the recommendations of this Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. But it is not *"looking for deep dark plots"* but *facts* that M–35, a nice fat volume entitled "1968 State Legislative Program of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations" is a compilation of *recommended legislation* for the 50 states, of neatly drawn up legislation with a blank left for a bill number, and the recommendations cover the methods of everything from Local Fiscal Powers, state tax concessions for New Industry, (policy statement only), standards for local governments, control of Urban water supplies, but in particular all facets involved in Metropolitan, region, Local planning, and government by commissions.

So we have a nation concerned with planning for the people's good. Fine, we're all for it. However, we do want to know the orientation of the planning. Don't we have a right to know.

Mr. Yntema said CED did not lobby or influence legislation. Perhaps he is correct in a sense. CED goes much further. They become a part of the planning.

Meyer Kestnbaum takes over—CED in new era of influence, reads page 104 of *Business Week*, page 104, January 24, *1953*.

Meyer Kestnbaum, president of Hart Schaffner & Marx, this week took over as the fourth chairman the Committee for Economic Development has had in its 10-year history. Kestnbaum had served nearly three years as chairman of CED's principal working group, the Research & Policy Committee. Before that, he had been a member of this committee for two years. So he's no newcomer to leadership of CED.

Continuing CED's "New Era of Influence":

This continuity of management of CED—by the businessmen who belong to it, as distinct from its paid staff—is a big reason why CED has risen to high esteem and influence in national policy-making since 1942. . . .

CED's financial support comes from industry as a whole . . . . CED works on the premise that "What's good for the country is good for business". . . .

When a study is finished, the report is analyzed by members of the full committee who alone can submit memoranda, comment or dissent . . . The theory behind this rule: Businessmen are qualified to pass judgment on the results of basic economic research.

The article writes of the impact of CED influence in the Marshall Plan:

. . . a deadlock in 1948 between Congress and the State Dept. over how the Marshall Plan should be implemented. A CED policy statement, an American Program for European Economic Cooperation suggested middle ground that was accepted happily by both sides. Paul Hoffman, was still chairman of CED, was selected to head the resulting Economic Cooperation Administration.

Mr. Yntema might choose to call CED's activities education. I choose to call it power. Mine is not a mathematical equation. It reads as follows:

CED (Meyer Kestnbaum) + Kestnbaum Report = ACIR (economics planning, *based on economic progress and growth*.

NOTE II

While preparing this paper, I received in the mail, an excellently-written paper by a British economist, Dr. E. F. Schumacher, economic advisor National Coal Board of England. The address was a Des Voeux Memorial Lecture, *Clean Air and Future Energy*, presented to the National Society for Clean Air's annual conference 1967, Blackpool England. Dr. Schumacher's qualifications: Rhodes scholar at Oxford, repeatedly called upon to act as Economic Adviser to Governments and planning commissions in developing nations such as Burma and India "convinced him that aid and development policies need to be given a new slant as they tend to by-pass those most in need—the people in the rural areas." He describes himself as an economist "concerned with people rather than goods:"

I enclose his material because he says so much better than what I tried to convey:

"Going back into history we may recall that when there was talk about founding a professorship for political economy at Oxford some 150 years ago, many people were by no means happy about the prospect. Edward Copleston, the great Provost of Orial College, did not want to admit into the University's curriculum a science "so prone to usurp the rest"; even Henry Drummond Esq. of Albury Park who endowed the professorship in 1825, felt it necessary to make clear that he expected the University to keep the new study "in its proper place". (Dr. Schumacher lists

---

[1] 27th Report by the Committee on Government Operations April 28, 1966, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations: the First Five Years: House Rept. Number 1457, April 28, 1966.

XUM

quote source as Dwight Culler's "The Imperial Intellect." Yale U. Press, p. 250, 1955).

The first professor, Nassau Senior, was certainly not to be kept in an inferior place. Immediately, in his inaugural lecture, he predicted that the new science "will rank in public estimation among the first of *moral* sciences in interest and in utility" and claimed that "the pursuit of wealth . . . is, to the mass of mankind, the great source of moral improvement". (source—John Stuart Mill autobiography, 1924 ed, p. 165).

Here I think relevant to add to Dr. Schumacher's comments on Nassau Senior. I quote from Cecil Woodham-Smith's masterful study of the Irish Potato famine, *The Great Hunger:* "I have always felt a certain horror of political economists," said Benjamin Jowett, the celebrated Master of Balliol, "since I heard one of them say that he feared the famine of 1848 in Ireland would not kill more than a million people, and that would scarcely be enough to do much good." The political economist in question was Nassau Senior, one of the Government's advisers on economic affairs."*

Dr. Schumacher continued:

And the great John Maynard Keynes, some 80 years later, admonished us not to "overestimate the importance of the economic problem, or sacrifice to its supposed necessities other matters of greater and more permanent significance". (source here: Keynes, Essays in Persuasion, London 1933, p. 373).

. . . It is hardly an exaggeration to say that, with increasing affluence, economics has moved into the very centre of public concern, and economic performance, economic growth, economic expansion, and so forth have become the abiding interest, if not the obsession, of all modern societies. In the current vocabulary of condemnation there are few words as final and conclusive as the word "uneconomic". If an activity has been branded as uneconomic, its right to existence is not merely questioned but energetically denied. Anything that is found to be an impediment to economic growth is a shameful thing, and if people cling to it, they are thought of as either saboteurs or fools. Call a thing immoral or ugly, soul-destroying or a degradation of man, a peril to the peace of the world or to the well-being of future generations; as long as you have not shown it to be "uneconomic" you have not really questioned its right to exist, grow and prosper.

. . . I am asking what it means, *what sort of meaning the method of economics actually produces*. And the answer to this question cannot be in doubt: something is uneconomic when it fails to earn an adequate profit in terms of money. The method of economics does not, and cannot, produce any other meaning. Numerous attempts have been made to obscure this fact, and they have caused a very great deal of confusion; but the fact remains. Society, or a group or individual within society, may decide to hang on to an activity or asset for *non-economic reasons*—social, aesthetic, moral or political. . . . The judgment of economics, in other words, is an extremely *fragmentary* judgment.

. . . Even within the narrow compass of the economic calculus, these judgments are necessarily and *methodically* narrow. For one thing they give vastly more weight to the short than to the long term . . . and then, secondly, they are based on a definition of cost which excludes all "free goods", that is to say, the entire God-given environment, except for those parts of it that have been privately appropriated. This means that *an activity can be economic although it plays hell with the environment*, and that a competing activity, if at some cost it protects and conserves the environment, will be uneconomic.

Economics, moreover, deals with goods in accordance with their market value and not in accord with what they really are . . . among primary good no distinction is made between renewable and non-renewable goods. . . .

We teach our children that science and technology are the instruments for man's battle with nature, but forget to warn them that, being himself a part of nature, man could easily be on the losing side. . . .

Something like an explosion has to occur before warning voices are listened to, the voices of people who had been ridiculed for years and years as nostalgic, reactionary, unpractical and starry-eyed.

The religion of economics .,. . promotes an idolatry of rapid change, . . . the burden of proof is placed on those who take the "ecological viewpoint". . . .

You know, Dr. Hardin, the sad thing about Dr. Schmacher's paper is that it came from the Anti-Pollution League of the Connecticut River Valley, Brattleboro, Vermont. Citizens, at their own expense, have to do battle with their own-tax-supported Big Education—to publish the truths society has a right to. And we are further insulted by picked up the price-tag of the CED's power in the prices of their goods and services. CED is tax-exempt too.

James Kuhn wrote: "Advocacy of the market ethic is understandable, and insofar as it contributes to the continuous debate of public interest, it is desirable; but apotheosis of the market is dangerous and idolatrous. In suggesting that the competitive market was an institution of nature, guided by an invisible hand, Adam Smith provided his later disciples with the rationalization that it was the direct creation of God—a holy instrument for fulfilling His purposes. They forgot that men had created the market, and in raising it high, had fashioned a Golden Calf. They alienated themselves from the fulfillment of Smith's hope, which was that the free market would bring an increase in the wealth of the nation; and in turn the market alienated them from each other and their fellow men who bore the market's injustice.

James Kuhn, "What's Wrong With the Old Business Ethic," *Catholic Mind*, March 1965. reprinted from the Columbia University Forum. Mr. Kuhn was associate professor of industrial relations, Graduate School of Business, Columbia.

References for Father Miller's Talks—Background Material.

Coke, Earl J., "Farmers Issue Stock? Ag Ready for New Role, 11th Annual Conference in Research sponsored by Chas. Pfizer & Co., Chicago; talk given to 300 agricultural scientists, business leaders, etc., *Drovers Telegram*, May 29, 1963, p. 5.

Davis, John W., "Next Twenty-Five Years in Agriculture," *Journal of Farm Economics*, Vol. XXXIV, May 1957, pp. 5–57 and Ray A. Goldberg, *A Concept of Agribusiness*.

Downey, Senator Sheridan, *They Would Rule the Valley*, San Francisco, 1947. No publisher is given. Author paid continual tribute to "rugged individualists" such as Kern County Land Company, DiGiorgio Company. This book brings out the real battle at that time—*abolishing the 160 acre limitation on public water*. Mr. Downey spared little in dragging both the BAE and the Bureau of Reclamation over the coals and back again, with particular fury for Mr. Goldschmidtt. Innuendos, warnings, with hints of mysterious leadership in the BAE, and CIO's intervention to destroy "free enterprise" in the Valley. A must if you wish to understand the *role of raw power in agricultural policy*.

Goldschmidtt, Walter, *As You Sow*. Harcourt, Brace and Company, N.Y., 1947, Mr. Goldschmidtt here goes into detail in his studies of the communities of Arvin, Dinuba, and Wasco, California.

Hardin, Charles M., "The Bureau of Agricultural Economics Under Fire: A Study in Valuation Conflicts," Journal of Farm Economics, Volume XXIII, August, 1946. No. 3, pp. 635–658. Here Mr. Hardin covers much of the disastrous career of the FSA, but he also goes into the conflict of Land Use Planning; the role of the Farm Bureau, etc.

The Politics of Agriculture, Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1952, 282 pages. Mr. Hardin here discusses in length the trials and tribulations of USDA, State colleges and Extension and other power groups getting along with each other.

"Food and Fiber in the Nation's Politics," Volume III, Technical papers, *National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber*, August, 1967.

Kirkendall, Richard, "Social Scientists and Farm Politics in the Age of Roosevelt," *University of Missouri Press*, 1966. A most excellent source Dr. Kirkendall's book is an expansion of a history doctorate; the bibliography is most excellent, for anyone wishing to gain an intelligent understanding of the agricultural revolution.

McConnell Grant, Decline of Agrarian Democracy in the United States, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1953. Originally this book was recommended to me by Solon Kimball of Columbia University. He sent a review of it from a National Council of Churches bulletin. The bibliography I found excellent for further research, particularly the FB, Everett Dirksen, and the Congressional Hearings.

Wells, O. V., J. D. Black, et al. P. H. Appleby, Henry C. Taylor, H. R. Tolley, R. J. Penn, and T. W. Schultz, "The Fragmentation of the BAE"—*Journal of Farm Economics*, Vol. XXXVI, Feb. 1954, no. 1, pp. 1–22. From this paper come all direct quotations of Msgr. Miller on the re-organization of USDA.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR COTTON IN EXECUTIVE SESSION ON TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, with respect to the order which has been previously granted, under which the able senior Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON) will be recognized on Tuesday next immediately following the prayer and the disposition of the reading of the Journal, that debate of 2½ hours should be in executive session. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be in executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 42 United States Code 2251, the Speaker had appointed Mrs. MAY of Washington as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 689, 84th Congress,

---

*Cecil Woodham-Smith, *The Great Hunger*, Signet Edition, Harper & Row, 1964, page 373. Here I am grateful for Mr. Rossiter's pointing out the economist's attitude at that time.

XUM

as amended, the Speaker had appointed Mr. DEVINE, of Ohio, as a member of that U.S. Group of the North Atlantic Assembly, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

The message announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 12964) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 12964) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MISSILE TEST FACILITIES AT KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE, AND RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2546) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, it is very clear that we have had a wholesome debate on the pending bill and on several of its main features, but more particularly on an item that has become known as the ABM.

There have been presentations from the technical and scientific viewpoint, debates from the international and political viewpoint and the situation with reference to the timing, research, and development end of the minor part of the initial beginning of the deployment work.

I think that both sides have been presented in excellent fashion. We had an unusually fine discussion in the closed session, which had to be held because of some very sensitive information.

I think there has been no contest here as to time. Everyone has had as much time as he wished to take, even though I know that properly some of us want to speak and maybe some who have already spoken will address themselves to another aspect of the matter.

I frankly think that the subject matter has certainly passed a stage where we ought to consider, if at all possible—and I believe it is possible—having a vote on the pending amendment, which is the Cooper-Hart amendment.

And in a full and wholesome spirit and wanting everyone to have a chance to say everything he wishes, after conference with the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Texas and others, I want to express a very strong hope that we can begin to dispose of the matter. I want them to respond if they will as to how they feel about the matter.

I do not know that we can dispose of the matter without giving prior notice. We should not just try to get an agreement now. And that is not my purpose. However, certainly we can bring the matter up at the next session of the Senate and perhaps then make a proposal and agree upon it.

I think there ought to be at least 48-hours notice in advance of an exact time to vote.

The Cooper-Hart amendment presents the whole issue in one bite.

There has to be notice and there has to be time for debate and we have to allow for the crowded airports and skyways. That is the sentiment of those of us who have a special responsibility here in connection with the pending bill.

I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky or the Senator from Michigan, or they may have the floor in their own right if they would rather do that.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I am sure the Senator from Michigan will also respond.

I have discussed the matter several times with the Senator from Mississippi and, of course, the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) and I have talked about it many, many times.

This is the third week of the debate. We considered that during the first week the Senator from Mississippi, as the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, would present the bill and discuss various sections, including the ABM. And, of course, that was done during the first week.

The Senator from Michigan and I intended to offer our amendment and ask that it be made the pending business last week. However, I think it was clearly understood that last week would not be satisfactory for the serious discussion of the amendment or any part of the bill. While it was a great week for the Nation and the world because of the moon landing, many were away, there was a holiday on Monday and with the closed session there was little time for debate.

On Wednesday, the Senator from Michigan called up the amendment and, on his motion, it was made the pending business.

It is my position—and while the Senator from Michigan will speak for himself, I think that he agrees with me—that we should proceed expeditiously to a vote.

Many Senators are interested in the amendment. They should have the opportunity to be present in the Senate at the time we discuss the time for a vote.

I agree with the suggestion that has been made, which, as a result of the discussion here today, will appear in the printed RECORD. It is to announce that on next Monday there will be a discussion on the floor as to a definite date to vote. Everyone will be notified and advised to be present and make their position clear.

I can say for myself I wish we would proceed as expeditiously as is possible to a vote.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I certainly thank the Senator. I know that has been his sentiment.

Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the able Senator from Kentucky has expressed, I think, fully the attitude which is mine with respect to assuring first that everyone who has an interest in this amendment, on either side of it, be given the opportunity to voice it; that the vote be established at a time sufficiently in advance to insure that anyone with travel problems or scheduled commitments will be able to be present.

I concur in the suggestion made by the Senator from Kentucky, that with this exchange in the RECORD today, we plan on Monday next to develop further the discussion, and at that time any Senator on either side of the amendment, who has a problem, a concern, or a suggestion be here to voice it. I think that all of us then will feel clear in our consciences that everyone has had an opportunity, and the Senate will have the benefit fully of the opinions of any of its Members on this subject before we proceed to fix a date.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

As has been true with respect to the Senator from Kentucky all along, the Senator from Michigan has taken the high road, has given the utmost cooperation, and has given the utmost consideration to every Senator, regardless of which side he is on, to have full time for discussion.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the distinguished Senator.

I believe we are probably all in concurence. There seems to be no disposition on the part of anybody to engage in any dilatory moves or debate.

The Senator from Kentucky just suggested that perhaps we sort of informally agree on something like 3 o'clock Monday afternoon to discuss this matter, which will give anyone out of town a chance to return, and we can work it out to everyone's satisfaction.

Perhaps we can get a line on how many

XUM

Senators have additional remarks to make. Considering that, we perhaps can arrive at a time certain for the vote.

Speaking for those whose views I express, we are ready to discuss it Monday afternoon. I think that is eminently fair, and I think the Senate is adequately on notice that that is what we are going to do on Monday.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Texas.

I think this reflects an attitude that we should not let a staleness develop about this matter. No Senator wants to do that. I believe that if we go on much longer, it will become stale. It will be stale with the Senators; it will be stale with the public. The matter is fully understood.

With the allowance of this time, everyone will have notice that there will be a request; and then with the allowance of more time for discussion, the outlook for proceeding is very good.

I think we should state that this has been mentioned to the majority leader and the minority leader, and they like the idea of proceeding as expeditiously as possible to a vote.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Texas has just said that we should fix the time certain as 3 o'clock on Monday afternoon and ask unanimous consent at that time that time be given for discussion.

Mr. STENNIS. I think that is a good suggestion. I want to agree to it, subject to this possible adjustment: The Senator from Mississippi has mentioned 48 hours as a minimum time of notice—that is, the lapse of time between the time of the actual agreement and the time of voting. If we set it for 3 p.m. and we have a good deal of discussion, that would run into late afternoon. Would it be just as well to say we will begin that discussion at 1 o'clock on Monday, with the idea that if we could conclude the discussion about a date within an hour or two, perhaps then a vote could be agreed upon for Wednesday? If we do not, it will take it into Thursday, and the week will be nearly gone.

What is the response to that? Is there any particular reason why the Senator wants 3 o'clock?

Mr. TOWER. It seems to me that we could go ahead and proceed at 1 o'clock, if everybody's interest is protected, and we could postpone the discussion to later on. I would be willing to set a time later in the afternoon. One o'clock sounds all right to me. I think we can all agree to protect everyone's interests, if someone cannot get here for the discussion at that time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky. He may have a special reason.

Mr. COOPER. I think a time certain should be set. The Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) suggested 3 o'clock, so that anyone who might be away could get back in time.

I have stated my position. I believe we should move forward as quickly as we can and come to a vote. But I cannot speak for others who are interested in this amendment, either for it or against it.

I do know—I must be very frank—of a situation which I would think would postpone the vote until after Wednesday; because I understand that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE) is to hold a hearing on this subject on Wednesday morning. He has not spoken to me, but I have this information, and if that is correct, I would assume that he would object to any vote until after that time. I have stated the position as well as I can, and my own position.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Kentucky has been very earnest and concerned about this matter all the way through, as has the Senator from Michigan and others.

I am pleased that we can set Monday for a genuine discussion of this matter, and give notice, so that everyone who wishes to can be present.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I just entered the Chamber. I did not hear the discussion.

Mr. STENNIS. We just started an around-the-floor discussion of the prospects for getting an agreement on a vote on the Cooper-Hart amendment. We were not asking for any agreement now. We were going to give notice that on Monday this matter would be brought up and a request made for some agreement as to voting. Certainly, we would not even request it with less than 48 hours elapsing before the agreement was reached, in order to provide travel time and speaking time. Among ourselves, it seems agreeable to have this discussion on Monday and to proceed as I have said.

Mr. COOPER. May I add to that?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from Texas, and I were discussing providing means for all Senators interested to be present at a time which is known, and we have agreed upon Monday—I am not sure whether we have agreed upon the hour as yet—when we will discuss the issue of trying to agree upon a time to vote.

I have stated, and so has the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) that our position is that we should proceed as expeditiously as we can toward a vote. I have made it clear that I do not speak for others who are interested in this matter, and I have just said that I have been informed that the Senator from Tennessee plans to secure further information at a hearing; and I would assume from that that he would not consent to vote before that hearing is held.

Mr. TOWER. All we are doing now is talking about agreeing on a time to talk about a time to vote.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I see.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am very glad to have that information. I, too, am thinking of a hearing and trying to set up a hearing for Monday.

Just yesterday, a man who I think is well informed about the matters of communication told me that he believes with respect to the national communications systems—and he is well informed—that the effect of radiation upon radars, upon electrical communications, is very significant in this debate and it is a matter we overlooked. I do not believe the subcommittee heard much of anything on that subject. But to give an illustration of the immense importance of it, in order to overcome or destroy the effectiveness of an ABM, all you have to do, Mr. President, is to send over one precursor weapon, as he calls it, explode it well above the radars and it would nullify and throw out of communication for 30 minutes to 2 hours the effectiveness of the radars, and during that time they could do anything they like.

I understand it is a slight effort, and it could be overcome. The Russians have discovered this and have withheld going along and building their ABM. The CIA has reported in secret session—I do not think it is secret, because this has been publicly stated—that the Soviets have held up proceeding with the deployment of their ABM. Anyway, it is an interesting further item about the effectiveness of it.

No one is alleging, as has been said here, that the ABM will not work. No one is saying an ABM could not be created that would work under normal conditions. The day before yesterday the Senator from Arizona asked, "How can anyone question our ability to build an ABM after what we have seen on the moon?" It seems to me that is totally irrelevant. As a matter of fact, if the Russians or anyone else cared to interrupt the moon shot with very slight interference electrically, they could have done it, because it is not possible to interdict electrical interference. We heard a good deal about that in the hearings on the Vietnam war.

There are items I would like to go into. What I would like to suggest to the Senator from Mississippi, for that reason and other reasons, is that we arrange to call up other amendments on this same bill. I have some amendments and I know other Senators have amendments; and we could defer the vote on this one—which has been discussed quite well, although new facts are coming up—until after the President returns.

I say that for the following reasons. I think it might be unwise and inappropriate, with the President out of the country, and more particularly behind the Iron Curtain, as has been said here—I understand he will be there next week—to take action on a matter in which he has involved himself, as in this matter. He has taken no position on a number of other matters. I do not think he has taken a position on some of the matters I have in mind, such as research projects, which have been discussed superficiously on the floor. There are amendments which I think the Senator from Wisconsin is going to submit in which the President is not involved. He certainly is not directly involved in them and has not taken a position.

I think it would be bad policy to bring up a measure he is interested in and vote on it while he is abroad. He is due back on the 3d of August, as I understand.

XUM

I recommend to the Senator from Mississippi that, if there is the urge to go on with this measure, we discuss and vote on other amendments, reserving the vote on this amendment, which is the most important of all the amendments, until after the President returns.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I can say with certainty that the administration would not mind if we voted while the President is absent from the country. I do not think the administration has objection to our voting perhaps in the middle of next week. All we are saying is that now we would like to set a time to discuss this matter and put Members of the Senate on notice. We are not making a decision on voting. At that time the Senator from Arkansas can come up with whatever suggestion he wishes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was not making my suggestion simply to please the President. He has expressed himself on the ABM positively. It is a matter in which he is interested.

I can hear them now. Some of the proponents would say, "What a dreadful thing; pulling the rug out from under the President while he is in Rumania fighting communism," and so forth. This is the situation I do not wish to face. I was not trying to put it off on the President. It is my judgment it is bad policy to vote on this kind of an amendment while he is in Rumania. I would not agree to vote on it while he is there. On the other hand I am willing to discuss and vote on a number of other amendments I am interested in before that time, if the Senator from Mississippi is willing.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this concern about the President is all news to me. It is totally new. The President knew the bill was pending. The President did not ask that it be deferred. I never heard of anyone—the Senator from Arkansas or anyone else—advising the President not to go or to hurry back, nor was anything said about deferring it until he got back, until after he was gone.

I just do not see the logic or reason or anything connected with it except that it seems to jar the opposition a little here just to suggest that the President is interested in this matter; and it does affect his position in this conference. That is a part of the picture here. There is nothing to be said with him here or gone that can change that. It is simply a part of the facts of life.

Mr. President, I wish to point out further that I do not have any particular personal choice in this matter. However, this is the 25th day of July and this bill has been under consideration by the committee and the Senate itself since a very few days after the inauguration in January. It contains all of the hardware for the military system for the fiscal year that started 3 weeks ago on July 1, 1969. We are already in the new fiscal year. This is merely an authorization bill, ordinarily contemplated to be passed by March or April. It is for the ships, submarines, airplanes, research and development, the missiles, and everything in the way of hardware.

I know from experience it is highly important that this matter be completed as soon as reasonably possible. No one is more in sympathy than I am with the procedure that everyone should have his say and get the facts. But the hearings on this subject have been going on in the Committee on Foreign Relations for about as long as we had the matter in the Committee on Armed Services. So if there are any real new facts to be developed, they could be developed in a few days as well as in a few months. I do not think there are many new facts to be developed unless it is something really new.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I shall yield in just a moment.

I think the bill should move along. We have lost a lot of time. I blame myself for not getting the bill here earlier, but there were requests for delay back then and they were legitimate requests. Everything is held up now, the whole program. I hope the bill will move along.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to make two comments. First, the President did not ask me about the advisability of making the trip. If he had I would have given it, but it would have been presumptuous for me to have given advice otherwise. That trip is his own idea. I did not have any opportunity to do so.

I wish to ask the Senator whether his committee at any time took testimony with regard to the effect upon the communications between the radars and the computers, and between the computers and the missiles. What is the effect of nuclear radiation upon such communications?

Mr. STENNIS. That is a form of jamming—what is ordinarily called jamming of one kind or another. I am sure that the matter has been fully gone into by scientists for both sides and by others who have to pass on the practical side of these matters. I know that they testified there were no problems that could not be overcome. This has to be worked out as they have to work out matters regarding Polaris and others. Yes, I think that matter is fully taken care of.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have seen no testimony. I was told no later than yesterday that there has been no testimony of the effect of radiation upon the system because, of course, this is a difficult thing to do. Under the test ban treaty, it is not easy to conduct a nuclear explosion in the air to test its effect upon communications. That is what was pointed out to me yesterday.

Frankly, I never thought of that. As the Senator knows, this was an aspect of it that had not occurred to me but, obviously, it is rather difficult to test the effect upon a missile or upon a system such as the ABM of a nuclear test in the atmosphere where that explosion will take place.

I was only asking: Has the Committee on Armed Services ever had any testimony on this question?

Mr. STENNIS. I am sure I definitely remember testimony about the possibilities, all the possibilities of jamming, and the working of the computers and the radars and all the rest of it. I cannot put my finger momentarily on testimony directed to that point.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I want to ask the Senator whether he would be good enough to ask his staff to locate such testimony and submit it to me by next Monday or Tuesday, whenever it is convenient. I will be very much interested in seeing it, to check whether the advice I was given is true.

But that is only one aspect of it. The main point that I wish to make, and I again ask the Senator to consider it, at least between now and Monday, if he is interested in promoting or pushing the bill through to enactment—and I certainly do not wish to delay it—why we cannot take up other amendments and make that much headway and get them disposed of? They should not take nearly so much argument because many are simple amendments in their purpose, as the Senator knows. He and I discussed these same things last year. We already had some communication with the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McINTYRE) earlier this session.

My own amendments will take me only 10, 15, or perhaps 30 minutes, so that we could dispose of some of them and get rid of a number of other amendments before the major one. I think the Senator will agree that the No. 1 amendment in significance is initiation of deployment of the ABM.

Mr. STENNIS. I do not know about that suggestion, so far as the authors of the amendment are concerned, that it be taken down, but even if it were, we have debated this question now into its third week and my opinion is based upon experience that if we take away or take off and leave the main issue alone, and abandon this part of the debate, we will have to go all through the debate again.

It will be almost like a new subject when it comes up again. I think that it would make the Senate look rather silly to spend 3 weeks and then abandon that part of the debate without some very substantial reason and then go over and go to talking about some experiments without any specifics somewhere on behavioral sciences or a subject of that kind which has little or nothing to do in a substantial way, that is, with our military program. I think the Senator is capable of making a decision now and we should proceed on this.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I beg to differ with the Senator. I have been in the Senate 25 years now and this is the first time in those 25 years that there has been a serious debate upon an important item in the defense budget. I believe the Senator from Mississippi agreed with me the other day that this is the first time the Senate has undertaken to examine, and in a way to exert influence on a decision of this kind. I am not sure whether it has been 2 or 3 weeks, but I do not believe that is very long. I can remember that the Senator and I have taken much longer than that on other issues of a domestic nature which we thought were important, for the sole reason of informing the public.

The Senator and I have joined in an effort to enlighten the public on certain subjects in which we were interested. Very often we performed a public service in that connection. That is what the Senate is for. I think this issue of whether the Senate is to have any real influence in decisions on a department of this Government, a bureaucracy which absorbs nearly one-half of the total budget, is equally important. It is so important that it would certainly justify 2 or 3 weeks or whatever length of time the Senator just said that we have spent on it. In other words, the ABM is an important matter. The other items are of much less importance.

I do not believe that we would revert back to the beginning at all. We can lay it aside pending the final hearings, but most important, I think it would be bad policy to vote on the ABM issue at this time.

For example, suppose the vote should go against the President—which I hope it will and I will do everything I can to make it go against the President—it would be embarrassing for the President to be in Rumania and have the headlines read that one of the major proposals of the President of the United States had been rejected by the Senate. I would not like that to happen while he was abroad.

When I am abroad, I am very careful in what I say about our internal politics. I try never to say anything that is even critical of our own policy when I am abroad.

It is a different situation, and I am sure it would embarrass the President if the Senate should vote to assert its prerogatives of giving advice and of approving or disapproving a matter of this importance while the President is in Rumania.

I do not believe we should do that. I still think that the Senate has enough respect for its own functions. I think there are enough Senators who think that the Senate is sufficiently important that it should play a role in the balance of our Government, that we should not be completely under the control of the military bureaucracy of our Government.

Really, that is what the ABM is a symbol of; namely, whether the Senate has got enough independence from the influence of the great manufacturers of this country, the great industrial enterprises, and the military bureaucracy. Whether we have it, I do not know. I think we have. I think that Senators do have such pride and such feeling of responsibility in being Senators that they will assert their right to play a role in the Government of the United Staees.

I have been extremely impressed by the outspoken position of the new Senators in this body, men who have just been elected, who are closer, I would say, then I am to the pulse of the electorate as to what is going on, because they were elected for the first time. It is remarkable how interested they are in being Senators and not stooges of the military.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Will he yield right there?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield right there. I withdraw the word "stooge." I overspoke myself. I did not mean that in the way the Senator may think.

Mr. STENNIS. I do not think the Senator can withdraw an insult unless he apologizes for it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I apologize for using the word "stooge." I overspoke myself.

Mr. STENNIS. I am proud of the Senator. I believed he would, as a gentleman.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was overspeaking myself, but I will try, in a moment, to be more precise as to what I intended to say, if the Senator will allow me.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. I accept the apology of the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I apologize for using the word, although I did not use it as applying to the Senator from Mississippi. I used it in the negative. I said they did not wish to become.

What I have been trying to say is that for 25 years the Senate has never challenged what the Military Establishment has asked for, to my knowledge, of any consequence. Perhaps it has on something little. The usual challenge was, "Look, you ought to have more planes. You have asked for 1,000. You ought to have 2,000."

This is not just because of the military. We all know the country we have. Each industrial State has great enterprises that employ thousands of people whose jobs are dependent upon those programs. There is no secret about it.

In the State of Washington, what is the biggest employer? Boeing Aircraft. In the State of Missouri, what is the biggest single employer, with 50,000 workmen? That means 50,000 votes. It is McDonnell Aircraft.

I do not need to call the roll. From General Electric, from Bell Telephone, it is all over the country. It is the kind of country we have. We are proud of it. It is effective. It is a very productive economy. I am not criticizing it. I am calling attention to it.

We are elected, are we not? All of us got here by getting more votes than our opponents. That is what I mean. The word "stooge" is not the right word. I was just shortcutting. What I was trying to say was that what President Eisenhower referred to as the military-industrial complex has a tremendous influence in this country. The Senator from Mississippi really does not challenge that.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; I will challenge it at the right time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That it has a great influence?

Mr. STENNIS. I will challenge the Senator's whole remarks when the Senator has concluded.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Look at the advertisements in the newspapers. Look at the books being published—two books within a week, one by the great Hudson Institute. What is the Hudson Institute? Well, it is an institute created by the Pentagon, supported by millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money that goes into the Hudson Institute that subsidizes Mr. Herman Kahn and his associates. They write books which invariably support the major issues in which the Pentagon is interested.

That is a fact of life.

We have the Institute of Defense Analyses. We have a hundred other "think tanks." We have the Rand Corp. These are supported primarily either by the Pentagon or by big industrial enterprises or through contracts made by such companies. I am not referring to a particular company with a particular "think tank," but, in general, the big companies of this country build the machinery and the gadgets that are paid for by part of the $80 billion which is supplied by the Government for that purpose. They are the people who support these companies.

I am not saying that in a critical way. I am not saying they should not. There is no other way, under our system, to build a defense establishment. I have no alternative, and I am not saying it in a critical way. It is a fact of life, however, that these people have gradually been able to build up the greatest military machine the world has ever seen, with the biggest budget the world has ever seen.

What the Senate ought to do, and what I am trying to do, and what I think other Senators are trying to do, is to bring back into our Government the system of the checks and balances provided for in our Constitution, so that in the future the Senate of the United States will be in a position, whenever it is proper and appropriate, to raise a question about any part of the defense budget.

As I have said, it is, in a sense, the first time in 25 years that the Senate has made a serious effort to curtail a particular weapons system.

Articles have appeared recently that nobody has challenged, particularly by Bernard Nossiter, in the Washington Post. He outlined a number of weapons systems, amounting to, I think, $30 billion, or something like that, that had been started, experimented with, and abandoned because they had been misconceived.

I do not say that because I think they should not have been tried. I know a certain amount has to be done. But in the past we have simply accepted them without any question. We hear around here an analogy with automobiles. It is suggested that the ABM is an Edsel. I saw one this morning. It is a sort of folklore that grows up. Everybody knows what the Edsel was. The Edsel was a mistake. Everybody agrees to that. That does not mean Ford does not make a good car. It does. It is making good cars now. Somebody just made a mistake. If someone had had the foresight at the time, it would have saved Ford $3 or $4 million.

I am not saying that we cannot make an ABM or make a missile. We know we can make one if we want to spend enough money and if it is the proper design. What I am saying, and what I think some of those who share my view are saying, is that this is not a proper design. Somebody has taken a concept called the Sentinel and overnight changed it and now calls it the Safeguard. I think even the Sentinel was very questionable. But they have changed it to Safeguard. The evidence is that the designs for the Sentinel are not proper for Safeguard, and, therefore, it ought not to be pursued at this time to the point of deployment.

All that Senators who are leading the opposition in this issue are saying is, "Look, it is premature to make a commitment to this weapons system. This weapons system could easily involve anywhere from $10 billion to $50 billion."

I know all these estimates and this numbers game can be challenged. This same principle was involved in the C-5-A, on helicopters, on tanks, and so forth. I do not want to get into that. But all I am saying is, "Just do not deploy this system. Do further research and if, after further research, you still think it is good, bring it back and we will look at it again."

All we are really doing is asking for a year's delay in deployment. That is all I believe the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky means—just wait for 1 year before deployment.

Mr. COOPER. That is right.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is all we are asking, bearing in mind the history of the requests from the Pentagon, the enormous cost of Government, and, above all, the very serious domestic budget situation we have, when every day we see the market going down.

Yesterday I spent nearly all day talking about the tax bill. The administration wants the surtax imposed right away, and they do not want any delay about it. The other day, when the President invited some of us to the White House, he had four secretaries of Treasury, present and past, impressing on us the dire situation in this country and the dire need of the surtax. Not once did he or anyone else say they might cut the budget.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator, before he gets off the surtax, I have been glad to yield to him all this time. I do not care to keep the floor indefinitely.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is all right.

Mr. STENNIS. I do have some responses to make as far as the Senator's remarks are concerned.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will stop now, if he wishes.

Mr. STENNIS. So if he could conclude his remarks within a reasonable time, I would appreciate it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will be glad to.

Mr. STENNIS. I am not asking him to stop now.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will either stop now and resume later or make a few more remarks. I do not wish to inconvenience the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. Just a reasonable time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All right. There are different views of what "reasonable" is, but I will try to make my remarks reasonably short.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The point comes back to this, and I submit to the Senator it is a very serious one. In view of all our circumstances, in view of the domestic situation that I have mentioned, in view of the President's own pleading that we enact a tax, and so on, for the control of inflation, which is becoming very acute and tends to destroy the confidence of the people in their own Government, in view of the protests we have had in this country, in view of the history of the last 3 or 4 years, beginning with the riot in Watts, and going to other riots, then finally leading to the protests in our universities, all these are signs of something wrong in our great country.

I know we are interested in trying to make our country as great as it is capable of being. Everyone has that purpose. The only difference among us is as to what it is that is great. Where is the priority? Is the building of an ABM now, as a symbol of our capacity, or a controlled defense budget more important? Are we so threatened by external enemies, in contrast to internal difficulties, that we must put that above everything else?

The delay for 1 year of the deployment of the ABM—that is what this argument is all about. That is important monetarily, but I still think the most important consideration of all is to reestablish the Senate of the United States as a coequal body, as a body that is capable of raising questions of this kind, and capable of making a decision in the face of the kind of influence and power that is represented by the great industrial enterprises of this country, and the Pentagon with all of its tremendous bureaucracy and its influence, all of which I do not criticize as such, but it does relate to whether or not the Senate still is an important body.

Lastly, I say to the Senator from Mississippi that when, as they often do, historians engage in looking at other great countries that have declined, right on back to the classic case of Rome, they find, for example, that the decline and destruction of Rome began with the decline and destruction of the Roman Senate. I only remind the Senator of that because there have been many other instances, also.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, in response, and with all deference to the Senator from Arkansas, the question we had here was really not an issue, just a discussion of whether next Monday we would discuss further the possibility of a vote on this bill. I think I gave my reasons for wanting to continue on this part of the bill, since the Senate set its course and made this amendment the pending measure.

But, Mr. President, I have fully made up my mind that no one could come here and impute bad motives, sinister influences, or anything that infers those things toward the membership of this body with reference to the military program, and go unchallenged. I challenged the Senator from Arkansas when he called us stooges, and I am very glad he apologized for that. But, in words that are a little more respectable, but have the same meaning, he said it over again when he asked, Is the Senate going to submit to military bureaucracy and the hyphenated industrial complex?

I think the Senator ought to prove those charges by something more than his bare, bald statement that he has made here before, and given to the press over a period of months. He ought to prove them with something substantial, other than just his assertion, or withdraw them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. Well, I want to make my point now.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On that point——

Mr. STENNIS. To show just how one Senator, at least, feels toward such assertions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would like to offer just one proof of the kind the Senator has requested, and I refer to the Starbird memorandum, which was itself generated in the Pentagon by General Starbird, submitted to Secretary Resor, and published. If that is not proof of their capacity to organize strength, I do not know what is.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator has, in effect, called names here, and made charges. He has been making them for many months. I say if we submit to things like that without proof, it will get to where a man will be afraid to go on the Appropriations Committee, the Armed Services Committee, or any of the others that has a responsibility to this Nation, of coming in here with what its members think is a sound military program, lest he have to face charges from the Senator from Arkansas—I do not know of any others, but there may be others who make the same charges—that he is base in his approach, that his motives are bad, and that he is serving some ulterior purpose instead of the welfare of this Nation. I am not going to let the membership of our committee, and I exclude myself, be so charged by any Senator, without his being severely challenged. I call on the Senator now to prove some instance of some particular Senator who has had a bad motive in mind when he took a position on these bills.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In the first place, the Senator has completely misrepresented the position I took. I said this is the nature of our country. It is not a bad motive to serve one's constituents.

Mr. STENNIS. I yielded to the Senator, now, for the purpose of giving an illustration, not to make that speech again about the bad motives of the membership.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the Senator completely misrepresents what I said.

Mr. STENNIS. I did not misrepresent anything.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I made no charge of bad motives. I said it is the kind of country we live in. To illustrate, in my own case, I have always supported the poultry raisers of Arkansas, because they are an important industry, and I have gone out of my way to do it. I do not consider that a bad motive. We do not happen to have an electronics industry in Arkansas of any consequence. It may well be if we had, I would have been representing them. This is nothing bad; it is the nature of our democratic system.

Mr. STENNIS. All right; I yielded to the Senator to give an illustration.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator challenged me.

Mr. STENNIS. I ask him to be courteous enough——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me ask the Senator this: What did General Eisenhower mean when, in his last statement, he warned us about the military-industrial complex? Was he charging the Senator with bad motives?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOK

XUM

in the chair). Does the Senator yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I yielded for an illustration only, Mr. President, and I do not yield further just at this moment.

My purpose here is not to engage in debate. I have said what I wanted to say on that point. My purpose is not to engage in a personal controversy. I will respond in the same pattern to anyone else who makes any such assertion.

Our purpose here now is to begin these discussions, that will perhaps lead to a disposition of this matter. I think we have given notice and we will have a good discussion.

I mention one other thing, though, about the President's absence. As far as a personal basis is concerned, I think the sooner the President gets back the better it would suit me. I would like to see him back in the country soon, and I am sure he will be.

But I think, as a very practical matter, no one knows how many votes there are here on each side; but if I were wanting to vote, if it were to my advantage, if I had the votes, I would say, "Vote now." The Senator from Arkansas referred to our previous debates here. When we think we have the votes, we are usually ready to vote; but I do not think this time anyone knows. However, I am willing to vote anyway, after reasonable discussion by everyone who wishes to be heard.

So I think that about covers the point I wanted to make.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Arkansas was not present in the Chamber when the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) and I began our colloquy with the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS); and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER); so I shall repeat something of what was said before.

Senator HART and I offered this amendment for ourselves and many other Senators. Since April 18, 1968, we have worked together on these amendments. So we have believed we had some responsibility to lead the way toward a disposition of this issue. We have had discussion over the past 2 weeks and with other sponsors of the amendment.

I must say that we did not think we had any responsibility at all to make the amendment the pending business until this week. The first week was one for the Senator from Mississippi to explain the bill and to support the different sections of the bill. Last week, as we know, it was impossible to have any rational discussion of the amendment. Senator HART made the amendment the pending business at the earliest date possible—Wednesday of this week.

We have had discussions with the Senator from Mississippi and the majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD. We propose, on Monday, to give notice that the subject of a day certain for voting will be raised in the Senate so that everyone who is interested in the amendment, proponents and opponents alike, may be here to give their views.

I have said that as far as I am concerned, I approve moving toward the vote as quickly as is possible.

I cannot speak for anyone else. I have told the Senate that I understand that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE) intended to have a hearing on Wednesday morning which would bear upon the ABM and that I was sure he would not want to vote until after the hearing.

I want to be open. One of the difficulties that those of us who support the amendment have had in agreeing to vote comes from several factors—and I think I might as well state them—is that some feel, and I must say that I am one of them—that it has been very difficult to secure information from the Defense Department.

I have been able to secure information because I have written time after time to the Secretary of Defense, to Dr. Foster, and the CIA. I must say that I have received information. However, as it is not made public many Senators have not had the opportunity to have the same information.

Mr. President, another development that disturbs many who support the amendment is the statements made before the closed hearing. Statements were made that last minute intelligence had been received just before the closed hearing began. That intelligence was not available to all, and there was no way to answer because one would not challenge the honesty of the Senators. However, we did not have the opportunity at the time to examine and question that at its original source. Since the closed hearings, I have written the Department of Defense for answers on some of the information that was presented. I must say that from those answers one could exercise a judgment one way or the other for they were not definitive beyond judgment.

I have been informed that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) is interested in reported studies in the Defense Department that would throw great light on this issue.

All of these factors made it apparent to me that we cannot agree on a certain date until these questions have been answered satisfactorily.

The Senator from Michigan and I want to bring these issues in the open on Monday.

I do believe that the meeting will be helpful and profitable in the discussion of these matters.

In fairness, Senator HART and I want to be open about these matters.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his remarks. It is always a pleasure to deal with the Senator. I know how earnest he has been in the matter.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his remarks. I think they clarify our motive in suggesting that we have the discussion and indicate to the Senator from Mississippi some of the concern we have had.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to comment further upon the idea of the Senator from Mississippi that I am attributing bad motives to him. I assure the Senator that it does not mean that people who disagree with him challenge his motives.

I can understand that the Senator has different responsibilities because of his committee chairmanship and his long experience and association with the Pentagon and all of that. That is perfectly natural. It affects all of us.

I would not for a moment exclude myself from any of the things I have said, and I did not intend to reflect on the motives of anyone.

I do think it is a fact of life in the kind of country in which we live. We are representatives. We represent in a very real sense the interests of our different communities. In those communities there are diverse and different interests. So, naturally we have different views. And in our minds we are the products of our own experiences. And those experiences include our associations with different people.

We are all the products of every experience we have had in life.

It was the furthest thing from my mind to try to attribute a bad motive to the Senator from Mississippi or to anyone else. However, it is a fact of life.

The other day we had a man named Casey before our committee who, I am sure, is a very reputable lawyer in New York. He has been nominated to be a member of the Advisory Committee on Disarmament. He had formed a committee, of which he is chairman, supporting the ABM. It is perfectly legitimate for him to do so.

He had obtained the names of a great many people—many of whom were very prominent people—among whom were the directors of 11 of the most prominent corporations, all of which have large contracts on the ABM.

There is nothing bad about this. There is not a bad motive intended. Is it not perfectly natural that if one is a director of a corporation which is playing an important part in the production of a great weapons system, he would be interested in it?

I think it is the most natural and human thing in the world that that would happen.

If there is some implication of bad motive in it, I certainly do not see it. If so, I apologize. The word "stooge" was the wrong kind of word to use. It leaves an implication that I did not intend. What I was trying to say was that in a country as rich and big and powerful as ours, we have very great interests growing up. The biggest of all is what we call the bureaucracy of the Pentagon, because there is not any corporation, not even General Motors or General Electric, that has quite the equal in resources of $80 billion. I do not quite remember the resources of General Motors. However, it is large.

This is a tremendous conglomerate of power. I make no point that there is anything bad about it. Every man, so far as I know, in the Pentagon today is doing his duty. I would not for a moment say that General Starbird, when he developed his so-called memorandum which

XUM

was published, was not doing his duty. He was clearly doing his duty as he saw it. He had the responsibility of promoting and selling to Congress and to the country the ABM system. And he put it down in writing, and Mr. Resor, I believe, approved it—one or the other of them approved it. They were both involved in it. It was called the Starbird memorandum.

It outlined and sought to muster together an organization of all of the various influences which are available to the Pentagon and tried to make the sale and get a favorable decision. That is his duty. He was given the responsibility of doing that.

The last thing I want to do is to imply a bad motive to General Starbird. As far as I can see, he is doing exactly what he was told to do by his organization. There is nothing bad about that at all. However, it is a fact of life.

The Senator from Kentucky has no such organization. He cannot write a letter and say to all the great corporations of the country, "will you please get your people together and will you solicit speeches? Will you have them written, and will you write books and will you do this and do that?" All of it is set out in the memorandum. I do not wish to misspeak what is said in the memorandum. But, as a resut of that, we do see books being published. Two books were announced last week, both in support of the ABM. I do not know that the Senator from Kentucky can produce a book against the ABM. He has to use whatever he has in his own mind and what he picks up from hearings, and so forth.

It is true that a large number of independent scientists, none of whom is on the payroll of the Senator from Kentucky, on the payroll of the U.S. Senate, my payroll, or on the payroll of anyone else I know of who is involved in this argument, came and gave their testimony. Many of them are heads of universities that have nothing to do with this. Some of them may have something to do with it, an indirect interest; but whatever they do, it was not on the side of the Senator from Kentucky. It was on the side of the Pentagon. And I admired them.

In any case, I make no point of the motives. This is a matter of judgment, and I think it is perfectly legitimate to point out that in some cases I am not sure that their judgment is not influenced by these things. That is no crime. It is not a sin that you are influenced by your constituents or by your employer or by your own experiences. If you have spent your life in creating electronic devices, I am certain their grows up in your mind a desire always to respond to any challenge. If you are an electronics engineer and someone says to you, "Here is a challenge to you. Do you think you can shoot down a missile that is traveling at 20,000 miles an hour and shoot it down with another missile?" immediately you say, "Yes, I bet I can do that, if you give me enough money and enough time."

It is like the story of the man who said, "Why does a man climb Mount Everest?" And the other fellow replied, "because Mount Everest is there." It is a challenge to him. There is no good reason to do it. I do not think there is any good reason to the ABM, other than that it is a challenge to Dr. Foster and some of his colleagues. They just want to do it. The trouble with that is a practical matter. I have no doubt he can do it in a normal peacetime operation, without interference from external elements such as radiation. I am not at all sure it can be done in an attitude of hostility, where someone is shooting at you with nuclear weapons.

It is like going to the moon. We are very proud of going to the moon. I doubt seriously that it would have been so easy to go, or possibly at all, if some other country was trying to thwart you, was interfering with your communications. I would doubt that it could be done.

I think the Senator from Mississippi misconceives the nature of the argument. I think it is perfectly legitimate to call attention to the fact that some of the arguments made in support of this could be less than objective or free from an interest in the ABM as a weapons system, aside from whether or not it is in the interest of the country or whether or not it is as important as some other priority. Even though it might be good under some circumstances and could be justified, in view of the financial situation of this country, in view of the inflationary pressures, and in view of the requirement for added taxes, is it justified?

This is where I come back to the Senate. I do not think General Starbird or General Wheeler or General X, Y, or Z feels that it is his responsibility—and I do not think it is his responsibility—to weigh such things as inflationary pressures, the budgetary situation, the need for the tax bill, and all the other elements that the Senate should take into consideration.

It seems to me that the Senator from Kentucky and his colleagues in this body have a different function to play from that of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I think that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, under our system of Government, are given a special, restricted responsibility. I make no criticism now, or at any other time, of the Joint Chiefs of Staff discharging their responsibility in the way they see it. I do criticize myself and the Senate for having accepted, for at least the 25 years I have been in the Senate, as an infallible sort of dictate from above, the judgment on all these weapons systems of people like Dr. Foster or the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In this case, Dr. Foster is the principal advocate of these various systems, as I understand it—and, of course, his predecessors. He happens to be the current one. His predecessors had the same role, and their role was to propose weapons systems of any kind they could imagine that might be useful. It is our role to take a look at them, to try to make some judgment as to whether or not they are essential under the present conditions, and to do the best we can.

Speaking for myself—I will leave out everybody else—I have not done my part, I know, in the last 25 years, because I always believed it was hopeless. I was sure that if I made a motion to cut any of these programs, I would not get any votes, because nobody ever had, and so there was no use in trying.

Furthermore, the circumstances did not exist. During much of that time we had what is called the dollar gap. We were too prosperous compared with the rest of the world. We were looking for ways to spend money abroad as well as at home, and nobody raised the question about budgetary matters of any consequence. Now that is all changed, and that is the reason why a number of others and I are raising these questions. I think I have been too negligent too long in coming to a feeling that it is my responsibility at least to have hearings about it in order to give experts in this area an opportunity to express themselves.

I think that is the function that the Senate, peculiarly, has. We have to weigh all these things.

I do not make these criticisms of the Senator from Mississippi, any member of his committee, or the Joint Chiefs of Staff. What I am trying to say is that they have their responsibilities and they play their part, and others play theirs. I do not criticize the big corporations. In the common language of the street, they are doing their thing; they are doing what they are set up to do, whatever they may make. That is all they are doing. But it is our job—and we are sent to the Senate as representatives—to make judgments of the whole, broad spectrum of our policy and to make judgments as to priorities.

With regard to an immediate vote, one other thing that I believe the Senator from Kentucky did not mention is the fact that practically a week has gone by with the moon shot, and everyone's attention has been diverted in watching this great exploit. Whether or not it is very significant, as has been represented, I do not know. History will have to prove that. In any event, our attention has been engaged. The Senator from Mississippi will not deny that our attention has been diverted from the affairs on the floor of the Senate to the moon shot, which has taken out practically a week of the debate that has been in progress.

Mr. President, in order to fortify this question, since it has been raised, it is my understanding that the Starbird memorandum was first proposed with regard to the Sentinel system. It is also my understanding that after it was revealed and discussed in the Washington Post, and comments made here, it was canceled or withdrawn, or whatever is done to a memorandum. Whether another one has been prepared, I am not sure. But I believe that as a result of that it has been declassified and that it would be proper to put it into the RECORD as a part of my comments, because I think it is appropriate to the comments that the Senator from Mississippi made a moment ago in which he asked me for proof of what I had alleged to be a capacity for organization of influence behind a program such as the ABM.

So I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of the so-called Starbird memorandum. While it goes to the Sentinel

XUM

system, I believe the Safeguard is the legitimate heir, by direct descent, of the Sentinel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the memorandum printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Public Affairs Plan for the Sentinel System

1. References:

a. Part No. 1.01, subject: Sentinel System Charter, SSMP, 3 Nov. 1967.

b. DOD Memorandum OASD(PA) 22/1, subject: Sentinel System Public Affairs Plan, 15 March 1968.

c. AR 360–11, subject: Army Information Guidance for Sentinel Program, 23 August 1968.

d. AR 1–20, subject: Administration Legislative Liaison, 26 Jan. 1967.

2. Purpose and scope:

a. This plan establishes guidelines, implements policy and assigns responsibilities for an active public affairs program on a country-wide basis regarding the Sentinel System and the Sentinel deployment program; it sets forth specific DA information objectives and milestones, suggests certain techniques and delineates responsibilities for the planning, execution and evaluation thereof.

b. The provisions of this plan apply to all U.S. Army elements and to all individual industrial firms and civilian contractors participating in the production and deployment of the Sentinel System.

3. Background:

a. On September 18, 1967, the Secretary of Defense announced the decision to produce and deploy a Communist Chinese-oriented ballistic missile defense system. This system will be deployed at 15 to 20 locations in the continental United States, Alaska, and Hawaii. On November 3, 1967, the Secretary of Defense named this ballistic missile defense system the Sentinel System and announced the appointment of LTG Alfred D. Starbird as the Sentinel System Manager (SENSM). Also on November 3, 1967, the Secretary of the Army approved and issued the Sentinel System Charter which, in part, states: "The Sentinel System Manager will develop and, when so directed, assure the timely, effective deployment of the Sentinel System, and will provide a single point of contact within the Department of the Army for the coordination and direction of all activities pertaining to the Sentinel Systems. . . . The Sentinel System Manager, within instructions issued by the Chief of Staff of the Army, will exercise staff supervision over all Army Staff elements and participating organizations of the Department of the Army for planning, direction, and control of the Sentinel program. . . . The Sentinel System Manager will utilize to the maximum extent, compatible with System requirements and within guidance issued by the Chief of Staff, the functional and process oriented capabilities of the Army Staff. . . ."

b. Opposition to the Sentinel deployment decision has arisen and been publicly expressed in three sectors of public opinion: in certain segments of the U.S. Congress, in scientific circles and in citizen/public official interest groups in local communities. Congressional and scientific opposition centers around questions as the Sentinel technical and operational feasibility, cost, disarmament, the international arms race and national priorities and is national in scope. The local interest groups raise these same national questions but also base their opposition to the Sentinel deployment decision on various factors stemming directly from such actions and proposed actions as (1) site selection and validation activities, (2) real estate acquisition, (3) effects of construction on the local environment, and (4) eventual impact of the Sentinel installation and its personnel on the community. Initial adverse reaction from private citizens and local public officials has been the direct results of site validation and acquisition actions which are a necessary prelude to the initiation of construction operations, and are vital to the Sentinel program.

c. The SENSM, in coordination with OCLL and OCINFO, will conduct a public affairs program, on a country-wide basis, to accomplish the objectives established herein.

4. Objectives: The objectives of the program are:

a. To gain public understanding of the reasons for a United States ballistic missile defense (BMD) system oriented on the developing Communist Chinese offensive ICBM nuclear capability.

b. To insure that all sectors of public opinion are fully informed of Sentinel System developments, progress, effectiveness and objectives (within the bounds of national security).

c. To inform the public regarding the reasons for the Sentinel deployment decision, the rationale behind it and why it is necessary and important to obtain real estate for use as Sentinel operational sites in particular geographic areas in implementing the Sentinel deployment decision.

d. To gain the understanding of the people of affected communities by keeping them informed of Sentinel oriented activities in their area. Such information will explain the general methods of site selection and validation, the local and national importance of the site, and the impact of Sentinel-connected activities in the community.

c. To provide timely, factual, and authoritative information by:

(1) Timely release of information on activities which will affect local communities.

(2) Responding to queries for information,

(3) Providing briefings and information fact sheets to members of Congress (OCLL coordination required), local governmental leaders and officials, military audiences, scientific, fraternal, and civic groups and organizations, and representatives of news media.

(4) Preparing informational or educational articles for general news and mass communication media, military, scientific and professional journals that are service-oriented.

(5) Preparing exhibits for showing before appropriate groups.

5. Concept: This program will use a gradual approach to the attainment of the objectives stated above. The thrust of the program will be directed primarily toward explaining the military requirement and strategic concepts inherent in the Sentinel deployment decision. As subordinate but related goals, the program will emphasize that the Sentinel System is specifically designed to meet a strategic defensive military requirement; that it is being deployed in an efficient and economical manner; that it is designed to provide a defense against a possible Communist Chinese nuclear ICBM attack through the late 1970's; (with the capability to continue to deny or at least substantially reduce damage from threats in later years); that it concurrently provides a limited added defensive capability over our Minuteman ICBM sites with the option of improving that defense if needed; that it provides added protection of our population against a possible accidental ICBM launch by any one of the world's nuclear powers; that it will complicate any attack on the United States by the Soviet Union; that its effectiveness in fulfilling its national missions requires the acquisition of Sentinel operational sites in certain selected areas for the emplacement of its missiles and radars.

6. Responsibilities:

a. SENSM will monitor the overall program for CofSA and will be consulted on all substantive implementing decisions or actions.

b. CINFO will:

(1) Serve as the initial DA staff level point of contact and coordinating agent on all public affairs matters pertaining to the program.

(2) Assume for the SENSM overall responsibility for coordination of all Sentinel, public affairs matters with the Army staff, other services when appropriate, applicable Unified and Specified Commands, and OASD(PA).

(3) Provide support and assistance to SENSM, as feasible and appropriate, in implementing the SENTINEL public affairs program.

(4) Arrange speaking engagements, as appropriate, for the CofSA, VCofSA, and senior members of the Army staff to provide opportunities for public explanation of the SENTINEL System.

(5) Establish within OCINFO a Sentinel Public Affairs Coordinating Committee (SENPACC) to provide for periodic review, advice and on-going coordination, development and evaluation of the Sentinel public affairs program. The membership of this committee will include, but not be limited to, representatives from the following commands and agencies: OCINFO, OCLL, Chief of Engineers, ODCSOPS, OCRD, and the Sentinel System Organization (SENSCOM 1.0). The SENPACC will meet periodically on the call of CINFO and submit appropriate analyses and recommendations to SENSM through CINFO.

c. OCLL, DA will:

(1) Provide support and assistance to SENSM as appropriate in implementing the SENTINEL Public Affairs Program.

(2) Provide a representative to SENPACC.

(3) Coordinate with OATSD(LA) as appropriate.

d. ODCSOPS, DA will:

(1) Provide support in those SENTINEL public affairs related to the military requirement and strategic concept of the SENTINEL System.

(2) Provide a representative to SENPACC.

e. OCRD, DA will:

(1) Provide support in those SENTINEL public affairs areas relating to scientific and technical matters or to the Nike-X Advanced Development Program.

(2) Provide a representative to SENPACC.

f. OCE, DA will:

(1) Provide support in those Sentinel public affairs areas relating to Sentinel Systems real estate acquisition and facilities design and construction.

(2) Provide a representative to SENPACC.

g. All elements of the Sentinel System Organization, CONARC, AMC, ARADCOM, and STRATCOM will provide support in those Sentinel public affairs areas germane to their mission and functional areas and as specifically assigned elsewhere in this plan.

h. The basic public affairs responsibilities of CINFO, SENSM, and participating organizations are included in AR 360–11. The SENSM has established as his staff agent for administration of the Sentinel Public Affairs Program the Information Officer assigned as Chief of the Information Office of the SENSCOM. The SENSCOM Information Officer will coordinate all Sentinel public affairs matters for the SENSM and will be the principal point of contact within the Sentinel System Organization on such matters.

i. Within instructions issued by the SENSM the SENSCOM Information Officer may clear and release the information described in paragraph 5.a(3), AR 360–11.

j. Time phases for the execution of the Sentinel Public Affairs Program are established in paragraph 4.a, AR 360–11. Basic responsibilities are with CG, ARADCOM during Phase I (initial briefings of public of-

XUM

ficials), the SENSCOM Information Officer acting for the SENSM during Phase II (prior to IOC) and (with CINCONAD, CINCPAC) during Phase III (subsequent to the IOC of individual sites).

k. The SENSCOM Information Officer will coordinate activities pertaining to visits to Sentinel installations, facilities or sites by representatives of news media or the public during Phase II, and will advise OCINFO directly on appropriate matters, with an information copy of all notifications furnished to the SENSM. CINCONAD and CINCPAC exercise this responsibility during Phase III.

l. Sentinel information release requests will be processed through the SENSCOM Information Officer, who will transmit his recommendations to OCINFO for staffing within the DA, and, as necessary, with appropriate Unified and Specified Commands, and OASD(PA). It will be the responsibility of OCINFO to coordinate all proposed releases with the SENSM. The following schedule will apply:

(1) News releases and photos will arrive at the SENSCOM Information Office not less than 15 working days before the intended release date.

(2) Speeches and films will arrive at the SENSCOM Information Office not less than 25 working days before the intended publication date.

(3) Briefing texts and technical papers will arrive at the SENSCOM Information Office not less than 25 working days before the intended publication date.

m. The following expands upon the statements of responsibilities contained in AR 360–11 only to the extent required to assure accomplishment of all aspects of the total public affairs program.

(1) CG, ARADCOM:

(a) Plan, supervise and execute the SENTINEL public information and public affairs responsibilities assigned in AR 360–11, and assure appropriate coordination with other participating organizations.

(b) During Phase II, submit proposed SENTINEL related public information releases, not previously cleared, to SENSCOM Information Officer for review and appropriate action.

(c) Support and assist the SENTINEL information and public affairs activities of SENSCOM, USAEDH, SENLOG, STRATCOM and SENSEA.

(2) CG, SENSCOM:

PHASES I AND II

(a) Monitor and coordinate for the SENSM overall Sentinel public affairs and public information activities.

(b) Furnish necessary data on Sentinel public information and public affairs matters as appropriate to SENSM and OCINFO, DA.

(c) Review proposed information material to include displays and obtain clearance for its use from the SENSM; OCINFO, DA; and DODOASD(PA) as appropriate.

(d) Coordinate with OCINFO, DA and SENSO proposed information actions involving other military services, i.e., Sentinel System tests requiring Navy or Air Force launched target vehicles or interface with Navy or Air Force operational systems of those under development.

(e) Review and coordinate with OCINFO, DA and SENSO, information plans prepared by major DA commands and agencies.

(f) Coordinate with OCINFO, DA and SENSO appropriate Congressional notifications through OCLL, DA concerning Sentinel information to be released.

(g) Advise SENSM and OCINFO, DA of impending developments in the Sentinel information program.

(h) Provide individuals to brief Members of Congress, public officials, news media representatives and the public as stipulated by SENSM.

PHASE I

(a) Provide CG, ARADCOM with qualified members of the Phase I initial briefing teams as authorized by SENSM.

(b) Assist other DA commands and staff agencies as appropriate.

PHASE II

(a) Conduct Sentinel Community Relations briefings as appropriate.

(b) During Phase II(a) and Phase II(b) monitor, coordinate and assist the community relations activities (AR 360–61) of the Division Engineer, USAEDH, at potential or approved Sentinel sites, as appropriate.

(c) During Phase II(c) plan, supervise and conduct community relations activities (AR 360–61) at approved Sentinel sites.

(d) Review for technical accuracy, security and consonance with SENSM policy proposed information materials submitted by all participating organizations and contractors; submit to OCINFO, DA for clearance as required by references b and c; advise originating agency and OCINFO of changes in the text of the proposed material made during the SENSCOM review.

(e) Conduct other public information and public affairs activities in consonance with the responsibilities of the SENSM as specified herein and in AR 360–11.

PHASE III

Provide such public affairs assistance as may be required to facilitate turn-over of Sentinel sites to CONAD/PACOM and to insure continuity and consistency of Sentinel site community relations activities with ongoing Phase II community relations activities at other sites.

(3) Division Engineer, USAEDH:

PHASES I AND II

(a) Coordinate and supervise the Sentinel information, public relations and community relations activities of Engineer Districts and Divisions.

(b) Submit public information releases concerning Sentinel related engineer activities which contain material or information not previously cleared for publication through the SENSCOM Information Officer for review and appropriate action.

(c) In coordination with SENSCOM conduct, as appropriate, other Sentinel public information and public affairs activities.

(d) Provide individuals to brief Members of Congress, public officials, news media representatives, and the public as stipulated by SENSM.

(e) Provide CG, ARADCOM and CG, SENSCOM with qualified members of the ARADCOM initial briefing team and subsequent SENSCOM briefing teams as required.

(f) Support and assist the Sentinel related public information and public affairs activities of CG, ARADCOM as appropriate.

(g) During Phase II(a) and Phase II(b), in coordination with CG, SENSCOM, plan, supervise and execute Sentinel public information, public affairs and community relations (AR 360–61) activities, as appropriate, in Engineer Divisions and Districts.

(h) During Phase II(c), support and assist the Sentinel public information, public affairs and community relations activities of CG, SENSCOM, as appropriate.

(4) CG, SENLOG: Support and assist the Sentinel information and public affairs activities of ARADCOM, SENSCOM, USAEDH, STRATCOM and SENSEA, as well as other participating organizations, as appropriate.

(5) CO, SENSEA: Support and assist the Sentinel information and public affairs activities of ARADCOM, SENSCOM, USAEDH, SENLOG and STRATCOM, as well as other participating organizations, as appropriate.

(6) Other Participating Organizations:

(a) Plan, supervise and execute appropriate public information and public affairs activities in consonance with DA policy as stated in AR 360–11 and this document.

(b) Support and assist the Sentinel information and public affairs activities of SENSM, ARADCOM, USAEDH and other commands and agencies as appropriate.

(c) Coordinate all SENSM identified activities through the SENSCOM Information Officer.

7. EXECUTION: The SENTINEL System public affairs program will be a responsive implementation of the policy guidance contained in references (a), (b), (c). and (d) as expanded and restated herein.

a. Information Kit. A kit will be assembled and distributed to all commands (to include applicable Unified and Specified Commands) and agencies participating in the Sentinel System Program for use in response to requests for information and to serve as background information.

(1) The SENSM will have the overall responsibility for assembling the kit and for procuring appropriate inputs to it from all commands and agencies participating in the Sentinel System Program and for processing its contents.

(2) The kit will include, but shall not be limited to, the following:

(a) Kit folder.

(b) A fact sheet on the Sentinel System which tells within the bounds of security regulations: What the Sentinel System mission is; what the functions of major Sentinel subsystems and components are; how the Sentinel System will operate; when deployed in CONUS, that Sentinel will be an operational element of CONAD; and when deployed in Hawaii, that Sentinel will be an operational element of PACOM; its defensive coverage area (schematic national footprint chart) and how operational sites are selected, validated and acquired for Sentinel radars and missiles.

(c) A chart showing all commands, agencies, contractors and subcontractors participating in the Sentinel Program together with a capsulized statement of mission or contract requirements.

(d) A listing of Sentinel information milestones as specified herein. (See Inclosure 1 hereto)

(e) Biographies and photos of key service personalities associated with the Sentinel System Program.

(f) Photos or artist-concept sketches of Sentinel missiles, radars, site lay-outs and test or training installations.

(g) Copies of all news releases of national import which have been made on the Sentinel Program.

(h) Copies of major speeches or articles pertaining to the Sentinel System considered appropriate for general distribution.

(i) Copies of major statements or testimony on the Sentinel System made by key DOD and DA personalities.

b. Press Releases.

(1) Press releases will be made when justified by newsworthy Sentinel activities executed in the public environment or by the accomplishment of a Sentinel Information Milestone (see AR 360–11 and Inclosure 1, hereto, for Sentinel Information Milestones). Such releases will normally originate with the Army element or Sentinel contractor or subcontractor having immediate responsibility for or cognizance of the event being reported. Releases will be cleared as required by AR 360–11.

(2) Requests for information about the Sentinel program received from members of the press, radio or television will be met with an affirmative response within security regulations.

c. Magazine Articles: All magazine articles and responses to queries will be processed in accordance with references b and c.

(1) Magazine articles will be prepared by Army staff members or major DA subordinate commanders having operational cognizance

XUM

of the Sentinel Program for submission to military, scientific and professional journals and publications that are service sponsored or oriented.

(2) OCRD will encourage and assist in the preparation for magazine articles on the Sentinel System by civilian scientific or technical writers of national stature.

(3) There will be an affirmative response to specific requests made by representatives of civilian, military and technical magazines for information about the Sentinel System Program.

d. Interviews.

(1) Requests by representatives of national news media to interview senior DA operating officials regarding the Sentinel System will be met affirmatively.

(2) Officials granting interviews will ascertain to the extent feasible the questions that will be asked concerning the Sentinel System by the news media representatives; where questions regarding the Sentinel System are asked which are outside the context of previously cleared Sentinel material, or where an answer to a question would reveal classified information, the official being interviewed will decline to answer. Every effort will be made to anticipate the questions that will be asked by the interviewing reporter; where unclassified Sentinel information has not been previously cleared which is responsive to the anticipated questions, the anticipated question and the proposed answer will be submitted to OCINFO for review and clearance by SENSM and OASD(PA).

(3) Requests by representatives of local or regional news media to interview Army officials concerned with Sentinel activities in their circulation/broadcast area will be met affirmatively. Officials granting such interviews will be guided by paragraph 6.d(2) above, and the provisions of AR 360–5.

e. Speakers Program. An active speakers program will be established. Senior Army personnel associated with the Sentinel Program will participate in this program to the maximum extent feasible in order to explain to the American people the reasons for the Sentinel deployment decision, the strategic rationale supporting the deployment decision and why it is necessary and important to obtain real estate in particular areas for Sentinel operational sites for the System's missile, radars and supporting facilities.

(1) Speech engagements in support of this program for senior Army staff members will be coordinated by CINFO.

(2) Speech engagements in support of this program for senior Sentinel commanders and members of their staffs will be coordinated by major Command Information Officers.

(3) Every effort will be made to interest high-ranking military and civilian personnel within DOD in making public statements in support of the Sentinel, System Program and the Sentinel deployment decision.

(4) OCINFO, DA and major Command Information Officers will maintain a library of quotations and public statements about the Sentinel System and the Sentinel deployment decision for insertion in speeches made by participating personnel.

(5) A standard briefing text with appropriate slides will be prepared by the SENSM, with appropriate inputs from participating commands and agencies and cleared in advance with OASD(PA). The SENPACC will review this briefing text periodically and suggest up-date inputs as appropriate. Copies of this briefing text will be distributed to major DA commands/agencies participating in the Sentinel Program.

f. Exhibit Program. If available, mobile exhibits cleared by OASD(PA) may be used in conjunction with speeches, panels, conventions and symposiums in which the Sentinel System is discussed.

(1) CG, SENSCOM and the Division Engineer, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Division, Huntsville (USAEDH), will coordinate and collaborate on the construction of several mobile Sentinel exhibits suitable for display at Community Relations briefings conducted in local communities in connection with Sentinel site validation, acquisition and construction activities.

(2) Requests for utilization of all exhibits in civilian sponsored fairs, expositions, conventions, etc., will be coordinated by OCINFO with the SENSM and OASD(PA) on a case-by-case basis. (Note: This does not apply to exhibits at Sentinel Site Community Relations Briefings conducted by SENSCOM or USAEDH personnel).

g. Sentinel Site Community Relations Briefings.

(1) SENSCOM and USAEDH will collaborate and prepare a Sentinel Site Community Relations Briefing Text, with supporting slides, which (after appropriate clearance by OASD(PA)) will be used by Corps of Engineers, SENSCOM and ARADCOM personnel in briefing, as appropriate, local governmental officials and citizens groups regarding Sentinel site activities underway or anticipated in local communities.

(2) These briefings will be designed to inform recipient audience groups regarding the reasons for the Sentinel deployment decision, the strategic rationale supporting the deployment and why it is necessary and important in implementing the Sentinel deployment decisions to obtain real estate in particular areas for use as operational sites for Sentinel radars, missiles and supporting facilities, and the operational roles of CINCONAD and CINCPAC after IOC. Whenever briefings are given in Unified Command areas, or in communities adjacent to military installations, the commanders concerned will be notified beforehand.

(3) The briefing text shall also include factual information identifying potential Sentinel sites in or near the local area where the briefing is given, and appropriate comments regarding site acreage requirements, site physical lay-out and functions, anticipated site population data, estimated site pay-roll data, how potential sites are validated and acquired (described entire decision-making process to include Title 10 action required by law), expected or anticipated effects of potential Sentinel sites on local property values, tax structure and payments, schools, sewers, water supply, fire protection, police protection, TV and radio reception, roads, highways, and safety to include its radiation and nuclear accident aspects.

h. Operation Understandings.

(1) CG, ARADCOM will periodically update ARADCOM's Operation Understanding Program to highlight appropriate aspects of the Sentinel decision and its supporting deployment program.

(2) Corps of Engineers Districts and Divisions participating in the Sentinel Program, and SENSCOM, will nominate appropriate citizen leaders and officials from local communities adjacent to potential Sentinel sites to ARADCOM for participation in ARADCOM's Operation Understanding.

(3) CG, ARADCOM will issue invitations to nominated citizens to participate in Operation Understanding as feasible and appropriate.

i. SENTINEL Training.

(1) CG, CONARC will develop a Sentinel Training Public Affairs Plan for implementation at the earliest feasible date.

(2) This plan will be submitted to OASD (PA) for review prior to implementation. (See AR 360–11).

j. Press Visit to National Missile Ranges.

(1) CG SENSCOM will develop, in coordination with OCINFO and OCRD, a Public Affairs Plan supporting a visit or tour by news media representatives to Kwajalein Island or to White Sands Missile Range to witness appropriate portions of Sentinel System tests.

(2) These plans will be submited to OASD (PA) for review prior to implementation (see AR 360–11).

k. Radio/Television.

(1) A program to acquaint service personnel with salient portions of the Sentinel System and the Sentinel deployment decision through Armed Forces Radio and Television will be conducted. CG, USCONARC, in coordination with CG, ARADCOM, will develop a plan to implement this program as part of the overall DA Command Information Program.

(2) There will be an affirmative response by all commands and agencies participating in the Sentinel Program to requests by commercial radio and television for cleared Sentinel newsworthy items to include film clips of missile flights, photos and taped interviews.

1. State officials and Civilian Aides to the Secretary of the Army, state Governors, state Adjutant Generals of the National Guard, Civilian Aides to the Secretary of the Army and other state officials as appropriate will be kept informed by direct mail or by personal visits by senior officers regarding Sentinel plans or activities which will or may have an effect in the respective states or areas of these officials. Specific notifications or briefings of these officials will be as directed and authorized by the SENSM.

m. Local Officials. CG SENSCOM and the Division Engineer, U.S. Army Engineer Division, Huntsville, will coordinate activities to keep local government officials informed as to activities which affect their areas. Cooperating Corps of Engineers divsion and district engineers will maintain liaison with public officials in affected communities to keep them informed of Sentinel-related real estate and construction activities which will impact on those officials' areas of interest.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that I apologize for that word "stooge" or any implication or any other word I used that would reflect on his good faith and good judgment. I think he is discharging his duty and he always has. I have told him on many other occasions in matters which have nothing to do with this matter that the Senator from Mississippi has made one of the greatest contributions of anyone I know of around here. He has been given some very difficult assignments by the Senate, and he has always discharged them with great integrity and judgment.

I hope he knows that there is room for legitimate differences of opinion on this particular system at this particular time and under these particular conditions of our financial situation that afflict the country at this particular time. I do not think the Senator should take offense because we differ on this particular weapons system.

Mr. President, there have been many more occasions on which we agreed than differed in the last 25 years, if my memory serves me correctly. I hope the Senator will understand that there is room for difference of opinion on the ABM.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief statement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's remarks. I want the Record to clearly show that the remark I was taking exception to was saying that the Senator should not submit to the military bureaucracy or the industrial complex.

I really feel kind enough toward the

XUM

Senator from Arkansas personally. I do not feel I was speaking for myself at all. I had made up my mind I was going to speak for the other 98 Senators if these charges were made again. That is the way I feel about it. There are no ill feelings toward the Senator from Arkansas at all.

As much as I can, and with my years of experience, I leave myself out of what he has said. I speak for the other 98 Senators.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With respect to the other 98 Senators, I do not think the Pentagon comes up and says, "Senator X, you do so and so." That is never the way it works.

I say this is characteristic of our country. A Senator is serving an important interest or a friend in an important matter. I confess I am influenced by it. I am very much influenced by rice growers, cotton growers, and poultrymen. I do not lie down and do exactly what they say, but I am influenced by them. They are important elements in my State. We have that kind of representative democracy. The only kind of government which does not have that kind of influence is a dictatorship where there is one man who is not responsible to anyone. We do not have that kind of government. I was seeking to make that plain, and what I think General Eisenhower was calling attention to: The probability of the growth of this kind of influence which he warned us against; that we must be on our guard against the growth of it because it could become so influential.

I was not impugning the motives of anyone. This is the type thing that can occur when there is the growth of such an enormous organization which dispenses so much money in our society. That is all I meant.

I had forgotten to mention another matter, but the Senator has reminded me of it. This has no bearing on that aspect. However, it has been remarkable to me that Senators who were elected last year have the attitude that they do on this question. I think it is significant. I do not know of any of these Senators and I am not being personal, but I think it reflects a feeling that is very widespread in this country. It is made up of very different things: First, the war in Vietnam, probably more than anything else. The great and overwhelming emphasis that has been given the war in Vietnam since 1965. I do not wish to review all of the record about that. I had my part in the beginning of it, of which I am not very proud, as the Senator knows. I was mistaken in my judgment. I think I was misled partly because I had been—what shall I say—complimented by the President and my judgment was a little warped and I did not exercise the judgment I should have been capable of exercising at the time in 1964.

But that is water over the dam. I think these new Senators come here free from past commitments. They come here fresh from the electorate and they look at these things with a fresh look. They are not burdened with some of the old alliances and influences that I and others have. I thought it extremely interesting and extremely reassuring. The most encouraging thing politically about this year is the quality and the intelligence of the men who were elected and who were sworn in last January. I think it is interesting that so many of them look on the ABM in what I think is a very enlightened manner.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I cannot pretend to speak for any Senator except one and that is the senior Senator from Florida. I found out a long time ago that the 100 Senators are very, very different in their points of view. They are different in their experience and in their background. That background helps to make the attitudes of each of us.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas, whom I am happy to call my friend, whom I was happy to support in his resolution of a few days ago after it had been changed in several important particulars to which I called his attention, has a background different from any of us. Certainly, I would expect that background to reflect somewhat in his point of view. My own background reflects mine.

I speak for no one but myself at this time. I came into this debate knowing very little about the subject. I am not privileged to be a member of either the Committee on Armed Services or the Committee on Foreign Relations. I came with somewhat of an inclination to support my President, although he is not of my party, because I knew that he was hoping—and the Nation was hoping—that he would soon begin a difficult confrontation with the Soviets, a summit conference on the question of whether we should have a limitation of armaments.

But I declined to make any commitment, and I stated to the press from time to time that I would make no commitment, until after the Senate had had a closed session and I could have access to classified information to which I had not been entitled up to that time, by reason of the fact that I was not a member of either the Committee on Armed Services or the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I attended very carefully the closed session, which had been requested, by the way, by Senators who oppose the ABM item in this important bill. I must say that I came out of that session not with a feeling that it had raised difficult questions for me and might bring me to feel that opposition to the deployment of the modified ABM was appropriate at this time but, instead, with a feeling that it had done exactly the opposite. I came out of the closed session feeling that the case of the President in asking for the modified ABM system and the position of those who were supporting him was made much stronger because of what we saw and heard in the closed session than it was by what is general knowledge.

With that background, let me say now that it is my very strong feeling that we should vote for the inclusion of the ABM in its modified form. I call attention to the fact that we are asked to vote for it—and it is what the President has asked us to do—as an authorization just prior to his entering a conference with the Soviets at the summit on the important question of limitation of armaments. I have voted for many authorizations which did not find fruition later in appropriations. I have voted for some appropriations based on authorizations made before that time which did not come into full fruition because the money was not actually expended.

What we are talking about now is only the first step in a change of direction from what we voted for last year and the year before last—a system which was primarily designed to protect cities, for what I think is a sounder, smaller program to protect our retaliatory power by protecting a part of our missile strength from destruction in the event we are attacked by forces from outside with nuclear weapons. It is my strong feeling that we would make a very great mistake—a very great mistake, indeed, at this particular time, to withhold this authorization.

I invite attention to the fact that this is only an authorization. Going to the summit conference for the important purpose which will carry him there, the President, under the circumstances now existing, will go either with an authorization, indicating that Congress, speaking for the people are back of him or without an authorization, indicating that there is great difference in our country to the extent that a majority of Congress is against him in that particular.

I think that any of us who have been through many conferences—I do not pretend to have been through any of as great importance as this one, and I do not suppose any other Senator has—but to go there without the assurance given by the facts, given by what has taken place, that his country is back of him is, in my judgment, to send the President there in a very weakened position and one which I do not wish to impose upon him.

Now, Mr. President, insofar as the backgrounds of the various Senators are concerned—and I question the motives of no Senator, and never have—I invite attention to the fact, again, that we are all of a different background.

If I may contrast the very distinguished background of the Senator from Arkansas with the much more modest background of the senior Senator from Florida, the Senator from Arkansas is a Rhodes scholar, he was the president of a university, and he saw at first hand the workings of the parliamentary system in Great Britain. The Senator from Arkansas has admired that system to the extent that he has expressed on this floor what amounts to questions as to whether it is wise—as we do—to separate the executive from the legislative, or whether the British parliamentary system may be a sounder and better system.

The Senator from Arkansas is in all ways a man of peace, a man of learning, a man of science, a man of great understanding—and, if I may say so, a man of very wonderful personality.

From that background he comes to one conclusion. I wish that I could say I have come to that conclusion, but from a very different background. In war quite a while as a young man, in law practice, and in public affairs in my own State of

XUM

Florida as a young man, and also as an older man both in the legislature for a long while, and then as Governor, and now here in the Senate, with entirely different committee assignments and with entirely different interests in many fields of study, certainly not the same interests and scholarship which my good friend has, I come to the conclusion that the practical, commonsense thing is for us to stand back of the President in this authorization.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. First, I, of course, cannot resist thanking the Senator for the implications in his remarks which are most complimentary to me about some of my past activities, although I do not think they are particularly relevant to this point. Let me say one other thing about this present situation. The Senator from Florida left out his own accomplishments. He has had a very long and distinguished career as Governor of his State, as a Senator, and as a public servant in many other ways.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my good friend.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We know that. No man in the Senate is more respected for attention to his duties and the contributions he makes to the Senate in many different ways, in his integrity, and so forth, than the Senator from Florida.

On many occasions, we have been on the same side of controversial issues. The Senator from Florida has always taken the lead in those and has done a very fine job.

But on this particular question, I have had some pretty bitter experience myself in adopting the attitude, "He is our President; therefore, we should follow him." Perhaps that is one of the things which has made me most skeptical about that particular approach. That is the point the Senator from Florida, apparently, really is making.

Mr. President, I felt that way in 1964. In 1964, I went out of my way as much as any man in the Senate to support the then Democratic candidate for President of the United States. I made speeches here and elsewhere, particularly in my own State. I was one of the few office holders in my State who made public speeches and took the responsibility of organizing a campaign in the summer of 1964.

I was chairman of the committee which reported to this body a resolution sometimes called the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. I later found out that that resolution, in my view—and I am more convinced now than I ever was—was based upon false information. It was not directly given by the President. It was given to my committee by his appointees. Of course, I think he has to take the responsibility for it. That was the beginning, in my view, of the greatest tragedy this country has suffered since the Civil War.

Maybe that is part of our background that makes me most skeptical just to say, "Well, the President wants it, so let us give it to him."

That is where I think I differ with the Senator. Perhaps it is because of my experience. The Senator from Florida did not go through that experience. He did not have the same responsibility for it. I doubt, being only one Member of this body, that I could have influenced the outcome in that situation, because it was a highly emotional one. The House of Representatives had voted unanimously for it, and in this body there were only two skeptics. Perhaps that is one of the deciding elements why I do not feel that, because the President wants it, we should give it to him.

I have great respect for the President. He used to be a Member of this body. He used to be a Member of the other body. He has moved from this end of the avenue to the other end. I have great respect for him as a public servant, but I do not think he is infallible.

I differ with the Senator from Florida as to the effect on his representation at a conference, assuming he goes to a conference. I could make as good an argument for the view that we should go there without trying to impress the Russians that we can overcome them, that we are the "big fellow," and we do not want to do anything unless they do this or that. I think it would be more effective if we approached them a little from the standpoint of equality.

I think the Russians suffer from the feeling that we are trying to outdo them; that we are the richest nation—everybody knows that—that we have great missiles—as everybody knows—that we spend at least 25, if not 30, percent more on our defense than they do. This is a psychological thing. The Senator thinks it strengthens the President's hand. I am not sure that it does not make it more difficult to arrive at an understanding, even on that basis.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I say again, I do not question his motives or objectives. I did not in connection with his sponsorship of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. I supported him. We had a long colloquy on it on the floor——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was wrong.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believed everything he told me. I reexamined it the other day. I think all the things he told me were true. They had to do, generally, with the relations of the nations in the Southeast Asia area, if the Senator will look at the colloquy, and not with the question of the soundness of the facts as related to him, and by him to us, as to what had taken place in the Gulf of Tonkin. They had to do more with the relationship of the various nations in that area.

I believe in the Senator from Arkansas, and I have tried to say so, but I do not always agree with him, and neither do I always agree with my President. But when I send my President, as I hope I may be a party to sending him, with every good wish, to confront the Soviets, I want him to have every assurance of support and backing from his own people that we can give him. When I know it is not a final expression we are asked to make, but simply an authorization, and when I know they know that just as well as we do, whether or not we pass this authorization, I want him to go there feeling that he is backed by his own people and his own Congress, and I think they should have the knowledge that he is so backed.

May I say, with reference to this whole question, that I have not blindly supported the President of the United States. The Senator from Arkansas spoke of a President whom we jointly helped elect in 1964. I think the Senator knows, without recounting them, how many times, in my conscience, I opposed that particular President, and I did so, and sometimes strongly. One of them was last year, just before he left office, when he tried to name as Chief Justice of the United States a man who I felt was not of the proper philosophy, as was shown by his own actions upon the high Court. The Senator may not know some of the things visited upon the Senator from Florida because of his position then, but the Senator from Florida did not waver.

So far as his support of the Defense Department is concerned, the Senator from Florida has frequently differed with it. I remember last year and the year before they wanted expensive, big ships to be stationed in various parts of the earth, full of all kinds of implements of war and peace, so that when anything broke out at remote areas of the earth, we could act very quickly. The records of the Congress show I opposed that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was taken out in committee, was it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. When they were trying to build a very impressive and large bomber—I do not remember the name of it, but it was an alphabetical name—the Senator from Florida opposed it. Another time, when they were trying to build an additional nuclear carrier, the Senator from Florida opposed it.

The Senator from Florida has, on frequent occasions, opposed the Defense Department, and he stands ready to do so again. But the feeling of the Senator from Florida at this time is that, if he were going into an argument, confronting our only great potential hostile force in the world, he would want to have the assurance of the backing of his own people, as shown by the vote of the Congress, which represents the people of this country; and the Senator from Florida would not want to send him there naked, and not clothed with that expression of support.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will yield, but may I finish with just one additional comment?

I remember when the question came up on the issue of selective service a few years ago. The Defense Department was begging for an extension. I remember that the Armed Services Committee was begging for an extension. I remember that, finally, after long debate, the Congress extended selective service by one single vote. That was the margin in one House of the Congress. And within a few weeks, Pearl Harbor fell upon us, and we realized how terrible a handicap we would have been under without an extension of selective service.

I think this is one of the issues we may be divided on, just as the Congress was then divided; but I think I am entitled to have a very strong conviction, which I do have in this instance. I promise nothing further, because I may vote against the President next time it comes before us. This is not because he asks for it. It is because he is going to represent the people of this Nation. I think he should go with the assurance of our support and that in giving him that support he will carry greater weight and greater strength with respect to those with whom he will be in difficult contest—and that is what it amounts to when he gets into such an experience as that conference will be.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield——

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator misconstrues the issue. The issue of the ABM goes beyond that conference. We have already had a vote which clearly supports the President on the conference. If the Senator will look at the debate on the Nonproliferation Treaty, he will see that article VI of the treaty commits us to discussions with the Soviets for the purpose of stopping the spiraling of the arms race. That was put in there at the urgent request of the smaller countries who were parties to the treaty. It was put in as article VI of the treaty itself. We discussed it in the committee. I discussed it on the floor. The vote for it was overwhelming. I think 80 Members of this body voted to advise and consent to the Nonproliferation Treaty.

That is the vote which is relevant to the President's going to a conference with Russia.

This issue is on just one item in a military bill, which, it seems to me, is utterly irrelevant to the President's discussions on armaments.

If the Senator wants to take an item which is more relevant, it would be the question of the MIRV. Much was said about it in the hearings before our committee. It was revealed that that is a far more dangerous weapon and much more likely to disrupt a conference. I refer to our proceeding with MIRV.

I could make a far better argument, I think, if we want to strengthen the President and place him in a position they could not challenge, for laying on the table the fact that we have MIRV, that we have MIRV-ed our weapons, and that we are absolutely invulnerable because of our strength.

I do not think that is really the way to approach a conference, if we are serious about seeking an agreement with the Russians. I would say that the ABM is of little consequence. The Russians have tried an ABM. They started to deploy one. They got it half way in, and they discovered it was a bad deal and quit deploying it. This is the information we had, and the Senator knows we had it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I listened to the information in the closed hearing. It was not entirely to that effect.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I beg to differ with the Senator. That is as far as you could go in reading anyone's mind. This was the conclusion of the intelligence community, that they had stopped and were not proceeding, and what they are doing is what we are saying we ought to do now, which is only to conduct research on it. They are not proceeding to deploy.

One thing that is very difficult to deal with is when the proponents of deployment get up and say, "The Russians have an ABM. Shouldn't we have?"

What the Russians have is absolutely nothing like what is proposed here. It is around only one city. If anything, it is like Sentinel, which we have abandoned, which was designed for the protection of a city. But they got it halfway up and decided it was a bad deal, and they have stopped deploying it. That is the uncontroverted testimony of the Chairman of the United States Intelligence Board. We had this information before we even got into this controversy over a year ago, when this matter came up with regard to the Galosh system.

They are not proceeding to build it because they know it needs further development, and maybe they cannot make it work at all; they do not know. That is the only rational conclusion one can draw from what they have done.

I do not see how the Senator thinks this would be a vote of confidence in the President. If any vote could be that, it was the vote on the nonproliferation treaty, which has a specific article on this subject. This is simply one item. I suppose, one could pick out any item in this bill and say a vote for it is a vote of confidence.

Why is it? I cannot understand the Senator's point that if we should vote not to deploy, but simply to go ahead as the Senator from Kentucky suggests, it would be interpreted abroad as a disavowal of the President. I think that is an absolute non sequitur. I do not think anyone would interpret it that way, and certainly not the Russians, because they know what an ABM is, even if we do not. They know how faulty it is. If they did not, why did they not proceed to put it in, not only around Moscow, but around Leningrad, Kiev, Irkutsk, and so on? Obviously because they have not been able to make it work up to this time, and there is grave doubt whether they can.

I have no purpose of disavowing the President, if and when he goes to meet with the Russians.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure the Senator does not, but there are Senators who think that to agree to the amendment would weaken the President, and the Senator from Florida, for one, is very strongly of that feeling.

I ask the Senator to go back with me a little bit. I think, in the first place, we here in this country are not as cautious as we should be in our dealings with the Russians. I hope that they are frank this time. I hope that the fact that Mr. Gromyko has indicated that they would like to have this conference for arms control may be taken at face value. But my memory goes back to some things that make me a little more cautious than I would be otherwise, and I am a little bit inclined to be suspicious and cautious, and I make no apology for so being.

I remember that we thought we had an assurance from the Russians that they would not explode a nuclear weapon in outer space, and we woke up suddenly to find that they had done so, and that they had secured information which we wished we had, and which we cannot get because we are, of course, conforming to the later treaty on that subject.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. May I say that was not a treaty.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I finish my point on this matter?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Just as a point of——

Mr. HOLLAND. May I please finish my point?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was not a treaty. That is the only point I wish to make. There is no such treaty.

Mr. HOLLAND. I supported the Senator in his nonproliferation treaty, and was glad to do so. I thought it was the patriotic thing to do so, just as I think now that in order to give our President the greatest strength and the greatest showing of unity at home, we should support him in this request, which comes from the Armed Services Committee on a perfectly nonpartisan and bipartisan basis.

I remind the Senator that not only did the Russians completely breach their agreement with us with reference to the explosion of a nuclear body out in space, but that this same man, Gromyko, when the Russians had transported some of their great weapons, some of their long-distance missiles, into Cuba, and they were installed there, and the President had on his desk the picture taken by some of our people in the Air Force showing that the missiles were there, and right where they were, this same man, Gromyko, came into the office of President Kennedy and told him that this was all a pipedream, that Russia had not sent any of its missiles to Cuba.

The Senator well remembers that, because I think he was close to that situation as the distinguished chairman of our highly distinguished Committee on Foreign Relations, I am sure that he knew all about that, and he knows of the rather atrocious misstatement made by Mr. Gromyko to our late, beloved President John F. Kennedy.

Then I remember that, though they were committed by treaty to give us access to Berlin, that they forgot all about that commitment, and we had to go through the very expensive but very effective airlift program, to show that even though they did violate it, we did not propose, because of a few million dollars, to abandon the people of Berlin on our commitment to them and to our allies in Europe.

Knowing these things, it seems to me that we would appear rather naive, that we would appear over optimistic, that we would appear over credulous to the Russians and to the world if, at this time, we took at face value—though I hope that later we can take it at face value—the assurance of Mr. Gromyko that they want to limit arms. We all know how badly we need to curtail the arms race, and I think Russia needs just as badly to curtail it; perhaps they need it more than we do. I think we would look very naive indeed, however, if we took the fact that he has approached us on this subject as a sort of assurance that the difficult objective was going to be worked out, and that therefore we were going to abandon what we had already entered into as a program to protect our retalia-

XUM

tory strength—not to make an offensive gesture of any kind, but in order to defend, if we needed to make use of them, the continuing availability of our weapons up in the areas of our Midwest where they are in place.

Mr. President, I feel so strongly about this issue that I felt that I should place this statement in the RECORD at this time. I am not prepared to discuss now, though I have read a great deal on the matter, the scientific questions that are involved. But those questions have been adequately discussed. I simply wish to bear down on this one point: that I think we would make a great mistake to leave the Nation with the feeling that we did not propose to support our President on this first step—and that is what this is—that as far as the modified ABM is concerned, and that we did not propose to support him just prior to the time that he goes away to this all-important conference. I feel that we should do so, and I do not think I need to remind my distinguished friend that I have very frequently opposed the Presidents, not just this President—though I have not had much chance to oppose him yet, because he has not asked for much that has come to the floor as yet—but I have frequently opposed my own Presidents, if one can so speak of those who belong to the party to which he and I both belong—and I opposed the previous President of the other party, under whom I had the privilege to serve together with the Senator from Arkansas.

I do not feel an obligation to support everything they ask for, and never expect to do so. But I feel that in this instance, whether he had asked for it or not, we should arm him with the additional assurance that his Nation is behind him and his Congress is behind him; that we are taking this first step, an authorization step only, on a program designed to protect our retaliatory power.

There is no crime in protecting our retaliatory power. There is no offensive action of any kind in doing that. I think we should begin on that path at this time.

I thank my friend the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for his patience. He knows how I feel toward him. I have shown that frequently by what I have said and how I have voted on the floor of the Senate.

I think the Senator is wrong in his conclusion at this time, although from the best of motives. I think he is entitled to know what my decision is, why I have made it, and why I feel the President will be a much stronger advocate of what we want him to stand for when he goes to have a summit conference with the Russians if he goes with the knowledge not only of himself and the Russians, but also of the world, that his Nation stands behind him in the beginning of an effort to protect our retaliatory power so that always we need not fear destruction at the hands of one who tries to destroy us by nuclear weapons.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have a few words to say in response.

There are a number of points that the Senator raises. I would be more than willing to cosponsor, sponsor, or vote for a resolution which in no uncertain terms states that we are behind the President in his efforts to reach some agreement on the limitation of armaments and so forth.

As I say, I consider the vote on the nonproliferation treaty, which contained article VI, to be just such a vote. I feel that this is just a weapons system on which there certainly is great doubt.

The Senator will agree that when we take the testimony of the scientists—and especially if we take into consideration those scientists who were the advisers of the previous Presidents, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, who are not now in the employ of either the Pentagon, the Government, or a contractor—and put it against the others, it is very impressive. I think that there is doubt about the state of the art at the present time.

As to the retaliatory strength that the Senator has mentioned, we have the weapons. There is no question about the number of weapons we have in place at four different locations: the Minuteman in silos, the Polaris in the submarines, the Poseidons in the Polaris, and the weapons at airports and even abroad.

The deterrence grows from the belief on the part of the Russians that we will use them. The way they were designed and the way they will operate as deterrents is that when our radars and satellites indicate the Russians are attacking, they will be released and destroy them. This is the whole theory of deterrents. It works now. It will work in the future.

In my opinion, I do not believe the ABM is relevant to the proposed conference with the Russians in any substantial way.

The question is whether we will use them. I think we will. They understand that; we understand that.

What we are going for now is—and it is the purpose of the conference—that we cease to escalate and cease to spend all of our money, or so much of it, on both sides for this nonproductive instrumentality known as nuclear weapons.

All we are doing in creating MIRV and ABM is stepping up an arms race and doing exactly the opposite of the purpose of the conference.

With reference to the conference—and I do not believe I am naive about it—I think it is very dubious that we will get any results, because I think there is great question about our credibility in really meaning to go forward with a restriction on the number of armaments because we are now making the decision to put in ABM. We have already begun the MIRV. Contracts were let and publicly announced a week or two ago for the deployment of MIRV.

Many of our best authorities have said that this is a more significant thing than the ABM because once we get the MIRV in operation, it is very difficult to find out what is going on by means of satellite or any other means.

There is no reason to be very optimistic about it. That is another reason, it seems to me, that we can agree this is not likely to promote an agrument. I am not so optimistic when it comes to getting an agreement. I would like to get an agreement. However, in the meantime, I do not want to spend all of our money on this.

Actually, with respect to the Senator's point of view about supporting the President, the day before yesterday the President had a large number of Senators and Representatives at the White House at 8 o'clock in the morning. And the present Secretary of the Treasury and his three predecessors were there.

What was he talking about? The ABM? No. He was talking about the surtax and its importance.

I would say that a vote against the surtax would be perhaps a more significant disavowal of the President than a vote against the ABM. At least the President gave the surtax far greater prominence in his efforts at prevailing upon the Senators. There were more Senators and Representatives present to listen to his very fervent pleas for the surtax than he has ever had present concerning the ABM.

Am I going to be in a position to say, "I can't vote against the surtax because it would be a disavowal of the President and he would go abroad without the full support of his Congress." Surely, to me the surtax is just as relevant to the purpose of the conference as is the ABM.

I do not think the ABM is so significant to the Russians one way or the other.

They know it is a rather insignificant thing. What I am really interested in is not going down the endless road of pouring our money into weapons systems which serve no useful purpose. We have serious matters to consider, and I agree with the President about inflation and the surtax.

The only criticism I made about his presentation at the White House with his people was that he spoke only about taxes, nothing about cutting the budget. I think that budgetary matters are as important as taxes. But that is another subject. I raise it at this point merely to say that the President himself has given, within the last 2 weeks, greater attention to persuading us of the necessity for a surtax than he has for the ABM. I think the ABM, even from his point of view, is merely another item in the overall program which his new Secretary of Defense, because, I am sure, of his feeling and his duty, is urging upon the President.

But I do not believe the President thinks at all that the ABM is as significant as the Senator from Florida thinks it is to support him. If it is support, and that is all it is, I would be more than willing to submit a resolution of support, backing the President 100 percent in his efforts in Moscow, if that is all it would take to satisfy the Senator from Florida on that point. If he has some other point, that is another matter. But I would have no hesitancy in backing the President in that way.

I do not believe there is a relevant connection between the ABM and backing the President in his conference on the limitation of armaments. Some persons have already said that the ABM is a de-

XUM

fensive weapon. Why should the Russians particularly care about it? I do not think the Russians particularly care. In the first place, they know it will not work. Second, it would be expensive. It would weaken us to divert money to the ABM, which is useless, instead of procuring more MIRV's or Poseidons, which are more dangerous. I think the Russians would be glad to have us proceed down this futile path.

It has been suggested that we ought to go all out in the arms race because the Russians will go bankrupt before we will. That argument has been suggested by some columnists and others who think that we cannot make an arrangement with the Russians anyway. They make the argument the Senator has made, that the Russians cannot be trusted.

They call attention to the fact that the Russians exploded a nuclear weapon before we did. Actually, that was not under a treaty. They had made no formal agreement; it was a tacit understanding which they broke. I do not think the Senator was correct in saying that there was a treaty—in other words, a formal agreement. It was what might be called a gentlemen's agreement, although that might not, perhaps, be appropriate in this connection.

I dislike to be in a position of trying to defend the Russians. They have done many things of which I do not approve. I think they have made many mistakes. I do not approve of their having gone into Czechoslovakia. I think it was a great mistake on their part. But I must say, also, that I did not approve of our intervention in the Dominican Republic in violation of treaties. We had made treaties with Latin American countries at Rio de Janeiro and other places, in which it was said in no uncertain terms that we would not intervene in those countries—the Senator knows that—but we did intervene directly against those treaties. So I do not like to use that type of action.

I think that big countries, when they feel that their interests are threatened, rightly or wrongly, and mostly wrongly, intervene.

I certainly do not approve of the misrepresentation about Cuba, but neither do I approve of the misrepresentation about the Gulf of Tonkin to my committee.

Surely, the Senator does not take the position that we are the only good people and that we have never gone against any of our treaties—going back to the Indians or anybody else. The Senator will not approve of the way we treated the Indians. The Senator will not approve of the way we treated the Filipinos after the Spanish-American War. I do not approve of it; I do not think history approves of it. I think we were absolutely without justification. It was a cruel and barbarous thing to do, after we had cooperated with Aguinaldo and then turned upon him and destroyed him.

But those are things that big countries have done, and I do not think any of us are without fault.

I am not trying to defend the Russians and say they are good people and we can trust everyone. The only purpose in having a conference with them is that their interest in this instance coincides with ours. We did make a treaty with them in the Antarctic. There was a great deal of opposition. I believe 30 Senators voted against it. To my knowledge—and we inquire from time to time—the Russians have abided by it to the letter, to this day, because their own interest coincided with ours. It was a good treaty. So far as I know, they have abided by the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, as well as we have. Both of us, I think—I know we did—inadvertently allowed a little to escape in our underground testing. I do not think it was intentional, and they have made no point of it, nor have we in their case. I think we all are subject to making mistakes or doing things we should not do.

Now, that has nothing really to do with this. What it comes back to on the ABM, the point I am trying to make, is that in all good faith I think the Senator, to some extent, misconceives the relevance of the ABM to the support of the President. I do not want to weaken the President; I do not think it does weaken him; and I am willing to do whatever the Senator thinks appropriate, other than this type of thing, to support him, if the Senator thinks it is necessary. I do not think it is necessary. I believe that the vote of 80 Senators on the Nonproliferation Treaty, with article 6 in it, is all the backing the President needs from this body to go to Moscow with the full assurance that they know he is speaking for us when he makes a proposal to limit armaments.

On the contrary—and I will end with this—I think that in proceeding with ABM and with MIRV, we are guilty to a degree of talking out of both sides of our mouth. On the one hand, we are saying we want to limit armaments. On the other hand, we are proceeding with both the MIRV and the ABM.

This is a characteristic which has been much in the public eye. The Senator knows about what was called the credibility gap and how it afflicted the last administration to the point that people felt there was a degree of talking one way and acting another. I do not like it. I think it destroys the faith of our people in their own Government. I believe this is bad.

If we are really serious about this negotiation, if we really mean to try to get an agreement, to be consistent with that I think we should, as the Senator from Massachusetts has so well put it, have a moratorium on the MIRV, and we should suspend the ABM at least until after the conference. I think that logically we could be accused of saying: "You voted 80 to 16, or whatever it was, to say we will proceed to a conference, and you turn around and begin to deploy ABM's and MIRV's. So you are speaking one way and acting another."

As our Indian friends, who had so much experience with us, said, "The white man speaks with a forked tongue"

And I think we could be guilty of it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

I just want to make it clear that, so far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he thinks that the authorization to proceed with the ABM is a necessary ingredient of our effort to remain strong. The Senator speaks of how strong we are. It is a defensive effort to make sure that we have the retaliatory force not only to defend ourselves but also to wipe out an opposing enemy, if we have to, if we are first attacked. No real criticism can be made of a nation that tries to protect its power to defend itself.

The Senator knows full well that so far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he has not been summoned to the White House, he has not talked with the President, and he has not talked with the Secretary of Defense. He has been forced, so far as his information about classified material is concerned, to rely upon the closed session, at which he heard a great deal, and it made him feel that there was a good case made for the authorization of the ABM.

I want to make it very clear, also, that the Senator from Florida has not been approached by anybody of the industrial-military complex to which the Senator has referred; but he has been approached by his own people, who did not know how he was going to stand. I had a count made of my thoughtful letters—from my own people the other day, and they were practically 3-to-1 in favor of the ABM, some 1,500 to 500. Many of them take the position that since it is a purely defensive effort, they feel that by all means it is necessary to help us preserve our strength. And that is what it is for.

I hope the Senator will not mind if I tell him a little story about something that happened to me many years ago. The Senator will recall that shortly after World War I, we used to have Armistice Day celebrations every November 11. The Senator from Florida, as one who had taken part in that war, was called upon at times to make speeches on Armistice Day. He recalls one that he made at the fine little city of Arcadia, Fla.

The host there was the preacher of the Methodist church, the largest place of meeting in the city, who later became a very distinguished bishop of the Methodist church. His name was John Branscomb, and I am certain that the Senator will recall him.

After the Senator from Florida had completed his speech, the customary type of speech made in those days about Armistice Day, about the efforts to make the world safe for democracy, about our having successfully fought a war to end all wars, and then with something about preparedness thrown in for good measure, we were all talking in front of the church. The preacher, who was a dear friend of mine, the Reverend Branscomb, said:

> Well, Judge Holland—

I happened to be a judge at that time—

> I want to tell you that I thought you made a fine speech, except the part about preparedness. I don't believe we ought to stay militarily prepared. I don't believe we ought to arm. I believe we ought to be peaceful.

I questioned that very mildly and finally we both turned to an old friend who was standing by. His name was Dr. Aurin. He was the dean of all doctors in south Florida at that time. As a young man he had fought in the Spanish-

American War as a cavalryman. Brother Branscomb said:

> What do you think about it? What is your judgment?

Dr. Aurin said:

> I have been here a long time. I was here in the days when there was much disorder here every Saturday night. The cowboys would come to town and the Indians would come to town and there would nearly always be a fight, there would nearly always be a shooting, and there would nearly always be all kinds of scraps. One of the things I noticed was that when a man came to town with a six shooter strapped to his hip where everyone could see it, nobody ever picked a fight with him.

That ended the discussion. For years I was good friends with Brother Branscomb. We both became trustees of Florida Southern College. He would frequently recall that incident.

I think that to have the ABM is to have a pistol on our hip where it is available and where all the world knows it is available; and we have the striking strength, if the need comes to strike back, so we can demolish anyone that has the effrontery to attack us. It is not an offensive effort; it is a defensive effort.

I want the Senator to realize that those who would confront us may honor us the more if we try to move from a position of strength rather than from a position of relative weakness.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In his last phrase, the Senator made reference to "relative weakness." That, I think, might be the key to the entire matter. The relative weakness is utterly inappropriate to our situation. I realize the Senator is not on our committee, and he could not possibly have heard the testimony from official witnesses about our relative strength and have any idea that we are relatively weak. We are relatively very powerful. There are many ways this can be judged.

In the first place, there is no question, according to people in authority, that we are spending at least 4 to 3 in purchasing dollars. This is translated by the best authorities as the purchasing power, not the number. We went into the matter in great detail.

I asked, "How do you estimate what the two countries are spending?" Of course, we have twice as much productivity as they have and they may be spending a little more of their GNP percentagewise, but we are spending far more in purchasing power.

Mr. HOLLAND. Our wages and living costs are vastly more than theirs.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am sure the Senator is being misled if he believes that. This is the very thing we asked the Director of the CIA to translate for our committee. Taking into account the cost of living, the cost of materials and everything else, he comes up with a ratio of 4 to 3, which is considerably more. We have these weapons, sufficient to destroy all of Russia several times over.

I beg to suggest that the analogy of the six shooter on the hip with hydrogen bombs is not appropriate. The days of six shooters, and rocks, and slingshots is gone. There was a different concept then. We are talking about nuclear weapons.

Nuclear weapons translate into hydrogen bombs which can utterly demolish a country. At the same time, they are piled up far beyond the capacity to destroy them completely, far beyond anything in the Soviet Union.

I also call attention to the fact that the ABM is not intended or designed to do anthing about protecting the *Polaris* submarine or the weapons in airplanes. It is only designed, even if it were effective, for the Minuteman. So you have all these Poseidons, and more than enough to destroy the whole Soviet Union.

The Senator is talking about only one aspect. If there is only that insignificance, why does the Senator oppose it? I am absolutely convinced we have more weapons than they have. We could destroy them. The deterrence is there. The best people in the military will confirm that, except when they are trying to make a sale on the ABM.

The Senator said that his constituents favored the ABM 3 to 1.

Mr. HOLLAND. 1,500 to 500.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is the result of the kind of misleading advertising and polls that I referred to. There have been polls in full-page ads. The question is: "The Russians have an ABM to protect them; wouldn't you like to have one?"

If that is not a loaded question, I do not know what is. Anyone who knows nothing about the ABM would say, "Sure, the Russians have it; we should have it also." This is the type thing which creates an impression.

Mr. HOLLAND. Has the Senator seen the page-long ads of the opponents of the ABM? I have.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have seen some of them, but they are very few compared to the others.

We had a Mr. Case before our committee the other day. He is the chairman of a committee which took a poll. The question was: "The Russians have the ABM to protect themselves. Don't you think we should have one?" How could anyone who has not heard anything about this help but say "Yes"? It says nothing about the facts. There is not a word in it that is factual at all. This feeling has been created by this very sort of thing which I mentioned a while ago. It is a good illustration of the military-industrial complex, because among the sponsors of that advertisement were representatives of 11 of the biggest contractors in the country, companies like General Electric, IBM, and so on. The directors of those companies pay for such ads.

As I have mentiond, they are putting out books. Mr. Herman Kahn of the Hudson Institute is publishing a book that I am sure will be spread all over the United States. I do not know who will pay for it, but undoubtedly it will be plenty of people. The $80 billion in the Defense budget is such an enormous amount of money that no one can conceive of it.

The Senator says we have to be strong. Nobody has ever been as strong as we are.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator was present in the Chamber during the closed session the other day, was he not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator knows that neither he nor I can reveal the information disclosed there, but with respect to nuclear submarines does the Senator remember that information?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, I remember the reference of our having 41. It is not secret. It has been in the newspapers.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator remember the information about the ones they are constructing?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, they are building submarines, but we are doing it, too, and we can build them faster and we will if we need them. It was only a few days ago that some of our people thought we have so many more than we need that they are thinking of retiring 10. We can destroy Russia 10 times over and some of the more thoughtful people said, "Why should we keep this up at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars?"

This brings me to one further point. I do not wish to belabor my argument with the Senator. If we have to build everything that comes up, there is no limit—we are already outspending them—unless one assumes we are more stupid than the Russians. We are doing lots more than they in the way of defense. I do not think we are stupid. I think our industrialists are more competent and efficient. There is no way to accept that result. We are already strong enough.

When the Senator refers to a position of strength in which we should go to this conference, we are in a position of strength.

I think we run a risk, by continuing to build the MIRV and ABM, of destroying credibility and creating a situation in which the Russians and everybody else will say, "The Americans are not serious about this. They talk one way and act another way."

But we want to negotiate by proceeding with MIRV which is the most dangerous development since the hydrogen bomb itself.

Mr. HOLLAND. Are not the Russians proceeding with a similar three-headed monster of their own?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But we were proposing that we stop. Everyone agrees, I think, that we are ahead of them insofar as the rate of development and the place of development are concerned. The Committee on Foreign Relations held a hearing with three or four of the best scientists we have. They said that MIRV is the most dangerous new development in the sense of preventing an agreement, because it cannot be supervised or—that is not the right word——

Mr. COOPER. Observed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Observed. In other words, we cannot tell what the other parties are doing. That is why we wanted to have a hearing. We had one. It was a good one.

When we go to the extent of proceeding with MIRV, under these circumstances, we are setting the stage for a failure in any conference. I do not think by threatening people, by saying we are coming in with twice as many weapons, that we are likely to create an attitude or an atmosphere in which we would get any agreement. If we want to sabotage that matter, that is one way to do it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not agree with that last statement at all. I think, to the contrary, if we do not proceed with an authorization, which is the first step only of this project, that the very reasonable conclusion for the Russians to reach is that again we are showing we are a bunch of saps, that we believe everything they say, that we are naive, because Mr. Gromyko comes this time to say that, "We sincerely want to limit armaments, so let us have a summit conference," and we regard that as already completed.

I think that we should go to the conference and do everything in our power to bring it out to a successful conclusion, but I do not believe that we will do it by the overoptimistic approach under which we would abandon what we were beginning to do, simply on the strength of his having said that we want to do thus and so. We have seen enough of him heretofore to know that he talks out of both sides of his mouth.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is not new. That was a conciliatory speech. This proposal for negotiating on arms limitations was made nearly a year ago. The preceding administration was seriously getting ready for a conference at the time of Czechoslovakia. We suspended it then and the preceding President—I happen to know from my own knowledge, because the last time I saw him was on this very question—asked me if I thought it was wise to proceed with negotiations with the Russians on arms limitations. That was in the early part of December. I said, so far as I could see, it was. It is my understanding, but this is secondhand, that subsequent to that the incoming administration vetoed the idea. But the Senator should not imagine all of this to be some devious idea of Gromyko's in his speech the other day. This matter has been underway for over a year.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that, but I know that the recent hope and the recent effort stem from the statement made by Mr. Gromyko. The Senator knows that that is true. It is not the first thing on this negotiation——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator spoke of the preceding President. Does the Senator take the same position that he does with reference to the ABM?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know about the ABM. I have not talked to him about that. I am talking about negotiations. The Senator brought in the question of negotiations.

Mr. HOLLAND. The press states that the preceding President has exactly the same conviction that the present President has.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With all deference, that is not persuasive with me.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thought the Senator was relying upon the preceding President.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, no. The Senator was talking about the Gromyko speech. In all fairness, I do not think that because he made a conciliatory statement, that we should make the argument that he is double dealing in order to proceed. On that theory, then they could condemn us.

But I do not attach that kind of condition to the speech he made. One of his main points was that he would like to have better relations with us and maybe we should exchange some Senators and Representatives to come over there. I do not know what he has in mind, in the long run. But we should try to eliminate expenditures and I said I do not think it was a wise policy to spend each other into bankruptcy. The real reasons the Russians want a conference is the reason I want one; namely, to quit breaking ourselves by spending our money on nonproductive enterprises. I think the demands by my constituents for sewer projects, water projects, roads, jobs, and so forth, are so great that this is a foolish and very irrational way to proceed—that is, to continue to spend our money in this way.

I am confident that the Russians feel the same way. They need money as badly as or worse than my constituents. This is ultimately the most persuasive reason not to continue an unlimited arms race.

Mr. HOLLAND. Again I appreciate the candor and always the motives of my distinguished friend, but it seems to me that we would be extremely naive to change our plans. The reason we require this new authorization at this time is that we are changing our plans for a cheaper program and for a clearly defensive program. I think just to change those plans on the eve of sending our President over there is not strong but weak.

It is for that reason, among others, that I want this project to be approved.

Now, Mr. President, one more thing. One of my friends from Virginia has sent me a fine editorial from the Daily Progress, published in Charlottesville, Va., an editorial on Tuesday, July 22, 1969, entitled, "Senator Byrd's Warning."

I have read the editorial, as it quotes from the Congressional Record, with a great deal of appreciation. I have read the comments made by the editorialist on that warning of our distinguished colleague from Virginia with a great deal of appreciation also; and I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Byrd's Warning

Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr. of Virginia had a great deal of common sense packed into a speech he made to the Senate last week in support of a $20 billion Defense Department authorization for military weapons and research and development.

First off, Sen. Byrd declared his support for a reduction in the $23 billion authorization sought for the Defense Department by President Johnson before he left office. The Nixon Administration reduced this by $1 billion and the Senate Committee on Armed Services, of which Sen. Byrd is a member, cut out another $2 billion.

Sen. Byrd supports the $20 billion authorization now proposed and in doing so he warned those who would curtail the nation's strategic offensive capability.

"All of us would like an end to the arms race," said the Virginia senator.

"All of us would like to devote to more constructive purposes the money being sought for weaponry.

"But the day that those objectives can be accomplished is not yet here—nor does it appear imminent.

"For the foreseeable future a strong military posture remains essential to our national survival.

"We cannot take a chance on just what might be the intentions of other nations.

"Hours of discussion have been consumed on the floor of the Senate as to the intentions of the Soviet Union, as to whether it intends to seek a first-strike capability against the United States.

"Frankly, I do not know just what the intentions of the Soviet Union are, nor, I submit, does any other member of the Senate. Nor does the President, nor the Secretary of Defense, nor the Central Intelligence Agency.

"In recent years, the Soviet Union has greatly increased its offensive capability. The Soviet Union is continuing to increase its offensive capability. The Soviet SS–9 missile has the capability of knocking out a U.S. missile site. It is our strong offensive missiles upon which we rely to deter any nuclear aggressor.

"The entire strategic concept upon which the United States has been relying to avert a nuclear war is that the United States be so strong that any foreign power deploying missiles against us would know that we could retaliate by destroying him who struck the first blow.

"Today, we are in such a position. But we must constantly be on the alert. These major weapons systems have a long lead time. We must legislate today for four and five and six years hence. We cannot let down our guard—not until the day, not yet discernible, when effective arms control agreements can be reached."

These are not pleasant words to hear or read but they are comforting to the extent that they face up to hard facts and the price the United States must pay in today's world. Once the nation learns to accept a burden that it must shoulder despite its natural reluctance, the stronger our national security will be. In today's world we cannot afford to drag our feet, to take chances or to make educated or uneducated guesses as to what our potential enemies intend to do.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR McINTYRE ON MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Fong) on Monday next, under the order already agreed to, the able Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McIntyre) be recognized until, and not to extend beyond, 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

XUM

COMMUNICATIONS RELATING TO EXPRESSIONS FROM BRITISH OFFICIALS ON LANDING OF AMERICANS ON MOON

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have been asked by the Vice President to call attention to a communication from the British Embassy addressed to the Vice President, in which communication there is conveyed to the Vice President a letter from the Right Honorable Lord Shackleton, of the British House of Lords, together with an official extract from the House of Lords' official report of July 22, 1969.

The letter to the distinguished Vice President from Lord Shackleton reads as follows:

HOUSE OF LORDS.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Today in the House of Lords I was asked by Lord St. Oswald a Private Notice Question: "Whether in view of the unique and inspiring achievement of the Moon Landing by the American Astronauts, and its importance to human history, it would be desirable for this House to convey their admiration to the Senate of the United States of America."

This suggestion was warmly supported in the Lords by Lord Jellicoe, Deputy Leader of the Conservative Party, Lord Byers, Leader of the Liberal Party, and Lord Snow, a former Minister speaking from the Labour Benches. It was clear that the proposal had enthusiastic and unanimous support in all quarters of the House and I hasten therefore to transmit this message of admiration and congratulation to you, Mr. Vice-President, in the hope that you will do us the honour of conveying this message to the United States Senate.

May I add my own personal warmest regards and admiration.

I remain,
Yours sincerely,
SHACKLETON.

The British Embassy asks that Lord Shackleton's message be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and also that the extract be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and, at the request of the distinguished Vice President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the British Embassy addressed to the Vice President, the letter addressed to the Vice President by Lord Shackleton, and the extract from the House of Lords' Official Report dated July 22, 1969, be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH EMBASSY,
Washington, D.C., July 24, 1969.

The VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: In the Ambassador's absence from Washington I should like to convey to you the attached letter from Lord Shackleton, the Leader of the House of Lords, together with an official extract from the House of Lords Official Report of 22 July, 1969.

Lord Shackleton would be most grateful if it were possible for his message and the extract to be read into the Senate Record.

Yours sincerely,
E. E. TOMPKINS.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Today in the House of Lords I was asked by Lord St. Oswald a Private Notice Question: "Whether in view of the unique and inspiring achievement of the Moon Landing by the American Astronauts, and its importance to human history, it would be desirable for this House to convey their admiration to the Senate of the United States of America."

This suggestion was warmly supported in the Lords by Lord Jellicoe, Deputy Leader of the Conservative Party, Lord Byers, Leader of the Liberal Party, and Lord Snow, a former Minister speaking from the Labour Benches. It was clear that the proposal had enthusiastic and unanimous support in all quarters of the House and I hasten therefore to transmit this message of admiration and congratulation to you, Mr. Vice-President, in the hope that you will do us the honour of conveying this message to the United States Senate.

May I add my own personal warmest regards and admiration.

I remain,
Yours sincerely,
SHACKLETON.

EXTRACT FROM HOUSE OF LORDS OFFICIAL REPORT, JULY 22, 1969

Lord ST. OSWALD. My Lords, I beg leave to ask the Question of which I have given Private Notice; namely, to ask the Leader of the House whether, in view of the unique and inspiring achievement of the moon landing by the American astronauts and its importance to human history, it would be desirable for this House to convey their admiration to the Senate of the United States of America?

Lord SHACKLETON. My Lords, I hope the House will agree that I was justified in allowing this Question on grounds of urgency and certainly in relation to timeliness. Speaking personally, I very much welcome the noble Lord's suggestion. He and I have both had a great interest in this subject for many years, so he is perhaps not surprised that I should be so much in agreement with him. Strictly speaking, this would probably be best done by a Motion on the Order Paper. On the other hand, if the House is in general agreement and there is not any dissentient voice, I would certainly be willing to make the feeling of the House known by conveying a message to the Vice President, who is the President of the Senate, to indicate our great admiration for this achievement; and I personally hope, whatever anyone may think about the best way of spending money, that this will be a real and vital unifying force for the whole of humanity.

Lord BYERS. My Lords, I am quite sure that my colleagues on these Benches would wish to be associated with the action that the noble Lord has proposed.

Earl JELLICOE. My Lords, I am certain that what the noble Lord has suggested would equally meet the feelings of all our colleagues on this side of the House in admiration for an extraordinary technical and extraordinary human performance.

Lord SNOW. My Lords, I should like to support this suggestion, if I may, speaking as one whose belief in the future of space exploration is not unqualified. Nevertheless, I suggest that this is probably the most remarkable single technological achievement yet made by man, and also an example, which is more important, of really astonishing and enduring human courage, which helps to make us feel proud for once of belonging to the same species; and I hope that this particular pride might give us the courage to attack more mundane problems, such as too little food and too many people.

Lord ST. OSWALD. My Lords, in thanking the noble Lord for his response, which does not take me entirely by surprise, I wonder whether I could add two observations which I did not think appropriate to include in the substantive Question, which I hope will be allowed by the Rules of Order: first, I should like to say how particularly and personally pleasant it is for me to have been able to address this Question to the Leader of the House in the person of the noble Lord, Lord Shackleton, knowing and sharing with him, as I do, his philosophical and cordial enthusiasm for this kind of endeavour, especially when it is crowned with triumphant success as in this case. Second, the universal nature of the achievement was most beautifully expressed some years ago in certain words, themselves a reflection of Zen Buddhism, which I beg leave to repeat: "One moon and one only is reflected in all waters, All moons in the water are one with the one moon."

Lord SHACKLETON. My Lords, I am much obliged to the noble Lord. We have gone so far out of order on this occasion, when clearly the House is tolerant in this matter, that I think I should be safe in saying that there will be no dissentient voices. I therefore greatly welcome the noble Lord's initiative. It would not be for me to discuss what the future space policy of this country should be, but I noticed yesterday in another place that at the time the astronauts blasted off from the moon there was a certain Member of Parliament quite properly called Mr. Moonman on his feet. I will certainly convey in the warmest way possible the feelings of your Lordships' House.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MISSILE TEST FACILITIES AT KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE, AND RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTH

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2546) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selective Reserve of each reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, for many weeks I have been engaged in an intensive review of President Nixon's recommendation to deploy the first phase of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system. It has been difficult to arrive at a decision on this issue because of basic disagreement among eminent scientists on the efficacy of the system itself, and because of the wide diversity of expert opinion on how deployment will affect prospects for arms limitations and a lessening of international tensions. Moreover, my study has been complicated by that fact that I do not serve on the committees which have examined these issues, and therefore have not had the benefit of hearing first-hand the testimony submitted at the hearings.

My evaluation of the testimony on the technical aspects of the ABM, and an appraisal of this Nation's history of scientific and technical accomplishments, is persuasive that a missile defense of our Minuteman sites can ful-

XUM

fill the objectives of its design. As the Armed Services Committee said in its report on this issue:

> The testing and design work on both the missile and radar components, and the computers, so far has not indicated that there are insuperable technological problems confronting the Safeguard system. It is prudent that any doubt on this question be resolved in favor of confidence in the system.

If our scientists can resolve technical problems involved in epochal achievement of landing a man on the moon, they should be able to integrate successfully the components of the ABM. Questions relating to the feasibility of other projects—most notably the hydrogen bomb and the Polaris missile—have been resolved by the scientific community. Accordingly, there is justification for the belief that our scientists and technicians can overcome any problems that may arise during deployment.

Deployment of the first phase of the system at two Minuteman sites is a logical extension of the research and development program which dates back to 1956, when the Nike-Zeus system was started. I would be constrained to oppose proposals limiting the administration to continued research and development in view of testimony that the first phase of the system is a prototype installation needed to enable the Defense Department to conduct shakedown tests and expose any problems not encountered in research and development. It is only through first-phase deployment that the system can be tested as a coordinated unit. Research and development cannot give answers to technical issues that only operational experience can provide.

In view of the intensity of opinion on this subject, I am confident that the Congress will assess the ABM situation on a continuing basis. Hopefully, with the reporting system recently announced by the Armed Services Committee, cost overruns and wastes which have occurred in the development of other defense projects can be avoided. The quarterly reports to be filed with the committee under its reporting system should provide up-to-date cost information on all weapons, and prevent recurrences of the miscalculations of the past.

One cannot deal with the question of ABM deployment solely on the basis of its technical feasibility. My consideration of whether deployment should proceed inevitably has involved the larger qeustion of the effect of Safeguard upon arms control. Initially, it seemed necessary to decide whether first-phase deployment would have an adverse effect upon the convening of discussions on arms limitations. A review of the history of the ABM has persuaded me that a favorable vote should not impede efforts to begin these talks. Soviet Premier Aleksei N. Kosygin said at a news conference in February 1967, that defensive systems, which prevent attack, are not the cause of the arms race, but constitute a factor preventing the death of people. As has been affirmed time and again during the debate on the ABM, Safeguard in no way can be considered an offensive weapon. It is intended to intercept incoming ballistic missiles fired by an aggressor, thereby protecting our deterrent. Within a week after Congress appropriated funds last year for deployment of Sentinel, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko expressed a willingness on behalf of Russia to discuss disarmament. Similar overtures were made earlier this month.

In view of Russia's reaction following the last ABM vote, and the more recent expression of interest by Mr. Gromyko, I have concluded that the Soviets, on the basis of their own utterances, cannot consider as provocative a favorable vote on the first phase of Safeguard.

In my judgment, a far more serious threat to arms limitations arises from MIRV, the offensive multiple warhead missiles being developed by both the United States and Russia. MIRV, a weapon which presents difficult on-site inspection problems, should be a top-priority matter for discussion at the forthcoming negotiations. I recognize that it is uncertain whether Russia's multiple warheads are independently targetable, but it must be assumed that it will be only a matter of time before the Soviets in fact have developed this weapon. In any event, the leadtime involved in MIRV deployment is shorter than that for Safeguard. Should the Soviet Union perfect and deploy multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles, a hard-point defense system would become absolutely necessary in this country.

A moratorium on MIRV would serve to preserve the existing second-strike capability of the United States and Russia, whereby either side could absorb an attack by the other and effectively retaliate. This situation promotes stability, because a first strike would constitute an invitation to destruction. A MIRV agreement could prevent mutual first-strike capability, whereby each side could destroy the other by firing its missiles first. Such capability would have a destabilizing effect, because the side which attacked first would win.

Because of the destabilizing effect of MIRV deployment, and because of the present absence of an agreement on testing and deployment of this system, it would seem desirable to me to support first-phase deployment of the ABM until we know the extent to which arms negotiations will be successful. If the talks lead to an acceptable agreement, it may not be necessary to proceed with further ABM deployment. On the other hand, if there is a breakdown in negotiations, or it appears they otherwise will not be productive, the United States at least will have initiated first-phase deployment of a defensive system which will provide a measure of protection against incoming ballistic missiles.

Because of the escalatory effect of MIRV, I shall support Senate resolution 211, sponsored by the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), which expresses the sense of the Senate that the President propose to Soviet Russia an immediate bilateral suspension of tests of multiple independently targetable offensive weapons, subject to national verification or such other measures of observation and inspection as may be appropriate. The resolution also provides that the United States should declare its intention to refrain from additional flight tests of multiple reentry vehicles so long as the Soviet Union does so.

Mr. President, as is obvious from my preceding remarks, I have decided to support the committee majority and vote for first-phase deployment. However, I reserve judgment on future authorizations and appropriations for the system. I shall be guided in subsequent voting by progress in arms control talks, estimates of the extent of offensive weapons deployment by Russia and China, and by evaluations of progress pertaining to both offensive and defensive weapons technology.

Proceeding with first-phase deployment may well serve the desirable purpose of providing an incentive for productive talks on arms limitations. It is a better response at the present time to the Soviet buildup than an increase in our offensive forces. First-phase deployment would serve notice only that we desire to provide a measure of protection for our deterrent force while arms talks are in progress, and give the President an additional measure of flexibility in the range of options available as a response to an attack.

It is my hope that the negotiations will be successful and it will not be necessary to proceed with subsequent phases of deployment. Because a defense of Washington is contemplated in a later phase, I have expressed to the Department of Defense my concern over planning and property acquisition for prospective ABM sites in metropolitan Washington.

Both the United States and Russia have much to gain from productive talks on arms control for both offensive and defensive weapons. The President, our Commander in Chief, is of the opinion that congressional approval of Safeguard would strengthen his hand in negotiations on arms limitations. If the United States acts unilaterally to stop deployment of defensive weapons, with the knowledge of Russia, it could encourage the Soviets to prolong talks on arms control while they continue their weapons development. Moreover, the system could guard against accidental or irrational attack upon our strategic forces, and provide a measure of protection in the event of a nuclear ultimatum.

I recognize there is a great division of opinion in the Senate on this issue, and respect the deep conviction which has motivated those on either side of the debate. It would seem desirable to me for the Senate to express its intent to proceed with a measured deployment of ABM, with a willingness to cease further offensive and defensive nuclear weapons development if the Soviet Union will do likewise.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPONG. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I have had the pleasure of serving in this body with the distinguished Senator from Virginia, and serving on committees with him, and wish to congratulate him on his talk. I think he has made a very careful analysis of the problems we face, of the situation vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, of our prospective problems in the seventies, and of the question of arms limitation talks with the Soviets.

I think his conclusions, particularly with respect to the deployment of the ABM, are certainly shared by many. The question of what we should do with respect to the MIRV has, of course, still not been fully debated in this body. It would involve the question of the Poseidon, and would involve title III and a few other things of that kind, on which research and development have already gone forward. But I suspect we will be into that at some length after we finish the debate on the pending measure. Meanwhile, I simply wish to express my thanks to the Senator for his careful consideration of the situation, and I welcome his support on behalf of the ABM.

Mr. SPONG. I thank the Senator from Colorado. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock on Monday morning next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 28, 1969, at 11 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, July 25, 1969:

U.S. Air Force

Gen. John P. McConnell, FR611 (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code.

Gen. John D. Ryan, FR1418 (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be appointed as Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, for a period of 4 years beginning August 1, 1969, under the provisions of section 8034, title 10, of the United States Code.

Lt. Gen. Seth J. McKee, FR4279 (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade of general, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code.

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code:

In the grade of general

Lt. Gen. John C. Meyer, FR4496 (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Jack J. Catton, FR4719 (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

In the grade of lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Harry E. Goldsworthy, FR1631, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John W. Vogt, Jr., FR8709, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Timothy F. O'Keefe, FR4608, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. George S. Boylan, Jr., FR4836, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. George B. Simler, FR9236, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. David C. Jones, FR9887, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Paul K. Carlton, FR8693, Regular Air Force.

The following officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the U.S. Air Force, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of sections 8218, 8351, 8363, and 8392, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be brigadier general

Col. Clarence E. Atkinson, FG751239, Delaware Air National Guard.

Col. William J. Crisler, FG822388, Mississippi Air National Guard.

Col. Jack Motes, FG1180275, California Air National Guard.

Col. Earl C. Pate, Jr., FG781393, Tennessee Air National Guard.

U.S. Army

The following-named officer, under the provision of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. William Joseph McCaffrey, O22065, U.S. Army.

Lt. Gen. Richard Giles Stilwell, O21065, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), for appointment as senior U.S. Army member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 711.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list, in grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Harry William Osborn Kinnard, O21990, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. George Irvin Forsythe, O24510, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

In the Navy

Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy for a term of 2 years.

Vice Adm. Kleber S. Masterson, U.S. Navy, and Rear Adm. Robert J. Stroh, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral when retired, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Rear Adm. C. Edwin Bell, Jr., U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

D.C. Court of General Sessions

William S. Thompson, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the District of Columbia court of general sessions for the term of 10 years.

In the Air Force

The nominations beginning LaVerne F. Huston, to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Donald C. Zartner, to be 2d lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 1969; and

The nominations of Col. William R. Jarrell, Jr., to be Registrar, U.S. Air Force Academy, and Richard H. White, to be 2d lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 15, 1969.

In the Army

The nominations beginning Claude W. Abate, to be captain, and ending James E. Robert, Jr., to be captain, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 26, 1969; and

The nominations beginning Jimmie B. Kinder, to be major, and ending Dwight Williams, Jr., to be 2d lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 10, 1969; and

The nominations beginning Glenn E. Nida, to be colonel, and ending Gerald D. Cox, to be 2d lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 18, 1969.

In the Marine Corps

The nominations beginning Hugh E. Loftin, to be captain, and ending Wayne M. Wynkoop, to be 1st lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 26, 1969; and

The nominations beginning Garland S. Bishop, to be 2d lieutenant, and ending Bruce M. Windsor, to be 2d lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 2, 1969.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ADDRESS BY GOV. MILLS E. GODWIN, JR., OF VIRGINIA

HON. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25, 1969

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, last Friday it was my pleasure to attend Virginia Night at the National Press Club along with our Governor, the Honorable Mills E. Godwin, Jr., several other members of the Virginia congressional delegation, and numerous civic and industrial leaders from our State.

The division of industrial development, Virginia Travel Service, the Virginia Ports Authority, the departments of agriculture and commerce, and the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce all joined together to arrange an outstanding meal featuring Virginia dishes and a variety of door prizes reflecting the best in our State's resorts and products. Governor Godwin was the principal speaker of the evening and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the speech

XUM

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY GOV. MILLS E. GODWIN, JR., VIRGINIA NIGHT, NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, JULY 18, 1969

I understand some of you who live across the river had a little difficulty getting to the press club tonight, and I am sorry. We have spent nearly $200,000,000 in the last five years to correct that situation, but there seems to be some hold up here on The Hill.

If we could just persuade a few more Congressional committee chairmen to move to Virginia and drive to work every day, I think you would get the Three Sisters Bridge in no time at all.

I think I know some folks who can sympathize with you. They have just had a little difficulty trying to get into the Governor's Mansion.

Everyone in politics understands that the entire political process and everyone in it is always fair game for jokes, but I think we understand too that when all is said and done, this is the way we choose our leaders in America, and nobody has yet figured out a better way.

There may be more efficient ways and less costly ways. There certainly must be ways that are easier on the candidates. Those of you who have followed campaigns at one time or another come to appreciate that in terms of sheer stamina, there is nothing more demanding than the campagin trail, and probably nothing that produces more heartbreak.

A man pushes himself and his staff to the point of pure exhaustion. If he loses, he has to put on a smile. If he wins, he finds that the job is far more complicated and far more difficult than he ever imagined.

I don't want to be mistaken for a political analyst, but I think the primary results have a certain significance to what is happening in Virginia today.

For the first time that I can remember, the voters in the primary were given a choice among various shades of political philosophies.

Some of the candidates didn't accept labels as "conservative," or "moderate" or "liberal," but I think by and large the voters did.

Obviously, personalities are going to enter into any politiical campaign, and I take that factor into account in my conclusions.

But to me, it is plain that the political center in Virginia continues in a moderate position. At the same time, I think the vote demonstrated that Virginia is looking more to the future than to the past.

We realize that this is the twentieth century, and that Virginia's new place in that century is enhanced by our high traditions of the earlier years which give added flavor and substance and balance to current accomplishments.

This is true in politics. It is true in state and local government. It is true on our city streets. It is true on our college campuses.

For the state as a whole, I think it is significant that there has been unrest and violence and political upheaval to the north of us, to the south of us and to the west of us, but Virginia is one state on the Eatsern Seaboard that has not had to call out the National Guard for civil disturbance of one kind or another.

It is one state where protesting college students have come to the capitol with their hair cut and wearing coats and ties.

On the other side of the coin, we have a record of sound progress in race relations, in integration in our schools and colleges and boards and commissions and public bodies that will compare with any state in the South and many other states in the nation.

We have doubled the student population at our state institutions of higher learning in five years. We have built half of a statewide system of community colleges that will eventually reach our entire college age population.

We have built more than half of our interstate highway mileage and a third of a supplementary state-financed arterial four-lane system. We have begun a program to triple the number of state parks and recreation areas and we have passed new laws governing clean air and clean water.

And we have done these things without major turbulence and without a great chorus of protest.

There is nothing special about that record. There is no extra credit due our elected officials or our law enforcement men or our college administrators, although I think they have done a good job.

We have our dissidents and our militants and our extremists just as other states do.

But I think that our record is a positive expression of a respect for tradition.

I would admit to you that there are some expressions of Virginia traditions that are not so positive, but we're not talking about them.

There is just no doubt that Yorktown and Jamestown and Williamsburg are still the spiritual center of Virginia, even if you count the Tenth Congressional District.

We have talked so much about them that we believe in them and in what they stand for, and I think it is a good thing that we do.

You understand that everything happened first in Virginia, so we have more experience to learn from than any other state.

One thing we have learned in Virginia is that we have some catching up and some keeping up to do, and as usual, we are falling back on Thomas Jefferson.

We have invoked his spirit for years in certain political connections, but it turns out he is just as helpful in promoting education.

I am not so sure what he would have thought of the sales tax, or of our recent bond issue, but he did borrow money for the Louisiana Purchase.

I don't suppose that I have contributed a great deal tonight to your understanding of Virginia politics, but you can take some comfort from the fact that not very many people do understand it.

What all of us who have taken part have tried to do is to give you a sample of Virginia hospitalitiy, including some handsome door prizes, for which we all have to thank the Virginia industries and attractions that made them possible.

In these remarks, I have simply tried to say that Viriginians are alive to the necessities of progress, that they do understand and appreciate the material and social emergence of the South, but that they are equally aware of tradition, of integrity, of the necessity for law and order and for justice.

Whoever her leaders may be in future years, Virginia will continue to progress, but she will not go overboard in any respect.

I thank you all for coming, and I thank the board and the management for permitting us to enjoy this evening with so many of the interpretive and inquisitive minds and the attractive wives of The National Press Club.

A PRAYER FOR ASTRONAUTS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the prayers and hopes of people all over the world went with the astronauts on their historic trip to the moon.

"A Prayer for Astronauts" written by Ed King was recently broadcast over station KDKA in Pittsburgh, Pa., on "Party Line," a program featuring Ed King and his wife Wendy.

I call the attention of my colleagues to this prayer and submit it for the RECORD at this time:

A PRAYER FOR ASTRONAUTS

You, up there, known and praised by a thousand different tongues, called a thousand different sacred names and titles, we come again to ask another favor.

Ah, we have asked so many; for your blessings on our angry crusades; for your approval of our unholy causes; asking special privileges for our selfish motives; demanding that you align with *our* cause; spewing ultimatums to the skies; and shaking our fists at your heavens.

We come again, for this time we prepare to explore the space that surrounds us, and examine the wonders you created. Earthbound man is heading into those heavens that have so long enchanted us.

We, your children, who have so long feared the night and welcomed the dawn. We, who have felt the tidal pulse within ourselves, felt the seas roll and the waves crash, and looked with awe at that night light you bequeathed us.

How long have we read into that moon portents and omens! That it runs red with war, predicts tomorrow, maddens the mind and causes hounds to bay.

Now, we are going there. No, not we, just three men; three test pilots who have long outflown death through the upper reaches.

We send them on a mission of good will—the greatest will. For now we embark on a voyage not for trade nor conquest nor plunder nor glory. Not like those explorers of before who sailed to steal or sell or gain or enslave, we seek no land, no gold, no riches and no ravishment.

The banner we carry bears not the insignia of the warrior's fist but the human question mark. And that first foot that touches the revolving jewel in the night sky is not the conqueror's heel but the innocent footstep of the seeker after knowledge. We come not to shout "this is mine!" but to ask "What are we?"

Three of us, three intrepid children outfitted with what knowledge we can give them and what tools we can devise are off on this peaceful adventure. A mission of curiosity, of good intent and hopeful purpose.

Smile upon it, and them.

How long their journey! How vast the distances! How infinite the unknown space! We hope we on earth have done all we can do for our three voyagers.

Please, you, who knows the sparrow's fall, hold them safely in the hollow of your hand.

HOW USEFUL IS THE MOON?

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the July 28, 1969, issue of U.S. News & World Report contains excerpts from a new book entitled "U.S. On the Moon—What It Means to Us." Because of the importance of our future national space activity and the outstanding success of man's first landing on the moon I am including this significant article in the RECORD:

XUM

HOW USEFUL IS THE MOON? A PRACTICAL ANSWER

Of what use is the moon? Can man colonize it, mine it for hidden riches, use it for a military base? Answers to these questions are among many given in a 256-page book, "U.S. on the Moon—What It Means to Us," just published by "Books by U.S. News & World Report." Here are excerpts from one of the book's 12 illustrated chapters—this one entitled "Our Lunar Base":

Getting sufficiently established on the moon to do extensive exploration and research will be as difficult as getting there in the first place.

In the initial years of moon exploration, landing vehicles will serve as shelters, scientific laboratories, living quarters, and radio stations. In far years ahead, visitors to the moon will work in underground stations covered over by the moon's surface material to shield them from heat and cold.

Provided an atmospheric cocoon, the inhabitants of these stations will be able to live in comfort, moving in air-pressurized tunnels through an underground network of laboratories. Dressed in pressurized space suits, they will go above ground for excursions of days or weeks into the lunar badlands.

The stations may well be international colonies, much like scientific stations in the Antarctic. . . .

The exploration for usable natural resources in the moon's crust will begin early. Perhaps these will be gold or diamonds, but moon explorers will be far happier if they find water or substances they can use for rocket fuel.

Water is needed not only for drinking, but for cooling electrical equipment, for heating and air conditioning, and for growing food. The electrical generating devices called fuel cells used in manned space vehicles produce some water. They generate electricity through a chemical reaction between hydrogen and oxygen, and water is a by-product.

Permanent moon stations will probably require nuclear power plants because they can generate large amounts of electricity over long periods with a very small amount of uranium or plutonium fuel.

It is possible that there is water on the moon. If, for example, the moon was once a part of the earth, it could have taken a huge amount of water with it when it was spun away. If it passed very near the earth and was captured, its gravity could have siphoned water away from the earth's oceans. Today the moon's gravity, weak as it is, is still strong enough to pull the earth's seas and oceans, thereby causing our tides.

Some scientists believe that there is a layer of ice—like permafrost in the Arctic—not far beneath the moon's surface, insulated well enough that it does not melt under the searing midday sun. Others have suggested that there is boiling water deep within the moon, and that even today steam is escaping through lunar fissures. This suggests the possibility of steam-powered, steam-heated and cooled moon colonies.

Or it may be possible to extract water from the moon's rocks. Scientists have detected evidence of sulphur at some places on the moon's surface. On earth, sulphur is invariably associated with water-bearing rocks. But to extract water from the rock itself will require enormous sources of energy.

Bizarre schemes have been suggested. One idea is to place huge, metal-foil mirrors at places in space called "libration points," where the gravity of the earth and the gravity of the moon are balanced. Theoretically, objects placed at these points would remain there, drifting neither toward the earth nor toward the moon. Giant mirrors so located would require only tiny control jets to keep them oriented so they could concentrate and focus the sunlight on a desired point on the moon. That would drive the temperature as high as 800 degrees, enough to chemically break down the rocks, making it possible to capture their water.

Growing food on the moon is an especially interesting problem. What we call moon soil may be extremely poor or void of plant nutrients, but we might turn to a science called "hydroponics" to produce vegetables.

Years ago, scientists found they could grow plants without soil. The technique involves using tanks filled with chemically treated water. Wire-mesh screens are placed over the surface of the water and covered with rocks or cinders. Such materials merely hold the plants in place; the roots stick down into the water and grow there. Some plants flourish this way, producing more and better fruit than they do growng in rich soil. . . .

Until ways are found to develop resources on the moon, explorers will have to make more and more efficient use of what they have. Even human waste materials will have to be carefully saved. Some of it, urine for example, will be treated to extract fresh drinking water.

The successful search for sources of oxygen or hydrogen would be as important as the discovery of usable water on the moon. This would raise the possibility of one day refueling rockets on the moon for their return trip to earth, or even for missions deeper into the solar system. . . .

As we look ahead to the time when man will establish himself as a resident of the moon, we might ask about the moon's potential for military uses. Can operations on the surface of the moon do anything to enhance our national security back on earth?

In the early days of the space age, there were real fears that the Soviet Union's lead would enable the Russians to establish control of the moon. When any potential adversary can operate in an environment where we cannot, it is a matter of great concern to military planners.

Now, an international treaty, signed by both the United States and the Soviet Union, forbids placing weapons in space or on the moon. It also prohibits a country from making territorial claims on the moon.

From a technical viewpoint, it would be possible to establish missile-launching pads on the moon to send bombs against targets on earth. The best insurance we have against this happening is the moon's great distance from us. If an intercontinental missile were fired at the United States from the Soviet Union, we might have no more than 15 minutes' warning, because the approaching warhead is shielded from radar detection by the horizon until it is in the latter phase of its flight.

On the other hand, a missile launched from the moon to the earth could probably be detected two or three days before arrival, giving time for defensive missiles to be launched to intercept it in space.

By the same token, it offers no advantage to use the moon for spying on earth when this can be done infinitely better by satellites in low earth orbit. Looking at the earth from the moon one cannot see evidence that our planet is inhabited. But satellites in earth orbit can even spot missile sites and detect rocket firings.

Satellites can be placed in stationary orbits so they observe the same point on the earth's surface all the time. At an altitude of some 23,300 miles, such satellites travel around the earth in the same time it takes the earth to turn on its axis; the result is that the satellite stays in the same place in relation to landmarks on earth.

Such constant surveillance can never be possible on the moon, even if some magical devices could be built which would allow observation of small objects. A given area on the earth would be in view only half the time because of the earth's rotation.

Nevertheless, weapons on the moon could have blackmail potential, just as a nuclear power could intimidate other nations by placing a bomb in earth orbit. It might be psychologically intimidating.

As for nonmilitary aspects, scientists have planned an exhaustive search for any evidence of life. They would be most surprised if they found any, but the possibility cannot be altogether discounted. If there is not life in the form of viruses or bacteria, there might conceivably be molecules left over from the process of life formation on earth. . . .

If the possibility of finding some crude form of life on the moon is farfetched, the idea of using the moon as the site for exciting new astronomical laboratories is not.

Just as the atmosphere filters out most of the radiation sent our way by the sun, it forms an opaque window which lets us see only a little of the energy coming from the stars. So, despite the advances of modern astronomy, scientists still have to do a great deal of guesswork about the characteristics of stars and their life and death.

In recent years, some of the most exciting discoveries of science have come from the field of radio astronomy. Gigantic telescopes which collect radio energy are making it possible to study the universe in an entirely new way.

But radio telescopes miles in diameter are needed to really take advantage of the opportunity to study the noise from the stars. It is difficult to find sites for such laboratories because of their susceptibility to interference from electronic equipment on earth. The back side of the moon is an ideal place. Protected from all interference, a radio telescope could gather information unobtainable either on earth or in earth orbit. Here again, the low gravity on the moon would offer an advantage. It would be possible to put up a gigantic receiver like a child's erector set. The structure could be built without the massive support required on earth, where gravity would make it topple.

In recent years, astronomers have discovered objects called quasars which seem to be so far away that their radiation we are now receiving was emitted before the solar system was formed. Even now they appear to be moving away from us at velocities approaching the speed of light.

Radio energy is being studied from other objects called pulsars, which seem to be extremely small, yet generate incredible amounts of energy. They send out pulses so accurately timed that when they were first discovered it seemed that they might be intricate radio signals from another civilization somewhere.

Our lunar base, then, will extend our vision and hearing so we may perceive a greater part of the universe than has ever before been apparent. At the same time, it will enable us to look back closer than ever toward the day of creation.

COINS OR TOKENS?

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, a few Members of Congress and a few others in the Treasury Department have said recently that there is no reason why our coins should continue to have silver in them. And so, it is being suggested that we take silver out of the half-dollar. Indeed, if the Government starts minting "silver dollars" again, there are those who would have us do so without the use of any precious metal whatsoever.

Columnist Alice Widener wrote about

XUM

this recently. She says that our currency is already so debased that it constitutes little more than tokens for laundromats and coke machines. Miss Widener makes some very good points as to what is happening to our monetary system, and I would like to include her article at this point in the RECORD:

OUR CURRENCY SO DEBASED THAT COINS BECOME MERE TOKENS

(By Alice Widener)

NEW YORK.—Ever come home from abroad with a pocketful of petty cash in small coins of foreign lands? The only thing to do with the ersatz pieces of metal alloy is to put them away for a return trip some day to where you came from, or else give them to the kids at home to play store with. The alloy coins aren't money outside the borders of the land that minted them.

Well, now our American dimes, quarters and fifty-cent pieces are going to be play money anywhere except inside the U.S.A. Our Treasury Department—which all during the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations created a lollapalooza of a credibility gap by stating again and again that it had no silver shortage—has announced there will be no more silver in U.S. coins.

Without precious metal, our coins are nothing but tokens for laundromats and subways, Coke machines and parking meters. We'll have only what I described in a column of April 11, 1967, as "push button money."

This month, Irene Eigler, secretary of a prominent attorney in Tampa wrote to me:

"Among my collection of newspaper clippings is an article you wrote in the Tampa Tribune on January 7, 1965: 'Silver Cutback in Coins Means One Thing: Devaluation.' I also saved Sylvia Porter's article in which she countered with the statement that our currency is not backed by any precious metal but by faith. I came to this country in 1951 as an immigrant from Germany. My parents lost their savings in the two devaluations of the mark. America has been very good to me; yet I am watching with growing concern what is happening in the U.S.A., of which I have been a citizen for many years."

In reference to the foregoing letter and also as a warning to readers, permit me to say again that demonetized coins—that is, coins without silver or gold—are devalued coins. They are not money in the sense that they are not freely convertible into currency of other lands.

It is important for us, the victimized American people, to know who is responsible for demonetizing our coins and making it necessary for us to jingle only push button tokens in our pockets. The villians are not greedy business men or private bankers; they are not stock market speculators or millionaires.

The villains are the New Economists who persuaded Franklin D. Roosevelt and succeeding American Presidents that they could spend and spend the taxpayers' money for every giveaway and adventure, at home and abroad, because when the U.S. Government piles debt on debt, "We only owe it to ourselves."

Here at home, from now on, we may have "faith" in an alloy two-bits. But try and hand one out as payment for a tiny trifle across our borders! Nobody else will have two-bits worth of "faith" in our coins.

During the Johnson Administration, the New Economists had their way and removed all gold backing from our paper dollars, claiming they could be demonetized and still be as good as gold. I hope they are. But we had better support the Nixon Administration's serious efforts to halt inflation in our country.

Otherwise, the U.S. dollar will be devalued this year when the British pound is devalued again and other foreign currencies are revalued. Besides, President Nixon can't undo all the damage done to our currency by his wildly extravagant predecessors. All he can do now is try to lessen the devastating effects of their debasement of our currency.

PFC. PETER F. McLAUGHLIN KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, Army Pfc. Peter F. McLaughlin, a brave young man from Hazelwood, was recently killed serving his country in Vietnam.

I wish to honor his memory and commend his courage and valor, by placing in the RECORD the following article:

PFC. PETER F. MCLAUGHLIN

Army Pfc. Peter F. McLaughlin, son of Mr. and Mrs. Regis D. McLaughlin of 420 Flowers Avenue, Hazelwood, Pennsylvania, was killed after serving 10 months in the Army, four of which were with the 4th Division of the 12th Infantry in Vietnam.

Pfc. McLaughlin a graduate of Central Catholic was 20 years old July 7th. He had worked at Jones and Laughlin Steel Corp. before entering the Army.

Beside his parents, he is survived by three brothers and five sisters.

XUM

69

in

ued
ued
re-
ado
his
ean
ef-
.

s

fc.
ng
ied

m-
ng

of
420
nia,
the
vi-

ral
had
rp.

ree

XUM